

Projection variability of clausal complements across different operators

Lisa Hofmann¹

Marie-Catherine de Marneffe²

Judith Tonhauser¹

¹University of Stuttgart

²UC Lovain

Does the projection of content differ across entailment-cancelling environments?

- ▶ Yes! Projection differs by entailment-cancelling **operator**
- ▶ By-operator effects differ by predicate (**operator**/**predicate** interaction)
- ▶ Current theories of **projective content** do not predict our results

Projection of clausal complements

Do you infer that Rachel is committed to the truth of the *content of the complement* (CC), that **Julian dances salsa**?

- (1)
- Rachel: 'Does Cole **know** that **Julian dances salsa**?'
✓ Yes, CC projects out of the question
 - Rachel: 'Does Cole **think** that **Julian dances salsa**?'
✗ No, CC does not project

Frege (1892); Strawson (1950); Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970); Karttunen (1971); Karttunen and Peters (1979), and many more

Entailment-cancelling operators

Family-of-sentences test:

No mention of differences in projection between different **operators**

- (2)
- Polar question:
Does Cole **know** that **Julian dances salsa**?
 - Negation:
Cole **doesn't** **know** that **Julian dances salsa**.
 - Epistemic modal:
Perhaps Cole **knows** that **Julian dances salsa**.
 - Conditional antecedents:
If Cole **knows** that **Julian dances salsa**, Logan will be joyful.

(e.g. Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet 1990; Coppock and Champollion 2020)

Hints at by-operator variation

Factive vs. semi-factive predicates (Karttunen 1971)

- Factives (*be annoyed, regret, ...*): CC projects across all four operators
- Semi-factives (*discover, realize, see, notice, ...*):
CC projects across negation, but not always for the other operators

Experiment with English projective contents (Smith and Hall 2014)

- Projective content of epithets (e.g. *idiot*) and the CC of *know*:
more projective under negation than conditionals
- Opposite pattern for appositive relative clauses and *win*

Experiment with German clause-embedding predicates

(Sieker and Solstad 2022)

- Higher projection ratings w/ negation than other three operators
- No by-predicate variation, no evidence for factive/semi-factive distinction




Figure 1. Sieker and Solstad 2022, p. 286: Projection-ratings by embedding operator, for purported factive and semi-factive predicates

Certain-that task for projection inferences

Christopher: "Cole didn't discover that Julian dances salsa."

Is Christopher certain that Julian dances salsa?

no yes

Next

Tonhauser (2016); Djärv and Bacovcin (2017); Tonhauser et al. (2018); de Marneffe et al. (2019); Mahler (2020); Degen and Tonhauser (2022); Sieker and Solstad (2022)

Variation among clause-embedding predicates

20 **predicates** that have shown projection variability in PQs (Degen and Tonhauser 2022)




Figure 2. Degen and Tonhauser 2022, p. 562: Mean certainty ratings by predicate

Materials

To assess the effect of **operator** and **predicate** on **projection**:

4 experiments (roughly 750 participants each)

- One per **operator**: polar questions, negation, modal *perhaps*, conditional

Participants saw:

- **20 clause embedding predicates**
 - Crossed with 20 CCs (20 × 20 = 400 combinations)
- (6 controls for exclusion)

(Experiments also used different at-issueness measures in separate block, not analyzed here)

Main effect of embedding operator & By-predicate variation in the effect of operator

By-operator variation aggregating across predicates (Figure 3)

- Conditional > Question > Negation, Modal

Model #1: Linear mixed effect regression

response: **certainty ratings**; fixed effect: **operator** (base level: Question); random intercepts: participants, items; MLEs: question (intercept) 0.51, conditional +0.05, modal −0.04, negation −0.03; with all $p < 0.001$

- But small differences, as in Sieker & Solstad's (2022) study
- Sieker & Solstad's results for German: Negation > Question, Conditional, Modal

Effect of operator differs by predicate (Figure 4), e.g.

- CC of **be annoyed**: Negation, Conditional > Question, Modal

Model #2: Linear mixed effect regression

response: **certainty ratings**; fixed effects: **operator**, **predicate**, and interaction (base level: **be annoyed** / negation); random intercepts: participant; MLEs: negation (intercept) 0.87, conditional −0.12, modal −0.16; with $p < 0.001$; question +0.02 (n.s.)

- CC of **know**: Question > Negation, Conditional > Modal

Model #3: Linear mixed effect regression

response: **certainty ratings**; fixed effects: **operator**, **predicate**, and interaction (base level: **know** / negation); random intercepts: participant; MLEs: negation (intercept) 0.79, modal −0.14, question +0.08; with $p < 0.001$; conditional +/ − 0, (n.s.)

- CC of **discover**: Modal > Negation > Conditional, Question

Model #4: Linear mixed effect regression

response: **certainty ratings**; fixed effects: **operator**, **predicate**, and interaction (base level: **discover** / negation); random intercepts: participant; MLEs: negation (intercept) 0.68, conditional +0.11, modal −0.06, question +0.10; with $p < 0.001$




Figure 3. Mean certainty ratings by operator




Figure 4. Mean certainty ratings by predicate, grouped by operator

Discussion — By predicate variation in the effect of operator

- Concurs with Smith and Hall (2014), who found content/operator interactions for English projective contents
- Differs from Sieker and Solstad (2022), who found no predicate/operator interaction for CCs of German clause-embedding predicates

No evidence for factive vs. semi-factive distinction (Karttunen 1971)

- CC of purported factive *be annoyed* does not invariably project across operators
- CC of purported semi-factives (*discover, see*) do not project more across negation than other operators

Provides support (from negation, modals, conditionals) for Degen & Tonhauser's (2022) result:

- Projection does not categorically differentiate between (semi-)factive/-factive predicates

Do existing theories of projection predict our results?

Dynamic accounts of projection: Lexical factivity & dynamic operators

(Heim 1983; van der Sandt 1992)

Distinguish factive and non-factive predicates:

- factive predicates (*be annoyed, regret, ...*): CC conventionally required to be contextually entailed in common ground
- non-factive predicates (*believe, say, ...*): no such requirement

Factive content projects globally, unless not admitted by common ground

Entailments & discourse structure

(Abrusán 2011; Simons et al. 2017)

Contextual entailments & Epistemic preconditions

(Schlenker 2021)

Theoretical implications

- Previous work: projection analyses need to consider the effect of **lexical meaning** (e.g. Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1970; Karttunen 1971, et. seq.), **world knowledge** (de Marneffe et al. 2012; Degen and Tonhauser 2021), and **discourse structure** (e.g. Simons et al. 2017; Tonhauser et al. 2018)
- Add to that the effect of various **entailment-cancelling operators**
- An analysis of projection should be able to address **operator** / **predicate** interaction effects. None of the extant projection analyses capture our data.

References

Márta Abrusán. Predicting the presuppositions of soft triggers. *Linguistics and philosophy*, 34:491–535, 2011. • Gennaro Chierchia and Sally McConnell-Ginet. *Meaning and grammar: An introduction to semantics*. 1990. • Elizabeth Coppock and Lucas Champollion. *Invitation to formal semantics*. online publication, in progress, 2020. • Marie de Marneffe, Mandy Simons, and Judith Tonhauser. The CommitmentBank: Investigating projection in naturally occurring discourse. *Sinn und Bedeutung*, 23:107–124, 2019. • Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Christopher D. Manning, and Christopher Potts. Did It Happen? The Pragmatic Complexity of Veridicality Assessment. *Computational Linguistics*, 38(2):301–333, February 2012. • Judith Degen and Judith Tonhauser. Prior beliefs modulate projection. *Open Mind*, 5:59–70, 2021. • Judith Degen and Judith Tonhauser. Are there factive predicates? An empirical investigation. *Language*, 98(3):552–591, 2022. • Kaja Djärv and Hezekiah Akiva Bacovcin. Prosodic effects on factive presupposition projection. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, 27:116–133, 2017. • Gottlob Frege. Über Sinn und Bedeutung. *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, pages 25–50, 1892. • Irene Heim. On the projection problem for presuppositions. *Formal semantics—the essential readings*, pages 249–260, 1983. • Lauri Karttunen. Some observations on factivity. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 4(1):55–69, 1971. • Lauri Karttunen and Stanley Peters. Conventional implicature. In Choon-Kyu Oh and David A. Dinneen, editors, *Presuppositions, Syntax and Semantics* Vol.11, pages 1–56. New York: Academic Press, 1979. • Paul Kiparsky and Carol Kiparsky. Fact. In Manfred Bierwisch and Karl Erich Heidolph, editors, *Progress in Linguistics*, pages 143–173. The Hague: Mouton, 1970. • Taylor Mahler. The social component of projection behavior of clausal complements. *Linguistic Society of America*, 5:777–791, 2020. • Philippe Schlenker. Triggers in presuppositions. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 6(1), 2021. • Judith Sieker and Torgrim Solstad. Projective variability of (semi) factive verbs in family of sentence contexts: A rating study. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Amsterdam Colloquium*, 2022. • Mandy Simons, David Beaver, Craig Roberts, and Judith Tonhauser. The best question: Explaining the projection behavior of factives. *Discourse processes*, 54(3):187–206, 2017. • E. Allyn Smith and Kathleen Currie Hall. The relationship between projection and embedding environment. In *Proceedings of the 48th Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 2014. • Peter F. Strawson. On referring. *Mind*, 59(235):320–344, 1950. • Judith Tonhauser. Prosodic cues to presupposition projection. In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, volume 26, pages 934–960, 2016. • Judith Tonhauser, David I. Beaver, and Judith Degen. How projective is projective content? Gradience in projectivity and at-issueness. *Journal of Semantics*, 35(3):495–542, 2018. • Rob A. van der Sandt. Presupposition projection as anaphora resolution. *Journal of semantics*, 9(4):333–377, 1992.

References (not visible later)

Márta Abrusán. Predicting the presuppositions of soft triggers. *Linguistics and philosophy*, 34:491–535, 2011. Publisher: Springer.

Gennaro Chierchia and Sally McConnell-Ginet. *Meaning and grammar: An introduction to semantics*. 1990. Publisher: MIT press

Cambridge, MA.

Elizabeth Coppock and Lucas Champollion. *Invitation to formal semantics*. online publication, in progress, 2020.

Marie de Marneffe, Mandy Simons, and Judith Tonhauser. The CommitmentBank: Investigating projection in naturally occurring discourse. *Sinn und Bedeutung*, 23:107–124, 2019. doi: 10.18148/sub/2019.v23i2.601.

Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Christopher D. Manning, and Christopher Potts. Did It Happen? The Pragmatic Complexity of Veridicality Assessment. *Computational Linguistics*, 38(2):301–333, February 2012. Publisher: MIT Press.

Judith Degen and Judith Tonhauser. Prior beliefs modulate projection. *Open Mind*, 5:59–70, 2021. Publisher: MIT Press.

Judith Degen and Judith Tonhauser. Are there factive predicates? An empirical investigation. *Language*, 98(3):552–591, 2022. Publisher: Linguistic Society of America.

Kaja Djärv and Hezekiah Akiva Bacovcin. Prosodic effects on factive presupposition projection. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, 27: 116–133, 2017. Publisher: Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.

Gottlob Frege. Über Sinn und Bedeutung. *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, pages 25–50, 1892.