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Ngarinyman (Pama-Nyungan, Australian) has two resultative constructions that differ in their morphological exponence. I claim that both can be analyzed as spelling out a Res(ult) phrase (Ramchand 2008), however the locus of lexical material is distinct in each construction. Specifically, the affixal adjectival resultative spells out a head+complement structure, as Svenonius (2008) has proposed for some light verb constructions, whereas the coverb resultative (to be detailed below) is the direct exponent of the functional head Result.

Resultative predicates in Ngarinyman are typically expressed through a type of complex predicate known as a coverb construction, which comprises a) a closed-class inflecting verb (underlined throughout) and b) an open-class coverb (bolded throughout) (1-2).

(1) Mangarri-ma=n nyila-ma gidgid man-i;¹
   bread-top=2sg.s that-top break.redup do/get-pst
   ‘You broke the bread;’ (Jones 1995: 50) [NH: CJ: Mangarri (Damper) line 24]

(2) Lunggura=n dambang ba-ni?
   blue.tongued.lizard=2sg.s die hit-pst
   ‘Did you kill the blue-tongued lizard?’ (NH:CJ:1995-06-21)

The resultative interpretation disappears when a manner coverb is used instead (3-4).

(3) Garan-ba=na=nyunu man-a.
   scratch-ep=1sg.s-r/r do/get-prs
   I’m scratching myself. (JC:JM1-020 2016)

(4) Dalurrbb-ba=wural=nyunu ba=ranjy jan.ga gujarra-rlu guduru-yawung.
   fight-ep=3du.s-r/r hit-prs woman two-erg fighting.stick-prop
   ‘The two women are fighting with fighting sticks.’ (CD:JM1-017 2016)

It appears that the result coverb, rather than the inflecting verb, is responsible for the resultative interpretation. The question that arises is where is this coverb merged? Specifically, is it the exponent of a verbal head that is part of the functional sequence (Cinque 1999), or is it a maximal projection, merged as a complement or adjunct to a verbal head? The appearance of tense inflection on the inflecting verb suggests that the inflecting verb is part of the functional sequence, however the lack of inflection on the coverb is inconclusive, since the inflecting verb could simply be a higher intervening head.

Svenonius (2008) discusses light verb constructions such as (5) from Hindi/Urdu, which share certain similarities with coverb constructions.

(5) Raam-ne kamraa saaf kiyaa.
   Ram=e room,n clean do,perf
   ‘Ram cleaned the room’ (Hindi/Urdu; Mohanan 1994: 201, cited in Svenonius 2008)

He proposes that the light verb kî- ‘do’ is a verbal head (Ramchand 2008’s Proc(ess) head), while the adjective saaf ‘clean’ is an AdjP that merges as the complement of a Result head. This might also be the structure of the result coverb construction. However, there is some evidence that this is not the case. Ngarinyman also has adjectival resultatives that occur with inflecting verbs; however, in these cases the resultative suffix -g appears (6a, 7a). Note that -g is absent when the adjective occurs with a non-resultative interpretation (6b, 7b).

(6a) Ngurra man-i gilga=g Nichra-rlu. (6b) Nyama-ma ngurra-ma, gilga=nyjurr.
   home do/get-pst clean-res skin.name-erg this-top home-top clean=2pl.o
   ‘Nimarra has made the place clean.’ (NH:CJ:1995-06-03) ‘This place is clean.’ (NH:CJ:98)

(7a) Gurnbirlm-gu bunyu=g man-ana garu. (7b) Majul bunyu=l u garr-inya nyarrulu-ma.
   doctor-erg good-res do/get-prs kid stomach good=3pl.s be-pst 3pl-top

¹ Abbreviations: ADJ ectivizing; DATive; DUAL; EP enthetic syllable; ERGative; O object; PERF ective; PL plural; PRS present; PRO Prietive; PST past; REDUPlication; RES ultative; R/R reflexive/reciprocal; S subject; SG singular; TOpic.
This affixal resulative in fact seems like the right candidate for the Res+complement structure, with -g spelling out the Res head, and appearing as an affix due to its complementation relation with the AdjP (Svenonius 2015). If coverbs were also merged as the complement of Res, we might expect -g to occur; however this is not the case. I propose instead that result coverbs are the direct exponent of Res. The proposed structure for affixal resultatives is given in (8a), and coverb resultatives in (8b).

(8a) ProcP
   /\            /
  /   \          /   \  
DP_1  Proc'  ResP
     /\      /
  /   \       /
DP_1  Proc  Res'

(8b) ProcP
   /\            /
  /   \          /   \  
DP_1  Proc'  ResP
     /\      /
  /   \       /
DP_1  Proc  Res'

Support for this analysis comes from the behaviour of result coverbs in adjectival function, which require extra morphology (9-10).

(9) Ngayiny wurlu gid-bari. 1SG.DAT leg break-ADJ
(10) Nag yuwa-ni warlagu dambang-bari put-PST dog die-ADJ

‘My leg is broken.’ (JC:JM1-019 2016) ‘He buried the dead dog.’ (CD:JM1-010 2016)

I suggest that this extra morphology has a nominalising function, which serves to existentially close the open event variable that is present in the denotation of the coverb (Moulton 2014). This extra morphology is not required for coverbs in the resultative construction when they are merged as part of the functional hierarchy, and as their event variable is existentially closed by a higher functional head such as Aspect (Svenonius 2008).

It this paper I argue that the morphological exponention of two resultative constructions gives clues to their structure. Under this proposal the location of lexical material is distinct: in the affixal resultative lexical content is located in the complement, whereas in the coverb resultative it is located in the functional head itself. This suggests that functional heads can have more lexical content than we typically expect. A parallel can be drawn with restructuring verbs, which merge relatively high in the structure but have more lexical material than a typical auxiliary verb (Cinque 2004).

References