1. Introduction

<Observation> String vacuous movement (SVM) shows insensitivity to locality conditions in English Right Node Raising (RNR) and Japanese RNR.

<Aims> (i) To present a mechanism that captures this fact. (Sections 2&3)

(ii) To consider how to capture apparent exceptions to the generalization that SVM is locality-insensitive. (Sections 4&5)


- A chain is produced by Copy, Merge, and Delete.

- Single cycle hypothesis:

  ➔ The overt vs. covert distinction is made by which copy of a chain is pronounced.

  (1) a. XP […] <XP>…] overt movement: the top copy is pronounced

    b. <XP> [ … XP …] covert movement: the bottom copy is pronounced

- SVM is prohibited:

  (2) The head of a chain created by Move cannot be pronounced unless it has an effect on PF output. (cf. Chomsky 1995)

  (3) John likes _ and Bill hates _, the linguistic professor teaching Ling 101.

  ➔ According to Sabbagh (2007), English RNR involves Across-the-Board (ATB) rightward movement.
(4) a. [ … DP₁] and [ … DP₂] <DP₃> (SVM: “covert” movement)  
b. [ … DP₁] and [ … <DP₂> …] DP₃ (other movement: “overt” movement)

(5) Locality conditions such as Right Roof Constraint (RRC) and island conditions apply only to “overt” movement for arguments.  
(i.e. only when the movement is not string-vacuous)

- RRC:
(6) *Max said [that he was going to return __ to the library] yesterday each of the books that he checked out last week. (Sabbagh 2007, p. 350)

(7) Josh said that he thought that I should sell __, and Jamie said that she thought that she might want to buy __, each of the Rambaldi artifacts that I have in my attic. (ibid., p. 358)

(8) *Joss said [that he was going to donate __ to the library] yesterday, and Jamie claimed [that she would donate __ to the museum] last week, a large collection of ancient texts. (ibid., p. 355)

- Island Conditions:
(9) I know someone who wants to buy __, and you know someone who wants to sell __, a copy of this manuscript. (ibid., p. 352)

(10) Josh wonders who bought __, and Bill will find out who sold __, pictures of Fred. (ibid., p. 382)

(11) Politicians win when they defend __, and lose when they attack __, the right of a woman to an abortion. (ibid., p. 382)

- P-stranding:
(12) *Jamie walked into __ suddenly, the dean’s office. (ibid., p. 350)

(13) Joss walked suddenly into __, and Maria is stormed quickly out of __, the dean’s office. (ibid., p. 351)

(14) *I sent one of the books to __ in perfect condition, and sent the other ones to __ in poor condition, the Somerville public library. (ibid., p. 355)
- Adjunct remnants:

(15) a. John got fired __ and Bill had his salary reduced __, because he talked back/because of office politics.

b. *Mary helped the person who got fired __ and comforted the person who had his salary reduced __, because he talked back/because of office politics.

⇒ Adjunct movement shows island-sensitivity even with covert movement (Huang 1982, so-called ECP effects).


(16) John-ga ringo-o, sosite Mary-ga mikan-o tabeta.

John-Nom apple-Acc and Mary-Nom orange-Acc ate
‘John _ an apple, and Mary ate an orange.’

- Abe and Hoshi (1997): the RNR remnant undergoes focus movement

(17) John-ga [T' ringo1-o [T t1 tabeta]], sosite Mary-ga [[T mikan2-o [T t2 tabeta]]

John-Nom apple-Acc ate and Mary-Nom orange-Acc ate
[Focus] [Focus]


(18) John-wa kuma-ni, sosite Mary-wa [raion-ni osowareta hito]-o tasuketa.

John-Top bear -by and Mary-Top lion -by attacked person-Acc saved
‘John _ by a bear, and Mary saved a person who was attacked by a lion.’

(19) John-wa [T' kuma1-ni [T1 osowareta hito]-o tasuketa],

John-Top bear -by attacked person-Acc saved

⇒ BUT, RNR is island-sensitive when the RNR remnant is not on the left-edge of the island.

(20) *John-wa kuma-ni, sosite Mary-wa raion-ni Bill-ga osowareta koto-o

John -Top bear -by and Mary-Top lion -by Bill-Nom attacked fact -Acc
minna-ni itta.
everyone-Dat told
‘John _ by a bear, and Mary told everyone that Bill was attacked by a lion.’
(21) *John-wa [T kuma-ni \[T Bill-ga t\-osowareta koto\-o \-minna-\-ni \-itta].

John -Top bear -by Bill-Nom attacked fact -Acc everyone-Dat told

⇒ Even if the remnant is on the left edge, RNR is island-sensitive if the remnant is an adjunct.

(22) *John-wa munoosa-no tameni, sosite Mary-wa

John-Top incompetence-Gen because and Mary-Top

mudan kekkin-no tameni kubi-ni natta hito-o nagusameta.
availability-without-notice-Gen because be-fired person-Acc comforted

‘John _ because of his incompetence, and Mary comforted a person who was fired because of his absence without notice.’

3.1. Proposal

\[\text{John-ga \[T <\text{ringo}_1-o> \[T \text{ringo}_o-\text{tabeta}], sosite …} \]

John-Nom <apple-Acc> apple-Acc ate and

[Focus] [Focus]

(23) John-ga \[T <\text{ringo}_1-o> \[T \text{ringo}_o-\text{tabeta}], sosite …

John-Nom <apple-Acc> apple-Acc ate and

[Focus] [Focus]

(24) The RNR remnant undergoes focus movement (a la Abe and Hoshi 1997).
The RNR remnant has a [Focus] feature, and deletion applies to T’ except the element with [Focus].

⇒ This analysis correctly captures the contrast in island-sensitivity between (18) and (20), because only the latter involves non-string-vacuous, “overt” movement.

⇒ The unacceptability of (22) follows, since “covert” movement of an adjunct remnant does show island-sensitivity.

3.2. P-stranding

RNR allows P-stranding when the remnant is on the left-edge ((25)), while P-stranding is prohibited if it is not ((26)).


John-Nom Mary -about and Bill-Nom Susan-about talked

‘John _ about Mary, and Bill talked about Susan.’
Only SVM allows P-stranding, because the movement is covert as shown in (27).

(27) John-ga [ₜₐₕ [Mary] [ₛₜₐₕ [Mary-nituite hanasita]]] John-Nom [Mary] Mary-about talked [Focus] [Focus]
(28) Mary [ₜₐₕ John-ga [ₛₜₐₕ [Mary-nituite hanasita]]] Mary John-Nom Mary-about talked [Focus] [Focus]

4. Further Questions
i) Why do arguments and adjuncts behave differently with respect to island sensitivity?
ii) Is there any “covert” movement that shows sensitivity to locality conditions?
iii) Is there any string-vacuous movement that shows sensitivity to locality conditions?

As for (ii) and (iii), if the answer is yes, how is such movement captured under the present theory?
- QR:

(29) a. Someone likes everyone.
   b. Someone thinks that Mary likes everyone.

- English gapping:
(30) Mary likes pizza and Bill spaghetti.
- Abe and Hoshi (1997, 1999)
(31) a. In English gapping, the [Focus] phrases must be moved out of the elliptic site.
   b. The direction of the movement involved is free.
   c. The movement in question obeys a crossing constraint.
(32) Mary likes pizza and [ₜₐₕ Bill [ₛₜₐₕ [Pres [ₛₜₐₕ [Bill likes spaghetti]] spaghetti]]] spaghetti] [Focus] [Focus]

Even though rightward movement of the second remnant looks like SVM, it obeys RRC.
(33) *John said that Mary liked pizza, and Bill spaghetti.
     John-Nom pizza-Acc ate Bill-Top spaghetti-Acc be
     John-Top Mary-Nom pizza-Acc ate Comp said Bill-Top spaghetti-Acc be

(35) Tom-ga [kuma-ni osowareta otoko]-o tasuketa.
     -Nom bear-by was-attacked man-Acc saved
*Mike-wa raion-ni da.                          (Mukai 2003, p. 4)
     -Top lion-by be
     ‘Tom saved a man who was attacked by a bear and Mike ___ by a lion.’

5. Proposal
- Hornstein (p.c.):
  There is a condition on movement that requires that gaps be “licensed” at both AP and CP interfaces.
  
  (i) The PF side: only “real” gaps will count due to what we propose above.
  ➔ Islands at PF could be evaded by not creating gaps.
  (ii) The LF side: “local” binding or resumption
  ➔ The problem with adjuncts is that there are no adjunct resumptive pronouns. Thus they must always be locally bound.

- Lebeaux’s (2009) lexical overlay analysis (= late insertion analysis):
(36) What did you see yesterday?
(37) a. [\text{CP what did [\text{TP you see <what> yesterday}]}
     b. [\text{CP pro did [\text{TP you see <pro> yesterday}]}
       \downarrow replacement of pro with \text{what}
     [\text{CP what did [\text{TP you see <pro> yesterday}]}
  ➔ Pro is a bundle of formal features and probably carries a feature we may call [+referential].
  ➔ No reconstruction into islands takes place in argument chains.
- Lasnik and Saito (1992):

(38) a. Who do you think everyone saw at the rally? (ambiguous)
    
    b. ??Who do you wonder whether everyone saw at the rally? (unambiguous)

- QR:

(39) a. Someone likes everyone.

    b. \[TP <everyone> [TP someone likes everyone]\]

    c. *\[TP pro [TP someone likes everyone]\]

⇒ No formal feature or no other trigger that could attract pro

- Japanese RNR:

(40) John-ga \[T' <ringo-o> [\_\_\_ringo-o, tableta], sosite …

    John-Nom \<apple-Acc> apple-Acc ate and

    [Focus] [Focus]

(41) E-feature in the sense of Merchant (2008) can serve as a trigger for movement of pro.

⇒ the chain of ringo-o ‘apple-Acc’ can have access to the pro-strategy, hence is immune to the LF locality conditions.

⇒ Due to parallelism, the corresponding chain in the second conjunct can also exploit the pro-strategy.

- Gapping:

(42) \[TP Mary \[T' Pres [\_\_\_Mary likes pizza]] <pizza>]]

    \[TP Bill \[T' Pres [\_\_\_Bill likes spaghetti]] <spaghetti>]]

    [Focus] [Focus]

⇒ In the first conjunct, the chain of pizza cannot exploit the pro-strategy, since no trigger for pro exists. Accordingly, the chain of spaghetti in the second conjunct cannot exploit this strategy, either, due to a parallelism constraint on conjunction.

⇒ Hence, the chain of spaghetti is subject to the LF locality conditions.
6. Consequences: Sluicing

- Ross (1969):

(43) a. Somebody just left — guess who.
   
   b. He is writing something, but you can’t imagine what.       (Ross (1969, p. 252)

(44) guess [*CP who [*TP just left]]

- Kimura’s (2007) in-situ analysis for the merger type:

(45) a. you can’t imagine [he is writing what]
   
   b. you can’t imagine [he is writing what]

- Island insensitivity:

(46) a. The administration has issued a statement that it is willing to meet with one of
   the student groups, but I’m not sure which one.       (Chung et al. 1995, p. 272)
   
   b. Sandy was trying to work out which students would be able to solve a certain
   problem, but she wouldn’t tell us which one.        (ibid.)

(47) a. They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don’t
   remember which language.       (Merchant 2001, p. 87)
   
   b. Ben will be mad if Abby talks to one of the teachers, but she couldn’t remember
   which.                                         (ibid., p. 88)

(48) a. Who wants to hire someone who speaks which language?
   
   b. Who will be mad if Abby talks to which teacher?

- Island sensitivity with respect to *wh*-adjuncts:

(49) a. *Who wants to hire someone [who speaks English how/why]?
   
   b. *Who will be mad [if Abby talks to the teacher how/why]?

   
   -Top what-Acc bought person-Acc be-looking-for Q
   'Q John is looking for the person [who bought what]?'
   
   
   -Top that book-Acc why bought person-Acc be-looking-for Q
   'Q John is looking for the person [that bought that book why]?'
(51) a. She’s practicing her serve so that she’ll be able to hit the ball in a certain deadly way, but her trainer won’t tell us in what way/??how.  
b. He wants to interview someone who works at the soup kitchen for a certain reason, but he won’t reveal yet ?what reason/*why.  
   (Merchant 2001, p. 129)

- Abe and Hornstein (2010):

(52) a. I can’t imagine \[ C_P \ <pro> C_Q \ [TP \ she’s \ reading \ <pro>] \]
       \[ \downarrow \] insertion of what
   b. I can’t imagine \[ C_P \ <pro> C_Q \ [TP \ she’s \ reading \ what] \]

- The contrast-type of sluicing:

(53) a. She has five CATS, but I don’t know how many DOGS.
   b. Abby knew which of the MEN Peter had invited, but she didn’t know which of the WOMEN.  
   (Merchant 2001, p. 36)

- Fox and Lasnik (2003):

(54) [FIVE CATS], [she has \( t \)], but I don’t know [HOW MANY DOGS], [she has \( t \)].

(55) a. *The detective ruled out the possibility that Fred killed ABBY, but I don’t know who else, [the detective ruled out the possibility that Fred killed \( t \)].
   
   (Fox and Lasnik 2003, p. 152)

   b. *Abby wants to hire someone who speaks GREEK, but I don’t remember what other languages, [she wants to hire someone who speaks \( t \)].

   (Merchant 2008, p. 148)
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