Kalamuna: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab dan Kebahasaaraban
P-ISSN: 2655-4267, E-ISSN: 2745-6943
Vol. 07, No. 1, January 2026
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.52593/klm.07.1.05*

Emphatic Particles in Indonesian and Arabic: A Contrastive Analysis

Wihandani[1], Rohanda[2*], Yuliarti Mutiarsih[3]

[1,3] Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia
[2] Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung, Indonesia
**Corresponding E-mail: wihandani@upi.edu*

Keywords:
Arabic language;
Contrastive analysis;
Emphatic particle;
Indonesian language;
Morphology.

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the morphological difficulty level of Arabic particles for Indonesian speakers through a contrastive analysis approach. The method used is a literature review with reference to Robert Lado's contrastive analysis theory and his six-level hierarchy of difficulty. The research data includes Indonesian and Arabic emphatic particles. The results of the analysis show four main morphological differences: (1) morphological position: Indonesian particles are generally postpositional, while Arabic particles are prepositional except for *nūn al-tawkīd*; (2) type of morpheme: Indonesian particles are mostly clitics except for pun, while Arabic particles are free morphemes except for *nūn al-tawkīd* and *lām al-ibtidā'*; (3) particle function: both function as emphatic particles, but the concept of *ḥurūf al-qasam* has no equivalent in Indonesian; (4) morphological variation: both are relatively invariant, although *nūn al-tawkīd* has phonological variations. A distinctive feature of Arabic is the use of more than one emphatic particle in a single word (e.g., *lām al-ibtidā'* and *nūn al-tawkīd*), which poses a unique cognitive challenge because Indonesian learners must process cumulative emphasis markers. Indonesian learners are not predicted to experience difficulties at level zero due to the similarity in basic functions. Difficulties arise at level three due to differences in morphological distribution, increase at level four due to features without equivalents such as *ḥurūf al-qasam* and variations of *nūn al-tawkīd*, and peak at level five due to the diversity of Arabic particle functions. This study provides a pedagogical framework for teaching Arabic emphatic particles with specific instructional strategies for each level of difficulty: positive transfer strategies for Level 0, explicit contrastive instruction for Level 3, intensive focus instruction with cultural-pragmatic explanations for Level 4, and systematic differentiation training for Level 5.

Kata kunci
Analisis kontrastif;
Bahasa Arab;
Bahasa Indonesia;
Morfologi;
Partikel penegas.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis tingkat kesulitan morfologis partikel penegas bahasa Arab bagi penutur bahasa Indonesia melalui pendekatan analisis kontrastif. Metode yang digunakan adalah kajian pustaka dengan rujukan teori analisis kontrastif Robert Lado dan hierarki enam tingkat kesulitannya. Data

penelitian mencakup partikel penegas bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa Arab. Hasil analisis menunjukkan empat perbedaan morfologis utama: (1) posisi morfologis: partikel bahasa Indonesia umumnya postposisional, sedangkan partikel bahasa Arab preposisional kecuali *nūn al-tawkīd*; (2) jenis morfem: partikel bahasa Indonesia mayoritas berupa klitik kecuali *pun*, sedangkan partikel bahasa Arab merupakan morfem bebas kecuali *nūn al-tawkīd* dan *lām al-ibtidā'*; (3) fungsi partikel: keduanya berfungsi sebagai penegas, namun konsep *ḥurūf al-qasam* tidak memiliki padanan dalam bahasa Indonesia; (4) perubahan bentuk: keduanya relatif invariant, meskipun *nūn al-tawkīd* memiliki variasi fonologis. Ciri khas bahasa Arab adalah penggunaan lebih dari satu partikel penegas dalam satu kata (misalnya *lām al-ibtidā'* dan *nūn al-tawkīd*), yang menimbulkan tantangan kognitif unik karena pelajar Indonesia harus memproses penandaan penekanan kumulatif. Pelajar bahasa Indonesia tidak diprediksi mengalami hambatan pada tingkat nol karena kesamaan fungsi dasar. Kesulitan muncul pada tingkat tiga akibat perbedaan distribusi morfologis, meningkat pada tingkat empat karena fitur tanpa padanan seperti *ḥurūf al-qasam* dan variasi *nūn al-tawkīd*, serta mencapai puncaknya pada tingkat lima yang berkaitan dengan keragaman fungsi partikel bahasa Arab. Penelitian ini memberikan kerangka pedagogis bagi pengajaran partikel penegas bahasa Arab dengan strategi instruksional spesifik untuk setiap tingkat kesulitan: strategi transfer positif untuk Tingkat 0, instruksi kontrastif eksplisit untuk Tingkat 3, instruksi fokus intensif dengan penjelasan kultural-pragmatis untuk Tingkat 4, dan pelatihan diferensiasi sistematis untuk Tingkat 5.

Article Information

Submitted 2025-12-01. Received 2025-12-01. Revised 2026-01-14. Accepted 2026-01-15. Published 2026-01-21.

INTRODUCTION

Language emerges and develops due to many factors, such as culture, geography, and contact with other languages (Urban, 2021) These influences shape unique linguistic forms and features in each region. As a result, languages show both similarities and differences. For example, some languages share similar grammatical rules. However, diverse speakers create linguistic diversity that appears even in small units, such as phonology, lexicon, and morphology (Kamsir, 2020; Rahmawati & Wahyudi, 2022).

Emphatic particles, which are words or short phrases added to convey emphasis, are a morphologically visible part of language. Nurwahdi (2016) notes that every language employs a range of emphatic particles, which highlight or strengthen a statement. These differences make each language unique and set them apart. For example, Indonesian emphatic particles (IEP) and Arabic emphatic particles (AEP) differ in both form and structure. Arabic particles show more diversity, with ten types: *inna* (إن), *anna* (أن), *lām al-ibtidā'* (لام الابتداء), *ḥarf al-tanbīh* (حرف التنبيه), *ḥurūf al-qasam* (حروف القسم), *nūn al-tawkīd* (نون التوكيد), *qad* (قد), *ammā* (أما), *innamā* (إنما), and

ḍamīr al-faṣl (ضمير الفصل) (Patah, 2024). This large number shows that Arabic emphatic particles are morphologically more complex (Supardi & Jabal, 2023).

The differences between IEP and AEP demonstrate that emphatic particles constitute a distinct and identifiable linguistic aspect. Emphatic particles possess only grammatical meaning; their interpretation is determined by the arrangement or structure of other words within a phrase or sentence (Rahmawati & Wahyudi, 2022). Alwi asserts that emphatic particles lack lexical meaning and therefore cannot serve as the basis for forming new words (Rahmawati & Wahyudi, 2022). Despite this, the study of emphatic particles in both languages remains significant for linguistic analysis (Al Qorin et al., 2022). Research on contrastive analysis of Arabic and Indonesian has primarily focused on phonological aspects (Kamsir, 2020) and verbal affixation (Mutaqin et al., 2024; Syafei et al., 2020) While Patah (2024) has comprehensively described Arabic emphatic particles, and Rahmawati & Wahyudi (2022) have analyzed Indonesian function words, including particles, no study has systematically compared the morphological features of emphatic particles in both languages using Lado's difficulty hierarchy (Listiani et al., 2025). Rini (2017) conducted a contrastive study on Japanese emphatic particles, demonstrating the value of such comparative analysis for pedagogical purposes. However, the specific morphological challenges that Indonesian learners face when acquiring Arabic emphatic particles remain unexplored. This study fills this gap by providing the first systematic contrastive analysis of IEP and AEP, specifically predicting difficulty levels based on morphological differences.

Preliminary observations in Arabic language classrooms in Indonesia reveal that learners commonly struggle with several aspects of emphatic particles. Many students incorrectly place Arabic particles in postpositional positions, influenced by their L1 pattern (e.g., *writing "al-haqqu la" instead of "la-al-haqqu"*). Additionally, learners often omit *ḥurūf al-qasam* entirely or confuse its use with that of regular emphasis markers, as this oath-taking particle has no functional equivalent in Indonesian. The concept of using multiple emphatic particles in a single word (e.g., combining *lām al-ibtidā'* and *nūn al-tawkīd*) is particularly challenging, with students typically using only one marker at a time, following Indonesian patterns (Xiao & Widodo, 2019). These observed difficulties motivate the need for a systematic contrastive analysis to predict and address learning challenges (Supardi & Jabal, 2023).

Contrastive analysis theory is used to compare languages. Lado (1957) defined it as a way to describe how easy or hard it is for learners to study a second language (Hidayat & Rohanda, 2024; Muslikah, 2025b). Lado focused not only on language systems but also on the

cultures surrounding them (Misdawati, 2019). He considered contrastive analysis useful for learners, testing, research, and general understanding (Royani & Alawiyah, 2021)

Despite being formulated in 1957, Lado's contrastive analysis framework remains highly relevant for morphological comparison of emphatic particles. Unlike more recent approaches, which focus on pragmatic or discourse functions, Lado's hierarchy targets structural and distributional differences, precisely those that distinguish IEP from AEP. Recent studies have successfully applied Lado's framework to morphological analysis (Mutaqin et al., 2024; Syafei et al., 2020), validating its continued applicability (Saqmi et al., 2025). The six-level hierarchy offers a systematic way to categorize differences, from identical patterns (Level 0) to complex divergences (Level 5). This makes it especially suited for analyzing the varied morphological distinctions between IEP and AEP (Al Qorin et al., 2022). Furthermore, its predictive nature supports the pedagogical goal of this study: anticipating learner difficulties before they arise in classroom contexts (Al Qorin et al., 2022).

Lado (1957) outlined four stages in contrastive analysis. First: describe structures, including the form, meaning, and patterns found in related languages (Mutaqin et al., 2024). Second: summarize findings on each language analysis level (Kamsir, 2020; Muslikah, 2025a; Royani & Alawiyah, 2021). Third: compare the two languages based on structures and patterns to find learning problems (Kamsir, 2020; Muslikah, 2025a; Royani & Alawiyah, 2021). Fourth: predict difficulties and errors that could arise for language learners (Kamsir, 2020; Muslikah, 2025a; Royani & Alawiyah, 2021).

According to Lado, similarities and differences between a learner's mother tongue and the new language strongly affect second-language learning (Sanga, 2008). Elements from the first language often lead to mistakes in the new language (Kamsir, 2020; Nurwahdi, 2016; Royani & Alawiyah, 2021; Syafei et al., 2020). Lado created a hierarchy of six difficulty levels, ranging from none (no difference) to the highest level (complex divergence) (Lado, 1957; Muslikah, 2025b). Table 1 summarizes these levels and will be used to analyze IEP and AEP in this study.

Table 1. Lado's Six-Level Hierarchy of Difficulty

Level	Category	Description	Difficulty Level
0	No difference	Identical patterns in both languages	Zero
1	Convergent phenomena	Several minor differences	Low
2	Under-	No similar language systems	Moderate

	differentiation		
3	Reinterpretation	Features reinterpreted differently	Moderate-High
4	Over-differentiation	Features with no equivalent	High
5	Divergent/Split	One feature becomes multiple elements	Highest

This study compares Indonesian and Arabic emphatic particles to predict their theoretical difficulty and possible challenges for Indonesian learners. The research is theoretical and predictive, and is based on comparing structures rather than learner data. Alongside predictions, the study gives teaching advice for each difficulty level. The analysis specifies: (1) features suited to transfer strategies (Level 0-1), (2) items needing contrastive teaching (Level 3), (3) items needing intensive practice for missing L1 equivalents (Level 4), and (4) items needing systematic exercises for functional complexity (Level 5). These insights will help Arabic teachers plan lessons and teaching materials that address predicted challenges efficiently.

METHOD

This study uses a literature review. According to Nasir (2014), a literature review is a data collection technique that examines relevant books, articles, and reports on the issue being discussed. This study also uses a descriptive method. The descriptive method aims to provide a systematic, accurate, and factual description of the data, its various properties, and the relationships among the phenomena (Djajasudarma, as cited in Rini, 2017) The objects of this study are IEP: *-kah, -tah, -lah*, and *pun* as contained in the book *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia* (Standard Indonesian Grammar) by Moeliono et al. (2017) and AEP: *inna* (إن), *anna* (أن), *lāmal-ibtidā'* (لام الابتداء), *ḥarfal-tanbīh* (حرف التنبيه), *ḥurūfal-qasam* (حروف القسم), *nūnal-tawkīd* (نون التوكيد), *qad* (قد), *ammā* (أما), *innamā* (إنما), *ḍamīral-faṣl* (ضمير الفصل) discussed in Patah's (2024) research entitled *Kata Penegas: Fungsi dan Cara Pemakaiannya dalam Bahasa Arab* (Emphatic Words: Their Functions and Usage in Arabic) published in the journal Adabiyyāt: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra.

To collect data, the documentation technique was used, which involves collecting information relevant to the research object in writing. Then, the data analysis technique used was Robert Lado's contrastive analysis with the following stages: (1) describing the morphological features of the emphatic particles of both languages, (2) comparing these features

to find similarities and differences, (3) determining the level of difficulty based on Lado's six-level difficulty hierarchy, and (4) predicting the difficulty of Indonesian language learners in AEP based on morphological analysis of Arabic forms in textual data (Lado, 1957; Muslikah, 2025b; Rohanda et al., 2025) Furthermore, the results of the analysis are presented descriptively and narratively to explain the state of the object (Waruwu, 2024), and tables are provided to facilitate understanding of the analysed object. Data validity is tested through the use of credible primary sources and cross-checking between various supporting literature to ensure the accuracy of the morphological feature descriptions of both languages.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After analysis, the results of this study are as follows:

Table 2. Research Results on Emphasis Particles

No.	Morphological Aspects	Similarities	Differences	Level of difficulty
1.	Morphological position	There are two types of particles: postpositional and prepositional.	IEP is postpositional, except for the particle pun, whereas in AEP it is prepositional, except for *nūn al-tawkīd*.	Third level (distribution difference/reinterpretation)
2.	Morpheme type	Particles cannot stand alone.	IEP is in the form of a clitic, except for the particle pun, whereas in AEP it is in the form of a free morpheme, except for *nūn al-tawkīd* and *lām al-ibtidā'*.	Third level (distribution difference/reinterpretation)
3.	Particle function	Affirmation or emphasis of meaning	The concept of *ḥurūf al-qasam* in AEP has no equivalent in	Zero level (No difference): generally serves to emphasises

			Indonesian. Furthermore, specifically, some particles have different functions in the two languages.	Fourth level (no equivalent/over-differentiation): the concept of *ḥarf al-qasam*
				Fifth level (divergence/split phenomenon): specific function of the defining particle
4.	Morphological variation	No change in form.	Some AEP have phonological variations, namely *nūn al-tawkīd*.	Zero level (no difference): dominant invariant
				Fourth level (no equivalent/over-differentiation): phonological variation of *nūn al-tawkīd* in Arabic

The Concept of IEP and AEP

Particles are a class of words that cannot stand alone (cannot be derived or inflected) and cannot function as subjects or predicates (Soegiarta and Kridalaksana in Syukri, 2023). Particles in Indonesian are sometimes written together, but sometimes separately. It all depends on the context in which the word is written (Syihaabul Hudaa in Putri & Gischa, 2021). So, it can be said that particles have grammatical meaning but no lexical meaning (Supardi & Jabal, 2023; Syukri, 2023).

Emphatic particles in Indonesian consist of *-kah, -tah, -lah*, and *pun*. The function of emphatic particles is to indicate the element they accompany. The forms of the emphatic particles *-kah, -lah,* and *-tah* are clitics, while pun is not a clitic (Islam et al., 2024). The complete explanation is as follows (Moeliono et al., 2017):

The particle *-kah* is a clitic, arbitrary, relatively freely distributed, and can emphasise interrogative sentences. It can also change position according to the element of the sentence to be emphasised, and because of this, the particle *-kah* can be combined with various types of words (Setyadi, 2018). One source even states that the function of the particle *-kah* is to focus the sentence(Kardana, 2013). There are three rules: (1) when used in a declarative sentence, *-kah* changes the sentence into an interrogative sentence, for example, "Hari ini, semuanya harus selesai?" (Is today when everything must be finished?) (2) If the interrogative sentence already has question words such as what, how, and where, *-kah* is arbitrary. The use of *-kah* makes the sentence a little more refined and formal. For example, "Apakah bapakmu belum datang?" (Has your father not arrived yet?) (3) When a sentence does not contain an interrogative word but has an interrogative intonation, *-kah* clarifies the sentence as interrogative, sometimes reversing the word order. For example, "Akankah hadir dia besok?" (Will he be present tomorrow?).

Then the particle *-tah* in the form of a clitic is used in interrogative sentences, but the questioner does not actually expect an answer, for example, "He seemed to be asking himself because of his surprise or doubt". The particle *-tah* was often used in old literature, but is no longer used today. For example, "Who on earth is that person who is coming?"

Then the particle *-lah* is a clitic, used in declarative or imperative sentences. This particle is predominantly combined with the predicate of the sentence. This particle is used in two types of sentences: (1) in imperative sentences, -lah is used to soften the tone of the command in the sentence and is placed after the verb in the imperative sentence, for example, "Pergilah hari ini juga!" (Go today!) (2) In declarative sentences, the particle *-lah* is used to give emphasis and is attached to the word or part of the sentence that is to be emphasized, for example, "Dialah yang menghukumku tadi!" (He was the one who punished me earlier!).

Finally, there is the particle pun. It is used in declarative sentences and is written separately from the preceding word. This particle tends to be placed at the beginning of a sentence. It should be noted that if the particle pun is written connected to the previous sentence, then it is a conjugation and not an emphatic particle, for example, "walaupun" (even though), "adapun" (as for), and so on. There are two rules for this particle: (1) the particle pun is used to reinforce the meaning of the word it accompanies, for example, "Siapa pun yang datang pasti akan diminta pendapatnya" (Whoever comes will definitely be asked for their opinion), (2) this particle is often combined with the particle -lah to indicate behavior or a process that is beginning to take place. For example: "Malam pun mulailah turun perlahan di atas desa itu" (Night slowly began to fall over the village).

Arabic refers to emphatic particles as *adawatal-taukid*. These emphatic particles have their own usage and specifications. Some particles are only used with verbs, and some are used

with nouns. However, their main function remains the same: to emphasise or accentuate the meaning of a word, phrase, or sentence so that the listener can fully understand it (Nurwahdi, 2016).

AEP consists of *inna* (إن), *anna* (أن), *lām al-ibtidā'* (لام الابتداء), *ḥarf al-tanbīh* (حرف التنبيه), *ḥurūf al-qasam* (حروف القسم), *nūn al-tawkīd* (نون التوكيد), *qad* (قد), *ammā* (أما), *innamā* (إنما), *ḍamīr al-faṣl* (ضمير الفصل). Here is the explanation (Patah, 2024):

Ḥarf inna and *anna* are emphatic particles placed in *ismiyyah* (*mutada*' and *khabar*). When these particles are placed at the beginning of *ismiyyah*, *mutada*' changes its function to ism *inna,* and khabar changes to khabar *inna*. Inna and Anna are the same particles, but they differ in usage. The word *inna* is used at the beginning of a sentence or what is categorised as the beginning of a sentence, while *anna* is used when it is in the position of a subordinate clause, and the structure of anna can be interpreted as *maṣdar*. For example, "إِنَّ اللهَ غَفُورٌ رَحِيمٌ" and " عَلِمْتُ أَنَّ الْوَقْتَ ثَمِينٌ". (Fitriani et al., 2024)

Lām al-ibtidā' is used in nominal and verbal sentences. The pattern of *lām al-ibtidā'* in nominal sentences is attached to *mutada*', khabar muqaddam, and *ism inna mua'kkhar.* Meanwhile, in verbal sentences, it can be placed before *fi'liunmuḍāri'* and before *qod* for *fi'lun māḍi*. This particle is used as an emphatic particle and lam with a *fataḥ* entering the mutada, to emphasise the content of the sentence, remove doubt, and change the meaning of the khabar to the meaning of *hāl* (Pusti et al., 2024). For example, "لَلْحَقُّ يُظْهِرُ نَفْسَهُ".

*Ḥarf tanbīh*is used to get someone's attention or give a warning. This *Ḥarf* is placed at the beginning of a sentence. For example, "أَمَا إِنَّهُ صَادِقٌ" and "أَلَا إِنَّ نَصْرَ اللهِ قَرِيبٌ".

Ḥurūf al-qasam is used in oaths. It is placed at the beginning of a sentence. This *ḥarf* consists of *al-wau* (و), *al-bā'* (ب), or *al-tā* (ت). *Ḥarf al-wau* is used for oaths in the name of Allah or with other words. The letter *al-bā'* can be used with or without the name of Allah and can be combined with *fā'il qasam*. Meanwhile, the letter *al-tā* can only be used with the name of Allah. For example, "وَبِاللَّهِ لَنَفْلَحَنَّ", "تَاللَّهِ لَأَكِيدَنَّ أَصْنَامَكُمْ", and " وَاللَّهِ إِنِّي لَصَادِقٌ". (حروف القسم الأحادية في تفسير فتح البيا,.

Nūn al-tawkīd is divided into two types, namely: *nūn al-tawkīd al-thaqīlah* (نون التوكيد الثقيلة) with the characteristics of *tasydīd* and *fatah harakat*, and *nūn al-tawkīd al-khafīfah* (نون التوكيد الخفيفة) with the characteristics of *sukun*. *Nūn al-tawkīd* is only used in *fi'lun muḍāri'* and *fi'lu al-amr*. For example, "لَيَكْتُبَنَّ الطَّالِبُ الدّ (Jārim & Amīn, 1948)رْسَ" and "لَيَكْتُبَنَ الطَّالِبُ الدَّرْسَ".

Ḥarf qad is an emphatic particle that is used in *fi'lun māḍi* (Patah, 2024). For example, "قَدْ فَازَ الْمُجْتَهِدُ".

Ḥarf ammā is generally used to clarify something, but is sometimes used for emphasis. It is placed at the beginning of a *kalimahism* (Patah, 2024). For example: "فَهَذِهِ كَلِمَاتِي ،أَمَّا بَعْدُ".

The letter *innamā* is a combination of the letters إن and ماكافية. The letter *mā* limits the status of أن, which specifically enters and makes slight changes to the structure of the *ismiyyah*, so that the letter *innamā* can be used in the structure of *ismiyyah* and *fi'liyyah*, but the sentence pattern after it no longer has its ism and khabar. *Ḥarf* makes the words that follow it *maqṣūs* (specified) over *maqṣūs* '*alaih* (the word at the end of the sentence) (Patah, 2024). For example, "إِنَّمَا الْأَعْمَالُ بِالنِّيَّاتِ".

And finally, *ḍamīr al-faṣl* is a pronoun for a name or person located between the *mutada*' and khabar to separate the two. For example, "زيدٌ هو القائمُ".

Comparison of IEP and AEP

After describing IEP and AEP, similarities and differences based on morphological aspects were identified. Based on the analysis results, four main aspects were found, namely morphological position, morpheme type, function, and form flexibility. The following is a discussion of these aspects:

First, based on morphological position. Some IEPs are attached at the end of a word (postpositional), such as *-kah, -tah*, and *-lah*. There is one particle that is separated from the previous word, namely, pun. Meanwhile, in Arabic, there are emphatic particles that are located at the beginning of a word (prepositional), such *as inna, anna, lām al-ibtidā', ḥarf al-tanbīh, ḥurūf al-qasam, qad, ammā, innamā, ḍamīr al-faṣl*, and some are attached at the end of the word, namely *nūn al-tawkīd*. So, we can say that the most obvious difference between the two is that IEP is mostly put at the end of a word, while Arabic puts it at the beginning.

Also, the AEP can be put more than once in a word, like in "إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَيَنْصُرَنَّ مَنْ يَنْصُرُهُ". In this sentence, there are two emphatic particles in the *fi'il mudhāri',* namely *lām al-ibtidā'* and *nūn al-tawkīd*. This is different from Indonesian, where only one emphatic particle is used in each word.

Second, based on the type of morpheme. Emphatic particles in Indonesian can be clitics, namely *-kah, -tah,* and *-lah*, while pun is a free morpheme. In Arabic, emphatic particles are free morphemes and do not change form except for *nūn al-tawkīd* and *lām al-ibtidā'*, which are clitics. From this data, it can be concluded that both are words that cannot stand alone. The difference is that in Indonesian they are predominantly clitics, whereas in Arabic they are free morphemes.

Third, based on function. IEP has functions including emphasis, focus, refinement, strengthening interrogation, and adding meaning. In Arabic, emphatic particles emphasise the meaning of nouns, verbs, or clauses. Both serve to emphasise and stress meaning so that the listener/reader clearly understands the message. The difference between the two is the specific function of each particle; for example, *-lah* in Indonesian softens a command. As for *ḥurūf al-qasam*, it is a particle that has no equivalent in IEP.

Fourth, based on morphological changes (flexibility). IEP generally does not undergo morphological changes, although *-kah* can change position according to the sentence to be emphasised, the particle -tah is rarely used, and *-lah* and pun are relatively stable. Similarly, Arabic emphatic particles are invariant in form despite phonological variations such as *nūn al-tawkīd al-thaqīlah* and *al-khafīfah*. Therefore, it can be concluded that these two particles do not undergo morphological changes. The difference is that there is one AEP that undergoes phonological variation, namely *nūn al-tawkīd*.

Level of Difficulty of IEP and AEP

The next step after identifying the similarities and differences between IEP and AEP is to determine the relative difficulty of the two. The following is a discussion of this:

Based on the aspect of morphological position, the level of difficulty between IEP and AEP is at the third level, namely, difference in distribution (reinterpretation). This is because, although both languages have emphatic particles, their distribution differs. In this case, learners must provide a new interpretation of the particle's position, which poses a challenge for participants in understanding the structure of particle placement.

Then, based on the type of morpheme, the level of difficulty between IEP and AEP is a difference in distribution (reinterpretation). This is because the concept of emphatic particles in Indonesian is more closely associated with clitics, while in Arabic it is more closely associated with free morphemes, requiring an understanding of these differences.

Furthermore, based on function, the level of difficulty is divided into three types: (1) for the general function as an emphatic particle, the level of difficulty is no difference because both particles are used for emphasis or stress, (2) for *ḥurūf al-qasam* in Arabic, it is categorized as no similarity because in Indonesian there is no similar concept, (3) the diversity of particle functions in Arabic represents a divergent/split phenomenon (Level 5) in the following sense: while Indonesian learners possess a single conceptual category of 'emphasis' that maps onto their four relatively uniform IEP particles, they must reinterpret this single concept into multiple distinct functional categories in Arabic. For example, the Indonesian learner's unified concept of 'emphasis' must diverge into: (a) emphasis on nominal sentences (inna/anna), (b) emphasis on

verbal sentences (lām al-ibtidā'), (c) oath-based emphasis (*ḥurūf al-qasam*), (d) attention-getting emphasis (*ḥarf al-tanbīh*), (e) verbal emphasis with morphological integration (*nūn al-tawkīd*), and others. This represents a classic case of Level 5 difficulty, in which one L1 category (general emphasis) must be differentiated into multiple L2 categories based on syntactic context, semantic nuance, and pragmatic function. Indonesian learners must not only learn new forms but also develop new functional distinctions that do not exist in their L1 system.

Finally, based on their morphological changes, the level of difficulty is divided into two types, namely general and specific. In general, the forms of the two particles are categorised as having no difference because the emphatic particles in both languages are invariant. Specifically, the phonological differences that occur only in *ḥarf nūn al-tawkīd* in Arabic place it in the category of no similarity (over-differentiation).

Predicted Difficulties

From the results of this analysis, it can be predicted that Indonesian language learners will not encounter significant obstacles in aspects at the zero level (no difference), namely the basic function of particles in both languages, which is to emphasise, and the fact that most of their forms are invariant.

However, difficulties begin to increase at the third level (reinterpretation), mainly due to differences in morphological distribution. Differences in particle position (postpositional in IEP and prepositional in AEP) and differences between morpheme types (clitics and free morphemes) require structural adjustments that cannot be directly transferred from the first language.

More significant difficulties arise at the fourth level (over differentiation) and at the fifth level (divergence/split phenomenon). At the fourth level, learners study features that have no equivalent in Indonesian. The absence of the concept of *ḥurūf al-qasam*, the phonological variation in *nūn al-tawkīd*, and the possibility of using more than one emphatic particle in a single word require learning from scratch without reference to the first language. In addition, at the fifth level, AEP has more diverse functions than the IEP system, thereby increasing the complexity of its understanding. The aspects at these two levels are predicted to be the greatest source of difficulty and require more intensive pedagogical attention.

The phenomenon of multiple emphatic particles in a single Arabic word presents unique cognitive challenges for Indonesian learners. While Indonesian speakers are accustomed to a 'one particle, one emphasis' pattern, Arabic's layered emphasis (e.g., *lām al-ibtidā'* and *nūn al-tawkīd* in "إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَيَنْصُرَنَّ") requires learners to process cumulative emphasis marking. This may initially appear redundant from an Indonesian perspective, where a single particle suffices.

Cognitively, learners must: (1) recognize that multiple particles serve complementary rather than redundant functions, (2) understand the incremental intensification that each particle adds, and (3) develop sensitivity to contexts where layered emphasis is appropriate versus excessive. From a processing standpoint, this requires increased working memory load during both comprehension and production, as learners must simultaneously track multiple morphological markers while maintaining semantic coherence. Pedagogically, this suggests introducing layered emphasis gradually, beginning with single-particle emphasis, then introducing two-particle combinations with explicit explanation of how each contributes to the overall emphatic effect.

CONCLUSION

Based on Robert Lado's contrastive analysis of Indonesian (IEP) and Arabic (AEP) emphatic particles, four main morphological differences were found. In terms of position, IEPs are generally postpositional, while AEPs tend to be prepositional, except for nūn al-tawkīd. In terms of morpheme type, IEPs are mostly clitics, while AEPs are generally free morphemes, except for *nūn al-tawkīd* and *lām al-ibtidā'*. In terms of function, both serve as emphatic particles, but AEP has the concept of ḥurūf al-qasam and variations in particle function that have no equivalent in Indonesian. In terms of form variation, both languages are relatively invariant, but AEP shows phonological variation in *nūn al-tawkīd* (*al-thaqīlah* and *al-khafīfah*) and allows the use of more than one particle in a single word, unlike IEP, which lacks this concept.

From the results of this analysis, it can be predicted that Indonesian language learners will not encounter significant obstacles in aspects at the zero level (no difference), because the basic function of particles in both languages is the same, namely emphasis, and most of their forms are invariant. The difficulty begins to increase at the third level (reinterpretation) due to differences in morphological distribution, especially differences in particle position (postpositional in IEP and prepositional in AEP) and differences in the types of morphemes between clitics and free morphemes, which require structural adjustments that cannot be directly transferred from the first language. At the fourth level (over-differentiation), the difficulty increases because learners are confronted with features that have no equivalent in Indonesian, such as the absence of the *ḥurūf al-qasam* concept, the phonological variation in *nūn al-tawkīd*, and the possibility of using more than one emphatic particle in a single word. Meanwhile, at the fifth level (divergence/split phenomenon), challenges arise from the diversity of particle functions in AEP, which is more complex than the IEP system, thereby increasing the analytical burden on learners. These two levels are predicted to be the greatest sources of difficulty and require more intensive pedagogical attention.

Based on these predictions, several concrete teaching strategies are recommended for each difficulty level. For Level 0 features (basic emphasis function and invariant forms), teachers can employ positive transfer strategies, explicitly connecting Indonesian emphatic concepts to Arabic counterparts through activities such as: "Just as *-lah* emphasizes meaning in Indonesian, *inna* serves a similar basic function in Arabic." For Level 3 features (position and morpheme type differences), explicit contrastive instruction is essential. The recommended approach includes: (1) presenting the Indonesian postpositional pattern explicitly, (2) contrasting with the Arabic prepositional pattern using parallel examples, (3) providing controlled practice with position-focused exercises where students must consciously place particles correctly, and (4) using error anticipation activities where students identify and correct predicted mistakes.

For Level 4 features (*ḥurūf al-qasam, nūn al-tawkīd variants*, and multiple particles), intensive focused instruction with no L1 reference point is required. For *ḥurūf al-qasam*, instruction should begin with a cultural-pragmatic explanation of oath-taking in Arabic discourse, provide extensive contextualized examples from Quranic and Modern Standard Arabic texts, and practice production in culturally appropriate contexts. For *nūn al-tawkīd* phonological variation, teachers should implement explicit pronunciation drills contrasting *al-thaqīlah* (with *tashdid*) and *al-khafīfah* (with *sukun*), provide written discrimination exercises, and use minimal pair practice. For multiple-particle use, the approach should introduce particles incrementally (single particles first, then two-particle combinations), explicitly explain complementary functions, and provide scaffolded production practice that moves from receptive recognition to controlled production. The phenomenon of multiple emphatic particles in a single Arabic word presents unique cognitive challenges for Indonesian learners, as they must recognize that multiple particles serve complementary rather than redundant functions, understand the incremental intensification each particle adds, and develop sensitivity to contexts in which layered emphasis is appropriate versus excessive.

For Level 5 features (functional diversification), systematic differentiation training is crucial. Teachers should create decision-tree diagrams showing which particle to use in which syntactic-semantic context, develop contextualized practice activities requiring functional discrimination (e.g., "Choose the appropriate particle: emphasis in nominal sentence / verbal sentence / oath context"), and implement error analysis activities where students explain why certain particles are inappropriate in given contexts. Cyclical review is essential, as functional distinctions require extended exposure and practice to internalize. Teachers should emphasize that while Indonesian has a unified concept of 'emphasis', Arabic requires learners to differentiate this into multiple distinct categories: emphasis on nominal sentences (*inna/anna*), emphasis on verbal sentences (*lām al-ibtidā'*), oath-based emphasis (*ḥurūf al-qasam*), attention-

getting emphasis (*ḥarf al-tanbīh*), and verbal emphasis with morphological integration (*nūn al-tawkīd*).

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, it is limited to theoretical predictions based on structural contrastive analysis without empirical verification from actual learners. The difficulty levels predicted here represent theoretical expectations that require empirical testing. Second, the analysis focuses exclusively on morphological features and does not address syntactic, semantic, or pragmatic dimensions of emphatic particle usage. Third, the study relies on published grammatical descriptions rather than corpus data, which may not fully capture actual usage patterns. Future research should address these limitations through: (1) error analysis studies examining Indonesian learners' actual production of Arabic emphatic particles to verify whether predicted difficulties manifest in real acquisition contexts, (2) experimental teaching studies implementing the recommended pedagogical strategies to test their effectiveness, (3) corpus-based analysis of Indonesian learner Arabic to quantify error frequencies for different particle types, (4) longitudinal acquisition studies tracking how learners progress through different difficulty levels over time, and (5) comparative studies with learners from other L1 backgrounds to determine whether difficulties are specific to Indonesian speakers or more universal. Such empirical research would validate, refine, or challenge the theoretical predictions of this contrastive analysis and contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of second-language morphology acquisition.

REFERENCES

Al Qorin, A. S., Akmalia, A., Syaifudin, A., Effendy, D. A. L., & Asrori, I. (2022). A Contrastive Analysis of Adjective Structure in Indonesian and Arabic and the Implication in Teaching Arabic | Tahlīl At-Tarkīb An-Na'tī At-Taqābulī fī Al-Lughah Al-Indūnīsīyāh wa Al-'Arabīyah wa Istifādah Natāijih fī Ta'līm Al-'Arabīyah. *Al-Ta'rib : Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Arab IAIN Palangka Raya*, *10*(1), 115–132. https://doi.org/10.23971/altarib.v10i1.3593

Hidayat, R., & Rohanda, R. (2024). Perbedaan Fonem Vokal dan Konsonan Bahasa Minangkabau dan Bahasa Sunda: Studi Linguistik Kontrastif. *Arus Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora (AJSH)*, *4*(3). http://jurnal.ardenjaya.com/index.php/ajshhttp://jurnal.ardenjaya.com/index.php/ajsh

Islam, I. S., Nurwahidah, L. S., & H, A. M. (2024). Analisis Penggunaan Kata Tugas Partikel dalam Buku "Remah-Remah Bahasa" Karya Eko Endarmoko sebagai Alternatif Pemilihan Bahan Ajar di SMA. *Caraka*, *12*(2). https://journal.institutpendidikan.ac.id/index.php/caraka/article/view/1057

Kamsir, R. Z. (2020). Analisis Kontrastif dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa (Kajian antara Konsonan-Vokal pada Huruf Hijaiyah dan Alpabet Indonesia). *(Indonesia Jurnal*

Sakinah) Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Sosial Islam, *2*(1). : http://www.jurnal.stitnu-sadhar.ac.id

Kardana, I. N. (2013). Marking System of Information Structure in Indonesian Language. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *5*(4), 119. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i4.3947

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics Across Cultures Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. University of Michingan Press.

Listiani, A., Analisis, D., Perbandingan, K. :, Kalimat, S., Teks, P., Arab, B., Al-Mufidah Ke Dalam Bahasa Indonesia, A.-J., Ashwary, F., Artikel, R., Kunci, K., & Kontrastif, A. (2025). *Analisis Kontrastif: Perbandingan Struktur Kalimat pada Penerjemahan Teks Bahasa Arab Al-Jumlah Al-Mufidah ke dalam Bahasa Indonesia A B S T R A K*. *16*(1), 96–109. https://doi.org/10.31503/madah.v16i1.983

Misdawati, M. (2019). Analisis Kontrastif dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa. *'A Jamiy: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra Arab, 8*. http://journal.umgo.ac.id/index.php/AJamiy/index'A

Moeliono, A. M., Lapoliwa, H., Alwi, H., Sasangka, S. S. T. W., & Sugiyono, S. (2017). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia* (Keempat). Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Muslikah, S. (2025a). *Analisis Kesalahan*.

Muslikah, S. (2025b). *Pengantar Linguistik Kontrastif*.

Mutaqin, I. A., Ainusyamsi, F. Y., & Dayudin, D. (2024). Afiksasi Inflektif Kata Kerja Masa Lampau dalam Bahasa Arab Dan Bahasa Jepang. *Hijai - Journal on Arabic Language and Literature*, *7*(1), 65–77. https://doi.org/10.15575/hijai.v7i1.28852

Nasir, Moh. (2014). *Metode penelitian*. Ghalia Indonesia.

Nurwahdi, N. (2016). Partikel Penegas (Nun Taukit) pada Fi'il Mudhari' dan Maknanya dalam Al-Quran. *Jurnal Ulunnuha*. https://doi.org/10.15548/ju.v5i2.564

Patah, A. (2024). Kata Penegas: Fungsi dan Cara Pemakaiannya dalam Bahasa Arab. *Adabiyyāt: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *2*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14421/ajbs.2003.%25x

Pusti, K. M., Renajaya, K. S., Nurrohmah, F., Syukronillah, S., & Milah, A. S. (2024). Analisis Makna Lam dalam Surat Al-Qalam. *Diwan: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra Arab*, *16*(1), 61–77. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15548/diwan/16.i1.1478

Putri, V. K. M., & Gischa, S. (2021, August 5). *Bagaimana Penulisan Partikel -lah, -kah, dan -tah?* https://www.kompas.com/skola/read/2021/08/05/151312069/bagaimana-penulisan-partikel-lah-kah-dan-tah?lgn_method=google&google_btn=onetap

Rahmawati, A., & Wahyudi, A. B. (2022). Bentuk dan Fungsi Kata Tugas dalam Teks Sejarah Karya Siswa Kelas XII SMAN 1 Cawas. *Lingua Franca:Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, *6*(2), 144. https://doi.org/10.30651/lf.v6i2.10494

Rini, E. I. H. A. N. (2017). Partikel Penegas Nanka dalam Bahasa Jepang. *Kiryoku*, *1*(4). https://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/kiryoku/article/view/16772/12191

Rohanda, R., Cahya Mahesa, D., & Dayudin, D. (2025). Analisis Afiks pada Fi`il Mujarrad dalam Surat Hud. *Kalamuna: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab Dan Kebahasaaraban*, *6*(1), 63–93. https://doi.org/10.52593/klm.06.1.05

Royani, A., & Alawiyah, N. L. (2021). Manfaat Analisis Linguistik Kontrastif dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab. *Seminar Nasional Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar-Kampus Merdeka Berbasis Integrasi Keilmuan Di Masa Adaptasi Kebiasaan Baru*, 139–151.

Sanga, F. (2008). *Analisis Kontrastif Mengatasi Kesulitan Guru Bahasa di Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Timur*. *15*(28).

Saqmi, S., Naim Madjid, M., Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, U., & Lisanudhad, J. (2025). *Analysis on the Interference of Indonesian Morphology in the Translation of Classical Arabic Texts* . 160–143), 02(*12*. https://doi.org/10.21111/lisanudhad.v12i2.15404

Setyadi, A., & Partikel, P. (2018). Pemakaian Partikel kah dalam Kalimat Tanya. In *NUSA* (Vol. 13, Issue 2).

Supardi, S., & Jabal, A. K. M. H. (2023). Contrastive Analysis of Concord in Arabic, English, and Indonesian. *Jurnal Al Bayan: Jurnal Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Arab*, *15*(2), 356. https://doi.org/10.24042/albayan.v15i2.14315

Syafei, I., Ardiansyah, A. A., & Nafsi, Z. (2020). Analisis Kontrastif Proses Afiksasi pada Verba dalam Bahasa Arab dan Bahasa Minangkabau (Contrastive Analysis of The Affixation Process on Verbs in Arabic And Minangkabau Language). *Metalingua, 18*(2).

Syukri, I. Z. (2023). *Mengenal Penggunaan Partikel dalam Bahasa Melayu Palembang* (Arhesa, Sandra). Perkumpulan Rumah Cemerlang Indonesia.

Urban, M. (2021). The geography and development of language isolates. *Royal Society Open Science*, *8*(4), rsos.202232. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.202232

Waruwu, M. (2024). Pendekatan Penelitian Kualitatif: Konsep, Prosedur, Kelebihan dan Peran di Bidang Pendidikan. *Afeksi: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*, *5*(3). https://afeksi.id/jurnal/index.php/afeksi/

Xiao, Q., & Widodo, P. (2019). Contrastive Analysis of Particles in Chinese and Indonesian Language. *LITERA*, *18*(3), 361–378. https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v18i3.24223