1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this article is to contribute to our understanding of what has come to be known as the free, or "logophoric," use of anaphors. My starting point will be a comparison of the interpretation of sig in subjunctive and infinitival clauses, summarizing some of the considerations given in Reuland and Sigurjónsdóttir (1997).

Since the initial discussions of Icelandic long-distance anaphora by Thráinsson (1976) and Maling (1984), it has become widely acknowledged that the anaphor sig in subjunctives in Icelandic can take as its antecedent a non-c-commanding argument. Thus, in (1) the NP Jón can serve as the antecedent for sig, although it does not c-command and anaphor.¹

(1) a. [NP Skoðun Jóns] er [að sig vanti hæfileika]
   Opinion John’s is that SIG-Acc lacks-Subj talents
   ‘John’s opinion is that he lacks talents.’ (Maling, 1984: 222)

b. [NP Álit Jóns] virðist [tj vera [að ég hati sig]]
   Belief John’s seems be that I hate-Subj SIG
   ‘John’s belief seems to be that I hate him.’ (him=John)

c. Björn sagði Pétri frá [NP ósk Jóns] um [að Ari síndi]
   Björn told Peter about wish John’s about that Ari showed-Subj
   séði virðingu]
   SIG respect
   ‘Björn told Peter about John’s wish that Ari showed him (=John)
   respect.’
Furthermore, sig in subjunctives can refer to a matrix object, even though otherwise sig is strictly subject oriented.

(2) ?Jón, er masókisti. Pad gleður Jón, [að ég muni lemja sig, í hausinn med spýtu á morgun]
   ‘John is a masochist. It pleases John that I will-Subj hit him on the head with a stick tomorrow.’
   (Sigurjónsdóttir, 1992: 95)

Comparing sig in subjunctive clauses with sig in infinitival clauses, we see that in clauses of the latter type, a c-command requirement on antecedents must be strictly observed (3a–c). The same holds true for subject orientation (3d).

(3) a. *[NP Skoðun Jóns]i] virðist [i_j vera hàttuleg fyrir sigj]
   Opinion John’s seems be-Inf dangerous for SIG
   ‘John’s opinion seems to be dangerous for him.’

b. *[NP Ósk Jóns]i] er líkleg til [i_j æð hafa slæmarafleðingar
   Wish John’s is likely to to have-Inf bad consequences
   fyrir sigj]
   for SIG
   ‘John’s wish is likely to have bad consequences for him.’

c. *[NP Álit Jóns]i] er sagt [i_j hæfa sér vel]
   Belief John’s is said suit-Inf SIG well
   ‘John’s belief is said to suit him well.’

d. *Ég hótaði Jón, [að PRO_j lemja sigj]
   I threatened John to hit-Inf SIG
   ‘I threatened John to hit him.’

That binding sig out of infinitival clauses is possible when c-command is obeyed is shown in (4). (examples cited in Thráinsson (1991))

(4) a. Pétur, bað Jóns um [PRO_j að raka sigj]
   Peter asked Jens to shave self
   ‘Peter asked Jens to shave him/himself.’

b. Anna, telur [þig hafa svikið sigj]
   Anna believes you-Acc have-Inf betrayed self
   ‘Anna believes you to have betrayed her.’

As has often been observed, the felicitousness of sentences as in (1) and (2) is governed by the discourse status of the antecedent. The antecedent of sig must be the person (distinct from the speaker-narrator) whose perspective or point of view is reflected in the sentence. This is illustrated by the following minimal pair reported in Sells (1987: 451):

(5) a. Barnið, lét ekki léjos [að það hefði verið hugsad]
   The child put not in light that there had-Subj been thought