### Exceptives and Ellipsis<sup>\*</sup>

# Eric Potsdam

# University of Florida

### 1. Introduction

Exceptives are a construction which expresses exclusion. (1) is an example from the VOS Austronesian language Malagasy, spoken on the island of Madagascar by about 18 million people. In (1), the EXCEPTIVE PHRASE, *afa-tsy Rasoa* 'except Rasoa' modifies the RESTRICTED QP *ny rehetra* 'everyone', excluding Rasoa from the set of people who laughed. *Rasoa* in this example is the EXCEPTION.

(1)	Nihomehy	ny	rehetra	omaly	[afa-tsy	[Rasoa]]	
	laughed	DET	all	yesterday	except	Rasoa	
	RESTRICTED				EXCEPTIVE PHRASE		
			EXCEPTION				
	'Everyone laughed yesterday except Rasoa.'						

Hoeksema 1987, 1995 recognizes two types of exceptives, CONNECTED EXCEPTIVES and FREE EXCEPTIVES. Differences between the two are summarized in the table in (4) (see Hoeksema 1987, 1995, Reinhart 1991, Pérez-Jiménez and Moreno-Quibén 2012, Soltan 2016, among others).

Connected exceptives, as in (2), semantically subtract from the domain of a quantifier.

(2) [Everyone except Rasoa] laughed. CONNECTED EXCEPTIVE

Syntactically, the exceptive phrase forms a constituent with the QP and thus is adjacent to it. Because the restricted QP is a nominal, the exception must also be a nominal, and its host QP must be overt so that the exceptive phrase has something to adjoin to.

Free exceptives, (3), express an exception to a proposition stated in the main clause.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>\*</sup> I would like to thank my consultants Bodo and Voara Randrianasolo, and audiences at AFLA 24 and NELS 48 for feedback on this work. Glossing follows the Leipzig glossing conventions.

- (3) a. [Everyone laughed], except Rasoa. FREE EXCEPTIVE
  - b. [We are open], except on Sunday.

Syntactically, the exception phrase does not form a constituent with the QP and typically appears clause-peripherally. Exceptions in free exceptives are not restricted to being nominals and the restricted QP may be implicit. These latter two characteristics are illustrated in (3b), where a PP exception *on Sunday* modifies an implicit temporal variable in the main clause.

	CONNECTED EXCEPTIVE (CE)	FREE EXCEPTIVE (FE)
semantics	subtracts from the domain	expresses an exception to
	of a quantifier	a generalization
syntax	DP modifier	main clause
		modifier/conjunct
position	adjacent to QP	clause-peripheral
constituency	forms a constituent with the	not a constituent with the
	restricted quantifier	restricted quantifier
category of exception	DPs only	not restricted to DPs
realization of QP	must be syntactically	may be implicit
	realized	

(4) *Differences between connected and free exceptives* 

This paper is concerned with free exceptives and has two goals.<sup>1</sup> The first is to argue that free exceptives in Malagasy are an elliptical construction in which the exceptive phrase has elided clausal structure (section 2). Such a claim has also been made for exceptives in French (O'Neill 2011), Spanish (Pérez-Jiménez & Moreno-Quiben 2012), and Egyptian Arabic (Soltan 2016). The second goal is to show that the missing structure at the ellipsis site in Malagasy is a focus cleft construction (section 3). Section 4 of the paper considers the ellipsis derivation in more detail.

# 2. Hidden clausal structure

This section argues that the exception in examples like (1) are contained in an elliptical clause, as schematized in (5). Evidence comes from unreduced exceptions, coordination, multiple exceptions, and island sensitivity.

(5) Nihomehy ny rehetra afa-tsy [ ... Rasoa ... ]<sub>CLAUSE</sub> laughed DET all except Rasoa 'Everyone laughed except Rasoa.'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The examples below have one or more of the free exceptive properties in (4), which makes a free exceptive analysis possible: the exceptive phrase is not adjacent to the QP, the exceptive phrase is clause final, the exception is not a DP, or the restricted QP is implicit. A connected exceptive parse is not precluded in some cases.

A first, straightforward piece of evidence in favor of hidden clausal structure is the observation that the exception in examples like (5) can be pronounced as a full clause:

(6) Nihomehy ny rehetra afa-tsy Rasoa (no tsy nihomehy) laughed DET all except Rasoa FOC NEG laughed 'Everyone laughed except Rasoa (didn't laugh).'

A second argument comes from Malagasy-internal coordination facts. Malagasy has two coordinating conjunctions. To first approximation, *ary* is used to coordinate clauses and *sy* is used to coordinate sub-clausal phrases such as DPs, VPs, and PPs (Rajemisa-Raolison 1969):

(7) Mihinana ny akondro sy/\***ary** ny manga Rasoa eat DET banana and DET mango Rasoa 'Rasoa eats bananas and mangoes.'

Although *ary* cannot be used to coordinate two DPs in (7), it can be so used in an exceptive, (8). The grammaticality of *ary* is expected if each exception is actually contained in an elliptical clause, as schematized in (5). *Sy* is possible as well because the exception itself can be a simple conjunction of DPs.

(8)	Mihinan	a	ny	voank	azo	reh	etra	Rasoa	
	eat		DET	fruit		all		Rasoa	
	afa-tsy	ny	ako	ondro	sy/ai	ſy	ny	manga	
	except	DET	bar	nana	and		DET	mango	
	'Rasoa e	eats a	ll fru	it exce	pt ban	anas	s and	mangoes.	,

The third argument for hidden structure comes from exceptives with multiple exceptions, (9). The presence of two exceptions strongly suggests that there is a clause, as the two exceptions otherwise are unlikely to form a phrasal constituent.

zazalahy (9) Nandihy daholo tamin' ny zazavavy rehetra ny danced all PREP DET girl all DET boy afa-tsy Rabe tamin- dRasoa except Rabe PREP Rasoa 'Every boy danced with every girl, except Rabe with Rasoa.'

The final argument for hidden structure is that exceptions cannot be related to restricted QPs that are inside islands, as shown in the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint example in (10). Island sensitivity follows if the exceptive phrase contains a clause out of which the exception moves, and this movement is subject to islands.

(10) \* Nihaona tamin' [ny mpiahy miantra olona rehetra] aho DET caretaker pity met PREP person all 1SG.NOM afa-tsy Rabe except Rabe ('I met the caretaker who has compassion for everyone, except Rabe.')

These facts indicate that the exception is contained in a clause, which I propose has been reduced by ellipsis. In the next section, I explore the structure of this missing clause.

# 3. Elided cleft clause

This section argues that the missing clause in (5) is a cleft. Basic word order in Malagasy is VOS or predicate-initial, (11). The language has a cleft construction that can be used to focus subjects and some adjuncts (Keenan 1976). It is formed by fronting a constituent and following it with the particle *no* 'FOC', (12).

- (11) Nihinana voankazo ilay gidro ate fruit DEM lemur 'That lemur ate the fruit.'
- (12) Ilay gidro no nihinana voankazo DEM lemur FOC ate fruit 'It's that lemur who ate the fruit.'

Although certain details remain unclear, there is general agreement that the focus construction is a biclausal cleft in which the initial element, the PIVOT, is the predicate of the matrix clause (Paul 2001, Potsdam 2005, Law 2007). The cleft construction is also used to form *wh*-questions. I return to the syntactic structure in section 4.

Given these two clause types, there are at least two ways in which the exception can be derived from a full clause. If the underlying clause is a cleft, then the exception is the initial cleft pivot/predicate and the deleted material is the non-focus material, (13). If the underlying clause is a VOS clause, then the exception is the subject and the deleted material is the predicate, (14).

Ni	homehy	ny	rehetra	afa-tsy	[ Rasoa	<del>no</del>	tsy	-nihomehy ] <sub>CLEF</sub>
laı	ughed	DET	all	except	Rasoa	FOC	NEG	laughed
Έ	veryone la	ughe	d except ]	Rasoa.'				-

(14) Underlying VOS clause analysis
Nihomehy ny rehetra afa-tsy [ tsy nihomehy Rasoa ]vos clause
laughed DET all except NEG laughed Rasoa
'Everyone laughed except Rasoa.'

Restrictions on Malagasy subjects will show that the cleft analysis in (13) is superior.

The first argument comes from a formal definiteness restriction on Malagasy subjects (Keenan 1976). The subject of VOS clauses must have an overt determiner, (15). The pivot of a cleft is not so restricted; a determiner is optional, (16). Exceptives pattern with cleft pivots and not subjects in not requiring formal definiteness marking, (17).

(15)	Nihira	*(ny)	ankizy	telo	(16)	(Ny)	ankizy	telo	no	nihira
	sang	DET	children	three		DET	children	three	FOC	sang
	'Three cl	hildren	sang.'			'Its (th	e) three c	hildren	who s	sang.'

(17) Nihira ny rehetra afa-tsy (ny) ankizy telo sang DET all except DET children three 'Everyone sang except (the) three children.'

The second argument comes from wh-phrases. Malagasy has two strategies for forming wh-questions: wh-in-situ or the cleft construction (Sabel 2003, Paul & Potsdam 2012). Wh-in-situ is not permitted for subjects. They must use the cleft construction:

(18) * Nitomany iza?	(19)	Iza	no	nitomany?
cried who		who	FOC	cried
('Who cried?')		ʻWho	o cried	d?'

As above, exceptives pattern with cleft pivots and not subjects. An exception can be a wh-phrase:

(20) Nitomany ny ankizy rehetra afa-tsy **iza**? cried DET children all except who 'All the children cried except who?'

Third, Malagasy subjects must be DPs. They cannot be PPs. DPs and non-DPs may be clefted however (see Paul 2000 for data and discussion). Exceptions pattern with cleft pivots in that they can be non-DPs. (21) illustrates a PP exception.

(21) Tsy nitoriteny tamin' ny olona izy, afa-tsy **tamin' ny Jiosy** NEG preach PREP DET person 3SG.NOM except PREP DET Jew 'He didn't preach to anyone, except to the Jews.'

Finally, case provides an argument for an underlying cleft. Pronominal subjects in VOS clauses appear in the nominative. The first singular pronoun *aho* '1SG.NOM' has a special strong form *izaho* '1SG.STRONG', which is used in the pivot/predicate position of a cleft, (22), and certain other places (Pearson 2001). It is not used in subject position, (23). A first person exception shows up in the strong form not the nominative form, (24).

- (22) \*Aho/\*Ahy/Izaho no nandevilevy an-dRabe 1SG.NOM/1SG.ACC/1SG.STRONG FOC scolded ACC-Rabe 'It's me who scolded Rabe.'
- (23) Nandevilevy an-dRabe aho/\*ahy/\*izaho scolded ACC-Rabe 1SG.NOM/1SG.ACC/1SG.STRONG 'I scolded Rabe.'
- (24) Nandevilevy ny rehetra Rabe afa-tsy **\*aho/\*ahy/izaho** scolded DET all Rabe except 1SG.NOM/1SG.ACC/1SG.STRONG 'Rabe scolded everyone except me.'

I conclude that the missing clausal structure in the exceptive phrase is a biclausal cleft. The next section explores the details of the syntactic derivation.

# 4. Derivation

This section provides a syntactic derivation for an exceptive, such as (1), repeated here, and discusses the specifics of the hypothesized clausal ellipsis.

(1) Nihomehy ny rehetra afa-tsy Rasoa laughed DET all except Rasoa 'Everyone laughed except Rasoa.'

I assume that Malagasy predicate-initial word order is derived by fronting the predicate to a left-peripheral position above the subject in spec, TP (Rackowski & Travis 2000, Pearson 2001). This is shown for the VS main clause in (25a), 'Everyone laughed', on the left. The subject occupies spec,  $TP_A$  and the predicate *nihomehy* 'laughed', for which I use the cover symbol PredP, has been fronted to the specifier of YP, a projection above  $TP_A$ .



The unreduced exceptive clause is shown on the right, (25b). I assume that *afa-tsy* consists of *afa* (derived from *afaka* 'free from' (Winterton 2011)) and the clausal negator *tsy* 'NEG', glossed 'except.NEG'. The remainder of the clause is a cleft structure, as argued for in section 3. I follow Paul 2001 and Potsdam 2007 in taking it to be specifically a pseudocleft. It consists of a fronted predicate *Rasoa* and a headless relative clause in subject position. The PredP of the cleft, which includes the pivot, is fronted to spec,YP and the headless relative clause occupies spec,TP<sub>E</sub>. The example thus has the same predicate-subject structure seen in (25a). The presence of the clausal negator *tsy* in the exceptive particle helps to explain the Polarity Generalization regarding exceptives:

 (26) Polarity Generalization (after García Álvarez 2008:129) The propositions expressed in the main clause and the exception clause must have opposite polarity

One problem with the proposal is that the word order in (25b) before ellipsis is not the word order in the unreduced version, repeated below. (27) has an extra instance of negation in the embedded clause, which seems to suggest that *afa-tsy* is not semantically negative.

(27)Nihomehv ny rehetra afa-tsv Rasoa no tsv nihomehy FOC NEG laughed laughed DET all except Rasoa 'Everyone laughed except Rasoa didn't laugh.'

To account for this apparent contradiction, I tentatively propose that there are two exceptive particles. The one that licenses ellipsis shown in (25b) is semantically negative and negates the following clause, satisfying the Polarity Generalization. The afa-tsy that is followed by an unreduced clause, in (27), does not license ellipsis and does not contain semantic negation.<sup>2</sup>

I adopt a semantic condition on ellipsis recoverability, following Merchant 2001 and Potsdam 2007. The ellipsis of  $TP_E$  in (25b) is licensed under semantic identity with the antecedent main clause TP<sub>A</sub>. Merchant's ellipsis licensing machinery is given in (28) through (30).

- Focus Condition on TP Ellipsis (Merchant 2001:26) (28)A TP E can be deleted only if E is e-GIVEN
- (29)e-GIVENness (Merchant 2001:26) An expression E counts as e-GIVEN iff E has a salient antecedent A and A entails F-closure(E), and a.
  - b. E entails F-closure(A)
- *F-closure(X)* is the result of replacing focus-marked parts of X with  $\exists$ -bound (30)variables of the appropriate type

To apply these definitions, one reconstructs the fronted predicate to its base position in each clause in (25) (Massam 2001, Potsdam 2007) and computes the denotations and Fclosures of the antecedent and elided clauses. These are given in (31).

- $\begin{bmatrix} A \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} everyone \ laughed \end{bmatrix} = \forall x [laughed(x)]$ F-closure( $\begin{bmatrix} A \end{bmatrix}$ ) =  $\exists x [laughed(x)]$ (31) a.
  - b.
    - [E] = [Rasoa laughed] = laughed(Rasoa)c.
    - F-closure([[E]]) =  $\exists x [laughed(x)]$ d.

The denotation of the antecedent clause, *everyone laughed*, is  $\forall x [laughed(x)]$ . Calculating the F-closure of A requires first Quantifier Raising the universal QP out of TP. It leaves behind a variable which gets existentially bound, yielding  $\exists x [laughed(x)]$ . The elided clause's denotation is simply laughed(Rasoa) after reconstruction. I assume that the exception is focus-marked, yielding F-closure(E) as  $\exists x [laughed(x)]$  as well. Given these calculations, the twin conditions in (29) are satisfied and ellipsis succeeds.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Some support for this claim comes from English. A free exceptive may optionally contain negation: Everyone left, except (not) Bill. If English except is ambiguous in the same way, the optionality of not follows. When not is absent, except semantically incorporates negation. When no negation is incorporated, not must appear to trigger the polarity reversal. See Soltan 2016 for discussion about the exceptive particle in Egyptian Arabic.

The actual deletion of  $TP_E$  is triggered by an E-feature on Y°, following Merchant 2001, Aelbrecht 2010, and others. This feature is a semantic instruction that the TP complement of Y° satisfy the Focus Condition above and a phonological instruction to not pronounce the TP complement of Y°. Combined with the proposal above regarding two forms of *afa-tsy*, I propose the following lexical entries. (32a) is the exceptive particle that contains semantic negation and triggers ellipsis. (32b) is the one followed by an unreduced clause. Note that the E-feature is not on the exceptive particle itself but on the head of its complement. In other words, *afa-tsy* 'except.NEG' selects for a YP that licenses ellipsis of its complement.

(32) a. afa-tsy, [\_\_YP[E]], 'except.NEG' b. afa-tsy, [\_\_YP], 'except'

Before concluding, a word is required about examples such as (33), in which the restricted QP is a non-subject. Under the ellipsis analysis proposed here, the example might be expected to have the analysis shown, in which the elided clause is syntactically parallel to the main clause.

Mihinana Rasoa afa-tsy akondro (33) ny voankazo rehetra ny eat DET fruit all Rasoa except.NEG DET banana no mihinana Rasoa FOC eat Rasoa 'Rasoa eats all fruit except bananas.'

The problem raised by this analysis is that the exception clause is not a well-formed cleft. As is well-known, only subjects and some adjuncts, but not objects, can be clefted in Malagasy (Keenan 1976, others), (34a,b). To cleft an object, the clause must first be passivized, promoting the object to subject position, (34c).

- (34) a. Rasoa no mihinana ny akondro Rasoa FOC eat DET banana 'It's Rasoa who eats bananas.'
  - b. \* Ny akondro no mihinana Rasoa DET banana FOC eat Rasoa ('It's bananas that Rasoa eats.')
  - c. Ny akondro no hanin- dRasoa DET banana FOC eat.PASS- Rasoa 'It's bananas that are eaten by Rasoa.'

(33) thus cannot be the correct underlying structure for the example. Instead, the missing material in the exceptive corresponds to the grammatical cleft in (34c):

(35)Mihinana voankazo rehetra Rasoa afa-tsy akondro ny ny DET fruit all Rasoa except.NEG DET banana eat dRasoa no hanin-FOC eat.PASS Rasoa 'Rasoa eats all fruit except bananas.'

Potsdam 2007 argues in detail for sluicing that ellipsis still succeeds because Merchant's ellipsis licensing machinery requires only semantic identity, not syntactic identity, between the antecedent and elided clauses. Further evidence for this conclusion comes from the observation that the antecedent is a canonical VOS clause but the elided clause is a pseudocleft. The two clauses are clearly not syntactically parallel. The voice mismatch in Malagasy contrasts with sluicing in English, which does not allow voice mismatches (Merchant 2001). This supports the widely-held view (Schachter 1976, Foley 1998, Keenan & Manorohanta 2001, Pearson 2005, others) that the so-called Philippine-type symmetrical voice system found in Malagasy and other Austronesian languages is rather different from the active-passive alternation found in Indo-European languages. Ellipsis is able to ignore some differences in inflectional morphology and Malagasy voice morphology needs to among the morphology that can be ignored.

#### 5. Conclusion

This paper has argued that free exceptives in Malagasy are an ellipsis construction similar to sluicing and that the exception contains hidden clausal structure. For Malagasy, this hidden material is a cleft. The existence of an unpronounced clause provides syntactic support for Garcia-Alvarez's (2008) claim that exceptions are invariably propositional.

If exceptives in at least three typologically distinct languages—Malagasy, Egyptian Arabic (Soltan 2016), and Spanish (Pérez-Jiménez & Moreno-Quiben 2012)—are an ellipsis construction, they are relevant to current topics in ellipsis, including the syntactic licensing of ellipsis, the formulation of the identity requirement holding between an elided element and its antecedent, and island (in)sensitivity under ellipsis.

#### References

Aelbrecht, Lobke. 2010. The syntactic licensing of ellipsis. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Foley, William A. 1998. Symmetrical voice systems and precategoriality in Philippine languages. Paper presented at the Workshop on Voice and Grammatical Functions in Austronesian Languages, LFG'98 conference, Brisbane.
- García Álvarez, Iván. 2008. Generality and exception: A study in the semantics of exceptives. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- Hoeksema, Jacob. 1987. The logic of exception. In *Proceedings of ESCOL 4*, ed. by Amanda Miller and Joyce Powers, 100-113. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.
- Hoeksema, Jacob. 1995. The semantics of exception phrases. In *Quantifiers, logic and languages*, ed. by Jaap van der Does and Jan van Eick, 145-177. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1976. Remarkable subjects in Malagasy. In *Subject and topic*, ed. by Charles Li, 247-301. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Keenan, Edward L. and Cécile Manorohanta. 2001. A quantitative study of voice in Malagasy. *Oceanic Linguistics* 40:67-85.
- Law, Paul. 2007. The syntactic structure of the cleft construction in Malagasy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25:765-823.

- Massam, Diane. 2001. Pseudo noun incorporation in Niuean. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19:153-197.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paul, Ileana and Eric Potsdam. 2012. Sluicing without wh-movement in Malagasy. In *Sluicing: Cross-linguistic perspectives*, ed. by Jason Merchant and Andrew Simpson, 164-182. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paul, Ileana. 2000. Malagasy clause structure. Doctoral dissertation, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec.
- Paul, Ileana. 2001. Concealed pseudoclefts. Lingua 111:707-727.
- Pearson, Matthew. 2001. The clause structure of Malagasy: A minimalist approach. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.
- Pearson, Matt. 2005. The Malagasy subject/topic as an A'-element. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23:381-457.
- Pérez-Jiménez, and Moreno-Quibén. 2012. On the syntax of exceptions. Evidence from Spanish. *Lingua* 122:582-607.
- Potsdam, Eric. 2005. The cleft structure of Malagasy wh-questions. In *Clause structure and adjuncts in Austronesian languages*, ed. by Hans-Martin Gärtner, Paul Law, and Joachim Sabel, 195-232. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Potsdam, Eric. 2007. Malagasy sluicing and its consequences for the identity requirement on ellipsis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25:577-613.
- Rackowski, Andrea, and Lisa Travis. 2000. V-initial languages: X or XP movement and adverbial placement. In *The syntax of verb initial languages*, ed. by Andrew Carnie and Eithne Guilfoyle, 117-141. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rajemisa-Raolison, Régis. 1969. *Grammaire malgache*. Fianarantsoa: Librairie Ambozotany.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1991. Elliptic conjunctions non-quantificational LF. In *The Chomskyan turn*, ed. by Asa Kasher, 360-384. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Sabel, Joachim. 2003. Malagasy as an optional multiple wh-fronting language. In *Multiple wh-fronting*, ed. by Cedric Boeckx and Kleanthes Grohmann, 229-254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: topic, actor, or none of the above. In *Subject and topics*, ed. by Charles Li, 491-518. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Soltan, Usama. 2016. On the syntax of exceptive constructions in Egyptian Arabic. In *Perspectives on Arabic linguistics XXVII*, ed. by Stuart Davis and Usama Soltan, 35-57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Winterton, Matthew. Malagasy-English phrasebook and dictionary. Ms., Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Eric Potsdam potsdam@ufl.edu