Lakoff and Johnson’s Conceptual Metaphor Theory (1980) asserts that we use concepts from one domain of knowledge to structure information in another domain, as reflected by metaphors in language. The current study expands on this idea by exploring the relative frequencies and patterns of one such metaphor, TIME IS SPACE, in English and Indonesian discourse. Clark (1973) established two main perspectives of this metaphor: Moving Time (e.g. “the new year is approaching”) and Moving Ego (e.g. “we’re approaching the new year”).

The TIME IS SPACE metaphor is well-documented across the world’s languages, from the opposing vertical directions found in Mandarin (Yu, 1998) and Wolof (Moore, 2014), to Aymara’s unique placement of the past and future (Núñez and Sweetser, 2006). Additionally, while psycholinguistic experiments have shown that spatial concepts can indeed be used to structure temporal concepts (Boroditsky, 2000), few studies have investigated how these metaphors are used in natural language. As experimental data may not match day-to-day discourse, the current study uses a novel corpus-based approach to conceptual metaphor research by searching for collocations between motion verbs (e.g. come) and temporal/event words (e.g. winter) in both English and Indonesian corpora (The Corpus of Contemporary American English and a corpus from PAN Localization, respectively), with the aim of determining the usage frequencies of both perspectives, as well as investigating crosslinguistic patterns at the lexical level.

The results obtained indicate that both languages appear to strongly prefer the Moving Time perspective, but also revealed several previously-undiscussed nuances, including the different behaviors of different verbs and their various morphological forms, as well as different behaviors of lexical equivalents across English and Indonesian. The study concludes with the potential primacy of the Moving Time perspective over Moving Ego and the notion of ‘perspective preference’ among different motion verbs in language. It also highlights the benefits of corpus-based approaches in metaphor studies (cf. Pragglejaz Group, 2007), as well as the need for conceptual metaphor researchers to focus more on the lexical level.
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