Husbands and wives in English and Japanese:
A cognitive, corpus-based semantic and sociopragmatic analysis

コーパスを用いた英日の夫と妻の使用における
認知的・社会語用論的考察

Carey BENOM
Center for Language Studies, Nagasaki University

Abstract

In order to examine the way married men and women are represented in English and Japanese, a study of various terms for *husband* and *wife* in English and Japanese was undertaken based on data collected from two huge, comparable corpora. The English terms *husband* and *wife*, as well as their Japanese translational equivalents *otto, shujin, danna, okusan/okusama, tsuma,* and *yome* were investigated. The results show that, in both English and Japanese, collocates of terms for married women primarily pertain to the semantic fields of physical appearance and sexuality, victimization by violence, subservience, and the capacity for childbearing, while the results for married men are more varied, but frequently involve the semantic fields of power, personality traits, physical appearance, and virility/sexuality. These results will be considered within the context of the study of gender and language (e.g. Connell 2002, Lakoff 1975/2004), and in particular as they relate to Ide's (e.g. 2004) claim that women are not subordinate to men in Japanese culture.

Keywords: language and gender, corpus linguistics,
contrastive analysis, semantic and pragmatic typology

1. Introduction and Overview

Within the context of the study of language and gender, sociocultural linguistics, and semantic and pragmatic typology, I wish to ask the following question: *How do*

we talk about married men and women in various languages? I choose to focus on married people in order to contrast men and women while controlling for variables involving age and various social factors.[1]

How are husbands and wives categorized in various languages? What is the nature of these categories, along which lines and to what extents can languages differ in their treatment of married men and women, and are there any (near-) universals in languages' treatments of these cultural roles? Beyond the existence of overt categories, what do broader, subconscious patterns of language use reveal about the gender-based stereotypes of married people that exist within the cultural matrix? In other words, how do cultural biases surrounding husbands and wives manifest linguistically? These are the broader questions which inspired this research.

Alternately, taking instead a bottom-up approach, as an L2 learner of Japanese, I am interested in distinguishing the many terms speakers employ for husbands and wives, so what I can do here to (begin to) address both concerns is to undertake a contrastive study of terms for husbands and wives, using Japanese and English as a sample of convenience.

To begin, I examined some English and Japanese translational equivalents for *husband* (*otto, shujin, danna/dannasan*) and *wife* (*okusan/okusama, tsuma, kanai, yome*, *nyoubou*) based on data derived from two large (~10 billion word), comparable, Web-derived corpora. The specific questions I addressed were as follows:

1)　How do speakers <u>refer to</u> married men and women?
2)　In what ways do we <u>describe</u> them?
3)　What are they most frequently said <u>to do</u>, and what is most often <u>done to them</u>?
4)　The way we talk about it, what do <u>we give them</u>, and what do <u>they give us</u>?
5)　The way we talk about it, what do <u>we do together with them</u>?

To address these five questions, I studied grammatical constructions used to refer, modify, express agentivity, and so on, and examined the lexical collocates (= word combinations that habitually co-occur) of each term for husband and wife in each construction. Using statistical analysis of co-occurrence data, I identified the words that "belong" in these environments, and measured the strength of attraction (or repulsion) of various words to these specific linguistic contexts. In addition, I contrasted the results (e.g. husbands vs. wives, or two categories of wives such as *yome* vs. *tsuma*; I also contrasted the overall results in Japanese vs. English), to better

identify the specific patterns associated with each term.

This relates to the research of Sachiko Ide (e.g. 2004), who argues that women are *not* subordinate to men in Japanese culture. Ide originally applied Lakoff's (1975) pioneering revelations – that language by and about women marks their lower status – and her vision of feminist theory to Japanese, and published prolifically using this perspective, but ultimately recanted, arguing that, in Japan, what is relevant is not a gender difference but a role difference. She contends that Lakoff's underlying assumptions are based on the egalitarian idealism of an individualistic society, and that this doesn't fit Japanese society, where role differences are assumed.

"If one is subordinate to the other, it may be called imbalance under egalitarian idealism. However, if one has a different role from the other, it is a matter of difference that may work complementarily." (Ide 2004: 185)

Ide argues that Japanese women are satisfied with their power, which simply belongs to a different domain than men's power. However, even if Ide is correct about this, "working complementarily" does not imply "valued equivalently", and here, I would like to ask if the different roles are valued differently.

With a focused effort toward arguing against Ide's conclusions, I will attempt to use the corpus data as evidence that, in Japan, just as in the English-speaking world, women are primarily valued for their physical appearance and sexuality, their child-bearing capacity, and their ability to quietly serve…in other words, in ways in which they serve men's purposes (from a patriarchal, gender normalized, heteronormative perspective). Here, I will present evidence that, in Japanese, just as in English, speakers talk about (married) women in ways that reveal that they are primarily valued for their service to men.

In order for this evidence to be relevant to Ide's claims, I need to make the following assumption: the values of a society are reflected in its language use (or, more simply, a society talks about what it cares about). However, I will not assume that the language of the internet is the same as spoken language, and therefore I will interpret the results, which reveal how speakers write about married people on the internet, as valid for the "culture" / medium of the Web, and as merely suggestive of the situation with other types of language use.

2. Background and Methods

The questions on which I focus here belong to gender studies, sociolinguistics, and cultural linguistics, but to address them, I have utilized a cognitive linguistic approach to semantic analysis, as well as the tools of corpus linguistics. However, I also modified the cognitive approach to reflect the perspectives and approach of cultural linguistics (cf. Frank 2016) in an effort to have the two approaches inform one another for the purpose of gaining deeper understanding of this social behavior.

Only relatively recently have cognitive linguists begun to pay attention to the relevance that sociocultural approaches to linguistics have to (and the influence they should have within) cognitive linguistics, but in this brief period a significant effort to make cognitive linguistics more social has arisen (e.g. Croft 2009; Geeraerts 2003, Geeraerts et al. 2010; Kristiansen and Dirven 2008, Pütz et al. 2014). Here, I will face the other direction, beginning with social/cultural questions and concerns and showing how the analyst can benefit from adopting a cognitive linguistic approach (as does e.g. Gries 2013). I aim to demonstrate that the primary strengths of cognitive linguistics, including detailed, cognitively-motivated semantic analysis, the theory of conceptual metaphor, frame semantics, and a constructionist, usage-based approach to grammar, as well as the use of a corpus-based methodology, are useful tools for addressing sociocultural questions by giving insight into social structure and social psychology.

Because this work draws on cognitive semantic theories to investigate the sociocultural bases of variation in use / meaning, considering cognitive, social and cultural factors that shape the patterns of use that are observed, and it applies the cognitive linguistic vision of meaning as a non-discrete yet structured category as part of the effort to account for this social, linguistic (behavioral) variation, my efforts can and should be seen as contributing to the emerging research paradigm known as cognitive sociolinguistics (e.g. Pütz et al. 2014).

My research utilizes this cognitive sociolinguistic approach to interact with sociolinguistic work on gender, especially with respect to the relative position of, and biases surrounding, men and women in English- and Japanese-speaking cultures.

One of the core concepts of the cognitive paradigm is that of neural embodiment, an approach that (re)unites perception and conception, but precisely how it does this is the issue. In the modern, mainstream cognitive linguistic treatment, this theory has become almost exclusively focused on the physical or bodily basis of embodiment.

Cognition is embodied when it is deeply dependent upon features of the physical

body of an agent, that is, when aspects of the agent's body beyond the brain play a significant causal or physically constitutive role in cognitive processing.
- The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, entry on embodied cognition, accessed 2020/11/15 at http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/embodied-cognition/

Embodied Realism, in contrast to Representationalist theories, rejects the notion that mind and body are two ontologically distinct kinds… - Johnson and Rohrer 2007: 17.

This, however, was not always the case (Frank 2016). The original conception of metaphor theory in cognitive linguistics recognized the essential contribution of culture to embodiment, where Lakoff and Johnson use the phrase *direct physical experience* to encompass cultural experience:

(W)hat we call 'direct physical experience' is never merely a matter of having a body of a certain sort; rather, every *experience takes place within a vast background of cultural presuppositions. It can be misleading, therefore, to speak of direct physical experience as though there were some core of immediate experience which we then 'interpret' in terms of our conceptual system. Cultural assumptions, values, and attitudes are not a conceptual overlay which we may or may not place upon experience as we choose. It would be more correct to say that all experience is cultural through and through, that we experience our 'world' in such a way that our culture is already present in the very experience itself.* (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 57)

It is not my purpose to examine why this focus on culture as a basis of embodiment was lost in cognitive linguistics (except to note that the phrase itself lends itself to such a misunderstanding), but rather to observe that the cultural basis of experience was not lost in cultural linguistics (e.g. Varela, Thompson, and Rosch, 1991/1993 used Lakoff and Johnson's original conception in their theory of the embodied mind; see Frank 2016). Benefits of using a modified cognitive approach include the ability to analyze the metaphorical patterns not as existing purely "between the ears" but as higher-level, cultural conceptualizations which are nonetheless embodied. This in turn provides converging evidence to support my argument that the corpus results speak to larger social themes regarding the valuation of gender roles, and that they point to

striking similarities in how different sexes (or genders; it is not always clear if speakers are primarily concerned with the physical or social differences between married men and women, and the two are often conflated in folk philosophy) are conceptualized by speakers in English- and Japanese-speaking cultures.

The first part of my argument is based on a study of the collocates of the English terms, in order to use this as a kind of baseline. The second part of the argument shows that the Japanese results display similar patterns, reflecting similar cultural biases. In addition to considering speakers' mostly implicit attitudes as exemplified in the corpus data, I cite sociolinguistic research studying speakers' explicit attitudes, such as Takemaru (2005), in order to support my argument.

2.1 Previous studies

Previous research focused on words for wives in Japanese. Cherry (1987) is based on subjective, intuitive analysis but makes use of social/historical motivation, and Takemaru (2010) is based on data from questionnaires, interviews, and also employs social/historical motivation. Their results: the common words for wives in Japanese (*tsuma, oku-san / -sama, kanai, yome(-san), nyoubou*) are all viewed as sexist and offensive.

Okusan: "I find it very depressing…to be called *oku-san*…There should be much more respectful terms in the Japanese language to address married women…" (Takemaru 2010: 96)

Kanai: "…I do not appreciate my husband referring to me as *kanai* to other people, because it makes me feel that I am less of a person than my husband." (Ibid: 97)

Nyooboo: "My heart sinks every time when I overhear my husband…referring me (sic) as *furu nyooboo*…" (Ibid: 98)

"The vast majority of the Japanese terms that refer to wives and husbands such as *oku-san, kanai, shujin*, and *teishu*, not only sound very old-fashioned, but also reflect and foster existing gender-based role division. I personally do not want to use any of these when I get married. They need to be replaced with more modern terms that are free from gender bias." (26 y.o. part-time office worker, cited by

Takemaru 2010: 162)

Here, I will try to provide converging evidence that is empirically grounded (both reliable and replicable). Instead of basing my analysis primarily on intuition (mine or others'), I will examine the usage patterns of these terms in the linguistic system to gain a deeper understanding of their behavior (and therefore their meaning) within the cultural system.

2.2 Methods

For data, I used two comparable corpora created by Web crawling: the enTenTen12, an English corpus containing 11 billion words (Jakubíček et al. 2013), and jaTenTen11, a Japanese corpus with 8 billion words (Srdanović et al. 2103). (TenTen refers to 10^{10}, or 10 billion words, and the number at the end refers to the final two digits of the year it was collected.)

There are many benefits to using a corpus. One key is that using a corpus allows the researcher to access statistical co-occurrence information that is not available to intuition, though sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic evidence shows that, as speakers, we are unconsciously aware of and extremely sensitive to such statistics, including frequencies of word combinations (see e.g. Bybee 1985, Bybee and Hopper 2001, Caldwell-Harris et al. 2012, Durrant and Schmitt 2009, Ellis 2002, Ellis et al. 2009, Labov 1966, Labov et al. 2006, Rumelhart and McClelland 1986, Teddiman 2012).

For instance, Durrant and Doherty (2010) show that collocations found in a corpus are psychologically real in speakers' minds. Baayen and Lieber (1997) argue that differences in semantic structure can be reflected in probability density functions for word frequency distribution. Labov et al. (2006) showed, through several experiments, that subjects are extremely sensitive to differences in frequency, even those as small as 10%. The work of Ellis and colleagues should be considered in any discussion of co-occurrence and mental representation:

"Accurate and fluent language perception…rests on the comprehender having acquired the appropriately weighted range of associations for each element of the language input." (Ellis 2002: 144, see also Ellis et al. 2009).

In linguistics, similar conclusions have been drawn, both historically (e.g. "You shall know a word by the company it keeps"; Firth 1957: 11) and more recently in usage-

based linguistics:

> "Frequency of exposure and use is an important factor in the establishment and maintenance of linguistic structure" (Bybee & Hopper 2001: 3; see also Bybee 2006; Goldberg 2006; Tomasello 2003).

Therefore, frequency – including frequency of co-occurrence – is part of the semantic structure of a word, and speakers' mental representations of linguistic items are determined by use, or, as relevant here, by frequency of (co-)occurrence). We could also describe this in the following way: meanings of collocates are cross-linked and simultaneously activated when we process a lexeme.

The careful reader might ask: isn't this semantics, not pragmatics? Semantics is the study of "conventional" or "encoded" meaning. Pragmatics involves meaning in context, as well as the speaker's intention and beliefs, etc. However, linguistic context is one type of context. Using a corpus, we can study a culture-wide propensity to use a term in a given context, revealing both social belief patterns and the (shared) understanding of the individual. Attempts to sharply differentiate semantics and pragmatics are typically doomed to fail, e.g. "Semantics deals with the question of meaning, while pragmatics deals with questions of use." (Kracht 2014: 1) And yet, as we have just seen, the meaning of a word lies in its pattern of usage. Collocational information therefore involves both meaning and use. How a word is used – the linguistic contexts in which it frequently appears – is (at least a large part of) the meaning of the word.

This approach is different from traditional / formal semantics, which might differentiate the terms in the following way: *husband* (+ male, + married); *wife* (+ female, + married). This type of "dictionary" approach allows semantics to be sharply distinguished from pragmatics (or "encyclopedic knowledge"). On the other hand, in cognitive linguistics, and functional or usage-based approaches in general, lexemes are considered to be access points to encyclopedic knowledge, thereby blurring the distinction between semantics and pragmatics. Therefore, grounded in a cognitive, usage-based approach, I will use co-occurrence data as I attempt to support my sociopragmatic arguments.

To access the corpora, I use the Sketch Engine interface, which is very useful, but below I will briefly discuss two types of situations in which the analyst must carefully analyze the results and delve deeper than a simple comparison of statistical correlation

rankings.

Collocations are ranked based on the statistical assessment known as LogDice, in which two scores are compared in this way: +1 point = collocation twice as frequent/often, and +7 points = collocation roughly 100 times as frequent/often (Rychlý 2008). Unlike the MI score and the t-score, LogDice does not rely on the problematic assumption of the random distribution of language, because it does not include expected frequency in its equation. It also eliminates the low-frequency bias of MI scores (Gablasova et al. 2017).

3. English Results and Discussion

I will present the English results first as a type of baseline against which to compare the Japanese results. In English, there are two unmarked terms, *husband* and *wife*, in addition to many non-standard or slang terms such as these for *wife*: *ball and chain, other half, better half, the missus, trouble and strife, her who shall be obeyed, my old girl, my old lady, the old bird, my bird, partner* etc. All of these return relatively few results, however, so it is not possible to study their behavior with much detail. Therefore, I have focused on the unmarked terms *husband* and *wife*.

I will begin with a cautionary tale. Performing a "Word Sketch Difference" for the terms *husband* and *wife* (including all variations, such as plural and possessive forms), we find that Sketch Engine makes two errors, which I will explain here. First, an example of the results:

Table 1: As "Subject" of Verb

Subject of	Husband	Wife	Husband LogDice	Wife LogDice
snore	269	42	4.7	1.9
abuse	389	68	4.7	2.1
swap	0	697	--	5.8

As for the first error, the prevalence of the set phrase *wife swapping* (and the interface's categorization of this nominalized phrase in the same way as a subject + main verb) can be said to be skewing the results. The examples with *swap* cannot be said to be equivalent to those with *snore* and *abuse*. However, it is also telling that the compound *wife swapping* occurs, and with such frequency, and that *husband swapping* was absent from the corpus. The metaphor WOMEN ARE OBJECTS is a prerequisite to the use of *swap*, which invokes the exchange frame, involving the

exchange of goods for goods.[2] This semantic evidence interacts with discussions in sociology about the objectification of women by male-dominant hegemonies. The study of the semantics of this compound, as I have analyzed it here, overlaps with the study of its pragmatics.

Note that to study the sociopragmatics of *wife* without using frame semantics (Fillmore 1982) and Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) would lead to missing this important point which provides converging evidence for the analysis of (married) women's place in English-speaking societies. And, to study the lexical semantics of *wife* without considering the social aspects of women's roles in a male-dominated culture would be missing the point of WHY such a metaphor exists.

As for the second error, in many cases, where the Sketch Engine interface tells us "subject of", it actually should usually say "agent of". It is in most cases not a syntactic but a semantic relationship that is the basis of the category or results. For instance, both of the following are included among the 389 examples listed for *abuse* and *husband:*

1) Margaret Dunn was being abused by her husband
2) After revealing her status, her husband abused her

The first example involves the use of a passive construction, and the syntactic subject of the sentence aligns with the victim. In the second, an example of an active transitive construction, the syntactic subject of the sentence is the abuser. Therefore, we might replace Sketch Engine's label of "subject" in such cases with the semantic term "agent" (roughly = 'the doer of the action'), which expresses what the husbands in (1) and (2) have in common. However, cases such as the idiomatic expression *wife-swapping* involve a wife who is the "patient" (roughly = 'one to whom the action is done'), and therefore, even this attempt to fix the results is ultimately insufficient.

Despite the limitations of Sketch Engine, it can be useful in various ways, and I will present some meaningful data below, highlighting some of the most striking results based on contrastive analysis. I will begin with these results for the "subjects" of adjectives (which here refers to the noun that is modified by the adjective) in copular constructions.

Table 2: "Subject" of Adjective in Copular Construction

Subject of Adj (e.g. *impotent husband*)	Husband	Wife	Husband LogDice	Wife LogDice
impotent	34	0	5.1	--
self-employed	39	0	4.6	--
diabetic	56	0	4.3	--
abusive	109	20	5.2	2.7
pregnant	15	1,389	0.1	6.7
bi-curious	0	14	--	4.4
submissive	0	33	--	4.5
childless	0	22	--	4.6
barren	0	72	--	5.4

Here, three of the five collocates for *wife* relate to child bearing, one to sexuality, and one to subservience. The collocates for *husband* relate to his medical condition and sexuality, to his relationship with his wife (asserting dominance via abuse) and his professional status.

Note the metaphor presupposed by *barren*: A WIFE IS A FIELD (to be farmed). (Notice that the wife takes a passive role.) This means that her husband is the farmer (active role), and the harvest is one of children (not food). A field is only valued for what it can provide for us. A wife that doesn't provide children is like a barren farm – pointless, or worse, a waste of time and energy. This is clear thanks to Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 1999).

Next, let's consider the results for "objects" of verbs in transitive constructions.

Table 3: "Object" of Verb in Transitive Construction

Object of… (e.g. *deploy her husband*)	Husband	Wife	Husband LogDice	Wife LogDice
deploy	449	0	4.9	--
philander	245	14	5.5	0.9
obey	375	37	5.3	1.7
cuckold	163	27	4.9	1.9
outlive	178	56	4.9	2.
abuse	84	421	2.9	5.0
assault	42	256	2.5	4.8
fuck	179	1,204	3.2	5.8
beat	209	2,416	2.6	6.0
rape	0	381	--	5.4

Here, again, the Sketch Engine parser fails to differentiate between main verbs and nominalized verbs, so we get *deploy her husband* as well as *her philandering husband*. Here, all collocates for *wife* involve violence and/or sex. Collocates for husbands include mention of extramarital sexual affairs (*philander, cuckold*) and a wife's submissiveness (*obey*). Next, observe predicates for *husband* and *wife*:

Table 4: Nominal and Adjectival Predicates

Predicate of (e.g. *husband is a workaholic*)	Husband	Wife	Husband LogDice	Wife LogDice
workaholic	18	0	4.5	--
snorer	14	0	4.3	--
cheater	19	0	4.1	--
carpenter	38	0	4.0	--
drunkard	12	0	3.9	--
trucker	18	0	3.8	--
fireman	19	0	3.6	--
jerk	30	0	3.5	--
pastor	94	0	3.3	--
firefighter	42	0	3.3	--
whore	0	27	--	3.4
heiress	0	10	--	3.4
housewife	0	27	--	3.5
nag	0	10	--	3.7
Sarai	0	11	--	4.1
Filipina	0	14	--	4.2
tilth	0	11	--	4.2
bi	0	28	--	4.3
homemaker	0	22	--	4.3
Gangster	0	16	--	4.6

Husbands are defined by their professional status or their personality. For wives, their sexuality and unpaid professions (heiress, housewife, homemaker) are frequent collocates.

Now let's observe modifiers of the nouns *husband* and *wife*.

Table 5: Modifiers

Modifier (e.g. *abusive husband*)	Husband	Wife	Husband LogDice	Wife LogDice
abusive	1,355	36	7.6	1.7
handsome	439	36	5.7	1.5
horny	46	498	2.7	5.4
lovely	255	2,930	3.6	6.8
trophy	49	1,021	2.4	6.2
Russian	37	972	1.3	5.6
beautiful	74	3,445	0.1	5.6
pregnant	27	2,054	0.6	6.6
plural	0	612	--	6.0

Here, we see wives modified more often based on their sexuality, reproductive status, beauty, and appearance. To understand the collocation "trophy wife", we need to employ the metaphor that WOMEN ARE OBJECTS, and specifically prizes for men to win and collect. Next, I will present the results in possessive constructions.

Table 6: As Possessors

Possessed Element (e.g. *husband's pyre*)	Husband	Wife	Husband LogDice	Wife LogDice
pyre	43	0	5.5	--
sperm	107	0	4.4	--
ex-wife	30	0	4.1	--
mistress	53	0	4.0	--
headship	13	0	3.8	--
dismay	0	20	--	3.4
pussy	0	117	--	3.6
Lament	0	10	--	3.7
nagging	0	13	--	4.0
great- grandfather	0	19	--	4.2
cunt	0	68	--	4.2
misgiving	0	23	--	4.2
dowry	0	23	--	4.4
lament	0	29	--	4.4
chagrin	0	24	--	4.5
decease	0	28	--	4.9

Here, taboo terms for women's genitals, likely relevant primarily to sex, appear on the list, but cannot be said to be truly parallel to men's *sperm*, which is relevant to virility

and producing children as well as sex. A husband's (sexual) partners (*mistress*, *ex-wife*) are present, but a wife's are not.

Next, observe the results for objects of *to* in table 7 below.

Table 7: As Object of the Preposition *to*

Adj/V/N before *to* PP (e.g. *submissive to her husband*)	Husband	Wife	Husband LogDice	Wife LogDice
submissive	173	0	6.7	--
subjection	110	0	6.5	--
obedient	121	0	6.0	--
subservient	53	0	5.5	--
helpmeet	27	0	5.0	--
subordinate	42	0	4.6	--
ungrateful	22	0	4.3	--
helpmate	18	0	4.3	--
reconcile	49	0	3.9	--
submit	706	90	4.1	1.2
bequeath	0	30	--	4.3
cleave	0	137	--	6.3

Here, the semantic field of wives submitting to their husbands is defined in substantial detail. Six of the top 10 collocates are *submissive, subjection, obedient, subservient, subordinate,* and *submit*. No such phenomenon exists for husbands.

Next, I present the results for objects of *from*.

Table 8: As Object of the Preposition *from*

Adj/V/N before *from* PP (e.g. *alimony from her ex-husband)*	*Husband*	*Wife*	*Husband LogDice*	*Wife LogDice*
alimony	11	0	3.5	--
splitting	13	0	2.8	--
spanking	11	0	2.5	--
hug	19	0	2.4	--
beating	18	0	2.4	--
depart	35	0	2.4	--
alienate	0	11	--	2.5
stray	0	12	--	2.8
loose	0	22	--	2.9
abstain	0	28	--	4.6
franklin	0	51	--	5.8

What do we receive from them? From husbands, we get alimony, as well as hugs, spankings, and beatings. From wives, we stray, get alienated, or get loose. Notice that nearly all collocations describe the husband as the active participant or focus of attention. One receives alimony/ a spanking / hug / beating from one's husband, but the husband strays / abstains / is loosed from/ is alienated from his wife.

   Finally, I present the results of agents in passive constructions including *husband* and *wife* in table 9.

Table 9: As Agent of Passive

V/N before *by* PP in passive (**e.g.** *raped by her husband)*	*Husband*	*Wife*	*Husband LogDice*	*Wife LogDice*
rape	93	0	5.3	--
father	16	0	4.4	--
mistreat	19	0	4.2	--
assault	41	0	4.1	--
batter	22	0	3.7	--
insemination	12	0	3.7	--
spank	12	0	3.6	--
neglect	43	0	3.5	--
abuse	259	39	5.3	2.5
abandon	249	38	4.4	1.7
scold	0	13	--	3.4
flank	0	29	--	3.9
cuckold	0	10	--	4.3
pre-deceased	0	12	--	4.6
emasculate	0	16	--	4.7

Here, I will simply note that many of the collocates for *husband* involve violence.

Overview of English results:

1) The way we talk about it (on the internet), what do they do? Husbands tend toward violence and *assault, rape, abuse, batter, abandon* and *neglect*, while wives *submit to, obey,* and flank their husbands, unless they *cuckhold* or *emasculate* them.

2) What are they? With Predicate Nominals or Adjectives (e.g. *wife is a nag*), husbands' professions or professional status defines them. They are also *impotent, diabetic, abusive,* and *adulterers.* Wives are *nags, whores, pregnant, childless,* or *barren*, and they are *heiresses* (rather than professionals).

3) How do we describe them? Husbands are *abusive* or *handsome*, while wives are

lovely or *beautiful,* or *horny* or *pregnant,* in addition to being *trophy wives* (which define them in terms of their value to a husband, based on their physical appearance).

4) What do we get from them? From husbands, we get alimony, as well as hugs, spankings, and beatings. From wives, we stray, get alienated, or get loose.

5) What do they have? Husbands have things that suggest their sexual potency such as sperm, mistresses, and ex-wives, while wives' genitals are a frequent topic, as well as misgivings, dismay and chagrin, not to mention nagging.

Some overall trends: husbands are described as committing many violent acts toward their wives, though they can also be *loving, wonderful, supportive,* and even *godly*. The semantic field of wives submitting to their husbands is defined in substantial detail.

The way we write about wives on the internet in English, it is clear that, unlike husbands, they are primarily valued for their physical appearance and sexuality, their child-bearing capacity, and their ability to quietly serve. Husbands, on the other hand, are often powerful and violent, and are valued for their professional and other contributions to society as well as (though apparently less than wives) for their child-bearing capacity and appearance.

4. Japanese Results and Discussion

It would be ideal to contrast grammatical constructions that are translational equivalents in two languages, and therefore the function of the construction was matched as closely as possible. Referring constructions, modifying constructions, etc. were also investigated in Japanese. I pursued an inductive, data-driven approach to analysis, observing the corpus results and noting patterns in the semantic and pragmatic aspects of the data.

To begin, I will present the results for the terms themselves, i.e. how we refer to spouses in Japanese.

Table 10: Words for **wives** found in the corpus, their literal meanings, and their frequencies:

Term	Tokens in Corpus	Frequency per million words
tsuma (term for one's own wife[3])	553,247	53.6
oku-san/-sama ("Ms. Interior")	398,206	38.1
yome ("bride")	307,921	29.8
nyōbō ("women's room")	50,363	4.9
kanai ("inside the house")	39,388	3.8
waifu (borrowed word)	11,059	1.1

Table 11: Words for **husbands** found in the corpus, their literal meanings, and their frequencies:

Term	Tokens in Corpus	Frequency per million words
shujin ("master/owner of store")	1,007,062	97.6
danna ("one who offers money")	553,736	53.6
otto (term for one's own husb.)	553,348	53.6
teishu ("shop owner")	24,440	2.4

Table 12: Words for **partners** found in the corpus, their literal meanings, and their frequencies:

Term	Tokens in Corpus	Frequency per million words
paatonaa (borrowing)	177,822	17.22
haiguusha (legal term)	36,501	3.53
tsureai (companion)	7,882	0.76

Due to data sparseness, only the top three terms in Tables 10 and 11 could be examined in detail. Due to the polysemy of *paatonaa* "partner", it was excluded from consideration, and lack of data on other terms for partners prevented them from being considered.

Data for collocations with three terms each for husbands (*shujin, danna,* and *otto*) and wives (*tsuma, okusan/okusama,* and *yome*) were examined. To report on the results for the six terms, I will describe generalizations that hold over multiple terms and unique patterns that apply to just a single term. This is partly due to the fact that the polysemous grammatical constructions of Japanese do not allow us to respond to the questions posed in part 1 of the paper neatly. For example, when a polysemous dative case marker *ni* follows a noun, it could mean that the following verb represents something that the implied "subject" (e.g. the speaker) will receive from his wife (as in one reading of *yome ni morau* 'I will get (sth.) from my wife'[4]), something that will be done by the wife to the implied "subject" (*yome ni bareru* 'my wife will discover my secret'), something that the implied "subject" will do or give to his wife (*yome ni kuwasu* 'I will feed my wife'), the fact that some woman (the topic of conversation) is going to become someone's wife (*yome ni iku* 'she is going to get married'), etc. Therefore, to try to answer our questions, we need to observe the collocates for each term in more than a dozen constructions, and then collect the subset of data that are relevant to each question from the various constructions where it can be found. Therefore, unlike the English results, here I will present representative highlights, rather than raw data.

Furthermore, due to space limitations, I will focus on ascertaining whether the

terms participate in patterns of collocation similar to the English terms, and only take small steps toward differentiating the terms for husbands, as well as those for wives. My priority will be to examine if husbands are powerful, violent, and valued for their professional status, as well as for their child-bearing capacity and appearance, and if wives are submissive, subject to violence, and valued for their looks, sexuality, and child-bearing capacity.

To answer the question, "How do people describe their husbands and wives?", I focused on adjectival collocates (both –*na* ADJ and –*i* ADJ, which are distinct in Japanese grammar). For each type of ADJ, I collected the 25 strongest collocates for each term, as long as they did not return negative LogDice values, and categorized the semantic field of the collocates. The results are presented in summary form in Tables 13 and 14 below.

Table 13: ADJ collocates describing **physical appearance**
(out of max. 25 strongest –*na* and 25 strongest –*i* collocates with non-negative LogDice scores)

Term	Number
Danna (husband "one who offers money")	5
Otto (one's own husband)	3
Shujin (husband "master")	4
Okusan (wife "Ms. Interior")	13
Tsuma (one's own wife)	12
Yome (wife "bride")	11

Table 14: ADJ collocates involving **sexuality and fidelity**
(out of max. 25 strongest –*na* and 25 strongest –*i* collocates with non-negative LogDice scores)

Term	Number
Danna (husband "one who offers money")	0
Otto (one's own husband)	1
Shujin (husband "master")	0
Okusan (wife "Ms. Interior")	9
Tsuma (one's own wife)	5
Yome (wife "bride")	1

To be clear, these numbers represent generalizations. Some collocates could be used to describe e.g. personality or physical appearance or both, such as *kawaii* 'cute'. In such cases, I excluded the data from consideration, focusing on clear instantiations of the categories.

Table 13 shows a gap between linguistic treatment of husbands and wives, and such a gap is also visible in Table 14, but is even more striking. The specific adjectival collocates involving sexuality and fidelity that are referred to in Table 14 are given below. Taboo terms are prevalent.

Okusan only: *youen* 'voluptuous, bewitching' *eroero* 'erotic', *eroi* 'erotic, pornographic', *hashitanai* 'improper, immodest', *iyarashii* 'filthy, lewd, obscene'
Tsuma only: *futei* 'unfaithful'
Both *okusan* and *tsuma*: *sukebe* 'lecherous', *inran* 'lecherous, lewd', *midara* 'loose, bawdy, improper', *teishuku* 'faithful, chaste, virtuous'
Yome only: *eroi* 'erotic'
Otto only: *fujitsu* 'faithless, insincere'

One point to be made is that speakers are deeply interested in the sexuality and fidelity of both *okusan* and *tsuma,* but fewer terms for (in)fidelity collocate with *yome,* and nearly none with the terms for husbands, at least in this construction. This is not to say that speakers do not describe husbands' sexuality or fidelity. In fact, *danna* and *otto* both collocated with some words for sexuality in a few of the other grammatical constructions investigated. However, those collocates are mostly of a different type:

Otto: *sekkusu* 'sex'*, seiseikatsu* 'sex life', *sekkusuresu* 'sexless'
Danna: *sekkusu* 'sex'*, sekkusuresu* 'sexless', *seikoui,* 'intercourse'

Note that these words refer in foreign and fairly formal terms to the plain fact of sexual relations (or lack thereof). There is no judgment. This is not the case with wives, as we saw above. Collocates for wives include many taboo terms which are neither scientific nor foreign, and, being both native terms and highly taboo, they are emotionally forceful. Many involve (negative) judgment, as suggested by translations such as 'lecherous', 'improper', 'filthy' and 'lewd'.

We also find terms relating to submission that collocate with some of the words for wives, and none of the terms for husbands, such as *juujun* 'submissive, obedient', which collocates with *tsuma* and *yome*.

Already, we can see that words for wives in Japanese look similar to English *wife* in that they collocate with many terms for physical appearance, sexuality and fidelity. Husbands in Japanese do collocate with these types of words, but less frequently, and

not in the same way. For instance, other data reveal an interest in husbands' fidelity and sexuality that was not present in the results for adjectives. This is seen in the results for e.g. genitive constructions, presented below.

Table 15: Husband's NOUN (= Genitive construction) with collocates involving **fidelity**
Numbers represent LogDice values

Husband's affair	*Otto*	*Danna*	*Shujin*
uwaki 'affair'	8.3	7.2	5.7
furin 'affair'	6.3	4.9	3.7
futei 'affair'	5.1	3.7	0

Table 16: Husband's NOUN (= Genitive construction) with collocates involving **sexuality**
Numbers represent LogDice values

Collocates with Husband's NOUN[5]	*Otto*	*Danna*	*Shujin*
sekkusuresu 'sexless'	6.9	7.3	5.2
sekkusu 'sex'	4.3	4.1	2.3
ecchi 'sexual'	1.8	4.4	0
seiko 'intercourse'	2.9	0	0

Here, most of the collocates are scientific or foreign borrowings that somewhat avoid directly invoking the taboo, although *ecchi* should be considered an exception, as it refers to sexuality in a relatively direct manner.

Further differentiating the husbands, we have deep interest in killing our own (*otto*). Let us examine the construction husband *wo* V *suru* ('do V to husband', in which the husband is the D.O.).

Table 17: Husband as Direct Object with collocates involving **killing**
Numbers represent LogDice values

Husband as Direct Object	*Otto*	*Danna*	*Shujin*
dokusatsu 'poison'	6.8	0	0
shisatsu 'stab to death'	5.6	0	0
shasatsu 'shoot dead'	4.5	0	0
zansatsu 'murder brutally'	4.4	0	0
shokei 'execute'	2.4	0	0

An analogous pattern holds with wives; we go into similar detail about methods of killing our own wives (*tsuma*), but not other wives. Interestingly, the LogDice scores

for killing our wives (*tsuma*) are higher than those for killing our husbands (*otto*) for nearly all methods (in the same construction, we have *zansatsu* 'murder brutally' (6.1 vs. 4.4)[6], *shasatsu* 'shoot dead' (5.0 vs. 4.5), *shisatsu* 'stab to death' (5.9 vs. 5.6), *satsugai* 'murder' (6.2 vs. 6.0), *yakusatsu* 'strangle' (6.0 vs. 0), *kousatsu* 'strangle' (5.7 vs. 0), and *jyuusatsu* 'shoot' (4.7 vs. 0), as opposed to *dokusatsu* 'poison' (4.9 vs. 6.8) and *ansatsu* 'assassinate' (0 vs. 1.9)) . We talk about killing our wives with brutal violence more often, but as for sneaky violence, we talk about doing it to our husbands more often.

After having digressed from the questions we initially asked in order to investigate collocates related to the semantic fields of sexuality, fidelity, and violence in other constructions, in order to contrast the Japanese and the English terms, we will now return to our attempts to address our initial questions. As for what they do: contrasting *tsuma* '(my) wife' and *otto* '(my) husband' in the construction husband/wife *ga* V ('husband/wife SUB + V'), we find that *tsuma*, but not *otto*, collocate with *netoru* 'cuckhold' (4.7), *migomoru* 'conceive' (4.4), *moushitateru* 'complain' (3.1), *umeku* 'groan' (3.0), and *hizamazuku* 'kneel' (2.5) while *otto* but not *tsuma* do things like *yoitsubureru* 'get drunk' (2.5) and *neshizumaru* 'fall asleep' (3.3).

Observing the same terms in the similar construction husband/wife *ga* V *suru* ('husband/wife SUB V *suru*', in which what Sketch Engine calls V is actually a verbal noun which combines with *suru* 'do' to act as a verb), we find that *tsuma* do things like getting pregnant and giving birth, and we find, once again, elements of sex and violence such as *rinkan* 'gangbang' (2.8) and *goukan* 'rape' (2.4) – both of which are used with passive forms of the verb *suru* 'do' (i.e. the wives are subjected to the sexual violence, rather than perpetuators of it). Other terms for husbands and wives follow similar patterns, though with less sexual violence among the collocates. For instance, *yome* in the same constructions collocates with *netoru* 'cuckhold' (3.4) and terms for 'get angry' such as *kireru* (2.0) and *okoru* (1.7), as well as *hakkyou* 'go crazy' (2.7), but not the terms for sexual violence.

As for what we do to them: we have already contrasted the collocates involving murder for *tsuma* '(my) wife' and *otto* '(my) husband' in the construction husband/wife *wo* V *suru* ('husband/wife D.O. V *do*', in which the husband/wife is the direct object). Other collocates in this construction for *tsuma* but not *otto* include *rien* 'divorce' (7.6) , *ribetsu* 'divorce' (6.0), *shikan* 'ogle, eye lecherously' (5.1), *hikinige* 'hit and run' (4.8), and *goukan* 'rape'(4.4). For *otto* but not *tsuma* we get terms such as *keibetsu* 'despise' (4.4), *shitta* 'scold' (4.2), and *shusse* 'promote' (3.3). In the

similar construction <u>husband/wife *wo* V</u> ('husband/wife D.O. V', in which the husband/wife is the direct object) we find collocations only with *tsuma* such as *nurasu* 'make wet' (5.2), *oshitaosu* 'push down' (4.5), and *hazukashimeru* 'rape' (3.8). Another term for rape, *okasu*, collocated with both *tsuma* and *otto*, but with the former much more strongly than the latter (4.5 to 1.1). Overall, our behavior is much gentler with our husbands, based on collocates such as *mikagiru* 'abandon' (4.4), *taburakasu* 'coax' (3.7), and *isameru* 'admonish' (3.4), which do not collocate with *tsuma*.

As for what they give us: one representative example can be found by contrasting *tsuma* '(my) wife' and *otto* '(my) husband' in the construction <u>husband/wife *kara no* X</u> ('X from husband/wife'). The only things we get from *tsuma* but not *otto* are *henshin* 'replies' (1.3) and *machigae* 'mistakes' (0.6), whereas things we receive from *otto* but not *tsuma* include *DV* 'domestic violence' (5.5), *bouryoku* 'violence' (3.1), *youiku* 'feeding/care' (3.3) and *isya* 'consolation' (3.1).

As for what we give them: contrasting the same two terms in the construction <u>husband/wife *he no* N</u> ('N for/to husband/wife'), we find these among the terms which collocate only with *tsuma* but not *otto*: *wabijyou* 'apology' (7.2), *isya* 'consolation' (4.2), *boukou* 'assault' (2.3), and *gyakutai* 'abuse' (1.1). Conversely, the following terms collocate only with *otto* but not *tsuma*: *teisetsu* 'chastity' (6.4), *haitoku* 'imorality' (5.1), *uragiri* 'betrayal' (4.4), *misao* 'manipulation' (4.3), and *shikaeshi* 'revenge' (4.2). Overall, the picture is one of husbands who assault and abuse their wives, as well as consoling them and apologizing (which, interestingly, is typical of the pattern of behavior of domestic abusers). What wives give their husbands is frequently based on sexuality and sexual- and other moral codes, including immorality, betrayal, and chastity.

Investigating what we give them also turned up some data that are best analyzed using Conceptual Metaphor Theory. In the construction <u>husband/wife *ni* V</u> (in which *ni* is a dative marker, and therefore, depending on the specifics of the verb, this can mean V 'to' or 'from' a husband or wife) we find the collocation *yome ni morau* 'to marry (a woman)' (4.2), which employs the verb *morau* 'receive' and therefore literally means 'receive as a bride'. It can be used by both the husband and the husband's parents, meaning 'to receive a daughter-in-law'. We see similar data in the results for the direct object construction, as *yome wo morau*. *Morau* is used prototypically when receiving material goods, and is also used for abstract concepts like permission, catching a cold, and marrying a woman or adopting a child. Therefore, it seems that the metaphor BRIDES/WOMEN ARE OBJECTS is motivating this

usage.

Finally, and least interestingly, as for what we do together with them: searching for verb collocates after *to* 'together / with' in the similar constructions <u>husband/wife *to* V</u> and <u>husband/wife *to* V *suru*</u>, we find for all six terms verbs describing marriage, divorce, living together or apart, and daily life (*machiawaseru* 'meet', *hanashiau* 'discuss', *kurasu* 'live', *dekakeru* 'go out', *hozaku* 'grumble', *kenka* 'argue') as well as death (*shi ni wakareru* 'be separated by death'), and *netoru* 'cuckhold' and, less frequently, *sekkusu* '(have) sex'.

After having previously observed the behavior of the English terms, in this section we saw strikingly similar patterns emerge with the Japanese terms, in which terms for women collocate with semantic fields including physical appearance, sexuality, and fidelity. Terms for men did collocate with a smaller number of terms for fidelity and (even less frequently) sexuality. However, the absence of taboo terms and negative judgments among collocates for men contrasted with the results for women. We saw much talk involving husbands inflicting violence, including sexual violence, on wives, and far less of the converse. The ways that we kill both our husbands and our wives were enumerated, but the violent methods all collocated with killing our wives more strongly, whereas the sneakier methods were used more frequently with our husbands. Wives submitting to their husbands was far less frequent of a topic in Japanese than in English, but a few such collocates did appear with wives (but not husbands), and we also saw that a wife's chastity, (im)morality, betrayal, and cuckholding of her husband were frequently mentioned.

5. Conclusions, future directions

Overall, there was a great extent of similarity between the two languages. All the words for wives in both languages collocated with many terms for physical appearance, sexuality, and fidelity. Words for husbands in both languages included reference to his fidelity and sexuality, but less frequently and in a less taboo manner than the terms for wives. In both languages, women were described as subject to violence, including sexual violence, and the extent of their sexual experience was frequently described in negative, taboo terms. In both languages, husbands were described more often based on their character or profession. Wives' subordination to their husbands was defined in detail in English, and less so in Japanese. Behavioral patterns of words for wives in both languages support the argument that they are valued in large part for their physical appearance and sexuality, their child-bearing

capacity, and their ability to quietly serve.

The application of Conceptual Metaphor Theory allowed us to recognize some implicit metaphors underlying terms and collocations of terms, most notably WOMEN ARE OBJECTS (that can be traded by their owners, that are prizes for men to win), which we saw in both English and Japanese, and A WIFE IS A FIELD (to be farmed), in which a wife is a specific object.

This is evidence against Ide's claims, and supports the idea that (married) women are subordinate to men in both Japanese and English-speaking cultures. While the data were all gathered from the internet, I take this to be suggestive that these patterns of behavior are likely to exist in the larger society. (If not, it would be hard to make sense of them if one were suddenly confronted with them on the internet, for instance.)

As a future step, I plan to distinguish the Japanese terms in more detail, as well as investigating the use of taboo terms that collocate with the terms for husbands and wives. Such terms have a unique power to express taboo concepts in a direct, emotionally forceful way. Their heightened emotion and power makes them a fitting object of study as part of research such as that which I undertake here. Patterns of use of taboo terms in conjunction with the terms for husbands and wives in both languages will serve to strengthen the argument by providing converging evidence. In particular, taboo terms involving the use of metaphor will be analyzed in terms of the light they shed on the larger picture.

References

Baayen, R. Harold and Rochelle Lieber. 1997. Word Frequency Distributions and Lexical Semantics. Computers in the Humanities 30: 281-291.

Bybee, Joan. 1985. *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan. 2006. From usage to grammar: the mind's response to repetition. *Language* 82(4): 711-733.

Bybee, Joan and P. Hopper (eds.). 2001. *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Caldwell-Harris, Catherine, Jonathan Berant and Shimon Edelman. 2012. Measuring Mental Entrenchment of Phrases with Perceptual Identification, Familiarity Ratings, and Corpus Frequency Statistics. Pp. 165-194 in Divjak, D. and S. Th. Gries (eds.) *Frequency Effects in Language Representation*.

Cherry, Kittredge. 1987. *Womansword: What Japanese Words Say about Women*. New York: Kodansha International.

Croft, William. 2009. Toward a social cognitive linguistics. In *New directions in cognitive linguistics*, ed. Vyvyan Evans and Stéphanie Pourcel, 395-420. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Durrant, Phillip and A. Doherty. 2010. Are high-frequency collocations psychologically real? Investigating the thesis of collocational priming. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*. 6(2), 125-155.

Durrant, Phillip and Norbert Schmitt. 2009. To what extent do native and non-native writers make use of collocations? *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 47(2).

Ellis, Nick. 2002. Frequency Effects in Language Processing: A Review with Implications for Theories of Implicit and Explicit Language Acquisition. *SSLA* 24, 143–188.

Ellis, Nick, Eric Frey, and Issac Jalkanen. 2009. The psycholinguistic reality of collocation and semantic prosody. In: Römer, Ute and Rainer Schulze (eds.), *Exploring the Lexis–Grammar Interface.* 2009. vi, 321 pp. (pp. 89–114)

Frank, Rosyln. 2016. Cultural Linguistics vis-à-vis Cognitive Linguistics: A Critical Perspective. Presentation at the First International Conference of Cultural Linguistics, Monash University Centre, Prato, Italy, July 20-22, 2016.

Fillmore, Charles. 1982. Frame semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul, Hanshin Publishing Co., 111-137.

Firth, John R. 1957. *Papers in Linguistics 1934–1951* (1957) London: Oxford University Press.

Gablasova, Dana, Vaclav Brezina, and Tony McEnery. 2017. Collocations in Corpus-Based Language Learning Research: Identifying, Comparing, and Interpreting the Evidence. *Language Learning*, Volume 67, Issue S1. Accessed Nov 15, 2020 at https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12225.

Geeraerts, Dirk. 2003. 'Usage-based' implies 'variational': On the Inevitability of Cognitive Sociolinguistics. Plenary paper given at the 8th International Conference on Cognitive Linguistics. Logroño, July 2003.

Geeraerts, Dirk, Gitte Kristiansen, and Yves Peirsman (eds.). 2010. *Advances in Cognitive Sociolinguistics*. Berlin/New York, De Gruyter Mouton.

Goldberg, Adelle. 2006. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Gries, Stefan Th. 2013. Sources of variability relevant to the cognitive sociolinguist, and corpus- as well as psycholinguistic methods and notions to handle them. *Journal of Pragmatics* 52 (2013) 5-16.

Ide, Sachiko. 2004. Exploring Women's Language in Japanese. In Mary Bucholtz (ed.) *Language and Women's Place: Text and Commentaries*, Revised and Expanded Edition (pp. 179-186). New York: Oxford University Press.

Jakubíček, M., A. Kilgarriff, V. Kovář, P. Rychlý, V. Suchomel. 2013. *T he TenTen Corpus Family*. Paper presented at the 7th International Corpus Linguistics Conference, Lancaster, July 2013.

Jay, Timothy. 2000. *Why We Curse: A Neuro-Psycho-Social Theory of Speech.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Johnson, Mark and Tim Rohrer. 2007. We Are Live Creatures: Embodiment, American Pragmatism, and the Cognitive Organism. In Zlatev, Jordan; Ziemke, Tom; Frank, Roz; Dirven, René (eds.). *Body, Language, and Mind*, vol. 1, pp. 17-54. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kracht, Marcus. 2014. *Pragmatics and Semantics*. Accessed at
http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Kracht/courses/semantics/pragmatics.pdf

Kristiansen, G. and R. Dirven (eds.). 2008. *Cognitive sociolinguistics: language variation, cultural models, social systems*. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Labov, William. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.

Labov, W., S. Ash, M. Ravindranath, T. Weldon, M. Baranowski, & N. Nagy. 2006. Listeners' Sensitivity to the Frequency of Sociolinguistic Variables. Pp. 105-129 in Penn *Working Papers in Linguistics,* vol. 12.2 (Papers from NWAV 34).

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

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy In the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, Robin. 1975. *Language and Women's Place*. London: Oxford University Press.

Pütz, Martin, Justyna A. Robinson, and Monika Reif (eds.). 2014. *Cognitive Sociolinguistics: Social and cultural variation in cognition and language use*. John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam / Philadelphia.

Rumelhart, D. and J. McClelland. 1986. On Learning the Past Tenses of English

Verbs: Implicit Rules of Parallel Distributed Processing? In J. McClelland, D. Rumelhart, and the PDP Research Group, eds., *Parallel distributed processing: Explorations in the microstructure of cognition,* 216-271. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Rychlý, P. (2008). A lexicographer-friendly association score. *Proceedings of Recent Advances in Slavonic Natural Language Processing, RASLAN*, 6–9. Accessed 9/5/14 at http://nlp.fi.muni.cz/raslan/2008/papers/13.pdf.

Srdanović, I., V. Suchomel, T. Ogiso, A. Kilgarriff. 2013. 百億語のコーパスを用いた日本語の 語彙・文法情報のプロファイリング (Japanese Language Lexical and Grammatical Profiling Using the Web Corpus JpTenTen) 『第3回コーパス日本語学ワークショップ 予稿集』国立国語研究所 言語資源研究系・コーパス開発センター (Proceeding of the 3rd Japanese corpus linguistics workshop, Department of Corpus Studies/Center for Corpus Development, NINJAL, 2013), 229238.

Takemaru, Naoko. 2010. *Women in the Language and Society of Japan: The Linguistic Roots of Bias.* Jefferson, N.C : McFarland & Co., Publishers.

Teddiman, Laura. 2012. Conversion and the lexicon: Comparing evidence from corpora and experimentation. Pp. 235-254 in Divjak, D. and S. Th. Gries (eds.) *Frequency Effects in Language Representation.*

Tomasello, Michael. 2003. *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Varela, Francisco, Evan Thompson, and Eleanor Rosch. 1991/1993. *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience.* Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

---

1 I would like to express my appreciation to Naoko Miura, Keiko Miura, Toshitaka Sakaki, Xiaoyang Hao, Michinori Shimoji and Haruhiko Murao for sharing their ideas and for discussing the data with me. I am also grateful for the astute comments of two anonymous reviewers.

2 One anonymous reviewer suggested that more evidence would better support this argument. However, I would contend that, for the compound *wife swapping* to make sense, the employment of the metaphor is a necessary prerequisite, and therefore no additional evidence for the use of this metaphor is needed.

3 The kanji for *tsuma* represents a woman with a broom, according to Cherry 1987. While *tsuma* and *otto* (in Table 11) are both prototypically used when referring to one's own wife and husband respectively, they may occasionally be used to refer to someone else's spouse, given specific types of relationships between the speech act participants and an appropriate social context. More research is needed to ascertain how widespread this phenomenon is and under which conditions it is possible.

4 Note that this compound typically means "receive as a bride", as discussed below, but in some instances in the data it clearly has the meaning of receiving something from one's wife.

5 Note that the collocates themselves are not nouns, but these words are strongly attracted to the construction "Husband's Noun".

6 All numbers in parentheses here and below refer to LogDice scores.