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I discuss in this article some of the forms and interpretations covered by the phrase 'point of view'. Point of view is familiar as a literary term referring to direct presentation of the speech and thought of a fictional character or, more generally, as "the perceptual or conceptual position in terms of which narrated situations and events are presented" (Prince 1987:73). The term is now used by linguists as well for a wide range of expressions, including speech and thought, evidentiality and other indications of an authorial voice, and particular perspectives on situations linguistically expressed. 'Point of view' is often used almost interchangeably with 'viewpoint,' 'perspective,' and 'subjectivity'. This has led to considerable confusion.

One of my goals here is to sort out some of the different uses as a basis for the systematic interpretation of sentences and discourse. I will be concerned mainly with the notion as discussed by linguists, while recognizing that there is a strong literary tradition. I will suggest a principled way of distinguishing basic cases. All are subjective, but in clearly different ways. I will use 'subjective,' 'subjectivity' to refer to the phenomena as a whole and suggest that the terms 'point of view' and 'perspectival' be used for the main classes of cases.

The second goal is to consider the empirical question of how grammatical forms give rise to interpretations of subjectivity when they occur in English sentences. I will suggest a 'composite' approach. Subjectivity is conveyed by composites of syntactic and semantic factors and interpreted by rules which look at several grammatical forms together. The composite approach is well-suited to dealing with it because can recognize information of different kinds. I will suggest principles of composition for interpreting subjectivity in the framework of Discourse Representation Theory.
There are differences between languages, of course, according to the grammatical resources available in each. I focus on English, but include some remarks about other languages. I will not consider lexical choice. However, a complete account would have to deal with it. The particular words that appear in a sentence may strongly suggest choices that a particular participant would make, and thus access to the mind of that participant.

I set the stage with introductory examples and commentary, in §1; §2 organizes the phenomena and discusses the basic distinctions between them; §3 sketches the composite analysis; §4 concludes.

§ 1. Introduction

I begin with examples which introduce some of the phenomena often included under the general notion of subjectivity, or point of view. The first three examples are in the first person. Fragments (1a-b) are from novels; (1c) appears in a newspaper article of opinion. The sources of the examples from texts are given at the end of this article.


4 I crossed to the window and stared downwards: down two floors to the ornamental fountain in the forecourt of the Paul Ekaterin merchant bank.
5 Down to where three entwining plumes of water rose gracefully into the air and fell in a glittering circular curtain. 6 To where, in the bowl, calf-deep, stood Gordon in his navy pin-striped suit...

(Dick Francis)

b .... 1 I sipped my drink and nodded. 2 The pulse in his lean grey throat throbbed visibly and yet so slowly that it was hardly a pulse at all. 3 An old man two-thirds dead and still determined to believe he could take it.

(Raymond Chandler)

c ......I feel reasonably certain of the final verdict on the current impeachment affair because I think history will see it as the climax of a six-year period marred
by a troubling and deepening failure of the Republican party to play within the 
established constitutional rules. (Peter Ehrenhalt)

Let us consider the subjective information conveyed by these examples. (1a) begins with 
several direct quotations, introduced by the verb said and quotation marks. The 
perception verb stared appears in sentence 4; we understand what follows as expressing 
what the subject perceives - including the material in sentences 5 and 6, taken as within 
the scope of stared. Perception is involved in (1b), but less directly: sentences 2 and 3 
suggest it although not introduced by a perception verb. The fragment in (1c), with the 
verbs feel and think, expresses the contents of the speaker's feelings and thoughts. In all 
three we would ascribe a point of view to the first person speaker-reporter.

The next example is from a detective novel narrated in the third person. Consider 
the provenance of sentence 4, which is not preceded by a verb of thought or perception.

(2) ....1 The workshop was dusty and messy, crusted with bits of old clay, and 
it suited a part of Mara's personality. 2 Mostly she preferred cleanliness and 
tidiness, but there was something special, she found, about creating beautiful 
objects in a chaotic environment.
3 She put on her apron, took a lump of clay from the bin and weighed off 
enough for a small vase. 4 The clay was wet.

(Peter Robinson)

Sentence 4 may express a perception or awareness of Mara's, the person working with 
the clay. The sentence might also be due to the reporter. This kind of uncertainty is not 
uncommon.

In a different type of example, subjectivity is conveyed as an authorial voice. 
There are no personal pronouns, verbs of communication, thought, or perception, and no 
suggestion of perception. Example (2), a fragment of an article of popular science, 
illustrates:
1 ...It might seem surprising that mere molecules inside our cells constantly enact their own version of telephone without distorting the relayed information in the least. 2 Actually, no one could survive without such precise signaling in cells. 3 The body functions properly only because cells communicate with one another constantly. 4 Pancreatic cells.... 5 Cells of the immune system ...cells of the nervous system rapidly fire messages to and from the brain.

6 But how do circuits within cells achieve this high-fidelity transmission?
7 For a long time, biologists had only rudimentary explanations. 8 In the past 15 years, though, they have made great progress in unlocking the code that cells use for their internal communications. (Scientific American)

The sense of voice can be traced to a number of sources: the modal might, the verb seem, the predicate surprising, all in sentence 1; the adverb actually in sentence 2; the direct question which comprises sentence 6; the adverb in the past 15 years of sentence 8.

The well-known examples of (4) have a subjective element, suggesting a particular standpoint from which the situation is presented:

(4) a Physicists like yourself are a godsend
    b John pulled the blanket over himself.

(4a) takes the perspective of a speaker toward an addressee (from Ross 1970); (4b), from Kuno (1987), demonstrates what he calls an "empathy perspective", in which the reflexive indicates the perspective of John, a participant in the situation.

These examples show that a variety of linguistic forms convey subjectivity. This fact is essential to the composite analysis sketched in section §3.

The domain of subjectivity is grammatical - that is, the sentence; yet subjectivity arises primarily in discourse. The interplay between them is demonstrated in some of the discourse fragments above. The grammatical forms that convey subjectivity are within the domain of the sentence: verbs and their complements, tense, aspectual viewpoint, anaphors, etc. However, anaphors and many other forms can only be interpreted with information from the discourse. Discourse has a particular set of characteristics, many
due to genre (e.g., narrative, newspaper editorial) which sets up expectations for stricture and interpretation. The dynamic established by relations between several sentences can set up a pattern that guides interpretation.

The question of responsibility for content arises with sentences that express subjectivity. Part of the meaning of such sentences is that their truth and formulation are ascribed to someone in particular, the reporter or a participant in the situation. When a sentence expresses a point of view, or takes a perspective, we want to identify the person who is responsible. For 'neutral' sentences - by convention objective - the question of responsibility does not arise. We may ask whether a neutral sentence is true but not, usually, who is responsible for it. In a sentence like Mary believed that John was sick, for instance, we want to ascribe the belief expressed in the complement clause to Mary and not to the reporter, or to John. I will comment on this issue in discussing the different types of subjectivity in sentences.

§ 2 In this section I discuss different types of subjectivity and the key linguistic factors that convey them. There are four categories. They are developed on the basis of intuitions about meanings and the linguistic forms that appear. The categories are Communication, Contents of mind, Evaluation, and Perspective.

At the end of the section I suggest that the material can be reduced to two major categories: sentences which express a point of view, and sentences which take a particular perspective on the situation presented.

§ 2.1 Communication

This category of deals with speech and other communicative events, by definition external. There are three types: quoted speech, represented speech, and indirect speech. The first two directly present what was said or thought, often introduced by a verb of communication. Quoted speech is often referred to as 'direct' speech. I use the term 'quoted' here because I want to both recognize quoted and represented speech as directly presented communication.

The features of communicative sentences have been analyzed extensively in the linguistics and literary fields. Verbs of communication are a distinct syntactic class. They allow a direct object complement which expresses the actual communication and an
indirect object referring to the addressee (X said Y to Z). The class includes the verbs say, ask, request, command, declare, confess, advise, insist, claim, shout, read, sing, remark, observe, note, yell, swear, promise, announce, pray. Some verbs of thought have the same syntactic characteristics.

I begin with examples of quoted and indirect speech. The former reproduces what was said, while the latter is indirect, a report. In discussing these and all later examples I will refer to the source of a sentence or main clause - the person responsible for the quotation or report - as the reporter.

(5) Quoted speech and thought
   a "I am getting ready for the party this afternoon."
   b Maryi said "I am excited."
   c Maryi told mej yesterday at the station, "I will meet youj here."
   d Maryi asked "Do I have to go?"

(6) Indirect speech and thought
   a Maryi told mej yesterday at the station that shej would meet mej there.
   b Maryi asked whether shej had to go.

Quoted speech is just that: as in (5), it typically appears with a verb of communication and a direct representation of what was said. Person, tense, and other deictics orient to the first-person speaker, as in the original utterance.

In contrast, indirect speech does not present exactly what was said: pronouns, tense, and deictics shift in accord with the report of the communication. Compare for instance (5c) and (6a), from Banfield (1982). The complement of (5c) reproduces Mary's utterance: it has the first person, present tense, and a proximal deictic oriented to the speaker. In (6a) these forms are shifted: the tense is past in accord with the tense of the main clause verb, the pronoun is third person, the deictic pronoun is non-proximal (distal). Syntax also shifts in indirect speech: constructions that are limited to main clauses, such as questions and exclamations, have other forms (or do not appear at all).
Compare for instance examples (5d and 6b): the question is direct in (5d) and indirect in its counterpart (6b).

The tenses of main and complement verbs are in concord, as the examples of (6) show; this concord is known as sequence of tense (Comrie 1986). The requirement of tense and deictic concord doesn’t hold for all languages. Japanese, for instance, does not have shifted deictics nor tense concord in the complements of communication verbs. (Hirose 2000); nor does Navajo (Speas 1999).

Indirect speech is explicitly introduced by a reporter, and in sentences of indirect speech there is a systematic ambiguity. Responsibility for the formulation may be due to the reporter or the person whose communication is reported. (7) gives a well-known and telling example.

(7) Oedipus said that his mother was beautiful.

This sentence could be used to report an utterance of Oedipus in which the speaker identifies the person that Oedipus talked about as Oedipus' mother (the de re reading). It could also be used to report exactly an utterance of Oedipus, "My mother is beautiful" (the de dicto reading). The difference is truth conditional. In cases like this truth depends both on the interpretation in question and what was actually said: (7) might be true on the de re but not on the de dicto reading. I will call this feature 'permeability' abd say that indirect speech complements may be permeated by the reporter.

In some cases the reporter is clearly responsible for the formulation of an indirect speech complement. Cues to this are deictic features that are oriented to the reporter rather than the main clause, as in (8).

(8) a John said that Mary was leaving tomorrow.  
    b John said that Louise is pregnant.

These reports are permeated by the reporter. In (8a), the complement has the adverb tomorrow while the verb of communication is past. This conveys that the reporter has recoded all or part of what was said. Again, the complement of (8b) is in the present tense while the verb of communication is past. In such cases the present tense is ascribed
to the reporter, who is responsible for the truth of the complement. (8b) conveys that John's utterance about Mary's pregnancy was made in the past; and that what he said is true at the time of the report according to the reporter. (8b) would be false if Mary were not pregnant at the time of utterance. Examples like this are known as "double-access" sentences; they are discussed by Ogihara 1996, Abusch 1997.

Given the close relation between them, we might attempt to derive indirect speech from direct speech. However it has been shown that this approach cannot work. The argument turns on two points: first, not all indirect speech reports have plausible counterparts in expressions of direct speech; and secondly, the ambiguity between de re and de dicto readings arises only for indirect speech (Partee 1973, Banfield 1982).

The third member of the category of communication is 'represented speech and thought'. Represented speech has some features of direct speech and some of indirect. It presents the syntax of actual speech, but tense and pronouns are shifted; (9) illustrates:

(9) Represented speech and thought

...1 Mrs Dalloway said she would buy the flowers herself. 2 For Lucy had her work cut out for her. 3 The doors would be taken off their hinges; Rumpelmayer's men were coming. 4 And then, thought Clarissa Dalloway, what a morning - fresh as if issued to children on a beach.

(Virginia Woolf)

The first sentence of this fragment has shifted tense and person: what Mrs Dalloway actually said, presumably, would have been I will buy the flowers myself. The subsequent sentences represent Mrs Dalloway’s thoughts. Banfield suggests that such examples represent the consciousness of the person whose thought is presented (1982:10).

The syntax of represented speech is not shifted, but preserves the locutions of speech and thought. For instance, sentence 5 ends with an exclamation. Exclamations are main clauses only and cannot occur in the complement clauses of indirect speech. Topicalization, elliptical fragments are similarly limited. Represented speech usually appears in fiction, where it can play an important role in conveying the character of a protagonist. Other terms include style indirect libre (free indirect style), narrated monologue, erlebte rede. Literary studies include Cohn 1978, Chatman 1978, Genette
1980, and others; approaches of a more linguistic nature are taken in Jespersen 1924, Banfield 1982.

§ 2.2 Contents of mind

This category comprises the expression of mental states such as thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes, and other propositional expressions. Standard examples of sentences expressing mental state have verbs like think and believe; their complements express the object of thought or belief, the content of mind. The complements are similar in form to those of indirect speech; they report mental states rather than external events of communication, as in (10).

(10) a We thought that Bella was in New York.
     b Mary believes that she won the race.

(10a) is subjective, expressing thought. There is tense concord between the main and complement clauses. In (10b), which expresses a belief, the main and complement clauses have coreferential subjects. This relation between referents in clauses involving thought or communication is sometimes called logophoric.

Logophoric pronouns convey coreference between the subject of main and complement clauses in the context of verbs of thought, belief, or communication. Certain languages have particular logophoric pronouns which are used in the complement of sentences like (10b). Languages differ somewhat in the distribution of logophoric pronouns. Verbs of psychological state, and perception introduce logophoric pronouns in some languages; complementizers and the subjunctive may also also introduce them (Stirling 1993: 259 et seq, Giorgi & Pianesi 2000). The term 'logophoric' is due originally to Claude Hagège, who studied African languages such as Ewe, Mundang, Tuburi, and Ubangi languages. Logophoric pronouns have been identified in other languages, among them Igbo and Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981), and Mapun, a Chadic language (Frajzyngier 1985). The existence of logophoric pronouns (and related forms, discussed in §2.4 below) shows that linguistic coding of access to mind is an important feature of language.
Reports of belief (and thought) may or may not involve the consciousness of the person holding the belief. In Japanese there are particular features of vocabulary and syntax which are used to convey access to mind (Kuroda 1972, Hirose 2000). Hirose distinguishes logophoric and point of view according to whether consciousness is involved. Hirose's examples concern the pronoun zibun in Japanese; he notes that it has logophoric and non-logophoric uses. He claims that logophoric pronouns convey access to consciousness: the referent is aware of the propositional content of the clause containing the pronoun (2000: 1646). In connection with Indo-European languages most uses of the term logophoric ignore this distinction.

Expressions of thought and belief can be permeable, in the sense noted above for indirect speech: (11), for instance, is ambiguous in the same sense as (5d) above:

(11) Mary believes that that fool Gwendolyn wants to take over the committee.

On one reading, the epithet that fool is due to Mary: it is part of Mary's belief. There is also a reading, perhaps more salient in an isolated sentence, in which the reporter designates Gwendolyn as a fool. The two interpretations are true under different circumstance so that one cannot be substituted for the other. This property is known as 'referential opacity'; it is typical of complements referring to propositions.

Thoughts and beliefs are due to the person who holds the proposition. Vendler notes that propositions belong to particular individuals and are thus limited by subjective factors; in particular, referential opacity reveals the subjectivity of propositions (1972:73, 81). Sentences with these predicates need not make explicit the holder of the proposition, as (12) illustrates; b and c are due to Peterson 1997 and Asher 1993 respectively.

(12) a It seems that Mary will win the race.
   b Mary's having refused the offer was unlikely.
   c Everything that John believes is true.

These sentences do not have a verb of thought or belief; we ascribe responsibility for the proposition to the reporter. The sentences are subjective because they refer to propositions. Predicates which take propositions as complements include seem, appear, believe, fear, hope, want, think, affirm, deny, unlikely, impossible, inconsistent, sure, true, be certain, propose, hypothesize. Sentences with predicates which refer to propositions
can be identified linguistically; sentences which directly express propositions cannot be.

Questions, imperatives, and sentences with modal auxiliaries or adverbials are another source of subjectivity in sentences. These forms express Projective Propositions, a class noted by Asher (1993). Projective Propositions are unrealized, as in (13):

(13) a Clean up your room!
   b Will he leave the room?
   c He may/might leave the room.
   d John will probably win the race.

Projective Propositions also appear as the complement of verbs expressing unrealized notions (e.g. wonder, want, desire, guess, command, plead, entreat, allow, permit). Projective Propositions can be distinguished from other propositions by their behavior under quantification.5

Modals, questions and other projective propositions are ascribed to the reporter when they appear in main clauses, as in (13). When they appear in the complement clause of a mental or projective propositional verb, they are ascribed to the human subject of the verb, as in (14).

(14) a John thinks that Mary will probably win the race.
   b They asked/ordered Mary to clean up her room.

In (14a) the modal is due to John, not the reporter; in (14b) they gave the order.

§2.3 Evaluation

This class of expressions comprises evaluation, emotional reactions, commentary, and evidentials. All are subjective since all involve mind. They are conveyed by predicates and adverbials. The person responsible or affected is sometimes made explicit but not always; (15) illustrates.

(15) a That Mary won the race was surprising to her/everyone.
   b That Mary won the race was surprising.
c Surprisingly, Mary won the race.

d That Mary won the lottery was lucky for her.
e That Mary won the race was lucky.
f Luckily, Mary won the race.

The person affected is identified in the prepositional phrases of (15a, d). Without such phrases (15b, e) we ascribe the effect to the reporter or to another person (the latter interpretation is plausible in contexts where other participants are mentioned or assumed).

Adverbials of this class are due to the reporter (15c, f) when they appear in a main clause. Many evaluative expressions have related 'psychological' verbs, e.g. *surprise, frighten, annoy*, etc. I do not think that these verbs are subjective in the sense being developed here: they do not require that responsibility be ascribed to a mind. For instance, we can account for a sentence like *That John was early surprised Mary* adequately with the notion of a thematic role of experiencer.

Commentary and evidentials are also inherently subjective. They are expressed by adverbials or predicates, and imply a mind that is responsible:

(16)  a  Frankly, Mary won the race.
    b  Clearly, Mary won the race
    c Allegedly, Mary won the race.
    d  It was alleged that Mary won the race.
    e  It was alleged by many observers that Mary won the race.

The reporter is responsible for adverbials of commentary and some of evidentiality (16a-c). The situation is different for *allegedly* which means that an allegation was made by a particular person or source other than the reporter. The adverbials in these examples correspond to the 'highest' classes of adverbs distinguished in Cinque 1999: Speech Act adverbials (frankly, honestly), Evaluative adverbials (unfortunately), Evidential (clearly, allegedly). Cinque gives a syntactically-based account in which a syntactic projection is posited for each class.
Evidentials may take other forms as well. Cinque points out that, in addition to predicates and adverbials, many languages have particles and idiomatic expressions of surprise, approval, etc. (1999). Cinque gives as an example the expression after all as in the sentence So he is coming after all! (despite our expectation to the contrary. Like other lexical expressions, they are beyond the scope of this discussion.

§2.4 Perspectival

The central examples of this category are reports of perception, direct and indirect; the category extends to other cases which convey or suggest a particular perspective. Among the latter are reflexives not syntactically conditioned, deictics, NPs and PPs that involve direction or location. The category is intended to include all sentences that take a particular perspective on a situation.

Sentences with a particular perspective depart from the standard understanding of perspective as neutral, objective. By tacit convention we understand the perspective of a sentence to be transparent - not filtered through a particular mind - unless the sentence contains information to the contrary. Perception, however, necessarily involves the particular perspective of the perceiver. Reports of perception are subjective because a situation is perceived from the perceiver's standpoint.

§2.4.1 Perception

Linguistic presentation of perception may be direct, indirect, or inferred. The most straightforward cases are reports of direct perception: a verb of seeing, hearing etc. introduces a complement which expresses the situation perceived, as in (17):

(17) a John saw that the sun was shining.
   b John saw Mary walk to school.
   c John saw Mary walking to school.

The examples illustrate the three forms of perception verb complements in English: propositional, a 'bare' or 'naked' infinitive, or gerundive. First-person reports of perception are also subjective: they express the perspective of the reporter as a participant (including the 'unreliable narrator' of fiction).
Less direct but clear are cases where a perception verb sentence precedes another sentence; the second is taken to express the percept of the perception verb's subject. Examples like this tend to occur in narrative contexts. (18) illustrates:

(18) a  John looked out the window. The children were building a sandcastle.

b  ...Gabriel smiled at the three syllables she had given his surname and glanced at her. She was a slim, growing girl, pale in complexion and with hay-colored hair. (James Joyce)

These and other examples are discussed extensively in Caenepeel 1989. The second sentences convey the percept implied in the first: they are 'perspectivally situated'. Perspectively situated sentences either have the imperfective aspectual viewpoint (18a), or express a state (18b).

Perspectively situated sentences must express unbounded situations, according to Caenepeel. She claims that when a sentence presents a bounded situation the perspectival interpretation is unlikely at best. As evidence she gives examples like (19); the second sentence expresses an event with the perfective viewpoint, presenting it as bounded.

(19)  John looked out the window. Mary arrived.

It is difficult to interpret the second sentence here as conveying John's percept. The more natural interpretation is that the two events occurred in sequence; or perhaps at the same time. Caenepeel explains such examples by appealing to our concept of perception. Since perception occurs in an instant, one can perceive only a segment of an unbounded situation in that instant; a bounded situation requires more than a single instant.

This explanation suggests that when perception continues over an interval, perspectively situated sentences with the perfective viewpoint would be appropriate. I think it is possible to construct such examples. (20) illustrates; the perception verb has the perfective viewpoint in (20a), the imperfective in (20b).
(20) a John looked out the window. Mary threw the ball to Sue and Bill played in the sandbox. The neighbor's dog arrived and trotted back and forth.

b John was looking out the window. Mary threw the ball to Sue and Bill played in the sandbox. The neighbor's dog arrived and trotted back and forth.

Both examples convey ongoing perception, in which situations unfold as John looks from the window. They differ slightly. In (20a) the verb of perception has an inchoative interpretation, suggesting the beginning of John's looking; in (20b) the looking is in progress. Context plays a role in the interpretation of examples involving perception. In narratives it is common for thoughts and perceptions to be represented, often with some ambiguity as to whether the perspective belongs to the reporter or a participant. Thus narrative contexts - the main topic of Caenepeel's discussion - lend themselves to the perspectivally situated interpretation.

The imperfective viewpoint is known to be hospitable to particular perspectives. The imperfective focuses an internal interval of a situation and is traditionally said to involve an 'internal perspective' (Comrie 1976). As evidence for this traditional view, note that shifted deictics, which suggest the perspective of a participant (see (27) below) are always good in imperfective sentences. They are more limited in perfectives. In French, for instance, the *imparfait* past tense allows shifted deictics freely (Kamp & Reyle 1993) than the perfective past tenses (Smith 1991).

There are also cases of inferred perception. Sometimes one infers that a sentence conveys a percept without a verb of perception in the context. (21) illustrates. Like the examples of indirect perception more than one sentence is required. The first example is repeated from the beginning of this article; the second is from Dowty 1986.

(21) a I sipped my drink and nodded. The pulse in his lean grey throat throbbed visibly and yet so slowly that it was hardly a pulse at all. An old man two-thirds dead and still determined to believe he could take it.

b John entered the president's office. The clock ticked loudly.
In these examples the first sentence sets up a participant in a situation. The sentence(s) following are taken to express the percepts and/or thoughts of that person. Fragments that lead to the inference of perception tend to appear in narrative contexts, in which one expects to find expressions of participants' perceptions.

I now turn to a different set of cases, where a particular perspective is suggested but perception does not play a role. Rather, a situation is presented from the standpoint of a given participant, or the reporter as participant. The examples have reflexive pronouns, deictics and other expressions which imply the standpoint of a participant rather than an 'objective' stance. (22) illustrates with reflexives.

(22) a  This paper was written by Ann and myself.
    b  They heard the stories about themselves.
    c  Mary put the blanket over herself.

The particular perspective of the reflexives' antecedent is suggested in these sentences. In (22a) the speaker must be the antecedent of the reflexive, and is plausible as participant Ross (1970).9 In (22b-c) the sentence subjects they and Mary are the antecedents of the reflexives, and the reflexive suggests that the stories and blanket are located with respect to these people, that is, from their standpoint or perspective; (22b-c) are based on examples from Cantrall (1974) and Kuno (1987).

When they convey a particular perspective, reflexive pronouns are optional rather than syntactically conditioned. Syntactically conditioned reflexives are obligatory in contexts defined in Government Binding theory with the notions of c-command and locality. Roughly, in these contexts the antecedent c-commands the reflexive, within the domain of the relevant governing category (Chomsky 1981). Reflexives that violate these conditions represent a choice of the anaphor rather than a pronoun. To see the contribution of the reflexive, compare the sentences of (23). Both are well-formed.

(23) a  John pulled the toy toward him.
    b  John pulled the toy toward himself.
The choice of the reflexive makes a difference in interpretation. (23b) suggests the perspective of John as he pulls the toy, (23a) has no such suggestion. According to Kuno 1987, these examples convey an "empathy perspective" such that the reporter takes the perspective of a particular participant. I shall refer to these and similar cases as 'perspectival'. Many of them are suggestive but do not necessarily convey access to the mind of the participant.

Reflexives that can contrast with pronouns are variously known as "Long Distance Bound" (Zribi-Hertz 1989), "Long Distance Reflexives" (Stirling 1993), "Locally Free Reflexives" (Baker 1995). I will use the latter term, Locally Free Reflexives, LFR for short. Not all LFRs are perspectival: they may also be emphatic or intensive (Zribi-Hertz 1989, Reinhart & Reuland 1993, Baker 1995); such cases are beyond the scope of this discussion.

The antecedent of a perspectival reflexive may appear in an independent sentence earlier in the discourse, as in (24), cited by Baker (1995):

(24) ... She was not immediately able to say anything, and even when her spirits were recovered, she debated for a short time on the answer it would be most proper to give. The real state of things between Willoughby and her sister were so little known to herself, that in endeavoring to explain it, she might be as liable to say too much as too little. (Jane Austen)

Perspectival LFRs are similar to the logophoric pronouns mentioned above, and are called logophoric by many scholars. The antecedent to a perspectival LFR is a referent whose perspective is being represented. Such reflexives tend to occur in just those contexts in which logophoric pronouns may occur. Perspectival and logophoric LFRs have been identified in many other languages, among them Igbo and Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981), Japanese (Kuno 1972), Scandinavian languages (Thránsson 1976), and Italian (Giorgi 1984). Kuno 1987 offers a survey of logophoric phenomena across languages.

Possessive pronouns may also suggest the perspective of a participant. They can do so, in English at least, because of the limited resources of the language. There is no possessive counterpart to the reflexive: only possessive pronouns exist. Therefore
possessive pronouns have the potential either for a reflexive or a perspectival reflexive reading. (25) gives examples in which possessive pronouns suggest the perspective of the antecedent: (25a) is from Kuno (1987), (25b) from Hirose (2000).

(25) a John criticized his brother.
   b Kazuo lost a book that he borrowed from a friend of his.

The perspectival reading of the possessives is only optional in these examples, I think. They can be read as simply giving information about the relationship of the participants. For the latter interpretation one might say that the possessive pronouns do not have a reflexive component.12

Kuno has suggested that the perspectival effect also occurs in other cases where a directional relationship is expressed. For instance, the phrase John's sister suggests John's perspective whereas Mary's brother suggests the perspective of Mary. If this is correct a sentence like (26) would offer the possibility of two perspectives.

(26) John and his brother talked to Mary about her sister.

Whether or not (26) involves two perspectives, I think that these effects are weaker than in the preceding cases. Recognizing differences in strength among the relevant examples, Kuno 1987 posits a continuum of 'degrees of empathy'. At the high end of the continuum the reporter totally identifies with a participant; in the middle the identification is partial; at the low end the reporter manifests a total lack of empathy with participants. On such a continuum the examples of (25) and (26) are toward the low end.

Perspective may also be suggested by adjectives or epithets that would be expected from the participant, e.g. John talked to Mary about his beloved cat.

Another source of participant perspective is the deictic adverbial. Deictics strongly suggest the perspective of a participant, especially when anchored to a time other than the time of speech, as in (27):

(27) a Mary lost her watch 3 weeks ago.
   b Mary had lost her watch 3 weeks ago.
c Mary packed her clothes. She would be leaving soon.

In (23a) the deictic 3 weeks ago is anchored to the time speech, and may be ascribed either to the reporter or to Mary. The deictics in the other two examples, 3 weeks ago and soon, are anchored to the past times referred to in these sentences, not to the time of speech.

I conclude this brief survey by observing that there is an additive effect in sentences with linguistic forms which suggest the perspective of a participant but do not require this interpretation. If there is one such form, the suggestion is weak: with two or more, the suggestion of a participant perspective becomes stronger. (28) illustrates. In these examples, consider whether the question should be ascribed to the reporter or to Mary in a narrative context. Recall that questions suggest subjectivity, since they belong to the class of projective propositions (§2.3 above).

(28) a Mary played in the sandbox. Was it going to rain?
   b Mary was playing in the sandbox. Was it going to rain?
   c Mary was playing in the sandbox with her brother. Was it going to rain?

In (28a) the direct question is the only subjective element; in (28b) the preceding sentence has the imperfective viewpoint, which as we have seen invites a subjective interpretation. The example with the strongest subjective interpretation is (28c), which also has a possessive phrase oriented to Mary.

§2.5 Summary and comment

The categories discussed above are all subjective, but in slightly different ways. Communication involves public events; it is subjective since it expresses the contents of mind. The next category, Contents of mind, comprises private events: reports of mental states such as thoughts, beliefs, attitudes. Evaluation, the third category, is essentially a subclass distinguishing a kind of mental state. Expressions of these categories are conventionally conveyed by certain classes of verbs, predicates, and adverbials.
The Perspectival category includes perceptual reports and indications of a particular standpoint; both involve a subject's perspective.

Organized in this way, the material suggests a principled distinction among sentences with a component of subjectivity: they may express a point of view, or take a perspective on a situation. In the latter case a sentence takes a point of view rather than expressing it. I suggest that the term Point of View be reserved for the categories of Communication, Contents of mind, and Evaluation; and that the term Perspective be used for perceptual reports and other members of the fourth category.

§3. The composite approach

In most of the cases discussed above more than one linguistic form contributes to subjectivity either in the expression of point of view, or of a particular perspective. To make this concrete I list the forms most often found, in alphabetical order:

(29) Linguistic forms contributing to subjectivity

Communication and consciousness verbs
Main clause constructions mirroring idiomatic thought, speech
Complementizers
Deictic adverbials: place, time
Directional & locational PPS
Epithets
Evaluative verbs & adverbs, conjunctions (yet, anyway, still, after all, but)
Evidential adverbials: evidently, possibly, frankly
Imperfective aspectual viewpoint
Lexical: verb direction (go vs come); psych verbs, dative verbs, etc.
Projective propositions
Pronouns, reflexives, possessives
Propositional attitude complements
Stative sentences
Subjunctive

The list is not complete but it gives a sense of the many and varied forms involved.
The analysis sketched here develops the interpretations of subjectivity through compositional rules that are triggered by the relevant combination of forms. The rules encode interpretations like those developed above. The rules will recognize two roles: the holder of the point of view or perspective, which I will call the SELF, and the reporter of the situation, which I will continue to call the REPORTER. The SELF is distinct from the REPORTER unless only first person reference is involved.

The interpretation of subjectivity can be made explicit with an extension of the Discourse Representation Theory (DR theory) framework. The theory develops a dynamic representation of the truth-conditional and conceptual meanings of sentences in discourse (Kamp 1981, Kamp & Reyle 1993). The individuals, situations, and times that a discourse introduces are represented as distinct entities in the Discourse Representation Structure. The roles of SELF and REPORTER should also be represented if we are to represent the meanings of a discourse. A detailed proposal to extend DR theory in this way is made by Stirling 1993; Sells 1989 also gives a proposal. In this article I will confine myself to a sketch of compositional rules that can analyze subjectivity.

The composite analysis looks at multiple information sources and constructs an interpretation. In previous work I have presented such an analysis for aspectual situation types (states and different types of event). The interpretation of a sentence as stative, telic, atelic, etc. arises from a composite of the verb, its arguments, and relevant adverbials (Smith 1991).

DR theory provides for rules which construct a Discourse Representation Structure (DRS) for a discourse. The construction rules apply to sentences and deliver an interpretation which is encoded in the DRS. They look at syntactically analyzed surface structure and at relevant factors in the context of a sentence. The rules for aspectual situation types focus on three aspects of surface structure: syntax, e.g. verb complement relations; categorial information (adverbial, NP, PP, etc.); and features which encode such information as verb class, definiteness, ± directional (for PPs), ± completive (for adverbials).

Construction rules can account for the interpretations of subjectivity discussed above. The interpretation will set up two roles, the REPORTER and the SELF, and ascribe responsibility for a clause to one or both of them. Relevant factors include the syntactic
relations between clauses, categorial information, and such features as 1st, 2nd or 3rd person of pronouns; tense values; proximal vs distal deictics.

As illustration, consider two cases of indirect speech. The first is example (6a), repeated here as (30a), (30b) is closely related.

(30) a Mary told me yesterday at the station that she would meet me there.
    b Mary told me yesterday at the station that she would meet me here.

The sentences differ only in the adverb of the lower clause. The adverb is distal in (30a). In (30b) it is proximal, indicating that the REPORTER has permeated the clause of indirect speech.

The forms which convey indirect speech are the verb of communication told; the complementizer that; in the complement, a non-first person pronoun, past tense in matrix and lower clause, and whether deictics are proximal or not. Together, this information triggers the interpretation of indirect speech. Much of it is encoded with features, e.g. verb class V[com], tense [past], NP [-1st person], Adverb [-proximal].

Besides a rule that recognizes indirect speech we need principles for ascribing responsibility. In the default case there is no formal indication that the reporter permeates the clause of indirect speech, though it is always a possibility. If tense, proximal deictics, or other forms directly indicate the reporter, then the reporter permeates and both REPORTER and SELF are responsible for the complement clause. I will call these 'reporter-based forms.' (This statement is too simple since it doesn't account for epithets or lexical cues, e.g. adjectives such as beloved.) The rules identify the role of SELF with a participant in the situation; the REPORTER is always the writer/utterer of the clause.

As a tentative first pass, I will state principles for interpreting indirect speech; responsibility for a clause is indicated by a reverse arrow <--. The principles apply to a sentence if it fits the template provided by construction rules.

(31) Interpretation of indirect speech
    REPORTER = Speaker/writer
SELF = Referent of subject NP, main clause

a  Default
REPORTER <-- Main clause, possibly complement clause
SELF <-- Complement clause

b  If reporter-based forms in complement
REPORTER <-- Main clause, complement clause
SELF <-- Complement clause

c  Logophoric if main clause subject is coreferential with
complement clause subject

d  
REPORTER = SELF if main and complement clause subjects
are first-person pronouns of the same plurality.

The default principle holds unless the complement clause has material explicitly related
to the REPORTER; in that case the second principle applies. If the main and complement
clauses have coreferential subjects, the interpretation is logophoric. If they have first
person subjects with the same plurality REPORTER and SELF are the same.

The information triggering an interpretation of indirect speech is encoded in
compositional rules. The input to such rules is the syntactic surface structure of a
sentence; the output is the interpretation. I state a rough rule that encodes the
information above, assuming a simple surface structure as is typical in DR theory. The
rule applies to active sentences with a verb of the appropriate class (noted here as Vcom,
for communication) and a human subject; the adverb is optional.

(32) Indirect speech
\[ S[ NP1_{subj} \ VP[V_{com} [past]...S[that [ \ [past] (Adv[ \pmproximal]) ]]]] \]
The statement is intended to exclude the application of the rule to passive sentences and to sentences with expletive subjects. I do not provide here for the subject of the lower clause, so a different statement would be needed to determine coreference between subjects of the two clauses. (33) shows informally how (31) applies to (30a and b): I assume that the interpretation of coreferentiality has been made available.

\[
(33)a\quad S[\text{Mary} \quad V_{\text{com}} \quad [\text{past}] \quad ... \quad [\text{that} \quad [\text{NP}[\text{she}] \quad [\text{would:past}] \quad \text{Adv}[-\text{proximal}]])
\]

REPORTER <-- Main clause
SELF = Mary <-- Complement clause

\[
(33)b\quad S[\text{Mary} \quad V_{\text{com}} \quad [\text{past}] \quad ... \quad [\text{that} \quad [\text{NP}[\text{she}] \quad [\text{would:past}] \quad \text{Adv}[+\text{proximal}]])
\]

REPORTER <-- Main clause; complement clause
SELF = Mary <-- Complement clause

Similar composite rules can be stated for the other cases discussed above. Different rules are required for each case, since they are conveyed by particular forms and structures.

§4. Conclusion

In this discussion I have considered some of the main phenomena usually covered by the term 'point of view.' I have argued that the terms 'subjective' and 'subjectivity' be substituted for the general set of cases. The domain for the linguistic expression of subjectivity is the sentence, although it is usually at the discourse level that I argue that the term 'point of view' be reserved for cases which express communication, content of mind, or evaluation. I use the term 'perspectival' for sentences which express perception or otherwise suggest a particular perspective on a situation.

A composite analysis was sketched for sentences which express subjectivity, using compositional rules in the framework of Discourse Representation Theory. The rules recognize the key forms or combinations of forms that trigger interpretations of subjectivity. They ascribe responsibility through two roles, REPORTER and SELF, which will be identified with participants in the Discourse Representation Structure.
Footnotes

1. I would like to thank the audience at the Conference on Information Structure in Oslo, Norway (December 2000) for helpful comments and questions.

2. The term logophoric is now widely used, often referring to discourse-oriented anaphors, or anaphors that appear in point of view contexts (Reinhart & Reuland 1993: 671). The term is also used for all kinds of indications of the mind or perspective of a participant; see the references cited.

3. The term is due to Hagège (1974), who proposed it in connection with the African languages Mundang, Tuburi, Ewe, as follows: "The term ..to designate a category of anaphoric pronouns, personal and possessive, which refer to the author of a discourse or to a participant whose thoughts are reported" (Stirling's translation 1993:253).

4. Hirose p 1646: "In the logophoric example (a) Kazuo is obviously aware that the is shy, because he says so. On other other hand in example (b), Kazuo does not have to be aware that the book he lost is the one he borrowed from his friend. This is shown [by the fact that]. (c) is not contradictory.

(a) Kazuo wa zibun wa tereya da to itteiru
    K. TOP self TOP shy.person COP QUOT say-STAT
    Kazuo̱ says that he is shy .

(b) Kazuo wa zibun ga tomodati karita hon o nakusit
    K. TOP self NOM friend from borrowed book ACC lost
    Kazuo̱ lost a book that he borrowed from a friend.

(c) Kazuo wa zibun ga tomodati karita hon o nakusita ga,
    K. TOP self NOM friend from borrowed book ACC lost
    sono hon ga tomodati kara karita mono da to wa kizuite-it-nai.
Kazuoi lost a book that he borrowed from a friend but he has not realized that the book is the one he borrowed from a friend.

According to Hirose, *zibun* in examples like (b) and (c) conveys 'point of view', whereas in (a) *zibun* is logophoric.

5. In the quantificational test, one constructs a sentences with predicates referring to abstract objects (facts, propositions, projective propositions). If there is no quantifier Qx for such sentences which is true or has a truth value, then the predicates take arguments of distinct, incompatible types. This test distinguishes Propositions from Projective Propositions: # indicates lack of truth value.

   a  #John desires everything that Mary believes.
   b  # Everything that Mary asks for is true.
   c  John asks for something that Mary wants.
   d  Everything that John believes is true.

In a and b the clauses refer to different types of entities: in the first clause, the complements refer to projective propositions while the complements of the second clauses refer to propositions. They are semantically anomalous. In contrast, c and d both have complements referring to propositions and the sentences are semantically well-formed (Asher 1993:33-34).

6. Aspectual viewpoints focus all or part of a situation. Imperfectives focus part of a situation, excluding endpoints; perfective viewpoints focus a situation in its entirety, including endpoints or implicit bounds for events. The imperfective viewpoint in English is also known as the 'progressive'; it is conveyed by the auxiliary *be+ing*.)

   In sentences with the imperfective viewpoint the situations presented are unbounded because the imperfective does not include endpoints; sentences expressing
states present unbounded situations because the temporal schema of a state has no endpoints (Smith 1991). In Caenepeel's work the two can be grouped together into a supercategory of 'stative'; see also Herweg 1991. I argue against this approach in Smith 1996, 1999.

7. Caenepeel says that bounded events - events presented perfectively - are impossible or awkward as perceptual reports unless there is a contingency relation between the event and the focalizing sentence.

8. This is essentially the same as Kamp’s account of why present perfective sentences cannot be used to express a bounded event. We conceive of communication as instantaneous; communication of a bounded event, even if instantaneous, requires at least one instant after the completion of the event.

9. This is one of a set of examples which led Ross (1970) to suggest that all sentences have a higher clause in underlying structure with a first-person pronoun and a verb of communication in the present tense.

10. The account in Chomsky 1981 has been the subject of much critical comment. Reinhart & Reuland 1993 offer another account in the same general framework; a different approach is taken in Pollard & Sag 1992.

11. Cantrall was perhaps the first to note the perspectival use of the reflexive. Cantrall presents many examples, among them the following sentences. Cantrall asks us to imagine that they describe a photograph in which the standing women have their backs to the camera

   a  The women {i were standing in the background, with the children behind them {i.

   b  The women {i were standing in the background, with the children behind themselves {i.

In (a) the children are located from the perspective of the speaker; in (19b) they are located from the perspective of the women. As Zribi-Hertz notes, the sentences provide
empirical evidence that the reflexive is correlated with an 'internal' point of view - that of a discourse protagonist as opposed to the speaker (1989: 704).


13. Sells 1987 proposes that three roles be recognized: SOURCE, the one who makes the report; SELF: the one whose mind is reported; PIVOT: the one from whose physical point of view a report is made. For arguments against this view see Stirling 1993.
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