

MOVING-TIME AND MOVING-EGO METAPHORS FROM A TRANSLATIONAL AND A CONTRASTIVE- LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE*¹

MARIO BRDAR

University of Osijek
mbrdar@ffos.hr

RITA BRDAR-SZABÓ

ELTE, Budapest
rbrdarszabo@gmail.com

Abstract

This article is concerned with some cross-linguistic asymmetries in the use of two types of time metaphors, the Moving-Time and the Moving-Ego metaphor. The latter metaphor appears to be far less well-entrenched in languages such as Croatian or Hungarian, i.e. some of its lexicalizations are less natural than their alternatives based on the Moving-Time metaphor, while some others are, unlike their English models, downright unacceptable. It is argued that some of the differences can be related to the status of the fictive motion construction and some restrictions on the choice of verbs in that construction.

Keywords: conceptual metaphor, moving time, moving ego, fictive motion, translation, contrastive linguistics

1. Introduction

In the history of contrastive linguistics several, in part complementary, procedures have been used. Researchers relied in some cases on intuitive data (provided by the researcher), just as was done in the beginnings of cognitive linguistics, and still is. Secondly, researchers combined intuition with elicitation,

* This work has been fully supported by the Croatian Science Foundation under the project 3624. The authors also received financial support for this research from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness, grant FFI2013-43593-P.

¹ The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful and constructive comments that greatly contributed to improving the final version of the paper.

i.e. they asked native speakers to provide equivalents for the items they were interested in. However, the most widely used procedure in contrastive linguistics at its heyday was translation. We are of course aware of the fact that translation data may contain a certain amount of “noise”, i.e. translations may be skewed due to some intrinsic aspects of the translation process, e.g. the parallels between languages may be distorted due to a whole range of reasons, among which stylistic factors may be very important. However, when we eliminate such “non-systematic” causes of variation, we may be able to observe some interesting correlations.

The initial wave of cross-linguistic work in cognitive linguistics, especially cross-linguistic comparisons in the domain of figurative speech, i.e. metaphor and metonymy, appears to have repeated history in being based primarily on intuition and translation. Data gained through the translation method proved to be a very useful complement to other types of data in cognitive linguistics, bridging the gap between intuition and more empirical sources of data such as corpus-based research, the study of language acquisition, or contrastive and typological research. Naturally, this applies to research on metaphor and other figurative expressions as well.

Not surprisingly, this methodology worked well because early contrastive cognitive linguistic research focused on cross-linguistic similarity, i.e. its intent was to demonstrate the universal character of image schemas, conceptual metaphors and metonymies, etc. Researchers usually concentrated on similarity (i.e. on the universality of the above) rather than contrasts, and when some cross-linguistic differences were discussed they tended to be only isolated contrasts that were, at best, motivated on a one-to-one, ad hoc basis.

Let us now illustrate what the classic translational method might uncover when applied to a cross-linguistic study of conceptual metaphors. As in the case of all figurative expressions, including metaphors, there are three major possibilities when it comes to their translation:

Table 1. Overview of the general possibilities in translating figurative expressions by figurative or by non-figurative expressions, and vice versa.

source text/ language	non-figurative expression
target text/ language	figurative expression
figurative expression	figurative expression
non-figurative expression	figurative expression

Naturally, we are not interested in the translation of non-figurative expressions by non-figurative expressions, so this fourth possibility is not in our table.

Most of the time cross-linguistic comparisons of metaphors or metonymies resulted in contrastive statements of the type: “for a metaphorical/metonymic expression x/type X in language A there is an/no equivalent metaphorical/metonymic expression x/type X in language B”. Specifically, a metaphorical expression can be translated by means of an equivalent metaphorical expression (the lower right-hand part of the table) or not (the lower left-hand part of the table). Of course it is also possible for a non-metaphorical expression to be translated by a metaphorical one (the upper right-handed part of the table), but such cases are not very likely to be discovered by a unidirectional contrastive research based on a classic translational method. They would come to the light if we reverse the source and the goal language of the translation, but unless we adopt a bi-directional approach, the cases in the lower left-hand part of the table would fall beneath the radar.

However, there is lot more in the possibility described in the medium heavily shaded part of the table in the lower right hand in terms of contrastive significance than meets the eye. Appearances are deceptive and things are not as simple as they might seem at first blush. As pointed out by Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (1987, 2010), languages often structure conceptual content in more or less different ways, i.e. asymmetrically, and as a result of this, interlingual translation involves “(re)calibration” aimed at optimisation of conceptual analogousness (cf. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, 2010: 22) where an expression in one language covers a different portion of conceptual-semantic material than in another language. This applies to the translation of metaphors as well, and can easily be demonstrated.

Mandelblit’s (1995) *Cognitive Translation Hypothesis* provides for two possible scenarios in the translation of metaphors. *Similar Mapping Condition* obtains if no conceptual shift occurs between languages, while in the case of *Different Mapping Condition* a conceptual shift takes place from source language to target language. In order to check the difference between the two scenarios, Mandelblit (1995: 493) used the time parameter, and concluded that “the difference in reaction time is due to a conceptual shift that the translator is required to make between the conceptual mapping systems of the source and target languages.” She has found that metaphorical expressions take more time and are more difficult to translate if they exploit a cognitive domain quite different from that of the target language equivalent expression. This was also confirmed by Tirkkonen-Condit’s (2002) study.

But the distance/difference between the two domains need not be immediately clear. As an illustration of the magnitude of the problem of translating metaphors, we just point to an example discussed by Ahrens and Say (1999: 100). When Liu Tai-ying, the Chairman of the China Development Corp, called George Soros, the international financier, a ‘pig’, it was necessary for the

English-language *China News* to modify the quote, adding the information that ‘a pig is the Mandarin equivalent of an idiot’ (*China News*, October 7, 1998). Without this information, English readers would interpret the metaphorical expression to mean that Soros is a greedy person, as opposed to the intended meaning of ‘a stupid person’, which is the entrenched meaning of this metaphor in Chinese. The Hungarian counterpart of *pig*, *disznó*, can be used metaphorically to refer to a human with disgusting, unpleasant characteristics. The same applies to Croatian (cf. Milić 2008: 90–91).

While in the above case the problem is caused by the fact that the same metaphor vehicle belonging to the same source domain is linked to a (slightly) different target domain, the asymmetry or the contrast may be less conspicuous. It is possible for a metaphorical/metonymic expression x /type X in language A to be translated by a metaphorical/metonymic expression y /type Y in language B . In other words, a metaphor vehicle denoting a concept associated with a given source domain may be translated by a different metaphor vehicle associated with a more or less different source domain while the target domain is shared by both languages. In our case, a time metaphor based on a given lexeme x may be translated by (i.e. may be equivalent to) a time metaphor based on a lexeme y that is not directly equivalent to x . As a variation on this theme on a more general level, we note that a time metaphor of the type X , expressed by some lexeme x , may be translated by (i.e. may be equivalent to) a time metaphor of the type Y , expressed by some lexeme y that is not directly equivalent to x . In theory, as a twist on the above, it is also possible that a time metaphor of the type X , expressed by some lexeme x , may be translated by (i.e. may be equivalent to) a time metaphor of the type Y , expressed by a lexeme x that is directly equivalent to x . In other words, it is possible that we have two submetaphors sharing the same source and target domain, and in the limiting case, also sharing the lexical expression (the differences showing in different mappings). In all these case we will end up with a formally asymmetric rendering of the conceptual content.

There is, however, another, subtler dimension of asymmetry that needs to be addressed here. Let us assume that two or more languages (L_1, L_2, L_n) exhibit two or more submetaphors (sM) related to a more general metaphor (M) such that respective realizations of the submetaphors in question in different languages are apparently direct equivalents of each other (indicated by the symbol \equiv between the cells in the table):

Table 2. The system of equivalent submetaphors across languages.

M		
L_1	L_2	L_n
$sM_1 - E_x L_1$	$sM_1 - E_x L_2$	$sM_1 - E_x L_3$
$sM_2 - E_y L_1$	$sM_2 - E_y L_2$	$sM_2 - E_y L_3$
$sM_3 - E_z L_1$	$sM_3 - E_z L_2$	$sM_3 - E_z L_3$

It is, however, possible that while the submetaphors in question may be structurally, functionally and translationally equivalent, their distribution may be different across languages, i.e. sM_1 may be far more frequent than sM_2 , or sM_3 in L_1 , or more frequent than sM_1 in L_2 or L_3 . This means that instead of the seeming equivalence between submetaphors in different languages we should be better advised to assume just approximation. In de Saussurean terms, although two submetaphors, sM_1 from L_1 and sM_2 from L_2 may be exact translations and contrastive equivalents of each other, i.e. be perfectly equivalent on a one-to-one basis, outside their metaphorical systems, their value within their respective system is different.

What follows in Section 2 is a study on conceptual metaphors of time in a cross-linguistic perspective. More specifically, it is a study on the subsystem of the time motion metaphors with its two submetaphors, the Moving-Time and the Moving-Ego metaphors. After providing some background on these two time metaphors we demonstrate that asymmetric situations of the type discussed above may obtain in the course of translating conceptual metaphors of time from one language into another (and back). A similar type of asymmetry is also found concerning the frequency of the two types of time metaphors in various languages. In Section 3, we consider some factors that may motivate this asymmetry. We first consider whether the two metaphors in question actually have a different status in the sense that one of them is not primary. While Grady (1997a, b) considers them to be primary metaphors, Evans (2003) argues that they are both complex metaphorical models. The differences are attributed in part to different cultural models of proactivity or passivity, but also to semantic clash brought about by not adhering to the folk model of time and its default assignment of roles of Figure and Ground in the Moving Ego metaphor. The same counterintuitive assignment of these two roles is observed in the fictive motion construction of the coextension path type, which is the mirror image of the Moving Time metaphor, which means that there is a correlation between the lower frequency of the Moving Ego, on the one hand, and the constraints on the fictive motion construction, on the other, as corroborated by Japanese, Croatian, Hungarian and German data.

2. Time metaphors

There are many ways in which time can be metaphorically conceived, as resource (*We're out of time*), as money (as a special case of the former, as in *Yesterday is a canceled check; tomorrow is a promissory note; today is the only cash you have, so spend it wisely*, Kay Lyons), as container (*We usually took what takes about a month of preparation, and we did it in five days*), human (*Time is a great teacher, but unfortunately it kills all its pupils*, Hector Berlioz; *Prince, I warn you, under the rose, /Time is the thief you cannot banish*, Phyllis

McGinley, “Ballad of Lost Objects”) as well as motion (TIME IS MOTION), etc. According to the relevant static or dynamic reference point metaphorical models of time can be classified as Ego-Reference-Point models (where the Ego’s location is the “now”), or as Time-Reference-Point models (where earlier events are in front of later events the Reference Point (cf. Núñez and Sweetser, 2006; Moore, 2014).

When it comes to the Ego-Reference-Point models, it is usual to draw a distinction between Moving-Time and Moving-Ego metaphors (Clark, 1973; Gentner, 2001; Evans, 2003; Lakoff, 1993; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, 1999; Traugott, 1978). We make use of the former when we conceptualize time events as moving with respect to a fixed observer from front (future) to back (past) as in:

- (1) Christmas is approaching.
- (2) Holidays are coming.
- (3) New Year is coming to us soon.
- (4) Time passes so quickly.
- (5) The summer went by.

Time is viewed here as an object moving with respect to the observer, and the metaphor can be fully spelled out as TIME PASSING IS MOTION OF AN OBJECT.

The latter metaphor is exemplified by:

- (6) We are approaching Christmas.
- (7) ... we are coming to holidays and we have more traffic to deal with...
- (8) As we are getting closer to the end of the year...
- (9) Those sad days are behind us.
- (10) Thanksgiving is looming on the horizon.

In this subtype the observer moves forward towards fixed (future) time events, fully spelled as TIME PASSING IS AN OBSERVER’S MOTION OVER A LANDSCAPE.

In an informal translation task 20 MA students majoring in English at the University of Osijek (either 2nd or 3rd year), whose mother tongue is Croatian, were asked to provide a most natural sounding translation of the following text:

- (11a) Loyal supporters of Nourish, Creaseys Chartered Accountants of Lonsdale Gardens, Tunbridge Wells recently supplemented their monthly donation with the thoughtful addition of Easter Eggs. As Assistant Client Manager Louise Tunstall explained: “As we were approaching Easter it occurred to us that many local families would not be able to afford Easter Eggs so we asked everyone here whether they would like to donate some kind of Easter treat as well as the usual food

items. Everyone was really enthusiastic about the idea and we ended up with a really good collection.²

The students, who had taken no cognitive linguistics course and were therefore unlikely to know anything about the way cognitive linguistic approach conceptual metaphors, let alone anything about metaphors of time, were told that this task formed part of a wider research on translation practice. Our focus of attention was an adverbial clause in the middle of the text in which time was construed metaphorically, viz. *As we were approaching Easter*. The majority of students, i.e. 16 out of 20, did not provide a translation that follows the original as closely as possible. They changed the role of the Croatian equivalent of Easter, *Uskrs*, in their translations, promoting it to the subject of the corresponding adverbial clause:

(11b) Kako se približava Uskrs,...
'As Easter is approaching'

The rest, i.e. 4 students, followed in their translations the original as closely as possible:

(11c) Kako smo se približavali Uskrsu
'As we were approaching Easter'

When another group of 10 students were asked to translate (11b) back into English, none of the respondents provided the original, *As we were approaching Easter*, but only *As Easter is approaching/getting nearer*, etc.

This means that our translators exhibited an interesting pattern – although two variants are in theory available in both languages, offering the possibility of pairing them in a 1:1 way, they clearly preferred the variant in which time is moving metaphorically in both languages. In other words, they produced an asymmetric situation in the sense of Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (1987, 2010).

Grady (1997b: 119) allows (though reluctantly) both of these metaphors to be primary ones. Recognizing them as primary also means that they are very likely to be universal, i.e. they are to be found in very many languages (Grady, 1997a: 228). Moore (2010: 87) notes that

... the Moving Ego and Moving Time metaphors have been observed in various unrelated languages around the world, and according to conceptual metaphor theory, part of the explanation for this type of widespread crosslinguistic commonality is that the experiential basis of the metaphor is available in all of the relevant cultures around the world.

² http://www.nourishcommunityfoodbank.org.uk/docs/Nourish_Community_Foodbank_-_Apr_14.pdf, accessed on 1 February 2017

Moore (2014: 13) states that “Moving Ego and Ego-centered Moving Time occur repeatedly – with the same inference patterns – in language after language around the world,” but only gives examples from various languages for the latter.

However, according to Sinha et al. (2011), both Moving-Time and Moving-Ego metaphors are lacking in Amondawa. Note also that Núñez and Sweetser (2006) show that Aymara, an Amerindian language spoken in the Andean highlands of Bolivia, Peru and Chile, does not have dynamic models of time. The Aymara language instead has a major static model of time wherein FUTURE IS BEHIND EGO and PAST IS IN FRONT OF EGO.

But even if these submetaphors were primary, and nearly universal, the question is whether they are equally natural and/or frequent in all languages. Gentner, Imai & Boroditsky (2002) report a number of interesting observations. They found that their subjects took longer to respond to items that used the Moving-Time metaphor than to those that used the Moving-Ego metaphor. In one of their experiments they observed spontaneous conversion from the Moving-Time to the Moving-Ego metaphor; such conversions never occurred in the reverse direction. Similarly, Huang & Hsieh (2007) report that Chinese speakers when tested in their native tongue, process Moving-Ego metaphors faster. But when the same subjects were tested in English (as L₂), they conceptualized Moving-Time metaphors much better. Both of these studies seem to suggest that the Moving-Ego metaphor is somehow easier or more natural for English.

Unsurprisingly, both submetaphors are attested in a range of languages, and this can be easily verified by translating some of the above examples from English. Cf. first some examples from Croatian:

- (12a) a. Božić se približava. ‘Christmas is approaching’
 b. Približavamo se Božiću. ‘We are approaching Christmas’
- (12b) a. Bliži se Uskrs. ‘Easter is getting nearer’
 b. Bližimo se Uskrsu. ‘We are nearing Easter’

Apparently, some combinations of motion verbs and temporal nouns do not agree with the Moving-Ego metaphor in Croatian:

- (13) a. Praznici dolaze. ‘Holidays are coming’
 b. *Dolazimo praznicima. ‘We are coming to holidays’

On top of that, there are also clear differences in the frequency of the use of the two metaphors, the expressions of the Moving-Ego being quite rare, to say the least, which is in complete agreement with the asymmetry in the translation task above:

Table 3. Differences in the frequency of some instances of the Moving-Time and the Moving-Ego metaphors in Croatian.

	Google ³	hrWac ⁴
“Božić se bliži” ‘Christmas is getting closer’	3,070	25
“Bližimo se Božiću” ‘We are getting closer to Christmas’	5	0
“Božić se približava” ‘Christmas is approaching’	1,040	9
“Približavamo se Božiću” ‘We are approaching Christmas’	114	0
“Nova godina je pred/ Nova je godina pred” ‘New Year is in front of’	112/24	17
“pred Novom smo godinom/smo pred Novom godinom” ‘we are in front of New Year’	2/0	0/0
“došla je Nova godina”/ “Nova godina je došla”	56/51	0/0
“došli smo do Nove godine” / “došli do Nove godine”	2/3	0/0

It is often pointed out in the literature that examples with *ahead* can be ambiguous between the two models. The Croatian preposition *pred* ‘before, in front of’ might be claimed to be similar to *ahead* in this respect, but note that “Nova godina je pred/Nova je godina pred”, the more frequent construction, is more likely to be interpreted as exemplifying the Moving Time metaphor. It is also interesting to add that the New Year’s Eve party is rendered in Croatian by means of the nominalization *doček Nove godine*, which literally means ‘welcome of New Year,’ making it clear that it is the new Year that is conceptualized as moving and coming to us, and not the other way round.

In short, sentences such as (12a:b) and (12b:b) are acceptable as translations, i.e. they are structurally and functionally equivalent to their English models, but they are not of the same weight as their English models. There does not obtain statistical equivalence between them in the sense of Krzeszowski (1991).⁵ They are not natural choices and certainly sound more marked than (12a:a) and

³ Exact Google queries were performed in which quotation marks were used as operators forcing Google to return only the exact matches of what is enclosed within them.

⁴ This is a web corpus collected from the .hr top-level domain. The current version of the corpus (v2.0) contains 1.9 billion tokens and is annotated with the lemma, morphosyntax and dependency syntax layers (Ljubešić and Klubička, 2014).

⁵ Among several types of equivalence that Krzeszowski (1991) discusses, we also find statistical equivalence. He claims that this sort of equivalence obtains between elements that have “maximally similar frequencies of occurrence” in their respective 2-text corpora in addition to semantic and/or formal similarity or equivalence (1991: 27).

(12b:a). It is therefore not surprising that the Moving-Ego metaphor is often replaced in translation by the Moving-Time metaphor.

Hungarian is in this respect very similar to Croatian. More or less literal translations of the English examples (1) and (6) are acceptable, as shown by (14) a. and b., respectively (cf. also Kövecses, 2005: 52):

- (14) a. Rohamosan közeledik a Karácsony. ‘Christmas is approaching apace’
 b. Lassan közeledünk a Karácsonyhoz. ‘We are slowly approaching Christmas’

However, translations of similar examples with a more typical motion verb apparently do not agree with the Moving-Ego metaphor in Hungarian, either

- (15) a. Jönnek az ünnepek. ‘Holidays are coming’
 b. *Az ünnepekhez jövünk. ‘We are coming to holidays’

The Moving-Ego is not compatible even with implicit movement:

- (16) a. Mindjárt itt a karácsony. ‘Christmas is almost here’
 b. *Mindjárt karácsonynál vagyunk. ‘We are almost at Christmas’

There is again a clear pattern concerning the differences in the frequency of use of the two metaphors – as in Croatian, sentences illustrating the Moving-Ego metaphor are outnumbered by their counterparts with the Moving-Time, where both are available:

Table 4. Differences in the frequency of the Moving-Time and the Moving-Ego metaphors in Hungarian (as of March 5 2017).

	Google
“közeledik a Karácsony” ‘Christmas is approaching’	53,700/173
“közeledünk a Karácsonyhoz” ‘We are approaching Christmas’	2,770/79
“Karácsony rohan” ‘Christmas is rushing’	85
“rohannunk Karácsonyhoz” ‘we are rushing towards Christmas’	0
“Húsvét jön” ‘Easter is coming’	1,070/170
“Húsvéthez jövünk” ‘We are coming to Easter’	0

The situation in German is very similar to what we have seen in Croatian and Hungarian. Sentences illustrating the Moving-Time metaphor are far more frequent than their Moving-Ego counterparts:

- (17) a. Weihnachten nähert sich in großen Schritten [...] ⁶ ‘Christmas is approaching with great strides’
 b. ... dass wir uns mit großen Schritten Weihnachten nähern. ‘... that we are approaching Christmas with great strides’

Table 5. Differences in the frequency of the Moving-Time and the Moving-Ego metaphors in German (as of 5 March 2017).

	Google
“Weinachten nähert sich” ‘Christmas is approaching’	181,000/181
“wir nähern uns Weihnachten” ‘We are approaching Christmas’	2,350/90

Although we have so far assumed that the two metaphors are statistically speaking on equal footing in English, this is not borne out by a Google query, as can be seen in Table 6 below. Although they do not treat explicitly Moving-Ego metaphors as such in their corpus study Schmidt and Omazić (2011) show that the Moving-Time metaphor is clearly more frequent in their samples in Croatian than in English, which indirectly suggests that this difference might be compensated by a larger number of Moving-Ego metaphors in English. The second number following the slash in the right-hand column is the number of what Google offers as the most relevant results (after deduplication, etc.). Although the figures are not always proportional, it is clear that the Moving Ego metaphors (cells in grey in the table) occur with a much lower frequency.

Table 6. Differences in the frequency of the Moving-Time and the Moving-Ego metaphors in English (as of 6 February 2017).

	Google
“Christmas is approaching”	1,850,000/207
“we are approaching Christmas”	7,870/168
“Christmas is coming”	8,770,000/137
“we are coming up to Christmas”	7,500,000/120

⁶ <https://de-de.facebook.com/hotel.schloss.mittersill/photos/a.329980500382107.75184.328786797168144/944988938881257/>.

As far as English is concerned, these results seem to be in keeping with Radden (2011: 32), who lists Google hits for similar examples in English, Chinese and Japanese:

Table 7. Differences in the frequency of the Moving-Time and the Moving-Ego metaphors in English, Chinese and Japanese.

	English	Chinese	Japanese
Moving Time approaching	1,760,000	201,000	8,970
Moving Ego approaching	142,000	1,830,000	365,000
Moving Time has arrived	197,000	44,900	54,100
Moving Ego has arrived	74,000	162,000	337,000

Note that this is somewhat unexpected in light of the findings of Gentner, Imai & Boroditsky (2002), as discussed above. The figures for Chinese appear to be in keeping with the results of the study by Huang & Hsieh (2007), but part of the difference may be attributed to the fact that many of the examples that are listed in the literature (from Lakoff and Johnson, 1980 onwards) for the Moving Ego (as well as for the Moving Time) metaphor are doubtful, as observed by Evans (2003: 67). Commenting on examples like *We're getting close to the start of the school year* and *She is past her prime*, he notes that:

Grady appears to be assuming that phrases such as *the holiday season*, *my favourite part of the piece*, *the start of the school year*, *her prime* etc. index the primary target concept time.

However, this begs the question as to what makes the primary target concept temporal. After all, sentences which reveal a similar pattern, in which a change in a world-state is elaborated in terms of Motion, [...] are treated as evidencing the primary metaphor CHANGE IS MOTION (and not one of the two variants of TIME IS MOTION)...

In other words, the figures for the Moving Ego metaphor in Chinese may be exaggerated due to questionable examples. However, the figures for Japanese are certainly at odds with Suzuki (2015). Moore provides (18) a. and b. as examples for the Moving Time metaphor (2014: 14) and the Moving Ego metaphor (2013: 87) in Japanese, respectively:

- (18) a. Kurisumasu ga tikaduite-kita.
 Christmas NOM approach-come.CONTIN
 'Christmas is coming near (i.e. approaching).' [Hirose 2013]
- b. Saki ni ikeba iku hodo okane ga nakunaru
 ahead DAT go:CND go farther money NOM become:scarce
 "The more ahead [I] go, [to that degree] money becomes scarce."
 'The farther [I] go, the poorer [I] become.'

Suzuki (2015: 102f) shows that while Time moving metaphors are acceptable in Japanese, their Moving Ego counterparts are not:

- (19) a. shimekiri-ga chikadsuite-ki-ta
 deadline-NOM come closer-come-PST
 “The deadline is coming closer.”
 b. ?shimekiri-ni chikadsuite-ki-ta
 deadline-OBL come closer-come-PST
- (20) a. 3-nen-no tsukihi-ga nagare-ta
 3-year-GEN years-NOM flow-PST
 “Three years have passed.”
 b. *3-nen-no tsukihi-ni nagare-ta
 3-year-GEN year-OBL flow-PST

In general, Suzuki (2015) finds that the Moving Time metaphor is more frequent in Japanese than the Moving Ego.

Romanian is apparently similar to Croatian, Hungarian, German, English, and Japanese, showing the same sort of asymmetry:

- (21) a. Tiptil, Crăciunul se apropie. ‘Slowly, Christmas is approaching’
 b. Desi ne apropiem de Craciun,... ‘Although we are slowly approaching Christmas’

Table 8. Differences in the frequency of the Moving-Time and the Moving-Ego metaphors in Romanian (as of 5 March 2017).

	Google
“Crăciunul se apropie” ‘Christmas is approaching’	304,000/210
“ne apropiem de Crăciun” ‘We are approaching Christmas’	20,800/112

Neagu (2008: 144) notes that:

While American English provides various linguistic realizations of this model, foregrounding active agents and deliberate action of these agents, Romanian phrases and sentences instantiating the Moving Ego Metaphor are relatively few...

- (22) a. Ne apropiem de sfârșitul meciului.
 lit. We are approaching the end of the match, ‘we are approaching full time’
 b. Mă apropii de cincizeci de ani.
 lit. I’m approaching fifty, ‘I’m almost fifty’

3. Motivating the asymmetries and contrasts

In a search for an explanation of the asymmetries observed in a number of languages concerning the distribution of the two types of time metaphors as well as for the contrasts between languages concerning the frequency of a given type of metaphor one could start from several points of departure. It could be assumed, for one thing, that the observed cross-linguistic differences and similarities may have to do with a different status of the two metaphors in question.

Recall that we mentioned that Grady (1997b: 119) takes both of these metaphors to be primary ones. However, we might suppose that the cross-linguistically less frequent type of two metaphors, viz. the Moving Ego, is actually not a primary metaphor, but a complex one, and that some of its various component parts somehow more or less do not agree with or fit into the larger figurative system of these languages. After all, as pointed out by Kövecses (2005: 4), primary metaphors are likely to be universal, while the complex ones are more likely to be language-specific.

Evans (2013: 243), however, casts doubts on the status of both the Moving Ego and the Moving Time metaphor as primary ones. He claims that these metaphors

... actually amount to what Grady refers to as complex metaphors - they are not comprised of phenomenologically simple facets of embodied experience. (Evans 2013: 244)

Evans (2004: 212) goes on to claim that these are culturally constructed complex cognitive models, i.e. they “consist of independently-motivated sets of temporal lexical concepts, and the elaborations associated with this range of concepts.”

Now it turns out that, regardless of whether Grady or Evans is right, the two metaphors are intrinsically no different from each other concerning their status, i.e. that it is not the case that one of them is primary and the other compound, we need to check whether there may be some elements of these two cognitive models that inhibit one and/or facilitate the other.

It transpires from the above data that the distribution of the time metaphors is different in different languages. In fact, experimental studies show that there is a lot of variation among speakers belonging to a single linguistic community. In some studies it was shown that it is possible to manipulate speakers, i.e. prime them in certain ways so as to produce utterances illustrating with one or the other metaphor.

Margolies and Crawford (2008) examined whether affect might influence the choice between the two time metaphors under study here, i.e. whether positive and negative events are associated with different time metaphors. The results of their experiments show that participants who imagined a negative event were more likely to report that the event was approaching them, whereas those who imagined a positive event were more likely to report that they were approaching

the event. Experiments also indicated that participants judge an event to be more positive if it is described from the ego-moving perspective than if it were described from the time-moving perspective.

Richmond, Wilson and Zinken (2012) report that participants who adopt an ego-moving representation exhibit significantly higher agency scores and significantly higher future time perspective scores than those with time-moving perspective. Participants adopting a time-moving representation reported significantly higher present fatalistic scores as well as significantly higher present hedonistic scores than participants with an ego-moving representation. Their study also shows that participants with an ego-moving representation reported significantly higher scores for happiness than those with time-moving representations. The latter reported significantly higher state and trait anxiety scores and depression scores than participants who indicated an ego-moving representation. What is more, Richmond, Wilson and Zinken (2012) argue that our representation of time is a fairly malleable, bidirectional relation obtaining between time representation and emotional experiences in the sense that manipulating the former has an effect on the latter and vice versa.

In a similar study, Duffy and Feist (2014) concentrate on how lifestyle and personality factors in two groups of participants with very different expectations concerning their structuring of time (university students in one group, and university administrators in the other) may influence the choice between the two perspectives, i.e. whether one is more likely to use a Moving-Time or a Moving-Ego metaphor. University students more frequently adopted the Moving-Ego perspective, while the opposite was true of administrators. Their experimental data also show that there is a correlation between adopting a Moving-Ego perspective and higher procrastination scores on the one hand, and lower conscientiousness scores on the other. Participants adopting this perspective also evidence higher levels of extroversion than those adopting the Moving-Time perspective.

These studies appear to invite us to draw a number of (sometimes conflicting) conclusions. Some of them suggest that there are some more permanent factors that might influence the choice across the population. Generalizing from this, we might assume that the differences we have observed above simply reflect differences between cultural-linguistic communities in the sense that in a given society hedonism, procrastination, active lifestyle, egotism, etc. may be more prevalent than in some other societies.

Radden (2003: 237) argues that Moving Ego model, implying static time, is inconsistent with our folk view of moving time. Neagu (2008: 144) links the small number of linguistic realizations of the Moving Ego metaphor in Romanian to a more passivity-oriented attitude to time and life in general. The Japanese situation, as described in Suzuki (2015), may be linked to such cultural model of proactivity or passivity. This is very similar to what was observed in Schmidt and Brdar (2012), where the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A GAMBLING

GAME was found to be frequently used in English, Croatian and Hungarian, but its lexicalization forms differed across languages. Gambling is a heterogeneous phenomenon including a broad range of activities, ranging from betting to card games such as poker, to lottery and bingo. Generally, these can be roughly divided into two large groups: active (cards and betting) and passive gambling (like tickets and lottery). The wording of their metaphors reveals that Croats and Hungarians are obviously fond of passive gambling, while English seems to be more in favour of using active gambling metaphors.

But there are also seem to be some structural correlates that may help complete the picture. Radden (2011: 29, fn 22) notes that:

Like many scholars, Lakoff and Johnson (1999) do not distinguish between static and truly motional terms and include under their moving observer metaphor cases such as *Will you be staying a long time or a short time?* and *He'll have his degree within two years*, which are static situations whose duration may be conceived of in terms of fictive motion.

The close links between time metaphors and fictive motion are also suggested in Boroditsky (2000), Boroditsky and Ramscar (2002), and Matlock, Ramscar and Boroditsky (2005). It has been shown (Boroditsky 2000) that in neutral contexts people answer ambiguous time questions from ego- and time-moving perspectives equally often, but that it is possible to entice speakers to assume either the ego- or the time-moving perspective by giving them a task with either imaginary or real manipulation of objects in space. Boroditsky and Ramscar (2002) showed that subjects primed to think of objects coming toward them through space were more likely to think of time as coming toward them, i.e. more likely to use the Moving-Time metaphor. On the other hand, subjects primed to think of themselves as moving through space showed the opposite pattern. They found that actual spatial motion is neither necessary nor sufficient to influence people's thinking about time. Rather, it is thinking about spatial motion that seems to underlie thinking about time. In a follow-up study, Matlock, Ramscar and Boroditsky (2005) demonstrate that engaging in thought about abstract motion can encourage people to take an ego-moving perspective, which in turn, encourages them to "move" forward through time.

The phenomenon of fictive motion was first applied by Talmy (1983, 1996, 2000) to descriptions in which settings that are factually stationary are construed as moving. Among the many subtypes of fictive motion, such as Emanation Paths (which can be Orientation paths (23) a., Radiation paths (23) b., Shadow paths (23) c., etc.), Frame-relative motion (24), Advent paths (25), etc. the most important for us is the Coextensive path fictive motion, illustrated in (26). The following are examples from Talmy (2000: ch 2):

- (23) a. I/The arrow on the signpost pointed toward/away from/into/
past the town.
b. The light is shining (from the sun) into the cave/onto the back
wall of the cave
c. The pillar cast/projected a shadow onto/against the wall.
- (24) I sat in the car and watched the scenery rush past me.
- (25) Termite mounds are scattered/spread/distributed all over the plain.
- (26) a. The path runs along the beach.
b. The beach runs along the town before coming to a disused harbour
made up of a long sweeping seawall and many rockpools inside.

McGlone and Harding (1998: 1211) note that the relationship between Moving Ego and Ego-centered Moving Time is analogous to the relationship between factive motion (ordinary motion regarded as real) and fictive motion. Factive motion and frame-relative fictive motion can be seen as Figure-Ground reversals of each other. The same could be said of Moving Time and Moving Ego metaphors. This means that there is an analogy between Moving-Ego/Ego-centered Moving Time and factive/fictive motion. According to Moore (2014: 56) the way the same information is construed differently in (27) is parallel to how Moving Ego and Ego-centered Moving Time construe the same information differently in (28):

- (27) a. He was rushing toward the brick wall (as he realized that his
brakes had failed).
b. The brick wall was rushing toward him (as he realized that his brakes
had failed).
- (28) a. We are fast approaching the end of the semester.
b. The end of the semester is fast approaching.

In addition to this analogy, we should also note a sort of cross-matching between (27) b. and (28) a.; the wall, i.e. the Ground-turned-Figure, is factively static, but is construed as moving, while the observer, *we*, is construed as moving instead of time, Figure-turned-Ground. Both of these run contrary to common-sense folk models.

Matsumoto (1998) reports that not all objects can be described by a fictive motion expression in Japanese. Unlike in English, nontravellable paths, that is, paths which cannot be travelled by humans, such as walls and fences, cannot be used in Japanese fictive motion constructions. This means that there is a sort of correlation between Moving Ego and fictive motion, both being subject to

restrictions. In other words, we might expect that other languages that exhibit a pronounced asymmetry in the use of time metaphors, favouring the Moving Time type, might also exhibit similar constraints concerning the use of fictive motion construction.

Let us now consider how some examples of prototypical fictive motion constructions are rendered in Croatian:

- (29) a. The road runs to the left.
 b. The road leads to the famous volcano Osorno.
 c. The fence runs through private property...
 d. The beach goes from Viareggio in the south to the border of Liguria,...
 e. The beach runs from the Shallow Inlet entrance to the small settlement of Waratah Bay, at the western end of the beach.
- (30) a. Cesta vodi/skreće na lijevo. Lit. 'the road leads/turns to the left'
 b. Cesta vodi prema poznatom vulkanu Osorn. Lit. 'the road leads to the famous volcano Osorno'
 c. Ograda ide preko privatnog posjeda... Lit. 'the fence goes across private property'
 d. Plaža se prostire od Viareggia na jugu to granice s Ligurijom,... Lit. 'the beach stretches/extends from Viareggio in the south to the border of Liguria,...'
 e. Plaža se prostire od ulaza u Shallow Inlet to malog naselja u Zaljevu Warath, na desnom kraju plaže. Lit. 'the beach stretches/extends from the Shallow Inlet entrance to the small settlement of Waratah Bay, at the western end of the beach'

It turns out that in the case of coextension path type of fictive motion constructions in Croatian, virtually all dynamic construals of a situation based on verbs that are counterparts of verbs like *run*, *move*, etc. are not acceptable. Instead we find verbs denoting slow movement like *ići* 'go', *voditi* 'lead/guide', change of direction such as *skretati* 'turn', or verbs denoting no movement but denoting rather static situations like spanning, such as *prostirati* / *pružati* / *protežati se* 'extend /stretch/ spread (itself).' Notice that the English counterparts of these verbs, *extend* and *stretch*, can also be used in such contexts, though in some cases the meaning of the whole might be slightly different. Notably, they are possible in contexts like (29) b., d. and e., but they are nevertheless used considerably less frequently than *lead* or *run*, which are felt to be more idiomatic. This means that when translating sentences like (30) d. and e. into English we can expect, depending on the experience and skill of the translator, more or less correct translations resulting in the overuse of *extend* or *stretch* and, conversely, the underuse of *run*, which would be more natural choice, and statistically speaking more frequent one. In other words, instead of an

asymmetry obtaining in the case of translating from English into Croatian, while we would have its levelling in the case of translating from Croatian into English.

The constraints observed are similar to what Suzuki reports for English and Japanese, which means that Croatian and Japanese again exhibit the same tendency. However, on the basis of the examples like (30) above, and (31) below, there also appear to be some differences between Croatian and Japanese:

- (31) a. Zapadno od Bola, pruža se/*vodi/*ide/**trči plaža Zlatni rat... ‘West of Bol there extends/*leads/*goes/runs the Golden Horn beach’
 b. Plaža se proteže 4 kilometra duž obale... ‘The beach stretches for 4 kilometres along the coast’

Apart from subjects, i.e. moving Ground-turned-Figures, denoting items whose primary function is transport (the travelling ones), verbs of slow movement are also compatible with non-travellable but traversable, elongated locative objects, such as fences, gates. The most static verbs of the extend type are found with locative objects that are neither travelling nor traversable. The same seems to be true for Hungarian (32), and German (33):

- (32) a. Hová vezet az út? ‘where does the road lead?’
 b. Arra, amerre a kerítés megy... ‘there, where the fence goes to...’
 c. A Parador Hotel golfpályája mögött húzódik meg ez a strand. ‘that beach stretches behind the Parador Hotel golf course’
- (33) a. Die Straße führt in die Berge. Lit. ‘the road leads into the hills’
 b. Der Zaun geht rund um das Haus herum. Lit ‘the fence goes around the house’
 c. Der Strand erstreckt sich meilenweit nach Süden. Lit. ‘The beach stretches (lit. stretches itself) for miles to the south’

At the moment we can only speculate about the reason for these constraints and more research is necessary, on more languages and based on more data. One of the possible reasons could be the semantic clash between a dynamic motion verb and the Ground-turned-Figure. We could say that the clash is removed in Croatian, Hungarian and German, where static verbs of the *extend*-type are used instead of a dynamic one. The semantic clash is not so open in English due to the fact that dynamic verbs such as *run* or *go* exhibit a great deal of polysemy. They can serve grammatical functions, i.e. they can be used as resultative copula verbs, *go* can be used for future time reference (*going to*), as well as in many well-entrenched collocations, with these verbs having a near grammatical role (e.g. *run danger / risk / test / business*, etc.).

5. Concluding remarks

In the introductory section, we stated that the data gained through the translation method can be a very useful complement to other types of data in cognitive linguistics, bridging the gap between intuition and some more empirical sources of data. Naturally, this applies to the research on metaphor as well. Combining translation with the contrastive approach may help uncover not only the conditions of their use at the token level, but also patterns of their use in the cultural and discorsal context.

We demonstrated this by taking a very close look at some cross-linguistic asymmetries in the use of two types of time metaphors, the Moving-Time and the Moving-Ego metaphor in a number of languages, such as English, German, Croatian, Hungarian, and Romanian. The Moving-Ego metaphor appears to be far less frequently used in languages such as Croatian or Hungarian, i.e. some of its lexicalizations are less natural than their counterparts based on the Moving-Time metaphor, while some others are, unlike their English counterparts, clearly unacceptable.

The differences are attributed in part to different cultural models of proactivity or passivity, but also to semantic clash brought about by not adhering to the folk model of time and its default assignment of roles of Figure and Ground in the Moving Ego metaphor. The same counterintuitive assignment of these two roles is observed in the fictive motion construction of the coextension path type, which is the mirror image of the Moving Time metaphor, which means that there is a correlation between the lower frequency of the Moving Ego, on the one hand, and the constraints on the fictive motion construction, on the other, as corroborated by Japanese, Croatian, Hungarian and German data.

References

- Ahrens, Kathleen and Alicia L. T. Say. 1999. Mapping Image-schemes and Translating Metaphors. In *Proceedings of 13th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, 1–8. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Boroditsky, Lera 2000. Metaphoric Structuring: Understanding Time Through Spatial Metaphors. *Cognition*, 75, 1–28.
- Boroditsky, Lera and Michael Ramscar. 2002. The Roles of Body and Mind in Abstract Thought. *Psychological Science* 13(2). 185–189.
- Clark, Herbert H. 1973. Space, Time, Semantics and the Child. In Timothy E. Moore (ed.), *Cognitive Development and the Acquisition of Language*, 27–64. New York.: Academic Press.
- Duffy, Sarah E., and Michele I. Feist. 2014. Individual Differences in the Interpretation of Ambiguous statements about time. *Cognitive Linguistics* 25 (1). 29–54.
- Evans, Vyvyan. 2003. *The Structure of Time: Language, Meaning and Temporal Cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Evans, Vyvyan. 2013. *Language and Time: A Cognitive Linguistics Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gentner, Dedre. 2001. Spatial Metaphors in Temporal Reasoning. In Merideth Gattis (ed.), *Spatial Schemas and Abstract Thought*, 203–222. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gentner, Dedre, Mutsumi Imai and Lera Boroditsky. 2002. As Time Goes By: Evidence for Two Systems in Processing Space → Time Metaphors. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 17. 537–565
- Grady, Joseph E. 1997a. THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS revisited. *Cognitive Linguistics* 8. 267–290.
- Grady, Joseph E. 1997b. *Foundations of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary Scenes*. Dept. of Linguistics, U.C. Berkeley: PhD Dissertation.
- Huang, Hsin-mei May and Shelley Ching-yu Hsieh. 2007. Time-moving Metaphors and Ego-Moving Metaphors: Which is Better Comprehended by Taiwanese? *The 21st Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information, and Computation, Seoul National University, November 1–3*, 173–181.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2005. *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krzyszowski, Tomasz P. 1991. *Contrasting Languages: The Scope of Contrastive Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lakoff, George 1993. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In Andrew Ortony, (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (2nd ed.), 202–251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George 1993. The Internal Structure of the Self. In Ulric Neisser and David A. Jopling (eds.), *The Conceptual Self in Context, Culture, Experience and Self Understanding*, 92–114. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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 Challenges to Western Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Barbara. 1987. *Conceptual Structure, Linguistic Meaning, and Verbal Interaction*. Łódź: Łódź University Press.
- Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Barbara. 2010. Re-conceptualization and the Emergence of Discourse Meaning as a Theory of Translation. In Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Marcel Thelen, (eds.), *Meaning in Translation*, 105–147. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Ljubešić, Nikola and Filip Klubička. 2014. {bs,hr,sr}WaC – web corpora of Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian. *Proceedings of the 9th Web as Corpus Workshop (WaC-9)*, 29-35. Gothenburg, Sweden. (Available online at <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W14-0405>, accessed on September 9, 2016).
- Mandelblit, Nili. 1995. The Cognitive View of Metaphor and Its Implications for Translation Theory. In Marcel Thelen and Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, (eds.), *Translation and Meaning, Part 3*, 483–495. Maastricht: Universitaire Press.
- Margolies, Skye Ochsner and L. Elizabeth Crawford. 2008. EVENT VALANCE and Spatial Metaphors of Time. *Cognition and Emotion* 22. 1401–1414.
- Matlock, Teenie, Michael Ramscar and Lera Boroditsky. 2005. On the Experiential Link Between Spatial and Temporal Language. *Cognitive Science* 29. 655–664.
- Matsumoto, Yo. 1996. Subjective Motion and English and Japanese Verbs. *Cognitive Linguistics* 7. 183–226.
- McGlone, Matthew S. and Jennifer L. Harding. 1998. Back (or Forward?) to the Future: The Role of Perspective in Temporal Language Comprehension. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition* 24(5). 1211–1223.
- Milić, Goran. 2008. Metaforički jezični izrazi tipa 'ljudsko biće je životinja' u engleskom i hrvatskom jeziku. MA thesis, University of Zagreb.

- Moore, Kevin Ezra. 2013. Frames and the Experiential Basis of the Moving Time Metaphor. In Mirjam Fried and Kiki Nikiforidou (eds.), *Advances in Frame Semantics*, 85–108. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Moore, Kevin Ezra. 2014. *The Spatial Language of Time: Metaphor, Metonymy, and Frames of Reference*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Neagu, Mariana. 2008. Metaphorical Thought in Culture: the Issue of Time in Romanian. In Michaela Praisler and Gabriela I. Colipcă (eds.), *Culture, Subculture, Counterculture*, 137–155. Galați: Editura Europlus.
- Núñez, Rafael E. and Eve Sweetser. 2006. With the Future Behind Them: Convergent Evidence from Aymara Language and Gesture in the Crosslinguistic Comparison of Spatial Construals of Time. *Cognitive Science* 30. 401–450.
- Radden, Günter. 2003. The Metaphor TIME AS SPACE Across Languages. *Zeitschrift für interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht*, 8, 226–239.
- Radden, Günter. 2011. Spatial Time in the West and the East. In Mario Brdar et al. (eds.), *Space and Time in Language*, 1–40. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Richmond, Jill, J., Clare J. Wilson and Jorg Zinken. 2012. A Feeling for the Future: How Does Agency in Time Metaphors Relate to Feelings? *European Journal of Social Psychology* 42(7). 813–823.
- Schmidt, Goran and Mario Brdar. 2012. Variation in the Linguistic Expression of the Conceptual Metaphor LIFE IS A (GAMBLING) GAME. In Mario Brdar, Ida Raffaelli and Milena Žic Fuchs (eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics Between Universality and Variation*, 271–292. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Schmidt, Goran and Marija Omazić. 2011. Time Metaphors in English and Croatian: A Corpus-Based Study. In Mario Brdar et al. (eds.), *Space and Time in Language*, 237–246. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Sinha, Chris. et al. 2011. When Time Is Not Space: The Social and Linguistic Construction of Time Intervals and Temporal Event Relations in an Amazonian Culture. *Language and Cognition* 3. 137–169.
- Suzuki, Kohei. 2015. Distributions of Temporal Metaphors in Japanese. *US-China Foreign Language* 13(2). 101–108.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja. 2002. Metaphoric Expressions in Translation Processes. *Across Languages and Cultures* 3. 101–116.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1978. On the Expression of Spatio-Temporal Relations in Language. In Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson and Edith A. Moravcsik, (eds.), *Universals of Human Language*, Vol. 3, 369–400. Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press.