EXCEPTION PHRASES AS FRAGMENTS: THE CASE OF ROMANIAN

Emil Ionescu[*]

Abstract: The paper proposes a formal account for Exception Phrases (EP) in Romanian. The analysis is expressed within the HPSG framework. We firstly show that an approach that treats EPs as structural ellipses faces multiple drawbacks. We then introduce the concept of fragment and we show that EPs meet the conditions of fragments. Finally, we formalize the concept of exceptive fragment, which results in an account that is free from the drawbacks identified in the case of the structural approach.

Keywords: Exception Phrase, Romanian, fragment, ellipsis, HPSG

1. Introduction

The present paper[1] discusses the main aspects of Exception Phrases (EPs) in Romanian. Some examples are given below. EPs (in italics) are individualised thanks to the exceptive connector (in bold):

(1) a. Ion a mâncat tot, ***în afară de*** *prăjitură*.
'Ion ate everything **apart from** *the cookie*'
b. Ion a mâncat tot, ***cu excepţia*** *prăjiturii*.
'Ion ate everything **except for** *the cookie*'
c. Ion a mâncat tot, ***mai puţin/minus*** *prăjitura*.
'Ion ate everything **save** *the cookie*'
d. Ion nu a mâncat (nimic altceva) ***decât*** *prăjitura.*
'Ion ate nothing **but** *the cookie*'

In the past 25 years EPs have been paid particular attention, thanks to the pioneering paper of Jacob Hoeksema (Hoeksema 1987). Presently, we already dispose of in-depth studies about the semantics of EPs (Moltmann 1995, Lappin 1996, Garcia Álvarez 2008). Grammatical aspects of EPs, though, came under focus more recently. A peculiar direction of research stimulated by the papers of Jason Merchant on ellipsis (Merchant 2001, 2004) tends to assimilate the incomplete character of EPs to structural ellipsis (Pérez-Jiménez and Moreno-Quibén 2012).

The present paper also addresses grammatical aspects of EPs. By taking Romanian as the case study, we make a critical evaluation of the arguments employed to support the ellipsis approach to EPs. The discussion ends with the conclusion that Romanian EPs cannot be seen as elliptical structures. We argue instead that the incomplete constituency

[*] University of Bucharest, Faculty of Letters, Department of linguistics, and "Solomon Marcus" Center for Computational Linguistics, emil.ionescu@litere.unibuc.ro.

[1] The present version benefits of numerous and valuable observations and suggestions of improvement made by three anonymous reviewers of the Formal Grammar Conference 2014. My highest gratitude goes to each of them. Of course, I remain uniquely responsible for the present form and content of the paper.

Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics XXI, 1, 95-107, e-ISSN 2392-8093, ISSN-L 2069-9239
DOI: 10.31178/BWPL.21.1.4

of EPs may be best explained through the concept of fragment, formally represented as a distinct linguistic entity in the HPSG theory. The conclusion holds for other languages, as well.

The structure of the paper is as follows. We begin with some current notions involved in the analysis of EPs in general. We then review the arguments adduced in favour of the ellipsis status of EPs and show that they do not have the relevance they are expected to have. In alternative, we argue that a non-derivational analysis is preferable and we show that, due to the concept of fragment, the incomplete constituency of EPs may be well accommodated with their full propositional semantics.

2. Basic notions in the analysis of EPs

In the analysis of EPs one usually distinguishes:

(i) an "exception marker" (in Romanian, the prepositions *în afară de,* 'apart from ', *cu excepţia* 'except for', and the adverbs *mai puţin* 'less', *minus* 'minus', *decât* 'no ...but');

(ii) a complement of the exception marker, called the "exception complement" (*prăjitura*, 'the cookie' in (1));

(iii) the "associate" of the exception complement (in (1a-c), the quantifier *tot* 'everything' ranging over a contextually determined class of edible things). In the case of EPs with *decât*, the associate may be unexpressed.

The present approach is focused on the syntax and semantics of the exception complement.

Analyses of EPs have shown that EPs obey three main constraints: the condition of inclusion, the negative condition and the quantifier constraint (Garcia Álvarez 2008: 6-11).

The Condition of Inclusion says that the denotatum of the exception complement must be in the class denoted by the restrictor of its associate. Example (2a) observes this constraint, whereas in (2b) the constraint is violated:

(2) a. Every American investor withdrew from Cuba, except General Motors.
b. *I visited all the museums in Paris, except on Sunday.

Example (2a) entails that General Motors is an American investor (which is true). On the contrary, in (2b) *on Sunday* denotes a certain time interval, whereas the restrictor of the quantifier (which is also the associate of the EP) makes reference to certain objects (i.e. museums) which are not time intervals. Consequently, the inclusion requirement is not met[2].

According to the Negative Condition, if the predicate which takes as argument the associate is applied to the complement of the exception marker, it must be of opposite polarity to the polarity in the source clause. For example, the polarity of *John kissed every girl at the party* is positive, but if the EP *except Mary* is attached to it, the new

[2] It can be then noticed that the Condition of Inclusion requires that the denotatum of the exception complement have the same property as the members of the inclusion class.

predication must be (and it really is) in the negative polarity: *John did **not** kiss Mary at the party*[3].

Finally, the Quantifier Constraint stipulates that the associate has to be a universal (or a negative universal) quantifier. Examples (1a-c) illustrate the former option, that is, the occurrence of the universal quantifier.

3. A chief property of EPs and a possible consequence: EPs as elliptical clauses

EPs in Romanian manifest a certain asymmetry, which, cross-linguistically, is well-known. It is the asymmetry in the relationship between constituency and semantics. The content of an EP is invariably propositional (Garcia Álvarez 2008: 77-90), because an EP entails a statement related to the statement expressed by the verb of the sentence. For example, if the sentence *Şeful i-a felicitat pe toţi angajaţii, mai puţin pe Ion* 'The boss congratulated every employee, save John' is true, then so is the sentence *Şeful nu l-a felicitat pe Ion* 'The boss did not congratulate John'. Nevertheless, the statement expressed by the EP *mai puţin pe Ion* 'save John', although part of the content of the whole sentence, does not have the expected syntactic form, because the EP lacks the head verb.

This asymmetry gave birth to the hypothesis that EPs are *elliptical clauses*. The hypothesis is illustrated in the recent analysis of Pérez-Jiménez and Moreno-Quibén (2012) for Spanish free EPs (that is, EPs with mobility inside the sentence[4]). According to this hypothesis, the exception complement is a "remnant", i.e. the visible part of an ellipsis. The missing material is recovered by reconstruction, and what is thus obtained is a full clause meant to be the base of the surface incomplete clause. One constituent in this reconstructed clause is obligatorily moved to the left periphery. This is the constituent which is to appear later on, as the remnant of the elliptical clause. Finally, the missing material the results from an operation which eliminates the phonological form of the complement of C^0 (marked with the deletion symbol E – from ellipsis: C^0[E]). Deletion is obligatory, too. The whole approach defines a typical derivational account of ellipsis.

3.1 Problems with the reconstruction

The first step in the derivational approach is reconstruction. By reconstruction, a full (hidden) clause is obtained, which represents the origin of the elliptical clause. Reconstruction, though, in the case of EPs has two problematic aspects.

---

[3] The consequence of the Negative Condition is also known as *polarity reversal*. As one of the reviewers of The Formal Grammar Conference 2014 notices, if the source clause expresses a question, the polarity of the exception fragment is not reversed. Indeed, in the clause *Who passed the exam, except of Jane?* (the reviewer's example) the polarity of the fragment *except of Jane* is identical with the polarity of the source clause. I am quite unprepared to deal with this phenomenon here in a unified perspective. I will be merely focusing on cases where the source clause expresses a proposition. For these cases, polarity reversal is in force.

[4] The distinction between free and connected EP is current in the literature and it also characterizes EPs in Romanian. Nevertheless, in the present analysis this distinction does not play any essential role.

The first problem appears when the complement of the exception marker is a subjunctive VP and the verb of the main clause is the light verb *a face* 'do' (both in italics, below):

(3) Ion *face* orice/de toate la bucătărie, mai puţin/minus *să spele vase*.
'Ion *does* everything in the kitchen, except for *washing* the dishes'

Examples of this type cannot be derived from full reconstructed clauses, because, actually, the verb *a face* cannot have a subjunctive VP complement. Hence reconstruction is not possible:

(3) Ion *face* orice/de toate la bucătărie, mai puţin/minus **face să spele vase*.

The other problem concerns the combination between the result of the reconstruction (i.e. the underlying full clause) and the exception marker. The problem, this time, is that the combination itself between the reconstructed clause and the exception marker is invariably ill-formed because no exception marker is actually allowed to combine with a clause resulted from reconstruction. Thus, in (4a) below we have a sentence with an EP (marked in italics), in (4b), we have the reconstructed clausal complement of the exception marker while in (4c) we have the combination between the exception marker and the reconstructed clause (again in italics). The combination (in bold in (4c)) is ill-formed, even if the reconstructed clause in (4b) is fine:

(4) a. Ion i-a invitat pe toţi la cină, *mai puţin pe Ioana.*
'Ion invited everybody to the dinner except for Ioana.'
b. Ion a invitat-o la cină pe Ioana.
'Ion invited Ioana to the dinner.'
c. Ion i-a invitat pe toţi la cină, **mai puţin* [*Ion a invitat-o la cină pe Ioana*].
'Ion invited everybody to the dinner except [Ion invited Ioana].'

The derivational account recognises the problem and assumes that elliptical EPs are obtained by means of obligatory movement and deletion, whereas other elliptical constructions (for example, gapping) allow these operations to be optional (Pérez-Jiménez and Moreno-Quibén 2012: 592-593). However, obligatory deletion is obviously an *ad-hoc* solution, because it is uniquely meant to remove the ill-formedness effect of the reconstruction.

3.2 Problems with other arguments for ellipsis

The derivational account defends the elliptical status of EPs, by using supplementary arguments. Among these arguments, of peculiar import are the occurrences in EPs of temporal and propositional adverbs (Pérez-Jiménez and Moreno-Quibén 2012: 597-602). These occurrences are interpreted as showing that EPs have behind them full (finite) clauses. We will be arguing that this strategy is unnecessarily complicated, as long as simpler solutions are available.

3.2.1 Temporal adverbs

In Romanian, temporal adverbs are indeed allowed to occur in EPs:

(5) *Muncitorii mănâncă aici zilnic, în afară de Ion*, ***lunea***.
'Workers eat here every day except for Ion on Mondays'

The occurrence of temporal adverbials in EPs is constrained. One cannot have, for example, instead of *lunea* 'on Mondays' in (5), the temporal adverb *ieri* 'yesterday' in (6):

(6) **Muncitorii mănâncă aici zilnic, în afară de Ion*, ***ieri***.
'Workers eat here every day except for Ion yesterday'

In the derivational analysis of EPs, an example like (5) is interpreted as proving that EPs have a hidden but active tense phrase (TP), as part of their syntactic structure. It is this TP which is said to constrain the occurrence of temporal adverbs.

In fact, the constrained occurrence of the temporal adverbs may be seen as directly illustrating the Condition of Inclusion, described above. More precisely, the constrained occurrence of the temporal adverbs is the instantiation of the Condition of Inclusion, whenever the elements of this condition convey a temporal/aspectual meaning. Consider again (5), rewritten below as (7):

(7) *Muncitorii mănâncă aici* ***zilnic****, în afară de Ion,* ***lunea***.
'Workers eat here every day except for Ion on Mondays'

In the EP *în afară de Ion, lunea* 'except for Ion on Mondays', each item of the sequence < *Ion, lunea* > has as associate an item in the corresponding main clause: *Ion* correlates with *muncitorii* 'the workers' and *lunea* 'on Mondays' with *zilnic* 'everyday'[5]. So, the sequence < *Ion, lunea* > fall within the range of the Condition of Inclusion, that is, a constraint on the relationship between the exception complement and its associate < *muncitorii, zilnic* >. Due to the adverb *zilnic* 'every day', the present tense of the verb in clause (7) *mănâncă* 'eat-PRES.3PL' denotes a habitual. The Condition of Inclusion, in this case, requires that *lunea* 'on Mondays', which is the pair of the associate *zilnic*, be also a habitual. This is indeed the case: *lunea* in (7) does not denote a certain Monday but a generic one: any Monday in the set of the days generically denoted by *zilnic*. So, the constraint of inclusion is observed, the result being the semantic well-formedness of the whole sentence. On the contrary, if the habitual meaning of the associate *zilnic* does not correlate with the meaning of the relevant part in the exception complement – as in (6), where the adverb *ieri* 'yesteday' is not an habitual, the Condition of Inclusion is violated, which yields semantic deviance.

[5] This is an instance of "exceptive cluster", because the exception complement does not consist in only one constituent (as in the case of the EPs discussed so far). For the HPSG concept of cluster, see Mouret (2006), (2007). For the application of this concept to the phenomenon of gapping see Bîlbîie (2011). We will not pursue here the issue of exceptive clusters.

The conclusion of the above remarks is, then, unsurprising: it is not necessary to explain the constrained occurrence of the temporal adverbs in EPs, by means of a hidden TP in EPs, as long as one already disposes of an principle with obvious and visible requirements – the Condition of Inclusion (also accepted in derivational syntax), which does the same job.

3.2.2 Propositional adverbs

EPs in Romanian may also host propositional adverbs (below in bold):

(8) Au venit toţi, *mai puţin, **fireşte**, Ion*.
'They came all, except, ***of course***, Ion'

According to the derivational perspective on EPs, the occurrence of propositional adverbs proves that EPs have a covert but active complementizer phrase (CP). The CP is said to be inherited from the hidden clause.

This conclusion gives support to subsequent syntactic operations involved in the structural approach to ellipsis: reconstruction, movement and deletion. However, a simpler account for the presence of the propositional adverbs is available, too. It does not rely on hidden syntactic structures, but on accessible semantic structures.

In this respect, it has to be firstly emphasized that in the literature of EPs there exists a much more cautious claim about propositional adverbs: that their occurrence show that EPs express a propositional content (Garcia Álvarez 2008: 77-90). Expressing a propositional content is less than having a CP clausal structure. However, the assumption that an expression has propositional content may be transparently justified, thanks to the inference test[6].

Secondly, it is already known that there are also verbless constructions containing propositional adverbs. Such verbless constructions are known to be non-elliptical. Thus, Culicover and Jackendoff (2005: 236-237) and Merchant (2006: 2-3) list a rich inventory of messages which are both non-elliptical and verbless, hence in no connection with CP and ellipsis. The inventory contains telegrams, titles, headlines, weather reports, recipes, instructions, short directives, labels, etc. At least some of these verbless, non-elliptical messages may host propositional adverbs:

(9) Speaker A: "Next exit?"
Speaker B: "*Next exit, Chicago, **of course***."

What holds for examples in English also holds for Romanian:

(10) Medicul a zis că *nici vorbă, **bineînţeles**, de cancer*.
'The doctor said that no way, of course, of cancer.'

[6] To repeat a previous example, *John kissed every girl at the party, except Mary* entails *John did not kiss Mary at the party.*

Again, then, arguing for a hidden syntactic configuration appears to be an unnecessary complication, as long as one dispose of pieces of evidence (of semantic nature), which are immediately accessible. Consequently, the present option of analysis will be the treatment as such of the asymmetry propositional semantics/non-clausal constituency. This amounts to approach EPs (more precisely, the exception complement in EPs) by means of the concept of "fragment".

4. Fragments

The concept of fragment has recently received a precise meaning in the linguistic theory, thanks to research developed within the HPSG framework (Ginzburg and Sag 2000, Abeillé 2006, Mouret 2007, Bîlbîie 2011). Fragments in HPSG are units, whose content does not correlate with a corresponding syntactic structure. This means that a fragment is not like an ordinary phrase. More precisely, a fragment is syntactically incomplete.

From a semantic point of view, a fragment is characterized by the fact that it expresses more than its syntactic structure allows it to express. In HPSG, the additional content of a fragment is explained by the linguistic context in which the fragment occurs. A fragment, then, has to have a source phrase (usually, a clause), which it should rely on. The additional content of the fragment is thus recovered through semantic reconstruction.

5. EPs in Romanian contain fragments, not ellipses

The features mentioned above may be easily identified in the case of the exception complements in Romanian. The properties of these complements are just the properties that define fragments. Thus, exception complements have the content of a clause (that is, a propositional content), but their structure is not apt to fully express this content. This is the asymmetry specific to fragments.

From a syntactic point of view, exception complements in Romanian behave like a clause. Nevertheless, this clause is special, because what is (apparently) missing in it is just the verb that should head the phrase.

As previously seen, even if the missing verb can be reconstructed, the combination between the exception marker and the reconstructed clause is invariably illicit. This demonstrates that the syntactic reconstruction is not only unnecessary, but plainly impossible.

Semantic reconstruction, instead, is required. Examine in this respect the sentence *Au venit toţi, mai puţin Ion* 'They came all, save Ion'. One cannot get the whole interpretation of the EP *mai puţin Ion* 'save Ion' without using the three interpretative factors specific to the content of the fragment complement *Ion*, namely: (i) the source clause *Au venit toţi*, 'have.3PL come.PST PTCP all' (which supplies the unexpressed predication of the EP); (ii) the literal content of the complement phrase itself *Ion,* and (iii) the type (that is, proposition, question, etc.) of the reconstructed content (Bîlbîie 2011: 246). Thanks to the source clause, the denotation of the verb in the source clause (*au venit*

'have.3PL come.PST PTCP') becomes part of the meaning of the EP. This denotation offers what is (apparently) missing in the exception complement. At the same time, the source clause determines the interpretation of the exception complement *Ion*, as one of the semantic arguments of the predication *a veni* 'come.PST.3SG'. As the complement *Ion* comes into the structure with its own meaning, this meaning will also participate in the semantic scenario introduced by the reconstructed predication. This leads to the proposition which combines with the meaning of the exception marker: *'mai puţin (a venit (ion))'* 'save (came (john))'.

5.1 Elements of HPSG

The analysis above may be expressed within the framework of HPSG. In order to do that, some introductory specifications about the framework itself are required.

HPSG (Pollard and Sag 1987, 1994) is a non-derivational theory. It does not resort to movement.

Linguistic information in HPSG is encoded by means of a system already known from phonology and structural semantics. It is the system of the feature-value pairs. Features (also called attributes) are conventionally written in capitals, usually, with suggestive abbreviations. Values are written in small italics. For example, the fact that something is in the accusative is encoded in HPSG as follows: [CASE: *acc*]. When two attributes necessarily have the same value, the shared value is written as a boxed/module number called tag (for instance, $\boxed{1}$).

Sets of feature-value pairs are called (feature-value) matrices (AVM). AVMs are given in brackets. They model various linguistic objects, such as phrases, parts of speech, etc. Matrices may be labelled, the label being called a "type". Types are disposed in tree hierarchies, with the most general type at the top and the most specific ones at the bottom. For instance, if the hierarchy regards parts of speech, the most general type here is *pos* ('part of speech'), whereas *noun* is a subtype of *pos*.

Types are subject to constraints. A constraint is an implicational statement which specifies a certain property of the type subject to the constraint. For example, an essential property of a phrase is that it has daughter(s). This property is captured in a constraint on the type called phrase (*ph*). The constraint says that if a linguistic object is a phrase then it has daughter(s) (formally, *ph* → [DTRS: *n*(on)*e*(mpty)*v*(alue)]).

Hierarchies in HPSG are therefore hierarchies *of types* and, at the same time, *of constraints on types*. Indeed, if a certain type is characterized by a certain constraint, that constraint will be also specific to every other subtype of the type in question. This aspect of the hierarchies is known as the inheritance principle: a subtype *t'* of a type *t* inherits all the properties of *t*.

Hierarchies and the principle of inheritance play a major role in HPSG. Every significant aspect in the grammar (well-formedness, semantic normality, acceptability, morphological structure of the word, etc.) is decided through types, constraints and inheritance. Types, type constraints and type hierarchies will also be used in the analysis of EPs.

5.2 HPSG representation of EPs

The HPSG representation of EPs presupposes the representation of the exception complement and of the exception marker. We will devote the final two sections to either of them.

5.2.1 Exception complements

As exception complements are phrases (in HPSG terms, *ph*), their properties in HPSG are determined by the place they occupy within the hierarchy (independently) established for phrases. In the following representation underlined phrasal types compose the path from the top of the hierarchy (i.e. the highest type dominating exception complements) to its bottom (the exception complement itself):

(Ph)
1. *ph: hd-ph* (endocentric phrase), *nhd-ph* (exocentric phrase)
2. *hd-ph: hd-only-ph* (phrase with a single daughter), *hd-subj-ph* (phrase with head and subject), *hd-comp-ph*, *hd-adj-ph*, ...
3. *hd-only-ph: hd-frag-ph* (phrase with a fragment),...
4. *hd-frag-ph : sluicing-ph*, *stripping-ph*, *pseudo-stripping-ph*, *exc-frag-ph*,...
5. *exc-frag-ph: exc-frag-ph*$_1$, ..., *exc-frag-ph*$_4$

At the same time, as exception complements in HPSG are also clauses (*cl*), their properties are determined by their place within the hierarchy of clauses. What is relevant here is that exception complements are declarative clauses:

(Cl)
1. *cl: decl-cl*, *ndecl-cl*

Fragments, as we saw, are contextually dependent on a previous phrase – in the present case, a source clause with which the EP is connected. In HPSG, the contextual dependence of a fragment is captured by means of two features, MAX(imal)-Q(uestion)U(nder)D(iscussion) and SAL(ient)-UTT(erance) (Ginzburg and Sag 2000: 304). MAX-QUD has as value the content of the source clause, when the source clause expresses a question. In the case of EPs, things are different. The source clause is declarative and expresses a proposition. A part of the proposition – a relation – also occurs in the proposition expressed by the EP[7]. What we therefore need is to reformulate MAX-QUD, such as to reach a higher level of generality. We propose in this sense the feature MAX-CONT(ent)-UD. MAX-CONT-UD supply the opportunity of disposing of relations as values, which are precisely the semantic type needed in the case of an exception complement, a relation.

[7] For example, in the proposition 'They came all, save Ion' expressed by the sentence *.Au venit toţi, mai puţin Ion* there is a relation 'come...' (put aside the tense) which reappears in the fragment *Ion*; the fragment means indeed 'come (Ion)'.

As for the feature SAL-UTT, it identifies in the source clause the associate of the exception complement.

The constraint on *hd-frag-ph* which accounts for the above mentioned dependencies looks as follows (*hd-frag-ph* is the immediate super-type of the exception complement):

(11) $$\textit{hd-frag-ph} \rightarrow \left[CTXT : \left[\begin{array}{l} MAX-CONT-UD : nev \\ SAL-UTT : nev \end{array} \right] \right]$$

The constraint mainly says that a fragment is defined by its non-empty values for the CONTEXT features MAX-CONT-UD and SAL-UTT. Notice that in the case of exception complements the salient utterance in the source clause coincides with the associate of that exception complement, e.g. ***Every American investor*** *withdrew from Cuba, except General Motors*, where *General Motors* is the exception fragment and *every American investor* is its associate phrase and, at the same time, the salient utterance.

Exception complements in HPSG are also clauses, because they express a message. More precisely, they express a subtype of message, a proposition. In HPSG, a clause expressing a proposition is a declarative clause (*decl-cl*, Ginzburg and Sag 2000: 42). What appears below is the constraint on the type *decl-cl* which says that if the content of a declarative clause is a proposition or an outcome, then, if no other more specific constraint intervenes, the head-daughter of the clause has the same value for the feature SOA as the mother phrase. The value *austinian* for the feature CONT ('content') in the representation below means a proposition or an outcome. SOA means 'state of affairs'. The slash / shows that the constraint is a constraint by default:

(12) $$\left[\begin{array}{l} decl-cl \\ CONT : austinian\left[SOA : /\boxed{1}\right] \end{array} \right] \rightarrow H \left[CONT : austinian\left[SOA : /\boxed{1}\right] \right]$$

Due to the inheritance relationship between types and their subtypes, fragments are now defined as both headed fragment phrases and declarative clauses. This means that they inherit the defining properties of these two super-types. The subtype itself of these super-types is the type *decl-frag-cl*.

There are several types of declarative fragment clauses identified in HPSG: sluicing (Ginzburg and Sag 2000), stripping (Abeillé 2006), gapping (Bîlbîie 2011), etc. Exception complements are just one type of these fragments. We denote them by means of the type *decl-exc-frag-cl* and we characterize this type through the following constraint:

(13) *decl-exc-frag-cl* →

$$\begin{bmatrix} HEAD : v\left[IC : -\right] \\ CONT : proposition \\ CTXT : \begin{bmatrix} MAX-CONT-UD : re\ln \\ SAL-UTT : synsem\begin{bmatrix} CAT : \boxed{1} \\ CONT\ \ \boxed{IND : 2} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \\ HD-DTR : synsem\begin{bmatrix} CAT : \boxed{1} \\ CONT\ \ \boxed{IND : 2} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

This constraint specifies that an exception complement cannot be an independent clause ([IC: -]). Also, the HEAD value of its unique daughter must be underspecified, which yields the possibility of having several subtypes of exception fragments, according to different values of the HEAD feature. The CONT value of the fragment must be, of course, a proposition. When the information about the head-daughter of the source clause is available, the MAX-CONT-UD is coindexed with the RELN value of the source clause head-daughter.

The constraint (13) is thus meant to define any exception fragment. There are, however, four subtypes of exception fragments. They differ from each other from the point of view of the HEAD value of the head-daughter and they are selected by corresponding distinct classes of exception markers:

(i) The first subtype consists of a fragment, whose head-daughter HEAD value is a genitive NP ([HEAD: *noun*[CASE:*gen*]); it is subcategorized by the marker *cu excepţia* 'except for': ... *cu excepţia lui Ion* 'with exception-the GEN Ion 'except for Ion';

(ii) The second one has the following possible HEAD values: accusative NP, AdjP, infinitive VP, temporal AdvP. It is selected by the marker *în afară de* 'besides, apart from'; for instance, … *în afară de ieri* 'apart from yesterday';

(iii) The third subtype has all the HEAD values the second one has, plus subjunctive VP, PP and CP. If its HEAD value is a NP, the NP may have any case. This subtype of fragment is selected by *mai puţin*, *minus* and *decât* 'but': *A spus de toate despre tine, mai puţin /minus că te urăşte* 'He said everything about you save that he hates you';

(iv) Finally, the fourth subtype has as HEAD values a PP headed by the preposition *de* 'of' or an infinitive/subjunctive VP. The marker that selects this type of fragment is *în afară* 'save, except for': *Ion face orice/de toate la bucătărie, în afară să spele vase* 'Ion does everything in the kitchen, except for *washing* the dishes'.

There remains to be specified that EPs headed by *cu excepţia*, *în afară de* and *în afară* are adjuncts of sentences. EPs headed by *decât*, *mai puţin* 'less' and *minus* are NP adjuncts.

5.2.2 Exception markers

The last step in the present analysis is the description of the main properties of exception markers. As seen above, exception markers subcategorize certain types of

exception complements and manifest certain preferences for the category of the constituent they modify. At the same time, though, exception markers have certain common features, more precisely, three:

(i) they all select fragment complements
(ii) they reverse the polarity of the statement carried by the exception complement
(iii) they trigger a presupposition

These features may be represented schematically as follows.

(14)

$$\begin{bmatrix} HEAD : ...prep \vee adv \begin{bmatrix} MODIF : ... \\ PRESUPP-TRIG : + \end{bmatrix} \\ COMPS : synsem \begin{bmatrix} MAX-CONT-UD : re\text{ln} \\ SAL-UTT : nev \\ CONT : |1| proposition \end{bmatrix} \\ CONT : \begin{bmatrix} RELN : neg-rel \\ ARG : |1| \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

In (14) the HEAD value of the exception marker is either a preposition or an adverb, which may modify a clause or a noun phrase; the complement (COMPS) value is specified as being a fragment, whose content consists in at least one proposition (tagged $|1|$).

The content (CONT) of the exception marker is a negation (*neg-rel*) that applies to the proposition tagged $|1|$. This part of the representation accounts for the Negative Condition, that is, one of the defining parameters of EPs. Thus, when the exception marker projects its complement the whole exception phrase inherits the polarity of the exception marker.

Finally, the value + of the feature PRESUPP-TRIG on the HEAD value shows that an exception marker triggers a presupposition. This is a presupposition about the denotatum of the non-reconstructed part of the exception complement. The presupposition belongs in fact to the whole EP and it actually encodes the Condition of Inclusion, another defining parameter of EPs. The presupposition says that the denotatum of the complement has the property of its associate[8].

Thanks to this analysis, the combination exception marker-exception fragment appears to be a phrase which in the syntactic theory of HPSG is of type head-complement phrase (*hd-comp-ph*).

---

[8] The idea that the Condition of Inclusion is a presupposition is supported by the fact that if the condition is negated the EP as a whole becomes senseless:

(i) ! All the members of the company came, save the principal, **but the principal is not a member of the company**.

6. Conclusions

The HPSG representation of EPs, then, pleads for their non-elliptical status and avoids the drawbacks mentioned above in the case of the derivational approach. Sentences with EP and the light verb *a face* 'do' in the source clause raise no problem for this approach, because the subjunctive VP fragment complement is simply selected by certain exception markers, i. e. *mai puţin* 'save', *minus* and *decât* '...but'. Also, there is no problem of reconstruction in this approach, because, due to their subcategorization frames, exception markers are not allowed to select (root) clauses and no hidden level of representation is consequently posited. The occurrence of temporal adverbs, in turn, is ruled through the Inclusion Condition. Finally, the occurrence of propositional adverbs in EPs is taken to be a piece of evidence for the propositional content of these phrases.

There is no reason to believe that this fragment-based analysis of EPs is restricted to Romanian. On the contrary, we strongly believe that, cross-linguistically, it may have wide applications.

References

Abeillé, A. 2006. Stripping constructions in French, manuscript, Université Paris 7.
Bîlbîie, G. 2011. Grammaire des constructions elliptiques. PhD dissertation, Université Paris 7.
Culicover, P. and Jackendoff, R. 2005. *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
Garcia Álvarez, I. 2008.Generality and Exception. A Study in the Semantics of Exceptives. PhD dissertation, Stanford University.
Ginzburg, J. and Sag, I. 2000. *Interrogative Investigations*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
Hoeksema, J. 1987. The logic of exception. In A. Miller and J. Powers (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, 100-113. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.
Lappin, S. 1996. The interpretation of ellipsis. In S. Lappin (ed.), *The Handbook of Semantic Theory*, 145-175. Oxford: Blackwell.
Merchant, J. 2001.*The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
Merchant, J. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27: 661-738.
Merchant, J. 2006. Rethinking the identity conditions in ellipsis. Hand-out, Ealing, Paris.
Moltmann, F. 1995. Exception sentences and polyadic quantification. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 18: 223-280.
Mouret, F. 2006. A Phrase Structure approach to Argument Cluster Coordination. In S. Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the HPSG '06 Conference*, 247-267. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
Mouret, F. 2007. Grammaire des constructions coordonnées. Coordinations simples et coordinations à redoublement en français contemporain. PhD dissertation, Université Paris 7
Pérez-Jiménez, I. and Moreno-Quibén, N. 2012. On the syntax of exceptions. Evidence from Spanish. *Lingua* 122: 582-607.
Pollard, C. and Sag, I. 1987. *Information-based Syntax and Semantics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
Pollard C. and Sag, I. 1994. *Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago, ILL: University of Chicago Press and CSLI.