

## Same form, but not the same construction

On the negative form *nu* 'no/not' in Romanian

---

**Gabriela Bîlbîie**

`gabriela.bilbiie@lils.unibuc.ro`

**University of Bucharest & LLF**

December 16th, 2022

The 31st Joint Workshop on Linguistics and Language Processing

Kyung Hee University

---

# Content

1 Pseudostripping and stripping

2 Two different constructions

3 Towards an analysis

## Two different constructions or not ?

- **Pseudostripping** (Depiante 2000) vs. **stripping** (Hankamer & Sag 1976)
  - ⇒ Common aspects : (i) there is interpretation beyond what is said/written, something is literally missing, or is semantically much less contentful than what is actually understood, and (ii) what is understood is understood because of the presence of an antecedent in the context.
  - ⇒ Same construction ? Ellipsis or not ?
    - **Romanian data** :
      - (1) a. Ion va veni la petrecere, dar **Maria nu**.  
Ion will come to party but Maria no
      - b. Ion va veni la petrecere, dar **nu și Maria**.  
Ion will come to party but not ASSOC Maria
    - **Spanish data**, cf. Fernández-Sánchez (2019) :
      - (2) a. Juan leyó Hamlet, pero **Otelo no**.  
Juan read Hamlet but Otelo no
      - b. Juan leyó Hamlet, pero **no Otelo**.  
Juan read Hamlet but not Otelo

- Other languages can make use of non-homophonous words.
  - French : *non* vs. *pas*, cf. Abeillé (2006), Morris (2008), GGF (2021)
- (3)
  - a. Jean aime le chocolat, mais **Marie non**.  
Jean likes the chocolate but Marie no
  - b. Jean aime le chocolat, mais **pas Marie**.  
Jean likes the chocolate but not Marie
- Italian : *no* vs. *non*, cf. Servidio (2012)
- (4)
  - a. Gianni è venuto, ma **Mario no**.  
Gianni has come but Mario no
  - b. E venuto Gianni, ma **non Mario**.  
has come Gianni but not Mario

# Pseudostripping

- Pseudostripping makes use of **polar propositional adverbs** such as ***nu*<sub>1</sub>** 'no' and ***da*** 'yes' in Romanian.
    - It occurs, in particular, as short answers (cf. Sailor 2012, '**polar response particles**') in dialogic contexts (5), but it can also occur in monologic contexts, in so-called contrastive coordinations (6).
    - Polarity particles *nu* 'no' and *da* 'yes' can be bare ((5-a), (6-a)) or preceded by a topic XP ((5-b), (6-b)).
- (5) a. A : Va veni Ion la petrecere ? B : {**Nu/Da**}.  
'A : Will Ion come to the party ? B : {No/yes}.'
- b. A : Iți vor veni copiii de Crăciun ? B : **Ion da**, dar **Maria nu**.  
'A : Will your children come for Christmas ? B : Ion yes, but Maria no.'
- (6) a. Astăzi se decide dacă se închid (**sau nu**) școlile (**sau nu**).  
'Today one decides whether schools close (or not).'
- b. Ion va veni la petrecere, dar **Maria nu**.  
'Ion will come to the party, but Maria no.'
- c. Ion nu va veni la petrecere, dar **Maria da**.  
'Ion will not come to the party, but Maria yes.'

## Stripping

- Stripping (or Bare Argument Ellipsis, cf. Ross 1969, Hankamer & Sag 1976) refers to any elliptical clause displaying a single remnant (7-a) which frequently – but not necessarily – contains a **focus-sensitive adverb**, such as the constituent negation **nu<sub>2</sub>** ‘not’ (7-b), the polar restrictive particle **nici** ‘neither’ (7-c) or the polar additive particle **și** ‘too’ (8-a).
  - Stripping elements can appear as answers (7) in a dialogue (also called fragment answers), or they can be coordinated (8).

- (7)
- A : Cine a venit? B : Ion.  
'A : Who came? B : Ion.'
  - A : Cine a mâncat prăjitura? B : **Nu eu**.  
'A : Who ate the cake? Not me.'
  - A : Nu mi-am făcut tema. B : **Nici eu**.  
'A : I did not do my homework. B : Neither me.'
- (8)
- Vine Ion la petrecere, dar {**nu și Maria/și Maria**}.  
'Ion is coming to the party, but {not Maria/also Maria}.'
  - Ion nu vine la petrecere, și **nici Maria**.  
'Ion is not coming to the party, and neither Maria.'

## Previous analyses

- ❶ Both patterns involve ellipsis (Depiante 2000, 2004, Vicente 2006, Morris 2008, Depiante & Vicente 2009).
  - Clausal TP-ellipsis (PF-deletion), after movement of the remnant XP to the left periphery above TP, i.e. movement to FocusP (cf. Depiante 2000, 2004) or movement to either FocusP or TopicP (cf. Vicente 2006, Morris 2008, Depiante & Vicente 2009).
- ❷ Each pattern has its own syntactic analysis (Fernández-Sánchez 2019).
  - Pseudostripping : clausal TP-ellipsis (PF-deletion), and high (sentential) coordination (Depiante 2000, 2004, Vicente 2006, Servidio 2012, Fernández-Sánchez 2019).
  - Stripping : no ellipsis at all, low (subclausal/constituent) coordination (Biezma 2014, Fernández-Sánchez 2019).

# Main goal of the presentation

- To show that pseudostripping and stripping are two distinct constructions.
- There are two mechanisms at work : proform-analysis vs. ellipsis-analysis.
  - Pseudostripping does not involve ellipsis at all. Pseudostripping sequences are polar verbless clauses.
  - Stripping may involve ellipsis, but the traditional analysis in terms of syntactic reconstruction is problematic.



# Content

1 Pseudostripping and stripping

2 Two different constructions

3 Towards an analysis

## Deep vs. surface anaphora

- The distinction between a proform-analysis vs. an ellipsis-analysis recalls the very influential paper of Hankamer & Sag (1976), which distinguishes between two main classes of anaphoric devices : deep vs. surface anaphora.
  - Deep anaphora do not result from an ellipsis process, they are rather model-interpretive anaphora (e.g. *do it, do this, do that*, personal pronouns). They are present as such in underlying representation and do not involve deletion or substitution.
  - Surface anaphora result from an ellipsis mechanism (e.g. stripping, gapping); they are generally derived by deletion or substitution under identity with a syntactically present antecedent.

## Possibility to have exophoric uses

- Surface anaphora must be linked to a linguistic (syntactically present) antecedent (i.e. they only have endophoric uses), whereas deep anaphora do not necessarily require a linguistic antecedent (i.e. they allow both endophoric and exophoric uses).
- Pseudostripping may have pragmatic antecedents, i.e. it may occur in situations in which the antecedent is presented in the context, but not explicitly introduced in a linguistic expression ('pragmatic control'). Therefore, unlike stripping, it can have an exophoric use (with no linguistic antecedent), which is interpreted either through ostension or via inference from the non-linguistic context.

(9) [*Context : Speaker A raises the teapot and wants to serve B.*]

- a. B1 : [**Nu**<sub>1</sub>], mulțumesc.  
'No, thanks.'
- b. B2 : [**Acum nu**<sub>1</sub>], poate mai târziu.  
'Not now, maybe later.'
- c. B3 : [**Eu nu**<sub>1</sub>], poate vrea Maria.  
'Not me, maybe it is Maria who wants it.'

## Syntactic identity/parallelism

- Surface anaphora are sensitive to the form of their antecedents in a way that deep anaphora are not.
- The adverbial proforms in pseudostripping are not sensitive to the form of their antecedents : they may substitute not only finite clauses or verbal phrases, but also other kinds of phrases, provided that they have a predicative use ; the form that their antecedent may have is therefore highly underspecified.
  - In (10-a), the adverbial proform *nu* substitutes a nominal and an adjectival phrase respectively, which cannot have a lexical negated form (10-b), challenging the syntactic reconstruction approach.

- (10) a. **Student** [sau **nu**<sub>1</sub>], [**tânăr** [sau **nu**<sub>1</sub>], oricine e binevenit în comunitatea Euphoria.  
'Student or not, young or not, anyone is welcome in the Euphoria community.'
- b. **Student** [sau {**\*nu student** /**\*nestudent**}], **tânăr** [sau {**\*nu tânăr**/**\*netânăr**}], ...  
'Student or not student, young or not young, ...'

## Different adverbials

- Pseudostripping and stripping typically display a complementary distribution of adverbials :
  - Pseudostripping : **polarity response proforms** ; when accompanying a remnant, they always follow it (11) ⇒ **XP-Adv.**
  - Stripping : **associative/focus-sensitive adverbs** that typically precede a focused remnant (12) ⇒ **Adv-XP.**

- (11) a. Ion nu a citit *Hamlet*, dar **Maria da**.  
Ion NEG has read *Hamlet* but Maria yes  
'Ion didn't read *Hamlet*, but Maria did.'
- b. \*Ion nu a citit *Hamlet*, dar **da Maria**.  
Ion NEG has read *Hamlet* but yes Maria

- (12) a. Ion nu a citit *Hamlet*, și **nici Maria**.  
Ion NEG has read *Hamlet* and neither Maria  
'Ion didn't read *Hamlet*, and Maria either.'
- b. \*Ion nu a citit *Hamlet*, și **Maria nici**.  
Ion NEG has read *Hamlet* and Maria neither

- Despite the homophony of forms, we distinguish between three different negation forms *nu* in Romanian, cf. Barbu (2004).
  - the proform negation **nu<sub>1</sub>** 'no' present in pseudostripping ;
  - the constituent negation **nu<sub>2</sub>** 'not' present in stripping ;
  - the verbal negation **nu<sub>3</sub>** 'not' present in the verbal complex.
- Both proform **nu<sub>1</sub>** and constituent negation **nu<sub>2</sub>** have a lexical status, while the verbal negation **nu<sub>3</sub>** has an affixal status, cf. (13-b), (14-b).

- (13) a. Ion să bea vin, [dar **Maria nu<sub>1</sub>**].  
 Ion SUBJ drink.3.SUBJ wine but Maria NEG  
 'Ion is allowed to drink wine, but Maria no.'
- b. Ion să bea vin, [dar **Maria să nu<sub>3</sub>**]  
 Ion SUBJ drink.3.SUBJ wine but Maria SUBJ NEG  
 \*(bea)].  
 drink.3.SUBJ  
 'Ion is allowed to drink wine, but Maria is not allowed to.'
- (14) a. A cânta [sau **nu<sub>1</sub>**] este același lucru.  
 to sing or not is same thing
- b. A cânta [sau a **nu<sub>3</sub>** \*(cânta)] este același lucru.  
 to sing or to not sing is same thing

## Different information structures

- The different position of adverbials is linked to a different informational status and interpretation (see also Vicente 2006 for Spanish, Winkler 2005 for German).
  - Pseudostripping **XP-Adv** : XP = contrastive topic, cf. the 'aboutness' feature in (15-a).
  - Stripping **Adv-XP** : XP = contrastive focus, cf. association with focus particles, and the paraphrase by a cleft structure in (15-b).

- (15)
- a. Profesorul le-a acordat altora a doua şansă, [dar **mie** **nu**<sub>1</sub>].  
'The teacher gave others a second chance, but to me no.'  
(= 'As for me, the teacher didn't give me a second chance.')
  - b. Profesorul le-a acordat altora a doua şansă, [dar **nu**<sub>2</sub> **mie**].  
'The teacher gave others a second chance, but not to me.'  
(= 'It is not to me that the teacher gave a second chance.')

## Different discourse relations

- The two constructions involve a contrast relation, but two different kinds of contrast :
  - Pseudostripping **XP-Adv** : complex parallelism, OPPOSE relation (cf. Repp 2016 ; opposite contributions to the same QUD) = exhaustive focus (cf. Cruschina 2021's typology)  $\Rightarrow$  contrast is less strong than with stripping.
  - Stripping **Adv-XP** : simple parallelism, CORRECTION relation (cf. Repp 2016 ; the propositions cannot both be true) = corrective focus (cf. Cruschina 2021's typology)  $\Rightarrow$  the strongest type of contrast.
- Focus typology (cf. Cruschina 2021) :
  - information focus > **exhaustive focus** > mirative focus > **corrective focus** $\Rightarrow$  The further up the scale one goes, the stronger the contrast.



## Prosodic differences

- Two different intonation patterns :
  - Pseudostripping **XP-Adv**, cf. (16-a) : prototypical comma intonation pattern, with a rise on the remnant followed by a fall on the propositional adverb (H-L). Two prosodic units.
  - Stripping **Adv-XP**, cf. (16-b) : prosodic stress (pitch accent) on the remnant and its correlate. One prosodic unit.

- (16)
- a. Profesorul le-a acordat altora a doua şansă, [dar **mie nu**<sub>1</sub>].  
'The teacher gave others a second chance, but to me no.'  
(= 'As for me, the teacher didn't give me a second chance.')
  - b. Profesorul le-a acordat **ALTORA** a doua şansă, [dar **NU**<sub>2</sub> **MIE**].  
'The teacher gave others a second chance, but not to me.'  
(= 'It is not to me that the teacher gave a second chance.')

## Ellipsis or not ?

- Pseudostripping and stripping are two different constructions, but they share some important properties in Romanian :
    - Both are insensitive to islands.  $\Rightarrow$  Evidence against PF-deletion (no leftward movement).
    - Both can be embedded.  $\Rightarrow$  Evidence for a clausal analysis.
- $\Rightarrow$  Both constructions do not involve a PF-deletion mechanism but should nevertheless be analyzed as clauses.

## (In)Sensitivity to islands

- Previous analyses in terms of clausal TP-ellipsis appeal to a PF-deletion process, preceded by leftward movement of the remnant XP above TP (Depiante 2000, 2004, Vicente 2006, Morris 2008, Servidio 2012, Fernández-Sánchez 2019, etc.).
- Consequently, both pseudostripping and stripping are assumed to obey locality constraints. However, in both constructions, remnants do not obey island constraints; they can appear in what would be an island for extraction, i.e. subjunctive or infinitival subjects, circumstantial adjuncts or relative clauses.

- Island violations with pseudostripping : subjunctive subjects (17-a) or infinitival subjects (17-b), circumstantial adjuncts (17-c) or relative clauses (17-d).

- (17) a. Să înveți la pian e greu, [dar la chitară nu].  
'To learn the piano is difficult, but the guitar no.'
- b. Pentru un francez, a citi în italiană nu e foarte dificil, [dar în portugheză da].  
'For a Frenchman, to read Italian is not very difficult, but Portuguese yes.'
- c. Intotdeauna îmi anunț părinții când plec la munte, [dar la mare nu].  
'Always I inform my parents when I go to the mountains, but to the seaside no.'
- d. Nu știu pe nimeni care să cânte la vioară, [dar la pian da].  
'I don't know anybody who plays the violin, but the piano yes.'

- Island violations with stripping : subjunctive subjects (18-a), circumstantial adjuncts (18-b) or relative clauses (18-c).

(18) a. Să înțelegi textul original în ebraică e dificil, [**nu** însă **și textul tradus**].

'To understand the original text in Hebrew is difficult, but not its translation.'

b. Intotdeauna îmi iau cortul cu mine când plec la munte, [dar **nu și la mare**].

'Always I take my tent with me when I go to the mountains, but not to the seaside.'

c. Nu știu pe nimeni care să cânte la vioară, [și **nici la pian**].

'I don't know anybody who plays the violin, and neither the piano.'

⇒ **Extraction of the remnant in the left periphery (leftward movement) is therefore not empirically supported.**

## Possibility of embedding

- Both pseudostripping and stripping have the same behaviour under embedding in Romanian, i.e. they can occur in embedded contexts.

- (19) a. Ion va veni la petrecere, dar cred că Maria  
Ion will come to party but I think that Maria  
nu.  
no
- b. Cineva a spart vaza, sper că nu Maria.  
somebody has broken the-vase hope that not Maria

- ⇒ **The possibility of embedding is a strong evidence for a clausal analysis of both constructions.** Only high coordination (no low – subclausal – coordination in stripping, *pace* Fernández-Sánchez 2019).
- Semantic (and not syntactic) constraints on embedding : embedding is constrained by the semantic type of the embedding predicate (as is the case for gapping, cf. Bîlbîie & de la Fuente 2019, Bîlbîie et al. 2021).

## Semantic constraint on embedding

- This was first noticed by de Cuba & MacDonald (2013) for Spanish, who observe that embedding is possible with non-factive verbs (e.g. *suppose, imagine, suspect, think, say*, etc.), but impossible with factive verbs (e.g. *hate, love, know, find out, regret*, etc.).
- However, the classical distinction between non-factives and factives is too reductive and cannot fully account for all the empirical facts.
- Crucially, factives are not all alike (cf. Karttunen 1971, Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1971, Hooper 1975) : semi-factives (cognitive predicates, e.g. *know, find out, see, notice, discover*) come closer to non-factive predicates rather than to other factives (emotive predicates, e.g. *regret, like, resent, be surprised*, etc.), when it comes to embedding.
- Our attested corpus data show that a semantic tripartition (non-factive vs. semi-factive vs. true factive verbs) seems to be a better fit to account for our data (cf. Bîlbîie & de la Fuente 2019, Bîlbîie 2021). Most of embedded cases are under non-factive verbs, but embedding may occur under semi-factives too. However, there are no attested examples with embedding under true factive (emotive) predicates.

- Embedded pseudostripping under non-factive (20) and semi-factive (21) predicates :

- (20) a. Există super eroi printre noi ? **Se pare că da.**  
'Are there any super heroes among us ? It seems that yes.'
- b. Nu ştiu sigur dacă în acest caz vei plăti din nou taxa, dar **presupun că nu.**  
'I'm not sure if in this case you will pay the tax again, but I suppose that no.'
- (21) a. Foloseşte Alex Velea steroizi ? **Eu ştiu că nu.**  
'Does Alex Velea use steroids ? I know that no.'
- b. Am verificat dacă supapa de la recirculare funcţionează şi **am constatat că da.**  
'I checked if the recirculation valve is working and I noticed that yes.'



- Embedded stripping under non-factives (22) and semi-factives (23) :

- (22) a. Ne-am plăcut din prima clipă când ne-am privit, a fost dragoste la prima vedere ! Nu mi s-a întâmplat niciodată, și **cred că nici lui** !  
'We loved each other from the first moment when we met, it was love at first sight ! It never happened to me, and I think that to him neither !'
- b. Sunt bine, **sper că și tu**.  
'I am fine, I hope that you too.'
- (23) a. Eu nu cred în chestii din astea fancy și **știu că nici tu**.  
'I don't believe in these fancy things and I know that you neither.'
- b. Imi plac mult florile, și **văd că și ție**.  
'I like much the flowers, and I see that you too.'

- The effects we observe in syntax with respect to factivity is not related to differences in syntactic structure (e.g. two complementizers with non-factive 'bridge' verbs vs. only one with factive 'non-bridge' verbs, cf. Haegeman 2006, de Cuba 2007, etc.).
  - The generalization based on syntactic explanations wrongly predicts the unacceptability of semi-factives in embedded contexts.
- These effects could come from other linguistic levels : semantics, discourse.
- Embedded assertions (under non-factive and semi-factive verbs) are more acceptable than embedded presupposed clauses (under true factive verbs), cf. Hooper & Thompson (1973), Hooper (1975), Farkas (2003).
- Embedded foregrounded complements are more acceptable than embedded backgrounded ones. With non-factives and semi-factives, the 'main point of utterance' (MPU, cf. Simons 2007) is its embedded complement (cf. parenthetical status), whereas with true factives, it is the embedding factive verb that contribute to the MPU.
- Discourse congruence/incongruence (cf. Reich 2007) : Embedding under a non-factive verb or a semi-factive verb does not affect the discourse coherence (it answers the same Question under Discussion as the source clause), whereas embedding under a true factive verb gives rise to a discourse incongruence (it answers a different QUD).

## Adjacency issues

- In Romanian, stripping is not necessarily subject to the adjacency condition : the stripped sequence is not required to be adjacent to its correlate (*pace* Fernández-Sánchez 2019).

⇒ **'Split conjuncts' : evidence against low (subclausal) coordination.**

- (24) a. **Paul**, [și **nu lon**], știe spaniola.  
'Paul, but not lon, speaks Spanish.'
- b. **Paul** știe spaniola, [și **nu lon**].  
'Paul speaks Spanish, but not lon.'
- (25) a. **lon** nu va veni la petrecere, [și **nici Maria**].  
'lon will not come to the party, and neither Maria either.'
- b. lon vrea **cafea** după masă, [și **nu ceai**].  
'lon want coffee after dinner, and not tea.'

## No syntactic reconstruction

- Stripping does not necessarily involve syntactic reconstruction.
  - The missing verb cannot be reconstructed after the constituent negation *nu*<sub>2</sub> or after some connectives such as *precum și* 'as well as'.

- (26) a. Ion a venit ieri, [dar **nu și Maria**].  
           'Ion has come yesterday, but not Maria.'
- b. \*Ion a venit ieri, [dar **nu și** **Maria** a  
           Ion has come yesterday but not ASSOC Maria has  
           venit].  
           come
- (27) a. Va veni Paul, [precum **și Maria**].  
           will come Paul as-well-as too Maria  
           'Paul will come, as well as Maria.'
- b. \*Va veni Paul, [precum **și** **Maria** va veni].  
           will come Paul as-well-as ASSOC Maria will come

⇒ Evidence against a PF-deletion approach of stripping.

# Content

1 Pseudostripping and stripping

2 Two different constructions

3 Towards an analysis

## Pseudostripping analysis (XP-Adv : *Maria nu*<sub>1</sub>)

- We adopt a proform analysis of pseudostripping (Krifka 2013), rather than an elliptical one (Depiante 2000, 2004, Vicente 2006, Kramer & Rawlins 2009, Holmberg 2015, Pasquereau 2020, etc.).
- Polar response particles are not the remnants of ellipsis, but rather adverbial proforms, behaving as propositional anaphors : they partly receive their interpretation through a contextually given antecedent (like an anaphorical pronoun).
- Pseudostripping sequences are therefore clauses with a non-verbal predicative head  $\Rightarrow$  polar verbless clauses.
  - The predicative head is an adverbial phrase containing a propositional adverb such as *nu* 'no' or *da* 'yes' in Romanian.
- Pseudostripping can contain only the predicative head (the adverbial phrase itself), or two phrases, the predicative adverbial phrase being preceded by a topic phrase (hanging topic, cf. Krifka 2013).

## Stripping analysis (Adv-XP : *nu<sub>2</sub> Maria*)

- The stripped sequence is an elliptical clause, but it is not derived by syntactic reconstruction (it does not involve PF deletion à *la* Merchant 2004).
- ⇒ It has a propositional content, but it lacks the predicative verbal head.
  - It only contains a contrastive focus phrase (modified by a focus-sensitive adverb).
  - When coordinated, the stripped sequence is an instance of high (clausal) coordination, and not low (subclausal) coordination.
- Stripping : clausal fragments (cf. Ginzburg & Sag 2000, Culicover & Jackendoff 2005 for short answers and sluicing). The remnant XP has to be matched with a 'salient utterance' in the preceding context.
- ⇒ A semantic reconstruction mechanism and a dedicated meaning-form rule that links a headless structure (i.e. a syntactic fragment) to a clausal meaning.
- The associative adverbs which accompany the focused remnant behave as phrase modifiers. Semantically, they behave as operators which quantify over alternatives varying in the focused position.

## Conclusions

- Homophonous forms such as the negative form *nu* 'no/not' in Romanian may give rise to two different constructions (cf. Hankamer & Sag 1976's distinction between deep vs. surface anaphora).
  - XP NEG : pseudostripping (the negative marker is an adverbial proform ; sentential negation)
  - NEG XP : stripping (the negative marker is a constituent negation)
- Ellipsis is a cover term for a variety of constructions. Some putative elliptical constructions may not involve ellipsis at all, e.g. pseudostripping cases, analyzed as polar verbless clauses.
- A construction-by-construction approach is necessary for discovering the empirical properties of each construction (syntactic, semantic, discursive and prosodic properties).
- An empirical study must be done before positing any elliptical construction in a language.



Thank you for your attention !