

**Two systems of anaphorically used pronouns in plain text and in reported speech:  
*der/die* and its counterparts in spoken German**

Mi 17.30 – 18.00

In my paper, the system of German pronouns in anaphoric function is examined. The paper focuses on the *der/die-type pronouns* (henceforth : ‘d-pronouns’) and their two main counterparts, the *er/sie* (‘s-pronouns’) and the clitic pronouns *-□-s(↔)* (‘k-pronouns’). Since the study is based on spontaneous spoken German, the picture is somewhat different from that of written standard German, where only two (*der/die* vs. *er/sie*) instead of three pronoun paradigms have to be taken into account. The corpus I am relying upon comprises of approximately 10.000 words of dialectal speech from south-eastern Germany (cf. Geyer 2003). Even though this is not a very extensive corpus, the high rate of occurrence of pronouns in anaphoric use allows both a detailed functional analysis as well as a sound interpretation of frequency data. A quite unexpected result of the analysis is that it is the s-pronouns, i.e. the classical anaphors, which are rarely found. Both d- and k-pronouns, on the contrary, are frequently used items. They are distributed according to conditions of information structure: d-pronouns serve to establish ‘accessible’ (in terms of Lambrecht 1994) referents as new discourse topics whereas k-pronouns serve the function to continue already established topical referents in the subsequent discourse.

An important extension is that the system of pronoun usage is organized in a considerably different way as far as reported speech is concerned. Somewhat oversimplified, the difference is along these lines: Whereas the status of discourse topicality of referents is operating as the guiding principle in plain texts, in reported speech constructions it is the question of coreference (or disjoint reference) of reporting and reported speaker which is the key factor. k-pronouns generally allow both, coreference and disjoint reference (largely comparable to standard German *er/sie*) here. s-pronouns once again prove to be dependent on special conditions (how far s-pronouns show traits of logophoricity will be a point of discussion here). d-pronouns referring to the reported speaker, if occurring in the reported speech sequence, force disjoint reference of reporting and reported speaker (cf. also Delisle 1993). But within reported speech, d-pronouns of this kind do not make any implications on information structure and topicality.

Delisle, H. (1993). Anaphora in German discourse: an empirical study. In: Eid, M. & G. Iverson (eds.): Principles and prediction: the analysis of natural language. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins. 243-268.

Geyer, K. (2003). Hetzlerisch: Dokumentation spontansprachlicher Texte und grammatische Analyse der phorischen Pronomina im ostfränkischen Dialekt des Dorfes Hetzles. München: Lincom Europa.

Lambrecht, K. (1994). Information structure and sentence form: topic, focus and the mental representation of discourse referents. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.