CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter presents the analysis of the findings. I focus on the differences of variants of Indonesian dative alternation. The variants of dative alternation are prepositional object or to-variant and double object or indirect object which analyzed by verb-sensitive approach. Then, I compare Indonesian dative alternation with English dative alternation. The data are collected through “Jawa Pos Newspaper” by the date 23 and 24 September 2015. Based on the founded data, Indonesian dative alternation has two meanings in semantic view by thematic rules. But, it does not always have two meanings in pragmatic view. Moreover, after knowing whether the sentence of Indonesian dative alternation posses one or two meaning, the next analysis is that compare them to English dative alternation. It is reviewed and explained in each section below.

From 185 dative verbs found (send-types verb and give-type verb), there are 70 ditransitive sentences. Those ditransitive consist of 37 to-variant, 18 for-variant and 2 double object or direct object in give-types verb. Then, there are 9 to-variant in send-types.

4.1. Semantic Aspects of Indonesian Dative Alternation

In English dative alternation there are restrictions either in using double object or to-variant. The restriction is based on the syntactic realization factors. Moreover, in Indonesian dative alternation is influenced by morphology and
syntactic factor. To know whether morphology and syntactic influence the meaning of Indonesian dative alternation or not, I begin this analysis by the simplest data which I found.

(1a) *Ronny Arnaz memberikan sapi kepada yayasan pendidikan Islam.*  
[Ronny Arnaz gave cow to Islamic school institute]  
Agent Theme Recipient  

(*Jawa Pos*, September 24, 2015, page 6)

According to Oehrle (1976: 19), for in such a case in English, it is perhaps simplest to see the necessity for sharply separating the semantic properties of each reading. It can apply in Indonesian dative alternation. On first reading, (1a) may be stated that the possession of cow pass from Arnaz to Islamic school institute. It means Arnaz owned a certain cow, then Arnaz acts in such a way as to transfer the ownership of the book to Islamic school institute. The second reading, (1a) may be appropriate for a situation in which Arnaz merely conveyed the cow to Islamic school institute and the possession meaning is not relevant. It means that the cow changes hands without the ownership being affected. (1a) may mean that Arnaz got mandate to consign the cow to Islamic school institute for dispensing to others. On the third reading, (1a) may be acceptable for a situation in which Islamic school institute owed some money which they would not have been gotten or bought cow if they had not gotten loan from bank in which Arnaz warrant it. However, it may be stated that Arnaz gives inspiration, motivation and suggestion to Islamic school institute in which they could not buy the cow if Arnaz did not do it. It means that there is no relationship between subject (Arnaz) and first object (cow).
In English, (1a) cannot be applied on first reading, second reading and third reading. Nevertheless, English can apply those readings if (1a) changed to be double object variant. It means the ambiguity arise in double object only. Yet, all sentence, either Indonesian or English can be define the meaning based on the context.

Regarding of this reason, I believe that (1a) has only one meaning. We can know it by pragmatic study, instantly we can choose one of those reading by understanding context of the discourse and the situational context (Fromkin and friends, 2011). The truth of (1a) is that a caption, while the title of the article is ‘Kasus Crane, Trafik Voice Meningkat 673%’ [Crane Case, Traffic Voice increases 673%]. The linguistic context of this discourse is about the traffic voice progress of Telkomsel (one of the Indonesia’s cellular telephone communication companies) in Idhul Adha and the peak of this increase is Crane tragedy in Makkah. Moreover, based on the situational context, Arnaz is delegation of Telkomsel to cede that cow to Islamic school institute for Idhul Adha moment (sacrificial animal). It shows by the picture of the caption. Arnaz and his friend were wearing Telkomsel uniform and there was Telkomsel banner behind them which written ‘Telkomsel peduli dan berbagi untuk negeri [Telkomsel care and share for country]’. It means that, the first reading, the possession of cow pass from Arnaz to Islamic school institute is not acceptable because that cow is not owned by Arnaz. The second reading seems more appropriate to (1a) sentence, where the cow changes hands without the ownership being affected. It is more crucial case, in which second reading may have several probably meanings which
focus on the ownership between subject (Arnaz) and second object (Islamic school institute) is not being affected. Sentence (1a) may have meaning Arnaz consigned Islamic school institute the cow to share to the members of Islamic school institute as meat (it means the name of sacrifice is Telkomsel and Rony Arnaz is the first mediator and Islamic school institute is the second mediator mediator); or (1a) may have meaning Arnaz consigned the cow to Islamic school institute and at that time, the cow is owned by Islamic school institute which would be shared for the members of Islamic school institute as meat (it means the mane of sacrifice is Islamic school institute).

I found in tribunnews that he said that “… The national total, we donate 653 sacrificial animals.” ‘We’ refers to Telkomsel, in which represented by Arnaz. So, Telkomsel donated the cows to Islamic school institute. It means that the name of sacrifice is Islamic school institute; Arnaz consigned the cow to Islamic school institute and at that time, the cow is owned by Islamic school institute which would be shared for the members of Islamic school institute as meat. Absolutely, the third reading is not appropriate in this situational context because there is relationship between subject and second object. (1a) is to-variant and (1b) is double object. To know they have single meaning or not, I use thematic roles as in Chapter II.

(1b)* Ronny Arnaz memberikan yayasan pendidikan Islam sapi.

[Ronny Arnaz gave Islamic school institute cow]

Agent Goal Theme

In cursory reading, these sentences ((1a) and (1b)) seem having same meaning. Nevertheless, many linguists debate about those. It naturally happens in
every study. In my first hypothesis, (1a) and (1b) have same meaning. Yet, if (1a) has same meaning with (1b), why is the usage of to-variant or prepositional phrases is preferred (see in appendix). It discusses further in 4.2.

What have been debated on (1a) and (1b) by many linguists are their differences in acceptability and semantic between these two contractions which arise from the profiling relationship between the thematic roles of Goal and Recipient, in which caused different entailment meaning: caused possession meaning and coursed motion meaning. By seeing the differences thematic roles of the both variant of dative alternation; prepositional object which represented by sentence (1a) and double object which represented by sentence (1b).

Regarding of (1a) and (1b) meaning, Pinker (1989) in Krifka (2003) propose as following.

DO: [EVENT give [Ann Beth [STATE HAVE Beth the car]]]
PO: [EVENT give [Ann the car [EVENT GO the car [PATH to [PLACE Beth]]]]]

In English, DO (double object) and PO (prepositional object) are different, in which those proposal may be interpreted as:

1. Pinker assumes that ‘Ann gave Beth the car’ express the meaning: Ann caused Beth have the car.
2. Pinker assumes that ‘Ann gave the car to Beth express the meaning: Ann caused the car to go to Beth (or rather, to Beth’s possession).
He states that the meanings (DO nad PO) can be very closed indeed, nut in certain contexts meaning differences appear, and certain verbs may be compatible only with one meaning.

That proposal can be applied in Indonesian dative alternation also. Based on Pinker’s proposal, Indonesian dative alternation in (1a) means that Arnaz caused the cow to go to Islamic school institute, whereas sentence (1b) express the meaning that Arnaz caused Islamic school institute to have the cow. In (1a) seems there is spatial entailment indicate by prepositional to which is interpreted as ‘to go to’. Meanwhile, (1b) involves caused possession meaning only. It seems there is caused motion meaning in sentence (1a). Hence, sentence (1a) may be interpreted as caused possession: ‘ARNAZ cause ISLAMIC SCHOOL INSTITUTE to have COW’ (Islamic school institute is recipient) and caused motion: ‘ARNAZ cause COW to be at ISLAMIC SCHOOL INSTITUTE’ (Islamic school institute is spatial goal). So, the semantic interpretation in this case that the cow becomes Islamic school institute. Based on my data collection, there is no (mem+root+kan in double object) variant like sentence (1b) in Indonesian language. It will be discussed further in 4.2.

To know whether give-types verb has caused motion meaning or not, firstly, let’s focus on the differences between Recipient and Goal. According to Dillon (1977) Goal is the place-to-which or person-to-whom an action is directed. Meanwhile, according to Jackendoff (1990), Recipient is a special kind of goal associated with verbs expressing a change in ownership or possession. It means
that the general event type is Goal and the special of Goal is Recipient. I try to illustrate it in the following diagram.

It is clearly that Goal (in Double object) is an objective of the agent to do event verb at the time. Meanwhile, Recipient (in to-variant) is someone who receives a theme from the agent. Nevertheless, I found in my data a sentence like (2).

(2)*Tiongkok meminjamkan sepasang panda ke Malaysia.
[Chinese loaned a couple of panda to Malaysia]
Agent Theme Recipient

(Jawa Pos, September 23, 2015, page 7)

Malaysia is recipient but it is not an animate. But sentence (2) is acceptable only if ‘Malaysia’ metonymically refers to the organization in Malaysia or the Malaysia
office (e.g., RH&L 2008; 138, Krifka 2003; 2). Therefore, I treat the Agent same as Recipient, in which Tiongkok refers to the organization in China.

I agree with RH&L definition in which all dative verbs involves an alternate realization of recipient, where a ‘recipient’ is generally an animate entity capable of possession, with corporations, governments and other organization qualifying as ‘extended’ animated. It is also consistently with Goldberg 1995, Green 1974 and Pinker 1989, in which the prototypical recipient is animate because the prototypical relation of possession involves an animate possessor and an inanimate possessum. However, possessors and thus recipients can be inanimate in certain instances of inalienable possession, as in our god, Allah SWT gives our face two eyes or the students give the page a number.

Sentence (2) includes in give-types verb where meminjamkan (loan) has meaning temporally giving. ‘meminjamkan’ describes a more specific type of possession, encoded in the possession type. It means that Tiongkok gave the two pandas temporarily to Malaysia. By reading the discourse of sentence (2), I know that it is not complimentary. It means that Malaysia must pay it by a particular term.

Concerning the meaning of loan in Indonesian is meminjami or meminjamkan which comes from the root pinjam (borrow). It is complicated case, in which the affixes influence the meaning. It means pinjam or meminjam is not ‘loan’. The root is same, but they have different meaning. The event type of ‘loan’ include in give-types verb. Meanwhile, the event type of ‘borrow’ does not
include in dative verb criterion. To make easy understanding, I put them in following example:

(2b) *Tia meminjam sebuah buku. (Tia borrowed a book)
(2c) *Tia meminjami Tio. (Tia lent Tio)
(2d) Tia meminjami Tio sebuah buku. (Tia lent Tio a book)
(2e) Tia meminjamkan sebuah buku. (Tia lent a book)
(2f) Tia meminjamkan sebuah buku kepada Tio. (Tia lent a book to Tio)
(2g) Tia meminjamkan sebuah buku untuk Tio. (Tia lent a book for Tio)

Those sentences come from the same root; it is pinjam (borrow, loan, lend). Based on contextual meaning, (2b) means that Tia did not have a book then she borrowed a book (from her friend). Meanwhile, sentence (2c) means that Tia had something and there was Tio who asked to borrow it, consequently, Tia lent Tio X. This sentence is imperfect because (2c) need more complement. So, (2d) is prefect form of (2c), in which Tia had a book and Tio asked to borrow it; consequently Tia lent Tio a book. However, (2e) means that Tia had a book (or more) and there was someone who asked to borrow Tia’s book; consequently, Tia lent a book. (2f) means that someone in (2e) is Tio. Meanwhile, (2g) means that Tio asked Tia to borrow a book from someone or Tia borrow a book in which the book is for Tio. (2g) has benefactive meaning. From those sentences, I can conclude that affixes (morphology) can influence and change the meaning of Indonesian word. It will discuss further in (4.2).
The Theme of (1a) and (2) are concrete or physical noun. However, in English, there is abstract noun which settle as Theme. Consider the following sentence:

(3a) I give a good time to all who come.

(clubtrentino.freewebbspace.com/calendar_for_club_trentino.html, cited by RH & L, 2008)

This sentence describes event of caused possession but do not involve transfer of possession. (3a) states that all who come will have a good time. Although give-type verbs sometimes may be understood as a source, giving the impression that the verb’s meaning does involve transfer of possession. Yet, this impression follows from the nature of this form of possession.

Regarding abstract Theme in English dative alternation, I found Theme which is not physical noun in my data collection. To know they have same treatment as (1a) and (2) here is my analysis.

(3a) Saya harus memberikan kesempatan kepada semua pemain.

Agent must give opportunity to Recipient

(Jawa Pos, September 23, 2015, page 19)

(3b) FSG dikabarkan bersedia memberikan lebih banyak waktu dan kesempatan kepada Rodgers.

times and opportunity to

(Jawa Pos, September 24, 2015, page 15)

The important consideration in finding the acceptable meaning is knowing the relationship between the arguments. Sentence (3b) means that saya caused the opportunity to be at all players. Naturally ‘give’ or ‘beri’ is verb event which will
often appear to involve transfer of possession from a source to a recipient, because in the real world people assume that ‘A’ cannot cause ‘B’ to have possession of a physical object unless A has possession of it first (Beth Levin: 2005). Nevertheless, ‘A’ represented by ‘saya’ does not need to have ‘an opportunity’ to cause ‘B’ which is represented by ‘all players’ to have an opportunity. Situationally, ‘saya’ (coach) gave an opportunity to all players to be starter in playing soccer. It means that ‘saya’ does not need opportunity to take a role as starter in soccer. Regarding of that reason, caused motion meaning is not acceptable in give-types verb.

The second reading, in which (3b) is not acceptable because saya can not merely handed the opportunity to all players. The verb ‘hand’ cannot apply for abstract theme whether in alienable or in alienable possession (Oehrle, 1976: 33). Meanwhile, the third reading is not compatible with this context. Oehrle (1976: 67) state that the third reading of English sentences with give is that the prepositional dative construction is not available or if so only in certain rather special cases. He also emphasizes that in all cases in which the third reading is available; the double object construction is base-generated (1976: 68). It means that if give-types dative verb categorize in the third reading, the sentence will use double object variant. It will discuss further in 4.2. Come back to the first reading, RH & L have propose it as following:

“Physical control of an entity can only be directly caused by someone who originally has physical control of that entity through physical manipulation. As the result, there is an impression that the meaning of ‘give’ involves the physical transfer of possession from a source to a goal (the recipient). But, this is illusory when possession involves an abstract entity and
thus cannot involve physical control, someone can bring a change of possession without being the original processor.”

(RH & L, 2008: 140)

Indeed, that quotation means that there is no caused motion in English to-variant of give-types verb. It happens as the physical manipulation of being different processor. It also happens in Indonesian prepositional object of give-types verb.

So, the meaning of sentence (3b) is that saya (coach) has authority as his obligation to give opportunity to all players. It means that the theme become an obligation for the subject and the theme become entitlement for the recipient. In another words, sentence (3b) means that saya does not have opportunity to give to the all players but saya has authority to do it.

The treatment of (3b) also applies in (3c) in which FGS (Fenway Sports Group) is name of an organization. It is not inanimate subject. But, it is metonymically Agent like the Agent of (2). FSG does not need to have more times and opportunity firstly to have an ability to give them to Rodgers.

Regarding of abstract noun or abstract entity, which should not be posses firstly to give to the recipient. It means that authority, ability, skill and experience of the agent can give abstract noun to the recipient. Then, is there any recipient does not receive or own although they had received the theme? Here, it is the data which I collect.

(4a) Sebegitu cepatnya Anda menyerahkan segala-galanya kepada seseorang lelaki yang baru ketemu sekali.

How fast you relinquished everything to a man who new meet once.

Recipient
In this case, the context of the word ‘segala-galanya’ refers to virginity. So, ‘Anda’ refers to the woman. When a woman gave her virginity to a man, the man does not have virginity. It is similar to (4b) which proposed by Oehrle (1976: 22).

(4b) Nia gave John her telephone number.

(4a) and (4b) are same in which the recipient does not get the theme. However, there are distinctions between them. The agent of (4a) lost her possession (virginity). Nonetheless, probably, the agent of (4b) still has her number in which the reading is ‘Nia dictated John her telephone number’. The other reading is ‘Nia gave a scrap of paper which written her telephone number to John’. Therefore, this case emphasizes that give-types verb do not involve caused motion because there is no path from the source to the recipient or goal. The presence of prepositional (to) does not mean the path exist in give—types verb in dative alternation sentence.

I have discussed dative verb in which the theme are physical entity and abstract noun. Absolutely, something that would be given is a noun whether it is physical noun or abstract noun. The subjects of all data above are physical noun which is Agent. Nevertheless, I found in my data collection that there are subjects which are not physical entity. Davies (1994: 72) stated that give-types verb takes three arguments which can be thematically designated as AGENT, THEME, and GOAL. I found in my data collection the sentence like (5a)
‘kehadiran Aremania’ is not agent because it is not animate. It is causative or force which caused an action mindlessly. Moreover, NP2 (calm) is predicational noun; nominalization of a verb (see Oehrle 1976: 46). There is no ambiguity in (5a). Nevertheless, if dative alternation consists of predicational noun and it is double object, the ambiguity will arise. The ambiguity comes from the thematic relation of NP1 (player). It may be theme of calm if the reading is ‘Aremania’s attendance calm player’ in which subject caused player to be calm. The second reading, NP1 may be agent if ‘Aremania’s attendance let player calm’ in which the subject gave opportunity to calm. Yet, in the to-variant, the second reading is not available. So, the proposal of Davies (1994) is not totally right. Subject is not always an agent. There are several inanimate subjects in my data collection as following:

(5b) "Pengalaman pahit bisa memberikan inspirasi bagi seseorang." (Bitter experience can give inspiration for someone.)

(Jawa Pos, September 23, 2015, page 16)

(5c) "Panjatan doa Nabi Ibrahim tersebut memberikan pelajaran bagi kita..." (That spate of Prophet Ibrahim’s prayer gives a course for us)

(Jawa Pos, September 24, 2015, page 2)

"Pengalaman pahit" and "panjatan doa Nabi Ibrahim" are inanimate subject. Not only that, but also there are many examples which propose by some linguists such as "the explosion gave me headache; interviewing Nixon gave an idea for a boot to..."
every journalist living in New York in the 1970s. I suggest that agent can be replaced by causative or force. Therefore, I believe that there is no path from a giver to the recipient/goal because inanimate subjects cannot possess noun (theme), so that they cannot transfer it to the other. They can cause only without responsibility.

In (5b) and (5c) do not use to as prepositional. Meanwhile, they use for as prepositional variant. I already stated that in this study, I focus in double object variant and to-variant only. Yet, I want to allude it at glance. Actually, in English dative alternation there is no give-types verb classification of for-dative verbs. It is consistent with Green (1974) in Oehrle (1976: 110). He classified for-dative verbs into five classes as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Verbs denoting creative acts in which an object is created or transfer to produce a certain effect</td>
<td>Make, cook, boil, roast, fry, sew, knit, paint, draw, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Verbs denoting activities involving selection</td>
<td>Buy, purchase, find, get, choose, pick out, gather, save, take, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Verbs denoting performance considered artistic</td>
<td>Sing, chant, recite, play (instrument and composition), dance, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Verbs that express a kind of obtaining</td>
<td>Earn, gain, win, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Benefactive construction</td>
<td>Rob me a bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1.1.

For-dative verbs

Therefore, in this case, Indonesian dative alternation differs to English dative alternation. It may be caused the suffix kan which discuss further in 4.2.
All data above is active voice (active sentence). In English, dative alternation is available in active and passive. Indonesian language also has dative alternation in active voice and passive voice. I found some passive form of dative alternation in my source of data. I put them in the following table to show the differences and similarities between passive forms of dative alternation and active forms of dative alternation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indonesian</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kepala sekolah itu telah <strong>diberi</strong></td>
<td><em>Dinas Pendidikan Kota Mojokerto <strong>memberi</strong> Kepala Sekolah itu teguran.</em></td>
<td><em>Dinas Pendidikan Kota Mojokerto memberi Kepala Sekolah itu teguran.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanksi teguran oleh Dinas Pendidikan</td>
<td>(That headmaster had been given rebuke by Mojokerto educational government)</td>
<td>(Mojokerto educational government had given that headmaster rebuke)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kota Mojokerto.</td>
<td>(Jawa Pos, September 23, 2015, page 13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detektif cilik sering <strong>diberi</strong></td>
<td><em>Pak Kadir sering memberi detektif cilik cemilan.</em></td>
<td><em>Pak Kadir sering memberi detektif cilik cemilan.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cemilan oleh Pak Kadir.</td>
<td>(Kid detective used to be given snack by Mr. Kadir)</td>
<td>(Mr. Kadir used to give kid detective snack)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Jawa Pos, September 24, 2015, page 21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapel gaji <strong>diberikan</strong> secara</td>
<td>... <strong>memberikan</strong> rapel gaji secara langsung <em>kepada</em> tenaga honorer K-2.</td>
<td>... <strong>memberikan</strong> rapel gaji secara langsung <em>kepada</em> tenaga honorer K-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>langsung <em>kepada</em> tenaga honorer K-2.</td>
<td>(overdue salary was given directly to K-2 honorary worker)</td>
<td>(....gave overdue salary directly to K-2 honorary worker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Jawa Pos, September 23, 2015, page 39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tulisan tangan Buyung di secarik</td>
<td><em>menyerahkan</em> tulisan tangan Buyung <em>kepada</em> Todung tadi.</td>
<td><em>menyerahkan</em> tulisan tangan Buyung <em>kepada</em> Todung tadi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kertas yang <strong>diserahkan</strong> kepada</td>
<td>(Butung hand writing on a peach of paper which was</td>
<td>(....forfeited Buyung hand writing on a peach of paper to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todung tadi.</td>
<td>... <strong>menyerahkan</strong> tulisan tangan Buyung <em>kepada</em> Todung tadi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Passive form of Indonesian dative alternation can be identified by several points. First are affixes. The passive form of to-variant can be seen in (6c) and (6d). In to-variant the root beri added by prefix di to show passive verb form of sentence (Warsiman, 2012: 13) and suffix kan to show that is prepositional object in which be followed by preposition kepada, then followed by Recipient. In contrast, (6a) and (6b) are double object which do not added by suffix kan. Therefore, they are not followed by proposition, but followed by theme. The second differences are hidden Agent. In to-variant the Agent is hidden. The reason why does it is hidden will explain further in 4.2.

Related to table 4.1.2, if Indonesian double objects passive forms ((6a) and (6b)) changed into the active form it seems like strange sentence. The reason is that I did not find give-types verb in double object variant like them in my source of data. The double object variant which I found is like (7a) and (7b)

(7a) Terima kasih telah memberiku kesempatan mengajar.
Thank you already given me opportunity instructing.

Goal Theme

(Jawa Pos, September 23, 2015, page 16)
Both of these sentences followed by pronoun after *give*. However, the pronoun in (7a) and (7b) stick to the event type verb; *give*. It means that those pronouns use their short forms; *-ku*, the short form of *aku* which has meaning ‘me’; *-nya* the short form of *dia* which has meaning ‘his/her’. Absolutely, (7a) and (7b) have possession meaning only because there is no prepositional *to* which manipulate the reading to guess these sentences have caused motion meaning. (7a) means that *me* has the opportunity to teach. Here, the agent is not mentioned. So, I do know exactly whose have the opportunity firstly. Based on explanation above, opportunity includes in abstract entity which must not be transferred from A to B. Then, (7b) means the father has a task to mix the dough in which the father caused his daughter does his task. In short words, the daughter have the task because of her father gave it.

Back to the passive form of Indonesian *give*-types verb, I guess that it is similar to the passive form of English *give*-types verb. To make clear cut understanding, I already put the passive form of English *give*-types verb in the table below. Now, let’s compare passive form of Indonesian dative alternation in *table 4.1.2* above to passive form of English dative alternation in *table 4.1.3*. 

(7b) *Sang ayah kerap memberinya tugas mengocok adonan.*

Respectful father often give her task mixing dough.

Agent       Goal      Theme
### Table 4.1.3.

**Passive form of English Dative Alternation (taken from One-Soon Her’s ‘ Lexical Mapping Theory Revisited’ )**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>… gave a book to me</td>
<td>A book was given to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>(He) gave me a book</td>
<td>I was given a book (by him)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the both tables, there is no tight difference between English and Indonesian dative alternation in passive form. Nevertheless, in English passive form of double object variant, adding Theme is optional, yet in Indonesian does not so. Then, in English passive form, there is no change in the verb form whether in prepositional object or double object.

To entrust that *give*-types verb do not have path or caused motion meaning, for instance the *to* phrase with *give*-type verb cannot be questioned by the locative *wh*-word; where (*di mana*) (Levinson 2005 in RH&L 2008), but the *to* phrase with *send*-types verb. It can be seen as follow:

(9a) * Where did you give those animals?  
(9b) Where did you send those animals? To the jungle/To zoo

The answer of (9b) is ‘I send the animals to the jungle’. Related to this case, (9a) can be answer if the *wh*-question by TO WHOM. So, the answer may be ‘To Ermi/To zoo keeper’. Absolutely, ‘to whom’ refers to the animate. Meanwhile, *send*-types verb can be followed by inanimate complement after prepositional *to*, such as ‘jungle’ in (9b), yet, it does not apply in *give*-types verb (except metonym).
Knowing that give-types verb cannot be questioned by where, send-types verb can be questioned by both of them.

(9c) To whom did you send the package? To my mother / to Julian  
(9b) Where did you send the package? To Tuban / to Madiun / to Surabaya

Implicitly, give-types verb can be questioned by TO WHOM only, but send-types verb can be questioned by both (TO WHOME and WHERE). It implies that give-types verb have one entailed meaning only; it is caused possession meaning. Meanwhile, send-types verb may have two entail meanings; it is caused possession meaning and caused motion meaning.

RH&L proposal can be applied in Indonesian also, like the following:

(9e) *Kemana kamu memberi surat itu?
(9f) Kepada siapa kamu memberi surat itu? Kepada pamanku

(9c) is not correct grammar and the correct one is (9f). But, kemana and kepada siapa can apply in Indonesian send-types verb.

Concerning to send-types verb can accept inanimate and animate recipient or goal; it intends that in thematic role, send-types verb apply Goal. The following data are the kinds of Indonesian send-types verb sentence in different recipient.

(10a) Sapi akan dikirim ke rumah pemotongan hewan…  
       Cow will was sent to house slaughtering animal…  
       THEME Mod V Pre GOAL

(Jawa Pos, September 23, 2015, page 16)
(10b) Kami tidak mengirim surat ke walikota ...
We not sent letter to mayor
AGENT Neg. V THEME Pre RECIPIENT

(Jawa Pos, September 23, 2015, page 30)

After prepositional to, sentence (10a) followed by inanimate NP, the place of slaughtering animal. Not only inanimate, after prepositional to, send-types verb in (10b) followed by animate. It is clearly show that give-types verb is not same as send-types verb which has motion meaning (See the differences illustration of give-types verb and send-types verb in appendix). To know whether send-types verb has caused possession meaning RH&L argued as following.

When send-type verb is used to describe an instance of caused motion that does not also involve a transfer of possession, it has a purely spatial goal, and it is only found in the to variant. The consequence is the well-known observation that the double object variant typically arises with animates, since they are typical potential recipients (e.g., Green 1974: 103, Oehrle 1976).

(RH&, 2008: 144)

By above quotation, it shows that English send-types may have two caused meanings (motion and possession) in double object variant. It can apply in Indonesian dative alternation also but there are some differences.

In English dative alternation, send-types verb Sentence (10a) and (10b) are to-variant of send-datives verb, of course, they had motion meaning if there was no negation. The Goal of (10a) is inanimate in which (10a) cannot have possession meaning. It support by the pragmatic context of (10a) in which based on the discourse ‘the cow sent to sell for stabilizing sacrificial animals’. So, situationally, (10a) has caused motion only because the place of sacrificial is not
possible to possess the cow. (10a) will be possible has possession meaning in double object variant and if the cow has been sold out. But, it is better to use verb sell, in which sell include in give-type verb. So, (10a) does not involve cause possession meaning.

If (10b) change to the double object and the negation is removed become the following:

(10c) Kami mengirim walikota surat
We sent mayor letter
AGENT V RECIPIENT THEME

I think (10b) and (10c) have same truth value. Although (10c) is double object variant, (10c) still has caused motion meaning form the event type itself. (10c) has caused possession is in the question. To answer this question, RH&L propose these following sentences as the differences between double object and to-variant in English send-types verb.

(11a) Lewis sent/shipped a bicycle to Sam, but it never arrived. (RH&L 2008: 145)
(11b) *Lewis sent/shipped Sam a bicycle, but it never arrived. (RH&L 2008: 145)

Sentence (11a) is acceptable in which one month ago Lewis sent/shipped a bicycle to Sam, but until today the bicycle does not arrive. Meanwhile, (11b) is not acceptable because in this reading Lewis has already sent/shipped Sam, it is bicycle; and Sam got it. It is not impossible that the bicycle never arrived because Sam handed it. It means that to-variant emphasizes the path transferred of event type of send. Meanwhile, the double object emphasizes the result (Otsuka, 2005: 262). Therefore, (10c) has caused possession meaning. Let’s take look at the
context; someone who was sent a letter from his boyfriend/enemy/ex, she is free to read or no, she has authority to save or to tear it up. It means that she posses that letter. Hence, ‘kami mengirim surat ke walikota’ still entails caused possession meaning because Walikota has authority to save the letter or no.

Shortly, Indonesian dative alternation in send-types verb has caused motion meaning in both variant (double object and to-variant). Nevertheless, send-types verbs may have caused possession meaning if the Recipient or Goal is animate. Then, send-types verb have caused motion meaning only if the Recipient or Goal is inanimate. Therefore, it differs to the English dative alternation, in which English send-types verb have caused motion meaning in to-variant and has caused possession meaning in double object.

The data finding of send-types verb above show that there is no double object in active form. It may be caused of preferred usage that send-types verb use to-variant to emphasize the path. The following table 4.14 are the passive form of send-types verb. (10a) is passive form of send-type verb of to-variant. The active form of (10a) is ‘…. akan mengirimkan sapi ke rumah pemotongan hewan (…. will send cow to the place of slaughtering animal)’. The active form of (10a) is same as give-types verb of to-variant in which the subject is hidden in spite of the verb form is not added by suffix kan. I don’t know exactly why it happens, but, it is only one data that I found. It may be caused of typo or others. Nonetheless, in the dominant data, I found as following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>Surat juga dikirimkan ke Wakil Presiden Jusuf Kalla dan pimpinan</td>
<td>... juga mengirimkan surat ke Wakil Presiden Jusuf Kalla dan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I want to clarify that table 4.1.4 shows clearly that Indonesian send-types verb do not use double object. I did not find Indonesian double object in send-types verb neither in passive nor in active. It may be caused of the Indonesian literal meaning of the event type of send in which send define as deliver using mediator (Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI) 2008: 778). Because of that reason, the path is must to use to elucidate the path between Agent and Recipient/Goal.

From the table 4.1.3 and table 4.1.4 above, I can sum up that in my data collection, Indonesian dative alternation in send-types verb is preferred to use because of path emphasizing. It may be caused limited data or the preferred usage (But, I ever find that there is double object in send-type verb). So, the
reason of example of (11a) and (11b) does not make sense in Indonesian dative alternation. Hence, the caused possession meaning in send-type verb is not influenced by the alternation but it depends on the context and the type of Recipient or Goal. In contrast, give-types verb has both variant although it has caused passion only. In addition, the position of Theme in the send-types is not only between Verb and Preposition. It will discuss further in 4.2.

4.2. The Characteristics of Indonesian Dative Alternation

In 4.1. explains that Indonesian language has dative alternation, especially in the give-types verb. The alternations which happen in the give-types verb do not totally change the intended meaning and the truth meaning. I do not deny that to-variant seem like have caused motion meaning because there is prepositional ke (to), in which lexically ke means preposition express direction as in KBBI (Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia: 2008, 700).

Nevertheless, it only means the change of possession from Agent (source) to the Recipient (but it is not always like that as (3a) and (3b)). The path follows naturally because change of possession. If the new processor goes to the new location, absolutely the Theme will change its location. It is consistent with the lexical meaning of beri in KBBI (2008: 184). So, if double object and to-variant in give-types verb are only associated with the caused possession event type, why
do they show the dative alternation? It can be answered by the characteristics of the both variants of Indonesian dative alternation. The characteristics of Indonesian dative alternation show a pattern of each variant.

4.2.1. The Characteristics of **To-Variant**

As already explain above, *give*-types verb does not have caused motion meaning although in *to*-variant. Differ to *give*-types verb, *send*-types verb in *to*-variant may have two meaning (motion and possession). Therefore, *to*-variant can be arisen because bound morpheme which adhere to the event types.

4.2.1.1 The Characteristics of To-Variant in *Give*-Types Verb

Bound morpheme which adheres to the event types means that one of the characteristics of *to*-variant in *give*-types verb is that Indonesian affixes. Those affixes can restrict the diction after the usage them. Here, I try to give an illustration of *give*-types verb.
Figure 4.2.2
Illustration of Give-types verb

(14a) Yulian *memberikan* *sebuah hadiah* kepada Nia/nya.
Yulian gave a gift to Nia
Agent Theme Recipient

(14b) Yulian *memberinya* *sebuah hadiah*.
Yulian gave her a gift
Agent Recipient/Goal Theme

The truth of figure 2 is that the Processor of the Theme change without mediator. So, the absence of mediator emphasize that there is no path of (14a). The alternation happens like in (14a) and (14b) because bound morpheme (derivational morpheme). The event type of (14a) added by suffix *kan*, in which has several intended meanings. It is related to morphology which is not my scope in this research. But, I just want to show that the characteristic of to-variant in give-types verb is added derivational morpheme in its verb.
In to-variant of give-types verb there is prefix ‘mem-’ which come from prefix ‘me-’. Not only that, but also there is suffix ‘-kan’ after the root verb beri. To know whether affix ‘me-kan’ can change the intended meaning of the sentence, I found the function of affixes me-kan as following.

a. Benefactive (to do something for other people necessity)

The verbs that show benefactive including membukakan (open), membilikan (buy) and others which also stated by Maryanto (https://prezi.com/xmvwosvrop7s/imbuhan-me-kan/ by tri maryanto on Prezi.htm)

E.g. Sari mengambilkan nenek segelas air putih.  
Sari took grandmother a glass of water

(http://www.bukupedia.net/2015/10/arti-dan-makna-imbuhan-me-kan-terlengkap.html)

b. Causative (making something new)

The verbs that express a change from A condition to B condition. This verbs which indicate causative are that membesarkan (enlarge), merapikan (tidy up), menelantarkan (abandon), mengecilkan (reduce) and so on

(www.enjang.com/imbuhan-fungsi-dan-arti-me-kan-dan-di-kan/
Enjang.com - Enjang.com.htm)

E.g. Kakakku meninggikan lampu.  
My brother heighten lamp.

(http://www.bukupedia.net/2015/10/arti-dan-makna-imbuhan-me-kan-terlengkap.html)
c. Instrumental (to state making with)

The verbs which express instrumental are *menusukkan* (stab), *melemparkan* (throw), etc. It means that this event types need tool/instrument/mediator to fulfill the event. Regarding this needs, these verbs also express motion meaning which include in *throw*-types verb.

*E.g.* Dia melemparkan batu.
She threw stone.


d. Motion (move something to the other place)

The verbs that express motion meaning is *memingsirkan* (sidetrack), *memusatkan* (centralize), *mendaratkan* (land), etc.

*E.g.* Ayahnya memingsirkan kendaraannya.
Her father sidetracks his vehicle.

(Khoiri A.F. Imron, http://bostep1.blogspot.co.id/2014/03/contoh-contoh-imbuhan.html)

e. Making as

The verb that express stating as something is *mengucilkan* (exclude), *mendewakan* (deify), etc.

*E.g.* Mereka mendewakan Tuhan-Nya
They deify their god

(Maryanto, https://prezi.com/xmvwosvrop7s/imbuhan-me-kan/by_tri_maryanto_on_Prezi.htm)
f. Express Deed

The verbs that express deed is menyemprotkan (sprinkled), menugaskan (assign), etc.

E.g: Gajah menyemprotkan air dari belalainya. Elephant sprinkled water from trunk his

(Khoiri A.F. Imron, http://bostep1.blogspot.co.id/2014/03/contoh-contoh-imbuhan.html)

The verb menyemprotkan (sprinkle) has meaning memberi air dengan cara menyemprotkan (give water by sprinkling to); the verb menugaskan means memberi tugas (give assignment by instruction to). So, this event type has intending meaning memberi (give).

The affixes meaning above is various. The first meaning is benefactive in which has two object also. Nevertheless, In English, benefactive meaning can be happened in for-dative verb only (see table 4.1.1). The second category of for-dative verb (verbs denoting activities involving selection) can be imply in the benefactive intended meaning of affixes me-kan. Moreover, Indonesian benefactive meaning can be found in:

1) All for-dative verbs which are added by me-kan. For instance:
   Zahra membelikan ibu gula.
   Zahra bought mother sugar

2) All verbs which are added by me-kan and inserted by ‘untuk (for) between first object and second object. For instance:
Firman melihatkan pengumuman lomba untuk Isaldi.
Firman look over announcement competition for Isaldi

Shortly, all verbs may have benefactive meaning if added by affixes me-kan and prepositional untuk (for). Therefore, memberikan (in 4.1) which include in give-types verb can apply in for-dative variant because have added by affixes me-kan and inserted by prepositional untuk. Nevertheless, So, benefactive meaning is not appropriate to the event type of memberikan in to-variant.

The second meaning is causative meaning which makes transformation from A condition to B condition. This meaning can apply to adjective only such as lebar (wide) to be melebarkan (widen); luas (extensive) to be meluaskan (extend); rapi (rapi) to be merapikan (tidy up). Therefore, memberikan come from the root beri which is verb. So, causative meaning is not appropriate to the event type of memberikan in to-variant.

The third meaning is instrument meaning which needs instrument to fulfill the event type. Nevertheless, the verb memeberikan does not need instrument to fulfill the event type. In contrast, the verb mengirimkan need instrument/mediator to fulfill the event type. Hence, (14a) does not have instrument meaning because Yulian does need instrument to give the gift to Nia.

The next meaning, forth meaning of affix me-kan is motion meaning which is absolutely inappropriate to give-types verb. The
fifth meaning is making as. This event types do not have ditransitive form. Therefore, this meaning causative meaning is not appropriate to the event type of *memberikan* in to-variant.

The sixth meaning is express deed. This meaning seems appropriate to the meaning of *memberikan*. It means that the verbs which express deed emphasizes that the verb is done by himself (by his hands/legs/trunk/tongue). Then, affix *me-kan* in express deed meaning stresses the context in which the Agent caused the Recipient posses the Theme. Therefore, based on lexical meaning of *give*-types verb affix *me-kan* in to-variant is preferred in Indonesian dative alternation. It uses to emphasize that the truth meaning of *give*-types verb is caused possession meaning.

As already questioned in 4.1 that (1b) is not acceptable in Indonesian dative alternation. It may cause the intended meaning of affix *me-kan* which is precedence the Theme from the Recipient. For instance, the verb *menugaskan* (assign) entails the meaning *memberikan tugas kepada* (give assignment to), in which *memberikan* is verb and *tugas* is Theme. So, if the sentence *Manajer menugaskan Andi* (Manager assign Andi) same as *Manajer memberikan tugas kepada Andi* (Manager memberi tugas kepada Andi). The other example as following
So, based on affix *me-kan* which entails meaning express deed, the usage of *to*-variant is preferred in Indonesian dative alternation. In another words, there is no *give*-types verb added by affix *me-kan* in double object variant.

Beside affix *me-kan*, the second characteristic of *to*-variant in *give*-types verb is the Recipient must be animate/name of the organization as explain in 4.1. Moreover, the characteristic of passive form of *to*-variant in *give*-types verb is hidden Agent. The Agent is hidden because *to*-variant function to emphasize the Theme. It entails in (1a), (2), (3a), (3b), (4a) and (5a) where the Theme is prioritized; the Theme precedes the Recipient. This happens because affix *me-kan* in *to*-variant of produce express deed meaning which event type cannot be alienated from the Theme. So, affix *me-kan* naturally

---

*Figure 4.2.3*

*Skema of affix me-kan which entails express deed meaning*
emphasize the Theme. So, if they are changed to be passive form, prefix me- which indicates active voice is disappear, than it is changed by prefix di- which indicate passive voice. Nevertheless, suffix –kan still appears to indicate to-variant characteristic. Not only that, if they are changed to be passive form, the Agent is hidden in order to focus or emphasize the Theme to (Recipient).

In addition, the characteristics of to-variant in give-types verb are affix me-kan which entails express deed, the second characteristic of to-variant in give-types verb is the Recipient must be animate or metonymically. The third characteristic is the hidden Agent in passive form.

4.2.1.2 The Characteristics of To-Variant in Send-Types Verb

As already explained in 4.1 that Indonesian send-types verb does not use double object (uses to-variant only). Regarding of this reason, automatically to-variant in send-types verb does not have special characteristic like give-types verb. The usage of affix me-kan in to-variant of send-types verb is scarce. Why does it happen? It is happened because changes the position of Theme. As question In 4.1 that the position of Theme in the send-types is not only between Verb and Preposition. It may be the characteristic of send-types verb. Let’s see the data which I found as following.
Sentence (15a) and (15b) differ to (10c) in which the position of Theme is in the first. Generally, like (10c) the first position is Agent followed by Verb, Theme, Preposition and Recipient. To make easily understanding the Theme’s changing, I give this scheme as following:

C: Agent Verb Theme to Recipient
   1  2  3  4  5

UC: Theme Agent Verb Pre. Recipient
    3  1  2  4  5

C is common to-variant and UC is uncommon to-variant in Indonesian send-types verb.

Because of this changing, the event type form is influenced. In C form, the event type is *mengirim* (*me+kirim*), but in UC the event type form is *kirim* (root). I do not know exactly why it happens, but this Theme alternation (not double object) shows that Theme position is not change the meaning of send-types verb. Send-types verb absolutely has caused motion meaning which indicate by Theme alternation and the absence of double object. The possession meaning of send-types verb based on the context of the sentence. Therefore, the characteristic
of send-types verb in to-variant is Theme position can be changed in the first position.

4.2.2. The Characteristics of Double Object

As already explained in 4.1 that the double object appear in give-types verb only. So, here, I try to find the characteristics of double object in give-types verb only. Back to (14a), the event type of (14b) is not added by suffix -kan. The event type of (14a) only appear prefix me- which indicates active form sentence. Moreover, there is suffix –kan and –i which generally has some functions. To know those specifications I put them in the following:

a. Derivational (change adjective to verb)

All lexemes which end by suffix –kan and –i with or without prefix –me is verb. Traditionally, the lexeme which adds by suffix –kan and –i is adjective. For instance is in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>panas (hot)</td>
<td>panaskan (warm) or panasi (warm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The adjective which was added by suffix –kan and –i means imperative form. Not only adjective, but also verb can be added by suffix –kan and –i which means imperative also.

b. Intense (emphasize that the verb often done)

Polisi menangkap penjahat (police arrested bandit); polisi menangkapkan penjahat (police arrest bandit); polisi menangkapi penjahat (police arrest bandit); polisi menangkapkan
penjahat untuk dia (police arrested bandit for them), verb+i means that the event type is often to do. However, verb+kan means benefactive in the second category of for-dative verb propose by Green.

c. Transitive (change intransitive verb to transitive verb)

Intransitive verb which absolutely does not need object if added by suffix –kan and –i become transitive verb. For example is in the following

1) Julian duduk di kursi. (intransitive)  
   Julian sit on chair
2) Julian duduki kursi itu. (transitive)  
   Julian sit chair that
3) Julian duduk kan adiknya di kursi. (transitive)  
   Julian sit his sister on chair

However, the verb by suffix -kan has intending meaning that the request is not directed for the interlocutors to do something without the Theme, but, suffix -kan defines that the request ask the interlocutors to do something related their surrounding, such as dudukan boneka itu (sit that doll). But there are differences between them. Those are

a) Object which follows verb+kan can move and this object is tool.

Nevertheless, object which followed verb+i cannot move and this object is a place where the event happen. For instance, petani menanam kan benih di sawahnya (the farmer plants seeds in his field); petani menanami sawahnya (the farmer plants his field). Benih (seed) is an object which can move and it is a tool, then, sawah is an object which cannot move and it is a place.

b) The verb which added by suffix –kan followed by Theme/Patient/Factive/Neutral. Meanwhile, the verb which added
by suffix –i followed by Goal/Recipient. It can be seen in this sentence: *Dia menawarkan pekerjaan kepada saya.* (He offered job to me); *Dia menawari saya pekerjaan.* (He offered me job).

*Pekerjaan* is Theme and *saya* is Goal/Recipient.

Based on those distinction shows that *memberi* actually comes from the root ‘beri’ adds by prefix *me-* and suffix –kan. It cannot be seen because the root ‘beri’ is ended by the some alphabet: i. Hence, it is consistent to the characteristic of Indonesian double object which followed by Theme after the verb *memberi*.

The second characteristic is clitic. In (14b) there is clitic *nya* which replace pronoun *dia* (her). Clitic has many functions. According to Warsiman (2012), the functions of clitic are showing possession, derivation (make noun), as Patient/Theme/Neutral/Factitive and as Recipient. In (14b) clitic –*nya* is Recipient because –*nya* (which refers to Nia) received the gift which came from Yulian. Therefore, the characteristic of double object is the verb event added by suffix –*i* and followed by Recipient. The Recipient is short NP or pronoun or clitic.

In addition, the meaning of Indonesian dative alternation is not influenced by the prepositional ‘to’ or the order of the Theme and Recipient or Goal. The determinant of dative alternation meaning based on lexical meaning of the event types themselves and the context of the discourse. Therefore, *give*-types verb has caused possession meaning only in both variants (to-variant and double object). Meanwhile, *send*-types verb has caused possession and caused motion in to-
variant. The reason why there is alternation because the presence of suffix. To-
variant arise because the presence of suffix me-kan. Meanwhile, double object
arise because suffix me-i. Those suffixes are the characteristic of Indonesian
double object.

To sum up this discussion, I found that Indonesian dative alternation and
English dative alternation have similarities. Each event-type verb in Indonesian
and English has both variants (prepositional object and double object). By using
verb sensitive approach, give-type verb have caused possession meaning only.
But, there are several differences. First, English send-types verb have two
meanings (motion and possession), but Indonesian send-types verb may have both
meanings depend on the context. Second, Indonesian give-types verb may be
followed by prepositional ‘for’, yet, English for-dative do not categorize give-verb
as for-dative verbs. It happens because the meaning of give in Indonesian
(memberikan) may have benefactive meaning which caused by the suffix –kan.
Third, in Indonesian, prepositional object is preferred, but in English double
object is preferred.