

THE DISTRIBUTION OF REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS IN NORWEGIAN*

Tania Strahan, *The University of Melbourne*

This study presents a non-syntactic analysis of non-clause-bounded reflexives (LDR) in Norwegian. Examples cited in the literature and new data are combined here. Four main approaches to accounting for LDR in Norwegian are examined: That LDRs have certain syntactic and morphological characteristics, including being bound within the finite domain, being subject-oriented and being monomorphemic; that perspective- and predication-command define LDR in Norwegian; that logophoricity is intrinsically related to LDR such that a hierarchy of logocentric predicates captures important generalisations about LDR in Norwegian; and that the reflexive carries some meaning other than merely indicating coreference. Consistent with other studies, it is found that LDRs in Norwegian are often monomorphemic, they are normally subject-bound, their distribution may often be explained by perspective- and predication-command rules, their distribution correlates to a certain extent with that of logophoric contexts, and they are used for disambiguation purposes. Contrary to other studies, it is found that LDRs in Norwegian need not be bound within the finite domain, and that their distribution cannot be explained by perspective alone. A proposal to include some notion of pragmatic plausibility in accounting for the distribution of Norwegian LDRs is suggested.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper focusses on the distribution in Norwegian of the third person (singular and plural) accusative reflexive pronoun *seg* (glossed as ‘R’) functioning as an object in embedded clauses¹. The focus of the current investigation is to answer the question: When is the accusative reflexive *seg* licenced to occur? A secondary question is: What is the difference between the use of the reflexive and the use of the pronoun in Norwegian? But firstly, some general comments concerning Norwegian LDRs are necessary.

2. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF NON-CLAUSE-BOUNDED REFLEXIVES IN NORWEGIAN

Non-clause-bounded reflexives are not equally acceptable to all speakers of Norwegian. In particular, there is a distinction between speakers who do not allow a reflexive to have an antecedent with an intervening finite tense clause boundary, those who do allow it and those who sometimes allow it. The variety of Norwegian that is normally referred to in the literature allows LDR, but not over a finite boundary (e.g. Hellan 1988, Hellan and Christensen 1986, Reuland and Koster 1991, Everaert 1991).

Reuland and Koster (1991) present an overview of Norwegian anaphora as defined by work in the same volume by Hellan, Thráinsson and Everaert. They define two domains – domain 1 has the first accessible subject as the boundary, which is equivalent to the minimal clause. The second domain is the first finite Infl beyond domain 1. Within domain 2 they say, *seg* and *sin* are bound by a subject in a predication-command relationship, and are not in complementary distribution with pronominals. Predication-command is a notion first suggested by Hellan which

* I would like to thank Lesley Stirling and the very helpful anonymous reviewers for their invaluable help with this paper. None of them are responsible for any errors that remain, nor do they necessarily share the views presented here. I would also like to thank Arne Kruse, Elisabeth Skogseth, Marit Julien and all my informants for collecting examples of LDR and for providing grammaticality judgements for the sentences in this study.

¹ See Strahan (forthcoming) for an investigation also involving the distribution of the third person (singular and plural) possessive reflexive *sin*.

says that element A predication-commands element B when B is contained in a constituent that is predicated of A².

According to Reuland and Koster (1991:10-11), LDRs cross-linguistically are morphologically simplex, their antecedents are often subjects, and they are not in complementary distribution with respect to pronouns. These features are commonly cited as applying to LDR in other languages such as Icelandic *sig*, Dutch *zich*, Polish *siebie* and Finnish *itse*, although not all these generalisations are relevant to every language with LDR. (See Reuland and Koster 1991:10-20 for a summary of LDR in these languages.) My data generally supports these claims, with some exceptions. In particular, although Norwegian LDRs are often monomorphemic, there are examples of non-monomorphemic LDRs in Norwegian; Norwegian LDRs may refer to a non-subject antecedent; and some speakers of Norwegian allow a reflexive to corefer with an antecedent over a finite clause boundary. Perspective is also relevant to LDR in Norwegian. Sections 2.1 to 2.4 present data illustrating these claims.

2.1. *Non-clause-bounded reflexives in Norwegian are often monomorphemic*

Norwegian LDRs are often monomorphemic, as example (1) shows³.

- (1) *Trond_i ba oss hjelpe seg_i.*
 T bade us help R
 ‘Trond_i asked us to help himself_i.’

Norwegian LDRs need not be monomorphemic, however, as example (2) shows.

- (2) *Eivor_i låvde Jone_j å snakke om seg sjølv_{ij}.*
 E promised J to speak about R self
 ‘Eivor_i promised Jone_j to speak about her-/himself_{ij}.’

The anaphor *seg sjølv* is composed of the simplex or SE-anaphor *seg* (after Reinhart and Reuland 1993) plus another reflexive element *sjølv*, literally ‘self’. *Sjølv* is sometimes referred to as having an emphasising function. The compound *seg sjølv* is a complex anaphor, also called a SELF-anaphor (after Reinhart and Reuland 1993), and is normally short-distance bound.

Another example of non-monomorphemic LDR comes from the Norwegian newspaper the *Østlendingen*⁴.

- (3) *Susann_i har ei bestemor_j [som_j er like fotballgal som seg_i sjølv].*
 S has a grandmother who is equally soccer.mad as R self
 ‘Susann_i has a grandmother_j [who_j is just as mad about soccer as herself_i].’

In (3), the reflexive element is within a relative clause. Hellan’s predication-command states that LDR out of a relative clause is acceptable in Norwegian, since the relative clause is predicated of the upstairs clause, thus the reflexive is within the domain of the upstairs antecedent. Koster’s (1987) dynasty model also predicts this construction to be fine, for the same reason. What is interesting with this example, however, is that the non-monomorphemic *seg sjølv* is used, which is typically clause-bounded. Compare (3) with the following.

² This is very similar to Koster’s (1987) notion of a *dynasty*.

³ All unsourced examples in this paper are from my own investigations.

⁴ *Østlendingen* 7.1.1998, Elverum.

- (4) *Susann_i har ei bestemor_j [som_j alltid snakkar med seg_i sjølv].*
 S has a grandmother who always talk with R self
 ‘Susann_i has a grandmother_j [who_j always talks with herself_{*i/j}].’
- (5) *Susann_i har ei bestemor_j [som_j er tilfreds med seg_i sjølv].*
 S has a grandmother who is satisfied with R self
 ‘Susann_i has a grandmother_j [who_j is happy with herself_{*i/j}].’

Mostly, though, LDRs in Norwegian are monomorphemic, and this supports the common generalisation made in the literature.

2.2. *Non-clause-bounded reflexives in Norwegian often have a subject antecedent*

Norwegian LDRs normally refer back to a subject, as shown in (6) with the possessive reflexive *sin*.

- (6) *Henrik_i trudde at kjæresten_i sin hadde vore utro.*
 H believed that partner R’s had been unfaithful
 ‘Henrik_i thought that R_i’s girlfriend had been unfaithful.’

Norwegian LDRs may refer back to an object, as shown by the following.

- (7) *Eivor_i låvde Jone_j å snakka om seg_{i/j}.*
 E promised J to speak about R
 ‘Eivor_i promised Jone_j to speak about R_{i/j}.’

(7) is the same as (2) above, except that it contains the regular, monomorphemic reflexive. In both (2) and (7), the reflexive may have either the subject or the object as the antecedent. However, it is in fact quite difficult to think of examples where the object of an upstairs clause may function as the antecedent, and this fact supports the generalisation that antecedents of LDRs are normally subjects.

2.3. *Non-clause-bounded reflexives in Norwegian often find their antecedent within a finite domain*

Norwegian LDRs generally find their antecedents within some finite domain, as shown in (8), as well as (1), (2) and (7) above. In each of these cases, the finite domain is the whole sentence.

- (8) *Per_i likte å sjå seg_i i speilet når han var på jobb.*
 P liked to look R in mirror when he was at work
 ‘Per_i liked to watch himself_i in the mirror when he was at work.’

However, it is sometimes possible for Norwegian LDRs to find their antecedent outside of some finite domain (henceforth F-LDR). Examples (9) (with the possessive reflexive) and (10) (with the accusative reflexive) below come from Sandøy (1992:103), and are from the Romdalsk and Trøndersk dialects respectively.

- (9) *Ho_i påstod at det_j var sin_i*
 she claimed that it was R’s
 ‘She_i claimed that it_j was hers_i.’
- (10) *De_i kan ikkje venta at folk_j skal komma til seg_i*
 they can not expect that people will come to R
 ‘They_i can’t expect that people will come to them_i.’

2.4. *Perspective and LDR in Norwegian*

Another feature of LDR which is often mentioned is *perspective*, in particular with respect to Icelandic (e.g. Maling 1984, Sigurðsson 1986). It has also been mentioned with respect to LDR in Norwegian (e.g. Hellan 1988, Moshagen and Trosterud 1990). Hellan (1988) states that grammatical use of LDR in Norwegian hinges upon the subject of the upstairs clause ‘perspective-commanding’ the reflexive. This occurs when the antecedent is the person whose point of view or perspective is taken by the matrix predicate. The following data, from Smøla (Moshagen and Trosterud 1990), supports Hellan’s view⁵.

(11) *Han_i trudde at dæm kom til å flir åt seg_i.*
 he believed that them come to to laugh at R
 ‘He_i thought that they’d laugh at himself_i.’

(12) *Han_i vesst at dæm kom til å flir åt seg_i.*
 he knew that them come to to laugh at R
 ‘He_i knew that they’d laugh at himself_i.’

In (11) and (12), the predicates *trudde* ‘believed’ and *vesst* ‘knew’ set up a context where the Believer/ Knower or Agent of believing/ knowing is responsible for the factivity of the following clause. It is thus from the Believer/ Knower’s perspective that the embedded clause is viewed, hence the term perspective command. In these examples *seg* is therefore embedded in a clause which receives its truth assertion from the subject *han*, with which it is coreferential.

In the F-LDR variety of Norwegian⁶, like in Icelandic (Sigurðsson 1986), the establishment of a perspective-command context licences the use of an LDR, although it does not dictate its use. Both (11) and (12) are also grammatical with a pronoun instead of the reflexive. An example of an ungrammatical use of LDR in the F-LDR dialect is shown in (13).

(13) **Han_i vesst itj at dæm kom te å flir åt seg_i.*
 he knew not that them come to to laugh at R
 *He_i didn’t know they’d laugh at himself_i

This ungrammatical use of LDR F-LDR dialect in (13) is accounted for (and predicted) by the fact that the subject of the upstairs clause does not perspective-command the reflexive. It is the fact that the potential antecedent (for the potential LDR) does not know the content of the complement clause which denies this entity the possibility of being the perspective-holder of the sentence, for the purpose of LDR. If the subject of the upstairs clause does not perspective-command the reflexive, then a pronoun must be used to give a grammatical sentence, as shown in (14).

(14) *Han_i vesst itj at dæm kom te å flir åt’n_i.*
 he_i knew not that them come to to laugh at him_i
 ‘he didn’t know they’d laugh at him’

This is known as the perspective model of LDR in Norwegian, following Hellan (1988).

⁵ Smøla is an island off the coast of Trøndelag and is an F-LDR dialect, ie the reflexive and antecedent may be separated by a finite clause boundary.

⁶ ie, in varieties of Norwegian where the reflexive may have an antecedent over a finite clause boundary – these dialects are mainly from Trøndelag, Midlandet, and Vestlandet, and will be referred to henceforth as F-LDR dialects.

2.5. *Summary*

In summary: Norwegian LDRs are generally monomorphemic, they normally refer back to a grammatical subject, and they usually find their antecedent within some finite domain. However, data has been presented here which shows that this is not always the case, in particular, there are many speakers of Norwegian for whom an LDR may have an antecedent over a finite clause boundary. This has been termed the F-LDR variety. In addition, Norwegian LDRs are subject to perspective command, where the reflexive must be in a clause which is viewed from the perspective of the antecedent. This has been shown to hold true for at least the F-LDR variety of Norwegian.

3. ON THE NATURE OF LOGOPHORICITY

Logophoricity is a phenomenon found in some West African languages where a special morphological or syntactic form is used to refer to an entity whose speech, thoughts, or feelings are represented⁷. The following examples show the difference between the logophoric and non-logophoric pronouns in the West African language Ewe. These examples are taken from Clements (1975:142).

- (15) *Kofi be yè-dzo*
Kofi say **LOG**-leave
'Kofi_i said that he_i left'
- (16) *Kofi be e-dzo*
Kofi say **3ps**-leave
'Kofi_i said that he_j/she_j left'

When the logophoric pronoun is used, as in (15), it must refer back to the entity whose ideas are being expressed, ie *Kofi*. When the non-logophoric pronoun is used, as in (16), it must be disjoint from this entity.

Languages which have logophoricity only allow certain predicates to license the logophoric contexts. The most common licenser of a logocentric context is a verb meaning 'say', as shown in the examples from Ewe above. Some researchers have postulated hierarchies of logocentric verb classes which licence logophoricity in languages such as Gokana and Ewe. Stirling (1993) has postulated one such hierarchy. The hierarchy is arranged such that, if a language has a particular class of predicates as triggers of a logophoric context, then so will it also have all classes to the left of that class as triggers. The hierarchy is shown in (17).

Stirling's Logocentric verb hierarchy

- (17) communication > thought > psychological state > perception

Culy (1994) conducted a detailed study of logophoricity in 'pure logophoric languages'. These are defined as languages which have 'some morphological and/ or syntactic form that is used only in logophoric domains' (Culy 1994:1056), ie some form that does not also have a reflexive or emphatic function. Using data from 32 pure logophoric languages, Culy identified a hierarchy of predicates that license logophoricity in these languages, which he calls the Logophoric Hierarchy. This hierarchy is shown in (18).

Culy's Logophoric verb hierarchy

- (18) speech > thought > knowledge > direct perception

⁷ See Hagège (1974) and Clements (1975) for indepth analyses of logophoricity.

Culy's analysis shows that, if a language uses some predicate of one of the predicate types in the hierarchy, then it will also use some predicates from each of the classes to the left of it on the hierarchy. It is important to note that this hierarchy does not imply that *all* predicates within a class will license logophoricity, only some.

3.1. *Logophoricity and LDR*

Non-clause-bounded reflexivisation has been previously connected by linguists to logophoricity. Clements (1975:142-144) describes a phenomenon in Latin and classical Greek often referred to as 'indirect reflexivisation', as having a logophoric function, of allowing the speaker to 'avoid ambiguity of reference' within certain contexts. An example of this is given in (19) from Latin.

- (19) *Cicero_i dixit eum sibi_i maladixisse.*
 C said he R insulted
 'Cicero_i said that he had insulted himself_i.'

This use of the reflexive is traditionally known as indirect reflexivisation, although it is clearly LDR. The feature [+logophoric] is sometimes given to reflexives of this type, highlighting the similarity between LDRs and logophoricity.

Other linguists to link logophoricity to LDR include Maling (1984), Sigurðsson (1986), Sells (1987) and Reinhart and Reuland (1993).

3.2. *Culy's logophoric hierarchy and LDR*

In his report, Culy (1994) also compares Sells' (1987) account of LDR in Icelandic, Italian and Japanese with his logophoric hierarchy. He shows that a strong reason why LDR and his logophoric data do not overlap is that his hierarchy is based upon pure logophoric languages, while languages with LDR are 'mixed logophoric languages', since the LDR anaphors also have other functions, such as an emphatic use. A major finding of Culy's (1994) paper is that LDRs always have a wider range of environments than do logophoric pronouns in pure logophoric languages. In sections 3.3 and 4, I will try to show that Stirling's Logocentric Hierarchy may be better applied to LDR than Culy's logophoric hierarchy.

3.3. *Stirling's Logocentric Hierarchy and LDR*

Stirling's (1993) hierarchy is similar to Culy's logophoric hierarchy, except that this one also takes verbs of psychological state, such as *want* and *like*, into consideration. This is important to account for examples such as (20) from Ewe, since Ewe has a number of "psychological" verbs and verbal idioms expressing emotional states and attitudes' (Stirling 1993:264), and it is unclear how such an expression would be classified in Culy's (1994) logophoric hierarchy. (8) (repeated from above) gives an example of the grammatical use of LDR in Norwegian with the psych verb *like* 'to like'.

- (20) *e-do dyidzo na Ama be yè-dyi vi.*
 Pro-put_forth happiness to A Comp Log-bear child
 'Ama_i was happy that she_i bore a child.'
- (8) *Per likte å sjå seg i speilet når han var på jobb.*
 P liked to see R in the _mirror when he was at work
 'Per_i liked to look at himself_i in the mirror when he was at work.'

Since it is unclear how this data would fit in Culy's hierarchy, the next section will present some new data from Norwegian which supports Stirling's logocentric hierarchy.

4. LDR IN NORWEGIAN

As mentioned in the introduction, not all speakers of Norwegian accept LDR over a finite boundary. Therefore, the data concerning LDR in sentences with finite and non-finite clause boundaries will be discussed separately.

4.1. *Non-finite sentences*

The sentences containing non-finite clause boundaries which are relevant to our discussion of LDR and the logocentric hierarchy are collated here. (7) and (8) are repeated from above, (21) is similar to (1) above, and (22) is new data. (7) and (21) contain a verb of communication, (8) contains a psych verb, and (22) contains a verb of perception. Verbs of thought only occur with finite complement clauses in Norwegian, so will be discussed in section 4.2. The sentences containing the verbs of communication and psychological state were judged fine by my three informants, while the sentence containing the verb of perception was judged fine by one speaker, marginal by the second, and ungrammatical by the third speaker⁸. Here this sentence is marked with a question-mark, as a reflection of the differences between the three speakers' intuitions.

- (7) *Eivor_i låvde Jone_j å snakka om seg_{ij}.*
 E promised J to speak about R
 'Eivor_i promised Jone_j to speak about R_{ij}.'
- (8) *Per likte å sjå seg i speilet når han var på jobb.*
 P liked to see R in the_mirror when he was at work
 'Per_i liked to look at himself_i in the mirror when he was at work.'
- (21) *Jon_i ba oss snakka om seg_i.*
 J bade us talk about R
 'Jon_i asked us to speak about himself_i.'
- (22) *?Jon_i hørte oss_j snakka om seg_{ij}.*
 J heard us speak about R
 '?Jon_i heard us_j speak about himself_i.'

Although this is only a tiny sample of data, it does support Stirling's logocentric hierarchy. In particular, the results for (22) are interesting. For the speaker who accepted this sentence as fine, the hierarchy predicts that the sentences containing the other logocentric predicates will also be fine, and this is indeed the case. Anticipating the discussion somewhat, it will also be seen that this speaker accepted LDR over a finite boundary, too, something the other two speakers did not do to the same extent. The speaker who thought that (22) was marginal also made the comment that (21) was better, since it made more sense, and was easier to imagine a context for (21) than (22). The third speaker rejected (22), but accepted the other sentences. Again, this is consistent with the logocentric hierarchy.

4.2. *Finite sentences*

The picture of LDR in Norwegian becomes considerably more complex when we consider sentences where the reflexive and the antecedent are separated by a finite clause boundary.

⁸ The three informants come from Asker near Oslo, Valen in Western Norway and Smøla – an island off the coast of Sør-Trøndelag. The judgements given by these speakers are consistent with the judgements given by speakers in these regions when compared to results from a study containing 180 speakers from all over Norway and are therefore representative of them (see Strahan, forthcoming, for the results from this larger study).

Since not all Norwegians allow reflexive-antecedent coreference over a finite clause boundary, here we will only consider those dialects which do allow it, ie the F-LDR dialects.

Firstly, let us consider some sentences already presented above.

- (9) *Ho_i påstod at det_j var sin_i*
 she claimed that it was R's
 'She_i claimed that it_j was hers_i.'
- (10) *Dei_i kan ikkje venta at folk_j skal komma til seg_i*
 they can not expect that people will come to R
 'They_i can't expect that people will come to them_i.'

These sentences are interesting cases of LDR in Norwegian, since they are recorded cases of LDR occurring in natural speech. The both use logocentric verbs, namely *påstå* 'to claim', being a verb of communication, and *venta* 'to expect', being a verb of thought, and so are consistent with the idea that the logocentric hierarchy is relevant to LDR in Norwegian.

Further examples can also be mentioned, of sentences which are consistent with idea that the logocentric hierarchy is relevant to LDR in Norwegian. The following sentences come from a study based upon data collected from 180 speakers of Norwegian (see Strahan, forthcoming, for a deeper analysis of this data). These sentences are not marked for grammaticality.

- (23) *Jon_i sa til meg at Maria elska seg_i.*
 J said to me that M loved R
 Jon_i said to me that Maria loved himself_i.
- (24) *Jon_i trur at Maria elska seg_i.*
 J believes that M loved R
 Jon_i believes that Maria loved himself_i.
- (25) *Trond_i ville at me skulle snakka om seg_i.*
 T wanted that we should talk about R
 Trond_i wanted us to talk about himself_i.

Based upon a sample of judgements by 180 speakers of Norwegian, it can be stated confidently that these sentences are not equally acceptable. (23) is the most acceptable, followed by (24) and then (25). And this is predicted by the logocentric hierarchy model, since (23) has a verb of communication, *sa* 'said', (24) has a verb of thought, *trur* 'believes', and (25) has a psych verb, *ville* 'wanted'. However, there is a complicating factor. The following sentence, which contains the same verb of communication as (23), is less acceptable than any of these three sentences.

- (26) *Han_i sa at ho hadde snakka med seg_i.*
 he said that she had spoken with R
 He_i said that she had spoken with himself_i.

This data presents problems for both the logocentric hierarchy and perspective analyses of LDR in Norwegian, since both (23) and (26) have the same matrix verb *sa* 'to say', while (23) is far more acceptable to Norwegians than (26). Clearly there must be some other factor/s involved. The difference between the two sentences is in the downstairs clause. The more acceptable sentence (23) uses *elska* 'to love', while (26) contains *snakka med* 'to speak with'. And, although this difference may be described as a lexical difference in the downstairs clause between this minimal pair, it must also be noted that the change alters the pragmatic interpretation of the whole sentence.

The claim being made here, then, is that for LDR to be acceptable, the LDR interpretation must produce a pragmatically acceptable sentence.

Thus, in determining whether LDR over a finite clause boundary is acceptable, there are two things that need to be assessed. Firstly, whether the sentence makes good sense if the reflexive has a non-local antecedent. And secondly, whether the sentence makes good sense if the reflexive is part of a reflexive predicate, and therefore has a local antecedent. This is relevant for sentences like the following.

- (27) *Han_i bruker det_j som_j passer seg_i.*
 he_i uses it_j which_j suits R_i
 'He_i uses that_j which_j suits himself_i.'

Sentence (27) is an example of the application of Hellan's predication-command, or Koster's dynasty model. The relative clause containing the reflexive is predicated of the matrix clause, hence LDR is allowed. Both of these analyses assume that this sentence unambiguously has LDR. However, this sentence is interpreted differently by different speakers. For speakers who do not readily allow F-LDR, this sentence apparently contains the intrinsically reflexive predicate *passer seg* 'fit/ suit/ look after oneself'. For these speakers, therefore, this sentence has the meaning 'He uses whatever suits itself/ whatever fits/ whatever looks after itself.' It is consequently a little odd. However, for those speakers who readily allow F-LDR, the meaning is that given in (27), which makes considerably more sense. A model of LDR based only upon predication will not make this distinction. As will be seen later, when the interpretation of the referent of the reflexive makes pragmatic sense as either the clause-mate or non-clause-mate antecedent, the result is an ambiguous sentence, which is resolved by other discourse means, including context and intonation.

This line of interpretation also occurs with sentences like (23). For speakers with F-LDR, the interpretation of 'Maria loved herself' is rejected for two reasons. Firstly, *i tilfelle er M ei sjølvoppteken person* 'in this case, M is a very self-obsessed person' (speaker's comment, my translation), which many speakers found unnerving. Secondly, it is logical to assume that, given a male and female person and the context of love, one of them is likely to love the other, not themselves. It therefore makes sense for (23) to have the meaning that 'John said that Mary loved John'. It makes less sense for (23) to mean that 'John said that Mary loved Mary', given no context, and no reason to make unusual assumptions. Pragmatically, it makes sense for there to be an LDR in this sentence.

With sentence (26), the same line of reasoning leads to a less likely LDR interpretation. It is not hard to imagine that the female in the sentence talked with herself. This is in contrast to (23), where people were uncomfortable with the idea of someone loving themselves. In (26), for those people who do not readily accept F-LDR, this meant that the sentence was unacceptable. For those people who do readily accept F-LDR, the sentence was still fine, although less clearly so than (23), since (23) had far less chance of being ambiguous as regards the choice of antecedent.

This need to take pragmatic factors into account also applies to the other sentences. Sentences (23) and (24) can be compared, since they differ only minimally, in that the matrix verb changes from *sa* 'say' to *tru* 'believe'. As stated above, it is reasonable to assume that a person would say that another person loved them. It may be that Norwegian speakers tend to believe that a person *believing* that another person loved them is slightly less reasonable, although for many people this is still highly probable. So the F-LDR interpretation may be fine for many people due to pragmatic factors.

Turning now to (25) and (26), we can see that these sentences differ minimally. Both contain the ‘speaking’ predicate in the downstairs clause. (25) has *ville* ‘wanted’ while (26) has *sa* ‘said’ as the matrix predicate. (25) is more acceptable than (26). An important feature of (25) is that there is only one entity in the sentence which matches the reflexive for the person feature, ie there is only one available antecedent in the sentence itself. So, the pragmatic interpretation of (25) cannot include ‘it is sort of okay to talk about oneself’, since the reflexive and clause-mate potential antecedent do not match for the person feature. The next step is to see if there is an available antecedent elsewhere in this sentence, which there is. Furthermore, the interpretation that person 1 would want person 2 to talk to them is not unreasonable. In this way, for F-LDR speakers, sentence (25) is acceptable. On the other hand, informants’ responses to (26) indicate that the notion of a female talking with herself was close to reasonable. This could explain speakers’ tendencies to prefer *seg sjølv* in this sentence, and to consider the LDR interpretation less favourably.

The pragmatic interpretation of the sentence as a whole is very important to the acceptability of F-LDR. It explains why (11) and (12) are permissible. These examples come from Moshagen and Trosterud (1990). The judgements on these sentences come from the Smøla dialect.

- (11) *Han_i trudde at dæm kom til å flir åt seg_i.*
 he believed that them come to to laugh at R
 ‘He_i thought that they’d laugh at himself_i.’
- (12) *Han_i vesst at dæm kom til å flir åt seg_i.*
 he knew that them come to to laugh at R
 ‘He_i knew that they’d laugh at himself_i.’

Both (11) and (12) make sense with the LDR interpretation. Interestingly, some people find these sentences ambiguous as to who gets laughed at, ie they could be laughing at him, or they could be laughing at themselves. This is consistent with the pragmatic approach being developed here.

However, the pragmatic interpretation analysis does not explain the following sentences. As shown in (11) and (12) above, both *veta* ‘to know’ and *tru* ‘to believe’ occur with an LDR. However, when these verbs are negated, there is an interesting result, as we saw above in 2.4.

- (28) *Han_i trudde itj at dæm kom til å flir åt seg_i.*
 he believed not that them come to to laugh at R
 ‘He_i didn’t think that they’d laugh at himself_i.’
- (14) **Han_i vesst itj at dæm kom te å flir åt seg_i.*
 he knew not that them come to to laugh at R
 *He_i didn’t know they’d laugh at himself_i

Only *trudde itj* ‘not believe’ occurs with the LDR, while the reflexive sentence with *vesst itj* ‘not know’ is ungrammatical. There seems to be no logical reason why there should be a difference between knowing or not knowing that someone was laughing at one. And this is where the perspective model of interpreting LDR in Norwegian takes over.

As mentioned in section 2.4, the notion of perspective is said to play a role in Norwegian LDR. Moshagen and Trosterud (1990) say that sentences (11), (12) and (28) all present the thoughts of the higher subject, and it is from this higher subject’s point of view that the rest of the sentence is understood. Sentence (14) does not present the higher subject’s thoughts – he is presented as *not* knowing the contents of the proposition of the embedded clause. Thus, the sentence is not viewed from this entity’s perspective, and the use of LDR is not permitted.

The perspective- and predication-command models are the accepted view of how Norwegian LDR works. However, it has hopefully been demonstrated that the picture is more complex than represented by either a logocentric hierarchy or the perspective model of LDR. Thus, there are several steps involved in producing or interpreting LDR in Norwegian. Firstly, whether a speaker always, sometimes, or never allows F-LDR must be considered. Secondly, for both F-LDR and non-F-LDR, there must be a plausible pragmatic interpretation of the sentence. And finally, the antecedent of the reflexive must be the perspective-holder of the clause containing the reflexive. The pragmatic interpretation of the sentence is important, since it can signal to the hearer whether the reflexive is likely to be an LDR or clause-bound reflexive.

The pragmatic model of LDR is important, since it explains why some speakers who normally do not allow F-LDR do allow it in sentences like (25). Use of the perspective model alone does not explain this. The logocentric hierarchy does seem to capture some generalisations about Norwegian LDR, although there are counterexamples. The pragmatic analysis of LDR presented here allows for factors such as availability of antecedents (e.g. sentence (25)), and the influence both the upstairs and downstairs predicates can have on the interaction of reflexive elements (e.g. the minimal sentence pairs (23) and (24) or (25) and (26)).

5. MEANING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN REFLEXIVES AND PRONOUNS

The data collected for this study indicates that there is a semantic factor involved in the use of reflexives in Norwegian, which concerns the complementary distribution of reflexives and pronouns, often called the Complementarity Principle. Reflexives in Norwegian often obey this principle, in that they are not found in exactly the same syntactic environments as pronouns. Examples of this are shown in the clause-bound contexts in (29) and (30), where the reflexive must refer to the subject, while the pronoun cannot.

- (29) *Elisabeth_i er glad i dottera si_{i/*j}.*
 E is glad in daughter R's
 'Elisabeth_i loves her_{i/*j} daughter.'
- (30) *Elisabeth_i er glad i dottera hennar_{*i/j}.*
 E is glad in daughter her
 'Elisabeth_i loves her_{*i/j} daughter.'

However, two types of reflexives in Norwegian do not obey the Complementarity Principle. These are non-subject-bound anaphors and LDRs. These two types of anaphors are sometimes referred to as non-prototypically-bound anaphors. Examples of non-subject-bound anaphors are given in (31) and (32) (the LDR examples will come later). The fact that both the reflexive and the pronoun are found in the same syntactic environment here shows that they are not always in complementary distribution in Norwegian. The semantic differences are highlighted in the glosses.

- (31) *Eg ga han_i pengane sine_i.*
 I gave him money R
 'I gave him_i R's_i (previously owned) money.'
- (32) *Eg ga han_i pengane hans_i.*
 I gave him money his
 'I gave him_i his_i (owed) money.'

The choice between the use of a reflexive as opposed to a pronoun here results in a different meaning, indicating that the use of a reflexive or a pronoun is a semantic choice, not a mere optionality present in the syntax.

Sigurðsson (1986) and Thráinsson (1976) both state there is a semantic difference between the use of a pronoun versus an LDR in Icelandic. The use of an LDR in Icelandic is not an automatic choice expressing coreference between two NPs, and ‘devoid of all other information’ (Thráinsson 1976:236). In addition to being licensed to occur in logocentric contexts, LDRs themselves carry information about point-of-view or empathy perspective in addition to grammatical coreference⁹.

An interesting point to keep in mind is that many speakers of Icelandic in fact prefer the reflexive over the pronoun in cases of LDR (Thráinsson 1976:236). This is probably due to the fact that the version with the reflexive is not ambiguous with regard to the antecedent, whereas the pronoun may also take a discourse antecedent. This observation is supported by data collected in this investigation of Norwegian, where speakers who allow LDR often preferred to use a reflexive rather than a pronoun for the disambiguating function it serves. One example is given here.

- (33) *Jon hørte at Tordis var klar til å snakka med han.*
 J heard that T was ready to to speak with him
 ‘Jon heard that Tordis was ready to speak with him.’

This sentence was presented, with the pronoun *han* ‘him’, to the informants. Several speakers rejected the pronoun in this case, or said that a reflexive was preferable in certain instances. One speaker in particular was quite specific.

- (34) *Eg skulle sagt 'med seg'. Eksemplet ville utfrå samanhengen vere lettare å forstå. Om det var snakk om ein annen person, så ville bruken av "han" peike tilbake på denne personen. Når ein ikkje ser nokon samanheng, så blir det vanskeleg å plassere dette "han" og kven det refererer til. Derfor ville det om det var snakk om ein mann til, vere klart at "seg" ville gjere "Jon" til samtalepartner og "han" ville vise til den andre.*
 I should said with R example.the will out.from together.hang.the be easier to
 understand if it was talk about a other person so will use.the of him point
 back on this person.the when a not see some together.hang so becomes it
 difficult to place this he and who it refers to therefore will it if it was
 talk about a man to be clear that R will do J to conversation.partner and
 he will show to the other.

‘I would have said ‘with himself’. The example would be easier to understand from the context. If there was talk of another person, then use of [the pronoun] would point back to this person. When one doesn’t see any connection, it becomes difficult to place this [pronoun] and whom it refers to. Therefore, if there was talk about another man, it would be clear that [the reflexive] would make ‘Jon’ into a conversation partner and [the pronoun] would refer to the other person.’

These comments are typical of responses from speakers who have LDR. The use of the reflexive is obligatory in the sense that it has a disambiguating function, which many informants referred to as ‘clarifying’ the sentence, or something similar. It may be that the link between the anaphor and the perspective-holder is strong when the LDR is used, which speakers prefer for stylistic reasons, such as the reason of disambiguation as cited here. The actual meaning of the reflexive still remains to be teased out. However, it can be stated that, as with the non-subject-

⁹ Kuno (1987:156) states that this also obtains in English, where the reflexive signals that the propositional content of the clause containing the reflexive must be from the referent of the perspective holder.

bound anaphors (examples (31) and (32) above), the use of the reflexive as opposed to the pronoun does carry semantic information other than just coreference.

Note that a similar kind of non-complementarity is also present in locative PPs in English. When a reflexive is permitted, using it has a different meaning to using the pronoun. This contrast in meaning is highlighted in e.g. Kuno (1987).

(35) *Brent_i hid the book behind him_i/ himself_i.*

(36) *Lucien_i pulled the doona over him_i/ himself_i.*

In (35) and (36), although both the reflexive and the pronoun are syntactically acceptable, they are not semantically equivalent. When the reflexive is used, there is a sense that the whole person is somehow involved, and contact between the person and the object is also involved. In (35), use of the pronoun could mean that the book was ten feet away behind him somewhere, whereas use of the reflexive means that it was his body that is hiding the book from sight. Use of a reflexive here asserts physical contact between the antecedent of the reflexive and the direct object. This is not the case when a pronoun is used. (36) with a reflexive means that Lucien hid the whole of himself under the doona, whereas the use of the pronoun implies only that some part of himself was covered by the doona after he had pulled on it.

Returning to the Norwegian examples, the reflexive in (31) indicates ownership, it asserts the possessive nature of the relationship between the possessed and antecedent NPs. Use of the pronoun in (32) denies this inherent relationship. In the Norwegian LDR example (33), the speakers who preferred the reflexive did so to assert the presence of the antecedent. The use of the pronoun by these speakers, in the context-free situation, denies the presence of the referent of the antecedent, in the same way as with clause-bounded reflexives, e.g. (29) and (30). Under the perspective model, asserting the presence of the antecedent by using a reflexive can be seen as asserting the role of the antecedent as the perspective-holder.

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Norwegian LDR is more complex than has been suggested in the literature. While some data presented here does support common generalisations about Norwegian LDR, such as the tendency to be monomorphemic, the tendency to be subject-bound and that Norwegian LDR is bound within the finite domain, some data provides counter-examples to these claims. In particular, many speakers of Norwegian allow a reflexive to corefer with an antecedent which is outside of its finite domain.

The link between LDR and logophoricity was tested on Norwegian data. It was found that the Logocentric Hierarchy does not have the power to predict LDR, although it does seem to capture some generalisations. This is consistent with Culy (1994), who tested a similar logophoric hierarchy on Icelandic, and drew the same conclusion.

It was also suggested that the perspective model alone does not explain all cases of LDR, although when joined with the pragmatic analysis suggested here, it is descriptively adequate. It is claimed that a complex array of factors, including syntactic domains, pragmatic plausibility, perspective and a meaning difference between reflexives and pronouns which is clear in cases of non-complementarity, are all necessary and relevant to the licensing and interpretation of LDRs in Norwegian.

References

Clements George M. 1975 'The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse' in *Journal of West African Languages* 10(2): 141-177.

Culy Christopher 1994 'Aspects of Logophoric Marking' in *Linguistics* 32(6): 1055-1094.

Everaert Martin 1991 'Contextual determination of the anaphor/ pronominal distinction' in Jan Koster and Eric Reuland (eds.) *Long-distance anaphora* Cambridge University Press Great Britain: 77-118.

Hagège Claude 1974 'Les pronoms logophoriques' in *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 69: 287-310.

Hellan Lars 1988 *Anaphora in Norwegian and the Theory of Grammar* Foris Publications Dordrecht.

Hellan Lars & Kirsti Koch Christensen 1986 *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax* D. Reidel Publishing Company: 1-29.

Koster Jan 1987 *Domains and Dynasties the radical autonomy of syntax* Foris Publications Dordrecht.

Koster Jan & Eric Reuland (eds.) 1991 *Long-distance anaphora* Cambridge University Press Great Britain.

Kuno Susumo 1987 *Functional Syntax: anaphora discourse and empathy* The University of Chicago Press Chicago.

Maling Joan 1984 'Non-clause-bounded reflexives in Modern Icelandic' in *Linguistics and Philosophy* D. Reidel Publishing Company 7: 211-241.

Moshagen Sjur Nørstebø & Trond Trosterud 1990 'Non-Clause-Bounded Reflexives in Mainland Scandinavian' in *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 46: 47-52.

Reinhart Tanya & Eric Reuland 1993 'Reflexivity' in *Linguistic Inquiry* 24(4): 657-720.

Reuland Eric & Jan Koster 1991 'Long-distance anaphora: an overview' in Koster Jan & Eric Reuland (eds.) 1991 *Long-distance anaphora* Cambridge University Press Great Britain: 1-26.

Sandøy Helge 1992 *Norsk Dialektkunnskap* 'Norwegian Dialect Proficiency' Novus Forlag Oslo.

Sells Peter 1987 'Aspects of Logophoricity' in *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(3): 445-479.

Sigurðsson Halldor Ármann 1986 *Moods and Long-distance Reflexives in Icelandic*.

Stirling Lesley 1993 *Switch-reference and Discourse Representation* Cambridge University Press Great Britain.

Strahan Tania (forthcoming) *Non-clause-bounded reflexives in Norwegian* Doctoral dissertation The University of Melbourne.

Thráinsson Höskuldur 1976 *A semantic reflexive in Icelandic* ms Harvard University.