Japanese Reciprocal Anaphor *Otagai* with Split Antecedents in Disguise and Multi-Dominant Syntactic Structure

Tomoya Kosuge

Tohoku University

1. Introduction This paper concerns some peculiar facts about Japanese reciprocal anaphor *otagai* 'each other', and argues for a multi-dominant structure analysis of Right Node Raising (RNR) construction proposed by Wilder (1999) and Citko (2011).

(1) a. John to   Bill ga   otagai   o   nagut-ta.
          And   Nom   each other   Acc   hit-past

b. *John ga Bill to otagai o nagut-ta.

'John and Bill hit each other.'

(2) a. John to Bill ga otagai {(i) o   / (ii) ni   } naguri-aw-ta.
                                    Acc   Dat

b. John ga Bill to otagai {(i) o / (ii) *ni} naguri-aw-ta.

'John and Mary hit each other.'

(3) John ga   kyositu   de, Bill ga   syoko de   otagai o nagut-ta.
                    classroom in   library in

'lit. John in the classroom, Bill in the library hit each other.'

As the contrast in (1) shows, *otagai* normally does not allow split antecedents. However, when *otagai* occurs in the so called *aw*-construction, it allows split antecedents if it is marked with accusative case whereas it doesn't if it is marked with dative case. Furthermore, *otagai* allows split antecedents when it occurs in the RNR construction.

For the contrast in (2a, b), I propose that (i) *aw* selects vP as its complement, (ii) *pro* resides in the Spec of that vP, and that (iii) *otagai* must be licensed in an argument position of *aw* or the embedded verb (V1). As for (3), I explain its well-formedness by adopting Citko's multi-dominant structure analysis of RNR construction.

2. *Otagai* in *Aw*-construction Ishii (1989) and Nishigauchi (1992) explain *otagai* in the *aw*-construction in different ways. According to Ishii, *aw* absorbs an argument position of V1. Since *otagai* occurs in a non-argument position, it loses its syntactic role as an anaphor and therefore allows split antecedents. On the other hand, Nishigauchi claims that (2b) is derived by extraposing [Bill *to*]$_i$ from [[Bill *to*]$_i$ John$_j$], so *otagai* is bound by the subject NP which contains the trace of [Bill *to*]$_i$ namely [t_i John$_j$]. In his analysis, the antecedents of *otagai* are not split. I will argue that both analyses are defective since they cannot explain why there is a contrast in (2a, b) nor why (3) is grammatical.

To account for this fact, I propose that *aw* selects vP whose Spec is filled with pro as its complement.

(4) [$_{vP}$ [$_{NP}$ John to Bill ga]$_{i+j}$ [$_{v'}$ [$_{VP}$ [$_{NP}$ (a) otagai-ni$_{i+j}$] [$_{V'}$ [$_{vP}$ [pro_{i+j}] [$_{v'}$ [$_{VP}$ [$_{NP}$ (b) otagai-o$_{i+j}$] [$_V$ naguri]] $_{\underline{v}}$]] [$_V$ aw]]] $_{\underline{v}}$]]

(5) [$_{vP}$ [$_{NP}$ John ga]$_i$ [$_{v'}$ [$_{VP}$ [$_{NP}$ {Bill-to$_j$ / (a) *otagai-ni}] [$_{V'}$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{NP}$ pro_{i+j}] [$_{v'}$ [$_{VP}$ [$_{NP}$ {(b) otagai-o$_{i+j}$ / (c) *otagai-ni}] [$_V$ naguri]] $_{\underline{v}}$]] [$_V$ aw]]] $_{\underline{v}}$]]

(4a, b) are grammatical since the antecedents of *otagai* are not split. As for the case of split antecedents, (5b) is acceptable because *pro*, which unifies the split indices into one, resides in Spec-VP1 and binds *otagai-o* in the same way as *pro* in (6) (Hornstein 1999).

(6) John$_i$ told Mary$_j$ [that [[pro_{i+j} washing each other] would be fun]]

On the other hand, *ogagai-ni* cannot occur in (5a) since this argument position is already filled with the PP *Bill to*. It cannot occur in (5c) either since *naguru* cannot license dative case on an NP in its argument position.

3. *Otagai* in RNR construction RNR construction like (7) has been analyzed in two ways as in (8-9).

(7) John bought and Mary read the book.

(8) [John bought t_i] and [Mary read t_i] [*the book*]$_i$ (ATB movement)

(9) [John bought ~~the book~~] and [Mary read *the book*] (Ellipsis)

In (8) the identical elements 'the book' move out of the two conjuncts in an ATB fashion, and in (9) 'the book' in the first conjunct is simply deleted. However, (8-9) are defective in predicting that (3) is a coordination of two ungrammatical sentences. Note that (10) is ungrammatical in isolation.

(10) *John ga otagai o nagut-ta.
     'lit. John hit each other.'

Therefore, I pursue Citko's multi-dominant structure analysis, where the object NP 'the book' is shared between 'bought' and 'read' and makes two VPs. Each VP projects to TP and they are coordinated by 'and' to project &P.

As for (3), given the multi-dominant structure, I propose a structure where a VP consisting of *otagai* and *naguru* 'hit' is shared between the two conjuncts to avoid the problem in (8-9). I further assume that *pro* is adjoined to the embedded VP to unify the split indices into one, whereby *otagai* satisfies Binding Condition (A).

4. Conclusion This paper discusses the binding nature of the Japanese reciprocal anaphor *otagai* and provides some pieces of evidence for the phonetically empty pronominal in the embedded subject position of the *aw*-construction and in a certain RNR construction and for the multi-dominant structure analysis of the latter construction.