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1. Introduction

In Mandarin, questions containing the adverb *nandao* (*Nandao-Qs*) have been shown to have rhetorical (Yu, 1984; Qi & Ding, 2006; Yu, 2006; Xu, 2012) as well as information-seeking bias uses (Gong, 1995; Su, 2000; Sun, 2007; Xu, 2013). Both uses necessarily express a bias, as shown in (1).

1. Nandao zhe jiushi shichang jingji (ma)?
   *nandao* this be market economy Y/N-Q

   (Rhetorical) ‘This isn’t a market economy.’

   (Biased) ‘This isn’t a market economy, right?’

Although (1) has the form of a question, it can express a meaning similar to a negative statement which the speaker fully believed or assumed to be true, or it can convey the speaker’s bias, i.e. lesser degree of belief, toward the negative polar answer. The first interpretation is a typical rhetorical question reading which is not information seeking (rhetorical questions in the sense of Rohde 2006; Caponigro & Sprouse 2007). The second interpretation is a typical information-seeking biased question reading which favors a particular answer.

In this paper, an analysis of Mandarin *nandao*-Qs is presented with a view to address the following questions: Are there dedicated words to express bias in natural languages? What is the nature of that bias? What is the syntactic and semantic properties of the dedicated bias words?1

2. Semantic and discourse properties of *nandao*-Qs

The difference between the two readings of the *nandao*-Q in (1) lies in the degree to which the speaker is committed to the negative polar answer, belief vs. bias. In the rhetorical question reading of *nandao*-p? question, the speaker is fully committed to, i.e. (near) 100% sure of, ¬p. In the biased question reading of *nandao*-p?, the speaker is less committed to, more than 50% but less than 100% sure of, ¬p. In both readings, *nandao*-Qs necessarily express the speaker’s bias, whether strong (belief) or weak (bias). They cannot appear in a situation where the speaker has no idea of the answer and there is no contextual evidence for any possible answers, when the speaker seeks information from others, *nandao*-Qs are still not felicitous.

2. (A sits in a windowless room working. A doesn’t know anything about the weather outside and does not have any expectation about the weather. At 10, B enters the room. Then A asks B:)

   Waimian xiayu-le ma?
   outside rain-ASP Y/N-Q

   ‘Is it raining outside?’

---

1 For a compositional semantic analysis of the dedicated bias words, please see Xu (2017).

The above examples also show that the necessary bias carried by nandao-Qs is contributed by the use of nandao, in that the only difference between nandao-Qs and normal Y/N-Qs lies in the occurrence of nandao.

As has been proposed in the literature, there are two kinds of bias in questions, an epistemic bias and an evidential/contextual bias (see Romero & Han 2002, Romero & Han 2004, Romero 2006, Asher & Reese 2007, Reese 2007 for epistemic bias; see Büring & Gunlogson 2000 for contextual bias; see Sudo 2013 for both). In the cases of nandao-Qs, the bias conveyed is an epistemic one. The bias is not from context or evidence, but is based on the speaker’s belief. This can be supported by the fact that nandao-Qs are still infelicitous if we add contextual evidence for raining (e.g. B enters the room with a dripping wet raincoat) to the context of (2). According to Büring & Gunlogson (2000) and Sudo (2013), such a context has a [-negative] evidential bias. The infelicity of nandao-Qs in such a context indicates that when there is only evidential bias available in the context, the speaker is not entitled to ask a nandao-Q.

Knowing that the bias conveyed in nandao-Qs is an epistemic one is the first step. The second step is to find out toward which answer those questions are biased. If the speaker thinks that the answer is more likely to be p than ¬p, then under any circumstances (s)he cannot use the form nandao-p? to express such a bias.

(3)  (The speaker believes that there is no one in a house.)

a. # Nandao wuli mei ren?
   nandao room.in no person
   (Intended) ‘There is no one in the room, right?’

b. Nandao wuli you ren?
   nandao room.in exist person
   ‘There is no one in the room, right?’

This suggests that the speaker is always biased toward the negative polar answer in nandao-Qs. To be more specific, a nandao-p? with the positive question nucleus p conveys an epistemic bias toward ¬p on the part of the speaker. Similarly, a nandao¬p? with the negative question nucleus ¬p conveys a bias toward p. This is what Han (2002) and Xu (2012) called “polarity reversal” effects.

Apart from bias, nandao-Qs also exhibit discourse and semantic properties that are distinct from normal Y/N-Qs. First of all, the bias of nandao-Qs can convey new information.

(4)  (A is a poor guy who never thinks about investing in stocks to earn money. On the other hand, C has been investing in the stock market for many years. A and C are not familiar with each other, but B is a friend of both A’s and C’s. B knows A and C quite well. One day, A approaches B and asks B.)

A: Can you help me ask C how to open an account in the stock market?
B: Why are you asking this question?
A: Nandao wo buneng ye chaogu ma?
   nandao I not.can too invest.stock Y/N-Q
   ‘I can make investment in stocks too, right?’
B: A... Yuanlai ni ye xiang chaogu a!
   ah so you too think invest.stock ah
   ‘Ah...So you want to make investment in stocks too!’

In (4), although B didn’t reply to the nandao-Q, B immediately becomes aware of A’s biased attitude towards the answers (i.e. A thinks he can invest in stocks too) when he hears the nandao-Q. From the
exclamatory expression Ah in B’s response, we get to know that the speaker’s attitude toward stock investment is unexpected and new to him.

Moreover, although the bias of nandao-Qs can convey new information, it is also felicitous to use them in a context where the information of the speaker’s bias has already been established (5).

(5) (A and B are talking about the war in Afghanistan. A thinks the US should retreat, while B disagrees. They know each other’s stance quite well.)

A: The US government cannot spend more money to keep the troops in Afghanistan.
B: But Al-Qaeda is still in power. We need the US troops to eliminate them once and for all.
A: More than two thousand soldiers have died!
Nandao meijun yinggai jixu zai Afuhan zhujun?
Nandao US.troop should continue at Afghanistan station.troop
‘The US troops shouldn’t continue to stay in Afghanistan, right?’

Lastly, the bias conveyed via nandao is speaker-oriented.

(6) A: Nandao Zhangsan bu xihuan shuiguo ma?
nandao Zhangsan not like fruit Y/N-Q
Bias = ‘A believes that it is more likely that Zhangsan likes fruits’.
Bias ≠ ‘(Generally/In fact), It is more likely that Zhangsan likes fruits.’
Bias ≠ ‘From what you (addressee) believe it is more likely that Zhangsan likes fruits.’

The core part of the meaning of the bias conveyed in (6) is an epistemic evaluation of the possible answer(s), i.e. the negative polar answer is more likely than the positive one. Such a bias is on the part of the speaker. It is not about a general fact or objective epistemic evaluation of the answers, nor can it be an epistemic evaluation on the part of the addressee.

Besides the above discourse properties, nandao has a special semantic property, viz. it scopes over negation and all other quantifiers.

(7) Nandao > negation

A: Nandao Zhangsan bu xihuan shuiguo ma? (= (6))
nandao Zhangsan not like fruit Y/N-Q
Bias = ‘A believes that it is more likely that Zhangsan likes fruits’.
(Intended) Bias = ‘A doesn’t believes that it is more likely that Zhangsan likes fruits.’
nandao > ¬
* ¬ > nandao

(8) Nandao > ∀

A: Nandao meige ren dou yao qu?
nandao each.CL person DOU need go
‘It is not the case that everyone needs to go, right?’
(Intended) ‘For every person x, nandao does x need to go?’
nandao > ∀
* ∀ > nandao

(9) Nandao > ◊

A: Nandao Zhangsan keneng qu Meiguo ma?
nandao Zhangsan possibly go America Y/N-Q
Bias = ‘A believes that it is impossible that Zhangsan goes to America is more likely.’
nandao > ◊
(Intended) Bias = ‘It is possible that A believes that it is more likely that Zhangsan goes to America.’
* ◊ > nandao
3. What nandao is and what it is not

The bias meaning contributed by *nandao* in many ways resembles presupposition, conventional implicature (henceforth CI), and illocutionary modifier (hereafter IM).

For example, like presupposition, CI, and IM, *nandao* can pass “*Hey, wait a minute*” test (see Shanon 1976, von Fintel 2004, Amaral et al. 2007, Koev 2013, Faller 2014 for examples of presupposition, CI, and IM passing the test).

(10) A: Nandao Zhangsan bu xihuan shuiguo ma?
    nandao Zhangsan not like fruit Y/N-Q
    ‘Zhangsan likes fruits, right?’

B: Wei, dengdeng. Ni renwei Zhangsan bu xihuan chi shuiguo de ba!
    hey wait.wait You believe Zhangsan no like eat fruit DE BA
    ‘Hey, wait a minute. You think Zhangsan doesn’t like fruits at first.’

B’: # Wei, dengdeng. Zhangsan bu xihuan chi shuiguo.
    hey wait.wait Zhangsan not like eat fruit
    (Intended) ‘Hey, wait a minute. Zhangsan doesn’t like fruits.’

The “*Hey, wait a minute*” test is a well-established diagnostic for not-at-issue content (Shanon 1976, von Fintel 2004, Amaral et al. 2007, Koev 2013, Faller 2014). The logic behind the test concerns conversational flow. Unlike at-issue content which can be directly accepted or denied, not-at-issue content which are “not the main point of the utterance” (Tonhauser 2012: 240) cannot be directly addressed in the discourse. Thus, when the not-at-issue content are falsified or rejected by other discourse participant(s), a pause to stop the conversation like *Hey, wait a minute* will be used to prevent the false not-at-issue content from slipping by (Roberts, 2006).

The fact that the bias meaning of *nandao*-Qs passes the “*Hey, wait a minute*” test suggests that *nandao*, like presuppositions, CIs, and IMs, expresses not-at-issue content. More evidence supporting this conclusion is provided below.

Another typical property of not-at-issue content encodes like CIs and presuppositions is that they cannot be part of the answers to the questions containing them (Amaral et al. 2007, Tonhauser 2012 and Koev 2013). Koev (2013) designs the Question Formation Test based on this property. The test can be used as a diagnostic for at-issue content, because “[i]n questions, only at-issue content determines the set of alternative answers” (Koev 2013: 22). Like those typical not-at-issue content encoders, the epistemic bias contributed by *nandao* cannot be part of the answers either (11).

(11) A: Nandao Yuehan shi ge yisheng?
    nandao John be CL doctor
    ‘John is not a doctor, right?’

B₁: # Shia, ni juede ta bushi yige yisheng.
    Yes.ah you think he not.be one-CL doctor
    (Intended) ‘Yes, you think John is not a doctor.’

B₂: # Bu, ni juede ta shi ge yisheng.
    no you think he be CL doctor
    (Intended) ‘No, you think that he is a doctor.’

To summarize, we have the following syntactic facts about *nandao*.

(12) *nandao* \( \rightarrow \) IntP, FocP

In terms of scope relations with other operators, *nandao* is also quite similar to other not-at-issue content triggers. We know that *nandao* takes global scope (7-9). Or, we may interpret the conclusion as *nandao* cannot be interpreted within the scope of operators in at-issue content. This is a typical phenomenon widely found in presupposition triggers (Keenan 1971, Karttunen 1971, Karttunen 1973,
Beaver 2001), CI encoders (Potts 2003), appositives (Koev 2013), and IMs (e.g. evidential) (Faller (2014)).

With all the above evidence, we can state with confidence that nandao is a not-at-issue content encoder. The not-at-issue meaning it encodes is the bias meaning on the part of the speaker.

Although nandao, the newly-joined not-at-issue content encoder, much resembles presupposition triggers, CI encoders, and IMs, it is still not clear what type of not-at-issue content encoder it exactly is. In the following, I will show that nandao are not presupposition triggers or CI encoders but a kind of Illocutionary Modifiers.

Presupposition, as discussed in great detail in Stalnaker (1974), conveys old, backgrounded information that both discourse participants know or assume to be true and is in the common ground (CG). In this case, as argued by Potts (2003), presupposition shows a backgrounding effect (see also Faller 2014).

(13) John has children and his children are bald. (van der Sandt 1992: 334)

(14) Lance Armstrong survived cancer. And most riders know that Lance Armstrong is a cancer survivor. (adapted from Potts 2003: 42)

On the other hand, as discussed in §2, the not-at-issue content conveyed by nandao-Qs can be new information (see (4) as an example). It does not show a similar backgrounding effect.

The other difference between the content conveyed by nandao and presupposition lies in it being speaker oriented. Potts (2003) regards all presuppositions to be lexical and not speaker-oriented. They can find references in the current discourse or context whose identities are independent of the discourse participants. Hence, a speaker may reject subsequently the presupposition set up in the prior discourse.

(15) Sue wrongly believes that Conner stopped smoking. However, he never smoked in the first place. (Faller 2014: 69)

However, the not-at-issue content in nandao-Qs is necessarily speaker-oriented (see (6) as an example). Given these two key differences, we can conclude that the not-at-issue content encoded in nandao-Qs is not presupposition.

Unlike presuppositions, CIs do not exhibit the backgrounding effect and are (mostly) speaker-oriented. Although the nandao meaning and CIs pattern alike in backgrounding effect, CIs show a stricter requirement on anti-backgrounding: “in cases where the content of a supplement is part of the initial context, the result is infelicity due to redundancy” (Potts 2003: 41).

(16) # Lance Armstrong survived cancer. When reporters interview Lance, a cancer survivor, he often talks about the disease. (adapted from Potts 2003: 42)

Nandao doesn’t pattern with CIs in this respect. As already shown in §2, though nandao conveys new not-at-issue information, it is still felicitous to use it in a context where such at-issue content has already been established (see (5) for an example). In this sense, nandao shows neither the backgrounding effect nor the anti-backgrounding effect. Thus, nandao does not convey conventional implicature.

A typical biased questions that has been widely discussed in the literature is questions with VERUM focus (Romero & Han 2002, Romero & Han 2004, Romero (2006), Domaneschi et al. (2017), a.o.), e.g. polar questions with really. Given the question nucleus p, it can also be represented as Really-p?. According to Romero & Han (2002, 2004), Romero (2006), and Domaneschi et al. (2017), the adverb really denotes VERUM which introduces the negative epistemic bias of the speaker, e.g. ¬p in Really-p? under Gricean Principles and Economy Principle. In terms of the form and the epistemic bias conveyed, nandao-p? is very similar to Really-p?. In this regard, we may wonder if nandao could also denote the epistemic conversational operator VERUM.

There are at least two reasons to reject such an assumption. First and foremost, VERUM is not restricted to polar questions like nandao. It can appear across a wide variety of sentence types. According to Höhle (1992),2 at least in German, VERUM focus is found in declaratives, polar questions, WH-Qs,

2 The VERUM focus analysis is first proposed by Höhle (1992). His idea inspires Romero & Han’s (2002, 2004) VERUM-analysis of biased polar questions.
and even in imperatives. But, *nandao* in Mandarin has a much narrower distribution. As shown in Xu (2012), *nandao* is only compatible with polar questions. If we try to analyze *nandao* as denoting a VERUM focus, we then have to assume that at the level of syntax *nandao* has a [+wh] feature which prevents it from occurring in declaratives and other [-wh] sentence types. But, again, in order to account for its incompatibility in WH-Qs, we have to stipulate a sub-type of [+wh] feature which solely checks Y/N-Qs. This kind of solution seems undesirable and ad-hoc, lacking explanatory power and theoretical grounding.

Next, as we can see from the experimental results from Domaneschi et al. (2017) (Table 1), *Really-p* doesn’t necessarily carry an epistemic bias. This is quite different from *nandao*-Qs which necessarily convey the speaker’s bias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domaneschi et al. (2007: Table 20)</th>
<th>ORIGINAL BIAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXTUAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>PosQ/Really-PosQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>HiNQ(outer)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¬p</td>
<td>HiNQ(outer/inner)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Overview of the primary choices in English and German.

In summary, a comparison among presuppositions, Conventional Implicatures (CI)s, and Illocutionary Modifiers (IMs) and the not-at-issue content conveyed by *nandao*-Qs is shown in Table 2.⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>IM ( alas)</th>
<th>IM (evidential)</th>
<th><em>nandao</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convey new information</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope over operators</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant-oriented</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hey, wait a minute test</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backgrounding effect</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Antibackgrounding effect</em></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Question Formation Test</em></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison among different kinds of not-at-issue content

According to the table, *nandao* patterns with Illocutionary Modifiers (IMs) in all the tests, which suggests that *nandao* is a type of IM. The problem now moves from what *nandao* is to how *nandao* modifies illocutionary force.

### 4. Syntactic properties of *nandao*

Within *nandao*-Qs, generally, can surface freely in before the predicate.

(17) (Nandao) Zhansan (nandao) bu (*nandao) renshi Lisi (*nandao) ma?
    nandao Zhansan nandao not nandao know Lisi nandao Y/N-Q
    ‘Zhansan knows Lisi, right?’

But, this free pattern cannot be found when *nandao* meets a focus DP (cf. Huang et al. 2009).

(18) (*Zhiyou/jiu [Zhansan]F) nandao (zhiyou/jiu [Zhansan]F) bu renshi Lisi ma?
    only/just Zhansan nandao only/just Zhansan not know Lisi Y/N-Q
    ‘It is not the case that only/just [Zhansan]F doesn’t know Lisi, right?’

This suggests that *nandao > Focus.*

*Nandao* can occasionally appear sentence finally in colloquial Mandarin.

---

Comparing (19) with (17), we can see that nandao must be placed after the Y/N-Q particle ma. Following the analysis of Japanese question particle -ka which marks the scope of the question containing it (Nishigauchi, 1990), we may conclude that nandao is outside of the scope of Y/N-Qs, or we can also say that nandao is syntactically higher than the embedded question. If we assume Rizzi’s (2001) cartography (attested in Tsai (2008) for Mandarin) (20), IntP is the functional projection for Y/N-Qs (FocP for focus).

(20) Force (Top*) Int (Top*) Foc Top* Fin IP (Rizzi 2001: 289)

We may now claim that nandao > IntP.

A further piece of evidence for nandao > IntP comes from the Y/N-Q scope test (Zimmermann 2008). In the standard analysis of Y/N-Qs (Hamblin, 1973), Y/N-op takes all the propositional content in its scope as its question nucleus and turns it into a set of all possible answers. Thus, if a lexical item within the scope of a Y/N-Q contributes to the propositional content of the question nucleus, the lexical item should be part of the input for the whole question formation. (21) exemplifies such a case.

(21) A: Is John possibly a doctor?
    B: Yes/No.

When B replies Yes, he doesn’t mean John is a doctor, but rather he acknowledges the possibility of John being a doctor. When he says No, he intends to deny the possibility that John is a doctor.

Following the same line of reasoning, in a nandao-Q, if nandao contributes to the propositional content within the scope of Y/N-op, we would expect that the epistemic bias meaning of nandao (i.e. a discourse participant, such as the speaker, believes that the negative polar answer is more likely than the positive one) should appear in the answers. However, such answers are infelicitous (see previous example (11)).

Since nandao contributes to nandao-Qs an epistemic bias, expressing that the negative polar answer is more likely than its alternative, I assume nandao to be an epistemic modal adverb. According to Lyons (1977), there are two kinds of epistemic modalities in natural languages (see also Kratzer (1981) for a semantic discussion).

In principle, two kinds of epistemic modality can be distinguished: objective* and subjective*. . . [O]bjective modalization differs from subjective modalization, the very essence of which is to express the speaker’s reservation about giving an unqualified, or categorical, “I-say-so” to the factuality of the proposition embedded in his utterance. Subjectively modalized statements . . . are statements of opinion, or hearsay, or tentative inference, rather than statements of fact; and they are reported as such. . . Subjective epistemic modality can be accounted for. . . in terms of the speaker’s qualification of the I-say-so component of his utterance. Objectively modalized utterances. . . can be described as having an unqualified I-say-so component, but an it-is-so component that is qualified with respect to a certain degree of probability, which, if quantifiable, ranges between 1 and 0. (Lyons 1977: 797-800)

In his framework, Lyons (1977) assumes a tripartite structure of utterances:

(22) . . . p

The first full stop stands for the I-say-so part, the second one for the it-is-so part. p is the propositional content. According to the schema, the I-say-so part scopes over the it-is-so part. Combining the schema with the information in the quote, we reach an important conclusion: subjective modalities which qualify the I-say-so part of an utterance have wider scope than objective modalities that qualify the it-is-so part of the utterance. In Lyons’ proposal, the I-say-so part provides illocutionary force, including interrogation, and the it-is-so part is propositional content.
This structure much resembles the syntactic CP-IP distinction. The *I-say-so* part corresponds to Force in the C domain, which is a head hosting illocutionary forces, such as interrogation, assertion and imperative, while the *it-is-so* component includes all the projections that are in the complement of ForceP.

Since *nandao* does not contribute to the propositional meaning of Y/N-Qs and has wide scope with respect to it, it must be a subjective epistemic modal rather than an objective one. A further piece of support for *nandao* being a subjective epistemic modal comes from (23).

(23) Zhangsan is a Chinese policeman. He strongly believes that a criminal he has been chasing is still lingering around. One day, when he searches the criminal’s house, he finds a flight booking confirmation email in the criminal’s computer. It is a ticket to the U.S. with the criminal’s name on it. But the date shown on it is the day before that day. He asks his colleague:

Z: Nandao ta pao dao Meiguo qu-le?
    nandao he run arrive America go-ASP
    ‘He didn’t escape to America, right?’

In this situation, even if there is strong evidence (i.e. the booking record of a flight to America) against the speaker’s prior belief that the criminal still lingered around, the speaker can still utter the *nandao*-Q to imply his continuing belief against the objective evidence. In that case, the question still conveys that the criminal didn’t escape to America is more likely to be true than he did.\(^5\) If *nandao*-Qs expressed an objective epistemic modal meaning, it should have been biased towards the positive answer the criminal escaped to America, which is not the case as shown in (23). The bias towards the negative answer, namely the speaker’s belief, in (23) suggests *nandao*-Qs express subjective epistemic modal meaning.

Thus, it can be concluded that *nandao* is a subjective epistemic modal adverb and hence qualifies the illocutionary force of interrogation. Syntactically speaking, I assume that the illocutionary modifier *nandao* is an adjunct to ForceP.


In our case, *nandao*, as a subjective epistemic modal adverb, qualifies the degree of speaker’s belief towards the possible answers of *nandao*-Qs, and expresses the bias meaning as a not-at-issue content.

Following the common practice of Chomsky-adjunction in X-bar theory (Chomsky 1986) and Krifka’s (2014) syntax for speech-act-modifying adverbials, I propose the following syntactic configuration for *nandao-p?* questions (QUEST is the illocutionary force operator for interrogative acts).

(24)  
```
  ForceP
   /\                         /\                         /\                         /\
       /\                         /\                         /\                         /\
  Force IntP IntP
          /\                         /\                         /\                         /\
  QUEST Int Int’
             /\                         /\                         /\                         /\
  Int FocP FocP
                /\                         /\                         /\                         /\
  IP IP IP
                  /\                         /\                         /\                         /\
  p p p
```

\(^5\) In a *nandao-p?*, the contextual evidence against the speaker’s belief (i.e. against \(\neg p\)) will increase the possibility of \(p\). The presence of the counter-evidence shifts the “focus” (in a non-technical sense) of the *nandao-p?* from the speaker’s belief to the increased possibility of \(p\). That’s why, the question is asked to seek the confirmation of either \(\neg p\) is true (his belief is more reliable) or \(p\) is true (the contextual evidence is more reliable), although the speaker’s bias still holds.
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