Perspective persistence and irregular perspective shift: mismatches in form-function pairings
Stef Spronck, An Van linden, Caroline Gentens & María Sol Sansiñena

Perspective has been a central topic in functionalist linguistics as least since authors such as Jespersen (1922), Jakobson (1957) and Benveniste (1966), and for good reason: if we assume that language is intrinsically shaped by the communicative situation, the way in which locutions index their sender (and/or addressee) and convey their communicative intentions lies at the heart of grammatical description. Paradigms such as Systemic Functional Grammar (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004) and Functional (Discourse) Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008) have formalized this insight by specifying grammatical meaning both at a conventional symbolic/representational level and at a speaker-hearer oriented, interpersonal/intersubjective level, which accounts for the pragmatic embeddedness of perspective constructions in the speech situation. A recent strand of cognitive-functionalist literature further explores the relation between (inter)subjective perspectival conceptualization and grammar under the label of 'viewpoint' (Dancygier, Lu & Verhagen 2016; Dancygier & Sweetser 2012).

The papers in this special issue explore this staple functionalist topic from a slightly different angle. Based on original fieldwork by the authors in South America (Van linden), in (the Himalayas in) Asia (Konnerth and Zemp), and in Africa (Nikitina), they address instances of perspective constructions in which there appears to be a clash between the referential identification of the conceptualiser that is conventionally signalled by the grammatical form and the interpretation of the conceptualiser value that is realised in context.

Van linden opens the issue with a discussion of an evidential category in Harakmbut (isolate, Peru). The evidential marking signals indirect evidentiality, indicating that the speaker was not a witness of the described event and that the information was retrieved indirectly, while the events referred to in the proposition (or at least their resultant states, cf. DeLancey 1990) are in principle directly accessible to them. In other words, the speaker signals that they were not directly involved in the event they report and renounces epistemic authority (Evans, Bergqvist & San Roque 2018; Heritage & Raymond 2005), placing the responsibility for the reported event in a perspective other than their own. Yet, in Harakmbut this indirect evidential marking *can* be used to report events the speaker was involved in. The paper homes in on two types of constructional effects. The first type concerns constructions with a first-person agent, in which the use of indirect evidential marking leads to the interpretation that the speaker(s) performed the action referred to unintentionally, an effect that has been described for other languages as well. The second type – which has not been documented so far – involves agentless constructions referring to the cycle of the sun. The use of indirect evidential marking on such impersonal predicates yields emphasis on the completion of the event referred to.

Van linden identifies a mismatch between the form and function of the indirect evidential makers in the constructions described: the marker *conventionally* signals a shift away from the perspective of the speaker, yet the perspective does not shift: it remains with the speaker. We refer to such types of form-function mismatches as cases of *perspective persistence* (Gentens et al. 2019). By examining the contexts, both pragmatic and grammatical, in which perspective persistence occurs, the analysis contributes to a more fine-grained account of the relation between the perspectival interpretation and grammatical form of perspective constructions in different languages.

Zemp also discusses evidential distinctions, in Tibetic and neighbouring Himalayan languages, and explores their respective diachronic origins. Both sets of languages show evidential systems in which markers indicating direct observation contrast with markers indicating participatory evidence, with the latter markers having been excluded from traditional accounts of evidentiality (e.g. Willet 1988; Aikhenvald 2004). Zemp builds a case for treating these two sets of markers as members of the same system, i.e. evidentiality, and shows that the languages discussed all contrast a 'weak' category – indicating direct access to the effect or resultant state of an event only – with a 'strong' category – signalling direct access to the entire causal chain of situations making up the event (DeLancey 1986: 211). A second interesting feature of these languages is that this choice of the strong versus weak marker always reflects the perspective of the informant (cf. Bickel 2008), viz. the speaker in statements, the addressee in questions, and the reported speaker in reported speech clauses, as had been observed for Lhasa Tibetan by DeLancey (1990).

In Zemp's account of the origin of the evidential distinctions in Himalayan languages that have been in close contact with Tibetic languages, the category of reported speech turns out to be the locus of change. Significantly, constructions of reported speech throughout Tibetica mixing of the perspectives of reported and current speaker: in the reported clause evidential marking on the predicate reflects the reported speaker's perspective, while the use of personal pronouns reflects that of the current speaker. It is hybrid constructions like these that form the locus of the 'evidentialization' of verbal distinctions found in neighbouring Himalayan languages. In such hybrid constructions, the relation between form and function is disrupted as well: the perspective interpretation is not fully codified by the elements involved because of the mixing referred to above, a case we label *irregular perspective shift* (Gentens et al. 2019). By exploring these diachronic and comparative dimensions of irregular perspective marking, Zemp's paper develops an innovative account of how and when interpretation clashes in perspective expressions arise and new perspective meanings conventionalize.

Konnerth similarly highlights the diachronic importance of reported speech constructions, which in Monsang (Trans-Himalayan, Sino-Tibetan; north-east India) – and other languages as well – led to expressions of volition or intention in the present language system. The construction focused on is the reported intentionality construction, which finds its origin in a specific configuration of directly reported speech/thought, for example 's/he says, <I will go>' leading to 's/he wants to go'. Crucially the quoted clause has a first person subject and future time reference, indexing the perspective of the volitional agent, but the construction idiomatically translates into a statement about this volitional agent from the perspective of the current speaker. That is, while the grammatical construction signals a shift to the reported speaker's content and speech context, there is no deictic shift to an original utterance setting in interpretation: the construction displays perspective persistence. The author also hypothesizes that the present-day desiderative construction in the language, which currently does not show perspective persistence, reconstructs back to a reported intentionality construction analogous to the one discussed above but with different structural elements. Monsang has thus recycled the mechanism of perspective persistence to cater for more fine-grained distinctions in the semantic realm of volition and intention.

Nikitina concentrates on reported speech as well, but, like Konnerth addresses constructions marked as reported speech that do not receive a reported speech interpretation. She specifically addresses logophoric marking, i.e. dedicated pronouns (or person inflection) signalling co-referentiality between the subject of the matrix clause and the (alleged) speaker of the reported utterance. Comparing data from Wan (Mande, Côte d'Ivoire) and Ewe (Atlantic-Congo, Ghana and Togo), the author shows that logophoric systems do not function alike across languages; language-specific constraints pertain to the use and interpretation of personal pronouns in reported speech contexts. The detailed analyses of examples bear out the fluid nature of logophoricity in spoken language, with ample attention paid to specific rhetorical effects obtained from the use of personal and/or logophoric pronouns (and potential co-referentiality between them). In addition, logophoric pronouns are also found in non-quotational speech contexts, yielding, amongst others, expressions of intention, – analogous to the reported intentionality construction in Konnerth's paper – purpose, and expressions of prospective aspect. These non-quotational uses display perspective persistence: reported speech constructions typically suggest a shift away from the current speaker towards the reported speaker, but the perspective remains with the current speaker instead.

By examining instances of perspective persistence and irregular perspective shift, the papers in this issue offer innovative analyses of perspective constructions, with respect to the range of data brought to bear on the phenomenon as well as the types of constructions and categories discussed. They bring up new questions and hold several implications for the study of perspectival grammar more widely.

First of all, the interpretation of irregular perspective shift and perspective persistence raises questions about the status of conventional meaning in perspective constructions. If a conceptualiser is typically interpreted in one way but interpreted differently in certain contexts, what are the semantic conventions involved? When is a perspective meaning truly conventionalized, and how many conventional perspective meanings can a construction have?

Many of the examples introduced here can be classified into a restricted number of types, which hints at a degree of conventionalisation and 'regularity' within the form-meaning mismatches observed. Reported intentionality as introduced by Konnerth (this issue) appears to have rather consistent properties cross-linguistically, displaying future tense and first person subjects in the reported clause both in Monsang and elsewhere (see the references in the article). Similarly, Zemp (this issue) discusses the grammatical context of reported speech in Tibetic and neighbouring Himalayan languages, which shows a mixing of the perspectives of the current and represented speaker, as has been observed in other languages as well (see the references in the article). The first person agent constructions Van linden (this issue) discusses constitute a consistent and predictable type of environment in which perspective persistence in the evidential domain occurs, yielding the interpretation of non-volitionality also in languages other than Harakmbut (see the references in the article).

Another avenue of research is opened up by Nikitina (this issue), who introduces the notion of narrative roles in her discussion of logophoricity. Nikitina points out that pronominal elements in perspective constructions do not only carry a referential function (*who* participates in the event or takes a perspective) but may also signal *how* the conceptualiser participates in the perspective construction. The difference between reported speech and reported intentionality (Konnerth, this issue) may also be explained along these lines: a reported *speaker* is a conventional role associated with the subject participant in a reported speech construction, but in reported intentionality this changes to a role we could label 'intention holder'. The notion of conceptualiser roles is also essential to Van linden's (this issue) discussion of the use of indirect evidential marking with first-person agents to signal involuntary action: the clash in interpretation does not relate to the referential identity of the conceptualiser, but rather to the role this conceptualizer has within the event in the proposition and the epistemic authority conventionally derived from this role.

In observing a remarkable degree of 'regularity' within the form-meaning mismatches studied and in raising further issues, we hope that this issue may spark a renewed interest in Jakobsonian back-to-basics study of perspective constructions.

References

Benveniste, Emile. 1966. Problèmes de Linguistique Générale. 258–266. Paris: Gallimard.

Dancygier, Barbara, Wei-lun Lu & Arie Verhagen (eds.). 2016. *Viewpoint and the Fabric of Meaning: Form and Use of Viewpoint Tools across Languages and Modalities*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Dancygier, Barbara & Eve Sweetser (eds.). 2012. *Viewpoint in language: a multimodal perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeLancey, Scott. 1986. Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan. In Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, 203–213. Norwood (NJ): Ablex.

DeLancey, Scott. Ergativity and the cognitive model of event structure in Lhasa Tibetan. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1(3). 289–321.

Evans, Nicholas, Henrik Bergqvist & Lila San Roque. 2018. The grammar of engagement I: framework and initial exemplification. *Language and Cognition* 110–140. doi:10.1017/langcog.2017.21.

Gentens, Caroline, Maria Sol Sansiñena, Stef Spronck & Van linden An. 2019. Introduction to Irregular Perspective Shifts and Perspective Persistence, Discourse-Oriented and Theoretical Approaches. *Pragmatics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen. 2004. *An introduction to functional grammar*. 3rd edition. London/New York: Arnold.

Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.

Heritage, John & Geoffrey Raymond. 2005. The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Assessment Sequences. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68(1). 15–38.

Jakobson, Roman. 1957. *Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb*. Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Jespersen, Otto. 1922. *Language: Its Nature Development And Origin*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.