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Abstract
A relatively recent development in the generative framework is the hypothesis that there exist in syntax silent elements (SEs) that have a semantic content that is recovered by accessing their phonologically overt counterparts (cf. Kayne 2005, 2012 and Her and Tsai 2015, among others). In this paper, we provide a careful assessment of the two SEs that have been argued by O'Neill (2011) and Homer (2015) to be present in the French (ne)...que exceptive construction; namely silent rien 'nothing' and silent autre 'other'. In doing so, we take to heart one of the main points made by Her and Tsai (2015) in relation to their criticism of Kayne (2012); namely, that for a proposed SE to be learnable, there cannot be any deviation in meaning from its overt counterpart. That is, the recoverability constraint assumed in the generative framework to be at work in, say, PF-deletion ellipsis, applies to all phonologically silent categories, including SEs. Additionally, as Her and Tsai argue, if semantic deviance between SEs and their phonologically overt counterparts were allowed, SEs would become 'empirically intractable'. We argue that while positing a silent n-word in (ne)...que is faithful to the recoverability constraint on silent categories, the alleged second SE, namely, silent autre 'other', is not semantically equivalent to its phonologically overt counterpart in several respects. As we demonstrate, however, if one assumes instead that its overt counterpart is plus 'more', the recoverability requirement is restored.
Identifying Phonologically Overt Counterparts to Silent Elements: The Case of French Exceptives
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1 Introduction

A relatively recent development in the generative framework is the hypothesis that there exist in syntax silent elements (SEs) that, unlike elided elements or obligatory control PRO, do not have overt antecedents, but have a semantic content that is recovered by accessing their phonologically overt counterparts in the lexicon (cf. Kayne 2005, 2012 and Her and Tsai 2015; among others). Crucially, as Her and Tsai (2015:580) argue, it is necessary to assume that there is semantic equivalence between SEs and their phonologically overt counterparts, for if semantic deviance were allowed, SEs would become ‘empirically intractable’. In this paper, we examine the claim made by O’Neill (2011) and Homer (2015) that French (ne)…que exceptives, illustrated in (1), are ‘hidden comparatives’ that contain two SEs: a silent n-word (rien ‘nothing’ or personne ‘nobody’) and a silent autre ‘other’.

(1) a. Ils (ne)     couperont que les érables.
     they (NEG) will-cut     than the maples
     ‘They will only cut down the maple trees.’
     b. Nous (ne) recevons    que le strict minimum pour nos dépenses    de base.
     we (NEG) receive    than the bare minimum for our expenditures of support
     ‘We get nothing more than the bare minimum to cover our basic financial needs.’

We argue that while there is solid evidence in favor of the correspondence between the former SE and the overt n-word rien, assuming that the overt counterpart of the latter is autre leads to the kind of semantic deviance shown to be undesirable by Her and Tsai (2015). We propose instead that the overt counterpart to the second silent component of French exceptive (ne)...que is plus ‘more’ and discuss empirical evidence that shows that overt plus and the second silent component of (ne)...que display identical semantic properties in a number of contexts in which autre fails to do the same.

2 Evidence for Silent rien

In this section we provide what we believe to be robust evidence in favor of the presence of an SE corresponding to the overt n-word rien ‘nothing’ in ne...que exceptives.

First, it explains the optional presence of ne, since this element is also optionally used in sentences containing an argumental n-word such as the one in (2a). Second, as pointed out by Masicotte (1986), while (ne)...que is considered prescriptive in the variety of Canadian French spoken in Montréal, rien que, illustrated in (2b), is the most productive exceptive expression in that dialect. Additionally, (ne)...rien que competes with (ne)...que in other varieties of French, including colloquial European French.

(2) a. Je (ne) demande rien en retour.
     I (NEG) ask nothing in return
     ‘I ask for nothing in return.’
     b. Elle rêve rien que de ça.
     she dreams nothing than of that
     ‘She only dreams about that.’

Third, as Gaatone (1999) points out, sentences containing (ne)...que display positive polarity and, as shown in (3) and (4), the polarity of a sentence containing (ne)...rien que is positive as well.
Fourth, given that sentential negation \textit{pas} ‘not’ does not participate in negative concord in European French, the co-occurrence of \textit{pas} with an n-word in the same clause, as in (5a), yields a double negation reading. Interestingly, as (5b) shows, the same is true of the combination (\textit{ne})…\textit{pas}…\textit{que} as well as the combination (\textit{ne})…\textit{pas rien que}, suggesting that an n-word is present in both.

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{Je (ne) demande pas rien en retour.} \hfill \textit{DN reading: ‘Everybody drinks more than just water.’}
\item b. \textit{Il (ne) boit pas (rien) que de l’eau.} \hfill \textit{DN reading: ‘Everybody drinks more than just water.’}
\end{enumerate}

Fifth, as shown in (6a), French sentences with two clause-mate n-words give rise to either a negative concord (NC) reading or a double negation (DN) reading. Interestingly, as Homer (2015) points out, the same readings obtain if an n-word and a (\textit{ne})…\textit{que} exceptive are clause-mates (6b) and, as we have also illustrated in (6b), both readings are available with (\textit{ne})…\textit{rien que} in the same context as well. This is, of course, expected if (\textit{ne})…\textit{que} exceptives contain a silent n-word. It is also worth noting that an exceptive adverb like seulement ‘only’, which is not an n-word, does not trigger negative concord readings. Thus, (7) contrasts with (6b).

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{Personne (ne) pense à rien.} \hfill \textit{NC reading: ‘Nobody is thinking about anything.’}
\item b. \textit{Personne (ne) boit (rien) que de l’eau.} \hfill \textit{NC reading: ‘Nobody drinks anything but water.’}
\item a. \textit{Je (n’) ai rien lu d’intéressant.} \hfill \textit{DN reading only: ‘Everybody drinks more than just water.’}
\item b. \textit{Je (n’) ai mangé rien que quelques dates.} \hfill \textit{DN reading only: ‘Everybody drinks more than just water.’}
\end{enumerate}

Sixth, as illustrated in (8), argumental \textit{rien}, being a quantificational head, can raise to pre-participial position, a movement that is arguably an instance of overt QR. Interestingly, the \textit{rien} that can appear overtly in (\textit{ne})…\textit{que} exceptives displays similar characteristics in colloquial registers. Thus, alongside the in situ \textit{rien} in (9a), one finds the pre-participial \textit{rien} in (9b).

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{Je (n’) ai rien lu d’intéressant.} \hfill \textit{I haven’t read anything interesting.’}
\item a. \textit{Je (n’) ai mangé rien que quelques dates.} \hfill \textit{I have nothing eaten than a-few dates}
\end{enumerate}
Finally, in colloquial styles, argumental *rien* can also raise out of an infinitival clause and into a tensed matrix containing a modal, as in (10). This is also possible with *ne...rien que* and the two possible c-command relations for *rien* with respect to the modal result in different readings, as (11) illustrates.

(10) Je (ne) suis rien obligé de te donner.

I (NEG) am nothing obliged of you to-give 'I don’t have to give you anything.'

(11) a. On est obligé de *ne rien* boire *que* de l’eau.

we are obliged of NEG nothing to-drink than of the-water

‘We are required to only drink water.’

b. On n’est *rien* obligé de boire *que* de l’eau.

we NEG-are nothing obliged of to-drink than of the-water

‘We are only required to drink water.’

In (11a) and (11b), *ne* and *rien* are clausemates; that is, *ne*, in some sense, marks the scope of *rien*. Further, in (11a), the deontic modal expression *être obligé* ‘be required’ c-commands *rien* and therefore scopes over it, yielding an interpretation according to which one is required to drink water and nothing else. In (11b), on the other hand, *rien* c-commands the modal and takes wide scope over it, yielding an interpretation according to which all one is required to drink is water (that is, one is free to drink other things such as wine, though it is not required). The latter reading is known as the ‘minimal sufficiency reading’, a topic to which we return in the next section.

Now, if *(ne)...que* contains an SE corresponding to overt *rien*, we expect similar readings to be available and, if *ne* is expressed, we expect it to ‘reveal’ the scope of the SE and select one reading or the other, depending on its position. These are indeed the right predictions, as the paradigm in (12) shows. That is, while (12a) is, in the absence of *ne*, ambiguous between the two readings associated with (11a) and (11b), (12b) only has the reading available in (11a) and (12c) the reading available in (11b).

(12) a. On est obligé de boire *que* de l’eau.

we are obliged of to-drink than of the-water

b. On est obligé de *ne* boire *que* de l’eau.

we are obliged of NEG to-drink than of the-water

c. On n’est *rien* obligé de boire *que* de l’eau.

we NEG-are nothing obliged of to-drink than of the-water

So far, we have seen cases in which *ne* signals that *rien*, be it overt or covert, undergoes raising to the periphery of the vP projection. Let us go one step further and hypothesize that this instance of head movement of *rien*, which strands the *que* + *XP*, is akin to the well-known cases of Quantification at a Distance (QAD), which, as Authier (2016) argues, involve head movement of degree quantifiers like *beaucoup* ‘a lot’, as well. Thus, the QAD configuration in (13b) is derived from its canonical quantification counterpart in (13a).

(13) a. *On a mangé beaucoup de frites.*

we have eaten a-lot of fries

b. *On a beaucoup mangé de frites.*

we have a-lot eaten of fries

‘We ate a lot of fries.’

As has been noted in the literature, QAD is unavailable in at least four basic configurations: from the subject position of a tensed clause, as in (14a), from within a PP, as in (14b), from the object position of an ECM clausal complement if movement is to the matrix vP-field, as in (14c); and from within a complex DP, as in (14d). (We refer the reader to Authier 2016, who uses these facts to support a movement analysis of QAD.)
Interestingly, *ne...rien...que* with *rien* having undergone head movement is prohibited in exactly the same contexts, as (15) illustrates.

The sentences in (15) can, however, be redeemed if *rien* does not undergo QAD and *ne* is obrigatorily absent. This is illustrated in (16). (Note that in (16c) *ne* is possible, but only in the ECM complement.)

Taken together, the paradigms in (15) and (16) suggest that *ne* is optionally present in exceptives only if overt or SE *rien* undergoes QAD either in the overt syntax or post-Spell-Out. This explains the contrast between (16b), which is ungrammatical with *ne* and (17), in which *ne* is possible, due to the fact that *rien* is external to the PP.
(17) Il (n’)a cuisiné rien qu’avec des produits frais.

‘He only cooked with fresh ingredients.’

Thus, the term "(ne)...que exceptives" is somewhat of a misnomer, since what we are dealing with here is (rien) que exceptives where the optional presence of ne signals the scope assigned to overt or covert rien via Quantification at a Distance in those contexts where such a movement is possible.

We turn next to the second hypothesized SE in (ne)...que constructions, namely covert autre ‘other’.

3 Positing a Silent autre Leads to Undesirable Consequences

French (ne)...que exceptives, just like only and just in English, are standardly assumed to give rise to two distinct components of meaning: the asserted (or at-issue) component and the semantically presupposed prejacent. To illustrate what these terms refer to, consider the sentences in (18).

(18) a. Nous (n’)avons invité que Sandrine.

‘We only invited Sandrine.’

b. Nous (n’)avons pas invité que Sandrine.

‘We didn’t just invite Sandrine.’

The sentence in (18a) contributes the semantic assertion that it is not the case that we invited anyone out of a relevant set of individuals of which Sandrine is not a member. We know this to be the assertoric content of (18a) because negating (18a), as in (18b), reverses the truth value of the proposition: (18b) asserts that it is the case that we invited someone out of a relevant set of individuals of which Sandrine is not a member. The second aspect of meaning associated with (18a) is the inference that we invited Sandrine. This inference is called the prejacent. This aspect of meaning is widely (though not universally) assumed to be a semantic presupposition because it also arises in conjunction with the negated version of (18a), namely (18b).

With this in mind, we turn to the hypothesis, defended by both O’Neill (2011) and Homer (2015) that (ne)...que constructions contain a silent autre ‘other’, which introduces the comparative complementizer que ‘than’. In other words, according to them, (ne)...que is really (ne)...rien/personne d’autre que, which means that they take a sentence like (19a) to be the minimal phonological realization of (19b), the total realization.

(19) a. Il (n’)a mangé que du pain.

‘He only ate some bread.’

b. Il (n’)a mangé rien d’autre que du pain.

‘He ate nothing other than bread.’

However, as Homer (2015) points out, there is an important difference between such minimal and total realizations, one that is linked to the presence of the prejacent. That is, the prejacent is an obligatory inference in minimal realizations but not in total ones. To see this, consider the discourse in (20).

(20) I don’t know if Aline called Johann but I’m sure that…

a. #...elle n’a appelé que Johann.

‘…she only called Johann.’

b. …elle n’a appelé personne d’autre que Johann.

‘…she called no one other than Johann.’
Given the discourse background spelled out in English in (20), the infelicitous continuation in (20a), which involves the minimal realization of \( (n) \ldots que \), is due the obligatory presence of the inference that Aline called Johann (which is the prejacent). Unexpectedly, however, the alleged total realization of \( (n) \ldots que \) in (20b) is felicitous in the same context, which indicates that it does not (or at least not necessarily) yield the same inference.

There is an additional problem tied to the assumption that total realizations contain autre, one that has so far gone unnoticed in the literature, as far as we know. It has to do with the fact that total realizations with autre appear to systematically enforce a complement exclusion reading in those cases where a rank-order reading or a minimal sufficiency reading of the minimal realization of \( (n) \ldots que \) is observed. Let us examine these two cases in some detail.

The issue of rank-order readings has been discussed in the context of English only by Coppock and Beaver (2011, 2013). Just like only, \( (n) \ldots que \) displays, in most cases, a complement exclusion reading as in (21), but it also does, in some cases, take on a so-called rank-order reading, for example in predicative sentences like (22).

\[
(21) \text{Paul} \ (n\text{')aime} \ que \ 	ext{Véro.}
\]
\[
\text{Paul (NEG)-loves than Véro}
\]
\[
\text{Paul loves only Véro.}
\]

\[
(22) \text{Paul n’est que lieutenant.}
\]
\[
\text{Paul (NEG)-is than first-lieutenant}
\]
\[
\text{Paul is only a first lieutenant.}
\]

A sentence like (21) displays a ‘complement exclusion reading’ in the sense that the complement of the singleton set \{Véro\} is excluded from the property of being loved by Paul. Thus, the assertoric component of (21) can be paraphrased as Paul loves no one other than Véro. The predicative sentence in (22), on the other hand, does not say that Paul has no relevant properties other than being a first lieutenant; it says that Paul has no relevant properties that place him higher than first lieutenant on the scale of army ranks. This is the so-called rank-order reading. A theory of \( (n) \ldots que \) should, of course, have the ability to allow sentences like (22) to not be paraphrased with nothing other than. Unfortunately, the maximal realization of \( (n) \ldots que \) proposed by O’Neill (2011) and Homer (2015) does not have that ability; that is, the alleged maximal realization containing rien d’autre que in (23), does not have the same interpretation as its minimal realization counterpart in (22).

\[
(23) \text{Paul n’est rien d’autre que lieutenant.}
\]
\[
\text{Paul (NEG)-is nothing of-other than first-lieutenant}
\]
\[
\text{Paul is nothing other than a first lieutenant.}
\]

While rien in (23) is certainly subject to domain restriction, its domain is not necessarily restricted to those properties that are army ranks, thus deriving the rank-order scale. Rather, (23), unlike its minimal realization counterpart in (22), allows for a reading whereby Paul has no other property than being first lieutenant out of a set of relevant properties that can include such properties as being a father, being a talented singer, etc.

The other reading sometimes associated with \( (n) \ldots que \) has previously been discussed in the context of English just by Grosz (2012), Coppock and Beaver (2014) and Coppock and Lindahl (2014). On this reading, \( (n) \ldots que \) again fails to take on a complement exclusion reading. It instead displays what Grosz (2012) calls a ‘minimal sufficiency reading’. The sentence in (24) illustrates the phenomenon in French.

\[
(24) \text{Rien que l’idée de travailler l’épuise.}
\]
\[
\text{nothing than the-idea of to-work him-exhausts}
\]
\[
\text{‘Just the thought of working exhausts him.’}
\]

The example in (24) does not have the complement exclusion inference that nothing other than the idea of working exhausts him. It implies instead that at least the idea of working exhausts him (i.e., that’s all it takes), which is the minimal sufficiency reading. The alleged maximal realization of (24)
containing *rien d’autre que* in (25) does not, however, yield this interpretation. That is, (25), unlike (24), does have the complement exclusion inference that the thought of working is the only thing that exhausts him.

(25) Rien d’autre que l’idée de travailler l’épuise.
nothing-of-other than the-idea of to-work him-exhausts
‘Nothing other than the thought of working exhausts him.’

To remedy these shortcomings, we argue next that a more likely candidate for the second SE present in the *(ne)*...*que* construction is covert *plus* ‘more’.

4 A New Candidate for the Second SE

As pointed out in the literature, by for instance von Fintel & Iatridou (2007), French exceptive *(ne)*...*que*, has correlates in other languages, for example, in Spanish. As it turns out, Spanish exceptives like the one in (26) are similar to their French counterparts in having as a ‘first component’ an overt or covert *n*-word; namely *nada* ‘nothing’. In addition, Spanish obligatorily spells out the ‘second component’ as *más* ‘more’.

(26) Sofia no comió *(nada) más que* alitas de pollo.
Sofia not ate (nothing) more than wings of chicken
‘Sofia only ate chicken wings.’

Interestingly, French can also spell out the second component of *(ne)*...*que as plus ‘more’, as in (27), though French differs minimally from Spanish in that the presence of overt *plus* is contingent upon *rien* being phonologically spelled out.

(27) Sophie *(n’)a mangé rien de plus que des ailes de poulet.
Sophie (NEG)-has eaten nothing of more than some wings of chicken
‘Sophie only ate chicken wings.’

Could it then be that *(ne)...rien de plus que* rather than *(ne)...rien d’autre que* is the maximal realization of *(ne)*...*que* exceptives? As we will now demonstrate, the evidence suggests that the answer to this question is positive.

First, unlike *(ne)...rien d’autre que*, *(ne)...rien de plus que* does not exhibit Homer’s prejacent problem. To see this, consider the discourse in (28).

(28) I don’t know if Sophie ate chicken wings but I’m sure that…
   a. #...elle n’a mangé que des ailes de poulet.
      ‘...she only ate chicken wings.’
   b. #...elle n’a mangé rien de plus que des ailes de poulet.
      ‘...she ate nothing more than chicken wings.’

Given the discourse background spelled out in English in (28), the infelicitous continuation in (28a), which involves the minimal realization of *(ne)...*que*, reveals the obligatory presence of the inference that Sophie ate chicken wings (the prejacent). But notice now that the new hypothesized total realization of *(ne)...*que* in (28b) is infelicitous as well, from which we conclude that it yields the same inference. This immediately solves Homer’s prejacent problem.

Second, unlike *(ne)...rien d’autre que*, *(ne)...rien de plus que* yields both the rank-order and the minimal sufficiency readings of *(ne)...*que* and does so in the appropriate contexts. To see this, consider the examples in (29).

(29) a. Paul *(n’)est rien de plus que lieutenant.
    Paul (NEG)-is nothing of more than first-lieutenant
    ‘Paul is nothing more than a first lieutenant.’
b. Rien de plus que l'idée de travailler l'épuise.

nothing of more than the idea of working exhausts

‘Nothing more than the thought of working exhausts him.’

Just like its minimal realization counterpart in (22), (29a) does not say that Paul has no relevant properties other than being a first lieutenant; it says that Paul has no relevant properties that are higher than being a first lieutenant on the army officer ranking scale. In a similar vein, (29b) mimics its minimal realization (ne)...que counterpart in (24) in that it does not have the complement exclusion inference that nothing but the thought of working exhausts him. It implies instead that at least the thought of working exhausts him, which is the minimal sufficiency reading.

5 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have provided a careful assessment of the two SEs that have been argued by O’Neill (2011) and Homer (2015) to be present in the minimal realization of the French (ne)...que construction. In doing so, we have taken to heart one of the main points made by Her and Tsai (2015) in relation to their criticism of Kayne (2012); namely, that for a proposed SE to be learnable, there cannot be any deviation in meaning from its overt counterpart. In other words, the recoverability constraint assumed in the generative framework to be at work in, say, PF-deletion ellipsis, applies to all phonologically silent categories, including SEs. We came to the conclusion that positing a silent n-word in (ne)...que is indeed faithful to this constraint. But the alleged second SE, silent autre, was shown not to be semantically equivalent to its phonologically overt counterpart in several respects. As we demonstrated, however, if one assumes instead that its overt counterpart is plus, the recoverability requirement is restored.
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