1st person

(1) △ kann die Verabredung leider nicht einhalten.
△ can the appointment unfortunately not keep.
‘Unfortunately, (I) cannot keep the appointment.’

(2) was gibt’s neues bei dir (julia)?
are there any news from (you) julia?

(3) a. (ich) lade sie disemal ein. (1st PERSON, TOPIC: REAL. | OMM.)
b. (sie) ladt mich disemal ein. (3rd PERSON, TOPIC: REAL. | OMM.)
(3) a. (ich) lade sie disemal ein.
b. (sie) ladt mich disemal ein.

(4) a: hey, was gibt’s neues?
a: hey, what’s up?

(5) a. b: am samstag gehe ich mit julia schick essen. (Toric 1st)
b. b: am samstag geht julia mit mir schick essen. (Toric 3rd)
b: on saturday, i go out with julia julia goes out with me.

(6) a. b: (ich) lade sie disemal ein. (1st PERSON)
b. b: (sie) ladt mich disemal ein. (3rd PERSON)
(6) a. b: (ich) lade sie disemal ein.
b. b: (sie) ladt mich disemal ein.

(7) a. b: (ich) möchte sie disemal einladen. (1st PERSON)
b. b: (sie) möchte mich disemal einladen. (3rd PERSON)
(7) a. b: (ich) want to invite her (she) wants to invite me.

Results & discussion

Analysis with Linear Mixed Effects Models (random intercepts for subjects and items and by-subject and by-item random slopes for PERSON; 1st vs in R):

- No significant interaction between TOPICALITY and OMISSION ⇒ topicality without effect on TD or question inadequate method to set topic?
- Significant interaction between PERSON-OMISSION $(\chi^2 = 22.4, p < 0.001)$ ⇒ data is in line with corpus findings of Auer (1993) and Frick (2017) by revealing a preference for 1st person (pragmatic prominence of speaker)?

Results & discussion

Analysis with linear mixed effects models (random intercepts for subjects and items and by-subject random slopes for PERSON; 3rd vs in R):

- Replication of the PERSON-OMISSION interaction $(\chi^2 = 13.93, p < 0.001)$ ⇒ data confirm again preference for 1st person
- Significant TOPICALITY-OMISSION interaction $(\chi^2 = 9.76, p < 0.01)$ ⇒ data support role of topicality for TD (is topicality itself a prerequisite or is the topicialized element simply more predictable and, thus, more easily recoverable?)

Results & discussion

Analysis with linear mixed effects models (random intercepts for subjects and items and by-subject random slopes for PERSON and by-item random slopes for all 3 IVs):

- Replication of the PERSON-OMISSION interaction $(\chi^2 = 17.07, p < 0.001)$ ⇒ data confirm preference for 1st person also with modal verbs, thus disproving Auer’s (1993) explanation adorning morphological marking of the verb
- No significant TOPICALITY-OMISSION interaction ⇒ no effect of topicality (because unlike in (2) verb form does not facilitate disambiguation?)

Conclusion

Further investigations to determine influence of extralinguistic cues and context:

- Modulate the context to modify the predictability of the omitted element
- Compare a discourse with one continuous topic to one with a lot of changing topics with respect to the influence of topicality on TD

Open question: Which process is involved in reconstructing the omitted element in Exp. 3 after the enactment of the opponent question?

- Disambiguation after having considered two or more alternatives?
- Reanalysis after having pursued a wrong analysis (1st person as subject?)

Summary