Situated within the framework of the conceptual metaphor theory, this article examines universal versus language-specific patterns in metaphorical motion event descriptions, comparing English and Turkish. The analysis focused on the crosslinguistic similarities and differences in the target domains and the types of metaphorical mappings that are structured by spatial motion. The data included written texts in English and Turkish. Results indicated strong crosslinguistic similarity in the target domains and the types of metaphorical mappings. Crosslinguistic variation, on the other hand, became evident in the specification of the source domain structure, particularly in describing the manner component of a metaphorical motion event. English writers paid greater linguistic attention to the way one moves from point A to point B metaphorically, using a greater amount and variety of motion verbs that encoded manner. Overall, the analysis revealed the source domain structure to be the best candidate for systematic language-based variation in a metaphorical event.

Earlier work on conceptual metaphor has shown that the English language pervasively structures a wide range of abstract domains using spatial motion (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, 1999). On the other hand, there is almost no systematic work on how other languages structure various target domains in terms of motion in space. The only crosslinguistic evidence comes from research that specifically focuses on the metaphorical structure of the domain of time (Moore, 2000; Nuñez & Sweetser, 2001; Shinohara, 2000; Yu, 1998). However, none of the studies provides a systematic account of the crosslinguistic similarities and differences in the
metaphorical organization of other abstract domains that are conceptualized in terms of motion in space.

Spatial motion also constitutes a source domain that can be construed in radically different ways in different languages, but which at the same time can be described by a limited set of underlying universal patterns (Slobin, 1997; Talmy, 1991, 2000). As suggested by earlier work on literal motion, English and Turkish belong to typologically distinct classes of languages; the semantic structure of English allows its speakers to easily encode and thus pay greater linguistic attention to the manner dimension of motion events as compared to Turkish (e.g., he ran/crept/plunged into the house; Slobin, 1996, 1997). Subsequent experimental work on literal motion provided support to the proposed typological distinctions and showed that English speakers encode manner at a much higher rate and use a greater variety of manner verbs in their motion descriptions as compared to Turkish (e.g., Özçalı& G68/GBA kan & Slobin, 1999a, 1999b, 2000a, 2000b, in press). However, the question as to whether the crosslinguistic differences in the source domain of motion in space extend to the metaphorical uses of the lexicon still remains to be answered.

This article—as an attempt to address both of the aforementioned issues—involves a systematic analysis of metaphorical motion events in English and Turkish. It aims to place the conceptual metaphor theory within a broader crosslinguistic perspective and to show the particulars and the universals in the metaphorical structure of various target concepts that are conceptualized in terms of motion in space in the two languages.

THE CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR THEORY

The conceptual metaphor theory defines metaphor as one of the basic cognitive mechanisms that structure the way we formulate and understand abstract concepts (M. Johnson, 1987; Lakoff, 1988, 1993; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, 1999). The main claim of the theory is that the human mind has access to many well-formed independent concepts, and that these concepts are typically connected metaphorically to other independent concepts with similar structure in long-term memory (Gibbs, 1999). Thus, cognitive mappings between conceptual domains form the backbone of the metaphor theory, and, accordingly, metaphor is defined as a systematic mapping between a source domain, which serves as the source of vocabulary and conceptual inferences, and a target domain, to which vocabulary and inferences are extended metaphorically (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). Even though the strength of these metaphorical correspondences is still controversial (Murphy, 1996), most theorists agree to treat metaphorical mapping as primarily a conceptual phenomenon, which plays a signifi-
icant role in structuring our mental representations of many abstract concepts
(e.g., Gibbs, 1994, 1999; M. Johnson, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, 1999;
Sweetser, 1990). Research in cognitive psychology and psycholinguistics over
the past two decades has provided support to the basic premises of the theory
and showed evidence for the psychological validity of many of the ideas inher-
ent in the theory (e.g., Boroditsky, 2000; Gentner & Gentner, 1983; Gibbs,
1994; Matlock, 2001), thus rendering the conceptual metaphor theory as a valid
and useful scientific framework.

Most of the metaphorical research since the introduction of the theory has been
based on English, which means that we know relatively little about the role of lan-
guage-based variation in the structure of metaphorical systems. Nonetheless, the
theory addresses the issue of crosslinguistic variability and defines levels of meta-
phorical mappings as the basis for (or lack thereof) potential language-based vari-
ation. As proposed by Grady (1997), metaphoric mappings can be “primary” or
“complex,” with the former being derived from more basic physical and cognitive
experiences as compared to the latter. For instance, “LIFE IS A PURPOSEFUL
JOURNEY” constitutes a complex metaphor that can be further decomposed into
the primary metaphors of “CHANGES ARE MOVEMENTS,” “VOLUNTARY
ACTIONS ARE SELF-PROPELLED MOVEMENTS,” “PURPOSES ARE
DESTINATIONS,” and “ACHIEVING A PURPOSE IS ARRIVING AT A
DESTINATION.” Researchers claim that primary metaphors are learned initially
by the correlation of a basic perceptual and a basic cognitive experience that co-oc-
cur (e.g., wanting to achieve a purpose and needing to move to a new location to do
so) in our everyday interactions with the world (e.g., Grady, 1997, 1999; Grady,
Taub, & Morgan, 1996; C. R. Johnson, 1999). Thus, primary metaphors are the
natural outcomes of the interaction between the particulars of our physical and
cognitive make-up as human beings and our subjective experience in the world, in-
dependent of language and culture. And the universality of such embodied experi-
ences renders primary metaphors universally applicable as well (Grady, 1997;
Lakoff & Johnson, 1999).

A metaphorical mapping is built on an asymmetry between source and target
concepts. The mapping is unidirectional—from source to target—and the source
concept is defined as being more closely related to physical experience (Lakoff &
Johnson, 1980) or as being more intersubjectively available (Grady, 1997, 1999)
than the target concept. In primary metaphors, unlike the target concept, the source
concept involves “image content” that is closely tied to bodily sensation and per-
ception (Grady, 1997). Complex metaphors, on the other hand, are formed by the
conceptual blending of primary metaphors and are less directly tied to embodied
experiences. Therefore, they are more likely to show crosslinguistic–crosscultural
variation than primary metaphors, which stem from universally applicable embod-
ied experiences (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999).
Motion in space serves as a major source domain in structuring our thinking about a wide range of abstract concepts, from our everyday conceptualization of time (e.g., “years slip away,” “hours pass by”) to making sense of fluctuations in economy (e.g., “prices plummet,” “economy tumbles”). This article—as an attempt to form a systematic database of metaphorical motion events in English and Turkish—examines the metaphorical structure of various target domains in the two languages that utilize motion in space as the source domain. Metaphor is defined as a conceptual–linguistic correspondence between two conceptual domains: the source domain, which is the source of vocabulary and conceptual inferences, and the target domain, to which vocabulary and inferences are extended metaphorically (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). Metaphorical motion is defined as any verb of motion—whether self-motion or externally caused—with a nonmotion interpretation and which involves metaphorical change of location.¹

This article aims to identify what aspects of a metaphorical event show systematic crosslinguistic variation, and what aspects of the event remain similar across the two languages. The analysis is mainly descriptive in character and involves two major goals. The first goal is to identify the target domains typically structured by motion in space in the two languages. The second goal is to identify the types of metaphorical mappings for each of the target domains that emerge from the first analysis and to examine the crosslinguistic similarities and differences in these mappings.

My expectation is that crosslinguistic variation will exert itself with varying degrees of force at different levels of conceptual organization. At a more basic level, languages are expected to be more similar in their organization of various abstract domains (Lakoff, 1987b). In this instance, English and Turkish are expected to

¹Some of these metaphors involve more idiomatic expressions, such as “he runs for president,” “he runs out of time,” “he runs the company.” These instances are also included in the analysis, because even though these forms have become linguistically frozen over time, they are still conceptually “alive.” That is, they constitute conceptual mappings that can be extended systematically and in novel ways. For instance, in the metaphor “he runs for president,” the political race is conceptualized as a foot race, where candidates correspond to athletes, and winning the presidency corresponds to crossing the finish line in the first place. Furthermore, this metaphor can be extended in novel ways by conceptualizing the race as a horse race (“the candidates are running neck and neck”), or a sailboat race (“he is sailing smoothly towards the primaries”). Similarly, in the metaphorical expression “he runs out of time,” time is conceptualized as a resource, and this (linguistically frozen) metaphor can be extended systematically, as in “he is short of time,” “he wasted a lot of time,” or “he does not have enough time.” Therefore, even though the linguistic expression is conventionalized and has become frozen over time, the mapping remains alive and can be varied systematically, leading to a variety of such expressions that conceptualize time as resource (see Lakoff, 1987a, for a more detailed discussion of this issue).
show similar patterns in terms of both the target domains that are structured by motion in space and the types of basic (or primary) metaphorical mappings (e.g., “TIME PASSING IS MOTION ALONG A PATH,” “STATES ARE LOCATIONS,” “ACTION IS SELF-PROPELLED MOTION,” “CHANGE IS MOTION,” “BODY IS A CONTAINER”).

Linguistic and/or cultural diversity, on the other hand, is expected to reveal itself in the more detailed aspects of the source domain structure and the metaphorical mappings. In this instance, English and Turkish are expected to differ in terms of the specification of the source domain structure (e.g., details of the landmark traversed, details of the motion itself) and the particular linguistic instantiations of the metaphorical mappings (e.g., “go through pain” in English vs. “acıya düştəmk” “fall to pain” in Turkish). Overall, the analysis of metaphorical motion events in English and Turkish within a comparative framework will provide valuable insight into the effect of language-dependent variation on the structure of the metaphorical systems.

Statements of metaphorical mappings are provided in quoted uppercase italics throughout the text, and the linguistic metaphors in the examples from the data are underlined. For the examples in Turkish, a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss is provided in brackets for the underlined segment of the excerpt, and a free gloss of the full excerpt is provided in single quotes, following the morpheme-by-morpheme gloss. An explanation of the abbreviated labels for the morphemes is provided in the Appendix.

METHOD

Sample

The sample included 20 novels (10 in each language) and 10 widely read daily newspapers (5 in each language). The novels included works of both contemporary and earlier writers, and an effort was made to include novels that were richer in metaphorical motion events in both languages.

---

2The link between primary metaphors and basic level actions is not clearly stated in either Grady (1997) or Lakoff (1987b). Lakoff (1987b, p. 271) stated that actions like running, walking, drinking are basic level; moving and ingesting are superordinate; and ambling and slurping are subordinate. However, as demonstrated by Grady (1997), actions like walking and running do not act as source concepts for primary metaphors, whereas an action like “self-propelled motion” is a good source concept for primary metaphorical mappings. Unfortunately, this still leaves us with an unanswered question about the conceptual link between basic level actions and primary metaphors. The term basic as used here refers to basic perceptual and mental experiences that co-occur in our everyday interactions with the world, and primary (or basic) metaphors refer to conceptualizations that derive from these experiences.
Procedure

Procedure for data collection. Each novel was opened 10 times randomly, and at each opening, the first 5 instances of metaphorical motion events were recorded, resulting in about 50 such instances from each novel. Each newspaper was followed for 3 consecutive days. On each day, all opinion pieces (i.e., editorials, columns) and a front-page news story were extracted, and all instances of metaphorical motion events were recorded. The total number of motion verbs was 827 for the newspapers in English and 894 for the newspapers in Turkish.

Procedure for data analysis. For each language, the data were first categorized into various target domains (e.g., states, time). Then, for each target domain, types of mappings were identified that used motion in space as the source domain (e.g., “STATES ARE LOCATIONS,” “TIME IS A CONTAINER”). Comparisons between the two languages were then made.

RESULTS

Target Domains and Types of Mappings in English and Turkish

The target domains that are metaphorically structured by motion in space show close crosslinguistic similarity in English and Turkish. Emotional and mental states are found to be the target domains that rely most heavily on the source domain of motion in space in both languages, especially in the novels. This is followed by the domain of time and the domain of bodily states (i.e., sickness, death). In the newspapers, in addition to time and states, various other abstract concepts and entities (e.g., economy, population, disaster, budget, government) also serve as target domains. They are reified, and their actions or changes in their states are typically conceptualized in terms of motion in space.

Types of metaphorical mappings also show a high degree of crosslinguistic similarity. In both the novels and the newspapers, many of the target domains are typically conceptualized as either a moving entity or a location. A comparative list of all the target domains and the metaphorical mappings that are observed in the two languages is provided in Table 1. The mappings that are not observed in the data but are available in the language are provided in parentheses. The target domains are printed in bold, and the metaphorical mappings are capitalized.

---

3The data collection from novels involved recording the entire sentence that contained the metaphorical event. In some instances, the sentence contained more than one metaphorical event. As a result, the total number of metaphorical motion event descriptions was slightly over 50 for each novel in both languages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>time</strong></td>
<td><strong>time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“TIME IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
<td>“TIME IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“TIME IS LOCATION”</td>
<td>“TIME IS LOCATION”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>body</strong></td>
<td><strong>body</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“BODY IS A CONTAINER”</td>
<td>“BODY IS A CONTAINER”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>birth</strong></td>
<td><strong>birth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“BIRTH IS ARRIVAL”</td>
<td>“BIRTH IS ARRIVAL”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>life</strong></td>
<td><strong>life</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“LIFE IS A MOVING ENTITY/SUBSTANCE”</td>
<td>(“LIFE IS A MOVING ENTITY/SUBSTANCE”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“LIFE IS LOCATION”</td>
<td>(“LIFE IS LOCATION”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“LIFE IS A JOURNEY”</td>
<td>(“LIFE IS A JOURNEY”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sickness</strong></td>
<td><strong>sickness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“SICKNESS IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
<td>“SICKNESS IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“SICKNESS IS LOCATION”</td>
<td>(“SICKNESS IS LOCATION”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>death</strong></td>
<td><strong>death</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“DEATH IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
<td>“DEATH IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“DEATH IS DEPARTURE”</td>
<td>“DEATH IS DEPARTURE”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“DEATH IS A FINAL DESTINATION”</td>
<td>“DEATH IS A FINAL DESTINATION”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>states</strong></td>
<td><strong>states</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“STATES ARE LOCATIONS”</td>
<td>“STATES ARE LOCATIONS”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>emotional states</strong></td>
<td><strong>emotional states</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“EMOTIONS ARE MOVING ENTITIES”</td>
<td>“EMOTIONS ARE MOVING ENTITIES”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“EMOTIONAL STATES ARE LOCATIONS”</td>
<td>(“EMOTIONAL STATES ARE LOCATIONS”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“EMOTIONAL ACTIVITY IS MOTION”</td>
<td>“EMOTIONAL ACTIVITY IS MOTION”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mental states</strong></td>
<td><strong>mental states</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“MIND IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
<td>“MIND IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“AN IDEA IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
<td>“AN IDEA IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A THOUGHT IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
<td>“A THOUGHT IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“MIND IS A CONTAINER”</td>
<td>“MIND IS A CONTAINER”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“HEAD IS A CONTAINER”</td>
<td>“HEAD IS A CONTAINER”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“THOUGHT IS A CONTAINER”</td>
<td>“THOUGHT IS A CONTAINER”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“MEMORY IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
<td>“MEMORY IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“MEMORY IS A CONTAINER”)</td>
<td>“MEMORY IS A CONTAINER”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“MENTAL ACTIVITY IS MOTION”</td>
<td>“MENTAL ACTIVITY IS MOTION”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>visual perception</strong></td>
<td><strong>visual perception</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“LOOKING IS MOTION”</td>
<td>“LOOKING IS MOTION”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“SEEING IS TOUCHING”</td>
<td>“SEEING IS TOUCHING”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“VISUAL PERCEPTION OF A STATIC SCENE IS MOTION”</td>
<td>“VISUAL PERCEPTION OF A STATIC SCENE IS MOTION”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>auditory perception</strong></td>
<td><strong>auditory perception</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“SPEAKING IS MOTION”</td>
<td>“SPEAKING IS MOTION”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“SOUND IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
<td>“SOUND IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 1 clearly demonstrates the close similarity between English and Turkish in terms of both the target domains that are metaphorically structured by motion in space and the types of metaphorical mappings. In the remainder of this section, I discuss each of the target domains and the metaphorical mappings listed in Table 1 with examples from the data.

**Time.** Time is conceptualized as either a moving entity or a bounded region in both English and Turkish. In the “**TIME IS A MOVING ENTITY**” metaphor, time moves in relation to a stationary observer. There are two versions of this metaphor. In the first version, both the observer and the moving time face the future, but the observer remains stationary, while time moves forward toward the future, away from the observer (see Examples 1, 2). In the second version, the observer and the moving time face each other, and time moves toward the observer, while the observer remains stationary (Examples 3, 4). The use of deictic verbs of motion, such as approach, come, and return, convey that here-and-now is colocated with the observer, and that time moves toward him, facing the observer.

(1) “It was sharply different from the West, where an evening was hurried from phase to phase toward its close, in a continually disappointed anticipation or else in sheer nervous dread of the moment itself.” (Fitzgerald, 1986, p. 13)

(2) “Patti Smith, Auster ve Adorno üçgeninde vaatler barındıran zamanın geçisini izliyorum.” (Kaplanoğlu, 1999, p. 21)

Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“SILENCE IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
<td>“SILENCE IS A MOVING ENTITY”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other abstract concepts</td>
<td>other abstract concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ABSTRACT CONCEPTS ARE MOVING ENTITIES”</td>
<td>“ABSTRACT CONCEPTS ARE MOVING ENTITIES”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ABSTRACT CONCEPTS ARE LOCATIONS”</td>
<td>“ABSTRACT CONCEPTS ARE LOCATIONS”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientational metaphors</td>
<td>orientational metaphors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“MORE IS UP, LESS IS DOWN”</td>
<td>“MORE IS UP, LESS IS DOWN”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“HAPPY IS UP, SAD IS DOWN”</td>
<td>“HAPPY IS UP, SAD IS DOWN”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“GOOD IS UP, BAD IS DOWN”</td>
<td>“GOOD IS UP, BAD IS DOWN”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“HEALTHY IS UP, SICK IS DOWN”</td>
<td>“HEALTHY IS UP, SICK IS DOWN”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“CONSCIOUS IS UP, UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN”</td>
<td>“CONSCIOUS IS UP, UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“CHANGES IN THESE STATES ARE MOVEMENTS”</td>
<td>“CHANGES IN THESE STATES ARE MOVEMENTS”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Bold entries are the target domains; capitalized entries are the metaphorical mappings; entries in parenthesis are available in that language, but were not observed in the data.
‘I watch the passage of time that shelters promises within the triangle of Patti Smith, Auster and Adorno.’

(3) “He felt oddly out of the sorts that morning, and even as the day wore on and three o’clock approached, an overwhelming sadness continued to drag down his spirits.” (Auster, 1990, p. 205)

(4) “Kentin uğultusuyla yaklaştığı akşamında herhangi bir yerde olmak istiyorum.” (Özlü, 1994, p. 23)

[in city-POSS:3SG approach-NOM evening-POSS:3SG-LOC]

‘I want to be at some random place in the evening of the city that is approaching with its roaring.’

In the “TIME IS LOCATION” metaphor, on the other hand, time is conceptualized as a landmark, and the observer of time moves toward or into this landmark. The movement can be forward, toward the future (Example 5), or backwards, toward or into the past (Example 6). In the latter case, the recollection of past events is construed as movement away from the present. In both languages, time can also be simultaneously conceived as both a moving entity and a location (i.e., a container; Examples 7, 8).

(5) “We Americans are always tearing down what we build, destroying the past in order to start over again, rushing headlong into the future.” (Auster, 1990, p. 84)

(6) “İkisi de susup Aras’ı düşündüler. Yarılı avdılık gecenin içinde sessizce geriye döndüler bir süre.” (Uzuner, 1997, p. 84)

[semi-light night-POSS:3SG interior-POSS:3SG-LOC silently back-PAST-3PL]

‘They both became silent and thought about Aras. Inside the semi-lit night they returned silently to the past.’

(7) “Time kept on passing; she kept on growing into it, drifting into it.” (Oates, 1967, p. 192)

(8) “Günler geçiyor ve alıp götürüyor herşeyi, zaman içine çekip öğütüyor bizi.” (Aral, 1999, p. 139)

[days pass-PRESENT … time interior-POSS:3SG-DAT pull-CONV we-ACC]

‘Days pass and take away everything, time pulls us to its interior and grinds us.’

As the previous examples illustrate, the types of mappings for the domain of time are almost identical in the two languages. The only difference that is observed is in the formulation of time passage as “caused motion.” In contrast to English, the passage of time is frequently described as an event caused by the observer of time in Turkish, with the use of the verb geçir ‘pass-CAUSATIVE’ (Examples 9, 10). Such an expression was never observed in the English data. The closest equivalent to this expression in English uses the verb spend (e.g., “He spent his days/years”) and is an instantiation of the “TIME IS RESOURCE” metaphor.
“Ondan sonraki günlerde... havyal ederek geçirmiş.” (Pamuk, 1996, p. 163)
[day-PLU-ACC also dream make-CONV pass-CAUS-PAST]
‘He made (spent) the following days dreaming.’

“İşini hep daha büyüterek, hep daha sıklaştırarak geçirdi yıllar ...”
(Soysal, 1996, p. 89)
[pass-CAUS-PAST year-PLU-ACC]
‘He made (spent) the years by always making his business bigger, and by always making it busier.’

**Body.** The “BODY IS A CONTAINER” metaphor conceives the body as a bounded space with an interior, an exterior, and a boundary. Thoughts and feelings are described as located inside the container, and mental and emotional activities are described as either movement within, into, or out of the container. The conceptualization of the body as a container is found to be quite common in both languages (Examples 11, 12).

(11) “*The knowledge went through Mrs. Bolton like a shot. He was Lady Chatterley’s lover.*” (Lawrence, 1980, p. 154)

(12) “*Aysel’in yanında olursam, kendi gözümde büsbütün küçülürüm korkusu düştü içime.*” (Ağaoğlu, 1998, p. 78)
[fear-POSS:3SG fall-PAST interior-POSS:1SG-DAT]
‘The fear of being further degraded in my own eyes if I had stayed with Aysel fell inside me.’

The use of deictic verbs (e.g., “come”) further conveys that “here” is colocated with the exterior of the body and “there” with the interior (Examples 13, 14).

(13) “‘Still,’” Flower said, ‘we never came out with any of those ludicrous remarks you hear from other winners.’” (Auster, 1990, p. 74)

(14) “*İçinden önce bir sevinç dalgasi gelir, bu belli belirsizdir, sonra bir dalga, bir dalga daha ...*” (Kemal, 1997, p. 248)
[interior-POSS:3SG-ABL first one joy wave-POSS:3SG come-PRESENT]
‘First a wave of joy comes from his interior, this is hardly perceivable, then another wave, another wave …’

**Birth, life, sickness, and death.** The three typical conceptualizations of birth, death, and life in English and Turkish that are structured by motion in space are “BIRTH IS ARRIVAL,” “LIFE IS A JOURNEY,” and “DEATH IS DEPARTURE.” Birth is typically described as “coming to the world,” where life becomes the deictic center of the motion, giving us the metaphor “LIFE IS HERE” (Examples 15, 16).
(15) “Who will be held accountable for making sure his children—who didn’t ask to come into this world—have the skills to make it in a 21st century economy?” (King, 1999)

(16) “Ne yapmak istedi neyi bilmiyordum; ama dünyaya getireceğim çocukların hayatında sunacağım olanakları elimden alacaklarını ... seziyordum.” (Aral, 1999, p. 74)

[world-DAT come-CAUS-FUTURE-NOM-1SG child-PLU]

‘I did not know for sure what I wanted to do; but I was sensing that the children I will make come (bring) to the world will take away the opportunities life will offer me ...’

Arrival (in)to life marks the beginning of a journey, where the person leading the life becomes a traveler (Example 17). The life goals correspond to destinations (Example 18) and the difficulties encountered in life correspond to impediments to travel (Example 19).

(17) “One is ejected into the world like a dirty little mummy; the roads are slippery with blood and no one knows why it should be so. Each one is traveling his own way and, though the earth be rotting with good things, there is no time to pluck the fruits; the procession scrambles toward the exit sign, and such a panic is there, such a sweat to escape, that the weak and the helpless are trampled into the mud and their cries are unheard.” (Miller, 1961, p. 187)

(18) “O şimdi gelebileceği en帅refli mertebeye ulaştı.” (Çölaşan, 1999, p. 5)

[come-ABIL-FUTURE-NOM most honorable rank-DAT reach-PAST]

‘Now he reached the most honorable rank that he could have come to.’

(19) “It is rather hard work: there is now no smooth road into the future: but we go round, or scramble over the obstacles.” (Lawrence, 1980, p. 1)

The point at which the journey ends is the departure point for death (Example 20, 21). At the same time, both life and death are states of either “being alive” or “being dead.” Thus, they are conceptualized as bounded spaces. Accordingly, “being born” and “dying” involve change of state, which corresponds to change of location metaphorically (Examples 15, 16, 20, 21).

(20) “…Clarence Thomas Ross, who departed this world in 1985 reportedly leaving 16 children by seven women.” (King, 1999)

(21) “Doktorlar kadıncağımız yakalandığı gribe çare bulamamış ve o da binlerce kadersiz benzeri gibi genç yaşta öldü gitmiş.” (Livaneli, 1999, p. 5)

[die-CONV go-PAST]

‘The doctors could not find a cure for the flu the poor woman had caught, and she, like thousands of her alike, died and went at a young age.’
“LIFE IS A MOVING ENTITY/SUBSTANCE” and “LIFE IS LOCATION” constitute the two other mappings for the target domain of life that are structured by motion in space. As a moving entity, life is mostly conceptualized as a flowing fluid substance in both languages (Examples 22, 23). As a location, life is typically conceptualized as a bounded space that one can enter, exit, or pass through (Examples 24, 25).

(22) “... the whole damned current of life flowing through you, through her, through all the guys behind you and after you ...” (Miller, 1961, p. 46)
(23) “Yaşamın doğal ağısi hızlanıyor.” (Özlü, 1994, p. 32)
[life-POSS:3SG natural flow-NOM-POSS:3SG accelerate-PRESENT]
‘The natural flow of life is accelerating.’
(24) “Fiona’s ex-boyfriend, who had walked out of her life a few months before Nashe entered it, had apparently returned after a change of heart ...” (Auster, 1990, p. 18)
(25) “O ikisi yaşamından çıkınca ben ne yapacaktım, fakan türünden tipik Tuna kuruntuları ...” (Uzuner, 1997, p. 226)
[life-POSS:1SG-ABL exit-CONV]
‘When those two exit from my life, what would I do type of typical Tuna worries ...’

Similar to life, death and sickness are also conceptualized as either a moving entity or a location in the two languages. Some examples of “SICKNESS IS A MOVING ENTITY” (Examples 26, 27) and “DEATH IS A MOVING ENTITY” (Examples 28, 29) are provided following.

(26) “From its origins in central Asia, it (the plague) was carried by rats aboard ships, reaching Italy in the fall of 1347 and quickly spreading as far as Britain and Scandinavia.” (Witkin, 1999)
[nerve sickness-POSS:3SG pass-ABIL-PRESENT]
‘That’s because mental sickness is a contagious thing. And it can pass by even sensing the despair of another human being deeply, not necessarily by getting germs.’
(28) “The town was a shambles; corpses, mangled by butchers and stripped by plunderers, lay thick in the streets; wolves sneaked from the suburbs to eat them; the black death and other plagues crept in to keep them company, and the English came marching on; while the danse macabre whirled about the tombs in all the cemeteries ...” (Miller, 1961, p. 43)

\[(\text{death}) \text{ approach-PAST side-POSS:1SG-DAT}\]

‘This was not our first encounter. When I first came face to face with death I was four years old. It approached to my side disguised in the attractive outfit of a mountain mushroom.’

As a location, death is seen as the final destination at the end of life’s journey (Example 30). Similarly, sickness is conceptualized as a container that one enters when one becomes sick and comes out of when one is healthy again (Example 31). Notice also that in both Examples 30 and 31, life is conceptualized as “being here,” and sickness and death are conceptualized as “being there,” where life becomes the deictic center of the motion.

(30) “Bundan sonra gene o sert cisim ağzımda gene ölümle gidip geliyorum.” (Özlü, 1994, p. 50)

\[\text{death-DAT go-CONV come-PRESENT-1SG}\]

‘From then on, I go to death and come (to life) with that hard object in my mouth.’

(31) “It will be a strange gathering this evening. … There will be bumpers downed and Sylvester who is ill will come out of her illness.” (Lessing, 1979, p. 29)

**States.** States—mental, emotional, or bodily—are conceptualized as locations, and the change from one state to another as motion from one location to another. Location refers to a bounded space with an interior, an exterior, and a boundary, and each of these components of space is mapped onto the domain of states. Thus, one could be in a state, or go into or out of a state. The metaphor “STATES ARE LOCATIONS” also constitutes a submapping of the event structure metaphor. A thorough discussion of the event structure metaphor is provided in the second half of the article, outlining the crosslinguistic similarities and differences in this mapping. In the remainder of this section, however, I try to outline the similarities between English and Turkish in structuring different kinds of states in terms of motion in space.

**Emotional states.** Emotional states are conceptualized as bounded regions, where change from one emotional state to another is understood as motion into (Examples 32, 33) or out of a bounded region (Examples 34, 35).

(32) “But Ifill also ran into frustrations at the Times.” (Kurtz, 1999)

(33) “Hikmet Uluğbay’ın bunalıma girip, kendisini kurşunlama girişiminden sonra …” (Doğru, 1999, p. 9)
‘After Hikmey Uluğbay entered into depression and attempted to shoot himself …’

(34) “…a growing number of Serbs will be encouraged to ‘come out of denial.’” (Secunda, 1999)


‘Don’t the depressive people sneak suddenly from their depression?’

As a corollary to the “EMOTIONAL STATES ARE LOCATIONS” mapping, emotions are also conceptualized as moving entities. This conceptualization frequently co-occurs with the “BODY IS A CONTAINER” metaphor, and emotions are understood as entities that go into or out of our bodies (Examples 36, 37).


‘God knows, at most, you think of love as something that enters a person’s heart by itself and that exits and goes by itself.’

(37) “She stared miserably at the floor. Everything was draining out of her. All her strength, all the hatred that had kept Lowry close to her for so long.” (Oates, 1967, p. 242)

Apart from emotions themselves, the behavioral displays of emotions are also understood in terms of motion in space. Emotional expressions (e.g., a smile, a laughter) are described as either moving figures (Examples 38, 39), or bounded regions that a person moves into (Examples 40, 41). The conceptualization of an emotional expression as a location is a mapping that is also available in Turkish—even though it was not observed in the data. Some common expressions include gülme krizine girmek ‘laughter crisis-POSS-DAT enter’, ağlamakta nTGılmeye geçmek ‘cry-NOM-ABL laugh-NOM-DAT pass’, and gözyaşlarına boğulmak ‘tear-PLU-POSS-DAT drown/sink.’

(38) “His smile faltered. He bowed and stepped back.” (Fowles, 1981, p. 74)


‘magnificent red lip-PLU-POSS:3SG-ABL hesitant white-INTENSIFIER one smile flow-PRESENT-PAST]
‘A hesitant, snow-white smile would flow from the magnificent red lips of Mabel who had been staring at someone or some place afar, with his dazzling, appealing, slit eyes.’

(40) “Now that he was pronounced out of danger, time established itself again, and Molly collapsed into hours of low and helpless weeping.” (Lessing, 1979, p. 372)

(41) “I began without thinking. Stopping only when it dawned on me that the entire courtroom had burst into laughter.” (Walker, 1993, p. 35)

**Mental states.** Like emotions, ideas, thoughts, and other mental activity concepts (e.g., memory, consciousness) are also conceptualized as moving entities in the two languages. This mapping frequently co-occurs with the “**MIND/HEAD IS A CONTAINER**” metaphor. The mind is conceptualized as a bounded space with various contents (Example 42), and mental activity is understood as movement into or out of this space (Examples 43, 44).

(42) “He is a genuinely friendly man, curious about the world, and without pretense, other than the delusion that it is a public service for him to give public tours of the mansion of his mind, regardless how sparsely some rooms in it are furnished. Coming months will tell whether he will discipline his entertainer’s impulse enough to respect the public’s thirst for some decorum.” (Will, 1999)

(43) “The thought of it had sent me reeling off into the shadows of my mind; where I had hidden out for months.” (Walker, 1993, p. 224)


[This rotten thought-ACC one bucket-ABL waste-DAT pour-NOM-MODIF pour-INF want-PAST-1SG]

‘By shaking my head rapidly, I wanted to pour this rotten thought as if I am pouring it from a bucket into the waste.’

Similar to the mind and the head, consciousness and thoughts are also conceptualized as containers, most likely because they are treated as states of the mind. In this mapping, it is either the person who is engaged in mental activity or the object of thought that corresponds to a moving figure. Consciousness and thoughts, on the other hand, are understood as locations that this entity moves in, out, or through (Examples 45 to 48).

(45) “It was like an arrival at the shrine of some remote and self-absorbed deity. She was plunged in thoughts of her own.” (Murdoch, 1976, p. 93)


[Deep thought-PLU-DAT plunge-PAST]

‘He plunged into deep thoughts.’
“Then she fell back almost voluptuously into a world of undifferentiated flapping things where words were silent and colors became textures. There were blossomings and explosions. From where she had floated far down the coastline of her consciousness, she called out.” (Bowles, 1966, p. 116)

“Bilgi insanınlığu bilincine iki yoldan ulaşır.” (Kırıkkanat, 1999, p. 7)

‘Knowledge reaches a human being’s consciousness from two roads.’

The mind is described as not only a bounded region, but also a moving entity that is capable of self-initiated movement. There are two versions to this mapping. In the first version, various mental states are conceptualized as locations, and mental activity is understood as the mind’s movement (in)to these locations (Example 49). In the second version, the head becomes the container for the mind, and the mind’s motion into or out of the container (i.e., the head) is understood as mental activity (Example 50). The former version is observed more frequently in English, whereas the latter version is more common in Turkish.

“The morning’s azure sky was overcast by a high veil of cirrus, harbinger of that thunderstorm we have already heard in Lyme, and his mind soon began to plummet into a similar climate of morose introspection.” (Fowles, 1981, p. 173)

‘… sonunda dayanamaz oldu, her şeyi unutup aklı başından gitti …’ (Kemal, 1997, p. 195)

‘… at last, he could not bear it anymore, he forgot everything and his mind went from his head.’

Auditory and visual perception. Sound or lack of sound (i.e., silence) is conceptualized as a moving entity that moves in relation to particular landmarks in both English and Turkish. The landmark can be any number of things, including a house or a room (Examples 51, 53), a person’s ear (Example 52), or as space between two people (Example 54).

“…her aunt’s snores began to creep through the silent house.” (Fowles, 1981, p. 200)

“It is as if a far away lute melody is coming to her ears, from her childhood, from the nights …”

(53) “Silence flowed back into the room … “ (Fowles, 1981, p. 350)
As an extension of the mapping “SOUND IS A MOVING ENTITY,” production of speech is also conceptualized as motion, giving us the metaphor, “SPEAKING IS MOTION ALONG A PATH.” In this mapping, the speaking subject corresponds to a figure that moves in relation to a bounded space, and the particular genre of speech (e.g., conversation, narrative) corresponds to the location this figure moves into (Examples 55, 56). The difficulties and diversions encountered in motion also correspond to dysfluencies encountered in speaking (Examples 57, 58).

(55) “I seem to have started here upon some general explanation of myself, and it may be as well to continue this before I plunge into a narrative of events which may, once under way, offer few opportunities for meditation.” (Murdoch, 1976, p. 14)

(56) “... öfkesini çekmek için Necmi’nin girmişti söz.” (Soysal, 1996, p. 255)

(57) “If a woman running for President ... stumbled on the pronunciations of several global hot spots, she would have been immediately dismissed as dizzy dame.” (Dowd, 1999)

(58) “‘Evlenmek zorunda mısın?’ sorusunu şimdi Ömer abinin sormasını önlemek istermek için önermeyi dilsim dolanarak, anlatmak istedikleri birbirine katarak, karşıtırarak ...” (Ağaoğlu, 1998, p. 260)

As with the perception of sound, visual perception of a scene is also conceptualized as movement along a path (“LOOKING IS MOTION,” “SEEING IS TOUCHING”). Once again, we find two versions to this basic mapping. In the first, the eye is conceptualized as a moving entity, and seeing corresponds to the self-initiated movement of this entity along a path (Examples 59, 60). In the second version, the eye is still conceptualized as a moving entity, but in contrast to the first, seeing corresponds to the caused-movement of the eye (Examples 61, 62).


(60) “Birden gözleri başka bir yöne kayar ...” (Soysal, 1996, p. 151)

‘Silence wandered between them once again.’
“As he got into the lift he threw me a last despairing glance, one of those mute appeals which a dog makes when you put a noose around its neck.” (Miller, 1961, p. 113)

“Kaydırıyor bakışlarını daha yukarılara doğru.” (Bahadır, 1999, p. 15)

‘He makes his gaze slide towards further up.’

As an extension of the “SEEING IS TOUCHING” metaphor, the perception of a static scene is also conceptualized as movement along a path (Examples 63, 64). In this mapping, the scene corresponds to the terrain of movement, and seeing corresponds to motion over this physical terrain.

“Its outer edge gave onto a sheer drop of some thirty or forty feet into an ugly tangle of brambles. A little beyond them the real cliff plunged down to the beach.” (Fowles, 1981, p. 61)

“Mezarlığın önü bir gecekondu vadisiyle Haliç’e doğru iniyor.” (Özlü, 1994, p. 15)

‘The front side of the graveyard descends towards Haliç with a valley of shanty houses.’

Other abstract concepts. The analysis conducted so far has focused on the most commonly observed target domains that are structured by motion in space in the two languages. There are also some others that are somewhat less frequently observed, yet are still seen in both English and Turkish. These abstract concepts cover a wide range of domains, from economy to political activities. A few examples are presented following from both languages in a comparative fashion that are illustrative of these target domains. Examples 65 and 66 conceptualize the economy as a moving entity that stumbles and surges, whereas Examples 67 and 68 describe political activity of particular groups in terms of motion into various political positions that are defined as bounded regions. The last two examples (69, 70) conceptualize the concept of debate in terms of a bounded region, where participation in the debate is conceptualized as movement into the bounded space, and lack of participation as movement outside of the space (e.g., over).

“In post-Communist Poland, the economy sagged and then surged as reforms kicked in because the best companies were allowed to win.” (Friedman, 1999)

“Bilindiği gibi tôkezleyen ekonomiyi canlandırmak için önceki gün bir paket açıldı.” (Atikkan, 1999, p. 8)
‘As known, a package was opened up the other day to liven up the stumbling economy.’

(67) “This week, however, a military regime came to power with its hand on the nuclear trigger …” (Gupta, 1999)

(68) “Türkiye’de iktidara gelenlerin ödün vermesini engellemişse …” (M. A. Kışlalı, 1999, p. 7)

[power-DAT come-NOM-PLU]

‘If he had prevented the ones who came to power in Turkey from compensating …’

(69) “Since her husband took a lot of flak for skipping a presidential debate that night to be at her side, she showed her gratitude by pointedly saying to the bank of TV cameras that she was grateful for his support …” (Pederson, 1999)

(70) “Bu konulara, tartışmaya girme yi gerekşiz görüdü Belkıs’la.” (Cumalı, 1998, p. 190)

[debate-DAT enter-NOM]

‘He found it unnecessary to enter into these topics or into a debate with Belkıs.’

Notice also that most of the previous metaphorical mappings involve complex metaphors, and each of these complex metaphors is composed of a number of basic submappings. If we take 65 as an example, where the economy is described as sagging and surging, we observe that the metaphor “ECONOMY IS A MOVING ENTITY” involves a number of submappings. Some of these include “CHANGE IS MOTION,” “GOOD IS UP; BAD IS DOWN” (sag vs. surge), “EXTERNAL EVENTS ARE LARGE MOVING OBJECTS” (reforms), and “CAUSES ARE FORCES” (“reforms kicking in”).

Orientalional metaphors. So far I have examined various target domains that are structured by motion in space in the two languages, and the mappings for each of these domains. Apart from these structural metaphors, there is another set of metaphorical mappings that do not specifically structure one concept in terms of another, but instead organize a system of concepts in relation to one another. These metaphors are called orientational metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). The unique feature of orientational metaphors is that they mostly deal with spatial configuration (e.g., up–down, front–back) by assigning a spatial orientation to a concept. Some of the typical orientational metaphors include “MORE IS UP; LESS IS DOWN,” “HAPPY IS UP; SAD IS DOWN,” “HEALTH and LIFE ARE UP; SICKNESS and DEATH ARE DOWN,” “GOOD IS UP; BAD IS DOWN,” and “CONSCIOUS IS UP; UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Orientalional metaphors are encountered frequently in the data in both languages, and they are used in quite similar ways across a wide range of target domains. Among the different orientational metaphors, the most commonly ob-
served one is the “MORE IS UP; LESS IS DOWN” metaphor. Following, you will find some examples from the data that are instances of this mapping (Examples 71 to 74).

(71) “… California has outpaced the national drop in violent crime by 26.7%. The state’s homicide rate has plummeted to the level it was in 1966 …” (Westerman, 1999)

(72) “The levels of volunteerism throughout the country among young people are skyrocketing, …” (Rich, 1999)

(73) “Amerika’da seçilmiş elemanlar olan güven son 35 yılda yüzde 42’den yüzde 11’e inmiş. İngiltere’de ise bu oran 15 yılda yüzde 48’den yüzde 24’e düştü.” (Koryürek, 1999, p. 9)

In America the trust for the elected people descended from 42 percent to 11 percent over the last 35 years. In England, this ratio fell from 48 percent to 24 percent in 15 years.

(74) “Piyasadaki genel görüş endeksin 6000 puanı kadar turmanacağı yönünde. Ancak beklenen para girişi yaşanmazsa sert bir yükselenin ardından gelecek kar satışlarıyla mevcut seviyelerin de altına inilebilir.” (Çetinel, 1999, p. 13)

The general opinion in the market is in the direction of the index climbing up to 6000 points. But if the expected money entrance is not actualized after a rough (sudden) rise, it can also descend below the existing levels with the incoming profit sales.”

Summary. The analysis of the target domains that are structured by motion in space in English and Turkish shows a high degree of crosslinguistic similarity. The most commonly observed target domains include time, states, birth, life, death, auditory and visual perception, and various other abstract concepts. In addition to the close correspondence between the target domains in the two languages, the metaphorical mappings for each of the target domains are also found to be very similar. For each target domain, the typical mapping constitutes a pair. Each target concept is formulated as either a moving figure (e.g., “time flies by,” “his anger bursts out”) or as a bounded region that a moving figure moves in relation to (e.g., “he drifts into time,” “he flies into a rage”); this pattern is found to be true for both English and Turkish.
The Event Structure Metaphor in English and Turkish

The event structure metaphor forms a complex metaphorical mapping with a number of submappings. The main mapping is from the source domain of motion in space to the target domain of events (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). In the mapping, various components of the event structure—states, changes, processes, actions, causes, purposes, and means—are described metaphorically in terms of space, motion, and force (Lakoff, 1993). The event structure metaphor takes one of two forms: the location event-structure metaphor and the object event-structure metaphor. This analysis focuses only on the former type, because of the nature of the data that is being analyzed. The location event-structure metaphor includes the following submappings (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999, p. 198, italics added):

- “STATES ARE LOCATIONS”
- “CHANGES ARE MOVEMENTS”
- “CAUSES ARE FORCES”
- “CAUSATION IS FORCED MOVEMENT”
- “ACTIONS ARE SELF-PROPELLED MOVEMENTS”
- “PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS”
- “MEANS ARE PATHS”
- “DIFFICULTIES ARE IMPEDIMENTS TO MOTION”
- “EXTERNAL EVENTS ARE LARGE, MOVING OBJECTS”
- “LONG-TERM, PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITIES ARE JOURNEYS”

Analysis of the data in terms of the previous submappings of the event structure metaphor shows a high degree of crosslinguistic similarity. Both English and Turkish use these submappings quite extensively in formulating the internal structure of various events. In the remainder of this section, I outline each of the submappings for the two languages in a comparative fashion, working my way through examples from the data.

**States (locations → states).** The mapping is from locations to states. Location refers to a bounded space with an interior, an exterior, and a boundary; each of these three components of space is mapped onto the respective components of states. Thus, one can be in a state (Examples 75, 76) or on the boundary between two states (Examples 77, 78). Similarly, one can also go into (Examples 79, 80) or out of a state (Examples 81, 82). The bounded space can also be further specified in terms of its various features, such as its size and dimension, or its material properties. For instance, Example 76 describes sadness as a bounded space with a vertical dimension (i.e., depth). Thus, further movement inside the container corresponds to gradual immersion in a particular emotional state. Along the same lines, the material properties of the location can be specified further. The location can be a con-
container with fluid contents (Examples 75, 76) or a solid surface where one can walk on (Examples 77, 78).

(75) “Ölünceye kadar mutluluklar içinde yüzceksiniz …” (Kemal, 1997, p. 197)
[happiness-PLU interior-POSS:3SG-LOC swim-FUTURE-2PL]
‘You will swim inside happiness until you die …’

(76) “It soothed him to indulge in these histrionics of grief, to sink to the depths of a lurid, imponderable sadness …” (Auster, 1990, p. 179)

(77) “Once there’s movement in a senior’s thinking, the typical parent jumps into action. But Sullivan cautions us to walk a fine line between being supportive … and being directive …” (Meltz, 1999)

(78) “Ama o aşk, bir Yunan heykeline hayranlıkla, eşcinsel bir tutku arasındaki hünsa bölgede dolasmaktadır.” (Özkök, 1999, p. 25)
[love one Greek sculpture-POSS:3SG-DAT admiration-INS, homosexual one obsession between-POSS:3SG-LOC hermaphrodite region-LOC wander-PRES-ENT]
‘But that love wanders in the hermaphrodite region between an admiration for a Greek sculpture and a homosexual obsession.’

(79) “Entering into single motherhood, as against marriage, is likely permanently to compromise her future prospects for marriage.” (Raspberry, 1999, p. 25)

(80) “Soka giriyor Hüseyin.” (Bahadır, 1999, p. 15)
[shock-DAT enter-PRESENT]
‘Hüseyin enters (in)to a shock.’

(81) “Falling out of love is chiefly a matter of forgetting how charming someone is.” (Murdoch, 1976, p. 165)

[fatigue-POSS:3SG-ABL slip-COND]
‘If only brother Ömer slipped from his fatigue …’

The mapping “STATES ARE LOCATIONS” also includes a set of entailments that apply invariably both to the source and target concepts (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999), and these entailments hold true in both English and Turkish. For example, if one is inside a bounded space, one is not outside of that space. Applied to the target domain, if one is in a state, one is not out of that state (e.g., one cannot simultaneously “fall into depression” and “climb out of depression”). Similarly, if one is deep inside a bounded space, one is further away from being outside of the space. Applied to the target domain, if one is deep in a state, one is further away from being outside of that state (e.g., one cannot be “at the edge of madness” and “sink deeper into madness” at the same time).

Change (change of location → change of state). Motion from one location to another corresponds to change from one state to another. The change can be
either self-initiated or caused. The self-initiated change of location is carried out by the agent who is undergoing the change of state. The agent can be an animate being (Examples 83, 84) or some other kind of entity that is conceptualized as having the capacity for self-initiated movement, such as the economy (Example 85) or a political party (Example 86). Furthermore, in some cases, the state itself may be conceptualized as changing location, transforming itself into another state (Example 87).

(83) “He had passed visibly through two states and was entering upon a third. After his embarrassment and his unreasoning joy he was consumed with wonder at her presence.” (Fitzgerald, 1986, p. 93)

(84) “О ani öfke krizinden böyle gönülüz bir güleme psikolojisine geçmişine pek de şaşırmanızı görmünen doktor Kutlu sabırla onu izliyordu.” (Uzuner, 1997, p. 335)

[that sudden anger attack-POSS:3SG-ABL a laugh-NOM psychology-POSS:3SG-DAT pass-NOM-DAT]

‘Doctor Kutlu, who did not seem all that surprised at his passage from a sudden attack of anger to a laughing psychological state, was watching him patiently.’

(85) “The economy bolted back from a spring rest as consumers continued to spend, and businesses restocked their shelves and invested in new plant and equipment.” (Dodge, 1999)


[Nationalists… emotion line-POSS:3SG-ABL move.away-CONV such a reason line-POSS:3SG-DAT come-NOM-DAT start-PAST-PLU]

‘How did Nationalists, Fethullah supporters, and so forth move away from the “emotional path” and start coming to such a “path of reason”?’

(87) “Sometimes she cried and sometimes she forgot to cry, her anger running out into a sudden sense of being helpless, being lost.” (Oates, 1967, p. 119)

The caused change of location, on the other hand, is carried out by an agent other than the entity who is undergoing the change of state. This external agent can be any number of things, such as the passage of time (Example 88) or a strong sensation (Example 89), along with various others.

(88) “Nashe was not quite desperate, but he sensed that he was getting there, that another month or two would be enough to push him into a full-blown panic.” (Auster, 1990, p. 19)

(89) “Ancak bazı özel durumlarda … kişisel sorunların açıma girmesi ve asla gözelemezeyeceği umutsuzluğu bizi panik ve dehset durumlarına sürükler.” (Uzuner, 1997, p. 335)
‘Only in some special circumstances … the entrance of one’s personal problems into a dead-end street, and the despair that they will never be solved drag us into states of panic and terror.’

The mapping “CHANGE OF STATE IS CHANGE OF LOCATION” also involves a set of entailments that hold true for both the source and the target domains (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). For example, if one moves from region A to region B, one is first in region A and then in region B. Applied to the target domain, if one moves from state A to state B, one is first in state A, and only later in state B (e.g., one cannot both “slide from extreme depression to insanity,” and be insane initially at the same time). Similarly, if one has moved from location A to location B, one is no longer in location A. Applied to the target domain, if one moves from state A to state B, one is no longer in state A (e.g., if one “falls into depression” and then “comes out of it,” one is no longer “in depression”). These entailments are found to be true for both languages.

**Causation (forced motion → causation).** Change of location corresponds to change of state. As an extension of this mapping, forced motion from one location to another corresponds to caused change of state. The forces become the causes, and the forced motion becomes the causation for the change of state. A few examples are presented following that are illustrative of this mapping (see Examples 90 to 93).

(90) “He paused. The immediate contingency overtook him, pulled him back from the edge of the theoretical abyss.” (Fitzgerald, 1986, p. 122)
(91) “The attack was likely to plunge Armenia into a major political crisis.” (Associated Press, 1999)
(92) “Tarihi kişilikler bazen düşündüklerinden çok farklı sonuçlara doğru sürükleştir, hiç akllarına gelmeyen gelişmelere yol açarlar.” (Alkan, 1999a, p. 5)

‘Historical personalities are sometimes dragged towards consequences very different from what they have ever thought about, they open the way for developments that never come to their minds.’

(93) “Yani şu anda var olan durumu ‘olmaması gereken bir durum’ haline getirecek …” (Mahçupyan, 1999, p. 9)

‘By making the existing situation come to a state where it is supposed to be a non-existent situation …’
The causal force can be further specified in terms of its various features. For example, the motion that is exerted for change of location can vary in intensity from being relatively neutral (e.g., *getir* ‘come-CAUS’, *take*) to being forceful (e.g., *bolt, push, throw*). Similarly, the exertion of the force can be more gradual (e.g., *drag*) or more sudden (e.g., *bolt, plunge*). In all of these examples, the semantic contrast in the meaning of the verbs in the source domain is carried onto the target domain, creating a different construal of how one is caused to move from state A to state B.

"CAUSATION IS FORCED MOTION" also carries a number of entailments. In caused motion, change of location is contingent on the application of a force. Applied to the target domain, change of state is also contingent on the actualization of a cause. Similarly, in caused motion, the exertion of the force either accompanies or precedes the motion. Applied to the target domain, the cause for change of state either accompanies or precedes the change of state (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). For example, if "political instability pushes the economy into recession," the economy cannot be "pushed into recession" without the existence of a political instability that instigates it, and the occurrence of this instability either precedes or accompanies the recession. These entailments are found to be true for both the English and Turkish data.

**Action (motion → action).** The performance of an action is conceptualized as motion carried out by an agent with his own force. The agent is most typically an animate being, but in some cases organizational structures, such as the government or a political party, also serve as agents. The motion can also be specified further in terms of its various features, such as the manner with which it is carried out, its continuity, or its suspension. Once again, the contrast in the meaning of the motion verbs in the source domain is projected onto the target domain, creating a different construal of how one performs an action (see Examples 94 to 98).

(94) “As Elizabeth Dole exits, everyone’s wondering what sort of woman will ever be able to crash through our stereotypes and tuck those nuclear codes into her pony-skin Fendi Baguette.” (Dowd, 1999)

(95) “Whereas Bluefields children somersault through complex sentences, Winston lumbers along slowly, one sign at a time.” (Osborne, 1999)

(96) “Yet, what about citizens who cannot afford to drive down the information superhighway, or who live far from mail distribution centers?” (Editorial, 1999)

(97) “Tayyip Erdoğan’ın kendisi de artık ucuz kahramanlıklar peşinde koşmayacaktır.” (A. T. Kışlalı, 1999, p. 6)

[himself no.longer cheap heroism-PLU behind-LOC run-NEG-FUTURE] ‘Tayyip Erdoğan himself will no longer run after cheap heroisms.’

This proves my worthiness even more. Even though I had less chance than she did at the beginning, I advanced continuously and took my situation to the better. Whereas she not only failed to use her chances well, but also went to a worse state than she initially was.’

Difficulties. As an extension of the mapping, “ACTIONS ARE SELF-PROPELLED MOVEMENTS,” difficulties that affect action are conceptualized as impediments to motion. The impediments may take many different forms. The traversed path can pose some physical challenges (Examples 99, 100, 101), one may have to divert from the main road and take a detour (Examples 99, 102), or the path may not allow any further movement (Examples 103, 104).

“When Gwen Ifill ran into bumps and detours in her newspaper career …” (Kurtz, 1999)

“Bu çalışmaların hemen hepsinde şöyle bir düğümü takılıyoruz.” (Birsel, 1999, p. XX)

“In almost all of these efforts we trip on such a knot.’

“Republican Ron Paul, R-Surfside, is proud to swim against the Capitol Hill tide.” (Camia, 1999)

“Erkler arasındaki eşitlikten, yargı erkinin zararına sapılması, dışündürücü ve demokrasimizin aşması gerekir bir iç çelişkidir.” (Altan, 1999, p. 4)

“The turn from the equality between powers to the loss in judicial power is a dilemma that our democracy has to go over and that is thought provoking.’

“Ermeni ve Yunan lobileri karşısında çıktı, önüne duvar ördüler.” (Uluç, 1999, p. 22)

“Armenian and Greek lobbies exited against us, they built walls in front of us.’

“Problem is, the Blue Jays seem to be running into a wall on Delgado ....” (Gammons, 1999)
Means and goals. As an extension of the mapping “ACTIONS ARE SELF-PROPELLED MOVEMENTS,” goals are conceptualized as destinations to be reached. This, in turn, gives us the mapping, “ACHIEVING A GOAL IS ARRIVING AT A DESTINATION.” Goals may take many forms depending on what one’s actions are (Examples 105, 106).

(105) “In retelling the story at his father’s funeral, Al Gore used it not just a reminder of a road not taken, but of the distance the Gore family traveled in one generation to reach the heights of national power.” (Maraniss & Nakashima, 1999)

(106) “Olğunluğun son aşamalarına gelmiş bir sanatçı gördük sahnede.” (Kurdakul, 1999, p. 13)

[consensus-LOC first step like-PAST]
‘We saw an artist on the stage who had come to the last stages of maturity.’

The path traversed to reach a destination corresponds to the means of achieving that goal. The motion on the path can be upwards (Example 107) or forwards (Examples 98, 108), both of which correspond to progress toward achieving a purpose. Consistent with this mapping, lack of progress is conceptualized as backward movement, away from the destination (Examples 109, 110).

(107) “It is about the demise of the era of big-city bosses, the way television changed electoral politics, how the Irish in America climbed out of their immigrant poverty on a ladder of politics …” (Jacoby, 1999)

(108) “Sayın Recai Kutan’ın genel başkanlığı, uzlaşımadaki ilk adım gibiydi.” (Kıslalı, 1999, p. 6)

[consensus-LOC first step like-PAST]
‘Recai Kutan’s presidency was like the first step in the consensus.’

(109) “That is what fueled Thursday’s big rally in the stock market, which had retreated from its August highs amid recent reports that rekindled inflation fears.” (Dodge, 1999)

(110) “… hükümet … emekli yaşında çoktan geri adım atmış olurdu.” (Arcayürek, 1999, p. 19)

[government backward step take-PAST]
‘the government … would have taken a backward step about the retirement age long time ago.’

The motion may also involve passing through multiple transitional landmarks, all of which correspond to stages in reaching a purpose (Example 111). Furthermore, the same destination can be reached by using different paths, and each of these paths corresponds to different means of achieving the same goal (Example 112).
(111) “While working for important American fashion magazines used to be considered an essential step for a young photographer hoping to advance to lucrative advertising work, the presence of these publications is making that step necessary.” (Bellafante, 1999)

(112) “Amacınıza ulaşmak istiyorsanız izleyebileceğiniz birden fazla yol vardır. Tek yola, üstelik çıkmaz sokak olan bir yola saplanıp kalmayın.” (Alkan, 1999b, p. 5)

[aim-POSS:2PL-DAT reach-INF want-COND-PRESENT follow-ABIL-FUTURE-2PL one-ABL more road exist-PRESENT]

‘If you want to reach your aim, there is more than one road that you can follow. Do not get stuck in a single road, that is also a dead-end street.’

Expected progress toward a goal is conceptualized as a travel schedule, where the traveler is supposed to reach prearranged destinations at prearranged times (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). However, in some instances of the journey, the path traversed may not lead to the desired location, deviating from the prearranged destinations. And, reaching an unplanned destination corresponds to failure to achieve one’s purpose in life (Examples 113, 114).

(113) “Here is a man who had taken his advance, accepted the access, sunk a decade of his life in the project, then, failing to fathom his subject, reaches some kind of intellectual/pyschological crisis.” (Krauthammer, 1999)

(114) “Çünkü devleti batma noktasına getirme sürecinde kendi sorumluluğu da var.” (Livaneli, 1999, p. 5)

[state-ACC sink-NOM point-POSS:3SG-DAT come-CAUS-NOM]

‘He also has responsibility in the process of making the (ship of) state come to the point of sinking.’

External events. External events are conceptualized as large moving entities that can exert force on the subject. The force may take many forms, from a political effect to the demands of a particular situation. Some examples from the data are presented following (Examples 115 to 118).

(115) “Perhaps I was simply swept along by the winds of change that were blowing over women’s lives in France …” (Walker, 1993, p. 127)

(116) “… Bradley is surfing a wave that threatens to capsize Vice President Al Gore.” (Pinkerton, 1999)


[So.many people-ACC net-POSS:3SG-DAT fall-CAUS-PRESENT]
‘For so many years, art fiddles with the hopes of so many people. It (art) makes so many people fall into its net.’

(118) “SSK batıyor … Batarken de kendisine yillarca prim ödemiş olan işçileri batığa sürükliyor.” (Vardar, 1999, p. 8)

‘SSK (Institute of Social Security) is sinking. … While it is sinking it is also dragging the workers who paid fees for it for years to a swamp.’

The exerted force can help the person to reach his destination and thus reach his purpose (Example 107). At the same time, the force may also prevent the person from reaching his destination, which, when mapped onto the target domain, corresponds to the person’s failure to achieve his goals (Examples 103, 104).

**Long-term activities.** Long-term activities are conceptualized in terms of journeys. The journey may itself involve a number of intermediate destinations, each of which corresponds to intermediate purposes (see Example 119). In this example, Ifill’s career (i.e., her long-term activity) is described as a journey, with multiple transitional destinations. Notice also that her progress is conceptualized as forward or upward motion along these various paths, marked with the use of motion verbs such as *leap* and *jump*.

(119) “Now Ifill has been deemed ready for the biggest leap of her career, her debut tonight as the host of “Washington Week in Review.” … The odyssey of this preacher’s daughter, from a poor childhood in church parsonages to the latest star in the PBS firmament, it is about persistence, religious faith and a disarming frankness. … When PBS approached her again … Ifill negotiated her way out of her NBC contract. … Next stop was Baltimore, where Ifill spent three years covering Maryland politics for the Evening Sun … Ifill says she left The Post in 1991 after editors told her that she wasn’t ready to cover Capitol Hill. She jumped to the New York Times, which made her a congressional correspondent and later assigned her to the White House.” (Kurtz, 1999)

The journey can also be specified further in terms of its various features. Some journeys may have ultimate destinations, whereas some others only consist of a number of intermediate ones. Applied to the target domain, some activities may have long-term goals (Examples 18, 105, 106, 119), whereas others may involve only short-term goals (Examples 107, 108). Likewise, some journeys may impose many impediments, whereas others may pose only a few challenges. Applied to the target domain, some long-term activities may involve many difficulties (Example 19), whereas some others do not impose quite as many (Example 119). The Turkish data do not include any instances of journey metaphors, even though such met-
aphors are available and quite commonly observed in the language (see Özçalışkan, 2003a, for examples of “LIFE IS A JOURNEY” metaphor in Turkish).

**Summary.** Analysis of metaphorical motion events in English and Turkish in terms of the submappings of the event structure metaphor shows a high degree of crosslinguistic similarity. Both languages rely on these submappings quite extensively in formulating the internal structure of various events, and in very similar ways. A summary chart for the submappings of the event structure metaphor that are observed in the two languages is provided in Table 2.

The Crosslinguistic Question: Is There an Effect of Language?

As shown in the earlier two sections, English and Turkish act in very similar ways in structuring various abstract conceptual domains in terms of motion in space. Of interest, however, the high degree of similarity in the target domains and the types of mappings co-occur with a high level of crosslinguistic variation at a more specific level of conceptual organization—namely, in the specification of the source domain structure. The two languages contrast with each other in the details of the motion event (i.e., source domain), particularly in encoding the manner with which one moves from point A to point B metaphorically. Overall, English pays more attention to the manner dimension of motion events than Turkish, using a greater amount and variety of motion event types that encode manner. A comparison of the manner of motion verbs used metaphorically in the two languages shows that English uses four times as many different types of motion verbs as compared to Turk-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Domain</th>
<th>Target Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>location</td>
<td>states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motion</td>
<td>action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motion from one location to another</td>
<td>change from one state to another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner of motion</td>
<td>manner of action/manner of change of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forces</td>
<td>causes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causing an entity to move from one location to another</td>
<td>causing an entity to change from one state to another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner of causative motion</td>
<td>manner of causative change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destinations</td>
<td>purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paths</td>
<td>means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulties encountered in the traversed path</td>
<td>impediments to action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journeys</td>
<td>long-term activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ► = “corresponds to.”
ish (138 to 39 types, $\chi^2(1) = 55, p < .001$). A list of all the manner of motion verbs used in novels and newspapers in the two languages is provided following:

**English (138 types):** bail out, blow away, bob, bolt, bounce, break away, burst, butt out, capsize, catapult, cave into, charge, chase, clamber, collapse, crash through, crawl, creep, dart, dip, drag, drain, draw, drift, drive, ebb, eject, escape, falter, flee, fleet, flit, float, flood, flounce, flow, fly, glide, hike, hurry, inch, jack into, jerk, jump, launch, leak, leap, loom out, lumber along, lunge, lurk, march, meander, oust, pace, percolate into, plummet, plunge, pop, port into, pour, pull, pump, pursue, push, race, rally, ramble, rebound, reel, ride, roam, roll, run, rush, rustle, sail, scramble, shoot up, shove, shower, shuffle, sink, siphon away, skip, skyrocket, slide, slip, slop, snake, slow, soar, somersault, spill, spin, spring, spurt, stagger, stamp out, steam ahead/take the steam, steer, step, stream, steamroller, stride, stumble, surf, surge, swarm, sway, sweep, swerve, swim, swing, swirl, sloop, throw, tip, topple, toss, track, trail, trample, tread, trip, trot, tumble, veer, vent, verge, walk, wander, wash over/through, whirl, worm one’s way, wrench.


Typically, for a single verb in Turkish that describes a motion with manner, English writers use at least two or more different types of verbs that describe the same metaphoric motion event. As an illustration of this phenomenon, some example motion verbs from the data are provided in a comparative fashion in Table 3.

It is evident from the previous lists that English makes finer categorical distinctions within movements that involve manner. A quick survey of Examples 120 to 125 illustrates this point even further. In Examples 120 and 121, the two
languages converge in conceptualizing the “MIND AS A CONTAINER,” but the way ideas move into this container shows clear crosslinguistic variation. English uses manner verbs (e.g., *spring*) to describe the motion, whereas Turkish relies on directional verbs of motion (e.g., *dü* ‘fall’) that do not convey any manner information.

(120) “And as he looked down at the face beside him, it was suddenly, out of nowhere, that Emma Bovary’s name sprang into his mind.” (Fowles, 1981, p. 100)

(121) “Salih kamyon aklına düşmesin diye neler yapmıyor, ne numaralara başvurmuyordu.” (Kemal, 1997, p. 199)

[truck mind-POSS:3SG-DAT fall-NEG-NOM]

‘So many things Salih had tried for the (idea of) truck not to fall into his mind.’

The same pattern is observed in Examples 122 and 123. The metaphor “EMOTIONS ARE MOVING ENTITIES” is common to both English and Turkish, whereas the type of motion is different (creep vs. yayıl ‘spread’) in the two languages. Similarly, in Examples 124 and 125, both languages converge in conceptualizing “TIME AS A CONTAINER,” but diverge in the specific details of how one moves into this container. Turkish uses a directional verb of motion (gir ‘enter’), whereas English employs a manner of motion verb (*march*) to describe the same metaphorical event.

TABLE 3
Comparison of Example Motion Verbs in Turkish and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sız “leak”</td>
<td>leak, drain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kay “slide”</td>
<td>slide, slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sürün “crawl”</td>
<td>creep, crawl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dök(ül) “pour”</td>
<td>pour, spill, slop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuvarlan “roll”</td>
<td>roll, tumble, wallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it “push”</td>
<td>push, propel, shove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yüz “swim”</td>
<td>float, flood, swim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kovala “chase”</td>
<td>chase, pursue, track, trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sendele, tikeze “stumble”</td>
<td>faller, stagger, stumble, trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirman “climb up”</td>
<td>climb, clamber, skyrocket, soar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atıl “leap”</td>
<td>leap, lunge, lurk, launch, swoop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fırıla “dart”</td>
<td>dart, burst, bolt, surge, pop, spurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atla, siçra “jump, bounce”</td>
<td>bounce, bound, jump, plummet, skip, spring, scramble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koş “run”</td>
<td>run, flee, fleet, rally, race, reel, surge, charge, flit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yürü “walk”</td>
<td>walk, drift, ebb, flounce, linger, lumber, march, meander, roam, rustle, stride, tread, worm one’s way, hike, pace, ramble, snake, trample, trot, swarm, forge, hurry, rush</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“So engrossed was she that she had no consciousness of being observed, and one emotion after another crept into her face like objects into a slowly developing picture.” (Fitzgerald, 1986, p. 125)

“Yüzüne suçluluk duygusu yayılmış olarak koştu ve Ada’ya sarıldı.”
(Uzuner, 1997, p. 297)

‘He ran towards Ada with the feeling of guilt having spread to his face, and he hugged her.’

“It is quite possible for us to enter into the 2000 years in a very different state of the soul.’

“We need a president strong enough to march us into the next millennium the Martha Stewart way.” (White, 1999)

As the previous examples illustrate, metaphorical motion event descriptions in English and Turkish show a clear contrast in terms of the expression of manner of motion. English writers use a greater variety of manner verbs than their Turkish counterparts, who only use a limited set of directional motion verbs (e.g., enter, fall, spread) and typically leave out manner information in their metaphorical descriptions (see Özçalışkan, 2002, 2003b, 2003c, for further analysis of the crosslinguistic differences in encoding manner of motion in the two languages).

The crosslinguistic difference seen in the description of metaphorical motion events stems from the typological contrast between the two languages. Turkish typically encodes direction of motion in the main verb of a clause (e.g., He enters, exits, ascends, descends), whereas English prefers to encode direction of motion by using particles or prepositions, making the main verb slot available for a manner verb (e.g., He walks, runs, crawls in/out/ across). This provides English speakers with a more accessible and easily codable linguistic option to indicate manner of motion (Slobin, 1996, 1997). Even though manner is likely to constitute a perceptually salient dimension of a motion event for speakers of any language, as suggested by the previous analysis, the encoding of manner information relies heavily on codability, and speakers of a language are more likely to pay attention to and elaborate manner if they use a language with high codability of this dimension (Slobin, 2003). As compared to Turkish, English allows for easier codability, where manner can be expressed using a single, finite, high-frequency lexical item (i.e., a main verb) rather than a phrase, or a nonfinite verb such as a subordinate construction (Slobin, in press). As a result, English speakers encode manner habitually, develop a richer lexicon of manner verbs, and make finer distinctions within the domain of manner in their motion event descriptions. As demonstrated in this article, the effect of codability became quite evident in the metaphorical extensions
of motion in space as well, with English making finer lexical distinctions in the manner with which one moves from point A to point B metaphorically.

DISCUSSION

The article aims to identify the universals and the particulars in the metaphorical structure of various target domains that are conceptualized in terms of the source domain of motion in space. It involves a comparison between English and Turkish and examines what dimensions of a metaphorical motion event show crosslinguistic variation and what dimensions remain constant in the two languages. The data include randomly chosen instances of metaphorical motion events from novels and newspapers written originally in English or Turkish. The article investigates the possibility that crosslinguistic variation may exert itself differently at different levels of conceptual organization. English and Turkish are expected to be more similar at a basic level of conceptual organization, with expected commonalities in the target conceptual domains and the types of primary metaphorical mappings. Crosslinguistic variation, on the other hand, is expected to reveal itself at a more specific level of conceptual organization, namely in the specification of the source domain structure, and English and Turkish are expected to differ in terms of their attention to the manner dimension of motion events.

As expected, the results show close crosslinguistic similarity in the target domains and the metaphorical mappings. Both languages are found to structure a finite, almost identical set of target domains in terms of motion in space and also rely on the same mappings to conceptualize each of these domains. Each target concept is typically formulated as either a moving figure (e.g., “his mind wanders,” “her anger bursts”) or a bounded space (“the idea bounces back into his mind,” “she flies into a rage”). Of interest, the high degree of crosslinguistic similarity in the target domains and the metaphorical mappings co-occurs with strong crosslinguistic variation observed in the specification of the source domain structure. As shown in the article, English writers use a greater variety of motion event types that encode manner as compared to their Turkish counterparts in their metaphorical descriptions. Turkish writers, on the other hand, typically focus only on the direction of motion and mainly use nonmanner verbs (e.g., exit, enter, ascend, spread) in their metaphorical descriptions. This pattern is found to be robust across different target domains and metaphorical mappings.

These results are important in several respects. First, they point to the structure of the source domain to be a reliable arena of systematic language-based variation. In earlier work, levels of metaphorical mappings are identified as the basis for crosslinguistic variation, and primary metaphorical mappings are argued to be the least likely candidates to vary across languages (e.g., Grady, 1997, 1999; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). The data presented in this article certainly extend the claim about
the universality of primary metaphorical mappings. In both the English and the Turkish data, a small set of primary metaphors (e.g., “STATES ARE LOCATIONS,” “ACTIONS ARE SELF-PROPELLED MOTIONS,” “CHANGE IS MOTION,” “PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS,” “BODY IS A CONTAINER,” “TIME IS A MOVING ENTITY”) provide the basic level structure for a number of more complex metaphors (e.g., “LIFE IS A PURPOSEFUL JOURNEY,” “DEATH IS A FINAL DESTINATION,” “ECONOMY IS A MOVING ENTITY,” “MIND IS A CONTAINER WITH MENTAL CONTENTS”). However, in contrast to what was suggested in earlier theoretical work, crosslinguistic similarity is observed not only in primary, but also in complex metaphorical mappings. As suggested by Lakoff and Johnson (1999), unlike primary metaphors, complex metaphors are not directly linked to embodied experiences and therefore are more likely to show culture and/or language-based variation. Of interest, however, our analysis has shown the two languages to be quite similar at the level of complex mappings as well. Crosslinguistic variability, on the other hand, is found to be strongly expressed in the source domain, particularly in the details of the motion event itself. Thus, the data clearly suggest the specification of the source domain structure to be the best candidate for systematic crosslinguistic variation, rather than the levels of metaphorical mappings.

Second, the data have shown that crosslinguistic variation in a semantic domain is observable not only in the literal uses of the lexicon, but also becomes apparent in the metaphorical extensions of the lexicon. As noted earlier, previous research has shown a difference between English and Turkish in encoding manner for literal motion events (e.g., Özçalıskan & Slobin, 1999a, 1999b, 2000a, 2000b, in press). In contrast to a literal motion event (e.g., he crawls into the house) that involves only one conceptual domain (i.e., motion in space), a metaphorical motion event is composed of a source domain (i.e., motion in space), a target domain (e.g., time, body, states), and a conceptual mapping between the two domains (e.g., “TIME PASSAGE IS MOTION ALONG A PATH,” “BODY IS A CONTAINER,” “STATES ARE LOCATIONS”). Thus, the source domain of ‘motion in space’ stays the same for a literal and a metaphorical motion event, and therefore any crosslinguistic effect that is evident in a literal motion event will unavoidably be observed in the metaphorical extensions of the event, which was clearly evident in the data.

Third, the crosslinguistic differences that are observed in the source domain of a metaphorical mapping may have effects on our conceptualization of the target domain. In a metaphorical event, the mapping is always unidirectional (source → target), where we both structure and understand the target concept in terms of the source concept. Therefore, any systematic crosslinguistic difference that we observe in the source domain is likely to be true of our conceptualization of the target domain as well. As shown in the article, for every target domain, English makes finer lexical distinctions in the manner with which the metaphorical motion is carried out as compared to Turkish. This difference, in turn, may lead English speak-
ers to have a more elaborate representation of a metaphorical mapping than Turkish speakers, sharpening their ability to detect and report more fine-grained distinctions in their experience of various target domains that are structured by motion in space.

Last, the data provide added support to the idea that our experiences of more abstract or less intersubjectively available domains of experience are structured largely by metaphors. The analysis has shown metaphorical motion events to be quite pervasive in both English and Turkish, providing the structure for a vast array of target concepts. Even for some target domains (e.g., time), it is impossible to talk or think about the domain in any other way but metaphorically in terms of motion in space. Nonetheless, there are certainly more literal ways of talking about almost any of these target domains (e.g., *he was born, lived, and died; I feel angry, happy, sad; I keep thinking about the matter; I remember her face; I hear a voice; I see the clock tower*). However, none of these literal conceptualizations seem to be extensive enough to capture our full representation of a target concept, as suggested by the abundance of metaphors in our everyday thinking and speech.
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**APPENDIX**

List of Abbreviated Morphemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABIL</th>
<th>abilitative suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative suffix (from)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONV</td>
<td>converb suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative suffix (to)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE</td>
<td>future tense suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrument suffix (with)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSIFIER</td>
<td>adjectival intensifier suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative suffix (at)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIF</td>
<td>modifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominalization suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive suffix (suffix varies by subject type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS:1SG</td>
<td>first person singular possessive suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS:3SG</td>
<td>third person singular possessive suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS:1PL</td>
<td>first person plural possessive suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS:2PL</td>
<td>second person plural possessive suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS:3PL</td>
<td>third person plural possessive suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLU</td>
<td>plural suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>passive voice suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past tense suffix: simple past or past progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>present tense suffix: generic or present progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.TAG</td>
<td>question tag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>subject suffix: first person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>subject suffix: first person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>subject suffix: third person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>subject suffix: first person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>subject suffix: second person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>subject suffix: third person plural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>