

Locality rules out variable binding in coreference resolution

Jens Roeser (Nottingham Trent University), Evgeniya Shipova, Shravan Vasishth & Malte Zimmermann (University of Potsdam)

jens.roeser2014@my.ntu.ac.uk

Introduction: Two mechanisms are assumed in pronoun interpretation (e.g., Grodzinsky and Reinhart, 1993): *Variable binding* is employed for c-commanding referents, the matrix subject in (2); *coreference* applies for non c-commanding referents, the NP in the relative clause in (2). In Primitives of Binding (POB) (Reuland, 2001) syntax/semantic variable binding is claimed to require less processing costs than discourse-based coreference (Runner and Head, 2014). Conversely, Cunnings et al. (2014) proposed that the linearly most recent NP is preferred in pronoun interpretation. We set out to investigate whether recency or interpretive mechanism influences the interpretation of the structurally ambiguous German possessive *seinen* ‘his’ as in (2). Contexts (1) are used to introduce the possessed element (e.g., *Vater* ‘father’ in (2)) of either *Fritz* in (1-a) or both *Fritz* and *Ernst* in (1-b) leaving the pronoun reference in (2) ambiguous. Antecedents were presented in two positions (2). In a disambiguating context (1-a), the pronoun requires coreference for the non c-commanding referent (2-a) but variable binding for the matrix subject (2-b).

- (1) a. ... Fritzs Vater wird bei Ausfällen in der Regel angerufen.
Fritz’s father will be in cancellation usually called
b. ... Fritz und Ernst müssen ihre Väter anrufen.
Fritz and Ernst must their fathers call
- (2) a. ... hatte Ernst_i, den Fritz_j eigentlich kennt, unverzüglich **seinen**_{i/j} Vater per Handy angerufen.
has Ernst who Fritz actually knows immediately **his** father by cell phone called
b. ... hatte Fritz_i, den Ernst_j eigentlich kennt, unverzüglich **seinen**_{i/j} Vater per Handy angerufen.
has Fritz who Ernst actually knows immediately **his** father by cell phone called

If coreference is more costly than variable binding as predicted by POB (Reuland, 2001), more processing difficulty is expected for the pronoun in (2-a) than for the pronoun in (2-b) in an unambiguous context. In contrast NP recency (Cunnings et al., 2014) predicts processing facilitation in (2-a) for a coreference interpretation compared to variable binding in (2-b).

Method: Contexts (1) and sentences in self-paced reading (2) (n=24) were presented to German natives (n=60). Questions targeting the pronoun interpretation were asked. In ambiguous contexts, the matrix subject was labelled as “correct” referent. Four Latin square lists included 36 randomly interspersed fillers.

Results: Lower accuracies were observed for (2-b) vs (2-a) in unambiguous contexts (Fig. 1). In the pronoun region, ambiguous contexts revealed significantly longer reading times (RTs) than unambiguous contexts. For the possessed noun region, shorter RTs were found in (2-a) vs (2-b) for unambiguous contexts and longer RTs in (2-a) vs (2-b) for ambiguous contexts (Fig. 2).




Fig. 1: Question response accuracy (with 95% CIs)




Fig. 2: RT in possessed noun region (with 95% CIs)

Discussion: Recency facilitation in unambiguous contexts was seen in response accuracy and RTs. The ambiguity effect shows that both antecedents were considered for the dependency computation. These results show processing advantage for more recent NPs in pronoun resolution and suggest that variable binders have no precedence over coreferent NPs during on-line processing.