

# Dative Case Verbs in Japanese

Made Ratna Dian Aryani

Faculty of Arts, Udayana University  
[dian\\_aryani@unud.ac.id](mailto:dian_aryani@unud.ac.id)

**Abstract** This study aimed to describe the dative case verbs in Japanese syntactically and semantically. Specifically, it aimed to explore the verbs that take an indirect object (IO) in the Japanese sentences. The theories used in this research were the theory of Givon (2001), and Nitta (1991). The data used in this research were the data obtained from Japanese corpus. The research method used was descriptive analysis. This research indicated that dative case verbs are verbs whose presence would potentially take an IO. The results of this research were (1) The verbs that require the presence of an IO in Japanese is a transitive verb, with the marker **ni**, and (2) those verbs are **ageru** 'give', **oshieru** 'teach', **kureru** 'give' and **kau** 'buy'. Semantically these verbs are **keizoku doushi** 'continuative verbs'.

Keywords: dative, double object, indirect object

## I. INTRODUCTION

Linearity is an aspect and also the characteristics of a language. There are two things associated with linearity, namely (1) the existence of lingual units as articulated language elements, (2) the order of the units as a means of forming grammatical constructions (Sudaryanto, 1983: 1). The units are sorted in the sequencing process and form an arrangement. Typologically, the languages of the world show that the sequence patterns in each language have a style in its subordinates concerning internal construction is in it. Lehmann (in Sudaryanto, 1983: 6) states that "each central of a language is the verb". That is, it is the verb to first determine the structure of the various constructions in the language in question and their changes. The main function of a verb is as a predicate or as the core predicate in a sentence.

Chafe (1970: 98-100) classifies verbs into four, namely the situation, process, action, and action-process. Furthermore, Chafe stated that the verb is the core proposition that elicits a noun or noun phrase that must be present together with the verb. Verbs also determine the role of semantic noun/noun phrases and semantic features of nouns that must be present to accompany the verb in building a proposition. Furthermore, Chafe explained that the semantic structure is based on a series of relationships between the core and the verbs as nouns which have bound specifically to the verbs semantic relationships that bind. Semantic structure can be seen through the case in the framework of the Grammar case, while the case is the role of semantic argument verbs. The new semantic structure of verbs

can be formulated if understood semantic roles. In analyzing the role of semantic note is characteristic of the verb and semantic relationships between verbs as predicates and arguments are bound by the verb.

Valence difference yields the relationship that varies between verbs and arguments. By category, verbs can be classified into three, namely (1) the verb with one argument, (2) the verb with two arguments, and (3) the verb with three arguments.

### Japanese (BJ)

#### The verb with one argument

- (1) 雨が 降っています。  
*Ame ga futte imasu.*  
rain-Nom fall-Morf (PROG)  
Subject Verb

'Rain is falling.'

#### The Verb with two arguments

- (2) 私は 魚を 食べます。  
*Watashi wa sakana o tabemasu.*  
1SG-Top fish-Ac eat-Morf (FUT)  
Subject Object Verb

'I would eat fish.'

### The Verb with three arguments

(3)	タロは	花子に	車を	買います。
	<i>Taro</i>	<i>Hanako ni</i>	<i>kuruma o</i>	<i>kaimasu.</i>
	Taro-Top	Hanako-Dat	car-Ac	buy-Morf
	Subject	Indirect Object	Object	Verb

‘Taro bought a car for Hanako.’

(JL. 1996:265)

Based on the sentence example above, sentence (1) the verb *futte imasu* ‘fall (for rain)’ is an intransitive verb with *ame ga* ‘rain’ functioning as the subject, and demonstrate the verb with one argument, sentence (2) the verb *tabemasu* ‘will eat’ is a transitive verb with *watashi wa* ‘I’ functioning as the subject and *sakana o* ‘fish’ as the object, and shows the verb with two arguments, and example sentence (3) the verb *kaimasu* ‘buy’ is a transitive verb with *Ari san wa* ‘Ari’ functioning as the subject, *Dian san ni* ‘Dian’ as the indirect object, and *kuruma o* ‘car’ as a functioning as the direct object, and shows three-argument verb that demands the presence of the dative case ‘*ni*’ (IO).

Based on the above phenomenon, which will be the focus of this research and the need to study the semantic structure of Japanese verbs, so it will obtain a clear picture that is a verb which has three arguments in Japanese and marked with the dative case ‘*ni*’ in an IO.

#### 1.1 The Concept of Verb

Verhaar (1999) claimed that the verb in sentence construction is the constituent head. As a constituent head, the verb has the task of giving birth to the other constituents. The constituent of the sentence is referred to as a noun. The properties (roles) of nouns also depend on the nature of the verb as a head. When presence a dative constituent is not obligatory, it will be assumed that the verb is not a verb that requires the presence of an IO and certainly dative case will not appear.

According to Givon (2001: 64-73) characteristics of a verb can be observed through three characteristics, namely semantic, morphological, and syntactic characteristics. Semantic features of verbs tend to refer to the circumstances, processes and actions. Morphological traits showed that the verb is marked by the addition of affixes which in certain states modality, aspect, tense, negation, pronominal adjustment, and case markers. Meanwhile, the syntactic characteristics reveal that a verb, in general, is the sentence which in this study would still be called the verb phrase. At the morphological level, observation in Japanese is inseparable from the philosophy of grammar, namely the function, form, and meaning. This means that this study, in addition to observing the functions and forms of the verb, it also observes meaning because

verbs produce different types of verbs that certainly influence the verb valence.

The comprehension of Japanese sentences based on case particles. To analyze the data obtained, the terms proposed by Tsunoda (2002: 66) will be used as follows:

Terms 1: Roles are generally bound only with case particles: *ga*, *ni*, and *o*

Terms 2: In each sentence, particle *ga* is attached to one of the arguments no more than one.

Term 3: In each sentence, sometimes arguments are not attached with case particle *o*, and when the particles that case arises, no more than one.

Term 4: In each sentence, if the argument is not attached to particle *ga* and *o*, it will appear with particle *ni*.

However, from a combination of particles of this case, it does not mean that every verb is acceptable for the meaning of the verb also determines the meaning relationship that exists between the verb and its arguments.

#### 1.2 Theoretical Framework

Dative generally functions as an IO of the verb. In Japanese, it typically uses particle *ni*. Tsujimura (1996: 165) states that in any constituent of Japanese, there is a marker to explain its function, namely markers nominative subjects (topics) that *ga* and the topic is *wa*, markers accusative object is *o* / *wo*, markers dative is *ni*, markers genitive ownership is *no*, markers are complementary *to*. The marker is placed after the word and shows grammatical relationships in the sentence. Tsujimura (1996: 134) states:

“Case particles include Nominative (Nom) ~*ga*, Accusative (Acc) ~*o*, Dative (Dat) ~*ni*, and Genitive (Gen) ~*no*, and these we add the Topic (Top) marker ~*wa*. **The Dative Case ~*ni* is primarily associated with verbs of giving, and together with the noun, it implies the recipient.**”

The function of particles in the case of BJ sentences would be to give the semantic role of the noun. Nitta (1991: 66) explains the marker case or *kakujoshi* 格助詞: が、の、を、に、で、へ、と、から、より、まで、これは、先行する名詞あるいは代名詞の格示します。”**Kakujoshi: *ga, no, o, ni, de, e, to, kara, yori, made, senkou suru***

*kore wa wa meishi arui daimeishi no kakushimeshimasu*". "That includes kakujoshi is ga, no, o, ni, de, he, kara, yori, made. The presence of all joshi in a sentence preceded by a noun or pronoun."

In connection with this, consideration of the experts, for example, the theory of theta (Theta theory) in transformational grammar developed by Nagashima (1983), Radford (1988), Comper (1992), and Tsujimura (1996), shows the study of syntax to the end this century cannot ignore the case (role) in terms of semantic relationships. Nitta (1991: 135) argues that the use of the particle "*ni*" is as follows:

- (A) 在り場所を表す, "*Aribashou o arawasu*" Declare the existence somewhere. Example: 庭に池がある. *niwa ike ni ga aru*. "In the yard, there is a pool".
- (B) 行く先を表す. "*Yukusaki o arawasu*" Stating a goal. Example sentence: 大阪に行く. *Oosaka ni iku*. "Go to Osaka",
- (C) 物の授受行う相手を表す. "*Mono no juju okonau aite o arawasu*" Stating the recipient/giver of goods. Example: 彼にペンを上げる. *kare ni o ageru pen*. "Give him a pen.
- (D) 動作や態度が向けられる先を表. "*Sin yes taido mukerareru saki ga o arawasu*" Declare target object of an action director. Example: "母に甘える. *Haha ni amaeru*. "Pampered mother",
- (E) 原因を表す. "*Gen'in o arawasu*" Declare cause, origin, for example: がん to 死ぬ. *Gan ni Shinu*. "Died of cancer".
- (F) 変化の先を表す. "*Henka no saki o arawasu*" Declare the result of variations/changes, for example: 水が氷になる. *Koori Mizu ni ga naru*. "Water becomes ice".
- (G) 形容詞の表す状態がなり立つの基準や志し向対象こうたいしょうなどを表す. "*Keiyōshi no arawasu jōtai ga nari tatsu no Kijun Yes kokorozashi Ko Ko Taishou Taishō nado o arawasu*" Declare a state consisting of a target object, standard, range. example: 彼は日本史に明るい. "*Kare wa ni nihonshi Akarui*. "He's a lot to know the history of Japan".
- (H) 動作の目的を表す. "*Dousa no mokuteki o arawasu*" Stating the purpose of an activity. For example: 花見に行く. *Hanami ni iku*. "Went to see the cherry blossoms."
- (I) 時を表す. "*Toki o arawasu*" Declare a time, for example: 七時におきる. *7ji ni Okiru*. "Woke up at 7 o'clock".
- (J) 動詞を受身文にしたときの動詞の主体を表す. "*Doshi o ukemibun ni shita toki no Doshi no, Shutai o arawasu*" Declare the subject of the passive sentence Example:

子供に死なれた. *Kodomo ni shinareta*. "Left to die by children".

- (K) 動詞を使役文にしたときの動詞の主体を表す. "*Doshi ni shita o shiekibun toki no, Doshi no Shutai o arawasu*" Declare causative subject of the sentence. Example: 彼にその仕事をやらせた. "*Kare ni o sono shigoto yaraseta*. "Make him do the job."

In this study, such as the marker function *ni* described by Nitta, then the points (C) who will be the focus. At the point (C) explains a significant marker *ni* dative/receiver that marked the presence of an IO.

## II. RESEARCH METHODS

The data in this study are in the form of a modern Japanese transitive verb construction with dative cases used today, which is compiled from a Japanese corpus of data. This is done with the consideration that the source of the data is used to represent Japanese common usage and is comprehensive. Japanese dative case study is a form of qualitative descriptive, explanatory, and synchronous for data described in this research done by giving an overview and explanation of the circumstances or the reality of the language as it is.

The analysis is based on (1) constituents marked by particle *ni*, (2) the syntactic elements are associated with the presence of verbs in the construction of the dative case, (3) the types of nouns that are present in the an IO constituent of dative case constructions and (4) the semantic roles of constituents building construction Japanese dative case constructions. The results of the analysis of this data can be used as a basis for making rules of any construction. The method used in this research is the distributional method with the basic technique is immediate constituent analysis.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section will discuss the determination of Japanese dative case verbs and discussion about the semantic structure of Japanese dative verbs.

The conception of cases is associated with the marking system in Japanese. Japanese sentence structure containing particles は '*wa*', が '*ga*', に '*ni*' へ '*he*', を '*o / wo*', で '*de*' that show grammatical relationships in the sentence. Japanese particles serve to explain the relationship between words in a sentence. The basic principles of particle or in the teaching of Indonesian are known as a preposition. A preposition refers to the presence of particles preceding a noun, whereas in Japanese these particles appear after a noun which is often called postposition.

Case in Japanese is usually given to a noun which is one of the features that determine the grammatical form of the noun; in a systematic

indicator, it shows the semantic-syntactic relation with sentences that contain nouns. It can be said, the case is a typical feature, by changing the form of the noun, syntactic relationships such as subject, object, semantic relationships, such as places, and objects to be subjected to the action is a sentence that contains nouns that are indicated by a marker. Central in the structure of the sentence is the predicate. This predicate slot is filled by a verb. Tsunoda (2002) pointed out that ditransitive verbs require the presence of the subject function, object functions,

complementary functions, and predicate functions that form the structure of **S-O-C-P**.

Kuno (1973: 165) states 与格は一般に動詞の間接目的を表示する。日本語では主に「に」で表される。'Yokaku ippan wa ni Doushi no kansetsumokuteki o hyouji suru. Nihongo de wa Shuni (ni) de arawasareru.' A dative is generally an indirect object (IO) of the verb. In Japanese, it typically uses particle *ni*.

- 4 Hanako が Taroo に英語を 教えます。  
*Hanako ga Taroo ni eigo o oshiemasu.*  
 Hanako-Nom Taroo-Dat English-Ac teach  
**Agen OTL Obyek Verba**

'Hanako teaches English to Taroo'.

- 5 Jiroo が Masako に 指輪を あげた。  
*Jiroo ga Masako ni yubiwa o age-ta.*  
 Jiroo-Nom Masako-Dat ring-Ac give-PERF  
**Agen OTL Obyek Verba**

'Jiroo give the ring to Masako.'

(Corpus, Gengogaku: 1996)

On the data line (4) and (5), arguments that appear are the arguments *Hanako ga* and *Jiroo ga* an agent, *Taroo ni* and *Masako ni* is the (IO) as dative/receiver, and *eigo o* and *yubiwa o* is the object direct (DO/object). In Japanese, the role of agents, experiencer, receiver, objects, and the other is a case marked, each marked with the particle *ga*, *o*, and *ni*.

Particle *ga* (agent), *o* (experiencer), and *wa* (agent / topic), *ni* (receiver). Particles used as markers required to meet the case and grammatical functions. Thus, one can say that the particle is a grammatical semantic role. Particles serve to explain the relationship between words in a sentence.

6. 彼が 私に 花を  
*kare ga watashi ni hana o*  
 (male).3SG-Nom 1SG-Dat flower-Ac  
 Subject Indirect Object Object

くれました。  
*kuremashita.*  
 give- morf-PAST (polite).  
 Verb

'He gave me flowers.'

7. 田中先生は 私たちに 日本語を  
*Tanaka sensei wa watashitachi ni nihongo o*  
 Teacher Tanaka-Top 1PL-Dat Japanese-Ac  
 Subject OTL Object

教えてくださいます。  
*oshitekudasaimasu.*  
 teach-morf- PROG (polite).  
 Verb

‘Mr. Tanaka was teaching Japanese to us.’

(Korpus, Yahoo Japan! 2006)

In sentence (6), *kare ga* argument is a doer (agent), *watashi ni* is the goal/objective (IO), and *hana o* is a theme (theme). The verb in sentence (6) is an action verb is *kuremashita* that is syntactically a verb that requires the presence of indirect object (IO) argument.

Likewise in the example sentence (7), *Tanaka-sensei wa* is the doer (agent), *watashitachi ni* are the goals/targets, and *verb oshite kudasaimasu* is an action verb that requires the presence of indirect object (IO) argument.

8. タロの 奥さんが タロに 着物を  
*Taro no okusan ga Taro ni kimono o*  
 Taro-Gen wife-Nom **Taro-Dat** kimono (Japanese clothes)-Ac  
 Subject **OTL** Object

買ってしまった。

**katteshimatta.**

give-morf-cont-intentional-PAST.

Verba

‘Taro’s wife intentionally bought a kimono for Taro.’

(Korpus, Gengo:2003)

Sentence (8), the argument *Taro ga* is no okusan actors (agents), *Taro ni* is the recipient (IO), *kimono o* is the theme (object), and *katte shimatta* is an

action verb. In sentence (8) the argument (IO) with the particle **ni** (dative) shows as a recipient/benefactive.

9. a. Katoさんは Ø 車を 買いました。  
*Kato san wa Ø kuruma o kaimashita.*  
 Kato-Top Ø car-Ac buys (PAST).

‘Kato has bought a car.’

- b. Katoさんは Satoさんに 車を 買ってあげました。  
*Kato san wa Sato san ni kuruma o katteagemashita.*  
 Kato-Top Sato-Dat car-Ac buy (PAST).

‘Kato bought a car for Sato’

(Korpus, Gakubu:2005)

10. a.\* 母は Ø お金を 上げた。  
*Haha wa Ø okane o ageta.*  
 mother-Top Ø money-Ac give(PAST).  
 ‘Mother was giving some money.’

- b. 母は 妹に お金を 上げた。  
*Haha wa imouto ni okane o ageta.*  
 mother-Top sibling (female)-Dat money-Ac give  
 ‘Mother gave some money to sister.’

(Furanki,2005: 324)

Analysis of sentence (9) indicates that with the use of verbs *kaimashita* with deletion indirect object (IO) argument in sentence (9a), and without deletion indirect object (IO) arguments in sentence (9b) can remain independent and grammatically acceptable in Japanese and Indonesian. *Kato san wa* argument is the doer (agent), *kuruma o* is the theme

(object), and *kaimashita* are action verbs/action on the data (9a). Data (9a) does not raise the argument (IO). While the data (9b) *Kato san wa* argument is the doer (agent), *Sato san ni* is the recipient (IO), *kuruma o* is the theme (object), and *katteagemashita* are action verbs/action. Data (9b) The changes in verb *kaimashita* be *katteagemashita*, gives the

meaning to buy in Indonesian. It shows the emergence of the dative recipient (IO) in the semantic structure of Japanese.

In sentence (10) deletion of the argument (IO) sentence (10a) is not grammatically acceptable in Japanese. This is related to the nature of the verb *ageta* demanding the presence of (IO) argument in Japanese dative construction and is certainly different from the example sentence (10b). *Haha wa* argument

11.	a.	ジロが	花子に	花を	あげます。
		<i>Jiro ga</i>	<i>Hanako ni</i>	<i>hana o</i>	<i>agemasu.</i>
		Jiro-Nom	Hanako-Dat	flower-Ac	give-FUT

‘Jiro will give flowers to Hanako’

	b.*	ジロが	東京に	花を	あげます。
		<i>Jiro ga</i>	<i>Tokyo ni</i>	<i>hana o</i>	<i>agemasu.</i>
		Jiro-Nom	Tokyo-Loc	flower-Ac	give-FUT

‘Jiro will give flowers to Tokyo’

(JL, 1996: 267)

In sentence (11) the argument *Jiro san wa* is an actor (agent), *Hanako san ni* is the (IO), *Hana o* is the theme (object), and *kaimashita* is an action verb/action in sentence (11a). In sentence (11b), the (IO) argument is substituted by *Toukyou ni* which equally has *ni* marker. Analysis of sentence (11) shows that the constituent having a dative marker in (11b) is substituted with a noun, then grammatically the Japanese construction is acceptable, but in semantically it becomes unacceptable. In contrast to sentence (11a), it is grammatically and semantically acceptable.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the above analysis, we can make the following conclusions.

- 1) The verb that requires the presence of an indirect object (OI) is a transitive verb, with *ni* marker.
- 2) Verbs analyzed in this study were dative case verbs *ageru* 'give', *oshieru* 'teach', *kureru* 'give', and *kau* 'buy'. Semantically these verbs are *keizoku doushi* 'continuative verbs'. Verbs of this type imply acts at a certain time, and the act or event continued in an utterance. The most obvious characteristic of the verb is always using the infinitive verb + ~ *te iru*.

The Japanese language has several dative cases, one of them can take an indirect object (IO). It is expected that this research is to distinguish the role of dative cases in more detail.

#### REFERENCES

Alwi, Hasan, dkk. 2006. *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia* (Ed. III), Jakarta: Balai Pustaka

is the doer (agent), *imouto ni* is the recipient (IO), *okane o* is the theme (object), and *ageta* are action verbs. Data (10a) indicates the disappearance of an indirect object (IO) ungrammatical resulting in the construction. This relates to the use of the verb is a verb *ageta* who argued three, so it requires the presence of a recipient/benefactive in sentence construction.

Aryani, MRD. 2017. “Datif dalam Bahasa Jepang: Kajian Sintaktis dan Semantis”. Bandung: Universitas Padjadjaran

Blake, Barry J.2001. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Bresnan, J. 2001. *Lexical-Functional Syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Butt, Miriam. 2006. *Theory of Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Chafe, W.L. 1970. *Meaning and the Structure of Language*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Ekowardono, Karno. 1982. “Konsepsi Morfem Afiks: Sebuah Studi atas Korelasi Bentuk, makna, dan Velensi dalam bahasa Indonesia” in *Pelangi Bahasa* (ed Harimurti dan Anton Moeliono). Jakarta: Bhratara

Fillmore, Ch. 1968. “The case for case”. Dalam: Bach, E. dan R.T. Harms (ed.) *Universal in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart Winston, 1-88.

Givon. Talmy. 1990. *Syntax A Functional - Typological Introduction*. Vol. II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Givon, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax An Introduction*. Vol I. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Givon, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax An Introduction*. Vol II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hopper, Paul & Sandra A. Thomson. 1980. *Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse*. *Language* 56: 251-299
- Katamba, Francis. 1993. *Modern Linguistics: Morphology*. London: The Macmillan Press
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *Nihon Bunpoo Kenkyuu ; Studi Gramatika Bahasa Jepang*. Tokyo : Taishukan
- Nitta, Yoshio. 1991. *Nihongo Bunpou Kenkyuu Josetsu*. Toukyou-Japan: Kuroshio Shuppan
- Sudaryanto. 1983. *Predikat-Objek dalam Bahasa Indonesia, Keselarasan Pola Urutan*. Jakarta: Djambatan
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana Universitas Press
- Sugai, Kazumi. 2000. 'Kakujoshi ni no Imi Tokusetsu ni Kansuru Oboegaki' dalam *Hyogo Kyouikudaigaku Kenkyuu Kiyuu* Vol. 20
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1976. *Syntax and Semantic: The Grammar of Causative Construction*. New York: Academi Press
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1995. *Approaches to Language Typology*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2000. *Gengo no Kouzou: Rinron to Bunseki*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2012. *Grammatical Relations and Surface Cases*. USA: Linguistic Society of America  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>
- Takahashi, Taro. 2003. *Dooshi*. Tokyo: Hitsuji Shoten
- Tsunoda, Tasaku. 2002. *Sekai no Gengo to Nihongo: Gengo Ruikeiron kara Mita Nihongo*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Tsujimura, Natsuko. 1996. *An Introduction to Japanese Linguistics*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing
- Tsujimura, Natsuko. 2004. *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*. London: Blackwell
- Verhaar, JWM. 1996. *Asas- Asas Linguistik Umum*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University