Dative Case Verbs in Japanese

Author(s) : Aryani, Made Ratna Dian 1, Sobarna, Cece 2, Kadir, Puspa Mirani 3,
and Wagiati 4

1 Udayana University/Padjadjaran University, Faculty of Arts, Japanese
Department , (Jl. Pulau Nias No. 13 Denpasar, Telp/Fax: 0361-249458)
mdiary13@yahoo.com

2 Padjadjaran University, Faculty of Arts, Linguistic Department, (Jl. Raya
Bandung - Sumedang Km. 21 Jatinangor), cecesobarna@yahoo.com

3 Padjadjaran Univesity, Faculty of Arts, Japanese Department, (Jl. Raya
Bandung - Sumedang Km. 21 Jatinangor), puspamiranik@gmail.com

4 Padjadjaran Univesity, Faculty of Arts, Linguistic Department, (Jl. Raya
Bandung - Sumedang Km. 21 Jatinangor), wagiati@unpad.ac.id

Dative Case Verbs in Japanese

Abstract

This study aimed to describe dative case verbs in Japanese syntactically and semantically. Specifically, it aimed to explore the verbs that take an indirect object (IO) in the construction of Japanese sentences. The theories used in this research were the theory of Givon (2001), the theory of Tsujimura (1996), and Nitta (1991). The data used in this research were the data obtained from Japanese corpus. The research method used was descriptive analysis.

Starting from the ungrammatical use of double object constructions of Japanese sentence which shows that in every Japanese sentence construction, sometimes arguments by a case marker '*o*' (accusative) is not attached to an argument and even when the case marker appears, it is no more than one. So, if an the marker '*ga*' or '*o*', is not attached to an argument, the marker '*ni*' (dative) will appear.

This reseach indicated that dative case verbs are verbs whose presence would potentially take an indirect object (IO). In accordance with the claim of Tsujimura (1996) and Nitta (1991) which states that the dative case [*ni*] is essentially a marker associated with the verb *give*, and combined with a noun, which implies to unravel a recipient (benefactive). The results of this reseach were (1) The verbs that require the presence of an indirect object (IO) in Japanese constructions 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'.

Key words: *dative, double object, indirect object,*

1.   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 a arrangement. Typologically, the languages of the world show that the sequence patterns in each language have a style in its own 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。
    Taro　　　　*Hanako **ni***　　*kuruma o*　*kaimasu.*
    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 intrantransitive 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 s*akana 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'*** (indirect object / 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 the indirect object (IO).

1.1   The Concept of Verb

Verhaar (1999) claimed that the verb in a sentence construction is the constituent head. Verb as a constituent head has the task of giving birth to the other constituents. The constituent of the sentence is referred to as 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 indirect object (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.

Hopper and Thompson (1980: 252) describe semantic features that distinguish the three types of verbs above, using semantic components as shown in the following table.

10 Characteristic of Transitivity Meaning in Japanese Grammar

No	Transitivity Prototype Feature high Low	High / Low Position	
		High	**Low**
1.	A. Participant	Two or more participants: Agent and Object	One participant
2.	B. Kinesic	Action	Non-action
3.	C. Aspect	telic	atelic
4.	D. Punctuality	Punctual	Non-punctual
5.	E. Volitionality	existence of intent	Absence of intent
6.	F. Affirmation	Affirmative	Negative
7.	G. Mode	Realis	Irrealis
8.	H. Agency	High in potency	Low in potency
9.	I. Affectedness of O	Wholly Affected	Partially Affected
10.	J. Individuation of O	High target	Low target

(Source of Hopper & Thomson, 1980)

Transitivity is considered important not simply linked to the number of NP accompanying particular verbs, but with the relationship derived from the intensity of the incident disclosed by the clause. The intensity of the incident in question is the degree of transitivity measured as a collection of a number of parameters, and each parameter that contributes to the relationship of transitivity.

Here is an explanation of these parameters that are characteristics of transitivity prototypes that can assist in analyzing the dative case.

A. Participants: clause containing the agent and the patient is more transitive than the clause which only has one between the two.

B. Kinesis: clause which implies a certain action, which involves the movement, be it a patient or an agent, is more transitive than the clause which does not require any action.

C. Aspect: clause containing a telic predicate (fixed points) is more transitive than the clause which does not imply anything.

D. Punctuality: a clause whose predicate does not disclose their transition phase, between the beginning and the end of the action is more transitive than the clause predicate contains a subtle continuity.

E. Volitionality: a clause whose action is done intentionally by an agent is more transitive than the clause whose agent acts involuntarily.

F. Affirmation: an affirmative clause is more transitive than a negative clause.

G. Modalities (Mode): a clause containing a realis predicate (i.e. predicates that express events seriously) is more transitive than the clause whose mode is not realis.

H. Potency of Agency (Agency): a clause whose agent is animate being is more transitive than the clause whose agent is inanimate or incapable of spontaneous action.

I. Affectedness of O: a clause containing patient physically affected by the action of the verb is more transitive than a clause whose patient is not affected.

J. Individuation of O: a clause whose patient is definite / referential is more transitive than the clause whose patient is no definite / not referential.

These characteristic prototypes serve as a tool to analyze the Japanese dative verbs particularly those closely related to the parameters A, E, I, and J.

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 with 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 meaning relationship that exists between the verb and its arguments.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

Dative generally functions as an indirect object (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 show 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 assosiated with verbs of giving, and together with the noun, is 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 direction. 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:* がんに死ぬ. *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 a aktivitas.Contoh:* 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 indirect object (IO).

2.   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 description in this research done by giving an overview and explanation of the circumstances or the reality of the language as it is.

The analyse 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 indirect object (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 distributional method with the basic technique is immediate constituent analysis.

3.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

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

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 requires 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*.' 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.'

(JL, 1996: 278)

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 indirect object (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 / intransitive), o (experiencer / object / verb transitive), and wa (agent / topic), **ni** (receiver / benefactive / dative). 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。
***kure**mashita.*
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

教えて下さいます。
oshitekudasaimasu.
teach-morf- PROG (*polite*).
Verb
'Mr. Tanaka was teaching Japanese to us.'

<div align="right">(Korpus, Yahoo Japan! 2006)</div>

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 (indirect object/ IO), *kimono o* is the theme (object), and *katte shimatta* is action verb. In sentence (8) the argument indirect object (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　buy (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 indirect object (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 dative recipient (IO) in the semantic structure of Japanese.

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

11.　a.　ジロが　　　花子に　　　花を　　　　あげます。
　　　　　Jiro ga　　*Hanako ni*　*hana o*　　*agemasu.*
　　　　　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。
          Jiro ga   *Tokyo ni*   *hana o*   *agemasu.*
          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 indirect object (IO), *Hana o* is the theme (object), and *kaimashita* is an action verb / action in sentence (11a). In sentence (11b), the indirect object (IO) argument is substituted by *Toukyou ni* which equally have **ni** marker. Analysis of sentence (11) shows that the constituent having 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.

4. CONCLUSION

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

1) The verb that requires the presence of 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.**

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

Blake, Barry J.2001. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambrige 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.

Furanki, Riri. 2005. *Tokyo Tawa: Okan to Boku, Tokidoki Oton*. Japan: Fushosha Publishing

Givon. T. 1990. *Syntax A Fuctional - Typological 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 Hyougo Kyouikudaigaku Kenkyuu Kiyou 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 Bunsek*i. 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