

Lenguas, lenguaje y lingüística

Contribuciones desde la Lingüística General

Adriana Gordejuela Senosiáin

Dámaso Izquierdo Alegría

Felipe Jiménez Berrio

Alberto de Lucas Vicente

Manuel Casado Velarde

(Eds.)

Título: Lenguas, lenguaje y lingüística.

Subtítulo: Contribuciones desde la Lingüística General.

Autor: A. Gordejuela Senosiáin, D. Izquierdo Alegría, F. Jiménez Berrio, A. de Lucas Vicente, M. Casado Velarde (eds.).

Editorial: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Navarra.

Maquetación y corrección de textos: Apiedepágina.net

ISBN: 978-84-8081-478-2

Reservados todos los derechos de edición.

Queda prohibida la reproducción total o parcial de esta obra por cualquier método o procedimiento.

Lenguas, lenguaje y lingüística.

Contribuciones desde la Lingüística General

Adriana GORDEJUELA SENOSIÁIN

Dámaso IZQUIERDO ALEGRÍA

Felipe JIMÉNEZ BERRIO

Alberto DE LUCAS VICENTE

Manuel CASADO VELARDE

(eds.)

ÍNDICE

PRAGMÁTICA NOMINAL EN LOS SUFIJOS DERIVADOS DE LA LENGUA ESPAÑOLA Jaume Alvedra i Regàs	9
LA DUPLICACIÓN PRONOMINAL EN LAS ORACIONES DE RELATIVO EN CATALÁN: UNA MARCA DE ESPECIFICIDAD Cristina Albareda	21
THE SYNTAX OF ELLIPSIS IN ARABIC FRAGMENT ANSWERS Ali Algryani	35
SELF-CONCEPT, EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND READING SKILL IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: IMPACT ON THE LEVEL OF ENGLISH? Elena Alonso-Blanco, Manuel Soriano-Ferrer, Ángel López García-Molins	45
THE INTERACTION OF EXTRAPOSITION FROM DP AND <i>RIGHT NODE RAISING</i> IN ENGLISH AND SPANISH Marian Alves	53
HACIA UNA SOCIOLINGÜÍSTICA DE LA ESCRITURA. LA ENCUESTA Leopoldo Idefonso Baliña García	65
APORTES DEL CONCEPTO DE NORMA AL ESTUDIO DE LAS ACTITUDES LINGÜÍSTICAS Rafael Alberto Barragán Gómez	79
ANALITISMO FRENTE A LA NOMINALIDAD. ESTUDIO CONTRASTIVO POLACO-ESPAÑOL Janusz Bien	91
LA EVOLUCIÓN DE LOS VERBOS DE MOVIMIENTO EN CHUJ Cristina Buenrostro	103
LA PÉRDIDA DEL LÉXICO DIALECTAL: ALGUNOS DATOS DE CASTELLANOPARLANTES DE SAN SEBASTIÁN Bruno Camus Bergareche, Sara Gómez Seibane	117
TECHNICAL TRANSLATION, TERMINOLOGY AND THE ACCESSIBILITY OF SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE IN PORTUGUESE Luis Cavaco-Cruz	129

HACIA UN GLOSARIO DEL LÉXICO DE LA INFORMÁTICA Y LA INTERNET EN ESPAÑOL Lirian Ciro, Neus Vila Rubio	141
EL LINGÜISTA EN EL PARLAMENTO Giovana de Sousa Rodrigues	153
ALGUNOS MITOS SOBRE LA ADQUISICIÓN DE LA LENGUA MATERNA Iván Enríquez Martínez	161
MARCO LEGAL Y PLANIFICACIÓN LINGÜÍSTICA EN LAS COMUNIDADES BILINGÜES DE ESPAÑA Gérard Fernández Smith, Luis Escoriza Morera	173
CORSICAN EQUIVALENTS OF <i>IT</i> -CLEFT SENTENCES IN ENGLISH: AN OVERVIEW Pierre-Don Giancarli	187
DESCOMPOSICIÓN LÉXICO-CONCEPTUAL DE LOS VERBOS PARASINTÉTICOS CON PREFIJO <i>DES-</i> Elisabeth Gibert Sotelo	203
TWO KINDS OF MINIMAL ANSWERS TO <i>YES-NO</i> QUESTIONS IN CZECH AND SPANISH Hana Gruet-Skrabalova	217
SOBRE LA NATURALEZA HÍBRIDA DE LAS RELATIVAS LIBRES INDEFINIDAS Edita Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Pilar Pérez Ocón	229
THE LEXICALIZATION OF ENGLISH LOANWORDS INTO EGYPTIAN ARABIC Walaa Hassan	243
¿ES EL CONOCIMIENTO MORFOLÓGICO UN MECANISMO DETERMINANTE EN LA RECUPERACIÓN DEL LÉXICO DISPONIBLE? Natividad Hernández Muñoz	259
TRADUCCIÓN COMO MEDIACIÓN INTERCULTURAL: DELIMITACIÓN CONCEPTUAL Y DIMENSIONES DE UNA PRÁCTICA Carlos Hernández Sacristán	269
LOS CENTROS DE CARÁCTER CULTURAL EN LOS ESTUDIOS DE DISPONIBILIDAD LÉXICA: ANÁLISIS Y NUEVA PROPUESTA María Herreros Marcilla	279
ASPECTOS ANTROPOLÓGICOS SOBRE EL FENÓMENO DEL CAMBIO DE CÓDIGO EN COMUNIDADES BILINGÜES. EL CASO DE ESTUDIO DE LA COMUNIDAD DE HABLA ALICANTINA José Iborra Torregrosa	291

LA RHINOGLOTTOPHILIA DESDE UNA PERSPECTIVA TIPOLOGICA (CON UNA NOTA SOBRE LA LENGUA VASCA)	
Iván Igartua	303
DIRECTIONALITY IN ADVANCED TONGUE ROOT HARMONY	
Gary Linebaugh	315
EL BILINGÜISMO INDIVIDUAL: ENFOQUES SOBRE UN CONCEPTO	
Lara Lorenzo Herrera	325
LA PREPOSICIÓN EN ESPAÑOL Y EN CHINO. DIFERENCIAS CONSERVADORAS ADITIVAS	
M^a Azucena Penas Ibáñez, Jinbai Zhang	333
LENGUA Y CULTURA EN EL EPISTOLARIO DE PEDRO DE MUGICA A ANTONI M. ALCOVER	
Maria Pilar Perea	345
INFLUENCIA DE LOS SONIDOS ADYACENTES Y LOS MÁRGENES DE DISPERSIÓN DE LAS VOCALES MEDIAS ANTERIORES DEL CATALÁN EN HABLA ESPONTÁNEA	
Agnès Rius-Escudé, Francina Torras Compte	357
LA CATEGORIZACIÓN DEL CONOCIMIENTO ESPECIALIZADO: ANÁLISIS Y CLASIFICACIÓN DE LAS RELACIONES DE SIGNIFICADO ENTRE TÉRMINOS COHIPÓNIMOS	
Mercedes Roldán Vendrell	369
LOS ESQUEMAS ENTONATIVOS DEL FRAGATINO: DESCRIPCIÓN Y COMPARACIÓN CON VARIEDADES ROMÁNICAS PRÓXIMAS	
Lourdes Romera, Ana Ma. Fernández Planas, Wendy García-Elvira, Paolo Roseano, Josefina Carrera, Albert Ventayol, Eugenio Martínez Celdrán	389
LA INFLUENCIA DEL GÉNERO TEXTUAL EN LA PRODUCCIÓN DEL ELEMENTO PROSÓDICO	
Asier Romero, Aintzane Etxebarria, Iñaki Gaminde, Urtza Garay	401
A VUELTAS CON EL YEÍSMO: PRODUCCIÓN FONÉTICA, PERCEPCIÓN CATEGORIAL Y CAMBIO	
Assumpció Rost Bagudanch	417
ESTUDIO DE DISPONIBILIDAD LÉXICA EN APRENDICES ITALIANOS DE ESPAÑOL: ANÁLISIS CUANTITATIVO	
Roberto Rubio Sánchez	429
SOME OBSERVATIONS ON MORPHOLOGICAL CASE IN OLD SAXON	
Iker Salaberri	443

REPRESENTACIONES SOCIALES EN TORNO AL PROCESO DE EVALUACIÓN: ALUMNOS DE ELE EN LA CIUDAD DE MÉXICO Yuritzky de la Paz Sánchez López	455
ESTRATEGIAS LINGÜÍSTICAS PARA LA CODIFICACIÓN DE LA CAUSALIDAD EN TEXTOS ESCRITOS POR ESTUDIANTES UNIVERSITARIOS Paola Sánchez Portilla, Celia Díaz Argüero	463
LA INFLUENCIA DEL CONOCIMIENTO DE VARIAS LENGUAS EXTRANJERAS EN EL LÉXICO DISPONIBLE Inmaculada Clotilde Santos Díaz	477
EN BUSCA DE LA IDENTIDAD LINGÜÍSTICA. EL ESPAÑOL CARA A CARA CON EL CROATA Anita Skelin Horvat, Maša Musulin	485
CARACTERÍSTICAS ACÚSTICAS DE LA ASPIRACIÓN DE /-S/ IMPLOSIVA EN EL ESPAÑOL HABLADO EN MÁLAGA. HACIA LA RESILABIFICACIÓN PRESTIGIOSA DE UN SEGMENTO SUBYACENTE ENTRE LOS JÓVENES UNIVERSITARIOS Matilde Vida-Castro	495
MICROINFORMÁTICA. MODELOS DE VARIACIÓN INFORMATIVA MICROPARAMÉTRICA Xavier Villalba, Sílvia Planas-Morales	507
AINDA AS ‘REFLEXÕES’ SOBRE A <i>PRONUNCIACÃO</i> NO SÉC. XVIII PORTUGUÊS Ana Paula Banza	517
ASPECTOS DE LA MORFOLOGÍA PORTUGUESA EN EL SIGLO XVIII: LAS <i>REFLEXÕES</i> (1768/1842) DE FRANCISCO JOSÉ FREIRE Maria Filomena Gonçalves	529
DIDASCALIAS E IMPLICATURAS: UN ESTUDIO LINGÜÍSTICO-PRAGMÁTICO DEL LENGUAJE FEMENINO EN EL SIGLO XVII M^a José Rodríguez Campillo	539
EL CONTACTO LINGÜÍSTICO EN LA LITERATURA ALJAMIADA: ¿DÓNDE ESTÁ DIOS? Juan Antonio Thomas	551
PRESENTACIÓN DE LIBRO: <i>LA LINGÜÍSTICA EN ESPAÑA: 24 AUTOBIOGRAFÍAS INTELECTUALES</i> Xavier Laborda, Lourdes Romera, Ana Ma. Fernández Planas	563

THE INTERACTION OF EXTRAPOSITION FROM DP AND *RIGHT NODE RAISING* IN ENGLISH AND SPANISH

MARIAN ALVES
Universidad del País Vasco

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper explores the interaction of two operations that have been traditionally analyzed as involving rightward movement: extraposition from DP (EX) and *Right Node Raising* (RNR)¹. The two operations are illustrated in (1) and (2), respectively. In the two sets of data the low hyphen indicates the positions in which the sentence-final constituent is interpreted. In what follows, it will also be shown that Spanish and English display the same patterns in this particular area of grammar.

- (1)a. Peter wrote a book _ last year about global warming.
b. Pedro escribió un libro _ el año pasado sobre el calentamiento global.
Peter wrote(3sg) a book the year past about the warming global.
- (2)a. Peter wrote _, and Mary edited _, the article about *Right Node Raising*.
b. Pedro escribió _, y María editó _, el artículo sobre RNR.
Peter wrote(3sg) and Mary edited(3sg) the article about RNR.

EX involves the rightward displacement of a PP or relative clause away from the head noun it modifies. The extraposed constituent (EC) is assumed to adjoin to the minimal maximal projection containing its head noun (Guéron & May 1984; Culicover & Rochemont 1990; Baltin 2005, among many others). Thus, in the case of EX from an object (to which the discussion is restricted for simplicity) the EC adjoins to VP. The operation is schematically represented in (3).

- (3) [_{TP} Peter [_{VP} *t*_{SU} [_V wrote [_{VP} [_{VP} *t*_V a book *t*_i] last year] about global warming_i]]]].

Right Node Raising (RNR) constructions are characterized by the presence of a gap in the non-final conjunct(s) of a coordinate structure. One consequence of this linearity is that the rightmost constituent in these sentences is interpreted in several positions. In the example provided in (2) above, the DP *the article about RNR/el artículo sobre RNR* is interpreted as the internal argument of the predicates in the two conjuncts. Following Postal (1998), I will refer to the right-node-raised constituent as the *pivot*. A more detailed account of the syntax of RNR is provided in section 2 below.

¹ It has to be noted that the acceptability of RNR in Spanish is subject to speaker-variation. Bošković (2004) makes the same observation concerning English.

Interesting for the purposes of this paper is the fact that a sentence-final PP or relative clause modifier can also modify two head nouns, as in (4) below, where both the article and the book can be interpreted as dealing with global warming.

- (4) a. Peter wrote an article and Mary read a book
about global warming.
 b. Pedro escribió un artículo y María leyó un libro
sobre el calentamiento global.
Peter wrote(3sg) an article and Mary read(3sg) a book
about global warming.

Similar data have been described in the literature on EX as involving split antecedents. The sentences in (5) are drawn from Culicover & Rochemont (1990).

- (5) a. A man came in and a woman went out *who were very similar.*
 b. A man came in and a woman went out *who know each other very well.*

The pivot can also include a head noun, an EC and an adverbial separating them, as in (6).

- (6) a. Peter wrote and Mary edited *a book last year about global warming.*
 b. Pedro escribió y María editó *un libro el año pasado*
sobre el calentamiento global.
Peter wrote(3sg) and Mary edited(3sg) a book the year past
about the warming global.

Before going on to analyze the sentences in (4) to (6) in more detail, I will dwell for a while on the syntactic analysis of RNR.

2. THE ANALYSES OF RNR

The name of the operation (RNR) describes quite closely what the phenomenon was traditionally assumed to involve: a constituent that occupies the rightmost position in two (or more) conjuncts is raised to adjoin to a high node (probably S'/CP). As a result, the phrase that now surfaces sentence-finally appears to be 'shared' by the two conjuncts. In the examples in (2) above, the pivot is at the same time the direct object of the two predicates *wrote/escribió* and *edited/editó*. The movement operation just described is of the Across-the-Board (ATB) type. This analysis is argued for in Ross (1967), Bresnan (1974), Hudson (1976), Maling (1972), Postal (1974, 1998), Sabbagh (2007), and Clapp (2008), among many others. The derivation of a sentence like (2) above is roughly as in (7). I will assume for concreteness that the pivot adjoins to the coordination phrase (&P).

- (7) [_{&P} [_{&P} [_{TP} Peter wrote *t*]] [_& and [_{TP} Mary edited *t*]]] [_i the article about RNR]_i

The data shown in (8) below –drawn from Abels (2004)– pose a serious problem for a derivation along the lines in (7), as RNR appears to be insensitive to islands, which is totally unexpected if it involves movement.

- (8)a. John wonders [when Bob Dylan wrote _] and Mary wants to know [when he recorded _] his great song about the death of Emmett Till.
- b. I know a man [who buys _] and you know a woman [who sells _] gold rings and raw diamonds from South Africa.
- c. Josh got angry [after he discovered _], and Willow quit [after finding out about _], the company's pro-discriminatory policy.

The pivot is related to a position inside an embedded *wh*-clause in (8a), a complex NP in (8b) and a clausal adjunct in (8c), all three well-established islands for extraction.

Another piece of evidence that has sometimes been presented against movement accounts is the fact that RNR (unlike other rightward movement operations) does not obey Ross's (1967) *Right Roof Constraint* (roughly, the prohibition to cross clause boundaries). Compare in this respect the two sentences in (9). (9a) is grammatical in spite of the fact that the pivot is related to positions inside embedded clauses. EX, on the other hand, cannot cross clause boundaries, as witnessed in the ungrammaticality of (9b). The datum in (9a) has been drawn from Sabbagh (2007), that in (9b) from Kayne (1994).

- (9)a. Josh promised [that he would give _ to Jamie], and Joss claimed [that he was going to give _ to Sue], all of the answers to the final exam.
- b. *The fact [_{CP} that someone *t_i* walked into the room] was irrelevant [who I knew]_i.

In the light of this type of data, some linguists have proposed an alternative analysis of RNR in terms of ellipsis of a constituent in the first conjunct under identity with the pivot (Wexler and Culicover 1980; Levine 1985, 2001; Kayne 1994; Bošković 2004; Wilder 1997; and Hartmann 2000). The constituent that is eventually realized occupies its base position, as shown schematically in (10).

- (10) [_{&P} [_{TP} Peter wrote ~~the article about~~ RNR] [_& and [_{TP} Mary edited the article about RNR.]]]

But this analysis is not exempt from problems. Thus, Sabbagh (2007) discusses the scope facts in (11) as indicative of a relatively high structural position of the pivot.

- (11) a. Some nurse gave a flu shot to _ and administered a blood test for _ every patient who was admitted last night.
- b. Some nurse gave a flu shot to every patient and administered a blood test for every patient.

Only in the case of RNR in (11a) can the universally quantified pivot take scope over the existentially quantified subject. Given that scope requires c-command, the pivot has to be in a position from which it c-commands the subject. This configuration arises only in the analysis in terms of ATB-movement. With the object *in situ* (as in (11b)), the reading in which the existential quantifier takes scope over the universal quantifier is obligatory².

² For a more complete review of pros and cons of the different analyses, the reader is referred to Bošković (2004), Sabbagh (2007) and Abels (2004).

Very recently, Valmala (2012) has proposed that the apparently conflicting evidence just reviewed results from the erroneous conflation of two different phenomena. According to him, the label *RNR* has been used to refer to two different constructions which he dubs *Focal-Pivot RNR (FP-RNR)* and *Non-Focal-Pivot RNR (NFP-RNR)*. Since both display the same linear sequence, they have been taken to be instances of the same operation. However, the two constructions differ in their information structural and prosodic properties. Roughly, in FP-RNR, the pivot is focalized, whereas in NFP-RNR it is not. In the paragraphs that follow, the two phenomena will be presented in some detail.

Valmala (2012) qualifies the claim made in Postal (1998) that verbal agreement in I' pivots must be summative when the two coordinated subjects are singular, as in (12) below. According to him, this is only the case in FP-RNR constructions. Things are different when the pivot is not focalized (i.e. in NFP-RNR). In the latter case, only singular agreement is possible. Following standard practice, the focalized constituents appear in capitals.

- (12) a. The pilot claimed that the first nurse, and the sailor proved that the second nurse, WERE SPIES/*WAS A SPY.
 b. The pilot claimed that the first nurse and the sailor proved that the SECOND NURSE was a spy/*were spies.

Given that the pivot is associated with a focus feature in FP-RNR, Valmala (2012) claims that its derivation involves ATB-movement of this constituent to the Spec of a focus projection in the left periphery of the sentence. Subsequent remnant movement of &P to the SpecTopicP derives the final linear sequence. The derivation of a sentence like (12a) is shown in (13)³.

- (13) a. ATB movement of the pivot to SpecFocusP
 $[_{\text{FocusP}} \text{ were spies}_i [_{\text{Focus}'} \text{ Focus } [_{\&P} [_{\text{TP}} \text{ the pilot claimed that the first nurse } t_i] [_{\&'} \text{ and } [_{\text{TP}} \text{ the sailor proved that the second nurse } t_i]]]]]$
 b. Remnant movement of &P to SpecTopicP
 $[_{\text{TopicP}} [_{\&P} [_{\text{TP}} \text{ the pilot claimed that the first nurse } t_i] [_{\&'} \text{ and } [_{\text{TP}} \text{ the sailor proved that the second nurse } t_i]]] [_{\text{Topic}'} \text{ Topic } [_{\text{FocusP}} \text{ were spies}_i [_{\text{Focus}'} \text{ Focus } t_{\&P}]]]]]$

- (14) below shows the schematic representation of the prosodic contour of this type of construction. The pivot is focalized, and there is a pause immediately before it. A second pause may be optionally inserted between the two conjuncts.

- (14) [conjunct₁] (,) [conjunct₂], PIVOT.

The derivation of what Valmala (2012) calls NFP-RNR involves ellipsis of the pivot in the first conjunct, as shown in (15).

- (15) $[_{\&P} [_{\text{TP}} \text{ The pilot claimed that the first nurse was a spy}] [_{\&'} \text{ and } [_{\text{TP}} \text{ the sailor proved that the SECOND NURSE was a spy}].$

³ Notice that this analysis is a reinterpretation of the old rightward movement account along lines that comply with minimalist assumptions. In more traditional terms, one would assume that the pivot moves ATB to the right to adjoin to &P. I will follow Valmala's reformulation as leftward movement.

(16) shows the prosodic patterns associated with NFP-RNR. As can be seen, when the pivot is not focalized (and independently from the fact that some other constituent may be a focus), there is no prosodic break before it.

- (16) a. [conjunct₁ FOCUS] (,) [conjunct₂ FOCUS] (*,) pivot
 b. FOCUS [conjunct₁] (,) [conjunct₂] (*,) pivot
 c. [conjunct₁] (,) [conjunct₂] (*,) pivot

Valmala (2012) provides several arguments in favor of this dual analysis. One of them has to do with parasitic gaps. Only a FP can license a parasitic gap, as shown in (17), a clear indication that the pivot has been A-bar moved⁴.

- (17) a. Peter reviewed without reading, and Bill revised, TWO PAPERS ON RNR.
 b. Peter revised, and Bill reviewed without reading, TWO PAPERS ON RNR.
 c. Peter edited without revising, and Bill reviewed without reading, TWO PAPERS ON RNR.

These sentences contrast with the NFP-RNR constructions in (18) below, where the parasitic gap cannot be licensed by the pivot, an indication that the latter does not occupy an A-bar position. This situation is compatible with the pivot being *in situ*.

- (18) a. Peter reviewed and Bill REVISED my paper.
 b. *Peter reviewed without reading and Bill REVISED my paper.
 c. *Peter published and Bill REVIEWED without reading my paper.
 d. *Peter published and Bill REVIEWED my paper without reading.

Another piece of evidence comes from scope facts like those presented in (11) above in favor of the movement analysis of EX. Valmala (2012) observes here again an asymmetry between FP- and NFP-RNR. Consider (19).

- (19) a. Some nurse gave a flu shot to, and administered a blood test for, EVERY PATIENT WHO WAS ADMITTED LAST NIGHT.
 b. Some nurse gave a flu shot to and ADMINISTERED A BLOOD TEST for every patient who was admitted last night.

Only if the pivot is focalized can the universal quantifier take scope over the existential quantifier in the subject of the sentence, as in (19a). This reading is not possible in (19b), where the pivot is not focalized.

Once the scene has been set, the time has come to present the data in which EX interacts with RNR.

⁴ These sentences pattern with ATB *wh*-movement, as in (i).

- (i) a. Which papers did Peter file without reading and Bill read twice?
 b. Which papers did Peter read twice and Bill file without reading?
 c. Which papers did Peter edit without revising and Bill review without reading?

3. THE INTERACTION OF RNR WITH EX

3.1. The data

Two linear patterns are relevant for the present discussion. They are illustrated in (20) and (21) for English and Spanish.

(20) a. Pedro escribió un artículo y María leyó un libro
sobre el calentamiento global.

*Peter wrote(3sg) an article and Mary read(3sg) a book
about the warming global.*

b. Peter wrote an article and Mary read a book *about global warming.*

(21) a. Pedro escribió y María editó un libro el año pasado
sobre el calentamiento global.

*Peter wrote(3sg) and Mary edited(3sg) a book the year past
about the warming global.*

b. Peter wrote and Mary edited a book last year about global warming.

The sentences in (20) show that a sub-constituent –in this case the PP modifier of a head noun– can undergo RNR. Thus, in these sentences, both the article and the book can be interpreted as dealing with global warming. The pivot in sentences like (21) is more complex. This time the sentence-final constituent is made up of the head noun, its modifier and the intervening adverbial. Here, both the writing and the editing of a book about global warming took place last year. The fact that the head noun is separated from its modifier is a clear indication of the fact that EX has taken place, and that this has happened before RNR.

In the following subsections the patterns just introduced will be analyzed in some detail. I will address first the constructions in which a modifier of a head noun constitutes the sole pivot of the RNR construction.

3.2. The modifier is the only pivot

Only post-nominal modifiers –the same constituents that can undergo EX– can become the pivot in RNR. The sentences I will use in this section to illustrate the phenomenon involve clausal pivots, as interesting patterns of agreement emerge in these cases.

The agreement patterns observed in the cases of RNR of a relative clause largely coincide with those illustrated in (12) above for I' pivots. When the relative (or a constituent inside it) is not focalized and there is no prosodic pause preceding it, summative agreement is not possible. In other words, the relative will be in the singular, even when it can be interpreted as modifying the DPs in the two conjuncts. English and Spanish display the same behavior in this particular respect, as can be seen in (22) and (23).

(22) a. John is writing an article and Mary is reading A BOOK that deals/*deal with
global warming.

b. John met a congressman and Bill interviewed A SENATOR that is/*are willing to vote for the amendment.

- (23) a. Juan escribió un artículo y María leyó UN LIBRO que analizaba/*analizaban las consecuencias del cambio climático.

John wrote(3sg) an article and Mary read(3sg) a book that analyzed(3sg)/analyzed(3pl) the consequences of-the change climatic.

‘John wrote an article and Mary read A BOOK that analyzed the consequences of climate change’.

- b. Juan se reunió con un diputado y Pedro entrevistó a UN SENADOR que votará/*votaran a favor de la reforma.

John CL_{refl} met(3sg) with a congressman and Peter interviewed(3sg) to a senator who will-vote(3sg)/will-vote(3pl) in favor of the reform.

‘John met a congressman and Peter interviewed A SENATOR who will vote for the reform’.

In the (a) sentences, both the article and the book can be interpreted as dealing with global warming/the consequences of climate change. Similarly, in the (b) examples, both the congressman and the senator will vote for the amendment/the reform. It is important to notice that if the head noun were not a focus in these sentences, the relative could only be construed with the closest head noun, never with both.

The sentences involve a NFP and are, consequently, analyzed as cases of ellipsis. It can therefore be assumed that the clausal modifier is deleted in the first conjunct under identity with the relative clause in the second conjunct.

- (24) a. John is writing an article ~~that deals with global warming~~ and Mary is reading A BOOK that deals with global warming.

b. John met a congressman ~~that is willing to vote for the amendment~~ and Bill interviewed A SENATOR that is willing to vote for the amendment.

Interestingly, summative agreement is not blocked in all cases. For it to be possible, the relative (or some constituent inside it) has to be a focus. When the relative is immediately adjacent to the head noun, a pause is obligatorily inserted between them. Otherwise, it would tend to be interpreted as a modifier of the adjacent head noun only, with the subsequent agreement mismatch and unacceptability.

- (25) a. John is writing an article, and Mary is reading a book, that deal/*deals with GLOBAL WARMING (not with global dimming).

b. John met a congressman, and Bill interviewed a senator, that are/*is willing to vote FOR (not against) the amendment.

- (26) a. Juan escribió un artículo, y María leyó un libro, que analizaban/*analizaba el CAMBIO CLIMÁTICO (no la crisis económica).

*John wrote(3sg) an article and Mary read(3sg) a book which analyzed(3pl)/*analyzed(3sg) the change climatic (not the crisis economic).*

‘John wrote an article and Mary read a book, which analyzed the climate change (not the economic crisis)’.

b. Juan se reunió con un diputado, y Pedro entrevistó a un senador que votarán/*votará A FAVOR de la reforma (no en contra).

*John CL_{re} met(3sg) with a congressman and Peter interviewed(3sg) to a senator who will vote(3pl)/*will vote(3sg) in favor of the reform (not against).*

‘John met a congressman and Peter interviewed a senator who will vote for the reform (not against it)’.

The presence of an adverbial between the head noun and the relative clause seems to force plural agreement, too. See (27).

(27) a. John met a congressman, and Bill interviewed a senator yesterday, that are willing to vote for the amendment.

b. Juan se reunió con un diputado, y Pedro entrevistó a un senador ayer que votarán/*votará A FAVOR de la reforma.

*John CL_{refl} met(3sg) with a congressman and Peter interviewed(3sg) to a senator yesterday who will vote(3pl)/*will vote(3sg) in favor of the reform.*

‘John met a congressman and Peter interviewed a senator yesterday who will vote for the reform’.

If plural agreement can be regarded as a side effect of the ATB-movement operation (Postal 1998), the derivation of the sentences above would be as represented schematically in (28).

(28) a. EX of the relative to adjoin to VP

$[_{\&P} [_{TP} \text{John} [_{VP} [_{VP} \text{wrote} [_{DP} \text{an article } t_i]] \text{that deals with } \dots_i]] [_{\&'} \text{and} [_{TP} \text{Mary} [_{VP} [_{VP} \text{read} [_{DP} \text{a book } t_i]] \text{that deals with } \dots_i]]]]]$

b. ATB-movement of the relative to SpecFocusP

$[_{\text{FocusP}} \text{that deals with } \dots_i [_{\text{Focus}'} \text{Focus} [_{\&P} [_{TP} \text{John wrote} [_{DP} \text{an article } t_i] t_i] [_{\&'} \text{and} [_{TP} \text{Mary read} [_{DP} \text{a book } t_i] t_i]]]]]]]$

c. Remnant movement of &P to SpecTopicP

$[_{\text{TopicP}} [_{\&P} [_{TP} \text{John wrote} [_{DP} \text{an article } t_i] t_i] [_{\&'} \text{and} [_{TP} \text{Mary read} [_{DP} \text{a book } t_i] t_i]]] [_{\text{Topic}'} \text{Topic} [_{\text{FocusP}} \text{that deals with } \dots_i [_{\text{Focus}'} \text{Focus } t_{\&P}]]]]]$

I have assumed that EX takes place before ATB-movement because ATB extraction of the relative clause from its base position inside DP would violate *Subjacency*, as two bounding nodes would be crossed: DP and TP (Chomsky 1986). The problem disappears if the clausal modifier is previously extraposed and adjoined to VP, as represented in (28a). Let me now briefly turn to sentences in which the pivot very clearly includes an extraposed constituent.

3.2. A complex pivot

In the sentences in (29), more has been extraposed than just a modifier. In this case, the discontinuous DP object and the adverbial that surface sentence-finally are shared by the two predicates. Interesting in this construction is the fact that EX has clearly operated before RNR.

- (29) a. John wrote and Mary edited three articles last year about global warming.
 b. Juan escribió y María editó tres artículos el año pasado sobre el calentamiento global.
John wrote(3sg) and Mary edited(3sg) three articles the year past about the warming global.

Depending on the context of utterance, the sentences above will be associated with the prosodic patterns illustrated in (30) and (31).

- (30) a. John wrote and Mary edited, THREE ARTICLES last year about global warming.
 b. Juan escribió y María editó, TRES ARTÍCULOS el año pasado sobre el calentamiento global.
 (31) a. John wrote and Mary EDITED three articles last year about global warming.
 b. Juan escribió y María EDITÓ tres artículos el año pasado sobre el calentamiento global.

In (30), the focus is on three articles, for example, to correct some previous information to the effect that they wrote/edited only one article. This construction instantiates FP-RNR and is derived by ATB movement of the pivot to SpecFocusP. If this interpretation of the construction is correct, the string *three articles last year about global warming* has to be a syntactic constituent. And it is, if EX applies inside VP. The simplified derivation is shown in (32).

- (32) a. PP EX

$$[_{\&P} [_{TP} \text{John} [_{VP} \text{wrote} [_{VP} [_{VP} t_V \text{three articles } t_i] \text{last year}] \text{about global warming}_i]]]$$

$$[_{\&} \text{and} [_{TP} \text{Mary} [_{VP} \text{edited} [_{VP} [_{VP} t_V \text{three articles } t_i] \text{last year}] \text{about global warming}_i]]]]]$$
 b. ATB-movement of VP to SpecFocusP

$$[_{\text{FocusP}} [_{VP} t_V \text{three articles } t_i \text{last year about global warming}_i] [_{\text{Focus}'} \text{Focus} [_{\&P} [_{TP} \text{John wrote } t_{VP}] [_{\&} \text{and} [_{TP} \text{Mary edited } t_{VP}]]]]]]]$$
 c. Remnant movement of &P to SpecTopicP

$$[_{\text{TopicP}} [_{\&P} [_{TP} \text{John wrote } t_{VP}] [_{\&} \text{and} [_{TP} \text{Mary edited } t_{VP}]]] [_{\text{Topic}'} \text{Topic} [_{\text{FocusP}} [_{VP} t_V \text{three articles } t_i \text{last year about global warming}_i] [_{\text{Focus}'} \text{Focus } t_{\&P}]]]]]$$

EX takes place creating a three-layer VP, as in (32a). The verb abandons this projection to raise to v. The whole VP moves ATB to SpecFocusP. Subsequent remnant movement of &P renders the final linear order.

Turning now to (31), these sentences –with focus on the predicate in the second conjunct– could be uttered in a context in which somebody has just claimed that Mary also wrote three articles. Since the focus is outside the pivot, the sentences have to be analyzed as case of NFP-RNR. In other words, they have to be derived via ellipsis of the pivot in the first conjunct. The (simplified) derivation is shown in (33). The VP in the first conjunct will undergo deletion under identity with the VP in the second conjunct.

- (33) [_{&P} [_{TP} John [_{VP} wrote [_{VP} [_{VP} [_{VP} ~~*t_i* three articles *t_i* last year~~] about global warming_{*i*}]]]]
 [_& and [_{TP} Mary [_{VP} edited [_{VP} [_{VP} [_{VP} *t_i* three articles *t_i* last year] about global warming_{*i*}]]]]]]

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper I have sketched a proposal to analyze sentences in which two rightward movement operations coexist: RNR and EX from DP. Two sets of examples have been inspected. In one of them a sentence-final modifier (PP or relative clause) appears to be modifying two DPs at the same time. In the other a discontinuous DP and the adverbial separating head noun and EC can be interpreted with the predicates in two conjuncts.

In sentences in which a relative clause appears to be modifying two head nouns, interesting agreement patterns emerge associated with different prosodic contours. These patterns are reminiscent of those discussed in Postal (1998) for I' pivots. The relative can be in the plural (even when each of the head nouns it modifies is in the singular) only if some constituent contained in it is focalized. When there is no focus inside the relative, on the other hand, plural agreement is impossible. Extending Valmala's (2012) proposal for I' pivots, I concluded that the former sentences are derived by moving the relative ATB to the specifier of a focus projection in the left periphery of the sentence, whereas the latter involve deletion of the relative in the first conjunct.

Based on the different prosodic contours that can be assigned to them, I conjectured that the same type of dual analysis extends to sentences with more complex pivots. This time the 'shared' constituent is a VP containing the trace of the verb, the DP source of the EC (which is the internal argument), a VP adverb and the constituent extraposed from the object. If either of these constituents is a focus, the derivation will proceed via ATB-movement of the VP. If the focus is outside this constituent, VP ellipsis will apply in the first conjunct.

Although certain aspects of the analysis outlined here are still in need of refinement, it is interesting to notice that, if it can be maintained, it provides a unified account to a set of rather complex data.

REFERENCES

- ABELS, K. (2004): "Right Node Raising: Ellipsis or ATB movement?", in K. Moulton & M. Wolf (eds.): *Proceedings of NELS 34*. Amherst, Mass.: GLSA, 45-60.
 BALTIN, M. (2005): "Extrapolation", in E. Martin, H. van Riemsdijk (eds.): *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 237-271.

- BOŠKOVIĆ, Ž. (2004): “Two notes on Right Node Raising”, in M. Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, M.E. Ticio (eds.): *University of Connecticut Working Papers in Linguistics 12*. Storrs: University of Connecticut, 13-24.
- BRESNAN, J. (1974): “The position of certain clause-particles in phrase structure”, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 5, 614-619.
- CHOMSKY, N. (1986): *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- CLAPP, J.M. (2008): “Right Node Raising: Evidence from ‘Rule Interaction’”, in C.B. Chang, H.J. Haynie (eds.): *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 129-137.
- CULICOVER, P.W., ROCHEMONT, M. (1990): *English Focus Constructions and the Theory of Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GUÉRON, J., MAY, R. (1984): “Extraposition and Logical Form”, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 15, 1-31.
- HARTMANN, K. (2000): *Right Node Raising and gapping: interface conditions on prosodic deletion*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- HUDSON, R. (1976): “Conjunction reduction, gapping and right node raising”, *Language*, 52/3, 535-562.
- KAYNE, R. (1994): *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- KLUCK, M. (2007): “The Perspective of External Reemerge on Right Node Raising”, in N. Hilton et al. (eds.): *Proceedings of the Fifth University of Cambridge Postgraduate Conference in Language Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge Institute of Language Research, 130-137.
- LEVINE, R. (1985): “Right-node (non-)raising”, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 16, 492-497.
- (2001): “The extraction riddle: Just what are we missing?”, *Journal of Linguistics*, 37, 145-174.
- MALING, J. (1972): “On gapping and the order of constituents”, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 3, 101-108.
- POSTAL, P.M. (1974): *On Raising*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- (1998): *Three Investigations of Extraction*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- ROSS, J.R. (1967 [1986]): *Infinite Syntax*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing.
- SABBAGH, J. (2007): “Ordering and linearizing rightward movement”, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 25, 349-401.
- VALMALA, V. (2012): “Two types of right node raising”. Ms. at the University of the Basque Country, Spain.
- WEXLER, K., CULICOVER, P. (1980): *Formal Principles of Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- WILDER, C. (1997): “Some properties of ellipsis in coordination”, in A. Alexiadou, T.A. Hall (eds.): *Studies on Universal Grammar and Typological Variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 59-107.