

# Complex Anaphors in Discourse

Manfred Consten and Mareile Knees

DFG-Projekt: "KomplexTex"
Institut für Germanistische Sprachwissenschaft
Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena

#### seit 1556

### 1. Definition

. . .

Complex anaphors are nominal expressions referring to propositional structured referents while introducing them as unified entities into a discourse.

(1) Young drivers usually drive too fast. <u>This</u> / <u>this state</u> / <u>this fact</u> / <u>this image</u>

#### 2. Ontological Types of Referents degree of ontological abstractness category proposition pp high fact <sub>f</sub> [ dependent on world] state<sub>s</sub> [-dynamic, -telic / dependent on world and time] [+dynamic, -telic] process <sub>p</sub> low event<sub>e</sub> [+dynamic, +telic] (fig. 1)

3.1 Types of Complexation

Antecedent	Maintenance by lexical anaphors	Maintenance by neutral	Ontology-changing complexation	
	$\mathbf{z_x} \approx \mathbf{x}$	anaphors z <sub>neutral</sub> ≈ x	$\mathbf{z_x} \approx \mathbf{y}$	
[The Jacob-Sisters' dogs resemble each other as much as their owners.] <sub>s</sub>	Insiders assume that [this resemblance] <sub>s</sub> is the reason for their success.	Insiders assume that [this] <sub>n</sub> is the reason for their success.	Insiders assume that [this fact] <sub>f</sub> is the reason for their success.	
<pre>  <it> is indisputable, that [the amount of jobs decreases, while the importance of the service sector is growing at the same time]<sub>p.</sub></it></pre>	[This process] <sub>p</sub> hasn't finished yet.	yet.	[This insight] <sub>f</sub> / [This misbelief] <sub>negf</sub> / [This assumption] <sub>pp</sub> determined economical sciences of the 20 <sup>th</sup> century.	
[The Americans tried to invade the building but were forced back by shots from the top floor.] <sub>e</sub>	Two soldiers were injured during [this action] <sub>e</sub> , one inside the house and the other one outside the house.	[This] <sub>n</sub> happened yesterday while Mr. Rumsfeld visited Bagdad.	[This fact] proves that the situation isn't under control yet.	

## 3.2 Constraints on Ontology Changing Complexation

(2)  $*z_v \approx x \text{ if } x > y$ 

("if x is higher on abstractness scale than y")

Anaphorical complexation can shift referents of any ontological type to a discourse entity of either the same ontological type or an ontological type that is more abstract. Thus, anaphorical complexa-tion can be a process of increasing abstractness (in terms of fig. 1).

[This process]<sub>p</sub> will presumably last for 7·10<sup>9</sup> years.

[This state]<sub>s</sub> will presumably last for 7·10<sup>9</sup> years.

[This fact]<sub>f</sub> is well known since the Middle Ages.

Researchers of the Vatican were not allowed to examine

[this possibility]<sub>pp</sub> / \*[This event]<sub>e</sub>...

# 4. Resolution and Disambiguation

The 'abstractness constraint' (2) can serve to explain ontological based resolution of ambiguous complex anaphors.

- (4) [Gerhard Schröder assured that [Railway Manager Mehdorn is a competent man]<sub>s</sub>]<sub>e</sub>.
- (a) [This act of lying]<sub>e</sub> distressed the Opposition. /
- (b) [This testimonial]<sub>s</sub> distressed the Opposition.

(fig. 2: resolution model)

### 5. Textual function

Once the complex referent is established as a unified discourse entity by a complex anaphor, the discourse entity is accessible by personal pronouns (as *it* in the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence), whereas the use of personal pronouns in the Vorfeld as a complex anaphor (as *it* in the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence) is restricted (cf. Hegarty 2003):

(5) [The earth turns about the sun.]<sub>p</sub> [This process]<sub>p</sub> / [This]<sub>n</sub> / \*[It] will presumably last for 7·10<sup>9</sup> years. [It] might, however, terminate a few years earlier.

	T	1	T
discourse	W X Y	W X Y	W XY E1
level	<b>▲ ★</b>		<b>A</b>
text semantic level	establish Schröder (w) e1 – assure (w, s1)  Mehdorn (x) – – –  s1 – competent man (x)  act-of-lying (z <sub>e</sub> )  e2 – distress (y, z <sub>e</sub> )  Opposition (y)	$z_e \approx e1$ (re)active e1 (* $z_e \approx s1$ )	establishes   Z <sub>e</sub>
phase	1	2	3

### nominal referents on text semantic level e1. s1. complex referents on text semantic level indicated as "event", "state" etc. $Z_e, Z_s$ : anaphors indicated as "event", "state" etc. W, X: nominal discourse entity established in discourse level **E**, **S**: complex discourse

entity indicated as

"event", "state" etc.,

established in dis-

course level

Legend: