

## Goals, beneficiaries and the double object construction in Bulgarian

Bulgarian is a language whose dative arguments are realized as a PP headed by the preposition *na* 'to'. In this talk, I will show that in contexts where the PP is a beneficiary rather than a goal argument, the order PP > DP(Theme) instantiates a double object construction (DOC) rather than a prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC).

Goal arguments in Bulgarian are freely ordered with respect to direct object DPs. Slavkov (2008) has observed that both orders exhibit the properties of the prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC) of English and other languages. To this effect, I provide the following additional diagnostics: (i) the Goal argument does not intervene in the relation between the Theme and T<sup>0</sup> under passivization, cf. (1a); (ii) nominalizations including a Goal argument are well-formed (Author & Cinque 2013), cf. (1b); (iii) the Goal can bind into the theme and the theme can bind into the goal, cf. (2).

The properties of Bulgarian goal ditransitives will be argued to follow from an account along the lines of Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005): either order DP (Theme) > PP (Goal) or PP (Goal) > DP (Theme) can be thought of as basic but importantly both arguments are introduced in the same minimal domain (VP). Leftward A-movement of either object to a higher c-commanding position produces the binding options seen in (2).

Goal ditransitive structures will then be compared to what I will argue to be true instances of a DOC, namely those containing a non-thematic *na*-beneficiary (or adversely affected) argument. In Bulgarian, such dative structures occur with a limited set of predicates (*buy*-verbs, verbs of creation, benefactives/malefactives); exhibit word order preferences, i.e., PP>DP, even though unlike English the preposition can never be omitted, cf. (3); do not allow Theme passivization due to intervention effects by the goal, cf. (4); cannot form a nominalization with the *na*-beneficiary, cf. (5). Crucially, the deviant binding of the Theme into the beneficiary (6) suggests that the order feeding binding can only be **beneficiary >> theme**.

The differences between *na*-goals and *na*-beneficiaries are handled in terms of a dedicated (low) ApplP layer for the latter type (Pykkänen 2002, a.o.). The talk will also consider other types of PP beneficiaries in Bulgarian, in particular those introduced by *za* 'for' in light of the distinction between applicative arguments and adjuncts. With respect to the relation between clitic doubling and DOC (Slavkov 2008), it will be concluded that differently from Spanish Bulgarian clitic doubled ditransitive constructions do not have the hallmarks of a DOC frame either with goal or with beneficiary arguments.

## Examples

- (1) a. Nagradite bjaxa razdadeni na detsata (ot direktora).  
awards.the were given.out to children.the (from director.the)  
b. razdavaneto na nagradi na detsata /\*razdavaneto na detsata na nagradi (theme > goal/\*goal > theme)  
giving.the of awards to childre.the /\* giving.the to children.the of awards  
Cf. the assignment of a hard sonata \*of/to Mary /\*the assignment Mary of a hard sonata
- (2) *theme* >> *goal*
- a. Izpratix [vsjako dete]<sub>i</sub> na majka mu<sub>i</sub> cf. \*Izpratix deteto j<sub>i</sub> na [vsjaka majka]<sub>i</sub>  
I sent every child to mother his  
'I sent every child<sub>i</sub> to his<sub>i</sub> mother.'  
I sent child.the her to every mother
- goal* >> *theme*
- b. Izpratix [na vsjaka majka]<sub>i</sub> deteto j<sub>i</sub> cf. \*Izpratix na majka mu<sub>i</sub> [vsjako dete]<sub>i</sub>  
I sent to every mother child.the her  
'For every mother<sub>i</sub>, I sent that mother<sub>i</sub>'s child to her<sub>i</sub>.'  
I sent to mother his<sub>i</sub> every child<sub>i</sub>
- (3) Baštite strojat na detsata kăšti.  
fathers build to children.the houses
- (4) \*Legloto beše prigotveno na Marija (ot Petăr)  
bed.the was prepared to Maria (by Peter)
- (5) \*prigotvjaneto na legla na turistite (Theme > Beneficiary)  
preparation of beds to tourists.the
- (6) a. Popravix na vseki sobstvenik<sub>i</sub> kolata mu<sub>i</sub>  
I repaired to every owner car.the his  
b. \*Popravix vsjaka kola<sub>i</sub> na sobstvenika j<sub>i</sub>  
I repaired every car to owner.the its

## Selected bibliography

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The syntax of ditransitives: evidence from clitics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2005. Cross-linguistic and cross-categorical variation of datives. In *Advances in Greek generative syntax*, eds. Melita Stavrou & Arhonto Terzi, Linguistics Today 76, 61–126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002. *Introducing arguments*. Doctoral dissertation, Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Slavkov, Nikolay. 2008. Formal consequences of dative clitic doubling in Bulgarian ditransitives: An applicative analysis. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 16: 139-166.