

On the Dative Construction

Noriko Ue

要約

与格構文について

上 紀子

本稿の目的は、Chomsky (1981, 1986) の GB 理論における格理論に基き、現代英語の与格構文を検討し、格付与に関するいくつかの問題点に考察を加えることである。従来、与格移動変形規則により関連づけられてきた二重目的語構文における格付与の問題に対し、これまで提案されてきた代表的な解案は、大きく二つに分かれる。一つは、与格動詞の補部を形成する二つの目的語の構成素間に階層的構造を仮定することにより、各々の名詞句に別々の統率子を持たせようとする分析で、もう一つは、空の前置詞を例外的統率子として設定することにより、例外的な格付与を提案するものである。与格構文に関して、特に問題となるのは、(i)与格の受動文における文法性の違い、(ii) wh-移動の可能性、そして(iii) to 与格と for 与格構文における違いであるが、二つの分析が、これらの事実を与える説明には、いくつかの不十分な点がある事を指摘し、与格動詞の二重目的語構文の格付与に関する有標性は、まさに与格動詞が二つの構造格を与える点にあるという仮説を提案する。

1. Introduction

One of the movement rules that came to be rejected under the Government-Binding (GB) theory developed in Chomsky (1981, 1986) is Dative Movement.

- (1) John gave a box of chocolates to Mary.
- (2) John gave Mary a box of chocolates.

The sentences (1) and (2), which were considered to be related by Dative Movement transformationally, cannot be related by Dative Movement because the derivation of (2) from (1) violates the θ -criterion. The θ -criterion states that each argument bears only one θ -role and each θ -role is assigned to one and only one argument. The movement of *Mary* to the post-verbal position in (2) will result in *Mary* having two θ -roles, one from the preposition and the other from the verb, for both the original and the landing positions are governed by the preposition and the verb respectively. Hence, Dative Movement does not exist and both the constructions (1) and (2) are assumed to be generated independently in the base. On the basis of several considerations, Oehrle (1976) also argues that both the prepositional construction and the double object construction are base structures of English.

The base analysis of the double object construction, however, presents some potential problems for Case Theory, and various attempts have been made within the GB framework to handle the double object construction in terms of the theory of abstract Case. In this paper, we will examine the treatments given by Stowell (1981), Chomsky (1981), Kayne (1984), and Czepluch (1982), and discuss the relative merits and demerits of the analyses in accounting for the basic facts of the dative phenomena. We will then suggest an alternative account of the double object construction.

2. Two Approaches to the Dative Construction : The Layered Complement Structure Analysis and the Covert-Category Analysis

2.1. The basic principle of Case Theory is the Case Filter, which states that every phonetically realized NP must be marked for abstract Case (Chomsky 1981 : 175) :

(3) The Case Filter

*NP, when NP has a phonetic matrix but no Case.

As is assumed in Chomsky (1986 : 193), UG makes available two kinds of Case : the structural Cases, objective and nominative, are assigned by V and INFL at S-structure, and the inherent Cases, oblique and genitive, are assigned by P, N, and A at D-structure. The former ones are assumed to be dependent on government.¹

Furthermore, Case Theory includes a principle of Case adjacency requiring that where Case is not morphologically realized, a Case-marked element must be adjacent to its Case-assigner (Chomsky 1986 : 82). The adjacency condition immediately predicts the ordering of complements of a dative verb. Dative verbs subcategorize for two objects and the two object NPs must have Case if they should not be blocked by the Case Filter. Since it is generally assumed that verbs assign only one Case (i. e. the single-Case principle), the second object NP, which

cannot be verb-adjacent, has to have a preposition as its Case-assigner. Thus the ordering of V NP PP is a natural consequence of the strict adjacency condition between the Case-assigner and the NP. Hence, the prepositional dative construction of (1) is the unmarked case with respect to Case Theory.

However, the double object dative construction as in (2) poses a serious problem. The adjacency condition together with the single-Case principle predicts that the sentence (2) is ungrammatical because the second object NP is not assigned Case. As it is grammatical contrary to the prediction, there must be some other device in the grammar that assigns Case to the second NP within the complements of the dative verbs.

2.2. There have been two different kinds of approaches to this problem : one is taken by Stowell (1981) and Chomsky (1981) and the other, by Kayne (1984) and Czepluch (1982).² Despite some minor differences in Case-assigning mechanism, Stowell and Chomsky agree in that they both assume a layered complement structure for the double object dative construction so that each NP complement may have its own governor. On the other hand, Kayne and Czepluch try to solve the problem by postulating an empty P functioning as an exceptional governor. We will call the former analysis 'the layered complement structure analysis' and the latter 'the covert-category analysis' in this paper.³

Let us consider the layered complement structure analysis first. Stowell and Chomsky give the following constituent structures respectively to the sentence (2).

(4) John [_V [_V gave Mary] [a box of chocolates]]
(Stowell)

(5) John INFL [_{VP} [_V gave Mary] a box of chocolates]
(Chomsky)

Under Stowell's analysis, the V NP₁ of V NP₁ NP₂ is assumed to form a complex verb in which the first object NP is incorporated by the rule of word-formation. Now that the first NP is incorporated into the verb, the second object NP really is adjacent to the governing verb. The complex verb will assign Case to the NP₂ without violating the adjacency condition.

An alternative to the analysis of NP incorporation suggested by Chomsky is the small- \bar{V} analysis which assumes that the VP contains an internal VP, namely, a small \bar{V} . The small \bar{V} is regarded as an exceptional governor. So *Mary* receives structural Case from V in the normal way and *a box of chocolates* receives structural Case from \bar{V} . By allowing \bar{V} , which is not a lexical category, to be a Case-assigner, Chomsky solves the problem of assigning Case to the non-adjacent NP of the double object construction.

Clearly, there is no violation of the adjacency condition and the single-Case principle in the analyses presented above. The two objects are distinguished hierarchically, either by NP incorporation or by small \bar{V} , and they are Case-marked adjacently and singularly by different governors. The marked nature of the double object dative construction with respect to Case Theory is related to the requirement of a layered complement structure on the relevant verb.

Kayne and Czepluch, on the other hand, assume that the two complements in the double object construction are sisters to the verbal head, and they propose to analyze the first NP as a 'covert PP', namely, an NP headed by an empty preposition [_p e]. Thus, the structure of (2) is represented as (6) in their analyses.

(6) John INFL [_V give [_{pp} [_e] Mary] [_{NP} a box of chocolates]]⁴

How are *Mary* and *a box of chocolates* assigned Case? Kayne assumes that, although an empty preposition cannot be the source of Case, it may transmit to its object an objective Case received by percolation in the case of English. The verb *give* governs PP whose head is an empty P, so it assigns objective Case to this PP and this objective Case percolates to the empty head P. Now the objective Case is transmitted to *Mary*. The verb cannot assign Case to *Mary* directly but it can via empty P. Czepluch gives a similar account but uses the term 'defective' for an empty headed PP. He regards this PP as defective because it lacks a phonetically realized head. Because it is defective, it loses its bounding character and therefore it makes it possible for Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) to operate into the PP. The crucial property of a covert PP in Czepluch as well as in Kayne is that the empty P is assumed to function as an exceptional governor.

As for the Case-marking of the second NP, Kayne does not tell clearly how it is Case-marked but only suggests briefly in the footnote that the second NP receives objective Case from the verb perhaps by percolation as in Chomsky (1980 : note 34), if the structure is '[VP_e-NP-NP]' (Kayne 1984:201). According to Czepluch, the verb directly governs and Case-marks the second NP with the assumption that, since the first NP is linked to V by transmitted governance, the second NP is successively adjacent to its governor.

3. Problems of the Double Object Construction

3.1. In what follows, we will compare and examine the analyses presented above by looking at other facts exhibited by the dative verbs. There are three major problems that need to be explained : the first concerns dative passives, the second concerns dative questions, and the third concerns *for*-datives. First, let us consider the interaction of dative verbs and passivization. The dative verbs display the following patterns with respect to passivization :

- (7) a. He gave a ring to the girl.
- b. A ring was given to the girl.
- c. *The girl was given a ring to.
- (8) a. He gave the girl a ring.
- b. The girl was given a ring.
- c. (?*)A ring was given the girl.

In the case of the prepositional dative construction, passive sentences involving NP-movement from the post-verbal object position are possible but those with NP-movement from the post-prepositional object position are deviant. This falls out straightforwardly from properties of Case Theory. As is pointed out by Czepluch, grammaticality judgements about the dative passives related to the double object construction vary considerably according to speakers and dialects. Of the two passives (8b) and (8c), the former is admitted in all dialects but the latter varies from ungrammatical, marginal to grammatical. The prepositional paraphrase (7b) is definitely more usual than (8c).

The account of the grammaticality of (8b) is not so straightforward as (7b). Stowell is forced to assume that (8b) is a passive version of (7a) rather than (8a). If (8b) were derived from the double object construction (8a), it would be a counterevidence to his NP-incorporation analysis, for the NP *the girl* is part of the verb and thus it should not be susceptible to movement of any

sort. To derive (8b) from (7a), he proposes to interpret *to* as a dummy Case-marker. When no movement applies, *to* is inserted for the NP *the girl* to be assigned Case, resulting in (7a). In (8b), where movement has taken place, the trace in the extraction site is part of an A-chain headed by the NP in subject position. Therefore it is associated with the nominative Case feature and θ -role assignment is possible. Given this assumption, the S-structure of (8b) will be (9).

(9) [the girl]_i was [given a ring t_i]

The problem here is how the NP *a ring* is Case-marked. As is assumed in the standard Case Theory, Stowell also assumes that the passive participle does not assign Case. If so, *a ring* will be Case-less and the sentence (8b) will be blocked because of the violation of the Case Filter (3). That the passive participle is not capable of assigning Case is evident from the grammaticality of (7b). The derivation of (8b) from (8a) is abandoned for the sake of maintaining the NP-incorporation analysis; yet this in turn ends up in having a non-Case-marked NP in the dative passive (8b).

Under the small- \bar{V} hypothesis presented by Chomsky, (8b) receives a somewhat different treatment. (8b) is supposed to have the following structure after NP-movement:

(10) the girl was [_{VP} [_{\bar{V}} given t] a ring]

The movement of *the girl* to the subject position which is assigned nominative Case is required by Case Theory. Here again, we face the problem of accounting for the Case-marking of the second NP *a ring*. As we have seen, the crucial property of the small- \bar{V} hypothesis is the acceptance of \bar{V} as a kind of exceptional governor. It is not clear whether or not the \bar{V} in the passive sentence (10) is still capable of assigning Case. If we assume it is, the grammaticality of (8b) is straightforward with respect to Case Theory. Although we may need further study before we conclude that \bar{V} functions as a Case-assigner in the passive construction as well, we may say that the small- \bar{V} hypothesis can give a more adequate account of (8b) than the NP-incorporation hypothesis.

The account of (8b) under the covert-category analysis is less convincing. Kayne touches on the dative passives like (8b), suggesting that (8b) must have a structure like (11).

(11) [the girl]_i was [given p_e [_{NPI} e] a ring]

The objective Case, he says, is assigned to *a ring* by the passive past participle *given* (201, note 8). However, it is unclear under what mechanisms this objective Case assignment is accomplished.

Czepluch is a most ambitious study to cope with the fundamental facts of dative construction in terms of Case Theory within GB framework. However, his account of dative passives in (8) is somewhat problematical. The structure that he gives to (8b) is (12), not (13).⁵

(12) the girl INFL be [_{\bar{V}} given a ring [_{XP} t]]

(13) the girl INFL be [_{\bar{V}} given [_{PP} e [t]] a ring]

Although he postulates an empty P for the double object construction as is shown in (6), he is forced to give up (13) as the S-structure of (8b) because *a ring* will not be Case-marked. In order to satisfy the adjacency condition, he proposes the structure (12). On this premise, *a ring* is objective with respect to the participle *given*. Note that he modifies the uncontroversial assumption that the passive participle does not assign Case, saying that syntactic passive parti-

ciple is a neutralized category, namely, [+V, α N], and therefore it is a Case-assigner still. He considers the suppression of the external role of the base verb, rather than the absorption of Case, to be the basic property of passive participle. He claims that NP-movement in passives is not triggered by the absorption of Case. As to the status of XP, he merely says that it is either NP or the defective PP [-V, α N]. Besides this dubious status of XP, this account cannot explain the difference in markedness between the passives (8b) and (8c). Czepluch bases his study on the dialect in which (8c) is considered grammatical, but it is a general fact that the passive like (8c) is definitely more highly marked than the one like (8b). According to Czepluch, sentence (8c) has the structure exhibited in (14).

(14) a ring INFL be [_V given [e the girl] [_{NP} t]]

The girl is assigned objective Case by the participle in terms of transmitted governance. If this is correct, then, we will predict that there should be no difference in grammaticality between (8b) and (8c). As we take the difference in markedness between them to be important, we consider the analysis unsatisfactory which fails to cope with this fact. Czepluch is aware of this fact and tries to attribute it to the assumption that neutralization of the empty P in a verb-adjacent position is less susceptible to participles than to active verbs. This may indeed give us a possible account for the relative markedness of (8a) and (8c) but it does not seem to explain that of (8b) and (8c).

3.2. The second fact of interest that we need to consider about the dative construction concerns *wh*-movement. In the double object construction, we notice that the second NP is subject to *wh*-movement while the first NP is not generally subject to it, as is illustrated below.

- (15) a. He gave the girl a ring.
 b. What did he give the girl ?
 c. *Who did he give a ring ?

As is pointed out by Czepluch, this fact has not been treated satisfactorily, perhaps because of the interaction of various kinds of factors involved. Chomsky's small- \bar{V} analysis does not account for the difference in grammaticality between (15b) and (15c). Stowell, however, uses this fact in support of his NP-incorporation hypothesis. Since he assumes that the first object in (15a) is actually incorporated into the verbal complex, it naturally follows that it cannot be subject to movement. Hence the ungrammaticality of (15c). On the other hand, there is nothing in (15a) that blocks an extraction of the second object by *wh*-movement. As far as the dative question data in (15) are concerned, Stowell's account is simple and straightforward. Czepluch is the only one besides Stowell that attempts to tackle this problem. The D-structure of the deviant question (15c) is supposed to be (16).

(16) [COMP [he INFL [give [e who] a ring]]]

He argues that if the empty headed PP is a neutralized category, the trace left behind by *wh*-movement is non-distinct from either PP or NP. But, in either case, the derivation of (15c) from its base (16) will result in ungrammaticality: if the trace is analyzed as NP, there will be the violation of the Case Filter because *a ring* cannot get Case, and if the trace is analyzed as PP, there will be ECP violation and the Case Filter violation.⁶ Here again, as is in the discussion of (12), the exact nature of the neutralized category needs to be clarified.

3.3. The third issue for consideration concerns *for*-datives. Like *to*-datives, *for*-datives allow

prepositional-prepositionless object variation and in this respect they are systematically related to *to*-datives.⁷

- (17) a. He bought a ring for the girl.
 b. He bought the girl a ring.

But it has been pointed out that they behave somewhat differently from *to*-datives with respect to passives as is reflected in the following:⁸

- (18) a. (?*)The girl was bought a ring.
 b. *A ring was bought the girl.

Grammaticality judgements about *for*-dative passives vary, and Stowell and Czepluch, who are the only ones that try to account for the *for*-dative and *to*-dative phenomena uniformly in terms of Case Theory, regard both (18a) and (18b) as ungrammatical. Allerton (1978), on the other hand, accepts (18a) as grammatical; thus, *to*-datives and *for*-datives behave alike in his dialect.

Stowell accounts for the difference between (8b) and (18a) in terms of a different status of the prepositions *for* and *to*. While *to* is taken to be a dummy Case-marker, *for* is taken to be a true preposition which is lexically inserted at D-structure. *For* being a true Case-marker, NP-movement to subject position will be impossible. This means that there is no possible source for (18a) other than the double object construction (17b). However, in (17b), the first NP is incorporated into the verb and it should not be subject to NP-movement, parallel to (15c). This predicts the ungrammaticality of (18a). In the dialects which admit (18a) as grammatical, *for* is understood to be a dummy Case-marker. He argues, therefore, that the relevant parameter for the dialectal variation with respect to passivized *for*-datives is related to the status of the preposition *for*.

The alternative to Stowell's account is Czepluch's, the crucial property of which is the assumption that *for*-phrases are complements to \bar{V} rather than to V. He claims that the structure of *for*-dative is different from that of *to*-dative as is shown in (19) and (20).

- (19) he [_{VP} [_{\bar{V}} gave a ring to the girl]]
 (20) he [_{VP} [_{\bar{V}} bought a ring] for the girl]

The corresponding double object construction for (20) has the structure (21).

- (21) he [_{VP} [_{\bar{V}} bought [_{PP} e the girl] a ring]]

In (21), the indirect object complement is lowered into \bar{V} and it is attracted to the verb-adjacent position by ECP. Now let us return to the problem of (18a). Given the \bar{V} -complement status of the *for*-dative, the possible structure of (18a) is (22).

- (22) the girl was [_{VP} [_{\bar{V}} bought a ring] [_{PP} e [t]]]

However, the trace is not c-governed by the participle and hence it is out by ECP. He excludes (23) as a possible structure for (18a) by saying that the \bar{V} -domain of *for*-dative verbs is not transparent to the dative alternation in the passive.

- (23) the girl was [_{VP} [_{\bar{V}} bought [_{PP} e [t]] a ring]]

Czepluch's account crucially depends on the assumption that the *for*-phrase is a \bar{V} -complement and the postulate that the dative alternation may not obtain in the domain of the passive participle. He argues that *for*-dative verbs are more marked than *to*-dative verbs in that they are monotransitive syntactically but they θ -mark two complements: they have the subcategorization [+ __ NP] and the thematic structure [__ TH G]. He goes on to say that the dative

alternation does not occur with the *for*-dative passives because passive participles may have one lexicalized object at most and *for*-dative verbs are subcategorized only for one complement. But if we stick to the fact that *for*-dative verbs have the subcategorization [+__ NP], why is it possible for the *for*-dative verbs to have the double object construction in the active as in (21)? Moreover, as is suggested by Chomsky (1981 : 38), there has been a movement in recent work in GB theory toward eliminating subcategorization information from the lexicon and allowing argument structure to specify the number of complements of a verb.⁹ If this is the right direction, we may need to modify the account in terms of subcategorization difference.

4 . A Proposal

The examination of the major analyses of the dative construction from the viewpoint of Case Theory reveals that the prepositionless dative construction is really a marked case. A satisfactory account of the construction, therefore, seems to require more work on the general properties of the construction from various angles as well as more work on Case Theory itself. In this section, we will propose an alternative account of the construction.

We assume that, as is generally assumed, a verb assigns one and only one structural Case to an internal argument in the unmarked situation. However, we propose to assume that dative verbs can assign two structural Cases. In the configuration [V NP NP], both adjacent and non-adjacent NPs are assigned objective Case by the verb if it is a dative verb like *give* or *buy*. Hence, we will have the S-structure (24).

(24) ... V NP NP ...
 obj obj

Thus it is this particular property of the Case behavior of dative verbs that accounts for the syntactic markedness of the dative construction. It might appear to be implausible to assume that a verb can assign two structural Cases, but it has been pointed out by Jaeggli (1986) that there appear to be languages where a verb may assign more than one structural Case, for example, Scandinavian and Kinyarwanda. Languages seem to vary depending on whether they have this option or not and we claim that English takes this option in one specified group of verbs. In this specified group of verbs are included not only *give*-type and *buy*-type dative verbs but also such verbs as *allow*, *fine*, *wish*, *cost*, etc., which normally cannot occur with external prepositional phrase indirect objects.

- (25) a. He allowed his son 3000 yen a month.
 b. The work will cost you a lot of time and labor.
 c. They fine jaywalkers \$10 in this city.

The two bare NPs in all these examples receive objective Case from the verbs. Notice that what is crucial in this proposal is the assumption that only a 'lexical' category V assigns Case. We do not need to stretch the interpretation of Case-assigner to be a non-lexical category such as \bar{V} in the small- \bar{V} analysis. The double object construction is syntactically marked not for admitting a non-lexical category governor or an empty governor but for allowing a lexical governor V to assign two Cases exceptionally.

It might be objected that our proposal is not in line with the adjacency condition in that the verb assigns Case to the non-adjacent NP. One possible account for this problem will be to

consider the first Case-marked NP invisible when the assignment of Case to the second NP takes place. Here we just want to assume that the relevant verb exceptionally assigns two Cases in one single operation.

Then how are the passive facts as in (8) and (18) accounted for in this analysis? Before discussing this matter, let us briefly sketch the characterization of a passive sentence under GB theory. A standard Case Theory assumes that the passive participle does not assign Case. In other words, the passive morphology absorbs Case and therefore the passive participle is not a Case-assigner to the post-verbal NP any longer. This is one of the defining characteristics of passive.

However, that the passive participle can take a NP complement is shown by the grammatical dative passive like (8b). This means we may have to either abandon the assumption that the passive participle absorbs Case or keep the assumption but find some other way to account for the Case-assignment of the NP complement. If we take the former, however, we will not be able to give a natural account of ordinary passives. In order to describe ordinary passives with monotransitive verbs and dative passives in a unified way, we propose to keep the assumption that passive participle absorbs Case. In addition to this, we further assume that if the base verb is capable of assigning two Cases, one is assigned to the passive morphology and the other is assigned to a nominal complement of the verb. In the case of ordinary passives, the derivation of a passive participle involves such changes as suppression of the external role of the base verb, externalization of an internal role of the base verb, absorption of Case and elimination of the [NP, VP] position. Let us assume that the process of deriving a dative passive participle effects the same changes in principle but it differs only in that it effects the elimination of the first [NP, VP] position.

Given this assumption, we will predict that both (8b) and (18a) are well-formed whereas (8c) and (18b) are ill-formed. Namely, the D-structure representations underlying these sentences are as follows respectively:

(26) [e] INFL be given the girl a ring

(27) [e] INFL be bought the girl a ring

The base verbs *give* and *buy* exceptionally assign two Cases, but the passive participles *given* and *bought* absorb the Case which is assigned to the first [NP, VP]. Therefore, *the girl* has to be moved to the subject position for the structure to surface as grammatical. On the other hand, the movement of *a ring* is predicted to be ungrammatical, *the girl* being Caseless and therefore not θ -marked. When we discussed (8) and (18) above, we mentioned that speakers seem to vary considerably about the grammaticality judgements of (8c) and (18a). But notice that there is definitely a difference in grammaticality between (8b) and (8c) and between (18a) and (18b): (8c) and (18b) are far worse than (8b) and (18a) respectively. We want to claim that this is the most crucial point about the dative passives that any analysis needs to capture. Syntactically, (8b) and (18a) should be predicted to be well-formed, but we claim that it is because of the different θ -roles that *the girl* has that the two sentences differ in well-formedness. *The girl* in *give*-type sentences bears the goal role while that in *buy*-type sentences bears the beneficiary role. This semantic role difference seems to create the difference in grammaticality between the two passive sentences. It is a well-known fact that thematic factors affect a ling-

uistic process, as is seen in passives involving monotransitive verbs, control phenomena, etc. We thus consider our suggestion not implausible.

As to those dialects which accept (8c) as grammatical, we assume that the passive participle *given* is interpreted to absorb freely the structural Case of either of the nominal complements of the verb. Thus the movement of either *the girl* or *a ring* will not cause deviancy in those dialects.

As Czepluch points out, the fact concerning the interrogative patterns shown in (15) has not been explained satisfactorily in formal terms. It is not at all clear how *wh*-movement can be blocked from the post-verbal position as in (15c). In our analysis, too, there is apparently no structural property that can block *wh*-movement in (15c). The associated S-structure representations for (15b) and (15c) are (28) and (29) respectively.

(28) [what [he INFL [give the girl t]]]

(29) [who [he INFL [give t a ring]]]

According to the Case properties of *wh*-movement, *wh*-trace must be Case-marked. In our analysis, the two object NPs are assigned Case by the dative verb. In both (28) and (29), the *wh*-words in COMP are not governed and Case-marked, but they bind Case-marked traces. This predicts both of the sentences to be well-formed. However, this is not true. *Wh*-movement from the post-verbal object position must be blocked. Therefore it remains to be explained why (15c) is ill-formed. We would like to claim that (15c) is syntactically well-formed but it is to be rejected for functional reasons. As Kuno (1980) argues, a linguistic process can be governed by purely syntactic factors, by functional factors or by both. We propose to describe the ungrammaticality of the dative interrogative (15c) in terms of functional or discourse factors. Notice that in the prepositionless dative constructions the first NP is either a pronoun or a definite NP in most cases.¹⁰ This is very natural from the viewpoint of the information structure of a sentence. In the double object construction, the post-verbal object functions as a theme representing old information and therefore it cannot be part of the assertion that the sentence makes (unless it is stressed). This immediately predicts the inappropriateness of the dative question (15c) in which non-asserted element is questioned. Thus, the difference between (15b) and (15c) is attributable to the functional difference related to the communicative function of the elements.

5 . Concluding Remarks

In this paper the dative construction has been reconsidered in terms of Case Theory presented in Chomsky (1981, 1986). In particular, it has been pointed out in some detail that the double object dative construction presents potential problems to the theory of abstract Case. We have discussed two different Case-theoretic treatments of the marked double object construction. The layered complement structure analysis tries to explain the marked nature of the dative construction by postulating a hierarchical complement structure, and the covert-category analysis, by assuming an empty P as an exceptional governor. We have seen that there are advantages and/or disadvantages in each of the analyses, especially with respect to dative passives, dative interrogatives and *for*-datives. In the final section, we have presented an alternative account of the dative phenomena in question.

The main points of our proposal are (i) A dative verb exceptionally assigns two structural Cases; (ii) A Passive verb absorbs Case. If the base verb can assign two Cases, one is assigned to the passive morphology and the other, to a NP complement of the verb; and (iii) A linguistic process is governed not only by purely syntactic factors but also by non-syntactic factors such as functional and thematic factors. It is very likely that these non-syntactic factors may be responsible for the ungrammaticality of some of the sentences with dative verbs.

NOTES

1. We will assume the definition of government given in Aoun and Sportiche (1983).
2. The analysis given by Hornstein and Weinberg crucially hinges on the assumption of oblique Case in English. However, as the oblique-Case assumption is somewhat questionable for English, which is not a Case-inflecting language, we do not include their analysis in our discussion.
3. The label 'the covert-category analysis' is taken from Czepluch.
4. The structures given by Kayne and Czepluch are not exactly the same. However, their minor differences are irrelevant to the present discussion and (6) is basically the structure both analyses assume.
5. As complement ordering is not implied in the subcategorization of the dative verbs, he considers the possibility of (i) as a possible structure for (8b) in addition to (13).

(i) the girl INFL be [_V given a ring [_{pp} e [t]]]

(i) is rejected because of ECP violation, however.

6. His ECP is as follows:

An empty category must be properly governed, where proper government requires that

(i) it is governed by a lexical category, and

(ii) it is coindexed with an antecedent.

7. *For*-datives do not always allow double object constructions due to a number of interacting factors. See Allerton (1978).
8. Fillmore (1965) judges (18a) to be ungrammatical. It was on the basis of the difference between (8b) and (18a) that he proposed to order a rule of *for*-dative movement after the passive transformation.
9. For example, see Woolford.
10. Oehrle (1976: 177) says that in virtually all the examples he encountered, the indirect object is a pronoun.

REFERENCES

- Allerton, D. J. 1978. Generating indirect objects in English. *Journal of Linguistics* 14. 21—33.
- Aoun, Joseph, and D. Sportiche. 1983. On the formal theory of government. *The Linguistic Review* 2. 211—36.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- _____. 1986. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Czepluch, Hartmut. 1982. Case theory and the dative construction. *The Linguistic Review* 2. 1—38.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1965. *Indirect object constructions in English and the ordering of transformations*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Green, Georgia M. 1974. *Semantics and syntactic regularity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert, and Amy Weinberg. 1981. Case theory and preposition stranding. *LI* 12. 55—91.
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo A. 1986. Passive. *LI* 17. 587—622.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1984. *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1980. *Functional syntax*. *Syntax and semantics*, II, ed. by E. Moravcsik. New York: Academic Press.

- Marantz, Alec P. 1984. On the nature of grammatical relations. (LI monograph 10.) Cambridge, MA : MIT Press.
- Oehrle, Richard T. 1976. The grammatical status of the English dative alternation. MIT dissertation.
- Stowell, Timothy A. 1981. Origins of phrase structure. MIT dissertation.
- Woolford, Ellen. 1983—84. Dative verbs with unspecified objects : Optional subcategorization versus lexical detransitivization. *The Linguistic Review* 3. 389—409.

April 13, 1987