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(1) MANNER COMPLEX PREDICATES (MCPs): \( V_1 = \) manner, \( V_2 = \) action
a. Induwa-an nopoh momoog(m-poN-wo‘og) inoh wagas toboh.
   \( \text{twice-DV} \) only AV-TR1-wash \( \text{that(NOM)} \) rice PRT
   ‘Just wash that (uncooked) rice two times.’

c. Basag-on noh mongogodong(m-poN-godong) ilo tali ...
   strong-OV FOC AV-TR1-pull \( \text{that(NOM)} \) rope
   ‘Pull hard on the rope (when you enter the tug-of-war).’

d. Bandan-o=i’ momurok(m-poN-purok) inoh manuk toh.
   big-OV=PRT AV-TR1-cut.up \( \text{that(NOM)} \) chicken PRT
   ‘Chop up that chicken into big pieces.’

e. Tuyuan-ai Ø-po-wiliw inoh runggou, a-babak dati.
   careful-DV AV-TR2-lay \( \text{that(NOM)} \) jar NVOL-shatter likely
   ‘Put that jar down gently or it might break.’

g. K[in]ondiri-Ø dialo mamatay(m-poN-patay) it tusu yoh.
   [PST]-self-OV 3sg AV-TR1-kill \( \text{NOM} \) dog 3sg.GEN
   ‘He killed his dog himself.’

(2) RESULTATIVE COMPLEX PREDICATES (RCPs): \( V_1 = \) result state or extent, \( V_2 = \) action.

a. N-a-rasak do karabau monginum(m-poN-inum) at weeg.
   PST-NVOL-dry.up GEN buffalo AV-TR1-drink \( \text{NOM} \) water
   ‘The stream was drunk dry by buffaloes.’

b. P[in]-toning-Ø kuh it sapi om karabau Ø-po-ogot.
   RECIP[PST]-near-OV 1sg.GEN NOM cow and buffalo AV-TR2-tie
   ‘I tied up the cow and the buffalo near each other.’

c. Adan-o’ yalo mamasut(m-poN-pasut)!
   faint-OV.IMPER 3sg.NOM AV-TR1-whip
   ‘Whip him unconscious!’

d. N-a-dapit-Ø do tulun momokok(m-poN-wokok) at bawang.
   PST-NVOL-span-OV GEN person AV-TR1-dam \( \text{NOM} \) river
   ‘Someone dammed up the river all the way across.’

e. Tuus-an noh momo’og(m-poN-wo’og) inoh tunturu nuh!
   faint-DV FOC AV-TR1-wash \( \text{that(NOM)} \) finger 2sg.GEN
   ‘Wash your fingers totally clean!’
(17) a. N-o­rikot kuh momilay(m-poN-pilay) i walay nuh sid tupak. PST-NVOL-arrive 1S.GEN AV-TR1-throw NOM house your DAT other.side ‘I threw (something) all the way to your house across the river.’ (lit: ‘Your house across the river was reached by me throwing something.’)

b. N-a­awi-Ø do kara mangakan it togilai yah. PST-NVOL-finish-OV GEN monkey AV-TR1-eat NOM maize 1pl.ex.GEN ‘Monkeys ate up all of our maize.’ (lit: ‘… finished the maize eating.’)

Defining features of the construction: V₂ is always in Active Voice and unmarked for TAM; nominative case on Pivot is assigned by V₁, even when it is not a semantic argument of V₁. See Holmer (2004) and Chang (in press) for similar examples in several Formosan languages.

(5) Kimaragang TAM affixes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice Category</th>
<th>Non-past</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Imperative/</th>
<th>Non-volitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor (AV)</td>
<td>m/-um-</td>
<td>m-in- /</td>
<td>Ø-</td>
<td>(no)ko-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-in-um-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective (OV)</td>
<td>-on</td>
<td>-in- _-Ø</td>
<td>-o’</td>
<td>(n)o-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative (DV)</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-in- _-an</td>
<td>-ai</td>
<td>(n)o- -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument (IV)</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>n-i-</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(no)ko-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative (LV)</td>
<td>-on</td>
<td>-in- _-on</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Evidence for monoclausality

a. the two verbs cannot be separated by a pause, conjunction, complementizer, linker, or any other marker of clause boundaries
b. there is no medial position that can host 2P clitics (see 8b)

(7) a. Suwab-suwab okuh manalu do pulut. PST-NVOL-every.day 1sg.NOM AV-TR1:tap GEN rubber ‘Every day I tap rubber.’

b. Sid tana yah n-odop-on. DAT earth 1pl.ex.GEN PST-sleep-LV ‘We slept on the ground (after the house burned down).’

(8) a. Ela’an kuh=i’ dot magaago yalo nga’ know 1sg.GEN=EMPH COMP hurry(AV) 3sg.NOM but n-antara-Ø kuh tu’ waro b[in]oros kuh sid dialo. PAST-intercept-OV 1sg.GEN because EXIST [NMLZ]say 1sg.GEN DAT 3sg ‘I knew that he was in a hurry but I held him up because I had something to say to him.’
b. Amu kuh yalo n-o-onong-Ø monimbak.
not 1sg.GEN 3sg.NOM PST-NVOL-hit- OV AV-shoot
‘I didn’t hit him when I shot.’

c. the undergoer gets nominative case marking from V\textsubscript{1} even when it follows V\textsubscript{2}; therefore undergoer must be a clausemate of V\textsubscript{1}. It can be topicalized, clefted etc. in “matrix” S (these examples cannot be instances of long-distance extraction):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(9)] a. It sapi om karabau p[in]-toning-Ø kuh Ø-po-o got.
NOM cow and buffalo RECIP[PST]-near-OV 1sg.GEN AV-TR2-tie
‘The cow and the buffalo I tied up near each other.’

b. Disai do tasu ot n-a-patai dialo momobog?
whose LNK dog NOM PST-NVOL-kill-OV 3sg AV-TR1-beat
‘Whose dog did he beat to death?’
\end{enumerate}

Biclausal result-reason sentences: both verbs are marked for past tense, each verb is followed by its own arguments, and each verb assigns nominative case to its own subject.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(10)] Naandab i=togilai tu’ minonutud okuh di=sakot id=tompil.
PST-NVOL-wilt NOM=corn because AV-PST-TR1-burn IS.NOM ACC=grass DAT=side
‘The corn wilted (from heat) because I burned some grass right next to it.’

\item[(11)] a. Noko-pilai yalo s[in]ungu-Ø do karabau.
PST.NVOL.IV-throw 3sg.NOM [PST]-horn-OV GEN buffalo
‘He was gored by a buffalo and tossed (into the air).’

b. N-a-alum-Ø nopoh ilo parai n-ajang-an do sarup tologod.
PST-NVOL-flatten-OV only that.NOM rice PST-affect-DV GEN wind strong
‘That rice was hit by a strong wind and flattened.’

\item[(12)] a. N-o-tuus-Ø do karabau mongotop i parai kuh. [RCP]
PAST-NVOL-eat.up-OV GEN buffalo AV-TR1-graze NOM rice 1sg.GEN
‘My rice crop was completely devoured by buffaloes.’

b. N-o-tuus-Ø i=parai kuh k[in]otop-Ø do karabaw. [biclausal]
PAST-NVOL-eat.up-OV NOM=rice 1sg.GEN [PST]-graze-OV GEN buffalo
‘My rice crop was all eaten up, grazed off by buffaloes.’
\end{enumerate}

2.2 Contrast with auxiliary verbs

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(14)] b. Minaan da manuk kakay-o’ it sayur kuh.
PAST.AUX GEN chicken scratch-OV.ATMP NOM vegetable 1sg.GEN
‘My vegetable plants were scratched by the chickens.’

\item[(d)] Maan tekau(kuh-ikau) jarum-ai.
AUX 1sg.GEN-2sg.NOM needle-DV.ATMP
‘I will give you a shot.’
\end{enumerate}
e. Mangay okuh poh dagang-ay do buduy.
   AUX.IMPER 1sg.NOM yet buy-DV.ATMP ACC watermelon
   ‘Please buy some watermelon for me.’

f. Amu yah noh mangan garaso’ ilo karabau.
   NEG 1pl.ex.GEN already AUX slaughter-OV.ATMP that(NOM) buffalo
   ‘We are not going to slaughter that buffalo any more (i.e., we changed our plans).’

(15) c. Minaan owi-o’ di Jaiwan mangakan i rinapa.
   PAST.AUX finish-OV.ATMP GEN Jaiwan AV-TR1-eat NOM cooked.food
   ‘Jaiwan intentionally ate up all the food.’

3. Argument sharing in RCPs

The two verbs in the resultative construction express a single complex transitive event which involves a unique Actor and a unique Undergoer. The Undergoer must always be an argument of \( V_1 \) and the Actor must always be an argument of \( V_2 \). This implies that \( V_1 \) must be either transitive or unaccusative (see 2a and 17a), while \( V_2 \) must be either transitive or unergative (18a).

(18) a. Amu o-owit-Ø dit tombolog t[um]ulud it wulanut.
   not NVOL-lift-OV GEN bird [AV]fly NOM snake
   ‘The bird was not able to fly off carrying the snake.’

The RCP in (20b) is ungrammatical, because the two verbs have different Actors.

   PST-NVOL-sleep NOM child [PST]-swing-OV GEN mother
   ‘The child fell asleep when its mother swung it (in a cloth sling/baby hammock).’

   b. *Nokoodop dit tidi mamayuk it tanak.
      PST-NVOL-sleep GEN mother AV-TR1-swing NOM child

The RCP in (21b) is ungrammatical, because the two verbs have different Undergoers.

(21) a. Nopilat itit lukap kuh nokoolok do=pansang. [biclausal]
   PST-NVOL-wound this.NOM sole my PST.NVOL.AV-step.on ACC=nail
   ‘The sole of my foot got wounded from stepping on a nail.’

      PST-NVOL-wound 1sg.GEN AV-TR1-step.on ACC nail this(NOM) sole my
      (intended: ‘The sole of my foot got wounded from stepping on a nail.’)

(22) a. Amu okuh ka-waya dikau suwab
   not 1sg.NOM AV.NVOL-accompany 2sg.ACC tomorrow
‘I can’t go with you tomorrow because I have to clear away the grass around my rice plants (#cut down my rice plants).’

‘You didn’t finish cutting grass around the rice plants (#cutting down the rice plants).’

Morphological evidence for argument sharing: when the Undergoer of a transitive verb is not selected as subject (= pivot), the verb bears one of two “transitivity” prefixes, glossed here as TR1 and TR2. These prefixes provide partial information about the semantic role of the Undergoer (= affected argument): TR1 (poN-) is used when the Undergoer is a patient, goal or recipient, while TR2 (po-) is used when the Undergoer is an instrument or displaced theme (see Kroeger 1996, Kroeger and Johansson 2005 for details).

Because of the Single Undergoer constraint on RCPs, the transitivity prefix on V2 must select the pivot/Undergoer of V1, otherwise the construction will be ungrammatical.

    PST-NVOL-throw 1sg.GEN  AV-TR1-throw ACC house your NOM PL mango
    (can only mean: ‘I finished off the mangoes by throwing your house at them.’)

b. Naawi kuh popilay sid walay nhu it tongo mangga.
    PST-NVOL-throw 1sg.GEN  AV-TR2-throw DAT house your NOM PL mango
    ‘I threw all the mangoes at your house.’ (cf. 17a)
4. A lexical analysis

(26) lexical rule of resultative complex predicate formation

\[ pred_1 < (A) \ U > \implies pred_1 < A \ U \ MEANS > \]

\[ pred_2 < A (U) \ldots > \]

The informal representation in (26) captures the following intuitions: \( V_1 \) may be either transitive or unaccusative when used by itself, but the complex predicate as a whole is always transitive, and both the Actor and Undergoer are governed and case marked by \( V_1 \). \( V_2 \) may be transitive or unergative, and may even introduce additional arguments such as instruments; but its Actor and Undergoer (if any) may not be distinct from the Actor and Undergoer of \( V_1 \). Shared arguments are identified by the process of argument structure merger (Alsina 1992), and receive a single syntactic expression. Notice the different interactions of RCP formation with reciprocal vs. causative derivations:

(27) b. Okon-ko pi-gogol-on ino tasu, o-pilat-an dati.  
   don’t RECIP-wrestle-OV that(NOM) dog NVOL-wound-DV likely  
   ‘Don’t make those dogs fight each other, they will get wounded.’

   [PST]-RECIP-eat.together-OV 3sg AV-CAUS-eat NOM married.couple  
   ‘He allowed the married couple to eat together.’

(29) a. N-i-pa-awi kuh di Jaiwan mangakan it rinapa.  
   PST-IV-CAUS-finish 1sg.GEN ACC Jaiwan AV-TR1-eat NOM viand  
   ‘I caused/allowed Jaiwan to eat up all the cooked food.’

   b. Subai ipeerot noh di tanak pootub i tuung.  
   PRT IV-CAUS-tight FOC ACC child AV-TR2-cover NOM box  
   ‘You’d better make the child close the lid of the box tightly.’

   c. Ipobirud nopo dialo manganu at tobu toh.  
   IV-CAUS-twist only 3sg AV-TR1-take NOM sugar.cane PRT  
   ‘Just have him twist the sugar cane off (pick by twisting).’

(30) apparent violation of the Single Actor constraint in (29) can be resolved through rule ordering:

a. Base form:  
   \( tighten < A, U > \)

b. complex pred.  
   \( tighten < A, U, MEANS > \)
5. A possible alternative analysis?

Maria Polinsky (p.c.) has suggested that \( V_2 \) be analyzed as a kind of gerund or participial adjunct, a depictive secondary predicate predicated of the Actor of \( V_1 \). (similar to the closest English equivalent of RCP examples like (2a): ‘The stream was dried up by buffaloes drinking.’) Note gerundive uses of “infinitival” verb forms (simple non-past form unmarked for aspect, mood or modality):

\[(31)\]

a. Ara’at ot [Ø-po-pi-oduwp do tulun sompusasawo].
   bad NOM AV-CAUS-RECIP-quarrel ACC person married.couple
   ‘To cause a married couple to quarrel is evil.’

b. [Monimba’al do tulun] nga ara’at=i’.
   AV-TR1-slander ACC person also bad=PRTCL
   ‘Slandering people is evil too.’

c. [Tinduk-on do wulanut] nga ka-patay=i’.
   peck-OV GEN snake also AV.NVOL-kill=PRTCL
   ‘Getting bitten by a snake can kill you too.’

d. [Pi-igol-on ot tasu] nga amu=i’ obbulih tu ko-bunsut.
   RECIP-dance-OV NOM dog also NEG=PRTCL allowed because AV.NVOL-curse
   ‘Making dogs dance with each other is not allowed either, because you could be struck by the bunsut curse (be swallowed into the ground).’

gerundive analysis accounts for:
   a. \( V_2 \) cannot be inflected for tense/aspect/mood
   b. uniqueness constraint for Actors
   c. possibly (with additional assumptions??) \( V_2 \) always appears in the Actor Voice form

gerundive analysis does not account for, but might be compatible with:
   a. uniqueness constraint for Undergoers

gerundive analysis does not account for, and may be incompatible with:
   a. interpretation of causative examples in (29)
   b. changes in valence and semantic content of \( V_1 \)
      (a characteristic feature of lexical processes)

\[(32)\]

a. N-o-rikot kuh *(momilay) i walay nuh. (cf. 3a)
   PST-NVOL-arrive 1S.GEN AV-TR1-throw NOM house your
   ‘I threw (something) all the way to your house.’
b. N-a-rasak do karabau *(monginum) a weeg. (cf. 2a)
   PST-NVOL-dry.up GEN buffalo AV-TR1-drink NOM stream
   ‘The stream was drunk dry by buffaloes.’

(33) I shouted myself *(hoarse).
I cried myself *(to sleep).
I worked my fingers *(to the bone).
She drank him *(under the table).
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