

**The prolongative, and what can hinder its grammaticalisation from loose,
enumerative coordination**

Frans Plank (Universität Konstanz)

Correspondence address:

Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Konstanz, D-78457 Konstanz, Germany

E-mail: frans.plank@uni-konstanz.de

Fax: +49-7531-88.4190

Tel: +49-7531-88.2656

The prolongative, and what can hinder its grammaticalisation from loose, enumerative coordination

Abstract

The theoretical point of this paper is that the grammar of scope matters for grammaticalisation. This is exemplified from the aspectual (or verbal number, or “pluractional”) notion of prolongation. Fully and distinctively grammaticalised in many languages, frequently in the iconic form of repetition, reduplication, or gemination, other languages, including German and English, appear to lack special grammatical means to express the continuation of a process or state beyond its normal temporal extension, or also its reiteration, and instead exploit the ordinary grammar of loose, enumerative coordination of non-identical verb-phrases or clauses for this purpose (e.g., *He talked, and [he] talked, and [he] talked ...*). There is incipient grammaticalisation here too, however: loose verb-phrase or clause coordination is reduced to more tightly structured binary verb coordination, and is even restructured further to a pseudo-coordinative modificational construction where prolongation is no longer expressed through a second conjunct (V [& V]) but through a preceding verb copy ([V&] V; e.g. *He [talked (a)n(d)] talked*). Being a scopal category, prolongation interacts with other scopal categories in the verb phrase, in particular negation. It is conflicts of scope, with prolongation and such other scopal categories ending up in the “wrong” linear order or in “wrong” syntactic command relations (e.g., **Godot didn't come and come* ‘Godot continued not to come’), which hinder the full grammaticalisation of prolongation, confining it to only such grammatical environments (e.g., positive, declarative, main clauses) which happen to be scopally inoffensive.

The prolongative, and what can hinder its grammaticalisation from loose, enumerative coordination

1. Prolongation as enumeration of identicals

In German, as in many other languages, the continuation of a process or state beyond their normal temporal extension, or also their prolongation through reiteration, with the participants remaining the same throughout, can be iconically expressed through simply repeating the verb as often as is desired, each time joined to the preceding verb by a coordinator:

- (1) Ein Volkswagen LÄUFT [und LÄUFT] [und LÄUFT] ...
'a Volkswagen runs [and runs] [and runs] ...'

The constituent structure and characteristic phonological phrasing are as indicated by brackets in (1): there is a clear break before each repetition and the coordinator *und* 'and' is a co-constituent of the repeat. All repetitions of the verb come with main stress (indicated by capitalisation of the syllable stressed), as does the verb in the simple clause.

Examples with transitive verbs show that what gets repeated is actually the entire verb phrase, and ultimately indeed the entire clause, which is subject to routine ellipsis of the subject:

- (2) Oma sang *STILLe Nacht* [und (sie) sang *STILLe Nacht*] [und (sie) sang *STILLe Nacht*] ...
'grandma sang *Silent Night* [and (she) sang *Silent Night*] [and (she) sang *Silent Night*] ...'

Especially with indefinite objects, the repeats (possibly in pronominalised form) can then be reduced further: their final part, carrying the main stress in a sentence in the absence of contrastive focus, suffices — that is, the object noun phrase including the focus particle in (3b):

- (3) a. Opa trank ein BIER [und (er) trank NOCH ein Bier] [und (er) trank NOCH ein Bier] ...
 ‘grandpa drank a beer [and (he) drank yet another beer] [and (he) drank yet another beer] ...’
 (pronominalised: [und (er) trank NOCH eines] ‘and (he) drank yet another one’)
- b. Opa trank ein BIER [und NOCH ein Bier] [und NOCH ein Bier] ...
 ‘grandpa drank a beer [and yet another beer] [and yet another beer] ...’
 (pronominalised: [und NOCH eines] ‘and yet another one’)

Main clauses are the most typical locus for such repetitions, owing to their rhetorical force, which is almost too strong to be applied in the communicative background of subordinate clauses. Still, in the right circumstances, with main clauses themselves not the main message, they are certainly also possible in subordinate clauses introduced by complementisers and with finite verbs in final position:

- (4) Es ist ein Fakt, dass
- a. ein Volkswagen LÄUFT [und LÄUFT] [und LÄUFT] ...
- b. Oma *STILLe Nacht* sang [und *STILLe Nacht* sang] [und *STILLe Nacht* sang] ...
- c. Opa ein BIER trank [und NOCH ein Bier (trank)] [und NOCH ein Bier (trank)] ...
 ‘it is a fact that [as above, (1), (2), (3)]’

It is the stressed constituent of the verb phrase that is obligatorily present in the repeats (the direct objects in (4b/c)); if anything is omissible, it is the finite verb, now in final position.

Naturally, not only occurrences, but also non-occurrences can have unexpectedly long temporal extensions or can be prolonged through reiteration. This can be expressed along the same lines, with the negator *nicht* repeated, too:

- (5) a. Ein Trabant ROStet nicht [und ROStet nicht] [und ROStet nicht] ...
 ‘a Trabant rusts not [and rusts not] [and rusts not] ...’
- b. ..., dass ein Trabant nicht ROStet [und nicht ROStet] [und nicht ROStet] ...
 ‘... that a Trabant not rusts [and not rusts] [and not rusts] ...’

- (6) a. Opa wollte nicht *STILLe Nacht* singen [und wollte nicht *STILLe Nacht* singen]
 [und wollte nicht *STILLe Nacht* singen] ...
 ‘grandpa wanted not *Silent Night* to sing [and wanted not *Silent Night* to sing]
 [and wanted not *Silent Night* to sing] ...’ (i.e., just didn’t want to sing *Silent Night*)
- b. ..., dass Opa nicht *STILLe Nacht* singen wollte [und nicht *STILLe Nacht* singen
 wollte] [und nicht *STILLe Nacht* singen wollte] ...
 ‘... that grandpa not *Silent Night* to sing wanted [and not *Silent Night* to sing
 wanted] [and not *Silent Night* to sing wanted] ...’

The position of the negator within the verb phrase, which will become an issue presently, is not an issue here: prolongation as such is expressed through the repetition of the entire verb phrase (or clause) including the negator, and it is thus acknowledged overtly that semantically negation is within the scope of prolongation.

Judging by examples like those above, there is no special grammar for the concept of an abnormally long extension of a process or state in time, in German and other languages which likewise exploit clause or verb phrase coordination for this purpose: this concept is parasitic on the grammar of loose, enumerative coordination of non-identical conjuncts. The coordinative combination of identical conjuncts is also available for other kinds of units — noun phrases, adjectives, adverbs or verb-related particles (cf. (7))¹ — and the common denominator is the iconic, and rhetorically effective, expression of ‘more of the same’.

- (7) a. There were DOGS and DOGS and DOGS ... all over the place
 b. He felt ANGrier and ANGrier
 c. He talked ON and ON and ON ...

¹ The English examples are from Quirk et al. (1972: 618). For German analogues, ancient and modern, see Behaghel (1928: 375-378). A different, and apparently later, use of the coordination of identicals is to highlight difference; its origin is with indefinite NPs in existential sentences (e.g., *Alack, there be roses and roses, John!* (1855, Browning)), and it may marginally be generalisable to VPs or verbs (e.g., *People will always read books and read books*, meaning ‘books of different kinds’).

The only special feature could seem to be the non-omissibility of the coordinator from any conjunct, regardless of their number and place in the sequence:

- (8) a. *There were DOGS, DOGS, and DOGS all over the place
b. *Ein Volkswagen LÄUFT, LÄUFT, und LÄUFT (cf. (1))

This serves to distinguish the expression of a quantitative increase in whatever is being referred to by the units repeated from plain emphasis, which is the typical function of an asyndetic combination of identical material (e.g., *There were dogs, dogs, dogs, not cats, cats, cats!*). However, in loose enumerative coordination itself, unlike in prototypically symmetric coordination, coordinators do not usually get omitted, either.

2. Prolongation under way towards a grammar of its own

Now, prolongation is such a salient notion that it would be surprising for it not to find any distinctive grammatical recognition, the more so as full repetitions of verb phrases or indeed entire clauses, while expressive, are also quite cumbersome. Prolongation is being used here as a cover term for continuation and reiteration, and continuatives, iteratives and the like — durative, progressive, cursive, habitual, conative, augmentative, cumulative, multiplicative, repetitive, duplicative, semelfactive, semeliterative, frequentative, raritive, reversive, dispersive, perambulative, etc. — indeed are commonly encountered as aspectual or verbal-number (or “pluractional”) categories.² Their grammatical encodings include suppletive lexical alternants (cf. German *zerren* as an iterative of *ziehen* ‘to pull, drag’, although such pairs are probably too sporadic to claim grammatical status), specialised multiplicative numerals or adverbs, modal auxiliaries (as in English, e.g. *It just wouldn’t rain, It useta rain*), regular affixation of a derivational or an inflectional kind (e.g., *-it* in Latin, as in *cant-it-are* ‘to sing again and again’; especially relevant inflectional categories are finiteness and nominalisation, tense, mood, and of course aspect

² The term “prolongative” appears to have been first introduced for an aspectual form of Navajo by Young & Morgan (1980: 325-326). However, the semantics of that particular form for unintentional action or suppressed initiator control (‘doing something excessively or incorrectly and being unable to stop’) is better captured by the term “errative”, commonly used elsewhere in Athapaskan (Rice 2000: 154-155, 338).

and actionality), or most commonly the doubling of units at all levels — lengthening of consonantal or vocalic segments, partial or complete reduplication of verb stems (or also affixes), asyndetic or coordinative conjunction of verbal words (including special-purpose ideophones), phrases, or clauses (sometimes accompanied by ablaut alternations).³

Languages like German and English, however, do not use any such means at all systematically for the specific purpose of expressing prolongation.

They did give it a serious try, though, insofar as they sought to adapt loose, enumerative clause or verb phrase coordination to this purpose. Such constructions would indeed seem to be easy to simplify, even with the iconic doubling retained. In German, and analogously in English, the standard simplification of prolongative clause or verb phrase repetition takes the form of (what seems to be) mere verb conjunction, with the remaining parts of verb phrases only given once:⁴

- (9) a. Oma sang und sang *STILLe Nacht*
‘grandma sang and sang *Silent Night*’
- b. Die Christbaumkugeln fielen und fielen RUNter
‘the Christmas tree decorations fell and fell off’
- c. Opa beTRANK und beTRANK sich
‘grandpa *be*-drank and *be*-drank himself’ (i.e., got more and more drunk)
- d. Mutti hat geHEULT und geHEULT
‘ma has cried and cried’
- e. Mutti hat und hat geHEULT
‘ma has and has cried’

³ For crosslinguistic approaches from either a formal or a functional angle see Pott (1862: 120-155), Brandstetter (1917: 24, 26-27), Jespersen (1924: 210-211), Jensen (1952: 19-20), Dressler (1968: 84-91, *passim*), Moravcsik (1978: 317-322), Steever (1987), Mithun (1988a), Xrakovskij (1989/1997), Newman (1990), Fitzpatrick-Cole (1994: 55-62, 68-69, 123-125, 198-199), Lasersohn (1995: 238-266, essentially drawing on Cusic 1981), and Evans (1995) and a few other chapters in Bach et al. (1995) (on “A-quantification”, verb-related and quantifying over events, as opposed to nominal or “D-quantification”).

Diachronic scenarios of the sort envisaged here seem to be missing, however. Characterising coordinative conjunction as “gewissermaßen eine aufgelöste Geminatio”, Jensen is getting it backwards, diachronically, at least for languages like German.

⁴ This goes unnoticed in the chapters on German and English in Xrakovskij (1989/1997). What will be ignored in the present paper, as tangential to its main focus, are constraints on this construction as well as differentiations of its continuative and iterative meanings in terms of verb meanings and actional (or Aktionsart) semantics.

What does not get repeated with the verb here is the direct object (9a), the separable verb prefix (only distanced from the verb when this moves into second position, (9b)), the reflexive (9c), the perfect or past tense auxiliary (9d), and the main verb in participial form (9e). As shown by (9d/e), there is sometimes a choice of what to repeat: either the non-finite main verb or the finite auxiliary. (Actually both can be repeated, too: *Mutti hat geHEULT und hat geHEULT*; with the auxiliary a mere tense marker, it is not obvious that this represents full verb phrase coordination.) This alternation possibly extends to other close associates of the verb, like separable verb prefixes, which can also be repeated instead of the verbs themselves:

- (9) b'. Die Christbaumkugeln fielen RUNter und RUNter
 'the Christmas tree decorations fell off and off'

As in typical cases of the grammaticalisation of loosely added amplifications, the simplified expression of the prolongative aspect (or verbal number) as verb rather than verb phrase conjunction is more tightly organised, insofar as (i) there is no major break in phrasing between the repeated material and (ii) the verb can only be repeated once rather than ad libitum. The simplification, thus, is no mere further ellipsis of parts shared by two verb phrases. As will be argued in the following section, on top of the omissions and the tightening, the loose pragmatic source construction has indeed been restructured even more drastically.

It is difficult to pinpoint a date when verb phrase or (elliptical) clause coordination began to be grammaticalised as verb conjunction. There are clear instances such as (10), with an impersonal verb, from Middle High German:

- (10) des wundert unde wundert mich
 'this (GEN) wonders and wonders me (ACC)' (i.e., this amazes me no end)

but they were probably rare, if the extensive selections of examples of identical conjuncts in Behaghel (1928: 314, 318, 375-378) or Grimm & Grimm (1936: 409) are representative, where verbal repetitions in general — only verb, whole verb phrase, or indeterminate — take a back seat to those of nouns, pronouns, adjectives (especially comparatives), and

adverbs.⁵ But then, this is perhaps not the most literary of rhetorical strategies. For English, the situation seems similar: the *Oxford English Dictionary* has early attestations of identical numeral, adverb, or comparative coordination, but not a single unequivocally verb-level example. Context, orthography, and number of repetitions identify (11) (1597, Shakespeare, *Henry IV*) as loose verb-phrase coordination, with the auxiliary elided:

(11) I haue borne, and borne, and borne

3. Prolongation caught in a conflict of scopes: Attempted escape through further restructuring

When it takes its compact form, the prolongative is not so completely entrenched in modern German as to be equally comfortable in all grammatical circumstances. Its most conspicuous limitation shows in its interaction with negation:

- (12) a. Godot KAM und KAM nicht
 ‘Godot came and came not’ (i.e., just wouldn’t come)
- b. Warum KAM und KAM Godot bloß nicht?
 ‘why came and came Godot but not?’
- c. *Es war zum Verzweifeln, dass Godot nicht KAM und KAM
 ‘it drove [us] to despair that Godot not came and came’

⁵ There is an interesting New High German example in Grimm & Grimm (1936: 409):

- (i) das thu ich nicht und [ich] thue es nicht
 ‘that do I not and [I] do it not’

These are conjoined clauses, even though the second conjunct, where the identical subject is elided but the quasi-identical object is retained, does not have subject and object in the same order as the first. This seems somewhat more tightly integrated a coordination than one with parallel order in the two conjuncts (ii), but not as tightly as verb-level conjunction (iii):

- (ii) das thu ich nicht und [das] thu ich nicht
 ‘that do I not and [that] do i not’
- (iii) das thu und thu ich nicht
 ‘that do and do I not’

This limitation to main clauses in the company of a negative is all the more unfortunate because negation is a most favourable context for the grammaticalisation of prolongation: it is often what continues NOT to happen rather than to happen, however strongly desired, that stirs up emotions and elicits more words than usual. Arguably, this limitation can only be made sense of formally, namely in terms of the scope of negation and that of the prolongative, itself a quantificational, hence scope-taking category.

The scope of the negator *nicht* is the verb phrase, or in particular its focused part, bearing main stress. This is usually expressed in syntactic structures, or representations more or less closely corresponding to them (such as Logical Form⁶), in terms of a hierarchical relation of c-command, sometimes supplemented or substituted by further asymmetric formal and functional relations such as linear precedence, relational ranking, animacy dominance, discourse prominence, and quantifier strength. With the finite verb in final position, the domain of the negator's scope begins immediately after *nicht* and potentially extends as far as the finite verb, corresponding to a well-motivated syntactic structure along the lines of (13).

(13) ... [NEG [... V_{finite}]]

When the verb is in any other position — second in main declarative clauses and in subordinate clauses without complementiser, first especially in yes/no interrogative clauses, in both instances preceding the negator — it is still to be construed as being within the scope of the negator, that is, as if it were still final. An adverbial quantifier over occurrences (such as 'twice' or 'again') is accordingly construed as being outside or within the scope of negation (here indicated by braces) depending on its surface position before or after the negator:

- (14) a. Der Postbote {klingelte} zweimal NICHT
 'the postman rang twice not' (i.e., he failed twice to ring)
 b. Es ist schade, dass der Postbote zweimal nicht {KLINGelte}

⁶ If true to their name, such representations would have full propositions rather than only verb phrases in the scope of negation. One would assume, though, that the scope relations at such more abstract levels, and in particular the relationships between scope-taking elements, tend to be maintained in syntactic representations closer to the surface.

‘it is a pity that the postman twice not rang’⁷

- (15) a. Der Postbote {klingelte} nicht {ZWEImal}
‘the postman rang not twice’ (i.e., it’s not the case that he rang twice — perhaps once, or thrice, or never)
- b. Es ist schade, dass der Postbote nicht {ZWEImal klingelte}
‘it is a pity that the postman not twice rang’

Semantically, the prolongative clearly takes scope over negation in straightforward readings of sentences like (5), (6), and (12). On the assumption of a coordinative constituent structure at the verb level (indicated by square brackets), this is hard to reconcile with the normal way of negative scope-taking.

- (16) a. Godot {[KAM und KAM]} nicht (=12a)
- b. Warum {[KAM und KAM]} Godot bloß nicht? (=12b)
- c. *Es war zum Verzweifeln, dass Godot nicht {[KAM und KAM]} (=12c)

In a main clause, declarative like (16a) or interrogative like (16b), the prolongative would, on our assumptions so far, come out as being in the scope of negation — which isn’t how such sentences, which are otherwise perfectly well-formed, are understood. In a subordinate clause like (16c), with the finite verb in its basic final position, the prolongative wrongly comes out as being in the scope of the negative, too — and to make matters worse, such sentences are ungrammatical.

The conclusion is inevitable that the command relation between negative and prolongative cannot be as fragmentarily indicated in (16), to be seen in conjunction with (13). The only plausible alternative with the prolongative construable as commanding the negative in a main clause, with the finite verb removed from final position, is given in (17), where the first bracketed constituent commands the second which follows it, regardless of whether it is assumed also to be hierarchically lower.

- (17) Godot [KAM und] [{KAM} nicht]

⁷ Equally naturally, main stress can be on the quantifier both times.

To show schematically how thoroughly the loose coordinative source construction must have been restructured:

- (18) a. VP [& VP] ...
b. X [V [& V]] Y
c. X [V & V] Y
d. X [V&] [V Y]

Phrase-structure bracketings like those in (18b) and (18c), with *X* and *Y* representing those parts of the verb phrase which do not get repeated, would continue the coordinative flavour of (18a) rather faithfully. That it is (18d) that (18a) has been restructured as, however, is tantamount to claiming that the grammaticalised prolongative construction is no longer a coordinative one, in the sense of its parts being either structurally equal (18c) or somewhat asymmetric, reflecting the sequential ordering of constituents (18b); and that the coordinator *und*, now used in non-coordinative function, is more closely associated with the preceding than the following verb. Moreover, in a structure of the kind of (18d), the prolongative is no longer expressed through repetition, i.e. through a copy FOLLOWING AFTER the original, as at the stage of (18a) and presumably also in structures along the lines of (18b/c), but through a copy of the verb form, in close union with a lookalike of the coordinative linker, which PRECEDES the verb phrase containing that verb. In spirit, though effectuated by syntactic rather than morphological means, the prolongative has thus come to be expressed through reduplication of the full word form of the verb. Regardless of whether the prolongative in the form of *[V&]* is syntactically a modifying dependent or a head relative to the following verb phrase, it contains a verb which regularly inflects as a verb and occupies the standard verbal positions, like verb-second in clauses without a complementiser. Owing to their origin in a coordinative construction restructured, the verb in the prolongative constituent and the verb in the following verb phrase continue to inflect identically, being both finite in all the examples above (but they may also be both non-finite: e.g., *Ewig auf Godot WARten und WARten zu müssen, ist eine Zumutung* ‘always to have to wait and wait for Godot is an imposition’), and to be adjacent in surface ordering.

The argument for a restructuring as in (17)/(18d) so far was that it provides the right syntax, in terms of command, for prolongative to take scope over negation.⁸ What can also be adduced in its favour is that such a restructuring is not as inconsistent with coordinative origins as it might seem.

Constituency in coordinate constructions is a perennial question. On the one hand, by definition coordinate conjuncts are supposed to have an equal rank in structural hierarchy, with the coordinator linking them symmetrically (*A & B*, like in (18c) above). On the other hand, omissibility patterns in more-than-binary coordination often suggest that the coordinator is more closely associated with following rather than preceding conjuncts (*A [& B]*, as in (18a/b) above). This fits in with the semantics or pragmatics of coordination insofar as conjuncts frequently are not entirely symmetrical, like when they express events in temporal sequence or items in one or another kind of hierarchical ranking, where the linker accordingly means ‘and then [in sequence or hierarchy]’. Also, coordination itself, in languages that have it (and not all do), tends to be grammaticalised from constructions where the second conjunct-to-be is subordinate, introduced by comitative or associative markers, adverbial connectors such as ‘also/too/as well’, temporal relators such as ‘already’, or discourse particles introducing a new paragraph.⁹

Crucially, however, despite such origins as introducers of secondary matter, coordinative linkers may eventually also end up in close association with preceding conjuncts (*[A &] B*, as in (18d) above). In languages like English or German, there are a variety of constructions that look coordinative, but aren’t — hence the terms “fake” or “pseudo” coordination:

- (19) a. nice and easy; good and tired
 b. You must come and meet Godot; Let’s go and fly to the Bahamas
 c. Grandma up(ped) and told grandpa all

⁸ There is yet another possible structure for sentences like (17), in some respects akin to (18d), but with the sequence of identical verbs forming a constituent, set off from whatever else belongs with the verb phrase:

X [[V&] V] Y

Its drawback is that again prolongation cannot take scope over negation, which would be in *Y*.

⁹ See Mithun (1988b) for such diachronic sources of coordination. The commonly reconstructed source of the English and German coordinator *and/und* is a sequential and additive linker ‘thereupon, also’.

d. I'll try and find Godot

Relating to quantification (in particular, intensification: 'rather easy', 'completely tired' (19a)), aspect, or similar notions, the first parts here are subordinate to the second, which contain the lexical content that matters. Sometimes the lookalikes of the coordinator are omissible (*Let's go fly to the Bahamas*) or replaceable by a subordinator (*I'll try to find Godot*); when they are present, as in (19), in informal speech they are always phrased with the preceding rather than the following item (*nice'n easy, come'n meet, try'n find*). In close-knit or set phrases whose coordinative nature would seem impeccable, even where the two members are perhaps not of entirely equal semantic standing ('fish with chips', fish being ideally the chief component of that dish¹⁰), the linker leans to the left, too:

- (20) a. fish'n chips, high'n low, come'n go, up'n down, over'n above
 b. hundred'n fifty

The phonological phrasing clearly shows such reduced *and*'s to be enclitic rather than proclitic, and so does their reluctance to assimilate to a following consonant (e.g., **come m'meet, *try m'find, *hundred m'fifty*).

The phrasing in prolongative constructions and the reductive and assimilatory behaviour of the ex-coordinative linker in informal speech is as in these left-associating coordinations and pseudo-coordinations. In particular, while in genuine coordinative constructions the final consonant of the linker assimilates to velar consonants in the onset of second conjuncts, even when enclitic on the first conjunct (21a), no such assimilation to a following consonant is found with the prolongative (21b), where the final dental is simply deleted and the nasal can be assimilated to the preceding consonant:

- (21) a. Godot KAM und GING nicht ['kam ʊnt / *ʊn / *n / *m / ʊŋ / ŋ 'giŋ nɪçt]

¹⁰ In this respect constructions with so-called sylleptic plurals and duals are similar: when, e.g., *we and grandma* is supposed to mean 'I and grandma', the second conjunct merely specifies who else belongs to the set of referents which includes the speaker (hence the plural/dual pronoun of 1st person as the first conjunct, with the speaker ranking highest on the referential hierarchy); a simply additive reading of [*& NP*] would give the wrong meaning. Like in pseudo-coordinations, it is common in relevant languages for the coordinative linker in such constructions to be replaceable by a subordinator or by zero (*we with grandma; we grandma*).

‘Godot came and went not’

b. Godot KAM und KAM nicht [ˈkam ʊnt / ʊn / n / m / *ʊŋ / *ŋ ˈkam niçt]

‘Godot came and came not’

It would be futile to expect phonological phrasing always to respect, hence unmistakably to reveal, syntactic constituency. Thus, for Germanic, it has been suggested that phonological phrasing is governed by a general principle of leftward association of function words, regardless of syntactic co-constituency;¹¹ and the phrasing of the linkers, coordinative or pseudo-coordinative, in all such constructions when there is no intonation break would thus follow from this principle, whatever their syntax. However, the argument here rather is that if there is no particular syntactic reason for a function word to associate in one direction or in another, the phonological phrasing itself does not militate against either syntactic option either, and might indeed suggest the one that is consonant with it as the preferable one, should it matter. Arguably, it did matter for the prolongative, when a restructuring from *A [& B]* or *A & B* to *[A &] B* was called for in order to get its scope right. Arguably, other pseudo-coordinative constructions may also have served as a model in this particular reanalysis of enumerative coordination as something subtly different.

A further consideration that bears on the syntactic constituency of prolongative constructions, and also supports the one assumed in (17)/(18d), is the ungrammaticality of verb-final equivalents, as in (12c)/(16c) above. Assuming restructuring as in (17), the verb-final equivalent of (17) would be as follows:

(22) *Es war zum Verzweifeln, dass Godot nicht {[[KAM und] KAM]}

The prolongative would still be in the scope of the negative, contrary to the standard reading; but as such, that should not render such sentences syntactically ill-formed. The added, and presumably crucial, complication here is that with verb-final order there is not really any possibility of restructuring so as to get the command relations between prolongative and negative right without altering the original word order of the coordinative

¹¹ See Wheeldon & Lahiri (2000), with further supporting references. Selkirk (1995) makes the exact opposite assumption that clitics generally associate rightwards in English and its relatives — which at least for linkers in well-integrated coordinative constructions is wrong.

source construction. Given the restructuring as in main clauses, which is where prolongatives occur most typically and where the priority to get their scope right is therefore highest, it is not in fact obvious what a corresponding subordinate clause ought to be like. As per (17), the finite-verb constituent in main-clause second position is the prolongative itself, i.e. [V&]; but owing to its still-transparent origin as a coordinative conjunct, it would seem too bold to conceive of it as being moved around independently. It would seem to be the relatively least offensive option under the circumstances to deal with it more or less as a coordinative construction, and only to see to it that the finite verb is final in the second conjunct:

(23) *³Es war zum Verzweifeln, dass Godot [KAM und] [nicht {KAM}]

The drawback here is that the verb-doubling gets interrupted by whatever happens to be part of the verb phrase to which the prolongative is being applied (the negator in (23)); but nonetheless, this is the only direction where prolongative grammar in a language like German could conceivably be heading. On the other hand, given the syntactic and semantic difficulties of matching main-clause prolongatives restructured as assumed above, along the lines of (17), with any fully convincing verb-final structures, a more realistic prospect probably is that the grammaticalisation of the prolongative will come to a halt before reaching down into verb-final subordinate clauses.

Structural limitations, incidentally, are something prolongatives share with other verbal pseudo-coordinations in German and related languages,¹² which confirms that this is indeed what they are. Most typically, *komm/geh/versuch es (und) V* constructions ('come/go/try it (and) V') are limited to the 2nd person singular imperative, with verbs in their pure stem forms (e.g., *Komm (und) hau ab!* 'come (and) push off!'). While the preferred mode of such verb serialialisation in German is to combine a function verb with a main verb in the bare infinitive (e.g., *Opa geht eine rauchen* 'grandpa goes smoke one', alongside *Opa geht und raucht eine* 'grandpa goes and smokes one'), sequences of inflected verbs are also possible in declarative main clauses:

(24) a. Oma ging einfach hin und flog auf die Bahamas

¹² For English, see Shopen (1971), Carden & Pesetsky (1977), and Pullum (1990), among others.

- ‘grandma simply went off and flew to the Bahamas’ (i.e., spontaneously flew off)
- b. Opa saß und träumte von Energie Cottbus
‘grandpa sat and dreamt of Energie Cottbus’ (i.e., was lost in his dreams)
- c. Du traust dich nicht und ziehst die Notbremse
‘you dare not and pull the emergency brake’ (i.e., don’t dare to pull)

In verb-final subordinate clauses, however, when both verbal components have the finite verb in final position (25), the meanings are subtly different, being more like those conveyed by ordinary coordinate clauses; and unlike in (24), one could almost add pronominal copies of the subjects (*Oma ging einfach hin und sie flog ...* ‘grandma simply went off and she flew ...’).

- (25) Es ist ein Fakt, dass
- a. Oma einfach hinging und auf die Bahamas flog
 - b. Opa saß und von Energie Cottbus träumte
 - c. du dich nicht traust und die Notbremse ziehst
‘it is a fact that [almost as above, (24a/b/c)]’

These pseudo-coordinations are syntactically special, too, and, more successfully than prolongatives, take special measures when extended beyond their most common usages: in informal speech, the real subordinate equivalents to main clauses as in (24) do not have the finite verb in the second components in final position, but immediately following after *und* — in the manner of a main clause (26).

- (26) Es ist ein Fakt, dass
- a. Oma einfach hinging und flog auf die Bahamas
 - b. Opa saß und und träumte von Energie Cottbus
 - c. du dich nicht traust und und ziehst die Notbremse
‘it is a fact that [as above, (24a/b/c)]’

In relation to negation, the prolongative found it even harder to catch on in English. While the unfortunate scope conflict only bars grammaticalised prolongation from negated verb-final subordinate clauses in German, in English it never occurs with negation at all:

(27) *Godot didn't {[[COME and] COME]}

As in German, the scope of the negator is (what is focused in) the rest of the verb phrase, which in English is invariably to its right, and this inevitably includes the prolongative [V&]. Other than falling back on full verb-phrase coordination (*Godot didn't COME and didn't COME*), a way out of this dilemma would be analogous to what could be attempted in verb-final subordinate clauses in German (23), namely to get the prolongative marker [V&], in the shape of the auxiliary, ahead of the negative so as to command it:

(28) *²Godot did and didn't COME

However, especially with main stress on the auxiliaries and thus on the negator itself, rather than on the verb, the preferred reading of repeated identicals here is the one highlighting difference: 'in a way he came, in another he didn't'. Another, equally marginal patch-up would be to consider the prolongative fused with negation and repeat both, evading the question of relative scopes:

(29) *²Godot didn't and didn't COME

Regardless of negation, there are further structural circumstances which can interfere with prolongative scope-taking, and in German these happen to obtain in subordinate clauses when the verbal parts are more complex and the finite verb is in final position. Here the prolongative's progress is smoother in English.

With a sequence of auxiliaries and a main verb as in (30), where the finite form is in main-clause second position, each verbal word on its own can undergo prolongative modification.

(30) a. Opa hat geWINnen wollen und (hat) geWINnen wollen
'grandpa has to win wanted and (has) to win wanted'

- b. Opa [hat und] {hat geWINnen wollen}
‘grandpa has and has to win wanted’
- c. Opa hat [geWINnen und] {geWINnen wollen}
‘grandpa has to win and to win wanted’
- d. ?Opa hat geWINnen [wollen und] {wollen}
‘grandpa has to win wanted and wanted’

In order to make sense of all the verb-level alternatives in (30b-d), the scope of the prolongative has to be assumed to be to its right in surface order and to be delimited to the constituent which comes after *[V&]*, in line with the constituency analyses above. The most natural reading of both (30b) and (30c), with stress on the auxiliaries as a possible alternative in (30b), is that there was a sustained intention to win — to win again and again in separate games (a possible nuance in both cases), or to win just this one crucial game (only possible in (30b)). Least optimal is (30d), at least with main stress on the main verb, which suggests a focus outside the scope of the prolongative (or leftwards-facing scope of *[& V]*, as in verb-phrase coordination of old); if the volitional verb itself is the focus (*Opa hat gewinnen [WOLlen und] WOLlen*), there is still a reasonable reading with volition as such temporally extended.

With the finite verb last, the most noticeable difference is that the counterpart of (30b), namely (31b), is solidly out.

- (31) Es ist ein Fakt, dass
- a. Opa geWINnen wollen (hat) und geWINnen wollen hat
 - b. *Opa geWINnen wollen [hat und] hat
 - c. Opa [geWINnen und] geWINnen wollen hat
 - d. ?Opa geWINnen [wollen und] wollen hat
‘it is a fact that [as above, (30a-d)]’

Unlike finite-verb order, the direction of prolongative scope remains immutable regardless of clause type. Thus, only the tense/aspect auxiliary would be in its scope in (31b) — which is too little semantic substance for prolongation. Adding volition, as in (31d), improves matters to about the same level as in (30d). But the only impeccable result with

this verb order is attained when the main verb itself is included in the scope of the prolongative, and this requires its own repetition (31c).

4. Midway crisis: Where scope matters

The moral of this short story about long drawn-out stories is that while clause and verb-phrase repetition as in loose enumerative coordination is a natural source for a prolongative aspect (or verbal number), grammaticalisation proceeding on this path is in danger of coming to a premature halt.¹³ As quantifying expressions, prolongatives have scope, and in circumstances like those in German and English, tightening up loose pragmatic addition, where each addendum is a scope domain of its own, is bound to interfere with the asymmetric syntax of scope relations. And this obstacle of scope conflicts, which prevents the extension of the prolongative to all syntactic contexts, effectively remains insurmountable unless grammaticalised prolongatives are restructured even further, shedding all traces of their coordinative origin and fully assuming the garb of verbal modifiers, able in particular to extract themselves from the scope of negation.

As mentioned at the outset, there are languages where prolongatives or similar verb-quantifying categories, ostensibly also grammaticalised from syntactic sources, have made it even further, namely to being parts of morphological constructions, possibly alongside negatives. At this stage, however, scope appears destined to lose much or all of its structural significance, being unconstrained by command relations among word parts. For example, in the Athapaskan languages, notorious for their complex verb forms, there are iteratives and similar bound verbal quantifiers which invariably take wide scope over the verb stem and other scopal categories such as negation, as does the kindred prolongative in German or English. Their positioning, however, varies within the Athapaskan family, as does that of affixal negators in particular, which completely disregard scope relations and are governed by phonological factors instead, showing up on

¹³ Though not well studied crosslinguistically, there are surely other and perhaps less problematic sources and paths for prolongatives, including the semantic reanalysis of similar categories, or also the incorporation into the verb of free lexical forms of suitable meaning (on which see Evans 1995).

either side of verbal quantifiers which invariably take scope over them.¹⁴ The disregard for word-internal scope is similar in the Iroquois family: in the Southern group, prepronominal prefixes can include negatives on both sides of such quantificational categories as the repetitive, while in the Northern group, negative always precedes repetitive — without linear order reflecting anything about scope.¹⁵

Thus, it only seems to be midway in the life cycle of constructions from loose pragmatic via tight syntactic to bound morphological status that scope is tied up with command relations, and thus with constituency, and with linear ordering, creating potential obstacles in the pathway of grammaticalisation. It needs especially favourable circumstances for this hurdle to be cleared.

To the extent that verbal morphology is templatic, the negligibility of scope at this stage is only what might be expected, for how could command relations be established over non-hierarchical, flat structures? They could perhaps be defined in terms of precedence; but that would run the risk of unsystematic interferences from other, non-semantic factors regulating linear ordering at the word level, such as phonological well-formedness considerations. On the other hand, where bound morphology originates from tight syntax, one would also expect some continuing correspondence to the scopal relations holding at the stage prior to binding. What has the widest scope over constituents including the verb should presumably get bound to the verb later than what is within its scope, to the extent that wider scope is reflected by greater distance from the morphological attractor, the verb. Such at least is the reasoning when word-internal ordering universally is held not to be arbitrary but to be governed by the “relevance” or “scope” of word parts for/over each other.¹⁶

¹⁴ See Rice (2000: 314-319, *passim*). According to Rice (2000), however, the wide scope of such verbal quantifiers is always maintained relative to other bound preverbal categories as well as to the stem, regardless of its “wrong” surface position, with *[[PREVERB STEM] QUANTIFIER]* being linearised as *PREVERB – QUANTIFIER – STEM*.

¹⁵ See Mithun (2000a: 236). Mithun’s argument is that Iroquois verb morphology is templatic, consisting in a string of position classes, rather than hierarchical, and she assumes that scope makes itself felt structurally in the latter type of morphology much more easily than in the former.

¹⁶ This is the claim of Bybee (1985) or Rice (2000), oft-repeated by others. Kindred in spirit, though lacking an explicit diachronic dimension, is Baker’s (1985) equally influential theory that morphological hierarchies, or at any rate arrangements, are not copies but mirror images of their syntactic counterparts. The counterclaim by Givón (2000), among others, that all that matters for word-level ordering is the relative chronology of affixes having become bound, with new affixes always added outside older

On evidence like that of Athapaskan and Iroquois, word-level ordering cannot be expected always to correspond to syntactic hierarchies, even with such eminently scopal categories as verbal quantification and negation. The blame may either lie with the old syntax, not having given scope its due (unlike that of German and English, see above), or with what happened as complex verbal words got assembled from syntactic bits and pieces, or indeed after, with the phonology forcing word-internal rearrangements or with affixes changing their meanings.¹⁷ A crucial presupposition of such fault-finding is that morphology indeed originated from syntax.

In the case of verb-quantificational notions such as prolongation being expressed through reduplication, as they frequently are, or through segmental gemination, as they sometimes are, this presupposition may at times fail. Given circumstances like those in Germanic, today's prolongative syntax, consisting of a pseudo-coordinative verb-copying constituent [*V&*], does not really look set to become tomorrow's prolongative morphology or phonology, i.e., reduplication or gemination. Reined in by scope conflicts, the use of syntactic verb doubling does not attain such generality as would be conducive to univerbation. Although circumstances could conceivably have been more favourable elsewhere, letting syntactic doubling become reduplication or gemination, that may be too complex a diachronic scenario to envisage. Wherever they exist, prolongative (or also other) reduplication or gemination may always have been just that: morphology or expressive phonology, not syntax morphologised or phonologised.

for Домодедово, where the fog (??? would and) would not clear

ones, is not as profoundly counter as it might seem: morphological binding needs syntactic adjacency, and to the extent that relative closeness is determined by scope relations, these will also influence binding chronologies. Factually rather underfed, the issue of the correspondence between morphological and syntactic structures is wider open than one would have hoped after so many centuries of research into grammaticalisation.

¹⁷ See Mithun (2000b) for an instructive case study of the extraordinary adventures of a close relative of the prolongative, the durative, in Central Pomo (Pomoan family), with repeated grammaticalisations of the same material producing a whole range of aspectual distinctions (perfective, imperfective, progressive, continuative, habitual, frequentative).

Acknowledgment: Conversations and correspondence with Pier-Marco Bertinetto, Aditi Lahiri, Marianne Mithun, Edith Moravcsik, and Keren Rice have prolonged the writing of this paper and the paper itself: they may not agree, but for me it has been worth it.

References

- Bach, Emmon, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, & Barbara Partee (eds.) (1995). *Quantification in Natural Languages*. 2 vols. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Baker, Mark (1985). The mirror principle and morphosyntactic explanation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16: 373-416.
- Behaghel, Otto (1928). *Deutsche Syntax: Eine geschichtliche Darstellung. Band III: Die Satzgebilde*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Brandstetter, Renward (1917). *Die Reduplikation in den indianischen, indonesischen und indogermanischen Sprachen*. (Beilage zum Jahresbericht der Luzerner Kantonsschule.) Luzern: [no publisher].
- Bybee, Joan (1985). *Morphology: A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Carden, Guy & David Pesetsky (1977). Double-verb constructions, markedness, and a fake coordination. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 13: 82-92.
- Cusic, David (1981). Verbal plurality and aspect. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.
- Dressler, Wolfgang (1969). *Studien zur verbalen Pluralität: Iterativum, Distributivum, Durativum, Intensivum in der allgemeinen Grammatik, im Lateinischen und Hethitischen*. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 259. Band, 1. Abhandlung.) Wien: Böhlau.
- Evans, Nick (1995). A-quantifiers and scope in Mayali. In Bach et al. (eds.), vol. 1, 207-270.
- Fitzpatrick-Cole, Jennifer (1994). The prosodic domain hierarchy in reduplication. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.
- Gildea, Spike (ed.) (2000), *Reconstructing Grammar: Comparative Linguistics and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Givón, T. (2000). Internal reconstruction: As method, as theory. In Gildea (ed.), 107-159.
- Grimm, Jacob & Wilhelm Grimm (1936). *Deutsches Wörterbuch. Elfter Band, III. Abteilung: Un – Uzvogel*. Bearbeitet von Karl Euling. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
- Jensen, Hans (1952). Die sprachliche Kategorie des Numerus. *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock, Reihe Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaft* 1, 2: 1-21.
- Jespersen, Otto (1924). *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Lasnik, Howard (1995). *Plurality, Conjunction and Events*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Mithun, Marianne (1988a). Lexical categories and the evolution of number marking. In Michael Hammond & Michael Noonan (eds.), *Theoretical Morphology*, 211-234. New York: Academic Press.
- (1988b). The grammaticization of coordination. In John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, 331-359. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- (2000a). The reordering of morphemes. In Gildea (ed.), 231-255.
- (2000b). The legacy of recycled aspect. In John Charles Smith & Delia Bentley (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 1995, Vol. 1: General Issues and Non-Germanic Languages*, 261-277. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Moravcsik, Edith A. (1978). Reduplicative constructions. In Joseph H. Greenberg, with Charles A. Ferguson & Edith A. Moravcsik (eds.), *Universals of Human Language*, vol. 3: *Word Structure*, 297-334. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Newman, Paul (1990). *Nominal and Verbal Plurality in Chadic*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Pott, August Friedrich (1862). *Doppelung (Reduplikation, Geminatio) als eines der wichtigsten Bildungsmittel der Sprache, beleuchtet aus Sprachen aller Welttheile*. Lemgo: Meyer.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. (1990). Constraints on intransitive quasi-serial verb constructions in modern colloquial English. In Brian D. Joseph & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *When Verbs Collide: Papers from the Ohio State Mini-Conference on Serial Verbs*, 218-239. (Working Papers in Linguistics, 39.) Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, & Jan Svartvik (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Rice, Keren (2000). *Morpheme Order and Semantic Scope: Word Formation in the Athapaskan Verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Selkirk, Elizabeth O. (1995). The prosodic structure of function words. In Jill N. Beckman, Laura Walsh Dickey, & Suzanne Urbanczyk (eds.), *Papers in Optimality Theory*, 439-469. (University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers, 18.) Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.
- Shopen, Timothy (1970). Caught in the act. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 7: 254-263.
- Steever, Sanford B. (1987). The roots of the plural action verb in the Dravidian languages. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 107: 581-604.
- Wheeldon, Linda & Aditi Lahiri (1997). Prosodic units in speech production. *Journal of Memory and Language* 37: 356-381.
- Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.) (1989). *Tipologija iterativnyx konstrukcij*. Leningrad: Nauka. Translated and revised as: *Typology of Iterative Constructions*. München: Lincom Europa, 1997.
- Young, Robert W. & William Morgan (1980). *The Navajo Language: A Grammar and Colloquial Dictionary*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.