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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to describe and to compare Arabic and Indonesian modality based on structure. In order to get valid results, three steps are needed. First, data collecting method were conducted by correct reading and technique note method. Second, the contrastive method with the descriptive and comparative technique was applied to analyze the data. The theories used in these researches were eclectic that they were taking ideas from several linguistic theories and combining them into a certain point of view. Third, the formal and informal method using the technique of formulation and clarification through ordinary words employed to present the data analysis result. The results of these researches show that the structure of Arabic modality were (1) Modal Auxiliaries (MA): käda and yukādū, (2) Finite Verbs of Modality (FVM): yastağfī and yajūzu, and (3) Lexical Modals (LM). The structures of modality in Indonesian were lexical modals (LM), phrase modals (PM) and clause modals (CM).

1. INTRODUCTION

Every nation has its own culture (Ma'ruf, 2011). When the culture is deeply examined, we will find out that a nation’s culture is sometimes similar or equal to another’s and sometimes not. Arabic is genealogically related to Semitic language, while Bahasa Indonesia is included in the Polynesian language (Arlotto, 1972). Geographically, Arabic is spoken in the West Asia and North Africa, while Bahasa Indonesia is in the South East Asia.

Bahasa Indonesia is the official language of Indonesian people which is predominantly Muslim. Bahasa Indonesia absorbs Arabic vocabularies of not less than 3000 words, among others: Arabic Language (AL)مسجد/masjid/mosque’, Indonesian Language (IL), ALمراجع/hakim/judge’ IL, ALمساور/IL/musyawarah/deliberation’. If Indonesian Muslims want to improve Islamic practices they must understand Arabic. Nahhani (2003) explains that it is because of the linguistic capacity that carries the capacity of Islam and consequently intermingles with it, such that perfect carrying of Islam cannot be undertaken except by it (the Arabic Language).

Every language has its structure, meaning and function. The structure of Arabic language (AL) and Indonesian language (IL) has similarities and characteristics of each. Structural equation AL and IL can be revealed by the comparative method, while the structural characteristics of AL and IL can be investigated by the contrastive method. Unfolding the structural from characteristics of the language, then it will also determine its meaning and function in our daily life.

One of the most important elements of the characteristic structure of language at the level of the sentence is the modality. Modality is an expression of the attitude of the speaker toward what modzakar/ma'annas wanted to response, based on modzakar/muannas knowledge or experience and his/her neighborhood. Understanding of the modalities is very important because it is used in various aspects of life based on the principles of intellectual, social principles and the principles of faith. Several studies on Arabic modalities have been previously studied (Safi, 2001; Wided, 2012), however, none of studies have analyzed the relation between Arabic modalities with Indonesian Language.

Attempts to comparatively analyses Arabic and Indonesian modalities in economical context have been done aiming to theoretically and practically contribute to Arabic-Indonesian discourses. Some of theoretical contributions are (1) registering modalities in the sentences containing structure of Arabic and Indonesian, (2) description of modality devices within the
meaning of the rules of grammar of Arabic and Indonesian. The practical contribution is, among others, functionalization of modalities in Arabic teaching books to non-Arabic speaker, i.e. Indonesia.

The method used in this study was a contrastive method, the theory of James (1998) ‘pure contrastive analysis’ and Dawod (2001). Adopted contrastive analysis by James (1998) with the following steps: (1) highlighting the level of language (phonology, structure and lexical), (2) Narrowing the object of unit study by classification in some language units: words, phrases and clauses, and (3) Application of the results of the analysis as a model of learning Arabic-Indonesian translation.

Dawod (2001) identically states that contrastive method is practically to remove the difficult perception of system language learners of target language and native language. It can be resolved by first, the duality of the language characteristics of the two systems, both Arabic and Indonesian. Second, the adjustment of the target language perception by doing a series of structured exercises.

To achieve the objective, we attempted to collect the data of modalities containing sentences in Arabic and Indonesian disclosure. We have completed the contrastive analysis of the data. The next step is dividing the result into 2 parts, namely the study of theory and application of the theory on the selected corpus.

The study of theory includes three discussions. First, previous studies on the modalities. Second, the study of Arabic language and Indonesian modalities terminology. Third, the method used in the research study. On the application of the theory on a corpus of data is to compare the structure of Arabic and Indonesian on the sentence level.

2. PART ONE: THEORY

2.1. Previous Research on Modality

Previous research on the modalities in a theory’s application can be classified into three categories. First, the research object of research modalities Arabic. Second, the object of the result is Indonesian modalities. Third, the study focuses on not Arabic or Indonesian. The first and second categories are directly related to the research ‘Contrastive Modality Study Arabic and Indonesian’, while the purpose of the third category is to determine the universality of the concept of modality or attitudes of the speaker.


2.2. Structure of Arabic Modality (AM)

Safi (2001: 9-11) describes Arabic modality in Arabic language (AL) in three types of modalities. First, Arabic modal auxiliaries (AMA), which is /kida‘/nearly, /yaKidu/nearly/, /ṣaraca/‘start’, /axadza‘start’. Second, finite verbs of modality (FVM), which is /tastaṭṭi‘/can, /yayüzü‘may/, /yaštamil‘maybe’. Third, non-verbal modality (NVM), which is /ṣi minha/‘he called the name of his mother’ leksikalisasi; with modalisasi Arabic modal verbs can form sentences with the structure of VSO or SVO.

Harbi (2011:27) names Auxiliary in Arabic term as /ṣaṃbi/‘want’, /yajibu‘want, would like’; /yajüz/yustahïl ‘can, could, be able to’; /yajib/alili ‘an tašça ‘l-qawänïni/’You must obey the rules’.

Alkhuli (1982:27) names Auxiliary in Arabic term as musâciđun Ẁggâyün. Musâciđun is the nature of words or verbs. Auxilliary is the nature of the word or verb that acts as an auxiliary verb. Verbs which help the main verb, such as may, can and will. Sometimes auxiliary verbs show the meaning of obligation, possibility, futurity, ability, past, sustainability, denouement and so on. Alkhuli (1982:95) calls finite verb in the Arabic term with fičlu maštudun. Fičlu maštudun is a perfect or imperfect verbs.

Finite is a perfect verb or imperfect verb that is not used for the whole persona pronouns and nouns or verbs that serve to connect /muštada and khabar/ on sentence/He is a doctor/‘He is a doctor’. In Arabic, it may connect a subject and verb in a verbal sentence (VSO). Harbi (2011) classifies Arabic modalities into 7 (7an-namziyyatu ‘l-fîliyyatu): First, /yurîdu/Arâda ‘want, wanted, would like’; second, /yastafa/iṣṭafa‘ and /yadîr/qadrî ‘can, could, be able to’; third, /yumiq/mumkin/yuhtmal/μuhtmal/qad ‘may/might/could/be probable’; fourth, /jäyiz/yajüz/yustahïl/Impossible ‘can/could be/possible/impossible’; fifth, (Sawfa) and (sa-) ‘will/shall/will be going to’; sixth, (yanbaṭi/yajib) and (labud) ‘should/must/ought to/be obliged to/have’; nada, seventh, (yalzam, usual) ‘be obliged to/should/have to’.

Harbi (2011:3) explains the difference in the character of modals of element of Arabic verbs and English verbs. First, The English modal verb is always a finite verb that accompanies the main while the modal of Arabic verb forms can be either finite or auxiliary. Second, modal English verbs do not inflect verbs with the subject while the modal Arabic verbs such as verbs AL can be an argument (subject) for the verb. Third, modal English verbs can be directly inserted with negative particles as well as modal Arabic verbs except [labud]. Fourth, modal English infinitives verbs always serve as a complement while the Arabic modal verb serves as a non-finite complement. Fifth, modal verbs in English can be a form of inversion of interrogative sentences while the modal of Arabic verbs can form sentences with the structure of VSO or SVO.

Wided (2010:25) differentiated contrastive of Arabic and English modalities as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Contrastive of Arabic and English Modalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Modalities</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>English Modalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>يكذك ان هاده الآن</td>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>I can run 10 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يكذك ان تدخل</td>
<td>Permission</td>
<td>May I call you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يتيم ان استقبل</td>
<td>Obligation</td>
<td>I should renew driver’s license</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ولسوم برهن</td>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>You should receive my letter in two days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يجدن اكبر حجر</td>
<td>Necessity</td>
<td>I must call my parent tonight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من المكوين ان امضر في البيت</td>
<td>Prohibition</td>
<td>You must not cross the street on red light</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wided (2010:25) also explains the meaning of English Modalities as following: (1) Epistemic Modality/can/ has a sense of ‘ability, possibility, permission, and impossibility’, (2) Intentional Modality/may/ has a sense of ‘possibility, and permission’, (3) Deontic Modality/must/ has a sense of ‘necessity, probability, and prohibition’, and (4) Dynamic modality/will/ has the meaning ‘future time and general truth’.

The theories from Alkhuli (1982), Safi (2001), Wided (2010) and Harbi (2011) above have not been yet described Arabic sentence structure in Arabic language. It is noted that the functional Arabic sentence structure (F) consists of subject, predicate, complement and adverb (SPOCA).

2.3. The Method and Data Analysis Techniques

Given the language is part of subculture (Ma’ruf, 2011), therefore, there are possibilities for the similarities and differences for some elements among some languages. However, the discussion on this study is only highlighting the contrastive analysis between the two genetically different languages, which means both of the languages are not mainly originated from the same family of language namely Bahasa Indonesia and Arabic. Kridalaksana (2009:15) terms it as contrastive analysis, differential analysis or differential linguistics, which means a synchronic method analyses language to show the similarities and differences among languages.

The first step of contrastive analysis method is to compare structure of the first language to second language in order to find similarities. Second, identify the differences between the two languages. James (1998:27) suggests combining descriptive method and comparative methods.

According to Dawod (2001:167), in modern Arabic grammar the term ‘nahwu’ (term of Arabic syntax) is more common and widespread than the traditional grammar ‘nahwu’. ‘Nahwu’ is traditionally discussed in terms of ‘I’rab, whereas in modern grammar, ‘nahwu’ is a study relates to the relationship between words in a sentence unit with an explanation of the function of structure in Arabic language. Figure 1 explains about words united in an Arabic sentence.

In the sentence classification of Arabic, it must be distinguished between the sentence with modality marker and the one without modality marker. Look at the following data (1) in Arabic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data (1a)</th>
<th>Data (1b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>نادرف لفه الإنجوسي</td>
<td>نريد أن نعرف لفة الإنجوسي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naqrif al-fiqha l-injilizya</td>
<td>Nuridu an naqrif l-fiqha l-injilizya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘We know the laws of England’</td>
<td>‘We want to know the laws of England’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alwi (1992:3) states that the expression of the attitude of Indonesian speakers is also expressed lexically. The use of auxiliary verbs such as will and shall (3), as it should be and perhaps adverbs (4), or the clause as I think (5a) and I want to (5b) is explained below.


Tomorrow Ali [will] come. [must]


Tomorrow, it [should] be the time for Ali to come. [may]

(5) Saya [kira ingin (agar)] besok Ali datang.

I [think] tomorrow Ali come. [want]
3. PART TWO: CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

3.1. Structure of the Arabic Modality

Linguistic expression of Arabic modalities (AM) contains two sentences structure in which one of the structure is the VSO structure of verbal sentences (jumlatun fi-iyyatun) and SVO structure of deverbal sentence (jumlatun ismiyyatun). The former consists of three modalities signs: (1) Modal Auxiliaries (MA), (2) Finite Verbs of Modality (FVM) and (3) Lexical Modsals (LM).

3.1.1. VSO Sentences Structure with Modal Auxiliaries (MA)

The signs of MA in SVO sentence structure in Al-Qur’an are kāda and yakādu.

Principle of MA (1.1): (Kāda-VP):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Kāda yazigu qulubu fariqin minhum (Q.S. 9:117)</th>
<th>nearly turned hearts party of their 'Parts of their hearts are nearly turned'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>V (im)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N(gen)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kāda is past tense (fīcī′u 'l-madi) form of nearly'. This is the formal structure of the sentence (P [v] S [s]), note the constituents in the sentence structure analysis (1).

Kāda position on the sentence structure is (1) a description of the verb/yazigu/→ kāda yazigu/‘nearly turned’. When sign of MA/kāda/ is disappeared, then this sentence is not a sentence that reflects the attitude of the speaker. Sign of /kāda/ has a function as quantitative basis adverb for /yazigu/. Subject of this sentence is a noun phrase /qulubu fariqin minhum/‘party of their hearts’.

Principle of MA (1.2): (Yakādu-VP):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Yakādu zaituhā yuḍī/u (Q.S 24:35)</th>
<th>Nearly oil illuminating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Atr</td>
<td>V (imp)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yakādu position on sentence structure (2) becomes a modifier for the verb/yuḍī/u/→ yakādu yuḍī/u/‘barely illuminating’. If, the sign of MA/yakādu/ is disappeared, then this sentence would not reflect the attitude of the speaker. Sign of yakādu/is a basis qualitative single adverb for verbs/yuḍī/u/. Subject of this sentence phrase that is composed by Noun + Pronoun /zaituhā/oil’.

3.1.2 Structure of VSO with Finite Verbs of Modality (FVM)

The signs such as FVM or fičī′un maḥḍudun in VSO structure in a book titled ‘as -siyāsatu ‘l-iqtiṣādiyyatu’ -muθlä by Al-malikiy Abdu ‘r-Rahm are yastaṭṣu′u and yajūzu.

Principle of FVM 2.1: (Tastaṭṣu′u-VP[subj.]):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Tastaṭṣu′u ’d-duwalu binaujibīhi ʔantadāca mina ‘n-nuqūdi</th>
<th>is able the country to handle it by giving of the-money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>FVM</td>
<td>Atr-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Atr</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formal structure of the verbal sentence is (Atr-SCPO). Note the analysis of constituents in the sentence structure (3).

On sentence structure (3) tastaṭṣu′u is finite or fičī′un maḥḍudun/tadāqa/→ tastaṭṣu′u ’an tadāqa/capable of delivering’. If, sign of FVM/tastaṭṣu′u/ is disappeared, then this sentence would not reflect the attitude of the speaker. So the function of the sign
/tastaṭācu/ as finite for verb /taḍāca/ that fulfills predicate position. This subject is a noun phrase composed by Art-N/d-duwalu/’state’, whereas the object is /‘n-νuqḍīfi/’money’ and complement /bimaujibihi/’to handle it’.

Principle of FVM 2.2: (yajüzu-VP subj.):

4

الْوَسَانُ أَنْ يَأْخُذَ مِنَ اهْنِرِ
allowed one to take (water) from the river?
Why is someone allowed to take(water) from the river? (PEI 2001: 89)

The formal structure of the verbal sentence is (Atr-SPC). Note the structural analysis of constituents in the sentence (4).

3.1.3 VSO Structure with Sign of Lexical Modals (LM)

The sign of lexical modals (LM) in VSO structure is arāda. Principle of LM 3.1: (ʔarāda + VP subj.):

5

أَرَادَ أَنْ يَدْخُوْهَا
(He) wants to import
(Ahlu di ‘uṣūmahu) wants to import (SEI:410)

SPO structure of declarative sentence intentional modality (InM) with lexical modal verb /ʔarāda/want’ → (S[N]P[Pro]O) is for data (5). This data is a verbal sentence (jumlatun fi/iyyatun). Note the analysis of constituent of declarative sentence structure InM:

6

؟اْنْ يَأْخُذَ مِنَ اهْنِرِ
allowed one to take (water) from the river?
Why is someone allowed to take(water) from the river? (PEI 2001: 89)

Based on data analysis (5) we can understand that the subject of the sentence is a pronoun or inclusive subject in /ʔarāda/’(the) wants’ that acts as a principal. The predicate is a subjunctive construction mode (ʔal-muḍāriṣu ‘l-manṣub)/ʔan yadxała/to incorporate’. The MS construction is a transitive verb. The object is in the form of object pronouns (Pro) or ‘ʔal-Damir/ha/’her (p3-tg-f).

3.1.4. Lexical Modal Noun (LMN)

Modal in Lexical intentional modalties (InM) is a modal in the form of noun (ismun) /‘l-Muradi/’who want’. The formal structure of SPOK sentence structure is → (SP[V][O][N]+C[M]).

Principle of LMN 1: (ʔal-Muradi-NP):

6

تَلْبِيْعُ عَلَى النِّعْمَةِ الْقَلْبِيَّةِ
Meet the needs for the things desire of her
Meet the needs for the things she wants. (PEI 2001: 49)

Data (6) is a verbal sentence (jumlatun fi/iyyatun). Note the constituent analysis of the Intentional Modality declarative sentence structure.

Based on data analysis (6) we can understand that the subject of the sentence is a subject pronoun or inclusive in /tashaṣṣ u/’meet’. The predicate is verb/tashaṣṣ/‘meet’. The object is in the form of noun/hājatan/’needs’. And the adverb is a prepositional phrase (genitive) or /‘l-ṣāiʔi/’l-muradi biyuṣṣāthi/’for the things she wants’.

3.2. Indonesian Modality Structure (IM)

The Indonesian modality structure are: firstly is lexical modals (LM), secondly is phrase modals (PM), and thirdly is clause modals (CM).
3.2.1. Indonesian Modality Structure with Lexical Modsals (LM)

Indonesian modality structure uses lexical modsals (LM) auxiliary verbs (AV) as /mampu/’able’ (7) and /hendak/’want’ (8). As for the use of lexical modsals (LM) ad verb is such as /hampir/nearly’ (9).

Data (7) /mampu/’able’ is an auxiliary verb /tackle/dynamic modality (DyM).

Data (8) /hendak/ is auxiliary verb /dimiliki/ in intentional modality.

Data (9) /hampir/ is an adverb for /berpaling/’turn’ in epistemic modality structure.

The country is /mampu/’able’ to cope with the channeling of money (Ba-3SKN: 274). Notice the sentence structure analysis of epistemic modality’s constituents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negara</th>
<th>mampu</th>
<th>mengatasi</th>
<th>dengan menyalurkan uang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data (7) /mampu/’able’ is an auxiliary verb /tackle/dynamic modality (DyM).

Data (8) is the formal structure of Indonesian Modality in SPK sentence, whereas the principle of LM is (hendak-VP).

(8) He meets the needs/hendak dimilikinya/’with something he wants to have’ (PEI, 2001: 49). Note the constituent analysis of intentional modality sentence structure below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dia</th>
<th>memenuhi</th>
<th>kebutuhan</th>
<th>dengan sesuatu yang hendak dimilikinya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data (8) /hendak/ is auxiliary verb /dimiliki/ in intentional modality.

Data (9) is the formal structure of Indonesian modality sentence that has SP, whereas the principle of LM is (hampir-V).

(9) Their hearts nearly turned ’(Q.S. 9:117).

Note the constituent analysis of Indonesian modality in sentence structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hatimereka</th>
<th>Hampir</th>
<th>Berpaling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Fadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data (9) /hendak/’want’ is an adverb for /berpaling/’turn’ in epistemic modality structure.

Indonesian Modality Structure of Phrase Modsals (PM)

Indonesian modality structure uses phrases modsals (PM), for example /hampir-hampir/almost’ (10).

Data (10) is formal structure of Indonesian modality sentence that consists of SP, while principle of PM is (hampir-hampir-V).

(10) The oil (only) is almost exactly illuminating (Sura 24:35).

Note the constituent analysis of Indonesian modality sentence structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minyaknya</th>
<th>hampir-hampir</th>
<th>Menerangi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Fadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data (10) /hampir-hampir/’almost’ is an adverb phrase for /illuminating/ in epistemic modality structures.

3.2.2. Structure of Indonesian modality with Clause Modsals (CM)

Indonesian modality structure uses Clause Modsals (CM) as /Someone allowed/ (11) and /Ahlu dhimma want/ (12).

Data (11) is the formal structure of deontic modality sentence that consists of SP-SPK, while principle of CM 1 is (Seseorang diperkenankan-Clause).

(11) Someone allowed him to take (water) from the river (PEI, 2001: 89). Note the constituent analysis of intentional modality (InM) sentence structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seseorang</th>
<th>diperkenankan</th>
<th>agar dia mengambil</th>
<th>dari sungai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data (11) /Seseorang diperkenankan/ is a clause modal (CM) of /untuk mengambil/ in MdDbI structure.

Look at data (12), the formal structures of Mdbs is SP-SPO, whereas the principle of CM 2 is (Ahlu dzimmah ingin-Clause).

(12) Ahlu dzimmah ingin agar dia mengimpornya (SEI: 410) ‘Ahlu dzimmah want him to import them’. Note the constituent analysis of intentional modality sentence structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ahlu dzimmah</th>
<th>ingin</th>
<th>agar dia mengimpornya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data (12) /Ahlu dzimmah ingin/’want’ is clause modal (CM) for his/her import/ in epistemic modality structures.

3.3. Comparison of Modality Structure in Arabic-Indonesian Language

Comparison of Arabic Modality (AM) structure can be describes as First, the structure of SVO sentence with sign of modal Auxiliary (MA) or musājīdan ṣṣāy‘awn. Second, VSO sentence with sign of finite verbs of modality (FVM) or fiḷun maṣḥudun.
Third, the structure of SVO sentences with sign of lexical modals (LM). While the structure of Indonesian modalities, first is lexical modals (LM), second is phrase modals (PM), and third is clause modals (CM). Arabic modality structure (AM) and Indonesian modality structure (IM) are shown in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

### Table 2. Arabic modality structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle of MA</th>
<th>Arabic Modality (AM)</th>
<th>Principle of LMN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(kāda+VP)</td>
<td>(tastaḥṣal+VP[subj.])</td>
<td>(ʔarāda+VP[subj.])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(yakādu-VP)</td>
<td>(ʔajāʾū+VP[subj.])</td>
<td>(ʔal-murādī-NP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Indonesian modality structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle of LM</th>
<th>Principle of PM</th>
<th>Principle of CM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(mampu-V)</td>
<td>(hampir-hampir-V)</td>
<td>(Seseorang diperkenankan- Clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hendak-VP)</td>
<td>(ʔajāʾū-VP)</td>
<td>(Ahlu dzimmah ingin-Clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hampir-V)</td>
<td>(ʔajāʾū+VP[subj.])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. CONCLUSION

The results of contrastive research study of MdbA-Mdbl structures in book "ʔas-siyāṣatu 'l-iqtīṣādiyyatu' l-muḥāţā" and its translation "Economy Politics of Islam", by Al-maliky Abdu ‘r-Rahman that firstly, the structure of VSO sentence with Arabic Modal Auxiliaries (AMA) marker or musāʿidun ʔiggīyi‘un. The sign of AMA Kāda and yakādu. And the principle of MA are (1) (Kāda-VP) and (2) (yakādu-VP).

**Principle of MA**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Principle of MA} &= \begin{cases} 
\kāda & \text{yakādu} \\
\end{cases} + \text{VP}
\end{align*}
\]

**Second**, VSO sentence with sign of Finite Verbs of Arabic Modality (FVAM) or fiẓlun maḥdudun. FVMA signs include yastāṭiṣu and yajūzu. The principle of FVM1 is (tastaḥṣal-VP[ subj.]-PP) and the principle of FVM (2) is (ʔajāʾū-N-VP[ subj.]-PP).

**Principle of FVM**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Principle of FVM} &= \begin{cases} 
\text{tastaḥṣal} & \text{yajūzu} \\
\end{cases} + \text{VP[subj.]} 
\end{align*}
\]

**Third**, the structure of SVO sentence with sign of Arabic Lexical Modals (ALM), such as Arāda and ʔ-l-Murādi. The principle of LMV is (1) (ʔarāda-VP[ subj.]) and the principle of LMN (1) is (ʔal-Murādi-NP)

**Principle of ALM**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Principle of ALM} &= \begin{cases} 
\text{LMV(ʔarāda-VP[ subj.])} & \text{LMN(ʔal-murādī-NP)} \\
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

The structure of the Indonesian modalities consists of: **first**, Lexical Modals (LM) as /hampir/ nearly’, /mampu/’able’, and /hendak/’want’, **second**, Phrase Modals (PM), for example /hampir-hampir/’almost’, and **third**, clause modals (CM) such as /seseorang diperkenankan/’someone is allowed’ and /Ahlu dzimmah ingin/’(Ahlu dzimmah) want’.
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**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>accusative</th>
<th>LM</th>
<th>Lexical Modals (LM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>Adverb (Ad)</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Modal Auxiliaries (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Arabic modality (AM)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Arabic language (AL)</td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>auxiliary verbs (AV)</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase (NP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Complement (C)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Object (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Predicate (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>clause modals (CM)</td>
<td>Par</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeM</td>
<td>Deontic Modality (DeM)</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>phrase modals (PM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DyM</td>
<td>Dynamic modality (DyM)</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase (PP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EpM</td>
<td>Epistemic Modality (EpM)</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>functional (F) structure</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Subject (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVM</td>
<td>Finite Verbs of Modality (FVM)</td>
<td>S(in)</td>
<td>Subject inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>Subjunctive mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Indonesian language (IL)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Indonesian modality (IM)</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verbal Phrase (VP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InM</td>
<td>Intentional Modality (InM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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