

*

1 2 2

(¹ , 200092) (² , 201620)

() ()

() , “ — ” “ ;

“ ,

“ ,

(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

(the) (again)

, , ;

(, meaning) , ,

(implicature) (“ ”)

(conventional meaning) (what is said) , (default

(assertion) (default

(, 2003; Domaneschi, 2016) , processing,

())

, ;

, ,

, 1.1

, ;

(Domaneschi, 2016; , (Tiemann et al., 2011)

, 2013) ,

() ,

, (

Tiemann et al., 2011,) ,

(

), (“ ...”),

(“ ,

(“ ”),

(“ ”) (“ ”)

”², presupposition felicity processing)

(Jiang & Zhou, 2020;

Pickering & Garrod, 2007; Schneider et al., 2021)

, (

,) ;

, ,

, ,

, ,

, 3(, 2007; Wang & Schumacher,

2013; Nieuwland & Martin, 2017; Coopmans &

Nieuwland, 2020) ,

,

1

(only) (“ ... ”)

(infelicitous condition),

(false condition)

(Schneider et al., 2019)

” vs. “

3

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”

,

(

)

()

,

(Tiemann et al., 2011),

,

“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),

4, Stillman et al. (2018)

remained the same.) (Domaneschi & Di Paola, 2018)

(,)

, , , Clifton

(2013)

, Domaneschi

Di Paola (2018) , (“In the kitchen, /Jason checked out/ the/a / stove / very carefully.”),

()

75% (“Jason was checking out something that he could cook with /that he could clean with.”)

, (the

stove) (a stove)

(very carefully) ,

(

,) () ;

, ,

, (Murphy, 1984; Schneider

et al., 2019); , (Mitchell, 2004)

(Tiemann et al., 2011); “the/a” “stove” ,

(Schwarz,

2014)

, Murphy (1984) , Masia (2017)

;

Tiemann (2011) , (“It is by

, now well established that the humankind is not pure.

; In fact, our DNA contains genetic information

, belonging to Neanderthals, who soon peopled

, Europe.”), (“The

, migration was confirmed by a very recent

article published by Italian and foreign researchers.”;

, Schwarz (2014) “There was a migration ,

confirmed by a very recent article published by

Italian and foreign researchers.”)

,

N400 (,

,

) ,

2.2

,

(“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 ((“ ” “ ”),

) , ; (“ ”)

Abusch (2010)

(Domaneschi et al., 2018)

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

3

, 1
3 ,
,
(Domaneschi & Di Paola, 2019)
, ,
(
) ,
(Domaneschi et al., 2014)
()
,
,
(Abusch, 2010;
Glanzberg, 2005) ,
, ;
,
,
(stop doing something “
”) , ,
,
(Domaneschi & Paola, 2018)
, ,
“N400-P600” ,
N400`jpÆq m Ý

3.3

(P600) (Burkhardt, 2006), (2), (Jiang et al., 2013) (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) ,

(Brown-Schmidt et al., 2008) ,

(Keysar et al., 2000)

(Brown-Schmidt & Heller, 2018;
, 2021)

/ ,

,

;

, /

,

(4.1);

(,)

- . (2007). , 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.
- Rapp, A. M., Mutschler, D. E., & Erb, M. (2012). Where in the brain is nonliteral language? A coordinate-based meta-analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging studies. *Neuroimage*, 63(1), 600–610.
- Reyes-Aguilar, A., Valles-Capetillo, E., & Giordano, M. (2018). A quantitative meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies of pragmatic language comprehension: In search of a universal neural substrate. *Neuroscience*, 395, 60–88.
- Schneider, C., Bade, N., Franke, M., & Janczyk, M. (2021). Presuppositions of determiners are immediately used to disambiguate utterance meaning: A mouse-tracking study on the German language. *Psychological Research*, 85, 1348–1366.
- Schneider, C., Bade, N., & Janczyk, M. (2020). Is immediate processing of presupposition triggers automatic or capacity-limited? A combination of the PRP approach with a self-paced reading task. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 49, 247–273.
- Schneider, C., & Janczyk, M. (2020). Capacity limitations of processing presuppositions triggered by determiners. *Acta Psychologica*, 211, 103159.
- Schneider, C., Schonard, C., Franke, M., Jäger, G., & Janczyk, M. (2019). Pragmatic processing: An investigation of the (anti-) presuppositions of determiners using mouse-tracking. *Cognition*, 193, 104024.
- Schwarz, F. (2014). Presuppositions are fast, whether hard or soft-evidence from the visual world. In Snider, T., D'Antonio, S., & Wiegand, M. (Eds.), *Semantics and linguistic theory* (Vol. 24, pp. 1–22). LSA and CLC Publications.
- Schwarz, F. (2016). Experimental work in presupposition and presupposition projection. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 2, 273–292.
- Shetreet, E., Alexander, E. J., Romoli, J., Chierchia, G., & Kuperberg, G. (2019). What we know about knowing: Presuppositions generated by factive verbs influence downstream neural processing. *Cognition*, 184, 96–106.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (Vol. 142). Massachusetts, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Stalnaker, R. (2002). Common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 25(5/6), 701–721.
- Stillman, P. E., Shen, X., & Ferguson, M. J. (2018). How mouse-tracking can advance social cognitive theory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 22(6), 531–543.
- Tiemann, S., Schmid, M., Bade, N., Rolke, B., Hertrich, I., Ackermann, H., ... Beck, S. (2011). Psycholinguistic evidence for presuppositions: On-line and off-line data. In R. Ingo et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* (Vol. 15, pp. 581–596). Saarbrücken, Germany: Universaar-Saarland University Press.
- van Moort, M. L., Jolles, D. D., Koornneef, A., & van den Broek, P. (2020). What you read versus what you know: Neural correlates of accessing context information and background knowledge in constructing a mental representation during reading. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 149(11), 2084–2101.
- van Moort, M. L., Koornneef, A., & van den Broek, P. W. (2018). Validation: Knowledge-and text-based monitoring during reading. *Discourse Processes*, 55(5-6), 480–496.
- van Moort, M. L., Koornneef, A., & van den Broek, P. W.

- (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