In corrections, the corrected element and the substitute offered for it are usually considered foci (Drubig 1994; Krifka 2006). So in (1), the direct objects (DOs) are the foci, and in (2), the VPs are. Each focus has the other in its alternative set. The foci are marked by accents on the focus exponent (small caps).

(1)    John didn't drink [$_{DP}$ CIder $_{Foc}$] but [$_{DP}$ VODka $_{Foc}$].

(2)    John didn't [$_{VP}$ drink CIder $_{Foc}$] but [$_{VP}$ ate CHOWder $_{Foc}$].

The negation in corrections can take positions different from normal clausal negation. This was examined for German by e.g. Jacobs (1982). For instance, in (3)(a), the negative marker takes a position before the focused definite DO, rather than after it, cf. (3)(b), which would be the normal position for a definite DO in non-corrections. It is usually thought that the negation has to c-command the focus in corrections, which is the case in (3)(a).

(3)    a. Hans   hat  nicht den      MerLOT getrunken sondern den  SauvigNON.
          Hans   has  not   the      Merlot  drunk     but     the  Sauvignon
       b. *Hans  hat  den   MerLOT nicht     getrunken sondern den  SauvigNON.
          'Hans didn't drink the Merlot but the Sauvignon.'

The study of corrections so far has mainly been concerned with narrow focus on DPs (but see Jacobs 1982). (4) and (5) are examples where the corrective clause contains a new, i.e. alternative VP (also compare (2)), and thus can be classified as corrections with VP-focus. Curiously, the negation in the corrected clause occurs in different positions in the two examples: after the DO in (4) and before the DO in (5).

(4)    *A few years ago, Paul had an accident with his old Buick, which got damaged pretty badly. Paul thought about selling it to a collector but didn't really want to part with his favourite.*
       Am    Ende hat   er    das  Auto   nicht verKAUFT,
       at.the end  has   he    the  car    not   sold
       sondern (hat) sich  bei seiner WERKstatt     erkundigt.
       but         has  REFL at  his    garage        enquired
       'At the end he didn't sell the car but enquired at his garage.'
       *They made him a fair price and he got the car repaired.*

(5)    *A few years ago Paul wanted to go on a trip around the world but didn't have enough money. Paul thought about selling his old Buick to a collector but didn't really want to part with his favourite.*
       Am    Ende hat   er    nicht das  AUto   verkauft,
       at.the end  has   he    not   the  car    sold
       sondern (hat) sich  bei seiner BANK erkundigt.
       but         has  REFL at  his    bank   enquired
       'At the end he didn't sell the car but enquired at his bank.'
       *They gave him a loan with fair conditions and he could go on his trip.*

These examples give the impression that the structural parallelism between corrected and corrective clause observed for DP focus observed in (1) & (3) breaks down. I suggest that this impression is wrong. If the negation is assumed to c-command the vP (e.g. Büring 1994; Hinterhölzl 2006, contra Frey 2001; Haider 1993) and the DO in cases like (4) is assumed to scramble out of the vP, (4) can still be considered an instance of VP focus. The question is, of course, why the definite leaves the vP in (4) but not in (5).

On the basis of an investigation of a large number of naturally occurring examples of the above sort, I suggest that the definite DO must leave the vP, i.e. the c-command domain of the negation, if it is discourse topical in previous discourse, and will still be discourse topical in the corrective clause. Otherwise the DO remains in the vP. Discourse topicality here is meant

in the sense of active referents in the discourse about whom something is said. So, if the DO leaves the c-command domain of the negation in the corrected clause, the corrective clause still is (also) about the referent of the DO – even if this is only indirect, see below.

The difference between (4) and (5) thus is the following: in (4), *the car* is still discourse topical in the corrective clause whereas in (5) it is not. To be sure, the expression *the car* occurs in neither example in the corrective clause. Yet, the corrective clause in (4) can be pragmatically enriched easily because an enquiry at a garage most plausibly concerns a/the car. The subsequent sentence confirms this in that it still comments on the car. In (5), on the other hand, the corrective clause is not about the car at all anymore. The correction as a whole removes the car as part of the act of selling from the list of discourse topics and returns to the theme of finding money for the world tour from the beginning of the passage. Even though there is no explicit mention of the referent of the topical DO of the corrected clause necessary in the corrective clause, in many of the investigated data the implicit referent of the DO can be added to the corrective clause as an optional argument. Still, I argue that such an argument need not be grammatically realized (overtly or silently). For instance, in (4), the enquiry at the garage could have been about vintage cars in general etc., and the sentence would still be felicitous.

The topical status of the DO in the corrective clause is supported inter alia by Frey's (2004) sentence adverb test – topics in the middle field occur before sentence adverbs. Below, variants of the corrected clauses in (4) are given, where the DO occurs before the sentence adverb *glücklicherweise* ('luckily'), see (4'), or after it, see (4''). The examples are constructed in a way that only one constituent occurs between the verb in C and the sentence adverb. (4') is clearly better than (4''). For (5), this particular test is not informative because the negation is situated below sentence adverbs.

(4')   Er hat das Auto glücklicherweise nicht verkauft, sondern… (cont'd as in (4))

(4'')  #Am Ende hat er glücklicherweise das Auto nicht verkauft, sondern…(cont'd as in (4))

The proposal developed so far does not carry over to pronouns. These always have to leave the c-command domain of the negation if they are no narrow focus. The only way to realize a VP-focus like (5) with a pronoun is to move the pronoun out of the vP and stress the negative marker[1] (but not the verb like in (4)). I assume that the different behaviour of pronouns is not particular to corrections but must be explained in conjunction with the behaviour of pronouns in relation to focus in general: moving pronouns has different information structural effects from scrambling full DPs (e.g. the latter can have the effect of 'producing' a focus on the next-higher argument DP). In this sense it is not surprising that the same should apply in corrections. I discuss this with reference to VP-, V- and DP-corrections with pronouns.

**References:** BÜRING, D. (1994). Mittelfeldreport V. In B. Haftka (ed.), *Was determiniert Wortstellungsvariation?* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 79-96. ♦DRUBIG, H.B. (1994). *Island Constraints and the Syntactic Nature of Focus and Association with Focus.* Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340, Nr. 51. Tübingen. ♦ FREY, W. (2001). About the Whereabouts of Indefinites. *Theoretical Linguistics 27*: 137-161. ♦FREY, W., 2004. A Medial Topic Position for German. *Linguistische Berichte 198:* 153-190. ♦ HAIDER, H. (1993). *Deutsche Syntax – generativ.* Tübingen: Narr. ♦ HINTERHÖLZL, R. (2006). *Scrambling, Remnant Movement, and Restructuring in West Germanic.* Oxford: OUP ♦ JACOBS, J. (1982). *Syntax und Semantik der Negation im Deutschen.* München: Fink.♦KRIFKA, M. (2006) Association with focus phrases. In V. Molnar and S. Winkler (eds.), *The Architecture of Focus*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 105-136.

---

[1] An option that is generally available in corrections with *sondern* ('but').