One of the most notorious properties associated with RNR is the strong condition on periphery that makes (i) grammatical but rules out (ii):

(i) [John read_] and [Mary burned_] a book
(ii) *[John bought_ today] and [Mary will buy_ tomorrow] a book.

Clearly, we have a restriction that allows only rightmost material to be displaced, elided or deleted (depending on one's approach). I will discuss this condition in different syntactic accounts of RNR (PF deletion, backward ellipsis and multiple dominance). I will argue in the line of Hartmann (2000) that the periphery condition is not syntactic but due to prosodic constraints on edge alignment. This then explains the ad hoc nature of the syntactic accounts with respect to the edge restriction. However, this does not mean that RNR itself is the result of deletion at PF. This would imply phonological identity that is not always detectable in the respective conjuncts, which are often seen as evidence for the elliptical nature of RNR (contra some multiple dominance accounts and PF deletion). I will argue that these data are restricted to morphological alternations of the same syntactic features, like some/any in (iii):

(iii) [Pete has read_] but [he hasn’t understood_] any of my books.

I will show how re-merge of the shared material into the second conjunct would allow for some sharing of non-identical elements but not all. My proposal for RNR elaborates on insights of De Vries (2005a,b) and Van Riemsdijk (2004) for external remerge and coordination.
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