

The Attitude Meaning of the Mandarin Repetition Adverb *chóngxīn* ‘again’

Changxin Ke | The University of Manchester

This research proposes an analysis of the Mandarin repetition adverb *chóngxīn* ‘again’, which, like English *again* (Rapp & von Stechow, 1999; Beck 2005), permits either a repetitive reading or a restitutive reading when used with predicates that encode result states, as in (1)¹.

(1) *XiaoMing chóngxīn huídào le Beijing*. ‘XiaoMing returned to Beijing again.’

Rep: XiaoMing returned Beijing before. | **Res:** XiaoMing was in Beijing before.

Predicates that do not encode result states, however, only permit a repetitive reading of *chóngxīn*. In addition, with these predicates, *chóngxīn* entails an **attitude meaning** (AM), as in (2), defined in (3).

(2) *XiaoMing chóngxīn xiě le yìpiān wénzhāng*. ‘XiaoMing wrote an article again.’

Rep: XiaoMing wrote an article before. | **Res:** #

AM: XiaoMing thinks the previous event of writing an article is unsatisfactory.

(3) AM of *chóngxīn*: a salient person in the discourse is unsatisfied with the previous event. As shown in (4), (1) is acceptable in a context which entails the falsity of the AM, while (2) is not, indicating that (2) entails the AM while (1) doesn’t. Even though there exist objective negative facts, as the underlined part in Context 3, if XiaoMing doesn’t have a negative attitude towards it, uttering *chóngxīn* is also infelicitous.

(4) Context 1: XiaoMing was in Beijing in 2005 and left there in 2006. He returned to Beijing in 2007 and he was very happy with the life there. This year, after having left Beijing for months, (1). [pure restitutive]

Context 2: XiaoMing wrote an article last month and it was accepted for publication. XiaoMing was happy about it, and yesterday, #(2).

Context 3: XiaoMing wrote an article last month and it was accepted for publication. However, the publisher’s computer broke down and lost all the manuscripts. XiaoMing wasn’t sad about it since he decided not to publish at the last minute. After that, #(2).

The AM is entailed by *chóngxīn* only when a restitutive reading is not possible, based on which I adopt a lexical approach to the AM and propose that *chóngxīn* is ambiguous. After testing the projective properties (Tonhauser et al., 2013) of both the repetition meaning and the AM of *chóngxīn*, I argue that both of them are presuppositions² and that while the former is anaphoric (Beck, 2007), the latter is informative (Tonhauser, 2015). I propose the lexical entries below: an AM is entailed by *chóngxīn1* but unspecified for *chóngxīn2*.

(5) $[[chóngxīn1]] = \lambda e'. \lambda P_{v,t}. \lambda e. \partial[P(v)=1 \ \& \ \tau(e') \ll \tau(e)] \ \& \ \text{a salient person } \alpha \text{ in the discourse thinks } e' \text{ is unsatisfactory}]. P(e).$

$[[chóngxīn2]] = \lambda e'. \lambda P_{v,t}. \lambda e. \partial[P(v)=1 \ \& \ \tau(e') \ll \tau(e)]. P(e).$

¹ I generate the examples and make judgements based on my native language intuition.

² Tests given in the appendix.

By contrast, since the Rep-Res ambiguity arises with both *chóngxīn*, I adopt a structural analysis that different readings are due to various modification scope of *chóngxīn* in the LF.

Appendix

Data & Tests: What is the property of the attitude meaning of *chóngxīn*? (a truth-conditional meaning, a presupposition, a conversational implicature or a conventional implicature?)

(6) XiaoMing *chóngxīn* made a budget.

- Assumption 1: the salient person holding the attitude is XiaoMing: $\alpha = \text{XM}$.
- Assumption 2: the presupposed event e' is a previous event of XM making a budget.
- e^* is the topic event of XM making a budget at the topic time.

AM = XiaoMing is unsatisfied with e' .

Test 1: non-cancelability: a conversational implicature?

(7) XiaoMing *chóngxīn* made a budget. At the same time, #he liked the first budget.

AM is **not a conversational implicature** since it cannot be cancelled by a context.

Test 2: family-of-sentences test: projective or truth-conditional?

(8) XiaoMing *yǒukěnéng chóngxīn zuò le yí fèn yùsuàn*. “It’s possible that XiaoMing made a budget again.”

(9) Context: XiaoMing liked his first budget very much. # (8). [One might ask: why would he possibly *chóngxīn* made a budget if he liked the first one?]

AM is **projective**, but not truth-conditional, since it projects in family-of-sentences.

Test 3: presupposition holes test: presupposition or conventional implicature?

(10) [Background: Speaker is Wang. Everyone knows that XiaoMing made a budget last week and that he made a budget yesterday.]

Wang: Li thinks that XiaoMing *chóngxīn* made a budget, but that’s ridiculous because XiaoMing liked his first budget. He just made a new one.

The AM embedded in a propositional attitude context, which is a presupposition hole, can only be attributed to the subject of the matrix clause, not to the speaker. Therefore, it’s **not a conventional implicature**, but a presupposition. This property is referred to as having an obligatory local effect in the terminology proposed by Tonhauser et al., (2013).

Test 4: out-of-blue context: anaphoric or informative presupposition?

(11) Context (no information about AM): XiaoMing made a budget last week. Yesterday, (6).

The AM of *chóngxīn* is informative and new information, since it can occur in out-of-blue contexts while anaphoric presuppositions must be entailed by a salient context (Beck, 2007; Kripke, 2009). This property is also referred to as not imposing a strong contextual felicity constraint in the terminology proposed by Tonhauser et al., (2013).

References (selected)

- Rapp, I., & von Stechow, A. (1999). Fast ‘Almost’ and the Visibility Parameter for Functional Adverbs. *Journal of Semantics*, 16(2), 149–204.
- Beck, S. (2007). Quantifier Dependent Readings of Anaphoric Presuppositions. In U. Sauerland & P. Stateva (Eds.), *Presupposition and Implicature in Compositional Semantics* (pp. 12–33). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Kripke, S. A. (2009). Presupposition and Anaphora: Remarks on the Formulation of the Projection Problem. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 40(3), 367–386.
- Tonhauser, J., Beaver, D., Roberts, C., & Simons, M. (2013). Toward a Taxonomy of Projective Content. *Language*, 89(1), 66–109.