

Clausal exceptives and exceptive sluices *

Rebecca Jarvis

University of California, Berkeley

1. Introduction

There are two main approaches to the syntax and semantics of exceptive expressions like English *but* and *except*. Phrasal approaches treat exceptives as syntactic and semantic quantifier modifiers (von Stechow 1993, Gajewski 2008, Hirsch 2016, Crnič 2018). The exceptive is assumed to form a constituent within the quantified DP:

- (1) a. every student but Grover
b. [DP [D every [ExcP but Grover]] student]
(cf. Gajewski 2008:86 (72))

In contrast, at least some exceptives in at least some languages have been argued to be derived via ellipsis from underlyingly clausal sources (Harris 1982, Pérez-Jiménez and Moreno-Quibén 2012, Soltan 2016, Potsdam and Polinsky 2017, Potsdam 2019, Potsdam and Polinsky 2019, Vostrikova 2021). On such an account, an exceptive takes as its complement a full clause that is almost entirely elided:

- (2) a. Every student cleared the bar [except Grover].
b. [ExcP except [FocP Grover_i [Foc [~~TP t_i did not clear the bar~~]]]]

The exceptive remnant (here, *Grover*) focus-moves out of the TP before the TP is elided (Stockwell and Wong 2020, Vostrikova 2021; see also Rooth 1992, who asserts that ellipsis remnants are generally focused).

Diagnosing phrasal and clausal structure in exceptives is a topic of ongoing interest. To make progress on this front, this paper relies on evidence from sluice readings as a diagnostic of phrasal versus clausal exceptive structure. As suggested by Stockwell and Wong (2020), English clausal (but not phrasal) exceptives give rise to a particular reading, which I term the exceptive-sluice reading, when they serve as antecedents to later sluices.

*I thank Richard Stockwell for helpful discussions of exceptives and sluicing and Susanne Gahl, Aglaia von Götz, and Kristina Liefke for discussion of the German examples. For comments and questions, I thank Amy Rose Deal, Line Mikkelsen, and audiences at UC Berkeley and NELS 52.

In Section 2, I discuss Stockwell and Wong’s proposal and extend it in two dimensions. For one, I discuss the repercussions of exceptive sluices for some popular accounts of sluicing; further, I discuss how exceptive-sluice readings can be used to diagnose the status of different English exceptives, ultimately suggesting that both phrasal and clausal accounts are needed to account for the range of English exceptive expressions.

From here, I aim to situate exceptive-sluice readings in a broader discussion of diagnosing phrasal and clausal exceptives. To this end, Section 3 validates exceptive-sluice readings as a diagnostic for clausal structure by showing that the availability of this reading aligns with other well-established diagnostics. I illustrate the utility of these diagnostics with German *aufßer*-exceptives, where we see interspeaker variation in exceptive type that aligns with these diagnostic profiles. Finally, Section 4 concludes.

2. Exceptive-sluice readings

When an exceptive-containing antecedent serves as the antecedent for a later sluice, the sluice can (with certain exceptives) have two readings. These are illustrated below:

- (3) [TP_1 Carmen tried everything except the fish], and I don’t know why [TP_2 ???].
 Reading 1: ...*why* [TP_2 Carmen tried everything except the fish].
 Reading 2 (exceptive-sluice reading): ...*why* [TP_2 Carmen didn’t try the fish].

Reading 2, which I term the exceptive-sluice reading, has been suggested by Merchant (2001) and Rudin (2019) to be problematic for accounts of the sluicing identity condition. These problems fundamentally stem from the assumption that TP_1 , containing a phrasal exceptive, serves as the antecedent for the sluice. For Merchant’s (2001) e-GIVENNESS criterion, *Carmen didn’t try the fish* does not entail *Carmen tried everything except the fish*. For Rudin’s (2019) head-licensing account, on which each head in the sluiced TP must have a structurally-matching head in antecedent TP, a problem also arises. Here, the issue is that *the fish* is the complement to the Exc *except* in TP_1 but the complement to the V *try* in TP_2 : the two occurrences do not structure-match each other.

Stockwell and Wong (2020) note that these problems can be circumvented on a clausal (rather than phrasal) approach to exceptives. A clausal approach offers a second potential TP antecedent, TP_E , for the later sluice:

- (4) [TP_1 Carmen tried everything except [the fish_{*i*} [TP_E ~~Carmen didn’t try the fish_{*t*}/*t*]]], and I don’t know why [TP_2 ~~Carmen didn’t try the fish~~].~~

Stockwell and Wong suggest that, in exceptive-sluice readings, TP_E serves as the antecedent for TP_2 . With this, the licensing of the exceptive-sluice reading is made much less mysterious. In the rest of this section, we will briefly explore how exceptive sluices inform theories of the sluicing identity condition.

2.1 Theories of sluice licensing

With the clausal approach to exceptive sluices, the problem for Rudin’s (2019) account effectively evaporates: a copy of *the fish* is present in both TP_E and TP_2 as the complement

to V. Note that this account is most explanatory in accounting for exceptive-sluice readings when paired with the Copy Theory of Movement (Chomsky 1993). The alternative, movement leaving behind traces, would require that we coindex *the fish* across the two clauses, with coindexation sufficing for identity.¹

Appealing to the coindexation account presupposes that the exceptive remnant and its correlate in the sluice are capable of being coindexed. If we take coindexation to mark coreferential elements of type *e* (Heim and Kratzer 1998), we cannot extend the coindexation account to some other exceptive sluices:

- (5) Alicia danced with everybody except [with Alex]_{*j*} [~~TP_E Alicia didn't dance~~
[with Alex]_{*j*}/*t_j*], and I don't know why ~~Alicia didn't dance~~ *with Alex*.

Here, *with Alex* is a verbal modifier not of type *e*, so the coindexation story does not straightforwardly explain its licensing in the sluice. By contrast, the Copy Theory of Movement encounters no such hurdle: a lower copy of *with Alex* is present in TP_E, which can license the occurrence in the sluice. Accordingly, if we adopt Rudin's account of sluice licensing, then exceptive sluices serve as an argument for the Copy Theory of Movement.

On Merchant's (2001) e-GIVENNESS account, we still encounter an issue due to the mechanics of the e-GIVENNESS calculation. On Merchant's account, we calculate semantic identity between the elided TP and its antecedent at F-closure, i.e., after existentially quantifying over traces and focused elements in both TPs. On the assumption that the exceptive remnant undergoes focus movement (Stockwell and Wong 2020, Vostrikova 2021), it should be existentially quantified over at F-closure, while there is no corresponding item to existentially quantify over in TP₂. This can be seen in the example below:

- (6) a. [TP₁ Carmen tried everything] except [TP_E ~~Carmen didn't try the fish~~_{*F*}], and I don't know why [TP₂ ~~Carmen didn't try the fish~~].
 b. F-CLO(TP_E) = F-CLO(Carmen didn't try the fish_{*F*}) = ∃*x*[Carmen didn't try *x*]
 c. F-CLO(TP₂) = F-CLO(Carmen didn't try the fish) = Carmen didn't try the fish

Here, F-CLO(TP_E) clearly does not entail F-CLO(TP₂). This lack of mutual entailment predicts, contrary to fact, that these exceptive sluices should not be licensed.

This speaks to a broader concern with incidental non-correlate focus on Merchant's account. Consider the example below:

- (7) A: Who baked what yesterday afternoon?
 B: Angel_{*F*} baked cupcakes_{*F*}, Adam_{*F*} baked a pie_{*F*}, and [TP₁ Anya_{*F*} baked something_{*F*}], but I don't know what_{*i*} [TP₂ Anya baked *t_i*].

As the correlate to a *wh*-item in the answer to a question, *Anya* bears focus in TP₁ (Rooth 1992). Again, there is presumably no focus on *Anya* in TP₂, leading to a similar mismatch at F-closure. Whatever accounts for the licensing of the sluice in (7) on Merchant's account will also extend to (4).

¹Note that Rudin also appeals to coindexation to account for other cases of Vehicle Change, where it is independently needed.

More broadly, we can also note that there is no conceptual issue with taking the nearly-completely-elided TP_E as a sluice antecedent. Elided material can generally serve as a sluice antecedent, as the below example shows:

- (8) A: Would [TP_A you ever donate your hair]?
 B: Well, [TP_B I probably would [VP_B ~~donate my hair~~] to *some* organizations], yeah. I don't really know which ones [TP_S ???], though.

Here, while TP_A is a *prima facie* plausible antecedent for TP_S , it cannot actually be the antecedent. B's sluice contains the verb *donate* and therefore strands and elides the preposition *to*. Prepositions can be stranded in sluicing only if they are overt in the antecedent (Chung 2005, 2013, Merchant 2013), so TP_B is the only possible antecedent. Thus, the presence of VP-ellipsis in TP_B does not prevent it from serving as an antecedent. Exceptive sluices simply more dramatically exploit the possibility of a partially-elided antecedent.

2.2 English exceptive heterogeneity

We can leverage the availability of exceptive-sluice readings as a diagnostic for clausal structure in English exceptives. Here, it is useful to note that we can disambiguate toward the exceptive-sluice reading with a positive universal quantifier in TP_1 and *why not* in the sluice, as below:

- (9) a. The [Mont-Saint-Michel] chapter of Rick's France guidebook covers all these options, except for the morning service hours (and I don't know *why not*; our tour members often go before breakfast).²
 b. Once upon a time you could read 'B.Monkey' on every tube station. Except the Northern beyond Kennington. *Why not?* Cos the... train never came.'³

These examples only have the exceptive-sluice reading: the speaker in (9a) is specifically surprised by the guidebook's lack of inclusion of the morning hours, not at its inclusion of other times.

Why not requires a negative antecedent (Stockwell 2021). The licensing of a *why not* continuation with a positive universal quantifier in TP_1 thus requires a clausal exceptive, regardless of whether we assume an account of *why not* as *why*-stripping (Yoshida et al. 2015) or polarity ellipsis (Stockwell 2021). Only with the mostly-elided clausal-exceptive TP, that is, do we have the (syntactic or semantic)⁴ negation that could polarity-match this later *not*. With this, then, we have an acceptability-based diagnostic for clausal structure in exceptives: only clausal exceptives should license *why not* sluices of this sort.

²This example comes from a Google search and can be found at <https://community.ricksteves.com/travel-forum/france/mass-at-mont-st-michel>.

³This example comes from COCA (Davies 2008).

⁴Throughout this paper, I remain agnostic as to whether negation in clausal exceptives is syntactically projected (Vostrikova 2021), or whether *except* contributes negation semantics (Potsdam 2019, Potsdam and Polinsky 2019, Stockwell and Wong 2020). As I see it, either account requires postulating a polarity mismatch somewhere in the process of licensing an exceptive-sluice reading. Consider (4), repeated below as (1):

- (1) [TP_1 Carmen tried everything except [the fish_{*i*} [TP_E ~~Carmen didn't try the fish_{*t_i*}~~]]], and I don't know why [TP_2 ~~Carmen didn't try the fish~~].

Clausal exceptives and exceptive sluices

Stockwell and Wong (2020) apply the exceptive-sluice reading diagnostic to clause-final and quantifier-adjacent *except*-exceptives; the former have been suggested to be clausal (Potsdam and Polinsky 2019, Stockwell and Wong 2020, Vostrikova 2021). Indeed, as Stockwell and Wong suggest, the availability of the exceptive-sluice reading varies along these lines:

- (10) a. Everyone laughed_(,) except Alan, and I don't know why not—he loves puns!
b. ?? Everybody except Asher joined the parade, and I don't know why not—he loves that kind of thing!

As Stockwell and Wong suggest, the syntactic position of the *except*-exceptive determines its structure (phrasal or clausal). This finding aligns with Hoeksema's (1987, 1996) discussion of the semantic distinctions between connected (roughly, quantifier-adjacent) and free (roughly, sentence-peripheral) *except*-exceptives.

Especially in the semantic literature, *but* and *except* tend to be treated quite separately. For instance, von Stechow (1993) develops a phrasal semantics specifically for *but*, while Vostrikova (2021) focuses exclusively on *except*. It is therefore worthwhile to extend our investigation to *but*-exceptives as well. In doing so, we can ask whether *but*- and *except*-exceptives have a shared syntactic structure and, more broadly, whether a fully parallel semantics might be warranted.

In fact, applying the diagnostic of exceptive-sluice readings, we see that the two types of exceptives differ. *But*-exceptives generally disallow exceptive-sluice readings, even when clause-final:

- (11) ?? Everyone but Ai wrote a poem, and I don't know why not—she loves to write!
(12) ?? Everyone laughed but Alan, and I don't know why not—he loves puns!

Here, (12) is degraded compared to (10a). This suggests that *but*-exceptives are uniformly phrasal, even when clause-final. (This is consistent with Hoeksema (1996), who suggests that clause-final *but* might be derived via extraposition from an underlyingly quantifier-adjacent position.) More broadly, this supports the approach in the semantics literature of ascribing different semantics to *but* and (clause-final) *except*, as the two project different amounts of structure.

Here, the projected-negation view requires a polarity mismatch between TP_1 and TP_E , while the *except*-semantics view requires a mismatch between TP_E and TP_2 (assuming that the TP is the maximal domain over which identity is calculated).

It would be interesting to know if the licensing of exceptive-sluice readings varies at all amongst speakers. It is known that clausal exceptives are fairly uniformly acceptable across English speakers (Vostrikova 2021). However, the acceptability of polarity mismatches in sluicing is somewhat variable (Rudin 2019). One way to test where the mismatch occurs, then, might be to look at whether there is cross-speaker variability in the licensing of exceptive sluices (and, especially, if this variation tracks with general variation in the acceptability of polarity mismatches in ellipsis). If there is, then that result might serve as evidence that there is a polarity mismatch between TP_E and TP_2 , i.e., that TP_E does not contain negation and that the semantics of *except* contributes the (semantic) negation present in the exceptive.

3. A slate of diagnostics

As Stockwell and Wong demonstrate, deriving exceptive-slucose readings is possible on the assumption that the exceptives that license exceptive-slucose readings are underlyingly clausal. With this assumption, they use the availability of exceptive-slucose readings to diagnose clausal structure, and I have also relied on this diagnostic above. However, work on exceptive structure often uses a broader and more heterogeneous set of diagnostics, and it is not always clear how fully these diagnostics align.

In this section, I situate exceptive sluces within a larger cluster of properties that can serve as a slate of diagnostics for clausal structure in exceptives. I summarize diagnostics that have been applied in this realm and demonstrate the utility and cohesiveness of a subset of these diagnostics with a case study of interspeaker variation in the German exceptive *aufßer*. This cohesiveness supports the utility of exceptive-slucose readings and highlights drawbacks of certain diagnostics.

3.1 Existing exceptive diagnostics

In this section, I review diagnostics that have been raised in the literature on exceptive structure. For reasons of space, I focus on a selection of recurrent diagnostics and refer the reader to the cited works for fuller discussion and additional language-specific diagnostics.

One diagnostic that is often given as evidence for clausal exceptive structure is the ability of an exceptive to host multiple exceptions (Soltan 2016, Potsdam and Polinsky 2019, Potsdam 2019, Vostrikova 2021). Here, as argued by Moltmann (1992, 1995), an analysis on which an exceptive directly modifies just one quantifier's restriction is untenable. Semantically, the single exceptive lists a joint exception to multiple quantifiers. Consider the following pair of sentences:

- (13) a. Every girl danced with every boy except Eva with Bill.
b. Every girl except Eva danced with every boy except Bill.
(Vostrikova 2021:8 (31–32))

Here, (13a) does not have the same meaning as (13b). (13a) claims that the only girl-boy pair that did not dance together was the ⟨Eva, Bill⟩ pair. By contrast, (13b) is also compatible with, for instance, Eva dancing with no one. Accordingly, Moltmann argues that (13a) cannot straightforwardly be semantically derived from (13b) and, instead, has a different source. On the syntactic side, this data is often raised as evidence for a multiple-remnant, ellipsis-based clausal account.

A second, closely-related diagnostic is the ability of an exceptive to host a non-DP exception (Soltan 2016, Potsdam and Polinsky 2019, Vostrikova 2021), like *from Barcelona* in (14) below:

- (14) I met a student from every city in Spain except from Barcelona.
(Vostrikova 2021:11 (45))

For both syntactic and semantic reasons (namely, selectional restrictions and the type-changing contributions of prepositions), these authors argue that this should not be possible in a quantifier-modifying phrasal exceptive.

Third, some authors appeal to the ability of an exceptive to assign a specific case to the exception it hosts as evidence against clausal structure in exceptives (Potsdam and Polinsky 2019). For instance, Potsdam and Polinsky (following Oskolskaya (2009)) note that the exception that occurs with the Russian exceptive *krome* must be genitive-marked. This behavior is easiest to explain if the exceptive directly selects for and assigns case to its (DP) complement.

A fourth diagnostic to which many authors appeal is the availability of full-clause pronunciation (Soltan 2016, Potsdam and Polinsky 2019, Potsdam 2019, Stockwell and Wong 2020). Below, we see such a full-clause pronunciation of a Malagasy *afa-tsy* exceptive:

- (15) Tonga ny vahiny rehetra, afa-tsy Rasoa (no tsy tonga).
arrived DET guest all except Rasoa FOC NEG arrive
'All the guests arrived except Rasoa (didn't arrive).' (Potsdam 2019:3 (6b))

The availability of full-clause pronunciation is often taken to be an overt manifestation of the structure that is (in these languages, only optionally) elided in clausal exceptives.

Finally, some authors directly point towards evidence for CP structure by seeing whether speaker-oriented, CP-level adverbs can occur with the exceptive (Pérez-Jiménez and Moreno-Quibén 2012, Soltan 2016). In the Egyptian Arabic example in (16), for example, the matrix clause and the exceptive occur with separate, contrasting speaker-oriented adverbs:

- (16) ?il-?amdu-li-laah kull ?il-?alaba na?ah-uu fii ?il-?imti?aan ?illaa
the-thanking-to-Allah all the-students succeeded.3PL in the-exam except
Ahmad li-l-?asaf
Ahmad to-the-regret
'Thank God, all the students passed the exam, except Ahmad, regrettably.'
(Soltan 2016:53 (35a))

These adverbs are taken to occur outside the elided TP and therefore to be outside the zone over which identity between the matrix clause and attached clausal exceptive is calculated. Accordingly, these authors argue, we might see mismatches between the matrix clause and clausal exceptives, while phrasal exceptives might lack sufficient structure to license their own speaker-oriented adverbs.

3.2 German *aufßer*: A case study

In this section, I validate the use of exceptive sluices as a diagnostic for clausal structure by showing that they align with other commonly-used diagnostics from the list above. To do so, we will turn to the German exceptive *aufßer*. Along the way, we will also see that a bidirectional version of the full-clause pronounceability diagnostic (i.e., a full-clause pronunciation is available if and only if the exceptive is clausal) does not align with these other diagnostics.

3.2.1 Two variants of *außer*

Stockwell and Wong (2020) discuss German *außer*, contrasting it with *nur...nicht*, and suggest that *außer* is uniformly phrasal. Their evidence comes from exceptive-slucice readings, which they show that the speakers they consulted disallow:

- (17) Jeder mochte den Film, außer Hans, aber ich weiß nicht warum.
 everyone liked the film AUSSER Hans but I know not why
 ‘Everyone liked the film except Hans, but I don’t know why (everyone liked the film except Hans).’ (Stockwell and Wong 2020:8 (17c))

Stockwell and Wong report that the exceptive-slucice reading of (17) is unavailable for the speakers they consulted. This data suggests that there is a population of German speakers for whom *außer*-exceptives are uniformly phrasal.

However, the behavior of *außer* is a bit more complicated across speakers. Moltmann (1992), who discusses German *außer* and its case-licensing properties, notes that *außer* comes in two variants. One variant, which I term *außer_P*, takes a (single) DP complement to which it assigns dative case:⁵

- (18) Außer diesem Jungen habe ich niemanden gesehen.
 AUSSER this.DAT boy have I nobody.ACC seen
 ‘I saw nobody except this boy.’ (Moltmann 1992:379 (3))

In Moltmann’s variety, this variant is positionally restricted to fronted *außer*-phrases, but some speakers allow it more broadly.⁶ A second variant allows for case-matching. Here, the case of the exception matches the case of the quantified DP in the matrix clause:

- (19) Hans lobte jeden außer den Jungen.
 Hans praised everyone.ACC AUSSER the.ACC boy
 ‘Hans praised everyone except the boy.’ (Moltmann 1992:378 (2a))

I term this variant *außer_C*. Given the third diagnostic from above, this case-matching behavior suggests that *außer_P* is phrasal, while *außer_C* is clausal.

This conclusion is further strengthened when we turn to multiple remnants. As Moltmann notes, *außer* can take multiple exceptions only when both exceptions display case-matching (20a). When the exceptions do not case-match the respective matrix-clause quantified DPs (20b), the result is ungrammatical:⁷

- (20) a. Maria stellte jeden Künstler jedem Besucher vor, außer
 M. introduced every.ACC artist every.DAT painter PART AUSSER
 diesen Maler jenem Experten.
 this.ACC painter that.DAT expert
 ‘Maria introduced every artist to every visitor, except this painter to that expert.’
 (Moltmann 1992:379 (2b))

⁵Throughout, I lightly modify Moltmann’s glosses for consistency.

⁶I am grateful to Susanne Gahl, Aglaia von Götz, and Kristina Liefke for discussions of this point and of the examples that follow.

⁷I have modified the form of *dieser Studentin* (in Moltmann’s example, *diese Studentin*) for consistency with Moltmann’s case glossing.

- b. *Kein Mann hat eine Frau gesehen, außer diesem Professor
No.NOM mann has a.ACC woman seen AUSSER this.DAT Professor
dieser Studentin.
this.DAT student
'No man has seen a woman except this professor this student.'
(Moltmann 1992:379 (4))

This further supports the claim that *außer_C* is clausal, since it permits multiple exceptions and does not assign case; by contrast, dative-assigning *außer_P* again appears phrasal. Importantly, we see evidence from multiple diagnostics (case-matching and multiple remnants) to support this claim.

3.2.2 Diagnostics and cohesiveness

Returning now to exceptive sluices, Stockwell and Wong's finding that *außer* does not license exceptive-sluice readings might seem surprising. Given the presence of clausal *außer_C*, we would expect exceptive-sluice readings to be available in sentences like (17). To resolve this tension, I suggest that the speakers that Stockwell and Wong consulted likely only have *außer_P*. While Stockwell and Wong do not provide data on multiple exceptions or case-matching that would help to support this conclusion, I believe that it is nonetheless warranted. It is prescriptively preferred for *außer* to assign dative case, and dative-assigning *außer_P* is higher in register than case-matching *außer_C*.⁸ It would thus not be surprising to find speakers whose grammars only contain *außer_P*. At this point, I do not know what other relevant factors (e.g., geographical variation) might contribute to what variants of *außer* any particular individual's grammar contains.

Further supporting this, German speakers who demonstrably have *außer_C* do permit exceptive-sluice readings with clause-final *außer*. Specifically, the three German speakers I consulted, who accept case-matching (21) and multiple remnants (22), also permit exceptive-sluice readings (23):

- (21) Ich habe jeden Kuchen probiert, außer den Käsekuchen.
I.NOM have every.ACC cake tasted AUSSER the.ACC cheesecake
'I tried every cake except the cheesecake.'
- (22) Jeder Schüler hat jeden Kuchen probiert, außer der Jüngste
every.NOM student has every.ACC cake tasted AUSSER the.NOM youngest
den Rhabarberkuchen.
the.ACC rhubarb.cake
'Every student tasted every cake, except the youngest the rhubarb cake.'
- (23) Er hat jeden Kuchen probiert, außer den Käsekuchen — keine
he.NOM has every cake tasted AUSSER the.ACC cheesecake no
Ahnung warum nicht!
idea why not

⁸I thank Susanne Gahl for discussion of this point.

‘He tried every cake except the cheesecake — no idea why not!’ (i.e., why he didn’t try the cheesecake)

With this, we do in fact see uniformity across the diagnostics of case-matching, multiple exceptions, and exceptive sluices. This validates the use of exceptive-sluice readings as a diagnostic for clausal structure, since the availability of this reading does meaningfully correlate with other known diagnostics for exceptive structure.

3.2.3 Full-clause pronounceability

As discussed above, one often-cited diagnostic for the presence of clausal structure is the possibility of full-clause pronunciation. Sometimes, the inverse implication is also leveraged: some authors use the unavailability of full-clause pronunciation as evidence towards phrasal exceptive structure. (Potsdam and Polinsky (2019), for instance, allude to this as one diagnostic for phrasal structure, while Stockwell and Wong (2020) use it as a key diagnostic.)

It is widely acknowledged in work on comparatives, where a similar phrasal/clausal dichotomy is relevant, that clausal comparatives in some languages undergo obligatory ellipsis (Bhatt and Takahashi 2011). Accordingly, the ungrammaticality of a non-elided comparative does not in itself speak against a clausal analysis of that comparative. We might expect such a pattern with exceptives. Indeed, Soltan (2016:fn.11) suggests that whether clausal exceptives optionally or obligatorily elide be a relevant parameter in cross-linguistic variation with underlyingly clausal exceptives. Vostrikova (2019:76) makes a similar claim based on Persian and Bulgarian exceptives, which she argues are clausal but obligatorily elide.

German *außer_C* provides another demonstration that there exist clearly clausal exceptives that undergo obligatory ellipsis. Even for the speakers I consulted who have clausal *außer_C* (i.e., who accept (21)-(23)), full-clause pronunciations are not permissible (cf. Moltmann 1992:352):

- (24) *Er hat jeden Kuchen probiert, außer den Käsekuchen hat er
he.NOM has every.ACC cake tried AUSSER the.ACC cheesecake has he
nicht probiert.
not tried
‘He tried every cake, except he didn’t try the chesecake.’

Thus, we see (the strong, bidirectional version of) full-clause pronounceability patterning unlike the other main diagnostics that we discuss here: while all other diagnostics point towards a clausal source, this diagnostic diverges from the rest. This provides clear evidence that clausal exceptives—just like clausal comparatives—can undergo obligatory deletion and that the unavailability of full-clause pronunciation is not a diagnostic for phrasal exceptive structure.

4. Conclusion

This paper has focused on two topics related to the use of exceptive-sluice readings as a diagnostic for clausal structure in exceptives. The first question involved how exceptive-sluice readings arise. Expanding on a proposal by Stockwell and Wong (2020), we explored the repercussions of this proposal on a few accounts of the identity condition in sluicing and saw how this diagnostic could be applied to English exceptives.

The second question relates to how exceptive-sluice readings fit in the landscape of exceptive-structure diagnostics. We used the case study of German *außer* as a lens to see that several major diagnostics—case-matching, multiple remnants, and exceptive-sluice readings—do meaningfully align. By contrast, we saw that the absence of full-clause pronounceability does not serve as evidence against a clausal analysis.

References

- Bhatt, Rajesh, and Shoichi Takahashi. 2011. Reduced and unreduced phrasal comparatives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29:581–620.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The view from Building 20*, ed. by Ken Hale and Jay Keyser, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chung, Sandra. 2005. Sluicing and the lexicon: The point of no return. In *Berkeley Linguistics Society 31: General session and parasession on prosodic variation and change*, ed. by Rebecca Cover and Yuni Kim, 73–91. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Chung, Sandra. 2013. Syntactic identity in sluicing: How much and why. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44:1–44.
- Crnič, Luka. 2018. A note on connected exceptives and approximatives. *Journal of Semantics* 35:741–756.
- Davies, Mark. 2008. The corpus of Contemporary American English. Available online at <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>.
- von Stechow, Kai. 1993. Exceptive constructions. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:123–148.
- Gajewski, Jon. 2008. NPI *any* and connected exceptive phrases. *Natural Language Semantics* 16:69–110.
- Harris, Zellig. 1982. *A grammar of English on mathematical principles*. Wiley and Sons.
- Heim, Irene, and Angelika Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in generative grammar*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Hirsch, Aron. 2016. An unexceptional semantics for expressions of exception. In *University of Pennsylvania working papers in linguistics*, ed. by Sunghye Cho, volume 22, 138–148. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.
- Hoeksema, Jack. 1987. The logic of exception. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, ed. by Ann Miller and Joyce Powers, 100–113. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

- Hoeksema, Jack. 1996. The semantics of exception phrases. In *Quantifiers, logic, and language*, ed. by Jaap van der Joes and Jan van Eijck, 145–177. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, Jason. 2013. Voice and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44:77–108.
- Moltmann, Friederike. 1992. Coordination and comparatives. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Moltmann, Friederike. 1995. Exception sentences and polyadic quantification. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 18:223–280.
- Oskolskaya, Sofia. 2009. The properties of the Russian construction with conjunction *krome kak*. Handout for AFLiCo 3.
- Pérez-Jiménez, Isabel, and Norberto Moreno-Quibén. 2012. On the syntax of exceptions. evidence from Spanish. *Lingua* 122:582–607.
- Potsdam, Eric. 2019. Exceptives: An under-appreciated ellipsis construction. In *Proceedings of the 54th meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Eszter Ronai, Laura Stigliano, and Yenan Sun, 435–450. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Potsdam, Eric, and Maria Polinsky. 2017. A preliminary look at exceptives in Tahitian. In *Asking the right questions: Essays in honor of Sandra Chung*, ed. by Jason Ostrove, Ruth Kramer, and Joseph Sabbagh, 28–36.
- Potsdam, Eric, and Maria Polinsky. 2019. Clausal and phrasal exceptives. Poster presented at GLOW 42.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. Ellipsis redundancy and reduction redundancy. In *Proceedings of the Stuttgart Ellipsis Workshop*, ed. by Steve Berman and Arild Hestvik. Stuttgart.
- Rudin, Deniz. 2019. Head-based syntactic identity in sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50:253–283.
- Soltan, Usama. 2016. On the syntax of exceptive constructions in Egyptian Arabic. In *Perspectives on Arabic linguistics 17*, ed. by Stuart Davis and Usama Soltan, 35–57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stockwell, Richard. 2021. Elliptical *why not*. Manuscript, Christ Church, University of Oxford, October 2021.
- Stockwell, Richard, and Deborah J.M. Wong. 2020. Sprouting and the structure of *except*-phrases. In *Proceedings of NELS 50*, ed. by Mariam Asatryan, Yixiao Song, and Ayana Whitmal, volume 3, 169–182.
- Vostrikova, Ekaterina. 2019. Phrasal and clausal exceptive-additive constructions crosslinguistically. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Vostrikova, Ekaterina. 2021. Conditional analysis of clausal exceptives. *Natural Language Semantics* 29:1–69.
- Yoshida, Masaya, Chizuru Nakao, and Iván Ortega-Santos. 2015. The syntax of *why*-stripping. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33:323–370.