

**Semantic differences in Japanese mimetics**

*The article will determine several lexical semantic differences between mimetic verbs and conventional prosaic verbs in Japanese, and exhibit that meaning for mimetic verbs demands a treatment precise from that of lexical verbs*

It seems an indisputable fact that there is a certain understanding of a single lexical item to stand as an equivalent of a form-meaning pairing as its linguistic property. Such association, however, may be inaccurate when we start thinking carefully about what constitutes the very meaning of mimetic words, which provide a descriptive expression function. Like many languages, Japanese has a wide range of mimetic words, and based on its phonological, prosodic, and morphological characteristics, this word class has been presented to form a lexical stratum independent of other classes that include native words, Sino-Japanese words, and other loan-words. During the last two decades the study on sound symbolism and sound-symbolic words, especially in the fields of cognitive linguistics and cognitive psychology is gaining relatively new wave of popularity among the researchers [9, p.28].

Now It is generally acknowledged by linguists that when a word is correlated with an object in the real world, the word is called "sound symbolism". This correlation can be formalized by onomatopoeia or mimetic words. Mimetic words are generally accepted as a phenomenon of language. However, the actual number of words in Japanese that are expressed by sound symbolic elements is disputed by linguists. There are those who feel that language is mainly arbitrary and that sound symbolism is just a usual phenomenon; others claim that language is inherently sound symbolic and always doing attempts to equate sound with sense. There is the same question about whether the Japanese language is having more or less sound-symbolic or whether it maintains a 'steady state' equally remains without a certain answer. Even if there are exceptions to every pattern in human languages, it can be demonstrated that some sound symbolism has a biological basis. It is obvious that mimetic words play a more crucial role than many linguists feel or believe.

Linguists are getting one step closer to understanding that mimetic words have universality, using the evaluation range they are classifying the examples of mimetic words. As the purpose of language is communication, the criteria for evaluation of mimetic words universality is whether one easily-understands naturally or not. In other words, understanding of mimetic words needs to be natural to have universality. If the mimetic words are not easily-understood, then they can be considered to be of a random meaning. One of the most distinctive features of mimetics in terms of interpretation process is their high level of flexibility beyond conventional meanings, as well as, the flexibility in the wide range of argument structure with which a mimetic verb is commonly associated. It is obvious that the relative freedom in meaning and argument structure separates mimetic verbs from prosaic ones.

Nowadays frame semantics gives a chance to create some new models of the structuring principles and expressing some certain part of the person's experience, by means of language units, as well as, different ways of general knowledge activation that provides understanding during the language interaction process. Each mimetic can be considered to evoke very specific frame, which elaborates a general frame. The core issue of the cognitive linguistics is considered to be lexical polysemy that is a peculiar sound-symbolic words feature. The definition of mimetics has been always a kind of a challenging point in terms of the crosslinguistic. Every researcher attempts to work out a completely different definition using various adjectives to describe the special semantic features of mimetics. The 'meaning' of mimetics may seem illusive because their key reference is to represent sounds, texture, intensity, and also to highlight the moment that, there is symbolic subtext of individuals entitled in nature. However, many of them have been conventionalized with quite specific "meanings" and referred to those non-mimetic lexical nouns like 水(mizu) "water" and verbs such as 飲む(nomu) "to drink" [14, p.140].

It is necessary to stress that one of the distinctive features of the mimetic stratum, mimetic verbs – and more generally mimetic words is that they express a high degree of extension to innovative meanings and a relative freedom of argument structure possibilities, that is much more than normal lexicon verbs can do [14, c.151].

One of the most distinctive features of mimetics in terms interpretation process is their high level of flexibility beyond conventional meanings, as well as, the flexibility in the wide range of argument structure with which a mimetic verb is commonly associated. It is obvious that the relative freedom in meaning and argument structure separates mimetic verbs from prosaic ones.

Recent studies in terms of cognitive linguistics have highlighted some important facts about the semantic extension of Japanese onomatopoeia. Many instances of metaphorical and metonymical extensions have been mentioned in terms of Japanese mimetics.

Metaphor is a domain-to-domain illustration, while metonymy is a within-domain extension. The two fictive types of semantic extension involve rather rich domains that contain inferred events in the past or future. Since all the metonymical fictive expressions are metonymical, so, all the metonymical expressions involve metaphorical illustrations between the auditory and the non-auditory domains. That is why we can call the fictive type of the metonymy "fictive metonymy" and the non-metonymical type of metaphor "only metaphor". Domains mostly correspond to "frames" in frame semantics [6, p.74].

As metonymical extension takes place between frame elements, it is quite obvious that noise mimetics metonymically shift their reference from sound to these various fragments of the frames they evoke. And the simple frame-semantic content of voice mimetics does not allow them to have the semantic flexibility.

To summarize, it should be mentioned that mimetic verbs exhibit a set of meaning-related properties that separates them from prosaic verbs. First, mimetic verbs show an extraordinary range of flexibility in their meaning, leading to polysemous situations. The nature of such meaning ranges from conventionalized

meaning on a par with that of prosaic verbs to innovative meaning that often relies on specific contextual information and pragmatic conventions for its proper interpretation. Second, related to the first point, mimetic verbs appear in a variety of argument structures as well as adjunct selections. Third, regular polysemy or systematic transfer of meaning that is commonly observed with prosaic verbs does not characterize the polysemous situation that emerges from mimetic verbs. And, finally, mimetic verbs do not follow the same lexicalization pattern as prosaic verbs, and manner incorporation in mimetic verbs is a natural consequence of the nature of mimetic bases upon which corresponding verbs are built.

The categorical status as verbs, by means of the morphological shape of the verb *する* *suru*, suggests that mimetic verbs denote states, events, or processes; and the images are conceptualized states, events, or processes in semantic frames or scenes [2, p.750]. So, that is why frame semantics approach gives a lot of possibilities to analyze the way of functioning for Japanese mimetics, as well as, the right ways of conveying all the units during the process of their translation. It is obvious that one word can be in used for creating a positive or negative attitude to the situations or moments in the life. Such an approach is meant for the mimetics semantic analysis and its further realization in the text according to the extralinguistic information. Sound symbolic frame cannot be realized in “parts”, it will be always an integral part that gives an opportunity to create belles-lettres, as well as, a great chance to the translator to depict the reality.

The image of a mimetic base serves as the most salient part of a profiled scene. The relation between the image of a mimetic base and a semantic frame in which the image is conceptualized is actually not constrained, resulting in a wide range of possible interpretations including innovative meaning that requires metaphorical extension or a high degree of contextual information. Furthermore, the image of a mimetic base seems to contribute its descriptive function to a given semantic frame. That is, the range of semantic frames in which an image is conceptualized and the range of semantic frames in which another image is conceptualized do not need to pattern in a parallel way.

## References

1. Akita, Kimi. 2012. “Toward a Frame-Semantic Definition of Sound-Symbolic Words: A Collocational Analysis of Japanese Mimetics”. *Cognitive Linguistics* 23.67–90.
2. Apresjan, J. D. 1974. “Regular Polysemy”. *Linguistics* 142.5–32. Aronoff, Mark. 1980. “Contextuals”. *Language* 56.744–758.
3. Chang, Andrew C. 1991. *A Thesaurus of Japanese Mimesis and Onomatopoeia: Usage by Categories*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
4. Clark, Eve & Herbert Clark. 1979. “When Nouns Surface as Verbs”. *Language* 55.767–811. Croft, William. 2009. “Connecting Frames and Constructions”. *Constructions and Frames* 1.7–28.
5. Fillmore, Charles. 1977a. “Topics in Lexical Semantics”. *Current Issues in Linguistics Theory* ed. by Peter Cole, 76–138. Bloomington: Indiana

- University Press.
6. Fillmore, Charles. 1977b. "The Case for Case Reopened". *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 8 ed. by Peter Cole & Jerrold Sadock, 59–81. New York: Academic Press.
  7. Goldberg, Adele. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
  7. Goldberg, Adele. 2010. "Verbs, Constructions, and Semantic Frames". *Syntax, Lexical Semantics and Event Structure* ed. by Malka Rappaport Hovav, Edit Doron & Ivy Sichel, 39–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  8. Hamano, Shoko. 1998. *The Sound-Symbolic System of Japanese*. Stanford: CSLI.
  9. Kageyama, Taro. 2007. "Explorations in the Conceptual Semantics of Mimetic Verbs". *Current Issues in the History and Structures of Japanese* ed. by Bijarke Frellesvig, Masayoshi Shibatani & John Charles Smith, 27–82. Tokyo: Kurosio.
  10. Kakehi, Hisao, Ikuhiro Tamori & Lawrence C. Schourup. 1996. *Trends in Linguistics. Dictionary of Iconic Expressions* Akita, Kimi. 2012. "Toward a Frame-Semantic Definition of Sound-Symbolic Words: A Collocational Analysis of Japanese Mimetics". *Cognitive Linguistics* 23. – 67–90.
  11. Kita, Sotaro. 1997. "Two-Dimensional Analysis of Japanese Mimetics". *Linguistics* 35.379–415.
  11. Lehrer, Adrienne. 1978. "Structures of the Lexicon and Transfer of Meaning". *Lingua* 45.95–123.
  11. Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  12. Murakami Haruki. *Nejimaki tori kuronikuru/ H. Murakami*. - Tokyo: Shinkosha, 1994. – 312 p.
  13. Rappaport Hovav, Malka & Beth Levin. 1998. "Building Verb Meanings". *The Projection of Arguments* ed. by Miriam Butt & Wilhelm Geuder, 97–134. Stanford: CSLI.
  14. Tsujimura, Natsuko. 2005. "A Constructional Approach to Mimetic Verbs". *Grammatical Constructions: Back to the Roots* ed. by Mirjam Fried & Hans C. Boas, 137–154. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.