TRANSITIVITY IN PAZAR LAZ

This study argues that in Pazar Laz (PL) – an endangered Caucasian language spoken in Turkey, all verbs project into syntax transitively, always including the vP projection which introduces the initiator of the event *à la* Ramchand (2008). Thus, there are no true unaccusative constructions which lack a vP layer and all unaccusatives are derived via stativizers from transitive bases. This pattern follows from PL' being a very conservative type of (I)-nitiation-language *à la* Ritter & Rosen (2000) (R&R), where only constructions with overt initiators are eventive, while others are non-eventive and are interpreted as stative.

PL differentiates between eventive and stative constructions via thematic suffixes (TS) on the verb. Transitives (1a) and unergatives (1b) bear the eventive TSs *–um* or *–am*, while unaccusatives (1c) are marked with the stative TSs *–e(r)* or *–u(r)*, which derive participles such as deverbal adjectives or nouns (2a-b). The deverbal participles in PL are of the Greek type, i.e., they take a StativeP above vP (2c), which introduce the initiator (Anagnostopoulou 2006), and thus are compatible with purpose clauses and initiator-oriented adverbs (2d).

The first piece of evidence for the transitive nature of PL verbs comes from the obligatory use of the stativizers *–e(r)* and *–u(r)* in the formation of unaccusatives (1c). This is the only intransitive pattern found in PL for unaccusatives, which can be used as the counterpart of passives, anti-causatives and middles depending on the context. Due to their stative nature they have an ability/capacity reading (Vendler 1967) and express a property of the theme subject. Furthermore, as they are also compatible with purpose clauses and initiator-oriented adverbs, they involve a vP-layer to introduce the implicit initiator/causer. Unlike the case in deverbal participles in (2d), in unaccusatives the initiator is morphologically marked with a clitic-like element *i-* (3a), which existentially closes the implicit argument and enforces an arbitrary interpretation for it, occupying Spec, vP (Chierchia 1995). To highlight the *able to* reading, a causative suffix, can be used which we assume to mark the v head in the structure (3b). Thus, unaccusatives are derived from transitives via stativizers in PL. The second piece of evidence for the transitivity of verbs in PL comes from unergatives. Unergatives (1b) require the reflexive marker *i-*, which implies that they are underlyingly transitive, where the theme is co-indexed with the initiator of the action in Spec, vP. It is possible to derive impersonal passives out of unergatives via arbitrarization of the initiator, but this again requires the use of the stativizer *–e(r)* and a causative suffix which occupies the v head (4).

As seen above, in PL there are no true intransitive predicates. This is because PL is an I-language *à la* R&R. R&R introduce an event-based typology based on initiation (I) and delimitation (D). I-languages base event status to the initial bound, while D-languages focus on the terminal bound of the event. D-languages can (i) group accomplishments with achievements; (ii) exhibit sensitivity to the case and specificity related properties of the object; (iii) show ergative splits based on aspect/tense; and (iv) have object agreement not specified for person features. I-languages, on the other hand, can (i) group accomplishments with activities; (ii) exhibit sensitivity to the properties of the subject; (iii) show ergative splits based on the properties of the subject; and (iv) have subject and object agreement specified for person features.

Given these properties, PL comes across as an I-language: PL (i) exhibits ergative splits based on the properties of the subject, where the initiators bear ergative suffix (1a-b), and undergoers nominative (1c); (ii) strictly groups accomplishments (5) and activities (1b) together, which both require ergative case on the subject and TSs *–um* or *–am*; (iii) exhibits subject and object agreement specified for person features (6a-b); and (iv) have constructions which are sensitive to the nature of the initiator subjects, such as perfect which is only compatible with transitives (7a), unergatives (7b) and internally caused unaccusatives (7c), but not with externally caused unaccusatives (7d).

As a very conservative I-language in PL, constructions lacking an initiator, such as impersonal passives and unaccusatives, come across as statives and cannot be interpreted as eventive. As events are always presented from the perspective of the initiator, all verbs are underlyingly transitive requiring the projection of vP in syntax, which introduce the inititator. This is such a strong tendency in PL that even what are called purely stative verbs in languages like English are derived from transitive verbs. For example, verbs like *have* (8a) and *know* (9a) are derived from *bring* (8b) and *send* (9b) via stativizers. Furthermore, psych-verbs in PL requiring both a stativizer and a causative marker are of the *frighten* type, but not of *fear* type, thus they also involve an initiator.

To conclude, in terms of mapping between event structure and argument structure PL comes across as a typologically rare I-language, where all predicates are underlying transitive.

Examples:

(1) a. Ali-k cami t'ax-**um**-s.　　b. Bere-k i-çaliş-**am**-s　　c. Cami i-t'ax-**e**-n.
　　Ali-erg glass break-TS-3ps　child-erg refl-work-TS-3ps　glass cl-break-stat-cop.3ps
　　Ali is breaking the glass.　　The child is working　　i. The glass breaks/is breaking
(2) a. t'ax-eri　cami　　b. tan-uri　　　　　　　　ii. The glass is being broken.
　　　break-stat　glass　　　sun-rise-stat　　　　　iii. The glass can be broken
　　　broken glass　　　　the rising of the sun　　c.　　StativeP
　　d. amolva şeni k'asi-te　　t'ax-eri cami
　　　enter　for　intentionally break-stat glass　　vP　　Stative
　　　The intentionally broken door to enter.　　　　　　　–e(r)/–u(r)
(3) a. Cami amolva şeni k'asi-te　　　**i**-t'ax-e-n　　Initiator　v'
　　　glass enter　for　intention-with cl-break-stat-3ps
　　　The glass is intentionally broken to enter.　　VP　　v
　　b.　Cami i-t'ax-**in**-e-n.
　　　glass cl-break-caus-stat-3ps　　　　　　　　Theme　V
　　　Glass can be broken/is breakable.
(4) İ-bgar-**in**-e-n.　　　　(5) Ali-k　oxori tzopx-um-s.
　　cl-cry-caus-stat-cop.3ps　　Ali-erg house build-TS-3ps
　　There is crying/People cry.　Ali is building a house.
(6) a. Ma si ce-**k**-ç-i.　　　　　b. Si　ma ce-**m**-ç-i.
　　　I　you PV-2p-beat-1ps.past　　you I　PV-1p-beat-2ps.past
　　　I beat you.　　　　　　　You beat me.
(7) a. Ali-s cami u-t'ax-ap-u-n.　　　　　c. Ombri　u-purk-ap-u-n.
　　　Ali-dat glass appl-break-caus-stat-cop.3ps　plum.tree appl-bloom-caus-stat-cop.3ps
　　　Ali has broken glass.　　　　　　The plum tree has bloomed.
　　b. Hak dido bere u-çaliş-ap-u-n.　　d.*Hak kartali m-u-lv-ap-u-n.
　　　here many child appl-work-caus-stat-cop.3ps　here letter PV-appl-come-caus-stat-cop.3ps
　　　Many children have worked here.　　Letters have come here.
(8) a. Ma para　m-i-**ğ**-u-n.　　　　　b. Ma dişk'a me-v-i-**ğ**-am-∅.
　　　I　money 1obj-appl-bring-stat-cop.3ps　　I　wood PV-1sbj-bring-TS-1ps
　　　I have money. (Lit: Money is brought to me)　I am bringing wood.
(9) a. Ma ham m-i-**şk'**-u-n.　　　　b. Nana-k　bere soti　　var o-**şk'**-um-s.
　　　I　this 1obj-appl-stat-cop.3ps　　mother-erg child anywhere not PV-send-TS-3ps
　　　I know this. (Lit: This is sent to me)　The mother does not send the child anywhere.
(10) Ali-s　layçi'i-şe a-şkur-**in**-**e**-n.
　　Ali-dat dog-abl　appl-fear-caus-stat-cop.3ps
　　Ali got scared of the dogs. (Lit: Ali was frightened of the dogs)