

Comparative Pseudogapping
Jeong-Shik Lee (Wonkwang University)

Basically under the Lasnik's (1999) VP-ellipsis analysis of pseudogapping in English examples like (1) (Levin 1978), this paper proposes to account for the so far untouched contrast between (2, 4) and (3, 5). The pseudogapping in (2, 4) is strikingly improved in a comparative context, as seen in (3, 5). Whatever the property that causes (2, 4) to be bad, e.g., saturation of pseudogapping remnants (Baltin 2000) or [+Case] of elliptic VPs, the otherwise bad pseudogap must be salvaged by an additional means in comparatives like (3, 5). This paper identifies it with a VP-Operator movement to be introduced below.

For the contrast in question, comparative ellipsis has been simply regarded as a different process in that it involves movement, unlike VP-ellipsis to which pseudogapping is reduced. As seen in the derivational stage (6), however, it is dubious how the null Op movement can license the deletion of the verb (this Op corresponds to an [X-much] degree phrase in Izvorski 1995). Nothing appears to differentiate (2, 4) from (3, 5) with respect to the pseudogapping environment. This paper proposes that VP further undergoes an operator movement to a Spec of CP, as seen in (7), for example, and that this VP is deleted there to yield the good pseudogapping in (3). The moved VP is in predication relation with its antecedent in the preceding clause, on a par with relative clauses, and the otherwise bad pseudogap is in turn antecedent-licensed by it.

The present VP movement analysis is supported by the locality effect in comparative pseudogapping. It is known that as seen in (8), in VP-ellipsis the second gap receives ambiguous interpretation, but that as seen in (9), in comparatives it receives only local one. This fact led to the claim that movement is involved in comparatives, but not in VP-ellipsis (Kennedy 1998). Exactly the same contrast holds of pseudogapping, as seen in (10) vs. (11).

This paper also tries to account for another intriguing contrast exhibited in double object constructions like (12a,b) (Boeckx 1988). As seen in the derivation (13), the postulation of the null Op_j corresponding to the first object in the comparative (12b), on a par with relative clauses, makes it possible to safely leave the second object as a pseudogapping remnant. But this postulation is impossible in (12a), and thus, pseudogapping here cannot delete the first object without deleting the second one. The locality effect in examples like (14) also supports the present proposal that the VP-Operator movement applies, as in (13). A VP-Operator and its syntactic function are independently attested in English VP-fronting (Huang 1993), in one type of Chichewa causative (Baker 1988), and in Yoruba predicate clefting (Dekydtspotter 1992).

