

To my parents. To my family. To my friends. In *particular* order.

Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my advisors, Professors Acrisio Pires and Samuel Epstein. Both of them (each with his own style) have been a constant source of inspiration since I began my training at Michigan and have always been my main source of support. And, as they know, there have been a few times in these five years when I really needed such support. I knew I could always count on them. Thank you!!

As my main advisor, Acrisio has always been available whenever I needed help and/or advice. He has given me extremely helpful reviews and comments on everything I have written, even when he was really busy with other tasks. All those comments meant significant revisions that greatly improved the quality of my work, in terms of both its content and form. This alone shows what an amazing mentor he is. Everybody knows how much he cares for his students, and I have been immensely lucky to work with him all these years. At one of my job interviews this year, I got the question “what do you think are the main qualities of a good advisor?” Right before I tried (but failed) to come up with a convincing answer, I thought to myself: “like Acrisio.”

Sam is one of the main reasons I am in linguistics. Many of my accomplishments in the field can in one way or another be traced back to his

enthusiasm about my work, and he has made me feel more comfortable about my work as well. Sam has also shaped the way I think about syntax and linguistics. He is also the best teacher I have ever had, and he is a symbol of what people who enjoy learning (like me) think education should be like. For these reasons he will always be a role model for me.

I also want to thank the rest of the members of my dissertation committee, Professors T. Daniel Seely, Hisatsugu Kitahara, and Richard Lewis, for helping me write a much better dissertation.

Daniel has always been an undercover Michigan syntactician; he interacts with the faculty and the students here as if he actually had an appointment in the department! Daniel has always been eager to provide me with helpful comments on many of my previous manuscripts and I have learned a lot from him.

Hisa has been a great addition to the Michigan syntax group, and I am really sad I won't be able to be here on his last year as a visitor. He has provided me with some of the best feedback on this dissertation. Thanks to his comments, I understand my *own* ideas much better.

Rick is one of the most impressive scholars I have ever met, and it has been an honor to have him on my committee. Even though he is not technically a linguist he is always able to give informed comments and important feedback. Besides, he has this amazing ability to make connections between virtually any

of the domains in Cognitive Science. He is definitely an example of the kind of scholar us syntacticians should speak to more often.

I would also like to thank other professors in the department for their support. Professor Julie Boland has been key in introducing me to field of Psycholinguistics, my secondary area of research. Had there been another open spot in my dissertation committee, I would definitely have asked her to join. I would also like to thank Professors Marlyse Baptista, Pam Beddor, Andries Coetzee, San Duanmu, Elaine McNulty, Teresa Satterfield, and Sally Thomason. I also want to thank the Linguistics staff for their help, especially the great Sylvia Suttor for being the most capable and helpful student services assistant ever.

Many thanks also to my friends and colleagues at Michigan: Rizwan Ahmad, Miyeon Ahn, Christopher Becker, Lisa Del Torto, Cati Fortin, Brook Hefright, Yu-fen Hsieh, Dave Kush, Susan Lin, Kevin McGowan, David Medeiros, Miki Obata, Christopher Odat, Hamid Ouali, Sai Samant, Andrea Stiasny, Lauren Squires, Terry Szymanski, Li Yang, and Yang Ye. Special thanks go to my really good friends Lillian Chen, Dina Kapetangianni, Mike Marlo, and Damon Tutunjian.

I would also like to thank Professors Juan Carlos Acuña Fariña, Tomás Jiménez Juliá, Víctor Longa, Guillermo Lorenzo, Javier Pérez Guerra, and especially Sara Rosen for their support in previous stages of my academic career.

Still in the realm of linguistics, I would like to thank an inordinate number of people (a mix of professors and students), for various reasons: Theresa Biberauer, Lepoglav Borelij, Ana Carrera, Chris Collins, Jordi Fortuny, Victoria Fossum, Ángel Gallego, Brent Henderson, Anders Holmberg, Norbert Hornstein, Susana Huidobro, Matt Husband, Aritz Irurtzun, Christina Kim, Nayoung Kwon, Thomas Leu, Ananda Lima, Pascual Masullo, Jason Merchant, Alan Munn, Jairo Nunes, Iván Ortega Santos, María del Carmen Parafita Couto, Jin Hee Park, David Pesetsky, David Poeppel, Ljiljana Progovac, Mike Putnam, Kristina Riedel, Ian Roberts, Michelle Sheehan, Juan Uriagereka, Luis Vicente, and Zeljko Boskovic.

I also want to thank many *non*-linguists! I want to thank my friends from my three homes, Ann Arbor, Santiago, and Vigo: Kazu(kun), Evelyn, Lily, Gemma, Merry, Arno, Christine, David, Shinobu, Justine, Jorge, Marc, Agustí, Monica, Yuki, Sonia, Philippe, Marta, Chantal, Sebastien, Alberto, Muriel, Neige, Arinah, Katherine, Gonzalo, Alejandra, Mikel, Nancy, Michie, Gerardo, Emilio, Dío, Germán, Begoña, Pati, Javi, Alex, María, Laura, Jose, Giova, Eva, Andrea, Ana, Jaime, Iván, Miguel, Rober, Santi, Julio, Luis, Geni, Cristina...

Finally, I want to thank my mom, my dad, and my brother. *Nos vemos pronto!!*

Gerardo Fernández Salgueiro

Ann Arbor, MI, May 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	ix
CHAPTER	
1. Introduction	1
2. The syntactic analysis of Coordination	5
2.1. Ternary branching, X', or adjunction?	5
2.2. Some notes on the adjunction formalism	10
2.3. Lowering the adjunction site of non-first conjuncts	12
2.4. Where is the coordination/subordination distinction to be found, then?	24
2.5. Consequences of the "lowered adjunction" analysis	26
3. Revisiting the Coordinate Structure Constraint	29
3.1. Exploring the redundancy between the CSC and the Condition on Extraction Domains	29
3.2. On extraction from a "first conjunct"? The parallelism requirement	37
3.3. A parallelism requirement at PF: word order restrictions in ATB extraction in Spanish	44
3.4. ATB extraction in English vs. Romance	46
3.5. Some remaining issues	54

4.	On the unification of ATB and PG constructions	60
4.1.	The Null Operator analysis	62
4.2.	Nunes' Sideward Movement analysis of ATB and PG constructions	68
4.3.	Some asymmetries in PG constructions	83
4.4.	Revisiting Crossover phenomena: Weak and Weakest (and Strong)	90
4.5.	Extensions of Sideward Movement	100
5.	General summary and implications for sentence processing	107
5.1.	Summary	107
5.2.	Possible implications for sentence processing	112
	REFERENCES	116

ABSTRACT

In this dissertation I investigate aspects of the syntax of sentential coordination, Across-the-Board extraction, and Parasitic Gap constructions, as well as their implications for our understanding of the language faculty. I first argue that the analysis of coordinate and subordinate structures should be unified in terms of their syntax. More specifically, I argue that in coordinate structures in which two TPs are coordinated, non-first conjuncts are adjoined to the vP, as is commonly assumed for adverbial clauses. I also argue against the traditional distinction between coordination and subordination and propose that any differences in the grammatical behavior of these constructions should be reduced to the individual lexical properties of their conjunctions. As in any version of the adjunction analysis of coordination (see Munn 1993), we find a partial redundancy between two different principles of the narrow syntax: the Coordinate Structure Constraint and the Condition on Extraction Domains. I explore this redundancy and argue that the former should not be maintained as a principle of the narrow syntax. I provide further evidence that the syntax does allow extraction from a first conjunct, although it is then ruled out in the semantics by the LF Parallelism Requirement (Hornstein and Nunes 2002). I then revise the LF Parallelism Requirement and argue, based on data from

Spanish, that conjuncts require parallelism regarding linear order at PF as well. Finally, I argue that the analysis of Across-the-Board and Parasitic Gap constructions should be unified in terms of Sideward Movement (see Nunes 2001, 2004). I provide further evidence for this approach here based on (the absence of) Weak Crossover, of which I propose a new formulation. I also take the absence of Weak Crossover as the basis for extending the Sideward Movement analysis to other cases of movement.