

LUND UNIVERSITY
Centre for Language and Literature – Japanese studies

Emil Mårup

emil.marup@gmail.com

2016-05-12

Eye to eye

A contrastive view on the metaphorical use of the eye in English and Japanese

Supervisor: Lars Larm

Abstract

The present thesis deals with the metaphorical role of the eye in the Japanese language and how it compares to English. Metaphorical concepts provided by Lakoff and Johnson are explained in the context of English, then translated and tested with native Japanese people to see if the same concepts are apparent in the Japanese language. A number of other aspects were also put into contrast to each language. In order to receive in depth information on the subject interviews with two native Japanese speakers were carried out. The results showed that many basic aspects of the eye were similar in Japanese and English. For example, the shape of the eye was shown to play a considerable role in both Japanese and English. Results showed that the more specific an aspect got; the bigger was the cultural significance. In addition, some – though not all – examples showed a degree of universality through their direct translatability.

Keywords

Conceptual metaphor, idiom, cognitive linguistics, Japanese, English, eye

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Keywords.....	i
Table of Contents	ii
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Purpose	2
1.2. Methodology	2
2. Metaphors and idioms.....	4
2.1. Lakoff & Johnson	4
2.1.1 Metaphorical concepts	4
2.1.2. Conduit metaphors.....	6
2.1.3. Orientational metaphors.....	8
2.1.4. Metonymy.....	10
2.3. Body idioms	12
2.3.1 Embodying the mind	12
2.3.2 Japanese body idioms	15
2.4. Importance of culture.....	16
3. Exploring the eye.....	17
3.1. Introduction.....	17
3.2. Conceptual metaphors	17
3.3. Uses of <i>me</i> in Japanese	18
3.4. Grammaticalization of <i>me</i>	19
3.4.1 Etymology.....	19
3.4.2. Historical development of <i>me</i>	20
(目 1).....	21
(目 2).....	22
(目 3).....	23
(目 4).....	24
4. Analysis	27
4.1. Introduction.....	27
4.2. Conceptual metaphors regarding the eye	27
4.3. A comparative look at the eye	30
4.3.1. Idiomatic use	30
4.3.2. EYES ARE HOLES	31
5. Concluding remarks.....	35
References	36

1. Introduction

Does a potato have eyes? According to the English language it does indeed. But would a Japanese person think the same? If one were to ask the question in Japanese, the answer would probably be 'yes', but that would most likely be because the word for 'eye' and the word for 'bud' share the same pronunciation. Is this but a mere coincidence, or could eyes and buds have something in common that has led to this occurrence in the Japanese language? In his paper on the grammaticalization of the eye in the Japanese language, Junji Kawaguchi (1998) brings up the possibility of a connection between buds and the eye.

Metaphoric expressions such as the above, where the similarity between an eye and the budding potato is used to create a new lexical item, are rooted in the way the mind works. This is the realm of cognitive linguistics, where the idea exists that metaphors are central in our perception of the world as well as the human cognitive system. Prominent within this field are George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, whose theories on what they refer to as *conceptual metaphors* – the idea that we use experiences and categories that are well known to us in order to grasp concepts which are abstract or unknown – will be elaborated on within this thesis.

For example, we systematically conceptualize arguments in terms of war, and this affects the very way in which we conceive of arguments. Brian McVeigh explores *the embodiment* of the mind in his study on body idioms. He argues that we utilize parts of our own body as metaphors in order to perceive and understand complicated and abstract concepts by physically grounding them. Being a crucially important sensory organ, as well as central to the expression of emotion in human communication, it is perhaps natural that the eye should be widely used in metaphoric expressions.

1.1. Purpose

The purpose of this essay is to create a summary of metaphorical meanings and structures regarding the eye in the Japanese language, and to see how it contrasts to the English language. Also, I hope to provide access to some Japanese literature, for non-Japanese speakers. A general understanding of metaphors and the broad use of body parts as metaphors will be given. Also, the importance of culture in metaphors will become apparent, and as the essay progresses more focus will be placed on the eye and its metaphorical role. The eye is one of the most frequently used body parts in body idioms in Japanese and several Indo-European languages. Its metaphorical use in the Japanese language seems to carry several similarities, but also differences, to Western languages. With the help of Lakoff and Johnson's theories regarding the structuring of metaphorical concepts I aim to test existing concepts on Japanese metaphors with the hope of generalizing, to some extent, the Japanese use of the eye and to contrast it to the English use. It would not be unreasonable to believe that there could be metaphorical concepts in the Japanese language that do not appear in the English language, in which case the differences might provide some understanding of the differences between the two.

1.2. Methodology

The work of Kawaguchi (1998) on the grammaticalization of the eye in the Japanese language will be interpreted and presented in English. This information and the Japanese dictionary *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* will act as foundation for the summary of metaphorical meanings and grounding of the eye in Japanese.

This essay will use metaphorical concepts that have already been outlined by in *Metaphors we live by*, which will be interpreted and explained in the framework of the English language. The chosen concepts will then be translated and tested on two native Japanese speakers to identify if the metaphors are as prominent in Japanese as they are in English, and in order to determine what similarities or differences exist in the use of the eye in the two languages.

The advantage of an interview, compared to for instance a survey, is that it is possible to discuss the subject in depth. An interview is also considerably more flexible than a survey

which is suitable for this essay as it allows for discussions to naturally branch out, as well as giving the interviewer the ability to alter the approach as more information comes to light. For these reasons interviews were deemed to be the ideal method of investigation.

The interviews were carried out at two separate occasions, with one informant at a time. The aim was to present the informants with a Japanese translation of conceptual metaphors, see if they were able to understand the concept, and if so, if they could provide further examples in Japanese. The original English version of the conceptual metaphor was also presented together with the Japanese translation. Next a general discussion on the metaphorical use of the eye in both Japanese and English was held. The informants were presented with pictures of various objects where the eye metaphors of both English and Japanese origin could be observed, aiming to spark spontaneous metaphoric usage.

The Japanese dictionary *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* provides detailed descriptions on the various uses of the eyes in Japanese. This, together with Kawaguchi's overview will be the main written sources for the Japanese part of the comparison, and the Oxford English Dictionary will be the main source in English.

2. Metaphors and idioms

2.1. Lakoff & Johnson

“The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:5)

When most people think of metaphor they see it as an optional, figurative addition to normal speech; simply a more poetic way of using our language. In addition it's commonly seen as just having to do with words, rather than thought or action. This leads people to believe that they will do just fine without metaphor. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980)

Contrary to this popular belief, Lakoff & Johnson do not believe that metaphors simply are an addition to our language, but that they are essential parts of our human cognition. Through their research presented in the book "*Metaphors we live by*" they have found that metaphors are actually an inescapable part of our daily lives. They argue that, at large, human thought processes are metaphorical. Because there are metaphors in a person's conceptual system, metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible. When we explain things that are new or abstract to us, we try to present them in terms of known, less abstract things. For example, arguments can be spoken of in terms of war (see below). In this way we use metaphors to structure our understanding of the surrounding world.

2.1.1 Metaphorical concepts

Lakoff and Johnson speak of what they call *metaphorical concepts*. A good introduction to, and popular example of, these conceptual metaphors is the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor. There are certain things that we normally do and do not do when arguing. The way we conceptualize arguments systematically affects the way we conceive of arguments.

1. Argument is war

Your claims are indefensible.

He attacked every weak point in my argument.

His criticisms were right on target.
I demolished his argument.
I've never won an argument with him.
You disagree? Ok, shoot!
If you use that strategy, he'll wipe you out.
He shot down all of my arguments. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:4)

We don't just speak of argument in terms of war. In the same way that one loses or gains ground in a war, one can lose or gain ground in an argument. We attack our opponents position and defend our own. Because we partially conceptualize arguments in terms of battle, it shapes the arguments and our view of arguing. If we were to not conceptualize it in terms of war, would that still be considered arguing at all? Lakoff and Johnson gives the hypothetical example of a culture in which the act of arguing is seen in terms of dancing. Instead of attacking and defending each other's positions, the participants would be to perform as gracefully and aesthetically pleasing as possible. From our cultural standpoint it wouldn't even be seen as arguing. In this way we can see how a metaphorical concept structures (in part) the way we argue and how we understand what we do when we argue (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:5).

Another great example is the TIME IS MONEY metaphor. This should further aid in understanding how metaphorical expressions in daily language can give us insight into the metaphorical nature of the concepts that structure our everyday activities.

2. Time is money

You're wasting my time.
This gadget will save you hours.
I don't have time to give you.
How do you spend your time these days?
That flat tire cost me an hour.
I've invested a lot of time in her.
I don't have enough time to spare for that.
You're running out of time.
You need to budget your time.
Put aside some time for ping pong.

Is that worth your while?
Do you have much time left?
He's living on borrowed time.
You don't use your time profitably.
I lost a lot of time when I got sick.
Thank you for your time. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:7-8)

“metaphors are not merely things to be seen beyond. In fact, one can see beyond them only by using other metaphors. It is as though the ability to comprehend experience through metaphor were a sense, like seeing or touching or hearing, with metaphors providing the only ways to perceive and experience much of the world.” (Lakoff, 1980: 239)

2.1.2. Conduit metaphors

Although metaphors allow us to seize an aspect of a concept in terms of another (as in comprehending an aspect of arguing in terms of war), it may also cloud our vision from other aspects of the same concept. Focusing on one aspect of a concept can keep us from focusing on other aspects that conflict with the metaphor. Lakoff and Johnson give the following example on the matter:

“in the midst of a heated argument, when we are intent on attacking our opponent's position and defending our own, we may lose sight of the cooperative aspects of arguing. Someone who is arguing with you can be viewed as giving you his time, a valuable commodity, in an effort at mutual understanding. But when we are preoccupied with the battle aspects, we often lose sight of the cooperative aspects.”(Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:10)

Michael Reddy gives an apt example of another metaphorical concept that may hide an aspect of our experience. He calls it the “conduit metaphor”. “The speaker puts ideas (objects) into words (containers) and sends them (along a conduit) to a hearer who takes the idea/objects out of the word/containers.” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:10) The language we use for speaking about language could be presented as being structured by the following metaphors:

IDEAS (OR MEANINGS) ARE OBJECTS.

LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS.

COMMUNICATION IS SENDING

Reddy has documented this structuring in over a hundred examples of expressions in English. Below are some of these examples, picked out by Lakoff & Johnson (1980:11):

It's hard to *get* that idea *across to* him.

I *gave* you that idea.

Your reasons *came through* to us.

It's difficult to *put* my ideas *into* words.

When you *have* a good idea, try to *capture* it immediately *in* words.

Try to *pack* more thought *into* fewer words.

You can't simply *stuff* ideas *into* a sentence any old way.

The meaning is right there *in* the words.

Don't *force* your meanings *into* the wrong words.

His words *carry* little meaning.

The introduction *has* a great deal of thought *content*.

Your words seem *hollow*.

The sentence is *without* meaning.

The idea is *buried in* terribly dense paragraphs.

Since this way of speaking about language is so ordinary to us it can be hard to even think that there is something extraordinary hidden in these sentences. In the aforementioned examples differences in context do not matter and all the participants of the conversation would understand the sentence in the same way. The same is true in the following sentence:

The meaning is *right there* in the words.

This could be said of any sentence according to the conduit metaphor, but there are cases where context does indeed matter. As in this example by Pamela Downing, quoted by Lakoff and Johnson:

Please sit in the apple-juice seat.

“In isolation this sentence has no meaning at all, since the expression "apple-juice seat" is not a conventional way of referring to any kind of object. But the sentence makes perfect sense in the context in which it was uttered. An overnight guest came down to breakfast. There were four place settings, three with orange juice and one with apple juice. It was clear what the apple-juice seat was. And even the next morning, when there was no apple juice, it was still clear which seat was the apple-juice seat.”(Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:12)

Reddy (1979:287) notes that although the notion is presented – through the COMMUNICATION IS SENDING metaphor – that language is used to (figuratively) encapsulate and *transfer* human thoughts and feelings, in the case of fault in communication the blame does not have to be at the sender. Just as there are unskilled speakers, there are poor listeners. The listeners’ task in communication is to extract the meaning "in the words" and put them "into his head". Failing to do so, there will be shortcomings in the conversation.¹

So far the examples that have been presented give a partial understanding of hidden aspects in the concepts of argument, time, and communication. Lakoff and Johnson stresses that it is important to understand that the metaphorical structuring involved in these examples is partial, not total. Were they total, one concept would not simply be understood in terms of another, it would literally be the other. As Lakoff & Johnson (1980:13) states, “time isn’t really money”.

2.1.3. Orientational metaphors

Presented so far have been, as Lakoff and Johnson calls them, *structural metaphors*; concepts metaphorically structured in terms of another. There is however another kind of metaphorical concept that instead of structuring one concept in terms of another, organizes a whole system of concepts with respect to one another (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:14). Since most of these concepts are associated with spatial orientation, Lakoff and Johnson refer to these as “orientational metaphors”. This includes spatial pairs such as: up-down, in-out, front-back, on-off, deep-shallow, central-peripheral, et cetera. This basis of spatial orientation comes from the fact that we are physical beings and the way that we function in our physical

¹ Reddy offers an exceptional anthology of English expressions utilizing the conduit metaphor in his work *The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language.* (1979)

surroundings. What defines orientational metaphors is that a concept is given a spatial orientation. As seen in HAPPY IS UP. “The fact that the concept happy is oriented up leads to English expressions like ‘I’m feeling up today’.”(Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:14)

It is important to note, however, that these metaphorical orientations are not arbitrary. They are grounded in our physical and cultural experience. The orientational metaphors based on the physical, spatial orientation may very well vary from culture to culture. Lakoff and Johnson give the example of how in some cultures the future is in front of us, while in others it is behind us. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:14)

Below, examples of up-down spatialization metaphors will be given, as presented by Lakoff and Johnson. To each metaphorical concept, hints to a possible physical and cultural basis will be given.²

HAPPY IS UP; SAD IS DOWN

I'm feeling up. That boosted my spirits. My spirits rose. You're in high spirits. Thinking about her always gives me a lift. I'm feeling down. I'm depressed. He's really low these days. I fell into a depression. My spirits sank.

Physical basis: Drooping posture typically goes along with sadness and depression, erect posture with a positive emotional state.

CONSCIOUS IS UP; UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN

Get up. Wake up. I'm up already. He rises early in the morning. He fell asleep. He dropped off to sleep. He's under hypnosis. He sank into a coma.

Physical basis: Humans and most other mammals sleep lying down and stand up when they awaken.

HEALTH AND LIFE ARE UP; SICKNESS AND DEATH ARE DOWN

He's at the peak of health. Lazarus rose from the dead. He's in top shape. As to his health, he's way up there. He fell ill. He's sinking fast. He came down with the flu. His health is declining. He dropped dead.

² More examples of up-down spatialization metaphors can be found at pages 15-17 in *Metaphors we live by*.

Physical basis: Serious illness forces us to lie down physically. When you're dead, you are physically down.

MORE IS UP; LESS IS DOWN

The number of books printed each year keeps going up. His draft number is high. My income rose last year. The amount of artistic activity in this state has gone down in the past year. The number of errors he made is incredibly low. His income fell last year. He is underage. If you're too hot, turn the heat down.

Physical basis: If you add more of a substance or of physical objects to a container or pile, the level goes up.

In their conclusions based on these examples, Lakoff and Johnson suggest that “most of our fundamental concepts are organized in terms of one or more spatialization metaphors”. Spatialization metaphors are not assigned at random, but are rooted in physical and cultural experience. The frequency and preference of spatialization metaphors differs from culture to culture, and since the choice of physical basis has to do with cultural coherence, it is difficult to distinguish the physical from the cultural basis. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:17-19)

2.1.4. Metonymy

Personification is a very common category frequently being used in a wide range of metaphor. We attach human traits to phenomena as a way to understand it in our own, human terms. An example of this, given by Lakoff and Johnson, is the INFLATION IS AN ADVERSARY metaphor. By personifying inflation, we conceive of it in a special way. Inflation can attack us, hurt us, and even destroy us. Thus we can more easily understand why we suffer from it and put our blame on it. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:34)

In the case of personification we input human *qualities* to non-human *things*. There is no *actual* human being referred to.

"The *ham sandwich* is waiting for his check."

In this example, the ham sandwich is used to refer to a person, the person who ordered "the ham sandwich". We are not imputing human qualities to "the ham sandwich" but instead using it as an entity to refer to another entity that is related to it, namely, the customer who ordered the ham sandwich. Lakoff and Johnson refer to cases like this as *metonymy*. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:35)

Although they may seem similar, Lakoff and Johnson emphasize that "metaphor and metonymy are different *kinds* of processes."(Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:36)

"Metaphor is principally a way of conceiving of one thing in terms of another, and its primary function is understanding. Metonymy, on the other hand, has primarily a referential function, that is, it allows us to use one entity to *stand for* another. But metonymy is not merely a referential device. It also serves the function of providing understanding. For example, in the case of the metonymy THE PART FOR THE WHOLE there are many parts that can stand for the whole. Which part we pick out determines which aspect of the whole we are focusing on. When we say that we need some *good heads* on the project, we are using "good heads" to refer to "intelligent people." The point is not just to use a part (head) to stand for a whole (person) but rather to pick out a particular characteristic of the person, namely, intelligence, which is associated with the head."(Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:36)

Metonymies and metaphors are similar in some of the purposes they servers and even in how they are used, but metonymies allow us to focus more on certain aspects of what is being referred to. And just like metaphor, metonymy is not just a poetic or rhetorical nuance, nor is it simply a matter of language. Metonymic concepts are part of our conceptual system. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:36)

2.3. Body idioms

”Idioms are in general everyday metaphors that have their roots in culture rather than in language, and often require fundamental knowledge of ordinary cultural references of all parts”
(Kandefelt, 2011:7, translation by me)

As stated above, idioms are, on a fundamental level, set phrases that are metaphorical in nature and linked to an understanding of the surrounding culture. Body idioms are simply idioms that make use of the parts of our bodies. Both the Japanese and English languages have a very rich lexicon of idioms.

2.3.1 Embodying the mind

While on the topic of metaphorical origin, Brian McVeigh gives an introduction on the subject, but with focus on as to why body parts have come to be put into service as a way to express emotions. In his article *Standing stomachs, clamoring chests and cooling livers: Metaphors in the psychological lexicon of Japanese*, he presents an outstanding summary of the subject and gives further insight on Lakoff’s philosophical theories on metaphors.

The 'mind' takes a central role in both Lakoff’s and McVeigh’s theories around metaphors. They question the concept of 'mind and body' as two separate entities. McVeigh speaks of the deeply rooted phenomena of dualism and how it dominates Western epistemology, spawning inseparable twins such as mind/body; subjectivity/objectivity, and mental/material (McVeigh, 1996:27-29). This dualism has caused scholars much theoretical trouble and Lakoff’s theories could be seen as an attempt to break down this idea.

A popular belief related to dualism is that "at their core, mind, body, sociocultural systems, and the environment somehow each possess an indwelling 'essence'." (McVeigh, 1996:27)

An idea that Lakoff refers to as *objectivism* places intellect in a nonphysical realm, disembodimenting it. Lakoff opposes this idea and with his philosophical theory of 'experientialism', striving to *embody* cognition, believing it to be physically grounded. McVeigh also notes that cognition is made possible by the body itself.

"Our mental worlds are the products of sociocultural processes which are based on the interchange of qualities of the bodily and the cultural, of things and values, using analogies from the sensate and observable world to describe and define psychological events. Bodily experiences and the qualities of concrete things are associated with belief and the abstract. Experiences of the concrete are used in a discourse that represents and defines abstract notions. This is because we do not and cannot just 'think;' we can only think 'of', 'about', or 'with' something borrowed from the world. It is, therefore, the tangible and observable, or in a word, the sensate, which is essential in defining our experience of mental events."(McVeigh, 1996:30)

McVeigh stresses that our minds are inherently metaphoric and compares it to machines which borrow things from the surrounding world – not the least our bodily experiences - to produce mentation. "Our minds do not simply use metaphors; rather, to possess a mind means to engage in metaphoric processes"(McVeigh, 1996:30). In other words, as a means to put shape on our inner *subjective* experiences, we install them into the surrounding, *objective* world. In this sense, bodily sensations have undeniably given birth to the metaphoric mind-lexicon of different languages. Physically grounding mental phenomena, the unobservable and inner happenings of our minds, for it to take form is a commonly used strategy found in many languages (McVeigh, 1996:30).

"When one says 'I have a lot on my mind' in English, both the speaker and listener realize that this is merely a figure of speech. There is nothing 'on' one's mind in a literal sense. Or when one says 'my heart is heavy with sadness', we understand that a person's heart is in fact not heavy; though certain physiological processes may come close to making one's internal organs feel as if they were heavy. And we know very well the difference between 'having a headache' and 'giving someone a headache'."(McVeigh, 1996:31)

It is language that tempts us to put mind in a spatial realm, and social pragmatics that determines the position within our bodies. In various cultures one's inner state is considered to exist in physical space. Common in Western thought is that the self is located in the head or brain, as shown in McVeigh's example. Ancient Egyptians believed it to be located in the heart. In Japanese culture *hara* (stomach, belly) is a part of the body that carries a spiritual meaning, said to be the bodily center, containing the inner self and spirit (Dürkheim 1962 cited by McVeigh, 1996:38).

A study by Carr (1983 cited by McVeigh, 1996) examines the history of the Chinese term *xin* (heart, mind), which reveals the metaphorical nature of psychological vocabularies and the mind. Overall, the metaphoric construction of mind seems to be universal. All languages use inner organs and body parts as a tool to manifest subjectivity. What organs are used and what kind of mental experience they represent is of cultural and historical significance. Oki (2004) and Terasawa (1997) speak of the same cultural and historical significance and how this complicates the learning of foreign languages. The meaning of idiomatic expressions may come as obvious to native speakers, but not so much to foreigners.

McVeigh uses the phrase 'that thought has been in the back of my mind' as an example when he expresses his belief that, "regardless of whether an individual interprets it as a figure of speech or as a literal fact about where a thought exists in an ontological sense" (McVeigh, 1996:31), it is still metaphoric in a general sense.

He goes on with putting such tropes into two categories; *figurative metaphors* (an individual interprets an analogical experience as a figure of speech) and *literal metaphors* (an individual believes an analogical experience to be true in a literal sense) (McVeigh, 1996:31). This, McVeigh means, demonstrates that basic metaphoric processes are ahistorical and part of our mentation. It is a matter of history, culture and belief whether we interpret metaphors as literal or figurative.

McVeigh offers a look at the Japanese term *kokoro*. Most commonly translated as heart, similarly to *hara* it carries a much broader meaning, ranging from "mind, thought, feeling, motive, intention, will, idea, attention, and other connotations, such as the true meaning (of a poem or story), the core of something, spirit, or the mood of a place" (McVeigh, 1996:37). Looking back at the Japanese term *hara*, anatomically it refers to the stomach, but the term may stand for many other things such as mind, heart, intentions, guts, and courage. *Hara* and *kokoro* share some of their definitions. McVeigh tells of how they symbolize the same kind of metaphoric category, namely an individual's inner, essential self (personalities). In contrast, if seen through an inner-private/outer-public point of view, *kao* (face) and *kuchi* (mouth) are used to express things more at 'face value'.

2.3.2 Japanese body idioms

In order to better understand Japanese idioms, it is beneficial to understand how they contrast with other languages. A number of contrastations made between Japanese and English body idioms will be shown as to better understand how Japanese idioms differ from it, as well as how it expresses what might be taken as more universal features.

In a joint study represented by Terasawa (1999) effort has been made to categorize body idioms and to give a contrastive look on Japanese and English idioms. These categorizations include labeling emotions by representative body parts.

One part of the study shows that the five body parts that are most commonly put into service in Japanese body idioms are: *mune* (chest), *kokoro* (heart), *kao* (face), *me* (eye), and *atama* (head)³. The most frequently used body parts in English idiomatic expressions are 'heart', 'eye', 'face', and 'head', which correlates to the Japanese equivalents.

The second most used word in English after 'head' is 'back', but the only corresponding word in Japanese that refers to the back in the same kind of idiomatic expressions is *sesuji* which refers to the muscles along the spine, and there is only but one instance of this being used in Terasawa's lists (Terasawa, 1999:53). Also, the second and third most used words in Japanese idiomatic expressions after *atama*, are *hana* (nose) and *hara*, but the usages of the corresponding words in English, 'stomach' and 'nose' are not quite as common.

One area of the body that Terasawa suggests could be thought of as visualizing characteristics in the comparison of Japanese and English body idioms, is 'buttocks' or 'arse'. In English, 'buttocks' comes in at eighth place in the most used body parts in body idioms. In Japanese however, there is only one example of 'buttocks' being used. One reason for this, Terasawa means, could be that in English these kinds of expressions are common in informal, everyday speech, as opposed to Japanese where it is more common in written language. She adds that it could also be that using the back part of the body such as 'buttocks' and 'arse' to express emotions is more typical in English than in Japanese where it's more common to use the facade of the body.

³ Actually, the word that is most commonly used, and overwhelmingly so, is *ki*. *Ki* "has a very special place in the Japanese language and culture" (Kandefelt, 2011) and as McVeigh stresses "In English, there is no equivalent"(McVeigh, 1996:36). Terasawa (1999) also chooses to exclude *ki* in her comparison for the same reasons. The use of *ki* can further be read about in Kandefelt's (2011) and McVeigh's (1996) essays.

2.4. Importance of culture

As mentioned numerous times in this essay, culture plays a central role in metaphors.

“The most fundamental values in a culture will be coherent with the metaphorical structure of the most fundamental concepts in the culture.”(Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:22)

Lakoff and Johnson propose that our cultural values are not independent from the prevalent metaphoric usage. Instead they “must form a coherent system with the metaphorical concepts we live by” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:22). By this they do not mean that all cultural values coherent with a metaphorical system actually exists, but instead that those that do exist and are deeply rooted are consistent with the metaphorical system. Culture is not an optional nuance that we may choose to add to an experience. Our cultural assumptions, values, and attitudes are always present in every experience. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:57)

Kövecses (2000) has made several studies on emotional language and metaphorical concepts. In his study on the concept of anger he showed that, despite the cultural, historical, and geographic difference of the four languages presented in the study, they all shared remarkable similarities in their way to express anger. At a basic level, anger was conceptualized the same way in all the languages, but the more distinct a concept got, the more culture specific it was.

Kapusta (2016) has put together a comparative study on conceptual metaphors in English and Japanese in which the English metaphors presented in *Metaphors we live by* are tested on the framework of the Japanese language. The study shows that the conceptual metaphors are very similar in most cases. Although they are similar, the frequency of each metaphor differs between the languages, and each language carries its own, cultural nuances.

3. Exploring the eye

3.1. Introduction

Eyes are probably the most prominent sensory organ in regard to symbolism. They are commonly associated with intelligence, vigilance, light, and truth. In western culture, looking someone in the eyes is a sign of honesty, but in Asian cultures it might come off as rude to unreservedly look someone into the eyes. It is said that the eyes are the window (or mirror) of the soul. Look someone in the eyes and you could be able to see what the person thinks and feels. The way we think of the eyes is shown in the innumerable amount of metaphor that it has spawned. The purpose of this section is to familiarize the reader with the various uses of the eye in the Japanese and English language.

3.2. Conceptual metaphors

In *Metaphors we live by*, Lakoff and Johnson list the following conceptual metaphors related to vision:

SEEING IS TOUCHING; EYES ARE LIMBS

I can't *take* my eyes *off* her. He sits with his eyes *glued to* the TV. Her eyes *picked out* every detail of the pattern. Their eyes *met*. She never *moves* her eyes *from* his face. She *ran* her eyes *over* everything in the room. He wants everything *within reach of* his eyes.

EYES ARE CONTAINERS FOR EMOTION

I could see the fear *in* his eyes. His eyes were *filled* with anger. There was passion *in* her eyes. His eyes *displayed* his compassion. She couldn't *get* the fear *out of* her eyes. Love *showed in* his eyes. Her eyes *welled* with emotion.

KNOWING IS SEEING

Lakoff and Johnson refer to Christopher Johnson (1997 cited by Lakoff & Johnson 1980:254) when on the topic of advances in metaphor theory and the neural basis of metaphorical thought. Johnson (1997) studied the development of the KNOWING IS SEEING metaphor in children. In his studies he demonstrated that children at first only use "see" in a literal way, simply referring to vision. Then comes a stage where seeing and knowing start to share characteristics in situations where seeing and knowing occurs together, as when children say the likes of "See Daddy come in" or "See what I spilled" (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:255). Later, clear metaphorical use of "see" as to refer to knowledge occurs. An example of this is the use of "see", as in "see what I mean".

3.3. Uses of *me* in Japanese

In the Japanese dictionary *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* the eye's usage is categorized into the following categories (translated by me).

(A) Noun

1. Referring to the anatomical eye. Examples of this usage can be found in Japan's oldest historical record, *Kojiki*, dating back to early 8th century.
2. The operation of category 1. The action of looking in different ways using the eyes. Also, expressions of vision and the eye used to express emotion.
3. Speaking of the observed target.
4. Expressions of position, shape, or merit.
5. Expressing consecutive gaps, punctuations, or notches.
6. Interruption in space or time. The punctuation or tangent point of two things or two situations. Often in combination with verbs.
7. Recent use as a symbol (approximately since the Meiji period) in tea trading.

(B) Emotion

1. Used when scolding. Expressing anger. (This category seems to refer to one specific expression.) Related to (Noun 1).

(C) Suffix

1. Ordinal number suffix. Similar to the English ordinal numbers (first, second, third, et cetera).
2. Expressing estimation on extent, degree, or nature of a thing or matter. Similar to the English suffix "-ish".

3.4. Grammaticalization of *me*

3.4.1 Etymology

Before looking closer at the various meanings and uses of *me* (目), it is necessary to consider the origin of the kanji. Kawaguchi (1998) presents the following three words: 見る, 芽, and 間.

Starting with 見る (*miru*), meaning 'to see', it is difficult to deny there being any connection. The syllabary are similar (*mi / me*), even the shape of the kanji are very similar. But the focus of Kawaguchi's discussion is on the meaning of the other two.

Looking at *me* (芽), 'sprout; bud', we see that it shares the same pronunciation as *me* (目). Kawaguchi notes that if we look at English and French, two closely related languages, both languages see 'eye/eail' as a synonym for 'bud/bourgeon'. He states, however, that he cannot claim more than that there could be a probability of etymology between (目) and (芽) from these examples, but that there indeed is a metaphorical connection between the two. This is grounded in fact that the shape of eyes and buds share the same characteristics. In Oxford English Dictionary we see numerous examples of this, as in the 'eye of a potato', referring to the black spots of a potato from which buds form. This subject will be further expanded on later in this essay.

Ma (間) is a Japanese word that roughly can be translated as 'space', 'gap', 'pause', or 'between'. It is a word that suggests interval, be it a matter of space or a matter of time. Kawaguchi points out that the kanji 目 also can be read as *ma*. This is observable in examples like *matsuge* (eyelashes) and *mabuta* (eyelids). *Me* can be used to refer to the sensory organ; eye, but it may appear in terms like "*me ga arai*" (loose weave [lit. "eyes are coarse"]),

amime (mesh [of a net]), or *nuime* (seam; stitch). What these terms have in common is that they all point to a gap. Kawaguchi means that this observation suggests that there could be an etymological connection between (目) and (間). The Japanese dictionary *Jidaibetsu kokugo daijiten* takes this standpoint, but it is necessary to know how (間) has been used throughout history. Tsujima (1989 cited by Kawaguchi, 1998) observes the following two types of usage. The first type is visible in expressions like "yama no ma", which refers to "an area of spatial existence", namely the physical area between two mountains. The second type appears in *kumoma*, the rift between clouds. This type refers to "the non-physical space between two objects", an "interruption".

Will compound terms in the likes of *amime* (網目) always take on the meaning of 'gap'? The following is an example from Kawaguchi's study (Kawaguchi, 1998:266). Let us call the component in front of 目 "X". Like this, it could be possible to find the connection with X and the referent of an expression like (X 目).

The word *amime* (網目) could refer to the space that is encircled by an organized material forming the net (let us call the material part *p*), in other words, "the gap of X" (non-physical space) or the part that is not *p* (let this part be *p'*). However, the word may also refer to both the material (*p*) and the encircled space (*p'*), namely "the interwoven shape of X (the arrangement of *p + p'*)" (physical space). This points to that 目 may take on the part of both a physical space and a non-physical space.

3.4.2. Historical development of *me*

Kawaguchi (1998) has put together an inquiry on the matter of the lexical description and grammaticalization of the eye (目) in the Japanese language. He begins by putting the eye into four categories, calling them (目 1 - 4). At large, 目 is divided into two groups (目 1) and (目 2). (目 1) refers to the eye as the body part. (目 2) is used in expressions like the ones mentioned previously (*amime*, *me ga arai*, *nuime*), namely expressing gaps, breaks, and holes. In addition to the two bigger groups are: (目 3), the same usage as seen in C2. Examples of this can be observed in expressions like *oome* (somewhat larger quantity) and *nagame* (longish). Finally (目 4), which is the same as seen in C1; the ordinal number suffix. This can be seen in expressions like *futarime* (second [person]) and *mitsume* (third [in order]).

(目 1)

Words indicating body parts may place the attention on the actual, physical body part itself, or the function of said body part. This is visible in *me ga ii* (eyes are good) "to have good eyesight". It is also common for body parts to get a spatial connection relevant to the position of said body part. For example, the word *mae* (in front [of]) appears to have come from the fusion of *ma* (eye) and *he* (area).

Kawaguchi states that, while (目 1) may refer to both a physical target and the functional aspect of the body part, there are cases where it can be difficult to determine which of the two is being indicated. In examples like *me ga itai* "eyes hurt" and *me ga ookii* "eyes are big", it is clear that the target is the physical body part and that its function does not play a role at all. Likewise, *me ga ii* (eyes are good) and *me ga takai* (be discerning; have an expert eye [lit. eyes are high]) refer to the ability of one's sense of sight or the value judgment grounded in the vision. However, though it is possible to think of a body part and its function as two separate aspects, one should not think of these aspects as independent meanings of (目 1). In the end, context plays a big role in deciding the specifications of a word. If the attention is brought to the functional aspect of a body part, it does not mean that the physical aspect disappears, but rather it subsists in the background (Kawaguchi, 1998:264).

Me ga itai directly refers to a sensation in a part of the body. Holding a tray at *me no takasa* "height of the eyes" puts the attention to the height of one's eyes in a standing posture and takes no notice of sensation. Yet, when it comes to terms like *meue* (superior; senior [lit. above eyes]) and *meshita* (subordinate; junior [lit. under eyes]), it becomes a matter of hierarchical relationships in a social domain. Kawaguchi suggests that in this case the attitude when looking (functional aspect) at another person can be felt in the background.

The use of (目 1) extends to expressions that convey the facial expression of a person. A person with *yasashii me* (kind eyes) is not just a person with a kind facial expression. It carries a deeper meaning beyond that of the expression, hinting at the personality of the person.

On the functional interpretation of *me* like the previously mentioned *me ga ii*, there are other expressions like *me o kakeru* (look after) and *me o hanasanai* (keep an/one's eyes on [lit. not release eyes]). These examples denote the behaviour of looking in a specific way.

(目 1) can also be used in expressions that are used to paraphrase "an experience". *Hidoi/kowai/itai me ni au* (suffer an awful/frightening/painful experience) In the majority of cases it is a negative experience. To my knowledge the eye takes on the meaning of 'experience' because it was something you "saw" (experienced) with your eyes.

Kawaguchi (1998:263) brings up the matter of how (目 1) may have gained its various descriptions, and presents two models.

The first model is based on the standpoint frequently seen in cognitive linguistics. It marks the eye's physical interpretation as a starting point, and every other usage is considered an expansion in usage by means of metonymy.

In the second model, Kawaguchi cites Kleiber (1994) and what he refers to as integrated metonymy (*métonymie intégrée*). The physical aspect and the functional aspect may have been coupled together and become a characterization of (目 1), so whichever one focuses on, we perceive the main subject of the owner of (目 1) in a comprehensive way, and depict it.

Kawaguchi comes to the conclusion that both models occur. That there are some usages of (目 1) that fit with the theory of integrated metonymy, and there are some that fit with the idea of usage expansion through metonymy/metaphor.

(目 2)

This category contains expressions that are related to *ma* (間). Kawaguchi (1998:262) chooses to subcategorize this even further.

- A. The gap in the organized part of a produced item: *amime* (mesh), *nuime* (seam; stitch)
- B. Things with carvings like teeth: *nokogiri no me* (teeth of a saw [lit. eyes])
- C. Parallel pattern appearing on a surface: *mokume* (grain [of wood])
- D. The boundary separating two things: *wareme* (chasm), *kireme* (break; pause)
- E. Parts that differ from the rest of a surface: *kogeme* (burn mark)
- F. The notches on scales and rules: *kizamime* (marks on a ruler)

G. Measurement and its units: *mekata* (weight), *masume* (measure)

H. The point in time where a thing or situation changes: *wakarime* (turning point), *shinime* (moment of death)

Subcategories (A) to (G) are spatial interpretations, and category (H) is a matter of time. Kawaguchi states that, unlike (目 1), it is difficult to settle on a single hypothesis that covers every meaning of (目 2). However, he believes that the time related (H) is a derivation of the spatial interpretation. He also affirms that (G) is a metonymic derivation of (F). The remaining categories can be summarized by means of, as Kawaguchi puts it, "spatio-cognitive salience". What is distinctive in this is that two contrasting parts are arranged into a single "whole". Like in the example of *amime*, it is made up of the material thread (p) and the encircled space (p'). The interwoven shape/pattern of these two parts is what makes the "whole". Category (A) to (C) are all composed of a repeating pattern, but there are cases like in (D) and (E), where two parts only confront each other once. It is possible that (H) could be part of the latter case, but instead applied to time.

After presenting his hypothesis on the grammaticalizations of (目 1) and (目 2), Kawaguchi brings up the question of whether these two aspects of the eye can be treated as being unified. As demonstrated earlier in this essay, it is difficult to determine already at an etymological level. If it is the case that it is a matter of unity, then it would mean that either (目 1) is a unique case of (目 2), or (目 2) is a derivation of (目 1) through changes in the range of application. (Kawaguchi, 1998:262)

(目 3)

(目 3) is observable in words like, *ookime* (largish), *amame* (sweetish), *koime* (strongish), et cetera, being attached to the stem of an i-adjective as a suffix. This category of *me* is thought to be a derivation from *mie* (to see), however it is also plenty possible that it has a direct relation to (目 1).

(目 4)

This application of the eye can be seen in examples like *futarime* (second [person]) and *sankenme* (third [building]) where it is attached as a ordinal number suffix after a (cardinal number + counter suffix) couple. Kawaguchi states that the suffix (目 4) is relatively new and is estimated to have sprung forth in the 14th century. Other examples of ordinal number affixes in the Japanese language are the prefix *dai* ("ordinal") as in *daisankai* (third time), the suffix *ban* (number [in a series]), *sanban* (number three), or both combined *dainiban* (second). However, it is also common that the cardinal number itself may be used as an ordinal number. *Mikka* can mean the same as "three days' time" (*mikkakan*), or "third day" (*mikkame*). (Kawaguchi, 1998:261)

To better understand how (目 4) may have come to be, aside from a bibliographic investigation, it would be necessary to consider both ordinal number suffixes and the grammaticalization in general.

Kawaguchi cites Benveniste (1948) as one of the biggest contributors to the research on ordinal number affixes. His study shows that in many languages, ordinal numbers and cardinal numbers both have a meaning resembling "making, completing". In his investigation on Indo-European languages, he concluded that the general function of the ordinal number affixes was that of a "completion function", and that it was similar among the languages.

This completion function can be applied to (目 4) as well. Kawaguchi gives the example of *yotsume* which means 'fourth (in an order)'. This could be used when talking of persons, as in 'the fourth person'. If we assume that it refers to a gathering of people then *yotsume* would tell us that in total there are 'four' people and the last person to join the group is the 'fourth' one. Before the introduction of the last member there were only three people. The forth/last person completes the gathering as a supplement to the whole. This is the completion function. (Kawaguchi, 1998:260) In modern language, even in a group of four people, it is still possible to designate the third person (*mitsume*). However, the third person will not be the 'final' person of a group of four, so the completion function will not be able to be implemented. This is believed to be because ordinal numbers only could be employed in a "closed set" with a set number, but due to expansion in the rules of use, ordinal numbers have come to be used in "open sets" as well.

(目 4) as an ordinal number suffix is thought to be the result of a grammaticalization of (目 2)'s sub-category (F) that was mentioned earlier in the essay. However, for this to be true, the change in the use of (F) must have been used frequently to be considered a possibility. In the section of the various descriptions of (目 2), it was mentioned that sub-category (G), which refers to various measuring units, was derived from (F); the sub-category related to scales and graduations. A particular measuring unit, *monme* (文目), originates from *mon* (文) originally used in the T'ang dynasty (618-907 A.D.) as a unit for weight (1/10 of a *zeni* [approximately 3,75 grams]). The notch of a scale on which the weight of one *mon* would point at (*ichi-mon no me* [一文の目]) was called *monme*, and later the kanji (匁) came to be used instead. All this suggests that *monme* was used frequently.

Kawaguchi takes a closer look at what is actually happening when one measures the weight of an object. He presents the following example. If one were to put four coins on a scale, each weighing one *monme*, then the scale would point at the spot corresponding to four *monme*, and the measuring ends. Still, just like in the example with a group of four people, it also includes the three *monme*, two *monme*, and one *monme*, but which of the coins that represents the one *monme* is of no interest and therefore out of the question. The completion function that Benveniste spoke of, where the last addition to a set supplements the whole set and completes it. When measuring the weight of an object on a scale, the final point where the scale stops at is of importance. The results show that the completion function is present in (F) and it was also suggested that it was used frequently. This all speaks in favor of Kawaguchi's thesis that (目 4) has come to be through changes in the use of (目 4)'s (F). (Kawaguchi, 1998:258)

In his concluding remarks, Kawaguchi proposes that one model for the grammaticalization of the eye could be polygrammaticalization. What this means is that the grammaticalization of a word has developed in more than one sequential line (e.g. $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow D$ and $A \rightarrow C \rightarrow E$). Another possible model is one which Kawaguchi refers to as "grammaticalization chain". (Heine, 1992 cited by Kawaguchi) If applied to the example above, D would have an indirect connection to A through B, and D and E would have no common features at all. However, A and B, A and C, B and D, and finally C and E would have a direct connection and share many specifications.

From this Kawaguchi claims the following based on both the "polygrammaticalization" and the "chain" model:

(目 1) → (目 2), (目 1) → (目 3), (目 2) → (目 4)

4. Analysis

4.1. Introduction

This section will be dedicated to the analysis and discussion on the comparison of the eye in Japanese and English. First, three metaphorical concepts presented by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) will be tested on the Japanese language to see if they are applicable in Japanese as well. Next, a general discussion and comparison of the various aspects of the eye in Japanese and English will be given. Here, the eye's properties and lexical descriptions as stated in the Japanese dictionary *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten*, and Oxford English Dictionary will be compared to each other. The contrastive studies on Japanese and English idioms by Oki (2004) and Terasawa (1997) will be summarized below. To further this analysis, two native speakers have been consulted, providing additional insight as well as ensuring accuracy.

4.2. Conceptual metaphors regarding the eye

In section 3.2., three of Lakoff and Johnson's metaphorical concepts were presented. What they all had in common was that they were all related to the eye. In cognitive linguistics and in *Metaphors we live by* we learn that metaphorical concepts are rooted in our very cognitive system and that they play a big part in how we perceive of the surrounding world. However, this study only lists English examples, while the theory as such should be applicable to other languages – indeed, on a universal, human level. It follows that much of what is laid out should also apply to other languages; specifically, in the case of this study, Japanese. To test these metaphors I presented my informants with the English version and a translated version of each one. I also included Lakoff and Johnson's examples, and a Japanese example of a sentence or expression which I believed portrayed the metaphor, then had the informants share their thoughts on it. I will go through each metaphor individually and present the results henceforth.

SEEING IS TOUCHING; EYES ARE LIMBS

Earlier some examples were shown where this metaphor is observable. For example: "I can't *take* my eyes *off* her". In this way the eyes are seen as something with which one can physically touch objects, and move in the same manners as limbs. The first Japanese expression that comes to mind is *me o hanasanai* which can be literally translated as "not release eyes". I included this expression in the following sentence:

(1) *Watashi no sūtsukēsu kara me o hanasanaide kudasai.*

"Please keep an eye on my suitcase."

The English translation of the sentence (1) does in itself display the metaphor, but how about the Japanese translation? *Hanasanai* (not release) implies that it would be connected to the idea of physical contact. Both of the informants said that the example (1) implied that the eyes were in physical contact to the suitcase, and added that the rest of the examples provided by Lakoff and Johnson could all, more or less, be directly translated to Japanese. The translations would not be literal, but the metaphor of "touch" would still persist, even in the equivalent Japanese expression. One of the informants provided the following translation of one of Lakoff and Johnsons examples:

(2) *Kare wa me no todoku han'i ni subete o oiteokitai.*

"He wants (to keep) everything within reach of his eyes."

In this example the metaphor is clearly visible. The informant's interpretation of the original sentence adds that act of 'keeping', a perfectly fine interpretation, which does not affect the metaphor in any way. The part that is of interest is *me no todoku han'i* (reach of the eye). The phrase can more or less be translated literally and still conveys the exact same metaphor.

This indicates that the SEEING IS TOUCHING metaphor is present in the Japanese language.

EYES ARE CONTAINERS FOR EMOTION

The eyes are one of the most important facial features when trying to understand a person's emotions. Since the eyes are such an important source of information in human interactions, it comes off as natural that one would want to see "inside" of another's eyes. This metaphor allows us to perceive the eyes as something that we may look *into*, something that can be *full* and *overflow*. Before presenting the informants with a Japanese example, we discussed the metaphorical concept itself. Both had no problem understanding the concept, but they were skeptical to the idea that the eye was a "container". I presented the informants with the Japanese example:

(3) *Me wa fukai kanashimi ni michiteiru.*

"(The) eyes are overflowing with deep sadness."

This example is similar to Lakoff and Johnson's example, "Her eyes welled with emotion". It does indeed portray the eye as a container, and the informants both wholeheartedly agreed that it did so even in Japanese. However, they were not certain if this is a widespread phenomenon in Japanese, in contrast with English where it's a fundamental part of how we conceive of the eye. Even in Japanese corpora it was difficult to find examples that matched with the metaphor. Notable however, was that when the informants were shown the English examples from Lakoff and Johnson, they both declared that the same kind could be said in Japanese, although they were still uncertain on the idea of a "container". One of the informants said that instead of a container, to her it was closer to a mirror. One might argue that a mirror can be construed as a kind of container. After all one can look *into* a mirror like one looks *into* a container. Another Japanese example where the eye is seen as a container is in *utsuro na me* (vacant eyes). That the eyes are vacant (same word and meaning as in English) could mean that the eyes are empty. It could also mean that the eyes are "blank" in which case it would no longer be a "container".

UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING/KNOWING IS SEEING

In English "to see" something can be the same as to "understand". "I *see* what you mean", can be the same as saying "I *understand* what you mean". In Japanese there is a similar kind of expression:

(4) *Hanashi ga mienai.*

"To not understand what somebody is getting at."

One of the informants suggested that another expression could be an example of the metaphor:

(5) *Shōrai/saki ga mienai.*

"Can't see the future/what's ahead."

To not "see" the future could be not "knowing" what will happen in the future.

4.3. A comparative look at the eye

4.3.1. Idiomatic use

Oki (2004) has assembled a list of body idioms used in modern Japanese. The list consists of 855 idiomatic expressions divided between 42 corresponding body parts.

Idioms using the eye are remarkably higher in number than most other body parts at 156 idioms, representing just over 18% of all idioms included. The body part used second most is the hand at 113 idioms.

The English 'eye' and the Japanese *me* closely match in what part of the body they can be used to refer to. That is, the whole eye fixated in the eye socket, the part of the eye being visible on someone's face, as well as the area circumfering the eye. Terasawa (1997:76) writes that how far this area reaches differs between English-English dictionaries. For example, in AHD it includes the eyelids, eyelashes and eyebrows, but in COBUILD it is limited to "the area of skin around the eye". Even in Japanese dictionaries it is not generally specified what this area includes.

Japanese is richer than English in idioms using the facial appearance of the eye to express emotions. One of Terasawa's examples is "*me o hosomeru*". The expression literally means "to narrow the eyes", but the idiomatic meaning is "to smile with one's whole face". Another example is "*me no iro o kaeru*", which literally means "to change the colour of one's eye", but is interpreted as changing the expression of one's eyes or face. In English there is also a habit of expressing anger and rejoice through the change in the glint or colour of one's eyes, but Terasawa states that these expressions lack stability as idioms (Terasawa, 1997:76). In comparison, idioms with a high degree of stability, for example "one's eyes nearly pop out", expressing surprise, are quite few in number.

One type of expressions in the English language that particularly draws attention is those that are used when someone shows interest in the opposite sex. One example of this is "make eyes at someone". The Japanese expression "*irome o tsukau*" can actually be translated as "make eyes at", but instead of the kind of awkward, innocent glances conveying signals of romantic feelings, the Japanese term is used when referring to women throwing amorous glances at someone of the opposite sex as to imply sexual interest.

4.3.2. EYES ARE HOLES

Consider the following, famous take on the quote by Marcel Proust:

"The real voyage of discovery consists not in seeking new landscapes, but in having new eyes."

In this sentence, the eyes are a metaphor for "perspective". To see something with new eyes is the same as seeing something in a new perspective. I presented the informants with the Japanese translation of the same sentence:

発見の旅とは、新しい景色を探すことではない。新しい目で見ることなのだ。
Hakken no tabi to wa, atarashī keshiki o sagasu koto dewanai. Atarashī me de miru koto nanoda.

Both informants had no problem understanding the sentence and were quick to explain the meaning of the "new eyes" in detail. The idea was that, as in the English version, the eyes are referring to "perspective". I do not know if this kind of expression is common in Japanese. Searching through a corpus shows little result, and since this Japanese sentence itself is a translation, it gives the intuition that it is not common. Nonetheless, the informants had no problem understanding the "hidden" meaning. This could be taken to imply an element of universality to this particular usage. Even though no previous examples could be found, indicating that if they exist they are in all likelihood uncommon, it was possible for the reader to construe a meaning identical to the one in English.”

In western culture the eye is commonly seen as a symbol of surveillance, omnipresence, and authority. Take for example the ever watching *Eye of Sauron*, or the *Eye of Providence* which represents the eye of God watching over mankind. A "private eye" is a metonymy for "private detective". In Japanese we get a similar meaning as seen in the example below.

監視の目をすり抜ける

Kanshi no me o surinukeru.

"Slip through the eye(s) of surveillance."

My informants both said that this was a common kind of expression in Japanese and one of the informants also pointed out that the conceptual metaphor SEEING IS TOUCHING; EYES ARE LIMBS could be present in *me o surinukeru* (slip through the eye[s]). It is indeed possible that there is more than one *layer* to this sentence. The "eye(s) of surveillance" could refer to cameras, human guards, or virtual surveillance on the internet, but it is still symbolized as an eye since it is something that is constantly "watching". It is my belief that even if the eye in "eye of surveillance" is no actual eye, the SEEING IS TOUCHING; EYES ARE LIMBS metaphor would still persist, further suggesting that the metaphor is occurring in the Japanese language.

Looking back at the eye of God, it should be noted that the Bible has generated a number of metaphorical expressions regarding the eye. Perhaps the most commonly known example of this is the idiomatic expression "An eye for an eye". Also known as "the law of retaliation", the principle of the expression is that a person who has in some way injured another person

will be penalized to a similar degree. The original quote includes 'tooth', 'hand', and 'foot' as well, but it is most common to only state the eyes, or the eyes and teeth.

Although this idiom is of Biblical origin, it has made its way into the Japanese language as well.

Me ni wa me o (ha ni wa ha wo).

The Japanese idiom is a direct translation of the English one, and it conveys the same meaning as the English one. Another example of a Biblical idiom is the "scales fall from the eyes" idiom. If the scales fall from someone's eyes, they are suddenly able to "see" the truth, or understand something they had not understood up to that point. This I believe is also an example of the UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING metaphor, or the SEEING IS BELIEVING. However, as with idioms in general there is a probability that the idiom in itself would not be perceived this way without the knowledge of the referential background. Although not otherwise verifiable, one informant provides that this expression is fairly common in Japanese.

This idiom as well, is a direct Japanese translation of the English idiom: *Me kara uroko ga ochiru.*

The Biblical citation most relevant to this essay is the following by Jesus Christ:

"[...]it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God."

The "eye" of a needle is a metaphor for the hole in the needle. Using the eye as a metaphor for a hole is quite common in English. From OED we learn that, aside from a needle, a cheese can be full of eyes, the eyes of a rope are convenient for securing things similar to the eye of an anchor. Aside from holes, something resembling the eye in shape in general is prominently used as a target domain for eye metaphor in the English language. This idea of a "shape", takes us back to Kawaguchi's review of the eye in Japanese. He suggested that there could be an etymological connection between *me* (目) and (間), and explored the category of *me* that pointed to this connection. Similar to English, the eye can represent a hole in Japanese (*amime*), but both languages add their own dimensions to the "shape" aspect of the eye.

Using the "eye" for a "spot/point" or the center of an object is common in both Japanese and English. The *center* of a storm is called the "eye": *taifū no me*, "eye of the storm". To hit the "bulls-eye" means to hit the center of an object. The dots on a die are called *sai no me* in Japanese. These examples are similar in that they point to the shape of the eye, but "bulls-eye" also has the aspect of "center of an object". However, a "point" can be a shape, but it can also be the "main point" of a matter, which takes a slightly different approach to the meaning. This approach is very common in Japanese in the form of kanji compound words. Take the following words for example: *mokuteki* (purpose; goal), *chūmoku* (notice; attention), *kamoku* ([school] subject), *mokuhyō* (objective; target), *mejirushi* (mark; landmark), *mokuroku* (catalogue; index), *medo* (aim; goal). The role of the eye becomes coherent in these examples. To both informants, the fact that all of these examples point to a main/focus point seemed to stick out. This use of the eye differs from the English language which, to my knowledge, does not utilize the eye in this way. In this case, I believe that the "main point" is related to the eye in the sense that an objective or target is a point that one can observe and focus on with the eyes. Similar use of body part can be seen in kanji compound words. For example, Japanese for 'prefix' and 'suffix' are respectively, *settō* (接頭) and *setsubi* (接尾). The meaning of the first kanji in both words is 'touch', 'contact', or 'adjoin'. The second kanji in *settō* (頭) means 'head', and the second one in *setsubi* (尾) means 'tail'. The metaphor is obvious in both words; the "head" of a word, and the "tail" of a word.

In the English language, experience suggests that the shape of the eye is not portrayed aside from holes and points. In Japanese however, the eye can represent gaps in time and space, as well as thin, consecutive lines. As presented in section (3.4.2) and Kawaguchi's examination of (目 2), there is an apparent presence of "pattern". Although that which has been presented so far has suggested that the EYES ARE HOLES metaphor is present in the Japanese language, it seems like there are more criteria that have to be fulfilled, for example "patterns".

In some cases it is somewhat unclear what shape of the eye is in focus. For example the Japanese word for "knot", *musubime*. In general *musubime* refers to a tightened knot, which creates a bump in a tied rope or thread. This bump stands out as a round "point" from the rest of the rope and in this sense it is connected to the eye. However, if one were to not fully tighten the knot, we would be left with a "hole" in the center of the knot. In this case, would

the metaphorical eye of *musubime* change from "point" to "hole"? To what extent would one have to untie a knot before it ceases being a knot? In both English and Swedish⁴ a loop can be called an "eye", but this does not seem to be the case with Japanese. I showed a figure depicting a thread with four consecutive loops to my informants and asked if there were any "eye" present in the picture. One of the informants thought that the figure depicted a stitching pattern and said that there indeed were "eyes" present in the image. However, when I told the informant that it was supposed to be loops, she changed her mind and said that there were no "eyes" in the picture. She later added that, to her, the loops in the picture were too big to be considered "eyes". That, if the "hole" in the loops were smaller she might have called them "eyes".

5. Concluding remarks

Some light has been shed on the grammaticalization and metaphorical aspects of the eye in the Japanese language.

Through the course of this essay it has become apparent that the eye plays many roles in both Japanese and English. We learnt that many basic, broader aspects of the eye were very similar and even hinted at universality as they showed to be present in other languages as well. As the comparison went on it became all the more clearer that the smaller and more specific these aspects got, the more distant and culture specific they proved to be.

The three metaphorical concepts that were tested on native Japanese speakers were verified to some extent that they existed in the Japanese language as well. It was apparent that although the metaphors were similar in general, frequency of use and specific details varied between English and Japanese.

This essay has but scratched on the surface of the contrast between English and Japanese, regarding but one body part. Still, I hope this essay will come to assistance in better understanding the subject or to serve as inspiration for further research in this field of linguistics.

⁴ *Ögla* (loop) comes from the Swedish word *öga* (eye).

References

Kandefelt, Joakim. 2011. "Ki och Oändliga idiom". Published by Lund University.

Kawaguchi, Junji. 1998. "「me」 no bunpōka o megutte" (Regarding the grammaticalization of me (eye)). *The geibun-kenkyū: Journal of arts and letters*, vol. 74, pp. 253-268. Published by Keiō Gijuku Daigaku Geibunkaka.

Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Published by University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London.

Kapusta, Jakub. 2016. "Love is War: A comparative study of conceptual metaphors in English and Japanese". Published by Lund University.

Kleiber, G., 1994. Nominales(essais de sémantique référentielle). *Linguistique*.

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2000. *The concept of anger: universal or culture specific?* *Psychopathology* 33(4). pp. 159-170.

McVeigh, Brian. 1996. "Standing stomachs, clamoring chests and cooling livers: Metaphors in the psychological lexicon of Japanese". *Journal of Pragmatics* 26(1): pp. 25-50. Published by Elsevier B.V.

Oki, Hiroko. 2004. "Nihongo noshintai kanyōku ichiran" (Overview of Japanese body idioms). *Shindai Nihongo Kyōiku kenkyū* 4: pp. 33-85. Published by Shinshū Daigaku Jinbungakubu Nihongo Kyōikugaku Kenkyūshitsu.

Reddy, M.J., 1979. The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. *Metaphor and thought*, pp.284-324.

Terasawa, Yoshio. 1997. "A Contrastive Study of Japanese and English Idiomatic Expressions". Annals of the Institute for Comparative Studies of Culture 58: pp. 64-129. Published by Tokyo Women's Christian University.

Terasawa, Yoshio. 1999. "A Contrastive Study of Japanese and English Idiomatic Expressions. Part II: Japanese Idiomatic Expressions of Emotions Referring to Parts of the Body". Annals of the Institute for Comparative Studies of Culture 60: pp. 35-106. Published by Tokyo Woman's Christian University.