Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, **Vol 24, December 2024, pp. 1353-1371**
DOI: 10.15738/kjell.24..202412.1353

KOREAN JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

ISSN: 1598-1398 / e-ISSN 2586-7474

http://journal.kasell.or.kr

Remarks on the Corrective *But* Construction*

Bum-Sik Park (Dongguk University) · **Sei-Rang Oh** (Gyeongsang National University) · **Philip Yoongoo Jung** (Dongguk University)

Received: November 8, 2024
Revised: December 4, 2024
Accepted: December 10, 2024

Bum-Sik Park (First author)
Professor, Dongguk University
Email: bumsikpark@dongguk.edu

Sei-Rang Oh (Corresponding author)
Professor, Gyeongsang National University
Email: seirangoh@gnu.ac.kr

Philip Yoongoo Jung
Ph.D. Candidate, Dongguk University
Email: yoongoo.jung@gmail.com

*We are very grateful to the two anonymous reviewers of *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* for their helpful comments and suggestions.

ABSTRACT

Park, Bum-Sik, Sei-Rang Oh and Philip Yoongoo Jung. 2024. Remarks on the corrective *but* construction. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 24, 1353-1371.

This paper discusses the two types of corrective *but* construction in English: the anchored form and the basic form (McCawley 1991, 1998). Toosarvandani (2013) claims that the anchored form (e.g., *John didn't drink coffee, but tea*) invariably involves vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis. However, challenging this claim, we argue that the derivational possibilities of the anchored form are contingent on the types of negation. In particular, we show that while the anchored form with constituent negation can involve vP-coordination in certain contexts, the one with sentential negation cannot. In line with previous analyses (McCawley 1998, Park et al. 2021a, Vicente 2010), we further demonstrate that the anchored form can involve coordination of larger constituents such as TP and T', to which certain ellipsis processes apply (such as clausal ellipsis and Left-Edge Ellipsis). Regarding the basic form (e.g., *John drank not coffee but tea*), we argue that it can also involve TP and T'-coordination and can be derived in the same way as the anchored form. However, irrespective of the type of negation, it cannot involve vP-coordination, unlike the anchored form. Our discussion of the two types of the corrective *but* construction has certain implications for identity/recoverability on ellipsis. Observing that negation can be disregarded for the purpose of identity/recoverability, we suggest that this effect arises from a unique restriction in the corrective *but* construction, one that requires both conjuncts to bear opposite polarity.

KEYWORDS

corrective *but*, anchored form, basic form, coordination, negation, ellipsis, identity

1. Introduction

This paper discusses the corrective *but* construction in English. As discussed by McCawley (1991, 1998), English allows two types of the corrective *but* construction: the anchored form (1a) and the basic form (1b). In this paper, following McCawley (1998), we distinguish these two forms, based on the contrast illustrated in (2): the anchored form does not require *but*-coordination as in (2a), whereas the basic form does, as in (2b). Semantically, the two forms are equivalent, both conveying a corrective meaning (Toosarvandani 2013): (1a) and (1b) are both true in case John didn't drink coffee and he drank tea, as shown in the translation (3):

(1) a. John didn't drink coffee but tea. [anchored form, McCawley 1998, p. 613]
b. John drank not coffee but tea. [basic form, McCawley 1998, p. 613]

(2) a. John didn't drink coffee (but tea).
b. John drank not coffee *(but tea).

(3) ¬ drank(coffee)(john) ∧ drank(tea)(john)

With respect to their syntax, two main approaches have been proposed. Vicente (2010) argues that the two forms uniformly involve clausal coordination, followed by clausal ellipsis in the second conjunct. In contrast, Toosarvandani (2013) puts forward distinct analyses of the two forms: while the basic form (1b) can involve DP-coordination or clausal coordination, the anchored form (1a) can only involve vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis.

In this paper, we argue against Toosarvandani's (2013) account for the two forms. First, we show that, the anchored form (1a) does not involve vP-coordination or vP-ellipsis, but rather involves coordination of larger constituents: in particular, we demonstrate, in line with Vicente (2010) and Park et al. (2021a), that (1a) can be derived with clausal coordination and with T'-coordination. It is shown that subsequent application of ellipsis processes (such as clausal ellipsis and Left-Edge ellipsis) derives the anchored form (1a). We also show that negation plays a crucial role in deriving the otherwise unallowable vP-coordination in the anchored form. Building on our findings regarding the anchored form, we further argue that the basic form (1b) can be derived in the same way as the anchored form (1a). The proposed analysis has certain implications for the notion of identity/recoverability in the corrective *but* construction.

The structure of this paper is as follows: Section 2 discusses previous analyses. Section 3 explores derivational possibilities of the anchored form and their implications for identity. Section 4 examines the basic form. Section 5 concludes this paper.

2. Previous Analyses

This section introduces Vicente's (2010) and Toosarvandani's (2013) analyses of the two forms of the corrective *but* construction. Vicente (2010) proposes that the two forms uniformly involve clausal coordination and clausal ellipsis, as shown in (4) and (5). Specifically, Vicente argues that in both (4a) and (5a), the second conjunct is underlyingly a clause (i.e., TP). The object, *spinach*, in the second conjunct moves out of the clause in overt syntax, followed by clausal (TP) ellipsis, in a similar way to derive fragments (Merchant 2004):

(4) a. John doesn't eat chard, but spinach. [anchored form]
b. [John doesn't eat chard] but [spinach$_i$ ~~[$_{TP}$ he eats t$_i$]~~].

(5) a. John eats not chard, but spinach. [basic form]
b. [John eats not chard] but [spinach$_i$ ~~[$_{TP}$ he eats t$_i$]~~].

Toosarvandani (2013) argues against Vicente's (2010) uniform approach to the two forms. Assuming Merchant's (2001) semantic identity condition, Toosarvandani claims that TP-ellipsis in (4b) is not allowed, even under the assumption that the object, *chard*, in the first conjunct covertly moves out of its clause, as illustrated in (6). This is because negation is contained only in the first conjunct, failing to satisfy the identity condition:[1]

(6) [chard$_j$ [$_{TP}$ John does**n't** eat t$_j$]] but [spinach$_i$ ~~[$_{TP}$ he eats t$_i$]~~].
covert movement overt movement

Toosarvandani claims that the anchored form (4a) involves vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis. Its derivation is shown in (7), with irrelevant parts suppressed. In both vP-conjuncts, the object raises and adjoins to vP, and in the first conjunct, functioning as constituent negation, the negator *not* is adjoined to vP. The smallest vPs in both conjunct (shaded) are semantically identical, and thus vP-ellipsis in the second conjunct is permitted. This analysis straightforwardly captures the scope fact in (8), where the quantified subject, *at most five students*, can take wide scope over conjunction (see Section 3 for further discussion). However, Vicente's clausal coordination analysis cannot account for this reading:

(7) *vP-coordination/ellipsis analysis of (4a), Toosarvandani (2013)*
John T-does [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ **n't** [$_{vP}$ chard$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat t$_i$]]]] but [$_{vP}$ spinach$_j$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eats t$_j$]]~~]].
covert movement overt movement

(8) At most five students didn't drink the whisky but the gin. [Toosarvandani 2013, (91b)]
'There were at most five students who did not drink the whisky and who drank the gin.'
[*at most five* > ∧]

Regarding the basic form (5a), Toosarvandani argues that it allows DP-coordination without ellipsis, as in (9). In (9), the negator functions as constituent negation inside the first DP conjunct. This correctly predicts that the scope fact of the basic form (10) patterns with that of the anchored form (8). Toosarvandani's claim that the basic form in general can coordinate smaller constituents of various kinds comes from data as in (11) (taken from Toosarvandani's (32) and (33)). In (11), the basic forms appear sentence medially in various positions, and thus it is unlikely that they involve clausal coordination:

(9) *Derivation of (5a), Toosarvandani (2013)*
John eats [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ not chard] but [$_{DP}$ spinach]].

[1] The semantic identity condition demands that there be mutual entailment relationship between the antecedent and elliptical site (Merchant 2001). In the derivation (6), no mutual entailment holds between the two TPs (with existential closer), due to the presence of negation only in the first conjunct.

(10) At most five students drank [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ not the whisky] but [$_{DP}$ the gin]]. [Toosarvandani 2013, (38b)]
'There were at most five students who did not drink the whisky and who drank the gin.'
[*at most five* > ∧]

(11) a. But the putting-forward, **not** of detailed and scientifically finished hypothesis, **but** of schemata for hypothesis, has long been a function of philosophy.
b. What was true, however, was that I.O. was bound **not** to **but** from Guernsey, where she had …loaded a goodly cargo of brandy and gin...

Given the discussion above, it is clear that the basic form (5a) can involve DP-coordination. However, Vicente (2010) presents an example such as (12a) that must be analyzed with clausal coordination and clausal ellipsis (Bianchi and Zamparelli 2004). Note that (12a) cannot involve underlying DP-coordination as in (9). This is because under DP-coordination, as illustrated in (12b), extraction of the DP-conjunct *[$_{DP}$ not Sue]* would violate the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC), which prohibits extraction of a conjunct out of the coordinate structure (Ross 1967). Consequently, Toosarvandani suggests the derivation (12c) for (12a), which involves clausal coordination and clausal/TP-ellipsis. Given this possibility, Toosarvandani further suggests that when corrective *but* appears in sentence-final position as in (5a), it could involve clausal coordination and clausal/TP-ellipsis, as well as DP-coordination:

(12) a. Not Sue did he invite, but Mary.
b. [he invited [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ not Sue] but [$_{DP}$ Mary]]]. [not allowed due to the CSC]
*
c. [[not Sue]$_i$ did [$_{TP}$ he invite t_i]] but [Mary$_j$ [~~$_{TP}$ he invited t_j~~]]. [allowed]

Note that basic forms such as (13a) cannot involve DP-coordination, since *to the party* does not form a constituent with *Mary* in the first conjunct. Toosarvandani suggests that (13a) could be derived with vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis, as illustrated in (13b).[2] If vP-coordination is indeed possible for (13), then by parallel reasoning, the basic form (5a) should also allow vP-coordination with vP-ellipsis (in the same way as (13b)), unless there are reasons to assume otherwise:

(13) a. He invited not Mary to the party, but Lucy.
b. He T [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ not Mary]$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ invited t_i to the party]]] but [$_{vP}$ Lucy [~~$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ invited t_j to the party]]~~]].

To summarize, Toosarvandani argues that the anchored form (4a) involves vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis, and that the basic form (5a) could involve DP-coordination, clausal coordination (with TP-ellipsis), and, potentially, vP-coordination (with vP-ellipsis).

[2] Toosarvandani (2013, fn. 39) acknowledges, without further discussion, that (13a) could also be derived with clausal coordination with TP-ellipsis.

3. Negation, Ellipsis, and Identity in the Anchored Form

In this section, we critically examine the derivational possibilities of the anchored form (4a) in the corrective *but* construction, challenging Toosarvandani's (2013) claim that it can only involve vP-coordination, followed by vP-ellipsis. We argue that (4a) involves neither vP-coordination nor vP-ellipsis. To set the stage for our argument, let us first consider the related constructions in (14), which differ from typical anchored forms, in that auxiliary verbs and modals can appear in the second conjunct. Given the standard assumption that these elements appear under T, it is natural to analyze these sentences as involving T'-coordination. We suggest that vP-ellipsis within the second conjunct derives these sentences. The derivations of (14a) and (14b) are illustrated in (15a) and (15b), respectively. In (15), the object in the first conjunct covertly raises and adjoins to vP, while the object in the second conjunct does overtly. When vP-ellipsis occurs in the second conjunct, the sentences in (14) are derived:

(14) *Anchored form with T'-coordination and vP-ellipsis: Pseudo anchored form*
- a. ?John doesn't eat spinach, but does chard.
- b. ?John won't invite Mary to the party, but will Lucy.
- c. ?John didn't invite Mary to the party, but did Lucy.

(15) a. John [$_{T'}$ [$_{T'}$ doesn't [$_{vP}$ spinach$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat t$_i$]]]] but [$_{T'}$ T-does [$_{vP}$ chard$_j$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat t$_j$]]~~]]]]. (=14a)

b. John [$_{T'}$ [$_{T'}$ won't [$_{vP}$ Mary$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ invite t$_i$ to the party]]]] (=14b)

but [$_{T'}$ T-will [$_{vP}$ Lucy$_j$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ invite t$_j$ to the party]]~~]]].

Note that the sentences in (14) are similar to Pseudogapping (e.g., *John eats chard, and Mary does spinach*), in that the element under T (such as *do* and modals) and the object in the second conjunct remains outside of the elliptical site (Gengel 2007, Lasnik 1995). Accordingly, we refer to the sentences in (14) as "pseudo anchored forms" in this paper.

Let us now consider what happens when ellipsis does not occur in pseudo anchored forms (14) (Under the standard assumption, ellipsis in general optional). The resulting sentences are shown in (16), where the object in the second conjunct does not undergo overt raising (when ellipsis is not involved).[3] The sentences in (16) involve T'-coordination. In (16a) without ellipsis, *do*-support is not induced in the second conjunct, yielding the inflected form of the verb:[4]

[3] This assumption is necessary. Otherwise, (i) would be derived. (This also holds for Pseudogapping):

(i) *John doesn't eat spinach, but chard$_i$ eats t$_i$.

[4] While Toosarvandani (2013) reports that an example like (16a) is not acceptable, our consultants find it acceptable. The corpus data in (i) also align with (16a):

(i) a. "And one of them doesn't eat meat, but eats fish. Another doesn't eat carbs." (Bay 2018, p. 25)

b. "... he didn't play what Cootie wanted him to play but played some jive crap purposely to mess him up." (Prudente 2024)

(16) a. John [$_{T'}$ doesn't eat spinach] but [$_{T'}$ eats chard].
b. John [$_{T'}$ won't invite Mary to the party] but [$_{T'}$ will invite Lucy to the party].

With this in mind, let us reconsider the baseline anchored form (4a), repeated as (17a). Under Toosarvandani's analysis, the second conjunct is derived with vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis as shown in (7), repeated as (17b):

(17) a. John doesn't eat spinach, but chard. [=(4a)]
b. John T-does [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ **n't** [$_{vP}$ chard$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat t$_i$]]]] but [$_{vP}$ spinach$_j$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ **eats** t$_j$]]~~]]. [=(7), Toosarvandani's (2013) analysis]
c. John T-does [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ **n't** [$_{vP}$ chard$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat t$_i$]]]] but [$_{vP}$ spinach$_j$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ **eat** t$_j$]]~~]].

However, the derivation (17b) incorrectly predicts the presence of the inflected verb form *eats* within the vP in the second conjunct. Under the standard assumption, when ellipsis targets vP, it always targets the vP containing the base form of the verb, not the inflected form, as shown in (18a-b); this induces *do*-support when there is no modals or auxiliary verbs appearing under T. (18c) further shows that the inflected verb form cannot be contained in the elliptical vP. Then, it follows that, with vP-coordination involved, the second conjunct in (17b) must contain the base form of the verb *eat*, as shown in (17c):

(18) a. John eats spinach and Bill does ~~[$_{vP}$ eat spinach]~~, too.
b. I know what John eats t but I don't know what Max does ~~[$_{vP}$ eat t]~~.
c. *I know what John eats t but I don't know what Max ~~[$_{vP}$ eats t]~~.

When ellipsis does not take place in (17c), the verb in the second conjunct must also be in its base form. However, as shown in (19), the base form of the verb *eat* is disallowed; only the inflected verb form *eats* is acceptable. The ungrammaticality of (19) with the base form *eat* poses a problem for Toosarvandani's vP-coordination analysis, as it fails to account for the necessity of the inflected verb form. Instead, the grammaticality of (19) with the inflected verb *eats* suggests that T'-coordination is involved, as shown in (16a). If (19)/(16a) underlies the anchored form (17a), it follows that (17a) can also involve T'-coordination (but not vP-coordination):

(19) John doesn't eat spinach, but eats/*eat chard.

At this point, two questions arise. First, how can the anchored form (17a) be derived with T'-coordination? (Recall that vP-ellipsis inside T'-coordination can only derive the pseudo anchored (14a).) Second, why is vP-coordination not allowed in (17a)? As will be shown below, these two questions are closely related with interesting implications. We first provide an answer to the second question. This question is significant, since in other contexts, vP-coordination is a valid option (e.g, *John will [$_{vP}$ sing tonight] and [$_{vP}$ dance tomorrow]*). Furthermore, it will be shown below that vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis are allowed in certain types of the anchored form, but not in (17a).

We propose that vP-coordination is disallowed in (17a) because the contracted negator *n't* functions as sentential negation, which is located above vP (Park et al. 2021b). Building on Laka (1990), Park et al. (2021b) suggest in a

different context that while the uncontracted negator *not* can function as sentential negation or constituent negation, the contracted negator *n't* always functions as sentential negation (see also Holmberg 2016).[5]

In (17a), since *n't* is sentential negation and thus located outside of vP, it cannot be contained within vP. This is why the vP-coordination structure in (17b) and (17c) is not allowed. With *n't* placed outside of vP, the vP-coordination possibility in (20) is not allowed, either (without ellipsis (20a) or with ellipsis (20b)); this vP-coordination derivation would not yield the corrective *but* reading because negation takes wide scope over conjunction. This also holds, when the uncontracted negator *not* functions as sentential negation. Thus, without ellipsis, *not* patterns with *n't*, as shown in (21) (see further discussion below):

(20) *Derivations with sentential negation and vP-coordination, Not allowed*

a. John T-does**n't/not** [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat chard]] but [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ **eat** spinach]]]. [without ellipsis, not allowed]

[surfaces as: **John doesn't/does not eat chard but **eat** spinach*.]

b. John T-does**n't/not** [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ chard$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat t$_i$]]] but [$_{vP}$ spinach$_j$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ **eat** t$_j$]]~~]].

[with ellipsis, not allowed]

(21) John does not eat chard, but eats/*eat spinach. [cf. (19)]

Let us now consider what happens when *not* functions as constituent negation and adjoins to vP, as in (22). (22a) involves vP-coordination without ellipsis. Without further operations, it surfaces with the base form of the verb *eat*, and it is unacceptable as shown in (21). Now, the question is why (22a) is ill-formed. We suggest that the derivation (22a) is disallowed because the auxiliary verb, *does*, affects (or, has dependency with) both conjuncts. In other words, (22a) is disallowed on a par with (23). Note, however, that application of vP-ellipsis as in (22b) derives the anchored form (24) (preceded by overt movement of *spinach*). Since *does* in (22b) is licensed by each conjunct (by *not* in the first conjunct and by vP-ellipsis in the second), this derivation is allowed. In other words, when the negator *not* functions as constituent negation, the anchored form can involve vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis (see discussion below for other possible derivations):

(22) *Derivations with constituent negation 'not' and vP-coordination*

a. John T-does [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ **not** [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat chard]]] but [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ **eat** spinach]]]. [without ellipsis, not allowed]

[surfaces as: **John does not eat chard, but **eat** spinach*.]

b. John T-does [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ **not** [$_{vP}$ chard$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat t$_i$]]]] but [$_{vP}$ spinach$_j$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ **eat** t$_j$]]~~]].

[with ellipsis, **allowed**]

[surfaces as: √*John does not eat chard, but spinach*.]

(23) *John does eat spinach. (vs. John does not eat spinach.)

[5] Park et al. (2021b) discuss the contrastive negation construction as in (i) (McCawley 1998, Wilder 1997a). Note that the second conjunct in (i) only allows the inflected form of the verb, patterning with (19). This suggests that the two constructions might receive a uniform analysis:

(i) John didn't denounce but praised/*praise Mary.

(24) John does not eat chard, but spinach. [can be derived with vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis]

The proposed analysis gains further support from the constructions involving emphatic *do* (Gutzmann et al. 2020, Höhle 1992, Wilder 2013). Note first that the unacceptable sentence (23) becomes acceptable when emphatic *do* is used as in (25):

(25) John DOES eat spinach.

It is then predicted that with emphatic *do* and *not*, the base form of the verb *eat* in the second conjunct should be allowed. The prediction is borne out, as shown in (26a), which is in keen contrast with (26b) with sentential negation *n't*. Another noticeable property of emphatic *do* is that, as Laka (1990) suggests, when it appears with *not*, the latter can only function as constituent negation (Park et al. 2021b). Given this, (26a) (with the base form *eat*) only allows the derivation (27), where emphatic *do* allows the base form *eat* in the second conjunct on a par with (25) ((26b) with sentential negation *n't* patterns with (19), as predicted):[6]

(26) a. John DOES not eat chard, but eats/**eat** spinach. [vs. (21)]
b. John DOESn't eat chard, but eats/***eat** spinach.

(27) *Derivation of (26a)*
John T-DOES [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ **not** [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat chard]]] but [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ **eat** spinach]]]. [without ellipsis, **allowed**]
[surfaces as: *John DOES not eat chard, but **eat** spinach*.]

What about the anchored forms with emphatic *do*? The relevant paradigm is shown in (28). Since *not* in (28a) is invariably constituent negation, (28a) can involve vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis. In other words, when vP-ellipsis occurs in the second conjunct of (27) above (which is preceded by overt movement of *spinach*), (28a) is derived. In contrast, (28b) with sentential negation *n't* does not allow vP-coordination. As suggested above, it can instead involve T'-coordination, as illustrated in (29a), which also holds for (29b) and (29c). Then, this directs us back to our initial question of how anchored forms with sentential negation (such as (17a)) can be derived. More specifically, how can the anchored forms with sentential negation in (29) be derived from underlying T'-coordination structures? ((29c) containing a modal raises the same question):[7]

[6] The inflected form *eats* in (26a) and (26b) is derived with T'-coordination in the same way as (16a), as shown below:

(i) John [$_{T'}$ DOES not/DOESn't eat chard] but [$_{T'}$ eats spinach].

Likewise, Pseudo anchored forms with emphatic *do* as in (ii) can be derived with T'-coordination (followed by vP-ellipsis in the second conjunct), in the same way as (15a):

(ii) ?John DOES not/DOESn't eat chard, but does spinach.

[7] In (i), when *not* functions as constituent negation, it allows vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis as in (i):

(i) a. John will not invite Mary, but Lucy.
b. John T-will [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ not [$_{vP}$ Mary$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ invite t$_i$]]]] but [$_{vP}$ Lucy$_j$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ invite t$_j$]]~~]].

(28) a. John DOES not eat chard, but spinach.
b. John DOESn't eat chard, but spinach.

(29) *With sentential negation and T'-coordination*
a. John [$_{T'}$ DOESn't eat chard] but [$_{T'}$ eats spinach]. [⇒ (28b): *John DOESn't eat chard, but spinach.*]
b. John [$_{T'}$ doesn't eat chard] but [$_{T'}$ eats spinach]. [⇒ (17a): *John doesn't eat chard, but spinach.*]
c. John [$_{T'}$ won't eat chard] but [$_{T'}$ will eat spinach]. [⇒ *John won't eat chard, but spinach*.]

As an answer to this question, we adopt the analysis of Park et al. (2021a) and push it forward further with supporting arguments and some implementations. Park et al. argue that the anchored forms can involve the Left-Edge Ellipsis (LEE). LEE is an elliptical process that operates from the left edge of non-initial conjuncts (Bruening 2014, Hofmeister 2010, Levine 2011, Sailor and Thoms 2013, Wexler and Culicover 1980, Wilder 1997a,b, van Oirsouw 1987). LEE does not target syntactic constituents, but rather a linear string, as exemplified in (30).[8] Park et al. show that the anchored forms exhibit the same pattern as in (31):

(30) a. Jan [is a Republican and ~~is~~ proud of it]. [Homfmeister 2010, (83)]
b. Sam [gave a car to his daughter and ~~gave~~ a motorcycle to his son]. [Homfmeister 2010, (84)]
c. Sue will [speak to Mary about linguistics on Friday and ~~speak to Mary about~~ philosophy on Thursday]. [Bruening 2014, (89)]
d. I [threw the ball to Brandon during John's speech and ~~threw the ball to~~ Miranda during the following ovation]. [Bruening 2014, (90)]
e. He [is not boiling but (rather) ~~is~~ frying the egg]. [Adapted from Wilder 1997a, fn. 22]

(31) a. Sam didn't give a car to his daughter, but ~~gave~~ a motorcycle to his son.
b. Sue won't speak to Mary about linguistics on Friday, but ~~speak to Mary about~~ philosophy on Thursday.
c. I didn't throw the ball to Brandon during John's speech, but ~~threw the ball to~~ Miranda during following ovation.

Recall that the anchored form (17a) with sentential negation can involve T'-coordination. Park et al. (2021a) suggest that when LEE targets *eats*, (17a) is derived as in (32).[9] Without ellipsis, the inflected form *eats* surfaces, as in (29b).[10] We suggest that the same analysis applies to the anchored forms with emphatic *do* (29a) and a modal (29c):[11]

[8] LEE resolves problematic coordinates that involve the seeming coordination of unlikes/non-constituents (Beavers and Sag 2004).

[9] In Park et al. (2021a), we neither showed that anchored forms with sentential negation such as (17a)/(29) cannot be derived by vP-coordination (with vP-ellipsis) nor discussed the basic form (which is investigated in Section 4 of this paper).

[10] Note that the elided verb *eats* in (32) is not exactly identical with the antecedent verb *eat*. We assume that LEE allows certain 'sloppy identity' (see further discussions below).

[11] LEE applies to (29c) as follows:

(32) *Derivation of the anchored form (17a), T'-coordination + LEE*
John [$_{T'}$ doesn't eat chard] but [$_{T'}$ ~~eats~~ spinach].

As an alternative, one might assume that the anchored form (17a) could be derived with T'-ellipsis. This assumption could be fleshed out with the derivation in (33a). In (33a), the object in both conjuncts raises and adjoins to T'. If the lowest T' is elided, (17a) would be derived. We reject this possibility, because T'-ellipsis, in general, is known to be unavailable, as shown in (33b):

(33) a. John [$_{T'}$ [$_{T'}$ chard$_i$ [$_{T'}$ doesn't eat t$_i$]] but [$_{T'}$ spinach$_j$ ~~[$_{T'}$ eats t$_j$]~~]].
b. *I know what$_i$ John eats t$_i$, but I don't know what$_j$ Max ~~[$_{T'}$ eats t$_j$]~~.

We present an additional argument in favor of the T'-coordination-LEE analysis. Recall that the scope fact in (8), repeated as (34a), allows wide scope of the quantified subject over conjunction. Since, with sentential negation, vP-coordination cannot be involved, T'-coordination is the only option to capture the scope reading at issue, as illustrated in (34b). This is further supported by (34c), which allows the same scope reading. Then, it follows that (17a) can also involve T'-coordination and LEE. (Recall that the Pseudo anchored form with *did* in (34c) is derived with vP-ellipsis inside the second T'-conjunct):

(34) a. At most five students didn't drink the whisky, but the gin. [=(8a)]
'There were at most five students who did not drink the whisky and who drank the gin.'
[*at most five* > ∧]
b. At most five students [$_{T'}$ didn't drink the whisky] but [$_{T'}$ ~~drank~~ the gin].
c. At most five students [$_{T'}$ didn't drink the whisky], but [$_{T'}$ did/drank/*drink the gin].
[*at most five* > ∧]

While T'-coordination is a viable option in (17a), it need not be the only one. Given the general workings of LEE, Park et al. (2021a) suggest that (17a) can also involve TP-coordination and LEE, as in (35). If this is indeed the case, we predict that (34a) also allows the inverse scope reading where conjunction scopes over the quantified subject (∧ > *at most five*). We submit that despite being somewhat weak, this reading is allowed and can be derived with LEE, as shown in (36):[12]

(35) *Derivation of the anchored form (17a), TP-coordination + LEE*
[$_{TP}$ John doesn't eat chard] but [$_{TP}$ ~~he eats~~ spinach].

(36) [$_{TP}$ At most five students didn't drink the whisky] but [$_{TP}$ ~~at most five student~~ ~~drank~~ the gin].
'It's not the case that at most five students drank the whisky, but it is the case that at most five student drank the gin.' [∧ > *at most five*]

(i) John [$_{T'}$ won't eat chard] but [$_{T'}$ ~~will eat~~ spinach].

[12] Discussing the basic form, Wu (2022) provides a context that allows wide scope of the quantified subject as follows: "The caterer is deciding what alcohol to serve at colloquium parties and wants to eliminate the drink that is drunk by at most five students because it is not economical." It seems that this context also works for the anchored form (36). (See Section 4 for discussion.)

Following Vicente (2010), Park et. al (2001b) also suggest that the anchored form can involve clausal coordination and TP-ellipsis. Park et. al provide an example like (37a). Given the fronting of the object *chard* in the first conjunct, which ensures that no subclausal coordination is possible, (37a) can only involve TP-coordination. They propose the derivation (37b), where the second conjunct involves TP-ellipsis:[13]

(37) a. Chard, John doesn't eat, but spinach.
b. [Chard$_i$ [$_{TP}$ Max doesn't eat t$_i$]] but [spinach$_j$ ~~[$_{TP}$ he eats t$_j$]~~]

overt movement overt movement

A potential issue for this analysis is identity/recoverability. Since only the first conjunct contains negation, but not the second conjunct, the identity condition would not be satisfied. For this issue, Park et al. (2021a) acknowledge that formulating a proper identity condition is evasive (Ross 1967, Weir 2020), and speculate that negation can be 'ignored' for identity considerations in the corrective *but* construction. To address this, we suggest that this kind of 'sloppy identity' may well be better understood with the notion of recoverability (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993), rather than the identity condition (in the sense of Merchant 2004 and Toosarvandani 2013). As alluded to by McCawley (1998), we can assume that *not... but* in the corrective *but* construction functions as a coordinating conjunction with the restriction on the second conjunct bearing the opposite polarity.[14,15] This means

[13] Being somewhat subtle, the scope fact in (i) seems to align with this analysis in that it only allows narrow scope of the quantified subject:

(i) The whisky, at most five students didn't drink, but the gin. [$^{?*}$*at most five* > ∧ ; ∧ > *at most five*]

[14] An example like (i) is suggestive in favor of this assumption. (i) is slightly degraded (probably due to its complexity with double negation in the first conjunct and interpretation of the opposite polarity (of double negation) in the second conjunct), and to the extent that it is allowed, speakers find that, in accordance with the restriction, it allows the reading that John eats spinach, but doesn't eat meat, where only the second conjunct bears a negative polarity:

(i) [Context: John is a vegetarian.]
a. $^{?}$John doesn't (#) not eat spinach, but meat. (= 'John eats spinach, but doesn't eat meat.')
b. John cannot (#) not eat spinach, but meat. (= 'John can eat spinach, but cannot eat meat.')

[15] Note that this restriction is independent of ellipsis in the second conjunct, as shown in (ia): in (ia), both conjuncts bear a negative polarity, and even without ellipsis, the sentence (ia) is unacceptable. Furthermore, the assumption that the restriction is induced by *not .. but* is strengthened by the following two facts: the fact that use of different coordinators as in (ib) renders it acceptable, and the fact that absence of negation in the first conjunct as in (ic) also renders it acceptable:

(i) a. *John doesn't eat chard, but doesn't (eat) spinach.
b. John doesn't eat chard, and/or doesn't eat spinach.
c. John eats chard, but doesn't eat spinach.

The same issue would also arise under Toosarvandani's (2013) vP-coordination analysis of (17a), which we repute in this paper. Toosarvandani's derivation (17b) is repeated as (iia): In (iia), the two lowest vPs are identical, licensing vP-ellipsis in the second conjunct. However, there are no reasons not to assume that vP in the second conjunct contains negation, to begin with, as in (iib), which would satisfy the identity condition and thus would generate the sentence **John doesn't eat chard but (does) not spinach*. But this sentence is not acceptable, indicating the necessity of the restriction in this analysis as well:

(ii) a. John T-does [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ **n't** [$_{vP}$ chard$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat t$_i$]]]] but [$_{vP}$ spinach$_j$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ eats t$_j$]]~~]].
b. *John T-does [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ **n't** [$_{vP}$ chard$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat t$_i$]]]] but [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ **n't/not** [$_{vP}$ spinach$_j$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ eats t$_j$]]~~]]]].

that the elided TP in (37b) is recoverable as a positive one, although the antecedent TP is negative. This kind of sloppy identity seems required even for application of LEE in (35).[16] As will be shown later, this also holds for the basic form (Section 4).

Thus far, we have seen that the anchored form (17a) containing sentential negation can be derived in various ways. It can involve T'-coordination with LEE. It can also involve clausal/TP-coordination with LEE or TP-ellipsis. Crucially, it is shown that (17a) cannot be derived with vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis, contra Toosarvandani (2013).

However, the anchored form (38a) with the reading '*at most five* > ∧' cannot be derived with T'-coordination or clausal/TP-coordination. First of all, TP-coordination isn't applicable, since as discussed above, it would only allow the reading where conjunction takes wide scope over the quantified subject (i.e., ∧ > *at most five*).[17] T'-coordination with LEE cannot derive (38a) either, as shown in (38b). In (38b), the application of LEE leaves the non-left edge elements *at Central Park* unelided, and renders the sentence degraded.[18] We suggest that (38a) can be derived with the applications of both LEE and vP-ellipsis as in (38c). In the second conjunct, the object *the gin* overtly raises and adjoins to vP. When vP-ellipsis occurs, *do* is inserted in T, forming *did*. Subsequently, *did* is elided by LEE.[19] Note that when vP-ellipsis alone occurs, it yields the pseudo anchored form (38d):

(38) a. At most five students didn't drink the whisky at Central Park, but the gin. [*at most five* > ∧]

b. ?*At most five students [$_{T'}$ didn't drink the whisky at Central Park] but [$_{T'}$ ~~drank~~ the gin at Central Park].

c. At most five students [$_{T'}$ didn't [$_{vP}$ the whisky$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ drink t$_i$ at Central Park]]] but [$_{T'}$ ~~did~~ [$_{vP}$ the gin$_i$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ at Central Park]]~~]]. [anchored form]
LEE vP-ellipsis

d. At most five students [$_{T'}$ didn't [$_{vP}$ the whisky$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ drink t$_i$ at Central Park]]] but [$_{T'}$ **did** [$_{vP}$ the gin$_i$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ at Central Park]]~~]]. [pseudo anchored form]
vP-ellipsis

In this section, we have shown that anchored forms with sentential negation cannot be derived with vP-coordination (with vP-ellipsis), contra Toosarvandani (2013). They can, however, be derived in various other mechanisms: clausal/TP-coordination with TP-ellipsis or LEE, T'-coordination with LEE, or a combination of LEE and vP-ellipsis. We have also shown that vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis are applicable in certain contexts involving constituent negation.

[16] LEE could avoid the identity issue with the assumption that the left edge elements (*he, eats*) in (35) can be elided separately one at a time. First, LEE targets *he* (which is identical with *John*), and then, moves on the next word *eats* and elide it, ignoring *not* in the middle in the antecedent.

[17] Patterning with (34a), (38a) seems to allow the '∧ > *at most five*' reading as well.

[18] Note that (38b) becomes acceptable with a contrastively focused PP (e.g., *at Riverside Park*) substituting for *at Central Park*, in the second conjunct. This seems to hold generally. Thus, in (37a), *chard* and *spinach* are contrastively focused.

[19] This may suggest that LEE is applicable after constituent ellipsis such as vP-ellipsis occurs.

4. Basic Form

This section discusses the basic form of the corrective *but* construction. Recall from Section 2 that Toosarvandani (2013) suggests that the basic form (5a), repeated as (39a), can involve clausal coordination with TP-ellipsis (Vicente 2010) or involve DP-coordination without elliptical processes. These derivations are repeated in (39b) and (39c), respectively:

(39) a. John eats not chard but spinach.

b. [[$_{DP}$ not chard]$_i$ [$_{TP}$ John eats t_i] but [$_{DP}$ spinach]$_j$ ~~[$_{TP}$ he eats t_j]~~]]. [clausal coordination + TP-ellipsis]

c. John eats [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ not chard] but [$_{DP}$ spinach]]. [DP-coordination]

Toosarvandani (2013) also suggests that basic form (13a), repeated as (40a), can be derived with vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis, as (40b):

(40) a. He invited not Mary to the party, but Lucy. [=(13a)]

b. He T [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ not Mary]$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ invited t_i to the party]]] but [$_{vP}$ Lucy ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ invited t_j to the party]]~~]]. [=(13b)]

Under this analysis, then, it is prima facie possible that the basic form (39a) could also involve vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis. With this possibility, (39a) would also allow the derivation in (41):

(41) He T [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{DP}$ not chard]$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eats t_i]]] but [$_{vP}$ [$_{DP}$ Spinach] ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eats t_j]]~~]].

We argue against the vP-ellipsis analysis of (40) and (41). Note first that vP-ellipsis in (40b) and (41) targets the constituent containing the inflected verb form. As discussed in Section 3, however, vP-ellipsis of this sort is not permitted, for the typical vP-ellipsis operation targets the vP containing the base form of the verb, which induces *do*-support (e.g., *John came and Bill did* ~~*[$_{vP}$ come]*~~, *too*). We suggest that (40a) can instead be derived with clausal coordination and TP-ellipsis in the same way as (39b). Note here that the impossibility of vP-coordination for the basic form (39a) parallels the anchored form (17c) with sentential negation (i.e., *John doesn't eat chard, but spinach*). Recall, however, that in certain contexts, the anchored form with constituent negation allows vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis. This is not possible for the basic form (39a), because the negator *not* in (39a) is not constituent negation of vP.[20]

Regarding the basic form (39a), we agree with Toosarvandani (2013) that it can be derived with clausal

[20] Based on this difference between the anchored form and the basic for, Park et al. (2024) provide an account for the asymmetrical intervention effect by negation in these two types, as shown in (i). While the anchored form (ia) allows the Pair-List (PL) reading, the basic form (ib) exhibits an intervention effect and thus disallows the PL reading (Beck 1996, 2006, Cable 2010, Kotek 2019, Pesetsky 2000). The gist of their analysis is that while the in-situ phrase *which book* (ia) can undergo covert movement across negation within the first conjunct (evading the intervention effect), the same operation is not allowed in the basic form (ib) (inducing the intervention effect):

(i) a. $^{\surd PL}$Which student didn't read which book, but which paper? [anchored form: allows PL reading]
b. ^{*PL}Which student read not which book but which paper? [basic form: disallows PL reading]

coordination and TP-ellipsis as in (39b), and can be derived with DP-coordination as in (39c). However, we propose that (39a) can also receive other derivations that are available to the anchored form (Section 3). First, it can involve T'-coordination and LEE, as in (42a).[21,22] Second, it can also involve clausal/TP-coordination with LEE, as in (42b). Note that in Section 3, we have seen that vP-ellipsis is possible within T'-coordination. This derives the pseudo basic form (43a), whose derivation is shown in (43b):

(42) a. John [$_{T'}$ eats not chard] but [$_{T'}$ ~~eats~~ spinach]. [T'-coordination with LEE]
b. [$_{TP}$ John eats not chard] but [$_{TP}$ ~~he eats~~ spinach]. [TP-coordination with LEE]

(43) *Pseudo basic form*
a. ?John eats not chard, but does spinach. [vP-ellipsis inside T'-coordination]
b. John [$_{T'}$ T [$_{vP}$ [not chard]$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eats t_i]]] but [$_{T'}$ T-**does** [$_{vP}$ spinach$_j$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ eat t_j]]~~]]]

Let us now consider the scope fact in (44a), repeated from (10). Recall that Toosarvandani (2013) reports that (44) allows the reading where the quantified subject scopes over conjunction (*at most five* > ∧). He suggests that this can be best captured with DP-coordination. Given the discussion above, this reading can also be captured with the derivation involving T'-coordination and LEE, as in (42a). Note further that if clausal-coordination is indeed allowed, (44) should also allow the inverse scope reading where conjunction scopes over the quantified subject (∧ > *at most five*). Wu (2022) confirms that this inverse scope reading is indeed allowed with a carefully constructed context.[23] We concur with this judgment:

(44) At most five students drank not the whisky but the gin. [=(10), *at most five* > ∧ ; ∧ > *at most five*]
- 'There were at most five students who did not drink the whisky and who drank the gin.'
- 'It's not the case that at most five students drank the whisky, but it is the case that at most five students drank the gin.'

With this in mind, let us consider (45a), which allows the quantified subject to take wide scope over conjunction, paralleling the anchored form (38a) (i.e., *At most five students didn't drink the whisky at Central Park, but the gin*).

[21] When LEE does not occur in (42a), (i) is derived. While Toosarvandani (2013) reports that an example like (i) is unacceptable, we find it acceptable. Likewise, we find the pseudo basic form (43a) acceptable, which Toosarvandani does not discuss. More work on this and potential speaker variation on an example like (i) is necessary. Note, however, that even under the vP-coordination analysis, as in (41), which we repute, (i) would be expected to be acceptable as well:

(i) John eats not chard, but eats spinach.

[22] The possibility of LEE in the basic form is further supported by examples in (i) (which parallel the anchored forms (31)) (see also Wu 2022):

(i) a. Sam gave not a car to his daughter, but ~~gave~~ a motorcycle to his son.
b. Sue will speak to Mary not about linguistics on Friday, but ~~speak to Mary about~~ philosophy on Thursday.
c. I threw the ball not to Brandon during John's speech, but ~~threw the ball to~~ Miranda during following ovation.

[23] Wu's (2022) context is the following (see also fn. 12): "the caterer is deciding what alcohol to serve at colloquium parties and wants to eliminate the drink that is drunk by at most five students because it is not economical."

We propose that (45a) is derived in the same way as (38a): It involves both LEE and vP-ellipsis within T'-coordination, as in (45c).[24]Applying LEE alone, as in (45b), leaves the PP *at Central Park* unelided, resulting in an unacceptable sentence due to a lack of contrastive focus. Applying vP-ellipsis alone yields the pseudo basic form in (45d), which induces *do*-support:

(45) a. At most five students drank not the whisky at Central Park, but the gin. [with '*at most five* > ∧']
b. ?*At most five students [$_{T'}$ drank not the whisky at Central Park] but [$_{T'}$ ~~drank~~ the gin at Central Park].
c. At most five students [$_{T'}$ T [$_{vP}$ [not the whisky]$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ drank t_i at Central Park]]] but [$_{T'}$ ~~T-did~~ [$_{vP}$ the gin$_i$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ t_i at Central Park]]~~]]].
LEE vP-ellipsis
d. At most five students [$_{T'}$ T [$_{vP}$ [not the whisky]$_i$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ drank t_i at Central Park]]] but [$_{T'}$ **did** [$_{vP}$ the gin$_i$ ~~[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ t_i at Central Park]]~~]]].
vP-ellipsis

To summarize, the basic form (39a) can be derived in the same way as the anchored form counterpart (17c): they both can involve clausal coordination or T'-coordination. The former differs from the latter in that it can also involve DP-coordination. However, neither the basic form (39a) nor (17c) with sentential negation can be derived with vP-coordination, contra Toosarvandani (2013). (Recall, however, that the anchored form containing constituent negation allows vP-coordination in certain contexts).

In the rest of this section, we discuss identity/recoverability in the basic form. Note first that the various derivational possibilities of the basic form (39a) do not raise the issue of identity. This is because the negator *not* serves as constituent negation, adjoined to DP. Thus, the identity issue does not arise with covert raising of the entire DP containing negation in (39b), or with negation staying low below the antecedent verb in the first conjunct in (42). However, certain basic forms raise an identity issue. To see this, let us first consider (46a). Under the proposed analysis, (46a) can be derived in four different ways, as shown in (46b)-(46e):

(46) a. John read not a report on every defendant, but a report on every plaintiff.
b. John read [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ not a report on every defendant] but [$_{DP}$ a report on every plaintiff]]
[DP-coordination]
c. [[$_{DP}$ not a report on every defendant]$_i$ [$_{TP}$ John read t_i]] but [$_{DP}$ a report on every plaintiff]$_j$ ~~[$_{TP}$ he read t_j]~~]]
[clausal coordination with TP-ellipsis]
d. John [$_{T'}$ read not a report on every defendant] but [$_{T'}$ ~~read~~ a report on every plaintiff].
[T'-coordination with LEE]
e. [$_{TP}$ John not a report on every defendant] but [$_{TP}$ ~~he read~~ a report on every plaintiff].
[clausal coordination with LEE]

With this in mind, let us now consider (47a). The second conjunct contains a relative clause that involves vP-ellipsis. This construction is called the Antecedent-Contained Deletion (ACD). (47b) is a simpler ACD example, which we will consider first. The standard analysis of ACD posits quantifier raising (QR) of the quantifier DP

[24] We assume that ellipsis of *did* by application of LEE in (45c) is allowed (as an instance of sloppy identity), although it is not present in the antecedent, since it is only required to support the stranded tense in T, not carrying any lexical meaning.

containing a relative clause (thus avoiding the infinite regress problem) (Fox 2000, Kennedy 1997, May 1985, Sag 1976, among many others). In (47b), the DP *every plaintiff that Max did* undergoes QR above the matrix vP in (47b) (or above TP). After QR, the antecedent vP is copied into the elliptical site (indicated with dotted strikethrough), yielding the appropriate reading, as in (47b'):

(47) a. ?John read not a report on every defendant, but every plaintiff that Max did.
b. John read a report on [$_{DP}$ every plaintiff that Max did].
b'. John [$_{vP}$ [$_{DP}$ every plaintiff that Max did ~~[$_{vP}$ read a report on t$_i$]~~]$_i$ [$_{vP}$ read a report on t$_i$]]. [with QR]

Returning to (47a), note first that it cannot involve DP-coordination. There are two potential ways of forming DP-coordination, as shown in (48). The DP-coordination possibility in (48a) is not allowed, because, after QR of the entire DP-coordination, it would yield the unallowable reading that John read not a report on every defendant but read every plaintiff that Max read. (48b) is not allowed either, because negation would scope over both conjuncts:

(48) *DP-coordination possibilities of (47a), Not allowed*
a. John read [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ not a report on every defendant] but [$_{DP}$ every plaintiff that Max did]].
b. John read **not** a report on [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ every defendant] but [$_{DP}$ every plaintiff that Max did]].

In contrast, TP-coordination and T'-coordination derivations can derive (47a), but these derivations all induce the identity/recoverability issues. Let us first consider the derivation with clausal coordination with TP-ellipsis in (49a). In (49a), the DP *every defendant* covertly moves out of TP in the first conjunct. Likewise, in the second conjunct, the DP *every plaintiff that Max did* overtly moves out of TP in the second conjunct, which resolves ACD. The TP in the second conjunct also undergoes ellipsis under identity with the antecedent TP. However, strictly speaking, they are not identical in that only the TP in the first conjunct contains negation. In other words, the same issue of identity/recoverability arises that we discussed on the anchored form (Section 3). The same issue arises with LEE. (49b) is the derivation with clausal coordination and LEE, and (49c) with T'-coordination with LEE. LEE in these derivations targets a string of words (i.e., *(he) read a report on*) at PF,[25] but the antecedent string of words contains negation in the middle. For this issue, as in the case of the anchored form (Section 3), we suggest that negation can be 'ignored' for identity/recoverability considerations in the corrective *but* construction, due to the unique properties of the corrective *but* construction:

(49) a. [[$_{DP}$ every defendant]$_i$ [$_{TP}$ John read **not** a report on t$_i$]] but [[$_{DP}$ every plaintiff that Max did ~~[$_{vP}$ ····~~

~~read a report on t]]$_j$ [$_{TP}$ he read a report on t$_j$]~~]. [TPs are not identical]

b. [$_{TP}$ John read **not** a report on every defendant] but [$_{TP}$ ~~he read a report on~~ every defendant Max did].
c. John [$_{T'}$ [$_{T'}$ read **not** a report on every defendant] but [$_{T'}$ ~~read a report on~~ every defendant Max did]].

[25] At the LF side, the universal quantifier in each conjunct in (49b) and (49c) undergoes QR to vP or to TP. At this point, it is not clear to us how such covert movement would interact with or affect the identity/recoverability condition on LEE that is assumed to occur at PF. A possibility is that LEE might be licensed by identity/recoverability operating on surface strings of words (unlike other types of ellipsis). We leave this for future research.

In this section, we have argued that the basic form such as (39a) (*John eats not chard but spinach*) can be derived in various ways, mostly in the same way as the anchored form. It can involve clausal coordination with TP-ellipsis or LEE. It can also involve T'-coordination with LEE. Unlike the anchored form, however, it can also involve DP-coordination (Toosarvandani 2013), but can never be derived with vP-coordination. We also show that negation (in the antecedent conjunct) can be ignored for identity/recoverability considerations.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have discussed the syntax of the two forms of the corrective *but* construction in English: the anchored form and the basic form. We have shown that the anchored form containing sentential negation cannot be derived with vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis, contra Toosarvandani (2013). However, we have shown that that the anchored form with constituent negation may, under certain conditions, be derived with vP-coordination and vP-ellipsis (in certain contexts). Additionally, the anchored form can involve other derivations: it can involve clausal coordination with TP-ellipsis (Vicente 2010) or Left-Edge Ellipsis (LEE). It can also involve T'-coordination with LEE (Park et al. 2022a). Likewise, the basic form can be derived by the same mechanisms, as well as with coordination of smaller constituents such as DP-coordination. Unlike the anchored form, however, the basic form does not allow vP-coordination.

The discussions of the corrective *but* construction have certain implications for the identity/recoverability condition on ellipsis. We have shown that the ellipsis process operative in the construction can 'ignore' negation in the antecedent. Awaiting further investigations, we have explored the possibility that this effect arises due to the restriction imposed by *not…but* functioning as a coordinating conjunction (McCawley 1998). We suggest that the restriction demands that the following conjunct bear the opposite polarity, whether ellipsis is involved or not, thereby giving rise to the apparent ignoring effect. This in turn suggests that formulating identity conditions on ellipsis should take into consideration the unique properties of the constructions at issue, in particular, when negation is involved. Of relevance might be the negative answer particle *no*, which is assumed to require presence of (uninterpretable) *not* in the prejacent (elliptical) clause, forming a negative concord chain. In the chain, *not* can be ignored for the purpose of identity (Kramer and Rawlins 2011, Park and Yang 2022, Park et al. 2023). We leave in-depth investigations of this for future research.

References

Bay, L. 2018. *The Ruthless Gentleman*. https://bookreadfree.com/162356/4013635

Beavers, J. and I. Sag. 2004. Ellipsis and apparent non-constituent coordination. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Stanford: CSLI.

Beck, S. 1996. Quantified structures as barriers for LF movement. *Natural Language Semantics* 4, 1-56.

Beck, S. 2006. Intervention effects follow from focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 14, 1-56.

Bianchi, V. and R. Zamparelli. 2004. Edge coordinations: focus and conjunction Reduction. In D. Adger, C. de Cat and G. Tsoulas, eds., *Peripheries: Syntactic Edges and Their Effects*, 313-327. Kluwer Academic.

Bruening, B. 2014. Precede-and-command revisited. *Language* 90(2), 342-388.

Cable, S. 2010. *The Grammar of Q: Q-particles, Wh-movement, and Pied-piping*. Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, N. and H. Lasnik. 1993. The theory of principles and parameters. In J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W.

Sternefeld and T. Vennemann, eds., *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, 506-569. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Gengel, K. 2007. *Focus and Ellipsis: A Generative Analysis of Pseudogapping and Other Elliptical Structures*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany.

Gutzmann, D., H. Harmann and L. Mattewson. 2020. Verum focus is verum, not focus: Cross-linguistic evidence. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 5(1), 1-48.

Hofmeister, P. 2010. A linearization account of *either ... or* constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28, 275-314.

Höhle, T. N. 1992. Ü ber Verum-Fokus im Deutschen. In J. Jacobs, ed., *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik*, 112-141. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Holmberg, A. 2016. *The Syntax of Yes and No*. Oxford University Press.

Fox, D. 2000. *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*. MIT Press.

Kennedy, C. 1997. Antecedent-contained deletion and the syntax of quantification. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 662-688.

Kotek, H. 2019. *Composing Questions. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs series.* MIT Press.

Laka, I. 1990. *Negation in syntax: On the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Lasnik, H. 1995. A note on Pseudogapping. In R. Pensalfini and H. Ura, eds., *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 27, 143-163. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.

Levine, R. D. 2011. Linearization and its discontents. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (HPSG 2011), 126-146.

May, R. 1985. *Logical From: Its Structure and Derivation*. MIT Press.

Merchant, J. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford University Press.

Merchant, J. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 661-738.

McCawley, J. D. 1991. Contrastive negation and metalinguistic negation. *In Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS) 27*, 189-206. Chicago Linguistic Society.

McCawley, J. D. 1998. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Park, B.-S., P. Y. Jung and S.-R. Oh. 2021a. Ways of deriving the anchored form of the corrective *but* construction in English. *The Journal of Linguistic Science* 98, 101-126.

Park, B.-S., P. Y. Jung and S.-R. Oh. 2021b. Contrastive negation, emphatic *do* and left-edge ellipsis. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 31(3), 451-467.

Park, B.-S., P. Y. Jung and S.-R. Oh. 2024. Intervention effects in the corrective *but* construction. *Language and Linguistics* 106, 27-49.

Park, B.-S. and H. Yang. 2022. On negative answers to polar questions in English. *Korean Journal of Linguistics*, 47(4), 705-725.

Park, B.-S., H. Yang and R. Ma. 2023. Negative answers to negative polar questions in Chinese. ms. Dongguk University.

Pesetsky, D. 2000. *Phrasal Movement and its Kin*. MIT Press.

Prudente, V. 2024. *The Essence and Duke Elligton.* Austin Macauley Publishers.

Ross, J. R. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Sailor, C. and G. Thoms. 2013. On the non-existence of non-constituent coordination and non-constituent ellipsis. In *Proceedings of the 31st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 361-370.

Sag, I. 1976. *Deletion and Logical Form*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Toosarvandani, M. 2013. Corrective *but* coordinates clauses not always but sometimes. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31, 827-863.

van Oirsouw, R. R. 1987. *The Syntax of Coordination*. Croom Helm.

Vicente, L. 2010. On the syntax of adversative coordination. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28, 381-415.

Weir, A. 2020. Negative fragment answers. In V. Déprez and M. T. Espinal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Negation*. Oxford University Press.

Wexler, K. and P. Culicover. 1980. *Formal Principles of Language Acquisition*. MIT Press.

Wilder, C. 1997a. English finite auxiliaries in syntax and phonology. In J. Black, ed., *Clitics, Pronouns, and Movement*, 321-362. Virginia Motapanyane and John Benjamins.

Wilder, C. 1997b. Some properties of ellipsis in coordination. In A. Artemis and T. A. Hall, eds., *Studies on Universal Grammar and Typological Variation*, 59-107. John Benjamins.

Wilder, C. 2013. English 'emphatic *do*'. *Lingua* 128, 142-171.

Wu, D. 2022. Syntax of negation in corrective *but* sentences. In Ö. Bakay, B. Pratley, E. Neu and P. Deal, eds., *Proceeding of the Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS)* 52, 241-253.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Level: Tertiary

