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Abstract: The article discusses fictive motion in coextension paths in Serbian and a possible reverse conceptual transfer in translating from English (L2) to Serbian (L1). In investigating the phenomenon, we have devised an English (L2) to Serbian (L1) translation questionnaire for Serbian learners of English to examine contrastively the conceptualisation and encoding of coextension paths in English (L2) and Serbian (L1) and the processing of coextension paths in translating from L2 to L1. The presence of fictive motion in both languages implies its pervasiveness, but the frequency of individual verbs in Serbian points to the fact that certain motion verbs are rather restricted in their fictive motion usage, while English fictive motion expressions allow for a wider variety of verbs. This indicates that encoding coextension paths in Serbian is rather constrained in motion verbs usage, which should be an important distinction to follow in restraining reverse conceptual transfer.
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Fictive motion across languages

Given the fact that fictive motion has been studied in many languages, such as English, Japanese, Finnish, Estonian, Thai, Hebrew and Spanish (cf. Talmy, 1996; Langacker, 1986; Matsumoto, 1996; Amagawa, 1997; Taremaa, 2013; Valenzuela & Rojo, 2009; Matlock, 2011), in the present study, through translation we examine the encoding of coextension paths in Serbian (L1) and English (L2) in order to contrast the expressions
in use in the two languages and to corroborate the premises that the transfer of fictive motion conceptualisation from L2 to L1 is rather low and that L2 encoding patterns do not interfere with the translation into L1 as translation is determined by L1 conceptualisation.

Several publications have appeared recently which document the usage of motion verbs in encoding fictive motion in a number of languages. Matsumoto (1996) has extensively dealt with the features of Japanese and English fictive motion expressions. The research rests on the premise that the differences between the two languages lie in the aspectual nature of verbs and the type of motion verbs used to describe a non-traversable linear entity. The study has demonstrated that the similarities between the two languages are rooted in the very nature of fictive motion as a cognitive phenomenon, while the differences are of grammatical and lexical character; thus, fictive motion is rooted in human conceptualization, but within every language there are linguistic restrictions and peculiarities which depend on the grammatical and lexical resources of the language.

Rojo and Valenzuela (2003) have endeavoured to contrast fictive motion expressions in English and Spanish to verify their supposition that the differences reported in the expression of factual motion in the two languages could apply to fictive motion expressions in the two languages. The research relied on the studies of strategies employed in English to Spanish translations and on a corpus of expressions generated using elicitation from drawings. Speaking of the results of the former inquiry, Rojo and Valenzuela (2003) demonstrated that in translating from English into Spanish translators habitually resorted to translation procedures by which to retain faithfulness to the original English fictive expressions, which is rarely the case when real motion expressions are translated. In the latter inquiry, Rojo and Valenzuela (2003) interviewed
English native speakers and Spanish native speakers by using the stimuli of seven pairs of black-and-white drawings of four different types of roads, a picket fence, a hedge and a bridge. The pairs included one complete picture and one picture with a missing path-like element. The subjects were interviewed in their respective native languages by being shown the pairs of drawings and being asked to give instructions on how to complete the unfinished picture B to make it identical to picture A in order to describe a fictive motion scenario. The results have pointed to the differences in fictive motion expressions of the two languages – streets, bushes, rivers, etc., were spontaneously used in fictive motion expressions by the English respondents in their language but were not used by the Spanish respondents in theirs. As Rojo and Valenzuela (2003) conclude, these interview results could indicate rhetorical differences between the languages to be investigated further.

Cognitive-linguistic concerns have rarely been correlated with translation research in the linguistic literature. Alonso (2011) has referred to the theoretical framework of conceptual transfer by Jarvis (2007) to explicate how conceptual transfer applies in translation. The author examines the translation of motion events patterns from Spanish (L1) into English (L2). The results of the translation task distributed to Spanish students of English have shown that the informants followed Spanish lexicalization patterns in English translations by encoding path in the main verb and manner as a separate constituent, thus transferring Spanish motion event patterns into English, in which manner of motion is encoded in a single lexical item and path is represented in a satellite. In her investigation, Alonso (2011) draws on the conceptual transfer hypothesis (CTH), which is concerned with how speakers use lexicalized and grammaticized concepts acquired in one language when performing in another language. Methodologically speaking, Alonso (2011) claims that in CTH research
language-performance data is necessary to show that the differences in cognition between two languages influence the choices a speaker makes in the target language. The author bases her study on translation data, which serve to explain the transfer of L1 lexicalization patterns in motion events into L2 as conceptual transfer, since it is evident that Spanish and English differ in conceptualizing and encoding motion events. Consequently, in translation education, the lexicalization and conceptual patterns of L1 and L2 have to be understood for appropriate translation, while more attention should be given to the cognitive structure of motion events in the training of translators.

In another study, Alonso (2013) has discussed translation tasks which suggest that when Spanish learners of English translate the sentences provided in the test into English, they employ the lexicalization pattern of non-manner verb + manner as a separate constituent in boundary-crossing situations, transferring the lexicalization patterns of Spanish into English. The study focuses on boundary-crossing constraint, which involves the information on whether a path involves the crossing of a spatial boundary. The tendency not to code manner and motion in the main verb is also be observed in non-boundary-crossing situations, which suggests that transfer from Spanish influences the conflation of motion and manner in the main verb in both boundary and non-boundary-crossing situations in English, although in English the pattern is typical of boundary-crossing situations.

Aransáez (1999) deals with differences in the use of motion verbs in Spanish and English and their effect on English to Spanish translations. The study is carried out on the sample of sentences from Oscar Wilde’s “The Happy Prince” and the Spanish translation in order to determine the significance of crosslinguistic contrast in motion verbs in the two languages. The differences are obvious in lexico-syntactic patterns in the languages contrasted in encoding manner. In Spanish, a participle, a noun or a
A prepositional phrase is needed to express manner, whereas in English the element of manner is included in the verb itself. The strategies employed by the Spanish translators involve (a) omitting the component of manner if the English motion verb has no direct Spanish equivalent and (b) encoding the manner information by means of additional lexical resources in Spanish.

**Coextension paths in English to Serbian translation**

**Fictive Motion in Coextension Paths**

Talmy (2000, pp. 138–139) defines a coextension path as a depiction of the form, orientation, or location of a spatially extended object in terms of a path over the object's extent. The fact in this fictive motion is that the object is stationary and no entity is actually traversing the depicted path. The fictivity rests on the representation of an entity as if it were moving along or over the configuration of the object depicted. What should be observed here is that, although it is not explicit, the entity which is fictively moving is the observer’s focus of attention, as in the sentence *The fence goes/zigzags/helms from the plateau to the valley* (Talmy, 2000, pp. 138–139). In the sentence cited, as Talmy (2000, pp. 138–139) explains, a factive representation is that of the fence as a stationary object with linear extent and a particular contour, orientation, and location in geographic space; the fictive representation is evoked by the literal sense of the sentence, in which an observer, or our focus of attention, or some image of the fence itself advancing along its own axis, moves from one end of the fence along its length to the other end of the fence. Talmy (2000, p. 138) notes that coextension paths can be linear, e.g. *The fence goes from the plateau to the valley*, radially outward over a two-dimensional plane, e.g. *The field spreads out in all directions from the granary*, or lateral, e.g. *The weather front advanced toward the east.*
To our knowledge, detailed studies of fictive motion in Serbian are still lacking (see Stojičić & Stamenković, 2015). Very many motion verbs in the language are frequently used to encode fictive motion, such as the following verbs discussed in Stamenković (2013, pp. 175–206), whose usage in coextension path expressions we shall illustrate below:

(1) ићи ‘go’

Између кућица иде мала уличица.

between house-PL go-PRES little street
‘between the houses goes a little street’

(2) кренути ‘set out’

Неколико корака даље креће уличица према центру.

few step-PL away set-PRES out little street towards downtown
‘a few steps away a small street leaves towards downtown’

(3) одлазити ‘leave’

Одатле одлази пуст ходник.

from it leave-PRES vacant corridor
‘a vacant corridor leaves from there’;

(4) изаћи ‘go out’

Улица излази на булевар.

street go-PRES out on boulevard
‘the street enters the boulevard;

(5) поћи ‘set off’

Од раскрнице полази једносмерна улица.

from junction set-PRES off one-way street
‘from the junction there goes a one-way street’
In Serbian, the nouns which regularly occur in fictive motion expressions denote the following entities:

(a) traversable paths, such as a railway, path and street;

(b) non-traversable paths, i.e. paths not traversable by humans but used for the conveyance of gas, water or electricity, such as the conduits transmission line, gas pipeline and cable; and

(c) boundaries and borders, which are perceived as non-traversable imaginary lines, less palpable than the entities under (a) and (b).

Fictive motion expressions in Serbian are typically accompanied by phrases which refer to the following:

(a) the direction of motion in fictive terms, i.e. the direction in which the path extends in factual terms:

Далековод иде на север ка Алексинцу.

transmission line go-PRES to north towards Aleksinac

‘the transmission line goes northwards toward Aleksinac’;

(b) the point from which the motion starts in fictive terms, i.e. the point from which the path length can be measured in factual terms:

Od Беле Паланке аутопут скрече на југ.

from Bela Palanka highway turn-PRES to east

‘from Bela Palanka the highway turns eastward’;

(c) the point at which the motion ends in fictive terms, i.e. the point to which the path can be measured in factual terms:

Граница иде до међе број 1674.

Border go-PRES to demarcation line number 1674

‘the border goes to the demarcation line number 1674’;
(d) the area across which the entity travels in fictive terms, i.e. the territory through which the path extends in factual terms:

Оптички кабл пролази кроз Димитровград.

optical cable pass-PRES through Dimitrovgrad

‘the optical cable passes through Dimitrovgrad’;

(e) the line or a course along which the entity moves in fictive terms, i.e. another path to which the given path is parallel or over the length of which it is continuing in factual terms:

Граница иде реком низводно.

boundary go-PRES along river downstream

‘the boundary goes downstream along the river’.

Standardized fictive motion expressions in frequent use in Serbian suggest that the verbs indicating the way in which motion develops, i.e. manner of motion, are restricted to literary register in which they contribute to lexical richness, such as вијугати ‘twist’, кривудати ‘wind’ and врлудати ‘meander, snake’, typically used with the noun путь ‘road’.

**English to Serbian translation research into coextension path encoding**

In this study, we employed an English to Serbian translation questionnaire to collect data on Serbian native speakers’ sense of naturalness in coextension path encoding when translating from English. The objectives of the study were to (1) explore translation responses to motion verbs expressing coextension paths in the English sentences assigned, (2) examine the contrasts between coextension path conceptualisations and encoding in Serbian and English and (3) investigate statistically significant differences between the trained and non-trained students’ responses.
The sample of English fictive motion sentences in the questionnaire, we shall provide below, includes the sentences in which actual motion verbs are used to encode coextension paths. Moreover, the sentences contain standard and typical fictive motion expressions, so that we excluded creative/poetic exceptions or literary metaphor, e.g. *To the left the avenue sweeps westward* (actual motion *The car swept by the house gate*) (cf. “metaphorical non-actual motion”, Blomberg & Zlatev, 2014). The sentences were extracted from the *British National Corpus* (BNC), a representative official sample of English, to which we referred to rely on naturally-occurring expressions. Furthermore, the authenticity of sentences helped us determine which individual motion verbs are frequently used in English in coextension paths, and, devise the questionnaire accordingly to include factual data for the respondents to process in translation. We also relied on *Word frequency data from the Corpus of Contemporary American English* (Davies, 2014) for the frequency of usage of motion verbs in actual motion sentences in English. The sample of fictive motion sentences examined in the BNC suggested that coextension paths are typically associated with the entities such as road, path, river, track, trail, railway and boundary. The questionnaire comprises the following fifteen English sentences:

(1) *A small river runs into the sea.*

(2) *The boundary goes parallel with the river.*

(3) *The road goes under the extension of the bridge.*

(4) *The path passes round a bay.*

(5) *The road winds along the coast.*

(6) *We picked him up at a corner where the road leaves Helsinki.*

(7) *A stream runs past the house.*

(8) *From the start, the path travels beside the river.*
The river rushes over rocks.

The important thing for us is where the state border runs.

The village is surrounded by woods through which a trail runs.

The track climbs through the woodland.

Alongside the beach runs a palm tree avenue.

The railway runs through a tunnel behind the hotel.

A new path climbs the steep bank.

The total of 150 Serbian respondents participated in the survey, all of them students of English as a foreign language (EFL). The respondents were two groups of students of advanced knowledge of English– (i) a group of 63 students of the 1st year of study with no translation training and (ii) a group of 87 students of the 4th year of study with advanced translation training.

We specified the following categories to code the responses in the questionnaire:

(0) NoAnswer – no response or incomplete response;

(1) FictiveS – fictive motion preserved in the translation, the Serbian verb is the equivalent of the given English verb;

(2) FictiveD – fictive motion preserved in the translation, the Serbian verb is not the equivalent of the given English verb;

(3) NTPathExt – the Serbian verb expresses a non-traversable path or a type of extension which involves a non-motion verb;

(4) NonFictive – fictive motion not preserved in the translation;

(5) NonFictiveW – non-fictive (factual) motion of water described.

We shall describe the statistical analysis we performed with a database created in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 16.0. Further, we shall qualitatively assess the quantitative results by examining the responses in which coextension path is
preserved in Serbian translations to reconsider Serbian equivalents to the given English expressions provided in the process of translation.

**Data Analysis**

**Table 1.** The frequency data for each response category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Response category percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) A small river runs into the sea.</td>
<td>NonFictiveW (98.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The boundary goes parallel with the river.</td>
<td>NonFictive (72.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The road goes under the extension of the bridge.</td>
<td>FictiveD (62.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) The path passes round a bay.</td>
<td>FictiveS (69.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) The road winds along the coast.</td>
<td>FictiveD (52.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) We picked him up at a corner where the road leaves Helsinki.</td>
<td>NonFictive (65.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) A stream runs past the house.</td>
<td>NonFictiveW (74.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) From the start, the path travels beside the river.</td>
<td>FictiveD (59.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) The river rushes over rocks.</td>
<td>NonFictiveW (65.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) The important thing for us is where the state border runs.</td>
<td>NonFictive (72.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) The village is surrounded by woods through which a trail runs.</td>
<td>FictiveD (84.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) The track climbs through the woodland.</td>
<td>FictiveS (74.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Alongside the beach runs a palm tree avenue.</td>
<td>NTPathExt (53.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) The railway runs through a tunnel behind the hotel.</td>
<td>FictiveD (84.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) A new path climbs the steep bank.</td>
<td>FictiveS (62.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 contains response category frequency data for each of the English sentences used in the questionnaire. Generally speaking, what the translations in which fictive motion is preserved have in common is a coextension path conceptualised as a motion along a traversable path. The clear-cut fictive motion cases are the translations of sentences (3), (4), (8), (11), (12), (14) and (15). The verbs in the English sentences readily translated by fictive motion expressions in Serbian are those which express motion without the information about the shape of the path or the manner of motion,
such as go, run and pass. Accordingly, in sentences (3), (4), (8), (11) and (14) the verbs go, pass, travel and run are translated either by ићи ‘go’ or пролазити ‘pass’, for example Пут иде / пролази испод продужетка моста ‘the road goes / passes under the extension of the bridge’, Стаза иде / пролази око залива ‘the path goes / passes around the bay’, Село је окружен шумом кроз коју иде / пролази стаза ‘the village is surrounded by woods through which a trail runs / passes’ and Пруга иде / пролази кроз тунел иза хотела ‘the railway goes / passes through a tunnel behind the hotel’. As for sentence (8), we find that the percentage of the fictive motion expressions used in Serbian translation may reflect a kind of vacillation between Serbian fictive and non-fictive options, since the Serbian verb путовати ‘travel’ is not associated with trajectories and not used to depict fictive motion. This is rather expected, as the equivalent путовати ‘travel’ is not typically used to express fictive motion in Serbian, and is restricted to human factual motion. In translation, coextension path is transferred by the verbs ићи ‘go’ and пролазити ‘pass’ which have a more general meaning (Од почетка, стаза иде / пролази поред реке ‘from the start, the path travels beside the river’). The verb climb in sentences (12) and (15) depicts the direction of the path, which is transferred into Serbian mainly by means of the verb пењати се, a literal translation of the English verb. The Serbian verb is not commonly used to depict a path as sloping upwards, but it is not nonstandard, e.g. Стаза се пење уз шумовит предео ‘the track climbs through the woodland’.

The sentences (2) and (10), which have a lower score of fictive motion transfer into Serbian, involve a boundary and a border, which are non-traversable delineations. These entities are not usually associated with the representations of co-extension path in Serbian; consequently, instead of motion verbs, the responses in the questionnaire involved the use of stative verbs бити ‘be’ and простирати се ‘extend’, e.g. Граница
је паралелна са реком ‘the boundary is parallel with the river’ and Граница се простире паралелно са реком ‘the boundary extends in a parallel position with the river’. In sentences (1), (7) and (9) the verbs run and rush are used to describe the path unfolded by a body of water in a river and a stream; the respondents chiefly opted for verbs which describe actual motion of water in Serbian, i.e. уливати се ‘flow in’ and ‘flow’, and did not transfer the fictive motion. We believe that the focus in the three English sentences is on the path of a body of water, whereas, in Serbian translations it is on the motion of water.

Sentences (6) and (13) exhibit low scores in fictive motion transfer in translation although they refer to traversable paths, i.e. a road and an avenue. In sentence (6) the low score may be the result of the cognitive-linguistic fact that Serbian speakers do not conceive paths as “leaving” a place nor do they represent this instance of fictive motion in language use while in sentence (13) the respondents seem to have focused on a line of palm trees rather than on the extension of the avenue. In sentence (13), the dominant responses involve the verbs that express a non-traversable path or an extension involving non-motion verbs, such as простирати се ‘extend’, пружати се ‘stretch’ and протезати се ‘stretch’.

The translations of sentences (1), (2), (6), (7), (9), (10) and (13) do not transfer fictive motion into Serbian, which means that conceptualisation and encoding patterns of certain coextension paths from L2 have not interfered into L1 patterns in translation. We presume the reverse conceptual transfer (the transfer from L2 to L1; cf. Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008, pp. 22; 99) was averted for the following reasons:

(a) sentences (1) and (7) – Serbian speakers conceive river and stream as flowing water, rather than the path of the water flow, so that the translations depict the motion of the liquid itself, in factual terms, e.g. Мала река се улива у море ‘a
small river flows into the sea’ or Поток тече поред куће ‘a stream flows past the house’. The same applies to sentence (9), of which there are only fourteen translations with the motion verb јурити ‘rush’ (Мала река јури преко камења ‘a small river rushes over the rocks’), while the rest contain the actual motion verb течи ‘flow’, modified by the adverb брзо ‘quickly’, e.g. Мала река брзо тече преко камења ‘a small river flows quickly over the rocks’;

(b) sentences (2) and (10) – the impalpability and non-traversability is dominant in Serbian conceptualisation of the direction and position of borders and boundaries; the translation Граница иде паралелно са реком ‘the boundary runs parallel with the river’, which incorporates a fictive motion expression, is less frequent (23 responses) than the translations in which the respondents used the stative verbs простирати се ‘extend’ and пружати се ‘stretch’;

(c) sentence (6) – the verb завршити се ‘end’ is predominantly used in Serbian translations e.g. ... где се пут за Хелсинки завршава ‘... where the road to Helsinki ends’; there are nine translations which contain the verb напустити ‘leave’, but we find the naturalness of the translation ?...где пут напушта Хелсинки ‘where the road leaves Helsinki’ questionable since in Serbian the verb is restricted to actual motion use. Such responses should then be classified into reverse conceptual transfer;

(d) sentence (13) – the exclusion of fictive motion from the translation of this sentence was almost certainly influenced by the prepositional phrase alongside the beach in the English sentence, which induced the respondents to choose the stative verb протезати се ‘stretch’ to encode position rather than motion, e.g. Дуж плаже се протеже стаза са палмама ‘a palm tree avenue stretches alongside the beach’.
Some translations in the questionnaire also suggest that the usage of fictive motion with manner verbs is rather restricted in Serbian. In coextension paths, manner verbs are used to encode the shape of the path, but as we mentioned above, such verbs are used primarily in literary register in Serbian. Therefore, more than a half of the translations of sentence (5) feature fictive motion expressions of which only nine instances involve the manner verbs вијугати ‘twist’ or кривудати ‘wind’, which transfer the image of the curving course of the road from the English sentence. More frequently used expressions in the translation of sentence (5) involve the verbs ићи ‘go’, e.g. Пут иде дуж обале ‘the road goes along the coast’ and пролазити ‘pass’, e.g. Пут пролази око обале ‘the road passes around the coast’.

In the course of processing the data from the questionnaire, we gained some additional information related to statistically significant differences between the groups of respondents, which we believe may be related to their translation training. These significant differences (tested against Chi-Square tests – Pearson Chi-Square, Likelihood Ratio, and Linear-by-Linear Association) were found in translating sentences (2), (3), (4) and (13). With these sentences, the percentage of non-fictive motion responses was significantly larger in the group of respondents with translation training in comparison with the other respondents, as the following figures show:

- Sentence (2):
  
  *NonFictive*: the 1st year: 55.5%, the 4th year: 83.9%
  
  *NTPathExt*: the 1st year: 15.1%, the 4th year: 12.5%

- Sentence (3):
  
  *FictiveS/D*: the 1st year: 74.5%, the 4th year: 49.7%

- Sentence (4):
  
  *NTPathExt*: the 1st year: 15.5%, the 4th year: 34.8%
FictiveS/D: the 1st year: 76.9%, the 4th year: 66.4%

- Sentence (13):
  
  NonFictive: the 1st year: 33.5%, the 4th year: 45.0%

  FictiveS/D: the 1st year: 15.5%, the 4th year: 2.5%

  NTPathExt: the 1st year: 43.0%, the 4th year: 52.4%

We believe that in the sentences discussed the advanced translation training of the respondents may correlate with a scarcer usage of fictive motion. Presumably, their sense of naturalness in translation induced them to discard fictive options whenever possible; such responses may be based on the idea that fictive motion expressions may add to “foreignness” in Serbian sentences, due to the following:

  (a) the differences in the conceptualisation and encoding of coextension paths in Serbian and English;

  (b) a rather restricted use of Serbian motion verbs in coextension path expressions; and

  (c) few direct equivalents of the English expressions assigned.

The advanced translation training enhances the sense of naturalness and the awareness of contrasts between L1 and L2, which restricts the reverse conceptual transfer.

All in all, the data we collected in the questionnaire indicate a low conceptual transfer when translating coextension path expressions into L1. The data suggest that coextension paths in Serbian are encoded to depict an extended object in terms of a fictive path over its extent by means of motion verbs in order to (a) determine the location and the distance mobile entities, such as vehicles, people or trains, cover when traversing a traversable path, such as a road, street, highway and railway and (b) specify the parameters of a boundary/border delineation, as the entity is otherwise of low localizability. When translating, the respondents were well aware of the fact that in
Serbian some motion verbs have a more restricted usage in fictive motion expressions than their English equivalents.

**Conclusion**

As mentioned above, motion verbs in Serbian are typically used to (a) determine the location and the distance mobile entities (people or vehicles) cover when traversing them, (b) specify the points from which and to which electricity, gas or water is transported, and (c) specify the parameters of the delineation of non-traversable paths of low localizability (boundary, border). In the present study, we have employed a translation questionnaire for 150 Serbian students of EFL to explore the ways in which fictive motion is processed in translating from English (L2) to Serbian (L1) and the contrasts between encoding coextension paths in English and Serbian. The analysis has shown that the translation sentences in which English coextension paths are paraphrased due to the differences in the encoding resources in the two languages indicate that reverse conceptual transfer with fictive motion has been low in this case study. Also, being aware of the fact that Serbian fictive motion expressions encode manner primarily in literary register and that it is not typical of everyday language, the respondents rarely employed manner motion verbs in the translation. Furthermore, the sentences assigned suggest that in English very many types of extended objects receive fictive motion descriptions; yet, in translation, the respondents employed static descriptions with certain entities since we hold that in Serbian the impalpability, low localizability and non-traversability of entities, such as a border and a boundary, affect the description of the entities’ extension in fictive terms. We assume that the percentage scores for individual sentences with regard to the employment of fictive motion in Serbian translations respectively indicate that fictive motion in Serbian exhibits its own
specificities as to the linguistic representations of the conceptual phenomenon examined, which suggests contrastive differences between the two languages, which were followed in the process of translation.
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