Constraint-based projection
Judith Tonhauser, University of Stuttgart

Based on joint work with Judith Degen, Stanford University

The constraint-based approach to pragmatics assumes that listeners integrate probabilistic information from multiple sources to identify speaker meaning (e.g., Degen and Tanenhaus 2019). This talk motivates a constraint-based approach to projection, the phenomenon whereby listeners can infer that speakers are committed to an utterance content even when that content is in the scope of an entailment-canceling operator. For instance, to identify whether Cam, who utters the question in (1), is committed to the content of the clausal complement, listeners integrate information from multiple sources, including the expressions uttered, the common ground, the information structure of the utterance, what they know about Cam, and the Question Under Discussion (see, e.g., Beaver 2010; Beaver et al. 2017; Cummins and Rohde 2015; Djärv and Bacovcin 2017; Mahler 2020; Simons et al. 2010, 2017; Tonhauser 2016, in press; Tonhauser et al. 2018, 2019).

(1)   Cam: *"Did Kim discover that Sandy's work is plagiarized?"*

From the constraint-based perspective, the overarching research question then is: which information sources do listeners rely on in drawing projection inferences in the domain under investigation and how is the information from these sources integrated?

In this talk, the constraint-based approach is illustrated on the basis of the projection of the content of the complement of a broad range of (factive and non-factive) clause-embedding predicates, such as *discover* in (1), as well as *know, think* or *confirm*. The findings of two comprehension experiments reveal two novel information sources that influence listeners' projection inferences in this empirical domain: (i) the lexical content of the predicate and (ii) listeners' prior beliefs. Although projection analyses currently on the market (e.g., Abusch 2010; Abrusán 2011; Heim 1983; Simons et al. 2017; Schlenker ms/2019) already consider the first of these information sources, a constraint-based recasting of these analyses highlights the danger of assigning too much privilege to binary categories derived from lexical content, such as 'factive predicate', 'presupposition' or 'entailment'. These analyses also differ in whether they are able to account for the second information source, listeners' prior beliefs. By forcing us to confront the multiple sources of information that listeners rely on in drawing projecting inferences, the constraint-based approach brings out a multitude of new research questions about projection cross-linguistically.

References

Abrusán, Márta. 2011. Predicting the presuppositions of soft triggers. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 34:491–535.
Abusch, Dorit. 2010. Presupposition triggering from alternatives. *Journal of Semantics* 27:37–80.

Beaver, David. 2010. Have you noticed that your belly button lint colour is related to the colour of your clothing? In R. Bäuerle, U. Reyle, and E. Zimmermann, eds., *Presuppositions and Discourse: Essays offered to Hans Kamp*, pages 65–99. Oxford: Elsevier.

Beaver, David, Craige Roberts, Mandy Simons, and Judith Tonhauser. 2017. Questions Under Discussion: Where information structure meets projective content. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 3:265–284.

Cummins, Chris and Hannah Rohde. 2015. Evoking context with contrastive stress: Effects on pragmatic enrichment. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6:Article 1779.

Degen, Judith and Michael K. Tanenhaus. 2019. Constraint-based pragmatic processing. In C. Cummins and N. Katsos, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Experimental Semantics and Pragmatics*, pages 21–38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Djärv, Kajsa and Hezekiah Akiva Bacovcin. 2017. Prosodic effects on factive presupposition projection. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 27:116–133.

Heim, Irene. 1983. On the projection problem for presuppositions. *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 2:114–125.

Mahler, Taylor. 2020. The social component of projection behavior of clausal complements. In *LSA 2020 XXX*.

Schlenker, Philippe. ms/2019. Triggering presuppositions. Downloaded from LingBuzz `https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004696`.

Simons, Mandy, David Beaver, Craige Roberts, and Judith Tonhauser. 2017. The Best Question: Explaining the projection behavior of factive verbs. *Discourse Processes* 3:187–206.

Simons, Mandy, Judith Tonhauser, David Beaver, and Craige Roberts. 2010. What projects and why. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 11:309–327.

Tonhauser, Judith. 2016. Prosodic cues to speaker commitment. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 26:934–960.

Tonhauser, Judith. in press. Projection variability in Paraguayan Guaraní. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* .

Tonhauser, Judith, David Beaver, and Judith Degen. 2018. How projective is projective content? Gradience in projectivity and at-issueness. *Journal of Semantics* 35:495–542.

Tonhauser, Judith, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Shari R. Speer, and Jon Stevens. 2019. On the information structure sensitivity of projective content. *Sinn und Bedeutung* 23:363–389.