Protagonist-Mediated Perspective[1]

Carolyn Jane ANDERSON — *Wellesley College*
Arjun GUHA — *Northeastern University*

Abstract. There are two main competing analyses of Free Indirect Discourse: bicontextual accounts, which posit two separate context parameters (Schlenker, 2004; Eckardt, 2014; Reboul et al., 2016), and quotation accounts (Maier, 2015, 2016, 2017b). In this paper, we show that the bicontextual approach is not powerful enough to explain the range of perspective-taking behavior in Free Indirect Discourse. We highlight overlooked data on how grammatically perspectival expressions like *come* are interpreted in Free Indirect Discourse, showing that these perspectival expressions can be anchored to any perspective that is accessible to the protagonist. To account for this data, the bicontextual account requires a significant enrichment: two separate assignment functions in addition to two context parameters. Formalizing quotation using a *store update model*, we argue that modifying the bicontextual account in this way makes the two competing accounts strikingly similar to each other.

Keywords: perspective, Free Indirect Discourse, context shift, quotation.

1. Introduction

Free Indirect Discourse (FID) is a mixed perspective environment: some elements are evaluated relative to the narrator's perspective, and others are evaluated relative to the perspective of a protagonist, or prominent character. Much of the existing work on the linguistics of FID focuses on accounting for its tense and person features (Doron, 1991; Schlenker, 2004; Sharvit, 2008; Egetenmeyer, 2020). Despite the fact that FID is a perspectival phenomenon, relatively little attention has been paid to how perspectival expressions are interpreted in FID.

Existing work agrees, for the most part, on the empirical facts about perspectival expressions in FID: they are interpreted relative to the protagonist (Doron, 1991; Reboul et al., 2016; Hinterwimmer, 2019). But perspectival expressions constitute a diverse class, encompassing epithets, expressives, predicates of personal taste, and deictic motion verbs. These various classes of expressions may encode perspective in their semantics in different ways. Whether current theories of FID predict protagonist-oriented readings depends on how each expression's reference to perspective is grammatically encoded.

In this paper, we explore the interpretation of perspectival expressions in FID in more depth. We show that perspectival expressions are subject to a looser restriction in FID than previously proposed. Rather than being obligatorily protagonist-oriented, their perspectival orientation is protagonist-mediated: they can only refer relative to perspectives accessible in the protagonist's (real or imagined) discourse context.

Throughout this paper, we use the perspectival motion verb *come* as an example perspectival expression. As we will argue, certain properties of perspectival motion verbs make them partic-

ularly useful diagnostics: they are anaphoric (Barlew, 2015, 2017; Anderson, 2021), rather than indexical, and, due to a quirk of their lexical semantics, they receive non-speaker orientations fairly easily in ordinary discourse.

We probe the interpretation of *come* in FID contexts drawn from various literary sources, and present evidence that *come* can be anchored to some non-protagonist perspectives, including addressees of the protagonist and attitude holders. To explain these findings, we put forward a view of perspectival expressions in FID as obligatorily protagonist-mediated, rather than protagonist-oriented. We show that this falls out naturally from a quotation-based account of FID (Maier, 2015, 2016, 2017b), but can also be explained under a significantly enriched version of the bicontextual treatment (Schlenker, 2004; Eckardt, 2014; Reboul et al., 2016).

To aid comparison between the quotation-based account and the modified bicontextual account, we borrow a formalism from programming languages: store updates. We formalize the quotational account at a finer-grained level using a store update model of the discourse context to illustrate how the bicontextual account, once enriched to account for protagonist-mediated perspective, becomes very similar to the quotational account.

2. Free Indirect Discourse

Free Indirect Discourse is a mixed perspective discourse style. Certain linguistic expressions are interpreted with respect to the protagonist's perspective, while others are interpreted with respect to the narrator's perspective. This makes it different from both indirect speech, in which the content of a speaker's utterance is conveyed, but their wording is paraphrased by the speech reporter (1a), and from quotation, in which the speaker's utterance is conveyed through a faithful reporting of their words (1b).

(1)   Mary: Later, I will go to the store.
       a.   Mary said that she was going to go to the store later.
       b.   Mary said, "Later, I will go to the store."

In Free Indirect Discourse, by contrast, the content and style of the protagonist's utterance is preserved, but not their exact wording. In (2), the speech report reflects Mary's voice, but third-person pronouns are used, and the tense/aspect of the verb differs from both the quoted and indirect versions.

(2)   Later she would go to the store, Mary said.

Although FID originally emerged as a topic of interest in literary studies, its linguistic properties pose interesting challenges for theories of context-sensitivity and perspective. A number of competing analyses of the semantics of FID have emerged. In this section, we review the empirical properties of FID.

There is some debate over how to define FID on the basis of linguistic properties, rather than stylistic criteria, such as the authors who use it or the genres in which it appears. Fleischman (1990) lays out a three-part definition of FID as a kind of narration where (1) the features of direct speech (exclamatives, fragments, hesitations, etc) are reported (2) in the manner of indirect speech, (i.e. with third-person pronouns and shifted tense) (3) without the normal

structure of a speech report, such as quotation marks or embedding verbs.

However, subsequent work has highlighted the existence of multiple kinds of narration that meet these criteria, such as Viewpoint Shifting (Hinterwimmer, 2017) and Protagonist Projection (Holton, 1997; Stokke, 2013; Abrusán, 2021).[2]

We adopt four criteria for what constitutes FID: narrator-oriented tense and person, protagonist-oriented temporal adverbials, and non-embeddability. Previous work has also used perspectival expressions as a FID marker. However, since our goal is to revisit the assumptions that have been made about perspectival expressions, we defer their behavior to Section 4.

Narrator-oriented tense   In FID, tense reports the temporal perspective of the narrator. In (3), the day being described is in the narrator's past, but the protagonist's future. The verb is past tense, indicating that tense is narrator-oriented.

(3)   Tomorrow was Monday, Monday, the beginning of another school week! (Lawrence, 1920)

Protagonist-oriented temporal adverbials   A striking feature of FID is the apparent conflict between tense and temporal adverbials. Future-oriented temporal adverbials can co-occur with the past tense, as in (3) above. This arises because tense is anchored to the narrator's *now*, but temporal adverbials refer relative to the *now* of the protagonist.

Narrator-oriented person   The interpretation of person pronouns is a topic of some debate in work on FID. There is general consensus that the person features of pronouns are narrator-oriented: first person pronouns refer to the narrator, and the protagonist is generally referred to in the third person (Banfield, 1982; Schlenker, 2004; Maier, 2017a).[3] The protagonist may also be referred to with first-person pronouns if they are the same individual as the narrator (Schlenker, 2004), as in (4a). More rarely, the protagonist may be referred to in the second person (Fludernik, 1995; Maier, 2017b), as in (4b), where the last sentence is a FID report of Lotte's thought.

(4)   a.   The door slammed shut and I was standing outside the flat. What an idiot I had been! I had left the keys inside. (Eckardt, 2014)
        b.   I told Lotte about your good health. She smiled. You had obviously finally stopped smoking! Eckardt (2014)

The interpretation of gender features is more contentious. Doron (1991); Schlenker (1999, 2004) argue that gender features, like tense, are interpreted relative to the narrator's perspective. However, Sharvit (2008) provides examples that demonstrate that this is not always the case: the protagonist's beliefs about the gender of individuals also plays a role. Maier (2015, 2017b); Reboul et al. (2016); Delfitto et al. (2016) concur with Sharvit (2008)'s data, arguing that the

---

[2]Other terms in the literature include *substitutionary perception* (Fehr, 1938), *non-reflective/unreflective perception* (Banfield, 1982), *represented consciousness* (Brinton, 1980), and *narrated perception* (Fludernik, 1995).

[3]Banfield (1982) and some subsequent authors (Reboul et al., 2016) have claimed that first-person pronouns are only licit in FID when the narrator is the addressee of the protagonist. See Schlenker (2004) and Maier (2017a) for counter-examples.

gender features of pronouns are protagonist-oriented, while the person features are narrator-oriented.

Because this debate is ongoing, we rely only on person as an indicator of FID.

Matrix scope FID is a root-level phenomena: it always takes matrix scope. Doron (1991) shows that although FID passages can be followed by speech or attitude report parentheticals (5a), they cannot be embedded (5b).

(5)   a.   Tomorrow was Monday, Ursula thought.
        b.   *Ursula thought that tomorrow was Monday.

Furthermore, the attitude verbs that appear in these parentheticals are not limited to those that take CP complements (6), providing further evidence that they should not be treated as marking ordinary speech reports (Reinhart, 1983).

(6)   What department did she want? Elizabeth interrupted. (Woolf, 1925: cited in Reinhart 1983)

Having spelled out the characteristics that we will use to identify FID, we turn to the interpretation of perspectival expressions.

3. Perspectival motion verbs

In this paper, we focus on the interpretation of one class of perspectival expressions: perspectival motion verbs like *come*. In this section, we illustrate the properties of these verbs and explain why they are a particularly useful diagnostic for understanding who can serve as the anchor for perspectival expressions in FID.

3.1. Anchoring

Perspectival motion verbs describe motion relative to the location of a perspective-holder. The verb *come* describes motion towards the perspective-holder, while the verb *go* describes motion away (Fillmore, 1966). In (7a), *come* can be used because the motion is to the location of the listener, who can serve as the perspective-holder. In (7b), on the other hand, there is no discourse-prominent individual in New York to serve as the perspective-holder, so *come* is infelicitous.

(7)   *Context: Abby and Beth are talking to each other in Boston.*
        a.   Abby: I'm coming/#going to see you right now.
        b.   Abby: I'm #coming/going to New York right now.

The most common perspective-holder for *come* is the speaker, as is typical for perspectival expressions (Fillmore, 1966; Kuno and Kaburaki, 1977; Lasersohn, 2005; Potts, 2005, 2007; Harris and Potts, 2009). However, other perspective-holders can also anchor *come*. In (7a), the perspective-holder is the listener. In (8), *come* is anchored to an attitude-holder, Rishi's brother, who is the subject of *hope*.

(8)   *Context: Rishi and Kate are talking in Boston. Rishi's brother lives in New York.*
        Rishi: My brother is hoping that I'll come to New York soon.

In ordinary conversation, the perspective-holder of *come* is not fixed. It can be any sufficiently discourse-prominent individual (Anderson, 2021). This sets *come* apart from other perspectival expressions such expressives, epithets, and predicates of personal taste, which exhibit much more limited ability to anchor to non-speaker perspectives (Harris and Potts, 2009; Harris, 2012; Kaiser, 2015; Kaiser and Lee, 2017).

3.2. Anchoring relations

The examples above make use of one kind of **anchoring relation** between the perspective-holder and the motion path: the perspective-holder is located at the destination of motion, at either event-time or utterance-time. However, English *come* allows two other anchoring relations. First, it can be used to describe motion towards a home-base of the perspective-holder (Fillmore, 1966). For instance, since Sherlock Holmes is habitually associated with 22B Baker Street, Moriarty's motion towards Baker Street can be described using *come* in (9), even though Holmes and his addressee are not in London (and will not be there at event-time).

(9)   *Context: Holmes and Watson are on the Cornish coast.*
        Holmes: I instructed Mrs. Hudson to visit her cousin in the country, to protect her in case Moriarty comes to call at Baker Street in our absence.

Second, English *come* allows an accompaniment anchoring relation: it can be used to describe motion alongside the perspective-holder (Fillmore, 1966). This is shown in (10).

(10)   Holmes: Watson, you are coming with me to Cornwall this weekend.

There is no perspective-holder at the destination of motion (Cornwall) at either event or utterance time, but the use of *come* is still felicitous.

It is important to note that under any analysis, the lexical semantics of *come* exclude its subject from serving as the perspective-holder if the event time motion towards perspective-holder anchoring relation is used. This is because the same person cannot both be in motion towards a location and already located there. This makes it particularly easy to set up non-speaker anchoring for *come*: if the speaker is the subject of *come* in an event time anchoring context, they cannot serve as the perspective-holder.

3.3. The semantics of perspectival motion verbs

Several competing analyses of the semantics of perspectival motion verbs have been proposed. Some previous work analyzes its perspectival component as indexical (Taylor, 1988; Oshima, 2006a, b; Sudo, 2018). In this view, the context parameter contains an additional field for a perspective-holder or set of perspective-holders.

More recent work has convincingly demonstrated that *come* is sensitive to discourse factors that do not affect indexicals (Barlew, 2017; Charnavel, 2018; Anderson, 2021). For instance,

in (11), the perspective-holder for *come* is first the listener, then the speaker. In (12), the perspective-holder co-varies with the quantifier.

(11)   John will come to your house before he comes here. (Fillmore, 1966)

(12)   Every mother believes that her wayward child is coming to Christmas dinner. (Barlew, 2015)

These examples argue in favor of analyses in which *come* is anaphoric to a discourse-given perspective, since indexicals do not shift under quantification. Anderson (2021) also presents examples where *come* shifts between perspective-holders within a clause, such as in (13).

(13)   *Context: Nick and Carolyn are siblings. Nick lives in Texas, Carolyn lives in Massachusetts, and their parents live in Washington. Nick is in Texas talking to his friend.*
        Nick: Carolyn says that our mom will come to Texas during bluebonnet season and come to Northampton during asparagus season.

We adopt a perspective-anaphoric treatment following Barlew (2017). In this treatment, *come* is anaphoric to a prominent perspective in the Common Ground, as shown in (14a).

(14)   a.   **Lexical semantics for *come***:
              $[[\text{come}]]^{w,g} = \lambda x.\lambda e.\text{MOVE}(e) \wedge \text{DEST}(e,x) \wedge x = \text{LOC}(g(p))$, where p is a perspective-holder, w is a possible world, and g is an assignment function.

In this account, p is a variable that is resolved anaphorically to a perspective-holder in the Common Ground by the assignment function.

We now return to FID and lay out the empirical evidence about how perspectival motion verbs behave in this environment.

4. Perspectival expressions in Free Indirect Discourse

Previous work has assumed that perspectival expressions in FID are obligatorily fixed to the perspective of the FID protagonist (Banfield, 1982; Schlenker, 1999, 2004). In this section, we revisit this assumption through the lens of the perspectival motion verb *come*, which, in ordinary speech, allows any discourse-prominent individual to serve as the perspective-holder. We present new data showing that in addition to the protagonist, there are several other kinds of acceptable perspectival anchors for *come* in FID.

4.1. Protagonists

Previous work on FID has assumed that perspectival expressions are obligatorily protagonist-oriented. Although we will show below that this is not always the case for perspectival motion verbs, it is common.

The protagonist can anchor *come* when they are located at the destination of motion at either utterance time or event time. Example (15) is a case of event-time protagonist anchoring.

(15)   Harriet had begun to be sensible of his talking to her much more than he had been
        used to do, and of his having indeed quite a different manner towards her; a manner of
        kindness and sweetness!–Latterly she had been more and more aware of it. When they
        had been all walking together, he had so often come and walked by her, and talked so
        very delightfully!–He seemed to want to be acquainted with her. (Austen, 1816)

In this passage from *Emma*, the protagonist, Harriet, is currently located at Hartfield, but is
reporting a motion event that occurred when she was at Donwell Abbey. Notice that the des-
tination of motion, and therefore, the perspective, actually co-varies with the quantifier in this
example: the destination of motion is wherever Harriet is at each moment.

Example (16) shows an instance of utterance-time protagonist anchoring. The perspective-
holder is the protagonist, Elena, who is at Tuscany at utterance time, but was not at event time.

(16)   Elena watched the cypress-tufted hills of Tuscany give way to the valley of the Arno.
        [...] Thirty years ago, in a different lifetime she had come here with Jeff, before they
        were married. And five years before that, by herself, when she had studied and taught
        in Europe. Those were vacations, pleasure trips, adventures. This was a pilgrimage, a
        quest. (Davies, 2008)

Example (17) illustrates either event-time anchoring or a homebase anchoring relation; in either
case, the perspective-holder is the protagonist, Anne Elliot, who lives at Camden Place and is
reflecting on a party that will be held there as she walks around Bath.

(17)   Anne could do no more; but her heart prophesied some mischance to damp the per-
        fection of her felicity. It could not be very lasting, however. Even if he did not come
        to Camden Place himself, it would be in her power to send an intelligible sentence by
        Captain Harville. (Austen, 1818)

These examples illustrate what is already well-known: the protagonist of FID can serve as the
perspective-holder for *come*.

4.2. Addressees and speakers

Although many uses of *come* in FID are protagonist-oriented, not all are. There are many
instances where *come* is oriented to the addressee of the protagonist, as in (18) below. In
(18), the FID passage reports Lady Bruton's perspective, but *come* is anchored to Richard's
perspective (the destination is his home).

(18)   Richard turned to Lady Bruton, with his hat in his hand, and said, "We shall see you at
        our party to-night?" whereupon Lady Bruton resumed the magnificence which letter-
        writing had shattered. She might come; or she might not come. Clarissa had wonderful
        energy. Parties terrified Lady Bruton. But then, she was getting old. (Woolf, 1925)

Examples (19a) and (19b) show that the accompaniment relation is also available with ad-
dressee perspective-holders. In (19a), the FID protagonist is Lily, but the perspective-holder is
Mr. Bankes, who has invited her to walk with him. This is an accompaniment relation because
Lily will be in motion alongside Mr. Bankes, rather than in motion towards his location. In

(19b), the protagonist is Mrs. Ramsay, who is expressing the wish to accompany her addressees (Minta, Prue, and Paul) to the beach.

(19) a. So, Lily thought, it was probably an excuse of his for moving, for getting out of earshot, that made Mr. Bankes almost immediately say something about its being chilly and suggested taking a stroll. She would come, yes. (Woolf, 1927)

   b. Instantly, for no reason at all, Mrs. Ramsay became like a girl of twenty, full of gaiety. A mood of revelry suddenly took possession of her. Of course they must go; of course they must go, she cried, laughing; and running down the last three or four steps quickly, she began turning from one to the other and laughing and drawing Minta's wrap round her and saying she only wished she could come too, and would they be very late, and had any of them got a watch? (Woolf, 1927)

These examples show that the protagonist's addressees can anchor *come* with various anchoring relations.

We note that in these examples, the protagonist is the subject of the motion verb; one might argue that addressees are licensed only when the protagonist's perspective is unavailable to license *come*. But this will not do, since the motion event could always be described in a way consistent with the protagonist's perspective, if another verb is used instead. If perspectival motion verbs were obligatorily protagonist-oriented in FID, we would expect the passages above to use *go* instead of *come*.

4.3. Attitude holders

Perspectival motion verbs in FID environments can also be anchored to attitude holders. For instance, (20a) contains two motion descriptions, both describing a trip from Mansfield, where Mrs. Norris is located, to Portsmouth, where Mrs. Price is located.

(20) a. [Mrs. Norris] proclaimed her thoughts. She must say that she had more than half a mind to go with the young people; it would be such an indulgence to her; she had not seen her poor dear sister Price for more than twenty years; and it would be a help to the young people in their journey to have her older head to manage for them; and she could not help thinking her poor dear sister Price would feel it very unkind of her not to come by such an opportunity. (Austen, 1814)

The first description uses *go*; presumably, Mrs. Norris is the perspective-holder and *come* is not licensed because her own motion is being described. The second motion description, which occurs inside an attitude report, uses *come*; it must be anchored to the perspective of Mrs. Price, the attitude holder, since Mrs. Norris is not a valid perspective-holder at utterance time (when she is in Mansfield) or event time (when she is in motion).

Example (21) shows another example of anchoring to an attitude holder. Emma, the protagonist, is at Hartfield, but the destination of motion is Abbey Mill Farm, the home of the Martins. Thus, the perspective-holder anchoring *come* must be the Martins, who issued the invitation.

(21) Emma, to dissipate some of the distress it occasioned, judged it best for [Harriet] to return Elizabeth Martin's visit. How that visit was to be acknowledged–what would be

> necessary– and what might be safest, had been a point of some doubtful consideration. Absolute neglect of the mother and sisters, when invited to come, would be ingratitude. It must not be: and yet the danger of a renewal of the acquaintance! (Austen, 1816)

We note that *come* is embedded here within a non-finite clause, an environment that usually does not allow indexical shift (Deal, 2020; Sundaresan, 2020); this is additional evidence that perspective shift for motion verbs is a grammatically distinct phenomenon.

Indeed, perspectival motion verbs can be anchored to attitude holders even when they are not syntactically embedded within the attitude report. In (22), the second instance of *come* is anchored to the speaker of the direct speech report that precedes it (Minta). The protagonist is Mrs. Ramsay, who is inside the house observing her guests through a window.

(22)   There was some quality which she herself had not, some lustre, some richness, which attracted him, amused him, led him to make favourites of girls like Minta. They might cut his hair from him, plait him watch-chains, or interrupt him at his work, hailing him (she heard them), "Come along, Mr. Ramsay; it's our turn to beat them now," and out he came to play tennis. (Woolf, 1927)

These examples demonstrate that several kinds of attitude holders can anchor perspectival motion verbs even within FID. However, we note that in all the cases shown above, the attitude report is one that is re-reported by the protagonist within the FID passage.

4.4. Co-variation

There are also some rare cases of *come* co-varying in quantificational contexts within FID. Example (23) is one such case: here, the perspective-holder of *come* co-varies with the individuals that Clarissa wants to please. The destination of motion is each of their locations.

(23)   How much she wanted it–that people should look pleased as she came in, Clarissa thought and turned and walked back towards Bond Street, annoyed, because it was silly to have other reasons for doing things. Much rather would she have been one of those people like Richard who did things for themselves. (Woolf, 1925)

This is a particularly valuable example because it is not a context that quantifies over speech or thought, which could introduce covert structure involving manipulation of context parameters.

4.5. The narrator is excluded

So far we have shown that other discourse-prominent individuals beyond the protagonist can anchor perspectival motion verbs in FID. Are there any potential perspective-holders who are excluded?

A key property of the perspective-holders in the examples we have shown is that they are *accessible* to the protagonist. The protagonist is aware of them, either as an addressee (18)-(19a), the subject of an attitude report that the protagonist is relaying (20a)-(22), or as an individual quantified over in a hypothetical context that the protagonist is mulling (23).

However, there is one key individual who cannot serve a perspective-holder within FID: the narrator of the FID passage. This is shown by the infelicity of *come* in (24a) below.

(24)   a.   Twelve years ago I had sat in my dreary London apartment, dreaming of Southern Italy, and now I was here. Oh how lovely it would be there! To feel the sun and taste the food! If only I could one day earn enough to go/#come there! So I had sighed then.

The narrator and the protagonist are the same individual, but have different utterance-time locations. Although the narrator is in Italy at utterance-time, *come* cannot be felicitously used to describe the protagonist's motion there. The narrator's perspective seems to be unavailable to anchor perspectival expressions within the FID passage.

This is striking because the narrator is discourse-prominent: nothing in the semantics of *come* seems to rule out (24a). In fact, *come* can be anchored to the narrator in a non-FID paraphrase, as in (25a):

(25)   a.   Twelve years ago I sat in my dreary London apartment, dreaming of Southern Italy, and now I was here. I'd thought it would be lovely to be there and feel and taste the food. I hoped for so long to earn enough to come here.

This suggests that the infelicity springs from violating some FID-specific condition, rather than from the semantics of *come*.

4.6. Summary

We have presented new data showing that *come* allows a wider range of perspectival anchoring than has been previously assumed for perspectival expressions in FID. We find that many non-protagonist individuals can serve as perspectival anchors, including addressees of the protagonist and subjects of attitude reports recounted by the protagonist. However, the licensing of *come* is still more restricted than in ordinary discourse: although the narrator is discourse-prominent, they cannot serve as the perspectival anchor for *come*.

5. Mediated perspective

Based on the evidence presented above, we propose that FID constrains the set of available perspectival anchors for *come* to individuals whose perspectives are accessible to the protagonist. We call this **Mediated Perspective**.

(26)   Mediated Perspective: in FID, perspectival expressions can only be anchored to perspectives that are available to the protagonist in the protagonist's discourse context.

Both the bicontextual and quotational accounts treat FID as involving two utterance contexts: the narrator's matrix context and the protagonist's embedded speech or thought context. The accounts differ, however, in how they model these contexts.

Mediated Perspective stipulates that the set of licit perspective-holders comes only from the

embedded speech or thought context of the protagonist. This has ramifications for the structure that must be assumed in modeling the two contexts: the protagonist's context must be tracked in a form that preserves the set of accessible perspectives. In this section, we discuss what this means for these two competing theories of FID.

5.1. Bicontextual analysis

One main family of accounts of FID is the *bicontextual* analysis. The bicontextual analysis proposes that FID passages are evaluated with respect to two context parameters simultaneously. Tense and person features are controlled by the matrix context, while all other indexicals are controlled by the protagonist's speech or thought context (Schlenker, 2004; Eckardt, 2014; Reboul et al., 2016). We focus on Eckardt (2021)'s version of this account.

The central proposal is that in indirect speech, two context parameters are at play: the matrix context parameter C, which tracks the context of reporting speech event, and an embedded context parameter d, which tracks the reported context. In a FID context, these are respectively referred to as the narrator's and protagonist's contexts.

In this account, the lexical entry for each expression determines which context parameter it refers relative to. Some always refer relative to the matrix context C, such as tense features, while others can refer relative to the embedded context d, such as temporal adverbials.

A rigid indexical is an indexical that remains fixed to the matrix context even in an embedded context. For instance, when the English indexical I is used in a speech report, it refers relative to C and picks out the narrator, even if it occurs in the embedded clause. In (27a), both occurrences of I refer to Kate; although the second occurs within the embedded clause, it cannot be interpreted as referring to Smita, who is the speaker of the embedded context.

(27)   a.   Kate: I heard Smita say that I was tall.

Other expressions can refer relative to the embedded context of utterance. Eckardt (2021)'s example is *thank heavens*. When *thank heavens* is used in an unembedded context, as in (28a) it refers relative to the speaker; when it is used in the embedded context in (28b), it expresses that Anna, rather than the matrix speaker, is thankful.

(28)   a.   Thank heavens she was rich.
        b.   Thank heavens she was rich, Anna said.

Eckardt (2021) posits that *thank you* always refers to an embedded context, if available, and expresses that the internal speaker (protagonist) is thankful (29a).

(29)   a. $[[\text{ thank heavens }]] = \lambda p.\lambda w.\text{RELIEF}(sp(v_c), time(v_c), p, w)$
             "added to any proposition p, states that the internal speaker is relieved about p"
             (Eckardt, 2021).

The interpretation in (28b) is straightforward under this treatment: the internal context variable v_c can be resolved to d, the embedded context of Anna's speech. In (28a), there is only one context parameter available (C); consequently, all context variables are resolved to it. This leads v_c to be instantiated with C, attributing relief to the speaker within C, who is the narrator.

Critically, the ability to shift some but not all expressions within Free Indirect Discourse rests on analyzing certain expressions as rigid indexicals, and others as shiftable. Rigid indexicals are unaffected by the embedded context; shiftable indexicals refer relative to an embedded context when it exists (as in FID).

Note that Eckardt (2021)'s account allows for quantification over contexts, which would lead shiftable indexicals to co-vary with the quantifier in some kinds of quantification, as in (30a):

(30)   a.   Every teacher$_i$ confirmed that luckily, her$_i$ students were reading a book. (Eckardt, 2021)

Here, each teacher serves as the speaker for a confirmation report, introducing an embedded context for every teacher. The expressive *luckily* then refers relative to each of these individual embedded contexts.

The final piece of Eckardt (2021)'s bicontextual account is the linking between the matrix and embedded contexts: she posits that matrix clauses of indirect speech reports serve to describe the embedded utterance context. This provides a temporal link between the matrix and embedded context.

A key feature of the bicontextual accounts is the reliance on context parameters to explain protagonist- versus narrator-oriented expressions in FID. A clear prediction is that only indexical expressions, more specifically, shiftable indexicals, should be affected by the presence of an embedded context, because it is this class of expressions that take their referent from the context parameter directly. Other classes of context-sensitive expressions, like anaphoric expressions, pick up their referent from the discourse context via the assignment function. Thus, their interpretation would not be affect by the presence of an embedded context parameter.

5.1.1. Mediated Perspective in the bicontextual account

The bicontextual account therefore makes a clear prediction about *come*: because it is anaphoric, its interpretation should not be changed within FID contexts. The set of available perspectives is determined by the discourse-prominence of various perspectives, not by the context parameter. Therefore, the presence of an embedded context parameter should have no effect on the licensing of *come*. As we have seen, however, *come* does behave differently in FID: even though the narrator is discourse-prominent, they cannot serve as the perspective-holder for *come*.

In order to capture Mediated Perspective, the bicontextual account would need a way to track which perspectives are accessible to the protagonist. The existing bicontextual account, however, tracks only the context parameter of the protagonist.

We are not the first to point out that FID affects expressions beyond indexicals. In fact, Schlenker (2004) points out that FID comes with a requirement that all content other than tense and person is read *de dicto* according to the protagonist. He achieves this for indexicals via the bicontextual approach. But anaphoric expressions will require something else, since they are sensitive to the discourse-prominence of individuals in the Common Ground, not the context parameter.

Similarly, Reboul et al. (2016); Delfitto et al. (2016) propose that FID is subject to a Maximize Shifting constraint, which requires all elements to shift to the protagonist's perspective when possible. However, if we interpret this constraint as governing anaphoric elements in addition to indexicals, it is too strong: it predicts obligatory protagonist-oriented readings of *come*, ruling out the other perspective-holders that we discussed in Section 4.

5.1.2. A modified bicontextual account

One solution would be to enrich the bicontextual account with access to the discourse context. In our modified bicontextual account, we posit two Common Grounds in addition to two context parameters in FID.

The matrix Common Ground perspective ranking determines who can serve as the protagonist for FID (as explored by Hinterwimmer (2019); Bimpikou (2020); Abrusán et al. (2021)), while the protagonist's Common Ground determines who can serve as a perspective-holder for expressions within the FID passage. The relationship between the two discourse contexts is asymmetrical. FID passages serve to update the protagonist's Common Ground as well as the matrix Common Ground, since the narrator is recounting the FID content in their own discourse context. Matrix utterances, on the other hand, only update the matrix Common Ground: the protagonist does not have access to the narrator's commentary.

This approach ensures that only protagonist-accessible perspectives are selected: perspectival expressions within FID refer relative to the protagonist's Common Ground. The embedded Common Ground does not contain the narrator, since the protagonist is unaware of them. This effectively rules out the narrator as a potential perspective-holder for *come* (and other perspectival expressions, both indexical and anaphoric), while allowing *come* to be anchored to any protagonist-accessible perspective.

5.2. Quotation analysis

A main competing account of FID pursues a quotation-based account. Maier analyzes FID using quotation and unquotation operations (Maier, 2015, 2016, 2017b), positing that the narrator is reporting the protagonist's (real or imagined) speech verbatim, but with certain elements selectively **unquoted**. Unquotation is a device for pausing verbatim quoting that is commonly used in journalistic reporting, as in (31) below.

(31)   Sarah said she would have to "do it [herself] after all."

Here, the originally first-person reflexive has been unquoted so that it matches its antecedent.

Maier proposes that FID is quoted speech or thought of the protagonist, with tense and the person features unquoted by the narrator. In his analysis, the FID example in (5a) could be represented using the square brackets of unquotation as follows:

(32)   a.   Tomorrow [was] Monday, Lily thought.

All content outside of the brackets is interpreted as the protagonist's direct thought, while the

brackets represent the narrator's paraphrasing of the tense of the verb.

Maier argues that FID has a verbatim faithfulness requirement: the words used to report the protagonist's speech or thought are in their register, not that of the narrator. This falls out naturally under a quotational analysis, since, other than the unquoted tense and person features of pronouns, everything else within a FID passage represents the protagonist's own words.

Maier (2015) uses a two-dimensional analysis of quotation in which quotes have both a use and mention component (Geurts and Maier, 2005). The mixed quotation in (33) contributes two components of meaning: the assertion that Ann used the literal words "not mah cup o' tea" to refer to a property, and the assertion that she meant that property to apply to the music.

(33)   Ann said that this music was "not mah cup o' tea." (Maier, 2015)

Formally, the use component is a property variable that ranges over semantic objects of the type corresponding to the syntactic category of the quoted material. A quotation operator takes a string of letters/phonemes and returns an expression referring to that string, represented with the corner brackets ⌜ ⌝. The truth-conditions for (33) are shown in (34).

(34)   Ann used ⌜not mah cup o' tea⌝ to refer to property $P \land$ Ann said that this music was P.

Unquotation is used to substitute a linguistic expression of the narrator's for one within the quote. A quotation containing an unquotation is interpreted as a function that expects an argument of the type of the unquoted material. To demonstrate how quotation and unquotation work together in FID, consider the FID passage in (35).

(35)   Mary was packing her bags. Tomorrow was her last day. Oh how happy she would be to finally walk out of here. To leave this godforsaken place once and for all. (Maier, 2017b)

We represent quotation with corner brackets and unquotation with square brackets. In the quotational analysis, (35) would have a quotation operator scoping over the last two sentences, with unquotation operators unquoting tense and pronouns, as shown in (36).

(36)   Mary was packing her bags. ⌜Tomorrow [was] [her] last day. Oh how happy [she] [would be] to finally walk out of here. To leave this godforsaken place once and for all.⌝

The truth-conditions of the first FID sentence are shown in (37).[4]

(37)   [[Tomorrow was her last day]] = Mary uses ⌜Tomorrow ... ... last day⌝ to refer to $P \land$ Mary thought P(was)(her).

---

[4]We have followed Maier (2015)'s semantics rather than Maier (2017b), which requires more notational overhead. In the later presentation, the semantics for (37) are:

[["Tomorrow [was] [her] last day"]] = $\exists e[\text{THINK}(e) \land \text{AGENT}(e) = x \land \text{TIME}(e) < \text{NOW} \land$
$\exists e' \sqsubset e, e'' \sqsubset e[\text{FORM}(e) = \ulcorner\text{Tomorrow}\urcorner^{\cap}\text{FORM}(e')^{\cap}\text{FORM}(e'')^{\cap}\ulcorner\text{last day}\urcorner \land {}^{\vee}\text{CONTENT}(e') = ||was|| \land$
${}^{\vee}\text{CONTENT}(e'') = ||her||]]$ where $^{\cap}$ denotes the concatenation of strings, and $^{\vee}$ is an operator that returns the extension of an intensional expression.

5.2.1. Mediated Perspective and the quotational account

In quotation-based accounts, FID passages are taken to be verbatim-faithful to the protagonist's thought or speech, except for select elements that are **unquoted** by the narrator (Maier, 2015, 2016, 2017b). This account naturally captures protagonist-mediated perspective, since perspectival expressions are predicted to be reported exactly how the protagonist used them.

However, our data does force the scope of the unquoting operator to be very narrow. In (36), we placed brackets around the entire verb, indicating that the entire verb was unquoted. However, in examples with *come*, like (38), this will not work: the perspectival anchoring of the verb must be quoted, while the tense and aspect of the verb must be unquoted.

(38)   [She] [would come], yes. (Woolf, 1927)

Thus, in order to account for Mediated Perspective, the quotational account must allow unquoting at the featural level, as Maier (2015) proposes to explain Sharvit (2008)'s cases of pronouns with narrator-oriented number and protagonist-oriented gender marking.

5.3. Alternative Accounts of FID

More recently, Charnavel (2023) has proposed an alternative analysis of FID drawing on Sharvit (2008)'s indirect discourse approach to FID. Charnavel (2023) argues that FID is indirect discourse in the scope of a logophoric operator.

(39) $[[log\text{-}FID]]^{c,g}(w)(p)(t)(x) = 1$ iff for all world-time-individual-assignment quadruples $< w', t', x', g' >$ compatible with x's mental state in w at t (where x' is the individual in w' that x self-identifies as), $p(w')(t')(x')(g') = 1$. (Charnavel, 2023)

This explains why FID can contain exempt anaphors if they refer to the protagonist, as in (40), and also why anti-logophoric elements are blocked within FID.

(40)   [pro$_i$ log-FID [That was one of the bonds between Sally and himself$_i$.]] (Charnavel, 2023)

Charnavel (2023)'s proposal neatly captures one aspect of the Mediated Perspective descriptive generalization: the logophoric pronoun would block *come* from referring relative to the narrator, since Charnavel (2020) shows that when *come* co-occurs with exempt anaphors, they must refer relative to the same perspective-holder:

(41)   [Le fils de Claire]$_i$ mérite que le temps permette à son$_i$ propre fils de venir à Lyon.
         '[Claire's son]$_i$ deserves the fact that the weather allows his$_i$ own son to come to Lyon.'
         Inference: Claire's son is located in (or associated with) Lyon. (Charnavel, 2020)

However, the logophoric account of FID fails to account for the second aspect of Mediated Perspective for exactly this same reason: it predicts that *come* should be obligatorily protagonist-oriented in FID, since the anaphoric reference of *come* is predicted to be bound by the protagonist-referring logophoric pronoun.

To fully account for Mediated Perspective, the examples of non-protagonist-oriented uses of

come would need to be explained, for instance, by positing an intervening logophoric binding context. While this would be plausible for many of the attitude-holder cases, it is harder to accept in addressee-oriented cases such as (18), repeated as (42) below:

(42)   Richard turned to Lady Bruton, with his hat in his hand, and said, "We shall see you at our party to-night?" whereupon Lady Bruton resumed the magnificence which letter-writing had shattered. She might come; or she might not come. Clarissa had wonderful energy. Parties terrified Lady Bruton. But then, she was getting old. (Woolf, 1925)

In this example, there is very little linguistic structure surrounding *come* that could support an intervening addressee-oriented logophoric binding context.

6. Shifting Discourse Contexts

We have presented evidence that perspectival motion verbs in FID are subject to Mediated Perspective: they can be anchored only to perspectives accessible to the protagonist. We have shown that this descriptive generalization is captured by quotation accounts of FID (Maier, 2015, 2016, 2017b), but argued that it presents challenges for competing accounts of FID, particularly, the bicontextual approach.

Bicontextual accounts posit two context parameters to explain why some elements in FID are protagonist-oriented and others are narrator-oriented. Since *come* is not indexical, it should not be affected by an additional context parameter. As we have shown, however, *come* does behave differently in FID compared to ordinary discourse: the narrator, though discourse-prominent, cannot serve as the perspective-holder. A stipulation that perspectival items are always protagonist-oriented (such as Schlenker (2004)'s de dicto requirement or Reboul et al. (2016); Delfitto et al. (2016)'s Maximize Shifting requirement) would be too strict, since *come* can be anchored to addressees and attitude holders in the protagonist's discourse context.

Above we suggested a way to salvage the bicontextual account by using two discourse contexts in addition to two context parameters. In this section, we present a formalization of this modified bicontextual account alongside the quotational account, in a common framework.

6.1. A store update treatment of assignment functions

The protagonist-mediated behavior of *come* in FID shows that FID affects anaphoric reference as well as indexical reference. One way to achieve this is to propose that there are two discourse contexts as well as two context parameters at play. We posit separate assignment functions for the protagonist and narrator, with an asymmetrical relationship: the narrator's assignment function can refer to entities tracked in the protagonist's Common Ground, but not vice versa.

We model this by adopting a *store update* model of assignment functions. We introduce an operator similar to the context shift operator posited in work on shifty indexicals (Schlenker, 2003; Anand and Nevins, 2004; Deal, 2017), but operating on assignment functions. To achieve the asymmetric relationship between the narrator and protagonist Common Grounds, we will need two versions of the operator: one to shift to the protagonist's discourse context (SWAP),

and one to shift and merge back to the narrator's (MERGE).

(43)　　a.　　$[[\text{SWAP}]] = \lambda(\langle c_1, g_1 \rangle, \langle c_2, g_2 \rangle).(\langle c_2, g_2 \rangle, \langle c_1, g_1 \rangle)$
　　　　b.　　$[[\text{MERGE}]] = \lambda(\langle c_1, g_1 \rangle, \langle c_2, g_2 \rangle).(\langle c_2, g_2 \oplus g_1 \rangle, \langle c_1, g_1 \rangle)$

SWAP takes two discourse contexts and switches between them, shifting between both context parameters and assignment functions. MERGE also switches between discourse contexts, but additionally, the discourse context it produces includes a merged assignment function: all assignments in g_2 are added to g_1. Alpha-renaming is used to avoid conflicts. By default, the interpretation function uses the first context in the tuple to evaluate all expressions.

A FID passage begins with a SWAP operation, moving the discourse context from that of the narrator to the protagonist, and ends with a MERGE operation, which merges any discourse referents introduced into the narrator's assignment function before changing back to the discourse context of the narrator. This achieves a general protagonist-oriented interpretation of FID. However, in FID, some elements remain fixed to the narrator's perspective: tense and person features. We propose that these features are wrapped within a MERGE and SWAP operator pair. An example is shown in (44).

(44)　　$[[\text{Her husband was coming tomorrow.}]]^{(<C,G,c,g>}$
　　　　a.　　[SWAP MERGE her SWAP husband MERGE was SWAP coming tomorrow MERGE]

Our treatment makes predictions about the interpretation of discourse referents in FID beyond perspectival anchoring. In the analysis we sketch, discourse referents introduced within the FID passage should be available in the matrix discourse context, since the embedded assignment function is merged into the matrix assignment function. However, the protagonist should not be able to refer to discourse referents introduced by the narrator unless they are also available in the embedded discourse context.

This prediction seems to be borne out. In (45a), Peter Wimsey is introduced within the embedded discourse context in the italicized FID passage. He can then referred to pronominally in the matrix context, as in the continuation in (45b). This shows that discourse referents introduced by the protagonist can be referred to by the narrator.

(45)　　a.　　For a long moment, Harriet simply could not believe her eyes. *Peter Wimsey. Peter, of all people. Peter, who was supposed to be in Warsaw, planted placidly in the High as though he had grown there from the beginning.* (Sayers, 1935)
　　　　b.　　Wrapping up his conversation with the Master of Balliol, he turned to face her.

In example (46), by contrast, the italicized exclamation can only be interpreted from the narrator's matrix perspective, not as a continuation of the previous FID passage.

(46)　　Anna looked pale and worried. How I longed to know what she was thinking! Many years later I discovered that her brother had stolen a large portion of her father's funds around that time. *What a scoundrel he was!*

The store update model therefore accounts for the asymmetrical nature of reference in FID: the narrator's discourse context tracks the protagonist's discourse, but not the other way around. Mediated Perspective is one consequence of this asymmetry: within FID, *come* can only be licensed by perspectives prominent within the protagonist's discourse context.

The store update model thus captures Mediated Perspective in FID. One challenge, however, lies in the fact that tense is narrator-oriented, while the perspectival anchoring conditions on *come* are evaluated relative to the protagonist's discourse context. As in Maier's quotational account, we will need to allow SWAP and MERGE to operate at a fine-grained level: the SWAP back to the protagonist's perspective must come after tense is evaluated, but before the perspectival anchoring conditions on *come* are evaluated. We leave this syntactico-semantic interface puzzle for future work.

6.2. Unifying Approaches to FID

The store update model sketched above is one way of implementing an enriched bicontextual account. Rather than lexically specifying each expression to refer either to the matrix discourse context or the embedded discourse context, we have introduced operators that shift between pairs of context parameters and assignment functions. This provides access to two discourse contexts through the two assignment functions: the narrator's and the protagonist's. Our account is inspired by the context shift operators proposed for indexical shift, but provides a mechanism for switching back again to the matrix context.

Notice that the store update model looks similar to the quotational account of FID, in which interpretation is controlled by the use of quotation and unquotation operators. Another way to look at the store update model is as a formalization of quote and unquote: SWAP begins a quotation, while MERGE provides a way to unquote and return to the matrix discourse context.

The store update model therefore draws together the quotation and bicontextual accounts of FID: to account for the mediated behavior of perspectival motion verbs demonstrated above, both must involve manipulating assignment functions.

7. Misleading Quotation

The store update formalization of quotation also makes predictions about quotation outside of FID. In a quote, the matrix speaker reports an utterance from a prior context. Both the context parameter and the assignment function within a quote are those of the original speech context. After the quote, the quoter can refer back to entities introduced within the quote.

In (47), the quotation introduces Valerie Saintclair into both the embedded and matrix discourse contexts. The quoter can then refer pronominally to her outside of the quotation.

(47)   Mrs. Oglander$_i$ said, "I had never seen Valerie Saintclair$_j$ before that fatal night." But she$_i$ was in fact her$_j$ mother!

Although the quoter can refer to discourse entities introduced by the quotee, the quotee cannot refer to discourse entities outside of the quote, unless they are also available within the embedded discourse context. Example (48) can only be felicitously uttered if Valerie Saintclair was in the original discourse context being quoted.

(48)   Even though Valerie Saintclair$_i$ was in fact her$_j$ daughter, Mrs. Oglander$_j$ said, "I had never seen her$_i$ before that fatal night."

Otherwise, this would be misquotation: it would lead to the false belief that Mrs. Oglander had asserted that it was Valerie Saintclair who was unknown to her, rather than whoever Mrs. Oglander was really speaking about. The formalization we have sketched thus provides a way of predicting when quotations are and are not felicitous.

Although we model quotation as a shift back to the original speech context, discourse participants do not usually have direct access to the original context (they may not have been present). In these cases, quotation must involve a reconstruction of the original context, using both the existing Common Ground (especially in the case of mixed quotation) and world knowledge.

If the reconstructed context differs from the original context in a way that changes the interpretation of the quote, the quotation is infelicitous: the listener will be unable to interpretation, or will interpret it misleadingly. Consider the two ways of quoting (49) in (50).

Example (50a) is misleading because, in the absence of explicit information about the original speech location, the addressee borrows the location from matrix speech context to resolve the indexical *here*. By contrast, (50b) first updates the matrix discourse context with information about the quotee's utterance location. This allows the addressee to reconstruct the embedded context and correctly solve the referent of *here*.

(49)   *Context: Sally Ride is being interviewed at NASA.*
         Sally Ride: I did not come here to make history.

(50)   *Context: Lisa Meedan is giving a speech about Sally Ride at Swarthmore.*
         a.   Lisa Meedan: Sally Ride said, "I did not come here to make history."
         b.   Lisa Meedan: Sally Ride said at NASA, "I did not come here to make history."

This approach echoes Eckardt (2014)'s proposal for FID, in which underspecified fields in the embedded context parameter are determined via anaphoric reference to the matrix context parameter. Thus, the store update model of quotation we have sketched could also be used to formalize the notion of misquotation.

8. Conclusion

We have presented new data about the interpretation of perspectival expressions in FID. Although perspectival expressions are commonly protagonist-oriented, we show that one perspectival expression, the motion verb *come*, can be anchored to other discourse-prominent individuals. However, its behavior is more restricted in FID than in ordinary discourse: although the narrator is discourse-prominent, they cannot serve as the perspective-holder for *come*.

We posit that *come* can only be anchored to perspectives accessible to the FID protagonist, a descriptive generalization we call Mediated Perspective. We show that this pattern of behavior is compatible with quotational accounts of FID, but is not easily captured by alternatives like the bicontextual approach.

We propose enriching the bicontextual account with two assignment functions in addition to two context parameters. We sketch a formalization using store updates, and show that in this framework, the bicontextual and quotational accounts become very similar. We also discuss

predictions that the store update model makes for reference in FID and in quotation more broadly.

References

Abrusán, M. (2021). The spectrum of perspective shift: Protagonist projection vs. free indirect discourse. *Linguistics and Philosophy 44*, 839–873.

Abrusán, M., E. Maier, and A. Stokke (2021). Computing perspective shift in narratives. In *The Language of Fiction*. Oxford University Press.

Anand, P. and A. Nevins (2004). Shifty operators in changing contexts. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory 14*, 20–37.

Anderson, C. J. (2021). *Shifting the Perspectival Landscape: Methods for Encoding, Identifying, and Selecting Perspectives*. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Austen, J. (1814). *Mansfield Park*. Project Gutenberg.

Austen, J. (1816). *Emma*. Project Gutenberg.

Austen, J. (1818). *Persuasion*. Project Gutenberg.

Banfield, A. (1982). *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. London: Routledge.

Barlew, J. (2015). 'Coming' to a doxastic agent. In *Sinn und Bedeutung*, Volume 19, pp. 71–88.

Barlew, J. (2017). *The semantics and pragmatics of perspectival expressions in English and Bulu: The case of deictic motion verbs*. Ph. D. thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Bimpikou, S. (2020). Who perceives? Who thinks? Anchoring free reports of perception and thought in narratives. *Open Library of Humanities 6*(2), 7.

Brinton, L. (1980). 'Represented perception': A study in narrative style. *Poetics 9*(4), 363–381.

Charnavel, I. (2018). Deictic perspective and logophoric exemption from Condition A. In W. G. Bennett, L. Hracs, and D. R. Storoshenko (Eds.), *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Volume 35, Somerville, MA, pp. 124–131. Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Charnavel, I. (2020). Logophoricity and locality: A view from French anaphors. *Linguistic Inquiry 51*(4), 671–723.

Charnavel, I. (2023). Free Indirect Discourse as logophoric context. Ms.

Davies, M. (2008). *The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA): 600 million words, 1990-present*. Available online at www.english-corpora.org/coca.

Deal, A. R. (2017). Shifty asymmetries: universals and variation in shifty indexicality. Unpublished ms.

Deal, A. R. (2020, 10). *A Theory of Indexical Shift: Meaning, Grammar, and Crosslinguistic Variation*. The MIT Press.

Delfitto, D., G. Fiorin, and A. Reboul (2016). The semantics of person and de se effects in free indirect discourse. *SpringerPlus 5*(1451).

Doron, E. (1991). Point of view as a factor of content. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory 1*, 51–64.

Eckardt, R. (2014). *The Semantics of Free Indirect Discourse: How Texts Allow Us to Mindread and Eavesdrop*. Number 31 in Current Research in the Semantics / Pragmatics Interface. Boston: Brill.

Eckardt, R. (2021). The parameters of indirect speech. In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Semantics*. Wiley Blackwell.

Egetenmeyer, J. (2020). The prominence value of the temporal anchor of free indirect discourse: A comparison with the perspectival center. *Discours 27*.

Fehr, B. (1938). Substitutionary narration and description: A chapter in stylistics. *English Studies 20*, 97–107.

Fillmore, C. (1966). Deictic categories in the semantics of Come. *Foundations of Language 2*, 219–227.

Fleischman, S. (1990). *Tense and narrativity: From medieval performance to modern fiction*. University of Texas Press.

Fludernik, M. (1995). *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: the linguistic representation of speech and consciousness*. London: Routledge.

Geurts, B. and E. Maier (2005). Quotation in context. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics 17*(1), 109–128.

Harris, J. A. (2012). *Processing Perspectives*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Amherst, MA.

Harris, J. A. and C. Potts (2009). Perspective-shifting with appositives and expressives. *Linguistics and Philosophy 36*(2), 523–552.

Hinterwimmer, S. (2017). Two kinds of perspective taking in narrative texts. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory 27*, 282–301.

Hinterwimmer, S. (2019). Prominent protagonists. *Journal of Pragmatics 154*, 79–91.

Holton, R. (1997). Some telling examples: A reply to Tsohatzidis. *Journal of Pragmatics 28*(5), 625–628.

Kaiser, E. (2015). Perspective-shifting and free indirect discourse: Experimental investigations. In S. D'Antonio, M. Moroney, and C. R. Little (Eds.), *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, Volume 25, pp. 346–372.

Kaiser, E. and J. H. Lee (2017). Predicates of personal taste and multidimensional adjectives: An experimental investigation. In W. G. Bennett, L. Hracs, and D. R. Storoshenko (Eds.), *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Volume 35, Somerville, MA, pp. 224–231. Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Kuno, S. and E. Kaburaki (1977). Empathy and syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry 8*, 627–672.

Lasersohn, P. (2005). Context dependence, disagreement, and predicates of personal taste. *Linguistics and Philosophy 28*, 643–686.

Lawrence, D. H. (1920). *Women in Love*. Project Gutenberg.

Maier, E. (2015). Quotation and unquotation in Free Indirect Discourse. *Mind and Language 30*(3), 345–373.

Maier, E. (2016). A plea against monsters. *Grazer Philosophische Studien 93*, 363–395.

Maier, E. (2017a). Mixed quotation. In D. Gutzmann, L. Matthewson, C. Meier, H. Rullman, and E. Zimmerman (Eds.), *The Companion to Semantics*, pp. 1–29. Wiley Blackwell.

Maier, E. (2017b). The pragmatics of attraction: explaining unquotation in Direct and Free Indirect Discourse. In P. Saka and M. Johnson (Eds.), *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Quotation*, Number 15 in Perspectives in Pragmatics, pp. 259–280. Springer.

Oshima, D. (2006a). GO and COME revisited: What serves as a reference point? In Z. Antić, Charles B. Chang, Emily Cibelli, Jisup Hong, Michael J. Houser, Clare S. Sandy, Maziar Toosarvandani, and Yao Yao (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Vol-

ume 32, pp. 287–298. Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Oshima, D. (2006b). Motion deixis, indexicality, and presupposition. In M. Gibson and J. Howell (Eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, Volume 16, pp. 172–189.

Potts, C. (2005). *The logic of conventional implicatures*. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. Oxford University Press.

Potts, C. (2007). The dimensions of quotation. In C. Barker and P. Jacobson (Eds.), *Direct Compositionality*, pp. 405–431. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reboul, A., D. Delfitto, and G. Fiorin (2016). The semantic properties of Free Indirect Discourse. *Annual Review of Linguistics 2*, 255–271.

Reinhart, T. (1983). Point of view in language: The use of parentheticals. In G. Rauh (Ed.), *Essays on Deixis*, pp. 169–194. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Sayers, D. (1935). *Gaudy Night*. Distributed Proofreaders Canada.

Schlenker, P. (1999). *Propositional Attitudes and Indexicality: A Cross-categorical Approach*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.

Schlenker, P. (2003). A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy 26*, 29–120.

Schlenker, P. (2004). Context of thought and context of utterance. A note on free indirect discourse and the historical present. *Mind and Language 19*(3), 279–304.

Sharvit, Y. (2008). The Puzzle of Free Indirect Discourse. *Linguistics and Philosophy 31*(3), 353–395.

Stokke, A. (2013). Protagonist Projection. *Mind and Language 28*(2), 204–232.

Sudo, Y. (2018). Come vs. Go and perspective shift. Ms. Rutgers University.

Sundaresan, S. (2020). A new theory of indexical shift. Unpublished ms.

Taylor, K. A. (1988). We've got you coming and going. *Linguistics and Philosophy 11*(4), 493–513.

Woolf, V. (1925). *Mrs Dalloway*. Project Gutenberg.

Woolf, V. (1927). *To the Lighthouse*. Project Gutenberg.