

Some Cognitive Insights into Perspectivization in Persian Narratives

Maryam Sadat Fayyazi,¹ Alieh Korde Zaferanloo Kambuzia,² Hossein Safi Pirloojeh³

Received: 6/6/2009

Accepted: 15/3/2011

Abstract

Perspective is one of the factors involved in the diversification of schema. The viewpoint from which one looks at a scene somehow affects the process of semantic representation of that scene. Every sentence has its special schema drawn upon the scene in question, and adopting different points of view towards the same event will result in the speakers' choosing different linguistic structures to express the event. Therefore, perspective is one of the most salient structure-formation processes that has received much attention from cognitive linguists.

Cognitivists interested in linguistic impacts of perspective, following Langacker (1987), have laid their study on the assumption that the *relative status* and the *angle of vision* influence what language is used in describing certain situations. However, the question in this regard is whether or not the two parameters meet the adequacy required both for describing and for explaining different scenes linguistically. The answer seems to be that the specific perspective taken by the speaker is itself very much based on some further elements as animacy, dynamicity, size, and speaker. Present article is therefore written in order to question the problem of perspective, and the elements that are likely to bear upon its linguistic representation in Persian. Furthermore, it will also be taken into question if, according to what cognitive linguists argue for, there is such a universal cognitional framework common to all the human beings. For this purpose, a body of Persian written and spoken data, gathered from narrative dialogues and everyday talks, is to be examined inductively. Although this is an unprecedented study on some fundamental cognitive-semantic issues, the results would pretty hopefully apply in much more detailed semantic analyses of sentence perspective as well.

Keywords: Viewpoint; Profiling; Perspective; Landmark; Trajectory

1. PhD Student, Tarbiat Modares University, Iran. msfayyazi@gmail.com

2. Assistant Professor, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Iran

3. Assistant Professor, Research Institute of Humanities and Cultural Sciences

Introduction

Any specific perspective that speakers of a language do adopt, hinges quite evidently on their status relative to the scene. That might be why philosophers prefer “situatedness” or “being-in-the-world” -drawing on Heideggerian terminology (1927: 79-80)- to detect the notion of *perspective*. They believe that being-in-the-world is the essential situatedness of presence, from a holistic point of view (no matter what the point of view is). This can result in a conclusion to the effect that everyone is always present in some situation and is observing the world through a certain perspective. In other words, due to various perspectives adopted on a certain scene, accounts provided of that very same scene scarcely conform. For instance, the two following sentences are not completely synonymous, even though they both are representing one single situation:

- 1) a. The road *runs* quite steeply *down to* the valley.
- b. The road *climbs* quite steeply *from* the valley.

The important point is that such cases do not necessarily account for the physical position of speaker, for he could have simply uttered each of them while depicting a picture. For the same reason, talking over the phone, we usually say, “I will *come* over to visit you”, which is an addressee-oriented sentence.

Perspective also conditions the choice of lexical

items to some extent; the two verbs “bought” and “sold” are used to foreground respectively the buyer’s perspective in (2a), and the seller’s in (2b):

- 2) a. Emir bought a car from Miriam.
- b. Miriam sold a car to Emir.

In order to highlight the different perspectives in these seemingly equivalent sentences, the prepositional phrase “at a good price” is added to them:

- 2) á. Emir bought a car from Miriam, at a good price.
- b. Miriam sold a car to Emir, at a good price.

It is the inconsistency of perspective that lets the expression “good price” bear relatively opposite interpretations of *low price* in (2á), and *high price* in (2b).

One of the main factors that should be taken into account in studying perspective is to determine what *reference point* a speaker has adopted in describing a scene. For instance considering the following sentences (cf. David Lee, 2001:3):

- 3) a. The lamp is above the table.
- b. The table is under the lamp.

“The table” is the reference point in (3a), and the position of “the lamp” is stated *with reference to* it. David Lee (Ibid:3) uses **landmark** and **trajectory** to distinguish the two states. Lee believes that some pragmatic circumstances often involve choosing landmark

and trajectory; however, he says nothing more of these circumstances. Our aim in writing this article is therefore to introduce a number of explicit cognitive procedures through which a Persian speaker would single out a landmark and a trajectory in describing every scene.

Theoretical Framework

One instance of general cognitive processes is *linguistic construal operation*, itself carried out through several other mental procedures, including appropriation of perspective. So, as for us to better grasp rudiments of perspective, first we will take a short look at different stages of linguistic construing operation (LCO), and then will zoom out to account for the very operation in general.

The first stage of LCO is one of the human cognitive faculties called **attention**. Many natural phenomena in the world draw our attention and make some of their characteristics stand out in the background of our mental experiences. Chafe (1994:26-30) calls *attention* the 'focus of consciousness' which comes over roughly through four stages of evoking conceptual structures. The initial stage is 'selection': choosing among parts of an experience, the ones most consistent with the speaker's communicative intentions during every instance of conversation, and putting aside the other irrelevant parts. This is the reason why in each communicative situation we

select only some of the words belonging to a common semantic field. For example, in figurative speech, simply the meanings relevant to the immediate local situation are interpreted, not the whole idea that is often metaphorically symbolized out of context. Consequently, selection, as it is, plays an effective role in 'profiling' certain phenomena out of a single semantic frame.

Once the speaker pays attention to one of the situational features, the second stage of attention begins. In this stage, the 'scope of dominion' will encompass what the speaker has selected. A scope of domain, as opposed to 'indirect domains' (the domains which are obviated directly by the profiled concept), is therefore accessible to the speaker. Langacker believes 'point of reference' to be the first focus of attention and its referents will jointly make a 'dominion'.

Then in the third phase of attention called "scalar adjustment", the extent of speaker's attention to a scene is estimated. Take the following examples:

4) a. I threw a rock at the bridge.

b. I threw a rock on the bridge.

Scalar adjustment can provide an explanation for why in a sentence like (4a) the bridge comes into focus in a way that it does not in a sentence such as (4b). Along the same lines, had it not been for different scalar adjustment by the predicates "touch" and "brush", an identical

scene would have been reported in both the sentences:

5) a. He touched his hair.

b. He brushed his hair.

However, “his hair” is mentally modeled as a two-dimensional entity in (5a), but a three-dimensional one in (5b).

At issue here is that all the three above stages of attentions are denoting static scenes, while events are inherently dynamic. To make up for the shortcoming, cognitive linguists have also called a fourth stage into play; “dynamic attention”, as the term suggests, touch upon the non-stativity of scenes. That is, interlocutors do often shift their attention from one scene to another. Of course, this is what the ‘conceptualization process’ requires, and has nothing to do with the state of affairs in the real world. For instance in the sentence “the road leads down to the valley, and ascends from the other slope”, in spite of the plain fact that the road is an immobile entity, it is conceptualized as if it were moving. Talmy (2000:73) terms such a phenomenon, in which a state is described from a dynamic point of view, a ‘fictive motion’.

Judgment/comparison is the second stage of LCO. Kant (1952:18) maintains that judgment is the general faculty of thinking over parts of a whole. However, Husserl (1973:14) tended to assume judgment as a process of comparing two entities. Moreover, Langacker (1987:103-

5) following philosophers, takes judgment one of the major cognitive processes, which includes two components: a ‘substrate’, about which something is affirmed, and that which is affirmed of it. In Langacker’s view, the process of judgment (unlike attention) takes place through ‘categorization’, ‘metaphor’, or ‘figure-ground alignment’. Categorization is the first and likely the most important, way of judgment. It is accomplished by means of comparing a current experience with the previous ones, and then drawing a conclusion. Specifically speaking, the one who categorizes wants to see if a statement about an experience corresponds to any of the preexisting mental categories. Langacker (ibid:66-71) applies the term ‘sanction’ to the process of comparing prevalent situations with the linguistic items that usually designate them. Then he draws a distinction between ‘full sanction’ as creating a new category for an absolutely unknown experience, and ‘partial sanction’, which involves a creative assignment of the current experience to an existing category.

Metaphoric judgment, a widely debated subject in the cognitive linguistics, deals with the correlation between ‘source domain’ and ‘target domain’. It can be generally defined as developing or framing a novel concept based on some other more familiar one (cf. Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 3-5). So, metaphor plays an important role in conceptualization.

Figure-ground alignment, as another way of judgement, strongly depends on the objective features of the scene. According to Talmy (2000), speakers follow the figure-ground alignment procedure when they foreground an object against the background of another object via spatial deixis (using mobility and space deictic expressions).

Perspective is known to be the third stage of LCO. Croft (2004:58) believes that keeping a perspective, and deixis in particular, is the most common structural process of all. We as human beings cannot encounter the world around us but almost inevitably through our own cultural backgrounds, beliefs, ideologies, and what Langacker in general calls “focal adjustment” and divides into ‘vantage point’ and ‘orientation point’ (1987:122-26). In the same vein, Talmy (2000) argues that choosing between phrases like “behind/in front of the tree” depends on the speaker’s vantage point, while his orientation point will distinguish between different vertical dimensions of viewpoint adopted in such expressions as “above/down the tree”.

Depicting a referent out of some surrounding objects already identified, ‘referring expressions’ are also indicative of speakers’ perspective. In other words, the way a speaker refers to an object in a certain scene usually marks, in the speech event, his relationship with the object. Such a symptomatic role derives

from referring expressions’ representing two levels: in one level, participants’ real situation, current at the speech time, is referred to; in the other, some displaced time and space is referred to, across the real situatedness of the participants.

Perspective is further supplemented by the ‘objectivity-subjectivity’ distinction. Objectivity reveals how the speaker conceptualizes himself in a scene. Consider these examples:

- 6) a. “Do not lie to me”, said her mother.
- b. “Do not lie to your mother”, said her mother.

The subjective perspective of “her mother” in (6a) has swallowed into a cognitively deeper objective perspective in (6b) due to the replacement of speaker pronoun “me” with the addressee pronoun “your”, which in effect lets the speaker keep the listener’s eye on herself.

Constitution or **Gestalt** accomplishes LCO through organizing the conceptualized scenes into different structures. In other words, as the final stage of LCO is to account for the most central constituents of experience, it will require a process like constitution or gestalt, which is comprehensive enough to vehicle them. Constitution itself is carried out in three turns: ‘structural schematization’, ‘force dynamics’, and ‘relationality’.

Structural schematization represents the way in which geographical elements and physical

location of the components have been conceptualized. Besides, it specifies through individuation whether the concepts are singular or plural, and if singular, what internal relations hold among their components. Individuation also detects countability in nouns, and influences conjugation in verbs.

Force dynamics conceptualizes multidimensional forces exerted on the participants of an event, so it can be thought of as a generalization of the concept 'causation'.

Following are some examples:

- 7) a. He kicked the ball.
 b. He kept the ball.
 c. He dropped the ball.

In (7a) "he" is an agent who exerts a force on the ball; in (7b) the same agent reduces causation to preserving the stativity of ball by holding it; (7c) is not causative at all, as the subject exerts no force on the ball.

Finally, relationality answers the question why some entities inherently imply the existence of some other entity. For instance, the event "teaching" cannot be conceived, but along with the concept "teacher". Cognitive linguists put nouns and adjectives together in a category distinct from Verb, for they do not recognize the former group to be inherently relational.

Perspective in Persian

In the rest of this article, we are going to

examine a body of Persian data in order to identify main criteria of perspective, applied by the Persian speakers.

Animacy is one of the most important subjects in different fields of linguistic inquiry. Here, it will also make the basis for our first assumption, to the effect that 'animacy' underlies the establishment of many schemas. Whaley (1997: 173; cf. Silverstein, 1976), has provided the following hierarchy according to the linguistic applications of animacy:

First/second person pronoun > third person pronoun > proper name/kin term > human NP > animate NP > inanimate NP

If the above animacy hierarchy, as Whaley (drawing on Silverstein) claims, is to be one of linguistic universals, it could be assumed to influence perspective as well. We can verify this assumption by the following examples:

- 8) a. Marjān qafas-e tuti rā joloye xodaš gozāšt. Marjan cage parrot acc against herself put-3rd sing-past
Marjan put the parrot's cage against herself. (Hedayat, 1381: 63)
- b. Tarlān be sor'at zire patuy-aš xazid
 Tarlan quickly under blanket-her creep-3rd sing-past
Tarlan crept under her blanket quickly. (Vafi, 1382: 36)
- c. Xurus rā az lāye basteye patu dar-āvardand. Rooster-acc from inside folded blanket take out-3 pl- past

They took out the rooster from inside the folded blanket. (Golestan, 1384a:42)

d. Hasan dast-aš rā az kenāre panjere bardāšt. Hassan hand-his-acc from ledge window take-3sing-past.

Hassan took his hand away from the window ledge. (Golestan, 1384b: 105)

e. Rāh čon māri mohtāt dar sarāziri milaqzid road like snake-a cautious (in) slope creep-3rd sing-past progressive

Va pāyin miraft and down go-3rd sing-past progressive

The road was creeping down the slope, like a cautious snake. (Golestan, 1384b: 63)

f. Aftāb az panjere tā kenāre siniye manqal āmada bud sunlight through window near tray brazier come-pp The sunlight had come near the brazier tray, through the window. (Najdi,1379:133)

Both Marjan and Tarlan in (8a) and (8b), are proper names preceding, in accordance with what the animacy hierarchy predicts, the inanimate noun phrases “the parrot’s cage” and “her blanket”. Now to make sure that such quite acceptable structural perspectives are chosen under the effect of animacy, we can compare them respectively with the corresponding structures in the following *literally* anomalous paraphrases:

8) á. Marjān xodaš rā joloye qafas-e tuti gozāšt

. Marjan herself-acc against cage-of parrot put-3rd sing-past

? Marjan put herself against the parrot’s cage.

ḃ. Patu xodaš rā ruye tarlān kešid blanket itself-acc over Tarlan creep-3rd sing-past

? The blanket crept over Tarlan.

Although Persian speakers would consider (8á) grammatical, they will find it semantically unnatural. However, (8ḃ) is likely to sound even semantically acceptable to them if accounted for in some literary context that could personify “the blanket” as an animate entity, and lead the reader to a fictive interpretation. Then, the problem in such cases -where all noun phrases making up a scene, are (considered) equally animate- is that the animacy hierarchy will fall short of justifying the perspective in question. We can compensate for the shortcoming with an extra factor involved; that is to say, the element bigger in **size** will be fore-grounded.

By the same token, regarding the following paraphrases for (8c) and (8d):

8) é. Basteye patu rā az dower xurus bāz kardand folded blanket blanket-acc of around rooster unfold-3rd pl-past They unfolded the blanket off the rooster.

ḋ. Hasan panjere rā az kenāre dast-aš bardāšt Hassan window-acc from near hand-his take away-3rd sing-past

? Hassan took the window away from his hand.

(8é) is a marked sentence with its own limited

context of application, though an acceptable one. Nevertheless, (8d) sounds too nonsensical to be accepted at all, for it does not comply with the way speakers would usually conceive of the world; as “his hand” is conceived – of course figuratively, in the way of synecdoche – as an animate entity, it should have been stated as a trajectory, not a landmark. Nevertheless, “the road” in (8e) and “the sunlight” in (8f) are both metaphorically animatized and, as a matter of course, are taken to be trajectories. Otherwise, if we had inverted these objects of metaphor with their landmark images (“a cautious snake” and “some implied person”), the following anomalous paraphrases would have also resulted:

8)é. Sarāziri dar rāh milaqzid va bālā
mi’āmad slope (in) road creep-3rd sing-
past progressive (and) up come-3rd sing-
past progressive ? The slope was creeping
up the road.

é. Siniye manqal az panjere xod rā tā
kenāre āftāb āvarde bud, tray brazier
through window itself-acc near sunlight
bring-pp

? The brazier tray had come near the sunlight
through the window.

These examples support the general fact that some elements in the scene are often overshadowed, and sometimes entirely overlooked, under the effect of some other highly conspicuous components; then,

comparatively the most salient element of all takes the role of trajectory with reference to a landmark. According to the above arguments, it can be additionally maintained that such an unmarked trajectory-landmark role assignment is a process contributed significantly through estimating the ‘animacy rank’ of the elements. That is, in their everyday talks as well as their figurative speech, Persian speakers do observe the higher rank of trajectory, compared with that of the landmark, in the ‘animacy hierarchy’.

However, the question may arise that how a Persian could choose a trajectory and a landmark among two items equivalent in animacy (when the animacy effect is cancelled out). Such a dilemma is actually faced before producing sentences like (9a-f) below:

9) a. Dude kabāb az miyāne hofreye hayāt
ruye bām āmad smoke-of kebab from
through hollow courtyard over roof
come-past The kebab smoke rising from the
courtyard, hung over the roof. (Golestan,
1384:68)

b. Raxtexāb-aš rā kenāre panjere pahn kard
bedding-her-acc near window lay-3rd sing-
past. He laid his bedding near the window.
(Vafi, 1382: 123)

c. Siniye čāy va livāne bolande āb howz rā
dowr zadand
tray tea and glass-of tall water basin-acc
round-3rd pl-past

The tray carrying the tall glass turned round the basin. (Najdi, 1379: 75)

d. čārpaye xord be vitrine ye maqāzeye xarrāzi stool hit-past to window-of a shop-of haberdashery The stool hit the window of a haberdashery. (Najdi, 1379: 19)

e. Dast-aš rā ruye muhāy-aš kešid his hand-acc on hair-his rub-3rd sing-past He rubbed his hand on his hair.

f. Sarangošte kučake daste čap-aš rā bā do lab gerefte bud fingertip little hand left-his-acc with two lip hold-pp
He had held his left little fingertip between his lips. (Golshiri, 1371: 158)

All the noun phrases in (9 a-d) are referring to inanimate entities. Therefore, we need a criterion other than animacy in trajectory-landmark specification. In a more careful look into the above examples and many other unmarked sentences, we will find out that speakers usually choose a mobile item as the trajectory, and an immobile one as the landmark. In the examples (9 a-c), the immovable entities “the roof”, “the window”, and “the basin” are stated in the role of trajectory, while the dynamic entities “the smoke”, “his bedding”, and “the tray” are provided as landmarks. The choice seems to be simply derived from the general cognitive rule that the smaller the objects, the more easily they would move as trajectories. Flouting this rule will result in the following (even

figuratively) unacceptable alternations:

9) á. Bām az miyāne hofreye hayāt az dude kabā migozašt roof from through hollow courtyard from smoke kebab drift-past
? The roof drifted through the courtyard the kebab smoke.

ბ. Panjere rā kenāre raxtexāb-aš pahn kard Window-acc near bedding-of lay-3rd sing-past
? He laid the window near his bedding.

ც. Howz siniye čāy va livāne bolande āb rā dowr zad Basin tray tea and glass tall water-acc round-past

! The basin turned round the tray carrying the tall glass.

Persian speakers would hardly admit (9d) restated as (9d'), even if they take “the window” to be of a rotating kind.

9) d. Vitrine ye maqāzeye xarrāzi xord be čārpaye. Window-of a shop haberdashery hit-past to stool
? The window of a haberdashery hit the stool.

As for (9e) and (9f), in which both the trajectory and the landmark can be regarded as animate entities by the way of synecdoche, again it is ‘mobility’, not ‘animacy’, that makes the trajectory-landmark distinction, by putting the immobile item in the state of landmark for the mobile trajectory; so as the sentences as follow would rarely apply:

9) é. Muhāy-aš rā be dasthāy-aš kešid hair-his-

acc to hand-his rub-3rd sing-past

? He rubbed his hair against his hand.

Ĥ. Do lab-aš rā do tarafe sarangošt-aš
gozāšte bud two lip-his-acc two side-of
fingertip-his put-pp-3rd-sing

? He had put his lips on the sides of his fingertip.

However, it is worthy noting that in addition to mobility, certain pragmatic factors like 'the speaker's intention' are often taken into account when encoding scenes that encompass two animate entities. In such cases, most of the differently coded perspectives are considered relevant to their immediate co-text (the linguistic context), as exemplified here:

10) a. Man be Amir nazdik šodam

I-nom to Emir near approach-past-1st-sing I
approached Emir.

b. Amir be man nazdik šod Emir to I-acc
approach-past-3rd-sing Emir approached me.

11) a. Gorbe muš rā be dandān gerefte bud
cat mouse-acc at tooth take-pp-3rd-sing

The cat had bitten at the mouse.

b. Muš gorbe rā gāz migereft mouse cat- acc
bit-past-progressive-3rd-sing The mouse was
biting the cat.

Based on the above arguments, we can say that the speaker focuses his attention at first on some immobile component in the scene. Then he takes mobile entities into this scope of attention after measuring their rate of movement against the immobile landmark

already identified. So that, there will be an inevitable modification of perspective while one is constantly turning his attention from a salient trajectory to another. There is a consistent correlation between saliency and perspective, since the focalizing element of an event is often itself the most prominent participant in the scene.

(12a-e) are a number of sentences that avoid both animacy and mobility rules. Therefore, we should look for still another explanatory tool.

12) a. Ruye puste surat va garden-aš čand
qatre rang bud on skin-of face and neck-
his several stain paint be-past-3rd-sing
There were some paint stains on his face and
There were some paint stains on his face and
neck. (Najdi,1379:82)

b. Ruznāmeha rā zire rupuš-aš jāsāzi kard
newspapers-acc under overcoat-his conceal-
3rd-sing-past He concealed the newspapers
under the overcoat [he had on]. (Vafi,1382: 46)

c. Robdošāmre atlasi ruye jāraxti bud robe
satin on clothes tree hang-3rd-sing-past The
satin robe hung on the clothes tree (Najdi,1379:
150)

d. Aftāb be gušeyi az āsemāne tehran časbid
sunlight into patch of sky-of Tehran stick-
past-3rd-sing The sun had stuck into a patch of
sky over Tehran. (Najdi,1379: 82)

e. Sarangošt bar pelk-aš kešid fingertip on
eyelid-his draw-3rd-sing-past He drew a
fingertip on his eyelid. (Golshiri,1371: 130)

Regarding the above examples all of which composed of equally inanimate and immobile elements, there seems to be a tendency among Persian speakers to identify as landmark the component bigger in 'size', and perceive the smaller one as trajectory. In spite of this tendency, however, the skewed correlation between landmarks smaller than trajectories will result in the following marked alternations:

12) á. čand qatre rang zire puste surat va garden-aš bud several stain paint under skin face and neck-his be-past-3rd-sing ?! His neck and face was under some paint stains.

ǎ. Rupuš-aš rā ruye ruznāmeha jāsāzi kard overcoat-acc on newspapers shroud-3rd-sing-past

! He shrouded the newspapers with the overcoat he had on.

é. Jāraxti zire robdošāmre atlasi bud clothes tree under robe satin be-past-3rd-sing

! The clothes tree was hanging a satin robe out.

đ. Gušeyi az āsemāne tehran āftāb rā be xodaš časbānd a patch of sky-of Tehran sun-acc to itself stick-past-causative-3rd-sing

? A patch of sky over Tehran stuck to the sun.

é. Pelk-aš rā bar sarangošt kešid eyelid-his-acc on fingertip-of draw-past-3rd-sing ? He drew his eyelid on a fingertip.

However, the crucial point is that for the most

part an *integration* of all the above said factors (i.e. animacy, mobility, and size) is at work in the ordinary use of language, so adhering only to one of them may make it a formidable –if not an impossible- task to account for many sentences as the following samples:

13) a. Sar-am ruye bāleštake čarmi ast

head-my on cushion leather be-present-3rd-sing

My head is on a leather cushion. (Najdi,1379: 167)

b. Dast-am rā ruye muzayike kafe hammām migozāram hand-my-acc on mosaic bricks-of floor-of bathroom lay down -present I lay my hand down on the mosaic bricks covering the bathroom floor. (ibid)

Having discussed that perspective is often determined as an interrelated function of animacy, mobility, and size of the scene elements, we have to admit in the end that even a host of these factors could not in effect explain exhaustively all the linguistic data. Hence, we came to modify our study with the last (rather irrefutable) assumption that sometimes 'the speaker' himself makes his final subjective decision and adopts a perspective quite contrary to the expectations. Every other factor being equivocal, the situatedness of an object is predictable in the light of the speaker's specific angle of vision, because he tries to put himself mostly in the spatial center of his

surrounding as he verbalizes any situation.

Take (14a-c) as some instances:

14) a. Qadamzanān be tarafe hamān
mosāferxāne raftam, on a walk towards
same inn go-past past-1st-sing I went on a
walk to the very same inn. (Najdi,1379: 5)

b. Xodam rābe doxtar resāndam myself-acc to
girl reach-causative-past past-1st-sing I
reached myself to the girl. (Daneshvar,1381:
47)

c. Bā Amir dast dādam with Emir hand shake-
past-1st-sing I shook hands with Emir.

The distortion of the above perspectives in the following set of sentences indicates that where animacy hierarchy, mobility, and size are neutralized (in b and c), linguistic inversion of the scene elements will not necessarily lead to semantic anomalism.

14) á. Vaqti qadam mizadam hamān
mosāferxāne be tarafam mi'āmad as
walk-progressive same inn towards-me
approach-past ? The very same inn
approached me as I was walking.

b'. Doxtar xodaš rā be man resānd girl
herself-acc to me reach-past The girl
reached me.

ć. Amir bā man dast dād Emir with I-acc
hand shake-past Emir shook hands with me.

The minute difference felt between (14b, c) on the one hand, and (14b', ć) on the other, is due to speaker's *communicating, for pragmatic reasons*, his active participation in the first

couple, as opposed to his passivity in the second, which in turn derives from his different 'mentality' or 'objectivism' towards the same scenes. More clearly speaking, either of the alternative information structures or *gestalts* will be much more preferable for the speaker to pick at a time just one of the concepts out in the same proposition, and the concept chosen happens to be the one irretrievable in the context. However, the most important point that draws our attention to the pragmatic factors in the first place pertains not to discourse, but to the way the speaker's *unique visual perception* influences the saliency of each and every concept (whatever its nature is) before any discourse is established at all: hence an indispensable 'role of the speaker' in perspective adoption. Of course, this unique visual perception works -though roughly- in parallel with the general schemata behind a situation; they both follow exactly the same foregrounding-backgrounding mechanism in accounting for one single scene, but sometimes result in different fore/backgrounds. The usual coincidence of schemata with visual perception especially breaks down when animate, mobile, and/or bigger elements do not play at the visual focal point.

Conclusion

In this article, we introduced several factors including 'animacy', 'mobility', and 'size',

involved in adopting different perspectives in Persian. We believe these factors to largely, but by no means definitely, determine a certain perspective. Although there is a (subconscious) tendency among Persian speakers towards observing the three factors operative by default, in descending order of importance, and in the form of one rule, a number of pragmatic parameters, like the 'communicative objective' of the speaker and his unparalleled angle of vision, may undermine or even flout the rule. Therefore, context-dependency of perspective, particularly the influence of visual perception on cognitive profiling processes, should be taken into account above all the other factors.

References

- [1] Chafe, Wallace (1994), *Discourse, Consciousness and Time: the flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [2] Clark, Herbert H. (1996), *Using Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Croft, William & Alan Cruse (2004), *Cognitive Linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Daneshvar, S. (1382), *Shahri Chon Behesht*, Tehran: Ghesse Publication.
- [5] Golestan, E. (1384a), *Azar, Mahe Akhare Paeiz*, Tehran: Kharazmi Publications.
- [6] Golestan, E. (1384b), *Khorous*, Tehran: Baztab-Negar Publication.
- [7] Golshiri, H. (1371), *Ayenehaye Dar-daar*, Tehran: Niloofar Publications.
- [8] Hedayat, S. (1381), *Se Ghatre Khoon*, Tehran: Jaame-Daran Publication.
- [9] Heidegger, Martin (1927 [1962]), *Being and Time*, New York: Hoper and Row.
- [10] Langacker, Ronald W. (1987), *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- [11] Lee, David (2001), *Cognitive Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [12] Najdi, B. (1379), *Dobare az Haman Kiyabanha*, Tehran: Markaz publication.
- [13] Vafi, F. (1382), *Tarlan*, Tehran: Markaz Publication.
- [14] Whaley, Lindsay J. (1997), *Introduction to Typology: the unity and diversity of language*, London: Sage Publication

روانشناختی بیش در شرح فارسی

مریم سادات فیاضی^۱، عالیه کرد زعفرانلو کامبوزیا^۲، حسین صافی پیرلوچه^۳

تاریخ دریافت: ۸۸/۳/۱۶

تاریخ پذیرش: ۸۹/۱۲/۲۴

یکی از عوامخلی که در بره وجود آمدن طرح واره های متفاوت ایفای نقش می کند منظر است. جایگاه خاص مشاهده کردن، بخشی از فرایند تولید معنی به وسیله ی زبان را تشکیل می دهد. لانگاکر مفهوم منظر را به عنوان نقطه ی تطابق کانونی لحاظ می کند و معتقد است که دو مفهوم نقطه ی برتری و نقطه ی جهت گیری در شرح صحنه های ما از یک رویداد اهمیت بسیار دارند. با توجه به اینکه نظریه ی شناختی با اتخاذ دیدگاه متفاوتی می کوشد پدیده های معنایی را تحلیل و تبیین کند و رویکردی کاملاً نوین به این حوزه از دستور دارد، و از آنجا که تاکنون هیچ تحقیقی با چنین رویکردی به بررسی پدیده ی منظر در زبان فارسی نپرداخته است، پژوهش حاضر بدیع می نماید.

پژوهش به روش توصیفی- قیاسی انجام شده است و نگارندگان پس از بررسی داده های خود دریافته اند که علاوه بر نقطه ی جهت گیری و برتری عوامل دیگری چون گوینده - محور بودن، جاندار- محور بودن، اندازه- محور بودن و متحرک - محور بودن بر شکل گیری شرح صحنه های متفاوت از یک رویداد ثابت تأثیر می گذارد.

واژگان کلیدی: زاویه ی دید، شرح صحنه، منظر، نقطه ی راهنما، نقطه ی عبور

۱. دانشجوی دکتری دانشکده علوم انسان دانشگاه تربیت مدرس تهران

۲. استادیار دانشکده علوم انسان دانشگاه تربیت مدرس تهران

۳. استادیار پژوهشکده علوم انسانی تهران