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Abstract:
This paper explores a set of surprising contrasts between two major classes of adjectives in Tagalog. It is concerned, in particular, with the discovery that adjectival passives in Tagalog cannot occur as the main predicate of various types of impersonal clauses—i.e., clause types in which the adjective’s sole argument cannot be promoted to subject. I argue that this fact follows ultimately from the claim that adjectival passives are unaccusative. This claim is compared with the observation that, in many other languages (e.g., Hebrew), adjectival passives apparently pattern as unergative. I explore the hypothesis that differences relating to the argument structure of adjectival passives can be related to larger architectural differences among languages, relating—in particular—to the structure of VP.
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If no other source is provided, example sentences for Tagalog are taken from my field notes (examples cited as LE are taken from Leo English’s *Tagalog-English* dictionary (English 1986, National Book Store).

The following abbreviations are used in glossing the examples:

S = Subject, NS = Non-subject, Obl = Oblique, Loc = Locative, Pl = Plural, Agr = Agreement, Asp = Aspect, Inf = Infinitive, Inv = Inversion marker (=ay), L = Linker, L(Rel) = Linker occurring in a relative clause
1. Introduction

This paper has two aims. The first is to document and analyze several surprising—yet completely systematic—contrasts between the class of adjectival passives in Tagalog (*basag* ‘broken’, *punit* ‘torn’, etc.) and a second major class of adjectives in the language (“*ma*-adjectives”, which includes adjectives such as *maganda* ‘beautiful’, *masaya* ‘happy’, etc.). As we will see, the latter class of adjectives can occur as the main predicate of a clause regardless of whether or not their sole DP argument is a subject, while—by contrast—adjectival passives can occur as the main predicate of a clause only when their sole DP argument is a subject. I will develop an account of this contrast in which it follows from a fundamental difference in the argument structure of the two classes of adjectives—namely, from the claim that adjectival passives are unaccusative, while *ma*-adjectives are unergative. Given this distinction, I will argue that the generalization follows from basic Case-theoretic principles.

The claim that adjectival passives in Tagalog are unaccusative predicates may seem rather mundane. After all, it is generally the case the sole DP argument of an adjectival passive is semantically related to the direct object of a related transitive verb, and, thus, one generally expects there to be a configurationally identical underlying syntactic relationship between this argument (i.e., the THEME argument) and its predicate (verb or adjective) on the basis of hypotheses like Baker’s (1988) Uniformity of Theta Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH) (see also, Perlmutter and Postal’s 1984 Uniform Alignment Hypothesis (UAH), and much related work). On the other hand, research on the argument structure of adjectival passives in other languages has revealed that adjectival passives often pattern, surprisingly, as unergative rather than unaccusative (Pesetsky 1982; Borer 1984; Borer and Grodzinsky 1986; Levin and Rappaport 1986; Belletti and Rizzi 1981; Burzio 1986; Cinque 1990).

A second aim of this paper, therefore, is to attempt to reconcile the evidence relating to the unaccusativity of adjectival passives in Tagalog with the evidence relating to adjectival passives in other languages. With this goal in mind, I draw upon Baker’s (2003) resolution to the problem posed for the UTAH by the unergative behavior of adjectival passives in certain languages. Baker demonstrates that the existence of unergative adjectival passives does not pose a problem for the UTAH (contra Borer 2005:55-64) as long as one is willing to adopt an abstract structure for VP, in which the THEME argument of a verb is projected as an external argument of the verb—more specifically, as a specifier to an complex VP constituent embedded within a larger “VP-shell” structure (see, e.g., Larson 1988 and many others in his wake; see also, Hale and Keyser 2002). By adopting this type of structure for VP, Baker demonstrates that the THEME argument of a (transitive or unaccusative) verb, as well as the THEME argument of an unergative adjectival passive, are projected in a configurationally uniform way syntactically, in a manner which accords with the UTAH. Reversing this logic, I will attempt to demonstrate that Tagalog does not countenance the type of VP structure that Baker motivates, and I will use this conclusion as the basis for explaining why adjectival passives must, in order to ensure configurational uniformity, have an unaccusative rather than an unergative argument structure.

Overall, this work raises and addresses a larger question. Namely, what kinds of differences do we find with respect to the argument structure properties of predicates (specifically, adjectives) cross-linguistically, and how might these differences, if they...
exist, be explained in a principled fashion such that that a constrained theory of argument structure is still maintained? The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, I offer general background relating to Tagalog clause structure and provide some initial descriptive background relating to adjectives in the language. Sections 3 introduces the two classes of adjectives that are the focus of this study. In Section 4, I demonstrate the contrasts named above with respect to the two classes of adjectives, and provide my account of this generalization in terms of and unaccusative/unergative distinction between the two classes of adjectives. In Section 5, I consider but reject an alternative syntactic analysis based on the Stage/Individual-level distinction. Finally, in Section 6, I address the larger architectural questions that arise from a comparison of the Tagalog data concerning adjectival passives with evidence from other languages. It is here that I draw upon Baker’s (2003) recent ideas to show how variation relating to the argument structure of adjectival passives may be related to independent properties of languages, pertaining—in particular—to the structure of VP.

2. Preliminary background

2.1. Tagalog clause structure

Tagalog is a predicate-initial language. In general, clauses have one argument that is singled out as the subject of the clause. In clauses where a transitive verb serves as the main predicate, the argument that advances to subject may bear any one of a number of thematic relations to the verb. Consider the examples in (1).

(1) a. Pumunit si Maria ng kanya-ng damit nang siya ‘y magalit.
   AGR.ASP.tear S Maria NS her-L dress when she INV got.mad
   ‘Maria tore her dress when she got mad.’

   b. I-binaon ng mga pirata sa isa-ng lugar na lihim ang kanila-ng mga dinambong.
   AGR-ASP.hide NS PL pirate LOC a-L place L secret S their-L treasure
   ‘The pirates hid their treasure in a secret place.’ (LE 406)

   c. Bigy-an mo ng kendi ang bawa’t isa.
   give-AGR you(NS) NS candy S every one
   ‘Give everyone some candy.’ (LE 176)

Significantly, subjects are morphologically distinguished from primary argument non-subjects and obliques. The table in (2) summarizes the morphological cases that arguments inflect for depending on their grammatical function as subject, non-subject primary argument (namely, the external argument or the direct object), or oblique.
Thus, the subject is the agent argument of the transitive verb in (1a), the theme argument of the transitive verb in (1b), and the goal argument of the transitive verb in (1c). Note that the agreement inflection on the verb varies depending on which argument, agent, theme, or goal, is selected as the subject. I will say more about this agreement immediately below.

Following Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis (1992), I will adopt a view of the clause structure of sentences like (1) in which the subject occupies Spec, TP. In order to derive predicate initial word order, I will also assume that Spec, TP occurs to the right rather than to the left as in subject-initial languages such as English (cf. Kroeger 1993; Rackowski 2002; and Aldridge 2004). Word order for arguments following the predicate is flexible, a fact that I will put aside here as it is not material to the main discussion.

Alongside clauses of the type in (1), Tagalog also has a number of impersonal clause types—namely, clause types in which no argument of the predicate advances to subject. For instance, clauses containing a verbal predicate inflected for recent perfective aspect, as in (3), are impersonal in this sense. Note in particular that the arguments of the predicates are inflected with the non-subject morphological case (ng or ni) in these sentences. Observe, furthermore, that the verb does not show inflection for agreement.

(3) a. Kapagluluto lang ng babae ng turon.
   REC-PERF.cook just NS woman NS turon
   ‘The woman just cooked some turons.’

   b. Kauupo lang nina Ben at Joe.
   REC-PERF.sit just NS(PL) Ben and Joe
   ‘Ben and Joe just sat down.’

Existential clauses are another type of impersonal clause. In existential clauses, the sole DP argument of the existential predicate is inflected for the non-subject morphological case rather than the subject morphological case, as shown in (4).

(4) M-agkakaroon ng parada dito bukas.
   ASP.exist.there NS parade here tomorrow
   ‘There will be a parade here tomorrow.’

Regarding clauses of this type, I assume that they differ minimally from the personal clauses in (1) in that there is no overt subject projected in Spec, TP. Rather, all arguments of the predicate in impersonal clauses of this type remain in the underlying position
where they are assigned a semantic role. The relevance of impersonal clauses will become clear shortly.

All of the examples considered so far have contained a verb as their main predicate. Tagalog also allows adjectives to function as the main predicate of a clause. In general, the sole DP argument of the adjective functions as a subject. Observe that adjectival predicates, in contrast to verbs, do not inflect for tense-aspect or agreement and there is no copula.

   rude S person if AGR. ASP. stare OBL other person
   ‘A person is rude if he stares at another person.’ (LE 166)

b. Si Maria ay pagód na m-aglinis ng kanya-ng kuwarto.
   S Maria INV tired L AGR. INF - clean NS her-L room
   ‘Maria is tried of cleaning her room.’

c. Biglá’ ang kanya-ng pagkamatay.
   sudden S his-L death
   ‘His death was sudden.’ (LE 194)

The remainder of this paper will focus entirely on adjectival predicates. First, I will complete this introductory section with a brief discussion concerning Case in Tagalog. (The reader may wish to skip this part for now and instead come back to it in Section 4.2, when it becomes more directly relevant.)

2.2. Case and A-movement in Tagalog.

As noted above in connection with the examples in (1), verbal predicates agree with their subject. This agreement does not involve the familiar agreement-features of the subject such as person, gender, or number, but something rather more abstract. Following Rackowski 2002, I take this agreement to be Case agreement. Concretely, the verbal predicate agrees with the abstract Case value (e.g., nominative or accusative) of the argument that occupies the subject position of the clause, Spec, TP.

As for the source of an argument’s Case, I’ll assume (closely following the authors cited above) that Case is assigned to an argument internal to the predicate phrase (i.e., vP-internally) in the manner summarized in (6):

---

1 We can plausibly assume that the subject position of an existential construction is filled by a null expletive. I’ll assume the presence of a null expletive in recent perfective clauses as well.

2 See also Pearson (2005) and Rackowski and Richards (2005). See Chung (1982, 1998) and Georgopoulos (1991), who set the empirical and theoretical background for this idea within the larger setting of Western Austronesian languages.

3 My reasons for saying that v assigns inherent, as opposed to structural, Case will be made clear in Section 4.2.3.
Looking back at the examples in (1), then, the verb agrees with the nominative Case of the subject in (1a) (which is assigned to Spec, vP as in (6i)), while it agrees with the accusative Case of the subject (which is assigned to V’s complement as in (6ii)) in (1b). (I leave oblique arguments out of the discussion for now, as they are not pertinent to the discussion.)

The two most important consequences of these assumptions to bear in mind are: (i) That movement to the subject position is not Case-driven, and (ii) That abstract Case should be distinguished from morphological case. The first point is relevant to the analysis of examples like (1b) from above (repeated below as (7b)). Although examples like (7b), where the direct object is promoted to subject, have occasionally been analyzed as passive sentences, there is substantial evidence—discussed in Schachter 1976:512; Kroeger 1993; Richards 2000; Rackowski 2002; Pearson 2005; Rackowski and Richards 2005; among others—which argues against this analysis. Rather, the evidence discussed by these authors (which, for reasons of space I will not review in detail here, but see above references) argues that a sentence like (7b) is transitive and active just as its minimal-pair counterpart, (7a), is (i.e., these sentences do not differ in voice). In contrast to passive sentences in English, for instance, there is no syntactic sense in which the AGENT has been demoted in (7b), where the THEME is the subject. (7a) seems to differ from (7b) only in that the external argument (i.e., the AGENT) rather than the internal argument (i.e., the THEME) functions as the subject of the clause.

(7) a. N-agbaon ang mga pirata ng mga dinambong sa isa-ng lugar na lihim.
   AGR-ASP.hide S PL pirate NS pl treasure LOC a-L place L secret
   ‘The pirates hid some treasure in a secret place.’

   b. I-binaon ng mga pirata sa isa-ng lugar na lihim ang kanila-ng mga dinambong.
   AGR-ASP.hide NS PL pirate LOC a-L place L secret S their-L treasure
   ‘The pirates hid their treasure in a secret place.’ (LE 406) (= (1b) above)

Since (7b) is not a passive of (7a), it is very unlikely that the promotion of the direct object in (7b) is amenable to the type of analysis usually proposed for passive sentences in other languages—e.g., involving Case-driven movement of the object to the subject position as a result of the verb’s inability to assign (accusative) Case (cf. Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis 1992; Aldridge 2004). The conclusion that promotion of the THEME to subject position in (7b) is not Case-driven forms part of a larger conclusion that Tagalog lacks Case-driven A-movement more generally, and that all instances of movement into subject position actually involve A-bar movement (see, in particular, Richards 2000; Sells 2000; Pearson 2005; Hymes et. al. 2006). (Again, for reasons of space, I will not review this evidence in detail here.)

---

3 An additional piece of evidence for this conclusion comes from a construction that resembles subject-to-subject raising constructions in English, in which the subject of an embedded non-finite clause raises to the...
From these conclusions it also follows that the form of the morphological case inflection of a DP does not reflect its abstract Case value—e.g., as nominative or accusative. Concretely, given an analysis of (7b) involving A-bar movement of the direct object and Case agreement, the direct object is assigned accusative Case in both (7a) and (7b), though the spell-out of Case differs in both of the examples. Concretely, it surfaces as ng ([nang]) in (7a), where it remains in-situ, but as ang in (7b), when it has been promoted to the subject position—Spec, TP. The same point can be made with respect to the external argument. By hypothesis, the external argument has nominative Case in both (7a) and (7b), though the specific morphological spell-out of this Case differs depending on whether it is a subject (as in (7a), in which case it is spelled-out as ang) or whether it remains vP-internal (as in (7b), in which case it is spelled-out as ng).

Summarizing: Case (e.g., nominative and accusative) is assigned to an argument within the maximal projection of the predicate (vP). Movement to the subject position is not Case-driven A-movement, but rather is an instance of A-bar movement. The specific spell-out of Case (i.e., case) therefore does not reflect the abstract Case value assigned to a DP. With these assumptions in place, I now turn to my main discussion.

3. Tagalog adjectives

Consider first the class of adjectival passives. Some representative examples are listed in (8).

(8)  
Adjectival passives
basá́g ‘broken’, puntí ‘ripped’, sunó́g ‘burnt’, batí́ ‘beaten’, gamí́t ‘used’
tapós ‘finished’, abálá́ ‘busy (occupied)’, kilálá ‘well-known’, hiló́ ‘dizzy’

Since the subject of the embedded non-finite clause is licensed without movement into the matrix finite clause, this strongly suggests that the when movement does occur, it is not Case-driven.
Like adjectival passives in other languages, adjectival passives in Tagalog generally form part of a larger paradigm with transitive verbs. From a semantic point of view, one can say, in general, that the adjectival passive denotes the result state inherent in the meaning of the corresponding event denoted by the transitive verb.⁴

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Transitive verb} & \text{Adjectival passive} \\
m\text{-agbasag} \text{ ‘to break’} & \text{baság ‘broke(n)’} \\
m\text{-agpunit} \text{ ‘to tear’} & \text{punít ‘torn’} \\
\text{sumunog} \text{ ‘to burn’} & \text{sunóg ‘burnt’} \\
tumapos \text{ ‘to finish’} & \text{tapós ‘finished’}
\end{array}
\]

We can further elucidate the relationship between adjectival passives and transitive verbs by observing that the sole DP argument of an adjectival passive, which functions as a subject of the sentence in (10a), corresponds thematically to the internal argument (i.e., the direct object) of the related transitive verb in (10b). Using the familiar terminology of thematic roles, the subject of (10a) and the object in (10b) is the \textit{theme} argument of, respectively, the adjectival passive predicate and the transitive verb.

(10)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Baság ang bote.} \\
& \quad \text{broken s bottle} \\
& \quad \text{‘The bottle is broken.’} \\
b. & \quad \text{N-agbasag si Juan ng bote.} \\
& \quad \text{AGR.ASP-broke s Juan NS bottle} \\
& \quad \text{‘Juan broke the bottle.’}
\end{align*}

Given the correspondence in terms of the thematic role between the surface subject in (10a) and the internal argument of the transitive verb in (10b), we can point out—in anticipation of the discussion to come in Section 4—the prediction that the surface subject of the sentence in (10a) should correspond syntactically to the underlying direct object of the adjectival passive. This prediction is based on hypotheses such as Baker’s (1988) Uniformity of Theta-Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH) (see also, Perlmutter and Postal 1984)—namely, the hypothesis that identical thematic relations between related lexical items bear identical syntactic relations at a non-surface level of representation (e.g., deep-structure). In Section 4, we will consider evidence confirming this prediction.

Despite the paradigmatic relationship of adjectival passives with transitive verbs, adjectival passives are categorically distinct from verbs. To show this, it is instructive to compare adjectival passives to related “stative verb” forms.⁵ “Stative verbs” are closely

---

⁴ I refer to the adjectives in (8) (in the main text) as adjectival passives on the basis of the observation that they share many characteristics of adjectival passives in other languages (stativity, inability to co-occur with an agent, etc.). It is perhaps important to point out, however, that it is unclear at present whether or not there also exists a true \textit{verbal} passive in Tagalog. It will therefore not be possible to compare the properties of adjectival passives to verbal passives.

⁵ The motivation for the term “stative verb”, as coined by the authors mentioned in the main text, is somewhat unclear. In particular, it is not clear in what sense these verbs are actually stative rather than eventive. They do differ from other eventive verbs, however, in that they are inherently telic—i.e., they entail rather than imply that the result of the action described by the verb has been achieved. Non-“stative
related to adjectival passives in that both seem to emphasize the resulting state of an event rather than the event itself (see, in particular, Dell 1983; Kroeger 1990:117; Phillips 2000; and Travis 2002). In certain environments, however, “stative verbs” and adjectival passives can be categorically distinguished. For instance, adjectival passives may appear as the complement of the verb *maging* (‘become’), as the examples in (11) illustrate.

(11)  

a. Masyado ako-ng naging abalá sa pagtuturo.  
    too I(s)-L ASP.become busy OBL teaching  
    ‘I became too busy (occupied) with teaching.’

b. Medyo naging hiló ako kanina sa simbahan.  
    rather ASP.become dizzy I(s) a.while.ag0 LOC church  
    ‘I became rather dizzy a while ago in church.’

By contrast, a “stative verb” cannot appear in this environment, as the ungrammaticality of the following examples shows:

(12)  

a. *Naging ma-abala sa pagtuturo.  
    ASP.become AGR.asp-busy OBL teaching  
    (I became busy (occupied) with teaching.)

b. *Naging ma-hilo ako kanina sa simbahan.  
    ASP.become AGR.asp-dizzy I(s) a.while.ag0 LOC church  
    (I became dizzy a while ago in church.)

This distinction seems comparable to the distinction observed in English and other languages between adjectival passives and verbal passives. Consider the contrast between the English examples in (13) (the *by*-phrase in (13b) is used to disambiguate between the verbal passive and the adjectival passive):

(13)  

a. This problem became expected after a while. (Adjectival passive)

b. ?*This problem became expected by Pablo after a while. (Verbal passive)

Plausibly, the ungrammaticality of the Tagalog examples in (12) and the English example in (13b) is due to a restriction imposed by *become* that it selects only non-verbal categories as its complement—namely, nouns and adjectives but not verbs (see, e.g., Wasow 1977 and Levin and Rappaport 1986).

Adjectival passives and “stative verbs” differ in a couple of other ways as well. For instance, a non-subject AGENT argument may co-occur with a “stative verb” when its THEME argument is the subject of the clause. This does not appear to be possible with an adjectival passive, however. The contrast in (14) illustrates.

---

verbs”, by contrast, are atelic (see, in particular, Dell 1983). A better term for these predicates might therefore be *result predicate*. “Stative verbs” have gone by many other names as well—including: “abilitatives”, “potentives”. To avoid introducing yet another coinage here to describe these verbs, I will simply stick with “stative verb”. However, in Section 4, I will make a distinction between “stative verbs” and true statives like *gusto* ‘want’, *marunong* ‘know’, etc.
(14)  a. Na-basag niya ang salamin. (“Stative verb”)
   AGR.ASP-break he(NS) s mirror
   ‘The mirror was broken by him.’

   b. *Basag niya ang salamin. (Adjectival passive)
   broken he(NS) s mirror
   (The mirror is broken by him.)

Related to this difference, “stative verbs” may be modified by manner adverbs like
madali (‘easily’), as shown by (15), which seem to imply the presence of an agent
argument even though no agent is overtly expressed in these examples (see, e.g., Kratzer
2000). By contrast, these adverbs cannot co-occur with adjectival passives, as the
ungrammaticality of the examples in (16) demonstrates.

(15)  a. Madali-ng ma-basag ang manipis na baso. (“Stative verb”)
   easily-L AGR.STAT-broke S thin L glass
   ‘Thin glass is easily broken.’ (LE 164)

   b. Madali-ng ma-punit ang puntás. (“Stative verb”)
   easily-L AGR.STAT-tear S lace
   ‘Lace is easily torn.’

(16)  a. *Madali-ng basag ang manipis na baso. (Adjectival passive)
   easily-L broken S thin L glass
   (Thin glass is easily broken.)

   b. *Madali-ng punit ang puntas. (Adjectival passive)
   easily-L torn S lace
   (Lace is easily torn.)

The other major class of adjectives in Tagalog is the class of “ma-adjectives”. Some
representative examples are provided in (17).

(17)  Ma-adjectives
       ma-ganda ‘beautiful’, ma-tahimik ‘quiet’, ma-búti ‘good’, ma-talino ‘intelligent’

Ma-adjectives have phonological and morphological characteristics that suggest that they
form a separate class from the adjectival passives. Most obviously, ma-adjectives
typically occur with the prefix ma-, while adjectival passives are always unaffixed or
possibly affixed by a null morpheme. There are also phonological differences relating to
the placement of stress: Stress on a ma-adjective may be either final or penultimate,
whereas stress on an adjectival passive is always final. Along with these morphological
and phonological differences, there also appears to be a semantic difference between the
two classes of adjectives. In particular, ma-adjectives tend to denote more permanent or
inherent states of the individual they are applied to, while adjectival passives denote
resultant states which does not necessarily hold of an individual permanently or
inherently. Roughly, this semantic difference seems reminiscent of the Stage-/Individual-
level distinction (Carlson 1977), with adjetival passives belonging to the Stage-level category, and ma-adjetives belonging to the Individual-level category. (I return to this semantic difference later to show that is not syntactically relevant.)

A final point concerning the difference between adjetival passives and ma-adjetives is that ma-adjetives are paradigmatically related to intransitive unergative verbs rather than to transitive verbs, in contrast to adjetival passives, which—as noted above—are paradigmatically related to transitive verbs (see (9) above). Consider (18).

   (18)  **Unergative verb**                                      **Ma-adjetive**
            dumali’ ‘to become quick or quicker’       ma-dali’ ‘quick’
            m-agsaya ‘to be(com)e happy’             ma-saya ‘happy’
            tumahimik ‘to be(com)e quiet’            ma-tahimik ‘quiet’
            m-agputik ‘to become muddy’              ma-putik ‘muddy’

Like adjetival passives, however, ma-adjetives clearly pattern as adjectives rather than verbs. For instance, ma-adjetives may occur as the complement of maging (‘become’), as shown in (19). But as the ungrammaticality of the examples in (20) shows, an unergative verb that is related to a ma-adjetive may not occur in this environment.

---

6 One reason to believe that these verbs are unergative comes from observations relating to the formation of causatives. In particular, Travis (2002) notes that verbal roots that co-occur with an internal THEME argument take part in lexical-causative formation:

   (i)  **(Root)**                      **Lexical causative**
               tumumba ‘fall down’          m-agtumba ‘knock down (s.t.)’
               sumabog ‘explode’           m-agsabog ‘scatter (s.t.)’
               sumali ‘join’               m-agsali ‘include (s.t.)’

   A predicate with an external argument (e.g., a transitive verb) can be causitivized by a productive causative formation rule, which involves a causative morpheme *pa*-

   (ii)  **Transitive**                  **Productive causative**
               m-agsabog ‘scatter (s.t.)’  m-ag-pa-sabog ‘cause (s.o.) to scatter (s.t.)’

   Relevantly, the verbs in (18) of the main text cannot be take part in the lexical-causative formation. To form a causative on the basis of such verbs, it is necessary to use the productive causative formation rule involving *pa*-

   (iii)  **Unergative**                   **Lexical causative**
               tumahimik ‘be(com)e quiet’  *m-agtahimik ‘to quiet (s.o.)’
               Productive Causative      m-ag-pa-tahimik ‘to quiet (s.o.)’
(19) a. N-agbaha at naging maputik ang mga lansangan
   and become muddy S PL street
   at bukid.

   ‘The streets and farms flooded and became muddy.’

   b. Nagiging masaya ako kapag nakikita ka
   become happy I(S) when see you(S)
   ‘I become happy when I see you.’

(20) a. *Naging m-agputik ang mga lansangan at bukid.
   The streets and farms became muddy.

   b. *Nagiging m-agsaya ako kapag nakikita ka.
   I become happy when I see you.

3.1. Interim summary

Summarizing up to this point, Tagalog appears to have a lexical class of adjectives that is
categorically distinct from verbs. Within this class of adjectives, there are two
important sub-classes—namely, adjectival passives and ma-adjectives. The preliminary basis for
this distinction centers on the observation that the two classes exhibit distinct
morphological and phonological, as well as semantic properties. In the next section, I
argue that the two types of adjectives are further distinguishable in terms of their
argument structure. I will argue, in particular, that adjectival passives are unaccusative,
whereas ma-adjectives are unergative.

4. Argument structure of adjectives

In all of the examples cited above where an adjective serves as the main predicate of a
clause, its sole DP argument is also the subject of the clause. There are certain exceptions
to this pattern, however, which are the focus of the present section. In particular, there are
three contexts where an adjective’s sole DP argument does not function as a subject. These are: (i) Impersonal clauses whose main predicate is an intensified adjective formed
with the prefix nápaka- (‘very’); (ii) Exclamative clauses, which are also impersonal; and
(iii) Equative comparative clauses. The important and surprising generalization regarding
these three types of clauses is that while ma-adjectives can occur as the main predicate of
each of them, adjectival passives systematically cannot. I will provide an account of this
generalization in which it follows from the claim the adjectival passives are unaccusative,
while ma-adjectives are unergative.
4.1. Intensive adjectives

Adjectives in Tagalog may be intensified in one of two ways. First, any adjective may be intensified by full reduplication. Thus, a construction used to intensify the *ma*-adjective occurring in the sentence in (21a) is the one given in (21b). Additional examples of intensive reduplication with a *ma*-adjective are given in (22).

(21)  

a. Matahimik na ang aso.
    quiet now s dog
    ‘The dog is quiet now.’

b. Matahimik na matahimik na ang aso.
    quiet L quiet now s dog
    ‘The dog is *very* quiet now.’

(22)  

a. Mataba-ng mataba si Juan.
    fat-L fat s Juan
    ‘Juan is *very* fat.’

b. Mahal na mahal ang presyo.
    expensive L expensive s price
    ‘The price is *very* expensive.’

c. Maganda-ng maganda ang pelikula.
    good-L good s movie
    ‘The movie was *very* good.’

Observe that, apart from the reduplication of the adjective, clauses containing intensified adjectives of this type do not differ significantly from examples that contain simplex—i.e., non-intensive—adjectives. In the examples in (22), for instance, the adjective’s sole DP argument is inflected with the subject morphological case (*ang/si*), just as it is in an example like (21a). Unsurprisingly, then, adjectival passives may also be intensified using the reduplication strategy. Consider the examples in (23).

(23)  

a. Basag na basag ang salamin.
    broke L broke s mirror
    ‘The mirror is *very* broken.’

b. Sira-ng sira ang buhok nila.
    damaged-L damaged s hair their
    ‘Their hair was *very* damaged.’

c. Bagot na bagot ang ina sa kanya-ng anak na babae.
    fed.up L fed.up s mother OBL her-L child L girl
    ‘The mother was *very* fed up with her daughter.’ (LE 115)

d. Abala-ng abala si G. Cruz ngayon.
    busy-L busy s Mr. Cruz now
    ‘Mr. Cruz is *very* busy now.’ (LE 2)
e. Bati-ng batin ang punti’ ng itlog.
   beaten-L beaten s white of eggs
   ‘The whites of the eggs are well beaten.’ (LE 172)

Intensive adjectives can also be formed using the prefix nápaka- (‘very’). In contrast to clauses whose main predicate is an intensive adjective formed with reduplication, clauses containing an adjective intensified with nápaka- are impersonal. Consider the sentences in (24). Observe, in particular, that the adjective’s sole DP argument is inflected with the non-subject morphological case (ng/ni) rather than the subject morphological case (ang/si). These examples thus clearly contrast with the examples above, in which the adjective’s DP argument is plainly a subject and the clauses are personal rather than impersonal.

      very-expensive NS price
      ‘The price is very expensive.’

   b. Nápaka-tahimik ng aso.
      very-quiet NS dog
      ‘The dog is very quiet.’

   c. Nápaka-sarap ng pansit.
      very-delicious NS noodles
      ‘The noodles are very delicious.’

   d. Nápaka-ganda ng bulaklak na ito.
      very-beautiful NS flower L this
      ‘This flower is very beautiful.’

Significantly, adjectival passives cannot be intensified using nápaka-, a fact that is illustrated by the ungrammaticality of the examples in (25), which should be compared with the examples in (23) from above.

      very-broken NS mirror
      (The mirror is very broken.)

   b. *Nápaka-sira’ ng buhok nila.
      very-damaged NS hair their
      (Their hair was very damaged.)

   c. *Nápaka-bagot ng ina sa kanya-ng anak na babae.
      very-fed.up NS mother OBL her-L child L female
      (The mother was very fed up with her daughter.)

   d. *Nápaka-abala ni G. Cruz ngayon.
      very-busy NS Mr. Cruz now
      (Mr. Cruz is very busy now.)
e. *Nápaka-kilala ng artisto-ng iyon.
   very.known NS artist-L this
   (This artist is very well known.)

We can dismiss the possibility right off that the ungrammaticality of the examples in
(25) is somehow rooted in the semantics. In particular, given that adjectival passives can
be intensified using reduplication (cf. the examples in (23) above), it is plain that there is
no semantic incompatibility between adjectival passives and the meaning associated with
intensification. Furthermore, observe that adjectival passives can co-occur with a variety
of other types of degree modifiers, which indicates—more generally—that these
adjectives are “gradable”.

(26) a. Punit-punit ang aki-ng mga damit.
    ripped-ripped S my-L PL dress
    ‘My dress is thoroughly torn.’

b. Medyo kilala ang artisto-ng iyon.
    rather well.known S artist-L this
    ‘This artist is rather well known.’

c. Medyo sira’ pa ang motor kaya hindi pa ma-gamit.
    rather damaged still S motor therefore not still INF.ABLE-use
    ‘The motor is still rather damaged, and so it’s still unable to be used.’

It seems reasonable to conjecture, therefore, that the ungrammaticality of the examples in
(25) lies with the syntax rather than the semantics. In the next sub-section, I will provide
a syntactic account of these contrasts in which they flow from the different argument
structure properties of the two classes of adjectives.

4.2. A Syntactic account

The basis for the syntactic account of the contrasts observed above—and, in particular, of
the ungrammaticality of sentences like (25)—is the observation that clauses containing
adjectival predicates intensified with nápaka- are impersonal. Constructions based on
nápaka- therefore resemble other types of impersonal clauses, such as recent perfective
and existential clauses (see Section 2.1). Recall that with respect to these types of clauses,
it was claimed that no argument of the predicate occupies the subject position of the
clause (Spec, TP). Rather, all of the predicate’s arguments in an impersonal clause reside
within the predicate phrase, in the underlying position where they are initially merged
and assigned a semantic role.

Suppose, then, that the adjective’s argument in the impersonal sentences in (24) –
(25) occupies its underlying syntactic position. Supposing this, we can now describe the
contrast between the sentences in (24) and (25) in the following way. The DP argument
of a ma-adjective can be syntactically licensed either in its underlying position (as in the
examples in (24)) or as a subject in Spec, TP (as in the examples in (22)). The argument
of an adjectival passive, by contrast, can only be licensed as a subject—i.e., by raising to
Spec, TP, as in the examples in (23). The first step towards accounting for this difference, then, involves fleshing out the identity of the relevant licensing principle involved.

Within the Principles and Parameters/Minimalist framework, it is hypothesized that arguments (specifically, DP arguments) must be licensed in accordance with the Case-filter—the condition that an overt DP must be assigned abstract Case (Chomsky 1981). As a syntactic licensing requirement, the Case-filter is needed to explain why DP’s can occur in certain environments but not others. In English, for instance, a DP can occupy the subject position of a finite clause but not the subject position of an embedded infinitival clause selected by raising predicates like seem. Consider the contrasts in (27).

(27) a. Maria seems [to be tired]. (Subject of finite clause)
    b. It seems [that Maria is tired]. (Subject of embedded finite clause)
    c. *It seems [Maria to be tired]. (Subject of embedded non-finite clause)

The Case-filter also explains why nouns and adjectives in certain languages—e.g., English—cannot take internal arguments directly without the presence of a “dummy” preposition, as the examples in (28) below illustrate. The hypothesis here is that nouns and adjectives constitute the class of non-Case assigners in English, distinct from verbs and prepositions, which constitute the class of Case assigners.

(28) a. Bill was afraid *(of) the storm.
    b. Bill’s fear *(of) the storm.

Returning to the ungrammaticality of the examples in (25), I propose that the licensing principle that is involved is the Case-filter. Concretely, suppose that the sole DP argument of an adjectival passive is an internal argument of the adjective—i.e., that adjectival passives are unaccusative. Significantly, this proposal accords with the expectation based on the UTAH (raised earlier in Section 3) that the surface subject of an adjectival passive ought to be syntactically merged as an underlying internal argument, exactly as it is for a related verb. Given this, since clauses with adjectives intensified with nápaka- are impersonal, the internal argument of the adjectival passive does not raise to the subject position of the clause (Spec, TP). Rather, the adjectival passive’s argument is forced to remain in its underlying position (as a complement of A). Adjectives are canonical non-Case assigners (both cross-linguistically, cf. (26a), as well as in Tagalog, see below), and—as such—the adjectival passive cannot assign Case to its DP complement. Given these two points, it follows that the adjectival passive’s DP argument

---

6 Within the general framework being assumed here (namely, that of Principles and Parameters/Minimalism), Case theory generally, and the Case-filter in particular, has undergone many formal changes (see Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2005 and also the papers collected in Brander and Zinsmeister 2003, and Section 4.2.2 of the present paper, for overview and discussion of some of these changes). As far as I have been able to determine, however, the basic ideas remain intact, and none of these developments affect my overall characterization of the phenomena being discussed in Case-theoretic terms.
fails to be licensed in accordance with the Case-filter. The examples in (25) are therefore ruled out.

Importantly, while this Case-theoretic account of the ungrammaticality of the examples in (25) crucially relies on the claim that adjectival passives are unaccusative, it is not the claim that unaccusativity is the direct cause of the problem for Case-licensing—for instance, relating to Burzio’s Generalization, the well-known hypothesis that unaccusatives cannot assign Case (Burzio 1986). Rather, the inability of an adjectival passive to Case-license its internal argument is a consequence of the fact that adjectival passives are adjectives, and—as such—cannot assign Case to their complements. This, in conjunction with the claim that adjectival passives are unaccusative, is what underlies the ungrammaticality of the examples in (25).

One reason for making this distinction is empirical. As we will see below, unaccusative verbs in Tagalog evidently can Case-license their internal argument in impersonal constructions. The second reason for making this point is that it ultimately bears on the answer to two important questions that we’ll need to address in relation to the proposed account of the ungrammaticality of the examples in (25). Concretely, how and why is the adjectival passive’s argument licensed when it is a subject of a personal clause, as in the examples in (23)? Second, what is the syntactic difference between ma-adjectives and adjectival passives that accounts for why the former but not the latter are compatible with nápaka- (cf. the examples in (24))? I turn to these issues immediately.

4.2.1. Verbs, adjectives, and Case. In contrast to adjectival passives, unaccusative verbs in Tagalog can occur in impersonal constructions. Two types of evidence establish this. First, certain intransitive verbs—namely, those that correspond to the iconic unaccusative predicates in other languages—can occur as the main predicate of an impersonal clause,

---

7 This assumes, of course, that there are no other mechanisms of case assignment available. In particular, there is evidently no process of “Case transmission” (Safir 1985) in Tagalog. Thus, Tagalog contrasts with other languages that have impersonal clauses where an argument of an unaccusative verb remains in-situ but acquires Case through some process of transmission or long-distance Case assignment (e.g., viz-à-viz the Agree operation proposed in Chomsky 2001 and related work in its wake). See Section 4.2.1 for additional discussion.

8 As a reviewer points out, if this account is correct, then impersonal constructions in Tagalog diagnose the unaccusative/unergative status of adjectival predicates for reason different than impersonal constructions in certain German languages. In German, for instance, unergative verbs may occur in the impersonal passive constructions, while unaccusative verbs cannot (Perlmutter 1978).

(i)   Er wordt hier door de jonge lui veel gedanst.

   there is here by the young people much danced

   (lit.) ‘There is danced here a lot by the young people.’

(ii)  *Er wordt in dit ziekenhuis door de patienten dikwijls gestorven.

   there is in this hospital by the patients often died

   (i.e., There is a lot of dying in this hospital by the patients.)

The contrast here is related to the conditions on passive—namely, passive can apply in the absence of a direct object (as with unergative verbs), but cannot apply in the absence of an external argument (as with unaccusative verbs).
such as when they are inflected in the recent-perfective aspect (see Section 2.1). Consider the following:

(29)  
   a. Kadarating lang ng bantay.
       REC-PERF.arrive just NS guard
       ‘A/The guard just arrived.’
   b. Kabababa’ lang ng eroplano.
       REC-PERF.go.down just NS airplane
       ‘A/The airplane just went down.’
   c. Kapapangyari lang ng aksidente.
       REC-PERF.happen just NS accident
       ‘A/The accident just occurred.’

Second, the verbal existential predicate, *m-agkaroon* (‘exist.there’), is an unaccusative predicate that occurs in an impersonal configuration. Significantly, the existential predicate’s argument is inflected for the non-subject morphological case.

(30)  
   M-agkakaroon ng parada dito bukas.
       ASP-exist.there NS parade here tomorrow
   ‘There will be a parade here tomorrow.’

If the presence of the non-subject morphological case *ng* ([nang]) is dependent on abstract Case, these facts point to the conclusion that the internal argument of an unaccusative *verb* can be Case-licensed in its base position as an internal argument (i.e., direct object) of the verb. How is this possible?

One possibility, the one that I will argue to be correct, is that Case is assigned to an unaccusative verb’s internal argument in the same way that Case is assigned to the internal argument of a transitive verb, which—following recent trends—I will assume involves accusative Case assigned to the internal argument by the light-verb, *v*, which dominates a verbal root, *V* (Chomsky 1995). According to this view, the difference between the examples in (29) and (30) above and the ungrammatical examples in (25) can be related to a basic difference between the Case-licensing ability of verbs and adjectives. Concretely, assuming that adjectival and verbal roots are dominated by a projection of a functional head, *a* and *v*, respectively, we can conjecture that *v* can, but *a* cannot, assign Case to an internal argument within its complement domain. Putting this conjuncture together with the hypothesis that verbal predicates in (29) and (30) as well as the adjectival passives in (25) are unaccusative, the impersonal constructions in (29) and (30) are correctly accounted for as grammatical, while the ones in (25) are predictably ungrammatical, since the internal argument is Case-licensed only in the former set of cases (by *v*), but not the latter.

Attributing the difference in Case-licensing ability between verbs and adjectives to a categorical difference between verbs and adjectives is supported by a couple of additional observations. First, as in English, certain adjectives in Tagalog may take an overt internal argument. This argument, however, is always an (oblique) PP and never a (*ng*-marked) DP. For instance, there is a class of psychological-adjectives that take both an external
(EXPERIENCER) and an internal (‘SUBJECT-MATTER’) argument (Pesetsky 1995:55-60). Consider:

(31)  a. Takot sa kulog si Juan.
      afraid OBL thunder S Juan
      ‘Juan is afraid of thunder.’

    b. Galit sa akin si Maria.
       angry OBL me(OBL) S Maria
       ‘Mary is angry at me.’

On the assumption that oblique phrases headed by sa are PP’s, we can reasonably conjecture that the sentences in (31) are grammatical because PP’s, in contrast to DP’s, do not require Case to be licensed (see, e.g., Stowell 1981). (As is clear from the form of the pronoun in (31b), furthermore, that the preposition sa appears to govern oblique case on its complement.) The fact that adjectives may only ever take overt PP complements and (in contrast to verbs, which select for any type of complement) can be related to the general fact that adjectives cannot assign Case.

A second, more intricate, demonstration that adjective differ from verbs in their ability to Case-license an internal argument comes from comparing the verbal existential predicate in (30) above with its non-verbal counterpart. Concretely, there is a non-verbal existential predicate mayroon (‘exist.there’), which is clearly related to the verbal predicate in (30), but which is adjectival rather than verbal ([REF]). In contrast to the verbal existential predicate, the adjectival existential predicate does not Case-license its internal argument, as evidenced by the fact that its argument appears with no morphological case at all. Consider:

(32)  Mayroon-g [parada] dito kahapon.
      exist.there-L parade here yesterday
      ‘There was a parade here yesterday.’

The contrast between (32) and (30) above can be accounted for in terms of the different Case-licensing abilities of verbs and adjectives. Namely, verbs can, but adjectives cannot, assign Case to their internal argument.9

As an alternative to the claim that the verb (v) assigns Case to the internal argument in the examples in (29) and (30), one might suppose that Case is assigned by the functional head of the clause, T(ense). According to this view, Case is assigned to the internal argument in the manner that has been proposed for various types of impersonal constructions in English—e.g., There (just) arrived a guard. Concretely, Chomsky (2001) proposes that T and the internal argument of certain unaccusative verbs enter into an Agree relation, which checks the Case-feature of the internal argument in-situ. While

9 [REF] proposes that the reason the existential predicate’s complement is able to be licensed without overt morphological case (as in (32)) is a consequence of the claim that the existential predicate requires its argument to be property denoting (i.e., a predicate) (see, e.g., McNally 1992), and the claim that predicative nominals, in contrast to nominals which function as true arguments, do not require (overt) case morphology.
perhaps the correct analysis for impersonal constructions in some languages, this approach will not be able to explain the difference between the grammatical impersonal constructions with a verbal predicate in (29), and the ungrammatical ones with an adjectival passive predicate in (25). Similarly, it would be unable to explain the difference between the verbal existential construction in (30) and the adjectival one in (32). Concretely, if T could Case-license the internal argument of the unaccusative predicates in (29) and (30) via Agree, then nothing should prevent it from doing so in (25) and (32), when the predicate is adjectival (i.e., contained within an aP).

To summarize, although the account of the ungrammaticality of the examples in (23) rests on the claim that adjectival passives are unaccusative, the actual failure of the adjective’s internal argument to be Case-licensed when the adjective occurs in an impersonal configuration is due not to the inability of unaccusative predicates as a class to assign Case, but rather than to the inability of adjectives to assign Case to their complements.\(^\text{10}\)

### 4.2.2. Licensing the subject in Spec, TP.

Having now accounted for the ungrammaticality of the examples in (25), we can move on to ask how sentences in which the adjectival passive’s internal argument functions as the subject of a clause—e.g., as in (23)—are licensed. Note that there is an analogue of this question in the paradigm of English impersonal constructions involving a set of unaccusative verbs. Concretely, the internal argument of intransitive unaccusative verbs like break (sink, explode, etc.) can be licensed as a subject, but can never be licensed in-situ within an impersonal configuration.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(33) a.} & \quad *\text{There broke a plate.} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{A plate broke.}
\end{align*}
\]

One standard account of the contrast between these examples runs as follows: Since unaccusative verbs in English do not assign accusative Case, the unaccusative verb’s internal argument cannot be licensed in-situ ((33a)), and must therefore raise to the subject position (Spec, TP) where nominative Case is assigned ((33b)). Can this approach be generalized to the contrast in Tagalog between sentences like (25) and their grammatical personal counterparts in (23)? The answer seems to be, not exactly.

Recall from Section 2.1.1 that Tagalog lacks Case-driven A-movement. Rather, movement into subject position is A-bar movement. Note, furthermore, that this claim is now corroborated by the facts we have just observed relating to unaccusative verbs. Consider, for instance, a sentence like (34), where the unaccusative verb is not inflected for recent-perfective aspect (cf. the examples in (29a)) and its sole (internal) argument advances to subject.

\[^{10}\text{Recently, Bhatt (2006) has argued convincingly that unaccusative verbs in Hindu-Urdu assign accusative Case to their internal argument, contra Burzio’s Generalization.}\]
(34) **Dumaraing ang bantay.**

AGR.ASP.arrive S guard

‘The guard arrived.’

Since the internal argument of an unaccusative can be Case-licensed in-situ (by $v$), as argued with respect to the example like (29)-(30), it presumably follows that movement to subject position (Spec, TP) is not Case-driven in the case of (34). Returning to the examples in (23), then, the important conclusion seems to be that although the internal argument of an adjectival passive is observably licensed as a subject, it is evidently not so licensed because the subject position (Spec, TP) is a Case-position. The question that we must ask now, then, is this: Assuming a standard Case-filter, how is the internal argument of an adjectival passive licensed in Spec, TP if this position is not a Case-position?

Before answering this question, let’s first take note of one other environment where a DP with no clause-internal source for Case is evidently licensed. In the examples in (35), for instance, we have a clause with a pre-verbal DP introducing a discourse-topic, but which is not an argument of the following clause. (Examples from Nagaya 2005:15; see also Schachter and Otanes 1974.)

(35) a. [DP Ang turo ni Hesus], [mahal-in mo ang kapwa mo].

s teaching ns Jesus imp.love-agr you(ns) s neighbor you(ns)

‘(According to) The teaching of Jesus, Love your neighbor.’

b. [DP Ang nais ko], [malusog ang mama ko].

s wish I(ns) healthy s mother I(ns)

‘(As for) My wish, my mother is healthy.’

Since these “hanging topics” in (35) are not related to an argument position of the clause they precede, they presumably could not have been assigned Case internal to the clause. They are nevertheless licensed.

What do these examples have in common with the examples we are interested in explaining? On the reasonable assumption that the hanging topics in (35) occupy an A-bar position, then they, along with subjects of personal clauses (in particular, as in (23)), both can be said to occupy an A-bar position. The possibility I would like to suggest, then, is that DP’s in Tagalog that occupy an A-bar positions are syntactically licensed irrespective of whether they have also been assigned Case (see Koopman 1992, who makes this proposal for Bambara).

How plausible is this approach? If we make the traditional assumption that Case-licensing is the only route by which DP’s can be syntactically licensed, then the answer is, of course, not very. It is plausible, however, for theories that separates Case-licensing from syntactic licensing in general (see, in particular, Marantz 1991; Harley 1995; Schütze 2001; McFadden 2004; among many others). Schütze (2001), for instance, identifies several idiosyncratic (i.e., language particular) environments in English and elsewhere where DP’s appear to be syntactically licensed in the absence of an available Case-assigner (e.g., in environments such as, *Me, I like beans*, or, *What, him wear a tuxedo?*). According to Schütze, such environments are not unexpected if syntactic
licensing does not exclusively depend on the availability of Case. This does not entail, however, that Case-assignment is irrelevant for all instances of DP-licensing (cf. *It is important *(for) him to be on time.*), but rather that there exist certain configurations in languages where a DP can be structurally licensed without being assigned Case.

This general approach to licensing is the one I will assume, along with the specific claim, for Tagalog, that DP’s that occur in an A-bar position can be syntactically licensed irrespective of Case-licensing.

4.2.3. Licensing the external argument. Having now accounted for the contrast between (23) and (25), we now must account for the contrast between adjectival passives and *ma*-adjectives with respect to the ability of the later but not the former to licitly occur in impersonal clauses involving intensification with *nápaka*.

When *nápaka*- combines with a *ma*-adjective to form an intensive adjective, the argument of the *ma*-adjective does not (and cannot) function as the grammatical subject of the clause containing the *nápaka*-adjective as its predicate (see the examples in (24) above, noting in particular the non-subject form of the morphological case preceding the adjective’s argument). Presumably, then, the argument of the *ma*-adjective resides in its underlying position within the predicate phrase where it is assigned its semantic role. Plainly, we would not want to claim that the argument of a *ma*-adjective is an underlying internal argument (complement of A), since, if it were, we would expect that it would fail to be Case-licensed in exactly the same way that the argument of an adjectival passive fails to be Case-licensed according to the account given of the ungrammatical constructions in (25).

Let us suppose, on the other hand, that the argument of a *ma*-adjective is external argument merged in the specifier of *aP*. This proposal is parsimonious with the observation, made earlier in Section 3, that *ma*-adjectives are paradigmatically related to unergative verbs. Given the UTAH, in other words, we expect that if the sole DP argument of an unergative verb is an external argument (merged in Spec, *vP*), then the sole DP argument of a *ma*-adjective should likewise be merged as an external argument—i.e., in Spec, *aP*. Suppose this is so.

There are now two conceivable ways in which the argument of a *ma*-adjective, as an external argument, might be Case-licensed. The first possibility, drawing on the proposals of Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis (1992), would be to say that the external argument is

---

11 Schütze does not offer an explicit proposal as to what these other licensing mechanisms are. It is also beyond the scope of this paper to provide such a proposal.

12 According to Schütze, DPs that are syntactically licensing without being Case-licensed are spelled-out with default morphological case. Which morphological case is the default is a language particular matter. In Tagalog, it appears that the default morphological case is the subject case (*ang/si*). Further evidence of this comes Copy-raising constructions such as (i) (from Kroeger 1993). In this construction, the non-subject external argument has topicalized to a pre-verbal A-bar position, leaving a pronoun behind. Note that the pronoun in the origin site of extraction is in the non-subject morphological case form, while the left-dislocated phrase is in the default subject case form:

(i)  
\[ 
\text{Gusto ko } \text{si Charlie [na lutu-in niya ang suman].} \\
\text{want (ns) s Charlie C inf.cook-agr he(ns) s rice.cake} \\
\text{‘Charlie, I want him to cook the rice cake.’} 
\]
assigned Case from the inflectional head of the clause, T, as schematized in (36) (the dashed lines represent Case assignment).

\[(36)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
T' \\
\downarrow \\
T \\
\downarrow \\
aP \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DP}_{\text{ext.}} \\
\downarrow \\
a' \\
\downarrow \\
a \\
\downarrow \\
\text{AP}
\end{array}
\]

This approach likens the manner in which the (in-situ) external argument is assigned Case to the manner in which subjects of embedded clauses are assigned Case in Exceptional Case Marking constructions in languages like English (see, e.g., Chomsky 1981, 1986).

\[(37)\]

a. The committee believes \textit{[Paula to be an asset to the company]}.

b. The committee considers \textit{[Kyle to be a traitor]}.

Drawing on the work of Aldridge (2004), who proposes that the external argument of verbs is assigned inherent Case (ergative Case, on her assumptions) by \(v\), we might alternatively suppose that the external argument of a \textit{ma}-adjective is assigned inherent Case (nominative, on my assumptions) by \(a\). This approach is schematized in (38).

\[(38)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
aP \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DP}_{\text{ext.}} \\
\downarrow \\
a' \\
\downarrow \\
a \\
\downarrow \\
\text{AP}
\end{array}
\]

Both of these approaches seem equally plausible. For the purposes of this discussion, however, I will adopt the approach in (38) based on Aldridge’s proposal that the external argument is assigned inherent Case from the functional head \((v, a)\) that assigns the semantic role to the external argument. The appeal of this approach is that, since inherent Case is tied to semantic role assignment (see, e.g., Woolford 1997, 2006), there is an automatic locality restriction imposed that has the desired effect that the only argument that is eligible to be assigned this Case is the external argument. If we adopted instead the approach in which T assigns Case (e.g., nominative) to the external argument, as in (36), we would also have to stipulate an additional locality condition that would prevent T from assigning Case as far down as the internal argument. Otherwise, it should be possible for T to assign Case to, and hence license, the adjective’s internal argument in
the examples in (25) (see, also, the discussion in Section 4.2.1). To keep the discussion as simple as possible, therefore, I will adopt the approach involving assignment of inherent Case by a to Spec, aP.

4.3. Exclamative clauses

My aim in this section and the next is to demonstrate that the contrast between adjectival passives and ma-adjectives observed with respect to intensification with napaka- is not an isolated case, but—in fact—more general. Concretely, the contrast arises systematically in all contexts where an adjective’s sole DP argument does not advance to subject.

Let us first consider, then, another impersonal clause type in which an adjective serves as the main predicate of a clause—namely, exclamative clauses like the ones shown in (39).

(39)  a. Ang ganda ni Rosa!
S pretty NS Rosa
‘How pretty Rosa is!’

b. Kay tahimik ng aso!
OBL quiet NS dog
‘How quiet the dog is!’

c. Kay lalaki ng patak ng ulan!
OBL PL big NS drop of rain
‘How big the rain drops are!’

Observe that each of the exclamative clauses in (39) are formed on the basis of a ma-adjective (ma-ganda ‘pretty’ in (39a), ma-tahimik ‘quiet’ in (39b), and ma-laki ‘big’ in (39c)). Furthermore, notice that the adjective’s argument is inflected with the non-subject morphological case, a fact that provides the morpho-syntactic clue that we are dealing here with impersonal clauses. Given this, it should come as no surprise at this point that exclamatory clauses cannot be formed with adjectival passives, as the ungrammaticality of the examples in (40) attests.

(40)  a. *Kay basag ng pinggan!
OBL broken NS plate
(How broken the plate is!)

b. *Ang punit ng damit niya!
S torn NS dress her
(How torn her dress is!)

c. *Kay hilo ng aso!
OBL dizzy NS dog
(How dizzy the dog is!)

The ungrammaticality of the examples in (40) can be accounted for in exactly the same way that the ungrammaticality of the examples in (25) from above was accounted for.
Concretely, since the adjectival passive’s argument is an internal argument that cannot raise to the subject position (viz-à-viz the impersonal nature of the sentences), it is forced to remain in its base position (complement to A) where no Case is assigned. As a result, the adjectival passive’s internal argument fails to be assigned Case and, therefore, to be licensed in accordance with the Case-filter.\(^\text{13}\) Exclamative clauses based on adjectival passives are therefore ruled out. By contrast, ma-adjectives are licensed in exclamative clauses because they have a source for Case that adjectival passives do not. Namely, ma-adjectives project an external argument (in Spec, aP), and inherent Case can be assigned to the external argument by a.

Very significantly, then, the fact that there is another type of impersonal clause involving adjectival predication where adjectival passives and ma-adjectives contrast shows that the contrast is not simply an idiosyncratic fact about either clauses involving intensification (with nápaka-) or exclamative clauses.

4.4. Comparative clauses

The focus of this section is equative comparatives and inequality comparatives in Tagalog. The observation of interest is that only ma-adjectives can licitly occur in equative comparatives, while both ma-adjectives and adjectival passives may occur in inequality comparatives. Once certain details of the syntax of comparative clauses are fleshed out, these contrasts are argued to follow from exactly the same account as was given for the contrasting behavior of the two adjective classes with respect to the two types of impersonal constructions documented above.

Equative comparatives are formed in Tagalog with the prefix kasing-. In addition to the presence of this prefix, the number of arguments compared to a clause containing a non-comparative adjective is increased by one. Consider the examples in (41).

\[(41)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Kasingtalino ni Elena si Maria.} \\
& \quad \text{as.intellegent.as NS Elena S Maria} \\
& \quad \text{‘Maria is as intellegent as Elena.’}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Hindi’ pa kasingganda ng Maynila ang Mandaluyong.} \\
& \quad \text{not still as.beautiful.as NS Manila S Mandaluyong} \\
& \quad \text{‘Mandaluyong is still not as beautiful as Manila.’ (Kabayan, 8/31/2003)}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c.} & \quad \text{Hindi’ ito kasingtaas ng iba pa-ng kilala-ng bundok sa Tsina} \\
& \quad \text{not this as.tall.as NS other-L well.known-L mountain LOC China} \\
& \quad \text{na 1200 metro.} \\
& \quad \text{L(REL) 1200 meter} \\
& \quad \text{‘This is not as tall as the other well known mountain in China which is 1200 meters’} \quad \text{(China International Radio, 6/2/2006)}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{13}\) An interesting question is what occupies the subject position in exclamatives such that the adjective’s internal argument cannot raise to this position. Drawing on Zannutini and Portner’s (2003) analysis of exclamatives in English and Paduan, one possibility is that a null factitive operator occupies the subject position (Spec, TP).
For concreteness, suppose that the prefix kasing- belongs to the functional category, Deg(ree), which heads its own projection, DegP, which in turn dominates the projection of the adjective (see, e.g., Abney 1987; Corver 1997; among others). The basic syntax for the comparatives constructions in (41) that I assume is schematized in (42).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DegP} \\
\text{Deg'} \\
\text{Deg} \\
\text{aP}
\end{array}
\]

Note that there are two DP arguments in an equative comparative. In terms of the surface syntax, one of these arguments is the subject (inflected with ang/si) of the clause while the other is a non-subject (inflected with ng/ni). Evidence from variable binding can be used to demonstrate that the argument of the comparative that is the grammatical subject c-commands the non-subject argument both on the surface and from its underlying position. Consider the contrast in (43). In (43a), the subject—a universal quantifier—licitly binds a pronoun contained within the non-subject argument. By contrast, a bound variable reading is impossible when the non-subject argument is a universal quantifier and the subject contains the pronoun.

(43)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{Kasingtalino ng kanya-\text{ng anak ang bawa’t ama}_i.} \\
& \text{as.intelligent.as NS his-L child S every father} \\
& \text{‘Every father is as intelligent as his child.’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
b. & \text{Kasingtalino ng bawa’t ama}_i \text{ ang kanya*}_{i,j}\text{-ng anak.} \\
& \text{as.intelligent.as NS every father S his-L child} \\
& \text{(His*}_{i,j}\text{child is as intelligent as every father)}
\end{align*}

Importantly, the binding asymmetry in (43) shows not only that the subject c-commands the non-subject argument (as we expect, in any case, given the clause structure we have been assuming so far, in which the subject occupies Spec, TP), but also that the underlying position of the subject c-commands the non-subject argument. Concretely, Rackowski (2002) has shown that the internal argument of a transitive verb may contain a variable bound by the external argument when the former but not the later is the grammatical subject of the clause. Consider (44) (from Rackowski 2002).

(44)  
\begin{align*}
\text{Minamahal ng bawa’t ama}_i \text{ ang kanya-\text{ng anak.}} \\
\text{ASP.love.AGR NS every father S his-L child} \\
\text{‘Every father loves his child.’}
\end{align*}

The fact in (44) is straightforwardly accounted for assuming reconstruction of the theme subject to its underlying position (complement of V), a position that is crucially lower.
than, and therefore c-commanded by, the position of the external argument. Significantly, the contrast between (44) on the one hand, and (43b) on the other, shows that the subject argument in (43b) does not, like the subject argument in (44), originate in a position lower than the non-subject argument.

Returning, now, to the structure in (42) above, we can account for the binding asymmetry observed in (43) by supposing that the subject of the equative comparative originates in Spec, DegP (i.e., before raising to Spec, TP), while the non-subject argument is contained within the projection of aP. Fleshing out the structure in (42) to indicate the underlying syntactic configurations of the two arguments gives us (45) (representing example (43a) above).

(45)

```
(45)

      DegP
         /\      \       
        DP    Deg'    aP
       /\      /\      /\ 
      ang bawa't ama Deg kasing-
                            DP
                            /\  
                           ng kanyang a  AP
                                   /\  
                                  talino  A'
```

The important fact that these observations establish is that the adjective’s argument in the equative comparative is a non-subject that is located in its underlying syntactic position, while another argument—namely, the one originating in Spec, DegP—occupies the subject position of the clause, Spec, TP. (I return shortly to the question of why it is that the only the argument introduced in Spec, DegP, rather than the adjective’s argument, can raise to the subject position.)

Now, we have already seen two contexts where adjectival passives cannot licitly occur where their argument is not a subject—namely, impersonal constructions involving nápaka- (‘very’) and exclamatives. Recall that the failure of adjectival passives to occur in this environment was accounted for by claiming that the adjectival passive’s argument is an in-situ internal argument (i.e., that adjectival passives are unaccusative) and that—as a direct complement of the adjective—it cannot be Case-licensed. Based on this account, we now make the prediction that adjectival passives will also be unable to serve as the predicate of an equative comparative. Concretely, since in this context the adjective’s argument does not advance to the subject position, then—as an in-situ internal argument—it should fail to be Case licensed. This prediction is born out. Adjectival passives cannot occur in equative comparatives.
Significantly, there is a way to express a meaning that is quite similar to the sentences in (46), using the adverbial *pareho* (‘same’). Consider the examples in (47):

     same-L broken S mirror and S window
     ‘The mirror and the window are equally (lit. same) broken.’ (cf. (46a))

   b. *Pareho-ng abala kami sa trabaho.
     same-L busy we(S.PL) OBL work
     ‘We are equally (lit. same) busy (occupied) with work.’ (cf. (46c))

In these examples, the equality relation is expressed with respect to a plural subject rather than as a relation between two singular DP arguments. These examples should make it clear, therefore, that the problem with the examples in (46) is syntactic rather than semantic in nature. The ungrammaticality of the examples in (46) follows straightforwardly from the claim that the argument of the adjectival passive is an internal argument of the adjective with no source for Case. Concretely, since the argument that originates in Spec, DegP advances to subject, the adjectival passive’s argument is forced to remain in-situ. But this in-situ position (complement of A) is one where no Case is assigned. The adjectival passive’s internal argument therefore fails to be Case licensed, and the result is that examples like (46) are ungrammatical.

4.4.1. *Inequality comparatives.* A question left open by the account of equality comparatives is why the argument in Spec, DegP rather than the adjective’s argument must advance to the subject position of the clause. The reason for this plausibly relates to locality conditions on movement to Spec, TP. Concretely, suppose that the inflectional head of the clause in Tagalog, T, has an EPPD feature (D for DP) which must be checked by bringing some DP argument within its c-command domain into Spec, TP. Suppose, furthermore, that the only eligible DP which can raise to Spec, TP is the one that is closest to T, where “closest” can be defined, for present purposes, as in (48) (cf. Chomsky 1995, 2001).
**Closest**

Y is closest to X if there is no Z such that Z c-commands Y, and both Y and Z contain a feature matching X.

Given (48), the closest DP argument in the structure of an equative comparative that is within T’s c-command domain is the DP that occupies Spec, DegP. Raising the adjective’s argument from within aP to Spec, TP would violate Closest.

Crucially, if the argument in Spec, DegP were occupied by a non-DP (e.g., by a PP), then we would expect that the argument of an adjective within aP rather than a higher element in Spec, DegP would be able to raise out of the aP to Spec, TP to become the subject of the clause. In other words, the element in Spec, DegP (if there is one) in such a construction would not cause intervene in such a way that would prevent the adjective’s argument contained within aP from raising to Spec, TP. Crucially, furthermore, both ma-adjectives as well as adjectival passive would predictably occur in such constructions. A construction of this hypothetical sort, I claim, is attested by the inequality comparative construction in Tagalog.

Alongside equative comparatives, Tagalog also has comparative construction of the sort that express inequality (equivalent to *more...than* comparatives in English). With respect to this type of comparative, ma-adjectives as well as adjectival passives are permitted. The examples in (49) are inequality comparatives formed on the basis of ma-adjectives. The examples in (50) are inequality comparatives formed on the basis of adjectival passives.

(49) a. Mas matanda siya kay Juan.
more old he(s) than OBL Juan
‘He is older than Juan.’ (Schachter and Otanes 1972:240)

b. Totoo ba-ng mas matalino ang computer kaysa tao?
really Q-L more intellegent S computer than S person
‘Is the computer really smarter than a person?’

(50) a. Si Juan ay mas kilala ko kaysa kay Al.
S Juan INV more well.known me(NS) than OBL Al
‘Juan is more well known to me than Al.’

b. Naging mas abala na si Juan sa kanya-ng mga trabaho
ASP.become more busy now S Juan OBL his-L PL work
at Sa the kanya-ng relihiyon.
and OBL his-L religion
‘Juan has become more busy with his work and his religion.’

c. Pero kung ako ang inyo-ng i-boboto, abya ‘y
but if I(s) s you.PL-L AGR-ASP.vote-for well inv
mas sira ang ulo ninyo kaysa akin.
more damaged S head your than mine
‘But if you vote for me, then you are crazier than I am.’
(lit., But if I am the one who you vote for, then your head is more
damaged than mine.) (Philippine Post, March 2001)
Like the equative comparative, there is one additional argument in an inequality comparative compared to a clause containing a non-compared adjective. The crucial observation to take note of here is that the additional argument that is introduced in the comparative constructions in (49)-(50) is a PP headed by the preposition *kaysa* (*than*) (note that in (50b), this argument is not expressed). Significantly, this argument is not the subject of the clause (PP’s never serve as subjects in Tagalog). Let us suppose that this PP argument is introduced as the argument of the degree element *mas* (*more*), so that the structure of the inequality is as shown in (51).

(51)

\[ \text{DegP} \]

\[ \text{PP} \]

\[ \text{kaysa} \]

\[ \text{Deg'} \]

\[ \text{Deg} \]

\[ \text{aP} \]

\[ \text{mas} \]

Crucially, the PP in Spec, DegP is not eligible to become the subject of the clause, on the hypothesis that the EPP\(_D\) feature of T can only be checked by having a DP, but not a PP, brought into its specifier.\(^{14}\) Given the definition of Closest in (48), it follows that a lower DP contained within aP may raise to the subject position to check T’s EPP\(_D\) feature. The important consequence of this relates to the licensing of adjectival passives in inequality comparatives. Concretely, the internal argument of an adjectival passive is eligible to raise from its underlying position (complement of A) to the subject position (Spec, TP). This situation contrasts with the equality comparative based on an adjectival passive (cf. the examples in (46)) where the adjectival passive’s internal argument is forced to remain in its underlying position (where no Case can be assigned to it) because of the DP argument in Spec, DegP, which must raise to Spec, TP due to Closest ((48)). Crucially, since the internal argument of the adjectival passive is able to raise to Spec, TP in the inequality comparatives, and because Spec, TP is an A-bar position where syntactic licensing does not depend on Case, no Case-filter violation is incurred, and the examples are grammatical.

5. An alternative syntactic account

At this point, one might want to consider an alternative way of deriving the contrast between *ma*-adjectives and adjectival passives in Tagalog that does not rely on the claim that adjectival passives are unaccusative. Such an alternative might be desirable from a cross-linguistic point of view, based on the observation (to be discussed in more detail

\(^{14}\) Tagalog evidently has no constructions where a PP occupies the subject position of the clause. For instance, there is no equivalent of the English Locative Inversion construction in the language.
shortly) that adjectival passives in many other languages apparently pattern as unergative rather than unaccusative.

The alternative I will sketch here, but ultimately reject, involves the observation— not noted earlier—that the two classes of adjectives contrast in a way that could reasonably be related to the Stage/Individual distinction of Carlson (1977) and others.

First, let us suppose that neither ma-adjjectives nor adjectival passives accept internal argument DPs. Following proposals of Diesing (1992), let us suppose that that the argument of a Individual-level predicate is a controlled PRO external argument, bound to an overt DP which is base generated in the subject position of the clause. The argument of a Stage-level predicate, by contrast, is merged as a predicate internal external argument, which may—depending on language particular factors—raise to the subject position of the clause. Under this approach, ma-adjjectives would have the I-level syntax shown in (52a). Adjectival passives, on the other hand, would have the S-level syntax shown in (52b).

\[
\begin{align*}
(52) & \quad \text{a. Ma-adjective (I-level):} & & \text{b. Adjectival passive (S-level):} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{DP}_1 \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{aP} \\
\text{PRO}_1 \\text{a'} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{aP} \\
\text{DP} \\text{a'}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

Adopting these structures for the moment, we can develop an account of at least the contrast between ma-adjjectives and adjectival passives with respect to the impersonal constructions discussed in Section 4.1. Consider again the contrast between ma-adjjectives and adjectival passives with respect to intensification involving nápaka-, as illustrated by the examples in (53) (repeated from earlier):

\[
\begin{align*}
(53) & \quad \text{a. Nápaka-mahal ng presyo.} & & \text{Ma-adjective} \\
& \quad \text{very-expensive NS price} & & \text{‘The price is very expensive.’} \\
& \quad \text{b. *Nápaka-basag ng salamin.} & & \text{Adjectival Passive} \\
& \quad \text{very-broken NS mirror} & & \text{(The mirror is very broken.)}
\end{align*}
\]

The alternative account of this contrast based on the structural distinctions proposed in (52) runs as follows: As proposed in Section 4, let’s assume that an overt DP argument contained within the projection of the predicate (i.e., not in Spec, TP) must be licensed in accordance with the Case-filter. For a ma-adjective, given the structure in (52a), the only argument within the aP projection is PRO. According to classic assumptions about the distribution of PRO (Chomsky 1981), it is limited to positions where Case is not
assigned. Thus, the argument PRO in Spec, aP in (52a) is licensed by virtue of the absence of Case. (This analysis therefore departs somewhat from the analysis in Section 4.2.3, where it was claimed that a assigns inherent Case to the DP in Spec, aP.) The overt DP that binds the aP-internal PRO in (52a) occupies Spec, TP. By our earlier hypothesis (Section 4.2.2), which we can carry over to the alternative account, a DP in Spec, TP does not require Case by virtue of occupying an A-bar position. Thus, the DP in Spec, TP in (52a) is licensed irrespective of whether it has been assigned Case clause-externally or not. Overall, then, sentences like (53a) are correctly accounted for as grammatical.

By contrast, the argument in Spec, aP in the structure in (52b) is a DP that requires Case according to the Case-filter. Since Case is not assigned to this position, however, the DP is not licensed in accordance with the Case-filter and the structure is ruled out. For this account to go through, we must assume that the aP-internal DP cannot raise to Spec, TP where it would be able to ‘evade’ the Case-filter by the current assumptions. In order to block such a derivation, we might hypothesize the presence of a covert EVENT argument (Kratzer’s 1995), which occupies the subject position (Spec, TP) and whose presence prevents any other argument from occupying this position. Given this assumption, the structure in (52b) is ruled out and the ungrammaticality of sentences like (53b) is correctly accounted for.

The alternative account just sketched is like the one proposed in Section 4 in that it explains the contrast exemplified by such minimal pairs as (53) in Case-theoretic terms in conjunction with the different structural relations between a ma-adjunctive and its argument on the one hand, and an adjectival passive and its argument on the other. However, while it seems to provide a coherent analysis of the contrast between the impersonal constructions in (53), it does not fare as well in dealing with the contrast we observed among comparative constructions. Consider the minimal pair in (54) (repeated from Section 4.4):

(54)  a. Kasingtalino ni Elena si Maria.  (Ma-adjunctive)
as.intelligent.as NS Elena s Maria
‘Maria is as intelligent as Elena.’
b. *Kasingsira’ ng aki-ng kotse ang kotse niya.  (Adjectival passive)
as.damaged.as NS my-L car s car his
(His car is as damaged as mine.)

The problem for the alternative account based on the structures in (52) is this: Recall from Section 4.4 that it was argued that the subject of an equality comparative occupies Spec, TP, while the non-subject argument is predicate-internal. This means that in a sentence like (54a), the non-subject argument, ni Elena, must occur internal to the aP projection of the adjective. On the conjecture that adjectives are external predicators (i.e., that they only license an external argument), the only predicate internal position for the adjective’s argument would be Spec, aP. This is dubious, however, given the current proposal that Spec, aP for a ma-adjunctive is filled by PRO. Even if we give up this assumption just for the cases in (54), it is still crucial for the alternative that Spec, aP is not a Case position, since it is this assumption that provided the basis for ruling out the structure in (52b) and hence, the ungrammaticality (53b). In other words, if we abandon either of these two features of the analysis to account for the grammaticality of (54a), we
loose the account that it provides for the grammaticality contrast in (53), and—furthermore—the account it would need to provide for the contrast in (54).

Overall, then, the proposal based on the structures in (52) does not make exactly the right structural distinctions that are needed in order to account for the contrast between *ma*-adjectives and adjectival passives. The original proposal from Section 4, however, does make the right distinctions assuming an unergative/unaccusative dichotomy. Concretely, this approach recognized an external position (Spec, *aP*) for *ma*-adjectives, where inherent Case was assigned, and an internal position for adjectival passives (complement to *A*), where no Case could be assigned. The availability of a Case licensing position for *ma*-adjectives meant that an argument could remain there without needing to raise out to the subject position of the clause. Hence, impersonal constructions like (53a) and equative comparative clauses like (54a) are grammatical. In contrast, the unavailability of a Case licensing position for adjectival passives meant that an argument originating there cannot remain there, but must raise to Spec, TP when possible. This accounted for the ungrammaticality of impersonal constructions like (53b) and equality comparatives like (54b), as raising to Spec, TP is blocked in both of these contexts.

In sum, the alternative approach based on the structures in (52) does not account for the full paradigm of contrasts between *ma*-adjectives and adjectival passives that our earlier account in terms of the unergative/unaccusative distinction allowed us to account for. We can conclude, therefore, that the unergative/unaccusative account is superior.

6. Broader theoretical implications

Up to this point, the discussion has centered on motivating an unaccusative analysis of adjectival passives in Tagalog. It was noted earlier on that from the point of view of a hypothesis like Baker’s UTAH, the result that adjectival passives are unaccusative is rather unsurprising. Concretely, the semantic role of the sole DP argument of many adjectival passive corresponds to the semantic role of the internal argument of a related transitive verb. For instance, the subject of the sentence in (55a) seems to bear the same semantic role—namely, THEME—as the object of the sentence in (55b).

      broken s bottle
      ‘The bottle broke.’

  b. N-agbasag si Juan ng bote.
     AGR.ASP-broke S Juan NS bottle
     ‘Juan broke the bottle.’

If the UTAH is correct, then, the expectation as far as the syntax is concerned is that the subject of the sentence in (55a) originates as an underlying internal argument (i.e., as a deep-structure direct object) of the adjectival passive predicate. From the point of view of the evidence presented in Section 4, we now have reason to believe that this expectation is born out.

The picture becomes more interesting and surprising, however, when we place the Tagalog facts alongside the facts that have been reported about adjectival passives in
other languages. Concretely, when tests for unaccusativity from other languages are applied to adjectival passives in those languages, adjectival passives appear to pattern as unergative predicates rather than unaccusative ones. Perhaps the most extensively documented, and—to my knowledge—unchallenged, case illustrating this claim comes from Hebrew (Borer and Gordzinsky 1986; Horvath and Siloni 2005: 5-7; Borer 2005).

In Hebrew, the ability of an argument to be construed in a possessive relation with a dative argument diagnoses unaccusativity. Concretely, an internal argument (e.g., a direct object) but not an external argument may stand in a possessor-possessee relation with a dative argument, as illustrated with the example in (56) (all Hebrew examples below are from Borer 2005: 40, 62).

(56) ha-yeladim le-Rani xatxu le-Rani ‘et ha-gader.
    the-children cut to-Rani ACC the-fence
    ‘The children cut Rani’s fence.’
    (not, Rani’s children cut the fence.)

The dative-possessive relation is not a simple matter of the surface subject/object distinction. As (57) shows, the surface subject of an unaccusative verb—e.g., a verbal passive—may also stand in a possessed relation to the dative, establishing that the surface subject of an unaccusative is underlyingly an internal argument.

(57) ha-‘uga hunxa l-i ‘al Sulxan.
    the-cake placed(V.PASS) to-me on table
    ‘My cake was placed on a table.’

Significantly, the surface subject of an adjectival passive cannot have a possessed interpretation in relation to a dative argument, as (58) shows, which strongly suggests that the adjectival passives’ surface subject is an external argument rather than an underlying internal argument.

(58) *ha-‘uga munaxat l-i ‘al Sulxan.
    the-cake placed(A.PASS) to-me on table
    (My cake was placed on a table.)

The patterning of adjectival passives as unergative rather than unaccusative has been reported on the basis of other languages as well. The list of languages include, at least, Italian (Burzio 1986; Cinque 1990); Russian (Pesetsky 1982); and English (Levin and Rappaport 1986). The evidence regarding adjectival passives in these languages has been taken as support for the general claim that adjectives fundamentally differ from verbs in that they are unexceptionally external predicators—that is, for the claim that adjectives never take internal arguments (see, in particular, Borer 1984; Levin and Rappaport 1986; and Baker 2003). From what we have argued so far on the basis of Tagalog, we now know that adjectives cannot universally be external predicators. The question that we face, then, is whether or not we can explain, in a principled way, why adjectival passives in Tagalog pattern in the way they do—i.e., as unaccusative—rather than in the way that
adjectival passives in other languages pattern—i.e., as unergative. Below, I suggest that there is a way to explain this variation.

6.1. The UTAH problem

Before we answer the cross-linguistic puzzle posed above, let us first consider a different angle on the problem posed by adjectival passives, relating—in particular—to the UTAH. Concretely, the fact that adjectival passives pattern as unergative in many languages is problematic for the UTAH, which predicts adjectival passives to be unaccusative. In particular, given that adjectival passives are related to transitive and passive verbs whose theme argument is realized underlyingly as an internal argument, then it ought to follow that the theme argument of an adjectival passive is an (underlying) internal argument as well. As discussed above, however, this expectation is not born out in all languages. I now outline two approaches to this problem.

6.1.1. Abandoning the UTAH. Borer (2005) argues that the unergative behavior of adjectival passives in languages like Hebrew presents strong evidence against the UTAH. She thus rejects a theory of argument structure that assumes the UTAH—so called “endskeletal” approaches to argument structure, and develops instead an alternative “exo-skeletal” approach to argument structure in which the projection of arguments depends principally on aspectual matters, but is independent of any lexical information.

According to Borer, unaccusative verbs (including passive verbs) and transitive change-of-state verbs are telic events (see also, Hoekstra 1984; Van Valin 1990; Dowty 1991; Tenny 1992; among others). Telicity, she proposes, arises in the syntax as a consequence of a specifier-head relationship between a DP (a THEME argument) and a functional head, Asp(ect)Q (Q for quantity). The projection of AspQ is necessary for a telic event interpretation, and the Spec, AspQ position is associated with all the properties associated with internal arguments. Adjectival passives, on the other hand, are atelic and stative. Thus, according to Borer’s assumptions, AspQP is not projection in the syntactic representation of a clause containing an adjectival passive. As such, there is no syntactic position associated with internal argument properties for the argument of an adjectival passive, and hence, the argument that is co-present in a clause containing an adjectival passive predicate (which, according to Borer, is generated directly in Spec, TP), exhibits prototypical external argument properties. The fact that adjectival passives and, say, verbal passives differ in their argument structure properties (the former being unergative, the latter unaccusative) thus arises as a consequence of their different aspectual properties.

Within Borer’s system, it seems that there is only one way in which adjectival passives could differ from one language to another in terms of their argument structure. Concretely, adjectival passives might pattern as unaccusative rather than unergative in a given language if their asaspectual properties pattern with unaccusative or transitive change-of-state verbs—i.e., if they were telic and eventive predicates rather than stative. Such an interpretation would be the result of a DP occupying Spec, AspQ, which is associated with internal argument propereties (i.e., unaccusativity). This does not seem to be the right approach to the characterization of adjectival passives in Tagalog, however, as I will now attempt to show.
Adjectival passives describe a result state but not the activity by which the result state is achieved. Thus, it does not make much sense to classify them as telic predicates, as this term applies only to eventive predicates but not to stative ones. We can illustrate the claim that adjectival passives are stative rather than eventive by observing that eventive predicates in Tagalog, of the sort that describe an activity with an endpoint, may be modified by a phrase indicating the duration of the activity before the endpoint was reached (e.g., modifiers of the sort—in English—in an hour).

(59) Sa loob ng isa-ng linggo matapos ang miting.
    LOC head NS one-L week AGR:ASP.finish S meeting
    ‘The meeting finished within a week.’
    (=It took a week for the meeting to finish.)

As in English and other languages, stative predicates in Tagalog cannot co-occur with a modifier of this sort, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (60) where the stative verb marunong (‘know’) co-occurs with the modifier sa loob ng isa-ng linggo (‘in a week’).

(60) *Sa loob ng isa-ng linggo marunong ng Tagalog.
    LOC head NS a-L week know NS Tagalog
    (I know/knew Tagalog in a week.)

Significantly, adjectival passives also cannot co-occur with such a modifier, as the ungrammaticality of (61) demonstrates (compare to (59)).

(61) *Sa loob ng isa-ng linggo tapos ang miting.
    LOC head NS a-L week finished S meeting
    (The meeting is/was finished within a week.)

The contrast between (59) and (61) suggests that adjectival passives in Tagalog are stative rather than eventive. Thus, according to Borer’s syntactic characterization of unaccusativity, adjectival passives are incorrectly predicted to be unergative predicates. Since this is not the result we are interested in, we can move on to consider an alternative approach.

6.1.2. Baker’s resolution. Baker (2003) offers a different approach to the UTAH problem, which attempts to resolve the problem while still maintaining the correctness of UTAH.
His solution involves adopting a view of thematic roles in which thematic roles like \textsc{agent} and \textsc{theme} are always associated with specific syntactic configurations.\footnote{This approach to the structure of simple transitives is similar to the approach presented in the work of Hale and Keyser (2002) (and see McCawley 1969 for precedent), though it differs in that thematic roles, while associated with specific syntactic configurations, are not defined with respect to these configurations. Other considerations lead to positing this type of structure as well. In particular, if one assumes Larson’s (1988) “shell-structure” view of triadic verbs such as \textit{give}. Concretely, Larson (1988) (and many others following) propose that the dative argument of verbs in the \textit{give}-class is the innermost argument of the verb (as in (i)) rather than an outermost argument (as in (ii)):}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] \[vP \[v [VP the toy \[V' give \[PP to the child]]]]\]
  \item[(ii)] \[vP \[v [VP \[V' give \[V the toy] \[PP to the child]]]]\]
\end{itemize}

Since the dative (=\textsc{goal}) argument in (i) is the innermost complement of \textsc{V}, this leaves only the specifier position of \textsc{VP} as a location for the verb’s \textsc{theme} argument. If this is the correct structure for triadic predicates like \textit{give}, then according to the UTAH, the theme argument of even a simple dyadic verb such as \textit{break} must also be realized as the Spec, \textsc{VP}.

I will argue in the following section (Section 6.4) against a VP-structure for Tagalog in which the \textsc{theme} argument of the verb is projected as a specifier of \textsc{VP}, as in (56). If these arguments are sound, the conclusion would seem to preclude a shell-structure analysis of triadic predicates in Tagalog. In general, the available evidence on triadic verbs in Tagalog is consistent with either Larsonian shell-structure analysis or an analysis along the lines in (ii). On the other hand, there is a significant distinction between an oblique argument that happens to be directly selected by a verb, and the oblique argument that occurs with triadic predicates. Concretely, the latter type of oblique (along with various PP adverbials), but not the former, may be \textit{wh}-extracted in apparent violation of the “Subject-only” restriction that characterizes many “Philippine-type” languages. This is shown by the contrast in (iii)-(iv), from de Guzmán (1986:65):

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(iii)] \textit{Sa akin nila} i-binigay ang laruan.
        Obl me they(ns) agr-asp.give s toy
        ‘To me, they gave the toy.’
  \item[(iv)] *\textit{Sa bata}’ako n-agbantay.
        Obl child I(s) agr.asp-guard
        ‘The child, I guarded.’
\end{itemize}

The contrast here might be explained, at least partially, in terms of a structural difference in the relation between the verb and the oblique argument. In particular, if we suppose that the extraction restriction in Tagalog prohibits any argument directly governed by the verb from being extracted, then the possibility of extraction in (iii) might follow from the fact that the oblique (=the \textsc{goal} argument) is not directly governed by the verb, as the Larsonian analysis of triadic verbs would have it.\footnote{There are adjectives (e.g., \textit{afraid}, \textit{upset}, etc.) that select oblique arguments. Baker’s claim pertains specifically to the ability of an adjective to take an internal DP argument that bears a \textsc{theme} theta-role. Things are complicated for Baker, then, in the light of de-verbal adjectives formed with –\textit{ive}. Consider the following:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] Marjorie is supportive of my proposal.
  \item[(ii)] Evil examples are destructive to/of the morals of youth.
  \item[(iii)] It is also critical and corrective of the inadequacies, omissions, and}
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theme DP), the adjective (or a projection thereof, rather) must first merge with a functional head—Pred(icate) (following Bowers 1993). Pred, according to Baker, is a syntactic head that is defined as having the function of Chierchia’s (1984) “up operator”. Its semantic function is to raise the type of a non-predicate of type $e$ into a predicate of type $\langle e, t \rangle$. Given these assumptions, the partial structure associated with an adjectival passive like broken would be as shown in (62).

(62)

On the one hand, Baker’s proposal simply represents one way of formalizing the claim that adjectives are, in Levin and Rappaport’s (1986) terms, external predications. Plainly, the theme argument in (62) is an external argument in the strict sense that it is not an argument that is selected for directly by the adjective.

Assuming (62), Baker proposes to solve the UTAH problem posed by adjectival passives by adopting a more complex structure of VP than that which is traditionally assumed. Concretely, he adopts a structure for VP in which the theme argument of a verb is not the internal argument of a verb in the traditional sense (i.e., a direct complement of a verb), but rather in which it “severed” from the verb. The version of this proposal that Baker adopts places the theme argument of a verb like break in the specifier of a predicate forming element, V$_{BE}$, which has an AP (denoting the result state inherent in the meaning of the verb) as its complement. This is shown in (63).  

17 This structure is not particularly novel to Baker’s work. In particular, it is related to the proposals of McCawley 1968, Dowty 1979, Parsons 1990, among others) in which event predicates (e.g., break) are semantically decomposed into an activity sub-event and a result/state sub-event. What is unique to Baker’s proposal is the proposal that this semantic decomposition is also represented syntactically (see also, Hale and Keyser 2002), something which the authors above did not explicitly assume.
(63)

What is crucial for Baker in adopting (63) is that the THEME argument is projected in a configurationally uniform way with the theme argument in the structure in (62). Concretely, the THEME argument of an adjective as well as the theme argument of a verb is projected in the specifier of a predicate forming head (Pred/V_{BE}), which takes an AP complement. In this way, Baker claims that the UTAH is able to be maintained.\textsuperscript{18}

6.2. Interim discussion

Baker’s solution to the UTAH problem is particularly interesting because it opens up a way for explaining cross-linguistic variation in the domain of the argument structure of adjectival passives. Concretely, Baker’s solution to the UTAH problem crucially depends on the independent availability of the VP-structure in (63) within the grammar of a language. If the VP-structure in (63) is not countenanced by the grammar of a particular language, on the other hand, then there would be no way to solve the UTAH problem posed by adjectival passives that pattern as unergative rather than unaccusative (i.e., where adjectival passives project a structure like (62)). On the other hand, The UTAH would still be respected in a language where the VP-structure in (63) is not countenanced if adjectival passives pattern as unaccusative rather than unergative. Of course, for this reasoning to be sound, we must assume that the UTAH (or whatever principles derive the UTAH) does not require the mapping of arguments onto syntactic structure to be uniform across-languages—rather, it simply requires the mapping to be uniformly consistent within a language. Suppose this is so.

Fleshing out these suggestions in more detail, let us suppose that UG makes two options available regarding the syntactic configuration in which a THEME argument associated with a predicate is projected. The THEME argument of verbs and adjectives

\textsuperscript{18} Note that according to this analysis, the theme argument is always an “external argument” in a narrow sense. I am leaving out of my exposition a demonstration of how the configurations in (55) and (56) still derive the major syntactic differences between internal and external arguments in a broad sense—e.g., relating to the Hebrew examples in (49-51). See Baker (2003:62-77) for a demonstration that such differences still follow.
may be uniformly projected as the specifier of a Pred/V<sub>BE</sub> head, which takes an AP complement, as in (64), following Baker (2003). Alternatively, the theme argument for verbs and adjectives may be uniformly projected as the complement of V/A, as in (65). (For illustration, I use the predicate BROKE, with capitals used to abstract away from particular surface inflected forms.)

Theoretically speaking, there does not seem to be an issue of simplicity in the “choice” of (64) over (65). The option spelled out in (64) involves positing a more abstract syntax, but arguably involves simpler lexical representations because lexical items like BROKE do not need to be listed in the lexicon with information about the argument that they syntactically select as their complement. On the other hand, the option spelled out in (65) involves a simpler syntax, but more complex lexical representations since lexical items like BROKE, as both an adjective and as a verb, must have the fact that it selects a DP complement stipulated as part of its lexical entry.

Assuming the correctness of the UTAH, (64) and (65) are the only options. In other words, there can be no language where the theme argument of an adjective occurs in the configuration in (64a) while the theme argument of a verb occurs in the configuration in (65b). Likewise, there can be no language in which the theme argument of an adjective occurs in the configuration in (65a) while the theme argument of a verb occurs in the configuration in (65b), and so on. This assumption has the important consequence that if, for example, the VP-structure in (64b) is not countenanced by the grammar of a given language, then the structure in (64a) will also be precluded. In such a language, the only option with respect to the syntactic configuration in which the theme argument is projected will be the one represented by the structures in (65). In such a language, in other words, adjectival passives will be predicted to be unaccusative.

Bringing Tagalog back into the discussion, we have now seen the evidence that adjectival passives are unaccusative and thus, have the argument structure representation
of (65a). If the suggestion sketched in the immediately preceding paragraphs is correct, we should now be able to explain why adjectival passives would have this structure and not the one in (64a) (i.e., why they are not unergative) if we can also demonstrate that the VP-structure in (64b) is not an available structure in the grammar of Tagalog. We now turn to this task.

6.3. VP-structure in Tagalog

The difference between the structure in (64b) and (65b) is subtle enough that it is difficult to provide direct evidence that can decide which of these structures a language makes use of. However, there is suggestive evidence showing that Tagalog does not countenance the more complex VP-structure in (65b).

6.3.1. Resultative constructions. Structures analogous to (64b) have been proposed in the analysis of various types of “complex predicate” constructions. Notably, such a structure has been proposed as the structure that underlies resultative constructions in languages like English, as exemplified by sentences like (66).

(66) a. John painted the house red. (complex predicate = paint + red)
    b. John pounded the metal flat. (complex predicate = pound + flat)

“Complex predicate” here refers to the particular analysis of these constructions, in which it is supposed that a main verb (e.g., paint, pound) combines with an AP complement denoting the result state that is achieved by the activity denoted by the main verb, as schematized in (67) (see, e.g., Hale and Keyser 1993; Embick 2004; Larson 1988):

(67)

```
VP
   /\   \V'
  /   /  \   \AP
 DP the house V  paint\A[red]
```

What is unique about such constructions in English is that a bare adjective which serves as the result or depictive seem to combine with a verb via direct complementation rather

19 With respect to Baker’s VP-structure, he proposes that the resultative predicate is head-adjoined to the lexical A projection that is the most deeply embedded projection with the verb phrase.

(i) \([vP\text{ John }[v\text{ V(Cause)}] [vP\text{ the house }[v\text{ V(BE) }\text{[AP ([A paint][A red])])}]])\]
than adverbial modification. Observe, for instance, that the adjectives in (66) do not have the same type of distributional flexibility available to adverbs. Compare:

(68) a. John (*red) painted the house (red).
   b. John (*flat) pounded the metal (flat).
   c. John (deliberately) painted the house (deliberately).

Significantly, Tagalog contrasts with English in that AP’s that function semantically as resultatives are VP adverbs rather than complements to a V-head. This is evidenced first by the fact, seen in (69), that they exhibit positional freedom (occurring either to the left or to the right of the verb) with respect to the verb, which true complements never do. Further evidence for their adverbial status comes from the fact that they can only be integrated into the clause by means of the linker element na (allomorph, -ng), which is generally responsible for joining adverbs to phrases but which does not—in general—have a role in introducing arguments.

(69) a. Pula-ng pininturah-an ni Juan ang bahay.
   red-L ASP,paint-AGR NS Juan S house
   ‘Juan painted the house red.’
   b. Pininturah-an na pula ni Juan ang bahay.
   ASP,paint-AGR L red NS Juan S house
   ‘Juan painted the house red.’

What this observation suggests is that Tagalog does not countenance structures of the type in (67), in which a lexical verb selects a bare lexical AP complement. But observe now that this is essentially the same type of configuration posited by the articulated VP-structure in (64b). To the extent that structures like (67) are ruled out, therefore, it stands to reason that structures like (64b) should also be ruled out.

6.3.2. Depictives. A related piece of suggestive evidence comes from depictive modification. While Tagalog allows subjects and non-subject external arguments to serve as controllers for depictive modifiers, true object depictives in which a non-subject direct object is predicated of the depictive modifier are apparently not possible (Kroeger 1993; Nagaya 2003). The facts are exemplified by the paradigm in (70)-(71) (from Nagaya 2003). (70) shows that an external argument (whether it is the subject as in (70a) or a non-subject as in (70b)) may be predicated of the depictive. As (71) shows, however, a non-subject direct object may not be predicated of a depictive ((71a)) unless, as in (71b), it has been promoted to subject.
a. Lasing na tumakbo ang lalaki sa dagat. (External/Subject)
   drunk L AGR.ASP.run S man LOC beach
   ‘The man ran to the beach drunk.’

b. Nakahubad na kina-in ni Juan ang hapunan. (External/Non-subject)
   naked L ASP.eat-AGR NS Juan S supper
   ‘Juan ate the supper naked.’

(71) a. *Hilaw na humiwa ang lalaki ng isda. (Object/Non-subject)
   raw L AGR.ASP.cut S man NS fish
   (The man cut some fish raw.)

b. Hilaw na hiniwa ng lalaki ang isda. (Object/Subject)
   raw L ASP.cut-AGR NS man S fish
   ‘The man cut the fish raw.’

To understand this pattern, let us first assume the minimal condition on depictive predication that the argument predicated of the depictive must c-command the depictive (Williams 1980: 204; Hale and Keyser 2002: 164-168). Now consider the two structures in (72), based on the sentence in (71a). The structure in (72a) is based on the articulated VP-structure in (64b), in which the verb’s internal argument is the argument of a complex predicate consisting of VBE plus a bare AP complement. The structure in (72b) is based on the more traditional VP structure in which the verb’s internal argument is the direct complement of the verb.

(72) a.       b.        
     VP          VP
     VP          DepP     DepP
     DepP
     DP          V’      DP
     V’          raw     V’
     fish        raw     AP
     VBE         A
     AP          A
     CUT         CUT
    |            |
   the fish    the fish

Comparing these two structures, we can see that in (72a) the verb’s THEME argument c-commands the depictive—or rather, that the theme argument and the depictive mutually c-command one another given a segment theory of adjunction. By contrast, the theme argument does not c-command the depictive in (77b). Of these two structures, then, only the one in (77b) correctly precludes the depictive from being predicated of the object.
The structure in (72a), on the other hand, incorrectly predicts object depictive modification to be possible, contrary to the fact.20

6.3.3. Snyder’s Complex Predicate Constraint. We are now in a position to ask what type of constraint would rule out complex predicate structure like (67)/(72a), and—by extension—(64b)? Interestingly, the absence of these structures in Tagalog is predicted on the basis of the claims and proposal reported in Snyder (2001).

Based on comparative findings as well as evidence from language acquisition, Snyder observes a significant correlation between the availability of complex predicate constructions, e.g., English style resultative constructions, and the availability of (endocentric) root compounds of the (cross-linguistically rare) type that do not require any overt morphological or syntactic connective. Thus, while English clearly allows such compound forms (e.g., emergency-exit), many other languages require a morphological or syntactic connective to combine items such as two nouns (e.g., in French, sortie de secours, ‘exit of emergency’). Significantly, Tagalog does not permit endocentric compounds of the English sort. When combining two nouns to form an endocentric compound, for instance, a linker is required. Consider the forms in (73).

(73)  
   a. mesa-ng sulatan
        table-L writing
        ‘writing table’
   b. awiti-ng bayan
        song-L nation
        ‘folk-song’
   c. mata-ng lawin
        eye-L hawk
        ‘hawk-eyes’

By Snyder’s observed correlation, therefore, Tagalog is predicted not to countenance complex predicate structure like the English resultative construction. As we saw with respect to the examples in (69) above, this prediction is born out. We can now also suggest that this constraint is what ultimately lies behind the absence of true objective depictives, as observed with respect to the examples in (70)-(71).

Snyder formalizes the correlation between endocentric compounding and complex predicate structure as an LF constraint, which he refers to as the Complex Predicate Constraint. Broadly speaking, he proposes that complex predicate structures, e.g., of the sort in (64b)/(67), can only be interpreted if the head of the complement (AP) combines with (in surface structure or at LF) the V head that selects it (e.g., by head-movement A-to-V), essentially forming an endocentric root compound (cf. the proposal of von

20 In principle, a language could have only the structure in (72b) and still allow true object depictives. For instance, if the condition on depictive predication for some languages requires m-command rather than c-command, then object depictives would be well formed on the basis of (72b). As a reviewer points out, the proposal Section 6.3.3 seems to predict that Italian, which does not allow root compounding, would also not allow the structure in (72a). This, however, would incorrectly predict that Italian also does not have object depictives. The m-command possibility discussed above may solve this problem.
Stechow 1996). Given this assumption, Snyder reasons that complex predicate structures will only be possible in a language that independently allows for the formation of root compounds in this manner, as evidenced by whether they allow root compounds to be formed (as in English) without a morphological or syntactic connective. For our purposes, the important point is that the absence in Tagalog of complex predicate structures of the English resultative type in (67) is consistent with, and evidently predicted by, Snyder’s correlation. Now, the VP-structure in (64b) is another a type of complex predicate structure. By parity of reasoning, therefore, Snyder’s correlation also predicts that Tagalog should not countenance this structure.

Overall, then, the absence of complex predicate structures like (67) and—crucially—(64b) is predicted, and explained as following from a deeper source (see Beck and Snyder 2001; and Beck 2005 for more in-depth discussion of the Complex Predicate Constraint and the type of structures it covers).

6.5. Summary

There is, then, reason to believe that Tagalog does not countenance the kind of VP-structure proposed in (56). The available evidence suggests that VP-structure in Tagalog is, in fact, more minimal. Concretely, the theme argument of a verb apparently bears the structural relation to the verb that traditional approaches to VP-structure posit—namely, that of being a direct complement. To the extent that Tagalog argument structure conforms in an expected way under the UTAH, it follows that the theme argument of an adjectival passive, like that of a verb, must also be licensed as a direct complement—i.e., that adjectival passives must be unaccusative. If adjectival passives instead had an unergative argument structure (i.e., a structure like the one in (54a)), then the argument structure of adjectives and verbs would not accord with the UTAH. Put in other terms, having adjectival passives with an unaccusative argument structure is the only way for the UTAH to be respected, once it is recognized that the VP-structure in (54b) is independently unavailable—namely because, as suggested above, it is ruled out Snyder’s Complex Predicate Constraint).

6.5.1. Cross-linguistic predictions. Before moving on, I would like to address some of the comparative issues that arise from the above discussion. The hypothesis under consideration is that if a language’s adjectival passives patterns as unergative, then—given the take on the UTAH discussed above—the language also ought to show positive evidence for a complex VP-structure (e.g., (54b)). Complex VP-structure involves a kind of complex predicate structure. Thus, drawing on Snyder’s Complex Predicate Constraint, a language with complex predicate structures must also be a language that allows root compounding. The minimal prediction, therefore, is that if a language’s

---

21 An anonymous reviewer asks whether Snyder’s Complex Predicate Constraint will also rule out the structures in which the external argument of a predicate is introduced by a light-predicate selecting a lexical complement. Concretely, recall from Section 4.3.2 that I assume that the external argument of a ma-adjectives is licensed by the light-predicate head, a, which selects a lexical AP complement. This structure is analogous to the structure I have been assuming for the verb phrase, in which the external argument is introduced by the light verb, v, which takes a VP complement.
adjectival passives (and perhaps all of its adjectives) patterns as unergative, then the language also ought to permit root compounding—i.e., as evidence that it could support a complex VP-structure.

Now, we have already seen that adjectival passives in Hebrew pattern as unergative, so, according to the prediction just stated, it should also allow root compounding. This is correct, given the existence of root compouns such as gan-yeladim ‘kindergarten (lit. garden-children), beyt-xolim ‘hospital (lit. house-sick)’ (Borer 1984). If adjectival passives in English also pattern as unergative, as Levin and Rappaport (1986) claim, then this would also be consistent with the predictions made above given that root compounding and complex predicate structures (e.g., resulatives) are attested for English. As an aside, it is perhaps surprising that Hebrew is evidently like Tagalog (and unlike English) in that it does not have resultative constructions of the English type in (66). This is not necessarily a problem, however. As Synder is careful to point out, the Complex Predicate Constraint does not predict that if a language has root compounding that it will also have all of the types of complex predicate structures (e.g., resulatives) that other language might possess. In other words, the Complex Predicate Constraint is a one-way implication, such that if a language has one or more types of complex predicate structures, then it must also have root compounding.

A more difficult case for a comparison with Tagalog comes from Romance—in particular, Italian. Like most Romance languages, Italian does not have root compounding (nor does it have English-style resultatives, but this is of lesser relevance given the above remarks). It is apparently problematic, then, that the celebrated ne-cliticization diagnostic used to distinguish unaccusatives from unergatives reveals that adjectival passives in Italian pattern as unergative rather than unaccusative. Possibly complicating matters further is the fact that there is also a class of adjectives in Italian (including, noto (‘well-known), chiar(o) (‘clear), cert(o) (‘certain), sicur(o) (‘sure), oscur(o) (‘obscure), probabil(e) (‘probably’), gradit(o) (‘welcome’), among others), which Cinque (1990) has convincingly showed to pattern as unaccusative.

However, while ne-cliticization is a widely used diagnostic for unaccusativity in Italian, problems have been noted in the literature that cast some doubt on the connection between argument structure (unaccusativity) and ne-cliticization. Lonzi (1986) observes, for instance, that a number of ‘have’-selecting (and therefore, decidedly unergative) intransitives permit ne-cliticization.

(75) Ne cammina tanta, di gente, su quei marciapiedi.
NE walk-3SG much of people on those pavements
‘Of them walk a lot (of people), on those pavements.’
(Lonzi 1986: 112)

Additionally, Bentley (2004) points out that some adjectives (including adjectival passives), which do not permit ne-cliticization in the present tense (76), do evidently license ne-cliticization in the perfective (77a) and punctual past (77b). (According to Bentley’s description, the predicate is interpreted in these contexts as a contingent state (Stage-level) rather than an inherent state (Individual-level).)
Bentley observes that *ne-cliticization with predicates like these (i.e., those which, in other contexts, might not allow *ne-cliticization) is only possible when the sentence is interpreted with sentence or presentational-focus, whereas *ne-cliticization with unaccusative verbs like *arrivano (‘arrive’) is compatible either with sentence or narrow-focus (e.g., predicate-focus). Overall, then, observations like this one suggest one of two things: (i) That some predicates (e.g., adjectival passives) that were thought to be unergative are actually unaccusative, and that unaccusativity is a necessary but not sufficient condition for licensing *ne-cliticization; or (ii) That unaccusativity is a sufficient but not necessary condition for *ne-cliticization (see Valin 1990; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; and Borer 2005 for additional discussion of this viewpoint). If the latter view turns out to be correct, then the argument structure properties of adjectival passives cannot straightforwardly be determined on the basis of *ne-cliticization alone.

This is not meant to dismiss Italian as a possible counterexample altogether, but rather to make clear that any clear counterexample must come from a languages with an uncontroversial diagnostic for determining unaccusative/unergative argument structure (i.e., one that it not also confounded by non-syntactic factors). Italian does not seem to be such a case. I currently know of other such examples, and therefore leave the predictions open to further research.22

7. Conclusion

The evidence from Tagalog presented here broadens the cross-linguistic profile of adjectives by demonstrating that unergative argument structure is not a universal property of adjectival passives. I have proposed that the variation in argument structure behavior

---

22 One other language mentioned in the text that would seem to be problematic for my proposal is Russian: Russian does not allow root compounding, and I therefore predict that its adjectival passives would pattern as unaccusative rather than unergative. It would appear problematic, then, that according to the widely cited “Genitive of Negation” diagnostic for unaccusativity (Perlmutter 1978; Pesetsky 1982), adjectival passives in Russian appear to pattern as unergative (Pesetsky 1982). Like Italian *ne-cliticization, however, “Genitive of Negation” has been argued not to be a straightforward unaccusativity diagnostic. Babby (1980, 2000), for instance, argues that unaccusativity is neither necessary nor sufficient for Genitive of Negation.
that is found (e.g., by contrasting Tagalog with Hebrew, for instance) can be tied to another property of languages—namely, the structure of VP, and—more specifically—to the particulars of how the THEME argument of a predicate is syntactically projected within VP in a given language. If the proposal is on the right track, then it would appear that the argument structure representations of predicates can vary to some extent from language to language. I suggested that in the face of such variation, a constrained theory of argument structure can still be maintained if principles like the UTAH are taken to enforce configurational uniformity of argument structure representations within a language, though not necessarily across languages.
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