

**WHERE TEXTUAL COHESION  
MEETS THE LOGICAL DIMENSION:  
RELATIONAL ANAPHORIC ENCAPSULATION\***

FILIPPO PECORARI  
(Universität Basel)

*ABSTRACT: This paper focuses on the phenomenon of relational anaphoric encapsulation, analysed as a meeting point between the two main organizational dimensions of texts, i.e. the referential and the logical dimension. We propose a new and comprehensive definition of the strategy under consideration, based on the functional properties of the construction in which the anaphor is inserted. We analyse some examples of journalistic language, taken from a corpus of Italian news, in order to point out the main semantic and pragmatic properties of relational anaphoric encapsulation, differentiating it from other grammatical forms of interclausal linkage, such as the use of simple connectives. Finally, the examples are classified according to the syntactic features of the elements licensing the logical relation and to the presence/absence of hypostasis (the definitional property of anaphoric encapsulation, in our approach).*

**1. The organizational dimensions of (written) text**

The aim of this paper is to explore the relationship between textual cohesion and the logical dimension of texts through the viewpoint of a specific cohesive strategy, i.e. anaphoric encapsulation (henceforth AE). The first two sections are devoted, respectively, to an introduction of the model of textual structure we adopt and to an overall presentation of AE. In the following, relational AE will be pinpointed as a peculiar instance, closely related to the logical dimension, of the phenomenon under consideration. We will discuss some examples and finally get to a new definition of relational AE, based on functional criteria rather than morphosyntactic ones, and to a classification of the data. The examples commented on in the paper are taken from a cor-

---

\* My gratitude goes to Michele Prandi and Iørn Korzen for their comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank the organisers and the audience of the 3<sup>rd</sup> International Conference on Grammar & Text (GRATO), where this research was first presented in December 2013, for their valuable feedback.

pus of Italian news, retrieved from the web archive of the newspaper *La Repubblica* (including both the articles published in the printed newspaper and those published only on the website)<sup>1</sup>.

The representation of textual structure upon which this work rests is the so-called Basel model (It. *Modello Basilese*), proposed in several works by the Basel research group headed by Angela Ferrari (cfr. Ferrari *et al.*, 2008, Ferrari, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2014). The model is specifically designed to account for written instances of text and is focused on Italian language, more particularly on functional (i.e. non-literary) uses of language. According to this model, the semantic content of the text is articulated in several dimensions of organization, which participate jointly in the construction of the textual plot. In particular, two of them might be seen as the more significant ones: the referential dimension and the logical dimension.

In the up-to-date version of the model, the referential dimension is defined as the plan that «rende conto dei collegamenti interni al discorso che riguardano i “referenti testuali”, vale a dire quegli oggetti concettuali specifici che vengono evocati dal testo e che, una volta evocati, possono essere caratterizzati tramite una proprietà o inseriti in particolari eventi<sup>2</sup>» (Ferrari, 2014: 175), whereas the logical dimension concerns «la logica in base alla quale si concatenano gli atti linguistici e le proposizioni che costituiscono via via il testo<sup>3</sup>» (*ivi*: 103). In other words, the referential dimension is the aspect of the organization of the text that accounts for how the text evokes the extralinguistic world it refers to, and, specifically, how discourse referents may be established and how cohesive links between them (i.e. anaphoric links) may be set up. As for the logical dimension, it regards the succession, intertwining and overlapping of logico-semantic, or simply logical, relations (e.g. consecution, concession, reformulation) between the units of the text (cfr. also Ferrari *et al.*, 2008: 37). It is necessary to underline that logical relations may articulate different kinds of units within the text, ranging from entire paragraphs to simple event-denoting referents. As will be shown in the following, we will mainly consider logical relations between utterances, considered as units whose boundaries are usually signalled, in the written form, by strong punctuation marks (Ferrari *et al.*, 2008: 33-34).

The example (1) allows us to see how the two dimensions may interact with each other<sup>4</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> The web archive of *La Repubblica* can be reached from the address [ricerca.repubblica.it](http://ricerca.repubblica.it).

<sup>2</sup> «accounts for the connections inside the discourse concerning “discourse referents”, viz. the specific conceptual objects that are evoked by the text and, once evoked, can be characterized through a property or inserted into particular events.» (my translation)

<sup>3</sup> «the logic according to which speech acts and propositions making up the text are connected.» (my translation)

<sup>4</sup> In all the following examples, anaphors are marked in bold, while antecedents, either sentential or nominal, are underlined. The English translations of the Italian examples are idio-

- (1) Tre giovani sono morti ieri notte all'incrocio tra corso Indipendenza e via Bronzetti dopo che l'auto sulla quale  $\emptyset$  stavano viaggiando, una "Range Rover", è stata centrata in pieno da una Fiat "Brava" con a bordo altri due ragazzi. -OPPOSITION-<sup>5</sup> Questi ultimi, invece, sono rimasti miracolosamente pressoché illesi. (*Corriere della Sera*, 06.04.1997, ex. taken from Zampese, 2005: 176)

*Three youngsters died yesterday night at the crossroads between corso Indipendenza and via Bronzetti after the car on which they [lit.  $\emptyset$ ] were traveling, a "Range Rover", was hit by a Fiat "Brava" with other two boys on board. -OPPOSITION- The latter, instead, were miraculously nearly unharmed.*

The global coherence of this textual fragment hinges on the interaction of aspects belonging both to the referential and to the logical dimension. In particular, as far as the referential dimension is concerned, we can observe two anaphoric relations: the former links a zero anaphor, with the function of subject of a relative clause, with the NP *tre giovani* inside the first utterance, having the function of subject of the main clause; the latter links the subject of the second utterance *questi ultimi* to a NP which establishes a discourse referent at the end of the previous utterance, i.e. *altri due ragazzi*. These relations concern aspects of textual cohesion, and more precisely the continuity of the entities making up the world evoked by the text.

On the other hand, if we move to the logical dimension, we may point out a different kind of progression, instantiated by a relation of opposition. The first utterance tells a part of the story (i.e. three youngsters died) and the second utterance tells the second part (i.e. other two boys were nearly unharmed). The opposition between these two semantic contents is also signalled by the connective of opposition *invece* (Engl. *instead*), which is, however, not necessary in order to establish the relation on a conceptual plan.

This example illustrates how the two dimensions are not mutually exclusive in the textual architecture. The referential plan and the logical plan support textual coherence from different perspectives, which may be central or marginal according to the text type (e.g. in argumentative texts the logical dimension is crucial, whereas in narrative texts the continuity of discourse referents is more important: cfr. Ferrari, 2010). From this perspective, as I will show in greater detail below (§ 3), AE is a particularly significant phenomenon, because it shares properties that prove to be relevant from both perspectives. On the one hand, it is a kind of anaphora, thus it works on the referential plan as a means of textual cohesion; on the other hand, it takes part in the establishment of a logical relation between two textual units, thus it acts on the logical plan.

---

matic; however, some points will receive a literal translation in square brackets when necessary for the sake of clarity.

<sup>5</sup> The presence of a logical relation within the examples is signalled, when relevant, by this notation, borrowed from the Basel model (cfr. Ferrari *et al.*, 2008: 11).

## 2. Anaphoric encapsulation

In this section, we will outline the main features of AE as a whole, without distinguishing between relational AE and other instances of the phenomenon. The label *incapsulazione anaforica* is widely used in the Italian literature, whereas in other scholarly traditions the same phenomenon is indicated by different labels (e.g. Engl. *complex anaphora* in Consten, Knees & Schwarz-Friesel, 2007; Sp. *anáfora conceptual* in González, 2008; Fr. *anaphore résomptive* in Lundquist, 2009). The first work to introduce the label *incapsulazione anaforica* in the Italian literature is (D'Addio, 1988)<sup>6</sup>, that does not provide, though, a consistent definition of the phenomenon. On the other hand, we may find a good definition in (Conte, 1996), where it is made clear that AE acts mainly on the referential dimension.

This term 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]: 107)

A very clear example of AE is the following:

- (2) 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 [...]*<sup>7</sup>.

The NP *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<sup>8</sup>. This property is identified by Conte (1996) under the label of *hypostasis*. Hypostasis corresponds to referentialization, since «what is already present in the discourse model is objectified, or, in other words, becomes a referent» (Conte, 1999 [1996]: 111). In the terms of (Ferrari, 2002: 180), the anaphor is the result of a syn-

<sup>6</sup> As Conte (1996) points out, the first appearance of the term *encapsulation* in the sense concerned here is due to an English-language paper by Sinclair (1981).

<sup>7</sup> 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-*.

<sup>8</sup> 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) (cfr. Lambrecht, 1994: 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, 1996).

tagmatic nominalisation, because a propositional content that may be expressed through a sentence is moulded by an event-denoting NP.

Both D'Addio (1988) and Conte (1996) stress the lexical nature of the phenomenon; AE may be realised, according to these scholars, only by lexical NPs. As a matter of fact, we will adopt a broader definition of AE that includes also pronouns, because hypostasis is assumed here as the definitional criterion of the phenomenon<sup>9</sup>. If we take a closer look to the definition of hypostasis, we have to admit that pronouns may objectify textual contents as much as lexical NPs do. We can briefly illustrate this point with the example given below:

(3) Young drivers usually drive too fast. **This / this fact / this image / this impertinence...** (ex. taken from Consten, Knees & Schwarz-Friesel, 2007: 82)

The demonstrative pronoun *this* occupies the first position on a scale of syntactically nominal expressions. The scale represents a *continuum*, from the viewpoint of semantic intension, going from the lack of lexical features of the pronoun *this* to the rich set of features of the NP *this impertinence*, with a general noun<sup>10</sup> in the middle (*this fact*). Each one of the four anaphors brings about the introduction of a new discourse referent in the universe of discourse, about which something can be predicated from that moment on; hence, according to the approach sketched above, they can be likewise considered as anaphoric encapsulators.

### 3. Relational anaphoric encapsulation: prototypical occurrences

The notion of *relational anaphoric encapsulation* was proposed by (Prandi, 2004, 2006) in the framework of a global treatment of interclausal linkage. According to Prandi, relational encapsulators are characterized by a peculiar lexical content. They qualify a complex antecedent not simply as the member of a class of events, but as the term of a logical relation involving what follows as the second term. In this formulation, relational AE is bound to the presence of a categorising noun; in other words, it is a lexically-based anaphora, as Conte's (1996) definition would prescribe.

We will start the analysis of corpus data with the example (4) below, where the encapsulator is indeed a lexical NP and may be considered as a prototypical instance of AE (§4 will be devoted to non-prototypical instan-

<sup>9</sup> The definitional aspects of anaphoric encapsulation are examined in more depth in (Pecorari, 2014.).

<sup>10</sup> The concept of *general nouns*, conceived of as nouns with a very broad semantic extension, dates back to (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). As far as Italian is concerned, we refer the reader to the synthesis offered by (Faloppa, 2010).

ces)<sup>11</sup>. In the following, we will especially focus on examples involving relations of consecution (It. *consecuzione*), according to Ferrari's (2014) terminology, because they are frequently expressed through anaphoric strategies, acting outside the borders of the sentence.

- (4) Il partito ha attraversato enormi difficoltà, ma adesso, per Epifani bisogna cominciare un percorso di ricostruzione. -CONSECUTION- Per **questo motivo** il Congresso non può essere rinviato [...]. (repubblica.it, 04.06.2013)

*The party experienced enormous difficulties, but now, according to Epifani, a path of reconstruction has to start.* -CONSECUTION- For **this reason** the Congress cannot be postponed [...].

In (4) the NP headed by the categorising noun *motivo* is combined with the simple preposition *per* in order to build an adverb-like expression (*per questo motivo*). This expression refers back anaphorically to a clause which is part of the previous utterance, categorising it as a motivation and establishing a logical relation of consecution (cfr. Ferrari, 2014: 143). From a semantic viewpoint, *per questo motivo* is almost equivalent to the connective *quindi* (Engl. *therefore*).

From the viewpoint of logical dimension, the relational encapsulator behaves as one of the possible actualizations of the underlying logical relation. We agree with Prandi (2004: 246) in saying that «interclausal linkage can use a wide range of grammatical and textual devices», placed along a *continuum* going from a complex sentence to a juxtaposition, or, in other words, from grammar to text. The interclausal linkage at stake in (4) may find other linguistic realizations, as we can see from its reformulations proposed below:

- (4a) Il partito ha attraversato enormi difficoltà, ma adesso per Epifani bisogna cominciare un percorso di ricostruzione, -CONSECUTION- **quindi** il Congresso non può essere rinviato.

*The party experienced enormous difficulties, but now, according to Epifani, a path of reconstruction has to start, -CONSECUTION- therefore the Congress cannot be postponed.*

- (4b) Il partito ha attraversato enormi difficoltà, ma adesso per Epifani il Congresso non può essere rinviato, -MOTIVATION- **perché** bisogna cominciare un percorso di ricostruzione.

*The party experienced enormous difficulties, but now, according to Epifani, the Congress cannot be postponed, -MOTIVATION- because a path of reconstruction has to start.*

<sup>11</sup> The notion of prototype used in this paper is only loosely connected with the cognitive notions of prototype semantics. We intend "prototypical" instances of relational AE as "best members" of the phenomenon, due to the specific lexical properties of the anaphor.

- (4c) Il partito ha attraversato enormi difficoltà, ma adesso, per Epifani bisogna cominciare un percorso di ricostruzione: -CONSECUTION- il Congresso non può essere rinviato.

*The party experienced enormous difficulties, but now, according to Epifani, a path of reconstruction has to start: -CONSECUTION- the Congress cannot be postponed.*

- (4d) Il partito ha attraversato enormi difficoltà, ma adesso, per Epifani bisogna cominciare un percorso di ricostruzione. -CONSECUTION- Il Congresso non può essere rinviato.

*The party experienced enormous difficulties, but now, according to Epifani, a path of reconstruction has to start. -CONSECUTION- The Congress cannot be postponed.*

From a merely conceptual viewpoint, these reformulations add nothing to the logical dimension of the text. The same pre-linguistic conceptual relation<sup>12</sup> may be realised inside the borders of the sentence (4a-4b) or as a juxtaposition without any linguistic marker of the relation (4c-4d). In the former examples, the connectives *quindi* (Engl. *therefore*) and *perché* (Engl. *because*) code the relation from cause to effect and from effect to cause, respectively; in the latter examples, the relation has to be inferred by the reader. More specifically, (4c) requires a partial inference, since the colon establishes an interpretive relationship between the two sides of the co-text and the reader has just to infer what kind of relationship is at stake (cfr. Lala, 2004); on the other hand, (4d) requires a total inference, since the full stop is silent about the existence of a relationship whatsoever between the two utterances.

We also have to consider that prototypical relational encapsulators, such as *questo motivo*, are very unlikely realized outside the borders of a specific adverb-like expression. A test accomplished on 200 occurrences of *questo motivo* in the web archive of *La Repubblica*<sup>13</sup> has shown that every single one of them is preceded by the preposition *per*. As a matter of fact, the behaviour of the NP *questo motivo*, when compared with other anaphoric encapsulators not connect-

<sup>12</sup> In this part of the argument, we move away from Ferrari's (2014) classification of logical relations, that relies on the semantic features of the connective in order to distinguish relations of motivation and relations of consecution. According to this criterion, the example (4b) would express a relation of motivation, going from effect to cause, as indicated in the body of the example. On the contrary, we share Prandi's (2004: 293) viewpoint, according to which «in the field of interclausal linkage the function – the imposition of a conceptual link on two or more independent processes – is prior and constant, whereas the structures are secondary and variable»; in particular, relations of motivation and consecution may be traced back to an underlying relation of causality, interpreted by those "surface" relations along two different directions. As Ferrari (2014: 134-135) points out, it is necessary to specify whether we assume a conceptual or a textual viewpoint in the analysis of logical relations: we are reasoning here on a conceptual plan, whereas the rest of the paper is focused on textual properties of the constructions.

<sup>13</sup> The test was accomplished on Nov. 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013 and comprised all the occurrences of the NP published between Oct. 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013 and the date of the test on the newspaper (in both the printed and the online version).

ed with the relational domain (e.g. *questo fatto* ‘this fact’, *questo problema* ‘this problem’), reveals clear grammatical features, since its use is bound to the connection with *per* and to the expression of a logical relation of consecution. In this regard, the adverbial containing the encapsulator proves very similar to simple adverbs with the function of connective, such as *quindi*<sup>14</sup>.

However, if we look at relational encapsulators from a textual-pragmatic viewpoint, and not merely from a semantic viewpoint, we can realise that the operation accomplished by the anaphor in the textual dynamics is particularly powerful and much richer than the operation of simple connectives. First of all, it is not trivial to remember that *questo motivo* is an encapsulator, therefore it realizes hypostasis, such as every encapsulator does. Through hypostasis, the event denoting antecedent may be represented in a holistic fashion, as a reified object. In other words, as (Ferrari, 2002: 183) points out, the use of an anaphoric event-denoting noun allows us to deal with the antecedent «non come una proposizione, associabile ad un valore di verità, ma come un concetto individuale<sup>15</sup>».

What is even more important is that this objectified representation is accomplished through the use of a relational noun; thus, the antecedent receives a referential status which is directly relevant to the logical dimension. The writer categorises the antecedent as a motivation and, at the same time, establishes a relation of consecution that brings about a logical progression in the text.

At this stage, the analysis enables us to see in which respects relational AE is different from the use of grammatical connectives. First of all, two different forms of expression are at stake. On the one hand, connectives may act on a grammatical ground, within the formal borders of the sentence; on the other hand, relational encapsulators act on a textual ground, since they are (usually) specified outside the sentence of their antecedent and they have to be linked to it by means of an implicature, guided by a general criterion of textual coherence<sup>16</sup>. In Prandi’s (2004) terms, connectives act more on the ground of coding, whereas AE acts more on the ground of inferencing.

In the second place, if we look at relational AE from a hierarchical-informational viewpoint, we notice that the anaphor is often inserted in a so-called Frame Unit (It. *Unità di Quadro*), according to the Basel model. The Frame Unit is defined by Ferrari *et al.* (2008) in these terms:

---

<sup>14</sup> The functional similarity between adverbial constructions containing relational encapsulators and proper connectives is captured by Prandi (2004: 302) through the extension of the concept of anaphora to both forms. In his terms, relational AE realises a strict anaphora, given the presence of a proper substitute for the complex antecedent, whereas adverbs like *quindi* and *dunque* realise a weak anaphora.

<sup>15</sup> «not as if it were a proposition, associable to a truth value, but as if it were an individual concept.» (my translation)

<sup>16</sup> According to (Sbisà, 2007), the resolution of AE depends on a conversational implicature, relying on the Gricean Maxim of Relation.



Quando l'Enunciato è informativamente complesso, il Quadro coincide con l'Unità Informativa che apre l'Enunciato. La sua funzione consiste nel definire *ab initio* il dominio semantico-pragmatico che assicura, esplicita e collabora a definire la pertinenza del Nucleo in diverse prospettive<sup>17</sup>. (Ferrari *et al.*, 2008: 46)

The example (4e) below restructures the second utterance of the original example (4) according to the conventional representation of informational units proposed by the Basel model<sup>18</sup>:

(4e) Il partito ha attraversato enormi difficoltà, ma adesso, per Epifani bisogna cominciare un percorso di ricostruzione. // / Per questo motivo /<sup>Frame</sup> [It. <sup>Quadro</sup>] il Congresso non può essere rinviato [...] /<sup>Nucleus</sup> [It. *Nucleo*]. //

The Frame Unit is an optional informational unit placed at the beginning of the utterance and is often, but not always, isolated by a comma. One of the main textual functions of the Frame Unit is to guarantee the referential continuity of the text, through the use of anaphora; when the Frame Unit is filled by an adverb-like expression containing a relational encapsulator, as in (4), referential continuity is thus associated and strictly intertwined with logical coherence. The Frame Unit gives more prominence to the logical relation itself, objectified by the anaphor, and clarifies the semantic connection holding between the informational core of the utterance and the co-text on the left.

#### 4. Other forms of relational anaphoric encapsulation: towards a comprehensive definition

In this section, we will analyse forms of relational AE that may be classified as non prototypical, since the anaphor does not categorise explicitly the antecedent as the term of a logical relation. As we have shown above, the definition of AE assumed here is broader than the traditional ones and includes also pronouns. Indeed, one of the most frequent instances of the relation of consecution in Italian written texts is the one realised by the PP *per questo*<sup>19</sup>. A real example is reported in (5):

<sup>17</sup> «When the Utterance is informationally complex, the Frame coincides with the Informational Unit that opens the Utterance. Its function consists in defining *ab initio* the semantico-pragmatic domain that ensures, makes explicit and contributes to define the relevance of the Nucleus in several perspectives.» (my translation)

<sup>18</sup> Due to space limitations, we cannot introduce in detail the vast array of notions and conventional representations foreseen by the Basel model. However, for the sake of clarity, note that the symbol of double slash (//) delimits utterances, while the symbol of slash (/) delimits informational units inside the utterances; note also that the Nucleus Unit is the main informational unit of an utterance, necessary and sufficient to create it. Cfr. Ferrari *et al.* (2008: 71-175) for a global presentation of the Basel model and its conventions.

<sup>19</sup> Ferrari (2014: 130-131) underlines that the PP *per questo* may function as a connective only when it opens an utterance (namely, when placed in a Frame Unit, according to the Basel model). In other cases, *per questo* keeps its denotational value and may be accompa-

- (5) Le difficoltà di Bersani con i voti al Senato e l'ipoteca di Berlusconi sul Quirinale rendono oggi la strada del premier incaricato complicatissima. -  
-CONSECUTION- Per **questo** ieri appariva molto più vicino il ritorno alle urne. (*La Repubblica*, 26.03.2013)

*Today Bersani's difficulties with the votes of the Senate and Berlusconi's mortgage on the presidency of the Republic make very complicated the way of the appointed premier.* -CONSECUTION- For **this reason** [lit. For **this**] yesterday a return to elections appeared much closer.

Prandi (2006) does not consider examples such as (5) as instances of relational AE, because in his terms encapsulation is necessarily bound to categorisation, i.e. to the presence of a relational noun as head of the anaphor. However, if we assume a general definition of AE based on the referential aspects of the phenomenon, pronouns have to be included (see § 2) and an example like (5), as a consequence, may be considered as an occurrence of AE. But is it also a *relational* AE?

The crucial point is, once again, hypostasis. The pronoun establishes, as much as the lexical NP, a new discourse referent through a resumptive strategy, therefore it is an encapsulator. Once we decide to downgrade the function of lexical categorisation to the level of prototypical (but not definitional) property, relational AE need not be restricted to instances with a relational (hence lexical) head. In other words, this line of reasoning leads us to adopt a functional definition of relational AE, regardless of the intrinsic morpho-syntactic form of the anaphor. An encapsulator, either lexical or pronominal, may be defined relational whenever a) it accomplishes hypostasis, and b) connects two textual units giving relevance to the logical dimension.

Going back to the example (5), the entity referred to by the anaphor *questo* gets a major relevance on the logical dimension due to its combination with the simple preposition *per*. The establishment of a relation of consecution is basically licensed by *per*, whose coded meaning is however unspecialised<sup>20</sup>, and by the implicature the reader needs to perform in order to find an antecedent for the encapsulator. The reader is required to perform a greater load of inferential enrichment compared to the example (4), due to the absence of a relational noun explicitly coding the logical relation at stake; however, this does not prevent us from including this instance into the boundaries of relational AEs, given the definition proposed above.

Other relational encapsulators are somewhat halfway between prototypical lexical instances and pronominal ones. An example is offered in (6),

---

nied by another connective of consecution, such as *quindi* (see also Ferrari *et al.* 2008: 56). Despite these behavioural differences, in the approach outlined in this paper we are allowed to classify *per questo* among relational AEs independently of its position in the sentence, given its undeniable anaphoric features and the presence of a logical relation of consecution between two textual units.

<sup>20</sup> In Prandi's (2004) terms, we could say that such a preposition is an example of undercoding, since it is not restricted to the expression of a single logical relation.

where a pronominal encapsulator (*ciò*) is the complement of a prepositional locution (*a causa di*), built around a relational noun:

- (6) Alcuni mesi fa, giocando a polo, il principe si ruppe il braccio destro. -  
-CONSECUTION- A causa di **ciò** l'erede al trono ha subito due operazioni  
[...]. (*La Repubblica*, 07.10.1990)

Some months ago, while playing polo, the prince broke his right arm. -  
-CONSECUTION- Because [lit. By reason] of **this** the crown prince under-  
went two operations [...].

*A causa di ciò* as a whole is an adverb-like expression, similar to *per questo motivo*. The relational noun *causa* reduces the load of inferences necessary in order to interpret the logical relation of consecution. We have to consider, though, that the lexical qualification of the logical relation (i.e. the relational noun *causa*) is specified outside the encapsulator, which in itself lacks lexical content. Therefore, the anaphor *per se* does not qualify the antecedent process as the term of a relation. The discourse referent established through hypostasis is a simple undifferentiated resumptive brick, so to speak, useful for the further construction of the text.

Something similar happens in (7) below:

- (7) [...] durante il 'duello' per l'assegnazione di vice-capo, un ragazzino di 14 anni è rimasto seriamente ferito, con milza e pancreas spappolati. -CONSECUTION- **Questo episodio** ha portato i carabinieri a indagare sul gruppo [...]. (*repubblica.it*, 11.03.2011)

[...] during the 'duel' for the appointment of vice, a 14-year-old little boy was seriously injured and had his spleen and pancreas crushed. -CONSECUTION-  
- **This episode** led the Carabinieri to investigate the gang [...].

Here the anaphor *questo episodio* is lexical, but not relational, since it is headed by an extensionally broad general noun. Nevertheless, the co-text yields an interpretation of the encapsulator which is indeed relevant to the logical dimension. Particularly, it is the verbal construction *portare qualcuno a* (Engl. *lead somebody to*) that introduces the subsequent event as a consequence of the antecedent and brings about, once again, a relation of consecution. This kind of logical movement is realised primarily by a verb, which belongs to the class of representational connectives, according to (Ferrari, 1999). Representational connectives are opposed by Ferrari to instructional connectives, starting from a basic morphosyntactic opposition. Both expressions have the function of establishing a logical relation, but the former do so relying on a noun or a verb, whereas the latter – usually called *connectives* in the strict sense – are realised by function words, mainly belonging to the class of conjunctions.

Representational connectives deeply affect the textual weight of the logical relation, assigning to it a greater communicative prominence and a greater transparency. These pragmatic properties are linked to the syntactic features of representational connectives: they act in the central linguistic part of their utterance, whereas instructional connectives act in the peripheral part

(cfr. Ferrari, 1999: 119). In the example (7), in particular, the encapsulator *questo episodio* acts as topic of the second utterance and the verb *ha portato* is the main predicative component of that same utterance. AE can be classified in (7) as relational thanks to the predication applied to the encapsulator.

We shall analyse two final examples where we have a relational noun, but the textual strategies at stake are not encapsulative, therefore we cannot postulate relational AE. Consider the following passage:

- (8) L'arrivo di Gabbiadini slitta ancora. **-MOTIVATION-** **Il motivo** è che la Juve, che deve darlo in prestito, non ha ancora girato all'Atalanta James Troisi come contropartita. (*La Repubblica*, 31.07.2012)

*Gabbiadini's arrival is postponed again. -MOTIVATION- The reason is that Juventus, that has to lend him, has not given yet to Atalanta James Troisi in exchange.*

In (8), the NP *il motivo* establishes a relation of motivation – conceptually identical, as we have shown above, to the relation of consecution. However, this NP does not encapsulate the previous utterance, since it is inserted as subject in a copular sentence; the actual referential content of *il motivo* in this fragment is what follows the copula, therefore we have no hypostasis of previous events. Cataphora is not at stake either, since the connection between *il motivo* and its referential completion is managed entirely by the syntactic structures of the copular sentence; textual cohesion is simply not involved in that very relation. What we could posit here is a particular form of associative anaphora<sup>21</sup>: there is an indirect referential relation between the first utterance and the NP under consideration, since *il motivo* could also be paraphrased, thus exploiting a form of AE, as *il motivo di ciò* (Engl. *the reason of this*). The NP *il motivo* may use a definite determiner because it refers to the motivation of a preceding text portion, but its proper referential content is only found in the complement of the copular sentence.

This formulation gives a great prominence to the logical relation, even more than what did the construction in (7), since the relation itself is not only objectified through the use of a NP, but also placed in a topical position. However, as far as anaphora is concerned, there is no resumptive referential connection between the two utterances.

- (9) Partirà questa sera da Bussoleno l'unico pullman organizzato dai No Tav per dirigersi a Roma **-PURPOSE-** con **l'obiettivo** di "assediare" il vertice intergovernativo Letta-Hollande. (*La Repubblica*, 19.11.2013)

*The only bus organised by the No Tav movement to head towards Rome is leaving tonight from Bussoleno, -PURPOSE- with the aim of "besieging" the intergovernmental summit between Letta and Hollande.*

<sup>21</sup> Associative anaphora is a strategy of cohesion whereby a new entity is introduced in the text by means of a definite determiner. The definite determiner signals the existence of a relation between that entity and another previously introduced entity or semantic content (see Kleiber 2001 for a comprehensive treatment).

Finally, in (9) the relational noun *obiettivo* is part of a prepositional locution (*con l'obiettivo di*) that qualifies the logical relation (namely, a relation of purpose<sup>22</sup>) with the help of the co-text on its right. As a matter of fact, similarly to (8), there is no textual relation between *l'obiettivo* and its referential completion (expressed by the infinitive clause *assediare il vertice...*), but only a syntactic relation. The two expressions belong to the same sentence and, what is more important, even to the same NP. More precisely, the construction at stake is the so-called "definitive genitive" (It. *genitivo definitivo*; cfr. Korzen, 1996: 565), in which the syntactic relation established by the preposition *di* allows the reader to define the content of the infinitive clause as belonging to the class denoted by the relational noun. In this case, anaphoric relations (either encapsulative or associative) are not involved at all. The presence of a definite determiner in the NP *l'obiettivo di...*, signalling the identifiability of the discourse referent, depends on the PP introduced by *di*<sup>23</sup>; on the other hand, the link between the event-denoting NP and the previous clause is entirely managed by syntax, viz. by the connection established by the preposition *con*.

### 5. Relational anaphoric encapsulation in Italian: a synthesis

The analysis of the examples proposed in this paper has brought to the fore several problems connected to the classification of AE and, more specifically, to the role it may have on the logical dimension. In Table 1, the analysed constructions (4-9) are summed up and classified according to two criteria: the syntactic features of the elements licensing the logical relation and the presence/absence of hypostasis (the definitional property of AE, in our approach).

Table 1: Logical relations and hypostasis in examples (4-9)

Constructions	What licenses the logical relation?	Where is hypostasis (i.e. encapsulation)?	Relational anaphoric encapsulation?
<i>Per questo motivo</i>	Per + motivo	Questo motivo	YES (prototypical)
<i>Per questo</i>	Per	Questo	YES
<i>A causa di ciò</i>	A causa di	Ciò	YES
<i>Questo episodio ha portato a</i>	Ha portato a	Questo episodio	YES
<i>Il motivo è che</i>	Motivo	∅	NO
<i>Con l'obiettivo di</i>	Obiettivo	∅	NO

<sup>22</sup> *Relazione di fine*, in the Italian formulation by Ferrari (2014: 137).

<sup>23</sup> This would be a case of cataphoric identification, according to Korzen's (1996) terminology, since the identifying element follows the nominal head. Note that, however, this does not imply *textual* cataphora; in other words, there is no referential cohesive connection between the two elements.

Constructions such as *per questo motivo* are the only instances in which the anaphor (i.e. the encapsulator) coincides, at least partially, with the element that licenses the logical relation. In other words, the element accomplishing hypostasis (i.e. the element establishing a new discourse referent in the universe of discourse) has a relational function, thanks to its lexical properties, which is relevant as such to the logical dimension. This is why we call this phenomenon a prototypical relational AE. In the following three instances (*per questo*, *a causa di ciò*, *questo episodio ha portato a*), hypostasis is projected on a non-relational element (i.e. a pronoun or a NP headed by a general noun) and the logical relation is uniquely dependent on the non-referential elements of the construction (i.e. the preposition *per*, the prepositional locution *a causa di*, the predicate *ha portato a*, respectively). Nevertheless, these examples may be classified under the label of AE, since an encapsulator is involved in a construction acting on the logical plan. Finally, the last two occurrences (*il motivo è che*, *con l'obiettivo di*) do not fall into the realm of encapsulation, because the definitional property of hypostasis is simply missing. In these examples, the logical relation is licensed by a nominal element that is referentially specified by a following propositional content, but without making use of an encapsulative strategy.

## References

- Consten, Manfred, Mareile Knees & Monika Schwarz-Friesel (2007). The function of complex anaphors in texts. Evidence from corpus studies and ontological considerations. In Monika Schwarz-Friesel, Manfred Consten & Mareile Knees (eds). *Anaphors in text. Cognitive, formal and applied approaches to anaphoric reference*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 81-102.
- Conte, Maria-Elisabeth (1996). Anaphoric encapsulation. In Walter De Mulder & Liliane Tasmowski (eds). *Coherence and Anaphora (= Belgian Journal of Linguistics 10)*, pp. 1-10 [reprinted in Conte, Maria-Elisabeth. 1999. *Condizioni di coerenza. Ricerche di linguistica testuale*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, pp. 107-114].
- D'Addio Colosimo, Wanda (1988). Nominali anaforici incapsulatori: un aspetto della coesione lessicale. In Tullio De Mauro, Stefano Gensini & Maria Emanuela Piemontese (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, pp. 143-151.
- Faloppa, Federico (2010). Parole generali. In Raffaele Simone (ed.). *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano Treccani*. Roma: Treccani, p. 1058.
- Ferrari, Angela (1999). Tra rappresentazione ed esecuzione: indicare la 'causalità testuale' con i nomi e con i verbi. *Studi di Grammatica Italiana XVIII*, pp. 113-144.
- Ferrari, Angela (2002). Aspetti semantici e informativi della nominalizzazione sintagmatica. In Gian Luigi Beccaria & Carla Marengo (eds). *La parola al*

*testo. Scritti per Bice Mortara Garavelli*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, pp. 179-204.

- Ferrari, Angela (2003). *Le ragioni del testo. Aspetti sintattici e interpuntivi dell'italiano contemporaneo*. Firenze: Accademia della Crusca.
- Ferrari, Angela (ed.) (2004). *La lingua nel testo, il testo nella lingua*. Torino: Istituto dell'Atlante Linguistico Italiano.
- Ferrari, Angela (ed.) (2005). *Rilievi. Le gerarchie semantico-pragmatiche di alcuni tipi di testo*. Firenze: Cesati.
- Ferrari, Angela (ed.) (2006). *Parole frasi testi, tra scritto e parlato (=Cenobio LV/3)*.
- Ferrari, Angela (2010). Coerenza, procedure di. In Raffaele Simone (ed.). *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano Treccani*. Roma: Treccani, pp. 219-222.
- Ferrari, Angela (2014). *Linguistica del testo. Principi, fenomeni, strutture*. Roma: Carocci.
- Ferrari, Angela, Luca Cignetti, Anna-Maria De Cesare, Letizia Lala, Magda Mandelli, Claudia Ricci & Carlo Enrico Roggia (2008). *L'interfaccia lingua-testo. Natura e funzioni dell'articolazione informativa dell'enunciato*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- González Ruiz, Ramón (2008). Las nominalizaciones como estrategia de manipulación informativa en la noticia periodística: el caso de la anáfora conceptual. In Inés Olza Moreno, Manuel Casado Velarde & Ramón González Ruiz (eds). *Actas del XXXVII Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística (SEL)*. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, pp. 247-259.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. & Ruqaiya Hasan (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Kleiber, Georges (2001). *L'anaphore associative*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Korzen, Iørn (1996). *L'articolo italiano fra concetto ed entità*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Lala, Letizia (2004). I Due punti e l'organizzazione logico-argomentativa del testo. In Angela Ferrari (ed.). *La lingua nel testo, il testo nella lingua*. Torino: Istituto dell'Atlante Linguistico Italiano, pp. 143-164.
- Lambrecht, Knud (1994). *Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lundquist, Lita (2009). L'anaphore résomptive. Navigation textuelle et comparaison discursive. In Federica Venier (ed.). *Tra pragmatica e linguistica testuale: ricordando Maria-Elisabeth Conte*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, pp. 379-399.
- Pecorari, Filippo (2014). Ai confini dell'incapsulazione anaforica: strategie incapsulative non prototipiche. In Elena Pîrvu (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, pp. 257-269.

- Prandi, Michele (2004). *The Building Blocks of Meaning. Ideas for a Philosophical Grammar*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Prandi, Michele (2006). *Le regole e le scelte. Introduzione alla grammatica italiana*. Torino: UTET.
- Sbisà, Marina (2007). *Detto non detto. Le forme della comunicazione implicita*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.
- Sinclair, John (1981). Planes of Discourse. In S. N. A. Rizvi (ed.). *The Twofold Voice. Essays in honour of Ramesh Mohan*. Salzburg: Universität Salzburg, pp. 70-89 [reprinted in John Sinclair & Ronald Carter (eds.). 2004. *Trust the Text: Language, Corpus and Discourse*. London: Routledge, pp. 51-66].
- Zampese, Luciano (2005). La struttura informativa degli articoli di cronaca: natura e funzioni dell'Unità di Quadro. In Angela Ferrari (ed.). *Rilievi. Le gerarchie semantico-pragmatiche di alcuni tipi di testo*. Firenze: Cesati, pp. 173-216.