

Helge Lødrup (U of Oslo): Are Norwegian 'type anaphora' really surface anaphora?

Introduction The syntax of the Norwegian pronoun *det* 'it, that' presents challenges. This personal pronoun is basically non-human third person neuter singular. Under certain conditions, however, *det* can have noun phrase antecedents that are not neuter singular. Cf. (1)-(2), with masculine antecedents.

- (1) John kjøpte en laks. **Det** kjøpte Marit også
 John bought a salmon that bought Marit too ('Marit bought one too')
- (2) John kjøpte en laks. Marit liker **det** ikke
 John bought a salmon Marit likes that not ('Marit does not like that (i.e. salmon)')

det used as in (1)-(2) is called a type anaphor in Borthen (semanticsarchive.net 2003, DAARC 2004). This anaphor does not refer to the same object as its antecedent; in Borthen's view it refers to the same type of thing as its antecedent.

This paper claims that type anaphora must be divided into two groups, with very different properties. One group realizes what was called surface anaphora in Hankamer and Sag (LI 1976), Sag and Hankamer (LP 1984). The other group will be called generic/eventive *det*.

Surface anaphora A deep anaphor refers to something in its linguistic or non-linguistic context. It has no internal structure in syntax. A surface anaphor, on the other hand, must have a linguistic antecedent, it cannot be deictic. One example is the zero proform in VP ellipsis (as in *Everything has changed, and he has Ø, too*). A surface anaphor must have internal structure in syntax; its antecedent must be available to check standard conditions on well-formedness. In Norwegian (and Scandinavian), the regular surface anaphor is the pronoun *det*, both with VP pronominalization, as in (3), and complement pronominalization with copular verbs (see Houser et al. WECOL 2007 on Danish).

- (3) Har du spist? Nei, jeg har ikke **det**
 have you eaten no I have not that ('Have you eaten? No, I haven't.')

The architecture of LFG makes it possible to utilize the distinction between c-structure and f-structure to account for surface anaphora. The surface anaphor must be present in c-structure, while the corresponding position in f-structure contains the f-structure of the antecedent (see Levin MRGR 1982 on sluicing).

Some type anaphora share properties of surface anaphora (from Hankamer and Sag LI 1976). The focus will be on those *det* that are complements of verbs that include a 'have'-relation in their semantics, such as *kjøpe* 'buy', *gi bort* 'give away', etc. Other groups of verbs that seem to take *det* with the same properties include verbs of creation and consumption.

->Surface anaphora cannot be deictic, they must always have an antecedent in the linguistic context. This is also true of the relevant type anaphora (Borthen DAARC 2004).

->Surface anaphora show the 'missing antecedent' phenomenon. This is also true of the relevant type anaphora. In (4), the antecedent of the pronoun *den* 'it' cannot be the type anaphor itself, because *den* 'it' is masculine. The antecedent of *den* 'it' must be the f-structure representation of the type anaphor, based upon the antecedent *hund* 'dog' (masculine).

- (4) John fikk ikke hund, men **det** fikk Marit. Den er veldig stor.
 John got not dog, but that got Marit It is very big
 (John did not get a dog, but Marit did. It is very big.)

->Other facts also show that there must be access to the antecedent of *det* in f-structure.

- The interpretation potential of the relevant type anaphor is always the same as that of the antecedent. The antecedent can be non-specific or specific (but normally not definite). An example is (5).

- (5) John vil kjøpe hund / en hund / hunder / noen hunder. **Det** vil Marit også kjøpe
 John will buy dog / a dog / dogs / some dogs that will Marit too buy

The antecedent determines the interpretation of *det*. With the bare singular *hund* 'dog', it can only be non-specific; with *en hund* 'a dog', it can be specific or non-specific, etc. (Note that the interpretation is not always identical in the two sentences.) This analysis is different from the one in Borthen, who insists that the type anaphor is always type referring and nonreferential (Borthen 2003:286-94).

-The antecedent must satisfy the selectional requirements of the predicate that takes the anaphor. For example, type anaphora can take antecedents that are non-referring (Asudeh and Mikkelsen, HPSG-book, CSLI 2000), including idiom chunks, as in (7).

- (6) John røyker pipe. **Det** røyker Marit også
 John smokes pipe that smokes Marit too ('So does Marit.')
- (7) John får hetta / fnatt. **Det** får Marit også
 John gets 'the-hood' / 'scabies' that gets Marit too ('John freaks out. So does Marit')

->The relevant type anaphora can occur in the object position of a presentational sentence, see (8). They are not affected by the indefiniteness restriction when the antecedent is indefinite.

->The relevant type anaphora are normally accented, and often topicalized, just like surface anaphora with VP pronominalization. They are reluctant to be object shifted, see (9), and compare (3) above.

- (8) (Alkohol er tillatt) når det blir gitt tillatelse, og **det** ble det gitt av NN (google)
 alcohol is allowed when there is given permission, and that was there given by NN
 ('Alcohol is allowed when permission is given, and it was given by NN.')
- (9) Har du bil? Nei, jeg har ikke **det** / ??**det** ikke
 have you car no I have not that that not ('Do you have a car? No, I don't.')

Surface anaphora The suggestion here is that type anaphora with some groups of verbs are surface anaphora. A surface anaphor must be allowed lexically by the verbs in question as a possible c-structure realization of a complement function. Verbs differ concerning the option of taking the surface anaphor *det*.

Generic/eventive *det* Example (2) above differs from (1). The antecedent of *det* is specific, but (2) cannot mean that Marit does not like some specific salmon. It can only mean that she does not like salmon in general. This is in itself reason enough that *det* cannot be a surface anaphor here. It is therefore necessary to assume another *det* that can take antecedents that are not neuter singular. Examples are (2) and (10)-(11) (with masculine antecedents)

- (10) Sykkel er kult, og **det** er et nyttig framkomstmiddel. (Borthen 2003:41)
 bike is cool, and it is a useful conveyance
- (11) Jeg foreslår en ferie i Florida. **Det** vil gi familien mange minner.
 I suggest a vacation in Florida that will give the-family many memories

The non-agreeing *det* in (2) and (10)-(11) raises many difficult questions. Tentatively, it could be split in two, generic *det* (examples (2) and (10)), and eventive *det* (example (11)).

Generic/eventive *det* does not share properties with surface anaphora. The generic *det* can be deictic. However, it can only be used generically; it does not establish a discourse referent (but possibly a 'short term referent' in a modal context). Referring to to a 'missing antecedent', as in (12), does not work

- (12) John liker ikke en stygg jente, men **det** liker Per. *Hun er rik
 John likes not an ugly girl, but that likes Per she is rich

The fact that generic/eventive *det* must always be non-specific makes it very different from the surface anaphor *det*. Generic/eventive *det* can take a referring noun phrase as an antecedent without being referring itself, as in (2) above. It can even take a definite antecedent; this is normally impossible with surface anaphora.

Generic *det* is also different from surface anaphora prosodically; it does not have to be accented, and it can object shift (as in (2) above).

An important difference between surface *det* and generic/eventive *det* is that generic/eventive *det* seems to have the distribution of a regular nominal phrase (semantic restrictions aside), there is no special selection by its predicate.

The view of generic/eventive *det* sketched above ties in with another issue in Norwegian (and Scandinavian) syntax. An adjectival XCOMP normally agrees with its subject, but any noun phrase that can be referred to by generic/eventive *det* can take an adjectival XCOMP with singular neuter morphology. An example is (10) above (*kult* 'cool' is neuter). This phenomenon is a classical problem in Scandinavian grammar. The last contribution, Josefsson (NJL 2009), proposes that there are two groups of disagreeing subjects, making a distinction which roughly parallels the one made here between eventive and generic *det*.