



Continuations as a semantics-pragmatics interface for presuppositions

Timothée Bernard

► **To cite this version:**

Timothée Bernard. Continuations as a semantics-pragmatics interface for presuppositions. *Sinn und Bedeutung* (SuB 23), Sep 2018, Barcelona, Spain. hal-01931283

HAL Id: hal-01931283

<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-01931283>

Submitted on 3 Jul 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Research questions

- How can all the components of a theory of presupposition be integrated in a single formal framework?
- What is the nature of the principles underlying the projection problem for presuppositions?

Take-home messages

- The projection of a presupposition can be conceptualised as an exception (as in computer programming), logical operators and quantifiers as exception handlers.
- In a proof-theoretic approach, cancellation of a presupposition can be seen as provability and the effect of operators can be based on a principle of plausibility of hypotheses.
- The above can be implemented in continuation semantics.

Some data

Mainly from Soames (1982), Heim (1983), Schlenker (2011).

- (1) If the problem was difficult, then Morton isn't the **one** who **solved it**.
- (2) **If John is 64 years old**, he knows that **he can't be hired**.
- (3) If the king has a son, the king's son is bald.
- (4) Mary knows that **there are infinitely many primes**.

Logical vs. heuristic principles

- If regularities in the data are accounted for by a principle that is a consequence of the logic used, any irregularity requires either changing the whole system or patching it with an additional layer.
- This is usually done by resorting to pragmatic mechanisms that often (i) are not rigorously integrated to the initial formalism and (ii) lead to new incorrect predictions.
- Instead, one could build a very expressive framework in which regularities are accounted for by heuristics, robust in their ability to handle irregularities.

Continuation semantics

- Can be seen as a generalisation of Montague (1973)'s type raising. It is a powerful tool to formalise the syntax-semantics interface (Barker & Shan 2014).
- (À la de Groote 2006) Each term has access to a local context variable (c) and its continuation, i.e., the future of the computation (ϕ).
- Lets one intertwine semantics and pragmatics (in the form of algorithms) rigorously in a single framework.
- A typical term performs some computation which includes executing its continuation on an updated context:

$$(5) \lambda c\phi. [\dots(\phi c')\dots]$$
- In our case, a context c consists of a list of formulas $[\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n]$ and represents the formula $\exists x_1, \dots, x_m. \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n$ where the x_i are the free variables of the ϕ_j .

Exceptions for presupposition

- When a presupposition is not satisfied, one needs to interrupt the flow of computation to either accommodate it or raise an objection (*Wait, do you mean that [...]?*).
- This is exactly what exceptions (from computer programming) allow one to do.

Triggering and accommodating

- If the presupposition cannot be proven from the local context, an exception is raised (extending Lebedeva 2012):

$$(6) \llbracket \text{know} \rrbracket = \lambda Psc\phi. \text{if}(\text{prove}(P, c)) : \text{know}(s, Pc \text{ stop}) \wedge \phi c' ; \text{else} : \text{raise } \text{Presupposition}(P)$$
- An occurrence of **gacc** scopes over each sentence S : it executes S and catches any presupposition P to accommodate it, i.e., to compute P with S as part of its continuation:

$$(7) \text{gacc} = \lambda Sc\phi. (Sc\phi) \text{ handle } \text{Presupposition}(P) \text{ with } \text{gacc } Pc(\lambda c'. Sc'\phi)$$

Conditionals (*if A, B*)

- In (9), a handler catches the presuppositions coming from the consequent and decides, through an algorithm choice_{if} , whether to weaken it (2) or not (1).

$$(8) \llbracket \text{if} \rrbracket_1 = \lambda ABC\phi. \neg(\text{Ac}(\lambda c'. \neg \text{Bc}' \text{stop})) \wedge \phi c'$$

$$(9) \llbracket \text{if} \rrbracket_2 = \lambda ABC\phi. \neg(\text{Ac}(\lambda c'. (\neg \text{Bc}' \text{stop}) \text{ handle } \text{Presupposition}(P) \text{ with } \text{if } \text{choice}_{if}(c, A, P) : \text{raise } \text{Presupposition}(P) \text{ else} : \text{raise } \text{Presupposition}(\llbracket \text{if} \rrbracket_1 AP))) \wedge \phi c'$$
- Always weakening leads to the predictions of satisfaction theory (e.g., Heim 1983); never leads to the ones of DRT (van der Sandt 1992); but the most plausible option can be selected as done by Lassiter (2012) with a probability measure pr :

$$(10) pr_{(p::c)}(q) = \frac{pr_c(p \wedge q)}{pr_c(p)}$$

A theory of presupposition?

- Cancellation of a presupposition is due to **provability** (with biases and bounded rationality) from the local context (4).
- The projection problem is governed by **plausibility**: upon catching a presupposition failure, logical operators and quantifiers generate a list of alternatives and project the most plausible one given the context.

References

- Barker, Chris & Chung-chieh Shan. 2014. *Continuations and natural language*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- de Groote, Philippe. 2006. Towards a Montagovian Account of Dynamics. In Masayuki Gibson & Howell Jonathan (eds.), *Proceedings of the 16th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference*, 1–16. University of Tokyo, Japan. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/salt.v16i0.2952>.
- Heim, Irene. 1983. On the projection problem for presuppositions. In Dan Flickinger, M. Barlow & M. Westcoat (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 114–125. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470758335.ch10>.
- Lassiter, Daniel. 2012. Presuppositions, provisos, and probability. en. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 5. 1–37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/sp.5.2>.
- Lebedeva, Ekaterina. 2012. *Expressing Discourse Dynamics Through Continuations*. en. Université de Lorraine Ph.D. Thesis. <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00783245>.
- Montague, Richard. 1973. The proper treatment of quantification in ordinary English. In Jaakko Hintikka, Julius Moravcsik & Patrick Suppes (eds.), *Approaches to natural language: 1970 Stanford workshop on grammar and semantics*, 221–242. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-2506-5_10.
- van der Sandt, Rob A. 1992. Presupposition Projection as Anaphora Resolution. en. *Journal of Semantics* 9(4). 333–377. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jos/9.4.333>.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2011. Presupposition Projection: Two Theories of Local Contexts Part I. en. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 5(12). 848–857. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2011.00299.x>.
- Soames, Scott. 1982. How Presuppositions Are Inherited: A Solution to the Projection Problem. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13(3). 483–545. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178288>.