

Maria Josep Jarque and Esther Pascual

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

Abstract: This chapter is based on in-depth qualitative analysis of original elicited and naturalistic narratives from 20 native signers of Catalan Sign Language. Signed languages are especially interesting for the study of mixed viewpoints, since their grammar is characterized by viewpoint shift (Herrmann and Steinback 2012). They also lend themselves particularly well for the study of conversational constructions, such as direct discourse, as they are typically used in situated intersubjective interaction.

We focus on the use of role shift to set up non-genuine quotes in Catalan Sign Language narratives. In particular, we examine multifunctional or polysemic direct discourse, which is characterized by (mixed) viewpoints. In signed languages direct discourse may serve to represent a referent's utterances, actions, thoughts, emotions, attitudes and source of information. We show that despite its complexity, constructed action, which involves multiple perspectives, is a central component of Catalan Sign Language narratives. In fact, although alternative descriptive constructions do exist, native signers consider constructed action as the most unmarked (cf. Quinto-Pozos 2007). We further propose that the structure of mixed viewpoints in narratives – and in grammar – mimics the mode in which language is mostly used, namely intersubjective conversation, characterized by constant perspective shifting.

1 Introduction

This chapter stems from the assumption that thought, grammar and discourse are not only embodied, as generally assumed in cognitive linguistics (Wilcox and Xavier 2013, *inter alia*), but also inherently intersubjective (Voloshinov [1929] 1986; Vygotsky [1934] 1962; Verhagen 2005; Zlatev et al. 2008), and hence *viewpointed* in nature (Dancygier and Sweetser 2012). More specifically, the assumption is that the structure of narratives as well as language's pragmatic functions and grammatical meaning are intimately related to and partly modelled by face-to-face interaction (Voloshinov 1929; Verhagen 2005; Zlatev et al. 2008; Pascual 2006, 2014; Pascual and Sandler forthcoming). The central question addressed

is: how is the basic interactional pattern of turn-taking reflected in grammatical structure? And, since turn-taking involves the alternation of viewpoints, how is viewpoint shift and the resulting mixing of viewpoints reflected in grammatical and discursive structures used in narratives?

The focus is on the form and function of conversational structures such as the use of direct discourse, which involves viewpoint shift and thus a mixture of viewpoints. Consider for instance this extract from a 1997 interview in Dutch with the then crown prince of the Netherlands. There, the future king illustrates his empathic capacities with a story on his visit to the victims of a crashed building:¹

- (1) *Met name na het bezoeken aan, aan het flat zelf, het samenkomen in de sporthal, waar de meest vre-se-lijke ellende door je heen gaan. Maar gewoon, het kunnen geven van een **gevoel** van er wordt aan **ons** gedacht, Nederland leeft met **ons** mee.*

‘Especially after visiting the- the apartment building itself, getting together in the sports hall, where the most ter-ri-ble things go through your_i head. But just being able to give this feeling of *we_j’re being thought of*, *The Netherlands is with us_i*.’

In (1), the narrator characterizes the kind of feeling he gave the victims he visited through an embedded enunciation ascribed to the experiencer of such a feeling. This involves the presentation of two mixed viewpoints in one and the same grammatical phrase. The embedded utterance “*we’re being thought of, the Netherlands is with us*” is produced from the victim’s perspective and thus the first person plural refers to them rather than to the utterer in the here-and-now. At the same time, this characterizing ‘utterance’ is produced from the narrator’s perspective, as this is his interpretation and presentation of an emotional state of his interlocutors. Note, too, that the string in italics is not a genuine utterance factually produced by the victims in unison, but rather an enactment or non-genuine ‘demonstration’ (Clark and Gerrig 1990). It is not only an instance of constructed choral speech (Tannen 1986), but also of *fictive interaction* (Pascual 2006, 2014). Its ontological state is between reality and fiction and it characterizes a non-conversational referent in conversational terms, as a kind of verbal exchange between the agents involved.

We suggest that all instances of direct discourse involve the fusion of different viewpoints, regardless of whether they present factual or fictive speech or writing. Such intersubjective structures occur in a great number of unrelated lan-

¹ Link at: <http://nos.nl/koningshuis/video/189536-prins-willemalexander-over-de-troonswisseling-1997.html> (min. 4:22, 4:37–4:57). All italics, bold and underlinings in the examples are ours.

guages (Pascual 2006, 2014; Pascual and Sandler forthcoming). In fact, a vast cross-linguistic study of direct speech for non-quotations across a large number of spoken languages from different families found no single language without this construction (Pascual 2014: ch. 4). There are, however, important differences in their degree of grammaticalization. Non-quotational direct speech constructions, which more often than not involve mixed viewpoints, all seem to be the more engrained in the grammar of a language, the more their speakers rely exclusively or mostly on oral communication among them. In fact, the only languages lacking an indirect speech construction tend to be languages without or with a limited writing system (Pascual 2014: ch. 4). When a language has both direct and indirect speech, direct speech is also used more frequently in spontaneous situated interaction as opposed to monologic writing (Tannen 1982, 1986, *inter alia*). The role of speech, voice and turn-taking naturally becomes less prominent in a written society, and consequently the role of conversation also becomes less exclusive as a locus of language change (see Pascual 2014: ch. 4 for references).

Mixed viewpoints in non-quotational direct speech appear fully grammaticalized in many unrelated spoken languages of the world with no or a poorly used writing system. These may serve to express: mental states (thoughts or the result of thoughts), emotions, desires, intentions, attempts, states of affairs, causation, reason, purpose and even future tense (Pascual 2014: ch. 4; ; Spronck forthcoming; van der Voort forthcoming).

The present chapter builds up on these studies to examine non-quotational direct discourse in signed languages. Languages in the visual-gestural modality are particularly interesting for our purposes since they have viewpoint or role shift as a critical feature of their grammar and discourse structure. To quote Herrmann and Steinback (2012: 222): “Only in sign languages has role shift become a genuine part of the grammatical system, because the visual-manual modality, unlike the oral-auditory modality, offers the unique property of grammaticalizing manual and non-manual gestures”. Sign languages are further interesting to our goal because they show the characteristics of oral and written languages. They are used (mainly) in face-to-face interaction by (mainly) literate individuals.

Our hypothesis is that the in-between position of signed languages on the orality continuum also places them in an in-between position in the grammaticalization of interactional structures continuum. In other words, we believe that signed languages will show a use of non-quotational direct discourse that is more grammaticalized than their counterpart constructions in spoken languages with established writing, but less grammaticalized than those in spoken languages with limited or no writing.

The non-quotational use of construed action or dialogue in signed languages is further particularly interesting for the study of mixed viewpoints,

since, according to some authors, it is characterized by a combination of direct and indirect speech features (Herrmann and Steinback 2007; Quer 2011, among others).² As Herrman and Pfau (2012: 213) state, “role shift seems to be part of a continuum between indirect and direct speech, most probably closer to direct speech”. Thus, in signed languages the construction under discussion per definition involves mixed viewpoints of the individual ‘reporting’ or being ‘reported’ and the ‘reported’ issuer.

2 Direct discourse in signed languages: Constructed action

In the sign language literature the visual-gestural direct discourse construction used to (re)present mixed viewpoints has been identified as *role shift*, *reference shift* or *role switching* (Lillo-Martin 2012). From a cognitive/functional perspective, the term *constructed action* is preferred, since it involves an enactment or *demonstration* (Clark and Gerrig 1990) that does not have to equate what actually happened, as described for spoken languages by Tannen (1986) and others.

Constructed action has been defined as “the reporting (usually via a demonstration) of another’s actions” (Quinto-Pozos 2007: 1288). Constructed action is a grammatical and discourse strategy used widely in signed languages, in which the signer uses his/her face, head, body, hands and/or other non-manual cues to represent a referent’s actions, utterances, thoughts, feelings and/or attitudes (Metzger 1995; Liddell and Metzger 1998; Wilcox and Xavier 2013 for ASL; McClearly and Viotti 2010 for Brazilian Sign Language – LIBRAS; Ferrara and Johnston 2014 for Australian Sign Language – AUSLAN; Cormier et al. 2013 and Smith and Cormier 2014 for British Sign Language – BSL).

Metzger (1995) distinguishes between *constructed action* (a signer’s representation of a referent’s actual or perceived actions) and *constructed dialogue* in the sense of Tannen (1986), that is, a language user’s (re)presentation of a referent’s words. We will regard *constructed action* as the overarching phenomenon and *constructed discourse* as a subtype or a specific function of it. As will become apparent in the next pages, in LSC narratives constructed action involving mixed viewpoints is used to present: referent(s) events (4.1), and discourse (4.2) as well

² Such constructions with characteristics of both direct and indirect speech are also found in languages with a written code used in a predominantly oral community, such as ancient Greek and some African languages (see Pascual 2014 for references).

as cognitive states, such as mental (5.1), emotional and attitudinal states (5.2), as well as source of information (5.3).

3 Methodology

This chapter is based on a qualitative analysis of our own corpus of narratives in Catalan Sign Language (*Llengua de signes catalana*, henceforth LSC). A poorly studied language, LSC is used by the signing deaf and deaf-blind community of Catalonia, in North-East Spain.

The data for this chapter were collected from 10 deaf adult signers in Barcelona. All are Catalan-born, between 40 and 68 years of age, and with LSC as their most frequently used language. They are all native or early signers, that is, they either come from a family in which LSC has been the native language for two to three generations, or they come from a hearing family, but acquired LSC before their sixth birthday. Almost all informants are trained as LSC instructors and most of them actually work as LSC instructors. All of them are in regular contact with written language (in Catalan or mostly in Spanish). Their written and especially reading competence is rather high.

Our Catalan Sign Language corpus includes narrative texts and narrative fragments from expository and argumentative texts. The data combine naturalistic discourse and elicited data. The naturalistic data come from personal video blogs, conversations between friends, and specially a LSC news website, including short news, documentaries and tales. The elicited data are narratives using different kinds of elicitation stimuli: (i) Mayer's (1968) *The Frog Story*; (ii) on one occasion: the short wordless movie *The Pear Story* (Chafe 1980), which is another story successfully used in a variety of studies; and (iii) five so-called made-up narratives of personal experience, considered the optimal technique to elicit the archetypical narrative (Labov 1984).

4 Direct discourse in Catalan Sign Language


4.1 Constructed action for reporting events in LSC

In Catalan Sign Language the expression of constructed action occurs through manual and non-manual markers (i.e. the upper part of the body, the head and the face). Signed constructed action may refer to the different characters in a nar-

rative, thus showing simultaneous mixed viewpoints. Note for instance example (2). This corresponds to the episode of *The Frog Story* narrative when the narrator describes how the boy character reacts when realizing that what he thought was a tree is actually a deer, now running and approaching the cliff (Jarque 2011: 88).

(2) *The Frog Story: The running deer*³

< _{CA: boy} DC: “the boy is on the deer while tree branches passing through” >
TILL DC: “plain landscape” DC: “there is a cliff” < _{CA: boy} DC: “the boy is scared since the deer’s body is approaching to the cliff” DC: “the boy calms down when the deer’s body stops just before the cliff” >

					
Fig.1a		Fig.1b		Fig.1c	
Fig.1d		Fig.1e		Fig.1f	
non-manual	<i>boy</i>	<i>boy > narrator</i>			<i>boy character > narrator</i>
	Boy’s head and torso looking back	neutral	neutral	neutral	The boy is scared seeing how they are approaching to the cliff.
					The scared boy calms down when the deer stops just before the cliff.
manual	<i>tree branches</i>	<i>narrator</i>			<i>Deer</i>
	DC: <tree branches passing through>	TILL	DC: plain landscape	DC: CLIFF	DC deer’s body approaching to the cliff. DC deer’s body stopping before the cliff.

³ The glosses appear in two different rows in order to show the simultaneous or consecutive combination of mixed viewpoints. We first specify the narrator or character(s) perspective (the grey shadow), followed by the action demonstrated. In all LSC examples, lexical and grammatical signs are glossed in upper case. Subscripts indicate points in the signing space. The signs “<>” mark the scope of the report or demonstration. “CA:xx” stands for *constructed action* where xx identifies the agent. “DC” stands for depicting construction in the sense of Liddell (2003) or *polycomponential verb* (Slobin et al. 2003), and it refers to the spatial verb type in other typologies. The meaning of the DC is described between inverted commas. Gestures are described in lower case.

Lit.: ‘The boy was on the deer, looked back with his head and torso, as they were moving (seeing tree branches passed through) and became scared when he saw they were approaching the cliff.’

‘The boy was sitting on the deer, looked back while the deer was running forward and became scared when seeing they were approaching the cliff.’

In Fig. (1a) the narrator first assumes the boy’s viewpoint, acting as a so-called ‘surrogate’ of the boy’s (Liddell 2003) by turning his torso, head and face, as the boy does in the story. At the same time, his hands produce a depicting construction with a spatial verb representing the static branches of the trees around, which seem to move when the boy on the deer moves forward. One of the main mechanisms signers use to relay information about referents in narratives is verbal morphology.⁴ LSC verbs include: (i) simple, (ii) deictic, and (iii) spatial verbs (Morales-López et al. 2005). Whereas all types of verbs may include morphemes expressing aspect⁵ and adverbial information regarding the different states of things, the three types differ in the perspective that may be adopted, as well as in the morphological expression of semantic notions such as agent, patient, theme, instrument, locative, etc. Simple verbs convey basically lexical information, whereas deictic verbs further include agent and/or patient/goal information, activating—through a change in the handshape orientation and/or movement direction – indexing meaning (always personal deixis, but in some contexts also social and spatial deixis) (Morales-López et al. 2005). In using constructed action with a deictic verb, the signer will adopt the *protagonist’s perspective* (Slobin et al. 2003), also called *character perspective* (Özyürek and Perniss 2011), and the verbal predicates will show first person morphology (as agent or patient), resulting in a demonstration or enactment, and not third person morphology, as expected in a descriptive discourse.

Finally, spatial verbs in Morales-López et al. (2005) correspond to *policomponential verbs* (Slobin et al. 2003) or *depicting predicates* (Liddell 2003). Using this type of verbs, signers may select either the narrator’s or the *protagonist perspective* (Slobin et al. 2003), also called *character perspective* (Özyürek and Perniss 2011), according to the type of depicting construction: entity (as in Figure 1a)

⁴ Contrary to the common assumption in the signed language literature, we will not speak of verbal inflection, since, from a typological perspective, it does not follow the established criteria (see Bybee 1985; Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca, 1987, among others). The arguments are: (i) these agent and patient morphemes are not present across all verbs in LSC; (ii) different types of morphemes occur according to the type of verbs, and (iii) the morphemes do not seem to be obligatory.

⁵ See Jarque (forthcoming) for references and the expression of aspect in LSC.

or handling construction (as the manual predicate in Figure 1e or 1f). In (2), the signer produces a depicting construction adopting a *character scale*, that is, the signer uses the space surrounding him as if he was acting or interacting with people or objects in a real-world scale (see Aarons and Morgan 2003 for South African Sign Language; Özyürek and Perniss 2011 for German Sign Language and Turkish Sign Language; and Smith and Cormier 2014 for British Sign Language).

Subsequently, the signer makes eye contact with the addressee, as he produces the lexical sign 'STILL', as shown in Figures (1b) to (1d), indicating that he is taking the narrator's viewpoint. This is followed by an entity construction, as he represents the landscape (i.e. the cliff). In (1e) there is a break of eye gaze, which shows that the narrator enacts the referent once more. The signer again uses his own facial expression to represent the referent's face (in this case, the boy), who is scared because of the cliff's proximity. The signer's head and torso represent the boy's head and torso movements, as well as his posture. At the same time, as shown in (1e), his hands produce a depicting construction: the right hand adopts an entity handshape that corresponds to a four-leg animal (i.e. the deer), whereas the left hand represents a plain entity (i.e. the ground). The signer simultaneously conveys two spatial scales and, thus, two mixed viewpoints: (i) the deer's running action (with manual articulators) from a *narrator's*, and (ii) the boy (with face, head and torso) from a *protagonist's perspective*. Whereas both hands produce a given type of linguistic material, the non-manual articulators produce the gestural part, representing the constructing action as such, thereby creating a composite utterance (Enfield 2009; Ferrara and Johnson 2014).


4.2 Constructed discourse in LSC

As is true for other signed languages (Lillo-Martin 2012; Herrman and Steinback 2012), the formal marking of constructed discourse in LSC may include a constellation of non-manual markers co-articulated with the (re)presented utterance (cf. Quer 2011):

- i. Eye gaze change towards the locus of the addressee of the quoted utterance, and thus temporal interruption of eye contact with the actual interlocutor.
- ii. Body leaning over, including a sideward movement of the upper part of the body towards the locus of the quoted signer and a midsagittal body shift towards the locus of the addressee of the reported utterance.
- iii. Change of head position towards the locus of the addressee of the reported utterance.
- iv. Facial and bodily expression associated with the quoted issuer conveying affective and attitudinal components.

These non-manual markers are produced more prominently by non-native signers (see Costello et al. 2008 for Spanish Sign Language). Moreover, in conjunction with prosodic pauses, they constitute the unmarked devices for expressing embedding constructing reports in LSC, rather than subjunctions or a marker as BE+LIKE, as described for American Sign Language (Ferrara and Bell 1995). It should be noted, however, that not all these markers are mandatory. Eye gaze change and temporal interruption of eye contact with the actual interlocutor constitute the most frequent kinds of marking. Consider the example in (3). This piece of dialogue describes an anecdote in which a man goes to visit a friend in a working-class neighbourhood, notorious for its many robberies. The signer narrates how the visitor’s motorcycle is stolen in front of his friend’s apartment.

- (3) *The stolen motorcycle story*
a. [DEAF [OF LIVE INDEX:_{neighbourhood}]-relative]-topic KNOW-ASP.PERF SEE-ASP.
HAB INDEX:_{neighbourhood}

						
non-manual	Narrator			Narrator		
	[]-top		
Manual	narrator			Narrator		
	DEAF	OF	LIVE	IX-THERE	KNOW-ASP. PERFECTIVE	SEE-ASP. HABITUAL IX-THERE

Lit.: ‘The deaf man (that) lives there (in that neighbourhood) knew (that the motorbike could get stolen), since he had often seen (that happen) there (in that neighbourhood)
‘The deaf man living there (in that neighbourhood) was aware of it (the risk that the motorbike get stolen) (since) he knew that (the neighbourhood’s bad reputation).’

- b. <_{CA: deaf host} PITY 2-TELL-1, MOTORBIKE SAVE WELL >



non-manual	character: deaf host				
	facial expression of	facial expression of “obligation”	[facial expression of “counterfactual”]-top		
Manual	character: deaf host				
	< PITY	2-TELL-1	MOTORBIKE	SAVE	WELL >

Lit.: ‘...he [the deaf host] said: “*Pity. You (should) have told me and (I would have) kept the motorbike in a safe place*”.’

‘...he [the deaf host] said it was a pity and told (the other man) that he should have told him (about the motorbike) and he would have taken it somewhere safe.’

c. [DEAF]_{-topic}<_{CA:guest deaf}INNOCENT >_{pause} [DEAF OF LIVE IX-THERE].
top<_{CA:hosting deaf}WAIT >

Lit.: ‘The (other) deaf (man) answered: “*I didn’t know that!*”. (Then) the deaf who was living there said: “*Wait*”...

‘The other deaf man answered that he didn’t know that. Then the deaf living there said: “*Wait*”...’



non-manual	narrator	Deaf guest	narrator	Deaf host		
	[]-top		[]-topic]-relative		
manual	narrator	Deaf guest	narrator	Deaf host		
	DEAF	INNOCENT	DEAF	OF	LIVE	IX-THERE <WAIT >

Lit.: ‘The (other) deaf (man) answered: “*I didn’t know that!*”. (Then) the deaf who was living there said: “*Wait*”...

‘The other deaf man answered that he didn’t know that. Then the deaf living there said: “*Wait*”...’

The markers of viewpoint shift in (3) are not very prominent. Moreover, several mechanisms frame the constructed action, marking its beginning and end (see Cornier et al. 2013 for British Sign Language). Along the narratives, we observe different framing strategies: contiguous reference, non-contiguous reference and subject omission. Contiguous reference (a noun phrase referring to the character portrayed by the constructed action followed by the constructed action) was preferred with an introduction function, but also for reintroduction (switch reference). Note examples (3a) and (3c), where a NP is followed by a relative clause for viewpoint switch. In a switch reference context, a pattern of overt subject expression is generally preferred in LSC, with body leaning over, change of head position/orientation, and/or other non-manual markers, as well as break of eye gaze, and especially when there is only a break of eye gaze. Moreover, subject omission was favoured when the subject was co-referential with the subject of the preceding clause, or shift reference context with body leaning over, change of head position/orientation, and/or other non-manual markers, as well as break of eye gaze.

Apart from serving to set up reports of actions and utterances, constructed action may also be used in LSC narratives as an unmarked means of presenting fictive discourse ascribed to character(s).

5 Fictive discourse in LSC

In Catalan Sign Language, a non-genuine action or fictive discourse constitutes an unmarked linguistic construction with discourse and grammatical functions, such as the expression of thoughts and intentions (5.1.), emotional states and attitudes (5.2.), and source of information (5.3.).

5.1 Fictive discourse for mental states

Just as is the case for the pragmatics of a large number of spoken languages with established writing (so-called ‘chirographic languages’), and the grammar of various spoken languages with no or restricted writing (so-called ‘oral languages’),

direct discourse in LSC may also serve to present thoughts and intentions. Consider example (4) from a tale about an old lady having troubles with a fly:

(4) *The spider tale*⁶

[OLD PERSON FEMALE_i]_{-topic} <_{CA:old woman} LOOK.FOR.A.SOLUTION-DURATIVE.ASPECT gesture: “she thinks for a while” [THINK]_{facial.expression.of. ‘aha!’.moment} [INDEX:_{spider} SPIDER]_{-topic} SPIDER-GO EAT(fly)...>

Lit.: ‘The old woman goes: “*What can I do?*” (She goes like) thinking for a while (and then says): “*I got it. If the spider eats (the fly then)...*”’.

‘The old lady wondered what to do. She thought for a while and then got an idea: If the spider ate the fly then...’.

In (4), the signer first establishes the referent with a topicalized nominal phrase, and then produces the constructed action that includes both thought representation (i.e. enacting the sign cluster ‘LOOK.FOR.A.SOLUTION’) and gestural enactment (the external attitude that accompanies the thinking process). This is followed by a cognitive predicate functioning as a framing device (i.e. the enacted ‘THINK’) introducing the reported thought (lit. ‘*I got it. If the spider ate (the fly then)...*’).

Other cognitive predicates that frame constructed action for thoughts and intentions are THINK, BELIEVE, WORRY, etc. This is also the case of zero manual marking, as in (5) below. This piece of LSC direct discourse, from the beginning of the deer episode of *The Frog Story*, illustrates the expression of intentions.

(5) *The frog story: The huge rock*

ROCK DC: “There was a huge rock” DC: “There were branches all around the rock”

[SEE INDEX-there THERE.BE FROG]_{raised.eyebrows}

⁶ For reasons of anonymity, we did not include the pictures in this example.



non-manual	Narrator		
	neutral	facial expression of massive quantity	facial expression of massive quantity
manual	narrator	Narrator	narrator
	ROCK	DC huge rock	DC branches all around the rock



non-manual	boy character			
	facial expression of intention		facial expression of possibility	
manual	boy character			
	SEE	IX-there	THERE.BE	FROG

Lit.: ‘There was a huge rock, taller than the boy, surrounded by branches. The boy said to himself: “*Let’s see if the frog is there*”.’

‘There was a huge rock, taller than the boy, surrounded by branches. The boy decided to go see if the frog was there.’


After the token of the manual depicting construction describing the branches and the rocks, the string in direct discourse (i.e. “<SEE IX-there THERE.BE FROG>”) represents neither reported action or dialogue nor actual dialogue. Instead, it presents the thoughts of the boy in the story, as constructed by the signer. The boy is not really talking to himself. Rather, the signer expresses the boy’s intention out loud for the sake of the signer’s interlocutor, temporarily turned in effect into the fictive bystander of the boy’s fictive enunciation. The interplay of mixed

viewpoints hence includes both the character (the boy) and the narrator (the female signer).

5.2 Fictive discourse for emotional and attitudinal states

The use of a non-genuine piece of discourse for presenting emotions and attitudes is very common in a wide range of spoken as well as signed languages (Pascual 2014: ch. 4). Consider the LSC example in (6).

- (6) *The Frog Story: The frog family*
<_{CA:boy} DC: “the boy and the dog are looking at the frog family”>
FEEL.EMOTION <_{CA:boy} FEEL.EMOTION DC: the boy and the dog are looking
at the frog family > [FROG]_{raised.eyebrows} <_{CA:frog} (frog)-LOOK.AT-(boy.and.
frog)>

						
<div>Fig. 7a.</div> <div>Fig. 7b</div> <div>Fig. 7c</div> <div>Fig. 7d</div> <div>Fig. 7e</div> <div>Fig. 7f</div>						
<div>boy</div> <div>narrator</div> <div>narrator>boy</div> <div>boy</div> <div>narrator</div> <div>frog</div>						
non-manual	The boy and the dog are looking at the frog family with a happy expression.					facial expression of happiness
	facial expression of happiness					facial expression of intentions
manual	boy and dog					
	narrator	Narrator	boy and dog	boy		
	DC: two entities with eyes (the boy and the dog) are looking at the frog family			DC: the boy and the dog are looking at the frog family	(frog)-LOOK. AT-(boy.and. frog)	
	FEEL.EMOTION			FROG		

Lit.: ‘The boy and the dog were looking [at the frog family]. “*Exciting, happiness!*”, the boy thought. The boy and the dog were looking [at the frog family]. The frog looked at the boy...’

‘The boy, looking at the frog family, got really excited and happy.’

In (6) the signer narrates how the boy and the frog in *The Frog Story* find the family of the lost frog. She does so by a demonstration. In this fragment she uses all of the non-manual markers available in LSC, mentioned in 4.1 and 4.2, for coding the mixed viewpoints of both herself as narrator and the boy as discourse character.

5.3 Fictive discourse for source of information

The last function of constructed action we will address involves the use of direct discourse from different viewpoints as a discourse strategy to present information from different sources (see Shaffer 2012 for a similar use in American Sign Language).

The semantic domain regarding the coding of source of information is referred to as *evidentiality*. It may be fully grammaticalized as an inflectional category in some spoken languages (Aikhenvald 2004), or be less grammaticalized and adopt a lexical, periphrastic and syntactic expression in other languages (Bermúdez 2005). The evidential function is relevant in narratives since it constitutes a deictic phenomenon of non-discrete nature. It expresses the speaker’s point of view and is based on both the context of utterance and the speaker’s relationship with the interlocutor and the conceptualized scene (Bermúdez 2005), including the participants and/or the characters in the narrative. Evidentiality is particularly relevant for the characterization of mixed viewpoints, since it allows the utterer to guide the interlocutor to the pragmatic interpretation of the state of affairs presented, based on the qualification of its source.

Consider example (7), from a news webpage addressed to the Catalan signing community, on a demonstration against social exclusion of the deaf. The narrator presents the contradictory report on the number of attendees given by the organizers and the police through a fictive dialogue between the two groups, a mixed viewpoint discourse structure, each speaking in unison.

(7) *The success of unity*⁷

- a. [ORGANIZATION OF DEAF.FEDERATIONENTITY]_{i+topic} <_{CA:Deaf}
 Federation₁^{contralateral}-LOOK-INDEX_{:demonstration}SAY_i COUNT SAY_i ROUGHLY
 2-THOUSAND PERSON-PLU PARTICIPATE-AT.1 DEMONSTRATION
 INDEX>

Lit.: ‘The Catalan Federation for the Deaf looked at the demonstration and said:
 “We count (and) two thousand people participated at our demonstration”.’

- b. [BUT]_{advers.} [OF POLICE^TRAFFIC INDEX_{:demonstration_z} POLICE INDEX_j]
{j-topic} 1{ipsil}-LOOK-INDEX_(demonstration) SAY_j<_{CA: POLICE} [NO]_{neg} ROUGHLY
 THOUSAND 5-HUNDRED A.LITLE MORE ROUGHLY>

Lit.: ‘But, the traffic police looked at it and said: “Not really, roughly one thousand five hundred, (or maybe) a little bit more approximately”.’

‘The Catalan Federation for the Deaf estimated that two thousand people participated in the demonstration. However, the traffic police claimed one thousand five hundred, or a little bit more, approximately.’

This piece of news is construed as a narrative in which the perspective of the narrator and the two quoted characters are thoroughly interwoven. After establishing the agent entity, the signer adopts the perspective of the Federation for the Deaf, by shifting his body slightly and producing the verb ‘SEE’ from a contralateral side. The sign begins from the signer’s body and ends at the point in space that corresponds to the deaf demonstration. The body orientation shift thus encodes both subject and object (Morales et al. 2005). This spatial orientation of the verb provides information about the signer taking one of the character’s voices. In indirect discourse, the verb would have to include an intermediate locus to mark the third person reference (i.e. the Federation for the Deaf).

This example illustrates possible variations in the use of the non-manual markers in LSC in order to encode role shift via constructed action. The signer changes his position and bodyshift into the perspective of the two ‘reported’ entities (i.e. the Deaf Federation and the traffic police), by adjusting his body and head position as well as his eye gaze and facial expression. His eye gaze changes towards the locus of the demonstration rather than towards the locus of the addressee of the quoted utterance, as one may expect. After assuming the perspective of the Deaf Federation (7a), the signer assumes the perspective of the

⁷ For anonymity reasons, we did not include the pictures in this example.

traffic police (7b). He does so not only by giving them voice, but also by presenting them as directly confronting the Deaf Federation in a discussion that never took place. In (7), an approximate number of attendees is presented through a fictive argument between two groups, each giving their estimation ‘as one voice’ that contradicts the other. By doing so, the signer manages to present both a piece of information and the source where this information comes from. The fictive dialogue set up thus serves an evidential function.

Critically, this is not a rhetorical device, like the presentation of a contemporary philosopher as debating with the long-deceased Kant in order to teach philosophy students (Fauconnier and Turner 2002). Quite differently, in LSC this is an entirely unmarked means of presenting information. The narrator indicates the source of information upon which his statement is based (see also Chafe and Nichols 1986; Aikhenvald 2004). By doing so, through conversational implicature, the news reader manages to present the degree of commitment in the information reported to the interlocutor (i.e. the viewer of the news), thereby giving it epistemic value.

6 Discussion and conclusions

In this chapter we showed that Catalan Sign Language signers use a schematic linguistic unit called *constructed action* (sometimes in combination with other linguistic devices, such as depicting constructions or framing cognitive predicates), by setting up multiple perspectives within a narrative. Signers enact a character’s actions and discourse – both a factual previous one and an entirely created one – by using non-manual articulators as well as body shifts in space, indicating viewpoint shift.

Instances of constructed action in LSC are *composite utterances* (Enfield 2009), combining different manual and non-manual components (linguistic and gestural ones). Although conventionalized and entrenched to a degree, some elements of their form and meaning are dependent on specific instances of use, as observed by Ferrara and Johnson (2014) for Australian Sign Language. They seem to be in-between purely pragmatic and obligatory grammatical structures. Since many constructions in Catalan Sign Language – and in signed languages in general, for that matter – are still in a conventionalization and entrenchment process, most signed language users being non-native signers, and since the transmission process is horizontal and discontinuous, we consider it more accurate to speak of unmarked rather than a (totally) grammaticalized viewpoint shift.

Despite its complexity, constructed action is a central component of LSC narratives and grammatical structure. Its effective use requires a mastery of non-manual facial features, verb morphology, pronoun reference, use of space, as well as the understanding that these mixed viewpoints can serve to express a wide range of meanings or functions (characters' events, discourse reports, expression of emotional and attitude states, as well as thoughts and intentions, and evidentiality). Signers are able to simultaneously express multiple physical and conceptual viewpoints in unique ways, since human bodies have relatively independent articulators, and signers may use space in complex ways (Janzen 2012).

Although alternative descriptive constructions for these same functions do exist and are used, LSC native and early signers consider those involving constructed action as more unmarked, necessary and genuine ones, in the line reported by Quinto-Pozos (2007) for American Sign Language. Based on the first author's notes from participant observation in the Catalan Deaf community for over twenty years, as well as our informants' explanations on the structure and discourse of LSC, we suggest that signing deaf people in Catalonia show a clear preference for demonstration or enactment, rather than description in narratives when referring to characters events and discourse. This has been an important issue in discussions on LSC interpreters training programs and LSC courses as L2 for the hearing at university level as well as in college programs.

We further propose that the structure of mixed viewpoint in narrative (as well as in a language's grammar) mimics the mode in which language is mostly used, namely intersubjective conversation, characterized by constant perspective shifting. This seems to confirm our hypothesis that relates the use and grammaticalization of conversational structures, such as direct discourse, to orality. The fact that languages without or with limited use of writing share a massive use of *unmarked* interactional structures, which are also vastly – if maybe less so – present in signed languages, further raises issues on grammaticalization.

It should further be noted that this preference for enactment or demonstration presents a challenge for cognitive theories of language representation, not only for amodal theories defending a propositional nature of mental representations, but also for grounded or embodiment theories. The embodiment approach to cognition suggests that the meaning of linguistic entities (words and constructions) are tied to perceptual experience, rather than derived from relationships between abstract, amodal symbols (Barsalou 1999). We argue that this perceptual experience is grounded in intersubjective action.

Constructed action is a schematic linguistic unit, a grammatical and discourse construction that evokes sensorimotor affordances of the entity referred to. Affordances of such entities are set up for ease of identification of (sometimes) simultaneity and multiplicity of mixed viewpoints expressed in narrative. This

increases efficiency in communication, not only regarding viewpoint identification but also informativity (Özyürek and Perniss 2011), and especially concerning the emotional content required for a better comprehension.

The data discussed in this chapter show that the several specific constructions – not only characters events or direct discourse, but also for the expression of mental states and evidential meaning – activate perceptual and motor information in the form of mental imagery. Direct action and discourse in LSC involves mental images, which rely on simulations of perception and action, simulation of the interaction – on occasions focusing on smaller pieces simultaneously, as in *The Frog Story*. The signer produces a text analogue to visual perception, shaped by action, both in genuine uses (reporting events and discourse) and in fictive ones (the expression of thoughts and intentions, as well as emotional states and attitudes, and source of information), giving support to grounded theories of cognition.

Grounded theories of language comprehension and production suggest that our environment, physical experiences, situated action, the body, social interaction, and simulations in the brain's modality specific systems (perception, action and introspection) interact and ground cognitive representations (Barsalou 2008; Horchak et al. 2014). Future lines of research may consider data from signed languages in order to test the role of sensorimotor experience in language production and comprehension, since in the signed modality the symbolic and embodied representation converge in the same linguistic elements. Critically, in signed languages both symbolic and embodied representation are often presented simultaneously, usually standing for different viewpoints.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by a Vidi grant by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), awarded to Esther Pascual (276.70.019). The work in this chapter is further embedded in the research group *Grammar and diachrony* (AGAUR 2014 SGR 994) and the research project FFI2013092-P (Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness). Informed consent was received from the two signers from whom images are reproduced.

References

- Aarons, Debra & Ruth Zilla Morgan. 2003. Classifier predicates and the creation of multiple perspectives in South African Sign Language. *Sign Language Studies* 3(2). 125–156.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barsalou, Lawrence W. 1999. Perceptual symbol systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22. 577–609.
- Barsalou, Lawrence W. 2008. Grounded cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology* 59. 617–645.
- Bermúdez, Fernando. 2005. *Evidencialidad. La Codificación Lingüística del Punto de Vista*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Chafe, Wallace (ed.). 1980. *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Chafe, Wallace & Johanna Nichols (eds.). 1986. *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Clark, Herbert H. & Richard J. Gerrig. 1990. Quotation as demonstration. *Language* 66(4). 784–805.
- Cormier, Kearsy, Sandra Smith & Martine Zwets. 2013. Framing constructed action in British Sign Language narratives. *Journal of Pragmatics* 55. 119–139.
- Costello, Brendan, Javier Fernández & Alazne Landa. 2008. The non- (existent) native signer: Sign language research in a small deaf population. In Ronice M. de Quadros (ed.), *Sign languages: Spinning and unraveling the past, present and future*. Petrópolis, RJ, Brazil: Editora Arara Azul.
- Dancygier, Barbara & Lieven Vandelanotte. 2009. Judging distances: Mental spaces, distance, and viewpoint in literary discourse. In Geert Brône & Jeroen Vandaele (eds.), *Cognitive poetics: Goals, gains and gaps*, 379–382. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dancygier, Barbara & Eve Sweetser (eds.). 2012. *Viewpoint in language: A multimodal perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dudis, Paul G. 2004. Body partitioning and real-space blends. *Cognitive Linguistics* 15(2). 223–238.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Elisabeth. 1995. Point of view expressed through shifters. In Karen Emmorey & Judy S. Reilly (eds.), *Language, gesture, and space*, 133–154. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Enfield, Nick J. 2009. *The anatomy of meaning: Speech, gesture, and composite utterances*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier, Gilles & Mark Turner. 2002. *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ferrara, Kathleen & Barbara Bell. 1995. Sociolinguistic variation and discourse function of constructed dialogue introducers: The case of BE+LIKE. *American Speech* 70(3). 265–290.
- Ferrara, Lindsay & Trevor Johnston. 2014. Elaborating who's what: A study of constructed action and clause structure in Auslan (Australian Sign Language). *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 34(2). 193–215.
- Herrmann, Annika & Markus Steinbach. 2012. Quotation in sign languages: A visible context shift. In Isabelle van Alphen & Ingrid Buchstaller (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, 203–228. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Horchak, Oleksandr V., Jean-Christopher Giger, Maria Cabral & Grzegorz Pochwatko. 2014. From demonstration to theory in embodied language comprehension: A review. *Cognitive Systems Research* 29–30. 66–85.
- Janzen, Terry. 2012. Two ways of conceptualizing space: Motivating the use of static and rotating vantage point space in ASL discourse. In Barbara Dancygier & Eve Sweetser (eds.), *Viewpoint in language: A multimodal perspective*, 156–175. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jarque, Maria Josep. 2011. Lengua y gesto en la modalidad lingüística signada [Language and gesture in the signed linguistic modality]. *Anuari de Filologia. Estudis de Lingüística* 2. 71–99.
- Jarque, Maria Josep. [Forthcoming] The coding of aspectual values in periphrastic constructions in signed languages. In Mar Garachana, Sandra Montserrat & Claus D. Pusch (eds.), *From composite predicates to verbal periphrases in Romance languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Labov, William. 1984. Research methods of the project on linguistic change and variation. In John Baugh & Joel Sherzer (eds.), *Language in use: Readings in sociolinguistics*, 28–53. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Liddell, Scott K. 2003. *Grammar, gesture, and meaning in American Sign Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liddell, Scott K. & Melanie Metzger. 1998. Gesture in sign language discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30: 657–697.
- Lillo-Martin, Diane. 2012. Utterance reports and constructed action in sign and spoken languages. In Roland Pfau, Markus Steinbach & Bencie Woll (eds.), *Sign language – an international handbook*, 365–387. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.
- Mayer, Mercer. 1969. *Frog, where are you?* New York: Dial book for Young Readers.
- McClearly, Leland & Evani Viotti. 2010. Sign-gesture symbiosis in Brazilian Sign Language narrative. In Fey Parrill, Vera Tobin & Mark Turner (eds.), *Meaning, form, and body*, 181–201. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Metzger, Melanie. 1995. Constructed dialogue and constructed action in American Sign Language. In Ceil Lucas (ed.), *Sociolinguistics in deaf communities*, 255–271. Washington: Gallaudet University Press.
- Morales-López, Esperanza, Rosa Boldú-Menasanch, Jesús A. Alonso-Rodríguez, Victoria Gras-Ferrer & M. Ángeles Rodríguez-González. 2005. The verbal system of Catalan Sign Language (LSC). *Sign Language Studies* 5(4). 529–532.
- Özyürek, Asli & Pamela Perniss. 2011. Event representation in sign language: A crosslinguistic perspective. In Jürgen Bohnemeyer & E. Pederson (eds.), *Event representation in language: Encoding events at the language-cognition interface*, 84–107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Padden, Carol. 1986. Verbs and role-shifting in American Sign Language. In Carol Padden (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth National Symposium on sign language research and teaching*, 44–57. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.
- Pascual, Esther. 2006. Fictive interaction within the sentence: A communicative type of fictivity in grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(2). 245–267.
- Pascual, Esther. 2014. *Fictive interaction: The conversation frame in thought, language, and discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Quer, Josep. 2011. Reporting and quoting in signed discourse. In Elke Brendel, Jörg Meibauer & Markus Steinbach (eds.), *Understanding quotation*, 277–302. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Quinto-Pozos, David & Sarika Mehta. 2010. Register variation in mimetic gestural complements to signed language? *Journal of Pragmatics* 42. 557–584.
- Quinto-Pozos, David. 2007. Can constructed action be considered obligatory? *Lingua* 117 (7). 1285–1314.
- Shaffer, Barbara. 2012. Reported speech as an evidentiality strategy in American Sign Language. In Barbara Dancygier & Eve Sweetser (eds.), *Viewpoint in language: A multimodal perspective*, 139–155. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Slobin, Dan I., Nini Hoiting, Marlon Kuntze, Reyna Lindert, Amy Weinberg, Jennie Pyers, Michelle Anthony, Yael Biederman & Helen Thumann. 2003. A cognitive/functional perspective on the acquisition of 'Classifiers'. In Karen Emmorey (ed.), *Perspectives on classifier constructions in Sign Languages*, 271–296. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Spronck, Stef. Forthcoming. Evidential fictive interaction in Ungarinyin and Russian. In: Esther Pascual & Sergei Sandler (eds.). *The conversation frame: Forms and functions of fictive interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Smith, Sandra & Kearsy Cormier. 2014. In or out?: Spatial scale and enactment in narratives of native and nonnative signing deaf children acquiring British Sign Language. *Sign Language Studies* 14(3). 275–301.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1982. Oral and literate strategies in spoken and written language. *Language* 58(1). 1–21.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1986. Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversational and literary narratives. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *Direct and indirect speech*, 311–322. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vandelanotte, Lieven. 2009. *Speech and thought representation in English: A cognitive-functional approach*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- van der Voort, Hein. Forthcoming. Recursive inflection and grammaticalized fictive interaction in the southwestern Amazon. In: Esther Pascual & Sergei Sandler (eds.). *The conversation frame: Forms and functions of fictive interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Verhagen, Arie. 2005. *Constructions of intersubjectivity: Discourse, syntax, and cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Voloshinov, Valentin N. 1986 [1929]. *Marxism and the philosophy of language* (trans. L. Matejka and I.R. Titunik). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, Lev S. 1962 [1934]. *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wilcox, Sherman & André Nogueira Xavier. 2013. A framework for unifying spoken language, signed language, and gesture. *Revista Todas as Letras* 11. 88–110.
- Zlatev, Jordan, Timothy P. Racine, Chris Sinha & Esa Itkonen (eds.). 2008. *The shared mind: Perspectives on intersubjectivity*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.