

Presently there is a theoretical deadlock in analyses of right-node raising, a subset of non-constituent coordination structures. I argue that this deadlock can be relieved by a novel approach that treats right node raising as a unified phenomenon with different derivational strategies reflecting different identity-conditions. In a typical case of right-node raising some syntactic material that is interpreted internal to each conjunct is realized only once as the rightmost element in the conjunction. Consider the following contrast of basic conjunction versus right-node raising:

- (1) **Basic:** Mary won't pass the test and I will pass the test.
- (2) **RNR:** Mary won't and I will pass the test.

We call the material shared between the conjuncts the pivot and the position in which the pivot is interpreted—the gaps. Any analysis of right-node raising must account for the pivot-gap identity relations, since the pivot's surface form may be different from the form it would have if it were realized in-situ within each gap. Variants of this basic structure have been attested in the literature that have thus far frustrated efforts at a unified analysis. For instance, right node raising structures may show morphological and semantic mismatch between the pivot and one or both of its gaps, as in the following:

- (3) **Collective Predication:** John stole and Mary borrowed 1000 meringues.
- (4) **Closest Conjunct Agreement:** Rumpelstiltskin will but Jennifer won't answer her phone.

In (3) the sentence is ambiguous between a 'collective' reading in which the conjunction of John and Mary's activities nets a total of 1000 meringues and a 'distributive' reading in which John stole 1000 meringues and Mary borrowed 1000 meringues, netting a total of 2000 meringues. Importantly only the latter reading is available in the simple in-situ conjunctions where the pivot '1000 meringues' is inside each conjunct individually. Thus the pivot's collective interpretation is non-identical to the in-situ interpretation it would have in either conjunct, making the resulting relation between pivot and gaps one of uniqueness. Likewise, in (4) there is an interpretation equivalent to the sentence 'Rumpelstiltskin will ~~answer his phone~~ but Jennifer won't answer her phone'. In this case the surface form only reflects the binding in the rightmost conjunct, creating a morphological mismatch between the pivot and the left gap. The pivot may then be identical to its gap in both conjuncts, neither conjunct, or the rightmost conjunct.

Emphasis on certain variants of RNR over others has led to a wide range of analyses: Ellipsis (Ha (2008) and Hartmann (2000)); ATB movement (Ross (1967) and Sabbagh (2007)); and Multi-dominance (Bachrach and Katzir (2007) and Grosz (2015)). Each family of analyses is capable of handling at least a subset of RNR variants but it is not clear whether any are capable of generalizing to the full range of data. This has led some to argue for or against a mixed analysis as in Barros and Vicente (2011) and Larson (2012), respectively.

I argue for a novel approach to right node raising that preserves it as a unified phenomenon but makes a distinction in terms of derivational strategies. My analysis provides a systematic exposition of the identity relations between the pivot and its gaps and a formal model instantiated within Minimalist Grammars Stabler (1997). These grammars have been extended to allow for feature-percolation by Kobele (2010), among others. I argue that when the pivot-gap relation is one of strict identity—as in singular agreement—or partial identity—as in closest conjunct agreement—RNR is derived by movement from the rightmost conjunct to a conjunct-external position, followed by an ellipsis operation triggered by a violation of the coordinate structure constraint Ross (1967). When the pivot-gap relation is one of uniqueness—as in cumulative agreement or collective predication—the structure is derived by feature percolation and a later merger of the pivot into a conjunct external position. I show that this distinction, when formalized, neatly explains the variety of surface forms available under RNR, thereby providing a unified analysis.

References

- Bachrach, A. and Katzir, R. (2007). Right-node raising and delayed spell-out. *Draft 1, Retrieved 2014-10-12 from lingbuzz/000314, listed as v1.*
- Barros, M. and Vicente, L. (2011). Right node raising requires both ellipsis and multidomination. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 17(1):1–9.
- Grosz, P. (2015). Movement and agreement in right-node raising constructions. *Syntax*, 18(1):1–38.
- Ha, S. (2008). On ellipsis features and right node raising. In *Proceedings of ConSOLE XV*, pages 67–90.
- Hartmann, K. (2000). *Right Node Raising and Gapping: Interface conditions on prosodic deletion*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Kobele, G. M. (2010). A formal foundation for a and a-bar movement in the minimalist program. In *MOL 10/11*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 145–159. Springer.
- Larson, B. (2012). A dilemma with accounts of right node raising. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 43(1):143–150.
- Ross, J. (1967). *Constraints on variables in syntax*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- Sabbagh, J. (2007). Ordering and linearizing rightward movement. *Natural Language and Linguistics Theory*, 25(2):349–401.
- Stabler, E. P. (1997). Derivational minimalism. In *Logical Aspects of Computational Linguistics*, pages 68–95. Springer.