Isolated non-canonical object-before-subject (OS) sentences usually cause comprehension difficulties compared to canonical sentences with a subject-before-object (SO) structure. As theories of discourse structure have shown, non-canonical structures are only licensed under certain discourse conditions. We investigated whether given objects - given either by identity or set-membership - ease the processing of German OS sentences. Results from a self-paced-reading study show that both discourse relations eliminate processing difficulties for non-canonical sentences. Their overall processing pattern does not differ from their canonical counterparts (apart from influences caused by divergent lexical items).

1 Introduction
Non-canonical sentences, such as active object-before-subject (OS) clauses in German, usually cause processing difficulties during online comprehension compared to canonical sentences with an active subject-before-object (SO) structure. This pattern has been detected in several languages for isolated sentences (e.g., Bader & Meng, 1999 for locally ambiguous structures in German; Hyönä & Hujanen, 1997 for unambiguous sentences in Finnish). It is well-known, however, that the occurrence of non-canonical structures must be motivated by discourse-pragmatic conditions. Theories of discourse structure (e.g., Birner & Ward, 1998; Lambrecht, 1996; Prince, 1981) highlight givenness – already being introduced via the previous discourse – and partially ordered set relations (poset) – standing in a poset relation to a referent already mentioned in the previous discourse (see (1) for a set/subset relation) – as some of the central factors in the licensing of non-canonical word order.

(1) We don’t get involved in all murders, but this one we thought we’d take a look at. ["ABC World News Tonight"; taken from Birner & Ward, 1998, p. 220]

In line with these theories, there is psycho- and neurolinguistic evidence that supportive contexts, when contrasted with unsupportive ones, indeed attenuate processing difficulties for non-canonical sentences (e.g., Burmester, Spalek, & Wartenburger, 2014; Gattei, París, & Shalom, 2021; Kaiser & Trueswell, 2004; Schumacher & Hung, 2012). For German, Speyer (2005) found that a general preference to fill the sentence-initial position in German with the topic (the backward looking center) is usually overridden when the sentence contains an element standing in a poset relation to the preceding context, because this element then occupies the initial position. Furthermore, Weskott, Hönnig, Fanselow, and Kliegl (2011) found in a self-paced reading study that possible comprehension disadvantages for non-canonical object-subject (OS) in comparison to canonical subject-object (SO) sentences disappear and can even be turned into processing advantages when the object stands in a poset relation to the context. The question whether an identity relation also alleviates possible disadvantages for German OS sentences has received far less attention (but see Experiment 3 in Weskott, 2003 for referential identity in a more complex discourse configuration). In an offline acceptability study, Bader and Portele (2021) found that OS sentences in which the object referent was given and realized as an NP with a demonstrative determiner were rated equally high as their SO counterpart. To our knowledge, corresponding online data are missing.

2 Experiment
The current experiment investigated the question whether appropriate discourse structure, manipulated via contexts, facilitates the online comprehension of non-canonical sentences in Ger-
Table 1: Example stimulus used in the experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Relation</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>SO target</th>
<th>OS target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Letzte Woche am Donnerstag hat der Sponsor mit einem Torhüter telefoniert. <em>Thursday last week, the sponsor talked to a goalkeeper on the phone.</em></td>
<td>Er hat diesen Torhüter zu einer Verlängerung seines Vertrages bewegt. <em>He persuaded this goalkeeper to extend his contract.</em></td>
<td>Diesen Torhüter hat er zu einer Verlängerung seines Vertrages bewegt. <em>This goalkeeper, he persuaded him to extend his contract.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Letzte Woche am Donnerstag hat der Sponsor mit der Fußballmannschaft telefoniert. <em>Thursday last week, the sponsor talked to the soccer team on the phone.</em></td>
<td>Er hat den Torhüter zu einer Verlängerung seines Vertrages bewegt. <em>He persuaded the goalkeeper to extend his contract.</em></td>
<td>Den Torhüter hat er zu einer Verlängerung seines Vertrages bewegt. <em>The goalkeeper, he persuaded him to extend his contract.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: Hat der Sponsor mit einem Torhüter telefoniert? *Did the sponsor talk to a goalkeeper on the phone?*

More specifically, we asked whether an identity relation (not investigated so far) eases the processing of non-canonical sentences in a similar way as poset relations or whether poset relations (found to alleviate and even override disadvantages) constitute licensing conditions that are more helpful for the human parser than an identity relation. A poset relation was established by creating a set-membership constellation, i.e., by including a collective noun (e.g., soccer team; employment agency) and mentioning a member of this collective (e.g., goalkeeper; clerk).1 We used this relation instead of the more frequently investigated part-whole relation (e.g., Weskott et al., 2011) to extend the investigation of different poset relations.

2.1 Methods

2.1.1 Participants

45 native speakers of German were recruited via Prolific or participated for course credit.

2.1.2 Materials

Twenty experimental item sets consisting of a context sentence and a target sentence were created (see Table 1). We manipulated the two factors Discourse Relation (Identity vs. Membership) and Word Order (SO vs. OS). In the Identity conditions, a context sentence introduced two male referents. The subject of the context sentence was a definite NP (e.g., the sponsor). The object was introduced by using an indefinite NP (e.g., a goalkeeper). The subject of the context sentence was rementioned with a personal pronoun (he) as subject of the target sentences – either in sentence-initial (SO) or sentence-medial (OS) position. The object was rementioned in the target sentences by using a demonstrative NP including a lexical repetition of the co-referent noun (e.g., this goalkeeper) and consequently also appeared in sentence-initial (OS) or sentence-medial (SO) position. In the membership conditions, the same definite NP subject as in the identity conditions was used. Instead of a male character referent, the object was a set-denoting definite NP (e.g., the soccer team). The subject of the target sentences was again the personal pronoun (he) referring back to the previous subject and also appeared in sentence-initial (SO) or sentence-medial (OS) position. The object of the target sentences

---

1Although the set-membership relation is not a poset relation in a technical sense, it is usually subsumed under poset relations in the relevant literature, e.g., IS-A-MEMBER-OF in Ward and Prince (1991). Under the mereological approach to plurals and collectives (Link, 1983), there is a poset relation also in the technical sense in our membership condition.
was a definite NP denoting a member, a human character, of the set introduced in the previous sentence. It could appear either sentence-initially (OS) or in mid-sentence position (SO). Fifty-two filler items were included in the experiment.

2.1.3 Procedure
The 72 items were distributed onto 4 lists according to a Latin Square design. Materials were presented in a self-paced reading experiment (word-by-word moving-window presentation) conducted via Ibex farm (Drummond, Von Der Malsburg, Erlewine, Yoshida, & Vafaie, 2016). Eight of the experimental sentences were followed by a yes-no comprehension question.

2.2 Results
Raw reading times are shown in Figure 1. Linear mixed-effects models showed significant effects at the positions n1 (first noun), V_fin (finite verb), det2 (second determiner) and MF 1 (first position of the midfield). At n1, there is a significant effect of Discourse Relation. Identity relations were processed faster than membership relations. In the identity relation, this is where the lexical item from the previous sentence is repeated. In the membership relation, this is where the noun denoting a singled-out member is mentioned for the first time. This difference is also visible as a spill-over effect in the form of a significant interaction at the following position V_fin. At det2, there was an effect of Word Order as well as Discourse Relation. OS sentences were processed faster. This difference stems from processing the lexical items for the personal pronoun he (er) in OS conditions vs. a determiner in SO conditions. The processing advantage for membership over identity relations at this point reflects the lexical difference between the articles this (dieser) in identity relations vs. the (den) in membership relations. This difference is still visible at the position of MF1, where there was an effect of Word Order with SO sentences being processed faster than their OS counterpart. No significant differences were detected in later regions within the sentence. Mean accuracy in the question comprehension task was 89.7%. There were no significant differences between conditions.

3 Discussion
We found several effects associated with different lexical items. We see two non-exclusive reasons for the effect for OS sentences found at the position of the first noun (n1), which was not significant for SO sentences at the position of n2. This effect can represent a processing advantage due to the lexical repetition of the noun in identity conditions or a processing disadvantage for having to infer the noun in membership conditions. We are currently running further self-paced reading studies investigating this issue by contrasting a poset relation with an identity relation established without lexical repetition, i.e., by using synonym expressions. We will compare this study with the current results to disentangle shortcomings of the current

Figure 1: Raw reading times in the different conditions. Note: There are no n1 and n2 data points in the respective SO or OS conditions since the subject was the one word personal pronoun he (er) whereas the object was a two word NP (determiner + noun).
experiment (such as the confound of discourse relation and article of the noun phrase). Overall, our results suggest that both discourse relations investigated in this study — identity and membership — alleviate potential processing difficulties of non-canonical OS sentences compared to their canonical SO counterpart in German. Self-paced reading patterns did not differ apart from lexical influences. Furthermore, there was no distinct advantage for a poset relation over an identity relation. We leave it to future work to investigate further discourse relations and their effect on the processing of non-canonical sentences. In addition, investigating different manifestations of *givenness* (e.g., situationally inferable vs. standing in a poset relation) will reveal important insight on the role of discourse licensing of non-canonical sentences.
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