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This article describes in detail how the idea of source and goal is manifested in language, especially English and Japanese. In this paper commonality of languages are foregrounded. Beginning with Ikekami (1987), the article considers the concepts of cognitive psychology and applies them to linguistic manifestations. This article especially focuses on psychological eye movement, and consequently the idea of divergence and convergence. I suggest that the idea of source and goal manifested in language is best understood in the context of the principle of divergence or convergence of perspectives. This principle is as follows: eye movements are, whether concrete or abstract, are motivated to converge at one time at one scene. I’d like to call this principle the principle of the convergence of the eye movement. Looking at the outcomes of this research in the context of cognitive psychology, our linguistic ability is undoubtedly a product of our psychological activity.

1. INTRODUCTION. My goal here is to discuss and elucidate the linguistic manifestations of the idea of source and goal. As far as my knowledge goes, there has not been much work along this line of research. Although there has been a certain amount of work concerning prepositions or postpositions, there have not been many pieces of work dealing with prepositions or postpositions from the perspectives of source and goal. Some aspects of the concept of source and goal need to be examined deeply.

For instance consider the following Japanese sentence:

(1) a. Taroo (Z) wa Hanako (Y) kara hon (X) o karita.
   Taro  TOPIC Hanako FROM book ACC borrowed
   ‘Taro borrowed a book from Hanaka.’

b. Taroo (Z) wa Hanako (Y) ni hon (X) o karita.
   Taro  TOPIC Hanako TO book ACC borrowed
   ‘Taro borrowed a book from Hanaka.’

In this sentence, Taro is a borrower of a book and Hanako is a lender. In a general sense a borrower is a receiver and a lender is a giver. In this article receiver in a broad sense is a person to whom something goes and categorized as Z
and a giver in a general sense is a person from whom something goes and categorized as Y. Something received, borrowed, stolen is indicated as X.

Here logically speaking, Y is the source and in every respect should be followed by *kara* ‘from’, but in fact *ni* ‘to’ is preferred as well as acceptable. This is exemplified by the following figure.

![Diagram](image)

**FIGURE 1**

This paper purports to elucidate the apparently wrong choice of the postposition *ni*.

2. PRIOR SCHOLARSHIP. The pioneer research paper that comes to my mind is Ikegami (1987). Ikegami (1987) suggests that although source and goal are, from the logical point of view, on an equal footing, they do not constitute an equal pair of concepts in some cases and he indicates that language manifests a dissymmetry in terms of the markedness of the concepts of source and goal. He summarized his idea as ‘the goal-over-source’ principle, in which the substitution of the goal for the source takes place in some linguistics representations but not vice versa. He claims that his ‘the goal-over-source’ principle is based on reciprocity: for instance an act of giving is made in a situation in which it is taken that the act of giving must be reciprocal. If Z gets X from Y, then Z is expected to give back an equivalent of X to Y. In this context, the receiving of some gift from Y should imply the giving of something to Y. The position of Y with respect to Z should change from that of the giver to that of the supposedly future receiver.

Ikegami (1987) concludes that as the psychological motivation, the act of giving is reciprocal. An similar idea that is related to the idea of reciprocity is expressed in Cialdini (2009: ch.2). Cialdini (2009) uses the word “reciprocation”. He perceives reciprocation as a rule which says that people have to try to repay, in kind, what other people have provided them. He then suggests that reciprocation is one of the
basic norms of human culture and notices that the members of a society must abide by the rule or they suffer social sanctions.

3. PROBLEMS. Ikegami (1987) solves the question of the goal-over-source principle through the idea of reciprocity. Or reciprocity rule or reciprocation if we are to apply Cialdini’s (2009) term. This idea is quite convincing if we apply the idea to such words as ‘to borrow’ or Japanese equivalent kariru ‘to borrow’, or ‘to learn’ or Japanese equivalent narau ‘to learn’. This idea seems also related to the article that Kaede (2009) wrote. In the article she says that people say “Ouch” even when they do not hit anything. She consulted a psychiatrist who is knowledgeable about psychology and he says that at the very moment when people think they’ll hit anything, their brains handle the incidents as if they already happened. In other words brains just think ahead. Those ideas satisfactorily explain why some Japanese reciprocal words tend to take a goal marker ni ‘to’ or ‘at’ when supposedly a source marker karu ‘from’ is highly expected.

But then we cannot explain why the Japanese expression yuraisuru ‘to derive from’ must take ni ‘to or at’ as opposed to karu ‘from’. We cannot apply the idea of reciprocation to the word yuraisuru since yuraisuru does not imply reciprocation. Neither can we apply the reciprocation to the word kitaisuru ‘expect’, although it takes ni and never takes karu.

Here one must take into consideration another factor that affects the choice of ni when karu is expected. I now focus on the idea of psychological eye movement and related concepts. They are in my framework categorized as divergence and convergence.

4. DIRVERGENCE. Divergence in my framework is a divergence in the sense of psychological eye movement. In this paper it is supposed that when people think of something, they look at them in their mind. Also it is presupposed that thinking can be subconscious as well as conscious. Smith and Kossly (2007: ch.2) insist that perceptual processes though brain and visual systems can lead people to see things that are not in fact in space. They also suggest that neurons in the brain respond to illusory lines in a way close to the way they respond to a real line.

First, let’s examine obvious examples before going for more abstract ones. Imagine that you’re in a room and there are two doors there. The doors are located in the two opposite corners and pretty far apart. If one person opens one door and another person opens the other door at the same time, you have trouble concentrating on the choice of the person coming from the door. Your eye move-

---

1 The Japanese preposition ni is categorized either as ‘to’ or ‘at’ depending on a context but in this paper ni is treated as ‘to’ since it is obviously felt as a goal marker when it is presented in parallel with karu ‘from’.
ment tends to split between the two doors and accordingly your mind is motivated to be nervous.

By the same token Smith and Kossly (2007: 112) assert that the studies concerning divided attention demonstrate that human perception is impeded when people must attend to two separate entities.

In short you would naturally like to focus your eye movement on one thing at one time. In the field of linguistics a similar idea is already adopted in Kuno (1978, 19897:129), although he uses the term 'camera angle'.

The similar concept can be applied to the idea of source; source can be associated with a divided attention. When something (in the figure below a person) departs from some source (in the figure below represented as Y), people naturally try to catch sight of it (in a metaphorical sense too) since a moving object should be interesting both to carnivore and herbivore animals. This idea can be applied to abstract concepts as well. Even though people trace trajectory of a moving object, when they talk about or even think about the source of the object, they naturally have to capture both the concepts of source and the object. In other words psychological eye movement to the source is immanent in talking about or even thinking about the source. Also the idea of source must be accompanied by the existence of an entity that departs from the source. The two eye movements to the source and to the entity (in a metaphorical sense too) split in two directions. This is illustrated in the following figure:

![Diagram](image)

Eye movements diverge in the case of source.

**FIGURE 1**

2 The term, 'entity' is adopted as defined in Langacker (2008: 98). Entity is maximally general in its application. The term can apply to anything that might be conceived of or referred to in describing conceptual structure. It is important here that it is not required that an entity be discrete, separately recognized, or cognitively salient. The term can be things, relations, quantities, sensations, changes, locations, dimensions, and so on.

3 For carnivore animals moving objects can be their food, and for herbivore animals moving entities can often be predators.
In short, their eye movement diverges. Here this is how divergence occurs. When divergence occurs, people tend not to stay calm and concepts associated with divergence are not as stable as not-diverged concepts. Split eye movements are obviously more complicated and take more effort to capture than one eye movement. There should be added cost in processing two things (Smith and Kosslyn 2007: 112). Complex concepts are motivated to be broken into more simple ones. Here the basic idea is that the more simple, the more natural to human beings unless an entity is a Geschtalt.

5. CONVERGENCE. Convergence is categorized as meeting together and becoming one unit. In this paper different eye movements come together and become one eye movement. This is how convergence occurs. Look at the following figure.
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In other words, their eye movements converge. Unlike divergence, when convergence occurs, people tend to stay calm and concepts associated with convergence are more stable than diverged concepts. Converged eye movement is obviously more simple and take less effort to capture than two eye movements. Simple eye movements should be more preferred means of perceiving things.

Now as has already been obvious, naturally we would like to make complex things more simple. There are two means to make it in this case. One is that the source is forced to be reanalyzed and re-construed as the goal. In this vein at the level of discourse the cause or reason can be re-construed as the end or goal. This reanalysis has two subcategories: 5.1 and 5.2 are type; 5.3 is the other. Consider the following figure.
Eye movements are converged as one.

FIGURE 3

In this figure even when X is transferred from Y to Z, in some Japanese expressions X’s transfer is expressed in a way that it happens as if X is moved from Z to Y. In other words although from a logical point of view X (in figure 3 a person and in (1ab) a book) is transferred FROM Y (in (1ab) lender) to Z (in (1ab) borrower), the situation is manifested in Japanese in such a way that X is moved TO Y.

5.1 SOURCE (REASON) Y REANALYZED AS GOAL (PURPOSE). The reversal of eye movement may very well be manifested according to the principle of the convergence of the eye movement. When this reversal occurs, source Y can be reanalyzed as goal (purpose). This type of manifestation is exemplified by the following:

(2) a. Because management wants to reduce the duplication of work, Radack Manufacturing’s processing and shipping departments will be merged.
   
   b. In an effort to reduce the duplication of work, Radack Manufacturing’s processing and shipping departments will be merged.

In (2a) Because management wants to reduce the duplication of work represents reason or cause. From its conception, reason is obviously associated with the concept of source. Reason is the starting point of the line of thought, always potentially leading to an outcome. But consider (2b). The reason that is the beginning phase of thoughts is manifested as the goal (or purpose on the semantic grounds); to infinitive (i.e. to reduce) is used. Now this is exactly applicable to Japanese equivalents.
(3) a. Keiei sha tati wa shigoto no juuhuku wo herashi tai
Management people PL TOP work GEN duplication ACC reduce want
to iu koto kara, Radack seizou gaisha no hakou
and saying thing FROM Radack manufacturing company GEN processing
bumon to haisou bumon ga tougou sareru yotei desu.
department and shipping department NOM merge PASSIVE plan POLITE

b. Shigoto no juuhuku wo herasu tame ni, Radack
work GEN duplication ACC reduce sake TO Radack
seizou gaisha no hakou bumon to haisou
manufacturing company GEN processing department and shipping
bumon ga tougou sareru yotei desu.
department NOM merge PASSIVE plan POLITE

In (3a) the Japanese postposition kara ‘from’ is also used as the marker of reason or cause. This kara functions as a conjunction and according to Kitahara et al (2000: 1048) the conjunction kara originated in the postposition kara.

As has been already clear, the postposion kara is also the source marker. As an intuition of a native speaker of Japanese, the fact that the source marker kara is also used as the marker of reason is quite natural as well as reasonable. Reason is naturally associated with the idea of source and purpose is with the concept of goal. In (3b), however, the reason is expressed as the goal, since it is coded as ni, the goal marker. It may be said that one can suggest that even the reason which should be coded as a starting point (i.e. as the source) has a clear motivation to be psychologically felt as the goal and thus linguistically manifested as the goal, too.

This is also exemplified by the word reason itself. When one wants to express the idea of reason, he or she should naturally code the word as [some starting point expression + reason]; the natural consequence is from the reason. But in reality a sort of goal marker for is in use; from the reason is not acceptable whereas for the reason is. Now consider the Japanese counterparts. From the reason may be translated into the following:

(4) sono youna riyyuu kara
    the like reason FROM

For the reason will be translated into the following:

(5) sono youna riyyuu ni yotte
    The like reason TO by
It must be stressed that in Japanese both 4 and 5 are acceptable and in English only the one with a goal like marker is acceptable. It must be emphasized that when a source expression is expected, a goal expression is occasionally acceptable, but not vice versa.

5.2 SOURCE (CAUSE) Y REANALYZED AS GOAL. Consider the following example:

(6) a. You are happy because you know he is safe.
   b. You are happy to know he is safe.

In this example, knowing the fact is clearly an entity that causes your happiness. In this example knowing is a cause. The causation should be coded as the source if you think about it on intuitive grounds. But in (6b) it is in fact coded by to, an obvious goal marker. The Japanese translation of (6ab) would be the following:

(7) a. Kare ga buji da to shitteiru kara anata wa
   He NOM safe is that knowing FROM you TOP
   anshin dekiru no desu.yo.
   secure can GEN assertion.
   b. Kare ga buji da to shiru koto ni yotte, anata wa
   He NOM safe is that know thing TO by you TOP
   anshin dekiru no desu.yo.
   secure can GEN assertion.

Just like examples in 5.1 these examples of both English and Japanese also hold good in terms of the substitution of the goal for the source marker. Here it cannot be emphasized too strongly that the idea of reason or cause should naturally be expressed as a starting point at abstract level, which thus ought to be coded only as the source marker.

5.3 SOURCE DELETED. The other way is that the source Y is deleted in the mind and only X and the goal Z are in focus. Consider Figure 4 and 5. Figure 5 is the same as figure 2 and consequently the same as the normal goal interpretation.
Eye movements are converged as one.

FIGURE 4

Eye movements are converged as one.

FIGURE 5

6 PRINCIPLE OF CONVERGENCE OF PERSPECTIVES. By this principle I assert that the concepts of source and goal are not on equal footing. I insist that by the principle the goal interpretation and thus goal coding is more preferred compared with the source construal and source coding. In actual practice it is highly expected that the linguistic coding of goal is made when the source coding is expected on the semantic or logical grounds, but not vice versa. When the goal coding is expected, it is extremely unlikely that the source coding is chosen. I have not yet found an example that follows this line. At this moment I cannot offer an incontrovertible proof that these are the proper explanations, but this line of thinking does have the advantage (over obvious alternatives) of being applicable to the broader range of actual instances.
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