

The cover features abstract geometric lines. A light green double-line shape is at the top, and a thick red double-line shape is at the bottom, both resembling stylized outlines of buildings or abstract shapes. The text is centered within these shapes.

**EXPRESSIVE  
MINDS**

and

**ARTISTIC  
CREATIONS**

*Studies in Cognitive Poetics*

*Edited by*

SZILVIA CSÁBI

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press in the UK and certain other countries.

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America.

© Oxford University Press 2018

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted by law, by license, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reproduction rights organization. Inquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above.

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Csábi, Szilvia, editor.

Title: Expressive minds and artistic creations : studies in cognitive poetics /  
edited by Szilvia Csábi.

Description: New York : Oxford University Press, [2018] |

Series: Cognition and poetics | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016039316 (print) | LCCN 2017000221 (ebook) |

ISBN 9780190457747 (cloth : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780190457754 (updf) |

ISBN 9780190457761 (online course)

Subjects: LCSH: Poetics—Psychological aspects. | Cognitive grammar.

Classification: LCC P311 .E97 2017 (print) | LCC P311 (ebook) |

DDC 808.1—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016039316>

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed by Sheridan Books, Inc., United States of America

## CHAPTER 6

# A Multiple-Parallel-Text Approach for Viewpoint Research Across Languages

*The Case of Demonstratives in English and Chinese*

WEI-LUN LU, ARIE VERHAGEN, AND I-WEN SU

### 6.1. INTRODUCTION

Recent years have witnessed a substantial increase in cognitive approaches to literary studies as an emerging field called cognitive poetics or cognitive stylistics (Lakoff and Turner, 1989; Tsur, 1992; Semino and Culpeper, 2002; Stockwell, 2002; Gavins and Steen, 2003; Freeman, 2006; Brône and Vandaele, 2009; and Harrison et al., 2014; among others), which has generated a meaningful body of research on literary texts in various languages. However, so far little attention has been paid to the cross-linguistic dimension of cognitive poetic research, although exceptions do exist (Tabakowska, 1993, 2014; Wu, 2004; Freeman and Takeda, 2006). In this chapter, we pick up on this insufficiency and try to promote the use of the multiple-parallel-text (MultiParT) approach as an innovative research methodology in contrastive cognitive poetics and linguistics in general. In particular, we discuss demonstratives in English and Chinese as a representative case to illustrate the usefulness of the proposed MultiParT method.

Demonstratives are deictic elements in language that help users identify which entity is being referred to within a frame of reference. The cognitive function of demonstratives is to single out a nominal referent and to direct the conceptualizer's attention to a certain referent from an open-ended set of possible candidates (Langacker, 2008, 277). At an interactional level, a speaker uses a demonstrative to intersubjectively share referential focus within the current discourse space, so as to coordinate the joint focus of attention (Diessel, 2006; Langacker, 2008, 291).

The assumption underlying the present study is that we take demonstratives in literary narratives as the author's cognitive stylistic devices that create and attempt to manage joint attention with the reader, thus viewpointing (Dancygier, 2012) the narrative in a certain way. By using a demonstrative construction (as a form–meaning pairing, in the sense of Goldberg, 1995) to single out a referent in a narrated event, the narrator adjusts joint attention created by his or her language use in the reader's awareness by guiding the reader's construal of the mental distance between himself or herself and the nominal referent in the narrative, resulting in a certain literary style. When the narrator uses a proximal demonstrative to mark reference, this creates a construal in which the referent is somehow close to the reader, whereas when a distal demonstrative is used, the referent is construed at a longer distance from the reader.<sup>1</sup> In this chapter, we limit our focus to *this*, *that*, *these*, and *those* in English and their counterparts *zhe* [this] and *na* [that] in Mandarin.

## 6.2. METHODOLOGY

The use of parallel texts has been a useful methodology in various fields of linguistics, including typology, pragmatics, and semantics (Van der Auwera, Schalley, and Nuyts, 2005; Chamonikolasová, 2007; Cysouw and Wälchli, 2007; Barlow, 2008) and has proven highly advantageous. The benefit of such methodology lies in its parallel alignment of various verbalizations of *the same usage event*: If we take a translator as a sensible text producer with a good intention of communicating the same message to his or her reader as does the source text, he or she is bound to deliver the content in the target language in a way that is as close to the source text as he or she can make it, trying to keep the cognitive and stylistic effects at all levels. Therefore we believe the use of parallel texts constitutes an optimal methodological approach to contrastive linguistic and literature research.

Although the use of parallel texts has also gained increasing interest in cognitive linguistics (e.g., Slobin, 1996, 2003; Rojo and Ibarretxe-Antuñano, 2013; Tabakowska, 1993, 2014; Verkerk, 2014; and Lu et al., submitted; among others), the method is still underutilized in the field, let alone in cognitive poetics. There are various studies on demonstratives (or even on referring expressions or deixis, in broader terms), but the majority of them are based on the use of monolingual corpora (e.g., Gundel et al., 1993; Himmelman, 1996; and Piwek, Beun, and Cremers, 2008; among others), with relatively rare uses of translation or parallel texts. In particular, in the study of demonstratives, the approach is still almost new, with only two exceptions that we are aware of, which will be introduced below in detail.

Wu (2004) is one whose scope and concern are the closest to those of the present study. In a detailed manner, the author compares the use of demonstratives in a story originally written in English and its Chinese translation, and the other way round. However, a factor that is not taken into account in the research design is individual variation, with only one version of translation included in the corpus—with data from only one speaker, idiolect becomes a variable that could not be controlled for, so no generalization over the language(s) of a community of speakers could be made. As individual variation and the distinction between the individual and community level in the study of language have recently gained more and more attention in cognitive linguistic research (see Dąbrowska, 2015, and references cited therein), we believe the parallel-text methodology should take that into account as well.

Tabakowska (2014) reported another important study in the same direction, discussing the general influence of grammar on point of view in translation. Tabakowska compares the English original of *Alice in Wonderland* with its five Polish translations, and especially comments on how the six versions make reference, given the grammatical fact that Polish, unlike English, lacks a systematic distinction between definite and indefinite articles (which is also the case in Mandarin). However, the scope of her paper also includes, in addition to demonstratives, modality, de-idiomatization, and iconicity, which is so extensive that it prevents the author from discussing how demonstratives are used as cognitive stylistic devices of proximal and distal viewpointing, and this is exactly what we address in this chapter.

The general research issue that we try to address is as follows: Is there a *systematic* way to compare viewpointing constructions cross-linguistically? When we identify a viewpointing construction in Language

A, do we *systematically* find its counterparts in Language B (see Dancygier, 2016; Lu and Verhagen, 2016)? The hypothesis is that because all translators base their language production on the source text, the viewpoint representation should ideally be identical in both languages. Even if viewpoint representations do not completely match in the two languages, at the very least we should expect to be able to find a relatively high degree of correspondence.

With the research issues in mind, our research focuses on world masterpieces of literature and their *multiple* published translations in the *same* target language. First, such works are likely to be widely translated into many languages, so researchers may take advantage of that and investigate a wide span of languages in an efficient way. More important, world masterpieces also stand a good chance of getting translated and published more than once in one language, which allows us to observe written-language production from more than one representative speaker in the same language.<sup>2</sup> Third, published (commercial) translations are usually carefully edited and proofread by the publisher to ensure reception of its language and style by potential readers, who are presumably all native speakers of the target language investigated.

In our study, we use the first chapter of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* and its four published versions in Mandarin, translated by Yuan Ren Chao, Li-fang Chen, Hui-hsien Wang, and Wenyan Jia and Wenhao Jia (cotranslators).

### 6.3. FINDINGS

First and foremost, what we find in our multiple parallel texts reveals highly frequent cross-linguistic mismatches between the English and the Chinese versions. We have three general observations of how the individual text producers provide very different takes on the same literary scene, which all nullify the hypothesis in an empirical way. In Section 6.3.1, we show a vast difference in the frequencies of the demonstratives, with those of the Chinese versions generally outnumbering those of the English text. Subsection 6.3.2 presents the highly frequent mismatches across the two languages involved. Building on the lack of perfect cross-linguistic correspondences that we present in Section 6.3.2, Section 6.3.3 nevertheless shows the general intralanguage consistency across the Chinese versions investigated.

**Table 6.1.** FREQUENCY OF DEMONSTRATIVES  
IN THE ENGLISH VERSION AND THE FOUR  
CHINESE VERSIONS<sup>4</sup>

	Proximal	Distal	Total
Carroll	14	11	25
Chao	34	49	83
Chen	27	9	36
Wang	35	23	58
Jia	36	16	52

### 6.3.1. Difference in Frequency as the Most Prominent Systematic Difference

The first and foremost observation that sticks out in the set of parallel texts that we collected is the vast difference in frequency in the use of demonstratives in the two languages. In general, the demonstratives in the Chinese versions outnumber those in the English text. Table 6.1 shows the tendency.

We also subsequently present some selective excerpts as illustration. Instances (1a)–(1c) show how a scene is presented in English without any demonstrative viewpointing but is heavily demonstrative-viewpointed in at least two Chinese versions. Demonstratives in all examples are shaded.

(1a) So she was considering in her own mind (as well as she could, for the hot day made her feel very sleepy and stupid), whether the pleasure of making a daisy-chain would be worth the trouble of getting up and picking the daisies, when suddenly a White Rabbit with pink eyes ran close by her.

(1b) 所以 她 就 無精打采 地 自己 在  
*suoyi ta jiu wujingdacai di ziji zai*  
 so she PRT bored LK self LOC

心裡 盤算- ( 她 亦 不過 勉強 地  
*xinli pansuan- ta yi buguo mianqiang di*  
 heart think she PRT only try to LK

醒著，	因為	這	熱天	熱得	她	昏昏
<i>xing-zhe</i>	<i>yinwei</i>	<i>zhe</i>	<i>retian</i>	<i>re-de</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>hun-hun</i>
wake-IPF	because	this	hot day	hot-PFV	she	dizzy

地	要	睡) -	到底	還是	做	一枝
<i>di</i>	<i>yao</i>	<i>shui</i>	<i>daodi</i>	<i>haishi</i>	<i>zuo</i>	<i>yi-zhi</i>
LK	MOD	sleep	on earth	or	make	one-CL

野菊	花圈兒	好	呢？	還是	為著	這
<i>yeju</i>	<i>huaquan-er</i>	<i>hao</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>haishi</i>	<i>weizhe</i>	<i>zhe</i>
daisy	chain-DIM	good	PRT	or	for	this

種	玩意兒	不值得	站起來	去	找	花
<i>zhong</i>	<i>wanyi-er</i>	<i>bu-zhide</i>	<i>zhan-qilai</i>	<i>qu</i>	<i>zhao</i>	<i>hua</i>
kind	thing-DIM	NEG-worth	stand-up	go	find	flower

的	麻煩	呢？	她	正在	納悶
<i>de</i>	<i>mafan</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>zhengzai</i>	<i>namen</i>
LK	trouble	PRT	she	being	contemplate

的	時候，	忽然	來了	一隻	淡紅	眼睛
<i>de</i>	<i>shihou</i>	<i>huran</i>	<i>lai-le</i>	<i>yi-zhi</i>	<i>danhong</i>	<i>yanjing</i>
LK	when	suddenly	come-PFV	one-CL	pink	eye



的	兔子，	在	她	旁邊	跑過。
<i>de</i>	<i>tuzi</i>	<i>zai</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>pangbian</i>	<i>pao-guo</i>
LK	rabbit	LOC	she	next to	run-past

“So out of boredom, she calculated in her heart—(She only tried to stay awake, as this hot day made her so sleepy)—Is it at all better to make a daisy chain? Or is it, for this kind of things, not worth the trouble of standing up to bother the flowers? As she was wondering, suddenly there came a white rabbit with pink eyes running past her.” (Chao)

As is obvious, (1b) presents two nominal referents that are proximally viewpointed in Chao’s version but not in the English text, which are *zhe retian* [this hot day] and *zhe zhong wanyi-er* [this kind of things]. However, as we look deeper into the examples, an interesting fact emerges—the nominal referent *wanyi-er* [thing-DIM] actually refers back to the daisy chain that Alice makes, which, however, is verbalized as such only in Chao’s version. To be precise, Chao’s text creates *wanyi-er* as a shell noun (Schmid, 2000) that anaphorically traces back to a referent in its prior text (the possible event of making a daisy chain), but such backtracking does not occur at all in Carroll’s version. We return to this point in the discussion in Section 6.4.

(1c)	她	開始	打算	編	個	雛菊	花環，
	<i>ta</i>	<i>kaishi</i>	<i>dasuan</i>	<i>bian</i>	<i>ge</i>	<i>chuju</i>	<i>huahuan</i>
	she	start	plan	make	CL	daisy	wreath
	可是	又	不知道	起身	去	摘	雛菊
	<i>keshi</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>bu-zhidao</i>	<i>qishen</i>	<i>qu</i>	<i>zhai</i>	<i>chuju</i>
	but	PRT	NEG-	rise	go	pick	daisy
			know				

是不是	太	費事	了。	(這	天	天氣
<i>shibushi</i>	<i>tai</i>	<i>feishi</i>	<i>le</i>	<i>zhe</i>	<i>tian</i>	<i>tianqi</i>
whether	too	trouble	CRS	<i>this</i>	day	weather

非常	炎熱，	使	她	昏昏欲睡。)	這
<i>feichang</i>	<i>yanre</i>	<i>shi</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>hunhunyuishui</i>	<i>zhe</i>
very	hot	make	she	dozy	<i>this</i>

時，	一隻	有著	粉紅色	眼睛	的
<i>shi</i>	<i>yi-zhi</i>	<i>you-zhe</i>	<i>fenhong-se</i>	<i>yanjing</i>	<i>de</i>
time	one-CL	have-IPF	pink-color	eye	LK

白兔	從	她	身邊	跑了	過去。
<i>baitu</i>	<i>cong</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>shenbian</i>	<i>pao-le</i>	<i>guoqu</i>
white rabbit	from	she	next to	run-PFV	past

“She started planning to make a ring of daisies, but did not know whether it would be too much a hassle to rise and pick daisies. (This day, the weather was very hot, which made her dozy.) At this moment, a white rabbit with pink eyes ran past her.” (Jia and Jia)

Example (1c) shows a different strategy of viewpointing the same scene by proximally presenting the setting, that is, the day and the time of speaking, elaborated as *zhe tian* and *zhe shi*. The use of *zhe tian* is highly similar to *zhe retian* in Chao’s version, whereas the other deictic construction *zhe shi* involves a completely different narrative strategy. We argue that the use of the proximal viewpointing construction *zhe shi* brings the reader deep into the narrated scene by inserting the proximal demonstrative as an indicator of Alice’s voice, the stylistic effect of which is, however, rendered in Carroll’s version in a very different way (to be specific, by use

of the adverb *suddenly*). We further discuss in Section 6.4 the fact that different languages prefer different stylistic strategies for similar view-pointing effects.

We believe the preceding set of examples testifies to the simple fact that Mandarin makes more frequent use of demonstrative constructions than English to viewpoint the same literary scene. As further examples similarly show, the generally much higher productivity of demonstratives in the Chinese versions compared with that of the English text is consistent throughout the first chapter of *Alice in Wonderland*.

Now there is the fact that the Chinese versions have an overall higher frequency of demonstratives than the English text, but what is the explanation for that? An intuitive approach would be to look into the *individual* grammatical systems, which might turn up an answer along the following lines: English is a language that systematically uses a determiner (including articles and demonstratives) to ground a count noun, which, however, is not the linguistic convention in Chinese, and because Chinese does not systematically use (definite) articles (see Li and Thompson, 1981, 131; Gundel, Hedberg, and Zacharski, 1993, 300), demonstratives should do the job of deciding the reference in context and are expected to be more productive. And that was generally what was done and claimed in most previous studies based on monolingual corpora.

In Section 6.3.2, we use our data to judge the appropriateness of this “vanilla” (Croft, 2005) approach of looking only into the respective linguistic systems.

### 6.3.2. Frequent Mismatches Throughout the Texts

The second important observation that we can make from the multiple parallel texts collected is an overall lack of correspondence within a certain stretch of the texts between the English original and the four Chinese versions, which means that it is not just the frequency that matters, but that lack of cross-linguistic correspondence seems to be the reality. This empirically nullifies our hypothesis. Excerpts (2a)–(2d) are clear illustrations.

(2a) There was nothing so VERY remarkable in that; nor did Alice think it so VERY much out of the way to hear the Rabbit say to itself, ‘Oh dear! Oh dear! I shall be late!’ (when she thought it over afterwards, it occurred to her that she ought to have wondered at this, but at the time it all seemed quite natural);

(2b)	就是	看見	一隻	淡紅	眼睛	的	白
	<i>jiushi</i>	<i>kan-jian</i>	<i>yi-zhi</i>	<i>danhong</i>	<i>yanjing</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>bai</i>
	even	see-PFV	one-CL	pink	eye	LK	white
	兔子，	本來	亦	不是	件	怎麼	大了不得
	<i>tuzi,</i>	<i>benlai</i>	<i>yi</i>	<i>bushi</i>	<i>jian</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>daliaobude</i>
	rabbit	originally	also/either	NEG	CL	what	big deal
	的	事情；	並且	就是	阿麗思	聽見	那
	<i>de</i>	<i>shiqing</i>	<i>bingqie</i>	<i>jiushi</i>	<i>alisi</i>	<i>ting-jian</i>	<i>na</i>
	LK	thing	and	even	Alice	hear-PFV	that
	兔子	自言自語	地	說，	「噯呀！	噫呀！	我
	<i>tuzi</i>	<i>ziyanziyu</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>shuo,</i>	<i>aiya</i>	<i>yiya</i>	<i>wo</i>
	rabbit	talk to self	LK	say	INTERJ	INTERJ	I
	一定	要	去	晚	了」	她	亦
	<i>yiding</i>	<i>yao</i>	<i>qu</i>	<i>wan</i>	<i>le</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>yi</i>
	for sure	MOD	go	late	CRS	she	also
	不	覺得	這	算	什麼	十二分	出奇
	<i>bu</i>	<i>juede</i>	<i>zhe</i>	<i>suan</i>	<i>sheme</i>	<i>shierfen</i>	<i>chuqi</i>
	NEG	feel	this	count	what	very	extraordinary

的	事情	( 事後	想起來	她	才	覺得
<i>de</i>	<i>shiqing</i>	<i>shihou</i>	<i>xiang-qilai</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>cai</i>	<i>juede</i>
LK	thing	afterwards	think-IPF	she	PRT	feel

<u>這</u>	是	應當	詫異	的	事，	不過
<i>zhe</i>	<i>shi</i>	<i>yingdang</i>	<i>chayi</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>shi</i>	<i>buguo</i>
<u>this</u>	be	MOD	surprise	LK	thing	but

當時	她	覺得	樣樣	事情	都	像
<i>dangshi</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>juede</i>	<i>yang-yang</i>	<i>shiqing</i>	<i>dou</i>	<i>xiang</i>
then	she	feel	kind-RED	thing	all	like

很	平常	似的；)
<i>hen</i>	<i>pingchang</i>	<i>side</i>
very	usual	PRT

“Even seeing a pink-eyed white rabbit was not a big deal whatsoever; and even when Alice heard that rabbit say to itself, “Oh mine! Oh mine! I will be late for sure,” she did not consider this anything extraordinary. (Afterwards, as she recalled it, she realized that she should have felt surprised at this, but at the moment she had thought everything was like usual.)” (Chao)

A comparison of (2a) and (2b) shows how Carroll’s and Chao’s versions viewpoint the scene in at least three different ways. In Carroll’s version, the first demonstrative construction is a distal one, which refers anaphorically to the event that Alice saw a rabbit with pink eyes. However,

the practice of pronominalizing an event is not followed in Chao's version, so the distal viewpoint on that part of the literary scene, as Carroll renders it, is not present in Chao's version. The second difference lies in how the narrator refers to the rabbit. In Chao's version, the rabbit is referred to as a distal one by means of the use of *na*, whereas the English version does not specify the distance, using only a definite article *the*. The third difference is again how the text pronominalizes an event. In the English version, the event of Alice's hearing the rabbit talk to itself is pronominalized by a viewpoint-neutral pronoun *it* (underlined), as part of a cleft construction. On the other hand, the same event is pronominalized in Chao's version with a proximal anaphoric demonstrative, which serves the stylistic function of involving the reader by bringing the reader closer to the scene.

(2c)	這	件	事	在	當時	看來	也
	<u>zhe</u>	jian	shi	zai	dangshi	kanlai	ye
	this	CL	thing	LOC	then	seem	PRT
	沒	什麼	特別，	而且	在	聽到	兔子
	mei	sheme	tebie	erqie	zai	ting-dao	tuzi
	NEG	what	special	and	LOC	hear-PFV	rabbit
	自言自語		地	說：	「天哪！	天哪！	我
	ziyanziyu		di	shuo	tianna	tianna	wo
	talk to self		LK	say	INTERJ	INTERJ	I
	要	遲到	了！」	時，	愛麗絲	也	不
	yao	chidao	le	shi	ailisi	ye	bu
	MOD	late	CRS	when	Alice	PRT	NEG

認為	有	何	不	尋常	( 事後	回想起來 ,
<i>renwei</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>he</i>	<i>bu</i>	<i>xunchang</i>	<i>shihou</i>	<i>huixiang-qilai</i>
think	have	what	NEG	usual	afterwards	recall-IPF

她	覺得	自己	早	該	對	此
<i>ta</i>	<i>juede</i>	<i>ziji</i>	<i>zao</i>	<i>gai</i>	<i>dui</i>	<i>ci</i>
she	feel	self	early	MOD	to	this

感到	奇怪 ,	但	在	當時	一切	似乎
<i>gan-dao</i>	<i>qiguai</i>	<i>dan</i>	<i>zai</i>	<i>dangshi</i>	<i>yiqie</i>	<i>sihu</i>
feel-PFV	strange	but	LOC	then	everything	seem

都	那麼	的	自然 ) 。
<i>dou</i>	<i>na-me</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>ziran</i>
all	that-so	LK	natural

“This thing did not look so special back then, and when hearing the rabbit say to itself: “Oh mine! Oh mine! I will be late for sure!,” Alice did not find anything unusual (afterwards, as she recalled, she felt that she should have felt strange about this, but at the moment everything had seemed as natural as that).” (Chen)

Excerpt (2c) presents a radical case with three differences from (2a): First, the event of Alice’s seeing a rabbit with pink eyes is viewpointed by means of the use of a proximal demonstrative, unlike Chao’s viewpoint-neutral representation and even contrary to Carroll’s distal viewpoint. In addition to the contrary viewpoint in the beginning of this excerpt, in Chen’s version, a distal demonstrative is used in the narrator’s comment in brackets to prompt a distanced viewpoint, away from the narrated event (of Alice’s seeing a rabbit, hearing it speak to itself, and so on). However, in Carroll’s version the same event is pronominalized as a proximal demonstrative, prompting a close-up take on it. The third difference, though quite subtle,

lies in the grammatical nature of the demonstratives used. In Chen's version, the distal demonstrative is joined by an adverbializer *me*, the combinatorial possibility of which is available only in Chinese, whereas in Carroll's version, the demonstrative occurs as a stand-alone pronoun instead of as part of an adverb. We discuss how the subtle difference in the grammatical profile of demonstratives makes a difference in construal in Section 6.4.

(2d)	再	沒有	更	令	人	興奮	的
	<i>zai</i>	<i>meiyou</i>	<i>geng</i>	<i>ling</i>	<i>ren</i>	<i>xingfen</i>	<i>de</i>
	PRT	NEG	more	make	man	excite	LK
	事	了，	尤其是	愛麗絲	親耳聽到		那
	<i>shi</i>	<i>le</i>	<i>youqishi</i>	<i>ailisi</i>	<i>qiner-ting-dao</i>		<i>na</i>
	thing	CRS	especially	Alice	in person-hear-PFV		that
	隻	小白兔	喃喃自語：		「噢！	天啊！	我
	<i>zhi</i>	<i>xiaobaitu</i>	<i>nannanziyu</i>		<i>ao</i>	<i>tian-a</i>	<i>wo</i>
	CL	rabbit	talk to self		INTERJ	INTERJ	I
	要	遲到	了！」	（就	在	她	聽
	<i>yao</i>	<i>chidao</i>	<i>le</i>	<i>jiu</i>	<i>zai</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>ting</i>
	MOD	late	CRS	PRT	LOC	she	hear
	懂	那	句	話	之後，	猛然	驚覺，
	<i>dong</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>ju</i>	<i>hua</i>	<i>zhihou</i>	<i>mengran</i>	<i>jingjue</i>
	understand	that	CL (sentence)	word	after	suddenly	realize



自己	應該	要	懷疑	到底	是	發生
<i>ziji</i>	<i>yinggai</i>	<i>yao</i>	<i>huaiyi</i>	<i>daodi</i>	<i>shi</i>	<i>fasheng</i>
self	MOD	MOD	wonder	on earth	be	happen
什麼	事	的，	但	一切	都	發生得
<i>sheme</i>	<i>shi</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>dan</i>	<i>yiqie</i>	<i>dou</i>	<i>fasheng-de</i>
what	thing	LK	but	everything	all	happen-PFV
太	突然	了。)				
<i>tai</i>	<i>turan</i>	<i>le</i>				
too	sudden	CRS				

“There is nothing more exciting, especially when Alice heard in person that rabbit talk to itself: ‘Oh! Mine! I will be late for sure!’ (After she understood that sentence, she realized she should have wondered what on earth had happened, but everything had happened all of a sudden.)” (Wang)

A comparison of (2a) and (2d) shows a similar result: No neat correspondences can be found between the texts. Two distal demonstrative pronouns are used to viewpoint the literary scene, one marking the rabbit [*na zhi xiaobaitu*], similarly to Chao’s text, and the other marking the sentence uttered by the rabbit [*na ju hua*]. We observe that *hua* [word] is also a shell noun that is created only in Wang’s version, which involves a noteworthy use of the human cognitive capacity of reification [see also *wanyi-er* in (1b)]. We return to this point in Section 6.4.

A comparison of (2a) with the three versions in Chinese allows us to make three generalized observations. First, perfect correspondence cannot be expected between the English and the Chinese versions; the strategies of viewpoint management are relatively different in the two languages. Second, a nominal referent viewpointed in a particular way in one language can be presented in a viewpoint-neutral way in another (e.g., Carroll’s *the Rabbit* and Chao’s *na tuzi*). Third, viewpoint representation can even be opposite across the two languages (e.g., Carroll’s use of *that* and Chen’s *zhe*

*jian shi*). To sum up, in what we see, the same literary scene has its various aspects viewpointed in completely different ways in the two languages.

### 6.3.3. Viewpointing Preference Across Languages

In Section 6.2, we showed how English and Chinese viewpoint the same literary scene in drastically different (and, perhaps to some, disillusioning) ways, which might create an impression that the MultiParT approach directs one's attention only to the ugly reality of lack of cross-linguistic correspondence. Quite the contrary, in this section we present the unparalleled beauty of this methodology: MultiParT also helps us identify intralanguage consistencies and how one language systematically differs from another.

Consider Excerpts (2a)–(2d) again. In (2a), Carroll presents the rabbit in a viewpoint-neutral way using a definite article (*the*) to ground the nominal referent, leaving the narrator's distance to the rabbit unspecified. (2b) faithfully preserves the viewpoint-neutral representation of the rabbit by using *tuzi* as a bare noun. However, note that, on the other hand, two text producers chose not to follow the practice but to use *na* to distally construe the rabbit, creating a long distance between the narrator and the rabbit that is *not in the original*.

If there were only one text producer who did this, it would still be possible to attribute the variation to the translator's idiolect. But now there are two, which makes it difficult to claim the variation to be a mere chance.

Another significant set of examples is (3a)–(3d), which shows a high intralanguage consistency among three translators.

(3a) Down, down, down. Would the fall NEVER come to an end!

(3b)	掉	阿，	掉	阿，	掉	阿！	這
	<i>diao</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>diao</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>diao</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>zhe</i>
	fall	PRT	fall	PRT	fall	PRT	this
	一	跤	怎麼	一輩子	摔不完		了
	<i>yi</i>	<i>jiao</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>yibeizi</i>	<i>shuai-bu-wan</i>		<i>le</i>
	one	fall	why	whole life	fall-NEG-PFV		CRS

嗎！

*ma*

PRT

“Fall, fall, fall! Why did this fall seem endless throughout the whole life!”  
(Chao)

(3c)	下墜，	下墜，	下墜。	難道	這	一	跤
	<i>xiazhui</i>	<i>xiazhui</i>	<i>xiazhui</i>	<i>nandao</i>	<i>zhe</i>	<i>yi</i>	<i>jiao</i>
	fall	fall	fall	PRT	this	one	fall

永無盡頭！

*yongwujintou*

endless forever

“Fall, fall, fall. Was this fall without an end forever!” (Chen)

(3d)	往	下	掉，	往	下	掉，	往
	<i>wang</i>	<i>xia</i>	<i>diao</i>	<i>wang</i>	<i>xia</i>	<i>diao</i>	<i>wang</i>
	LOC	down	fall	LOC	down	fall	LOC
	下	掉。	這	地道	難道	永遠	沒有
	<i>xia</i>	<i>diao</i>	<i>zhe</i>	<i>didao</i>	<i>nandao</i>	<i>yongyuan</i>	<i>meiyou</i>
	down	fall	this	tunnel	PRT	forever	NEG

盡頭 嗎？

*jintou ma*

end PRT

“Fall downwards, fall downwards, fall downwards. Was this tunnel without an end forever?” (Wang)

As is clear in (3a), the narrator’s take on Alice’s fall is viewpoint unspecified, with the fall grounded only by the definite article *the*, whereas in the three other versions, the narrator takes a close-up view of Alice’s fall, indicated by the use of the proximal demonstrative *zhe*. Note that, although Wang’s version linguistically elaborates the tunnel (in the second half of the excerpt) instead of the fall, the constructional means for the viewpointing of the construal is consistent with the other two versions.

One might think, from a comparison of (3a)–(3d), that the Chinese proximal demonstrative pronoun might be the equivalent of the English definite article. But further examples show that it is not the case at all. Excerpts (4a)–(4c) show just the opposite tendency of how the nominal referent grounded in English with a definite article is actually systematically grounded in Chinese with a distal demonstrative.

(4a) However, on the second time round, she came upon a low curtain she had not noticed before, and behind it was a little door about fifteen inches high: she tried the little golden key in the lock, and to her great delight it fitted!

(4b) 可是 再 第二回 試 的 時候， 她

*keshi zai dier-hui shi de shihou ta*

but again second-time try LK when she

看見了 一個 上回 沒有 看見

*kan-jian-le yi-ge shang-hui meiyou kan-jian*

see-PFV-PFV one-CL last-time NEG see-PFV

的	低	簾子，	簾子	後頭	有	一個
<i>de</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>lianzi</i>	<i>lianzi</i>	<i>houtou</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>yi-ge</i>
LK	low	curtain	curtain	behind	have	one-CL

小門，	只不過	一尺	多	高：	她	把
<i>xiaomen</i>	<i>zhibuguo</i>	<i>yi-chi</i>	<i>duo</i>	<i>gao</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>ba</i>
small door	only	one-meter	more	high	she	PRT

那	金	鑰匙	放	在	鎖	裏
<i>na</i>	<i>jin</i>	<i>yaoshi</i>	<i>fang</i>	<i>zai</i>	<i>suo</i>	<i>li</i>
that	golden	key	put	LOC	lock	LOC

試試，	果然	真	配得上，	好個高興	呀！
<i>shi-shi</i>	<i>guoran</i>	<i>zhen</i>	<i>pei-de-shang</i>	<i>haogegaoxing</i>	<i>ya</i>
try-RED	indeed	real	match-PFV-PFV	very happy	PRT

“But when trying the second time again, she saw a low curtain that she had not seen last time, after which there was a small door, only roughly one feet in height: She put that golden key in the lock, and they matched, so happy!” (Chao)

(4c)	然而，	就	在	愛麗絲	再一次	試用	那
	<i>raner</i>	<i>jiu</i>	<i>zai</i>	<i>ailisi</i>	<i>zaiyici</i>	<i>shi-yong</i>	<i>na</i>
	however	PRT	LOC	Alice	again	try-use	that
	支	鑰匙	時，	卻	發現	一	片
	<i>zhi</i>	<i>yaoshi</i>	<i>shi</i>	<i>que</i>	<i>faxian</i>	<i>yi</i>	<i>pian</i>
	CL	key	when	but	find	one	CL
	先前	沒	留意到	的	窗簾，	窗簾	後面
	<i>xianqian</i>	<i>mei</i>	<i>liuyi-dao</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>chuanglian</i>	<i>chuanglian</i>	<i>houmian</i>
	previous	NEG	notice-PFV	LK	curtain	curtain	behind
	是	一	扇	大約	五	英尺	高
	<i>shi</i>	<i>yi</i>	<i>shan</i>	<i>dayue</i>	<i>wu</i>	<i>yinchi</i>	<i>gao</i>
	LK	one	CL	about	five	feet	tall
	的	小門。	她	試著	將	那	把
	<i>de</i>	<i>xiaomen</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>shi-zhe</i>	<i>jiang</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>ba</i>
	LK	small door	she	try-IPF	PRT	that	CL
	小	鑰匙	放進	小門	門鎖	中，	而
	<i>xiao</i>	<i>yaoshi</i>	<i>fang-jin</i>	<i>xiaomen</i>	<i>mensuo</i>	<i>zhong</i>	<i>er</i>
	small	key	put-in	small door	lock	LOC	and

令	人	開心	的	是，	鑰匙	正
ling	ren	kaixin	de	shi	yaoshi	zheng
make	man	happy	LK	LK	key	PRT
吻合	那	扇	門！			
wenhe	na	shan	men			
match	that	CL	door			

“However, as Alice was trying again with that key, she found a curtain that she had not noticed, behind which was a small door of about five feet tall. She tried putting that key into the small door’s lock, and what made (her) happy was the key matched that door!” (Wang)

In English version (4a), the golden key, as a nominal referent, is grounded by the definite article *the* in a viewpoint-neutral way. However, in both (4b) and (4c), the same referent is presented from an obvious distance, elaborated by the use of the distal demonstrative *na*. The Chinese versions share a clear distance between the narrator and that specific part of the narrated scene (i.e., the key).

A comparison between Set (3) and Set (4) shows a clear advantage of MultiParT: Recall the fact that Chinese does not make systematic use of definite articles like English does, so it was difficult to really say what grounding and viewpointing solution a typical Chinese text producer would come up with. However, from Sets (3) and (4) we see that some nominal referents grounded with a definite article in English are systematically viewpointed in a proximal way in Chinese and others systematically in a distal way. Of course it is still far from clear under what circumstances a nominal is marked proximally or distally, but we believe that the use of multiple parallel texts involving a certain number of (representative) text producers from the same language provides a starting point for making valid intralanguage generalizations.<sup>3</sup>

What we can generalize from a comparison between the English and the Chinese versions in Sets (2), (3), and (4) in terms of intralanguage consistency is important. First, there *is* a viewpointing tendency shared by at

least over half of the Chinese versions. Second, the viewpointing tendency shared by most of the Chinese text producers is systematically different from the way the English narrative is viewpointed. Third, the same grounding element (the English definite article *the*) may find systematic correspondences that convey opposite viewpoints in Chinese. We believe the preceding findings constitute powerful testimonies to MultiParT as a useful methodological tool for empirical cross-linguistic viewpoint research, which we return to in Section 6.4.

#### 6.4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In Section 6.3, we showed the overall differences in relevant viewpointing constructions identified by means of the MultiParT approach, which we believe point to fundamental differences at the discourse and the cognitive levels between the two languages.

Our findings first show the text producers' different strategies of facilitating a flow of information by creating and tracking nominal referents in a literary narrative in the respective languages. A comparison between Excerpts (1a) and (1b) shows that the distribution of demonstratives interacts with, and as a result is influenced by, the use of shell nouns in the narrator's language. Specifically, only in Chao's version is a schematic entity created for the possible event of making a daisy chain and a schematic label (*wanyi-er*) assigned to that, and a proximal viewpointing construction is used to mark that created nominal referent, with a close-up construal created on that particular creation in the narrative as a consequence. Such discourse operation is not seen in the English version. At the cognitive level, such creation of a nominal referent in discourse reflects the fundamental human capacity of *reification* and *tracking relationships* (Langacker, 2008). What our data reveal at this level is that in the same usage event, different text producers in different languages have completely *different ways of utilizing the same cognitive capacity in parallel usage events*, which is reflected in their actual use of language. This has an important implication: Although the general human cognitive infrastructure may be universal, the cognitive and conceptual operations in different languages simply have to follow the linguistic conventions in the respective languages (Croft, 2001). Viewpoint taking in language in general, and in literary narratives more specifically, is naturally part of that (Lu and Verhagen, 2016).

The second important factor to consider in terms of viewpointing in literary narratives is the influence of the grammatical profile of the viewpointing construction. As we showed in Excerpts (2a) and (2c), the grammatical



profiles of the viewpointing construction are different. In Carroll's version, the demonstrative constructions as viewpoint markers stand alone as pronouns, whereas in Chen's version, one of the viewpoint operators is joined by an adverbializer (*na-me*). We argue that this subtle grammatical difference has an important conceptual consequence in terms of *profiling* (in the sense of Langacker, 2008) and the respective construals that the viewpoint marker participates in. In particular, when a viewpoint is lexicalized in a pronominalized event, the pronoun confers focal prominence on the entire event as *a thing*. On the other hand, when a viewpoint coincides with an adverbializing construction, the entire adverbial construction, as a relational expression in Langacker's (2008, 112–17) sense, profiles *a relation*. In addition, the relation profiled is not only between the narrated event and the ground but between only *one out of the many* attributes of the narrated event and the ground, as the head of the adverbial is an adjective (*ziran* [natural]). Similar to what we have claimed before, although the general cognitive capacities of profiling and reification are universal, their instantiations in literary narratives, as a matter of fact, vary radically across languages.

The third important factor is how reference making is influenced by the interplay between viewpointing and viewpoint-neutral constructions in the respective languages. Excerpts (2a)–(2d) show that, although it is possible (and preferable) for the English version to pronominalize the event of Alice hearing the rabbit talk to itself and make reference to that as part of the cleft construction, such practice is not at all possible in *any* of the Chinese versions. The different constructional repertoire in the two languages forces the Chinese versions to adopt different strategies, with Excerpts (2b) and (2c) taking a proximal viewpoint on that same event and (2d) a distal one. Therefore the split in translation strategies is actually a natural result of lack of correspondence between the grammatical systems in the individual languages: The possibility of embedding a pronominalized event in a cleft construction is simply not available in the translators' *construct-i-con*, which is "the totality of our knowledge of language . . . captured by a network of constructions" (Goldberg, 2003).

We believe that the preceding points provide a powerful testimony for the effectiveness of MultiParT as an empirical method in cognitive linguistic and poetic research. Given its parallel nature, this methodology allows us to compare a set of almost identical usage events under highly similar circumstances, which turns up useful linguistic facts relevant to linguistic theorizing that other methodological approaches simply cannot show. For instance, our finding in Section 6.3.3 is in line with the observation by Gundel, Hedberg, and Zacharski (1993, 300) that both demonstratives

seem to function like a definite article in Chinese, with the proximal form being more frequent. However, MultiParT further allows one to identify precisely under what circumstances the English definite article corresponds to the proximal demonstrative in Chinese [such as Excerpts (3a)–(3d)] and to the distal one [such as Excerpts (4a)–(4c)].

We claim that MultiParT is also highly innovative in the sense that it provides a systematic way of comparing the overall distributions of relevant viewpointing constructions, not only across languages but also across different representative users within the same language, which allows us to plausibly distinguish purely individual characteristics of a translator's usage from more systematic, community-wide properties of the language involved. Now the language-internal systematicity also leads us back to a reconsideration of the observation that we made in Section 6.3.2. The lack of perfect correspondence between the languages should be seen as an epiphenomenon of each language having its own “grammar of viewpoint.”

Of course, the present study also has its own share of limitations. In this chapter, we focus on parallel texts translated from English to Chinese only, and we acknowledge that translations in the other direction should also be considered for a methodological balance as in Wu (2004) and Lu and Verhagen (2016). However, the potential of MultiParT is not in the least undermined by the methodological constraint. If translated texts in only one direction already allowed us to see such stark cross-linguistic differences (in terms of frequency, distribution, etc.) between the languages, we believe that a bidirectional MultiParT approach will definitely prove even more fruitful. Finally, we believe that demonstratives as viewpointing constructions should be further studied in relation to the use of other viewpointing constructions, such as modal verbs and adverbs, iconicity, and so forth, as Tabakowska (2014) has initiated. Further systematic cross-linguistic research on viewpointing constructions is definitely a must, and we expect to see more studies in this direction in the near future.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this paper was jointly supported by a grant awarded to the first author, “The Language of Death in Taiwan: Evidence from Condolatory Idioms, Presidential Eulogies and the Self-introductions of Undertakers” (RG002-N-15) and another grant awarded to the third author, “Nominalization in Academic Discourse: A Pragmatic Account” (NSC 100-2410-H-002-160-MY3). We thank an anonymous reviewer for

useful comments, with the typical disclaimer that applies. Questions or requests for reprints should be addressed to the first author at wlu@phil.muni.cz.

## NOTES

1. Demonstratives are important viewpoint tools that may coincide in narratives with various others, such as personal pronouns, deictic verbs, modals, etc. Interested readers are referred to Dancygier (2012), Lu and Verhagen (2016), and Tabakowska (2014) for details.
2. The representativeness comes from the fact that most commercial publishers very carefully select as their contracted translators speakers who are highly proficient in both the source and the target language to ensure the quality of the translation.
3. Of course this is not an exhaustive list here. Readers are referred to Chapters 4 and 5 of Wu (2004) for a detailed discussion on a comparison between English and Chinese using parallel texts (with only one text producer from each language though).
4. Mandarin Chinese has another (though less frequent) demonstrative construction *ci* as a (slightly more written, in terms of genre) synonym of *zhe*. We did not yet include *ci* in the scope of this chapter, but we believe this would not at all undermine the general claim that we try to make here. Excerpt (2c) contains this construction.

## REFERENCES

- Barlow, Michael. 2008. "Parallel Texts and Corpus-based Contrastive Analysis." In *Current Trends in Contrastive Linguistics: Functional and Cognitive Perspectives*, edited by María de los Ángeles Gómez González, J. Lachlan Mackenzie, and Elsa M. González Álvarez. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 101–21.
- Brône, Geert, and Jeroen Vandaele. 2009. *Cognitive Poetics. Goals, Gains and Gaps*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Chamonikolasová, Jana. 2007. *Intonation in English and Czech Dialogues*. Brno: Masaryk University Press.
- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Croft, William. 2005. "Logical and Typological Arguments for Radical Construction Grammar." In *Construction Grammars: Cognitive Grounding and Theoretical Extensions*, edited by Jan-Ola Östman and Mirjam Fried. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 273–314.
- Cysouw, Michael, and Bernhard Wälchli. 2007. "Parallel Texts. Using Translational Equivalents in Linguistic Typology." *Sprachtypologie & Universalienforschung STUF* 60(2): 95–9.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2015. "Individual Differences in Grammatical Knowledge." In *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (Vol. 39 of *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science* series), edited by Ewa Dąbrowska and Dagmar Divjak. Boston and Berlin: de Gruyter, 650–68.

- Dancygier, Barbara. 2012. *The Language of Stories: A Cognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dancygier, Barbara. 2016. "Concluding Remarks: Why Viewpoint Matters." In *Viewpoint and the Fabric of Meaning: Form and Use of Viewpoint Tools Across Languages and Modalities*, edited by Barbara Dancygier, Wei-lun Lu, and Arie Verhagen. Boston and Berlin: de Gruyter, 281–88.
- Diessel, Holger. 2006. "Demonstratives, Joint Attention, and the Emergence of Grammar." *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(4): 463–89.
- Freeman, Margaret H. 2006. "The Fall of the Wall Between Literary Studies and Linguistics: Cognitive Poetics." In *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives*, edited by Gitte Kristiansen, Michel Achard, René Dirven, and Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez. Boston and Berlin: de Gruyter, 403–28.
- Freeman, Margaret H., and Masako Takeda. 2006. "Art, Science, and Ste. Emilie's Sunsets: A Háj-Inspired Cognitive Approach to Translating an Emily Dickinson Poem into Japanese." *Style* 40(1–2): 109–27.
- Gavins, Joanna, and Gerard Steen. 2003. *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions. A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2003. "Constructions: A New Theoretical Approach to Language." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7(5): 219–24.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg, and Ron Zacharski. 1993. "Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse." *Language* 69(2): 274–307.
- Harrison, Chloe, Louise Nuttall, Peter Stockwell, and Wenjuan Yuan. 2014. *Cognitive Grammar in Literature*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 1996. "Demonstratives in Narrative Discourse: A Taxonomy of Universal Uses." In *Studies in Anaphora*, edited by Barbara Fox. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 205–54.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner. 1989. *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago 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, and Arie Verhagen. 2016. "Shifting Viewpoints: How Does That Actually Work Across Languages? An Exercise in Parallel Text Analysis." In *Viewpoint and the Fabric of Meaning: Form and Use of Viewpoint Tools Across Languages and Modalities*, edited by Barbara Dancygier, Wei-lun Lu, and Arie Verhagen. Boston and Berlin: de Gruyter, 169–90.
- Lu, Wei-lun, Svitlana Shurma, Suzanne Kemmer, and Jiri Rambousek. Submitted. "Use of Translation as a Research Method in Contrastive Cognitive Poetics: Word Formation in Jabberwocky and Its Ukrainian Translations." Submitted to *Poetics*.
- Piwek, Paul, Robbert-Jan Beun, and Anita Cremers. 2008. "'Proximal' and 'Distal' in Language and Cognition: Evidence from Deictic Demonstratives in Dutch." *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(4): 694–718.
- Rojo, Ana, and Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano (eds.). 2013. *Cognitive Linguistics and Translation: Advances in Some Theoretical Models and Applications*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Schmid, Hans-Jörg. 2000. *English Abstract Nouns as Conceptual Shells: From Corpus to Cognition*. Boston and Berlin: de Gruyter.

- Semino, Elena, and Jonathan Culpeper. 2002. *Cognitive Stylistics. Language and Cognition in Text Analysis*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Shurma, Svitlana, and Wei-lun Lu. 2016. "A Cognitive Poetic Analysis of LIFE and DEATH in English and Ukrainian: A Multiple-Parallel-Text Approach to Hamlet's Soliloquy." *Theatralia* 19(2): 9–28.
- Slobin, Dan I. 1996. "Two Ways to Travel: Verbs of Motion in English and Spanish." In *Grammatical Constructions: Their Form and Meaning*, edited by Masayoshi Shibatani and Sandra A. Thompson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 195–220.
- Slobin, Dan 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 Dedre Gentner and Susan Goldin-Meadow. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 157–92.
- Stockwell, Peter. 2002. *Cognitive Poetics. An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 1993. *Cognitive Linguistics and Poetics of Translation*. Tübingen, Germany: Narr.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 2014. "Lewis Carroll's Alice in Grammatical Wonderlands." In *Cognitive Grammar in Literature*, edited by Chloe Harrison, Louise Nuttall, Peter Stockwell and Wenjuan Yuan. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 101–16.
- Tsur, Reuven. 1992. *Toward a Theory of Cognitive Poetics*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Van der Auwera, Johan, Ewa Schalley, and Jan Nuyts. 2005. "Epistemic Possibility in a Slavonic Parallel Corpus: A Pilot Study." In *Modality in Slavonic Languages: New Perspectives*, edited by Björn Hansen and Petr Karlik. Munich: Sagner, 201–17.
- Verkerk, Annemarie. 2014. *The Evolutionary Dynamics of Motion Event Encoding*. Nijmegen, The Netherlands: MPI Series in Psycholinguistics.
- Wu, Yi'an. 2004. *Spatial Demonstratives in English and Chinese: Text and Cognition*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

### Research Materials Used

- Carroll, Lewis. 1939. *Alisi Manyou Qijing Ji* [Alice's Adventures in Wonderland]. Translated by Yuan Ren Chao. Shanghai: The Commercial Press.
- Carroll, Lewis. 2005. *Ailisi Mengyou Xianjing* [Alice's Adventures in Wonderland]. Translated by Wenhao Jia and Wenyuan Jia. Taipei: Shangzhou Publishing.
- Carroll, Lewis. 2006. *Ailisi Mengyou Xianjing* [Alice's Adventures in Wonderland]. Translated by Li-fang Chen. Taipei: Gaobao Publishing.
- Carroll, Lewis. 2008. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. E-book edition. Available at <http://www.gutenberg.org>.
- Carroll, Lewis. 2011. *Ailisi Manyou Qijing* [Alice's Adventures in Wonderland]. Translated by Hui-hsien Wang. Taipei: Licun Culture Publishing.