

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

## Two notes on right node raising <sup>♦</sup>

Željko Bošković  
University of Connecticut

### 0. Introduction

Right node raising constructions (RNR), illustrated by (1), have received both movement and non-movement analyses in the literature.<sup>1</sup>

(1) John likes, and Peter hates, your best friend

Under the movement analysis (Ross 1967, Maling 1972, Bresnan 1974, Postal 1974, 1993, Hudson 1976, among others), the ‘shared’ constituent in (1) undergoes across the board (ATB) rightward extraction, adjoining to the coordinated phrase.

(2) [<sub>IP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> John likes *t<sub>i</sub>*] and [<sub>IP</sub> Peter hates *t<sub>i</sub>*]] your best friend<sub>*i*</sub>]

Non-movement analyses (Ertshik-Shir 1987, McCawley 1982, 1987, 1988, Moltmann 1992, Muadz 1991, Phillips 1996, Wexler and Culicover 1980, among others) leave the shared constituent in situ and associate it with both conjuncts without movement. As a representative of this approach, I will take here Wexler and Culicover’s (WC) PF deletion analysis, revived in Kayne (1994), since this analysis fits into the Principles and Parameters framework, adopted here, without any additional assumptions.<sup>2</sup> Under WC’s analysis of (1), your best friend in the complement of the first conjunct verb

---

<sup>♦</sup> This paper is somewhat old; it was written in 1996. I have changed nothing from the original version. The paper is a shortened version of my paper ‘On right node base-generation’, written in February 1996. For helpful comments and suggestions, I thank Howard Lasnik, Colin Phillips, and the participants of my fall 1995 syntax seminar at the University of Connecticut.

<sup>1</sup> I am using the term RNR in a neutral fashion without committing myself to a particular analysis of this phenomenon.

<sup>2</sup> Note that the purpose of this paper is to compare the movement and the non-movement approach to RNR, and not different non-movement approaches.

37 is deleted at PF under identity with your best friend in the second conjunct, which is  
38 located in the complement position of the second conjunct verb, the same position as in  
39 Peter hates your best friend.<sup>3</sup>

40

41 (3) [John likes [your best friend]] and [Peter hates your best friend] PF deletion

42

43 In this paper I present new data pertaining to RNR and examine how the  
44 movement and the base-generation approach fare with respect to these data.<sup>4</sup>

45

## 46 1. Right node raising and VP ellipsis

47

48 In this section I will show that there are a number of similarities between RNR and VP  
49 ellipsis that can be more naturally accounted for under the PF deletion analysis of RNR  
50 than under the movement analysis.<sup>5</sup>

51 It is well-known that VP ellipsis can take place under strict identity of the VPs  
52 involved in the process, as illustrated in (4):

53

54 (4) a. John can win, and Peter can (win) too

55 b. John is entering the championship, and Bill is (entering the championship) too

56

57 In addition, VP ellipsis can ‘ignore’ certain inflectional differences between the  
58 antecedent and the elided verb (see Quirk et al 1972, Sag 1976, Williams 1977, Fiengo  
59 and May 1994, Lasnik 1995a, among others). This is illustrated in (5), which shows that

---

<sup>3</sup> If, as argued by Koizumi (1993, 1995) and Lasnik (1995b,c), among others, direct object NPs in simple transitive constructions in English are located in SpecAgroP at SS, your best friend in (1) would be located in the second conjunct SpecAgroP.

<sup>4</sup> Note that the goal of this paper is not to provide a comprehensive account of the RNR construction, but simply to compare how the two existing approaches fare with respect to the data discussed in this paper. The strongest argument previously offered either for or against one of the two approaches to RNR seems to me to be WC’s observation that the shared constituent in RNR can be buried within an island, as illustrated by Mary knows a man who buys, and Bill knows a man who sells, pictures of Fred, which is unexpected under the movement, but not under the base-generation analyses of RNR. One of the arguments against the movement analysis of RNR given in Bošković (1996) concerns the fact that otherwise completely immobile elements can undergo RNR, as illustrated by John asked when, but he didn’t ask why, Mary left and I like expensive, and you like cheap, dresses, whose RNRred elements cannot undergo other movement operations. I will not repeat here other arguments given in the literature for or against one of the two approaches to RNR, or discuss the technicalities of these approaches in any detail. The reader is referred to the references given above. For additional arguments against the movement analysis, see also Levine (1985) and McCloskey (1986).

<sup>5</sup> I will confine myself here to discussing morphological properties of RNR and VP ellipsis and ignore their interpretational properties such as those pertaining to binding and scope, since it is not clear what predictions different theories of RNR would make with respect to these, given the peculiar interpretational properties of RNR constructions. (Note that the shared constituent in RNR receives a strong non-contrastive focus, and the coordinated phrases receive contrastive focus. Precedence may also be relevant here.)

## Two notes on right node raising

60 an infinitive can be deleted under identity with a progressive and a participle, and that a  
61 participle can be deleted under identity with a progressive and an infinitive.

62

- 63 (5) a. ?John was sleeping in her office, and Peter will (sleep in her office) too  
64 b. John has slept in her house, and now Peter will (sleep in her house)  
65 c. John may be questioning our motives, but Bill hasn't (questioned our motives)  
66 d. John will sleep in her house, and Peter already has (slept in her house)

67

68 A sort of sloppy identity is at work in (5a-d). 'Sloppy identity' VP ellipsis is,  
69 however, not always allowed, i.e., not all inflectional differences between verbs involved  
70 in VP ellipsis can be ignored. Thus, according to Lasnik (1995a), a progressive cannot be  
71 anteceded by an infinitive, and be cannot be anteceded by a different form of be.<sup>6</sup>

72

- 73 (6) a. \*John won't enter the championship, but Jane is (entering the championship)  
74 b. \*John was being obnoxious, and Jane will (be obnoxious) too

75

76 Turning to RNR, as shown in (7), RNR can affect VPs under strict identity of the  
77 verbs involved in the process.

78

- 79 (7) a. John can (win), and Peter must, win  
80 b. John is (entering the championship), and Bill isn't, entering the championship

81

82 In addition, VP RNR can also take place under sloppy identity. In fact, sloppy  
83 identity RNR is allowed exactly in those cases in which sloppy identity VP ellipsis is  
84 allowed. Where sloppy identity VP ellipsis is not allowed, sloppy identity RNR isn't  
85 either. In other words, VP RNR can ignore only the inflectional features that can be  
86 ignored by VP ellipsis. (An adverb is added to some examples to make them more  
87 natural.)

88

- 89 (8) a. ?John will (sleep in her office), and Peter definitely was, sleeping in her office  
90 b. John will (sleep in her house), and Peter already has, slept in her house  
91 c. John hasn't (questioned our motives), but Bill may be, questioning our motives  
92 d. John has (slept in her house), and Peter definitely will, sleep in her house  
93 e. \*John is (entering the championship), but Jane won't, enter the championship  
94 f. \*John will (be obnoxious), and Jane actually was, being obnoxious

95

96 The parallelism between VP RNR and VP ellipsis strongly suggests that a similar  
97 process is at work in both operations. If VP ellipsis involves PF deletion (Chomsky 1955,  
98 Harris 1957, Ross 1969, Grinder and Postal 1971, Postal 1972, Sag 1976, Hankamer and  
99 Sag 1976, Chomsky and Lasnik 1993, Lasnik 1995c, among others), RNR should then

---

<sup>6</sup> Lasnik (1995a) provides a principled account of the data in (5-6) that readily extends to the RNR data discussed below.

100 also be taken to involve PF deletion, as in WC's analysis.<sup>7</sup> Note also that there is some  
 101 variability in judgments for the relevant examples, particularly the RNR constructions.  
 102 (Certain amount of variability in judgments is often found with RNR constructions, see,  
 103 for example, Abbott 1976.) For example, some speakers find some of the good examples  
 104 in (8) somewhat marginal. Note, however, that absolute judgments are not important  
 105 here. What is important is that (8a-d) are better than (8e-f) ((8a) actually has an  
 106 intermediate status for most speakers) and that the same pattern is found with VP ellipsis.  
 107 ((5a-d) are better than (6a-b) with (5a) having an intermediate status for most speakers.)  
 108 This pattern is not found with VP fronting, as discussed below. On the other hand, it is  
 109 difficult to see how the parallelism between VP ellipsis and RNR can be captured under  
 110 the movement analysis of RNR. The problem that the parallelism raises for this analysis  
 111 becomes even more serious when we take into consideration the fact that VP preposing, a  
 112 movement process, differs from VP ellipsis and RNR with respect to the possibility of  
 113 sloppy identity of relevant elements. Thus, (9a-c), which indicate that the relevant  
 114 inflectional differences cannot be ignored under (ATB) movement, clearly contrast with  
 115 (8a-c), which in turn indicates that RNR does not involve ATB movement.<sup>8</sup>

- 116  
 117 (9) a. \*[Sleeping in her office], (Peter was  $t_i$  and) John will  $t_i$   
 118 b. \*[Slept in her house]<sub>i</sub>, (John has  $t_i$  and) Peter will  $t_i$   
 119 c. \*[Questioning our motives]<sub>i</sub>, (John may be  $t_i$  and) Peter hasn't  $t_i$

120  
 121 RNR constructions with complex verbal forms confirm this conclusion. Consider

122 (10):

- 123  
 124 (10) John must have been hassled by the police, and Peter must have been hassled by  
 125 the police too

126  
 127 (11) shows the possibilities for RNR in the construction in question:

- 128  
 129 (11) a. ?\*John must, and Peter could, have been hassled by the police  
 130 b. John must have, and Peter could have, been hassled by the police  
 131 c. John must have been, and Peter could have been, hassled by the police

132  
 133  
 134

---

<sup>7</sup> Note that in an RNR counterpart of a VP ellipsis construction the missing material in the first conjunct (given in parenthesis) corresponds to the missing material in the second conjunct of the VP ellipsis construction. Thus, (8a) but not \*John was, and Peter definitely will, sleep in her house is a RNR counterpart of (5a), the latter being the RNR counterpart of \*Peter will sleep in her house, and John was.

<sup>8</sup> Changing the order of the conjuncts in (9) does not improve the constructions. Interestingly, as noted in Oku (1996), most speakers allow either a participle or an infinitive to appear in the complement of *have* under VP preposing (cf. Win/won the race John has), though only the participle is allowed without VP preposing (cf. John has won/\*win the race). Given Oku's observation, the grammaticality of Sleep in her house, John has and Peter will is not surprising.

## Two notes on right node raising

135           Significantly, VP ellipsis has the same possibilities as RNR:

136

- 137 (12) a. ?\*John must have been hassled by the police, and Peter must too  
138           b. John must have been hassled by the police, and Peter must have too  
139           c. John must have been hassled by the police, and Peter must have been too

140

141           VP preposing again differs from RNR and VP ellipsis:

142

- 143 (13) a. \*Have been hassled by the police, John must  
144           b. \*Been hassled by the police, John must have  
145           c. Hassled by the police, John must have been

146

147           That RNR patterns with VP ellipsis rather than VP preposing is even clearer in  
148 more complex constructions. Consider, for example, the following construction:

149

- 150 (14) Mary must have been being hassled by the police, and Bill must have been being  
151           hassled by the police too

152

153           Sag (1976) notes the possibilities for VP ellipsis in (14) shown in (15). Again,  
154 RNR turns out to pattern with VP ellipsis (16), rather than with the movement operation  
155 of VP preposing, which is not fully acceptable in the construction under consideration  
156 (17).

157

- 158 (15) a. \*Mary must have been being hassled by the police, and Bill must too  
159           b. Mary must have been being hassled by the police, and Bill must have too  
160           c. Mary must have been being hassled by the police, and Bill must have been too  
161           d. \*Mary must have been being hassled by the police, and Bill must have been being  
162           too

163

- 164 (16) a. \*Mary must, and Bill could, have been being hassled by the police  
165           b. Mary must have, and Bill could have, been being hassled by the police  
166           c. Mary must have been, and Bill could have been, being hassled by the police  
167           d. \*Mary must have been being, and Bill could have been being, hassled by the  
168           police

169

- 170 (17) a. \*Have been being hassled by the police, Bill must  
171           b. \*Been being hassled by the police, Bill must have  
172           c. \*Being hassled by the police, Bill must have been  
173           d. \*Hassled by the police, Bill must have been being

174

175           To summarize, I have shown that RNR of VPs patterns with VP ellipsis in a  
176 number of respects. VP preposing, on the other hand, differs from RNR and VP ellipsis in  
177 the relevant respects. The parallelism between RNR and VP ellipsis, as well as the

178 differences between these operations and VP preposing, raise serious problems for the  
 179 movement analysis of RNR, but can be accounted for under the PF deletion analysis.<sup>9</sup>  
 180 Howard Lasnik (p.c.) notes that certain facts concerning adverbs that can be  
 181 base-generated in right-adjoined but not in left-adjoined positions, such as this week,  
 182 provide evidence that heavy NP shift, a rightward movement operation (see n. 15), cannot  
 183 affect VPs, which can be interpreted as providing additional evidence against the  
 184 movement analysis of RNR. Note, e.g., that heavy NP shift, which despite its name is not  
 185 restricted to NPs, cannot affect the VP in John has bought a house this week, as indicated  
 186 by the impossibility of the VP occurring following the adverb (cf. \*John has t<sub>i</sub> this week  
 187 [bought a house]<sub>i</sub>). The impossibility of other rightward movement operations affecting  
 188 VPs casts a doubt on the rightward movement analysis of RNR.  
 189

## 190 2. Right node raising and heavy NP shift

191  
 192 The most important difference between the movement and the base-generation analyses  
 193 of RNR is that under the latter analysis the shared constituent cannot be dislocated from  
 194 its base-generated position by RNR. If the shared constituent is not located in its  
 195 base-generated position, under the base-generation analysis it must have been removed  
 196 from there by an operation distinct from RNR, which is not the case under the movement  
 197 analysis. To illustrate this with an example, consider (18):  
 198

199 (18) Mary kissed (yesterday), and John hit last week, the man you met in Paris  
 200

201 Given that direct objects are generated adjacent to verbs, the shared constituent in  
 202 (18) cannot be located in its base-generated position. Under the movement analysis, the  
 203 constituent could have still been dislocated from its original position by RNR. This is not  
 204 the case under the base-generation analysis, on which the man you met in Paris must have  
 205 been removed from its original position by an operation distinct from RNR. The only  
 206 candidate seems to be heavy NP shift (HNPS), which under standard assumptions (but  
 207 see Kayne 1994 and Larson 1988) moves heavy constituents to the right (see n. 15).  
 208 There are two ways of analyzing (18) under WC's analysis: (i) the man you met in Paris  
 209 undergoes HNPS within the second conjunct, after which the man you met in Paris in the  
 210 first conjunct, which can be either located in situ or itself undergo HNPS within the first  
 211 conjunct, is deleted under identity with the corresponding phrase in the second conjunct.  
 212 (ii) the man you met in Paris undergoes ATB HNPS. Under the base-generation analysis,  
 213 the shared constituent in (18) thus must undergo HNPS at least within the second  
 214 conjunct, which is not the case under the movement analysis. Since HNPS is subject to  
 215 several constraints that do not affect other movement operations, this provides us with  
 216 another way of teasing apart the movement and the base-generation analysis of RNR.  
 217

---

<sup>9</sup> As Colin Phillips (p.c.) observes, the same actually holds for other base-generation approaches to RNR cited above.

## Two notes on right node raising

218 It is well-known that, as shown in (19), RNR is compatible with preposition  
219 stranding, whereas HNPS is not (see Ross 1967).<sup>10</sup>

220

- 221 (19) a. John talked about, and Mary ignored, the man you met in Paris  
222 b. Mary ignored, and John talked about, the man you met in Paris  
223 c. \*John talked about yesterday the man you met in Paris

224

225 If rightward dislocated shared constituents must have undergone HNPS within the  
226 second conjunct, we would expect that the dislocation will not be able to strand a  
227 preposition. As shown in (20), the expectation is borne out.

228

- 229 (20) \*Mary ignored and John talked about yesterday the man you met in Paris

230

231 Since, in contrast to RNR, HNPS cannot strand a preposition, the  
232 ungrammaticality of (20) indicates that the shared constituent is ‘removed’ from its  
233 base-generated position by HNPS, and not some kind of a movement operation particular  
234 to RNR. If RNR were to involve rightward movement, it would be difficult to account for  
235 the contrast between (19b) and (20). Under the base-generation analysis, on which RNR  
236 does not involve a distinct movement operation and elements that appear to the right of  
237 their base-generated position must have been heavy NP shifted, the contrast in question is  
238 readily accounted for.<sup>11</sup>Note that Wilder (1995) independently reaches the conclusion  
239 that constructions with rightward dislocated shared phrases involve HNPS.

240

241 Certain facts concerning extraction out of the shared constituent provide more  
242 evidence for this conclusion. The relevant contrasts are, however, more subtle here. WC  
243 observe that, as (21a-b) illustrate, extraction from heavy NP shifted phrases is degraded,  
244 whereas extraction from RNR complements is fine.

244

- 245 (21) a. Who<sub>i</sub> did Mary buy, and Bill sell, pictures of t<sub>i</sub>  
246 b. ?\*Who<sub>j</sub> did Mary sell t<sub>i</sub> to Peter [a picture of t<sub>j</sub>]<sub>i</sub>

247

248 Bearing in mind that extraction is allowed out of RNRed but not heavy NP shifted  
249 constituents, let us return to constructions in which a shared constituent direct object NP  
250 in what could be RNR is not adjacent to the verb. As (22), which contrasts with (21a),  
251 illustrates, extraction out of such constituents is degraded. This indicates that the

---

<sup>10</sup> Rochemont and Culicover (1992:191, n. 34) claim that prepositions that permit pseudopassivization can be stranded under HNPS. However, Baltin and Postal (1996) dispute this claim, and my informants agree with them.

<sup>11</sup> The same point can be made with respect to (ii), if (ia-b) are taken to indicate that RNR differs from HNPS in that the affected constituent does not have to be heavy. One could, however, relativize the notion of heaviness to the amount of intervening material, in which case (ia), where the direct object is PF adjacent to the verb, would not necessarily indicate that RNRed constituents do not have to be heavy.

- (i) a. Mary kissed, and Peter hit, Bill  
b. \*Mary kissed yesterday Bill  
(ii) \*Mary kissed (yesterday) and John hit last week Bill

252 construction must involve ATB HNPS, as expected under the base-generation analysis,  
 253 but not under the movement analysis of RNR.

254

255 (22) ?\*Who<sub>i</sub> did Mary buy (yesterday) and Bill sell last week pictures of t<sub>i</sub>

256

257 Recall now that constructions with rightward dislocated shared constituents can  
 258 be analyzed in two ways under the base-generation analysis: they can either involve  
 259 HNPS within the second conjunct, followed by RNR, i.e., PF deletion of the relevant  
 260 material in the first conjunct, or they can simply involve ATB HNPS. Given that both  
 261 options are available, we can conclude that under the base-generation analysis of RNR,  
 262 HNPS must take place within the second conjunct in the relevant constructions, but not  
 263 necessarily within the first conjunct. That this is indeed the case is confirmed by the  
 264 grammaticality of (23), with P-stranding within the first conjunct.<sup>12</sup>

265

266 (23) ?Mary talked about, and John ignored yesterday, the man you met in Paris

267

268 (23) contrasts with (20) and (19c), which provides evidence that HNPS does not  
 269 have to take place within the first conjunct of the relevant constructions, i.e., they can be  
 270 derived through the interaction of HNPS and RNR.<sup>13</sup> Whereas the contrast between (23)  
 271 and (20) is readily accounted for under the base-generation+PF deletion analysis of RNR,  
 272 it is difficult to see how it can be accounted for under the movement analysis.

273

274 Interestingly, as noted in Oehrle (1991), if the gap in the first conjunct of  
 275 constructions such as (23) is followed by an adverb, we get a degraded sentence.

275

276 (24) ?\*Mary talked about yesterday, and John ignored, the man you met in Paris

277

278 The ATB HNPS derivation for (24) is ruled out because HNPS cannot strand a  
 279 preposition. The RNR derivation is apparently also illegitimate. This is not surprising,  
 280 given WC's claim (p. 298, 303) that only conjunct final elements can be deleted by  
 281 RNR.<sup>14</sup> To be elided by RNR, the man you met in Paris then must undergo HNPS within

---

<sup>12</sup> The lack of parallelism between the two conjuncts, a result of the adverb being present only in one conjunct, which was necessary to complete the paradigm (see below), is probably responsible for the slight marginality of (23). To control for the interfering factor, the adverb is also present only in one conjunct in (20) and (24), which are to be compared with (23).

<sup>13</sup> Note that moved phrases can license deletion of phrases in situ, as shown by Buy that house I never will, although you claim that I should (buy that house).

<sup>14</sup> See also Wilder (1995), who argues that quite generally, an ellipsis site must be right-peripheral in its domain (conjunct in the relevant cases). Assuming some kind of a parallelism requirement on deletion, WC's requirement follows from the fact that the antecedent in RNR constructions must be conjunct final (cf. \*John likes e<sub>i</sub>, but he couldn't give your neighbor<sub>i</sub> a good grade), which in turn is most likely a result of the requirement that the antecedent bear non-contrastive focus. (Note that in the good examples discussed above the antecedent is located in the right-edge of VP, which is a typical focus position in English.) One might try to impose a conjunct-final requirement on the movement analysis by stipulating that only conjunct-final elements can be moved by RNR. Recall, however, that the corresponding assumption with the deletion analysis follows from the focus requirement on the RNR antecedent. A similar requirement



## Two notes on right node raising

282 the first conjunct stranding the preposition, which is not allowed. The contrast between  
283 (23) and (24) is thus accounted for. On the other hand, it is difficult to see how the  
284 contrast can be accounted for under the movement analysis of RNR.

285 Turning now to ECM constructions, notice that under the base-generation  
286 analysis, (25) should be analyzed as involving HNPS, given that the shared constituent  
287 cannot be located within its base-generated position within the second conjunct.

288

289 (25) John believed to be innocent, and Peter proved to be guilty, the man you met in  
290 Paris

291

292 As with (18), we would expect HNPS to be forced to take place only within the  
293 second conjunct. This is confirmed by (26a), which, like (23), can be derived by applying  
294 HNPS within the second conjunct and RNR (PF deletion) within the first conjunct.<sup>15</sup> The  
295 construction degrades if the element affected by RNR is forced to undergo HNPS within  
296 the first conjunct (26b). This can be accounted for in the same way as (24).

297

298 (26) a. John talked about, and Peter proved to be guilty, the man you met in Paris

299 b. ?\*John talked about yesterday, and Peter proved to be guilty last week, the man  
300 you met in Paris

301

302 To summarize, we have seen in section 2 that RNR cannot dislocate elements to  
303 the right of their base-generated position, as expected under the base-generation, but not  
304 under the movement analysis of RNR.

---

with the movement analysis would not follow from anything. In fact, it would not resemble any other constraint on movement. Furthermore, the stipulation would be falsified by (23), which under the movement analysis must be analyzed as involving RNR.

<sup>15</sup> There are contexts in which ECM constructions must involve HNPS within both conjuncts. Postal (1974) notes that there is a class of verbs that cannot ECM the subject of their infinitival complement unless it undergoes A'-movement from the infinitival SpecIP. This is illustrated in (i) with respect to allege and wager. (For an account of the peculiar behavior of this class of verbs with respect to ECM, see Bošković (1997). Note incidentally that the fact that (id) patterns with (ib-c) rather than (ia) favors the standard rightward movement analysis of HNPS over Larson's (1988) and Kayne's (1994) analyses, which leave the heavy NP in situ.)

- (i) a. \*Jim alleged/wagered that man to have stolen the money
- b. That man<sub>i</sub>, Jim alleged/wagered t<sub>i</sub> to have stolen the money
- c. Who<sub>i</sub> did Jim allege/wager t<sub>i</sub> to have stolen the money
- d. John alleged/wagered t<sub>i</sub> to have stolen the money the man she fell in love with,

Postal (1993) claims that RNR also improves (ia) on the basis of (ii).

- (ii) John alleged to have stolen the money, and Peter wagered to have won a lottery, the man she fell in love with

The grammaticality of (ii) provides evidence that the infinitival subject moves from the infinitival SpecIP. Given this and the above discussion, there are two ways of deriving (ii). One way is by ATB HNPS. Alternatively, the infinitival subject could move from the infinitival SpecIP separately within each conjunct via HNPS, with RNR deleting the element undergoing HNPS within the first conjunct under identity with the heavy shifted NP in the second conjunct.

References

- 305  
306  
307 Abbott, Barbara. (1976). Right node raising as a test for constituenthood. *Linguistic*  
308 *Inquiry* 7, 639-642.
- 309 Baltin, Mark, and Paul Postal. (1996). More on reanalysis hypotheses. *Linguistic Inquiry*  
310 27, 127-145.
- 311 Bošković, Željko. 1996. On right node base-generation. Ms., University of Connecticut,  
312 Storrs.
- 313 Bošković, Željko. (1997). *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: An economy account*.  
314 Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- 315 Bresnan, Joan. (1974). The position of certain clause-particles in phrase structure.  
316 *Linguistic Inquiry* 5, 614-619.
- 317 Chomsky, Noam. (1955/1975). *The Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory*. New York:  
318 Plenum.
- 319 Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. (1993). The Theory of Principles and Parameters.  
320 In *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, Joachim  
321 Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld and Theo Vennemann (eds.),  
322 506-569. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- 323 Erteshik-Shir, Nomi. (1987). Right node raising. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 9,  
324 105-127.
- 325 Fiengo, Robert, and Robert May. (1994). *Indices and identity*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT  
326 Press.
- 327 Grinder, John, and Paul Postal. (1971). Missing antecedents. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2,  
328 269-312.
- 329 Hankamer, Jorge, and Ivan Sag (1976). Deep and surface anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7,  
330 391-428.
- 331 Harris, Zellig S. (1957). Co-occurrence and transformation in linguistic structure.  
332 *Language* 33, 283-340.
- 333 Hudson, Richard. (1976). Conjunction reduction, gapping, and right node raising.  
334 *Language* 52, 535-562.
- 335 Kayne, Richard. (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- 336 Koizumi, Masatoshi. (1993). Object Agreement Phrases and the Split VP Hypothesis.  
337 *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 18, 99-148.
- 338 Koizumi, Masatoshi. (1994). Layered Specifiers. *Proceedings of NELS* 24, 255-269.
- 339 Koizumi, Masatoshi. (1995). Phrase Structure in Minimalist Syntax. Doctoral  
340 dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- 341 Lasnik, Howard. (1995a). Verbal Morphology: Syntactic Structures Meets the Minimalist  
342 Program. In *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of*  
343 *Carlos Otero*, Paula Kempchinsky and Héctor Campos (eds.), 151-175.  
344 Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- 345 Lasnik, Howard. (1995b). Last Resort. In *Minimalism and linguistic theory*, Shosuke  
346 Haraguchi and Michio Funaki (eds.), 1-32. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
- 347

## Two notes on right node raising

- 348 Lasnik, Howard. (1995c). A note on pseudogapping. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*  
349 27, 143-163.
- 350 Larson, Richard. (1988). On the Double Object Construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19,  
351 335-391.
- 352 Levine, Robert D. (1985). Right node (non-)raising. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 492-497.
- 353 Maling, Joan. (1972). On gapping and the order of constituents. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3,  
354 101-108.
- 355 McCawley, James D. (1982). Parentheticals and discontinuous constituent structure.  
356 *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 91-106.
- 357 McCawley, James D. (1987). Some additional evidence for discontinuity. In *Syntax and*  
358 *Semantics Vol. 20: Discontinuous Constituency*, Geoffrey Huck and Almerindo E.  
359 Ojeda (eds.), 185-200. New York: Academic Press.
- 360 McCawley, James D. (1988). *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. Chicago: University  
361 of Chicago Press.
- 362 McCloskey, James. (1986). Right node raising and preposition stranding. *Linguistic*  
363 *Inquiry* 17, 183-186.
- 364 Moltmann, Friederike. (1992). Coordination and comparatives. Doctoral dissertation,  
365 MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- 366 Muadz, Husni. (1991). Coordinate structures: A planar representation. Doctoral  
367 dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- 368 Oehrle, Richard. (1991). Categorical frameworks, coordination, and extraction.  
369 *Proceedings of WCCFL* 9, 411-425.
- 370 Oku, Satoshi. (1996). Perfective participle paradox in English VP-fronting. *Proceedings*  
371 *of ESCOL* 14.
- 372 Phillips, Colin. (1996). Order and structure. Doctoral dissertation. MIT, Cambridge,  
373 Mass.
- 374 Postal, Paul. (1972). Some further limitations of interpretive theories of anaphora.  
375 *Linguistic Inquiry* 5, 367-424.
- 376 Postal, Paul. (1974). *On Raising*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- 377 Postal, Paul. (1993). Some Defective Paradigms. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 357-364.
- 378 Quirk, Randolph, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. (1972). *A Grammar of*  
379 *Contemporary English*. London: Longmans.
- 380 Rochemont, Michael, and Peter Culicover. (1992). *English focus constructions and the*  
381 *theory of grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 382 Ross, John Robert. (1967/1986). *Infinite Syntax*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing.
- 383 Ross, John Robert. (1969). Guess who. *Proceedings of CLS* 5, 252-286.
- 384 Sag, Ivan A. (1976). *Deletion and Logical Form*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge,  
385 Mass.
- 386 Wexler, Kenneth and Peter W. Culicover. (1980). *Formal Principles of Language*  
387 *Acquisition*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- 388 Wilder, Chris. (1995). Some properties of ellipsis in coordination. Ms. Max-Planck-  
389 Gesellschaft, Berlin.
- 390 Williams, Edwin. (1977). Discourse and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 101-139.

Željko Bošković

391  
392 Željko Bošković  
393 University of Connecticut  
394 Department of Linguistics  
395 341 Mansfield Road Unit 1145  
396 zeljko.boskovic@uconn.edu