

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

Brandy Juan Ferrero¹, Xiao Renfei², Subandi Subandi³, Cicik Arista⁴, Rosita Nugraheni⁵, Iffa Mar’atus Shohibul Birri⁶

^{1,2,3,4,5,6}Centran China Normal University; Universitas Negeri Surabaya

ABSTRACT: The Chinese word “有” and the Indonesian word “ada” are both frequently used verbs that mainly express possession and existence. However, differences in language typology and cognitive prototypes cause systematic differences in their syntax, semantic extension, and pragmatic functions. Using Prototype Category Theory, contrastive analysis, and literature review, this study examines the etymological meanings, prototypical meanings, and semantic networks of “有” and “ada.” The findings show that both words can express possession, existence, and change. However, Chinese “有” can also indicate attributive relations and the attainment of a certain quantity or degree, usages generally absent in Indonesian “ada.” Conversely, “ada” can express the presence of living beings, a meaning represented in Chinese by “在.” Syntactically, Chinese usually follows the SVO structure, such as “subject + 有 + object” and “location + 有 + noun phrase.” Indonesian word order is more flexible, especially when “ada” expresses existence. Pragmatically, the negative form of “有” is “没有,” while “ada” becomes “tidak ada,” though the two are not fully equivalent. Chinese “有” may combine with aspect markers like “了” and “过,” whereas Indonesian relies on adverbs. In formal Indonesian, possession is more commonly expressed by “punya,” while “ada” mainly indicates existence.

KEYWORDS: Chinese; Indonesian; “有”; “ada”; contrastive study; International Chinese language education

1. RESEARCH BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

With the deepening implementation of the Belt and Road Initiative and the increasingly frequent economic, trade, and cultural exchanges between China and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Indonesia, as the largest economy in Southeast Asia, has developed ever closer connections with China in the political, economic, and cultural fields. Against this backdrop, the enthusiasm of Indonesian people for learning Chinese has continued to grow, bringing new opportunities for the development of international Chinese language education in Indonesia.

However, language teaching practices have shown that Indonesian learners of Chinese often encounter specific difficulties when acquiring Chinese grammatical structures. Among them, the acquisition of the core Chinese verb “有” (*yǒu*) represents a particularly notable grammatical issue. The Chinese word “有” carries multiple meanings, including possession, existence, indicating a certain quantity or degree, occurrence, and abstract attributes. Meanwhile, the Indonesian word “ada,” which corresponds to it in some contexts, also performs similar functions. Nevertheless, the two are not completely equivalent in terms of semantic prototypes, syntactic structures, and pragmatic constraints, which creates difficulties for Indonesian learners in studying Chinese.

In second language acquisition theory, negative transfer from the mother tongue is considered one of the major causes of learner errors. Since the Indonesian word “ada” primarily emphasizes existence and allows flexible word order, Indonesian learners tend to transfer the grammatical rules of their native language into Chinese learning. As a result, errors resembling *ada*-type sentence patterns and usages frequently appear, such as “有我一本书” (“There has me a book”) and “书有桌子上” (“The book has on the table”), thereby causing difficulties in Chinese acquisition. In addition, the Chinese word “有” also has usages that do not exist in the Indonesian word “ada.”

Therefore, conducting an in-depth comparative study of the similarities and differences between the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada,” revealing their cognitive and syntactic distinctions, and formulating scientific and effective teaching strategies on this basis are of great significance for improving the quality of international Chinese language education and overcoming the difficulties Indonesian learners face in acquiring Chinese “有” sentence structures.

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

2. CURRENT STATE OF DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH

2.1 Ontological Research on Chinese “有” (yǒu) Sentences

Chinese academia has produced extensive research on Chinese “有” (yǒu) sentence constructions. Early descriptions appeared in *Ma Shi Wen Tong* by 马建忠 (2004 [1898]), where “有” was classified as a content word expressing possession and existence. Later, 吕叔湘 (1942) further developed the study of “有” sentence patterns and inspired subsequent syntactic analyses.

For a long time, studies mainly focused on the usages and syntactic structures of “有” sentences, while semantic and pragmatic research remained limited (Zhang Yufeng, 1998). Since the 1980s, research has expanded into broader and multi-perspective studies concerning the scope, structure, characteristics, and meanings of “有” sentences, including their usage in Classical Chinese and Chinese dialects. Representative scholars include Cao Wei (1987), Song Yuzhu (1987), Zhan Kaidi (1981), Cui Jianxin (1990), Yi Zhengzhong (1992), He Yang (1994), Peng Lizhen (1995), Zheng Yide (1997), Zhang Dengqi (1997), Zhang Yufeng (1999), and Liu Suqiao (2002) (see Zhang Yufeng 1998; Zeng Changhong & Wang Jiayi 2004).

A widely accepted view divides “有” sentences into narrow-sense and broad-sense categories. Narrow-sense “有” sentences are those in which “有,” including “没有” and “没,” functions as the predicate or central predicate, whereas broad-sense “有” sentences include all sentences containing “有,” regardless of its syntactic role (Zhan Kaidi, 1981).

In recent years, Construction Grammar and Functional Linguistics have introduced new research perspectives. Scholars now emphasize the integrative nature of “有” constructions and their syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic functions. For example, Su Danjie (2010) applied the “construction-chunk” teaching method to existential sentences, while Yin Changle (2025) examined conditional “有 + N + VP” and attributive-possession “有 + VP + 的 + N” constructions, focusing on noun selection restrictions and focus-regulating functions.

2.2 Comparative Studies of Chinese and Foreign “有” (yǒu) Sentence Constructions

Comparative studies of Chinese “有” (yǒu) sentence constructions and their counterparts in other languages can generally be divided into three categories.

The first category focuses on ontological comparisons between Chinese “有” and equivalent forms in other languages, including English, Japanese, Korean, Russian, Vietnamese, and Thai. Comparative studies with English are especially common, such as those by Sun Delin (2010), Dong Yanbiao (2021), and Yuan Zaicheng (2017). Other representative studies include Xie Shihua and Xiao Xiqiang’s (2014) comparison of Chinese “有” sentences and Vietnamese “có” constructions; Lin Lijuan and Liu Liyuan’s (2016) analysis of Russian existential sentences using быть and Chinese “有” constructions; and studies comparing Chinese “有” and Thai “[mi33]” constructions by Qi Chunhong and Wang Dongmei (2009), He Shuang, Yang Chengfeng, and Wang Zheng (2015), and Feng Yueyan (2019).

The second category concerns acquisition-error studies related to Chinese “有.” Che Hui and Li Baogui (2016), as well as Li Baogui and Wang Xiaotian (2015), discussed Korean learners’ errors through comparisons between Chinese and Korean “有” constructions. Tang Yihan (2025) examined Japanese learners’ acquisition errors and compared Chinese and Japanese “有” sentence patterns. Zheng Ting (2007) analyzed native-language interference by comparing Chinese “有” with Japanese “ある” (aru). Putong (2020) studied Vietnamese learners’ errors in acquiring Chinese “有” sentences and identified negative transfer from the native language as a major factor.

The third category involves translation studies, which also require comparisons between Chinese “有” and equivalent expressions in other languages. Yuan Hui, Yi Wei, and Xu Jian (2020) investigated English translation strategies for Chinese “有” sentences, identifying nine usages and comparing them with English structures such as “there be.” Similar studies were conducted by Yu Buli (2010), Yang Hao (2020), and Jia Chengnan (2018).

In contrast, comparative studies between Chinese and Indonesian “有” constructions remain limited. At present, only one relevant study has been identified: Thea Sairine Wong (2014), who examined Indonesian learners’ errors in acquiring Chinese “有” and “在,” briefly comparing Chinese “有” with Indonesian “ada.” However, the study focused mainly on possession and existence, without addressing cognitive prototype categories or empirical analyses of acquisition errors.

3. RESEARCH APPROACH AND METHODS

This study intends to conduct a comprehensive horizontal contrast between the Chinese “有” (yǒu) and the Indonesian “ada” from the perspectives of semantics, syntax, and pragmatics. The research approach is as follows:

First, from the perspective of prototype categories, the study traces the prototypes of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada,” attempting to explain why Chinese “有” is used in its particular way, while Indonesian “ada” operates through a different

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

pattern. Second, the study carries out a comprehensive and systematic comparison between Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada” at the syntactic and pragmatic levels.

In Indonesian, other words can express meanings similar to “有,” such as “punya (mempunyai)” and “miliki (memiliki).” However, in order to maintain a more focused discussion, this study limits the scope of comparison to Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada.” To ensure the effectiveness of the comparative study, the following research methods will be employed:

3.1 Contrastive Analysis Method:

Contrastive Analysis is an important method in linguistics that aims to reveal the internal规律 (regularities) of language, predict learning difficulties, and deepen understanding of the universality of human language through systematic comparison of two or more languages. It was proposed by the American linguist Robert Lado in his 1957 publication *Linguistics Across Cultures*. This study uses contrastive analysis to compare the differences between Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada” in terms of prototype semantics, syntax, and pragmatics.

3.2 Error Analysis Method:

Errors are a natural part of learners’ Interlanguage development. This study combines teaching examples with analyses of typical errors made by Indonesian learners in acquiring the Chinese “有,” tracing these errors to native-language transfer.

The study has two main innovations. First, it goes beyond traditional syntactic comparison by examining the prototype meanings of “有” and “ada” from the perspective of cognitive semantics, exploring their differences in syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Second, the study is closely connected to international Chinese language education, as it integrates actual learner errors and proposes targeted teaching strategies for Indonesian learners of Chinese.

4. THE PROTOTYPES AND SEMANTIC NETWORKS OF CHINESE “有” (Yǒu) AND INDONESIAN “ADA”

4.1 Overview of Prototype Semantic Theory

Prototype Theory argues that categories are not defined by fixed necessary conditions but are organized around a prototype, the most typical member of a category (Yuan Yulin 1995; Wu Shixiong & Chen Weizhen 1996). For example, robins and sparrows are considered typical birds because they possess common bird characteristics, while penguins and ostriches are peripheral members due to their inability to fly. Bats, although capable of flight, are mammals rather than birds.

Applied to linguistics, Prototype Theory suggests that the multiple meanings of a word develop from a central prototype meaning and are connected through family resemblance (Ao Shicui 2006). As semantic categories expand, their boundaries become less distinct and may overlap with other categories.

Both the Chinese “有” (yǒu) and the Indonesian “ada” are polysemous verbs whose semantic networks can be viewed as prototype categories. Their meanings extend through family resemblance, although important semantic differences remain between the two languages.

4.2 Semantic Analysis of the Chinese “有” (yǒu)

1) Etymology and Prototype Meaning

From an etymological perspective, “有” is an ideographic character. In oracle bone script, its form resembles a hand holding a piece of meat, and its original meaning was “to possess” or “to own.” Therefore, the semantic prototype of the Chinese “有” is possession (Possession). Possession and ownership constitute the prototype-category meaning of “有,” expressing a controlling relationship between an animate subject and an object.

2) Core Semantic Network

Starting from this prototype meaning, the Chinese “有” has extended into the following semantic fields through mechanisms of metaphor and metonymy:

a. Possessive Relationship

This is the relationship expressed by its prototype meaning. For example:

(1) 我有一本书。

(I have a book.)

In this example, “我有一本书” expresses the controlling relationship between an animate subject and an object. “我” (I) is the subject, while “书” (book) is the possessed object, indicating the subject’s ownership or control over the object.

b. Attribute Relationship

For example:

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

(2) 他很有学识。

(*He is very knowledgeable.*)

(3) 他很有经验。

(*He is very experienced.*)

In these examples, the object controlled by “他” (*he*) is no longer a concrete object such as a “book,” but rather abstract entities such as “knowledge” and “experience.” “学识” (*knowledge*) and “经验” (*experience*) are objects possessed by “him,” yet expressions such as “有学识” and “有经验” also function descriptively, indicating attributes such as being highly knowledgeable or rich in experience. These expressions can also be modified by “很” (*very*). Scholars such as Peng Lizhen (1995) and Yang Defeng & Yang Honglu (2020) have conducted in-depth studies on the internal structure, overall functions, negative forms, and corpus-based symmetrical/asymmetrical patterns of “很 + 有 + NP” and “很 + 没有 + NP.”

c. Existential Relationship

For example:

(4) 屋里有人。

(*There is someone in the room.*)

(5) 春天有希望。

(*There is hope in spring.*)

In these examples, the subject of “有” is no longer an animate being such as a person, but rather a location or an abstract carrier. In “屋里有人,” the subject is the location “屋里” (*in the room*), while in “春天有希望,” the subject is the abstract carrier “春天” (*spring*). “Spring” may be understood either as a location-like conceptual space or as a temporal concept; the metaphorical relationship between time and place is common in language. In these examples, the objects are “人” (*person*) and “希望” (*hope*).

d. Expressing Occurrence and Emergence

For example:

(6) 他有病了。

(*He became ill.*)

(7) 外面有情况。

(*Something has happened outside.*)

In these examples, “病” (*illness*) in sentence (6) is not an object possessed or controlled by “他” (*he*). Rather, it indicates that he has become ill, representing a change from a healthy to an unhealthy state. The same applies to “外面有情况,” where “情况” (*situation*) may refer to a phenomenon existing outside, but in most contexts it refers to something that has occurred or emerged outside.

e. Expressing the Reaching of a Certain Quantity or Degree

For example:

(8) 他有我高。

(*He is as tall as me.*)

(9) 这根绳子有十米来长。

(*This rope is about ten meters long.*)

In these examples, “我高” (*as tall as me*) and “十米来长” (*about ten meters long*) function as standards of comparison. “有” expresses reference to a quantity or degree. In these sentences, the subjects are “他” (*he*) and “这根绳子” (*this rope*), while the objects are standards or requirements. The purpose of the sentence is to judge whether the subject reaches a certain standard or meets a particular requirement.

In addition, “有” can also be used before words such as “人” (*people*), “时候” (*time*), “地方” (*place*), and “一天” (*one day*) to indicate “some” or “a certain part.”

4.3 Semantic Analysis of the Indonesian “ada”

1) Etymology and Prototype Meaning

The Indonesian word “ada” originates from the Austronesian language family, and its core semantic feature is “existence” or “presence” (Existence/Presence). Existence constitutes the prototype-category meaning of Indonesian “ada.” In Indonesian cognition, what is first perceived is that “something is there,” which is then extended to meanings such as “someone possesses something.”

2) Core Semantic Network

Starting from this prototype meaning, Indonesian “ada,” through mechanisms of metaphor and metonymy, has also extended into the following semantic fields:

a. Existential Relationship

This is the relationship expressed by the prototype meaning of “ada.” For example:

- (10) *Di meja ada buku.*
at table ada book
There is a book on the table.

“ada” may also appear at the beginning of the sentence. For example:

- (11) *Ada buku di meja.*
ada book at table
There is a book on the table.

In the above sentences, the existential subject of “ada” is “桌子” (*table*), while the object is “书” (*book*). The meaning expressed is that the object “book” exists in the location “table.”

This kind of existential relationship in Chinese may sometimes correspond to “在” (*zài*, “to be at/in”) rather than “有” (*yǒu*). For example:

- (12) *Adik laki-laki saya ada di rumah.*
younger sibling male my ada at home
My younger brother is at home.
- (13) *Adik perempuan saya ada di rumah.*
younger sibling female my ada at home
My younger sister is at home.

In the examples above, the Indonesian expressions convey the relationship that “my younger brother” or “my younger sister” exists in the location “home.” In this relationship, “my younger brother” and “my younger sister” are not agentive subjects, but merely existing entities. Therefore, the relationship expressed differs from the Chinese sentences “我弟弟在家里” (*My younger brother is at home*) and “我妹妹在家里” (*My younger sister is at home*).

b. Possessive Relationship

Indonesian “ada” can also express possessive relationships. For example:

- (14) *Saya ada uang.*
I ada money
I have money.
- (15) *Kita ada waktu.*
we ada time
We have time.

In the examples above, the Chinese sentence “我有钱” (*I have money*) expresses the speaker’s complete possession and control over “money.” The same applies to “有时间” (*have time*), which indicates time possessed and controlled by “us.” In Chinese, “有” explicitly conveys the meaning that the subjects “我” (*I*) and “我们” (*we*) possess the objects “钱” (*money*) and “时间” (*time*).

In Indonesian, however, this is not always the case. On the one hand, “ada uang” may simply mean “there is money on me,” implying that money exists with the speaker, without necessarily emphasizing ownership. Similarly, “ada waktu” is somewhat ambiguous: it may be understood either as “time exists” (an existential meaning) or as “having time” (a possessive meaning).

To emphasize a possessive relationship more clearly, Indonesian more naturally and specifically uses expressions such as *saya punya uang* (*I have money*) and *kita punya waktu* (*we have time*), which more accurately convey the meaning of ownership or possession.

c. Expressing Appearance or Change

For example:

- (16) *Mas, apa celananya ada restok?*
brother question-word pants ada restock
Brother, have the pants been restocked?
- (17) *Nanti kalau ada kesempatan*

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

later if ada opportunity

Aku akan datang main ke tempatmu.

I will come play to your place

If there is an opportunity in the future, I will come visit and hang out with you.

In the two examples above, sentence (16) uses “ada” to express the speaker’s concern about whether the event of the pants being restocked has occurred. If there has been a restock, the respondent would answer “ada restok” (*there is a restock / it has been restocked*). If not, the response would be “Tidak ada restok” (*there is no restock / it has not been restocked*).

Similarly, in sentence (17), “ada kesempatan” literally means “there is an opportunity,” but it actually conveys the meaning of “an opportunity arises” or “an opportunity appears.” Another example is as follows:

(18) *Itu berarti ada orang yang memperhatikan,*

that means ada people particle pay attention

lalu ada pemasukan.

then ada income

That means there are people paying attention, and then there is income.

In this example, “ada” appears twice consecutively, but the meanings conveyed by the two instances are not the same. The first “ada” simply expresses existence, referring to the objective existence of people who are paying attention. The second “ada” not only expresses the existence of income itself, but also conveys the sense of emergence or change.

However, Chinese differs from Indonesian in this respect. In Chinese, “有收入” (*to have income*) not only expresses basic possession or existence, but also implicitly contains a causal relationship, emphasizing that the income results from people’s attention. In contrast, Indonesian “ada pemasukan” is semantically more neutral and objective, merely stating the existence of income without highlighting any causal inference between the preceding and following events.

d. Expressing Survival and Presence

For example:

(19) *Dia masih ada.*

he still ada

He is still alive / He is still here.

(20) *Apakah kamu ada?*

question-word you ada

Are you there?

In the two examples above, sentence (19) indicates that “he is still alive” or “he is still in this world,” expressing the continuation of life. Sentence (20) is an interrogative sentence asking whether someone is present or available. The former expresses the continuation of existence in life, while the latter expresses a person’s presence.

In addition, Indonesian “ada” can also be used before certain indefinite expressions. For example:

(21) *Ada beberapa perjalanan cocok untuk seorang diri,*

ada several trips suitable for one person alone

Ada beberapa perjalanan cocok untuk dua orang,

ada several trips suitable for two people

Ada beberapa juga cocok untuk banyak orang.

ada several also suitable for many people

Some trips are suitable for one person, some are suitable for two people, and some are also suitable for many people.

In the example above, “ada” appears before the indefinite expression “beberapa” (*several / some*), expressing the meaning of “there are some” or “certain.”

4.4 Contrastive Analysis of the Semantic Prototypes and Asymmetries Between the Two

The semantic prototypes of the Chinese “有” (yǒu) and the Indonesian “ada” differ in orientation. In Chinese, possessive sentences with human subjects are the prototype, while existential meanings are extensions. In Indonesian, existential sentences are the prototype, whereas possessive meanings are extensions. Nevertheless, because possession and existence are cognitively related, both forms have developed overlapping usages and functions.

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

Cross-linguistic studies suggest that possessive constructions historically and cognitively derive from existential constructions, meaning that “possession” is metaphorically projected from “existence” (Heine 1997; Creissels 2019; Heine & Kuteva 2002; Zhang Ruijia 2024). Some scholars argue that the Chinese sentence “我有一本书” (“I have a book”) also originated from an existential structure in which “我” (“I”) functions as a spatial location where the book exists. However, most studies maintain that Chinese “有” developed from possessive to existential meanings. For example, 大西克也 (2011), through a diachronic study of Ancient Chinese, proposed that “有” first expressed possession before gradually extending to existential usages.

This study argues that both possession and existence may serve as prototype meanings of “{have},” but languages prioritize them differently. Chinese treats possessive “有” as the prototype, while Indonesian prioritizes existential “ada.” This difference in prototype orientation leads to distinct semantic networks as well as syntactic and pragmatic differences between the two languages.

From a semantic perspective, the asymmetries between Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada” can roughly be summarized in the following aspects, first, the Chinese “有” can express attribute relationships, whereas Indonesian “ada” generally does not have this usage. For example:

(22) 你看的书真的相当有深度呢!

The book you are reading is truly quite profound!

(23) *Buku yang dibaca benar-benar cukup mendalam ya!*

book that read truly quite profound particle

The book being read is indeed quite profound!

In the examples above, sentence (22) in Chinese uses “有深度” (*have depth*) to express the quality of being “profound” or “meaningful.” In this sentence, “深度” (*depth*) is a noun representing an abstract concept, while “有” functions to indicate that the subject possesses or embodies this quality. In Indonesian, however, the same characteristic is expressed directly through the adjective *mendalam* (*profound/deep*), without the need for a word expressing possession or existence such as “ada.” The relationship between the subject and the attribute is expressed directly, without the use of nominalization.

Second, the Chinese “有” can express reaching a certain quantity or degree, whereas Indonesian “ada” generally does not have this usage. For example:

(24) 这次调查样本有一百五十人。

The sample for this survey consists of 150 people.

(25) *Sampel penelitian ini mencapai 150 orang.*

sample research this reach 150 people

The research sample reached 150 people.

In these examples, Chinese uses “有” to indicate reaching a particular quantity or standard, namely that the sample size is 150 people. In Indonesian, however, reaching a certain quantity or standard is not explicitly expressed through “ada,” but rather through the verb *mencapai* (*to reach*), which means that the quantity has attained a certain level or standard.

In Chinese, “这次调查样本有150人” is generally an objective description. If one instead says “这次调查样本达到150人” (*the sample reached 150 people*), it often carries a subjective evaluation, implying that a sample size of 150 is relatively large or difficult to obtain. In Indonesian, using “ada” in this context would create redundancy, because the verb *mencapai* already inherently conveys the meaning of achieving a numerical result.

Third, when Indonesian “ada” expresses survival or presence, Chinese usually uses “在” (*zài*) rather than “有” (*yǒu*). For example:

(26) *Kakekmu masih ada atau sudah meninggal?*

your grandfather still ada or already passed away

(27) 你爷爷是还在世还是已经死了?

Is your grandfather still alive or has he already passed away?

In these examples, Indonesian “ada” expresses the meaning of “being alive” or “still existing in the world,” whereas Chinese “有” does not have this usage. In Chinese, one always “has” a grandfather; the difference is only whether the grandfather is still alive or has already passed away. For native Chinese speakers, “grandfather” is conceptualized not as existence but as possession. Therefore, this usage of Indonesian “ada” corresponds not to Chinese “有,” but rather to “在.”

The sentence “你爷爷还在吗” (*Is your grandfather still here/alive?*) may convey different meanings depending on the context. One usage means “Is your grandfather still alive?” while another means “Is your grandfather still there?”

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

Fourth, Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada” share similarities and differences in expressing change or emergence. For example:

(28)

- A: *Kak, celana yang ini ada stok tambahan nggak?*
boss pants particle this ada stock additional particle
Boss, has this pair of pants been restocked?
- B: *Belum ada restok, Kak. Mungkin minggu depan.*
not yet ada restock brother maybe next week
There hasn't been a restock yet. Maybe next week.

(29)

- A: 老板，这条裤子补货了吗？
Boss, has this pair of pants been restocked?
- B: 还没有补货呢！可能下周。
It hasn't been restocked yet. Maybe next week.

In these examples, the Indonesian expression “ada stok tambahan” literally translates into Chinese as “有补货” (*have restock*). However, this usage only appears in certain southern Chinese dialects and has not become widespread in Standard Mandarin. In Standard Mandarin, the accurate equivalent of this Indonesian usage requires the dynamic particle “了” (*le*). Thus, Indonesian “ada stok tambahan” would normally be expressed in Mandarin as “补货了” (*has been restocked*).

However, in negative forms, Indonesian and Chinese display similarities. Indonesian says “Belum ada restok,” while Chinese says “没有补货” (*there has not been a restock*). The difference is that in Chinese, “没有” is a single word, whereas in Indonesian, “belum” and “ada” are separate words. In everyday spoken Indonesian or informal written communication (such as social media and chats), people may also occasionally shorten “Belum ada restok” to simply “Belum restok.”

4.5 A Construction of the Syntax and Pragmatics of Chinese “有” (yǒu) and Indonesian “ada”

It is precisely because Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada” differ in their semantic prototypes that they also display certain differences in syntax and pragmatics.

1) Syntactic Construction

a. Construction of Possessive Sentences

From the analysis above, we can see that both Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada” can express possessive relationships, but they differ syntactically in several ways.

Chinese possessive sentences follow a strict SVO (Subject–Verb–Object) structure. For example:

(30) 我有一本书。

I have a book.

In Chinese, “我” (*I*) is the subject, “有” is the predicate head, and “一本书” (*a book*) is the object. The overall structure follows the pattern:

S (possessor) + 有 + O (possessed object)

Even when the object is an abstract noun and the sentence accepts modification by degree adverbs, the syntactic structure remains the same. For example:

(31) 他很有才华。

He is very talented.

(32) 你这个项目很有竞争力。

Your project is very competitive.

In the two examples above, the objects are abstract nouns such as “才华” (*talent*) and “竞争力” (*competitiveness*). Because they simultaneously express certain attributes, they can be modified by “很” (*very*), but syntactically they still follow the SVO word order.

Indonesian word order, however, is relatively more flexible. For example:

(33) *Saya ada buku.*

I ada book

I have a book.

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

(34) *Ada buku saya.*

ada book my

My book is here / There is my book.

In Indonesian, both “*Saya ada buku*” and “*Ada buku saya*” are acceptable expressions, though their meanings differ somewhat. In “*Saya ada buku*,” “*ada*” functions similarly to “*have*.” This is a colloquial but widely accepted usage. In standard Indonesian, the more formal words expressing possession would be *mempunyai* or *memiliki*. However, in daily communication, “*Saya ada...*” is also very common. The sentence emphasizes the ownership relationship between the subject “*saya*” (*I*) and the object “*buku*” (*book*), with the semantic focus placed on the subject.

In contrast, in “*Ada buku saya*,” “*ada*” returns to its core and most standard meaning of “*exist*” or “*be located*.” It forms an existential sentence equivalent to “*My book is here*” or “*My book exists*.” This sentence emphasizes the existence or location of the object and may be used to answer questions such as “*Buku kamu di mana?*” (*Where is your book?*) or to inform someone of the status or location of “*my book*.”

In teaching practice, because Indonesian allows syntactic structures such as “*Ada buku saya*,” it is important to avoid the following learner errors in Chinese:

(35) 有我一本书。(×)

(36) 有他一条狗。(×)

The syntactic structures above are acceptable in Indonesian, conveying meanings such as “*My book is here*” or “*His dog is here*.” However, in Chinese, such structures absolutely violate the grammatical rules of “*有*” sentence constructions.

b. Comparison of Existential Sentences

The syntactic structure of Chinese existential sentences is also relatively fixed. For example:

(37) 墙上有一幅画。

There is a painting on the wall.

(38) 桌子上有一本书。

There is a book on the table.

In these sentences, “*墙上*” (*on the wall*) and “*桌子上*” (*on the table*) are locative expressions, while “*一幅画*” (*a painting*) and “*一本书*” (*a book*) are noun phrases. The overall sentence structure follows the pattern:

Locative Expression + 有 + Noun Phrase

Chinese existential sentences also have a variant form. For example:

(39) 有一只鸟在天上飞。 → 天上有一只鸟。 → 天上飞着一只鸟。

There is a bird flying in the sky. → There is a bird in the sky. → A bird is flying in the sky.

(40) 有一条鱼在水里游。 → 水里有一条鱼。 → 水里游着一条鱼。

There is a fish swimming in the water. → There is a fish in the water. → A fish is swimming in the water.

In the examples above, “*有一只鸟在天上飞*” and “*有一条鱼在水里游*” express not only existence, but also the state of an action. These constructions can therefore be transformed into ordinary existential sentences or state-descriptive sentences.

The syntactic structure of Indonesian existential sentences is relatively more flexible. For example:

(41) *Ada seekor burung di langit.*

ada classifier bird at sky

There is a bird in the sky.

(42) *Di langit ada seekor burung.*

at sky ada classifier bird

There is a bird in the sky.

In Indonesian, both of the above structures are acceptable. The former begins with “*ada*,” while the latter begins with a locative expression. Semantically, there is no essential difference between them; both express the existence of something in a particular place.

In addition, Indonesian locative expressions must be preceded by the preposition “*di*,” which is a feature absent in Chinese. For example:

(43) *Di dalam tasku masih ada camilan sisa kemarin.*

at inside my bag still ada snacks leftover yesterday

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

There are still snacks left from yesterday in my bag.

In this example, the Indonesian phrase “*di dalam tasku*” appears at the beginning of the sentence and means “inside my bag.” “*masih ada*” functions as the predicate, while “*camilan sisa kemarin*” serves as the object, meaning “snacks left over from yesterday.”

Although the syntactic structure resembles Chinese in following the pattern “location + ‘have/exist’ + noun phrase,” Indonesian requires the preposition “*di*” before the locative phrase, and this “*di*” cannot be omitted. In Chinese, however, the sentence “我包里还有很多昨天没吃完的零食” (*There are still many snacks left from yesterday in my bag*) more naturally uses the locative expression “我包里” (*in my bag*) without the preposition “在” (*at/in*).

Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, Indonesian “*ada*” also carries the meaning and usage of “being present.”

Because of these two characteristics, it is especially important in teaching to pay close attention to the following types of learner errors. For example:

(44) 在201教室李老师有上课。(×)

(45) 李老师有上课在201教室。(×)

(46) 李老师在201教室有上课。(×)

In the examples above, “李老师” (*Teacher Li*) functions as the agentive subject in Chinese and therefore must appear at the beginning of the sentence. “在教室” (*in the classroom*) is a locative adverbial and must appear before the predicate verb. “上课” (*teach / give a class*) is the verb, and it cannot be preceded by “有.”

In Indonesian, however, because “*ada*” expresses existence and has extended into a meaning of presence, the following three expressions are all grammatically acceptable in Indonesian. For example:

(47) *Bu Li ada mengajar di ruang kelas 201.*

Ms. Li ada teach in classroom 201

Ms. Li is teaching in Classroom 201.

(48) *Di ruang kelas 201 Bu Li ada mengajar.*

in classroom 201 Ms. Li ada teach

In Classroom 201, Ms. Li is teaching.

(49) *Bu Li di ruang kelas 201 ada mengajar.*

Ms. Li in classroom 201 ada teach

Ms. Li is teaching in Classroom 201.

In Indonesian, all three sentences above convey the meaning that “Teacher Li is teaching in Classroom 201.”

2) Pragmatic Comparison

In addition to syntactic structures, Chinese “有” (*yǒu*) and Indonesian “*ada*” also differ in several pragmatic features. This section mainly discusses their differences from three aspects: negative expressions, modal expressions, and semantic tendencies.

a. Negative Expressions

The negative form of the Chinese “有” is “没” (*méi*) or “没有” (*méiyǒu*). For example:

(50) 今天上午我没有时间。

I did not have time this morning.

(51) 我身上没有钱了。

I no longer have money on me.

Whether “有” expresses a possessive relationship or an existential relationship, its negative form is always “没有.”

Even when “有” expresses reaching a certain standard or degree, its negation is still expressed through “没有.” For example:

(52) 他有我那么高。

He is as tall as me.

(53) 他没有我那么高。

He is not as tall as me.

In the two examples above, the former is an affirmative form, while the latter is a negative form. The negative form of Chinese comparison sentences using “比” (*bǐ*) is also expressed with “没有.” For example:

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

(54) 他比我高。

He is taller than me.

(55) 他没有我高。

He is not as tall as me.

In Chinese, “他不比我高” means that he is about the same height as me; it does not necessarily mean that he is shorter than me. If one wants to indicate that he is shorter, the form “他没有我高” must be used instead.

The negative form of Indonesian “ada” is created by adding the negation word *tidak* before it. For example:

(56) *Saya tidak ada waktu.*

I not ada time

I do not have time.

(57) *Saya tidak ada uang.*

I not ada money

I do not have money.

(58) *Tidak ada uang pada saya.*

not ada money on me

There is no money on me.

From Indonesian examples, it can also be seen that regardless of whether “ada” expresses existence or possession, its negative form is formed by placing *tidak* before “ada.”

However, precisely because the prototype category of “ada” is existence—representing a category of present existence rather than past possession—its negative form is always “tidak ada.” In contrast, Chinese “有” relates to possessing something, and its negation uses “没,” which is associated with past or completed situations. For example:

(59) 我不有时间。(×)

(60) 我不有钱。(×)

In Chinese, expressions such as “我不有时间” and “我不有钱” are incorrect. Indonesian learners must pay attention to these error patterns during instruction and avoid producing such nonstandard expressions due to native-language transfer.

For the negation of Chinese verbs, when negating actions that occurred in the past, “没有” must be used. For example:

(61)

A: 你看见他了吗?

Did you see him?

B: 我没有看见他。

I did not see him.

(62)

A: 你吃了吗?

Have you eaten?

B: 还没(有)吃。

Not yet.

In the examples above, sentence (61) uses “没有看见” (*did not see*), while sentence (62) uses “还没有吃” (*have not eaten yet*).

Indonesian, however, does not function in the same way. Instead, it uses the following structure:

(63) *Apa kamu tidak melihat apa pun hari ini?*

question-word you negation see anything today

Didn't you see anything today?

In Indonesian, “tidak ada” is not used here. Instead, negation is expressed by placing the negation word *tidak* before the verb *melihat* (*to see*). In fact, the form “*tidak ada melihat” is grammatically incorrect.

Another way to express negation is by placing the negative adverb *belum* before *melihat*. For example:

(64) *Belum melihat.*

not yet see

Haven't seen yet.

In teaching, attention should also be paid to the following learner error:

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

(65)

A: 今天你什么都没有看到吗?

Didn't you see anything today?

B: 我不看到。(x)

In Indonesian, “tidak melihat” is grammatically acceptable. However, in Chinese, negation of past actions requires “没有,” while “不” is used only for present or future negation. Therefore, “我不看到” is incorrect.

b. Tense, Aspect, and Modality

As mentioned earlier, because the Chinese “有” (*yǒu*) expresses possession, it functions as a verb and can undergo tense-aspect changes. It may be followed by aspect markers such as “了” (*le*) and “过” (*guo*) to indicate the modality of an event. For example:

(66) 她有了孩子。

She has had a child / She now has a child.

(67) 我也有过这种经历。

I have also had this kind of experience.

In the examples above, sentence (66) uses “了,” which is a perfective aspect marker placed after “有,” while sentence (67) uses “过,” which marks experiential aspect, meaning “I have had such an experience before.”

Indonesian “ada,” however, does not undergo tense-aspect changes. Modal and aspectual meanings in Indonesian are expressed through adverbs such as *sudah* (*already*) and *belum* (*not yet*). For example:

(68) *Dia sudah ada anak.*

she already ada child

She already has a child.

(69) *Saya belum ada buku itu.*

I not yet ada book that

I still do not have that book.

In Indonesian, *sudah ada* means “already have/possess,” while *belum ada* means “not yet have.”

c. Semantic Tendencies

This section discusses the semantic tendencies and pragmatic values of Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada.”

In Chinese, “有” can express both possession and existence, and there seems to be no clear boundary between the two. For example:

(70) 我有500块钱。

I have 500 yuan.

(71) 我身上有500块钱。

There is 500 yuan on me / I have 500 yuan on me.

In the first example, “我有500块钱” expresses possession, while the second sentence, “我身上有500块钱,” may be interpreted as existence. There appears to be no strict distinction between possession and existence, and the meanings are relatively similar.

In Indonesian, however, the most common and natural way to emphasize possession is to use *punya*. For example:

(72) *Saya punya 500 RMB.*

I possess 500 RMB

I have 500 RMB.

Another example:

(73) *Saya belum punya buku itu.*

I not yet possess book that

I still do not have that book.

In the examples above, the speaker means that they do not yet own that book—that the book is not yet among their possessions or collection, because they have not yet bought or obtained it.

Although colloquial expressions such as “*saya ada 500 RMB*” and “*saya belum ada buku itu*” may occur in spoken Indonesian, they are not considered especially standard or formal.

If “ada” is used, the following expressions are generally more appropriate:

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

(74) 500 RMB ada pada saya.

500 RMB exist on me

There is 500 RMB on me.

(75) Buku itu belum ada pada saya.

book that not yet ada on me

That book is not yet with me.

In these two examples, the first means “I have 500 RMB on me,” while the second means “I do not yet have that book.” However, the existential meaning is more strongly emphasized: the former highlights whether “500 RMB exists on me,” while the latter emphasizes that “the book is currently not in my possession or near me.”

Therefore, when Indonesian learners study existential sentences in Chinese, they may produce errors such as the following:

(76) 钥匙有门上。(×)

(77) 钥匙有在门上。(×)

(78) 在门上有钥匙。(?)

In Indonesian, the following two expressions are both acceptable:

(79) Kunci ada di pintu.

key ada on door

The key is on the door.

(80) Di pintu ada kunci.

on door ada key

There is a key on the door.

In Chinese, however, when “钥匙” (key) functions as the subject, the predicate verb must be “在” (zài), meaning that the key exists at the location of the door. When the locative phrase “门上” (on the door) functions as the subject, the predicate verb becomes “有” (yǒu), and “钥匙” (key) becomes the object possessed by that location.

We must therefore carefully distinguish the subtle semantic tendencies between “有” and “ada” to better analyze their different pragmatic values.

The Indonesian sentences “Kunci ada di pintu” and “Di pintu ada kunci” also differ slightly in information structure. In the former, *di pintu* (on the door) is generally the semantic focus and conveys new information, whereas in the latter, *kunci* (key) becomes the semantic focus.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Research Summary

In summary, this study began with a comparison of the semantic prototypes of the Chinese “有” (yǒu) and the Indonesian “ada,” and then carried out a comprehensive and systematic comparison of their syntactic and pragmatic manifestations. The following conclusions were reached:

First, the semantics of Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada” are asymmetrical. Chinese “有” takes possession as its prototype, whereas Indonesian “ada” takes existence as its prototype, and from these prototypes different meanings have developed.

According to the investigation, both Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada” can express possession, existence, and change. However, Chinese “有” can additionally express attribute relationships and indicate reaching a certain quantity or degree, whereas Indonesian “ada” generally does not possess these usages or meanings. On the other hand, Indonesian “ada” can express the existence of life and presence, meanings that Chinese “有” does not have. In Chinese, such meanings are instead expressed through “在” (zài).

Second, this study also examined the syntactic and pragmatic differences between Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada.”

We found that, syntactically, Chinese generally follows SVO word order, namely structures such as “subject + ‘有’ + object,” “subject + ‘有’ + attribute,” and “location + ‘有’ + noun phrase.” Regardless of whether the sentence expresses possession, attributes, or existence, the word order is basically fixed in this way.

Indonesian word order, however, is relatively flexible. When expressing possession, Indonesian usually adopts SVO word order, though in such cases the equivalent of “have” is more commonly expressed by *punya*. When expressing existence, “ada” may appear either in the middle of the sentence or at the beginning, and both arrangements are acceptable.

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

Pragmatically, this study mainly investigated the negative expressions, tense-aspect modality, and semantic tendencies of Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada.” The results show that the negation of Chinese “有” is “没有” (*méiyǒu*), whereas the negation of Indonesian “ada” is *tidak ada*. However, *tidak ada* does not completely correspond to “没有.”

With regard to tense and aspect, “有” can be followed by aspect markers such as “了” (*le*) and “过” (*guo*) to indicate completion or experience, whereas “ada” requires the use of adverbs to express these meanings.

As for semantic tendencies, Chinese “有” expresses both possession and existence without a strict boundary between them. Although Indonesian “ada,” through grammaticalization, can also express both existence and possession, there is still a certain semantic tendency: when “ada” expresses possession, it is often used in spoken or informal communication, while in formal and standard language, *punya* remains more common.

In sentences where “ada” can express either existence or possession, it generally tends toward an existential interpretation.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications

It is precisely because Chinese “有” (*yǒu*) and Indonesian “ada” are both similar and different that learners produce various kinds of errors during the acquisition of Chinese. The most common errors include word-order mistakes, unnecessary additions, misuse, and overgeneralization. To address these errors, this study analyzes Indonesian learners’ acquisition of Chinese “有” sentences and proposes appropriate teaching strategies based on the findings.

1). Classification of Typical Errors among Indonesian Learners

Based on the previous comparison, the errors made by Indonesian learners mainly stem from negative transfer from their native language.

a. Word Order Errors (Syntactic Transfer)

Influenced by the Indonesian prototype structure in which *ada* may appear sentence-initially, learners incorrectly translate Chinese existential sentences into the word order “有 + noun + location.”

Erroneous sentence:

有一本书在桌上。

(Correct form: 桌上有一本书。 — *There is a book on the table.*)

Erroneous sentence:

有我一个问题。

(Correct form: 我有一个问题。 — *I have a question.*)

b. Semantic Overgeneralization Errors

Learners confuse the polysemous semantic network of “有” and forcibly map Indonesian *ada* onto meanings in Chinese that do not express “possession” or “existence.”

Erroneous sentence:

他很有聪明。

(In Chinese, “聪明” (*smart*) is an adjective directly modified by an adverb. Correct form: 他很聪明。 — *He is very smart.*)

Erroneous sentence:

今天有下雨。

(In Chinese, event occurrence is not expressed with “有”; the verb is used directly. Correct form: 今天下雨了。 — *It rained today.*)

c. Errors in Negative Markers

Learners directly transfer the Indonesian structure *tidak + ada* into Chinese.

Erroneous sentence:

我不有书。

(Correct form: 我没有书。 — *I do not have a book.*)

2). Construction of Teaching Strategies

Based on the error analysis above, this study proposes the following teaching strategies.

a. Contextualized Pragmatic Training

Teachers should create authentic real-life situations, such as “looking for objects” or “describing environments,” so that students can experience the functional differences of “有” in different contexts through practice, thereby avoiding rote memorization.

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

b. Prototype-Sequence Teaching Method

In teaching, instruction should begin from the semantic prototype, first teaching the core meaning and then gradually extending to peripheral meanings.

For Chinese “有,” possession is its most basic usage, so possessive sentences should be taught first. At this stage, students may associate “有” with Indonesian *ada* or *punya*. Teachers should emphasize its similarity to *punya* in expressing possession and focus especially on the Chinese SVO word order, namely:

“subject + ‘有’ + object.”

The second stage should introduce existential sentences. At this stage, students are more likely to associate “有” with *ada*. During this process, teachers must pay careful attention to the syntactic and pragmatic differences between them. Students should be taught that Chinese existential sentences follow the structure:

“location + ‘有’ + noun phrase”

This is not completely identical to Indonesian *ada* constructions. In addition, Chinese locative expressions normally do not take the preposition “在” before them.

For teaching Chinese existential sentences, the Construction Grammar approach may also be adopted, as this method has been proven effective in teaching existential sentence patterns (Su Danjie, 2010).

The third stage should introduce the remaining usages of “有,” including:

1. the attributive usage of “有,”
2. expressions indicating reaching a certain standard or degree,
3. and usages expressing a part of an object or group of people, among others.

c. Contrastive Diagram Method

The Contrastive Diagram Method visually presents the differences between Chinese “有” (*yǒu*) and Indonesian “ada” in terms of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics through diagrams and comparison charts. By constructing comparative tables, students can better understand the differences between Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada” with respect to semantic meanings, word order, syntactic structure, negation, tense-aspect modality, and semantic tendencies, thereby helping them develop metalinguistic awareness.

Through this process, learners are able to recognize that Chinese “有” does not always correspond directly to Indonesian “ada,” and that its specific meaning changes according to context.

d. Contextualized Pragmatic Training Method

The Contextualized Pragmatic Training Method is a function-oriented teaching approach. According to the semantic function of “有” within sentences, teachers should classify its usages into several core functional categories, rather than simply translating it as “ada.”

On this basis, each functional category should be taught separately and accompanied by different example sentences and exercises, enabling learners to clearly distinguish among the usages and understand their corresponding relationships in different contexts.

In practical teaching, instructors may provide specific situations, such as “in the office” or “tomorrow,” and ask students to construct Chinese sentences accordingly, such as:

1. “有会议” (*There is a meeting*), or
2. “有人找你” (*Someone is looking for you*).

Through this type of training, learners can understand that the use of “有” depends on contextual requirements rather than having a one-to-one correspondence with Indonesian “ada.”

5.3 Research Limitations and Future Prospects

In conclusion, this study adopted an empirical analytical approach to conduct a detailed comparison between the Chinese “有” (*yǒu*) and the Indonesian “ada.” However, due to limitations of time, energy, and research ability, several shortcomings remain in the following aspects:

First, the linguistic data used in this study mainly came from introspective data. Although these data were also verified by several specialists, there are still certain limitations regarding their objectivity and completeness. Future research should collect a wider range of authentic corpus data to conduct a more comprehensive comparative analysis and study of Chinese “有” and Indonesian “ada.”

Second, the learner error data in this study were summarized mainly on the basis of teaching and learning experience. In the future, empirical studies may be further carried out through questionnaire surveys or interlanguage corpus analysis to

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

quantitatively investigate the acquisition process of “有”-sentences among Indonesian learners at different proficiency levels. Such research would provide stronger data support for Chinese language teaching and the compilation of international Chinese education materials.

Third, besides “ada,” Indonesian also contains other words corresponding to the Chinese concept of “有,” such as *punya* and *miliki*. Future studies may incorporate these expressions as well in order to conduct a more comprehensive comparison and investigation of the categories of possession and existence in Chinese and Indonesian.

REFERENCES

- 1) Creissels, D. (2019). "Location, existence, and possession: A constructional-typological exploration." *Linguistics*, 57(3).
- 2) Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- 3) Heine, B. (1997). *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- 4) Wong, S. T. (Zhang Saiying). *An Analysis of Errors in the Acquisition of Chinese "Yǒu" (have/exist) and "Zài" (be at/in) by Indonesian Students* [Master's thesis]. Fujian Normal University, 2012.
- 5) Ao Shicui. *An Explanation of Polysemy Based on Prototype Category Theory* [J]. *Journal of Hubei University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition)*, 2006, (04): 508-510.
- 6) Zeng Changhong & Wang Jiayi. *A Review of Research on "Yǒu"-Sentences Since the 1990s* [J]. *Journal of Shaoyang University*, 2004, (02): 77-80.
- 7) Che Hui & Li Baogui. *Error Analysis and Acquisition Study of "Yǒu"-Sentences by Korean Students* [J]. *Journal of Liaoning Normal University (Social Science Edition)*, 2016, 39(04): 109-116.
- 8) Ōnishi Katsuya. *From "Possession" to "Spatial Existence": The Developmental Process of "Yǒu"-Sentences in Archaic Chinese* [J]. *Studies in Historical Linguistics*, 2011, (04).
- 9) Dong Yanbiao. *Existential Emphatic-Theme Structures in Modern Chinese: A Comparison with English* [J]. *Journal of Hubei Normal University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition)*, 2021, 41(03): 88-93.
- 10) Feng Yueyan. *A Comparative Study of Chinese and Thai "Yǒu"-Sentences from the Perspective of Linguistic Typology* [Master's thesis]. Shanghai Normal University, 2019.
- 11) He Shuang, Yang Chengfeng & Wang Zheng. *Chinese "Yǒu"-Sentences and Thai... A Syntactic Comparison of Sentences Containing the Verb *yǒu** [J]. *Journal of Baise University*, 2015, 28(03): 41-49.
- 12) Jia Chengnan. *Prototype Effects in the Mutual Translation of *yǒu*-Existential Sentences and "there be" Structures* [J]. *Journal of Chongqing Jiaotong University (Social Science Edition)*, 2018, 18(03): 136-142.
- 13) Li Baogui & Wang Xiaotian. *An Analysis of Errors Made by Korean Students in Acquiring Chinese *yǒu*-Sentences and Corresponding Teaching Strategies* [J]. *Journal of Liaoning Normal University (Social Science Edition)*, 2015, 38(06): 831-836.
- 14) Lin Lijuan & Liu Liyuan. *A Cognitive Analysis of Russian *byt'-Existential Sentences and Chinese *yǒu*-Sentences* [J]. *Northeast Asia Foreign Language Studies*, 2016, 4(04): 50-56.
- 15) Peng Lijzhen. *On the Structure "hěn yǒu NP"* [J]. *Linguistic Research*, 1995, (02): 16-21.
- 16) Pu Tong. *An Analysis of Errors Made by Vietnamese Students in Acquiring Chinese *yǒu*-Sentences* [J]. *Journal of Yuxi Normal University*, 2020, 36(04): 54-60.
- 17) Qi Chunhong & Wang Dongmei. *A Comparative Study of Chinese *yǒu*-Sentences and Thai *mī*-Sentences* [J]. *Journal of Yunnan Normal University (Teaching and Research on Chinese as a Foreign Language)*, 2009, 7(05): 80-84.
- 18) Su Danjie & Lu Jianming. *The "Construction-Chunk" Syntactic Analysis and Teaching Method* [J]. *Chinese Teaching in the World*, 2010, 24(04): 557-567.
- 19) Su Danjie. *An Analysis of the "Construction-Chunk" ...Pedagogy—A Case Study of Teaching Experiments on Existential Sentences* [J]. **Chinese Language Learning**, 2010, (02): 83-90.
- 20) Tang Yihan. *A Study on Errors and Teaching Strategies Regarding Chinese Sentences with "You" (有) among Japanese Learners* [D]. Jilin University, 2025.
- 21) Wu Shixiong & Chen Weizhen. *On Family Resemblance in Semantic Categories* [J]. **Foreign Language Teaching and Research**, 1996, (04): 14-19+80.
- 22) Xie Shi Hua & Xiao Xiqiang. *A Comparative Study of Chinese Sentences with "You" (有) and Vietnamese Sentences with "có"* [J]. **Linguistic Research**, 2014, 34(04): 75-79.

A Contrastive Study of the Chinese “有” and the Indonesian “ada”

- 23) Yang Defeng & Yang Honglu. Symmetry and Asymmetry of "Degree Adverb + You (有) + N" and "Degree Adverb + Mei(you) (没/没有) + N": A Corpus-based Investigation [J]. *Studies on Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language*, 2020, (01): 14-25.
- 24) Yang Hao. A Brief Discussion on English Translation Techniques for Sentences with "You" (有) from a Semantic Perspective [J]. *Overseas English*, 2020, (13): 245-246+248.
- 25) Yin Changle. Selectional Restrictions on Nouns and Focus-adjusting Functions of Conditional "You (有) + N + VP" and Attributive-Possessive "You (有) + VP + de (的) + N" Constructions [J]. *Chinese Teaching in the World*, 2025, 39(02): 224-239.
- 26) Yu Buli. Expressing existence: "there... ..and *yǒu*-sentences and their translation [J]. Journal of Anhui Agricultural University (Social Science Edition), 2010, 19(06): 100-104.
- 27) Yuan Hui, Yi Wei, Xu Jian. A Study on the Classification and English Translation Strategies of the Special Chinese *yǒu*-sentence Construction [J]. Journal of Mudanjiang University, 2020, 29(07): 57-61.
- 28) Yuan Yulin. Family Resemblance in Parts-of-Speech Categories [J]. Social Sciences in China, 1995, (01): 154-170.
- 29) Yuan Zaicheng. On the Structural Differences Between English and Chinese Sentences [J]. Journal of Hunan University of Science and Engineering, 2017, 38(11): 126-129.
- 30) Zhang Ruijia. Existential and Possessive Sentences from a Typological Perspective [M]. Jilin Publishing Group Co., Ltd., 2024.
- 31) Zhang Yufeng. A Review of Research on *yǒu*-sentences [J]. Chinese Language Learning, 1998, (03): 28-32.
- 32) Zheng Ting. Interference of the Mother Tongue in Second Language Acquisition: On the Locative Correspondence Between *yǒu*-sentences and *aru*-sentences [J]. Foreign Language Research, 2007, (06): 49-53.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.