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The aim of this paper is to show that all passive participles in OE and PE are members of the same category with the feature specification [+V], unspecified for a value of the feature [N]. It will be shown firstly that there is no reason to distinguish between lexical adjectival and transformational verbal passives. Then the Case assignment properties of passive participles will be considered. It will be shown that inherent Case can be assigned by categories that are non-distinct from [−N], whereas structural objective Case is assigned by categories that are [−N], and therefore passive participles which can assign only inherent Case should be analyzed as unspecified for a value of the feature [N].

1. INTRODUCTION. It has long been noticed that passive participles have both adjectival and verbal properties. However, it was not until 1977 that the ambiguous nature of passive participles was seriously gone into. As a reaction to Freidin’s 1975 claim that all passive participles should be considered as deverbal adjectives, Wasow 1977 has insisted that there are two types of passive participles: those which exhibit adjectival properties are adjectives; those which do not exhibit adjectival properties are verbs. Although the categorial distinction has generally been accepted in generative studies, e.g. Wasow 1980, Bresnan 1982, Fabb 1984, Levin and Rappaport 1986, there are some linguists who deny it, e.g. Lightfoot 1980, 1981, and Hoekstra 1984.

In this paper, I will argue, on the basis of the data from Old English (OE) and Present-day English (PE), that the position of Hoekstra 1984 is correct. That is, all passive participles are members of the same syntactic category, and they have a neutralized feature specification [+V], unspec-
fied for a value of the feature \([N]\).\(^1\)

2. Previous Analyses. Freidin 1975 argues that all passive participles should be analyzed as adjectives. One support for this claim is the overlap in distribution of adjectives and passive participles in the following environments.

(1) \([\text{NP} \text{Det-A-N}]\)
- the locked door
- the acclaimed speaker
- the unintelligible solution
- the enthusiastic linguists

\([\text{S} \text{NP-be} [\text{AP} \text{A-PP}]\]
- The door was locked by Sam.
- The speaker was acclaimed by the senator.
- The solution was unintelligible to Max.
- The linguist was enthusiastic about lexicalism.

\([\text{NP DET-N-AP}]\)
- the door locked by Sam
- the speaker acclaimed by the senator
- the solution unintelligible to Max
- the linguists enthusiastic about lexicalism

(Freidin (1975: 397))

However, contrary to what we would expect if all passive participles were indeed adjectives, there are passive participles which exhibit non-adjectival behavior. As noticed by Wasow 1977, some passive participles may be followed by NP objects or predicative expressions which never appear directly after adjectives in PE.

(2) a. Bill was told the story.
   b. Sue was sent the letter.

(3) a. John is considered a fool.
   b. Mary was elected President.
   c. *John is obvious President.
   d. *Mary was happy President. (Wasow (1977: 341, 344))

Furthermore, as noticed by Stowell 1981, unlike adjectives, passive parti-

---

\(^1\) I assume, following Chomsky (1981: 48), that the categories N, V, A, P are composed of the features \([\pm N]\) and \([\pm V]\) in the following way:

\[N=[+N, -V], V=[-N, +V], A=[+N, +V], P=[-N, -V]\]

See Stowell (1981: 21–23) for justification of this system.
principles are not subject to the rule of of-insertion.

(4) a. Everyone is fearful of these snakes.
b. These snakes were feared by everyone.
c. *Everyone was feared of these snakes.
d. *There was feared of these snakes.
e. *It was feared of these snakes. (Stowell (1981: 47))

These differences of behavior suggest that some passive participles are not adjectives.

Let us now turn to Wasow’s 1977 analysis. The distinction between lexical and transformational rules plays a crucial role in his argument. The following five criteria have been established for distinguishing between lexical and transformational rules.

(5) Criterion 1:
    Lexical rules do not affect structure.
    Transformations need not be structure preserving.
Criterion 2:
    Lexical rules may relate items of different grammatical categories.
    Transformations do not change node labels.
Criterion 3:
    Lexical rules are ‘local’; involve only NPs bearing grammatical relations to items in question.
    Transformations need not be ‘local’; formulated in terms of structural properties of phrase markers.
Criterion 4:
    Lexical rules apply before any transformations.
    Transformations may be fed by transformations.
Criterion 5:
    Lexical rules have idiosyncratic exceptions.
    Transformations have few or no true exceptions.

(Wasow (1977: 331))

Wasow argues that the grammar of PE includes both a lexical and a transformational passive rule. Passive participles which exhibit all or some of the following adjectival characteristics are analyzed as adjectives: prenominal position, appearance as complements to verbs like act, look, and seem, prefixing of negative un-, and degree modification by very (without much).²

² As to last diagnostic, much is obligatory in (a) but impossible in (b).
(6) a. The broken box sat on the table. (Prenominal position)
b. John acted elated. (Appearance as complements to verbs like act, look, and seem)
c. Our products are untouched by human hands. (Prefixing of negative un-)
d. Your family was very (much) respected. (Degree modification by very (without much))

(Wasow (1977: 338-40))

By criterion 2, the rule which derives adjectival passive must be lexical since lexical rules, but not transformations, can change grammatical categories. On the other hand, by criterion 3, there must be a transformational passive rule: though the subject of the passive usually corresponds to the direct object of the active, in passives of the ‘accusative subject’ construction, passives of idiom chunks, and passives of verbs like help and thank, the derived subject cannot be the underlying direct object.3

(7) a. Mary is thought to be a genius. (Passives of the ‘accusative subject’ construction)
b. Advantage is easily taken of John. (Passives of idiom chunks)
c. John was helped/thanked by Bill. (Passives of verbs like help and thank)

(Wasow (1977: 342, 344, 345))

Passive participles which are transformationally derived remain verbs since transformations, unlike lexical rules, do not change node labels. Thus they can be followed by NP objects or predicative expressions as examples (2-3)a, b show.

(a) John very *(much) respects your family.
(b) John is very (*much) fond of your family.

(Wasow (1977: 340))

According to Wasow, the optionality of much in 6d follows from the derivational ambiguity: when the passive is lexically derived, the participle is an adjective, and therefore much is excluded; when the passive is transformationally derived, the participle remains a verb, and therefore much is obligatory.

3 Wasow (1977: 338) states that verbs like help and thank take only indirect objects since the corresponding verbs in many other Indo-European languages take dative objects, and in the corresponding nominals, the preposition to which is the marker of indirect object is preferred to of which is the marker of direct object in nominals.

(a) Our help/thanks ?to/*of the hostess went unacknowledged.

(Wasow (1977: 338))
According to Wasow's analysis, transformational passives, i.e. passives of double object constructions, passives of the ‘accusative subject’ construction, passives of idiom chunks, passives of verbs like help and thank, and passives followed by predicative expressions should not exhibit adjectival properties cited above. Contrary to this expectation, it has been noticed that passives of the ‘accusative subject’ construction, passives of verbs like help and thank, and passives followed by predicative expressions may appear in adjectival environments.\(^4\)

(8) Passives of the ‘accusative subject’ construction:
   a. John seems expected to win. (Lightfoot (1981: 94))
   b. Bill seems proved to be a spy.
   c. The story remains denied to be true. (Amano (1980: 42))
   d. ?John seems widely believed to be a fool. (Fabb (1984: 156))

(9) Passives of verbs like help and thank:
   a. He seems aided by his ignorance of the subject.
   b. He seems helped by his experience. (Fabb (1984: 155))
   c. I remain unthanked for my effort.
   d. an unaided survey
   e. an unfairly helped pupil (Fabb (1984: 168))

(10) Passives followed by predicative expressions:
   a. Mary seems widely considered a fool.
   b. Perry seems generally thought insipid.
   c. ?He remains unproclaimed king. (Fabb (1984: 156))
   d. Edward already acts ordained a deacon.
   e. John sounds elected President. (Lightfoot (1979: 100))

\(^4\) Appearance as left dislocated elements in ‘though preposing’ sentences has been taken by some linguists as a diagnostic of adjectival status. Passives of double object constructions and passives of the ‘accusative subject’ construction appear in this position.

(a) Given a toy though the baby was, the brat still cried anyway.
(b) Expected to win though he was, McEnroe was beaten in the early rounds. (Weinberg (1987: 185))

However, Weinberg 1987 casts doubt on the feasibility of this test as a diagnostic for adjectival status.
Examples like 9 could be subsumed under the lexical passive rule if its scope is extended so that it relates the indirect object of actives to the subject of passives. Since indirect objects are present in the subcategorization frames just like direct objects, they are in principle accessible to lexical operations. However, sentences like 8 and 10 must be derived transformationally: in passives of the 'accusative subject' construction and passives followed by predicative expressions, the derived subjects correspond to the underlying subjects of the embedded clauses, and the subject of embedded clause is not present in the subcategorization frame of the main verb.5 Wasow's analysis, which clearly dichotomizes passive participles, does not allow transformational passives to exhibit adjectival properties, and therefore wrongly excludes sentences like 8 and 10.

Now let us turn to OE passive participles. As noticed by Lieber 1979, OE passive participles also exhibit both adjectival and verbal properties. They occur in prenominal position like adjectives, and inflect in the same way as adjectives do.

(11) a. be þam gecwedenan andagan
    (Ælfric Gen. 18. 14)
on the agreed appointed-day
    ‘on the day agreed’

    b. Heofena rice is gelic gehiddum goldhorde.
    (OE Gospel Mt. 13. 44)
    heaven's kingdom is like hidden gold-hoard
    ‘The kingdom of heaven is like a hidden treasure.’

OE passive participles appear in comparative and superlative forms like adjectives. The passive participle *gelæredstan* in 12 is in superlative form.

(12) ealla þa gelæredstan men
    (Ælfred, Bede (Miller) 344, 20)
    all the most taught men

OE passive participles agree with their subjects as predicative adjectives do.

(13) Sume by wurdon ablende, and sume of land adrifene
    (OE Chron. an 107?)
    some they became blinded and some from land driven
    ‘Some were blinded and some driven from the land.’

5 Following Chomsky 1981, I assume the small clause analysis for sentences like *they considered [sc John a fool]*.
OE passive participles appear with the prefix *un-* which does not attach to the corresponding active verb.

(14) Sume preostas ... unbedene gaderiap he to þam lice.  
(Ælfric Past. Ep. 49)  

some priests ... unbidden gather they at the body  
‘Some priests gathered unbidden at the body.’

OE passive participles also exhibit verbal properties. The following example has dynamic reading which often linked to the verbal status of passive participles.

(15) þa ðis gefeoht neah Winwede streame wæs gefohten.  
(Alfred, Bede (Miller) 236, 16)  

then this battle near Winwede river was fought  
‘Then this battle was fought near Winwede river.’

OE passive participles can occur with predicative expressions, whereas non-participial adjectives do not occur in this configuration.

(16) a. þu ... eart cynebeam gecydd.  
(Lord’s Prayer II. 116)  

you are royal-cross proclaimed  
‘you are proclaimed a kingly cross’

b. þu, cnapa, byst þæs hehstan witega genemned.  
(OE Gosp. Luke I, 76)  

you boy are the highest wiseman called  
‘You, boy, are called the highest wiseman.’

(11-16 from Lieber (1979: 673-7))

Now consider the following examples.

(17) a. we þe ... næron wurpe beon his wealas gecigde  
(Ælfric, Hom. ii, 316, 25)  

we that were not thrown were his slaves called  
‘we that were not thrown were called his slaves’

b. hi wæron Cristes martyras gefremede  
(Martyrology (EETS) 116, 18)  

they were Christ’s martyrs made  
‘they were made Christ’s martyrs’

(Hatori (1982: 174))

The passive participles, *gecigde* in 17a and *gefremede* in 17b, are accompanied by predicative expressions. In this respect, they must be analyzed as verbal. On the other hand, they have plural endings agreeing with their subjects, and therefore they must also be analyzed as adjectival. Examples like 17 are thus incompatible with an analysis which dichoto-
mizes passive participles and does not allow them to exhibit adjectival and verbal properties at the same time.

3. Passive Participles as [+V]. It has been suggested by Chomsky (1981: 54f.) that whereas lexical passive participles are adjectives with ordinary feature specification [+V, +N], transformational passive participles are neutralized verb-adjectives with the feature specification [+V]. The neutralization analysis has been extended to all passive participles by Hoekstra (1984, §3.3.3.1). We have seen above that passive participles are free to occur in environments appropriate for either verbs or adjectives, and there is no clear-cut distinction between lexical adjectival passives and transformational verbal passives. These facts suggest that Hoekstra's position is correct.6

In this section, the Case assignment properties of passive participles will be considered.7 It will be shown that passive participles can assign inherent Case but not structural objective Case, and therefore they should be analyzed as [+V], unspecified for a value of the feature [N], according to the theory of Case proposed by Chomsky 1981 and elaborated by Riemsdijk 1983 and Kemenade 1987.

6 Chomsky (1981: 54–5) points out that some passive participles cannot appear as complements of the verb seem, and that some passive participles cannot appear as complements of the verb have, as illustrated in the following examples.

(a) John seems old (sad, tired, troubled, untaught, *taught by Bill, *believed to be a fool, *killed)
(b) John had Bill leave (killed, taught French, *sad, *troubled, *untaught) (Chomsky (1981: 54))

Chomsky accounts for these facts by the categorial distinction between lexical and transformational passive participles, and categorial restrictions on the complements of seem and have, i.e. seem requires [+V, +N] complements and have rejects [+N] complements. This account is incompatible with our position. In fact, we can take the phenomena illustrated in (a) and (b) as the results of semantic restrictions: complements of seem must be gradable; complements of have must be non-stative.

(c) The music seems nice/*choral. (Bolinger (1972: 77))
(d) Donald had Paula learn/*know the score of Beethoven's Fifth. (Baron (1974: 320))

The ungrammatical passive phrases in (a) refer to events. Since, as Freidin (1975: 399) says, events are not conceived of by degrees, passive phrases which refer to events cannot appear as complements of seem. On the other hand, the ungrammatical passive phrases in (b) express a state, and therefore are incompatible with the semantic restriction on complements of have.

7 By Case I mean abstract case, and by case morphological case.

(18) **Case Filter:**

*NP if NP has phonetic content and has no Case.

(Chomsky (1981: 49))

(19) **Case assignment rules:**

i. NP is nominative if governed by AGR.

ii. NP is objective if governed by V with the subcategorization feature: _ NP (i.e. transitive).

iii. NP is oblique if governed by P.

iv. NP is genitive in [NP _ X'].

v. NP is inherently Case-marked as determined by properties of its [−N] governor.

(Chomsky (1981: 170))

According to the Case assignment rules 19, only the [−N] categories, V([+V, −N]) and P(−V, −N)), but not the [+N] categories, N(−V, +N]) and A([+V, +N]), can assign Case. Thus, 18 and 19 together explain why V and P, but not N and A, can take NP complements in PE. However, as noticed by Besten 1981, Platzack 1983, Riemsdijk 1983, etc., there are some languages which have transitive adjectives, i.e. adjectives which can take NP complements at the surface level. The following examples are from German.

(20) a. Dieser Mann muss des Französische machtig sein.

   this man must French in command of be

   ‘This man must speak French.’

b. Das Französische ist ihm ungelaufig.

   French is him not-fluent

   ‘He is not fluent in French.’

(Riemsdijk (1983: 225–6))

It has been suggested by Chomsky (1981: 50) that the morphological case markings act as Case assigners in languages with a rich morphological case system. However, languages like Dutch and Swedish, which have an impoverished morphological case system like PE, also have transitive adjectives.

---

8 Swedish and Dutch look like PE with regard to morphological case in that the only overtly marked case of nouns is the genitive case, whereas some pronouns also have an objective case.
(21) Dutch:
   a. Ik ben het beu.
      I am it sick
      'I am sick of it'
   b. Ik ben je zat.
      I am you fed up
      'I am fed up with you'
      (Besten (1981: 95))

(22) Swedish:
   a. Han var hängiven religionen
      he was devoted the religion
      'he was devoted to the religion'
   b. Hon är lik sin mor
      she is like her mother
      (Platzack (1983: 41))

The fact that languages like Dutch and Swedish have transitive adjectives is also problematic to Emonds’ 1985 account by empty P structure like 23.

(23)
```
    A'
   /   \
 PP  A
     /  \ [NP,P] lexical item
 P   [N,P] φ
```

Emonds (1985, §5.7) argues that German NP complements of adjectives receive Case by being objects of lexically empty structural P. The empty P is allowed to remain empty throughout the transformational derivation by the Invisible Category Principle 24, where a category C is morphologically transparent in XP if and only if the rules of morphology of a language yield a productive number of pairs of minimal XP which differ phonologically only by virtue of whether XP contains C (Emonds (1985: 222)).

(24) Invisible Category Principle:
   An obligatory closed category B (such as a SP (X) or P) with a feature C may remain empty throughout a derivation if C is morphologically transparent in a phrasal sister of B.
   (Emonds (1985: 227))

Emonds assumes that morphological oblique case markings are realizations of the Case feature P. Thus, according to the Invisible Category Principle 24, the P in 23 can remain empty if and only if the language in
question has a live morphological case system and distinctive oblique case markings. Thus, contrary to the fact, Emonds' analysis predicts that languages like Dutch and Swedish cannot have transitive adjectives at the surface level.

Let us now turn to Riemsdijk's 1983 account in terms of neutralization of the syntactic feature. He argues that in German syntax the value of the syntactic feature \([N]\), which distinguishes between \(V([+V, -N])\) and \(A([+V, +N])\), is neutralized in attributive and predicative positions so that only the feature specification \([+V]\) remains. In conjunction with the principle 25, this neutralized feature specification explains why German adjectives can take NP complements in these positions.

\[(25)\] Abstract Case is assigned by structural heads that are non-distinct from \([-N]\).  

(Riemsdijk (1983: 232))

Various parallelisms between AP and VP have been noticed by Riemsdijk to corroborate the claim that transitive adjectives are neutralized verb-like elements. For example, German verbs have the following properties.

\[(26)\]
i. Verbs are base-generated in the VP final position.
ii. PP, but not NP, can be extraposed over VP-final V.

As for 26i, adjectives usually follow their objects in German.

\[(27)\] a. Der Hans ist seiner Freundin überdrussig geworden.
Hans is his girl-friend weary become
'Hans has grown tired of his girl friend'
b. Die Universalgrammatik soll Menschen ungeboren sein.
universal grammar shall man innate be
'universal grammar is said to be innate to man'

(Riemsdijk (1983: 225–6))

As for 26ii, PP, but not NP, can be extraposed over AP-final A.\(^9\)

\[(28)\] PP:
a. Er ist auf Musik erplicht.
he is on music keen 'he is keen on music'

\(^9\) We may take this distributional difference between overt NP and PP complements as another problem to Emonds' analysis.
b. Er ist erplicht auf Musik.
   he is keen on music

NP:

c. Er ist dieses Problems gewältig
   he is this problem conscious
   'he is conscious of this problem'

d. *Er ist gewältig dieses Problems
   he is conscious this problem

(Riemsdijk (1983: 235))

Similar parallelism between AP and VP can be found in Dutch, a language with an impoverished morphological case system. Dutch verbs have the following properties.

(29)  
   i. Verbs are base-generated in the VP-final position.
   ii. PP, but not NP, can be extraposed over V.

Dutch adjectives also can follow their complements as examples in 30 show.

(30)  
   a. dat hij dat gezeur moe is
      that he that drivel weary is
      'that he is weary of that drivel'
   b. dat hij op zijn moeder verliefd is
      that he with his mother in love is
      'That he is in love with his mother'

(Hoekstra (1984: 26))

As exemplified in 31, PP complements, but not NP complements, can be extraposed over AP-final A.

(31)  
   PP:
   a. dat hij op zijn vrouw gek is
      that he about his wife crazy is
      'that he is crazy about his wife'
   b. dat hij gek op zijn vrouw is
      that he crazy about his wife is

NP:

c. dat hij dat gezeur moe is
   that he that drivel weary is
   'that he is weary of that drivel'

d. *dat hij moe dat gezeur is
   that he weary that drivel is

(Hoekstra (1984: 26))

Thus, the neutralization analysis is corroborated in a language with an
impoverished morphological case system as well as in a language with a rich morphological case system. However, there remains a problem of accounting for why the NP complements of transitive adjectives in German and OE usually appear in dative and genitive but never in accusative.

It has been shown by Kemenade (1987, §3.1) that accusative case assigned by V is structural Case but dative case and genitive case assigned by V or A are inherent Case. According to Kemenade, this statement is corroborated by the fact that accusative case assigned by V is dissociated from θ-role assignment but dative and genitive case assigned by A or V are linked to specific θ-roles. The dissociation between accusative case assigned by V and θ-role assignment is evident in the causative construction 32, which is an exceptional Case marking construction.

(32) se ealdormon sceal lætan [S hiene selfne gelicne his
subjects
‘the ruler must put himself on the same level with his subjects’
(CP, 106, 8)

On the other hand, dative and genitive case marking by A or V is closely related to θ-role assignment. Dative case is linked to the θ-role of ‘goal’ or ‘experiencer’, and genitive case is linked to the θ-role of ‘content’.

(33) a. þe hie him (dative) þæs (genitive) gepæfiende
though they him that agreeing
naeron
not were
‘though they were not in agreement with him on that’
(Oros, 50, 17)

b. þeah hit þam cyng (dative) ungewill wäre
though it the king displeasing was
‘though it was displeasing to the king’
(PC 1097, 23)

c. and bio he ælces wites wyrðe
and be he every punishment deserving
‘and may he deserve every punishment’
(charters)

(Kemenade (1987: 73–4))

Now we can provide an account for the problem raised above by mak-

---

10 According to Chomsky (1981: 171), structural Case is dissociated from θ-role, whereas inherent Case is closely linked to θ-role.
ing a distinction between structural objective Case assigners and inherent Case assigners. Structural objective Case is assigned by categories that are $[-N]$, whereas inherent Case is assigned by categories that are non-distinct from $[-N]$. Transitive adjectives, though specified as $[+V]$, are unspecified for a value of the feature $[N]$. Since structural objective Case is assigned by elements that are specified as $[-N]$, transitive adjectives cannot assign it. However, since elements that are unspecified for a value of the feature $[N]$, as well as elements that are specified as $[-N]$, are non-distinct from $[-N]$, transitive adjectives can assign inherent Case. In the following subsection we will turn to passive participles and examine their Case assignment properties.

3.2. CASE ASSIGNMENT PROPERTIES OF PASSIVE PARTICIPLES. Let us begin with passive participles in PE. Consider the following examples.

(34) a. The enemy destroyed the city.
   b. *It was destroyed the city by the enemy.
   c. The city was destroyed t by the enemy.

(b and c from Hoekstra (1984: 197))

(35) a. I believe $[S John to be intelligent].$
   b. *It was believed $[S John to be intelligent].$
   c. John was believed $[S t to be intelligent].$

(Lasnik and Uriagereka (1988: 18))

It has generally been accepted that inherent Case has been lost during the period of Middle English (ME) so that PE has only structural Case, except in the double object constructions which we will consider below. As examples 34 and 35 show, NP movement is obligatory in PE passive sentences in general. This fact indicates that PE passive participles cannot assign structural objective Case.

Now, consider the passives of the double object constructions. Here the passive participles can be followed by NP objects.

(36) a. Paul was given a coffee grinder by his parents.
   b. Neil's parents were sent a wedding announcement.

(Stowell (1981: 48))

According to one of the analyses proposed by Chomsky (1981: 170), in a double object construction like 37, the first object is assigned objective Case and the second object is assigned inherent Case.

(37) John gave Bill a book

objective inherent

(Chomsky (1981: 117))
As the following examples show, only the second objects can be retained in passives of the double object constructions.

(38)  a. John was given a book.
     b. *That book has been given John.

(Besten (1981: 117))

Thus, PE passive participles can assign inherent Case, but not objective Case.

Let us now turn to OE passive participles. As exemplified in 39, OE passive participles can appear with NP complements in dative and genitive.

(39)  a. And him (dative) wæs swa forwyrnad ðæs
     and him was thus prohibited the inganges (genitive) (Hexameron St Basil (ed Norman) 24)
     entry
     ‘thus he was prohibited from entering’
     b. Swa wræf eac gestiered ðæm gitsere (dative) ðæs so is also corrected the miser the reaflices (genitive) (CP, 341, 11)
     extortion
     ‘also the miser is corrected for the extortion’

(Kemenade (1987: 87))

Thus, OE passive participles can assign inherent Case.

On the other hand there is no examples of accusative case assignment by passive participles in OE. According to Mitchell (1985, §834), in OE, the accusative object of an active verb becomes the subject of the corresponding passive participles as a rule.

(40)  a. he ofslog pone cyning
     he killed the king
     b. se cyning wæs ofslægen (fram him)
     the king was killed (by him)

(Mitchell (1985: 348))

Verbs which take an accusative object and a dative or genitive object follow the rule. The accusative object of the active verb becomes the subject of the passive, and the dative or genitive object of the active verb, if expressed, remains unaltered.

(41)  a. ... on anne cyle se wæs afylled monnes
     in a vessel that was filled man’s blodes (genitive)
     blood

(Or 76. 32)
'in a vessel that was filled with blood of man'

b. ic sege eow to sopan þæt sib is forgifen godes
   I say you verily that peace is given God’s
geladunge (dative) (ÆLS 9.130)
   congregation
   ‘I say to you verily that peace is given to God’s congrega-
   (Mitchell (1985: 351))

No passive sentence of the type the girl was given a book, where an accusa-
tive object is retained, occurs in OE. Also we cannot find a retained
accusative object when verbs which take double accusative are pas-
sivized. Verbs of teaching and similar verbs take an accusative of the per-
son taught and an accusative of what is taught. With these verbs, the
personal object of the active verb regularly becomes the subject of the
 passive, as illustrated in 42. There is no example where an accusative of
what is taught is retained when the personal object becomes the subject
of the passive.

(42) a. ... ic eom gelæred (ÆGram 158. 12)
   I am taught
b. ond he scole gesette, in þære cneohtas 7 geonge
   and he school established in which boys and young
   menn tydde 7 lærde wærón (Bede 208. 10)
   men instructed and taught were
   ‘and he established a school in which boys and young men
   were instructed and taught’
   (Mitchell (1985: 349))

When what is taught is the subject of the passive, the accusative of the
person never appears, though the dative of the person taught appears as
in 43.

(43) mid hwylcere fulfremednesse se dædbeta gebet
   with such perfection the penitent repented
   hæbbe þæt him getæht wæs (Conf 3. 1 11. 12)
   have that him taught was
   ‘with such perfection the penitent has repented of what is
   taught to him’
   (Mitchell (1985: 351))

Thus, OE passive participles, although able to assign inherent Case, are
unable to assign objective Case.

Now, we have seen that passive participles, in both OE and PE, can
assign inherent Case, but not objective Case. Therefore, they must be
non-distinct from $[-N]$ but they cannot be $[-N]$. A reasonable conclusion to draw will be that they are members of the neutralized category with the feature specification $[+V]$, unspecified for a value of the feature $[N]$.$^{11}$

4. SUMMARY. In this paper, I have tried to show that all passive participles in PE and OE are members of the same syntactic category, and that the feature specification for them must be $[+V]$, unspecified for a value of the feature $[N]$. In section 2, we have seen that passive participles have truly ambiguous nature, i.e., the categorical distinction between lexical adjectival and transformational verbal passives should be rejected. In section 3.1., we have seen that inherent Case can be assigned by elements that are non-distinct from $[-N]$, whereas structural objective Case can be assigned only by elements that are $[-N]$. In section 3.2., we have examined the Case assignment properties of passive participles in PE and OE, and seen that they can assign only inherent Case, not structural objective Case. We may take this fact to be a confirmation for the claim that passive participles, although specified as $[+V]$, are unspecified for a value of the feature $[N]$: elements that are unspecified for a value of the feature $[N]$ is non-distinct from $[-N]$, and therefore can assign inherent Case, but since they are not $[-N]$, they cannot assign structural objective Case.
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$^{11}$ As for the inapplicability of the rule of $of$-insertion, we may impute it to the lack of the $[+N]$ feature, as Chomsky 1981 and Stowell 1981 have done. Chomsky (1981: 50) formulated the $of$-insertion rule as follows, $NP \rightarrow [\_ of] \ NP$ in env.: $[+N]$. Since passive participles lack the crucial feature $[+N]$, they cannot undergo this rule.