ACC-ing clauses and labels
Daniel Milway (University of Toronto)

As Cinque (1996) notes, direct perception reports (DPRs) with ACC-ing clauses (ACs) are ambiguous. In one parse of such a sentence, given in (1-a), the AC is adjoined to the VP and its subject is the internal argument (IA) of the perception verb, while in another, given in (1-b) the AC itself is the IA of the verb and its subject is *in situ*.

(1)   a.   **Adjunct AC**
              I [[saw Mario$_i$] [ec_i running at full speed]]
        b.   **Argument AC**
              I [saw [Mario running at full speed]]

When DPRs with ACs are passivized, the resulting subjects are obligatorily interpreted as the IA of the perception verb.

(2) a. I heard Mario being slandered.   b. *Mario was heard being slandered.

This suggests that DPRs with ACs can be passivized only if the AC is adjoined to the VP. The lack of passives with argument ACs suggests that subjects never move out of argument ACs. Furthermore, the ungrammaticality of strings like (3) suggests that subjects must move out of adjunct ACs.

(3)   *I saw Lydia Mario running at full speed.

This paper provides an explanation this puzzling behaviour of AC subjects based on a modified version of Label Theory (Chomsky 2013, 2015).

According to Label Theory, the narrow syntax generates unlabelled structures which are labelled by a labelling algorithm (LA) upon Transfer to the CI interface. This paper make two extensions to Chomsky's Label Theory: First, by proposing that a syntactic object's label determines how its immediate constituents compose semantically (*i.e.*, by Function Application or something like Predicate Abstraction (Heim and Kratzer 1998)). Second, by proposing that adjunction structures receive no label, and are therefore compose by Predicate Modification. Futher, it follows from the latter extension that adjoined phrases are also unlabelled, and compose by Predicate Modification. This extended version of Label Theory provides an explanation for the distribution of AC subjects described above.

Assuming ACs are ProgPs, and Prog° is a phase head (Harwood 2015), the complement of Prog will have been transferred (and labelled) before the AC is adjoined to VP or merged in [Comp V]. It further follows that Prog bears φ-features (Chomsky 2008), putting it in the class of heads which are too weak to label without an agreeing specifier (Chomsky 2015). When ACs are in argument position, then, they require an overt subject for labelling, meaning the subject cannot move. Adjunct ACs, however, are ignored by LA, meaning that an *in situ* subject is not needed. Furthermore, the unlabelled object in (4-a) will be interpreted by predicate modification, which will lead to the deviant interpretation in (4-b).

(4) a. [[the boy], running]   b. $\lambda x[\textbf{the\_boy}(x)\& \text{running}(x)]$

Thus, if the subject DP cannot stay in the AC, and must move.

To summarize, the subjects of ACs clauses show a puzzling distribution, namely, subjects must move out of Adjunct ACs, but cannot move out of Argument ACs. While standard minimalist theory is ill-suited to explaining this phenomenon, a modified version of Chomsky's Label Theory provides an account of it. Furthermore, the theory proposed in this paper makes the prediction that all subjects of adjoined phrases must move.

References

Chomsky, Noam (2008). "On phases". In: *Foundational issues in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*. Vol. 45. MIT Press, pp. 133–166.

— (2013). "Problems of projection". In: *Lingua* 130, pp. 33–49.

— (2015). "Problems of projection: Extensions". In: *Structures, Strategies and Beyond: Studies in honour of Adriana Belletti*. Ed. by Elisa Di Domenico and Simona Matteini Cornelia Hamann. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 3–16.

Cinque, Guglielmo (1996). "The pseudo-relative and ACC-ing constructions after verbs of perception". In: *Italian syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 244–275.

Harwood, William (2015). "Being progressive is just a phase: celebrating the uniqueness of progressive aspect under a phase-based analysis". In: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33.2, pp. 523–573.

Heim, Irene and Angelika Kratzer (1998). *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.