

## **The Property of Resolution in" Indian Summer of a Forsyte"**

**(dunya Muhammad Muqdad I'jam(M.A. in English Language and Linguistics**

### **The Problem -1**

Until recently the text has been widely discussed from a variety of theoretical perspectives. The most recent investigations base their analyses on the communicative occurrences (Beaugrande and Dressler 1981).The system explicated by Halliday and Hasan(1976) and the theoretical assumptions of Beaugrande and Dressler are common .reference sources for such enquiries

The present study is concerned with the determination and descriptive analysis of the basic patterns of intersentential anaphoric use of personal pronouns in .J.Galsworthy's novel **Indian Summer of a Forsyte**

### **Hypotheses**

It is-2

:hypothesized that

the writer uses the third person pronouns (they, he, she and it) with their definite as -1 .well as indefinite referential interpretation

.the writer uses the simple anaphora and the complex one in equal rates -2

### **Aims-3**

The present study attempts to provide a classification of patterns of anaphoric pronoun use across sentences. It seeks to examine the gradual expansion of a simple pattern and determine the possible distance between the pronoun and its antecedent taking into account the number of anaphors sequentially following the antecedent. It also intends to describe the patterns of antecedent intervention within one text segment and examine ambiguous types of relationship between the pronoun and its .antecedent

In addition, this study aims at examining the textual functions of personal pronouns drawing upon the theoretical assumptions of the science of text linguistics. The complexity of the relation between the pronoun and the antecedent determines the distinction between simple and complex patterns of the anaphoric resolution of personal pronouns. Simple patterns serve the examination of the distances between the .pronoun and the antecedent

#### Limits of the study-4

The scope of analysis is limited to the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun use selected from J.Galsworthy's novel **Indian Summer of a Forsyte**.

#### The Approach-5

With a view to complex syntactic, semantic, and discourse analysis, there is an approach to pronoun resolution which relies heavily on the efficiency of sentence segmentation, part of speech tagging, noun phrase identification and the high performance of the antecedent indicators. Therefore, it is a backward-looking approach ,i.e., the basic procedure in the present study is looking at the preceding stretches of a text from the vantage point of the current pronoun in order to resolve anaphoric reference, i.e., following the centering theory model

#### Centering Theory Model-6

Text linguists and computational researchers have tried to resolve pronouns by applying the basic assumption of centering theory which claims that for each utterance in a discourse, there is precisely one entity which is the centre of attention (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981:54).It is also called as "the backward-looking centre"(Kibble, 2001:78).In Strube and Hahn (1999) model, there is a shift when a new entity is introduced, and the previous centre is retained through prenominalization

#### General Definitions-7

Reference items may be exophoric or endophoric.The latter is either anaphoric or cataphoric

Lexical items as" John, tree, or run" have referential meaning in that they are names for something: " object, class of objects, process and the like". An exophoric item signals that the reference must be made to the context of situation (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:33).As

(1)What is *this*?

**This** can be considered exophoric (it refers to some object near the speaker or, colloquially, to a situation which is happening).

Both exophoric and endophoric reference embody an instruction to retrieve from  
(elsewhere the information necessary for interpreting the passage (Ibid

Anaphora

and cataphora are in contrast since with cataphora words refer forewords (Crystal, 2003:24). It is defined as the use of a grammatical form, e.g. a pronoun, to refer to a  
following noun phrase

Anaphora refers to the result of a linguistic unit whose interpretation  
:has been driven from some previously expressed unit or meaning.e.g

*He who hesitates is lost*(2)

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976:56)

where **he** does not have any referent in the preceding text but simply refers to who

(hesitates. In (3

(3) Pam went home because **she** felt sick.

**She** is anaphoric (it refers to Pam).

Huddleston and Pullum (2002:51) refer to such relations as retrospective and  
.anticipatory anaphora, respectively

## 8-Anaphor resolution

Postolache (2004:3) mentions that anaphora resolution represents the relation between a term (named anaphor) and other (named antecedent), when the interpretation of the anaphor is somehow determined by the interpretation of the antecedent.

Reference resolution requires differentiation between anaphoric and cataphoric relations; therefore, this research aims to determine the criteria for distinguishing between patterns of anaphoric pronoun use.

Resolution means finding what the anaphor is referring to, and is often required when sentences are taken out of context.

(4) *The Prime Minister of New Zealand* visited us yesterday. The visit was the first time *she* had come to New York since 1998.

If the second sentence is quoted by itself, it is necessary to *resolve* the anaphor:

(5) The visit was the first time *the Prime Minister of New Zealand* had come to New York since 1998.

Although of course, as *The Prime Minister of New Zealand* is an office of state and *she* would seem to refer to the person currently occupying that office, it could quite easily be that *the Prime Minister of New Zealand* had visited New York since 1998 and before the present day, whilst the present incumbent *she* had not.

However, even when taken in context, anaphor resolution can become increasingly complex. Consider the two examples:

(6) We gave the bananas to *the monkeys* because *they* were hungry.

(7) We gave the *bananas* to the monkeys because *they* were ripe.

In sentence (6), "*they*" refers to "*monkeys*", whereas in (7) sentence, "*they*" refers to "*bananas*". A semantic understanding that monkeys get hungry, while bananas become ripe is necessary when resolving this ambiguity. Since this type of understanding is still poorly implemented in software, automated anaphora resolution is currently an area of active research within the realm of natural language processing (Wikipedia, 2009:2).

## 9-Complement Anaphora

In some special cases, an anaphor may refer not to its usual antecedent, but to its complement set. This phenomenon was first extensively studied in a series of psycholinguistic experiments, in the early 1990s.

In (8), the anaphoric pronoun '*they*' refers to the children who are eating the ice-cream. Contrastingly, in (9), '*they*' seems to refer to the children who are not eating ice-cream.

(8) Only a few of the children ate their ice-cream. *They* ate the strawberry flavour first.

(9) Only a few of the children ate their ice-cream. *They* threw it around the room instead. (Ibid: 5)

The fact that sentences like (9) exist in the language seems at first odd: by definition, an anaphoric pronoun must refer to some noun that has already been introduced into the discourse. In complement anaphora cases, since the referent of the pronoun hasn't been formerly introduced, it is difficult to explain how something can refer to it. In the

first sentence of (9), the set of ice-cream-eating-children is introduced into the discourse; but then the pronoun '*they*' refers to the set of non-ice-cream-eating-children, a set which has not been priorly mentioned.

Several accounts of this phenomenon are found in the literature, based on both semantic and pragmatic considerations. The most important point of debate is the question, whether the pronoun in (9) refers to the complement set (i.e. only to the set of non-ice-cream-eating-children), or to the maximal set (i.e. to all the children, while discounting the minority).

## 10-Anaphora in generative grammar

In generative grammar, the term *anaphor* is used to refer to English reflexive and reciprocal pronouns, and analogous forms in other languages. Anaphors in this sense must have strictly local antecedents, because they receive their reference via the local syntactic operation (or rule of interpretation) known as *binding*. (Ibid, 9)

Reflexive anaphors must obey binding condition A, which states that "a reflexive pronoun must be bound within the smallest category containing it, its selecting head and a subject (=its governing category, or GC)." In the following sentence:

(10) \*John thought that she saw *himself*.

the GC of the reflexive '*himself*' is the relative clause, since it contains the anaphor itself, its selecting head (saw) and a subject (she). The only available noun that could bind '*himself*' is 'she', but this is ruled out because of the gender mismatch. The anaphor is therefore left unbound, which violates condition A - explaining the sentence's ungrammaticality. (Ibid, 7)

## The Characteristics of Third Person Pronoun-11

A pronoun, whose defining characteristics is its anaphoricity or obligatory dependence on an antecedent, comes in definite and indefinite varieties. For instance, *a car*, *four books*, and *people* introduce a new discourse referent to the discourse context in which they are uttered, while definite expressions like *the dog*, *the four books*, and *the people* refer back to discourse referents that have already been established. For example

.Elizabeth wants to buy a car (11)

.a-She will buy *it* tomorrow

.b-She will buy **one** tomorrow

The definite pronoun **it** in (11a) refers back to previously mentioned discourse referent which is a car in (11). However, **one** does not refer back to an entity but only a

(property, it does not require that any particular car is introduced in (11

The definite third person plural pronoun **they** is typically used referentially, as in

:(12), where **they** refers back to the plural individual John and Edward

.Smith saw John and Edward. Max saw **them** too (12)

Carlson (1977:434) and Ward et al. (1991:82) discuss some examples about the

:indefiniteness of **they**

.a- My mother hates raccoons because **they** stole her sweet corn last summer (13)

b-My mother thinks snakes are nasty creatures, but that hasn't stopped me from

.having **them** as pets my whole life

c- Martha told me that beans don't grow as well in this climate, but **they** grew

.well for me last year

The third person singular pronouns, **he, she and it**, are less apparently have an

:indefinite use, but Karttunen (1968:364) realizes they do

The casting director was looking for an innocent blonde. He found **her** in New (14)

.York

For him, the pronoun **her** does not force the de re reading of an innocent blonde

i.e., both **her** and innocent blonde do not refer to the same property. Rather, **her** in (15) and (16) stands for something like "just the person he was looking for", without suggesting that the casting director knew of *Emmy Lou Fleaner* before finding her in

:*New York*

.He found her in *Emmy Lou Fleaner* from *New York* (15)

(Ibid)

In (16), it is clear which pronoun is definite and which is not:

(16) a- The casting director was looking for an innocent blonde. He found **her** in New York. Then he found **her** again in Muncie.

b-The casting director was looking for an innocent blonde.He found **one** in New York. Then he found **one** again in Muncie.

(Ibid)

In (16a) **her** and **an innocent blonde** are the same person because (16a) has a legitimate interpretation i.e., it asserts that the casting director found the same innocent blonde in Muncie he found in New York (she moved).However, in (16b) the casting director found two different innocent blondes, one in New York, and one in Muncie because **one** introduces a new discourse referent and attributes property to it borrowed from an obligatory antecedent.

In general, definite noun phrases in previous sentences are more likely antecedents of pronominal anaphors i.e., definite anaphors. This is because "in English, a noun phrase is regarded as definite if the head noun is modified by a definite article, demonstrative, or possessive pronouns. This rule is ignored if there are no definite articles, possessives or demonstratives in the paragraph (Mitkov and Belguith, 2005:3).

## 14-Data Analysis

### Theme -14.1

**The Forsyte Saga** is a series of three novels and two interludes published between 1906 and 1921 by Galsworthy; the first is called **The Man of Property** and the second **Indian Summer of a Forsyte**. They chronicle the vicissitudes of the leading members of an upper-middle-class British family. Only a few generations removed from their farmer ancestors, the family members are keenly aware of their status as "new money". The main character, Soames Forsyte, sees himself as a "man of property," by virtue of his ability to accumulate material possessions—but this does not succeed in bringing him pleasure. In a short interlude after **The Man of Property**, Galsworthy delves into the interlude **Indian Summer of a Forsyte**, which takes place in the summer of 1892.He describes the rekindling of Old Jolyon and Irene's relationship,

after Irene's leaving Soames. This attachment gives Old Jolyon pleasure, but exhausts his strength. He leaves Irene money in his will with Young Jolyon, his son as trustee. In the end Old Jolyon died under an ancient oak tree. Within a very few pages a whole drama reveals itself but without any superficial exaggeration, which is an important feature of Galsworthy's quiet and restrained art ( Wikipedia ,2009:12).

#### 14.2 Anaphoric Pronouns: Simple Patterns

Throughout the whole corpus of analysis, it is clear that the simple pattern use of anaphoric pronouns has (1.5/1) mean per sentence. This ratio is due to the (150) occurrences per the whole novel. The table below clarifies the occurrences and ratios of the simple use of the anaphoric pronouns:

**Table (1)**  
**Frequencies and Ratios of the Simple Anaphoric**  
**Pronoun**

<i>Pronoun category</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>They</i>	30	20
<i>He</i>	90	60
<i>She</i>	20	10
<i>It</i>	10	10
<i>Total pronoun No.</i>	150	100
<i>Total sentences</i>	1051	
<i>Pronoun ratio</i>	1.5/1	



The intricate pattern of pronoun arrangement after the antecedent is the distribution of pronouns after an entity to which they refer in an orderly sequence. By the orderly arrangement of pronouns after an antecedent is meant the occurrences such as *old Jolyon..... his ...; he he...he. Holly...her...her...her...she*. Within the range of pronoun sequence of this kind, it is possible to distinguish shorter and longer stretches of pronouns following the antecedent and to determinate the extent of variability in the number of pronouns present within one sentence. The least complicated pattern can be characterized as the one in which the antecedent is followed by one pronoun located in the immediately following sentence.

In the examined corpus, the antecedent was generally referred to by a single pronoun. If the number of pronouns following an antecedent in the immediate stretch of a text is regarded as the criterion for the complexity of a pattern, it may be supposed that with an increase in the number of pronouns referring to the same antecedent, the complexity of the pattern of anaphoric pronoun use reach a higher level. The third stage towards the complexity of the patterns of anaphoric pronominalization is the occurrence of three pronouns in an orderly sequence after the antecedent.

Another infrequent pattern involved four occurrences of the pronouns after the antecedent. As the sequence of the pronouns following one antecedent gradually expanded, the previous patterns had to be logically supplemented by the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth number referring through quite a lengthy chain of preceding pronouns to one and the same antecedent. It is possible to assume that together with an increase in the number of pronouns referring to the same antecedent in the immediate stretch of a text, the possibilities for all the pronouns to be employed in one sentence significantly decrease due to purely grammatical factors. It becomes clear that the text is devoid of any such structural constraints and at least at a theoretical level it seems that in anaphoric pronoun use it might be complicated to determine the boundaries of the sequential pronoun occurrences after an antecedent in the immediately following stretch of a text. The boundaries of any pattern then in a way may be dependent on the

next antecedent which, as it were, marks the beginning of a new pattern of anaphoric pronoun use.

The simple patterns of anaphoric pronominalization were found to expand up to thirty pronouns following an antecedent in an orderly sequence. The introduction of a new antecedent marked a boundary between two separate stretches of a text, each of which had their own peculiar pronoun arrangements. It may be observed that with an increase in the number of pronouns sequentially following an antecedent, a large number of pronouns were used within one sentence.

It is difficult to determine whether the number can be counted as a sound criterion for the complexity of a pattern. On one hand, it may be supposed that the increasing number of pronouns after an antecedent do not change the relationship between the antecedent and the pronoun. It is quite easily understood by the text-user that the pronoun chain is a kind of an expanded variant of a single and a simple way of creating cohesion in a text. On the other hand, it might be supposed that with an increase in the number of pronouns referring to the same antecedent, the complexity of the pattern reaches a higher level in the sense that a wider span of attention has to be employed so as not to divert and misinterpret any of the abundant elements of a chain (Halliday, 1990: 291). If the length of a pattern is counted as the complexity factor, the number of successive pronouns remains a significant criterion in examining other patterns of anaphoric pronoun used in a text.

### 14.3-Anaphoric Pronouns: Complex Patterns

The total number of the complex pronoun use is (580) per (1051) sentence. Therefore, the mean of the complex anaphor is (5.5/1) per each sentence, as shown in Table (2) below:

*Table (2)*

#### *Frequencies and Ratios of Complex Anaphors in the Corpus*

<i>Pronoun Category</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
-------------------------	-----------	----------

<i>They</i>	30	6
<i>He</i>	420	72
<i>She</i>	120	21
<i>It</i>	10	1
<i>Total pronoun No.</i>	580	100
<i>Total sentences</i>	10051	
<i>Pronoun Ratio</i>	5.5/1	

Other uses of anaphoric pronominalization incorporated the patterns whose complexity degree was largely conditioned by the antecedent intervention, or shift, within one text segment. It should be mentioned that the majority of the patterns possessed the feature of being complex due to the occurrence of antecedent intervention. Within a wide range of such patterns, it was possible to distinguish less complex and more complex models. Less complex patterns occurred more frequently (80%) than their more complicated counterparts (20%).

Antecedent intervention determined the length of a pattern .Hence, the more antecedents were introduced within the pattern, the greater the possibility was to develop a chain of pronoun reference because the intervening antecedent brought with itself a new space for reference development .The simplest pattern of antecedent shift showed the predominance of two antecedents within a single stretch of a text:

And into *old Jolyon's* mind came a sudden recollection, a face *he* had seen...*Irene...he* had remembered *her* at once, for *he* admired *her*. P.2

When gender criterion could be relied upon, it was not complicated to relate the anaphor to the appropriate antecedent. However, when it was not applicable; the process of the proper pronoun resolution was obstructed. If all the pronouns in the sequential flow belonged to the same gender, any sudden shift may have resulted in decreased understanding of relations between the pronoun and the entity it corefered with. Readers may initially interpret the pronoun that follows as a new antecedent corefered with it, but are; in any case, forced to reanalyze the relations in the sequence if necessary:

It was the Greeks...*Phil* adored *them*...the word jarred *him* perceived why *he* was putting up with *him*...Yes,*he* loved balance and symmetry..."you're of the Golden Age,too,*Uncle Jolyon*. P.11

It might be assumed that if the sentence " you're of the Golden Age, too, *Uncle Jolyon*." were not present, the pronoun *him* could be interpreted as either referring to Soames or the butler. However, ambiguity is avoided since the writer provided sufficient material in the text so as not to mislead the reader. It is interesting to observe the pronoun and the antecedent relationship in the following sample:

*Irene* evaded the question. *Holly* smiled superciliously. ...*she* said....*They* found little else to say to each other, but on the way to the station *Holly* asked...

P.14

Two antecedents are introduced in separate sentences in the form of proper names. The pronoun *she* may refer to either of the antecedents. There is one factor that aids in determining the right relation between the anaphor and the antecedent. It is possible to ground one's judgment on the recency criterion and maintain that the more recent antecedent is, the more likely it will be pronominalized. Thus *she* may refer, according to this criterion, to the second antecedent in a sequence of sentences (Rose,2002,:5) .

The pronoun *they*, which refers to both antecedents at a time, might be interpreted in two ways. First, it may be regarded as a purely anaphoric item referring to *Irene* in the first and *Holly* in the second sentence. If there was not the coordinate clause containing the recent antecedent *Holly*, it would be possible to maintain that the pronoun *they* in the given stretch of the text functions anaphorically: however, the coordinate clause... *but on the way to the station Holly asked* repeatedly introduces the antecedent and initiates another interpretation of the textual function of the pronoun *they*. Referring to both antecedents at a time, it points back to *Irene* anaphorically, and it points forward to *Holly* cataphorically. However, only an anaphoric relation creates texture, since it is established between sentences and not only within one and the same sentence. Thus it is possible to say that the pronoun *they* performs two textual functions at a time. i. e, it creates cohesion between sentences and it establishes cohesion within a sentence.

The combinations of pronouns following two antecedents in a pattern were sometimes characterized by a more or less equal number of anaphors pointing to respective antecedents. However; in some patterns of anaphoric pronoun use a shift occurred to establish only one anaphoric link between a newly introduced antecedent and its pronoun.

*Mrs. Irene Heron...she* had taken *her* maiden name and this pleased *old Jolyon. He* went... *He* stood... *he* could not wear out all those *he* had.

P.15

The later pattern demonstrates that the ratio of pronouns referring to *Irene* and to *old Jolyon* is two to four. As regards this pattern, it should be noted that the antecedent that occupied the primary position in a pattern was normally followed by a number of pronouns which was twice or three times as large as the number of pronouns referring to the intervening antecedent.

*Old Jolyon thought* ...after dinner which *he* scarcely touched, after *his* cigar which *he* left half-smoked for *it* made *him* feel faint, *he* went very slowly upstairs... *he* sat down, *he* could just see... *he* pressed... *he* had never

seen....there was something wrong with *him* .

P.13

While the antecedent *cigar* corefers with the pronoun *it* and establishes a single instance of anaphoric link, the antecedent *old Jolyon* is linked to ten pronouns.

The pattern of two distanced antecedents was found to possess the structure of pronoun and antecedent arrangement in which the intervening antecedent was not referred to by an individual cohesive element.

...*old Jolyon.He* fixed *his* eyes on *the dog Balthasar.They* looked at each other.

P.17

The intervening antecedent *the dog Balthasar* is referred to by the pronoun *they* which at the same time corefers with the initial antecedent of a pattern, *old Jolyon*. In other patterns the two antecedents occurred together. Under appropriate conditions they were combined in the following way: *old Jolyon* and *the dog Balthasar* ... . . .*they*.... .Antecedents occurring in diverse positions and referred to by a common cohesive element are termed split antecedents (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002:1512).

The pattern of two antecedents demonstrates one more alternative way of judging the relation between the antecedents and their anaphors. In a chain of pronouns, elements obviously refer to two different antecedents .However; only one antecedent is present within a given pattern of anaphoric pronominalization.

" Because my name was *Forsyte* ,I suppose?"...*His* eyes involuntarily swept *her* body.Perhaps even now *she* was \_\_ and yet *she* wasn't thin...the answer did not reassure *him* .*He* had lost confidence.But *his* sense of justice stifled condemntation.No,*she* would certainly had died rather than take another penny from *him*.*He* enjoyed that stroll to the Kensington end of the gardens .

P.18

Although in the pattern above we do not find the antecedent to which the pronoun *he* refers, the reader determines it with ease basing his/her knowledge on the previously read stretches of a text. The pronoun *he* refers to one of the main men characters, and due to its prominence in the preceding passages of the text, it might become unnecessary to rename it directly through the use of the appropriate noun phrase. Moreover, a special effect is achieved by the writer by means of placing the antecedent in the position remote enough but possible for the text user to perceive and establish proper relations between coreferring parts. Considering such patterns of anaphoric pronoun use means finding out how patterns are intertwined among themselves. As can be seen, between the pronoun *he* and its antecedent there are a number of intervening patterns of anaphoric pronoun use. Since these patterns claim diverse types of characterization, it is no use describing an extremely lengthy stretch of the text in order to demonstrate the coreferent relation between the pronoun *he* and its remote antecedent.

*Old Jolyon* started...*his* side always hurt *him* a little. Then remembering that *she* had come to talk about *Boisnny*,"....*he* wouldn't have let me put that there"...pressing *Boisnny*'s arm to *her*,*she* talked...*he* know.  
P.27

In the example above the noun phrase *Boisnny* is mentioned twice. The pattern could be considered complete with the first occurrence of the noun *Boisnny* unless there was one more link to the proper noun phrase *old Jolyon* after the second introduction of *Boisnny*. The following example also illustrates the tendency of reference for the first antecedent be extended over succeeding antecedents and their anaphors.

*Old Jolyon* was not restless....*He* played many *games* with *Holly*... pitching *them*.given *them*,*he* had kept *them*....*old Forsyte* they called *him*....*he* took a liver pill,*his* side hurt *him* rather ...*he* had found a new excitement in life and that excitement was not for *him*.  
P.28

The noun phrase *old Jolyon* and *old Forsyte* denote the same person. The third antecedent in the pattern is *games*, and it establishes two anaphoric links by means of two occurrences of the pronoun *them* occurring in the immediately following sentence. It is quite difficult to determine the antecedent with which the rest of the personal pronouns corefer. The next chain of pronouns also has its own antecedent which is *old Forsyte*. However, if the reader were to interpret the relation of pronouns to this antecedent, the understanding of who the *old Forsyte* might not be full without reference to the first antecedent of the given stretch of the text. That is why the whole pattern might be regarded as constituting a single whole and the antecedent *old Forsyte* is not necessary in order to perceive that the majority of the pronouns refer to *old Jolyon*, which is the main antecedent within a given stretch of the text. Moreover, repetition is a characteristic of the first antecedent in a pattern rather than the second one. This could account for the communicative value of the primary antecedent.

## 15- Conclusions

It is concluded that:

- 1- Both the plural (they) and the singular pronouns (he, she, and it) have a discourse referent introducing indefinite interpretation, in addition to their usual definite referential interpretation.
- 2- the use of the third person pronouns in the data is limited to the definite referential interpretation regardless to their ambiguous references in some instances found in the data. Such a result falsifies the first hypothesis.
- 3- although at first sight it is not absolutely clear what restrictions on the degree of pattern extension are, the number of antecedents within a pattern cannot be limitless. One condition for the pronoun to be regarded as a single whole is the occurrence of uninterrupted links through the use of pronouns. Personal pronouns can be regarded as forms which establish boundaries among patterns of anaphoric pronoun use in discourse.
- 4- it is obvious that J.Galsworthy uses complex anaphors (4.3/1) per the sentence more than the simple ones. The differential is clear in the following table:



Table (3)

*The differential Of Complex and Simple Anaphors*

<i>Pronoun category</i>	No.	%
<i>Simple anaphors</i>	150	1.5
<i>Complex anaphors</i>	580	5.5
<b><i>Differential</i></b>		
<i>Complex/Simple</i>	5.5-1.5=4 /1	

Therefore, such a result does not verify the second hypothesis of the study.

**References:**

- Beaugrande, R and Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Carlson, G. (1977). *A Unified Analysis of the English Bare Plural* . Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal , D.(2003). *A Dictionary to Phonetics and Linguistics*. Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- Galsworthy , J. (2001). *The Forsythe Saga*. Vol I.London:Penguin Books.
- Halliday, M.A.K and R. Hasan (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London:Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1990). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hallman, P. (2005). *Property-Anaphoric Pronouns in English*. <http://www.edu/ling.hallman.ulca.edu>.
- Huddleston, R. and G. Pullum. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karttunen.L. (1968). *Discourse Referents*. Indiana University Linguistics Club:Bloomington ,Ind.
- Kibble, R. (2001). *An Integrated Framework for Text Planning and Pronominalization*. London:University of Brighton.<http://aclIdc.upenn.edu/W/WOO/WOO-1411.pdf>.
- Mitkov, R. and Belguith , N. (2005) *Evaluation Issues in Anaphora Resolution and Beyond* .[http://acdc.linguisteca.pt/aval\\_conjunta/DS-beschreibung.html](http://acdc.linguisteca.pt/aval_conjunta/DS-beschreibung.html).
- Postolache, O. (2004). *Anaphora, Discourse and Information Structure*. <http://www.des.shef.ac.uk/~Postolache/unt-alg.pdf>.

Rose, R .L. (2002).*Semantic Factors in Pronominal Resolution*.

<http://www.ling.northwestern.edu/~rose/files/proposal.pdf>.

Strube, M., Hahn, U. (1999).*Functional Centering-Ground Referential*

*Coherence in Information Structure*.[http://acl.lidc.upenn.edu/J/J99-](http://acl.lidc.upenn.edu/J/J99-3001.pdf)

[3001.pdf](http://acl.lidc.upenn.edu/J/J99-3001.pdf).

Ward, G; Richard Spoot; and G. Mckoon. (1991).A *Pragmatic Analysis of so-*  
*Anaphoric Islands*.Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*called*

Wikipedia, org. (2009) . [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Forsythe\\_Saga](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Forsythe_Saga) .