Lexical markers of evidentiality on vernacular malay dialect used by the speech community of kualuh

marcadores léxicos de evidencia en el dialecto malayo vernáculo utilizado por la comunidad de habla de kualuh

NUZWATY
ORCID: https://ordcid.org/0000-0002-5810-4107
nuzwaty@fisip.uisu.ac.id
Islam Sumatera Utara University, Medan, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The study talks about lexical markers of evidentiality used by the speech community of Bahasa Kualuh. The data was utterances dealing with lexical makers of evidentially that exist in the face to face communication and employed from ten native speakers who were 35-45 years old. It is found; the indicator of lexical markers of evidentiality evokes in two formulas: the first one is the quotative marker of evidentiality, supports the evidence-based under the speaker judgment, then he reports the result to the hearer, the second one is sensory evidential markers, which related to the evidential information based on human senses.

Keywords: Quotative, sensory, auditory, marker.

RESUMEN

El estudio habla sobre los marcadores léxicos evidentemente utilizados por la comunidad de habla de Bahasa Kualuh. Los datos eran enunciados que trataban con fabricantes léxicos de evidencia que existen en la comunicación cara a cara y empleados de diez hablantes nativos que tenían entre 35 y 45 años. El indicador de marcadores léxicos evidentemente evoca en dos fórmulas: el primero es el marcador de prueba de evidencia, apoya la evidencia basada en el juicio del hablante, luego informa el resultado al oyente, el segundo son los marcadores de evidencia sensorial, que se relacionan con la información de evidencia basada en los sentidos humanos.

Palabras clave: Cita, sensorial, auditivo, marcador l

Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana; ISSN 1316-5216; ISSN-e 2477-9555
Año 25, n° Extra 2, 2020, pp. 406-415
407

INTRODUCTION

Language is a universal characteristic of human property which continuously exits in their life. By using language, one might be able to share or to express many things in or around his life, and it is available in sufficient numbers on the aspects of life itself. In accomplishing with their needs, people raise ways of expressing how they mutually exchange experiences and information by arranging strings of utterances, which will be understood and accepted. The judgment to be understood and accepted is commonly involved in the structural or grammatical elements of the utterances to give and demand information. When people exchange information, they will argue about whether something can be affirmed or denied, see (Eggins: 2004; Asudeh & Toivonen: 2018). Such types of utterances are theoretically considered as evidential expressions with the term's mark, evidentiality.

The first person to introduce the term of evidentiality was De Haan in 1999 (De Haan 1999, pp. 83-102), and he labeled it as a grammatical category of the information source. Similarly, De Haan was among the linguist who had discussed evidential meaning in Tajik, and Iranian language, (Aikhenvald: 2004; Leung 2011). Evidentiality, as Cruse (Cruse: 2000) notes, is a semantic phenomenon supported by the grammatical structure which concerns speakers as well as hearer judgment on a piece of information that produced. The lexical marker of evidentiality can be regarded as any given lexicon those used as markers denoting evidential capacity. The evidentiality expression that discussed is the lexical markers of evidentiality which exist in Kualuh Dialect or Kualuh language.

According to Nuzwaty (Nuzwaty: 2016, pp. 1-5), Bahasa Kualuh is a vernacular language used in Kualuh and its surroundings. Kualuh is a small region on one of a part in North Sumatera Province, Indonesia. This region is on the coast of Malacca channel across to Malaysia and exactly situated in the coastal area of Labuhan Batu Utara Regency. The significant population in Kualuh is Malay. Nasution (Nasution: 2019, pp. 59-85) proposes that the vernacular used in this region belongs to the group of Malay Language with Kualuh dialect. But the language community does not recognize their language as Malay since there is plenty of the vernacular vocabulary of Kualuh Language that differs from the ones which exist and commonly used by the speech community of Malay. They conventionally assign their language as Cakap Kualuh (Kualuh Language), since a significant number of both languages' words differ from one another. Further (Nasution: 2019, pp. 59-85) proposes the Malay language has several dialects, namely Malay dialect of Tamiang, of Langkat, of Deli, of Serdang, of Batubara, of Asahan, of Kualuh, of Panai, and Bilah.

Generally, the community of Kualuh is bilingual, the languages that are being used Indonesian and Kualuh language. Both of them mutually serve different domains. Indonesian is an official and unifying language for myriad tribal languages; therefore, in a formal situation, for example, Indonesian is automatically used, such as in school, in Government office, and any other official chambers. On the other hand, in the unformal situation, however, the language community prefers to use Kualuh language to Indonesian. As mentioned above that by doing communication between speaker and hearer or speaking partner in a speech situation, they commonly share messages influenced by subjective feelings. This kind of speech is popular denoting in the term of evidentiality, which universally found in many languages. And a language usually uses a particular item to be the marker of evidential utterances that might distinguish from one language to another. The markers of evidentiality being discussed now are the lexical markers of Kualuh language. The study reveals the nature of evidentiality used by the language community of Kualuh while the problems revolved is round about the types of the lexical makers of evidentiality found in that vernacular.

METHODS

Most linguists agree that evidentiality is a semantic phenomenon owned by every language. (Palmer: 2000) states that evidentiality is utterances as the source of information uttered by the speakers whom it believes that his statements proved truthfully. A speaker is essentially able to display his attitude towards the truth of information. Evidentiality as a linguistic phenomenon belongs to almost all languages universally, but it appears in grammatical structures that might differ from one language to the others. When a speaker interacts with a speech partner in verbal communication, they exchange information, which sometimes, the content of speech is subjective.

Some of this situation generally arises due to the desire of speakers to provide information about something, more to what he thinks either positively or negatively. Being similar (Palmer: 2000) also notes that every language treats the evidential semantic domain differently, and the lexical markers in each language commonly differ from one to another. Some languages provide evidential markers in the form of inflection, either prefixes or suffixes. In some other languages, the markers might be denoted by a package of several words or lexicons such as verbs, adjectives, and adverbs.

Talking about evidentiality (Gonzales: 2011, pp. 145-172) remarks, some languages of the world mark the evidentiality utilizing lexical markers like adverbs, verb periphrasis, and model particles, such as verbal periphrasis of Catalan language es Veu Que (means 'it is seen that'). The evidentiality (Gonzales et al.: 2017, pp. 68-87) notes as linguistic aspects, which are not a merely grammatical category but which have to do with cognitive- functional domains of pragmatic as well. And it could be identified when speakers or writers share mutual understanding and commit themselves to a piece of information to convey a positive, truthful, and relevant contribution to the interactive process.

The terminology of evidentiality, Gaumann (Gaumann & Topadze: 2011), covers the semantic category, and it is not homogeneous in the linguistics literature. In his research on evidentiality in Georgian showed that the evidentiality fulfill the domain in movement, that acknowledge some intimidate stages, as manifested by the presence of both processes involving lexical items, and procedures involving affixes. Evidentiality, according to Aikhenvald (Aikhenvald: 2004), is about information sources displayed by verbs concerning reports, claims, or opinions and might be with adverbs, with prepositional phrases or with partial. Further, he said there has been about a quarter of the world's languages has a grammatical category of evidentiality by making information source is obligatory. In another word, the grammatical concepts will support the evidential utterances, and the term of evidential denotes a label for the grammatical category of the information source.

The Grammatical concepts of evidential might be either similar or different from one language to the others is also claimed by (Leung: 2011; Arrese et al.: 2016, p. 289). He further expresses that evidentiality refers to how the speaker explains the source of knowledge, attitude about knowledge and commitment to knowledge. According to him, even the evidentiality exists in every single language, but it might be displayed in different linguistics forms, which could perform in the grammatical inflections or the lexical items. In Cantonese for example, the evidentiality marked as the sentence-final particle, (Ahmad & Ahmad: 2019; Leung: 2011; Saeed: 2000) says that it will be accustomed for humans to use the form of evidential makers when they communicate with each other and it is quite common the content of the expressions based either on their point of view or on their judgment towards the information they receive.

Therefore, expressions of evidentiality could be regarded as forms of utterances expressed by a speaker to cover his demeanor towards the source of his information. Evidentiality could be recognized as a form or a component used by the speech community to stress the meaning of his speech. The forms imply the truth level of the speech or manifest an assessment or either speaker's estimation regarding the evidence that supports his utterances. Saeed (Saeed: 2000) further states that evidentiality is considered as part of the epistemic modality that contains an assessment or estimation of the speaker regarding the evidence to support his words, for example, the telephone at one's home is not answered, he certainly / may have left.

Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana; ISSN 1316-5216; ISSN-e 2477-9555
Año 25, n° Extra 2, 2020, pp. 406-415
409

The evidentiality study is carried out intentionally through a qualitative approach. The data collection was merely from the verbal expressions; it is only because the written source as a textbook of the Malay dialect of Kualuh had not been found yet. Moreover, there was no research concerning this kind of language been launched either. Therefore all of the data employed were from ten native speakers of Kualuh language since all of these informants are qualified enough for their linguistic behavior. They were not only born, brought up, and live in Kualuh but married the locals as well. Five men and five women accommodate the tenth informants. On language research, ten informants are eligible, because according to Guo (Guo: 2019, pp. 524-531), linguistic behavior in a language community tends to be homogeneous; therefore, one informant is also justified in language research since he has relevant information and standard quality concerning to the research done.

The data is a form of utterances that contain evidentiality, and it is overall in the formula of phrases or clauses. Either the data collection or the data analysis done was through the recording process. The data that was not related to evidentiality be reduced. The reduction of the un-related data was simultaneously made when data collections were done. Crossing –check on the reliability of the data had been endeavored towards fifteen native speakers of the language as participants excluding the informant.

As has been talked earlier that the discussion of the lexical markers of evidentiality will run around the domain of evidential quotative markers and the markers of sensory evidence. The first is regarded as an evidential type showing that someone is a source of information or statement is spoken or expressed by a speaker, and the source might be a package of information that comes from another person which is then reported back by the speaker to the hearers or the speaking partners. And the next one consists of the markers as sensory evidence that is the evidential makers which show proof of truth formerly source of the speaker's utterances which come from his sensory experience, but which sometimes the information uttered by the speaker might be in the formula of the speaker 's attitude.

RESULTS

The discussion covers two categorized of the evidential lexical markers of Kualuh language. Firstly, the discussion is upon quotative evidential markers of Kualuh Language, and the following will be upon the sensory evidential markers of that language. In discussing the sensory evidential markers, we will discuss the evidential component which tries to account for sensory perception of the speakers, namely visual, non-visual, and auditory evidence. Here is a further explanation.

Lexical makers of Quotative Evidentiality

Lexical markers of quotative are evidential marker which indicates that a person but not the speaker is the source of the utterances being produced. This evidence of quotative might be considered as a formulation of reports from someone else, (Gaumann & Topadze: 2011, pp. 1-13; Alwi: 1992; Aikhenvald: 2015) propose this kind of evidential as indirect evidential concerning the evidential notified when the speaker reports an event that he did not involve but comes to know it from an actual condition. Moreover, this marker not only refers to the source of the statement uttered but refers to the form of the utterance of someone else as well. The speech community of Kualuh language commonly uses lexical Kotonyo, ado yang mambilang, and dibilangnyo. Study the respective expressions below:

1. Kotonyo, Wak Ute Ondak Mangantar Anaknyo Sakolah Kaluar Nogri.
It is said uncle Uteh wants to send his daughter to school abroad.
He said "Ucle Uteh wants to send his daughter to school abroad.
2. Dio tak porlu bantuan ko, kotonyo.
He no need help you said he.

"He doesn't need your help," he said.

3. Ado yang mambilang atok Nuar sakit koras di Ledong.

Someone said Grandfather Nuar sick hard in Ledong.

(Ledong is the name of a place in Kualuh).

Someone said: " Grandpa Nuar is seriously ill in Ledong.

4. Ado yang mambilang, ko ambek duit nyo yo?

Someone said you take money his huh?

(yo) used to emphasize the expression

Someone said, "you took his money right."

5. Dibilangnyo Datanglah ko Besok yo

Said he do come you tomorrow ok

He said," do come tomorrow, OK".

6. Dibilangnyo payah kali maminta utang di si Udin.

Said he difficult very to ask debt upon Mr Udin.

He said," it is very difficult to ask debt from Mr Udin.

In utterance (1) and (2) the speaker is the giver information then this information is based on the situation obtained from another person or the third party (Kotonyo), but the speaker does not try to tell the speaking partner about someone (hidden person) who informed the news or the information. Simply because someone or nyo (The third person singular) in Kotonyo is either only in the cognitive of the speakers or only recognized by themselves. Thus, by doing this, the speaker is solely willing to emphasize both the proof of the information he discloses and the meaning of the expression he desires too.

In individual utterances (3), (4), (5), and (6), the speaker wants to convey information to the speech partner in the form of a report. Thus, there would not be a hidden person as the speech partner's assumptions, because the speaker as well as the partner both share mutual interpreting and recognizing someone called ado yang and nyo (The third person singular) in ado yang mambilang and dibilangnyo which would be someone which is similar to nyo that identifies ' x'.

Lexical makers of sensory evidentiality

The next evidential which will be discussed is evidential sensory. Evidential sensory is categorized under the lexical markers of evidentiality, which designates the accuracy evidence of the speaker's utterances, which is originated from sensory experiences acquired by himself. As initially mentioned above in the part of the literature review, the evidence of this sensory contains three types of evidence, namely visual evidence, non-visual evidence, and auditory evidence. The following is a discussion on the three evidential types expressed by the speech community of Kualuh language (Ahmad & Ahmad, 2018; McKeown & Ladegaard: 2019, pp. 53-74).

Lexical makers of visual evidentiality

Evidential Visual is an evidential type that conveys undeniable evidence of the utterances based on vision or based on the visual sense of the speaker. This type of the lexical markers in Kualuh language utilizes lexicons, mamandang '(to star), Pandangi (to watch), manengok, and Kutengok (to see, look at). All of the lexicons are grammatically categorized under the verb category, as in the following examples:

7. Oi, Lotih Aku manengok peel nyo.

Wou, tired I see/ star behavior he

I am bored to see his attitude

8. Kutengok batambah lagak ocik Jenab.

I see getting more beautiful aunty Jenab.

Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana; ISSN 1316-5216; ISSN-e 2477-9555
Año 25, n° Extra 2, 2020, pp. 406-415
411

I think Aunty Jenab getting more beautiful

9.   Ibo atiku manengok cucu ku jatoh.

Sad my heart to see grandchild I (my, me) fall.

I was sad to see my grandchild fell down

10. Oi yang lagak anak daro tu tak jolak ku pandangi dio.

Wou what beautiful girl that not boring I look at her.

What a beautiful girl is. I am not boring to look at her

11. Ku pandangi tak boronti bajalan torus tak lotih dio samalam tu.

I watch not stop to walk continue not tired him yesterday.

I watch him never stop walking, he was not tired yesterday.

12. Mamandang muko doktor tu sajo dah botah aku.

To look at face doctor the just have well I.

Just to see the doctor, I have been well.

In utterances (7) and (8) and (9), speakers try to emphasize the actual truth conditions or information which have been faced or captured by the speaker himself directly through his sight which are identified by the lexical markers; manengok (to see, to look) Kutengok (I see, it is seen). In utterances (10) and (11), and (12) speakers try to report the results of their feeling and thoughts about things based on their sense of vision. This kind of lexical markers consists of lexical Pandangi and mamandang.

Lexical markers of non-visual evidentiality

Lexical marker of non-visual evidentiality is one of the sensory types of evidentiality, which indicates the proof of the correctness of the speaker's utterances is not associated with a particular expression on their physical vision but based on the feelings of the speakers. Or the processes to prove the inherent correctness of the utterances, the non-visual evidential markers are denoted by the lexicon, gayo-gayonyo (maybe), agaknyo (seem), and Ruponyo (probably). Such as in the individual following utterances

13. Gayo-gayonyo dah Lupo Dio Korjo nyo, Balampar Dapur tu

'maybe has forgotten she job her messy kitchen that

Maybe she has forgotten about her job. The kitchen is messy.

14. Gayo-gayonyo tak dikonal nyo aku. Malintas dio tak ditogur nyo aku.

Maybe not recognize he I pass he does not greet him I

Maybe he did not recognize me when he passed he did not greet me.

15. Ruponyo lupo,Usman samo janji nyo.Tak datang dio yo.

Probably forget Usman with the promise he Not come he uh

It's probably Usman forget his promise. He does not come.

16. Rupo-ruponyo dah lotih budak tu manangis. Ta tidor dio kinin.

Probably has a tired child that cry sleep he now

It's probably has been tired of crying. He falls asleep now.

17. Agaknyo bangga kali dio. Macam orang kayo dio.

It seems selfish much he. Like person rich she/he is

It seems he is much selfish. He acts like a rich man.

18. Agaknyo sakit dio. Tak banyak lagi dio bacakap.

It seems sick he. No much more he talks.

It seems he is sick. He did n't talk much anymore.

In utterance (13) and (14), speakers endeavor to tell the truth around the information that comes from the feelings and thoughts positing on the cognitive of the speaker. This truth is objective because they convey

statements that can be proven by the next supporting phrases Balampar Dapur tu (the kitchen is messy) in (13) and in (14) the supporting prase is Malintas Dio Tak Ditogurryo Aku (when he passed he didn't greet me). While utterances (15), (16), (17), and (18), the speaker expressed the truth of the information. He spoke through the emphasis on the accompanying statements, Tak Datang Dio yo (he did not come) in Utterance (15), ta Tidor Dio kinin (he falls asleep now) in Utterance (16), and in utterance (17) macam orang kayo Dio (she looks like a rich man) and tak banyak Lagi Dio Bacakap (he didn't talk much anymore) in Utterance (18).

Lexical markers of auditories evidentiality

Evidential auditories are other types of sensory evidence that show that the proof of the correctness of the speaker's utterances not based on the thoughts, feelings, and visions of the speaker, but the evidence of truth is obtained based on the hearing part of the speaker. This type of evidential marker is characterized by lexical dongar, mandongar, and Babisik as in the following example:

19. Siapo di Muko, ku dongar suaro orang mangotuk Pintu
Who in front, I hear sound person knock the door
Who is in front I heard someone knocked at the door
20. Usah babantah, ku dongar suaro tu sampek ka sumur
Do not quarrel I hear voice that until to the bathroom.
Don't quarrel I heard the voice until the bathroom.
21. Oi, sodihnyo aku mandongar corito budak tu.
Oi very sad I hear story child that
I was very sad to hear that child's story.
22. Pocah rasonyo otak ku mandongar budak tu manjorit.
Break feel head I (my, me) hear kid that screaming
I feel my head is broken to hear that kid screaming.

In utterances (19) and (20), lexical dongar is pronounced followed by the appearance of events that can be proven directly by the speech partner. On this occasion, the partner is directly in where the event happens. In the utterance (21) and (22) lexical mandongar (to hear or to listen), the word mandongar is commonly used by speakers to explain the proof of the truth of his speech form as a reality that might happen to everyone.

DISCUSSION

The type of evidentiality lexical markers in Kualuh language is categorized into two main divisions. They are the markers of quotative and sensory evidentiality. This type of evidentiality universally found in nearly a quoter of the world languages, as said by (Gaumann &Topadze: 2011, pp. 1-13; Alwi: 1992; Aikhenvald: 2015).

All of the markers in Kualuh language play their functions to display the evidential information. The misplaced position will sound awkward and might raise misinterpretation. The speaker is fully aware of the lexical makers' role naturally; therefore, the lexical markers of evidentiality are compulsory in Kualuh language. Like other languages in common, Kualuh languages as one of Malay dialects accommodates lexical markers of evidentiality as well. These markers display the content of utterance conveying evidence as proof of truth. They are consisting of two evidential categories, namely:

a. Lexical markers of Quotative evidentiality.
b. Lexical makers of Sensory evidentiality.

Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana; ISSN 1316-5216; ISSN-e 2477-9555
Año 25, n° Extra 2, 2020, pp. 406-415
413

Lexical markers of quotative evidentiality are the lexical markers that manifest forms of evidentiality where the speaker is the giver of information towards the situation obtained from another person or the third party nyo in Kotonyo (someone said). Still, the speaker presumably does not intend to recount the speaking partner about someone (hidden person) who informed the news or the information. Merely because the lexicon nyo (The third person singular) in Kotonyo is only in the cognitive of the speakers, which only recognized by the speakers themselves. Thus by doing this, the speaker is prominently willing to reinforce for the proof of the information he discloses and the meaning of the expression he desires too. Besides Kotonyo, there are two other lexical markers of quotative in Kualuh language.they are ado yang mambilang and dibilangnyo. Both of these markers occur as forms of a report in which the speaker wants to establish information transferred to the speech partner is reported the news.

There would not be a hidden person as the speech partner's assumptions, because the speaker as well as the partner both share mutual interpreting and recognizing someone called ado yang and nyo (The third person singular) in ado yang mambilang and dibilangnyo which would be someone which is similar to nyo that identifies'x'. Other lexical makers that exist in Kualuh language is lexical makers of sensory evidentiality. These markers evolve evidence in which the sensory domain indicates the truth. It is carried out through three forms of truth, namely visual evidentiality, non-visual, and auditory evidentiality.

The Visual one supported by lexical markers that manufacture the proof of reality based on the visual sense of the speaker, which are characterized by lexical, manengok (see), tengok (see), pandang, and mamandang (view, look, star). Next is lexical markers of non-visual evidentiality. These markers convey evidence of truth which obtained from the results of thoughts recorded verbally in the cognitive of the speakers. This proof of reality is characterized by lexical Raso-rasonyo (probably), agak-agaknyo (seem), gayo-gayonyo (maybe) and as a marker. The last one is the lexical markers of auditory. It classifies the proof of truth evoked from the hearing sense of the speaker and is characterized by the usage of lexical dongar (hear) and mandongar (listen) markers.

CONCLUSION

There would not be a hidden person as the speech partner's assumptions, because the speaker as well as the partner both share mutual interpreting and recognizing someone called ado yang and nyo (The third person singular) in ado yang mambilang and dibilangnyo which would be someone which is similar to nyo that identifies'x'. Other lexical makers that exist in Kualuh language is lexical makers of sensory evidentiality. These markers evolve evidence in which the sensory domain indicates the truth. It is carried out through three forms of truth, namely visual evidentiality, non-visual, and auditory evidentiality.

The Visual one supported by lexical markers that manufacture the proof of reality based on the visual sense of the speaker, which are characterized by lexical, manengok (see), tengok (see), pandang, and mamandang (view, look, star). Next is lexical markers of non-visual evidentiality. These markers convey evidence of truth which obtained from the results of thoughts recorded verbally in the cognitive of the speakers. This proof of reality is characterized by lexical Raso-rasonyo (probably), agak-agaknyo (seem), gayo-gayonyo (maybe) and as a marker. The last one is the lexical markers of auditory. It classifies the proof of truth evoked from the hearing sense of the speaker and is characterized by the usage of lexical dongar (hear) and mandongar (listen) markers

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AIKHENVAL, AY (2004). "Evidentiality". Oxford: Oxford University Press.

AIKHENVAL, AY (2015). "The grammaticalization of evidentiality". Oxford Handbook.

ALWI, H (1992). "Modalitas dalam Bahasa Indonesia". Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

ARRESE, JIM, CARRETERO, M, ABASOLO, KC, ROMERO, ED & DE LA ROSA, MVM (2016). "The Expression of Evidentiality in English, Basque and Spanish: Cross-linguistic Perspectives and Criteria for a Database of Evidential Markers". Glancing Backwards To Build a Future in English Studies, p. 289.

ASUDEH, A & TOIVONEN, I (2018). "A modular approach to evidentiality".

AHMAD, I., & AHMAD, S. (2018). Multiple Skills and Medium Enterprises' Performance in Punjab Pakistan: A Pilot Study. Journal of Social Sciences Research, 7(2010), 44-49

CRUSE, DA (2000). Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.

DE HAAN, F (1999). "Evidentiality and epistemic modality: setting boundaries". Southwest Journal of Linguistics, 18, pp. 83-102.

EGGINS, S (2004). "An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics (2nd Ed)". London, UK: Continuum.

GONZALES, M (2011). "Indirect Evidence in Catalan: a case study". In: Payrató, L., Cots, J.M. (Eds). The Pragmatics of Catalan. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/ New York, pp. 145-172.

AHMAD, I., & AHMAD, S. (2019). The Mediation Effect of Strategic Planning on The Relationship Between Business Skills and Firm's Performance: Evidence from Medium Enterprises in Punjab, Pakistan. Opcion, 35(24), 746-778.

GONZALEZ, M., ROSEANO, P, BORRAS-COMES, J & PRIETO, P (2017). "Epistemic and evidential marking in discourse: Effects of register and debatability". Lingua, 186, pp. 68-87.

GAUMANN, M & TOPADZE (2011). "The expression of Evidentiality between Lexicon and Grammar. A Case Study from Georgian". Linguistics Discovery, pp 1-13.

GUO, J (2019). "A Contrastive Study of Evidentiality in English and Chinese MA Thesis Abstracts". In 6th International Conference on Education, Language, Art and Inter-cultural Communication (ICELAIC 2019), pp. 524-531. Atlantis Press.

LEUNG, WM (2011). "A Study of Evidential In Cantonese: The Case of WO3 & WO5". The Buckingham Journal Of Language and Linguistics.

MCKEOWN, J & LADEGAARD, HJ (2019). "Evidentiality and identity positioning in online disputes about language use in Hong Kong". Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice, 14(1), pp. 53-74.

NASUTION, LA (2019). "Sejarah Pers Perempuan di Sumut (Studi Analisis Wacana Kritis Perspektif Feminis dalam Konten Koran 'Perempoean Bergerak'di Sumut)". JURNAL SIMBOLIKA: Research and Learning in Communication Study, 5(1), pp. 59-85.

NUZWATY, E (2016). "Modals Used By the Speech Community of Bahasa Kualuh In Interpersonal Interaction". IOSR Journal Of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS), pp. 1-5.

PALMER, FR (2000). "Mood and Modality". Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.

SAEED, JI (2000). "Semantics". China: Blackwell.

BIODATA

E NUZWATY: Nuzwaty studied in higher education at Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia, in 2010-2014. She is a doctor of linguistics, lecturer and associate professor at Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia. Her qualification is Linguist. The research area is Phonetics, speech, and language, grammar and structure of languages.