Sosite-Coordination of Case-Marked Nominals in Japanese

Japanese has nominal coordination in which conjunction -to is attached to the first conjunct and the entire coordinate structure is case-marked ([(1a), I confine myself to cases with two conjuncts]). I call this construction To-Coordination (TC). Japanese allows a construction in which conjunction sosite is flanked by case-marked nominals too (1b). I dub this construction Sosite-Coordination of Case-Marked Nominals (SCCMN) and refer to the first conjunct and the second one as the Case-Marked Nominal 1 (CMN1) and CMN2, respectively. The CMN1 and CMN2 bear the same grammatical function, the same semantic role, and the same case. This paper considers the structure of SCCMN, comparing it with TC. As for TC, I assume that the conjuncts form a constituent (i.e. a nominal coordinate structure) (2). See Oda (2017), for details of structure (2).

(1a) John-[wa] [Kokoro-to Sorekara]-o yon-da
   John-NOM.Kokoro-CONJ Sorekara-ACC read-PAST  'John read Kokoro and Sorekara.([(1a), b])

(1b) John-ga Kokoro-o, sosite-Sorekara-of,? yon-da
   Kokoro-ACC CONJ Sorekara-ACC

(2) [NP[CP [ne: Kokoro]-Ho [NP[Sorekara]]]-o ((1a)]

I assume that UG allows Parallel Merge and multi-domination (Chto 2005): Merge can apply to a syntactic object (e.g. B in (3b)) that has already been merged with another one (i.e. A) and is already dominated by a mother (i.e. C) to form B's new mother (i.e. E). In (3b), neither E nor C dominates the other, E and C dominate B, and B is shared by E and C (4(4)). Merger of A and D with B in (3) is an instance of Parallel Merge.

(3) a. A is merged with B to form C.

b. D is merged with B to form E.

(4) X and Y share Z iff (i) neither X nor Y dominates the other, and (ii) both X and Y dominate Z.

On this theoretical basis, I propose that SCCMN arises if the CMNs undergo Parallel Merge with a predicate or its projection. In (1b), two accusative NPs each undergo Parallel Merge with V to form their own VP (5).

(5) [NP John(ga)] [TP vP t-da [t: T]]

In the case of (5), VP2 is then merged with Conj as the second conjunct (the complement of Conj) and VP1 is then merged as the first conjunct (the specifier of Conj). ConjP is merged with v. I assume that the material shared by both the conjuncts (e.g. V in (5)) is ordered after the non-shared part of the second conjunct (see Chto (2018), for technical details). The CMNs that undergo Parallel Merge with the same predicate or the same projection of a predicate receive the same semantic role and bear the same grammatical function. They are case-licensed by the same element (V, v, or V-v) in complex in (5) and thus bear the same case.

Importantly, under this analysis, the CMNs in SCCMN do not form a constituent, unlike conjuncts in TC. This point explains several facts about SCCMN. Among them is its behavior in Germaine Sluising (GS), which this abstract concentrates on for the space reason. GS is exemplified by the reduced interrogative complement in (6). The antecedent of this clause elliptical contains the volitional modal (i)yo. Takita (2012) shows that the reduced interrogative clause in (6) cannot be taken to involve the cleft-construction and should be taken to engage wh-movement into [Spec, C] and deletion of the complement of C (7)).

(6) John-ga [[dono hon]-o yon-oo]-ka kime-ta-ga.
   Bill-wa [[dono hon]-o e-ka]
   John-TOP which book-ACC read-VOL-Q decide-PAST but Bill-TOP which book-ACC -Q
   kime-ague-tei-ru
   decide-hesitate-ASP-PRES
   decide-but Bill still cannot decide which book.

(7) Bill-wa [e [wa: dono hon]-o e-ka] PRO-un-rem-i

In (7), wh-word dono pied-pipes the entire object. I assume that pied-piping is induced by a covert question-particle Q (Cable 2010); a constituent that dominates a wh-word (e.g. NP in (7)) is merged with Q by set-oparmerge to form [QP [[wa: dono hon]-o] Q] and the entire QP-NP is moved. Then a string of terminal symbols can be wh-moved by pied-piping, only if it forms a constituent that Q can be merged with. With this in mind, let us turn to the behavior of TC and SCCMN in GS. In both TC and SCCMN, one of the 'conjuncts' or both can be wh-phrases (e.g. the first clauses in (8) and (9)). TC is allowed as the remnant in GS both in cases when only one
of the conjuncts is a wh-phrase (8a) and in cases when they are both wh-phrases (9a). SCCMN is allowed as the
remnant when both the CMNs are wh-phrases (9b), but not when only one of them is a wh-phrase (8b).

(8a)  John-wa [CP1 [tP [sNP [sNP John [Np Kokoro] [NP Kokoro] to [NP soso manga]] -o [NP yom-o-ka]] kime-te-ga
John-TOP Kokoro-CONJ which conjunct is ACC read-VOL-Q decide-PAST-but
Bill-wa [CP2 [NP3 [sNP sore] [NP soso manga]] -o [NP e-ka] kime-agune-te-i-ru
Bill-TOP Kokoro-CONJ which conjunct is ACC -Q decide-hesitate-ASP-PRES

(8b) John-wa [CP1 [tP Kokoro-o, sosite [NP dono manga] -o [NP yom-o-ka]] kime-te-ga, Bill-wa
Kokoro-CONJ which conjunct is ACC

[CP1 [[*Kokoro/*sore]-o, sosite [NP dono manga] -o [NP e-ka] kime-agune-te-i-ru

Kokoro-CONJ which conjunct is ACC -Q 'J. decided Kokoro and which conjunct he would read, but B. still cannot decide [Kokoro] and which conjunct.'

(9a) John-wa [CP1 [tP [NP dono shoosetu-to [NP soso manga]] -o [NP yom-o-ka]] kime-te-ga, John-TOP which novel-CONJ which conjunct is ACC read-VOL-Q decide-PAST-but
Bill-wa [CP2 [NP3 [sNP dono shoosetu-to [NP soso manga]] -o [NP e-ka] kime-agune-te-i-ru
Bill-TOP which novel-CONJ which conjunct is ACC -Q decide-hesitate-ASP-PRES

(9b) John-wa [CP1 [tP [dono shoosetu]-o, sosite [NP dono manga] -o [NP yom-o-ka]] kime-te-ga, John-TOP which novel-ACC CONJ which conjunct is ACC read-VOL-Q decide-PAST-but
Bill-wa [CP2 [dono shoosetu]-o, sosite [NP dono manga] -o [NP e-ka] kime-agune-te-i-ru
which novel-ACC CONJ which conjunct is ACC -Q 'J. decided which novel and which conjunct he would read, but B. still cannot decide which novel and which conjunct.'

The acceptability of (8a) and (9a) follows from the assumption that the conjuncts in TC form a constituent (i.e. NP1/ConjP in (8a) (9a)). Q can be merged with it, inducing pied-piping. Let us turn to (8b). Under the proposed analysis, there is no constituent exhaustively dominating the string CMN1, sosite CMN2 that Q can be merged with: the string CMN1, sosite CMN2 cannot be wh-moved as a constituent by pied-piping. The fact that (8b) is less acceptable than (8a) is partly due to this factor. Let us consider (9b). Given the unacceptability of (8b), the string with CMN1, sosite with CMN2 in (9b) cannot be taken as having been moved as a single constituent. Rather, under the present assumption that the CMNs undergo Parallel Merge with a predicate (10), it can be considered that each wh-CMN is moved within each CP (CP1/2) that is projected on top of each of the VPs (VP1/2) that are formed by Parallel Merge. The two T/ModPs that have undergone Parallel Merge with C are elided to derive the relevant part of (9b). Now let us reconsider (8b). I have claimed that the string non-wh-CMN1, sosite wh-CMN2 cannot be wh-moved as a constituent. To exclude (8b), movement of the non-wh CMN1 and the wh CMN2 within their own CP (CP1/2) should be ruled out too. It is natural to think that the non-wh element cannot be moved to Spec of an interrogative C. This is another factor that is responsible for the unacceptability of (8b).

(10) The entire picture is a little bit complicated, because there are two possibilities that should be excluded: (a) pied-piping of CMN1, sosite CMN2 as a constituent; (b) parallel and independent movement of CMN1 and CMN2 within their own CPs. The possibility (b) is unavailable for (8b), because one of the CMNs is a non-wh element. The possibility (a) is unavailable too, simply because the string CMN1, sosite CMN2 does not form a constituent. This point is an important consequence of the present analysis of SCCMN.