This is a study of the anaphoric system in Norwegian and various theoretical consequences to be drawn from that system. The consequences bear partly on the theory of anaphora binding in general, partly on more specific issues in syntax and semantics. To mention the developments pertaining to binding theory first, they may be seen in relation to the principles [A] and [B] of the standard Government and Binding Theory (GB) of Chomsky 1981 and related work. These principles go as follows: [A] An anaphor is bound in its governing category. [B] A pronominal is free in its governing category. We argue that these principles, which are based essentially on English, cover only a very limited subpart of what constitutes a possible anaphoric system. Our proposal for a more general set of principles takes Norwegian as its point of departure, but the values of the parameters proposed are not limited to factors found there. Very briefly, the main principles proposed are the following:

1. The Principle of Independent Targeting (PIT), which says that the target of an anaphoric binding relation (i.e. the binder of the anaphor), must serve as target of some other significant relation as well. It is in terms of such relations, rather than various types of intervening material, that binding relations are determined. This principle is established in Chapter 2.

2. The Command Principle, proposed in Chapter 4, which says that a binder must stand in what we call a command relation to the anaphor. This principle highlights the circumstance that a binder is in a superiority relation to the bindee. Whereas standard GB recognizes only c-command and, to some extent, linear precedence as such relations, we argue in favor of a much richer inventory, including relations of predication, relations within hierarchies of thematic roles, and relations of perspective or point of view (also known under the name of ‘logophoricity’). The relevance of all of these relations being demonstrable in Scandinavian, they are well known to play a role also in other languages, and our ‘Command Principle’ is a step in the direction of bringing them together in one unifying principle.
3. The Generalized Complementarity Principle (of binding domains of anaphors and non-anaphors). In English, complementarity effects obtain between reflexives and pronominals and are stated in standard GB through the conjunction of principles [A] and [B] given above. In Norwegian, such complementarity is seen to obtain also between different types of anaphors. On this basis we state a complementarity principle of a more general form than has so far been currently assumed, using anaphoric words, rather than anaphoric phrases, as the crucial items inducing complementarity. This issue is treated in Chapter 3. Here we also address the phenomenon of non-argument reflexives, which is the main apparent counterexample to the complementarity principle as we state it.

In addition to developing these aspects of binding theory, Chapters 2, 3, and 4 also provide the main descriptive part of this book and serve as a basis for what is said in the later chapters.

An aspect of reflexives distinct from their possible binding domains is their interpretation in terms of the distinction 'variable/constant' from standard logical theory. This issue is tied to aspects of the behavior of quantified noun phrases and the phenomenon of verb phrase deletion or anaphora. A common assumption being that reflexives can be construed as variables in the logical sense, their behavior in Norwegian will be seen to motivate a more nuanced view. This is the topic of Chapter 7.

Reflexives also shed important light on the phenomenon of 'permutation', or dependencies between constituents fronted to sentence initial position and 'gaps' inside the sentence. Norwegian has rich possibilities of such fronting, with reflexives showing up inside the fronted constituents, and allows the phenomenon to be addressed in its full complexity. We argue that these constructions in a crucial way involve movement processes, organized according to what we call the Loop Model. This model is developed in Chapter 8.

Argumenthood, a key notion in Grammar in general, appears to be able to 'degenerate' along two dimensions: the 'degeneration' can affect the extent to which a phonologically realized item has content, as exemplified by the phenomenon of non-argument reflexives (see 3.2), and it can affect the extent to which grammatically significant thematic roles are syntactically manifest, as will be exemplified by the phenomenon of Implicit Arguments. The latter phenomenon is the main topic of Chapters 5 and 6. Here we show the way Implicit Arguments function as binders of anaphors, and we develop a format for their formal representation which allows their participation in binding relations to be explicitly stated. This formal analysis
is integrated in an overall conception of the organization of the Lexicon. The key idea is that in the formal representation of Implicit Arguments, special access is needed to the content of lexical entries. This access is ensured by the level of *P*-structure, a special interface between Lexicon and the grammatical derivation of sentences. The organization of the Lexicon also pertains to the analysis of non-argument reflexives presented in Chapter 3. The theory of the Lexicon we develop is in line with some recent developments within GB, and shares features with the Lexicon as conceived in other frameworks; it is outlined in detail in Section 2 of Chapter 1. Shorter sections of that chapter give an overview of other features of the framework.

The overall reference frame of this work is GB. It should be clear from what has been said, however, that this is not an investigation wholly within the frame of standard GB. First, the general binding theory argued for is quite different from that of standard GB. Second, a theory of levels of representation in grammatical derivations is proposed which differs very much from that of standard GB, and although it bears some resemblance to the ‘NP-structure’ model of van Riemsdijk and Williams 1981, it differs from this one as well. Third, the proposals concerning the Lexicon, along with the level P-structure, go well beyond existing analyses. What the sum of these proposals constitutes is still within the overall conception of grammar represented by GB; this is apparent, for example, in the principal status given to relations, among which government and binding play a prominent role. As a consequence, most of the discussion and exposition is related to the GB literature.

As a guide to the reader, those who want to get a quick idea of my version of the binding theory may well skip most of Chapter 1 to begin with (except 1.3-4) and go directly to Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 8. Chapter 7 may likewise be read without having been through all of Chapter 1. On the other hand, an appreciation of the proposals in Section 3.2, Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 require familiarity with what is said in Chapter 1. In addition, Chapter 1 provides the intuitive basis for the present model, and presents some background of Norwegian syntax relevant for the analyses of anaphors.
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