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1. Pseudogapping and Gapping: Introduction

This paper introduces a new movement-based analysis of Pseudogapping (PG) that unifies PG with Gapping and improves both conceptually and empirically on Lasnik's (1995, 1999) analysis of PG Levin (1979) gives the name Pseudogapping to forms that show apparent verbal deletion under identity, with a tensed auxiliary as a left remnant. The following provide simple examples:

1. a. Robin could speak French before Kim could speak Russian
   b. Pat will attend CSU and Terry will attend CSU

   On the other hand, Gapping shows apparent verbal deletion without any remnant auxiliaries. The following provide simple cases:

2. a. Pat loves Fresno, and Terry loves Clovis
   b. Robin ate beans, and Kim ate rice

PG and Gapping share some superficial similarities: i) a main verb (at least) deletes in both; ii) both require remnants on both sides of the apparent deletion. This alone suggests the plausibility of a unified analysis for the two. More compelling motivation, however, comes from a previously unnoticed implicational universal:

3. If a language exhibits PG, it also exhibits Gapping.

   We know of no language that falsifies the above statement. Example languages in keeping with (3) include (PG in (a), Gapping in (b));

4. German
   a. Robin konnte Russische sprechen bevor Kim Französisch konnte
      'Robin could speak Russian before Kim could French'
   b. Robin verkauft Fisch, und Kim Reis
      'Robin sells fish, and Kim rice'

5. Latvian
   a. Vina var runat angļu, un viņš var itāļu
      She can speak English, and he can Italian
   b. Vina runat angļu, un viņš itāļu
      She speaks English and he Italian

6. American Sign Language
   a. I WILL READ BOOK, YOU WILL READ MAGAZINE
   b. I PREFER FISH, YOU PREFER CHICKEN

   There are, however, languages that exhibit Gapping but not PG. Spanish gives one example:

7. Robin comió los frijoles, y Kim el arroz
   'Robin ate beans, and Kim rice'

8. *Robin puede hablar español, y Kim puede inglés
   'Robin can speak Spanish, and Kim can English'

   The above one-way implicational universal in addition to the aforementioned similarities motivates us to analyze PG as a marked type of Gapping. We do this by accepting Johnson's (1994) Gapping analysis and extending its spirit to cover PG as well.

2. Johnson's Gapping Analysis

Johnson analyses Gapping as resulting from Across-the-Board verb movement from conjoined VPs.
I. \(\text{and} \)

Note that in this analysis, Gapping, contrary to the traditional deletion analysis, does not underlyingly consist of two full clauses; we have VP-coordination rather than conjoined CPs. The verbs (obligatorily) undergo V-to-I movement in ATB fashion. The subject of the first conjunct raises from [Spec, VP] to [Spec, IP]; Johnson suggests that Case requirements override the Coordinate Structure Constraint violation. The subject of the second conjunct remains in its [Spec, VP] position. This analysis makes several correct predictions that a deletion-based analysis cannot. First, Gapping constructions require non-coreferential subjects.

10. *Pat loves Fresno, and Pat/she, Clovis

This falls out under binding theory, since the subject of the first conjunct, from its landing site of [Spec, IP], \(c\)-commands the in situ subject of the second conjunct. Johnson’s analysis also correctly predicts that Gapping prohibits an S-adverb on the second conjunct, which is actually a VP rather than CP:

11. *Certainly, Pat loves Fresno, and [\(\text{VP probably, [W } \text{Terry I Clovis]}\)]

Also, Gapping can show “quirky Case” on the second conjunct:

12. Robin cooked the fish, and him/she, the rice

The possibility of quirky Case follows from the fact the second subject never undergoes a checking relationship within IP. These virtues seem sufficiently strong for us to analyze PG in a similarly-spirited fashion.

3. The New Pseudogapping Analysis

In our effort to show PG as essentially a more marked case of Gapping, we propose:

13. Pseudogapping results from ATB V-to-I movement from a VP and a subordinate CP.

We assume that subordinate clauses adjoin to VP. Under the new analysis, the structure for (1a) becomes:

14. Robin, T could

This analysis makes several important correct predictions. First, we have a correct expectation for the aforementioned implicational universal: PG \(\rightarrow\) Gapping. Both result from ATB V-to-I, so that languages \(\text{standardly}\) showing V-to-I will be candidates to exhibit Gapping and PG. However, the asymmetric nature of PG makes it the marked case. We assume that UG permits symmetrical ATB “for free,” but that...
asymmetric ATB will come at some cost. So a language might show Gapping but not PG (Spanish), but never the other way around.

Second, the new analysis predicts that any language without V-to-I movement will have neither PG nor Gapping. Vietnamese, Thai and Mandarin support this prediction. Consider Vietnamese, in which verbs lack inflection totally, suggesting that they never raise to I.

16. Kim đọc sách, read books

Vietnamese also fails all other traditional diagnostics of verb movement (no inversion in questions, etc.). And without verb raising, Vietnamese can show neither Gapping nor PG:

17. a. *Kim ăn cá, và Robin ăn bo, eat fish and beef (Gapping bad)
   'Kim eats fish, and Robin beef'

18. a. *Kim sẽ mua một chiếc xe trước Robin sẽ mua một cái nhà, (PG bad)
   'Kim will buy a car before Robin will a house'

Note that a deletion-based analysis simply has to stipulate that Vietnamese-type languages lack deletion; with a movement-based analysis, though, we have an explanation based on prior principles.

Third, this analysis predicts Gapping will sound less marked than PG in languages that allow both. In Gapping constructions, Case requirements within IP motivate the ATB V-to-I movement. However, in PG the ATB V-to-I stands as truly optional. Neither the main clause nor the subordinate clause needs to satisfy Case requirements. In addition, the asymmetric nature of the ATB in PG makes it marked.

Fourth, PG actually sounds more natural with a subordinator than it does with a coordinator. This falls out under our analysis, since we say PG crucially involves subordination:

19. Robin could speak French (and) before Kim could Russian

Were the diagram in (14) to show the word and, it would have to show it in a C position; in this case and would serve as a "defective" subordinator of sorts. Since before more naturally fills the C position, its PG form sounds better. For its part, Gapping requires pw coodination.

In addition, the analysis predicts that PG, unlike Gapping, allows for coreferential subjects. This follows since PG involves a subordinate clause, with the consequent binding domain (contrast w/(10) for Gapping):

20. Robin could speak French [CF before she] could Russian

We point this out primarily because Levin gives the above as the principal argument for not showing PG and Gapping as related. We have seen, though, that we can capture the similarities between the two from the fact that they both involve ATB V-to-I, while capturing the important differences with the claim that the ATB proceeds from different types of conjuncts.

4. Pseudogapping: NOT a Special Case of VPE

Lasnik (1995, 1999) has offered an interesting analysis of PG as a special case of Verb Phrase Ellipsis (VPE). Here, we show several problems for Lasnik’s idea that the new analysis does not face. Lasnik shows PG as a two-step process: 1) overt raising of a verbal complement to [Spec, Agr-op], followed by 2) VPE. So a sample derivation becomes:

21. a. Robin könnte Russische sprechen bevor Kim konnte Französisch sprechen, could Russian before French could
   'Robin could speak Russian before Kim could French'
b. *Robin könne Fisch essen und Kim könne auch Fisch essen, can eat fish, and Kim can also (VPE bad)

However, this forces the prediction that any and all languages with PG must have VPE as well. This prediction simply does not bear out:

22. German
   a. *Robin konnte Russische sprechen bevor Kim konnte Französisch sprechen, could Russian before French could
   'Robin could speak Russian before Kim could French'
   b. *Robin könne Fisch essen und Kim könne auch Fisch essen (VPE bad)

23. Latvian
   a. Vina var runat angliski, un vina var Italiani, (PG good)
   She can speak English, and he can Italian
   b. *Vina var runat angliski, un vina var Italiani (VPE bad)
   She can speak English, and he can also

Our analysis (apparently correctly) connects PG with Gapping, rather than WE, in the implicational universal.

Lasnik’s analysis faces other empirical problems as well. Lasnik relies on [Spec, Agr-op] as a landing site for the overt movement of the surface right remnant. The following examples, though, prove unlikely candidates for such overt raising:
24. a. You behaved shamefully, but I did behave [ADV V bravely]  
   b. This new road will lead to Clovis, and that one will lead [PP to Fresno]  
   c. Robin is likely to win, and Kim is likely [IF to lose]  
   d. Pat may believe now that every cloud has a silver lining, but she will tomorrow believe [CP that no good can ever come to people in this evil, evil world]

None of the above bracketed elements has Case or Agreement features normally associated with AgrP. [One loosens the concept of the role of AgrP (Lasnik appeals to an EPP feature checked there), problems remain. Adverbs do not make good subjects, so the (a) form would not seem to allow raising to [Spec, AgrP]. In (d), we see an extraposed clausal complement, which cannot have [Spec, AgrP] as its landing site. Furthermore, contrary to the expectations of Lasnik’s analysis, PG and VPE differ in important empirical ways. For instance, PG shows island effects, whereas W E does not:

25. a. Robin can speak Russian, and I know [a friend [who can speak Russian too]]  
   b. *Robin can speak Russian, and I know [a friend [who can speak Italian]]

26. a. Robin will fascinate the children, and I believe [the claim [that Kim will fascinate the children too]]  
   b. *Robin will fascinate the children, and I believe [the claim [that Kim will fascinate the adults]]

For us, the illformed PG examples fall out under general constraints on movement. Since VPE does not involve movement, no such problem exists. Also, as Levin (1986:54) notes, VPE readily allows for more than one supporting auxiliary, while PG does not. The following contrast:

27. a. Robin has been playing the oboe, and Kim has been playing the oboe too  
   b. *Robin has been playing the oboe, and Kim has been playing the bassoon

28. a. Pat could have been drinking beer, and Kim could have been drinking beer too  
   b. *Pat could have been drinking beer, and Kim could have been drinking gin

Lasnik equates PG with VPE and hence cannot explain the above contrasts. For us, PG involves V-to-I movement. We take I as including T F and Agr-V. Note that to arrive at the (b) forms above, the ATB Verb movement would have to have as its landing site a projection below IP (perhaps an Asp head position) The degradation follows, then, from a suboptimal landing site.

5. Conclusion

Pseudogapping and Gapping are the same, but different. They are the same in that they both involve ATB V-to-I movement; they are different in that PG shows asymmetric ATB movement. Our unification of PG as essentially a marked type of Gapping enables us to make a number of correct predictions, and avoids the set of problems facing’s Lasnik’s VPE/spirit analysis of PG.
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