## Syntactic features of exceptive constructions with krome in Russian

The meaning of exception can be expressed by various syntactic constructions with various lexical items: *za iskl'ucheniem, krome, pomimo* and others. All of them have the meaning 'except', while some of them have also other meanings and can be used in different contexts. This talk will be devoted to the syntactic features of the word *krome* and their connection with semantics of the word.

First of all, it is necessary to distinguish two types of the preposition *krome*: *krome1* with the meaning of exception (1) and *krome2* with the meaning of addition (2).

(1) Vse prishli, krome Peti.

all came except Peter

'All but Peter came'.

(4)

(2) *Krome Peti prishla Masha.* except Peter came Marie 'Besides Peter, Marie came'.

The main criterion to distinguish these two types of the preposition is below. In the case of *krome1* only the predicate with the opposite polarity is true for an NP in the scope of *krome*: the example (1) is true if everybody came and Peter <u>didn't</u> come. In the case of *krome2* the predicate is true both for NP in the main clause and for NP in the exceptive phrase: the example (2) means that Peter came and Marie <u>came</u>. This formal criterion allows to divide the majority of sentences with *krome* in two groups — with *krome1* and with *krome2*.

However, this criterion meets with a problematic case — sentences with lexical items that mean 'the only':

(3) *Krome Peti ja edinstvennyj pianist.* except Peter I the.only pianist

'Besides Peter I am the only pianist'.

If we consider 'to be the only pianist' to be a predicate, then the criterion above doesn't work well: <sup>?</sup>'I am the only pianist, and Peter is the only pianist'. I suppose that we deal with the existential quantifier in such sentences. According to this, the example (3) can be reformulated as 'Besides Peter one pianist exists. This pianist is me'. In this case, the predicate is 'exists' and *krome* in (3) can be interpreted as *krome2*. Some discussion of the assertion function of words with the meaning 'the only' can be found in [Apresjan 2004: 486].

Sentences with *krome1* and *krome2* differs structurally. Thus, the almost obligatory condition for *krome1* is the presence of the universal quantifier in the main clause. It follows from the meaning of the preposition: an NP in exceptive phrase expresses the set that is excluded from the larger, universal, set. Sometimes, the universal quantifier isn't expressed explicitly, but it is always implied. In the case of *krome2* a combination of two sets — in exceptive phrase and in main clause — gives a universal set. For example, in (2) a combination of *Peter* and *Marie* is a universal set of all who came. However, the last structure is also possible for *krome1*:

Na	koncert	prishli	pochti vse,	krome Peti.
to	concert	came	almost all	except Peter
'Alm	lost everybod	y but Peter cam	he to the concert'.	

The combination of *almost everybody* and *Peter* gives a universal set of *everybody* who came to the concert. Nevertheless, the universal quantifier is always present (explicitly or implicitly) in such sentences, but with the word *almost* (or some other) that predicts the exception. Such sentences account for 6,5 % of all the examples with *krome1* in data analysed<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The data for analysis is taken from Russian National Corpus (<u>www.ruscorpora.ru</u>). The amount of examples -250, from the texts of the end of  $20^{\text{th}}$  century.

It is reasonable to distinguish two types of exceptive phrases with *krome1* — connected exceptive phrases and free exceptive phrases. This distinction was first suggested by J. Hoeksema [1991] for English exceptive constructions. Connected exceptive phrases form a constituent with a universal quantifier in the main clause (5), while free exceptive phrases join to the whole main clause (6).

(5a)	Ja	dal	[vsem	druz'ja	ım,	krome Peti]	ро	konfete			
	Ι	gave	to.all	friends	5	except Peter	PREP	sweet			
	'I gave sweets to all friends but Peter'.										
(5b)	* Vsen	ndruz'je	am	ја	[dal,	krome Peti],	konfety	<i>v</i> .			
	to.all	friends	5	Ι	gave	except Peter	sweets				
(6a)	<sup>ok</sup> Vsen	n druz'je	am	ja	dal	konfety,	krome	Peti.			
	to.all	friends	5	Ι	gave	sweets	except	Peter			
(6b)	<sup>ok</sup> Kron	ne	Peti,	ja	dal	konfety vsem	druz'je	ım.			
	except		Peter	Ι	gave	sweets to.all	friends	5			

The possible structures for connected and free exceptive phrases correspondingly are below: 1. [PRED [X *krome* Y]] or [[X *krome* Y] PRED] — (5a).

2. [[PRED X] *krome* Y] or [[X PRED] *krome* Y] — (6).

The structure [X [PRED *krome* Y]] is impossible as exceptive phrase [*krome* Y] should join to a constituent with the universal quantifier X.

The sentences with *krome2* contains free exceptive phrases, that is connected with the word order: 90% of all examples with *krome2* has the word order with the exceptive phrase in the beginning of a sentence, while among examples with *krome1* there are just 22% with such a word order.

There are different points of view on the nature of the exceptive preposition. I would like to point out two of them. T. Reinhart [1991] treats it as a constituent conjunction<sup>2</sup>:

(7a) [[Everyone smiled] except Felix]

(7b) [[e smiled] [everyone except Felix]]

Z. Harris [1982] treats *except* as a sentential conjunction:

(8a) Everyone smiled, except Felix did not smile.

- (8b) Everyone smiled, except Felix did not.
- (8c) Everyone smiled, except not Felix.
- (8d) Everyone smiled, except Felix.

There is evidence in Russian to approve Reinhart's point of view for connected exceptive phrases and Harris's point of view for free exceptive phrases.

## References

Apresjan, V.Ju. 2004. KROME1. In: Ju.D. Apresjan (ed.). Novyj ob'jasnitel'nyj slovar' sinonimov russkogo jazyka. Moscow.

Harris, Z. 1982. A Grammar of English on Mathematical Principles. John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Hoeksema, J. 1991. *The semantics of exception phrases*. In: J. van der Does and J. van Eijk (eds.). *Generalized Quantifiers and Applications*. Dutch Network for Language, Logic, and Information.

Reinhart, T. 1991. *Elliptic conjunctions — non-quantificational LF*. In: A. Kasher (ed.). *The Chomskyan Turn*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The examples (7) and (8) are taken from [Hoeksema 1991].