The Dative Goal and Intervention Effects*

Doo-Won Lee

(Korea National University of Transportation)

Lee, Doo-Won. 2012. The Dative Goal and Intervention Effects. *The Linguistic Association of Korean Journal.* 20(3). 91-108. The so-called intervention effect may be driven by the dative argument when the nominative object undergoes Agree with T. At this point, the nominative object cannot move to spec-T. The goal- or object-oriented honorific morpheme *tuli* or the subject-oriented honorific morpheme *si,* which is marked on the verb, can appear only when its target is honorific. In this respect, as a Probe, the honorific morpheme *tuli* or *si* with an uninterpretable honorification feature, which is active due to the feature, should search down for its matching feature in a Goal. If an uninterpretable honorification feature in a Probe finds a matching feature in a Goal in its local c-command domain, then both features come into an operation called Agree (Chomsky, 2000). However, an intervention effect occurs whenever a non-honorific dative argument intervenes between an honorific v (i.e., *tuli* on v, here) and an honorific object. The dative argument in the higher clause triggers the intervention effect against its own anaphor binding when the coindexed anaphor phrase in the lower clause moves over the dative argument; hence, the anaphor binding in the copy position is cancelled. To sum up, the VP-dative argument triggers an intervention effect against both honorication agreement and anaphor binding.

Key Words: Agree, anaphor binding, dative, Goal, honorific morpheme, intervention effect, Probe,

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is five-fold. Korean allows a dative subject (cf. Park & Park, 2004; Kim, 2005). There are two kinds of dative arguments in Korean: a dative subject and a dative goal.[1] If the nominative object moves to spec-T across the dative subject, the so-called intervention effect can be driven.[2] At this point, the nominative object cannot undergo Agree with T across the dative argument. On the other hand, the dative argument only appears as a thematic role of goal in the dative construction. It triggers the intervention effect against the honorific nominative object's Agree with the object-oriented honorific morpheme in the predicate. In this paper, first of all, it will be shown that while the dative argument (i.e., dative subject) can trigger the intervention effect between T and a nominative object, the dative goal induces the intervention effect between the honorific morpheme and the honorific object. In this paper, I will focus on investigating why the dative argument of the thematic goal triggers the intervention effect.

Second, it will be shown that the honorific morpheme *tuli* 'give' occupies the head v. In Korean, the goal- or object-oriented honorific morpheme *tuli* and the subject-oriented honorific morpheme *si*, which are marked on the verb, are both acceptable only when the respective target is honorific.

Third, in this vein, I will show that as a Probe, the honorific morpheme *tuli* or *si* with uninterpretable [HON] feature, which is active due to the feature, should search down for its matching feature in a Goal.

If uninterpretable φ-features in a Probe finds matching features in a Goal in its (local) c-command domain, then the features in both sides come into an operation called Agree. Fourth, in this respect, I will further show that an intervention effect occurs whenever a non-honorific dative argument intervenes between an honorific v (i.e., *tuli* on v, here) and an honorific object.

When the dative argument occurs in the higher clause and the anaphor phrase appears in the lower clause, the anaphor phrase is bound by the dative

---

1) In this paper, I express the thematic argument comaptible with the indirect object as "goal", and the counter-part of Probe as "Goal".

2) However, Korean typical unaccusative and passive constructions show different aspects, which is a matter of my ongoing research.

argument. When the anaphor phrase undergoes movement to the matrix clause, the dative binding is not available any more. Fifth, based on this observation, this paper will further observe that the dative argument in the higher clause triggers intervention effect against its own anaphor binding when the coindexed anaphor phrase in the lower clause moves over the dative argument; hence, the anaphor binding in the copy position is cancelled.

2. Agree Difference between Dative Subject and Dative Goal

As Kim (2005) points out, there arises a parametric difference of the availability of the dative subject cross-linguistically. In other words, Icelandic and Italian allow a dative subject in spec-T, whereas English does not, as shown in the examples in (1).

(1) a. Icelandic (Holmberg & Hróarsdóttir, 2003, p. 998)
    Dormaranum   virtist [að bornin   hefðu leikið mjög vel]
    the judge-DAT seemed that the kids have played very well
    'It seemed to the judge that the kids have played very well.'
  b. Italian (Cuervo, 2003, p. 2)
    Al giudicei   sembra [che I bambini giochino moto bene]
    the judge-DAT seems that the kids   play   very well
    'It seems to the judge that the kids play very well.'
  c. English
    *To the judge seems that the kids play very well.'

However, while English allows the raising of the embedded subject over the dative NP, Icelandic and Italian do not, as shown in the following.

(2) a. Icelandic
    *Hestarnir$_i$ virðast einverjum nanni [t$_i$ vera seinir].
     the horses seem   some man-DAT   be   slow
    'It seems to some man that the horses are slow.'

b. Italian
  *Gianni$_i$ sembra a María [t$_i$ essere stanco].[3]
   Gianni-NOM seems to Mary   be   ill
  'Gianni seems to Mary to be ill.'
c. English
  John$_i$ seems to Mary [t$_i$ to be nice].

As shown above, Icelandic and Italian do not allow the raising of the embedded subject over the dative NP, which is what the Korean example in (3b) shows.[4]

(3) a. halapeci-eykey   halmeni-ka mwusewu-si-ta.
    grandfather-DAT grandmother scary-HON-DC
    'Grandfather is afraid of grandmother.'
  b. *halmeni-ka$_i$ halapeci-eykey t$_i$ mwusewu-si-ta.

The unacceptability of the example in (3b) is clearly due to blocking of a dative element between the launching and landing site of the raising.[5] This is an example of the defective intervention effect of Chomsky (2000, 2001).

(4) Defective Intervention Effect
  *α > β > ɣ
  · · · > is c-command, β and ɣ match the Probe α, but β is inactive so that the effects of matching are blocked (Chomsky, 2000, p. 123).

In the minimalist framework (Chomsky, 2000; 2001, and more recently, Chomsky, 2005), feature checking is done by Agree at a distance, as in (5).

---

3) In Italian, the same raising is allowed if a dative argument comes in the form of a pronoun.
4) See Kim (2005) for the more refined explanation on the dative intervention effect on raising to the subject. The intervention effect shown in (3b) may not be triggered in a typical unaccusative construction. This is a matter of my ongoing research.
5) Refer to Boeckx (2000a, b), Holmberg & Hróarsdóttir (2003), Park & Park (2004) and Kim (2005) for such cross-linguistic observations.

(5) (i) Agree between a Probe P and Goal G is based on the relation Matching under the locality condition of closest c-command, where Matching is feature identity.

    (ii) Agree deletes the uninterpretable features of P and G, allowing derivations to converge at LF.

Defective intervention is set in motion if an inactive feature happens to come between a Probe and a Goal in the Korean dative construction (cf. Kim, 2005, p. 652, fn. 2).

For the present purpose, let's consider Match, Agree, and Move. Match is a preliminary operation which is required for Agree (Chomsky, 2000): A set of uninterpretable φ-features of a Probe, which are active due to the feature, search down for their matching features in a Goal. If uninterpretable φ-features in a Probe find matching features in a Goal in its c-command domain, then the features in both sides come into an operation called Agree. For Chomsky (2000), Move is a complex operation consisting of Match, Agree, and Move. Match and Agree are prerequisites for Move, and Match is a preliminary for Agree.[6] Move occurs due to the EPP feature of a Probe when these preconditions are fulfilled.

At this stage, let's return to the examples in (3). The set of uninterpretable φ-features of T in (3a) are checked against the interpretable features of the dative subject *halapeci-eykey* (i.e., matching Goal) in its c-command domain, eliminating the uninterpretable features. And then the dative subject undergoes movement to spec-T, as shown in (3b), which is triggered by the EPP feature of T.

In this paper, however, what I want to show is that the dative argument in (3a) is totally different from that in (6). That is, while the intervention effect is triggered when the nominative object moves to spec-T across the dative argument as in (3b), the intervention effect is triggered without any nominative object's movement as in (6b).

---

6) In this vein, Kim (2005) argues that raising over a dative experiencer is allowed if the movement is done soly under Match; the same raising is not allowed if the movement is done under Match and Agree. In this paper, I argue that the sentence is acceptable, only when the feature checking is done by Agree.

(6) a. Yenghi-ka **Kim sensayngnim-kkey** Chelswu-lul   sokayhay-**tuli**-ess-ta.
       Y-NOM teacher-DAT C-ACC introduce-HON(obj)-PST-DC
       'Yenghi introduced Chelswu to teacher Kim.'
    b. *Yenghi-ka *Chelswu-eykey* **Kim sensayngnim-ul** sokayhay-**tuli**-ess-ta.
       Y-NOM C-DAT teacher-ACC introduce-HON(obj)-PST-DC
       'Yenghi introduced teacher Kim to Chelswu.'

Kim (2005) argues that if there is Agree included in Korean object honorification, the dative intervention effect is predicted to show up as in (6b). That is, when the Korean object honorification agrees with the honorific verbal morpheme on v, as will be shown in detail, the dative argument induces the intervention effect. We need to note that while the intervention effect is triggered when the nominative object moves to spec-T across the dative argument as in (3b), the intervention effect is driven when the object honorification agrees with the honorific verbal morpheme on v across the dative goal as in (6b).

   Further notice that while the dative argument in (3) has an option to move to spec-T, the dative goal in (6) cannot. Futhermore, there arises a difference between the two types in light of the anaphor binding.

(7) a. halapeci$_i$-eykey   caki$_i$ myenuli-ka   mwusewu-si-ta.
       grandfather-DAT self   daughter-in-law scary-HON-DC
       'Grandfather is afraid of his daughter-in-law.'
    b. Chelswu$_j$-ka Yenghi$_i$-eykey caki$_{*i/j}$ chayk-ul   cwu-ess-ta.
               -NOM   -DAT self   book-ACC give-PST-DC
       'Chelswu gave Yenghi his book.'

It has been well known in the literature (Song, 2005; Lee, 2007, *inter alia*) that in the simplex sentence, the anaphor *caki* 'self' is construed to be bound not by the dative goal, but by the subject.[7] This means that while the dative argument *halapeci-eykey* in (7a) is really in the subject position (i.e., spec-T, here), the dative goal in (7b) is not. Accordingly, we can verify that while the dative argument in (3b) triggers the intervention effect between T and the nominative object in the

---

7) This will be shown in detail soon.

complement position, the dative goal in (6b) drives the intervention effect between v and the honorific object. That is, the properties of the two Probes are different when in Agree with the Goal. In this paper, I focus on the dative goal's intervention effect shown in (6b), but not on the dative argument's intervention effect shown in (3b).[8]

3. Honorification Agreement

3.1 Honorific Morphemes *si* and *tuli* on the Verb

It is generally assumed that in Korean, the goal- or object-oriented honorific morpheme *tuli* and the subject-oriented honorific morpheme *si*, which are marked on the verb, are acceptable only when the respective target is honorific. This is what the contrast between the examples in (10) and (11) shows.

(10) a. *Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul   towa-cwu-**si**-n-ta.
            -NOM   -ACC help-give-HON-PRS-DC
        'Chelswu helps Yenghi.'
      b. *Chelswu-ka Yenghi-eykey chayk-ul   ponay-**tuli**-ess-ta.
            -NOM   -ACC   book-ACC send-HON-PST-DC
        'Chelswu sent a book to Yenghi.'
(11) a. **apeci-ka**   emeni-lul   towa cwu(-si)-ess-e.
        father-NOM mother-ACC help give(-HON)-PRS-DC
        'Father helps Mother.'
      b. Chelswu-ka   **apeci-eykey** chayk-ul ponay (tuli)-ess-e.
            -NOM father-DAT   book-ACC send (HON)-PST-DC
        'Chelswu sent a book to his father.'

In the colloquial speech, the honorific subject or goal does not necessarily require the honorific morpheme on the verb, as shown in (11). That is, the

---

8) It is a matter of my ongoing research why the intervention effect in the so-called dyadic unaccusative construction such as the example in (3) is triggered in terms of Chomsky's (2001) Phase Impenetrability Condition.

examples in (11) are acceptable even when the honorific morpheme *tuli* or *si* is not used on the verb.[9] At this point, however, what I want to show is that the honorific morpheme *si* or *tuli* must agree with the honorific subject or goal, respectively, which is what the contrast between the examples in (10) and (11) shows. The honorific object patterns in the same way as the goal, as will shown soon. Chomsky(2000) argues that the difference between valued and unvalued grammatical features correlates with a related distinction between those grammatical features which are interpretable (in the sense that they play a role in semantic interpretation) and those which are uninterpretable (and hence play no role in semantic interpretation). As the contrast between (10) and (11) shows, the honorific morphemes bear an unvalued feature, while the honorific expressions such as *halapeci* 'grandfather' and *apeci* 'father' a valued feature. In this respect, I argue that as a Probe, the honorific morphemes *tuli* and *si* with an uninterpretable [HON] feature, which are active due to the feature, should search down for their matching feature in a Goal. If an uninterpretable [HON] in a Probe finds a matching feature in a Goal in its local c-command domain, then both features come into an operation called Agree (Chomsky, 2000).

3.2 Position of Honorific Morpheme *Tuli*

As Lee & Kuno (2004) points out, the presence of *-si* in (12b) is said to reflect the speaker's deference towards the subject. This is called the subject honorification here.

(12) a. Nonhonorific: Inswu-ka   ka-ss-ta.
                        -NOM go-PST-DEC
              'Inswu went.'
     b. Honorific: Kim sensayng-nim-i   ka-si-ess-ta.
                      teacher-HON-NOM go-HON-PST-DEC
              'Teacher Kim went.'

For the present purpose, let's consider another type of honorification in

---

9) The sentences are somewhat awkward in the formal speech. However, they are much better than the examples in (10).

Korean. The following honorific morpheme attached to the verb agrees with the dative argument. Thus, we can say that it is a goal-oriented honorific verb.

(13) Chelswu-ka halapeci-kkey caki-uy chayk-ul **tuli**-ess-ta.
C-N grandfather-HON DAT self-GEN book-ACC give-PST-DC
'Chelswu gave Grandfather his book.'

It can further function as an object-oriented honorific verb, only if it occurs as a serial verb. This is what the following example shows:

(14) ellun halapeci-lul kkaywe-**tuli**-e.
quickly grandfather-ACC awake-give-DC
'Awake Grandfather quickly.'

The verb *po-y* 'meet-HON' is another verb which is responsible for the agreement of the object honorification:

(15) na-nun ecey halapeci-lul po-y-ess-ta.
I-TOP yesterday grabdfather-ACC meet-HON-PST-DC
'I met Grandfather yesterday.'

At this stage, let's consider which head the goal- or object-oriented honorific morpheme *tuli* in (14) or *y* in (15) occupies. For the present purpose, let's examine the following morphological causative construction.

(16) Chelswu-ka han haksayng-eykey chayk-ul ilk-**hi**-ess-ta.
Chelswu-Nom a student-DAT book-ACC read-CAUSE-PST-DC
'Chelswu made a student read a book.'

It has been well known in the literature (Ahn, 2001; Song, 2005; Lee, 2007) that the causative morpheme (i.e., causative suffix) -*hi* in (16) should occupy v for its phonological realization. Keeping this point in mind, let's consider the following examples, where the goal- or object-oriented honorific morpheme *tuli* follows the causative morpheme.

(17) a. Yenghi-ka halabeci-kkey cwuk-ul mek-**i**-e-**tuli**-ess-ta.
           -N grandfather-D porridge eat-CAUSE-L HON(obj)-PST-DC
    'Ynghi made her grandfather eat porridge.'
  b. halmeni-ka   halabeci-kkey   cwuk-ul   mek-**i**-e
    grandmother-NOM grandfather-DAT porridge-ACC eat-CAUSE-L
    -**tuli**-**si**-ess-ta.
    HON(obj)-HON(subj)-PST-DC
    'A grandmother made a grandfather eat porridge.'

As shown the examples in (17), the goal- or object-oriented honorific morpheme *tuli* must show up above the causative morpheme in the hierarchical structure. However, it must be below the subject honorific marker *si*, which occupies T. This is what the example in (17b) shows. If this observation is on the right track, the candidate position for the honorific morpheme *tuli* would be the head v. At this point, notice that the honorific marker *tuli* cannot be on the head T, since it is a goal- or object-oriented honorific morpheme. In this vein, it should be more likely that the honorific morpheme *tuli* occupies the head v. If this is correct, the skeletal structure of (17b) is as follows.

(18) [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$ halmeni-ka [$_{vP}$ [$_{v'}$ [$_{VP}$ halabeci-kkey [$_{V'}$ cwuk-ul
    mek]]-**i**-e-**tuli**]-**si**-ess]-ta].

3.3 Dative Intervention Effect in Honorification Agreement

In Japanese, as is reported by Niinuma (2003), the dative intervention effect is effective in the following example.

(19) a. Hanako-ga Tanaka sensei-ni Mary-o   gosyooka-si-ta.
           -NOM   prof-DAT   -ACC introduce-HON(obj)-PST
    'Hanako introduced Mary to Prof. Tanaka.'
  b. *Hanako-ga *Mary-ni* Tanaka sensei-o   gosyooka-si-ta.
           -NOM   -DAT   prof-ACC introduce-HON(obj)-PST

The example in (19b) shows that in the presence of a dative element,

possible object honorification fails in Japanese. Based on this sort of data, Niinuma (2003) suggests the following generalization.

(20) Object Honorification Agreement Generalization
   Mark the predicate as [object honorification] when a person who is socially superior to speaker is
   a. a dative argument
   b. the direct object, if the predicate does not take a dative argument.

As Kim (2005: 657-58) points out, Korean object agreement data pattern in the same way with those of Japanese, as shown in (21a, b).

(21) a. Yenghi-ka Kim **sensayngnim-kkey** Chelswu-lul sokayhay-**tuli**-ess-ta.
     Y-NOM teacher-DAT C-ACC introduce-HON(obj)-PST-DC
      'Yenghi introduced Chelswu to teacher Kim.'
   b. *Yenghi-ka *Chelswu-eykey* **Kim sensayngnim-ul** sokayhay-**tuli**-ess-ta.
      Y-NOM C-DAT teacher-ACC introduce-HON(obj)-PST-DC
      'Yenghi introduced teacher Kim to Chelswu.'
   c. Yenghi-ka   **Kim sensayngnim-ul** sokayhay-**tuli**-ess-ta.
          -NOM   teacher-ACC   introduce-HON(obj)-PST-DC
      'Yenghi introduced teacher Kim (to someone).'

At this point, if there is Agree involved in the object honorification, as shown in (21c), the dative intervention effect is predicted to show up as in (21b).[10] However, notice that when the honorific object moves across the dative argument, the intervention effect would be gone, as shown in the following.

(22) Yenghi-ka **Kim sensayngnim-ul**$_i$ (*Chelswu-eykey*) t$_i$ sokayhay-**tuli**-ess-ta.
   Y-NOM Kim teacher-ACC (Chelswu-DAT) introduce-HON(obj)-PST-DC
   'Yenghi introduced teacher Kim (to Chelswu).'

If this observation is on the right track, how can we explain the intervention

---

10) That is, if in (21b), the intervening dative goal is not used, the sentence is acceptable, as shown in (21c).

effect in the minimalist framework (Chomsky, 2000; 2001, and more recently, Chomsky, 2005). For the relation between an honorific head v and an honorific expression, I argue that the head v should have an uninterpretable [HON] feature, and the honorific expression should have an interpretable [HON] feature, as shown in the skeletal structure.

(23) (i) Probe: [uHON] in v (must be valued by Goal)
   (ii) Goal: [iHON] in HON expression
   (iii) *[$_{vP}$ v$_{[uHON]}$ [... DAT$_{[-HON]}$ ... [... OBJ$_{[iHON]}$ ...]]]

To be more specific, while the Probe bears [u-Pers], [u-Num], and [uHON], the Goal a set of φ-features and [iHON]. At this point, a set of uninterpretable φ-features of a Probe, which are active due to the feature, search down for their matching features in a Goal. If uninterpretable φ-features in a Probe find matching features in a Goal in its local c-command domain, then both features come into an operation called Agree. However, an intervention effect occurs whenever a non-honorific dative argument intervenes between an honorific v (i.e., *tuli* on v, here) and an honorific object, as shown in (23iii) and (24).

(24) *Yenghi-ka [$_{vP}$ **v$_{[uHON]}$** [$_{VP}$ *Chelswu-eykey* **Kim sensayngnim-ul**
   sokayhay]-**tuli**]-ess-ta. (=21b)

The Probe v has an uninterpretable honorification feature (i.e., [uHON]), which needs to be checked against the interpretable feature of a matching operator. Only the honorific object *Kim sensayngnim-ul* has the interpretable honorification feature (i.e., [iHON]) and so only it can Agree with v, eliminating the uninterpretable feature. However, when the intervening dative argument with the feature [-HON] appears between the head v and the honorific object, the intervention effect arises. Note that the local c-commanding DAT cannot match on the feature with the Probe, since it does not have the feature [iHON]. Hence, the Probe [uHON] in v and the Goal [-HON] in the object cannot be in an Agree relation. As a result, DAT with [-HON] does induce an intervention effect. However, if the honorific object in (21b) undergoes movement across the dative argument, as shown in (22), the intervention effect would be gone, as

already mentioned. The skeletal structure of the example is as follows.

(25) Yenghi-ka [$_{vP}$ **Kim sensayngnim-ul**$_i$ [$_{v'}$ **v$_{[iHON]}$** [$_{VP}$ *Chelswu-eykey* t$_i$
sokayhay]-**tuli**]-ess-ta. (=22)

When the honorific expression *Kim sensayngnim-ul* 'teacher Kim-ACC'
undergoes movement between the subject and the dative argument, the
compatible position is the spec-v, since the movement is triggered by the edge
feature on v. At this point, it carries discourse effect such as specificity.[11] Notice
that the Probe finds matching features in the Goal in its local (or closest)
c-command domain; hence, both come to be in the Agree relation.

Next, let's consider the dative honorification agreement in (21a). As Niinuma
(2003) points out in the generalization in (20), also in Korean, the object
honorification shows up, if the predicate does not take a dative argument.
However, if the predicate takes both the object and dative honorifications, as
shown in (26), the honorification should only agree with the dative argument.

(26) Yenghi-ka *Choi sensayngnim-kkey* **Kim sensayngnim-ul**
　　　-NOM　　teacher　-DAT　　teacher-ACC
　　sokayhay-**tuli**-ess-ta.
　　introduce-HON(obj)-PST-DC
　　'Yenghi introduced teacher Kim to teacher Choi.'

To be brief, the honorification agreement of the dative argument in (26) is
the same as that in (21a). The skeletal structure of the example in (21a) is as
follows.

(27) Yenghi-ka [$_{vP}$ **v$_{[uHON]}$** [$_{VP}$ **Kim sensayngnim-kkey** [$_{v'}$ Chelswu-lul
sokayhay]]-**tuli**]-ess-ta.

In (27), the Probe [uHON] in v and the Goal [iHON] in the dative argument
are in an Agree relation. In (21c), there is no an intervention effect, either; hence,

---

11) Refer Lee (2005) for more details.

the sentence is acceptable. Its skeletal structure is as follows.

(28) Yenghi-ka [$_{vP}$ **v$_{[uHON]}$** [$_{VP}$ **Kim sensayngnim-ul** sokayhay]-**tuli**]-ess-ta.
(=21c)

In (28), the Probe [uHON] in v and the Goal [iHON] in the verbal complement position are in an Agree relation. The Probe v has the uninterpretable feature [uHON], which needs to be checked against the interpretable feature of the honorific object. Thus, it can Agree with the object, eliminating the uninterpretable feature.

4. Dative Intervention Effect against the Anaphor Binding[12)]

Here, for the present purpose, let's consider whether the anaphor can be bound by the dative element. Notice that the anaphor *caki* 'self' in (29) is construed to be bound not by the goal *Yenghi-eykey* 'Yenghi-Dat', but by the subject *Chelswu-ka* 'Chelswu-Nom'.[13)]

(29) Chelswu$_i$-ka   Yenghi$_j$-eykey caki$_{i/*j}$-uy chayk-ul   cwu-ess-ta.
Chelswu-Nom Yenghi-Dat   self-Gen   book-Acc give-Past-Dec
'Chelswu gave Chelswu's book to Yenghi.'

---

12) Some may say that the dative argument's triggering the intervention effect in Agree of the uninterpretable honorification feature on v against the interpretable feature of the honorific expression is different in nature from the dative argument's driving the intervention effect in the anaphor binding dealt with in this section. However, in this paper, I focus on the VP-dative argument's playing a role intervening inbetween.

13) See Lee (2007) for more information. At this point, further notice that the anaphor binding-freezing operation of the object against the goal can apply only if they are both in the VP-domain (Lee & Lee, 2010). When the goal is outside the VP, the anaphor binding-thawing effect is driven, as shown in the following.

sensayngnim$_i$-i [vP Yenghi$_j$-eykey-nun/to [VP caki$_{i/j}$ sacin-ul hyensanghay-cwu]]-ess-ta.
teacher-NOM   -D-TOP/FOC   self picture-ACC develop-give-PST-DC
'A teacher developed his/Yenghi's film and gave it to her.'

Unlike in (29), however, when the dative argument occurs in the higher clause and the anaphor phrase appears in the lower clause, the anaphor phrase can be bound by the dative argument, as shown in the following.

(30) a. Chelswu$_i$-ka Yenghi$_j$-eykey [Inho$_k$-ka   caki$_{i/j/k}$ sensayngnim-ul
             -NOM   -DAT   -NOM self   teacher-ACC
     piphanha-yess-ta-ko]   malha-yess-ta.
     criticize-PST-DC-COMP say-PST-DC
     'Chelswu$_i$ told Yenghi$_j$ that Inho$_k$ criticized his$_{i/j/k}$ teacher.'
   b. Chelswu$_i$-ka Yenghi$_j$-eykey [caki$_{i/j}$-uy chayk-i
             -NOM   -DAT   self-GEN book-NOM
     ponay-ci-ess-ta-ko]   malha-yess-ta.
     send-PASS-PST-DC-COMP say-PST-DC
     'Chelswu$_i$ told Yenghi$_j$ that his$_i$/her$_j$ book was sent to her$_j$.'

At this point, notice that when the anaphor phrase undergoes movement to the matrix clause, as in the (31), the dative binding is not available any more.

(31) a. Chelswu$_i$-ka **caki$_{i/*j/k}$ sensayngnim-ul** Yenghi$_j$-eykey [Inho$_k$-ka
     ~~caki$_{i/j/k}$ sensayngnim-ul~~ piphanha-yess-ta-ko] malha-yess-ta.
   b. **caki$_{i/*j/k}$ sensayngnim-ul** Chelswu$_i$-ka Yenghi$_j$-eykey [Inho$_k$-ka
     ~~caki$_{i/j/k}$ sensayngnim-ul~~ piphanha-yess-ta-ko] malha-yess-ta.

Accordingly, we can say that the dative argument in the higher clause triggers the intervention effect against its own anaphor binding, when the coindexed anaphor phrase in the lower clause moves over the dative argument, as shown in (31); hence, the anaphor binding in the copy position is cancelled. At this point, the moved anaphor phrase carries a discourse effect such as specificity, which is triggered by the edge feature on v or C.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have observed that Korean may allow a dative subject. If the

dative argument does not undergo movement to spec-T, the nominative object occupies the subject position. An intervention effect is triggered when the nominative object cannot undergo Agree with T across the dative argument. I have also observed that while the dative argument can trigger the intervention effect between T and a nominative object, the dative goal always drives the intervention effect between the honorific morpheme and the honorific object. In this paper, I have focused on investigating why the dative goal, but not the dative subject, triggers the intervention effect. I have further shown that the goal- or object-oriented honorific morpheme *tuli* and the subject-oriented honorific morpheme *si*, which are marked on the verb, are acceptable only when its target is honorific. In this respect, I have argued that as a Probe, the honorific morphemes *tuli* and *si* with the uninterpretable honorification feature should search down for their matching features in a Goal. If an uninterpretable honorification feature in a Probe finds a matching feature in a Goal in its local c-command domain, then both features come into an operation called Agree (Chomsky, 2000). Based on this, I have also shown that an intervention effect occurs whenever a non-honorific dative argument intervenes between an honorific v (i.e., *tuli* on v, here) and an honorific object. At this point, if the honorific object undergoes movement over the dative argument, the intervention effect would be gone. Furthermore, I have pointed out that if the predicate does not take a dative argument, the uninterpretable honorific feature on v must be checked against the interpretable feature of the honorific object, eliminating its uninterpretable feature. I have also observed that the anaphor phrase on the object position is construed to be bound not by the goal, but by the subject. I have further observed that the dative argument in the higher clause triggers the intervention effect against its own anaphor binding when the coindexed anaphor phrase in the lower clause moves over the dative argument; hence, the anaphor binding in the copy position is cancelled. To be brief, the overall conclusion to be drawn from the discussion so far is that the VP-dative argument triggers an intervention effect against both honorification agreement and anaphor binding.

References

Ahn, S.-H. (2001). What can Korean say about the v-VP structure? In S. Kuno, I.-H. Lee, J. Whitman, J. Mailing, Y.-S. Kang, & P. Sells, et al. (Eds.), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics, IX*, 251-64.

Bobaljik, J. (2002). A-chains at the PF-interface: Copies and "covert" movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 20*, 197-267.

Boeckx, C. (2000a). Raising and experiencers. Unpublished manuscript, University of Maryland, College Park.

Boeckx, C. (2000b). Quirky agreement. *Studia Linguistica, 54*, 354-380.

Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, & J. Uriagereka (Eds.), *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik* (pp. 89-155). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowvicz (Ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language* (pp. 1-52). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (2005). On phases. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.

Cuervo, M. C. (2003). A control-vs-raising theory of dative experiencers. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.

Holmberg, A., & Hróarsdóttir, T. (2003). Agreement and movement in Icelandic raising constructions. *Lingua, 113*, 997-1019.

Jeong, E. (2002). Sayeokhyeonguy tongsajek bunsek [A syntactic analysis on causatives]. *Korean Journal of Linguistics, 27*, 641-661.

Kim, S.-W. (2005). On the dative intervention effect on raising to subject. *Studies in Generative Grammar, 15*, 649-660.

Kuno, S. (1973). *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Larson, R. (1990). Double objects revisited: reply to Jackendoff. *Linguistic Inquiry, 21*, 589-632.

Lebeaux, D. (1991). Relative clauses, licensing, and the nature of the derivation. *Syntax and Semantics, 25*, 209-238.

Lee, D.-W. (2007). Goals in the ditransitive construction vs. syntactic subject causees in the morphological causative. *Studies in Modern Grammar, 47*, 53-72.

Lee, D.-W. (2012). Dative arguments in unaccusative and passive constructions. *Language and Linguistics, 56*, 227-252.

Lee, D.-W., & Lee, N.-U. (2010). Scope freezing effect vs. scope thawing effect in the numeral quantifiers IO-DO order. In S. Kuno, I.-H. Lee, J. Whitman, J. Mailing, Y.-S. Kang, & P. Sells, et al. (Eds.), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics, X,* 453-466.

Lee, I.-H., & Kuno, S. (2004). Empathy and hearer-based honorifics in Korean. In Y. Kim & J. Whitman (Eds.), *Studies in Korean syntax and semantics by Susumu Kuno* (pp. 87-138). Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Nakanishi, K. (2001). Frozen scope and week crossover in ditransitives. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 41,* 109-126.

Niinuma, F. (2003). *The syntax of honorification.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Park, M.-K., & Park, J.-U. (2004). Intervention effects in experiencer constructions and their implications of the theory of move and agree. *Studies in Generative Grammar, 14,* 199-224.

Song, H. (2005). *Causatives and resultatives in Korean.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Stepanov, A. (2001). Late adjunction and minimalist phrase structure. *Syntax, 4,* 94-125.

Doo-Won Lee
College of Humanities and Arts
Korea National University of Transportation
50 Daehak-ro, Chungju 380-702,
Republic of Korea
Phone: +82-43-841-5499
Email: dwlee@ut.ac.kr