On the lexicon-Information Structure connection

Nomi Erteschik-Shir and Tova Rapoport Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

INTRODUCTION. Word order variation is tied both to lexical differences and differences in information structure, IS. With this in mind, we examine the dative and benefactive alternations:

(1) Dative: Jane gave a shirt to Mary. Benefactive: Jane sewed a shirt for Mary. Jane gave Mary a shirt. Jane sewed Mary a shirt.

We argue that differences in meaning between the alternants, as well as syntactic differences between the two alternations of (1), derive from variation in the projection and interpretation of lexical meaning components; and these interpretations derive corresponding IS distinctions.

LEXICON TO SYNTAX. In our analysis, each alternant is projected directly from a verb's single lexical entry, with differences derived by a combination of free merge of Hale & Keyser (e.g. 1993)-type structures and a requirement of lexical component interpretation.

The lexical representation of dative verbs contains an underspecified location component (L) that must be identified in syntax. L may be identified with the *to*-phrase of the PP-dative (2), yielding the interpretation 'movement of theme to goal': (2) [Jane [gave [a shirt [to=L Mary]]]]

Alternatively, the same L may be identified with the lower subject of the double-object (DOC) structure (3):

(3) [Jane [gave [Mary=L [a shirt]]]]

The lower subject's identification as a location yields the DOC's interpretation of possession (Jackendoff 1976, a.o.). L-identification also derives the individual-level interpretation of the lower predication of DOCs. Thus, the particular L-identification in each structure yields the distinct semantic properties of the dative alternants from the lexical entry of a single verb.

The verbs of the benefactive are creation verbs, whose lexical definition also includes an L-component: We analyze (4) as transitive *appear*, or coming into existence (Basilico 1998):

(4) Jane sewed a shirt→

'Jane caused (by sewing) a shirt to appear in the contextual spatio-temporal location(=L).'

We claim that in the benefactive DOC (the BOC): (5) Jane sewed Mary a shirt. the spatio-temporal location in which a shirt appears is defined by *Mary*; creation is necessarily effected with reference to *Mary*: thus, the range of benefactive interpretations.

The lexicon-based aspect of the analysis captures the insights of others (e.g., Green 1974, Oehrle 1976), without different templates or prepositions, or derivations of one alternant from the other (Larson 1988, Pesetsky 1995, Harley 2002, Hallman 2015, Beavers & Koontz-Garboden 2020).

LEXICON TO IS: We argue that L-identification with the lower subject in the DOC yields an interpretation of a spatio-temporal topic; thus the fixed IS of DOC (Erteschik-Shir 1979, Basilico 1998, Brandt 2000, Jiménez-Fernández 2009): **(6)** Jane gave [Mary=L-Top a shirt-Foc] (6) contrasts with the L-identification and so the IS of the PP-dative, thus deriving the contrasts between the alternants in extraction, scope, and pronoun facts (Larson 1990, Brandt 1999).

L-identification and its IS correlate also account for the DOC - BOC distinction in the passive:

(7) DOC: Jane was given a shirt. BOC: #Jane was sewn a shirt.

Our analysis of the alternations thus demonstrates the impact of lexical analysis on IS.

References

- Basilico, David. 1998. Object Position and Predication Forms. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 16:541-595.
- Beavers, John, and Koontz-Garboden, Andrew. 2020. *The Roots of Verbal Meaning: Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP.
- Brandt, Patrick. 1999. Scope, Topichood and Double Objects. In *Proceedings of the ESSLLI Student Session 1999*, ed. Amalia Todirascu, 17-26.
- Brandt, Patrick. 2000. In the double object construction. In *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, eds. Helen de Hoop and Ton van der Wouden, 31-43. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1979. Discourse Constraints on Dative Movement. In *Syntax and Semantics: Discourse and Syntax*, ed. Talmy Givon, 441-468. New York: Academic Press.
- Green, Georgia M. 1974. *Semantics and Syntactic Regularity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hale, Kenneth, and Keyser, Samuel Jay. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In *The view from building 20: Essays in Linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, eds. Ken Hale and Jay Keyser, 53-109. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hallman, Peter. 2015. Syntactic Neutralization in Double Object Constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46:389–424.
- Harley, Heidi. 2002. Possession and the double object construction. In *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 2, eds. Pierre Pica and J. Rooryck, 31-70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1976. Toward an Explanatory Semantic Representation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7:89-150.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel. 2009. The low periphery of double object constructions in English and Spanish. *Philologia Hispalensis*, 23:179-200.
- Larson, Richard K. 1988. On the double object construction. Linguistic Inquiry 19:335-391.
- Larson, Richard K. 1990. Double objects revisited: Reply to Jackendoff. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:589-632.
- Oehrle, Richard. 1976. *The grammatical status of the English dative alternation*. MIT: Ph.D. dissertation.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. Zero Syntax: Experiencers and Cascades. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.