Relating Narrative Events in Translation[1]

Dan I. Slobin
University of California, Berkeley

> *Crosslinguistic studies of language …, are motivated by the goal of comparing shared, universal features of language structure and use with patterns attributable to language-particular properties of a given language or group of languages.*
>
> –Ruth A. Berman
> (2002: 25)

Beginning with frogs

About two decades ago, Ruth Berman and I set out to explore the development of "the ability to relate events in narrative" (Berman 1988; Berman & Slobin 1987, 1994). We devoted a great deal of research attention to a seemingly simple task: oral narratives elicited by a picture storybook created for children, *Frog, where are you?* (Mayer 1969), originally discovered as a research tool by Michael Bamberg (1985, 1987). The "frog story" has proven to be an exceptionally useful tool, used by now in dozens of languages and fueling far more research than we could have imagined (see recent papers, and a full bibliography of frog story studies, in Strömqvist & Verhoeven 2004). The strength of the frog story lies in the wordless presentation of a readily understood plot, with sufficient complexity to allow for detailed analysis of temporal, causal, and spatial dimensions of events.

Our original study was both developmental and crosslinguistic. We collected narratives from children aged 3, 4, 5, and 9, as well as adults, in English, German, Hebrew, Spanish, and Turkish. Although we found common developmental patterns across languages, we also found many patterns that were characteristic of individual languages and typological groups of languages. In this chapter, I focus on typological factors that seem to shape the "rhetorical styles" of narratives. The issue of rhetorical style was already anticipated in our first working paper on the frog story project: "The exact same scene is described by speakers of all five languages in ways which are peculiarly suited to the perspectives most naturally encoded in each language" (Berman & Slobin 1987: 17). This theme is presented in detail in *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study* (Berman & Slobin 1994). Together with an international group of colleagues,[2] we explored plot structure and form–function relations in the development of narrative, in a framework of contrastive rhetoric. Each of the five languages presented a distinctive style, especially in representations of time and space. With regard to temporal relations, three of the languages—English, Spanish, and

---

[1] This chapter is dedicated to my friend and colleague, Ruth Berman, who has been a faithful companion along the path sketched out here. Our work together, over many years, has been crosslinguistic and typological (and lively and fun). Here I offer a glimpse of how the search for the frog led to the adventures of hobbits and how they are seen through translations into some of the languages that we studied together.

[2] Chapters in Berman and Slobin (1994) were written in collaboration with Ayhan A. Aksu-Koç (Turkey), Michael Bamberg (USA), Lisa Dasinger (USA), Virginia Marchman (USA), Yonni Neeman (Israel), Philip Rodkin (USA), Eugenia Sebastián (Spain), Cecile Toupin (USA), Tom Trabasso (USA), and Christiane von Stutterheim (Germany).

Turkish—have systems of morphological marking of aspect, whereas Hebrew and German have no grammatical categories of either progressive/nonprogressive or perfective/imperfective. Narratives in the three "aspect rich" languages showed greater attention to temporal overlap between events as well as to differing temporal contours of events. The five languages group differently with regard to spatial relations, particularly in the expression of motion events. Hebrew, Turkish, and Spanish are "verb-framed" (Talmy, 1991, 2000), in that they rely on monomorphemic path verbs, such as 'enter' and 'ascend', to encode direction of movement. English and German are "satellite-framed," using verb particles to encode direction. Compare, for example, English *go in* and *go down*, with Hebrew *nixnas* 'enter' and *yarad* 'descend'. Two consequences of this typological distinction were found in the frog stories. With regard to ***manner of movement***, a verb-framed language requires some sort of adjunct expression, such as *nixnas b'rica* 'enter in a run', whereas a satellite-framed language has access to the main verb slot for this function, e.g., *run in*. For this reason, among others, narratives in satellite-framed languages contain significantly more information about manner of motion (for a detailed account of these patterns, see Slobin 2000, 2004). With regard to ***paths of movement***, again there is a typological contrast. If a path has several components, each is typically expressed by a separate verb in a verb-framed language: schematically: 'exit the house – cross the field – enter the forest'. This "heavy" sequence of clauses can be compacted in a clause with a single verb in a satellite-framed language: 'run – out of the house, across the field, into the forest'. Frog stories in English and German tend to have more extended path descriptions than frog stories in Hebrew, Turkish, and Spanish. By contrast, stories in the latter three languages tend to have richer scene-setting descriptions, allowing for inference of both path and manner. In the course of the past decade, these patterns have been found in frog stories in numerous languages (for the most recent compilation, see Strömqvist & Verhoeven, 2004).

One may wonder whether typological contrasts in rhetorical style found in frog stories are restricted to this limited genre of picture-elicited narratives intended for children. In the years since *Relating events in narrative,* I have been searching out similar patterns in novels, newspaper reports, and conversations. Most of this work is still unpublished (but see Slobin 1996, 2000), however, there is strong evidence that the frog story is not special with regard to typological differences in narrative style. The contrasting typological patterns of the language of space, briefly summarized above, turn up across genres and languages.[3]

Moving on to hobbits: Analyzing and coding motion events

In order to compare the encoding of motion events across languages, it is necessary to identify and categorize the range of concepts and linguistic devices pertinent to this domain. Clearly, more is involved than verbs and particles: to use the felicitous term introduced by Sinha & Kuteva (1995), we are dealing with "distributed spatial semantics." That is, information about the movement of protagonists requires specification of physical locations and paths; and further information relevant to movement can be provided by descriptions of inner states, terrain, weather, and so forth. Out first task, at Berkeley in 1995-97, was to create a framework for the coding of motion events in narrative texts. This coding system has not yet been published, and a rough outline of its major components follows.[4]

---

[3] The larger sample of novels, newspapers, and conversations, as well as more frog stories, includes a range of verb-framed languages: Romance (French, Spanish, Galician, Portuguese, Italian), Basque, Turkish, Korean, and Japanese; and a range of satellite-framed languages: Germanic (English, Dutch, German, Yiddish, Danish, Swedish, Icelandic), Slavic (Russian, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, Ukrainian), as well as Mandarin Chinese and Thai (categorized by Slobin 2004 as a third type: *equipollently-framed*).

[4] The following people participated in various phases of the work, bringing expertise from a great range of languages: Rutie Adler, Collin Baker, Heike Behrens, Lucinda Camões, Eve Clark, Lisa Dasinger, Aleksey Dumer, Jane Edwards, Joe Grady, Roni Henkin, Annette Herskovits, Jelena Jovanović, Reyna Lindert, Kevin Moore, Kyoko Ohara, Şeyda Özçalışkan, Enrique Palancar, Natalia Perelman, Alain Samson, Jonathon Segal, Sarah Shull, Gail Solomon, Sabine Stoll, and Sarah Taub.

In order to carry out this task, we decide to focus on a single English text and examine its translation in a number of languages. This preliminary exercise proved fruitful in identifying the basic conceptual elements of motion events, along with the available forms in various languages. We chose *The hobbit* (Tolkien, 1937), because it has been widely translated and is full of vivid motion events.   And we worked with Chapter 6, which narrates the movements of hobbits, elves, goblins, humans, wolves, and eagles. The sample of translations included:

- Satellite-framed languages
    - Germanic: English (original text), Dutch, German
    - Slavic: Russian, Serbo-Croatian
- Verb-framed languages
    - Romance: French, Portuguese, Italian, Spanish
    - Semitic: Hebrew
    - Turkic: Turkish

In the present chapter, I summarize rhetorical styles with regard to the movements of these various creatures as they are described in this collection of languages.   The goals of this brief presentation are to present the elements of distributed semantics in the domain of motion events, and to compare and contrast the styles of languages representing the two major typological groups identified by Talmy and studied in *Relating events in narrative*.

The conceptual categories of the motion coding system extend and elaborate the basic components of Talmy's (1985) analysis. Talmy analyzed locative situations as consisting of: (a) a moving figure, (b) the fact of stasis or motion, (c) path of motion, (d) manner of motion, and (e) the physical grounds with respect to which the figure is located or moving. (He also considered the factor of self- versus caused-change of location; our analysis applies to both conditions. That is, the same motion elements are present in *he fled from the room* and *he was expelled from the room*).   The following conceptual categories emerged as essential in coding our English text and set of translations:

- Figure
    - individual or group
    - type (human, animal, bird, etc.)
    - posture (change of posture at beginning or end of path)
- Path
    - direction of movement (forward, up, north, etc.)
    - deixis (direction with regard to viewpoint of narrator)
    - contour (curved, zigzag, etc.)
- Extent
    - spatial extent of motion
    - temporal/aspectual duration, limits of motion (initiation, conclusion)
    - relation of motion event to another point in space (far, high, etc.)
- Manner
    - motor pattern required to execute movement
    - force dynamics
    - rate
    - means of conveyance (by animal, car, airplane, etc.)

- Ground
  - source (initial location ±boundary)
  - goal (final location ±boundary)
  - milestone (location passed along path)
  - linear substrate (path, bridge, etc.)
  - medium, terrain (field, river, etc.)
  - non-solid environment (air, fog, storm, darkness, etc.)

These factors provide a schematic summary of the *functions* of motion event descriptions. The other half of the picture, of course, is the set of *forms* made available by the language for form–function mapping in this domain. The relevant linguistic elements often conflate several of the conceptual notions, and some notions are mapped across several linguistic elements. The most interesting part of the analysis lies in the varying patterns of distributed semantics. Again, there is room for only a schematic summary of the formal elements:

- verb or verbal noun
  - transitive
  - intransitive
- directional verb particle
- adverbial expression
- adjectival expression
- noun or pronoun
- locative term
  - locative noun or nounphrase
  - adpositional phrase
- adverbial

Information about path and manner can be arrayed in various combinations of these elements. As already pointed out, a path verb like 'enter' can correspond to a verb–satellite construction such as 'go in', and a manner path expression like 'run in' can correspond to a construction with a path verb and manner adverbial, such as 'enter at a run'. Motion verbs can also be nominalized, as in 'his running' or 'the escape'. However, this list of parts of speech and construction types does not exhaust the means for providing information about motion events. Narratives contain information that allow the listener or reader to *infer* path and manner. For example, if we know that the protagonist was walking in the street and later is in a café, we can infer that he entered the café. If we know that he was tired or angry or restless, or that the path was steep and muddy, we can infer his manner of motion. A full comparison of linguistic descriptions of motion events across languages, therefore, must go beyond coding of lexical categories and their semantics. Such considerations are included in the coding system discussed here, and have proven valuable in more extended, ongoing analyses of novels, newspaper reports, and conversations.

Dealing with paths and manners of motion in translation

This is not the place to present the formalism of the codes. Suffice it to say that there is a full set of notations that can be easily used and that can be subjected to computer analyses. Consider only a simple example from *The hobbit*. Dori, a hobbit, moves downward from a location in a tree. (A hobbit is a small, human-like creature.) Tolkien writes that, "Dori climbed out of the tree." The motion event is thus directed in a descending path, in a grasping manner, from a source defined as the tree to an unspecified goal that is not in the tree. The figure is designated by a noun (*Dori*), the main verb presents a manner of motion (*climb*), a

particle ("satellite") gives the path (*out*), and a prepositional phrase gives the source (*of the tree*).[5]

When we compare translations of this clause across languages, the ten languages fall into two groups. The four satellite-framed languages (Dutch, German, Russian, Serbo-Croatian) use a manner verb equivalent to 'climb' together with a path satellite (Germanic particles or Slavic prefixes). For example, Russian *s-lezt'* 'down-crawl'. The six satellite-framed languages (French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, Hebrew, Turkish) all use a verb meaning 'descend'. For example, in Hebrew, *yarad legamrey min ha-'ec* 'descended totally from the-tree'. In these languages, a verb is required to encode direction and there is no verb of grasping movement that is available for downward movement; that is, equivalents of 'climb' are only used for upward movement. Thus manner of movement is eliminated in all six translations. Furthermore, because the translators are obliged to pick a main verb meaning 'descend', there is no convenient way of also indicating the totality of exit conveyed by the English *climb out.* Some of the translators, as in the Hebrew example, add some adverbial expression of totality, whereas others leave this aspect to inference, as the Spanish *bajó del árbol* 'descended of/from the tree'. In all ten languages, source is encoded by a prepositional phrase or noun with some kind of ablative marker.

The purpose of this mini-example is simply to indicate what can be learned about typologies of rhetorical style by careful analysis of form–function relations in a set of target-language texts in comparison with each other and the source-language text from which they derive. We have already seen that path satellites are retained in target languages that match the source language in typology but are replaced with path verbs in the opposite type of target language, and that manner verbs disappear when a verb is required to encode path.

Keeping track of path and manner in complex events

When the English original presents more complex paths, together with a manner verb, the translators are faced with decisions about how to array path and manner, and whether to retain all of the distinctions in the original. Consider a typical satellite-framed example that occurs at the beginning of the chapter. Bilbo the hobbit is lost and is searching for his companions. Tolkien tells us:

(1) *He still wandered on, out of the little high valley, over its edge, and down the slopes beyond.*

Here we have a single verb—the manner verb *wander*—with three path segments, indicated by *out, over,* and *down*.

Translations into Germanic languages follow this model exactly; for example, the Dutch version reads:

(2) *Hij zwierf verder, het kleine hoge dal uit, over de rand en daarachter gelegen hellingen af.*
    'He wandered further, out of the little high valley, down over the edge and the slopes lying beyond.'

---

[5] The formal notation for the motion segment, "climb out of the tree," is: <u>V:m=climb P:d=out PP:s=of the tree</u>. (V:m=intransitive manner verb, P:d=directional particle, PP:s=prepositional phrase marking source.) Note that syntactic categories are in upper case, conceptual categories are in lower case following a colon, and lexical items are indicated by an equal sign. These conventions make it possible to search for each of the formal and functional components, separately or in combination. And, across languages, comparisons can be systematically made of arrays of forms, functions, and form–function relations. (The full coding scheme is available on request: slobin@berkeley.edu.)

The Slavic languages are also satellite-framed, but present a problem that we will return to after examining the problems faced by verb-framed translators. All of these are forced to make changes of one sort or another, because some of the segments must be encoded by path verbs. The French translator picks a separate verb for each segment, using an adverbial expression to indicate manner:

(3) *Il continua d'avancer au hasard, sortit du haut vallon, en franchit le bord et descendit la pente au-delà.*
 'He continued to advance aimlessly, exited from the high small valley, crossed the edge of it and descended the slope beyond.'

The Portuguese translator omits manner as well as one of the path segments:

(4) *Continou avançando, saiu do vale alto e estreito, e desceu as ladeiras além.*
 'He continued advancing, exited from the high and narrow valley, and descended the slopes beyond.'

And the Turkish translator manages to retain an indication of manner, using a manner verb, but reducing the path description:

(5) *Küçük, yüksek vadiden çıkıp, kenarında ve arkasındaki eğimlerden aşağı gezindi.*
 'Exiting from the little high valley, he strolled downward on the edge and from the slopes (that were) behind.'

Returning to Slavic, we find solutions that lie between the two broad language types.[6] The path satellites in Russian and Serbo-Croatian are verb prefixes, rather than separable verb particles as in Germanic languages; and only one prefix occurs per verb. Slavic languages, therefore, like verb-framed languages, are forced to use separate verbs for path segments. But they also have a rich lexicon of manner verbs that are freely combined with path prefixes. In the *Hobbit* translations they retain manner distinctions while also retaining full path elaboration. Serbo-Croatian, for example, uses one manner verb and two path verbs:

(5) *Švrljao je dalje, izišao iz male doline, preko ivice, i spustio se niz padinu iza nje.*
 'He strolled further, exited from the little valley, over the edge, and descended down the slope behind it.'[7]

 This sentence provides an instructive example of what can be learned by comparing translations in the cognitive grammar framework developed by Talmy. Table 1 summarizes the translations of this sentence in the ten languages, and Table 2 schematizes the data in terms of linguistic elements. (A dashed line separates satellite- and verb-framed languages. The languages are abbreviated in the first column as: EN = English, DU = Dutch, GE = German, RU = Russian, S-C = Serbo-Croatian, FR = French, IT= Italian, PO = Portuguese, SP = Spanish, HE = Hebrew, TU = Turkish.) Note that the three Germanic languages use a single verb, whereas the other languages require 2–4 verbs. Note, too, that there are some empty cells among the verb-framed languages: the Portuguese, Hebrew, and Turkish

---

[6] In a recent paper on typology in a broad range of frog stories, I propose that various additional morphosyntactic and lexical factors interact with satellite- and verb-framed typologies in shaping rhetorical style, specifically the factor of "manner salience" (Slobin 2004).

[7] The path verbs *iz-aći* 'out-go / exit' and *s-pustiti se* 'down-go / descend' have transparent path prefixes, but are treated as monomorphemic path verbs by native speakers (Jelena Jovanović, personal communication). The Slavic languages thus seem to be on a diachronic plane away from satellite-framing, although the path prefixes are fully productive with manner verbs. (For a detailed analysis of motion events in one Slavic language, Serbo-Croatian, see Filipović 2002.)

translators have left out some information provided in the English original. Where manner verbs are used, they differ in their "vividness"—a factor that turns out to be especially striking in comparing the two types of languages (Slobin, 2004). Compare 'wander', 'march', 'wobble', and 'stroll' in the satellite-framed languages, with 'wander', 'stroll', and 'walk' in the verb-framed languages.

Table 1.
Components of the Hobbit's Trajectory
Expressed in 11 Languages

Lang	wander	exit	cross	descend
EN	wander on	out of the valley	over its edge	down the slopes beyond
DU	wander further	out of the valley	over the edge	down the slopes lying beyond
GE	march further	out of the valley	down over the slope	down the slope beyond
RU	walk and walk	go up from the valley	wobble across over its edge	start to go down
S-C	stroll further	go out from the valley	over its edge	go down the slope behind it
FR	continue to advance aimlessly	exit from the valley	cross the edge	descend the slope beyond
IT	wander again	out of the valley	cross it	descend down along the slope on the other side
PO	continue advancing	exit from the valley		descend the slope beyond
SP	continue walking	out of the valley	along the edge	then descending the slopes
HE	continue to walk	pass the edge of the valley		descend on the slopes beyond it
TU		exit from the valley	stroll on its edge	down from the slopes behind it

Table 2.
Linguistic Elements of the Hobbit's Trajectory
in 11 Languages

Lang	wander	exit	cross	descend
EN	manner verb	path + ground	path + ground	path + ground
DU	manner verb	path + ground	path + ground	path + ground
GE	manner verb	path + ground	path + ground	path + ground
RU	verb	path-verb + ground	manner verb + path + ground	path-verb
S-C	manner verb	path-verb + ground	path + ground	path-verb + ground
FR	path verb + manner adverb	path verb + ground	path verb + ground	path verb + ground
IT	manner verb	path + ground	path verb + ground	path verb + ground
PO	path verb	path verb + ground		path verb + ground
SP	manner verb	path + ground	path + ground	path verb + ground
HE	manner verb	path verb + ground		path verb + ground
TU		path verb + ground	manner verb + ground	path + ground

Dealing with manner information in translation

One of the most striking differences between the two sets of translations overall lies in the use of manner verbs. (There are also striking differences in temporal expressions, but that would be a topic for another chapter.) As I have suggested earlier (Slobin 1996, 2000, 2004), satellite-framed languages are "manner salient languages," apparently because they provide a ready slot in sentence structure for the encoding of manner—that is, the main verb in a clause—leaving it to satellites to encode path. Verb-framed languages, by contrast, tend to commit the main verb slot to path verbs. Translators of *The hobbit* are faced with particular challenges with regard to this dimension of motion events, because the book is a dynamic and dramatic quest narrative involving confrontations between a range of creatures. There is, therefore, a compelling reason to retain Tolkien's rich and often fanciful verb lexicon in this domain. However, verb-framed translators generally lack a comparably elaborate lexicon upon which to draw, and they are also faced with the need to avoid non-native heaviness of motion event descriptions that—in separate phrases or clauses—would serve to spread out details of path and manner that were conveniently compacted in the English original. The set of translations provides graphic evidence of this issue of comparative rhetoric.

There are several ways to examine the issue of manner descriptions in the source and target languages. Overall, through Chapter 6, Tolkien uses 26 different types of manner verbs. Translations into the four satellite-framed languages use an average of 25.6 types— that is, matching the original. (Russian actually surpasses the original, with 30 types.) However, the verb-framed translations use an average of 17.2 types, with only Italian approaching Tolkien's diversity.[8] The figures for each language are presented in the second column of Table 3.

Another comparison looks at the total number of manner expressions in Chapter 6, including adverbials and descriptions of terrain and inner states of protagonists. This comparison gives each translator ample leeway to encode manner by whatever means seem suitable to the task and the style of the language. For example, the Portuguese translator renders Tolkien's *limp along* as *ir avançando com dificuldade* 'go advancing with difficulty'. Or where Tolkien has wolves *trot into the clearing*, the Italian translator uses a path verb with an adverb: *arrivare di corsa nella radura* 'arrive at a run in the clearing'. Here there is more diversity between the languages, as translators decide how true to be to the nuances of Tolkien's English while attending to the stylistic preferences of the target language. Note, however, that 'advancing with difficulty' is rather different from *limp*, and 'arrive at a run' is rather different than *trot.* But again—even with the possibility of augmenting path verbs with manner expressions—the mean values are clearly different, with about 62 expressions in the satellite-framed and 52 in the verb-framed languages. (See column three of Table 3.)

---

[8] There is some evidence that Italian is moving in the direction of satellite-framing in its use of a range of path adverbials with manner verbs (Schwarze 1985; Slobin 2004). Note, too, that although the Slavic languages approach verb-framed languages with regard to the encoding of complex paths, they are fully in line with the Germanic languages with regard to the diversity of manner verbs. Thus Talmy's typology is best seen as a cline, with the Slavic languages and Italian somewhere between the poles.

Table 3.
Manner-of-Motion Expressions
in Chapter 6 of *The Hobbit*

Satellite-framed languages	Number of types of manner verbs	Total number of manner expressions
English	26	64
Dutch	22	62
German	24	63
Russian	30	57
Serbo-Croatian	26	65
MEAN VALUE	**25.6**	**62.2**
Verb-framed languages		
French	17	48
Italian	22	54
Portuguese	12	46
Spanish	19	59
Hebrew	17	49
Turkish	16	56
MEAN VALUE	**17.2**	**52**

The differences in lexical diversity between the languages are most clearly revealed by an examination of the actual verbs used. Tables 4a and 4b give the full list of types of verbs used in each language for describing the motions of human-like creatures (human, hobbit, elf, goblin). The verbs are grouped by a rough categorization of sorts of manners of motion. Table 4a shows satellite-framed verbs and 4b verb-framed. It does not matter, for the purpose of this overview, what the actual lexical items mean. What is striking is that, with rare exceptions, the diversity of the English original is matched or surpassed by the satellite-framed translations, but not by the verb-framed translations. For example, *climb* and *clamber* are matched by two Germanic verbs, and by three Slavic verbs, but by only one verb in Romance, Semitic, and Turkic. Note, too, that there are two empty cells in 4a, but twelve empty cells in 4b—that is, sorts of manners that found no translation equivalent at all in a particular target language. These comparisons give clear evidence of the differing degrees of manner salience (Slobin 2004) in the two types of languages.

Table 4.
Types of Manner-of-Motion Verbs Used for
Human-like Creatures in Chapter 6 of *The Hobbit*:
4a. Satellite-framed Languages

MANNER OF MOTION	ENGLISH	DUTCH	GERMAN	RUSSIAN	SERBO-CROATIAN
RAPID	run scramble scuttle	rennen	rennen hüpfen	begat' kinut'sja	trčati leteti kaskati
SLOW, CAUTIOUS	creep crawl	kruipen	kriechen	krast'sja polzat' probirat'sja bresti	puzati vlačiti se
SACCADIC	jump	springen	springen	prygat' skočit'	bacati se
IMPAIRED	limp	strompelen	humpeln	kovyljat' valit'	hramati
CONTINUOUS	march	lopen	marschieren	xodit'	hodati
ASCENDING	climb clamber swarm	klimmen klauteren	klettern krabbeln	lezt' karabkat'sja vzobrat'sja	pentrati peti se koprcati se
SLIDING	slide	glijden	rutschen schlittern	katat'sja	
WANDERING	wander	dolen zwerven slingeren	wandern		lutati švrljati
FOOT MOVEMENT	step	treden	stapfen	stupat'	koraknuti
TOTAL	14	12	12	16	15

4b. Verb-framed Languages

MANNER OF MOTION	FRENCH	PORTUGUESE	SPANISH	ITALIAN	HEBREW	TURKISH
RAPID	courir	correr	correr	correre	rac dileg	koşmak
SLOW, CAUTIOUS	ramper	arrastrarse	arrastrarse	strisciare	zaxal	sürünmek sokulmak
SACCADIC	bondir	saltar	saltar	saltare	kafac	atlamak zıplamak
IMPAIRED	clopiner		cojear	zoppicare		sendelemek
CONTINUOUS	marcher		marchar caminar	marciare	ca'ad	
ASCENDING	grimper	trepar	trepar	arrampicarsi	tipes	tırmanmak
SLIDING	se glisser	deslizarse escorregar	deslizarse	sdrucciolare slittare scivolare	galaš	kaymak
WANDERING	errer			girovagare	šat	gezinmek dolanmak
FOOT MOVEMENT						
TOTAL	8	6	8	10	8	10

Additional morphosyntactic factors

Grammatical marking of path elements

Although path verbs, in themselves, encode minimal directional information, they combine with nominal elements to convey more detailed path information. For example, Table 1 shows various uses of prepositional phrases and casemarked nounphrases that provide elements of source and goal. The satellite-framed languages freely combine a number of path phrases with a single motion verb—either a neutral verb like 'go' or a manner verb. Verb-framed languages differ, however, in how many path elements typically cooccur with a single motion verb. The norm seems to be the use of a separate verb for each element, as in the French example in (3): 'exit' – 'cross' – 'descend'. By contrast, Basque is a verb-framed language with rich morphological means for encoding of path elements. Nouns and pronouns are inflected for five locational cases, and there are more than 30 postpositions, also inflected with these cases. Ibarretxe-Antuñano has suggested that this morphological richness leads Basque speakers and writers to elaborate path descriptions—for example, using a single verb with an ABLATIVE-marked noun to indicate source and an ALLATIVE-marked noun for goal. She first noticed this Basque tendency toward path elaboration in an analysis of frog stories (Ibarretxe-Antuñano, 2004) and has now turned her attention to *The hobbit* (Ibarretxe-Antuñano, 2003). Because the book has not yet been translated into Basque, she engaged four professional translators to translate portions of Chapter 6 into Basque, thus providing a larger range of options for Basque than the other languages considered here. In the trajectory analyzed in Table 1—the Hobbit's exit from the valley—Basque seems to pattern rather differently from other verb-framed languages. Although two of the four translators use more than one path verb, the other two use a single verb (a manner verb or a neutral verb) with three casemarked path segments, such as:

(6) *Bera oraindik noraezean zebilen, goiko bailara txikitik kanpo, bere mugaz gain eta bestaldeko aldapan behera.*
he:ABS still aimlessly walk:3S:IMPF top:AND valley small:ABL outside it:GEN limit:INST top and other.side:AND slope:LOC below:ALL
'He was still walking aimlessly, out of the small high valley, over its edge and down the other slopes.'

The translation in (6) is typical of Basque, both in frog stories and *Hobbit* translations, leading Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2004) to propose a "complete path hypothesis" for Basque—that is, "a tendency to provide an extensive and detailed elaboration of path." She notes, however, that Basque, like other verb-framed languages, tends to provide little information about manner of movement (overall, even less than the Spanish *Hobbit* translations and frog stories). However locative morphology places Basque in a different position with regard to path encoding:

> Similarly to other satellite-framed languages like English, [Basque's] morpho-syntactic characteristics allow it to compact to the verb several pieces of path information, and it is therefore only natural that Basque offers more detailed information about this semantic component than other verb-framed languages. (Ibarretxe-Antuñano, 2003: 3).

Additional lexical means for encoding manner

Translations of *The Hobbit* have recently been examined in two other verb-framed languages, Japanese (Sugiyama, 2000) and Korean (Oh, 2003). Both of these languages have extensive means of verb compounding, but the resulting patterns with regard to manner expressions seem to be rather different, at least with regard to *Hobbit* translations.

Sugiyama reports that the Japanese translation has far fewer manner verbs than the English original, but that it exceeds English in variety of manner expressions when compounds are considered. She lists three major types of compounds:

- *te*-forms, e.g., *mai-ori-te-kuru* 'flutter-descend-and-come' (=fly down to)
- *i*-forms, e.g., *nori-koeru* 'ride-cross' (=ride across)
- main verb – secondary verb, e.g., *tobi-tsuku* 'jump-attach' (=jump onto)

These several means of verb compounding are reported to be colloquial and greatly exploited in the translation. Sugiyama concludes with a pointed comparison of Japanese with another type of verb-framed language, French:

> It seems that French and Japanese take the opposite choice in describing Manner. Following the characteristics of a language that does not syntactically require Manner to appear in the main verb, French does not elaborate in expressing Manner of motion. On the other hand, Japanese has developed a way of expressing Manner by making use of compounds. Compared to English that necessitates speakers of the language to think of Manner when they talk about motion events, the concept of Manner may not play a significant role for the speakers of Japanese. Nonetheless, the ubiquity of compounds that encode Manner in a compound suggests that expression of Manner is readily available in Japanese. (Sugiyama, 2000: 15)

Korean is typologically similar to Japanese, and also has means of verb compounding. However, the Korean translation of *The hobbit* does not make comparably rich use of this option. Oh (2003) reports that although the translation maintains the overall number of manner expressions presented in the English original, it contains both fewer types and fewer tokens of manner verbs than the original, and "the vividness of manner expressions in the English original seems to be lost in Korean translation." Verb compounds are used sparingly and often do not distinguish nuances provided by Tolkien. For example, the verb *kita* 'crawl', which Oh glosses as 'move carefully not to be seen', is used to translate *crawl, creep, climb*, and *clamber*:

- *crawl into* → *kita-kata* 'crawl-go'
- *creep down* → *kita-narita-kata* 'crawl-descend-go'
- *climb down* → *kita-narita-ota* 'crawl-descend-come'
- *clamber off into* → *kita-oruta-kata* 'crawl-ascend-go'

Further research is needed to determine the extent to which the differences between these two translations are indicative of broader differences between Japanese and Korean. But the comparison certainly demonstrates that a full analysis of manner information in translation goes beyond the typology of lexicalization patterns of motion events in single-verb expressions.

An additional lexical means of manner expression can be found in the use of ideophones or mimetics. In a crosslinguistic examination of manner expressions in frog stories (Slobin, 2004), I have suggested that ideophones can provide a rich lexicon of manner distinctions. This issue has not been systematically explored in *Hobbit* translations, but it is noted in passing by both Sugiyama and Oh. Examples are not provided for Japanese, but it is well known that mimetics play an important role in that language (e.g., Hamano, 1998; Kita, 1997). Oh provides several Korean examples, such as *ttwuita kkenchungkkengchung* 'run/jump up.and.down.in.leaping.motion' (=translation of *leap*).

Typological considerations

A consideration of factors of morphosyntax, verb compounding, and ideophones points to a conclusion that also emerges from crosslinguistic studies of the frog story:

> Rather than put languages into typological categories, it might be more profitable to lay out the collection of factors that, together, interact to contribute to particular rhetorical styles. … Typologies are useful in sorting out the multifarious dimensions that characterize human languages. But just because of this diversity of dimensions, each language is an intersection of many interacting patterns. (Slobin, 2004).

In overviewing the frog story, I propose some typological refinements that go beyond this brief exploration of *The hobbit* and its vicissitudes (see Slobin, 2004, for details). For now, let us assess what can be learned from relating narrative events in translation.

Conclusion: Comparing languages through translation

We must assume that translators strive to maintain or enhance the force and vividness of the source text. Thus the use of translations provides a particularly stringent test of each language's capacities (within the limits, of course, of the skills of individual translators).   The translation task gives us a window into the maximum possibilities of a language, as it strives to adapt to the demands of a source language. Even under these strong demand factors, verb-framed languages apparently are less concerned with the domain of manner of motion than are satellite-framed languages (though with some possibilities of expanded attention to manner using special means). And verb-framed languages break paths up into somewhat different sorts of segments. Nevertheless, each of the translations of *The hobbit* provides a great and gripping story—the same essential story that Tolkien must have had in mind. The last sentence of Berman and Slobin's *Relating events in narrative* is an appropriate conclusion to this little study of translation as well: "We are left, then, with a new respect for the powerful role of each individual language in shaping its own world of expression, while at the same time representing but one variant of a familiar and universally human pattern" (1994: 641).

REFERENCES

Bamberg, M. (1985). *Form and function in the construction of narratives: Developmental perspectives*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Bamberg, M. (1987). *The acquisition of narratives: Learning to use language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Berman, R. A. (1988). On the ability to relate events in narrative. *Discourse Processes, 11*, 469-497.

Berman, R. A. (2002). Crosslinguistic aspects of later language development. In S. Strömqvist (Ed.), *The diversity of languages and language learning* (pp. 25-44). Lund, Sweden: Lund University, Centre for Languages and Literature.

Berman, R. A., & Slobin, D. I. (1987). *Five ways of learning to talk about events: A crosslinguistic study of children's narratives.* Berkeley Cognitive Science Report No. 46, Institute of Cognitive Studies, University of California, Berkeley.

Berman, R. A., & Slobin, D. I. (1994). *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Filipovic, L. (2002). *Verbs in motion expressions: Structural perspectives*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cambridge University.

Hamano, S. (1998). *The sound-symbolic system of Japanese*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. (2003). *What translation tells us about motion: A contrastive study of typologically different languages*. Unpublished paper, University of Deusto – University of the Basque Country, Bilbao.

Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. (2004). Motion events in Basque narratives. In S. Strömqvist & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative: Typological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 89-112). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kita, S. (1997). Two-dimensional semantic analysis of Japanese mimetics. *Linguistics, 35*, 379-415.

Mayer, M. (1969). *Frog, where are you?* New York: Dial Press.

Oh, K. (2003). [Unpublished analysis of Korean translation of *The Hobbit*.] Dept. of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley.

Schwarze, C. (1985). "Uscire" e "andare fuori": struttura sintattica e semantica lessicale. *Società di Linguistica Italiana, 24*, 355-371.

Sinha, C., & Kuteva, T. (1995). Distributed spatial semantics. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics, 18*, 167-199.

Slobin, D. I. (1996). Two ways to travel: Verbs of motion in English and Spanish. In M. Shibatani & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning* (pp. 195-220). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Slobin, D. I. (1997). Mind, code, and text. In J. Bybee, J. Haiman, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Essays on language function and language type: Dedicated to T. Givón* (pp. 437-467). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Slobin, D. I. (2000). Verbalized events: A dynamic approach to linguistic relativity and determinism. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (Eds.), *Evidence for linguistic relativity* (pp. 107-138). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Slobin, D. I. (2004). The many ways to search for a frog: Linguistic typology and the expression of motion events. In S. Strömqvist & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative: Typological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 219-257). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Strömqvist, S., & Verhoeven, L. (Eds.). (2004). *Relating events in narrative: Typological and contextual perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sugiyama, Y. (2000). *Expressing manner in the Japanese translation of* The Hobbit: *A preliminary study of comparison between Japanese and English stories*. Unpublished paper, LIN 636 Seminar on Space, Time, and Force, SUNY Buffalo.

Talmy, L. (1985). Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and lexical description: Vol. 3. Grammatical categories and the lexicon* (pp. 36-149). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, L. (1991). Path to realization: A typology of event conflation. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 17*, 480-519.

Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics: Vol. II: Typology and process in concept structuring.*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Tolkien, J. R. R. (1937). *The Hobbit or there and back again.* London: George Allen & Unwin. [Dutch transl. M. Schuchart. (1960). *De Hobbit*. Utrecht: Prisma-Boeken.] [French transl. F. Ledoux. (1980). *Bilbo le Hobbit*. Paris: Hachette.] [German transl. W. Scherf. (1995). *Der kleine Hobbit*. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch.] [Hebrew transl. Ha-na'ami, M. (1976). *ha-hobit o le-sham u-ve-xazara.* Zmora.] [Italian transl. E. J. Conte. (1973). *Lo hobbit o la riconquista del tesoro*. Milan: Adelphi Edizioni.] [Portuguese transl. L. M. R. Esteves & A. Pisetta. (1995). *O hobbit*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.] [Japanese transl. T. Seta. (1999). *Hobitto no bouken*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.] [Russian transl. N. Raxmanova. (1976). *Xobit, ili, tuda i obratno*. Leningrad: Detskaja Literatura.] [Serbo-Croatian transl. M. Milišić & M. Milišić. (1986). *Hobit*. Belgrade: Nolit.] [Spanish transl. M. Figueroa. (1982). *El hobbit*. Barcelona: Minotauro.] [Turkish transl. E. İzmirli. (1996). *Hobbit: Oradaydık ve şimdi buradayız.* Istanbul: Mitos Yayıncılık.]