It has been argued that a variety of ellipsis constructions in Spanish show properties of rightward movement, e.g., Wh-Stripping (ellipsis with a wh-remnant other than why followed by a non-wh-remnant, [1]), (1a), Multiple Sluicing (Sluicing with multiple remnants, [2] following [3]), (1b), and Gapping (an ellipsis construction where a verb goes missing in the second conjunct of a coordinate structure, [4], a.o.), (1c). **Goal:** to capture the fact that i. rightward focus movement does not apply in non-ellipsis contexts; ii. rightward focus movement arguably does not apply in ellipsis structures involving a single remnant, e.g., Sluicing; iii. rightward focus movement is restricted to a subset of ellipsis structures involving multiple remnants, e.g., it applies in the structures in (1), in contrast to Why-Stripping, which typically involves the wh-element why (por qué in Spanish) followed by a non-wh-phrase, (2). **Analysis:** Following [5] and references therein, evidence is provided for the view that in the structures in (1) there is full-fledge syntax at the ellipsis site, as shown by various connectivity effects, and (ii.) the remnant at the right edge shows properties of rightward movement (see [6], a.o.), as shown by the fact that it is clause-bound and that it cannot drop the preposition, (3a) and (3b), respectively (data exemplified for Gapping; see [7]), in contrast to Sluicing; see (4) for illustration of the P-stranding facts in Sluicing ([8]). Under the assumption that derivational antisymmetry ([9]) bans multiple Specifiers due to their not being linearizable, it is argued that ellipsis provides a way to solve this linearization conflict. Specifically, ellipsis creates an escape hatch for multiple remnants competing for the same position when attempting to survive ellipsis, e.g., in the structures in (1) as opposed to Why-Stripping, where why is generated higher than the landing site of the focused XP and, therefore, there is no competition among the remnants, [10]). It is claimed that in the former constructions one of the Specifiers may take the place of the elided chunk of structure at PF, resulting in what looks like rightward movement. This means that specific aspects of the LCA in its more recent instantiations ([9]), in particular, the ban on multiple Specifiers, can be violated under well-defined circumstances (see also [11]). Accordingly, an analysis is developed in OT-terms, as this framework is particularly well-suited to handle the interaction among multiple factors. Inasmuch as no competition is involved in Why-Stripping, this structure patterns with Sluicing in that it shows no properties of rightward movement, e.g., it is not clause-bound as seen in the long-distance interpretation in (5) and P-Stranding is allowed, (2B) (in turn, see [10] for evidence that there is full-fledge syntax at the ellipsis site in this construction). Finally, various alternative analyses (e.g., [12], [13], [14]) and issues raised by structures involving more than two remnants or the availability of rightward movement without ellipsis in English-kind of languages are discussed. **Conclusion:** The study of the interplay between focus and ellipsis reveals that rightward movement is not just restricted to English-kind of languages, rather ellipsis conspires to allow for it in other languages. Specifically, rightward movement is argued to be part of the syntax of Spanish, clearly a non-standard assumption (though see [11] and [15] for notable exceptions).

(1) a. A: Alguno de estos catedráticos me recomendó una revista de filosofía.
    some of these full professors me recommended a journal of philosophy
    ‘One of these full professors recommended me a philosophy journal.’

    B: Y cuál de ellos un artículo?
    and which of them an article
    ‘And which of them recommended an article to you?’

b. Un catedrático me recomendó una revista de filosofía, pero no recuerdo
    a full professor me recommended a journal of philosophy but not remember.1SG
which of them what journal
‘A full professor recommended a certain philosophy journal to me, but I cannot remember which professor which journal.’

c. Un catedrático me recomendó una revista, y un estudiante un artículo.
‘A full professor recommended a journal to me, and a student an article.’

(2) A: Pedro se casará con María. B: Por qué (con) María?
Pedro will marry María. ‘Why María?’

(3) a. Luis sabe que María juega al tenis y Antonio al baloncesto.
Luis knows that María plays tennis and Antonio basketball.
Short-distance reading: ‘Luis knows that María plays tennis and that Antonio plays basketball.’ / Long-distance reading: ‘*Luis knows that María plays tennis and Antonio knows that she plays basketball.’

b. Pedro habló con María y Jorge *(con) Susana.
Pedro talked with María and Jorge with Susana.
‘Pedro talked to María, and Jorge to Susana.’

(4) Felicitas habló con alguno de estos tíos, pero no sé (con) cuál de ellos.
Felicitas talked with one of these guys, but I don’t know (with) which of them.
‘Felicitas talked to one of these guys, but I don’t know (with) who(m).’

(5) A: Pedro jura que Juan se casará con María. B: Por qué con María?
Pedro swears that Juan will marry María.
‘Pedro swears that Juan will marry María.’
Short-distance interpretation of B: ‘Why will Juan marry María?’ / Long-distance interpretation of B: ‘Why does Pedro swear that Juan will marry María?’