

Cognitive Linguistics Research

Editors

Dirk Geeraerts
Dagmar Divjak
John R. Taylor

Honorary editors

René Dirven
Ronald W. Langacker

Volume 55

Viewpoint and the Fabric of Meaning

Form and Use of Viewpoint Tools
across Languages and Modalities

Edited by
Barbara Dancygier
Wei-lun Lu
Arie Verhagen



DE GRUYTER
MOUTON

ISBN 978-3-11-036907-6
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-036546-7
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-039307-1
ISSN 1861-4132

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2016 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Typesetting: PTP-Berlin, Protago-T_EX-Production GmbH, Berlin
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck
♾ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com



Table of contents

List of contributors — vii

Arie Verhagen

Introduction: On tools for weaving meaning out of viewpoint threads — 1

Part I: The ubiquity of viewpoint

Barbara Dancygier and Lieven Vandelanotte

Discourse viewpoint as network — 13

Jeroen Vanderbiesen

Mixed viewpoints and the quotative-reportive cline in German: Reported speech and reportive evidentiality — 41

Katsunobu Izutsu and Mitsuko Narita Izutsu

Viewpoint fusion for realism enhancement in Ainu and Japanese narratives — 93

Elisabeth Engberg-Pedersen and Ditte Boeg Thomsen

The socio-cognitive foundation of Danish perspective-mixing dialogue particles — 125

Part II: Across languages

Kobie van Krieken, José Sanders, Hans Hoeken

Blended viewpoints, mediated witnesses: A cognitive linguistic approach to news narratives — 145

Wei-lun Lu and Arie Verhagen

Shifting viewpoints: How does that actually work across languages? An exercise in parallel text analysis — 169

Ad Foolen and Toshiko Yamaguchi

Perspective: Kawabata's *Beauty and Sadness* and its translations into English, German, and Dutch — 191

Part III: Across modalities

Chie Fukada

The dynamic interplay between words and pictures in picture storybooks: How visual and verbal information interact and affect the readers' viewpoint and understanding — 217

Eve Sweetser and Kashmiri Stec

Maintaining multiple viewpoints with gaze — 237

Maria Josep Jarque and Esther Pascual

Mixed viewpoints in factual and fictive discourse in Catalan Sign Language narratives — 259

Barbara Dancygier

Concluding remarks: Why viewpoint matters — 281

Index — 289

Ad Foolen and Toshiko Yamaguchi

Perspective: Kawabata's *Beauty and Sadness* and its translations into English, German, and Dutch

Abstract: It has been pointed out that Japanese culture, including literature, has a preference for a special type of subjective construal, with an experiencing subject embedded in the experienced situation (see, for example, Ikegami 2005, 2008). At the same time, it is often claimed that Western culture and literature prefer a more objective, distanced, perspective. In the present paper, this assumed contrast is tested by analyzing the opening scene of *Beauty and Sadness*, a novel by the Japanese author Yasunari Kawabata and its translations in English, German, and Dutch. The four versions differ with respect to the way perspective is handled. In our analysis, we show that the original author and the translators recruit a variety of linguistic means (adverbs, pragmatic markers, negation, and constructions on the sentence level) to express perspective and guide perspectival shifts. We did not find, however, a systematic contrast in perspective taking between the Japanese original and its translations in Western languages. Instead, we found variation among the three translations, sometimes coming closer to the original, sometimes deviating from it substantially. We conclude that perspective in literary texts is a challenge for translators, which deserves more attention in translation theory and practice.

1 Introduction

The central question in cognitive linguistics is how languages conceptualize the world, or better, how *people* conceptualize the world in their language, or, even better, how they conceptualize *experience* (of the world) in their language. Whichever version one prefers, conceptualization remains the central notion. Conceptualization takes place with the help of cognitive processes like categorization, image schemas, metaphor, metonymy, etc. (see for example, the different chapters in Part I of Geeraerts and Cuyckens [eds., 2007] *Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*).

The central aspect of conceptualization is ‘construal’, a cover term for “non-objective facets of meaning” (Verhagen 2007: 48). In general, construal can be defined as “the relationship between a speaker (or hearer) and a situation that he conceptualizes and portrays” (Langacker 1987: 487–488). With objective con-

ceptualization, the relation between the speaker and the situation stays in the background, but when the conceptualization is “nonobjective”, or “subjective”, it becomes part of the portrayed situation. It is as if the conceptualizer brings the conceptualization relation itself into the picture.

Within construal, different aspects can be distinguished, such as the degree of detail in the conceptualization of a situation (“granularity”) or the degree of prominence of different parts of the situation (“figure” versus “ground”). Another aspect of construal, the one that will be central to this chapter, is “perspective”, or the phenomenon where the same situation can be viewed from different perspectives. In Cognitive Grammar, perspective has been part of the model from the beginning (cf. Langacker [1987: 120], where he defines perspective as “the way in which a scene is viewed”). The overall relationship between the “viewer” and the situation being viewed is called the “viewing arrangement” (Langacker 2008: 73).

A standard example of perspective taking is the difference expressed by the deictic verbs *come* and *go*, as used in *John came into the house* and *John went into the house*. In the first example, the conceptualizer perceives the situation from inside the house and in the second example from outside. How central or widespread perspective as an aspect of the conceptualization process is, is a question that will be on the research agenda of Cognitive Linguistics for some time to come. The present chapter intends to contribute to answering this question by exploring perspective phenomena in a Japanese novel and its translations into English, German, and Dutch.

Perspective is not an important notion only in Cognitive Linguistics; it has played a central role in theorizing literary narrative for several decades already. In section 2, we will pay attention to this line of research. Section 3 is devoted to a presumed Japanese preference for subjective construal. In section 4, we will consider perspective as a specific challenge for translators. We chose translations into English, German, and Dutch to avoid analyzing solely the choices of one translator and to see whether these closely related languages nevertheless show subtle differences based on, for example, word order patterns. In section 5, we will present our data, which will be analyzed in section 6. The analysis will make use of the notions and distinctions we have introduced in section 2, 3 and 4, with special attention to the passages where multiple perspectives seem to play a role simultaneously, as this is the central topic of the present volume. Section 7 concludes this chapter.

2 Perspective in literary texts

Niederhoff (2013) gives an overview of perspective research in literary theory. He points out that terminology varies: *perspective*, *point of view*, *vantage point*, *voice*, and *focalization*. There are certain subtle theoretical differences between these notions, but for the present purpose, we can consider them to be more or less equivalent.

The perspective in a literary text can vary. The “viewer” can be the character (“protagonist”) who plays a central role in the story (this is typically the case in first person narratives) or it can be a narrator who does not play a role himself except being the narrator, typically leading to third person narratives. In the latter case, the narrator often shifts perspective to different characters, which makes the narrative more lively and easier to identify with.

2.1 Multiple perspectives

In a third person narrative, the perspective of the narrator is the unmarked perspective. If the narrator shifts the perspective to that of a character, he can mention the character explicitly and state what he/she perceived, thought or felt. There are, however, more implicit means to indicate perspective shift, like the use of adverbs or particles that evoke a subjective perspective. Analyzing the use of the German particle *wohl*, which indicates epistemic uncertainty, Eckardt points out that “uncertainty often only makes sense for a protagonist, not for the narrator. Hence, *wohl* can be a reliable clue for a shift in context.” (Eckardt 2012: 11). Harris and Potts (2009) discuss epithets like *the idiot*, which can easily lead to what they call “pragmatically-mediated perspective shifting” (p. 524). More research into other linguistic techniques that can be used for implicit or explicit perspective shifting is still necessary.

The narrator can also explicitly switch the perspective to him/herself. Chafe (2010: 57) gives examples of what he calls “interpolated narrator comments” from George Eliot’s *Middlemarch* (1871). Similar examples can be observed in *The Luminaries*, the Man Booker Prize winning novel of 2013 by Eleanor Catton, who uses the explicit narrative perspective as one of the ways to imitate 19th century novelistic style. Some of these narrator comments relate to the actual wording chosen, as in *[T]he benefit of the doubt, to take the common phrase, ...* (p. 125); others refer to an earlier passage, as in *Mannering, as has been already observed, was a very fat man* (p. 178); or bring in a reflection by the narrator on a specific observation, as in *Clinch's efforts in love were always of a mothering sort, for it is a feature of human nature to give what we most wish to receive, and it was a mother*

that Edgar Clinch most craved – his own having died in infancy ... The narrator even uses the explicit personal pronoun *we* to refer to himself when he makes a discourse organizational remark in reaction to the very elaborate style of one of the characters: *We shall therefore intervene, and render Sook Yongsheng's story in a way that is accurate to the events he wished to disclose, rather than to the style of his narration* (p. 262).

Up till now, we have seen that the unmarked narrative perspective can shift to an explicit perspective of a character or to that of the narrator. These shifts lead to a sequence of different perspectives, which, together, constitute multiple perspectives in a stretch of discourse. This type of sequential multiperspectivity can fulfill a broad range of functions, such as “creating suspense, as a self-reflective way of foregrounding the process of narration, or as a method of endorsing a thematic aspect of a moral within the narrative by, for example, presenting it repeatedly from different standpoints” (Hartner 2014: section 2).

In the context of the present paper and volume, the relevant question is, however, whether it is also possible to express different perspectives at the same time, in situations of simultaneous perspectives or mixed points of view. There are indeed techniques to bring different perspectives in even closer contact than just presenting them sequentially. Cui (2014) shows how Virginia Woolf uses parentheticals to insert a different perspective within one that is created in the main clause: “the consciousness presented in a parenthetical works collaboratively with the consciousness presented in the host to depict a whole picture for a certain scene. The text no longer revolves around a single source of consciousness; simultaneity and multiplicity have become the new mode.” (Cui 2014: 184).

The simultaneous presence of multiple perspectives is strongest when linguistic elements (words or constructions) encode two or more perspectives at the same time. Evans (2005) presents fascinating examples from different languages, for example demonstrative pronouns which locate referents with respect to both the speaker and the hearer, or particles like Italian *mica*, which indicates that the speaker assumes that the proposition is believed by the hearer, at the same time asserting himself that the proposition does not hold. In this way, the speaker presents his perspective against the background of the assumed perspective of the hearer.

In narrative theory, free indirect discourse is the best known and most studied technique for creating mixed points of view, combining the perspective of the narrator with that of a character (Vandelanotte 2009). This is a relatively new technique, which fully developed in the context of writing in the 20th century. In our data, we find a clear example of this technique (see section 6 for further discussion).

2.2 On-line experience

One aspect of perspective concerns the distance between the viewer and what is viewed, which also typically correlates with granularity: with decreasing distance, granularity typically increases. If the distance is very small, the distinction between the viewer and the viewed can get blurred, the viewer becoming the experiencer, the viewed experience “involved experience”. The viewer is not at a distance from the experience anymore but in the middle of it. What we mean here is not simply that the viewer is “on stage” in Langacker’s sense, but rather that the distinction between the experiencer and the experience dissolves.¹

Several researchers have tried to capture this type of “involved perspective” from different theoretical backgrounds. MacWhinney (2005) distinguishes between the depictive and enactive mode in perspective taking, the latter being the involved one. Dancygier (2012: 102ff) distinguishes “on-line conceptualization” as one type of perspective taking, which seems to come close to what MacWhinney calls the enactive mode. Dancygier writes (2012: 103–104): “there is a difference between thoughts and experiential conceptualizations (...) [which] allow the reader to *experience* the narrated reality through the eyes of the narrating Ego... The fictive vision here is a simulation of experiential on-line conceptualization (as opposed to stable categorization)”. As Dancygier points out, the progressive is one of the grammatical means that can help to implement this experiential viewpoint (cf. her example on p. 104: *We were shrinking; at the rate I was going ...*). Techniques like these contribute to one of the main characteristics of narratives, namely their “experientiality”, as Garrod and Emmott (2012: 6) call it: “the importance of embodiment and emotion as a basis for experiencing narrative”. Chafe (2010: 54) contrasts displaced and immediate consciousness. The first type is often discontinuous (island-like), with low resolution (attenuated detail) and distal (there, then), the second is continuous, with high resolution (granularity) and proximal. We are not claiming that MacWhinney, Dancygier, and Chafe are aiming at exactly the same concepts and distinctions, but, in our view, they come close to each other. In particular the notions of enactive mode, on-line experience, and immediate consciousness are meant to capture a type of perspective where the viewer is “in the middle of” the viewed situation, which then becomes involved, direct experience.

¹ Sheets-Johnstone (2009: 34) points out that a similar kind of experience can occur in dance. She calls it “thinking in movement”, which is “an experience in which all movements blend into an ongoing kinetic happening; a singular kinetic density evolves. (...) My experience of an ongoing present exists only in virtue of an immediate moment, that is, the actual here-now creating of this gesture or movement”.

3 Perspective in Japanese

3.1 Subjective construal in Japanese

In section 2.1, we have pointed out that different historical periods have different literary preferences for certain types of perspectives (interventions with explicit narrator perspective in the 19th century, mixed point of view in free indirect discourse in the 20th century). Perspectival preferences seem to exist between different cultures as well. As has been argued by Japanese scholars in particular, Japanese narrative shows a preference for a type of perspective that comes close to what has been characterized above as enactive perspective, narrating on-line experience, and immediate consciousness.

Starting from Langacker's notion of subjective construal, Yoshihiko Ikegami has explored this Japanese preference (Ikegami 2005, 2008). In Ikegami (2008: 230), for example, he characterizes it as follows: "The maximally subjective construal is one in which the conceptualizer is totally embedded in the environment which s/he is to construe and encode. In other words, the conceptualizer is on the very scene, verbalizing what s/he directly perceives and experiences". Another term Ikegami uses for this specific perspectival arrangement is "subject-object merger" (p. 239).

Ikegami and other authors (for example Maynard 2002; Ide and Ueno 2011) link this preference for subjective construal to other preferences in Japanese culture. One of these preferences is associated with the notion of *ba*, which means 'field' or 'context' (cf. Ide and Ueno 2011: 458 ff.; Maynard 2002: Ch. 4) and which indicates that the individual should make a coherent whole with the context. There are two other notions that have to do with the relation between individual and context. The first one is *wakimae* (cf. Ide & Ueno 2011; Ide 2012), which indicates the position of the self in the contextual relation with others. The other is *mono no aware*, 'the sense of things', the emotion one feels for things and the awareness of their temporal existence, which often leads to sadness and melancholy (cf. Maynard 2002). The combination of *wakimae* and *mono no aware* characterizes a situation in which someone is coherently and emotionally connected with the environment.

Reflections of these social-cognitive characteristics of Japanese culture can be found in Japanese art. As Ikegami (2008: 240) points out: "the technique of 'perspective' was generally not practiced in Japanese painting until its introduction from the West". Similarly, reflections of this ethos can be found in the language. Ide (2012: 121) points out that "the Japanese language has abundant modal expressions from the morpheme level to the discourse level that index the context

in order to show the speaker's attitude toward the contextual elements involved". The sensitivity to context also shows up in politeness phenomena and in particles that indicate awareness of "territories of knowledge" (cf. Hayano 2013). The recurring theme is that subjects of conception are embedded in the context and that this implies a non-distanced perspective.

Another linguistic phenomenon which can be interpreted from the perspective of embeddedness in the context and avoiding a distanced perspective is that of pro-drop. Japanese is a pro-drop language, which means that pronouns, in particular subject pronouns, referring to referents that can be inferred from the context, can be left out. This property occurs in other languages as well. Generally, linguistic theory assumes that sentences with and without explicit pronouns have the same meaning. In their experimental work, Sato and Bergen (2013) have shown that for Japanese speakers this meaning equivalence indeed holds on the level of pure propositional content. But when it comes to perspective, they found that utterances without pronouns lead to "viewpoint-invariant representations" (p. 372). The specific meaning of such viewpoint-invariant, pronoun-less utterances fits the characterization of the Japanese subjective construal as given by Ikegami (cf. also Uehara 2006, 2011).

3.2 A possible explanation for the Japanese construal preference

There is an increasing body of research showing that Japanese language and culture display construal preferences that are different from Western preferences. Often, this difference is attributed to the difference between "East Asians" and "Westerners", as is done in Nisbett and Masuda (2003: 11169): "We have shown that East Asians attend to the field more than do Westerners and that Westerners pay more attention to focal objects". However, Tajima and Duffield (2012: 706) provide evidence for their claim that "the notion of a homogeneous Asian culture, and a concomitant uniform Asian bias, is too wide-sweeping a construct to explain observed cultural variation... Japanese speakers attend more to the Ground, primarily because they *need* to do so in Thinking for Speaking: because they are speakers of Japanese, not because they are Asian".

One does not have to go with this Neo-Whorfian view of Tajima and Duffield to accept their finding that the *Chinese* subjects who participated in their experiments attended more to the Figure, like the English (UK) speakers. Unfortunately, they do not make explicit which part of China their Chinese subjects come from. Region might, however, be an important variable. Talhelm et al. (2014: 607) claim that the main regional difference is that between rice and wheat

agriculture: “This study shows that China’s wheat and rice regions have different cultures. China’s rice regions have several markers of East Asian culture: more holistic thought, more interdependent self-construals, and lower divorce rates. The wheat-growing north looked more culturally similar to the West, with more analytic thought, individualism, and divorce”. In their view, collectivism and attention to the ground has its primary explanation in a type of agriculture that requires collaboration, implying more holistic thinking. Now, if we may link “collectivism” with a psychological tendency to pay strong attention to the context, then we have the start of an answer why Japanese people (and, expectedly, other rice-growing cultures) have a strong preference for a perspective in which the perceiver is embedded in the context.

4 Perspectives in translation

If, as we have suggested before, languages and cultures differ in their preferences for perspective taking, then this will lead to challenges for the translator. Bernaerts et al. (2014: 204) point out that “narrative theorists often assume that, even though the act of translation is never neutral and may involve significant alterations (...), the translation process does not affect the narrative structure of texts”. By “narrative structure”, they mean “place and time, perspective and narrative voice”. They argue, however, that these aspects *are* affected, without getting sufficient attention in the translation process. Empirical research is scarce, but there are a few studies, which we will summarize here.

Data-Bukowska (2007: 308) analyzed translations from Swedish into Polish and found that “in Swedish conceptualizations... the reality described in the story is seen from afar and it presupposes a distant vantage point. By contrast, in Polish it is consistently brought closer. These ways of viewing reality seem to be encoded within the two languages”. This difference results in the choice of demonstrative pronouns and specificity of verbs. For example, the Swedish verb *dra* ‘pull’ corresponds to a variety of more specific Polish verbs, implying a higher granularity.

Tabakowska (2014) analyzed translations of *Alice in Wonderland* into Polish and observed several challenges on the level of perspective. One example is the progressive which can be used for the “internal perspective” of a character, as in the opening passage of Alice: *Alice was beginning to get very tired*. Because in Polish a construction parallel to the English progressive is missing, “the Polish translations choose either the objective POV [point of view] of the narrator ... or a more subjective construal with the imperfective” (p. 111). Another example, discussed by Tabakowska, has to do with epistemic modality. English *seem* is

translated with a variety of Polish epistemic adverbs like *prawdopodobnie* and *chyba*, both meaning ‘probably’, but conveying a subjective and objective construal respectively.

Against the background of these examples from translations between ‘Western’ languages, and the difference, pointed out before, between Japanese and Western preferences for perspective taking, the question is how perspective phenomena in Japanese literature are rendered in translations into Western languages like English, Dutch, and German.

In publications on subjective construal in Japanese, passages from novels by Kawabata are often given as illustrative examples. For instance, Maynard (2002: 396) compares the original and the English translation of the first sentence of *Snow Country* (1948 [1955]). The translation takes an “outside” perspective: *The train came out of the long tunnel into the snow country*, whereas a literal translation of the original would be: ‘Coming out of a long tunnel at the border (of provinces), it was snow country’. Maynard comments: “The self presented in [the original] is the self who witnesses what happens in the context of a locale, a place, and describes it from a personal perspective. ... The English translation takes the ‘agent-does’ structure; the ‘train’ as an agent of action (i.e., came out) surfaces, although in the original Japanese, there is no mention of it [the train]”. In the Japanese text “this self is the ‘feeling self’ who describes the event on the basis of one’s personal experience, from a personal point of view”.

In a similar vein, Ide and Ueno (2011: 440) analyze a passage from *The Izu Dancer* (1926). Two girls observe a passing boy and the one girl whispers to the other girl, in a respectful manner: *He is a high school boy*, as the English translation says. In the Japanese original, there is no subject or copula, the phrase *high school boy* is accompanied by the honorific form *-san* and the utterance contains the final particle *yo*. With this type of utterance “Japanese speakers ... situate themselves in the context while speaking, whereas English speakers take an objective perspective on the speech event”. One could comment that the translations are of low quality, but both novels were translated by Edward Seidensticker (1921–2007), well known for his landmark translations of Yasunari Kawabata.²

Inspired by these examples, we would like to explore this topic further by comparing passages from another novel by Kawabata, namely *Utsukushisa to Kanashimi to, Beauty and Sadness*, from 1964, with its translations into English, Dutch and German.

² http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward_Seidensticker

5 The analyzed text and its author

5.1 Yasunari Kawabata (1899–1972)

Ikegami (2008: 239–240) points out that Kawabata explicitly positioned himself as a “neo-subjectivist” writer, in opposition to the naturalistic approach in literature. Kawabata (1925) states that there are three possible types of construal in describing a lily: (i) ‘I am inside the lily’, (ii) ‘The lily is inside me’, and (iii) ‘The lily and I exist independently of each other’. According to Kawabata, and Ikegami, there is ultimately no difference between (i) and (ii). They involve a merger between subject and object, which is typical for the Japanese type of subjective construal, which Kawabata advocates in his neo-subjectivist approach to writing.

In Kawabata’s own view, the neo-subjectivist approach of literature fits Japanese culture. In his Nobel Prize address (1968), he reflects on qualities of the wisteria plant: “Disappearing and then appearing again in the early summer greenery, they have in them that feeling for the poignant beauty of things long characterized by the Japanese as *mono no aware*”. The title of the novel he wrote four years earlier, *Beauty and Sadness*, also expresses this feeling of “poignant beauty.”³

5.2 *Beauty and Sadness*

In chapter 1, the main character Oki Toshio travels by train from Tokyo to Kyoto on the 29th of December. The official goal of Oki’s trip is to hear the New Year’s Eve bells in Kyoto (that is what he told his wife and son), but his personal, and rather primary goal, is seeing Otoko again. Otoko is the woman he had an affair with 24 years ago, when she was 15 and he was 30 and married (16 and 31 in the Dutch translation). Otoko got pregnant, the baby was born prematurely and died soon after birth. Otoko never married, probably because of this scandalous affair in her youth and moved from Tokyo to Kyoto. After his arrival in Kyoto, Oki goes

³ In fact, instead of speaking of “the feeling of poignant beauty”, singular, it might be better to speak of feelings in the plural, as it is a typical case of mixed emotions. Research on mixed emotions is a growing field in psychology, cf. Larsen and McGraw (2014: 263), who point out that there is “a growing body of evidence that people can feel happy and sad at the same time while watching films, listening to music, and experiencing meaningful endings. We also review evidence that people sometimes experience other types of mixed emotions, including disgust accompanied by amusement and fear by enjoyment”.

to his hotel and makes a telephone call to Otoko. She agrees to meet him on New Year's Eve, to hear the bells together. Oki had hoped to spend the evening alone with Otoko, but she organized company, a protégée of Otoko and two geisha's.

We focus here on the first four paragraphs of the novel. Below, the English translation is copied, divided up in fragments, mostly consisting of sentences, numbered 'S1' to 'S13'.

S1. Five swivel chairs were ranged along the other side of the observation car of the Kyoto express. Oki Toshio noticed that the one on the end was quietly revolving with the movement of the train. **S2.** He could not take his eyes from it. **S3.** The low armchairs on his side of the car did not swivel.

S4. Oki was alone in the observation car. **S5.** Slouched deep in his armchair, he watched the end chair turn. **S6.** Not that it kept turning in the same direction, at the same speed: **S7.** sometimes it went a little faster, or a little slower, or even stopped and began turning in the opposite direction. **S8.** To look at that one revolving chair, wheeling before him in the empty car, made him feel lonely. Thoughts of the past began flickering through his mind.

S9. It was the twenty-ninth of December. **S10.** Oki was going to Kyoto to hear the New Year's Eve Bells.

S11. For how many years had he heard the tolling of those bells over the radio? **S12.** How long ago had the broadcast begun? **S13.** Probably he had listened to them every year since then.

6 Comparison of the Japanese, English, German, and Dutch versions

In this section, we will have a closer look at most of the first thirteen sentences, presenting the original version in transliterated form, accompanied by English glosses and followed by the translations in English, German, and Dutch.

First paragraph

- (1) *Tōkaidō-sen, tokubetsu-kyūkō-ressha “hato” no tenbōsha ni wa Tokaido-line special-express train “Hato” GEN observation car LOC TOP katagawa no madogiwa ni sotte, itsutsu no kaitenisu ga one.side GEN side.of.the.window LOC along five GEN swivel.chair NOM naran-deiru, sono hashi no hitotsu dake ga, resshano ugoki ni be.arranged-ASP that edge GEN one only NOM train GEN movement LOC tsurete, hitorideni sizukani mawat-teiru-no-ni, Oki wa kizui-ta following by.itself quietly swivel-ASP-NMLZ-LOC Oki TOP notice-PAST*

E: Five swivel chairs were ranged along the other side of the observation car of the Kyoto express. Oki Toshio noticed that the one on the end was quietly revolving with the movement of the train.

G: Im Aussichtswagen des Expresszuges >>Hato<< der Tokaido-Linie standen an einer Fensterseite fünf Drehsessel in einer Reihe. Toshio Oki bemerkte, dass sich der letzte Sessel in dieser Reihe durch die Bewegungen des Zuges geräuschlos hin- und herdrehte.

D: Vijf draaistoelen stonden op een rij langs het raam in het panoramarijtuig van de Hato-expres op de Tokado-lijn. Het viel Toshio Oki op dat alleen de verste rustig ronddraaide op het ritme van de trein.

Our first observation has to do with the order in which the Figure, the five chairs, and the Ground, the observation car, are presented. The Japanese version displays the Ground-Figure order, in accordance with the preference that Tajima and Duffield (2012) pointed out: first the context, then the Figure. Starting with the Ground and then zooming in on the Figure fits the Japanese preference for taking the whole situation into perspective and situating the Figure in this context. In the English and Dutch translation, this order is reversed, but the German version follows the Japanese order. German is known for its flexibility regarding the constituents that can be put in the initial position; it is even more flexible than Dutch, which might explain the choice that the translator has made for German. With this choice, the translator stays closer to the Japanese way of portraying the situation.

If we turn to perspective now, we observe that in the Japanese original, the sentence ends with *Oki wa kizui-ta* ‘Oki noticed’, which places the foregoing content in Oki’s perspective. The reader thus receives this perspectival information only after the content itself. In all three translations, the sentence is split up in two. In the first sentence, the arrangement of the five swivel chairs in the observation car is described from a neutral narrator perspective. At the beginning of the second sentence, Oki’s perspective is introduced (*Oki Toshio noticed, Toshio*

Oki bemerkte, Het viel Toshio Oki op). Probably, this leads the reader to incorporate, in retrospect, what has been described in the first sentence into Oki's perspective. A foreshadowing of this incorporation-in-retrospect can be seen in the English version, which has *on the other side* in the first sentence, which implicitly already evokes a vantage point which is situated "on this side". The other versions, including the original, present the placement of the chairs from a neutral perspective: *katagawa* 'one side', *an einer Fensterseite* 'at one window side', *op een rij langs het raam* 'at a row along the window'. Only later is the personalized perspective of Oki introduced.

Already in this first fragment, we have observed a subtle interplay between the perspectives of the narrator and the character. The two perspectives are distinguishable but smoothly merge and separate.

- (2) *sore ni me o hika-reru-to hanase-nakat-ta.*
it DIR eye ACC attract-PASS-as depart-NEG-PAST

E: He could not take his eyes from it.

G: Er starrte gebannt darauf.

D: Nu dit zijn aandacht had getrokken, kon hij er zijn ogen niet meer van afhouden.

In the Japanese original of S2, the observed situation (represented by the pronoun *sore*) is the point of departure of the sentence. From there, the attention of the reader moves to the fascination in the eye and mind of Oki. The same "direction" is taken in the Dutch translation (with the pronoun *dit* 'this'), whereas the English and German translations depart from Oki. It is hard to decide which of the two perspectives is the more subjective one. The English and German versions are ambiguous: on the one hand, they allow a separate narrator's perspective, observing Oki and seeing that he is fascinated and keeps on looking at the one revolving chair. The alternative interpretation is that starting with *he/er* allows the reader to take Oki's perspective directly and follow the fascination from his eyes to the situation. The German verb *staren* 'stare' captures the fascinated view early on in the sentence in a compact way. The Japanese and Dutch versions proceed stepwise, from the observed situation to the more subjective perceptual process itself, stating that Oki could not give up his involved perception.

- (3) *Oki no koshikake-teiru-gawa no hikui hijikakeisu wa ugoka-nu-mono
de korera wa mochiron kaiten deki-nai.*
Oki GEN sit-ASP-side GEN low arm.chair TOP move-NEG-NMLZ
as these TOP certainly swivel can.do-NEG

E: The low armchairs on his side of the car did not swivel.

G: Die niedrigen Sitze mit Armlehne auf der Seite, wo er saß, waren fest und unbeweglich.

D: De lage armstoelen aan Oki's kant zaten vast, en konden *uiteraard* niet om hun as draaien.

The aspect we want to comment upon in this sentence is the modal adverb *mochiron* 'certainly' in the Japanese version, translated in Dutch as *uiteraard*, 'of course, as everybody will understand'. Note that an equivalent of this modal meaning is totally lacking in the English and German versions.

In section 2.1, we referred to Eckardt (2012: 110), who pointed out that a marker of uncertainty "often only makes sense for a protagonist, not for the narrator. Hence, *wohl* can be a reliable clue for a shift in context". In a footnote, Eckardt notes that narrators too can indicate their uncertainty, although this is rather exceptional. In the present text, we have a marker of *certainty*. To whom should this be ascribed? Is it the narrator who indicates that the non-swiveling property of the chairs is evident or is it rather to be ascribed to Oki, meaning that he realizes that the chairs on his side are fixed?

Mochiron and *uiteraard* evoke an implicit dialogic, intersubjective context for the actual utterance (cf. Engberg-Pedersen & Boeg Thomsen, this volume, on dialogue particles). The possibility of the alternative (swiveling chairs) is evoked as a possible option, proposed by another voice and then strongly rejected. But who, then, is the other voice in the dialogue? If the modal marker is ascribed to the narrator, then the reader comes into the picture as the partner addressed. In this interpretation, we have to do with an "intrusive narrator", commenting on the observation of the non-swiveling and sharing it with the reader, who is treated as someone who has the same knowledge about chairs in Japanese observation cars. Nuyts (2012) would call this "intersubjective modality", where the attitude of certainty is shared (between the narrator and the reader). An extra effect that occurs under this interpretation is that of taking a certain distance from the character: we, the narrator and the reader, see poor Oki, sitting in his chair, "stuck", as his chair can't move.

The alternative interpretation would be that the modal certainty is ascribed to Oki and only to Oki. In that case, we have a strong subjective perspective. An inner dialogue of Oki is suggested, wherein he talks to himself. In the end Oki realizes that he is "stuck", as his type of chair is not of the moving type.

We find it hard to reach a final decision about which interpretation is the right one. Given the fact that Japanese, and Kawabata in particular, opts for a subjective perspective, Japanese *mochiron* can very well be interpreted as a means to intensify Oki's subjective perspective ('I am stuck, no doubt about it'). Dutch

uiteraard is a rather formal word, which invites the ascription to the narrator. The ascription problem might have been the reason for the English and German translators simply to neglect the modal marker.

Second paragraph

- (4) *tenbōsha ni Oki hitoride at-ta.*
observation.car LOC Oki alone be-PAST

E: Oki was alone in the observation car.

G: Oki war der einzige Reisende im Aussichtswagen.

D: Oki was de enige passagier in de wagen.

Note first that in the Japanese original the order is again Ground-Figure, whereas all three translations take the reverse order. With regard to perspective, it can be observed that German and Dutch use the predicate *Reisende, passagier* ‘passenger’, which rather suggests an objective, outside perspective, as if someone counted the number of passengers, with the outcome “one”. Japanese *hitoride* and English *alone* can also mean ‘feeling alone’, which makes the text more ambiguous. Besides the narrator’s perspective, Oki’s feelings or even his perspective come into the picture. If we accept both perspectives holding at the same time, then we have a case of mixed perspectives here.

- (5) *Oki wa hijikakeisu ni fukaku motare-te, mukō-gawa no kaitenisu no hitotsu ga mawaru-no o nagame-tei-ta.*
Oki TOP arm.chair LOC deep lean-CONJP over.there-side GEN swivel.chair GEN one NOM swivel-NMLZ ACC observe-ASP-PAST

E: Slouched deep in his armchair, he watched the end chair turn.

G: Tief in seinem Sitz zurückgelehnt, beobachtete er den sich hin-und herdrehenden Sessel *auf der anderen Seite*.

D: Diep achterovergeleund staarde hij naar die ene stoel *aan de overkant*.

S5 has two parts. In the first clause, it is observed that Oki is slouched deep in his armchair. This evokes primarily the narrator’s perspective. But in the second clause, the perspective switches to Oki’s, who observes the turning of the chair. Note that the Japanese, German and Dutch versions refer to ‘the other side’, which had been done in the English version already in S1. This ‘other side’ phrasing strengthens the subjective perspective. We conclude that in all four versions the two perspectives easily flow from one to the other.

- (6) *kimatta hōhō-ni kimatta sokudo de mawat-teiru to*
 fixed direction-DIR fixed speed at turn-ASP QUOTE
iu-no-de-wa nakat-ta.
 say-NMLZ-CONJP-TOP non.existent-PAST

E: *Not that* it kept turning in the same direction, at the same speed:

G: *Nicht dass* dieser sich immer in dieselbe Richtung mit immer derselben Geschwindigkeit bewegte,

D: Hij draaide niet in een bepaalde richting of met een constante snelheid.

In the Dutch translation, there is no main clause–subordinate clause division, and the negation is simply embedded in the one main clause. The English and German versions have a special construction here: *not that ...*, with an elliptical main clause containing a negation, and an embedded clause without negation. It seems that in Japanese, the construction is similar in this respect: there is a main clause at the end, *iu-no-de-wa nakka-ta*, with a negation in *nakat*. Danygier (2012b) discusses the neg-raising controversy and claims that the presence of negation in an embedding main clause often relates to an epistemic stance. This seems to be the case here too. The Japanese, English and German versions suggest a deliberating subject, who wonders why the chair is not simply swiveling in one and the same direction and at the same speed. This inner dialogue can be seen as a mixing of points of view within one person. In the Dutch version, the construction is not subjective; the observation of the varying swiveling could as well be ascribed to the narrator, although in the context of the previous sentence, the ascription to the protagonist is the more plausible one. One could say that the ascription to Oki is more strongly prompted by the construction in Japanese, English and German, while it is left to the reader in the Dutch version.

- (7) *sukoshi hayaku nat-tari, yuruyakani nat-tari, tokidoki*
 little fast become-and slow become-and sometimes
tomat-tari, mata gyaku no hō e mawaru-koto mo at-ta.
 stop-and again opposite GEN direction DIR turn-NMLZ too be-PAST

E: Sometimes it went a little faster, or a little slower, or even stopped and began turning in the opposite direction.

G: Er drehte sich mal etwas schneller, mal etwas langsamer, stand zuweilen still und schwenkte dann wieder in die entgegengesetzte Richtung.

D: Nu eens ging hij snel, dan wat trager, en soms stopte hij eventjes, om vervolgens weer de tegengestelde richting uit te gaan.

In S7, the swiveling movements of the chair are observed in on-line sequential detail, with high resolution. According to Chafe (2010: 54), such passages evoke “immediate consciousness”, this time Oki’s. We see no differences between the four languages here. This immediate consciousness of the details in the movement easily affects the inner motions of the perceiver, and that is indeed what happens in the next passage.

- (8) *tonikaku shikashi kyakusha ni Oki hitori-dake no mae de,*
 anyway but passenger.car LOC Oki alone-only GEN front at
kaitenisu no hitotsu-dake ga hitorideni mawaru-no o
 swivel.chair GEN one-only NOM by.itself turn-NMLZ ACC
mi-teiru-no wa, Oki no kokoro no uchi no sabishisa
 see-ASP-NMLZ TOP Oki GEN heart GEN inside GEN loneliness
o sasoi-dashi, ironna omoi o yurameka-se-ta
 ACC invite-begin various thought ACC flicker-CAUS-PAST

E: To look at that one revolving chair, wheeling before him in the empty car, made him feel lonely. Thoughts of the past began flickering through his mind.

G: Der Anblick dieses einen sich im Aussichtswagen hin-und herdrehenden Sessels weckte ein Gefühl der Einsamkeit in ihm. Die verschiedensten Gedanken gingen ihm durch den Kopf.

D: *Hoe dan ook*, het tafereel van de stoel die als enige rondtolde in het bijzijn van één enkele passagier, deed Oki in eenzame gedachten verzinken.

As opposed to S7, S8 shows differences between the four versions. In the Japanese and Dutch versions, the sentence starts with a marker which is absent in the English and German versions. In Japanese, it is *tonikaku shikasi*, in Dutch *hoe dan ook*, ‘however that may be, anyway’, marking a rather abrupt transition, in this case from describing the swiveling of the chair to the feelings of Oki caused by it. Such discourse markers are typical for a narrator’s voice, but what precedes and what follows the discourse marker represents content from Oki’s perspective. The sentence is about Oki’s attention, which shifts from his outward oriented observation to his inside feeling. There is a natural connection between the two, as the observed swiveling chair evokes the lonely feeling. Connections between observation and feeling are a favorite “topos” in Japanese literature, and in the translations, the link does not look strange either. So maybe the right interpretation of the discourse markers in the Japanese and Dutch versions is that they are meant to indicate Oki’s rather sudden realization that he feels lonely. However, Dutch *hoe dan ook* sounds rather formal, and the same holds for *uiteraard* in S3. Whereas the English and German translators decided to leave out a direct transla-

tion in both cases, the Dutch translator tried to stay close to the original, with a non-optimal result.

Third paragraph

- (9) *kure no nijuku-nichi de ar-u.*
year.end. GEN twenty.nine-day LOC be-PRES

E: It was the twenty-ninth of December.

G: Es war der 29. Dezember.

D: Het was 29 december.

- (10) *Oki wa Kyoto e joya no kane o kiki-ni iku-nodat-ta.*
Oki TOP Kyoto DIR New.Year's.Eve GEN bell ACC listen.to-PURPOSE
go-EXPLAIN-PAST

E: Oki was going to Kyoto to hear the New Year's Eve bells.

G: Oki war auf dem Weg nach Kyoto, um dort das Neujahrglockenläuten mitzu-erleben.

D: Oki was op weg naar Kyoto, om er te luisteren naar de nieuwjaarsklokken van de tempels.

The second paragraph ends in a very subjective way: Oki's feeling of loneliness, strengthened by the one revolving chair, whirling up memories of the past. In contrast to this, the third paragraph strikes the reader as a sharp break, back to the perspective of the narrator, who gives some background information on time and place. This information sounds "objective", but in fact, both time and place are strongly loaded with emotion: the change of place from Tokyo, where Oki's family resides, to Kyoto, where Otoko lives. And New Year's Eve has a strong emotional meaning for Oki, as the next paragraph makes clear. From the narrator's objective informational perspective in the present paragraph, there is a shift to a mixed perspective in the next paragraph.

Paragraph 4

- (11) *Oki ga ōmisoka no yoru rajo de joya no kane o kiku narawashi wa mō ikunen tuzui-ta-daro-ka*
Oki NOM Silvester GEN night radio LOC New.Year's.Eve GEN bell
ACC listen.to custom TOP already many.years
continue-PAST-ASSUM-QUEST

E: For how many years had he heard the tolling of those bells over the radio?
 G: Wie viele Jahre mochte er es *wohl schon* in der Silvesternacht im Radio gehört haben?

D: Hoe lang had hij *nu al* de gewoonte om op oudejaarsavond via de radio naar het luiden van de klokken te luisteren?

- (12) *kono hōsō ga nannen-mae kara hajimat-ta-ka*
 this broadcast NOM how.many.years-before from begin-PAST-QUEST
osorakuwa sore irai, kakasazuni
 probably that since continuously
kii-ta-no-de-wa-nakaro-ka
 listen.to-PAST-NMLZ-CONJP-TOP-ASSUM-QUEST

E: How long ago had the broadcast begun? *Probably* he had listened to them every year since then, ...

G: Wie viel Jahre gab es diese Sendung schon? Hatte er überhaupt *je* versäumt, sie zu hören?

D: De uitzending ervan was jaren geleden begonnen, en *ongetwijfeld* had hij er sindsdien geen enkele gemist.

- (13) *Nihon no achirakochira no furudera no meisho no oto*
 Japan GEN here.and.there GEN old.temple GEN attraction GEN
o kiki-nagara, anaunsā no kaisetu ga kuwawar-u.
 ACC listen.to-as announcer GEN commentary NOM be.added-PRES

E: ... and to the commentary by various announcers, as they picked up the sound of famous old bells from temples all around the country.

G: Während das Geläut berühmter Glocken alter Tempel aus allen Teilen Japans erklang, sprach der Ansager seinen Kommentar.

D: Men liet het gelui van beroemde oude tempelklokken van over heel Japan horen, voorzien van enige toelichting door verslaggevers.

S11, 12, and 13

These sentences represent free indirect discourse, the paradigmatic case of mixed point of view in narrative discourse. One indication can be found in the Dutch translation of S11, where *nu* ‘now’ is combined with past tense *had* ‘had’ (cf. Nikiforidou 2012). S11, 12, 13 present in more detail the ‘thoughts of the past’, which were indicated already in S9. Oki is not sure about the number of years he has listened to the bells over the radio. The questions in S11 and 12 represent a clear example of “inner dialogue in which self-knowledge is achieved through the

posing of questions, to which answers are provided" (Pascual 2014: 6, referring to the ideas of Bakhtin). In S11, the Japanese particle *mō* 'already, by this time', German *wohl schon*, and Dutch *nu al* contribute to the subjective perspective (cf. Eckardt 2012). The prototypical epistemic marker *probably* in S12 also indicates a subjective perspective. It is remarkable that the Dutch version has *ongetwijfeld* 'without doubt' here. We have no idea why the translator shifted the modality, but it is quite possible to interpret it from Oki's perspective as an answer to his self-question about whether there had been a year when he had missed the broadcast. His answer is "certainly not".

7 Conclusion

The opening fragment of *Beauty and Sadness* is full of motion and emotion. The time moves to a new year, the train moves from one city to another, Oki leaves his family behind and looks forward to seeing his lover again, his thoughts move to memories of the past. The perspective is also "floating". We as readers look with the narrator at Oki. Oki looks at the revolving chair. But the narrator's perspective easily merges with Oki's, and the perceived object, the revolving chair, easily merges with Oki's revolving feelings and memories. The smooth transitions and mergers can be interpreted as an implementation of Kawabata's intention to write in a subjectivist way.

We had expected to find a uniform pattern in which the Japanese text differs in a systematic way from its European translations. Besides finding some support for the expected Japanese preferences (Ground-Figure presentation, subjective perspective), we also found quite a lot of variation in the translations. Aspects of perspective and subjectivity varied quite a lot between the different versions. The least we can say is that the translators seem to have had some problems with finding the right perspective and degree of subjectivity and intersubjectivity. In general, perspective is an aspect of a literary text that provides a challenge for translators, but this challenge is even greater when it comes to (certain) Japanese texts, as we hope to have shown.

Perspective is primarily a cognitive dimension, but we have seen that linguistic cues of different kinds (adverbs, pragmatic markers, constructions) play a role in guiding the perspective in the direction of the narrator or the character, or into a mix of these two perspectives. We hope that linguistic analyses of perspective phenomena will find their way into translation training programs and yield more consistent translations.

Besides the practical use of studies like the present one, we agree with Chafe (2010: 52) when he suggests that “studying the language of literature should be seen not only as a valid branch of linguistics, but as having the potential to shed unique light on the nature of human consciousness and thought.” Studying the *translation* of literature can add another dimension to this potential in that it shows us that human consciousness and thought has cultural specific preferences. These preferences also show in perspective taking. Realizing this can contribute to a stronger awareness of what is involved in intercultural communication.

Acknowledgements

We thank the editors of this volume and two anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback. We also thank the participants of the theme session Linguistic Manifestations of Mixed Points of View in Narratives at the ICLC12 conference in Edmonton (June 26–27, 2013), where we presented an earlier version of this paper.

References

- Bernaerts, Lars, Liesbeth De Bleeker, & July De Wilde. 2014. Narration and translation. *Language and Literature* 23(3). 203–212.
- Catton, Eleanor. 2013. *The luminaries*. London: Granta.
- Chafe, Wallace. 2010. Literature as a window to the mind. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 42(1). 51–63.
- Cui, Yaxiao. 2014. Parentheticals and the presentation of multipersonal consciousness: A stylistic analysis of *Mrs Dalloway*. *Language and Literature* 23(2). 175–187.
- Dancygier, Barbara. 2012a. *The language of stories. A cognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dancygier, Barbara. 2012b. Negation, stance verbs, and intersubjectivity. In: Barbara Dancygier & Eve Sweetser (eds.), *Viewpoint in language. A multimodal perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 69–93.
- Data-Bukowska, Ewa. 2007. The world from afar – the world in close-up. Some thoughts on manifestations of viewing in translations of Swedish texts into Polish. In: Władysław Chłopicki, Andrzej Pawelec & Agnieszka Pokojska (eds.), *Cognition in language. Volume in honour of Professor Elżbieta Tabakowska*. Kraków: Tertium. 290–311.
- Eckardt, Regine. 2012. Particles as speaker indexicals in free indirect discourse. *Sprache und Datenverarbeitung* 35(2) & 36(1). 109–119.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Elisabeth & Ditte Boeg Thomsen. This volume. The socio-cognitive foundation of Danish perspective-mixing dialogue particles.

- Evans, Nicholas. 2005. View with a view: Towards a typology of multiple perspective constructions. *BLS* 31(1). 93–120.
- Harris, Jesse A. and Christopher Potts. 2009. Perspective shifting with appositives and expressives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 32(6). 523–552.
- Hartner, Marcus. 2014. Multiperspectivity. In: Peter Hühn et al. (eds.), *The living handbook of narratology*. Hamburg: Hamburg University, <http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/multiperspectivity> (accessed 17 August 2014).
- Hayano, Kaoru. 2013. *Territories of knowledge in Japanese conversation*. PhD Nijmegen, MPI.
- Ide, Sachiko. 2012. Roots of the *wakimae* aspect of linguistic politeness. Modal expressions and Japanese sense of self. In: Michael Meeuwis & Jan-Ola Östman (eds.), *Pragmaticizing understanding. Studies for Jef Verschueren*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 121–138.
- Ide, Sachiko & Kishiko Uemo. 2011. Honorifics and address terms. In Gisle Andersen & Karin Aijmer (eds.), *Pragmatics of society* (Handbook of Pragmatics 5). Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton. 439–470.
- Ikégami, Yoshihiko. 2005. Indices of a subjectivity-prominent language: Between cognitive linguistics and linguistic typology. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 3. 132–164.
- Ikégami, Yoshihiko. 2008. Subjective construal as a ‘fashion of speaking’ in Japanese. In: María de los Ángeles Gómez González, J. Lachlan Mackenzie & Elsa M. González Álvarez (eds.), *Current trends in contrastive linguistics. Functional and cognitive perspectives*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 229–250.
- Kawabata, Yasunari. 1925 [1999]. Shinshin sakka no shinkeiko kaisetsu. [Commentaries on the new trends of the latest authors]. In *Kawabata Yasunari Zenshu* [Collected works of Kawabata Yasunari] 30. 172–183. Tokyo: Shinchosha.
- Kawabata, Yasunari. 1998. *The Izu dancer and other stories*. North Clarendon, VT: Tuttle Publishing. [Original Japanese version 1926, *Izu no odoriko*].
- Kawabata, Yasunari. 1956. *Snow country*. New York: Knopf. [Original Japanese version 1948, *Yukiguni*].
- Kawabata, Yasunari. 1975. *Beauty and Sadness*. London: Penguin Books. [Original Japanese version 1964, *Utsukushisa to kanashimi to*].
- Kawabata, Yasunari. 1990. *Schönheit und trauer*. Munich: dtv 1990. [Original Japanese version 1964, *Utsukushisa to kanashimi to*].
- Kawabata, Yasunari. 2006. *Schoonheid en verdriet*. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff. [Original Japanese version 1964, *Utsukushisa to kanashimi to*].
- Kawabata, Yasunari. 1968. Nobel Lecture: “Japan, the Beautiful and Myself”, http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1968/kawabata-lecture.html.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, vol. 1, Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen, Jeff T. & A. Peter McGraw. 2014. The case for mixed emotions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 8. 263–274.
- Maynard, Senko K. 2002. *Linguistic emotivity. Centrality of place, the topic-comment dynamic, and an ideology of pathos in Japanese discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- MacWhinney, Brian. 2005. The emergence of grammar from perspective. In: D. Pecher & R. Zwaan (eds.), *Grounding cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 198–223.
- Niederhoff, Burkhard. 2013. Perspective – Point of view. In: Peter Hühn, John Pier, Wolf Schmid & Jörg Schönert (eds.), *The living handbook of narratology*. Hamburg: Hamburg University,

- <http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/perspective-%E2%80%93-point-view>. (Accessed 17 August 2014).
- Nikiforidou, Kiki. 2012. The constructional underpinnings of viewpoint blends: The Past + now in language and literature. In: B. Dancygier & E. Sweetser (eds.), *Viewpoint and perspective in language and gesture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 177–197.
- Nisbett, Richard E. & Takashiko Masuda. 2003. Culture and point of view. *PNAS* 100(19). 11163–11170.
- Nuyts, Jan. 2012. Notions of (inter)subjectivity. *English Text Construction* 5(1), Special issue 'Intersections of intersubjectivity'. 53–76.
- Pascual, Esther. 2014. *Fictive interaction. The conversation frame in thought, language, and discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Sanford, Anthony J. & Catherine Emmott. 2012. *Mind, brain and narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sato, Manami & Benjamin K. Bergen. 2013. The case of missing pronouns: Does mentally simulated perspective play a functional role in the comprehension of person? *Cognition* 127. 361–374.
- Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine. 2009. *The corporeal turn. An interdisciplinary reader*. Exeter: Imprint Academic.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 2014. Point of view in translation. Lewis Carroll's *Alice* in grammatical wonderlands. In: Chloe Harrison, Louise Nuttall, Peter Stockwell & Wenjuan Yuan (eds.), *Cognitive Grammar in literature*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 101–116.
- Tajima, Yajoi & Nigel Duffield. 2012. Linguistic versus cultural relativity: On Japanese-Chinese differences in picture description and recall. *Cognitive Linguistics* 23(4). 675–709.
- Talhelm, T., X. Zhang, S. Oishi, C. Shumin, D. Duan, X. Lan, & S. Kitayama. 2014. Large-scale psychological differences within China explained by rice versus wheat agriculture. *Science* 344. 603–608.
- Uehara, Satoshi. 2006. Internal state predicates in Japanese: A cognitive approach. In: June Luchjenbroers (ed.), *Cognitive linguistics investigations across languages, fields, and philosophical boundaries*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 271–291.
- Uehara, Satoshi. 2011. *The cognitive theory of subjectivity in a cross-linguistic perspective: Zero 1st person pronouns in English, Thai and Japanese*. Paper, ICLC11, Xi'an.
- Vandelanotte, Lieven. 2009. *Speech and thought representation in English: A Cognitive-Functional approach*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Verhagen, Arie. 2007. Construal and perspectivization. In: Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 48–81.