

Problems with Reinhart's Analysis of Exception Conjunction Constructions in English

journal or publication title	東京商船大学研究報告. 人文科学
volume	52
page range	91-100
year	2001
URL	http://id.nii.ac.jp/1342/00000597/

PROBLEMS WITH REINHART'S ANALYSIS OF EXCEPTION CONJUNCTION CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH

MASAAKI FUJI
Tokyo University of Mercantile Marine


The purpose of this article is to provide evidence against Reinhart's (1991) QR analysis for exception conjunction constructions in English. In so doing, specific attention is paid to syntactic differences between *except* and *except for*.*

keywords: exception conjunction, *except*, *except for*, QR, PCC

1. Introduction

When a generalization needs to be amended with an exception, surface syntax of English seems to become a stumbling block to compositional semantics. Reinhart (1991) is an attempt to solve this problem. She argues that the D-structure of exception conjunction (EC) constructions like (1) is (2):

(1) Every man smiled, {*except/except for*} Felix.




One crucial aspect of this structure is that *every man* and the exception phrase (EP) do not form a constituent. That is to say, the EP is adjoined to the matrix IP at D-structure. This adjunction analysis contrasts with extraposition analysis, in which the EP originates in the subject NP forming a constituent with *every man*, and is later adjoined to the matrix IP by extraposition. Reinhart rejects this analysis on the ground that the syntactic behavior of an EP is different from that of an extraposed phrase.

It is easy to see that a simple-minded adjunction analysis, such as the one just described, faces a serious problem with compositional interpretation. If (1) has a structure like (2) throughout the derivation, we cannot assign the proper meaning to *every man {except/except for} Felix*, unless we abandon the principle of compositionality. This is because the referent of *every man* is determined before the EP's contribution is calculated (see Keenan and Stavi 1986).¹ To solve this problem, Reinhart proposes a QR analysis, in which QR raises *every man* from inside the subject and adjoins

* Part of this paper is based on my presentations in a monthly colloquium of the Tokyo English Linguistic Circle at Sophia University (October 19, 1991) and the 64th national conference of the English Literary Society of Japan at Seinan Gakuin University (May 23, 1992). I am indebted to Masaru Kajita, Noriko Imanishi, Yasuo Ishii, Jonathan Goodacre, Mika Funahashi, and Takako Niwa for invaluable comments and suggestions. All remaining errors are mine.

¹ See also Hoeksema (1987), Hoeksema (1995), Moltmann (1995) for semantic treatment of ECs. it to the EP.



Thus, the desired constituent *every man {except/except for} Felix* is formed at LF, and the proper interpretation is obtained without violating the principle of compositionality.

2. Problems with Reinhart's QR Analysis

2.1. Problems with Remnants

First, Reinhart's QR analysis is primarily designed to explain cases where the complement to an EC is an NP. However, there are also cases in which an EC can take not only an NP, but also other categories such as PP, AP, AdvP, VP, CP, and IP. In the following, I will present data, mostly from novels and letters, to show the range of possible categories after *except*. (I will use the terms *remnant* and *correlate* to refer to the complement to an EC and the constituent restricted by a remnant, respectively. In what follows, a correlate and a remnant are marked by square brackets.)

(4) [NP]

- a. Let [no one] past the front gate **except** [the FBI]. (AH EN 138)
- b. Nor could he think of [anything] to write **except** ["thank you for having me,"] which was what kids said when they had been to tea. (RR LF 187)
- c. I don't seem to remember [anything] **except** [hitting my head on the cherry tree]. (RR VO 70)

(5) [PP]

- a. She (=the puppy) refuses to sleep [anywhere] **except** [in my room] and usually insists upon a game in the middle of the night. (LW LLW 229)
- b. We have No Smoking signs [all over the floor], **except** [in the lobby]--- you didn't see them? (TC HRO 275)
- c. Raspberries seem to prefer cooler areas and strawberries also do well [in a wide variety of areas], **except** [in those places where there is too much moisture]. (RW GN 44)
- d. ...and it was real, all real, he assured himself, fingering the coin in his pocket, real [to everyone] **except** [to him and to her]. (VW CSFVW 94)
- e. She said she had failed [with everything] **except** [with Lytton]... (VW LVW5 34)

(6) [AP]

- a. How do you like your steak? I'd have it done [anyway] **except** [rare].
- b. She is [everything a secretary should be], **except** [beautiful].

(7) [AdvP]

- a. Finally, those satellite phrases which are not arguments themselves break down into types. What I call complements are found with simple event nominals. They correspond to lcs arguments and hence obey selectional requirements of these arguments. Modifiers, on the other hand, do not correspond to lcs arguments, **except** [indirectly, when the external arguments of the nouns they are modifying are bound to lcs positions]. (Grimshaw 1991, *Argument Structure*, p.46)

(8) [to VP]

- a. Within this bank we have a number of accounts for several delegations to the United Nations. I won't go into those, **except** [to say our bank has strong ties with certain countries...]. (AH EN 432)
- b. The intelligence grapevine reports some more individual terrorist movements. I won't bother you with details **except** [to say they're apparently confined to Europe and the Middle East]. (AH EN 299)
- c. She would seldom speak even to Leonard, **except** [to abuse him]. (NN LVW2 57)
- d. Mosconi hadn't told him much about Rhodes **except** [to explain his bail situation and to say that he didn't think Rhodes acted like the criminal type]. (RC HI 251)
- e. She was certain that her seeing the patients at that moment was not going to accomplish anything **except** [to make her feel "exposed"]. (RC 0 47)

(9) [VP]

- a. Miguel realized there was nothing he could do **except** [go back to his seat and wait]. (AH EN 315)
- b. If you can't support yourself, then what else can you do **except** [go back to your parents]?

(10) [CP]

- a. If you'll give me that number, I promise I will never breathe a word of how I got it, **except** [that next time I'm in Stonehenge I'll come to the switchboard room and thank you personally]. (AH EN 602)
- b. 'Why, snow flowers, of course,' Putin said, laughing loudly. 'On a day like this the faces of the children and the woman glow pink, your breath trails behind you like a cloud, and the vodka tastes especially fine. Ah, to be in Gorkiy on a day like this!' The bastard ought to work for Intourist, Ramius told himself, **except** [that Gorkiy is a city closed to foreigners]. (TC HRO 11)
- c. All the patients were seriously ill, and none felt much like talking. Still, Marissa went through her list of questions, concentrating on whether each patient was acquainted with any of the other people who were ill. The answer is always no, **except** [that each one knew Dr. Richter, and all were members of the Richter Clinic health plan]! (RO 0 54)
- d. She couldn't go through any questions on her list, **except** [whether each patient was acquainted with any of the other people who were ill].

(11) [IP]

- a. "That's fine," Partridge said, "**except** [we hope to have three more passengers flying back than we will have going out]. (AH EN 568)
- b. "Do I know the number of papers? No, not exactly, **except** [it's a bleedin' lot]. (AH EN 275)
- c. Then a half-dozen motley-dressed men, who could have been farmhands **except** [they carried guns], had boarded also, followed by the man whom she remembered vaguely having seen before. (AH EN 362)
- d. What's special about money, **except** [it's money]? (AH EN 412)

It seems to me that the QR analysis is not easily accommodated to cover all those non-NP remnant cases, particularly when the remnant is a VP, CP, or IP.

Second, not all ECs behave like *except* with regard to types of complement they take. In fact, there seem to be three-way distinctions among ECs: (i) ECs that take a diversity of categories (i.e., *except*), (ii) ECs that take NPs and locative/temporal PPs (i.e., *except for*), (iii) ECs that can take only referential NPs. (i.e., *with the exception of*).

(12)

- a. Everyone came, {except/except for/with the exception of} Tom. [Referential NP]
- b. John is everything a politician should be, {except/?except for/*with the exception of} an honest man. [Predicate NP]
- c. Tom is everything a secretary should be, {except/?*except for/*with the exception of} handsome. [AP]
- d. The old man can't walk {except/?except for/*with the exception of} very slowly. [AdvP]
- e. It's the same everywhere {except/?except for/*with the exception of} in Scotland. [Locative PP]
- f. He tried to hide the money everywhere {except/?except for/*with the exception of} under the bed. [Locative PP]
- g. He can't walk {except/?except for/*with the exception of} in a very slow manner. [Manner PP]
- h. He is always complaining {except/?*except for/*with the exception of} on Saturday nights. [Temporal PP]
- i. There is nothing to be said {except/?*except for/*with the exception of} about a sheer waste of it all. [PP]
- j. Very few Japanese know of Saturn {except/*except for/*with the exception of} as the sixth planet from the earth. [PP]
- k. The wall was undecorated {except/?*except for/*with the exception of} by graffiti. [PP]

We could explain cases with *except* and *with the exception of* by claiming that *except* as a true coordinator can take a variety of categories, while *with the exception of* as a true (complex) preposition can only take a referential NP. A difficulty arises, however, as to how we could explain the intermediate nature of *except for*. As the above examples suggest, *except for* cannot be a true coordinator nor a true (complex) preposition.

2.2. Problems with Correlates

First, although it might be possible to apply the QR-analysis to some of the cases in which the remnant is a PP, the following sentences show that it cannot be generalized to all of the PP-remnant cases. This is because there are cases in which PP-remnants are allowed without corresponding overt correlates. In those cases, the phrase QR is supposed to raise is non-existent.

(13)

- a. I haven't heard anything, **except** [on TV]. (AH EN 217)
- b. Such a story is scarcely possible **except** [in London]. (VW CSFVW 30)
- c. Even the lift was not as other lifts elsewhere, being of rattling gray metal undecorated **except** [by graffiti]. (RR VO 1)
- d. Thus an argument is external or internal by virtue of its intrinsic relations to other arguments. Its status cannot be changed **except** [by the introduction of another argument]. (Grimshaw 1991, *Argument Structure*, p. 5)
- e. The multi-modular view of parts of speech is familiar (see, for example, Schachter 1985), and I will therefore not attempt to back it up, **except** [by example]. (Sadock, "Parts of speech in autolexical syntax," *BLS* 16, p. 269)
- f. The grouchiness was unusual for Amsler who was basically cheerful and friendly, **except** [to those who broke the laws he upheld]. (AH EN 316)
- g. Revolutionaries seldom do make sense, except [maybe to themselves]. (AH EN 500)
- h. But it hadn't happened -- **except** [on one unparalleled occasion which, as it came to mind, he thrust away]. (AH EN 91)

The second problematic set of sentences is concerned with examples in which no overt correlate NP is present:

(14)

- a. She was quite still **except for** [occasional spasms].
- b. The room was empty **except for** [one student].
- c. She lives alone **except for** [a little girl].

Since Reinhart's analysis is designed to explain NP-remnant cases, the sentences in (14) without NP-correlates surely pose a serious problem with her analysis.

2.3. A Problem with Split-Antecedent

The contrast between (15a) and (15b) poses another problem for QR analysis. Both sentences contain two correlates, associated with a single remnant. The difference is that in (15a) both correlates occupy the subject position, but in (15b) the first and the second correlates occupy the subject and the object positions, respectively.


(15)

- a. [Every husband] went fishing, and [every wife] went shopping, **except** [a young couple who wanted to stay at a hotel together].
- b. *[Every husband] told me about [every wife] yesterday, **except** [a couple who didn't love each other].


Although she does not say anything about this type of EC constructions, I believe that under her analysis, QR raises both quantified NPs to the remnant to form a doubly quantified structure.

(16)

a.



b.



One apparent problem is that despite Reinhart's claim against treating EPs as extraposed phrases, the contrast between (15a) and (15b) seems to suggest that EC constructions are in fact closely

related to ordinary extraposition cases, as the contrast in (17) indicates.

- (17) a. A man came in and a woman came out, who were similar.
 b. *A man told me about a woman, who were similar.

2.4. Problems with \bar{A} -Dependency

In Reinhart's QR analysis, Pesetsky's (1982) Path Containment Condition (PCC) is adopted to explain the superiority effect. The problem is that there are cases in which her analysis and the PCC cannot be both correct. First, observe the following contrast:

- (18)
 a. [All of the children] helped clean [the whole house] yesterday, **except** [the bathroom], **except** [the youngest, who had caught a cold].
 b. *[All of the children] helped clean [the whole house] yesterday, **except** [the youngest], **except** [the bathroom, whose door was broken].

In each of the above sentences, we have two EPs, either of which is related to the subject or the object NP. In (18a), the first EP is related to the object and the second EP, to the subject, while in (18b) the order of EPs is reversed. The difference in acceptability shown in (18) can be easily explained if we postulate the crossing constraint based on linearity, as in (19).

- (19) *Crossing Constraint*
 \bar{A} -dependency lines may not cross. (Pesetsky 1982: 271)

- (20)
 a. $NP_1 \dots NP_2$ yesterday, **except** NP_2 , **except** NP_1 . (=15a)
 b. * $NP_1 \dots NP_2$ yesterday, **except** NP_1 , **except** NP_2 . (=15b)
-


In (20a), the outer \bar{A} -dependency line contains the inner one and so the Crossing Constraint is satisfied, while in (20b), two \bar{A} -dependency lines are crossing and the Crossing Constraint correctly excludes this case.

However, Pesetsky's PCC, a crossing constraint based on the hierarchical structure, cannot explain the difference in acceptability shown in (18). Before going on to the application of the PCC to the present case, I will present the definitions of the *PCC*, *paths*, and *overlapping*:


- (21) *Path Containment Condition*
 If two paths overlap, one must contain the other. (Pesetsky 1982: 309)
- (22) *Definition of Paths*
 Suppose t is an empty category locally \bar{A} -bound by b . Then
 (i) for α the first maximal projection dominating t
 (ii) for β the first maximal projection dominating b
 (iii) the path between t and b is the set of nodes p such that
 $p = \{x | (x=\alpha) \vee (x=\beta) \vee (x \text{ dominates } \alpha \ \& \ \neg x \text{ dominates } \beta)\}$
 (Pesetsky 1982: 289)
- (23) *Overlapping*
 Two paths overlap iff their intersection is non-null and non-singleton.
 (Pesetsky 1982: 309)

We are now in a position to evaluate our claim that the PCC and Reinhart's QR-analysis cannot be both correct. According to the QR-analysis, the LF-representations of (18a) and (18b) are as follows:

(24)=(18a)



(25)=(18b)



The definition in (22) gives us the following paths for each case:

(26) The relevant paths in (24)

path $\langle i \rangle = \{ \quad IP^1, IP^2, IP^3 \}$

path $\langle j \rangle = \{ VP, IP^1, IP^2 \}$

(27) The relevant paths in (25)

path $\langle i \rangle = \{ \quad IP^1, IP^2 \}$

path $\langle j \rangle = \{ VP, IP^1, IP^2, IP^3 \}$

(27) shows that the set of nodes constituting path $\langle i \rangle$ are a proper subset of the set of nodes making up path $\langle j \rangle$. On the other hand, (26) shows that the intersecting paths overlap, so that neither is a proper subset of the other. Thus, the representation in (24), which should be well-formed, is ruled out by the PCC, and the representation in (25), which should be ill-formed, is ruled in by the PCC. Our consideration so far clearly shows that Reinhart's QR-analysis and the PCC cannot be both correct, and so her analysis, with the PCC as a principle of UG, simply contains a kind of

self-contradiction.

Just like the case in the previous section, there is an obvious similarity between extraposition and EC constructions. Roshemont and Culicover (1990) observe that sentences with double extraposition exhibit the same relative order restriction as EC constructions.

(28)

- a. [A man] came into [the room] last night [that I had just finished painting][who had blond hair].
 b. *[A man] came into [the room] last night [who had blond hair][that I had just finished painting].

(29)

- a. ?[More people] ate [more bananas] at the party [than cherries][than I talked to].
 b. *[More people] ate [more bananas] at the party [than I talked to][than cherries].

(30)

- a. [More people] ate [food] at the party [that was rotten][than we talked to].
 b. *[More people] ate [food] at the party [than we talked to][that was rotten].

The contrasts in (28) through (30) can be captured by the Crossing Constraint, which stipulates that \bar{A} -dependency lines may not cross.

Further evidence for applying the Crossing Constraint to EPs can be obtained by the following contrast, in which the relevant association lines are created by the EP and the extraposed relative.

(31)

- a. [Everyone] ate [food] at the party [that was rotten][except Mary].
 b. *[Everyone] ate [food] at the party [except Mary][that was rotten].


The fact that the same constraint applies even to this mixed case strongly indicates that the distribution of EPs is constrained by the Crossing Constraint.

Second, let us consider the case, in which two \bar{A} -dependency lines are not crossing.

- (32) **Except for** [Tom], [everyone] will agree to clean [the whole house], if you insist, **except** [that room].

The LF representation for (32) is given in (33).

(33)



Since the \bar{A} -dependency lines are not crossing, the Crossing Constraint is satisfied. This predicts that the sentence is grammatical, which is in fact the case. On the other hand, the PCC predicts that the sentence is out, because the two paths are overlapping, as shown in (34).

(34) The relevant paths in (32)
 path $\langle i \rangle = \{ IP^1, IP^2, IP^3 \}$
 path $\langle j \rangle = \{ VP, IP^1, IP^2 \}$

Again, Reinhart's analysis is incompatible with the PCC.

2.5. Problems with Differences among ECs

First, there are differences between *except* and *except for* with respect to relative order between a remnant and a correlate. As sentences in (35) and (36) show, the *except*-phrase (*except Tom*) cannot precede its correlate NP (*nobody*), whereas the *except for*-phrase (*except for Tom*) can.

(35)

- a. **Except Tom, nobody* would have been kicked by the terrorist.
- b. *Nobody, except Tom,* would have been kicked by the terrorist.
- c. *Nobody* would have, *except Tom,* been kicked by the terrorist.
- d. *Nobody* would have been kicked, *except Tom,* by the terrorist.
- e. *Nobody* would have been kicked by the terrorist, *except Tom.*

(36)

- a. *Except for Tom, nobody* would have been kicked by the terrorist.
- b. *Nobody, except for Tom,* would have been kicked by the terrorist.
- c. *Nobody* would have, *except for Tom,* been kicked by the terrorist.
- d. *Nobody* would have been kicked, *except for Tom,* by the terrorist.
- e. *Nobody* would have been kicked by the terrorist, *except for Tom.*

Since the QR analysis proposed by Reinhart treats all ECs on a par, this discrepancy between ECs poses a problem for her analysis.

Second, there is evidence indicating that the ordering restriction on *except*-phrases just described had been non-existent until the beginning of the twentieth century. I have found that authors like Jane Austen and Thomas Hardy exclusively used *except*, rather than *except for*, when they wanted to begin sentences with EP. Following are actual examples from some of their novels.²

(37)

- a. **Except** [the daughter of one of the cotters, who was their servant, and a lad who worked in the garden and stable], [scarcely anyone but themselves] ever entered the house. (Thomas Hardy, *Return of the Native*)

² I have checked with the following novels by Jane Austen (1775-1817): *Sense and Sensibility* (1811), *Pride and Prejudice* (1813), *Mansfield Park* (1814), *Northanger Abby* (1817), *Emma* (1815), *Persuasion* (1817). Also, Thomas Hardy's (1840-1928) novels have been examined. The following are the titles of his work that have been checked: *Far From the Madding Crowd* (1874), *The Return of the Native* (1878), *The Mayor of Casterbridge* (1886), *The Woodlanders* (1887), *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* (1891), *Jude the Obscure* (1896)

- b. She passed downstairs very quickly, never looking back at him or saying another word. The other maids were already down, and the subject was not pursued. **Except** [Marian], [they] all looked wistfully and suspiciously at the pair, in the sad yellow rays which the morning candles emitted in contrast with the first cold signals of the dawn without. (Thomas Hardy, *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*)
- c. **Except** [the hall] [the rooms] were all in darkness, and they ascended the staircase. Up here also the shutters were tightly closed, the ventilation being perfunctorily done, for this day at least, by opening the hall-window in front and an upper window behind. (Thomas Hardy, *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*)
- d. "Thank you, dear Miss Woodhouse. Yes, indeed, there is every thing in the world that can make her happy in it. **Except** [the Sucklings and Braggies], there is not [such another nursery establishment, so liberal and elegant], in all Mrs. Elton's acquaintance. (Jane Austen, *Emma*)
- e. "Indeed, the truth was, that poor dear Jane could not bear to see any body--any body at all--Mrs. Elton, indeed, could not be denied--and Mrs. Cole had made such a point--and Mrs. Perry had said so much--but, **except** [them], Jane would really see [nobody]." (Jane Austen, *Emma*)
- f. Some mothers might have encouraged the intimacy from motives of interest, for Edward Ferrars was the eldest son of a man who had died very rich; and some might have repressed it from motives of prudence, for, **except** [a trifling sum], [the whole of his fortune] depended on the will of his mother. (Jane Austen, *Sense and Sensibility*)
- g. Mr. Collins on his return highly gratified Mrs. Bennet by admiring Mrs' Phillips's manners and politeness. He protested that, **except** [Lady Catherine and her daughter], he had never seen [a more elegant woman]; for she had not only received him with the utmost civility, but even pointedly included him in her invitation for the next evening, although utterly unknown to her before. Something, he supposed, might be attributed to his connection with them, but yet he had never met with so much attention in the whole course of his life. (Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*)

All native consultants pointed out that the sentences in (37) sound awkward, unless *except* is replaced with *except for*. This diachronic difference is hard to account for within Reinhart's QR analysis.

References

- Hoeksema, Jack (1987) "The Logic of Exception," *Proceedings of the Fourth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, ed. by Miller and J. Powers, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 100-113.
- Hoeksema, Jack (1995) "The Semantics of Exception Phrases," *Quantifiers, Logic, and Language*, ed. by Jan van Eijck and Jaap van der Does, CSLI, Chicago, 145-177.
- Moltmann, Friederike (1995) "Exception Sentences and Polyadic Quantification," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 18, 223-280.
- Keenan, E. and Y. Stavi (1986) "A Semantic Characterization of Natural Language Determiners," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9, .
- Pesetsky, David (1982) *Paths and Categories*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Reinhart, Tanya (1991) "Elliptic Conjunctions – Non-Quantificational LF," *The Chomskyan Turn*, ed. by Asa Kasher, 360-384.
- Rohemont, Michael S. and Peter W. Culicover (1990) *English Focus Constructions and the Theory of Grammar*, Cambridge University Press.