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1. Introduction

Ditransitive verbs have two internal arguments, a Theme argument and a Goal argument. In Northwest British English dialects, we can find a ditransitive verb frame in which the Theme argument precedes the Goal argument but the preposition to is missing from the Goal argument, as in (1).

* I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their comments. All remaining errors and inconsistencies are solely mine.
I will call this frame Theme-Goal Ditransitives (TGD), following the literature. Although this pattern exists only as a dialectal variation in present-day British English, it was present in earlier stages of English, according to Gerwin (2013).

(1) Theme-Goal Ditransitives (TGD)
   a. % John gave it the teacher.
   b. % Mary sent the ball my brother.

This frame exists as a third ditransitive frame in addition to the well-known ditransitive frames that occur in all varieties of English, namely, the double object constructions (DOC) (2) and the prepositional dative construction (PDC) (3). In the DOC, the DP Goal argument precedes the DP Theme argument, whereas, in the PDC, the DP Theme argument precedes the PP Goal argument. Many ditransitive verbs participate in the dative alternation between these two frames.

(2) Double object constructions (DOC)
   a. John sent Mary some flowers.
   b. John gave Mary a book.

(3) Prepositional dative constructions (PDC)
   a. John sent some flowers to Mary.
   b. John gave a book to Mary.

In the literature, there are some discussions on the TGD structure of Northwest British English dialects including Manchester English (Haddican 2010, Haddican and Holmberg 2012), Lancashire English (Gast 2007, Siewierska and Hollmann 2007, Myler 2011, Nye 2012, Myler 2013), and Liverpool English (Biggs 2010, 2015). Although these subvarieties of Northwest British English all have the TGD on the surface, there seem to be micro-variations among them. Biggs (2013, 2015), for instance, shows that the Liverpool TGD is an alternative PDC which is derived from regular PDCs through the application of Preposition drop. Haddican (2010) and Haddican and Holmberg (2012) argue that the Manchester TGD is derived from the DOC via short object shift of the Theme argument over the Goal argument. As for Lancashire English, Myler (2010, 2013) argue that it is an alternative DOC, whereas Nye (2010) argues that it is an alternative PDC.

In this paper, I will review the data presented in Myler (2010, 2013) and Nye
(2010), and propose that the Lancashire TGD is derived from the DOC via Theme object shift. In section 2, I will describe semantic properties of the TGD and establish that it is a variant of the DOC. In section 3, I will summarize previous approaches to standard ditransitive alternations in the literature and describe a potential analysis for the TGD, namely, the rightward Goal shift analysis. In sections 4.1 through 4.4, I will refute the rightward Goal shift analysis, and argue for a Theme object shift analysis. Section 5 offers concluding remarks.

2. Lancashire Theme-Goal Ditransitives: a Variant of the DOC

In this section, I will focus on a variety of Northwest British English spoken in West Lancashire region as documented by Myler (2010, 2013) and Nye (2010), who are native speakers of that dialect, in addition to newly collected data through personal communications with Myler.

Many ditransitive verbs may participate in the alternation between the PDC and the DOC. However, certain verb classes are compatible only with the DOC and others only with the PDC. As is well-known, Latinate verbs (such as contribute, donate, exhibit, reveal, etc.), manner of communication verbs (such as mutter, shout, whisper, yell, etc.), and verbs of continuous imparting of force (such as carry, lift, lower, pull, push, etc.) are compatible with the PDC only, as we can see in (4), (5), and (6), respectively. (See Levin 1993, Haddican 2010, Myler 2010, Biggs 2013, 2015 for more data.)

(4) Latinate verbs:
   a. She donated money to the fund. (PDC)
   b. *She donated the fund money. (DOC)

(5) Verbs of manner of communication:
   a. She whispered the answer to me. (PDC)
   b. *She whispered me the answer. (DOC)

(6) Verbs of continuous imparting of force:
   a. She pushed it to me. (PDC)
   b. *She pushed me it. (DOC)

On the other hand, verbs such as prevention of possession verbs (such as cost,
**deny, refuse** occur only in the DOC, as we can see in (7).

(7) Verbs of prevention of possession (Biggs 2015):
   a. *The car cost five grand to Beth. (PDC)
   b. The car cost Beth five grand. (DOC)
   c. *She denied the ice cream to the child. (PDC)
   d. She denied the child the ice cream. (DOC)

With respect to these verb classes, Lancashire English patterns with the DOC, and not with the PDC, as we can see in (8) (Myler 2010).

(8) Lancashire TGDs:
   a. *I’m going to **donate** the books the library. (Latinate verbs)
   b. ?He **refused** the opportunity the man. (Verbs of prevention of possession)

It is well-known that the DOC exhibits animacy constraints for the Goal argument (Oehrle 1976). In the PDC (9a), both animate and inanimate Goals are allowed; in the DOC (9b) only animate Goals are fine. (In the literature, animacy constraints are shown almost always with verbs like **send**. I will discuss this point regarding verb types in section 3.)

(9) a. I sent a package to the **boarder/the border**. (PDC)
    b. I sent the **boarder/*the border** a package. (DOC)

What is crucial here is that Lancashire TGDs are sensitive to animacy constraints (Myler 2010, Myler (p.c.)) just like the DOC, as shown in (10).

(10) Lancashire TGDs:
    a. He sent the letter John/*France.
    b. I gave the money the **student/*the state**.

I conclude that the Lancashire TGD is a variant of the DOC, following Myler (2010), because it consistently patterns like the DOC rather than the PDC in
terms of animacy constraints and verb class diagnostics.\textsuperscript{1} These semantic properties suggest that Lancashire TGDs have a caused possession meaning like the DOC.

3. Ditransitive Alternations in Standard English

3.1. Previous Approaches

There are two main approaches to the relationship between the two ditransitive frames of all varieties of English in (2) and (3). They are the single meaning/transformational approach and the multiple meaning/alternative projection approach. Single meaning/transformational approaches argue that the DOC and the PDC are derivationally related; i.e. verbs in both structures are assumed to have the same meaning yet appear in two different derivationally related structures. Within this approach two subapproaches differ regarding which is considered the underlying structure. The PDC is argued to be the basic structure in Hall (1965), Baker (1988), Larson (1988), den Dikken (1995), among others. On the other hand, Kiparsky (1985), Dryer (1986), and Aoun and Li (1989) argue that the DOC is the underlying structure from which the PDC is derived. On the other hand, multiple meaning/alternative projection approaches (Hale and Keyser 1996, Arad 1998, Harley 2002, Bruening 2010, 2014, etc.) assume a non-derivational relation between the two frames, and argue that the two frames have distinct meanings and distinct structures, specifically, the DOC with caused possession semantics and App\textsc{IP} plus VP layers; and the PDC with caused motion/locative semantics and just VP layer. See section 3.2 for the syntactic structure of these frames.

Recently, Bruening (2010, 2014) argue that some surface instances of PDCs are actually DOCs, and that they are derived from the DOC via the process of what he calls “R(rightward)-dative shift.” In other words, although the DOC and the

\textsuperscript{1} In Liverpool English (another Northwest British dialect), the situation is exactly the opposite: the animacy constraint is not at work in the TGD. Liverpool English also patterns with the PDC in terms of the verb class compatibility. These constitute supporting arguments for Biggs’ (2010, 2015) PDC analysis of Liverpool TGDs.
PDC have different structures and meanings, some apparent instances of the PDC are actually derived from the DOC. This proposal belongs to the multiple meaning/alternative projection approach but it acknowledges the presence of the derivational relationship between the two frames at least under certain conditions, specifically, when the Goal argument is involved in A’-processes such as wh-movement and heavy shift.

According to Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008), almost all approaches are uniform approaches because all dative verbs are assumed to be associated with either one meaning or two meanings. In other words, they are either the uniform single meaning approach or the uniform multiple meaning approach. Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008), developing insights of Jackendoff (1990), propose a verb sensitivity approach. In this approach, verbs like give and sell involve only a change-of-possession meaning, whereas verbs like send and throw involve both change of possession and change-of-location meanings inherently, as cited in (11).

(11) A summary of the verb-sensitivity approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dative Frame</th>
<th>Double Object Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>give-type verbs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caused possession</td>
<td>caused possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throw-type verbs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caused motion or caused possession</td>
<td>caused possession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008:3))

The following (12) gives a list of give-type verbs and send-type verbs in Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008).

(12) a. Give-type verbs: assign, give, lend, loan, offer, promise, rent, sell...
    b. Send-type verbs: forward, hand, mail, send, ship... ; includes throw-type verbs: flip, kick, shoot, toss...

Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008) show that give-type verbs and send-type verbs are different in terms of the (in)ability to question the to-phrase with the question word where, as in (13). Unlike send-type verbs, give-type verbs cannot select spatial prepositions other than to, as in (14), nor take a source phrase, as in (15).
(13) (In)ability to question the to-phrase with where:
   a. To whom/where did you throw/send the ball? (send-type)
   b. To whom/*where did you give the ball? (give-type)
   (cited from Levinson 2005)

(14) (In)ability to select spatial prepositions beside to:
   a. Fred threw/sent the ball under the porch/behind the tree/over the fence. (send-type)
   b. *Fred gave the ball at/behind/over Mary. (give-type)

(15) (In)ability to take a source phrase:
   a. Jill threw/sent the ball from home plate to third base. (send-type)
   b. *Josie gave/offered the tickets from Marla to Bill. (give-type)

Recently, Hallman (2015) proposed a similar analysis to that of Bruening’s, incorporating main insights of Rappaport Hovav and Levin’s (2008) verb-sensitivity approach. The proposal is that in the case of give-type verbs, both the PDC and the DOC always have only caused possession semantics, and that the PDC is derived from the DOC; For send-type verbs, on the other hand, the PDC is syntactically ambiguous between the derived possessive structure from the DOC (with a caused possession meaning) and the base-generated locative structure (with a caused motion/locative meaning). In other words, the PDC of give-type verbs are always derived from the DOC, whereas the PDC of the send-type verbs are of two sorts, one derived from the DOC and the other base-generated as such. Hallman (2015:405) notes that give-type verbs show animacy effects even in the PDC frame, as we can see in the contrast between (16) and (17). On the other hand, send-type verbs show animacy constraints in the DOC only, as shown in (18) (repeated from (9)). Only send-type verbs can have inanimate Goals that are compatible with locative semantics.

(16) Give-type verbs in the DOC
   a. I gave Mary/*the cupboard the dishes.
   b. I lent Mary/*London my bicycle.
   c. I offered Mary/*my car a car wash.

(17) Give-type verbs in the PDC
   a. I gave the dishes to Mary/*to the cupboard.
   b. I lent my bicycle to Mary/*to London.
   c. I offered a car wash to Mary/*to my car.
(18) *Send*-type verbs in the DOC (repeated from (9))
   a. I sent a package to the boarder/ the border. (PDC)
   b. I sent the boarder/*the border a package. (DOC)

Hallman (2015) also shows that the DOC and the PDC (with animate Goals) may behave the same way with respect to the availability of purpose clauses. In both the DOC (19a,b) and the PDC (19c,d), the Goal argument can control the PRO in the purpose clause; whereas in true locative structures in (20), the locative PP argument cannot control the PRO subject of the purpose clause. The contrast between (19c,d) and (20) shows that true locative PPs and to-dative PPs are not in the same structural position.

(19) Purpose clauses in DOCs and PDCs:
   a. Mary gave John, a puppy [CP Op [IP PRO to play with t]].
   b. Mary sent John, a manuscript [CP Op [IP PRO to read t]].
   c. Mary gave a puppy to John, [CP Op [IP PRO to play with t]].
   d. Mary sent a manuscript to John, [CP Op [IP PRO to read t]].

(20) Purpose clauses in true locative constructions:
   a. *Mary put the child on the horse, [CP Op [PRO to carry t]].
   b. *Mary led the horse to John, [CP Op [PRO to feed t]].

Based on the evidence from this distribution of purpose clauses, Hallman concludes that some apparent PDCs are actually derived from DOCs, and that the Goal argument of the *send*-type verbs appear higher than the Theme in the derived PDC structure (with a caused possession meaning) but lower than the Theme in the base-generated PDC structure (with a caused motion meaning). Bruening and Hallman both argue that some surface PDCs are actually alternative DOCs, although details of these proposals are quite different.

3.2. Rightward Goal Shift

As for the structure of these two canonical ditransitive frames, many different proposals have been put forward (See Harley and Miyagawa (to appear) for a nice summary). In this paper, I will assume (21) for the base-generated PDC with locative semantics (as is assumed by most proposals, including Bruening and
Hallman), in which both the Theme and the Goal are merged within the same projection, VP.

Regarding the DOC, both Bruening and Hallman, as well as many others, assume an applicative structure, where an independent ApplP is merged over the VP and hosts indirect/applied objects like Goal, Beneficiary, etc, as in (22). (See Marantz 1993, Doggett 2004, Pylkkänen 2008, Citko 2011, among others.)

As for the apparent PDC, which is an alternative DOC, Bruening and Hallman propose a structure like (23). Bruening, specifically, proposes that R(rightward)-dative shift is involved in apparent PDCs; hence the Goal argument appears in the rightward specifier position of the ApplP. Hallman, on the other hand, proposes that internal passivization-like processes are involved in deriving the PDC from the DOC, and thus the Goal is demoted to become an adjunct for Appl’ (i.e. his \( v_2’ \)). A rightward Goal shift is at the heart of deriving these apparent PDCs. In the base-generated PDC structure (21), there is no ApplP and the Theme asymmetrically c-commands the Goal in the same minimal VP. In the derived PDC (23), it is the Goal that is in a higher position than the Theme, and they are in different projections, the ApplP and the VP, respectively.

(21) Base-generated PDCs with locative semantics:

```
... vP (VoiceP)
   /  \
  /    \ 
Subj v'
    /  \ 
   /    \ 
  v_CAUSE VP
     /  \
    /    \ 
  Theme V'
     /     \
    /       \ 
   V PP_loc
      /  \ 
     /   \ 
    Goal
```
(22) DOCs:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
  \ldots \\
  \text{vP (=VoiceP)} \\
  \text{Subj} \\
  \text{v} \\
  \text{v}_{\text{CUSE}} \\
  \text{vP (=ApplP)} \\
  \text{Goal} \\
  \text{v} (=\text{Appl'}) \\
  (=\text{ApplP}) \\
  \text{VP} \\
  \text{V} \\
  \text{DP} \\
  \text{Theme}
\end{array}
\]

(23) Derived PDCs (with rightward Goal shift):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
  \ldots \\
  \text{vP (=VoiceP)} \\
  \text{Subj} \\
  \text{v} \\
  \text{v}_{\text{CUSE}} \\
  \text{ApplP} \\
  \text{Appl'} \leftarrow \text{GOAL} \text{ (See Bruening)} \\
  \text{Appl'} \leftarrow \text{GOAL} \text{ (See Hallman)} \\
  \text{Appl} \\
  \text{VP} \\
  \text{V} \\
  \text{Theme}
\end{array}
\]

In the next section, I will examine whether the Lancashire TGD with the Theme-Goal order (another variant of the DOC) also involves this rightward
appearance of the Goal argument, whether it involves Bruening’s R-dative shift or Hallman’s internal passivization, or some other processes.

4. Deriving Lancashire Theme-Goal Ditransitives

In this section, I will examine two possible analyses for the derivation of the Lancashire TGD from the canonical DOC. One analysis is the rightward Goal shift analysis as depicted above in (23). The other analysis is the short Theme object shift analysis proposed for Manchester TGDs in Haddican (2010) and Haddican and Holmberg (2012).

4.1. Short Object Shift of Theme Argument

Haddican (2010) and Haddican and Holmberg (2012) argue that the Manchester TGD is a true DOC and that it is derived from the canonical DOC. They argue that the Manchester TGD is not derived from the PDC, nor is it a third variant with the Theme first-merged above the Goal. They present data regarding animacy constraints on the Goal, verb class restrictions, and nominalizations to support their DOC analysis of the Manchester TGD.

According to Haddican (2010) and Haddican and Holmberg (2012), the Theme-Goal order is derived via movement of the Theme to an outer specifier of the same head hosting the Goal argument, i.e. the TGD is derived as an outcome of the Theme object shift in the DOC structure, as in (24b). If there is no object shift we get ordinary DOCS; if the short object shift applies we get the TGD construction. In this structure, when we get the TGD, the Theme argument comes to be in a structurally higher position than the Goal argument.

(24) a. DOC: 
\[
[TP \ldots [VP \ldots [App\,\, GOAL [App\,\, Appl [VP \, V \, Theme \,]]]]]
\]
b. TGD (with Theme object shift): 
\[
[TP \ldots [VP \ldots [App\,\, THEME [App\,\, GOAL [App\,\, Appl [VP \, V \, t_{TH}]]]]]]
\]
As for the structural relation between the Goal and the Theme, the two analyses in (23) and (24b) differ. In (23) (with rightward processes for the Goal), the Goal asymmetrically c-commands the Theme; In (24b) (with leftward object shift of the Theme), the situation is the opposite.

4.2. Structural Asymmetries: Barss and Lasnik’s Tests

In this section, I will discuss Barss and Lasnik’s (1986) diagnostics for the structural relation between the arguments. All the data given here are taken from Nye (2010). First, the sentences in (25) show the relation between quantifiers and pronominal variables. A quantifier must c-command a pronoun at S-structure if it is to bind it (Larson 1988). The contrast between (25a) and (25b) suggests that the Theme argument is structurally higher than the Goal argument.

(25) a. ? I gave/sent [every cheque]_i [its_its rightful owner].
    b. *I gave/sent [his_i pay-cheque][every worker].

Secondly, the sentence (26) concerns wh-movement and WCO (weak crossover) facts. A wh-phrase c-commanded at D-structure by an NP containing a pronoun cannot be moved over that NP if wh- and the pronoun are coreferential (Larson 1988), which means that a wh-phrase cannot start off a position lower than a coreferential pronoun. In (26), wh-movement of the Theme argument whose pay does not invoke WCO, suggesting that it does not cross the Goal argument as it is in a structurally higher position than the Goal.

(26) [Whose_i pay]_j did you send t_j his_i mother?

Thirdly, the distribution of both each...other construction in (27) and NPIs like any in (28) shows that the Theme is structurally higher than the Goal, as it is a standard assumption that other NPs and NPIs should be in the domain of (i.e. c-commanded by) each NPs and negative elements, respectively.

(27) a. ? The teacher lent [each book] [the other’s owner].
    b. *The teacher lent [the other’s book] [each boy].
(28) a. ?I gave [nothing] [anyone].
   b. *I gave [anything] [no one].
   c. ?I sent [no presents] [any of the children].
   d. *I sent [any of the packages] [none of the children].

To sum up, Barss and Lasnik’s diagnostics all seem to suggest that the Theme argument is structurally higher than the Goal argument. This favors the Theme object shift analysis in (24b) over the rightward Goal shift analysis in (23).

4.3. Passivization and Quantifier Scope

Now, let’s consider passivization. In canonical DOCs, only the Goal argument can be passivized, as we can see in (29). In locality approaches to passive movement (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Doggett 2004, etc.), the Goal argument in Spec, Appliance is closer to the subject position than the Theme argument in the VP. (See the tree diagram (22).) Hence, it is correctly predicted that only Goal passivization is possible in the DOC. In the PDC (30) (with the tree diagram in (21)), on the contrary, only Theme passivization is possible. The DP within the PP Goal cannot move out of the PP to undergo passivization, as shown in (30c). The Goal argument is not as close to the subject position as the Theme argument. Moreover, there is no motivation for it to move to the subject position as it is already case licensed by the preposition to.

(29) DOCs:
   b. *A book was given _ John. (Theme passive)
   c. John was given _ a book. (Goal passive)

(30) PDCs:
   b. His book was sent _ to Mary/to London. (Theme passive)
   c. *Mary/London was sent his book to__. (Goal passive)

Now consider passivization of the Lancashire TGD. Myler (2010) shows that it is impossible for the Goal argument to move into the subject position, as (32c) and (32d) show. Only the Theme argument can be passivized (31b-f).
(31) Theme passives in the Lancashire TGD
   a. I gave the children books.
   b. Books were given _ the children. (Myler (p.c.))
   c. A book was sent _ the man. (Myler (p.c.))
   d. I was sent _ the shops. (Myler 2010)
   e. (?)The antique book was given _ the professor on his 60th birthday. (Nye 2010)
   f. (?) The book was lent _ the man (by Sarah). (Nye 2010)

(32) Goal passives in the Lancashire TGD (Myler 2010)
   a. Me nan sent me the shops.
   b. My dad took me the pub.
   c. *The shops were sent me _ (by me nan).
   d. *The pub was taken me _ (by my dad).

If the Theme argument is structurally higher than the Goal argument, and thus is closer to the subject position, we can account for why only Theme passives are possible under the locality approach. This, again, supports the Theme object shift analysis in (24b) rather than the rightward Goal shift analysis in (23).

Finally, let's consider quantifier scope interpretations. It is documented in the literature that the TGD is more common with pronominal arguments. But Myler (2010) and Nye (2010) also note that the acceptance of TGDs with at least one full lexical DP is a feature of Northwest British English too. And it is also well agreed upon that the Theme and the Goal in the TGD follow general information-related constraints such that a pronoun comes before a full DP; that a definite DP comes before an indefinite DP; that a given DP comes before a new DP.

Myler (personal communications) says that he has another idiolectal restriction for the TGD such that two quantified DP arguments cannot appear so he cannot test quantifier scope relations between the Theme and the Goal. However, Nye (2010) presents the sentences in (33) to discuss quantifier scope relations in the Lancashire TGD. Considering the scarcity of data, the discussion below is only tentative at best and further data collection is necessary. As we can see in (33b), there is scope freezing in the DOC and only the surface scope reading is available. In the PDC (33a), both surface and inverse scope readings are possible. Bruening (2001) argues that scope ambiguity obtains because the Theme and the
Goal are equidistant for QR, being in the same minimal VP in (21). In the DOC (22), QR obeys superiority condition, and the Goal argument is a closer element for QR than the Theme argument, being in a higher projection. In the Lancashire TGD (33c), both surface and inverse scope readings are available.

(33) a. He assigned [two new topics] [to every girl in the class].
   (PDC: two>every, every>two)
   b. He assigned [every girl in the class] [two new topics].
   (DOC: every>two, *two>every)
   c. He assigned [two new topics] [every girl in the class].
   (TGD: two>every, every>two)

In the rightward Goal shift analysis in (23), the Goal argument is in a higher position in the ApplP, whereas the Theme argument is in a lower position in the VP, hence, only the inverse scope reading is predicted to be available. 2 On the other hand, in the Theme object shift analysis (24b), the surface scope reading is accounted for. As for the inverse scope reading, it is not clear whether the Theme can be reconstructed and interpreted in a position within the VP of the canonical DOC, which is the underlying source for the TGD. I will leave this quantifier scope interpretation issue for future research.

4.4. Quantifier Floating, Locative Inversion, and Preposition-Drop

As is well-known, quantifiers can float off a DP, but not off a PP, as the contrast between (34a,c) and (34b) shows.

(34) a. We sent the books (all) to that man.
   b. We sent a refund to those men (*all) by mail.
   c. Mary sent the boys (all) a present.

Now consider TGDs in (35) (from Nye 2010). The unavailability of quantifier floating off the Goal argument in (35b) seems to suggest that the Goal argument is actually a PP.

Bruening (2010), in fact, shows that only the inverse scope reading is available in R-dative shifted PDCs.

2
(35) a. I promised these jumpers (all) my nephew by Christmas.
   (Theme DP in TGD)
b. I promised these jumpers my nephews (*all) by Christmas.
   (Goal in TGD).

It may be the case that the Goal argument in the TGD actually involves a
null preposition to, as in (36).

(36) My dad sent [me] [∅ TO the shops]

In fact, Lancashire English has a Preposition-drop phenomenon. It is noted
in Myler (2010, 2013) and Biggs (2015) that the availability of null to is recently
increasing in Northwest British English, although there are some differences
concerning details across sub-dialects. Myler (2010) observes that the
preposition-drop is restricted to motion verbs such as go, drive, run, etc. as well
as to ditransitive verbs such as send and take, where the Goal argument can only
get a directional interpretation. Some examples are given in (37). Only directional
to in (37a,b) undergoes dropping.

(37) a. Come (to) the pub with me.
   b. Today I’m going (to) the library.
   c. He spoke *(to) the woman.
   d. *Today I’m staying *(at) the library.

Thus, it is plausible that the Goal argument in the TGD involves a null
preposition to, considering this general preposition-drop phenomenon in the
region.

The analysis (24b) is not undermined even if the Goal argument has a null
preposition to. The point is that the TGD is actually a variant of the DOC, as
it involves an applicative structure syntactically, and encodes a caused possession
meaning, just like the canonical DOC. Crucially, we saw that the TGD is not
derived from the PDC. Although DP passivization out of the Goal PP is not
possible from the PDC, the PP itself can undergo movement to the subject
position by locative inversion, as shown in (38). However, locative inversion of
the Goal argument with a null preposition in the TGD is not acceptable, as shown
in (39). The absence of examples such as (39), again, supports an alternative DOC analysis of the PDC. If the Goal argument were like prepositional Goals in the PDC with a null preposition to, we might expect (39) to be an instance of legitimate locative inversion, contrary to fact. This suggests that the TGD is not the same as the PDC. Of course, the assumption that null prepositions behave like overt ones should also be scrutinized.

(38) \[PP \text{To Mary/To London}] was sent his book __.
(locative PP inversion from the PDC)

(39) *\[\emptyset \text{TO The shops}] were sent me __.
(locative null PP inversion from the TGD)

To conclude, Quantifier floating suggests that the Goal argument of the TGD may involve a null preposition to. The unavailability of locative (PP) inversion in the TGD, though, could be taken to support the alternative DOC analysis of the Lancashire TGD.

5. Conclusion

The central thesis of this paper is that in English ditransitive alternations, the DOC is the underlying structure for the Lancashire TGD (and some instances of the PDC). The Lancashire TGD is derived from the DOC via the application of object shift of the Theme argument. Between the Theme object shift analysis and the rightward Goal shift analysis, I supported the former, as it captures various structural asymmetries better than the latter although further investigation is required to give the analysis greater validity. The ditransitive alternation between the DOC and the TGD discussed in this paper is a true alternation; They are derivationally related, and we may consider familiar information-related constraints and phonological heaviness as factors deciding speakers’ choice between these alternating frames.
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