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Japanese has sentences such as (1a), involving what is called Left Node Raising (LNR), an apparent mirror image of Right Node Raising (RNR) in (1b). In LNR, the shared fronted NP (‘book’ in (1a)) is interpreted in both conjuncts.

   book-ACC John-NOM ___ wrote (and) Mary-NOM ___ read
   Lit: ‘The book, John wrote and Mary read.’

   b. John wrote ___, and Mary read ___, a book.

Some researchers claim that RNR is derived by Across-the-Board (ATB) movement of a shared NP (e.g., Ross 1967, Sabbagh 2007, Abe and Hornstein 2012, and Kimura 2018). Similarly, LNR is argued to be derived by leftward ATB movement of a shared NP, as in (2) (e.g., Abe and Nakao 2012 and Nakao 2010).

(2) [Hon-o\[i \[John-ga ti kaki], (sosite) [Mary-ga ti yonda]]

Indeed, LNR shows sensitivity to islands, as illustrated in (3).

(3) *[Sono saihu-o] John-ga [ti hirot-ta hito]-o sagasi,
   the wallet-ACC John-NOM pick-up-PAST person-ACC look-for
   Mary-ga [ti nusum-ooto si-ta otoko]-o oikake-ta.
   Mary-NOM steal-to do-PAST man-ACC chase-PAST
   ‘The wallet, John looked for [the person who picked up], and Mary chased [the man who tried to steal]’ (Nakao 2010:160)

In this snippet, however, I will discuss data that cannot be explained by the ATB movement analysis of LNR. First of all, (4), where a shared NP is fronted, is grammatical.

(4) *[Sono hon-o] Taroo-wa [TP Hanako-ga ei katta] to] itta si,
   that book-ACC Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM bought COMP said and
   Ziroo-mo [TP Hanako-ga ei katta] to] itta.
   Ziroo-too Hanako-NOM bought COMP said
   ‘Taroo said that Hanako bought the book, and Ziroo also said that she bought it’

Second, as Shinohara (2006) and Saito (2007) argue, argument/CP-ellipsis resists extraction from within the ellipsis site, as in (5). This is because the ellipsis site is filled by an empty slot with no internal structure (and is resolved by LF-copying).
Given this background, consider the following sentence. (6) is an instance of LNR, where the embedded CP in the second clause is elided. If, as the ATB analysis of LNR suggests, the shared NP undergoes ATB movement, (6) should be ungrammatical because extraction from within the elided CP is banned as we saw in (5).


Intended: ‘Taroo said that Hanako bought a book, and Ziroo said that she bought a magazine’ (Saito 2017:724)

The above argument suggests that LNR can be derived by extraction with argument ellipsis, moving the shared NP either to the front of the first conjunct, or asymmetrically out of the first conjunct, and also applying argument ellipsis to the second conjunct, as in (7). As expected, a sloppy reading is available in (8).

(7) [[shared NP]i . . . [subj verb ti] and [subj verb te]]

(8) [Zibunij-no musume-o]k [Taroj-wa ti shikari], [Jiroj-wa e nagusameta]].

Lit: ‘Self’s daughter, Taro scolded and Jiro consoled.’
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