Chapter IIIB

DEVELOPMENT OF LINGUISTIC FORMS: GERMAN

Michael Bamberg

0. INTRODUCTION: PERSPECTIVE TAKING ON EVENTS, SCENES, AND CHARACTERS

This chapter, like the rest of the book, is concerned with linguistic forms and how they change over time as put to use by children of different ages compared with adults. On the one hand, the task used to elicit the database — narration of a picture-book — severely restricts this investigation of how linguistic forms are deployed. On the other hand, however, the task shares with other types of narrative (for instance, accounts of personal experiences) the fact that narrators cannot simply rely on the "events," the "spatial scenes," and the "characters" who move and act in these scenes and events as givens. Rather, events, scenes, and characters are "middle-level units" of what I have called "part-whole relationships" (Bamberg, 1993). They are parts of larger units such as episodes, plots, and the overall "drama," though at the same time they are also "wholes," in the sense that they are made up of other parts such as movements, states, internal states, feelings, motives, and the like.

Events, scenes, and characters can thus be further broken down into lower-level units, which can then be analyzed as differentiated and re-integrated into middle-level units in the form of events, scenes, and characters. From this point of view, events, scenes, and characters can be viewed as the products of developmental processes of differentiation and integration. At the same time, middle-level units are also the products of top-down processes, derived from themes which take the form of "plots" and, ultimately, of "the drama" as a whole. From this perspective, events, scenes, and characters gain their contour from culturally given themes that govern the whens, the wheres, and the whos, and how these interact with one another, in light of what is considered "relevant," "good," and "human" (Burke, 1968, 1969).

This view of language as operating to construct part-whole relationships has consequences for the notion of linguistic forms. Forms do not "express" or "reveal" nonlinguistic perspectives; they **are** the perspectives. What forms can in fact reveal is the composition of part-whole relationships, that is, how smaller, lower-level units interact with higher-level units in the constitution of "events," "scenes," and "characters."

This chapter, accordingly, considers an array of linguistic forms that are in one or another way relevant to the task of telling the frog story from the pictures. The chapter is divided into three main sections. Section 1 analyzes how events are constructed by use of linguistic forms that aid in the integration of their temporal and aspectual contours, to construct a so-called timeline, including verbal and adverbial marking of tense and aspect distinctions, and temporal conjunction and subordination. Section 2 examines how linguistic forms function in the construction of spatial relationships, particularly in the scenic layout of movements that can be appropriately integrated

only from an overarching plot-perspective. Section 3 considers how the story characters emerge as the products of linguistic form, with special attention to different linguistic means for the attribution of agency, for topic-comment, and for figure-ground relationships, including: word order, voice, Aktionsart, and referential choices.

Before discussing the changes of form-function relationships in the German narratives in more detail, let me briefly describe a few common characteristics of German grammar that will help in the interpretation of what German children, as part of their developing narrative competence, have to come to grips with.

First of all, an important characteristic of German is the variable though rule-governed word order which is best characterized in terms of "the verb in second position rule." This general rule holds that, in declaratives, the finite verb follows the first phrasal element — usually the subject. However, a temporal or spatial prepositional phrase or adverb can take the sentence-initial position, followed by the verb, as in *da geht der Hund rein* 'there goes the dog inside' [*G3e*]. In subordinate clauses, the finite verb occupies the clause-final position. Furthermore, it should be noted that the past participles and infinitives of compound tenses in declarative sentences occupy the clause-final position, as in *Peter ist inzwischen auf den Baum geklettert* 'Peter has in the meantime up the tree climbed' [*G20f*], while in subordinate clauses the auxiliary, being the finite verb, comes last, as in *weil der Hund daran geschüttelt hat* 'because the dog on that shaken has' (=because the dog has shaken it) [*G20b*].

Passives, which are used much less in German than in English (e.g., Hammer, 1971, p. 210), are formed in similar fashion to English, by use of the auxiliary *werden* 'become'/'get', the use of *von* 'by' in front of the agent, and by use of the past participle of the verb in clause-final position. Passive constructions that focus on actions employ *werden* 'get', while passives that focus on the resultant state (also called *Zustandspassiv*) are expressed by *sein* 'be'. An interesting difference between German and English is that datives in German active constructions remain datives in the passive voice (*mir wurde ein Buch gegeben* 'to.me was given a book'), whereas accusative objects typically become nominatives, as in *die Bienen jagten ihn* 'the bees chased him' versus *er wurde von den Bienen gejagt* 'he was chased by the bees'.

In addition to word-order variations as well as varieties of passive constructions, it should be noted that German has an extensive gender, case, and number system marked in complex noun phrase morphology as well as in the article and adjectival inflections preceding the noun. Furthermore, there is subject-verb agreement in person and number, leading to a more complex verb morphology when compared with English. More detailed discussions of

the acquisition of German grammar can be found in Clahsen (1988), Mills (1985), and Tracy (1991). Behrens (1993) presents a valuable new analysis of the development of temporal reference in German child language.

1. MOVING THROUGH TIME IN GERMAN

1.1. The Linguistic Creation of Temporal Units

As I have argued elsewhere (Bamberg, 1993), the notion of forming the temporal unit of an event needs to be considered in light of two factors: (1) the contour that the unit receives in terms of its lexical (Aktionsart) and aspectual boundaries, and (2) the contour that the unit receives from the preceding and subsequent event in which it is embedded in discourse. In terms of Aktionsart boundaries, accomplishment (transitive-activity) and achievement (change-of-state) verbs are relatively good candidates for temporally bounded units, in contrast to intransitive activity and particularly state verbs. The temporal contour of units realized as events through these latter two classes of verbs is generally more clearly defined in relation to other, surrounding textual properties. The following analysis of how linguistic forms are deployed to create such temporal units in the frog story considers distinctions marked on the verb through the German tense system (Section 1.2) as well as lexical distinctions and temporal conjunctions (1.3).

1.2. Tense and Aspect

Dialect differences in contemporary German have led to the claim that the simple past is in the process of being replaced by the present perfect (*Praeteritumsschwund*: Eisenberg, 1986; Schmidt, 1967, p. 220), particularly in southern parts of former West Germany. In order to circumvent dialectal variation, narratives were collected well to the north of this region. The northern varieties make use of both the simple past and the present perfect. Narratives were elicited from children in Bokeloh and Meppen, two neighboring communities in northwest Germany, south of Friesland, 25 miles from the border with the Netherlands, and from adults (aged between 20 and 32 years) from the same area as well as from other parts of northern Germany. There were 12 subjects in each of four age groups: 3, 5, 9, and adult. (For statistics on age and story length, see Chapter IB.)

A wealth of literature, both contemporary and less recent, has addressed the German system of tense/aspect, but there is by no means general agreement as to the semantics or pragmatics of the main tense forms: simple present, simple past, present perfect, past perfect, as well as future and/or modality markers.[1] I have proposed (Bamberg, 1990) that an analysis of

[1] The present analysis focuses primarily on the simple present, the simple past, the present perfect, and the past perfect, with little note of auxiliary markers of future and modality, since these are extremely rare in our sample, even in the adult texts. Note, also, that there is no marking on the German verb for either progressive/nonprogressive or perfective/imperfective aspects. Valuable recent analyses of temporality in German can be found in Ehrich (1992) and Thieroff (1992).

tense/aspect contrasts requires two basic presuppositions: (1) Tenses in their discursive context should not be taken to "refer" to points or places on a pre-established timeline; rather, verb-tense forms serve as an instruction to imagine — points, durations, events, episodes, plots, and the drama (see, also, Bamberg, 1993). (2) The differential force of these forms derives in part from their compliance to such instructions to imagine and in part from the formal contrasts afforded by the grammar. From this perspective, it turns out, for instance, that the present perfect functions differently when it contrasts with the simple present rather than the simple past (Bamberg, 1990).

In terms of surface constructions, the four forms in question (simple present, simple past, present perfect, and past perfect) reflect the same processes of morphological formation as their English counterparts; however the functions served by these apparently parallel constructions differ considerably between the two languages. In addition, on the syntactic level, a major difference between German and English is that the verb stem in German requires sentence-final positioning in the present or past perfect, as indicated in (2) and (3) by sentence-final *geschneit* 'snowed'. Simple past and simple present follow SVO word order as illustrated by example (1).

(1) *Es schneite gestern fünf Stunden lang.*
'It snowed:SIMPLE.PAST yesterday for five hours.'

(2) *Es hat gestern fünf Stunden lang geschneit.*
'It has yesterday for five hours snowed.' [PRESENT PERFECT]

(3) *Es hatte gestern fünf Stunden lang geschneit.*
'It had yesterday for five hours snowed.' [PAST PERFECT]

Another difference between the two languages is the higher frequency of use of the present perfect in German compared with English, which may be responsible for the much earlier appearance of such forms among German-speaking children. The present perfect, at first without the required auxiliary, but soon afterwards in the correct form, is the first tense form in the acquisition of German, even though it is morphologically more complex than the simple past, which emerges later (for more details on the acquisition of the German tense distinctions, see Bamberg, 1986; Behrens, 1993; Rau, 1979; Stern & Stern, 1928; Szagun, 1976, 1979). These properties of the German tense system presumably affect how these forms are deployed in the context

of our narrative texts from age 3 through to adulthood.

1.2.1. Dominant tense: Temporal anchoring

Forty-four out of the total 48 German-speaking narrators, across four age groups, anchor their narratives in the simple present. That is, the simple present is by far the predominant tense form (80-95%), followed by between 5% to 15% in present perfect, with almost no simple past or past perfect forms at all.[2] Out of the four exceptions, two subjects (both 9-year-olds) anchor their narratives clearly in the simple past, while the two others (both 5-year-olds) mix simple present, simple past, and present perfect, switching back and forth between them. The present analysis focuses on the developmental picture emerging from narratives anchored in the simple present, followed in the next section (1.2.3) by a brief consideration of the remaining four narratives.

1.2.2. Simple-present anchoring: Adults and children

What follows is a summary account first for the adult narratives, and subsequently for those of the three age groups of the German-speaking children. This summary account follows methodologically prior and more detailed analyses conducted for similar data (Bamberg, 1987, 1990, 1993).[3] The focus here is on the form-function relationships expressed by the use of the present perfect in the adult German sample as a form contrasting with the simple present, rather than on a detailed quantitative analysis of the distribution of these forms across the sample. All 12 adult narrators used present perfect forms, contrasting with the simple present in two major functions. First, there is what I have termed the **prospective relevance** function of the present perfect, typically used to begin a new scene or episode, followed by one (or more) subsequent proposition(s) that elaborate(s) the happening mentioned in a sequential or even consequential manner. In this way, use of the present perfect instructs the listener to construct a "new" activity scene, and to hold it open for subsequent information relevant to this scene. At the same time,

[2] Hickmann and Roland (1992) have found a similar pattern of tense usage in a study employing different picture-story materials. They report the following percentages of present-tense anchoring in German-speaking narrators: 4-year-olds — 77%, 7-year-olds — 75%, 10-year-olds — 80%, adults — 88%. (See, also, footnote 14, Chapter IIA.)

[3] The data for these earlier analyses came from German-speaking adults recorded while narrating the contents of the frog-book to their own children. Accordingly, the form-function relationships expressed to which the verb tenses were put to use may correspond more closely to what is commonly termed "motherese" or "zone of proximal development" (Snow, 1977a, 1977b; Snow & Ferguson, 1977; Vygotsky, 1962; Wertsch, 1985) in contrast to the elicitation conditions of the present study. However, the two functions of present perfect forms revealed in both narrative settings emerged as identical.

taking the middle of such scenes as their deictic center, the content of a proposition marked by a present perfect is temporally prior to that center and so points forward to it. This yields a discursive function which, if the deictic center is taken to be what is "currently occurring," closely resembles the "current relevance" attributed to the perfect form in other Indo-European languages (Comrie, 1985; Flier & Timberlake, 1985). The following example illustrates this use of the present perfect in an adult German narrative.

(4) *Das Glas ist zerbrochen und der Dackel ist wieder frei.*

'The jar has broken and the doggy is free again.' [*G20a*]

In the example in (4), the state of being free (from the jar) is viewed as a consequence of what happened in the first clause. Reversing the order of the two clauses (*Der Dackel ist wieder frei, und das Glas ist zerbrochen* 'The doggy is free again, and the jar has broken') would take away their consequential force, and might even be mistaken for an instruction to the listener to construct a scene in which the two events are unconnected. The only way to reinstate the consequential underpinning would be by way of an overt marking (*weil* 'because' or *nämlich* 'namely'), as in (4a) and (4b).

(4a) *Der Dackel ist wieder frei,* ***weil*** *das Glas zerbrochen ist.*

'The dog is free again, **because** the glass has broken.'

(4b) *Der Dackel ist wieder frei, das Glas ist* ***nämlich*** *zerbrochen.*

'The dog is free again, the glass, **namely**, has broken.'

In these two constructed examples, the use of the present perfect *zerbrochen* 'broken' in the second clauses of (4a) and (4b) takes on a "relative" temporal value which is not signaled when used in initial position, as in example (4). This temporal value of the present perfect in the constructed examples instructs the listener to "relate" both events represented in the two clauses in terms of a reverse order: The breaking of the jar takes place before the dog is liberated again. This sequence of events mirrors the order of the clauses in example (4), with an additional marking of the first clause as completed.[4] In

[4] The narrator could have used the simple present *zerbricht* 'breaks', thus not overtly marking the current endstate of the process. But then the inference that the jar's breaking ends up as a completive state of being totally broken (the only way that the dog can be inferred as being 'free') rests to a larger degree on the listener. Besides, at the level of discourse organization, the marked aspectual perspective does more than merely lighten listeners' inferential burdens; it also instructs them in the construction of a deictic center from which the internal coherence of linearly strung events will become clear. It is unnecessary and ultimately misleading to first construct the "meaning" of the present perfect (perhaps decontextually) and then explore how it affects the presentation of discourse. This would involve setting up a barrier between the semantic and pragmatic force of tense-aspect forms. In contrast, the view presented here is that the way these forms are used **is** their meaning!

the constructed examples (4a) and (4b), then, the present perfect serves primarily to mark that the event in question took place before the event described in the preceding clause or clauses. This particular way of using the present perfect in German is the **retrospective assessment** function of the present perfect. The examples in (5) and (6), from two different adults, demonstrate even more clearly how the simple present and the present perfect contrast.

(5) *Als am frühen Morgen dann Hans und der Hund* ***aufwachen***, bemerken *sie zu ihrem großen Schrecken, daß Frau Frosch durch das geöffnete Fenster nach draußen* ***weggelaufen ist***.

'When in the early morning then Hans and the dog **wake up**, they **realize** to their great fright, that Mrs. Frog through the opened window towards outside **has run away**'. [*G20c*]

(6) *Aber Moritz* ***ist*** *'n bißchen erbost denn er* ***hat*** *einen riesigen Schrecken* ***gekriegt***.

'However, Moritz **is** a little angry since he **has received** a huge fright.' [*G20d*]

Use of the present perfect in these two examples clearly serves as an instruction to reconstruct the sequence of events in reverse order. The instruction to construct the order with a consequential underpinning is further expressed by use of *daß* 'that' in (5), and *denn* 'since' in (6). Such instructions to reverse the sequential order are often signaled in a context in which consequentiality and/or causality is at issue and, interestingly, mostly when events are viewed from the perspective of one of the characters in the story.[5] In such situations, the character's mental or emotional state is in focus, and so is expressed first, followed by what is assumed to have led to the state in question.

Consider, next, uses of the simple past in the adult narratives, all of which are, as noted, anchored in simple-present-tense narratives. Five of the 12 German adults do not use any simple past forms at all; another four use only one such form; and only three subjects use it three or more times — a total of 21 uses. These divide up into several uses, as follows. (1) Nine instances are uses of *Praeteritopraesentia*, a class of German verbs that historically lost their present tense morphology, which was replaced by the then strong past-tense morphology (e.g., the modals *wollen* 'want', *sollen* 'should', *können* 'can', *mögen* 'may', *müssen* 'must', *dürfen* 'ought'). Essentially, then,

[5] For methodological reasons it is important to distinguish between the narrator's perspective and the perspective of the story characters. However, as I have argued elsewhere (Bamberg, 1992), the boundaries between these two different perspectives are fluid and cannot always be clearly differentiated.

these modals have a single past-tense form, and do not normally contrast with present perfect. (2) One narrator starts with four past-tense forms, then switches to the simple present as anchor tense for the rest of her narrative. (3) Another six cases are of simple past with the verbs *sein* 'be' and *haben* 'have' (as main verbs, not auxiliaries). (4) The single remaining simple past form merits consideration, since it demonstrates nicely how the "pragmatics" of the present perfect in contrast with the simple present can be transformed into a simple past form, so long as other pragmatic means are also employed along with the past-tense form, as in (7).

(7) *Was steckte hinter diesen Büschen? Ein großer Hirsch.*

'What hid behind these bushes? A big deer.' [*G20d*]

The use of the simple past in the opening clause of (7) can only take on the prospective-relevance discourse force normally carried out by the present perfect because of its question format, which pragmatically enforces the answer as the upcoming orientation point or deictic center of this sequence.

In sum, all 12 German adult narratives are anchored in the present tense, so that the simple present is the overarching, dominant tense form contrasting with the present perfect. The latter functions in these narratives to relate propositions discursively to each other: either prospectively pointing forward to an orientation point or center towards which the discourse is moving, or pointing retrospectively to previously constructed units, for the purpose of clarifying, tallying, or simply wrapping up. The few simple past forms can all be explained as local deviations, grounded either in peculiarities of the German language (as in the case of *Praeteritopraesentien* and the use of simple past *war* 'was' compared with its present perfect counterpart *ist gewesen* 'is been' [=has been] and of *hatte* 'had' rather than *gehabt hatte* 'had had'), or in particular pragmatic constraints that allow these forms to take on the same discourse function as the present perfect. These German tense contrasts in the adult versions of the frog story reflect a telos towards which children will work in their deployment of tense forms for this narrative task.

Few of the total group of children who anchor their narratives in the simple present use this form exclusively, without any other tense forms. We have already noted that children as young as age 3 seem to recognize the present perfect as the appropriate form to contrast with the dominant anchor tense, the simple present. That is, the formal configuration of tense contrasts in the frog-story task appears to have been figured out relatively early. The question which remains, then, is whether these two forms, simple present and perfect, serve the same functional differentiations from early on as well. Should age-related differences be revealed in form-function matchings, these may provide grounds to argue for a developmental sequence in use of verb tense in our

sample.

A closer view of the way the 45 present perfect tokens are used by the 12 3-year-old narrators reveals that in 10 cases the present perfect follows the use of the same verb previously marked by the simple present, thus repeating the action description, but taking a completive stance in the second mentioning. Examples (8) and (9) illustrate this common use of the present perfect.[6]

(8) *und der Hund und Walter - die plumpsen da runter*
'and the dog and Walter - they plop down there'
da sind die runtergeplumpst
'there they have plopped down'
und da sind die im Wasser
'and there they are in the water' [*G3f-3;11*]

(9) *die geben einen kleinen mit*
'they [=frogs] give (them) a little one (to take) along'
die beiden Frösche haben einen mitgegeben
'the two frogs have given (them) one (to take) along' [*G3c-3;11*]

Four further uses of the present perfect appear in the text of one 3-year-old (G3d), marking a completive stance on an action of the frogs in the form of a question-answer sequence. This sequence results in a question about how the endstate of reaching the top of the tree trunk may have been achieved, and from there moves on to take a completive stance on the deer's actions as well, thus:

(10) *und wo sind da die Babyfrösche?*
'and where are the baby frogs there?'
die sind da weggelauft, sind weggelauft
'there they have runned away, have runned away'[7]
da sind se hingelaufen
'there they have run toward'

[6] When the forms of individual clauses are at issue, examples are given with one clause per line, as in the transcripts, with interlinear glosses and no punctuation. Nouns are capitalized, following German orthographic conventions.

[7] The form *weggelauft* is an overregularization, similar to *runned away*, as given in the gloss. Note the contrast with the morphologically correct *hingelaufen* in the following clause.

sind da die Frösche, die kleinen?
'are the frogs there, the little ones?'
wie sind die da hochgekommen?
'how have they (managed to) come up there?'
und wo ist der Reh hin?
'and where has/is the deer (gone) to?'
der ist weggelauft
'he has run away' [*G3d-3;6*]

Four other present perfect forms of the 3-year-olds can be interpreted in terms of a retrospective perspective similar to the retrospective assessment function noted for present perfect in the adult narratives. Another four present perfect forms closely resemble the adult prospective relevance function. This form-function pairing is illustrated in (11).

(11) *Jetzt ist er auf den Baum geklettert und ruft da.*
'Now he has climbed up the tree and calls there.' [*G3b-3;11*]

The other 3-year-old present perfect forms (around half the total) appear not to cluster around particular patterns. It is not clear whether they reveal a completive aspectual stance or are tied to a particular lexical choice. Though most of the present perfect forms cluster around the action descriptions of falling, breaking, and hiding, it is not clear whether the action itself engendered this perspective or whether the perspective is independently realized, as it were, externally to the action description. The evidence for the existence of an aspectual stance not motivated merely by the type of action in half the 3-year-olds' uses of the present perfect / simple present contrast, as illustrated in (8) through (11), seems to support the notion that children's aspectual stances are discursively motivated at this early age, although, as suggested by the remaining 50% of such instances, this motivation may not always be recoverable from the data. The fact that it was possible to more clearly identify a discursive motivation for choice of the present perfect in the much longer texts of the 3-year-olds in my earlier corpus (Bamberg, 1987) lends further support to this assumption.

Even under such an assumption, however, the form-function match of the simple present / present perfect contrast of these younger children is not the same as among adult narrators. Adults discursively orient the propositions to some past or future deictic orientation point within the universe of discourse, whereas the 3-year-olds adhere to a single action as their center. The younger children can change a previous perspective on this center, using the simple present, to a completed perspective, using the present perfect. However, this tense contrast does not contribute to the development of a

center outside those propositions from which a directive for these propositions could be orchestrated.

The 5-year-old texts include only 43 present perfect forms in all (compared with 45 among the 3-year-olds), but the proportion of present perfect forms per narrative is slightly higher than in the younger group, if we discount the two 5-year-old texts that are not anchored in the present tense. In the other remaining 10 simple present anchored narratives, use of the present perfect yields a somewhat mixed picture. On the one hand, it continues to be used in the same limited function as by the 3-year-olds, as shown in (12).

(12) *und da fällt der runter*
'and there he falls down'
und der Hund auch
'and the dog too'
kuck mal jetzt sind se in's Wasser gefallen
'look now they have fallen into the water'
und hier fällt er runter mit dem Hund - siehst du?
'and here he falls down with the dog - see?' [referring back to the previous page] [*G5d-5;3*]

This example demonstrates how the narrator switches back and forth between the taking of an open-ended perspective by use of the simple present (which in English might be expressed by progressive aspect) and the completive stance expressed by the present perfect. However, this kind of restrictedness to a "here-and-now" of the deictic center is relatively rare among 5-year-olds. The example in (13) illustrates a more sophisticated orientation by moving the discourse perspective towards a center from which the sequence of events is viewed as evolving.

(13) *der ist dahin gegangen*
'he has gone there'
und da ist ne Eule gekommen
'and there an owl has come'
und da ist er da schnell runtergefallen
'and there he has there quickly fallen down'
weil er sich losgelassen hat
'because he has let go'
darum kommt das
'that's why this happens' [*G5h-5;1*]

Here, as in several other instances, the center is upcoming in the discourse. In (13), the center from which these activities are viewed (thereby creating the impression that they have been moving towards it) is given with the last proposition in the form of a summary: 'That's why this (one) comes', switching back to the use of the simple present after the previous four propositions have been marked by the present perfect. (13) also demonstrates the child-like quality of this precursor of the prospective relevance function of the present perfect.

Another use of the present perfect occurs several times in the story-setting, where the narrators seemingly give the instruction to catch up on previous happenings that may have led to what counts as the current "here-and-now," as in (14) and (15).

(14) *hier ist der Frosch drin*
'here is the frog inside'
den haben die gefangen
'him they have caught'
haben die mitgenommen
'have they taken along'
und in das Glas gesteckt
'and put into the jar'
und der Hund kuckt drin
'and the dog looks inside'
ob er noch drin war
'whether he still was inside' [*G5f-5;10*]

(15) *da haben sie den Frosch ins Wasser getan*
'there they have put the frog into the water'
und der Hund kuckt dadrin
'and the dog looks inside it' [*G5g-5;3*]

In (14), the present perfect form is totally framed by simple presents, whereas in (15) it seems to have more of a forward-pointing orientation towards an upcoming deictic discourse center. Both of these examples, and several others from the 5-year-olds, demonstrate that the contrast between simple present and present perfect is increasingly employed from a discursive orientation center. It appears that at this age, perspectives no longer hover around the same event or happening, as in example (12), but they take shape from an "outside" viewpoint towards which or from which events appear in sequence.

The texts of the 9-year-old children, 10 of which are likewise present-tense anchored narratives, reaffirm this general tendency of the emergence of patterns. A number of 9-year-olds start the story with use of a present perfect form, as in (16).

(16) *Also da hat ein Junge einen Frosch gefangen.*

'Well there a boy has caught a frog.' [*G9a-9;3*]

By and large, the 9-year-olds show a more adult-like use of the simple present / present perfect contrast, with discursive purposes similar to the adults. There are still a few cases where they use the present perfect like the younger children, but these are outweighed by far by the more sophisticated use of relating "past" events to the "here-and-now" of internal states. (17) gives an example of a sophisticated interpretation of causal relations between events resulting in an internal state, viewed from a discourse perspective that posits the internal state as the center from which new strings of action can emerge.

(17) *und der Junge ärgert sich*

'and the boy is angry' [lit. 'angers himself']

weil er runtergefallen ist

because he has fallen down' [*G9g-9;10*]

In sum, the present perfect in texts anchored in the simple present shows the following development. Early on, particularly among the 3-year olds, present perfect is used to present a completive perspective on an event or chain of events. The vantage point for this perspective originates from "outside" of the event, and as such is motivated in the discourse, but it is not yet motivated by a vantage point that itself is organized in light of some past or future deictic orientation point within the universe of discourse. Over time, children begin to group events together and integrate them into units that are organized from discursive orientation (deictic) centers, spanning a number of propositions, as in examples (13) through (15). In the final phase, the present perfect is differentially employed to point forward to an upcoming orientation center (with prospective relevance), or to point back to a previously mentioned orientation center (retrospectively assessing).

1.2.3. Simple-past and temporally mixed anchorings

As noted, two 9-year-olds anchor their narratives in the simple past, while two 5-year-olds present a mixed pattern of tense usage: One has 53 simple present clauses, 24 simple past, and 8 present perfect; the other, 17 simple present, 37 simple past, 9 present perfect, and 6 past perfect forms. The question addressed in this analysis is whether simple-past narratives are "the same" as present-tense ones, particularly with respect to tense contrasts.

Both "past-tense" anchoring 9-year-olds start their narratives in the same way:

(18) *Es war einmal ein Junge der hatte einen ...*

'There once was a boy who had a ...' [*G9d-9;11*, *G9l-9;5*]

The *es war einmal* 'once upon a time' formula, typical of fairy tales in the past tense, may have triggered the past tense in the rest of these two narratives. Child G9d presents a highly sophisticated narrative, exclusively in simple past, except for one past perfect form, corresponding to the prospective relevance function of the present perfect noted for the simple-present narratives, e.g.:

(19) *doch als der Hund mit dem Nest gespielt hatte*

'however when the dog had played with the nest'

fiel das Nest auf die Erde

'the nest fell to the ground'

und alle Wespen flogen hinter dem Hund her

'and all the wasps flew after the dog' [*G9d-9;11*]

Child G9l seems to have a harder time maintaining the simple past as anchor tense. In the middle of his report of ongoing events, he refers in an atemporal fashion to the relationship between an emotion experienced by the boy and its script-like cause, as shown in (20).

(20) *aber der Junge war böse*

'but the boy was angry'

daß der Hund sowas macht

'that the dog does something like this'

daß das Glas jetzt in Scherben liegt

'that the jar lies now in fragments'

aber der Hund leckt fröhlich an seine Wange

'but the dog licks happily at his cheek'

dann gingen sie in den Wald hinaus

'then they went out into the forest' [*G9l-9;5*]

The orientation from which this sequence is viewed is marked by the deictic form *jetzt* 'now', but the simple present of *liegen* 'lies' is due to the simple present in the previous clause *macht* 'does', reflecting the ordinary, atemporal, script-like quality of the relationship between action and emotion-evaluation of the type "whenever this happens, the boy gets angry." This example thus demonstrates how the grounding of the picture-book narrative in the simple past may become somewhat problematic at points where narrators try to

establish orientation centers from which temporal relationships are viewed as grounding relationships.

The temporally "mixed" narratives of the two 5-year-olds highlight even more clearly the problem of tense consistency in the establishment of orientation centers. Neither child switches randomly back and forth between the simple past and the simple present. Rather, small blocks of discourse are kept consistently in one of the two tense forms, with the present perfect and the past perfect used to signal completive (and often temporally previous) stances on particular events or larger information units.

In sum, the four narratives not grounded in the simple present as anchor tense reveal difficulties in establishment of orientation centers from which events can be viewed as interrelated, difficulties which are more marked in the two 5-year-old texts than in those of the two 9-year-olds. The fact that children as well as adult narrators so generally opt for the simple present as their anchor tense is further evidence that this constitutes "the better choice" option of German speakers in this particular narrative task — an option that has consequences regarding the use of other linguistic devices for the arrangement of temporal and spatial relationships.

1.3. Temporal and Aspectual Relations

1.3.1. Lexical marking of aspect and temporality

This section considers three types of lexical devices for marking aspectual distinctions: by inherent verb aspect or Aktionsart (e.g., activity versus state predicates), by aspectual adverbials (e.g., *noch* 'still'), and by markers of sequentiality (e.g., *dann* 'then').

One determining feature of how events acquire a temporal contour is the actual choice of the lexical item constituting the predicate. Although German differs from other languages in our sample in its very productive use of an extensive particle system, this has little effect on deployment of lexical verb aspect (Aktionsart) in the frog-book task. There is a slight increase with age in use of action verbs (describing what an actor does without affecting a change of state), and a slight decrease in motion verbs (actor-initiated movements toward a goal). One group of verbs in the German sample is, however, quite distinct: those used for describing states. These are typically verbs of location or existence such as *stehen* 'stand' or *sein* 'be' and verbs of possession or attribution such as *haben* 'have' or *kaputt sein* 'be broken'. The 3- and 5-year-olds use a much higher ratio of stative verbs, not only in comparison to action and motion verbs, the next-most common type of verbs in the German data, but also in comparison to the other languages. The high frequency of state descriptions drops considerably by age 9 years, and levels in

the adults to the same as adults in the other languages. An explanation of this discrepancy between the younger German children and those in the other languages is suggested in the following discussion of temporal deictic and sequential markers and in a consideration of how spatial scenes are linguistically constructed (Section 2.2) in German.

Consider, next, the use of aspectual adverbs like *noch* 'still' and *wieder* 'again', which represent two of the four categories of extended aspect (of those specified in Chapter III0) most commonly elicited by the frog-story narratives: (1) **protraction** of an event or activity, in German mainly by use of *weiter* 'further' and the verb *fortsetzen* 'to continue' + NOUN; (2) **inception**, marking the beginning of an activity or process, for instance by the aspectual phase verbs *beginnen* or *anfangen* 'begin/start' + INFINITIVE COMPLEMENT; (3) **recurrence** or **repetition** of an action or happening, particularly by German *wieder* 'again'; and (4) relating the event or state to some other **reference time** or to the time of the speech event, e.g., German *schon* 'already' and *noch* 'still'. These four categories together account for more than 80% of all lexical aspect marking (apart from Aktionsart) across the German sample. Since special attention is accorded to the first two, continuity and inceptive aspect, in Chapter IVD, this section focuses on the latter two, as exemplified by the terms *wieder* for recurrence and *noch* for relative aspect.

These two terms seem to operate on opposite ends of the aspectual perspective of being or existence. For example, following on from an expression like *da sein* 'be there', ***noch da sein*** '**still** be there' focuses on a state previous to a movement or disappearance, while ***wieder da sein*** 'be there **again**' focuses on the state after the movement has come to full circle, or the disappearance is over. Both forms seem to contribute effectively to the establishment of the theme of the overall narrative, i.e., the frog's disappearance, the search for it in several locations, and its final reappearance. However, *noch* and *wieder* can also be put to use to establish background assumptions of a more general nature, such as in *sich wieder beruhigen* 'to calm down again' (said of the owl in text G20b) or in *sich wieder vertragen/versöhnen* 'to make up with each other again' (as used by several adult narrators), where *wieder* creates an association with a previous state of harmony. Across the sample, *noch* and *wieder* together account for about one-third of all aspectual markings, and as high as three-quarters among the youngest children. That is, these two forms are the most common lexical encodings of aspect (again, apart from Aktionsart).

Noch 'still' is used for different purposes, most often together with other adverbials. *Noch einer* or *noch welche* '(yet) another', are used on the assumption of previous mention of the person or object in question. This is how *noch* is most commonly used by the younger children, together with

nochmal 'yet another time', 'once more = again'. With age, there is more variety of forms: *noch weiter* 'still continuing', and particularly *immernoch* '(ever) still' and *noch nicht* 'not yet'. The functions of *noch* also differ with age. For example, when an adult describes the dog as *Stuppsi ist* ***noch*** *heil und gesund* 'Stuppsi is **still** healthy and well' (G20g) after his fall out of the window, there is an implied reference to the dog's state of health previous to the fall. Thus *noch* is used here for a local narrative purpose. At a later point in the same narrative, *noch* evokes previous activities of calling for the frog: *Peter ruft noch einmal* 'Peter calls yet another time'. A different narrator (G20d) uses *noch* to introduce the entire purpose of the search into the discourse: *den Frosch, den haben sie ja nun* ***noch*** *nicht gefunden* 'the frog, him they have not found **yet**' (at this point in the story).

Although *nochmal* or *noch einmal* can be replaced by *wieder*, the latter usually creates more than the image of mere repetition. The cyclic gestalt created by *wieder* seems already fully grasped in the 3-year-olds' use of *wieder da rauf wollen* 'wanting to move back up again' (onto the tree trunk in the last picture) or *wieder nach Hause gehen* 'going back home again'. A three-part schematic cycle is evoked by this use of *wieder*: first, the previous, original location; second, the locale at the "present" time; and third, the orientation from here back to the original source. This holistic cycle is most often evoked by adult uses of *wieder* through such forms as *wiederfinden, wieder komplett sein, wiederentdecken, wiederbekommen, wiedersehen* 'find again, be complete again, discover again, get again/back, see again'. In nine out of the 12 adult texts, narrators use such predicates to express the cyclic nature of the overall narrative theme.

Younger children are usually more locally oriented. Moreover, a few 5-year-olds and several 3-year-olds use *wieder* to create character continuity, as in (21).

(21) *da ist der Hirsch*
'there is the deer'
da ist ***wieder*** *der Hirsch*
'there is the deer **again**'
und da sind die ***wieder***
'and there they are **again**' *[G3e-3;5]*

As this example shows, *wieder* as an early means of marking character continuity may actually be a prerequisite for the creation of cyclic images of the kind found in the narratives of older children and adults.

Another kind of temporal distinction concerns marking of interclause relations through sentence-modifying adverbials. Three categories were

distinguished for analyzing the German data from this point of view: **deictics**, **sequentials**, and **externally temporal adverbs**. These may occur in different positions within the clause, but sentence-initial position is commonest, since all three types function to shift the temporal (deictic) center of a (spatial) scene (see Section 2). Note that deictic adverbs such as *jetzt* or *nun* 'now' do not necessarily function purely "deictically," that is, to create temporal centers for spatial scenes in the pictures; they also "anaphorically" connect previous and subsequent happenings and as such aid in the creation of a "timeline."

The distribution of sequential compared with deictic adverbs is unexpected in German, compared with the four other languages: German-speaking children at all three age groups make relatively more use of deictics and less of sequentials; the German adults alone use sequentials to the same extent as adults in the other languages. The German forms that are used to give the sense of a sequential arrangement of events are sentence-initial *dann* or *und dann* 'then' or 'and then'. The developmental curve for these two forms is the same in German as in other languages, from rather low frequency at the youngest age group to a peak in the middle age groups with a subsequent drop in the adults. On the other hand, the German forms *jetzt* and *nun* 'now' show the same distribution across the different age groups. The question thus is what motivates German narrators, particularly the younger ones, to overuse deictic *jetzt* and *nun* and to underuse *und dann*. The answer is not a simple one-to-one exchange of deictics for sequential forms, but relates to the broad use of sentence-initial spatial *da* 'there' (as discussed further in Section 2.2). That is, the sentence-initial position in most clauses, particularly in the children's texts, is already occupied by spatial *da*, so ruling out the sequentials *dann* or *und dann*. This does not apply, however, to deictic *jetzt/nun*, which is more likely to be sentence-final. In fact, spatial *da* and temporal *jetzt* are not in competition, since both can be employed in the frame of the same sentence or clause. Thus, as long as *da* occupies the syntactic position of the temporal sequential marker, narrators may be more likely to make use of other temporal adverbs, such as deictic *jetzt* or *nun*. The overall tendency revealed by the German narratives to move the deictic centers by use of (spatial and temporal) deictics rather than sequential adverbials may also be grounded in the fact that nearly all the German narratives are anchored in the simple present, a tense form that more closely signifies the speaker's involvement in the "here and now" of the speech event and the spatial and temporal centers of events and how they figure in higher-order units such as episodes and the plot.

German *mittlerweile, in der Zwischenzeit*, and *inzwischen* 'meanwhile' or 'in the meantime' are used relatively late, first by the 9-year-olds, and more frequently by adults. These markers of discourse sequentiality create

temporal and referential continuity, more specifically, when a particular character has been "out of focus" for a while; 'meanwhile' discursively moves back to the last time the character was "in focus." Within this frame of reference, 'meanwhile' is not a simple marker of continuity, nor of co-temporality or even simultaneity with other events, which explains its relatively late acquisition, as shown by its nonuse among the younger children.[8]

The third category of temporal modifiers, temporally external adverbs such as *morgens* 'in the morning', or *nachts* 'at night time', are rare in these narratives. When younger narrators occasionally use them, they typically do so in conjunction with a spatial scene, adding a temporal feature to a locative, as in (22).

(22) *und da ist es mitten in der Nacht*

'And there it is in the middle of the night' [*G3c-3;11*]

Adverbs of external temporality are integrated into the narrative whole relatively late when, mainly in the adult texts, they serve as anchor points for subordinate clauses functioning as backdrops to two events taking place in parallel or in sequence. The following example from a 9-year-old narrator illustrates this kind of ordering relationship.

(23) *Und abends **als der Junge schläft,** steigt der Frosch heimlich aus dem Glas und zum Fenster raus, und morgens **als der Junge aufwacht,** sehen sie daß der Frosch weg ist.*

'In the evening **when the boy sleeps**, the frog secretly climbs out of the jar and out of the window, and in the morning, **when the boy wakes up**, they see that the frog is gone.' [*G9a-9;3*]

The German sample shows similar developmental trends to the other languages in deployment of these types of adverbials.

1.3.2. Temporal conjunction and subordination

Linear ordering of elements in speech (or written language) provides a key to the interpretation of events, episodes, and the plot as sequentially ordered. Additional clues to textual structure are the means by which the information is presented, for instance, the linguistic choice of stative versus active/eventive information. For example, two states, as in (24), are less

[8] Terms for 'meanwhile' do not appear before age 9 in any of the languages except for Hebrew, where there are four instances at age 5. For further discussion, see Chapter IVA. Interestingly enough, terms for 'meanwhile' are also used much earlier in Bamberg's 1987 corpus, where the children had been familiarized with the plot, and consequently were able to create characters in their spatio-temporal connectedness at an earlier age.

likely to be understood as following each other in sequence than are two actions, as in (25).

(24) The sun was shining. The moon was in the sky.

(25) The sun set. The moon rose.

A sequential interpretation is particularly likely where the same character or actor is retained across clauses, as in (26).[9]

(26) *He looks in his shoes. He turns the table over.* [*E20j*][10]

Thus, any use of linguistic means to mark the temporal relationship between two or more propositions works in conjunction with more general, implicit principles of text organization and interpretation. This applies to any temporal marking of interclause relationships, whatever the language-particular means used to mark them.

In German, as in other languages in this sample, the order of MAIN CLAUSE / ADVERBIAL CLAUSE is variable. However, in addition, subordinate clauses differ syntactically from main clauses, since they require final placement of the finite verb. (Consider, for example, the opening clause of (19): *Doch als der Hund mit dem Nest gespielt hatte...* 'However when the dog with the nest played had...') As such, in German, word order in subordinate clauses could be considered "more complex," but so could the splitting of the auxiliary and the nonfinite verb in main clauses by the object and any (additional) adverbial (e.g., *Er hat einen Frosch gefangen* 'He has a frog caught'). The temporal conjunctions most used in this sample to introduce subordinate clauses are *als* 'when' and *während* 'while', which together account for about 80% of overall temporal subordinators, followed by less common *indem* 'as',

[9] Sequential coherence is particularly strong in cases of a pronoun following a full nominal, and of an ellipsis following a pronominal expression (Bamberg, 1986, 1987). German and English are similar in this regard: *aber auf einmal schlüpfte der Frosch aus dem Glas raus und hüpfte weg* 'but suddenly the frog slipped out of the glass and hopped away' [*G5a-5;7*].

[10] 'Looking' into an object (such as a shoe), and 'turning' an object 'over' (such as the table) are "bounded" activities, that is, they are extended in time and have a relatively clear beginning and ending (i.e., they are bounded to the left and to the right). In English, as in German, these boundaries are much clearer if the events are established by means of the simple past, as in *He looked in his shoes, he turned the table over*, which is far more amenable to a sequential reading than the simple present of example (26). Along the same lines, ellipsis in the second clause combined with the connective *and* is even more suggestive of a sequential reading, as in *He looked in his shoes and turned the table over*. That is, the more closely and explicitly the two clauses are tied together, where both events are bounded, the less likely is a simultaneous reading of the two events; and the closer the ties of two conjoint event clauses, the stronger the likelihood of a sequential reading.

wenn 'since', *bis* 'until', and *wie* 'like'.

In general, temporal subordinations are much less common in the German texts than in the other languages in our sample (see further, Chapter IVA), and the form *als* 'when' occurs only once before age 9, in the following 5-year-old text.

(27) *Und als sie aufwachen, ist der Frosch weg.*

'And when they wake up, the frog is gone.' [*G5i-5;2*]

Among 9-year-olds, there are sporadic uses of temporal subordinations of the kind illustrated in (23) above, where *als* is subsequent to the deictic center, so elaborating on a given temporal anchor point. Among adults, there is an equal distribution of temporal subordinations which follow the main clause and so elaborate on the preceding temporal center and of ones which precede it, and so establish a deictic center for the clause to follow. (28) and (29) illustrate these two options.

(28) *Als der Junge und der Hund am Morgen aufwachen, ist der Frosch verschwunden*

'When the boy and the dog wake up in the morning, the frog is gone' [*G20i*]

(29) *Natürlich ist Peter am nächsten Morgen sehr überrascht und sehr enttäuscht als er auf das Glas schaut und keinen Freund mehr entdeckt.*

'Naturally Peter is very surprised and very disappointed the next morning when he looks at the jar and discovers no more friend.' [*G20l*]

1.4. The Emergence of Temporal Movement

A number of potentially interesting interim conclusions can be drawn from this analysis of temporal forms within the German corpus. First, the deployment of a variety of linguistic forms that all in one or another way seem to encode temporality (in its broadest sense) cannot be investigated apart from what they are used for, and apart from other linguistic forms that are used to convey aspects of the spatial arrangement and characterhood/agency. Analysis of lexical choices of verb types indicates that the high proportion of state verbs used by the younger children needs to be viewed as closely interconnected with three other features of the younger children's texts: relatively high use of temporal deictics and low use of temporal connectives, the abundance of sentence-initial spatial deictics — ruling out the use of temporal connectives, and the predominant anchoring of the narratives in the simple present.[11] The interaction of these three factors

[11] In my opinion, the lower frequency of temporal subordinate clauses in the overall German corpus (and probably also the lower frequency of relative subordinate clauses, which is discussed in further detail in chapter IVB) is motivated by the interplay of these three features. Further comparisons with other narrative genres, in particular those that are grounded in past-tense anchored personal narratives, could contribute to clearer hypotheses as to which features contribute more heavily to the relative infrequency of such grammatical constructions in our German texts.

contributes strongly to the impression that the younger the children, the more they adhere to the "here-and-now," coinciding — from an adult viewpoint — with what the pictorial units "represent." Only with increasing age do children learn to connect bounded temporal units (events), thereby contributing to the emergence of the impression of a sequentially progressing timeline.

A second interim conclusion concerns the issue of what it is that is developing across the different age groups. Apart from the development of new forms and the use of old forms for new discursive functions, it seems as if the focus of using forms for local characterizations of the "here-and-now" changes with age to a characterization of discourse units of more than one or two clauses. While younger children order "here-and-nows" (deictic centers) in a serial fashion, older children create a qualitatively different order: The deictic centers become focal points from which previous and subsequent discourse is comprised. In other words, with increasing age, discourse units emerge that gain their organizational orientation "from their middle," as it were. In terms of an underlying strategy, this form of organizing discourse maintains two perspectives at the same time: one that is oriented forward, the other backwards. In consequence, the sequential arrangement of these units contributes to the emergence of a narrative whole, giving "structure" to what holds beginning, middle, and end together.

This is not meant to imply that our 3-year-olds do not tell a complete narrative. Rather, their arrangement of (usually) single deictic centers in a linear fashion is different from that of older children and adults. This kind of linear arranging of states and events appears superficially identical to the genre activity of "describing" the pictures as separate and individual entities. However, "picture descriptions" are of a different genre-type (see Bamberg, 1991b). In order to avoid the developmentally problematic thesis that children first have to learn to describe the picturebook before they can "narrate" the story (see Bamberg, 1991b, 1993; Bamberg & Marchman, 1990, for an extensive critique of this view), I would propose that the younger children resort to a narrative (but not purely "descriptive") strategy that "gets the job done" with an emphasis on the linear order of the part-whole relationships of the frog story. The way the narrative activity at this (relatively) early point in development is structured points to other expressive means and linguistic forms by which a beginning, a middle, and an end are united.[12]

[12] It also should be kept in mind that children at the age of 3 years are very well able to

2. MOVING THROUGH SPACE IN GERMAN

2.1. The Linguistic Creation of Spatial Scenes

I have argued elsewhere (Bamberg, 1993) that sentences in storied discourse are invariably constructed, and interpreted, with a spatial scene in mind. The perspective from which a particular scene is viewed is either overtly stated through spatial expressions (most commonly adverbials) or is inferred by implication. The vantage point from which spatial consistency is created usually does not exist inside the sentence frame, but lies "outside" of it (Langacker, 1985, 1987b). Although the spatial characteristics of a scene do not exist independent of its temporal and referential properties (as explained in greater detail in Bamberg, 1993), for present purposes, spatial relationships are dealt with as a relatively autonomous domain, with the aim of showing how, with age, German speakers create a vantage point for each of the propositions that form their narrative. This account of how spatial scenes evolve in the German narratives is followed by an analysis of how these scenes are connected in terms of actor movement, focusing on certain scenes which require a particular vantage point from which a character perspective is selected, where the character is viewed as a volitional agent engaged in movement that shifts him from one location to another. Both aspects of the telling of the story — the creation of individual scenes in a bottom-up fashion and the interconnection of these scenes from a more top-down plot orientation — are relevant for understanding the linguistic choices characteristic of this task, in particular in young children.

2.2. The Emergence of Spatial Scenes

The earliest and most basic form relating the "here and now" location of the speech event to the location of a narrated event in spoken German is *da* 'there'. This is first and foremost a spatial adverb, but it also occurs in numerous, very common composite forms where it can mark causal, conditional, or temporal relationships between events or happenings, e.g., *dabei* 'thereby', *dazu* 'to that end', *dafür* 'therefore', *davon* 'away from (there)', *damit* 'with (that)' (cf. corresponding English forms with *there*: *thereby, therefore, therefrom*). The creation of spatial scenes in German relies on the differentiation between *hier* 'here' and *da* 'there'. This becomes particularly evident in the narratives of the younger age groups: almost two-thirds (62%)

narrate personal experiences or narrate the frog book if sufficiently familiarized with its plot. What earlier studies (Bamberg, 1986, 1987) reveal is not that 3-year-olds simply imitate their parental story input, but that they **create** their own linguistic means to index the binding and unfolding relationships.

of all the 3-year-olds' clauses are marked by use of *da*; with age, this drops somewhat, down to 44% for the 5-year-olds, while even the 9-year-olds have *da* in almost one-third (31%) of their clauses, dropping markedly in the adult narratives (7%).

Consider, first, the difference between clause-initial and clause-internal, preverbal positioning of this very widespread spatial adverb, *da*. (30a) through (30c) are constructed examples that represent variations on how the frog's escape (in Picture 2) can be described using the same subject *er* 'he' and the predicate *ist rausgegangen* 'has gone out'.

(30a) ***Da** ist er rausgegangen.*

(30b) *Er ist **da** rausgegangen.*

(30c) ***Da** ist er **da** rausgegangen.*

Sentence-initial *da*, as in (30a) and (30c), constructs a general scenario within which all other actions and spatial relationships are framed. In this particular scenario, the preverbal clause-internal *da* in (30b) and (30c) constructs (or reconstructs, if it has been previously mentioned) the jar. Thus, (30a) is best conveyed in English as 'in this scene he stepped out', (30b) as 'he stepped out of there', and (30c) as 'in this scene he stepped out of there'. In view of this distinction, it is relevant that the younger the narrators, the higher the frequency of sentence-initial *da*; with age, there is a relatively greater proportion of clause-internal *da*, particularly among the adult narrators. This suggests that the younger narrators tend to create an independent scene for each clause, so giving the impression that there is no other "spatial glue" holding the clauses together. The following first six lines from a 3-year-old text illustrate this use of *da*:

(31) ***da** ist der Frosch drin*
'**there** is the frog inside'
***da** kuckt der rein*
'**there** he looks inside'
der Junge auch
'the boy too'
*und **da** schlafen die*
'and **there** they sleep'
*und **da** schlüpft der Frosch raus*
'and **there** the frog slips out'
***da** wachen die wieder auf*

'**there** they wake up again'

***da** ist der Frosch weg*

'**there** the frog is gone' [*G3b-3;11*]

Each clause, except for the gapped third clause *der Junge auch* 'the boy too', creates its own spatial scene within which a happening can take place. In this sense, any chain of clauses not marked by sentence-initial *da* can be viewed, in a spatial sense, as inserted into the previously created scene, and as such, as part of a more extended scenario.

In contrast to this stringing along of serially-positioned scenes by the younger children, older children and adult narrators in particular create more integrated spatial scenarios, as in (32).

(32) *der Junge hat immer noch das Problem*

'the boy still has the problem'

den Frosch wiederzufinden

'to find the frog again'

*und kuckt **in einem Baumloch** nach*

'and looks **in a treehole**'

*ob er sich **da** versteckt haben könnte*

'whether he could have hidden **there**'

*aber stattdessen kommt **da** ein Uhu oder eine Eule heraus*

'but instead an owl comes out of **there**'

und der Junge fällt um

'and the boy falls over'

und fällt runter

'and falls down'

und der Junge macht

'and the boy makes'

daß er wegkommt

'that he gets away' [*G20b*]

The scene in (32) is spatially depicted in the third line of this excerpt as *in einem Baumloch* 'in a treehole'. Subsequent activities of the antagonist (the owl) and the boy are viewed within the frame of this scene; that is, the boy does not literally fall out of the treehole, but off of the tree that is created inferentially. Similarly, the movement implied in the last line is no longer away from the tree or the treehole, but away from the implied scene that has emerged fully by now, before a new spatial scenario is created in the following lines. The uses of clause-internal *da* in the fourth and fifth lines of (32) further demonstrate its role for the creation of a fuller scenario.[13]

This analysis has treated the linguistic creations of these scenes in a somewhat decontextualized and idealized fashion. It must be borne in mind that vantage points on spatial scenes always coexist with perspectives on temporal events and on the characters, within the hierarchical levels of the scene, the episode, the plot, and the human drama.

2.3. Movement: A Potential Link between Scenes

This section examines two spatially-constructed scenes: the movement of the frog leaving the jar (Picture 2) and the final scene in the book, when the boy walks off with a frog in hand (Picture 24). Picture 2 depicts the frog with one leg still in the jar, the other leg already outside. In fact, the temporal characteristics of 'still' versus 'already' are used as instructions to connect a previous scene, where the frog is "still" "fully" inside the jar (Picture 1), with a subsequent scene (Picture 3), where he is "fully" and "already" out of it.[14] The sequence of spatial scenes in the Pictures 1, 2, and 3 provides good grounds for construing the frog's activity in Picture 2 as a movement from inside to outside of the jar, even though nothing is visible in Picture 2 itself to yield this interpretation. The (appropriate) construal of the frog's action is based on connecting the interpretation of a state in Picture 1 with the interpretation of a state in Picture 3. From this point of view, the interpretation of movement in Picture 2 is a relatively local task, since it relies on making a connection between the immediately surrounding pictures in terms of a "movement" interpretation. In contrast, the last scene in the book, where the boy is depicted as walking (through the water), waving back to the frogs that have been "left behind," requires a more global construal of the movement component. Here, the movement — if constructed as having started from a source, from where the frogs were on the previous picture(s), towards a goal, most probably back to the place from where the search started out — requires a much more global perspective: It needs to make sense as an integrated movement in space, which demands evocation of the overall plot theme

[13] To label this kind of reference "anaphoric" and sentence-initial *da* as "deictic" is misleading and confuses the issue. It is more important to address the question of what a narrator **does** — in terms of creating spatial scenarios within which actors "become alive" — when using such forms.

[14] Pronominal reference to animals in this chapter is based on their gender in German, where the word for frog is masculine, for owl is feminine. (Compare the converse in the other two gender languages in our sample: Spanish — feminine *la rana* 'frog' and masculine *el buho* 'owl', and Hebrew — feminine *cfardea* 'frog' and masculine *yanshuf* 'owl').

holding the narrative together as a whole.

The two spatial scenes analyzed here thus require a different overarching perspective: The first requires a quite local perspective with regard to the movement of the frog, the second requires a more global perspective for the movement of the boy (and the location of the frog) to be meaningfully integrated in relating to the contents of the picture.

2.3.1. The frog's departure (Picture 2)

The first, and in a way surprising, finding is that all narrators of all age groups (except for one 3-year-old) focus on the frog's action in terms of a spatial relationship. One other 3-year-old constructs this relationship in perceptual terms (*da kuckt der Frosch raus* 'there the frog looks out' [*G3f-3;11*]), while the other 10 3-year-olds all construct a spatial movement scene, i.e., the frog as a volitional agent moving away from a source (VERB OF MOVEMENT + *raus* 'out.of'). The source, however, remains unspecified; at best it is constructed as part of the larger scenario established by a sentence-initial *da*, in eight out of the ten cases. One 3-year-old also characterizes the movement in terms of an additional goal-path (VERB OF MOVEMENT + *raus* 'out.of' + *weg* 'away').

Among the older children, all 12 5-year-olds construct the same scene as a movement + source scenario: six in the same way as the 3-year-olds, with the other six all specifying the source, either by *da* or by a nominal expression (e.g., *aus dem Wasser* 'out of the water'). Two of these 5-year-olds also relate to the goal path of the frog's spatial movement. In contrast, only two 9-year-olds construct the scene in the same way as the bulk of the 3-year-olds and half the 5-year-olds: by means of movement + unspecified source. The other ten all specify the source, with four adding a focus with regard to the direction and/or goal path of the movement.

The adults yield a similar picture to the one that emerged in the 9-year-olds with regard to specification of source: Nine specify the source (*aus dem Glas* 'out of the jar'), and five of these double-mark the source by an additional verbal prefix (*heraus-, ent-*, and *hinaus-*, all equivalent to English 'out of', adding deictic orientation). In this way, some adult narrators take an **additional** spatial perspective in their construction of the relationship between the source and the character's movement to specify components of the movement scene. In addition, adults describe the movement with less lexical specificity than the children, all of whom use verbs of motion for this purpose, e.g., the highly specific *klettern* 'climb', *hüpfen* 'hop', *steigen* 'mount', or the more general *gehen* 'go'. In contrast, adults tend to perspectivize the movement from a more global stance, by expressions of agentive and volitional (though much more general and unspecific) removal from the scene,

e.g., *verschwinden* 'disappear', *sich davonmachen* 'escape, get away', *sich entfernen* 'remove, distance oneself', *abhauen* 'scram, beat a retreat'.

In sum, the construction of the movement in Picture 2 starts out as a movement (of a character) from an unspecified source. Movement and source are grounded in a deictic center that is given, though unspecified at the beginning of each sentence. Gradually, with age, the source becomes specified and a goal-path is added; concurrently, the additional grounding in a sentence-specific center fades, and is replaced by a more integrated and global perspective from which source, movement, and goal path are viewed as forming an episodic whole, along with an intentional act on the part of the character. In other words, the movement that is constructed in Picture 2 connects more than a full jar in Picture 1 with an empty jar in Picture 3. With age, it takes on the function of an integrated link in the construction of a narrative unit spanning over these first three pictures, best identified as the "setting" and the "complication" (see Chapter IIA). As such, the frog's departure becomes the ground for the theme of the subsequent story, the search of the boy and his dog.

2.3.2. The boy's departure (Picture 24)

The last scene in the booklet (Picture 24) again allows narrators to construct a character as moving in space — this time the boy.[15] Note, first, that all 12 adults focus in one or another way on the boy as an actor in this scene, whereas eight (= 2/3) of the 3-year-olds fail to mention the boy as actively involved in this scene. In contrast to the scene in Picture 2, the one in Picture 24 cannot be viewed as connecting a previous and subsequent spatial scene. Rather, the movement of the boy gains its meaningfulness from inferences that span over the search theme as a whole, resulting in the construction of a "return." In other words, the movement of the boy, or what it might imply, requires relating to previous movements in space as motivated by the theme of the story, its result (finding the lost frog), and a "happy" returning home, to the place from where the search started, and where it all began. Thus, the boy's departure is best constructed as a "leave-taking" scene that successfully completes the search and defines a goal path of "back home."

Only three out of the 3-year-olds construct movement scenes here, two in terms of moving away from an unspecified source (*weg* 'away') and two as a movement with a specific goal ('home'). One 3-year-old views the boy as taking leave, and two others view the frogs as giving the boy a little one

[15] The dog could be characterized along the same lines, but for present purposes, focus is on the boy's activity alone, with the dog considered only if his and the boy's actions are viewed as a combined entity.

'along' with them (*mit*), thereby evoking an unspecified path of the movement. Among the 5-year-olds, five children still fail to construct a movement on the part of the boy, and two others simply note the movement per se, but the other five in this age group do, to varying degrees, all attend to the source or the goal of the boy's movement. This trend towards more differentiation and specification of the movement scene in Picture 24 is more noticeable among the oldest children: 10 of the 12 9-year-olds specify the source or the goal of the movement, and only two fail to provide any spatial relation. Half of the ten, in fact, construct more than one part of the source-movement-path-goal scene, with three children overtly appealing to the theme of the circular movement from home-to-forest and back-home 'again'. Among the adults, all of whom include movement in their characterization of the boy's action-role in Picture 24, five specify the goal ('home') and the remaining seven focus in one way or another on the source. Several adults also note additional aspects of the path of the movement (*davon* 'away.from.there', *fort* 'further', and *mit* 'with'); three explicitly allude to the thematic cycle of the boy's movement.

Construction of the leave-taking scene in Picture 24 thus presents a somewhat different developmental picture compared to Picture 2. Moving through space in the leave-taking scene becomes relevant only in light of a growing appreciation of the story theme. Young children, like older narrators, who construct their narratives in terms of part-whole relationships and so index more aspects of the overall structure of the story, are more likely to view the boy "in motion." Once the motion perspective is chosen, it is coupled with a source (away from the group of frogs) and a goal (home), often also with acknowledgment of the cyclical movement throughout the theme: starting from home, to the finding of the frog(s), back home again. Younger children simply do not seem to see the relevance of the motion of the boy with regard to any local or global transformation, and consequently do not take any perspective on his movement. Sporadic notings of the movement per se in the 3- and the 5-year-olds pave the way for an increasing emphasis on the source of movement in the 5- and 9-year-olds, which subsequently can be more fully integrated into the construction of the boy's movement in accordance with the theme of the narrative whole, as done in most of the adult narratives. However, as noted, the ability to construct the boy as a moving agent is less dependent on age than on the ability to index aspects of the plot. Although more narrators reveal this ability with age, the fact that even a few 3-year-olds can construct the boy's movement from a thematic plot perspective should not be disregarded.

2.4. The Linguistic Expression of Movement

The linguistic construction of movement in German adheres to the satellite-framed typology discussed in Chapter III0. In this regard, German is like English, in contrast to the three other languages of the sample, which are verb-framed. As in English, there is a rich collection of verbs of motion and caused motion, most of them simultaneously expressing manner. There are 37 types of verbs of motion, across the entire age range:

(33) *sich-entfernen* 'distance-oneself', *erklimmen* 'climb', *fallen* 'fall', *fliegen* 'fly', *gehen* 'go', *hoppeln* 'hop', *hüpfen* 'hop', *jagen* 'chase', *klettern* 'climb', *kommen* 'come', *krabbeln* 'crawl', *kriechen* 'creep', *landen* 'land', *laufen* 'run', *plumpsen* 'plop', *purzeln* 'tumble', *rasen* 'speed', *rennen* 'run', *reiten* 'ride', *schieben* 'push', *schleichen* 'creep', *schlittern* 'glide', *schlüpfen* 'slip', *schmeißen* 'hurl', *schubsen* 'shove', *schwimmen* 'swim', *springen* 'jump', *steigen* 'ascend', *sich-stellen* 'stand.up', *stürmen* 'dash', *stürzen* 'tumble', *tauchen* 'plunge', *tragen* 'carry', *treten* 'step', *verfolgen* 'chase', *werfen* 'throw', *ziehen* 'pull'

In addition, each of these verbs can be combined with a large range of path satellites, expressed as verb particles in German. For example, using a simple verb with no indication of manner — *kommen* 'come' — the sample of German texts yields:

(34) *an-kommen* 'arrive', *raus-kommen* 'exit', *rein-kommen* 'enter', *zu-kommen* 'arrive'

Conversely, we can pick a German path satellite and note its occurrences with a range of verbs of motion. For example, all of the following verbs of motion were combined with the particle *raus* 'out':

(35) ***raus-*** *-fallen* 'fall out', *-fliegen* 'fly out', *-gehen* 'go out', *-gleiten* 'slide out', *-hüpfen* 'hop out', *-klettern* 'climb out', *-kommen* 'come out', *-laufen* 'run away', *-rennen* 'run out', *-schlüpfen* 'slip out', *-springen* 'jump out', *-steigen* 'climb out'

Thus, in fact — when all of these possibilities of combination are taken into consideration — there are far more than 37 types of verbs of motion in the German texts.

Path satellites in German encode directionality, as in English. In addition, they encode deictic viewpoint by means of the particles *hin* 'thither' and *her* 'hither', which can combine with the directional particles. The range of possibilities is thus considerably greater than in English, allowing for expression of viewpoint perspective. Compare, for example, the following two descriptions of the dog's fall from the window. In (36a) the narrator's eye is outside of the house, at ground level, as indicated by the satellite *her* 'hither', while in (36b) the satellite *hin* 'thither' traces a path downward from the

viewpoint of the windowsill.

(36a)*Da fiel der Hund zur Erde* ***her****-aus.*

'There the dog fell **hither**-out to the ground.' [*G9l-9;5*]

(36b)*Als er sich auf die Fensterbank setzte und* ***hin****-unter-fiel, zerbrach das Glas in tausend Stücke.*

'When he got onto the windowsill and **thither**-down-fell, the glass broke into a thousand pieces.' [*G9d-9;11*]

German thus provides rich possibilities for detailed description of motion in a given direction in a given manner. Table 1, on the next page, shows the range of satellites that were combined with verbs of motion by the children in our sample. The translations are only an approximation: Here the richness of German exceeds English. Note that even the 3-year-olds command a large number of verb-satellite combinations.

As discussed in Chapter VB, this range of motion-manner expressions has consequences for the particular "rhetorical style" that characterizes German frog stories (and German narrative generally). Where Spanish, for example, elaborates temporal movement and temporal boundaries by means of its elaborated tense/aspect system, German elaborates spatial movement and location by means of its elaborate verb-satellite and prepositional constructions.

3. CREATION OF CHARACTERS AND AGENCY IN GERMAN

3.1. Characters as Topics

Much of the narrative task consists in picking the appropriate candidates to talk about. From an adult perspective, it is obvious that this story is about a boy, a dog, and a (runaway) frog. While the boy can best be characterized as the protagonist of the story, the dog is better viewed as a fellow protagonist, who at times even gets in the way of the boy's main goal, to recover his frog. The frog is not a protagonist of the story, but he does play a major role, because his actions allow the main goal of the story to emerge. The other characters (the gopher, bees, owl, and deer) all appear at places where the boy or the dog are looking for the frog. As such, they may be characterized as antagonists, since they all block the protagonist's goal of finding the frog at that particular location. But this is by no means a necessary construal, as shown by a German 5-year-old (G5e) who constructs the gopher as a friendly animal who is helping the search by giving directions. Another group of characters enters the story towards the end, when the two protagonists find "their" frog with a number of other frogs, presumably his mate and their baby frogs.

TABLE 1
Particles Used with Verbs of Motion by Children

Particle	3 yrs.	5 yrs.	9 yrs.
her 'hither'		+	
daher 'thence'		+	
hin 'thither'	+	+	+
dahin 'thither'			+
aus 'out'		+	+
heraus 'hither-out'			+
raus 'hither-out'	+	+	+
hinaus 'thither-out'		+	+
rein 'inward'	+	+	+
drin 'therein'	+		
runter 'down'	+	+	+
hinunter 'thither-down'			+
hinab 'downwards'			+
rauf 'thereon'	+	+	+
darauf 'thereon'	+		+
rüber 'over'	+		
darüber 'thereover'			+
an 'to'			+
dran 'thereon'	+	+	
ran 'thereon'		+	
nach 'after'			+
hinterher 'behind'	+	+	+
vor 'in-front'		+	
weg 'away'	+	+	+
davon 'away-from'		+	
lang 'along'			+
um 'around'		+	+
rum 'around'			+
hoch 'high-up'	+	+	+

In general, these characters are linguistically referred to by devices such as a full nominal expression or pronoun, and they may also be referred to by a zero form such as a null subject. In German, nouns are accompanied by articles that are grammatically marked for number, gender, and case. Animals, when referred to by third-person pronouns, particularly in fables and fairytales, are usually marked by the (grammatical) gender of their nominal

counterpart. Thus, the owl is referred to as *sie* 'she', the deer by *es* or *das* 'it', and the gopher (*der Maulwurf* or *der Hamster*) by *er* 'he'. Person-marking on the verb in German also clearly differentiates between three different singular person forms and one plural form.[16] Verb inflection thus provides additional information as to the identity of the subject referent, even where the latter is not overtly expressed by a pronoun form. However, German is not a "pro-drop" language: Subject pronouns are required except under specified syntactic conditions that allow for ellipsis.

3.1.1. Creating characters as discourse referents

Prior studies of reference in frog story narratives (Bamberg, 1986, 1987; Kail & Hickmann, 1992; Wigglesworth, 1992) have assumed that the conventional way of introducing characters or groups of characters into a discourse is by means of the least presupposing form that a language offers. In German, this form is the singular indefinite article *ein/eine* 'a' for a single individual and the zero article for more than one individual (e.g., *Bienen* 'bees' or *Frösche* 'frogs'). In this analysis, the bees might also be referred to first by an object noun for 'beehive' (*der Bienenkorb* or *das Bienenhaus*).

A clear developmental picture emerges if we distinguish between three different groups of characters: (1) the boy, dog, and frog; (2) the four antagonists (gopher, owl, deer, and bees); and (3) the group of frogs mentioned towards the end of the story. Three-year-olds create the first group (the boy, dog, and frog) at the discourse level, overwhelmingly by use of the definite article *der* 'the:MASC:SG:NOM, which with age changes increasingly to the indefinite *ein* 'a:MASC:SG:NOM. Note, further, that the younger children tend not to use an ARTICLE + NOUN combination, preferring the third person masculine pronoun *er* or *der* 'he'. Older children and adults sometimes use proper names for the boy-protagonist, occasionally even for the dog and/or frog. However, 9-year-olds and even adults also use the definite article for referent introduction, particularly for the boy, less for the dog, and least for the frog, as shown in Table 2.

The second group of characters that share characteristics in terms of their linguistic realization in discourse are the four antagonists: the gopher, the owl, the deer, and the bees. There is a clear developmental trend with age towards

[16] This is true of verbs in the present tense, used for the vast majority of the German sample. Past-tense verbs distinguish between two singular person forms and one additional plural form.

TABLE 2
First References (Character Introduction)[a]

	3 yrs		5 yrs		9 yrs		Adult	
	def	indef	def	indef	def	indef	def	indef
Boy	10	0	6	2	6	5	4	5
Dog	12	0	8	2	6	3	2	4
Frog	10	1	9	2	7	4	1	6
Gopher	0	5	2	6	3	9	0	12
Bees/Hive	8	0	5	5	2	2	1	11
Owl	7	3	6	4	5	6	1	11
Deer	6	2	4	6	5	7	1	11
Frog(s)	4	2	3	1	6	1	5	3

a. Uses of pronouns, possessives, and names for any of these characters are not included in the table.

use of the **indefinite** article for introducing these four characters, to a point where almost all the adults do so. This trend holds more for the three individual antagonists than for the group of bees, but it is marked even from the youngest age group, particularly in comparison to how the first group of characters was introduced (the boy, dog, and frog). Relatedly, an early tendency to introduce these characters by use of the definite article *der*, *die*, or *das* 'the' + GENDER ASSIGNMENT decreases with age, as shown in Table 2.

No clear developmental picture emerges from analysis of the linguistic forms used to refer to the third group of characters, the frogs mentioned towards the end of the story, where the boy and the dog find "their" frog again. As shown in Table 2, narrators across all age groups use roughly the same distribution of formal devices. This may be because the group of frogs represents a mixed category, one of whose members is "old information" and so has already been introduced before, the others being a number of other characters who need to be introduced. However, closer scrutiny reveals not only formal, but also interesting functional differences between the younger children and the older narrators in this respect. The former use mainly pronouns or a DEFINITE ARTICLE + NOUN to introduce and/or reintroduce the group of frogs, even though there are no other clues in the text to show that they actually intend to convey that this group (or parts thereof) have been introduced into the discourse before. In contrast, the definite forms used by the older children and adults occur in the context of other elaborative means indicating that this group is familiar or has some connection to the protagonists and hence to the listener as well. Use of the indefinite article for the

frogs in this scene is even more interesting. As illustrated in (33), the identity of the frog is left open, at least initially, in order to convey how the protagonists entered the scene not knowing the true identity of the characters behind the treetrunk. The point of recognizing the frog as their runaway pet is textually identified, and as such takes greater account of the protagonist's perspective by means of the DEFINITE ARTICLE + NOUN or use of a possessive pronoun, as in *Peter hört das Quaken **seines** Frosches* 'Peter heard the croaking of **his** frog' [*G20l*].

(37) *Und was finden sie da, eine ganze Froschfamilie! Hier sitzt Vater Frosch Mutter Frosch und einige Kinder und zur ganz großen Überraschung findet der Junge auch seinen kleinen Frosch wieder.*

'And what do they find there, a whole frog-family! Here sits Father Frog, Mother Frog, and a few children and to their great surprise, the boy also finds his little frog again.' [*G20k*]

In sum, the use of linguistic forms to introduce referents into the discourse presents a rather complex picture. There is a clear sensitivity to differentiate linguistically between two groups of referents: the boy, the dog, and the frog, on the one hand, and the gopher, bees, owl, and deer, on the other. This sensitivity is manifest at all age groups, though it surfaces differently at different ages. In addition, the linguistic treatment of the boy stands out when compared to that of the dog and the frog, even moreso when compared to the other characters. Although the boy and dog are marked by more definite articles, the boy is linguistically privileged in that he is often given a name and referred to by a bare pronoun. This reveals a possible attempt of narrators at all ages to view events and scenes as being connected from the boy's (i.e., the main protagonist's) perspective. The present database is insufficient for deciding whether this attempt is motivated by the fact that the boy ranks higher on the animacy hierarchy (Comrie, 1981), and as such is the best candidate for being "mapped" onto the corresponding linguistic devices, or whether the linguistic forms are simply available from the child's linguistic environment in conventional clusterings for differentiating between humans and animals in general, and in a similar vein between such categories as protagonists and antagonists. However, the fact that the privileging of certain characters holds across the sample suggests that such notions as "given" versus "new" and/or what is considered as "shared" or "presupposed" might need to be revised. The narrator does not appear to simply take his/her interpretation of what is "given" or "presupposed" as the sole source for deciding how to instruct the listener to view the identity of the characters in question, but presents the information from an involved vantage point. "Involved" in this context implies that the intentions, values, and motivations of the most privileged character, the protagonist, are revealing of the vantage

point from which events and scenes are held together. And it is this involvement between narrator and protagonist that finds its expression in the way the protagonist is (linguistically) differentiated from other characters.

3.1.2. Grammatical subjects as discourse topics

Another, equally revealing analysis considers how characters are linguistically encoded after they have been established in discourse. The three options noted for German are: a full nominal expression, a pronoun, and a zero form. It is generally assumed that full nominal expressions are used to reintroduce a character after he/she has been temporarily out of focus; pronouns are used to maintain a character's identity in subsequent discourse that is not interrupted by other characters' foregrounded activities; and zero forms can only be used if a character has been clearly established in the immediately preceding clause (with additional syntactic constraints). Below I first examine the linguistic forms by which the story characters are referred to after they have been introduced, and then consider whether any distinctive forms are used to keep particular characters in focus in contrast to others.

TABLE 3
Percentage of References in Subject Position to Story Characters and Other Story Items, by Age[a]

	3 yrs	5 yrs	9 yrs	Adult
Total Number	665	608	741	1244
Story Characters				
noun/name	35.8	37.5	54.9	37.7
pronoun	41.7	41.8	28.7	28.9
zero form	5.1	3.6	12.9	22.3
Other Story Items	17.4	17.1	3.5	10.1

a. Passives were coded twice, for surface-subject as well as for deep-subject.

Table 3 reflects two clear developmental trends across the four groups of narrators. First, there is a clear increase with age in use of the zero form for the story characters: The two younger age groups rarely use a zero form, 9-year-olds use it in 13% of all clauses that have a story character in subject position, and adults use it in 22% of such cases. Second, while 3- and 5-year-old children rely on nominal and pronominal forms to an equal extent,

there is a radical drop in pronouns among 9-year-olds and adults. Also, 9-year-olds use mainly nominal forms when referring to a character (55% of the time) and they also refer much less to inanimate objects such as the jar or the boy's clothes in the house, or bushes, trees, flowers, and water out in the forest, where the search takes place.

The function served by null subjects increases with age. The following excerpt from an adult narrative shows an abundance of such uses, where ∅ represents a null subject or zero form.

(38) *Also ich hätte jetzt damit angefangen daß der durch den Wald zieht* [new referent = boy] *und einen Frosch sucht* [∅ = boy] *und den auch findet* [∅ = boy] *und den mit nach Hause nimmt* [∅ = boy] *und in ein Glas packt* [∅ = boy] *und abends dann garnicht schlafen kann* [∅ = boy], *der Mond ist nämlich schon aufgegangen* [new referent], *und mit seinem kleinen Hund vor dem Glas sitzt* [∅ = boy] *und den Frosch bewundert* [∅ = boy] *und auf ihn aufpaßt* [∅ = boy]. *Aber irgendwann werden die beiden dann doch müde* [new referent], *gehen schlafen* [∅ = boy + dog], *und die Gelegenheit benutzt der Frosch* [new referent] *und entschlüpft wieder aus dem Glas* [∅ = frog].

'Well I would have started now with (saying) that he moves through the forest [new referent = boy] and looks for a frog [∅ = boy] and even finds him [∅ = boy] and takes him along home [∅ = boy] and sticks him into a jar [∅ = boy] and can't sleep at all in the evening [∅ = boy], the moon has namely already gone up [new referent], and sits with his little dog in front of the jar [∅ = boy] and admires the frog [∅ = boy] and watches out for him [∅ = boy]. But at some point the two get tired after all [new referent], go to sleep [∅ = boy + dog], and the frog uses the opportunity [new referent] and slips out of the jar again [∅ = frog].' [*G20a*]

As shown in this excerpt, use of a zero subject ties activities of the same character together and presents them as "topical packages." These are generally set against each other by use of nominal forms, as in the next to last line, where the narrator switches reference to another character, the frog.

The 9-year-old narrators, in contrast, are much more concerned with differentiating between the characters by mainly nominal forms (note the drop in pronouns compared to the two younger groups, and the increase in nominals in Table 3). This concern with character differentiation in the 9-year-olds is also reflected in the sudden increase of **left-dislocations** in this age group, where a clause-initial full noun phrase is reiterated by a subsequent pronominal copy. While 3-year-olds used no left dislocations at all, and 5-year-olds only sporadically (four occurrences in four narratives), six of the 9-year-olds used as many as 44 left-dislocations, going down to only 11 in four adult

narratives. The example in (39), from the opening of a 9-year-old narrative, shows how left-dislocations are used to clearly mark the introduction of a new referent, and so contribute to a clearer differentiation between new topical packages.

(39) *Der Mond steht noch am Himmel und* ***der Hund der*** *ist mit der Nase im Glas drinne wo der Frosch drin ist mit dem Wasser und so, und* ***der Junge der*** *sitzt und kuckt ihn sich an* [∅ = boy].

'The moon still stands in the sky and **the dog he** is inside the jar with his nose where the frog is inside with the water and such, and **the boy he** sits and watches him.' [*G9i-9;11*]

Right-dislocations — references to characters by means of a pronoun reiterated by a clause-final full noun — do not occur at all in the 3-year-old German texts; 5-year-olds use them four times; and 9-year-olds and adults five times each. In the children's texts, this form of dislocation is better viewed as a false start, that is, the children seem to recognize that the pronoun was not sufficiently clear, and so needed to be replaced by a full nominal expression; adults, on the other hand, use it for more felicitous stylistic purposes. These two different functions of right-dislocations are illustrated by the following examples from a 5-year-old and an adult narrator.

(40) *Und dann ruft er ganz laut aber* ***er*** *kam nicht,* ***der Frosch.***

'And then he [=boy] calls very loudly but **he** did not come, **the frog**.' [*G5e-5;0*]

(41) *Und da machen sich alle drei, Moritz, sein Hund und der Frosch machen sich auf den Heimweg.*

'And there all three of them start, Moritz, his dog and the frog start to go home.' [*G20d*]

As shown in Table 3, the younger children, aged 3 and 5 years, rely more heavily on pronouns than 9-year-olds and adults. Six children in each of the two younger groups use far more pronouns than nouns in their narratives, deploying what has been termed a "thematic subject strategy" (see Bamberg, 1986, 1987; Karmiloff-Smith, 1981; Wigglesworth, 1992), that is, they match the third person pronoun with virtually all references to the boy as main protagonist, and refer to other characters of the story by a full noun when reintroduced into the discourse, and by a pronoun when reference to the same character is maintained. That is, the pronoun for the boy as the thematic subject of this story collapses two functions, reference maintenance and reference shift. In contrast, a pronoun, when used for any of the other characters in the story, is preserved for reference maintenance only.[17] The following example

[17] Bamberg (1987) documents the thematic subject strategy in German children's narra-

illustrates how the pronoun is used for the boy in a 5-year-old's narrative, while the other two characters (the owl in the first and the dog in the last line of the text) are mentioned by a nominal expression.

(42) *und hier sitzt die Eule*
'and here the owl sits'
und der sitzt auf'm Schneemann
'and he sits on the snowman'
hier ist er auf'm Rehhut
'here he is on top of a deer's hat'
und der fällt da runter
'and he [=boy] falls down there'
und der Hund auch
'and the dog too' [*G5d-5;3*]

A more refined analysis, of the sort suggested by Wigglesworth (1992), may reveal additional referential strategies, particularly in the younger age groups. Still, the tendency to privilege the main character of the story by use of particular linguistic devices receives clear support from the German data examined here. In addition, the 9-year-olds' focus on clear identification and differentiation of all characters suggests a streamlining of the referential strategies of the two younger age groups. This overemphasis of the discourse boundaries of topical (character) packages marks a stepping stone in the German-speaking children — and probably children generally — towards the more conventional means available to speakers of their language for switching and maintaining reference.

3.2. Agency

This section brings together three different narrative devices that are quite distinct in surface linguistic form and appear to make reference to rather different aspects of "the world": (1) voice alternations, (2) Aktionsart, and (3) evaluations, i.e., references to psychological states of the characters. These different devices can be considered together if one takes into account, as I

tives in more detail. The fact that this strategy was so strongly evinced by even the 3-year-olds in this earlier investigation, was in part because the children were already highly familiar with the story-plot, unlike in the present study. In Wigglesworth's (1992) analysis of frog-book narratives collected from Australian English-speaking children, using the same elicitation procedure as in the present study, a similar trend was found, although it showed up rather later than in my (1987) study. Her more fine-grained analysis revealed various other strategies used by young children in this task.

have suggested elsewhere (Bamberg, 1991b), that passives can serve the same indexical function as references to negative states of existence or to internal states of story characters (e.g., their emotions or evaluative stances). Apart from the description of how these devices are employed in the narrative context of the frog story, I will document how the different devices can be used — at least to some degree — interchangeably; and that different languages may opt for different devices when compared with each other.

3.2.1. Voice alternations

The following two examples from a German adult illustrate the typical way passives are used in these narratives.

(43) *und dann der Junge fällt vom Baum runter*
'and then the boy falls off the tree'
wahrscheinlich weil ***er von dem Uhu hier erschrocken wurde***
'probably because **he got frightened by the owl** here'
und der Bienenschwarm jagt hinter dem Hund her
'and the swarm of bees chases after the dog'
das kriegt der Junge aber noch nicht mit
'this however the boy does not notice yet'
dann ***wird der Junge*** *wahrscheinlich* ***von dem Uhu angegriffen***
'then **the boy** probably **gets attacked by the owl**'
der macht so 'ne Abwehrbewegung
'he makes such a defensive move'
und kuckt so
and looks this way' [*G20j*]

Both the passives in this text keep the boy in (surface) subject position, and as such contribute to the creation of a smooth discourse flow with the boy as the discursive topic: The passage is mainly "about" him. The next example is something of an exception to the way passives are used in the frog narratives, since a new character, the owl, is inserted into the text line, giving it the clause-initial subject position.

(44) *der Dackel hat inzwischen die Bienen rebellisch gemacht*
'in the meantime the doggy has made the bees rebellious'
die hinter ihm her sind
'which are after him'

*und **die Eule wird** auch **aufgeschreckt***
'and **the owl** also **gets aroused**'
und der kleine Junge fürchtet sich vor ihr
'and the little boy is afraid of her'
und klettert dann auf einen Fels rauf
'and then climbs up onto a rock'
und ruft nach dem Frosch
'and calls for the frog' [*G20a*]

Note, however, that the passive *wird aufgeschreckt* 'gets aroused' in (44) is a parallel construction, if the issue of agency and its motivating force is taken into account: In the second clause of (44), the bees have become the agents, chasing the dog who was the causal instigator of their action. Now, in line three, the same kind of causal role relationship is evoked for the construction of the interactive relationship between the owl and the boy: The boy had caused the owl to wake up, resulting — supposedly — in some reaction by the owl, which in turn resulted in the boy's internal response (expressed in line four) and the external response (expressed in the two subsequent lines). The use of *auch* 'also' underscores the parallel construction of the two revenge themes. If the narrator had opted for the active construction as in 'and the boy has **also** aroused the owl, and is afraid of her', the underpinning revenge motif would have been lost, and in addition, the use of 'also' would have been highly misleading in so far as it would have instructed the recipient to construct the boy's action (of arousing the owl) as a repetitious act.

In sum, as demonstrated in example (43), in most cases, the passive construction is used to hold the main character in a foregrounded and topical syntactic position, yielding a smooth flow of topical discourse units (Chapter IVC; see also Bamberg 1991b, where I make this point explicitly for American-English speakers). However, occasionally, other motivations for using the passive construction may compete with this general topic-preserving function. In such particular situations, the use of the passive is nevertheless still (motivationally) grounded in the narrator's intent to index reasons for particular happenings or doings, such as the revenge motif in example (44).

A more fine-grained analysis of where passives are used in the German sample (this chapter), combined with the American English sample (Chapter IIIA), reveals an interesting pattern. In 85% of the cases, adult narrators passivize scenes in which one of the four antagonists (the gopher, the bees, the owl, the deer) block the goal of the protagonists, i.e., to find their pet frog. Furthermore, in almost all of these cases, the boy or the dog are kept in topic position, as demonstrated in (43). Rarely are the antagonists passivized as in

(44). Children of both language samples never use passives to topicalize the antagonist. From this we may be able to conclude, in a preliminary way, that passives in the frog narration serve the discursive function of "promoting" the actions of the protagonists and "demoting" the actions of the antagonists. And as such, it can be argued that passive constructions are linguistic means that aid in the construal of "prot-" and "antagonistship."

Further evidence for this kind of argument comes from another level of analyzing the narratives. Almost all passive constructions by all narrators are used to characterize actions from a particular evaluative perspective: They are negative, i.e., they should not have happened, and as such resulted in negative emotional states — at least in a startle or a surprise. Along this line of analysis, all three passive examples in (43) and (44) above fit this pattern. In (43), the main protagonist is characterized as going through two negative experiences, while in example (44) this kind of negative evaluative stance could have been adopted to highlight that the owl actually should not have been disturbed.[18] As a matter of fact, the passive construction in example (44) leads to the impression that a consecutive reaction from the owl is to be expected and potentially even justified; thus, the boy had better be aware.

Building on these analyses of how and where passive constructions are put to use in the frog story, the seemingly different functions of "topic construction," signaling underlying thematic coherence (such as a revenge theme), or indexing a particular "negative" evaluative stance, can all be viewed as operating in concert with what has been termed the **binding** and **unfolding** of part-whole relationships (Bamberg 1992, 1993; Bamberg & Marchman, 1991; see also Chapter IVD).

In terms of frequency of occurrence, German narrators across the age groups make conspicuously infrequent use of passives. Only two children among the 3- and 5-year-olds attempt a passive, both times resulting in an awkward construction. The reason for the relatively low, and relatively late, use of passives in German, particularly when compared to the English narratives, may be in part due to the fact that German presents a more complex problem-solving space in comparison with English (see Chapter IVC, and Slobin, 1990, for supporting arguments for this position). Another way of resolving this puzzle is to look into where in the narratives typical passive constructions are used in the English texts, and compare these uses with how German

[18] In parental tellings of the frog book, narrators actually make this point quite explicit to their children: Owls sleep during the day, and they should not be disturbed (Bamberg 1987). See, also, a similar report on the functions of passives in maternal input in American English by Budwig (1990).

narrators solve similar problems linguistically.

In the English adult narratives, we do have a number of occurrences of the type *the boy was frightened by the owl* [E20d] or *the little boy falls off the tree, frightened by an owl* [E20h] or *the dog is intrigued by this beehive* [E20b], all appealing to states of arousal in one of the protagonists, caused by one of the antagonists. In the German narratives, narrators typically do not use passives for exactly the same information value, but rather use reflexive constructions of the following sort: *und Tom hat sich auch sehr erschrocken* 'and Tom has scared himself [=gotten scared] quite a bit' [G20f], *erst mal hat er sich erschrocken* 'first off, he has scared himself' [G20b]. Though it is quite possible to view the action in a transitive way, i.e., the antagonist (e.g., the owl) *erschrickt* 'scares' the protagonist (the boy), German adult narrators as well as the children of the older age groups opt for a perspective that anchors the origins of the scare/fright experience in the self of the protagonist, though not directing the experience outward but rather full circle back to the self. In a similar vein, German narrators are not 'intrigued by something', but rather *interessieren sich für etwas* 'interest themselves for something'.

In general, German reflexives are probably better viewed as middle constructions. Reflexive constructions such as *sich waschen* 'wash oneself', *sich freuen über* 'enjoy oneself', *sich erschrecken* 'get a fright/get frightened', *sich verlieben* 'fall in love', *sich wehtun* 'get hurt', and many others, all signify the source or origin of the action and the goal or recipient as the same person. Some of these actions are by their very nature more agentive than others,[19] that is, they focus more on the source of the action; and this is reflected in their English glosses as active (sometimes even reflexive) constructions. Other actions, however, orient more to the recipient, and so background the agent as actor, as reflected in their English glosses by *get*-passives. Thus, German reflexive constructions of the kind common in everyday conversational usage and in the German frog stories, including those used by 3-year-olds, may in part play a role parallel to syntactic passives in English.

3.2.2. Aktionsart reconsidered

So far, concern has been mainly with how characters are discursively created as separate topics, independent of each other. Yet, story characters are created to relate to each other, and one character's actions have consequences for what others in the story do, think, and feel. Here, I reanalyze the predicates chosen to characterize the actions and interactions of the characters

[19] The question arises whether this "nature" is extralinguistic. I believe that it is not, so that my appeal to the "nature" of actions or activities is no more than a figure of speech.

in light of these considerations.

Three-year-olds depict story characters mainly in terms of motion and existential predicates. For instance, the scene where the boy falls out of the tree (Picture 12) or the scene where boy and dog fall off the cliff (Picture 15) are described by 3-year-olds as 'falling' and 'being at a new location'. Analysis of how movements are linguistically constructed (in Section 2) revealed the younger narrators' preoccupation with aspects of the spatial scenery. It is rare for 3-year-olds to elaborate on reasons for events, as in the following example, narrating Picture 8:

(45) *da fällt er*
'there he [=boy] falls'
und dann ist er am Erde
'and then he [=boy] is on the ground'
weil da einer rauskommte
'because someone [=owl] came out of there' [*G3l-3;3*]

Five-year-olds are far more likely to characterize the falling scene in terms of an agent who causes the fall; for example, the deer is often described as the one who volitionally *wirft* 'throws' the boy. The 5-year-olds also show the first references to mental states and a few overt causal relationships between events, a trend which is far more marked in the 9-year-old narratives. The older children often characterize the actions of the deer and/or the owl by causatives such as *runterschubsen* 'push down', *runterwerfen* 'throw down', or *runterschmeißen* 'hurl down', and they describe the activities of characters in terms that incorporate telic orientations that affect other characters, e.g., *beschimpfen* 'yell at', *verfolgen* 'follow', and most especially *suchen* 'search'. And 9-year-olds also make more references to internal states of the characters and use more direct speech than the younger children. Nevertheless, there are still long passages that give the impression of parallel-running actions of different characters that are not necessarily viewed as interconnected, even in the narratives of the 9-year-olds, all of whom clearly have a grasp of the overall plot of the frog story.

Adult narratives reveal far more about the characters' inner states and motivations as a basis for expressing complex interactions between characters, as in (44). Adults also very often make references to non-existent states and indulge in extended departures from the storyline to let the listener know how the different characters hook up with each other. Consequently, their descriptions of the characters' actions, though often very similar to those found in texts of 5- and even 3-year-olds, are far more grounded in a network of interpersonal motivations of the story characters. In the mature narratives,

in sum, the listener appears to have an easier task in understanding the characters and, hence the narrator as well.

3.2.3. Evaluations and motives to act

The preceding analyses of characterhood and agency have concerned mainly the linguistic means by which characters are introduced and how they acquire a specific contour in the course of the narrative discourse. As a result, the focus of this section has been on the identity and deeds of the story characters. The fact that activities are generally viewed as motivated by thoughts, intentions, feelings, attitudes, and desires — in our Western folk-beliefs at all events — was noted only when narrators explicitly attributed such psychological states to characters of the story. But implicit attributions of psychological states are highly relevant to choice of action descriptions attributed to the characters in the story, and they are ultimately also responsible for how the characters are viewed as moving through time (Section 1 above) and space (Section 2).

As I have discussed elsewhere (Bamberg, 1991a, 1991b, 1992, in press; Bamberg & Marchman 1990, 1991) actions, actors,[20] (spatial) scenes, and (spatio-temporal) events are always viewed from an overarching perspective and as such appear in an integrated relationship.[21] Narrators can try to conceal their integrative perspective, but they cannot run the risk of their narratives becoming fragmented and dissociated, since this might reflect back onto the narrator himself or herself. The integrative perspective from which part-whole relationships are viewed as tied together and at the same time unfolding, is part of an inferential system computed on the basis of linguistic choices. As such, the linguistic means analyzed in this chapter, when viewed as contributing to the constitution of events, scenes, and characterships in the German frog-book narratives, also provide insight into the overall perspectives from which part-whole relationships emerge.

This final subsection briefly considers linguistic devices traditionally viewed as functioning in direct service of signaling the overall perspectives of narratives (and hence of narrators): so-called "evaluative" devices or "evaluations." In the present context, this is done by focusing on two devices that illuminate the development of evaluative stances in the German corpus. The

[20] In this chapter, actors and acts (or actions) have been collapsed into the unit of "characters."

[21] This perspective, in line with the work of Burke (Burke, 1968, 1969), originates from the (human) drama (see Bamberg, 1993).

first such device is the linguistic form *wollen* 'want to', by which younger children in particular seem to refer to characters' intentional stances; the second considers use of the adverb *plötzlich* 'suddenly' and overt mention of characters' being scared or startled.

As background, recall some aspects of the overall picture presented in this chapter. The 3- and the 5-year-olds' narratives are clearly shorter than those of the 9-year-olds and adults. One overall characterization of the younger narratives is that they seem to be more "descriptive" (Bamberg & Damrad-Frye, 1991; Bamberg & Marchman, 1990). This, however, does not mean that the younger children's narratives do not contain any evaluative means nor, more particularly, that 3- or 5-year-olds are unable to take a "second" look at the same event to reevaluate it by connecting the "what-is-said" with the "why-it-is-said." Younger children clearly do take evaluative stances in their narratives, but they do so mainly for what we have termed "local" narrative purposes. With age, these "local" stances become more differentiated and integrated into a "global" narrative perspective. Again, this is not to say that younger children do not "have" a global perspective. In fact, there is good evidence to the contrary, particularly in terms of referential strategies as well as aspectual markings used by even 3-year-old children (Bamberg, 1986, 1987, 1993). Thus, even while calling the younger children's narratives more "descriptive" is not really an accurate characterization, it does reflect the overall impression yielded by their texts of a lack of clear evaluative stances, such as stepping out of the narrative clause-line and thereby taking on this second interpretive orientation of "why-it-is-said."

Young German narrators do, nevertheless, overtly express their interpretive stances on characters' perspectives. One clear way they do so is by use of the modal expressions *will, wollte* 'wants to', 'wanted to'. Characters' actions are often described in terms of their wishes and/or wants. The 3-year-olds do so 26 times, and the 5-year-olds 23 times, while 9-year-olds in their much longer narratives use this particular device only nine times, and adults in their even longer narratives only seven times. In contrast, other evaluative devices that are only sporadically used by the younger children, occur increasingly in the texts of the older children and the adults.

A second relevant device that differs markedly across the different age groups is the use of questions. Three-year-olds quite often use questions as genuine queries about the underlying motives of participants — e.g., *Und da warum rennt der denn da weg?* 'And there, why does he run away there?' [*G3g-3;8*], but this decreases with age. Adult narratives show an increase in questions, but these have a clearly rhetorical function to direct the listener's attention and relate his/her local orientation and expectation to the global story thread, e.g., *Sie kucken über den Baumstamm hinweg, und wer sitzt*

dort? Dort sitzt Frau Frosch ... 'They look over the treetrunk, and who sits there? There sits Mrs. Frog ...' [*G20c*].

Another development is revealed by comparing two seemingly unrelated linguistic devices, the adverb *plötzlich* 'suddenly' and the overt evaluation of the impact of an event on a character's state of mind by use of terms like *überrascht* 'amazed', *erstaunt* 'surprised', *verdutzt* 'puzzled', and the like, to express surprise, and *erschrocken* 'frightened', *entsetzt* 'disturbed', expressing a surprise turned into a scare. Both *plötzlich* and *erschrocken* take two simultaneously occurring events or situations into account: on the one hand the event that happens (so to speak outside of a perceiver) and on the other hand the mind of a character from whose perspective this event happened unexpectedly — *plötzlich*. The German synonym *auf einmal*, literally 'at one-time', with the connotation of 'all at once' or 'at the same time', demonstrates clearly that a co-temporal perspective is at work in the merging of these two perspectives. The lexical characterization of a character's state of mind as *erschrocken* or *entsetzt* presents the same situation from a slightly different perspective: Only if something has happened unexpectedly — *plötzlich* and *auf einmal* — can this something have the effect of a surprise and potentially cause a fright. Thus, though *plötzlich* and *erschrocken* seem on the surface to be two independent and different characterizations of a temporal and an affective contour respectively at the level of "what-is-said," they are closely related in terms of their discursive value, i.e., at the level of "why-it-is-said."

In contrast to the common characterizations of characters' intentional stances by the 3- and the 5-year-old children, they use few overt references to their states of mind. There is only one reference to the "fright" aspect of an experience, and one to its suddenness by German 3-year-olds. And they make few references to other internal states as well. This changes somewhat in the narratives of the 5-year-olds, some of whom do try to convey the connections between characters' actions more explicitly, though most of their narratives likewise lack reference to an internal state of any kind, or to the suddenness of events. They use *auf einmal* or *plötzlich* and refer to the "fright" factor a total of five times each.

Interestingly enough, the overall samples of narratives of the 9-year-olds, and also of the adults, still include a few narratives that could be characterized as "purely descriptive" in the sense that they fail to make any overt reference to evaluative orientations of the sort under discussion here.[22] The

[22] Interviews of the German adult narrators conducted at the end of the session revealed an interesting correlation between story length and use of evaluative devices, on the one hand, and the imagined story recipient, that is, the construction of the interactive situation, on the other. Adults who revealed that they had actually tried to imagine a child recipient constructed longer narratives which included an abundance of overt evaluative stances, whereas those who reported that they simply "wanted to get the job done" for the interviewer, used minimal evaluations in the much shorter texts which they produced.

other narratives of the older subjects, however, all in one way or another exploit forms of "suddenness" or the "fright" motif. The 9-year-olds use *plötzlich* or *auf einmal* 26 times, the adults 22 times; the 9-year-olds express a character's surprise 6 times, and the fright factor 10 times; adults do so 9 times and 32 times, respectively.

The marked rise in this particular narrative stance on characters' actions and reactions to events in the German frog stories documents nicely the shift in narrative orientation across the four age groups. Younger children are able to take an evaluative stance on single events, that is, the "here-and-nows" of deictic centers (Sections 1 and 2 above), by revealing characters' volitions and wants; with age, children develop a kind of double-look onto the deictic centers of larger sections or segments of the discourse. In consequence, the evaluative stances taken by older children and adults can take on a signaling function that relates parts of the narrative to the construction of the whole, and as such reveal insights of actors' motivations with regard to the narrative in its entirety.

4. SUMMARY

4.1. Temporal Expression

Almost all of the narrators, across age, anchor their narratives in the present tense, contrasting this with the present perfect. The earliest uses of the present perfect are for marking completion; more developed uses (present in only a few preschoolers) are **prospective relevance**, which points forward from a completed situation to a new activity scene, and **retrospective assessment**, which introduces a prior situation which is relevant to the current situation. A major developmental shift, however, is from early centering on a single action to more developed orientation to a past or future point in a hierarchically ordered narrative structure.

Aspectual adverbs are most commonly used to indicate protraction, inception, recurrence, and relation to another reference time. The variety of forms increases with age. In comparison with the other four languages of the study, German children make more use of deictic adverbs and less use of sequential adverbs in marking interclausal relations. Specific time adverbials are rare. Temporal subordination is a relatively late development. It is proposed that the frequent use of sentence-initial spatial deictics might block the

use of temporal connectives, presenting a narrative sequence from one deictic center to the next.

4.2. Spatial Expression

The younger narrators rely heavily on clause-initial use of the spatial adverb *da* 'there'. Directional prefixes on verbs are used from the youngest age to indicate path in a general way, with specification of source and/or goal becoming more frequent in the later preschool period. A wide range of verbs of motion is used, generally conflated with manner, and combined with path satellites and deictic directional particles. Three-year-olds have almost full command of this complex, satellite-framed system.

4.3. Characters and Agency

The main protagonists tend to be introduced by definite noun-phrases by narrators of all ages, with use of indefinite noun-phrases becoming an equal option only by school-age. Peripheral characters come to be introduced by indefinite noun-phrases more frequently and at earlier ages. Continuing reference is by noun or pronoun, with preschoolers making especially heavy use of pronouns for the boy as "thematic subject"; but there is increasing use of zero pronoun in conjoined clauses by 9-year-olds and adults. Nine-year-olds also make frequent use of left-dislocations in which a clause-initial noun-phrase is followed by a pronominal copy; right-dislocations are rare.

Passives are used by adults to keep a topical participant in subject position, especially when the goal of a main protagonist is blocked. Most passives also focus on a negative consequence for the subject. This construction is rarely used by children; however they do make use of reflexive constructions which often function to downgrade agency. Attention to inner states and motivations develops with age, but even the youngest narrators comment on intentions of the protagonists.

Chapter IIIC

DEVELOPMENT OF LINGUISTIC FORMS: SPANISH

Eugenia Sebastián and Dan I. Slobin