Introduction: two approaches to ATB constructions

1. What, did (John sell e) and (Bill buy e)?
     - a. What, did [John sell ] and [Bill buy ]?
     - [What, did John sell ] and [Bill buy ]?
     - [What, did John sell ] and [what, did Bill buy ]?

Goal: to defend the ATB movement approach by investigating the nature of the second gap in Japanese ATB constructions. Japanese independently has pro and ellipsis strategies.

Two types of conjunction: “te” and “siki/edo”

- “te” coordinates tenseless verbal domains. \rightarrow V P coordination
- “siki/edo” coordinates clausal domains. \rightarrow CP coordination

Investigation of the exact size of “te” and “siki/edo-coordinations

- ConP(te) cannot be embedded under progressive, negation, and low modal.
- ConP(te) can be embedded under high modal but ConP(siki/edo) cannot.

Proposition: ATB VP-coordination is derived by ATB movement. ATB CP-coordination is derived by pro/ellipsis.

- Ellipsis allows interrealation mismatches, cancelling polarity sensitivities of NPs and PPs (Sag 1976; Johnson 2001).
- ATB CP-coordination allows interrealation mismatches, whereas ATB VP-coordination does not.

Implications

- Why is the ellipsis/pro approach unavailable to ATB VP-coordination?
- Why is the ATB movement approach unavailable to ATB CP-coordination?