

Phrasal or Phasal Coordination?
-From the Evidence of Suspended Affixation-

Synopsis: In this paper, introducing novel facts in Japanese that different categories can be coordinated, I will argue that the relevant factor is not the categorial isomorphism but whether the elements that are coordinated constitute a phase (Chomsky 2000, Embick 2010).

Facts: Japanese has three ways to connect two sentences as in (1).

- (1) Taroo-ga betsubetsu-no ronbun-o {kopii-si/kopi-si-te/kopii-shita sosite} fairu-si-ta.
 Taroo_{-NOM} different_{-GEN} paper_{-ACC} copy-do/copy-do-and/copy-do and.then file-do-PAST.
 ‘Taro copied a paper and filed another different paper. / Taro copied and filed a paper.’

Among the three, the sentence with a bare-verbal element in the first conjunct is regarded as coordination (Takano 2004, Hirata 2006), since it can co-occur with *betsubetsu* ‘different’, which induces a sentence-internal reading, according to which the paper that is copied and the paper that is filed can be different as the translation in (1) indicates. Although the traditional analysis of Japanese sentential coordination (SC) is TP-coordination (Tomioka 1994, Nishiyama 2012 a.o.), the existence of T in the sentential coordination is not well-established. If the sentence in (1) involves TP-coordination, the shared part (i.e. *-ta*) must be moved to C via Across-the-board (ATB) movement. That is, (1) has the following structure:

- (2) [_{CP} [_{TP1} SUBJ OBJ V] [_{TP2} SUBJ OBJ V] C(=*-ta*)]

However, if (2) is on the right track, we expect that negation, which amalgamates with *-ta*, always takes scope over SUBJ in (3), which is not the case.

- (3) [_{TP} Zen’in-ga ronbun-o kopii-si] [_{TP2} *pro*(SUBJ) *pro*(OBJ) fairu-si]-nak-at-ta.
 Everyone_{-NOM} paper_{-ACC} copy-do file-do-NEG-COP-PAST.
 ‘Everyone didn’t copy and file a paper.’ (everyone > not / not > everyone)

In (3), the subject universal quantifier can be outside the scope of the negation. I thus assume in line with Takano (2004) and Hirata (2006) that what is coordinated in (1) and (3) is *vP* as in (4).

- (4) [_{TP} Zen’in-ga [_{vP1} *t*₁ robun-o kopii-si] [_{vP1} *t*₁ *pro*(OBJ) fairu-si]-nak-at-ta.
 Everyone_{-NOM} paper_{-ACC} copy-do file-do-neg-cop-past
 ‘Everyone didn’t copy and file a paper.’ (everyone > not / not > everyone)

Issues: Crucial here is the scope interpretation observed in (5) and (7), where Suspended Affixation (SA) is invoked due to the presence of *-(s)ase* (causative) and *-nai* (negation). Given the above argument that what is coordinated is *causP*, the scope facts regarding (5a) are not surprising; the causative morpheme takes scope over both *causP1* and *causP2*. Moreover, the existence of CAUS in both clauses is evident by the realization of additional arguments. Observe:

- (5) a. [_{TP} Hanako-ga [_{XP} Masao-ni [_{causP1} *t*₁ piano-o narai *t*_{sase}] [_{causP2} *t*₁ syuujji-o naraw *t*_{sase}]-**ase**]-ta].
 Hanako_{-NOM} Masao_{-DAT} piano_{-ACC} learn Taro_{-DAT} calligraphy_{-ACC} learn-CAUS-PAST
 b. [_{TP} Hanako-ga [_{XP} Masao-ni [_{causP1} *t*₁ piano-o naraw-**ase**] [_{causP2} *t*₁ syuujji-o naraw-**ase**]-ta].
 Hanako_{-NOM} Masao_{-DAT} piano_{-ACC} learn-CAUS calligraphy_{-ACC} learn-CAUS-PAST
 ‘Hanko made Masao learn piano and Hanako made Masao learn calligraphy.’

(V1<V2<CAUS /*V1<CAUS <V2/*V2<CAUS<V1)

Here, (5a) only has a V1<V2<CAUS reading just like (5b), which indicates that (5a) has the following structure:

- (6) [_{CAUSP} [_{causP1} ... *t*_{caus1}] [_{causP2} ... *t*_{caus2}] CAUS]

However, if (6) is the right structure for the bare-verbal coordination, (7) will be problematic.

- (7) *Because he has to drive ...*
 Kare-wa [_{vP1} sushi-o tabe] [_{vP2} sake-o noma]-nak-at-ta.
 he-TOP sushi-ACC eat sake-ACC drink-NEG-COP-PAST
 ‘He neither ate sushi nor drunk sake. / He ate sushi but he didn’t drink sake.’

(V1<V2<NEG / V2<NEG<V1)

(7) allows a V2<NEG<V1 reading, which is unexpected if the relevant structure is (8).

- (8) [_{NEGP} [_{vP1} ... *t*_{neg1}] [_{vP2} ... *t*_{neg2}] NEG]

The existence of a V2<NEG<V1 reading in (7) indicates that there is a case where only the second conjunct (i.e. *vP2*) is negated, which is normally ruled out due to the heterogeneous categories being coordinated (i.e. *vP1* and NEGP). This is surprising since both CAUSE and NEG are suffixes to the verb, and the former is verbal and the latter is adjectival by nature. Note that logical combinations of negation and coordination do not work. Consider:

