

The Many Ways to be Located in French and Serbian : the Role of Fictive Motion in the Expression of Static Location

Dejan Stosic, Laure Sarda

► **To cite this version:**

Dejan Stosic, Laure Sarda. The Many Ways to be Located in French and Serbian : the Role of Fictive Motion in the Expression of Static Location. M. Brala Vukovic & L. Gruic Grmusa. Space and Time in Language and Literature, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp.39-60, 2009. halshs-00482170

HAL Id: halshs-00482170

<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00482170>

Submitted on 7 Jan 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

CHAPTER TWO

THE MANY WAYS TO BE LOCATED IN FRENCH AND SERBIAN: THE ROLE OF FICTIVE MOTION IN THE EXPRESSION OF STATIC LOCATION

DEJAN STOSIC & LAURE SARDA

Abstract

The general aim of this paper is to explore different ways of expressing static location in French and Serbian. Both languages use three main types of locative predicates: neutral verbs (e.g. FR. *être* ‘to be’), posture verbs (e.g. ENG. *to sit, to lie, to stand*) and verbs expressing fictive motion, i.e. verbs whose reference is to motion but which actually describe static situations (e.g. *The road descends towards the coast*) (Talmy 2000). In this study, based on a large contrastive corpus of expressions of static location in French and Serbian novels, we compare the role that these different types of locative predicates play in each language. We point out that Serbian uses the posture verbs much more extensively by locating both animate and inanimate Figures, and that the limited use of posture verbs in French (with only animate Figures) makes fictive motion more salient. Finally, we show how such cross-linguistic differences in attention to fictive motion affect human spatial cognition.

Our analysis adopts the framework of Talmy’s typology, which opposes Verb-framed languages (e.g. French, Turkish) to Satellite-framed languages (e.g. Serbian, English) (cf. Talmy 2000) and discusses the validity of the distinction between “high-manner-salient” and “low-manner-salient” languages for the domain of static location (cf. Slobin 2004). By assuming that posture verbs are static equivalents of manner of motion verbs (e.g. *to run, to walk*)—as suggested by M. Lemmens (2002a, 2002b, 2005)—, we argue that, in the domain of static location (as well as in the domain of motion), Satellite-framed languages (e.g. Serbian) pay more attention to the expression of manner than Verb-framed languages (e.g. French).

Introduction

In this paper, we discuss different ways of expressing static location in French and Serbian. Both languages use several types of locative predicates as well as many kinds of syntactic constructions to describe static spatial relationships. We will particularly focus on the semantic nature of verbal components in static spatial descriptions and will compare the importance of different types of locative predicates in the expression of static space in French and Serbian. Section 1 presents an inventory of locative predicates across languages. In section 2, we define the framework adopted in this study. Next, we discuss different types of locative predicates in French and Serbian and examine, on the basis of contrastive data, their importance in the expression of static location in each of the two languages. This comparison reveals some interesting typological differences between two languages (sections 3.1. and 3.2.). In the last part of the article, we tackle the issue of the importance of fictive motion in expressing static location in French and Serbian and show that the limited use of posture verbs in French makes fictive motion more salient. Finally, we show that such cross-linguistic differences in attention to fictive motion can affect human spatial cognition (sections 3.3. and 4).

1. Many ways to be located across languages: different types of locative predicates

The most exhaustive inventory of locative predicates across languages can be found in studies on Basic Locative Constructions. For example, this has been a central topic in much research at Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (Nijmegen) (see MPI Annual Reports 1998, 1999, 2001), as well as in (Newman (ed.) 2002; Lemmens 2002a, b, 2005; Kopecka 2004; Grinevald 2006; Ameka and Levinson (eds) 2007; Levinson and Wilkins (eds) 2006). A Basic Locative Construction is “the typical construction selected by speakers of a language to answer a where-question like ‘Where is the cup?’” (MPI Annual Report 1998, ch. 7). Relevant research is based on the idea that one can identify a small set of Basic Locative Constructions across languages and argues that all languages fall into one of four types of constructions:

Typology of locative predication (MPI Annual Report, 1999: 63)

Type 0: No verb in basic locative construction (e.g. Saliba, Austronesian)

1. something like “cup on the table”

Type I: Single locative verb

Ia: Copula (e.g. English, Tamil)

Ib: Locative (+ Existential) verb (e.g. Japanese, Yukatek)

2. The cup is on the table. (ENG)

Type II: Postural verbs (3-6 verbs) (e.g. Dutch, Arrernte)

3. De fles staat op de tafel (DUTCH) (MPI AR: 68)
the bottle stands on the table
'The bottle is on the table'

Type III: Positional verbs (12-100 dispositional verbs) (e.g. Tzeltal, Zapotec)

4. metzel-Ø ta tz'amal te' xawin (TZELTAL)
lying on its side PREP bench ART cat (Grinevald 2006)
'the cat is lying (on its side) on the bench'

A particularly interesting aspect of this typology for our purposes is the distinction between three main types of locative predicates present across languages: first, copula or general neutral locative verbs, second posture verbs and third positional verbs, as shown in examples (1) to (4). In this study, we will not consider French and Serbian as belonging to one of these types with respect to their Basic Locative Construction. Instead, our aim is to explore the variability of locative constructions that can appear within a given language. More precisely, we discuss the role and the importance of different types of locative predicates that can be used in French and Serbian in the expression of static spatial relationships. It is well known that in a large majority of languages, other constructions are used in addition to the locative predicates mentioned above in descriptions of static location. One such construction is the passive (or resultative) construction, as shown in (5).

5. SR Torbe su okačene na zidu.
FR Les sacs sont accrochés au mur.
ENG The bags are hanging up on the wall.

Another possibility is to use fictive motion, as shown in example (6).

6. SR Put ide duž obale.
 FR La route longe la côte.
 ENG The road runs along the coast.

The importance of fictive motion in expressing static location has not been studied extensively and not at all studied in a crosslinguistic or typological perspective (see, however, Matsumoto 1996; Rojo and Valenzuela 2003). In this article, we attempt to define the importance of fictive motion in the expression of static location in French and Serbian.

2. Comparing French and Serbian in the framework of Talmy's typology (Talmy 2000)

It is particularly interesting to compare French and Serbian, because they are representatives of two different groups of languages according to Talmy's typology, which we adopt here. As is well known, (Talmy 2000) opposes Verb-framed languages (**VL**) (such as French, Turkish, Japanese, Basque and Hebrew) to Satellite-framed languages (**SL**) (such as Serbian, English, Dutch, Finnish and Hungarian) (cf. Talmy 2000; Slobin 2004). This typological distinction reflects two ways to encode change of location, i.e. the "path of motion" (cf. Slobin 2003). The path is one of the essential components of a motion event. In Verb-framed languages, the path of motion is preferentially encoded by the verb. In Satellite-framed languages, in contrast, the path component is mainly encoded by various particles or "satellites" associated with the verb, such as prepositions, prefixes, postpositions, etc. Examples (7) and (8) illustrate this opposition.

7. FR Jean est **entré** dans la maison. (**VL**)
 'John entered the house'
 8. ENG John went **into** the house. (**SL**)

This crucial difference in coding the path of motion is accompanied by another interesting difference: the manner of motion, also a very important component of a motion event, is highly codable in Satellite-framed languages, but not in Verb-framed languages.

9. ENG John **ran** into the house. (**SL**)
 10. FR Jean est entré dans la maison **en courant**. (**VL**)

‘John entered the house by running’

In Satellite-framed languages, the encoding of manner poses no problems because manner can be expressed by the verb (for instance *go in* or *run in*), see example (9). In Verb-framed languages, the verb is not available because it must encode the path. As a consequence, the manner of motion is generally optional information, as in the French sentence (10). This suggests that the manner of motion is linguistically and cognitively much more salient in Satellite-framed languages than in Verb-framed languages. Thus, in the expression of motion, one can distinguish between “high-manner-salient” and “low-manner-salient” languages.

This distinction between Verb-framed and Satellite-framed languages raises several interesting questions. First, does this distinction extend to the domain of static location? If so, how is manner expressed by static location? Does the reference to the manner of location in the static domain occur more frequently in Satellite-framed languages or in Verb-framed languages? In order to answer these questions, we first present an inventory of locative predicates in French and Serbian, then compare the importance of each type of predicate in the expression of static spatial scenes in the two languages. The comparison is based on a contrastive corpus of expressions of static locations in French and Serbian novels (detailed references are listed at the end of the paper).

This work is part of the larger *Location verb project* which focuses on location and posture verbs in many languages and which tries to draw a parallel between motion and location. *The Location verb project*¹ is an essential complement to the existing typological research on motion verbs in the framework of Talmy’s typology.

3. Locative predicates in French and Serbian

In French and Serbian, three main types of locative predicates contribute to the expression of static location: neutral verbs, posture verbs and verbs describing fictive motion. In the following, we compare the role that these different types of locative predicates play in each language.

1 The Location verb project is supported by the French Ministry of Research and is managed by M. Lemmens (University of Lille III). For more details about project see (Lemmens 2005).

3.1. Neutral verbs

Neutral verbs are widely used in French and Serbian. They are listed in Table 1. We call them neutral because they have no particular semantics, and they often behave as locative or existential copula.

Neutral location verbs		
French	Serbian	English
<i>être</i>	<i>biti</i>	'be'
<i>se trouver</i>	<i>nalaziti se</i>	'be located'
<i>rester</i>	<i>ostati</i>	'stay'
<i>il y a</i>	<i>ima</i>	'there is'

Table 1. Neutral location verbs in French and Serbian

We wish to stress that in both languages, the use of these predicates is equally widespread and that they are capable of expressing location of both animate and inanimate Figures, as can be seen in examples (11) and (12). We will use the term "Figure" for the entity to be located, and the term "Ground" for the reference entity, following Talmy's terminology (2000).

11. SR Ana / moja omiljena stolica **je** u kuhinji.
 12. FR Anne / ma chaise préférée **est** dans la cuisine.
 'Anne / my favorite chair is in the kitchen'

3.2. Posture verbs

Almost all languages have a small set of verbs expressing cardinal positions of the human body: *sit*, *lie*, *stand* as well as *kneel*, *squat*.

Posture verbs		
French	Serbian	English
<i>être debout</i>	<i>stajati</i>	'stand'
<i>être assis</i>	<i>sedeti</i>	'be sitting'
<i>être couché</i>	<i>ležati</i>	'be lying'
<i>être accroupi</i>	<i>čučati</i>	'squat'
<i>être agenouillé</i>	<i>klečati</i>	'kneel'

Table 2. Posture verbs in French and Serbian

The main use of these verbs is to describe situations in which some animate Figure (human or animal) is ‘sitting’, ‘standing’, ‘lying’, ‘hanging’, and so on. They reflect the sensitivity of languages to the orientation and disposition of the Figure for expressing its location. As shown in examples (13) and (14), both French and Serbian employ cardinal posture verbs to localize animate entities:

13. SR Putnici **su stajali** u holu.
 ‘the passengers were standing in the hall’
14. FR Le chien **est assis** devant la maison.
 ‘the dog is sitting in front of the house’

However, we note a contrast between the two languages for expressing the localization of inanimate entities. Indeed, several studies on posture verbs have shown (see Newman (ed.) 2002; Lemmens 2002a, 2002b; Grinevald 2006; Ameka and Levinson (eds) 2007; Levinson and Wilkins (eds) 2006), that many languages have significantly extended or even grammaticalized the use and the meaning of posture verbs (e.g. DUTCH: *Er zit geen bier meer in het vat*. ‘there sits no more beer in the barrel’; *In elk kind zit een leraar*. ‘in every child sits a teacher’—see Lemmens 2002a). These verbs have become basic location verbs for describing the location of any entity, animate or inanimate. They also have a wide range of metaphorical and grammatical uses across languages. In the following, we take a closer look at the possibilities of using posture verbs in French and Serbian.

First, French allows a limited use of posture verbs *être debout* ‘to stand’, *être assis* ‘to sit’ et *être couché* ‘to lie’, since only animate Figures can occur with this type of verb. The combination with inanimate Figures is not allowed in French, as seen in these examples:

15. FR *La lampe **est debout** sur la table.
 (La lampe **est/se trouve** sur la table)
 ‘the lamp is standing on the table’
16. FR *Le livre **était couché** sur la table.
 (Le livre **était** sur la table)
 ‘the book was lying on the table’

Moreover, (Lemmens 2005) argues that French often uses neutral verbs like *être* ‘to be’ or *se trouver* ‘to be located’, even when referring to human beings in one of the three cardinal positions (be sitting, standing or lying).

In Serbian, the use of posture verbs is quite different. Indeed, Serbian uses posture verbs for both animate and inanimate Figures, as we can see in example (17). Moreover, Serbian posture verbs have acquired many metaphorical, abstract and idiomatic uses.

17. SR Marija / moja torba **je stajala** u holu.
 ‘Mary / my bag was standing in the hall’

We note that Serbian posture verbs do not all have the same behavior: unlike the other posture verbs, *sedeti* ‘be sitting’ only occurs with animate Figures, as exemplified in (18).

18. SR Marija / *moja torba **je sedela** u dvorištu.
 ‘Mary / my bag was sitting in the hall’

3.2.1. Corpus analysis

We now take a look at the data. As will be discussed below, the data confirm the observations made above and lead to several other interesting findings. We performed a bidirectional analysis of French and Serbian novels by observing how each type of locative predicate is translated in the target language. The size and the composition of the corpus are given in Table 3.

Verb type or Verb meaning	FRENCH		SERBIAN	
	Number of examples	Number of translated examples	Number of examples	Number of translated examples
Neutral verbs	Ø	Ø	90	89
Posture verbs	176	160	247	245
Change of posture V	378	167	93	91
Fictive motion	98	86	19	19
Grand Total	652	413	449	445

Table 3. The Size and the Composition of the corpus

The translations from French to Serbian show that, with animate Figures, French posture verbs are most often translated in Serbian by posture verbs. On the opposite, Serbian posture verbs are not always translated by posture verbs in French, because Serbian allows the use of

posture verbs with inanimate Figures, whereas French generally does not. As we will see, we found some extensions of the uses of the French verb *gésir* ('to lie', as 'to lie in the grave') with inanimate Figures.

Type of predicate in FRENCH translation	Posture verbs (SERBIAN)			
	Animate Figures		Inanimate Figures	
Posture Verbs	56 %	(19)	12,5 %	(24)
Neutral Verbs	17 %	(20)	30 %	(25)
Change of posture V	13 %	(21)	Ø	
Fictive motion	0,5 %		10 %	(26)
Other verbs	9 %	(22)	37,5 %	(27)
Omission	4,5 %	(23)	10 %	

Table 4. Translation of Serbian posture verbs in French

Table 4. shows that Serbian posture verbs appearing with animate Figures are translated in 56 % of cases by posture verbs, in 17 % of cases by neutral verbs and in 13 % of cases by verbs of movement, *i.e.* by verbs of change of posture (e.g. *sit, lie*). Some of these possibilities are illustrated by examples from (19) to (23).

19. SR Ponajviše su **sedeli** ili **ležali**, nemi i bez pokreta. (Andrić, *Prokleta avlija*: 46)
 FR Le plus souvent, **ils étaient assis ou couchés**, muets et immobiles. (p.51)
 '...they were sitting or lying...'
20. SR Jednog jutra **stajao sam** pored ogledala i češljao se. (Andrić, *Jelena*: 269)
 '... I was standing in front of the mirror...'
 FR Par un matin tout ensoleillé, **j'étais** devant ma glace et je me coiffais, quand il me sembla tout à coup voir... (p. 223)
 '... I was in front of the mirror...'
21. SR **Ona je**, kao gost, u čelu **sedela** i čekala da, što se iznese, jede, pije. (Stanković: 83)
 '... she was sitting at the end of the table...'
 FR Telle une invitée, **elle s'asseyait** au haut bout de la table et attendait qu'on serve les plats et qu'on se mette à manger, à boire. (p. 97)
 '... she used to sit at the end of the table...'
22. SR **Sedeo je** i glodao šestolisni tropek... (Pavić: 26)

- FR **Il était déjà attablé** et en train de ronger un biscuit hexapétale, lorsqu'une créature apparut... (p. 27)
 'he was already sitting at the table eating a biscuit...'
23. SR Postave. Čekaju. Naročito **Mladen stoji**, neće ni da sedne za sofru a kamoli da jede. (Stanković : 84)
 FR Mladen, en particulier, n'acceptait même pas de s'attabler, et encore moins de commencer à manger. (p. 99)
 'Mladen, particularly, didn't even accept to sit at the table, much less so to start eating'

These results also confirm the claim that French often uses neutral verbs even when referring to human beings in one of the three cardinal positions: in 17 % of cases the French translator has preferred to use a neutral verb such as *rester* 'stay', *se tenir* 'to stay, to remain', *être* 'to be', *il y a* 'there is', rather than to use a posture verb. As suggested by (Lemmens 2005), "manner of being positioned in space" is not a notion that French speakers care to express, even for human posture".

When occurring with inanimate Figures, Serbian posture verbs are most often translated by neutral verbs—in 30 % of cases—and in very few cases by the French posture verb *gésir* 'to lie' (as 'to lie in the grave'). Finally, a very interesting finding is that 10 % of situations described by posture verbs in Serbian are expressed as fictive motion in French, see example (26). We present a detailed analysis of this possibility in the following. Note also the presence of other lexical items in French translations (38 %), see example (27), as well as many cases of omission (10 %).

24. SR U tankom pepelu **ležao je bačen crni pekarski nož**, krvav do dršaka. (Andrić, *Anikina vremena*: 91)
 FR Dans la cendre légère **gisait le couteau noir du boulanger**, ensanglanté jusqu'à la poignée. (p. 88)
 'in the ashes, was lying a black knife ...'
25. SR Gore u sobi, gori mu sveća i **leže otvoreni tevetri** (...). (Stanković: 71)
 '... the accounting books were lying wide open...'
 FR Là-haut, dans sa chambre, une bougie brûlait et **les livres de comptes** (...) **étaient** grands ouverts... (p. 81)
 '... the accounting books were wide open...'
26. SR Pop-Vujadinova **sudbina je stajala** pred njim prosta a neobjašnjiva: neveselo dete, usamljen mladić, nesrećan čovek. (Andrić, *Anikina vremena*: 23)

‘his destiny was standing in front of him ...’

FR **Son destin se dressait** devant lui, simple et imprévisible: un enfant triste, un jeune homme solitaire, un homme malheureux. (p. 20)

‘his destiny was standing / “rising” in front of him’

27. SR **Bačena hartija i raskidan staniol leže** u travi i belasaju se poslednjim naporom u sumraku. (Andrić, *Anikina vremena*: 16)

‘papers and leaves are lying/scattered on the grass...’

FR **Les papiers jetés et les feuilles d'étain déchirées traînaient** dans l'herbe, lançant un dernier éclat dans le crépuscule. (p. 14)
‘papers and leaves were lying/scattered on the grass...’

3.2.2. Drawing a parallel between motion and location: “high-manner-salient” vs. “low-manner-salient” languages

The comparison above shows that an extensive use of posture verbs in Serbian allows the speaker to pay more attention to the manner in which the Figure is positioned in space when localizing it. According to (Lemmens 2002a, 2002b), posture verbs can be considered as static equivalents of manner of motion verbs.

Motion

manner of motion

run, jump, swim, walk

Static location

manner of location

stand, sit, lie, hang

If one assumes that posture verbs are static equivalents of manner of motion verbs, then Serbian, as a representative of Satellite-framed languages, seems to be more ‘manner salient’ than French, which makes limited use of posture verbs. It thus appears that, in the domain of static location (as well as in the domain of motion), Satellite-framed languages pay more attention to the expression of manner than Verb-framed languages. It also appears that the distinction between “high-manner-salient” and “low-manner-salient” languages proposed for the domain of motion (Slobin 2004) can be applied to the domain of static location.

3.3. Fictive motion

We have shown that verbs expressing “fictive motion” (also called abstract or subjective motion) can serve to express static location in French and Serbian. According to Talmy’s definition, verbs expressing fictive motion are verbs whose basic reference is to motion, but which actually describe stationary situations (Talmy 2000: vol. I: ch. 2).

28. The road descends towards the coast.
29. That mountain range goes from Canada to Mexico (Talmy 2000: vol. I: 104)

In example (28), the scene is static (the road does not move), but the motion verb *to descend* is used for describing it. In such a situation, there is a mental representation of some entity moving along or over the configuration of the Ground (the fictively moving entity can be imagined as being an observer, or the focus of one’s attention or the object itself). In examples (28) and (29), the observer mentally imagines something moving along the road or along the mountain range. Many factors can motivate this kind of conceptualization of static scenes, but this is not our concern here. Fictive motion considered as a cognitive and widespread linguistic phenomenon, has been studied by several authors, see in particular (Talmy 1996, 2000: vol. 1: ch. 2; Matlock 2004a, b; Matlock and Richardson 2004; Langacker 1986, 2000; Matsumoto 1996; Rojo and Valenzuela 2003). However, the very importance of fictive motion in the expression of static location across languages has not been studied. Up to now, there are no studies that try to define cross-linguistically the place of fictive motion in the expression of static scenes. We believe that verbs expressing fictive motion are worth studying in comparison with other types of locative predicates. T. Matlock (2004a) uses the term *fictive motion construction* for sentences including fictive motion and suggests that “it may be appropriate to treat it as a subset of a more basic construction”. Our work here is an attempt to define the place of fictive motion among the other ways of expressing static location in French and Serbian.

L. Talmy (2000: vol. I: ch. 2) distinguishes many kinds of fictive motion with regard to various features². In this paper, we are concerned

² (Talmy 2000: vol. I: ch. 2) distinguishes the following types of fictive motion: Orientation Paths (e.g. *I/The arrow on the signpost pointed toward/away from/into/past the town.*), Radiation Paths (e.g. *The sun is shining into the cave/onto the back wall of the cave.*), Shadow Paths (e.g. *The pillar’s shadow fell onto/against the wall.*), Sensory Paths (e.g. *I can hear/smell him all the way from where I’m standing.*), Pattern Paths (e.g. *As I painted the ceiling, (a line of) paint spots slowly progressed across the floor.*), Frame Relative Motion (e.g. *I sat in the*

with only three of them: advent paths, coextension paths and frame relative paths. For this investigation, we thus considered a small set of verbs which express motion (e.g. *descendre*, *longer*), change of posture or shape (*se dresser*, *s'allonger*, *s'étendre*) or verbs of appearance (e.g. *apparaître*, *surgir*) and which are capable of describing fictive motion. Table 5 shows a sample of the verbs we studied in both French and Serbian. In the same table, we indicate certain morphological, temporal and aspectual properties of verb forms expressing fictive motion. Further grammatical and semantic properties of fictive motion constructions are discussed in (Matlock 2004a).

Verb type	Lan g.	Sample of studied verbs	Tense / Aspect	Person
motion	FR	<i>descendre</i> 'go down', <i>longer</i> 'go along', <i>passer</i> 'pass', <i>grimper</i> 'climb', <i>monter</i> 'go up', <i>zigzaguer</i> 'zigzag'	present, imparfait	3th person singular or plural
	SR	<i>ići</i> 'go', <i>penjati se</i> 'climb', <i>spuštati se</i> 'come down',	imperfective aspect	
change of posture /shape	FR	<i>se dresser</i> 'stand up', <i>s'élever</i> 'rise up', <i>s'allonger</i> 'stretch out', <i>s'étendre</i> 'extend',	present, imparfait	
	SR	<i>dizati se</i> 'rise', <i>protezati se</i> 'extend', <i>izdizati se</i> 'rise up', <i>širiti se</i> 'be spreading'	imperfective aspect	
appearance	FR	<i>apparaître</i> 'appear', <i>surgir</i> 'arise', <i>se dresser</i> 'stand up'	perfect, preterit, (present, imparfait)	

car and watched the scenery rush past me. or I was walking through the woods and this branch that was sticking out hit me.), Advent Paths: a) Site arrival (e.g. *The beam leans/tilts away from the wall.* – active verb form or *Termite mounds are scattered/strewn/spread/distributed all over the plain.* – passive verb form), b) Site manifestation (e.g. *This rock formation occurs/appears/shows up near volcanoes.*), Access Paths (e.g. *The bakery is across the street from the bank.*), Coextension Paths (e.g. *The fence goes/zigzags/descends from the plateau to the valley.*).

	SR	<i>pojavit</i> se ‘appaer’, <i>iskrsnuti</i> ‘arise’	perfective aspect, (imperfective aspect)	
--	----	---	---	--

Table 5. Sample of fictive motion verbs

Our corpus based study shows that fictive motion sentences from one language are generally translated by fictive motion sentences in the other, see examples (30) and (31).

Type of predicate in translation	Fictive motion			
	FR—SR		SR—FR	
Fictive motion	70 %	(30)	89 %	(31)
Neutral Verbs	10 %	(32)	∅	
Posture Verbs	5 %	(33)	∅	
Other verbs	5 %		∅	
Omission	10 %		11 %	

Table 6. Translation of fictive motion descriptions from French to Serbian and vice versa

30. FR Dehors, **la route**, comme tu sais, **s'allonge** tout droit entre deux collines, tantôt montant, puis descendant, puis montant encore. (Yourcenar, *NO*: 1242)
 SR Napolju se **drum**, kao što znaš, **pruža** pravo između dva brega, čas naviše, čas naniže, pa onda opet naviše. (p. 115)
 ‘... the road stretches out straight between the hills ...’
31. SR **Podrum se protezao** dužinom cele kuće. (Stanković: 12)
 FR **La cave s'étirait** sur toute la longueur de la maison. (p. 13)
 ‘the cellar stretched out all along the house...’
32. FR **Un lac**, rose des premiers rayons, **s'étendait** à ses pieds. (Makine: 242)
 ‘a lake ... stretched out at her feet...’
 SR Pred njom **je bilo jezero**, ružičasto pod prvim sunčevim zracima. (p. 165)
 ‘in front of her was a lake...’
33. FR La fenêtre de ma chambre donnait sur un immeuble en démolition. **Un mur** couvert de papier peint **se dressait** au milieu des gravats. (Makine: 269)
 ‘a wall ... was standing up in the middle of the rubble’

- SR Prozor moje sobe je gledao na neku zgradu u ruševinama.
Jedan zid oblepljen tapetima **stajao je** uspravno usred gomile šuta. (p. 184)
 ‘a wall ... was standing in the middle of the rubble’

This is not surprising given that both languages have a very rich verbal lexicon capable of describing fictive motion—lexical counterparts can easily be found. We would like to stress that certain spatial descriptions including posture verbs and inanimate Figures in Serbian are translated into French by fictive motion, as in examples (34) and (35), and conversely, that French fictive motion descriptions are translated into Serbian by posture verbs, see examples (33) and (36). As shown in Table 4, 10% of Serbian posture verb descriptions are translated into French by fictive motion.

34. SR Čitajući, u postalji, ja sam s časa na čas pogledao na nju kako **stoji malena a svetla i skladna stvar**, u krugu svetlosti ispod lampe. (Andrić, *Žena od slonove kosti*: 250)
 ‘a little object is standing in the circle of light...’
 FR Je lisais dans mon lit et, de temps à autre, je jetais un regard à **la petite chose gracieuse et claire qui se dressait** dans le cercle de lumière de la lampe. (p. 206)
 ‘a little object was “standing” in the circle of light...’
35. SR Nedaleko od Krnojelčeve pekarnice, malo po strani od glavne čaršije, **stajala je gazda-Nikolina kuća** u kojoj je živeo Mihailo. (Andrić, *Anikina vremena*: 80)
 ‘... his house was standing not far from the bakery ...’
 FR Pas loin de la boulangerie de Krénoyélats, un peu hors du centre **s'élevait la maison du gazda Nicola**, où vivait Mihailo. (p. 78)
 ‘... his house was standing / “rising up” not far from the bakery’
36. FR Parcourant l'île en tous sens, il finit par découvrir en effet un quillai dont **le tronc**—terrassé sans doute par la foudre ou le vent—**rampait** sur le sol dont il s'élevait médiocrement en se divisant en deux grosses branches maîtresses. (Tournier : 120)
 ‘... its trunk slithered on the ground ...’
 SR Prelazeći ostrvo u svim pravcima, na kraju je zaista otkrio jedan kilaj čije je **stablo**—bez sumnje oboreno gromom ili vetrom—**ležalo** na tlu iz kojeg se malo izdizalo račvujući se na dve glavne grane. (p. 82)

‘... its trunk was lying on the ground ...’

The translation of Serbian posture verbs by fictive motion descriptions in French is possible when the Figure entity is inanimate and when the verb does not involve any change of location. There are some exceptions, however, where the Figure is animate, as in example (37), or with manner of motion verbs that lexically involve a change of location, as in the example (36) with *rampier* ‘slither’.

37. SR Na samim vratima **stoji** **proto**, crn i bled u svetlosti luča koji neko drži za njim u hodniku. (Andrić, Anikina vremena, p. 71)
 ‘on the threshold, was standing the priest...’
- FR Sur le seuil même **se dressait** **le curé**, noir et pâle sous la lumière de la torche que quelqu’un tenait derrière lui, dans le couloir. (p. 69)
 ‘on the threshold, was “standing” the priest...’

The fact that certain spatial descriptions including posture verbs can be translated by fictive motion is not surprising. In an experimental work, (Matlock and Richardson 2004) examined whether the use of fictive motion in spatial descriptions influences eye movements, and more generally, whether this use is associated with a particular conceptual representation. The authors compared the eye movements that accompanied fictive motion (FM) sentences (e.g. *The palm trees run along the highway*), and those that accompanied non-fictive motion (NFM) sentences (e.g. *The palm trees are next to the highway*). In this work, Matlock and Richardson (2004) showed that: a) all FM- and NFM-sentences are equally sensible in meaning, b) all FM- and NFM-sentences describe comparable information, and c) all FM- and NFM-sentences are equally good descriptions of pictures used as stimuli. We believe that the same holds true for Serbian sentences with posture verbs and French translations including fictive motion. In other words, both types of descriptions are good candidates to express the situation at hand, but the former is preferred in Serbian, the latter in French. Why is that?

Our corpus is not large enough to answer this question definitively, but these preliminary results confirm our intuition that French speakers will preferably use fictive motion in describing certain static spatial scenes that are canonically described by posture verbs in Serbian. Moreover, in many cases, translating French fictive motion descriptions by posture verbs seems to be more natural than translating them by fictive motion, see example (38).

38. FR Il n'eut pas longtemps à chercher pour le découvrir. **La silhouette du grand mâle se dressait** comme un rocher au milieu d'une houle de chèvres et de chevreaux qui refluent en désordre à son approche. (Tournier : 195)

SR Nije ga morao dugo tražiti da bi ga otkrio. **Silueta velikog mužjaka uspravljala se** kao stena usred gomile koza i jariča koji su u neredu ustuknuli kada je on prišao. (p. 131) (stajala je / stajala je uspravno)

'its silhouette was standing like a rock in the middle of...'

Using the verb *uspravljati se* is not wrong, but the verb *stajati* would have been better. The translator is probably influenced by the source language. To avoid this bias, it would be interesting to collect data on the basis of visual stimuli in order to obtain comparable data in French and Serbian. We believe that the differences would be more important than what is suggested by the translation data.

These observations suggest that, to express static location with inanimate Figures, French uses either neutral verbs or fictive motion, whereas Serbian can also use posture verbs. Since French makes limited use of posture verbs, it uses fictive motion in reference to some situations described by posture verbs in Serbian. Therefore, we can conclude that the lack of an extensive use of posture verbs in French makes fictive motion more salient.

If one now tries to define the place of fictive motion among the other ways of expressing static location in French and Serbian, one can say that fictive motion plays a more important role in French than in Serbian, possibly because Serbian pays much more attention to the manner of being positioned in space. Thus, comparing French and Serbian suggests that in "high-manner-salient languages", like Serbian, fictive motion is less salient.

FR	Neutral V	Posture V	F M
SR	Neutral V	Posture V	F M

Schema 1: Different ways of expressing static location in French and Serbian and their distribution

It would be interesting to examine the importance of fictive motion in languages using a wider set of posture or positional verbs. If our hypothesis is correct that the extensive use of posture or positional verbs

makes fictive motion less salient, then this will result in a very limited usage of fictive motion in “high-manner-salient” languages.

4. Conclusion

To conclude, we ask a few questions that place this study in a more cognitive perspective.

One interesting question is whether such cross-linguistic differences in attention to fictive motion affect spatial cognition. According to (Matlock and Richardson 2004): “fictive motion processing includes mentally simulated motion”. This means that representations underlying fictive motion descriptions are not static, as can be expected, but rather dynamic. People mentally simulate motion when interpreting fictive motion sentences. (Matlock and Richardson 2004) argue that fictive motion “evokes a dynamic mental simulation, and that this simulation determines how the visual system interprets and inspects the world”. One can now ask what happens when translators use fictive motion instead of posture verbs, as we have seen for French and Serbian. Even though both types of spatial descriptions convey similar information, translating posture verbs by fictive motion considerably changes the conceptual representation of the spatial scene. Furthermore, since “simulating motion is part of fictive motion understanding” (idem), the cognitive processing of fictive motion must be more complex than the cognitive processing of other ways of expressing static spatial scenes. We can also ask whether the complexity of this cognitive processing of fictive motion can explain its relatively small share in the expression of static location across languages. Hence, an extensive use of fictive motion in certain languages can in many ways affect human spatial cognition.

References

- Ameka, F. and S. Levinson (eds). 2007. *Locative Predicates, Linguistics* 45 (5/6).
- Grinevald, C. 2006. Vers une typologie de l'expression de la localisation statique: le cas des prédicats locatifs. In *Linguistique Typologique*, edited by G. Lazard and C. Moyse, 33-54. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.

- Kopecka, A. 2004. *Etude typologique de l'expression de l'espace: localisation et déplacement en français et en polonais*. PhD Thesis, Université de Lyon 2.
- Langacker, R.W. 1986. Abstract motion. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 455-471.
- Langacker, R.W. 2000. Virtual reality. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 29: 77-103.
- Lemmens, M. 2002a. The semantic network of Dutch posture verbs. In *The Linguistics of Sitting, Standing, and Lying*, edited by J. Newman, 103-139. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lemmens, M. 2002b. Tracing referent location in oral picture descriptions. In *A Rainbow of Corpora - Corpus Linguistics and the Languages of the World*, edited by A. Wilson, P. Rayson, and T. McEnery, 73-85. München: Lincom-Europa.
- Lemmens, M. 2005. Motion and location: toward a cognitive typology. In *Parcours linguistiques. Domaine anglais*, edited by Girard-Gillet, G. 223-244. Saint-Etienne: Université de Saint Etienne.
- Levinson, S. and D. Wilkins (eds). 2006. *Grammars of Space. Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matlock, T. 2004a. The conceptual motivation of fictive motion. In *Studies in linguistic motivation*, edited by G. Radden and K.U. Panther, 221-248. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matlock, T. 2004b. Fictive motion as cognitive simulation. *Memory & Cognition* 32 (8): 1389-1400.
- Matlock, T. and Richardson, D.C. 2004. Do eye movements go with fictive motion? *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 909-914. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Matsumoto, Y. 1996. Subjective motion and English and Japanese verbs. *Cognitive Linguistics* 7: 183-226.
- Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics Annual Reports (Nijmegen) 1998, 1999, 2001. <http://www.mpi.nl/world/research/research.html>
- Newman, J. (ed.). 2002. *The Linguistics of Sitting, Standing, and Lying*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rojo, A. and J. Valenzuela. 2003. Fictive Motion in English and Spanish. *International Journal of English Studies* 3 (2): 125-151.
- Slobin, D.I. 2003. Language and thought online: cognitive consequences of linguistic relativity. In *Language in mind: Advances in the study of language and thought*, edited by D. Gentner and S. Goldin-Meadow, 157-192. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Slobin, D.I. 2004. The many ways to search for a frog: Linguistic typology and the expression of motion events. In *Relating Events in Narratives: Typological and contextual perspectives*, edited by S. Strömquist and L. Verhoeven, 219-257. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Talmy, L. 1996. Fictive motion in language and 'ception', In *Language and Space*, edited by P. Bloom, M. Peterson, L. Nadel and M. Garrett, 211-276. Cambridge, MA: MIT-Press.
- Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT-Press.

Corpus

French novels and their translations

- Duras, M. 1950. *Un barrage contre le Pacifique*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Dira, M. 1959. *Brana na Pacifiku*. Beograd: Beletra. (tr. Zorica Mišković)
- Makine, A. 1995. *Le testament français*. Paris: Mercure de France.
- Makin, A. 2001. *Francusko zaveštanje*. Beograd: Paideia. (tr. Andja Petrović)
- Perec, G. 1978. *La vie mode d'emploi*. Paris: Le livre de poche.
- Perek, Ž. 1997. *Život uputstvo za upotrebu*. Beograd: Plato. (tr. Svetlana Stojanović)
- Tournier, M. 1972. *Vendredi ou les limbes du Pacifique*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Turnije, M. 1990. *Petko ili limbovi Pacifika*. Novi Sad: Bratstvo i Jedinstvo. (tr. Gordana Stojković)
- Yourcenar, M. 1968. *L'oeuvre au noir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Jursenar, M. 2000. *Crna mena*. Beograd: BMG. (tr. Ivanka Marković)
- Yourcenar, M. 1963. *Nouvelles orientales*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Jursenar, M. 1963. *Osmeh Kraljevića Marka*. Beograd: Bigz. (tr. Djordje Dimitrijević)

Serbian novels and their translations

- Andrić, I. 1963. *Anikina vremena, Jelena, žena koje nema. Pripovetke*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Andritch, I. 1979. *Au temps d'Anika, Au temps d'Anika. La soif*. Paris: L'Age d'Homme. (tr. Anne Yelen et Jean Descat)
- Andrić, I. 2002. *L'Eléphant du vizir*. Paris: Le Serpent à plumes. (tr. Janine Matillon)

- Andrić, I. [1955] 1963. *Prokleta avlija*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Andritch, I. 1962. *La Cour maudite*. Paris: Stock. (tr. Georges Luciani)
- Pavić, M. 1997. *Le chapeau en peau de poisson*. Monaco: Editions du Rocher (bilingual edition). (tr. Gojko Lukić and Gabriel Iaculli)
- Stanković, B. 1982. *Gazda-Mladen*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Stanković, B. 2000. *Gazda-Mladen*. Lausanne: l'Age d'homme. (tr. Dejan Babić)