This study takes up two sets of problems about coordination, namely:

(i) How do we generate coordinate structures?

(ii) What is the nature of the constraints on extraction from a coordinate structure?

The solution to the first comes from X-bar theory and the second from the ECP.

Assuming that coordinators are subcategorized for a single argument X, where X is any category, coordination can be assimilated to the schema of X-bar syntax, thus eliminating Phrase Structure rules for generating coordinate structures. Since a coordinator is not a proper governor, extraction of its complement, or any material contained in its complement, leaves an offending trace which will not be properly governed. By virtue of the typical adjunction structure created via coordination, extractions will necessarily leave a trace at some point in the chain where government will be blocked by some intervening barrier in the structure. The hypothesis that, in an adjunction structure, \( \chi \)-indexing takes place only at LF precludes the possibility of government of this offending trace even
by the $\gamma$-indexing mechanism. Thus all cases of traditional CSC violations can be accounted for in terms of ECP.

The present work examines in detail three systematic classes of exception to the CSC, namely, ATB ("across-the-board") extractions, extractions from asymmetric conjuncts and RNR ("Right-Node-Raising"). Asymmetric conjuncts which are conventionally treated as constructions containing a single gap are shown to be constructions containing two gaps, thus placing them on a par with ATB examples. ATB examples in turn can be treated as parasitic gap constructions (a suggestion that comes from Pesetsky (1982)). Despite the parallelism between ATB constructions and parasitic gap constructions, the chain composition mechanism proposed in Chomsky's (1986) Barriers cannot bring them under a single roof. Since the chain composition analysis fails to account for parasitic gaps violating island constraints and ATB gaps violating the CSC, an alternative account is suggested. It is shown here that both ATB and parasitic gap constructions are derivable from an RNR source. And RNR is construed to be not a movement rule, but a bidirectional copying rule which mimics the direction of government.

The Malayalam facts given here reveal some important properties of coordination in general and of coordination in Malayalam in particular. Malayalam coordinators being
clitics are obligatorily present with every conjunct. They are subcategorized for \([-v]\) categories. There is a severe restriction as regards the conjoinability of prenominal specifiers in Malayalam. This is because of the empty feature matrix which is generated with the bare specifiers. If this feature matrix is filled with PNG markers they can be conjoined (a property which is hopefully true of all Dravidian languages). Clauses become conjoinable only when some lexical material is present in the COMP.

The Malayalam facts given here give supporting evidence to the claim that ATB constructions are derivable from RNR sources. Also, the hypothesis that RNR is a copying rule which imitates the direction of government is well supported by the Malayalam facts.

Thus more than suggesting a typological difference between the two languages, the study focuses on things that may be looked for in UG. It achieves its goal in showing that coordinate constructions are like any other constructions, and do not demand any special mechanisms exclusively designed for them. Coordination may be a peculiar creature; but after all, it is tamable!
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