Some constructions containing VP anaphora occur with an additional PP. The PP can correspond to a VP-adjoined adjunct as in (1) or to a constituent inside the minimal VP as in (2).

(1) Peter mows the lawn on Saturdays and George does the same on Sundays.
(2) They have now decided to look at the old alliances and to do the same to the new ones.

We will refer to these PPs as orphans (Culicover & Jackendoff, 2005:257 ff.) and the correspondent in the antecedent as their correlate. In (1) the P on of the correlate is repeated in the orphan. In (2) the P of the correlate shifts to to and the antecedent is not a constituent without the correlate. In (2) the orphan PP triggers an instruction to lambda-abstract on the correlate and to interpret the anaphor by Functional Application of the object of the P in the orphan. Here the P is restricted to to (patients), with (themes) or for (benefactives). We address two questions raised by this little-studied construction 1) What are the possible correlates of the orphan? 2) What is the proper syntactic analysis of the orphan PP?

As (3) shows, not all VP-internal constituents make for good correlates of an orphan.

(3) #George took Margret to the beach and Peter did the same to/for/with the fair

The oddity of (3) is not due to the orphan being unaffected or a locative argument. Orphans do occur in unaffected contexts (4) and locatives can serve as correlates (5) (for affectedness, see Beaver to appear). Cf.

(4) I try my best to understand my opponent’s positions on the issues and I expect him to try to do the same with my positions.
(5) Peter put salt in the rice and he did the same with the ratatouille

Many factors appear to improve a VP-internal constituent as a correlate (definiteness, animacy, high informativity of the verb, further modification of the verb). We claim that this can be explained by reference to aboutness. The successful correlate is what the antecedent clause can be about. We appeal to Reinharts (1981) definition of aboutness: A VP-internal complement can be a correlate if it can serve as an anchor for assessing the assertion. In (4), possible topics are the referents of my opponent’s positions and I:

(4’) As for my opponent’s positions, I always try to understand them.

In contrast the beach in (3) fails the aboutness-test, and that, we propose, is the source of the infelicity of (3).

(3’) #As for the beach, George took Margret there

The fact that the preposition changes in (2) shows that orphans are different from the remnant of sluicing (6), where the original preposition is repeated.
(6) He was looking at something, but I don’t know at /*to what.

In sluicing the remnant is licensed by the verb in the antecedent suggesting syntactic reconstruction. Orphans are not licensed by the antecedent (2), arguing against syntactic reconstruction in the interpretation of overt VP anaphora. Culicover and Jackendoff (2005) license the orphan in a specific construction rule (p. 289). In contrast we claim that the PP is a syntactic adjunct modifying the agentive main verb *do*. This explains the optionality of the PP and the fact that *do* shows the same range of prepositions in pseudo-clefts and predicate questions as in this construction with a VP anaphor and an orphan.

(7) What I did to/for/with my mother, was take her to the beach.  (Jackendoff 1990:125-128)
(8) What did you do to/for/with your mother?

Third, it explains the presence of a preposition: English does not allow bare NP adjuncts except temporal and some manner ones (e.g. *to talk that way*). Finally it explains why the preposition is semantically contentful and not the case-marker *of*.

Despite appearances, and contra Culicover & Jackendoff (2005), orphans hosted by VP anaphora do not constitute a construction that needs licensing by a special rule. Orphans are syntactic adjuncts that trigger semantic abstraction over an aboutness-topic in the presence of VP anaphora.

Much research has attempted to unify anaphora and ellipsis as either syntactically derived (e.g. Elbourne 2001,2008, Baltin & van Craenenbrock 2008) or semantically derived (e.g. Hardt 1993, Culicover & Jackendoff 2005). The contrast in prepositional marking of remnants between VP anaphora and sluicing identified here argues against such unification.
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