# THE CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF EPISTEMIC MODALITIES AND JAPANESE AND INDONESIAN EVIDENTIALITIES IN THE *KOKORO* NOVEL BY NATSUME SOSEKI

Oleh:
**Irma Qurrota A'yun[1], Roni[2], Didik Nurhadi[3]**
[1,2,3]UniversitasNegeri Surabaya
[1]irma.17070835011@mhs.unesa.ac.id
[2]roni@unesa.ac.id
[3]didiknurhadi@unesa.ac.id

***Abstrak***

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengontraskan modalitas epistemik dan evidentialitas bahasa Jepang dan bahasa Indonesia. Penelitian ini merupakan jenis penelitian kualitatif dengan pendekatan kontrastif dan deskriptif, yang membandingkan konstruksi dua bahasa (perbedaan dan persamaan) dengan data berupa deskripsi. Data penelitian berupa kalimat yang mengandung modalitas epistemik dan evidentialitas bahasa Jepang pada novel "Kokoro" versi asli berbahasa Jepang serta kalimat yang mengandung modalitas epistemik dan evidentialitas bahasa Indonesia pada novel "Rahasia Hati"; versi terjemahan bahasa Indonesia dari novel "Kokoro". Teknik pengumpulan data yang digunakan yaitu melalui dokumentasi, kemudian baca dan catat, lalu dianalisis dengan cara reduksi, kategorisasi, sintesisasi, dan hipotesis kerja. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa perbedaan muncul terutama pada penandaan modalitas. Satu modalitas bahasa Indonesia bisa dipadankan dengan banyak modalitas bahasa Jepang, seperti 'mungkin' yang bisa dipadankan dengan 'kamoshirenai', 'darou', dan 'deshou'. Selain itu, pada modalitas evidentialitas subjenis "reported", penandaan modalitas dalam bahasa Jepang dapat ditunjukkan dengan 'to iu' dan 'tte', sedangkan dalam bahasa Indonesia tidak dapat ditunjukkan adanya penandaan modalitas (Ø). Kemudian untuk persamaan antara keduanya, muncul dari makna modalitas, yang mana antara modalitas bahasa Jepang dan bahasa Indonesia memiliki makna yang sama pada tiap jenis modalitas, hanya bentuk penandaan modalitasnya saja yang berbeda.

**Kata Kunci:**Kontrasif, Modalitas, Epistemik, Evidentialitas

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, Japanese is one of the foreign languages that is quite attractive to Indonesians to study. However, in learning Japanese, language errors sometimes arise which can become obstacles in learning Japanese. Language errors that occur in Indonesian Japanese language learners, often caused by differences in the structure of Indonesian grammar with Japanese grammar studied. Therefore, as one way that differences in grammatical structure do not become obstacles to learning, and on the contrary, become a strategy for learning Japanese, contrastive analysis can be used.

Contrative analysis according to Ishiwata and Takada (1998: 9) is a way to compare various parts of two or more languages such as sound (phonemes), vocabulary, grammar, or other language systems that contain language action, and as one area of language research to state whether it is clear that parts of one language support each other or not. From this opinion, it can be understood that contrastive analysis covers all aspects of language, sound systems related to phonology and grammatical systems at the syntactic level starting from morpheme, phrases, clauses, even sentences.

One of the things that can be studied with contrastive analysis and is a problem for Indonesian Japanese learners is about modality. Modality is the grammatical part used by the speaker to express his attitude towards an event (Hasegawa, 2015: 307). So it can be said that modality is essentially related to the speaker's attitude. If modalities in Japanese are usually marked by changes (conjugations) in one word itself (morphologically) or by the addition of other words (perifrastic), then modalities in Indonesian in general are more often marked perifratically.

Palmer (2001: 1) views modality differently from time and aspect, which does not refer directly to some of the characteristics of events, but rather refers directly to the factuality of the propositions. Proposition is a term used for statement sentences that have full and complete meaning. In addition, propositions in linguistic terms can be interpreted as expressions that can be trusted, doubted, denied, or proven true or not. So it can be said that a sentence can consist of only propositions or a combination of propositions and modalities. So that it can be said that the modality is different from the time and aspect, but intersect in a sentence.

Palmer divides modalities into four types, namely epistemic, evidentiality, deontic, and dynamic. Epistemic modality is an expression of the speaker's judgment about the factual status of the proposition. The modality of evidence indicates the evidence that is possessed to show the factual status of the proposition. Deontic modalities

indicate the existence of conditional factors that affect the individual is external. While the dynamic modality indicates the existence of conditional factors that originate from within (internal) affect the individual.

Based on those above, this research is only focused on examining two types of modalities, namely epistemic modalities and evidentialities. This is because there are several theories that incorporate evidentiality modalities into epistemic modalities so that the forms of epistemic modalities and evidentialities overlap, especially if the modalities are translated from Japanese into Indonesian or vice versa. So this topic is interesting to discuss.

In addition, the focus of this research is also different from the existing modality studies, such as the research conducted by Septarani (2017) with the title *"Epistemic Modalities of Japanese and Sundanese: Contrastive Studies ('Youda', 'Mitai da', and ' Jigana; Jiga ',' Sigana; Siga ',' Kawasna; Kawas') ",* then Özbek (2011) in his research entitled*"Aspect and Modality in Negative Constructions: A Contrastive Analysis of Turkish and Japanese ",* and research conducted by Hariri (2011) with the title *"A Review of Deontic Modality in Indonesian Language Based on The Theory of Japanese Modality".* This study focuses on the classification of epistemic modalities and evidentialities according to Palmer (2001), Hasegawa (2015), and Alwi (1992) and studied constructively on Japanese sentences and Indonesian sentences. When compared with the three studies above, the two studies focus on contrast, one discusses the contrastive modalities of Japanese and Sundanese, while the other discusses contrastive aspects and modalities on negative constructs. Then another study focused on reviewing deontic modalities, which focus is different from this study. Therefore, it can be said that this research is an update of existing research.

## 2. RESEARCH METHODS

This is qualitative research because the entire research process involves data that is described descriptively through language and words. This is in line with the understanding of qualitative research according to Yusuf (2014: 330), which is a process of finding, collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data both visually and narratively that is comprehensive to get an understanding of a phenomenon or problem that attracts attention. Through this explanation, it can be said that the design of this research design is focused on qualitative research which is described descriptively and contrastively. That is because this research is a study that is comparing the construction of two languages (differences and similarities) with descriptive data.

The data sources of this research are the original *Kokoro* novel by Natsume Soseki in the Japanese version and the Indonesian translation version. While the data in this study are sentences containing epistemic modalities and Japanese evidentiality in the original Japanese version of the *Kokoro* novel as well as sentences containing Indonesian epistemic modalities and evidentialities in *RahasiaHati* novel, the Indonesian translation version of the *Kokoro* novel.

To collect the data of this study used data collection techniques through documents, with advanced techniques read and note because the research data was taken from novels in the form of written text. So after reading the text of the novel, the sentences will be noted in accordance with the focus of the study, namely epistemic modality and evidence of the novel in Japanese and Indonesian. Then for data analysis techniques, used a fixed comparison method according to Glaser and Strauss (in Moleong, 2014: 288) which consists of data reduction (reducing unnecessary or too homogeneous data), data categorization (sorting data based on grouping of several theories used), data synthesis (looking for links between one group and another), and developing working hypotheses (provisional conclusions / provisional classifications).

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section, the results of the research are in the form of data and data analysis about the contrast of epistemic modalities and evidence in Japanese and Indonesian. The discussion begins with the classification of epistemic modalities and evidentialities in Japanese and Indonesian, and then compares the differences and similarities that emerge.

### 1. Epistemic Modality

In this classification of epistemic modality, not all forms of modality can be found in the data, but they can still meet the grouping into each sub-system type of epistemic modality.

### a. Deductive

The deductive subtype shows the meaning of certainty and belief. Forms of modalities that appear in Japanese data can be marked with adverb tashika ni, while in Indonesian language data can be marked with certain and correct words, such as the following example:

(1a) 「罪悪です。**たしかに**」 (BJ.ME.33)
　　 *"Zaiaku desu. **Tashika ni**."*
(1b) "Yes, **sure**" (BI.ME.28)
(2a) 私の眼に映する先生は**たしかに**思想家であった。 (BJ.ME.38)
　　 *Watashi no me ni utsusurusensei wa **tashika ni** shisouka de atta.*
(2b)**Right**, on my view, Sensei is a thinker. (BI.ME.33)

In examples (1a) and (2a), the adverb *tashika ni* indicates the existence of an epistemic modality of deductive subtypes in Japanese data. The word *tashika ni* means 'sure', and is usually used to

express certainty or belief in Japanese. Example (1a) states that the speaker is truly sorry, because the word *zaiaku* itself means feeling guilty or guilty, after that the speaker also gives *tashika ni* epistemic modality as an emphasis on the certainty of remorse. Whereas (2a), the *tashikani* adverb states the speaker's confidence in the personality of Sensei's character.

Then in examples (1b) and (2b), the word *certainly* and *correctly* indicates the existence of epistemic modalities of deductive subtypes in Indonesian language data. Both of these words can be used to express the speaker's certainty and belief about something. Besides these two words, the word *Sure* also appears in some other Indonesian language data. From the four examples of the data above, there are similarities in the data in Japanese and Indonesian, because marking modalities in both languages occurs perifrasticly, by adding adverbs such as *tashika ni* and *of course*.

### b. Speculative dan Assumptive

These two sub-types together show the meaning of possibilities in Japanese and Indonesian. Forms of modalities that emerge in Japanese can be marked with the words *kamoshiremasen, deshou, darou,* and *to omou* which generally follow the verb or occupy a predicate position, whereas in Indonesian it can be marked with the word *perhaps, maybe, really,* and *I suppose*, as an example following:

(3a)ここによると生涯で一番気楽かもしれない。(BJ.ME.73)
Koko ni yoru to shougai de ichiban kiraku **kamoshirenai**.

(3b) **Perhaps** you will never again be so free from accountability in your life. (BI.ME.71)

(4a) 「．．．大方ないんでしょう」(BJ.ME.52)
*"...ookata nain deshou."*

(4b) "...**Maybe**not." (BI.ME.48)

(5a) 「．．．別に嫌いな人もないだろう」(BJ.ME.54)
*"...betsu ni kiraina hito mo nai darou."*

(5b) "...But **really,** nobody dislikes it." (BI.ME.50)

(6．．．丁度三日目の午後だったと思う。(BJ.ME.12)
*...choudo mikkame no gogo datta to omou.*

(6b) **I suppose**, it was on the evening of the third day... (BI.ME.07)

It can be observed in examples (3a), (4a), (5a), and (6a) that the epistemic modality of assumptive / speculative subtypes of Japanese data is marked by the addition of the words *kamoshirenai, deshou, darou,* and *to omou*. The words *kamoshirenai* (informal / ordinary / familiar) and *kamoshiremasen* (formal / polite) mean 'maybe' and 'perhaps', expressing a stronger possibility and can be used to express the possibility to the speaker himself. While *to omou* (informal / ordinary / familiar) and *to omoimasu* (formal / polite), are generally used to express one's thoughts such as guesses, estimates, opinions, decisions, and so on.

Then for the words *deshou* and *darou*, both have more varied meanings and meanings. First, as an epistemic modality, the words *deshou* and *darou* mean 'maybe', usually used to express possibilities, sometimes also combined with the word *tabun* for stronger possibilities, but cannot be used to express possibilities to yourself. Second, *deshou* and *darou* also have the meaning 'isn't it?' Which can be used to seek approval from the other person. Third, if you add the *ka* particle behind *deshou* and *darou* words, so that it becomes *deshouka* and *darouka*, it can express doubt.

In examples (3b), (4b), (5b), and (6b), the word *might, perhaps, really,* and *I suppose* indicate an epistemic modality for assumptive / speculative subtypes in Indonesian data. These words can be used to express a person's possibilities or thoughts about conjecture. Of the four forms of modality, three of them indicate perifrastic marking of modality, that is the word *perhaps, maybe,* and *really*. Whereas in modality, *I suppose*, there is a change in morphology, with the presence of the *ku*-proxy tic before the basic morpheme of *think*.

The words *kamoshirenai, deshou, darou,* and *to omou* can follow a variety of word classes, such as verbs, nouns, adjectives, etc. in Japanese data, as well as in Indonesian data with modality markers, *perhaps, maybe,* and *really* because modality markings occur perifrastis. But on the markers of the Indonesian modality I suppose, this does not apply, because the marking occurs morphologically.

Besides these differences, there are other differences that are quite interesting to be discussed in examples (3a) and (3b). In example (3a), the word *kamoshirenai* follows the noun as well as *kiraku* adjective which means' comfortable 'in Japanese language data, so that if translated in free gloss, the Indonesian sentence will be like this' Starting from now, perhaps this will be the most comfortable for life '. However, the Indonesian language data in example (3b), displays the sentence 'Perhaps you will never again be so free from accountability in your life'. What we want to highlight here is that there is a negative form 'never to be so free again', even though the Japanese language data does not bring up any negative form at all. These differences may arise due to different styles of translation of literary works with free translations.

### 2. Modalities of Evidentially

In this classification of evidentiality modalities, for *sensory* sub-types, the data obtained are quite diverse and can meet the classification of these sub-types. As for the *reported* sub-types, it does not appear in Indonesian language data, but there are markings with other words.

*a. Sensory*

*Sensory* subtype shows the meaning of estimation and security. Forms of modalities that appear in Japanese can be marked with the adverbs *youda, souda*, and *rashii*, whereas in Indonesian they can be marked with the words *appear, seem,* and *like*, like the following example:

(7a)　「新婚の夫婦のよう**だ**ね」 (BJ.ME.32)
　　　*"Shinkon no fuufu no **youda**ne."*
(7b)　"They are **like** a newlywed couple." (BI.ME.27)
(8a)　「仲が好さ**そうです**ね」 (BJ.ME.32)
　　　*"Naka ga yosa **soudesu**ne."*
(8b)　"They **seem** sweetly love each other, aren't they?" (BI.ME.27)
(9a) この答は先生に取って少し案外**らしかった**。 (BJ.ME.26)
　　　*Kono kotae wa sensei ni totte sukoshi angai **rashikatta**.*
(9b) That answer, it **seemed**, was a little unexpected. (BI.ME.22)

In examples (7a), (8a), and (9a), *youda, soudesu,* and *rashikatta* mark the modality of the *sensory* subtitude evident in Japanese data. *Sou da* (informal / ordinary / familiar) or *sou desu* (informal / normal / familiar) can be used in a number of situations, including to show that the speaker can determine a questionable thing that might happen in the future based on several conditions, also to show that some circumstances are possible. Then *youda* will show that the speaker has evidence to declare certain content based on his experience or knowledge, more subjective than *rashii*. *Rashii* (current / futur) or *rashikatta* (past) is a suffix which derives adjectives from nouns, can be interpreted as markers of evidentiality, and can be replaced with *you da* or *mitai da*.

Next in example (8a), the word before *souda* undergoes morphological changes. The word that was originally read yoi, when combined with *souda* to show the meaning of predictions or predictability, turns into *yosasouda*. Then in example (9a), *rashikatta* shows the modality of evidentiality and in the past there was a change in the tail of the *-i* word which changed to *-katta*, so that *rashii* changed to *rashikatta*.

Then for example (7b), (8b), and (9b), words such as *like, appear,* and *seem* to indicate a modality marking the evidentiality of sensory subtypes in Indonesian language data. In the modality *seems* that there is a morphological change, that is, with the addition of the enclosure *-nya* after the basic morpheme *appears*. These three markers of modality can be used to express the meaning of predictability or estimation.

If in Japanese language data, there are three definitions of *sensory* modality that can be found, namely *youda, souda,* and *rashii*, then in the Indonesian language data, the markers of this modality are found to be more varied, including: *looks, seems, like, apparently*, and *visible*. Besides that, the marking of the modality of the *sensory* subtances in both languages can also occur morphologically or perifratically.

*b. Reported*

Subtypes *reported* showed the meaning of proof based on what is conveyed by others. The form of modality that appears in Japanese can be marked with *-to iu* and *-tte*, whereas in Indonesian the modality does not appear, but can be indicated by the word *(someone else) saying that,* and *he says that* like the following example:

(10a) 「医者は到底治らない**という**んです」 (BJ.ME.58)
　　　*"Isha wa toutei naoranai **to iu**ndesu."*
(10b) "He <u>said that</u> my father would not be cured anymore." (BI.ME.55)
(11a) 寧ろ外出嫌いだ**という**事も聞いた。 (BJ.ME.14)
　　　*Mushiro sotode kirai da **to iu** koto mo kiita.*
(11b) Really, <u>he even told me that</u> he doesn't like going out. (BI.ME.09)
(12a) 「．．．少し此所で休まして下さい**って**」 (BJ.ME.68)
　　　*"...sukoshi koko de yasumashite kudasai **tte**"*
(12b) "...<u>say that</u> we hope to be allowed to rest briefly here." (BI.ME.65)

In examples (10a), (11a), and (12a), *to iu* and *-tte* indicate the marking modality of subtype *reported* perifratically to declare proof. Usually the source of evidence comes from someone else that can be trusted will appear in data such as example (10a), namely *isha* which means 'doctor', and because the words come from a doctor, it can be proven if the speaker's father's condition is really like that. But sometimes other people who give evidence is not mentioned in the sentence, as in examples (11a) and (12a).

Then, in Indonesian language data, the opposite happened. No marking modality of sub-type *reported* evidence appears in Indonesian language data. However, if translated into Indonesian, sentences containing the modality of the subtypes *reported* in the Japanese language can be equated with indirect sentences in Indonesian. Indirect sentences are indicated by the words *saying that* or the like, as in examples (10b), (11b), and (12b). In addition, if in sentences (11a) and (12a), the source of proof does not appear in Japanese data, then in sentence (10b) the source of evidence appears using third-person singular pronouns, that is to mention 'doctor' in the language data Japan. Furthermore, in example (11b) a first person singular pronoun *is* also used, but it is changed into enclosure *–nya* which is incorporated in *the said* word. Finally, in example (12b) even though the source of proof does not appear directly, but with the plural first person pronouns, that is, *we* show that my character makes himself and others as the source of proof, and asks others to deliver his words.

Based on the discussion above, a research data classification table can be made as follows:

Tabel2. *The Classification of Research Data Containing Epistemic Modalities and Evidentialities*

| Type of Modality | Modality Subtype | Forms of Japanese Modalities | Form of Indonesian Modalities | The meaning of modality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Epistemic | Deductive | *tashika ni* | sure, right, certain | certainty, confidence |
| | Speculative/ Asumtive | *kamoshirenai* | Maybe, perhaps | possibility, doubt |
| | | *darou* | maybe, really, I suppose | |
| | | *deshou* | | |
| | | *to omou* | I suppose, I think | thought, conjecture, estimate |
| Evidentialities | *Sensory* | *rashii* | seems, seems, like, seems, apparently, as | estimates, predictability |
| | | *sou da* | looked, seems, like | |
| | | *you da* | | |
| | *Reported* | *-tte* | Ø | proof |
| | | *to iu* | (modality does not appear, but if it is aligned with Indonesian indirect sentences, it is usually indicated by *saying that*) | |

From table 2 above, it can be said that the form of Indonesian modality can be paired with various forms of Japanese modality, for example *might be* that paired with *kamoshirenai, deshou* and also *darou*. In addition there are also modalities that appear in Japanese but do not appear in the Indonesian modalities, namely modalities evidentiality *reported* subtypes.

## 4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussion described above, it can be said that the contrastive analysis between epistemic modalities and Japanese-language evidentiality shows some differences and similarities. Differences arise mainly in marking modalities. One Indonesian modality can be paired with many Japanese modalities, as possible which can be paired with *kamoshirenaii, darou,* and *deshou*, or it *seems* that can be paired with *rashii, youda*, and *souda*. In addition, in the reported substantive evidential modality, modality marking in Japanese can be found, while in Indonesian there is no modality marking (Ø), but if the Japanese sentence containing the *reported* substantive evidential modality is translated, marking will appear (not modality) ), i.e. with words *that say* or other variations.

Then in the process of marking modality in a sentence, Japanese modality is generally marked by morphological changes and some of them are perifrastic, while the process of marking Indonesian modality is generally marked by changes in perifrastic, but some forms of modality in Indonesian experience morphological changes, such as *I guess* , and *apparently*, as the Japanese modality of *rashikatta* also undergoes a morphological change. Contrary to this, the similarity between the two arises from the meaning of modality, which between Japanese and Indonesian modalities has the same meaning in each type of modality, only the forms are different.

## 5. SUGGESTION

From the research that has been done and the conclusions obtained, it is suggested that in the future a free translation can be added to Japanese data, because if the data source is a translation novel, then the Indonesian language data is often translated in a style appropriate to the translation of literary works so that modality sometimes changes In addition, when viewed from the above data classification, it is recommended to continue research focused on epistemic modalities of deductive subtypes. Because the data in this study are still too homogeneous, they cannot dig deeper into the contrast between epistemic modalities of deductive subtypes in Japanese and Indonesian.

## 6. REFERENCES

Alwi, Hasan. 1992. *Modalitas dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Chaer, Abdul. 1994. *Linguistik Umum*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Hariri, Tatang. 2011. "A Review of Deontic Modality in Indonesian Language Based on The Theory of Japanese Modality" dalam *Jurnal Humaniora (online)* Vol.23, No.1, 2011.

Hasegawa, Yoko. 2015. *Japanese: A Linguistic Introduction*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Ishiwata, Toshio dan Takada, Makoto. 1998. *Taishou Gengogaku*. Tokyo: Oufuu.

Moleong, Lexy J. 2014. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif Edisi Revisi*. Bandung: Rosda.

Özbek, Aydın. 2011. "Aspect and Modality in Negative Constructions: A Contrastive Analysis of Turkish and Japanese" dalam *Journal of Linguistics and Literature* Vol.8, No.2, Juli 2011.

Palmer, F.R. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Septarani, Electra. 2017. *Modalitas Epistemik Bahasa Jepang dan Bahasa Sunda : Kajian Kontrastif ('Youda', 'Mitai da', dan 'Jigana;Jiga', 'Sigana;Siga', 'Kawasna;Kawas')*. Thesis. Tidak dipublikasikan. Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

Soseki, Natsume. 1952. *Kokoro*. Jepang: Shinchousha.

Soseki, Natsume. 2016. *Rahasia Hati*. Jakarta: KPG (Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia).

Yusuf, A. Muri. 2014. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif & Penelitiun Gabungan*. Jakarta: KencanaPrenadamedia Group.