

Unbounded Successive-Cyclic Rightward Movement

The existence of rightward movement faces at least two serious challenges. First, it appears to be subject to stricter locality conditions than, for instance, wh-movement (Ross 1967, a.o.). Second, it is not obviously successive-cyclic (Akmajian 1975, a.o.) in the way that wh-movement is often taken to be (cf. Chomsky 1977). This paper argues that rightward DP-movement actually displays both of these properties given appropriate licensing conditions. In particular, rightward movement can apply successive-cyclically in a potentially unbounded fashion when licensed by a parasitic gap as in (1), adapted from Engdahl (1983, ex. (26)).

Based on the presence of derived island effects (Wexler and Culicover 1980) and non-sensitivity to the Right Edge Restriction (Wilder 1999), the paper argues that structures like (1) are not derived via Right Node Raising (cf. Postal 1994, a.o.), but by rightward DP-movement. Starting from the observation by Larson (1989) that a parasitic gap is obligatory when a DP is displaced rightward over an adjunct clause (2), the movement operation is suggested to be licensed by the parasitic gap. Various diagnostics including VP-ellipsis, VP-fronting, and a form of antecedent-contained deletion suggest that only adjunct clauses adjoined above the locus of typical focus-driven Heavy-NP Shift at the edge of ν P require the parasitic gap. Thus, the parasitic gap in (1) and (2) is licensing additional movement beyond Heavy-NP Shift in violation of the Right Roof Constraint (3).

The paper proposes a theory for the derivation of rightward DP-movement and parasitic gaps that achieves the representation for parasitic gap licensing proposed in Nissenbaum (2000) but allows a parasitic gap to license movement beyond ν P according to local economy considerations. The parasitic gap domain is a null-operator structure, and thus a $\langle et \rangle$ predicate, which is merged cyclically to the type t matrix clause. Rightward movement is allowed because it converts the matrix clause to a derived predicate, which allows it to compose via predicate conjunction with the parasitic gap domain. This repair strategy is made possible by a logical extension of the operation Merge based on the ideas that Merge can be counter-cyclic (Lebeaux 1988, a.o.) and should be decomposed into a number of smaller operations (cf. Hornstein 2009). I propose a sub-type of Merge called *Mixed Merge*, shown in (4). The operation that establishes a sisterhood relation between syntactic objects cyclically combines a copy of the DP with the matrix clause. The operation that inserts a binder index after movement applies counter-cyclically to change the ν P node into the needed $\langle et \rangle$ derived predicate. Thus, this movement, like quantifier raising, is type-driven.

This analysis straightforwardly accounts for instances of a parasitic gap in an adjunct clause that is not in the same clause where the rightward moved DP originates (5). This fact, in conjunction with the more basic obviation of the Right Roof Constraint like in (2), suggests that rightward DP-movement is not subject to unique locality conditions and is potentially unbounded, just like wh-movement. It is also possible for a parasitic gap to simultaneously appear in an adjunct clause below and in an adjunct clause above negation (6). Given the analysis being proposed, the displaced DP here must have ultimately moved beyond the ν P and above negation. But it also must have moved cyclically through a position above each adjunct in order to repair the type mismatch between the parasitic gap domain and the matrix clause.

To conclude, this paper not only supports the existence of rightward movement, but demonstrates its potential unboundedness (a result reached independently for Right Node Raising constructions by Sabbagh 2007) and its successive-cyclic application. These supposed differences between rightward DP-movement and wh-movement, then, are only apparent. The remainder of the paper spells out the claim that the true difference between rightward DP-movement beyond typical Heavy-NP Shift and wh-movement lies purely in their licensing conditions.