

# A REVIEW OF DEONTIC MODALITY IN INDONESIAN LANGUAGE BASED ON THE THEORY OF JAPANESE MODALITY<sup>1</sup>

Tatang Hariri

## ABSTRAK

Menurut Hasan Alwi (1992), lingkup modalitas deontik dalam bahasa Indonesia adalah perizinan dan perintah dengan modalnya seperti *boleh*, *bisa*, *dapat* dan verba modalitas yang lain. Dua makna ini, perizinan dan perintah, ditelusuri dari sudut predikasi dan kedeiktisan. Dalam kajian ini modalitas deontik dalam bahasa Indonesia akan dipertimbangkan kembali berdasarkan teori modalitas bahasa Jepang.

**Kata Kunci:** *touihyouka*, *gimu*, *hitsuyousei*, *susume*, *kyoka*

## ABSTRACT

According to Hasan Alwi (1992) the scopes of deontic modality in Indonesian are permission and command with its modals such as “*boleh*, *bisa*, *dapat*”, and other modality verbs. These two meanings, permission and command, are investigated from the point of view predication and deictivity. In this study deontic modality in Indonesian will be reviewed on the basis of the theory of Japanese modality.

**Keywords:** *touihyouka*, *gimu*, *hitsuyousei*, *susume*, *kyoka*

## INTRODUCTION

Based on the theory of modality in western languages, Hasan Alwi (1992) divided modality in Indonesian into four categories, one of which is deontic modality. Deontic modality is a modality which is related to obligation, and it is also concerned with the meaning of “permission” and “command”. In this paper, I would like to review the theory on the basis of the theory of Japanese modality. The reasons are, first, the fact that in Japanese, the study of modality is making a great progress and, second, I think that the time has come to review the theory of deontic modality in Indonesian.

First, in the section of “Literature Review and Problems”, I explain the main idea of Hasan Alwi’s theory of deontic modality in Indonesian and point out its problems. Next, by taking those problems into account and also by referring to the theory of deontic modality in Japanese, I review the theory. The objects of the review are the definition of deontic modality, modality markers and the meaning of each marker, in the Indonesian language. Finally, in the concluding section, I draw some conclusions and point out several problems which might need further research to solve.

## LITERATURE REVIEW AND PROBLEMS

We can summarize Hasan Alwi’s theory of deontic modality in Indonesian as follows points. On the basis of western linguistic theories such as Givon (1973), Quirk et.al (1985), Lyons (1977), Palmer (1979), Meunier (1981), Geerts & Melis (1976), and Kalinowski (1976), Hasan Alwi explains that the concerns of deontic modality are “permission” and “command”, and the markers for “permission” are *boleh*, *bisa*, *dapat* and some verbs with the meaning of “permission” such as *mengizinkan*, *memperbolehkan*, *memperkenankan* etc. As for “command”, the markers are *wajib*, *harus*, *mesti*, *jangan*, *tidak boleh* and some verbs which express order or command and prohibition such as *mengharuskan*, *memerintahkan*, *melarang*, etc. He analyzes the two meanings of deontic based on predication, which is concerned with negation and orientation, and also its deictivity, which is related to the first and second person.

---

Lecturer in Japanese Culture Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta

Furthermore, Hasan Alwi shows the problems of predication and deictivity by giving and describing the following examples.

- 1) Kamu { *boleh / bisa / dapat* } bermain di sini.
- 2) Kamu { *boleh / bisa / dapat* } tidak bermain di sini.
- 3) Kamu tidak { *boleh / bisa / dapat* } bermain di sini.

The relation between negation and “permission” is formulated as (a) the deontic source allows x not to do something, or (b) the deontic source does not allow x to do something. Sentence (01) is a sentence which expresses the “permission” meaning, and is not yet related to the problem of negation. Meanwhile, sentences (02) and (03) are examples of sentences resulting from an analysis based on negation. Sentence (02) shows a negation of the predicate, which fits in with the formula (a), and sentence (03) shows a negation of the modality marker, which is suitable with the formula (b). We can say that sentence (03), which is a negation of the “permission” meaning, has the same meaning as a sentence which expresses “prohibition”

“Permission” shows the orientation of modality which is closely related to the deontic source. It indicates that “permission” has an orientation to the speaker or the rules. For example, as for those three sentences mentioned above, the “permission” meanings have orientation to either speaker or rule.

The analysis of the meaning “permission” which is based on the problems of its deictivity is an analysis which is related to the use of the first person pronoun, which is speaker or deontic source, and the use of the second person pronoun, which is a partner in conversation and a person who actualizes an event. The use of the first person pronoun as the deontic source is a constituent which functions as the subject of the main clause. The person who actualizes an event is stated by one of the constituents in the subordinative clause. For example,

- 4) Saya {*mengizinkan/memperbolehkan/memperkenalkan*} kamu menebang pohon itu.

Sentence (04) shows that the first person pronoun “saya” is the subject of the main clause, and also the deontic source. The second person pronoun “kamu” acts as a person who actualizes an event. However, there is also the use of the first person pronoun “saya” as the subject but not as the deontic source as shown in sentence (05) where the modality markers include “*boleh, bisa, dapat*”.

- 5) Saya {*boleh/bisa /dapat*} meminjam mobilnya

Furthermore, on the basis of Marino (1973), Perkins (1983), and Coates (1983), Hasan Alwi states that there are deontic sources which come from the speaker, and there are also some which come from rules which are valid in a certain society as social regulations or norms. For instance,

- 6) Kamu *bisa* menitipkan pesan-pesan kepada kita
- 7) Kamu { *boleh / bisa / dapat* } ikut ujian untuk memperoleh SIM karena umurmu sekarang sudah 18 tahun.

Sentence (06) describes the deontic source which comes from the speaker, and sentence (07) shows that the deontic source comes from rules.

It is clear from the discussion above that the theory offered by Hasan Alwi has some problems which is related to (a) a clear definition of deontic modality in Indonesian, (b) modality markers, (c) the meanings of deontic modality in Indonesian, and (d) the needs for alternative analyses.

From several reference books, I picked up two theories of deontic modality in Japanese as the basis of the review, i.e., Nitta (2000: 81-87) and Takanashi (2002: 80-120). Both of them provide clear and detailed explanations and they also represent the theory of deontic modality in Japanese. In the following section, I will first describe the theory of deontic modality in Japanese, then identify markers of modality in Indonesian which have similar or the same characteristics and specification as those in Japanese, and compare them with those that Hasan Alwi has identified.

## PROCESS AND RESULT OF REVIEWING

As for the terms of deontic modality, Nitta (2000) uses the term *touihyouka no modality* and Takanashi (2002) the term *hyouka no modality*. Below are the definitions of deontic modality offered by Nitta (2000) and Takanashi (2002):

“*Nakereba naranai*”, “*bekida*”, “(se) *zaru wo enai*”, “(suru/shita) *houga ii*”, “(shi) *temo ii*” *nado no keishiki wa, ue de mita youni, gairyaku, jitai ni taishite, sono jitsugen wo touzen deari gimuteki dearu mono toshite toraetari, sono jitsugen ga suishou saretari mitomeraretari suru mono toshite toraetari suru, to itta jitaijitsugen ni taisuru touihyoukatekina toraekata wo arawashita mono dearu. Aruiwa, jitai ga touzensei-hyoukasei wo obita mono toshite sonzai shiteiru koto wo arawashita mono dearu. Korera no shokeishiki no arawasu, jitaiseiritsu ni taisuru touihyoukatekina toraekata-arikata wo honshou dewa, **touihyouka no modality** to kashou shi, meidaimeate no modality no ichirui toshite ichizuketeoku.* (Nitta, 2000:84-85).

*Jojutsu no modality towa, jouhou wo nobetsutaeru kotoni kakawaru modality de ari, meidai naiyou ni taisuru hanashite no hyoukatekina toraekata wo shimesu **hyouka no modality** to, meidai naiyou ni taisuru hanashite no ninshikitekina toraekata wo arawasu ninshiki no modality ni nibun sareru.* (Takanashi, 2002:79)

As for Indonesian, the naming can be as it is, i.e., deontic modality, or if we would like to make it sound more like Indonesian we can use such terms as, for example, *Modalitas Pertimbangan Nilai*, and it can be defined briefly as follows:

*Deontic modality is a variety of modality which has an orientation to the proposition which describes the way the speaker understand the proposition on basis of valid value or norms.*

As shown above, Nitta (2000) mentions five markers of deontic modality in Japanese, that is, *nakereba naranai*, *bekida*, *(se) zaru wo enai*, *(suru / shita) houga ii*, and *(shi) temo ii*. The markers *nakereba naranai*, *bekida*, *(se) zaru wo enai* have the meaning of *gimu* ‘obligation’ and *hitsuyousei* ‘necessity’, the marker *(suru / shita) houga ii* has the meaning of *susume* ‘advice’, and the marker *(shi) temo ii* has the meaning of *kyoka* ‘permission’.

Meanwhile, Takanashi (2002) provide more markers and their meanings though not all of them are explained in his writing. Takanashi (2002) classifies them into these groups. As for the meaning of *hitsuyoudatoukei* ‘necessity-propriety group’, the markers are *to ii*, *ba ii*, *tara ii*, *houga ii*, *nakutewa ikenai*, *bekida*, *zaru wo enai*, *hitsuyou ga aru*, etc. As for the meaning *fu hitsuyoukei* ‘unnecessity groups’, the markers are *nakutemo ii*, *mademo ii*, etc. As for the meaning *kyoyoukei* ‘permission group’, the marker is *temo ii*. As for the meaning *hikyoyoukei* ‘prohibition group’, the marker is *tewa ikenai*.

From several markers given by Nitta (2000) and Takanashi (2002), in this paper I would like to deal with *nakereba naranai*, *bekida*, *(suru/shita) houga ii*, and *(shi) temo ii*. Note that *nakereba naranai* and *nakutewa ikenai* is considered the same. I do not wish to make any distinction between *(suru/shita) houga ii*. By knowing the characteristics of each marker, and their meanings, I would like to search for some markers which have similar or the same characteristics and specifications in Indonesian. Next, I am going to discuss these markers.

### **NAKEREBA NARANAI AND BEKIDA**

The marker *nakereba naranai* has many variations of forms such as *nakutewa ikenai*, *nakutewa naranai*, *nakereba ikenai*, and *naito ikenai*. They all have the same meaning. Takanashi (2002) distinguishes between *nakereba naranai* and *bekida*. The former belongs to the *hyoukateki fukugokeishiki* group, and the latter to *jodoushi* ‘auxiliary verb’. But, from the point of view of meaning we can put them together in the same group, that is, *hitsuyoudatoukei*

‘necessity-propriety group’.

Nitta (2000) states that *nakereba naranai* and *bekida* are used for (a) type which uses *ishi doushi* and subjects which have needs or obligation to realize an action, (b) type which has *ishi doushi* and plural or general subjects, and the subjects also have needs or obligation to realize an action, and the realization itself is proper and clear, and (c) a condition in which the performer is *muishiteki* ‘unintentional’, this describes a logical propriety meaning from the realization condition or necessity-propriety from its realization condition. Takashi (2002) uses the marker *nakutewa ikenai*, and he argues that this marker has an essential meaning ‘describing a judgement that the related condition must be realized’. From this statement, we can say that this marker is basically has the meaning *kyousei* ‘compulsion. If the related condition is not realized, the marker will have the meaning *koukai* ‘regret’ or *fuman* ‘dissatisfaction’, as shown in (08). The speaker expresses his regret because he is late for the train. He should have left his house 10 minutes earlier.

8) (*densha ni noriokurete*) “*Shimatta. Ato jippun hayaku ie wo denakya ikenakatta.*”

From the above explanation, we can search some markers in Indonesian which are equivalent with *nakereba naranai* and *bekida*, by examining their characteristics. For instance, sentences (09), (10), and (11) fit with explanation (a), and (12), (13), (14) fit with explanation (b), and (15) fits with explanation (c) above. Sentence (16) fits with Takashi’s explanation (2002), considering the second meaning of the marker “*nakutewa ikenai*” as shown in sentence (08) above.

9) “Lebih dari sekedar terima kasih, kamu wajib bersyukur pada Yang Maha Kuasa.....”(Nyanyian Malam, Uki Bayu Sedjati )

10) “Saya belum bisa memutuskan, Pak. Saya mesti memikirkannya dulu sehari atau dua hari. Tapi ngomong-ngomong bagaimana kasus tersebut bisa sampai ke meja Bapak?” (*Denting Dawai-dawai Kecapi*, Endang Werdiningsih)

11) “Lebih baik kau tidak usah menikah daripada Ibu harus melamar anak perempuan mereka!” geram Ibu sama berangnya. (*Luruh Kunci Sebelum Berbunga*, Mira W.)

In sentences (09), (10), and (11), the performing subjects are specific, that is, the conversation partner *kamu* in (09), the speaker *saya* in (10), and the speaker *ibu* in (11), and each subject uses *ishi doushi*, which is *bersyukur* in (09), *memikirkannya* in (10), *melamar* in (11). Each sentence shows that the performing subject has a necessity or obligation to realize an action, which is *bersyukur* in (09), *memikirkannya* in (10), *melamar* in (11).

Meanwhile, in sentences (12), (13), and (14), the performing subjects are general, that is, *setiap mahasiswa* in (12), *PDAM* in (13), and *Timor Timur* in (14), and use *ishi doushi*, which is *memenuhi* in (12), *memperbaiki* in (13), and in *menerima* (14). Each performing subject has a necessity or obligation to realize an action, and the realization of the action or condition itself is proper and clear. For example, in (12), it is a student’s obligation to pay his school expenses since the regulation is clear; in (13) it is proper that the PDAM (water supply company) should increase their service before asking for an increase in water rate; and in (14) it is proper and clear that building a country is not an easy thing to do, so it is an obligation for Timor Timur to stay together with Indonesia and accept the offer of autonomy.

12) *Setiap Mahasiswa* wajib memenuhi administrasi keuangan sesuai dengan peraturan yang berlaku. ([www.stieperbanas.ac.id](http://www.stieperbanas.ac.id))

13) Pendapat senada disampaikan Warisman (48), konsumen di Tlogosari. Dia mengatakan, *semestinya* sebelum menaikkan tarif *PDAM memperbaiki* pelayanan. Selain itu, kenaikan tarif yang wajar cukup 20-30%. ([www.suamerdeka.com](http://www.suamerdeka.com))

14) Ia berkata bahwa *Timor Timur seharusnya menerima* tawaran otonomi. “*Semestinya* mereka *harus* tetap bersama Indonesia. Mereka tidak tahu bagaimana sulitnya untuk membangun suatu negara,” ([www.ips.org/indonesia](http://www.ips.org/indonesia))

Sentence (15) shows that, the verb used is an unintentional verb *pusing*, and the realization condition is clear and logical, which is to make them (the criminals) easier to escape

after they have done their crime. Why do they (the criminals), as the performing subject, have to bother looking for a place to park if they can park their car in front of the victim's house so that they can escape easily?

- 15) “Mengapa *mereka harus pusing* mencari tempat seperti ini, mobil kan bisa diparkir di depan rumah, lalu langsung lari?” bantah Anton. (Memperhatikan *Hal-hal Kecil*, Enggar Adibroto, Majalah Intisari)

Finally, sentence (16) can be considered the same with *nakutewa ikenai* which means *fuman* ‘dissatisfaction’. Since the related condition did not happen, the speaker “aku” expressed her dissatisfaction. She was upset because she had to serve the guests alone because her friend had a stomach ache.

- 16) “..... Tadi malam *mestinya* aku melayani tamu berdua. Tapi temanku perutnya sakit. Dia, katanya, kalau menstruasi selalu sakit. Terpaksa aku sendirian, tamunya ada 5, satu perempuan empat lelaki.” (Nyanyian Malam, Uki Bayu Sedjati)

### **(SURU/SHITA HOUGA II**

Nitta (2000) states that this kind of marker is based on the type of verb and the subject, and it has the meaning of *susume* ‘advice’ to the subject to perform an action. Takanashi (2002) also states the same thing, but he adds that *houga ii* can also have the meaning of *keikoku* ‘warning’, i.e., “if the related condition does not happen, it will have the meaning *koukai* ‘regret’ or *fuman* ‘dissatisfaction’”. Further, he also argues that as for the marker *houga ii*, if the related condition can not be controlled, it will have the meaning of *ganbou* ‘wish’.

In the Indonesian language, as for *houga ii* which has the meaning of *susume* ‘advice’, sentence (17) can be considered the same. The speaker Wiwin gives advice to the hearer and also partner in conversation “Roman”. She advises Roman to take Wulandari home.

- 17) Wulandari berdiri di luar sedan. Wajahnya pucat. / *Sebaiknya*, antarkan dia pulang, Man,” kata Wiwin yang dibonceng Bambang. (Roman Picisan, Eddy D. Iskandar)

As for “*houga ii*” which means *keikoku* ‘warning’, it seems difficult to use the marker *sebaiknya* as the marker which has that meaning, since it is more suitable to the meaning ‘advice’ than ‘warning’. However, sentence (18) might be considered similar, by having the meaning ‘warning’, since “instead of trying first by drinking water, trying various medicines will likely bring about something bad”, so the marker *sebaiknya* in this sentence can be considered having the meaning ‘warning’.

- 18) Sebelum mencoba berbagai macam obat *sebaiknya* coba dulu dengan minum air putih. ([www.aqua.com](http://www.aqua.com))

Regarding *houga ii* which has the meaning *koukai* ‘regret’ or *fuman* ‘dissatisfaction’, in sentence (19), for example, the speaker regretted why he didn’t take the train, if he had found out that taking the cab would also be trapped in a traffic jam.

- 19) (Di tengah perjalanan, naik taksi, terjebak oleh kemacetan lalu-lintas) ”Tahu begini, *sebaiknya* tadi saya naik kereta saja.”(mengambil referensi dari Takanashi, 2002)

As for *houga ii* which has the meaning *ganbou* ‘wish’, as in sentence (20), the speaker felt that rather than not trying to do anything, it was better to try, even though the result might be different from what he had expected.

- 20) (Ketika bermaksud akan membuktikan suatu kebenaran, tetapi bukti-bukti pendukung kurang lengkap) “Walaupun bagaimana hasilnya nanti belum dapat dipikirkan, tapi *sebaiknya* kebenaran ini tidak dipendam begitu saja.”

### **(SHI) TEMO II**

Nitta (2000) states that this marker is based on the type of verb and the subject, it has the meaning *kyouka* ‘permission’. Takanashi (2002) argues that the main meaning of this marker is “describing whether the judgement to the related condition is allowed or permitted”.

As for the related condition which can be controlled, it describes *touihandan* ‘value judgement’, and if it has the function of *hatarakikake*, it will be a sentence in which the speaker gives a “permission” to his partner in conversation. As for an interrogative sentence, based on whether the hearer (partner in conversation) can allow the speaker to perform an action, it will be a sentence which the speaker asks the hearer’s permission. If the related condition does not happen, this marker will have the meaning *koukai* ‘regret’ or *fuman* ‘dissatisfaction’.

In Indonesian, by examining the following sentences, we can determine which marker has the same or similar characteristics to *temo ii*. For instance, sentence (21) shows that the speaker gives permission to the hearer or partner in conversation “Anda” to make a wish or to have any hope. In sentence (22), which is an interrogative sentence, the first person *saya* asks a permission to the partner in conversation whether the speaker can go together or not. Sentence (23) is also the same. The speaker asks a permission to the partner in conversation, but instead of *boleh*, the marker is *bisa*. As for the affirmative sentence, it often has the meaning of ability, as we can see in sentence (24). If we look further, we can say that the marker *bisa* tends to be more ‘compelling’ to the partner in conversation rather than *boleh*.

- 21) Percayalah, Anda *boleh* bermimpi apa saja, tapi selama Anda tak punya keberanian untuk memulai dan yakin bahwa itu tak mungkin, maka mimpi Anda benar-benar cuma bunga tidur! (Hanyawanita.com)
- 22) “Ada perampokan lagi, kali ini sedang berlangsung. Saya pinjam mobil, saya harus segera ke sana.” / “Boleh ikut?” / “Boleh, asal tidak ikut campur dan tidak bertindak di luar perintah saya.”(Memperhatikan Hal-hal Kecil, Enggar Adibroto, Majalah Intisari)
- 23) Ketika telepon diletakkan, beberapa kemudian berdering lagi. “Da, saya ingin ketemu kau besok sore. *Bisa* saya ke rumahmu?”. Farida ragu-ragu.(Misteri Bunga Tasbih, Lestari)
- 24) Subagia yang baru pulang dari berbelanja tampak syok begitu mengetahui apa yang terjadi. Sampai beberapa saat ia belum *bisa* diajak berkomunikasi. (Gara-gara Killing Me Softly, Riady B. Sarosa/fiksi, Majalah Intisari)

As for *temo ii* which has the meaning *koukai* ‘regret’ or *fuman* ‘dissatisfaction’, as Takanashi (2002) explains, in Indonesian, it is not easy to find data in which the marker *boleh* has the same meaning as those meanings. If we try to translate the example which Takanashi (2002:107) gives, it will be *padahal ...pun ...boleh / bisa* like the sentence below. The speaker regrets and it is shown in *temo yokatta* (=the past form of *temo ii*)

- 25) Kouen demo souda. Hajime wa en da en da to omou. Danjou ni agattemo, shibaraku wa furueteiru. Tokoroga, owatte hakushuu ga atte hikaeshitsu ni modottekuruto, ato juugofun gurai hanashitei*temo yokattana* to omottari suru. (Yamaguchi Hitomi, “*Sakenomi no jikobengo*”)
- 26) Kuliah juga begitu. Awal-awalnya saya merasa jemu. Begitu naik podium pun, masih gemeteran. Tapi begitu selesai terdengar tepuk tangan, dan begitu kembali ke ruang tunggu, saya berpikir *padahal* berbicara lima belas menit lagi *pun boleh*.

As for these markers, Nitta (2000) explains that in Japanese, these markers can not be used together in the same sentence, since they belong to the same group. For example, *shinakereba naranai – bekida*, or *shitemo ii – bekida* are not valid. But in Indonesian, as shown in the sentence below, two markers of deontic modality can be used together.

- 27) *Seharusnya* Megawati Soekarnoputri sebagai Presiden *tidak boleh* melupakan kasus 27 Juli, karena melupakan kasus itu, sama saja dengan anti demokrasi. Kasus 27 Juli adalah peristiwa pelecehan dan pemerkosaan terhadap demokrasi dan siapapun tidak boleh melakukan hal tersebut. ([www.kompas.com](http://www.kompas.com))

The above sentence shows that syntactically and semantically, the marker *seharusnya* which has the meaning of “obligation” can be used together with the marker *tidak boleh* which has the meaning of “prohibition”. However, we can not exchange the position these markers since it will be ungrammatical and will also have a different meaning. We need further research on when the markers can be used together in a sentence. From this point of view, we can say that a

review based on Japanese can help us to understand the similarities and also differences in languages, and these differences become the characteristics of each language.

From this review, we got some results, such as defining deontic modality in Indonesian language, gathering markers and their meanings. By considering some examples in Japanese language, such as *nakereba naranai*, *bekida*, *houga ii* and *temo ii*, in Indonesian language we can gather markers and their meanings such as (a) *wajib*, *mesti*, *harus*, and their variations *sewajibnya*, *semestinya*, *seharusnya*, has the meaning obligation, necessity, compulsion, regret or dissatisfaction; (b) *sebaiknya* has the meaning of advice, warning, regret or dissatisfaction, and wish; and (c) *boleh* has the meaning of permission.

## CONCLUSION

In this paper, based on the theory of deontic modality in Japanese, I review Hasan Alwi's theory of deontic modality in Indonesian, which is based on the theory of deontic modality in European languages, and I got results: (1) a clear definition of deontic modality in Indonesian language. (2) A clear distinction to the meaning "order" or "command" given by Hasan Alwi. Since this meaning tends to have the characteristic *hatarakikake*, it is better to classify this into *hatsuwa-dentatsu no modality* 'utterance-transmission modality' which needs the presence of a hearer or partner in conversation. (3) A group of meanings and their markers for deontic modality in Indonesian, which consist of obligation, advice, permission, and other markers in Japanese which have not been analyzed.

However, there are still some problems, which need further research. (1) It is necessary to examine further markers in the Indonesian language which have the same characteristics as such markers as *to ii*, *ba ii*, *tara ii*, *zaru wo enai*, *hitsuyou ga aru*, *nakutemo ii*, *mademo ii*, and *tewa ikenai*. (2) It is necessary to examine further whether all of the markers of deontic modality in Indonesian discussed in this review are markers of modality. A research is needed to avoid repetition like what Hasan Alwi has done, by making all of the elements of word, phrase, and clause as a marker of modality. Hasan Alwi called markers of modality such as *wajib*, *mesti*, *harus*, *boleh* as auxiliary verb, and *sewajibnya*, *semestinya*, *seharusnya*, *sebaiknya* as adverb. Morimura (1996:58-60) does not directly call words such as *wajib*, *mesti*, *harus*, *boleh* markers of modality with the term auxiliary verb, but he calls them *jodoushiteki ni mochiirareru go* which means 'words used as auxiliary verbs'. To find out whether markers or words like them can be considered as markers of modality or not, we can refer to Nitta (1991) who classifies this kind of markers into *shinsei modality keishiki* 'pure marker of modality', *giji modality keishiki* 'impure marker of modality' and *kinjiteki keishiki* 'approximative marker of modality'. (3) It is necessary to examine the characters of each marker, syntactically and semantically.

## REFERENCES

- Alwi, Hasan. 1992. *Modalitas dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius
- Morimura, Shigeru. 1996. *Sekai wo manabu orijinaru gogaku kyouzai shiriizu - Indonesiago -*, Osaka Gaikokugo Daigaku.
- Nitta, Yoshio. 1991. *Nihongo no Modality to Ninshou*. Hitsuji shobou.
- Nitta, Yoshio. 2000. *Ninshiki no Modality to sono shuuhin in Moriyama Takurou-Nitta Yoshio-Kudou Hiroshi, Nihongo no Bunpou 3 Modality*. Iwanami shoten.
- Takanashi, Shino. 2002. *Dai 3 shou Hyouka no Modality*, in Miyazaki Kazuhito-Adachi Tarou-Noda Harumi-Takanashi Shino, *ShinNihongo Bunpou Sensho 4 Modality*, pp.80-120 Kuroshio shuppan.

1 This paper has been presented in 13<sup>th</sup> Indonesian Scientific Conference Japan 2004 "Strengthening Japan-Indonesia Strategic Alliances through Science, Technology and Engineering Innovations", in Tokyo Institute of Technology, O-okayama Campus, September 4-5, 2004, organized by Indonesian Student Association