

ANAPHORIC ENCAPSULATION AND PRESUPPOSITION: PERSUASIVE AND STEREOTYPICAL USES OF A COHESIVE STRATEGY

Filippo Pecorari

ABSTRACT:

This paper focuses on the presuppositional values of anaphoric encapsulation. We highlight that presupposition is a basic feature of argumentative and persuasive uses of this cohesive strategy, but may also apply to stereotypical instances, where evaluation does not coincide with persuasion. Finally, we analyse examples where a higher-order definite noun phrase does not presuppose the existence of a discourse referent.

KEYWORDS: anaphora; presupposition; higher-order entities.

Anaphoric encapsulation: a brief introduction

Anaphoric encapsulation (henceforth AE) is a strategy of textual cohesion that allows the reader to sum up considerable portions of text, given in the left co-text of the anaphor, within a single referential expression. The anaphor, or encapsulator, establishes a new discourse referent¹ in the universe of discourse², unlike in traditional instances of (coreferential)

¹ In the theoretical framework of textual linguistics, the entities established by referential expressions are usually called *discourse referents* and not simply *referents*, in order to underline that their existence is evaluated only in relation to the universe of discourse. Discourse referents need not have a proper counterpart in the factual world.

² The universe of discourse is formed by a text-external world (*i.e.* speech participants and speech setting) and a text-internal world (*i.e.* linguistic expressions and their meanings) (cf.

anaphora, where only a textual link with a given discourse referent is at stake. From a semantic viewpoint, the main feature of this strategy is its restriction to higher-order referents; in other words, the referent it establishes in the universe of discourse is not an individual (or first-order referent, in Lyons' terms³), but an entity belonging to the second order (*i.e.* an event, a process, an action), to the third order (*i.e.* a fact, a concept, a proposition) or to the fourth order (*i.e.* a speech act)⁴ (cf. LALA, 2010). According to Conte,

This term [anaphoric encapsulation] describes a lexically based anaphora constructed with a general noun (or an evaluative noun, an axionym) as the lexical head and a clear preference for a demonstrative determiner. Anaphoric encapsulation can be defined in the following way: it is a cohesive device by which a noun phrase functions as a resumptive paraphrase for a preceding portion of text. (CONTE, 1999 [1996], p. 107)

As a matter of fact, we do not restrict AE to lexically based anaphors, as the definition above would require: pronouns are likewise considered as a possible morphosyntactic form of encapsulator. In the approach we are following, the only definitional criterion for AE is hypostasis (CONTE, 1996), *viz.* the objectification of a textual portion, syntactically realized by one or more clauses/sentences, into a single referential object, syntactically realized

LAMBRECHT, Knud. *Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 36-37). Of course, the latter is crucial in written discourse, where writer and reader are not in face-to-face contact. One of the alternative labels used in the literature for this notion is *discourse model*, used *inter alia* by Conte: CONTE, Maria-Elisabeth. Anaphoric encapsulation. In: DE MULDER, W.; TASMOWSKI, L. (Eds.). *Coherence and Anaphora (Belgian Journal of Linguistics, 10)*, 1996, pp. 1-10 [reprinted in CONTE, M.-E. *Condizioni di coerenza. Ricerche di linguistica testuale*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1999, pp. 107-114].

³ LYONS, John. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

⁴ The ontological typology on which these remarks are based is the one proposed by Dik (DIK, Simon C. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997a), based in turn on the well-known typology by Lyons (LYONS, John. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977). Dik's taxonomy is more comprehensive in that it includes five orders of entities and recognises the basic differences between propositions and speech acts, grouped together by Lyons in the class of third-order entities.

by a (lexical or pronominal) noun phrase. This property allows the speaker to establish a new discourse referent and to predicate something about it from that moment on⁵. Briefly, this is the definition of AE we adopt in this paper: we have AE in a text whenever a linguistic expression (syntactically nominal) establishes a new discourse referent through a resumptive link with a preceding text portion.

These points may be clarified by taking a closer look to a simple authentic example⁶:

(1) Un operaio di 47 anni è rimasto ferito ieri mattina in un incidente avvenuto al Voltri Terminal Europa. *L'infortunio* è avvenuto alle 8.30 [...]. (*La Repubblica*, 08.05.2012)

'A 47-year-old worker was injured yesterday morning in an accident at the Voltri Terminal Europa. *The injury* happened at 8.30 [...]'.

In (1), the noun phrase *l'infortunio* sums up the entire previous utterance and, which is more important in a textual perspective, brings about the introduction of a new discourse referent in the universe of discourse. The predication *è avvenuto alle 8.30* may be applied to the injury event only after its establishment as a discourse referent through AE. The encapsulator has a function of synthesis and paraphrase towards the co-text on its left⁷.

We strongly agree with Conte that «anaphoric encapsulation is a non-co-referential anaphora» (CONTE, 2010 [1998], p. 285)⁸, since its antecedent is, by definition, non-referential; strictly speaking, coreference may be established only between two actual referential expressions. This property gives AE a

⁵ The definitional aspects of anaphoric encapsulation are examined in more depth in the following paper: PECORARI, Filippo. Ai confini dell'incapsulazione anaforica: strategie incapsulative non prototipiche. In: PÍRVU, E. (Ed.). *Discorso e cultura nella lingua e nella letteratura italiana. Atti del V Convegno Internazionale di italianistica dell'Università di Craiova, 20-21 settembre 2013*. Firenze: Cesati, 2014, pp. 257-270.

⁶ In all the following examples, anaphors (or other elements under consideration) are marked in italics. The English rendering of the Italian examples is close to literal.

⁷ In the English translation, the cohesive relationship between the complex antecedent and the anaphor is made even clearer by the surface form of the utterances, because the main verb of the antecedent and the noun acting as head of the anaphor share the same lexical root *injur-*.

⁸ "L'incapsulazione anaforica è un'anafora non-coreferenziale".

somewhat paradoxical nature, because textual cohesion, based on formal (*i.e.* anaphoric) relations of continuity between parts of the text, is here intertwined with the introduction of a new discourse referent, often with the function of topic of a new utterance.

AE has a privileged position among the strategies of textual cohesion. It fully belongs to the realm of anaphora, but displays a vast array of properties that, in several ways, add something to the universe of discourse. In other words, it does not limit its task to linking parts of the text together and to reassuring the reader about the continuity of what he is reading, but calls into question new blocks of meaning, that have to be accepted as such by a cooperative reader.

This paper deals with a specific type of meaning connected with AE, namely implicit meanings belonging to the class of presuppositions. As we will show, these parts of meaning, though not superficially visible, are a basic and powerful feature of AE, since they allow the writer to act persuasively towards the reader and to lead him/her on a specific argumentative path without attracting his/her attention.

The data we will comment on in the following are mainly taken from a corpus of Italian news, retrieved from the web archives of national (*La Repubblica*, *Corriere della Sera*) and local (*La Provincia Pavese*) newspapers⁹. Since we deal only with written text, we will often adopt the labels of “writer” and “reader”, replacing the more common labels of “speaker” and “listener/interlocutor”.

Anaphoric encapsulation and implicit meanings: presupposition and implicature

Among the main pragmatic values of AE, we have to consider the exploitation of implicit contents, situated at the level of the communicative meaning of the text. The implicit portion of communicative meaning may be distinguished from the explicit portion because the latter is more connected to linguistic meaning, whereas the former «is only intersected with linguistic meaning, or separated from it» (FERRARI *et al.*, 2008, p. 23)¹⁰. The opposi-

⁹ These are the URLs of the web archives: <<http://ricerca.repubblica.it/>> for *La Repubblica*, <<http://sitesearch.corriere.it/archivioStoricoEngine>> for *Corriere della Sera*, <<http://ricerca.gelocal.it/la-provinciapavese?&view=locali.la+Provincia+Pavese>> for *La Provincia Pavese*.

¹⁰ “Si limita a intersecarsi con il significato linguistico o è disgiunto da esso”.

tion between linguistic meaning and communicative meaning is described by Ferrari *et al.* (2008) as follows:

The linguistic meaning may be defined as the meaning situated in the linguistic structure of the “sentence”, *viz.* the meaning given by the combination of the meanings of lexical items, according to the indications offered by syntax and punctuation. The communicative meaning, on the other hand, is the meaning arising by way of inference from the combination of linguistic meaning and contextual pieces of information that are presented as relevant by the enunciative situation [...]. (FERRARI *et al.*, 2008, p. 22)¹¹

Communicative meaning may be seen as «an interpretive hypothesis made by the interlocutor» (FERRARI *et al.*, 2008, p. 23)¹², based on inferential reasoning. The implicit contents originating from this interpretive hypothesis may be classified, according to Sbisà (2007, p. 6) and Ferrari (2014, p. 62), in two categories: presuppositions and implicatures. Presuppositions are defined as «utterances whose truth is taken for granted, since they act as preconditions of the communicative event or as common background on which the event may be understood», whereas implicatures are «utterances that may be inferred from the fact that the communicative event is taking place in a certain way and supply additional or corrective pieces of information with respect to the sense that is explicitly formulated in the text» (SBISÀ, 2010, p. 1132)¹³.

¹¹ “Il significato linguistico può essere definito come il significato iscritto nella struttura linguistica della “frase”, vale a dire quel significato dato dalla combinazione dei significati delle forme lessicali secondo le indicazioni offerte dalla sintassi e dalla punteggiatura. Quanto al significato comunicativo, esso è invece quel significato che nasce inferenzialmente dalla combinazione del significato linguistico con le informazioni contestuali che la situazione d’enunciazione presenta come pertinenti”.

¹² “Un’ipotesi interpretativa dell’interlocutore”.

¹³ “Enunciati la cui verità viene data per scontata, in quanto fungono da precondizioni dell’evento comunicativo o da sfondo comune su cui esso può essere compreso”; “Enunciati che possono essere inferiti dal fatto che l’evento comunicativo si sta svolgendo in un certo modo e forniscono informazioni aggiuntive o correttive nei confronti del senso esplicitamente formulato nel testo”.

In the following, we will not deal with implicatures, though they are crucially connected to textual cohesion: some brief notes will suffice for now. As far as AE is concerned, what is implicated is an utterance that states the referential congruence¹⁴ between the linguistic expressions involved. In other words, while presupposition licenses the existence of a discourse referent with the properties indicated by the anaphor (cf. *infra*), implicature allows the reader to reconstruct the referential (and cohesive) link between the anaphor and the antecedent¹⁵.

As underlined by Ferrari, «implicature may consist in the categorization or definition *a posteriori* of what is referred back» (FERRARI, 2014, p. 73)¹⁶. The encapsulator allows the speaker to categorize *ex novo* a propositionally structured antecedent. The action of implicature is particularly meaningful when the encapsulator gives an unpredictable label to the antecedent. An example will suffice to illustrate this point:

(2) Gli sms venivano ancora usati, ma erano considerati oramai un mezzo di comunicazione obsoleto. Meglio i social network. “Amici” che parlano tra di loro, in un linguaggio criptato come sempre nei casi della droga, per scambiarsi informazioni. [...] Metodi di comunicazione tra giovani spacciatori, quattro gruppi che controllavano il mercato di eroina, cocaina e hashish a Sorrento. *La scoperta* è stata fatta dai carabinieri di Sorrento [...]. (*La Repubblica*, 18.10.2013)

¹⁴ The notion of “referential congruence”, borrowed from Apothéloz (APOTHÉLOZ, Denis. *Nominalisations, référents clandestins et anaphores atypiques. Travaux Neuchâtelois de Linguistique (TRANEL)*, 23: 143-173, 1995), has the advantage of indicating clearly the resumptive features of the encapsulator towards the complex antecedent and, at the same time, the lack of a relationship of coreference, in the strict sense (cf. *supra*).

¹⁵ In this respect, see in particular Sbisà: “anaphoric encapsulators are a phenomenon of textual cohesion that, in my opinion, joins a presuppositional aspect and the activation of an implicature of Relation” (“[gli] incapsulatori anaforici sono un fenomeno di coesione testuale che a mio avviso congiunge un aspetto presupposizionale e l’attivazione di un’implicatura di Relazione”, SBISÀ, Marina. *Detto non detto. Le forme della comunicazione implicita*. Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2007, p. 150).

¹⁶ “L’implicatura può consistere nella categorizzazione o definizione a posteriori di quanto viene ripreso”.

‘SMSs were still used, but they were by now considered as an outdated means of communication. Social networks are better. “Friends” talking amongst themselves, in an encrypted language as always happens in drug affairs, in order to exchange information. [...] Methods of communication among young pushers, four groups controlling the market of heroin, cocaine and hashish in Sorrento. *The discovery* was made by the Carabinieri of Sorrento [...]’

As for the anaphor *la scoperta* in (2), presupposition concerns only the existence of a discovery in the universe of discourse, whereas implicature is responsible for the (textually cohesive) connection between the anaphor and the text span on its left. The complex antecedent has a purely descriptive nature and does not contain any predicative element semantically connected to the lexical root of *scoperta*. Only after the introduction of the encapsulator, we are able to reinterpret the utterances above as the object of a discovery. The activated implicature, in particular, is “The Carabinieri of Sorrento have discovered new methods of communication among young pushers”.

Persuasive uses of presupposition in anaphoric encapsulation

The presuppositional values of AE are basically linked to its formal features. Definite and demonstrative noun phrases, the usual morphosyntactic forms of the construction, are presupposition triggers: they are responsible for the presupposition of existence of the discourse referent they refer to. The presupposition of existence linked to the use of a definite description is a well known phenomenon in the philosophical literature, starting from Strawson’s (1950) criticism to Russell’s (1905) theory of definite descriptions. It is not pointless to underline, moreover, that definite descriptions are presented by Levinson (1983, p. 181) as the first construction in a list of presupposition triggers.

The interaction between AE and presupposition is highlighted, though with different terms, by D’Addio (1988). The Italian scholar recognises the feature of “hidden persuasion” possessed by AE. When a definite or demonstrative determiner is associated with an axiological (*i.e.* evaluative)

lexical head, or with a head modified by axiological elements, «the speaker may accomplish real acts of force towards the receiver, letting a personal judgment pass surreptitiously. However, this judgment is presented as a shared piece of information, due to the syntactic aspects of anaphora» (D'ADDIO, 1988, pp. 145-146)¹⁷. The persuasive features linked to the presuppositional aspects of AE are particularly clear in texts with a definite ideological orientation, such as the journalistic opinion piece containing the following example:

(3) Mentre scrivo queste righe – la notte di domenica scorsa – è il Fronte nazionale ad apparire come il grande vincitore del primo turno delle presidenziali francesi. Ha la meglio politicamente poiché recupera, ottenendone anche di nuovi, gli elettori che gli aveva risucchiato Sarkozy nel 2007. [...] Infine, ridicolizza la Francia mostrando che un elettore su cinque si riconosce in un programma demente, presentato da un partito fetido [...]. La Storia dirà di chi è la responsabilità di *questo disastro*, di *questa vergogna*. (*Corriere della Sera*, 26.04.2012)
 ‘While I am writing these lines – last Sunday night – the National Front emerges as the great winner of the first turn of French presidential election. It gets the upper hand from a political point of view, since it gets back the voters gained by Sarkozy in 2007, obtaining also some new ones. [...] Finally, it ridicules France by showing that a voter out of five agrees with a demented agenda, presented by a fetid party [...]. History will tell whose responsibility *this disaster*, *this shame* is.’

The antecedent of (3) is very wide (three more utterances¹⁸, in addition to those reported) and complex. The success of the National Front at French presidential election is encapsulated by the author of this fragment through two highly evaluative noun phrases, with *disastro* (Engl. *disaster*) and *vergogna*

¹⁷ “Il parlante può compiere dei veri e propri colpi di forza nei confronti del ricevente facendo passare surrettiziamente una sua personale valutazione che, però, per gli aspetti sintattici dell’anafora, viene presentata come informazione condivisa”.

¹⁸ For the sake of clarity, we consider utterances as communicative units delimited in the surface of the text by strong punctuation marks.

(Engl. *shame*) as head nouns. These nouns convey a clearly subjective opinion, linked to clear-cut ideological beliefs; however, the syntactic aspects of anaphora (here, the use of demonstrative determiners) convey the property of givenness, as if the corresponding discourse referents were already present in the universe of discourse with those same categorizations. The reader is forced to presuppose that a disaster and a shame actually exist in the universe of discourse.

Nevertheless, we must also consider that the evaluative strength of AE is diminished in (3) by the use of other strongly evaluative expressions within the complex antecedent (e.g. *programma demente* ‘demented agenda’, *partito fetido* ‘fetid party’). These expressions disclose very clearly, and very provocatively, the orientation of the author towards the facts he is reporting. In other words, these terms project some very clear evaluative expectations (they act as cataphoric triggers, according to Caffi¹⁹), confirmed by the semantic features of the two encapsulators.

The textual operation performed in the following example is even more effective, on the plan of persuasion:

(4) Uno Scudo da cinque punti di Pil. Si capisce l'esultanza di Giulio Tremonti, per il clamoroso successo della manovra di "rientro dei capitali dall'estero". Se è vero che frutterà tra gli 80 e i 100 miliardi di euro in soli tre mesi (contro i 78 miliardi accumulati nei tre anni 2001/2003) il ministro del Tesoro ha ragione a compiacersi. [...] Ma da *questa criticabile operazione* si può trarre qualche utile lezione. (*La Repubblica*, 17.12.2009)
'A tax shelter for five points of Gross Domestic Product. Giulio Tremonti's rejoicing for the resounding success of the measures for "repatriation of capital funds from abroad" is understandable. If it is true that it will yield between 80 and 100 billion Euro in only three months (as opposed to the 78 billion gathered in the three years 2001/2003), the minister of Treasury has some reasons to be pleased. [...] But from *this objectionable operation* some useful lessons can be drawn.'

¹⁹ CAFFI, Claudia. *Pragmatica. Sei lezioni*. Roma: Carocci, 2009.

The anaphor presupposes the truth of an utterance that states the existence, in the universe of discourse, of an operation that may be defined as objectionable. The complex antecedent does not reveal in advance the negative evaluation that is made explicit within the encapsulator, through the use of the modifier *criticabile*. However, if some early traces of the evaluation within the antecedent are to be found, they result in any case very subtle – *i.e.* the conditional relation realized by the two clauses *Se è vero che frutterà...il ministro del Tesoro ha ragione a compiacersi* (Engl. *If it is true that it will yield... the minister of Treasury has some reasons to be pleased*) may lead the reader to understand that the author actually thinks that the measures will *not* yield the promised amount of money. The anaphor – supported on the logical plan by the connective of opposition *ma* – clarifies, once and for all, the negative evaluation of the governmental measures given by the author. In addition, it forces the reader to share the idea that the measures are actually objectionable.

Textual coherence is somewhat threatened by an evaluative anaphor like the one in (4), since, if the reader does not share the evaluation of the writer, what follows becomes completely pointless for him/her. A reader who does not believe that the measures are objectionable will evaluate the presupposition as false and will reject the remarks put forward in the following sections of the article.

The persuasive function of AE is linked to the mechanism of presupposition accommodation (FERRARI, 2014, p. 65). When an axiologically marked discourse referent is established, as we have just seen, the interlocutor may decide to reject the presupposition of existence of a referent with such qualities as false, rejecting at the same time the argumentative path arranged by the writer. However, the unmarked choice for the reader is the accommodation of the presupposition, that leads in turn to the acceptance of the existence of the discourse referent and of the validity of the evaluations expressed by the anaphor.

As Sbisà (2007, p. 55) points out, presuppositions have a normative character, because their truth is not simply taken for granted *de facto* by a cooperative reader, but *has to be* taken for granted in order to safeguard the appropriateness of the whole text. The textual strength of presuppositions lies precisely in this ability of constraining the reader into given interpretive limits in a subtle way, without attracting his/her attention. The unmarked choice (*i.e.* the accommodation of the presupposition) assures the maintenance of an overall textual coherence, whereas the marked choice (*i.e.* the refusal of the presupposition as

false) produces a disagreement between coherence *a parte obiecti* (modelled by the writer in the communicative substance of the text) and coherence *a parte subiecti* (modelled by the reader as a result of the activity of interpretation)²⁰. Therefore, if accommodation is the unmarked choice, the persuasive potential of AE is more probably subject to an acceptance rather than a refusal.

Ferrari (2002) underlines that presupposition acquires a particular value when higher-order referents are concerned. The reason lies in the intrinsic nature of syntagmatic nominalization, *viz.* «the phenomenon according to which a propositional content that may be expressed through a sentence becomes a noun phrase, thus characterized by an argumental head». Syntagmatic nominalization allows the writer to «treat a propositional content as a definite description» (FERRARI, 2002, p. 180 and p. 187)²¹. When it comes to implicit meanings, the result of a nominalization is that a presupposition is triggered and, at the same time, an entire propositional content is selected as target of the presupposition. The pragmatic functions of this strategy are situated on a more complex conceptual level compared to noun phrases with a first-order referent, since the existence of a whole state of affairs, and not simply of a person or an object, is presupposed. This presupposition is two-faced, in some way: on the one hand, the syntactic features of the definite or demonstrative noun phrase trigger the presupposition of existence of a discourse referent; on the other hand, the semantic features of the referential expression at stake trigger the presupposition of truth of a proposition.

If we consider that presupposition, in the examples under consideration, brings about the reification of a state of affairs (*i.e.* the hypostasis of a propositional content), we may better understand the pragmatic correlates of evaluative AE. The definite (or demonstrative) noun phrase is subject to a mechanism of referential inertia (CAFFI, 2009, p. 101), allowing simultaneously the writer to build a discourse referent around a subjective evaluation and to

²⁰ We refer the reader to a paper by Conte (CONTE, Maria-Elisabeth. Coerenza, interpretazione, reinterpretazione. *Lingua e stile*, 21: 347-372, 1986 [reprinted in CONTE, Maria-Elisabeth. *Condizioni di coerenza. Ricerche di linguistica testuale*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1999, pp. 83-95]) for a thorough presentation of the notions of coherence *a parte obiecti* and *a parte subiecti*.

²¹ “Quel fenomeno [...] per cui un contenuto proposizionale esprimibile con una frase viene calato in un sintagma nominale, il quale viene così ad essere caratterizzato da una testa di tipo argomentale”; “Trattare un contenuto proposizionale come una descrizione definita”.

make it objective. The evaluation is presented as if it were a shared piece of information, taken for granted by the interlocutors. Thus, the evaluation is protected from discussion (or shielded from challenge, in Givón's terms²²), since it is not expressed through a regular utterance, with a topic-comment structure (e.g. *This is a disaster*). If the reader has the desire to call into question the evaluation given by the writer, (s)he is obliged, first of all, to make it explicit (e.g. *What you call a disaster...*) (SBISÀ, 2007, p. 90).

Moreover, evaluative encapsulation, thanks to hypotaxis, allows the writer to establish a discourse referent that may be referred back, from that moment on, through a coreferential anaphora. The construction of an anaphoric chain is another instrument in the writer's hands, useful for strengthening the persuasive effect of the evaluation. Every link in the chain, *viz.* every syntactically nominal anaphor, consolidates the reification of the state of affairs (*i.e.* the existence, in the world evoked by the text, of an actual discourse referent for the expression) and restates the argumentative orientation of the text.

The persuasive strategy acting in (3) and (4) is more frequent in textual genres where argumentation is a basic part of texture, such as opinion pieces and editorials (the genres to which [3] and [4] respectively belong). These articles have as main function the conveyance of the position of the writer (or of the newspaper itself) on one of the latest news; the use of axiologically marked linguistic strategies is thus very common.

Stereotypical uses of presupposition in anaphoric encapsulation

The interaction between evaluative AE and presupposition leads the reader to believe in the existence of a higher-order discourse referent, since, as we have seen, the unmarked choice of presupposition accommodation is preferred over the marked choice of refusal. This discourse referent is endowed with axiological features, that a cooperative (*i.e.* accommodative) reader has to accept. Nevertheless, the use of an axiologically marked encapsulator does not imply necessarily that persuasive effects are at stake. On the contrary, one of the most common cases of evaluative AE in journalistic language concerns events whose evaluation is perfectly plain and shared between writer and reader.

²² GIVÓN, Talmy. *Mind, code and context. Essays in pragmatics*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1989.

The best example of these “common-sense” evaluative AEs is given by those minor events that are usually told in the local news sections of newspapers (*e.g.* births, weddings, robberies, road accidents)²³, often referred back by overtly evaluative encapsulators. In these occurrences, evaluative AE has no argumentative function; on the contrary, it is limited to the reproduction of stereotypical narrative *clichés*²⁴ of news stories. Textual coherence is not threatened at all by this kind of anaphor. We propose two examples below, with an opposite evaluative direction:

(5) Fiocco azzurro nella casa del sindaco Pier Roberto Carabelli. La figlia Daniela, capogruppo di maggioranza, ha dato alla luce Giulio, un bimbo di 4,1 chilogrammi. *Il lieto evento* è avvenuto all’Ospedale di Voghera. (provinciapavese.gelocal.it, 31.07.2013)

‘Blue ribbon in the mayor Pier Roberto Carabelli’s house. His daughter Daniela, coordinator of the majority group, has given birth to Giulio, a boy weighing 4.1 kilos. *The happy event* happened at the Hospital of Voghera.’

(6) È scivolato per venti metri lungo la scarpata ed è rimasto attaccato ad un albero per circa tre ore di fronte ad un precipizio di circa ottanta metri. A. L. [...] è stato salvato dai vigili del fuoco. *Il drammatico incidente* è avvenuto, l’altra sera, in una scogliera impervia [...]. (provinciapavese.gelocal.it, 29.08.2013)

‘He slid twenty metres along the slope and remained attached to a tree for about three hours in front of an eighty metres precipice. A. L. [...] was saved by the fire brigade. *The dramatic accident* happened, yesterday night, by a high cliff [...].’

²³ The marginal nature of the events narrated by local news stories is highlighted by Zampese, in the framework of a study focused around the informational structure of this textual sub-genre. Cf. ZAMPESE, Luciano. La struttura informativa degli articoli di cronaca: natura e funzioni dell’Unità di Quadro. In: FERRARI, A. (Ed.). *Rilievi. Le gerarchie semantico-pragmatiche di alcuni tipi di testo*. Firenze: Cesati, 2005, pp. 173-216.

²⁴ We mean by *cliché* «a fixed expression that became banal due to its continuous repetition» («un’espressione fissa divenuta banale a forza di essere ripetuta»), interpretable from a linguistic viewpoint as the result of a lexicalization. Cf. FALOPPA, Federico. 2010. *Cliché*. In: SIMONE, R. (Ed.). *Enciclopedia dell’Italiano Treccani*. Roma: Istituto dell’Enciclopedia italiana Treccani, pp. 212-213, cit. p. 212).

In examples such as (5) and (6), the evaluation transmitted by the encapsulator through the modifiers *lieto* and *drammatico* is completely justified by the facts (CAFFI, 2009, p. 101) and reflects a viewpoint which may be largely shared by the potential readers of the text. The removal of the axiological modifiers would result in two coherent text fragments (at least, as coherent as the original ones), but less characterized on the emotional plan. On the other hand, the substitution of the modifier with another oppositely connoted adjective – e.g. *infausto* ('unfortunate') in (5) and *buffo* ('funny') in (6) – would result in an irremediable textual incoherence.

This property clearly highlights the difference between these examples and the two previously commented on (3) and (4). When a purpose of persuasion may be recognised, the substitution of the axiological element with an antonym does not result in an incoherence with the semantic contents of the antecedent; on the other hand, incoherence may hold between the anaphor and other terms conveying an interpretive expectation within the antecedent. When these triggers are not overtly evaluative (e.g. the conditional relation analyzed in [4]), the modification of the encapsulator assigns the text a different persuasive direction. An example is shown below with a reformulation of (4), requiring only the removal of the adversative connective *ma* at the beginning of the anaphoric utterance in order to keep the text coherent:

(4a) Uno Scudo da cinque punti di Pil. Si capisce l'esultanza di Giulio Tremonti, per il clamoroso successo della manovra di "rientro dei capitali dall'estero". Se è vero che frutterà tra gli 80 e i 100 miliardi di euro in soli tre mesi (contro i 78 miliardi accumulati nei tre anni 2001/2003) il ministro del Tesoro ha ragione a compiacersi. Da *questa esemplare operazione* si può trarre qualche utile lezione.

'A tax shelter for five points of Gross Domestic Product. Giulio Tremonti's rejoicing for the resounding success of the measures for "repatriation of capital funds from abroad" is understandable. If it is true that it will yield between 80 and 100 billion Euro in only three months (as opposed to the 78 billion gathered in the three years 2001/2003), the minister of Treasury has some reasons to be pleased. From *this exemplar operation* some useful lessons can be drawn.'

Non-presuppositional uses of higher-order noun phrases

At the end of our analysis, an important feature of noun phrases realizing AE must be underlined: the presupposition of existence triggered by a higher-order definite noun phrase does not apply without exceptions. As a matter of fact, the co-text of event-denoting definite noun phrases has a crucial role in confirming or invalidating the presupposition. This is due to the peculiar status of second-order entities: they are bound to a judgment of reality which is strictly dependent on the temporal dimension (KORZEN, 2000, pp. 204-207)²⁵. To begin with, we may observe this behaviour in an example, quite trivial in itself, not involving anaphora:

(7) Per il neodeputato di Padova Giorgio Vido: «Sia nel caso dell'*ingresso al governo* sia nel caso dell'*appoggio esterno* la Lega garantirà la governabilità». (*La Repubblica*, 01.05.1994)

'According to the new deputy from Padua Giorgio Vido: «Both in the case of *the entrance at the government* and in the case of *the external support*, Lega will guarantee governability.»'

In (7), the two higher-order definite noun phrases in italics denote events that may take place in the future and whose existence, at the moment of the enunciation, is only hypothetical. These noun phrases do not presuppose the *existence* of the discourse referent they refer to; they only meet the parameter of *identifiability*. In other words, the designated event is indicated by the definite article as identifiable by the reader, due to the connection with an argument that is not necessarily explicit within the noun phrase (in [7], this argument, *la Lega*, has to be indeed retrieved co-textually). The identifiability of the discourse referent is not necessarily linked to the existence of the latter in the universe of discourse, but may limit its scope to a referentially opaque domain, as we will explain immediately below.

These features have an impact even on the encapsulative occurrences of higher-order noun phrases. We may find, for example, encapsulators referring

²⁵ I would like to thank the author for giving me an English translation of these pages, on which the considerations of this section are based.

back to a non-factual propositional content, thus building an anaphoric chain with anomalous semantic features:

(8) A Cattolica Eraclea non sarà demolito il campanile della chiesa Madre, così come ha ordinato il Comune di Cattolica Eraclea per evitare il crollo in caso di eventi sismici. Il Tar Sicilia, infatti, ha accolto il ricorso della Curia arcivescovile di Agrigento, e ha sospeso l'esecuzione dell'ordinanza di demolizione notificata dal Sindaco lo scorso di novembre [*sic*]. Secondo la Curia, dai rilievi tecnici emergono esiti che non sarebbero così preoccupanti da giustificare *la demolizione del campanile*. (trs98.it, 08.04.2013)

'In Cattolica Eraclea the bell tower of the Mother Church will not be demolished, as the Municipality of Cattolica Eraclea commanded in order to avoid its collapse in case of seismic events. The regional administrative court of Sicily accepted the complaint of the diocesan administration of Agrigento and interrupted the execution of the order of demolition notified last November by the mayor. According to the diocesan administration, the technical remarks gave results that are not so alarming as to justify *the demolition of the bell tower*.'

The behaviour of the anaphor in (8) seems very close to what is required by the definition, due to the Finnish scholar Lauri Karttunen²⁶, of short term referents. According to Karttunen's terminology, a discourse referent as *la demolizione del campanile* cannot be seen as properly *established*, because the co-text does not license its existence in the universe of discourse. On the other hand, we may define that discourse referent as "set up" (KARTTUNEN, 1969, p. 18) within an opaque and limited domain of reference. The opaque domain is created by a modal operator (*e.g.* negation, counterfactual verb). Within this domain, the speaker may go on talking about the discourse referent even if, in the global domain of the text, this does not benefit from a factual existential status.

What makes an example like (8) peculiar is that the short term referent is not set up *ex abrupto*, but thanks to the encapsulation of a co-textual portion

²⁶ KARTTUNEN, Lauri. Discourse referents. Preprint n. 70. Sänga-Säby/Stockholm: International Conference on Computational Linguistics (Coling), 1969, pp. 1-38.

on the left (*i.e.* the clause at the beginning of the example *A Cattolica Eraclea non sarà demolito il campanile della chiesa Madre*). The operator that creates the opaque domain of reference is the negative adverb *non* within the complex antecedent, that describes a non-factual event. The encapsulator sets up the short term referent by referring back to the portion of meaning in the scope of the adverb.

The existence of this kind of anaphora is an additional proof of the conceptual character of the universe of discourse. The textual brackets created by the modal operator allow the speaker to establish a sort of “world apart”. Inside this world, the author may establish anaphoric relations that would not be allowed out of the brackets (cf. DIK, 1997b, pp. 418-419).

Conclusions and future work

In this paper, we addressed the issue of presuppositional aspects of AE, seen as a class of implicit meanings activated by the use of an encapsulator. Presuppositions act as preconditions that the reader must take for granted in order to guarantee the appropriateness of the text. In the specific case of AE, the morphosyntactic form of the anaphor (*i.e.* demonstrative or definite noun phrase) triggers a presupposition of existence of the discourse referent referred to by that expression.

We first focused on evaluative encapsulators, highlighting that evaluation often has a persuasive effect on the reader. The presuppositional aspects of anaphora allow the writer to express a personal judgment in a surreptitious way, without explicitly stating it, and thus leading the reader on an argumentative path. The cooperative reader must be ready to accept the judgment that is inherent to the encapsulator, otherwise the whole text would be rejected as biased. The refusal of the writer’s evaluation is particularly hard to accomplish, in any case, since a judgment needs to be made explicit before being criticized.

On the other hand, we pointed out that some evaluative AEs have nothing to do with persuasion: minor events of news stories, such as births and accidents, are positively or negatively evaluated in a more objective and unquestionable way and the writer need not convince the reader about the validity of his/her judgment.

Finally, we have shown that the existence of higher-order entities, *i.e.* the kind of entities encapsulators intrinsically refer to, is not presupposed without exceptions by event-denoting definite noun phrases. Some of them only have a hypothetical or non-factual nature, due to the properties of the co-text of the referring expression. In this respect, AE may introduce an anomalous “short term” discourse referent, non-existent in the universe of discourse, yet identifiable by the reader in an opaque domain of reference.

A foreseeable development of the line of research followed by this paper would be the consideration of AE through the lens of implicature. A study of the implicative aspects of AE would lead us to examine the properly cohesive aspects of the strategy, connected to the establishment of a link between the encapsulator and the complex antecedent. When it comes to implicature, the research focus shifts from persuasive aspects of the strategy to informational density. We may acknowledge this aspect, for the moment, in (2) above, where the anaphor categorizes the complex antecedent in a compact way, without devoting an explicit utterance to this task of categorization (*i.e.* *What happened is a discovery*). Once again, journalistic language would offer us a privileged source of data, since informational density is one of its main textual features (cf. BORREGUERO, 2006, pp. 74-75).

References

- APOTHÉLOZ, Denis. Nominalisations, référents clandestins et anaphores atypiques. *Travaux Neuchâtelois de Linguistique (TRANEL)*, 23: 143-173, 1995.
- BORREGUERO ZULOAGA, Margarita. Naturaleza y función de los encapsuladores en los textos informativamente densos (la noticia periodística). *Cuadernos de Filología Italiana*, 13: 73-95, 2006.
- CAFFI, Claudia. *Pragmatica. Sei lezioni*. Roma: Carocci, 2009.
- CONTE, Maria-Elisabeth. Anaphoric encapsulation. In: DE MULDER, W.; TASMOWSKI, L. (Eds.). *Coherence and Anaphora (Belgian Journal of Linguistics)*, 10, 1996, pp. 1-10 [reprinted in CONTE, M.-E. *Condizioni di coerenza. Ricerche di linguistica testuale*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1999, pp. 107-114].
- _____. Coerenza, interpretazione, reinterpretazione. *Lingua e stile*, 21: 347-372, 1986 [reprinted in CONTE, M.-E. *Condizioni di coerenza. Ricerche di linguistica testuale*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1999, pp. 83-95].

CONTE, Maria-Elisabeth. Il ruolo dei termini astratti nei testi. In: BERNINI, G.; CUZZOLIN, P.; MOLINELLI, P. (Eds.). *Ars Linguistica. Studi per Paolo Ramat*. Roma: Bulzoni, 1998, pp. 151-160 [reprinted in CONTE, M.-E. *Vettori del testo. Pragmatica e semantica fra storia e innovazione*. Roma: Carocci, 2010, pp. 279-288].

D'ADDIO COLOSIMO, Wanda. Nominali anaforici incapsulatori: un aspetto della coesione lessicale. In: DE MAURO, T.; GENSINI, S.; PIEMONTESE, M. E. (Eds.). *Dalla parte del ricevente. Percezione, comprensione, interpretazione. Atti del XIX congresso internazionale di studi della SLI - Società di Linguistica Italiana (Roma, 1985)*. Roma: Bulzoni, 1988, pp. 143-151.

DIK, Simon C. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997a.

_____. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part II: Complex and Derived Structures*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997b.

FALOPPA, Federico. 2010. Cliché. In: SIMONE, R. (Ed.). *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano Treccani*. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia italiana Treccani, pp. 212-213.

FERRARI, Angela. Aspetti semantici e informativi della nominalizzazione sintagmatica. In: BECCARIA, G. L.; MARELLO, C. (Eds.). *La parola al testo. Scritti per Bice Mortara Garavelli*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2002, pp. 179-204.

_____. *Linguistica del testo. Principi, fenomeni, strutture*. Roma: Carocci, 2014.

_____. CIGNETTI, Luca; DE CESARE, Anna-Maria; LALA, Letizia; MANDELLI, Magda; RICCI, Claudia; ROGGIA, Carlo Enrico. *L'interfaccia lingua-testo. Natura e funzioni dell'articolazione informativa dell'enunciato*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2008.

GIVÓN, Talmy. *Mind, code and context. Essays in pragmatics*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1989.

KARTTUNEN, Lauri. Discourse referents. In: *Proceedings of the 1969 International Conference on Computational Linguistics (Coling)*. Sångä-Säby/Stockholm, 1969, Preprint n. 70, pp. 1-38.

KORZEN, Iørn. Reference og andre sproglige relationer. In: SKYTTE, G.; _____. *Italiensk-dansk sprogbrug i komparativt perspektiv. Reference, konnexion og diskursmarkering*. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur, 2000, pp. 161-619.

- LALA, Letizia. Incapsulatori. In: SIMONE, R. (Ed.). *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano Treccani*. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia italiana Treccani, 2010, pp. 641-643.
- LAMBRECHT, Knud. *Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- LEVINSON, Stephen C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- LYONS, John. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- PECORARI, Filippo. Ai confini dell'incapsulazione anaforica: strategie incapsulative non prototipiche. In: PÎRVU, E. (Ed.). *Discorso e cultura nella lingua e nella letteratura italiana. Atti del V Convegno Internazionale di italinistica dell'Università di Craiova, 20-21 settembre 2013*, Firenze: Cesati, 2014, pp. 257-270.
- RUSSELL, Bertrand. On denoting. *Mind*, 14: 479-493, 1909.
- SBISÀ, Marina. *Detto non detto. Le forme della comunicazione implicita*. Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2007.
- _____. Pragmatica. In: SIMONE, R. (Ed.). *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano Treccani*. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia italiana Treccani, 2010, pp. 1127-1134.
- STRAWSON, Peter Frederick. On referring. *Mind*, 59: 320-344, 1950.
- ZAMPESE, Luciano. La struttura informativa degli articoli di cronaca: natura e funzioni dell'Unità di Quadro. In: FERRARI, A. (Ed.). *Rilievi. Le gerarchie semantico-pragmatiche di alcuni tipi di testo*. Firenze: Cesati, 2005, pp. 173-216.

ENCAPSULAMENTO ANAFÓRICO E PRESSUPOSIÇÃO: USOS PERSUASIVOS E ESTEREOTIPADOS DE UMA ESTRATÉGIA DE COESÃO

RESUMO

Este artigo analisa os valores pressuposicionais do encapsulamento anafórico. A pressuposição é uma característica básica dos usos argumentativos e persuasivos desta estratégia de coesão, mas também pode se aplicar a instâncias estereotipadas, onde a avaliação não coincide com a persuasão. Finalmente, analisamos exemplos onde sintagmas nominais definidos de ordem superior não pressupõem a existência de um referente do discurso.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: anáfora; pressuposição; entidades de ordem superior.

Recebido em 21/03/14

Aprovado em 30/05/14