

Indirekte Anaphern als Kohärenzerscheinungen mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die indirekten pronominalen Anaphern

Haase Zsófia

The dissertation studies indirect anaphors as a spoken language phenomenon in German, with special respect to indirect pronominal anaphors. Pronouns referring to implicit referents have been subject to linguistic research (Postal 1969; Ward et al. 1991 Schwarz 2000, Erkü & Gundel 1987; Sanford et al. 1983; Yule 1982; Greene et al. 1994), however, **the conditions under which pronouns can be used as indirect anaphors (general fundamental question=GFQ)**, have not satisfactorily been clarified for a long time. Cornish et al. (2005) contributed to the debate on the ability of pronouns to refer to implicit referents in carrying out two reading-time experiments in French and English with the help of which the following general hypothesis was supposed to be tested: A non-subject pronoun can felicitously retrieve an implicit referent without increasing processing cost on the condition that it is "nuclear" and not "peripheral" in terms of the situation which is evoked. The results of the experiment confirmed their hypothesis. The research documented in the dissertation is based on the predictions and results of Cornish et al. (2005). Since the experiment using English language material replicated the results of the experiment using French language material, it can be suggested that reference centrality was conceptual and not purely linguistic in nature. Supposing that reference centrality applies to German, too, I tested the following hypothesis with the help of online-questionnaires using dialogues: **A non-subject pronoun can felicitously retrieve an implicit referent without native speaker grammaticality judgments turning out negative – but only on the condition that it is "nuclear" and not "peripheral" in terms of the situation which is evoked.** The present work also aims at presenting grammaticality judgments as insightful sources of information in linguistic theory.

On the basis of my theoretical investigations I draw the conclusion that the non-clarification of the GFQ can be explained with two reasons: Firstly, the notion of so called *anaphoric islands* (Postal 1969), which are supposed to be blocking the use of indirect pronominal anaphors, has constantly been reinterpreted in research (s. Postal (1969), Ward et al. (1991) and Schwarz (2000)). Secondly, there are discrepancies between empirical findings (Erkü & Gundel (1987) and Sanford et al. (1983) (based on Sanford & Garrod (1981)); Yule (1979, 1982) and Cornish et al. (2005)). Finally, I claim that it is the work of Cornish et al. (2005) that substantially contributed to the clarification of the GFQ.

The statistically evaluated results of my empirical investigations (based on the work of Cornish et al. (2005)) confirm the above mentioned hypothesis, however, in a weaker form than expected. The insights gained by the results of the doctoral dissertation are the following: Firstly, it was proved that indirect pronominal anaphors can be regarded as accepted and widely used coherence (and not cohesion) phenomena in German as well. Secondly, it was confirmed that the use of indirect pronominal anaphors is basically determined (in German as well) by explicitness and centrality of the referent (Cornish et al. (2005)) (even if other factors may also play a role), thus showing that reference centrality is indeed conceptual and not purely linguistic in nature. Thirdly, the research is also a proof of grammaticality judgments being insightful sources of information in linguistic theory.

Literature

- CORNISH, F. & GARNHAM, A. & COWLES, H. W. & FOSSARD, M. and ANDRÉ, V. 2005. Indirect anaphora in English and French: A cross-linguistic study of pronoun resolution. In: *Journal of Memory and Language* 52(3): 363-376.
- ERKÜ, F. & GUNDEL, J. 1987. The pragmatics of indirect anaphors. In: Verschueren, J. & Bertuccelli-Papi, M. (eds.). *The Pragmatic Perspective. Selected papers from the 1985 International Pragmatics Conference*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 533–545.
- GREENE, S. B. & GERRIG, R. & MCKOON, G. & RATCLIFF, R. 1994. Unheralded pronouns and management by common ground. In: *Journal of Memory and Language* 33, 511-526.
- POSTAL, P. 1969. Anaphoric islands. In: *Chicago Linguistic Society* 5, 205-39.
- SANFORD, A.J. & GARROD, S.C. 1981. *Understanding written language*. Chichester: Wiley and Sons.
- SANFORD, A. J. & GARROD, S. & LUCAS, A., & HENDERSON, R. 1983. Pronouns without explicit antecedents. In: *Journal of Semantics* 2, 303-318.
- SCHWARZ, M. 2000. *Indirekte Anaphern in Texten. Studien zur domänengebundenen Kohärenz und Referenz im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer (=Linguistische Arbeiten 413).
- WARD, G. & SPROAT, R. & MCKOON, G. 1991. A pragmatic analysis of so called anaphoric islands. In: *Language* 67(3), 439–474.
- <http://www.ling.northwestern.edu/~ward/Language91.pdf> [2012.01.10.]
- YULE, G. 1979. Pragmatically controlled anaphora. In: *Lingua* 49, 127-135.
- YULE, G. 1982. Interpreting anaphora without identifying reference. In: *Journal of Semantics*, 1(4), 315-322.