Two paths to correction
Danfeng Wu | danfeng.wu@magd.ox.ac.uk

Danfeng Wu | danfeng.wu@magd.ox.ac.uk

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Background

- Mandarin *bing* and *you* are used for correction.
- In a dialogue, they may be used to correct the interlocutor, and thus require there to be a proposition to correct.
- *Bing* and *you* are odd out-of-the-blue (1), but fine if the interlocutor had said 'Zhangsan works out.'
- (1) Context: I tell you about my friend Zhangsan, who you don't know anything about. I say:
  Zhangsan (#{bing/you}) bu jianshen
  Zhangsan BING/YOU NEG work.out
  'Zhangsan doesn't work out.'
- When correcting a negative p, they still require negation:
- (2) A: 'Zhangsan doesn't work out.'
  B: Zhangsan {bing/you} *(mei you bu) jianshen
     Zhangsan BING/YOU NEG have NEG work.out
     'It's not the case that Zhangsan doesn't work out.'
- *Bing* and *you* can not only contradict at-issue content, but also presuppositions and non-linguistic statements (3):
- (3) Context: A puppy approaches Zhangsan, who looks scared. I tell Zhangsan:
  bie pa. ta {bing/you} bu hui yao ni
  don't afriad it BING/YOU NEG will bite you
  'Don't be afraid. It won't bite you.'

3 differences between *bing* and *you*

#1: *You* but not *bing* implies the speaker's impatience.
- The use of *you* but not *bing* in (3) implies the speaker's impatience with Zhangsan–perhaps they think Zhangsan is too cowardly and his fear of a puppy is not justified.

#2: *Bing* but not *you* can contradict the expectation created in the same sentence (e.g. out of the blue: 'ZS goes to the gym every day, but he {bing/#you} doesn't work out').

#3: *Bing* can be embedded in finite clauses and negative polar questions, while *you* cannot be embedded:
(4) Zhangsan {bing/#you} bu jianshen ma
    Zhangsan BING/YOU NEG work.out q
    'Does Zhangsan not work out?'

Proposal:
(5) $[\![$bing not p$]\!]^c$(w) = 1 iff p is false
    Defined only if ∃r: ∃q: q is salient ∧ q⇒r ∧ ¬p⇒¬r
    "There's a salient proposition q and an (explicit or implicit) proposition r such that q normally entails r and ¬p normally entails ¬r."

(6) $[\![$you not p$]\!]^c$(w) = 1 iff p is false
    Defined only if ∀w' [w' is compatible with what the speaker$_c$ knows in w → ¬p ∈ CG$_{w'}$]
    "The speaker$_c$ believes that ¬p was in the CG."

Accounting for the data

Bing: (1) seems to suggest that *bing not p* requires p to be salient; (7) suggests that this requirement is too strict.
(7) A: 'I'm hungry.'
    B: (danshi) fandian bing mei you kai
       but restaurant BING NEG have open
       'The restaurants aren't open.'

My proposal in (5) accounts for (7):
- r = Speaker A will get to eat;
- q⇒r: A is hungry normally entails (⇒) that A will get to eat;
- ¬p⇒¬r: The restaurants aren't open ⇒ A will not get to eat

You is fine in (3) because normally a puppy doesn't bite.
- But if the animal in the situation is a hungry wild lion in a savannah, then the use of *you* is very odd because it is odd to presuppose that lions don't bite.
- *Bing* is fine in both situations because Zhangsan's fear makes p salient (i.e. the puppy / the lion will bite him).
- *You* cannot be embedded in questions (4) because the question *p?* lets the interlocutors negotiate what are the facts about p, but the user of *you* believes that the negotiation already happened, and ¬p is already in the CG.

Comparison with Italian and Hindi-Urdu

- *Mica* in Italian and *thoṛi:* in Hindi-Urdu also require a salient proposition to correct.

Competing proposals for *mica*:
- *Mica* requires a prior claim or a salient expectation to deny (=*bing*; Cinque 1976).
- *Mica* presupposes that the speaker is sure that p should not be added to the CG (≈*you*; Frana & Rawlins 2019).
- *Thoṛi:* presupposes that the speaker is sure that p should not be added to the CG, but instead an alternative p' should be (≈*you*; Bhatt & Homer 2022).
- Key data that supported Frana & Rawlins' analysis but not Cinque's (Frana & Rawlins 2019:47):
(8) Context: A, an IKEA delivery person, asks B about their building; buildings normally have elevators not escalators
    A: 'Does your building have an {elevator/escalator}?'
    B: 'No, my building doesn't have {#mica an elevator / mica an escalator}.'
- *Bing* is fine in both answers, whereas *you* is odd in both.
- *Bing* is licensed because its prejacent contrasts with the proposition made salient by A's question (i.e. B's building has an elevator / escalator).
- *You* is odd because it is rude to assume that A should know whether B's building has an elevator / escalator, even if buildings normally don't have escalators.

Corrective negation in English, German, Spanish…

- Languages that don't appear to have a dedicated word for correction actually do–the negation in the first conjunct of corrective 'but' (e.g. German *sondern*) sentences.
(9) Max does**n't** eat spinach but chard. (Toosarvandani 2013:828)
(10) Dasist **nicht** bewusst, sondern ganz automatisch.
     'This is not conscious, but completely automatic.' (Anscombre & Ducrot 1977:2)
- Like *bing*, they all require negation, but not incorporated negation (e.g. *impossible*).

poster   paper