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This paper is a remark on Park (2012), which described British English as behaving differently from American English regarding A/A’-movement in double object constructions in that it shows perfectly symmetric patterns. Park’s (2012) Generalization is an attempt to capture the alleged different patterns between American and British English, by connecting Case absorption approach to passivization (with inherent/structural Case distinction) and the availability of (a)symmetric wh-movement patterns. In this paper, I will discuss three Northwest British English dialects, and show that Park’s (2012) presentation of British English data is inadequate. I will also show that his generalization cannot handle the observed dialectal variation in British English, and propose an alternative analysis based on Lohndal’s (2011) approach to freezing and Georgala’s (2012) applicative hypothesis.

Keywords: double object constructions, prepositional dative constructions, theme goal ditransitives (TGDs), GOAL/THEME passivization, wh-GOAL/THEME movement, structural Case, inherent Case, applicatives, freezing

1. Introduction

The double object construction is formed with ditransitive verbs (such as give, send, lend, show, etc.) that take two DP object arguments, namely, the GOAL

* I would like to express my appreciation to three anonymous reviewers for their valuable criticism and comments. I am especially grateful to one of the anonymous reviewers for detailed comments that were particularly helpful in the revision process. Thanks also to William Haddican, Rachel Nye, and especially to Alison Biggs and Neil Myler, for assistance with British English dialect data. All remaining shortcomings and errors are of course mine.
argument and the THEME argument, as in the sentence ‘Mary gave John a book.’ In American English, the GOAL argument can undergo A-movement such as passivization, whereas the THEME argument cannot, as we can see in (1).

(1) a. John was given a book. (GOAL passivization)
   b. *A book was given John. (THEME passivization)

In A’-movement contexts, on the other hand, the movement pattern is exactly the opposite: the GOAL argument resists wh-movement, whereas wh-movement of the THEME argument is allowed, as shown in (2).

(2) a. *Who shall we give a present? (wh-movement of GOAL)
   b. What shall we give John? (wh-movement of THEME)

This asymmetry of movement in American English between the GOAL and the THEME arguments in A vs. A’-movement contexts is an interesting question that deserves attention on its own.

Park (2012) presents another intriguing set of data, given in (3) and (4). He notes that British English, unlike American English, allows both GOAL and THEME arguments to undergo A and A’-movement alike, i.e. the movement pattern of British English is perfectly symmetric in both types of movement.

(3) a. John was given a book. (GOAL passivization)
   b. A book was given John. (THEME passivization)

(4) a. Who shall we give a present? (wh-movement of GOAL)
   b. What shall we give John? (wh-movement of THEME)

Park (2012) investigates why there holds this cross-dialectal contrast between American and British English on the A and A’-movement patterns and proposes what I summarize and call here as Park’s (2012) Generalization, given in (5).

(5) Park’s (2012) Generalization
   If IO (=GOAL) always receives structural Case, it cannot undergo
   A’-movement in that language. (i.e. if a language allows IO to have an
   inherent Case, then wh-IO movement is possible).

Park (2012) argues that the GOAL argument of American English always bears
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structural Case, whereas the GOAL argument of British English can bear either structural or inherent Case, which yields the alleged passivization patterns in both varieties of English, and that there is a strong connection between A-movement (passivization) and A’-movement (wh-movement), whose relation is mediated through Case.

However, Park’s (2012) presentation of British English pattern is overgeneralized and inadequate. Standard British English actually patterns with American English (1-2) in that THEME passivization and wh-movement of GOAL are not accepted (cf. Haddican & Holmberg (2012), Biggs (2013), and most of the works dealing with British English data). Although some dialects of British English do allow THEME passivization or wh-movement of GOAL (cf. Radford (1988), Woolford (1993), Doggett (2004), Haddican (2010), Citko (2011), Biggs (2013), among others, for THEME passivization; cf. Myler (2010), Biggs (2013) for wh-GOAL movement), there are variations among these British English dialects regarding whether the acceptability of THEME passivization and that of wh-GOAL movement always pattern together, which presents a different picture from Park’s (2012) description given in (3-4). (cf. Haddican & Holmberg (2012), Biggs (2013)).

Another important but less known fact is that we cannot take a lumping approach to British English dialects that exhibit THEME passivization. According to some previous works (cf. Radford (1988), Nye (2010), Haddican & Holmberg (2012), Biggs (2013), among others), the acceptability of THEME passives is linked to the availability of an alternative ditransitive pattern in these dialects (where the DP THEME argument precedes the DP GOAL argument, as in 'Mary gave a book John'). Moreover, there is cross-dialectal variation as to whether the alternative ditransitive pattern behaves like the double object construction (DOC) or the prepositional dative construction (PD) (such as 'Mary gave a book to John') in each of these dialects.

My main goals in these remarks are: (i) summarizing & describing relevant cross-dialectal variation, (ii) critically reviewing Park’s (2012) Generalization against the dialectal data, and (iii) presenting an alternative analysis. This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces ditransitive patterns available in British English with their distribution, and presents diagnostics for DOCs and PDs. Section 3 summarizes Park’s (2012) Generalization. Section 4 introduces and discusses three British dialects (i.e. Liverpool, Manchester, and Lancashire dialects), all of which at first glance appear to have symmetric passivization pattern (with THEME passives available) but differ on details and A’-movement patterns. In addition to showing that Park’s (2012) description of British English is not
adequate, I will also show that his generalization & analysis cannot handle the observed variation among these dialects. Section 5 provides an analysis of the described dialectal variation, addressing issues of applicatives, locality, Case valuation, and freezing effects. Section 6 is a concluding remark with summary and limitations of the present paper.

2. Ditransitives of British English

2.1. Available patterns and their distribution

As is well known, there are two alternating canonical ditransitive patterns in all dialects of English: DOCs in (6a) (where the DP GOAL precedes the DP THEME) and PDs in (6b) (where the PP GOAL with the preposition to follows the DP THEME). In non-standard (regional) varieties of British English there exists an alternative third pattern where the DP THEME precedes the DP GOAL, as in (6c), which I will call TGD (standing for THEME-GOAL Ditransitives), following Haddican (2010).

(6) a. I gave John a book; She sent my brother a ball. (DOC)
b. I gave a book to John; She sent a ball to my brother. (PD)
c. %I gave a book John; %She sent the ball my brother. (TGD)

This third pattern (i.e. TGD as in (6c)) is typically found in (North)western varieties of British English (cf. Hughes and Trudgill (1979), Siewierska and Hollmann (2007), Gast (2007), Haddican (2010), Myler (2010), Nye (2010), Gerwin (2013)), although Hughes et al. (2006) reports that the pattern is quite acceptable to many southern speakers as well. Gast (2007) shows that TGDs are more

---

1 There are two main approaches to the relationship between these two ditransitive patterns: (i) dative shift/alternation approach that posits derivational relationship between the two (e.g., Larson (1988), den Dikken (1995), among others), and (ii) base generation/alternative projection approach that takes the two patterns to be lexical alternations and to be not related syntactically and semantically and to have alternative base generated projections (e.g., Pesetsky (1995), Harley (2002), among others). Although the relation between these two patterns has received much attention in the literature, I will set this debate aside in this paper.

2 Haddican (2010:2426) says "[TGDs are] most readily accepted by speakers in Northwestern and Western dialects of England from Lancashire through Glocestershie, including parts of the Midlands and West Yorkshire. They also are sometimes accepted by speakers in Wales and from dialects further South including London and Cornwall. Speakers of Northeastern English dialects and Scots typically do not accept theme-goal ditransitives. Our results and previous literature suggest that all speakers who accept theme-goal ditransitives also accept both DOCs and prepositional datives (Siewierska and..."
common when both arguments are pronominal. Most recently, Gerwin (2013), based on an extensive synchronic and diachronic corpus study of ditransitives with pronominal arguments, reports that TGDs involving pronominal THEME and GOAL arguments are most frequently found in the (western part of) Midlands in current British English; according to her findings, dialects spoken in the North comes the next in line.³ Nye (2010) reports that TGDs with both arguments in pronominal forms are more widely accepted; and that the acceptance of TGDs involving at least one full lexical DP argument is mainly a feature of Northwestern British English (including regions such as Lancashire and Greater Manchester).⁴ As there is no study of dialects spoken in (western) Midlands on A and A’-movement of ditransitives documented and available so far (to the best of my knowledge), I will focus on a couple of Northwestern dialects about which some studies are available in the literature. Besides, these dialects also allow TGDs with (at least one) full lexical DP (although in general there seems to be much variation in the restrictions imposed on TGDs). These dialects include Liverpool dialect (cf. Biggs (2013, personal communication (p.c.)), Manchester dialect (cf. Haddican (2010), Haddican & Holmberg (2012), Haddican (p.c.)), and Lancashire dialect (cf. Myler (2010, p.c.) and Nye (2010, p.c.)).

2.2. Diagnostics for DOCs vs. PDs

DOCs and PDs differ regarding which verb classes they are compatible with. The following verb class diagnostics and relevant examples are originally from Levin (1993) and have been used by Myler (2010), Haddican (2010), and Biggs (2013), whose work I will summarize in following sections.

³ It is also reported in Gerwin (2013) that the TGD is actually the oldest form of the three ditransitive patterns that was available from earlier stages of English.

⁴ The possibility of TGDs is reported to be the strongest with two pronominal arguments (Siewierska & Hollmann (2007), etc.), and the pronominal vs. full DP status of the arguments seem to affect the choice among DOCs, PDs, and TGDs. In addition, whether pronominal forms are strong, weak, or clitic forms (in the sense of Cardinaletti & Starke (1999)) may also be relevant. Siewierska & Hollmann (2007) also note that while both DOCs and TGDs are attested in the South and the North when the THEME and the GOAL are pronominals, with mixed or two lexical constituents the North appears to have more options available, a point in line with what Nye (2010) says. As it is well known that (personal) pronominal objects may display different syntactic behavior from DP objects, the consideration of TGDs in terms of pronominality seems to be important to the study of ditransitives. However, licensing of pronominals and alternative ordering involving pronominals (weak or clitic) often get different analyses or treatments than those of full lexical DPs (or strong pronominals), so I will only consider Northwestern dialects, where mixed or two lexical arguments seem to be possible.
First, Latinate verbs (such as donate and contribute) may appear in PDs but not in DOCs, as shown in (7).

(7) a. Mary donated/contributed money to the typhoon victims. (PD)
   b. *Mary donated/contributed the typhoon victims money. (DOC)

Manner of communication verbs (such as whisper and shout) and verbs of continuous imparting of force (such as push and lift) can be used in PDs but not in DOCs, as we can see in (8) and (9), respectively.

(8) a. Mary whispered/shouted the word to me. (PD)
   b. *Mary whispered/shouted me the word. (DOC)

(9) a. Mary pushed/lifted the box to John. (PD)
   b. *Mary pushed/lifted John the box. (DOC)

On the other hand, "prevention of possession" verbs (such as refuse and deny) only occur in DOCs, as shown in (10).

(10) a. *Mary refused the ice cream to the child. (PD)
    b. Mary refused the child the ice cream. (DOC)

DOCs and PDs also differ in terms of animacy constraint on the GOAL argument, which is well known as Oehrle's (1976) generalization. As we can see in (11a,a') both animate and inanimate GOALs are allowed in PDs, but DOCs only allow animate GOALs, as (11b,b') show.

(11) a. I sent a package to the boarder/the border. (PD)
    a'. The editor sent the article to Sue/to Philadelphia.
    b. I sent the boarder/*the border a package. (DOC)
    b'. The editor sent Sue/*Philadelphia the article.

There are other pragmatic factors known to affect the choice between the two constructions such as topicality and focality, length and heaviness, of object arguments, but we will not be concerned with these pragmatic variables here. (cf. Choi (2005) for relevant discussion and literature.)

We will discuss properties of TGDs with respect to these diagnostics in section 4 to establish whether TGDs of each dialect behave like DOCs or PDs.
3. Park’s (2012) Generalization on structural Case and A/A’-movement

As for DOCs, Park (2012) follows Marantz’s (1993) applicative analysis and assumes the structure in (12).5

(12) 
\[ \text{vP} \]
\[ \text{spec} \]
\[ \text{v'} \]
\[ \text{AppIP} \]
\[ \text{DP(GOAL)} \]
\[ \text{Appl} \]
\[ \text{VP} \]
\[ \text{V} \]
\[ \text{DP(THEME)} \]

In order to explain the asymmetry vs. symmetry in A-movement (i.e. passivization) in American English (1) vs. (his description of) British English (3), Park assumes that in British English both v and V (or the complex of V and Appl) can host the passive morpheme -EN and absorb the structural Case, whereas in American English only v can have -EN and absorb the structural Case. For him, in British English, when v hosts -EN and absorbs the structural Case the GOAL argument has a structural accusative Case that gets absorbed in

---

5 Pylkkänen (2008) extends Marantz’s applicative analysis of DOCs and proposes two different types of applicatives, namely, high and low applicatives. Marantz’s structure in (12) is the same as Pylkkänen’s high applicative structure (with Appl projection above VP), which she argues, to express the relation between individual and event. Her low applicative structure (in the form of \[ [\text{vP} \text{v'} \text{AppIP} \text{DP(GOAL)} \text{Appl} \text{VP} \text{V} \text{DP(THEME)}] \]), where Appl projection appears VP-internally, expresses possession relationship between two individuals, GOAL and THEME; English DOCs correspond to low applicatives in Pylkkänen’s system. Although Pylkkänen’s characterization of applicatives has been very influential (cf. McGinnis (2002), Doggett (2004), Citko (2011), among others), it has morphological and syntactic problems, as discussed by Georgala (2012); it also has semantic problems, as pointed out in Larson (2010). To amend the problems, Georgala (2012) proposes revised applicative structures as in (i) and (ii) below, in which Appl projections are uniformly represented above the lexical VP.

(i) Thematic applicatives (= high applicatives)
\[ [\text{vP} \text{SUB} [\text{v'} [\text{AppIP} \text{IOINF/LOC/INSTR...} [\text{AppP} \text{APPI [VP V DO ]}]])] \]

(ii) Raising applicatives (replacing low applicatives)
\[ [\text{vP} \text{SUB} [\text{v'} [\text{AppIP} \text{IOREC} [\text{AppP} \text{APPI [VP IO DO [v' V DO ]]}]]] \]
passivization context, and we get GOAL passivization; when V absorbs the structural Case, however, the THEME argument has a structural accusative Case that gets absorbed and undergoes THEME passivization, and the GOAL is assigned inherent Case. On the other hand, in American English, as only v is assumed to be able to absorb the structural Case, the GOAL argument must always have a structural accusative Case and GOAL passivization obtains. As the THEME argument cannot undergo THEME passivization, it always gets an inherent Case. Park’s assumption on Case of both arguments is summarized in (13) below. His approach to passivization of DOCs is basically a Case absorption-based one.

(13) Park’s assumption on Case properties
   a. British English: GOAL = structural or inherent
      (THEME= inherent or structural)
   b. American English: GOAL = always structural
      (THEME = always inherent)

Assuming that Case properties of the GOAL(=IO) and the THEME (=DO) arguments have to do with passivization pattern, he goes on to consider A’-movement patterns and proposes Park’s (2012) Generalization introduced in (5), repeated as (14) here, for his observed correlation between Case properties of the GOAL argument and the availability of A’-movement.

(14) Park’s (2012) Generalization
   If IO (=GOAL) always receives structural Case, it cannot undergo A’-movement in that language. (i.e. if a language allows IO to have an inherent Case, then wh-IO movement is possible).

---

6 There have been two main approaches to cross-linguistic differences between symmetric passive languages and asymmetric passive languages in ditransitive literature: Case-based approach and locality-based approach. According to Case-based approach (e.g., Baker (1988), Woolford (1993)), in asymmetric passives the Case of the GOAL can be absorbed, yielding GOAL passivization; in symmetric passives, on the other hand, passive morphology may absorb Case of either the GOAL or the THEME, yielding both GOAL and THEME passivization. In locality-based approach (e.g., McGinnis (1998), Anagnostopoulou (2003), Doggett (2004), among others), on the other hand, asymmetric passives (e.g., only GOAL passives) are available as the GOAL is the closer argument than the THEME for the derived subject position, [Spec,TP]. In symmetric passives, short movement of the THEME to an outer specifier of the GOAL, creating escape-hatch, makes the THEME to be able to move as well. (There are different ways of implementing why escape-hatch is available in symmetric passive languages: phase-based ones, anti-locality-based ones, etc.)
Park argues that checking of structural Case in the projection of a functional category (such as ApplP) induces freezing effect, i.e. an element cannot undergo (further) movement after structural Case checking; hence in American English where the GOAL argument (=IO) always bears structural Case, A’-movement is expected to be forbidden due to freezing (after Case checking by v within ApplP via Agree). In other words, prior structural accusative Case checking of the GOAL (=IO) prohibits its further A’-movement. British English, on the other hand, has a possibility for the GOAL argument (=IO) to bear an inherent Case, in which situation it is not frozen for further movement, and wh-movement is expected to be allowed.

To summarize, Park argues that the main difference between American English and (his description of) British English lies in the Case properties of object arguments, i.e. the kinds of Case that they may bear, and that Case difference is responsible for different movement patterns such that British English allows A and A’-movement of both object arguments, and American English only allows A-movement of the GOAL and A’-movement of the THEME.

4. A and A’-movement in Northwest dialects of British English

According to Haddican & Holmberg (2012), the availability of THEME passivization (15a) is significantly linked to the availability of TGDs (15b) in Manchester dialect.

(15) a. A book was given the man by Mary. (THEME passivization)  
    b. Mary gave a book the man. (TGD)

7 Lohndal (2011) and Citko (2011) also offer freezing account for immobility of the GOAL argument, although their ways of implementation are different from Park’s (2012) approach.

8 In this freezing account related to structural Case checking, there arises a question regarding why regular wh-movement of subjects and direct objects (e.g., ‘Who likes Mary?’ and ‘Who does John like?’) is not subject to freezing effects after structural nominative and accusative Case checking. Park (2012) resorts to Rizzi & Shlonsky’s (2007) thesis that an element escapes freezing if there is Phi/Agree feature on its higher (sister) head: Object wh-DP does not get frozen because its sister V is inherently bestowed with Phi/Agree features, whereas subject wh-DP avoids freezing because Rizzi & Shlonsky’s Fin (corresponding to C) has Phi/Agree features and satisfies Subject Criterion (i.e. EPP), making the subject wh-DP moves directly into [Spec,FocP] without dropping by the usual subject position [Spec,SubP] (corresponding to [Spec,TP]) that counts as Criterial Freezing position. As for v above IO, Park mentions that it is not clear whether it has Phi/Agree feature to allow IO to avoid freezing and undergo A’-movement; thus he concludes that what is responsible for impossibility of IO’s A’-movement is its structural Case (and not v equipped with Phi/Agree feature).
In this section, I will discuss A and A’-movement patterns of DOCs and TGDs observed in three Northwest British English dialects (i.e. Liverpool and Lancashire dialects as well as Manchester dialect), and consider whether Manchester-type correlation between TGDs and THEME passivization obtains in the other two dialects as well, along with the question of whether TGDs pattern with DOCs or PDs in each dialect. Then, after considering A’-movement facts, I will discuss these dialects in the light of Park’s (2012) Generalization on the intimate relationship between A and A’-movement patterns mediated through Case.

4.1. Liverpool dialect

4.1.1. A and A’-movement

Biggs (2013) introduces newly collected data on Liverpool dialect, based on her survey of 9 native speakers of the dialect between the ages of 20-30. Liverpool dialect speakers allow TGDs with full DPs, as in (16a-b), as well as TGDs with pronominal arguments. THEME passivization is also possible when the THEME and the GOAL are both full DPs, as in (17a-b). Both TGDs and THEME passivization (with full DPs) are very free and not sensitive to definiteness, either.9

(16) a. Mary gave [the book/a book] [the teacher].
   b. Mary sent [the package/a package] [her nan’s].
   (TGD: *Standard; √Liverpool (cf. Biggs 2013))

(17) a. [The book/A book] was given the teacher.
   b. [The package/A package] was sent her nan’s.
   (THEME passives: *Standard; √Liverpool (cf. Biggs 2013))

---

9 Despite the considerable freedom Liverpool dialect exhibits, TGDs with the THEME-GOAL sequence in the form of ‘DP_{def} > pro’ (as in (ia)) or ‘DP_{indef} > DP_{def}’ (as in (ib)) are not allowed. Their unacceptability seems to be linked to general discourse/information structural constraints for ditransitive arguments. The example (ia) is subject to independent constraint on a pronoun following a lexical DP (cf. Bresnan and Nikitina (2003)), operating even in Standard English DOCs; the example (ib) is not good because there is a general information structural preference for old information to precede new information in English ditransitives. Their THEME passive counterparts seem to be possible as two arguments do not occur next to each other in passive contexts.

(i) a. *She gave the book him. (DP_{def} > pro)
   b. *She gave a book the man. (DP_{indef} > DP_{def})
Biggs (2013) shows that despite the presence of two overt DPs, TGDs of Liverpool dialect are underlying PDs. As for the diagnostics in section 2.2, Biggs presents the following examples (18a-c). Only PDs (but no DOCs) are compatible with the verbs used in (18) in English. Liverpool dialect allows these verbs in its TGDs, as in (18), showing that Liverpool TGDs pattern with PDs rather than with DOCs.

(18) a. She donated/contributed it me. (Latinate verbs)
   b. She whispered/shouted it me. (Manner of communication verbs)
   c. She pushed/lifted it me. (Verbs of continuous imparting of force)
   (Liverpool PD: *Standard; √Liverpool (cf. Biggs 2013))

On the other hand, "prevention of possession" verbs (such as refuse and deny) can be used in DOCs but not in PDs, as in (19a-b), repeated from (10b-a). The sentence (19c) shows that Liverpool dialect speakers reject using refuse in TGDs, demonstrating, again, that TGDs behave like PDs in this dialect.

(19) a. She refused the child the ice cream. (DOC: √Standard; √Liverpool)
   b. *She refused the ice cream to the child. (PD: *Standard; *Liverpool)
   c. *She refused the ice cream the child. (TGD with refuse: *Liverpool)
   (Biggs (p.c.))

Moreover, unlike DOCs that reject inanimate GOALs in both Standard British English and Liverpool dialect, inanimate GOALs are allowed in the TGD of Liverpool dialect, as shown in (20c). In other words, the GOAL argument in the TGD of Liverpool dialect is not subject to animacy constraint, patterning with the GOAL of the PD, which also shows that the TGD is an alternative PD in Liverpool dialect. So, we can conclude that Liverpool TGDs are underlying PDs.

(20) a. He sent the letter to France./*I gave the money to the state.
   (PD: √Standard; √Liverpool)
   b. *He sent France the letter./*I gave the state the money.
   (DOC: *Standard; *Liverpool)
   c. He sent the letter France./*I gave the money the state.
   (TGD: *Standard; √Liverpool)
   (Biggs (2013))

Now, the next question is whether THEME passives such as (17a-b) present in Liverpool dialect is derived from DOCs or TGDs. First, consider THEME
passives in (21). As the verbs such as donate and whisper only occur in PDs, there are no DOCs involving these verbs in Standard British English and Liverpool dialect\(^\text{10}\) (as well as American English); hence THEME passives with these verbs cannot be derived from DOCs and should be nonexistent. However, in Liverpool dialect, THEME passives with donate and whisper are actually available, as shown in (21). Thus, we can say that the source of THEME passives in (21) in Liverpool dialect is not DOCs, but TGDs (i.e. an alternative PD).

(21) a. The winnings from last week’s draw were donated the hospital.
   b. The code was whispered Mary before Sally knew what was happening.
   (THEME passives: *Standard; √Liverpool (cf. Biggs 2013))

THEME passivization is also possible for the Liverpool TGD sentence in (20c) with an inanimate GOAL, as we can see in (22a). The sentence (22b) shows that GOAL passivization is not possible for it here: this is exactly the same pattern found with PDs, as (23) shows.

(22) Inanimate GOALs:
   a. The letter was sent France; John was sent the pub.
      (THEME passives: *Standard; √Liverpool (cf. Biggs 2013))
   b. *France was sent the letter; *The pub was sent John.
      (GOAL passives: *Standard; *Liverpool (cf. Biggs 2013))

(23) PD (in Standard BrE & Liverpool):
   a. A letter was sent to France.     (THEME passivization)
   b. *France was sent a letter to_.   (GOAL passivization)

Before turning to A’-movement, let’s briefly take a look at the structure of Liverpool TGDs Biggs (2013) argues for. She proposes that the GOAL argument is headed by a null covert preposition, as represented in (24),\(^\text{11}\) and that an

---

\(^{10}\) DOCs such as ‘She donated/contributed me it.’ and ‘She whispered/shouted me it.’ are unacceptable in both Standard English and Liverpool dialect (cf. Biggs (2013)).

\(^{11}\) Biggs links the null preposition analysis in (24) to widespread preposition drop phenomenon present in the region, given in (i), which is a feature of Northwest British English.

(i) a. I want to go _ Chessington.     (Haddican & Holmberg (2012))
    b. I’m planning on going _ the shops. (Biggs (2013))

Compared to other neighboring dialects with preposition drop property (allowing dropping of allative
abstract (oblique) Case corresponding to the null preposition licenses the GOAL argument in TGDs and THEME passives.

(24) Mary gave [the book][∅ TO the teacher].

To summarize, although THEME passives are observed in Liverpool dialect, unlike Standard British English, their source is TGDs (with null preposition), which behave like PDs in this dialect. As far as regular DOCs are concerned, Liverpool dialect is no different from American and Standard British English in that THEME passives are not allowed.

Now let’s discuss A’-movement of Liverpool ditransitives. There is no work that reports relevant data (to the best of my knowledge), so I collected them via personal communications with Biggs. In American English and Standard British English, wh-movement of the GOAL argument is not allowed, as we can see in (25), i.e. there is a well-known generalization of "No A’-movement of GOALs in DOCs." In Liverpool dialect, however, such wh-GOAL movement is just fine.

(25) Who did Mary give it?
   (Wh-GOAL movement: "Standard; √Liverpool (cf. Biggs 2013, p.c.))

As Liverpool dialect has both DOCs and TGDs, the source of (25) seems potentially ambiguous between the two patterns.

However, there is evidence supporting that Liverpool wh-GOAL questions are derived from TGDs, and not from DOCs. Consider (26). Wh-GOAL questions are rejected by Liverpool speakers when the verb is refuse, which is used in DOCs only in both Standard English and Liverpool dialect, as we saw in (19) above. The unacceptability of (26) is in line with "No A’-movement of the GOAL in DOC" generalization; in Liverpool dialect, as the verb refuse cannot be used in TGDs either (i.e. there is no such TGD sentence as ‘She refused the ice cream the child.’) the wh-question (26) could not have been derived from the TGD.

---

TO only), Liverpool dialect is more liberal in that it even allows preposition drop with non-directional verbs (that comes with stative at) or when the verb and the GOAL are not adjacent, as we can see in (iia) and (iib), respectively.

(ii) a. She’s staying _ John’s tonight./I’m working _ the library today.
   b. Come with me _ the pub./He took both of them _ the zoo.   (Biggs (2013))
(26) *Who does she refuse it?/*Who did she refuse the ice cream?  
(*Standard; *Liverpool, (cf. Biggs p.c.))

Thus, we can conclude that the source of wh-GOAL question in (25) is actually not ambiguous between the DOC and the TGD: the verb give appears in both DOCs and TGDs, whereas the verb refuse only in DOCs. The fact that wh-GOAL questions are bad with refuse, but fine with give suggests that Liverpool DOCs do not allow wh-GOAL movement, like Standard British English. The good wh-GOAL question with give in (25) is derived from TGDs.

There are other supporting examples for this conclusion: wh-counterpart of the TGD in (20c) (repeated as (27a)) is given in (27b), which is accepted by Liverpool speakers.

(27) a. He sent the letter France.  
    (repeated from (20c); TGD)  
    b. Which country did he send the letter _?  
    (Biggs (p.c.))

The same is true of wh-GOAL questions with verbs such as donate, whisper, shout, and push in (28), which only occur in TGDs and not in DOCs.

(28) a. Which hospital/Who did she donate money _?  
    b. Who did she whisper the code _?  
    c. Who did she shout the word ___?  
    d. Who did she push the box ___?  
    (Biggs (p.c.))

Wh-GOAL movement is certainly possible in PDs, too, as the examples in (29) show. So we can say that wh-movement of the GOAL in TGDs is nothing special but a covert counterpart of these examples.

(29) a. Who did Mary give it to__?  
    b. Which country did he send the letter to__?  
    (PD: \Standard; \Liverpool)

4.1.2. Liverpool dialect and Park’s Generalization

In Liverpool dialect, both THEME passivization and wh-GOAL movement are linked to TGDs (i.e. an alternative PD), not to DOCs. Liverpool dialect DOCs behave like DOCs of American and Standard British English. The summary is
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provided in (30).

(30) Liverpool dialect:
   a. DOC: (i) *THEME passivization (17, 21, 22);  ✓GOAL passivization
      (ii) ✓wh-THEME movement; *wh-GOAL movement (26 (vs. 25))
   b. TGD: (i) ✓THEME passivization (17, 21, 22)
      (ii) ✓wh-GOAL movement (25 (vs. 26), 27, 28)
      (where TGD = alternative PD)

In PDs (in general) and Liverpool TGDs, the GOAL argument always receives structural oblique Case from overt and null prepositions, respectively. Although potentially controversial, if PPs with directional preposition to are functional, rather than lexical (cf. Grimshaw (1991), Froud (2001)), Park's (2012) approach predicts that GOAL arguments in PDs and TGDs get frozen after structural oblique Case checking within PP, and their wh-GOAL movement should be unavailable, contrary to fact. Rizzi & Shlonsky's (2007) escape strategy with Phi/Agree features of higher head cannot be applied here to save Park (2012), as they claim that P is [-N] and does not carry Phi features.

Therefore, Park's (2012) implementation of freezing account (linked with structural Case licensing and A'-movement) may be inadequate in this context. In section 5, I will show that not all instances of structural Case licensing result in freezing; freezing of an element occurs only when structural Case licensing is done via its movement into checking domain (rather than by in-situ Agree).

4.2. Manchester dialect

4.2.1. A and A'-movement

In this section, I will summarize Manchester dialect as discussed in Haddican (2010) and Haddican & Holmberg (2012), which report their experiments with Manchester speakers. Just like Liverpool dialect, this dialect also has TGDs, as shown in (31). There is cross-speaker variation with respect to pronominal/DP type of the THEME argument, and TGDs with pronominal THEMES are preferred than TGDs with full DP THEMES (cf. Haddican (2010: 2427; Figure 1)), although there still are speakers allowing TGDs with two full DP arguments. Haddican (2010:2426; fn.2) reports that Manchester dialect speakers are not sensitive to definiteness of arguments and accept any combination of indefinite and definite nominals.
(31) a. She gave it him.  (TGD)
b. She gave it the boy.

What is crucial about Manchester dialect is that speakers allow THEME passivization, as in (32), only if they also accept TGDs. Haddican & Holmberg (2012) find that although there are speakers who accept TGDs without accepting THEME passives, there are no speakers who accept THEME passives but reject TGDs in their sample. If a speaker only allows DOCs and PDs but no TGDs, she does not accept THEME passives. In other words, the acceptability of THEME passives is strongly correlated with the availability of TGDs. Manchester THEME passives are, thus, derived from TGDs, not DOCs, like Liverpool THEME passives.

(32) a. The ball was given my sister.
b. The letter was sent my mate.
   (THEME passives: derived from TGDs; not from DOCs)
   (*Standard; vManchester)

According to Haddican (2010), verb class and animacy constraint diagnostics both suggest that the TGD is an underlying DOC rather than an underlying PD in Manchester dialect. TGDs are not good with Latinate verbs (33a), manner of communication verbs (33b), verbs of continuous imparting force (33c), which are used in PDs only (and not in DOCs) in both Standard English and Manchester dialect.

(33) a. *She donated it me.
b. *She whispered/shouted it me.
c. *She pushed/lifted it me.
   (Haddican & Holmberg (2012:74))

The canonical DOC verb refuse is fine in Manchester TGDs, as shown in (34).

(34) She refused it me.  (Haddican & Holmberg (2012:74))

Unlike Liverpool TGDs, Manchester TGDs do not allow inanimate GOALs with

---

12 Haddican (2010) notes that a few speakers treat TGDs like PDs in the diagnostics discussed below; hence he marks TGD examples with % marking. I will, instead, use * marking to represent acceptability judgment of most speakers, who treat TGDs like DOCs, here.
verbs of motion, as in (35), which also supports an alternative DOC analysis.

(35) *I sent the letter/it France. (cf. Haddican (2010:2428; figure 2))

Haddican (2010:2431) also provides nominalization data (36) as additional argument. For more arguments, see Haddican (2010:2431-2432).

(36) a. the giving of it to me. (PD: √Standard; √Manchester)  
b. *the giving of me it. (DOC: *Standard; *Manchester)  
c. *the giving of it me. (TDG: *Manchester)

How about A’-movement? Although Haddican (2010) and Haddican & Holmberg (2012) do not really discuss A’-movement facts and collection of more data seems necessary, Haddican (2010:2432, fn. 10) reports that Manchester dialect speakers accepting TGDs do not accept wh-GOAL questions, as shown in (37b) and (37c). Both DOCs and TGDs do not permit wh-GOAL movement.

(37) a. Who did she give it to? (PD: √Standard; √Manchester)  
b. *Who did she give _ _ it? (DOC: *Standard; *Manchester)  
c. *Who did she give it _ _ ? (TDG: *Manchester)

Haddican (2010) takes this as a supporting argument for the DOC analysis of Manchester TGDs. Although we do not have additional A’-extraction examples, the verb give is one of the most basic and frequently used DOC (TGD) verbs, and I will take (37c) as an example showing that no A’-movement of the GOAL argument is possible from either DOCs or TGDs in Manchester dialect.

4.2.2. Manchester dialect and Park’s Generalization

THEME passives of Manchester dialect are derived from TGDs (i.e. an alternative DOCs), and not from regular DOCs. Wh-GOAL movement is not available in Manchester dialect. As summarized in (38), Manchester DOCs pattern with

---

13 Sentences like the following (ia) and (ib) (with canonical DOC verbs) are all expected to be degraded in Manchester dialect. Unfortunately, I could not collect data on this point as Haddican is not a native speaker of Manchester dialect himself. I hope to be able to check this in near future to confirm the lack of A’-movement of the GOAL in the dialect.

(i) a. Who did she refuse the ice cream?  
    b. Who did she deny the charge?
American and Standard British English. Manchester TGDs allow THEME passivization but no wh-GOAL movement.

(38) Manchester dialect:
   a. DOC: (i) *THEME passivization (32); \( \checkmark \) GOAL passivization
      (ii) \( \checkmark \)wh-THEME movement; *wh-GOAL movement (37b)
   b. TGD: (i) \( \checkmark \)THEME passivization (32)
      (ii) *wh-GOAL movement (37c)
      (where TGD = alternative DOC)

Manchester TGDs argue against Park’s (2012) Generalization because the correlation between the availability of THEME passives and that of wh-GOAL questions breaks down in this dialect. Under Park’s (2012) Case-absorption approach to passivization, the THEME argument must have a structural Case in TGDs as it undergoes passivization. This, in turn, means that the GOAL argument has an inherent Case, which is not subject to freezing. We would, then, predict the GOAL to be able to undergo wh-movement, contrary to fact.

A crucial ingredient of Park’s (2012) proposal is the assumption that there are one structural Case & one inherent Case for two ditransitive object arguments in DOCs (or TGDs for us here). Although inherent Case has been posited for an argument, say, for the THEME argument in American English, in many previous works, including Park (2012), to capture the lack of THEME passivization in such languages, there is no independent evidence for the assumption that the THEME argument has an inherent Case or for the assumption that there are one structural Case & one inherent Case in ditransitive verb phrases. See footnote 20 in section 5 on this issue.

4.3. Lancashire dialect

4.3.1. A and A’-movement

In this section, I will consider (west) Lancashire dialect as documented by Myler (2010) and Nye (2010).14 Lancashire dialect also shows a correlation between acceptance of TGDs and acceptance of THEME passives, as given in (39) and

---

14 Neil Myler is a native Lancashire dialect speaker from Ormskirk in southwest Lancashire. Rachel Nye is also a native speaker of Lancashire, which she refers to as parts of Greater Manchester and Blackburn with Darwen. I cross-checked data reported in their work, and found their data to be consistent to each other.
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(40), respectively: there is a general trend that only speakers allowing TGDs accept THEME passivization, which suggests that there is no THEME passives derived from DOCs (Nye (2010: fn. 10)).

(39) TGDs (cf. Nye 2010):
   a. He gave it him.
   b. I gave the books the students.
   c. He assigned two new topics every girl in the class.
   d. I promised these jumpers my nephews by Christmas.
   e. I gave the meat Mary raw.

(40) THEME passives (derived from TGDs; not from DOCs):
   a. Books were given the children. (Myler (p.c.))
   b. A book was sent the man. (Myler (p.c.))
   c. (?) The antique book was given the professor on his 60th birthday. (Nye (2010))
   d. (?) The book was lent the man (by Sarah). (Nye (2010))

"Standard: /Lancashire"

According to Myler (2010, p.c.), there is much variation in the restrictions on TGDs in terms of (pro)nominality and (in)definiteness. As for THEME

---

15 Nye (2010) mentions Czepuch (1982/3), who reports that three out of four informants accept THEME passivization, which suggests that there is no THEME passives derived from DOCs. Myler (2010) also says that there are speakers like that around, at least anecdotally. However, Nye (2010) says that her own findings suggest a correlation between TGDs and THEME passives. So, there is a possibility open that THEME passives are allowed beyond the situations where TGDs are allowed, and we may reach a different picture. But, even if THEME passivization may turn out to be possible out of regular DOCs for some speakers, it still remains to be checked whether those speakers may also accept wh-GOAL questions, i.e. whether THEME passivization and wh-GOAL movement are correlated for those speakers in the manner presented in (3) and (4).

16 Myler (2010) reports that 'DP>pro' combination is not good, like Liverpool dialect (although Biggs (2013) says that it becomes fine with contrastive stress on the pronominal GOAL). See footnote 9 for relevant remarks. The 'pro>DP' combination and the combination of two definite DPs are relatively fine; it may be possible to have 'indefinite DP>indefinite DP' combination or 'definite DP>indefinite DP' combination; but the combination of 'indefinite DP>definite DP is reported to be bad (e.g. "He gave a book/books the children"). Although Biggs (2013) reports that it also becomes good with contrastive stress on the definite GOAL. This seems to reflect information structure/discourse constraint on the order between old information and new information such a way that old information precedes new information in general. It is not a TGD-specific constraint, as DOCs (and PDs) are also subject to some information structure/discourse-related constraints (cf. Choi (2005) for further references on the matter). As mentioned above, Manchester dialect does not exhibit sensitivity to (in)definiteness.
passivization, Myler (p.c.) mentions that THEME passivization is fine in the dialect as long as the remaining GOAL argument is definite -- so, passive sentences like 'Books were given children.' with an indefinite THEME are not acceptable as opposed to the acceptable (40a) with a definite GOAL.17

The next question for us is whether Lancashire speakers treat TGDs like DOCs or PDs. Myler (2010) argues that TGDs behave like DOCs, based on the verb class and animacy constraint diagnostics: it is shown that TGDs are not available with canonical PD verb donate (41a); but the canonical DOC verb refuse is (more or less) grammatical with TGDs (41b); the GOAL of TGDs cannot be an inanimate entity such as France, as in (41c), showing that TGDs are sensitive to animacy constraint typical of DOCs.

(41) a. *I'm going to donate the books the library.
   b. ?He refused the opportunity the man.
   c. He sent the letter John/*France.

Based on these diagnostics, we can conclude that Lancashire TGD is an alternative DOC.

Lancashire dialect also has wh-GOAL questions: it is fine to extract wh-GOAL argument within and over clause boundary, as shown in (42a,b) and (42c), respectively. Non-Lancashire speakers are reported to reject (43) as it violates superiority condition (from DOCs), but Lancashire speakers readily accept it, suggesting that the underlying source of wh-GOAL question (43) is not DOCs (with the GOAL in the structurally higher position than the THEME) but TGDs (with the THEME in the higher position than the GOAL).18,19

17 The difference between TGDs and THEME passives in terms of (in)definiteness (as well as pronominality) is one of the more difficult puzzles in Lancashire ditransitivites, for which I do not have a solution now and will leave for future research.

18 Myler (p.c.) says that there is a subtle but consistent effect for (in)definiteness in wh-GOAL questions as well, in such a way that GOAL extraction is perfect if the remaining THEME is definite but degrades slightly (to ? or ??, depending on speakers) if the THEME is indefinite, as shown in (i). However, the degree of (in)definiteness in wh-movement is less strong than that in THEME passivization.

(i) a. ?Who did you give a book/book?
   b. ?Who did you refuse ice cream?

19 There is evidence from Barsi and Lasnik's (1986) tests that the THEME c-commands the GOAL in TGDs, as shown in (i)-(iii).

(i) a. ?She gave everybody, its, owner.
(42) a. Who did you give the book?
   b. Who did they deny their rights?
   c. Who did you say he gave the book? (Myler (p.c.))

(43) Which book did you give who? (on non-echoic reading)
   (√Lancashire speakers; *non-Lancashire speakers (cf. Nye 2010))
   (Superiority context: derived from TGDs; not from DOCs)

Consider (44) as well. There is no weak crossover effect for Lancashire speakers, suggesting again that wh-THEME originates in a position higher than the GOAL, as in TGDs; if the underlying source of (44) were DOCs, we would expect weak crossover effect as in non-Lancashire speakers.

(44) Whose pay did you send his mother?
   (√Lancashire speakers; *non-Lancashire speakers (cf. Nye 2010))
   (WCO context: derived from TGDs; not from DOCs)

4.3.2. Lancashire dialect and Park’s Generalization

Both THEME passives and wh-GOAL questions are derived from TGDs rather than from DOCs in Lancashire dialect. Lancashire DOCs, like DOCs of American English and Standard British English, do not allow THEME passivization and wh-GOAL movement, as summarized in (45).

(45) Lancashire dialect:
   a. DOC: (i) *THEME passivization (40); √GOAL passivization
      (ii) √wh-THEME movement; *wh-GOAL movement (43, 44)
   b. TGD: (i) √THEME passivization (40)
      (ii) √wh-GOAL movement (42, 43, 44)
      (where TGD = alternative DOC)

Although Lancashire THEME passives and wh-GOAL questions are not derived from DOCs, contrary to Park’s (2012) description of "British English", and

b. *She gave his book every man. (Myler (2010), Nye (2010))
   (ii) a. ?The teacher lent each book the other’s owner.
       b. *The teacher lent the other’s book each boy. (Nye (2010))
   (iii) a. ?I sent no presents any of the children.
       b. *I sent any of the packages none of the children. (Nye (2010))
from TGDs, Park’s (2012) Generalization can be held with Lancashire dialect, because THEME passivization and wh-GOAL movement appear to be correlated.

5. Analysis

As pointed out in section 4, Park (2012) cannot account for the whole range of dialectal variation. In addition to the empirical inadequacies and overgeneralization on British English data, there are two problems, which are related to (i) postulation of inherent Case in English ditransitives and (ii) his way of implementing freezing effects linked with structural Case licensing. In this section, I will develop an analysis for the described dialectal variation.

To repeat facts regarding dialectal variations observed in British English ditransitives, A and A’-movement patterns from DOCs are the same in American English, Standard British English, and all three dialects discussed here in that only GOAL passivization and wh-THEME movement are available. Liverpool TGDs, which are analyzed as a covert PD, yield both THEME passivization and wh-GOAL movement. In Manchester and Lancashire dialects, THEME passives are available from TGDs, where they behave like DOCs. However, these two dialects differ regarding the possibility of wh-GOAL movement.

To account for this, I will assume Georgala’s (2012) raising/thematic applicative structures introduced in footnote 5 in section 3, repeated as (46a,b) here, which maintains Pylkkänen’s (2008) insight in her high/low applicative theory based on semantic considerations but avoids many problems associated with low applicative structure therein (cf. Larson (2010), Georgala (2012)). Georgala’s main thesis is that both applicative projections are above VP, but applied objects (such as IO) start out in the lower position within VP in raising applicatives (corresponding to Pylkkänen’s low applicatives) and moves into the specifier of Appl, which is an expletive head introducing no argument but serving as a licensor for the highest DP selected by the lexical verb. As English ditransitives have low applicative semantics encoding possession relationship between two DPs, according to Pylkkänen (2008), they will be given a raising applicative structure.

\[\text{(46) a. Thematic applicatives (= high applicatives)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[SP SUB [v [AppP IO\_BEF/LOC/INSTR\ldots [AppP APPI [VP V DO]]]]]}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{b. Raising applicatives (replacing low applicatives)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[SP SUB [v [AppP IO\_REC [AppP APPI [VP to [v V DO]]]]]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[EPP]}\end{array}
\]
Georgala (2012) also makes the following assumptions: (i) Appl has an EPP feature; (ii) both $v$ and APPL have an ability to value Case of an element they Agree with; (iii) the ordering between EPP and (Case) Agree is not fixed.

I will follow these three assumptions of Georgala’s. In addition, I will also assume that both $v$ and APPL have uninterpretable person features associated with structural Case, and give the value structural ‘accusative’ to the uninterpretable Case features on the elements with which they Agree, i.e. both THEME and GOAL bear structural Case in English DOCs, contrary to Park’s (2012) approach.20

Let’s first consider DOCs whose movement pattern is asymmetric in both A and A’-movement contexts across all English dialects considered in this paper. The schematic representation for the DOC is given in (47), and the analysis is the same as Georgala’s analysis for American English DOCs. In DOCs, EPP is assumed to precede Agree, so (i) GOAL raises to [Spec, AppIP] for EPP checking as it is the closest matching goal for the probe Appl; (ii) then, Agree takes place between Appl and THEME, which is the closest matching goal, at which point the trace of the GOAL is invisible to this Agree; (iii) finally $v$ Agrees with the raised GOAL.

20 Recall our discussion at the end of 4.2.2. According to Woolford (2006), crosslinguistically, only external arguments and DP GOALS may have inherent Case, and THEMEs never get inherent Case. Woolford (2006:115) mentions “although Burzio (1986) claimed that themes get inherent accusative Case when they occur as the second object in the double accusative construction, that claim had only theory-internal motivation: to explain how the second object gets accusative Case in the passive under the assumption that passive verbs cannot license structural Case....There appears to be no independent motivation for an inherent accusative Case....”

Woolford (2006:119) also shows that structural Case is not preserved under passivization, and that although inherent Case is preserved in general, it may also change in contexts where nonstructural Cases are prohibited. In English, the GOAL always changes its Case to nominative in passivization and [Spec,TP] is never a position with possibilities of allowing nonstructural Case depending on verb types. So, the English GOAL argument also has to bear structural Case.

In sum, if we follow Woolford (2006), we must conclude that both the THEME and the GOAL in English ditransitives have structural Case.
In passivization, v's ability to value Case is absorbed and the T is the closest probe that can value the GOAL's Case, which makes only GOAL passivization to obtain in DOCs.

Why is wh-GOAL movement banned from DOCs? Here I will assume, following Lohndal (2011), that structural Case feature checking by movement into a checking domain induces freezing effect, whereas in-situ structural Case checking (such as accusative Case checking of direct object by V) and inherent Case checking do not. In (47), as EPP precedes Agree, the GOAL gets its structural Case checking after moving into a checking domain; hence the GOAL gets frozen for further movement, which makes wh-GOAL movement unavailable.

Now, let's consider TGDs of Lancashire dialect and Manchester dialect. As TGDs of these dialects are alternative DOCs, they are also expected to have raising applicative structures. I will assume that TGDs arise via short movement of the THEME argument over the GOAL argument (in a way similar to Scandinavian Object Shift) in raising applicative structures, although I have no answer for motivation of this movement.21

The schematic representation for Lancashire TGDs is given in (48). I assume that Agree precedes EPP, hence (i) Agree takes place between GOAL and Appl; (ii) EPP feature of Appl, then, triggers movement of GOAL into [Spec, ApplP]; (iii) short movement of THEME over GOAL occurs into the outer specifier of ApplP, resulting in TGD order; (iv) At this point, v and the moved THEME enter Agree, valuing THEME's Case.

(48) Lancashire TGDs:

\[\begin{array}{c}
[TP \ [\varepsilon \ T \ [\varepsilon \ v \ [\text{AppP THEME [AppP GOAL [AppP Appl] [VP t GL [V' V t T]]]]]]]]
\end{array}\]

(i) Agree

(ii) EPP-movement

(iii) short THEME movement

In passivization, the THEME raises to [Spec, TP] as the closer goal, resulting

---

21 As TGDs seem to be affected by (pro)nominality and/or (in)definiteness, I speculate that short THEME movement in TGDs may have either morphological or discourse-related motivations.
in THEME passives. Note that Case valuation of the GOAL argument is done \textit{in-situ} before it moves to [Spec, ApplP]. The GOAL argument is, thus, expected to avoid freezing; and it is explained why wh-GOAL movement becomes possible in Lancashire dialect.

Finally, let’s consider Manchester TGDs, for which I further assume that a Linker head (in the sense of Baker and Collins (2006)) is present above Appl, following Haddican & Holmberg (2012), and that the probe assigning Case to the THEME is on this Lk head (instead of on Appl).\footnote{If we do not posit an independent LkP, we may think of the following alternative derivation to account for Manchester TGD facts: (i) GOAL moves to [Spec, ApplP] for EPP; (ii) THEME moves to outer specifier of ApplP; (iii) Agree takes place between \(v\) and THEME, and between Appl and GOAL. Here, the probe (i.e. Appl) should Agree with goal (i.e. GOAL) in its specifier position, which seems dubious.} Thus, the schematic representation in (49) is a hybrid structure of Georgala’s and Haddican & Holmberg’s structures.

In Manchester TGDs, (i) Appl first triggers movement of the GOAL argument into [Spec, ApplP] for EPP; (ii) Agree, then, takes place between Lk and the GOAL, resulting in Case valuation; (iii) the THEME, then, raises into [Spec, LkP], deriving TGDs; (iv) Agree takes place between \(v\) and the THEME argument.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics{diagram.png}
\caption{Manchester TGDs: (i) EPP-movement; (ii) Agree; (iii) short THEME movement; (iv) Agree.}
\end{figure}

In passivization, the THEME moves to [Spec, TP] as the closer argument to \(T\), giving us THEME passives. Case licensing of the GOAL is done after movement, which induces freezing effect; hence wh-GOAL movement is prohibited in Manchester TGDs.

A note on Liverpool TGDs is in order: the GOAL argument is analyzed to
get structural oblique Case licensing by covert preposition. Although structural Case licensing takes place, it is done without movement, so, under the present approach to freezing, no freezing effect is predicted to arise for wh-GOAL movement. Hence, the potential problem with Park’s (2012) implementation of freezing disappears.

Finally, let’s suppose there exists a dialect of British English that does not have TGDs but allow THEME passivization out of DOCs. In the current proposal, it can be analyzed in the following manner (cf. Georgala (2012)): (i) Agree takes place between Appl and GOAL before EPP movement of GOAL, which makes the GOAL escape from freezing effect (and undergo wh-movement); (ii) then, THEME Agrees with v, (making the THEME to raise into [Spec, TP] in passivization). This is the dialect corresponding to what Park (2012) describes as “British English.” Although it remains to be checked whether such dialects exist that allow THEME passivization and wh-movement out of DOCs, the current analysis has a way of explaining them.

In sum, my analysis is different from Park (2012) in three respects: first, 23 In the pre-revision version of this paper, I speculated on a structure in which the THEME is base-merged in a higher position than the GOAL in the manner schematized in (i):

(i) [TP ... [vP ... v [Appl THEME [Appl' Appl [VP V [GOAL ]]]]]]

An anonymous reviewer points out that such a structure is problematic for Baker’s (1988) UTAH. Although it is definitely a correct point, such structures are not unprecedented in applicative literature (cf. Pietrosky (2003), Doggett (2004), McGinnis (2004), Jeong (2007), among others). Pietroski (2003) argues that English DOC's semantics has to be ‘transfer’ + ‘possession’ rather than just ‘possession.’ He captures the ‘transfer’ semantics by positing that THEME is generated in the specifier of an intermediate Larsonian VP shell, whose head encodes the meaning of ‘transfer,’ and the lower shell encodes the GOAL relation and contains the GOAL argument, i.e. his analysis requires the THEME to start off higher than the GOAL. In McGinnis (2004), both upward and downward merge are discussed, and she argues that high applicative structures can be downmerged, which results in the following structure with THEME appearing higher than the GOAL: [vP V [Appl THEME [Appl' VP GOAL]]]. Jeong (2007) argues that PPs can be an applied object (e.g., GOAL) in certain languages and they can appear in a lower position than DP THEME. Even if these proposals may involve problems of their own, I just would like to note that the option in (i) has some predecessors.

Another anonymous reviewer asks whether there is no problem with (i) regarding original motivation of Pylkkänen-style applicative structures based on semantic grounds: if we take Pylkkänen seriously, Park’s (2012) analysis of English ditransitives as high applicative structures already becomes problematic. The problems associated with (i) and high applicative analysis both disappear if we assume Georgala’s (2012) raising applicative analysis in (46b).

24 Another speculation I presented in the pre-revision version was based on the idea that information structure concepts (such as topicality and focality of the object arguments) result in different syntactic structures. Two anonymous reviewers noted that the speculation is rather dubious. Although the consideration of relationship between syntactic structures and information structures in
I maintain Pylkkänen’s insight for possession semantics associated with English ditransitives by positing raising applicative structure (which corresponds to low applicative structures and encodes possession semantics in VP), whereas Park (2012) assumes high applicative structures (whose diagnostics English ditransitives do not pass); Second, I argue that both object arguments get structural Case in English ditransitives (of applicative type), contra Park (2012), in which English DOCs are assumed to have one structural Case and one inherent Case for object arguments; Third, freezing related to structural Case licensing only occurs when it is done after movement into a checking domain; if a structural Case checking is done without movement (e.g., Case licensing for direct object by V, or for prepositional object by P), no freezing effect arises.

6. Concluding remarks

In this paper, I considered three British English dialects spoken in Liverpool, Manchester, and Lancashire area, and showed that none of these dialects exhibit Park’s (2012) "British English" pattern (i.e. symmetric A and A’-movement pattern) out of DOCs. These dialects show asymmetry in both A and A’-movement out of DOCs, just like American English and Standard British English.

These dialects do have THEME passives and wh-GOAL questions, but, they are derived from a third ditransitive frame (i.e. TGDs) present in these dialects. TGDs of Liverpool dialect turned out to be a covert PD, whereas those of Manchester and Liverpool dialects are analyzed as an alternative DOC. TGDs of both dialects allow THEME passives but only Lancashire dialect allows wh-GOAL movement. The unavailability of wh-GOAL movement in Manchester TGDs suggests that Park’s (2012) Generalization based on the assumption about the correlation between THEME passivization and GOAL’s inherent Case cannot be maintained. The described dialectal variations can be accounted for if we assume the following: (i) both THEME and GOAL get structural Case licensing; (ii) English ditransitives are analyzed as Georgala’s (2012) raising applicatives with free ordering between EPP and Agree; (iii) Case checking of an element by movement into a checking domain induces freezing effect for further movement; and (iv) Manchester dialect also has a Linker phrase.

This study, of course, has limitations. Collection of more data from more speakers is necessary along with closer analyses of each dialect with consideration of (pro)nominality and (in)definiteness restrictions. A’-movement contexts such as ditransitive contexts seems an interesting issue, I will leave it for future work.
Heavy NP Shift, relative clause formation, and tough-movement in addition to wh-movement should also be tested to confirm the differing A’-movement patterns across dialects. Data from dialects beyond these regions and from potential speakers allowing THEME passives without accepting TGDs also have to be searched to discuss the whole range of British English pattern. It would also be necessary, from cross-linguistic perspective, to investigate other symmetric movement languages such as Norwegian and Chaga, for example, whether there is any variation within dialects of these languages, and whether there is correlation between passivization and A’-movement (mediated by Case).

Acknowledging these limitations, this paper, however, has shown that we cannot simply take a lumping approach to British English pattern, and that variations amongst dialects have to be taken into consideration in any analysis.
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