Once Upon a Time in the Realm of Notions: the Conceptualisation of Novak Djokovic-Inspired Personality Shifts

Abstract: An analysis was carried out with two interviews given by the tennis-player Novak Djokovic, one of which was in English and the other in his native Serbian. In both instances, Novak Djokovic used many conceptual metaphors throughout his speech, some of which were analysed in more detail. The main premise of the research was that people’s personalities change in accordance with language they speak at any given time and that they use different conceptual metaphors to describe the same events in different languages. The aim of the paper was to investigate whether personality shift in bilingual speakers can be observed through the speaker’s use of conceptual metaphors in different languages. Through the framework of conceptual metaphor theory, it was shown that Djokovic’s personality does change with the language he speaks. This change was shown through the conceptual metaphors, i.e., source and target domains that Djokovic used during the interviews. He does indeed use different source domains to conceptualise the same target domains in different languages.
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Introduction

Knowing many languages multiplies one’s personality. This is one of those proverbs that often come attached to many philosophers’ names; however, the truth is that it is simply a fact of life. It has not been clearly stated, yet everybody accepts it as a universal truth - a dogma of a sort.
Different languages work in different ways. Noam Chomsky talked about Universal Grammar and how each person has a built-in language module, i.e., each person is predetermined to learn a language. While the underlying Universal Grammar may be true, it is hard to claim that languages from different language families work and function differently. It is also hard to disagree with the posit that languages reflect the cultures that use them. Languages form underlying grammatical rules and coin new words in order to suit the users. These new words simply do not exist in all languages since other societies do not recognise the categories which those words determine. For example, in the American higher education system, there are concepts of major and minor courses, which in the Serbian education system, and by extension in the minds of Serbian people, simply do not exist.

By speaking another language, a speaker effectively becomes a member of the social group which uses the language as a native speaker. In a mind of a Serbian speaker who speaks English as a second language, major and minor courses make perfect sense while discussing the American education system, even though such things do not exist in either the Serbian language or education system.

This is what led to the main assumption of this paper. The main premise of this paper claims that people’s personalities change in accordance with which language they speak at any given time. Thus, a bilingual speaker has two personalities influenced by each other, but quite different, when they use their two languages. For the purposes of this paper, personality is perceived as a nexus of multifaceted linguistic personae. Only one personality exponent - linguistic persona - is activated at a time, whilst others remain dormant depending on the context. Personality is not defined from the perspective of either psychology or psychiatry. It is construed as a multi-layered system of public and private faces that we label linguistic personae.

Methodology

This section will describe research instruments and the underlying theory of the research. It will also provide a brief biography of Novak Djokovic, whose case study will be dealt with in this article.
Research instrument

This paper is based upon research conducted in two interviews that Novak Djokovic gave to both Serbian and international journalists following his win at the Australian Open 2019, which is a major tennis tournament held in Melbourne, Australia in January each year. Because of its organisation, prizes and quality in general, it draws the world’s best tennis players to compete for the title.

Who is Novak Djokovic?

Because the research is a case study of one person, it is important to give some insight into who the person is and why he is important. In this section, some basic biographical data about the world-famous tennis player will be given.

Novak Djokovic is a Serbian professional tennis player. He was born in Serbia in 1987. Djokovic started playing tennis when he was four years old. Following many successes in the youth categories, he became a professional in 2003 at the age of 16. He won his first major tournament in 2006 and his first Grand Slam title in 2008. The Grand Slam tournaments are the most prestigious individual competitions in tennis.

Aside from being a professional tennis player, he is also one of the best and most important ambassadors of Serbia in the world.

Why is Novak Djokovic important?

From a linguistic standpoint, he is a very fruitful subject for research. He is fluent in several languages, including his native Serbian, English, French, German and Italian, while he can understand and speak a little bit of several other world languages. Because he speaks several languages fluently, it is possible to compare his speeches and draw certain conclusions. Throughout his career, Djokovic has been interviewed numerous times in multiple languages. It is worth noting that he is an excellent English speaker. Players’ English proficiency on the ATP Tour varies, however, some players such as Novak Djokovic and Roger Federer excel at communicating fluently and successfully.
Post tournament interview – Australian Open 2019

Novak Djokovic won the Australian Open in 2019. Following the final match, Djokovic had a press conference with both international and Serbian journalists. The interview with international journalists was conducted in English, while the interview with Serbian journalists was conducted in Serbian. Since the two interviews took place one after another, and since they tackled largely the same topic, they are ideal for comparative linguistic research.

Interviews were conducted orally and were captured on video. The interview in English took place first, and it lasted longer than the Serbian counterpart (16:59 minutes compared to 9:18). The interview in Serbian followed shortly after the one in English. Original interviews in English and Serbian can be accessed through the following links: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EsZpo8dRKdc&t=845s and https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PvX5Hxy4Zys&t=2s.

Both interviews were transcribed by the authors of the paper. The major part of the research was, therefore, conducted on the transcripts of the original interviews. And both interviews were then further divided into separate sentences. Relevant data was found and extracted from individual sentences.

Theoretical framework

The hypothesis presented in the introduction of this paper can be tested in a variety of ways. One could approach the issue by employing various linguistic sub-disciplines. This paper will, for the most part, use the theoretical framework of cognitive linguistics, specifically the conceptual metaphor theory.

Cognitive linguistics is an approach to the study of language informed by both linguistics and psychology (Robinson and Ellis 2008). The most prominent linguists who dealt with cognitive linguistics are, at the same time, its founders: George Lakoff and Ronald Langacker. For them, meaning is in the centre of grammar, and it is the main reason languages exist. Langacker says that “meaning is what language is all about” (Langacker 1987). Lakoff even states: “Meaning is not a thing; it involves what is meaningful to us. Nothing is meaningful in itself. Meaningfulness derives from the experience of functioning as a being of a certain sort in an environment of a certain sort” (Lakoff 1987).
The foundation of research within the domain of cognitive linguistics is the posit that the transfer of meaning is the primary reason for all communication. Considering, that language reflects the world as well as the way a person experiences the world, cognitive linguistic analysis focuses on finding a way to conceptualise the world surrounding the person. The end products of this conceptualisation are language forms that “have” meaning.

**Conceptual metaphor theory in a nutshell**

Cognitive linguistics as a linguistic theory is very broad, and only a small part of it will be used for the purposes of this paper. Conceptual metaphor theory started with the work of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, more specifically with their book called *Metaphors We Live By*. In the book, Lakoff and Johnson stated that metaphors can be found not only in literary works but rather even in the most neutral, natural forms of language, such as everyday speech. They also proposed a standard definition of conceptual metaphor, which claims the following: “A conceptual metaphor is understanding one domain of experience (that is typically abstract) in terms of another (that is typically concrete)” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980).

Zoltán Kövecses states that most linguistic metaphors are part of a native speaker’s mental lexicon. He says that such metaphors stem from more basic meanings of words and reflect a high degree of polysemy and idiomaticity in the structure of the mental lexicon. The degree of polysemy and idiomaticity in the lexicon was taken as evidence that metaphors are all-pervasive (Kövecses 2017: 13-28).

In the same paper, Kövecses also describes what conceptual metaphors mean and how they work. He rephrases the definition proposed by Lakoff and Johnson and builds upon it, stating that: “A conceptual metaphor is a systematic set of correspondences between two domains of experience” (Kövecses 2017: 13-28).

It is also very important to point out here that another term for “correspondence” is “mapping”, and arguably, it is used even more often. Here is an example of one mapping – LOVE IS A BATTLE. First, let us provide some linguistic metaphors that make up a conceptual metaphor:

- He *fought* to get her number.
- She deflected his advances.
- In the end, she surrendered.

In these examples, several mappings can be proposed:

- Physical fight → winning a woman’s attention
- Sword fight → emotional resistance
- Military movement → flirting
- Surrendering → falling in love

These mappings help explain why the metaphorical expressions mean exactly what they do: why, for example, fight means winning attention and why advancing means flirting. These mappings are also systematic in the sense that they capture a clear view of the battle that is mapped onto love: there is a battle that has started. Two people engage in a sword fight. One person loses the fight though not willingly. For love, it is, to an extent, the same: seduction has started. Two people engage in flirting. One person falls in love though he/she does not want to. Elements and relations within the BATTLE, source domain correspond to the elements and relations within the LOVE or target domain.

Not all elements from a source domain can be transferred to a target domain, though. For example, Kövecses provides a metaphor where THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS, however, the number of rooms or whether the building has a cellar or not are not mapped (Kövecses 2017: 13-28). Several linguists have tried to provide an explanation for this phenomenon, one of them being Lakoff himself. His “invariance hypothesis” states that everything from the source can be mapped onto the target that does not conflict with the image-schematic structure of the target (Lakoff 1990: 39-74).

From the LOVE IS A BATTLE example, it can be concluded that the conceptual metaphor theory makes a distinction between source and target domains. The source domain is always a concrete one, whereas the target domain is an abstract one. Once again referring to the example given above, BATTLE is something concrete, something that people have experienced and know quite a lot about, while LOVE is abstract, this is an emotion which is often inexplicable.
In most conceptual metaphors, source domains are physical, visible, palpable sources that are easy for humans to interpret, whereas target domains are abstract and often have to do with human emotions or thoughts of some sort. This makes perfect sense as, for example, emotions are hard to explain and are therefore conceptualised through a source domain as something more easily recognisable by most people.

Conceptual metaphor theory, according to Kövecses, exists not only in language but in thought as well. He states that people not only use metaphors in speech but also to think about what they are trying to say (Kövecses 2017: 13-28). In his *The Conduit Metaphor*, Michael Reddy showed that the metaphor is placed in thought and not in language. The metaphor is an essential part of the conventional way of conceptualising the world, and people’s everyday behaviour reflects the metaphorical understanding of experience (Reddy 1993: 284-324).

George Lakoff further expands on this idea that metaphors are not only words. He uses the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY to explain what he means. He says:

The metaphor is not just a matter of language, but of thought and reason. The language is secondary. The mapping is primary, in that it sanctions the use of source domain language and inference patterns for target domain concepts. The mapping is conventional, that is, it is a fixed part of our conceptual system, one of our conventional ways of conceptualising love relationships. This view of metaphor is thoroughly at odds with the view that metaphors are just linguistic expressions. If metaphors were merely linguistic expressions, we would expect different linguistic expressions to be different metaphors. Thus, “We’ve hit a dead-end street” would constitute one metaphor. “We can’t turn back now” would constitute another, entirely different metaphor. “Their marriage is on the rocks” would involve still a different metaphor. And so on for dozens of examples. Yet we don’t seem to have dozens of different metaphors here. We have one metaphor, in which love is conceptualised as a journey (Lakoff 1993).

**A case study of Novak Djokovic**

This paper has so far mostly dealt with theoretical approaches to the study of language and how language affects human thought and behaviour. The theory has also already explained
the personality shift, however, not many authors have tackled the same phenomenon through conceptual metaphors.

The main point of this paper is exactly this – to connect the two theories. Personality changes depending on the language a person speaks, which means that conceptual metaphors as a product of conceptualisation and thought should change as well.

**Analysis of Novak Djokovic’s interview in English**

Novak Djokovic, like any other person, uses certain metaphorical constructs in his speech. In this section, the paper will analyse the major metaphors that Djokovic has used during the interviews. It should be noted that the paper will not extensively cover every metaphorical construct, but rather a selection of interesting ones.

The following sub-sections will discuss each of the major metaphors used in such a way as to point out what the source and target domains are, how the two are connected, and if possible, try to propose other metaphorical constructs relating to the same domains. The metaphors were found in particular sentences the focal parts of which will be present in each of the sub-sections.

Furthermore, the sub-sections are all named following the same pattern: X is Y. X denotes the target domain, and Y denotes the source domain of the conceptual metaphor discussed in the sub-section.

**Importance of the vertical position**

In the following sentence, Djokovic uses a vertical position to talk about importance:

It ranks right at the top, under the circumstances, I’m playing against Nadal in such an important match.

He describes highly important events as “top.” Similarly, events of low importance might be described as “bottom.”
Consecutive actions are the human body

In the part of the interview where he speaks of playing two matches one after the other and how well his results were, he says:

…back-to-back semi-finals and finals to make 15 unforced errors in total in two matches…

He describes consecutive matches as “back-to-back”, as in two humans standing in such a way that their backs are facing each other. When two people are facing opposite ways, their eyes see completely opposite views, together forming a sense of continuity, and by extension, consecutiveness.

Tournament as an athlete

In the following part of the interview, Djokovic discusses the quality of the tournament itself, stating:

… it’s definitely a tournament that sets the bar quite high…

Here, the tournament is described as an athlete, a competitor in the athletic discipline of the high jump. The quality of the tournament is conceptualised through raising the bar used in the high jump. The higher the bar is raised, and the higher the athlete jumps, the better. When an athlete raises the bar high, he or she prepares for a difficult action. If, however, they successfully overcome the challenge, and the bar remains standing, it is set for other competitors to try to beat their record. This metaphorical construct means that quality-wise, the tournament is very good because the bar is set high.

Inspiration is looking upwards

Much the same way as other people, when searching for guidance and inspiration, Djokovic looks upwards:

He was someone that I looked up to when I was starting to play tennis.
Conceptualising motivation, inspiration, and guidance is generally done through the process of looking upwards. This metaphor has connections with the metaphor GOOD IS UP discussed by Lakoff and Johnson (Lakoff and Johnson 1999). When individuals are inspired by other people, generally, they are inspired by individuals better than themselves in some way, shape, or form. Because they are better, they are associated with being up; hence motivation is looking upwards.

**Memory is a picture**

A very common way of conceptualising memory is through pictures or images. Djokovic is no different, and he says:

> Actually, one of the first images of tennis, in general, was him playing in Wimbledon and winning his first title back in ’92.

Past events are often remembered the way people saw them. Photographs, pictures, or images of any sort always capture a point in time, whether real or imaginary. This is why people often conceptualise past events as pictures – still points in time not susceptible to change.

**Dedication is touching**

Not all metaphors that Djokovic uses are as common. The following sentence goes as follows:

> I was a small boy in Kopaonik, this mountain resort in the south of Serbia where nobody has ever touched a tennis racket probably before me.

In this sentence, he expresses the lack of devotion and dedication of other people from the same region to play tennis. He conceptualises playing the game as physically touching the racket.

**Success is position**

In this part of the interview, Djokovic talks about Pete Sampras, his mentor, and an excellent tennis player of his time. When the interview took place, Djokovic had become more successful than Sampras, on which he remarks:

> …to aspire to be as good as Pete, and to surpass him with Grand Slam titles, I’m speechless.
From this sentence, it is clear that Djokovic conceptualises the action of becoming more successful and winning more tournaments as moving in front of that person, in this case, Sampras. Another example of the same mapping could be the exact opposite – becoming less successful is being surpassed.

**Being remembered is creating**

The interview took place after Djokovic has won the Australian Open for the 7th time, which was a record. This is why he says the following:

> I am aware that making history of the sport that I truly love is something special…

In this sentence, he conceptualises the idea of being remembered, somehow etched in the history of tennis as the first person to have won the Australian Open seven times, as creating history. Even though history is not a physical object, he sees it as something that can be made, created. Creating the conceptualised object called history ensures his place in the books of tennis, which makes him forever remembered.

In 2020, he won the tournament once again, setting up the new record as the person who won the Australian Open eight times.

**Time is a person**

When Djokovic discusses his future plans, he speaks about the upcoming seasons. He also asks how many more seasons he will be playing. Specifically, he says:

> How many seasons are to come?

The action is usually associated with a living being, most often a person. The tennis season is clearly not a living being but is conceptualised as one. It is given the property of being able to come somewhere or sometime.

The tennis season is only one specific unit from the source domain of time periods, which are clearly not people, but which are often conceptualised as people. For example, the same source domain contains, but is not limited to seasons of the year (“Winter is coming”), months (“November hit us hard”), etc.
Starting is taking

This metaphor is yet another fairly simple and common conceptualisation. The action of taking something usually signalises the beginning of some sort of journey of the object taken. For example, if a person takes a pen from another person, the pen will begin its journey in one hand and end it in another. Djokovic does not speak of a concrete object, but he rather says:

I’m obviously first going to enjoy this victory and share it with my family and friends and then take it from there.

As said above, the object of taking is not a concrete object. By “it”, Djokovic means his own life and thoughts. Starting the rest of life, with the new title and with all that it entails is conceptualised as taking “it”.

Sports is war

The previous sub-section dealt with two specific units within one broad domain, which itself can be conceptualised as something different. Djokovic conceptualises sport as war in the following example:

…I mean starting off well in the match, and coming off from the blocks with the right intensity and trying to be aggressive and protect the line and make him feel pressure from my side.

Aggression and protection are generally associated with confrontation. War is a clear example of a confrontation where people need to behave in a certain way to survive. By conceptualising tennis as war, he sees certain parts of a tennis court as parts of a battlefield (“the line”), and also himself as a belligerent in a skirmish. War is a fertile source domain, as discussed by Lakoff and Johnson. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980)
Degree is position

The vertical position was already discussed as a source domain. It seems that the idea or vertical position might come from the GOOD IS UP metaphor. One more special case of this mapping can be found in the following sentence:

Not impossible, but highly unlikely.

The quality of being unlikely is conceptualised once again on a vertical axis of sorts. The higher up on the axis, the higher the degree of unlikeliness. It is clear from this example that the extent of the GOOD IS UP metaphor covers many other cases, one of which is the degree of likelihood that an action would happen.

Desire is hunger

Kövecses claims that this metaphor is quite common and that desire is often conceptualised as hunger or thirst (Kövecses, 2002). When speaking about his desire for success, Djokovic says:

Well, to be honest, I was always hungry for success…

Hunger is a physical force that drives humans and other living beings to try to satisfy it.

Success is food

The previous paragraph stated that there was a by-product in the DESIRE IS HUNGER metaphor. This by-product is another metaphorical construct in which success is conceptualised as food. People are, generally, hungry for food. In his statement, Djokovic says that he is hungry for success, which means that not only does he conceptualise desire as hunger, but also success as food.

Analysis of Novak Djokovic’s interview in Serbian

The following sub-sections will analyse Djokovic’s interview in Serbian in the same way as the previous section discussed the interview in English. Since the original interview was in Serbian, all example sentences will be translated into English as literally as possible and with the
intention of preserving the metaphor. Only translations will be used in the text, while the original statements in Serbian will be paired with their translations in the Appendix.

**Sports is war**

In the above sub-section the metaphor SPORTS IS WAR was discussed. Djokovic used the same metaphor in Serbian, as can be seen in the following example:

a) “A moment ago, I said that the key to the victory was that dosed aggression…”

Obviously, Djokovic conceptualises a game of tennis as war in both languages. In both English and Serbian, there is the same analogy, even the vocabulary is identical and speaks about the same thing.

**Starting is jumping**

The metaphor STARTING IS TAKING was mentioned earlier. This metaphor works well in English, however, when talking about the beginning of the match in Serbian, Djokovic says:

b) “…which is why that beginning, in fact, I believe, was crucial, and it was the springboard for the rest of the match.”

A springboard, in sports is used in gymnastics, and diving, and serves to provide an initial boost of energy to an athlete. It is no wonder that such conceptualisation exists. Djokovic sees the beginning of a game of tennis the same way a gymnast sees the initial run towards the springboard.

**Openness is honesty**

Honesty is often described as having nothing to hide. It is generally best to hide things in crowded areas and places with many distractions. For Djokovic, having nothing to hide is the same as being open. He says:

c) “Now that we speak openly about it…”
Speaking honestly with nothing to hide is conceptualised as speaking openly. The open place, a square or an empty room of some sort, is an ideal place to put something with the intention to make it easily visible.

**Favourable circumstances are nice clothes**

This is another unusual metaphor used by Djokovic. When talking about various circumstances that eventually led to his victory, he says the following:

d) “…it all put on nice clothes for me tonight.”

Even though the metaphor does not truly work in English, it makes perfect sense in Serbian. Putting nice clothes on, and especially clothes that fit perfectly, is sometimes conceptualised as enjoying favourable circumstances. Even though the same metaphor is not particularly common in Serbian either, it does work, and the same domains are connected in more than only one way. For instance, one could say the following, albeit, in an informal fashion: “Pokidaću se od posla.” This translates as: “I will rip myself apart because of my work.” The action of ripping usually has to do with clothing, which proves that the metaphor, even though it is quite clumsy, does work in the Serbian language.

**Court is court**

The title of this sub-section might be misleading, which is why it will be explained in more detail. The metaphor Djokovic uses is TENNIS COURT IS COURT OF LAW. Djokovic says:

e) “I was young, crazy and then I was punished on the court…”

Punishment is most often associated with law practice. People get punished because they break the law. In this case, the courtroom in the tennis court, and the punishment is losing the game.
Time is space

In the above sub-section the metaphor TIME IS A PERSON was discussed. However, when speaking in Serbian, Djokovic conceptualises time as space. Traveling through time, in the form of remembering past events, is therefore seen as traveling through space. He says the following:

f) “…we are going back how much, almost 15 years back.”

This conceptual metaphor is fairly common as opposed to several others discussed previously. Time, on the other hand, is a fruitful target domain. It is a hard concept to understand, which is why people use conceptualisation as a mechanic of understanding (Kövecses 2002). Two different mappings have thus far been discussed; however, these are not the only ones.

Success is a fight

Becoming and being better than the competitors is something a world-class athlete often discusses at press events. Djokovic is no exception. However, he conceptualises success in different ways. When speaking about the success and the process of becoming better than others, he says:

g) “Roy Emerson said that he was angry with me because I knocked down his record…”

In boxing, knockdown is a move that clearly signalises that one of the opponents is better than the other. Boxing, however, is a martial sport, and fighting is something humans have done since the dawn of time. In such situations, becoming better in any sort of way can be conceptualised as being stronger, smarter, or otherwise superior.

Extracting is reaching the peak

Becoming the best is a process. It involves improving oneself in every possible way. In the case of professional athletes, the top ones always perform at a very high level, and to be the best, one has to step up physically and mentally and overcome all difficulties. Djokovic conceptualises this
process of overcoming all obstacles as extracting something from some sort of container. He says the following:

h) “…in order to somehow manage to extract the maximum out of myself…”

Extracting juice out of fruit, for instance, is one example of this visualisation. In order to let as little of the fruit go to waste, one should extract as much juice as possible. Reaching maximum efficiency in this regard is much the same as reaching the peak physical condition needed to overcome the hurdles of being the world’s best athlete.

**Novak Djokovic’s personality shift as seen through the use of conceptual metaphors**

The interviews Novak Djokovic gave upon winning the Australian Open in 2019 were analysed in the article. He gave two consecutive interviews, one in English and one in Serbian.

Both interviews were examined, however not all conceptual metaphors have been mentioned and discussed in more detail. Through the analysis, it has been observed that Djokovic has, on certain occasions, used the same target domain in both languages, however, the source domains did not always coincide. He needed concrete conceptualisations of several abstract concepts, but he used different source domains for these mappings.

The following sections will discuss these mappings and what they mean in terms of how Djokovic’s personality changes.

**Conceptualisation of success**

Novak Djokovic talked about success in both of his interviews. The interviewers asked him what it was like to win the Australian Open for the 7th time, and to answer their questions, he talked about his success. He spoke about it on two separate occasions in the English interview, and once in the Serbian interview.

In English, Djokovic conceptualised success as an abstract concept through position and through food (these points were discussed earlier in the paper).

In Serbian, however, he conceptualised success through fighting. All three conceptual metaphors regarding the notion of success, in both English and Serbian, have the same target
domain. However, the source domains are all different. Graphical representation of the source and target domains and mapping between them can be seen in the image below.
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**Figure 1. Conceptualisation of success in English (blue) and Serbian (red)**

Success, as an abstract concept, can, in Serbian, also be conceptualised as food, much the same as it was when Djokovic spoke in English. However, his choice to conceptualise success as a fight in Serbian might be influenced by the very fact that he is Serbian.

**Conceptualisation of time**

In the English interview, Djokovic spoke about his plans for the future. Interestingly, in the Serbian interview, he spoke about his past. In both interviews, nonetheless, he talked about time and different time periods. As already stated, Kövecses pointed out in his *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* that the concept of time is notoriously difficult for people to grasp.

It is, therefore, clear that some sort of conceptualisation has to take place. Djokovic, however, uses two different source domains to conceptualise the target domain of time. Graphical representation of this mapping can be seen in Figure 2.
When speaking about the future in English, Djokovic conceptualised time as a person, while in Serbian, he spoke about time as if it were a spatial concept. Different source domains in this metaphor may shed light on Djokovic’s different personalities. In English, he is more friendly, “facing the future” as if he were, in a way, talking to it.

On the other hand, in Serbian, his conceptualisation of time as space through which one can navigate may point to the part of his personality that wanders through time, reflecting on past actions and how he behaved in the past.

**Conceptualisation of the process of starting**

As discussed before, time is a difficult concept to understand. Many different ideas emerge from the concept of time, which makes them inherently hard to understand. Conceptualisation through metaphors is only one way to improve one’s understanding of such concepts. One of them is the concept of beginning.

Humans usually start doing something at one point in time and finish the process at another, which is how the two concepts link. However, in the case of Novak Djokovic, the process of beginning is not conceptualised the same way in both languages he speaks in.

In English, he conceptualises the beginning of a process as taking something. Following the same mapping, the ending of a process is conceptualised as giving the same something back.
In Serbian, this is different. Djokovic conceptualises the beginning of a process through jumping, and more specifically, the kind of jumping that has to deal with jumping sports. Graphical representation of this mapping can be seen in Figure 3.

_Discussion_

At the beginning of this paper, the theoretical framework was set as to how the analysis would be performed. So far, theoretical findings have laid a foundation for the prospect that one’s personality changes with the language one speaks. Multiple language concepts were discussed; the most important one for this paper is the conceptual metaphor theory.

Conceptual metaphor theory, in its essence, suggests that people conceptualise abstract constructs (target domains) through more concrete and more familiar ideas (source domains). The main hypothesis of this paper was that the personality does indeed shift and that the shift can be seen in the use of conceptual metaphors.

In order to put the claim to the test, two interviews with Novak Djokovic were analysed. Both interviews took place at roughly the same time, under roughly the same circumstances, and in both English and Serbian languages.

The hypothesis was put to the test in the following way. Both interviews were examined, and certain, but not all, conceptual metaphors from Djokovic’s speech were analysed. Following the analysis, the findings were compared, and it was found that Djokovic did indeed use different source domains in order to conceptualise the same target domain in different languages.
This could be seen through the metaphors SUCCESS IS POSITION and SUCCESS IS FOOD in English compared to SUCCESS IS FIGHT in Serbian, then TIME IS PERSON in English and TIME IS SPACE in Serbian, and finally STARTING IS TAKING in English and STARTING IS JUMPING in Serbian.

An analysis of the interviews within the framework of conceptual metaphor theory proved that a personality shift is evident when a person switches between languages. However, Novak Djokovic is but an individual, and conceptual metaphor theory is but a single theory in the vast pool of linguistic knowledge.

More comprehensive research involving psychology, linguistics, and social studies could be performed in order to provide a more solid foundation to such a bold claim. Therefore, research is suggested to be performed that would take into account not only speech, but facial expressions, gesticulation, and other non-verbal types of communication of not only one individual but a diverse test group of people covering a wide range of languages, ages, ethnicities, etc.
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**Appendix**

a) “Malopre sam spomenuo da je ključ pobede bila ta dozirana agresivnost…”
   “A moment ago, I said that the key to the victory was that dosed aggression…”

b) “…tako da je taj početak, u stvari, ja mislim i presudio i bio odskočna daska za dalje”
   “…which is why that beginning, in fact, I believe, was crucial, and it was the springboard for the rest of the match.”

c) “Evo sad kad pričamo otvoreno o tome…”
   “Now that we speak openly about it…”

d) “…sve se negako lepo skockalo za mene večeras.”
   “…it all put on nice clothes for me tonight.”

e) “Bio sam mlad, lud i onda sam bio i kažnjen na terenu…”
   “I was young, crazy and then I was punished on the court…”

f) “…vraćamo se koliko, skoro 15 godina unazad.”
   “…we are going back how much, almost 15 years back.”

g) “Roj Emerson je rekao da je ljut na mene što sam mu oborio rekord…”
“Roy Emerson said that he was angry with me because I knocked down his record…”

h) “...da bih nekako uspeo da izvučem maksimum iz sebe...”

“...in order to somehow manage to extract the maximum out of myself…”