

Nina Ž. Manojlović¹
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Philology and Arts
English Department

PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF THE CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR *TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY* IN SERBIAN AND ENGLISH²

The conceptual metaphor *TIME IS MONEY* / (VALUABLE) *COMMODITY* is considered to be fairly new and its origins are a matter of debate. Some researchers believe that cultural changes brought about this particular conceptualization, while others claim that the inherent finiteness of time is the basis for viewing time as something valuable. The aim of this paper is to examine the pragmatic aspects of concretizations of the said metaphor in Serbian and English. Namely we aim to investigate, within the framework of cognitive-inferential pragmatics, the possibility of certain expressions being an instance of descriptive and/or interpretative use of language. The theoretical framework is relevance theory and two approaches to metaphoric expressions taken into account are explicature analysis and modified explicature analysis. The analysis comprises examples of conceptual metaphors *TIME IS A (LIMITED) RESOURCE* (since we believe it serves as a basis for further elaboration and profiling *value* when it comes to mapping on the examined target domain) and *TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY* with special attention dedicated to examples of the conceptual metaphor *TIME IS MONEY*. The results show that speakers of English and Serbian conceptualize time in a similar way when it comes to the source domains *RESOURCE* and *VALUABLE COMMODITY* (attested metaphors include *TIME HAS A PRICE*, *TIME IS FOR SALE*, etc.). When it comes to the pragmatic aspects of our analysis, the results point to the adequacy of both interpretative and descriptive approach to the interpretation of metaphoric expressions, depending on the entrenchment and routinization of an expression.

Key words: conceptual metaphor, *TIME*, *RESOURCE*, *VALUABLE COMMODITY*, cross-domain mapping, explicature approach, modified explicature approach, ad hoc concept

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The conceptual metaphor *TIME IS MONEY* / (VALUABLE) *COMMODITY* is considered to be fairly new.³ Lakoff and Johnson (1980/2003: 139–146) state that great cultural changes can be regarded as a consequence of the introduction of novel metaphors such as the abovementioned *TIME IS MONEY*.

1 nina.manojlovic@filum.kg.ac.rs

2 The research presented in the paper was financed by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia (Agreement on the realization and financing of scientific research work of SRO in 2023 no. 451-03-47/2023-01/ 200198).

3 Compared to other conceptualizations of the target domain time (e.g. time is a container, time is a moving object, time is a devourer, time is a healer, etc.).

Conceptual metaphors TIME IS MONEY, TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE and TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY are coherent since, in the society we live in, time is deemed a limited resource and limited resources are indeed a valuable commodity. This coherent system of conceptual metaphors is the basis for a coherent system of metaphorical expressions such as *waste time, spend time, (not) have (enough) time, invest time* etc. (Serbian: *tračiti vreme, uložiti vreme, gubiti vreme, imati/nemati (dovoljno) vremena*, etc.). These metaphoric concepts are suitable for the cultures they arise from, but the same source domains would not be a part of concretization of the target domain TIME (Lakoff and Johnson: 1980/2003: 7–8) since time is not viewed in terms of valuable commodity universally across all societies.

On the other hand, Klikovac (1998: 36) states that cultural change has led to the creation of the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY, which is a very distinct conceptualization from, for example, mappings of domains such as MOVEMENT OR HORIZONTAL AXIS onto the domain TIME, which are grounded in our bodily experience and that this is the reason why it has emerged fairly late in human history and does not occur in all cultures. Evans (2003: 100–101) points out the notion of *finiteness* as being the grounds for the existence of the cross-domain mapping between COMMODITY and TIME. Namely, the finiteness of time intervals stems from the conceptualization of those intervals as CONTAINERS, and he illustrates this implied finiteness with the following example (taken from Evans 2003: 100):

(1) Time is running out for those trapped beneath the earthquake rubble.

The time interval in this example (within which the survivors have to be found) is limited, hence the implied finiteness which in turn provided the basis for the emergence of a new lexical concept. Namely, even though in this example it is the context that generates the conceptualization of time as being limited, eventually this brought about the conceptualization of time as commodity precisely due to the continued use of the lexeme *time* in the abovementioned sense, since that which is finite is also considered to be valuable (Evans 2003: 100–101).

There can be more than one explanation for the creation of a new meaning, which reflects the different directions and ways a certain meaning was created and elaborated (Evans 2003: 102). This particular conceptualization (COMMODITY) could have developed from various experiences that ground and reinforce the meaning of *value*. For example, the amount of money in exchange for labor is measured in relation to intervals such as day, hour etc. On the other hand, since there is a correlation between achieving a goal and the amount of time available for that, the meaning of *value* is necessarily tied to *time*. Since a certain amount of time is needed to achieve a certain goal the lack of time is tied to inability to achieve the said goal and greater amount of time to greater possibility of achieving the said goal (Evans 2003: 102). The meaning of *value* is present even when the

context does not imply finite duration (see examples below, taken from Evans 2003: 101, our emphasis):

- (2) My psychiatrist's time is so expensive!
- (3) Time is money. So start an Equitable 2000 Personal Pension Plan now.
- (4) The advertisers bought more air time for their ads.

In the examples above, time is profiled as an entity which possesses value, without the requirement to be conceptualized as an entity that exists in limited amounts. As such, time can be expensive and even bought or sold (as in example (4)).

Regardless of the issue of origin of conceptualizing TIME in terms of (VALUABLE) COMMODITY, it can be concluded that this cross-domain mapping is productive in both examined languages (Manojlović 2021). The focus of this paper is not the cognitive linguistic approach to metaphoric expressions but the cognitive pragmatic approach to the interpretation of utterances containing such expressions. The reason for such an analysis is the growing number of papers that aim at reconciling these two approaches (Tendahl and Gibbs 2008; Tendahl 2009; Wilson 2011; Rasulić and Mišković-Luković 2021; Manojlović 2022 in print etc.) and the research presented in this paper will hopefully contribute to this discussion.

2. CORPUS AND METHODOLOGY

Since the aim in this paper is the examination of pragmatic aspects, we will not deal with cognitive-linguistic aspects of analyzed expressions. Namely, the examples analyzed in this paper are taken, without adaptation, from a cognitive linguistic research (Manojlović 2021). The corpus of the said study comprises five novels in English and five in the Serbian language, two scientific studies in each language and newspaper articles in both English and Serbian (see Sources). The corpus was chosen based on the search for time-related lexemes in two electronic corpora and constructed to represent texts of similar content and scope in Serbian and English.⁴ The examples excerpted for the said study (and analyzed in this paper) include expressions with the lexemes *vreme* and *time*, as well as other lexemes in both languages denoting various time intervals. The total of 114 examples was checked using MIPVU (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010). This procedure was chosen (over MIP) primarily because it does not require the investigation into historical order of meanings (for deciding about what the basic meaning is) and the addition of a step pertaining to words used for lexico-grammatical substitutions. It should be noted here that the step pertaining to direct metaphors had to be omitted since the contribution of

4 For detailed account of the process used for choosing the texts and the description of corpus see Manojlović 2021.

such expressions to the explicature is entirely different (for detailed explanation see Manojlović 2022). After comparing contextual meaning of each relevant lexical unit from the said 114 examples with their basic meaning we have determined that in all excerpted examples these two meanings differ, and that contextual meaning could be understood in terms of the basic meaning.⁵

After completing the procedure described above the examples were analyzed in terms of their pragmatic contribution to the proposition expressed. Namely, the goal was to determine whether the examined constituents contribute to the truth conditions of the overall utterance by investigating whether they are examples of descriptive or interpretative language use. Precise demarcation was not possible for all expressions since mental lexicon differs from what can be found in dictionaries and the division between descriptive and attributive concepts can depend heavily on background knowledge, communal common ground and the level of routinization.

Since the focus is to test the applicability of the relevance-theoretic approach to metaphor treatment, the next two chapters will briefly present the main tenets of the theory and how it can be applied to the study of metaphoric expressions.

3. RELEVANCE THEORY AND METAPHOR

According to relevance theory, human cognition tends to be geared towards the maximization of relevance (the cognitive principle of relevance) and every ostensive act of communication carries the presumption of its own optimal relevance (communicative principle of relevance). Relevance is not subject to quantification and the simplest way to define it is to observe it as a relation between the cognitive effort needed for arriving at the intended interpretation and the cognitive effects achieved – relevance is proportional to cognitive effects and inversely proportional to cognitive effort. Assuming that the ostensive stimulus is relevant enough to be worth the processing effort and the most relevant one according to the speaker's abilities and preferences, the hearer tests the interpretive hypotheses in order of their accessibility and stops when the interpretation that satisfies the expectation of relevance is reached, or when such interpretation cannot be reached (*the least effort strategy*).

The initial input for pragmatic inference is the logical form which is a schematic semantic representation of a sentence and the output is a fully fledged proposition. This proposition is the basic explicature of an utterance if it is indeed communicated by the speaker (and not, for example, unexplicated proposition expressed as is the case in ironic utterances).

5 In cases where RMS did not offer conclusive results internet search was used as a secondary source for basic meaning, since it can show the contemporary language use.

Pragmatic processes involved in the development of the basic proposition are reference assignment, disambiguation (both processes featured in Grice's construct *what is said*), saturation (a process whereby a conceptual slot in the decoded logical form is filled), free enrichment (the process of conceptual enrichment of a constituent based on narrowing of meaning) and ad hoc concept construction (a pragmatically adjusted lexical concept which becomes the conceptual constituent of the proposition intended by the speaker).

Within the relevance-theoretic approach to communication, two approaches to metaphoric expression stand out – explicature analysis (EA) and modified explicature analysis (MEA).⁶ EA is a lexical pragmatic approach (Sperber and Wilson 1986/95; Carston 2002a, 2010) according to which there is a continuum of cases from literal use of language, through approximation and hyperbole, to metaphor. It is only a matter of degree of parting from the encoded concept, and on this continuum the metaphoric expressions represent the communicated concept that departs the most from the encoded concept. Another important assumption within this approach is that interpretation is contextually conditioned (Wilson 2011: 202), which means that, depending on the context, the same utterance can be interpreted in various ways. So, EA presumes that figurative use of language represents the most prominent example of linguistic underdetermination. i.e., that it illustrates, in a very obvious way, the difference between what is said and what is communicated⁷.

This approach has three basic assumptions: 1) the use of metaphor is considered to be a part of a continuum containing other examples of loose use of language; 2) interpretation of metaphoric expressions is an entirely inferential process that does not require associative mapping from one domain onto another; 3) deriving the emergent property does not require special interpretative mechanisms compared to those needed for the interpretation of literal expressions (Wilson and Carston 2006).

According to EA, the pragmatic processes of narrowing (strengthening) and broadening (loosening) of meaning are treated in the same way – as pragmatic enrichment of the basic proposition of an utterance (Mišković-Luković 2013: 50). See the following example (all the examples in this chapter are taken (and translated) from Manojlović, in print)

(1) Marko is a machine.

Given that both processes – narrowing and broadening – are treated in the same way, and that both processes contribute to the explicit content of an utterance, the result is the following explicature:

6 For the explanation of the two other (earlier) approaches to metaphor within inferential pragmatics – implicature analysis (Grice) and modified implicature analysis (relevance theory) – see Mišković-Luković (2013).

7 According to relevance theory, *communicated* means that the speaker is committed to the truth of the proposition or the propositional constituent.

(1a) MARKO_x IS A MACHINE**

X stands for the pragmatic process of reference assignment, while the symbol ‘**’ marks the ad hoc concept which is the result of pragmatic processes of narrowing and broadening. The encoded concept MACHINE is narrowed in such a way that only certain encyclopedic information are chosen – those that are relevant for arriving at the intended interpretation. Depending on the context, these may include quick, efficient, precise (excluding those pertaining to the more mechanical aspect of machines, such as having bolts, screws, etc.).⁸ The encoded concept MACHINE is broadened (loosened) so that it can refer to (certain) people. Based on the described ad hoc concept formation process, the addressee can arrive at the following contextual assumption (1b) and contextual implication (1c):

(1b) MACHINE** IS EFFICIENT, QUICK, PRECISE (etc.)

(1c) MARKO_x IS EFFICIENT, QUICK, PRECISE (etc.)

Within MEA (Mišković-Luković 2013, 2015), metaphoric expressions are considered as interpretative use of language (in the same way irony is), which relieves it from truth-conditional constraints (Mišković-Luković 2013: 54). Note that in EA metaphoric expressions are examples of descriptive use of language which means that they contribute to the truth conditions of the proposition expressed. The frequent use of certain metaphoric expressions leads to routinization, since it contributes to their cognitive entrenchment, which, in turn, contributes to decrease in the cognitive effort needed for their interpretation (Mišković-Luković 2014: 353). According to MEA, metaphoric expressions are attributive concepts – a kind of ad hoc concept where the speaker disassociates from the descriptive content of the lexical concept and ascribes it to someone else (the hearer, a third party, people in general or herself at another time) (Mišković-Luković 2015: 129). Hence, the basic proposition of the utterance in (1) would be:

(1d) ‘Marko_x is “a machine” (as one would say or think)’

The communicated ad hoc concept (attributively used in this case) can be modulated in the same manner which EA proposes, with the difference being that it remains an interpretatively used propositional constituent and does not contribute to the truth-conditional content of the utterance (Rasulić and Mišković-Luković 2021: 29). The implicatures within EA and MEA are generated in the same way, depending on the context.⁹

8 It is important to note here that in a different context other encyclopedic information could be relevant – such as cold, without emotions, constantly working, etc.

9 For examples of generating an implicated premise and implicated conclusion within this line of approach to metaphor see Manojlović, in print.

4. CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR, DESCRIPTIVE AND INTERPRETATIVE APPROACH

As previously stated in the introductory section, the cognitive pragmatic and cognitive linguistic approach are compatible, and the tendency in recent research of metaphoric expressions has been to develop a unified and explanatorily adequate approach.

In the simplest terms, according to cognitive linguistics, a conceptual metaphor is a cross-domain mapping, i.e. mapping of certain elements of the conceptual structure of the source domain (which is commonly more concrete) onto the target domain (which is commonly more abstract). These mappings are usually grounded in our bodily experience, but not necessarily. For instance, the utterance in (1) from the previous section would be an example of a conceptual metaphor *PEOPLE ARE MACHINES*, which is grounded in our socio-cultural experience within the metaphoric system *GREAT CHAIN OF BEING* where, among other mappings, the domain *OBJECT* is mapped on the domain *HUMAN* (Rasulić and Mišković-Luković 2021: 32).

It has been pointed out that cognitive pragmatics deals with linguistic metaphors, while the subject of cognitive linguistics are conceptual metaphors (Mišković-Luković 2015: 128). These are not necessarily irreconcilable. For example, conceptual integration (or blending) theory (Grady et al. 1999) succeeds in explaining mappings typical for so-called linguistic metaphors, since in those expressions direct cross-domain mapping is problematic because the element that is to be mapped onto the target domain does not exist in the conceptual structure of the source domain (e.g. the element of *incompetence* in the expression *This surgeon is a butcher*). This is resolved by the introduction of two more domains – generic and blended. The generic space contains elements that the two input mental spaces (source and target) have in common, while the blended space contains a novel structure with the relations that are absent from the input mental spaces individually.

In recent research, a link between deliberate metaphor and interpretative use of language has been pointed out (Manojlović 2022). In deliberate metaphor theory (Steen 2008, 2011, 2015; Reijnierse et al. 2019), the communicative dimension becomes increasingly relevant and is important in determining the distribution of deliberate metaphors and those that are not within different texts and registers. In relevance theory, the focus is precisely on communication and the communicative value of expressions and utterances. Therefore, this approach aims at explaining the pragmatic processes that guide inference and communication, including the production and interpretation of metaphoric expressions and utterances containing them. Having the relevant aspects of both approaches in mind, the following conclusion can be drawn: deliberate metaphors can be said to be instances of interpretative language use, and due to repetitive use in a certain language, culture or community these expressions can become

routinised and cease to be used attributively (Manojlović 2022: 224-225). Having become instances of descriptive use of language, these expressions might lose the status of deliberate metaphor. So, there is a continuum between the expressions that are distinctly metaphorical (and used with that intent) and those that are not perceived as being metaphorical (either by the speaker or by the hearer, or both). This stratification can be used to explain the contribution that metaphoric expressions have to the basic proposition of an utterance (Manojlović, in print). The importance of routinization has been pointed out (Mišković-Luković 2013, 2015; Rasulić and Mišković-Luković 2021) – however, in what way and to what extent this frequent and prolonged use of an expression can affect its interpretation is a much more difficult task.

Establishing a clearcut demarcation between descriptive and interpretative use of language is not only (nearly?) impossible, but unnecessary (Manojlović in print). There is an important question raised by deliberate metaphor theory – are all metaphoric expressions equally metaphorical to everyone (Steen 2011). While the same expression can be perceived by one participant in communication as used metaphorically, for someone else it will not require the activation of the source domain. Certain expressions are not problematic in this respect. For instance, the use of prepositions is widely considered as non-deliberate – hence the descriptive use of language (Steen 2015: 67; Bach 1994: 148), since their meaning is highly schematic and abstract and their contribution to a given proposition is pragmatically determined. On the other end of this continuum, we would find expressions that are pronouncedly metaphorical, as is the case with example (1) in section 2. What remains questionable is the status of other (un)metaphorical expressions along this continuum. The solution is to treat certain expressions as potentially both descriptive and interpretative use of language, depending on the speaker's and hearer's abilities and preferences (Manojlović, in print). It is not unusual that the same concept is descriptive for some speakers, while attributive for others.¹⁰ For example, the acquisition of new words follows the same path – from an attributively used concept, to a fully-fledged descriptive one.

If a hearer is exposed to a novel metaphor or expression, he/she has not heard or seen before, it is safe to assume that the given expression will be interpreted by accessing information within the conceptual address of an attributively used concept that are relevant for the given context. This interpretatively used propositional constituent will have no contribution to the truth conditions of the basic proposition. He/she can then continue to use this expression without fully developing the descriptive concept, which still remains an instance of interpretative language use. By frequent usage it becomes stored in the cognitive system of the speakers of a given language/community, i.e., the conceptual address becomes filled with in-

¹⁰ For an illustration and additional explanation of simultaneous attributive and descriptive use of both metaphoric and non-metaphoric expressions see Manojlović, in print.

formation (linguistic, logical and encyclopedic entry). Such concept is now used descriptively, or, in cognitive-linguistic terms, does not require cross-domain mapping.

In the following analysis of linguistic concretizations of the conceptual metaphor TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY, the expressions will be analyzed according to the descriptive vs interpretative distinction criterion. Three groups of expressions are singled out – those that are used descriptively, those that are used interpretatively and those that can be analyzed both within the EA and MEA framework.

5. ANALYSIS

As previously stated, the examples analyzed in this paper were taken from a cognitive-linguistic study, without adaptation, organized in keeping with the source domains (taken from the same study, without adaptation). The expressions were, however, checked according to MIPVU (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010) to confirm that they are indeed examples of (indirect¹¹) metaphor. We will start the analysis with examples of expressions pertaining to qualities that are characteristic for, but not necessarily limited to, VALUABLE COMMODITY or, rather, VALUABLE RESOURCE. These expressions refer to certain general properties of a resource, they are very frequently used in language, and expected not to be interpreted metaphorically due to their level of routinization.

Various expressions attested in the Serbian language present a common manner of talking about time and time intervals, hence are used descriptively. These expressions include *biti raspoloživ*, *imati višak*, *nedostajati*, *štedeti*, *iskoristiti*, *(u)trošiti*, etc. We shall illustrate this with only a few selected examples:

1) Kao svaki dokoni bonik, bio se suočio sa viškom slobodnog vremena [...] (Dem 19) / Broj kandidata podnosilaca pojedinih biračkih lista određuje se zavisno od raspoloživog vremena za predstavljanje [...] (Pol) / Bila je ideja da se uradi sportska edicija, u 10 knjiga, ali se posle iskustva sa ovom zbog ogromnog utroška vremena i sredstava odlučilo da broj bude prepolovljen [...] (Pol) / Na ovaj način se, čulo se prilikom jučerašnjeg izlaganja, umnogome štedi vreme neophodno za pregled pacijenata. (Pol) / Preostaje da se preostalo vreme do olimpijskih okršaja iskoristi na najbolji način. (Pol) / Nije imalo smisla saslušavati ga više, trošiti energiju, vreme i opremu. (Ars 122) / Tamo će je čekati mladić koji se upravo, kao i ona, osetio sam straćivši vreme na čitanje iste knjige. (Pav 284) / Vreme sam utrošio na konstruisanje cipela za hodanje po vodi. (Bas 278) / Срећом, двостепена организација чини језике

11 Since the analysis conducted in this paper is cognitive-pragmatic the so-called *direct* metaphors (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010) could not be taken into account as they are treated completely differently within this framework (for more detailed account of the distinction between simile and metaphor within frameworks of relevance theory and deliberate metaphor theory see Manojlović 2022).

ванредно економичним системима, који омогућају корисницима огромне уштеде у времену и напору. (Bug 72)

It could be argued here that these expressions and their different meanings in a given context are instances of contextual modulation. This does not negate the underlying cross-domain mapping, but it does, however, point to the fact that they are necessarily instances of descriptive language use. We shall illustrate this with the following example taken from 1):

1a) Na ovaj način se, čulo se prilikom jučerašnjeg izlaganja, umnogome štedi vreme neophodno za pregled pacijenata.

1b) NA OVAJ NAČIN SE, ČULO SE PRILIKOM JUČERAŠNJEG_y IZLAGANJA, UMNOGOME ŠTEDI_i VREME NEOPHODNO ZA PREGLED PACIJENATA.

The focus in the explicature in 1b) is the communicated (ad hoc) concept ŠTEDI_i. This propositional constituent is broadened so that the meaning of the encoded concept ŠTEDI_i (*to be rational in spending money, material, etc.*, RMS: 1004 (our translation)) can refer to things other than money and material.

However, even in this group of expressions in which time is ascribed general properties of a resource, there are some with a greater level of defamiliarization which can be instances of descriptive use of language for some and interpretative for others. This has to do either with the lexeme which denotes the time interval (as in 1c)), or with the lexeme that indicates the source domain (as in 1d)).

1c) Čitav jedan septembar noći nabraćemo usput odavde do Topčisaraja, a od Aja Sofije do Vlaherene troše već oktobar. (Pav 267)

1d) Tako se stvara zagrobna zaliha vremena, a time se objašnjava mogućnost komunikacije s umrlima. (Bas 188)

In 1c) the propositional constituent in question could be TROŠE_e or “troše” (as one would say or think). Similarly, in 1d) the propositional constituent in question could be ZALIHE_e or “zalihe” (as one would say or think). Namely, even though the verb *trošiti* is very commonly used with certain lexemes denoting time and time intervals (e.g. *trošiti dane*, *trošiti vreme*, etc.), with the lexeme denoting a month the overall expression is less entrenched and routinized, and therefore can represent interpretative use of language for some speakers. On the other hand, the expression in 1d) is not frequently used with temporal expressions and can be analyzed both within EA and MEA approach.

A very similar situation was attested in the English language when it comes to expressions in which time and time intervals are ascribed general properties of a resource. The most frequent lexemes are *spend* and *waste*, and these are used exclusively descriptively, due to their recurrent pairing with lexemes denoting time and time intervals. Other attested expressions

include *take (up), make (up), provide, save, use, be/have left, rest, amount*, etc. Some of the expressions are listed below:

2) Reaching the water's edge, the warrior spent several moments walking slowly back and forth [...]. (Kaz 273) / Tell your chauffeur to go far away and spend an hour. (Fitz 92) / There are many who think that all language learning is a waste of time. (Crys 15) / Well then, let's waste no more time, for this talk was only to satisfy custom. (Kaz 353) / He could use the time to catch up on all the things he'd failed to do yesterday. (Sim 147) / Don't want to take up what's left of your morning. (Urs 221) / He would have a nice little cottage at point D, with axes over the door, and spend a pleasant amount of time at point E, which would be the nearest pub to point D. (Ad 11) / There were only ten minutes left. (Sim 16) / "I thought I'd save time for everyone by asking you now." (Urs 94)

As was the case with the examples excerpted from Serbian texts, due to routinization in the cognition of the speakers, these expressions are used descriptively, and the resulting ad hoc concepts are constituents of the proposition expressed (or basic explicature) and hence represent a part of the truth-conditional content. We shall illustrate this with the following example taken from 2):

- 2a) Don't want to take up what's left of your morning.
- 2b) DON'T WANT TO TAKE UP WHAT'S LEFT OF YOUR_x MORNING.

The encoded concept TAKE UP (*to occupy entirely or exclusively; fill up*, MWD) is slightly broadened so that it can apply to the temporal notion. It can be argued here that there is no ad hoc concept formation in the strict sense, but, rather, that this is a case of contextual modulation. This can be confirmed by the fact that this meaning is listed in some dictionaries (*to fill an amount of space or time*, LD, CD, MD). What can be claimed with certainty is that the said concept is used descriptively and forms part of the truth-conditional content.

However, if a certain expression is not frequently paired with time expressions it opens up a possibility for it to be analyzed as an instance of interpretative use of language:

- 2c) Especially in languages which have never been written down, or which have been written down only recently, language is the repository of the history of a people. (Crys 20)

In 2c) the concept REPOSITORY could be an instance of descriptive use (resulting in the ad hoc concept REPOSITORY'), or interpretative (resulting in propositional constituent "repository" – as the speaker would say or think).

It can be concluded that referring to time and time intervals as valuable in terms of general properties of a resource is very common in both analyzed languages, resulting in the prevalent descriptive use of the con-

cepts involved. The second group of examples comprises expressions where time and time intervals are conceptualized not merely as a resource, but more specifically as having value. Apart from expressions with the lexemes *zlatan* in Serbian and *golden* in the English language, several other lexemes were attested – *zadužiti*, *uložiti*, *investicija*, *zaloga*, *kapital*, *pozajmiti*, i.e. *owe*, *pay off*, *treasure*, *cherish*, *put in*, etc.

3) Beograd je napustila u ono doba o kom se sad tamo govori kao o „zlatnom“ – krajem sedamdesetih. (Ars 208) / To je moglo da nas podseti na 19. vek, taj „zlatni vek“ koji je u Srbiji pokazao da je moguće da ljudi različitih političkih orijentacija [...] (Pol) / Ostaće u knjigama iz ove maglovite šahovske sadašnjice prošlog meseca su otišla još dva velikana njenog zlatnog doba. (Pol) / WHEN CBS first broadcast “Death of a Salesman” in 1966, critics hoped its substantial ratings might ignite a new golden age of television. (NYT)

When it comes to expressions with *zlatan* and *golden*, they are descriptively used with time expressions and the resulting ad hoc concepts ZLATAN´ and GOLDEN´ would be loosened not to refer only to that which is made of gold but to a period of time that is special in a certain way, usually by being advantageous or promising. On the other hand, expressions with other attested lexemes ascribing value to time and time intervals are not solely instances of descriptive use of language.

4) Ne može zadužiti večnost onaj ko nije zadužio svoje vreme. (Bec 44) / U nju je uloženo, kako kažu autori, mnogo rada i vremena i 45.000 maraka. (Pol) / Što se Kruševca tiče bila je to sjajna investicija u budućnost vaterpola, igralo se pred prepunim tribinama, možda se tu i tada rodio još jedan vaterpolo centar – nadajmo se da jeste. (Pol) / U situaciji u kakvoj smo ne možemo više sebi dozvoliti luksuz da zapostavljamo poljoprivredu koja je bogomdana zaloga naše bolje budućnosti. (Pol) / Njemu je prošlost jedini kapital [...]. (Бас. 337) / Tako se Al Saferov život sastojao delom iz života drugih ljudi, koji su mu pozajmljivali po nekoliko svojih sedmica naizmenice. (Пав. 232)

Here it is a matter of degree of routinization that will determine whether an expression is used exclusively attributively, or whether it can be analyzed within both the EA and MEA framework. For instance, the following example taken from 4) is an instance of an attributively used concept:

4a) Tako se Al Saferov život sastojao delom iz života drugih ljudi, koji su mu pozajmljivali po nekoliko svojih sedmica naizmenice.

4b) Tako se Al Saferov život sastojao delom iz života drugih ljudi, koji su mu „pozajmljivali“ (as the speaker would say or think) po nekoliko svojih sedmica naizmenice´

In example 4a) we can see the defamiliarization that is to have aesthetic and literary effect. This is the reason why the propositional constitu-

ent in question is an instance of interpretative use of language and does not affect the truth conditions.

Certain expressions can be analyzed as either interpretative or descriptive use of language. We illustrate it with the following example taken from 4):

4c) Njemu je prošlost jedini kapital.

4d) NJEMU_x je PROŠLOST JEDINI KAPITAL₁

4e) 'Njemu_x je prošlost jedini "kapital" (as one would say or think)'

According to the EA approach, the encoded concept *KAPITAL* (*the value or set of all economic goods used for production, which bring the owner surplus value or profit*, RMS 657 (our translation)) is broadened so it can apply to a temporal concept and the resulting explicature is the one in 4d). Here the communicated concept *KAPITAL₁* is a descriptively used propositional constituent and hence a part of truth-conditional content. According to the MEA approach, the said concept would be used attributively, resulting in the explicature in 4e). This interpretatively used concept would not affect the truth conditions of the overall proposition expressed.

Similarly, expressions in the English language containing lexemes ascribing value to time and time intervals, other than the lexeme *golden*, are not solely instances of descriptive use of language.

5) You put in six or eight years at the Music Syndicate conservatory, didn't you? (Urs 141) / He looked at his watch as if there was some pressing demand on his time elsewhere. (Fitz 91) / They know this is to come, and so must cherish the earlier days of the siege, when the enemy first pay the price for what they will later do. (Kaz 162) / We don't remember our fierce quarrels or the small moments we enjoyed and treasured. (Kaz 51) / [...] weak with the thankfulness that it had not happened, that the years on that fantastic rifle range had at last paid off. (Sim 192) / I dare say your brother owes him and Father Ninian his life. (Kaz 228)

As can be seen from the expressions in 5), there is no clearcut distinction between those that are necessarily instances of descriptive use of language and those that are not. For instance, the lexeme *treasure* in the example below (taken from 5)) could be used descriptively so that the encoded concept *TREASURE* (*to keep and care for something that is very special, important, or valuable to you*, LD) would result in an ad hoc concept *TREASURE₁* or, on the other hand, the same concept could be used attributively which would result in a propositional constituent "treasure" (as one would say or think), which would have no bearing on the truth conditions. We assume here that it is far more likely that the said concept would be used descriptively, since the pairing of the verb *treasure* with certain time expressions is not infrequent.

5a) We don't remember our fierce quarrels or the small moments we enjoyed and treasured.

Another important group of examples are those in which time and time intervals are conceptualized as having a price. As was the case with the previous group of examples (in 4) and 5)), the level of routinization will determine whether a concept is an instance of descriptive or interpretative language use. The same expression can be interpreted differently depending on the context.

6) Najpre je još u Carigradu morao dati da mu se odseče ruka, jer je jedan od moćnih ljudi na grčkom dvoru platio suvim zlatom drugu veliku hazarsku godinu ispisanu na poslanikovoj levoj šaci. (Pav 74) / Ne pristajem na neke velike polemike u vašoj rubrici, vreme nam je odveć skupo da bismo ga lako traćili. (Pol) / Kada bih poverovao u vašu priču, zašto bih kupovao dan koji već imam? (Pav 109) / Očekuje se da u zapadnom delu Nemačke ove godine bude ostvareno 1,62 milijarde plaćenih prekovremenih sati rada, što je za 6,3 odsto više nego lane. (Pol) / Shevek's costly day with Veia had taken most of his ready cash, and the taxi ride in to Nio took ten units more. (Urs 233) / Martin's reaction is funny so it manages to be a tender moment that doesn't get cheapened by something didactic or predictable. (Ad 273) / He demands this, and cares not whether our errand is well done, or if his life is given at a good price. (Kaz 298) / [...] considering proposing to advertisers and agencies that they could do so during UPN prime-time series as a bonus for buying large blocks of time to run traditional commercials during regular breaks. (NYT) / [...] an agency that specializes in buying commercial time and ad space for marketers. (NYT) / Another executive who buys commercial time at a media agency said he believed the ad bug could appear on a network [...] (NYT)

We grouped the examples excerpted from Serbian and English texts together, since they can be analyzed jointly due to the observed similarities. Namely, apart from the expression *kupovao dan* in Serbian, which is not an instance of a commonly used expression, but, rather, another expression used for achieving a literary effect, and which is used interpretatively (“kupovao” (as the speaker would say or think)), the status of other expressions in 6) depend heavily on the context (or co-text). For example, in the context of paid labor (expression *plaćenih prekovremenih sati rada*) or in the context of advertising (*buys commercial time, selling your time and buying large blocks of time*), expressions that represent the cross-domain mapping between COMMODITY WITH A PRICE and TIME are not instances of interpretative use of language and are part of truth-conditional content. On the other hand, there are expressions, for instance, with lexemes *skupo* and *costly* where both EA and MEA could be applied. So the propositional constituents could be, respectively, *SKUPO* or “skupo” (as the speaker would say or think) and *COSTLY* or “costly” (as the speaker would say or think).

The final group of expressions are examples of the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY. In the selected corpus of English language only two ex-

amples were attested, both with lexeme *life* denoting time period (As if one could earn beauty, or life! (Urs 167) / And if that fellow bravely buys your escape, even with his own life, you must grasp it gratefully. (Kaz 184)). In Serbian, however, more expressions were found with different levels of defamiliarization, or different degrees of routinization:

7) Vreme devalvira i nastaje inflacija: umesto 24 časa ljudi su imali na raspolaganju 1.240 minuta; po prvi put se javlja dosada, smrtni greh *accediae* koji će kasnije dovesti civilizaciju Zapada na ivicu propasti. (Bas 189) / Ali nije trebalo čekati dugo da i minut devalvira, pa da uznapredovala veština izgradi časovnik koji će pokazivati i sekunde. (Bas 190) / [...] upita Pavle Kuzmič Gribojedov, filozof, osuđen na pet godina, plus dodatnih pet zarađenih u logoru. (Bas 207) / Danas, godinu dana nakon „Dahićevog spiska“, sarajevski nezavisni mediji konstatuju da se praktično gotovo ništa nije promenilo i da je tek poneko od njih „završio u zatvoru za dela koja ga neće u tom zatvorenom prostoru koštati puno vremena“. (Pol) / Ovom prilikom tražimo od Vlade Republike Srbije da ispravi ovu nepravdu i da našoj deci koja su bez stanova, omogući da im se u cenu stana uračunaju godine koje smo mi ostvarili, uplaćujući u stambeni fond a stanove nismo dobili. (Pol)

From the examples above, the first two, with the lexeme *devalvira*, stand out as clear examples of interpretative use of a concept. The attributive concept that is a propositional constituent of the explicature in 7a) does not affect the truth conditions. On the other hand, the idea of *earning time* is not so unusual in the context of jail time and that is the reason that the example with the expression *zarađenih* can have explicature 7b) (in line with EA) and 7c) (in line with MEA), depending on the level of familiarity or entrenchment of the given expression for certain speakers or hearers.

7a) 'Vreme „devalvira“ (as one would say or think)'

7b) [...] OSUĐEN NA PET GODINA, PLUS DODATNIH PET ZARAĐENIH** U LOGORU

7c) ' [...] osuđen na pet godina, plus dodatnih pet „zarađenih“ (as one would say or think) u logoru'

When it comes to the other two attested expressions in Serbian, it is safe to assume that they represent instances of descriptive use of language due to their frequency of use (as is the case with *koštati puno vremena*) or the specific context (buying a real estate one has previously been paying a certain amount of money over a period of time).

6. CONCLUSION

Since the expressions analyzed in this paper were examples of a very frequent and productive cross-domain mapping between VALUABLE COMMODITY and TIME, it was expected for the majority of them to be instances of descriptive use of language due to the level of routinization and cognitive

entrenchment. Among the expressions in which time and time intervals were ascribed general properties of a resource nearly all attested expressions proved to be instances of descriptive language use and their interpretations yield ad hoc concepts that form part of the truth-conditional content. There was a small number (e.g. expressions with *zaliha* and *repository*) whose interpretation could follow both EA and MEA.

In the second group of examples comprising expressions where time and time intervals are conceptualized not merely as a resource, but more specifically as having value, only expressions with adjectives *zlatan* and *golden* were indisputably instances of descriptive language use, while certain examples represented the interpretative use of concepts (e.g. *pozajmljivali po nekoliko svojih sedmica*), with other examples falling somewhere in between. Apart from being ascribed value, time and time intervals were found to be conceptualized as having a price. In this group of examples the vast majority could be both interpretative and descriptive use of language, depending on the context.

Lastly, we have analyzed the expressions where the metaphor TIME IS MONEY is realized. Only two examples were attested in the English language (an expanded corpus would certainly yield different results) and the analysis of expressions in the Serbian language provided evidence that, even though it is common to speak about time as money, depending on the lexemes used and the context of the utterance, not all of them can be said to represent descriptive use of language.

Finally, it is important to note that despite the frequency of use and consequent transition into descriptive language use, the underlying cross-domain mapping is not questioned.

Sources:

Serbian Language:

(Ars) Arsenijević 2008: V. Arsenijević, *Predator*, Beograd: Samizdat B92.

(Bas) Basara 1985: S. Basara, *Fata o biciklistima*, Beograd: Dereta.

(Bec) Bečković 1985: M. Bečković, *O meђuvremenu*, Beograd: Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod.

(Bug) Bugarški 1995: P. Bugarški, *Uvod u oјiшћu linјivisћиku*, Beograd: Zavod za uћbenike и nastavna sredstva.

(Dem) Demić 2006: M. Demić, *Sluge hirovitog luћonoše*, Zrenjanin: Agora.

(Pav) Pavić 2014: M. Pavić, *Hazarski reћnik*, Beograd: Vulkan izdavaštvo.

(Pol) *Politika*, 2001, August; texts by various authors.

English language:

(Ad) Adams 2005, D. Adams, *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy*, London: Pan Books.

- (Kaz) Ishiguro 2015: K. Ishiguro, *The Buried Giant*, London: Faber & Faber Ltd.
- (Crys) Crystal 2003: D. Crystal, *English as a Global Language*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (Sim) Simak 1963: C. D. Simak, *Way Station*, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- (Urs) Le Guin 1975: U. Le Guin, *The Dispossessed*, New York: Avon Books.
- (Fitz) Fitzgerald 1994: F. S. Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*, London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- (NYT) *The New York Times*, 2001, texts by various authors.
- (UKN) *Daily Express* and *Sunday Express*, 2006, texts by various authors.

Dictionaries:

- RMS: *Rečnik srpskoga jezika*, Novi Sad: Matica srpska (2007).
- MD: Macmillan Dictionary (<https://www.macmillandictionary.com>).
- LD: Longman Dictionary (<https://www.ldoceonline.com>).
- MWD: Merriam-Webster Dictionary (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/>).
- CD: Cambridge Dictionary (<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>).

References

- Bach 1994: K. Bach, Conversational implicature, *Mind and Language*, 9(2), 124–162.
- Carston 2002a: R. Carston, Metaphor, ad hoc concepts and word meaning—more questions than answers, *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 14, 83–105.
- Carston 2002b: R. Carston, *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Carston 2010: R. Carston, Metaphor: Ad hoc concepts, literal meaning and mental images, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 110(3), 295–321.
- Evans 2003: V. Evans, *The Structure of Time: Language, Meaning and Temporal Cognition*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Grady et al. 1999: J. Grady, A typology of motivation for conceptual metaphor: correlation vs. resemblance, in: R. W. Gibbs, G. J. Steen (eds.), *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 79–100.
- Grice 1989: H. P. Grice, *Studies in the Way of Words*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Klikovac 1998: D. Klikovac, Metafore naše nasušne, *Svet reči: srednjoškolski časopis za srpski jezik i književnost*, 6(8), 35–37.
- Lakoff and Johnson 1980/2003: G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live by*, Chicago/ London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Manojlović 2021: H. Manojlović, *ВРЕМЕ као циљни домен у српском и енглеском језику*, необјављена докторска дисертација, Крагујевац: Филолошко-уметнички факултет.
- Manojlović 2022: H. Manojlović, Метафоре у комуникацији – теорија хотимичне метафоре и модификована експликатурна анализа, *Српски језик: сџудије српске и словенске*, 27, 215–230.
- Manojlović in print: H. Manojlović, Метафора и семантичко-прагматички интерфејс, *Српски језик: сџудије српске и словенске*, 28.

Mišković-Luković 2013: M. Mišković-Luković, Od fikcije ka realnosti: leksika kao osnova za generiranje stereotipa, u: B. Mišić Ilić i V. Lopičić (ur.), *Jezik, književnost, vrednosti: zbornik radova. Jezička istraživanja*, Niš: Filozofski fakultet, 47–63.

Mišković-Luković 2014: M. Mišković-Luković, Doslovno i figurativno značenje: pragmatičke perspektive, u: M. Kovačević (ur.), *Srpski jezik, književnost, umetnost*, Kragujevac: Filološko-umetnički fakultet, 345–355.

Mišković-Luković 2015: M. Mišković-Luković, *Pragmatika*, Kragujevac: Filološko-umetnički fakultet.

Rasulić and Mišković-Luković 2021: K. Расулић, М. Мишковић-Луковић, Шта спаја а шта раздваја когнитивнолингвистички и когнитивнопрагматички приступ метафори?, *Лиуар*, 72, 11–45.

Reijnierse et al. 2019: W.G. Reijnierse, C. Burgers, T. Krennmayr, G.J. Steen, Metaphor in communication: The distribution of potentially deliberate metaphor across register and word class, *Corpora*, 14(3), 30–326.

Sperber and Wilson 1986/95: D. Sperber, D. Wilson, *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Steen 2008: G. Steen, The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor, *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23(4), 213–241.

Steen 2011: G. Steen, From three dimensions to five steps: The value of deliberate metaphor, *Metaphorik.de*, 21, 83–110.

Steen 2015: G. Steen, Developing, testing and interpreting deliberate metaphor theory, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 90, 67–72.

Steen, Dorst et al. 2010: G. Steen, A. Dorst, J. Herrmann, A. Kaal, T. Krennmayr, T. Pasma, *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tendahl 2009: M. Tendahl, *A Hybrid Theory of Metaphor*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tendahl and Gibbs 2008: M. Tendahl, R. W. Gibbs, Complementary perspectives on metaphor: Cognitive linguistics and relevance theory, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(11), 1823–1864.

Wilson 2011: D. Wilson, Parallels and differences in the treatment of metaphor in relevance theory and cognitive linguistics, *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 8(2), 177–196.

Wilson and Carston 2006: D. Wilson, R. Carston, Metaphor, relevance and the 'emergent property' issue, *Mind & Language*, 21(3), 404–433.

**Нина Ж. Манојловић / ПРАГМАТИЧКИ АСПЕКТИ ПОЈМОВНЕ МЕТАФОРЕ
ВРЕМЕ ЈЕ ВРЕДНА РОБА У СРПСКОМ И ЕНГЛЕСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ**

Резиме / Појмовна метафора ВРЕМЕ ЈЕ НОВАЦ / (ВРЕДНА) РОБА сматра се метафором новијег датума у поређењу са неким другим међудоменским пресликавањима. Неки научници сматрају да се разлог појаве овакве концептуализације времена налази у културолошким променама, док други виде инхерентну финитност временских интервала као основ за посматрање времена као нечега вредног (као што је сваки ресурс који постоји у ограниченим количинама). Циљ овог рада јесте испитивање прагматичких аспеката конкретизације наведене појмовне метафоре у српском и енглеском језику. Наиме, циљ је да се у оквирима когнитивно-инференцијалне прагматике испита да ли су одређени изрази употребљени дескриптивно и/или интерпретативно. Теоријски оквир је теорија релеванције, а два приступа узета у обзир при анализи јесу експликатурна и модификована експликатурна анализа. Корпус анализе чине примери појмовне метафоре ВРЕМЕ ЈЕ (ОГРАНИЧЕН) РЕСУРС (јер сматрамо да управо ова концептуализација служи као основ за даљу елаборацију и профилисање *вредности* када говоримо о пресликавању на испитивани циљни домен) и време је вредна роба уз неизоставно пресликавање ВРЕМЕ ЈЕ НОВАЦ. Резултати указују на то да говорници српског и енглеског језика концептуализују време на сличан начин када су у питању испитивани изворни домени. Када говоримо о прагматичким аспектима анализе, резултати указују на адекватност и дескриптивног и интерпретативног приступа, а у зависности од похрањивања и рутинизације датог израза.

Кључне речи: појмовна метафора, ВРЕМЕ, РЕСУРС, ВРЕДНА РОБА, међудоменско пресликавање, експликатурна анализа, модификована експликатурна анализа, ад хок концепт

Примљен: 16. јануара 2023.

Прихваћен за штампу априла 2023.