

Reports on the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of  
the Tsukuba English Linguistic Society

### Some Remarks on Gerunds

Katsuo Ichinohe, Satoru Kobayakawa, Joe Morita,  
Koji Nabeya, and Ken'ichiro Nogawa

In this report, we are concerned with *Acc-ing* and *Poss-ing* constructions, which are exemplified in (1).

- (1) a. John likes [Mary singing the song]. (*Acc-ing*)  
b. John likes [Mary's singing the song]. (*Poss-ing*)

We propose that the *Acc-ing* and the *Poss-ing* construction have the structures schematized in (2a) and in (2b), respectively, irrelevant details omitted:

- (2) a. [<sub>CP</sub> \_ [<sub>C</sub> ' [<sub>IP</sub> DP<sub>Acc</sub> [<sub>I'</sub> [<sub>I</sub> V-ing][<sub>VP</sub> tv . . . ]]]]]  
b. [<sub>DP</sub> DP<sub>Poss</sub> [<sub>D'</sub> D [<sub>IP</sub> PRO [<sub>I'</sub> [<sub>I</sub> V-ing][<sub>VP</sub> tv . . . ]]]]]

Note that the *Acc-ing* construction has the CP-IP structure and its Spec,CP is left unoccupied, while the *Poss-ing* construction has the DP-IP structure and its Spec,DP is occupied by a possessive DP (DP<sub>Poss</sub>). A second point is that in the *Poss-ing* construction, the PRO in Spec,IP is controlled by the DP<sub>Poss</sub> in Spec,DP.

Our proposal provides a natural account for the contrasts in (3) and in (4):

- (3) a. Who did you remember John kissing?  
b. \*Who did you defend Bill's hitting?  
(4) a. There being no beer is nightmare.  
b. \*There's being no beer is nightmare.

In (3), extraction is possible from the *Acc-ing* construction through the unoccupied Spec,CP, which works as an escape hatch. On the other hand, such extraction is impossible from the *Poss-ing* construction due to the DP<sub>Poss</sub> in Spec,DP, which induces the islandhood against the extraction. The difference in acceptability between (4a) and (4b) is explained by the second point above: the ungrammaticality of (4b) will be ascribed to the generalization that expletives cannot control PRO, as shown in (5):

- (5) a. \*There<sub>i</sub> can't be peace without PRO<sub>i</sub> being war first.  
b. \*It<sub>i</sub> seemed that John was guilty after PRO<sub>i</sub> appearing that he had a strong motive.

Next, let us examine the validity of the idea that the *Acc-ing* construction involves a CP category by considering some facts concerning passivization. It has been argued in the literature that in parallel with the ECM construction, the grammatical category of the *Acc-ing* construction is IP and its Spec,IP position is assigned accusative Case by the matrix verb. This analysis is problematic, however. In the ECM construction, when the matrix verb is passivized, the subject of the subordinate clause moves to the matrix

subject position for a Case-theoretic reason, as shown in (6a). On the other hand, such movement is not permitted in the *Acc-ing* construction, as shown in (6b):

- (6) a. He<sub>i</sub> is believed [<sub>t<sub>i</sub></sub> to be honest ].  
 b. \*He<sub>i</sub> will be resented [<sub>t<sub>i</sub></sub> coming late ] by them.

The ungrammaticality of (6b) suggests that in the *Acc-ing* construction, the matrix verb is irrelevant to Case assignment to the subject of the subordinate clause. In other words, the contrast in grammaticality in (6) implies that the *Acc-ing* construction is a grammatical category different from the ECM construction, which blocks Case assignment from the main verb. In addition, the *Acc-ing* construction shares several distributional properties with CP, but not with IP: it occurs in the subject position of a clause and in the focus position of clefts. These observations lead us to the conclusion that the construction involves a CP.

Finally, we extend our proposal to the analysis of the gerundive construction with a PRO subject (*PRO-ing* construction). Of the two types of gerundive constructions discussed thus far, verbs like *defend* select only the *Poss-ing* construction. They also select the *PRO-ing* construction with a PRO subject having an arbitrary reading. Even in the latter case, extraction from this construction is not allowed, as is the case with the *Poss-ing* construction (see (3b)).

- (7) \*Who did the American Congressman defend PRO<sub>arb</sub> attacking?

On the other hand, verbs like *imagine* select all of the three constructions. *PRO-ing* constructions selected by such verbs exhibit interesting behavior with respect to extraction from within: as shown in (8), extraction is possible only when the PRO has a controlled reading. In other words, the possibility of extraction from the *PRO-ing* construction correlates closely with the construal of PRO.

- (8) a. What did we<sub>i</sub> imagine PRO<sub>i</sub> singing but were afraid to try?  
 b. \*What did we imagine PRO<sub>arb</sub> singing as being fun for some people?

Recall that extraction is not allowed from the gerundive constructions selected by the verb *defend*, that is, from the *Poss-ing* construction and the *PRO-ing* construction with an arbitrary PRO. The facts observed in (7) and (8) suggest that *PRO-ing* constructions divide into two types: one has the CP-IP structure in parallel with the *Acc-ing* construction, the other has the DP-IP structure in parallel with the *Poss-ing* construction.

To conclude, our proposal in (2) not only gives a natural explanation of some empirical facts provided by the *Acc-ing* and the *Poss-ing* construction, but also has some interesting consequences for the analysis of the *PRO-ing* construction.