

## Foreword

Maria-Elisabeth Conte

1. This issue of *Rivista di linguistica* is devoted to the topic of anaphora. Anaphora is in fact a highly debated subject in contemporary linguistics. It has been given considerable treatment in the framework of generative grammar on the one hand and of textual linguistics (or discourse analysis) on the other.

It should be pointed out however that the term 'anaphora' does not cover the same phenomena in these two branches of research. In fact, while in textual linguistics 'anaphora' is used in a broad sense and applies to all those elements which have an antecedent in the text (or for which an antecedent can be reconstructed), in generative linguistics the term is used in a restricted sense to denote such special phenomena as reflexives and reciprocals, which require a syntactic antecedent in the sentence.

In textual linguistics there is a paradigmatic opposition between anaphora and deixis.<sup>1</sup> In generative linguistics though the paradigmatic opposition is between anaphora and pronominalization, two phenomena, which in textual linguistics are specific realizations of the more general concept of anaphora.

In spite of these profound diversities not only in terminology, but also in approach, method and domain, a presentation of the state of the art from both perspectives seemed quite rewarding.

A number of specialists have therefore been invited to outline representative pieces of research in their respective fields.

2. The articles of the present issue can easily be grouped into two sections according to their domain of inquiry.

The *first* section, where the domain of inquiry is the *sentence*, is made up of three articles by Alessandra Giorgi, Luigi Rizzi and Denis Delfitto respectively. In all three papers, written within the framework of Chomsky's Government and Binding Theory, some very specific but crucial syntactic questions are analysed in depth.

<sup>1</sup> To be more precise, anaphora is opposed to different kinds of deixis: situational deixis, textual deixis, *Deixis am Phantasma* (deixis at phantasma). These kinds of deixis are differentiated according to their respective deictic fields in which the pointing devices are functioning.

The *second* section, where the domain of inquiry is the *text*, consists of six papers (by Francis Corblin, Monica Berretta, František Daneš, Maria-Elisabeth Conte, Georges Kleiber, Peter Bosch & Bart Geurts) which deal with the text-cohesive function of anaphoric relations and the contextual or co-textual constraints on the occurrence of particular anaphoric forms. Some of these papers put forward a global approach to the production or interpretation of anaphoric referential chains in the textual sequence, while others present detailed inquiries into the processing of particular anaphoric means (pronouns, definite noun phrases, demonstratives).

3. I will now briefly present the papers in this issue and point out some interesting connections between some of them.

3.1. In the first paper of the present collection Alessandra Giorgi provides a contrastive analysis of third person non-clitic anaphoric/pronominal elements in Italian ('*lui*', '*se*', '*se stesso*') and in French ('*lui*', '*lui-même*') and takes into account the distributional patterns of these items in both languages.

The main aim of her paper is to show that, in spite of the surface differences (there are three lexical items in the Italian system and only two in the French one), the underlying abstract systems in both languages are very similar. They both exhibit a tripartite structure. It turns out, in fact, that French '*lui*' plays a twofold role: it functions as a pronoun (like '*lui*' in Italian) and as a subject-oriented anaphor (like '*se*' in Italian).

3.2. Luigi Rizzi discusses the anaphor-agreement effect (the fact that anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement). He evaluates the way this constraint has been treated in Chomsky's Binding Theory and proposes an alternative solution which takes as its basic assumption the idea that agreement is pronominal in nature.

Rizzi's proposal, which involves a series of technical adjustments in the Binding Theory, provides a unified explanation of the anaphor-agreement effect and of a seemingly unrelated phenomenon: the disjoint reference effect in subjunctive clauses in Romance languages.<sup>2</sup>

3.3. The paper by Denis Delfitto is a very technical and conceptually complex discussion of backward pronominalization and weak crossover phenomena. The author clearly privileges structural principles in explaining conditions on backward pronominalization (or cataphora) and weak crossover.

However he also takes into account pragmatic factors and discourse strategy (particularly the status of a constituent in terms of the old/new information dichotomy and the salience of a referent in a discourse situation).

<sup>2</sup> The disjoint reference effect in Romance subjunctive clauses is just one instance of a more systematic relation between reference and modality in natural languages. Another instance of the determination of reference by modality concerns the distinction of specific/non-specific reference in modal contexts.

3.4. Francis Corblin studies coreference-relations in natural discourse and proposes a complete redefinition of C. Chatelain's distinction between anaphoric chains and referential chains. According to Corblin, coreference in discourse is established by two different procedures: by *anaphoric links* (which are linguistically based), where a connection is drawn to a previous mention or antecedent in the text, and by *referential links* (which are communicative in nature), where two referential NPs are independently processed and where the first NP cannot be taken as the source or antecedent of the second.

Thus pronouns, demonstrative NPs and bare definite NPs function as anaphoric links, while complete definite descriptions and proper names function as referential links. By this distinction new light is also shed on indefinite NPs and on associative anaphora. (Cf. also Kleiber's paper.)

3.5. Monica Berretta adopts a functional perspective (Talmay Grivón's framework) for her analysis of the co-textual conditions which govern the choice of anaphoric forms in particular text-types (Italian academic lectures and everyday conversations). These conditions operate at both the microstructural and the macrostructural level of a text.

At the microstructural level Berretta focusses her interest on those antecedents which are low in the topical hierarchy. In particular, she takes into account those antecedents which occur in syntactically embedded clauses or which are incorporated into a nominal. (Cf. also Conte's paper.) There exists a functional correlation between the accessibility of the antecedent and the degree of explicitness of the anaphoric form.

At the macrostructural level the crucial factor responsible for the explicitness of an anaphoric form is the presence of a boundary between textual units: if the anaphor and its antecedent are separated by such a boundary, then the antecedent becomes a "difficult antecedent" requiring an explicit anaphoric form. The on-line syntagmatic distance between an anaphor and its antecedent seems though to be a much less important factor than has hitherto been claimed.

3.6. František Daneš writes on the techniques of constructing coreferential anaphoric chains in literary discourse. He analyses the way in which a discourse referent can be characterized by different referential expressions (or "naming units") and argues that the choice of particular coreferential expressions is dependent on the co-text and governed by various factors, notably by empathy. (This point is also briefly dealt with by Conte).

Co-text dependence is particularly evident in those cases where naming units are prepared by preceding predications: characterizations of individuals by predication may be shifted via nominalization or attributivization to a following referring expression.

Daneš makes it quite clear that the options of different naming units contribute in a significant way to the stylistic make-up of a text. In samples of modern English and German prose he discovers the stylistic principle of austerity: some authors (Hemingway and Kafka, for instance) build up what

he calls "austere chains" (coreferential "non-deictive, non-descriptive" chains) in which a discourse subject is continually and invariably referred to by one and the same linguistic expression (for instance, by a proper name, by a role name or by a pronoun).

3.7. In Maria-Elisabeth Conte's paper stress is laid on the *interpretation* of anaphoric pronouns and emphasis is laid on the interpreter's active role in constructing (or reconstructing) the antecedent for an anaphoric pronoun in a text.

The research only takes account of non-coreferential anaphoric pronouns and analyses their behaviour in three kinds of textual situations: 1. anaphoric pronouns with referential (but non-coreferential) antecedents; 2. anaphoric pronouns with non-referential (and thus *a fortiori* non-coreferential) antecedents; 3. anaphoric pronouns without any antecedents in the text.

The analysis shows that in the process of interpretation an anaphoric pronoun is not just a signal of continuity: it may not be the *posterius*, but the *prius*. It is argued, that a pronoun itself (by its formal properties, and by its intrinsic referentiality) together with some elements of its co-text (in particular the predicate which co-occurs with the pronoun) may give important instructions for selecting the antecedent and identifying the referent of the pronoun. The paper also attempts to provide a reassessment of the notion of anaphoric island. (Cf. also Berretta's paper.)

3.8. The interesting problem of associative anaphora (which has been briefly touched upon by Corblin) is fully discussed in Georges Kleiber's paper. What is meant by 'associative anaphora' is that once an object has been introduced into a discourse the constitutive parts of this object can be referred to by a definite NP, but not by a pronoun or by a demonstrative NP.

Kleiber concentrates his analysis on the interchangeability of definite NPs and demonstrative NPs and discusses in detail the constraints on the distribution of the demonstrative. These constraints have generally been explained in the following way: the demonstrative can be used only *in praesentia* of the referent, or, more explicitly: a necessary condition for the appropriateness of its use is the presence of the referent in the situation or a previous mention of the referent in the text.

Kleiber criticizes this view and puts forth a new hypothesis which takes into account some hitherto unexplained deictic uses of the demonstrative for absent referents (the case of indirect ostensive reference)<sup>3</sup> and at the same time explains why the demonstrative cannot refer anaphorically without an anterior mention of the referent in the text. To refer to something *in absentia* seems thus to be thoroughly different in the case of deixis as compared to anaphora.

<sup>3</sup> In the case of indirect ostensive reference there is an object present in the discourse situation which functions as an intermediary element of the intended referent which is absent. This deictic situation is different from what Karl Bühler called "*Deixis am Phantasma*" (Cf. Karl Bühler, *Sprachtheorie*, Jena, Fischer, 1934; Stuttgart, Fischer, 1965<sup>5</sup>).

3.9. The paper by Peter Bosch and Bart Geurts deals with the processing of definite NPs in a computational model which simulates human text understanding. They argue against a two-stage approach, where semantic and discourse processing (including definite NP resolution) starts only after a complete syntactic parsing of each individual sentence. Since humans process definite NPs immediately when they encounter them in the reading or listening process (as has been shown by psycholinguistic research), it is cognitively more realistic to let a specialized module ("NP-Resolver") interact with the parser.

For the interpretation of anaphoric definite NPs some referents are available from the preceding co-text and are represented in the discourse model, while others are accessible via background knowledge. Some definite NPs which are not anaphoric are interpretable by knowledge of the global context. (As for anaphoric and non-anaphoric definite NPs, there are some interesting points of contact between Bosch and Geurts' view on definiteness and Corblin's distinction between anaphoric links and referential links.)

In the computational model elaborated by Bosch and Geurts the search strategy for a suitable referent is sequentially ordered. It examines consecutively 1. objects in explicit focus in the preceding discourse; 2. objects that can be accommodated in relation to explicit focus (this heading subsumes what other authors call 'associative anaphora', cf. Kleiber's paper); 3. uncussed objects in the discourse model; 4. objects in the global context.

4. I would like to conclude this short *Foreword* by mentioning just one publication out of the very impressive bulk of work on anaphora, namely: *Sull'anaphora* (1981).<sup>4</sup> This volume brings together the proceedings of a memorable workshop on anaphora organized by Giovanni Nencioni in Florence, at the Accademia della Crusca, in 1978. In setting out to prepare the present issue on anaphora ten years later I ideally conceived of my endeavour as a continuation of Nencioni's enterprise.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Sull'anaphora. Atti del Seminario. Accademia della Crusca, 14-16 dicembre, 1978*, Firenze, Accademia della Crusca, 1981.