

Type of the Paper (Article, Review, Communication, etc.)

On the limits of across-the-board movement: Distributed extraction coordinations

Željko Bošković¹

¹ University of Connecticut; zeljko.boskovic@uconn.edu

Abstract: The paper examines distributed extraction coordinations, in which different elements move out of conjuncts of a single coordination, as in *Which book and which magazine did Mary buy and Amy read respectively*, from a crosslinguistic perspective. A number of properties of such coordinations are discussed, which includes showing that they are also subject to the ATB requirement, which will shed light on the nature of the ATB phenomenon itself. It is also shown that there is a rather strong restriction on distributed extractions which confines such extractions to one context and completely excludes one type of movement, in particular head-movement, from participating in them. The higher coordination is shown to be formed during the derivation and to be semantically expletive. Distributed extraction constructions are also shown to have consequences for the proper analysis of a number of phenomena, including subject-oriented anaphors, right node raising, *tough*-constructions, agreement, and clausal structure. Regarding subject-oriented anaphors, the paper teases apart different approaches to subject-oriented anaphors based on constructions where different elements fill SpecvP and SpecTP (the latter undergoes agreement with T and the former binds subject-oriented anaphors).

Keywords: across-the-board movement, clausal structure, coordination, Japanese, sideward merger, Slavic, subject-oriented anaphors

Citation: Lastname, F.; Lastname, F.; Lastname, F. Title. *Philosophies* 2021, 6, x. <https://doi.org/10.3390/xxxxx>

Academic Editor: Firstname Lastname

Received: date

Accepted: date

Published: date

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

It is well-known that extraction out of conjuncts is disallowed, unless the moving element moves out of each conjunct. This well-known phenomenon is illustrated by (2)-(3). The ban on extraction out of conjuncts, given in (1), is standardly referred to as the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC), and the rescuing effect in (3) as across-the-board-movement (ATB).

- (1) Extraction out of conjuncts is disallowed.
- (2) *Who_i did you see [enemies of t_i] and John?
- (3) Who_i did you see [friends of t_i] and [enemies of t_i]?

Both the CSC and the ATB exception were noted in Ross (1967). (4) and (5) give the original formulations of the CSC and the ATB exception.¹

- (4) In a coordinate structure, no conjunct may be moved, nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct (Ross 1967:98-99)
- (5) There is an important class of rules to which (4) does not apply. These are rule schemata which move a constituent out of all the conjuncts of a coordinate structure (Ross 1967:107)

The upshot of (4)-(5) is that extraction of X out of a conjunct is unacceptable unless X is extracted out of each conjunct of the coordination.

There is an interesting exception to this well-known pattern that has not received much attention, the most detailed discussions being smaller parts of larger works, in particular Postal (1998) and Zhang (2010). The exception concerns examples like (6).²

(6) Which book_i and which magazine_j did [John buy t_i] and [Bill read t_j] respectively?

Postal (1998) provides strong evidence that *which book* and *which magazine* undergo separate extractions out of the conjuncts in (6), and Zhang (2010) argues that such cases involve coordination-formation that takes place after (more precisely, through) movement.³ These examples violate the CSC ban in (1). They also do not fit the ATB pattern in (3): it is not the case that the moving element is extracted out of each conjunct in (6). (6) in fact appears to involve two separate extractions, of two different elements, out of the conjuncts. One may then expect (6) to be even worse than (2).

The goal of this paper is to examine this kind of constructions, which for ease of exposition I will refer to as distributed extractions. Additional cases of distributed extractions will be discussed in the effort to examine restrictions on distributed extractions. Evidence will be provided that all these cases involve coordination formation after movement (I will refer to such coordination as late coordination) and the precise timing of (and the operations involved in) this late coordination formation will be discussed. It will also be argued that distributed extractions are actually subject to the ATB requirement, which will shed light on the nature of the ATB phenomenon itself. It will also be shown that there is a rather strong restriction on distributed extractions which confines such extractions to one context and completely excludes one type of movement, in particular head-movement, from participating in such extractions.

It should, however, be noted that one of the main goals of the paper is descriptive, namely to broaden the scope of the phenomenon empirically. There has been very little discussion of the phenomenon in question outside of English (and outside of constructions like (6)). In this respect, the paper will bring in additional languages, with constructions which are quite different from (6). The restrictions on distributed extraction coordination established below should also be looked at from this perspective: their goal is to empirically broaden the scope of the phenomenon in question—in this respect the restrictions are actually more important than their deductions. At any rate, one of the main goals of this paper is to prompt further crosslinguistic investigation of the phenomenon in question as well as several related properties of coordination which are discussed below.

Going beyond coordination, the coordination data discussed in this paper will be shown to have consequences for a number of coordination independent mechanisms in that they shed light on how the mechanisms in question should be analyzed. To mention just some of them here: subject-oriented anaphors, right node raising, *tough*-constructions, and agreement. Regarding subject-oriented anaphors, the paper will tease apart different approaches to subject-oriented anaphors based on constructions where different elements fill the SpecvP and the SpecTP position (the latter undergoes agreement with T). The coordination data discussed in the paper will also be shown to have consequences for determining clausal structure more generally.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 I present arguments (mostly from Postal 1998, but also new arguments) that (6) involves extraction out of each conjunct. The section will also show that the ATB requirement (more precisely, a reformulated ATB requirement) is operative with such constructions. In sections 3 and 4 I present additional cases of distributed extractions and show that these additional cases are also subject to the reformulated ATB requirement. The possibility of mixing distributed extraction and traditional ATB in the same sentence is also discussed. Section 5 establishes a new generalization regarding the availability of distributed extractions and section 6 discusses islandhood of distributed extraction constructions. Section 7 and 8 examine the exact timing (and the mechanism) of late-coordination formation and explore conse-

quences of distributed extraction coordinations for other phenomena, like subject-oriented anaphors, right node raising, *tough*-constructions, agreement, and clausal structure. Section 9 is the conclusion, and Appendix discusses a related construction (referred to as *wh&wh* coordination) that also involves late coordination, outlining the range of possible crosslinguistic variation in the relevant domain. It also discusses the ordering of elements involved in late coordination formation.

2. Distributed coordinations with *wh*-movement in English

2.1. Distributed coordinations involve separate extractions

Postal (1998) gives strong evidence that each *wh*-phrase is separately extracted from the conjuncts in constructions like (6). A rather strong argument to this effect is provided by the possibility of binding into the individual conjuncts in (7), where *which man* binds an anaphor in the first conjunct and *which woman* binds an anaphor in the second conjunct.

(7) [Which man]_i and [which woman]_j did respectively the doctor talk to _{t_i} about himself_i, and the lawyer talk to _{t_j} about herself_j (Postal 1998:161)

Such licensing is also possible with parasitic gaps, as shown by (8), where the first *wh*-phrase licenses a parasitic gap in the first conjunct and the second *wh*-phrase licenses it in the second conjunct.

(8) [Which secretary]₁ and [which programmer]₂ did Jerome respectively fire _{t₁} after finding _{t₁} drunk and hire _{t₂} after finding _{t₂} sober? (Postal 1998:136)

Another argument comes from cases where the extracted elements contain an anaphor: the anaphor can be bound within the first conjunct or within the second conjunct, as in (9) (for a somewhat different reconstruction effect, see (83)).⁴ The binding relations can also be combined, as in (10) (for additional binding data, see section 7.3).

(9) a. (?) [Which painting]_i and [which book about herself]_i did John buy and Mary_i sell respectively?

b. (?) [Which book about herself]_i and [which painting]_i did Mary_i buy and John sell respectively?

(10) [Which book about himself]_i and [which picture of herself]_i did John_i buy and Mary_i sell respectively?

Also relevant are examples like (11). It is well-known that the indirect object in double object constructions cannot undergo *wh*-movement. This constraint is also operative with distributed coordinations, as shown by (11b).

(11) a. [Which nurse]₁ and [which hostess]₂ did Ernest sell cocaine to _{t₁}, and George sell heroin to _{t₂}, respectively?

b. *[Which nurse]₁ and [which hostess]₂ did Ernest sell _{t₁} cocaine and George sell _{t₂} heroin, respectively? (Postal 1998:135)

2.2. The ATB requirement on distributed coordinations

The evidence discussed in the previous section shows that distributed coordination constructions like (6) involve separate wh-movements from each conjunct. As such, they do not fit the traditional ATB-exception-to-the-CSC schema, where the CSC is voided if the moving element moves out of each conjunct. Notice, however, that examples like (6) do actually involve movement out of each conjunct, the difference between (3) and (6) being that in (3) it is the same element that moves out of each conjunct while in (6) different elements move out of the conjuncts.

Interestingly, it turns out that the ATB requirement holds for constructions like (6) as well. This is shown by the unacceptability of (12)-(13), which contrast with (14).

(12) *Which book_i and which magazine_j did [John buy t_i], [Bill read t_j] and [Mary write a novel] respectively?

(13) *Which book_i and which magazine_j did [Mary write a novel], [John buy t_i] and [Bill read t_j] respectively?

(14) Which book_i, which magazine_j and which novel_k did [John buy t_i], [Bill read t_j] and [Mary borrow t_k] respectively?

These data indicate that the ATB requirement is at work in the construction under consideration: movement still must take place out of each conjunct. This means that the ATB requirement needs to be reformulated: it is not the case that the moving element must move out of each conjunct; rather, movement must take place out of each conjunct. It can be the same element moving out of each conjunct or different elements: as long as there is a gap in each conjunct the ATB requirement is satisfied. I will refer to the cases where different elements move from the conjuncts as non-ATB ATB.⁵

Not only does the ATB requirement hold for distributed coordination constructions but it in fact holds in the same way as with regular ATB constructions. It is well-known that there is an interpretative parallelism requirement on regular ATB. Thus, both gaps must be either subjects or objects (the requirement is actually more detailed than that, it can also affect two internal arguments and concerns thematic prominence—see Franks 1993, 1995 and references therein).

(15) *I wonder who_i [t_i left] and [Mary kissed t_i].

(16) *I wonder who_i [John saw t_i] and [t_i kissed Mary].

Zhang (2010:193) observes the data in (17)-(19), which indicate that the parallelism requirement in question also holds for non-ATB ATB.

(17) [[Which nurse]_i and [which hostess]_j] t_i dated Fred and t_j married Bob respectively?

(18) [[Which nurse]_i and [which hostess]_j] did Fred date t_i and Bob marry t_j, respectively?

(19) *[[Which nurse]_i and [which hostess]_j] did Fred date t_i and t_j marry Bob, respectively?

Zhang does not discuss cases involving cross-clausal extraction. With regular ATB, the parallelism requirement in question is relaxed; i.e. it does not hold with cross-clausal ATB, as (20) shows.

(20) I wonder who_i [John saw t_i] and [Peter thinks t_i kissed Mary].

The same holds for distributed extraction coordinations.⁶

(21) Which writer_i and which actor_j does John adore t_i and Peter claim t_j will succeed in Hollywood respectively? 193
194

The ATB requirement thus holds in the same way in distributed coordination constructions as with regular ATB constructions, which further indicates that the former are a type of ATB constructions although they do not involve extraction of the same element (hence the term non-ATB ATB). 196
197
198
199

In the following sections I will present additional cases of non-ATB ATB which are quite different from English examples like (6). We will see that the ATB requirement holds in these cases as well: although different elements are moving out of the conjuncts there must be movement out of each conjunct. The cases discussed in the following sections will also enable us to establish additional restrictions on non-ATB ATB. 200
201
202
203
204

3. AP ATB in SC 205

I now turn to a case of distributed ATB in Serbo-Croatian (SC) which has interesting additional properties. SC productively allows left-branch extraction of adjectives (see Corver 1992, Bošković 2005, 2013a, Despić 2011, Talić 2017, 2019, among many others).⁷ 206
207
208

(22) Crvena_i se je meni [t_i suknja] dopala. 210
red self is_{medat} skirts pleased 211
'The red skirt pleased me.' 212
213

It also allows it in distributed coordinations. One difference from English wh-movement involving distributed coordination is that such cases involving adjectival ATB in SC do not require "respectively" (in fact, there is no clear counterpart of *respectively* in SC; note that in some cases *respectively* is not needed in English, see (93)).⁸ 214
215
216
217

(23) Crvene i bijele ona suknje i kapute prodaje. 219
red and white she skirts and coats is-selling 220
'She is selling red skirts and white coats.' 221

(24) Crvena i bijela meni suknja i haljina smetaju. 222
red and white_{medat} skirt and dress bother 223
'The red skirt and the white dress bother me.' 224
225

It is also possible to have three adjectives in this type of constructions, as in (25), with the relevant traces indicated in (26). 226
227

(25) Crvena, bijeli i šareni meni suknja, kaput i šešir smetaju. 229
red white and colorful_{medat} skirt coat and hat bother 230

(26) Crvena_i, bijeli_j i šareni_k meni [t_i suknja], [t_j kaput] i [t_k šešir] smetaju. 231
red white and colorful_{medat} skirt coat and hat bother 232
233

Importantly, as in the case of English non-ATB ATB examples from section 2, the ATB requirement is operative in the SC construction under consideration. Thus, (27), where ATB does not take place out of the last conjunct, is unacceptable.⁹ 234
235
236

- (27) *Crvena_i i bijeli_j meni [t_i suknja], [t_j kaput] i [šareni šešir] smetaju. 239
 red and white me_{DAT} skirt coat and colorful hat bother 240
 241

One might try to argue that the ATB requirement in English cases like (12)-(13) is somehow forced by *respectively*. This, however, would not extend to SC (26), where *respectively* is not present. 242
 243
 244

It should be pointed out that ATB-violating examples like (27) improve if the first two conjuncts are pronounced as a single prosodic unit (followed by a pause), with another coordinator, as in (28). What is going on here is that *suknja i kaput* form a coordination, which is then coordinated with *šareni šešir*. In other words, we are not dealing here with a single coordination with three conjuncts, as in (26)-(27), but with two separate coordinations, each of which has two conjuncts: *suknja i kaput* forms a ConjP that is itself located in the Spec of a ConjP (the head of the second coordination takes *šareni šešir* as its complement), as shown in (29). 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253

- (28) ?Crvena_i i bijeli_j mene (t_i suknja i t_j kaput) i [šareni šešir] iritiraju. 254
 red and white me skirt and coat and colorful hat irritate 255
 ‘The red skirt, white coat and colorful hat irritate me.’ 256

- (29) ?Crvena_i i bijeli_j mene [_{ConjP1} ([_{ConjP2} t_i suknja i t_j kaput]) i [šareni šešir]] 257
 red and white me skirt and coat and colorful hat 258
 iritiraju. 259
 irritate 260
 261

This kind of examples also have consequences for the domain of application of the ATB requirement. While there is extraction out of each conjunct of ConjP2, this is not the case with ConjP1 in (29). What matters here is that the first conjunct of ConjP1, which is the only conjunct from which extraction takes place, is itself a ConjP. The ATB requirement apparently does not hold across ConjPs (in a configuration where a ConjP dominates a ConjP).¹⁰ 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267

This in fact holds for regular ATB as well, as indicated by (30) (assuming the same prosody as in (29), with the first two conjuncts pronounced as a single prosodic unit (with a pause following them); *crvene* here undergoes regular ATB extraction from the first ConjP—as result, “red” modifies both “skirts” and “dresses”; there is a potential interfering factor here that is controlled for in fn. 47). 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273

- (30)?Crvene_i mene [_{ConjP1} ([_{ConjP2} t_i suknje i t_j haljine]) i [šareni šeširi]] 274
 red me skirts and dresses and colorful hats 275
 iritiraju. 276
 irritate 277
 ‘Red skirts, red dresses and colorful hats irritate me.’ 278
 279

It should also be noted that there is evidence that we are dealing with actual extraction in the relevant cases. This is confirmed by their island-sensitivity. Thus, the presence of an adjunct island between the extracted APs and the remnant NPs causes ungrammaticality in (31).¹¹ 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286

- (31) *Crvena_i, bijelij_j i šarenik_k je otišao zato što mene [t_i suknja], [t_j kaput] 287
 red white and colorful is left because me skirt coat 288
 i [t_k šešir] iritiraju. 289
 and hat irritate 290
 'He left because the red skirt, white coat, and colorful hat irritate me.' 291

There is another rather interesting aspect of the SC construction under consideration. 293
 Consider (32). There are only two fronted APs in (32), with three nouns in the lower co- 294
 ordination. Yet, in contrast to (27), (32) is acceptable. 295

- (32) Crvena_i i bijeli_j meni suknja, kaput i šešir smetaju. 297
 ed and white me_{DAT} skirt coat and hat bother 298

What is important here is that (32) is acceptable only on a particular meaning: 'red skirt, 300
 white coat, and white hat', where a traditional ATB dependency is formed between 301
 'white coat' and 'white hat' with respect to 'white'. What makes this possible is that both 302
 'coat' and 'hat' are masculine: the adjective that modifies them is also masculine (note 303
 that *crvena* and *suknja* are feminine). 304

- (33) Crvena_i i bijelij_j meni [t_i suknja], [t_j kaput] i [t_k šešir] smetaju. 306
 red and white me_{DAT} skirt coat and hat bother 307

The ATB requirement is then still satisfied in (32): (32) is in fact acceptable only on the 309
 reading on which there is an AP-gap in the base position of each of the conjuncts in (32). 310
 What is particularly interesting about this example is that it involves a mix of non-ATB 311
 ATB and regular ATB. Examples like (32) then provide evidence that non-ATB ATB can 312
 be mixed with true ATB. 313

Another example of this sort is given in (34), which involves regular ATB between 314
 'red skirt' and 'red shirt' (*košulja* is feminine). 315

- (34) Crvena_i i bijelij_j meni [t_i suknja], [t_k košulja] i [t_j kaput] smetaju. 317
 red and white me_{DAT} skirt, shirt and coat bother 318

A question arises whether this kind of mixing of non-ATB ATB and regular ATB is also 320
 possible in English. It turns out that it is although constructions of this type are less ac- 321
 ceptable in English than in SC possibly because of an additional processing load. (Gender 322
 agreement resolves the relevant filler gap dependencies in SC; this filler gap dependency 323
 resolution is not available in English. It is also possible that the presence of *respectively* 324
 interferes here, leading to an expectation that there should be three antecedents for the 325
 three gaps.¹²) 326

- (35) ?How many cakes and how many letters did Mary bake, John write, and Peter mail 328
 respectively? 329

- (36) ?How many cakes and how many letters respectively did Mary bake, John write, and 330
 Peter mail? 331

- (37) ?Which magazine and which book did Peter buy, John read, and Mary borrow re- 332
 spectively? 333

(38) ?Which magazine and which book respectively did Peter buy, John read, and Mary borrow? 334
335

Returning to SC, interestingly, in contrast to (33), (39) is unacceptable. 337

(39) *Bijeli_i i crvena_j meni [t_i kaput], [t_j suknja] i [t_k šešir] smetaju. 339

white and red me_{DAT} coat skirt and hat bother 340

Apparently, a traditional ATB dependency can only be formed between contiguous NPs here. There can be no ATB between ‘red skirt’ and ‘red hat’ given that the adjective needs to agree with the nouns and these nouns have different gender (*suknja* is feminine and *šešir* masculine). Also, there can be no ATB between ‘white coat’ and ‘white skirt’ since these nouns also have different gender (*kaput* is masculine and *suknja* feminine). Interestingly, there can apparently be no ATB between ‘white coat’ and ‘white hat’. There is no gender disagreement issue here since the nouns have the same gender. 342
343
344
345
346
347
348

The same effect is found in English. Thus, (40), where given the pragmatics of the example regular ATB dependency has to hold between the first and the third conjunct, skipping the second conjunct, is worse than (36)-(38), where this is not the case. This contrast also provides evidence that the English and the SC construction in question should be treated in the same way (given that both exhibit the contiguity effect). 349
350
351
352
353

(40) *How many letters_i and how many cakes_j did Peter write t_i, John bake t_j, and Mary address t_i respectively? 355
356

We may be dealing here with a locality effect on traditional ATB formation, where it is not possible to skip a potential ATB site.¹³ 358
359

Alternatively, this may be related to a general interpretive effect associated with distributed extraction coordinations. Notice first that examples like (6) are not ambiguous: the first trace must correspond to the first wh-phrase and the second trace to the second wh-phrase. In other words, only a crossing wh-trace dependency is possible here; a nesting dependency, which would give an interpretation where the first trace corresponds to the second wh-phrase, is disallowed. This is a general property of distributed extraction coordinations. Thus, (41) gives the only possibility for the distributed interpretation of the extracted adjectives in this SC example (ignoring the irrelevant regular ATB interpretation, on which each conjunct is red, white, and colorful), where all adjectives have the same gender, and (42) illustrates the same effect for English distributed coordination constructions involving three conjuncts, where the indices again indicate the only possibility for the interpretation of the conjuncts (the parallel behavior of the SC and the English construction under consideration in this respect can be taken as another argument for treating the two in a uniform manner). 360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373

(41) Crveni_i, bijelij i šareni_k meni [t_i sako], [t_j kaput] i [t_k šešir] smetaju. 375

red white and colorful me_{DAT} jacket coat and hat bother 376

‘The red jacket, white coat, and colorful hat bother me.’ 377

(42) Which book_i, which magazine_j, and which painting_k respectively did [John buy t_i], [Bill read t_j], and [Mary sell t_k]? 378
379

380

Distributed extraction coordinations apparently require crossing dependencies. Returning now to the unacceptable example in (39), which mixes non-ATB ATB and regular ATB, gender specification of the adjectives forces the dependencies shown in (43).

(43) *Bijeli_i i crvena_j meni [t_i kaput], [t_j suknja] i [t_i šešir] smetaju.
white and red me_{DAT} coat skirt and hat bother

(43) involves a mixture of crossing and nesting dependencies (the last trace is involved in a nesting dependency). It then seems plausible that it is ruled out due to the general crossing dependencies requirement on distributed coordinations.

As for the source of the effect of question, notice that what we are dealing with here is essentially a matching effect: the order of the conjuncts within the newly formed ConjP must match the order of the conjuncts from which extraction takes place in the original ConjP. Given that in this kind of cases the co-ordination structure is in a sense “re-created” in a higher position, with another ConjP, it seems natural to assume that there should be some parallelism between the two coordinations where the order of the conjuncts in the higher ConjP should correspond to the order of the conjuncts (which contain the relevant gaps) in the lower ConjP, which means that the first conjunct should correspond to the first gap, the second conjunct to the second gap and so on. The result of this is strictly crossing dependencies. Under this approach the ordering effect is essentially a parallelism effect (see, however, the appendix, where the parallelism effect is deduced from independent considerations).

Before concluding this section, one potentially interfering issue should be discussed. Consider (44). Gračanin-Yukseš (2007) and Citko and Gračanin-Yukseš (2013) show that SC examples like (44) can involve either coordinated wh-phrases or coordinated clauses, with ellipsis taking place in the first conjunct (they implement ellipsis through multidominance structures).

(44) Ko i šta kupuje?
who and what is-buying
‘Who is buying what?’

Evidence for the possibility of a clausal structure for (44) is provided by the possibility of examples like (45), where a clitic (*je*) follows the first as well as the second wh-phrase: this indicates that the first conjunct is actually a clause, and the same holds for the second conjunct.

(45) Ko je i šta je kupio?
who is and what is bought
‘Who bought what?’

A question then arises whether SC examples like (24) could be analyzed as involving coordinated clauses with ellipsis in the first conjunct instead of involving coordination formation in the moved position. Crucially, (46) differs from (45) regarding clitic placement.

(46) *Crvene su i bijele su meni suknje i haljine smetale.
red are and white are me_{DAT} skirts and dresses bothered

‘The red skirts and the white dresses bothered me.’ 429

The contrast between (45) and (46) then provides evidence that in (24)/(46) we are not 430
dealing with a larger coordination: it really is APs that are coordinated here. In other 431
words, we have here evidence that the construction in question does not involve a larger, 432
clausal coordination with ellipsis in the first conjunct.¹⁴ 433

Notice also that adjectives involved in the coordination in question must bear the 434
same case, as shown by the unacceptability of (48) (as shown by (47), ‘manage’ assigns 435
instrumental and ‘sell’ assigns accusative to its complement). The restriction would be 436
very difficult to formulate if what we were dealing with here were a larger coordination 437
(cf. (47c)), not coordination of adjectives. 438

(47) a. On rukovodi malom fabrikom. 440

he manages small_{INSTR} factory_{INSTR} 441

b. On prodaje velike kuće. 442

he sells big_{ACC} houses_{ACC} 443

c. On rukovodi malom fabrikom i prodaje velike kuće. 444

he manages small_{INSTR} factory_{INSTR} and sells big_{ACC} houses_{ACC} 445

(48) *Malom_i i velike_j on rukovodi t_i fabrikom i prodaje t_j kuće. 446

small_{INSTR} and big_{ACC} he manages factory_{INSTR} and sells houses_{ACC} 447

It is also worth noting here that SC clitics are second position clitics (see Bošković 449
2001 and references therein); as such they are standardly used as a constituenthood test 450
(since they cannot follow more than one constituent). Clitic placement in (49) then con- 451
firms that *crvene i bijele* is a single constituent, which is indeed the case under the coor- 452
dination-in-the-moved position analysis.¹⁵ 453

(49) Crvene i bijele su meni suknje i haljine smetale. 455

red and white are_{MEDAT} skirts and dresses bothered 456

‘The red skirts and the white dresses bothered me.’ 457

Additional evidence that we are dealing here with a regular coordination in the moved 459
position is provided by comparing left-branch extraction non-ATB ATB cases, which 460
involve multiple left-branch extraction with coordination, with multiple left-branch ex- 461
traction cases that do not involve coordination. Bošković (2016) discusses multiple 462
left-branch extraction cases like (50).¹⁶ 463

(50) Onu_i staru_j prodaje t_i t_j kuću. 465

that old sells house 466

‘He is selling that old house.’ 467

(51) *Prodaje onu_i i staru_j kuću. 468

sells that and old house 469

‘He is selling that old house.’ 470

(52) *[Onu_i i staru_j]_i prodaje [t_i kuću]. 471

that and old sells house 472

(50) shows that multiple left-branch extraction of the demonstrative and the adjective is 474
possible (left-branch extraction of both demonstratives and adjectives is in principle 475

possible in SC). The elements in question cannot be coordinated within a single NP in situ, as shown by (51); not surprisingly, they also cannot undergo left-branch extraction as a coordination, as shown by (52).

Turning now to non-ATB ATB left-branch extraction, such cases also involve multiple LBE. Notice, however, that (24) contrasts with (53).

- (53) *Oni_i i bijele_j meni [t_i kaputi] i [t_j haljine] smetaju.
 those and white me_{DAT} coats and dresses bother
 ‘Those coats and white dresses bother me.’

What we see at work in (53) is what is at work in (50)–(51). The relevant elements, the demonstrative and the adjective, can undergo left-branch extraction; in fact they can be involved in multiple left-branch extraction, as shown by (50). However, these elements cannot be coordinated, as shown by (51), hence they cannot undergo left-branch extraction as a coordination (cf. (52)). The ungrammaticality of (53) is not surprising from this perspective: (53) is ruled out on a par with (51) because *one* and *bijele* cannot be coordinated. That the restriction in question is relevant in (53) is not surprising given that elements that undergo non-ATB ATB are involved in a coordination with each other. However, in contrast to (51), where the demonstrative and the adjective are coordinated in their base position and modify the same noun, the demonstrative and the adjective obviously cannot be involved in a coordination in their base position in (53). This is so because of the interpretation of (53), which is “those coats and white dresses”—the demonstrative and the adjective do not modify the same noun in (53), in contrast to (51). The coordination in (53) can then only take place after movement, since the relevant elements are clearly not coordinated in their base-position. The individual movements themselves also must be possible in (53), given that such multiple left-branch extraction is in principle possible, as shown by (50) (see Bošković 2016). (53) is thus ruled out because it involves illicit coordination, where the coordination takes place after movement. The data in question then also provide evidence that we are indeed dealing here with late coordination formation (i.e. non-base coordination).

Notice that we also have additional evidence here that non-ATB ATB examples involving left-branch extraction do not involve a larger coordination with ellipsis in the first conjunct. Under such an analysis we would not be able to appeal to the impossibility of coordination of a demonstrative and an adjective, i.e. the ungrammaticality of (51), since this is not what would be coordinated in (53) under that analysis.¹⁷

Another issue that is relevant here is that a clitic (*mu*) can intervene between the demonstrative and the AP in (50), as shown by (54). Recall that this is not possible with non-ATB ATB constructions, as shown by (46).

- (54) ?Onu_i mu staru_i prodaje t_i t_jkuću.
 that him_{DAT} old sells house
 ‘He is selling that old house to him.’

All this confirms the coordination in the moved position analysis of (24)/(46). Elements undergoing multiple LBE need not move to the same position, hence a clitic can intervene between them, as in (54). Elements involved in non-ATB ATB (as in (46)), on the other hand, are located in the same position, in fact non-ATB ATB involves a coordinated phrase, hence a clitic cannot intervene between the relevant elements, which are coordinated with each other.

The above data thus provide additional evidence that coordination formation should not be restricted to base-generation (i.e. lexical insertion/external merge), i.e. it should not be restricted in such a way that it can only occur pre-movement.

In summary, in this section we have seen another case of non-ATB ATB, which also involves non-base coordination formation and which is also subject to the ATB requirement. We have also seen that the ATB requirement does not apply across ConjPs. Furthermore, we have seen that non-ATB ATB can be combined with traditional ATB and that the crossing dependencies requirement on distributed coordination is maintained regardless of whether such constructions involve only non-ATB ATB or a mixture of non-ATB ATB and traditional ATB.

4. Japanese numeral constructions

Japanese floating quantifier constructions provide another case of non-ATB ATB extraction.¹⁸ Consider (55).

- (55) John-ga [VP [PP yaoya-kara] [mikan-o 3-ko]-to [banana-o 5-hon] katta.
 John-NOM vegetable.store-from orange-ACC 3-CL and banana-ACC 5-CL bought
 'John bought [3 oranges and 5 bananas] from a vegetable store.'

Importantly, it is possible to extract the NP from the conjuncts in (55), with a coordination structure recreated in a higher position (for some speakers 'respectively' is optional here, others require it; see also fn. 18).

- (56) John-ga [mikan-to banana]-o yaoya-kara (sorezore) [3-ko]-to
 John-NOM orange and banana-ACC vegetable.store-from respectively 3-CL and
 [5-hon] katta.
 5-CL bought

Furthermore, the ATB requirement is also imposed in such cases, as shown by the contrast between (59), where extraction takes place from each conjunct, and (58), where this is not the case (extraction does not take place from the last conjunct).¹⁹

- (57) John-ga yaoya-kara [mikan-o 3-ko]-to [banana-o 5-hon]-to
 John-NOM vegetablestore-from orange-ACC 3-CL and banana-ACC 5-CL and
 [budou-o 2-fusa] katta.
 grape-ACC 2-CL bought
 'John bought 3 oranges, 5 bananas and 2 bunches of grapes from a vegetable store.'

- (58) ?*John-ga [mikan-to banana]-o yaoya-kara (sorezore) [3-ko] to
 John-NOM orange and banana-ACC vegetable.store-from respectively 3-CL and
 [5-hon] to [budou-o 2-fusa] katta.
 5-CL and grape-ACC 2-CL bought

- (59) John-ga [mikan-to banana-to budou]-o yaoya-kara (sorezore)
 John-NOM orange and banana and grape-ACC vegetable.store-from respectively
 [3-ko] to [5-hon] to [2-fusa] katta.
 3-CL and 5-CL and 2-CL bought

It should also be noted that this kind of non-ATB ATB is possible without the coordinator *to* in the higher position. In such cases another coordinator, *sosite*, appears in the higher position.²⁰

- (60) John-ga [mikan-oi *sosite* banana-oi] yaoya-kara (sorezore)
 John-NOM orange-ACC and banana-ACC vegetable.store-from respectively
 [ti 3-ko]-to [tj 5-hon] katta.
 3-CL and 5-CL bought

The ATB requirement is imposed in this case too. Thus, (62), where extraction takes place from each conjunct, is better than (61), where extraction takes place from the first and the second, but not the third conjunct.

- (61) ?*John-ga [mikan-oi *sosite* banana-oi] yaoya-kara (sorezore)
 John-NOM orange-ACC and banana-ACC vegetable.store-from respectively
 [ti 3-ko] to [tj 5-hon] to [budou-o 2-fusa] katta.
 3-CL and 5-CL and grape-ACC 2-CL bought

- (62) John-ga [mikan-oi *sosite* banana-oi *sosite* budou-ok] yaoya-kara
 John-NOM orange-ACC and banana-ACC and grape-ACC vegetable.store-from
 (sorezore) [ti 3-ko] to [tj 5-hon] to [tk 2-fusa] katta.
 respectively 3-CL and 5-CL and 2-CL bought

As another parallel to SC, (61) and (58) are actually marginally acceptable if there is a pause following the second conjunct in the lower ConjP (i.e. if the first two conjuncts in the lower ConjP form a separate intonational phase). This is the same prosody as the one discussed above with respect to SC (28). Recall that this prosodic pattern, on which the first two conjuncts in (57) are pronounced as a single prosodic unit, has a different derivation, on which ‘three oranges’ and ‘five bananas’ form a coordination (as reflected in this unit also forming a prosodic unit), which is then coordinated with “two grapes”. In other words, on this prosodic pattern we are dealing here with two separate coordinations, each of which has two conjuncts.

Notice also that both examples like (61) and examples like (58) show island sensitivity, as shown by (63) and (64) respectively, where an adjunct island intervenes between the final and the original position of the relevant elements.²¹

- (63) ?*Mikan-o *sosite* banana-o Mary-wa [John-ga yaoya-kara (sorezore)
 orange-ACC and banana-ACC Mary-TOP John-NOM vegetable.store-from respectively
 3-ko-to 2-hon katta-kara] okotta.
 3-CL and 2-CL bought-because got.angry

‘Mary got angry because John bought 3 oranges and 2 bananas from a vegetable store.’

- (64) ?*Mikan-to banana-o Mary-wa [John-ga yaoya-kara (sorezore)
 orange and banana-ACC Mary-TOP John-NOM vegetable.store-from respectively
 3-ko-to 2-hon katta-kara] okotta
 3-CL and 2-CL bought-because got.angry

‘Mary got angry because John bought 3 oranges and 2 bananas from a vegetable store.’

The Japanese construction under consideration in this section thus represents another case of non-ATB ATB, where movement takes place out of each conjunct, but it is different elements that are moving out of the conjuncts. As in the case of non-ATB ATB examples from English and SC discussed above, the ATB requirement holds in this case too: although different elements are extracted, extraction must take place from each conjunct.

5. When is non-ATB ATB possible?

The above data confirm the existence of non-ATB ATB, where there is movement out of each conjunct but different elements are moving out of the conjuncts. In other words, the ATB requirement should be stated in a such a way that it does not require that the same element moves out of each conjunct but simply that there is movement out of each conjunct.

There is another interesting property of non-ATB ATB. All the cases involving non-ATB ATB discussed above involve coordination formation in the moved position. What happens when non-ATB ATB is attempted without coordination formation in the moved position? Consider in this respect (65):

(65) *Which president do you wonder which famous writer John reads [articles about t] and [essays by t] respectively?

(65) involves extraction of different elements from a single coordination without coordination formation in the higher position. In English this requires moving wh-phrases to different +whCPs, which in turn brings in a wh-island violation. Still, (65) is clearly much more degraded than typical wh-island violations.²² The fact that the contrast between (65) and (6) is stronger than a typical wh-island violation suggests that coordination formation in the moved position is necessary for non-ATB ATB.

Consider also (66)-(67), which also involve non-ATB ATB without coordination formation in the moved position. Both examples are unacceptable. Furthermore, (67), where movement does not take place out of each conjunct (hence it is not in accordance with the ATB requirement), is even worse than (66), where movement does take place out of each conjunct (in ATB fashion) (in (67) there are two moved elements and two gaps, while in (66) there are two moved elements and three gaps; the example mixes non-ATB ATB and ATB).

(66) *Which president do you wonder which famous writer John reads [articles about t], [essays by t], and [tweets from t] respectively?

(67) **Which president do you wonder which famous artist John reads [articles about t], [essays by t], and [tweets from Brady] respectively?

The contrast between (66) and (67) parallels in the relevant respect the contrast between SC (26) and (27), indicating that the ATB requirement still holds in such cases. Both examples are, however, unacceptable. What seems to be going on here is that performing non-ATB ATB without coordination formation in the moved position leads to a violation, call it a violation of requirement X (to be discussed more below): X is violated in both (65) and (66). The reason why (67) is even worse is that it violates X as well as the ATB requirement that there needs to be movement out of each conjunct of a coordination.

Notice now that in (65), the wh-phrases that are moving out of the coordination are interpreted in different SpecCPs (i.e. different clauses). It is not out of question that this is the source of the ungrammaticality of (65); i.e. it may be that for some reason wh-phrases undergoing this kind of extraction must be interpreted in the same SpecCP, in which case

(65) would not necessarily show that non-ATB ATB requires coordination formation in the moved position. This potentially interfering factor cannot be controlled for in English, but it can in SC, SC being a multiple wh-fronting language. Let us then test the possibility of non-coordinated non-ATB ATB with multiple wh-fronting in SC. The relevant examples are given below. (68), involving non-ATB ATB without higher coordination, is unacceptable. (69), its counterpart involving coordination in the higher position, is clearly better than (68).²³

(68) *Prema kome_i za kim_j su podržali [otpor t_i] i [potragu t_j]?
to whom for whom are supported resistance and pursuit

(69) Prema kome_i i za kim_j su podržali [otpor t_i] i [potragu t_j]?
to whom and for whom are supported resistance and pursuit
'Resistance to whom and pursuit of who did they support?'

The interfering factor noted above with respect to English (65) also does not arise with respect to SC non-ATB ATB constructions discussed in section 3. These constructions also require coordination formation in the moved position, as shown by the contrast in (70), where (70a) involves coordination formation in the moved position and (70b) does not, as well as the contrast in (71), involving wh-counterparts of constructions like (70a-b), where the wh-phrases are interpreted in the same SpecCP.²⁴

(70) a. Crvenu_i i bijelu_j je kupio [[t_isuknju] i [t_jhaljinu]].
red and white is bought skirt and dress
'He bought a red skirt and a white dress.'

b. *Crvenu bijelu je kupio suknju i haljinu.

(71) a. Kakvu_i i čiju_j je ukrao [[t_isuknju] i [t_jhaljinu]]?
what-kind-of and whose is stolen skirt and dress
'He stole what kind of a dress and whose skirt.'

b. *Kakvu čiju je ukrao suknju i haljinu?

The data discussed in this section thus indicate that non-ATB ATB requires coordination formation in the moved position, i.e. the elements undergoing non-ATB ATB must participate in a coordination in their final position.

Recall now the example noted in fn. 5, repeated here, which is unacceptable although, just like (14), it involves extraction (of different elements) from each conjunct. The issue here is that, in contrast to (14), which involves wh-movement out of each conjunct, (72) involves wh-movement out of the second and third, and head-movement out of the first conjunct.

(72) *[Which newspaper_i and which magazine_j] did_k [Mary t_k write a book], [John may buy t_i], and [Bill will read t_j] respectively.

If the ATB requirement simply requires that there is movement out of each conjunct, there is then no violation of the ATB requirement here. The ungrammaticality of (72) can, however, now be accounted for independently of the ATB requirement. We have seen above that when different elements are extracted out of conjuncts of a single ConjP they must participate in a coordination in the higher position. This is not the case with *did* in (72). The unacceptability of (72) then follows independently of the ATB requirement.

But there is a more general issue here. In English, distributed coordination is also possible with A-movement, as in (73) (*respectively* is not needed in (73)).

(73) The dogs and the roosters barked and crowed all night. (Zhang 2010:170)

Japanese, however, does not allow constructions like (73) on the relevant reading (the distributed interpretation is difficult to obtain in (74), where the pragmatically implausible regular ATB reading where (the) dogs and (the) birds were both barking and flying is strongly preferred), whereas SC patterns with English in allowing them (see (75)), which can be taken to indicate that distributed coordination can be more restricted with A- than with A'-movement, given that such constructions clearly involve the former.²⁵

(74) Inu-to tori-ga hitobanzuyuu hoe-te ton-da.
 dog-and bird-Nom all.night bark-and fly-Past
 '(The) dog(s) and (the) bird(s) barked and flew all night.' (Japanese)

(75) Psi i pjevci su cijelu noć lajali i kukurikali.
 dogs and roosters are all night barked and crowed (SC)

Importantly, I am unaware of any language that allows it with head-movement, i.e. I am not aware of any language that allows examples like (76).

(76) *Will_i, can_j, and must_k [John t_i buy a book], [Peter t_j sell a magazine], and [Mary t_k borrow a novel] respectively?

There may then be something more general about head-movement that disallows distributed coordinations involving head-movement. Interestingly, Kayne (1994) argues that head coordination is quite generally disallowed (see his work for evidence to this effect and discussion how traditional head coordination constructions should be treated²⁶). If distributed extractions require that extracted elements be coordinated, as argued above, and if head coordination is quite generally disallowed, as Kayne (1994) argues, it then follows that distributed coordinations with head-movement, as in (76), will be disallowed. The impossibility of distributed extraction involving head-movement can in fact be taken as another argument for the proposed coordination-in-the-moved position restriction on non-ATB ATB.

6. Islandhood

In this section I briefly note a locality effect associated with late coordination formation. SC allows extraction of conjuncts, as in (77) (see Stjepanović 2014a, 2020a, Bošković 2017, Oda 2017).

(77) ?Knjige je Marko [t_i i filmove] kupio.
 books is Marko and movies bought
 'Marko bought books and movies.'

Such extraction is, however, disallowed with constructions under consideration: after formation of non-ATB ATB coordination, conjunct extraction is not possible:

- (78) *Crvene_i tvrdiš da se [t_i i bijelij] meni dopadaju [t_i suknje] i 762
 red you-claim that self and white _{medat} please skirts and 763
 [t_i kaputi] 764
 coats 765
 ‘You claim that red skirts and white coats please me.’ 766

While it is not trivial to implement this formally, intuitively it seems clear what is going 768
 on here: ConjP that is formed after movement, i.e. ConjP not located in the base position, 769
 is an island (such ConjP would in fact be a barrier in Chomsky’s 1986 *Barriers* system). 770

In fact, not only conjunct extraction, but extraction out of a conjunct is also disal- 771
 lowed from a coordination formed by movement. This is shown by (79), involving ATB 772
 wh-movement out of a late-formed ConjP located in SpecCP, which is clearly worse than 773
 simple extraction out of interrogative SpecCP, as in (80). 774

- (79) *Which famous president_i do you wonder [which paintings of t_i]_j and [which books 776
 about t_i]_k did he meet [fans of t_i]_k and [readers of t_k]_k? 777
 (80) ?Which famous president_i do you wonder [which paintings of t_i]_j John sold t_j? 778

Late-formed coordinations are apparently islands, disallowing any kind of extraction, 780
 even extractions that are in principle possible out of regular (i.e. base-generated) coor- 781
 dinations. 782

7. When and how is late coordination formed? 783

While the primary goal of this paper is not to provide a full analysis of distributed 784
 extraction coordinations—it is simply premature to do that before the empirical domain 785
 of the phenomenon is properly determined (the main goal of this paper being to make a 786
 contribution to that end)—in this section I will nevertheless address the issue of how late 787
 coordination formation is to be implemented, focusing on its timing. 788

Zhang (2010) discusses examples like (6) and argues that they involve coordination 789
 formation through movement. More precisely, she argues that the higher ConjP is 790
 formed through sideward movement (see Nunes 2004).²⁷ On this analysis, the higher 791
 ConjP of (6) (the relevant steps of the derivation of (6) are outlined in (81)) is formed not 792
 by regular (i.e. upward) movement but by sideward merger of the relevant elements into 793
 ConjP (see (81b)), which is introduced into the structure directly in its final position, the 794
 interrogative SpecCP (see (81c)). 795

- (81) a. [bought which book] [read which magazine] 797
 b. [_{ConjP} [which book] and [which magazine]] 798
 c. [_{CP} [_{ConjP} [which book] and [which magazine]] did John buy [~~which book~~] and 799
 Peter read [~~which magazine~~]] 800

While the analysis captures the most prominent property of distributive extraction coor- 802
 dination, namely that it involves late-coordination formation, it faces issues with some of 803
 the data discussed above. Recall that distributed extraction coordinations exhibit island 804
 effects, as illustrated again below with an inner island effect (cf. also SC (31) and Japanese 805
 (63)-(64)). Under this analysis we cannot capture such islandhood effects, since the 806
 wh-phrases do not undergo movement out of the island. 807

(82) *[[How loudly] and [how softly]] didn't you say [[that John had spoken t] and [that Peter had replied t]]? (de Vos and Vicente 2005)

Another problem for Zhang's analysis is raised by the possibility of intermediate reconstruction effects, as in (83), where Condition A cannot be satisfied in either the final or the original (i.e. θ) position of *which picture of himself*. (Under Zhang's analysis, only at these points are both *John* and *which picture of himself* present in the structure.)

(83) Which book and which picture of himself_i did John_i say that Mary bought and Sue sold respectively?

Parasitic gap constructions like (8), repeated here, also raise an issue for Zhang's analysis.

(84) [_{CP}[_{ConjP} [Which secretary]₁ and [which programmer]₂] did Jerome respectively fire t₁ after finding t₁ drunk and hire t₂ after finding t₂ sober]? (Postal 1998: 136)

The wh-phrases that participate in late coordination license parasitic gaps within their initial conjuncts here. As is well-known, a wh-phrase in situ cannot license a parasitic gap: a parasitic gap is licensed by a moved wh-phrase that c-commands the parasitic gap. Under Zhang's analysis, there is never a c-command relationship between the moved wh-phrases and the parasitic gaps which they license in (84).

These facts indicate that some regular (i.e. upward) movement must be involved in the derivation of distributed extraction coordinations. Under Zhang's analysis there is no regular movement, as a result of which the coordination is formed (i.e. integrated into the structure) in the final position. While this captures the late-coordination formation requirement, it essentially does it too late. However, while the above facts indicate that regular movement must also be involved in the derivation of distributed coordinations (note that sideward movement obviates island effects, see Nunes 2004 and the discussion below) they do not necessarily mean that Zhang's sideward-movement analysis is fatally flawed. The late-formed ConjP can still be formed through sideward movement, as long as this ConjP is introduced into the structure earlier, not in the final position (e.g. within the same phase as the original ConjP, but this will be revised below), in which case the late-formed ConjP would be moving out of the island in (82), and the movement would bring the anaphor close enough to *John* in (83) to satisfy Condition A during the derivation. (This would still leave (84) unaccounted for; I will return to that example below—see the discussion of (119), which resolves the issue in question.) The modification of Zhang's analysis, on which distributed coordinations involve a combination of sideward movement and regular movement, as a result of which the higher coordination is formed earlier than on Zhang's analysis (though it is still formed during the derivation) is in the spirit of the well-known fact that in ATB constructions, there cannot be an island boundary between the edge of the second conjunct and the original extraction site within that conjunct, which under Nunes's sideward-movement analysis means that the relevant element needs to get to the conjunct edge, i.e. 'close' to its sideward movement site in the first conjunct. It is then not that surprising that the newly formed ConjP, which is also formed through sideward merger from the original ConjP under Zhang's analysis, cannot be indefinitely far from the original ConjP, which means that it should be introduced into the structure earlier, not in the final position.

7.1. Deducing the coordination in the moved position requirement

Involving sideward movement in derivational coordination formation may help us deduce the coordination in the moved position requirement, established in section 5,

according to which extraction of different elements from a coordination is possible only if they are themselves later involved in a coordination. The derivationally-formed coordination is essentially semantically expletive, the elements involved in our derivationally-formed coordination are not interpreted as coordinated. E.g. the interpretation of (6) is ‘which book did John buy and which magazine did Bill read’, there is no coordination of *which book* and *which magazine* in the interpretation of this example. Similarly, there is no coordination of *the dogs* and *the roosters* in the interpretation of (73), whose interpretation is that ‘the dogs barked and the roosters crowed’. The same holds for any of the SC examples discussed above; thus, there is no coordination of ‘to whom’ and ‘for whom’ in the interpretation of (69). In fact, SC examples like (23)-(24) are ambiguous: on one reading, the adjectives are interpreted as coordinated (on that reading, (23) is interpreted as ‘she is selling red and white skirts, and she is selling red and white coats’). This is not the case on the other reading, which we have been focusing on above, on which (23) is interpreted as ‘she is selling red skirts and white coats’. The ambiguity is easily captured if on the latter reading the higher coordination is indeed expletive since the adjectives are not interpreted as coordinated on that reading.

That the higher coordination is not itself interpreted (see below for additional evidence to this effect) suggests that it is present for a formal reason. Sideward merger in fact provides a straightforward formal reason for that. It seems safe to assume that it is not possible to move different elements out of a single ConjP. Sideward merger is the mechanism that makes it possible to get around that restriction. As noted above, sideward merger was originally employed by Nunes (2004) to get around islandhood/locality effects: sideward merger out of a context that would induce a locality/islandhood effect voids that effect. Sideward merger is then also what makes it possible to get around the restriction on moving more than one element out of a single coordination. The relevant elements are sideward merged before they move out of the ConjP. The derivationally formed coordination is then introduced into the structure. But crucially, the relevant constructions then never involve regular movement of different elements out of a single coordination (despite appearances). Sideward merger is then needed to get around the restriction in question, and derivational coordination formation is exactly what provides the needed sideward merger mechanism.

Notice that a single element can move out of a ConjP—this is in fact what happens with regular ATB. This is not surprising. ConjP is traditionally considered to be an island, this is in fact what the ban on extraction out of coordinations implies. In the phasal system, it is then natural to assume that ConjP is a phase, given that phases have a potential for inducing locality violations (Bošković 2017 and Oda in press in fact propose that ConjP is a phase).²⁸ There are a number of analyses of regular ATB where movement takes place only out of the first conjunct. This is e.g. the case with the often assumed null Operator movement analysis (see e.g. Munn 1992, 1993), on which a null Op moves within non-initial conjuncts but there is no movement out of these conjuncts: movement takes place only out of the initial conjunct. The same holds for Nunes’s (2004) sideward movement analysis, where XP participating in an ATB construction is merged in its theta-position in the second conjunct, then re-merged in the theta-position in the first conjunct, undergoing movement only from that conjunct.²⁹ Under both of these analyses of regular ATB, upward movement out of ConjP takes place only out of the initial conjunct. In (3), it takes place from SpecDP of the first conjunct, where *who* is located prior to the extraction out of ConjP. Under Chomsky’s (2000, 2001) approach to the PIC, *who* at the edge of the first conjunct is actually located at the edge of ConjP.³⁰ If two different elements were to undergo movement out of the same ConjP, the second one could not get to the edge of ConjP (the element at the edge of the second conjunct is not at the edge of the ConjP). Sideward merger into another ConjP is then what enables this element to get out of the problematic ConjP without undergoing actual movement out of it.³¹

To summarize, under the suggestion made here the derivational ConjP formation provides a formal mechanism that makes it possible for more than one element to get dislocated from a single ConjP. This also deduces the restriction established above that different elements that move out of a single ConjP must themselves get coordinated. It also captures the semantic expletiveness of late coordination formation, given that it is present for a strictly formal reason.

The semantic expletiveness of late coordination formation enable us to capture another property of late coordination formation constructions. *And* is not the only coordinator in English. What is interesting is that even when a different coordinator is used in the lower, semantically contentful coordination, *and* is used in the higher, semantically expletive coordination. Thus, while the literature discusses only cases with the coordinator *and*, it is possible to use the disjunctive *or* in the lower position of the constructions under consideration; still, only *and* is possible in the higher, non-interpreted coordination, *or* is not possible, as shown by (85) (we are looking at the distributed reading here, e.g. “either John bought Moby Dick or Mary sold Vogue”).

- (85) a. Which book and which magazine did John buy or Mary sell respectively?
 b. *Which book or which magazine did John buy or Mary sell respectively?

What is essentially going on here is that the most neutral coordinator is used in the derivationally-formed coordination, even if a different element is used in the lower position (note that this shows that we are not simply dealing here with coordinator copying), which is not surprising if the higher coordination is not interpreted (i.e. if it is indeed semantically expletive).

Also relevant here are the SC examples in (86)-(87) (noted by Ksenia Zanon, p.c., for Russian). Repetition of the coordinator *i* ‘and’ in SC brings in an additional meaning, as indicated by the rough translation of (86). Importantly, this kind of coordination cannot be used in derivationally-formed coordination, as shown by (87).³² Note also that (87) gets better if the first *i* ‘and’ is dropped.

- (86) Ona prodaje i suknje i kapute.
 she sells and skirts and coats
 ‘She sells both skirts and coats.’
 (87) *I crvena i bijela meni i suknja i kaput smetaju.
 and red and white meDAT and skirt and dress bother
 ‘The red skirt and the white coat bother me.’ (SC)

All this makes sense if the derivationally-formed coordination is indeed semantically expletive (see below for additional evidence to this effect)—this is why the neutral coordinator is used to perform that function. This in turn confirms that the late-formed coordination is present for a strictly formal reason; as discussed above, this is what enables extraction of different elements from a single coordination, deducing the generalization from section 5 that such extraction is possible only in the presence of a higher coordination.

7.2. Where is late-formed ConjP inserted?

Returning now to the derivation of non-ATB ATB constructions, let us now address more closely the question of how close to the original ConjP, the late-formed (i.e. derivationally-formed) ConjP is introduced. To address the question I will look at distributed

coordination under A-movement. First, examples like (88) indicate that what is present in the θ -position of the relevant conjuncts (given the predicate-internal subject hypothesis) is not the *you and me* ConjP: only *you* is present in the θ -position of the first conjunct and only *me* is present in the θ -position of the second conjunct, given that each conjunct agrees separately in (88), in contrast to (89). These examples thus confirm that elements involved in distributed extraction coordinations start the derivation separately, as expected given the interpretation of such constructions. (For additional arguments to this effect based on binding, see (100), (101), and (103) below; the data in question quite conclusively show that the conjuncts start the derivation separately.)

(88) He wants you and me to respectively go out of your mind and (go) out of my mind. 971

(89) cf. You and I are going out of our/*my/*your mind(s). (Postal 1998:161) 972

In (88) the conjuncts trigger agreement separately. In (90), on the other hand, they trigger it (in fact must trigger it, cf. (91)), jointly. 973

(90) A dog and a rooster were barking and crowing all night. 974

(91) *A dog and a rooster was barking and crowing all night. 975

This means that late coordination must be formed before subject-verb agreement is determined here. In light of this I will use such constructions as a diagnostic for determining when exactly the derivationally-formed coordination is inserted into the structure. I will consider the constructions discussed in this section under Chomsky (2000, 2001) approach to agreement, where agreement is established through the Agree relation holding between a probe and a goal, leaving it to the reader to verify that the conclusions reached below can also be maintained under e.g. Chomsky (1995) approach, where agreement is established in a Spec-Head relation (though with somewhat different derivations). Under the Agree analysis, when the relevant agreement relation is established ConjP must be located lower than T, so that T can probe it (which means T must c-command it). 976

Consider (90) in light of this. The relevant part of (90) can be derived as in (92) (only the relevant elements are shown in the structures below): we have a vP&vP coordination in the lower position, with the subjects still not being conjoined with each other at this point. Another ConjP (what I have referred to above as late/derivationally-formed ConjP) is then formed through sideward movement (92b). Given that this ConjP must be higher than the θ -positions of the relevant elements, as discussed above (cf. (88)), and that it must be below T so that T can probe it, there must then be a phrase between vP and TP, with the late-formed ConjP (see (92b)) introduced into the Spec of this phrase (see (92c); I leave open the identity of this phrase, referring to it as XP below). T then probes the late-formed ConjP (92d), before the latter moves to SpecTP (92e).³³ 977

(92) a. [ConjP [vP a dog...]] and [vP a rooster ...]] 1001

b. [ConjP a dog and a rooster] 1002

c. [XP [ConjP a dog and a rooster] X [ConjP [vP a dog...]] and [vP a rooster ...]] 1003

d. T [XP [ConjP a dog and a rooster] X [ConjP [vP a dog...]] and [vP a rooster ...]] 1004

| _____ | **Agree** 1005

e. [TP [ConjP a dog and a rooster]] T [XP [ConjP a dog and a rooster] X [ConjP [vP a dog...]] and [vP a rooster ...]] 1006

1007

1008

1009

Additional structure then needs to be present between T and vP so that the higher ConjP can be inserted into the structure outside of the lower ConjP but still below T (92c). This is straightforward in examples like (90), involving an auxiliary. It also needs to be the case in examples like (93).³⁴ I take this not to be an issue, given that many authors have anyway argued for additional structure between TP and vP even for examples like (93) (see Bošković 2015, Cinque 1999, Collins 2005, Merchant 2013, de Swart 1998, Ramchand and Svenonious 2013, Tenny 1992, among others).

(93) A dog and a rooster barked and crowed all night.

Consider now a very interesting example in (94).³⁵

(94) John and Mary were hunting lions and were frightened by snakes respectively (Dougherty 1970)

What is particularly interesting about this example is the discrepancy between agreement and interpretation within the conjuncts: what is interpreted in the relevant θ -position of the first conjunct is *John*, and what is interpreted in the relevant θ -position of the second conjunct is *Mary*. Yet, the agreement within the conjuncts is with *John and Mary*.³⁶ Let us see how this mismatch can be captured.

First, the lower coordination here must be on a higher level than in (90)—it cannot be a vP&vP coordination given that the auxiliary is present inside each conjunct. The auxiliary is plural (although what is interpreted as the subject of each conjunct is singular), which means that the auxiliary agrees with the late-formed ConjP. So, what has to happen here is that the auxiliary agrees with the late-formed ConjP, just as in (90), but the auxiliary must be within the lower ConjP, in contrast to (90).

Note first that, quite independently of the issues under consideration here, there are two ways of analyzing such constructions, as noted in Bošković (2020a). If only phrases can be coordinated, the subject and the auxiliaries cannot be located in the same phrase here, given that the subject is outside of the coordination and the auxiliaries are inside of the coordination—such examples would then provide evidence for a return to split Infl. (94) would then involve TP&TP coordination, with the subject undergoing ATB-movement out of each conjunct to the Spec of a higher projection, which for ease of exposition I refer to as YP.³⁷ Alternatively, if traditional bar-level coordination is allowed, (94) can involve T'-coordination, with the subject undergoing ATB-movement from each conjunct to SpecTP. The choice between the two analyses is immaterial here, I will adopt the former for ease of exposition (the reader should bear in mind though that both analyses are compatible with the discussion below).

Consider then (94). The derivation will proceed similarly to (90), as shown in (95)-(98): *John* and *Mary* are inserted in their θ -positions, i.e. the positions where they are interpreted, separately (95). Late coordination is then formed (96), and inserted into SpecXP of each conjunct (97). Since XP is located lower than the auxiliary, each auxiliary will probe this ConjP, resulting in plural agreement on the auxiliary. The late-formed ConjP then undergoes ATB movement out of the coordination ((98); what is coordinated here is TP&TP, hence lower ConjP (ie. the ConjP that is not late-formed) dominates TP).

(95) [_{VP} John hunting lions] b. [_{VP} frightened Mary by snakes]

(96) [_{ConjP} John and Mary]

(97) [_{TP} were-T [_{XP}[_{ConjP} John and Mary] X [_{VP} John hunting lions] and [_{TP} were-T [_{XP}[_{ConjP}

| _____ | Agree

| _____ | Agree

John and Mary] X [_{VP} frightened Mary by snakes]

(98) [YP [ConjP John and Mary] [ConjP [TP [XP [ConjP John and Mary] [VP John hunting lions] and
[TP were-T [XP [ConjP John and Mary] [VP frightened Mary by snakes]

The example, which shows a mismatch between agreement and interpretation in the second conjunct, can then be accounted for.

7.3. Binding and subject-oriented anaphors

In the derivations of non-ATB ATB constructions discussed above the conjuncts start separately, the coordination being formed during the derivation and inserted into the structure above the position where the relevant elements were originally generated. Strong evidence that this is indeed what is going on in the constructions under consideration is provided by the behavior of the relevant elements regarding binding, in particular, by the fact that depending on their position the relevant elements can function as binders either jointly or separately. (99) illustrates the former case: the derivationally-formed coordination, *John and Mary*, binds the reciprocal.

(99) [John and Mary]_i seem to each other_i to be the best candidate in the election and the best nominee for the convention respectively.

In (100), on the other hand, the conjuncts function as binders separately: *John* binds *himself* and *Mary* binds *herself*.

(100) [John_j and Mary_k]_i hired himself_j and nominated herself_k respectively.

The dual behavior with respect to binding is easily captured under the current analysis: when the anaphor is located low in the structure, namely below the position in which the relevant elements are base-generated (i.e. inserted prior to derivational coordination formation), the relevant elements function as binders separately (this is the case with (100)). On the other hand, when the anaphor is inserted high in the structure, where only the derivationally-formed coordination is higher than the anaphor, the relevant elements function as the binder together (this is the case with (99)).

Furthermore, (101) (due to Steven Franks, p.c.) confirms that the conjuncts must start separately. In (101), they induce a blocking effect for binding separately, as the simplified structure in (102) shows (the closest subjects for the anaphor are *t_i* in the first conjunct and *t_j* in the second conjunct).³⁸

(101) *John and Mary seem to be the best candidate in each other's campaigns and the best nominee in each other's parties respectively.

(102) *[John_i and Mary_j]_k seem to be *t_i* the best candidate in each other's_k campaigns and *t_j* the best nominee in each other's_k parties respectively.

Furthermore, the individual conjuncts can function as binders of subject-oriented anaphors, as shown by (103) (*svom* is a subject-oriented anaphor).

(103)?Pasi i kokoška_j su lajali u [svom_i dvorištu]_i kokodakali u
dog and chicken are barked in its.anaphor yard and crowed in
[svom_j kokošinju].
its.anaphor hen-house

‘A dog and a chicken barked in its yard and crowed in its hen house.’ (SC) 1108

Such examples have important consequences for the debated and unsettled issue of how subject-oriented anaphors should be analyzed. What is important here is that what is located in SpecvP are the individual conjuncts but what is located in SpecTP and what agrees with T is the whole coordination, as the simplified derivation in (104) shows. 1109
1110
1111
1112
1113

(104) [TP [Pasi i kokoška]_k su [XP tk [ConjP [vP ti lajali u svom_i dvorištu] i
dog and chicken are barked in its yard and
[vP ti kokodakali u svom_j kokošinju]]]. 1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119

This is a rather rare mismatch, which can help tease apart different approaches to subject-oriented anaphors. What functions as the binder of the subject-oriented anaphors in (103)/(104) is the element in SpecvP, not the element in SpecTP or the element that undergoes Agree with T. (103) then provides evidence for approaches where the binder of subject-oriented anaphors is (or can be) the element located in SpecvP and against approaches where the element located in SpecTP and/or the element that undergoes Agree with T functions as the binder. There are many different approaches along the latter lines (see e.g. Pica 1987, Reuland 2011, Antonenko 2012), examples like (103) provide evidence against all of them (I discuss the implications of distributed extraction for subject-oriented anaphors in more detail in work in progress). 1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130

7.4. Where is agreement? 1131

The agreement/semantics mismatch constructions also have ramifications for an important question, where is agreement (i.e. what is its locus). It is standardly assumed that although agreement surfaces on the verb, it is not actually on the verb, i.e. its source is somewhere else (but see Lasnik 1995a for a proposal that in V-raising languages, the agreement is actually on the verb). It is certainly not a priori clear what the source of agreement is, whether the verb has it to start with (the verb is in fact where the agreement surfaces), or it is somewhere higher up (like on T/I). Semantics/agreement mismatches discussed above provide evidence for the latter (including for V-raising languages). If the source of agreement is the verb itself, not a higher head like T/I, given the standard assumptions regarding the locality of agreement and the VP-internal subject hypothesis, we would expect the verb to show singular agreement in (105) (cf. (105b)). What is going on here is that the subject of the verbal projection and the subject of the clause are different elements—the coordination is the subject of the latter but not the former. That the agreement here is with the coordination can then be taken to provide evidence that the source/locus of agreement is not its host, the verb. The same point can be made with SC, where the verb raises out of vP (see Bošković 2001 and Stjepanović 1999); in fact both the auxiliary and the participle show plural agreement in (106a), indicating that even when it comes to the agreement that shows up on the participle, the verb is not the source/locus of the agreement. 1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151

(105) a. In this neighborhood, a dog and a rooster bark and crow all night. 1152

b. [vP a dog barks]..... [vP a rooster crows] (expected if the verb agrees) 1153
1154

(106) a. Pas i pjevac su cijelu noć lajali i kukurikali. 1155
dog and rooster are all night barked.pl and crowed.pl 1156

b. Pas i pjevac non-stop laju i kukuriču. 1157
 dog and rooster non-stop bark.pl and crow.pl (SC) 1158

The system developed above may also enable us to account for some rather puzzling constructions noted by Goodall (1987). Consider (107)–(108), focusing on the former example ((108) is a result of a familiar ordering effect with late coordination constructions discussed briefly above, and in more detail in the appendix). 1159–1163

(107) John and Mary saw himself and herself (respectively). 1164–1165

(108) *John and Mary saw herself and himself (respectively). 1166–1167

In the current system, (107) can be analyzed as involving late coordination formation for both the subject and the object, as shown below. 1168–1169

(109) a. [_{vP} John saw himself] b. [_{vP} Mary saw herself] 1170–1171

(110) a. [_{ConjP1} John and Mary] b. [_{ConjP2} himself and herself] 1172–1173

ConjP1 is then inserted into SpecXP from (92) and ConjP2 undergoes right node raising (more on right node raising below). Agreement in this kind of double late coordination constructions works as in the constructions discussed above, as illustrated by (111), and can be accounted for in the same way. 1174–1177

(111) John and Mary like/*likes himself and herself (respectively). 1178–1179

There is, however, one wrinkle raised by such constructions, which is that only one verb is pronounced. I suggest that there actually is coordination of the vPs here. The derivation discussed above (cf. (109)–(110)) would lead to *John and Mary saw and saw himself and herself*. It is possible that a haplology motivated PF deletion takes place here, deleting *and saw*. There is a potential alternative. A number of authors have argued that verbs in English undergo short V-movement (see e.g. Johnson 1999, Lasnik 1995b, Bošković 1997; such analyses often assume overt object shift in English, which would not affect anything given the discussion below). Under this analysis, and still assuming that there is vP coordination here, the verb would undergo across-the-board head movement out of the vPs in (109). The only thing that would remain in the coordinated vPs would then be the coordinator itself. I suggest that in such a case, where independent movement operations move everything out of a coordinated phrase but the coordinator, the coordinator itself is deleted. 1181–1193

7.5. Right node raising and tough-constructions 1194–1195

In the examples discussed above, the late-formed coordination undergoes wh-movement (cf. (6)) or A-movement to SpecIP (cf. (90), whose derivation is given in (92)). There are other movement operations that the late-formed coordination can undergo, like right node raising (112) or *tough*-movement ((113); additionally, SC and Japanese examples discussed above involve scrambling). 1196–1200

(112) John sold, and Mary bought, gold rings and raw diamonds from South Africa respectively. (Abels 2004) 1201–1203

(113) George and Martha are respectively easy for me to fool and hard for anyone to take advantage of. (McCawley 1998:294)

While exploring the issue in detail would take us beyond the scope of this paper, I will briefly note here that distributed coordination constructions may have some implications for the proper analyses of right node raising and *tough*-constructions. Thus, (113) seems to be difficult to handle under the null Op-movement analysis of *tough*-constructions, where what undergoes movement is a null Op that is licensed by a co-indexed c-commanding element, as in *John_i is Op_i tough to please t_i*. In (113), it is not clear that there would ever be a c-command relationship between *George* and *Martha* and the null operators that each of these DPs would need to license (for discussion and comparison of different analyses of *tough*-constructions, see Bošković 2020b).

Regarding right node raising, constructions like (112) raise a serious problem for most accounts of right node raising (e.g. the ATB rightward movement or the PF deletion one; see Abels 1994), since *gold rings and raw diamonds from South Africa* would be generated in the object position of each verb, which would give us wrong interpretation (the whole thing should then be interpreted as the object of each verb). The late coordination formation analysis straightforwardly resolves the issue since under this analysis the coordination is not present in the base: what is present in the base (i.e. the relevant theta-positions) is simply *gold rings* in the first conjunct and *raw diamonds from South Africa* in the second conjunct. The coordination in question is formed derivationally (the relevant elements are not interpreted as coordinated, as discussed above). Under the rightward movement analysis, the derivationally-formed coordination can then be inserted in the right-node raised position.³⁹

8. Movability

Returning to the derivation of non-ATB ATB constructions, we have seen above that the coordination that participates in agreement is formed during the derivation. Looking at the structures in (92) and (98), we can see that the late-formed ConjP is inserted into the Spec of the first projection (not counting the lower ConjP in determining the first projection) above the position where the relevant elements are interpreted.⁴⁰ Such examples may then help us determine the timing of derivationally-formed coordination insertion into the structure (assuming that they are illustrations of a broader pattern): based on such examples I then tentatively conclude that the derivationally-formed ConjP is inserted into the first projection above the position where the relevant elements are interpreted—(this can even be within the original ConjP, in which case the derivationally formed ConjP is inserted in both conjuncts, undergoing regular ATB out of the lower ConjP). The precise locality condition—“the first projection”—in the above statement may end up being revised upon future scrutiny of distributed coordinations⁴¹—what is important here is that the derivationally-formed ConjP is inserted very close to the positions where the relevant elements (i.e. its conjuncts) are interpreted (for the reason why this is the case, which ties the issue to the ordering of elements participating in late-coordination formation, see Appendix).

The SC construction discussed in section 3 can help us become more precise regarding the derivation of non-ATB ATB constructions, the reason for that being that with left-branch extraction (LBE), which is employed in the SC construction in question, it is possible to introduce a locality/islandhood effect very close to the base-generation position of the relevant elements. But before we discuss that, one point needs to be emphasized.

In any language I am aware of, only mobile elements can participate in ATB non-ATB constructions. The SC construction discussed in section 3 involves LBE, which is not possible in English, but is possible in SC. While non-ATB ATB involving LBE is possible in SC, as we have seen above, it is not possible in English (114a), a language which disallows LBE (114b).⁴²

- (114) a. *Red, Mary bought dresses 1256
 b. *Red and blue, Mary bought houses and dresses. 1257
 1258

The effect in question is actually also illustrated with English (11), repeated here. 1259
 1260
 1261

- (115) a. [Which nurse]₁ and [which hostess]₂ did Ernest sell cocaine to t₁, and George sell heroin to t₂, respectively? 1262
 1263
 b. *[Which nurse]₁ and [which hostess]₂ did Ernest sell t₁ cocaine and George sell t₂ heroin, respectively? (Postal 1998:135) 1264
 1265
 c. cf. Which nurse₁ did Ernest sell cocaine to t₁ 1266
 d. *Which nurse₁ did Ernest sell t₁ cocaine? 1267
 1268

As noted above, in contrast to the prepositional double object constructions (115c), the indirect object in DP DP double object constructions cannot undergo wh-movement (115d).⁴³ It also cannot participate in distributive extraction coordinations, as shown by (115b), which contrasts with (115a). 1269
 1270
 1271
 1272

As another illustration of this effect, there are prepositions in English which disallow stranding: 1273
 1274

- (116) a. Jerome tickled Marsha in that way. 1275
 1276
 b. *What way did Jerome tickle Marsha in? 1277
 c. cf. In what way did Jerome tickle Marsha? 1278
 d. Ernie did it for someone else's sake. 1279
 e. *Whose sake did Ernie do that for? 1280
 f. For whose sake did Ernie do that? (Postal 1998:127) 1281
 1282

Informally, we can consider the PPs in (116) to be barriers, which renders the P-complements in (116) immobile (note that the whole PP can move). Importantly, the same effect is found with the distributive extraction coordination in (117), which involve the PPs in question. 1283
 1284
 1285
 1286

- (117) *What way_i and whose sake_j did Jerome tickle Marsha in t_i and Peter hugged Mary for t_j respectively? 1287
 1288
 1289
 (118) cf. In what way_i and for whose sake_j did Jerome tickle Marsha t_i and Peter hugged Mary t_j respectively? 1290
 1291
 1292

The mobility requirement (which is essentially a locality-of-movement requirement) is surprising from the point of view of Zhang's sideward merger analysis. Sideward movement/merger was originally employed by Nunes to get around islandhood/locality effects (provided it takes place while the island is an independent root phrase, which is the derivation we are focusing on): sideward movement/merger out of a context that would induce a locality/islandhood effect voids that effect. Whatever locality/islandhood effect is involved in (114), (115b), and (116) (see, respectively, Bošković 2013a and Corver 1992, Douglas 2016 and Hornstein and Weinberg 1981, and Hornstein and Weinberg 1981 and Postal 1998, among others), sideward merger should be voiding it. What these facts then indicate is that the relevant elements undergo regular movement before sideward 1293
 1294
 1295
 1296
 1297
 1298
 1299
 1300
 1301
 1302

merger into another ConjP (i.e. there is a no-directly-from-the-interpreted-position restriction on derivational ConjP formation). 1303
1304

The parasitic gap constructions discussed above also require this movement. Consider again (119). 1305
1306
1307

(119) [Which secretary]₁ and [which programmer]₂ did Jerome respectively fire t₁ after 1308
finding t₁ drunk and hire t₂ after finding t₂ sober? (Postal 1998: 136) 1309
1310

As noted above, a parasitic gap is licensed by a moved wh-phrase that c-commands the parasitic gap. In accounts like Nissenbaum (2000) and Nunes (2004), it is not necessary for the wh-phrase to move to SpecCP to license a parasitic gap; movement to a lower position can do it. In fact, under Nissenbaum's account the wh-adjuncts in (119) are adjoined to their vPs, and the wh-phrases crucially need to move to adjoin to these vPs to license the parasitic gaps. This is the crucial step in parasitic gap licensing in this account. What is important for our purposes is that the wh-phrases need to undergo regular movement to license parasitic gaps within their conjuncts before undergoing sideward merger into ConjP in (119)—immediate sideward movement, as in Zhang's analysis, would not be sufficient for parasitic gap licensing. I then take the above facts to indicate that the relevant elements undergo regular movement before sideward merger into another ConjP.⁴⁴ 1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322

The SC construction from section 3 can help us pinpoint the timing of regular and sideward movement. What is relevant here is that, in contrast to regular LBE as in examples like (22), what is in the literature referred to as deep LBE, illustrated by (121), is disallowed (see Corver 1992, Bošković 2005, 2013a, Stjepanović 2014b, among others). With deep LBE, the nominal from which LBE takes places is a complement of another nominal, which assigns it genitive case. 1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329

(120) Crvene_i sam vidio [t_i kuće]. 1330
red am seen houses 1331
'I saw red houses.' 1332

(121) *Crvenih_i sam vidio [NP₂ vlasnike [NP₁ t_i kuća]]. 1333
red am seen owners houses 1334
'I saw owners of red houses.' 1335
1336

For an account of the ungrammaticality of (121), the reader is referred to Bošković (2013a) and Corver (1992). The precise reasons for the grammaticality of (121) need not concern us here. What matters is that, as Corver (1992) and Bošković (2013a) show, the problem here arises with movement from NP1 to NP2 (there is no issue with movement out of NP1 per se (i.e. when the relevant NP is not dominated by another NP), otherwise even (120) would be unacceptable). 1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342

Bearing this in mind, the following data shed a crucial light on the timing of regular and sideward movement involved in ATB non-ATB. 1343
1344
1345

(122) ?Crvenih_i i plavih_j sam vidio [NP₁ vlasnike [ConjP [NP t_i kuća] i [NP t_j 1346
red and blue am seen owners houses and 1347
automobila]]] 1348
cars 1349
'I saw owners of [red houses and blue cars].' 1350

- (123) *Crvenih_i i plavih_j sam vidio [_{ConjP}[_{NP1} vlasnike [_{NP} t_i kuća] i [_{NP1} ljubitelje
red and blue am seen owners houses and fans
[_{NP} t_j automobila]]]
cars
'I saw [owners of red houses] and [fans of blue cars].'

There is a contrast between (122) and (123), which is particularly telling in light of the deep LBE effect from (121). The deep LBE effect is apparently still present in (123), but is voided in (122). What this means is that there is regular movement into NP1 in (123) but not in (122) (there are two NP1s, i.e. higher NPs, in (123) due to the level of coordination—cf. the translation of the examples). As discussed in Corver (1992) and Bošković (2013a) and briefly noted above, adjectives are base-generated at the very edge of the nominal domain in SC (this is what makes LBE possible in SC). Any movement from this position will take the APs into NP1 in (123); this movement is precisely what Bošković (2013a) argues causes a problem in (121). Crucially, in (122), there is a phrase, namely ConjP, in between the lower nominal domain and the higher NP (i.e. NP1). The APs can then undergo movement from the base-position without moving into the higher nominal domain in (122), in contrast to (123), namely by moving to the edge of ConjP. Stjepanović (2014a, 2020a), Bošković (2017), and Oda (2017) provide independent evidence that movement to the edge of ConjP is in fact independently possible in SC. After undergoing this movement from their interpreted positions, the APs can then undergo sideward merger into the late-formed ConjP in (122). This late-formed ConjP should be inserted into the structure higher than the original ConjP (i.e. the indicated ConjP in (122)) given that, as Bošković (2013a) discusses, regular movement from the edge of the complement of N into the NP itself causes a locality violation in SC. Recall that, as discussed above, late-formed ConjP can be inserted into a phrase right above the original ConjP, which in this case is NP1. Since there is no regular movement from one NP domain into another there is then no locality violation.

The relevant derivations are mapped out below: simplifying what exactly happens here, I will simply assume that the complement of a noun in this context is a barrier (the exact situation is more complicated (see Bošković 2013a, Corver 1992 and discussion below), but this suffices for our purposes—the relevant phrase (i.e. the complement of the noun) is given in shadow bold red below). In (125), which corresponds to (123), regular movement (shown as movement of α) crosses a barrier, which induces a locality effect (in fact, the same effect as in (121)). In (124), which corresponds to (122), regular movement does not cross a barrier—only sideward movement crosses a barrier, but sideward movement voids locality effects (crossing here is metaphorical, sideward movement voids islandhood because it actually does not involve crossing of the island boundary: α is merged with β (forming a ConjP) in a separate derivational space, and then inserted into the position shown in (124)).⁴⁵

- (124) [_{NP1} [$\alpha+\beta$] N1 [**ConjP** α_i [_{NP} t_i (t_i in base-interpreted position of α)
(125) *_{[NP1} [$\alpha+\beta$] [_{NP1} α_i N1 [**NP** t_i

The contrast between (122) and (123) was important in establishing the derivations outlined in (124)-(125). Now, in these examples the nominal complement bears genitive case, which is the counterpart of accusative with verbs—it is the regular structural case

that nouns assign to their complements. Just like some verbs assign special inherent cases to their complements, the same holds for some nouns. Importantly, Bošković (2013a) shows that while deep LBE out of genitive complements of nouns is unacceptable, as shown by (121), where the nominal complement is genitive, deep LBE out of complements of inherently case-marked complements of nouns is possible, as shown below.⁴⁶

(126) Ekstremnom_i je podržao otpor [t_i kongresu].
 extreme_{DAT} is supported resistance congress_{DAT}
 ‘He supported resistance to the extreme congress.’

As pointed out by a reviewer, this makes a prediction: the counterpart of (123) with an inherently Case-marked nominal complement should be better than (123). This is indeed the case.

(127)?Ekstremnom_i i privremenom_j je podržao otpor [t_i kongresu] i
 extreme_{DAT} and temporary_{DAT} is supported resistance congress_{DAT} and
 pomoć [t_j parlamentu]
 help parliament_{DAT}

The contrast between (123) and (127) quite strongly confirms the conclusions reached above regarding the contrast between (122) and (123).⁴⁷

Notice also that when a noun is modified with two adjectives, double LBE distributed extraction is disallowed:

(128) *[ConjP [Skupe_i stambene_j] i [stare_k željezničke_l]] sam vidio [ConjP [t_i t_j
 expensive_{fem} residential_{fem} and old_{masc} railway_{masc} am seen
 zgrade] i [t_k t_i mostove]]
 buildings_{fem} and bridges_{masc}
 ‘I saw expensive residential buildings and old railway bridges.’

Importantly, even regular LBE is not possible in this context (see Bošković 2005).

(129) *Skupe_i stambene_j je vidio [t_i t_j zgrade].
 expensive residential is seen buildings
 ‘He saw expensive residential buildings.’

There are, however, cases where double LBE is in principle. One such case, discussed in section 2.1, is shown in (130). Importantly, distributed extraction coordination is also possible in this context, as (131) shows.

(130) Onu_i staru_j je prodao [t_i t_j kuću].
 that old is seen house
 ‘He saw that old house.’

(131) [Onu_i staru_j] i [ovu_k novu_i] je prodao [t_i t_j kuću] i [t_k t_i vikendicu].
 that old and this new is sold house and weekend.house

All of this confirms the movability requirement on elements that participate in distributed extraction coordination: the relevant elements must be mobile, which indicates that they undergo regular movement before sideward merger.

Putting everything that we have seen above together, we can map out the derivation of non-ATB ATB constructions more generally. It is apparently not possible for the relevant elements to undergo sideward movement into late formed ConjP directly from the positions where they are interpreted. They have to undergo regular movement from that position, after which they can undergo sideward movement into the newly-formed ConjP. If a locality effect can be created right at the base-generated position, sideward movement will then not be able to obviate it (it would be taking place too late); but if the locality effect is created slightly higher than the base-generated position so that there is room for regular movement to take place before the locality effect kicks in, the locality effect gets obviated through sideward movement. Any locality effect higher up, i.e. higher than the point of insertion of the late-formed ConjP, which we have seen is still inserted close to the positions in which the relevant elements are base-generated, will still be in effect, due to the movement of the late-formed ConjP itself. All of this is mapped out in (132). (The brackets where a locality effect could in principle pop up due to regular, not sideward, movement crossing it are given in shadow bold red. For ease of exposition, I use a trace for the movement that precedes formation of the derivationally-formed ConjP, and a struck-out copy for the movement of the derivationally-formed ConjP itself. Two phrases are given between the final landing site and the original position of the movement of the derivationally-formed ConjP merely to indicate that this movement is generally longer than the movement that α alone undergoes, which is generally very short.)

(132) $[\alpha+\beta]_j$ **[wp** ... **[zP** ~~$[\alpha+\beta]_j$~~ $[_{YP} \alpha_i$ **[xP** t_i

Regarding locality effects seen above, the locality effect in (123) arises due to the crossing of the redded XP between α_i and t_i in (132), which means with movement of the element that will later participate in late coordination ((122) crucially differs from (123) in that that step of movement in (122) does not cross a barrier; it essentially takes place below XP in (132) due to the presence of additional structure in (122)). The locality effect in (82), on the other hand, arises due to the crossing of a redded phrase between $[\alpha+\beta]_j$ and ~~$[\alpha+\beta]_j$~~ in (132), which means with movement of the late-formed coordination itself. The reconstruction effect in (83) also occurs on the path between $[\alpha+\beta]_j$ and ~~$[\alpha+\beta]_j$~~ . Regarding agreement effects, if agreement takes place below ZP in (132), which means below ~~$[\alpha+\beta]_j$~~ (see (132)), it will involve agreement with an individual conjunct, i.e. α . This is the case with (88) (and with SC A-N agreement). On the other hand, if it takes place above ZP, it will involve agreement with the whole ConjP, i.e. $[\alpha+\beta]$, which is the case with examples like (90) and (94). The same holds for binding. If it takes place below YP, the individual conjuncts will function as binders. This is the case in (100), (102), (103), and (107). If it takes place above YP, the whole coordination will function as the binder, which is the case in (99).⁴⁸

Importantly, the facts discussed above indicate that islandhood/locality effects are selectively present with non-ATB ATB constructions. In most cases they are present, but in some cases they are voided. This could not be captured if we were to simply adopt Zhang's analysis, where the relevant elements undergo sideward merger into the late-formed ConjP straight from their interpreted position, with the late formed ConjP inserted in the final landing site—no locality effects should then be present at all (all the examples in (31), (64), (82), (114b), (117), (123), and (128) are thus problematic for this analysis). We also could not capture the state of affairs depicted above if the relevant elements were to undergo regular movement from their interpreted position all the way

to their final landing site, with the late-formed ConjP formed there. E.g., having in mind examples like *And then Ann left*, where the complement of *and* is a non-coordinated CP, one could imagine an alternative to the sideward merger analysis on which the Conj head takes the whole CP as its complement. Assuming that the coordinated phrases have to move into ConjP, (6) could then be analyzed in terms of ConjP shells, as in [_{ConjP} which book and_i [_{ConjP} which magazine t_i [_{CP} ..]]].⁴⁹ On such an analysis locality effects would never be obviated ((122) is thus problematic for this analysis).⁵⁰ On the other hand, the selective presence of locality effects can be captured on an analysis which essentially combines the two accounts just noted, on which there is both regular movement and sideward movement involved in the derivation of non-ATB ATB constructions. We have seen that such an analysis can also capture agreement and binding effects found with non-ATB ATB constructions as well as the mobility requirement on the elements involved in non-ATB ATB and the ability of these elements to license parasitic gaps on their own.

9. Conclusion

This paper has provided additional evidence that it is possible to move different elements from conjuncts involved in the same coordination and that such constructions involve coordination formation in a non-base generated position, i.e. after movement (cf. Zhang 2010). It was shown that such constructions are also subject to the ATB requirement: although different elements are moving out of conjuncts movement still must take place out of each conjunct. This means that the traditional ATB requirement needs to be reformulated: it is not the case that the moving element must move out of each conjunct but simply that movement must take place out of each conjunct. It can be the same element that is moving out of each conjunct or different elements; the ATB requirement is satisfied as long as there is movement out of each conjunct (furthermore, the ATB requirement does not hold across ConjPs). Traditional ATB, where the same element moves out of more than one conjunct, and what I have referred to as non-ATB ATB, where different elements are moving out of the conjuncts, can in fact be mixed under extraction out of the same coordination, as expected if all that is needed is that there is movement out of each conjunct. Furthermore, mixed non-ATB ATB cases have the same ordering restrictions (regarding the order of the conjuncts) as pure non-ATB ATB cases.

We have also seen that there is a restriction on non-ATB ATB, where different elements are moving from different conjuncts, in particular, non-ATB ATB requires coordination formation in the moved position. Additionally, head-movement cannot be involved in non-ATB ATB, which in fact follows from the coordination-in-the-moved-position requirement if head coordination is disallowed, as Kayne (1994) argued.

I have also discussed the precise timing of derivational coordination formation, concluding that the late-formed coordination is inserted into the structure very close to the phrase where the relevant elements are interpreted (under sideward merger analysis of distributed coordination; see Appendix for the reason for this), not in the final position of the relevant elements (as in Zhang 2010). The relevant elements, however, first need to undergo regular movement from the positions where they are interpreted: they cannot undergo sideward merger into the derivationally-formed ConjP straight from the positions where they are interpreted: The derivation of non-ATB ATB constructions then involves both regular and sideward movement.

The derivationally-formed coordination is semantically expletive in that elements participating in such coordination are not interpreted as coordinated; as a result only the most neutral coordinator is used in such coordination (even when a different element is used in the lower position). The coordination in question has also been shown to cause agreement/semantics mismatches, which arise because a coordination that is not semantically interpreted participates in determining agreement. The presence of the coordina-

tor in question was shown to be motivated by formal reasons (this is in fact what enables extraction of different elements from a single coordination).

Finally, the analyses and the coordination data discussed in this paper have been shown to have consequences for determining the proper analysis of a number of mechanisms and constructions, in particular subject-oriented anaphors, right node raising, *tough*-constructions, the source of agreement, and the more general issue of clausal structure. Regarding subject-oriented anaphors, non-ATB ATB constructions were shown to provide evidence against approaches where the element located in SpecTP and/or the element that undergoes Agree with T function as the binder for subject-oriented anaphors based on constructions where different elements fill SpecvP and SpecTP (in such cases, the latter undergoes agreement with T but the former binds subject-oriented anaphors).

Funding: This research received no external funding

Acknowledgments: For helpful comments and suggestions, I thank anonymous reviewers, the audiences at University of Ljubljana and Slavic Linguistic Society 15 (organized by Indiana University), and the participants of my Fall 2021 seminar at the University of Connecticut, especially Akihiko Arano, Steven Franks, Adrian Stegovec, Sandra Stjepanović, and Ksenia Zanon.

Appendix: On the typology of late coordination constructions

Above we have seen a number of cases involving coordination formation in the moved position, i.e. after movement. All these cases also involve coordination in the lower position, i.e. they involve extraction out of a coordination. A question arises if late coordination formation is possible without coordination in the lower position, i.e. if the relevant movements do not take place out of a ConjP. Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek (2013) argue that it is. They consider constructions like (133) and argue that crosslinguistically they can involve either larger (i.e. clausal) coordination where only the *wh*-phrase is realized in the first conjunct, which they argue is the case with English (133), or coordination of *wh*-phrases, which they argue is the case with Bulgarian (134).

(133) What and where did you eat?

(134) Koj and kakvo e kupil?

who and what is bought

'Who bought what?'

They furthermore argue that *wh&wh* coordinations like (134) involve coordination formation after movement (analyzing it in fact in terms of sideward movement, following Zhang 2010).⁵¹ Thus, they observe that in English, it is not possible to have obligatory arguments in the coordination in question, as (135) shows. This is expected under the clausal coordination analysis, where (133) is treated as involving coordination of two clauses, *what did you eat and where did you eat?*

(135) *What and where did you buy?

The acceptability of (134) then indicates that we are dealing here with *wh&wh*, rather than clausal coordination.⁵²

Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek also observe that coordinations like (134) are not possible with *wh*-phrases in situ. In fact, it is quite generally not possible to coordinate a subject and an object of the same clause, which means that (134) cannot involve base coordination that would then undergo movement. In other words, the coordination here can only be formed after movement.

Note also that, like distributed coordinations, wh&wh coordinations are sensitive to islandhood, as shown by Bulgarian (136), involving an adjunct island (note that Bulgarian does not show Comp-trace effects).

- (136) *Koj i kakvo si jadosan zaštoto e kupil?
 who and what are angry because is bought
 ‘You are angry because who bought what?’

At any rate, if Citko & Gračanin-Yukseš’s account of Bulgarian (134) is correct, such examples provide evidence that late coordination formation is not limited to constructions involving movement out of a coordination. Notice also that, like the derivationally-formed coordination discussed in the main text, the coordination discussed in the appendix is also not semantically interpreted. Thus, the interpretation of (134) is simply ‘who bought what’, there is no coordination of the wh-phrases in the interpretation of this construction.⁵³ Not being interpreted, i.e. being semantically expletive in the relevant sense, can then be taken to be the hallmark of derivationally formed coordination (regardless of whether late coordination formation takes place out of a coordination or not). In other words, coordination can be formed during the derivation but if that happens it has no semantic import—only base-coordination is interpreted.

Notice furthermore that given that the structure instantiated by Bulgarian (134) is apparently not allowed in English, the availability of non-distributed wh&wh coordinations, which, if Citko and Gračanin-Yukseš (2013) are right in their treatment of such coordinations involve late coordination formation without movement out of a coordination, should not be tied to the availability of constructions like (6) (which involve coordination in the lower position, i.e. late coordination formation out of a coordination), in a sense that the availability of the latter would imply the availability of the former (though SC happens to allow both, see (44) and the discussion below).

It should, however, be noted that the former (i.e. non-distributed late coordination) is not possible with the non-wh arguments in the SC example in (137) (the fronting in (137a) can in principle involve topicalization, focalization, or scrambling (see Bošković 2004a), the construction is apparently ruled out regardless of which of these options is taken, in contrast to (44)).⁵⁴

- (137) a. *Jovanu i knjigu daju.
 Jovan_{DAT} and book_{ACC} they-are-giving
 ‘They are giving Jovan a book.’
 b. *Jovan i kuću kupuje.
 Jovan_{NOM} and house_{ACC} is-buying
 ‘Jovan is buying a house.’ (SC)

Postal-style distributed coordinations are not restricted in this way. Thus, they are possible with topicalization in (138) or even with A-movement, as discussed above (cf. (73), though there is crosslinguistic variation in this respect, as noted above).⁵⁵

- (138) Under the pillow and in the drawer Lulu put the diary and hid her letters, respectively (Zhang 2010:170)

Given that there clearly must be rather strong additional restrictions on non-distributed wh&wh coordinations, which are not operative with Postal-style distributed coordina-

tions, it is not out of question that the unavailability of the former in English (in contrast to the availability of the latter) is due to those additional restrictions, i.e. that we are not dealing with a deeper point of variation in this case, where English would allow late coordination formation only out of another coordination. (Recall that SC allows it regardless of whether late coordination formation takes place out of a coordination or not.) Rather, more construction-specific issues could be involved.

Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek (2013) in fact tie the availability of wh&wh coordination to the availability of multiple wh-fronting: since English does not have multiple wh-fronting it cannot then have the structure in question. However, it is not clear why multiple wh-fronting should be relevant here. Under Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek's analysis, the interrogative C in (134) has only one Spec, which is filled by ConjP.

There are additional reasons why the availability of (134) should not be tied to multiple wh-fronting. Thus, as another argument for the wh&wh (as opposed to clausal) coordination account of Bulgarian (134), Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek (2013) observe that such constructions show Superiority effects, i.e. strict ordering of coordinated wh-phrases. They argue that this would not be expected if (139) involves coordination of two clauses, where each clause has only one wh-phrase, which undergoes movement.

- (139) a. Koj i kakvo e kupil?
 who and what is bought
 b. *Kakvo i koj e kupil?

Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek (2013) argue that what is relevant here is that Bulgarian is a multiple wh-fronting language. Multiple wh-fronting languages differ regarding whether they show superiority effects under multiple wh-fronting (see for example Rudin 1988, Bošković 2002). Bulgarian does show such effects (see (140)), just as it does with wh&wh coordinations (see (139)).

- (140) a. Koj kakvo e kupil?
 who what is bought
 'Who bought what?'
 b. *Kakvo koj e kupil?

In light of this, Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek (2013) tie the possibility of wh&wh coordinations to multiple wh-fronting. The correlation is, however, rather difficult to maintain. Under the standard account the superiority effect in (140) arises as a result of the interrogative C attracting two wh-phrases, where these wh-phrases undergo separate wh-movements, occupying separate CP Specs. This is, however, not the case with (139) under Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek's (2013) analysis, where the coordination of wh-phrases (i.e. ConjP dominating the wh-phrases) is merged into SpecCP—there are no two separate wh-movements or two CP Specs in (140). Furthermore, Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek (2013) also observe that some speakers of Bulgarian do allow free ordering of the coordinated wh-phrases in (139). On the other hand, there is no speaker variation regarding superiority effects with multiple wh-fronting.

Also relevant here is SC, which does not show matching in the ordering of wh-phrases in simple multiple wh-fronting constructions and wh&wh coordinations. As noted above, multiple wh-fronting languages differ regarding whether or not they show superiority effects in examples like (140). Thus, as discussed in Rudin (1988) and Bošković (2002), SC does not show Superiority effects in simple multiple wh-fronting constructions like (141).

- (141) a. Ko šta kupuje? 1698
 who what is-buying 1699
 'Who is buying what?' 1700
 b. Šta ko kupuje? 1701
 1702

However, SC does show ordering effects with wh-coordinations.⁵⁶ 1703
 1704

- (142) a. Ko i šta kupuje? 1705
 who and what is-buying 1706
 b. *Šta i ko kupuje? 1707
 1708

Now, as discussed above, SC also allows larger coordinations involving wh-phrases, as 1709
 indicated by the fact that additional material can be present within what appear to be 1710
 wh&wh conjuncts. 1711
 1712

- (143) Ko je i šta (je) kupio? 1713
 who is and what is bought 1714
 'Who bought what?' 1715
 1716

The presence of the auxiliary clitic in (143) indicates that the first conjunct is actually a 1717
 clause. Interestingly, such constructions, which unambiguously involve coordination 1718
 that is larger than wh&wh, do not show superiority effects.⁵⁷ 1719
 1720

- (144) Šta je i ko (je) kupio? 1721
 what is and who is bought 1722
 1723

When there is nothing following the first wh-phrase there is a superiority effect, as shown 1724
 by (142).⁵⁸ On the other hand, when the clitic follows the first wh-phrase, which clearly 1725
 shows that in such cases the first conjunct is larger than the wh-phrase itself, there is no 1726
 superiority effect (see (143)-(144)). These data indicate that when there is no additional 1727
 material following the first wh-phrase we are indeed dealing with a wh&wh coordina- 1728
 tion.⁵⁹ These facts also indicate that there is no parallelism between Superiority effects in 1729
 simple multiple wh-fronting constructions and wh&wh constructions, given the contrast 1730
 between (141) and (142) (more precisely, (141b) and (142b)), i.e. the parallelism shown by 1731
 Bulgarian (140) and (139) is accidental. 1732

In fact, there is reason to believe that whatever is going on with the ordering of 1733
 wh-phrases in wh&wh coordinations is different from superiority effects with multiple 1734
 wh-fronting. As discussed in Bošković (2002), quite generally when the superiority effect 1735
 is found with multiple wh-fronting it holds only for the first and the second wh-phrase; 1736
 beyond that the ordering of the wh-phrases is free. This is shown by Bulgarian (145): 1737
 when only two objects undergo wh-movement, the indirect object must precede the di- 1738
 rect object, a superiority effect given that the former is higher than the latter prior to 1739
 wh-movement. However, when a higher wh-phrase is present, the ordering of the indi- 1740
 rect and direct object is free (the nominative must be first in (145c-d) as well as (146c) and 1741
 (147) below). The same point is illustrated by SC (146), where the superiority effect also 1742
 holds only for the first and the second wh-phrase (see Bošković 2002 for discussion of the 1743
 superiority effect in (146a-b)).⁶⁰ 1744
 1745

- (145) a. Kogo kakvo e pital Ivan? 1746
 whom what is asked Ivan 1747
 ‘Who did Ivan ask what?’ 1748
 b. ?*Kakvo kogo e pital Ivan? 1749
 c. Koj kogo kakvo e pital? 1750
 who whom what is asked 1751
 ‘Who asked whom what?’ 1752
 d. Koj kakvo kogo e pital? (Bošković 2002:366) 1753
- (146) a. ?Ima kome kako da pomogne. 1754
 has whom how part helps 1755
 ‘(S)he has someone to help somehow.’ 1756
 b. *Ima kako kome da pomogne. 1757
 c. ?Ima ko kako kome da pomogne. 1758
 has who how whom part helps 1759
 There is someone who can somehow help somebody.’ (Bošković 2002:367) 1760
 1761
- Recall now that SC shows an ordering effect with wh&wh coordinations involving two 1762
 wh-phrases. However, the ordering effect here extends to all wh-phrases: when there are 1763
 more than two wh-phrases there is strict ordering between all of them, as shown by (147). 1764
 1765
- (147) a. Ko kome i šta daje? 1766
 who whom and what is-giving 1767
 ‘Who is giving what to whom 1768
 b. *Ko šta i kome daje? 1769
 who what and whom is-giving 1770
 1771
- The data discussed above indicate that the ordering effect found with wh&wh coordina- 1772
 tions is independent of Superiority (more precisely, what is considered to be superiority 1773
 effects associated with multiple wh-fronting). 1774
- That the ordering effect found in late coordination formation constructions, which 1775
 holds in all types of such constructions discussed in this paper (see below), should be 1776
 dissociated from ordering/superiority-style effects found with multiple wh-fronting is 1777
 confirmed quite strongly by certain data regarding multiple left-branch extraction dis- 1778
 cussed by Stjepanović (2020b). Although SC generally does not show superiority effects 1779
 with simple multiple wh-fronting constructions (there are contexts where SC does show 1780
 such effects, see Bošković 2002), Stjepanović shows that if multiple wh-fronting involves 1781
 multiple left-branch extraction it does show ordering effects, as illustrated below. (An 1782
 intervening element is added in (149) to make sure that there is left branch extraction 1783
 from the subject. Stjepanović (2020b) shows that several factors are relevant in such cases, 1784
 including agreement patterns between the extracted left-branch and the remnant.) 1785
 1786
- (148)*Čiji_i kakva_j [t_i otac] kupuje [t_j kola]? 1787
 whose what-kind-of father is-buying car 1788
 ‘Whose father is buying what kind of a car?’ 1789
- (149) Kakva_i čiji_j danas [t_i otac] kupuje [t_i kola]? 1790
 what-kind-of whose today father is-buying car 1791

‘Whose father is buying what kind of a car today?’

1792

1793

Importantly, wh&wh coordinations do not match multiple wh-fronting constructions in this respect.

1794

1795

1796

(150) Čiji_i i kakva_j [t_i otac] kupuje [t_j kola]?

1797

whose and what-kind-of father is-buying car

1798

‘Whose father is buying what kind of a car?’

1799

(151) *Kakva_i i čiji_j danas [t_i otac] kupuje [t_j kola]?

1800

what-kind-of and whose today father is-buying car

1801

‘Whose father is buying what kind of a car today?’

1802

1803

As noted above, Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek (2013) take the superiority parallelism between Bulgarian (140) and (139) to indicate that the availability of multiple wh-fronting underlines the availability of wh&wh coordinations (which, recall, involve late coordination formation). The fact that, as shown above, wh&wh coordinations do not track multiple wh-fronting with respect to Superiority suggests that the two should be divorced. There should then be no connection between multiple wh-fronting and the possibility of late coordination formation (which underlines the possibility of Postal-style distributed coordination—this is desirable given the possibility of the latter in English).

1804

1805

1806

1807

1808

1809

1810

1811

At any rate, there is crosslinguistic variation regarding non-distributed wh&wh coordinations, whose availability should not be tied to either the availability of multiple wh-fronting or Postal-style distributed coordination in the language.

1812

1813

1814

While the issues discussed in this appendix merit a much more extensive scrutiny than they could be given in this appendix, whose scope is rather limited, what we are seeing here is that languages differ with respect to how they behave regarding the relevant properties of coordinate constructions. The point of the above discussion was merely to outline some of the possible crosslinguistic variation in the relevant domain, as well as to highlight the need for more extensive crosslinguistic investigations of the relevant properties of coordinations (recall that languages also differ regarding whether they allow conjunct extraction, see for example SC (77), which is unacceptable in English). Hopefully, such investigations will reveal correlations between the properties of coordination investigated in this paper and other properties, which should help determine in a more principled way the factors that are behind the phenomena (and the variation with respect to these phenomena) discussed in this paper.

1815

1816

1817

1818

1819

1820

1821

1822

1823

1824

1825

1826

I will close this appendix with a note on the ordering effect. Postal-style distributed extractions pattern with wh&wh coordinations in the relevant respect. As discussed in section 3, there is an ordering effect with Postal-style distributed extractions—the order of the conjuncts within the newly formed ConjP must match the order of the conjuncts from which extraction takes place in the original ConjP—which in the cases involving three conjuncts holds for all conjuncts, as shown by SC (152) which gives the only possibility for the distributed interpretation of the extracted adjectives. The same holds for English distributed coordinations, as shown by (153).

1827

1828

1829

1830

1831

1832

1833

1834

1835

(152) Crveni_i, bijeli_j i šareni_k meni [t_i sako], [t_j kaput] i [t_k šešir] smetaju.

1836

red white and colorful me_{DAT} jacket coat and hat bother

1837

‘The red jacket, white coat, and colorful hat bother me.’

1838

1839

soon as possible) thus deduces the strict ordering requirement as well as the contiguity requirement on derivationally formed ConjPs.

Recall now that the derivationally formed ConjP has to be inserted into the structure very close to the step of regular movement that the relevant elements need to undergo. This can be interpreted as indicating that the derivationally formed ConjP has to be inserted into the structure as early as possible. From this perspective this earliness requirement can be looked at as part of a more general earliness requirement on derivational ConjP formation: such ConjPs must be formed as soon as possible and inserted into the structure as soon as possible.

Notes

¹ (4) also involves a ban on extraction of conjuncts, which will not be examined in this work (the ban on extraction out of conjuncts and the ban on extraction of conjuncts have anyway been argued to be independent conditions, see e.g. Grosu 1973, Postal 1998, Stjepanović 2014a, Oda 2017, in press).

² There are some differences across speakers regarding the most natural prosody of such constructions. The judgments given below reflect the most natural prosody for the speakers in question (not all speakers accept such coordinations in the first place).

³ Zhang argues the higher ConjP is formed through sideward movement, proposed in Nunes (2004). The analysis is discussed in section 7.

⁴ Some speakers do not find a difference between (9a) and (9b), while some have a slight preference for either (9a) or (9b) (hence (?) in the examples).

⁵ Regarding examples like (i), where *wh*-movement takes place out of the second and third, and head-movement out of the first conjunct, they will be discussed in section 5, where we will see that a problem independent of the ATB requirement arises here.

(i) *[Which newspaper_i and which magazine_j] did_k [Mary_{t_k} write a book], [John may buy t_i], and [Bill will read t_j] respectively.

⁶ One of my informants actually rejects (21). Importantly, the informant also disallows (20) (the informants who accept (21) also accept (20)), which confirms that non-ATB ATB and regular ATB indeed behave in the same way with respect to the parallelism requirement in question.

⁷ These authors argue that constructions like (22) involve extraction of the AP out of the NP. There are two alternative analyses: remnant movement of the NP which contains only the AP (Franks and Progovac 1994; Abels 2003) and full NP movement with scattered deletion, where the NP is deleted in the highest copy and the AP in the lower copy (Fanselow and Ćavar 2002). There are a number of arguments in the literature for the left-branch extraction analysis, which is adopted here; see e.g. Bošković (2005), Stjepanović (2010, 2012); Talić (2013, 2017), and Despić (2015). The reader is also referred to Bošković (2019) for discussion of the CSC regarding SC, where it is shown that (1) is operative in SC.

⁸ All the judgments below are given **only** for the distributive reading, indicated in the translations of (23)-(24) (and with traces when they are given in the structures below).

⁹ A referee observes that, as expected, (i), where there is no adjective at the edge of the conjunct that is not involved in ATB, is also unacceptable:

(i)*Crvena_i i bijeli_j meni [t_i suknja], [t_j kaputi] i [košulje] smetaju.
red and white_{ME DAT} skirt coat and shirts bother

¹⁰ What may matter here is the following: Chomsky (2013) proposes that the first conjunct determines the category of the whole coordination (which essentially means that the coordination itself does not inherently have it; note that Chomsky's proposal is stated somewhat differently, in terms of labeling), and a number of authors (e.g. Sag et al 1985, Takahashi 1994, Bošković 2019) have argued that the ATB requirement is related to the coordination-of-likes requirement (see Chomsky 1957, Schachter 1977, Williams 1978, Sag et al 1985, Bowers 1993, Beavers and Sag 2004, among others, on this requirement). An intuitive idea here is that

when the first conjunct, which is supposed to determine the category of a coordination, is itself a coordination, the category of the higher coordination is undetermined—this then voids the ATB requirement, which is tied to category specification (this is what is relevant to the coordination-of-likes requirement). This makes a prediction, which is borne out: if the order of the conjuncts in (29) is switched, the category of the coordination will be determined since the first conjunct is not a coordination; this then activates the ATB requirement, ruling out (i) because it does not have a gap in each conjunct (namely the first conjunct).

(i) *Crvena_i i bijelij_j mene [_{ConjP1} [šareni šešir] i [_{ConjP2} t_i suknja i t_j kaput]] iritiraju.
red and white me colorful hat skirt and coat irritate

¹¹ See also de Vos and Vicente (2005) regarding islandhood of English non-ATB ATB. One of their examples, involving an inner island effect, is given in (i) (see this work for additional examples, but see also Zhang 2010).

(i) *[[How loudly]_i and [how softly]_j]] didn't you say [[that John had spoken t_i] and [that Peter had replied t_j]]?

¹² Speakers differ regarding the preferred position for *respectively* here, hence both options are given in the examples.

¹³ This could also be seen as a maximize ATB effect, similar to Merchant's (2001) Max Elide (see Citko 2003 for a Max ATB-style proposal). It may be worth noting that a similar effect is found with parasitic gaps, which are often treated similarly to ATB (see e.g. Nunes 2004, who treats both in terms of sideward movement), as the following data from Nissenbaum (2000:547) show: it is not possible to skip a potential parasitic gap site in (i).

(i) a. Who did you praise *e* to the sky [after criticizing *e*] [in order to surprise *e*]?
b. Who did you praise *e* to the sky [after criticizing *e*] [in order to surprise **him**]?
c. *Who did you praise *e* to the sky [after criticizing **him**] [in order to surprise *e*]?

The contrast between (33) and (39) in fact parallels the contrast between (ib) and (ic).

Another case of the maximize ATB effect may be provided by the contrast between (33) and (ii).

(ii) *Crvena_i, crvena_j i bijelik_k meni [t_i suknja], [t_j košulja] i [t_k kaput] smetaju.
red red and white me_{DAT} skirt, shirt and coat bother

¹⁴ It is also not clear how the interpretation would work on the clausal ellipsis analysis, given that 'white' modifies only the second conjunct (i.e. "dress") in (24). Note that the following is not the relevant interpretation for (46) (the example is marginally acceptable on that interpretation):

(i) Crvene su ~~meni suknje i haljine smetale~~ i bijele su meni suknje i haljine smetale.
red are ~~me_{DAT} skirts and dresses bothered~~ and white are me_{DAT} skirts and dresses bothered
'Red skirts and dresses bothered me and white skirts and dresses bothered me.'

¹⁵ There is a potential prosodic issue in (49). For some speakers, under the most natural prosody the fronted adjectives bear focal stress and are followed by a pause. This causes an issue regarding clitic placement. There is variation across speakers whether under certain conditions a clitic can follow a sentence internal pause (see Bennett 1987, Percus 1993, Browne 1975, Schütze 1994, Bošković 2001). I ignore here speakers for whom there needs to be a pause following the fronted adjectives and who disallow clitic placement after such a pause (pronominal clitics are quite generally disallowed in that case, hence they are avoided below in this context).

¹⁶ On the relevant reading, *onu* is not a separate nominal in (51)-(52) (demonstratives can be separate nominals, as in *I like this*) but modifies *kuću*, just like *staru* does (there is only one nominal on this reading, 'that old house'). Below, where possible different gender will be used for the demonstrative and the adjective to control for this.

¹⁷ It is worth noting here that NP ellipsis that strands demonstratives and adjectives is also possible in SC, see Bošković (2013b). One might try to treat (24) this way. The ungrammaticality of (53), however, provides evidence not only against the clausal ellipsis analysis, but also against the NP ellipsis analysis.

¹⁸ As with other languages, there is some controversy regarding whether Japanese floating quantifiers should be analyzed in terms of Sportiche (1988)-style stranding, or as adverbials generated outside of the relevant nominals (for relevant discussion of Japanese, see Miyagawa 1989, Kawashima 1998, Ishii 1999, Miyagawa and Arikawa 2007, Watanabe 2006, 2008, Fitzpatrick 2006, Nakanishi 2008, among others). The controversy is actually not relevant to the current discussion; the point made in this section holds regardless of which of these two analyses is adopted. In this respect, it should be noted that Kamio (1977) argues for Sportiche's analysis on the basis of examples like (55). Koizumi (1995), however, points out that (55) can be analyzed in accordance with the adverbial analysis if what is coordinated in (55) is VPs, with the verb undergoing string vacuous V-to-T-to-C movement, with each numeral adjoined to a VP conjunct (this is necessary under the semantic implementations of the adverbial analysis, as in Nakanishi (2004) and Brisson (1998), where the individual numerals, not a ConjP containing the numerals, need to be composed with the VP). Given this, regardless of which of these two analyses of floating quantifiers is adopted, examples like (56) below involve non-ATB ATB out of a coordination, which is what is important for our purposes. (The two analyses would differ regarding what is coordinated in (55)-(56), nominals or VPs, but that difference is not relevant for our purposes—under both analyses examples like (56) would involve non-ATB ATB out of a coordination, the relevant nominals would move either from a coordinated quantifier+nominal complex or from inside of coordinated VPs).

¹⁹ For independent reasons, it is not possible to test the possibility of mixing non-ATB ATB and regular ATB here (regular ATB is independently not possible in this case since the ATBed NP would have to be associated with two different numbers).

²⁰ Notice that such cases argue against an analysis on which the presence of two conjunctions in distributed coordinations would somehow be a result of pronunciation of two copies of the same conjunction.

It should be noted that Ishii (2014) suggests that *sosite* is a clausal coordinator (for relevant discussion, see also Koizumi 1995). However, my informants allow examples like (i) on the interpretation where John and Mary arrived together, in fact *tomoni* 'together' can be added to (i) (the argument regarding *sosite* constructions holds for the speakers who allow *sosite* to function as a non-clausal coordinator, in addition to functioning as a clausal coordinator). Note also that the case marker is optional in the first conjunct in both (i) and (60). Under Ishii's clausal coordinator analysis, the first conjunct would actually be a full clause, with ellipsis taking place in it. It is then expected that the relevant clause should be fine in isolation, with or without the case particle. However, for my informants, the relevant example is degraded without the case particle, as in (ii). (The same argument extends to (60). Note that this does not rule out the clausal coordinator option for *sosite*).

(i) John(-ga) *sosite* Mary-ga tootyakushita.

John-NOM and Mary-NOM arrived

'John and Mary arrived.'

(ii) John(??-ga) tootyakushita.

John-NOM arrived

²¹ Note also that, as in SC, nothing can be inserted between the elements undergoing non-ATB ATB in the Japanese construction under consideration.

²² Wh-island violations with D-linked wh-phrases are actually very weak; (65) is way worse than (i).

(i) ?Which president do you wonder why John reads articles about?

²³ Examples similar to (68), involving extraction of different elements from conjuncts without coordination in the higher position, were discussed in Kasai (2004), Citko (2003), and Zhang (2010) for Russian, Polish, as well as SC, and noted to be unacceptable. Note that (68) is unacceptable regardless of the placement of the clitic *su*. (69) gives the only possible clitic placement here (this also holds for (70)-(71), see section 3 for relevant discussion).

²⁴ Notice that wh left-branch extraction, as well as multiple left-branch extraction, are in principle possible in SC (see Bošković 2016, Stjepanović 2018 and section 3).

²⁵ Such crosslinguistic differences underscore the need for more in depth crosslinguistic investigations of the distributed extraction coordination construction, one of the main goals of this paper in fact being to spur such investigations. Note that examples like (74) indicate that we cannot simply have allowing or disallowing distributed extraction coordination as the point of crosslinguistic variation since the same language can allow it with some but not other movements. In fact, the variation can also concern the coordination from which it takes place; thus, Japanese allows it out of *-to* coordinations (see section 4) but disallows it out of *sosite* coordinations: In contrast to (55), (i) disallows non-ATB ATB regardless of whether the higher coordination involves *-to* or *sosite* (see section 4 for relevant options; what may actually be relevant here is also when different options for what *sosite* may coordinate are allowed, see fn. 20).

(i) John-ga [VP [PP yaoya-kara] [mikan-o 3-ko] *sosite* [banana-o 5-hon] katta.
 John-NOM vegetable.store-from orange-ACC 3-CL and banana-ACC 5-CL bought
 ‘John bought [3 oranges and 5 bananas] from a vegetable store.’

²⁶ One of his arguments concerns the impossibility of coordinating clitics, as in the French example in (i).

(i) *Je le et la vois souvent.

I him and her see often (French)

²⁷ Sideward merger might be a more appropriate term (if movement is taken to involve a c-command relation between the relevant positions); at any rate I will use the terms interchangeably below.

²⁸ This does not mean that phases in general are islands; phases have the potential to induce locality violations, which can then capture islandhood.

²⁹ One issue these works were concerned with is the well-known impossibility of reconstruction into the second conjunct with regular ATB (see Munn 1992, 1993 and Nunes 2004 for relevant discussion under the null operator movement and the sideward movement analysis respectively).

³⁰ Chomsky’s approach to the PIC differs in this respect from Hiraiwa (2005) and Bošković (2015), where the edge of the edge of phase XP is not at the edge of XP. I am adopting Chomsky’s approach to the PIC in this respect. (Notice also that Bošković 2018 argues that movement to the edge of individual conjuncts is quite generally allowed).

It should be noted that it is beyond the scope of this paper to examine the nature of the ATB requirement itself. As noted in fn. 10, several works have argued that the ATB requirement actually follows from the coordination-of-likes requirement, namely Sag et al (1985), Takahashi (1994), and Bošković (2018). Under the implementation of this approach in Bošković (2019), extraction out of the first conjunct is allowed in certain cases even where there are no gaps in other conjuncts (which is in part due to the accessibility of the edge of the first conjunct, see Bošković 2019 for other factors involved). Any gap in a non-initial conjunct, on the other hand, obligatorily “activates” the ATB requirement, forcing the presence of a gap in each conjunct.

³¹ We will see below some cases where the relevant elements move to the edge of ConjP. Given that only the outmost edge of a phase is actually available for movement out of a phase, as argued extensively in Bošković (2016), the problem discussed in the text would still arise there (though the trace voiding mechanism discussed in Bošković 2016 should not be applicable with ConjP, possibly because of its island status).

³² Notice that Japanese *sosite* does not bring in any additional meanings; semantically, it is as ‘neutral’ as *-to*.

³³ Under the Spec-Head agreement analysis, there would be no need for XP since the late-formed ConjP could be inserted directly into SpecTP, with agreement taking place between T and the ConjP in SpecTP in a Spec-Head relation. (Certain constructions discussed below would, however, require the presence of XP even under this analysis, see fn. 48.)

³⁴ Plural agreement is not morphologically realized here in English, but it is in SC, where the verb is plural in (93).

³⁵ Such examples were noted in Dougherty (1970), McCawley (1998), Postal (1998), and Zhang (2010).

³⁶ In other words, the interpretation of the conjuncts is ‘John was hunting lions’ and ‘Mary was frightened by snakes’. Still, the agreement in (94) is plural. Note that the agreement/interpretation mismatch confirms the semantic expletiveness of derivationally formed coordination. The mismatch arises because a coordination that is not semantically interpreted participates in determining agreement.

³⁷ This would be AgrsP of early minimalism (Bošković 2020a in fact uses examples like *John travels to Rome tomorrow and will travel to Tokyo on Monday* to argue for a return to Split Infl (see also Cardinaletti 2004 and Rizzi 2006, among others).

³⁸ The same point can be made with (i) (from Godall 1987, modified to include a simplified derivation from the current approach).

(i)*Every Sunday, [John_i and Mary_j]_k [_{VP} t_i see each other_k] and [_{VP} t_j kiss each other_k] respectively.

Note that a late formed coordination can be itself modified. This is what happens in (ii), where the late-formed coordination, *Sue and Karen*, is modified with an appositive.

(ii) Sue and Karen, who love each other very much, sing and dance respectively. (Chaves 2012)

³⁹ Regarding the PF deletion analysis, typically (see e.g. Kayne 1994), what is deleted under this analysis, applied to (112), is the object in the first conjunct, with the object in the second conjunct staying in situ, which seems to leave no room for insertion of the late formed ConjP in (112). Bošković (2004b), however, shows that the element in the second conjunct can undergo rightward heavy NP shift within that conjunct. The late formed ConjP can then be inserted in that position.

Another case of distributed extraction coordination interacting with right node raising is provided by (i).

(i) George and Martha respectively denounced and were denounced by the governor. (Zhang 2010)

(i) can be derived similarly to (94) (cf. (95)-(98)), as shown in (ii), with T agreeing with the late-formed coordination within each conjunct prior to this coordination undergoing regular ATB movement.

(iii) [_{YP} [_{ConjP} George and Martha] [_{ConjP} [_{TP} T [_{XP} [_{ConjP} ~~George and Martha~~] [_{VP} ~~George~~ denounced]]] and [_{TP} were-T
[_{XP} [_{ConjP} ~~George and Martha~~] [_{VP} denounced ~~Martha~~]]

The partial structure in (ii) raises a question: how is the ‘governor’ interpreted in the object position of the first conjunct? The answer is provided by right node raising, which is possible in this context:

(ii) John denounced and Martha was denounced by the governor.

⁴⁰ Above I have briefly alluded to an alternative analysis on which agreement is established in a Spec-Head relation. While for reasons of space I did not discuss this analysis, this conclusion also extends to the Spec-Head agreement analysis (although this analysis comes with different structural assumptions, see fn. 33).

⁴¹ A small adjustment will in fact be made below to accommodate an additional step in the derivation of distributed coordinations discussed below. (I have assumed above that there is no vP in passives although there is some controversy regarding this issue. At any rate, what is important here is simply that the late-formed ConjP is inserted very close to the base positions of the relevant elements.)

⁴² In this respect, note that Slovenian speakers generally disallow regular adjectival LBE and they also disallow it with distributed extraction coordinations of the kind discussed for SC here, which confirms that the mobility of the relevant elements matters.

⁴³ There is actually some speaker variation in this respect in British English, see Holmberg et al (2019).

⁴⁴ The first-projection-locality-requirement on late-formed ConjP insertion discussed above should now be adjusted to take into consideration this short regular movement (it would be the first projection above the phrase where this short regular movement lands (or even within that phrase in some cases—I return to this issue below). At any rate, what is important is that the late-formed ConjP is inserted very close to the landing site of this movement.

It should be noted that there is one exception to the mobility requirement, which concerns right node raising. Right node raising is known to be able to affect elements that are otherwise immobile, see e.g. Bošković (2004b). The same holds when right

node raising involves distributed extraction. It then seems that we are dealing here with a right node raising-specific issue, which is independent of the mobility requirement on distributed extractions discussed in the text:

- (i) a. John likes cheap, and Mary likes expensive, swimming suits.
 b. John is asking when, and Mary is asking why, Peter is leaving.
 (ii) a. John likes cheap, and Mary likes expensive, trousers and dresses respectively.
 b. John is asking when, and Mary is asking why, Peter is leaving and Amy is late respectively.

⁴⁵ Slightly more complicated are cases like (34), which involve a mixture of non-ATB ATB and traditional ATB.

- (i) Crvena i bijeli meni [t_i suknja], [t_i košulja] i [t_i kaput] smetaju.
 red and white me_{DAT} skirt, shirt and coat bother

Consider (i) under Nunes's (2004) sideward merger analysis of traditional ATB. Under this analysis and the current analysis of distributed coordinations, (i) is derived as follows: "white" is merged with "coat"; "red" is merged with "shirt" and then undergoes sideward merger with "skirt" (this is regular ATB). Both "red" and "white" then move to the edge of the lower ConjP, after which derivational coordination formation takes place, with "red" and "white" undergoing sideward merger that forms what I have called late-formed ConjP (note that only derivational ConjP formation is subject to the not-directly-from-the-interpreted-position restriction).

⁴⁶ Bošković (2013a) argues that in inherent case configurations, there is actually a PP-like projection between the two NPs, which means that the higher noun does not directly take NP as its complement in (126) (and (127) below), in contrast to (121) and (123) (see Bošković 2013a for discussion why this matters).

⁴⁷ As noted by Sandra Stjepanović (p.c.), examples like (127) can also help us control for an interfering factor regarding (30). In (i), the adjective can modify both conjoined nouns, which means (ib) doesn't necessarily involve ATB movement of the adjective; it can also involve regular ATB of a single adjective with (ia) as its input (note this is not possible in three conjunct examples (on the true coordination non-list reading), as with the SC counterpart of white coat, red skirt, and dress). Given this, an issue arises: how do we know that (30) doesn't involve adjectival ATB from the first conjunct, instead of one adjective being adjoined to the ConjP, taking scope over both Ns?

- (i) a. Svidaju mi se crvene suknje i haljine. b. Crvene mi se svidjaju suknje i haljine.
 please me self red skirts and dresses
 'I like red skirts and (red) dresses.'

Deep left-branch extraction with inherently Case-marked NPs controls for this interfering factor: due to the extra layer of embedding, AP adjunction to ConjP that conjoins the relevant nouns is not possible in (ii) (*kongresu* and *parlamentu* are not conjoined), which means that the possibility of one adjective taking scope over, and modifying, two conjoined nouns prior to extraction is not an option here. (iii) must then involve regular ATB.

- (ii) Ovogodišnjem_i je podržao [otpor [t_i kongresu]] i [pomoć [t_i parlamentu]].
 this-year's is supported resistance congress_{DAT} and help parliament_{DAT}
 'He supported resistance to this year's congress and helping this year's parliament.'

- (iii) Ovogodišnjem_i je podržao [otpor t_i kongresu] [t_i pomoć parlamentu] i prijetnje [t_i predsjedniku]
 this-year's is supported resistance congress_{DAT} help parliament_{DAT} and threats president_{DAT}
 'He supported resistance to this year's congress, helping this year's parliament, and threats to this year's President.'

When regular ATB dependency is blocked, as in (iv) (in (iii) all relevant elements, the adjective and the nouns, are masculine; in (iv) 'government' is feminine, blocking ATB), we get an ungrammatical construction.

- (iv) *Ovogodišnjem_i je podržao [otpor [t_i kongresu]] [pomoć [t_i parlamentu]] i [prijetnje (novoj) vladi]
 this-year's is supported resistance congress_{DAT} help parliament_{DAT} and threats new government_{DAT}

Importantly, like (30), (v), where there is no possibility of the adjective modifying both nouns prior to extraction (the nouns are not conjoined), is also acceptable with the relevant prosodic pattern (like (30), (v) has an additional coordinator).

(v) Ovogodišnjem_i je podržao ([otpor [t_i kongresu]] i [pomoć [t_i parlamentu]]) i [prijetnje (novoj) vladi].
 this-year's_i is supported resistance congress_{DAT} and help parliament_{DAT} and threats new government_{DAT}

⁴⁸ The derivations of examples (90) and (94) given above can be easily adjusted to accommodate the movement from the interpreted position prior to sideward merger into the late-formed ConjP. Regarding (94) (cf. the derivation in (95)-(98)), one possibility is that there is a projection between XP and VP, with the relevant elements moving to that projection within their respective conjuncts prior to sideward merger (i.e. prior to step (96)). There is, however, another possibility which does not require an additional projection: the individual conjuncts, *John* and *Mary*, undergo separate movements to Specifiers of XP in (97) prior to the late-formed ConjP insertion, with this ConjP inserted into the higher Specifier of XP (note that the Spec-Head Agreement analysis, briefly discussed in fn. 33, would also require a projection between VP and TP to accommodate the regular movement that precedes sideward merger into the late-formed ConjP). As for (90) (cf. the derivation in (92)), given that it is not possible for different elements to undergo movement out of a ConjP (so sideward merger is needed to obviate the locality effect, as discussed above), *a dog* and *a rooster* would move separately to the edge of ConjP if movement to the edge of ConjP is also allowed in English, or, if this is not possible in English, (90) would involve coordination on a slightly higher level (than vP in (92a)), with *a dog* and *a rooster* moving to the edge of the projection that undergoes coordination prior to undergoing sideward merger into the late-formed ConjP. Further research is needed to tease apart the options in question.

⁴⁹ If there are more than two conjuncts, the higher ConjP can have multiple Specs, or there can be additional ConjP shells.

⁵⁰ There are other issues that would arise on this analysis. Under this analysis, it is not clear how the relevant elements could trigger agreement together (cf. (90), (94), (105), (106), (111)) or function as binders together (cf. (99)) (assuming the ConjP in question is on top of the structure; we might actually then expect the coordination in question to be a strictly matrix phenomenon, which it is not (cf. *Peter inquired which book and which magazine John bought and Mary sold respectively*). Notice also that the relevant elements can be clefted together (cf. *it is this book and that song that Mary wrote and Tom sang respectively*). This indicates that they are a constituent, which is not the case under the alternative analysis outlined in the text.

⁵¹ I will use the term (non-distributed) wh&wh coordination to refer to constructions which involve coordination of wh-phrases (not a larger constituent) and where the wh-phrases are not extracted out of a coordination. For ease of exposition, to differentiate such cases from examples like (6), where there is a lower ConjP, I will refer to the latter as (Postal-style) distributed coordinations.

⁵² Furthermore, Gračanin-Yuksek (2007) note that wh-DP external material can occur within the relevant ConjP in English, as shown by (i). Nothing of that sort is possible in Bulgarian. (Note that SC allows both obligatory arguments and DP-external material in the coordinations in question, as shown by (44)-(45), the reason for this being that SC allows both wh&wh and larger clausal coordination, see Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek 2013 (I am simplifying their discussion here) and the discussion below.)

(i) What did Peter and why did Peter eat? (Gračanin-Yuksek 2007)

⁵³ It would be interesting to see whether such coordination is possible in rare languages that disallow multiple questions (e.g. Italian, which disallows constructions like *who bought what*); whether or not such languages would allow late coordination formation of wh-phrases might shed light on the reason for the unacceptability of multiple questions in such languages.

⁵⁴ I discuss restrictions on non-distributed late coordination in SC in work in progress, where I show that this kind of coordination, without coordination in a lower position, is actually not completely restricted to wh-phrases/wh-movement.

⁵⁵ In SC, Postal-style wh-movement distributed coordinations are actually more restricted than in English. One issue could be that SC does not have a real counterpart of *respectively* that is used in such cases in English. What is happening in SC is that (possibly

due to the lack of ‘respectively’ or the possibility of wh&wh coordinations), the non-distributed reading on which the coordination of wh-phrases undergoes ATB-movement from each object position is the only reading in the counterpart of (6) in SC.

(i) [Koji knjigu i koji magazin]_i je Jovan kupio t_i i Ivan prodao t_i?

which book and which magazine is Jovan bought and Ivan sold

‘Which book and which magazine did John buy and Ivan sell?’

However, when such non-distributed ATB-movement parse is not possible, as in (69), Postal-style distributed coordination is available with wh-phrases in SC. It is also marginally available in constructions more similar to (i) where the pragmatics increases the saliency of the distributed reading (with a different coordinator though; *a* is a clausal coordinator, which does not coordinate nominals).

(ii) ?Koliko jela i koliko pisama je Marija napravila a Ivan napisao?

how-many dishes and how-many letters is Maria made and Ivan wrote

‘How many dishes and how many letters did Maria make and Ivan write?’

⁵⁶ (142b) improves if there is a pause following the first wh-phrase, which is not necessary in (141b). For the relevance of this prosodic pattern, which I put aside in the text, see fn. 59.

⁵⁷ There may be a null subject in the first conjunct and a null object in the second conjunct here. SC is a pro-drop language so the former is not surprising. On null objects in similar constructions, see Zanon (2015) and references therein (for other perspectives on these issues, see Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek 2013, Gračanin-Yuksek 2007).

⁵⁸The same holds if the clitic follows the coordinated wh-phrases.

(i) a. Ko i šta je kupio? b. *Šta i ko je kupio?

who and what is bought

⁵⁹ This in itself is quite interesting. We may be dealing here with an economy of representation effect (see Bošković 2011 and references therein): when both a smaller and a larger structure are in principle available for X, if there is no evidence for the larger structure X is analyzed in terms of the smaller structure. (We would not necessarily expect to find this effect in all languages of this sort since the effect would hold only in an all-else-being-equal scenario, which is not always the case; e.g. lexical properties of elements that are elided on the larger structure option could block the effect—see Bošković 1997.) There may, however, be another factor at work here. Recall that, as noted in fn. 56, (142b) improves if there is a pause following the first wh-phrase. It may then be that wh&wh and clausal coordination are associated with two distinct prosodic patterns in the cases where nothing intervenes between the coordinated wh-phrases, the prosodic pattern with a pause following the first wh-phrase reflecting clausal coordination structure. This prosodic pattern is forced by a superiority violation, which is not allowed in the wh&wh derivation. It should be noted that according to Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek, there is no superiority effect in wh&wh coordinations in Croatian. The speakers I have consulted, all of which come from Bosnia, do show a superiority effect here (in fact all the data discussed above come from the Bosnian variety of what I have referred to as SC). It is not out of question that there is no real variation here, and that Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek were checking the prosodic pattern associated with clausal coordination. (This may also be behind what they report as speaker variation in the ordering effect in Bulgarian; while Citko and Gračanin-Yuksek do not give relevant Croatian data they do give superiority-violating examples from Russian. However, it turns out superiority violations in Russian are possible only under the prosodic pattern associated with clausal coordination). At any rate, while the issue under consideration is quite interesting, it goes beyond the scope of this paper, which focuses on distributed coordinations.

⁶⁰ As discussed in Bošković (2002), SC shows superiority effects in certain contexts; one such context is the one given in (146).

⁶¹ (i) may indicate that the wh-phrase that enters the structure first may not need to merge with the coordinator immediately, but simply before the other wh-phrase enters the structure. This is so if ‘what car’ in (i) moves in front of the verb before *kakva* is sideward-merged into the late formed ConjP. Alternatively, it is possible that *kakva* sideward merges into the late formed ConjP

before the object moves in front of the verb in (i). (i) would then involve a remnant-like fronting of the object (the remnant being created by sideward merger).

(i) Čiji i kakvaj [ti otac] [tj kola] kupuje?

whose and what-kind-of father car is-buying

(ii) cf. *Kakvaj i čiji danas [tj kola] [ti otac] kupuje?

what-kind-of and whose today car father is-buying

⁶² While I have been assuming that sideward merger into ConjP takes place after the short movement step, it could even take place before—in the latter case the original copy would both sideward-merge and undergo the short movement step; note the lack of a c-command relation, even the ConjP doesn't c-command anything before integration into the structure.

References

- Abels, Klaus. 2003. Successive cyclicity, anti-locality, and adposition stranding. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Abels, Klaus. 2004. Right Node Raising: Ellipsis or Across the Board Movement? In *Proceedings of NELS 34*, ed. by K. Moulton and M. Wolf, 45-59 Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Antonenko, Andrei. 2012. Feature-Based Binding and Phase Theory. Doctoral dissertation, Stony Brook University.
- Beavers, John, and Ivan A. Sag. 2004. Coordinate ellipsis and apparent non-constituent coordination. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Center for Computational Linguistics, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven*, ed. by Stefan Müller, 48–69. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Bennett, David C. 1987. Word order change in progress: The case of Slovene and Serbo-Croat and its relevance for Germanic. *Journal of Linguistics* 23:269-287.
- Bošković, Željko. 1997. *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: An economy approach*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Bošković, Željko. 2002. On multiple wh-fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 351-383.
- Bošković, Željko. 2004a. Topicalization, focalization, lexical insertion, and scrambling. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:613-638.
- Bošković, Željko. 2004b. Two notes on right node raising. In *University of Connecticut Working Papers in Linguistics* 12, 13-24.
- Bošković, Željko. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica* 59:1-45.
- Bošković, Željko. 2013a. Phases beyond clauses. In *The Nominal Structure in Slavic and Beyond*, ed. by Lilia Schürcks, Anastasia Giannakidou and Urtzi Etxeberria, 75-128. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Bošković, Željko. 2013b. Adjectival escapades. In *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 21, ed. by Steven Franks, Markus Dickinson, George Fowler, Melissa Whitcombe, and Ksenia Zanon, 1-25. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Bošković, Željko. 2015. From the Complex NP Constraint to everything: On deep extractions across categories. *The Linguistic Review* 32: 603-669.
- Bošković, Željko. 2016. Getting really edgy: On the edge of the edge. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47: 1-33.
- Bošković, Željko. 2017. On the Coordinate Structure Constraint, islandhood, phases, and rescue by PF deletion. Ms., University of Connecticut.
- Bošković, Željko. 2019. On the Coordinate Structure Constraint and Labeling. In *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 36:71-80. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, Mass.

- Bošković, Željko. 2020a. On The Coordinate Structure Constraint, Across-the-Board-Movement, Phases and Labeling, In *Recent developments in Phase Theory*, Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, Cora Pots, and Tanja Temmerman, 133-182, Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Bošković, Željko. 2020b. On Smuggling, the freezing ban, labels and tough-constructions. In *Smuggling in Syntax*, ed. by Adriana Belletti and Chris Collins, 53-95, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bowers, John. 1993. The syntax of predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 591–656.
- Brisson, Christine M. 1998. Distributivity, maximality, and floating quantifiers. Doctoral dissertation, New Brunswick Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.
- Browne, Wayles. 1975. Serbo-Croatian enclitics for English-speaking learners. In *Contrastive analysis of English and Serbo-Croatian*, ed. by Rudolf Filipovic, 105-134. Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2004. Towards a cartography of subject positions. In *The Structure of CP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures, volume 2*, ed. by Luigi Rizzi, 115-165. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chaves, Rui P. 2012. Conjunction, cumulation and respectively readings. *Journal of Linguistics*, 48(2), 297-344.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries. In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, 89-155. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130: 33-49.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Citko, Barbara 2003. ATB wh-questions and the nature of Merge. In *The Proceedings of NELS 33*, ed. by Makoto Kadowaki and Shigeto Kawahara, 87-102, Umass, Amherst: GLSA Publications.
- Citko, Babara and Martina Gračanin-Yuksek. 2013. Towards a new typology of coordinated wh-questions. *Journal of Linguistics* 49:1-32.
- Collins, Chris. 2005. A smuggling approach to the passive in English. *Syntax* 8: 81-120.
- Corver, Norbert. 1992. Left branch extraction. In *Proceedings of 22nd Conference of the North-Eastern Linguistic Society*, ed. by Kimberly Broderick, 67-84. Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.
- Despić, Miloje. 2011. Syntax in the absence of Determiner Phrase. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Despić, Miloje. 2015. Some issues in the theory of nominal domain: Reflexive possessives, left branch extraction and quantifier raising. Handout from talk at Mie University.
- de Swart, Henriette. 1998. Aspect shift and coercion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16: 347-385.
- de Vos, Mark and Luis Vicente 2005. Coordination under Right Node Raising. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 24*, ed. by John Alderete, Chung-hye Han, and Alexei Kochetov, 97-104. Somerville, MA.
- Dougherty, Ray C. 1970. Recent studies on language universals. *Foundations of Language* 6: 505-561.
- Douglas, Jamie Alexander. 2016. The syntactic structures of relativisation. Doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Fitzpatrick, Justin Michael. 2006. Syntactic and semantic routes to floating quantification. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Franks, Steven. 1993. On parallelism in across-the-board dependencies. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:509-529.
- Franks, Steven. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Franks, Steven, and Ljiljana Progovac. 1994. On the placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics. In *Indiana Linguistic Studies 7, Proceedings of the 9th Biennial Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore*, 69-78. Indiana University Linguistic Club, Bloomington.
- Fanselow, Gisbert, and Damir Ćavar. 2002. Distributed deletion. In *Theoretical approaches to universals*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou, 65-107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Goodall, Grant. 1987. *Parallel structures in syntax: Coordination, causatives, and restructuring*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gračanin-Yukse, Martina. 2007. About sharing. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Grosu, Alexander. 1973. On the nonunitary nature of the coordinate structure constraint. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 88-92.
- Hiraiwa, Ken. 2005. Dimensions of symmetry in syntax: Agreement and clausal architecture. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Holmberg, Anders, Michelle Sheehan and Jenneke van der Wal. 2019. Movement from the double object construction is not fully symmetrical. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50: 677-722.
- Hornstein, Norbert and Amy Weinberg. 1981. Case theory and preposition stranding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 55-91.
- Ishii, Yasuo. 1999. A note on floating quantifiers in Japanese. In *Linguistics: In search of the human mind, A festschrift for Kazuko Inoue*, ed. by Masatake Muraki and Enoch Iwamoto, 236-267. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Ishii, Toru. 2014. On coordinated multiple wh-questions. In *Proceedings of FAJL 7: Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics*, ed. by Shigeto Kawahara and Mika Igarashi, 89-100, Cambridge: MITWPL.
- Johnson, Kyle. 1999. Object Positions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9: 577-636.
- Kamio, Akio. 1977. Suuryooshi-no shintakusu [Syntax of numeral quantifiers]. *Gengo* 6: 83-91.
- Kasai, Hironobu. 2004. Two notes on ATB movement. *Language and Linguistics* 5:167- 188.
- Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kawashima, Ruriko. 1998. The structure of extended nominal phrases: The scrambling of numerals, approximate numerals, and quantifiers in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 7: 1-26.
- Koizumi, Masatoshi. 1995. Phrase structure in minimalist syntax. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1995a. Verbal Morphology: Syntactic Structures Meets the Minimalist Program. In *Evolution and revolution in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of Carlos Otero*, ed. by Campos, H., Kempchinsky, P, 251-275, Georgetown University Press: Georgetown.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1995b. A note on pseudogapping. In *MIT working papers in linguistics 27: Papers in minimalist syntax*. MITWPL, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, Cambridge.
- McCawley, James D. 1998. *The syntactic phenomena of English, second edition*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, Jason. 2013. Voice and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44: 77-108.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1989. *Structure and Case marking in Japanese*. New York: Academic Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru and Koji Arikawa. 2007. Locality in syntax and floated numeral quantifiers. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38:645-670.
- Munn, Alan. 1992. A null operator analysis of ATB gaps. *The Linguistic Review* 9: 1-26.
- Munn, Alan. 1993. Topics in the syntax and semantics of coordinate structures, Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Nakanishi, Kimiko. 2004. Domains of measurement: Formal properties of non-split/split quantifier constructions. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Nakanishi, Kimiko. 2008. The syntax and semantics of floating numeral quantifiers. In *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, ed. by Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito, 286-318. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Nissenbaum, Jon. 2000. Investigations of covert phrase movement. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Nunes, Jairo, 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Oda, Hiromune. 2017. Two types of the Coordinate Structure Constraint and rescue by PF deletion. In *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 47*, ed. by Andrew Lamont and Katerina Tetzloff, 343–356. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Graduate Linguistic Student Association.
- Oda, Hiromune. In press. Deducing and decomposing the Coordinate Structure Constraint. *The Linguistic Review*.
- Percus, Orin. 1993. The captious clitic: Problems in Serbo-Croatian clitic placement. Ms., MIT.
- Pica, Pierre. 1987. On the nature of the reflexivization cycle. In *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 17*:483-500.
- Postal, Paul M. 1998. *Three investigations of extraction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ramchand, Gillian and Peter Svenonius. 2014. Deriving the functional hierarchy. *Language Sciences* 46: 152-174.
- Reuland, Eric. 2011. *Anaphora and language design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2006. On the form of chains: Criterial positions and ECP effects. In *Wh-movement: Moving on*, ed. by Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver, 97-133. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ross, John Robert. 1967. Constraints on variables in syntax. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge.
- Rudin, Catherine. 1988. On multiple questions and multiple *wh*-fronting. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6:445-501.
- Sag, Ivan A., Gerald Gazdar, Thomas Wasow, and Steven Weisler. 1985. Coordination and how to distinguish categories. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3: 117–171.
- Schachter, Paul. 1977. Constraints on coordination. *Language* 53: 86–103.
- Schütze, Carson. 1994. Serbo-Croatian second position clitic placement and the phonology-syntax interface. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 21: Papers on phonology and morphology*, ed. by Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley, and Tony Bures, 373-473. Cambridge: MITWPL.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 1988. A theory of floating quantifiers and its corollaries for constituent structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 425-451.
- Stjepanović, Sandra. 1999. What do second position cliticization, scrambling and multiple *wh*-fronting have in common? Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Stjepanović, Sandra. 2010. Left branch extraction in multiple *wh*-questions: A surprise for question interpretation. In *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics (FASL) 18*, ed. by Wayles Browne, Adam Cooper, Alison Fisher, Esra Kesici, Nikola Predo-lac, and Draga Zec, 502-517. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Stjepanović, Sandra. 2012. Differential object marking in Serbo-Croatian: Evidence from left branch extraction in negative concord constructions. In *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 19*, ed. by John Bailyn, Ewan Dunbar, Yakov Kronrod, and Chris LaTerza, 99-115. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Stjepanović, Sandra. 2014a. Left branch extraction and the Coordinate Structure Constraint. In *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 44*, ed. by Jyoti Iyer and Leland Kusmer, 157–170. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Graduate Linguistic Student Association.
- Stjepanović, Sandra. 2014b. In search for the correlate of a preposition missing under sluicing. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 22: The McMaster Meeting*, ed. by C. Chapman, O. Kit, and I. Kučerová, 418-439. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Stjepanović, Sandra. 2018. Deriving Multiple Left Branch Extraction. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 25*, ed. by W. Browne, M. Despić, N. Enzina, R. Karlin, S. De Lemos, and D. Zec. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Stjepanović, Sandra. 2020a. Extraction out of Coordinate Structure Conjuncts. In *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 26*, ed. by Tania Ionin and Jonathan McDonald, 380-397. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

-
- Stjepanović, Sandra. 2020b. On multiple source left-branch extraction. paper presented at 29th Annual Meeting of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics (FASL 29), University of Washington, May 2020.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 1994. Minimality of movement. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Talić, Aida. 2013. Extraordinary complement Extraction: PP-complements and inherently Case-marked nominal complements. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 8(3), 127-150.
- Talić, Aida. 2017. From A to N and Back: Functional and bare projections in the domain of N and A. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Talić, Aida. 2019. Upward P-cliticization, accent shift, and extraction out of PP. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 37: 1103-1143.
- Tenny, Carol. 1992. The aspectual interface hypothesis. *Lexical Matters* 24: 1-28.
- Watanabe, Akira. 2006. Functional projections of nominals in Japanese: Syntax of classifiers. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24: 241-306.
- Watanabe, Akira. 2008. The structure of DP. In *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, ed. by Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito, 513-540. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, Edwin. 1978. Across-the-board rule application. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 31-43.
- Zanon, Ksenia. 2015. On hybrid coordination and quantifier raising in Russian. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.
- Zhang, Niina. 2010. *Coordination in syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.