

Presupposition triggers require that their prejacent be entailed by the common ground (**stalnaker2002common**). In other words, utterances with presuppositions are only defined when the presupposition is already part of the accepted facts. In (??), no truth-value can be assigned since, in the actual world, there is no king of France, which causes a presupposition failure with respect to the definite determiner heading the subject constituent. On the other hand, in the parallel case (??), the presupposition is met and the utterance can be assigned a truth-value.

- (1) a. The king of France is bald.
- b. The prince of Monaco is bald.

Taking this as a starting point, we can say that presuppositions (in the ideal case) refer to old pieces of information. This being the case, a further property is revealed: presuppositions are entailments that are not (usually) up for discussion; they are not at-issue (**aravind2017factivity**). To see this, consider the direct denial in (??) where the only possible interpretation refers to the at-issue content of A's utterance – the fact that Peter gave up stripping – but not the presupposed, non-at-issue component – the fact Peter used to strip (**tonhauser2012diagnosing**).

- (2) A: Peter stopped stripping.
- B: # That's not true.
- Intended*: Peter never stripped before.

- (3) Lexikoneinträge

$\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket = \lambda p \in D_t . p = 0$

$\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket = \text{Carla}$

$\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket = \lambda x \in D_e . [\lambda y \in D_e . y \text{ lädt } x \text{ ein}]$

$\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket = \lambda f \in D_{\langle e, t \rangle} . [\lambda g \in D_{\langle e, t \rangle} . \text{es gibt ein } x, \text{ sodass } f(x) = 1 \text{ und } g(x) = 1]$

$\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket = \lambda x \in D_e . x \text{ ist ein Politiker}$