**Introduction:** In this paper, I show that coordination behaves identically both below and above the word, using facts like those in (1) as a starting point:

1. a. pre- and post-syntactic  
   b. over- and under-generate

Cases of sublexical coordination offer a challenge to certain conceptions of morphology which view word-formation as fundamentally distinct from syntax: the function of coordination is to combine syntactic objects, but for the view just described, the sublexical domain is closed to syntactic operations. I therefore take the similarities between sub- and supralexical coordination to support a syntactic approach to word-formation.

**Background:** Similarities in the behavior of coordination above and below the word are especially salient with respect to properties of semantic composition and the types of syntactic dependencies that can be established within coordinate structures. With respect to the first point, conjuncts in coordinate structures must combine with material outside the coordinate structure in a unitary way (Sag et al., 1985; Hudson, 1988), ruling out coordinations like those in (2) and (3):

2. * She arrived in a sedan and in tears.  
   3. * John kicked a rock and the bucket.

We see a similar compositional principle in effect below the word as well. While coordinate structures like the ones in (4) are licit, showing that the relevant word-parts may be coordinated, the ones in (5) are only not grammatical under the reading of *preoccupation* as *worry*, or *remember* as anything except *put body parts back together*:

4. a. pre- and post-natal surgery  
   b. dis- and reaffirm  
5. a. *pre- and post-occupation  
   b. *dis- and remember

Both above and below the word, it is possible to exploit the compositional principles of coordination to pragmatic effect, particularly in humorous contexts. This is evident for the supralexical domain in (6) and for the sublexical domain in (7):

6. You are free to execute your laws and your citizens as you see fit.  
   7. Given the choice to dis- or remember my ex, I’ll take the former.  
   *Star Trek: TNG*

There are also several types of syntactic dependencies which are specific to coordinate structures, among them Across-the-Board (ATB) movement, which takes identical pieces of structure contained within each conjunct and moves them outside the coordinate structure. A version of rightward ATB movement known as right-node raising (RNR; Ross, 1967) is available both above and below the word.

8. John liked Titanic, and Mary disliked Titanic.  
9. My distinction between the pre-paradigm and the post-paradigm paradigm periods in the development of a science is, for example, much too schematic.  
   *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*

Both cases involve the appearance of discontinuous constituent structure, are marked by special prosody (the content immediately preceding the right-node in each conjunct must be emphasized), and in both cases, the dependency that is established is unidirectional and backwards.

10. * John liked Titanic, and Mary disliked Titanic.  
11. * My distinction between the pre-paradigm and the post-paradigm periods in the development of a science is, for example, much too schematic.
That these properties of coordination and RNR are shared across domains suggests that the mechanisms behind them are the same, and in particular, that the sublexical domain is accessible to the syntactic component of the grammar. In the next section, I sketch my analysis of sublexical right-node raising.

**Analysis:** I take as my starting point the movement analysis of RNR developed in Sabbagh (2007), which posits right-node raising to right-adjoin to CP on the basis of differences in the availability of various scope configurations in RNR and full coordination.

(12) Some nurse gave a flu shot to, and administered a blood test for, every patient.

(13) Some nurse gave a flu shot to every patient and administered a blood test for every patient.

In (12), the universal can take scope over the existential, producing a reading where a different nurse treats each patient. This reading is absent in (13), where the existential must outscore the universal, and we can only get the reading where a single nurse is responsible for all the patients in the relevant context set. Sabbagh attributes this difference to movement, and argues that RNR raises the right-node (which contains the universal quantifier) to a position above the existential in Spec,T. Crucially, this movement is only licit because it is string-vacuous: movement is constrained by Spell-Out, which establishes the order of components in a cyclic fashion, with each phase serving as a cyclic domain. Movement out of a phase is allowed, but only if it preserves the linear order established at Spell-Out. This principle is known as Order Preservation (Fox and Pesetsky, 2004).

The challenge is that right-node raising, as we have seen, operates in more than one domain. The landing site of RNR cannot itself be CP, because movement to CP is not order-preserving in every instance of RNR. I therefore propose a slight modification to this approach in which the landing site of RNR depends on the domain in which it occurs, but can feed additional, order preserving movement. RNR moves the target to a position right-adjoined to the nearest phase edge. For RNR in the verbal domain, movement is licit to right-adjoin to vP; further movement can be independently licensed as long as it preserves order. This is schematized below the word in (14).

(14)

**Conclusions:** I have presented evidence that coordination occurs both above and below the word, and that processes which are parasitic on coordination are found in both domains as well. For both simple coordination and RNR, the similar character of these constructions in the supralexical and sublexical domains is striking. That syntactic processes as basic as coordination and movement should operate below the word is surprising if we take word-formation to be predicated on different mechanisms than sentence formation; however, it is predicted on a view where word-formation is fundamentally syntactic. This paper can thus be viewed as a defense of the claim that words are decomposable into independently manipulable pieces of syntactic structure.
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