

Shifting viewpoints: How does that actually work across languages? An exercise in parallel text analysis¹

1. Introduction

The questions that comparative stylistic research is dealing with are simultaneously quite concrete and quite general. On the one hand, we are interested in a very concrete question of cross-linguistic comparison: How exactly is a specific discourse pattern in English— one in which the dominant viewpoint shifts from the narrator to a character in a story rather smoothly— rendered in Chinese, a language that does not have direct parallels of the linguistic features that constitute the English pattern? On the other hand, and at the same time, we are interested in a much more general theoretical and methodological question, namely, how precisely this *type* of question may and should be investigated: What procedures and what kind of data are appropriate, and especially: What is the status of concepts that we use in such a comparative study? The main goal of this paper is to address these general methodological and conceptual questions. We will do so by means of a detailed comparison of a small number of highly significant text fragments involving mixed viewpoints, using parallel texts: four translations from an English original to Chinese, and one from Chinese to English.

2. Method, data and research question

The use of parallel texts —putting an original alongside its translation(s) and comparing them for the purpose of semantic and grammatical analysis— already has some history and some systematic reflection in linguistics in general (Barlow 2008; Chamonikolasova 2007; Cysouw and Wälchli 2007; Van der Auwera et. al 2005). The use of parallel texts is highly beneficial, as by seeing the author and the translators as sensible text producers that try to get across the same conceptual contents in different languages, it allows us to compare how a usage-event is verbalized by the speakers of different languages, i.e. with different sets of linguistic tools available to each text producer.² It moreover allows us to compare languages in a more time-efficient way than experimental methods would, if the researcher has adequate knowledge of all or most of the languages involved.³

The method has also gained interest in cognitive linguistics in recent years, witness Rojo and Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2013), Slobin (1996, 2003), Tabakowska (1993, 2014), Verkerk (2014), among others. However, in the study of viewpoint phenomena, the parallel-corpus-based approach is still almost new, Tabakowska (2014) being the only study, as far as we know. Tabakowska investigates viewpoint manifestations in *Alice in Wonderland* in terms of

¹ Parts of this study were presented at the 12th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference (ICLC-12) and 2014 Conference on Language, Discourse and Cognition (CLDC 2014). We thank the conference participants for suggestions. We also thank two reviewers for insightful comments on a previous version, with the usual disclaimers applying. The completion of this paper was partially supported by the project “Employment of Best Young Scientists for International Cooperation Empowerment” (CZ.1.07/2.3.00/30.0037) co-financed by the European Social Fund and the Czech Republic.

² The method also has its own specific limitations, as translational discourse may be different from natural discourse. See Xiao (2010), for instance, for how translational Chinese is different from Chinese discourse that is spontaneously produced by native speakers. Another issue taken with parallel texts is that translations are largely confined to the written genre (Verkerk 2014:34). But in spite of the above constraints, the parallel text is still a powerful tool for contrastive linguistic research.

³ For a more comprehensive overview of use of parallel texts in linguistics research, see Verkerk (2014) and Wälchli (2007).

the theoretical framework of Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987, 2008), using the original and five different Polish translations. Most extensively, she discusses reference (in view of the fact that Polish, unlike English, lacks the systematic distinction into definite and indefinite articles), and then more briefly the use of aspect (involving differences between the Polish imperfective and the English progressive), epistemic modality, de-idiomatization and iconicity, as tools for viewpoint construction in *Alice* and its Polish translations. They function as signals for different aspects of common ground shared by Alice, the narrator and the reader, and thus as indicators of a particular point of view in a clause or text fragment. However, although Tabakowska mentions the classical narratological and stylistic phenomenon of Speech and Thought Representation (STR), and especially that of viewpoint mixture in so-called Free Indirect Discourse (FID), she does not include these in her analysis. Given their importance and pervasiveness, we consider it useful to focus on these in this study. Our goal, moreover, goes beyond a demonstration of the usefulness of a cognitive semantic approach to translation studies: We will argue that the detailed study of translations (in this case in English and Mandarin Chinese) of STR fragments provides evidence for the radically language-specific nature of the grammatical tools for ‘implementing’ viewpoints.⁴

Given that verbalizations of the same usage event are largely aligned sentence by sentence in parallel texts, the special organization of texts creates a methodological opportunity that allows us to look into this research issue: How may grammatical constructions involved in viewpoint management be compared cross-linguistically? Put more precisely, when we see a viewpoint construction of Language A in a certain stretch of discourse, do we also systematically find some counterpart, or translation equivalent, in its translation in Language B? If not, what do we find in Language B and what does that tell us about viewpoint management cross-linguistically?

To answer this query, we also begin, like Tabakowska, with a study of *Alice in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll, now alongside its Chinese translations published in Taiwan. *Alice in Wonderland* is well known for its juxtaposition of the narrator’s voice with the protagonist’s voice that reflects the author’s split personality (see Tabakowska 2014 for a review and for further references). We use four Chinese translations, done by Yuan-ren Chao, by Li-fang Chen, by Hui-hsien Wang, and by Wenhao Jia and Wenyuan Jia. We focus on a special, highly significant pattern of STR in the original, and the different ways that translators have dealt with it in the Mandarin translations, constrained by the conventional grammatical patterns of that language.

To counterbalance the possible impression that English would provide a ‘richer’ toolkit for viewpoint management than Mandarin, we also present a brief case study of translation in the opposite direction: from Mandarin to English; the original text is *Jiu Guo* (*The Republic of Wine*), a Chinese masterpiece written by Mo Yan, Nobel laureate in 2012, and the translation into English, done by Howard Goldblatt. Our choice of *Jiu Guo* was motivated by the hallucinatory realism of Mo Yan’s writing, which was one of the main reasons for Mo Yan’s receiving the Nobel Prize for Literature.

3. Mixing Viewpoints in *Alice in Wonderland* and Its Four Chinese Translations

First we will demonstrate a recurrent textual patterns of mixing viewpoints used by Lewis Carroll. Our examples all come from the first chapter, but readers can easily verify that it is in fact characteristic of, and throughout, the whole book. In section 3.1, we identify the grammatical patterns which allow the author to construct this specific pattern. As we will

⁴ As we will see, grounding predications of the type that Tabakowska focuses on, will ultimately turn out to be important in our analysis as well, especially in the section on *Jiu Guo*.

show, at least part of this pattern is specific to the grammar of English – it is based on an English *convention* for connecting a reported to a reporting clause, a convention that does not as such exist in Mandarin. In section 3.2, we present the corresponding passages in the Mandarin versions to demonstrate and evaluate different strategies employed in the translations.

3.1. Analysis of the English text

The very first sentence (and paragraph) of *Alice in Wonderland* reads as follows:

- (1a) Alice was beginning to get very tired of sitting by her sister on the bank, and of having nothing to do: once or twice she had peeped into the book her sister was reading, but it had no pictures or conversations in it, ‘and what is the use of a book,’ thought Alice ‘without pictures or conversations?’

The fragment appears to start with an outsider’s view of Alice sitting on the bank (though with some *hint* of an internal mental state: experiencing boredom), and ends clearly and unambiguously with a *direct* evocation of a highly specific thought of Alice, in her own words (“direct thought”). It is worthwhile to consider in some detail how exactly the point of view progresses from (almost) completely outside to completely internal to Alice. At least the following elements, and their specific combination, play a role. One is the coordinating conjunction *and*⁵ at the beginning of Alice’s direct thought, and the fact that *and* is in lower case (preceded by a comma). The use of the coordinating conjunction *and*, in lower case, presents Alice’s *direct* thought as a straightforward continuation of the text segment preceding it – so this preceding segment must at least to *some* extent also represent Alice’s thought; put differently, in terms of content: The (rhetorical) question in quotation marks is Alice’s thought; it must be based on some consideration presented in the text preceding it (*but it had no pictures or conversations in it*); so this must also to some extent contain Alice’s thought; the combination of the comma, conjunction, and lower case marks the direct thought as part of a *train* of thoughts. But up until the first quotation mark, this train of thoughts is not presented as a *direct* representation, in Alice’s own words, so here it is partly the narrator who is responsible for the wording and the presentation of Alice’s thought: in this sense, this segment – the first conjunct of *and* – shows a mixture of viewpoints: the content primarily gives Alice’s point of view (what she perceives as a result of her ‘peeping’ into her sister’s book), but it is presented to us in the narrator’s voice.

Another element is the combination of the contrastive conjunction *but* and the negation (*no pictures or conversations*) in the fragment itself. As these evoke a configuration of mental spaces with different epistemic stances towards the same object of conceptualization (Verhagen 2005, ch.2, and references cited there), they in fact invite the reader to imagine some mental agent who might be looking for or expecting to see pictures or conversations. In the present context, the best candidate is of course Alice (an expectation that is quickly fulfilled with the repetition of the words *pictures or conversations* in Alice’s direct thought); this makes the use of *and* at the start of the direct thought as natural as it is. So the contrastive conjunction and the negation are linguistic cues pointing to Alice’s viewpoint, her world view

⁵ Strictly speaking, the element *and* may also function as a discourse marker. In this context, however, its status as a conjunction seems clear. Moreover, as we will see, there are other instances of the same pattern in which the place of *and* is taken by an element that is unambiguously a conjunction.

and expectations, even though the narrator is (co-)responsible for the wording;⁶ this also contributes to this fragment creating a ‘smooth’ transition between the initially external (narrator) viewpoint and the final internal (Alice) viewpoint.

Thirdly, there is the relative ordering of the reported and the reporting clause, i.e. the medial placement of the reporting clause, *between* two parts of the reported clause.⁷ In order for the gradual shift in viewpoint to work, the reporting clause must not be placed before the reported clause (as in prototypical direct discourse). Compare (1a) with the constructed example (1b) below.

- (1b) ...but it had no pictures or conversations in it, and/so Alice thought: ‘(and) what is the use of a book without pictures or conversations?’

The stylistic effect of a smooth transition between external and internal viewpoints no longer exists in (1b), where the full clause in the narrator’s discourse is now structurally severed from Alice’s direct thought. As a consequence, the use of a coordinating conjunction at the beginning of this direct thought is also less felicitous (*and* would have to be interpreted differently here, perhaps as a discourse marker; hence the parentheses): it cannot immediately connect to a relevant piece of information in the preceding context. The structural independence of the two text segments in the narration thus has important consequences for the management of the viewpoints in the text. As stated above, the thought that the book contains no pictures or conversations is primarily Alice’s (though filtered through the narrator’s voice); in (1b), by contrast, we are now pushed towards reading the *but*-clause as an explanation of Alice’s (naïve) response to the book by the *narrator*.

Sentence (1a) is definitely not the only one exhibiting this particular effect of a very gradual transition from narrator’s to Alice’s viewpoint, dependent on precisely this combination of linguistic items. Example (2) is another instance, which we will explain in a bit less detail.

- (2) ... but she could not even get her head through the doorway; ‘and even if my head would go through,’ thought poor Alice, ‘it would be of very little use without my shoulders. [...]’

As we can see, (2) is structurally highly similar to (1a). Both excerpts comprise a full narrative clause followed by a secondary boundary mark⁸, a lower case coordinating conjunction that starts the direct thought of the character (containing a repetition of an element in the first conjunct: here *head*), with a medial reporting clause. The only difference is the use of a semicolon at the end of the full clause in the narration. A semicolon also indicates interdependency of the conjoined clauses, so it still contributes to the slow shifting of the viewpoint when used in this position, like the comma in (1a).

As the narrative unfolds, the next passage that shares the same pattern, now with the coordinating conjunction *for*, is (3).

⁶ One might want to take this as a basis for labelling this clause as Free Indirect Discourse (FID), but it does not show the linguistic characteristics traditionally associated with it, especially not a mixture of past tense with proximal adverbs (such sentences do occur elsewhere in the text, e.g. *she was now only ten inches high*). On the other hand, this observation could be a starting point for a criticism of the traditional conception of FID, but we will not pursue that issue here.

⁷ According to Quirk et al. (1985: 1022) “[m]edial position is very frequent”; see also McGregor (1990) and Vandelanotte (2009).

⁸ Secondary boundary marks include the comma, the semicolon and the colon, as opposed to terminal marks, which include the full stop, the question mark and the exclamation mark (Huddleston and Pullum 2002).

- (3) ... she felt a little nervous about this; ‘for it might end, you know,’ said Alice to herself, ‘in my going out altogether, like a candle...

In (3), the combination of structural tools that creates a shifting viewpoint mixture is almost identical to (1a) and (2), including the full clause in the narrator’s discourse, followed by a semicolon and Alice’s subsequent self-oriented direct speech, interrupted by a reporting clause.⁹ All of the examples above stem, as we said, from the first chapter of *Alice in Wonderland*, but the pattern occurs throughout the entire story: 21 of the 26 cases of the phrase *thought Alice* occur in precisely this pattern (in only 5 cases is the formula sentence final), and the same holds for about half of the 115 cases of the phrase *said Alice* (the difference between *thought* and *said* is mostly due to the fact that the latter also occurs in descriptions of conversations, with another participants taking the turn after Alice has said something).

Based on these observations, we can formulate a general pattern for a recurrent stylistic strategy in *Alice in Wonderland*, a schematic viewpoint construction for constructing a gradually shifting mixture from the narrator’s to the protagonist’s viewpoint:

- (4) [CL] – [SecBound Mark] – “[CoorConj] – [Frag1]” - [Reporting CL] – “[Frag2]”

In this schema, [CL] stands for a Full Clause, [SecBound Mark] for a Secondary Boundary Mark, [CoorConj] for a Coordinating Conjunction, [FragX] for Fragment-of-a-sentence.

Below, we will first examine whether the translators have a consistent strategy for expressing the viewpointing effect in the Chinese passages corresponding to the English ones that are characterized by (4). As we have seen, the viewpointing effect in the English text is achieved through a consistent and recurrent constructional complex, and we would like to see whether the translators, in the same context, are similarly able to craft a (more or less) consistent constructional means for the same stylistic end of mixing viewpoints.

3.2. Analysis of the Four Chinese Translations

In this section, we will first discuss the commonalities of the four translations to describe how Chinese can accommodate the shifting viewpoint mixture in the original, and then we will further explore whether and how such recurring choices are capable of rendering the shifting viewpoint effect in the original text.

However, the very first observation that we can make about the four translations is that no consistent set of structural tools is used to produce the stylistic effect of a shifting mixture of viewpoints.

The absence of such a consistent set of structural tools may be surprising at first sight, but the reasons quickly become clear when we consider some properties of the grammar of Chinese, especially with regard to the ordering of clauses: Chinese does not have a conventional pattern for a medial reporting clause (though such an arrangement does not sound completely intolerable); the preferred convention clearly is to place a reporting clause before the reported one. The four translations of (3a) adhere to this convention by consistently placing the reporting clause before Alice’s direct thought; (5) and (6) are typical examples.

⁹ Notice that the element *for*, playing a crucial role in the gradual transition from the narrator’s to (100%) Alice’s discourse, is unambiguously a coordinating conjunction (cf. note 5).

- (5) ...她 有時候 偷偷 地 瞧 她
 ta youshihou tou-tou di qiao ta
 she sometimes secret-RED LK see she
- 姊姊 看 的 是 什麼 書, 可是 書
 jie-jie kan De shi sheme shu, keshi shu
 sister read LK PRT what book but book
- 裡 又 沒有 畫兒, 又 沒有 說話,
 li you meiyou hua-er, you meiyou shuohua,
 in also NEG picture-DIM also NEG speech
- 她 就 想道, 「一本書 裏 又
 ta jiu xiang-dao, “yi-ben-shu li you
 she PRT think-COMP one-CL-book in PRT
- 沒有 畫兒, 又 沒有 說話, 那樣書
 meiyou hua-er, you meiyou shuohua, na-yang-shu
 NEG picture-DIM also NEG speech that-kind-book
- 要 牠 幹什麼 呢?」(Chao)
 yao ta gansheme ne?”
 want it what for PRT

“... She sometimes secretly looked what book her sister was reading, but the book did not have any picture, nor did it have any conversation, so she thought “A book that does not have any picture, nor any conversation, why would one want a book like that?””¹⁰

- (6) 雖然 她 也 曾 在 一旁 窺視
 suiran ta ye ceng zai yipang kuishi
 although she also at one point LOC next to peep
- 姊姊 所 閱讀 的 書籍, 卻 因 書
 jie-jie suo yuedu de shuji, que yin shu
 sister REL read DE book but because book
- 中 無 圖 也 無 對話 的 內容
 zhong wu tu ye wu duihua de neirong
 in NEG picture also NEG conversation LK content

¹⁰ The main goal of the ‘back-translations’ of the Chinese translations of the *Alice* fragments in this example and subsequent ones, is to give the reader an idea how the Chinese translations differ from each other and from the pattern that is shared by the English originals and that we represented in (4). So there may be other systematic differences between the English original and the Chinese translations that are not visible in our back-translations, as we adjusted the back-translations to fluent English as much as possible. For example, we use past tense for the narrator’s text and present tense for Alice’s thought in (5), while there is actually no tense (let alone a tense distinction) in the Chinese clauses. But since we are not concerned with tense here (and it is not a component of (4) as we represent it), we have chosen to make the distinction here.

| | | | | | | |
|---------|-------|--------------|--------------|--------|--------|---------|
| 而 | 覺得 | 索然無味。 | 愛麗思 | 心 | 想： | 「沒有 |
| er | juede | suoranwuwei. | ailisi | xin | xiang: | “meiyou |
| CONJ | feel | bored stiff | Alice | heart | think | NEG |
| 圖案 | 也 | 沒有 | 對話 | 的 | 書 | |
| tuaan | ye | meiyou | duihua | de | shu | |
| picture | also | NEG | conversation | LK | book | |
| 有 | 什麼 | 用處 | 呢？」 | (Wang) | | |
| you | sheme | yongchu | ne?” | | | |
| have | what | use | PRT | | | |

“Although she at one point peeped at the book that her sister was reading, she felt bored from the content of the book that contained no picture and no conversation. Alice thought: “What is the use of a book that contains no picture and no conversation?””

The consequence of this grammatical convention of Chinese is that it deprives translators of the possibility of exploiting the same structural tools that are used throughout the original, i.e. a medial reporting clause, for the same stylistic purpose; as a result, translators seem to be forced to find other linguistic tools available to them, or to abandon the attempt to render the shifting of viewpoints in the Chinese translation.

However, when we look at the translations of (2), it turns out that three out of four actually have the reporting clause in medial position; (7) and (8) are examples.

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----|----------|-------------|-----|----------------|
| (7) | 但是 | 她 | 連 | 頭 | 都 | 擠不進 |
| | danshi | ta | lian | tou | dou | ji-bu-jin |
| | but | she | PRT | head | PRT | squeeze-NEG-in |
| | 那扇門。 | | 「就算 | 我 | 的 | 頭 |
| | na-shan-men. | | “jiusuan | wo | de | tou |
| | that-CL-door | | even if | I | LK | head |
| | | | 擠得進，」 | | | ji-de-jin,” |
| | | | 可憐 | 的 | 愛麗絲 | 心想， |
| | kelian | de | ailisi | xin-xiang, | | 「肩膀 |
| | poor | LK | Alice | heart-think | | “jianbang |
| | | | | | | ye |
| | | | | | | shoulder |
| | | | | | | also |

擠不進去... (Chen)

ji-bu-jin-qu...
squeeze-NEG-in-go

“But she could not squeeze her head into that door. “Even if my head could be squeezed in,” poor Alice thought, “my shoulder would not go through...”

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|------|-----------|-----|----------------|
| (8) | 但 | 她 | 連 | 頭部 | 都 | 鑽不進 |
| | dan | ta | lian | tou-bu | dou | zuan-bu-jin |
| | but | she | PRT | head-part | PRT | squeeze-NEG-in |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|-------------------|--------|----------|------|------------|-----|
| 門口： | 「就算 | 我 | 的 | 頭 | 能 | 勉強 | |
| menkou: | “jishi | wo | de | tou | neng | mianqiang | |
| entrance | even if | I | LK | head | AUX | with force | |
| 塞進 | 門口， | 」 | 愛麗絲 | 悲傷 | 地 | 想， | 「我 |
| sai-jin | menkou,” | | ailisi | beishang | di | xiang, | “wo |
| squeeze-in | entrance | | Alice | sad | LK | think | I |
| 的 | 肩膀 | 擠不進去... | (Wang) | | | | |
| de | jianbang | ji-bu-jin-qu... | | | | | |
| LK | shoulder | squeeze-NEG-in-go | | | | | |

“But she could not even get her head through the door: “Even if my head could be forced into the door,” Alice thought sadly, “my shoulder would not go through...”

The inconsistency among the translations of (1a) and (2) is striking, which raises a question: What is Chinese language usage really like in this respect, in natural (not translated) discourse? One possibility is that Chinese, unlike English, does not allow a nominal head and a post-modifier to be split (as in (1a)), but does allow splitting the two clauses of a conditional (as in (2)). So the question is: Does a medial reporting clause occur in natural (written) discourse of Chinese at all? To answer this question, we consulted the Sinica Corpus of Modern Chinese. We looked up all instances of *xin-xiang* (‘heart-think’, used in Chen’s translation) and *pansuan* (‘calculate’, used in Jia & Jia’s translation), and determined the position of the reporting clauses headed by one of these verbs relative to the associated reported clause. There were 127 reporting clauses with *xin-xiang*, all of which preceded their reported clause; there were 12 reporting clauses with *pansuan*, 9 of which occurred initially relative to the reported clause, and 3 finally. In other words, the overwhelming majority of reporting clauses occurs initially, and none of them are medial, in the corpus. Thus, we may safely conclude that the conventional ordering patterns for reporting and reported clauses in English and in Chinese are different. As recognized in the comprehensive Quirk et al. (1985:1022), English has three conventionalized patterns – initial (‘reporting-reported’), final (‘reported-reporting’), and medial (‘reported1-reporting-reported2’) – the last of which can be used in the construction of gradual viewpoint shift.¹¹ Chinese, on the other hand, has at most two conventional patterns, initial and final, possibly with a preference for the former.¹²

Thus, there is a tension between the grammatical conventions of Chinese and the ‘local’ communicative goal of construing a shift in viewpoint from narrator to character. In three out of the four translations of (2), translators have chosen to use a non-conventional pattern, allowing them to follow the order of clauses in the original English text and thereby to try to construct the viewpointing effect in the original, but not, of course, undoing the tension. The unconventional clause ordering seems to some extent tolerable (also according to the first author’s intuitions). Thus, it is not expected to block an average Mandarin reader’s understanding of the situation being described; at the same time, its effect, as a non-standard device, is not that of a *smooth* shift from the narrator’s viewpoint to Alice’s, as in English. Notice that neither (7) nor (8) has a coordinating conjunction at the beginning of Alice’s direct thought (the original, see (2), has *and*); recall that we argued that this use of a coordinating conjunction is integral to the construal of a smooth transition between

¹¹ Conceivably, there may also be functional differences between initial and final position of the reporting clause, but we do not discuss that possibility any further here.

¹² But this might also be dependent on the reporting verbs (witness the difference between *xin-xiang* and *pansuan*). Again, we leave this issue for future research.

viewpoints in the English narrative, which thus clearly cannot be straightforwardly constructed in Chinese.

In fact, in the Chinese translations of these three passages, coordinating conjunctions are missing at the beginning of Alice's direct thought in all cases but one. Of the twelve translated passages involved, only one (the translation of (3) by Chen) has a coordinating conjunction: *yinwei* in (9):

- (9)
- | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
| | 她 | 有一點 | 擔心， | 「因為，」 | 愛麗絲 | 自言自語： |
| ... | ta | youyidian | danxin, | “yinwei,” | ailisi | ziyanziyu: |
| | she | a little | worry | because | Alice | talk to oneself |
| | 「再 | 縮下去 | 的 | 結果， | 有可能 | 是 我 |
| “zai | suo-xiaqu | | de | jieguo, | youkeneng | shi wo |
| further | shrink-IPFV | | LK | result | possible | PRT I |
| | 整個 | 人 | 就 | 像 | 一個 | 蠟燭 |
| zhengge | ren | jiu | xiang | yi-gen | lazhu | ban... |
| entire | person | PRT | like | one-CL | candle | PRT |

“She was a little worried, “because,” Alice spoke to herself: “the result of my going even smaller could be my going out like a candle...””

The systematic absence (compared to the English original) of coordinating conjunctions in this significant position points to another difference in the relevant grammatical constructions available in English and in Chinese. In Chinese, the coordinating conjunction that is semantically closest to English *and* is *erqie*, but this is typically not used for temporal or causal relations, while the relations in fragments of the type characterized in (4) precisely do have some causal (viz. inferential) aspect (it is the absence of pictures that makes Alice draw a conclusion about the book's function, etc.). The distribution of *erqie* is in fact quite different from that of English *and*. In particular, *erqie* does not typically occur utterance initially in direct discourse; in the Sinica Corpus of Modern Chinese, we find no tokens of *erqie* introducing direct discourse, in a total of 2,637 tokens in the corpus. The only initial conjunction we find is in the translation by Chen in (9), where the English original in fact has a causal conjunction (*for* in (3)): *yinwei* ‘because’. Interestingly, this conjunction has a distributional profile that is actually more similar to English *and* than *erqie*, in particular in direct discourse: In the Sinica Corpus, we find four tokens of *yinwei* opening direct discourse, in a total of 5,000 in the whole corpus.

Finally, a closer look at the remaining translations of (3) reveals the possibility of yet another strategy, which comes down to an attempt to follow the English original and adhere to the conventions of Chinese at the same time. Consider Wang's translation in (10):

- (10)
- | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|----------|-----|--------|---------|----------|
| 愛麗絲 | 有點兒 | 緊張 | 地 | 想： | 「再 | 繼續 |
| ailisi | youdianer | jinzhang | di | xiang: | “zai | jixu |
| Alice | a little | nervous | LK | think | further | continue |
| | 縮下去， | 可能 | 會 | 完蛋 | 的，」 | 又 對 |
| | suo-xiaqu, | keneng | hui | wandan | de,” | you dui |
| | shrink-IPFV | AUX | AUX | doomed | PRT | again to |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-----|
| 自己 | 說， | 「如果 | 全 | 身 | 的 | 皮膚 | 都 |
| ziji | shuo, | “ruguo | quan | shen | de | pifu | dou |
| self | say | if | whole | body | LK | skin | all |
| 不見 | 了， | 像 | 隻 | 蠟燭 | 般... | (Wang) | |
| bujian | le, | xiang | zhi | lazhu | ban... | | |
| gone | CRS | like | CL | candle | PRT | | |

“Alice thought a little nervously: “(If I) keep going smaller, I am doomed,” again (she) spoke to herself, “if my skin is gone, like a candle...””

The first clause in the original is *she felt a little nervous about this*, a description of Alice’s mental state, but not a reporting clause. The translator turned this clause about nervousness into a reporting clause, with the proper name *Alice* as the subject, and then further on inserts another (subjectless) reporting clause, in medial position. While the latter splits the direct thought in two and thus more or less directly reflects the English original, the first intervention makes Alice’s viewpoint explicit (more so than in the original) in the first clause, thereby preventing it from being read as the narrator’s explanation for her state of mind, and it conforms to the conventions of the Chinese language (moreover, as the first part of the direct thought in (10) constitutes a full sentence, the second reporting clause might also be taken as initial, introducing a new thought; notice the element *you*, “again”). There is a tension between the attempt to preserve a stylistic effect by respecting the author’s practice of placing the reporting clause medially and the conventions of the target language (that the reporting clause preferably precedes the reported one); (10) shows a compromise between these two competing forces.

We have now looked at 12 translations of a single consistent linguistic pattern of viewpoint mixing and shifting in *Alice in Wonderland*. Looking closely at the translations, the first thing that we observe is that there does not seem to be a single consistent linguistic pattern to evoke this mixture and shifting in Chinese, and that this is certainly due, at least to a very large extent, to differences in conventionalized grammatical patterns for relating reported to reporting clauses. Table 1 below summarizes the four translators’ choices.

| | Translation of (1a) | Translation of (2) | Translation of (3) |
|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Y.R. Chao | Initial | Initial | Initial |
| L.F. Chen | Initial | Medial | Medial |
| H.H. Wang | Initial | Medial | Initial (10) |
| W. Jia & W. Jia | Initial | Medial | Medial |

Table 1: Position of the reporting clause with respect to the direct discourse

Among the four translations, there is one (by Y.R. Chao) that sticks strictly to the preferred pattern of Chinese grammar. In his translations of all three fragments, he places the reporting clause before Alice’s direct thought. This translator chooses to render the viewpoint effect by combining less schematic, lexical constructions and of reporting Alice’s thought verbatim in the narration, instead of trying to use a general constructional schema as in the English text. For instance, in (5), the Chinese expression *you* is an emphatic negation marker, and also a part of the larger composite construction *you... you...* (functioning somewhat similarly to *neither... nor...* in English). The narration in (5) contains *you meiyou hua-er, you meiyou shuo hua*, which is repeated verbatim in Alice’s direct thought. This full and literal repetition aligns Alice’s viewpoint at the end of the fragment with that reported by the narrator and thus

helps make the transition less abrupt, which is functionally similar to the structural pattern in the English text – in fact, it is an ‘enhanced’ version of the lexical repetitions present in the English text (cf. above). But the other three translators choose to partially follow the clausal order of the English text more closely, while also selectively adopting other constructions, such as *lian... dou...* in (7) and (8), to embed Alice’s viewpoint in the narration.¹³

The specific mixing and shifting of viewpoints in Lewis Carroll’s text is a result of the author’s strategic exploitation of the conventional tools available to him in his language, with the medial placement of the reporting clause being an indispensable element of the stylistic schema. Since this medial placement is not a conventionalized pattern in the grammar of Chinese (although it is not totally impossible either), this language does not provide its users with a consistent way of rendering a consistent pattern of viewpoint construction in the English original, as we see reflected in the variety of different translation strategies.

The crucial term here is “conventional”. The relevant differences do not only involve grammatical rules in the traditional sense, i.e. regular patterns for combining words and phrases into sentences, but also typographic factors, which are equally conventional tools stemming from a specific cultural development, according to usage-based principles. Given the logographic writing system of Chinese, the distinction between upper case and lower case is meaningless, as opposed to the segmental writing system of English. So as a number of important constitutive elements in a relevant constructional complex in the source language is missing in the target language, any adoption of the constructional schema in the target language is necessarily going to be only partial, and will not do the same job as it does in the source language.

A difference between languages in the conventional tools available for viewpoint management does not entail that the ultimate viewpoint relations constructed by readers in interpreting a text are going to be radically different as well. After all, different sets of tools may serve to create similar products. Linguistically mediated meaning construction always combines the use of words and constructions with inferences based on common ground. The relative proportion of what comes from explicit signals and what from inferencing may differ between languages, while the combined results for particular texts may well be similar. Parallel texts provide an excellent basis for investigating precisely the question of in what ways and in what dimensions the explicit, conventionalized tools for viewpoint management in languages differ or coincide, and thus ultimately also: how the *general* conceptual space of viewpoint management is and can be structured. We will return to this issue at the end of the next section and in our conclusion.

4. Mixing viewpoints through deixis in *Jiu Guo* and its English translation

We will now reverse the perspective, and briefly look at the way viewpoint is managed in an original Chinese text and how this comes out in its translation. As we have seen, English has quite a rich set of clause combining tools that may be used in viewpoint management, while Chinese has a comparatively less elaborate set of such tools. However, Chinese may well have more elaborate tools than English in some other domain. A case in point is constituted by the occurrence of the morphemes *lai* ‘come’ and *qu* ‘go’ in verbal resultative constructions (cf. Lu et al., in preparation).¹⁴ Consider (11a), (11b), (12a) and (12b), where examples (a) are

¹³ Readers are referred to Lai (2008) and Wang and Su (2012) for a thorough analysis of the *lian... dou...* construction.

¹⁴ The term “resultative” as used in Chinese linguistics is different from that in English. The latter denotes an argument structure construction with two participants, the second of which reaches a specified state as a result of the process described by the verb ([NP-V-NP-Result-state], as in *He cried his eyes red*; cf. Goldberg

taken from the narration of the Chinese original, and examples (b) are their counterparts in the published English translation.

- (11a) 丁钩儿 接过 酒瓶子， 晃晃，
 Dinggouer jie-guo jiuping-zi huang-huang
 Ding Gou'er take-over wine bottle shake-RED
- 蝎子 在 参须 间 游泳， 怪 味道
 xiezi zai sen-xu jian youyong guai weidao
 scorpion LOC ginseng root LOC swim strange odor
- 从 瓶口 冲出来。
 cong ping-kou chong-chu-lai
 LOC bottle mouth rush-out-come

“Ding Gou'er took over the bottle, shook it, scorpions swimming among the ginseng roots, with a strange odor rushing out (coming [towards ORIGO]) from the mouth of the bottle.”

- (11b) He shook the bottle, and the scorpions swam in the ginseng-enhanced liquid. A strange odor emanated from the bottle.

- (12a) 他 感到 乏味、 无趣， 便 把 她
 ta gan-dao fawei wuqu bian ba ta
 he feel-PFV bland uninteresting then PRT she
- 推开。
 tui-kai 她 却 像 一只 凶猛的
 push-aside she nevertheless like one-CL fierce-LINK
- 小豹子 一样， 不断地 扑上来...
 xiao baozi yiyang buduandi pu-shang-lai
 leopard cub same relentlessly pounce-up-come

“He felt uninterested and then pushed her away. But she was like a fierce leopard cub and relentlessly threw herself (upon him) - coming [towards ORIGO].”

- (12b) That was a turn-off, it killed his desire, and he pushed her away. But, like a plucky fighting cock, she sprang back at him hard, catching him off guard and making resistance all but impossible.

We can observe that the way viewpoints are constructed in the Chinese original and in the English translations differ, due to the occurrence of *lai* in the verbal complex of the sentences in the Chinese version of the story. In (11a), the viewpoint presented in the narration is a mixture of the narrator's and the protagonist's (Ding Gou'er's). The way Ding Gou'er is

and Jackendoff 2004). The former denotes a verbal construction indicating a verbal process leading to some result associated with the meaning of the verb, i.e. a kind of 'intrinsic' result (cf. certain particle constructions in English like *come in*, *jump up*, where the particles also indicate resultant states of the verbal process, and thus turn the verbal expression as a whole into one of achievement, not just a process. Readers are referred to Chao (1968) or Li and Thompson (1981) for a detailed description of these resultative constructions in Chinese.

referred to, by his full name, is an indication of the narrator's perspective; the resultative verbal construction presents the manner and the end-state of the movement (rushing out), while the combination with *lai* invites the reader to take the point of view of the one perceiving the odor i.e. the character. This kind of mixture can be produced straightforwardly in Mandarin, due to the fact that there is a conventional way of marking deixis on a verb (here by adding *lai*). Since English lacks such a tool, the mixing of viewpoints cannot be represented so easily; the choice of the verb *emanate* by Goldblatt makes the movement explicit and leaves the character's viewpoint implicit.

Fragment (12a) shows the same mixture of viewpoints. Ding Gou'er is referred to by a third person pronoun *he*, so the deictic center is the narrator. On the other hand, with *lai* in the verbal complex, the event of her throwing herself at him is explicitly and effortlessly presented as perceived from the protagonist's point of view, in the Chinese version. In the English translation, the latter point of view is much more left to inference, for example through the addition of lexical elements suggestive of his attitude (*off guard, resistance*).

There is a lexical construction in English that can be considered a translation equivalent of the deictic verbal element *lai* in Chinese, viz. the lexeme *come*. But what is crucial here is the difference between the conventional combinatorial properties of these elements in the two languages. In the original Chinese version of the story, the stylistic effect of mixed viewpoints is achieved through a combination of an objective reference to the protagonist, presentation of the protagonist's perceptual content, and the use of a deictic verbal morpheme. The stylistic 'recipe' is different in the English version, as the constructional possibility of the deictic verbal morpheme is missing, so the translator has to resort to linguistic means available in the target language, such as the lexical items mentioned above, or, more subtly, the spatial preposition *at* in (12b).¹⁵ Note that the construals created by use of a deictic verb and by a preposition are bound to be different, as different parts of a conceptual scene are profiled (Langacker 1987). Therefore, although the difference in linguistic convention does not make translation impossible, the ways viewpoint mixture can be linguistically *achieved* (and conceptually appreciated) in the two languages remain irreducibly different. As we mentioned at the end of section 3, different 'compositional pathways' may well lead to comparable overall interpretations of viewpoint relations, but the pathways are as much a factor in the style of a text as the overall interpretation. Creating a complex mixing of viewpoints for the same usage event in another language at least involves an irreducibly different constructional composition of the mixed viewpoints.

Again, this analysis demonstrates the methodological advantages of using parallel texts in cross-linguistic viewpoint research. The method first of all shows us that the distribution of viewpoint constructions – in this case, the translation equivalents *lai* and *come* – varies according to the conventions of the languages involved. Therefore, although English also has viewpoint expressions like *come see for yourself, go figure* that may create a construal similar to one that involves *lai* and *qu* 'go' in Chinese, the linguistic manifestation of mixing viewpoints *in the same usage event* is bound to be constrained by the relevant conventions of a specific language. Second, on this basis, the method provides a methodological cutting edge for investigating the relation between the general conceptual space of viewpoint and the

¹⁵ It was suggested to us that *at* might have a strong association with *come*, stronger than with *go*, and because of that it might represent (deictic) viewpoint. However, a Google search for both *came at him* and *went at him* returned numbers of results in the same order of magnitude, and *went back at him* in fact occurred considerably more frequently than *came back at him*, so that a connection between *at* and deictic viewpoint must at least involve more than association with *come*. Still, looking at possible viewpoint effects of the use of spatial prepositions in English is a valuable direction of investigation (in this context, the use of *come* would work better than *went*, while another preposition (e.g. *to, after*) would not have that effect).

dimensions in which languages may differ in their explicitly coded, conventionalized tools for viewpoint management.

5. Conclusion

In sections 3 and 4, we considered very different linguistic phenomena and translation samples of different directions, which we believe point to the same methodological and theoretical significance.

First of all, we see an important *methodological* advantage: Putting parallel passages in different languages side by side, especially when the languages involved are not at all related, focuses the investigator's attention on elements that would otherwise easily remain below the level of conscious awareness. Indeed, some of the details of the shifting viewpoint pattern in *Alice in Wonderland*, such as the role of the coordinating conjunction and that of lower case, only became apparent to us in the comparison with the Chinese translations.

Secondly, there is a fundamental *theoretical* consequence of the approach we implemented here. Ultimately, all management of viewpoints in discourse, especially of viewpoint mixing, depends not only on general cognitive abilities (empathy, Theory of Mind), but crucially also on the linguistic tools for viewpoint management that language users have at their disposal, and what we can now clearly appreciate is that these are language and culture specific, having been transmitted (with slight modifications) to present day language users over the generations. Thus, although the necessary cognitive infrastructure is presumably universal, there will not be universal *linguistic patterns* of viewpoint management. The systematic possibility of shifting smoothly from mainly-narrator-viewpoint to mainly-character-viewpoint in *Alice in Wonderland* is dependent on certain conventions of the English language, and the systematic possibility to effortlessly combine manner of movement and viewpoint in *Jiu Guo* is dependent on certain conventions of the Chinese language. That is, we can establish a conclusion about categories of viewpoint organization in discourse that parallels Croft's (2001) conclusion about syntactic categories: As such categories can only be defined in terms of properties of constructions, and the latter are necessarily language specific, the categories are of necessity also language specific. Similarly, as linguistic patterns of viewpoint mixing can only be defined (in a way that allows instances of them to be identified in texts) by reference to conventional linguistic items, with all their language specific properties, they are also of necessity language specific. The generality suggested by terms like "direct" and "indirect discourse" for certain patterns of viewpoint organization may thus be misleading. It induces investigators to ask questions like: "How is FID expressed in Language X?" (cf. Hagenaar 1992), while these are in fact unanswerable as the presuppositional condition (that a language independent way of identifying different types of STR exists) cannot be met as a matter of principle. This is not to say that attempts to answer such a question have not produced interesting and insightful results (as Hagenaar (1992) in fact demonstrates). But to the extent that they have, we conclude that they should be 'reconceptualized' as insights about the variability in the possible conventional coding of different aspects of viewpoint management.

What exactly the properties of the items involved in viewpoint management in a specific language are will have to be established by a large scale investigation of actual language use. Thus, our characterizations of the English and Chinese phenomena discussed here, may in some respects be inaccurate, or incomplete. For example, in section 3, we did not look at a large number of verbs of communication and cognition, so there might be different ordering patterns associated with different semantic types of verbs in Mandarin, or in English, or in both. But our theoretical point is not weakened by this kind of uncertainty, because of the

method of studying parallel text fragments: The conclusion *that* viewpoint construction in discourse is language specific can already be drawn on the basis of careful analysis of specific parallel instances of language use, precisely because they are parallel.

Finally, the use of parallel texts has a high potential in helping set a research agenda for cross-linguistic viewpoint research, especially if the scope can be extended to cover a representative sample of languages, and preferably also discourse types (there are limitations here; we do not foresee parallel day-to-day conversations in the near future, for example). It will allow a better understanding of how various languages represent viewpoint and what aspects of viewpoint construction are systematically distinguished in the grammars of many different languages and which only in a few. The methodology of parallel text analysis can contribute significantly to a solid empirical foundation for answering this intriguing and important question.

References

- Barlow, Michael. 2008. Parallel texts and corpus-based contrastive analysis, In: Gómez González, M., Mackenzie, L. and González Alvarez, E. (eds.), *Current Trends in Contrastive Linguistics: Functional and Cognitive Perspectives*. Benjamins, 101-121.
- Chamonikolasová, Jana. 2007. *Intonation in English and Czech Dialogues*. Brno: Masaryk University Press.
- Chao, Yuan Ren. 1968. *The Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cysouw, Michael, and Bernhard Wälchli. (eds.), 2007. *Parallel Texts. Using Translational Equivalents in Linguistic Typology. Theme issue in Sprachtypologie & Universalienforschung STUF 60.2*.
- Goldberg, Adele E. and Ray Jackendoff. 2004. The English resultative as a family of constructions. *Language* 80: 532-568.
- Goldblatt, Howard. 2011. *The Republic of Wine*. New York: Arcade Publishing.
- Hagenaar, Elly. 1992. *Stream of Consciousness and Free Indirect Discourse in Modern Chinese Literature*. Leiden: Center for Non-Western Studies.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lai, Huei-ling. 2008. Using constructions as information management devices: Analysis of Hakka *lien5...ya3/du3* constructions. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology Academia Sinica* 79: 343-376.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Vol I. Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. New York: Basic Books.
- Li, Charles N. and Sandra Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lu, Wei-lun, I-wen Su and Arie Verhagen. In preparation. Constructions as cultural tools of viewpoint operation: A case study of deictic verbs in Chinese-English parallel texts.
- McGregor, William B. 1990. The metafunctional hypothesis and syntagmatic relations. *Occasional Papers in Systemic Linguistics* 4: 5-50.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sydney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London/New York: Longman.
- Rojo, Ana and Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano (ed.) 2013. *Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Advances in Some Theoretical Models and Applications*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Slobin, D. I. 1996. Two ways to travel: Verbs of motion in English and Spanish. In M. Shibatani & S.A. Thompson (Eds.), *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning*, 195-220. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Slobin, Dan I. 2003. Language and thought online: Cognitive consequences of linguistic relativity. *Language in mind: Advances in the study of language and thought*, D. Gentner and S. Goldin-Meadow eds., 157-192. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tabakowska, Elzbieta. 1993. *Cognitive Linguistics and poetics of translation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Tabakowska, Elzbieta. 2014. Lewis Carroll's *Alice* in grammatical wonderlands. *Cognitive Grammar in Literature*, Harrison, Chloe, Louise Nuttall, Peter Stockwell and Wenjuan Yuan (eds.), 101-116. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Vandelanotte, Leiven. 2009. *Speech and thought representation in English: A cognitive-functional approach*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Van der Auwera, Johan, E. Schalley and Jan Nuyts. 2005. Epistemic possibility in a Slavonic parallel corpus - a pilot study. *Modality in Slavonic Languages, New Perspectives*. ed. by B. Hansen & P. Karlik. München: Sagner, 201-17.
- Verkerk, Annemarie. 2014. *The evolutionary dynamics of motion event encoding*. Nijmegen: MPI Series in Psycholinguistics.
- Wang, Chueh-chen and Lily I-wen Su. 2012. Distinguishing synonymous constructions: A corpus-based study of Mandarin *lian...dou* and *lian ...ye* constructions. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 40 (1): 84-101.
- Xiao, Richard. 2010. How different is translated Chinese from native Chinese? *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*. 15 (1): 5-35.
- Xiao, Richard, and Dai Guangrong. 2014. Lexical and grammatical properties of Translational Chinese: translation universal hypotheses reevaluated from the Chinese perspective. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 10 (1), 11-55.

Research materials used

- Carroll, Lewis. 2008. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (e-book version). Available at <http://www.gutenberg.org>.
- Carroll, Lewis. 1939. *Alisi Manyou Qijing Ji* (*Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Trans. Yuan Ren Chao). Shanghai: The Commercial Press.
- Carroll, Lewis. 2005. *Ailisi Mengyou Xianjing* (*Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Trans. Wenhao Jia and Wenyan Jia). Taipei: Shangzhou Publishing.
- Carroll, Lewis. 2006. *Ailisi Mengyou Xianjing* (*Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Trans. Li-fang Chen). Taipei: Gaobao Publishing.
- Carroll, Lewis. 2011. *Ailisi Manyou Qijing* (*Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Trans. Hui-hsien Wang). Taipei: Licun Culture Publishing.
- Mo, Yan. 2008. *Jiu Guo* (*The Republic of Wine*). Shanghai: Shanghai Wenyi Publishing.
- Mo, Yan. 2011. *The Republic of Wine* (Trans. Howard Goldblatt). New York: Arcade Publishing.

Sinica Corpus of Modern Chinese
<http://app.sinica.edu.tw/kiwi/mkiwi>