Some constructions containing VP anaphora (VPA) 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 such a PP as an orphan (Culicover & Jackendoff, 2005:257 ff.) and the correspondent in the antecedent as the correlate. In (1) the P (on) of the correlate is repeated in the orphan, and the antecedent for the VP anaphor do the same is the complete VP mows the lawn. In (2) the P of the correlate shifts to to and the antecedent (look at) is not a complete VP. We address three questions raised by this little-studied construction 1) How does the VP anaphor (do the same) get its meaning from the antecedent? 2) What is the proper syntactic analysis of the orphan PP? 3) What constraints are there on VPA with orphans?

**Meaning:** we appeal to lambda abstraction over the correlate to produce the desired meaning. We argue that, with respect to VPA with orphans, lambda abstraction is syntactically unconstrained, and we suggest that lambda abstraction in related constructions such as VP ellipsis is similarly unconstrained. We observe that VPA differs from VP ellipsis in another respect: the definiteness in VPA gives rise to a presupposition which is absent in VP ellipsis. This argues against the claim (Elbourne 2008) that VP ellipsis involves a covert definite description.

**Syntactic Analysis:** 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.

(3) 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, which has been accounted for with syntactic reconstruction (Merchant 2001) or indirect licensing (Culicover and Jackendoff (2005)). With orphans with VP-internal correlates, the P is restricted to to (patients), with (themes) or for (benefactives), and it is not licensed by the antecedent. While Culicover and Jackendoff posit specific construction rules for orphans (p 289), we claim that the PP is a syntactic adjunct modifying the agitative 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. 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.

**Constraints:** While we argue that there are no syntactic movement constraints on possible correlates and orphans, we observe that there are many cases in which orphans are degraded or impossible.

**Locative**
(4) *George took Margaret to the beach and Peter did the same with the fair.

**Temporal Adjunct**
(5) *Abby said she would stop smoking by Christmas and Beth did the same with New Years.

We argue that these effects derive from factors relating to information structure. In particular, there is a requirement that a correlate and orphan must be contrastively focused; furthermore, we suggest that the orphan is subject to an aboutness requirement (Reinhart 81), in which the orphan sentence must be understood as “filed under” the entity denoted by the orphan NP.