



## DOUBLE-OBJECT CONSTRUCTIONS IN INDONESIAN LANGUAGE: A SYNTACTIC STUDY

Riki Nasrullah<sup>1)</sup>, Arip Budiman<sup>2)</sup>, Abdul Kosim<sup>3)</sup>

Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia<sup>1)</sup>

Universitas Sebelas April Sumedang, Sumedang, Indonesia<sup>2)</sup>

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung, Indonesia<sup>3)</sup>

E-mail: rikinasrullah5@gmail.com<sup>1)</sup>, aripbudiman74.id@gmail.com<sup>2)</sup>,  
abdulkosim@uinsgd.ac.id<sup>3)</sup>

\*Korespondensi Penulis

Diterima: 30 Juni 2023 Direvisi: 11 Juli 2023 Diterbitkan: 29 Juli 2023

**Abstract:** *This paper explores the different types of double-object sentences in Indonesian. This study aims to identify the types of double object constructions based on syntactic behavior, word categories of verb-accompanying constituents, and the verb's form at the construction center. Double object constructions in Indonesian can be divided into two types: double object constructions with double FN constituents (type 1) and double object constructions with combined FN constituents (type 2). The difference between the two types is seen in verb form, syntactic behavior, and the category of verb-accompanying constituents. In terms of verb form, type 1 constructions have verbs ending in -kan and -i, while type 2 does not. In terms of syntactic behavior, type 1 constructions come from single sentences. They can be fixed into other forms by changing the verb and using prepositions "for" and "to" as adverbial function markers in the last constituent. In contrast, type 2 constructions come from broader sentences, so their verb-accompanying constituents form a construction. In terms of the verb-accompanying constituent filler category, type 1 double object constructions only involve nouns as the second filler of the verb-accompanying constituent. In contrast, in type 2 double object constructions, the categories can be nouns, nouns with verbs, adjectives with adjectives, and prepositional phrases.*

**Keywords:** *construction; double object; Indonesian; syntax.*

**Abstrak:** Tulisan ini membahas perbedaan jenis kalimat objek rangkap di dalam bahasa Indonesia. Tujuannya adalah untuk mengidentifikasi tipe konstruksi objek rangkap yang ada, dilihat dari perilaku sintaksis, kategori kata konstituen pengiring verba, dan bentuk verba yang menjadi pusat konstruksi. Konstruksi objek rangkap di dalam bahasa Indonesia dapat diidentifikasi menjadi dua tipe, yaitu konstruksi objek rangkap tipe konstituen FN ganda (tipe 1) dan konstruksi objek rangkap tipe konstituen FN gabungan (tipe 2). Perbedaan kedua tipe tersebut ditilik dari segi bentuk verba, perilaku sintaksis, dan kategori konstituen pengiring verba. Dilihat dari bentuk verba, konstruksi tipe 1 memiliki bentuk verba berakhiran -kan dan -i, sedangkan pada tipe 2 tidak. Secara perilaku sintaksis, konstruksi tipe 1 diturunkan dari kalimat tunggal dan bisa diparafrasekan menjadi bentuk yang lain dengan mengubah bentuk verbanya dan memunculkan preposisi untuk dan kepada sebagai pemarkah fungsi keterangan pada konstituen akhir, sedangkan konstruksi tipe 2 diturunkan dari kalimat luas sehingga konstituen pengiring verbanya membentuk suatu konstruksi. Dari segi kategori pengisi konstituen pengiring verbanya, konstruksi objek rangkap tipe 1 hanya memunculkan kategori nomina dengan nomina saja sebagai pengisi kedua konstituen pengiring verbanya, sedangkan pada konstruksi objek rangkap tipe 2, kategori yang muncul bisa berupa nomina dengan nomina, nomina dengan verba, nomina dengan ajektiva, dan nomina dengan frasa preposisi.

**Kata Kunci:** konstruksi; objek ganda; bahasa Indonesia; sintaksis.



## Introduction

Language, indeed, consists of a series of structures. The structure is understood as everything that always exists, is fixed, and repeats (Hübler, 2022; Sinnemäki & Di Garbo, 2018; Urban & Moran, 2021). The things that are always there, fixed and recurring - called structure - in language are sound, which is studied in the phonology subfield, form, which is discussed in the morphology subfield, grammatical units (words, phrases, clauses, and sentences), which are discussed in the syntax subfield, and meaning, which is discussed in the semantics subfield.

In practice, language always contains two main things: form and meaning (Cassani & Limacher, 2022; Mollica et al., 2021; Zane et al., 2021). These two things are always present in the language. In reality, both theoretically and practically, they do not always correspond to one another. One form can have multiple meanings, and vice versa; some forms can have only one meaning (Niharika & Prema Rao, 2020; Sun et al., 2021; Tong et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2019; Zhang & Kang, 2022). Thus, in the realm of the lexicon, for example, several word forms such as *die*, *wafat*, *tewas*, and *mampus* have one underlying meaning of 'loss of life'. On the other hand, a single form of a word can denote several meanings, such as the word *can*, which has the meaning of 'able' and 'poison contained in snakes'. This is language empiricism, which shows that language's elements of form and meaning do not always correspond.

That the elements of language form and meaning at the level of the lexicon do not correspond to each other has been proven, as well as it happens at a more complex level, namely the sentence structure - which is discussed in the sub-study of syntax (Adagale, 2022; Dotan et al., 2021; Zekaj, 2015). At the sentence level, Yule (2015) (in Clarke et al., 2022) reveals the existence of deep structure and surface structure. The deep structure we understand as the concept of language meaning and the surface structure we understand as the concept of language form. As with the lexicon level, the incongruence of one sentence structure is evident in the sentence level. The following speech forms, for example, express the same thing.

- (1) Hasan membeli buku untuk Husen.  
Hasan bought a book for Husen.
- (2) Hasan membelikan Husen buku.  
Hasan bought Husen a book.
- (3) Hasan membelikan buku Husen  
Hasan bought Husen a book.

The three sentences mentioned above have different structures but express the same meaning. The existence of the same meaning in the three sentences can be proved by examining the semantic role of the noun phrases that make up the sentences. The term "noun phrase" (hereafter FN) in the context of this paper is used broadly, as explained by generative grammarians. It includes nouns, pronouns, possessive phrases, and other units with syntactic behavior similar to nouns. Referring to this definition forms such as "kursi (chair)" in the construction "kursi itu tidak bisa dipakai (the chair is unusable)"; the form "dia (he/she)" in the construction "dia mengambilkan adiknya tas (he got his sister a bag)"; and the form "dia gila (he is crazy)" in the construction "saya mengira dia gila (I think he is crazy)"; are all referred to as noun phrases in this paper.

In the three sentences above, the semantic role of FN Hasan is agentive, FN buku (book) is objective, and FN Husen is benefactive. The semantic role of the three words above will remain unchanged, despite their different presence in the sentence construction.

There are differences in the analysis of the semantic roles of noun phrases (FNs) in the three sentences above, although the roles produce the same results. However, the

syntactical analysis of the three sentences will become very complex. For example, consider the position of Husen (as the beneficiary) in the sentence construction "dia tas (him bag)". In sentence (1), Husen is at the end of the sentence and precedes the preposition "untuk (for)". In sentence (2), Husen does not appear at the end of the sentence but directly after the verb without any words separating them. In sentence (3), Husen appears at the end of the sentence without being preceded by any preposition. In sentence (2), the preposition "untuk (for)" that appears in the sentence (1) is omitted, and the verb form is changed by adding the prefix -kan. In sentence (3), Husen is at the end of the sentence (as in sentence (1) but does not precede the preposition "untuk (for)", and the verb changes form with the addition of the prefix -kan (as in sentence (2)).

The structural difference between sentences (1) and (2) can be explained through a fundamental change in grammatical relationship. Sentence (2) paraphrases sentence (1), and vice versa. Sentence (2) is a bi-transitive sentence, and sentence (1) is a monotransitive sentence. The difference between the two can still be explained grammatically. The core discussion of this paper is the difference in the structure of sentences (2) and (3) that give rise to two arguments behind them. This construction is called the double object construction in this paper.

The term double object is not a theoretically correct term. As an argument behind the verb in this construction, the FN does not function as an object at all. This term is used only to facilitate the identification and analysis of the problem. It is hoped that using the term double object will make explaining and analyzing the issues raised in this paper easier. This term explains the construction designation that requires two consecutive FNs to appear as arguments behind the transitive verb.

This paper discusses the types of sentences (2) and (3) above included in the double object construction. The aim is to identify the types of double object constructions that exist in terms of syntactic behaviour, word categories of verb-accompanying constituents, and the verb form at the construction's center.

## Methods

The method applied in this research is descriptive and conducted qualitatively. In this context, the method allows the researcher to present the data as it is without any judgment that it is right or wrong but presented following the facts collected (Sudaryanto, 2015). The data described in this paper is obtained through a corpus found randomly through website addresses relevant to the purpose of this research.

The data collection process was carried out by searching the corpus through various randomly selected website addresses, in line with the interests of this research. The data presentation method used was the listening method with careful note-taking techniques.

## Results and Discussion

### Double-object construction type

We reiterate that the use of the term double object is, theoretically, not very precise. The constituents behind the transitive verb in this construction do not function as objects at all. However, Ramlan (2005) still refers to the two constituents behind the transitive verb as object 1 and object 2. Up to this point, the term double object is still valid when referring to Ramlan's opinion.

From the author's temporary observation of double object constructions in Indonesian, at least two types of double objects are identified. For convenience, the two types of constructions are called double FN constituent type constructions and compound

FN constituent type constructions. This designation refers to the category that appears as a constituent behind the verb.

### **Double Object Construction of Double FN Constituent type**

Double FN-type, double object construction, refers to a double object construction that has similarities with the previous sentences (2) and (3). The mention of a double FN constituent type double object construction is due to two constituents appearing after the transitive verb, which acts as a noun phrase (FN). The mention of this construction type is not done without reason. A very important reason is that special features in this construction type are not found in other construction types.

Here are some examples of sentences with this type of construction.

- (4) Orang tua membelikan anaknya pakaian.  
Parents buy their children clothes.
- (5) Orang tua membelikan pakaian anaknya.  
Parents buy their children clothes.
- (6) Obama memberi Trump kesempatan.  
Obama gave Trump a chance.
- (7) Obama memberi kesempatan Trump.  
Obama gave Trump a chance.
- (8) Piala Eropa memberi dia pengalaman berharga.  
The European Cup gave him valuable experience.
- (9) Piala Eropa memberi pengalaman berharga dia.  
The European Cup gave him valuable experience.
- (10) DPR mengirimi KPU surat teguran.  
The DPR sent the KPU a letter of reprimand.
- (11) DPR mengirimi surat teguran KPU.  
The DPR sent a letter of reprimand to the KPU.

Sentences (4) to (11) are included in the double object construction of the double FN constituent type because they have characteristics not found in the double object construction of the combined FN constituent type. In these sentences, three main characteristics distinguish this type of construction from other types.

Firstly, the verb that becomes the predicate in this construction is formed by attaching the suffixes *-kan* and *-i*, except for "memberi" (give). Words such as *membelikan*, *mengirim*, and *memberi* are the verb elements that form this construction. The verb "memberi" has essentially undergone a morphophonemic process of affixation. This word is attached to the suffix *-i*, but because there is already an *i* phoneme behind this form, if it is attached to the suffix *-i*, it will become double phoneme *i*. One is removed if two phonemes are attached to the same complement. This means that the form "memberi" can be explained morphophonemically.

Secondly, the double object construction of the double FN constituent type has a characteristic that distinguishes it from other types in terms of the formation of this construction. This construction is formed from the derivation of a single construction. The derivation process of this construction is done by paraphrasing. This construction is derived from a single sentence, not a broad sentence. Sentence (2) above is derived from sentence (1) in its singular form. This means that this feature becomes the identity of this type of construction that distinguishes it from other types of constructions.

Sentences (4), (6), (8), and (10) can be paraphrased into other sentences as follows.

- (12) Orang tua membeli pakaian untuk anaknya.  
Parents buy clothes for their children.
- (13) Obama memberikan kesempatan kepada Trump.  
Obama gave Trump a chance.
- (14) Piala Eropa memberikan kesempatan kepada dia.  
The European Cup gave him a chance.
- (15) DPR mengirimkan surat teguran kepada KPU.  
The DPR sent a letter of reprimand to the KPU.

From the paraphrased form above, we can see a change in the form of the verb that occupies the predicate function in the sentence above. The forms that originally ended in -kan is changed to without -kan, and the forms that originally ended in -i are changed to ending in -kan. In addition, the paraphrased form also requires the preposition *to* and *for* to appear in the final constituent. This construction's final constituent (adverb) is either obligatory or optional. In the construction of *Obama memberikan kesempatan kepada Trump* (Obama giving Trump a chance), *Piala Eropa memberikan kesempatan kepada dia* (European Cup giving him a chance), and *DPR memberikan surat teguran kepada KPU* (DPR giving a warning letter to KPU), the constituents *kepada Trump* (to Trump), *kepada dia* (to him), and *kepada KPU* (to KPU) are elements that must be present in the construction because if these constituents are omitted, the construction is still incomplete. However, in the construction *Orang tua membeli pakaian untuk anaknya* (Parents buy clothes for their children), the constituent *untuk anaknya* (for their children) becomes an optional element because its presence can be omitted, and its omission does not change the essence of the construction.

From this, we can see that the construction of multiple FN constituent types, when paraphrased, will affect the presence of syntactic functions in the transformed construction. Some final constituents (adverbial functions) are obligatory, while others are optional.

Thirdly, judging from the category that fills the accompanying constituent behind the verb in this construction, all the accompanying constituents are nouns. The verb-accompanying constituents are all nouns in sentences (4) to (11). The forms such as *anaknya* (his son) and *pakaian* (clothes) in constructions (4) and (5) are all nouns, the forms *Obama* and *Trump* in sentences (6) and (7) are all nouns, the forms *dia* (he) and *pengalaman berharga* (valuable experience) in sentences (8) and (9) are all nouns, and the forms *DPR* and *letter of reprimand* in sentences (10 and (11) are also nouns or FNs.

Thus, there are three main characteristics of the double object construction of the double FN constituent type: (i) the verb form that fills the predicate in this construction is suffixed with -kan and -i. (ii) this form is derived from a single sentence. It can be paraphrased by changing the form of the verb and introducing prepositions *untuk* (for) and *kepada* (to) in the final constituent, which can be either an obligatory or an optional constituent. (iii) The categories that exist as verb-accompanying constituents in this construction are all nouns and FNs.

### **Double Object Construction Combined FN constituent type**

The compound FN constituent type double object construction in this paper is understood negatively from the double FN constituent type double object construction, i.e., as a construction that does not have the characteristics of the type 1 construction above.

Judging from the form of the verb that fills the predicate function in this type of construction, the verb does not have a form with the suffixes -kan and -i. Regarding syntactic behavior, this type of construction is not derived from a single sentence but from a complex or extended sentence type so that its verb-accompanying constituents form a single

construction. And when viewed from the category that becomes the verb-accompanying constituent, the constituent can be a combination of FN with FN, FN with FV, FN with FAdj., and FN with FPrep.

From my temporary identification, the predicate verbs in this construction are usually thought verbs. The verbs that still belong to this type in the Indonesian language are, for example, *menyangka* (suspect), *mengira* (suppose), *menganggap* (assume), *menduga* (surmise), *menuduh* (accuse), *mendakwa* (indict), and so on. The following constituents will form one construction in constructions where the verb is of this type, resulting in a broad sentence. Here are some examples of this type of sentence.

- (16) Ibunya tidak menyangka Pak Tahjo jadi menteri.  
His mother did not expect Mr. Tahjo to become a minister.
- (17) Jokowi tidak menyangka pertumbuhan ekonomi meningkat.  
Jokowi did not expect economic growth to increase.
- (18) Masyarakat awam mengira investasi saham sebagai judi.  
*The common people think of stock investment as gambling.*
- (19) Keluarga mengira gadis cantik ini hilang.  
*The family thought this beautiful girl was missing.*
- (20) Banyak orang menganggap Pancasila kuno.  
Many people consider Pancasila to be archaic.
- (21) Bupati Mojokerto menganggap wajar adanya pungli.  
The Mojokerto Regent considers extortion to be normal.
- (22) Hakim menduga perusahaan penyedia genset fiktif.  
*The judge suspected that the company providing the generator was fictitious.*
- (23) Pengamat menduga SBY di balik demo 4 November.  
Observers suspect SBY is behind the 4 November demo.
- (24) Banyak kalangan menuduh HMI provokator pada aksi 4 November.  
Many people accused HMI of being the provocateur of the 4 November protests.
- (25) Jaksa mendakwa Panitera Pengadilan Negeri Jakarta Utara terjerat suap.  
*Prosecutors charged the North Jakarta District Court Registrar with bribery.*

Sentences (16) to (25) above are included in the combined FN constituent type double object construction because they have different characteristics from the type 1 construction above.

The sentences above are constructed of two clauses forming a broad subordinative sentence. One clause is the parent sentence, and the other is the subordinate clause. In sentence (16), his mother did not expect him to be the parent clause and Mr. Tjahjo to be the minister in the subordinate clause, as well as in sentences (17) to (25). All the constituents following the verb in this sentence form an S-P construction, sometimes more than that. In sentence (16), the constituents follow the verb form an S-P construction, with Pak Tjahjo as S and becoming a minister as P.

This type of sentence construction can be expanded to include *bahwa* (that) as a complementizer so that sentence (16) will change to "his mother did not expect Mr. Tjahjo to become a minister". Sentences (17) to (25) above can be expanded with the same pattern.

### **Category Two Constituent Accompanying Verba in Double Object Construction**

As stated earlier, the term double object is theoretically not very precise. This is because the verb follower constituents in this type of construction do not all function as objects. Judging from the filler category of the two verb follower constituents, there will be

a difference between the double object construction of the double FN constituent type and the double object construction of the combined FN constituent type. The difference lies in the category of the final constituent filler of the construction.

From the results of the author's temporary observations from some of the existing linguistic data, it can be concluded that the categories of fillers of verb-accompanying constituents in type 1 double object constructions are both noun categories. This can be seen in sentences (4) s.d. (11). Unlike type 1, the filler category of verb-accompanying constituents in type 2 double object constructions can be a combination of a noun with a noun, noun with the verb, noun with an adjective, and noun with a prepositional phrase. This can be seen in sentences (16) to (25) above. The most obvious difference between the two types of double object constructions is the verb-accompanying constituent that appears. In type 1 constructions, the verb-accompanying constituents do not form a construction; in type 2 double object constructions, the verb-accompanying constituents form a construction.

## Conclusion

Double object constructions in Indonesian can be identified into two types: double object constructions of double FN constituent type (type 1) and double object constructions of combined FN constituent type (type 2). The two types differ in verb form, syntactic behavior, and the category of verb-accompanying constituents.

In terms of verb form, type 1 constructions have verb forms ending in *-kan* and *-i*, while type 2 do not. Regarding syntactic behavior, type 1 constructions are derived from single sentences. They can be paraphrased into other forms by changing the verb form and introducing prepositions for and to as markers of adverbial function in the final constituent. In contrast, type 2 constructions are derived from broad sentences, so the verb-accompanying constituents form a construction. Regarding the category of the verb-accompanying constituent filler, the type 1 double object construction only brings up the category of noun with the noun as the second filler of the verb-accompanying constituent. In contrast, in the type 2 double object construction, the appearing category can be a noun with a noun, a noun with a verb, a noun with an adjective, and a noun with a prepositional phrase.

## References

- Ramlan, M. (2005). *Ilmu Bahasa Indonesia: Sintaksis*. CV. Karyono.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Adagale, A. (2022). Syntactic Model for the Analysis of Moral Stories. *Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities*, 2(5), 38–45. <https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.2.5.7>
- Cassani, G., & Limacher, N. (2022). Not just form, not just meaning: Words with consistent form-meaning mappings are learned earlier. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 75(8), 1464–1482. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17470218211053472>
- Clarke, A. T., Soto, G. E., Cook, J., Iloanusi, C., Akwarandu, A., & Still Parris, V. (2022). Adaptation of the Coping With Stress Course for Black Adolescents in Low-Income Communities: Examples of Surface Structure and Deep Structure Cultural Adaptations. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 29(4), 738–749. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpra.2021.04.005>
- Dotan, D., Breslavskiy, I., Copty-Diab, H., & Yousefi, V. (2021). Syntactic priming reveals an explicit syntactic representation of multi-digit verbal numbers. *Cognition*, 215, 1–

33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2021.104821>
- Hübler, N. (2022). Phylogenetic signal and rate of evolutionary change in language structures. *Royal Society Open Science*, 9(3), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.211252>
- Mollica, F., Bacon, G., Zaslavsky, N., Xu, Y., Regier, T., & Kemp, C. (2021). The forms and meanings of grammatical markers support efficient communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 118(49), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2025993118>
- Niharika, M. K., & Prema Rao, K. S. (2020). Processing syntax: perspectives on language specificity. In *International Journal of Neuroscience* (Vol. 130, Issue 8, pp. 841–851). Taylor and Francis Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207454.2019.1707818>
- Sinnemäki, K., & Di Garbo, F. (2018). Language structures may adapt to the sociolinguistic environment, but it matters what and how you count: A typological study of verbal and nominal complexity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(8), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01141>
- Sun, X., Zhang, K., Marks, R. A., Nickerson, N., Eggleston, R. L., Yu, C. L., Chou, T. L., Tardif, T., & Kovelman, I. (2021). What's in a word? Cross-linguistic influences on Spanish–English and Chinese–English bilingual children's word reading development. *Child Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/CDEV.13666>
- Tong, X., Deng, Q., & Tong, S. X. (2022). Syntactic awareness matters: uncovering reading comprehension difficulties in Hong Kong Chinese-English bilingual children. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 72(3), 532–551. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-022-00268-y>
- Urban, M., & Moran, S. (2021). Altitude and the distributional typology of language structure: Ejectives and beyond. *PLoS ONE*, 16(2), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245522>
- Wang, J., Rice, M. L., & Booth, J. R. (2019). Syntactic and semantic specialization and integration in 5-to 6-year-old children during auditory sentence processing. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 32(1), 36–49. [https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn\\_a\\_01477](https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01477)
- Zane, E., Arunachalam, S., & Luyster, R. (2021). Personal pronoun errors in form versus meaning produced by children with and without autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Cultural Cognitive Science*, 5(3), 389–404. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41809-021-00087-4>
- Zekaj, M. (2015). Synonymy Relationships between the Subjunctive and the New Infinitive in the Syntactic Aspect. *European Journal of Language and Literature*, 3(1), 91. <https://doi.org/10.26417/ejls.v3i1.p91-95>
- Zhang, C., & Kang, S. (2022). A comparative study on lexical and syntactic features of ESL versus EFL learners' writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1002090>