POSSESSOR DATIVES IN PAZAR LAZ

BALKIZ ÖZTÜRK[1]


Abstract. The aim of this paper is to analyze the internal structure of possessor dative constructions in Pazar Laz. We will argue that possessor datives constitute high applicatives in terms of Pylkkänen (2008)'s criteria. We will further show that they do not pattern with raising possessor applicatives found in languages like Hebrew or German (Landau 1999 and Lee-Schoenfeld 2005), but they are benefactive/malefactive arguments of the verb which acquire the possessive reading by binding an anaphoric element in the possessee in the lines of Borer and Grodzinsky (1986).

Keywords: Pazar Laz, high applicatives, raising applicatives, inalienable possession, affectedness.


1. INTRODUCTION

Pylkkänen (2008) proposes that cross-linguistically there are two types of applicative constructions: i. Low applicatives which select DP complements and denote a relation between two individuals as in (1a), and ii. High applicatives which select a VP as their complement denoting a relation between an event and an individual as in (1b):[2]

(1) a.



b.



Laz is an endangered South-Caucasian language spoken in North-Eastern Turkey. The Pazar dialect of Laz (PL) makes extensive use of applicative morphology to introduce various types of arguments. Applicatives can introduce recipients as in (2), benefactives as in (3) and possessors as in (4). The experiential perfect construction (EP) in (5) and dynamic modality (DM)/unintentional causation (UC) constructions in (6) also require applicative morphology. Applicatives in (2–6) are overtly marked on the verb with one of

[1] Boğaziçi University, balkiz.ozturk@boun.edu.tr

[2] The cross-linguistic availability of low applicatives has been questionned in the literature (Lee-Schoenfeld 2005, Folli&Harley 2006, Georgala *et al*. 2008, Grashchenkov&Markman 2008, Larson 2010).

RRL, **LXIV**, *4*, p. 355–372, Bucureşti, 2019

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

the three markers: *u-* for third person, *i-* for first and second persons, *a-* person neutral.[3] As seen in (a) examples in (2-6), applied arguments bear dative case. They are also marked with m-set object agreement as seen in (b) examples (Holisky 1991):[4]

(2) a. Koçi-k **bere-s** cenç'areri **u**-ncğon-u. Recipient
man-ERG child-DAT money 3APPL-send-PST.3S
'The man sent the money to the child.'
b. Koçi-k **ma** cenç'areri m-**i**-ncğon-u.
man-ERG me money 1OBJ-APPL-send-PST.3S
'The man sent me the money.'

(3) a. Ma **Ahmedi-s** pasta v-**u**-ç'v-i. Benefactive
I Ahmet-DAT cake 1SBJ-3APPL-bake-PST.1S
'I baked Ahmet a cake.'
b. Si **ma** pasta m-**i**-ç'v-i.
You me cake 1OBJ-2APPL-bake-PST.2S
'You baked me a cake.'

(4) a. Nana-k **bere-s** xe-pe d-**u**-mbon-u. Possessor
mother-ERG child-DAT hand-PL PV-3APPL-wash-PST.3S
'The mother washed the child's hands.'
b. Nana-k **ma** xe-pe m-**i**-mbon-u.
mother-ERG me hand-PL 1OBJ-APPL-wash-PST.3S
'The mother washed my hands.'

(5) a. **Ali-s** cami **u**-t'ax-ap-u-n. EP
Ali-DAT glass 3APPL-break-CAUS-TS-PRES.3S
'Ali has broken glass (before).'
b. **Ma** cami m-**i**-t'ax-ap-u-n.
I glass 1OBJ-APPL-break-CAUS-TS-PRES.3S
'I have broken glass (before).'

(6) a. **Ali-s** cami **a**-t'ax-e-n. DM/UC
Ali-DAT glass APPL-break-TS-PRES.3S
i. 'Ali can break the glass.'
ii. 'Ali involuntarily breaks glasses.'
b. **Ma** cami m-**a**-t'ax-e-n.
I glass 1OBJ-APPL-break-TS-PRES.3S
i. 'I can break the glass.'
ii. 'I involuntarily break glasses.'

[3] Note that while EP requires *u-* or *i-*, DM/UC applicatives require *a-*. The subject in (5) is a voluntary agent, whereas the ones in (6) are not. See Demirok (2018) for a detailed analysis of these constructions.

[4] Note that while third person is unmarked for agreement in PL, first and second persons are unmarked for case. See section 2 for case and agreement patterns in PL.

[5] List of abbreviation: 1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; ABL = ablative; ALL = allative; APPL = applicative; CAUS = causative; COP = copula; DAT = dative; ERG = ergative; GEN = genitive; IMPF = imperfect; NACT = non-active; NEG = neagation; NMZL = nominalizer; NOM = nominative; OBJ = object; PASS = passive; PL = plural; POSS = possessive; PV = preverb; PRS = present; PTCP = participle; PST = past; REFL = reflexive; SBJ = subject; TS = thematic suffix; VAL = valency.

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

As seen in (7), it is possible to stack more than one dative argument introduced via applicatives bearing different semantic roles per clause in PL. Note that even though there are multiple dative arguments in the clause, only one applicative morpheme associated with the highest dative argument can appear on the verb (cf. Demirok 2013):

(7) a. Xordza-k Ali-s k'oçi-s bere u-şk'-u. Benefactive+Recipient
woman-ERG Ali-DAT man-DAT child 3APPL-send-PST.3S
'The woman sent the child to the man for Ali.'

b. Xordza-s Ali-s bere u-ş'k-ap-u-n. EP+Recipient
woman-DAT Ali-DAT child 3APPL-send-CAUS-TS-PRES.3S
'The woman has sent the child to Ali.'

c. Xordza-s Ali-s bere a-ş'kv-e-n. DM/UC+Recipient
woman-DAT Ali-DAT child APPL-send-TS-PRES.3S
'The woman may send the child to Ali.'

d. Ma Ali-s m-i-çalişin-ap-u-n. EP+Benefactive
I Ali-DAT 1OBJ-APPL-work-CAUS-TS-PRES.3S
'I have worked for Ali.'

e. Ma Ali-s m-a-çalişin-e-n. DM/UC+Benefactive
I Ali-DAT 1OBJ-APPL-work-TS-PRES.3S
'I am able to work for Ali.'

Our focus in this study will be the possessor applicatives. We observe that there are certain restrictions in the co-occurrence of possessor applicatives with other types of applicatives. While possessor applicatives can co-occur with applicatives denoting experiential perfect or dynamic modality/unintended causation as in (8), they cannot co-occur with recipient and benefactive applicatives as shown in Table 1:

(8) a. Ayşe-s bere-s ti u-mbon-ap-u-n Perfect + Possessor
Ayşe-DAT child-DAT head 3APPL-wash-CAUS-TS-PRES.3S
'Ayşe has washed the child's head before.'

b. Ayşe-s bere-s ti a-mbon-e-n DM/UC+Possessor
Ayşe-DAT child-DAT head APPL-wash-TS-PRES.3S
'Ayşe can wash the child's head.'


Table 1. Possible and impossible applicative combinations in PL


	Recipient	Benefactive	Possessor	Perfect	Modal
Recipient		√	X	√	√
Benefactive	√		X	√	√
Possessor	**X**	**X**		**√**	**√**
Perfect	√	√	√		X
Modal	√	√	√	X	

There are two main approaches to possessor applicatives. While Borer and Grodzinsky (1986) assume that possessive datives are benefactive/malefactive arguments of

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

the verb which acquire the possessive reading by binding an anaphoric element in the possessee as shown in (9a), Landau (1999) and Lee-Schoenfeld (2005) argue that the possessor is part of the possessive phrase, which undergoes raising into a position where the affectedness reading can be established as illustrated in (9b):

(9) a.


b.


In this study, we will argue that possessor datives in PL comply with the raising analysis along the lines of Borer and Grodzinsky (1986). They are not derived via possessor raising, but they are merged as high applicatives (cf. Pylkkänen 2008) denoting benefactives/malefactives which bind into the possessive phrase as in (9a). The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we will introduce the case and agreement patterns of dative arguments. In Section 3, we will show that benefactive and recipient applicatives in PL are high applicatives under Pylkkänen (2002, 2008)'s criteria. In Section 4, we will present an account of possessor datives in PL along the lines of Borer and Grodzinsky (1986), accounting for the co-occurrence restrictions observed in Table 1 above. Finally, Section 5 will present our concluding remarks.

2. CASE AND AGREEMENT AND AGREEMENT PATTERNS OF DATIVES

PL exhibits highly rich case and agreement morphology (Öztürk and Pöchtrager 2011, Öztürk 2019). In PL, the distribution of case morphology is sensitive to the thematic roles arguments bear. Agents/causers/initiators acting as subjects bear ergative case as shown in (10). Undergoer subjects, on the other hand, appear as nominative as shown in (11), in parallel to undergoer/theme objects (10a). [6] Similar to the recipients and benefactives illustrated above, most experiencers appear as dative, and typically require specific applicative morphology on the verb as shown in (12):

(10) a. Bere-**k** tzari-∅ şum-s.
child-ERG water-NOM drink-pres.3s
'The child is drinking water.'

b. Bere-**k** i-bgar-s.
child-ERG VAL-cry-PRES.3S
'The child is crying.'

(11) Bere-∅ do-ğur-u.
child-NOM PV-die-PST.3S
'The child died.'

[6] Note that it is possible to call the case theme arguments bear 'absolutive', however, following the tradition in the literature on Caucasian languages we opt to call it 'nominative' (cf. Harris 1982). We have marked nominative with the symbol ∅ only in Section 2.1 to highlight the case patterns.

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

(12) Bere-**s** Ali a-limb-e-n.
child-DAT Ali APPL-love-TS-PRES.3S
'The child loves Ali.'

Dative in PL is not linked to animacy. It can be used both with animates and inanimates as seen in (13a). PL does not have a separate locative marker, and dative case can be used to introduce inanimate locations as (13a) illustrates, where *oda* 'the room' is marked with dative. However, as it can be used together with prepositions as in (13b), we take it to be a case-marker, rather than a postposition.

(13) a. Bere-k oda-s i-bgar-s.
child-ERG room-DAT VAL-cry-PRES.3S
'The child is crying in the room.'

b. p'i yema-s.
before noon-DAT
'before noon'

In PL, in addition to case, arguments are also encoded with specific agreement morphology on the verb which involves both preverbal and postverbal agreement markers:

(14) Suffixes:

	Present Set:		Past Set:
Person	*-s set*	*-n set*	
1&2	∅	∅	-i
3s	-s	-n	-u
3pl	-an	-nan	-es

Prefixes:

Person	*v-set*:	*m-set*:
1	v- [p', p, b]	m-
2	∅	g-
3	∅	∅

The agreement suffixes are grouped into past and present sets. The present set is further divided into *-s* and *-n sets*. Demirok (2013) assumes T to be the probe for suffixal agreement, which only targets subjects. While suffixal agreement can reflect the features of ergative and nominative subjects as in (15a) and (15b), respectively, they can never reflect the features of dative subjects introduced via applicative morphology (as seen in 15c). Dative subjects require default 3s agreement suffix. Thus, suffixal agreement in PL exhibits case discrimination. This follows from the inherent nature of the dative case, as opposed to the structural nature of ergative and nominative (Emgin 2009)[7]. The inherent dative is provided by the applicative head.

[7] Emgin (2009) shows that dative cannot alternate with genitive in nominalized clauses borrowed from Turkish but only ergative and nominative can undergo such an alternation:

(i) a. Bere-k i-bgar-u.
child-ERG VAL-cry-PST.3S
'The child cried.'

b. Ma [bere-şi var o-bgar-u-muşi] b-gor-um.
I child-GEN NEG NOMIN-cry-NOMIN-3S 1SBJ-want-TS
'I want the child not to cry.'

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

(15) a. Ma v-i-bgar-**i**. Ergative Subject[8]
we 1SBJ-cry-PST.1S
'I cried.'
b. Ma b-ğur-**i**. Nominative Subject
I 1SBJ-die-PST.1S
'I died.'
c. Ma si m-a-cer-**u**. Dative Subject
I you 1OBJ-APPL-believe-PST.3S
'I believed you.'

When the nominative theme in dative constructions is focused, it can govern the suffixal agreement as in (16b). This we take as a piece of evidence that the theme interacts with T and thus checks the structural case of T in the presence of an inherently dative marked subject, regardless on focus[9]:

(16) a. Si ma g-a-cer-u. b. Si MA v-a-cer-i.
you me 2OBJ-APPL-believe-PST.3S you me 1SBJ-APPL-believe-PST.1S
'You believed me.' 'You believed ME (not someone else)'

Now let us turn to the preverbal agreement markers given in (14), which are grouped into m-set and v-set markers by Holisky (1991). As discussed in detail in Demirok (2013), the realization of preverbal agreement markers are dependent on the features encoded in the suffixal agreement slot and follow a strict person and case hierarchy given in (17). Note that (17) also reflects which arguments are encoded with which set of prefixal agreement markers in PL:

(ii) a. Bere-∅ ğur-u. b. Ma [bere-şi var o-ğur-u-muşi] b-gor-um.
child-NOM die-PST.3S I child-GEN NEG NOMIN-die-NOMIN-3S 1SBJ-want-TS
'The child died.' 'I want the child not to die.'
(iii) a. Ali-s Ayşe a-limb-u. b. *Ma [Ali-şi Ayşe o-limb-u-muşi] b-gor-um.
Ali-DAT Ayşe APPL-love-PST.3S I Ali-GEN Ayşe NOMIN-love-NOMIN-3S.POSS 1SBJ-want-TS
'Ali loved Ayşe.' 'I want Ali to love Ayşe.'

[8] First and second person pronouns are not inflected for case in Laz, unlike the third person, but the quantifiers they take exhibit relevant case morphology as in (i):

(i) Tkva iri-k i-bgar-i-t.
you.PL all-ERG VAL-cry-PST.2-PL
'You all cried.'

[9] Since both nominative and ergative subjects check their case with T, case-checking and case-realization should be taken to be two separate phenomena in PL, associated with syntax and morphology respectively in the lines of Marantz (1991) and Harley (1995). Thus, even though nominative theme subjects and ergative agentive subjects are differentiated through different case markers at the level of morphology, syntactically they all check structural cases against the T head. This qualifies PL as a regular nominative-accusative system at the level of syntax, hence it makes use of the ergative case only at the level of morphology (Dixon 1994). Thus, PL patterns with languages like Warlpiri, Enga and Niuean, which Legate (2005) calls languages with absolutive (nominative in the case of PL) as the morphological default.

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

(17) $\underset{\textit{m-set}}{\underline{DAT_{exp}1/2/3 > DAT_{caus}1/2}} > \underline{DAT_{Benef}1/2/3 > NOM_{obj}\ 1/2} >$

$\underset{\textit{v-set}}{\underline{NOM_{sbj}\ 1/2= ERG\ 1/2 > ERG\ 3}} = \underset{\textit{m-set}}{\underline{DAT_{caus}\ 3 = NOM3}}$

As observed in Demirok (2013), the features reflected in the preverbal slot should be dissociated from the features reflected in the suffixal slot. That is, when the suffixal slot agrees with an ergative or nominative subject then the preverbal slot should reflect the features of another argument (if there is one) based on the hierarchy above. For example, in (18a) the 1s dative causee governs preverbal agreement blocking agreement with the 2s nominative theme, while the suffixal slot reflects the features of the 3s person ergative subject. If the causee were 3s then the 2s nominative will govern the preverbal agreement as in (18b) in accordance with the hierarchy:

(18) a. K'oçi-k ma si-∅ m/(*g)-o-ncir-ap-u
man-ERG me-DAT you-NOM 1OBJ/2OBJ-CAUS-sleep-CAUS-PST.3S
'The man made me make you sleep.'
b. K'oçi-k Ali-s si-∅ g-o-ncir-ap-u
man-ERG Ali-DAT you-NOM 2OBJ-CAUS-sleep-CAUS-PST.3S
'The man made Ali make you sleep.'

In (19), on the other hand, where there is a dative argument introduced via applicative morphology, we see a different pattern. Even though there is a 2s theme in the presence of a 3s dative, what governs the preverbal agreement is the dative applied argument. This is not possible for 3s dative causees, as illustrated in (18b):

(19) Ko'çi-k bere-s si-∅ (*g)-u-ncğon-u.
man-ERG child-DAT you 2OBJ-APPL-send-PST.3S
'The man sent you to the child.'

This asymmetry implies that the dative the causees bear in (18a-b) is different from the dative the recipient/goal introduced via applicative morphology bears in (19). Dative causees behave like nominative themes in the way they govern the preverbal agreement based on the person/case hierarchy. Therefore, we assume that this type of dative is also a structural case, checked by the causative head introducing the causer argument and indicated via the marker *o-* on the verbal complex. However, the dative applied arguments which require applicative morphology such as experiencers, benefactives, recipients always govern the preverbal agreement regardless of their person feature and therefore, it is an inherent case.

Only in unaccusatives as in (20a), in unergatives as in (20b), and in transitives where there is no dative experiencer, benefactive or recipient introduced via applicatives, but just a regular 3s nominative object as in (20c), the preverbal agreement slot bears the features found in the postverbal slot. Thus, both the preverbal and postverbal agreement slots reflect the identical set of phi features as shown in (20a-c). Note that only in those cases the v-set agreement paradigm is used (See Demirok 2013 for details):

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

(20) a. Ma-∅ b-ğur-i. b. Ma v-i-bgar-i. c. Ma Ali-∅ b-dzir-i.
I-NOM 1SBJ-die-PST.1S I-ERG 1SBJ-VAL-cry-PST.1S I Ali-NOM 1SBJ-see-PST.1S
'I died.' 'I cried.' 'I saw Ali.'

To summarize:
i. Ergative, nominative and also the dative borne by causees are structural cases in PL, whereas the dative on applied arguments is an inherent case.
ii. Postverbal agreement governed by T can only reflect the features of ergative and nominative subjects, but never those of applied dative subjects, which lead to 3s default postverbal agreement.
iii. If there is an applied argument which bears inherent dative case, then the preverbal agreement always reflects the features of the applied argument, regardless of person features, otherwise, all other arguments are subject to a person/case hierarchy.

3. BENEFACTIVE AND RECIPIENT APPLICATIVES AS HIGH APPLICATIVES

In the following, we will show that in PL both benefactive and recipient applicatives qualify as high applicatives under Pylkkänen's criteria.

3.1 Benefactives

PL benefactives which select the whole VP as their complement and introduce a non-core dative argument to the whole event pattern as high applicatives, as they are not only compatible with transitives (21a-b) or unaccusatives (22a-b), but also with unergatives (23a-b) and statives (24a-b). Note that in the following examples, benefactives are formed with the applicative heads *i-* and *u-*. The applied arguments are marked with dative case and require m-set agreement on the verb where relevant:

(21) a. Xorza-k bere-s pasta u-çv-u.
woman child cake 3APPL-bake-PST.3S
'The woman baked a cake for the child.'
b. Xorza-k ma pasta m-i-çv-u.
woman me cake 1OBJ-APPL-bake-PST.3S
'The woman baked a cake for me.'
(22) a. Tzari Ayşe-s u-nçx-u.
water Ayşe-DAT 3APPL-heat.up-PST.3S
'The water got heated up for Ayşe.'
b. Tzari ma m-i-nçx-u.
water me 1OBJ-APPL-heat.up-PST.3S
'The water got heated up for me.'
(23) a. Xorza-k bere-s u-çaliş-u.
woman-ERG child-DAT 3APPL-work-PST.3S
'The woman worked for the child.'

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

b. Xorza-k ma m-i-çaliş-u.
woman-ERG me 1OBJ-APPL-work-PST.3S
'The woman worked for me.'

(24) a. K'oçi-k xorza-s şemşiye u-kaç-u.
man-ERG woman-DAT umbrella 3APPL-hold-PST.3S
'The man is holding the umbrella for the woman.'


b. K'oçi-k ma şemşiye m-i-kaç-u.
man-ERG me umbrella 3APPL-hold-PST.3S
'The man is holding the umbrella for me.'

Preverbal agreement facts indicate that the benefactive argument is introduced higher than the theme argument in accordance with the thematic hierarchy. As seen in (25), a 3s benefactive dative argument can block agreement with a 2s nominative object.

(25) Ali-k xorza-s si (*g-)u-car-u.
Ali-ERG woman-DAT you 2S-3APPL-feed-PST.3S
'Ali fed you for the woman.'

Thus, we represent benefactives as introduced by an ApplP selecting a VP as in (26), which would be the representation for a sentence like (25), depicting the case-checking relations. While the ergative subject checks case with T, and the nominative object with v, the dative on the benefactive is inherently assigned by ApplP:

(26)



As seen in (26), while T agrees with the ergative subject for the suffixal agreement, the preverbal agreement is governed by the 3s benefactive marked with inherent dative, thus blocking agreement with the 2s nominative theme.

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

3.2 Recipient applicatives

As shown above, benefactives constitute high applicatives in PL. The next question is whether there are low applicatives in PL. Pylkkänen (2008) argues that low applicatives which establish a transfer of possession relation between two individuals are only compatible with unaccusatives and transitives, but not with unergatives, thus they require a theme argument. In terms of their semantics both goal/recipient and possessor applicatives in PL appear as good candidates for low applicatives. However, recent literature has revealed that languages can have high applicatives which are incompatible with unergatives in general (Lee-Schoenfeld 2005, Folli and Harley 2006, Grashchenkov and Markman 2008, Boneh and Nash 2011).

There are two sets of ditransitive verbs in PL. Verbs such as *give* and *show* are inherently ditransitive verbs, which do not require applicative morphology to introduce their goal/recipient arguments as in (27a).[10] However, verbs such as *send* and *bring,* introduce their goal/recipient arguments via applicative morphology, hence they are derived ditransitives as in (27b). Note that in the following examples, similar to benefactive datives, recipient datives are formed with the applicative heads *i-* and *u-*.[11] The applied arguments are marked with dative case and require m-set agreement on the verb:

(27) a. K'oçi-k Ali-s si me-k-ç-u. non-derived ditransitive
man-ERG Ali-DAT you PV-2OBJ-give-PST.3S
'The man gave you to Ali.'

b. K'oçi-k xorza-s si (*g)-**u**-şk'-u. derived ditransitive
man-ERG woman-DAT you 2OBJ-3APPL-send-PST.3S
'The man sent you to the woman.'

In (27a), a 3s dative recipient in non-derived ditransitive constructions does not block preverbal agreement with a 2s nominative object. In (27b), on the other hand, the 3s dative recipient introduced via applicative morphology blocks agreement with the 2s nominative object, implying that it is introduced higher.

Non-derived ditransitive verbs also differ from derived ditransitives in terms of their scope behaviors. In non-derived ditransitives, the theme argument can scope over the goal/recipient argument. However, in derived ditransitives the theme argument cannot take scope over the goal/recipient[12]:

[10] Note that in our data corpus we have only found the verbs *give* and *show* as inherently ditransitive verbs, all the others require applicative morphology and this holds true for all tenses. See Taylan and Öztürk (2014) and Öztürk and Taylan (2017) for the verb classes in PL.

[11] Note that the applicative voice head *u-* has an identical counterpart in Georgian, too, a very close relative of PL. Unlike its Georgian counterpart which is used to introduce a human dative argument (cf. Nash 2018), the *u-* applicative in PL is compatible both with human and non-human datives. As shown in (i), *u-* in PL can introduce a non-human dative:

(i) Ali-k mektebi-s mektubi u-ncğon-u.
Ali-ERG school-DAT letter 3APPL-send-PST.3S
'Ali sent the letter to the school.'


[12] The Georgian counterpart of (28b) given in (i) is scopally ambiguous, which Nash (2018) takes to indicate that the dative animate argument can be generated high and low. This is not possible in PL, which we take to show that dative arguments are generated higher than the nominative themes:

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)


(28) a. Ali-k ar talebe-s k'ata çitabi me-ç-u.
Ali-ERG one student-DAT every book PV-give-PST.3S
'Ali gave every book to a student.' Theme>Recip, Recip>Theme
b. Ali-k ar talebe-s k'ata çitabi u-şk'-u.
Ali-ERG one student-DAT every book 3APPL-send-PST.3S
'Ali sent every book to a student.' *Theme>Recip, Recip>Theme

In terms of Bruening (2001), the scope ambiguity observed in regular ditransitives implies that both the theme and the recipient arguments in (28a) start out from the same phrasal (XP) domain, but this is not the case in derived ditransitives in (28b). This further implies that the applicative construction in (28b) cannot be a low applicative construction of Pylkkänen's type where both the recipient and the theme start out from the same XP projection. Therefore, we assume that recipient applicatives are also high applicative constructions introduced above VP, that is in a separate phrasal domain. Thus, the representations for regular ditransitives and derived ditransitives are given in (29a) and (29b) respectively. While we represent recipient applicatives as high applicatives in (29b), we adopt Folli and Harley (2006) for underived ditransitives, where both the theme and the recipient are introduced within a single PP projection as in (29a), enabling the scope ambiguity.

(29) a.



b.



As seen in (30), these applicatives can be easily combined with the high benefactive applicatives, but should be introduced lower than the benefactives as evidenced by their agreement facts. When both a benefactive and a recipient applicative are available, only the features of the benefactive can be encoded in the preverbal agreement slot regardless of the person hierarchy. Thus, the recipient is invisible for the preverbal agreement slot. In both (30a) and (30b), the applicative on the verb is interpreted as associated with the benefactive, rather than the recipient, as one can tell based on the choice of the applicative prefix. As seen in (30a), as the benefactive is third person the applicative *u-* is chosen rather than *i-* which would be compatible with the first person recipient, whereas in (30b), when

(i) Man da=u-brun-a vigac kals q'oveli k'aba.
3S.ERG PREV=APPL-return-AOR.3S some woman.DAT each dress.NOM
'She returned each dress to some woman.' (∃>∀), (∀>∃) (Nash 2018: 13)


BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

the benefactive is first person *i-* is chosen instead of *u-* which would be selected for the third person recipient.

(30) a. Ali-k Ayşe-s ma ham bere u-şk'-u/*m-i-şk'-u
Ali-ERG Ayşe-DAT I this child 3APPL-send-PST.3S/1OBJ-APPL-send-PST.3S
'Ali sent me this child for Ayşe.' (Not: Ali sent Ayşe this child for me)
b. Ali-k ma Ayşe-s ham bere m-i-şk'-u/ *u-şk'-u
Ali-ERG I Ayşe-DAT this child 1OBJ-APPL-send-PST.3S/3APPL-send-PST.3S
'Ali sent this child to Ayşe for me.' (Not: Ali sent me this child for Ayşe)

In the light of this evidence, we propose that recipient/goal applicatives are also high applicatives which belong to a separate domain than the theme, yet are introduced below the benefactive applicative as in (31). Thus, it is possible to stack high applicatives above a VP in PL, but following the theta-hiearchy. Recipients are introduced lower, while benefactives are higher in the theta hierarchy. Furthermore, the recipients introduced by the applicatives to verbs such as *send* and *bring* are presupposed by their event structure, benefactives, however, are not necessarily so.

(31)



4. POSSESSOR APPLICATIVES

Possessor applicatives can only be used with unaccusatives and transitives as seen in (32a) and (32b), respectively, but they are not compatible with unergatives as shown in (32c). Thus, they also exhibit a transitivity requirement. Note that (32c) cannot have a possessor dative interpretation as in (i), but a pure benefactive reading as in (ii) is possible.

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

(32) a. Bere-**s** nana d-**u**-ğur-u-n. Unaccusative
child-DAT mother PV-3APPL-die-TS-PRES.3S
'The mother of the child is dying.'
b. Nana-k bere-**s** xe-pe d-**u**-mbon-am-s. Transitive
mother-ERG child-DAT hand-PL PV-3APPL-wash-TS-PRES.3S
'The mother is washing the child's hands.'
c. Bere-**s** nana-k d-**u**-çaliş-am-s. Unergative
child-DAT mother-ERG PV-3APPL-work-TS-PRES.3S
i. '*The mother of the child is working.'
ii. 'The mother is working for the child.'

The possessor reading typically surfaces with inherently relational nouns, e.g. body parts, kinship terms. Furthermore, the possessor has to simultaneously bear an affectee (e.g. benefactive or malfactive) role. (32a) could only be uttered if the child is alive, but if the child had passed away before the mother a genitive marked possessor is required on *bere* 'child' without an applicative morpheme on the verb as in (33):

(33) Bere-**şi** nana do-ğur-u.
child-GEN mother PV-die-PST.3S
'The mother of the child died.'

Given that affectedness is required, possessor datives are incompatible with verbs which do not imply a direct effect on the possessor and again a regular genitive possessor is required to express the possession relation in such cases. Compare the examples in (34) with the ones in (35). As seen in (34), verbs like *smell, think* which do not impose a direct effect on the possessor are not compatible with the possessor applicative construction hence they require a genitive construction as in (35):

(34) a. *Xordza-k bere-**s** toma u-nt'in-u.
woman-ERG child-DAT hair APPL-smell-PST.3S
'The woman smelled the child's hair.'
b. *Xordza-k bere-**s** toma u-duşun-u.
woman-ERG child-DAT hair APPL-think-PST.3S
'The woman thought about the child's hair.'
(35) a. Xordza-k bere-**şi** toma int'in-u.
woman-ERG child-GEN hair smell-PST.3S
'The woman smelled the child's hair.'
b. Xordza-k bere-**şi** toma iduşun-u.
woman-ERG child-GEN hair think-PST.3S
'The woman thought about the child's hair.'

The affectedness is not necessarily associated with sentience (cf. Bosse, Bruening and Yamada 2012). Possessors can also be inanimate in the context of inalienably possessed nouns. (36a) could be used in a context that the table has been thoroughly ruined, but (36b) does not necessarily have such an implication:

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

(36) a. Xordza-k masa-s k'uçxe m-u-t'ax-u.
woman-ERG table-DAT leg PV-APPL-break-PST.3S
'The woman broke the table's leg.'
b. Xordza-k masa-şi k'uçxe me-t'ax-u.
woman-ERG table-GEN leg PV-break-PST.3S
'The woman broke the tables leg.'

As shown in Table 1, the possessor construction cannot co-occur with benefactive or recipient applicatives as illustrated in (37). Such a reading is only available if the possessor is introduced within the theme DP and bears genitive case as in (38):

(37) a. *Ali-k nana-**s** bere-**s** xe-pe d-**u**-mbon-u *Benefactive-Possessor
Ali-ERG mother-DAT child-DAT hand-PL PV-3APPL-wash-PST.3S
'Ali washed the child's hands for the mother.'
b.*Ali-k t'oxtori-**s** xorza-**s** bere **u**-şk'-u.
Ali-ERG doctor-DAT woman-DAT child 3APPL-send-PST.3S
'Ali sent the woman's child to the doctor.'
(38) a. Ali-k nana-**s** **[**$_{DP}$ bere-**şi** xe-pe**]** d-**u**-mbon-u
Ali-ERG mother-DAT child-GEN hand-PL PV-3APPL-wash-PST.3S
'Ali washed the child's hands for the mother.'
b. Ali-k t'oxtori-**s** **[**$_{DP}$ xorza-**şi** bere**]** **u**-şk'-u.
Ali-ERG doctor-DAT woman-GEN child 3APPL-send-PST.3S
'Ali sent the woman's child to the doctor.'

To provide the possessor with an affectee role, we believe a benefactive applicative is involved in these structures in addition to the possessive construction. In the literature, there are mainly two approaches to these constructions. While Borer and Grodzinsky (1986) assume that possessive datives are benefactive/malefactive arguments of the verb, but acquire the possessive reading by binding an anaphoric element in the possessee, Landau (1999) and Lee-Schoenfeld (2005) argue that the possessor is part of the possessive but undergoes raising into a position where the affectedness reading can be established. We believe an account in the lines of Borer and Grodzinsky (1986) is more compatible with PL possessive applicatives, given the following pieces of evidence.

First, it is possible to have an overt pronominal possessor marked with genitive case within the possessee which can be interpreted as co-indexed with the dative argument as in (39). The overt possessor is used when the possessor needs to be focused. If the dative argument were to raise from the possessor position of the nominative theme, we would not expect its place to be overtly filled with a pronominal element:

(39) Xorzha-k bere-s$_i$ himu-şi$_i$ toma u-mbon-u.
woman-ERG child-DAT he-GEN hair 3APPL-wash-PST.3S
'The woman washed the CHILD's hair.' (for the child, not someone else's hair).

Second, as in (40), it is not possible to introduce a pronominal or an overt affectee via a postpositional phrase, in addition to the dative possessor:

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

(40) *Xorzha-k himu$_i$/Ali şeni bere-s$_i$ toma u-mbon-u.
woman-ERG him/Ali for child-DAT hair 3APPL-wash-PST.3S
'The woman washed the child's hair for him/Ali.'

Finally, there is a third piece of evidence for the non-raising account which is related to the clausmateness of the possessor and the possessee. Lee-Schoenfeld (2005) shows that there cannot be a clausal boundary between the possessor and possessee in the case of raising possessors. As seen in the contrast between (41a-b), in German it is not possible to have a clausal boundary between the raising possessor and the possessee. Only in the case of restructuring predicates which take reduced infinitivals as their complements as in (41c), it is possible to separate the possessor and the possessee:

(41) a. Jan hat beschlossen [*v*P/IP **Luise** **die Haare** zu waschen].
Jan has decided Luise.DAT the hair to wash
'Jan decided to wash Luise's hair.'

b. *Jan hat **Luise** beschlossen [*v*P/IP **die Haare** zu waschen].

c. Jan hat **Luise** versucht [VP **die Haare** zu waschen].
Jan has Luise.DAT tried the hair to wash
'Jan has tried to wash Luise's hair.' (Lee-Schoenfeld 2005: 19)

When we take a look at PL, both with restructuring verbs as in (42a) or non-restructuring verbs as in (42b), it is possible to insert adverbials in between possessor and the possesse and interpret the adverbs as modifying the matrix verb. As seen in (42a), the adverb *xolo* 'again' intervenes between the possessor and the possessee modifying the matrix verb *try*, which is a restructuring predicate. However, we again observe the same pattern in (42b), where the adverb is interpreted as modifying the non-restructuring matrix verb *decide*. Note that in (42b), the matrix predicate bears the applicative morphology, which indicates that the possessor indeed is part of the matrix clause. This implies that the possessor and the possessee do not have to belong to the same domain in PL, unlike the case we observe in German which is a language with raising possessors:


(42) a. Xorzha-k bere-s xolo toma o-mbon-u c-i-tsad-u.
woman-ERG child-DAT again hair NOMIN-wash-NOMIN PV-VAL-try-PST.3S
'The woman again tried to wash the child's hair.'
b. Xorzha-k bere-s xolo toma o-mbon-u c-u-zad-u.
woman-ERG child-DAT again hair NOMIN-wash-NOMIN PV-3APPL-decide-PST.3S
'The woman again decided to wash the child's hair.

Thus, we argue that rather than a raising analysis, what we have here is a benefactive/malefactive dative argument binding a covert pronominal element within the possessee. Note that the possessor reading typically surfaces with inherently relational nouns, such as body parts (e.g. hand, hair), kinship terms (e.g. mother, father), dependent

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)


part-wholes (e.g. top of a table) (cf. Vikner and Jensen 2000). Thus, the DPs introduced by ApplPs in these constructions are benefactive/malefactive arguments. And this is the reason why such applicatives cannot co-occur with benefactives, as the dative marked possessor itself is the benefactive argument.

(43)



Although it is possible to have a benefactive and a recipient applicative co-occuring, possessive applicatives cannot co-occur with recipient applicatives. This provides further support for the non-raising analysis. As recipient applicatives thematically occur lower than benefactive applicatives, in terms of locality they intervene and act as potential binders for the covert pronominal within the possessee DP as shown in (44):

(44)



BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)


Recipient and possessor combinations are only possible if the possessor remains within the object DP, bearing genitive case, which does not obligatorily imply a benefactive semantics as illustrated in (45):

(45) Ali-k t'oxtori-s [$_{DP}$ xorza-**şi** bere] u-şk'-u.
Ali-ERG doctor-DAT woman-GEN child 3APPL-send-PST.3S
'Ali sent the woman's child to the doctor.' (No obligatory benefactive reading.)

Furthermore, as benefactive applicatives are not introduced above vP, possessors within agents in Spec, vP will not be co-indexed with the applied argument. This explains the incompatibility of these constructions with unergatives.

Finally, it is not surprising that possessor datives are compatible with applicatives denoting dynamic modality, unintentional causation and experiential perfect. Demirok (2018) has hown that such applicatives are introduced above the vP layer in PL and hence do not interact with VP level applicatives. [13]

(46)



5. CONCLUSION

To conclude, we have argued that possessor datives in PL are VP-selecting high applicatives denoting benefactives or malfactives, supporting a non-raising analysis along the lines of Borer and Grodzinsky (1986). Being merged in the Spec of a high applicative,

[13] Boneh and Nash (2011) also argue that coreferential dative constructions in French involve a vP-selecting higher applicative. However, in PL the applicative head selects EventP above the vPs.

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)

they bind the covert possessor within the theme DP, which then gives rise to an affected possessor reading. Given such an analysis, their incompatibility with benefactive and recipient datives and their compatibility with DM/UC and EP applicatives find an immediate explanation.

REFERENCES

Boneh, N., L. Nash. 2011. "When the benefit is on the fringe", in: J. Berns, H. Jacobs, T. Scheer (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory XX*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 19–38.

Borer, H., J. Grodzinsky, 1986, "Syntactic Cliticization and Lexical Cliticization: The Case of Hebrew Dative Clitics", in: H. Borer (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 19*, Academic Press, New York, 175–217.

Bosse, S., B. Bruening, M. Yamada, 2012, "Affected Experiencers", *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 30, 4, 1185–1230.

Bruening, B., 2001, "QR obeys superiority: Frozen scope and ACD", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 32, 233–273.

Demirok, Ö. F., 2013, *A Post-syntactic Analysis of the Morphological Dependencies in Pazar Laz*, MA Thesis, Bogazici University.

Demirok, Ö. F., 2018, "A Modal Approach to Dative Subjects in Laz", *Proceedings of NELS 48.*

Emgin, B., 2009, *Finiteness and Complemantation Patterns in Pazar Laz*, MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University.

Dixon, R. M., 1994, *Ergativity*, Cambridge; New York, Cambridge University Press.

Folli, R., H. Harley, 2006, "Benefactives aren't Goals in Italian", in: J. Doetjes, P. Gonzalez (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2004,* Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 121–142.

Georgala, E. *et al.*, 2008, "Expletive and Thematic Applicatives", in: C. B. Chang, H. J. Haynie (eds), *Proceedings of the 26th WCCFL*, Somerville, Cascadilla Proceedings, 181–189.

Grashchenkov, P., V. G. Markman, 2008, "Non-Core Arguments in Verbal and Nominal Predication: High and Low Applicatives and Possessor Raising", in: N. Abner, J. Bishop (eds), *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Somerville, MA, Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 185–193.

Harley, H., 1995, *Subjects, Events and Licensing*, Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Harris, A. C., 1982, "Georgian and the Unaccusative Hypothesis", *Language*, 58, 290–306.

Holisky, D. A., 1991, "Laz", in A.C.Harris (ed.), *The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus*, New York, Delmar.

Landau, I., 1999, "Possessor Raising and the Structure of VP", *Lingua*, 107, 1–37.

Larson, R., 2010, "On *Pylkkänen's Semantics for Low Applicative*", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 41, 701–704.

Lee-Schoenfeld, V., 2005, "Introducing Possessor Datives–High or Low?", *LSA Annual Meeting,* Oakland.

Legate, J., 2005, "The Absence of Absolutive", in: J. Alderete, H. Chung-hye, A. Kochetov (eds), *Procedings of the 24the WCCFL*, Simon Fraser University.

Marantz, A., 1991, "Case and licensing", in: G.F. Westphal, B. Ao, H-R. Chae (eds), *Proceedings of ESCOL 8*, University of Maryland, Baltimore, 234–253.

Nash, L., 2018, "Third argument of ditransitive verbs: height and interpretation", Talk given at Datives in Discourse Workshop – University of Cologne, October 26th, 2018.

Öztürk, B., M. Pöchtrager (eds.), 2011, *Pazar Laz*, LINCOM, *Languages of the World Materials* 484, Münich.

Öztürk, B., E. Eeguvanli Taylan, 2017, "Omnipresent little vP in Pazar Laz", in: R. D'Alessandro, I. Franco, A. Gallego (eds.), *The Verbal Domain*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 207–232.

Öztürk, B., 2019, "The loss of Case System in Andeshen Laz and its Morphosyntactic Consequences", *STUF: Language Typology and Universals*, Berlin, Mounton, 193–220.

Pylkkänen, L., 2008, *Introducing Arguments*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Taylan, E., B. Öztürk, 2014, "Transitivity in Pazar Laz", *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 61, 271–296.

Vikner, C., P. A. Jensen, 2002, "A semantic analysis of the English genitive. Interaction of lexical and formal semantics", *Studia Linguistica*, 56, 191–226.

BDD-A30408 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 03:03:41 UTC)