Right node raising, scope, and plurality[*]

Aron Hirsch[1] and Michael Wagner[2]

[1] Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA
aronh@mit.edu
[2] McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada
chael@mcgill.ca

Abstract

This paper establishes an empirical generalization about right node raising ('RNR'), based on a novel test using interactions with focus operators: the rightmost constituent ('pivot') can take wide scope above the conjunction, as predicted by ex situ theories of RNR, and as previously argued in Sabbagh (2007). Wide scope is possible, however, only if the pivot is not associated with a position within an island (pace Sabbagh, 2007). Our results are compatible with a hybrid approach to RNR: there is (i) an ex situ analysis achieved by rightward ATB-movement which is island-sensitive, and (ii) an analysis with the pivot in situ, which does not require movement.

1 Ex situ and in situ analyses of right node raising

Right node raising refers to coordinate constructions like (1), where a constituent apparently associated with both conjuncts is pronounced once, at the right edge of the sentence.

(1)   John likes and Mary hates **The Fantastic Mr. Fox**.

Two families of RNR analyses have been advanced in the literature. According to **ex situ** approaches, the surface position of the pivot is external to the coordinate structure. A number of authors have proposed a derivation where the pivot originates internal to the conjuncts and undergoes rightward across-the-board ('ATB') movement to adjoin above the conjunction (Ross, 1967; Hankamer, 1979; Postal, 1974; Sabbagh, 2007, i.a.):[1]

(2) $[[_{TP} [_{TP}$ John likes $t_1]$ and $[_{TP}$ Mary hates $t_1]]$ [The Fantastic Mr. Fox]$_1]$

The second family of approaches (**in situ**) take the pivot to stay internal to the conjunction. One in situ approach involves backward ellipsis: separate occurrences of the pivot are present in each conjunct, and the occurrence of the pivot in the left conjunct elides (Wexler and Culicover, 1980; Swingle, 1995; Kayne, 1994; Wilder, 1995; Hartmann, 2001; Ha, 2008, i.a.).

(3)   [John likes ~~The Fantastic Mr. Fox~~] and [Mary hates The Fantastic Mr. Fox]

Another in situ approach involves a multi-dominance structure: there is a single occurrence of the pivot with multiple mothers, one in each conjunct (McCawley, 1982; Wilder, 1999; Bachrach and Katzir, 2007, 2009). In (1), a single occurrence of *The Fantastic Mr. Fox* is both the complement of *likes* in the left conjunct and the complement of *hates* in the right conjunct.[2]

---

[1]Another type of ex situ approach allows for co-ordination of non-standard constituents, and assumes that a surface structure like (1) is base-generated, rather than derived by movement (Steedman, 1985). In the remainder the paper, we will assume that ex situ structures (if possible at all) involve ATB-movement.

[2]While proponents of in situ accounts usually assume either ellipsis or multi-dominance, Barros and Vicente (2011) argue that *both* are necessary, but see Larson (2012) for counterarguments.

Our aim in this paper is to establish whether, and under what circumstances, an ex situ analysis is available. We focus, in particular, on a dissociate scope prediction:[3]

(4) **Dissociative Scope Prediction**
  a.   If an ex situ analysis is available, the pivot can scope above *and*.
  b.   If only an in situ analysis is available, the pivot must scope below *and*.

We introduce a new way to diagnose the scope of the pivot based on focus operators (§2), which supports the following generalizations:

(5) **Empirical generalizations**
  a.   The pivot can scope above *and*.
  b.   When the (base) position of the pivot is within an island, the pivot must scope below *and*.

The result in (5-a) confirms that RNR has an available ex situ analysis, as already argued in Sabbagh (2007). The result in (5-b) is most straightforwardly understood if RNR has *both* an ex situ analysis and an in situ analysis. The ex situ analysis involves rightward ATB-movement which respects islands, contrary to the finding in Sabbagh (2007). In island configurations, the ex situ analysis is blocked, while the in situ analysis is preserved, predicting (5-b).

In the remainder of the paper, we consider other ways of testing for the scope of the pivot involving universal quantifiers (§3, building on Sabbagh, 2007) and the distributive operator *different* (§4, building on Abels, 2004). Although Sabbagh (2007) has argued that data with universal quantifiers indicate that the pivot can take scope above *and* out of an island, we reconcile his data with (5-b). In the final section (§6), we identify a residual puzzle.

2 Focus operators

Our strategy to diagnose the scope of the pivot will be to insert *only* into it. To set up discussion, let us first introduce the analysis of *only* by considering the mono-clausal example:

(6)   John likes **only Hamlet**.

We assume that *only* is a two-place operator (cf. Rooth, 1985; Drubig, 1994; Krifka, 2006; Wagner, 2006). *Only* combines with a focused XP of any type α, and then a constituent of type $<\alpha,st>$. We take it that, in (6), this argument structure obtains with covert movement of *only Hamlet* to derive the LF in (7). *Only* combines with *Hamlet* (type e) and the derived property $\lambda x.\lambda w.$ *John likes x in w* (type $<e,st>$).

(7) $[_{TP} [_{DP}$ only Hamlet$_F]$ $\lambda 1$ $[_{TP}$ John likes $t_1]]$

Only is defined as in (8) (cf. Rooth, 1985; Wagner, 2006). Only(x)(f) presupposes f(x)(w) and asserts the falsity at w of all alternatives f(a) that are not entailed by f(x).

(8) $[\![$only$]\!] = \lambda x_\alpha$. $\lambda f_{<\alpha,st>}$. $\forall a \in$ ALT(x) $[f(a)(w) \rightarrow (f(x) \Rightarrow f(a))]$
   Presupposition: f(x)(w)

Then, (6) presupposes that John likes Hamlet and asserts that for every alternative a to Hamlet, John does not like a, unless John liking a is already entailed by him liking Hamlet.

Given this analysis, *only* is predicted to scopally interact with other operators. Taglicht (1984), for instance, observes (9), which is ambiguous between (9-a) and (9-b). (9-a) derives from an LF like

---

[3]Note that Bachrach and Katzir (2007) propose a way to make a multi-dominance account compatible with wide scope readings. We will not be able to pursue this possibility further here due to space restrictions.

(10-a) where *only Spanish* QRs to a position above *advised*, while (9-b) derives from an LF like (10-b) where QR targets a position below *advised*.[4]

(9) You were advised to learn **only Spanish**.

  a. Only Spanish is such that you were advised to learn it. *only > advised; (10-a)*

  b. What you were advised was to learn only Spanish. *advised > only; (10-b)*

(10) a. $[_{TP} [_{DP}$ only Spanish$_F] \lambda 1 [_{TP}$ you were advised to learn $t_1]]$

  b. $[_{TP}$ you were advised $[_{TP} [_{DP}$ only Spanish$_F] \lambda 1 [_{TP}$ to learn $t_1]]$

2.1 Diagnosing *only > and*

Let us now consider an RNR example minimal to (1), but with *only* inserted into the pivot, as in (11):

(11) John likes and Mary hates only The Fantastic Mr. Fox.

A first available reading is one with *and > only*, according to which (11) licenses the inference:

(12) ... therefore, John dislikes all the other movies and Mary likes all the other movies.

This inference is expected to be valid if the pivot including *only* is interpreted separately within each conjunct — i.e. *and > only* — as in the baseline:

(13) John likes only The Fantastic Mr. Fox and Mary hates only The Fantastic Mr. Fox.

Critically, (11) also allows for a second reading with *only > and*, which can be paraphrased: only The Fantastic Mr. Fox is such that both John likes it and Mary hates it. This reading is brought out:

(14) John and Mary like and dislike many movies, but their taste is nearly identical. **John likes and Mary hates only the Fantastic Mr. Fox**.

  The observation that *only > and* is possible provides a direct argument that RNR has an available ex situ analysis, per the Dissociative Scope Prediction. On the in situ analysis, the pivot is internal to the conjuncts in the narrow syntax and would have to undergo covert ATB-movement. It is clear from the unavailability of an *only > and* reading in the in situ baseline in (13) that such covert movement is not generally available. An ex situ analysis is required to derive *only > and*.

  Regarding the first reading (*and > only*), it derives on an ex situ analysis with ATB-reconstruction of the pivot. In fact, since we will argue below that RNR has both an ex situ analysis and in situ analysis, there are *two* derivations which each yield *and > only* in (11): *and > only* is the "reconstructed" reading of the ex situ analysis and straightforwardly derives on the in situ analysis.

2.2 The effect of an island

It is well known that RNR is grammatical even when the conjunct-internal base position of the pivot is within an island:

(15) John found a critic who likes and Mary found a critic who hates The Fantastic Mr. Fox.

Yet, we demonstrate that the generalization is more nuanced: although RNR is grammatical in island configurations, the range of available readings is more restricted. In particular, the pivot cannot scope above *and*. Once again, this is diagnosed by inserting *only* into the pivot.

---

[4]The surface distribution of *only* can be accounted for as follows: *only* can adjoin to any constituent, as long as at LF the syntactic configuration [only(x)][y] can be established. Consistent with this, covert movement of *only* and its associate leading to Taglicht ambiguities is subject to familiar LF-movement constraints (for example, it is not possible from a finite clause) (Wagner, 2009).

As a control, the data in (16) demonstrate that a DP containing *only* cannot normally escape a relative clause island. (16-a) involves overt movement with negative inversion, and (16-b) shows that *only* must be interpreted internal to the relative clause and scope below *someone*.

(16)   a.   *Only The Fantastic Mr. Fox did John find a critic who likes.
          b.   John found someone who likes only The Fantastic Mr. Fox. *(some > only, *only > some)*

Turning to our RNR test case, consider the bolded example, first in a context biasing *and > only*:

(17)   It seems some critics either like or dislike almost everything. **John found a critic who likes and Mary found a critic who hates only The Fantastic Mr. Fox.**

In (17), the sentence is felicitous, indicating that it can convey the *and > only* reading where John managed to find a critic who likes a single movie, and Mary one who hates a single movie. But, now consider the following, which biases *only > and*:

(18)   It's hard to find critics that disagree with each other. **#John found a critic who likes and Mary found a critic who hates only only The Fantastic Mr. Fox.**

The incoherence of (18) suggests that *only > and* is not available. This is evidence that for island-violating RNR, the pivot must scope below the conjunction. The interaction between *only* and the conjunction hence provides evidence for the generalizations in (5).[5]

To account for the island facts, we suggest that the ex situ analysis of RNR is island-sensitive, and that RNR has, in addition, an in situ analysis. In island-violating RNR, only the in situ analysis is available, so the pivot must scope below *and*. Given that the ex situ analysis involves ATB-movement, island sensitivity is expected from the behavior of leftward ATB-movement:

(19)   *Which book does John know the man who likes _ and Mary know the woman who hates _?[6]

3   Universal quantifiers

Sabbagh (2007) provides a different way of diagnosing the scope of the pivot, and reports results convergent with our first generalization (that *pivot > and* is available), but contradictory to our second (that *pivot > and* is bled in island configurations). In Sabbagh's test cases, the pivot is universal:

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

The subject *some nurse* necessarily scopes above *and*; that is, it is necessarily the same nurse that gives the flu shot and administers the blood test.[7] The pivot is *every patient*. *Every patient* is scopally

---

[5]We do not explore the exact generalization of what constrains wide scope reading here. We think that the wide-scope pattern might be similar to that of overt leftward ATB movement. It seems different from LF movement in that wide scope seems possible in double object constructions (i.). And it might be also in allowing extraction from a finite clause (ii.), although the judgments we obtained were conflicting; it is different from rightward movement, in that wide scope readings seem to be possible with preposition stranding:

(i.)   a.   John sent some student and Mary sent some professor every piece of gossip that they heard of around the department.
          b.   I found that Bill likes and you found that Bill hates only The Fantastic Mr. Fox.
          c.   Bill raved about and yet Mary complained about only The Fantastic Mr. Fox.

Another caveat is that we found that examples involving the operator *even* might pattern differently. To explore the exact generalization more carefully is beyond the scope of this paper.

[6]A parallel example in which island-violating RNR feeds *wh*-movement is reported as acceptable in Bachrach and Katzir (2007); however, the judgments we elicited suggest that this is in fact not possible. We think this data point has to be tested more extensively.

[7]The assumptions is *v*Ps are conjoined, and some nurse ATB-moves out of the conjuncts to spec-TP, where it is interpreted as scoping above the conjunction (Moltmann, 1992; Fox, 2000).

commutative with *and*, but interacts with *some nurse*. Because *some nurse* scopes above *and*, if *every patient* can scope above *some nurse*, it must also be able to scope above *and*. Sabbagh observes that this wide scope reading is available in (20).

3.1 Island configurations

Let us now consider Sabbagh's datum with an island configuration:

(21)   John knows someone who speaks and Bill knows someone who wants to learn every Germanic language.

The universal pivot, as above, is commutative with *and*, but scopally interacts with *someone*. Sabbagh observes that (21) is ambiguous between *some > every* and *every > some*. The critical result is the availability of *every > some*, paraphrased: for every Germanic language x, John knows someone who speaks x and Bill knows someone who wants to learn x.

This reading could come about in two ways. On an in situ analysis, *every Germanic language* could QR above *someone* separately in each conjunct:

(22)   **Derivation 1** (after in situ analysis): (*and > every > some*)

a.   [$_{TP}$ [$_{DP}$ every Germanic language] λ1 John knows someone who speaks t$_1$]
and [$_{TP}$ [$_{DP}$ every Germanic language] λ2 Bill knows someone who wants to learn t$_2$]

On an ex situ analysis, the LF corresponding to the narrow syntactic structure is (23-b), where *every Germanic language* has ATB-moved above the conjunction. If the pivot is above the conjunction, it also must scope above *someone*.

(23)   **Derivation 2** (after ex situ analysis): (*every > and > some*)

a.   [$_{TP}$ John knows someone who speaks t$_1$
and Bill knows someone who wants to learn t$_1$] λ1 [$_{DP}$ every Germanic language]

For (21) to be a counter-example to our conclusions, it must be demonstrated that the ex situ derivation is an available one. The premise of the argument is that the example in (24) is unambiguous (*some > every*, **every > some*), where one conjunct is considered in isolation:

(24)   John knows someone who speaks every Germanic language.

This shows that *every Germanic language* cannot QR above *someone* within the conjunct in violation of the island, ruling out Derivation 1. To account for (21), rightward ATB-movement must, then, not be sensitive to islands, allowing *every > some* to derive from an ex situ structure like Derivation 2.

We believe, however, based on the judgments we elicited, that the baseline in (24) may actually allow for *every > some*. We can improve the test if we find an island configuration where QR of the universal within the conjuncts is more clearly blocked. Postal (1998) observed that *wh*-extraction out of a relative clause in a definite DP is notably worse than in other DPs (cf. Szabolcsi, 2006). Building on this, we modify (23) by changing the DP to a definite:

(25)   John knows the professor who wrote every exam.

The judgment in (25) is clearer than in (24): (25) allows a reading with *the > every*, but an inverse reading with *every > the* is marginal. The RNR test case is:

(26)   John knew the professor who wrote and bribed the student who graded every exam.

Most of our informants report that the judgment tracks the baseline: just as *every > and* is marginal in (25), it is marginal in (26). (26) can convey (implausibly) that John knew the professor who wrote every exam and bribed the student who graded every exam (*and > every*), but a plausible reading where professors and students co-vary with exams is at least difficult.

A more direct test of the predictions is to substitute *and* with *or*, which directly interacts with the universal quantifier.

(27)   A: How did John get through the semester?
        B: He blackmailed the professor who wrote or bribed the student who graded every exam.

Again, a wide scope of *every* was at least difficult for most of our consultants.

4   Distributive and cumulative readings

Another source of evidence for our generalizations are interactions with distributive operators such as *different* or *similar*. Consider (28) (see Abels (2004) for a parallel example):

(28)   Carl and Sue married two quite different people.

This sentence conveys that Carl and Sue each married one person, and the person Carl married was quite different from the person Sue married ('distributive reading'). The generalization about distributive readings is that they are possible if the constituent modified by *different* can take scope over a plural or a coordination (cf. Beck, 2000, for cases not involving RNR).

Turning to RNR, a distributive reading is available in non-island configurations (cf. Abbott, 1976, 642, for an example with *similar*):

(29)   Bob and Sally brought their partners over for dinner. Their partners did not get along. **Bob dates and Sally married two quite different people.**

The distributive reading in (29) is expected under an ex situ account, where *two quite different people* attaches above the coordination and can hence scope over it, but not under an in situ account.[8] The in situ baseline is (30), where the distributive reading is clearly impossible:

(30)   Bob dates two quite different people and Sally married two quite different people.

To make explicit how the distributive reading derives if *different* scopes above the coordination, we sketch a possible analysis of (29):

(31)   [[[Bob dates t_1] and [Sally married t_1]] [two quite different people]$_1$]

After Beck (2000), *different* may be analyzed as a reciprocal relational adjective. Simplifying somewhat for exposition, *two quite different people* denotes:

---

[8]This is acknowledged in Abels (2004). However, Abels (2004) argues that this apparent advantage of ex situ analyses is illusory. Consider:

(i)   John says that Friederike must, and that Konrad may, record two quite different songs.

This example is meant to illustrate that raising the VP also licenses a distributive reading, but it is unexpected that the DP could take scope over the coordination from inside the VP. Abels concludes that there must be some other mechanism to allow distributive scoping than movement. We have doubts about this judgment, however. The following at least seems to lack a distributive reading:

(ii.)   Trent Reznor did sing and Johnny Cash will sing two quite different songs.

A second argument that Abels makes in order to show that distributive scope are not sensitive to movement constraints is the following:

(iii.) Konrad and Frederike know men who have written quite different songs.

But here, it is the constituent *men* that *quite different songs* out-scopes and distributes over, and then *Konrad and Friederike* can distribute over the two men—no scope-taking out of the island is necessary to derive the intended reading.

(32) $[\![$two quite different people$]\!]$
    $= \lambda f_{<e,t>}$. $\exists X$ [people(X) & #(X)=2 & $\forall y[y \leq X \rightarrow \forall z[z \leq X$ & $y \neq z \rightarrow$ different(y,z)]] & f(X)]

The conjunction must provide a predicate of pluralities to be taken as the argument of $[\![$two quite different people$]\!]$. To achieve this, we make two assumptions: (i) predicate abstraction can occur separately in each conjunct (λy . *Bob dates y,* λz . *Sally married z*), and (ii) *and* is optionally analyzed as something other than logical *and.* Link (1984) provides the entry for *and* in (33-a), which composes with the aforementioned predicates to yield the predicate of pluralities in (33-b).

(33) a. $[\![and_2]\!] = \lambda P_{<e,t>}$. $\lambda Q_{<e,t>}$. λX . $\exists y \exists z[X=y \oplus z$ & P(y) & Q(z)]
    b. $[\![\&P]\!] = \lambda X$. $\exists y \exists z[X=y \oplus z$ & Bob dates y & Sally married z]

Applying $[\![\&P]\!]$ to $[\![$two quite different people$]\!]$ delivers the distributive reading: the sentence is true iff there is some two-membered plurality of people $y \oplus z$ where y and z are different from one another (from (32)), and Bob dates y, and Sally married z (from (33-b)).

4.1 Island configurations

Let us now turn to island contexts. In non-RNR structures, the distribution of distributive readings appears to be sensitive to islands such that the distributive reading is unavailable when *different* is trapped in an island:

(34) Bob and Sally know a politician that married two quite different people.

Consistent with our second generalization, a distributive reading is similarly absent in RNR if the pivot originates in an island. This effect of islands has already been observed for adjunct islands in Abels (2004), and we illustrate with a relative clause island:

(35) Our co-workers, Bill and Sally, do not get along. At Thanksgiving, I always go over to Bill's house and you always go over to Sally's house. So, **#I know the man who married and you know the woman who married these two quite different people.**

4.2 Cumulative readings

The operator *total* seems to show a convergent paradigm to the one seen above with *different*:

(36) a. There seems to have been an odd sort of concert going on in the street last night. **A man hummed and a woman whistled four songs total.**

    b. There seems to have been an odd sort of concert going on in my street last night and in my sister's street. **I heard a man who hummed and my sister heard a man who whistled four songs total.**

The bolded sentence in (36-a), but not (36-b) allows a "cumulative reading" in which each of the two singers individually sang less than four songs, but four songs in total were sung between them. In sum, the generalizations about distributive and cumulative readings are as expected if there is an ex situ analysis of RNR, but only when respecting island constraints, convergent with our conclusions in the preceding sections.

5 Summary

Data are consistent with the empirical generalizations in (37), restated from the introduction. The most conservative interpretation of these generalizations leads to the analytical conclusions in (38).

(37) **Empirical generalizations**
  a. In island-respecting RNR, the pivot can scope above *and* (cf. Sabbagh 2007).
  b. Island violating RNR is grammatical, but the pivot must scope below *and*.

(38) **Analytical conclusions**
  a. RNR has an island-sensitive ex situ analysis.
  b. RNR has an island-insensitive analysis that is only compatible with *and < pivot*.

Throughout the paper, we have argued that the island-sensitive ex situ analysis in (38-a) involves rightward ATB-movement of the pivot from conjunct-internal base positions to a conjunct-external position. Our data are most straightforwardly analyzed with a "hybrid" analysis of RNR where the ex situ and in situ approaches – rather than being mutually exclusive – co-exist. Island-respecting RNR is ambiguous between this ex situ analysis and an in situ analysis, and island-configurations disambiguate in favor of an in situ analysis. A hybrid approach has been previously proposed in Valmala (2013).

6 A remaining puzzle: conjunctive pivots

To conclude the paper, we point out a class of examples which constitute a residual puzzle:[9]

(39) Madonna sang and McCartney wrote *American Pie* and *Let it Be*, respectively.

This example has two features: the pivot is a conjunction and *respectively* is present. The interpretation involves pairwise distribution of the conjuncts in the pivot between the conjoined clauses: Madonna sang *American Pie* and McCartney wrote *Let it Be*.[10] This reading can only obtain with the pivot ex situ, as is clear from:

(40) Madonna sang *A. Pie* and *Let it Be* and McCartney wrote *A. Pie* and *Let it Be* (respectively).

The sentence in (40) is an in situ baseline, and is truth-conditionally distinct from (39): whereas Madonna sang just *American Pie* in (39) and McCartney wrote just *Let it Be*, (40) says that Madonna sang both songs and that McCartney wrote both songs.

The same profile of example with a distributed reading seems to be available in island-configurations, although this seems to require an ex-situ pivot:

(41) I know the artist who sang and John has met the artist who wrote *American Pie* and *Let it Be*, respectively.

Hence, the example in (41) is an apparent counter-example to our second generalization: the pivot can take scope above the conjunction despite the island configuration.

But, the puzzle runs deeper still. Although the pivot must be ex situ, the individual conjuncts in the pivot behave syntactically as though they were within their respective conjuncts. Consider:

(42) John likes and Mary hates **himself** and **herself**, respectively.

By Condition A, *himself* must be c-commanded by John, and *herself* by Mary. Note that this result cannot be obtained by reconstructing the entire conjunction *himself and herself* into the two clausal conjuncts: if the entire conjunction reconstructed, *himself* and *herself* would both be present in both conjuncts, which would result in an incorrect interpretation and violations of Condition A.[11]

---

[9]Data in this section build on examples in Moltmann (1992) and references therein. The binding data also relate to observations in Hirsch and Marty (2015).

[10]See Gawron & Kehler (2004) for an analysis of *respectively*. As in the examples above with *different*, *and* is analyzed as something other than logical conjunction in their analysis of *respectively*.

[11]*Himself* and *herself* could be 'exempt anaphors' in this example, not subject to Condition A. Reinhart and Reuland (1993) observe that the anaphor in the coordination in (i) is exempt, as diagnosed by the non-complementarity between it and the pronoun:

NPI licensing shows a similar pattern:

(43)   Madonna won't sing and McCartney won't record **any song** and **any album**, respectively.

The NPIs are licensed if *any song* and *any record* are c-commanded by negation separately in their respective conjuncts. If the conjunction itself reconstructed, in addition to a wrong meaning, the NPIs would not be licensed, since *and* is an intervener for NPI licensing (Linebarger, 1987; Guerzoni, 2006).

Further binding data involving Conditions B and C show that the conjuncts in the pivot not only *can* behave as though they were within the conjoined clauses, but in fact *must* (just like in the case of regular RNR, cf. Phillips,i.a.):

(44)   a.   *John$_1$ likes and Mary$_2$ hates **him**$_1$ and **her**$_2$, respectively.   *(Condition B)*
         b.   *He$_1$ likes and she$_2$ hates **John**$_1$ and **Mary**$_2$, respectively.   *(Condition C)*

In (44-a), co-indexation of *John* and *him* is impossible, as is co-indexation of *Mary* and *her*, indicating that *John* necessarily c-commands *him* and *Mary* c-commands *her*. The pattern in (44-b) is parallel.

In sum, it appears that the pivot must be ex situ, but the construction is not island-sensitive and the individual conjuncts in the pivot behave as they though are necessarily in situ in separate conjuncts. While a full account of this pattern is beyond the scope of the present paper, one possibility is that the entire pivot, in (39) *American Pie and Let it Be*, ATB-moves above the conjunction and then the individual conjuncts *American Pie* and *Let it Be* are "metalinguistically" reconstructed as syntactic objects into separate positions in the two clausal conjuncts. If island effects arise through an interaction of syntax and interpretation, this metalinguistic strategy may not respect islands. This type of metalinguistic RNR might also be understood with an approach that views (at least some cases of) RNR as a consequence of incremental structure building during processing (Phillips, 1996) or as a consequence of delayed spell-out (Bachrach and Katzir, 2009). We leave further exploration of this idea for future research.

References

Abbott, B. (1976). Right node raising as a test for constituenthood. *Linguistic Inquiry*, pages 639–642.

Abels, K. (2004). Right node raising: Ellipsis or movement? In Wolf, M. and Moulton, K., editors, *Proceedings of the Northeast Linguistic Society Proceedings Meeting in 2003 at Stony Brook*, pages 45–60.

Bachrach, A. and Katzir, R. (2007). Spelling out QR. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, volume 11, pages 63–75, Barcelona.

Bachrach, A. and Katzir, R. (2009). Right Node Raising and Delayed Spellout. In *InterPhases: Phase-Theoretic Investigations of Linguistic Interfaces*, pages 283–316.

Barros, M. and Vicente, L. (2011). Right node raising requires both ellipsis and multidomination. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 3(1):15.

Beck, S. (2000). The semantics of different: Comparison operator and relational adjective. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 23(2):101–139.

Drubig, H. B. (1994). Island constraints and the syntactic nature of focus and association with focus. In *Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340: Sprachtheoretische Grundlagen der Computerlinguistik*, volume 51. Sonderforschungsbereich 430, Tübingen/Stuttgart.

Fox, D. (2000). *Economy and semantic interpretation*. Number 35. MIT Press.

Guerzoni, E. (2006). Intervention effects on NPIs and feature movement: towards a unified account of intervention. *Natural Language Semantics*, 14(4):359–398.

(i)   Max boasted that the queen invited Lucie and himself/him for a drink.

The datum in (44-a), however, shows that complementarity does hold in the conjunctive pivot examples, calling into question an analysis of (42) in terms of exempt anaphora.

Ha, S. (2008). *Ellipsis, Right Node Raising, and Across-The-Board Movement*. PhD thesis, Boston University.

Hankamer, J. (1979). *Deletion in Coordinate Structures*. Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics. Garland.

Hartmann, K. (2001). *Right node raising and gapping: Interface conditions on prosodic deletion*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Hirsch, A. and Marty, P. (2015). Binding evidence for conjunction reduction. MS. MIT.

Kayne, R. S. (1994). *The antisymmetry of syntax*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Ma.

Krifka, M. (2006). Association with focus phrases. In Molnár, V. and Winkler, S., editors, *The architecture of focus*, volume 82 of *Studies in Generative Grammar*, chapter 4, pages 105–136. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Larson, B. (2012). A dilemma with accounts of right node raising. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 43(1):143–150.

Linebarger, M. (1987). Negative polarity and grammatical representation. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 10:325–387.

McCawley, J. D. (1982). Parentheticals and discontinuous constituent structure. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 13(1):91–106.

Moltmann, F. (1992). *Coordination and comparatives*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Phillips, C. (1996). *Order and Structure*. PhD thesis, MIT.

Postal, P. M. (1974). *On raising: One rule of English grammar and its theoretical implications*. The MIT Press.

Postal, P. M. (1998). *Three investigations of extraction*, volume 29. MIT Press.

Reinhart, T. and Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic inquiry*, pages 657–720.

Rooth, M. (1985). *Association with Focus*. PhD thesis, University of Massachussetts, Amherst.

Ross, J. R. (1967). *Constraints on variables in syntax*. PhD thesis, MIT.

Sabbagh, J. (2007). Ordering and linearizing rightward movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 25(2):349–401.

Steedman, M. (1985). Dependency and coordination in the grammar of Dutch and English. *Language*, 61:523–568.

Swingle, K. (1995). On the prosody and syntax of right node raising. *Ms., UC Santa Cruz*.

Szabolcsi, A. (2006). Strong vs. weak islands. *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, 4:479–531.

Taglicht, J. (1984). *Message and Emphasis. On focus and scope in English*, volume 15 of *English Language Series*. Longman, London and New York.

Valmala, V. (2013). On right node raising in Catalan and Spanish. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 12:219–251.

Wagner, M. (2006). Association by movement. Evidence from NPI-licensing. *Natural Language Semantics*, 14(4):297–324.

Wagner, M. (2009). Focus, topic, and word order: A compositional view. In van Craenenbroeck, J., editor, *Alternatives to Cartography*, pages 53–86. Mouton De Gruyter, Berlin/New York.

Wexler, K. and Culicover, P. (1980). *Formal principles of language acquisition*. Mit Press.

Wilder, C. (1995). Rightward movement as leftward deletion. *On extraction and extraposition in German*, pages 273–309.

Wilder, C. (1999). Right node raising and the LCA. In *Proceedings of WCCFL*, volume 18, pages 586–598.