

A first look at Tagalog modals*

Paul Law
City University of Hong Kong

SUMMARY

This paper considers the Tagalog modals expressing the meanings of necessity, obligation, desire, possibility or ability. The facts suggest that some modals (*kailangan* ‘need, necessary’ and *gusto* ‘want, like’) take either a clausal or a VP complement and may undergo a process of unification of argument structure to the effect that an argument of the thematic predicate is not projected in syntax. Marking of the arguments with *ang* or *ng* and non-occurrence of negation, too, support this view of complementation. Some other modals (*dapat* ‘must, necessary’, *maaari/puwede* ‘may, can, possible’) take only a clausal complement and one (*kaya* ‘can’) takes only a VP complement.

RESUME

Cet article examine les modaux en tagalog exprimant les notions de nécessité, d’obligation, de désir, de possibilité ou de compétence. Les données suggèrent que quelques modaux, comme *kailangan* ‘avoir besoin de, nécessaire’ et *gusto* ‘désirer, vouloir, aimer bien’, prennent soit une proposition, soit un SV comme complément et peuvent subir un processus d’unification de structure d’argument; il en résulte que l’argument du prédicat thématique ne se projette plus dans la syntaxe. Le marquage des arguments avec *ang* ou *ng* et le manque de négation appuient aussi cette perspective de complémentation. Quelques autres modaux, comme *dapat* ‘devoir, nécessaire’ et *maaari/puwede* ‘peut-être, pouvoir, possible’, ne prennent qu’un complément propositionnel, et un modal, *kaya* ‘pouvoir’, ne prend qu’un complément SV.

* It is my pleasure to dedicate this modest contribution to Lisa Travis, whose work on Austronesian languages over the years has inspired me and no doubt many other linguists. As suggested by the title, the paper requires further refinement, but I am very pleased that I have the opportunity to contribute to the Festschrift. I would like to thank Nenita and Reuben Domingo, Valerie Yap as well as Tagamanila of filipinolessons.com for sharing their native judgment with me. All inadequacies are my responsibility.

1 INTRODUCTION

According to Schachter and Otnes (1972:261), there is in Tagalog a class of predicates, which they called pseudo-verbs, that do not vary in form for tense, aspect or focus that marks arguments with *ang* or *ng*, in contrast with other predicates.¹ These carry the modal meanings of necessity, obligation, desire, ability or possibility.

In this paper I consider the modal predicates *kailangan* ‘need, necessary, ought to’, *gusto* ‘desire, like, want’, *dapat* ‘ought to, necessary’, *maaari/puwede* ‘can, may, possible’ and *kaya* ‘be able to, can’, and more specifically, the morpho-syntactic properties of their complements. I argue that certain facts regarding argument-marking, negation and aspectual morphology are evidence of their complements being nominal or clausal, and that there is a process of unification of argument structure in which the actor argument of the modal and that of the following predicate are identified, resulting in non-projection of the actor argument of the thematic predicate.

2 THE PSEUDO-VERBS IN TAGALOG

2.1 NECESSITY

Necessity is expressed by the modal *kailangan* ‘need, necessary, ought to’. It may be used either as a lexical verb taking (a) two nominal arguments, (b) a nominal argument and a clausal complement, (c) a clausal complement or (d) a nominal argument (Schachter and Otnes 1972:261ff).²

- (1) a. *Kailangan ni Pedro ang/ng libro.*
 need GEN Pedro NOM/GEN book
 ‘Pedro needs the book.’
- b. *Kailangan ni Pedro-ng mag-luto ng pagkain si Maria.*
 need GEN Pedro-LK AF-cook GEN food NOM Maria
 ‘Pedro needs Maria to cook food.’
- c. *Kailangang mag-basa ng libro bukas si Pedro.*
 necessary.LK AF-read GEN book tomorrow NOM Pedro
 ‘It is necessary that Pedro read a book tomorrow.’
- d. *Kailangan iyon.*
 necessary that
 ‘That is necessary.’

The *ng*-marked nominal immediately after the modal *kailangan* in (1a,b) is its argument, for it exhibits certain restrictions. First, it cannot be *ang*-marked. Second, it must denote an entity that

¹ This is not quite accurate. The modal *kailangan* has forms like *kinailangan* and *nangailangan* and *gusto* has a form like *gustahin*. As these different forms do not bear on the issues discussed here, I put them aside.

² Abbreviations: ADV=adverb, AF=actor focus, ASP=aspect, GEN=genitive, LK=linker, NOM=nominative, OF=object focus, PL=plural, Q=question. For the sake of concreteness, *ng* (or *ni*) and *ang ng* (or *si*) are here glossed as case markers. The glossing is neutral with respect to the issue of whether Tagalog is a nominative/accusative language (Kroeger 1993:47) or an ergative/absolutive language (Payne 1982, Aldridge 2004). By *ng*- or *ang*-marking, it is meant the nominal respectively begins with *ng*- or *ang*-, or with *ni* or *si* for proper names. As the paper here is not specifically concerned with the semantics of modals, the translations here are approximate.

may have some inherent or internal need. Thus, the examples would be ungrammatical if *ni Pedro* is replaced with a nominal denoting an inanimate being, e.g., *ng mesa* ‘table’ (cf. also Asarina and Holt 2005). For (1c), most speakers take it to mean that the necessity is external, i.e., for the general situation (cf. Bowen 1965:335, Schachter and Otanes 1972:261, Abenin-Adar and Angelopoulos 2016).³ (1d) can be likened to (1c) in that the sole argument of the modal can be taken to be the nominal counterpart of the clausal complement.

The actor argument of the thematic verb in (1c) may be absent, regardless of focus morphology on the verb, resulting in a reading that recalls control in English (Kroeger 1993):

- (2) a. Kailangan ni Pedro-ng mag-luto ng pagkain.
 need GEN Pedro-LK AF-cook GEN food
 ‘Pedro needs to cook food.’
 b. Kailangan ng titser (na) basahin ang libro.
 need GEN teacher LK read.OF NOM book
 ‘The teacher needs to read a book.’

The missing argument is understood to be the same as the *ng*-marked experiencer argument of the modal, i.e., the former is controlled by the latter:

The *ng*-marked experiencer argument of *kailangan* in (1b) may follow the thematic verb, but most notably, the actor argument *si Maria* of the thematic verb *magluto* ‘cook’ that appears in (1c) can no longer occur (cf. Kroeger 1993:193):

- (3) a. Kailangang mag-luto ni/si Pedro ng pagkain.
 need.LK AF-cook GEN/NOM Pedro GEN food
 ‘Pedro needs to cook food.’
 b. *Kailangang mag-luto ni Pedro ng pagkain si Maria.
 need.LK AF-cook GEN Pedro GEN food NOM Maria
 ‘Pedro needs Maria to cook food.’

From the perspective of argument-marking, the *ng*-marked experiencer argument in (3a) clearly is the argument of the modal *kailangan*, and not that of thematic verb in actor focus *magluto* ‘cook’. This is no different from (2a) where the *ng*-marked nominal is the argument of the modal. I show presently, however, that example (3a) with *ni* is not a variant of example (2a) with a different word order and that the *ni/si* alternation is not alternative argument-marking in the same structure. These two facts are due to different complementation.

The thematic verb in example (2a) may carry aspectual morphology (cf. Schachter and Otanes 1972:271), but that in (3a) with *ni* may not (see also Kroeger 1993:194). There is thus no good reason to consider them to be variants of the same underlying structure:

- (4) a. Kailangan ni Pedro-ng mag-luluto ng pagkain.
 need GEN Pedro-LK AF-cook GEN food
 ‘Pedro needs to be cooking food.’

³ The internal vs external necessity interpretation of *kailangan* is not always consistent, though. Schachter and Otanes (1972:270) noted that (1c) is acceptable with the meaning of (1b). My consultants concur with this judgment.

- b. *Kailangan mag-luluto ni Pedro ng pagkain.
 need AF-cook GEN Pedro GEN food
 ‘Pedro needs to be cooking food.’
- c. Kailangang mag-babasa ng libro bukas si Pedro.
 necessary.LK AF-read GEN book tomorrow NOM Pedro
 ‘It is necessary that Pedro be reading a book tomorrow.’

Given that the actor focus verb *magluto* ‘cook’ sanctions *ang*-marking of the actor argument (see 1b,c), it must be that example (3a) with *si* has a complement structure on a par with that in (1b,c).

The differences with respect to occurrence of the actor argument of the thematic verb (1b vs. 3b) as well as aspectual morphology (4a vs. 4b) indicate that the different positions of the *ng*-marked argument reflect different complementation.

From the examples considered so far, it seems clear that the modal predicate *kailangan* ‘need, necessary, ought to’ may have more than one argument structure, such as in (5):

- (5) *Kailangan*:
 a. ___ (NP) {NP, CP}
 b. ___ VP

(1a) realizes the argument structure in (5a) with two NPs, and (1b) realizes it with an NP and CP, which is possibly headed by the linker *ng/na*. The NP first argument denotes the entity with internal need, while the second argument denotes what is necessary. (1c) realizes (5a) where the NP first argument is left unspecified, with the default interpretation of an external need of a situation. The CP complement is a syntactic constituent that can be independently projected, e.g., as a main clause.⁴ (1d) realizes (5a) where the first NP argument is left unspecified, and the second NP is the nominal counterpart of the CP. (3a) realizes the argument structure in (5b) where the argument structure of the modal predicate *kailangan* and that of the thematic verb are composed, perhaps as part of the process of Clause Reduction along the lines of Aissen and Perlmutter (1983) (Kroeger 1993:198-199), to the effect that the actor argument of the thematic predicate is identified with that of the modal:⁵

⁴ Independent projection of a clause in syntax is subject to restriction. The embedded CPs in (1b,c), for instance, with the verb carrying no aspectual morphology, are not possible main clause declaratives, for Tagalog main clause declaratives must carry aspectual morphology:

- (i) a. *Magluto ng pagkain si Maria.
 cook.AF GEN food NOM Maria
 ‘Maria cooks food.’
- b. Kailangang kumain ng pagkain si Maria.
 necessary.LK eat.AF GEN food NOM Maria
 ‘It is necessary that Maria eat food.’
- c. Kumain ng pagkain si Maria.
 eat.AF GEN food NOM Maria
 ‘Maria ate food.’

It may seem like that the embedded CP in (ib) can be a main clause declarative. But this is simply because the *-um-* form of an actor focus verb can either be of the perfective aspect or aspectless.

⁵ This is a technical implementation of the idea that the actor argument is semantically an argument of both the modal and the complement verb (Kroeger 1993:182), without assuming that the actor is a syntactic argument of both of them.

(6) *kailangan* <experiencer> [_{VP} V<actor, ...> ...]

We can take the process to be unification of argument structure; consequently, the projection of this unified argument structure allows only the argument to occur (see 3b).

As Tagalog is a language with predicate-initial word-order, it is sometimes unclear if the sequence *kailangan* and a thematic verb is the realization of (5a) with the first NP argument left unspecified or that of (5b). The distinction between them comes out most clearly when the thematic verb carries actor focus morphology and the experiencer-actor argument is *ng*-marked, as in (3a). In that case, the *ng*-marked argument cannot possibly be an argument of the thematic verb, but must be an argument of the modal *kailangan* (2a vs 3a).

As the CP second argument in (5a) is an independently existing syntactic constituent, it should be able to contain, as it does independently, in addition to different aspect and focus morphology on the verb (cf. 4a,c), negation (Asarina and Holt 2005) as well as other possible word-orders:

- (7) a. *Kailangan ni Pedro-ng hindi mag-luluto ng pagkain si Maria.*
 need GEN Pedro-LK not AF-cook GEN food NOM Maria
 ‘It is necessary for Pedro that Maria not be cooking food.’
 b. *Kailangang hindi iluto ni Maria ang pagkain.*
 necessary.LK not cook.OF GEN Maria NOM food
 ‘It is necessary that Maria not cook food.’
 c. *Kailangang si Maria ay hindi mag-luto ng pagkain.*
 necessary.LK NOM Maria AY not AF-cook GEN food
 ‘It is necessary that Maria not cook food.’

Conversely, structures embedding an independently impossible clause as the CP second argument in (5a) are excluded (see also footnote 4):

- (8) a. **Hindi mag-luluto ni Maria ang pagkain.*
 not AF-cook GEN Maria NOM food
 ‘Maria is not cooking food.’
 b. **Ng pagkain ay mag-luluto si Maria.*
 GEN food AY AF-cook NOM Maria
 ‘Mary is cooking food.’
- (9) a. **Kailangan ni Pedro-ng hindi mag-luluto ni Maria ang pagkain.*
 need GEN Pedro-LK not AF-cook GEN Maria SUBJ food
 ‘It is necessary for Pedro that Maria not be cooking food.’
 b. **Kailangang ni Pedro-ng ng pagkain ay mag-lulutosi Maria.*
 necessary.LK GEN Pedro-LK GEN food AY AF-cook NOM Maria
 ‘It is necessary that Maria is cooking food.’

The projection of the argument structure in (5b) and the unification of the argument structure of the modal and the thematic verb as in (6) predict that negation cannot intervene between the

two (Asarina and Holt 2005:12). The example in (10a) shows that this prediction is correct:

- (10) a. *Kailangan hindi(ng) mag-luto ni Pedro ng pagkain.
 need not.LK AF-cook GEN Pedro GEN food
 ‘Pedro need not cook food.’
 b. [_{ASPP} ASP [_{VP} *kailangan* [_{VP} V]]]

Furthermore, if aspect is syntactically projected above VP, as in (10b), it then follows that the thematic verb may not bear aspectual morphology, for the modal intervenes between ASP and V.

The structure in (6) where the modal *kailangan* is in clause-initial position and takes a VP complement allows second-position clitics, such as pronouns or other adverbial enclitics (Schachter and Otnes 1972:411ff), to intervene between the two. The facts in (11) show that this is indeed the case (see also Asarina and Holt 2005:12):⁶

- (11) a. Kailangan pala bumili ng lalaki ng kotse.
 necessary surprise AF-buy GEN man GEN car
 ‘Oh, I see the man must buy a car.’
 b. Kailangan ba-ng mag-luto ni Pedro ng pagkain?
 need Q-LK AF-cook GEN Pedro GEN food
 ‘Need Pedro buy food?’

In the same vein, the argument structure in (5a) with CP as the sole complement also projects a structure that allows for second-position clitics to occur between the modal and the clausal complement:

- (12) a. Kailangan siya-ng mag-luto ng pagkain.
 necessary 3SG-LK AF-cook GEN food
 ‘It is necessary that he/she cook food.’
 b. Kailangan yata mag-luto ng pagkain si Maria.
 necessary perhaps AF-cook GEN food NOM Maria
 ‘It is perhaps necessary that Maria cook food.’

There is thus considerable evidence for the modal *kailangan* ‘need, necessary’ having the argument structure in (5).

2.2 DESIRE

Desire is expressed by the modals *gusto*, *ibig* and *nais* ‘want, like’. Negated desire is expressed by the special form *ayaw* ‘not want, not like’ (Schachter and Otnes 1972:263-265).

The syntax of these modals is largely similar to that of the modal *kailangan* ‘necessary, need’, but speakers seem to differ with respect to the CP second argument:

⁶The actor pronoun *siya* in (10a) is not an argument of the modal predicate *kailangan*, but of the thematic verb in actor focus. If the thematic verb is object focus, then the pronoun actor would be *ng*-marked as *niya*. In that case, it is unclear if it is the argument of the thematic verb or of the modal. This is why non-pronominal arguments are chosen in most examples.

- (13) *Gusto*
 a. ___ NP {NP, CP}
 b. ___ VP

The examples in (14) instantiate the projections of the argument structures in (13), analogous to those in (5):

- (14) a. *Gusto ni Pedro ang/ng libro.*
 like GEN Pedro NOM/GEN book
 ‘Pedro likes a/the book.’
 b. *Gusto ni Pedro-ng mag-luto ng pagkain si Maria.*
 want GEN Pedro-LK AF-cook GEN food NOM Maria
 ‘Pedro wants Maria to cook food.’
 c. *Gusto-ng pumunta sa tindahan ang nanay.*
 want-LK go.AF to store NOM mother
 ‘Mother wants to go to the store.’
 d. **Gusto iyon.*
 like that
 ‘That is desirable.’

Unlike *kailangan* the modal *gusto* does not take a nominal as the sole argument (see 14d).

Like *kailangan*, the modal *gusto* ‘want, like’ may take a nominal argument and clausal complement, and the actor argument of the thematic verb need not be syntactically projected (see also 2b), or a VP complement, where the *ng*-marked experiencer-actor argument follows both the modal and the verb (see also 3a):

- (15) a. *Gusto ni Pedro-ng mag-luto ng pagkain.*
 want GEN Pedro-LK AF-cook GEN food
 ‘Pedro wants to cook food.’
 b. *Gusto-ng mag-luto ni Pedro ng pagkain.*
 want-LK AF-cook GEN food GEN food
 ‘Maria wants to cook food.’

In this latter case, the actor argument of the thematic verb may not be syntactically present (see also 3b), the thematic verb may not carry aspectual morphology (see also 4b), and negation may not intervene between the modal *gusto* and the verb (see also 11a):⁷

⁷ However, one speaker accepts (i), contrary to the expectation from example (16b):

- (i) *Gusto-ng nagluluto ng titser ng pagkain.*
 like-LK cook.AF GEN teacher GEN food
 ‘The teacher likes cooking food.’

Two problems arise with example (i). First, the experiencer-actor is *ng*-marked and hence is an argument of the modal *gusto*. This is only possible if the argument structure of the modal and that of the thematic verb are unified. If so, then it is unexpected that the verb may bear aspectual morphology (cf. 4b). Second, despite the past form of the verb with the prefix *n-*, it has no past interpretation. Further work with more examples of this sort with more speakers is necessary in order to see how general this is.

- (16) a. *Gusto-ng mag-luto ni Pedro ng pagkain si Maria.
 want-LK AF-cook GEN food GEN food NOM Maria
 ‘Pedro wants Maria to cook food.’
- b. *Gusto-ng mag-luluto ni Pedro ng pagkain.
 want-LK AF-cook GEN food GEN food
 ‘Pedro wants to be cooking food.’
- c. *Gusto hindi(-ng) mag-luto ni Pedro ng pagkain.
 want-LK not-LK AF-cook GEN Pedro GEN food
 ‘Pedro wants Maria to cook food.’

The ungrammaticality of the examples in (16a-c) can be explained in the same way as that for examples (3b), (4b) and (11a) in terms of unification of argument structure.

For many speakers, the CP second argument in (13a), like that in (5a), is an independently possible clause, the verb it contains may carry aspectual and focus morphology (Schachter and Otnes 1972:268) as well as negation (cf. 4a and 7a):

- (17) a. Gusto ko-ng lulutuin ni Maria ang pagkain.
 want 1GEN-LK cook.OF GEN Maria NOM food
 ‘Pedro wants Maria to be cooking food.’
- b. Gusto ni Pedro-ng hindi mag-luluto ng pagkain si Maria.
 want GEN Pedro-LK not AF-cook GEN food NOM Maria
 ‘Pedro wants Maria to not be cooking food.’

Like *kailangan*, the modal *gusto* may be immediately followed by a second-position clitic, such as a pronoun or yes/no question particle *ba* (Schachter and Otnes 1972:268, Bowen 1965:330):

- (18) a. Gusto sila ng Nanay (na) mag-aral mamayang gabi.
 want 3PL.NOM GEN mother LK AF-study tonight
 ‘Mother wants them to study tonight.’
- b. Gusto ba-ng kumuha ng bibingka ni Boy?
 want Q-LK get.AF GEN rice.cake GEN Boy
 ‘Does Boy want to get a rice cake?’

The grammatical examples considered above follow from the argument structures in (13), modulo speaker variation with respect to the CP argument in (13a) (see footnote 7).

2.3 OBLIGATION AND POSSIBILITY

Obligation is expressed by the modal *dapat* ‘must, should, be fitting’ and possibility is expressed by the modals *maaari* or *puwede* ‘can, possible’. They are monadic predicates taking only one argument. The argument can be a clause, or for the latter two it can also be a nominal argument.

- (19) a. *Dapat*: __ CP
 b. *Maaari/puwede*: __ {CP, NP}

The following examples are instantiations of the above argument structures (Schachter and Otanes 1972:271-272):

- (20) a. Dapat (na) mag-basa ng libro bukas si Pedro.
 should LK AF-read GEN book tomorrow NOM Pedro
 ‘Pedro should read a book tomorrow.’
 b. *Dapat iyon.
 should that
 ‘That is obligatory.’
- (21) a. Maaari-ng/puwede-ng mag-ingles ang alkalde.
 possible-LK AF-English NOM mayor
 ‘The mayor can speak English.’
 b. Maaari-ng/puwede-ng iyon.
 possible-LK that
 ‘That is possible.’

As with the previous two cases, the CP complement that occurs in (19) is an independently possible clause. The thematic verb in the CP may carry aspectual morphology (Schachter and Otanes 1972:271-272) and negation may occur:

- (22) a. Dapat (na) (hindi) mag-babasa ng libro bukas si Pedro.
 should LK not AF-read GEN book tomorrow NOM Pedro
 ‘Pedro should (not) be reading a book tomorrow.’
 b. Maaari-ng/puwede-ng (hindi) ginagawa iyon ni Pedro.
 possible-LK not do.OF that NOM Pedro
 ‘It is possible that Pedro is (not) doing that.’

However, these modals differ from the modals *kailangan* ‘need’ and *gusto* ‘want’, in that they do not take a nominal argument. The examples in (23)-(24) are not possible:

- (23) a. *Dapat ni Bob (na) pumunta sa tindahan.
 should GEN Bob LK go.AF to shop
 ‘Bob should go to the shop.’
 b. *Dapat ni Max (na) mag-basa ng libro.
 must GEN Max LK AF-read GEN book
 ‘Max must read a book.’
- (24) a. *Maaari/Puwede ng alkalde-ng mag-ingles.
 possible GEN mayor-LK AF-English
 ‘The mayor can speak English.’
 b. *Maaari/Puwede ni Bob (na) mag-basa ng libro.
 possible GEN Bob LK AF-read GEN book
 ‘Bob can read the book.’

As they take CP, not VP, as complement, the nominal that follows the thematic verb necessarily

is the argument of the thematic verb in the CP. It is marked with *ang* or *ng* according to its focus morphology of the verb:

- (25) a. *Dapat (na) pumunta ni Bob sa tindahan.
 should LK go.AF GEN Bob to shop
 ‘Bob should go to the shop.’
 b. Dapat (na) puntahan ni Bob ang tindahan.
 should LK go.DF GEN Bob NOM shop
 ‘Bob should go to the shop.’
- (26) a. *Maaari-ng/Puwede-ng mag-luto ng titser ng adobo.
 possible-LK AF-cook GEN teacher GEN adobo
 ‘The teacher can cook adobo.’
 b. Maaari-ng/Puwede-ng lutuin ng titser ng adobo.
 possible-LK cook.OF GEN teacher GEN adobo
 ‘The teacher can cook adobo.’

The examples in (19)-(26) thus show clearly that the modals *dapat* ‘must, necessary’ and *maaari/puwede* ‘may, can, possible’ only take a CP complement.

2.4 ABILITY

Ability is expressed by the modal *kaya* ‘can, be able to’. The complementation of this modal is the opposite that of the modals *dapat* ‘must, necessary’ and *maaari/puwede* ‘may, possible’ in that it takes only a VP complement:

- (27) *Kaya*: __ VP

The modal *kaya* resembles *kailangan* ‘must, necessary’ and *gusto* ‘want, desire’ in that it may be followed by either a *ng*-marked nominal argument, or a thematic verb and its arguments:

- (28) a. *Kaya ng titser na mag-basa ito-ng libro.*
 can GEN teacher LK AF-read this-LK book
 ‘A teacher can read this book.’
 b. *Kaya-ng mag-basa ng/*ang titser ito-ng libro.*
 can-LK AF-read GEN/NOM teacher this-LK book
 ‘A teacher can read this book.’
 c. **Kaya-ng mag-basa ng libro ang titser.*
 can-LK AF-read GEN book NOM teacher
 ‘A teacher can read a book.’

It is of some significance that the experiencer-actor argument cannot be *ang*-marked (see 28b,c), even though it can be in some other cases with an actor focus verb, e.g., in (20a). This fact is readily accounted for if the modal *kaya* takes only VP complement, and the argument structure of the modal *kaya* and that of the thematic verb are unified. The different word-orders in (28a,b) is much the same observed elsewhere. Post-predicate order of the arguments and adjuncts is

relatively free. The reason why the experiencer-actor argument cannot be *ang*-marked, in sharp contrast with the complement of the modal *kailangan* ‘need, necessary’ (see 3a), is because unlike *kailangan*, the modal *kaya*, may not take a clausal complement. For the same reason, the example in (28c) cannot be derived from a structure where the modal takes a clausal complement.

With the argument structure in (27) the modal *kaya* may not have more arguments than those of the thematic verb, in contrast with the modals *kailangan* and *gusto* (see their argument structures in 5a and 13a):

- (29) a. *Kaya ni Pedro-ng pumunta sa tindahan (* ni/si Maria)*
 can GEN Pedro-LK go.AF to shop GEN/NOM Maria
 ‘Pedro is able to go to the shop.’
 b. *Kaya ni Pedro-ng mag-luto ng pagkain (* ni/si Maria).*
 can GEN Pedro-LK AF-cook GEN food GEN/NOM Maria
 ‘Pedro is able to cook food.’

As the thematic verb *punta* ‘go’ takes only one nominal argument and *luto* ‘cook’ can only take two, the occurrence of another nominal argument like *Maria*, whether it is *ng*- or *ang*-marked, would exceed the number of arguments they can take.

As the complement of the modal *kaya* is a VP, it is not possible for negation to occur between the modal and the thematic verb, or for the thematic verb to carry aspectual morphology:

- (30) a. *Kaya (*hindi)-ng mag-tulog ni Bob nang dalawa-ng araw.*
 can not-LK AF-read GEN Bob ADV two-LK days
 ‘Bob is able not to sleep for two days.’
 b. **Kaya-ng mag-tutulog ni Bob nang dalawa-ng araw.*
 can AF-read GEN Bob ADV two-LK days
 ‘Bob is able not to be sleeping for two days.’

The facts considered here show that the modal *kaya* ‘can, be able to’ only takes a VP complement.

3 CONCLUSION

The various facts considered here show that modals are divided into three different classes with respect to complementation. The modals *dapat* ‘ought to, should’, *maaari/puwede* ‘can, possible’ take only a clausal complement, the modal *kaya* ‘can, be able to’ takes only a verbal argument, while the modals *kailangan* ‘need, necessary’, *gusto* ‘want, like’ can take either a nominal argument or a clausal or some combination thereof. Their different complementation can be diagnosed by the occurrence of negation and aspectual morphology as well as argument-marking.

Clausal complementation results in a biclausal structure whose clausal complement shows properties observed in independent clauses, while non-clausal complementation shows properties of monoclausal structures. The properties in each case necessarily cluster together, for they are the properties of a clause as a whole, and not idiosyncratic properties of individual categories. For instance, as negation and aspectual morphology is independently possible in a clause, they can therefore both occur.

REFERENCES

- Abenin-Adar, M. and Angelopoulos, N. (2016). On root modality and thematic relations in Tagalog and English. In Proceedings of SALT 26: 775-794.
- Aissen, J. and Perlmutter, D. (1983). Clause reduction in Spanish. In D. Perlmutter (ed), *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Aldridge, E. (2004). Ergativity and word order in Austronesian languages. PhD dissertation, Cornell University.
- Asarina, A. and Holt, A. (2005). Syntax and semantics of Tagalog modals. In J. Heinz and D. Ntelitheos (eds), Proceedings of AFLA XII. UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics. Department of Linguistics, UCLA.
- Bowen, D. (1965). *Beginning Tagalog: A course for speakers of English*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Kroeger, P. (1993). *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Payne, T. 1982. Role and reference related subject properties and ergativity in Yup'ik and Tagalog. *Studies in Language* 6: 75-106.
- Schachter, P. and Otones, F. (1972). *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.