

## PRESUPPOSITION PROJECTION AND ALTERNATIVE PLACEMENT OF FOCUS: A CASE OF COGNITIVE FACTIVE VERBS IN SERBIAN

**Abstract:** The aim of the present study is to contribute to the growing body of research on projective meaning. We take projection to be the ability of projective content to remain constant under different entailment-cancelling operators, such as negation, modals, conditionals and questions. The goal of the conducted experiment was to examine the projection behavior of presuppositions triggered by three cognitive factive verbs in Serbian: *otkriti* (to discover), *primetiti* (to notice) and *saznati* (to find out). Furthermore, we investigated whether the projection of presuppositions triggered by cognitive factives depended on information structure, i.e., whether alternative placements of focus (on the trigger itself and on the presupposed complement) would trigger alternative readings in terms of presupposition projection, so we manipulated the prosody of the target utterances. The participants were presented with aural stimuli which included a trigger placed in the antecedent of a conditional. Their task was to judge whether the negation of the relevant content was possible. The results indicated that presuppositions triggered by cognitive factive verbs in Serbian showed a high probability to project out of conditionals. It was also shown that different cognitive factive verbs were associated with similar probabilities to project. Finally, alternative placement of focus marked by prosodic prominence did not influence the projection of the content of cognitive factive verbs in a significant way.

**Key words:** presupposition, projection, cognitive factives, focus, trigger, alternative

### 1. Introduction

The overall meaning of an utterance is usually composed of multiple layers of meaning. Some of the content it conveys expresses the speaker's main point, while others are secondary to the main point of the discourse. This observation is reflected in example (1) below. The given utterance carries the main proposition that John's dog is dangerous. However, the listener also takes it for granted that a person named John exists and that he has a dog. These backgrounded pieces of information are treated as known by the interlocutors, and they are referred to as presuppositions.

Presuppositions differ from asserted content in their ability to project, i.e., to remain constant under a variety of sentence operators, such as negation, modals, conditionals and questions. For example, even if the previous example sentence

is negated, as in (2), the presuppositions that John exists and that he has a dog remain true. The notion of presupposition projection has generated a lot of interest in literature (see among others Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet, 1990; Heim, 1983, Karttunen, 1973, 1974; Langendoen & Savin, 1971; Schlenker, 2006, 2008a, 2008b; Simons, Tonhauser, Beaver, & Roberts, 2010; Stalnaker 1973, 1974).

- (1) John's dog is dangerous.
- (2) John's dog isn't dangerous.

Presuppositions are typically associated with a variety of lexical expressions and linguistic constructions known as presupposition triggers, such as definite descriptions, change of state verbs, cleft structures, etc. One of the most studied presupposition triggers is factive verbs. Factives are clause-embedding predicates that take for granted the truth of their complement (Aravind & Hackl, 2017, p. 46). The presuppositional nature of an inference triggered by a factive verb is evident from the fact that it remains constant in the syntactic scope of an operator, such as negation in (3).

- (3) a. Sam knew that Đoković had won the tournament.  $\Rightarrow$  Đoković won the tournament.
- b. Sam didn't know that Đoković had won the tournament.  $\Rightarrow$  Đoković won the tournament.

There are cases, however, when a presupposition does not project. This observation often applies to verbs belonging to the group of cognitive factives, which is a class of factive verbs used primarily "to convey information about what information the interlocutor has or how the information is acquired or lost" (Beaver, 2010, p. 1). Example (4) shows that the presupposition associated with the cognitive factive verb *to find out* in the antecedent of the conditional, that Đoković won the tournament, does not survive under the conditional operator.

- (4) I don't know if Đoković won the tournament, but if I find out that he did, I will be over the moon.

Until this point, both the theoretical and the empirical work on presupposition projection have been conducted mainly in English and other Germanic languages. In this study, we aim to contribute to the development of the empirical coverage of projective meaning by examining the behavior of presupposition triggers in a language which has not been thoroughly investigated in this respect – Serbian. In particular, we are concerned with the projection of inferences associated with cognitive factives in this language.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 defines the notion of presupposition projection and reviews the relevant literature on this issue. Section 3 highlights the main research questions and provides motivation for the experimental work conducted in this study. Section 4 elaborates on the experiment and provides details on the stimuli, participants and procedure. In section 5, the results obtained through the statistical analysis of the data are presented and discussed with regard to the

initial research questions. The concluding section gives an overview of the paper together with some suggestions for further research.

## 2. Theoretical background

### 2.1. Presupposition projection

As previously noted, a defining property of presuppositions is projection. It represents the ability of the presupposed content to be interpreted as falling outside of the scope of an entailment-canceling operator within whose syntactic scope its trigger occurs. However, presuppositions do not always project. Xue & Onea (2011, p. 1) provide an example, given in (5). The aspectual verb *to stop* is typically regarded as a presupposition trigger, which presupposes the truth of the embedded proposition at times before the reference time. In (5a), the verb *to stop*, which is embedded under the scope of negation, triggers the presupposition that Peter used to smoke. In this case, the presupposition projects. However, Xue & Onea demonstrate that this presupposition does not necessarily project. In (5b), the presupposition is rejected in the second sentence directly, therefore indicating that the first sentence does not actually presuppose that Peter used to smoke. In this case, the presupposition fails to survive under the negation operator and, hence, does not project.

- (5) a. Peter didn't stop smoking.  
 b. Peter didn't stop smoking. He never smoked!

It has been observed that not all presuppositions project equally. Presuppositions triggered by some triggers show less stable projection behavior than others (Abrusán, 2016; Abusch, 2002; Karttunen, 1971; Simons, 2007). This contrast has been used as evidence for distinguishing between two different kinds of presuppositions: those triggered by hard triggers, whose presuppositions are characterized by stable projection, and those triggered by soft triggers, whose content is less projective (Abusch, 2002). When it comes to the class of factive verbs, we find diversity with respect to projection. While presuppositions triggered by some factives, like *to regret*, *to be upset* and *to be glad*, show relatively stable projection, inferences triggered by other factives, such as *to know*, *to realize* and *to find out* do not necessarily project. The first group of verbs represents emotive factives, used primarily to convey the interlocutor's emotional attitude towards information, and they are categorized as hard triggers. The second group of factives are classified as cognitive factives and they are considered to be soft triggers or 'semifactives', as Karttunen (1971, p. 65) calls them. The difference between emotive and cognitive factives is exemplified by (6) and (7), taken from Karttunen (1971, p. 64). In (6), the presupposition triggered by the verb *to regret*, is that the speaker has not told the truth. This presupposition projects out of the scope of the conditional. On the other hand, in (7), the speaker is not necessarily committed to the truth of the complement of the verb *to realize*.

- (6) If I *regret* later that I have not told the truth, I will confess it to everyone.  
 (7) If I *realize* later that I have not told the truth, I will confess it to everyone.

## 2.2 Focus and projection

It has recently been suggested in literature (Beaver, 2010; Simons, Beaver, Roberts, & Tonhauser, 2017; Tonhauser, 2016) that projectivity can vary with prosody. In particular, the prosodic realization of an utterance with a factive verb can influence whether the content of the complement projects or not. Beaver (2010, p. 27) provides an example of this observation<sup>1</sup>. In (8), the last word of the complement of the verb *to discover* is narrowly focused. Focus<sup>2</sup> gives rise to the set of focus alternatives where the T.A. discovers something about the interlocutor's work. So, the proposition that there is something about the work to discover projects, but the proposition that the work is plagiarized does not necessarily project. In this case, the content of the complement does not represent a commitment of the professor to the truth of the proposition, i.e., the presupposition does not necessarily project out of the antecedent of the conditional.

In (9), however, where the factive trigger *to discover* is narrowly focused, the professor is committed to the student's work being plagiarized, which means that the presupposition projects. Beaver concludes that the content of the complement of an utterance with a factive verb projects if it is deaccented but does not necessarily project if an expression in the complement is focused. While this prediction has been tested and (at least partly) confirmed in English (Djäv & Bacovcin, 2017; Tonhauser, 2016), it remains to be tested in other languages.

- (8) If the T.A. discovers that your work is [plagiarized]<sub>F</sub>, I will be [forced to notify the Dean]<sub>F</sub>.  
 (9) If the T.A. [discovers]<sub>F</sub> that your work is plagiarized, I will be [forced to notify the Dean]<sub>F</sub>.

## 3. Present study

The aim of the present study is to contribute to the growing body of cross-linguistic research on projective meaning. So far, to our knowledge, there have been no studies dealing with this issue in Serbian. In particular, the goal of the experiment presented in the next section is to examine the projection behavior of presuppositions triggered by cognitive factive verbs in Serbian.

Following Tonhauser, Beaver, & Degen (2018), we assume that projectivity is a gradient property of projective content such as presuppositions, rather than a binary, categorical one. This assumption is motivated by the experimental findings

<sup>1</sup> In this paper, we use angle brackets with a subscripted 'F' ( $[ ]_F$ ) to identify focused expressions.

<sup>2</sup> Focus is standardly defined in terms of evoking a set of alternatives (exhaustive mutually exclusive possibilities) which are relevant for the interpretation of the sentence and which are taken to be salient by the speaker (Krifka, 2008; Rooth, 1992).

about projection variability between soft and hard triggers (Smith & Hall, 2011; Tonhauser et al., 2018; Xue & Onea, 2011). With this observation in mind, the research questions that we are interested in answering in this study are:

Q1: How projective are presuppositions, when triggered by cognitive factive verbs in Serbian?

Q2: Does projective content of different cognitive factive verbs in Serbian vary in how projective it is?

Q3: Does information structure influence the projectivity of presuppositions triggered by cognitive factive verbs in Serbian?

With regard to the last research question, it should be highlighted that in Serbian, the relatively free word order has a great influence on the relationship between syntax and prosody, as reflected in the information-structural notion of focus. Halupka-Rešetar (2010, p. 132) notes that focus can be marked prosodically and by specific syntactic structures, i.e., by placing the focused constituent in a designated syntactic position. In this study, however, we are focused only on prosodic prominence as a means of expressing information structure, as in Tonhauser (2016).

The significance of conducting experimental investigations of projective content and projection variability in languages other than English and determining the cross-linguistic validity of the proposed taxonomies of projective meanings has been highlighted recently (Matthewson, 2006; Tonhauser, 2020). Tonhauser (2020) points out that questions such as how projective presuppositions in various languages are, whether projection variability is a universal or language-specific property, and whether projective content associated with a translation pair is similarly projective remain open as there are not many experimental investigations of projective content and projection variability in languages other than English and German (although, see Amaral & Cummins, 2015; Tonhauser, 2020). For instance, the investigation conducted by Xue & Onea (2011) on projective meanings found that in German, the content of the complement of the cognitive factive verb *wissen* (to know) is less projective than the content of the complement of *erfahren* (to discover), whereas Tonhauser et al. (2018) showed that the content of the complement of the verb *to know* is more projective than that of *to discover*. While these results may point to cross-linguistic variation, it should be noted that there were some differences between the experimental designs of the two investigations. As Tonhauser et al. (2018) emphasized, more research is needed on the potential variation in projectivity in various languages.

Based on this, the motivation for the present study is twofold. First, the replication of the general pattern of projection behavior of various presupposition triggers, including cognitive factive verbs, across languages would support the view that similarities and differences between presupposition triggers are rooted in general logical principles, rather than emerging as a language-specific feature. Secondly, in order to understand the degree to which certain expressions are cross-linguistic counterparts, it is important to investigate the possibility of gradience among presupposition triggers (in this case, cognitive factive verbs) in terms of

how projective their content is. By conducting this research in Serbian, we hope to contribute to the understanding of projective content across languages.

## 4. Method

### 4.1. Stimuli

Following Xue & Onea (2011), we designed an experiment in which the strength of projectivity of presuppositions triggered by cognitive factive verbs in Serbian was tested using a forced-choice task. The test items followed the structure presented in (10). Each involved the description of the context of a situation in which the main character, Marija, was always present. The description was followed by Marija's comment on the situation, presented in auditory form. This was the critical sentence, which contained one of the three investigated lexical triggers embedded in the antecedent of a conditional. The investigated triggers were the following cognitive factive verbs: *otkriti* (to discover), *saznati* (to find out) and *primetiti* (to notice).

- (10) Kontekst: Marija posmatra Bobana, kolegu sa fakulteta, kako priča o svom seminarskom radu.

Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže: Ako profesor otkrije da je Boban plagirao rad, moraće da ga prijavi dekanu.

In order to test whether focus marked by prosodic prominence has an impact on the interpretation of the projective property of presupposed content, the critical sentences were presented under two conditions. Following Tonhauser (2016), under one condition, a narrow focus was placed on the cognitive factive verb, as in (11a). Under the second condition, the factive verb was not stressed in any way, while the verb in the complement clause was marked by narrow focus, as in (11b). All critical sentences were recorded by a native speaker of Serbian who is a trained phonetician, guided by the literature on prosody, which notes that cross-linguistically, a focused element carries prosodic prominence and stands out perceptually from the remainder of the utterance.

As in Xue & Onea's study, after the critical sentences were presented to the participants, each of them was followed by a question about the possibility of negating the content triggered by the factive verb in a given critical sentence, as in (12). The participants' task was to answer the questions on the basis of the information provided by the given context. The forced-choice task consisted of choosing one of the two possible responses: *Da, postoji* (Yes, it's possible) and *Ne, ne postoji* (No, it's not possible), as in (13). We assumed that the participants would choose the *Yes* answer if the target presupposition failed to project. For example, if a participant answered *Yes* to the question in (12), it was assumed that she thought that it was not necessarily the case that Boban plagiarized his paper. Therefore, the presupposition that Boban plagiarized his paper, triggered by the verb *otkriti* in the given critical

sentence, failed to survive the conditional operator since the participant did not take it for granted. On the other hand, we assumed that the participants would choose the *No* answer if the target presupposition projected in the given context. In example (12), by choosing the negative answer, a participant would commit herself to the truth of the presupposition that Boban plagiarized his paper, which would mean that the presupposition survived the conditional and projected.

(12) Kontekst: Marija posmatra Bobana, kolegu sa fakulteta, kako priča o svom seminarskom radu.

Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže:

a. Ako profesor [otkrije]<sub>F</sub> da je Boban plagirao rad, moraće da ga prijavi dekanu.  
 b. Ako profesor otkrije da je Boban [plagirao]<sub>F</sub> rad, moraće da ga prijavi dekanu.

Da li postoji mogućnost da Boban nije plagirao rad?

R1: Da, postoji.

R2: Ne, ne postoji.

Nine sets of test items (three per trigger) such as the one in (12) were generated, amounting to a total of 18 test items, all included in the Appendix. The items were then distributed between the two lists. The participants were randomly assigned to one of the two lists, which means that each participant saw nine test items. Each test item on the list belonged to a different set, so that each participant saw only one test item from each set. The test items were presented to the participants together with 19 fillers, which resembled the test items in form. Some of them were constructed to distract the participants from the goal of the experiment and others were part of another empirical study. There were 28 items in total per participant, and they were presented in randomized order.

## 4.2. Participants

The participants of the experiment were 50 native speakers of Serbian. They were all 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year students of Communicology and Journalism at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš (31 female and 19 male students, age range = 18 – 24, average age = 20.8, SD = 1.45). The participants were randomly assigned to one of the two lists of test items described in the previous section. They were distributed between the lists evenly – each list involved 25 participants. None of the participants reported any hearing difficulties.

## 4.3. Procedure

The experiment took place in a quiet room. Before starting the experimental session, the participants were asked to read the on-screen instructions<sup>3</sup>, which explained the procedure. The instructions told the participants that they would be presented with 28 items – the descriptions of various situations, all witnessed by the main character, Marija. Each item was followed by an auditory stimulus, which they



could hear through their headphones by clicking on a button. The participants were presented with one item at a time on the computer screen, and then heard the target sentence in a female voice. After listening to it, they saw on the screen a question about the possibility of the presupposed content of the given test item not being true. Their task was to answer the question by choosing one of the two offered answers. They were given an unlimited amount of time to choose the answer. Before the experiment began, the participants were told that there were no correct answers and that they should base their judgments on their first impressions.

It took the participants less than 15 minutes to complete the experiment. Once the responses from all the participants were collected, they were submitted for statistical analysis. The following section presents the way the results were computed together with their summary and then discusses them in relation to the initial research questions.

## 5. Results and discussion

The obtained data was analyzed in SPSS (version 24.0). 450 responses were collected in total. Out of these, 99 responses, or 22%, involved the *Yes* answer, while 351 responses, or 78% of the total number of responses, included the *No* answer. The z-test for one population proportion indicated that this difference in the frequency of occurrence of the two possible responses was significant ( $z = -14.34, p = .000^4$ ). This means that in a significant majority of cases, the participants interpreted the content of cognitive factives as projecting from the scope of conditionals, which was expected.

The next step involved examining the participants' responses to each of the three investigated triggers. The results are presented in Table 1. To explore the association between the different cognitive factives investigated in the study and the participants' responses, we conducted a chi-square test for independence. The dependent variable was the percentage of responses chosen for each verb. The independent variable was the type of trigger. The results indicated that the two variables were independent ( $X^2(2, 450) = 1.63, p = .442$ ), which means that there was no significant difference in the participants' responses to the three investigated verbs.

	Yes, it's possible.	No, it's not possible.	Total
<i>otkriti</i>	32	118	150
<i>saznati</i>	29	121	150
<i>primetiti</i>	38	112	150
Total	99	351	450

**Table 1.** The number of responses per trigger

Finally, we analyzed the participants' responses depending on whether focus was placed on the trigger itself or on the complement clause verb. As shown in Table 2, the results indicated that there was a slight difference in the number of responses based on this variable. To investigate whether this difference was significant or not,



we conducted a chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction to compensate for the overestimate of the chi-square value when used with a 2 x 2 table). The results showed that there was no significant association between the responses and the condition variable:  $\chi^2(1, 450) = 0.83, p = .363$ . In the remainder of this section, the results will be discussed in terms of the questions posed at the beginning of the study.

	Yes, it is possible.	No, it's not possible.	Total
Narrow focus on the trigger	45	180	225
Narrow focus on the complement clause verb	54	171	225
Total	99	351	450

**Table 2.** The number of responses per condition

The first research question was concerned with how projective are presuppositions, when triggered by cognitive factive verbs in Serbian. The results clearly indicated that the presuppositions triggered by the factives investigated in the experiment showed a high probability to project – the participants in the experiment interpreted the relevant content as projecting in 78% of the cases. If we take into consideration that cognitive factive verbs are thought to be soft triggers, which are characterized by lower projection strength, this percentage might seem high. Furthermore, the results obtained in this study diverge from the ones obtained by Xue & Onea (2011) in German. Namely, in their study, the factive verbs *wissen* (to know) and *erfahren* (to find out) showed far lower probabilities to project – they projected in 38.24% and 51.96% of the cases, respectively. It should be noted here that while the designs of both experiments were similar in that they both used triggers placed in the scope of conditional clauses and they both used the negation of the relevant content to test how projective presuppositions were, they differed in some respects. The participants in Xue & Onea's experiment were presented with stimuli in the form of isolated sentences, without any context. This means that, when confronted with a target sentence, the participants always had to reconstruct a conversational context with themselves as listeners and an imaginary speaker. As Xue & Onea (2011, p. 7) point out, reconstructing a context involves identifying the communication goal of the participants in the conversation and accommodating assumptions that should be included in the Common Ground. The probability of the tested presuppositions to project was then interpreted by the authors as the probability of the participants to reconstruct a context in which the presupposition projects.

In our experiment, however, the participants were presented with some contextual information which might have influenced their interpretation of a presupposition projection. For example, in (13), the fact that Marija is watching what the people in the zoo are doing probably led the participants to conclude that she could see that the children were feeding the monkeys, which means that the context made it possible for the participants to conclude that the speaker, Marija, was

committed to the factive complement being true. In other words, the presupposed content was triggered by the verb *primetiti* projects in this particular example. It can be concluded that projection strength cannot be interpreted as an intrinsic lexical property of various triggers (Jayez, Mongelli, Reboul, & van der Henst, 2015, p. 18). Even within the same sentence, the same presupposition can show different projection behavior, depending on the given context. In summary, the presence of contextual information could have had an effect on the high probability of presupposition projection in the present study.

- (13) Marija posmatra ljude koji šetaju u zoološkom vrtu.  
 Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže: Ako čuvar primeti da deca hrane  
 majmune, reći će im da se udalje od kaveza.  
 Da li postoje mogućnosti da deca ne hrane majmune?

The second research question was concerned with the potential difference among three different cognitive factives in Serbian (*otkriti*, *primetiti* and *saznati*) with respect to the projection strength of their content. The results showed that the differences obtained in the experiment were minor and not significant. In German, however, it was shown by Xue & Onea (2011) that the cognitive factive verbs *wissen* (to know) and *erfahren* (to find out) were associated with different projection probabilities of their presuppositions. At the beginning of the study, we defined projectivity as a gradient property of presuppositional content. While there is a general agreement that presupposition is a universal property of language, it might be the case that the projection strength of presuppositions triggered by various triggers is subject to cross-linguistic variation. In other words, it is not necessarily the case that translational equivalents across languages always display the same behaviors. Presuppositional content of particular lexical triggers might show different projection strengths in different languages. While there might be some variability in projection strength among cognitive factive verbs in German, the same group of verbs in Serbian seems to show uniformity in this respect. It should be pointed out again, however, that the two studies differed in their experimental designs, so more research is needed in order to confirm this conclusion regarding the potential cross-linguistic variation in projectivity in the two languages.

The final question dealt with the influence of focus realized by prosodic prominence on the projectivity of presuppositions triggered by cognitive factive verbs in Serbian. The statistical analysis showed that while presuppositions in the target sentences with a narrow focus on the complement clause verb showed a slightly lower probability to project, the difference between the two investigated groups was not statistically significant. Therefore, we come to the tentative conclusion that focus realized by prosody does not impact the interpretation of presupposed content in the context of embedding operators such as a conditional in Serbian. We propose, however, that presupposition projection is not completely unaffected by the prosodic contour of an utterance, which is reflected in a slightly higher tendency of deaccented factive complement content to project, as seen in Table 2. There are simply other factors which have a greater impact on projection interpretation, such as the provided

contextual information in the present study. Deriving the ultimate interpretation of an utterance can be influenced by multiple factors, and focus is another cue which can strengthen or weaken the inference that the speaker is committed to the projective content and help the listener arrive at the final interpretation successfully.

## 6. Conclusion

The study reported here provided insights into the projection behavior of presuppositions triggered by cognitive factive verbs in Serbian. As there are no previous studies on this topic in the literature on Serbian, not much is known about the contribution this group of verbs makes to presupposed meaning in discourse. The present study aimed to start filling in a part of this gap. A short summary of the analyzed data and findings is given below.

The study was interested in the projective content triggered by three cognitive factive verbs in Serbian: *okriti*, *primetiti* and *saznati*. Guided by previous research on projectivity (Tonhauser, Beaver, Roberts, & Simons, 2013; Tonhauser, 2016; Xue & Onea, 2011), we designed an experiment which included stimuli that contained the target triggers embedded within a sentence operator – a conditional. The participants were asked to judge whether the negation of the relevant presuppositions was compatible with the given stimuli. The results indicated that, in general, presuppositions triggered by cognitive factive verbs in Serbian showed a high probability to project out of conditionals. It was also shown that different cognitive factive verbs were associated with similar probabilities to project. The experiment further manipulated the prosodic contour of the given utterances to examine the influence of information structure expressed by prosodic prominence on the strength of projectivity in Serbian. The results showed that placing narrow focus on the trigger within the scope of a conditional did not increase the projective strength of the triggered presupposition to a significant degree, nor did placing narrow focus on the complement clause verb decrease its strength. We, therefore, concluded that focus realized by prosodic prominence might only serve to support other cues such as context in enabling the ultimate interpretation of utterances containing projective content, but it does not affect projection in a significant way on its own in Serbian.

The present study included only cognitive factive verbs. However, in order to gain a deeper insight into the issue of presupposition projection in Serbian, it is necessary to conduct further experimental work which would test a wider range of presupposition triggers. Future studies can focus on other types of lexical triggers, such as emotive factive verbs (e.g., *zažaliti*, *biti srećan*, *biti uznemiren*), which are considered to be hard triggers, so their presuppositions should show greater projection strength than the presuppositions of the triggers tested in our study. As Tonhauser (2020) points out, while it has been established that projective content in English varies in its projectivity, empirically adequate analyses must account for projective content and projection variability in other languages as well.

## References

- Abrusán, M. (2016). Presupposition cancellation: explaining the ‘soft–hard’ trigger distinction. *Natural Language Semantics*, 24(2), 165–202.
- Abusch, D. (2002). Lexical Alternatives as a Source of Pragmatic Presuppositions. In B. Jackson (Ed.), *Proceedings of SALT XII* (pp. 1–20). Ithaca: CLC Publications.
- Amaral, P., & Cummins, C. (2015). A Cross-Linguistic Study on Information Backgrounding and Presupposition Projection. In F. Schwarz (Ed.) *Experimental Perspectives on Presuppositions. Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics, vol 45* (pp. 157–172). Cham: Springer.
- Aravind, A., & Hackl, M. (2017). Factivity and At-Issue-ness in the Acquisition of Forget and Remember. In M. LaMendola & J. Scott (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 41st annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* (pp. 46–59). Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Beaver, D. (2010). Have you noticed that your Belly Button Lint colour is related to the colour of your clothing? In R. Bäuerle, U. Reyle & E. Zimmermann (Eds.), *Presuppositions and Discourse: Essays Offered to Hans Kamp* (pp. 65–99). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Chierchia, G., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1990). *Meaning and Grammar*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Djäv, K., & Bacovcin, H. A. (2017). Prosodic Effects on Factive Presupposition Projection. In D. Burgdorf, J. Collard, S. Maspong & B. Stefánsdóttir (Eds.), *Proceedings of SALT 27* (pp. 116–133). NY: Linguistic Society of America.
- Halupka-Rešetar, S. (2011). *Rečenični fokus u engleskom i srpskom jeziku*. (Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad).
- Heim, I. (1983). On the projection problem for presuppositions. *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 2, 114–125.
- Jayez, J., Mongelli, V., Reboul, A., & van der Henst, J. B. (2015). Weak and Strong Triggers. In F. Schwarz (Ed.) *Experimental Perspectives on Presuppositions. Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics, vol 45* (pp. 173–193). Cham: Springer.
- Karttunen, L. (1971). Some Observations on Factivity. *Papers in Linguistics*, 5, 55–69.
- Karttunen, L. (1973). Presuppositions of compound sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 4(2), 169–93.
- Karttunen, L. (1974). Presupposition and linguistic context. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 1, 181–193.
- Krifka, M. (2008). Basic Notions of Information Structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55(3-4), 243–276.
- Langendoen, D. T., & Savin, H. (1971). The projection problem for presuppositions. In C. Fillmore & D. T. Langendoen (Eds.), *Studies in Linguistic Semantics* (pp. 373–388). New York: Holt, Reinhardt and Winston.
- Mathôt, S., Daniël S., & Theeuwes, J. (2012). OpenSesame: An opensource, graphical experiment builder for the social sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 44(2), 314–324.
- Matthewson, L. (2006). Presupposition and cross-linguistic variation. *Proceedings of NELS 26*, 63–76.

- Rooth, M. (1992). A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75–116.
- Schlenker, P. (2006). Anti-dynamics: Presupposition projection without dynamic semantics. *Journal of Logic, Language, and Information*, 16(3), 325–56.
- Schlenker, P. (2008a). Be articulate: A pragmatic theory of presupposition projection. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 34(3), 157–212.
- Schlenker, P. (2008b). Presupposition projection: Explanatory strategies. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 34(3), 287–316.
- Simons, M. (2007). Observations on embedding verbs, evidentiality, and presupposition. *Lingua*, 117(6), 1034–1056.
- Simons, M., Tonhauser, J., Beaver, D., & Roberts, C. (2010). What projects and why. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, 20, 309–327.
- Simons, M., Beaver, D., Roberts, C., & Tonhauser, J. (2017). The best question: Explaining the projection behavior of factives. *Discourse Processes*, 54(3), 187–206.
- Smith, E. A., & Hall, K. C. (2011). Projection diversity: Experimental evidence. *Proceedings of the 2011 ESSLLI Workshop on Projective Content*, 156–170.
- Stalnaker, R. (1973). Presuppositions. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 2(4), 447–457.
- Stalnaker, R. (1974). Pragmatic presuppositions. In M. K. Munitz & P. K. Unger (Eds.), *Semantics and philosophy* (pp. 197–213). New York: New York University Press.
- Tonhauser, J. (2016). Prosodic cues to presupposition projection. In C. R. Little, J. Collard, M. Moroney & D. Burgdorf (Eds.), *Proceedings of SALT 26* (pp. 934–960). NY: Linguistic Society of America.
- Tonhauser, J. (2020). Projection variability in Paraguayan Guaraní. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 38, 1263–1302.
- Tonhauser, J., Beaver, D., Roberts, C., & Simons, M. (2013). Toward a taxonomy of projective content. *Language* 89, 66–109.
- Tonhauser, J., Beaver, D., & Degen, J. (2018). How Projective is Projective Content? Gradience in Projectivity and At-issueness. *Journal of Semantics*, 35(3), 495–542.
- Xue, J., & Onea, E. (2011). Correlation between presupposition projection and at-issueness: An empirical study. *Proceedings of the ESSLLI 2011 Workshop on Projective Meaning*, Ljubljana, Slovenia.

## Appendix

Below are presented the sets of test items involved in the experiment. In each set, the critical sentence appears under the two investigated conditions. In condition A, narrow focus was placed on the cognitive factive verb. In condition B, the factive verb was not stressed in any way, while the complement clause was marked by narrow focus on the verb.

1. Kontekst: Marija posmatra Bobana, kolegu sa fakulteta, kako priča o svom seminarskom radu sa ostalim kolegama.  
Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže:

A. Ako profesor [otkrije]<sub>F</sub> da je Boban

plagirao rad, moraće da ga prijavi dekanu.

B. Ako profesor otkrije da je Boban

[plagirao]<sub>F</sub> rad, moraće da ga prijavi dekanu.

Da li postoji mogućnost da Boban nije plagirao rad?

2. Kontekst: Marija posmatra Snežanu kako sa drugaricama priča o nedavnoj krađi nakita u studentskom domu u kome stanuje.

Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže:

A. Ako policija [otkrije]<sub>F</sub> da je Snežana ukrala nakit, moraće da plati kaznu.

B. Ako policija otkrije da je Snežana

[ukrala]<sub>F</sub> nakit, moraće da plati kaznu.

Da li postoji mogućnost da Snežana nije ukrala nakit?

3. Kontekst: Marija posmatra tatu kako pere auto u dvorištu.

Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže:

A. Ako tata [otkrije]<sub>F</sub> da je Milica ogrebala auto, zabraniće joj da izlazi sa drugaricama u grad.

B. Ako tata otkrije da je Milica [ogrebala]<sub>F</sub> auto, zabraniće joj da izlazi sa drugaricama u grad.

Da li postoji mogućnost da Milica nije ogrebala auto?

4. Kontekst: Marija posmatra svog druga Sašu, koji priča o svojoj bivšoj devojci Jasmini, koja se preselila u Norvešku.

Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže:

A. Ako Saša [sazna]<sub>F</sub> da se Jasmina vratila, želeće da se vidi sa njom.

B. Ako Saša sazna da se Jasmina [vratila]<sub>F</sub>, želeće da se vidi sa njom.

Da li postoji mogućnost da se Jasmina nije vratila iz Norveške?

5. Kontekst: Marija posmatra svoju majku kako priča sa njenom sestrom Milicom o fakultetu.

Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže:

A. Ako mama [sazna]<sub>F</sub> da je Milica pala ispit, biće veoma razočarana.

B. Ako mama sazna da je Milica [pala]<sub>F</sub> ispit, biće veoma razočarana.

Da li postoji mogućnost da Milica nije pala ispit?

6. Kontekst: Marija posmatra drugaricu Sandru, koja priča o svom sinu, koji je krenuo u prvi razred gimnazije.

Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže:

A. Ako Sandra [sazna]<sub>F</sub> da je njen sin pobegao sa časa, neće mu dati da ide na ekskurziju.

B. Ako Sandra sazna da je njen sin [pobegao]<sub>F</sub> sa časa, neće mu dati da ide na ekskurziju.

Da li postoji mogućnost da Sandrin sin nije pobegao sa časa?

7. Kontekst: Marija posmatra ljude koji šetaju u zoološkom vrtu.

Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže:

A. Ako čuvar [primeti]<sub>F</sub> da deca hrane majmune, reći će im da se udalje od kaveza.

B. Ako čuvar primeti da deca [hrane]<sub>F</sub> majmune, reći će im da se udalje od kaveza.

Da li postoji mogućnost da deca ne hrane majmune?

8. Kontekst: Marija posmatra Mašu i Milana kako piju kafu u bašti kafića.

Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže:

A. Ako Maša [primeti]<sub>F</sub> da je Milan laže, neće više pričati sa njim.

B. Ako Maša primeti da je Milan [laže]<sub>F</sub>, neće više pričati sa njim.

Da li postoji mogućnost Milan ne laže Mašu?

9. Kontekst: Marija posmatra svoje prijatelje Dejana i Branku kako pričaju o poslu.

Posle nekog vremena Marija kaže:

A. Ako Dejan [primeti]<sub>F</sub> da je Branka nezadovoljna poslom, odmah će joj ponuditi mesto u svojoj kompaniji.

B. Ako Dejan primeti da je Branka [nezadovoljna]<sub>F</sub> poslom, odmah će joj ponuditi mesto u svojoj kompaniji.

Da li postoji mogućnost da Branka nije nezadovoljna poslom?

**Ema Živković**

## **PROJEKCIJA PRESUPOZICIJE I ALTERNATIVNO MESTO FOKUSA: KOGNITIVNI FAKTIVNI GLAGOLI U SRPSKOM**

### **Rezime**

Cilj ovog rada je da doprinese sve mnogobrojnijim istraživanjima o projekciji presupozicije. Projekcija se odnosi na odliku presupozicije da bude postojana čak i kada se iskaz negira ili kada se, na primer, nađe u okviru pitanja ili uslovnih konstrukcija. Cilj



našeg istraživanja bio je ispitati projekciju presupozicija čiji su okidači sledeći kognitivni faktivni glagoli u srpskom: otkriti, saznati i primetiti. Zatim, istraživali smo da li mesto fokusa (na okidaču ili presuponiranoj dopunskoj klauzi) utiče na interpretaciju postojanosti presupozicije. Rezultati istraživanja pokazali su da su presupozicije čiji su okidači pomenuti kognitivni faktivni glagoli izuzetno postojane kada se nalaze u okviru uslovnih konstrukcija, odnosno da imaju veliku moć projekcije. Takođe se pokazalo da u pogledu projekcije ne postoje razlike između pomenutih okidača. Kada je u pitanju fokus, on nije značajno uticao na interpretaciju projekcije presupozicija ispitanika.

ema.zivkovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs