

Abstract

In this article, we argue that the so-called semi- or *krijgen*-passive is transformationally derived, and hence that dative Case must be considered as a structural Case comparable to accusative Case. Further, we argue that the auxiliaries of the regular and semi-passive are responsible for the assignment of dative and accusative Case in the regular and semi-passive construction, respectively. Additional support for the claim that the (semi-)passive auxiliaries have Case-assigning properties is provided by the (semi-)copular construction, where the same verbs are used as copulas, and the locational *hebben/krijgen* construction.

1. Introduction

In the current generative framework, dative Case is generally taken to be an inherent (oblique) Case in the continental West-Germanic languages. In this article, however, we will show that there are reasons to believe that it is a structural Case comparable to accusative Case, i.e. a Case assigned by the verb in a certain structural configuration.

There are two reasons for assuming that accusative Case is a structural Case. The first is that the availability of accusative Case depends on certain morphological and/or lexical properties of the verb. The second is that accusative Case can be assigned by a verb to a non-argument (Exceptional Case Marking).

Despite the fact that dative Case is often taken to be an inherent Case, there are cases in which the availability of dative Case appears to be subject to the morphological and/or lexical properties of the verb as well. For instance, besides the regular passive in which the direct object is promoted to subject there is a semi-passive in which the indirect object is promoted to subject (cf. section 2 for further discussion).

With respect to Exceptional Case Marking, on the other hand, the situation is less clear-cut. It appears to be the case that there are no main verbs that are able to assign dative Case to a non-argument. (Note, however, that we will argue in the sections 3 and 4 of this article that there exists a class of auxiliary verbs that has this property). Nevertheless, there is reason to assume that Exceptional Dative Marking is possible. Consider the following German example, which contains a so-called absolute *with*-PP (the relevance of this example has been pointed out to us by Marcel den Dikken (p.c.)).

- (1) Mit diesem Jungen im Tor werden wir sicher gewinnen.
With this boy_{dat.} in-the goal will we certainly win
'With this boy in the goal, we will certainly win.'

If we assume that the complement of the dative assigning preposition *mit* is a Small Clause, i.e. that the structure of this PP is [*PP mit [sc diesem Jungen im Tor]*] (cf. Bennis and Hoekstra 1989 and references cited there), (1) should involve assignment of dative Case to a non-argument across a SC-boundary, and hence we would be dealing with Exceptional Dative Marking.

From this preliminary discussion, it will be clear that there is no *a priori* reason to reject the assumption that dative is a structural Case. The main goal of this article is to provide empirical evidence in favour of this assumption.

The data in this article are mainly taken from Standard Dutch and its non-dialectal variety spoken in Heerlen (henceforth: Heerlen Dutch).¹ Most of the Standard Dutch constructions can also be found in Geerts et al. (1984), unless we explicitly refer to other work. The Heerlen Dutch data are collected by Leonie Cornips (cf. Van Bree 1981 for similar facts in a variety of Eastern-Dutch dialects).

2. Semi-passivization

Triadic verbs often have two alternants, one in which the indirect object appears as a prepositional object and one in which it appears as a ‘bare’ NP (cf. (2)). As can be seen in (3), the two alternants give rise to different kinds of passive constructions in English: in the passive construction corresponding to (2a), the direct object is promoted to subject, whereas the indirect object is promoted to subject in the passive construction that corresponds to (2b).

- (2) a. I offered the books to Mary.
 b. I offered her the books.
- (3) a. The books were offered to Mary.
 b. She was offered the books.

In Dutch (and other continental West-Germanic languages), the counterparts of the English examples in (2), given in (4), have passive alternants in which the direct object is promoted to subject (cf.(5a,b)). Promotion of the indirect object, however, is excluded (cf.(5c)).

- (4) a. Ik bood de boeken aan Marie aan.
 I offered the books to Marie PRT
 b. Ik bood haar de boeken aan.
 I offered her the books PRT
- (5) a. De boeken werden aan Marie aangeboden.
 the books were to Marie PRT-offered
 b. De boeken werden haar aangeboden.
 the books were her PRT-offered

¹ Heerlen Dutch is the result of a process of language shift with the dialect as the source and Standard Dutch as the target language (cf. Cornips in prep. for detailed discussion).

- c. *Zij werd de boeken aangeboden.
 she was the books PRT-offered

The difference between English on the one hand and Dutch on the other is sometimes related to the Case-assigning properties of the preposition: in English, the preposition *to* is assumed to assign structural, objective Case, whereas Dutch *aan* assigns inherent (oblique) Case. This difference is sometimes also held responsible for the difference between the two languages with respect to extraction from PP: the English example in (6a) is grammatical since the trace of NP is licensed under government by a structural Case-assigner, whereas the Dutch example in (6b) is excluded since the preposition is not a structural Case-assigner (Kayne 1984:ch.3/5 for a more detailed discussion).

- (6) a. Who_i did you offer the books to *t_i*?
 b. *Wie_i heb je de boeken aan *t_i* aangeboden?
 who have you the books to PRT-offered

Often, it is assumed that the double object construction in (2,4b) is transformationally derived from the prepositional object construction in (2,4a) by a rule of Dative Shift (cf. e.g. Larson 1988 and Den Dikken 1992 for two different kinds of proposal). If this is indeed the case, this would immediately account for the difference between the English passive construction in (3b) and the Dutch ones in (5b,c).

Generally, it is assumed that inherent Case cannot be affected by the application of transformations. If this is really the case, this implies that the ‘bare’ indirect object in the Dutch example (4b) also has inherent Case, which cannot be affected by the application of Passive either. Consequently, the indirect object cannot be promoted to subject in Dutch, which accounts for the ungrammaticality of (5c). The ‘bare’ indirect object in (2b) on the other hand has objective Case, which can be absorbed by Passive, and (3b) is therefore grammatical.

If this account of the ungrammaticality of (5c) is correct, the grammaticality of the construction in (7), which is often called the semi- (or *krijgen*-)passive, comes as a surprise, since it appears to be the case that the indirect object in (4b) surfaces as the subject of this construction. The subject of (4b) may be expressed by a *van*-PP.

- (7) Zij kreeg de boeken (van mij) aangeboden.
 she got the books (of me) PRT-offered

If the construction in (7) is transformationally derived from the construction in (4b), we have to assume that in the semi-passive dative Case is absorbed, despite the fact that it assumed to be an inherent Case.

Often, a transformational derivation of the semi-passive is rejected, since it seems to be to a large extent idiosyncratically constrained: in Standard Dutch, the semi-passive seems only to be possible, if the referent of the direct object is actually transmitted to the referent of the indirect object (an exception to this rule

is given in (7): *aanbieden* ‘to offer’ does not have to imply actual transmission of the object). This can be illustrated by means of the following examples.

- (8) a. Ik bezorgde hem de boekenop zijn kantoor.
I gave him the books at his office
‘I delivered him the book at his office.’
b. Hij kreeg de boekenop zijn kantoor bezorgd.
he got the books at his office` delivered
‘He got the books delivered at his office.’
- (9) a. De heks bezorgt het kind de koude rillingen.
the witch gives the child the cold trembles
‘The witch gives the child the creeps.’
b. *Het kind kreeg de koude rillingen bezorgd (van de heks).
the child got the cold trembles given (of the witch)

Example (9b) is unacceptable, since we are dealing here with an idiomatic expression, and no actual transmission is involved. This, however, cannot be a convincing argument against a transformational derivation, since similar observations can be made with respect to the regular passive. Whereas the regular passive of (8a) in (10a) is fully acceptable, the regular passive of (9a) in (10b) is impossible on its idiomatic reading – a literal interpretation is forced upon us.

- (10) a. De boeken werden hem op zijn kantoor bezorgd.
The books were him at his office given
b. ?*De koude rillingen werden het kind (door de heks) bezorgd.
the cold trembles were the child (by the witch) given

A more serious argument against a transformational analysis of the semi-passive is that it appears not to be fully productive: even if we restrict our attention to constructions in which actual transmission is implied, the semi-passive is not always possible. Consider the examples in (11).

- (11) a. Ik gaf hem de boeken.
I gave him the books
b. De boeken werden hem (door mij)gegeven.
the books were him (by me) given
c. *Hij kreeg de boeken(van mij) gegeven.
he got the books (of me) given

If the semi-passive is the result of a transformational process, we would wrongly expect (11c) to be as acceptable as the regular passive in (11b). *Geven* seems however to be the only transmission verb that resists semi-passivization. Possibly, this may be due to the fact that the proposition that (11c) would express if it were grammatical, can be expressed by means of (12).

- (12) Hij krijgt het boek van mij.
he gets the book from me

Note that the thematic relations in (12) are identical to those in (8b). According to, e.g., Baker's (1988) *Uniformity of Theta Assignment Hypothesis* (which states that identical thematic relationships between items are represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure), we may conclude that *hij* in (12) is a derived subject, i.e. that *krijgen* acts as an 'undative' verb.² Generally, the verb *krijgen* can be replaced by the verbs *hebben* (Janssen 1976, Hoekstra 1984a), be it that the source-PP must then generally be suppressed (cf.(13); note that this example is acceptable if the *van*-PP is construed as a part of the NP *een boek*, e.g. 'a book by me').³ This indicates that *hebben* must also be considered as an 'undative' verb.

- (13) Hij heeft het boek (*van mij).
he has the book (from me)

In Standard Dutch, the use of dative NPs is more or less restricted to verbs that express transmission of the direct object. In other varieties of Dutch, however, dative NPs can also be used in benefactive and possessive constructions. As is to be expected on our assumption that the semi-passive is syntactically derived, these constructions may undergo semi-passivization.

Consider the Heerlen Dutch data in (14) and (15), which involve a beneficiary.

² If semi-passivization of a ditransitive verb is excluded, as for instance in (9b), the intended proposition can often be expressed by means of this *krijgen*-construction. And, as is to be expected on basis of the discussion below, there generally also exists a *hebben*-variant.

- (i) a. Het kind kreeg de koude rillingen (van de heks).
the child got the cold trembles (of the witch)
b. Het kind heeft de koude rillingen (?van de heks).
the child has the cold trembles (of the witch)

³ Sometimes *hebben* can also be used with a source PP (cf.(i)). Further, it must be noted that for some speakers (iib) is also acceptable if we replace *gekregen* by the participle of *hebben*, *gehad*.

- (i) Hij had/*kreeg dat idee natuurlijk van haar.
He had/gets that idea of course from her

(ii)a. Hij kreeg/*heeft het boek (van haar) cadeau.
Hegot/*has the book (from her) present
'He got the book as a present.'
b. Hij heeft het boek (van haar) cadeau gekregen/?gehad.
Hehas the book (from her) present got/?had

- (14) a. Ik spit hem de tuin om.
I dig him the garden PRT
'I dig the garden up for him.'
- b. De tuin werd hem (door mij) omgespit.
the garden was him (by me) PRT-dig
- c. Hij kreeg de tuin (van mij) omgespit.
he got the garden (from me) PRT-dig
- (15) a. Ik maak hun de verwarming in orde.
I make them the heating in order
'I repair the heating for them.'
- b. De verwarming werd hun (door mij) in orde gemaakt.
the heating was them (by me) in order made
- c. Zij kregen de verwarming (van mij) in orde gemaakt.
they got the heating (from me) in order made

As can be seen in the b- and c-examples both the regular and the semi-passive are possible. The same holds if we are dealing with possessive datives.

- (16) a. Ik was haar de handen.
I wash her the hands
'I wash her hands.'
- b. De handen werden haar (door mij) gewassen.
The hands were her (by me) washed
- c. Zij kreeg de handen (van mij) gewassen.
She got the hands (from me) washed
- (17) a. Jan verfde haar de haren grijs.
Jan dyed her the hairs grey
'Jan dyed Mary's hair grey.'
- b. Haar zijn de haren (door mij) grijs geverfd.
her are the hairs (by me) grey dyed
- c. Zij kreeg de haren (van mij) grijs geverfd.
she got the hairs (from me) grey dyed

Since in Heerlen Dutch semi-passivization of examples such as (14a)-(17a) is fully productive, the suggestion that the semi-passive is severely constrained and should therefore be considered as an idiosyncratic phenomenon cannot be upheld. In fact, the reason for the semi-passive to occur so rarely in Standard Dutch is just that the distribution of dative NPs is rather limited in this variety.

Above we have argued in favour of a transformational analysis of the semi-passive in (18a). Further, we suggested in passing that the main verbs *krijgen* and *hebben* (in (18b,c)) must be considered as 'undative' verbs.

- (18) a. Hij_i kreeg *t_i* de boeken aangeboden.
 he got the books PRT-offered
 b. Hij_i kreeg *t_i* de boeken.
 he got the books
 c. Hij_i heeft *t_i* de boeken.
 he has the books

If we assume that the regular passive at least implies absorption of an external θ -role, our analysis correctly predicts that the examples in (18a-c) cannot be passivized; the surface subject *hij* is not an external argument but an underlying indirect object. This is illustrated in (19).⁴

- (19) a. *De boeken werden/zijn aangeboden gekregen.
 The books are/have-been PRT-offered got
 b. *De boeken werden/zijn gekregen.
 c. *De boeken werden/zijn gehad.

Although our predictions with respect to (19) are correct, the current assumptions about Passivization are potentially a problem for our analysis, since it is assumed that besides the process of absorption of the external θ -role, Passivization also implies absorption of structural Case. Consequently, if we give a transformational derivation of both the regular and the semi-passive, we must account for the fact that structural Case assignment is still possible: dative can be assigned in the regular, and accusative can be assigned in the semi-passive construction. Since we have assumed that both accusative and dative Case are structural Cases and since it is assumed that passive participles do not assign structural Case, some other element must be responsible for Case-assignment. We believe that the most feasible assumption is that the auxiliaries are responsible for it, i.e. that we are in fact dealing with Exceptional Dative/Accusative Marking by the auxiliaries: the auxiliaries *worden* and *zijn* are able to assign dative, and the auxiliary *krijgen* (and also *hebben*) is (are) able to assign accusative Case. Our claim that auxiliaries have Case-assigning properties will be substantiated in the following two sections.

4. Especially, the impossibility of (19b) is striking, since passivization of the near synonymous example in (ia) gives rise to a perfect result.

- (i) a. Hij ontving de boeken.
 he received the books
 b. De boeken worden/zijn ontvangen.
 The books are/have-been received

Such minimal pairs cannot be constructed with *hebben*, since its only near synonym, *bezitten* ‘to own’, cannot be passivized either.

3. Possessive constructions in Heerlen Dutch

Since the semi-passive is fully productive in the possessive constructions in (16/7a), it is interesting to have a closer look at other possessive dative constructions. Consider the copular constructions below. In Standard Dutch only the constructions in (20) are possible, but in those varieties of Dutch that allow for possessive datives, these examples may also show up as in (21).

- (20) a. Zijn handen zijn vies.
his hands are dirty
b. Haar haren zijn grijs.
her hairs are grey
c. Zijn fietsband is lek.
his bike tire is punctured
- (21) a. Hem zijn de handen vies.
him are the hands dirty
b. Haar zijn de haren grijs.
Her are the hairs grey
c. Hem is de fietsband lek.
him is the bike tire punctured

Interestingly, the possessive dative copular construction in (21) alternates with the construction in (22), where the possessive dative of (21) apparently shows up as the surface subject.

- (22) a. Hij kreeg/had de handen vies.
he got/had the hands dirty
b. Zij kreeg/had de haren grijs.
she got/had the hairs grey
c. Hij kreeg/had de fietsband lek.
he got/had the bike tire punctured

Of course, this is fully in accordance with the proposal we put forth in the preceding section: in (21), we are dealing with the copular verb *zijn*, which is able to assign dative to the possessor; in (22), however, we are dealing with the semi-copulas *krijgen* and *hebben*, which cannot assign dative to the possessor, and therefore the possessor must show up in the nominative. Further, the fact that the possessive reading is present in (22) provides us with a conclusive argument in favour of the claim that we are dealing with raising of the underlying indirect object to subject position. We will point this out below.

In unergative constructions, a possessor can only be expressed by means of a dative NP. Consider the examples in (23); the asterisk in front of the second English paraphrase in (23b) conveys that the example is excluded on this reading (cf. Cornips 1991 for a more extensive discussion).

- (23) a. Peter_i wast haar_j de handen schoon.
 Peter washes her the hands clean
 ‘Peter cleans her_j hands.’
- b. Peter_i wast de handen schoon.
 ‘Peter washes the hands.’
 ‘*Peter_i cleans his_i hands.’
- c. Peter_i wast zich_i de handen schoon.
 Peter washes REFL the hands clean
 ‘Peter_i cleans his_i hands.’
- d. Peter_i wast zijn_i handen schoon.
 Peter washes his the hands clean

As will be clear from the English paraphrase, (23a) can be interpreted as a possessive construction, the referent of the dative NP being construed as the person whose hands are cleaned. The subject, on the other hand, cannot enter into a possessive relation with the direct object, not even if the indirect object is absent: (23b) can only be interpreted such that Peter washes somebody else’s hands. A possessive relation between the subject and the direct object can only be expressed indirectly, viz. by inserting the reflexive *zich*, as in (23c), or by adding the possessive pronoun *zijn* to the direct object, as in (23d). Consequently, we must conclude that a possessor cannot be the subject of an unergative construction, i.e. cannot be the external argument of the predicate.⁵

Now consider again the examples in (22). In these constructions, the possessive relation holds between a subject and the direct object. Since we saw that an external argument cannot entertain a possessive relation with the object, we are compelled to assume that the subject in (22) is not an underlying, but a derived subject. And this, of course, is exactly what our analysis claims.

Finally, note that our proposal solves two seemingly puzzling facts. First, consider the example in (24), which has two readings that are quite contradictory.

- (24) Peter heeft de fiets gestolen.
 Peter has the bike stolen
 ‘Peter has stolen the bike.’
 ‘Peter has his bike stolen.’

On one reading, Peter has stolen somebody else’s bike. In this case, (24) is of course the perfect tense of *Peter steelt de fiets* ‘Jan steals the bike’. On the second reading, however, Peter’s bike has been stolen – no action of Peter is implied: the bike has probably been stolen by somebody else. On this reading, *gestolen* acts as an adjectival predicate and the surface subject is an underlying indirect object, i.e. we are dealing with a semi-copular construction. Secondly, consider the examples in (25).

⁵ This seems generally to be the case across languages, although some exceptions are given by, e.g., Guéron (1985) and Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992). We refer to these articles for relevant discussion.

- (25) a. Peter heeft de jas gescheurd.
 Peter has the coat torn
 ‘Peter has torn the coat.’
 ‘Peter has his coat torn’
- b. Peter heeft zich de jas gescheurd.
 ‘Peter has torn his own coat.’
 ‘*Peter has his coat torn.’

As in (24), (25a) has both the verbal and the adjectival reading: either Peter tore up somebody else’s coat or Peter’s coat is torn and no action of Peter is implied. Example (25b), on the other hand, only has the verbal interpretation: it is Peter’s coat that has been torn up, and Peter did it himself. The fact that the adjectival reading is not possible in (25b) is of course due to the fact that in that case no dative Case would be available and hence that the reflexive *zich* would violate the Case Filter.

In this section, we argued that our suggestion that the semi-passive verbs *krijgen* and *hebben* are responsible for assignment of accusative Case in the semi-passive construction is supported by the possessive semi-copular constructions discussed in this section.

Further, we have argued that a possessor cannot be an external argument of a root predicate. If this is really true, we have additional evidence in favour of a transformational derivation of the semi-passive in Standard Dutch: recall from the previous section that in Heerlen Dutch the semi-passive can be productively applied to the possessive dative construction, and since the possessive reading is maintained under semi-passivization, this implies that the surface subject must be an underlying indirect object. The same argument can be applied to Dutch, if we take into consideration the rare constructions in which Standard Dutch also allows for a possessive dative. Consider the examples in (26), which are possible both in Standard and in Heerlen Dutch.

- (26) a. Zij stopt hem het kind in de armen.
 she puts him the child in the arms
 ‘She puts the child in his arms.’
- b. Het kind werd hem in de armen gestopt.
 the child was him in the arms put
- c. Hij kreeg het kind in de armen gestopt.
 he got the child in the arms put
- d. Hij kreeg/heeft het kind in de armen.
 he got/has the child in the arms

In (26a), there is a possessive relation between the dative NP *hem* and the prepositional object *de armen*; as before, the external argument of the predicate, the NP *zij*, cannot entertain a possessive relation with the direct object.⁶ Both the

⁶ This is not very clear in (26a), because of the meaning of the example, but it can be very clearly illustrated by means of the examples in (i). In (ia), the dative NP *hem* enters in a possessive relation with the prepositional object *de baard* ‘the beard’. If the dative NP is absent, as in (ib), no

regular passive in (26b) and the semi-passive in (26c) are possible. Since the possessive relation between *hij* and the prepositional object is maintained in (26c), we may safely conclude that *hij* is an underlying indirect object. To be complete, we added (26d), which supports our claim that *krijgen* and *hebben* are ‘undative’ verbs.

4. The locational *hebben/krijgen* construction

In this section, we will discuss a construction that at first sight resembles the semi-copular constructions in (22). This construction always involves some notion of location, which can be expressed by adjectives such as *open* ‘open’, *dicht* ‘closed’ or a PP such as *in de kast* ‘in(to) the cupboard’. On closer inspection, however, it will become clear that it constitutes a totally different kind of construction that provides independent support for our assumption that the auxiliaries *hebben* and *krijgen* have Case-assigning properties.

Consider the example in (27), which is possible both in Standard and in Heerlen Dutch. At first sight, this example seems to be a case of the semi-copular construction. In Standard Dutch, for example, (27) can be paraphrased by the regular copular constructions in (28a). In Heerlen Dutch, however, the subject in (27) cannot show up as a possessive dative. This is shown in (28b).

(27) Hij heeft het raam open.
 He has the window open

(28) a. Zijn raam is open.
 His window is open
 b. *Het raam is hem open.
 The window is him open
 ‘His window is open.’

The fact that (28b) is ungrammatical in Heerlen Dutch is not really surprising, though, since, contrary to what is the case in (22), the possessive interpretation is not compulsory in (27). This becomes clear if we compare the examples in (29). In

possessive relation is implied: somebody else’s beard is involved. To express a possessive relation with the subject, a reflexive must be present as in (ic), or the prepositional object must contain a (reduced) possessive pronoun as in (id).

(i) a. Jan_i trok hem_j een haar uit de baard.
 Jan pulled him a hair out-of the beard
 ‘Jan_i pulled a hair out of his_{i/j} beard.’
 b. Jan_i trok een haar uit de baard.
 *Jan_i pulled a hair out of his_i beard.’
 c. Jan_i trok zich_i een haar uit de baard.
 Jan pulled REFL a hair out-of the beard
 ‘Jan_i pulled a hair out of his_i beard.’
 d. Jan_i trok een haar uit z’n baard.
 Jan pulled a hair out-of his beard
 ‘Jan_i pulled a hair out of his_{i/j} beard.’

(29a), we are dealing with a genuine semi-copular construction: the surface subject, *hij*, compulsorily enters into a possessive relation with the direct object, and hence a possessive pronoun such as *mijn* ‘my’ is excluded. In (29b), on the other hand, such a possessive pronoun can be used.

- (29) a. Hij heeft de/*mijn fietsband lek.
 he has the/*my bike tyre punctured
 b. Hij heeft het/mijn raam altijd open
 he has the/my window always open
 (als hij hier is).
 (when he here is)

Additional evidence that we are not dealing with a possessive construction in (27) is provided by the fact that attributive modification of the direct object is possible. As can be seen in (30), a possessive dative is excluded if the possessed NP is modified by an attributive adjective (cf. also Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992; of course, (30b) is acceptable with a benefactive reading). This restriction also applies to the semi-copular construction, whereas attributive modification gives rise to a perfect result in examples such as (27). This is shown in (31a) and (31b), respectively.⁷

- (30) a. Hij breekt haar het raam open.
 He breaks her the window open
 ‘He breaks her window open.’
 b. Hij breekt haar het verroeste raam open.
 He breaks her the rusty window open
 ‘*He breaks her rusty window open.’
- (31) a. *Hij heeft de versleten fietsband lek.
 He has the worn-out bike tyre punctured
 ‘His worn-out bike tyre is punctured.’
 b. Hij heeft het verroeste raam open.
 He has the rusty window open

From the fact that (27) is clearly not a case of a possessive construction, we may safely conclude that it is not a semi-copular construction either. This raises the question what kind of construction we are dealing with.

As can be seen in (32a), the construction in (27) is also possible with *krijgen* (preferably some kind of modifying adverb such as *niet* ‘not’ or *met moeite* ‘with difficulty’ is present then). The *krijgen*-construction can, however, not be paraphrased by means of the regular copular construction in (32b). The only paraphrase available is with the verb of motion *gaan* ‘to go’ in (32c). Again, it

⁷ Example (31a) is marginally possible on the transmission reading, which is even more clearly if we replace *hebben* by *krijgen*: *Hij kreeg de versleten fietsband lek* ‘He received a worn-out, punctured tyre’. On that reading, we are of course dealing with the construction-type discussed in section 2.

must be noted that, as can be seen in (32d), a possessive dative cannot appear in Heerlen Dutch, which is also clear from the fact that attributive modification is possible. (Note however that (32d) is grammatical if it is interpreted as an “affective” dative; cf. Cornips 1994.) This is of course in accordance with the fact that there is no obligatory possessive relation between the subject, *hij*, and the direct object in (32a) either: consequently, if the object contains a possessive pronoun such as *mijn* ‘my’, the result is perfectly fine.

- (32) a. Hij kreeg het/mijn raam niet/met moeite open.
 he got the/my window not/with difficulty open
 b. *Het raam werd niet/met moeite open.
 the window becamenot/with difficulty open
 c. Het raam ging niet/met moeite open.
 The window went not/with difficulty open
 d. Het (verroeste) raam ging hem niet/met moeite open.
 ‘*His (rusty) window didn’t open.’
 ‘*His (rusty) window opened with difficulty.’

As example (32a), (27) can be paraphrased by means of a locational verb as well, be it that we must use the stative verb *staan* ‘to stand’ instead of *gaan* ‘to go’ (cf.(33a) and (32c)). An even better paraphrase is given in (33b): in fact, (27) feels like an ellipsis of (33b). Note that *hebben* in (33b) is not a perfective auxiliary: in that case, the main verb would have to appear as a past participle, and we would wrongly expect the corresponding present tense example in (33c) to be grammatical. Nevertheless, *hebben* is an auxiliary of some sort: *staan* acts as a regular verb, which is clear from the fact that it undergoes Verb Raising in embedded contexts, as has been shown in (33d).

- (33) a. Het raam staat open.
 The window stands open
 b. Hij heeft het raam openstaan.
 he has the window openstand
 c. *Hij staat het raam open.
 He stands the window open
 d. dat hij het raam open heeft staan.
 that he the window open has stand

The discussion above suggests that the constructions in (27) and (32a) are somehow related to the examples containing a locational predicate in (32c) and (33a). These constructions recently have been subject to extensive research. Here we will adopt the conclusions of Hoekstra (1984a), according to which the locational PPs in (34a,b) are the predicates of a Small Clause, and Mulder and Wehrmann (1989) and much subsequent work, according to which the examples in (34/5b) are the ergative counterparts of the unergative constructions in (34/5a).

- (34) a. Jan legt [_{SC} het boek op tafel].
 Jan puts the book on table
 ‘Jan is putting the book on the table.’
 b. Het boek_i ligt [_{SC} t_i op tafel].
 the book lies on table
 ‘The book is lying on the table.’
- (35) a. Jan hangt [_{SC} de jas in de kast].
 Jan hangs the coat in the closet
 ‘Jan is hanging the coat in the closet.’
 b. De jas_i hangt [_{SC} t_i in de kast].
 the coat hangs in the closet
 ‘The coat is hanging in the closet.’

Now, consider again the examples in (27), (32a) and (33d), repeated in a slightly different form as (36). There are two things that leap to the eye: (i) the external argument of the SC, *het raam*, is not the surface subject, and hence must have been assigned accusative Case; (ii) the surface subject, *hij*, is not an argument of the locational verb in (36c) (cf.(33a)).

- (36) a. Hij heeft het raam open.
 He has the window open
 b. Hij kreeg het raam niet/met moeite open.
 He got the window not/with difficulty open
 c. Hij heeft het raam openstaan.
 he has the window openstand

What this suggests is that in (36c) the auxiliary *hebben* makes accusative Case available to the external argument of the SC, and introduces the θ -role for the additional argument, *hij*. Whether we assume (36a,b) to be an ellipsis of (36c) or not, we may account for them in a similar way: the external argument of the SC is assigned accusative Case by *hebben* or *krijgen*, and consequently the subject position is available for the NP *hij*.

The constructions in (36) deserve more discussion than we are able to give them at this point, but at least one important conclusion can already be drawn, namely that the auxiliary verb *hebben* in (36c) is able to assign Case to the external argument of the SC. This conclusion supports our analysis of the constructions discussed in section 2 and 3, which crucially relies on the Case-assigning properties of *krijgen* and *hebben*, when they are used as a semi-passive auxiliary or a semi-copula verb.

5. Conclusion

In section 2, we argued that both the regular and the semi-passive are transformationally derived, which implies that both accusative and dative must be considered as structural Cases. Further, we adopted the assumption that passive morphology absorbs structural Case, which led to the question how to account for

dative and accusative assignment in the regular and semi-passive construction, respectively. We suggested that the involved auxiliaries have Case-assigning properties: the passive auxiliaries *zijn* en *worden* assign dative Case, and the semi-passive auxiliary *krijgen* assigns accusative Case. In section 3, we further showed that these auxiliaries have the same Case-assigning properties if they are used as (semi-)copulas. In section 4, finally, we discussed a construction that provides independent evidence for the claim that auxiliaries have Case-assigning properties.

References

- Baker, M.C. 1988. *Incorporation. A Theory of Grammatical Function Change*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Bennis, H. and T.Hoekstra 1989. *Generatieve grammatica*. Dordrecht/Providence: Foris Publications.
- Bree, C. van 1981. *Hebben-constructies en datiefconstructies binnen het Nederlands taalgebied: een taalgeografisch onderzoek*. Diss. Leiden.
- Broekhuis, H. 1992. *Chain-government. Issues in Dutch Syntax*. Diss. Amsterdam: HIL Dissertations.
- Cornips, L. 1991. Possessive Objects Constructions in Heerlens. In F.Drijkoningen and A. van Kemenade. *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1991*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cornips, L. in prep. *Syntactische variatie in het Algemeen Nederlands van Heerlen*. Diss. Amsterdam.
- Dikken, M. den 1992. *Particles*. Diss. Leiden: HIL Dissertations.
- Geerts, G. et al. (eds.) 1984. *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Groningen/Leuven: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Guéron, J. 1985. *Inalienable Possession, PRO-inclusion and Lexical Chains*. In J.Guéron et al. (eds.). *Grammatical Representations*. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson: Foris Publications (SSG 22).
- Hoekstra, T. 1984a. *Krijgen*. H.Bennis et al. (eds.). *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1984*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Hoekstra, T. 1984b. *Transitivity. Grammatical Relations in Government-Binding Theory*. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson: Foris Publications.
- Hoekstra, T., M.Lansu and M.Westerduin 1987. *Complexe verba*. *Glott* 10:61-77.
- Hoekstra, T. and R.Mulder 1990. *Unergatives as Copular Verbs; Locational and Existential Predication*. *The Linguistic Review* 7:1-79.
- Janssen, Th. 1976. *Hebben-konstrukties en indirekt-objektconstructies*. Diss. Nijmegen.
- Kayne, R. 1984. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson: Foris Publications.
- Larson, R. 1988. *On the Double Object Construction*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:335-91.
- Mulder, R. and P.Wehrmann 1989. *Locational Verbs as Unaccusatives*. In Bennis and Van Kemenade. *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1989*. Dordrecht/Providence: Foris Publications.
- Mulder, R. 1992. *The Aspectual Nature of Syntactic Complementation*. Diss. Leiden: HIL Dissertations.
- Vergnaud, J.-R. and M.Zubizarreta (1992). *The Definite Determiner in French and English*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23:595-652.