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The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the syntactic and the semantic characteristics of the not...but construction within a Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) and Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS). This thesis mainly explores a positional variability of the negative element not in the not...but construction and the mismatch between semantic scope of not in the not...but construction and its syntactic structure.

In terms of the positional variability of the negative element not, the previous studies on the not...but construction (McCawley 1991; Toosarvandani 2010, 2012; Vincente 2010) covered only balanced coordination cases. However, I discovered that the negative element not is able to float over a sentence either too high or too low direction and restricted to float only before the contrastive focus. This floating pattern is the same as other coordinate markers in the correlative coordination – such as either, neither and both – and results in unbalanced coordination sentences.

In order to explain the not-floating phenomena, I will adopt the word order domain approach, which allows the independent level of representation for ordering of words, because the previous movement approach and the ellipsis approach do not provide a successful analysis on both too low and too high cases, keeping the Symmetric Condition, and the restriction on floating. I propose corrective but modification construction based on the word order domain approach, which enables not to float either too high or too low.
Moreover, with *Linear Precedence Rules*, *not* is restricted to float by the left edge of the contrastive focus.

In terms of the syntax-semantics mismatch, it is argued that the negative element *not* in the *not...but* construction, specifically in the *basic form*, takes a sentential negation meaning while it has syntactic properties of constituent negation. To analyze the syntactic and semantic mismatch, either the previous studies assume correspondence between the syntactic structure and the semantic relations and adopt a clause-level coordination approach or the previous studies assume a subclause-level coordination approach, which is based on the other syntactic and semantic properties. However, they do not provide a successful analysis on deriving a proper surface form and the *not*-floating phenomena.

I will analyze both the sentential negation meaning and the syntactic characteristics of the constituent negation by means of Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS), which suggests a flat semantics, by separating the semantic relations from the hierarchical structure.
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1. Introduction

Concerning a coordination structure, there is a theoretical assumption that the conjuncts of the coordination structure should be identical in terms of syntactic and semantic properties, which is known as the Symmetric Condition\(^1\). Based on this assumption, the previous studies on the not...but construction have concentrated on the cases of balanced coordination only, whereby the size of each conjunct is identical, as in (1). (two conjuncts are represented underlined)

(1) The symmetric cases of the not...but construction\(^2\)

a. Third, if a man is ordering not a cocktail but a drink with nothing but ice, he wants a goddamn drink.

b. It is gentle even as it is stirred by something not gentle, but horrid, something with an evocative cover, at once fresh and old.

c. Religion and power commandeered art, not entirely, but substantially, for millennia.

d. In much of the world, human excreta are perceived not as a resource but as something to be removed.

e. I began to attend writer’s conferences -- not to win competitions but to learn from others.

f. It advanced to a position right in front of the girl, not rolling, but floating just above the ground.

g. These voters are upset not because they think you’ve gone sodalist, but

---

\(^1\) This condition has been discussed by many researchers (Sag et al. 1985; Larson 1985; Schwartz 1999; den Dikken 2006).

\(^2\) All the examples in (1) were from Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). Only written corpus data from news, magazine and academic field are used to make sure the not-floating phenomenon is not caused by a production error.
because they feel you haven't delivered on these three fronts.

The property of two conjuncts of the *not...but* construction is same as a verbal complement DP in (1a), as a modifier AP in (1b), as a phrasal adjunct AdvP in (1c), as a phrasal adjunct PP in (1d), as a phrasal adjunct VP in (1e-1f), and as a clausal adjunct S in (1g).

However, in this study, I present some of the new data that show the violation of the *Symmetric Condition* on the surface structure as in (2).

(2) *not*-floating phenomenon

a. America’s expectation lies **not** in its successes **but** its failures. ³

b. This may sound like an odd notion to a publisher, but you can achieve the most success by **not** selling your book, **but** by selling the benefits potential customers will get from your book’s content. ⁴

Unlike the balanced coordination examples in (1), the size and property of each conjunct in (2) are not identical – in (2a), one conjunct is PP and the other is DP and in (2b), one conjunct is VP and the other is PP. This unbalanced coordination is resulted from the floating of the negative element *not*. In other words, since the negative element *not* is positioned too left in (2a) or too right in (2b) from its original position, the asymmetric coordination cases are drawn.

Though the floating phenomena of *not* in the *not...but* construction has yet to be investigated, the floating phenomena ⁵ of the coordinate markers in the correlative

---

³ An example from *Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)*

⁴ A column by Brian Jud *Brian Jud's Beyond the Bookstore* (http://www.bookbusinessmag.com/channel/beyond-bookstore)

⁵ More examples on the *either, neither and both* floating are referred in the section 2.2
coordination, such as *either* in the *either...or* construction, *neither* in the *neither...nor* construction, and *both* in the *both...and* construction, as in (3), have been studied by many researchers.\(^6\)

(3)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. John *either* ate rice *or* beans.
  \item b. John *either* ate rice *or* he ate beans.
\end{itemize}

In the previous studies on the floating coordinate markers (*either*, *neither* and *both*), it has always been controversial that how to formalize this floating phenomenon, satisfying the *Symmetric Condition* on the underlying representation. They have tried many approaches to solve the issue such as a movement approach, an ellipsis approach or a word order domain approach. However, the movement approach and the ellipsis approach tried to analyze the floating phenomenon on the level of syntax but did not provide a successful analysis on the floating phenomenon.

In this study, I will investigate the *not*-floating phenomena of the *not...but* construction along the lines with the previous studies on the correlative coordination and analyze by the means of the word order domain approach, which posits the independent representation for linearizing words. By analyzing the *not*-floating phenomenon separated from the level of syntax, the limitations of the other approaches will be overcome.

Another interesting characteristic of the *not...but* construction which has intrigued previous researchers on the *not...but* construction is that the semantic scope of negative element *not* does not correspond to its syntactic structure. This semantic idiosyncrasy stems from the meaning of the *not...but* construction.

Semantically, *but* in the *not...but* construction, which will be called *corrective but*,

---

has an adversative meaning, as in (4a).  

(4) a. Joe ate not beans but rice.  \textit{Corrective but}

b. Joe is a French teacher but he has never been to France.  \textit{Counterexpectational but}

The adversative meaning of \textit{corrective but} evokes two semantic alternatives — but only one of them is true and the other is false. In other words, \textit{but} in the \textit{not...but} construction contrasts an explicitly negated statement with a positive one, $[(\neg p) \land q]$ (Toosarvandani 2010:20, 25). Thus, the \textit{corrective but} sentence (4a) is true in a state of affairs where only the one of the two alternatives is true — \textit{Joe didn’t eat beans and he ate rice}.

The adversative meaning of \textit{but} should be distinguished from a denial-of-expectation meaning of \textit{but}, which will be called \textit{counterexpectational but}. The \textit{counterexpectational but} does not entail the denial of the one of the propositions, as in (4b). Rather, it simply gives rise to implicature that the one of the propositions is somewhat unexpected given the other proposition (Vincente 2010:384). Thus, a truth condition of the \textit{counterexpectational but} sentence (4b) does not have to do with the denial of the proposition of the first conjunct. (4b) is felicitous only because it is somewhat unexpected that a French teacher has no experience in visiting France. However, since the \textit{not...but} construction has the adversative meaning, in this study I will focus on the adversative meaning of \textit{but} only.

Back to the point, the interesting point of this semantic meaning is that the negative element \textit{not} in the \textit{not...but} construction negates the whole proposition like a sentential negation meaning, even if the negative element \textit{not} follows syntactic
properties of constituent negation.

(5)  a. Joe ate not beans but rice

       b. ¬eat(beans)(joe) ∧ eat(rice)(joe)

In (5a), for example, the negative element not negates the first proposition Joe ate beans as a whole despite that it is not located in the canonical finite negation position. This syntax-semantics mismatch has aroused controversy on deciding the structure of not...but construction, whether the underlying structure should be based on its semantic interpretation or its syntactic characteristics.

I will deal with the syntax-semantics mismatch problem with Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS), which suggests a flat semantics with underspecification of scope relations, because the previous approaches allowing the correspondence between the semantic interpretation and the syntactic structure show some limitations on deriving a proper surface form and accounting for the not-floating phenomena. By differentiating the semantic interpretation from the syntactic structure with MRS, I will be able to provide an analysis both on the syntactic and the semantic characteristics of the not...but construction.

The present thesis is organized as follows. In chapter 2, the basic phenomena of the not...but construction are illustrated with some of the new data on the not-floating. In chapter 3, previous studies on the not...but construction are critically reviewed and in chapter 4, a theoretical background on the word order domain approach and Minimal Recursion Semantics is briefly introduced. In chapter 5, my proposal on the syntactic and the semantic structure of the not...but construction is presented through the word order domain approach and MRS. Finally, a conclusion is given.
2. Phenomena

In this chapter, general phenomena on the not...but construction will be presented. I will classify the not...but construction into two forms (a basic form and an anchored form). In addition, the specific floating patterns of the negative element not in the basic form will be investigated compared with other coordinate markers such as either, neither and both in the correlative coordination. Finally, the discrepancy between the syntactic and semantic characteristics of the negative element not in the not...but construction, specifically in the basic form, will be explored.

2.1. Two forms of the not...but construction

There are two different forms in the not...but construction, 8 and these two forms are divided based on the position of the negative element not, as in (6).

(6)  a. Joe ate not beans but rice                        basic form
     b. Joe didn’t eat beans but rice                      anchored form
     c. ¬eat(beans)(joe) ∧ eat(rice)(joe)                Sentential negation

In the basic form, the negative element not immediately precedes the first conjunct. In the anchored form, on the other hand, the negative element not appears in its canonical finite negation position, at the left edge of the verb phrase, where it

---

8 These are first observed by McCawley (1991), who classified the five forms of contrastive negation among which two forms included but in the not...but construction (corrective but).

(i)  a. John drank not coffee but tea. (basic form)
     b. John drank tea, not coffee. (reverse form)
     c. John didn’t drink coffee but tea. (anchored form)
     d. John didn’t drink coffee, he drank tea. (basic expanded form)
     e. John drank tea, he didn’t drink coffee. (reverse expanded form)  

(McCawley 1991:190)
optionally cliticizes onto the auxiliary verb to its left (Toosarvandani 2010:27). In other words, the anchored form means a case that the negative element not appears on the canonical finite negation position, whereas the basic form means a case that the negative element not appears on a constituent negation position.

Despite the different position of the negative element not between the basic form and the anchored form, these two forms have the semantically identical meaning – the adversative meaning that one proposition is true and the other is false. Thus, in (6), both the basic form and the anchored form have the same meaning. Joe didn’t eat beans and he ate rice.

It is interesting that the negative element in the basic form negates not the constituent it precedes but the whole proposition, considering its position. The detailed analysis on the unusual semantic interpretation of not in basic form will be presented on the section 2.3. and 5.

2.2. Not-floating in the basic form

Concerning the correlative coordination, the theoretical condition that two conjuncts should be of the same linguistic sort, the Symmetric Condition, is assumed. However, the previous studies on the other correlative coordination such as either...or, neither...nor and both...and have investigated the cases that the Symmetric Condition is violated on the surface, because of the floating of the coordinate markers (either, neither, and both). Similarly, negative element not in the not...but construction is also able to float over a sentence and shows the same floating pattern as the coordinate markers of the correlative coordination. Additionally, not-floating is discovered only in the basic form because not in the anchored form is fixed in its canonical finite negation position.
In specific, the *Symmetric Condition* is violated by the coordinate markers floating in two directions: *too high* or *too low*. In the case of *too high*, coordinate markers are located in the position that is higher, that means too leftward, than it is supposed to be. On the contrary, in the case of *too low*, coordinate markers are positioned so low, that means too rightward, as to be embedded inside the first conjunct, \(^9\) as in (7) and (8). (the size of the each conjunct is indicated by the underline)

(7) Floating *too high*\(^10\)

a. John *either* ate *rice* or *beans*.

b. These circumstances proved fortunate *both* for *myself* and *Augustus*.

c. It was his custom, indeed, to speak calmly of his approaching dissolution, as of a matter *neither* to be *avoided* nor *regretted*.

(8) Floating too low

a. John *either* ate rice or he ate beans.

b. Mary is *both* going to the wedding *and* she is attending the reception afterwards.

c. If (...) it was found to come under *neither* the category Aries (...) *nor* under the category Hog, why then the savans went no farther.

Similarly, I assume that the asymmetric cases of the *not..but* construction demonstrates theses two floating patterns – *too high* or *too low* – and the new data I

---

\(^9\) According to Kaplan (2007), *too high* cases are more frequent than *too low* cases in *either*, *neither* and *both*. Kaplan (2007) analyzed 1283 sentences on *either*, *neither* and *both* coordination from Treebank corpus (Marcus et al. 1999), among which 150 sentences were *too high* cases and 69 sentences were *too low* cases.

\(^{10}\) The examples (7a) and (8a) are from Den dikken (2006) and (7b), (7c), (8c) are from Hendriks (2004:126) and (8b) is from Larson (1985:237).
present back up this assumption, as in (9)\(^1\)\(^2\) and (10).

\[(9)\] not too high cases:\(^1\)\(^2\)

\[a.\] America’s expectation lies not in its successes but its failures.

\[b.\] She seems to have a political heart aching not for forgiveness but position.

\[c.\] He removed a folded piece of paper from his pocket and rattled off a series of numbers that made clear how he wanted the election to be seen: not as a squeaker but a rout.

\[d.\] … and sat with him till one o’clock in the morning — not drinking wine, but tea and talking metaphysics and morality.\(^1\)\(^3\)

\[e.\] And you learn a good lesson in not to trust anyone but yourself.

\[f.\] I come not to bring peace but a sword.

\[g.\] … you have to not look at age but the situation.

\(^1\)\(^2\) All the examples in (9) (except for (9c)) and (10a) were from Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). Only written corpus data from news, magazine and academic field are used to make sure the negation floating phenomenon is not caused by a production error.

\(^1\)\(^2\) Even though coordinate markers either, neither and both seem to float over determiner in too high cases, it is quite questionable if not can float over determiner in the not too high case.

\[(i)\]

\[a.\] The challenge is for either the man or woman to pretend to be a member of the opposite gender while the other answers naturally (Trading Zones and Interactional Expertise: Creating New Kinds of Collaboration, Gorman 2010:302)

\[b.\] Since neither the man nor woman speak, the robbers make themselves at home, eating the couple’s food and picking up personal belongings (Brick walls: reflections on race in a southern school district, Truitt 2006:156)

\[c.\] But through the learning process we will break down each position of a giro into its components for both the man and woman (Gotta tango, Paz and Hart 2008:106)

As in (i) either, neither and both can float over the determiner the. These kinds of examples are found so many on the internet in the case of either, neither and both. However, the same example applied to the not…but construction “not the man but woman” is not found on the internet.

\[(ii)\]

Their primary focus is not the event, but anxiety which flows from the (real or imaginary) event.

Although I found the example like (ii) in COCA, the presence of the before the noun anxiety is ambiguous because it is an uncountable noun. I searched in COCA for not floating over the countable nouns but it was not easy to find. I cannot assure that not is unable to float over DP in not too high cases but I can assure that it rarely occurs and maybe it could be caused by some intonation issues.

\(^1\)\(^3\) The letters and private papers of William Makepeace Thackeray: Volume I (William Makepeace Thackeray, Gordon Norton Ray 1994)
(10) *not too low cases:*

a. …Andrea Dornbracht, the managing director of Dornbracht, a German faucet company, reportedly declared that the future was in *not just selling products but in selling rituals.*

b. Recently, publishers have starting to wring revenue out of their traffic by selling *not ads, but by selling data* about the people trolling their sites.¹⁴

c. This may sound like an odd notion to a publisher, but you can achieve the most success *by not selling your book, but by selling the benefits potential customers will get from your book’s content.*¹⁵

d. Your role in working with your prospect is to *sell not your product or service, but to sell yourself* by finding out what it is your prospect really wants.¹⁶

e. An option is to *not sell the embargoed quantities to other foreign markets,* i.e. to C, but to *sell domestically.*¹⁷

f. …his boss told him to *not come into the office for the next week but to come by the boss's house every night* so the two men could talk.¹⁸

g. That's the persecution, a mentality that tells us to *buy not because we need, but to buy for the prestige of owning something bigger and more shiny than our neighbor's.*¹⁹

As indicated in (9) and (10), *not* is located too leftward from its canonical position

---

¹⁵ A column by Brian Jud *Brian Jud's Beyond the Bookstore* (http://www.bookbusinessmag.com/channel/beyond-bookstore)
¹⁶ *Sell When You See the Whites of Their Eyes!* (Steve A. Klein 2002:67)
¹⁸ *How honesty pays: restoring integrity to the workplace* (Charles E. Watson 2005:105)
¹⁹ “Amen, I Say to You” (Clyde A. Bonar 2007: 559)
in (9) while *not* is located too rightward from its original position in (10). In addition, the negative element *not* in the *basic form* floats in either direction over various categories such as proposition, gerund, to-infinitive, and verb, resulting in the unbalanced coordination.

In chapter 5, the *not*-floating phenomena will be analyzed in detail by means of the word order domain approach, which posits the independent level for ordering words, after comparing it with other approaches.

### 2.3. Syntax-semantics mismatch of the construction

In the previous section, we discussed that the negative element *not* in the *basic form* and the *anchored form* take the same sentential negation meaning\(^0\) while the position of the negative element *not* is different — *not* in the *basic form* appears on the left edge of the first conjunct and *not* in the *anchored form* appears on the canonical finite negation position.

\[(11)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Form</th>
<th>Anchored Form</th>
<th>Sentential Negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Joe ate <em>not</em> beans <em>but</em> rice</td>
<td>b. Joe didn’t eat beans <em>but</em> rice</td>
<td>c. ¬eat(beans)(joe) ∧ eat(rice)(joe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As repeated in (11c), semantically *not* in these two forms take the sentential negation meaning, considering the proposition *Joe ate beans* is negated, not the DP

\(^0\) The distinction between constituent negation and sentential negation is first suggested by Klima (1964). Klima (1964) draws the necessity for distinguishing the negation in English with the examples like (i) (ia), which negates the sentence as a whole, is named sentential negation while (ib), which negates a constituent itself, is named constituent negation.

(i) a. Jay didn’t go to the movies.
    b. Jay decided not to go to the movies.
constituent *beans*. However, judging from the position of *not* in the *basic form*, it is quite peculiar that the negative element *not* does not take the constituent negation meaning but the sentential negation meaning, because *not* in the *basic form* is positioned on the left edge of a phrasal element, DP *beans*. On the contrary, in the *anchored form*, since *not* is located in a canonical finite negation position, after a finite auxiliary verb, it is not difficult to infer that *not* takes the sentential negation meaning.

I suggest that the negative element *not* in the *basic form* takes the sentential negation meaning semantically, while it follows the characteristics of the constituent negation syntactically. Some could be suspicious if *not* in the *basic form* correspond to the constituent negation syntactically, so I present some independent evidences that show syntactic characteristics of *not* in the *basic form*.

First, the negative element *not* in the *basic form* can take various types of complement, as repeated in (12).

(12)

a. Third, if a man is ordering *not* a cocktail *but* a drink with nothing *but* ice, he wants a goddamn drink.

b. It is gentle even as it is stirred by something *not* gentle, *but* horrid, something with an evocative cover, at once fresh and old.

c. Religion and power commandeered art, *not* entirely, *but* substantially, for millennia.

d. In much of the world, human excreta are perceived *not* as a resource *but* as something to be removed.

e. I began to attend writer’s conferences -- *not* to win competitions *but* to learn from others.

f. It advanced to a position right in front of the girl, *not* rolling, *but* floating just
above the ground.

g. These voters are upset not because they think you’ve gone sodalist, but because they feel you haven't delivered on these three fronts.

Contrary to the finite negation, whose position is fixed after the finite auxiliary verb, the constituent negation can appear before a constituent of the various categories. Likewise, not in the basic form is able to take a variety of types of complement, such as DP in (12a), AP in (12b), AdvP in (12c), PP in (12d), VP in (12e-12f), and S in (12g).

Second, constituent negation must be lexically constrained to prevent from modifying a finite VP, but not to prevent from modifying any type of nonfinite VP – such as Verb Form (VF) present participle (prp), base (bse), and past participle (psp) – as in (13) (Kim and Sag 2001).

(13)  a.* Pat not [VP[fin] left].

    b.* Pat certainly not [VP[fin] talked to me].

    c. I saw Pat acting rude and not [VP[prp] saying hello].

    d. I asked him to not [VP[bse] leave the bar].

    e. Their having not [VP[psp] told the truth]. (Kim and Sag 2001:18)

The same phenomenon is captured in the basic form sentences as McCawley (1991) suggested that the finite V or V’ focus greatly reduces the acceptability of the basic form, whereas the nonfinite V focus does not reduce the acceptability.


    b. * Ann not [VP[fin] left the building] but the room.

d. Ann decided to not [VPbase sleep] but go on a sleep strike.

e. Ann has not [VPpsp solved] but complicated the question

As shown in (14), the negative element not in the basic form to modify the finite VP is grammatically unacceptable, no matter whether the finite VP is the focus (14a) or not (14b). On the other hand, not in the basic form can modify any type of the nonfinite VP without decreasing grammaticality. That is, the negative element in the basic form behaves the same way as any other constituent negation.

Finally, constituent negation takes various positions in English infinitives like (15).

(15) a. It was foolish for him not to have been watching more carefully.

b. It was foolish for him to not have been watching more carefully.

c. It was foolish for him to have not been watching more carefully.

d. It was foolish for him to have been not watching more carefully.

(Kim and Sag 2001:41)

The same positional variability of the negative element not is acceptable in the basic form as well, so that not can float from to-infinitive preceding position to the position before the focus, as in (16).

2 1 Some may be dubious about this floating but the same floating phenomena in the same construction are found in many literatures.

a. Nor did I say the principle of this text is that we are not to trust in human might but in God's protective care. (Michael Rydelnik 2010: 107 The Messianic Hope: Is the Hebrew Bible Really Messianic?)
b. Your safety at the present time, when your mind is tortured with doubt, is not to trust in feeling, but in the living God. (Ellen Gould White 2007: 313 This day with God)
c. We are to not trust in ourselves, but in the LORD (Richard S. Hockett 2009 83 Foundations of Wisdom)
d. It can be a constant, important, physical reminder of an important spiritual truth—to not trust in the flesh but in God who made us distinctly male and female. (Gary D Naler 2007: 42 Coverings)
e. Remember to trust not in the person but in God's Holy Spirit at work in his or her life. (Ed Delph, Alan Heller, Pauly Heller 2007:174 Learning How to Trust... Again)
f. Wright's suffering in Black Boy teaches him to trust not in external gods but in the internal genius of inspiration... (Thadious Davis 2011: 153 Southscapes: Geographies of Race, Region, and Literature)
(16) a. We learned not to trust in the person, but in the God.

b. We learned to not trust in the person, but in the God.

c. We learned to trust not in the person, but in the God.

d. The seventh figure in this particular Mesopotamian king list is recorded to have not died, but ascended into heaven.  

e. Under such a stimulus our metaphor turns out to have been not dead, but dormant.  

Therefore, judging from taking various types of the complements, modifying only the nonfinite VP and various positions in English infinitives, syntactically not in the basic form should be classified as a type of constituent negation. However, in the light of the semantic interpretation and the scopal properties, it should be classified semantically as a type of sentential negation. In section 5.3.3., an analysis on this syntactic and semantic mismatch will be presented with MRS.

---

2 3 The act of thinking (Derek Melser 2004:174)
3. Previous Studies

There have been competing arguments on the structure of the *not...but* construction. Some researchers like McCawley (1991) and Vincente (2010) argues a clause-level coordination approach while Toosarvandani (2010, 2012) argues subclause-level coordination approach in explaining the structure of the *not...but* construction. The difference stems from whether it allows the correspondence between the underlying structure and the semantic meanings. Since semantically the *not...but* construction coordinate two clausal propositions, some researchers have advocated the clause-level coordination approach, while others refuted this approach on the ground of other syntactic and semantic properties. In the following sections, the pros and cons of each approach will be weighed up.


McCawley (1991) advocated the idea that the underlying structure should reflect the semantic relations. McCawley assumed that two forms of the *not...but* construction, *anchored form* and the *basic form*, should be derived from the same clause-level underlying structure, which is based on the meaning of the *not...but* construction – between two propositions, only one of which is true, while the other is a false.

(17)

![Diagram of the *not...but* construction](image-url)
(17) represents the underlying structure of the *not...but* construction, where two Ss with a coordinating conjunction *not...but* are combined into larger S. In order to derive the appropriate surface structure, McCawley (1991) applies Conjunction Reduction (CR) to this underlying structure. Although McCawley (1991) did not specify how CR could be applied in the *not...but* construction, assuming from his previous research (McCawley 1988, 1998), CR seems to be applied in a fashion like (28).

(18) Tom drinks not water but milk.

a. 

b. 
According to McCawley (1998:272), CR takes place when two conjuncts are identical except for the one contrasting constituent. By means of CR, the shared materials are factored out and the non-shared part is turned into a conjoined constituent. For example, in the underlying structure (18a), the shared part *Tom, drink* is factored out and the conjoined NP constituent is created instead of the non-shared part *water, milk* as shown in the surface structure (18b).

However, this CR operation is quite questionable. First, it does not make sense to factor out the shared materials regardless of constituency. In (18), the shared part *Tom, drink* is moved out despite its being a non-constituent. Second, the movement of the shared part out of the coordinate structure violates the *Coordinate Structure Conditions* (CSC). Lastly, McCawley (1991:197) suggests that the *anchored form* should be derived by detaching *not* from the first conjunct and attaching it as a sister of V’, in (18b). However, detaching *not* from the coordinate structure also violates the CSC.

Thus, McCawley (1991) seems to fail to derive the proper surface forms from the identical underlying structure, which was based on the semantic structure.

### 3.2. Vincente (2010)

Vincente (2010) also advocated the clause-level coordination based on the meaning of the *not...but* construction and assumed that two surface forms stem from the same underlying structure, as McCawley (1991) did. However, Vincente (2010) adopted different mechanisms to derive the surface forms.

Above all, for the *anchored form*, Vincente (2010) applied the elliptical operation proposed by Merchant (2001, 2004a) — the remnant of ellipsis moves to the left periphery and TP is deleted at PF.
As in (19), the corrective but coordinate two CP-level conjuncts, Joe didn’t eat beans and Joe ate rice, where the negative element not is involved only in the first conjunct, so as to capture the adversative meaning. Through the elliptical operation, the remnant of ellipsis rice moves to the left periphery and the rest of the TP Joe ate is deleted, drawing the surface form Joe didn’t eat beans but rice.

On the other hand, to derive the basic form like (20), Vincete (2010) applied the adjacent initial edge coordinations of Bianchi and Zamparelli (2004) to the underlying clause-level coordination.

(20) Not a mathematician but a physicist discovered the neutron. (Vincente 2010:400)

Though the basic form sentences are hard to be derived from the clause-level coordination due to Backwards Anaphora Constraint, Vincete (2010) rejects the subclause-level coordination and sticks to the clause-level coordination, adopting an alternative analysis, adjacent initial edge coordinations. According to the adjacent initial edge coordinations, corrective but has two clausal conjuncts which are FPs
(Focus Phrase). Each TP in the FPs, except for the subject DPs, undergoes *across-the-board movement*, resulting in the subclause-level coordination on the surface structure.

However, it seems that Vincent (2010) also failed to draw the right surface forms from the clause-level coordination.

First, the elliptical operation of Merchant (2001, 2004a) cannot be applied to the anchored form because the anchored form does not satisfy Merchant’s (2001:26) eGIVENness identity constraint, as pointed out by Toosarvandani (2012).

(21) IDENTITY CONSTRAINT ON ELLIPSIS (a simplified version)

An elided phrase XP_E must have an antecedent phrase XP_A, such that modulo ∃-binding of any traces in XP_E and XP_A:

(i) XP_E entails XP_A, and
(ii) XP_A entails XP_E. (Toosarvandani 2012:25)

The *identity constraint on ellipsis* specifies that the elided and antecedent elements should mutually entail each other. However, in the assumption of clause-level coordination on the anchored form, the negative element *not* in the first coordinate prevents the mutual entailment from the second coordinate, as shown in (22).² ⁴

(22) a. [CP [TP Joe didn’t eat beans] but [CP [rice] [TP Joe ate t]]].

b. [[TP_A]] = ∃x(¬eat(x)(Joe))
c. [[TP_E]] = ∃x(eat(x)(Joe))

Second, the *basic form* is not able to be derived through the *adjacent initial edge coordinations*. As pointed out in Toosarvandani (2012), the *adjacent initial edge

---

² ⁴ According to Merchant (2008) the object DP *beer* in the first coordinate undergoes LF movement to spec CP.
coordinations cannot account for the cases like (23), where the basic form appears on a sentence-medial position.

(23) But the putting-forward, not of detailed and scientifically ‘finished’ hypotheses, but of schemata for hypotheses, has long been a function of philosophy.

(Toosarvandani 2012:10)

Since the basic form is only able to occupy a left-peripheral position under the adjacent initial edge coordinations, a sentence-medial position of the basic form phrase is not explainable.

Moreover, an explicit focused element can exist in the basic form phrase as in (24)

(Toosarvandani 2012:12).

(24) THE NEUTRON, not a mathematician but a physicist discovered.

(Toosarvandani 2012:12)

According to Rizzi (1997), all clauses contain only one FP, and in that case, the FP is occupied by THE NEUTRON. Under the adjacent initial edge coordinations, the FP position should be occupied by two conjuncts of the corrective but. How can the conjuncts of the basic form occupy the FP position which is already taken by another focused element, THE NEUTRON? Therefore, it is not plausible to assume adjacent initial edge coordinations that the corrective but coordination of the basic form should take the clausal conjuncts, FPs.

McCawley (1991) and Vincente (2010) tried to derive the surface forms from the identical clause-level coordination on the assumption that the underlying structure should reflect the semantic meanings. However, they failed to derive the right surface
forms. In the *not…but* construction, therefore, it seems that it is not the best move to assume the correspondence between the syntactic structure and the semantic meanings.

### 3.3. Toosarvandani (2010, 2012)

Unlike McCawley (1991) and Vincente (2010), Toosarvandani (2010, 2012) tried not to draw the surface forms from the clausal coordination but to suggest two different underlying forms according to syntactic and semantic properties of the *basic form* and the *anchored form*, respectively.

Above all, in the *basic form*, *corrective but* coordinates two subclause-level conjuncts without ellipsis in most of the cases\(^2\) as in (25).

\[(25)\] The structure of the *basic form*

![Diagram of basic form structure]

There are some evidences for which the *basic form* should be analyzed by using

\(^2\) In (i), *corrective but*’s first DP conjunct *not Mary* moved to sentence-initial position, which is not explainable with the subclause-level coordination approach because of the “Coordinate Structure Constraint”. Thus Toosarvandani (2012) applies the clause-level coordination in the cases like (i).

(i) Not Mary, did he invite, \(t\) but Lucy.  
(Toosarvandani 2012:17)
the subclause-level coordination.

First, the conjuncts (along with the negative element) and coordinator but form a single constituent.

(26) a. Not Hermia but Helena now I love.

b. It’s not wordplay but weaponplay that’s needed.

c. As far as I know, what Wilde’s bon mot aroused was not Proust’s indignation but his compassion.  

(Toosarvandani 2010:29)

The single constituency is proved by the constituency test – the basic form can be topicalized as in (26a), can be a focus in a It-cleft construction as in (26b), and can be a focus in a Pseudo cleft construction as in (26c). If we adopt the clause-level coordination approach in the basic form, this single constituency of the basic form cannot be explained.

Second, the basic form like (27), which occurs in the subject position, cannot be generated by the clausal coordination but by the subclausal coordination, because the Backwards Anaphora Constraint does not allow the material that precedes its antecedent in the coordination to be elided.

(27) a. Not a mathematician but a physicist discovered the neutron.  

(Vincente 2010:400)

b. * [[Not a mathematician discovered the neutron] but [a physicist discovered the neutron]].  

(Toosarvandani 2012:9)

Finally, Subject quantifiers can take scope over corrective but in the basic form, as in (28).
(28) No child ate not chard but spinach.  

‘There was no child who did not eat chard and who ate spinach.’

(Toosarvandani 2012:11)

A state of affairs in (28) is true when there was no child who did not eat chard and who ate spinach, which is expected only in the subclause-level coordination, where corrective but is within the scope of the subject quantifier. On the other hand, in the clause-level coordination, corrective but takes wide scope over the subject quantifiers and have a strong meaning as no one did not eat chard, and no one ate spinach. Thus, to capture the right interpretation in the cases like (28), the subclause-level coordination should be adopted.

On the other hand, in the anchored form, corrective but involves vP-level conjuncts with ellipsis, which was proposed by Merchant (2001, 2004a) and adopted by Vincente (2010), as in (29).

(29) The structure of the anchored form
There are some evidences for which the vP-level coordination should be assumed for the anchored form.

First, subject quantifiers can outscope corrective but in the anchored form, as well as in the basic form.

(30) No child didn’t eat chard but spinach. no > \^ 

‘There was no child who did not eat chard and who ate spinach.’

A state of affairs in (30) is true when there was no child who both did not eat chard and did eat spinach. This interpretation is possible when a quantifier in subject position takes scope over corrective but. That is, the clausal coordination cannot be a right structure in eliciting this interpretation.

Second, the identity constraint on ellipsis, which specifies the mutual entailment of the elided and antecedent elements, makes the CP-level coordination impossible, as mentioned before. Whereas, when the vP-level coordination is assumed in the anchored form as in (29), the elided vP and the antecedent vP is identical and mutually entail each other like (31) because the negative element not is not involved in the first conjunct. Thus, a correct surface form is elicited through the following vP-level ellipsis.

(31) a. \([vP_A] = \exists x \exists y(eat(x)(y))\) 
b. \([vP_E] = \exists x \exists y(eat(x)(y))\)

Contrary to the clause-level coordination approach, the subclause-level coordination approach proposed by Toosarvandani (2010, 2012) does not have trouble deriving the right surface forms because it does not assume the only one underlying structure based on the semantic relations. However, from the subclause-level
coordination approach, it is hard to capture the right semantic interpretation that two propositions are coordinated and one of which is negated, because it does not coordinate two clauses.

Toosarvandani (2010, 2012) tried to solve this semantic matter by adopting Partee and Rooth (1983)’s proposal of the generalized conjunction using a meet operator \( \sqcap \), which allows truth-functional conjunction even if subclausal constituents are coordinated. In addition, by using a complement operator \(-\), truth-functional negation can be allowed, even though it combines a subclausal constituent, as in (32).

\[
\begin{align*}
(32) \quad a. \quad X \sqcap Y &= \begin{cases} 
X \land Y, & \text{if } X \text{ and } Y \text{ are truth values} \\
\lambda Z (X(Z) \sqcap Y(Z)), & \text{if } X \text{ and } Y \text{ are functions}
\end{cases} \\
b. \quad -X &= \begin{cases} 
- X, & \text{if } X \text{ is a truth value} \\
\lambda Y (-X(Y)), & \text{if } X \text{ is a function}
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

Accordingly, the truth conditions of the corrective but and not can be equal to those of classical truth-functional meanings regardless of whether it coordinates clausal or subclausal coordinates.

It seems that Toosarvandani’s subclausal coordination approach satisfied all the syntactic and semantic properties of the not…but construction. However, the negative element not had to be positioned inside the first conjunct so as to make not take scope within the first conjunct, which makes it hard to explain the cases of the not-floating, like (33) and (34), under the basic form structure of the Toosarvandani as in (25).

(33) not too high cases:

a. America’s expectation lies not in its successes but its failures.

b. She seems to have a political heart aching not for forgiveness but position.
c. He removed a folded piece of paper from his pocket and rattled off a series of numbers that made clear how he wanted the election to be seen: not as a squeaker but a rout.

d. … and sat with him till one o'clock in the morning — not drinking wine, but tea and talking metaphysics and morality.

e. And you learn a good lesson in not to trust anyone but yourself.

f. I come not to bring peace but a sword.

g. … you have to not look at age but the situation.

(34) not too low cases:

a. …Andrea Dornbracht, the managing director of Dornbracht, a German faucet company, reportedly declared that the future was in not just selling products but in selling rituals.

b. Recently, publishers have starting to wring revenue out of their traffic by selling not ads, but by selling data about the people trolling their sites.

c. This may sound like an odd notion to a publisher, but you can achieve the most success by not selling your book, but by selling the benefits potential customers will get from your book’s content.

d. Your role in working with your prospect is to sell not your product or service, but to sell youself by finding out what it is your prospect really wants.

e. An option is to not sell the embargoed quantities to other foreign markets, ie to C, but to sell domestically.

f. …his boss told him to not come into the office for the next week but to come by the boss's house every night so the two men could talk.

g. That's the persecution, a mentality that tells us to buy not because we need.
but to buy for the prestige of owning something bigger and more shiny than our neighbor's.

As shown in (33) and (34), the negative element not in the basic form can float either a higher or a lower position. In the not too high cases, not can float higher over P, V, and to-infinitive; in the not too low cases, not can float lower than P, V, and to-infinitive. That means the size of the two conjuncts in the basic form can be different and the unbalanced coordination is possible.

However, if the negative element not is to be positioned inside the coordinate structure as Toosarvandini (2010, 2012) argues, for the not too high cases, ellipsis operations at the level of PP, TP or DP should take place to explain the different size of two conjuncts, although Toosarvandini (2010, 2012) argued that the ellipsis operations in the basic form rarely occur, as in (35b).

(35) a. And you learn a good lesson in not to trust anyone but yourself.
    b. And you learn a good lesson in not [to trust anyone] but [to trust yourself].
    c. And you learn a good lesson in not_i to trust [t_i anyone but yourself].

In (35b), the unbalanced coordination on the surface is derived from the underlying balanced VP coordination along with ellipsis. Despite that Toosarvandini (2012) argues the subclause-level coordination without ellipsis in the basic form, the elliptical operation should be posited even in the cases of the subclause-level coordination to elicit the too high cases.

Instead of the ellipsis approach, some could suggest a movement of not from its underlying structure, as in (35c). However, it is impossible to extricate not from the balanced DP coordination anyone but yourself in order to draw the unbalanced surface
form. Since the negative element not is positioned inside the DP coordinate structure, Coordinate Structure Conditions prevents not from being extricated from the coordinate structure.

What’s worse, the not too low cases are not explainable under the structure of Toosarvandini (2010, 2012) as well. Under the structure of Toosarvandini (2010, 2012), not should be lowered from adjunct position to inside the first conjunct for the not too low cases, as in (36b).

(36) a. Recently, publishers have starting to wring revenue out of their traffic by selling not ads, but by selling data about the people trolling their sites.
   b. Recently, publishers have starting to wring revenue out of their traffic [t, by selling not ads, but by selling data] about the people trolling their sites.
   c. This may sound like an odd notion to a publisher, but you can achieve the most success by not selling your book, but by selling the benefits potential customers will get from your book’s content

However, the lowering process is almost impossible because according to the Probe-Goal model, movement takes place by the EPP feature of a probe demanding an element in its c-command domain (a goal) should be remerged into its specifier position. Since a landing site of the goal is the specifier position of the probe, the surface structure (36a) cannot be derived from the lowering process like (36b).

Even if the lowering process is possible, it is not restricted how far not can be lowered. Comparing (36a) with (36c), not is lowered to the left edge of a DP ads in (36a), whereas not is lowered to the left edge of VP selling your books in (36c). The different position of not in the not too low cases cannot be explained.

Even though Toosarvandani (2012) suggested the negative element not should be located within the first conjunct in the basic form to make only the first conjunct
negated, considering *not* floating *too high* and *too low* phenomena, it does not seem to be an appropriate analysis.

In the chapter 5, I will propose a modified subclausal coordination structure for the *not...but* construction and solve the *not*-floating phenomena with the word order domain approach and analyze the semantic relations with MRS.
4. Theoretical Background

In the previous chapters, the idiosyncratic characteristics of the negative element *not* in the *not…but* construction are explored that it is able to float over a sentence and has a sentential negation scope, which does not match with its syntactic position. Before making a proposal on this matter, I will introduce a syntactic and a semantic background widely accepted in HPSG.

4.1. Word order domain approach (Reape 1994, 1996)

As discussed in the previous chapter, it is hard to capture the floating phenomena in the level of syntax. However, the HPSG approach posits another representational level that determines the linear ordering of words: the word order domain. The existence of the independent representation for the linear ordering, which is distinct from the syntactic hierarchical structure, makes it easier to analyze the floating phenomenon as well as other scrambling phenomena.

A DOM (domain) feature, representing the linear ordering of words, consists of a list of signs such as PHON (phology), SYN (syntax), SEM (semantics), and morphological FORM. Basically, elements in the DOM list of DTRS (daughters) pass up to the DOM list of MTR (mother) and Concatenation, symbolized as ⊕, takes place to make the linear order of the DOM list of MTR correspond to the hierarchical structure, as in (37). In addition, the ordering of the assembled elements in the DOM list of MTR represents the order of pronunciation.
(37) The concatenation construction

$concat - cx \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix}
MOTHER \\
DTRS
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
[DOM \delta_1 \oplus \delta_2] \\
\langle[DOM \delta_1],[DOM \delta_2]\rangle
\end{bmatrix}$

However, the ordering of the DOM list is not always invariable. The ordering could be changed through *shuffle* relation, symbolized as $O$. Kathol (2000) proposes the dissociation of linear orders with a caveat that the DOM list order of each DTR should be preserved, when shuffling takes place.

(38)

$\langle a, b \rangle \circ \langle c, d \rangle \in\begin{cases}
\langle a, b, c, d \rangle, & \langle a, c, b, d \rangle, & \langle a, c, d, b \rangle \\
\langle c, a, b, d \rangle, & \langle c, d, a, b \rangle, & \langle c, a, b, d \rangle
\end{cases}$

For example, in (38), when a DOM list order of DTR\(_1\) merges with a DOM list order of DTR\(_2\) and shuffling takes place, the possible sets of the DOM list order of MTR are only six cases, keeping the original ordering that $a$ precedes $b$ and $c$ precedes $d$.

This shuffling process can be represented by means of *Liberating construction* (Donohue and Sag 2004), which shows that the DOM list order of MTR consists of the DOM list of each DTR but the final ordering of these elements are undecided, as in (39). That means, all the combinations of the linear ordering of the elements can be accepted, theoretically.

(39) The liberating construction

$liberating - cx \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix}
MOTHER \\
DTRS
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
[DOM \delta_1 \circ \ldots \circ \delta_i] \\
\langle[DOM \delta_1],\ldots,[DOM \delta_i]\rangle
\end{bmatrix}$
If so, how could be the undesirable orderings ruled out? There are two devices that moderate this freedom: LP (linear precedence) rule and domain compaction. LP rules are language specific such as Determiner precedes Noun or Auxiliary precedes Verb in English (the precedence is symbolized as ⪽). Since LP relations in a domain should be preserved in all the other domains, even though other larger domains are built up from, the LP rules prevents some undesirable orderings from taking place.

Moreover, Domain compaction (Chaves 2007; Donohue and Sag 2004) restrains other elements from intermingling within a specific domain.

(40) The domain compaction construction

\[
\text{compacting} - cx \implies \begin{cases} \text{MOTHER} \\
\text{DTRS} \end{cases} \begin{cases} \text{DOM} < \text{DOM} \delta 1 \circ \ldots \circ \delta i \rangle ] \\
\text{⟨[DOM } \delta 1 \text{, \ldots, [DOM } \delta i \rangle \rangle} \end{cases}
\]

As in (40), since elements in the DOM list of MTR are compacted as a singleton DOM list, there is no possibility of the domain outside elements intervening inside of the compacted domain, whereas shuffling is possible inside the compacted DOM list.

In chapter 5, the floating phenomenon of not in the basic form will be handled by means of the word order domain approach.

4.2. Minimal Recursion Semantics (Copestake et al. 2005)

In the previous chapters, we discussed that the semantic interpretation of the not…but construction does not correspond with its hierarchical structure. However, with the Minimal recursion semantics (MRS) framework, this mismatch can be resolved because MRS suggests flat semantic representations without regard to the hierarchical structure. Before making a proposal on the semantic interpretation of the
not...but construction by means of MRS in the chapter 5, I will introduce the MRS framework briefly.

Basically, the flat semantic representations are embodied by the underspecification of scope relations, which means semantic distinctions are basically left unresolved.

(41) Every dog chases some white cat.
   a. some(y, white(y) ∧ cat(y), every(x, dog(x), chase(x, y)))
   b. every(x, dog(x), some(y, white(y) ∧ cat(y), chase(x, y)))

As a fully specified reading, (41) has two interpretations: one is the case that some takes wide scope (41a), the other is the case that every takes wide scope (41b). However, MRS allows the scopal possibilities between the two readings, by a partially specified structure.

(42) h1: every(x, h3, h8), h3: dog(x), h7: white(y), h7: cat(y), h5: some(y, h7, h9), h4: chase(x, y)

As in (42), h8 and h9, \(^{26}\) which are in the body positions of the quantifiers (or referred to hole), are not linked and just left open. If h8 are linked to h5 and then h9 to h4, the interpretation (41b) can be drawn. In addition, if h8 is linked to h4 and then h9 to h1, the interpretation (41a) can be derived. However, instead of making h8 = h9 = h4, h stands for handle and EPs (elementary predications) mean a relation with its arguments. Copestake et al. (2005:288) defines handles like the following:

“To take the next step to a flat representation, we want to be able to consider the nodes of a tree independently from any parent or daughters. In MRS, this is done by reifying the links in the tree, using tags which match up scopal argument positions with the EPs (or conjunctions of EPs) that fill them. We refer to these tags as handles, since they can be thought of as enabling us to grab hold of an EP. Each EP has a handle which identifies it as belonging to a particular tree node (henceforth label), and if it is scopal, it will have handles in its scopal argument positions.”
the result of which is not a tree, MRS makes the scope relations underspecified and two readings both possible.

Though MRS left the possible scope relations open, additional scopal linking constraints are necessary to avoid undesirable results like (43c) and (43d).

(43) a. Every nephew of some famous politician runs.
   b. \(< h1, \{h2: every(x, h3,h4), h5: nephew(x, y), h6: some(y, h7,h8), h7: politician(y), h7: famous(y), h10: run(x)\}, \{}\>
   c. every \((x, run(x), some(y, famous(y) \land politician(y), nephew(x, y)))\)
   d. some\((y, famous(y) \land politician(y), every(x, run(x), nephew(x, y)))\)

Accordingly, a qeq constraint \(^{27}\) (symbolized as \(=_{q}\)), which stands for equality modulo quantifiers, is added. The qeq constraint relates a hole to a label. Thus, if a handle argument \(h\) is qeq to some label \(l\), the label \(l\) fills the argument \(h\) or other quantifiers could float in between \(h\) and \(l\).

(44) \(< h1, \{h2: every(x, h3,h4), h5: nephew(x, y), h6: some(y, h7,h8), h9: politician(y), h9: famous(y), h10: run(x)\}, \{h1=q h10, h7=q h9, h3=q h5\}>\)

In (46), since the equality relations of the restriction of each quantifier \((h7=q h9, h3=q h5)\) and between the top handle and the verb \((h1=q h10)\) are specified, the undesirable results like (43c) and (43d) can be excluded, keeping the scope relation of the quantifiers unresolved.

\(^{27}\) The formal definition of qeq condition illustrated in Copestake et al. (2005:297):
   “An argument handle \(h\) is qeq to some label \(l\) just in case \(h=l\) or there is some (non-repeating) chain of one or more quantifier eps \(E_i, E_2, \ldots E_n\) such that \(h\) is equal to the label of \(E_1\), \(l\) is equal to the body argument handle of \(E_n\) and for all pairs in the chain \(E_{m-1}\) the label of \(E_{m+1}\) is equal to the body argument handle of \(E\)”
Furthermore, the qeq constraint can determine the outscope relations, as well.

(45) Every dog **probably** chases some white cat.

\[
\langle \text{h0}, \{\text{h1:every(x, h2,h3), h4:dog(x), h5:probably(h6), h7:chase(x, y), h8: some(y, h9,h10), h11: white(y), h11: cat(y)}\}, \{\text{h0= q h5, h2= q h4, h6= q h7, h9= q h11}\}\rangle
\]

Unlike non-fixed quantifiers like *every* and *some*, *probably* is a kind of fixed scopal adverb. By means of the qeq constraint, *probably* comes between the top handle (h0) and the label of the verb *chase* (h7). To put it more specifically, since the argument of the *probably* (h6) is qeq to the label of the verb *chase* (h7), the scopal relation that *probably* takes scope over *chase* can be posited.

This concept of MRS can be embodied in the HPSG framework using typed feature structures. Basically, every EP (elementary predication), which specifies a relation with its arguments, is encoded using the feature structure’s type. For example, the EP of *every* is introduced in the form of the lexical entry.

Moreover, the type **mrs** consists of features HOOK, RELS and HCONS. First, HOOK is made up of the features GTOP (global top handle) and LTOP (local top handle) that are visible to semantic functors. Second, RELS have a list of the bag of EPs, and finally HCONS introduces a list of the qeq constraints with features HARG (hole) and LARG (label).
(46) Every dog probably sleeps.

```
<\text{h1, h7, \{h2:every(x, h4, h5), h6:dog(x), h7:probably(h8), h9: sleep(x)}>, \{h1=, h7, h4=, h6, h8=, h9\}>
```

Comparing the feature-structure form with the non-feature-structure form in (46), the handle numberings of the non-feature-structure form correspond to the squared number value of the feature LBL (label) and the variable $x$ in the non-feature-structure form is replaced with the coindexation labeled with $\Box$. In addition, by not coindexing the LBL of \texttt{every} \texttt{rel} with the LTOP, it shows that \texttt{every} \texttt{rel}, as a ‘floating EP’, has an underspecified scope. Moreover, since the LARG coindexed with the LBL of \texttt{probably} is \texttt{qeq} to the HARG, which is coindexed with LTOP of the structure, \texttt{probably} takes scope over the main predicate \texttt{sleep}.
5. Proposal

In this chapter, I will propose an appropriate syntactic and semantic structure of the not...but construction, an analysis on the not-floating phenomena and a semantic interpretation of the not...but construction. Before discussing the specifics, I will explore the characteristics of the corrective but first and move on to determine the proper structure.

5.1. Lexical entry of the corrective but

Since but in the not...but construction, the corrective but, has idiosyncratic semantic and syntactic properties, they should be determined from its lexicon. Above all, corrective but should be distinguished semantically from the counterexpectational but or other buts in that it takes an adversative meaning that only one of the semantic arguments is true and the other is false.

(47)  a. Joe ate not beans but rice. \textit{Corrective but}

b. Joe is a French teacher but he has never been to France. \textit{Counterexpectational but}

As with (47), only the corrective but coordination has the adversative meaning. Accordingly, it should be specified in its lexicon that the corrective but takes semantically two arguments and the first one is negated. On the other hand, there is a syntactic characteristic of the corrective but.
(48) a. Joe ate **not** beans **but** rice  
    b. Joe didn’t eat beans **but** rice  
    c. ¬eat(beans)(joe)∧eat(rice)(joe) **Sentential negation**

As in (48), there are two different forms in the *not…but* construction, which share the same *corrective but* and the same adversative meaning. Despite that these two forms have the same *corrective but*, they are involved in a different construction. Elaborating it further, the negative element *not* in the *basic form* should be regarded as a constituent negation based on its modifying the nonfinite VP only and allowing various positions in English infinitives. Since in the HPSG approach on the negation, the constituent negation should be analyzed as a modifier, therefore, the *basic form* structure should be involved in a *head modification construction* (*hd-mod-cx*). However, *not* in the *anchored form* should be analyzed as a finite negation because it appears on the canonical finite negation position and can be contracted with the preceding finite auxiliary verb. Thus, along the lines with the HPSG analysis of the finite negation structure, which regards the finite negation as a complement of the finite auxiliary verb, the *anchored form* should be involved in the *head complement construction* (*hd-comp-cx*). (in the following sections, 5.3.1. and 5.4.1., the detailed analysis on the each syntactic structure will be presented.) Accordingly, from the lexical entry of the *corrective but*, it should be specified that there exist two different syntactic forms, which share the same adversative meaning. Let’s look into the lexical entry of the *corrective but*. 
Basically, the lexical entry of the corrective but specifies that the corrective but is a type of a conjunction. Since in the associated correlative coordination constructions, or, nor and and in the either...or, neither...nor, and both...and constructions are regarded as a con/disjunction in the previous studies, it is most likely that but in the not...but construction would be considered as a conjunction. However, I present some independent evidence that but in the not...but construction should be regarded as a conjunction.

First, corrective but is in a complementary distribution with other coordinators, as in (50).

(50) a. At the second shot he did not collapse but climbed with desperate slowness to his feet . . 

b. * At the second shot he did not collapse and but climbed with desperate slowness to his feet . . (Toosarvandani 2010:28)

Since and and corrective but are in the same grammatical function, a conjunction, it is not allowed for two elements to take the same position, as in (50b).

Second, a conjunction and must occupy the first position in the second coordinate, while a connective adverb moreover is able to take up various positions, as in (51).
(51) a. Lisa told me that it rained all week <and> that they were <and> short of food <and>.
   
   b. Lisa didn’t tell me that it rained all week <but> that they were <but> short of food <but>.
   
   c. Lisa told me that it rained all week; <moreover>, they were, <moreover>, short of food, <moreover>.  
      (Toosarvandani 2010:28)

Judging from its located positions, on the left-edge of the second coordinate, we should regard the corrective but as a conjunction rather than a connective adverb, along with its holding identical distributional restriction with the conjunction and.

Third, the second coordinate and the conjunction along with it are prevented from being fronted to the sentence initial position.

(52) a. * And the reading group, he joined the club __________.
   
   b. * But the reading group, he didn’t join the club __________.  
      (Toosarvandani 2010:28)

Likewise, the second coordinate with the corrective but cannot move to the sentence initial position.

Finally, right node raising and across-the-board relativization is applicable to the not…but construction.

(53) a. ? John collects not books about _____ but pictures of [Elvis Presley].
   
   b. ? John doesn’t collect books about _____ but pictures of [Elvis Presley].  
      (McCawley 1991:198)
(54) a. The singer [who] John collects **not** books about ____ **but** pictures of ____.

b. The singer [who] John doesn’t collect books about ____ **but** pictures of ____.

(McCawley 1991:198)

Since the *right node raising* and the *across-the-board relativization* is applied to coordinate structures, the **not**...**but** construction can be regarded as a type of the coordinate structure in spite that the acceptability of *right node raising* is slightly lowered. Accordingly, the *corrective but*, which is positioned before the second coordinate, can be considered as a conjunction. From the arguments above, we can draw a conclusion that the *corrective but* should be classified as a conjunction.

Back to the lexical entry of the *corrective but*, Secondly, the lexical entry specifies that *corrective but* takes *and* relation and two arguments, one of which has *not* relation. Since *corrective but* has the unusual semantic characteristic that between two semantic alternatives, only one of which should be true and the other should be false (\((\neg p) \land q\))], it would be natural that the only one of semantic arguments takes the *not* relation.

Thirdly, new features CRTV (corrective) and ADVS (adversative) are introduced. These two features distinguish the *basic form* from the *anchored form*. The *basic form* and the *anchored form* have the different syntactic structure – the former is involved in the *hd-mod-cx* and the latter is in the *hd-comp-cx*. Since the features CRTV and ADVS functions to specify the different syntactic construction, the *basic form* and the *anchored form*, the features should belong to the SYN.

In addition, CRTV and ADVS should be regarded as head features because they represent the core property of the *corrective but* that *corrective but* makes a *correction* on the proposition mentioned just before and makes an *adversative* meaning between two propositions. These features also distinguishes *corrective but* from other types of *buts*. 
Lastly, the features CRTV and ADVS have three values, [+ , – , none] and basically they takes + values in the lexical entry of corrective but because the corrective but has an adversative and corrective meaning.

5.2. Constructions of the corrective but coordination

As discussed before, since the corrective but is a conjunction, the corrective but coordination phrase is involved in a coordinate construction (coord-cx). Specifically, two kinds of the corrective but coordination are necessary to elicit two forms of the not…but construction because each form is involved in the different syntactic construction. Before moving on to the specific analysis, let’s look into the coordinate construction first.

Concerning the coordinate construction, there are two types of the coordinate structures, a headed type and a non-headed type. Between them, I will choose the non-headed type coordinate structure. Since it does not posit a hierarchical structure within a coordination phrase, it is easy to capture the underlying symmetry between conjuncts. Moreover, the syntactic headness is represented well under the non-headed type because the syntactic properties are inherited from each conjunct. Therefore, I will adopt the non-headed type coordinate construction (coord-cx) in (55), which is slightly modified to the non-headed version from what Beavers and Sag (2004) suggested.

---

28 In this thesis, the corrective but coordination means the conjunction corrective but and the other two conjuncts, except for the negative element not in the basic form and except for the finite auxiliary verb and the negative element not in the anchored form.
(55) Coordinate construction (coord-cx)

for $n, m \geq 0$

Basically, the coord-cx posits the symmetric coordination, as indicated by the identical SYN values in all conjuncts as with coindexation $\underline{0}$. However, the coord-cx also allows the unbalanced coordination, which is represented by an elliptical operation. The basic idea is simple – only shared left-peripheral elements in non-initial coordinates can be elided. This ellipsis occurs to the elements in the word order domain and appears in the form of the shared elements in the domain of non-initial coordinates not being passed up to the mother node. Thus, the elided elements cannot be pronounced.

However, in order to differentiate the two forms of the not…but construction, we need two kinds of the corrective but coordination, which is subtype constructions of the coord-cx. As discussed before, two forms of the not…but construction have different syntactic structures – the basic form is involved in the hd-mod-cx and the anchored form is involved in the hd-comp-cx. In the basic form, the negative element not should be added to the corrective but coordination as a modifier. On the other hand, in the anchored form, the corrective but coordination should function as a complement of the finite auxiliary verb along with the negative element not. Thus, two types of the corrective but coordination are necessary, where the negative element not is added in a
different syntactic way, so as to elicit either the basic form or the anchored form, respectively.

Accordingly, I propose two types of the corrective but coordination. First one is the corrective but basic form construction (crtv-but-bsc-cx), from which the basic form is elicited. The other one is the corrective but anchored form construction (crtv-but-ancrd-cx), from which the anchored form is elicited. Since both constructions are the subtypes of the coordination construction (coord-cx), they inherit all the features and constraints of the coord-cx.

(56)

As mentioned before, there are the feature CRTV and the feature ADVS in the lexical entry of the corrective but, which were introduced to distinguish the basic form and the anchored form. Accordingly, by modifying the value of the feature CRTV and the feature ADVS, the crtv-but-bsc-cx and the crtv-but-ancrd-cx can be distinguished.

(In the construction below, the DTR with the HEAD value conj signifies corrective but.)
(57) Corrective but basic form construction (crtv-but-bsc-cx)

\[
\left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{MOTHER} & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{SYN} \mid \text{HEAD} & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{CRTV} & + \\
\text{ADVS} & \text{none}
\end{array} \right] \\
\text{DTRS} & < \cdots \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{SYN} \mid \text{HEAD} & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{CRTV} & + \\
\text{ADVS} & +
\end{array} \right] \cdots>
\end{array} \right]
\end{array} \right]
\right]
\]

(58)

In the \textit{crtv-but-bsc-cx}, the \texttt{[ADVS +]} value turns into \texttt{[ADVS none]}, only leaving the value of the \texttt{[CRTV +]} in its MTR node. The basic form can be derived by attaching the modifier \textit{not} to the corrective but coordination that takes the values \texttt{[ADVS none]} and \texttt{[CRTV +]}.

(59) Corrective but anchored form construction (crtv-but-ancrd-cx)

\[
\left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{MOTHER} & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{SYN} \mid \text{HEAD} & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{CRTV} & \text{none} \\
\text{ADVS} & +
\end{array} \right] \\
\text{DTRS} & < \cdots \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{SYN} \mid \text{HEAD} & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{CRTV} & + \\
\text{ADVS} & +
\end{array} \right] \cdots>
\end{array} \right]
\end{array} \right]
\right]
\]

(60)
In the \textit{crtv-but-ancrd-cx}, the [CRTV +] value turns into [CRTV none] and the feature ADVS remains in the + value. The basic form can be drawn by attaching the complement \textit{not} to the corrective \textit{but} coordination that has the values [ADVS +] and [CRTV none].

Therefore, by differentiating two constructions with the features CRTV and ADVS, two different forms with different syntactic structures can be built up.

\section*{5.3. The basic form}

It has remained the main questions of this study that how to explain the \textit{not}-floating phenomena and the idiosyncratic scope of \textit{not} in the basic form. In this section, I will figure out the syntactic structure of the basic form first and then analyze the \textit{not}-floating phenomena with the word order domain approach and the idiosyncratic scope of \textit{not} with MRS.

\subsection*{5.3.1. Syntactic structure of the basic form}

As discussed earlier, two arguments have been competing each other in explaining of the structure of the basic form – the clause-level coordination (McCawley 1991; Vincente 2010) and the subclause-level coordination (Toosarvandani 2010, 2012). I suggest that the syntactic structure of the basic form should be analyzed as the subclause-level coordination, because the clause-level coordination failed to derive the right surface form\footnote{A detailed account was given in the chapter 3.} and the other syntactic and semantic properties of the basic form also can be well-explained under the subclause-level coordination approach.
First, the *corrective but* coordination along with the negative element *not* forms a single constituent, as repeated in (61).

(61) A single constituency of the *basic form*

a. *Not Hermia but Helena* now I love.

b. It’s *not wordplay but weaponplay* that’s needed.

c. As far as I know, what Wilde’s bon mot aroused was *not Proust’s indignation but his compassion*. (Toosarvandani 2010:29)

Under the clausal coordination approach, the single constituency of the *not…but* construction of the *basic form* in (61), which is proved by topicalization, *it-cleft* construction and *pseudocleft* construction, cannot be explained. Only the subclausal coordination approach is appropriate for capturing the syntactic structure of the *basic form*.

Second, the *basic form* located in the subject position can be only explained under the subclausal coordination.

(62) The *basic form* in the subject position

a. *Not a mathematician but* a physicist discovered the neutron. (Vincente 2010:400)

b. * [[Not a mathematician discovered the neutron] but [a physicist discovered the neutron]]. (Toosarvandani 2012:9)

If the clause-level coordination is assumed, to draw the surface form like (62a) the *Backwards Anaphora Constraint* cannot help but be violated as in (62b).

---

Vincente (2010) adopted *adjacent initial edge coordinations* to deal with the cases that the *basic form*
However, under the subclausal coordination, the cases that the basic form occurs in the subject position can be tightly explained without violating the Backwards Anaphora Constraint.

Finally, Subject quantifiers can take scope over corrective but in the basic form, which can be explained only under the sub-clause level coordination.

(63) The subject quantifier outscoping the corrective but

\[
\text{No child ate not chard but spinach.} \quad no > \wedge
\]

‘There was no child who did not eat chard and who ate spinach.’

(Toosarvandani 2012:11)

Since corrective but takes wide scope over the subject quantifiers in the clause-level coordination, the subclause-level coordination should be assumed to capture the right interpretation.

The clausal coordination is unable to derive the right surface form and unable to satisfy other syntactic and semantic properties suggested above, despite that the clausal coordination structure well captures the adversative meaning. Thus, I will follow the subclause-level coordination approach.
Toosarvandani (2010, 2012) suggested the subclausal basic form structure like (64), where the negative element not is embedded within the first conjunct. However, the basic form structure like (64) should be modified to capture the floating phenomenon of not in the basic form. As discussed in the section 3.3., since the negative element not is embedded inside the coordinate structure, in order to account for the positional variability of not, the embedded not should be extricated from the coordinate structure or should be lowered. However, extricating not from the coordinate structure is impossible because it violates the CSC and causes an unpredicted ellipsis. Lowering not within the first conjunct is also impossible because it is systematically inappropriate movement.

Therefore, I suggest the subclause-level coordination in the basic form, where the negative element not is located outside of the corrective but coordination to explain the positional variability of not. Furthermore, I suggest that the negative element not in the basic form should be regarded as a modifier, as in (65).
As mentioned in chapter 2, the negative element *not* in the *basic form* goes syntactically along the lines of constituent negation on the ground of taking various types of complement, not being able to modify finite VPs and various positions it takes as repeated in (66) and (67).

    d. Ann decided to *not* [VP[bse] sleep] *but* go on a sleep strike.
    e. Ann has *not* [VP[psp] solved] *but* complicated the question

(67) a. We learned *not* to trust in the person, *but* in the God.
    b. We learned to *not* trust in the person, *but* in the God.
    c. We learned to trust *not* in the person, *but* in the God.
    d. The seventh figure in this particular Mesopotamian king list is recorded to have *not* died, *but* ascended into heaven.
    e. Under such a stimulus our metaphor turns out to have been *not* dead, *but* dormant.
In the HPSG approach, the constituent negation is regarded as an adverb that modifies the embedded constituent, as in (68), because of the similarity between the constituent negation *not* and a negative adverb *never* in nonfinite verbal constructions. Furthermore, the flexibility of the constituent negation is better explained under the modifier approach than the transformational approach which assume a head-movement analysis with the fixed position of functional projections (Kim and Sag 2001:41).\(^1\)

(68) Constituent negation

![Diagram of constituent negation]

Since *not* in the *basic form* is a sort of constituent negation, *not* in the *basic form* should be regarded as a modifier in the same way as other constituent negations in the HPSG framework are analyzed.

In addition, though the negative element *not* is positioned extricated from the

\(^1\) Pollock (1989: 375) suggests that English employs Affix Movement to adjoin the infinitival marker *to* to the lower VP.

(i) a. It was foolish for him not to have been watching more carefully.
   b. It was foolish for him to not have been watching more carefully.
   c. It was foolish for him to have not been watching more carefully.
   d. It was foolish for him to have been not watching more carefully.

That is, the ordering of *not to VP* in (ia) is derived from the base ordering of *to not VP* in (ib) via Affix Movement to the marker *to*. However, Kim and Sag (2001:41) contradicts the suggestion of Pollock (1989: 375). Kim and Sag (2001:41) argues that there are potential difficulties here posed by the ECP as well as the general problem of motivating such a movement. But even leaving these concerns aside, there remains the problem of accounting for the position of *not* in examples like (ic) and (id), for neither Affix Movement nor head movement allows these orderings. Pollock (1989: 375) suggests in a footnote that the marker *to* in (ia) should be generated under Tense and the one in (ib) under Agr. But this account also fails to capture the distribution illustrated in (ic) and (id).
corrective but coordination, as in (65), it fulfills the arguments of the subcLausal coordination suggested by Toosarvandani (2012). First, the single constituency of 
not...but construction is explainable with the structure in (65) because not and the corrective but coordination form a single constituent. Second, since two conjuncts are still subclause-level in the structure that not is positioned extricated from the coordination, the basic form can occur in the subject position without violating Backwards Anaphora Constraint and also the subject quantifiers can take scope over corrective but. Thus, locating not outside of the coordination does not cause any problem in following the subcLausal coordination.

5.3.2. Not-floating phenomena

In the previous chapter, I propose that not in the not…but construction is able to float over a sentence in two directions – too high or too low - in the same way as other coordinate markers either; neither; and both in the correlative coordination, resulting in the asymmetric coordination on the surface, repeated in (69) and (70).

(69) not too high cases:

a. America’s expectation lies not in its successes but its failures.

b. She seems to have a political heart aching not for forgiveness but position.

c. He removed a folded piece of paper from his pocket and rattled off a series of numbers that made clear how he wanted the election to be seen: not as a squeaker but a rout.

d. … and sat with him till one o'clock in the morning — not drinking wine, but tea and talking metaphysics and morality.

e. And you learn a good lesson in not to trust anyone but yourself.
f. I come not to bring peace but a sword.

g. … you have to not look at age but the situation.

(70) not too low cases:

a. …Andrea Dornbracht, the managing director of Dornbracht, a German faucet company, reportedly declared that the future was in not just selling products but in selling rituals.

b. Recently, publishers have starting to wring revenue out of their traffic by selling not ads, but by selling data about the people trolling their sites.

c. This may sound like an odd notion to a publisher, but you can achieve the most success by not selling your book, but by selling the benefits potential customers will get from your book’s content.

d. Your role in working with your prospect is to sell not your product or service, but to sell yourself by finding out what it is your prospect really wants.

e. An option is to not sell the embargoed quantities to other foreign markets, ie to C, but to sell domestically.

f. …his boss told him to not come into the office for the next week but to come by the boss’s house every night so the two men could talk.

g. That’s the persecution, a mentality that tells us to buy not because we need, but to buy for the prestige of owning something bigger and more shiny than our neighbor’s.

However, there seem to be a restriction on the not-floating phenomena because not cannot float all over a sentence as in (71).

(71) Joe succeeded <not> by <? not> selling <not> books <not>, but by buying
shoes.  

In (71), *not* in the basic form can be located before *selling*, while it is impossible to float down to the left edge of *books*.

The same restriction holds for the *either*-floating phenomena.

(72)  *<either>* Joe *<either>* ate *<either>* rice *<either>* or drank milk.

As in (72), *either* is able to float before the verb *ate*, but, *either* cannot float down to the left edge of *rice*, like *not* in the basic form.

With regards to the issue, den Dikken (2006) made a proposal that the coordinate marker *either* must precede the contrastive focus and cannot follow the contrastive focus. The contrastive focus is defined as a material which the speaker calls to the hearer’s attention, by making a contrast with other entities that might fill the same position and, therefore, the scope of the contrastive focus can be identified only in the context. In addition, the minimum extent of the contrastive focus can be determined by identifying the structurally highest point where the each conjunct come to differ lexically, because conjunctions represent contrasting alternatives of the focus (Hofmeister 2010:279). (in the example below, capitalized letters indicate the  

---

3. Someone could be suspicious about the position of *not* in the example like (i).
   (i) Joe succeeded by *not* selling books, but by buying shoes.

However, *not* too low cases like (i) are observed in many literatures.

(ii) Fortunes are made by *not* selling that quick double or triple but by waiting for that five-star stock to rise 50-fold. (Forbes: Volume 135, Issues 9-13 / Bertie Charles Forbes 1985)

3. *either* is a phrasal constituent in construction with
   a. the first disjunct, attaching to it; or
   b. the first contrastive focus, attaching to
      i. the contrastive focus itself, or
      ii. a phrasal node on the θ -path projected from the first contrastive focus (den Dikken 2006:707)


3. There is no formal definition of the interpretive scope of the contrastive focus. However den Dikken (2006:716–717) suggested that there would be more than one contrastive scope assignment in the disjunction construction and the contrastive scope could be assigned by determining felicitous follow up statements.
intonational focus; the interpretive scope of the contrastive focus is bracketed).

(73)  \(<\textit{either}>\ >\textit{Joe}<\textit{either}>[\text{VP} \text{ate}<\not\textit{either}> \text{RICE}]\ or [\text{VP} \text{drank MILK}].

In (73), \textit{either} that is placed inside the scope of the contrastive focus causes ungrammaticality. Since the scope of the contrastive focus is VP, \textit{either} placed directly adjacent to the direct object \textit{rice} brings about ungrammaticality of the sentence. Therefore, whether \textit{either} floats \textit{too high} or \textit{too low}, \textit{either} must linearly precede the scope of the contrastive focus.

The restriction on the \textit{either}-floating can be applied to the not...\textit{but} construction as well.

(74) Joe succeeded <not> in <\? not> [\text{VP} \text{selling}<\not\textit{not}> \text{BOOKS} <\not\textit{not}>], \textit{but} in [\text{VP} \text{buying SHOES}].

As in (74), not in the basic form cannot float down within the scope of contrastive focus selling books. Not is able to float only to the left edge of the scope of contrastive focus as \textit{either} does. Thus, not locating in the preceding positions of the contrastive focus selling books does not cause ungrammaticality.

Now that we fully figure out the not-floating phenomena with the restriction, I will explore the not-floating phenomena with the word order domain approach for some advantages over the other approaches – a movement approach and an ellipsis approach – which were proposed to analyze the floating phenomena of the other coordinate markers.

Above all, the movement approach and the ellipsis approach have some limitations on explaining floating \textit{too low} cases.
(75) John either ate rice or he ate beans.

a. John either ate rice or he ate beans.

b. John either ate rice or he ate beans.

In the case of the movement approach, to explain the *either too low* case like (75), rightward movement should be suggested. As in (75a), *either* has the sentential initial position underlyingly under the *Symmetric Condition* and should be lowered to the position between the subject *John* and the main verb *ate* to account for the surface position. However, the lowering process is unnatural in the transformational framework and the movement approach cannot set a restriction on how low the element can be moved. In order to avoid the rightward movement, Larson (1985) posited an asymmetric coordination, VP and S coordination for the *too low* cases like (75a) – the underlying position of *either* is between the subject *John* and the main verb *ate* and the surface position in (75a) is a result of *either* remaining in situ. However, the asymmetric coordination of Larson is quite questionable in that it violates the *Symmetric Condition* and in that the particular underlying structure should be posited only for the *too low* cases – Larson (1985) assumes symmetric S-coordination for the case that *either* is located in the sentential initial position like *Either John ate rice or he ate beans*.

Moreover, it is natural that the ellipsis approach only applied to the *too high* cases and cannot be applied to the *too low* cases like (75b). Accordingly, these two approaches have some limitations in explaining the both *too high* and *too low* floating phenomena and the restriction on floating, assuming the underlying symmetric coordination.

However, under the word order domain approach, the floating phenomenon can be analyzed not on the level of syntax but on the independent level of word order
domain. Both too high and too low cases can be well-explained with the word order domain approach, assuming the underlying symmetric coordination and without regard to syntactic constraints. In addition, the word order domain approach can set a boundary on how far a material can float down thanks to the LP rule (Linear Precedence rule). Thus, the word order domain approach will be most appropriate for analyzing the not-floating phenomena.

Hofmeister (2010) analyzed the either-floating phenomena with the word order domain approach and proposed a basic structure of either disjunction, disjunction modification construction. In the disjunction modification construction, the DOM values of each DTR (either is the left-hand daughter and a disjunction is the right-hand daughter) put together in the DOM list of MTR, shuffling together in the compacted singleton DOM list. These mechanisms enable either float over inside the disjunction and keep other constituents from intermingling with the singleton DOM list.

In the light of disjunction modification construction, I propose corrective but modification construction (crtv-mod-cx) so as to enable the negative element not to float over. As discussed in the section 5.2., the coordination construction (coord-cx) assumes the symmetric coordination underlyingly and also two types of the corrective but coordination were posited – the corrective but basic form construction (crtv-but-bsc-cx) the corrective but anchored form (crtv-but-ancrd-cx) – because the basic form and the anchored form has a different syntactic structure.
Since the not-floating phenomena take place in the basic form, DTRs of the *crtv-mod-cx* are the corrective but coordination, which involves in the *crtv-but-bsc-cx* and the negative element *not*.

(77) Corrective but modification construction (*crtv-mod-cx*)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MTR} & : \begin{cases}
\text{SYN} & : \text{HEAD} [\text{CRTV} -] \\
\text{DOM} & : < [\text{DOM} \delta_1 \circ \delta_2] > \\
\end{cases} \\
\text{HD-DTR} & : \begin{cases}
\text{SYN} & : \text{HEAD} [\text{CRTV} + \text{ADVS none}] \\
\text{VAL} | \text{COMPS} & : < > \\
\text{DOM} & : \delta_2 \\
\end{cases} \\
\text{DTRS} & : \begin{cases}
\text{SYN} | \text{VAL} & : \text{COMPS} < > \\
\text{SEM} | \text{RELN} & : \text{MOD} [\text{not}_{rel}] \delta_1 \\
\text{DOM} & : \delta_1 \\
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

*Crtv-mod-cx* is a subtype of the head modification construction (*hd-mod-cx*) and inherits all the features and constraints of the *hd-mod-cx*. As with (77), the corrective but coordination constituent, which is the MTR of the *crtv-but-bsc-cx*, is specified as the HD-DTR and the modifier *not* is specified as the other DTR. Since the modifier *not* is present in the basic form not in the anchored form, the modifier *not* has to modify the corrective but coordination, from which the basic form is elicited (*crtv-but-bsc-cx*). Therefore, the modifier *not* modifies only the [CRTV +] and [ADVS none] marked element because the values [CRTV +] and [ADVS none] are present in the MTR of the *crtv-but-bsc-cx*. Moreover, the feature [CRTV +] and [ADVS none]
is turned into [CRTV -] after merged with the modifier not. This process prevents not from stacking, like (78).

(78) * Joe ate not not beans but rice.

Furthermore, the elements in the DOM list of each DTR pass up to the DOM list of MTR and then can be shuffled onto the compacted singleton DOM list. This enables not to float only inside the corrective but coordination and no other elements never to intervene in the DOM list of MTR. Since the crtv-mod-cx is a hd-cx, the rest of the HEAD and the VALENCE values of MTR are identical with the head daughter, the corrective but coordination.

Lastly, since not in the basic form cannot float down past the scope of contrastive focus, the LP rule which specifies that not always precedes the contrastive focus is necessary to restrict the not-floating phenomenon, as in (79).

(79)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PHON} & \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{SYN} \\
\text{MOD} \\
\text{ADV} \\
\text{none}
\end{array} \right]
\quad \text{CRTV} \\
\text{INFO} - \text{STRUCT} \\
\text{CONTR-FOC} \\
\delta \text{one - list}
\end{align*}
\]

The LP rule above makes sure that not in the basic form is to be positioned before the entire contrastively focused element\(^3\)\(^6\) in the same word order domain.

Now that the construction for the corrective but coordination and the appropriate LP rule are completed, not too low cases can be accounted for with the mechanisms above.

\(^3\)\(^6\) Information structure representation is expressed by the feature INFO(RMATION)-STRUCT(URE), which consists of FOCUS, CONTR(ASTIVE)-FOC(USE), and TOPIC features. Since contrastive focus values are subject to the “focus projection principles”, both narrow scope and wide scope are possible (Hofmeister 2010:295).
Joe succeeded \(<\textbf{not}>\) by \(<\textbf{not}>\) selling \(<\textbf{not}>\) \([\text{BOOKS}]\), \textbf{but} by selling \([\text{SHOES}]\).

\(80\) is an example of \textit{not too low} case. The modifier \textit{not} can float down to the left edge of the contrastive focus \textit{BOOKS} from its original position, preceding the preposition \textit{by}.

Through the corrective \textit{but modification construction} and the domain compaction, the modifier \textit{not} comes to float over inside the coordination \textit{by selling books but by selling shoes} and then the LP rule sets the boundary before the contrastive focus \textit{books} to prevent \textit{not} from floating down past the contrastive focus.
On the other hand, for the *not too high* cases, the ellipsis operation will be applied. As mentioned before, the ellipsis operation is specified on the *coordination construction* (\textit{coord-cx}), so as to explain the unbalanced coordination, repeated in (82).

Since the *corrective but basic form construction* (\textit{crtv-but-bsc-cx}) is a subtype of the \textit{coord-cx}, it is natural that \textit{crtv-but-bsc-cx} should inherit the elliptical properties.

(82) Coordinate construction (\textit{coord-cx})

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textit{coord} \text{\textit{--} MTR}} \\
\text{\textit{DOM} (\text{\textit{DOM}} \text{\textit{--} list})} \\
\text{\textit{SYM} (\text{\textit{SYM}} \text{\textit{--} list})} \\
\text{\textit{DTR} (\text{\textit{DTR} -- list})}
\end{array}
\]

for \(n, m \geq 0\)

As in (82), since this elliptical operation is applied on the DOM level, the shared materials in the DOM list of the non-initial coordinate are not to be passed up to the DOM list of MTR and never to be pronounced.

Someone may raise a suspicion that the movement approach, which moves \textit{either} from its base-generated position to the left, would be better than the ellipsis-based approach, like (83).

(83) Joe \textit{either} ate [\(t\) RICE or BEANS].

However, there are some evidences that the ellipsis-based approach is more plausible than the movement approach in the *too high* cases, as Kaplan (2008) suggests.
(84) a. **either** the tenor **or** alto saxophone.

   b. \[ DP \text{either} [DP \text{the tenor} t_i] \text{or} [DP \text{the alto} t_i] \text{saxophone} \]

c. **either** the \[ AP \text{tenor} t_i \text{or} AP \text{alto} \text{saxophone} \]

d. * the **either** tenor **or** alto saxophone  

   (Kaplan 2008:298)

The ellipsis-based approach, (84b), assumes underlyingly coordinated DPs, whereas the movement approach, (84c), assumes underlyingly coordinated APs. *Either* appearing on its base-generated position before the movement, as in (84d), turns out to be ungrammatical. However, in the ellipsis approach, *either* does not have the base-generated position from the first because it does not assume the movement of an element. What’s worse, in the movement approach, the base-generated position of *either* has a different meaning from (84a), which refers to two saxophones of different kinds. On the contrary, (84d) refers to a single saxophone whose exact nature could be either tenor or alto. However, the ellipsis approach (84b) represents the right meaning that two saxophones of different kinds. Thus, considering the acceptability of the base-generated version and meaning, the ellipsis-based approach seems more plausible for the *too high* cases.

Back to the point, in the *not too high* cases, the asymmetric coordination can be formed on the surface representation because it is involved in the *crtv-but-bsc-cx*, in which the elliptical operation is applied. Subsequently, the positional variability of *not* appears under the *crtv-mod-cx*, which enables *not* to shuffle. Let’s see how it works with the example (85).  

37 The same *not*-floating pattern as example (85) is easily discovered in many literatures.

a. The power of horn manure and horn silica lies *not* in size, **but** quality  
   (Bio-dynamic Farming and Gardening Association 1997 *Bio-dynamics: Issues 211-220*)

b. I believe the answer, in part lies in *not* the quality **but** the quantity.  
   (Society of Die Casting Engineers, North American Die Casting Association 2003 *Die casting engineer: Volume 47*)
(85) The answer lies <not> in <not> [quality] but [quantity].

The basic form above (85) is underlyingly balanced PP-coordination, in quality; but in quantity. However, the shared elements in the DOM list of the non-initial coordinate cannot pass up to the DOM list of the mother node by the crtv-but-bsc-cx, so that the elided element [in] cannot be pronounced, resulting in in quality; but in quantity. Moreover, the corrective but modification construction and the LP rule allow not to float down before the contrastive focus quantity.

5.3.3. Semantic structure of the basic form

As discussed in the previous chapters, the basic form has the adversative meaning, only one of the evoked two alternatives is negated, [(¬p) ∧ q]. Strangely enough, the
negative element *not* in the *basic form*, which is syntactically behaves like constituent negation, takes scope over the main clause, as in (86).

(86) a. Joe ate **not** beans **but** rice         (not > eat)
    b. ¬eat(beans)(joe)∧eat(rice)(joe)

Before I present the specific semantic analysis on the *basic form*, I will investigate the scope of the negative element *not* in detail. I assume that *not* in the *basic form* has the sentential negation meaning only when it is in simple sentences. Though it has not been widely discussed yet, I suggest that *not* in the complex sentences takes scope over the embedded clause, not the main clause.

(87) Joe came **not** to see Kim **but** to see Ann.
    a. Joe came not to see Kim; Joe came to see Ann.         (not > see)
    b. # Joe did not come to see Kim; Joe came to see Ann.    (# not > come)

(88) Joe succeeded **not** in selling books **but** in selling paintings.
    a. Joe succeeded not in selling books; Joe succeeded in selling paintings.
        (not > sell)
    b. # Joe didn't succeed in selling books; Joe succeeded in selling paintings.
        (# not > succeed)

In the example above, the negative element *not* in the reading (a) outscopes the embedded predicate whereas the negative element *not* in the reading (b) outscopes the main predicate. However, I assume that only the reading (a) is possible. For example,
the only possible reading in (87) is that *Joe came. It is not the case that the reason he came was to see Kim. It is the case that the reason he came was to see Ann.* On the contrary, (87b) reading is impossible. Even if it is possible, it is obviously infelicitous because the state of affair of (87b) - *Joe's coming and Joe's not-coming* - cannot take place simultaneously. For the same reason, (88) has only a single reading where *not* takes scope over the embedded predicate (88b) because it is infelicitous that *Joe succeeded and Joe didn't succeed* take place at the same time.

Therefore, the case that *not* takes scope over the main clause appears when the *basic form* coordination is non-predicative and non-VP level; the case that *not* takes scope over the embedded clause appears when the *basic form* coordination is predicative or VP level. (For convenience I refer to the former as a non-propositional coordination and the latter as a propositional coordination.)

I will analyze the semantic relations of the *basic form* with the help of MRS, which suggests a flat semantics. In the section 5.3.2., I suggested the *basic form* structure, in which the subclausal coordination is assumed and the negative element *not* is positioned outside of the corrective *but* coordination, on the ground of the syntactic and semantic properties of the *basic form*, as repeated in (89).

(89) The *basic form* structure

![Diagram](image-url)
The reason why the semantics of the *basic form* should be analyzed by means of the flat semantics is that we can draw the appropriate semantic interpretation of the *basic form* by separating the semantic interpretation from the syntactic structure.

First, since the *basic form* has the adversative meaning, only one of the evoked two propositions is negated. However, that is hard to explain from the *basic form* structure (89), where the negative element *not* is positioned outside of the corrective *but* coordination. As in (89), since the negative element *not* is a sister to the mother of two conjuncts along with the conjunction *but*, it will be natural to analyze that semantically *not* outscopes the whole coordination constituent, two conjuncts and the conjunction *but*. Even if we adopt the meet operator and the complement operator like Toosarvandani’s analysis, it is unable to make the negative element *not* take scope over only one conjunct, as long as *not* is positioned outside of the first conjunct. Accordingly, it seems to be hard to draw the right semantic interpretation based on the hierarchical structure.

Second, *not* in the *basic form* takes a different scope between the non-propositional coordination and the propositional coordination. In the non-propositional coordination, the negative element *not* should take scope at least over the main predicate (Penka 2007), in order to be interpreted as sentential negation. On the other hand, in the propositional coordination, the negative element *not* should outscope the embedded predicate. However, it is almost impossible to draw two different semantic interpretations from the identical subclausal coordination structure of (89).

Therefore, I assume that there exists the syntax-semantics mismatch of the *basic form* and MRS should be adopted to explain the idiosyncratic meaning of the *basic form* because MRS is able to draw the semantic interpretation or semantic relations regardless of the hierarchical structure.

Before getting down to the semantic interpretation of the *basic form*, I present an
example that shows how the sentential negation scope can be represented in MRS as in (90).

(90) A dog does not sleep.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{HOOK|LTOP} \\
\text{RELN} < \\
\text{HCONS} <
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{mrs} \\
\text{arg} \\
\text{body} \\
\text{LTLB} \\
\text{RSTR} \\
\text{HNDL}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{arg0} \\
\text{arg1} \\
\text{arg2}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{arg3} \\
\text{arg4} \\
\text{arg5} \\
\text{arg6} \\
\text{arg7}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

In (90), since the negative element *not* is eqq to the main predicate *sleep* (\[7=3\]), the negative element outscopes the main predicate. Moreover, the negative element *not* is eqq to the LTOP (4=5), *not* comes to take the sentential negation meaning.

Back to the point, two separate mechanisms for the propositional and the non-propositional coordination are necessary, because the semantic relations between the non-propositional coordination and the propositional coordination are fundamentally different.

Above all, the non-propositional coordination requires that the semantic relation of the main predicate should be duplicated

(91) a. Joe ate not beans but rice \((\text{not} > \text{eat})\)

\[\neg \text{eat}(\text{beans})(\text{joe}) \land \text{eat}(\text{rice})(\text{joe})\]

In spite that there is one main predicate *eat* in the surface structure, semantically one more duplicated main predicate *eat* is required to complete the adversative meaning. I propose the lexical rule of the *non-propositional corrective coordination* \[3^{9}\]

\[3^{9}\] The reason why I build up not a new construction but a lexical rule for the adversative meaning of the
for the non-propositional coordination. The core idea of the lexical rule is duplicating the RELN, which has a bag of EP of the main predicate, if the main predicate has the non-propositional corrective coordination in its DEPS list. In other words, in (91) eat relation of the main predicate ate is duplicated because the non-propositional not…but construction exists in the DEPS list of the main predicate ate.

Since the basic form is able to appear as an adjunct as well as an argument, not ARG-ST but DEPS list seems to be appropriate to capture the phenomenon.

(i) Not Joe but Ann found the dog.

Since the lexical rule of the basic form - non-predicative is applied to the main predicate which takes the not…but construction in its DEPS list, the adversative meaning of the cases like (i) can be drawn through the lexical rule.

The DEPS list was first suggested by Bouma et al. (2001). It is broader concept than the ARG-ST list and enables adjuncts to be subcategorized by a lexical item.

40 The DEPS list was first suggested by Bouma et al. (2001). It is broader concept than the ARG-ST list and enables adjuncts to be subcategorized by a lexical item.
As with (92)\(^1\), this lexical rule is applied to the main predicate, as specified by the HEAD feature verb and [AUX -], if the main predicate verb has the nonverbal and non-propositional not…but construction in its DEPS list. The not…but construction is specified by the feature CRTV and the ADVS in the DEPS list and the non-propositional property is defined by the HEAD value [non-verb ∧ PRED -]. In addition, the feature CRTV and the ADVS take the values [CRTV -] and [ADVS none] because the modifier not is attached to the corrective but coordination as a result of the crtv-mod-cx. In the case of (91), the main predicate ate undergoes this lexical rule because the main predicate ate takes NP-level coordination in its DEPS list.

Subsequently, RELN of the main predicate \(\text{L1}\) is copied and the duplicated RELN \(\text{L1}'\) is generated. That means, in the case of (91), eat relation is copied. By this process, the not…but construction comes to have two main predicates semantically. Then, by means of qeq, each conjunct of the corrective but becomes an argument of the main predicate and the copied one, respectively \((\text{L1}'=\text{L1} \quad \text{L1}'=\text{L1})\). In other words, in (91) the left conjunct beans becomes an argument of the eat relation and the right conjunct rice becomes an argument of the copied eat relation.

Now that two propositions are prepared, one of which that takes the left conjunct as its argument should be outscoped by the negative element not, so as to make the adversative meaning. Thereby putting not in the qeq relationship with the main predicate \((\text{L1}=\text{L1})\), the modifier not comes to have the sentential negation meaning. That means, in (91), the eat relation, which takes beans as one of its arguments, is outscoped by not relation.

Finally, two propositions – the eat relation outscoped by not and the copied eat relation – come to be conjoined by the coordinator but, which has and relation, \((\text{L1}=\text{L1})\).

\(^1\) According to Copestake et al. (1999), the feature RELS is composed of a list of relations such as _event_rel, _det_rel, _noun_rel and so on.
On the other hand, the propositional coordination does not require the RELN copy of the main predicates. Since there are two proposition-level conjuncts, the RELN copy process does not have to occur, even if one of them is not pronounced phonologically, as in (93).

(93) Joe came **not** [to see Kim] **but** [to see Ann].

Even though there seems to be present only one predicate-level conjunct on the surface structure, two predicate-level conjuncts ([see-rel]) exist underlingly.

I suggest that the propositional coordination should be involved in *propositional corrective but construction* (prop-crtv-cx), unlike the non-propositional coordination, which requires the lexical rule. There are some reasons why I do not propose a lexical rule for the propositional coordination.

First, in the case of the propositional coordination, it does not make sense to apply the lexical rule to the main predicate (in (93) the verb *came*) unlike the non-propositional coordination does, because the semantic relation of the main predicate is not relevant to constitute the semantic interpretation of the propositional coordination.

Second, even though the lexical rule is applied to the embedded predicate (in (91) the verb *see*), which is involved in the semantic interpretation of the propositional coordination, it is unable to capture the *not* relation because structurally there is no way

\[ [\text{not}] \]

Some may be suspicious that *the lexical rule of the basic form - non-predicative* might be applied to the higher verbs as in (i).

(i) Joe **suggests** that Mary **drink** not water but milk.

However, the lexical rule cannot be applied to the higher verb *suggest*. The features CRTV and ADVS, which specifies the *not...but* construction, cannot pass up beyond the *not...but* construction because there are no constructions or rules that makes the features CRTV and ADVS pass up to the higher nodes. Therefore, the higher verb *suggest*, which does not have the features CRTV and ADVS in its DEPS list, cannot undergo *the lexical rule of the basic form - non-propositional.*
to draw the semantic relation of the modifier *not* from the embedded predicate position.

Lastly, if the lexical rule is applied to the modifier *not*, the semantic relations of the rest of the propositional coordination (in (93) the relations of *see, Ann, and Kim*) would be overlapped in the nodes higher than the modifier *not* because the semantic relations of the rest of the propositional coordination, which are located both in their original position and in the modifier *not* position, pass up to the MTR node by *Semantic Compositionality Principle*.

For these reasons I propose the *prop-crtv-cx* for the propositional coordination. The *prop-crtv-cx* is a subtype of the *corrective but modification construction* (*crtv-mod-cx*) because the *prop-crtv-cx* is applied only to the *corrective but* construction which has propositional conjuncts. It inherits all the features and the constraints of the *crtv-mod-cx*.

(94) The construction type
The HEAD value of a HD-DTR [verb ∨ PRED+] represents that the basic form which takes verbal or predicative coordinates can be involved in this construction. In this construction, the HD-DTR is a corrective but coordination and the other DTR is the negative element not. All the RELN values of DTRS put together in the SEM of MTR, where HCONS relations are decided. Subsequently, by means of qeq, not comes to take scope over the left conjunct (2 = q 3) and then the negated left conjunct and the right conjunct conjoined by the coordinator but (6 = q 1, 7 = q 8). Thus, the adversative meaning of the not...but construction is completed.

With the example below let’s see how the semantic structure of the basic form is constructed.
A dog drank not water but milk.

For example, (96) undergoes the lexical rule of the non-propositional corrective coordination because the main predicate verb drank has the NP-level coordination not water but milk in its DEPS list. Accordingly, the main predicate verb drank undergoes the RELN copy, so that the RELN of the main predicate \([\text{L}3]\) is copied as \([\text{L}3']\).

Subsequently, the left conjunct water becomes a semantic argument of the main predicate \((\text{q} = \text{q}6)\) and the right conjunct milk becomes a semantic argument of the copied one \((\text{q} = \text{q}4)\). In addition, the uncopied main predicate, which takes the left conjunct water as its argument, is outscoped by the negative element not \((\text{q} = \text{q}5)\).

Finally, two propositions not drink water and drink milk come to be conjoined as a semantic argument of the coordinator but \((\text{q} = \text{q}10, \text{q} = \text{q}5)\).
(97) Joe succeeded not in swimming but in running.

(97) is involved in the prop-crtv-cx because the basic form is the propositional coordination, *in swimming but in running*, which is specified by the HD-DTR’s value, [PRED+]. All the RELN values of HD-DTR and the other DTR, the negative element *not*, put together in the MTR node. Subsequently, *not* is qeq to the *swim* relation \(2=q3\) to take scope over it and then *and* relation is qeq to the *not* relation and *run* relation \(6=q1, 7=q8\). Thus, the adversative meaning \([\neg \text{swim} \land \text{run}]\) is completed.

So far, we have investigated the syntactic and semantic characteristic of the basic form. First, the syntactic structure of the basic form was analyzed as the subclause-level coordination because the single constituency, locating in the subject position and the wide scope of the corrective *but* over the subject quantifier can be explained only under the subclause-level coordination. Moreover, I suggested that the negative element *not* in the basic form should be located outside of the coordination as a modifier because *not* has the properties of the constituent negation syntactically and the *not*-floating phenomenon is able to be explained without violating the syntactic
conditions.

Second, the not-floating phenomenon was analyzed under the word order domain approach. The previous movement approach and the ellipsis approach failed to provide a successful analysis on not floating in two directions – too high and too low - and failed to define the boundary of the not-floating. However, I proposed corrective but modification construction based on the word order domain approach, which allowed not to float either too high or too low and the LP rule restricted the not-floating by the left edge of the contrastive focus.

Finally, in terms of the idiosyncratic semantic meaning of the basic form, I gave a detailed account on the scope of not with the non-propositional and the propositional coordination case. Moreover, the adversative meaning of the each case was analyzed by means of the lexical rule of the non-propositional corrective coordination and the prop-crtv-cx respectively, based on MRS. By differentiating the semantic interpretation from the syntactic hierarchical structure, both the syntactic property as constituent negation and the semantic property as sentential negation could be fully explained.

5.4. The anchored form

In this section, I will investigate the syntactic and the semantic structure of the anchored form with a constraint-based approach.

(98) a. Joe didn’t eat beans but rice
    b. ¬eat(beans)(joe) ∧ eat(rice)(joe)

The syntactic and semantic structure of the anchored form has been proposed by previous researchers with the transformational approach. However, it has not been
analyzed by means of the constraint-based approach. Moreover, in the previous section, it turned out that the constraint-based approach had an advantage over the transformational approach because the not-floating phenomenon and the idiosyncratic semantic interpretation of the basic form can be well-explained under the constraint-based approach. Since the anchored form is the other type of the not…but construction and shares the same adversative meaning as the basic form, analyzing the anchored form with the constraint-based approach will enhance the uniformity of the analysis and help understating the not…but construction as a whole. Furthermore, the anchored form also shows the discrepancy between its syntactic hierarchical structure (according to the HPSG analysis on the negation) and semantic meanings, it should be analyzed by means of MRS.

5.4.1. Syntactic structure of the anchored form

On the structure of the anchored form, there have been two competing approaches – the clause-level and the subclause-level coordination approach.

(99) The clause-level coordination approach (Vincente 2010)

---
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The subclause-level coordination approach (Toosarvandani 2012)

In the clause-level coordination, Vincente (2010) argues that the corrective but coordinate two clausal conjuncts and ellipsis occurs within the second conjunct. On the other hand, Toosarvandani (2012) argues the subclause-level coordination, specifically vP-level coordination, where the vPE is deleted under identity with the vPA after the remnant in the second coordinate is raised.

I will suggest the subclausal coordination approach, specifically VP-level coordination, for the structure of the anchored form because the clausal coordination has some limitations on deriving the right surface form and accounting for the other syntactic and semantic properties, as mentioned in section 3.3.

First, a subject quantifier can take wider scope than the corrective but, repeated in (101).

(101) No child didn’t eat chard but spinach. no > ∧ (Toosarvandani 2012:29)

‘There was no child who did not eat chard and who ate spinach.’
If the clausal coordination is assumed, the corrective but outscopes the subject quantifier, therefore, the right semantic interpretation is not elicited. However, under the subclausal coordination, the subject quantifier takes scope over the corrective but and the correct interpretation can be drawn.

Second, the mutual entailment of the elided and antecedent elements is possible only under the subclausal coordination, repeated in (102) (Toosarvandani 2012:30).

(102) a. $[[vP_a]] = \exists x \exists y(eat(x)(y))$

b. $[[vP_b]] = \exists x \exists y(eat(x)(y))$

In the clausal coordination of Vincente (2010), the appropriate surface form cannot be drawn. Since the negative element not is involved in the first conjunct, the TP in the second conjunct cannot be elided under the identity constraint on ellipsis. However, the subclausal coordination is able to draw the right surface form because two $vP$-level conjuncts mutually entail each other, eliding the second conjunct.

Moreover, there is another reason that the subcalusal coordination is more proper than the clause-level coordination. The subject focus has very low acceptability in the anchored form.

(103) ?? JOHN didn’t win the 1st prize but MARY. (McCawley 1991:192)

However, there is no way to figure out the low acceptability in (104), if the clause-level coordination is assumed (Toosarvandani 2010:33).
Under the proposal of Vincente (2010), as with (104), the subject focus structure should be as acceptable as the object focus structure, because they are drawn by the same movement mechanism – by moving the subject Mary to the spec CP and deleting the rest of TP. Thus, the clause-level coordination cannot solve the low acceptability issue of the subject focus structure. On the contrary, if the subclausal coordination is assumed, there is no slot for the subject of the second coordinate, Mary. In other words, since the subject Mary cannot be located inside the second coordinate from the first, the subject focus sentence like (103) has no choice but to be ruled out.

From the arguments above, it seems to be clear that clause-level coordination is not suitable for the anchored form and the coordination should be smaller than clause-level. Thus, I suggest that the VP-level coordination be appropriate for the structure of the anchored form.

However, some could be suspicious as to why not it should be smaller than the VP-level coordination. Above all, VP-level is more suitable for the semantic

\[ (104) \]

\[
\text{butP} \\
\text{CP} \quad \text{but'} \\
\text{Joe didn’t win first prize} \quad \text{but} \quad \text{CP} \\
\text{Mary} \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{won first prize}
\]
interpretation of the *anchored form*. As discussed earlier, the *not…but* construction has semantically two propositions, which means two predicates, even though there exists only one main predicate on the surface. If we assume VP-level coordination, there are two main predicates underlyingly. Therefore, assuming VP-level coordination is more suitable for the semantic interpretation than assuming smaller size of the coordination.

In addition, the smaller coordination does not form a single constituency, as in (105).

(105) Joe didn't drink milk but water


b. * It is [milk but water] Joe didn't drink.

c. * What I didn't drink was [milk but water].

If (105) assumes DP-level coordination *milk but water* underlyingly, it should be form a single constituent. However, it seems that DP-level coordination *milk but water* does not constitute a single constituent judging from its failure on *Topicalization, It-cleft* construction and *Pseudo-cleft* construction.

Thus, taking the evidence into account, I suggest VP-level coordination for the *anchored form*. However, we need one more step to decide a specific structure of the coordination. It would be necessary to consider the function of *not* in the *anchored form*, because the HPSG approach posits two types of negation structure according to the function of a negative element, repeated in (106).
Between two types, I assume that *not* in the *anchored form* behaves like finite negation while *not* in the *basic form* syntactically behaves like constituent negation, as a modifier. First, *not* in the *anchored form* appears on the canonical finite negation position – the position right after the finite auxiliary verb. Second, *not* in the *anchored form* can be contracted with the preceding finite auxiliary verb, such as *don’t, won’t, can’t* etc., like any other finite negation element.

Accordingly, it would be appropriate to regard *not* in the *anchored form* as a sort of finite negation and follow the finite negation structure of HPSG approach, in which *not* is selected as a complement of a finite auxiliary verb or does not appear on the surface position in the case of the contracted form (Sag 2001; Kim and Sag 2001), as in (107).

4 4 The negative element *not* is bracketed because it can be contracted to the finite auxiliary verb.
Besides, we assumed that the corrective but coordination is VP-level coordination. Thus the VP-level coordination is located on the other complement position of the finite auxiliary verb completing the syntactic structure of the anchored form, as in (108).

(108) The anchored form structure

![Diagram](image)

From the structure of the anchored form, we can assume the underlying VP-level level coordination, as in (109b).

(109) a. Joe did not eat beans but rice.
    
    b. Joe did not [VP eat beans] but [VP eat rice].

Since the VP-level level coordination is involved in the crtv-but-archrd-cx, which is a subtype of the cood-cx, the shared materials in the second conjunct is elided and does not appear on the DOM list of MTR.

Now that we have all the mechanisms for the anchored form, let’s see how it works.
(110) Joe did not eat beans but rice.

As discussed, the anchored form structure is considered as the VP-level coordination and the shared element *eat* in the DOM list of the right conjunct is not pass up to the MTR. Thus, both *not* and the VP *eat beans* but *eat rice* are posited as a complement of the finite auxiliary verb. Besides, the values [CRTV +] and [ADVS +] in the coordinator *but* turns into [CRTV *none*] and [ADVS +] because the corrective but coordination is involved in the *crtv*-but-archrd-cx.

5.4.2. Semantic structure of the *anchored form*

In this section, I will propose the semantic analysis on the *anchored form* with the constraint based approach and MRS. As discussed previous chapters, the *anchored form*, also, has an idiosyntratic semantic interpretation that only one of the propositions is negated between two propositions, as in (111).
(111) a. Joe didn’t eat beans but rice.

\[ \overline{\text{eat(beans)(joe)}} \land \text{eat(rice)(joe)} \]

This semantic interpretation is quite unusual considering its syntactic structure, where the negative element *not* adjoins to the VP that is consist of two VP-level conjuncts and the *corrective but*, because it is natural that *not* take scope over two VP conjuncts along with the *corrective but* under the structure like (112).

(112) The *anchored form* structure

![Diagram of the anchored form structure]

That means, the syntactic structure of the *anchored form* does not correspond to its semantic interpretation. In order to figure out the semantic structure of the *anchored form*, I propose the corrective complementation construction (*crtv-comp-cx*), which takes the finite auxiliary verb, the negative element *not* (only in the uncontracted case) and the VP-level *corrective but* coordination as its DTRs. The reason why the finite auxiliary verb should be involved in the *crtv-comp-cx* (the construction for the semantic interpretation of the *anchored form*) as a DTR is the finite auxiliary verb, which selects the negative element *not*, includes the semantic information of *not* in its lexicon, according to the HPSG approach.
(113) The lexical entry of the uncontracted finite auxiliary verb (Sag and Wasow 2003)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SYN} & : \begin{cases} \text{HEAD} & \text{[NEG+] [SPR < z >]} \\
\text{VAL} & \end{cases} \\
\text{ARG} - \text{ST} & : < \Theta > \ominus < \text{ADVpol INDEX s2} \text{RESTR} < \text{[ARG s1]} > > \Theta \Theta \\
\text{SEM} & : \text{INDEX s2}
\end{align*}
\]

(114) The lexical entry of the contracted finite auxiliary verb (Sag and Wasow 2003)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SYN} & : \begin{cases} \text{HEAD} & \text{[NEG+] [SPR < X >]} \\
\text{VAL} & \end{cases} \\
\text{ARG} - \text{ST} & : < \Theta > \ominus < \text{RELN not SIT s2 ARG s1} > > \Theta \Theta \\
\text{SEM} & : \text{INDEX s2}
\end{align*}
\]

(113) and (114) represent the uncontracted and the contracted lexical entry of the finite auxiliary verb, respectively. In the lexical entries, the SEM of finite auxiliary verb which has the [NEG+] feature includes the semantic information of the negative element not. Specifically, in the uncontracted form, the semantic index of not (ADVpol), S₂, is identical with that of the finite auxiliary verb. In the contracted form (the finite auxiliary verb with the contracted negative suffix n't), the semantic information of not is incorporated in the SEM of the finite auxiliary verb, itself. Therefore, the construction that specifies the relation between the finite auxiliary verb and the corrective but coordination is necessary, so as to capture the accurate semantic interpretation of the anchored form.

Moreover, since the finite auxiliary verb and the corrective but coordination is in the head complement relation, the crtv-comp-cx is a subtype of the head-complement construction (hd-comp-cx), as in (115).
The construction type

In addition, as discussed in the section 5.2., two types of the corrective but coordination, `crtv-but-bsc-cx` and `crtv-but-ancrd-cx`, were proposed because of the different syntactic structure between the basic form and the anchored form. Since the anchored form is involved in the corrective complementation construction (`crtv-comp-cx`), one of the DTRs of the `crtv-comp-cx` is the corrective but coordination, which involves in the `crtv-but-ancrd-cx`, as in (116).

Now that all the background information is presented, let’s look into the corrective complementation construction (`crtv-comp-cx`) in detail to see how the
semantic interpretation of the anchored form can be represented.

(117) The corrective complementation construction (crtv-comp-cx)

In the crtv-comp-cx, the head-daughter (HD-DTR) is a finite auxiliary verb, which takes not relation in its SEM. Another DTR is the negative element not, which is bracketed to deal with both the contracted and uncontracted form. The other DTR is the MTR of the crtv-but-ancrd-cx, which makes the features CRTV and ADVS takes the values [CRTV none] and the [ADVS +] and represents that it is the anchored form coordination. In addition, the HEAD value VP indicates that it is VP-level coordination. Besides, the adversative meaning is represented by the qeq constraint in the MTR node. The left VP conjunct of the corrective but coordination is outscoped by the not relation of the HD-DTR \([10 = q 3]\) making the negated proposition. Subsequently, the coordinator but takes each proposition as its semantic argument \([6 = q 1, 7 = q 8]\). With the example below let’s see how it works.
(118) A dog didn’t drink water but milk.

Since (118) is an anchored form sentence, it is involved in the crtv-comp-cx. In the crtv-comp-cx, the HD-DTR is the contracted finite auxiliary verb *didn’t*. The negative element *not* is not included as a DTR because the finite auxiliary verb is a contracted form. The other DTR is VP-level anchored form coordination *drink water but drink milk*, which is a MTR of the crtv-but-ancrd-cx and takes the values [CRTV none] and [ADVS +]. In order to complete the adversative meaning, the left VP conjunct *drink water* is outscoped by the *not* relation \((10 = q 2, 7 = q 9)\) and then each proposition *not drink water* and *drink milk* becomes the semantic argument of the *and* relation \((7 = q 1, 8 = q 9)\). Therefore, the adversative meaning of the corrective *but* is completed.  

\[45\]

\[^{45}\text{In the basic form, I assume that *not* on the *not*...*but* construction in the complex sentences takes scope over the embedded clause, not the main clause. It seems that the same thing is applied to the anchored form.}\]

(i) Joe didn’t succeed in swimming but in running.

a. Joe succeeded not in swimming; Joe succeeded in running  
   (not > swim)

b. # Joe didn’t succeed in swimming; Joe succeeded in running  
   (# not > succeed)
Thus far, we have looked into the syntactic and semantic characteristics of the anchored form and analyzed them through the constraint-based approach. First, I suggested that the anchored form should be analyzed as VP-level coordination because the clause-level coordination was not able to explain the wider scope of the corrective but over the subject quantifier, the low acceptability of the subject focus and failed to draw the right surface form. Moreover, since the negative element not in the anchored form is regarded as a finite negation, considering its position and being contracted with the finite auxiliary verb, the VP-level corrective but coordination and the negative element not should be analyzed as a complement under the HPSG approach on the negation.

Second, I proposed the crtv-comp-cx, which is based on MRS, to figure out the mismatch between the hierarchical structure and the adversative semantic interpretation.

Finally, the same adversative meaning between the basic form and the anchored form was uniformly explained by making the negative element not only be qeq to the first proposition by means of MRS.

5.5. Data overview

Until now, I analyzed the syntactic and semantic characteristics of the not…but construction and all the mechanisms were prepared. Let’s see how the syntactic and the semantic properties of the basic form and the anchored form can be explained through theses mechanisms with examples.

In (i), the negative element not takes scope over the embedded clause, because it is infelicitous that Joe succeeded and Joe didn't succeed take place at the same time. However, my current analysis has a limitation on this matter. A further study for this matter should be followed.
(119) A dog drank not water but milk.
(119) is a basic form sentence. Syntactically, the negative element not is analyzed as a modifier which modifies the corrective but coordination water but milk (MOD [18]). Since the corrective but coordination is involved in the crtv-but-bsc-cx, the values [CRTV +] and [ADVS +] turns into [CRTV +] and [ADVS none]. Subsequently, the MTR of the crtv-but-bsc-cx and the modifier not is involved in the crtv-mod-cx and then the feature [CRTV +] turns into [CRTV -] to prevent further stacking of the negative element not. In addition, not must precede the contrastive focus water because of the LP rule. Semantically, the main predicate drank undergoes the lexical rule of the non-propositional corrective coordination. The RELN of drink is duplicated (E') and the RELN of drink which takes water as its argument becomes outscoped by not (3 = q [5]). Finally, the RELN of and takes each proposition as its argument (7 = q 10, 8 = q [5]).
(120) A dog didn’t drink water but milk.

(120) is an anchored form sentence. Syntactically, the corrective but coordination is a VP-level coordination, which is a complement of the finite auxiliary verb didn’t. Since the corrective but coordination drink water drink milk is involved in the crtv-but-anchrd-cx, the values [CRTV +] and [ADVS +] turns into [CRTV none] and [ADVS +]. Moreover, by the crtv-but-anchrd-cx, the shared material undergoes ellipsis in its DOM list of MTR to satisfy the surface form drink water drink milk. In addition, the contracted finite auxiliary verb didn’t and the corrective but coordination is involved in the crtv-comp-cx. Thus, the RELN of not takes scope over the RELN of drink which takes water as its argument (11 = q 8). Finally, the RELN of and takes each proposition as its argument (2 = q 10, 3 = q 4).
6. Conclusion

In this study, I investigated the syntactic and semantic characteristics of the *not...but* construction and mainly focused on the *not*-floating phenomena and the mismatch between syntactic structure and the semantic interpretation of the *not...but* construction.

First, the previous studies on the *not...but* construction focused on the syntactic and semantic characteristics of the *not...but* construction itself and also explored only the balanced coordination cases. However, in this study, I investigated the *not...but* construction as a kind of the correlative coordination such as *either...or, neither...nor* and *both...and* and found out that the negative element *not* in the *basic form* is able to float over sentences, resulting in the unbalanced coordination. The *not*-floating phenomena share the same floating patterns as other coordinate markers – *either, neither and both* – that *not* in the *not...but* construction can float *too high* or *too low* direction and has a restriction on floating that *not* must precede the contrastive focused element.

I analyzed the *not*-floating phenomena based on the HPSG framework and the *word order domain approach*, which allows the linearized ordering of words in the independent level of representation, because the movement approach or the ellipsis approach are unable to account for both *too low* and *too high* cases, keeping the *Symmetric Condition*, and unable to set the boundary on floating before the contrastive focus. However, I basically analyzed the *not...but* construction as a *coordinate construction (coord-cx)*, which allowed the underlying symmetric coordination, and proposed the *corrective but modification construction* and the *LP rule* and they enabled the negative element *not* in the *basic form* to shuffle *too high* or *too low* by the left edge of the contrastive focus. Since the floating phenomena were handled not on the
level of syntax but on the independent word order domain, the both directions of floating and restriction on it could be explained.

Second, the critical issue of the *not...but* construction that previous studies (Vincente 2010; Toosarvandani 2010, 2012) have worked on was the mismatch between the syntactic structure and its semantic interpretation. Elaborating it further, the negative element *not* in the *not...but* construction has a sentential negation meaning, even though *not* in the *basic form* follows syntactic properties of constituent negation. Moreover, only the first proposition should be negated both in the *basic form* and the *anchored form* despite the position of *not*. In order to figure out this mismatch of the *not...but* construction, the previous studies proposed a clause-level coordination approach, which is based on the semantic interpretation of the *not...but* construction, and a subclause-level coordination approach, which is based on the other syntactic and semantic properties. However, both approaches were not enough to solve this puzzle. The clause-level coordination approach had serious limitations on deriving the surface form, such as violating the *Coordinate Structure Conditions* (CSC) and the *identity constraint on ellipsis* and the subclause-level coordination approach of Toosarvandani (20102, 2012) was not able to account for the unbalanced coordination because the negative element *not* should be embedded inside the coordinate structure so as to make *not* negate only the first proposition. That is, this puzzle is hard to solve as long as the correspondence between syntactic structure and the semantic interpretation is assumed.

Therefore, I proposed an analysis which suggests a flat semantics using Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS). By separating the semantic relations from the syntactic hierarchical structure, I did not need to apply the clausal coordination approach for the representation of the semantic scopes and also I could modify the position of the negative element *not* in the subclausal coordination approach to match with its floating properties. In addition, I could explain the different meanings of two cases of the *basic
form, the propositional and the non-propositional coordination, with the flat semantics, MRS.

The significance of this study is as follows. First, the not-floating phenomenon in the not…but construction was first investigated and its floating pattern and floating restriction were fully analyzed with the word order domain approach. Second, I specified the semantic scope of the negative element not in the basic form in detail and investigated the syntax-semantics mismatch of the not…but construction with the flat semantics, MRS. Finally, I believe this study adds some value on increasing the necessity on the independent representation for the word order and on a flat semantics. The word order domain approach will help in solving scrambling or other discontinuous constituency issues and lightening the syntactic complexity. The flat semantics, MRS, will play an important role in figuring out the syntax-semantics mismatch such as idioms or idiosyncratic lexicon related issues and also in simplifying the scope relations.
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국문초록

영어 *not…but* 구문에 대한 제약 기반 접근

본 논문의 목적은 *not…but* 구문의 통사의미적 특성을 핵어중심 구구조 문법이론 (Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar)과 최소귀환의미론 (Minimal Recursion Semantics)을 통해 나타내는 것이다. 본 논문은 *not…but* 구문에서 부정어 *not*의 위치적 다양성과 *not…but* 구문에서 부정어 *not*의 의미적 범주와 통사적 구조간의 불일치성을 주된 탐구 사항으로 삼는다.

부정어 *not*의 위치적 다양성에 관해서 *not…but* 구문의 선행 연구들은 오직 균형적 병렬구문 (balanced coordination) 만을 다뤘었다. 그러나 본 저자는 부정어 *not*이 문장 내에서 너무 높거나 (too high) 너무 낮은 (too low) 방향으로 유동 (float) 할 수 있으며 오직 대조 초점 (contrastive focus) 전 까지만 유동이 가능하다는 제약을 발견하였다. 이 유동 양식은 *either, neither, both*와 같은 다른 상관 접속 구문 (correlative coordination)의 동위 표지 (coordinate markers)가 보여주는 양식과 동일하며 결과적으로 불균형적 병렬구문 (unbalanced coordination)을 생성하게 된다.

*Not*-유동 (*not-floating*) 현상을 설명하기 위해, 본 저자는 어순에 대한 독립적인 표시수준 (level of representation) 활용하는 어순 영역 접근법 (word order domain approach)을 사용한 것이다. 왜냐하면 이 전의 이동 (movement) 접근법과 생략 (ellipsis) 접근법은 대칭 조건 (Symmetric Condition)을 지키면서 너무 높거나 너무 낮게 이동하는 경우와 유동에 대한 제약을 잘 설명하지 못했던 때문이다. 본 저자는 어순 영역 접근법에 기반한 *corrective but modification construction*을 제안하여 이것은 *not*이 너무 높거나
너무 낮게 이동하는 것은 가능하게 할 것이다. 또한, 선형 우선 규칙 (Linear Precedence Rule)을 통해 not의 유동은 대조 초점의 왼쪽 가장자리까지로 제한된다.

 통사-의미적 불일치성에 관해서는, not…but 구문 중 basic form에서의 not이 통사적으로는 성분 부정 (constituent negation)의 속성을 가짐에 반하여 문장 부정 (sentential negation)의 의미를 가진다고 주장되었다. 이 통사-의미적 불일치성을 분석하기 위해, 선형 연구들은 통사구조와 의미 관계간의 일치성을 가정하여 not…but 구문의 의미 해석에 기반한 절 수준 병렬구조 (clause-level coordination) 접근법을 채택하거나 다른 통사-의미적 속성에 기반한 절 이하 수준 (subclause-level coordination) 병렬구조 접근법을 채택하였다. 그러나 둘 다 알맞은 표현 형태를 도출하고 not-유동 현상을 설명하는데 성공하지 못했다.

 본 저자는 문장 부정 의미와 성분 부정의 통사적 특성 둘 다를 통사와 의미 간의 일치성을 가정하지 않음으로써 평면 의미론 (flat semantics)을 제시하는 최소귀환의미론을 통해 설명할 것이다.

주요어 : not…but 구문, 핵어중심 구구조 문법이론, 최소귀환의미론, 어순 영역 접근법, 유동, coord-cx
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