

Anaphoricity and Logophoricity with reference to Binding Principles

Dr. K. Somasekharavaraprasad

Abstract

Classical/Standard Binding Theory was inadequate to discuss the differences in the way anaphoric relations are elicited across languages. And, Minimalism did not give any attention on the concepts which are central to the Binding theory besides did provide an alternative to account for anaphoricity and logophoricity. Although the parametric approach outlined in Manzini and Wexler seems to be a promising one, it predates Minimalism and hence does not focus some of the problems that are related to anaphora. This seems to suggest that we must look elsewhere for factors that define something as complex as anaphora.

Keywords: anaphor, logophor, reflexives, reciprocals, Binding Theory

Aim of Binding Theory

The aim of Binding theory is to examine the distribution of anaphoric and non-anaphoric features in any given language. This is a very important because the idea that the distribution of anaphora and non-anaphora elements are intrinsically held to their inherent properties which can be explained by the features [+/- pronominal] and [+/- anaphor].

Three Different Types of Overt DPs

[+] and [-] features have opposite specifications which explains an element cannot both be [+pronominal] and [-pronominal]. Thus, Standard Binding Theory gives three different types of overt DPs depending on the contradictory nature of the feature specifications.

According to the Binding Theory, Chomsky explains that an anaphor as an element is bound in the GC (Governing Category). But, Burzio (1991) looks at some conceptual problems of defining anaphor in Binding Theory.

He observed that in English, the anaphora definition is based on the availability of certain elements, the *-self*. But, in a few languages, the difference between anaphors and pronouns are not marked explicitly. Therefore, the morphological definition of an anaphor will not make a clear sense. For example, the reflexives which are found in Romance languages do not exhibit any morphological reflexive element.

To illustrate the point further, consider the following Italian examples by Burzio (1991)

- 1) a) Io mi vedo.
I me see
I see myself.
- b) Tu pensi solo a te
You think only to you
You only think about yourself.

In a few cases, the clitics are used as pronouns.

- 2) a) Gianni mi vede.
Gianni me sees
Gianni sees me.
- b) Maria pensi solo a te.
Maria think only to you
Maria only thinks about you.

Scope of Anaphor

To explain these problems, Burzio (1991) proposed a definition to explain the scope of anaphor.

- 3) Definition of an Anaphor (Burzio 1991)
An NP with no features is an Anaphor.

The given definition explains the dependent referential characters of anaphor. And, this referential dependent nature of anaphors helps us to distinguish anaphors from pronouns.

Binding Theory obeys a structural approach to make a clear distinction between anaphors and pronouns. Thus, an anaphor has to follow and obey structural conditions such as C-command, locality and antecedenthood

Now let us turn our attention to Logophors.

The Definition of a Logophor

Huang Y. (1994) says “Logophoricity refers to the phenomenon whereby the point of view of an internal protagonist of a discourse as opposed to that of the current, external speaker, is reported”. And, explains further saying that these distinct logophoric pronouns are very much different from pronouns and reflexives. And, these logophoric pronouns that are occurring in embedded clauses refer to the individual whose speech, thoughts, or feelings are reported or reflected in a given context (Clement 1975). We can find these in the languages like Ewe which have logophoric pronouns distinct from their normal pronouns and are cliticized to the embedded verb. Consider the examples taken from Clements (1975:142).

- 4) Logophoric pronouns: Cliticized to the verb
 - a) Kofi be ye-dzo
Kofi say LOG-leave
Kofi_i said that he_i left
 - b) Kofi be e-dzo
Kofi say 3SG-leave
Kofi_i said that he*_{i/j} left
- (Ewe, Clements (1975))

In (4 a) the embedded verb contains cliticized logophoric pronoun *ye*. Thus, the pronoun which is logophoric in its nature has to take the matrix subject as its antecedent. In (4 b), the cliticized actual pronoun *e* can only refer the antecedent outside but not the matrix antecedent. With the help of the above examples, we observed that the logophoric pronouns *ye* usage is different from the personal and reflexive pronoun.

We have been observing that logophoric pronoun *ye* is used in the Ewe language to show logophoricity. But, in a few languages, for example, Telugu, Kannada, Korean, Japanese and Icelandic, the same reflexive form is used to express the logophoricity.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 18:9 September 2018

Dr. K. Somasekharavaraprasad

Anaphoricity and Logophoricity with reference to Binding Principles

Logophoric Function of Reflexive

Let us look at logophoric function of reflexive crosslinguistically.

- 5) raaju_i ravi too [tanu_i america ki velthaa-nu ani] cepp-aa-Du
Raju ravi dat self NOM America dat go 1 sg.n COM say pst 3 sg.m
Raju said to Ravi that he would go to Amercia.

Telugu

- 6) raamu_i shyaamu [tann-annu_i priitis-utt-aane anta] namb-utt-aane.
Ramu Shyamu self acc love pres 3sg-m COM believe pres-3sm-m
Ramu_i believes that Shyamu loves self_i

Kannada

- 7) Chelswu_i-nun Yengswu-ka caki_i-lul coahanta-ko sayngkakkan-ta
Chelswu-Top Yengswu-Nom self-Acc like-Comp think-decl
Chelswu_i thinks that Yengswu loves him_i Korean (Choi 2000).
- 8) Taroo_i-wa Yosiko-ga zibun_i-ni aitagatteiru-to iwareta.
Taroo-Top Yosiko-ga self-Dat visit-ws-wanting-Comp was-told
Taroo_i was told that Yosiko wanted to visit him_i Japanese (Choi 2000)
- 9) Jon_i segir ath Maria elski sig_i
John says that Maria loves (subj.) self
Jon_i says that Maria loves him_i Icelandic (Choi 2000)

When reflexives in English function like logophors, they are entirely different from anaphors and do not obey the properties mentioned for anaphors such as C-command, locality and antecedenthood. And, another important characteristic of logophor is that it exhibits Blocking Effect although there are some exceptions to this. These logophors go against to the principles proposed in the Binding Theory.

Zribi-Hertz (1989) argues that in certain contexts reflexives in English are used like logophors to indicate logophoricity. Consider the following examples taken from Zribi-Hertz (1989).

- 10) Miss Stepney_i's heart was a precise register of facts as manifested in their relation to herself.
- 11) But, Rupert_i was not unduly worried about Peter_j's opinion of himself_i.

In (10), both C-command and locality conditions are violated. In (11), the reflexive *himself* violates the syntactic condition on an anaphor as it is bound across the Specified Subject. Consider some more examples.

- 12) John_i believed that the paper had been written by Mary and himself.
- 13) James_i thinks that Mary is taller than himself_i

In (12 & 13), the reflexive gets coindexed with the matrix subject in spite of having an intervening subject in the embedded clause. The above two sentences give a counter evidence to the Binding theory.

=====

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 18:9 September 2018

Dr. K. Somasekharavaraprasad

Anaphoricity and Logophoricity with reference to Binding Principles

Functional Difference between Anaphor and Logophor

From the above observations, we can note that there is a functional difference between an anaphor and a logophoric in the following way.

Anaphor: Obeys the syntactic conditions such as C-command, Locality and Antecedenthood proposed in Binding Theory.

Logophor: Need to obey the syntactic conditions such as C-command, Locality and Antecedenthood relation proposed in Binding Theory.

From the above examples, we could see that the reflexives in all these different languages are bound by the matrix antecedent across the local domain in which a reflexive ought to be bound. Reflexives in these languages can be bound within the local domain as an anaphor or can refer to the matrix antecedent as a logophor. And, it is this particular characteristic of logophor presented problems to the Standard Binding Theory. Therefore, it is observed that reflexives in these languages are lexically ambiguous between an anaphor and a logophor.

Binding Theory failed to accommodate Long-distance anaphors found in many languages including English. Secondly, the notion of Binding had to be modified for various reasons. Thirdly, the Binding domain for anaphors had to be redefined since there were languages in which Long-distance anaphors exhibited different properties.

References

Andersen, T., & Goyvaerts, D. L. (1986). Reflexivity and logophoricity in Moru-Madi. *Folia Linguistica*, 20(3-4), 297-318.

Anderson, S. R. (1976). On the notion of subject in ergative languages. *Subject and topic*, 1, 23.

Battistella, E. (1985). On the Distribution of PRO in Chinese. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 3(3), 317-340.

--- (1989). Chinese reflexivization: A movement to INFL approach. *Linguistics*, 27(6), 987-1012.

--- (1990). Remarks on the reflexive in Chinese. *Linguistics*, 28(2), 205-240.

Belletti, A., & Rizzi, L. (1988). Psych-Verbs and Theta-Theory', *NLLT*6, 291-352. *Belletti2916NLLT1988*.

Bilova, E. (1991 a). 'Null subjects, identification, and proper government', *Linguistics*, 29: 33-51.

Brown, C. P. (1852). *A Dictionary, Telugu and English explaining the colloquial style used in business and the poetical dialect, with explanations in Telugu and English*. Christian Knowledge Society's Press.

Burzio, L. (1991). 'The morphological basis of anaphora', *Journal of Linguistics*, 27: 81-105.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 **18:9 September 2018**

Dr. K. Somasekharavaraprasad

Anaphoricity and Logophoricity with reference to Binding Principles

Camacho, J. to appear in M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *The Companion to Syntax* 2nd edition, Wiley-Blackwell.

Chayanika Hazarika (2011). 'Binding principles in Assamese and English' M.Phil. Thesis, EFLU

Choi, D.-I. (1997). Binding principle for long-distance anaphors. University of Kansas. *Linguistics Graduate Student Association*.

Choi, K. S. (2000). Anaphoricity and logophoricity. *LANGUAGE RESEARCH-SEOUL-*, 36(1), 83-102.

=====
Dr. K. Somasekharavaraprasad, NET, SET, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Indian Institute of Information Technology (IIIT)
Nuziveedu 521201
Krishna District
Andhra Pradesh
India.
kancherlasekhar70@gmail.com

=====
Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 **18:9 September 2018**

Dr. K. Somasekharavaraprasad

Anaphoricity and Logophoricity with reference to Binding Principles