

# When Talmy's Typology Meets Peculiar Mimetics in Japanese

Takeshi Usuki  
Fukuoka University

Talmy (2000) proposes that languages can be divided into S(atellite)-framed languages and V(erb)-framed languages depending on where a language characteristically encodes path. Talmy's typology is influential partly because it can explain the parallelism between Motion Constructions (MC) and Resultative Constructions (RC). Ono (2010), however, shows that based on the English examples in (1) and *-sase* constructions in Japanese, the Rout-Path Compensation (RPC) is only available for MC, and argues that the putative parallelism between MC and RC do not exist. According to Ono (2010), the two-way typology is not relevant, and the surface typology falls out from general constraints on how manner and path may be encoded together with lexical resources of particular languages, which is called "*a lexical resource view*" (cf. Beavers et. al. 2010).

- (1) a. John walked in the store. (cf. John walked into the store.)  
b. \*John pounded the metal in pieces. (cf. John pounded the metal to/ into pieces.)

In this paper, I will show that Ono's (2010) argument based on the examples (1) is inadequate, and argue that the parallelism between MC and RC in fact exists. Furthermore, I will present new data employing peculiar mimetics in Japanese to show the parallelism between MC and RC, and develop a Manner Incorporation (MI) theory based on "*an event extension view*" (cf. Harley 2010).

First, a careful investigation of verb classes reveals that Ono's (2010) argument based on the examples (1) is inadequate, and the parallelism between MC and RC exists as depicted in (2). I also argue that the applicability of RPC in MC in Japanese is not a feature of MC but depends on other factors.

- (2) a. \*John laughed in the store. (cf. John walked in/ into the store.)  
b. \*John pounded the metal in pieces. (cf. John broke the stick in/ into pieces.)

Secondly, I present new data to show another parallelism between MC and RC, where the event is coercively restructured to have a path [<sub>dir</sub>-WARD [<sub>path</sub> TO...]] by the introduction of the path-oriented mimetics (e.g. *tobotobo*, *sutasuta*, *tekuteku*) in (3a) and the result-oriented mimetics (e.g. *bokoboko*, *pikapika*, *dorodoro*) in (3b). The ungrammaticality of mimetic verb constructions shows that these mimetics actually trigger a path in the event structure (e.g. *\*tobotobo-suru*/*\*bokoboko-suru*) (cf. Akita 2009), and an aspectual test ensures that [<sub>dir</sub>-WARD [<sub>path</sub> TO...]] is encoded in the Lexical Conceptual Structure(LCS) of verbs.

- (3) a. ?Takuya-wa eki-ni tobotobo(-to) arui-ta.  
Takuya-Top station-Ni <path-oriented m.> walk-Past  
'Takuya walked to the station in a manner of trudging.'  
(cf. \*Takuya-wa eki-ni arui-ta.)  
b. ?Luffy-wa Teach-o bokoboko-ni nagut-ta.  
Luffy-Top Teach-Acc <result-oriented m.> beat-Past  
'Luffy beat up Teach.'  
(cf. \*Luffy-wa Teach-o hangoroshi-ni nagut-ta.)

Based on the examples in (3), it is clear that these examples cannot be explained in "*a lexical resource*

*view*” since their analysis fails to treat the pattern where a manner is expressed by a verb and a path is expressed by an adverb (Beavers et. al.: 43). I argue that the data in (3) are following Talmy’s typology since the meaning of *-ni* is underspecified in Japanese and the path must be encoded in a verb. Therefore, I assume that these examples are theoretically consistent with a V-framed property. Following Tada’s (2010) proposal, I assume that the roots of mimetics lack semantic information, and the mimetics coercively get proper meanings through the interface between the phonological form and the semantic form after the spell-out (cf. Marantz 2006), and that in these examples RPC to LCS of the verb is possible because of the coercion of peculiar mimetics (cf. Jackendoff 1997, Pustejovsky 1995).

As a consequence, the peculiar nature of mimetics in Japanese sheds a new light on “*an event extension view*.” Harley (2010) proposes that Talmy’s typology can be explained depending on whether MI is an available option in a particular language. Adopting the coercively created interface between the phonological form and the semantic form, we can give a theoretical explanation for MI. I propose that the MI to  $v^0$  is derived by coercion, and I will show a piece of evidence employing double object constructions with denominal verbs in English (e.g. *e-mail*, *FedEx*), in which denominal verbs are freely exempted for a phonological restriction on double object constructions (Pinker 1989). Moreover, taking a step further from Harley’s MI strategy, I propose that Talmy’s typology can be reduced to the timing of MI across languages based on Usuki (2007).

Finally, adopting “*an event extension view*”, we can also give a theoretical explanation for the Lexical Iconicity Hierarchy (LIH) in Akita (2009). Specifically, language variations described in LIH are determined by the timing of MI in a particular language, which eventually leads to the conclusion that “*an event extension view*” has both theoretical and empirical advantages over “*a lexical resource view*.”

#### References

- Akita, K. 2009. A Grammar of Sound-Symbolic Words in Japanese: Theoretical Approaches to Iconic and Lexical Properties of Mimetics. PhD. Dissertation, Kobe University.
- Beavers, J., Levin, B. and T. Shiao Wei. 2010. The typology of motion expressions revisited. *Journal of Linguistics* 46.
- Harley, H. 2010. “The syntax and argument structure of motion constructions in English”, handout presented at MLF 2010, National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics, Tokyo.
- Jackendoff, R. 1997. *The Architecture of the Language Faculty*. Cambridge, Mass.:MIT Press.
- Marantz, A. 2006. Phases and words, unpublished ms, NYU.
- Ono, N. 2010. A Lexical Resource View of Motion and Resultative Constructions, a talk at MLF 2010, National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics, Tokyo.
- Pinker, S. 1989. *Learnability and Cognition: The Acquisition of Argument Structure*, Cambridge, Mass.:MIT Press.
- Pustejovsky, J. 1995. *The Generative Lexicon*. Cambridge, Mass.:MIT Press.
- Tada, H. 2010. Gitaigodoshi-niokeru <chikaku • zokusei> koutai-no tokuisei-nituite (On the Peculiarity of the Cognition–Property Conversion in Mimetic Verbs), the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Fukuoka University Linguistic Colloquium, handout presented at Fukuoka University.
- Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. vol. 1: Concept Structuring Systems. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Usuki, T. 2007. Manner Conflation in  $v/\sqrt{\text{Root}}$  Partition, In *Journal of the Graduate School of Fukuoka University*, 1-30. Fukuoka University.