

## Toward the Identification of Japanese Particles: The case of *Ni*

Tomoko YASUTAKE

(Department of Foreign Languages)

(Received September 1, 1983)

### 0. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to present a unified functional analysis of *ni*, one of the adpositional particles in Japanese. By examining its diverse manifestations in discourse, we will see that its apparently inconsistent and mysterious behavior cannot be easily accommodated in any of the generally accepted notion of case in current linguistic theories. Rather, it is the kind of marker that requires a special case status all to itself. Our conclusion is that the function of *ni* is inherently of semantic nature and that it unanimously serves to mark a specific point in the universe, in direct relationship to which an action or process takes place.

### 1. Diverse instances of *ni*

The notion that *ni* is a homonymous particle that requires separate treatments from one instance to another has been assumed true, often implicitly, in much recent work in Japanese grammar. Listed below are varieties of *ni* expressions. I classified them here utilizing familiar semantic names solely for the purpose of explication.

#### (1) Location

- a. John wa uti ni iru  
TOP home be  
'John is at home'
- b. Saihu wa kaban no naka ni aru  
wallet TOP bag GEN inside be  
'the wallet is in the bag'
- c. Tokyo ni sunde iru<sup>1</sup>  
living be  
'he lives in Tokyo'
- d. Tukue no ue ni oi-ta  
desk GEN top put PAST  
'I put it on the desk'

Tomoko YASUTAKE

- (2) Goal/Purpose
- a. Haha ni tegami o kai-ta  
mother letter ACC write PAST  
'I wrote a letter to my mother'
  - b. Hana ni mizu o yaru  
flower water ACC give  
'I'll water the flower'
  - c. Sizuka ni!  
quiet  
'Be quiet!'
  - d. Oyogi ni iku  
swimming go  
'I'll go swimming'
- (3) Experiencer/Patient/Causee
- a. John ni ik-ase-ta  
go CAUS PAST  
'I let John go'
  - b. Watasi ni yar-ase-te kudasai  
I do CAUS INF give-favor  
'please let me do it'
  - c. John ni tanon-da  
ask PAST  
'I asked John to do it'
  - d. Wasi ni wa ano ko no sinsetu ga uresii  
I TOP that child GEN kindness NOM pleasing  
'I appreciate her kindness'
  - e. John ni dekiru hazu ga nai  
can reason NOM not  
'John can't possibly do it'
- (4) Result
- a. Otona ni nat-ta  
adult become PAST  
'he grew up'
  - b. Tokui ni nat-ta  
proud become PAST  
'he was proud of himself'
  - c. Buzi ni todoi-ta  
safely reach PAST  
'it reached me all right'
- (5) Agent/Causer
- a. Sensei ni homer-are-ta  
teacher praise PASS PAST  
'I was praised by the teacher'
  - b. Ka ni sas-are-ta  
mosquito stab PASS PAST

'I was bit by a mosquito'

- c. Oya ni misuter-are-ta  
parent abandon PASS PAST  
'he was abandoned by his parent(s)'
- d. John ni mitukat-ta  
be found PAST  
'John found me'

(6) Source

- a. Tomodati ni kii-ta  
friend hear  
'I heard it from a friend'
- b. Sensei ni osowat-ta  
teacher learn PAST  
'I learned it from my teacher'

(7) Time

- a. Yoru ni nat-ta  
night become PAST  
'it grew into night'
- b. Tugo no ii toki ni denwa o kudasai  
circumstances good time phone ACC give favor  
'please call me whenever it is convenient for you'
- c. Hito-asi saki ni de-ta  
one foot before depart PAST  
'he left a minute ago'

(8) Miscellaneous

- a. Tomodati ni at-ta  
friend meet PAST  
'I met a friend'
- b. Nakama ni ire-ta  
company put PAST  
'we accepted him to our group'
- c. Issho ni utat-ta  
together sing PAST  
'we sang together'
- d. Gengo-gaku ni kansuru hon  
language study concern book  
'books on linguistics'
- e. Onna na no ni naka-nai  
female be NOM cry not  
'she doesn't cry even though she is a female'
- f. Osen ni kyarameru, ramune ni saida  
rice cracker caramel lemon pop soda pop  
'rice crackers and caramels, lemon pop and soda pop'
- g. Komat-ta koto ni denwa ga kosho da  
be troubled PAST thing phone NOM out of order PAST

'unfortunately, the phone is out of order'

There may certainly be other and better grouping possibilities than the one above. Any suggestion for improvement of the classification such that any number of instances in any of the group should go to the other group or should be attached other labels reinforce my standpoint. My sole intention here is to illustrate that this kind of classification does not lead us to any satisfactory account of the behavior of *ni* in Japanese.

In fact, if we proceed in this line of investigation, the conclusion that we will draw would be that Japanese is an illogical language. It is difficult or impossible to master Japanese if one particle behaves so mysteriously. Some of the functions it seems to serve are just incongruous or discrepant from others. Or, these *ni*'s can't be one. They are homonymous, or *ni* is a chameleon-like marker. But when it comes to that, other Japanese particles are also chameleons, if we note English translations given to them. As is well-known, *ga* is used sometimes to mark the subject (*John ga kita* 'John came') and sometimes the object (*Mizu ga nomi-tai* 'I want to drink water'). *To* serves as a conjunction marker (*kami to eripitu* 'paper and pencil'), a complementizer (*Oisii to omou* 'I think that it's delicious') and a Result marker (*wazawai o tenzite fuku to nasu* 'to turn a misfortune into a blessing'). *De* marks Location (*Niwa de asobu* 'to play in the garden'), Instrument (*Kanazuti de utu* 'to hit with a hammer') and Condition (*hitori de iku* 'to go alone'). But are Japanese people conscious of their separate functions when they speak or understand sentences with these particles? The answer is no. To a Japanese speaker *ni* is *ni*, *ga* is *ga*, *de* is *de*, *to* is *to*, etc. and nothing but that. They are never conscious, for example, of different functions of *ni* as listed in (1) – (8). Rather, each particle is learned as one entity with a specific function distinct from all the other particles. Children learn them quickly and easily and never make mistakes.

## 2. Putative analysis and their defects

In order to make my point more explicit, we shall discuss problems with some of the analyses of *ni* that are found in some literature on Japanese language. First, the analysis of *ni* as a Location marker, which is customarily employed in explaining Japanese sentences like the ones in (1). It may be useful in Japanese-as-a-foreign-language classrooms to refer to *ni* as a location particle that can be used for *at*, *in*, *on*, *under*, *from*, etc. in English. Everyone is happy with the explanation. So, Japanese is easy after all, native speakers of English think, once you get the knack of saying everything in the backward order. To some extent, this explanation is satisfactory. Any non-native speaker will ask no more until he comes across facts like the following.

- (9) a. Hikidasi no naka de mitukat-ta  
 drawer GEN inside be found  
 'I found it in the drawer'

b. \*Hikidasi no naka ni mitukat-ta

If *ni* is a location marker, why can't we say (9b)? What is the difference between *ni* and *de*? The most perplexing minimal pair, in this connection, might be the following kind.

(10) Tokyo ni/\*de sumu  
live  
'to live in Tokyo'

(11) Tokyo de/\*ni kurasu  
live  
'to live in Tokyo'

One tentative hypothesis would be that *ni* is used with verbs expressing states, while *de* is reserved for verbs of action. Thus, the verb *sumu* is classed as a stative verb and *kurasu*, as well as *mitukaru*, is classed as an action verb. This will do as a working hypothesis but not for long. It is difficult to classify *oku* in (1d), for instance, as a stative verb. Similarly, all the verbs in examples (2) – (8) are hardly statives. In order to maintain the analysis of *ni* as a locative marker, it is necessary to solve this problem, as well as the existence of its other usages illustrated in (2) – (8) above.

Let us examine next the notion of *ni* as a syntactic indirect object marker. Many syntacticians who are comfortable with this notion will frown at any suggestion otherwise, but there are others who take the same view concerning the status of *ni* in constructions like those in (2a-b). Compare the following two expressions.

(12) a. He sent a package to Mary  
b. He sent Mary a package

As is discussed in Nakau (1982), these are not strictly synonymous with each other. The semantic difference between the two types of bitransitive construction is reflected in their syntax. The sentence (12b), where *Mary* directly follows the verb, implies that *Mary* actually received the package. But in (12a), where *Mary* is in an oblique position, there is no such implication. It simply means that he mailed or asked somebody to deliver a package to *Mary*. But this sentence by itself does not imply that the package reached *Mary*. This difference in meaning is illustrated in the following.

(13) a. He sent a package to *Mary*, but she didn't receive it  
b. \*He sent *Mary* a package, but she didn't receive it

Even a simple case like this is enough to undermine the notion Indirect Object as a uniform grammatical category. As for Japanese, there is no sentence pattern equivalent

to (12b). There is only (14), which is close in form and meaning to (12a), as is evidenced by the acceptability of (15).

- (14) Kare wa Mary ni kodutumi o okut-ta  
 he TOP package ACC send PAST
- (15) Kare wa Mary ni kodutumi o okut-ta ga, todoka-naka-ta  
 he TOP package ACC send Past but reach not PAST  
 'he sent a package to Mary, but she didn't receive it'

Thus, to speak of *ni* in such constructions as (14) and (15) as an indirect object marker will not provide us any useful clue to their semantics. It is evidently unsatisfactory from the point of view of unified functional analysis of *ni* in Japanese.

Quite a few linguists, however, are comfortable with the syntactic treatment of *ni* as an indirect object marker. They seem to be content with the analysis that *ga* is the subject marker, *o* is the object marker and *ni* is the indirect object marker. Why do you dare to destroy such a neat analysis, they might object, saying that it is in perfect harmony with the facts in other languages and is quite convincing from the point of view of Universal Grammar? But is the category Indirect Object a universal grammatical category? Has anybody proved it to be the case? People just vaguely assume it, but nobody actually proved it. On the contrary, Faltz (1978), having conducted a cross-linguistic study in search of the category Indirect Object, concludes that "Indirect Object is not a uniform syntactic category for all languages." Besides, when we compare English and Japanese adpositional phrases, we find that *ni* marking covers a wide variety of cases—much wider than the uses of the preposition *to* with Indirect Object NP as its object. *Ni* is used for *for* phrases as well, in such constructions as the following.

- (16) a. Mary cooked dinner for me  
 b. Mary wa watasi ni shokuji o tukutte kure-ta  
 TOP I meal ACC making give-favor PAST
- (17) a. John bought a hat for his wife  
 b. John wa tuma ni bosu o katte yat-ta  
 TOP wife hat ACC buying give-favor PAST

Our next task is to present an argument that it is not quite correct to speak of *ni* in constructions like (5a-d) as an agent marker. It is true that Japanese has a productive passive morpheme *are* which is attached to transitive verbs and produce passive constructions, where *ni* manifests itself as if it were an agent marker. But this method is by no means as productive as English passives. The percentage of passive constructions in a text or discourse in Japanese is considerably lower than in English, even including the so-called indirect passives. This is because Japanese has devices other than *are*-passives to express an event when the discourse topic is not the agent of the action but

some other participant in the discourse, such as the use of Topic marker *wa*. The only place where we find lots of passives is in the work of translation, of inferior quality, of things written in English or other languages. Another place where we find high percentage of passives is English classrooms in Japanese highschools, where the students are taught to translate English sentences word for word into Japanese. Therefore, in translating, or more correctly transliterating, English passives they feel free and safe to employ *are* morpheme and *ni* agent phrase, without pausing to think or wonder if people really talk or write like that in Japanese. For instance, in translating *it was found in the drawer*, they say something like *sore wa hikidasi no naka de mituker-are-ta*, whereas a natural Japanese expression would be (9a). They just learn to do it mechanically, never worrying about the facts in Japanese.

Japanese is a language highly sensitive to the animate-inanimate distinction, as is evidenced by the existence of two verbs ‘exist’, *aru* and *iru*. *Aru* is used to talk about the existence of inanimate things and *iru* for animate beings. Inanimate things can never be the subject of an active transitive sentence. This is a very strong constraint. Inanimate things, however, can come freely to the position before *ni*, followed by verbs with passive morphology.

- (18) Taki ni ut-are-te kuru  
 waterfall beat PASS INF come  
 ‘I’ll go and stand in the waterfall’
- (19) Ensoku wa ame ni tatar-are-ta  
 TOP rain curse PASS PAST  
 ‘the picnic was ruined because of the rain’

What this suggests is that this position is not the agent position. *Waterfall* in (18) and *rain* in (19) are not agents, hence, they cannot appear in the corresponding active subject position. Both (20) and (21) are impossible.

- (20) \*Taki ga watasi o utu  
 waterfall NOM I ACC beat
- (21) \*Ame ga ensoku o tataru  
 rain NOM picnic ACC curse

One might argue here that the agent marking function of *ni* is restricted to passive constructions and the active agent position is reserved for *ga*. But counter-evidence is soon provided by the example (5d), where *John* is clearly the one who did the act of finding and is marked by *ni*, but *mitukaru* is an intransitive verb. The sentence as a whole is in the active voice.

The last remaining view that we now proceed to refute is that *ni* is homonymous,

that there are many *ni*'s around in Japanese—one type is used as a location marker and another as a dative (indirect object) marker and still others as an agent marker, etc. As is pointed out in the above discussion, it is often the case that we are at a loss pinpointing the specific functions of some of its instances using some familiar names. Many of them refuse classification, as those in (8) do. It is difficult to name their case roles. If there really are many homonymous *ni*'s around, it should not be so hard to differentiate them all.

Let us consider the following expressions.

- (22) *Watasi ni osie-te kudasai*  
 I teaching give-favor  
 'please teach me'
- (23) *Nani-ka watasi ni dekiru koto wa arimase-n ka?*  
 anything I can thing TOP is not Q  
 'is there anything I can do?'

*Watasi ni* in both (22) and (23) above will not easily come under any of the familiar semantic case labels. In (22), it can be goal, experiencer, benefactive, etc. and in (23), it can be experiencer, agent, location etc. One might be tempted to argue that these problematic instances of *ni*'s are simply vague in their semantic function, but such a solution will not lead us anywhere. It is not compatible with the native speaker's linguistic intuition. For a native speaker of Japanese, *ni* in simply *ni*, one of the case particles. There is nothing vague about any of its usages, and that's that. Nobody is worried about its usage varieties until he tries to translate all the instances into English or other languages. The majority of the case labels that are now familiar to us is English oriented. It may well be that there are others among languages of the world.

### 3. *Ni* is an integrated case marker

In this section, we try to reveal the identity and the basic semantic function of *ni* marking in Japanese. As was discussed briefly in the preceding section in connection with two verbs 'live,' *sumu* and *kurasu*, there exists a certain lexically determined co-occurrence restriction between a verb and its argument, which is called valency by some linguists. Thus, *sumu* requires a *ni* phrase, while *kurasu* concatenates with a *de* phrase. What the following examples show is that there are two Japanese expressions corresponding to the English sentence (24).

- (24) I had an idea
- (25) a. *Ii koto ni ki-ga-tui-ta*  
 good thing mind NOM get PAST  
 b. *Ii koto o omoi-tui-ta*  
 good thing ACC think get PAST

Here, the complex verb *kigatuku* requires a *ni* phrase, while the verbal compound *omoi-tuku* takes an *o* phrase, not the other way around.

- (26) a. \**Ii koto o ki-ga-tui-ta*  
b. \**Ii koto ni omoi-tui-ta*

Let us consider further the following difference in valency of the two verbs *ukeru* and *ukaru*.

- (27) *Siken o/\*ni uke-ta*  
exam ACC take PAST  
'I took the exam'
- (28) *Siken ni/\*o ukat-ta*  
exam pass PAST  
'I passed the exam'

When we say that these valency differences are lexically determined, we naturally assume that there is a certain core meaning or function of each particle that will render our choice of particles automatic. If we consider the diverse manifestations of each of the English prepositions, *at*, *in*, *on*, *with*, *by*, *under*, *from*, etc., it is hard to believe that native speakers of English acquire the knowledge of the correct use of each of them in one fashion, viz. which verb takes which preposition in which environment. If we try to count them, there are an infinite number of combinations and manifestations. Yet, native speakers seldom make mistakes. It is the non-natives who are often at a loss wondering which preposition is correct to use with which verb in order to make themselves properly understood. There is bound to be a certain core meaning or semantic function for each preposition. There must be rules, which are not so much context dependent but simple and straightforward. Only we just do not see them consciously. It is not available to us at present. A similar situation holds in the case of Japanese particles. Though they appear to serve diverse functions, apparently non-related with each other, no native speaker has any problem in utilizing them in proper contexts.

The following is the basic rule of *ni* marking that I surmise here as a first approximation.

- (29) NP<sub>i</sub> is marked with *ni* when the predicate expresses a STATE or a CHANGE OF STATE of NP<sub>j</sub> which has direct bearing on NP<sub>i</sub>,<sup>2</sup> where
- (i) NP<sub>i</sub> refers to a point (an entity, or a notion) either in the three-dimensional or four-dimensional world,
  - (ii) NP<sub>j</sub> is the primary argument of the predicate that is to be realized syntactically either as a transitive

- object or an intransitive subject,<sup>3</sup>  
 (iii) both NP<sub>i</sub> and NP<sub>j</sub> are subject to deletion if inferable  
 from the context.

The core semantic function of *ni*, therefore, is to mark a point (abstract and concrete) in the universe or in time, in direct relationship with which a certain entity exists or an action or process takes place.

4. *Ni* phrase is an obligatory argument of the predicate

What is important in this connection is that the argument which is marked with *ni* is an obligatory argument of the predicate, although it is normally not realized when inferable from the context. In other words, predicates which concatenate with a *ni* phrase actually require one at the deep semantic level, even though they often occur without any in their surface forms. At first glance, this may seem hard to believe, but it is the case with all the verbs that take a *ni* phrase as one of its internal arguments. If this type of verb occurs without a *ni* phrase, then it is a case of contextual deletion. We introduce here a test which is set up by Thomas (1979). Compare the following two discourse fragments.

- (30) A: Have you been reading 'Hamlet'?  
 B: I've been reading, but not 'Hamlet'  
 (31) A: Have you been watching television?  
 B: I've been watching  $\phi$ , but not television

(30B) makes sense in this context. There is no contradiction here, for *I've been reading* is in itself a self-sufficient expression and is not the result of the contextual deletion of 'Hamlet.' In (31), on the other hand, B's response is self-contradictory, since *I've been watching* does not suffice as an independent utterance—the missing object is automatically supplied from the context. Hence, the nonsensical interpretation 'I've been watching television, but not television.'

Let us apply this test to our *ni* expressions.

- (32) A: John wa uti ni iru no ka?<sup>4</sup>  
           TOP home be NOM Q  
           'Is John at home?'  
 B: Iru kedo, uti ni ja nai.<sup>5</sup>  
     be but home COND not  
     'he is  $\phi$  but not at home'

B's response in (32) is not felicitous for the same reason as we have noted in connection with (31). The verb *iru* obligatorily requires a *ni* phrase, which, however, is subject to

contextual deletion. Hence the interpretation ‘John is at home but not at home.’ Similar situations hold in the majority of other examples. There are, however, some exceptions to the claim that all *ni* phrases are obligatory arguments of the predicate. Consider the following instance.

- (33) A: Onna na no ni naka-nai no ka?  
 female be NOM cry not NOM Q  
 ‘doesn’t she cry even though she is a female?’  
 B: Naka-nai kedo onna na no ni ja nai, onna da kara da.<sup>6</sup>  
 cry not but female be NOM COND not female be from be  
 ‘she doesn’t cry. It is not even though but because she is  
 a female’

B’s response makes perfect sense, hence *ni* phrase is not an obligatory argument of *nakanai* here. This kind of *ni* phrase, however, is an external argument of the predicate, which functions like an adverbial disjunct/conjunct. Another example of this kind is found in (8g) above.

##### 5. *Ni* is a semantic case marker

What we need next is a clarification of the nature of *ni* marking. Is it a grammatical relation marker, such as Subject, Object, Indirect Object? Is it a syntactic case marker, such as Nominative, Accusative, Dative, Ergative, Absolutive, Locative? Is it a semantic case marker, like Agent, Patient, Goal, Source? Or is it a marker of a pragmatic relation which is in line with notions like topic, definiteness/indefiniteness, given/new information? The answer is that *ni* marking in Japanese is inherently of a semantic nature and it is incorrect to refer to it as anything else. Its status is different from those of syntactic case particles, like *ga* (Nominative) and *o* (Accusative), nor is it a pragmatic relation marker like *wa* (Topic). As we have discussed in the previous section, it is not quite correct to refer to some instance of *ni* as an Indirect Object marking. It is simply that one of its manifestations appear to be a grammatical equivalent of Indirect Object marker in some languages. For that matter, *ga* and *o*, respectively, are not really the Subject and the Direct Object marker. In fact, there is no particle in Japanese whose primary function is to mark a grammatical relation of a noun phrase to the verb, as will be discussed shortly.

Syntactically speaking, *ni* may be classed as one of the oblique case markers, hence is not a Dative marker. *Ga* and *o*, on the other hand, are non-oblique case markers. The principal basis for this dichotomy is that, while *ga* and *o* are frequently dropped in spoken discourses, as in (34) and (35) below, *ni* deletion is impossible under any circumstances.

- (34) *Watasi siken uke-nakat-ta*  
 I exam take not PAST  
 'I didn't take the exam'
- (35) *Sono hon kat-ta?*  
 that book buy PAST  
 'did you buy that book?'
- (36) *Tokyo \*(ni) sunde iru* (cf. 1c)
- (37) *John \*(ni) tanon-da* (cf. 3c)

If there is a zero-marked noun phrase in a sentence, it is interpreted naturally as a non-oblique, i.e. Nominative or Accusative. Our only reaction, on hearing utterances like (34) and (35), is to interpret them as 'Tokyo is living' and 'I asked somebody to look after John,' respectively; *Tokyo* gets interpreted as a Nominative NP, and *John* an accusative NP. The former is nonsensical or absurd and the latter interpretation radically differs from the intended meaning. However, in situations where it is more natural not to mention *ga* nor *o*, if you do supply them, the resulting sentences would be somewhat different in meaning. They sound more restrictive and emphatic. If you say, instead of (34), *watasi ga siken o ukenakatta*, then you will be understood as saying 'it is I that didn't take the exam' in most cases. Similarly, if you say, when it is more appropriate to say (35), *sono hon o katta?*, then what you mean is 'did you buy THAT BOOK?' This is because *ni* is not in line with *ga* and *o*. Another piece of evidence for the non-dative status of *ni* is that its use is more extensive than authentic dative markers in other languages, as we have seen above.

*Ni* is, again, not a special pragmatic relation marker. In principle, all Japanese case particles *kakujoshi* are new information markers, i.e. they are used to mark either an NP of first-mention, or topic shift or topic contrast.<sup>7</sup> This principle applies both to the syntactic case markers and to the semantic case markers, but not to the same degree. In the case of *ga* or *o*, when the specific piece of information is given, predictable, we have the choice of deleting only the particle, as in (34) and (35), or the whole noun phrase, like *ukenakatta* 'I didn't take it' or *katta?* 'did you buy that?' But in the case of semantic case markers, we cannot delete only the particles, as we have discussed in connection with (36) and (37). This is another piece of evidence for the difference between *ga* and *o* on one hand and *ni* and other particles of the semantic category on the other.

There is a well-known pragmatic relation marker in Japanese, *viz.* the topic marker *wa*, which signals the topic (or the focus of contrast) status of the element to which it is adjoined. The combination possibility (or the impossibility) of the two types of particles with this topic marker provides an illustrative piece of evidence for the difference between them. A semantic case particle is used in conjunction with the topic marker, but a syntactic case particle does not appear in the topic (or the focus of contrast) position.

*Wa* simply takes its place.

- (38) a. Tokyo ni wa aru  
           TOP be  
           ‘it’s in Tokyo’  
    b. Tokyo de wa mi-ta  
           in TOP see PAST  
           ‘I’ve seen that in Tokyo (but not in other cities)’  
    c. Tokyo e wa iku  
           to TOP go  
           ‘I’ll go to Tokyo (but not to other places)’
- (39) a. Tokyo (\*ga) wa okii  
           TOP big  
           ‘Tokyo is big’  
    b. Tokyo (?o) wa toru  
           TOP pass  
           ‘I’ll pass Tokyo (but not other places)’

If we remove the semantic particles from the sentences in (38), then they get interpreted differently and in the case of (38c) the result is nonsensical—‘Tokyo is going.’ Those versions in (39), where *wa* follows syntactic case markers are ungrammatical or awkward. We can account for this fact as follows. Semantic case markers cannot be, in any way, deleted because they are essential for the interpretation of a sentence; without them it is impossible to know the relationship of the noun phrases with the predicate correctly. Syntactic case markers, on the other hand, are not necessary semantically. Their function is that of reinforcement, i.e. they serve to make explicit the syntactic relationships of noun phrases to the predicate, which are lexically determined by the valency of the predicate. Hence, it is most natural for them not to be there when there is no motivation, i.e. the piece of information expressed by the noun phrase is given, predictable. Our claim is supported by definite diachronic evidence, as is found in Nishida (1977).

## 6. Concluding remarks

In this paper, I have argued that the particle *ni* in Japanese is a distinct semantic case marker, the name of which I tentatively call Deictic case. It serves to point to a certain entity or an abstract idea in the universe or time, which have direct bearing on the state/change of state that is expressed by the sentence. Depending on the environment, *ni* manifests itself as any of the familiar semantic case markers; like Goal, Result, Experiencer, Agent, Source, Causee, Location. However, it is not the property of the particle but the valency of the predicate that provides this sort of information; the diverse functions that are commonly ascribed to the adposition *do*, in fact, derive from the lexical nature of the predicate. The solution to postulate a new semantic case like Deictic may seem ad hoc with no cross-linguistic support. I have little to say against such a criticism,

as I have not looked at other languages. But at least I am not surprised if there exist some such markers in some other languages of the world.

### FOOTNOTES

- \* An abridged version of this paper was presented at the workshop on Japanese Linguistics, Linguistic Institute 1983 at UCLA.
1. The interpretation of zero-forms depends heavily on the discourse context. The English translations of zero expressions throughout the paper are mostly arbitrary.
  2. It appears that verb-less instances like (8f) are not covered by this rule. However, it may well be a case of zero predicate; the verb 'be' is not realized as being contextually or situationally recoverable.
  3. In the case of causative expressions like (3a-b),  $NP_j = NP_j$ .
  4. The status of *no* in this position is controversial. Here we follow the traditional view and gloss it as a Nominalizer.
  5. The status of *ja* is anything but settled. We tentatively give it the status of Conditional particle in the gloss.
  6. *Da* is another controversial auxiliary in Japanese. I am aware that it is not just an equivalent of an auxiliary *be* in English.
  7. I do not have space to prove this fully here. But as to the notion of the dichotomy of given and new information, see Chafe (1976), and as to the notion of Topic Shift/Contrast, see Gundel (1980).

### REFERENCES

- Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. "Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view," in C. Li (ed.) *Papers from the Parasession on Functionalism*. New York: Academic Press. 25–56.
- Faltz, Leonard M. 1978. "On indirect objects in universal syntax," *CLS* 14. 76–87.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. 1980. "Zero NP-anaphora in Russian: a case of topic prominence," in J. Kreiman and A.E. Ojeda (eds.) *Papers from the Parasession on Pronouns and Anaphora*. Chicago Linguistic Society. 139–149.
- Jacobsen, Wesley. 1982. *Transitivity in the Japanese Verbal System*. IULC.
- Kunihiro, Tetsuya. 1967. *Structural Semantics: A contrastive Study of English and Japanese*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Mikami, Akira. 1972. *Gendai Goho Shin-setsu*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Nakau, Minoru. 1982. "Kaku no Hyogen-keishiki: Eigo," in K. Morioka et al. (eds.) *Koza Nihongo-gaku 10: Gaikokugo to no Taisho I*. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin. 139–158.
- Nishida, Naotoshi. 1977. "Joshi (1)," in S. Ohno and T. Shibata (eds.) *Iwanami-Koza Nihongo 7: Bunpo II*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. 191–289.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1979. "Taikaku-gengo ni okeru nookaku-sei ni tsuite," in *Nihongo to Eigo to*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan. 61–77.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1982. "Japanese grammar and universal grammar," *Lingua* 57. 103–123.

- Thomas, A.L. 1979. "Ellipsis: the interplay of sentence structure and context," *Lingua* 47. 43–68.
- Yamada, Susumu. 1981. "Kinogo no imi no hikaku," in T. Kunihiro (ed.) *Nichi-Eigo Hikaku Koza vol. 3: Imi to Goi*. Tokyo: Taishukan. 53–100.
- Yasui, Minoru. 1983. "Eigo ni okeru shoryaku gensho," *Modern English Teaching* 8. Tokyo: Kenkyusha. 17–19.

正誤表

Yasutake Tomoko "Toward the Identification of Japanese Particles: The case of Ni" 愛知教育大学研究報告 人文科学 Vol.33 p.61-75 (1984)

		誤	→	正
p. 64	l. 24	analysis		analyses
p. 65	l. 19	frawn		frown
p. 68	l. 20	in		is
p. 72	l. 11	(34)		(36)
p. 72	l. 11	(35)		(37)
p. 74	l. 4	workship		workshop