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ABSTRACT


This research examines the application of Binding Theory of syntax to anaphoric expressions in *Mail Online* article entitled: “*The next game is my next drug! Wenger speaks ahead of his landmark 1000th game*”, March 20, 2014 edition using qualitative method.

The writer finds twelve expressions which follow Anaphora, Cataphora, and Exophora patterns from that online article. He uses X-bar tree diagram to display sentences syntax chain out. He also uses binding principles to analyses syntactic relation between references and its antecedents to prove qualitatively whether Binding Theory (BT) is kind of effective treatment to describe *Mail Online* syntactic English grammar. However, the research also presents failures from Binding principles in order to extract referential commands of Cataphoric and Exophoric sentence patterns out.

In conclusion, the writer figures out that Binding principles are effective in particular situation but seem fail in other situations exclude orthodox anaphora which has formal referent-antecedent syntactic relation.
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APPENDIX
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of The Study

Online media has become a friend of gadget users. People habit such to read morning newspapers also has transformed to be digital. Online newspaper which is a kind of online media is a digital product of media information that brings some functions like news, broadcasting, and communications which connect institutions to the readers.\(^1\) Thus, online newspapers or known as e-papers have an important part in the development and public scrutiny.

Furthermore, like the conventional one, e-paper has various topics related to the development and oversight functions were presented in the form of article, a piece of writing about a particular subject in a newspaper or magazine.\(^2\) An article should meet the standard terms and conditions in accordance to the basic model that has been established by the relevant newspaper or magazine. General framework which is often used in writing articles usually consist of the inclusion of the title, the existence of introduction which is then presented in the body of the article, and


conclusion pertaining to the closing of an article. In addition to the news, articles can also be ideas of the writer.

Moreover, Mail Online is a digital evolution of British well known morning daily newspaper, Daily Mail. Like the old brother, Mail Online comes up with simple and readable articles but full of expressions that eager people to love to read it. As an English online media, Mail Online has an indirect obligation in the public scrutiny of language development through the usage of good dictions, grammars, or even other expressions of English. One of English expressions that are used in its article is anaphora.

Anaphora is a linguistic pattern that has relation between two elements or more, where one of them is a clue for its interpretation. Specifically, Huddlestone & Pullum argues that "anaphora is the relation between an anaphor and an antecedent, where the interpretation of the anaphor is determined via that of the antecedent." To understand the concept, Gardelle gives the following example:

(1) **Bruce** smiled to **himself**.

*Himself* is an anaphor and *Bruce* is its antecedent.

---


5 Ibid.
Referring to the definition above, then an anaphora should have a bound anaphor with its antecedent. The patterns of anaphora must necessarily also meet the rules. Consequently, each writer or correspondent of Mail Online is required to understand the bonding of anaphoric expressions before putting them out in a post.

There are also other types of anaphoric expressions which are important to comprehend grammatical consequences of a language. Thus, the writer analyzes the regularities that occur in anaphoric expressions contained in Mail Online article since an anaphor must have a similar relation with antecedent interpretation within the sentence. Therefore, the writer argues that anaphoric relationship that occurs in a sentence can be explained through the approach of syntax theory.

B. Focus of The Study

Focus of this study is to predict the grammatical and/or ungrammatical of anaphoric expressions which exist in Mail Online article, March 20, 2014 edition entitled “The next game is my next drug! Wenger speaks ahead of his landmark 1000th game”. The writer of this study focuses on the syntactic relationship between the antecedent and anaphoric reference of the sentences through the application of Binding Theory (BT), which becomes the most important part of the 'Government and Binding Theory of Syntax.'
C. **Research Questions**

In order to conduct this study, the writer formulates the problems which emerge on the background of the study and its focus in several scientific questions:

1. What are the patterns of anaphoric expression which exist in *Mail Online* article?
2. How are the syntactic relations between anaphoric references and its antecedents which exist in *Mail Online* article through the application of Binding Theory of syntax?
3. How effective can the principles of Binding Theory of syntax describe the syntactic relations between anaphoric references and its antecedents which exist in *Mail Online* article?

D. **Significances of The Study**

Theoretically, this study can be one of the gates to adapt Universal Grammar (UG) of Noam Chomsky. In addition, syntactic analysis using BT to explain anaphoric expressions in *Mail Online* news article is a crucial instrument in comprehending the structure of syntax in general.

Practically, since *Mail Online* is a global media then it has to have clearer syntactic relations between anaphoric references and antecedent in its articles. Thus, the readers will not generate confusions to interpret the
message of it. Especially, for this case, *Mail Online* March 20, 2014 edition entitled “*The next game is my next drug! Wenger speaks ahead of his landmark 1000th game*”. The main reason why this article is chosen as corpus is because the writer of the article uses complete types of anaphoric patterns from anaphora to cataphora and exophora.

E. Research Methodology

1. Objectives of Research

Based on the research questions, objectives of this study are:

a. To determine what anaphoric patterns are exist in *Mail Online*, March 20, 2014, entitled: “*The next game is my next drug! Wenger speaks ahead of his landmark 1000th game*”;

b. To describe its syntactic chains by applying Binding Theory of syntax to anaphoric expressions in that *Mail Online* article;

c. To analyze the effectiveness of binding principles in term of describing anaphoric expressions.

2. The Method of Research

The research is conducted by using qualitative method. The writer describes anaphoric sentences within *Mail Online* article referring to Gardelle’s anaphora classification. He also exposures its syntactic relation on x-bar tree diagram then applies Binding Theory of syntax to gain scientific findings without any statistical equipment.
3. **The Technique of Data Collection & Data Analysis**

The writer uses bibliography technique to find anaphoric sentences. This technique is using written source to gain the data then the data which follow anaphoric patterns are collected into a data card. To collect those, the writer does following steps:

a. To choose an article from *Mail Online*;

b. To read the article;

c. To mark sentences which are containing anaphoric expressions;

d. To classify it by following Gardelle’s work;

e. To write the chosen expressions into data card.

After that, those specific numbers of data is analyzed. To do that, the writer runs steps as follow:

a. To exposure syntax structure of the data by using x-bar chart;

b. To describe its syntactic structure by using Chomsky’s Binding Theory of syntax;

c. To apply binding principles into data;

d. To make conclusions based on that theoretical description and its principles application.

---


4. The Instrument of Data Analysis

To analyze sentences patterns of the corpus, the writer uses data card as instrument of research in order to write, to identify and to classify the data which are needed from that article. Then, the identified and classified data which have anaphoric expressions are examined through the application of Binding Theory of syntax of Noam Chomsky.

5. Analysis Units

The units of analysis of this research are anaphoric expressions in Mail online March 20, 2014 edition entitled “The next game is my next drug! Wenger speaks ahead of his landmark 1000th game“.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL DESCRIPTION

A. Previous Research

To start this chapter, the writer highlights some previous researches. The first one was a research that using Government and Binding Theory (GB) in order to analyze phase structure rules in Natural Language Process (NLP). Kumari, Shyam, Debbarma, Kar, and Das devised it to filter out Hindi incorrect grammatical sentences. However, they were modifying its theoretical approach to fit with Hindi language structure. The research also presented c-command and m-command relations out which fundamentally were important prerequisite to picture out syntactically proper sentence structure.

The second previous research was Modi Fahad Al-Mendeel’s Application of Government and Binding Theory (GB) on Agreement in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and Moroccan Arabic (MA). He stated that Arabic either MSA or MA have to deal with its SVO and VSO basic patterns. As Arabic insisted agreement between subjects and its verbs so that


Al-Mendeel devised GB to conclude some problems that occurred in those two basic patterns.

The third previous research was an anaphoric study which Gardelle had published in title of Anaphora, Anaphor, and Antecedent in Nominal Anaphora: Definitions and Theoretical Implications.\textsuperscript{10} Fundamentally, Gardelle had stated that anaphoric expressions are divided into syntactic anaphora, discourse anaphora, and pragmatic anaphora. Two of her classification were among writer’s research since anaphors, pronominals, and r-expressions were syntactic anaphora while Cataphora and Exophora were discourse ones.

The fourth previous research was dedicated in the light of Binding Theory (BT). Atreya and Kumar held a study on reflexives and reciprocals in Magahi which analyses both syntactic relations.\textsuperscript{11} The research – Anaphors in Magahi: Binding Theoretic Treatment – represented Magahi sentence structure in tree diagram and used BT principles as its main analytical instrument. To conclude, this research displayed that anaphors in Magahi syntactically followed principle A of Binding.

Nevertheless, all of previous researches avoided to apply binding principles to different type of anaphoric patterns. Differently, here, the writer is aiming to examine the effectiveness of binding principles into all of anaphoric sentences, including Cataphora and Exophora. He also uses X-bar


instrument in order to describe word syntactic chain within the sentences. Thus, the next point is prepared to give clearer paradigms about this research.

B. Antecedence and Reference

A relation between reference and its antecedent will occur in particular sentences. Consequently, we have to know the definition about both of it at first.

Literally, antecedent means a thing or an event that exists or comes before another, and may have influenced it.12 However, antecedent has references. The references are pronouns which bounded into antecedent syntactic form. For example:

(2) Benny hates himself.

From the sentence (2) we can stated that himself is a reference and Benny is its antecedent. However, there are also circumstances which excluded the relation between reference and the antecedent in a sentence, as in (3).

(3) Jessica helps her.

The reference in (3) has no antecedent in the same sentence because her cannot be co-referential with Jessica.

---

Sentence patterns as in (2) and (3) are identified as anaphoric expression. Gardelle opposed anaphoric expression to deixis, in which an expression also gets its own interpretation indirectly, but prototypically via a situational element, indicated for instance by a gesture. However, it requires a system which is universally capable to determine the option of anaphoric reference in anaphoric sentences whether *himself* (in (2)) and *her* (in (3)) from the examples above are syntactically correct.

C. **Anaphoric Expression**

Anaphoric expression will conduct us to a pattern where antecedents meet references within syntactic relationship.

Logically, since antecedent comes before another, then its references must come after it. But, the relationship between antecedent and its reference is typically unique and complex. The references can also come earlier or even are textually boundless to the antecedents.

Dušková divides these unique and complex situations into several patterns based on the location of reference: After antecedent, prior it and reference which refers to context of situation.

---


1. Anaphora

The regular pattern of antecedent-reference relationship is anaphora. Lust *et al.* (In Atreya and Kumar) defines anaphora as "the relation between a form and a linguistic antecedent".\(^{15}\) It is understood that in an anaphoric sentence there are formal links between antecedents with grammatical form of the sentence structure. Pronoun himself contained in the example below is one example of anaphora:

(4) **Robert** does the job by **himself**.

Sentence (4) is able to be understood that the pronoun *himself* refers to *Robert*. Gardelle terms pronoun *himself* as an anaphor, while *Robert* is its antecedent.\(^{16}\)

In grammatical relation, *himself* and *Robert* can occur because of the co-referential between them. Consequently, anaphor will always depend on antecedent to determine the exact reference of the relations between those two units.

One of the real forms of this dependence can be seen in several instances in which a pronoun cannot be interpreted with another noun phrases.

(5) *Bob* was nominated by him. (him ≠Bob)\(^{17}\)

---


\(^{17}\) (*) mark indicates ungrammatical
(6) She hoped that Mary would win the contest. (She ≠ Mary)

That happens because the pronouns cannot receive a reference from another NP, unless the NP is syntactically has a certain relation with anaphor in a same sentence.

2. Cataphora

The second pattern of anaphoric expression as expressed by Dušková is a reference where is located before the antecedent.

As claimed before, literally, this pattern violates the rules. Because, antecedent is a unit signs its position before something. But, in this case, reference precede antecedent. For example:

(7) I can’t believe it! We won!

We can understand that what is cannot be believed by I is it; the situation that causes we won.

3. Exophora

The third one of anaphoric expression pattern is Exophora. It can be interpreted as anaphoric reference where antecedent and anaphor are bound through contextual relationship. In other words, on this expression, context becomes very important and has an active role in order to the understanding of anaphoric relation.

(8) By this time, Mr. Parkhill was genuinely with the inexorable logic which Mr. Kaplan was following.
“That’s precisely the point. Come to the board and make the change, Mr. Kaplan.”

It is quite possible that the definite article in the board refers back to the preceding text, to some earlier mention of the board contextually. But, it also possible that it refers to the environment in which the dialogue is taking place. Ideally, it refers to the context of situation which occurs on the text.

In addition, Gardelle argues that anaphora is typically different with Cataphora and Exophora. Consequently, she insists that not only syntactic forms are among them but also discourse analysis inside. As the argument is quite strong then she states that there are syntactic anaphora and discourse anaphora as well. Anaphora is genuinely syntactically allowed while Cataphora and Exophora need some discourse adjustments.

D. Anaphoric Expressions in Binding

In order to describe the relation between references and antecedents in anaphoric expressions, the writer uses a system that syntactically fits with it. Binding is a system which can predict the grammatical and/or ungrammatical option of references in a sentence with its antecedent.

---

Binding system is capable to explain syntactic relation in anaphoric expression that also can lead us to the grammatical reference option. The system has been developed by Noam Chomsky consists of notions, conditions and principles which are needed in order to comprehend anaphoric relation.

Furthermore, binding is limited to the co-referential relation of NPs (Noun Phrases) and other NPs which only occur in the same sentence structure. Since references are pronouns and pronouns are nominal, then references are considered as Noun Phrases (NPs). It is able to be understood that the antecedent of a reference is also an NP. But, somehow, the research is aiming to the application of binding theory of syntax to both of binding or non-binding domain. The writer will test the effectiveness of binding principles to the data here to know whether it is applicable or non-applicable.

However, for the purposes of binding system, NPs as arguments are assumed to fall into one of three categories: Anaphors, pronominals, and referential expressions.  

1. **Anaphors**

Anaphors are items that, in some extents, must pick up their reference from something else in the sentence. It means that anaphors

---

has no independence to choose its antecedents. In English, reflexive NPs like *himself* as in example (2) page 11 and 13 and reciprocals like *each other* are in this class.

2. **Pronominals**

Sometime it is called pronouns. Horrocks argued that pronominals are NPs that lack specific lexical content and have only the features person, number, and gender. Unlike anaphors, it is either free to refer to the independent individuals or individuals already named in a stated sentence. NP like *her* in example (3) page 11 is one of its examples or *she* in the widening sentence of (3) below which is bounded outside the local domain.

(9) Jessica helps her while she had problem.

3. **R-expressions**

R(eferential)-expressions are NPs with lexical hands which potentially refer to something while co-reference is excluded here. On the example below *Louis Hamilton* and *Fernando Alonso* must denote different persons.

(10) **Louis Hamilton** believes **Fernando Alonso** can be his great rival.

---


E. Binding Theory of Syntax

Since Binding theory (BT) fits to predict syntactic option of anaphoric expressions, we have to comprehend the system deeply.

Binding theory of syntax is a part of Government and Binding (GB) theory that is specifically developed by Noam Chomsky (1981, 1982, 1986). Thus, BT is kind of Universal Grammar (UG) product.

In the decade 1955 to 1965 the foundations of UG were laid and a complex formalism was developed. The formal description represented by two basic units: representation level and default system.

Figure 1 shows the model of four representation levels. Lexicon represents idiosyncratic lexical property connected with the atomic units of syntax. Lexical units had been incorporated in the D-structure.

D(EEP)-structure is mapped into the S(URFACE)-structure, where the structure is exposed to a syntactic representation that is closest to the surface composition of the sentence. However, the outer structure cannot be interpreted directly, but is formed into the shape of phonological form (PF) and logical form (LF).

PF is a connected phonological region where shape, sound and word grouping are represented at once. Meanwhile, LF is closer to the area of

---


Semantics study. LF definition indicates that the predicative relationship of a sentence explicitly represented in the phrase structure.  

Figure 1

Binding Theory of syntax is a kind of compact principles which offers some futuristic solutions in syntactic field. Thus, to adopt such type of syntax theory is a must in order to adapt with the progress of language study, particularly in the generative system.

In order to expert Binding Theory of syntax (BT), we should learn its composition from one unit to the other units comprehensively. However, BT will only concern with the syntactic domains in which NPs can or cannot be construed as co-referential.

1. X-bar theory

The first component of GB is the equation of X-bar. A word form, such as nouns, verbs, adjectives or prepositions belongs to the lexical category. A group of words that are built from the same lexical category called a phrase. Examples of phrases are: Noun Phrase (NP),

---


Verb Phrase (VP), Adjective Phrase, and Prepositional Phrase (PP).\textsuperscript{28} Chomsky also added IP and CP as the projection of non-lexical categories maximal projection as Inflectional Phrase and Complement Phrase, respectively.\textsuperscript{29} All of it is a basic element in the formation of the X-bar chart. In addition, Black insists that auxiliaries and modals are categorized as a head (V) in VP maximal projection (see figure (2) page 21).

X-theory tries to connect the similarities between some of the different categories of lexical phrases by creating united structure. Chomsky stated,

\begin{quote}
"The idea that there should be a general unifying concept of locality that enters into various sub-domains of UG has been pursued in a number of ways since it was proposed by Jan Koster (1978)."\textsuperscript{30}
\end{quote}

However, tree figure becomes a major equation in X-bar representation of lexical units. It is comprehensible that the use of tree figures has become widespread among linguists since the 50's when earlier work on generative grammar had been started.\textsuperscript{31}

Furthermore, X-bar theory also uses tree figure data processing system in order to create phrase structure rules are different for each

\textsuperscript{28} Black, \textit{Op Cit.}, p.3.
\textsuperscript{29} Noam Chomsky, \textit{Barriers}, (Massachusetts: MIT press, 1990), p.3.
\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Ibid}, at p.2.
VP, NP, etc. The following two basic rules are capable of covering all the lexical categories.

Phrase structure rules:

\[(\text{For each lexical category } X \text{ where } X^0 = \text{Head})\]

\[XP \rightarrow \text{Specifier } X'\]

\[X'X \rightarrow \text{Complements (YP)}^{32}\]

It is yet quite clear to understand those equations. Thus, the figure below generalizes it from earlier rules; node (XP; maximal projection) which is likened to a mother with her two children (specifier and intermediate projection) is represented by two branches locates at the lower level. The two branches are bound in a brotherhood, which is in (7), one sister (X') also has two children (head and complement).

![Figure 2](image)

We can try to transform intransitive sentence below into x-bar figure.

---

(11) She slept.

Figure 3

2. Binding Theory

a. Command relation

The main job of Binding Theory is to determine anaphoric option, for instance, herself, is used instead her in figure 4 page 24.

C(onstituent)-command is a major factor in the movement of the theory of syntax. C-command represents binary relationship that exists between any two nodes of a tree figure. Chomsky defines as follows:

\[ \alpha \text{ c-commands } \beta \text{ iff } \]

\[ \begin{align*}
& \text{a. } \alpha \text{ does not dominate } \beta, \text{ and } \\
& \text{b. Every } \gamma \text{ that dominates } \alpha \text{ also dominates } \beta. \end{align*} \]

He added that $\gamma$ is restricted to the maximal projection.

Then, we could state that:

$\alpha$ c-commands $\beta$ iff

a. $\alpha$ does not dominate $\beta$, and

b. Every maximal projection that dominates $\alpha$ also dominates $\beta$.\(^{34}\)

From the definition above, $\alpha$ and $\beta$ represents certain categories. As noted by Black, in the figure 4, it can be seen whether $\alpha$ that represents NP-1 *Sally* c-commands *herself* NP-2 (=$\beta$). The first law of the definition (a) requires that NP-1 should not dominate the NP-2. The (a) law works here, because NP-1 is not above NP-2 directly on the same branch of the tree figure.

Furthermore, the law (b) emphasizes that the maximal projection which dominates NP-1, in this case is an IP-2, also must dominate the NP-2 (as consideration, NP-1 also c-commands all branches located in the right of the IP-2). In fact, IP-2 dominates the NP-2, so that NP-1 c-commands NP-2.

\(^{34}\) *Ibid*, at p.9.
Further analysis can be done on the figure 4 related to the definition of the c-command is proving whether NP-1 c-commands *Sally* NP-3 *her*. In this instance, $\alpha = \text{NP-1}$ and $\beta = \text{NP-3}$. The law (a) has proven as NP-1 does not dominate the NP-3. While the law (b) fails because the node of the branch that dominates NP-1 is an IP-2 and NP-3 is not located under the IP-2.

b. Binding conditions

The next step of GB quest is binding. There are prerequisites among binding then certain conditions must be fulfilled to meet with the requirement of binding theory, and we have addressed these prerequisites in the previous points.

---

This example tree has been originally copied from *Ibid*, at p. 41.
However, we must add co-index situation to the c-command. Co-indexing is two NPs that refer to the same entity.

\[ \alpha \text{ binds } \beta \iff \]

a. \( \alpha \) c-commands \( \beta \), and

b. \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are co-indexed.\(^{36}\)

Furthermore, to go to the advanced formulation of binding, Black added A-binding and \( \breve{A} \)-binding\(^{37}\). A-binding is a binding where its antecedent lies on argument (=subject or complement) position, while on \( \breve{A} \)-binding, the antecedent is not on it. Thus, we can state that:

\[ \alpha \text{ A-binds } \beta \iff \]

a. \( \alpha \) lies on the argument position, and

b. \( \alpha \) binds \( \beta \).\(^{38}\)

Nevertheless, the figure 5 which is originally copied from Black (1999) is needed to express the understanding of A-binding concept. Consider that NP-1 Sally and NP-2 Max both are on the argument position and both c-commands the object of the verb disliked, NP-3, and both also co-index with NP-3. Therefore, the NP-3 is A-bind.

\(^{36}\) Ibid, p.43.

\(^{37}\) Ibid.

\(^{38}\) Ibid.
However, A-Binding is not capable to explain choices that may occur in the NP-3. Why must use *her* instead of *herself* to refer back to *Sally*, and vice versa with on the reference of *Max*. Consequently, we still need certain tools to define whether it is grammatical or not.

c. Binding principles

The description above requires another solution to a grammatical or ungrammatical reference. It appears that the binding needs other conditions to determine the appropriate use of references to anaphoric sentence. Consequently, a fundamental

---

39 Copied from Ibid.
principle is urgently needed which can binds all the requirements in an anaphoric expression.

To obtain these requirements, let us consider some tests which have been done by Lasnik and Uriagereka\(^\text{40}\) against some anaphoric references.

(12) John likes him.

In a sentence like (12) John and him cannot be co-referential; that is informally speaking, those two NPs cannot be used to designate the same person.

(13) John likes himself.

The obvious fact here is that John and himself must be co-referential, exactly the opposite of what happens in (12).

From both simple tests, they suggested two initial principles that "an anaphor must have an antecedent nearby" and "a pronominal must not have an antecedent nearby".\(^\text{41}\)

However, both of the principles are not able to bind whole categories of anaphoric expressions. Therefore, they suggested that in addition to the two principles above, it must be added also the condition which states that "an anaphor must be bound within its


\(^{41}\) Ibid, p.31.
"clause" and "a pronominal must be free within its clause." The consequences of the two statements that can be described as in the following example:

\[(14)\] a. *John's mother likes himself.\(^{43}\)

b. John's mother likes him.

It is comprehensible from the experiment is that to explain the relationship between the antecedent anaphor located on an anaphoric sentence required certain conditions to be met.

To that end, as has been stated from the beginning, is required to describe the binding principles of syntactic relations between the two components contained in anaphoric expressions.

Chomsky has offered some principles to describe anaphoric relations:

A. An anaphor must be **bound** in its governing category.

B. A pronominal must be **free** in its governing category

C. An R-expression must be **free** everywhere.\(^{44}\)

The term **bound** above means that an NP not simply co-indexed but also has command relation with the other NP. Thus, an

\(^{42}\) Ibid

\(^{43}\) (*) mark indicated ungrammatical

NP may be bound if it co-indexes with another NP, and it c-commands that NP.

Nevertheless, it has been a significant foothold in the analysis of an anaphoric expression pattern formed in English utterances which also can be found in English media, for instance, *Mail Online*. 
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH FINDINGS

A. Data Description

The writer uses bibliography technique to find written source to gather anaphoric sentences into a data card.\textsuperscript{45} He finds twelve sentences which follow the rules of anaphoric expressions.

Table 1: Anaphoric Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SENTENCES</th>
<th>LINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arsene Wenger insists there is always reason to question himself</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The 64-year-old Frenchman, appointed in late September 1996, will reach the personal landmark</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Frenchman insists the desire to better himself burns as fierce as ever</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>You learn more the most in the biggest games when the pressure is there, where the talent is against you and when the pace of the game is at the top, top level</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>You question yourself more</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wenger, though, does not intend to allow himself much time of nostalgia</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would like to say for me it’s an honour to manage a club of this dimension for such a long time</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The 40-year-old, who is training at Arsenal’s Hertfordshire base to maintain fitness levels, would</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{45} Edi Subroto, \textit{Op.Cit.}
view the opportunity to work alongside Wenger once again as a dream

9 He has recently appointed another former Arsenal player Steve Bould to assist him 36

10 I have not spoken to him about that 43

11 The 23-year-old, who came up through the club’s youth ranks, cannot ever see himself leaving 45

12 I feel attached to the club and the coach 50

Furthermore, the collected sentences are converted into x-bar tree diagram in order to describe its syntactic relations. The next step is to analyze whether those syntactic relations follow the principles of binding or not.

In addition, Gardelle argues that anaphors, pronominals, and R-expressions are bound to the same sentence and calls these as syntactic anaphora while the unbound ones are discourse anaphora. Thus, to ease the analysis, the writer follows that classification pattern.

1. **Syntactic anaphora**

The anaphoric expressions which are bounded in a same sentence structure contained in *Mail Online* entitled: ‘*The next game is my next drug! Wenger speaks ahead of his landmark 1000\(^{th}\) game*’ can be seen as in the table below:

---

Table 2: Syntactic Anaphora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>DATA NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaphor</td>
<td>1, 3, 5, 6, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-expression</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Discourse anaphora

The writer also considers another situation of anaphoric types in term of its reference-antecedent location. Typically, antecedents come earlier in the sentences, but, in some condition, the references can precede it or even locate out of the core sentence. Gardelle names each of both patterns as cataphora and exophora.47

These are cataphoric and exophoric expressions which are chosen from the same article:

Table 3: Discourse Anaphora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>DATA NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cataphora</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exophora</td>
<td>2, 7, 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 Ibid.
However, the writer only picks data no. 12 as a sample of exophora while the others (anaphors, pronominals, r-expressions and cataphora) are holistically been described.

B. Data Analysis

As the main purpose of the research, the writer examines the syntactic relation between antecedents and references of anaphoric expressions which are extracted from Mail Online entitled: “The next game is my next drug! Wenger speaks ahead of his landmark 1000th game”.

Then, he examines those anaphoric options by applying Binding Theory of syntax. Whether the references are syntactically correct or not will be described by the principles that bind the system. There are three main binding principles:

A. An anaphors must be bound in its governing category.

B. A pronominal must be free in its governing category.

C. An R-expression must be free everywhere.48

He also uses tree diagram based on X-bar notion to picture out its formal relations as seen on the point A before. The analysis below is provided to show the application of binding theory of syntax and also to occur the effectiveness of its principles as stated in A, B, and C above.

1. Syntactic anaphora

Gardelle states that binding only covers pronouns in one sentence. Pronouns or references that bound within a sentence are considered as syntactic anaphora. Anaphors, pronominals, and R-expressions are among them.

a. Anaphors

Anaphors are anaphoric expressions with reciprocal pronouns as its main syntactic point. The writer will apply the binding theory of syntax and proves the effectiveness of its principles to each anaphors in the data below:

1) Data 1

“Arsene Wenger insists there is always reason to question himself...”

As been described before, binding theory of syntax (BT) insists that a reference should have an antecedent. It is bordered by the system that specialize syntactic relation within a sentence.

Furthermore, BT also offers some principles that help readers to be able how to refer a reference to the proper antecedent. So, here, the writer will try to prove the application of the theory to the data 1.

---

49 Gardelle, Loc.Cit.
The tree Diagram is one of the ways to comprehend syntactic relation which occurs in the sentence. The main reason why the writer uses X-bar tree Diagram is to get clearer command relation from the data (re: c-command condition). Since principle A requires **bound** condition where NP c-commands another NP. Then, the Diagram is the best line to get into the light. Let us take a look to the X-bar representation of this data:

Diagram 1

---

The Diagram shows us syntactic relation between word orders that occur in the sentence. However, since the pronoun here is *himself*, then the highlighted point of the data is its anaphor and antecedent.

We can see that reflexive *himself* (an NP) needs an antecedent to be correct (another NP). So, let us begin with the first notion of principle: The anaphor must be bounded in its governing category.51

As described in chapter II (page 19), *bound* in its governing category means that *himself* not only co-indexed with another NP in its governing category but also has command relation with that NP.

The first NP above *himself* is not co-index. Then, the top NP is the most convenient NP that co-indexes with *himself*. But, it is yet enough. To prove that *himself* is refer to NP-1 (Arsene Wenger) then NP-1 has to c-command *himself*. Since NP-1 is located on argument position52, then it c-commands all things in its right side include reflexive pronoun *himself*.

Consequently, NP-3 *himself* syntactically is allowed to refer to the NP-1. It is also shows us that the principle A of Binding is applicable and also effective to figure out antecedent-referent relation among this sentence.

51 Ibid.
2) Data 3

*The Frenchman* insists the desire to better *himself* burns as fierce as ever.

Data 3 has the same pattern with the data 1. In this sentence, the writer is going to explain how the choice of pronoun *himself* could be syntactically correct.

Since *himself* is an anaphor, then the principle A of Binding Theory is used to underlie patterns of the existing sentences and word choices are used.

It is said that the anaphor must be bound in its governing category.\(^{53}\) Thus, in the data 3 *himself* has to be bound to one of the NPs were available previously. Furthermore, the most likely option is NP that has an element of co-index with *himself*. As NP-2 *the desire* does not include co-index, NP-1 *The Frenchman* became the most grammatical option. However, the co-index alone is not enough. NP-1 must comply with another condition. NP-1 *The Frenchman* should c-command NP-3 *himself*. In this case, NP-1 c-commands NP-3 as can be seen in the following diagram:

---

As fierce as ever insists The Frenchman himself burns to the desire better himself IP_2 VP NP_2 I' VP V to V' IP_2 NP_2 I' VP V V' "Legend:

IP = Inflectional Phrase
NP = Noun Phrase
VP = Verb Phrase
AdvP = Adverbial Phrase
AdjP = Adjectival Phrase
CP = Complement Phrase
PP = Prepositional Phrase
Conj = Conjunction"
Because of NP-1 is located at the argument position\textsuperscript{54}, then NP-1 c-command s all that was next to his right and holds it down.

Therefore, since NP-1 *The Frenchman* fulfills the co-index and pre-requisites such as c-command, the NP-1 is the most appropriate antecedent of the anaphor *himself* that contained in data 3.

3) Data 5

You question yourself more.

Let us take a look to the Diagram first.

Legend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Inflectional Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdvP</td>
<td>Adverbal Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjP</td>
<td>Adjectival Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Complement Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{54} Subject or complement position, Black, *Loc.Cit.*
As known before, an anaphor based on the principle A of Binding Theory must be bound to another NP in the same sentence.\textsuperscript{55}

Data 5 has an anaphor \textit{yourself}. But, the main question is where does the pronoun refer to? According to Binding Theory, \textit{yourself} has to be tied to one of the NP which lies in the governing category of that sentence. In addition, as mentioned earlier, an anaphor that bound to another NP has to be co-index and have a clear command relation with that anaphor.

However, from exposure of X-bar Diagram above, we can see that there is only one NP that has the possibility to be bound by \textit{yourself}, it is pronoun \textit{you}. And it is also been understood that \textit{you} co-indexes \textit{yourself}; and \textit{you} c-commands \textit{yourself} as well. Because of that, \textit{you} is a syntactic reference of \textit{yourself}.

4) Data 6

\begin{quote}
\textit{Wenger}, though, does not intend to allow \textit{himself} much time for nostalgia.
\end{quote}

The fourth anaphor that the writer has found on the \textit{Mail Online} is – again – reciprocal \textit{himself}. Data 6, however,

\textsuperscript{55} Horrocks, \textit{Loc. Cit.}
identically has the same pattern with 1 and 3 data so that we can state that its analysis result will have the same equations with the analysis which exist in both.

However, the writer will give a different point of view from the previous analysis. This time he will try to examine the choice of *himself*. Is *himself* a correct option in accordance with the rules of syntax? Then, could *himself* be semantically correct too?

Let us examine from the syntax viewpoint first. To determine the accuracy of *himself* as a syntactic choice, then we have to study it based on syntax rules application. First, we must consider the position of the word *himself* (see Diagram 4 in the next page). It can be seen, *himself* lies in the object position, so that the choice of words that must be done has to fulfill the demands of that serves as the object.

From there we find that pronoun option in the object position falls on *him/her or himself/herself*. It might not be constructed by pronoun *he/she*. The reason why it is limited by *him/her or himself/herself* is that object position is only require those elements of pronouns while *he/she* is designed for the subject position.
Diagram 4

Legend:
- **IP** = Inflectional Phrase
- **NP** = Noun Phrase
- **VP** = Verb Phrase
- **AdvP** = Adverbial Phrase
- **AdjP** = Adjectival Phrase
- **CP** = Complement Phrase
- **PP** = Prepositional Phrase
- **Conj** = Conjunction
Furthermore, though we have got the most feasible syntax option, but what are the most appropriate choices? Him/her or himself/herself?

To answer this, the principle A Binding Theory can be devised as a consideration. It said that anaphors have to be bound in its governing category.\(^{56}\) The definition of bound itself have discussed previously; the element must meet the co-index and c-command condition.\(^{57}\)

The first condition is co-index. It is becoming a major requirement in the determination of an anaphor because this is the first condition that may indicate the main reference of an anaphor. From X-bar Diagram of the data 6, NP-1 Wenger is the only one that lies before NP-2 himself. It also directly demonstrates that NP-1 c-commands NP-2. In conclusion, the two conditions are met.

Nevertheless, because NP-1 Arsene Wenger is the proper name for a male, then to meet co-index condition the NP-2 must also be masculine. Thus, from the choices of him/her and himself/herself, we can eliminate her and herself so the recent option is him/himself.

To choose between him or himself, then the semantic study is needed. We must look at the meaning of the sentence

\(^{56}\) Ibid. \\
\(^{57}\) Ibid.
on the data 6. This sentence has meaning connection with the sentences before and afterwards so that the building of meaning contained in it also influenced by other sentences.

Contextually, this sentence is trying to describe a condition where a coach who has reached the 1,000 games trying to keep focus in every single match, even it means that he has to eliminate space in his mind to have fun or just to reminisce. Thus, it is understood that the sentence 6 is a reflexive one which also requires reflexive element in it. Anaphor is one of the reflexive elements in a sentence, and himself was anaphor. Therefore, it can be concluded that the choice of the most appropriate pronoun which semantically and syntactically allowed is the reflexive pronoun himself.

5) Data 11

The 23-year-old, who came up through the club’s youth ranks, cannot ever see himself leaving.

Data 11 has a similar characteristic with data 1, 3, 5, and 6. This is possible because the pattern which appears on that anaphora sentences are supported by the anaphor himself. Therefore, the analysis of the data that will be obtained from 11

---

58 The complete sentence is: “Wenger, though, does not intend to allow himself much time for nostalgia.” (line 18, Mail Online, March 20, 2014)
will have typical data with the analysis that has been mentioned previously.

However, as the previous data, it is known that the most logical reference is syntactically is NP-1 *The 23-year-old* who has fulfilled the conditions of co-index and c-command relations. However, there is little difference where NP pronominal *himself* refers to a category that is still unknown gender of the pronouns. In other words, the writer proposes that the choice of anaphor *himself* is probably wrong semantically if the result of discourse analysis of NP-1 *The 23-year-old* showed that it refers to another type instead of the masculine NP.

For that, we must look at other supporting sentences that build sentence meaning of data 11. It is known that the phrase "*The goalkeeper Wojciech Szczesny recently agreed a new long-term contract at Arsenal*" is a phrase that precede. In other words, it can be concluded that the NP-1 *The 23-year-old* has a semantic relation with a Goalkeeper named Wojciech Szczesny where he is a man.

---

59 Line 55-56 of the corpus (see appendix point B).
The 23-year-old

Legend:

IP = Inflectional Phrase
NP = Noun Phrase
VP = Verb Phrase
AdvP = Adverbial Phrase
AdjP = Adjectival Phrase
CP = Complement Phrase
PP = Prepositional Phrase
Conj = Conjunction

Diagram 5
Once we know the NP-1 refers to something or something that is masculine, then the anaphor of NP-1 must be the same. The choice is remain on *him* or *himself*. However, because this sentence is reflexive, then the reflexive pronoun must have been the most appropriate choice. Thus, the syntactic relation between antecedent and the appropriate references are acceptable in grammatical and semantic. Again, the principle A of Binding Theory provides us quite help.

b. Pronominals

1) Data 9

*He has recently appointed another former Arsenal player Steve Bould to assist him.*

Slightly different than the previous pronoun, data 9 shows the relationship between the syntactic and pronominal reference in one sentence. To find out, let us take a look at X-bar diagram from the following data:
It can be seen that NP-5 *him* has the possibility to be bound with one of the NPs were located previously. It may occur due to co-index elements are met between NP-1 *He* with NP-4 *Steve Bould*.

However, if you see the principle B then the pronominal must be free from bound condition.⁶⁰ This principle is important to be fulfilled because if not then NP-5 *him* could have tied with one of the pre-existing NPs. For example, if the NP-5 *him* bound with NP-4 *Steve Bould* then there is the ambiguity of meaning arising from syntactic relations that occur between them. If so, then the resulting meaning will be different from the original purpose of which is intended by *him* here is a person who employs another person to become assistant coach of Arsene Wenger not for assisting Steve Bould who is factually Arsene deputy.

In other words, the writer proposes that the principle B is very helpful in maintaining the sovereignty of the semantics construction of a sentence. Although basically NP-5 *him* can be freely refers to another NPs in the same sentence (for example, NP-1 *He* is very close to the condition of allowance for NP-5 *him* refer to it), but, conceptually it violates principle B which is effective to reduce the confusion that can be caused as a result of errors in the syntactic binding relations.

---

The second type of syntactic anaphora is pronominals. Unlike anaphor, pronominals or pronouns can have antecedent in the same sentence, or may also not. Horrocks stated that pronominals are NPs that lack specific lexical content and have only the features person, number, and gender. However, Gardelle added that although it might be bound outside its local domain, pronominals has to be free from their local domain.

Chomsky through principle B Binding Theory offers another rule that can explain the syntactic relationships between NPs in a same sentence. The principle states that pronominals must not be bound in its governing category.

The statement indicates the existence of freedom of a pronominal reference. However, even then the principle gave rise to different interpretations. First, the meaning must not be bound is pronominal must be free from any NP. Second, must not be bounded not mean that pronouns are not tied to an NP only, the antecedent of the pronouns may be the same or may be located in different sentences.

Thus, the condition of co-index and c-command that applies the principle of A should not

---

64 As stated by Gardelle, Op.Cit., p.27., whom concludes that pronominals must be free in its governing category even they could be bound outside the governing category.
apply in principle B. Therefore, in principle it is important to understand what part is the governing category.

Diagram 7

Legend:
- IP = Inflectional Phrase
- NP = Noun Phrase
- VP = Verb Phrase
- AdvP = Adverbial Phrase
- AdjP = Adjectival Phrase
- CP = Complement Phrase
- PP = Prepositional
- spoken
- have not
On data 10 *him* is pronoun that must not be bound in its governing category. Although NP-1 *I* c-commands the NP-2 *him*, however, NP-1 does not co-index with NP-2. In other words, *I* was not the antecedent of *him*, because *I* do not co-index with it.

From the data analysis of data above, the principle B proved to be effective and can be applied to describe the quality of the relationship between pronouns with their antecedents.

c. **R-expressions**

Data 8:

*The 40-year-old, who is training at Arsenal’s Hertfordshire base to maintain fitness levels, would view the opportunity to work alongside Wenger once again as a dream.*

The next domain of syntactic anaphora is referential expressions. Data 8 is one example of the R-expression that the writer got from the *Mail Online* article Entitled: "*The next game is my next drug! Wenger speaks ahead of his landmark 1000th game* ".

There are anaphoric elements contained in the sentence. NP-1 *The 40-year-old* must necessarily refer to something or someone, so it does not cause confusion in the meaning. Similarly, other NPs contained in the sentence. In this case,
NP-5 Wenger is a proper name that refers to a man who works as a manager of a club in the English Premier League. But, whether NP-1 The 40-year-old and NP-5 Wenger are connected to the similar purpose? Principle C of the binding provides a rule that applies to conditions such as sentence in data 8.
The 40-year-old Arsenal Hertfordshire base is training alongside his former manager Wenger to maintain fitness levels as he would view the opportunity to work alongside a dream again.

Legend:
- **IP** = Inflectional Phrase
- **NP** = Noun Phrase
- **VP** = Verb Phrase
- **AdvP** = Adverbial Phrase
- **AdjP** = Adjectival Phrase
- **CP** = Complement Phrase
- **PP** = Prepositional Phrase
- **Conj** = Conjunction
Principle C binding states that R-expressions must be free of any element in its governing category.\(^{65}\) Thus, the R-expressions contained in the data do not refer to any NPs in the sentence structure. In other words, NP-1 *The 40-year-old* and NP-5 *him* not bound to each other and refer to two different things. To find the main reference of the NP-1 we can do discourse analysis in the previous sentence stating "Former France international Robert Pires was part of Wenger's all-conquering 'Invincibles' team won the 2003-04 league roommates title undefeated."\(^{66}\) It is understood that the NP-1 refers to a *Former France international* [player, whose name is] *Robert Pires*. It was also confirmed by the complement phrase (CP) contained in 8 "*who is training at Arsenal's Hertfordshire base to maintain fitness levels.*" Thus, NP-1 is not antecedent of NP-5 and NP-5 refers to different NP with NP-1. From these examples, it can be seen the effectiveness and implantable of principle C of binding system.

2. Discourse anaphora

    a. Cataphora

    ```
    You learn more the most in the biggest games when the pressure is there, when the talent is against you and when the pace of the game is at the top, top level.
    ```

\(^{65}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{66}\) Line 32 of corpus (see appendix).
The next question that arises is whether the binding principle can be applied in other anaphoric pattern?

As expressed by Gardelle, besides syntactic anaphora, there are also Cataphora which references precede the antecedent, and Exophora which have references outside the sentence structure or be domain as discourse anaphora.\(^\text{67}\)

Previously, the writer has tested the binding principles to the normal anaphoric expressions, here, he wants to test those principles to the cataphoric expression which he has found on the Mail Online article Entitled: "The next game is my next drug! Wenger speaks ahead of his landmark 1000\(^{\text{th}}\) game."

As Anaphora and Cataphora differ only to the position of the antecedent, both phenomena have been grouped together by Halliday & Hasan under the umbrella term Endophora, having characterized as an antecedent within the text.\(^\text{68}\) Because of that similarity, it should be binding principles that can effect on anaphora also can be applied into cataphoric pattern.

Principle A: It was explicitly stated that the anaphor must be bound by the governing category of the structure of the main sentence.\(^\text{69}\) From the point A can be understood that the principle applies only to the pattern of reciprocal sentence anaphora.

---

\(^\text{68}\) In Ibid, p.31.
Meanwhile, if the antecedent position is transformed to the anaphor, then there is ungrammatical sentence like the following example:

\[ (15) \]

\( \begin{align*} 
& \text{a. Billy smiled to himself} \\
& \text{b. *Himself smiled to Bruce}^{70} 
\end{align*} \)

Thus, it can be said that principle A cannot be applied into Cataphora.

In other term, the principle B suggests that pronouns or pronominals must not be bound in their governing category.\(^{71}\) Anaphor may not be constructed into Cataphora, but pronouns are able to place either before or after antecedent. For example:

\[ (16) \]

\( \begin{align*} 
& \text{a. When Jane came to the house, John was not in there as he went to the gym.} \\
& \text{b. When Jane came to the house, He was not in there as John went to the gym.} 
\end{align*} \)

What the writer is trying to express is that principle B may still be used to describe the syntactic patterns that occur in the cataphoric expression. Because, on the basis of general principle it states that pronouns must be free on its governing category. Thus, a pronoun which is located after or before antecedent is a domain of principle B.

---

\(^{70}\) The asterisk (*) shows ungrammatical

\(^{71}\) Horrocks, *Loc.Cit.*
Data 4 shows the only Cataphora that contained in the *Mail Online* article. Pronoun *there* precedes the antecedent of its meaning interpretation. Referring to the binding principle B, the pronoun is actually not tied specifically to one unit of the sentence.\(^72\) However, by doing discursive study, it found that the pronoun *there* must have other supporting sentences that define its meaning unless it will be meaningless dummy pronoun. So that, *there* must has its own antecedent which in data 4 structurally located after it. To be considered, the clause *when the talent is against you and when the pace of the game is at the top, top level is located after there*. Syntactically, it is its antecedent which also semantically acts properly as an interpretation of pronoun *there*.

Diagram 9

Legend:
- IP = Inflectional Phrase
- NP = Noun Phrase
- VP = Verb Phrase
- AdvP = Adverbial Phrase
- AdjP = Adjectival Phrase
- CP = Complement Phrase
- PP = Prepositional Phrase
- Conj = Conjunction

...
b. Exophora

To explore the Exophoric patterns, the writer picks a sample of it by determining data 12 below:

*I feel attached to the club…*

Exophora is another variation from normal anaphora. But, to gain its reference a reader needs some discourse ability to get a clearer purpose and meaning of this sentence pattern. Therefore, the relationship between the antecedent and referent in Exophoric pattern that occurs in this expression is outside the main structure of the sentence.

In sample data 12, NP the club must necessarily refer to someone or something. When we try to refer the phrase to other word entities contained in the sentence structure, somehow, we will have trouble. It happens because there is no single word or phrases that can meet the elements of co-index that relates to the NP the club.

However, is the binding principle able to provide a solution? Unfortunately, we probably will be disappointed. Again. The reason is binding principle cannot demonstrate the certainty which unit is referred to NP the club. Binding principle can only
basically explain that a referential expression such NP above is should be free of any unit.\footnote{Lasnik and Uriagereka, \textit{Op.Cit.}, p.39.}

Diagram 10

Legend:

- **IP** = Inflectional Phrase
- **NP** = Noun Phrase
- **VP** = Verb Phrase
- **AdvP** = Adverbial Phrase
- **AdjP** = Adjectival Phrase
- **CP** = Complement Phrase
- **PP** = Prepositional Phrase
- **Conj** = Conjunction
Consequently, the reference of NP *the club* is freely not bound by words or other NPs in that sentence structure. However, semantically, this NP has to be tied to one of the NPs which are bound inside or outside it. Through a discourse comparison, it is able to be understood that the NP *the club* is a personification of NP *Arsenal* in line 2 of the article.\(^{74}\)

Fundamentally, the principle, particularly principle C of binding, is capable to reveal the nature of R-expression contained in exophoric sentence. However, on the term of Exophora, the principles of binding have failed to demonstrate the precise relation between antecedent and its reference. Since it is an inter-sentential relation then it requires other instruments to be successfully meaningful.

Nevertheless, analyzing process that occurs in data 12 is applicable and typically similar with the other exophoric sentences which contained in the corpus.

The rest data 2 and 7 also show us that referencing process in exophoric patterns is done outside of the core sentence structure. NP *The 64-year-old* and NP *the personal landmark* from 2.1 (line 3 of the article) refers to preceding text in line 1-2 as *Arsene Wenger* and *competing 1,000 games in charge of Arsenal* are the antecedents of both respectively.

\(^{74}\) It shows that the NP *the club* is likely to refer to precede context. From discourse, NP *Arsenal* in line 2 ("...of competing 1,000 game in charge of Arsenal") is the strongest reference argument that NP *the club* refers to, syntactically and semantically as well.
NP *a club of this dimension* from data 7 also identically has a same referring chain with line 2 where NP *Arsenal* is its antecedent.

Similarly, NP *The 60-year-old Frenchman* from data 2 refers to *Arsene Wenger* which has been mentioned on the lines before and syntactically is outside of the main structure.

To conclude, it is important to do a discourse on the whole corpus text in order to get clearer referent-antecedent relation. Not only syntactically allows but also semantically as well. In the term of Binding principles, it fails to give strict solution in that exophoric referring chain. However, the principle C says that r-expressions must be free everywhere.75

The tenet, somehow, proves that Chomsky is right though to gain proper antecedent-referent in an Exophora is need another instrument in discourse.

---

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusions

For such a long time, people believe that language is a pure science and also tried to extract its form into universal formulae. Binding Theory of syntax is a system that helps people to be able to draw out the science of language becomes more scientific. However, anaphoric expressions provide some syntactic problems where are empiric solutions needed. Binding Theory is offering ways to crack out syntactic cases in anaphoric expressions into several valid data. So, people can do analysis scientifically and precisely.

From the research that has been carried which is aimed to examine the binding principles application to one of the Mail Online articles entitled: “The next game is my next drug! Wenger speaks ahead of his landmark 1000th game”, the writer finds that there are several types of sentences structure herein that follow the pattern of Anaphora, Cataphora and Exophora. Then, through the exposure of X-bar tree representation, he obtains clearer description of the syntactic chain relations that occur on the patterns of the sentences.

The research indicates suitability between Binding Theory and its application through binding principles in Anaphora patterns. It happens because of reference variety of anaphora sentences – includes anaphor,
pronouns, and r-expressions – are specifically regulated by the principles A, B, and C of binding.

However, when testing the applicable of binding principles against two other patterns, the writer faces some resistances among sentences. Particularly, for the binding principle A as an anaphor cannot be transformed to precede the antecedent and it must necessarily have an antecedent on the same sentence structure.

Furthermore, the principle of B and C respectively can be applied to Cataphora and Exophora. However, both principles fail to demonstrate syntactic relations that occur between antecedences and references of each of these patterns specifically. Instead, the writer requires further study through discourse and semantic meaning relation analysis to obtain appropriate reference of pronouns which situated at the corpus.

**B. Suggestion**

Binding theory of syntax is just a small part of larger syntax construction. The application of binding becomes crucial for understanding the syntactic relation within a sentence. Even so, there are several things to be considered before claiming that these principles can be used massively.

First, binding theory is a system that constructed under Generative Grammar context. This theory has not proven its validity when applied to the other grammatical approach – Functional Grammar – for example.
Second, it should be emphasized that the principle application only capable to analyze syntactic chain which occurs in a same sentence structure. If the principle was applied to different type sentence patterns that syntactically have different reference in another sentence, the principles are non-applicable and likely to fail. From that, further study is required to cover those problems.

However, the system have given some fundamental things by its B and C principles as it could be a general benchmark of referring pronouns and referential expressions that apply to various sentences.

Finally, the writer recognizes that further study in this subject has to be held in order to be able to understand generative syntax and the grammar of English in general. Various research innovations that are not restricted by certain linguistic perspectives are needed. It becomes a necessity to bring us to the next level of language comprehension. With the openness and understanding between research components (particularly between student and lecturer) on this strata level, we will have futuristic, innovative, and boast study. To conclude, the writer expects appreciation through criticisms and suggestions from parties. Hopefully, this research can benefit us all.
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Arsene Wenger insists there is always reason to question himself and look for improvement, even though he stands on the verge of completing 1,000 games in charge of Arsenal.

The 64-year-old Frenchman, appointed in late September 1996, will reach the personal landmark at Chelsea on Saturday lunchtime, when the Gunners will be out to close up to within a point of the Barclays Premier League leaders.

Wenger has seen and done it all since arriving at Highbury as a relative unknown coach some 17 seasons ago, but the Frenchman insists the desire to better himself burns as fierce as ever.

'You learn from every game,' Wenger said on Arsenal Player.

'You learn more from the lost games than the games won. Certainly because you go into deeper analysis, you question yourself more, you question the players more and you learn basically the most from the higher the level goes up, the more you see the limitations of your team and your players.

'You learn the most in the biggest games when the pressure is there, when the talent is against you and when the pace of the game is at the top, top level. This is where you learn.'

There is genuine belief 2014 could finally be the year Arsenal are able to end their trophy drought, which is now fast approaching a decade, with an FA Cup semi-final against Wigan next month.
Wenger, though, does not intend to allow himself much time for nostalgia, with a special presentation understood to be planned for training on Friday as he aims to keep Arsenal in the title hunt.

'It makes you feel 'where did the time go?'. It looks to me like I started yesterday, I can't believe it is such a long time,' the Gunners boss said.

'Why? Because you're always focused on looking forward to the next game and when you look back you think 'I made quite a distance there'.

'Despite that, your only interest is the next game, our drug is the next game, the hope for the next game, the desire to win the next one. You go step by step and finally when you look back it's a long time.

'I would just like to say for me it's an honour to manage a club of this dimension for such a long time, and I would like to thank everybody who is involved in the club for giving me such a confidence for such a long time.'

Former France international Robert Pires was part of Wenger's all-conquering 'Invincibles' team which won the 2003/04 league title undefeated.

The 40-year-old, who is training at Arsenal's Hertfordshire base to maintain fitness levels, would view the opportunity to work alongside Wenger once again as 'a dream'.

Speaking to IBTimes UK, Pires said: 'I have not spoken to him about that because he has recently appointed another former Arsenal player Steve Bould to assist him, but for me it would be great.

'Coaching with Wenger is a good opportunity to learn. In the future you never know.'

Wenger's contract is set to expire in the summer, and although the Arsenal board are understood to remain relaxed about the situation, there has as yet been no confirmation either way of the manager's intentions.

Nevertheless, Arsenal have continued to sign up key men on new deals, with midfielders Aaron Ramsey and Santi Cazorla the latest to put pen to paper.

Goalkeeper Wojciech Szczesny recently agreed a new long-term contract at Arsenal.
The 23-year-old, who came up through the club's youth ranks, cannot ever see himself leaving - and would fight for the gloves ahead of any reported summer interest in Real Madrid goalkeeper Iker Casillas.

Szczesny said to Polish newspaper Przegląd Sportowy: 'If they give me a contract to the end of my career, I would sign it without any hesitation.

'I feel attached to the club and the coach who has given me a chance.

'I will play at Arsenal as long as am wanted here. I am not afraid to fight for number one with anyone: (Arsenal number two) (Lukasz) Fabianski or Casillas.

'I hope I won't make the boss think, 'Wojciech's not number one'.

'It is all in my hands. I am in the best form of my life.'
Wenger, who has come under increasing pressure in recent weeks, has scored 200 wins at the age of 56. He is still looking to better himself.

Wenger’s tactical and psychological prowess has been tested in recent weeks, but he has shown a resilience and strength of character that has made him a legend in the game.

Wenger’s name is synonymous with success at Arsenal, and his legacy is secure. He has won numerous domestic and European titles, and his influence on the club and the game as a whole cannot be overstated.

Wenger is widely regarded as one of the greatest managers in football history, and his impact on the game will be felt for years to come.
Wenger holds up a copy of the Gunners magazine bearing his portrait whilst meeting the media.

New blood: Wenger brought plenty of talented players including Emmanuel Petit (L) and Marc Overmars (C).
I would just like to say for me it's an honour to manage a club of this dimension for such a long time, and I would like to thank everybody who is involved in the club for giving me such a confidence for such a long time.

Former France international Robert Pires was part of Wenger's all-conquering 'invincibles' team which won the 2003-04 league title undefeated.

The Frenchman, who is training at Arsenal's Wokingham base to maintain fitness levels, would relish the opportunity to work alongside Wenger once again as 'a dream'.

Speaking to IBTimes UK, Pires said: 'I have not spoken to him about that because he has recently appointed another former Arsenal player Steve Bould to assist him, but for me it would be great. Coaching with Wenger is a good opportunity to learn. In the future you never know.'

Wenger brought in a number of European players to Arsenal including Robert Pires and Lee Dixon.
Champion Arsenal finals the Premier League for the second time in the 2001-2002 season.

Wenger's contract is set to expire in the summer, and although the Arsenal board is understood to remain indignant about the situation, there has as yet been no confirmation either way of the manager's intentions.

Nonetheless, Arsenal have continued to sign key men on new deals, with midfielders Aaron Ramsey and Samir Nasri the latest to put pen to paper.

Goalkeeper Wojciech Szczesny recently agreed a new long-term contract at Arsenal.

The 23-year-old, who came up through the club's youth ranks, cannot see himself leaving - and would fight to the hilt for the gloves ahead of any reported summer interest in Real Madrid goalkeeper Iker Casillas.

Szczesny's impressive form this season has put Arsenal in hunt for the Premier League title.

Szczesny's said to Polish newspaper Prasowe Biuro, 'If they give me a contract to the end of my career, I would sign it without hesitation.

'I feel attached to the club and the coach who has given me a chance.

'I will stay at Arsenal as long as I am wanted here. I am not afraid to fight for number one with anyone' (Arsenal number two Gabriel Paulista or Casillas).

'I hope I won't make the boss think, Wojciech's not number one.

'It is all in my hands. I am in the best form of my life.'