

MIMETIC VERBS IN JAPANESE AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THEM

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. There will be also represented a brief research on the core of frame semantics and construction grammar; and showed lexical semantic properties of mimetic verbs.

Key words: *mimetic verbs, polysemy, frame semantics, construction grammar.*

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].

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 cross-linguistic. 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].

This paper is focused on the verb form of mimetic words, and demonstrates that mimetic verbs display a set of properties different from that of non-mimetic lexical verbs or "prosaic" verbs. Mimetic verbs are most commonly constructed by suffixing the light verb する(suru) to a mimetic base. For example, きちんとする(kichinto suru) "do properly", and わくわくする(wakuwaku suru) "be excited" and many more.

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.

Analyzing “The Wind – Up Bird Chronicle” by Haruki Murakami translated by Jay Rubin, there was sorted out one mimetic verb, for example, きちんとする (kichinto suru) “do something properly” [3]. The mimetic dictionary lists the definition as the following:

- (1) The placement of things, Ex.: the neatly-set dinner table;
- (2) Evaluation of something, Ex.: decent pay, a fine wife/husband;
- (3) In terms of etiquette, Ex.: proper clothing, a proper greeting.

In his translation Jay Rubin shows the variety of ways to interpret mimetic word きちんとする (kichinto suru) according to the context of the story presented in “The Wind – Up Bird Chronicle” by Haruki Murakami. Examples with the mimetic verb きちんとする (kichinto suru) are the following:

1. 一つ一つ番号を数えながら、きちんと順序どおりにアイロンをかけていく。
...the order **is invariable**, and I count off each stage to myself
2. いつでも料理にかかれるように野菜も大皿にきちんと切り分けてあった。
...and the vegetables were all sliced and **arranged in separate piles** in a large dish...
3. 一週間丸々続いたり、きちんと規則正しくやってきたり
Some were finished in three days, other took over a week, some were **regular**...
4. きちんと背広を着て、きちんとネクタイを締め、きちんと黒い靴をはいていた。
...to these men, all of whom were **properly dressed** in suits and ties and black shoes.
5. そのことをきちんと知りたい
...we want to **know for sure**
6. 両足がきちんとそこに揃えられていた。
...they were **in perfect alignment**.

7. 彼女は電話ではきちんとした普通の方をした。
...she turned into a **very proper** young woman

In most of the cases in all the examples provided above, Jay Rubin reflects the conventional meaning of mimetic word *きちんとする* (*kichinto suru*) by using such adjectives as *proper* and *regular*, as well as, *perfect* in (3), (6) and (7). The rest of the examples demonstrate various degrees of departure from the definition in (1) and (2). The mimetic verb *きちんとする* (*kichinto suru*) used in (5) is defined specifically in this particular context as having a strong wish to know something for sure, based on some particular reasons and causes. Also, the mimetic verb in (4) refers to a caused motion with an exact and concrete set of specific manners and purposes; it is worth mentioning the way Jay Rubin's avoiding Murakami's tautology with the mimetic *きちんと* (*kichinto*), by replacing it with the linking word «*and*» after the listed nouns. One more brilliant example to convey the meaning of mimetic verb is (1), in this context mimetic *きちんと* (*kichinto*) was translated by means of adjective *invariable* which is contrastive to the conventional one.

All the examples show that mimetic verbs receive a wide range of interpretations, from a conventionalized meaning to an innovative and creative sense that often relies on pragmatic conventions for a specific interpretation. This aspect of meaning that mimetic verbs have is shared by innovative verbs in Japanese, and many of the English denominal verbs to contextuals.

The second property of mimetic verbs that differs from prosaic verbs has to do with as transfer of meaning or regular polysemy and demonstrates, members of a semantically coherent set of verbs behave uniformly in their extension of meaning leading to polysemy which has long been unexplored fields in the study of mimetics. Moreover, the semantic flexibility of the words has been generally recognized by such researchers as Kakehi, Kita, Takeda and many others. Until recently, not so many theoretical attempts have been made for analyzing its peculiarities in detail [10, p.80].

In English, for example, a change-of-state verb, *bake* as in *bake a potato*, has another meaning as a creation verb, as in *bake a pie*. This semantic extension from change of state to creation also applies to other members of change-of-state verbs like *carve* and *sew* [13, p.100]. The same situation holds for prosaic verbs in Japanese, between change-of-state verbs and creation verbs parallel to English.

If there is a set of words that have semantic relationships in a semantic field (where such relationships are described in terms of synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, etc.), and if one or more items pattern in another semantic field, then the other items in the first field are available for extension to the second semantic field. Perceived similarity is not necessary [7, p.42].

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 the 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 すゑ 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.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Akita, Kimi. Toward a Frame-Semantic Definition of Sound-Symbolic Words: A Collocational Analysis of Japanese Mimetics / Akita Kimi // *Cognitive Linguistics*, 2012. – № 23. – P. 67-90
2. Apresjan, J. D. Regular Polysemy / Apresjan J. D // *Linguistics*, 1974. – №142. – P. 5-32
3. Aronoff, Mark. Contextuals / Aronoff Mark // *Language*, 1980. – № 56. – P. 744-758
4. Chang, Andrew C. A Thesaurus of Japanese Mimesis and Onomatopoeia: Usage by Categories / Chang, Andrew C. – Tokyo: Taishukan, 1991

5. 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.
6. Fillmore, Charles. 1977a. "Topics in Lexical Semantics". *Current Issues in Linguistics Theory* ed. by Peter Cole, 76–138. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
7. 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. Goldberg, Adele. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
8. 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.
9. Hamano, Shoko. 1998. *The Sound-Symbolic System of Japanese*. Stanford: CSLI.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. Kita, Sotaro. 1997. "Two-Dimensional Analysis of Japanese Mimetics". *Linguistics* 35.379–415. Lehrer, Adrienne. 1978. "Structures of the Lexicon and Transfer of Meaning". *Lingua* 45.95–123. Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Murakami Haruki. Nejimaki tori kuronikuru/ H. Murakami. – Tokyo: Shinkosha, 1994. – 312 p.
14. Rappaport Hovav, Malka & Beth Levin. 1998. "Building Verb Meanings". *The Projection of Arguments* ed. by Miriam Butt & Wilhelm Geuder, 97–134. Stanford: CSLI.
15. 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.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 29.03.17 р.

Д. Ржевська, викладач

Національний авіаційний університет, Київ

ОДИНИЦІ ОНОМАТОПОЕТИЧНОЇ ЛЕКСИКИ В ЯПОНСЬКІЙ МОВІ ТА ЇХНІ СЕМАНТИЧНІ ВІДМІННОСТІ

У статті визначено низку лексико-семантичних відмінностей в японській мові між дієсловами-ономатопеями та звичайними дієсловами, а також наголошено, що значення дієслова-ономатопеї потребує іншого, більш детального підходу при перекладі. Запропоновано коротке дослідження у керунок пошуку методів визначення фреймових моделей та продемонстровано лексико-семантичні особливості дієслів-ономатопей.

Ключові слова: *дієслова-ономатопеї, полісемія, фреймова семантика, граматики конструкцій.*

ЕДИНИЦЫ ОНОМАТОПОЭТИЧЕСКОЙ ЛЕКСИКИ В ЯПОНСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ И ИХ СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ РАЗЛИЧИЯ

В статье определены некоторые лексико-семантические отличия в японском языке между глаголами-ономатопеями и обыкновенными глаголами, а также продемонстрировано, что значение глагола-ономатопеи требует иного, более детализированного подхода при переводе. Предложено краткое исследование относительно поиска методов определения фреймовых моделей, а также продемонстрировано лексико-семантические особенности глаголов-ономатопей.

Ключевые слова: *глаголы-ономатопеи, полисемия, фреймовая семантика, грамматика конструкций.*

УДК 1751'81'1 / 4

І. Рябоволенко, к. філол. н., старший викладач
Державний університет інфраструктури та технологій
Інститут водного транспорту

РИТМІКА ТА ПАУЗАЦІЯ ВИСЛОВЛЮВАНЬ РОЗПОРЯДЖЕНЬ ТА НАКАЗІВ У ЯПОНСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Проведено компаративний аналіз лінгвістичних доробків різних лінгвістів щодо понять інтонації в японській мові, а також поняття мелодійності, музичного наголосу, інтенсивності висловлювання. Запропоновано висновки на основі експериментальних порівняльних досліджень просодичних параметрів трьох типів операторів: команди, накази і розпорядження; визначено особливості ритму.

Ключові слова: *японська мова, інтонація, наголос, ритм.*

Розглядаючи різні аспекти комунікації в сучасній японській мові, ми звернули увагу на те, що акт комунікації часто підміняють поняттям писемної форми мовлення. Історично склалося, що дослідники приділяли увагу в першу чергу писемному тексту, а не усному мовленню. Уваги до звукової форми японської мови, інтонації, ритміки, тонового різнобарв'я приділялося дуже мало. У нашому дослідженні ми проаналізуємо лінгвістичний доробок сучасних учених щодо понять *інтонація, тонізація і тоновий акцент*. Мета дослідження – звернути увагу українських японістів на фонетичну складову сучасної японської мови, яка мало досліджена та проаналізована, й відповідно висвітлити практичні шаблони застосування японської інтонації, музичного наголосу як засобів підвищення ефективності комунікації.

В одному з японських розмовників натрапляємо на такий вислів: «Японські слова та фрази вимовляються рівним тоном. Замість наголосу використовується підйом тону голосу, який необхідний для відповідного членування фрази» [17]. Таке твердження не лише вводить в оману, а й не є коректним. Співзвучно цьому: «Японське мовлення достатньо монотонне. Потрібно вимовляти японські фрази рівним голосом, без наголосів, роблячи паузи між словами» [17]. В інших навчальних посібниках немає жодного слова про інтонаційні особливості японської мови, хоча там існує розділ