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I will advocate a syntactic analysis of the formation of predicative adjectival passives. In particular, I will argue in the first half of this paper that Myers' generalization (Myers (1984), Pesetsky (1995)) plays a crucial role in the formation of predicative adjectival passives, showing that a verb accompanied by a covert morpheme, such as a verb in the double object construction, cannot enjoy the formation of adjectival passives.

In the latter half of this paper, I will provide four pieces of evidence in favor of a syntactic analysis of the formation of adjectival passives. They are concerned with the fact that they are compatible with a resultative predicate, an as-clause, a floating quantifier in a post-adjectival passive position, and reanalysis.*
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1. Introduction

The central aim of this paper is to provide a syntactic analysis of the formation of predicative adjectival passives, which has been widely assumed to be a matter in the lexicon (e.g. Wasow (1977), Williams
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In particular, paying attention to restrictions imposed upon the formation of predicative adjectival passives, I will argue that these restrictions can be readily accounted for in terms of Myers' generalization (Myers (1984), Pesetsky (1995)). Then, assuming constraints imposed upon resultatives, as-clauses, and floating quantifiers, I will show that DP-movement is involved in the formation of predicative adjectival passives, which lends further support for their syntactic analysis. Furthermore, I will suggest that the restriction on reanalysis between a verb and a preposition strengthens the syntactic view of the formation of predicative adjectival passives.

This paper is organized as follows: after reviewing some restrictions on the formation of predicative adjectival passives in section 2, I will show how Myers' generalization comes into play in the formation of adjectival passives in section 3. In section 4, I will show the presence of an internal argument in predicative adjectival passives, and then, I will argue that the presence of reanalysis in predicative adjectival passives further confirms the view that will be developed in this paper. In section 5, I will present some implications of the analysis. Finally, section 6 concludes this paper.

2. Restrictions on Predicative Adjectival Passives

It has long been recognized in the literature (e.g. Wasow (1977)) that the formation of predicative adjectival passives is not entirely free, though it seems very productive at first glance. In what follows, I will show six restrictions imposed upon it.\(^1\) First, as opposed to the dative

\(^1\) I employ two of the criteria shown by Wasow (1977) so as to distinguish adjectival passives from verbal passives. The first one concerns the position in which adjectival passives appear. More specifically, they can serve as a complement to certain verbs, such as *act*, *become*, *look*, *remain*, and *sound*, as illustrated in (i).

\[ \text{(i) John acted / became / looked / remained / seemed / sounded elated / annoyed at us / convinced to run} \] (adapted from Wasow (1977: 339))

The second one, originally provided by Siegel (1970), is concerned with the fact that adjectival passives can be accompanied by the prefix *un-*, as illustrated in (ii).

\[ \text{(ii) a. The island was uninhabited by humans.} \]
\[ \text{b. Her whereabouts may be unknown.} \] (Wasow (1977: 339))

Note that the verbs in (ii) in their transitive use cannot be accompanied by the prefix, as illustrated in (iii).
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construction in (1), the double object construction does not participate in adjectival passive formation, as in (2).

(1) The story was untold (?to Bill). (Wasow (1977))
(2) *Bill was untold (the story). (Wasow (1977))

Second, help and thank do not participate in adjectival passive formation, as shown in (3):

(3) *John always acted/seems helped/thanked by his friends. (Wasow (1977))

Third, in contrast to the (a)-examples in (4) and (5), where the complementizer that is present, its absence gives rise to ungrammaticality, as shown in the (b)-examples in (4) and (5).

(4) a. ?It seems widely believed that the earth is round.
   b. ??It seems widely believed the earth is round.
(5) a. ?It seems widely accepted that the earth is round.
   b. ??It seems widely accepted the earth is round.

Note that like the data in (4) and (5), the absence of the complementizer for in a post-adjectival passive position yields ungrammaticality in (6b).

(6) a. ?It seems preferred for students from Japan to study English much harder.
   b. *Students from Japan seem preferred to study English much harder.

Fourth, ECM verbs cannot take part in the formation of predicative adjectival passives, as shown in (7).

(7) *Smithi seems believed ti to have fled the country. (Levin and Rappaport (1986))

Fifth, like the ECM construction, verbs followed by small clauses cannot entertain the formation of adjectival passives, as in (8).

(8) ??John seems considered a fool. (Wasow (1977))

Sixth, and finally, while resultatives derived from transitive verbs (henceforth, transitive resultatives) participate in the formation of predicative adjectival passives, as shown in (9), those derived from intran-
sitive verbs (henceforth, intransitive resultatives) do not, as in (10).

(9) It seems hammered flat. (Fabb (1984))

(10) *The pavement looked run thin. (Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995))

In the next section, I show how these restrictions can be explained in terms of Myers' generalization.

3. An Analysis

As for the data reviewed in the previous section, I propose a syntactic analysis of the formation of predicative adjectival passives. In particular, I claim that syntactic affixation of the adjectival morpheme -en onto a verb is involved in the formation of adjectival passives, inducing movement of a postverbal DP into [Spec, TP], just like with verbal passives. Furthermore, the morpheme should be regarded as a derivational one in the sense that the affixation induces a categorial change from V to A. Thus, it is natural to claim that the affixation of this morpheme to a verbal stem is subject to Myers' generalization in (11), just as other derivational morphemes are.

(11) Myers' generalization
Zero-derived words do not permit the affixation of further derivational morphemes.

(Pesetsky (1995: 75); see also Myers (1984))

Given this, (12a) and (12b) schematically represent well-formed and ill-formed structures respectively.²³

(12) a. \([TP \; DP_i \; \text{seems} \; [AP \; t'_i \; [A \; V\text{-en}] \; [VP \; t_v \; t_i]]]\) (well-formed)

b. *\([TP \; DP_i \; \text{seems} \; [AP \; t'_i \; [A \; [V \; V+\emptyset] \; \text{-en}] \; [VP \; t_v \; t_i]]]\)
   (ill-formed; "\emptyset" is a zero morpheme)

Note that the verbal passive morpheme -en, which is homophonous

² Note that "V" and "VP" in (12) stand for the lower V and VP in the VP-shell structure in the sense of Larson (1988) and Chomsky (1995).

³ I assume that the DP serving as a surface subject of a predicative adjectival passive goes through [Spec, AP] due to the requirement of shortest movement (Chomsky (1995)).
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to the adjectival passive morpheme, is exempted from Myers' generalization, since it is an inflectional morpheme and Myers' generalization applies only to derivational morphemes. Thus, two different passive morphemes are assumed: one for verbal passives and the other for adjectival passives.

In what follows, I will show how my analysis explains the grammaticality and the ungrammaticality of the examples shown in section 2.

3.1. The Double Object Construction vs. the Dative Construction

Let me begin with the analysis of the contrast in grammaticality between the adjectival passive counterpart of the dative construction and that of the double object construction, repeated here as (13) and (14), respectively.

(13) The story was untold (?to Bill).  (Wasow (1977))  (=1))
(14) *Bill was untold (the story).  (Wasow (1977))  (=2))

A key to the contrast lies in the difference between the structure of the dative construction and that of the double object construction. More specifically, Pesetsky (1995) claims that a covert preposition is involved in the double object construction, whereas such a covert preposition is not involved in the dative construction. A piece of evidence for the proposal comes from the grammaticality of the nominal counterpart of the dative construction and the ungrammaticality of the nominal counterpart of the double object construction, as shown in (15a) and (15b), respectively (see also Kayne (1984)).

(15) a. John's assignment of a hard sonata to Mary  (Pesetsky (1995))
   cf. John assigned a hard sonata to Mary.

b. *John's assignment of Mary (of) a hard sonata  (Pesetsky (1995))
   cf. John assigned Mary a hard sonata.

As for (15a), the structure is something like (16), in which the verbal stem is not accompanied by a covert morpheme.

(16) John's [assign-ment] of a hard sonata to Mary  
   (no covert prepositions are involved)

Due to the absence of a covert morpheme, the verb can undergo the affixation, in accordance with Myers' generalization in (11), yielding grammaticality (cf. Pesetsky (1995)).

Concerning the ungrammaticality of (15b), its structure is something like (17), where the verb accompanied by a covert preposition under-
goes further affixation of a nominal suffix.\(^4\)

\[(17) \ *\text{John's } [\text{assign-}O_P-\text{ment}] \text{ of Mary } t_P \text{ a hard sonata} \]

\[\quad (O_P=\text{a covert preposition involved in the double object construction})\]

Thus, (17) is excluded by Myers' generalization in (11), giving rise to the ungrammaticality of (15b) (cf. Pesetsky (1995)).

Adapting the proposals into the VP-shell structure put forth by Larson (1988) and further developed by Chomsky (1995), I assume that the structure of the dative construction and that of the double object construction are something like (18b) and (19b), respectively.

\[(18) \quad \begin{array}{ll} 
\text{a. } & \text{John assigned a hard sonata to Mary.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Johni } [v_P \ t_i [v \text{ assigned}] [v_P \text{ a hard sonata } t_j [PP \text{ to Mary}]]].
\end{array} \]

\[(19) \quad \begin{array}{ll} 
\text{a. } & \text{John assigned Mary a hard sonata.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Johni } [v_P \ t_i [v \text{ assigned}+O_P] [v_P \text{ Mary } t_j [PP \ t_P [DP \text{ a hard sonata}]]]].
\end{array} \]

Given this, I assume that \textit{tell} in its dative use in (13) contains no covert preposition, while \textit{tell} in the double object construction in (14) involves the affixation of a covert preposition onto the verb. Thus, I assume the following structures.

\[(20) \quad \begin{array}{ll}
\text{a. } & \text{Johni } [v_P \ t_i [v \text{ told}] [v_P \text{ the story } t_j [PP \text{ to Bill}]]].
\quad \text{cf. John told the story to Bill.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Johni } [v_P \ t_i [v \text{ told}+O_P] [v_P \text{ Bill } t_j [PP \ t_P [DP \text{ the story}]]]].
\quad \text{cf. John told Bill the story.}
\end{array} \]

Turning now to the contrast in the grammaticality of the adjectival passive counterpart of the dative construction and the ungrammaticality of the adjectival passive counterpart of the double object construction, the structures given in (20) offer a principled account for it. More precisely, the structure for (21a) is something like (21b), where the verb not accompanied by a covert morpheme takes part in the affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme \textit{-en}, in accordance with Myers' generalization.

---

\(^4\) Pesetsky (1995) claims that a covert morpheme is an affix, thereby adjoining to a verb in the course of a derivation.
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(21) a. The story was untold (?to Bill).  
(Wasow (1977))  (=1)

b. [DP The story]i was [AP ti [A un [A [V tell]j -en]] [VP tj [PP to Bill]]]

Thus, the adjectival passive counterpart of tell in its dative use is well-formed.

In contrast, the structure of the adjectival passive counterpart of the double object construction is something like (22b), where the verb accompanied by a covert preposition participates in the affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme -en:

(22) a. *Bill was untold (the story).  
(Wasow (1977))  (=2)

b. *Billi was [AP ti [A un [A [V tell+OP]j -en]] [VP ti tj [PP tP the story]]].

Thus, the structure in (22b) is excluded by Myers’ generalization, and hence, the adjectival passive counterpart of tell in the double object construction is ill-formed.5

3.2. Help and Thank

I would like to show that the ungrammaticality of the adjectival passive counterparts of help and thank, as in (23), can be analyzed on a par with that of the adjectival passive counterpart of the double object construction just discussed in the previous subsection.6

(23) *John always {acted/seems} {helped/thanked} by his friends.  
(Wasow (1977))  (=3)

In so doing, I briefly discuss the structure of help and thank in their transitive use. Though the verbs in question appear at first glance to be transitive, subcategorizing a DP as their complement, I would like to claim that their complement is a PP, headed by a covert preposition.

5 I assume that a morpheme that resides in v0 should be regarded as an inflectional morpheme, exempt from Myers’ generalization. Thus, given that the verbal passive morpheme -en resides in v0 (cf. Yamada (2000)), a verb in the double object construction can participate in the affixation of the morpheme, as shown in (iib), though it is accompanied by a covert morpheme ((ii) is the underlying structure for (iib)).

(i) a. They gave John a book.
   b. John was given a book.

(ii) [TP be [vP [v -en] [vp John [v give] [pp OP [dp a book]]]].

6 I am indebted to Heizo Nakajima for the analysis presented in this subsection.
Furthermore, I assume that due to its affixal nature, the preposition undergoes affixation onto V. Thus, the structure of help in its transitive use is something like (24) (irrelevant details are left unexpressed):

\[
(24) \text{Mary} \left[ v \text{helped+}O_P \right] \left[ P_P \text{tP John} \right].
\]

A piece of evidence for the presence of a covert preposition in help and thank is provided by the selection of a preposition in their nominal counterparts, which is originally employed as a piece of evidence for Wasow’s (1977) claim that a postverbal DP with help and thank is an indirect object:

\[
(25) \text{Our} \left[ \text{help/thanks} \right] \left[ ? \text{to/*of} \right] \text{the hostess went unacknowledged.} \quad \text{(Wasow (1977))}
\]

I claim that to in (25) is an overt realization of the covert preposition in the verbal use of help and thank.

Turning back to the ungrammaticality of (23), the structure in (24) provides an analysis in terms of Myers’ generalization. More specifically, the adjectival passive counterparts of the verbs are ill-formed, because a verb accompanied by a covert morpheme undergoes affixation of an adjectival passive morpheme, as in (26) (irrelevant details omitted).

\[
(26) \text{*Johni always seems} \left[ A_P \text{t'i} \left[ A \left[ v \text{helped+}O_P \right] -\text{en} \right] \right] \left[ V_P \text{tV} \left[ P_P \text{tP tP} \right. \right] \ldots].
\]

7 Note that the direct object of a verb is preceded by the preposition of in its nominal counterpart, as shown in (i), and that a DP that is a complement to a (covert) preposition is marked by other prepositions in the nominal counterpart of a verb, as shown in (ii).

(i) a. the destruction of the city
cf. They destroyed the city.
b. the establishment of an organization
cf. They established an organization.

(ii) a. Your story bears/has/shows/ little or no resemblance to the facts. \text{(OALD p. 1074)}
b. He gave assistance to me in time of distress. \text{(Sunrise p. 83)}

Given these data, the DP in the postverbal position of help and thank is not a direct object, but a complement to a covert preposition.

8 I suggest that the covert preposition affixed onto verbs such as resemble, assist, help and thank in their transitive use must be overtly realized in their nominal counterparts, since the verbs accompanied by a covert preposition cannot undergo the affixation of a nominal morpheme.
Thus, *help* and *thank* cannot undergo adjectival passive formation.

3.3. The Presence or Absence of a Complementizer

The (b)-examples in (27) and (28), which show that the absence of the complementizer *that* gives rise to deviance in adjectival passives, lend further support for the syntactic analysis of the formation of adjectival passives.

(27)  
  a. ?It seems widely believed that the earth is round.  
  b. ??It seems widely believed the earth is round.  

(28)  
  a. ?It seems widely accepted that the earth is round.  
  b. ??It seems widely accepted the earth is round.  

I assume that the embedded clause in the (a)-examples is a CP headed by the complementizer *that* as is usually assumed, and more crucially, that the one in the (b)-examples is also a CP headed by a null complementizer, which ultimately adjoins to a verb due to its affixal nature (cf. Pesetsky (1991)). Thus, the structures for the transitive counterparts of (27a) and (27b) are something like (29a) and (29b), respectively.

(29)  
  a. They [*V believe* [*CP [*C that* [*TP the earth is round*]]]].  
  b. They [*V believe+ØC* [*CP [*tC [*TP the earth is round*]]]].

A piece of evidence in favor of the presence of the affixal covert complementizer in *that*-less clauses as shown in (29b) comes from the fact that the deletion of the complementizer in the nominal counterpart of a verb gives rise to ill-formedness, as exemplified in (30b) ((30b) is adapted from Pesetsky (1991)).

(30)  
  a. Sue's confirmation [*that* the world is round]  
  b. *Sue's confirmation [*the world is round]*

---

9 Note that the complementizer *that* in a postnominal position cannot be deleted, even if the head noun is not derived from a verb, as illustrated in (i).

(i)  
  the rumor *(that) John loves Mary*

As for this, I assume that CP in the nominal is an appositive modifier, right-adjointed to the noun. Thus, movement of the covert affixal C out of CP will always violate the adjunct island condition, giving rise to ungrammaticality (cf. Ogawa (1996: fn. 9)).

Note, however, that CP in an adjectival passive should be regarded as a complement to a verb, so that the ungrammaticality of (27b) and (28b) with the absence of an overt C should be attributed to Myers’ generalization, as argued in the text.
Given that an overt complementizer, on the one hand, does not undergo affixation onto V, as in (29a) and a covert complementizer, on the other, does undergo affixation onto V as in (29b), the contrast in (30) can be attributed to Myers’ generalization. Namely, since the verbal stem confirm in (30a) is not accompanied by a covert complementizer, it allows further affixation of a derivational morpheme, giving rise to well-formedness, as illustrated in (31).

(31) Sue’s [N [V confirm] -ation] [that the world is round]

In contrast to (30a), (30b) is excluded by Myers’ generalization, since the verb accompanied by a covert morpheme undergoes further affixation of a derivational morpheme (i.e. the nominal affix -ation in this case), as shown in (32).

(32) *Sue’s [N [V confirm+ØC] -ation] [CP tC [TP the world is round]] (adapted from Pesetsky (1991))

Turning now to the contrast between the (a)-examples and the (b)-examples in (27) and (28), I would like to show that it is also explained in terms of Myers’ generalization on a par with (30). As for the (a)-examples in (27) and (28), where the complementizer is present, (33) is obtained for the structure of (27a).

(33) ?It seems [AP widely [A [V believe] -en] [VP tV [CP that [TP ...]]]] In this structure, the verb not accompanied by a zero morpheme undergoes affixation of the adjectival morpheme -en, in accordance with Myers’ generalization. Hence, (27a) is well-formed.

In contrast, assuming the presence of a covert complementizer in that-less clauses, the structure of (27b) is something like (34):

(34) ??It seems [AP widely [A [V believe+ØC] -en] [VP tV [CP tC [TP ...]]]].

In this structure, the verb accompanied by a covert morpheme takes part in further affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme -en. Thus, (34) is excluded by Myers’ generalization, giving rise to the ungrammaticality of (27b).

In this connection, note that a similar contrast to the one in the (a)-examples and the (b)-examples in (27) and (28) can be observed in (35), as mentioned in section 2. More specifically, the adjectival passive counterpart of prefer, when followed by an infinitival clause headed by the overt complementizer for, is much better in grammaticality, as in (35a), than that of prefer in its ECM use, as in (35b).

(35) a. ?It seems preferred for students from Japan to study English much harder. (= (6a))
b. *Students from Japan seem preferred to study English much harder. (=6b)

In providing a principled explanation of the contrast, I would like to briefly discuss here the structures of the embedded clauses of the transitive counterparts of (35a) and (35b), showing that they are parallel to the structures of CPs headed by the overt complementizer that and those headed by a covert complementizer, respectively. That is, I would like to claim that the structures of the former and the latter are something like (36a) and (36b), respectively.

(36) a. Everyone [V prefers] [CP [C for] [TP students from Japan to ...]]
b. Everyone [V prefers+ØC] [CP tC [TP students from Japan to ...]].

Notice that in (36b), the covert complementizer undergoes affixation onto V, just like that of a CP headed by the covert counterpart of that (cf. (29b)).

A piece of evidence for the difference in the structure is concerned with the nominal counterpart of the verb. Of particular interest here is the fact that while the nominal counterpart of the verb when followed by an infinitival clause headed by the complementizer for is grammatical, as in (37a), that of the verb in its ECM use is ungrammatical, as in (37b).

(37) a. John’s preference for Mary to study English much harder
b. *John’s preference of Mary to study English much harder
cf. John prefers (for) Mary to study English much harder.

Given the difference in the structures proposed in (36) and Myers’ generalization, this contrast can be readily accounted for. As for (37a), the structure is something like (38), where the verb not accompanied by a covert morpheme undergoes the affixation of the nominalizer -ence, in accordance with Myers’ generalization.

(38) John’s [N [V prefer] -ence] [VP tV [CP for [TP Mary to study ...]]]

Thus, the nominal counterpart of the verb when followed by an infinitival clause headed by the complementizer for is grammatical.

In contrast, assuming the structure in (36b), the structure for (37b) is something like (39), where the verb accompanied by a covert morpheme takes part in the affixation of the nominalizer -ence:

(39) *John’s [N [V prefer+ØC] -ence] [VP tV [CP tC [TP (of) Mary to ...]]]
Since (39) is excluded by Myers’ generalization, the nominal counterpart of the verb in its ECM use is ungrammatical.

Turning now to the contrast in (35), the structures in (36) enable us to account for the contrast in terms of Myers’ generalization. Concerning (35a), repeated here as (40a) for convenience, the structure in (40b) is obtained.

\[
\text{(40) a. } ?\text{It seems preferred for students from Japan to study English much harder.}
\]
\[
\text{b. } ?\text{It seems } [\text{AP } [\text{A } [\text{V prefer] } -\text{en}] [\text{VP } t\text{V } [\text{CP for } [\text{TP ...}]]].
\]

In this structure, the verb not accompanied by a covert morpheme participates in the affixation of the adjectival suffix \(-\text{en}\), in accordance with Myers’ generalization. Hence, grammaticality is obtained.

As opposed to (35a), the structure of (35b), repeated here as (41a), is excluded by Myers’ generalization, because the verb accompanied by a covert morpheme undergoes the affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme, as shown in (41b).

\[
\text{(41) a. } *\text{Students from Japan seem preferred to study English much harder.}
\]
\[
\text{b. } *[\text{Students from Japan}; \text{seem } [\text{AP } t'i [\text{A } [\text{V prefer+OC] } -\text{en}] [\text{VP } t\text{V } [\text{CP } t\text{C } [\text{TP } t_i \text{ to study English much harder}]]]]
\]

Hence, the ungrammaticality.

3.4. ECM Verbs

This subsection focuses on the analysis of the ungrammaticality of the adjectival passive counterparts of ECM verbs, which is illustrated in (7), repeated here as (42).

\[
\text{(42) } *\text{Smith; seems believed } t_i \text{ to have fled the country. (Levin and Rappaport (1986))}
\]

A key to the analysis of the ungrammaticality lies in the structure of the ECM construction. Concerning this, Pesetsky (1991) claims that the embedded clause of ECM verbs is not TP, but CP headed by a null complementizer. He also proposes that the covert complementizer is an affix, required to adjoin to the matrix verb. Thus, under his analysis, (43a) has the structure in (43b).

\[10\text{Movement of students from Japan to [Spec, TP] of the matrix clause in (41b) must be required so as to satisfy the EPP requirement of the T.} \]
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(43) a. John believes Mary to be clever.
    b. John \( [V \text{ believes} + \emptyset_C] [CP t_C [TP \text{ Mary to be clever}]] \).

A piece of evidence in support of the presence of the covert complementizer comes from the ban against the nominalization of ECM verbs, as shown in (44).

(44) *Bill's belief of Mary to be happy (Pesetsky (1991))

As for the ungrammaticality of (44), the structure is shown in (45), in which the verb accompanied by the covert complementizer takes part in the affixation of a nominal suffix.

(45) *Bill's \( [N \ [V \text{ believe} + \emptyset_C] -f] [CP t_C [TP (of) \text{ Mary to be happy}]] \)

\( (-f \text{ is a nominalizer}) \)

This structure is precluded by Myers' generalization in (11), and hence, the ungrammaticality is obtained (cf. Pesetsky (1991)).

As for the ungrammaticality of the adjectival passive counterparts of the ECM verbs, I would like to propose that a similar analysis to the one in (44) is applicable to (42). More specifically, I would like to claim that the structure for (42) is something like (46), where the verb accompanied by a covert complementizer undergoes further affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme \(-en\).

(46) *Smithi seems \( [AP t'i [A [V \text{ believe} + \emptyset_C] -en] [VP t_V [CP t_C [TP t_i \text{ to ...}]]]] \).

Since this structure is excluded by Myers' generalization in (11), ECM verbs fail to participate in adjectival passive formation.

### 3.5. Small Clauses

A piece of evidence that lends further support to the syntactic analysis of the formation of adjectival passives comes from the ungrammaticality of the adjectival passive counterparts of the verbs that select small clauses, repeated here as (47):

(47) ??John seems considered a fool. (Wasow (1977)) (=8)

A key to the ungrammaticality lies in the structure of small clauses. Concerning this, I would like to suggest that their category is CP, headed by a non-overt complementizer. I further suggest along the line of Pesetsky (1991) that it should undergo affixation onto a verb in the course of a derivation due to its affixal nature. Thus, the structure for (48a) is something like (48b):

(48) ??John seems considered a fool. (Wasow (1977)) (=8)
(48)  a. John believes the earth flat.
    b. John [V believes+ØC] [CP tC [TP the earth T0 flat]]

A piece of evidence in favor of the presence of a covert complementizer comes from the ungrammaticality of the nominal counterpart of (48a), as illustrated in (49) (see also Kayne (1984: 152)).

(49) *John's belief of the earth flat

Since the verb accompanied by a covert morpheme undergoes the affixation of a nominal suffix, as illustrated in (50), (50) is precluded by Myers' generalization in (11).

(50) *John's [N [V believe+ØC] -f] of the earth flat

(-f is a nominal suffix)

Hence, the ungrammaticality is obtained.

Turning now to the ungrammaticality of the adjectival passive counterparts of the verbs that select small clauses, this is explained on a par with the ungrammaticality of (49). That is, assuming that the verbs in question, such as believe and consider, are accompanied by a covert complementizer, the structure for (47) is something like (51):

(51) ??John\textsubscript{i} seems [AP t'i [A [V consider+ØC] -en] [VP tV [CP tC [TP t'i T0 a fool]]]].

Since the verb accompanied by a covert morpheme undergoes the affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme -en, (51) is excluded by Myers' generalization. Thus, the ungrammaticality of (47) is obtained.

3.6. Resultatives

The grammaticality of the adjectival passive counterparts of transitive resultatives and the ungrammaticality of the adjectival passive counterparts of intransitive resultatives, repeated here as (52) and (53), respectively, can be explained in a similar fashion to the contrast observed between the adjectival passive counterpart of the dative construction in (1) and that of the double object construction in (2), relative to the analysis of resultatives which Kamiya (2000) has put forth.

(52) It seems hammered flat. (Fabb (1984))
(53) *The pavement looked run thin. (Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995))

More specifically, adapting Hasegawa's (1998) analysis of resultatives, Kamiya has argued that a verb in transitive resultatives resides in the head position of ResP (resultative phrase) below VP at the underlying structure, moving to higher positions at a later stage of the derivation.
This is illustrated in (54b).

(54)  
   a. John hammered it flat.
   b. \([TP [vP John v^0 [VP it V [ResP [Res hammered] [AP flat]]]]]\)

As for intransitive resultatives, adapting Hasegawa's (1998) proposal, Kamiya (2000) has proposed that a covert morpheme \(O_{Res}\) resides in \(Res^0\), adjoining to a verb base-generated in \(V^0\) at a later stage of the derivation. Thus, intransitive resultatives have the underlying structure in (55b).

(55)  
   a. John ran the pavement thin.
   b. \([TP [vP John v^0 [VP [DP the pavement] [V ran] [ResP O_{Res} [AP thin]]]]]\)

A piece of evidence for the absence of a covert morpheme in transitive resultatives and the presence of a zero morpheme in intransitive resultatives comes from the fact that transitive resultatives are permitted to undergo nominal formation, as in (56a), whereas intransitive resultatives are not, as in (56b).

(56)  
   a. The watering of tulips flat is a criminal offense in Holland.
   b. *The drinking of oneself sick is commonplace in one's freshman year. (Carrier and Randall (1992))

Kamiya (2000) has argued that (56a) and (56b) have the structures in (57a) and (57b), respectively:

(57)  
   a. \([DP The [N [V water] -ing] [vP t''V [VP of tulips t_V [ResP t_V flat]]]]\) is ...
   b. *[DP The [N [V drink+O_{Res}] -ing] [vP t''V [VP of oneself t_V [ResP t_{Res} sick]]]] is ...

In (57a), the verb not accompanied by a covert morpheme takes part in the affixation of the nominal suffix -ing, in accordance with Myers' generalization. Therefore, (56a) is well-formed. As opposed to (56a), the verb in (56b) cannot undergo affixation of the nominal affix -ing, since affixation onto the verb accompanied by the covert morpheme \(O_{Res}\) is excluded by Myers' generalization (cf. (57b)). Hence, (56b) is ill-formed.

---

11 The verb together with the covert morpheme moves to \(v^0\) at a later stage of the derivation.
Returning to the contrast in adjectival passives, I propose that it is explained on a par with the contrast in nominalization in (56). More specifically, given the structures in (54b) and (55b), the structures for (52) and (53) are (58a) and (58b), respectively.

(58) a. Iti seems [AP t'i [A [hammer]\textsc{v} -en] [\textsc{vp} t_i t'\textsc{v} [\textsc{res}\textsc{p} t\textsc{v} [\textsc{ap} flat]]]]).

b. *[The pavement]i looked [AP t'i [A [\textsc{run}\textsc{v}+\textcircled{\textsc{or}\textsc{es}}] -en] [\textsc{vp} t_i t'\textsc{v} [\textsc{res}\textsc{p} t\textsc{res} [\textsc{ap} thin]]]].

The verb not accompanied by a covert morpheme allows affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme \textsc{-en} in (58a), in accordance with Myers' generalization. Hence, the adjectival passive counterparts of transitive resultatives are grammatical, as in (52).

In contrast, (58b) is excluded by Myers' generalization, since the verb accompanied by the zero morpheme (i.e. \textcircled{\textsc{or}\textsc{es}}) takes part in the affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme. Therefore, the adjectival passive counterparts of intransitive resultatives are ill-formed, as shown in (53).

3.7. Summary

In this section, I have argued that Myers' generalization plays a crucial role in the formation of adjectival passives. In particular, I have shown that verbs accompanied by a covert morpheme cannot participate in the formation of adjectival passives, since the affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme to the verbal stem is banned by Myers' generalization. Hence, adjectival passive counterparts of verbs in the double object construction, \textsc{help} and \textsc{thank}, verbs followed by \textsc{comp}-less clauses, \textsc{ecm} verbs, verbs followed by small clauses, and intransitive resultatives give rise to ungrammaticality.

In passing, I would like to show that the examples put forth in favor of a lexical analysis of the formation of adjectival passives do not pose a problem for the syntactic analysis being developed in this paper. Assuming that adjectival passives are derived by a lexical redundancy rule, Wasow (1977) claims that the subject of an adjectival passive must be a direct object in its transitive counterpart. Thus, verbs in the double object construction cannot participate in the adjectival passive formation, since the subject in (59b) is the indirect object of \textsc{tell} in its transitive counterpart.

(59) a. They told Bill the story.

b. *Bill was untold (the story). (Wasow (1977)) (=2)
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Just like (59), the subjects of the adjectival passive counterparts of the verbs help and thank are not direct objects in their transitive use because of the presence of to in their nominal counterparts as in (60b) (see also section 3.2. and note 7), giving rise to the ungrammaticality of (60c).

(60)  a. We helped the hostess.
     b. Our {help / thanks} {?to / *of} the hostess went unacknowledged. (Wasow (1977)) (=25))
     c. *John always {acted / seems} {helped / thanked} by his friends. (Wasow (1977)) (=3)

Furthermore, the subjects of the adjectival passive counterparts of the ECM verbs are not direct objects in their transitive use, yielding the ungrammaticality of (61b).

(61)  a. They believe Smith to have fled the country.
     b. *Smith seems believed to have fled the country. (Levin and Rappaport (1986)) (=7)

Finally, the subjects of the adjectival passive counterparts of verbs that select small clauses as their complement are not direct objects in their transitive use, giving rise to the ungrammaticality of (62b).

(62)  a. They consider John a fool.
     b. ??John seems considered a fool. (Wasow (1977)) (=8)

Note, however, that the examples illustrated in (59b), (60c), (61b), and (62b) do not pose a problem for the syntactic analysis of the derivation of adjectival passives being developed in this paper, since they are excluded by the illicit affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme -en onto a verb which has been already accompanied by a covert morpheme, as I have argued in this section.12

12 I would like to suggest that the ungrammaticality of the adjectival passive counterparts of idioms as shown in (i) can be explained in terms of Myers' generalization (the analysis presented below is based on the suggestion made by Heizo Nakajima (personal communication)).

( i ) Advantage {is/*sounds} easily taken of John. (Wasow (1977))

Suppose that a trace yielded by movement of an idiom chunk is a zero morpheme, undergoing affixation to V. Then, further affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme is banned by Myers' generalization, since the verb accompanied by a covert morpheme undergoes the affixation of the adjectival passive morpheme. This is illustrated in (ii).

( ii ) *Advantagei sounds easily [V take+ti] -en of John
Maintaining a lexical analysis of the formation of adjectival passives, however, one might argue that the ungrammaticality with the absence of an overt complementizer in (63b) and (64b) should be attributed to a violation of the condition that an adjective cannot be accompanied by a covert morpheme, as an anonymous reviewer suggests.

(63)  a. ?It seems widely believed that the earth is round.
       b. ??It seems widely believed the earth is round.  (=4)

As for this, I would like to suggest that such an analysis loses its force with the data in (65), where an adjective can be followed by a clause whose head (i.e. C) is missing.

(65)  a. She is certain (that) he is wrong.
       b. He is sure (that) he will pass the exam.

That is, the structure of (65a), for instance, is something like (66), where the adjective is accompanied by a covert complementizer.

(66)  She is \text{[AP [A certain+ØC] [CP IC [TP he is wrong]]]}

Thus, the grammaticality of (65) suggests that the condition that an adjective cannot be accompanied by a covert morpheme cannot be maintained, and hence the analysis attributing the ungrammaticality of (63b) and (64b) to a violation of this condition is untenable.

4. DP-Movement and Reanalysis

In the previous section, I have provided a syntactic analysis of the formation of adjectival passives, showing that it is subject to Myers’ generalization. I will show in this section that the syntactic analysis is further strengthened by four pieces of evidence which are different from that presented in the preceding section. Three of pieces of evidence are concerned with the presence of an internal argument in adjectival passives. More specifically, paying attention to the restriction imposed on resultatives, as-clauses, and floating quantifiers, I will show that a position for an internal argument is present in adjectival passives. The last of them concerns the so-called “reanalysis,” supposed to be an instance of a syntactic operation.

4.1. Resultatives

The first piece of evidence in favor of the presence of an internal argument in adjectival passives is concerned with the resultative con-
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struction. Note specifically that adjectival passives are compatible with a resultative predicate, as illustrated in (67):\(^{13,14}\)

(67) It seems hammered flat. (Fabb (1984)) (= (9))

As for the condition imposed upon a resultative predicate, it is well established in the literature (e.g. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995)) that it must be predicated of a direct object (referred to as the "Direct Object Restriction (DOR)" by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995)), giving rise to the contrast in (68):\(^{15}\)

(68) a. *Dora shouted hoarse.
   b. Dora shouted herself hoarse.

(Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995))

(68a) is in violation of the restriction because there is no direct object and hence ill-formed, while (68b) is well-formed because there is a direct object, i.e. the fake reflexive herself.

Carrying over the observation in (68) to the example in (67), I would like to claim that the presence of a resultative predicate indicates that the DP serving as a surface subject of the adjectival passive in (67) originates in a postverbal position, as in (69), in accordance with the DOR.

(69) Iti seems \[AP t_i [A [v hammer] -en] [VP t_i t_V [ResP t_V flat]]\].

Thus, the presence of DP-movement in (67) lends support to the syntactic analysis of the passives, since "movement" is supposed to be a matter in the syntax.

4.2. As-Clauses

The second piece of evidence in support of a syntactic analysis of adjectival passives is concerned with the fact that adjectival passives are

\(^{13}\) As I have argued in section 3.5, the adjectival passive counterparts of intransitive resultatives are excluded on different grounds. Thus, their ungrammaticality does not pose a problem for a syntactic analysis of the formation of adjectival passives.

\(^{14}\) On the basis of the data in (67), Fabb (1984) also provides an argument in favor of the presence of a trace of an internal argument in adjectival passives. Thus, my account can be regarded as a variant of his in the sense that both crucially depend on the fact that a resultative predicate is sensitive to the presence of a direct object.

\(^{15}\) Though I assume the DOR throughout this paper, Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1999) present counterexamples to the restriction.
compatible with *as*-clauses, as shown in (70):

(70) As is well-known, Liszt took many years over the composition of the two Concertos.

(taken from the British National Corpus (BNC))

It is worth reviewing here Stowell’s (1991) observation on *as*-clauses. He observes that the gap in the clauses (i.e. the underlined part in (71)) corresponds to an AP or a VP predicate, as in (71a, b), or a CP complement as in (71c).

(71) a. If John is really angry, as **he seems**_, then ....  (AP)
    b. John went to the movies, as **he did**_.  (VP)
    c. John is a liar, as **Bill claimed**_.  (CP)

(Stowell (1991))

Particularly crucial here is that the position of the CP gap is restricted to that of a D-structure complement position (cf. Stowell (1991)).

Thus, (72a) is well-formed, since the gap followed by the verb is the position where the CP complement resides at D-structure. In contrast, the gap in (72b) corresponds to the position of the external argument of *proves*, giving rise to ungrammaticality.

(72) a. John is a liar, as (_) was claimed by Bill.
    b. *John is a liar, as **proves** he untrustworthy.

(Stowell (1991))

Bearing in mind Stowell’s (1991) observation on *as*-clauses, I would like to claim that the structure for (70) is something like (73), where the adjectival passive is followed by the CP gap, just like (71c) and (72a).

(73) As is [AP well-known _], Liszt took many years over the composition of the two Concertos.

The analysis illustrated in (73) amounts to saying that the adjectival passives in (70) do have internal arguments at D-structure. The presence of an internal argument at D-structure leads to the conclusion that they are derived in the syntax.

---

16 The analysis presented below is based on suggestions by Heizo Nakajima (personal communication).

17 In this paper, I employ the term “D-structure” for expository purposes, though it is eliminated from the grammar in the current minimalist framework of Chomsky (1995, 2000).
4.3. Floating Quantifiers

The third piece of evidence comes from the distribution of floating quantifiers. Specifically, the presence of a floating quantifier in a post-adjectival passive position as in (74b) further strengthens the view that adjectival passives are syntactically derived.

(74)  
a. All the books seem neatly placed on the table.
    b. The books seem neatly placed all on the table.

Assuming that the requirement that a floating quantifier stand in a mutual c-command relation with its host DP in Japanese (cf. Miyagawa (1989)) is also applicable to English,18 the structure for (74b) is something like (75) (irrelevant details omitted), where the floating quantifier conforms to the requirement due to the presence of a trace of the DP:

(75)  
\[
[\text{DP The books}] \text{ seem } [\text{AP } t'_{\text{DP}} \text{ neatly } [\text{A } [\text{V place}] -\text{en}] [\text{VP all } t_{\text{DP}} \text{ tV } ...]].
\]

The presence of a trace of the DP in a post-adjectival position as indicated in (75) amounts to saying that DP-movement is involved in adjectival passives, just like verbal passives. Thus, it can be concluded that adjectival passives as well as verbal passives are derived in the syntax, leaving a trace of a subject in its base position.

4.4. Reanalysis

The final piece of evidence in favor of syntactic analysis of adjectival passives is concerned with the presence of the so-called “reanalysis,” which is supposed to apply to a verb and a preposition, giving rise to a single verb. For instance, the structure for (76a) is supposed to be something like (76b), where V and P have undergone the operation, yielding the single verb laugh at.

(76)  
a. John was laughed at (by Mary).
    b. John was [\text{V laughed at}] (by Mary).

18 Note that the presence of a floating quantifier in a postverbal position in verbal passives as in (ia) shows the presence of a trace of DP, in conformity with the mutual c-command condition imposed on floating quantifiers (cf. (ib)).

( i )  
a. The books were neatly placed all on the table.
    cf. All the books were neatly placed on the table.
    b. [\text{DP The books}]_{i} \text{ were neatly placed all } t_{i} \text{ on the table}.

Thus, the requirement is also applicable to floating quantifiers in English.
Of particular interest in this connection is that V and P in adjectival passives as well as in verbal passives participate in the operation at stake, as shown in (77):

(77) a. One passenger is still unaccounted for. (OALD p. 1386)
b. Your opinion is unasked for. (Sunrise p. 1547)
c. For almost a decade it was considered inferior to other means of detection and its uses for other purposes remained undreamed of. (http://www.angelfire.com/nc2/whitetho/1963hwpr.htm)
d. They don’t know why their father seems laughed at now and unloved, ...
   (http://www.randomhouse.com/boldtype/0998/swann/sstory.html)

In accounting for the derivation of (77), it is necessary to discuss in which component reanalysis applies to a verb and a preposition. As for this, Keyser and Roeper (1984) claim that syntactic rules allow preposition stranding by making use of the exceptional operation of reanalysis, whereas lexical rules eliminate prepositional phrases rather than reanalyze them (see also Roeper and Siegel (1978)). Thus, (78a, c) are well-formed, since the prepositions are eliminated when the verbs participate in the affixation of -able in the lexicon. In contrast, (78b, d) are ruled out because of the presence of a preposition between the verbal stem and the affix.  

---

19 I would like to suggest that the obligatory deletion of a preposition in a lexical operation on the one hand, and its presence in a syntactic operation on the other, should be ascribed to the presence of uninterpretable features. More specifically, the uninterpretable Case feature (or the uninterpretable Φ-feature) of a preposition cannot be checked against a DP by virtue of lexical integrity, when it is a part of a lexical item (cf. (ib)).

(i) a. *dependonable (cf. depend on)
   b. [A depend on -able]
      [Case] → unchecked

The presence of the Case feature would lead a derivation containing (ia) to crash. Put differently, the deletion of P remedies the derivation due to the absence of the uninterpretable Case feature.

In contrast, assuming that the verbal passive morpheme -en carries an uninterpretable Case feature (this is a reformulation of the analysis of verbal passives, put forth by Jaeggli (1986), Baker, Johnson, and Roberts (1989)), a preposition should be present in the formation of verbal passives, since the Case feature of the mor-
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(78)  
(a) laughable  
(b) *laughatable (cf. laugh at)  
(c) dependable  
(d) *dependonable (cf. depend on)

(Adapted from Keyser and Roeper (1984: 399))

In addition to at and on, I would like to point out that the prepositions for and of are subject to the same constraint as the one operable in (78). For instance, for is eliminated when the verb account is affixed with -able, yielding the example in (79a). Furthermore, of is subject to deletion in the affixation of the morpheme, similarly to (79a), giving rise to (79b).

(79)  
(a) His bad temper is accountable.  
(b) Anything that is dreamable is capable of becoming a reality.

(http://www.angelfire.com/pa/scire/myth.html)

In this connection, note also that unaccountable shows a similar behavior to (79), in that it does not take a preposition, as in (80).

(80) If the claims were made simply on the basis of introspection without systematic observation in the community, they would be of precisely the same order (except that they would be unaccountable and probably much less reliable).

(taken from the BNC; italics are mine)

Furthermore, the comparison of the compound in (81a) with its phrasal counterpart in (81b) on the one hand, and the comparison of (81c) and (81d) on the other, lead to the conclusion that the prepositions for and of are deleted in the compounds, rather than incorporated into them by the application of reanalysis.20

(81)  
(a) [power-mad] people (adapted from Namiki (1985: 107))  
(b) people [mad for power]  
(c) travel-weary (Oishi (1988))  
(d) He is weary of travel.

20 See Namiki (1985), Oishi (1988) and the references therein for this type of compound in which a preposition is eliminated.
Thus, it should be concluded that for and of as well as at and on are subject to the constraint that they should be eliminated by lexical operations.

Keeping in mind the conclusion reached at the end of the preceding paragraph, I would like to claim that the adjectival passives in (77), repeated here as (82) for convenience, are derived in the syntax, since the prepositions for, of and at in the examples are not eliminated, but rather undergo reanalysis.21

(82) a. One passenger is still unaccounted for.
   b. Your opinion is unasked for.
   c. For almost a decade it was considered inferior to other means of detection and its uses for other purposes remained undreamed of.
   d. They don’t know why their father seems laughed at now and unloved, ...

Put differently, were the adjectival passives in (82) derived by a lexical rule as Wasow (1977) and Williams (1981) put forth, the prepositions should be deleted just like the examples of -able and the compounds, which are undoubtedly handled in the lexicon.22 Therefore, it is concluded that adjectival passives are derived in the syntax, just like verbal passives.23

21 I would like to speculate that a similar analysis to the one presented in (ii) in note 19 is applicable to adjectival passives as well. That is, assuming that the adjectival passive morpheme -en can carry an uninterpretable Case feature, it must be in a checking relation with the uninterpretable Case feature of P, as illustrated in (i).

   (i) \[\text{AP [A -en] [VP [V account] [PP [P for] his disappearance] \[Case\] \[Case\]} \]
   checking

Thus, a preposition is required in the formation of adjectival passives, just like that of verbal passives.

22 Note that a preposition should not be eliminated in adjectival passives in their attributive use as well, as shown in (i):

   (i) a. the talked-about story
   b. *the talked story

I thank Heizo Nakajima for bringing this fact to my attention.

23 See also Keyser and Roeper (1984), who maintain that while the middle construction is derived in the syntax so that it participates in reanalysis (cf. (ia)), ergative verbs are derived in the lexicon so that a preposition that follows an ergative verb should be eliminated (cf. (ib)).
5. Implications

In this section, paying attention to the analysis of the formation of adjectival passives proposed in the previous sections, I would like to discuss three implications. Specifically, they are concerned with the timing of the affixation of a derivational morpheme, similarity of the derivation of adjectival passives to that of verbal passives, and the presence of unaccusative adjectives.

The first implication is concerned with the point at which the affixation of a derivational morpheme takes place. More specifically, if the presence or absence of an affixal covert complementizer that resides in the functional layer in *that*-less clauses, the ECM construction, and the small clause construction plays a crucial role in the grammaticality of adjectival passives as argued in section 3, it should be concluded that the affixation of a derivational morpheme can and in the case of adjectival passives must take place in the syntax.

Secondly, the formation of adjectival passives is very similar to that of verbal passives in that both passives involve the affixation of the suffix *-en* to a verb. Furthermore, the formation of adjectival passives is similar to that of verbal passives in that they both involve DP-movement from a complement position of a verb to a subject position, as I have argued in section 4. Thus, the only difference observed between them is reducible to that of the category of the suffix (i.e. adjectival in the former and verbal in the latter).

Finally, the analysis presented in the previous sections, in particular the one presented in section 4, brings to light the presence of unaccusative adjectives. That is, as far as adjectival passives are concerned, they are similar to unaccusative verbs in that both involve DP-movement from a post-predicate position to a subject position. In this sense, they are regarded as unaccusative adjectives.

In this connection, note that some prepositions can also be regarded as unaccusative. Specifically, observe that the complement to the preposition *notwithstanding*, for instance, can not only follow the preposi-
tion, but also precede it, as shown in (83).24

(83)  a. Notwithstanding your generous offer, we are going to
demolish the building anyway.
      b. Your generous offer notwithstanding, we are going to
demolish the building anyway.

(Culicover (1999: 69))

I would like to suggest that (83b) is derived from (83a) by DP-move-
ment driven by the (optional) EPP requirement of the preposition, as
illustrated in (84).

(84)  \[PP \[DP Your generous offer\]i \[P notwithstanding\] ti\], ...

Thus, if this analysis is tenable, *notwithstanding* in (83b) can be re-
garded as an unaccusative preposition in the sense that DP-movement
of its complement is involved, just like with unaccusative verbs and un-
accusative adjectives.

6. Conclusions

I have claimed that Myers’ generalization plays an important role in
the formation of adjectival passives. In particular, I have shown in
section 3 that verbs accompanied by a covert morpheme cannot partici-
pate in the formation of adjectival passives, since the affixation of the
adjectival passive morpheme to the verbal stem is excluded by Myers’
generalization. Hence, the adjectival passive counterparts of verbs in
the double object construction, *help* and *thank*, verbs followed by
COMP-less clauses, ECM verbs, verbs followed by small clauses, and
intransitive resultatives give rise to ungrammaticality.

Paying attention to the restriction imposed on resultatives, *as*-clauses
and floating quantifiers, I have shown in section 4 that DP-movement is
involved in adjectival passives. Furthermore, I have also claimed in
section 4 that the presence of “reanalysis” in adjectival passives lends
further support to a syntactic analysis of adjectival passives.

Finally, I have suggested in section 5 (i) that verbs can participate in
the affixation of a derivational morpheme in syntax, (ii) that the forma-
tion of adjectival passives is very similar to that of verbal passives in

24 I thank Heizo Nakajima for bringing my attention to this fact.
that the affixation of the passive morpheme -en is involved in both of them, and (iii) that adjectival passives are regarded as unaccusative adjectives.
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