

PRONOUNS FOR PUPILS WHILE ANAPHORAS FOR ADULTS: AN APPRAISAL ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ANAPHORA IN PRAGMATICS

Joyce Sirigiri

PhD Research Scholar, K.L. University, Guntur

Dr. S. K. Sheela

Assoc. Prof., Dept. of English, K.L. University, Guntur

Abstract: Moving on from knowing a handful of nouns to learning pronouns and reflexive pronouns seem to be the beginning of abstraction on pupils' minds. However, at an advanced stage of language learning to find the same pronoun functions as an Anaphora and, as a concept to be found at the very heart of syntactic and pragmatics and to realize that it also helps to distinguish the Deixis in a given context could be pleasant surprise. In support of such developments, this paper aims to give a broad view of the significance of anaphora in relation to the speaker, the listener and the linguist who critically observes their interaction.

Etymologically speaking, the Greeks who have coined the term ἀναφορά, the English equivalent of Anaphora, originates as a word which means, 'carrying back'. However, their consideration of Anaphora was restricted to the grammatical and structural usage. Now, while recognizing the expanses, complexities and precisions of expressions in communications, we place Anaphora and Cataphora with those at a higher level of acquired skills in language since much of the usage is found in complex sentences which were phrased by those whose grammar was at an advanced level and are aware of the context. It is in identifying and allotting the appropriate quarters to Anaphora in the domain of Linguistics can one begin to see the significance of the part in light of the whole. The study of language discourse, as it has evolved to be, is significant both in Linguistics and the Philosophy of language since intelligent and intentional discourse entails efficacy of thought, speech, as well as economy and efficiency. Complimenting such developments, contemporary study of Pragmatics in Linguistics, with its origins in the Anglo-American literary world of reflections on human mind, language and thought seem to embrace such diverse fields of human discourse as the above. In order to give a comprehensive view of the discussion that surrounds the issue of Anaphora, it appears that it requires a triangular framework that includes, (1) The parameters of the language proficiency of the Speaker (2) The inferential capabilities of the listener/s and (3) The critical observation of the Linguists concerning communication between the Speaker and the Listener.

Keywords: Anaphora, Pragmatics, Deixis, Communication, Intentions, Context, Speaker, Listener and Linguist/ICS.

Introduction: Since communication with the aid language - the unique human capability is the matter of study and research for a variety of academic as well as amateur study groups, the ever growing significance of linguistics propelling research into cognitive and neurosciences evidences the fact of it. Seeking for *clarity* and *certainty* on the one hand and pursuing *precision* and *creativity* on the other seem to be accomplished by the ever increasing proficiency in a language and thus resulting in better communication. Pragmatics in Linguistics, as developed in the last century, rightly seem confirm the inseparable nature of context and communication, more particularly in observing how meaning and brevity of expression are integral part of the economy of thought and expression. Most certainly, in aligning the themes of communication, Linguistics, pragmatics, Anaphora seems to come to the fore front and I aim to provide a succinct rationality that underlines such a view.

It is important to ask, 'Why grammar, when spoken language is sufficient for communication and understanding?' History of the development of languages has clearly demonstrated that the very dynamic nature of language also provide a window into the capabilities of the human mind. The felt need for formal grammar seem to point to the human mind's drive for precision and creative expression. It does not come as a surprise that the parallel and complimentary growth of contemporary linguistics, philosophy of mind and sociolinguistics, now flow together into interdisciplinary studies such as cognitive linguistics and theory of

Mind and the study of the English language brain.² Anaphora, as the linguistic device facilitating precision and with its synthetic nature of usage seems to indicate very the complexity imbedded in the DNA of any language.

Etymologically speaking, the Greeks who have coined the term, ἀναφορά, the English equivalent of Anaphora, originates as a word which means, 'carrying back'³ However, their consideration of Anaphora was restricted to the grammatical and structural usage. Now, while recognizing the expanses, complexities and precisions of expressions in communications, we place Anaphora and Cataphora with those at a higher level of acquired skills in language since much of their usage is found in complex sentences which were phrased by those whose grammar was at an advanced level and are aware of the context. It is in identifying and allotting the appropriate quarters to Anaphora in the domain of Linguistics can one begin to see the significance of the part in light of the whole. The study of language discourse, as it has evolved to be, is significant both in Linguistics and the Philosophy of language since intelligent and intentional discourse entails efficacy of thought, speech, as well as economy and efficiency. Complimenting such developments, contemporary study of Pragmatics in Linguistics, with its origins in the Anglo-American literary world of reflections on human mind, language and thought seem to embrace such diverse fields of human discourse as the above. In order to give a comprehensive view of the discussion that surrounds the issue of Anaphora, it appears that it requires a triangular framework that includes, (1) The parameters of the language proficiency of the Speaker (2) The inferential capabilities of the listener/s and (3) The critical observation of the Linguists concerning communication between the Speaker and the Listener.

The Speaker, The Parameters of Language Proficiency and The Context of Communication: Speaking or writing, since it may or may not be conscientious of rules of phrasing, its phrasing and the appropriateness of its grammar can be meaningful as long as it is in conformity with the normative standards of a given Language community. However, on the other hand, conscientious phrasing, willful emphasis, usage of metaphorical or idiomatic phrases require an advanced and critical level of the knowledge of the language. In other instances, it would be the grammarian who might notice either Anaphora or Epistrophe in the act of repetition and the speaker might be unconscious of it. However, the common denominator required between the speaker and the observant Linguist is the measure of certainty concerning both the context and the content of speech that conveys a meaningful message. Paul Grice, with his formidable work concerning the maxims of the speaker, captured comprehensively what a speaker would aim at, beyond the syntactical appropriateness and semantic awareness.⁴ The maxims of *quality*, *manner*, *relevance* and *quantity* that he points to, build bridges between the syntactical nature of the content of speech and the meaning and relevance of what has been communicated in the sphere of a given context. Anaphora is subservient to the maxims laid down by Grice since the deictic notions that anaphora carry do not make sense unless they meet the standards of the maxims and vice a versa.

In short, communication is not restricted either to the grammatical correctness or semantic propriety but various moods and occasions call for the usage of deictic notions which in turn can be considered as anaphora since the latter is meant to be used as a linguistic reference within the shared context; pragmatics clearly uphold that sharing the context is imperative. However, it in light of growing influence of cognitive science, a question must be asked, if sharing the context requires visual and auditory capabilities of both the speaker and the listeners and it is important to wonder if Deixis and anaphora makes sense to the visually challenged.

Communication as is already understood does not lack intentionality, therefore causality, reason context and emphasis are the prerogatives of the speaker and the anaphora enhances the speaker to deliver with maximum effect within the radius of the economy of expression. Placing anaphora within the domain of communication seems to mean wondering at the speaker and the capabilities for sense making semantics of her expressions.

The Listeners/S, Inferential Capabilities and the Content of Speech: The study of language and the modes of its functions universally seem to be identical in the way communication reaches and evokes meaning and understanding in the listeners or readers; the receivers share the inter subjectivity of the speakers as far the language parameters are concerned. What speakers assume is similar to that of what listeners expect. The known and the familiar in what is communicated may not reach as a surprise but syntactical as well as semantic competence of the listeners is such that it matches to that of the speakers. The maxims of the speaker that are mentioned in the previous section *are meant for the* listeners since quantity, manner and relevance and quality are concerns of the speaker having the listeners at the hindsight. However, the inferential capabilities of the listeners is such that receiving the content may evoke sense in light of the context

even when the communication may have novelty or previously not known. Inference and the knowledge of the context, though are rule governed and require logical capabilities, the Implicatures, Entailments, and Presuppositions of the speakers which pragmatics care for could only meet on the syntactic bridge or binding. This is the juncture that the speaker and the listener share the same capabilities even concerning anaphora. Since anaphora may refer to person time and place and belong to a discourse, the content is inferred in the context on the basis of the syntactical rules. In other words, what is grammatically a pronoun can be perceived as anaphora pragmatics wise; similarly with the temporal and spatial notions. In such instances, give me your hand could only mean, extend your hand towards me, and when one exclaims, I am leaving you' is responded to as 'who is he' indicate that the listener is aware of both the rules that apply to the speaker and the listener since the mutual expectation is communication characterized by truthfulness and trust.

The Critical Observations of the Linguists Concerning Communication between the Speaker and the Listener and Pragmatics: It has come to be part of everyone's knowledge that communication with the aid of language not only is dealing with information but also to *make known the intentions* or *to draw intentions and make inferences from information*— either explicitly or implicitly. While Grammar and Syntax seem to care of the clarity and certainty of expression, pragmatics concerns to the creativity and intentionality and more particularly to the economy of expression. One significant aspect of intentionality seems to be brevity of speech that reduces repetition and thus redundancy. A scheme towards brevity is clearly seen in Question tags, Non-finites and in phrasing complex sentences; anaphora serve as good examples since all of them are characterized by intentionally arriving at brevity of speech without impinging on the entirety of what was intended to communicate. Reduction of repetition in complex sentences also serves aesthetically well be it in spoken or written form. As Anaphora, as a term, is not commonly used in spite of innumerable anaphora's in mundane usage of a language and as it belongs to that cluster of words that describe the functionality of the words, its usage must be predominantly ascribed to the Grammarians and Linguists. To call something as Anaphora is an act of linguistic analysis and criticism. Understandably, Anaphora's arise in a narration or a discourse when a certain subject or subjects are the focus and there arises a need to reduce such a repetition and thus the necessity to use the anaphoras: An antecedent provides the interpretation for a second expression (anaphor) which has little meaning of its own. An example can be, 'If you see Bhasker, give him my greetings.' In such a sentence, Bhasker being antecedent and 'him' turns to be an Anaphora. Similarly, 'Meena went to her home,' and 'Rahim injured himself playing football.' In addition to the need for the reduction of repetition or dealing with redundancy of the usage of nouns and phrases, Deixis also necessitate the usage of anaphora since in a *given context*, the spatial, temporal and person Deixis give the necessary cues instead of phrasing in long sentences.⁵ The usages such as, 'here' instead of, 'The great battle of Panipat took place here,' while narrating the battle 'Now' instead of 'We all are leaving home now' while everyone is ready to leave, and 'he' instead of the 'The man who has come from the village.' While everyone in the context is aware, are some examples of how anaphora's function as Deixis. Dealing with the antecedents in making reference to them in the proceeding sentences can be cumbersome since it might require the entirety of the phrasing and the usage of anaphora's can reduce the burden.⁶ Grice must be acknowledged for his monumental work concerning Pragmatics and the relevant principles which clearly help advance our view of how a language functions; that the meaning of a proposition is not restricted to the syntax of a sentence but the context also plays a significant role and thus the knowledge of the Anaphoras.⁷

Paul Grice's thought provoking article, '*Meaning*' and further developments of his writing culminating in his *Way of Words* and both seem to lay foundation for his theory of Implicatures which probed the nature of utterance, intent and meaning.⁸ The four conversational maxims that he has developed – the Maxims of Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner, ignited renewed conversations about utterance and meaning and thus leading to renewed interest concerning syntax and pragmatics. Noam Chomsky, complementing the work of Grice, with his theory of syntax, a phrase structure grammar, resulting in Transformational grammar and further developed in The Minimalist Program, thought place meaning as found within the parameters of syntax of a sentence, recognizing the place of anaphora's, he proposed Intra sentential anaphora alternative to syntactic and thus to his notions of Government and binding: government, which is an abstract syntactic relation applicable, among other things, to the assignment of case; and binding, which deals chiefly with the relationships between pronouns and the expressions with which they are co-referential⁹It is the line of thought that progressed from meaning, intent, syntax, and relations between pronouns and the expressions that led to a rekindled interest in the long forgotten anaphora that Greeks thought about.

Stephen Levinson and James Huang brought in complimentary insights in understanding the nature of anaphora. Recognizing the intra semantic binding and control concerning meaning, they argue that it is not true with all the languages. Levinson points to Guugu Yimidhirr language native to Australia and Huang to Chinese, Japanese and Korean in which anaphora is more dependent on context than intra semantic word order. Levinson contends that grammatical process may have their sources in pragmatic process and what is preferred interpretation in one language may be grammar in the other.¹⁰ Louise Cummings considers Levinson and Huang as having Neo-Gricean approach and finds them as differing from Chomsky. He finds Levinson arguing Anaphora as essentially connection of pragmatic Phenomenon and Huang contending that in Chinese Japanese Korean – principle of language usage is more significant rather than rules grammatical structure as in English French and German and so the significance for anaphora far beyond the Deixis of time, place and person.¹¹ With such a radical differentiation, anaphora is poised to estimate and distinguish the very ways in which languages function. With the pioneering work of Vijayasri Nyanaru in Telugu, the significance of anaphora is taking roots in the Indian soil of Linguistics.¹²

References:

1. [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Anaphora_\(liturgy\)&oldid=810271454](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Anaphora_(liturgy)&oldid=810271454)
2. I have borrowed the concept from the phrase ‘Enlanguaged brian’ used by Peter Hagoort: <http://www.mpi.nl/departments/neurobiology-of-language/projects/the-enlanguaged-brain>
3. [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Anaphora_\(liturgy\)&oldid=810271454](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Anaphora_(liturgy)&oldid=810271454)
- 4.
5. The resource taken from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GacC9bewOw4>
6. The source drawn from <https://www.englishgrammar.org/antecedent-anaphor/> In contemporary linguistics the term “anaphora/ anaphor/ anaphoric,” has three distinct senses. In the first sense it can be used to refer to a relation between two or more linguistic elements, in which the interpretation of one element (called an anaphor or anaphoric expression) is in some way determined by the interpretation of another element (called an antecedent).
7. Herber P., Grice (1975). "Logic and Conversation," *Syntax and Semantics*, 1989, 22–40
8. ‘In the sense in which I am using the word say, I intend what someone has said to be closely related to the conventional meaning of the words (the sentence) he has uttered.’ Grice, 1989. P.25
9. Government and binding theory. (2017, September 27). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 10:25, November 29, 2017, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Government_and_binding_theory&oldid=802674848
10. Levinson, ‘Pragmatics and the grammar of anaphora’ 1987, p.428
11. Cummings, Louise, ed. *The Routledge pragmatics encyclopedia*. Routledge, 2010.p.
12. Vijayasri, N (2003). *Anaphora in Telugu*. PhD Dissertation. Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati
13. Abe, Jun (2014): *A movement theory of anaphora*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton (*Studies in generative grammar*, 120).
14. Anaphora (liturgy). (2017, November 14). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopaedia. Retrieved 23:20, November 29, 2017, from [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Anaphora_\(liturgy\)&oldid=810271454](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Anaphora_(liturgy)&oldid=810271454)
15. Baldi, Philip (Ed.) (2011): *Constituent Syntax. Quantification, Numerals, Possession, Anaphora*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter; De Gruyter Mouton (*Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs [TiLSM]*, 180/3).
16. Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. Routledge.
