and space’, could be related to the degree in which those languages allow
discontinuity—‘structural distance’—between constituents that belong
together. In other words, the extension of the depictive coding strategy
into the less usual areas of the domain possibly correlates with ‘freedom of
word order’.
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On depictive secondary predicates
in Laz

SILVIA KUTSCHER AND N. SEVİM GENÇ

7.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with morphosyntactic, semantic, and prosodic characteristics
of depictive secondary predication in Laz. We show that Laz adjunct expressions
generally cannot be divided into depictive and adverbial constructions on the
basis of their morphosyntactic properties. We also deal with some prosodic
characteristics of adjuncts expressing manner and state, and discuss to what
extent depictive expressions may be delimited from manner adverbials on the
grounds of intonational patterns. Concerning the semantic interpretation of
adjuncts in Laz, we argue that they are vague with respect to participant- or
event-oriented readings. Laz clause-level adjuncts thus are general adjunct
constructions in the terminology proposed in the introduction to this volume.
An interesting exception to this generalization are distributive numeral
expressions, which can be argued to be a genuine depictive construction.

A sister language of Georgian, spoken on the south-eastern coast of the Black
Sea, Laz is the only member of the South Caucasian family which is spoken
primarily outside Georgia. The vast majority of its speakers live in Turkey and
are bilingual. An increasing number of young Laz, however, are fluent only in
Turkish. In addition, native speakers of Laz restrict using their mother tongue
to private communications amongst friends and family members.

The variety of Laz discussed here is the one spoken in the city of Ardeşen and
the villages of the Ardeşen region. Although this dialect (Ardeşen-Laz) differs
from other Laz varieties with respect to the case-marking system (see Kutscher
2001: ch. 5), it is similar to the other dialects in that no variant of Laz exhibits

The authors would like to thank Eva Schultze-Berndt, Nikolaus Himmelmann, and Katrin Lehmann
for numerous comments on previous versions of this chapter, and Britte Temme for brushing up our
English. We also are grateful to the patience and helpfulness of the Laz speakers in the region of
Ardeşen and in Germany, who have supported our work for several years now.
NP internal agreement or an adverbial case, in contrast to the Georgian varieties discussed by Boeder (Ch. 6, this volume).

The data presented in this chapter consist of utterances taken from a corpus of spoken texts recorded on location in Turkey. Some texts from this corpus have been published in Wodarg (1995) and Kutscher and Genç (1998). Examples from these publications are marked with W (for Wodarg) and K/G (for Kutscher and Genç) followed by an abbreviated title of the source text and the reference number of the intonation unit (e.g. K/G murunxzi 003). Other examples are from our research on positional verbs elicited with stimuli of the Language and Cognition Group of the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen. These are marked ‘Posit’. Examples not marked for their source have been elicited for the purposes of this article.

The structure of the chapter is as follows. Section 7.2 gives a short overview of Laz basic clause structure. Section 7.3 focuses on how NP-internal modifiers can be delimited from adjuncts. Section 7.4 concerns participant-oriented and event-oriented manner expressions, and gives an overview on their segmental and distributional characteristics (7.4.1) followed by a few remarks on prosodic commonalities and differences (7.4.2). Section 5 deals with participant-oriented and event-oriented uses of adjuncts in instrumental case (7.5.1), motative case (7.5.2), and locational nominals (7.5.3). Section 7.6 argues that distributive numerals are expressed by a genuine determinative construction in Laz. Section 7.7 deals with expressions of role and life stage, which in Laz are biclausal in nature. Section 7.8 concludes.

7.2 Morphosyntactic essentials

Laz is basically an SOV language, exhibiting the categories case and number in nominal expressions and a rich inventory of verbal categories with up to ten different morphological slots to be filled in the predicate (see Kutscher 2001: ch. 1). Predicates in Laz are head-marking—i.e. depending on the valence of the verb, verbal inflection is mono- or polypersonal.

With polypersonal verbs the finite verb inflects for both actor and undergoer as in (1).

(1) cemcanc
hit:[2>3]1SG.PRS
‘You beat me.’

1 Examples are written in the Lazoğlu/Feistman orthography introduced to the Laz community in Turkey in 1986. It deviates from the Caucasianist transcription in the following graphemes (<Laz=Caucasionist>): <c=ɛ>, <ç=ɛ̅>, <k=ɛ̅>, <p=ɛ̅>, <ç=ɛ̅>, <EC=ɛ̅>, <EC=ɛ̅>, <EC=ɛ̅>, <EC=ɛ̅>, <EC=ɛ̅>, <EC=ɛ̅>.

Laz is an active language (Klinov 1974), i.e. monopersonal verbs subdivide into two classes, depending on whether the verb takes a controlling or non-controlling single core argument. Controlling single core arguments are marked as actor on the predicate, cf. the first person marker b- in (2a). Non-controlling single core arguments are marked as undergoer, cf. the first person marker m- in (2b). This is indicated by an arrow (>) in the gloss.

(2) a. bulur
get:3SG.PRS
‘I go.’

b. maçinden
sneeze:3SG.PRS
‘I sneeze.’

Note that information on person and number in Laz predicates is not marked by a single prefix but rather results from the interaction of prefixes and suffixes. These are portmanteau forms coding tense/aspect/mood simultaneously (see Mattissen 1995).2

Argument NPs are always non-obligatory and often are omitted in discourse. If present, all argument NPs in Ardeşen-Laz are unmarked for case, as opposed to other Laz dialects. This holds for the actors of polypersonal predicates (3a, b), primary and secondary objects (3b), and for the single core argument of monopersonal inactive predicates (3c).

(3) a. baba pencere kosuy
father window clean:3SG.PRS
‘Father wipes the window.’

b. nana baba bere meçay
mother father child give:3SG.PRS
‘Mother gives the child to Father.’

c. biçi aşkurinen
boy be_afraid:3SG.PRS
‘The boy is afraid.’

2 Person-marking in the glosses includes information on the macro-roles actor and undergoer. Undergoers are marked with a preceding angled bracket, >. In polypersonal-inactive predicates, it marks the single core argument as a non-controlling argument. The single core argument of monopersonal active predicates is an actor and has no special marking.
Adjectives, e.g. goals (4a) or instruments (4b) take oblique case-marking.

(4) a. yeckeşleşa  
   yeckešten (. . . ) 
   yeckešle-te  
   -mot up-go-PL.FUT.PFV 
   ‘We went up to yeckešle.’  (K/G gekekle 005)

  b. şarite 
     göcüw;  
     şikomu V 
     şari-te 
     göcüw  
     şikomu  
     water-INS clean:SG.PST.PFV eat:SG.PST.PFV 
     ‘He cleaned it with water and ate it.’  (K/G proyoni 031)

Expressions of location (5a) or time (5b), however, are always unmarked for case.

(5) a. Trabzoni  
     ya (0.3) xolo  
     ieyare kocepædi 
     Trabzoni ya  
     xolo ieyare ko-ce-pxedi 
     Trabzon  
     quot again plane EMPH-down-sit:1SG.PST.PFV 
     ‘He said: “In Trabzon I sat down in an airplane once again.”’  (K/G Ferat dayi 1 002/3)

  b. a mapça ndyu (0.2)  
     xvala pucepe 
     a mapça ndya  
     xvala puci-pe 
     one sunny day alone COW-PL 
     keşkebüçvi 
     k-şekkebüçvi 
     EMPH-up: lead:[1>3]SG.PST.PFV 
     ‘One sunny day I brought the cows up alone.’  (W Kuh tekst 004)

Having set out the major characteristics of Laz clause structure, in the following sections we will turn to the nature of participant-oriented adjunct constructions beginning with delimiting unmarked adjuncts from NP-internal modifiers.

7.3 Participant-oriented adjuncts vs. NP-internal modifiers

In contrast to Georgian (see Boeder, Ch. 6, this volume), Laz NPs only inflect on the last element of the phrase and do not exhibit NP-internal agreement.

---

3 In transcripts of audio data intonational units are delineated as follows: \ = final intonation, i.e. 
pitch drops to the base line; / = medial intonation, i.e. pitch ends in mid-range either level or slightly 
falling; \ = progressive intonation, i.e. final pitch is clearly rising. A number in brackets, e.g. (0.3), 
indicates the length of a pause in seconds.

---
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(6) ( . . . ) pasiari lenșite  
     kelebuçi / 
     pasiari lenși-te  
     ko-ebuçi 
     rusty needle-INS EMPH-see: [1>3] SG.PST.PFV 
     ‘I sew it together with a rusty needle.’  (K/G korme 011)

In (6) the instrument-NP pasiari lenși ‘with a rusty needle’ is case marked only on the semantic nucleus (lenși ‘needle’) of the NP, whereas the attribute pasiari ‘rusty’ is a bare adjective stem. The last lexical element of an NP can either be the semantic nucleus (as in (6)) or a possessive pronoun (cf. (7)).

(7) pasiari lenși  
     škimi-te  
     kelebuçi 
     pasiari lenși škimite-te  
     ko-ebuçi 
     rusty needle POSS.ISS-INS EMPH-see: [1>3] SG.PST.PFV 
     ‘I sew together it with my rusty needle.’

Hence, the right border of an NP can clearly be identified by inserting a possessive pronoun into the phrase. NP-internal modifiers can thus be formally distinguished from participant-oriented adjuncts following the NP. Compare (8a) with (8b).

(8) a. ́uğa  
     cari škimi  
     bimxor 
     hot bread/meal POSS.ISS eat:ISS.PRS 
     ‘I eat my hot meal.’

  b. cari škimi  
     ́uğa 
     bread/meal POSS.ISS hot eat:ISS.PRS 
     ‘I eat my hot meal.’

In (8a) the adjective ́uğa ‘hot’ is part of the NP and functions as an NP-internal modifier to its head noun. The position of škimi in (8b) shows that the modifier ́uğa ‘hot’ is outside the NP. It serves as a clause-level adjunct with object-oriented reading. Although the semantic nucleus of the NP functions as the controller of this participant-oriented adjunct, ́uğa ‘hot’ exhibits no morphological means to show this semantic relation overtly. In this respect as well, Laz contrasts with Georgian.

While participant-oriented adjuncts following their controller NP can be distinguished from NP-internal modifiers, the possessive pronoun insertion test obviously does not work for adjuncts that are placed to the left of their controller-NP. Hence, ́uğa ‘hot’ in (8a) may either be read as an NP-internal modifier or as a participant-oriented adjunct of its own. In actual utterances,

4 Note that Laz is mainly a spoken language. There are no widespread mass media in the language and only a few printed books and journals. Most Laz do not read and write in their language. There is no standard variety.
however, a participant-oriented adjunct construction differs from one with NP-internal modification with respect to prosody. A participant-oriented adjunct may form an intonation unit of its own (see section 7.4.2), while this does not hold for NP-internal modifiers.

7.4 Depictive and manner expressions

This section is concerned with participant-oriented expressions of state (i.e. the kind of expression widely used to exemplify depictives) and event-oriented manner expressions. We use the term DEPICTIVE in this section as a convenient shorthand for ‘participant-oriented expression of a state’, i.e. for a purely semantically defined expression type. As we will see, there is little evidence to support the distinction of two different (formal) constructions for these two kinds of expression.

7.4.1 Similarities in distribution

In Laz, there are no segmental means to distinguish manner adverbials and depictives. For manner expressions, compare the adjectives vrosi ‘good, well’ and evedi in (9), for depictive compare the participle okoko’eri in (10).

(9) a. vrosi gamajedi; gazirasen ya kocepe \ vrosi gamajedi gazirasen ya koce-pe
    good look through\2SG.PST.PFV see\>2SG.FUT.PFV quot man.pl
    “Look carefully. You’ll see (something),” the men said.’ (K/G murun’xi 032)

b. evedi komoxti \ evedi ko-mocti
    quick EMPH-COME\2SG.IMP
    ‘Come here quickly!’ (W Bienentext 034)

(10) masa-ji cindo(19) okoko’eri eo-zun \ table-gen surface folded in half on-lie\3SG.PRS
    ‘It is on the table, folded in half.’ (Posit)

The position of an adjunct constituent of any kind is more or less free, i.e. it depends on discourse pragmatic rules. The preverbal position is the preferred position for both depictive and manner expressions with respect to text frequency and in terms of the order usually given in elicited utterances. Note that preverbal position is the preferred slot for focused constituents. For example, interrogative pronouns are obligatorily placed there and cannot be intonationally detached from the predicate: compare (11).

(11) yoma cuma skani noya mu iindru
    yesterday brother POSS.2SG market what buy\3SG.PST.PFV
    ‘What did your brother buy on the market yesterday?’
    yoma cuma skani mu noya iindru

    In this position, participant-oriented and manner expressions as well as other kinds of constituents tend to have a falling pitch accent with the fall continuing on the following predicate (cf. figures 7.1 and 7.2). Topics are placed utterance-initially.

    Depictive expressions may precede or follow their controller, as the examples in (11) illustrate. In (12a), the controller lo’i ‘rope’ precedes the depictive adjunct kirkol’eri ‘wound up’, while in (12b) the controller lo’i ‘rope’ follows the adjunct ko’eri ‘folded’. Note that the depictive expressions in both utterances are prosodically separated from the adjacent constituents.5

b. bo’i ti’ika (0.5) ko’eri (1.1) lo’i goo’zun \ tui ti’ika koer i lo’i goo’zun
    bo’i ti’ika ko’eri lo’i goo’zun
    empty basket fold-PRTC rope on-lie\3SG.PRS
    ‘On an empty basket there is a rope in a folded state.’ (Posit)

Furthermore, depictive expressions may appear in clause-initial position; cf. kucxe tu’uncu ‘barefoot’ in (13).

(13) kucxe tu’uncu zari moyapay
    kucxe tu’uncu zari moy-ap-ay
    foot-naked water bring-CAUS-[3\>3]3SG.PRS
    ‘She sent her barefoot for water.’ (W Fadume 009)

    Depictive expressions may also be placed after the predicate as is the case with the depictive kuru ‘plain’ in (14).

(14) nezi bimxor (0.1) kuru
    nezi bimxor kuru
    walnut eat\1\SG.PRS plain
    ‘I eat the walnuts plain [i.e. without any other food].’ (K/G nezi 036)

5 At this point, it remains to be investigated what kinds of semantic effect correlate with these alternative positions and prosodic breaking.
These variations in word order are also found with manner expressions. They too may follow the predicate, as shown for the manner adverbial evedi ‘quickly’ in (15).

(15) Kedir Kedir a (o.1) a komoxti \ evedi;
Kedir Kedir a a ko-moxti evedi
Kedir Kedir one one EMPH-COME-2SG.PST.PFV quick
‘Kedir, Kedir, come on. Quickly!’ (W Bienentext 032)

In post-predicate position, both depictive and manner expressions exhibit the characteristics of afterthoughts, i.e. they constitute a separate intonation unit and follow a prosodic unit with final intonation.

Manner adverbials may also be non-adjacent to the predicate, as is the case in (16), where the interrogative pronoun mi ‘who’ directly precedes the predicate.

(16) biți mi vroši mi ompula?
all well who hide:1SG.PST.PFV
‘Who has hidden everything well?’

In conclusion, we can state that in Laz depictive (participant-oriented) and manner (event-oriented) expressions cannot be distinguished by segmental or distributional means. They would therefore appear to be formally expressed by a single construction type which allows both participant-oriented and event-oriented readings, thus exemplifying a general adjunct construction as defined in the introduction to this volume. However, there may be prosodic differences between the two expression types, as further discussed in the next section.

7.4.2 Prosodic differences?

In this section, we provide preliminary evidence for the observation that depictive and manner expressions differ with regard to at least one aspect of prosodic marking. In preverbal position, depictives may be intonationally detached from the main predicate of the clause, i.e. they may form an intonation unit of their own. In contrast, manner adverbials cannot be intonationally separated from the predicate in this position. Note that these are very tentative observations, since Laz prosody is still very poorly understood.

In Laz, elements in preverbal position show a strong tendency to form an intonational unit with the following predicate. This holds for adverbials as well as depictive expressions, as the following examples demonstrate. Figure 7.1 shows the waveform and pitch extraction for the manner adverbial in (gb) above. The vertical cursor line crossing the graphs indicates the word boundary between the adverb evedi ‘quickly’ and the predicate komoxti ‘come’.

Figure 7.1 clearly shows rising F0 on the first syllable of the manner adverb evedi followed by a fall on the second syllable. The fall continues smoothly into the first syllable of the predicate komoxti.

A continuous contour like the one in Figure 7.1 is found on most of the preverbal depictive expressions in our corpus, as well. Figure 7.2 illustrates the F0 contour of the depictive expression okokolari ‘folded’ given in example (10) above. The relevant section of the contour is marked with a vertical line in the figure. Once again, the falling contour on the depictive participle okokolari ‘folded’ is continued on the following predicate eozun ‘it lies on sth.’.

In contrast to adverbial manner expressions, with depictive expressions we also find examples in our corpus where the depictive expression is intonationally detached from the following predicate by a clear break in the
F0 contour, as is illustrated in (17) and figure 7.3.

\begin{equation}
\text{gzalineri / (o.6) mendaxetey} \\
\text{by_foot} \quad \text{go_fo:plp_pst_pfv}
\end{equation}

'\text{They went there by foot.}' \quad (K/G askerepe 111)

As Figure 7.3 illustrates, the F0 contour in this case is quite the opposite of those given in Figures 7.1 and 7.2. In figure 7.3 the F0 clearly rises on the last syllable of the depictive \
gzalineri \text{ 'by foot'} (in all likelihood realizing a high-rising boundary tone). The onset pitch of the following predicate, \text{mendaxetey}, is clearly much lower and in the mid range typical for the onset of a new intonation unit.

As for manner adverbials, we did not find an F0 contour in our corpus comparable to the one illustrated in Figure 7.3 for depictive expressions. Therefore, we tested this intonation pattern by elicitation. The test utterance

\footnote{The semantic effects of the prosodic break need further investigation.}

\begin{equation}
(18) \text{bitumi o3xone vrosi / dvompuli} \\
\text{bitumi o3xone vrosi dv-ompuli} \\
\text{all attic good EMPH-hide[2<3]sg.imp}
\end{equation}

'Hide everything well in the attic.' \quad (K/G askerepe 104)

For our test, the second author of this chapter, a native speaker of Laz, produced the utterance illustrated in (19), i.e. a high-rising, unit-final pitch on the manner adverbial \text{vrosi} followed by a break and a mid range onset on the predicate \text{dvompuli}.

\begin{equation}
(19) \text{bitumi o3xone vro / dvompuli} \\
\text{all attic well EMPH-hide[2>3]sg.imp}
\end{equation}

'Hide everything well in the attic.'
This test utterance was played to two other native speakers. Both speakers clearly rejected it on the grounds that it was ‘not sounding right’. Both of them only accepted intonation patterns close to the one found in (18), i.e. with no intonational break.

To conclude, manner adverbials and depictive expressions appear to be very similar with respect to (the lack of overt) marking and distribution. But depictive expressions may constitute intonation units of their own (typically with progradient final intonation) when in pre-predicate position. In contrast, sequences of manner adverbial plus predicate strongly disfavour prosodic breaking. Preliminary analyses of other adverbial expressions support the impression that the restrictions concerning possible intonation patterns demonstrated for manner adverbials in this section also hold for other adverbials. But the intonational properties of adverbial and depictive expressions definitely need further investigation. For the time being, we consider them to instantiate a single construction type, i.e. a general adjunct construction.

7.5 Other types of adjunct that allow participant-oriented readings

This section provides data on other types of expressions which share semantic characteristics with depictive expressions in Laz. Section 7.5.1 investigates the semantic range of the instrumental case, section 7.5.2 discusses uses of expressions marked with motative case, and section 7.5.3 deals with locational nouns. For all three kinds of expressions, we will argue that no clear boundary can be drawn between participant-oriented and event-oriented constructions.

7.5.1 Instrumentals

The suffix -te mainly marks NPs referring to the instrument of an event. Its use is restricted to non-human referents (see Kutscher 2001: ch. 5 for details). In addition to encoding an instrument, the suffix covers cause (20), purpose (22), and accompaniment (25) readings. In the following, we discuss these uses in more detail.

An instrumental case may mark adverbials of cause, as is the case with the verbal noun obriru ‘play’ in (20) which gives the reason why the speaker returned home late.

(20) himndya / (0.1) obriru leba domau
    him-ndo ya obrir-te leba do-mau
    DEM-day play:VN-INS late EMPH-become:1SG.PST.PFV
    ‘On this day I was late because of playing.’ (W K exhibited 006)

Instrumentals of cause are not restricted to event-oriented uses. Compare the noun škurina ‘fear’ in instrumental case in (21). The example is from a narrative about a mother and a daughter harvesting tea up in the mountains away from their village. On their way home they reach a river and as dusk comes, the mother begins her evening prayer. While the mother is praying, the daughter hears some strange noises and thinks the river ghosts are coming to get her. The mother, knowing that her daughter is a timid person and would prefer to go home and not pray at the bank of the river, thinks that her daughter is hallucinating and says:

(21) (...) škurina oγnam ya
    škurina-te oγnam ya
    fear-INS hear:[2>3]SG.PRS quot
    ‘You only hear it because you are frightened.’ (K/G
göcekulesa 028)
In this context, the nominal πκυρίνατε denotes a mental state of the actor of the predicate ὁγνάμ 'you hear it', i.e. the daughter, and hence functions as a participant-oriented expression.

The same holds for the instrumental phrase παράτα 'with money' in (22) which denotes the purpose of the activity of the actor participant of the main predicate πιτλόμ 'I pluck':

(22) σαγι (0.1) παράτα πιτλόμ
σαγί para-te πιτλόμ
tea money-INS pluck:3SG.PRS
'I am harvesting tea for money [in order to get money].'

The instrumental in (22) also relates to the mental state of the actor or rather, it encodes that the actor is accompanied by a certain mental state, namely the thought of money. Hence, more literally one may translate (22) as 'I pluck tea with money on my mind'.

An instance of the participant-oriented use of the accompaniment meaning of the instrumental is the instrumental phrase κακαλίτε 'with a stone' in (23).

(23) mbuli κακαλίτε ceşkidu
mbuli κακαλί κακαλί ceşkidu
cherry stone-INS swallow:3SG.PST.PFV
'S/he swallowed the cherry with its stone.'

As can be shown by the insertion of a possessive pronoun in (24) (see section 7.2 above), κακαλί 'stone' in (23) is not internal to the object NP mbuli. It forms a constituent of its own and functions as a participant-oriented adjunct.

(24) mbuli şkimi κακαλίτε ceşkidu → *mbuli κακαλίκε şkimi ceşkidu
mbuli şkimi kakali-te ceşkidu
cherry poss.1SG pip-INS swallow:3SG.PST.PFV
'S/he swallowed my cherry with its stone.'

In some cases the instrumental expression is semantically vague as to a participant- or event-oriented reading, as seen in (25).

(25) şuneri kibrite cari imxoy
Şun-eri kibi-te cari imxoy
hurt-PTCP teeth-INS meal/bread eat:3SG.PRS
'S/he eats the meal with hurting teeth.'

In (25), the hurting teeth of the actor are the instruments of the eating process, i.e. on the one hand the expression is event-oriented. Simultaneously, the instrumental phrase in (25) refers to the physical state of the eater and therefore is participant-oriented.

To conclude, the instrumental allows event-oriented as well as participant-oriented uses. Moreover, in some instances the orientation of the instrumental is in fact vague. Hence, Laz instrumentals instantiate what Himmelmann and Schultz-Berndt (Ch. 1, this volume) call a general adjunct construction. In the following section, we will show that comparable findings hold for motative phrases.

7.5.2 Motatives

The term motative originates in the grammar of Pazar-Laz written by Rosen (1844) and captures the particular semantics of this case, which only encodes that the referent of a nominal thus marked has moved, but it is vague with respect to whether the referent is moving towards a goal (as in (26a); see also (4a) above) or moves away from a source, as in (26b).

(26) a. bere oxori-şa amulun
    bere oxori-şa amo-ulud
    child house-mot into-Go:3SG.PRS
    'The child goes inside the house.'

b. bere oxori-şa gamulun
    bere oxori-şa gamo-ulun
    child house-mot out-go:3SG.PRS
    'The child goes out of the house.'

The direction of movement is usually specified by a spatial prefix to the predicate, e.g. amo- 'into' in (26a) or gomo- 'out' in (26b).

Motative phrases most frequently are event-oriented, as in the preceding examples. In some cases, however, we have found motative-marked phrases which clearly have participant-oriented semantics. In these cases, the predicate denotes an event of emission and the motative relates to the source of this event; compare (27) for illustration.

(27) şarmakuyepşa buxam \ nana
şarmakul-yi-şe buxam nana
railings-pl-MOT call:[1]>3SG.PRS mother
'I called her from the railings. “Mother.”\

(K/G nezi 044)

In (27), the narrator of the story is accidentally caught in a storehouse and tries to call her mother so that she may be released. The actor of the predicate buxam 'I call her' is behind the railings of the storehouse, while the undergoer, the person called, is outside the storehouse, coming down the street. Interestingly, the motative phrase in these participant-oriented uses expresses the
location of the controller, not its movement towards a goal or from a source. The calling, however, is directed away from the controller in (27), which makes the controller the source of the event expressed in the predicate. Hence, the motative phrase at the same time is also event-oriented. Compare (28), where the caller comes to the storehouse and calls a person standing behind the storehouse’s railings. In this case the motative-marked phrase is purely event-oriented, denoting the direction of the calling but not the location of the caller.

(28) serende-sa moxtu do
storehouse-MOT come:3SG.PST.PFV and
parmakluyepe-sa uoxu
railings-MOT call:[3]>3SG.PST.PFV
‘She came to the storehouse and called to her towards the railings.’

To conclude, Laz has a general adjunct construction of location—the motative-marked phrase. These motative phrases may be used to express the location of a participant and at the same time are event-oriented in that they indicate the direction to which the event is oriented.

7.5.3 Locational nominals
In addition to the general adjunct construction of location dealt with in the preceding section, Laz also has expressions in which the location of a participant is expressed by an unmarked locational nominal, e.g. cindo ‘top’ in (29).

(29) cindo keizdaman i
  cindo ko-e-izdaman
top EMPH-UP-pull:3PL.PRS
‘They [the boys] pull it (the food) up [from a shelf in the kitchen] being on the top [i.e. in the store room above the kitchen].’ (K/G lu 062)

The landmark expression cindo ‘top’ in (29) denotes the location of only one of the participants in the event, namely the boys. Conversely, the preverb e- ‘up’ denotes the direction of the food which is being pulled up, i.e. the food is on its way up to the boys. With respect to participant orientation, Laz locational nominals, which consist of a locative adverb plus the suffix -ndo, differ from the locative adverbs from which they are derived.7 The latter are compatible with spatial preverbs of the same semantic domain. Thus, the locative adverb cindo ‘up’ in (30) specifies or emphasizes the spatial semantics of the preverb e- ‘up’.

(30) cindo e-izdaman
  up up-pull:3PL.PRS
‘They pull it up [above].’

Locative adverbs are event-oriented only. The adverb cindo ‘up’ denotes the upward movement of the food and, in contrast to the locational nominal in (29), does not relate to the location of the actor. The puller in (30) may as well transport the food away from herself with the help of a block and tackle.

Since the nominal expressions may be participant-oriented, there is a functional difference between locational adjunct expressions containing a nominal with -ndo suffix and those with an adverb. Nevertheless, locational nominal expressions cannot be analysed as a genuine depictive construction, since they may also be used as locative modifiers. In this function, the locational expression refers to the location of the event to which the predicate relates. Compare (31), where the locational expression oxirsi cindo ‘on top of the house’ relates to the place where the event of the speaker’s spreading the hazelnuts is taking place.

(31) oxirsi cindo ntxiri goob-bobyam
  house-GEN top hazelnut on-throw:1-3SG.PRS
‘I spread hazelnuts on top of the house.’

Laz locational nominal expressions may also serve to relate only to a part of the event expressed by the predicate (i.e. internal modifier function, cf. Maienborn (2001)). Compare (32) for illustration.

(32) kafri cindo me-buqadi
  nail top at-hammer:1-3SG.PST.PFV
‘I hammered the nail on the upper part [of the door].’

The locational nominal cindo ‘top’ in (32) does not relate to the location of the whole event, since only the hammering and the object of the hammering is located on the upper part of the door. The actor of the event is not located there. Hence, the locational nominal specifies an internal aspect of the event

Conversely, bare forms, i.e. expressions without -ndo suffix, are locative adverbs. They cannot appear in core argument function (see Kutscher 2000, chapter 3 for details) and cannot be modified by a genitive NP.

(32) ntxiri cindo goob-bobyam => *oxirsi cindo
  hazelnut above spread-on:1-3SG.PRS
‘I spread hazelnuts above.’
but does not locate the event as a whole. In this function, the locational nominal is both participant-oriented (relating to the location of the nail, but not the actor) and event-oriented.

Locational nominals can also be used as frame-setting expressions (Maienborn 2001). In this function, the locational nominal does not relate to the location of the event directly but sets a frame for it. Compare (33), where a young woman is instructed by her mother-in-law how to escape from the Russian soldiers who are about to invade the village.

\[
(33) \begin{align*}
\text{oxori doloxendo} & \text{ neknapet pencepe vrosi; (0.3)} \\
& \text{oxori doloxendo nekna-pe pencepe-p} \text{ vrosi} \\
& \text{do\text{\textdagger}} \text{adi} / (0.5) (\ldots) \\
& \text{do-o\text{\textdagger}} \text{adi} \\
\text{EMP'h-nail}:2>3 \text{sg.pst.pfv} \\
& \text{\textquoteleft Inside the house, nail the doors and windows well\textquoteright}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

(K/G askerepe 098-102)

The locational expression oxori doloxendo ‘inside the house’ in (33) is intonationally detached and has a protracted intonation contour. It sets the frame of the hammering event denoted in the following intonation unit neknapet pencepe vrosi do\text{\textdagger} \text{adi} ‘nail the doors and windows well’.

In sum, locational nominal expressions in Laz serve the three different functions which Maienborn (2001) argues to be typical for locative adjuncts: internal and external modification and frame-setting. With respect to these functions, locational nominal expressions in Laz are event-oriented. In addition, locational nominals in some uses exhibit purely participant-oriented readings. Hence, locational nominal expressions in Laz are another instance of the general adjunct construction.

### 7.6 A genuine depictive construction: distributive numerals

This section deals with quantifier expressions. On constructional grounds, these have to be divided into two subclasses in Laz: collective quantificational and distributive quantificational expressions.

Collective quantificational expressions are similar in construction to the manner expressions discussed in section 7.4 above. They are construed with unmarked quantifiers such as xvala ‘alone’ in (34) and may have participant-oriented readings (34a) or are vague with respect to participant and event orientation (34b).

\[
(34) \begin{align*}
a. \text{xvala e\text{\textdagger}} \text{ka-fiare} / \\
& \text{alone up-go:1sg.fut.pfv} \\
& \text{\textquoteleft We will go up alone\textquoteright}. \\
\text{(K/G xvala 004)} \\
b. \text{ki\text{\textdagger}} \text{ci oyi xvala pskultur} \\
& \text{winter village alone live:1sg.prs} \\
& \text{\textquoteleft In the winter I live on my own in the village\textquoteright}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Bare numerals, however, can only be interpreted as event-oriented. Compare the numerals ar ‘one’ and cur ‘two’ in (35), which denote the frequency of the soldiers’ comings.

\[
(35) \begin{align*}
\text{askerepe a m\text{\textdagger}} \text{oxetey} / \\
& \text{askere-pe ar m\text{\textdagger}} \text{oxetey cur m\text{\textdagger}} \text{oxetey} \\
& \text{soldier-pl one come:3pl.pst.pfv two come:3pl.pst.pfv} \\
& \text{\textquoteleft The soldiers came once, they came twice\textquoteright}. \\
\end{align*}
\text{(K/G askerepe 019)}
\]

Reduplicated numerals, in contrast, are clearly participant-oriented, as in (36).

\[
(36) \begin{align*}
\text{askerepe curcur m\text{\textdagger}} \text{oxetey} \\
& \text{soldier:two:rdp come:3pl.pst.pfv} \\
& \text{\textquoteleft The soldiers came in pairs\textquoteright}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

These participant-oriented numeral expressions can only have a distributive meaning (e.g. ‘two by two’ in the above example) and cannot be used to express the total number of referents of the phrase, as the German construction with zu ‘to’ + numeral.

Other participant-oriented quantifiers may also be reduplicated, compare (37).

\[
(37) \begin{align*}
\text{xvalaxvala} / 2.3 \\
& \text{xvala:rdp bulur} \\
& \text{alone go:1sg.prs} \\
& \text{\textquoteleft I walk totally alone\textquoteright}. \\
\end{align*}
\text{(K/G inonu 058)}
\]

In these cases, however, the reduplication seems to be emphatic or, in the case of Turkish loans, may be induced by the Turkish source construction. Reduplication in these emphatic cases, however, is non-obligatory and hence not a genuine constructional means to encode participant orientation. In contrast, for numerals functioning as participant-oriented adjuncts...

---

\footnote{When used in argument position, numerals show a special form with a suffix (for details, see Kutscher 2001: ch. 3.2.2).}

\footnote{Compare German Sie kamen zu zweit (3pl. came at two) ‘The two of them came’, referring to exactly two persons coming, in contrast to the distributive construction Sie kamen in Paaren (3pl. came in pairs) ‘They came two by two’, referring to more than two persons.}
reduplication is obligatory. Therefore, we would argue that reduplicated numeral expressions are an example of a genuine depictive construction.\(^{10}\)

7.7 On expressing role and life stage in Laz

Expressions of role such as I got the book as a present are often considered to be typical examples of depictive secondary predicate expressions. Interestingly, adjunct constructions of this type cannot be found in Laz. Role expressions in Laz always have to be biclausal constructions. Both the role predication and the main predication form independent main clauses, each containing a finite verb. An example is given in (38).

(38) baba ŝkimi doktori on ∵ hastahane içalısay\)
    baba ŝkimi doktori on hastahane içalısay
    father POSS.1SG doctor be:3SG.PRS hospital work:3SG.PRS

‘My father is a doctor. He works at the hospital.’

Life-stage expressions, which often occur in the same type of construction as role expressions (e.g. she lived in Paris as a child), occur in two types of construction in Laz. The first type of life stage construction is again biclausal in nature. The life stage is expressed in a finite copula construction such as borti ʻI wasʼ in (39). In contrast to biclausal role expressions, however, the life-stage expression in biclausal life-stage constructions is the predicate of a subordinate clause marked by the motative suffix -sa. The motative in these constructions, together with imperfective aspect, expresses the simultaneity of the two predications.

(39) bere bortișa / lu zeri va bimxorri \)
    bere borti-rą lu zeri var-bimxorri
    child be:3SG.PST.IPFV-MOT traditional mealNEG-ERG:3SG.PST.IPFV

‘When I was a child, I didn’t eat lu zeri.’

The subordinate clause construction is obligatory for this type of life-stage expression and not merely an alternative as is the case e.g. in English, where

\(^{10}\) Subject to the condition that distributive numeral expressions are analysed as depictive expressions. McGregor (Ch. 5, this volume) provides a detailed discussion of numeral expressions in some Australian languages. As he points out, distributive quantificational expressions (or, in his terms, iterative co-participation) do not as easily qualify as depictive expressions. Although semantically they are participant-oriented and predicative, at least in some of the Australian languages under consideration, they lack agreement with the designated controller. In the Panoan language Shipibo-Konibo (Valenzuela, Ch 8, this volume), on the other hand, numerals in distributive function show agreement with the controller.

the subordinate clause when I was a child could be turned alternatively into the depictive construction as a child.

The fact that the subordinate clause is marked by a suffix expressing simultaneity which is similar in form to the motative case marker -sa (see section 7.3.2) gives rise to the question of whether this construction is a converb construction.

The finite verb of the subordinate clause allows for an explicit subject NP and may have complements that are not coreferential with a participant of the matrix clause, we analyse the suffix in this use as a temporal conjonction. Compare (40), where nana škimi ʻmy motherʼ is the subject of the predicate komoxtu ʻshe cameʼ.

(40) nana škimi oxori ko-moxtu-ša
    mother POSS.1SG house 3MPH-COME:3SG.PST.PFV-MOT
    kitabı golobioni
    book read:3SG.PST.PFV

‘When my mother came home, I was reading a book.’

The second type of life stage expressions has two variants. It may either contain a temporal adverb, as in (41b), or, for expressions denoting the exact age of the controller, a numeral is combined with the participle šaneri ʻof ageʼ, as in (41a).

(41) a. cur šaneri osinapu ceboğî
    cur šan-eri osinapu ceboğî
    two year-PTCP speak:V see1<3SG.PST.PFV

‘Two years old I began to speak.’

b. ordo yuru
    early die:3SG.PST.PFV

‘S/he died young.’

This kind of life stage construction is an instance of the general adjunct constructions discussed in sections 7.4 and 7.5.

7.8 Conclusion

In this chapter we have presented an overview of expressions in Laz which allow participant-oriented readings. We have argued that although Laz has a wide range of expressions of this kind, there are no unique segmental or distributional means marking a given construction as a genuine depictive construction. The single major exception to this claim is reduplicated numerals functioning as distributive quantifiers (section 7.6). The fact that otherwise there appears to be no genuine depictive construction in Laz seems
to be based on two factors: (a) the lack of case agreement on various levels, including agreement between controllers and participant-oriented adjuncts; (b) the fact that participant- and event-oriented adjuncts share essentially the same distributional possibilities. They also appear to share essentially the same possibilities of prosodic marking, in particular the ability to appear in intonation units of their own. The only possible exception with regard to prosody pertains to the observation discussed in section 7.4 that manner adverbials in pre-predicate position cannot be separated prosodically from the following predicate. However, this observation as well as other features of prosodic marking and packaging are still in need of much deeper exploration.

Panoan is a well-established linguistic family in South America; it comprises some thirty languages spoken in the Amazon regions of Peru, Brazil, and Bolivia. Participant agreement (PA) can be considered the typologically most salient feature of Panoan grammar. It refers to the use of a distinct inflectional morphology on adjuncts, in correlation with the syntactic function of the participant they are predicating of. In this contribution, I examine PA in Shipibo-Konibo (SK), a Panoan language spoken by c.30,000 people settled along the Ucayali river and its main tributaries in the Peruvian Amazon. Although the discussion will be restricted to this single language, most of the points made also apply to the sister languages for which sufficient description is available. Consider the following sentences where the locative

The present account of the SK Participant Agreement system is based on Valenzuela (2003). I would like to thank Eva Schultz-Berndt and Nikolaus Himmelmann for their invitation to participate in this volume and for helpful comments on a previous version of this chapter. My analysis of the Panoan PA system has benefited from input from audiences who attended my talks at the Michigan Historical Linguistics Group hosted by Sally Thomason, and the MPI for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig, in 2001 and 2002; I am very grateful for this. Foremost, I am indebted to the various Shipibo speakers who shared with me data and valuable insights on this fascinating aspect of their language; especially, I express my gratitude to Kesín Beso, Sanken Bari, and Yol Sani. jakiribš ichibirí irakší
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