On Pseudogapping*

Jeong-Shik Lee
(Wonkwang University)

Lee, Jeong-Shik. 1999. On Pseudogapping. *Linguistics*, 7-1, 85-99. This paper mainly deals with restrictions on pseudogapping reported in terms of stativity of the main verbs (Levin 1978). More observation reveals that the restrictions in question are rather due to the Case-assigning ability of the main verbs. Under the analysis where the pseudogapping remnants are raised to Spec F(ocus) to check off the contrastive focus feature (cf. J.-S. Kim 1999), I propose that Infl containing an overt auxiliary verb needed in pseudogapping interacts with the Case feature of the main verbs to license the gap in pseudogapping constructions. In addition, the improvement of normal pseudogapping in the context of comparative pseudogapping is also accounted for under the movement approach to comparative constructions. (Wonkwang University)

1. Introduction

Ellipsis phenomena, as illustrated in (1)-(3) below, have received much attention in recent syntactic study under the minimalist framework (Chomsky 1995, Lasnik 1995 and others).

(1) John played the guitar, and Mary ___ the violin. (Gapping)
(2) John played the guitar, and Mary did ___, too.   (VP-ellipsis)
(3) ?John played the guitar, and Mary did ___ the violin.

                                                    (Pseudogapping)

In (1) gapping deletes the verb, with the object left, and in (2) VP-ellipsis deletes the main verb and the object, with the auxiliary verb

---

left. In (3), pseudogapping deletes only the main verb, with the auxiliary and the object left, sharing the properties of both gapping and VP-ellipsis. (Pseudogappings are normally considered awkward.)

The focus of recent discussion on these phenomena has been on how to obtain elliptic sites. Recently, PF deletion approach gains support (Chomsky 1995, Lasnik 1995, among others). Levin (1978) reported that some cases of pseudogapping with stative verbs are in sharp contrast with those with non-stative verbs, and are greatly improved in the context of comparative pseudogapping. In this paper, under the above recent trend I mainly deal with these restrictions.

2.   Examples of Pseudogapping

I present three types of pseudogapping examples mostly from Levin (1978). Examples in (4)-(6) are named regular pseudogapping.[1]

(4) ?If you don't believe me, you will _____ the weather man!

(5) ?Kathy likes astronomy, but she doesn't _____ meteorology.

(6) ?Sue will eat dog biscuits, and Neil will _____ goldfish.

Next, examples of causative pseudogapping are illustrated in (7)-(9).

(7) A: I'd like to know how that thing works. It really fascinates me.
    B: ?It doesn't _____ me.

(8) A: Drinks like that knock me over.
    B: They would _____ me _____.

(9) A: Does it [writing a check at the grocery store] usually take this long?
    B: No. It never did _____ me _____ before.

---

1. On the other hand, gapping can obtain only in coordinate construction:

   i) *Kathy likes astronomy, but she _____ meteorology.

Finally, examples of comparative pseudogapping are given in (10)-(12).

(10) She doesn't understand me as well as I do ____ her.
(11) I want to date Bill more fervently than Jill does ____ Ted.
(12) ... if he had my dad teaching him and working him like he did ____ me, he would be good.

Comparative pseudogappings are found better than regular and causative pseudogappings, as observed in the following contrast.

(13) a. ?Tom only shovels sidewalks, but Harry will ____ driveways.
     b.   Tom shovels more sidewalks than Harry will ____ driveways.
(14) a. ?Maybe it makes you feel bad, but it doesn't ____ me ____.
     b.   It makes me feel as bad as it does ____ you ____.

Some examples of regular pseudogapping become dramatically improved in the context of comparative pseudogapping, as seen in the following contrast.

(15) a. *You probably just feel relieved, but I do ____ jubilant.
     b.   I probably feel more jubilant than you do ____ relieved.

Another fact of interest, due to Levin (1978), is that comparatives are systematically different from non-comparatives. All comparatives have inherent contrast, which is not found in non-comparatives. Non-comparative pseudogappings are greatly improved when they have a contrast. If they are to attain the same degree of acceptability as comparative pseudogappings, they usually require both reverse polarity in the left and right conjuncts and a fair amount of focus stress. The following contrast between (16) and (17) shows that an element of contrast is required in non-comparative pseudogappings (Kuno 1975).

(16) A: Where did John visit museums?

      B: He visited museums/*did ____ in London.

(17) Mary did not visit museums in Paris, but she did ___ in London.

The difference between (16B) and (17) shows that the contrast in polarity saves (17), which is otherwise bad, as seen in (16B).

    The contrast found in the following examples from Levin (1978) confirms the observation that the pseudogapping remnant should have a contrast.

(18) a. ?Laura notified a cop, and Gus did ___ a sheriff.

     b. *Laura notified a cop_i, and Gus did ___ him_i, too.

(19) a.   I'll go home right now, and Joe should ___ soon.

     b. ??I'll go home right now, and Joe should ___ right now, too.

In the above acceptable pseudogapping sentences in (18a, 19a), the pseudogapping remnant contrasts with its corresponding constituent in the antecedent clause. The lack of this contrast in the (b) examples of (18, 19) explains the status of them.

    In sum, it is seen that pseudogapping remnant should have a contrast such as reverse polarity or focus stress, and that comparative pseudogapping needs additional analysis.

3.   Overt Object Shift vs. Focus Movement

Lasnik (1995) offers an overt object shift analysis for pseudogapping, arguing against the HNPS (Heavy NP shift) analysis of Jayaseelan (1990). According to Jayaseelan, the discontinuous gap in the second conjunct in (20) results from deletion of VP after *Smith* undergoes HNPS, as in (21).

(20) The DA proved Jones guilty and the Assistant DA
     will ____ Smith ____.

(21) The DA proved Jones guilty and the Assistant DA
    will [$_{VP}$ [$_{VP}$ prove t$_i$ guilty] Smith$_i$]

Although Lasnik agrees with Jayaseelan in that the pseudogapping
remnant is obtained via movement, he argues that it cannot result from
HNPS but from overt object shift to Spec AgrO. The pseudogapping
possibility in the following double object construction illustrates the
point.

(22) a. ?John gave Bill a lot of money, and Mary will ___ Susan ___.
                                     (Pseudogapping)
    b. *John gave t a lot of money [the fund for the preservation of
       VOS languages].   (HNPS)
(23) a. *John gave Bill a lot of money, and Mary will _____ a lot of
       advice.   (Pseudogapping)
    b. John gave Bill t yesterday [more money than he had ever seen].
                                        (HNPS)

In (22) the first object is a good pseudogapping remnant but it cannot
be moved by HNPS. On the other hand, in (23) the second object is a
poor pseudogapping remnant but it can undergo HNPS.
    Lasnik (1995) proposes that pseudogapping results from VP deletion,
preceded by overt object shift of the remnant to Spec AgrO. This
proposal is also tied to the observation that the good pseudogapping
remnant is accusative Case-marked NP. Thus, (20) is derived by
deletion of VP in the second conjunct containing the trace of the object
shifted to Spec AgrO:

(24) The DA [$_{AgrOP}$ Jones$_i$ [$_{AgrO'}$ [$_{VP}$ proved t$_i$ guilty]]] and the Assistant
    DA will [$_{AgrOP}$ Smith$_j$ [$_{AgrO'}$ [$_{VP}$ (proved   t$_j$ guilty)]]]

In (24) the object *Smith* in the second conjunct overtly moves to Spec
AgrO to check the strong EPP feature in AgrO. At this stage, where

the verb has not raised yet, the VP in the second conjunct is deleted to yield (20). Lasnik suggests that the verb has a strong theta-features to be checked off in overt syntax. If the verb is not raised, the unchecked strong feature in V will cause the derivation to crash. But if the VP containing this verb is deleted in PF, that problematic feature will be deleted by a PF deletion operation.

The contrast between (22a) and (23a) is accounted for: in (22a) the first object is raised to Spec AgrO, and then the VP (containing the verb and the second object) is deleted; while in (23a) the second object cannot be raised to Spec AgrO over the first object (due to minimality), and thus, the first object cannot be deleted alone unless the second object is deleted, hence the ill-formedness.

PPs can also be the pseudogapping remnants:

(25) a. John spoke to Bill, and Mary should _____ to Susan.
   b. John talked about linguistics and Mary will ____ about philosophy.

Under the above NP object shift analysis, a question arises as to what raises PP remnants. Lasnik suggests that the EPP feature is also responsible for it. This is not implausible since the PPs in (25) are complements of the verbs.

J.-S. Kim (1999), however, pointed out that in examples like (26) below, the PP remnants are not complements of the verbs, but they are more like adjuncts. So it is not clear that the PPs in (26) should move to Spec AgrO to check off the EPP feature.

(26) a. ?John swam beside Bill and Mary did _____ beside Susan.
   b. ?John stood near Bill and Mary should _____ near Susan.

The more acute point can be made by the following examples.

(27) I can't go back to Madison now, but I can _____ next week.

(28) Mary did not visit museums in Paris, but she did _____ in London.
                                                               (=17)

In the above examples, despite the fact that the most likely candidates for EPP feature checking are PP and NP complements, the apparent pseudogapping remnants are peripheral adjuncts. So there must be another reason for raising pseudogapping remnants. As observed in section 2, the raising in question seems to be motivated not by EPP feature checking but by reasons of contrast. J.-S. Kim (1999) suggests that this movement occurs to check off the contrastive focus feature at Spec v (or Spec AgrO). Basically in line with Lasnik (1995) and J.-S. Kim (1999), I suggest that pseudogapping remnants raise to Spec F(ocus) above vP (or AgrOP) for the contrastive focus feature checking. This is because the complement of the verb in examples like (28) raises to Spec v (or Spec AgrO) to check off the strong EPP feature.

Lasnik (1995), however, may say that examples (26)-(28) simply result from ordinary VP-ellipsis affecting the verb and its complement, if any, but not from pseudogapping, since the apparent pseudogapping remnants, being the adjuncts, are far out from V. Even if this is the case, the apparent pseudogapping remnants in examples like (27, 28) should be raised above the complements shifted to Spec AgrO for the strong EPP feature checking. Otherwise these remnants cannot survive at the point of deletion. (See also section 4 on this matter.)

With this much background, I now turn to restrictions on pseudogapping.

4. Restrictions on Pseudogapping

Levin (1978) observed that stative verbs cannot figure in regular pseudogappings: psych perception verbs (e.g., *smell, taste, sound, look)* and raising verbs (e.g., *seem, appear, turn out*).

(29) *Rona looked/sounded annoyed, and Sue did ___ frustrated.

(30) *The watchdog appeared/seemed/turned out (to be) friendly,
    but the house dog did ___ ferocious.
(31) A: These leeks look/smell/taste terrible.
    B: *Your steak will ___ better.
        *The onion rings do ___ even worse.

It appears that those verbs which are the least active are the worst in pseudogappings. Pseudogapping with these verbs are worse than that with stative verbs that take NP complements (e.g., *own, have, contain, constitute, believe, like*):2)

(32) ?We don't own a house, but we do ___ a trailer.
(33) ?They have a United flight from New York to Chicago every hour.
    I don't know if they do ___ TWA ___.
(34) ?If you don't believe me, you will _____ the weather man! (=4)
(35) ?Kathy likes astronomy, but she doesn't _____ meteorology. (=5)

The following causative pseudogappings, where non-agentive verbs have stative properties, can have NP complements.

(36) A: I'd like to know how that thing works. It really fascinates me.
    B: ?It doesn't _____ me.   (=6)
(37) A: Drinks like that knock me over.
    B: They would _____ me _____.   (=7)
(38) A: Does it [writing a check at the grocery store] usually take this
        long?
    B: No. It never did _____ me _____ before.   (=8)

---

2. The auxiliary *do* makes pseudogappings slightly worse than a modal does.

(i) This bottle might contain sulfuric acid, but it ?shouldn't/??doesn't ___ copper sulfate.

This contrast suggests that the auxiliary *do* does not show up if the first conjunct contains a modal auxiliary. I leave this contrast for further study.

The contrast between (29-31) and (32-35, 36-38) might be described in terms of the category of the pseudogapping remnants: the examples in (29, 30) have adjectival complements and the sentences in (31) have adverbial complements; on the other hand, the examples in (32-35, 36-38) have NP complements.

This distinction appears to fit into the object shift analysis combined with EPP feature checking in Lasnik (1995), since adjectival and adverbial complements, unlike NP and PP complements, are not likely to raise to Spec AgrO to check off the EPP feature.

But this analysis does not go through since peripheral adjuncts in examples like (39)-(40) can make good pseudogapping remnants.

(39) I can't go back to Madison now, but I can _____ next week.
(=27)

(40) Mary did not visit museums in Paris, but she did _____ in London.
(=28)

In both examples, the elements that undergo object shift to check off the strong EPP feature will be the complements of the verbs, but not the apparent pseudogapping remnants. If so, the deletion of these complements will undesirably delete these remnants as well, yielding the wrong result. Especially, an adverbial pseudogapping remnant is allowed in (39), unlike in (31).

So the contrast in question must be handled in another way. Levin (1978) said that this contrast may eventually refer to the kind of stative verb since the type of complement is determined by the verb. Thus, it may be said that verbs with stative properties cannot form non-comparative pseudogappings.

But a question arises as to why some stative verbs are more easily pseudogapped than other stative verbs when they have an NP complement. I suspect that the relevant property that can license a pseudogap is Case -- some stative verbs that take an NP complement have Case-assigning ability, while other stative verbs that take a

complement other than an NP lack this ability. An initial generalization will then be that verbs with Case-assigning ability allow pseudogapping, stative or non-stative, but verbs with no such ability do not allow it. Of course, as observed before, pseudogapping possibility is closely associated with a contrastive focus as well. J.-S. Kim's (1998) analysis needs more work on the contrast in question in that it must be able to exclude cases like (29-31).

The following good pseudogappings, however, must not be excluded, though the verbs here are apparently non-Case-assigners.

(41) a. John spoke to Bill, and Mary should _____ to Susan.
     b. John talked about linguistics and Mary will ___ about
        philosophy.   (=25)
(42)   I can't go back to Madison now, but I can _____ next week.
                                                            (=27, 39)
(43) a. ?John swam beside Bill and Mary did _____ beside Susan.
     b. ?John stood near Bill and Mary should _____ near Susan. (=26)

To maintain the above Case generalization, I suggest that a non-Case-assigner and the preposition in the following complement PP combine into a reanalyzed category that bears Case-assigning ability. Now under this suggestion the pseudogap in (41, 42) can be allowed.[3]

In cases like (43), however, the PP is not a complement of the verb, (though Lasnik 1995 considers it a complement,) and thus, reanalysis

---

3. Similar problematic examples of pseudogapping that can be treated in the same way are found in imperatives and nonfinites (Warner 1993:13):

(i) a. I hope you are patient with father. And please be ___ with mother.
    b. Which was more surprising: for Paul to be angry with Mary or for John
       to be ___ with Christine.

In (i) the remnants are PPs, which are complements of non-Case-assigning adjectival predicates.

between the verb and the preposition will not be possible. If so, they must be allowed in a different manner. I treat these apparent pseudogappings as instances resulting from ordinary VP-deletion, considering that the remnants are far out from V or in the outer VP, as alluded in section 3 (cf. Levin 1978). Notice also that in (42) the gap results from deleting the verb and its PP complement. Thus, example (42) can also be described as an instance of ordinary VP-deletion. This implies that ordinary VP-ellipsis affecting the verb and its complement is not sensitive to the Case-assigning ability of the main verbs, but the pseudogapping in its core case, as in (3), is sensitive to it.

If (42, 43) are instances of VP-ellipsis rather than pseudogapping, Lasnik's (1995) basic analysis appears to have no particular problems. As pointed out in section 3, however, his analysis needs further elaboration in order to raise adjunct remnants in examples like (39, 40). Also examples like (15a) and (29)-(31), where adjectival and adverbial complements cannot remain as pseudogapping remnants, require more work on his analysis (e.g., (39) vs. (31)).

Under the present treatment, the remnants in (42, 43) undergo raising to Spec F for contrastive focus feature checking, and the apparent pseudogaps result from ordinary VP-ellipsis.

5. What Licenses the Gap in Pseudogapping?

In Aarts (1997), an observation of the VP gap is provided, the gap resulting from VP-preposing.

(44) a. Ralph says that he will clean his room, and [clean his room] he will _____.
   b. *Ralph says that he will clean his room, and [will clean his room] he _____.
(45) a. Sally said that she returned my book, and [return my book] she did _____.

    b. *Sally said that she returned my book, and [returned my book]
       she _____.

It is noticed that the VP gap is possible only if an overt auxiliary verb appears. The only difference between VP-preposing construction and pseudogapping construction is that in the former the VP is preposed and in the latter the VP is deleted. This leads us to say that an overt auxiliary licenses the gap in some way.

    The next question is then what makes pseudogapping with some stative verbs unacceptable but that with some others acceptable. In section 4, I claimed that Case-assigning ability of the main verbs is responsible for this difference. In addition, the property of Infl containing an overt auxiliary needs to be specified in relation to a Case-assigning main verb and a non-Case-assigning main verb. This means that Infl with a Case-assigning main verb has a certain property that can license the gap in pseudogapping, while Infl with a non-Case-assigning main verb doesn't have this property. To implement this, I suggest that Infl containing an overt auxiliary verb interacts with the Case feature of the main verbs to yield the contrast in question.

    Finally, the following contrast needs further explanation.

(46) a. *You probably just feel relieved, but I do ___ jubilant.
    b. I probably feel more jubilant than you do ___ relieved.　(=15)

Under the present analysis, in (46a,b) the adjectival complements will be raised to Spec F to check off the contrastive focus feature. In (46a) the remaining [$_{VP}$ feel $t_{jubilant}$] will be deleted by pseudogapping. The pseudogap, however, cannot be licensed since Infl containing the auxiliary verb *do* interacts with the non-Case-assigning main verb *feel*, hence the ill-formedness. Nevertheless, the pseudogap in the comparative (46b) is good. This requires a separate treatment. For the above contrast, no explanation is provided yet in the literature. In what follows, I will briefly offer one explanation in terms of VP operator

movement.

Since Chomsky (1977) movement analysis has been widely accepted for comparatives. In this paper, I also assume that movement is involved in the comparative in (46b). That is, in (46b) [vp feel t_relieved] undergoes an operator movement to Spec CP, as represented below.

(47) I probably feel more jubilant than [cp [vp feel t_relieved]_i [ip you do t_i relieved]].

The deletion of the moved VP in Spec CP in (47) will yield the comparative pseudogapping in (46b). Here the question is how the pseudogap, which is normally not licensed as in (46a), is salvaged in (46b, 47). I assume that the VP operator in Spec CP is licensed under the predication relation with its antecedent in the preceding clause (see Dekydtspotter 1992 and Lee 1995 for the same analysis provided to account for predicate clefting phenomena). The pseudogap in (46b, 47) can then be licensed by its antecedent VP operator, which is not available in (46a).

6. Summary

In this paper I presented three types of pseudogapping examples from Levin (1978). The observation of them revealed that a pseudogapping remnant should have a contrast with its corresponding constituent in the antecedent clause. The overt object shift analysis for pseudogapping in Lasnik (1995) was reviewed. In this analysis the movement is motivated by the need for checking the strong EPP feature. But it appears that not all constituents are raised for the EPP feature checking. This thus led to an analysis in which movement takes place to check off the contrastive focus feature at Spec F(ocus) so that it can refer to adjuncts as well (cf. J.-S. Kim 1999).

Under the latter focus movement analysis, I proposed to deal with the contrast between pseudogappings with stative verbs and those with

non-stative verbs. With more observation on the contrast, I claimed that the key feature responsible for the contrast in question is Case. The main point of the proposal was that Infl containing an overt auxiliary can licence the pseudogap only when this Infl interacts with the Case feature of the main verbs, but not when this Infl interacts with non-Case-assigning main verbs. How Case enables Infl to license the pseudogap with the interaction of the Case feature of the main verbs requires more technical elaboration.

References

Aarts, Bas (1997). *English Syntax and Argumentation*. London: Macmillan Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1977). "On Wh-movement," in P. Culicover et al., eds., *Formal Syntax*, 71-132. New York: Academic Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Dekydtspotter, Laurent (1992). "The Syntax of Predicate Clefts," in *Proceedings of NELS* 22, 119-133. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Jayaseelan, K. A. (1990). "Incomplete VP Deletion and Gapping," *Linguistic Analysis* 20, 64-81.

Kim, Jeong-Seok (1999). "What Moves Pseudogapping Remnants?" ms., Korea University, Seoul.

Kuno, Susumu (1975). "Conditions for Verb Phrase Deletion," *Foundations of Language* 13, 535-562.

Lasnik, Howard (1995). "A Note on Pseudogapping," in R. Pensalfini and H. Ura, eds., *The MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 27, Papers on Minimalist Syntax*, 143-163. Cambridge, Mass.: MITWPL.

Lee, Jeong-Shik (1998). "A Study on Predicate Clefting," *Studies in Generative Grammar* 5-2, 531-584.

Levin, Nancy (1978). "Some Identity-of-Sense Deletions Puzzle Me. Do They You?" in *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 229-240.

Warner, Anthony (1993). *English Auxiliaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

English Department
Wonkwang University
344-2 Shinyong-dong, Iksan
Chonbuk 57-749, Korea
E-mail: jslee@wonnms.wonkwang.ac.kr