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Sentence (1) illustrates expletive negation, a construction where a negator (no) appears in the complement clause of a verb, adjective, preposition, or adverb, but does not correspond to a negation semantically (the content of the speaker’s fear in the Catalan example in (1) is that a new director will be elected).

(1) Em temo que no escullin nou director.
    me.cl.am.afraid that NEG.elect.SBJV.3PL new director
    ‘I’m afraid that a new director would be elected.’ (Espinal, 2000, 54)

Although expletive negation is often mentioned in the context of Romance languages, Jin & Koenig (2021) and Jin (2021) show that it occurs widely across languages. In Jin’s 1,140 language sample it occurred in 125 languages, on all continents, and in 61 genera. Moreover, expletive negation is grossly underreported in reference grammars (out of the 37 languages discussed in both research papers and grammars that Jin consulted, expletive negation was mentioned in research papers but not grammars in 21 languages). Jin & Koenig (2019, 2021) also show that expletive negation occurs in very similar environments across languages (e.g., BEFORE, FEAR, …; henceforth EN triggers). In fact, in Jin & Koenig’s (2021) study of Januubi Arabic, French, Mandarin, and Zarma-Sorai, expletive negation occurs in basically the same environments. A corpus study of English also showed it occurs in the same set of environments in unrehearsed English parole (Horn, 2010), although with different frequencies for different triggers (from close to 0% to close to 100% using restricted search patterns; the mean was 28.34%).

To explain why expletive negation occurs in similar contexts and in so many languages, but is often deemed a performance error, Jin & Koenig (2019, 2021) propose a language production model based on Dell (1986) of the emergence of expletive negation. Because EN triggers entail (in some cases strongly contextually imply) a proposition that contains the trigger’s argument proposition’s dual, the negation that is part of this entailment is strongly activated and is, as a result, sometimes erroneously expressed. For example, because fear(a, p) entails want(a, ¬p), ¬p becomes activated and sometimes ¬ is lexicalized as a negator (e.g., no in (1)). We call the entailment (strong contextual implication) that includes the dual of the lexical item’s argument proposition the negative inference. Jin & Koenig’s account of expletive negation models both the variability of expletive negation across triggers and languages and its systematic optionality.
(aside from a couple of languages where expletive negation has become obligatory in some contexts): even in Romance languages or Mandarin where expletive negation is rampant, it is never obligatory.

Jin & Koenig’s model, though, leaves open how expletive negation is represented in native speakers’ grammars. It could remain a performance phenomenon—no matter how frequent it is—or it could be part of native speakers’ competence in some languages, but not others, or for some triggers, but not others. Their model is agnostic on this point. In this paper, we argue that expletive negation should be included in native speakers’ grammatical competence and that an EN trigger’s negative inference is part of an alternate lexical entry for the EN trigger that includes the negative inference as non-at-issue content (à la Potts 2005).

To establish that expletive negation is not just a performance phenomenon, we ran three similar experiments in English, French, and Mandarin. An example stimulus set is provided in (2). Stimuli across the three languages were kept maximally similar (after translation from English to French and Mandarin), with a few necessary adjustments only made with respect to culture-specific proper names or differences in particular EN-triggers. Participants in each experiment saw a small text followed by a target sentence (in red in (2)) that was either headed by an EN trigger or non-EN trigger and had to judge whether the target sentence was consistent with the preceding text. Logical accuracy and decision latencies were recorded (see Jin & Koenig 2020 for more details on the English experiment). Stimuli were content-wise as similar as possible across the three languages. French EN trigger stimuli were divided in two halves, one half containing ne (a dedicated marker of expletive negation, Muller 1991) and the other half containing ne . . . pas, which can but is not very frequently used expletively (Larrivée, 1996). We predicted that if a negator is interpreted expletively after an EN trigger, participants should make more logical errors and take longer to decide if the target is consistent with the preceding text. Logical accuracy and decision latencies were recorded (see Jin & Koenig 2020 for more details on the English experiment). Stimuli were content-wise as similar as possible across the three languages. French EN trigger stimuli were divided in two halves, one half containing ne (a dedicated marker of expletive negation, Muller 1991) and the other half containing ne . . . pas, which can but is not very frequently used expletively (Larrivée, 1996). We predicted that if a negator is interpreted expletively after an EN trigger, participants should make more logical errors and take longer to decide if the target is consistent with the context, as the ambiguity of the negator (expletive or logical negation) should make it harder to decide whether the target sentence coheres with the preceding text. Overall, we found, as predicted, that participants made more logical errors and took longer to decide when the target sentence’s matrix clause contained an EN trigger than when it did not. We also found an interaction between the ± EN trigger condition and language: French and Mandarin speakers made more logical errors than English speakers when the matrix verb, adposition, or adverb was an EN trigger, which is expected given the different status of expletive negation in the languages’ reference grammars. We also found an interaction between language and negator form. French EN trigger stimuli with ne as negator lead to the most number of logical errors, compared to the corresponding English and Mandarin stimuli, but French EN trigger stimuli with ne . . . pas as negator lead to about the same number of logical errors as the corresponding English stimuli and less logical errors than the corresponding Mandarin stimuli. Finally, there was no rank order correlation between EN triggers ordered by percentage of logical errors in the three languages, but there was a near-high correlation ($r = .60$) between the percentage of logical errors after individual EN triggers and the percentage of expletive negation produced after the corresponding triggers in our corpus in both English and Mandarin.

(2) a. **Non-EN-trigger + logically inconsistent negation**

I used to be a strict vegetarian. Last year, I was diagnosed with iron-deficiency anemia, a disease caused
by not eating enough meat. My doctor strongly recommended that I eat meat. So I started not eating
meat.

b. EN-trigger + logically inconsistent negation
After learning that being vegan can prevent the exploitation of animals and promote a greener life on our
planet, I decided to become vegan. So I quit not eating meat.

c. Non-EN-trigger + logically consistent negation
After learning that being vegan can prevent the exploitation of animals and promote a greener life on our
planet, I decided to become vegan. So I started not eating meat.

d. EN-trigger + logically consistent negation
I used to be a strict vegetarian. Last year, I was diagnosed with iron-deficiency anemia, a disease caused
by not eating enough meat. My doctor strongly recommended that I eat meat. So I quit not eating meat.

The results of our three experiments suggest that speakers of English, French, and Mandarin include
fine-grained information about how likely an expletive negation is to appear after partic-
ular triggers and that this information is language specific, as there is no rank order correlation
between triggers ordered by percentage of logical errors across the three languages. Furth-
more, the difference between the likelihood of an expletive interpretation of ne and ne … pas in
our French experiment suggests that particular lexical items can be conventionally associated
with an expletive negation interpretation.

The need to include in the lexical description of individual triggers its expletive negation
potential is confirmed by the choice of expletive negator in languages that include more than
one negator. We discuss Mandarin here, but similar data from Januubi Arabic and Zarma-Sonrai
can be found in Jin & Koenig (2021). Mandarin has at least three negators, bù, méi, and bié (Li
& Thompson, 1981). Simplifying, bù is a neutral negation typically used when the described
event is still not completed later than reference time, whereas méi is the negation used when the
described event is not completed at reference time; finally, bié is the negation used in imperatives
and negative wishes. Critically, the rules for choosing negators are respected when the negator
is used expletively. Thus, bié is used after predicates expressing fear, since the negative inference
pertains to negative wishes, as shown in (3).

(3) xùduō rén zài wèile xuéyè hé shìjiè núlì-zhe, shèngpà zìjì bié bèi shìjiè
many people PROG for study and career work.hard-PROG fear self IMP.NEG PASS world
táotái-diào.
eliminate-COMPL

‘Many people are working hard in their studies and careers for fear that they might be out of step with the
world.’

Similarly, the form of the negator after qián ‘before’ differs depending on whether the negation
is expletive or logical, as predicted by the rules for choice of negator. Consider (4) and (5). The
negation in (4) is expletive, so the sentence means that the export had not started at reference
time (this is the negative inference) and the negator must therefore be méi. The negation in
(5), on the other hand, is logical, so the sentence means that the end of the exports will take
place later than reference time and the negation must be bù. The data from Chinese illustrated
in (3)-(5) suggests that expletive negation must be part of the representation of individual EN
triggers, as the meaning that is relevant for the selection of negator (e.g., bié in (3)) depends on the specific negative inference triggered by the matrix verb. Only words such as shèngpà ‘fear’ entail a negative inference that is a negative wish that provides the appropriate context for the use of bié.

(4) (Context: Since we started exporting our products to the US last year, our profits have quadrupled)

qíshi. hái méi chūkòu qián wòmen jiù néng yǔjiàn zhè ge jiéguò le.
in.fact still PRF.NEG export before we already can predict this result PFV

‘In fact, we could already predict this result before we exported.’ (Not exporting is true at reference time = past of argument proposition of before)

(5) (Context: Since we stopped exporting our products to the US because of the trade war, our profits have plummeted greatly)

qíshi. bù chūkòu qián wòmen jiù néng yǔjiàn zhè ge jiéguò le.
in.fact IPFV.NEG export before we already can predict this result PFV

‘In fact, we could already predict this result before we stopped exporting.’ (Not exporting is what will happen in future of reference time)

To represent expletive negation in the grammar of French, Mandarin, and other languages, we use Lexical Resource Semantics (Richter & Sailer, 2004) as underspecification makes it relatively easy to state the constraints on the lexical description of EN triggers and treat the negative inference as a non-at-issue content, following Potts (2005) (see Hasegawa & Koenig 2011 and Sailer & Am-David 2016 for some previous work in Lexical Resource Semantics that tackles non-at-issue content). We add to the value of the feature SEM the attribute NI-CONT (non-at-issue content) whose value is a list of meaningful expressions. The (informal) descriptions of the two entries for qián ‘before’—the one used when no expletive negation occurs in the complement clause and the one used when an expletive negation occurs in the complement clause—are provided in (6); the two corresponding entries for shèngpà ‘fear’ are provided in (7). The value of PARTS for the two EN entries includes a negation and its argument proposition ([¬ in (6) and (7)], but the argument proposition (not the negation of the argument proposition) is the argument of ‘before’ and ‘fear’, respectively, since the negation belongs to the non-at-issue content.

\[
\begin{align*}
(6) & \quad \text{SEM} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{before1} \\
\text{ICONT} \quad \text{before}(\alpha) \\
\end{array} \right] \\
(7) & \quad \text{SEM} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fear1} \\
\text{ICONT} \quad \text{fear}(\alpha, \alpha) \\
\end{array} \right]
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(6) & \quad \text{SEM} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{before2} \\
\text{ICONT} \quad \text{before}(\alpha) \\
\text{NI-CONT} \quad \langle \ldots, \neg \ldots \rangle \\
\text{PARTS} \quad \langle \ldots, \neg \ldots \rangle \\
\end{array} \right] \\
(7) & \quad \text{SEM} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fear2} \\
\text{ICONT} \quad \text{fear}(\alpha, \alpha) \\
\text{NI-CONT} \quad \langle \ldots, \neg \ldots \rangle \\
\text{PARTS} \quad \langle \ldots, \neg \ldots \rangle \\
\end{array} \right]
\end{align*}
\]
The expletive negation entry for qián ‘before’ includes as non-at-issue content the negation of the argument proposition of before’ (its internal content). Interestingly, the expletive negation entry for shèngpà ‘fear’ includes the predicate want’ in its non-at-issue content. Although that predicate does not appear to be expressed in (3), want’ must still be present in the semantic representation so as to license the choice of negator (biè). Interestingly, additional predicates that are terms of the negative inferences can be expressed for other triggers. Jin & Koenig (2021) provide examples that predicates like regret(p) license expletive negation because they entail that according to the attitude holder’s behavioral standards ¬p, in other words they entail □¬p with respect to the appropriate modal base and ordering source (Kratzer, 1981). The fact that all examples of expletive negation in English, French, and Mandarin we found after verbs expressing regret include a necessity modal operator support Jin & Koenig’s hypothesis. The attested French example in (8) whose (informal) representation is provided in (9) illustrates. In the case of regretter ‘regret’, then, both □ and ¬ within the NI-CONT value are expressed (as falloir and ne, respectively) and are members of the PARTS list whereas in the case of shèngpà ‘fear’, only ¬ is, want’ is not.

(8) Je regrette qu’il ne faille souvent attendre des années avant que l’histoire ne juge les tyrans.

‘I regret that it often should take years before history judges tyrants.’

(9) To conclude, our paper suggests that although expletive negation starts as a slip of the tongue due the semantic interference between the speaker’s intended message and a negative inference that derives from that message, EN triggers (and negators for French) can grammaticalize into distinct lexical entries. While most work on performance-based emergence of grammatical structure assumes the resulting grammatical structures optimize some aspect of production, parsing, or communication (see Horn & Bayer 1984 and Hahn et al. 2020 among others), the grammaticalization of expletive negation results from slippage—the entrenchment of a frequent slip of the tongue whereby an entailment of the speaker’s message rather than the message itself is expressed.
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