Abstract. English Pseudogapping constructions share some surface similarities with both Gapping and Verb Phrase Ellipsis (VPE). Levin (1978, 1979) concludes, however, that Pseudogapping is transformationally unrelated to both Gapping and VPE. We argue that this conclusion is only partially correct. Gapping and Pseudogapping are transformationally related in that they both involve the application of verb movement, in particular sideward movement of the main verb. We take Johnson’s (1994) ATB Movement analysis of Gapping as an important precedent in this regard, and we draw from proposals of Nunes (2001) and Nunes and Uriagereka (2000) for the possibility of sideward movement out of coordinate structures and adjunct clauses. After pursuing the sideward movement approach to Pseudogapping (and ultimately Gapping as well), we outline some important empirical differences between Pseudogapping and VPE that we think raise substantial problems for any analysis that treats Pseudogapping and VPE on a par (e.g., Jayaseelan 1990, Lasnik 1995, 1999a, 1999b). We present evidence for a fundamental syntactic difference between Pseudogapping and VPE, and conclude that the VPE analysis of Pseudogapping cannot be maintained.

1. Introduction: Pseudogapping and Gapping

Both Pseudogapping (Levin 1978, 1979) and Gapping have received a fair amount of attention in recent work. This article adds to the discussion, with the principal goal of offering a new analysis of Pseudogapping. This new analysis, which relies on movement rather than deletion, confers several benefits. It (unlike the familiar deletion accounts) enables a unified and novel analysis for Gapping and Pseudogapping that we argue accounts for both the similarities and differences between the two phenomena. We also argue that the movement analysis correctly predicts certain empirical facts that are potentially problematic for the Verb Phrase Ellipsis analysis of Pseudogapping (Jayaseelan 1990, Lasnik 1995, 1999a, 1999b).

In Pseudogapping forms, we find apparent verbal deletion under identity, with a tensed auxiliary as a left remnant. The following provide simple examples (strikeout text here and elsewhere indicates Pseudogapped/Gapped material):

---
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1 References to Levin’s 1979 dissertation are actually to the 1986 published version. We will refer to it as Levin 1979 throughout, though.
People in Greece drink more ouzo than they do drink brandy. (Levin 1979:16).

They like rutabagas more than they do like lima beans.

Robin will eat rutabagas, but she won’t eat ice cream.

Levin (1979:30) points out that Pseudogapping in spoken English occurs most frequently in particular structural environments. Some of the ideal environments include: comparatives (as in (1,2)); a polarity contrast between clauses (as in (3)); and clauses with coreferential subjects (as in (1,2,3)). Many speakers find Pseudogapping forms that do not conform to these environments degraded; for example, many speakers we have consulted judge the following as quite unnatural:

Robin will eat lima beans, and Kim will eat rutabagas.

In this paper, we present examples of Pseudogapping forms that match the ideal environments as closely as possible.

Gapping, on the other hand, shows apparent verbal deletion without any remnant auxiliaries. Here we consider only simple cases, such as the following:

Pat loves mysteries, and Terry loves romances.

Robin ate beans, and Kim ate rice.

Dana will read War and Peace, and Kim will read Ivanhoe.

Pseudogapping and Gapping share important similarities. First, a main verb (at least) apparently deletes in both. Second, both Pseudogapping and Gapping require remnants on both sides of the apparent deletion (unlike Verb Phrase Ellipsis). On the other hand, Pseudogapping shares a property with Verb Phrase Ellipsis that Gapping lacks: Both Pseudogapping and Verb Phrase Ellipsis have a tensed auxiliary as a left-side remnant (though Verb Phrase Ellipsis differs from Pseudogapping in also allowing for an infinitival marker or more than one supporting auxiliary as the left-side remnant). Interestingly, Levin (1978, 1979 [main text]) concludes that Pseudogapping is transformationally unrelated to both Gapping and Verb Phrase Ellipsis. We argue in this paper that this conclusion is only partially correct. We argue that Gapping and Pseudogapping are transformationally related in that they both involve the application of verb movement, in particular sideward movement,

However, in notes added to the 1986 published version of her dissertation, Levin states “…I now believe it doesn’t make much difference whether [Pseudogapping] is given separate treatment or collapsed with VP Deletion. Some of the restrictions on Pseudogapping would not need to be reflected in the rule, but could be relegated to the discourse component.” (1986:89)

In section 4 we will argue that Pseudogapping should not be collapsed with VP Ellipsis due to syntactic differences between the constructions, and we will further argue that the differences we point out are crucially syntactic in nature and should not be relegated to discourse distinctions.
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following proposals of Nunes (2001) and Nunes & Uriagereka (2000). This attempt at unifying Gapping and Pseudogapping is guided, in part, by some key similarities between the constructions. First, both Gapping and Pseudogapping require a right-side remnant. Second, it has been noted (Levin 1979) that both constructions serve a similar discourse function (different altogether from Verb Phrase Ellipsis): to contrast VP-internal elements across two “clauses”. Thus, we pursue an analysis that unifies Gapping and Pseudogapping. We explore and ultimately defend Johnson’s (1994) Across-the-Board Movement analysis of Gapping, and we take it as an important precedent for a movement-based analysis. We then explore the possibility of extending a movement-based analysis to Pseudogapping as well (section 2). After pursuing the sideward movement approach to Pseudogapping (and ultimately Gapping as well) (section 3), we outline some important empirical differences between Pseudogapping and Verb Phrase Ellipsis that we think raise substantial problems for any analysis that relates Pseudogapping to Verb Phrase Ellipsis (e.g., Jayaseelan 1990, Lasnik 1995, 1999a, 1999b), and which, we argue, validate a movement-based analysis of Pseudogapping constructions (section 4).

2. Gapping as Verb Movement

2.1. Johnson’s (1994) ATB movement analysis

Johnson (1994) analyzes Gapping as resulting from Across-the-Board (ATB) verb movement from conjoined VPs. Under his idea, the relevant portion of the diagram for (5) becomes:

(8) 

This analysis differs from the traditional deletion-based analysis (e.g. Ross 1967, Neijt 1979) in several important ways. Note that Gapping does not underlyingly consist of two full clauses; we have VP-coordination rather than CP- or IP-coordination. The two occurrences of the verb undergo
obligatory ATB-movement to the single matrix I. The gap in the second
conjunct, then, results not from deletion but rather from movement. The
subject of the first conjunct raises from [Spec, VP] to [Spec, IP].³ This
movement-based analysis makes several correct predictions that a verb
deletion analysis cannot. First, Gapping constructions require non-
coreferential subjects.

(9) *Pat₁ loves mysteries, and Pat₁/she₁ loves romances.

This falls out under standard binding principles, since the subject of the
first conjunct, from its landing site of [Spec, IP], c-commands the in situ
subject of the second conjunct within a single IP. Note that a verb deletion
analysis cannot appeal to this syntactic explanation, since Pat₁ loves
mysteries, and she₁ loves romances would make a grammatical input form.⁴

³ This raising of the first conjunct’s subject to [Spec, IP] violates the Coordinate Structure
Constraint, at least as commonly understood. Johnson argues, though, that the standardly
accepted version of the CSC proves too strong, and suggests (1994:40–1) “…the Coordinate
Structure Constraint does not prevent independent A-movement from the initial coordinate.”
He gives as supporting evidence the following grammatical example, in which
A-movement from an initial conjunct to the left of the matrix verb particle does not render
ungrammaticality:

(i) Liz made Mason out [IP [IP t to be intelligent] and [IP Sarah to be kind]].

⁴ It is well known that Gapping requires the left and right remnants to be referentially
distinct from the respective elements of the first conjunct. For example:

(i) *Alex loves peas₁, and Pat loves peas₁/Them₁ (too).

The prohibition on coreferential objects may be captured if the object of the first conjunct
has raised out of the conjunct to a higher projection (e.g., Agr-oP, as in Koizumi 1995).
From this position, the first object would bind the R-expression or pronominal object in the
second conjunct within the same binding domain, violating Principle C and Principle B,
respectively. Note that this raising of the first object violates the CSC, on a par with raising
of the subject.

It is not immediately clear under usual assumptions about Binding Theory how the
Johnson-style analysis rules out examples like (ii), since the anaphor in this example would
have a clausemate antecedent. Suppose that the “subject”, which for Johnson resides in the
Spec of VP, actually sits in the Spec of vP (“light verb” phrase) following the clause structure
of Chomsky 1995, with “light” vP coordination in Gapping (and verb raising up to an
Aspect head).

(ii) *[TP Alex₁ [AspP loves₂ [vP t₁ t₂ peas], and [vP himself₁ t₂ beans]]].

Let us assume that for the purposes of Binding Theory Principle A (though apparently not
for Principle B), vP counts as binding domain, so that obedience to the principle is computed
at the level of vP, and not TP. Thus, consider the derivation of Alex criticized himself:

(iii) a. [vP Alex₁ criticized himself₁]. ← Principle A satisfied
b. [TP Alex₁ criticized [vP t t himself]].

If Principle A is in effect at the vP level only, then either it applies at the level of vP when the
subject has not yet raised to TP (assuming Principle A applies anywhere: see Lebeaux 1988),
or the copy of the subject in Spec of vP counts if Principle A applies only at LF. Under this
analysis, the ungrammaticality of example (ii) falls out as a Principle A violation, since
the anaphor and its antecedent are in different binding domains (note that taking vP as the
binding domain for Principle A may be consistent with the idea that vP is “propositional”
and counts as a derivational phase in the sense of Chomsky 2000).
Johnson’s analysis also correctly predicts that Gapping prohibits adjunction of an S-adverb to the second conjunct, which is actually a VP rather than CP:

(10) *Pat loves mysteries, and \([VP \text{ probably, } [VP \text{ Terry romances}]\].

A verb deletion analysis, which assumes two complete clauses as the underlying input, cannot readily account for the ill-formedness of the above form. Furthermore, Johnson’s analysis is compatible with the fact that Gapping can show accusative case on the “subject” of the second conjunct:

(11) Robin cooked the fish, and him/(?)he cooked the rice.

Although generally speaking pronouns do not make for ideal subjects in Gapping constructions for discourse reasons, for our consultants (though apparently not for all speakers), the accusative form is more natural than the nominative form for the “subject” pronoun in the second conjunct. This is difficult for a verb deletion analysis which assumes conjoined CPs/IPs, since *Him cooked the rice is an illicit input form. Under the movement analysis, though, the case pattern follows from the fact that the second “subject” is not in [Spec, IP] on the surface (for those speakers who allow the nominative form, there may be feature / LF movement of the second “subject” to a case licensing position outside of VP).

2.2. The nature of “V-to-I” in English

We note the reliance on English V-to-I movement in the ATB movement analysis of Gapping. The assumption that English has V-to-I movement is at odds with verb height asymmetries found in languages like French vs. English. However, the possibility of V to “I” in English is opened up under a clause structure that splits IP into several projections of separate heads (Pollock 1989). We therefore assume the following clause structure, which incorporates TP, whose head forces the subject to raise and form a specifier. T is also the host of tensed modal and tensed aspectual auxiliaries in English. We also incorporate into this structure an Aspectual projection where uninflected aspectual auxiliaries reside (English would need two such Aspectual projections in clauses with two overt uninflected Aspectual auxiliaries), and light vP, which assigns the external argument theta-role to its Spec (for v, see Chomsky 1995). We posit that in English the verb raises through v to the Aspect head in overt syntax if no auxiliary occupies that position. This would appear as (simplifying away from two Aspectual projections):
We derive the classic French vs. English verb height asymmetry (see Pollock 1989) by positing that V overtly raises as high as Aspect in English (subjects raise to [Spec, TP]), but as high as T in French (with Negation intervening between TP and AspP in both languages). We appeal to a categorial feature [+V] in Aspect, which motivates movement of the verb to the Aspect head (alternatively, [+V] could be checked by directly merging an aspectual auxiliary verb). We further propose that Gapping involves coordination of vP, rather than VP as originally proposed by Johnson. Our modified analysis of ATB movement for Gapping would then look as follows (irrelevant details omitted):

The verb movement analysis of Gapping predicts that a language in which V does not raise out of vP cannot exhibit Gapping, because the verb would not be able to “escape” the vP coordination (see Huang 1992, 1996 for independent evidence that Chinese (Mandarin) shows “shorter”
verb movement than English, suggesting that Chinese does not have V-to-Aspect movement. See also Zoerner and Agbayani 2000, who correlate these findings with the lack of Gapping in Chinese). Under this analysis, verb-raising out of vP is necessary though not sufficient to create Gapping structures. All languages with Gapping will have such verb-raising, though a language might have verb-raising and yet lack Gapping (highly incorporating languages, for example, come to mind).

In the following sections we will argue that it is desirable to give Pseudogapping and Gapping a unified analysis. We have seen some of the virtues of a movement-based analysis for Gapping. Now we extend the idea of a movement-based analysis to Pseudogapping.

3. Pseudogapping as ATB/sideward verb movement

In our effort to show Pseudogapping as derived from the same basic operation that derives Gapping, we propose (as a first approximation) the following:

(14) Pseudogapping results from verb movement “across-the-board” from a matrix VP/vP and an adjunct CP.

Under the new analysis, the structure for (2) becomes:

(15)
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An immediate prediction of this approach is that Gapping with just the verb or verb and tensed auxiliary should be fine, as V raises to Asp below T.

(i) Terry ate marshmallows, and Robin, cookies.
(ii) Terry has eaten / is eating marshmallows, and Robin, cookies.

However, if the configuration is Tensed Aux – Aspektual Aux – V, the prediction is that Gapping should be degraded, as the verb would be forced to remain lower than Asp. We and other speakers we have consulted find that such attempted Gappings are in fact degraded:

(iii) ?*Terry may have eaten / may be eating marshmallows, and Robin, cookies.
(iv) ?*Terry may have been eating marshmallows, and Robin, cookies.
Two key points distinguish this new analysis. First, Pseudogapping involves ATB verb movement, just like Gapping (though, again, we claim that such verb movement is necessary though not sufficient for Pseudogapping; a language might preclude Pseudogapping for discourse or other reasons). We owe this intellectual debt to Johnson; in Pseudogapping, the apparent deletion site actually results from movement. Second, this apparent ATB movement is “asymmetric”, since the phrases extracted out of are not of like type (VP and CP), and they enter into a non-parallel relation of subordination, as opposed to parallel coordination. This second point of apparent asymmetric ATB movement poses certain theoretical questions, and this leads us to reanalyze it as “sideward movement”.

3.1. Sideward movement in ATB structures

Since Ross (1967), ATB movement has normally been understood as a process governing extraction from parallel coordinate structures (thus, the mechanism is used to circumvent otherwise fatal violations of the Coordinate Structure Constraint). The notion of asymmetric ATB movement, though unusual, has precedent; it has been argued that Parasitic Gap constructions involve such movement out of “non-parallel/subordination contexts (Williams 1990; Nunes & Uriagereka 2000; Hornstein & Nunes 2002):

(16) a. [Which newspapers]1 did Kim [VP [VP recycle t1] [CP after PRO reading t1]]? b. This is the paper which1 Kim [VP [VP read t1] [CP before PRO filing t1]].

Note that, under this analysis, both Pseudogapping and Parasitic Gap constructions would involve movement of an element out of an adjunct. Nunes & Uriagereka (2000) and Nunes (2001) argue that Parasitic Gaps arise via copy of a single wh-element from the adjunct (which is constructed in its own “derivational workspace”) to the matrix VP; that is, via “sideward movement” between chunks of structure that have not yet been merged together. The (a) example above would thus involve copying which newspapers from the adjunct /CP which newspapers after PRO reading <which newspapers> / and merging it with the verb recycle, prior to merging the adjunct with the matrix VP (angled brackets <> indicate the copy):

6 We suggest that comparative clauses are adjunct clauses. For detailed discussion of the syntax and semantics of comparative adjunct clauses, see Kennedy (1999).

7 Note that the proposed ATB movement out of the subordinate clause in (15) violates the Head Movement Constraint/Minimal Link Condition as it applies to head movement, because the verb moves past a c-commanding auxiliary. This is a problem that the sideward movement analysis of Pseudogapping in section 3.2 is able to overcome.
The adjunct CP is subsequently spelled out, then merged to the matrix VP. According to this account, the adjunct is spelled out through cyclic Spell-Out for linearization purposes prior to its merging with VP. Complex adjuncts cannot be linearized with respect to main clause elements, under the simple notion that asymmetric c-command maps to linear precedence between lexical items (Kayne 1994, Chomsky 1995). This is the case under the assumption that phrasal syntactic objects are not legitimate objects at the PF level. The computational system should not deliver complex structures to the phonological component through Spell-out, because the linearization procedure would not be able to determine precedence relations among all of the lexical items (e.g., the precedence relations between the lexical items in the matrix structure and the lexical items within the complex adjunct). Nunes & Uriagereka’s solution to the problem makes use of multiple Spell-Out, as suggested by Uriagereka (1999). In the case at hand, the adjunct CP is spelled out separately from the main clause VP, and in the phonological component its lexical items are linearized internal to the adjunct.

The CP is later “plugged in” where it belongs in the matrix structure. Nunes & Uriagereka assume that “the label of a given structure provides the ‘address’ for the appropriate plugging in, in both the phonological and the interpretive components.” (2000:23). It is assumed that the label of the spelled-out syntactic object K is still accessible to the computational system, because the label encodes the relevant pieces of information that allow a category to undergo...
syntactic operations (like Merge), even though the constituent parts of K have already been spelled out. This yields the following (boldface text represents the spelled out object; we represent adjunction as segment-, rather than bar-, adjunction, but nothing crucially hinges on this choice):

(19) \([{\text{VP recycle which newspapers}}]_{\text{VP}} <\text{which newspapers}> \text{ after PRO reading} <\text{which newspapers}>\)].

Once matrix C is merged, the wh-phrase raises to [Spec, CP] to check the [Q] feature of C, yielding:

(20) \([{\text{CP which newspapers did Kim}}]_{\text{CP}} <\text{which newspapers}> \text{ recycle} <\text{which newspapers}>\]

This analysis thus derives Parasitic Gaps by copy and merge of a single wh-element across two derivational domains. We refer the reader to Nunes (2001) and Nunes & Uriagereka (2000) for more detailed discussion of sideward movement and the role of multiple Spell-out (see also Hornstein & Nunes (2002) for discussion of certain asymmetries between Parasitic Gap and “normal” ATB movement constructions).

The question arises as to how “asymmetric ATB movement” in Parasitic Gap constructions (here re-analyzed as sideward movement) avoids violating the Condition on Extraction Domains (CED; Huang 1982), which prohibits extraction out of adjuncts and subjects. In this analysis CED effects arise because syntactic domains such as adjuncts are delivered to PF through cyclic Spell-Out (Uriagereka 1999) for linearization purposes prior to extraction of an element from that particular domain. Once a chunk of structure is spelled out and delivered to PF, elements within that chunk are no longer accessible to operations within the syntax. This provides a natural and elegant account for why elements within adjunct domains generally cannot be extracted through syntactic movement. This account of Parasitic Gap constructions relies on the notion that in an example like (21) the selectional/thematic properties of the verb recycle must be checked via Merge.

(21) \([\text{Which newspapers}_1 \text{ did Kim}}]_{\text{VP}} \text{ recycle } t_1 <\text{which newspapers}>\text{ after PRO reading } t_1]\)

However, given the numeration which provides the input elements for the derivation of this structure, there are no elements within that numeration that can satisfy the thematic requirements of recycle at the point in which recycle is introduced into the numeration (the only two NPs in the structure are Kim and which newspapers). Note that the matrix subject Kim, being an external argument, cannot serve as the complement of the verb, allowing the verb to discharge a theta role to its internal argument. If the NP Kim were used to satisfy the verb’s selectional/thematic requirements, then the thematic properties
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of light $v$ (which licenses the external argument) could not be discharged. Simple lexical insertion from the numeration will therefore lead the derivation to crash, so sideward movement of which newspapers from the adjunct to the complement position of recycle is used as a Last Resort. The verb recycle then takes the copied and merged wh-phrase as its internal argument, allowing the derivation to converge. Thus, selectional/thematic requirements which need to be satisfied at the derivational stage prior to adjunct spell-out and attachment allow the necessary element to be extracted out of the adjunct that contains it. Again, the adjunct clause and the matrix VP (which requires an internal argument) are being constructed in parallel. In such a case, the wh-element can be copied and merged into the matrix VP before the adjunct clause is spelled out. This sideward movement of the wh-element from the adjunct clause to the matrix VP is motivated by Last Resort, as not applying the movement would lead to non-convergence. In ordinary (non-Parasitic Gap) wh-questions, the wh-element embedded in an adjunct clause would not be able to escape the adjunct, as the adjunct clause would be spelled out before interrogative $C$ is introduced in the matrix clause (we assume here that structure building proceeds in a bottom-up fashion). Interrogative $C$ would otherwise force movement of the wh-phrase, but in this case the wh-phrase is inaccessible to movement once the adjunct containing it is spelled out. In the case of Parasitic Gaps, then, “extraction” occurs before spell-out of the adjunct (avoiding a CED violation), and this possibility is excluded in non-Parasitic Gap environments.

3.2. A sideward movement account of pseudogapping (and gapping) structures

We propose to extend this analysis to the case of Pseudogapping, thereby modifying the Johnson-type analysis while maintaining its key insight. We suggest that, like Parasitic Gaps, sideward movement is also utilized in Pseudogapping constructions as a Last Resort in the following way: there is only one verb in the numeration, and in order to license elements in the matrix clause, the verb must be moved sideward from the adjunct clause to the matrix clause in the course of the derivation. Consider the (simplified) numeration for sentence (2) They like rutabagas more than they do lima beans.

(22) $N = \{they(2), rutabagas, lima beans, more than, like, do, T, v(2), Asp(2), C\}$

There is a single verb like in the numeration; there are two elements that will require licensing under sisterhood with a verb: rutabagas and
lima beans. Recall that the adjunct clause is spelled out prior to merge with the matrix VP. As there is only one verb in the numeration (merged within the adjunct, where it licenses lima beans), the verb must copy and merge with the main clause object rutabaga to license its thematic properties (note that this assumes that the verb’s “theta discharge” property is still active even after it has “discharged” theta roles to the arguments of the adjunct clause). Furthermore, the derivation will crash if the [+V] feature of the matrix Aspect head is not checked once Aspect is merged in the matrix clause. Thus, sideward movement of V must apply prior to spelling out the adjunct clause; otherwise, the derivation will not converge.

The adjunct CP is spelled out and subsequently merged to the matrix VP for linearization purposes. This yields:

(24) [VP like rutabaga [VP [CP more than they do <like> lima beans]]]

Once matrix Aspect is merged, the verb raises to Aspect, yielding (25) (we omit vP in the representation):

(25) [AspP like [VP <like> rutabaga [VP [CP more than they do <like> lima beans]]]]

T is merged with AspP, and the subject raises to [Spec, TP] (the subject is initially merged in [Spec, vP]).

(26) [TP They T [AspP like [VP <like> rutabaga [VP [CP more than they do <like> lima beans]]]]]

The rest of the structure is subsequently spelled out. This analysis for Pseudogapping, like the analysis for Parasitic Gaps outlined above,
derives Pseudogapping by copy and merge of a single element across two derivational domains. The difference is that the element that is copied and merged is a single verb in Pseudogapping, rather than a wh-phrase as in Parasitic Gaps. Copy and merge of the verb into the matrix VP is motivated by Last Resort, since not applying the operation would lead to non-convergence. Thus, Last Resort forces sideward movement out of the adjunct. As in Parasitic Gap cases, the sideward movement occurs as the adjunct clause and the matrix VP are constructed in parallel. It is therefore possible for sideward movement to apply out of the adjunct prior to its spell-out, circumventing a CED violation. The account captures the asymmetric ATB property and apparent non-observance of the CED seen in both Parasitic Gaps and Pseudogapping constructions.8

Nunes (2001) argues that ATB movement out of parallel coordinate structures may be reanalyzed as sideward movement out of a coordinate structure, which does not violate the Coordinate Structure Constraint. For us, Gapping would be a case of sideward movement out of a coordinate structure, with much the same mechanics as suggested for Pseudogapping above. Note that we have an immediate account for the fact that, to us and to other speakers we have consulted, Pseudogapping is acceptable in adjunct clauses but quite unnatural in coordinate structures (note that we treat but as a subordinator rather than as a coordinator given that it patterns with well-known subordinators rather than with coordinators in Gapping and Pseudogapping contexts). Gapping, however, requires pure coordination of Ps, and fails under subordination:9

(27) ?*Robin likes rutabagas, and/or she does(n’t) lima beans.
(28) Robin likes rutabagas more than/as (much as) she does lima beans.
(29) Robin doesn’t like rutabagas, but she does lima beans.
(30) Robin likes beans and Kim, rice.
(31) Robin likes beans *more than/*as (much as)/?*but Kim, rice.

Furthermore, the analysis predicts that Pseudogapping, unlike Gapping, will allow for coreferential subjects. This follows since Pseudogapping

8 Unlike an ATB account, sideward movement of the verb does not violate the Head Movement Constraint/Minimal Link Condition. This is because the sideward movement does not target a c-commanding position. This suggests that sideward movement in general should be immune to intervention effects that are ruled out by the Minimal Link Condition (Chomsky 1995).

9 We also find a contrast between pure and vs. temporal and then in Pseudogapping contexts:

(i) ?*Robin will eat the rutabaga, and she will the lima beans (too).
(ii) Robin will eat the rutabaga, and then she will the lima beans.

The distinction is subtle for some speakers, but real. Arguably, and then functions as a subordinator introducing a temporal adjunct clause, whereas pure and exhibits a coordinative function, accounting for the degraded status of (i).
involves a subordinate clause, with the consequent binding domain. Recall that Gapping, which involves vP conjuncts, does not provide an appropriate binding domain (assuming TP is the relevant binding domain for Principle B), so that coreferential subjects fail:

\[(32) \text{Robin}_1 \text{ likes rutabagas, but she}_1 \text{ doesn’t lima beans.} \]
\[(33) \ast \text{Robin}_1 \text{ likes rutabagas, and she}_1 \text{ lima beans.} \]

We point this out primarily because Levin (1979:58) gives the above difference as the principal argument for not positing that Pseudogapping and Gapping are related. We have seen, though, that we can capture the similarities between the two from the fact that they both involve verb raising and ATB movement (here analyzed as sideward movement), while capturing the important differences with the claim that in Pseudogapping, sideward verb movement proceeds from an adjunct clause, whereas in Gapping it proceeds from a vP conjunct.\(^{10}\)

This difference gives some insight into an important fact: many languages have Gapping yet lack Pseudogapping. Even a language as closely related to English as Swedish patterns this way (we thank Christer Platzack for providing the Swedish data):

\[(34) \text{Gapping} \]
\[
\text{Robin åt bönor och Kim ris.} \\
\text{Robin ate beans, and Kim rice.} \\
\]

\(^{10}\) A reviewer cites Levin’s examples of Pseudogapping applying across a discourse as in (i):

\[(i) \text{Sp A: “People who are like that amaze me.”} \\
\text{Sp B: “They do also amaze me too.”} \text{} (\text{Levin 1979: 2}) \]

The question arises as to how such cases work under a movement account. We suggest that these would work in the same way as such plausible cross-discourse exchanges like the following, which involves a Parasitic Gap construction.

\[(ii) \text{Speaker A and Speaker B are interrogating someone suspected of a cover-up:} \\
\text{Sp A: “Which papers did you shred e …} \\
\text{Sp B: “without first filing e ?!”} \]

We assume that within a discourse, speakers may share the same/similar structural descriptions of the utterances being produced (which may involve movement processes, ellipsis, etc.), allowing them to add to or modify each other’s utterances. For Levin’s case in (i) it is plausible that Speaker B is subordinating his/her utterance to the utterance of Speaker A. In contrast, Sag (1976) notes that Gapping normally does not apply across a discourse except under specific conditions. Gapping usually works only if the second speaker switches the subject and object:

\[(iii) \text{Sp A: “John loves Mary”} \\
\text{Sp B: “and Mary, John!”} \]
\[(iv) \text{Sp A: “Mary prefers mysteries”} \\
\text{Sp B: “and John, romances”} \]

These facts suggest that though Pseudogapping and Gapping are derived from the same syntactic source, Gapping appears in this respect to be more pragmatically restricted.
(35) Pseudogapping

*Folk i Grekland dricker mer ouzo än de gör konjak.
People in Greece drink more ouzo than they do brandy.

Recall that under the present analysis, Pseudogapping parallels with Parasitic Gaps in that both result from sideward movement out of an adjunct clause; they differ in that Pseudogapping involves a moved verb while Parasitic Gap constructions involve a moved NP. Of course, not all languages which exhibit overt wh-movement show Parasitic Gaps. We must simply say that although UG allows for sideward movement, a specific language might exclude such movement in certain cases for independent reasons. And so it is with Pseudogapping. Although a specific language may otherwise exhibit the requisite verb movement, the independent factors which preclude Pseudogapping might include the nature of the language’s auxiliary system, language-specific discourse considerations, the language’s treatment of adjunct clauses generally, and the like. Just why a particular language forbids Pseudogapping remains an interesting line of research. On the other hand, Gapping simply requires sideward movement from a conjoined structure, and in this sense patterns with traditional “standard” ATB effects. We therefore expect Gapping to be less restricted crosslinguistically than Pseudogapping is.

4. Pseudogapping: a special case of VP ellipsis?

Lasnik (1995, 1999a, 1999b) offers an interesting analysis of Pseudogapping as a special case of Verb Phrase Ellipsis (VPE). Modifying the VPE-based analysis of Pseudogapping first proposed by Jayaseelan (1990), Lasnik analyzes Pseudogapping as a two-step process: 1) overt raising of a verbal complement to [Spec, Agr-oP] to check an EPP feature, followed by 2) VPE. Lasnik assumes a split VP structure which contains an intervening object agreement project between VP-shells (Koizumi 1995); VPE applies to the lower VP-shell. (36) exemplifies this analysis for Pseudogapping (we ignore various details of this analysis. See the references cited above for more detailed discussion).

(36) Robin likes astronomy, but [TP she doesn’t [VP V [AGR-op meteorology] [VP like]]]

Under this line of thinking, Pseudogapping consists of two parts: overt object raising and VPE. Importantly, this analysis (which we will call the “VPE approach to Pseudogapping”) takes Pseudogapping to be an instance of VPE (contra Levin 1978, 1979 [main text]; though see Sag 1976 for an early suggestion that such constructions might involve VPE). The VPE approach to Pseudogapping, though elegant, raises
substantial empirical questions. In this section we first consider an empirical benefit of the VPE approach, and show that the movement-based approach can obtain the same benefit. We then observe certain empirical differences between Pseudogapping and VPE which suggest that Pseudogapping may not be conflated under VPE. We outline each of these empirical differences, many of which were observations originally cited by Levin (1979). We also attempt to show how these differences can be accounted for under our movement-based analysis for Pseudogapping.

4.1. An advantage shared by the VPE approach and the movement approach

The VPE approach to Pseudogapping yields the benefit of dispensing with the conceptually unpleasant notion of “discontinuous deletion.” Consider, for example, the following:

(37) Perry Mason can’t prove Paul innocent, but he can prove Della innocent.

The VPE approach avoids appealing to such apparent discontinuous deletion. Under this analysis, Della would raise overtly out of its VP, and then the VP would delete:

(38) …he can [ Agr-oP Della1 [ VP prove t1 innocent] ].

The movement-based analysis can also avoid discontinuous deletion. Levin (1979:24) suggests an intriguing alternative possibility, which we will pursue here (though translated within our movement based approach): Chomsky (1957:479) postulates that obligatory complements of transitive verbs are generated next to V, with the direct object following. In X-bar theoretic terms, the base structure for the relevant portion of the above example would be as in (39) rather than as in (40):

(39) …he can [ VP [ V prove innocent] Della ]
(40) …he can [ VP prove [ SC Della innocent] ]

Let us suppose that Chomsky’s (1957) basic characterization is correct, and that (39) represents the underlying pattern prior to the application of a transformation that moves the direct object to a position immediately following the main verb. If (39) is the underlying structure for such constructions, then sideward movement targets the [V + complement] string, which we analyze initially as a V’, to derive the Pseudogapping structure (Levin originally suggested that this substring is a variable
targeted by the deletion rule). We posit that $V'$ in these instances is reanalyzed as a $V$ in the sense of Larson (1989). His $V'$ Reanalysis rule is offered below:

(41) If $\alpha$ is a $V'$ and $\alpha$ is thematically monotransitive, then $\alpha$ may be reanalyzed as $V$.

According to Larson (1989:8), “$V'$ Reanalysis says that any $V'$ that corresponds semantically to a binary relation may be categorially construed as a head.” We extend the application of Larson’s $V'$ Reanalysis rule to the $[V + \text{complement}]$ string, which compositionally assigns a theta-role to the direct object NP (in some sense behaving like a lexical predicate). Thus $[\text{prove innocent}]$ is reanalyzed as $V$ within the adjunct clause. The reanalyzed $V'$ then undergoes sideward verb movement to the matrix clause. Subsequently, the reanalyzed string must be “unpacked” to allow the following order in the matrix clause: $\text{prove}_1$, Della $[\text{t}_1 \text{ innocent}]$. If the direct object has raised to Spec of Agr-oP/vP overtly in these cases, then the complement $\text{innocent}$ may be stranded within VP while the verb raises to the left of Agr-oP/vP, yielding the surface order.

Note that such reanalysis does not apply to arbitrary strings within VP (it applies only to the $V'$ containing the $[V + \text{complement}]$ string in the case of Pseudogapping). This is potentially related to Levin’s (1979:55) point that Pseudogapping is blocked in contexts like the following (we have slightly modified Levin’s original examples):11

(42) Terry seems to want to try to impress John,
     *but he doesn’t seem to want to try to impress Bill.
     *but he doesn’t seem to want to try to impress Bill.
     *but he doesn’t seem to want to try to impress Bill.

11 The deviance of the first two Pseudogapping examples in (42) may ultimately be derived from a constraint that disallows some movements which strand infinitival to (see section 4.2).

A reviewer notes that $[\text{V}$ $V + \text{complement}]$ strings of apparently unbounded length can be Pseudogapped:

(i) Perry Mason can’t prove Paul to be likely to be the guilty party, but he can $[\text{VP}$ $[\text{V}$ $\text{prove to be likely to be the guilty party}]$ Della $]$.

We do not see this as problematic, since the length of the $[\text{V}$ $V + \text{complement}]$ string has no bearing on the application of the $V'$ Reanalysis rule in (41). We should note here that the facts may also be compatible with an approach which moves a remnant VP, instead of just $V$, as suggested for other reasons by Kayne (1998). Such an analysis of Pseudogapping would require the object to first move out of VP (reminiscent of the Lasnik/Jayaseelan analysis), with subsequent sideward movement of the remnant VP to the matrix clause. Though such an analysis may also be compatible with these data, space considerations preclude us from pursuing it here.
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In contrast, VPE works well in such contexts:

(43) Everyone says that Terry seems to want to try to impress John, but he really doesn’t seem to want to try to impress John.

We conclude this subsection. The VPE approach and the movement approach can both arrive at surface forms that have apparent discontinuous deletion (though they do so under differing views of constituency). 12

We now turn to empirical issues that favor the movement analysis.

4.2. Drawbacks of the VPE approach that the movement approach overcomes

We present here five principal empirical arguments in favor of the movement approach over the VPE one. First, the VPE approach to Pseudogapping suggests that syntactically Pseudogapping should be able to appear in structural environments in which VPE occurs (Pseudogapping being an instance of VPE). However, as noted previously, Pseudogapping occurs naturally in subordinate constructions but not in coordinate constructions, whereas VPE obtains equally well under both coordination and subordination: 13

(44) *Robin likes rutabagas, and/or she does(n’t) like lima beans.

(45) Robin likes rutabagas more than/as (much as) she does like lima beans.

12 Note that the movement analysis of Pseudogapping proposed here does not preclude the possibility of overt object movement out of VP (as suggested in the analyses of Lasnik and Jayaseelan). Unlike the case in (42), certain V + infinitival clauses may Pseudogap, leaving the object of the lower verb as the remnant:

(i) a. Sally liked to eat beans, but she didn’t like to eat rice.
   b. Sally asked to eat beans, but she didn’t ask to eat rice.

These suggest the possibility that the object first moves out of the lower VP, with subsequent V’ Reanalysis and sideward movement of the remnant [V + infinitival clause]. This possibility is apparently blocked in (42). Note that the same can apply in certain instances of Gapping (example from Ross 1970: 250).

(ii) I want to try to begin to write a novel, and Mary wants to try to begin to write a play.

Furthermore, object movement is suggested by island facts such as the following:

(iii) a. *Sally danced to impress Maribel, but she didn’t dance to impress Paul.
    b. *Sally left to eat beans, but she didn’t leave to eat rice.

Here, the object would have moved out of an adjunct infinitival clause, which constitutes an island. Overt object movement is compatible with either the VPE approach or the sideward V movement approach to Pseudogapping. Our argument will simply be that Pseudogapping cannot be subsumed under VPE. (We thank a reviewer for pointing out the relevance of these facts)

13 We depart from traditional assumptions by treating but clauses as subordinate clauses rather than coordinate ones (though but itself does not stand in C; see fn. 15). We base this on the observation that but patterns with subordinators rather than with coordinators in Gapping and Pseudogapping contexts (see section 3.2).
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(46) Robin likes rutabagas, and Kim does like rutabagas too.
(47) Robin likes rutabagas more than Kim does like rutabagas.

This follows naturally under the analysis that Pseudogapping results from sideward movement from an adjunct clause to a main clause (as opposed to Gapping, which results from movement from conjoined vPs).

Second, Levin (1979:54) notes that VPE readily allows for more than one supporting auxiliary, while Pseudogapping does not. Our judgments concur with Levin’s observation. We note the following contrast (we use a comparative environment and a polarity distinction between clauses for the Pseudogapping cases to ensure the most natural environment for the construction):

(48) Robin has been playing the oboe, and Kim has been playing the oboe too.
(49) ?*Robin hasn’t been playing the oboe as much as she has been playing the bassoon.
(50) Pat could have been drinking beer, and Kim could have been drinking beer too.
(51) ?*Pat couldn’t have been drinking beer as much as she could have been drinking gin.

The VPE approach cannot capture the contrast above syntactically. If Pseudogapping is just VPE, there should be no syntactic distinction between VPE and Pseudogapping with respect to multiple auxiliary environments. For the examples above, we propose that in multiple auxiliary constructions the auxiliaries occupy T and Aspect heads above v. In these cases the main verb is forced to remain below Aspect. For us, the degraded nature of the Pseudogapping examples follows from the failure of V to raise high enough.14

Third, VPE can apply “backward”, but Pseudogapping typically cannot (Levin 1979:53):

(52) a. Even if Kim could speak French, she wouldn’t speak French.
    b. As much as I should paint the kitchen, I won’t paint the kitchen.

14 When the Pseudogapping examples are made more parallel to the VPE examples the results improve slightly for some speakers (as pointed out by a reviewer), though they are still somewhat degraded:

(i) ?*Robin has been playing the oboe, but she hasn’t been playing the bassoon.
(ii) ?*Pat could have been drinking beer, but she couldn’t have been drinking sake.

Note that in (i) and (ii), there is greater “parallelism” in the shape of the main clause and subordinate clause (the examples in (49) and (51) of the text involve comparatives, normally the ideal environment for Pseudogapping). Though “parallelism” seems to have an ameliorating effect here (see fn 18 for further discussion of this effect), the deviance which we and our consultants detect is expected under the present analysis.
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Recall that we’ve proposed an isomorphism between Pseudogapping and Parasitic Gap constructions; an element undergoes sideward movement from an adjunct clause into the main clause, rather than from the main clause into an adjunct clause. Simply put, the forms in (52c,d) fail because they would presumably require sideward movement into the adjunct clause. However, the question arises as to what blocks sideward movement from the preposed adjunct clause into the matrix clause below.

We posit that the adjunct clause in such cases is directly merged in the position where it precedes the matrix clause. We assume that the adjunct clause and the matrix clause are constructed in parallel, and that the adjunct clause is adjoined leftward at the matrix CP level. Thus, the verb may move sideward from the adjunct clause into the matrix VP in much the same way as the licit cases of Pseudogapping discussed in section 3. We propose that the deviance of (52c,d) stems from the inability of a chain to be determined between the copy of the verb in the adjunct and the copy of the verb in the Asp head position in the matrix clause. Chain determination requires a c-command relation between a copy at the head of the chain and a copy at the foot of the chain. Chain determination is crucial if deletion of the foot of the chain is to take place in the phonological component; if there is no c-command relation between two copies, they do not constitute a chain, and deletion of one of the copies will not be licensed (Nunes & Uriagereka 2000). This is shown in the following representation of (52d) (copies are identified in angled brackets).
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Recall that there is only one occurrence of the verb ‘paint’ in the Numeration. The verb is first merged in the adjunct clause (copy 3). It is then copied and merged into the matrix VP (copy 2). The verb then raises out of the matrix vP to the Aspect head (copy 1). Note that normally two chains will be formed (a “regular” chain and a “parasitic” chain). A chain may be determined only if a c-command relation exists between the head of the chain and foot of the chain. Given that a chain is determined, the phonological component normally selects the foot of the chain for copy deletion. In (53), a chain is determined between copy 1 and copy 2 (constituting the “regular” chain), since copy 1 c-commands copy 2. This will allow copy 2 to be deleted in the phonological component. However, a chain is not determined between copy 1 and copy 3, since a c-command relation does not hold between the two. Therefore, copy deletion cannot apply, accounting for the deviance of the “backward” Pseudogapping cases in (52c,d). Since VPE is presumably not a movement process, chain identification should not affect its application.15

Fourth, as Levin (1979:53) writes, “VP Deletion can apply in infinitive clauses, while Pseudogapping cannot.” The following examples confirm this:

(54) a. Maybe I should read Ivanhoe, but I don’t have to read Ivanhoe.
    b. I don’t play chess as often as I would like to play chess.

15 A related fact comes from the (al)though type of construction:

(i) Although I can’t read Greek, I can read Latin.

Here it looks as though the subordinate clause, with the “subordinator” although, precedes the main clause and contains the landing site for the moved verb read; this comes contrary to expectations of the analysis, which posits sideward verb movement from the adjunct clause to the matrix clause, but not vice-versa. Other apparently similar cases, however, fail as expected:

(ii) *Before Merle reads Hamlet, she should read King Lear.

(iii) *Because Terry didn’t eat any vegetables, he won’t eat dessert.

There is reason to believe that although is not a true subordinator in the head of CP, but rather a CP-adjoined adverb:

(iv) Some people want me to learn Greek, although [why should I]? 

The presence of the wh-element and auxiliary inversion after although suggests that although does not occupy C. We claim that (i) above simply patterns with but-type Pseudogapping constructions; in effect we have a phonetically null but (whose overt form is in complementary distribution with although):

(v) [CP although [CP I can’t [VP [VP read1 Greek] [CP (but) I can’t1 Latin]]]]

Under this idea, the although-type Pseudogapping constructions do not prove exceptional; the first clause is actually the main clause rather than a subordinate one.
(55) a. *I have to read *Lady in the Lake, but I don’t have to read Ivanhoe.
    b. *I don’t play chess as often as I would like to play checkers.

Since VPE obtains so readily with the infinitival marker to as a left-remnant, it comes as a surprise that the correlating Pseudogapping forms should prove ungrammatical under the VPE approach. The present analysis, however, relies on movement rather than deletion. There may be independent motivation for ruling out some movements after an infinitival marker. Consider as one example VP Preposing. Although a VP may freely prepose when it leaves a finite auxiliary as a remnant, in some cases it cannot strand infinitival to:

(56) a. I said I am going to reform, and reform I certainly will t₁.
    b. She said she can speak Latin, and [speak Latin] she can t₁.

(57) a. *I said I would reform, and reform I certainly am going to t₁.
    b. *She said she is able to speak Latin, and [speak Latin] she is able to t₁.

It is not clear to us what the ungrammaticality of these cases with infinitival to arise from. In any case, attempted movement of the post-to V/VP fails. Since some constraint on movement seems to be involved, only the movement-based account of Pseudogapping, but not the VPE approach, seems to be consistent with the facts.¹⁶

Fifth, and perhaps most importantly, Pseudogapping, unlike VPE, shows sensitivity to well-known islands (as also observed by Levin 1979:53, where she states that “embedded” Pseudogappings are awkward; however, the awkward embedded contexts she refers to are island contexts, and not subordinate clauses in general). The examples below show VPE in complex NP and relative clause

---

¹⁶ We should note that the facts concerning the stranding of infinitival to are more complex; it is in fact possible in some cases to strand to via VP Preposing:

(i) a. ?I said I’d try to eat beans, and [eat beans] I’ll try to t₁.
    b. ?I said she’d want to eat rice, and [eat rice] she wants to t₁.

We should note here that the examples in (57) in the text involve “semi-modal” be going to, be able to, whereas the examples in (i) do not. Whatever the factor is that licenses VP Preposing in these latter cases, it does not license Pseudogapping in the same environments:

(ii) a. *I’d try to eat beans, but I wouldn’t try to eat rice.
    b. *She wanted to eat rice, but she didn’t want to eat beans.

Importantly, Zagona (1988) argues that VPE is generally licensed in infinitival clauses in the same places where VP Preposing can strand infinitival to. Notice that the same correlation does not hold between VP Preposing and Pseudogapping, suggesting, again, that Pseudogapping should not be subsumed under VPE.
domains, both of which are grammatical. The corresponding Pseudogapping cases in the same environments are ungrammatical. This is a distinction that not only raises questions for the VPE approach to Pseudogapping, but also suggests that Pseudogapping crucially involves verb movement and, equally importantly, that the differences we’ve pointed out between VPE and Pseudogapping are syntactic differences, not pragmatic ones. The contrast in grammaticality between the VPE examples in (58, 59) and the Pseudogapping examples in (60, 61) shows this distinction:

(58) Robin will fascinate the children, and I believe [the claim [that Kim will fascinate the children too]].
(59) Robin can speak French, and she has [a friend [who can speak French too]].

(60) *Robin won’t fascinate the children, but I believe [the claim [that she will fascinate the adults]].
(61) *Robin can’t speak French, but she has [a friend [who can speak Italian]].

Under our analysis, Pseudogapping requires verb raising, which is subject to constraints on movement. We make the assumption that relative clauses and appositional clauses in pure complex NPs are adjuncts, and that movement out of these domains violates the CED. We follow Nunes & Uriagereka’s (2000) argument that CED effects arise because syntactic domains such as adjuncts are delivered to PF through cyclic Spell-Out for linearization purposes prior to extraction of an element from that particular domain. Once a chunk of structure is spelled out and delivered to PF, elements within that chunk are no longer accessible to operations within the syntax. What makes the situation in (60, 61) different from grammatical instances of Pseudogapping is that, in the ungrammatical cases (60, 61), the adjunct within which the verb is originally merged is already “too far embedded” by the time the matrix VP is being constructed (assuming the derivation proceeds in phases (Chomsky 2000)). The adjunct clause in these cases is adjoined to NP, and once that NP is constructed, the adjunct must be spelled out for linearization purposes. The single verb in the numeration cannot be copied to the matrix clause, because the adjunct containing the verb has already been delivered to PF, making the verb inaccessible to movement. The ungrammaticality of (60, 61) thus falls under the same account that gets the ungrammaticality of “doubly embedded” Parasitic Gaps:

(62) *Which book did you finally read [after leaving the bookstore [without finding ]]?
For us, the ill-formed Pseudogapping examples fall out under a general constraint on sideward movement.\textsuperscript{17} Since VPE does not involve movement, no island effect results.\textsuperscript{18}

We conclude this section by noting that the differences we have discussed between VPE and Pseudogapping can be given a syntactic explanation. If this is correct, then they point to a fundamental syntactic distinction between VPE and Pseudogapping that does not simply reduce to discourse/pragmatic distinctions between the two. We mention this because it can be argued (as Lasnik 1999a suggests) that Pseudogapping is simply an instance of VPE, with the observed differences falling out from differences in discourse properties (e.g., Pseudogapping may be a more pragmatically restricted variant of VPE). However, we have argued that the differences we have outlined can be derived from a single syntactic distinction: that Pseudogapping involves movement, but VPE does not.\textsuperscript{19} We point particularly to the fact that Pseudogapping, but not VPE, obeys islands. This is a particularly clear argument for a fundamental syntactic difference

\textsuperscript{17} In our analysis, verb movement is a property of narrow syntax and thus is subject to syntactic constraints on movement. This is contrary to the view expressed in Chomsky (2000:149; see also Boeckx & Stjepanović 2001), who suggests that verb displacement may be a property of the post-Spell-Out derivation to PF.

\textsuperscript{18} A reviewer points out that if one makes the two clauses in the Pseudogapping examples (60, 61) more “parallel” (where the clause containing the ‘antecedent’ verb has a more closely matching shape with the clause containing the Pseudogap), then the examples seem to improve slightly:

(i) a. ??I believe the claim that Robin won’t fascinate the children, but I don’t believe the claim that she will fascinate the adults.
   b. ??Robin has a friend who can speak French, but she doesn’t have a friend who can speak Italian.

It might be concluded from this that these Pseudogappings actually involve ellipsis, since a requirement of “parallelism” is a property often seen in constructions involving ellipsis (Fox 2000). However, interestingly—and for (perhaps extra-syntactic) reasons that we do not quite understand—the same subtle ameliorating effect occurs with some more obvious cases of movement, shown in the (b) cases below (underlining represents heavy intonation on the matrix subject):

(ii) a. *Who1 do you believe the claim that Robin will fascinate t1 ?
   b. I believe the claim that Robin will fascinate the children; (but) ?Who1 do you believe the claim that Robin will fascinate t1 ?

(iii) a. *Which language1 does Terry have a friend who can speak t1 ?
   b. (I know that) Robin has a friend who can speak French; (but) ?Which language1 does Terry have a friend who can speak t1 ?

Thus, the slight ameliorating effect of “parallelism” on Pseudogapping out of islands may not necessarily argue against a movement account.

\textsuperscript{19} Perhaps advantageously, we can remain noncommittal as to whether VPE forms result from true deletion (as Lasnik must suppose) or from phonetically null VP proforms, as advocated by Lobeck (1995). Should Lobeck’s analysis actually prove more attractive in the long run, the present analysis can go through unchanged, though Lasnik’s analysis would become untenable.
between Pseudogapping and VPE, which suggests that more than discourse distinctions are involved.\(^{20}\)

5. Conclusion

We have argued, somewhat paradoxically, that Pseudogapping and Gapping are the same, but different. They are the same in that they both involve apparent ATB verb movement. They are different in that Pseudogapping shows apparent “asymmetric” ATB movement. We analyze ATB movement in terms of sideward copy movement along the lines of Nunes & Uriagereka (2000) and Nunes (2001) for Parasitic Gaps (along with certain background assumptions regarding the nature of sideward movement, linearization, and multiple Spell-out pursued in Nunes 2001 and Uriagereka 1999). In this way, we can connect both the empirical similarities and differences between Pseudogapping and Gapping. We have also shown some empirical differences between Pseudogapping and VPE that raise substantial questions for a VPE approach to Pseudogapping. Thus, Levin’s original conjecture that Pseudogapping is transformationally unrelated to both Gapping and VPE is only partially correct: Pseudogapping and VPE do seem to be fundamentally unrelated transformationally, but Pseudogapping and Gapping share verb movement across the board.

If it is on the right track, the present analysis suggests several interesting lines of research, including investigation into the crosslinguistic distribution of Pseudogapping and like phenomena, and careful study of other constructions which, like Pseudogapping and Parasitic Gaps, exhibit diagnostics of sideward movement.
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\(^{20}\) There are, of course, several discourse properties that restrict the distribution of Pseudogapping in spoken English, and many of these are pointed out by Levin. Among these are the preference for coreferential subjects, polarity distinctions between clauses, comparative environments, and the freedom of Pseudogapping outside of comparative environments with psychological predicates (a point which we did not discuss here). We simply note that many aspects of the construction point to a fundamental syntactic difference as well between Pseudogapping and VPE.
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