

CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF THE METAPHOR AND METONYMY DRIVEN SEMANTIC EXTENSIONS OF THE BODY PART WORD HAND “手” IN CHINESE AND JAPANESE LANGUAGE

JOVANOVIĆ ANA * - TRIČKOVIĆ DIVNA **

ABSTRACT

Human body has relatively recently been acknowledged the role in human conceptualisation. Many of the basic bodily experiences get projected onto different spheres of human life via two basic mechanisms of thought, metaphor and metonymy, with a sole purpose of facilitating human understanding of the world. In this paper we investigate the metaphoric and metonymic extensions of one body part word, HAND, in Chinese and Japanese language. The aim of this study is, firstly, to point out the main mechanisms that govern the semantic extensions of the word HAND towards other cognitive domains in both languages. Secondly, the contrastive study we present here aims to show the similarities and differences that exist between these two languages both on the level of cognitive mechanisms and on the level of their surface language representations. Basic comparison with the two Indo-European languages, English and Serbian, given at the end of this paper contributes to the hypothesis that some of the cognitive mechanisms could have a universal status in human languages.

Key words: contrastive analysis, cognitive mechanisms metaphor metonymy mapping, meaning extension

0. Introduction

The ground-breaking work of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson (1980) has paved the way not only to the new trend in linguistic research known as the cognitive linguistics, but more importantly, to the new way of understanding human cognition as a complex function of mental abilities and bodily capabilities, as a unity of once mutually exclusive human mind and human body. Re-entering the big stage, human body and its experiences became the focus of attention to all of those who aimed to comprehend the way we think, reason and talk about the world around us. On this stage, once considered as strictly stylistic ornaments, metaphor and metonymy gained the status of the most important mechanisms of thought, without which not much could be understood and in the absence of which we would have been living in the dauntingly poor world of “literal concepts”, the world that would not have been called human at all. Given the importance of human body and its basic experiences as well as the mechanisms of figurative thought in comprehending everything from the concept of “time” to the complex ideas

* PhD, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philology

** PhD, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philology

of “social hierarchy” and alike, it becomes obvious why in this paper we chose to deal with them both. Naturally, talking about the “human body” as a whole would require much more space than available to us here, for which reason we chose to investigate the role of one body part word, HAND, and its multiple senses, all of which extended from the basic bodily meaning via metaphoric and metonymic transfers. The aim of this paper is to introduce one new way metaphor and metonymy can be examined, and that view is given through Chinese and Japanese language. For this purpose we singled out the word HAND in both languages.

The choice of HAND was not random. As a part of human body, “hand” has multiple functions, from maintaining equilibrium, grasping and holding objects, to communicating and operating complex machinery. Many of these functions we become aware of in a very early stage of our development. It does not surprise then that, the word 手/shǒu/ (hand) in Chinese, for example, has as many as 14 extended meanings.¹ Nor does it surprise that the number of collocations (including compounds, idioms and phrases) made by this body part word in Chinese numbers 336.² All this makes HAND not only a basic vocabulary word, but also a basic word for building a vocabulary of a language. And that is the main reason why we chose it as a topic of our present research.

The reason why we chose Chinese and Japanese language first of all lies in the very nature of the writing systems, in which the relation between the basic meaning and form is far from being random, as it is most clearly seen in the case of the body part word 手 /Ch. shǒu; Jp. te; shu/ “hand” (to be discussed later). Second, given the proximity of these two countries, and a very strong influence that Japan, historically speaking, has received from China, we can easily track the similarities in semantic extensions due to the use of the same character in both languages, induced not only by basic human experiences but also by similarities in certain cultural elements. We can also see the differences that are, as we believe, grounded in particularities of both of these cultural systems.

Our discussion will run as follows: in section one, we will give a short introduction of conceptual metaphor and metonymy as defined by the cognitive linguistic theory. In section two, we will give a short review of the main features of Chinese and Japanese writing systems with a special focus on the development of character 手. In section three, we will present an overview of the main paths of metaphoric and metonymic extensions of the

¹ 赵倩：汉语人体名词词义演变规律及认知动因. 博士研究生学位论文. 北京：北京语言大学，2007：55.

² According to statistical data given in Ana Jovanović’s PhD thesis ‘概念隐喻论与汉语人体词及其相关表达研究——“人体”在概念化过程中的作用，北京：北京师范大学，2009：6.

above said body part word in Chinese and Japanese respectively. Section four brings a short comparison on the existing similarities and differences with English and Serbian language, while section five brings a short conclusion of the findings and some new insights. For the purpose of this research we have used the dictionaries listed at the end of this paper.

1. Metaphor and metonymy in the light of cognitive linguistic theory

Originally considered to be “stylistic devices”, both metaphor and metonymy have, since the time of Aristotle onwards, been a research topic of those who were, for one reason or another, interested in that special part of human language that is called “figurative”. None of the two was ever considered crucial to any part of communication, but rather seen as a random occurrence urged by some special pragmatic need. Metaphor and metonymy as seen from the cognitive linguistic point of view, are something substantially different. “The word metaphor has come to mean a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system”³, says Lakoff (1992) and adds: “The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another”.⁴ It is considered to be a basic mechanism of thought through which we use simpler and more basic concepts to comprehend and structure more complex and abstract ones. Metaphor is essentially a mapping between a source and a target domain, in which the source domain is used to structure and organize the target. Source and target are two different domains between which we, as a consequence of our metaphoric thought, establish some sort of experiential similarity. The result of such cross-domain mappings are various expressions permeating the human language, that use terminology specific to one domain to talk about something completely different. Those expressions are called “metaphorical expressions”, which Lakoff (1992) defines in the following manner: “The term metaphorical expression refers to a linguistic expression (a word, a phrase, or sentence) that is the surface realization of such a cross-domain mapping(...)”⁵. Therefore, English expression “Your claims are indefensible”⁶ is, as Lakoff and Johnson state, surface language realization of the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR.

³ Lakoff, G. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor, online edition, available at: <http://terpconnect.umd.edu/~israel/lakoff-ConTheorMetaphor.pdf>, 1992: 1

⁴ Lakoff, G., Johnson, M., *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1981: 5.

⁵ G. Lakoff. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor, online source available at <http://terpconnect.umd.edu/~israel/lakoff-ConTheorMetaphor.pdf>, 1992: 1-2.

⁶ Lakoff, G. , Johnson, M., *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1981: 4.

Metonymy is another cognitive mechanism that applies slightly different strategy. While metaphor implies a conceptual mapping between two different cognitive domains, metonymy is a mapping between the two members of one cognitive domain. Lakoff (1990) defines metonymy in the following way: “Given an ICM⁷ with some background condition (e.g., institutions are located in places), there is a ‘stand for’ relation that may hold between two elements A and B, such that one element of the ICM, B, may stand for another element A. (...) We will refer to such ICMs containing stands-for relations as metonymic models”.⁸ Among the most common metonymic transfers are: PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT, OBJECT USED FOR USER, INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE, THE PLACE FOR INSTITUTION etc.,⁹ but as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) believe, THE PART FOR THE WHOLE, although formerly defined as a synecdoche, should be considered a “special case of metonymy”¹⁰ too. This is very important for our present study, since many body part words (and we shall see that in the case of 手) use this cognitive strategy in the process of semantic extensions.

Although considered to be a common cognitive feature of all human beings, metaphors and metonymies are believed to be universally present in languages only on the generic level. On the more specific level they are heavily dependent on cultural models. Universal human bodily experience renders common cognitive mechanisms, while cultural, historical and geographical particularities of every nation give birth to the culture-specific mechanisms.

2. Main features of Chinese and Japanese writing systems

The character for HAND is, as it can be seen, directly derived from the stylistic simplification of the picture of hand itself. Therefore it is known as one of the pictographic characters, rather rare but very functional sort of characters which are believed to be the oldest ones.



手

⁷ ICM: Idealized Cognitive Model. (explanation given by the authors of this paper)

⁸ Lakoff, G. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things – What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990:78.

⁹ Lakoff, G., Johnson, M., *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1981: 38.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 36.

jin wen script *xiao zhuan script* *modern form in standard typeface*

Picture 1. The development of character 手 (Ch. /shǒu/; Jp. /te; shu/ “hand”) ¹¹

Apart from the above said pictographic characters, standard classification in Japanese language distinguishes two more types, namely, ‘co-semantic’ (also called ‘associative’) and ‘semasio-phonetic’ (or ‘pictophonetic’) characters which are derived from the pictographic ones ¹². The so called ‘co-semantic/associative’ characters, use simpler characters to represent more complex things or concepts (for example: 拝 /jap. ogamu; hai/ consisting of two elements ‘hand’ + ‘offering, sacrifice’ which combine to form the meaning “worship, pray”). ‘Semasio-phonetic/pictophonetic’ characters, are formed from two elements, one carrying the clue for pronunciation and another for the meaning. In contrast to Japanese, widely accepted classification of characters in Chinese is the so called 六书/liù shū/, i.e. “six scripts”, which, apart from the above mentioned three types existing in Japanese, includes also the self-explanatory characters (for example 上 /shàng/, “above”), mutually explanatory characters and phonetic loans.¹³ Of all types of characters existing in Chinese and Japanese language, the most interesting ones are semasio-phonetic/pictophonetic characters. It would be interesting to examine the mechanisms at work in structuring more complex characters from the simpler ones, as we are sure that metaphor and metonymy can be found in this process as well, especially because in the most frequent ‘semasio-phonetic’ ones, the phonetic part is usually not unrelated to the meaning, as can be seen from the example, 招 /jap. maneku; shou/ ‘hand’ + ‘call’/ phonetic /shou/ = ‘invite, beckon’¹⁴. Nevertheless, on this occasion we

¹¹ Symbols for this body part term in *jinwen* script (i.e. script on bronze) as well as the *xiao zhuan* script (i.e. smaller seal script) (picture 1) are reproductions of the illustrations given in 王朝忠主编《汉字形义演释字典》，成都：四川出版集团：四川辞书出版社，2006：111.

¹² There are different classifications of characters. The one introduced here is based mainly on the structure of the meaning. We have not considered different historical approaches to this question. This classification is discussed in ‘A New Dictionary of Kanji Usage’ (Gakken, Tokyo, 1995, p. 427 and further), and is rather usual in the dictionaries of the Japanese language.

¹³ 汉英词典（修订版缩印本），北京外国语大学英语系词典组编，北京：外语教学与研究出版社，2006（first edition 1997）：778/1627/1362/1396/531/ 1661/573.

¹⁴ “Over 80% of all *kanji* [i.e. Japanese word for character] are multi-component. With so many *kanji* and so few components, clearly there is considerable overlap of components. Conversely, it may be said that the vast number of *kanji* are created of a small number of components. In fact, there are only about 250 components for the entire 50,000 *kanji*.” *A New*

will focus only at the combination of the characters, leaving HAND as a character component for some future research.

One of the most obvious features of Chinese language is that the words are written with two characters representing two morphemes, which in some cases can function as two independent words. Since great percentage of Japanese words are borrowed from Chinese, this principle is almost equally present in Japanese as well. Due to this, and other circumstances already mentioned, we expect to find great deal of similarities between these two languages. On the other hand, this also means that most of the words in these two languages are compounds. In the present research we will show that, although in some Indo-European languages metaphors and metonymies are examined mostly through the meanings of independent words in sentences, collocations or other applicable context, in Chinese and Japanese, due to the characteristics of the writing system, they can be, and usually are tested on the level of morphemes since they can be quite easily verified through the letters/characters in compounds. For this reason, we will not be dealing with the meanings of 手/Ch.shǒu; Jp. te,shu/ (“hand”) when used as an independent word in sentences.

3. Meaning extensions of the word HAND 手 /Ch. shǒu; Jp. te, shu/ induced by the mechanisms of metaphor and metonymy

The most important metaphoric extension of the word HAND (手Ch. /shǒu/, Jap. /te/; /shu/) in both languages is based on combined similarity in form, position and function. This similarity is established through everyday experience with our hands on one side and other concrete objects in the outside world on the other. This experientially grounded similarity enables us to use the word 手 to name a part of some concrete object that “resembles” our body part, either in its shape, position or function, or in a way that combines all three types of similarity. The meaning HANDLE is created in such a way, as in Chinese compound 机械手 /jīxièshǒu/ (lit: machine - hand, hand of a machine; i.e. “manipulator”) and Japanese 取手 /totte, or torite/ “handle; knob; grip”.

Second line of semantic extension of the word 手 in both languages is based on metonymic transfer THE PART FOR THE WHOLE. In Chinese, in particular, it follows the path HAND → PERSON THAT DOES CERTAIN WORK or PERSON SKILLED IN SOMETHING, rendering thus a metonymic transfer THE HAND STANDS FOR THE PERSON¹⁵. This metonymic transfer is experientially grounded in the function of holding and manipulating objects that hand as a body part has. In Chinese language, this type of metonymic transfer produces a large number of compounds by

Dictionary of Kanji Usage, Gakken, Tokyo, 1995: 427.

¹⁵ For more information on this metonymy see Yu (2009).

combining a noun, an adjective or a verb with body part word HAND (手/shǒu). Belonging to this category are the following examples: 拳手/quánshǒu/ (lit. fist - hand, a person good in boxing, “boxer”), 歌手/gēshǒu/ (lit. song - hand, a person good in singing, “singer, vocalist”) and 鼓手/gǔshǒu/ (lit. drum – hand; “drummer”). These three are the examples of compounds formed by combining a noun (with a purpose of denoting a specific field someone is skilled in) with the word 手/shǒu/. Compounds 好手/hǎoshǒu/ (lit. good - hand, “good hand, past master”), 高手/gāoshǒu/ (lit. high - hand, “past master, master-hand, ace”) etc. exemplify the combination of an adjective with the word 手/shǒu/, while compound 射手/shèshǒu/ (lit. aim - hand, hand that aims; “shooter, marksman, archer”) illustrates the combination of a verb and this body part word. We can say that the cognitive basis for the compounds 拳手(/quánshǒu/, “boxer”), 射手(/shèshǒu/, “shooter, marksman, archer”) or 獵手(/lièshǒu/, “hunter”) is more apparent than for the others, since there is an obvious relation between the basic function of the hand and the meaning of the compound as a whole. In contrast to those three, compounds such as 歌手(gēshǒu/, “singer, vocalist”), give no clue as to the reason why HAND is used, so that the cognitive basis for the formation of this connection has already been lost. This type of noun formation is used in Japanese too, albeit in much lesser number. It is mostly present in combinations with a verbal root, as in the case of a compound 借手/kaite/ “a tenant; a lessee”, 買手/kaite/ “a buyer; a purchaser” etc. Apart from the examples representing a combination of a verb and body part word 手, there are some other examples, such as 歌手/kashu/ “singer” (which is identical to Chinese), and 手不足/tebusoku/ “shorthanded”. It is however very interesting to note that while most of the Chinese compounds with 手/shǒu/ formed via this metonymic transfer carry the semantic component TO BE GOOD IN SOMETHING, this semantic element is far less dominant in Japanese compounds, although still apparent in the compounds such as 上手/jouzu/ “to be skilful, clever, good (at something)”, 下手/heta/ “to be unskilful, poor, bad (at something)”¹⁶.

Another line of semantic extension of the word 手 is driven by metonymic transfer PART FOR FUNCTION, which is again based on the function of “hand” in human body. This metonymic transfer governs the following semantic extensions of 手/shǒu/ in Chinese: HAND → MEASURE WORD FOR SKILL, exemplified in the sentence 他真有两手 /Tā zhēn yǒu liǎng shǒu/ (lit. He – really – to have – two – hands; i.e. He really knows his stuff) ¹⁷; HAND → METHOD / WAY exemplified with 手辣/shǒulà/ (lit:

¹⁶ It is interesting to note that both of these examples are the so called *ateji* in Japanese language, i.e. special category of originally Japanese words combined with the phonetically inadequate characters just on the basis of the meaning they represent.

¹⁷ 汉英词典 (修订版缩印本), 北京外国语大学英语系词典组编,

hand / method / way – hot / vicious, ruthless; i.e. “vicious, ruthless means”) and also to the verbal meaning HAND → HOLD / GRASP, which is illustrated with: 人手一册/rén shǒu yī cè/ (lit: man - hand / hold - one - copy; i.e. “everyone has one copy”). Induced by the same cognitive mechanism is the Japanese extension of the word 手 towards the meaning JOB THAT YOU DO WITH YOUR HANDS (as in 手入れ/teire/ “repair”; 手写/shusha/ “copying by hand”) → JOB (as in 手工/shukou/ “manual work, handicraft”; 手工芸/shukougei/ “handicraft”) → METHOD / WAY (as in 手口/teguchi/ “style of work; method employed”; 手本/tehon/ “model, pattern”; 手法/shuhou/ “technique; technical skill”). Even when used alone, as a separate word, 手 in Japanese language can mean METHOD or even TRICK. Driven by the same metonymic mapping is the meaning MEASURE that the word HAND (手/te;/shu/) has in Japanese language (ex. 手一速/teissoku/ “length of a hand”).

The meaning PERSONALLY, done WITH ONE’S OWN HAND that the word 手/shǒu/ has in Chinese, as exemplified with the compound 手抄/shǒuchāo/ (lit: hand / personally - copy; i.e. “write by hand, handwrite; handwritten”), appears in Japanese language too, as in 手弁当で/tebentou-de/ “furnishing one’s own lunch”; and 手前/temae/ “this way, towards you; this side of”). Although it could be expected for this word in Japanese to develop the meaning TO CARRY (and even though it really does have this meaning albeit in a very limited number of examples (such as 手持ち/temochi/ “holdings, goods on hand”), the meaning EASY TO CARRY, ex. 手小荷物/tekonimotsu/ “hand baggage”) is more common, as it is the case with Chinese too. It is not at all simple to decide whether the compound 手札/tebuda/ “name card; a hand (in card playing)” developed from the meaning TO CARRY or EASY / TO CARRY/ CONVENIENT (that is THE SIZE THAT CAN FIT IN ONE’S HAND). The meaning HANDY/CONVENIENT exists in Chinese too, which is illustrated with the compound 手册/shǒucè/ (lit: hand / handy - copy; “handbook, manual”).

Another interesting usage of the word HAND in Japanese is the meaning PALM, in which case the word, which is originally used to denote both arm and hand, is used to point to just one specific part of the whole body part it represents. This usage is exemplified with the compound 手相占/tesou-uranai/ “palmistry”.

4. Similarities and differences in comparison with English and Serbian language

East Asian languages such as Chinese and Japanese, which were the object of our study in this paper, are genealogically unrelated to the Indo-European languages, for which reason we would expect no similarities, or at least, no

significant similarities to be found between them on the lexico-semantic level. And yet, even a very basic comparison shows the existence of astonishing similarities between these languages at the level of meaning extensions and mechanisms that govern them. Let us take a look at some basic usages of body part word ‘hand’ in English and ‘ruka’ (hand) in Serbian language.

Extended meaning SOMETHING SUGGESTING THE SHAPE OR FUNCTION OF THE HUMAN HAND¹⁸ is an extended meaning of body part word ‘hand’ in English, which is a product of metaphorical mapping based on similarity which, as shown earlier, exists in Chinese and Japanese too. Although not so obvious as in the case of Chinese, Japanese and English, due to the complex system of morphological changes in Serbian language, this type of metaphoric transfer exists in it too, as can be seen from the example RUČKA/RUČICA (lit. small hand, diminutive of RUKA – “hand”), which is used to denote a HANDLE (usually of a tool, a weapon etc).¹⁹

Metonymic transfer THE PART FOR THE WHOLE makes it possible for the use of ‘hand’ in English in the sense of ONE WHO PERFORMS MANUAL LABOR, as shown in the example “a factory hand“. The same mechanism governs the extension of the word ‘ruka’ (hand) in Serbian towards SOMEONE WHO DOES CERTAIN WORK, WORKER, as in “Čitave industrije i zanati...ostali [su] bez radnih ruku“ (lit. Many industries and trades... [were] left without working hands“, i.e. “without manpower“). It is however necessary to highlight that the metonymic use of HAND to denote a person who does some work in Serbian, does not carry the semantic component of “being especially good in doing something“ or “having a special skill“ as it is the case in Chinese, which makes it more similar to Japanese. In English however, HAND develops the meaning A PARTICIPANT IN AN ACTIVITY, OFTEN ONE WHO SPECIALIZES IN A PARTICULAR ACTIVITY OR PURSUIT which is shown in the expression „an old *hand* at labour negotiations.“

Metonymic transfer PART FOR FUNCTION exists in English and Serbian too, and is exemplified in the verbal use of ‘hand’ (as in “*hand* me your keys“), as well as in Serbian „*rukovati*“ (lit. “to handle“). The same metonymic mechanism is responsible for the meaning A MANNER OR WAY

¹⁸ Extended meanings of the word ‘hand’ in English, as well as all of the examples given in this paper are taken from The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth edition copyright 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company, updated in 2009. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company. available at <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/hand>

¹⁹ Explanations of meanings related to the body part word ‘ruka’ (hand) or its compounds in Serbian language, as well as all the lexical and sentential examples appearing in this paper are taken from Rečnik Srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika, (uređivački odbor Mihajlo Stevanović i dr.), Novi Sad: Matica srpska, (2. fototipsko izd.), 1990: vol. 5:575/576/577/589. For the purpose of this paper all the explanations and examples are translated into English by the author Ana Jovanović.

OF PERFORMING SOMETHING which can be seen in the English example “a light *hand* with makeup“, or Serbian WAY, MANNER, as shown in the sentence „Počinjali smo od svake *ruke*, pa ne ide“ (lit. [We]-started – from – every – *hand* – but- it doesn’t work, i.e. We used all sorts of *ways*, but without any success“). Clearly, there is a high degree of similarity with Chinese and Japanese in this respect too.

Listed above are just some examples of similarities that exist between these four languages. What is important to note is that these similarities exist at the conceptual level, and that similar usages of the body part word HAND are just surface manifestations of similar cognitive mechanisms that exist in the minds of ordinary users of Chinese, Japanese, English and Serbian. But, as mentioned earlier in this paper, similarities are usually the result of common bodily experience all human beings share regardless of their national, racial or cultural affiliation.

The differences between these languages are also not to be neglected. The most obvious one is probably the common verbal usage of the word ‘hand’ in English and ‘ruka’ (hand) - RUKOVATI (handle) in Serbian, in contrast to Chinese and Japanese where this usage, although possible, is much more restricted. The use of HAND as a measure word in Chinese is yet another important example of differences stemming directly from the different natures of these languages.

5. Conclusion

The conclusions we draw from the above said are the following:

1. Contrastive analysis of the meaning extensions of the word HAND in Chinese and Japanese language shows a high degree of conceptual similarity between these two non-related East Asian languages. These similarities stem, on one hand, from the basic human experiences in the world, and from the geographical proximity and cultural influences on the other. Differences between the two are, however, related to the scope of presence of a certain cognitive mechanism rather than its lack in any of them. We have noticed that certain cognitive mechanisms, although present in Japanese language, are less productive, i.e. have fewer examples on the lexical level. We believe that one of the reasons for this difference could be the acceptance of certain Chinese words as loans. Although carrying certain cognitive mechanisms in them, these loans could not further develop into the widely accepted model for word formation due to the specific features of Japanese culture.²⁰

²⁰ It is interesting to note that the words known as *ateji* in Japanese language (which we have mentioned earlier), are the best examples of the mechanisms borrowed directly from

2. A short comparison with English and Serbian shows that similar metaphoric and metonymic transfers exist in these two Indo-European languages too. This fact makes it possible for us to assume a universal status of these mechanisms in human languages. However, we believe that a definite conclusion on this matter should be made only after further and more detailed examination.

3. The specific nature of the writing systems in Chinese and Japanese language makes the compounds in these two languages a very interesting topic for metaphoric and metonymic research. It is therefore possible (and it is shown in the text above with concrete examples) to investigate the role of cognitive mechanisms on the level of morphology and word formation, as opposed to usual practice in Indo-European languages where this kind of research is mostly carried out in regard to different usages of one word in different sentential contexts.

Although it is widely accepted by the researchers of East Asian languages to investigate individual usages of one single word in different contexts (similar to their European and American colleagues) as well as to examine its use in word formation (which is typical for Chinese and Japanese), we believe that yet another interesting research topic would be the case of simple character becoming a constituent part of another (more complex) character. The complex characters formed in such a way could then be seen as a form of metaphor or metonymy driven “semantic compounds”. We shall, however, have to leave this to be the topic for some future research.

References

- Kristal, Dejvid (1996) *Kembrička enciklopedija jezika*, Beograd: Nolit.
- Klikovac, Duška (2004) *Metafore u mišljenju i jeziku*, Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek, knj. 139.
- Lakoff, George. Johnson, Mark (1981) *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. (First edition 1980)
- Lakoff, George (1990) *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things – What Categories Reveal about the Mind*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. (First edition 1987).
- Lakoff, George (1992) *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor*, online source available at: <http://terpconnect.umd.edu/~israel/lakoff-ConTheorMetaphor.pdf> [last visited on July 6th, 2012.]
- Packard, J.L. (2001) *The Morphology of Chinese: A Linguistic and Cognitive Approach*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, (originally published by Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Chinese, which, due to the cultural specificity of Japanese language could not further develop and become more productive.

Yu, Ning. (2009) The Bodily dimension of meaning in Chinese – What do we do and mean with “hands”? in Yu, Ning: *From Body to Meaning in Culture: papers on cognitive semantic studies of Chinese*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2009:111-133.

Jovanovic, Ana, (2009) 概念隐喻论与汉语人体词及其相关表达研究——“人体”在概念化过程中的作用, 北京: 北京师范大学(unpublished PhD thesis)

黄伯荣, 廖序东(2002) 现代汉语(增订三版)(上册), 北京: 高等教育出版社, 163 – 188.

裘锡圭(1998) *文字学概要* 北京: 商务印书馆(First edition 1988.)

束定芳(1996) 亚里士多德与隐喻研究 *外语研究* (1):13-17.

赵倩(2007). 汉语人体名词词义演变规律及认知动因 博士研究生学位论文 北京语言大学

Dictionaries:

A New Dictionary of Kanji Usage, (1995). Gakken, Tokyo.

Japanese – English dictionary of characters *Nelson* (abbrev. NEL; Nelson, N. Andrew 1995: *The Original Modern Reader’s Japanese-English Character Dictionary*, Classic edition. Charles E. Tuttle Company).

Rečnik Srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika, (1990). (uređivački odbor Mihajlo Stevanović i dr.), Novi Sad: Matica srpska, (2. fototipsko izd.).

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth edition copyright 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company, updated in 2009. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company. Available at <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/hand> [last visited on 20th July, 2012.]

现代汉语词典 第5版, (2007). 中国社会科学院语言研究所词典编辑室编 北京商务印书馆 (First edition 2005)

汉英词典(修订版)(增订本). (2006). 北京外国语大学英语系词典组编 北京: 外语教学与研究出版社 (First edition 1997)

王朝忠主编《汉字偏旁义演释字典》(2006). 成都: 四川出版集团 四川辞书出版社

『日本国語大辞典』 第六卷, 第八卷, 第十四卷, 第十八卷, 第十九卷 (編集: 日本国語大辞典刊行会) 小学館

『広辞苑』第四版 (編集: 新林) 岩波書店