



A Study on the Comparison between the Chinese Structural Auxiliary Words “de” and the Relevant Word “dengan” in Indonesian Language

Leni Cahyati^{1✉}, Liu Haibo²

¹ Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia

² Nanchang University, China

Keywords

Chinese structural particles “de”; Indonesian word “dengan”; Contrastive analysis

Abstract

This research was to examine the Chinese structural auxiliary words “de” with the related Indonesian word “dengan”. The aims of this research were to disclose the correspondence between Chinese words “de” and relevant word “dengan” in Indonesian and also to elaborate their similarities and differences. The data of this research focused on the Chinese structural auxiliary words “de”, the Indonesian function word “dengan”. The writer analyzed the data by using comparative approach. The analysis would focus on the semantical, pragmatical and syntactical aspects. This research used descriptive qualitative method in analyzing data. The results of this research indicate that the Chinese structural auxiliary words “de” are correspond to the Indonesian function word “dengan”, but the Chinese structural auxiliary words “de” can not be completely translated into “dengan” and the Indonesian function word “dengan” can not be completely translated into “de”.

✉ Corresponding Author:
E-mail: lenichvt@unhas.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Chinese language uses many structural particles (助词). For foreign students, this is a major difficulty in grammar. Because particles have only grammatical meaning, they cannot form sentences alone. If used incorrectly, they alter the meaning of a sentence. The particles “地” and “得” are common, but Indonesian students often find them hard to master.

While learning Chinese, the writer noticed that “地” and “得” are related to the Indonesian word “dengan.” Previous research by Zhang Qiongyu (1998) argued that “dengan” matches with conjunctions like “与, 和, 同, 跟,” and with forms like “以……” and “用…….” Weiyi (2016) supported this, saying “dengan” is similar to “用, 以, 与, 跟,” except for “和” and “同.”

Based on earlier research, the writer became highly interested in this topic. The writer believes auxiliary particles “的, 地, 得” should be clearly distinguished to avoid errors, not mixed. Although previous research covers structural particles, this study focuses only on “地” and “得”. The writer agrees with Zhang Qiongyu that the Indonesian "dengan" relates to Chinese conjunctions “与, 和, 同, 跟, 以, 用”, but also believes “dengan” can be equivalent to Chinese “地” Thus, a comparative method is used to examine the relationship between the Chinese particles “地” and “得” and the Indonesian word “dengan”, deepening existing research. The results are expected to help Indonesian learners better understand and master these two structural particles.

This study primarily focuses on a comparative analysis across three main aspects: syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic functions. First, it analyzes the similarities and differences between the Chinese structural particles “地” and “得” and the Indonesian word “dengan” dialectically. Then, it examines the conditions under which the Chinese structural particles “地” and “得” can correspond to the Indonesian word “dengan”, as well as the conditions in which such correspondence does not apply or is inappropriate.

This research analyzes the similarities and differences between “得”, “地”, and “dengan” from semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic perspectives. It also identifies which sentence patterns correspond and how closely they match. The study is limited to modern Chinese’s structural particles “地” and “得”. The focus is on the equivalence relations between “地” / “得” in Chinese and “dengan” in Indonesian.

METHOD

The data in this study focuses on the Chinese structural particle “**de**” (地/得) and the Indonesian

function word “dengan”. This research analyzes the data using a comparative approach, emphasizing semantic, pragmatic, and syntactic aspects. The method used is a descriptive, qualitative approach to processing the data. The data collection technique is note-taking.

This study was organized into several stages: first, analyzing the similarities and differences between the Chinese structural particles “得” and “地” and the Indonesian word “dengan” across syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects. Then, identifying the sentence patterns in which the Chinese structural particles “得” / “地” correspond to the Indonesian word “dengan”, examining the extent to which these patterns are equivalent or non-equivalent, and observing the structural and functional differences of each.

A systematic literature review was conducted from the outset. The writer examined theses, journals, scientific articles, and other works discussing “地”, “得”, and “dengan”. These sources were compiled, critically reviewed, and synthesized for the theoretical framework and research solutions. Pairwise comparative analysis revealed confusion points for learners. Based on the results, rules for correspondence and non-correspondence were developed.

The data sources include academic works and relevant teaching materials. These are books on modern Chinese grammar, practical Chinese grammar, concise Chinese grammar, Indonesian grammar works, practical Indonesian grammar, Chinese teaching books, textbooks for foreign learners, and academic or popular articles on this topic. This combination provides both a theoretical foundation and empirical comparison for the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Similarities Between the Chinese Structural Particles “地” and “得” and the Indonesian Word “dengan.”

In Chinese, “地” and “得” are function words (虚词). “dengan” in Indonesian is also a function word. None can stand alone or carry lexical meaning, but all have key grammatical roles. Functionally, “地” and “得” in Chinese and “dengan” in Indonesian serve similar roles. They connect elements within a sentence and form clear syntactic relationships. In Chinese, “地” marks adverbial modifiers, linking the modifier to the head word. “得” marks complements, linking a verb or adjective with its complement. In Indonesian, “dengan” is a preposition that links an adverbial phrase or complement to the main verb.

Examples:

1. 我高兴地邀请你们到我家。

2. 她说汉语说得很好。

3. Kevin belajar dengan rajin.

凯文 学习（介词）努力

“凯文努力地学习。”

These three examples show that all particles function as connectors between sentence elements. In (1), 高兴 is an adverbial modifier, 邀请 is the verb, and “地” connects them. In (2), 很好 is the complement, 说 is the verb, and “得” is the connector. In (3), *rajin* is an adverbial modifier, *belajar* is the verb, and “dengan” connects them.

Differences Between the Chinese Structural Particles “地” and “得” and the Indonesian Word “dengan.”

“地” and “得” in Chinese, and “dengan” in Indonesian, differ in their sentence position. “地,” the adverbial marker, is generally between subject and predicate. “得,” the complement marker, follows the predicate verb. These Chinese positions are relatively fixed.

The Indonesian word “dengan” is mostly used after the predicate, but it can also come before the subject. It is rarely found between the subject and predicate. This is because adverbials in Indonesian have more complex positions, and adverbials and complements are often placed after the predicate.

Examples:

1. 师傅认真地修车。

2. 凯文跑得满足大汗的。

3. Mama memasak lauk dengan senang.

妈妈 做 饭菜（介词）高兴

“妈妈高兴地做饭菜。”

These examples show different syntactic positions for “地”, “得”, and “dengan”. In (1), “地” is between the subject and predicate, which is standard in Chinese. In (2), “得” is used after the verb and before the complement. In (3), the adverbial prepositional phrase “dengan senang” comes after the predicate. Thus, functions may be similar, but positions differ.

Correspondences and Non-Correspondences Between the Chinese Structural Particles “地” and “得” and the Indonesian Word “dengan”

Cases Where “地” Corresponds to “dengan.”

When “地” is used to express the *manner* or *mode* of an action, its structure generally takes the form:

adjective + 地 + verb.

In Chinese: **adjective + 地 + verb + object.**

In Indonesian: **V + O + dengan + adjective.**

Examples:

(1) Indonesian : *dia memelukku dengan antusias.*

Word-for-word: 他 拥抱 我 地 热情

Sentence translation: 他热情地拥抱了我。

(2) Indonesian : *Kevin menerima kritikan dengan tulus.*

Word-for-word : 凯文 接受 批评 地 诚恳

Sentence translation: 凯文诚恳地接受了批评。

From these examples, it is clear that the Chinese structural particle “地” corresponds to the Indonesian word “**dengan**”. All the example sentences (1) and (2) use adjectives as adverbial modifiers (状语). In Chinese, only the structural particle “地” may appear between the predicate head and the modifier; no other word may be inserted. Conversely, in Indonesian, a preposition such as “dengan” may be placed before the modifier.

When “地” is translated as “dengan”, the Indonesian verb that follows typically requires the **meN-** prefix. The uppercase **N** represents a nasal sound that changes depending on the initial phoneme of the base word: it may become *m*, *n*, *ny*, *ng*, or disappear entirely.

Examples:

menerima = meN- + terima,

membaca = meN- + baca, etc.

In example (2), it is also seen that in Indonesian, a third-person singular pronoun indicating possession may be inserted after the verb, for instance: *memelukku* = memeluk + *-ku* (personal pronoun).

Cases Where “地” Does *Not* Correspond to the Indonesian Word “dengan.”

There are a few situations in which the Chinese structural particle “地” does not correspond to “**dengan**” in Indonesian. This occurs when “地” expresses the *scope* or *degree* of an action or state. Its structures commonly appear as follows:

• **adverb + 地 + adjective**

(1) Indonesian : *dia membuat lelucon secara sengaja.*

Word-for-word: 他 做 笑话 方式 故意

Sentence translation: 他故意地开玩笑。

• **numeral + 地 + verb**

(2) Indonesian : *saya membacanya satu per satu kata.*

Word-for-word: 我 念 它 一个地一个 字

Sentence translation: 我一个字一个字地念。

• **pronoun + 地 + verb**

(3) Indonesian : *kamu seharusnya tidak melakukan seperti ini.*

Word-for-word: 你 应该 不 做 这样

Sentence translation: 你不应该这样地做。

• **noun + 地 + verb**

(4) Indonesian : *kamu menganalisis masalah ini secara ilmiah.*

Word-for-word: 你 分析 问题 这 方式 科学

Sentence translation: 你科学地分析这个问题。

• **verb + 地 + verb**

(5) Indonesian : *Hari ini hujannya tidak berhenti turun.*

Word-for-word: 今天 雨 它 不 停 下

Sentence translation: 今天雨不停地下。

From the examples above, there are cases in which the Chinese structural particle “地” does *not* correspond directly to “**dengan**” in Indonesian.

In sentence (1), “地” is translated as “**secara (方式)**”, which means “manner”. The phrase “secara (地)” functions as an adverbial modifier (状语), and “secara” itself acts as a preposition. When “地” is translated as “secara”, the verb following it usually receives the **meN-** prefix in Indonesian, such as in *menganalisis* (分析). In sentence (2), the prefix **per** is used to convey the meaning of “地”. In Indonesian, “per” is often inserted between repeated numbers to form an adverbial expression of manner. Sentences (3) and (5) show special conditions where “地” may be omitted without changing the meaning of the sentence. In sentence (5), the verb must also take the **ber-** prefix, for example, *berhenti* (停). In sentences (2) and (5), the suffix **-nya** is added after the noun or verb to mark possession or a third-person singular possessive pronoun. It should be noted that when “-nya” is added, the verb preceding it typically must already take the **meN-** prefix.

Cases Where “得” Corresponds to the Indonesian Word “dengan.”

When “得” is used to describe the *result, degree, or state* of an action, or to give an evaluation of that action, its structure typically takes the form: **verb + 得 + complement**, where the complement is often an adjective.

In Chinese: **verb + 得 + adjective** (as the complement).

The equivalent structure in Indonesian is: **V + dengan + adjective**, where the adjective functions as a complement.

Examples:

(1) Indonesian : *dia berbicara dengan sangat cepat.*

Word-for-word: 他 说 得 太 快

Sentence translation: 他说得太快。

(2) Indonesian : *anak-anak mendengar dengan sangat serius.*

Word-for-word: 孩子们 听 得 很 认真

Sentence translation: 孩子们听得很认真。

(3) Indonesian : *mama memotong roti dengan sangat tebal.*

Word-for-word: 妈妈 切 面包 得 太 薄

Sentence translation: 妈妈把面包切得太薄了。

From the examples above, it can be seen that the Chinese structural particle “得” corresponds to the Indonesian word “**dengan**”. In sentences (1)–(3), only the structural particle “得” may appear between the predicate core and the complement; no other word can be inserted. In Indonesian, however, a preposition such as “dengan” may precede the complement. When “得” is translated as “**dengan**”, the Indonesian verb that precedes it generally must take the **ber-** or **meN-** prefix, for example:

berbicara (说话), *bermain* (玩儿), *menggambar* (画), *mendengar* (听), and so on.

The phrase following “dengan” in Indonesian expresses a state or manner. Sentence (3) uses the “把” construction. From this sentence, it is evident that Chinese word order differs from Indonesian: In Indonesian, the verb precedes the passive phrase, whereas in Chinese it follows. Additionally, in Indonesian, the verb precedes the object, whereas in Chinese it follows the object.

Cases Where “得” Does Not Correspond to the Indonesian Word “dengan.”

There are not many cases in which “得” has no correspondence with “**dengan**”, because in several situations “得” can instead be translated as “**sampai**” (“until/to the point that”) in Indonesian.

This occurs when “得” expresses:

- the **result** of an action, or
- the **degree of intensity** of some characteristic of the action.

If the word before “得” is an adjective, the structure generally takes the form:

adjective + 得 + complement, where the complement may be a verb or a noun.

The equivalent structure in Indonesian is:

adjective + sampai + verb, where the verb functions as a complement.

Examples:

(1) Indonesian : *dia senang sampai mengeluarkan air mata.*

Word-for-word: 她 高兴 到直 流 眼泪

Sentence translation: 她高兴得直流眼泪。

(2) Indonesian : *dia lelah sampai untuk bernapas.*

Word-for-word: 她 累 到 为 上气

Sentence translation: 她累得上气不接下气的。

(3) Indonesian : *aku berdiri sampai tergesa-gesa.*

Word-for-word: 我 站 到 急

Sentence translation: 我急得站起来。

From these examples, it can be concluded that the Chinese structural particle “得” does not always correspond to “dengan” in Indonesian. In sentences (1) to (3), “得” is instead translated as “sampai”, which indicates a result or degree of the resulting state. In sentence (1), when “得” is translated as “sampai,” the verb that follows it in Indonesian typically receives the **meN-** prefix, for example, *mengeluarkan* (流). In sentence (2), the verb must take the **ber-** prefix, as in *bernapas* (上气). Meanwhile, in sentence (3), the verb uses the **ter-** prefix, as in *tergesa-gesa* (急).

From the available data, it can be concluded that only **two semantic functions** of the Indonesian word “dengan” can correspond to “地” or “得”, namely:

- the meaning of **manner** → corresponds to “地” (Adj + 地 + V)
- the meaning of **result** → corresponds to “得” (V + 得 + Adj)

Meanwhile, the meanings of **instrument**, **companionship**, **cause**, and **similarity** do not correspond directly to “地” or “得” but instead correspond to other Chinese words such as “用”, “跟”, “因为”, or “像”.

Table 1. analysis and comparison of particles

Indonesian	Chinese	Structural particles
dengan + Adj (manner)	Adj + 地 + V	地
dengan + Adj (result)	V + 得 + Adj	得
dengan + Adj (tool)	用 + N	Not to 地/得
dengan + Adj (accompaniment)	和/跟 + N	Not to 地/得

CONCLUSION

By comparing the Chinese structural particles “地” and “得” with the Indonesian word “**dengan**”, several similarities, differences, and correspondence rules are revealed:

1. **Grammatically**, both “地” and “得” belong to function words (虚词) in Chinese grammar; likewise, “dengan” is a function word in Indonesian. They belong to the same word category: none of the three can be used independently, none carries concrete lexical meaning, yet all play highly important syntactic roles.
2. The functions of “地” / “得” and “dengan” are aligned: besides linking elements, they form phrases that establish specific syntactic relationships.
3. There is **no absolute equivalence**: “地” / “得” cannot always be translated as “dengan”, and conversely, “dengan” is not automatically equivalent to “地” or “得”.
4. Their **positions differ**: “地” typically appears between the subject and predicate, “得” always appears after the predicate verb, whereas “dengan” is generally placed after the predicate.
5. “地” corresponds to “dengan” when expressing the **manner or mode** of an action (structure: adjective + 地 + verb). A special requirement in Indonesian is that the verb following “dengan” must take the **meN-** prefix.
6. “得” corresponds to “dengan” when indicating the **result or degree** of an action (structure: verb + 得 + complement). In Indonesian, the verb preceding “dengan” must carry an appropriate Indonesian prefix, such as **ber-**, **me-**, **di-**, **men-**, etc.

REFERENCES

- 程美珍, 李珠. 汉语病句辨析九百例 [M]. 北京: 华语教学出版社, 2009.
- 崔灿心. 母语为英语者现代汉语结构助词习得研究 [D]. [河南大学硕士学位论文]. 2015年5月
- 高霞. 英语母语者汉语结构助词“地”、“得”的偏误分析 [J]. 云南开放大学学报, 2016年第2期.
- 郭振华. A Concise Chinese Grammar (简明汉语语法) [M]. 北京: 华语教学出版社, 2017.
- 胡玲芳. 偏正短语中的“的”和“地”的区分和隐现问题考察 [D]. [陕西师范大学硕士学位论文]. 2014年5月
- 胡明亮. 汉语印尼语对比语法 [M]. 广州: 暨南大学出版社, 2017.
- 黄伯荣, 廖序东. 现代汉语 (增订六版) [M]. 北京: 高等教育出版社, 2017.
- 金松姬. 韩国汉语学习者带“得”字情态补语句习得研究 [D]. [中山大学硕士学位论文]. 2015年
- 李德津, 程美珍. A Practical Chinese Grammar for Foreigners (外国人实用汉语语法) [M]. 北京: 华语教学出版社, 2012.

- 刘月华,潘文娣.实用现代汉语语法(第三版)[M].北京:商务印书馆,2019.
- 牛春生.对“的”、“地”合并提出异议[M].宁夏大学学报,1983年第3期.
- 苏卉,荣国庆.媒体用语中结构助词“的”“地”“得”常见差错分析[J].晋城职业技术学院,2016年第5期.
- 宛志文.古今汉语常用字字典(Z).武汉:湖北人民出版社,2002.
- 吴长安.关于“的”“地”“得”合一的建议[J].绥化学院学报,2009年第7期.
- 王华.<水浒传>动态助词“得、的、地”用法分布计量研究[J].泰州师范专科学校,2009年3月.
- 王海峰.请区别使用“的、地、得”[J].绥化学院学报,2009年第11期.
- 韦伟.马来语工具格标记“dengan”的功能拓展[J].中国人民解放军外国语学院,2016年第5期.
- 徐阳春,刘小川.现代汉语(第二版)[M].北京:高等教育出版社,2018.
- 杨茹.结构助词“的”、“地”、“得”在“红色经典”歌曲中的发音问题[D].[山东大学硕士学位论文].2013年4月
- 阳小莲.结构助词“的、地、得”在《博雅汉语起步篇》中的编排及教学研究[D].[湖南师范大学硕士学位论文].2017年5月
- 邹欢威.韩国留学生汉语结构助词“de”习得偏误分析[D].[湖南师范大学硕士学位论文].2017年5月
- 张书岩.现代汉语规范字典(Z).上海:上海辞书出版社,2015.
- 张琮郁.现代印尼语语法(M).北京:外语教学与研究出版社,1998.