

*

1 2 2
(¹ , 200092) (² , 201620)

() ()
“ — ” “

“ ;
÷)3? 52+± ĩ ; Ō g G ž ú : 9Kc â+±M±@ë Í W '-A/£ ũ 6 W>ÿ ŌE - ' ;
+±@Ñ- '-mUŸ(1) () ;(2)

;(3)

B842

(trigger)

(Degen et al., 2020)

(presupposition)”

(common ground; Stalnaker, 2002)

()

(“ ... ”) (“ ”)

(“ ”) (“ ”)

(“ ”)

(linguistic co-presence,

) (visual co-presence,

)

(computational point, “ ”)

(world knowledge)/ (community membership,

)

(Clark & Marshall, 1981)

“ — ” “ ” “ ”

()¹,

: 2021-06-18

* (31971037)
: , E-mail: xiaoming.jiang@shisu.edu.cn;
: , E-mail: xz104@pku.edu.cn

”)

1.2

(Schwarz, 2016)

(presupposition satisfaction)

“He said that the conductor was very impressive.”

“Tobias visited a conductor in Berlin.”

(presupposition violation)

“Tobias talked to Nina.”

(presupposition failure presupposition falsification)

(presupposition accommodation)

(“Due to overstaffing problems, about a month ago the graphic designer was made redundant”)

(“In Paolo’s office there are many employees”)

(Domaneschi et al., 2018)

(Schwarz, 2014)

(Wang & Schumacher, 2013; Nieuwland & Martin, 2017; Coopmans & Nieuwland, 2020; Jiang & Zhou, 2020)

(Nieuwland & Martin, 2017; Coopmans & Nieuwland, 2020)

(Schwarz, 2014)

(Domaneschi et al., 2018)

2

2.1

() , (the) (a) , (Murphy, 1984) (Schneider et al., 2020; Schneider & Janczyk, 2020) Murphy (1984) (Schneider et al., 2019) (mouse-tracking paradigm)⁴, () () () (Tiemann et al., 2011), “again” “twice”, (“Tina ist mit einer guten Freundin shoppen.” : “Tina is shopping with a good friend.”), (“Sie kauft heute rote Handschuhe .” : “She buys red gloves today .”), (“Sie kauft wieder rote Handschuhe .” : “She buys red gloves again .”) (Tiemann et al., 2011,) ;

world paradigm) (“again”) (“twice”) (Schwarz, 2014) (, “ ”, “ ”, “ ”) (“Some of these children went to play golf on Monday, and some to play volleyball.”), (“John went to play golf (i) again later on...” (“John went to play golf (ii) twice this week...”)) , “again” “twice” 200 ms (200~400 ms), ; “again” “twice” () () (“Prima della gravidanza Gaia fumava dieci sigarette al giorno” Before her pregnancy Gaia smoked ten cigarettes per day; “Gaia è al terzo mese della sua primagravidanza” Gaia is at the third month of her first pregnancy), (“Le possibili malattie del feto la spaventano davvero molto. Sin dall’inizio ha smesso di fumare del tutto ma le sue paure sono rimaste sempre uguali.” The possible fetal diseases scare her a lot. From the very beginning she has given up smoking but her worries

⁴ , Stillman et al. (2018)

“In Paolo’s office, there used to be a very bad-tempered graphic designer”

(“In Paolo’s office, there are many employees”),

(“Due to overstaffing problems, about a month ago the graphic designer was made redundant”)

(e.g., designer)

N400 , P600 (,) ,

(Domaneschi et al., 2018)

(Domaneschi et al., 2018; Jiang et al., 2009; Jiang et al., 2013)

3

3.1

(Abusch, 2010; Domaneschi et al., 2014; Glanzberg, 2005)

(“ ” “ ”), ; (“ ”) Abusch (2010)

(soft presupposition trigger, “Tom continues to go to school.”) (hard presupposition trigger, “Tom was late again .”)

; Glanzberg (2005)

(weak trigger, “John solved the problem too .”) (strong trigger, “ John regrets voting for Bush.”)

, Domaneschi (2014)

(1 vs. 3)

3.2

1
3 (Sperber & Wilson, 1986),
(Domaneschi & Di Paola, 2019)
(Sperber & Wilson, 1986) , Burkhardt (2006)
(Domaneschi et al., 2014) (Tobias visited a conductor in Berlin.) (1 Tobias visited a concert in Berlin.) (2 Tobias talked to Nina.) (He said that the conductor was very impressive.)
L H
(Abusch, 2010; Glanzberg, 2005)
(stop doing something “ ”)
(Domaneschi & Paola, 2018)
“N400-P600” N400 , P600
(Domaneschi et al., 2018)
(Burkhardt, 2006; Domaneschi & Paola, 2018; Kirsten et al., 2014; Jiang et al., 2013; Jouravlev et al., 2016; Shetreet et al., 2019)

3.3

(P600) (Burkhardt, 2006), (Jiang et al., 2013) (2), (3.2) , 5 (Domaneschi & Paola, 2018; Burkhardt, 2006) (Schwarz, 2014; Schneider et al., 2019), / (Jiang et al., 2013; Zang et al., 2019) **3.4**

; (Galati & Brennan, 2021) ; (van Moort et al., 2020; van Moort et al., 2018, 2021) , Jiang (2013) “ (A)... (B)” , A B (“* ”) (“ ”) (“ ”) (“ ”) (N400 (350~450 ms) (550~800 ms) N400 “ ... ” “ ... ”) (Keysar et al., 2000) () ()

(Zang et al., 2019)

⁵ , Burkhardt (2006) , Jiang (2013) ,

/ ,
,
(Dietrich et al., 2019; Feng et al., 2017,
2021; van Moort et al., 2020)
,

- (2007). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *33*(1), 15(01), 22–28.
- Abusch, D. (2010). Presupposition triggering from alternatives. *Journal of Semantics*, *27*(1), 37–80.
- An, S., Bill, C., & Yang, Q. (2020). Comprehension of the presupposition trigger Ye “Also” by mandarin-speaking preschoolers with and without autism spectrum disorders. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 570453.
- Brown-Schmidt, S., Gunlogson, C., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2008). Addressees distinguish shared from private information when interpreting questions during interactive conversation. *Cognition*, *107*(3), 1122–1134.
- Brown-Schmidt, S., & Heller, D. (2018). Perspective-taking during conversation. In S. Rueschemeyer & M. G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Psycholinguistics* (2nd ed.) (pp. 551–574). Oxford University Press.
- Burkhardt, P. (2006). Inferential bridging relations reveal distinct neural mechanisms: Evidence from event-related brain potentials. *Brain and Language*, *98*(2), 159–168.
- Cheung, C. C. H., Politzer-Ahles, S., Hwang, H., Chui, R. L. Y., Leung, M. T., & Tang, T. P. Y. (2017). Comprehension of presuppositions in school-age Cantonese-speaking children with and without autism spectrum disorders. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, *31*(7-9), 557–572.
- Cheung, C. C. H., Rong, Y., Chen, F., Leung, M. T., & Tang, T. P. Y. (2020). Comprehension of presupposition triggers in Cantonese-speaking children with and without autism spectrum disorders. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, *34*(4), 388–406.
- Clark, H. H., & Marshall, C.R. (1981). Definite reference and mutual knowledge. In A.H. Joshe, B. Webber, & I.A. Sag (Eds.), *Elements of discourse understanding* (pp. 10–63). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Clifton, C., Jr. (2013). Situational context affects definiteness preferences: Accommodation of presuppositions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *39*(2), 487–501.
- Coopmans, C. W., & Nieuwland, M. S. (2020). Dissociating activation and integration of discourse referents: Evidence from ERPs and oscillations. *Cortex*, *126*, 83–106.
- Degen, J., Hawkins, R. D., Graf, C., Kreiss, E., & Goodman, N. D. (2020). When redundancy is useful: A Bayesian approach to “overinformative” referring expressions. *Psychological Review*, *127*(4), 591–621.
- Dietrich, S., Hertrich, I., Seibold, V. C., & Rolke, B. (2019). Discourse management during speech perception: A functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) study. *NeuroImage*, *202*, 116047.
- Domaneschi, F. (2016). *Presuppositions and cognitive processes: Understanding the information taken for granted*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Domaneschi, F., Canal, P., Masia, V., Vallauri, E. L., & Bambini, V. (2018). N400 and P600 modulation in presupposition accommodation: The effect of different trigger types. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *45*, 13–35.
- Domaneschi, F., Carrea, E., Penco, C., & Greco, A. (2014). The cognitive load of presupposition triggers: Mandatory and optional repairs in presupposition failure. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, *29*(1), 136–146.
- Domaneschi, F., & Di Paola, S. (2018). The processing costs of presupposition accommodation. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *47*(3), 483–503.
- Domaneschi, F., & Di Paola, S. (2019). The aging factor in presupposition processing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *140*, 70–87.
- Feng, W., Wu, Y., Jan, C. Yu, H., Jiang, X., & Zhou, X. (2017). Effects of contextual relevance on pragmatic inference during conversation: An fMRI study. *Brain and Language*, *171*, 52–61.
- Feng, W., Yu, H., & Zhou, X. (2021). Understanding particularized and generalized conversational implicatures: Is theory-of-mind necessary? *Brain & Language*, *212*, 104878.
- Franke, M., & Degen, J. (2016). Reasoning in reference games: Individual-vs. population-level probabilistic modeling. *PLoS One*, *11*(5), e0154854.
- Frank, M. C., & Goodman, N. D. (2012). Predicting pragmatic reasoning in language games. *Science*, *336*(6084), 998–998.
- Galati, A., & Brennan, S. E. (2021). What is retained about common ground? Distinct effects of linguistic and visual co-presence. *Cognition*, *215*, 104809.
- Glanzberg, M. (2005). Presuppositions, truth values, and expressing propositions. In G. Preyer & G. Peters (Eds.), *Contextualism in philosophy: Knowledge, meaning, and truth* (pp. 349–396). Oxford University Press
- Holler, J., & Levinson, S. C. (2019). Multimodal language processing in human communication. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *23*(8), 639–652.
- Jacoby, N., & Fedorenko, E. (2020). Discourse-level comprehension engages medial frontal Theory of Mind brain regions even for expository texts. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, *35*(6), 780–796.
- Jiang, X., Li, Y., & Zhou, X. (2013). Even a rich man can afford that expensive house: ERP responses to construction-based pragmatic constraints during sentence comprehension. *Neuropsychologia*, *51*(10), 1857–1866.
- Jiang, X., Tan, Y., & Zhou, X. (2009). Processing the universal quantifier during sentence comprehension: ERP evidence. *Neuropsychologia*, *47*(8-9), 1799–1815.
- Jiang, X., & Zhou, X. (2020). An alternative structure rescues

- failed semantics? Strong global expectancy reduces local-mismatch N400 in Chinese flexible structures. *Neuropsychologia*, *140*, 107380.
- Jouravlev, O., Stearns, L., Bergen, L., Eddy, M., Gibson, E., & Fedorenko, E. (2016). Processing temporal presuppositions: An event-related potential study. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, *31*(10), 1245–1256.
- Keysar, B., Barr, D. J., Balin, J. A., & Brauner, J. S. (2000). Taking perspective in conversation: The role of mutual knowledge in comprehension. *Psychological Science*, *11*(1), 32–38.
- Kirsten, M., Tiemann, S., Seibold, V. C., Hertrich, I., Beck, S., & Rolke, B. (2014). When the polar bear encounters many polar bears: Event-related potential context effects evoked by uniqueness failure. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, *29*(9), 1147–1162.
- Li, S., Jiang, X., Yu, H., & Zhou, X. (2014). Cognitive empathy modulates the processing of pragmatic constraints during sentence comprehension. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *9*(8), 1166–1174.
- Masia, V., Canal, P., Ricci, I., Vallauri, E. L., & Bambini, V. (2017). Presupposition of new information as a pragmatic garden path: Evidence from event-related brain potentials. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *42*, 31–48.
- Mi, Q., Wang, C., Camerer, C. F., & Zhu, L. (2021). Reading between the lines: Listener's vmPFC simulates speaker cooperative choices in communication games. *Science Advances*, *7*(10), eabe6276.
- Mitchell, D. C. (2004). On-line methods in language processing: Introduction and historical review. In M. Carreiras, & C. J. Clifton (Eds.), *The on-line study of sentence comprehension: Eyetracking, ERPs, and beyond* (pp. 15–32). Brighton, UK: Psychology Press.
- Murphy, G. L. (1984). Establishing and accessing referents in discourse. *Memory & Cognition*, *12*(5), 489–497.
- Nieuwland, M. S., & Martin, A. E. (2017). Neural oscillations and a nascent corticohippocampal theory of reference. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *29*(5), 896–910.
- Pickering, M. J., & Garrod, S. (2007). Do people use language production to make predictions during comprehension? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*(3), 105–110.

- (2021). Differentiating text-based and knowledge-based validation processes during reading: Evidence from eye movements. *Discourse Processes*, 58(1), 22–41.
- Wang, L., & Schumacher, P. B. (2013). New is not always costly: Evidence from online processing of topic and contrast in Japanese. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, 363.
- Willems, R. M., de Boer, M., de Ruiter, J. P., Noordzij, M. L., Hagoort, P., & Toni, I. (2010). A dissociation between linguistic and communicative abilities in the human brain. *Psychological Science*, 21(1), 8–14.
- Yang, X., Zhang, X., Yang, Y., & Lin, N. (2018). How context features modulate the involvement of the working memory system during discourse comprehension. *Neuropsychologia*, 111, 36–44.
- Yang, X., Zhang, X., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Q., & Li, X. (2020). How working memory capacity modulates the time course of semantic integration at sentence and discourse level. *Neuropsychologia*, 140, 107383.
- Ye, Z. & Zhou, X. (2009). Conflict control during sentence comprehension: fMRI evidence. *Neuroimage*, 48(1), 280–290.
- Zang, C., Zhang, L., Zhang, M., Bai, X., Yan, G., Jiang, X., ... Zhou, X. (2019). Eye movements reveal delayed use of construction-based pragmatic information during online sentence reading: A case of Chinese Lian... dou Construction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2211.
- Zhang, X., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Z., Yang, X., & Yang, Y. (2021). How working memory capacity modulates the time course of indirect replies comprehension: An event-related potential study. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 36(10), 1246–1257.

Presupposition processing in language comprehension

YANG Qi¹, JIANG Xiaoming², ZHOU Xiaolin²

(¹ School of Humanities, Tongji University, Shanghai 200092, China)

(² Institute of Linguistics, Shanghai International Studies University, Shanghai 201620, China)

Abstract: Presupposition refers to the non-explicit assumption or belief held by both the listener and the speaker (or the “common ground”). When encountering a message of presupposition, the listener is required to infer what the speaker implies from the specific linguistic marker (or presupposition trigger) and its constrained object (or computational point). For instance, the sentence “Zhang Ming published a paper_{computational point} again_{trigger}” generates a presupposition “Zhang Ming published a paper before”. The listener relies on the trigger to access the common ground of both sides of the communication, and infers the presupposed content on the computational point; subsequently, the comprehender relates the generated presupposition to the common ground and then updates their mental representation. Ling6331 -9(.64e o)grpeg6 1029. 1029. 1029