Epistemic Modality in Angkola Language: A Semantic Prespective

Muhammad Dalimunte and Robert Sibararni

Universitas Sumatera Utara (USU) Indonesia
prosmunte_71@yahoo.co.id

ABSTRACT

This study is about epistemic modality in Angkola language. The language is one of local languages in South Tapanuli of North Sumatera– Indonesia. The problems investigated in this study are : what modality makers of epistemic are in Angkola language, and how the modality markers give meaning in Angkola language. The research design is descriptive method with qualitative approach. The research location is Bunga Bondar a village of Sipirok district in South Tapanuli. The research data are spoken and written language. The spoken language is taken from the informants, The number of informants are decided by using purposive sampling. The other data source is a folklore written in Angkola language. The method for data collection uses interview, and document analysis of the folklore written in Angkola language, after the data analysis is done by applying the theory of Miles and Huberman (there were three steps Data reduction, Data display, and Conclusion drawing/verification), It has been found that the modality markers of epistemic are modals and non modals (lexical), the modality markers express how the speakers' attitude to propositions that he/she stated

Key words: Angkola language, modality, modality markers, epistemic modality.

1. INTRODUCTION

This article is a study about epistemic modality in Angkola language, it is one of the local languages in South Tapanuli of North Sumatera – Indonesia. Angkola language is used in some areas of South Tapanuli but the language was affected by other language such as Indonesian, Javanese and Batak Toba language in some of the areas. There is a village where the original language can be found which the language is still not yet affected by other languages. The village was found in Sipirok district of South

Tapanuli in North Sumatera -Indonesia, the village is Bunga Bondar. In this village the societies are still using the language in daily interaction, wedding ceremony and the other custom activities.

This study is crucial to exist the local language. The local language users in Indonesia tend to be decreased. As the matter of fact the decreasing of language users can be affected by the movement of society from the village and doing intermarriage. The people who move to other town and who got married with different ethnic tend to speak Indonesian or the language used in the area. This phenomena may cause a language death, these prove that the study of Angkola language is very important to be done by bachelors or the researchers of Indonesia. Angkola language as one of the local languages in Indonesia should be protected from the extinction because it is not only as cultural wealth of Indonesia but a collective identity of an ethnic group as well.

2. RELATED LITERATURE
2.1 Epistemic Modality
Epistemic is one of the modalities recognized by logicians. It is quite relevant to language in general. The epistemic modality relate to how the speakers' assumption of possibilities on truth of statement. The term epistemic is derived from episteme, the Greek word for knowledge; however the key concept which underlines modality seems to be the state lack of knowledge.[1] It is similar to the view of Coates, in his book was stated that the epistemic indicates the speaker's confidence (or lack of confidence) in the truth of the proposition expressed.[2] The other linguist Palmer said epistemic modality indicates the status of the proposition in terms of the speakers' degree of commitment to it, [3] while Halliday said that[epistemic modality]… is the speaker's assessment of probability and predictability. It is external to the content, being a part of the attitude taken up by the speaker: his attitude, in this case, towards his own speech role as 'declarer.[4] Another comprehending stated that epistemics are clausal – scope indicators of a speaker's commitment to the truth of proposition.[5] The epistemic modality expresses the confidence measures of the speakers' utterances. It is similar to the sense of evidentiality that represents a diminished belief in the truth of the statement, in terms of this discussion Palmer describes evidentiality is part of the epistemic modal system. He explores a large discussion and sums up by stating

---

[1] see Perkins, Michael R. 1983. Modal Expression in English. New York: Ablex.p.10
[2] See Coates, Jenniver.1983. The semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries. London: Croom Helm.p.18
[3] See Palmer, F.R. 1986. Mood and Modality. New York: Cambridge University Press.p.45-46
[4] See Halliday, M. A. K. 1970. Functional Diversity in Language as Seen from consideration of Modality and Mood in English. Foundation of Language.p.349
[5] See Bybee, J., Fleisch, S. 1995. Modality in Grammar and discourse: An Introductory essay, Amterdam :Benjamin.p.6

both evidentiality and epistemic modality deal with the degree of commitment on the part of the speaker to the utterances. Regarding the possible truth of speakers' utterances, Palmer denotes there are at least four ways in which a speaker may indicate that he is not presenting what she is said as a fact, but rather: (a) that he is speculating about it, (b) that he is presenting it a deduction, (c) that he has been told about it, (d) that he is a matter only of appearances, based on the evidence of possible senses.[6] All the four points above indicate the speaker's lack of commitment or lack of confidence in the truth of the proposition being expressed. According to Palmer's thought, type (a) denotes pure epistemic modality, while (b, c, and d) deal with evidentiality, namely inference, hearsay, and sensory evidence. Another view about epistemic in the notions of Bybee, et al. correlates with indirect evidential, they said the indirect evidentiality indicates that the speaker has only indirect knowledge concerning with the proposition being asserted, implies that the speaker is not totally committed to the truth of that proposition and thus implies an epistemic value.[7] The information given by a speaker without any real facts will be expressed by using epistemic modality and it will really show how the speaker's attitude to the proposition.

2.1.1 Epistemic Possibility

Epistemic possibility is a possibility based on a speaker's opinion and his attitude to a proposition. It can be noted by using may and can. Coates stated that can has core meaning ability or permission and possibility (epistemic meaning), while may has core meaning permission, it has epistemic meaning (possibility).[8] Further Coates places the basic meaning in core part and epistemic meaning in peripheral part. Based on the categories, he also notes basic meaning as core meaning and epistemic meaning as peripheral meaning.

According to Coates, the difference between possibility and ability can be investigated based on the gradience of inherency, and gradience of restriction can be used to distinguish "possibility" and "Permission". The gradience of inherency denotes that can shows ability, it is identified by three characteristics; (a). Subject is animate, (b). Verb is agentive, (c). The possible action is defined by characteristic of subject inherency. The following part will discuss deeply about epistemic possibility of may and can.

a. The Modal May.

The epistemic modality may is used to express root possibility, May is also used in

---

[6] See Palmer, F.R. 1986. Mood and Modality. New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 51

[7] See Bybee, Joan., Perkins, Revere and Pagliuca, William. 1994. The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Language of The world. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.p.180

[8] See Coates, Jenniver.1983. The semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries. London: Croom Helm.p.14

more formal context when we compare with can. May is more commonly used to express epistemic possibility, that is, to express the speaker's lack of confidence in the truth of the proposition.

(1) Wafi : Have you got a pen? Farhan : I may have one. (=' it's possible that I have one) Can can not be submitted for may in this meaning " I can have one" Can is most commonly used to express "Root possibility". Can= 'Root Possibility' means 'nihil obstat', as True comprehensive education can be achieved only when parents, teachers and children work as a team. [9] If we use it in negative example means ' not nihil obstat', but it does not mean 'nothing prevents', there is still 'something prevents'. The following example is taken from Coates' notions :

(2) You can't see him because he is having lunch with a publisher (i.e. 'his having lunch with a publisher prevents you from seeing him').[10]

b. The Modal Can
The meaning of can is usually discussed under the three convenient headings 'permission', 'possibility' and 'ability'. The function of modal can is discussed as. First, it will be described can as Permission and continued illustrating the gradient of restriction. When it has been discussed, it will be continued discussing about can as ability then continued to the gradient of inherency. The modal can as permission is illustrated in the following example:

(3) Mother says to her daughter "you can go with your friend".

(4) He can keep studying in the university because he has paid his school fee. [11]
All the examples above show the meaning of can as Possibility. They have the following characteristics: (a) Subject is animate, (b) Verb is agentive' (c) utterance can be paraphrased with the word " permitted" or "allowed". These first two characteristics (3) and (4) are a reminder that granting permission has much in common with imposing obligation, all such personal directive are governed by the addressee based condition that the speaker must believe that the addressee is able to carry out.

The third characteristic does not specify the course of the authority to grant with hold permission. In the case of example (4) it is the university and in the case of (3) The subject alone (mother).

i. Can as permission
Can (Permission) is related to can (Possibility) through the gradient of restriction.[12] The modal 'Can' can be seen as implying a universe of possible world, ranging from

---

[9] See Coates, Jenniver.1983. The semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries. London: Croom Helm.p.98

[10] See Coates, Jenniver.1983. The semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries. London: Croom Helm.p.96

[11] See Coates, Jenniver.1983. The semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries. London: Croom Helm.p.86

[12] Lyons, J.1977. Semantics, Volume 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University. p.28

the most restricted (where human laws and rules are in force) to the least restricted (where everything is permitted except what is contrary to so-called natural laws).

At one end of the gradient, that is, at the one core, a paraphrase with "allow" of permit is more acceptable, while at the other end, that is, at periphery, a paraphrase with possible is more acceptable, but there is no non arbitrary way to draw the line between "permission" and 'possibility': paraphrase with "possible" are acceptable for utterances referring to restricted as well as to unrestricted world. The following example will illustrate this.

(5) You can take your salary now. (personal authority)

(6) You can't drive your car because you haven't got a driver license. (law)

(7) There are three answers they can give. (rules and regulations)

(8) We can't expect him to leave his customers. (Reasonableness)

(9) How, then can I help the man who always makes me disappointed. (ethical/moral).[13] Based on the function of 'Can' in the above example it can be illustrated that example (6) denotes the case of "possibility" and refers to unrestricted world, while example (5), (6) and (7) all refer to restricted worlds, and they would paraphrased with "permit" and "allow". Further, the example (8) and (9) refer to restricted world they would be more acceptably paraphrased by "possible".

ii. Can as Ability
The use of modal "Can" as the previous functions as have been discussed, it also has other functions as referring "ability". The following examples give illustration about the use of the modal "Can"

(10) I can walk all the way to the place.

(11) I can only type very slowly as I am quite beginner. These two examples have the following characteristic (a) subject is animate and has agentive function; (b) verb denotes action /activity; (c) the possibility of the action is determined by inherent properties of the subject (this includes what the subject has learnt – example (11).

A more distinction between Can "ability" and other meaning can be seen in the three 'covert aspects'. All modals are stative (refer to a state of possibility, ability etc.) but the main predication can have one of three aspects: (i). It can refer to an event (dynamic aspect), (ii). it can refer to state (stative aspect) or (ii). it can refer to a habit (iterative aspect).

iii. Can as possibility
As we see in the preceding explanation that Can has different function based on context, The use of Can has semantically three functions. They are illustrated in the following example:

(12) I can do it = **Permission** - human authority /rules and regulations allow me to do it.

(13) I can do it = **Possibility** - External circumstances allow me

---

[13] Lyons, J.1977. Semantics, Volume 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University.p.28

(14) I can do it = **Ability**- Inherent properties allow me to [14] The three – way distinction is nicely demonstrated by the interrogative use of Can, which question the "enabling" circumstances, but when we say " Can I smoke in here?" it is a question the authority of the addressee or the local rules and regulations, as to the permissibility of smoking. The following is Interrogative examples involving 'ability' Can question the addressee's innate capabilities;

(15) Can you swim ? This is included such examples in the "ability" group is justified by B's response here, which clearly indicates personal ability, not external circumstances. Interrogative example involving "possibility" Can questions the existence of enabling (or disabling) circumstances. The addressee will often expand his/her yes/no response to spell these out, let's see the following example:

(16) A. Can you go with me to have lunch? B. No. My professor ask me to meet him at one o'clock (Paraphrased: the meeting with professor at one make it impossible / probably). The action in the example (16) denotes that an external circumstances (meeting with professor) affects the event to take place, the other use of Can, Can = Possibility where no external circumstances effects.

2.1.2 Epistemic Necessity (certainty)

The epistemic must conveys the speaker's confidence in the truth of what he is saying, based on logical process of deduction from fact known by him (which may or may not be specified).

(17) The guests must be more than that I am sure, because he has invited so many people. In (17) notes that the speaker's confidence is overtly expressed (and includes the harmonic phrases I'm sure), and the reason for his confidence is given explicitly ('because …'). Quirk et al. claims that must possesses necessity meaning that based on logical necessity. It can be seen in the following example:

(18) There must be some mistakes

(19) You must be feeling tired

(20) The young man must have a lot of money According to Quirk at al., must in (18), (19), (20) have meaning of epistemic necessity because it denotes the speaker's judgment on his proposition, in (20) The speaker knows the young man lives in a big house and has a beautiful car so he uses modal must to express his confidence that Young man must have a lot of money or he must be rich [15]. The following examples also denote that modal 'must' expresses speaker confidence on the proposition.

(21) They must be telling lies (It's certain that they are telling lies).

3. METHOD AND PROCEDURES

The research design of this study was descriptive method with qualitative approach.

---

[14] See Coates, Jenniver.1983. The semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries. London: Croom Helm.p.93

[15] See Quirk, R, Sidney Greenbaum, Geofrey Leech, and J. Svarvik. 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of English Language, London: Longman.p.24

This research exposed systematic description of the phenomenon in the language world in order to give the explanatory adequacy about the modality in Angkolanese. The procedures for data collection were done by interviewing the informants. The number of informants was decided by using purposive sampling. They were two custom figures and other four villagers who are also the native speakers of the language. The other data were taken from a folklore written in Angkolanese "Halilian: Sipirok Bango-Bango".

The research location was a village in South Tapanuli of North Sumatera province –Indonesia, the village is Bunga Bobdar located in Sipirok district.

The technique for data analysis applied an interactive analysis. This interactive analysis consists of three flows namely; Data reduction, Data display, and Conclusion drawing/verification[16]

4. DATA ANALISIS

The data analysis was done by reducing the gathered data from the research field, the clauses which did not have modal operators or non modals (lexical) as modality expression was excluded. The clauses which contained modality expression were displayed and classified based on the sub categories of epistemic modality. The process of identifying the clauses are as below:

4.1 Epistemic Probability

The epistemic possibility in Angkola language are expressed in the following clause

(1) **Arokku**, ima mambaen si tigor sai parkohom-kohom [**I think**, it - make - Tigor - to be - calm] 'I think, it makes Tigor to be calm'. The   lexical   aro/naro   in arokku (I think) denotes that the speaker has knowledge pertaining to the spoken persons (Tigor), it is denoted by word **ima (that is / it)**, the speaker did judgment even he is not sure about the truth of the proposition he expressed. His attitude to the proposition was described by the lexical aro/naro in arokku (I think). The use of lexical aro/naro in arokku as modality marker as in (1) distinguishes from aro/naro in arokku in (2)

(2) Bahat do **arokku** halahi dapotan (hepeng), umak ni si Siti, umak ni Amir [Much - **I think** -they - got (money), Siti's mother- Amir's mother] 'I   think   they (Siti's and Amir's mother) have got much money''

(3) Anggo inda copat diharejoi paret na tuppati, **arokku** nakkan nabanjir do huta on [If-not quick-done-waterworks- gagged, I think - wiil– flood -this village] 'If   the gagged waterwork is not diged, **I think** this village will be flood'

The lexical aro/noro (think) in arokku (I think) in (2, 3) denotes that the possibility of the event takes place. In (2) the speaker just guesses that the event will take place without the information he gets (bahat do alai na dapotan (hepeng)/the got much money, and in (3), the subject of the sentence (paret na tuppati/ the gagged

---

[16] See Miles, Mathew. B. & Huberman, A. Michael. 1994. Qualitatve Data Analysis. New Delhi: Beverly Hills.p.10-11

waterwork) is inanimate, the event (banjir/flood) will be affected by natural law (If it rains) where the subject can not affect the event to take place. The meaning of possibility can also be expressed by using modal bisa (can). In Angkola language the modal bisa (may) denotes a possibility where the subject can do an action as stated by the verb of the sentence as in (4).

(4) Bia ma he ttong baenon, rupa madung sifat na mardunia on do. [It is reality, it has become a reality of life. Muda taradong diiba kecet pe mur bahat. Na pola marlang-alang If-we were rich- talk - more. not need - to be shy iba makkuling gogo di lopo I/we - speak – loudly- at Traditional shop. **Bisa** buse ma iba mandok sipaingot tu halak, on na tusi on na tuson, bope. **Can** -I /we-give-advice - to people, like this - like that, - eventhough naso si tutu nadidokkonani, halak pe na bagi aha didokkon na manangihon I/we do not say seriously, -the people - anything - say -just listen up, tai muda nadong di iba, giot mangecet iba, na ditangihon kalak anggo but if- I/we were poor, want - speak- I/we, nobody listened to - hum na aha ditangihon, na pola hatcit dilala. if only not listened, - it doesn't make me/us offended].

Bia ma he 'ttong baenon, rupa madung sifat na mardunia on do. Muda taradong diiba kecet pe mur bahat. Na pola malang-alang iba makkuling gogo di lopo, **bisa** buse ma iba mandok sipaingot tu halak, on na tusi on na tuson, bope naso si tutu nadidokkonan i, halak pe na bagi aha didokkon na manangihon i, tai muda nadong di iba, giot mangecet iba, na ditangihon kalak anggo hum na ahaditangihon, na pola hatcit dilala.

'It is a reality, It seems to be a reality of life. If we were rich, we would talk more. we don't need to be shy of speaking loudly at a coffee shop. We **can** give people advice, "you should do like this or like that", even though we don't say it seriously, the people will listen to us, but if we are poor, no body will listen to us and it won't offend us'.

The use of bisa (can) in (4) indicates a possibility for the subject Iba (I/we) to speak among people if she/he is rich. The other expression of possibility can be seen in (5) by using bisa jadi (may);

(5) **Bisa jadi** peresiden na baru i torus konia, bisa jadi isetopia, tai goarna do [**May**-the president-new-continue-he/she, **may** –he-stop, but-only the name na marbedai najolo Village Assistance Program (Bankdes), muda Bankdes different - at once - Bankdes, if – Bankdes na joloi ipaborokkon, on memangkan natarlibat dosude lapisan masyrakat, at once - contructed, it really - involved - all - the element of class social, asal ma na idokkon program nasional ma jelas- kepala negarai do I if - called - National program - must be- president's responsibility].

Bisa jadi peresiden na baru i torus konia, bisa jadi isetopia, tai goarna do na marbedai na jolo Bankdes, muda Bankdes na joloi ipaborokkon, on memangkan natarlibat do sude lapisan masyrakat, asal ma na idokkon program nasional ma jelas kepala negarai do i

'The new president **may** continue the program or he /she may stop it, but at one time it had the distinguished name of Village Assistance Program (Bankdes), if it is Village Assistance Program (Bankdes) the entire contructs will be given, it really involves every element of social class. If it is' National Program" it must be the president's responsibility'.

The modal bisa jadi (may) is placed at the beginning of the sentence as in (5) illustrates subjective modality, the speaker uses his own prediction in the proposition because he lacks knowledge regarding the case that he is talking about.

The other modal bisa (can) can also indicate an objective possibility based on facts that the speaker knows, as in (6).

(6) Muda sai adong halak na mulak sian pangarattoan, [If - there is- one- coming back from -the foreign country, dibaen ia mangido doa, sanga muda adong halak namatean, baru ma **bisa** held- he- a blessing, or if - there is a person died, so I **can** mangan juhut. eat – meat]

Muda sai adong halak na mulak sian pangarattoan, dibaen ia mangido doa, sanga muda adong halak namatean, baru ma **bisa** mangan juhut.

'If there is some body coming back from a foreign country or someone has died, his family holds a blessing, so at this moment I **can** eat meat'.

The modal bisa (can) indicates a possible event (mangan juhut / eating meat) to be actualized by the subject if the other factor takes place (muda sai adong halak na mulak sian pangarattoan sanga mudang adong halak namate / if there is some body coming back from a foreign country or died). The modal bisa (can) in (6) does not really denote ability or permission, but it indicates a probability.

The use of jadi in bisa jadi in (5) is generally used in Angkola language. This construction is called sensitive context or bounded context, the modal bisa jadi (may) denotes a possibility.

The other modals operators which expresses the speaker's attitude to the proposition can be seen in the following examples (7) as the use of modal betak (may);

(7) **Betak** naso mate do anggi 'kki, hudokkon mate", ning rohan ia. [**May** – not -died -my little brother, I say – die, think – he] 'My little brother **may** not be died", He thinks'. The modal betak (may) in (7) denotes that speaker is not sure about the truth of the proposition, the verbs mate (died) in (7) is stative verbs which the subjects have experienced something stated by the verbs of the sentence.

4.2 Epistemic Certainty

A certainty denotes that the speaker is sure with the truth of the propositions, if it is compared among possibility, necessity, obligation, the certainty has the highest degree of epistemic which indicates the speaker's sureness. In Angkola language a certainty expressed by some modals as akkon (will), musti akkon (certain), musti (must), pasti (must/certain), nakkan (will) and lexical bararti (must/certain). The use of akkon can be seen in (8), musti akkon (certain) in (9), musti (certain) in (10), pasti (certain) in (11), nakkan (will) in (12), bararti (must/certain) in (13).

(8) Ise sajo halak na mangaligi ia manortor, muda mangurdot ia tu [Anybody -who - see - she- dance, if - move - she - to- Siamun, dohon halak sude mangurdot tu siamun; muda mangurdot ia tu the right, follow -all people - move to the right; if - move -she – to siambirang, sude halak na midaan **akkon** dohot mangurdot tu the left, all people- who - see - must- follow - move to siambirang the left] Ise sajo halak na mangaligi ia manortor, muda mangurdot ia tu siamun, dohot halak sude mangurdot tu siamun; muda mangurdot ia tu siambirang, sude halak na midaan **akkon** dohot

mangurdot tu siambirang.

'Every body who sees her dancing will dance too, if she moves to the right, all the people **will** move to the right, if she moves to the left, all people must do so too'.

(9) Dung dijalahi denggan-denggan, diboto ia ma bahaso ursa i [after-seeking-cerefully, know– he- that- deer -the

Musti akkon mamolus sian Gotting Siarang-arang. certain- go through -Gotting Siarang-arang.

Dung dijalahi denggan- denggan, diboto ia ma bahaso ursa i **musti akkon** mamolus sian Gotting Siarang-arang.

'After seeking carefully, he knows that the deer certainly goes by the the way of Gotting Siarang – arang (brushes)'

(10) Taraso do tusia (Haposan) rupa bahaso **musti** na dimuruhi ni [Feel – he (Haposan) - that must - scolded- oppungnia i harani pinggan na ditaporkon ni anak nia i his grand father -because - plate – broken – his son] Taraso do tusia (Haposan) rupa bahaso **musti** na dimuruhi ni oppungnia i hara ni pinggan na ditaporkon ni anak nia i. 'He (Haposan) feels that he is **certainly** be scolded by his grandfather because the plate was broken by his son'

(11) Anggo nabisa ia mangaluahon diri, yakindo si Sakkot **pasti** dimatehon [If Sakkot – cannot-escape- himself, sure - Sakkot- certain - be killed]. Anggo na bisa ia mangaluahon diri, yakin do si Sakkot **pasti** dimatehon. 'If Sakkot cannot escape, he believes that he is certainly killed'.

(12) Disi dope ia (Sakkot) mula- mula mamatehon jolma, harana muda na Over there he- firstly- killed - some one, - because- if - not – to be Dimatehok ia panjagonia i, ia **nakkan** dimatehon. Killed he -bodyguard- his-, he – must- to be killed. Disi dope ia (Sakkot) mula- mula mamatehon jolma, harana muda na dimatehon ia panjagonia i, ia **nakkan** dimatehon 'He (Sakkot) had killed some one over there first, because if he did not kill him, he **would** have been killed by his bodyguard'.

(13) Madung mangolu tai, **bararti** tong natarbalik batere nai baen komu [Already-on - ut, must- up side down- battery – the - put you]. madung mangolu tai, **bararti** tong natarbalik batere nai - baen komu 'But it is already on, the battery **must** be up side down before'.

4.3 Epistemic Prediction

The modality expression of prediction denotes how a speaker tells his logical conclusion on a proposition. His uncertain opinion is delivered by using non modals (lexical) nuaeng/luai (might) in the example (14) and lexical dugaan (think) in (15).

(14) Bayo datu Dja Humutur na sian baringin mandok, dung lilu do I [The supranatural Dja Humutur- from -baringin said-, have lost way -. **nuaeng** akkon na di lului do i. should - seeked]. Bayo datu Dja Humutur na sian Baringin mandok, dung lilu do i **nuaeng**. akkon na di lului do i. 'The supranatural Dja Humutur from Baringin said that he (Sakkot) might loose his way. He should be sought after'.

(15) Anggo jam 2 do halei barangkat sian bagas, **dugaatku** madonok mai [If- at two oclo'ck- they –leave- from the house, I think- to son nearby- here]. Anggo jam 2 do halei barangkat sian bagas, **dugaatku** madonok mai tu son. 'I think, if they leave the house at 2 o'clock pm, they will be nearby here'.

4.4 Findings

The Angkolanese epistemic modality has three categories, they are probability, certainty and prediction (possibility). The epistemic probability is marked by modals and non modal (lexical) such as; bisa (can), bisa jadi (may), mungkin (probable/may), aro (arokku/ I think) /naro (naro nia/ he thinks), naro nai /we think), naro nihalahi (they think), dugaan (think) /dugaatku (I think) /dugaan nai (we think) /dugaan nia (he/she thinks)/dugaan ni halahi (they think). The epistemic certainty is also marked by modals and non modals (lexical) such as musti akkon (certain), musti (certain), nakkan (will), pasti (must/certain), bararti (certain). The other category is epistemic prediction (possibility), this category is marked by modals and non modals (lexical) such as; nuaeng (might), luai (might), betak (might), betak jadi (might).

The epistemic modality in Angkola language is used in daily interaction, and wedding ceremony in Sipirok district of South Tapanuli in North Sumatera – Indonesia. This modality was used by the language users of Angkola language to denote the speaker's attitude to the propositions. The following is the table of modal operators and non-modals used in the epistemic modality.

Table1: Epistemic Modality of Angkola language in use

Meaning	Modality marker		Example
	Modal operators	**Non modal operators (lexical)**	
Probability	bisa (can)		**Bisa** buse ma iba mandok sipaingot tu halak, on na tusi on na tuson, bope naso si tutu nadidokkonan i, halak pe na bagi aha didokkon na manangihon i, tai muda nadong di iba, giot mangecet iba, na ditangihon kalak anggo hum na ahaditangihon, na pola hatcit dilala.
	bisa jadi (may)		, we **can** give people advice, "you should do like this or other one", even though we don't tell it seriously, the people will listen to us, but if we are poor, nobody will listen to us and it doesn't make us offended'.
		mungkin (probable	**Bisa jadi** peresiden na baru i torus konia, bisa jadi isetopia, tai goarna do na marbedai na jolo Bankdes, muda Bankdes na joloi ipaborokkon, different on memngkan natarlibat do sude lapisan masyrakat, asal ma na

		/may) aro (arokku/ I think) /Naro (naro nia/ He thinks), Naro nai /we think), naro nihalei (They think)	idokkon program nasional ma jelas kepala negarai do i 'The new president **may** continue the program or he /she may stop it, it's name was called Village Assistance Program (Bankdes), if it is "Bankdes", I it was given the entire contruct, it really involves every element of social class. If it is National program, it must be the president's responsibility'.
		dugaan (think) /dugaatku (I think) /dugaan nai (we think) /dugaan nia (he/she thinks) /dugaan ni halahi (They think)	
		mungkin (probable/may)	Mungkin nadiboto ia ro hamu She/he probable doesn't know that you come. **Arokku**, ima mambaen si tigor sai parkohom-kohom. '**I think**, it makes Tigor to be calm'. Anggo jam 2 do halei barangkat sian bagas, **dugaatku** madonok mai tu son. '**I think**, If they left the house at 2 o'clock, they would be already nearby here '.
	nakkan (will)		**Mungkin** na tarbalik do battere nei dibaet kamu Oppung. 'It is **probable** that the battery is up side down' **Mungkin** nadiboto ia ro hamu 'It is probable she/he doesn't know that you come'. Disi dope ia (Sakkot) mula- mula mamatehon jolma, harana muda na dimatehon ia panjagonia i, ia **nakkan** dimatehon. 'He (Sakkot) killed someone over

			there first, because if he (Sakkot) had not killed him, he **would have been** killed by his bodyguard'.
Certainty	musti akkon (certain)	pasti (certain)	**Pasti** ro do ia sadari on
			He **certainly** comes today
		pasti (must/certain)	Dung dijalahi denggan- denggan, diboto ia ma bahaso ursa i **musti akkon** mamolus sian Gotting siarang-arang.
			'After seeking carefully, he knows that the deer **certainly** goes by the way of the underbrush (gotting siarang – arang)'
	musti (certain)	bararti (certain)	A: Inda adong hu ida ia dalam sapokonen on B: Anggo jam-jam songonon do **pasti** adong ia di lopoan
			A: 'I haven't seen him this week'
			B: He **must** be at the coffee shop now'
			Anggo na bisa ia mangaluahon diri, yakin do si Sakkot **pasti** dimatehon. 'If Sakkot can not escape, he believes that he is **must** be killed'.
			Taraso do tusia (Haposan) rupa bahaso **musti** na dimuruhi ni oppungnia i hara ni pinggan na ditaporkon ni anak nia i.
			'He (Haposan) feels that he is certainly scolded by his grandfather because the plate was broken by his son'
			Madung mangolu tai, **bararti** tong natarbalik do batere nai - baen komu

			'But it is already on, the battery **must** have been up side down before'.
prediction (possibility)	nuaeng (might)		Bayo datu Dja Humutur na sian Baringin mandok, dung lilu do i **nuaeng**. akkon na di lului do i.
	luai (might)		'The supranatural Dja Humutur from Baringin said that he (Sakkot) **might** loose his way. He should be seeked'.
			On do **luai** halak bujing na didokkon ni Dainang i, madung songon namardonok hira-hirakki hian", ning roha ni si Sakkot.
	betak (might)		'Sakkot thinks "This **might** be the woman that my aunt said, because she seems similar to what she said'.
			...Na sai binoto **betak** sai dibege si Sakkot, harana sora ni si Kobul tarbege do sian dolok na sada tu dolok na sadanai.
	betak jadi (might)		'It is not certain, Sangkot **might** hear Kobul's voice because his voice usually can be heard from one block to another'.
			Betak jadi do ro ia sadari on.
			He **might** come today

4.5 Discussion

The epistemic modality in Angkola language denotes the degree of speaker's commitment on the propositions she/he stated. The degree of the commitment is expressed by modal operators and non modals (lexical). The epistemic modality in Angkola language is used in spoken and written language. In Angkola language there is no tense used as in English. The time signals used in the language do not affect the form of the verbs, all the verbs used in the language are base form. When the verbs are used in passive voice, they are added with prefix di as dipaboa (informed), dipette (waited), diboto (known) etc. The Angkola language is one of local languages in Indonesia who used by people in South Tapanuli of North Sumatera province.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

Modality in Angkola language denotes how the attitude of speaker to the proposition. The attitude is expressed by modal operators and non modals (lexical). The epistemic modality in Angkola language describes about probability, certainty, and prediction. The degree of modal operators and non modals (lexical) in epistemic modality are three levels high, median, and low. High**:** musti akkon (certain), musti (certain), pasti (certain), pasti (must/certain), bararti (certain), Median **:** nakkan (will), and Low**:** bisa jadi (may), mungkin (probable /may) aro (arokku/ I think) /naro (naro nia/ he thinks), naro nai /we think), naro nihalei (they think), dugaan (think) /dugaatku (I think), bisa (can), /dugaan nai (we think) /dugaan nia (he/she thinks) /dugaan ni halahi (they think), mungkin (probable/may), nuaeng (might), luai (might), betak (might), betak jadi (might)

5.2 Suggestion

This study discussed about epistemic modality in Angkola language on semantic perspective. The other perspectives of the language such as Grammatical and Phonological are necessary to investigate. These aspects have not been investigated, it is suggested to researchers to do research regarding these. In accordance with reserving the Angkola language, It is strongly needed to do research and documentation about the language. It is the responsibility of local government and researchers to document and expose the language at national and international level.

REFERENCES

[1] Bybee, J., Fleisch, S. 1995. Modality in Grammar and discourse: An Introductory essay, Amterdam :Benjamin.

[2] Bybee, Joan., Perkins, Revere and Pagliuca, William. 1994. The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Language of The world. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[3] Coates, Jenniver.1983. The semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries. London: Croom Helm.

[4] Halliday, M. A. K. 1970. Functional Diversity in Language as Seen from consideration of Modality and Mood in English. Foundation of Language

[5] Lyons, J.1977. Semantics, Volume 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

[6] Miles, Mathew. B. & Huberman, A. Michael. 1994. Qualitatve Data Analysis. New Delhi: Beverly Hills.

[7] Palmer, F.R. 1986. Mood and Modality. New York: Cambridge University Press

[8] Perkins, Michael R. 1983. Modal Expression in English. New York: Ablex.

[9] Quirk, R., Sidney Greenbaum, Geofrey Leech, and J. Svarvik. 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of English Language, London: Longman.