

Deictic Perspective and Logophoric Exemption from Condition A

Isabelle Charnavel

1. Introduction

It has been crosslinguistically established that anaphors can be exempt from the locality conditions imposed by Condition A (Chomsky 1986, Charnavel and Sportiche 2016, a.o.) when they are logophoric, i.e. when they are anteceded by a perspective center (Clements 1975, Sells 1987, a.o.). But what exactly counts as a perspective center remains unclear. In particular, the role of spatial perspective (cf. Sells's notion of 'Pivot') in licensing exempt anaphors has been understudied.

The goal of this paper is to show that only mental perspective centers can license exempt anaphors. Based on the distribution of French and Mandarin anaphors, I demonstrate that spatial perspective (created by deictic motion verbs like *come* or spatial prepositions like *behind*) does not create sufficient conditions for logophoric exemption from Condition A: anaphors anteceded by deictic centers are not necessarily exempt. This is so, I claim, because exempt anaphors must appear in clauses expressing the perspective of their antecedent, and only mental perspective has clausal content.

This does not mean that spatial perspective is never relevant to logophoric exemption. One complication arises with deictic motion verbs like *come*, which create necessary conditions for exemption: the deictic center for *come* must corefer with the logophoric antecedent of a clausemate anaphor because, I argue, *come* itself requires a logophoric argument, and two logophors in the same domain must corefer.

2. Spatial perspective is insufficient for logophoric exemption

Anaphors such as English *himself* (Pollard and Sag 1992, a.o.), Icelandic *sig* (Maling 1984, a.o.), French *lui-même* and *son propre* (Zribi-Hertz 1989, Charnavel 2017a-b, a.o.), or Mandarin *ziji* (as illustrated in (1); Huang and Liu 2001, a.o.), among many others, escape the locality requirement of Condition A under logophoric conditions, that is, when they are anteceded by a perspective center.

- (1) Zhangsan_i shuo Lisi you zai piping ziji_i le.
Zhangsan say Lisi again at criticize REFL ASP¹
'Zhangsan_i said that Lisi was again criticizing him.'
(Huang and Liu 2001)

According to Sells (1987: 457), three types of perspective centers qualify for licensing exempt anaphors: Source (i.e. "one who is the intentional agent of the communication", as in (1) above), Self ("one whose mental state or attitude the content of the proposition describes") or Pivot ("one with respect to whose (space-time) location the content of the proposition is evaluated"). The definition of Pivot could suggest that it is sufficient for an entity to be the spatial reference point (the deictic center) to count as a logophoric center and thus license exempt anaphors. The aim of this section is to show

* Isabelle Charnavel, Harvard University, icharnavel@fas.harvard.edu. Thanks to the audience of WCCFL35 for interesting questions and comments. I am also grateful to Yujing Huang for helping me with the Mandarin data. This work has been supported by the National Science Foundation under grants 1424054 and 1424336.

¹ The following abbreviations are used in the glosses throughout the paper: ASP=aspectual marker; CL=classifier; NEG=negation; PART=particle; PASS=passive; PRON=pronoun; REFL=reflexive. Also note that the Mandarin elements *ba* and *de* are simply glossed as BA and DE. The *ba* construction roughly introduces an affected object and *de* serves as a relativizer and is used to form possessive constructions

that this is not the case: an anaphor anteceded by a deictic center is not necessarily exempt from Condition A. The notion of Pivot must be further specified so as to include mental properties.

2.1. The case of spatial prepositional phrases

Spatial prepositional phrases like *behind*, *in front of* or *to the left/right of* (and their French and Mandarin counterparts, a.o.) encode a spatial relation between two entities and require a deictic center for their interpretation, as illustrated by the examples in (2) (intended to describe Figure 1).

- (2) a. The virginal is in front of the young woman. [intrinsic]
 b. The virginal is behind the young woman. [relative]



Figure 1. *The Music Lesson* by Johannes Vermeer [via Wikimedia Commons]

Specifically, they give rise to two types of interpretation (see Levinson 2003, Oshima 2006, Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd 2007, a.o.). Under the intrinsic interpretation, the deictic center is the referent of the complement of the preposition (the young woman in (2)a) and has to be intrinsically oriented (the young woman has a front/back). Under the relative interpretation, the deictic center is a reference point (the external speaker in (2)b) distinct from the two entities spatially located (the virginal and the young woman in (2)), and the referent of the complement need not (but can) be intrinsically oriented.

Crucially, the deictic center does not license logophoric exemption under any interpretation: an anaphor does not (necessarily²) escape Condition A when we guarantee that it is anteceded by the deictic center, as shown with the French anaphors *son propre*³ and *lui-même* in (3).

- (3) a. *Devant [la jeune femme]_i est accroché un miroir où apparaît son_i (*propre) reflet.*
 ‘In front of [the young woman]_i hangs a mirror where her_i (*own) reflection appears.’
 b. *[La jeune femme]_i est à l’arrière-plan, avec une viole de gambe derrière elle_i(*-même).*
 ‘[The young woman]_i is in the background, with a viola da gamba behind her_i(*self).’

In (3)a-b, the anaphors *son propre* ‘her own’ and *elle-même* ‘herself’, which can in principle be exempt under logophoric conditions (see Charnavel 2017a-b), are not locally bound by their antecedent *la jeune femme* ‘the young woman’. This antecedent is construed as the deictic center ((3)a-b are correct descriptions of the painting in Figure 1 only under the intrinsic interpretation), and cannot be understood as any other type of perspective center (the neutral description of a painting is incompatible with empathy). In that case, the anaphors are degraded as compared to the pronouns *son* ‘her’ and *elle* ‘her’. Thus, the deictic center does not qualify as a logophoric center for exemption.

² Unless, of course, the deictic center also qualifies as another type of perspective center (i.e. attitude holder, empathy locus, see Section 3.1). All relevant examples (e.g. (3)-(4)) have been controlled for avoiding that.

³ As explained in Charnavel (2017a-b) and references therein, *son propre* behaves like an anaphor under a contrastive reading with respect to the possessor. In several examples (e.g. (8)), the contrast with other possessors is made explicit; in the rest of the examples (e.g. (3)a), it is intended to be implicit.

This is confirmed by the fact that (French) inanimate anaphors are never exempt (Charnavel and Sportiche 2016). If deictic centers could count as logophoric centers, this would predict that inanimate spatial points of reference can antecede exempt anaphors. But this is not borne out, as illustrated in (4) (cf. Cantrall 1974 about English *itself*).

- (4) [L'épINETTE]_i est à l'arrière-plan, avec le mur derrière elle_i(*-même).
 'The virginal]_i is in the background with the wall behind it_i(*self).'

The same holds in Mandarin: in (5), the anaphor *ziji* complement of *houmian* 'behind' is not exempt from binding ((5)a) or locality ((5)b) requirements when it is anteceded by the deictic center.⁴ Furthermore, inanimate *ziji* can never be exempt, even under deictic conditions as in (6).⁵

- (5) a. [Zhexie daren]_i hougian de shu jilu zhe {tamen_i / *ziji_i} de guoqu.
 these adults behind DE book record ASP PRON REFL DE past
 'The book behind [the adults]_i records their_i (*own) past.'
 b. [Lisi zhe ge bendan]_i zhao-bu-bao shu le yinwei shu zai {ta_i / *ziji_i} de hougian.
 Lisi this CL idiot find-not-PART book ASP because book at PRON REFL DE behind
 'That stupid Lisi]_i could not find the book because it was behind him_i(*self).'

- (6) [Zhe zuo fangzi]_i daota de shihou, {ta_i / *ziji_i} hougian de huayuan
 this CL house collapse DE time PRON REFL behind DE garden
 bei wanhao de baocun le xialai.
 PASS intact DE preserve ASP PART
 'When [this house]_i collapsed, the garden behind it_i(*self) was preserved intact.'

Thus, deictic centers cannot serve as logophoric antecedents for exempt anaphors neither in French nor in Mandarin, which suggests that this holds more generally.

2.2. The case of deictic motion verbs

That this observation holds generally is further suggested by the fact that it is not only verified in the case of spatial prepositional expressions, but also in the case of deictic motion verbs.

Deictic motion verbs like English *come* (French *venir* and Mandarin *lai*, a.o.) usually require that the speaker (or addressee) be (mentally) located at the goal of the motion⁶ as shown in (7)a (cf. Talmy 1975, Fillmore 1997, Oshima 2006, a.o.). The deictic center for *come* can also shift from a discourse participant to the attitude holder (cf. Oshima 2007, Sudo 2015, a.o.) as illustrated in (7)b.

- (7) a. Liz came to Calgary. [speaker/addressee] {is/was} (mentally) located in Calgary
 b. Liz said that they came to Calgary. [speaker/addressee/Liz] {is/was} (mentally) located in Calgary

Just as in the case of spatial prepositional expressions, this type of deictic center (i.e. the individual (mentally) located at the goal of motion) does not license logophoric exemption: the French anaphors *sa propre* and *lui-même* in (8) are not exempt from Condition A (absence of local binding yields ungrammaticality), even if they are anteceded by the deictic center *un voisin* 'a neighbor', who is located at the goal of motion. Note that the pronouns *sa* and *lui* are acceptable as long as the speaker is

⁴ This is the case under both intrinsic and relative interpretations. The antecedent of *ziji* is the deictic center under an intrinsic interpretation in (5)a and (5)b. But the same would hold if we replaced *ziji* 'himself' with *ziji de qiu* 'his own ball' as complement of *houmian* 'behind' in (5)b: in that case, which would force a relative interpretation (given that a ball is not oriented), Lisi could still remain the deictic center.

Also, note that the use of *bendan* 'stupid' is meant to disfavor the interpretation under which Lisi is construed as an empathy locus, which would license exempt *ziji* independently of deixis.

⁵ And this is not due to the fact that *ziji* can never be inanimate: contrary to what is standardly claimed, *ziji* can be inanimate when it obeys Condition A (Charnavel and Huang 2017 [this volume]).

⁶ This requirement is usually cast as a presupposition (Oshima 2007, a.o.), see fn.12.

understood as being in the hospital (i.e. at the goal of motion). Also, the presence of *chère* ‘dear’ is meant to shift the empathy locus away from the antecedent of the anaphor so as to guarantee that *un voisin* ‘a neighbor’ does not qualify as any other type of perspective center, but only as a deictic one.⁷

- (8) a. Ma chère mère ainsi que sa_i (*propre) mère sont venues voir [un voisin]_i à l’hôpital.
 ‘My dear mother as well as his_i (*own) mother came to see [a neighbor]_i in the hospital.’
 b. Ma chère fille qui est amoureuse de lui_i(*-même) est venue voir [un voisin]_i à l’hôpital.
 ‘My dear daughter who is in love with him_i(*self) came to see [a neighbor]_i in the hospital.’

Again, the same holds in Mandarin: unlike the pronoun *ta*, the anaphor *ziji* is deviant when its antecedent is the deictic center for *lai* ‘come’ and does not c-command *ziji* (as in (9)a) or is not its clausemate (as in (9)b). Note that in (9)b, it is ensured that Lisi cannot be construed as any other type of perspective center by making Lisi’s mother the attitude holder.

- (9) a. Lisi_i de mama lai kan {ta_i / *ziji_i}.
 Lisi DE mother come visit PRON REFL
 ‘Lisi’s mother came to visit him_i(*self).’
 b. Lisi_i de mama gaosu wo Lisi zai ta lai kan {ta_i / *ziji_i} de shihou zhengzai shuijiao
 Lisi DE mother tell me Lisi at she come visit PRON REFL DE time ASP sleep
 ‘Lisi’s mother told me that Lisi was sleeping when she came to visit him_i(*self).’

2.3. Analysis

The previous data show that in various languages, anaphors cannot be exempt from Condition A when their antecedents are construed as deictic centers without any other type of perspectival property. This reveals that spatial perspective is not sufficient for logophoric exemption: deictic centers do not qualify as logophoric centers licensing exempt anaphors.

The reason for that, I hypothesize, is that only mental perspective creates the relevant logophoric conditions for exemption. Spatial reference points, however, need not have mental properties.

This generalization can be explained if we further specify the conditions for exemption. So far, we have claimed that an anaphor can only be exempt if it is anteceded by a perspective center. This is not sufficient: more specifically, an anaphor is exempt if it occurs in a clause (the logophoric domain) expressing the perspective of its antecedent, as in (1) above. This implies that the type of perspective at stake must be able to be expressed by a clause. Crucially, spatial perspective lacks clausal content. Thus, deictic centers cannot license exempt anaphors because they cannot create logophoric domains.

This can be implemented using logophoric operators (cf. Koopman and Sportiche 1989, Anand 2006, a.o.). According to Charnavel (2017a-b), exempt anaphors are in fact not exempt from Condition A, but locally bound by a silent pronoun *pro* introduced by a logophoric operator OP_{LOG} (which itself corefers with the superficial antecedent *A* of the anaphor) as represented in (10). This does not only explain why exempt anaphors have the same form as plain anaphors (they are one and the same element subject to Condition A), but also why they are logophoric, i.e. they need to occur in a domain expressing the perspective of their antecedent: as (roughly) stated in (11), the logophoric operator presents its clausal complement *P* from the perspective of the referent of *pro*.

- (10) $A_i \dots [pro_i [OP_{LOG} [P \dots exempt\ anaphor_i \dots]]$
 -----→ -----→
 coreference local binding

- (11) $\llbracket OP_{LOG} \rrbracket = \lambda P. \lambda x. P$ from *x*’s perspective

⁷ Expectedly, inanimate exempt anaphors are also unacceptable when anteceded by the deictic center of *come*:

- (i) Quelques années après l’accident nucléaire, ses_i (*propres) habitants sont finalement revenus à Nahara_i.
 ‘Some years after the nuclear accident, its_i (*own) inhabitants finally came back to Nahara_i.’

This analysis predicts that deictic centers cannot antecede exempt anaphors: the *pro* introduced by a logophoric operator cannot corefer with a deictic center, as a deictic center does not fulfill the semantic conditions for marking the domain P as logophoric, since spatial perspective lacks intensional content.

In sum, Sells's (1987) notion of Pivot should not be understood as a purely spatial reference point: a Pivot can only serve as a logophoric center for the purposes of exemption if it has mental properties.

3. One complication: Logophoricity of deictic motion verbs

The result of the previous section should imply that spatial perspective does not play any role in logophoric exemption. One complication however arises with deictic motion verbs. As we have seen, they do not create sufficient conditions for exemption. But they create necessary conditions for exemption, in the sense that their deictic center must corefer with the logophoric antecedent of clausemate exempt anaphors. The goal of this section is to provide an account for this.

3.1. Interaction of deictic motion verbs with logophoric exemption

As made clear above, exempt anaphors must be anteceded by mental perspective centers. Specifically, they can appear in attitude contexts when anteceded by the attitude holder of the context (cf. Sells's 1987 Source/Self), or in non-attitude contexts when anteceded by the empathy locus (cf. Sells's 1987 Self/Pivot) as can be diagnosed by various tests (see Charnavel 2017a-b for a detailed justification of this categorization and a comparison with Sells's).

When exempt anaphors co-occur with deictic motion verbs, their logophoric antecedents must crucially be located at the goal of motion. In other words, verbs like *come* require these antecedents to be their deictic centers, as shown in (12) involving the French anaphor *son propre* in the same clause as *venir* 'come'.

(12) [Le fils de Claire]_i craint que la pluie n'empêche son_i (propre) fils de venir à Lyon.
'[Claire's son]_i is afraid that the rain prevents his_i (own) son from coming to Lyon.'

In (12), the anaphor *son propre* 'his own' is licensed despite having a long distance antecedent because it occurs in the attitude context created by the attitude verb *craint* 'is afraid' and is anteceded by the corresponding attitude holder *le fils de Claire* 'Claire's son', subject of that verb. But the anaphor is only acceptable under the interpretation where Claire's son is (mentally) located in Lyon, the goal of motion.⁸ The pronoun *son* 'his', however, allows the interpretation where Claire's son is not located in Lyon, but the speaker is. Thus, the deictic motion verb *venir* 'come' forces the antecedent of exempt *son propre* (the attitude holder) to be at the goal of motion.

The same holds in non-attitude contexts as in (13).

(13) [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.'

Here, *son propre* does not appear in an attitude context as the verb *mérite* 'deserves', unlike *craint* 'is afraid', does not create one.⁹ But the anaphor is nevertheless licensed even if it is not locally bound because it is anteceded by the empathy locus, i.e. the individual with whom the speaker empathizes or identifies (cf. Kuno 1987, Oshima 2006, a.o.), which makes it logophoric.¹⁰ In that case, just as above,

⁸ Furthermore, a *de se* reading is required: Claire's son cannot be mistaken about the identity of the location at the goal of motion (Lyon). This makes the deictic center even more similar to the exempt anaphor *son propre*, which must also be read *de se* (see Charnavel a-b).

⁹ This can be tested in several ways (see Charnavel 2017a-b and references therein): in particular, an epithet referring to the matrix subject is licensed in the complement clause of *mérite* 'deserves', but not in that of *craint* 'is afraid'; also, the distinction between *de dicto* and *de re* readings is only relevant in the latter case.

¹⁰ One test identifying the empathy locus relies on the availability of the expression *son cher* 'his dear', which is intrinsically first-personal (no one else than me can know whether someone is dear to me) and thus requires identification with its referent (see Charnavel 2017a-b for more details).

the presence of *venir* ‘come’ imposes some restrictions on the interpretation: Claire’s son must be (mentally) located in Lyon (only if the anaphor *son propre* is used; if the pronoun *son* is used instead, Claire’s son need not be in Lyon as long as the speaker is).

Mandarin data confirm this interaction between deictic motion verbs and exempt anaphors: when *lai* ‘come’ and exempt *ziji* co-occur, the deictic center for *lai* must corefer with the logophoric antecedent of *ziji*, whether it is an attitude holder as in (14) or an empathy locus as in (15).

(14) Lisi_i shuo zhe chang yu zuzhi le {ziji_i / ta_i} de xuesheng lai Beijing.
Lisi say this CL rain stop ASP REFL PRON DE student come Beijing
‘Lisi_i said that the rain prevented his_i (own) student from coming to Beijing.’

(15) {Ziji_i / ta_i} de haizi bu neng lai Beijing de xiaoxi shi Lisi hen shangxin
REFL PRON DE child NEG can come Beijing DE news make Lisi very sad
‘The news that his_i (own) child cannot come to Beijing makes Lisi_i very sad.’

In both (14)-(15), the logophoric center Lisi must be (mentally) located in Beijing if it antecedes *ziji*; but if it antecedes the pronoun *ta*, Lisi need not be associated with Beijing, the speaker can instead be.

The French and Mandarin facts thus show that deictic motion verbs impose necessary - if not sufficient - conditions for exemption: when they co-occur with exempt anaphors, they require their logophoric antecedent to be at the goal of motion. In other words, the deictic center for *come* cannot create a logophoric center licensing exempt anaphors, but it must corefer with any independently logophoric antecedent of exempt anaphors.

This is not a general fact about deictic centers: such an interaction between exemption and deictic perspective is not observed with spatial prepositional expressions. This is illustrated in examples (16)-(17), which involve exempt *son propre* and exempt *ziji* in attitude contexts.

(16) [Le fils de Claire]_i souhaite qu’on place les enfants à gauche de son_i propre fils sur la photo.
[‘Claire’s son’]_i wishes that one would put the kids on the left of his_i own son on the picture’.

(17) Yingying_i renwei Zhangsan hui zhan zai ziji_i erzi de zuobian.
Yingying think Zhangsan will stand at REFL son DE left.
‘Yingying_i thinks that Zhangsan will stand to the left of her_i own son.’

In these sentences, the anaphors (French *son propre* in (16), Mandarin *ziji* in (17)) occur in an attitude context containing a spatial prepositional expression (*à gauche de*, *de zuobian* ‘to the left of’) and have the attitude holder as long distance antecedent (*le fils de Claire* ‘Claire’s son’ in (16), *Yingying* in (17)). But unlike in the case of deictic motion verbs, the attitude holder anteceding the exempt anaphor does not have to be the deictic center here: it is not necessarily from Claire’s son’s (Yingying’s) perspective that the kids (Zhangsan) should be located to the left of his (her) son. Another relative interpretation is available, according to which the speaker is the spatial reference point. Moreover, the intrinsic interpretation is also available in (17),¹¹ according to which Yingying’s son is the deictic center, the referent of the complement of *de zuobian* ‘to the left of’.

Thus, only deictic motion verbs impose necessary conditions on logophoric exemption by forcing coreference between their deictic center and the antecedent of clausemate exempt anaphors. The other types of expressions creating spatial perspective do not interact with logophoric exemption.

¹¹ The intrinsic interpretation is not available in (16) because of a lexical restriction. The intrinsic and relative interpretations are lexically distinguished in French in the case of spatial expressions involving the notions of right and left: *à la gauche/droite de* ‘to the left/right of’ (with a definite article) triggers the intrinsic interpretation as in (ii)a, and *à gauche/droite de* ‘lit. to left/right of, on the left/right of’ (without definite article) the relative interpretation as in (ii)b. Note that the sentences in (ii) are meant to describe the painting in Figure 1.

- (ii) a. La jeune femme est à la droite du professeur de musique.
‘The young woman is to the right of the music teacher.’ [intrinsic: from the teacher’s perspective]
b. La jeune femme est à gauche du professeur de musique.
‘The young woman is on the left of the music teacher.’ [relative: from the speaker’s perspective]

3.2. Analysis

The relevance of logophoric exemption for the interpretation of deictic motion verbs results, I hypothesize, from a specific lexical requirement of this type of verbs interacting with general conditions of logophoricity.

First, recall that a verb like *come* usually requires a discourse participant or an attitude holder to be at the goal of motion (see examples (7)a-b). This is standardly cast as a presupposition involving a discourse participant¹² with possibility of shifting in attitude contexts (Oshima 2007, Sudo 2015, a.o.). But we have seen in examples (13) and (15) that instead of a discourse participant or an attitude holder, the empathy locus can also serve as the deictic center for *come* and be at the goal of motion.¹³ This means that *come* requires its deictic center to be a logophoric center (discourse participant, attitude holder or empathy locus). I therefore propose to recast the purported presupposition of *come* as a lexical selectional restriction: deictic motion verbs require a logophor as implicit argument. In other words, ‘to come’ roughly means ‘to move to a location associated with the relevant perspective center’. Note that this also explains why as noted in examples (7), the deictic center does not have to be physically located at the goal of motion, but can only be mentally there, i.e. mentally associated with the location in some way (see fn. 12).

Second, it has been observed that two logophors co-occurring in the same domain must corefer. In particular, Huang and Liu (2001) report that two exempt *ziji* sitting in the same clause must corefer as illustrated in (18): the two interpretations under which one *ziji* in the embedded clause refers to Zhangsan and the other one to Lisi are unavailable (**ziji_i...ziji_k*; **ziji_k...ziji_i*). The same holds in French: example (19) is degraded if the two instances of *propre* are present (see Charnavel 2017b).

(18) Zhangsan_i renwei Lisi_k zhidao Wangwu_m ba ziji_{i/k/m} de shu song-gei le ziji_{i/k/m} de pengyou
 Zhangsan think Lisi know Wangwu BA REFL DE book gave-to ASP REFL DE friend.
 ‘Zhangsan_i thinks that Lisi_k knows that Wangwu_m gave his_{i/k/m} book to his_{i/k/m} friend.’

(19) D’après Luc_k, [les voisins]_i disent que leur_i (propre) fils et son_k (propre) fils sont adroits.
 ‘According to Luc_k, [the neighbors]_i say that their_i (own) son and his_k (own) son are skillful.’

According to Huang and Liu (2001), this derives from a conflict in perspectives: clausemate exempt anaphors must corefer because they must occur in clauses expressing the perspective of their antecedent, and a given clause must represent a single perspective. This can be implemented using logophoric operators if we assume that there is at most one logophoric operator by domain, as already assumed by Koopman and Sportiche (1989) to handle logophoric pronouns in Abe: all logophors of a domain must be bound by the single logophoric operator of that domain.

These two facts taken together explain the interaction between deictic motion verbs and logophoric exemption sitting in the same clause: the deictic center of *come* must corefer with the antecedent of the exempt anaphor in examples like (12)-(15), because the implicit logophoric argument of *come* and the exempt anaphor occur in the same logophoric domain and must thus both be bound by the pronoun introduced by the single logophoric operator of that domain, as represented in (20).

(20) A_i ... [*pro*_i [OP_{LOG} [P ... *come*(x_i) ... *herself*_i ...]

Thus, deictic motion verbs like *come* do not create logophoric domains, but require one; they do not introduce a logophoric operator, but need one. That’s why they do not create sufficient, but only

¹² Here is for instance the lexical entry of *come* provided by Sudo (2015):

(iii) [[*come*]] = λx.λy.∃e Move(e) & Theme (e,y) & Goal (e,x)

Presupposition: Goal is speaker’s (or hearer’s or their associate’s) home location, such that l is x’s home location if l is x’s current location, or l is associated with x (l is x’s home-base), e.g. x was born and brought up in l, x’s close relatives are in l...etc.

¹³ Sudo (2015) notes that the deictic center of *come* can also shift in non-attitude contexts, but leaves such cases for further research.

necessary conditions for logophoric exemption from Condition A. Spatial prepositional expressions, however, neither create nor require logophoric conditions because they do not have any specific lexical requirement related to logophoricity.

4. Conclusion

In sum, spatial perspective does not play any role in logophoric exemption from Condition A: a deictic center does not qualify as a logophoric center that can antecede exempt anaphors. This is so because only mental perspective, which has clausal content, can create the appropriate logophoric conditions for licensing exempt anaphors.

One specific type of expressions introducing spatial perspective, namely deictic motion verbs, nevertheless interacts with logophoric exemption by requiring coreference between their deictic center and any clausemate exempt anaphor. This derives from the fact that this kind of verb does involve mental perspective: *come* requires that the goal of motion be associated with a logophoric center. Thus, deictic centers in general are not logophoric centers, but some of them require one.

References

- Anand, Pranav, 2006: *De De Se*. Ph.D. Dissertation. MIT.
- Cantrall, William R., 1974: *Viewpoint, Reflexives, and the Nature of Noun Phrases*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Charnavel, Isabelle, 2017a: Exempt Anaphors and Logophoricity in French. To appear in *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 12 - Selected papers from the 45th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil*.
- Charnavel, Isabelle, 2017b: Logophoricity and Locality. Harvard Manuscript. lingbuzz/002683.
- Charnavel, Isabelle & Yujing Huang, 2017: Inanimate *ziji* and Condition A in Mandarin [this volume].
- Charnavel, Isabelle & Dominique Sportiche, 2016-a: Anaphor Binding – What French Inanimate Anaphors Show. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47 (1): 35-87.
- Chomsky, Noam, 1986: *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. New York, Praeger.
- Clements, George N., 1975: The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10: 141–177.
- Fillmore, Charles J., 1997: *Lectures on Deixis*. CSLI Publications.
- Huang, C.-T. James & C.-S. Luther Liu, 2001: Logophoricity, Attitudes and *ziji* at the Interface. In Peter Cole et al. (eds.), *Long Distance Reflexives, Syntax and Semantics* 33, 141-195. Academic Press, New York.
- Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche, 1989: Pronouns, Logical Variables and Logophoricity in Abe. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 555-589.
- Kuno, Susumu, 1987: *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy*. University of Chicago Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C., 2003: *Space in Language and Cognition: Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. Cambridge University Press, Volume 5.
- Maling, Joan, 1984: Non-Clause-Bounded Reflexives in Modern Icelandic. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 7: 211-241.
- Oshima, David Y., 2006: *Perspectives in Reported Discourse*. PhD Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Oshima, David Y., 2007: Motion Deixis, Indexicality, and Presupposition. In *Proceedings of SALT 16*: 172–189.
- Pollard, Carl & Ivan A. Sag, 1992: Anaphors and the Scope of Binding Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 261–303.
- Rooryck, Johan & Guido Vanden Wyngaerd, 2007: The Syntax of Spatial Anaphora. *Nordlyd* 34(2).
- Sells, Peter, 1987: Aspects of Logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 445–79.
- Sudo, Yasu, 2015: *Come and go*. Talk presented at the *Perspectives in Context* Workshop, Georg-August Universität Göttingen.
- Talmy, Leonard, 1975: Semantics and Syntax of Motion. *Syntax and Semantics* 4: 181-238.
- Zribi-Hertz, Anne, 1989: Anaphor Binding and Narrative Point of View: English Reflexive Pronouns in Sentence and Discourse. *Language* 56: 695-727.

Proceedings of the 35th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Wm. G. Bennett, Lindsay Hracs,
and Dennis Ryan Storoshenko

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2018

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 35th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2018 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-472-0 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Charnavel, Isabelle. 2018. Deictic Perspective and Logophoric Exemption from Condition A. In *Proceedings of the 35th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Wm. G. Bennett et al., 124-131. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #3382.