Syntax of Japanese Predicative Ideophones

KOJI KAWAHARA
Nagoya University of Foreign Studies

1 Introduction

Japanese, as well as Korean, is known to have a rich system of ideophones, which lexical items are somehow associated with sound symbolism (Akita, 2009; Akita and Dingemanse, 2019; Akita and Pardeshi, 2019; Dingemanse, 2018). Adverbial uses are the most abundant, but predicative uses are also available in Japanese ideophones. This paper shows that predicative ideophones denote an event or a state with an optional thematic argument. An agentive argument is also possible, but it is licensed by a light verb adjoined to ideophones. The light verb can also attach to a verbal noun in so-called light verb constructions (LVCs). The purpose of this paper is to argue that predicative ideophones are derivable from a nominal ideophone available for adjectival use with so-called adjectival verb (*keiyoo dosi*) in Japanese. This paper notes that the anti-iconiciy constraint on predicative ideophones that states that iconic ideophones cannot be used for predicatives (Akita, 2009) is because ideophones that are too iconic cannot denote an event or a state. The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 discusses the status of the light verb in LVCs. Section 3 overviews the properties of predicative ideophones, providing a syntactic account for predicative ideophones. Finally, section 4 mentions the anti-iconicity constraint and concludes this paper.

2   Light Verb Constructions

Japanese has an option to build LVCs, where the semantically light verb *-suru* 'do' takes a verbal noun as its complement (Miyagawa, 1989; Tsujimura, 1990; Hasegawa, 1991; Kageyama, 1993; Grimshaw and Mester, 1988; Saito and Hoshi, 2000; Ishii, 2009; Kishimoto, 2019). An action-denoting noun can be followed by a case particle as shown in (1a), in which the verb *-suru* is regarded as a heavy verb that takes a nominal complement. Some nominals such as *keikoku* 'warning' or *tiryoo* 'treatment' are ambiguous between a verbal noun and an action or normal noun. In the case of verbal nouns, only the light verb *-suru* is available, and the accusative case particle *-o* must be omitted.

(1)   a.   Keisatu-ga   keikoku(-o)   sita
              police-NOM warning-ACC did

              '(Lit.) The police did warning.'

       b.   Teki-ga   tosi-o   hakai(*-o)   sita.
              enemy-NOM city-ACC destroy-ACC did

              '(Lit.) The enemy did destroying the city.'

An important issue about LVCs is the status of *-suru*, whether it has a Θ role or semantically vacuous, whereby its function is to satisfy a syntactic requirement such as the supporting *do* in English. Some influential views about the status of *-suru* are summarized below:

(2)   a.   *-suru* does not assign a Θ role (Grimshaw and Mester, 1988; Kageyama, 1993; Saito and Hoshi, 2000; Ishii, 2009).
       b.   -suru assigns a Θ role (Hasegawa, 1991; Kishimoto, 2019)

LVCs have received much attention in syntactic literature because of their PF-LF mismatch; a case-assigner is a lexical item at T or *-suru*, but a Θ assigner is a verbal noun within a noun phrase. In (1), the agentive subjects *Keisatu-ga* and *Teki-ga* are assigned their case in TP, but each receives an agentive Θ role within the verbal nouns *keikoku* and *hakai*, respectively. An influential analysis to provide an explanation for this mismatch is by Grimshaw and Mester's (1988) argument transfer analysis. According to this theory, Θ roles are included in verbal nouns, and they are transferred to the light verb *-suru*, which is semantically vacuous.

(3)   *hakai* 'destroy' (Agent, Theme) + *-suru* (   ) ⇒ *hakai -suru* (Agent, Theme)

Therefore, the Θ roles are assigned to the arguments by the light verb *-suru* after argument transfer.

The argument transfer analysis is somehow 'translated' into a better theory based on an independent syntactic mechanism. Assuming that there are two kinds of syntactic operations, (overt and covert,) Saito and Hoshi (2000) propose an LF incorporation analysis, where a verbal noun is covertly incorporated into the light verb *-suru*. Under the analysis, the incorporated structures

for (1) will be as follows, where the amalgam of the verb phrases can assign their Θ roles within a sentential projection.

(4)   a.   Keisatu-ga [$_{NP}$ keikoku] sita ⇒ Keisatu-ga [$_{NP}$ t_i] keikoku$_i$-sita

     b.   Teki-ga tosi-o [$_{NP}$ hakai] sita ⇒ Teki-ga tosi-o [$_{NP}$ t_i] hakai$_i$-sita

The most productive form of predicative ideophones is also made by -*suru*. A natural question is how similar the structure of LVCs is to that of predicative ideophones. Specifically, it is necessary to provide an explanation for what role -*suru* plays and what is the argument structure of predicative ideophones. In the next section, I will address these problems.

3   Ideophones

According to Doke (1935: 118), an *ideophone* is 'a vivid representation of an idea in sound. A word, often onomatopoetic, which describes a predicate, qualificative or adverb in respect to manner, colour, sound, smell, action, state or intensity.' Japanese is known to have a rich system of ideophones, and categorically, most of them are adverbials, but other uses are also available. The next subsection introduces the basic properties of predicative ideophones.

3.1   Predicative Ideophones

I adopt the word *ideophone* because the word *onomatopoeia* is basically limited to words that mimic sounds. According to Kindaichi (1978); Akita (2009), Japanese has four types of ideophones:

(5)   i.   *Giseigo* (phonomime): Ideophone/onomatopoeia that mimics a human or animal vocalization. (e.g., *wanwan* (a dog's barking) or *nyaanyaa* (a cat's miaow).)

    ii.   *Giongo* (phonomime): Ideophone/onomatopoeia that mimics natural noises by inanimate objects (e.g., *dondon* (hitting something) or *gorogoro* (thunder's flushing).)

    iii.   *Gitaigo* (non-phonomime/phenomime): Ideophones that describe states or motion (e.g., *kankan* (the sun blazing) or *tekipaki* (briskly, actively).)

    iv.   *Gizyoogo* (non-phonomime/phenomime): Ideophones that describe psychological states (e.g., *yakimoki* (anxiously) or *bikubiku* (scared))

Almost all ideophones can be used as adverbs. Many of them can compose predicates. The most productive form of predicative ideophones is accompanied by -*suru* as shown below:

(6) a. * Bera-ga   *wanwan*-sita.
       Bella-NOM IDEO-did

       '(Intended) Bella did the act of *wanwan*.'

  b. Taroo-ga doa-o   *dondon*-sita.
       Taro-NOM door-ACC IDEO-did

       '(Lit.) Taro did the act of *dondon* (hit) the door.'

  c. Hada-ga   *subesube*-suru.
       skin-NOM IDEO-do
       '(Lit.) My skin does the state of *subesube* (smooth).'

  d. Hanako-ga   *burabura*-sita.
       Hanako-NOM IDEO-did

       '(Lit.) Hanako did the act of *burabura* (strolled).'

Giseigo is basically not available for predicative uses as shown in (5a). Example (5b) is a type of accusative predicate in that there are two arguments involved: the agent and the theme. Both (5c) and (5d) are examples of intransitive verbs. The former is an unaccusative verb, because the argument is a theme, and the latter is an unergative verb, because the argument is an agent.

Kageyama (2007) suggests the following two types of predicative ideophones.

(7) Group A (Agent or Experiencer subjects)
  a. Ikka-no   aruzi-wa   mainiti *akuseku*-suru.
       home-GEN husband-TOP everyday IDEO-do

       'The husband works hard every day.' (activity verbs)

  b. Hahaoya-ga akatyan-no senaka-o *tonton*-suru.
       mother-NOM baby-GEN   back-ACC IDEO-do

       'Mother taps her baby on the back.' (impact verbs)

  c. Ryokoosya-ga kankooti-o   *urouro*-suru.
       tourist-NOM   sightseeing.resort-ACC IDEO-do

       'Tourists wander about in the sightseeing resort.' (manner-of-motion verbs)

  d. Watasi-wa siken-no   kekka-ni *gakkari*-sita.
       I-TOP   exam-DAT result-DAT IDEO-do

       'I was disappointed at the result of the exam.' (psychological verbs)

(8) Group B (Theme subjects)

    a.   Atama-ga *zukizuki*-suru.
            head-NOM IDEO-do

        'My head throbs with pain.' (physiological verbs)

    b.   Suwaru-to, isu-ga   *guragura*-suru.
            sit.on-if   chair-NOM IDEO-do

        'The chair wobbles if I sit on in.' (physical perception verbs)

    c.   Suupu-no azi-ga   *assari*-site-iru.
            soup-GEN taste-NOM IDEO-do-be

        'The taste of this soup is light.' (characterising predication)

The purpose of this paper is to show that there are two lexical entries available for *-suru*; one is for Group A and the other is for Group B.

3.2   The Structure of Predicative Ideophones

In this subsection, I show that *-suru* in predicative ideophones is lexically independent of ideophones and that raising or incorporating ideophones into *-suru* is not involved. Under the assumption that a verb overtly raises to T in Japanese, Miyagawa (2001) points out that *sae* prohibits the raising of a verb, but *-suru* can induce the *do*-support effect. Example (9b) is ungrammatical, because the focus particle hinders the raising of *semeru* to T. This problem is rescued by the *-suru* support in (9c), where the light verb *-suru* occupies T-head.

(9) a.   Taroo-ga   sensei-o   semeta.
          Taro-NOM teacher-ACC criticized

          'Taro criticized his teacher.'

      b.   * Taroo-ga   sensei-o   seme-sae-ta.
             Taro-NOM teacher-ACC criticize-FOC-PAST

            'Taro criticized his teacher.'

      c.   Taroo-ga   sensei-o   seme-sae-sita.
             Taro-NOM teacher-ACC criticize-FOC-did

            'Taro criticized his teacher.'

Following Miyagawa's (2001) analysis, Ishii (2009) argues that the *-suru*-support effect can be found in LVCs. If incorporation did happen in (10), the raising of *ryakudatu* 'plunder' would be blocked by the intervening focus particle, contrary to fact.

(10)   Taroo-ga   Hanako-kara hooseki-no ryakudatu-sae-sita.
        Taro-NOM Hanako-from jewel-GEN plunder-FOC-did

        'Taro plundered jewels from Hanako.'

In predicative ideophones, the focus particle can intervene between an ideophone and *-suru*, which indicates that the raising or incorporation of ideophones is not involved and that an ideophone and *-suru* is morphologically separated.

(11) a. Taroo-ga doa-o *dondon*-sae-sita.
Taro-NOM door-ACC IDEO-even-did

'(Lit.) Taro even did the act of *dondon* (hit) the door.'

b. Hada-ga *subesube*-sae-suru.
skin-NOM IDEO-even-do
'(Lit.) My skin even does the sate of *subesube* (smooth).'

c. Hanako-ga *burabura*-sae-sita.
Hanako-NOM IDEO-even-did

'(Lit.) Hanako even did the act of *burabura* (strolled).'

Since *-suru* is an independent lexical item, *-simasu* (the polite form of *suru*) can stand alone as a response to a question.

(12) a. Taroo-ga doa-o *dondon*-simasita ka? Hai, simasita.
Taro-NOM door-ACC IDEO-did Q yes did

'(Lit.) Did Taro do the act of *dondon* (hit) the door?' 'Yes, he did.'

b. Hada-ga *subesube*-simasu ka? Hai, simasu.
skin-NOM IDEO-do Q yes do

'(Lit.) Does your skin do the state of *subesube* (smooth).' 'Yes, it is.'

c. Hanako-ga *burabura*-simasita ka? Hai, simasita.
Hanako-NOM IDEO-did Q yes did

'(Lit.) Did Hanako do the act of *burabura* (strolled)?' 'Yes, she did.'

The examples above indicate that *-suru* is morphologically independent of ideophones, but *-suru* is not a heavy verb in the sense that it can be replaced by a usual, lexical verb. The examples below show that *-suru* cannot be replaced by another lexical verb. Unlike some LVCs, the accusative case marker *-o* cannot be attached to an ideophone either.

(13) a. * Taroo-ga doa-no *dondon*-o {sita, zissisita}.
Taro-NOM door-NOM IDEO-ACC {did, carried.out}

'(Lit.) Taro {did, carried out} the act of *dondon* (hit) the door.'

b. * Hada-ga *subesube*-o {suru, zissisuru}.
skin-NOM IDEO-ACC do, carry.out}

'(Lit.) My skin {is, carries out} the state of *subesube* (smooth).'

    c.   * Hanako-ga   *burabura*-o {sita, zissisita}.
          Hanako-NOM IDEO-ACC {did, carried.out}
          'Hanako {did, carried out} the act of *burabura* (strolled).'

The conjunction is also a good diagnostic to show that an ideophone and -*suru* are separated and that the raising of ideophones is not relevant here. Fukui and Sakai (2003) showed that an across-the-board movement of different elements into a single landing site is prohibited. The ungrammaticality of (14) is a good example.

(14)   * Taroo-ga kotosi-no   natu   [Amerika-ni t_i-mo]
         Taro-NOM this.year-GEN summer America-to also
         [Doitu-ni t_j-mo] ryokoo$_i$-ryuugaku$_j$-sita.
         Germany-to also   travel-study.abroad-did

         '(Intended) This summer, Taro did [a travel to America and a study abroad in Germany].'

As Fukui and Sakai (2003) claimed, the grammaticality of the LVCs in (15) is because no incorporation is involved in the constructions. Since the constituents of an argument and a verbal noun are connected by either the connective particle -*to* or -*mo*, the grammaticality indicates that the coordination in question is established during derivation irrespective of the incorporation of verbal nouns.

(15)   a.   Taroo-ga kotosi-no   natu   [Amerika-ni ryokoo]-to
              Taro-NOM this.year-GEN summer America-to travel-CON
              [Doitu-ni   ryuugaku](-to)-o   sita.
              Germany-to study.abroad-CON-ACC did

              '(Intended) This summer, Taro did [a travel to America and a study abroad in Germany].'

      b.   Taroo-ga kotosi-no   natu   [Amerika-ni ryokoo]-mo
              Taro-NOM this.year-GEN summer America-to travel-also
              [Doitu-ni   ryuugaku]mo   sita.
              Germany-to study.abroad-alsoACC did

              '(Intended) This summer, Taro did [a travel to America and a study abroad in Germany].'

If incorporation were involved in predicative ideophones, it would be expected that coordination should be impossible, contrary to fact. The grammaticality of the following example indicates that incorporation is not relevant in predicative ideophones.

(16)   Atama-ga *gangan*-to ha-ga   *zukizuki*-suru.
       head-NOM IDEO-and tooth-NOM IDEO-do

       '(Lit.) My head is *gangan* and my tooth is *zukizuki* (throb with pain).'

Deletion of ideophones is possible in coordinated structures. If so-called LF incorporation is adopted after the syntactic derivation, deletion would not be expected under the PF deletion hypothesis (Merchant, 2001). Since the target of ellipsis is limited to ideophones, it is not expected that an ideophone and -*suru* are a constituent at LF either.

(17) a. Taroo-ga doa-o *dondon*-si, Hanako-wa tukue-o
     Taro-NOM door-ACC IDEO-and Hanako-TOP desk-ACC
     ~~*dondon*~~-sita.
     IDEO-did

     '(Lit.) Taro did the act of *dondon* door (hit) and Hanako did the act desk.'

  b. Hada-ga *turuturu*-suru si atama-mo ~~*turuturu*~~-suru.
     skin-NOM IDEO-do head-also IDEO-do

     '(Lit.) My skin does the state of *turuturu* (smooth) and my head is too.'

  c. Hanako-ga *burabura*-si, Taroo-mo ~~*burabura*~~-sita.
     Hanako-NOM IDEO-and Taro-also IDEO-did.

     '(Lit.) Hanako did the act of *burabura* (strolled) and Taro did too.'

To summarize, ideophones and the light verb -*suru* is syntactically independent and that raising or incorporating ideophones is not involved in predicative ideophones.

3.3 Proposal

I have shown that LF incorporation analysis is not valid and that the structural properties of predicative ideophones are parallel to those of LVCs. Following the analysis of LVCs by Kishimoto (2019), I argue that there are two lexical entries available for -*suru*; one that can assign an agent or experiencer Θ role, and the other is semantically vacuous. The first one is used for Group A in (7), and the second one is used for Group B in (8). Note also that a thematic argument can be taken by ideophones.

(18) a. -*suru* <agent, (theme)>
  b. -*suru* <(theme)>

Under the proposed analysis, a thematic argument is base-generated within an ideophone phrase and then it moves out of it. The schematic structures for the grammatical examples in (6) will be as follows:

(19) a. $[_{TP}$ Agent $[_{ideo}$ Theme *dondon*]-suru] $\Rightarrow$ $[_{TP}$ Agent Theme$_i$ $[_{ideo}$ ~~Theme$_i$~~ *dondon*]-suru]
  b. $[_{TP}$ $[_{ideo}$ Theme *subesube*]-suru] $\Rightarrow$ $[_{TP}$ Theme$_i$ $[_{ideo}$ ~~Theme$_i$~~ *subesube*]-suru]
  c. $[_{TP}$ Agent $[_{ideo}$ *burabura*]-suru]

The structure of (19a) corresponds to that of accusative verbs, the structure of (19b) corresponds to that of unaccusative verbs and the structure of (19c) corresponds to that of unergative verbs. Based on the VP-shell analysis of verb phrases, Murasugi and Akita (2019) claimed that -*suru* can be either causative or non-causative. Causative -*suru* builds either accusative or unergative structures, and non-causative *suru* builds unaccusative structures. Since the treatment of arguments based on ideophone types is basically the same, it is safe to say that Murasugi and Akita's (2019) analysis and the present analysis reach the same conclusion.[1]

Another strategy for building predicative ideophones is to make use of the copular -*da* attached to verbal nouns that can be used adjectively.[2] Since an agentive Θ role is assigned by -*suru*, an agentive argument is not available for the predicative ideophones with the copular -*da*. The prediction is borne out as shown below.

(20) a. * Taroo-ga   doa-o   *dondon*-da.
          Taro-NOM door-ACC IDEO-be

          '(Lit.) Taro was *dondon* (hit) the door.'

      b.   Hada-ga   *subesube*-da.
           skin-NOM IDEO-be

           '(Lit.) My skin is *subesube* (smooth).'

      c. * Hanako-ga   *burabura*-da.
           Hanako-NOM IDEO-be

           'Hanako was *burabura* (strolled).'

In addition, the availability of the copula predicts that the 'unaccusative' ideophone can modify noun phrases in the pre-nominal position because both predicative and attributive uses are the characteristics of adjectives. The contrast below shows that the prediction is correct.

(21) a. * *dondon*-no doa, *dondon*-no Taroo
           IDEO-GEN door IDEO-GEN   Taro

           '*dondon* door, *dondon* Taro (sound)'

      b.   *subesube*-no hada
           IDEO-GEN skin

           '*subesube* skin (smooth).'

      c. * *burabura*-no Hanako
           IDEO-GEN Hanako

           '*burabura* Hanako (strolling).'

---

[1] I owe Keiko Murasugi and Kimi Akita for pointing this out and thank them for providing me with their handout.

[2] Adjectives in Japanese are divided into two major types: *i* adjectives that end with the *i* sound and *keiyoo dosi* 'adjectival verbs' that are categorical nouns and are supported by the pre-nominal particle -{*na, no*} and the copular -*da*.

In LVCs, the syntactic status of verbal nouns is somehow clear because of their morphological properties (e.g. verbal nouns can be expressed by Chinese characters (*Kanzi*)). In the present analysis, I treat the ideophonic part of predicative ideophones as a noun. The following examples indicate that ideophones that can be used as predicatives are syntactically nouns; thus, it is not necessary to hypothesize that ideophones can be verbs on their own.

(22) a. *Iraira*-ga {osae-rare-nai,   karukunaru}
   IDEO-NOM keep.down-can-NEG, calm

   '(Lit.) *Iraira* (irritated) {cannot be kept down, is calmed}'

  b. *Dokidoki*-ga {tomara-nai, tari-nai,   kanzi-rare-nai}
   IDEO-NOM {stop-NEG   enough-NEG feel-can-NEG

   '(Lit.) *Dokidoki* (thrilled) {cannot be stopped, is not enough, cannot be felt}.'

  c. *Wakuwaku*-ga {tomara-nai, sugokat-ta,   ippai}
   IDEO-NOM {stop-NEG   great-PAST full

   '(Lit.) *Wakuwaku* (excited) {cannot be stopped, was great, was full}.'

(23) a. *iraira*-suru
   IDEO-do

   'illitated'

  b. *dokidoki*-suru
   IDEO-do

   'thrilled'

  c. *wakuwaku*-suru
   IDEO-suru

   'excited'

However, it is very difficult to provide an overall generalization for predicative ideophones. First, as shown in (22) and (23), nominal uses of ideophones seem to be available for ideophones that are related to feelings and morphologically reduplicated forms. In fact, the nominal usage for the ideophones in (6) seems acceptable but they seem somehow like 'anacoluthons'.

(24) a. # Taroo-no doa-no   *dondon*-ga   urusai.
   Taro-GEN door-GEN IDEO-NOM noisy

   '(Lit.) Taro's door's *dondon* is noisy.'

  b. # Hada-no *subesube*-ga uresii.
   skin-GEN IDEO-NOM happy

   '(Lit.) My skin's *subesube* is good.'

  c. # Hanako-no   *burabura*-ga nagai.
   Hanako-NOM IDEO-NOM long

   'Hanako's *burabura* is long.'

This kind of unusual use of ideophones is quite frequent in commercial usage.[3] We can find many nominal uses of unusual ideophones but it is difficult to determine whether to treat them as grammatically possible examples. The eccentric usage of *i* adjectives can also be found in many TV commercials.

(25) a.   Kawaii-wa tuku-reru.
          pretty-TOP make-can

          'You can make yourself pretty.'

     b.   Kirei-ga   itiban.
          clean-NOM best

          'It's best to be clean.'

In addition, the accusative case particle *-o* is not possible for predicative ideophones, while many LVCs allow it as already shown in (1a).

(26) a. * Taroo-ga   doa-no   *dondon*-o   sita.
          Taro-NOM door-GEN IDEO-ACC did

          '(Lit.) Taro did *dondon* (hit) the door.'

     b. * Hada-ga   *subesube*-o suru.
          skin-NOM IDEO-ACC do

          '(Lit.) My skin does *subesube* (smooth).'

     c. * Hanako-ga   *burabura*-o sita.
          Hanako-NOM IDEO-ACC did

          'Hanako did *burabura* (strolled).'

The accusative case particle is not possible even for the ideophones that can be readily used as a noun as shown below:

(27) a. * Watasi-wa *iraira*(*-o) sita.
           I-TOP   IDEO-ACC did

           'I was *iraira* (irritated).'

     b. * Watasi-wa *dokidoki*(*-o) sita.
           I-TOP   IDEO-ACC   did

           'I was *dokidoki* (excited).'

     c. * Watasi-wa *wakuwaku*(*-o) sita.
           I-TOP   IDEO-ACC   did

           'I was *wakuwaku* (excited).'

Many non-reduplicated predicative ideophones can be found (Tamori and Schourup, 1999).

---

[3] I thank Jiyeon Park for pointing this out.

(28) a.   CVQ: *hotto*-suru 'relieved', **hotto*-da

b.   CVN: *syanto*-suru 'in shape, straight', **syanto*-da

c.   CVQCVri: *funwari*-suru 'soft', *funwari*-da

d.   CVNCVri: *bonyari*-suru 'aimlessly', **bonyari*-da

e.   CVCVQ: *sukatto*-suru 'refreshing', **sukatto*-da

f.   CVCVN: *garanto*-suru 'empty', **garanto*-da

g.   partly reduplicated: *dotabata*-suru 'romp around', ??*dotabata*-da

   As shown above, the most productive predicative ideophones are unergative types that take an agent argument except for (28c), where the predicative ideophone takes a thematic argument and thus an agentive argument is not relevant. Since the agentive Θ role is assigned by -*suru*, it is expected that the ideophones above cannot be attached to -*da* except for (28c). The prediction is borne out as shown on the right side. It has also been pointed out that adjectival uses of ideophones are possible if they take only a theme argument or they are unaccusative types. Therefore, except for (28c), all the examples in (28) cannot modify a noun as shown below:

(29) a.   * *hotto*-no   watasi
            IDEO-GEN I
            '(Lit.) relieved I'

b.   * *syanto*-no   watasi
            IDEO-GEN I
            '(Lit.) I in shape'

c.   *funwari*-no kami
            IDEO-GEN hair
            'the hairstyle that is *funwari* (soft)'

d.   * *bonyari*-no watasi
            IDEO-GEN I
            '(Lit.) aimlessly I'

e.   * *sukatto*-no watasi
            IDEO-GEN I
            '(Lit.) refreshing I'

f.   * *garanto*-no watasi
            IDEO-GEN I
            'empty I'

g.   * *dotabata*-no watasi
            IDEO-GEN   I
            '(Lit.) romping around I'

An unusual nominal usage is somehow possible for the ideophones in (28), but it is not clear whether they are grammatically possible or just a special metonymical usage or not.

(30) a. # *Hotto*-ga ii   ne.
          IDEO-NOM good P

     'To be relieved is good.'

     b. # *Syanto*-ga   nozomasii.
          IDEO-NOM desirable

     'Being in shape is desirable.'

     c. # *Guttari*-wa yoku-nai.
          IDEO-TOP good-NEG

     'Being exhausted is not good.'

     d. # *Funwari*-ga ii.
          IDEO-NOM good

     'Being soft is good.'

     e. # *Sukatto*-ga itiban.
          IDEO-NOM best

     'Being refreshing is the best.'

     f. # *Garanto*-wa iya-da.
          IDEO-TOP   disagreeable-COP

     'Being empty is disagreeable.'

     g. # *Dotabata*-ga komaru.
          IDEO-NOM   annoying

     'Romping around is annoying.'

I have shown that predicative ideophones denote an event or a state and can take a thematic argument depending on their lexical characters. It is safe to say that ideophones in predicative uses are syntactically nominals but they somehow resist case particles. Ideophones by themselves do not involve an agentive argument. Thus, an event expressed by ideophones is somehow incomplete, and an agent must be introduced by the light verb *-suru* during grammatical operations.

4   Conclusion

I have shown that predicative ideophones are possible if they denote an event or a state with an optional thematic argument. The most productive form of predicative ideophones is made by the light verb *-suru*, which can introduce an agentive argument. It must also be pointed out that predicative ideophones must somehow have a symbolic flavor because iconic or phonomime ideophones cannot denote an event or a state. Akita (2009) proposed an anti-iconicity constraint on predicative ideophones. According to the constraint,

iconic ideophones are not available for predicative uses. The ungrammaticality of the following examples is due to the fact that ideophones are too iconic.

(31) a. * Bera-ga   *wanwan*-sita.
           Bella-NOM IDEO-did

           '(Intended) Bella did the act of *wanwan*.'

      b. * Ame-ga   *zaazaa*-suru.
           rain-NOM IDEO-do

           '(Lit.) It does the act of raining *zaazaa*.'

According to the present analysis, the ideophone in the predicative position is categorically a noun that can also be used adjectively with the help of a particle. It is expected that iconic ideophones cannot modify a noun in the pre-nominal position either. The prediction is borne out as shown below:

(32) a. * *wanwan*-no inu
           IDEO-GEN   dog

           'a dog that barks *wanwan*'

      b. * *zaazaa*-no ame
           IDEO-GEN rain

           '*zaazaa* rain' (not a metonymical use meaning 'heavy')

The present paper implies that the ideophones in Japanese are categorically an adverb or a noun because adjectival usage is derived from nouns.

Acknowledgements

References

Akita, K. 2009. *A Grammar of Sound-Symbolic Words in Japanese*. Ph. D. thesis, Kobe University.

Akita, K. and M. Dingemanse 2019. Ideophones (mimetics, expressives). In M. Aronoff (Ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Akita, K. and P. Pardeshi 2019. *Ideophones, Mimetics and Expressives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dingemanse, M. 2018. Redrawing the margins of language: Lessons from research on ideophones. *Glossa 3*, 1–30.

Fukui, N. and H. Sakai 2003. Visibility guideline for functional categories: Verb raising in Japanese and related issues. *Lingua 113*, 321–375.

Grimshaw, J. and A. Mester 1988. Light verbs and θ -marking. *Linguistic Inquiry 19*(2), 205–232.

Hasegawa, N. 1991. On head movement in Japanese: The case of verbal nouns. In *Proceedings of SLS*, Volume 6, pp. 8–33.

Ishii, T. 2009. On PF-LF mismatch in the Japanese light verb construction. *Language and Linguistics 10*, 629–667.

Kageyama, T. 1993. *Grammar and Word Formation (*Bunpooto Gokeisei*)*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Kageyama, T. 2007. Explorations in the conceptual semantics of mimetic verbs. In B. Frellesvig, M. Shibatani, and J. C. Smith (Eds.), *Current Issues in the History and Structure of Japanese*, pp. 27–82. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publisher.

Kindaichi, H. 1978. *Giongo, Gitaigo Ziten (Mimetics dicitonary)*. Tokyo: Kadokawa.

Kishimoto, H. 2019. θ-role assignment in light verb constructions (*keidoosi koobunniokeru imiyakuwarifuyono mekanizumu*). In H. Kishimoto (Ed.), *Modern Theories of Lexicon and Their Applications (*Lekisikonno Gendairironto Sono Ooyoo*)*, pp. 99–126. Kuroshio Publisher.

Merchant, J. 2001. *The syntax of silence: sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miyagawa, S. 1989. *Structure and Case Marking in Japanese*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Miyagawa, S. 2001. Causatives. In N. Tsujimura (Ed.), *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, pp. 236–268. Blackwell Publishing.

Murasugi, K. and K. Akita 2019. Mimetic predicates in the VP-shell hypothesis: Deriving the mimetic parameter from morphological typology. In *International Workshop on Mimetics III: Crucibles of Mimetics*, Nanzan University.

Saito, M. and H. Hoshi 2000. The Japanese light verb construction and the minimalist program. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (Eds.), *Step by Step*, pp. 261–296. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Tamori, I. and L. Schourup 1999. *Onomatopoe: Keitai-to imi (Onomatopoeia: Form and Meaning)*. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Tsujimura, N. 1990. Ergativity of nouns and case assignment. *Linguistic Inquiry 21*(2), 277–288.