Taking perspectives on events

Whenever we compose a message in words, we take a perspective. Indeed, it’s impossible to utter or write a sentence without, at the same time, deciding how to “frame” the content that we are trying to express. Furthermore, we must make use of the tools that are provided by the particular language we are using. The purpose of this paper is to suggest that each language provides a set of preferred perspectives on events. Of course, one has a range of choices in any particular language; nevertheless, some choices seem more “natural” than others, depending on the language. I will try to demonstrate this point by exploring a domain of experience that is central in all languages: statements about how living creatures move from place to place.

Motion events

The linguist Leonard Talmy (1991, 2000) has analyzed motion events into a set of components:

- **Motion**: displacement in space (different location at time \( t_1 \) and time \( t_2 \))
- **Path**: direction of motion (into, upwards, etc.)
- **Figure**: the entity that is moving (person, animal, etc.)
- **Ground**: landmarks that define the path (source, goal, medium, etc.)
- **Manner**: the way in which motion is carried out (rate, motor pattern, etc.)

The languages of the world differ with regard to the expression of the core element of motion events—namely, Path. In fact, according to Talmy, there are two types of languages with regard to Path expression. In one type, represented by the languages derived from Latin, there is a separate verb for each type of path. These verbs can also be found in English, though they are not the everyday means of talking about motion events: *He entered the room. She ascended the stairs.* Talmy refers to this type of expression as “verb-framed,” because it is the verb that “frames” Path. For many languages, this is the major means of expression for motion events. Verb-framed languages include the Romance languages (French, Spanish, etc.), Semitic languages (Arabic, Hebrew, etc.), Turkic Languages (Turkish, Uzbek, etc.), Korean, Japanese, and others. The opposite type is represented by Germanic languages, such as English and Swedish. In English, for example, the most natural way to express Path is in an element associated with the verb: *He went into the room. She went up the stairs.* Talmy calls such elements satellites. They can be verb particles, as in the Germanic languages; or they can be expressed by other elements associated with the verb, such as prefixes in the Slavic languages.
(the equivalents of ‘he in-went the room’ or ‘she up-went the stairs’). This type of language is called “satellite-framed,” because Path is expressed by a satellite to the verb. Satellite-framed languages include Germanic and Slavic languages (Russian, Polish, etc.), Finno-Ugric (Finnish, Hungarian, etc.), Chinese, various American Indian languages, and others.

This typological contrast between verb-framed and satellite-framed languages (V-languages and S-languages) has consequences for the expression of Manner of motion. For example, compare two descriptions of a simple motion event in Spanish and in English:

- **Ella entró a la casa corriendo.**
  ‘She entered the house running.’
- **She ran into the house.**

In Spanish, the verb entrar ‘enter’ expresses Path, and an additional adverbial expression, corriendo ‘running’, is needed if one wants to say something about the Manner of entering. In English, the verb run describes Manner, and the satellite in provides Path. Every sentence requires a verb. In a V-language like Spanish, the verb is occupied with Path, and if one wants to say something about Manner, it’s necessary to make the sentence more complex by adding some sort of adverbial expression, such as corriendo ‘running’. In an S-language like English, the verb slot—which is required by grammar—can be filled with a Manner verb, such as run, dash, crawl, limp, etc. No additional grammatical complexity is required, since the verb + satellite construction is a basic, simple sentence in English. It is as easy to say she ran into the house as she went into the house. Accordingly, Manner is syntactically and lexically easier to express in an S-language than in a V-language.

To return to the question of preferred perspectives, we can ask whether users of V-languages and S-languages differ with regard to the perspectives that they take on Manner in motion events. A considerable amount of evidence, of various sorts, suggests that this is, indeed, the case. Manner seems to be a matter of everyday attention for speakers of S-languages, while speakers of V-languages seem to attend to Manner only when it is especially significant. Let us consider evidence for this rather surprising claim.

**Elicited narratives: the “frog story”**

For the past twenty years or so, my colleagues and I have been gathering short narratives elicited by a children’s picture storybook without words, Frog, where are you? (Mayer, 1969). The story is about a boy who has a pet frog. The frog has run away, and the boy and his dog go looking for it—a search that involves many motion events and many protagonists (boy, dog, frog, owl, bees, deer, and more). We have gathered “frog stories” from children as young as 3, and from narrators across the age range from preschool to old age. Our sample of frog stories includes the following languages:

**Verb-framed languages:**
- **Romance**: French, Galician, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish
- **Semitic**: Moroccan Arabic, Hebrew
- **Turkic**: Turkish
- **Japanese**

**Satellite-framed languages:**
- **Germanic**: Dutch, English, German, Icelandic, Swedish, Yiddish
- **Slavic**: Polish, Russian, Serbo-Croatian
To begin with, consider the scene depicted in the following two pictures: the boy is searching for the frog in a hole in a tree when an owl emerges.
In V-languages, narrators of all ages almost always describe the appearance of the owl with a single Path verb, meaning ‘exit’. For example:
• Spanish: Sale un buho. [=Exits an owl.]
• Turkish: Oradan bir baykuş çıkyor. [=From there an owl exits.]
• Hebrew: Yaca mitox haxor yansuf. [=Exits from-inside the-hole owl.]

By contrast, many S-language narrators, at all ages, use some kind of Manner verb together with a Path satellite to take a perspective on the owl’s emergence. For example:

• English: An owl popped out.
• Russian: Tam vyskočila sova. [=There out-jumped owl.]
• Mandarin Chinese: Fei1-chu1 yi1 zhi1 ma01 tou2 ying1. [=Fly out one owl.]

The following figure—combining data from preschoolers, school-age children, and adults — clearly shows a significant difference between the two language types in describing this scene. Speakers of five V-languages—Spanish, French, Italian, Turkish, and Hebrew—hardly ever use a Manner verb, while this is a frequent option (to varying degrees) in five S-languages—English, German, Dutch, Russian, and Mandarin Chinese.

This pattern holds up across all of the motion events in the frog story. The following figure presents data for 3-year-olds from a sample of six languages, showing the percentage of motion events descriptions that contained Manner verbs, as opposed to Path verbs or simple verbs of motion such as ‘come’ and ‘go’. It is clear that speakers of S-languages pay far more attention to Manner than speakers of V-languages. The 3-year-old pattern is demonstrated at all ages (3, 5, 7, 9, 11, adult), with essentially no developmental change in any of the languages. Evidently, this is something that children learn about their language from very early on.
Creative writing: novels

The frog story is an artificial stimulus, based on an American children’s book. Can we find evidence for differential attention to Manner of motion in more natural narrative productions? To answer this question, we have turned to novels written in V-languages and S-languages. The research procedure is to open a novel at random and read until a protagonist begins to move; the protagonist is then tracked until he or she comes to rest again and another plot-advancing event takes place. Using this procedure, we have extracted 20 motion events each from a collection of novels in the two language types. Creative fiction writers have a full set of tools at their disposal, yet it appears that they follow the preferences of their language to the same extent as oral narrators of frog stories. For example, the following figure compares novels and adult frog stories in two V-languages—Spanish and Turkish, and two S-languages—English and Russian. Again, the statistic is the percentage of motion events that are described by Manner verbs. It is evident that there is a close correspondence between the frog stories and novels for each language—even though these languages represent different language families and literary traditions. Again, the data suggest that Manner of motion is relatively more salient to users of S-languages, in comparison with V-languages (Slobin, 1996b, 1997).
The two types of languages also differ with regard to the diversity of types of Manner verbs that are available. For example, compare the Manner verbs from 20 motion events in nine English novels with 20 motion events in nine Spanish novels. The lists include single-verb expressions (monomorphemic verbs) as well as combinations of verbs (phrasal verbs), in order to give Spanish—the V-language—full opportunity to display Manner expressions.

**English novels**
- **monomorphemic verbs (51 types):** bolt, brush, bump, burst, climb, crawl, creep, cut, dart, dip, dive, drift, drop, edge, flee, glide, grope, hasten, hurry, jump, leap, limp, loiter, march, plod, plunge, race, roll, run, rush, rustle, scramble, skitter, slide, slip, sneak, spring, sprint, step, stride, stroll, struggle, stumble, thread, tiptoe, tramp, trip, wade, walk, wander, work
- **phrasal verbs (11 types):** drag oneself, edge one's way, grope one's way, hurl oneself, make one's way, pick one's way, push one's way, strike a path, take a step, thread one's way, work one's way

**Spanish novels**
- **monomorphemic verbs (23 types):** andar [go, walk], arrastrarse [drag oneself], atropellarse [hasten], caminar [go, walk], chocar [bump], cojear [limp], correr [run], deslizarse [slip, creep], echarse [throw oneself], escabullirse [slip, scurry], escapar [escape], flotar [float], gatear [crawl on all fours], huir [flee], irrumpir [burst in], lanzarse [throw oneself], pasear [walk, promenade], pedalear [pedal (bicycle)], pisar [step], rodar [roll], saltar [jump], trepar [climb], tropezar [stumble]
- **phrasal verbs (4 types):** abrirse paso [force one's way], apretar el paso [increase the pace], correr en puntas de pie [run on tiptoe], estar al galope [be at a gallop]

Clearly, the English lexicon is more diverse than Spanish: 62 types of expressions versus 27 types. Note, too, that the English verbs—overall—seem to present many more dynamic, dramatic, or expressive event perspectives than the Spanish verbs. The same difference in lexical
diversity is revealed if one checks dictionaries: English has at least three times as many Manner of motion verbs as Spanish. Similar contrasts hold up for all of the S- and V-languages that we have checked thus far (English, Dutch, German, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Hungarian, Mandarin vs. French, Spanish, Basque, Turkish, Hebrew, Japanese, and Korean).

**Conversational discourse**

Both frog stories and novels are narrative creations. Could it be that we are dealing with a special genre, rather than general tendencies in the two types of languages? To answer this question, we turn first to recordings of spontaneous conversations. It turns out that the Manner verbs used in English novels are not limited to the sphere of fiction. Verbs of this sort are quite readily available to English speakers. For example, in about two hours of British and American conversations, we have found the following 34 types of Manner of motion verbs:

clamber, climb, crawl, dash, dive, drag oneself, drift, drive, flee float, flop, fly, glide, hike, jump, leap, march, poke, plunge, run, rush, slide, sneak, stagger, step, swim, tread, trip, trot, trudge, walk, wander

These verbs occur in quite normal conversations—to refer to actual human motion, as well as figurative motion and motion of vehicles. For example:

- “…and then you clambered up on the platform…” (British)
- “…well, you’ve got to plunge into London…” (British)
- “…Miranda was played as a very gauche girl who sort of staggers around…” (British)
- “…I wandered around to this one main area…” (American)
- “…we all dove under the table…” (American)
- “…as you trudge off to work to support them…” (American)

By contrast, similar conversation samples in Spanish and Turkish yield almost no Manner verbs at all. For example, the following motion verbs occurred in two hours of lively gossip among a group of Colombian women. Note that the overwhelming majority of verbs are simple Path verbs, and that the only Manner verbs are simply equivalents of ‘walk’:

- 9 types of path verbs (97% of tokens): ir, venir, alcanzar, bajar, entrar, llegar, pasar, salir, volver [=go, come, reach, descend, enter, arrive, pass, exit, return]
- 2 types of manner verbs (3% of tokens): caminar, pasear [=walk]

**Child language**

It is not only in adult conversations that Manner verbs are used in S-languages; such verbs form a regular part of parent discourse with preschool-aged children. Accordingly, children are trained by their language to attend to those dimensions of experience and activity that are expressed by such verbs. For example, we have carried out an extensive search of verbs used by children between the ages of 2 and 4, available in transcriptions of parent-child discourse in the CHILDES archive (http://childes.psy.cmu.edu/). The transcripts show that English-speaking children in this age range use at least 34 types of Manner verbs—of the same sort as we find in adult conversations and novels:
• bump, chase, climb, crawl, creep, dance, float, flop, fly, hike, hop, jog, jump, march, paddle, pounce, race, roll, run, rush, scoot, skip, slide, slip, sneak, step, swim, tread, trip, trot, walk, wiggle

By contrast, *Manner* verbs are relatively infrequent in the preschool discourse of *V*-language children. For example, the following limited sets of six types in French and eight types in Spanish are found in comparable transcriptions in the CHILDES archive:

- **French:** courir, faire du ski, glisser, nager, sauter, voler  [=run, ski, slip, swim, jump, fly]
- **Spanish:** bailar, caer(se), correr, chocar(se), escaparse, nadar, saltar, volar  [=dance, fall, run, crash, escape, swim, jump, fly]

Note, again, that the *V*-language *Manner* verbs do not call upon the same range of nuanced differentiations of types of motion as encountered in *S*-languages. That is, the *S*-language child is learning how to differentiate many different sorts of movement—*crawl vs. creep, run vs. jog vs. march vs. trot vs. scoot*, and so forth. We can conclude, then, that children are trained by their language—from very early on—to adopt particular perspectives on events, based on degrees of differentiation of meanings within a semantic domain. English-speaking children have to make more fine-grained distinctions with regard to motor patterns and rate of movement than do children learning French or Spanish, for example. In this case, we are dealing with learning to distinguish manners of motion. Of course, as we go from one domain to another, we find that each language trains its speakers to attend to distinctions within particular domains, as discussed in more detail below (Slobin, 1996a).

**Reading the newspapers**

If it is true that *S*-languages and *V*-languages favor differential perspectives on motion events, what might be possible consequences of such differences? We gain much of our information about the world through hearing and reading about events. Indeed, this is our only source of knowledge about places and times where we are not personally present. For example, if you read a newspaper in an *S*-language, you regularly encounter the sorts of *Manner* verbs that we have been examining. Such verbs are used for a variety of purposes by reporters and columnists: to make accounts of events more vivid, to evaluate the participants in events, and to use motion verbs metaphorically to describe other sorts of processes. Let us look at several types of examples from English-language newspapers, both British and American.

**Actual motion is made vivid.**

Reporters make use of *Manner* verbs to make their stories more lively, more vivid, easier to visualize. Consider, for example, the following event descriptions:

- “Sometimes the gunfire drives them to *flee* again, *crawling* under the coiled wire at the back of the compound and *scaling* the hillside…” (*New York Times*)
- “Yesterday’s aftershock was big enough to send frightened people *scurrying* out of their homes…” (*San Francisco Chronicle*)
The moving figure is evaluated.

Often, the choice of a particular Manner verb subtly conveys the writer’s attitude towards the person being described. This is a sort of covert evaluation, facilitated by the large lexicon of such verbs in the language. In the following examples, we are implicitly invited to imagine the kind of person who might “stride” (as opposed to “walk” or “stroll”) through a library; or the kind of person who might “waltz up to a counter” (as opposed to, say, “stride up”):

- “Striding through the library, Dr. Simmons shook each hand…” (New York Times)
- “Solomon Moss had never applied for a loan before… He bit his lip, waltzed up to the counter and asked to borrow $100.” (Washington Post)

Organizations and nations are personified and evaluated.

Manner of motion verbs are extended to describe political and economic processes, organizations, countries, and so forth. The particular choice of verb, again, subtly conveys an evaluation of the situation being reported. For example:

- “…the nationwide campaign stumbled on roadblocks and controversy.” (New York Times)
- “Ethiopia and Eritrea know full well that they are shambling into a confrontation nearly impossible for either of them to win.” (New York Times)

Rate of change is embodied and evaluated.

Temporal processes are frequently described in terms of spatial movement. This is a well-known phenomenon across languages. However, in S-languages it is possible to choose Manner of motion verbs to convey an attitude towards the process of change being reported. For example:

- “Yasir Arafat, American officials, and even some Israelis have begun worrying that peacekeeping momentum is slowing from a gallop to a saunter.” (New York Times)
- “Change has crept in.” (The Guardian)

Crosslinguistic comparisons

Descriptions of this sort are not just limited to English; they are common in all of the S-language newspapers that we have examined. Here are typical examples from two other S-languages:

- Dutch: “Maar nog steeds sluipen er vooroordelen in het lesmateriaal.” [=But biases still creep into the lesson materials.] (NRC Handelsblad)
- Mandarin Chinese: “Zhejia qiye zhengzai pa dou po.” [=This enterprise is crawling on a steep slope.] (People’s Daily) (Yu, 1998)

By contrast, Manner verbs are rarely encountered in V-language newspapers—for any of the functions briefly summarized above. At least this is what we are finding in ongoing studies of newspapers in Spanish, French, and Turkish (Özçalışkan, in preparation).
Consequences: Is the “same” event described in newspapers in different languages?

It is our impression—reading newspapers in various languages, and talking to bilinguals who regularly read the news in an S-language and a V-language—that reported events seem more “dynamic” in S-language accounts. This raises the intriguing possibility that readers in different countries, reading newspapers (or listening to radio or TV reports) in different types of languages, may end up with different conceptions of the events being reported. As one example, consider an event that occurred several years ago. France was planning to carry out a nuclear test in the South Pacific, and Greenpeace attempted to block the effort. This is how the event was reported in the British newspaper, The Guardian:

- “Squads of troops … stormed the Greenpeace flagship Rainbow Warrior II… 15 commandos clambered on board… Greenpeace defied warning not to breach the 12-mile exclusion zone to power across the lagoon in Greenpeace dinghies.”

Although this was clearly an event that deeply concerned the French, it was reported by Le Figaro in much less dynamic terms:

- “Les commandos de marine arraisonnent le Rainbow Warrior… Le Rainbow Warrior est passé à la offensive dès l’aube, franchissant la limite des eaux territoriales françaises…”
  [=The marine commandos took control of the Rainbow Warrior… The Rainbow Warrior switched over to the offensive at dawn, crossing the limits of French territorial waters…]

According to The Guardian, French troops “stormed” the ship and “clambered on board,” while Le Figaro simply reported that the troops “took control” of the ship. And while, according to the English account, Greenpeace “breached” the exclusion zone and “powered across” the lagoon, the French reader is simply told that Greenpeace “crossed the limits.” Such crosslinguistic differences are typical, and lead one to wonder about the different sorts of mental images and event memories held by members of S-language and V-language communities.

Translation between an S-language and a V-language

Differential attention to Manner in the two types of languages poses problems for translators. Literal translation of a V-language text into an S-language would seem dry and non-dynamic, while literal translation in the other direction would seem overly dramatic, paying unexpected attention to Manner. We are comparing translations of novels between several languages of the two types (English, German, Spanish, French, Turkish). As shown in the following figures, based on translations between English, Spanish, and Turkish, the perspective of the target language tends to dominate in the process of translation. That is, English novels translated into Spanish or Turkish lose about one-third of their Manner verbs, while Spanish and Turkish novels translated into English tend to keep their Manner verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satellite-framed → Verb-framed</th>
<th>MANNER VERBS KEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English to Spanish</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English to Turkish</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attention to manner-of-motion is diminished.
**Verb-framed → Satellite-framed**

Attention to manner-of-motion is maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Combination</th>
<th>MANNER VERBS KEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish to English</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish to English</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following example, the Spanish translator has replaced “stomped from the house” with a simple Path verb, with no indication of Manner:

*He stomped from the trim house.* → *Salió de la pulcra casa.*

[=He exited from the trim house.]

Translations from German to French show the same pattern, e.g.:

*Eine Stunde schlich ich noch um das Haus herum…* → *Une heure durant, je fis le tour de la maison…*

[=For another hour I crept around the house…]

Again, an expressive Manner verb, *schleichen* ‘creep’, is replaced by a simple Path expression, *faire le tour* ‘make a circuit’. Apparently the use of verbs with meanings such as ‘stomp’ and ‘creep’ would unacceptably foreground Manner in V-languages like Spanish and French, which only have recourse to such verbs when Manner of motion is really at issue.

By contrast, translations into an S-language like English require the translator to add expressive descriptions of Manner which were only implicit in the original text. Consider the following enrichment of a Spanish motion event in English translation:

*…luego de diez minutos de asfixia y empujones, llegamos al pasillo de la entrada.* → *…after ten minutes of nearly being smothered or crushed to death, we arrived at the exit.*

[=…after ten minutes of asphyxiation and pushes, we finally fought our way to the exit.]

In the Spanish novel, two young men are trying to leave a crowded rock concert. Although the Spanish reader may be able to infer the force required to maneuver through the crowd, a simple literal translation of “asphyxiation and pushes” and “arrive at the exit” would be too bland for an English-speaking reader. It was necessary for the translator to make the struggle lexically explicit. Clearly, perspectives must be adjusted to the target language when moving from one type of language to the other.

**Language-specific perspectives in another domain: social relations**

As mentioned above, motion events constitute only one of many semantic domains in which languages present their users with different types of perspectives. As a final example, consider the domain of social relations, expressed in languages by the use of various sorts of forms of address—pronomns, honorific particles, special verb forms, etc. In terms of second-person pronouns, the languages of our sample divide themselves quite differently. For example,
English uses a single pronoun, you, for all persons—singular and plural, intimate or distant. Russian makes a distinction between the intimate ты and the polite ви, but makes no further distinctions of number or gender. German uses a single formal address term, Sie, for singular and plural, but for familiar address distinguishes the singular du from the plural ihr. Peninsular Spanish attends to both intimacy/distance and number, and, in the intimate plural, also to gender: singular tú vs. plural vosotros (masculine) and vosotras (feminine), along with singular Usted and plural Ustedes (formal). And so forth. Clearly, with regard to the linguistics of social relations, there are more types of languages than the binary division into V- and S-languages that we’ve encountered in the domain of motion events. And, clearly, typology in one domain is independent of typology in another.

Again, learning a particular language requires the child to attend to the distinctions that are regularly encoded by that language. For example, an English-speaker does not automatically know how to make use of the various pronouns of address in other European languages. And, again, translators must adhere to the perspectives provided by the target language. The following example makes this point clearly. A Spanish translator of an English novel is required to choose the pronouns of address that might be used between a doctor and a poor man. Although the English original uses the all-purpose you in both directions, the Spanish translation, of necessity, underlines the status difference between the speakers. In addition, the translator had to decide whether the doctor intended to address just the man (singular) or the man and wife together (plural).

**Doctor to poor man and wife**

*When do you think you can pay this bill? → ¿Cuándo creéis que podréis pagarme estas visitas?*  
(=2nd person plural familiar)

**Poor man to doctor**

*Tomorrow … I will pay you. → Mañana … le pagaré.*  
(=2nd person singular polite)

Thus, in translating between languages, it is necessary to take on the perspectives towards status and solidarity that are lexicalized and grammatically marked in the target language. Similar issues of language and preferred perspective arise in every domain of experience that is regularly expressed in language. (For a discussion of different perspectives on temporality in frog stories, see Slobin, 1996a.)

**Conclusions**

Each language provides its users with preferred perspectives for encoding dimensions of human experience. For any given domain, languages can be grouped into typological categories on the basis of the grammatical and lexical means used to establish preferred perspectives in that domain. As a consequence, acquisition of a first language establishes perspectives on events, and acquisition of a new language provides new perspectives. Translators are faced with the delicate task of finding suitable means of expression for capturing the perspectives of both the source and target language—but readjustments in perspective are unavoidable. However, to the extent that typological contrasts between languages are understood and attended to, both translation and foreign language acquisition can be facilitated.
Note

The ideas briefly presented here are part of a framework that I refer to as “thinking for speaking” (Slobin, 1996a). More detailed discussion of data on manner of motion can be found in Slobin (2000, in press); discussion of typological differences in descriptions of Path and Ground can be found in Slobin (1996b, 1997); child language data are in Berman and Slobin (1994). The first frog story study was carried out by Bamberg (1987). Data discussed in this paper were gathered with support from the National Science Foundation, the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, and the University of California at Berkeley. The following collaborators have been involved in gathering and analyzing the data: Arabic: Petra Bos; Dutch: Ludo Verhoeven; English: Ruth A. Berman, Virginia Marchman, Tanya Renner, Şeyda Özçalışkan, Gillian Wigglesworth; Finnish: Lisa Dasinger; French: Michelle Chouinard, Jelena Jovanović, Harriet Jisa, Sophia Kern; Galician: José Ramón García Soto, Ana Rodríguez-Trelles; German: Michael Bamberg; Hebrew: Ruth A. Berman, Roni Henkin, Yoni Ne’eman; Icelandic: Hrafnhildur Ragnarsdóttir; Italian: Pietro Bottari, Anna Maria Chilosi, Paola Cipriani, Elisabetta Lanzetta, Rosanna Mucetti, Margherita Orsolina, Lucia Pfanner; Japanese: Keiko Nakamura, Kyoko Ohara; Korean: Kyung-ju Oh; Polish: Magdalena Smoczyńska; Mandarin: Jiansheng Guo, Amy Hsiao; Portuguese: Isabel Hub Faria; Russian: Yana Anilovich, Elena Dukhovny, N. V. Durova, Margarita Kaushanskaya, Natalia Perelman, Tatiana Uşakova; Serbian-Croatian: Jelena Jovanović, Aida Martinović-Zić, Svenka Savić; Spanish: Aura Bocaz, Laura Mayorga, Rosanna Mucetti, Eugenia Sebastián; Swedish: Asa Nordqvist, Sven Strömqvist; Turkish: Jeroen Aarsen, Ayhan Aksu-Koç, Aylin Küntay, Şeyda Özçalışkan, Iskender Savaşır; Yiddish: Judith L. Slobin, Norval L. Slobin.
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