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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.1 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; Himmelmann, 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 viewpoint constructions cross-linguistically? When we identify a viewpoint 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. 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 Wenyuan 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.
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

(1c) 心裡 盤算- （她 亦 不過 勉強 地

Table 6.1. Frequency of Demonstratives in the English Version and the Four Chinese Versions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>Distal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
醒著，因為這熱天熱得她昏昏

地要睡)到底還是做一枝

野菊花園兒好呢？還是為著這

的麻煩呢？她正在納悶

的時候，忽然來了一隻淡紅眼睛

的時後，突然來了。一隻淡紅眼睛
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“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.
“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 viewpoint 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);
兔子，本來亦不是件怎麼大了不得的事情；並且就是阿麗思聽見那兔子自言自語地說，「噯呀！噯呀！我一定要去晚了」她亦不覺得這算什麼十二分出奇。
“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

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zhe</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>thing</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>seem</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mei</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>special</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>hear-PFV</td>
<td>rabbit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yao</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

自言自語 地 說： 「天哪！ 天哪！ 我

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ziyanziyu</td>
<td>LK</td>
<td>say</td>
<td>INTERJ</td>
<td>INTERJ</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chidao</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>shi</td>
<td>ailisi</td>
<td>ye</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

沒 什麼 特別， 而且 在 聽到 兔子

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mei</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>special</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>hear-PFV</td>
<td>rabbit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

要 遲到 了！」 時， 愛麗絲 也 不

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yao</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>shi</td>
<td>ailisi</td>
<td>ye</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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认为有何不寻常（事后回想起来，

```
renwei you he bu xunchang shihou huixiang-qilai
```

think have what NEG usual afterwards recall-IPF

她觉得自己早该对此

```
ta juede ziji zao gai dui ci
```
she feel self early MOD to this

感到奇怪，但当时一切似乎

```
gan-dao qiguai dan zai dangshi yiqie sihu
```
feel-PFV strange but LOC then everything seem

都那么的自然）。

```
dou na-me de ziran
```
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
zai meiyou geng ling ren xingfen de
PRT NEG more make man excite LK

事 了， 尤其是 愛麗絲 親耳聽到 那
shi le youqishi ailisi qiner-ting-dao na
thing CRS especially Alice in person-hear-PFV that

隻 小白兔 喃喃自語：「噢！天啊！我
zhi xiaobaitu nannanziyu ao tian-a wo
CL rabbit talk to self INTERJ INTERJ I

要 遲到 了！」 （就在 她 聽
yao chidao le jiu zai ta ting
MOD late CRS PRT LOC she hear

懂 那 句 話 之後， 猛然 驚覺，
dong na ju hua zhihou mengran jingjue
understand that CL (sentence) word after suddenly realize
“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
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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
diao a diao a diao a zhe
fall PRT fall PRT fall PRT this

一 跤 怎麼 一輩子 摔不完 了
yi jiao zeme yibeizi shuai-bu-wan le
one fall why whole life fall-NEG-PFV CRS
“Fall, fall, fall! Why did this fall seem endless throughout the whole life!” (Chao)

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

(4c) 看見了 一個 上回 沒有 看見

[148]  Multiperspectivity: Proximity and Distance
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)
然而，在愛麗絲再一次試用那把鑰匙時，卻發現一片先前沒留意到的窗簾，窗簾後面是約五英呎高的小門。她試著將那小鑰匙放進小門門鎖中，而

然而，就在愛麗絲再一次試用那把鑰匙時，卻發現一片先前沒留意到的窗簾，窗簾後面是約五英呎高的小門。她試著將那小鑰匙放進小門門鎖中，而
"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 viewpoint 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.3

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 viewpoint tendency shared by at
least over half of the Chinese versions. Second, the viewpointung 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 viewpointung 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 viewpointung 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 viewpointung in literary narratives is the influence of the grammatical profile of the viewpointung construction. As we showed in Excerpts (2a) and (2c), the grammatical
profiles of the viewpoint 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 viewpoint 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
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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 viewpoint 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 viewpoint constructions should be further studied in relation to the use of other viewpoint constructions, such as modal verbs and adverbs, iconicity, and so forth, as Tabakowska (2014) has initiated. Further systematic cross-linguistic research on viewpoint constructions is definitely a must, and we expect to see more studies in this direction in the near future.
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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 \textit{ci} as a (slightly more written, in terms of genre) synonym of \textit{zhe}. We did not yet include \textit{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.
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