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1. Introduction

With regard to a coordination structure, there is a theoretical condition that assumes the conjuncts of the coordination structure should be identical syntactically and semantically, which is known as the *Symmetric Condition*¹. On the ground of this assumption, the previous researches on the *not...but* construction have only focused on the

¹ The *symmetric condition* has been discussed in many researches (Sag et al. 1985; Larson 1985; Schwartz 1999; den Dikken 2006).
balanced coordination types, in which the size of each conjunct is the same. (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 because they feel you haven't delivered on these three fronts.

As shown in examples in (1), the property of two conjuncts of the not...but construction is identical 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). In this study, however, I present some new data that seem to be contradicted to the Symmetric Condition on their surface structure, as in (2).

\(^{2}\) All of the examples in (1) came from Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). I used written corpus data only (news, magazine and academic field) in order to make sure that the floating phenomena are not a result of a production error.
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

The size and property of each conjunct in (2) are different – one conjunct is PP and the other is DP, in (2a) and one conjunct is VP and the other is PP, in (2b) – which is contrasted with the balanced coordination examples in (1). This unbalanced coordination is caused by the positional variability of the negative element not. In other words, the asymmetric coordination cases are derived because the negative element not is floated too left, in (2a) or floated too right, in (2b) from its base position.

Although the not-floating phenomena in the not...but construction has not been investigated yet, the positional variability of other coordinate markers in the correlative coordination, such as either in the either...or construction, neither in the neither...nor construction, and both in the both...and construction, have been explored by many researchers as in (3).⁵

(3) a. John either ate rice or beans.
   b. John either ate rice or he ate beans.

The previous researchers on the floating coordinate markers (either, neither and both) have argued for the way to formalize the floating

---

³ 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)
phenomenon, satisfying the Symmetric Condition on the underlying structure. They have tried many approaches, such as a movement approach, an ellipsis approach or a word order domain approach, in order to solve the issue. However, the movement approach and the ellipsis approach, which have analyzed the floating phenomenon on the level of syntax, could not provide a successful analysis on it.

In this study, the not-floating phenomena of the not...but construction will be investigated in the light of the studies on the correlative coordination and analyzed with the word order domain approach, which postulates the independent level for linearizing words. By positing the independent word order level, which is a separated level from the syntax, the limitations of the other approaches can be solved.

The present study is organized as follows. In chapter 2, the basic phenomena of the not...but construction are illustrated with some new data on the not-floating. In chapter 3, my proposal on the not...but floating phenomena will be presented through the word order domain approach and in chapter 4 a conclusion will be given.

2. Not-floating Phenomenon

As for the correlative coordination, the Symmetric Condition, which postulates that two conjuncts should be of the same linguistic sort, is assumed. However, the previous researches on the other correlative coordination showed that the Symmetric Condition can be violated on the surface, due to the floating of the coordinate markers (either, neither, and both). Similarly, negative element not in the not...but construction also can float over a sentence and demonstrates the same floating pattern as the other coordinate markers of the correlative coordination.

Specifically, the coordinate markers float in two directions – too high or too low – violating the Symmetric Condition. In the case of too high, coordinate markers are placed in the higher position, which
means too leftward, than it is supposed to be. On the other hand, in the case of *too low*, coordinate markers are located so low, which means too rightward, as to be stuck in the first conjunct, \(^6\) as with (4) and (5). (the size of the each conjunct is indicated by the underline)

(4) Floating *too high*\(^7\)
   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.

(5) 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 suggest that the same floating patterns – *too high* or *too low* – are applied to the asymmetric cases of the *not..but* construction and the new data I present support this assumption, as in (6)\(^8\) and (7).

---

\(^{6}\) Kaplan (2007) argued that *too high* cases take place more frequently than *too low* cases in *either*, *neither* and *both* by analyzing 1283 sentences from Treebank corpus (Marcus et al. 1999).

\(^{7}\) (4a) and (5a) are from Den dikken (2006). (4b), (4c), (5c) are from Hendriks (2004:126). (5b) is from Larson (1985:237).

\(^{8}\) The examples in (6) (except for (6c)) and (7a) came from *Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)*. I used only written corpus data (news, magazine and academic field) to avoid a production error.
(6) not too high cases:9
   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.10

9 While coordinate markers either, neither and both are likely to float over a determiner in too high cases, not floating over determiner is quite questionable 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) the examples of floating over a determiner are found so many in the case of either, neither and both on the internet. However, not floating over a determiner “not the man but woman” is not likely to be found on the internet.

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

Even if the example like (ii) is found in COCA, since a noun anxiety is an uncountable noun, the presence of the determiner the is ambiguous. In COCA the examples of not floating over the countable nouns were not easy to find. I assume that not floating over DP in not too high cases is rarely occurs.

10 The letters and private papers of William Makepeace Thackeray: Volume 1 (William
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.

(7) **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.\(^{11}\)
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.\(^{12}\)
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.\(^{13}\)
e. An option is to **not** sell the embargoed quantities to other foreign markets, i.e. to C, **but** to sell domestically.\(^{14}\)
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.\(^{15}\)

---


\(^{12}\) A column by Brian Jud *Brian Jud's Beyond the Bookstore* ([http://www.bookbusinessmag.com/channel/beyond-bookstore](http://www.bookbusinessmag.com/channel/beyond-bookstore))

\(^{13}\) *Sell When You See the Whites of Their Eyes!* (Steve A. Klein 2002:67)

\(^{14}\) *The economics of export embargoes: the case of the US-Soviet grain suspension* (Per Lundborg 1987:21)

\(^{15}\) *How honesty pays: restoring integrity to the workplace* (Charles E. Watson 2005:105)
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.  

In (6), not is placed too leftward from its original position whereas in (7), not is positioned too rightward from its canonical position. Additionally, the negative element not is able to float over various categories such as proposition, gerund, to-infinitive, and verb and the positional variability of not leads to the unbalanced coordination. In chapter 3, the not-floating phenomena will be analyzed in detail through the word order domain approach.

3. Proposal

In the previous chapter, I showed the positional variability of not in the not...but construction, which was able to float in two directions – too high or too low. The floating pattern of not in the not...but construction was the same as other coordinate markers of correlative coordination, such as either, neither, and both, resulting in the unbalanced coordination on the surface. However, since not is not able to float all over a sentence as in (8), there should be a restriction on the not-floating phenomena.

(8) Joe succeeded <not> by <not> selling <*>not> books <*>not>, but by buying shoes.  

---

16 “Amen, I Say to You” (Clyde A. Bonar 2007: 559)
17 The position of not in the example like (i) is observed in many literatures

(i) Joe succeeded by not selling books, but by buying shoes.
(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)
In (8), *not* in the *basic form* can be positioned before *selling*, whereas *not* cannot float down to the left edge of *books*. The *either*-floating phenomena show the same restriction.

(9)  \(<\text{either}>\) Joe  \(<\text{either}>\) ate  \(<\text{**either}>\) rice  \(<\text{**either}>\) or drank milk.

As in (9), *either* can float down before the verb *ate*, on the other hand, it is impossible to float down to the left edge of *rice*, like *not* in the *not…but* construction.

On this issue, den Dikken (2006)\(^{18}\) proposed that the coordinate marker *either* must precede a contrastive focus and it cannot follow the contrastive focus. The contrastive focus means a material which a speaker draws a hearer’s attention by contrasting with other entities which may fill the same position\(^{19}\) and, therefore, only in the context,\(^{20}\) the scope of the contrastive focus can be determined. Since a conjunction contrasts alternatives of the focus, the minimum extent of the contrastive focus can be set by identifying the structurally highest point in which each conjunct lexically come to be different (Hofmeister 2010:279). (in the example below, capitalized letters indicate the intonational focus; the interpretive scope of the contrastive focus is bracketed).

(10)  \(<\text{either}>\) Joe  \(<\text{either}>\) [\(_{\text{VP}}\) ate  \(<\text{**either}>\) RICE] or [\(_{\text{VP}}\) drank MILK].

---

\(^{18}\) *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)

\(^{19}\) Gundel and Fretheim (2004)

\(^{20}\) Den Dikken (2006:716–717) argued that by the felicitous follow up statements, the contrastive scope can be assigned.
In (10), *either* which is positioned inside the scope of the contrastive focus brings about ungrammaticality. That is, *either* which is directly adjacent to the direct object *rice* causes ungrammaticality of the sentence because the scope of the contrastive focus is VP *ate rice*. Thus, *either* has to linearly precede the scope of the contrastive focus.

The same restriction on the *either*-floating holds for the *not* floating of the *not...but* construction as well.

(11) Joe succeeded <not> in <? not> [VP selling <*not> BOOKS <*not>], but in [VP buying SHOES].

As with (11), *not* in the *not...but* construction cannot be placed within the scope of contrastive focus *selling books*. Only *not* is able to float down before the scope of contrastive focus like *either*. Therefore, *not* in the preceding positions of the contrastive focus *selling books* does not cause ungrammaticality while *not* within the contrastive focus causes ungrammaticality.

Now that the restriction of the *not*-floating phenomena is examined, the *not*-floating phenomena will be analyzed with the word order domain approach. The word order domain approach has some advantages over the other approaches such as a movement approach and an ellipsis approach.

Above all, the movement and the ellipsis approach cannot provide a successful analysis on the floating *too low* cases.

(12) John either ate rice or he ate beans.

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

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

As for the movement approach, a rightward movement should be assumed so as to explain the *either too low* case. In (12a), *either* takes a sentential initial position on its underlying structure based on the
Symmetric Condition and moves rightward to a position between a subject John and a verb ate. However, the rightward movement is unnatural under the transformational analysis and the movement approach cannot set a boundary on how low the element can be lowered. To avoid the lowering movement, Larson (1985) suggested an asymmetric coordination of VP and S for the too low cases like (12a), where the underlying base position of either is between the subject John and the verb ate and the surface position is drawn by either remaining in situ. However, the asymmetric coordination of Larson has limitations on its violation of the Symmetric Condition and on its postulating particular underlying structure only for the too low case.

Moreover, as for the ellipsis approach, it can be only applied to the too high cases not to the too low cases like (75b). Therefore, these two approaches show some limitations in explaining the both too high and too low cases and setting the restriction on floating.

However, the word order domain approach can analyze the floating phenomenon not on the level of syntax but the level of word order domain. With the word order domain approach, both too high and too low cases can be well-analyzed, not violating the symmetric condition and not affected by syntactic constraints. Moreover, with the word order domain approach, the restriction can be set on how far an element may float down, thanks to the Linear Precedence rule. Therefore, the word order domain approach will be the most appropriate in explaining the not-floating phenomena.

Hofmeister (2010) made a proposal on the either-floating phenomena by means of the word order domain approach and suggested a basic structure for either disjunction – disjunction modification construction. In the disjunction modification construction, where the left-hand daughter is either and the right-hand daughter is a disjunction or, the DOM (domain) values of each DTR (daughter) are joined together in the DOM list of MTR (mother) and shuffle together in the compacted singleton DOM list. This mechanism allows either to float down within
the disjunction and prevents other elements from intermingling with the singleton DOM list.

To explain the not floating phenomena with the word order domain approach, I propose corrective but modification construction (crtv-mod-cx), in the light of Hofmeister’s analysis.

(13) Corrective but modification construction (crtv-mod-cx)

As in (13), a HD-DTR (head-daughter) is a corrective but coordination constituent and the other DTR is a modifier not. The modifier not is specified in its lexical entry to modify the [CRTV +] element. As shown in a MTR (mother) node, the feature [CRTV +] of the HD-DTR is changed into [CRTV -] after it is merged with the modifier not. This feature changing prevents not from stacking, as in (14).

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

Moreover, the materials in the DOM list of each DTR put together in the DOM list of MTR and then shuffling takes place in the compacted singleton DOM list. With this shuffling process, not can float inside the corrective but coordination constituent and the other materials cannot be intervened inside the DOM list of MTR. Additionally, the rest of the HEAD and the VALENCE values of MTR are same as the head daughter, the corrective but coordination, because the crtv-mod-cx is a
hd-cx (headed construction).

Finally, we need to set a boundary on not floating because not must precede the scope of contrastive focus. With the LP rule which regulates that not must linearly precede the contrastive focus, the restrictions on the not floating will be well-explained, as in (15).

\[
(15) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{PHON} \\
\text{SYN}
\end{array} < \text{not} > \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{MOD} [\text{CRTV} +]\end{array} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{INFO} \rightarrow \text{STRUCT} \quad \text{CONTR} \rightarrow \text{FOC} \quad \bar{\delta}ne \rightarrow \text{list}
\end{array}
\]

The LP rule above specifies that not in the not...but construction should be placed before the entire contrastively focused materials in the same word order domain.

With corrective but modification construction (crtv-mod-cx) and the LP rule above, let’s see how not too low cases can be analyzed.

\[
(16) \quad \text{Joe succeeded} <\text{not}> \quad \text{by} <\text{not}> \quad \text{selling} <\text{not}> [\text{BOOKS}], \quad \text{but} \quad \text{by} \quad \text{selling} [\text{SHOES}].
\]

In (16), a modifier not can float down before a contrastively focused element BOOKS from its original position, a left edge of a preposition by. By means of the corrective but modification construction, the modifier not can float over within the coordination constituent by selling books but by selling shoes and then the LP rule makes the modifier not to be placed before contrastive focus books.

On the other hand, the ellipsis operation will be applied in the not too high cases as the ellipsis operation is already specified in the coordination construction (coord-cx), to explain the unbalanced coordination cases, as in (17).
(17) Coordinate construction (coord-cx)

As in (17), the ellipsis operation is applied in the DOM level. Since the shared materials in the DOM list, which are in the non-initial coordinate, cannot pass up to the DOM list in MTR, therefore, it cannot be pronounced.

There are some evidence that the *not too high* cases should be explained through the ellipsis operation, not through the movement operation like (18).

(18) Joe either ate [ t, RICE or BEANS].

(19) a. either the tenor or alto saxophone.
   b. [DP either [DP the tenor t₁] or [DP the alto t₂] saxophone, ]
   c. either, the [AP t₁, [AP tenor] or [AP alto] ] saxophone
   d. * the either tenor or alto saxophone (Kaplan 2008:298)

As Kaplan (2008) suggests, the ellipsis-based approach, (19b), posits underlyingly coordinated DPs, while the movement approach, (19c), posits underlyingly coordinated APs. Under the movement approach, *either* which appears on its base-generated position is ungrammatical, as in (19d). However, the ungrammatical position of *either* in (19d) has
nothing to do with the ellipsis approach, because it does not posit the base-generated position from the first. What’s worse, in the movement approach, the base-generated position of *either* in (19d) cannot capture the original meaning in (19a), which means two saxophones of different kinds – (19d) means a single saxophone whose attribute may be either tenor or alto. On the other hand, the ellipsis approach (19b) refers to the exact same meaning as (19a). Accordingly, it seems that the ellipsis approach is more plausible that the movement approach for the *too high* cases, considering the evidence above.

Back to the point, the unbalanced coordination of the *not too high* cases can be explained through the ellipsis operation in the *coordination construction* (*coord-cx*). Subsequently, the floating of *not* can be explained through the *corrective but modification construction* (*crtv-mod-cx*). Let’s see how it works with the example (20).  

(20) The answer lies <not> in <not> [quality] **but** [quantity].

The example (20) has balanced PP-coordination, *in quality, but in quantity* in its underlying representation. However, the shared elements of the non-initial coordinate *in* cannot pass up from its DOM list to that of the mother node by the *coordination construction* (*coord-cx*) so that the surface form *in quality, but in quantity* is drawn. In addition, the *corrective but modification construction* (*crtv-mod-cx*) and the LP rule enables *not* to float to the left edge of the contrastive focus *quantity.*

---

21 *Not*-floating pattern like (20) 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*)
4. Conclusion

In this study, the not-floating phenomenon was investigated. I regarded the not...but construction as a sort of the correlative coordination and first discovered that the negative element not in the not...but construction can float over sentences, resulting in the asymmetric coordination. In specific, not in the not...but construction showed the same floating pattern that it floats in two directions – too high or too low – as other coordinate markers. Moreover, it showed a restriction on floating that not has to float to the left edge of the contrastively focused element.

The not-floating phenomena was analyzed on the ground of the HPSG and the word order domain approach, because the other approaches such as movement approach or the ellipsis approach were not enough to explain both too low and too high cases and satisfy the symmetric condition. However, I considered the not...but construction as a coordinate construction (coord-cx), which allows the ellipsis operation and the underlying balanced coordination. Moreover, I proposed the corrective but modification construction and the Linear Precedence rule so that the negative element not can shuffle either too high or too low and precede the contrastive focus. Under the word order domain approach, both the too high and too low cases and the floating restriction on it can be well-explained because the floating phenomenon was analyzed on the level of word order domain, not on the level of syntax.

Finally, a contribution of this study is as follows. First, the not-floating phenomenon was first studied and suggested the analysis by means of the word order domain approach. In addition, this study increased the necessity of the independent level of the word order. With the word order domain approach, issues on the scrambling or the discontinuous constituency can be solved.
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