0. Introduction

▲ A derivational affix can occur not alone, but accompanied with another marker with the same or similar meaning.

● both are morphological (one and the same affix repeated or two synonymous affixes) vs. a morphological one + a lexical (= expressed by a lexeme) one.

▲ There are three logical possibilities of the resulting meaning of such a combination

● 1) A «recursive» interpretation: the primary meaning is applied to the stem twice consecutively:

♣ cf. RUSSIAN (see Nedjalkov 2002)

(1) nača-l za-sypa-tj (begin-PST INCH-sleep-INF) ‘he began to fall asleep (lit. began to [begin to sleep])’

● 2) A «redundant» interpretation: the resulting meaning is the same as (or very similar to) the primary meaning of a single marker:

♣ cf. RUSSIAN: a colloquial construction bolee lučše – lit. ‘more bett-er’ (see Rahilina 2013)

● 3) An «iconic» interpretation: the meaning of reiteration or intensification is added to the primary meaning (the resulting meaning is equal neither to the meaning of a single marker nor to the combination of two such meanings).

♣ cf. (Lyutikova, Bonch-Osmolovskaya 2006): PASS+PASS in BALKAR (Turkic, Russia) = ‘reiterated passive’

(2) Gitara ojna-l-in–ŋ an-di
guitar.NOM play-PASS-PASS-PF-3
‘The guitar was played on repeatedly’.

▲ The doubling in the domain of derivation seems to be understudied:
- cf. a crosslinguistic study on causatives (Kulikov 1993)
- cf. on the interaction of synonymous derivational markers and lexical ones on the example of diminutives in (Rusakova 2013);
- ???

0.1. Preliminary remarks

0.1.1. The «redundant» interpretation

● The problematics of Multiple Exponence (= extended exponence, ME):

- a well studied domain within different frameworks,
- however mainly the data of inflectional markers, not derivational ones
- cf. a classical examples from Matthews 1974 – plurals in GERMAN:
  Bild – Bild-er (suffix)
  Vater – Väter (umlaut)
  Wurm – Würm-er (suffix + umlaut)
Cf. Xu, Aronoff 2011; Caballero, Harris 2012 among many others.
- The main point of interest: ME contradicts to the general principle of economy.

▲ On ME within derivation in the crosslinguistic study Caballero, Harris 2012: possible, but much more rare, than within inflection

   HOWEVER: only combinations of morphological markers were taken into account;
   if one takes into account also the combinations of morphological markers with lexical ones, this phenomenon a priori seems in contrast to be typical (but / so less studied).
In comparison to inflection:
- derivational meanings are in general more concrete => more complex;
- they interact with the stem in a less predictable way;
- two derivational markers (or a derivational marker and a lexeme) are seldom fully synonymous => the meaning of the combination of markers which is in general outline equal to the initial meaning(s) of one marker is in fact the result of a complicated and nontrivial adjustment of two initial meanings:
  - **INFLCTION**: marker 1 ‘meaning A’+ marker 2 ‘meaning A’= ‘meaning A’

Cf. (Letučiy 2009) on the double reciprocal construction in RUSSIAN: 
*celovatj-sja drug s drugom* ‘lit. to kiss-RECIP each other’ – a specific sub-meaning of reciprocality, equal neither to the meaning of -*sja* nor to the meaning of *drug druga*.

? In what way is this semantic adjustment processed?
? Which marker «wins» in case of the interaction of an affix and a lexeme?

### 0.1.2. The «recursive» interpretation
- It was discussed in detail on the data of causatives (cf. Kulikov 1993);
- It is logically possible not for all derivational meanings, cf.:
  - *causative*: to make [to make V];
  - *reflexive*: *oneself [oneself V]*.

### 0.1.3. The interpretation with semantic shifts
- Iconic shifts: reiteration, intensity, emphasis (cf. (Kulikov 1993) on causatives);
- Less predictable shifts are also possible: cf. (Lyutikova, Bonch-Osmolovskaya 2006) on the passive in Balkar (decausative vs. passive interpretation).

### 0.2. Double ‘again’-markers
- The problematics of doubling in derivation is discussed below on the data of ‘AGAIN’-MARKERS (such as re- in Romance languages)
- This data is quite convenient and very interesting for such a study:
  - the meaning again can be expressed both morphologically (usually productive derivation) and lexically;
  - all three interpretations are logically possible for the meaning ‘again’ (including the recursive one);
  - the competition of different interpretations is possible;
  - the borderline between the interpretations is less clear, than in general.
- ... 

NB A terminological convention: DOUBLE ‘AGAIN’-MARKER – is used below for a combination of ‘again’-markers with any interpretation.

- Main sub-meanings of ‘again’-domain (cf. Wälchli 2006, Stoynova 2013 on the typology of ‘again’-markers)
  - Repetitive (‘one more time’)
  - Reditive (‘to return’) and Restitutive (‘to return to the initial state’).

- Repetitives are in focus (the combinations of markers of which at least one has the repetitive meaning).
- Morphological markers are mostly in focus (affix + affix / affix + lexeme).

### 0.3. The data
- Data from the database on morphological and (in a less number and detail) lexical ‘again’-markers (473 markers, including 216 morphological markers), mostly data from grammar descriptions.
- For some particular languages: text analysis.
- No elicitation.
1. **The «recursive» use of ‘again’-markers**

▲ The repetitive meaning is one of the meanings that being used twice (or more times) gives a logically meaningful result:

‘to repeat [the repetition of V]’.

NB ‘to repeat [the repetition of V]’ = (V + V) + (V+V) or V + V + V? The matter of semantic scope.

A probable tendency:

- 2 markers with the same morphological status => V + V + V is more probable;
- 2 markers with different morphological status => (V + V) + (V+V) is more probable.

▲ However marking an event repeated twice seems to be pragmatically not so relevant, as, e.g., for causatives (*‘to make [to make V]’*).

The meaning of ‘again’-markers in terms of presupposition – assertion (cf., e.g., Tovena, Donazzan 2008)

- assertion: event V takes place;
- presupposition: event V has already taken place before (NB it does not matter, how many times).

1.1. **The combination of morphological ‘again’-markers**

1.1.1. **Multiple use of the same marker**

- **FRENCH**: re-re- – occasionally, as a pun, emphatically, usually within the expression re-V et re-re-V:

  (3) *Lire, relire, rerelire!* Les bébés aiment la répétition (http://activitesbebes.com)
  ‘To read, re-read and re-re-read! Babies like repetition’.

- **RUSSIAN**: pere-pere- – occasionally (only 1 example in RNC):

  (4) *Teper' ostalas' pere-pere-delka v Sojuzpise, i moj garderob polnost'ju budet obnovlen...* [RNC]
  ‘Now the last thing to do is a re-re-making in The Union of Writers, and my wardrobe will be renewed’.

  *Pere* - seems to be the only Russian verbal prefix, that can be used twice (cf. Tatevosov 2009: this possibility is predicted for pod-pod- ‘slightly-slightly’ and do-do- ‘to finish-to finish’, but in fact such uses are more doubtful).

  NB This use is facilitated by the semantics of *pere* -: not a simple repetition, but reconstruction – ‘to do one more time better, than before, to improve the previous result’ (the multiple repetition is pragmatically more natural in this case).

1.1.2. **Different markers**

- **NOON (Atlantic, Senegal)**, Soukka 2000: 171–172: two again-affixes, -is and -aat:

  (5) *hay ‘come’ – hay-is ‘come back’ – hay-sis (<is-is) / hay-aat-is ‘come back again’ – hay-sis-is / hay-s-aat-is ‘come back for the third (and more) time’*

  (NB In the grammar (Soukka 2000) this case is interpreted as an automatic replacement of one of the markers -is with the marker -aat).

  NB This example illustrates also the multiple use of the same marker in different meanings – ‘back’ and ‘one more time’ (*one more time [back V]*). See below.

1.2. **The same picture for lexical ‘again’-markers**

- **SONGHAY**, Koyraboro Senni (Nilo-Saharan, Mali), Heath 1999: 340: serial verb construction with *yee* ‘to return’

  (6) *ay yee ka yee ka i dir-andi*

  1SG.S return INF return INF 3PL.O travel-CAUS

  ‘I made them go a third time’. (lit. ‘I returned to return to make them travel!’)
2. The redundant use of ‘again’-markers

2.1. Two morphological markers

2.1.1. Different markers

● TEPEHUA HUEHUETLA (Totonacan, Mexico), Kung 2007: 294–298: the affixes -choqo ‘back, again’ + -pala ‘one more time’
(7) ʔentons maa pastak-choko-pala-kan-li
then RPT think-REP1-REP2-INS-PFV
‘Then they rethought it again’.

● JARAWARA (Arauan, Brazil), Dixon 2004: 180: the affixes -ma ‘back, to the initial state’ + -tasa ‘one more time’
(8) otaa kibe-ma-tasa otaa-ke kanawaa jaa
1EXCL.S get.in-REP1-REP2.F 1EXCL-DEC.F canoe PERI
‘We got back in the canoe again’.

● SPOKANE (Salishan, USA), Carlson 1972: ʔeł- ‘back’, + ʔełuł- ‘again’:
(9) ʔeł-xʷuy ‘He went back’ – ʔełuł-aʔilən ‘He ate again’.

NB All these examples present the affixes with not fully identical meanings.

2.1.2. The same marker repeated

NB The most problematic case for any theory, cf. (Caballero, Harris 2012): a crosslinguistic tendency to avoid the identical material; a rare type; it is typical to use different allomorphs in case of doubling.

▲ The data on ‘again’-markers are (at least partly) consistent with this tendency.

1) Formally identical markers

- in some languages the simple affix and the reduplicated one have different meanings (within the range, listed above):
  ● KIHOLU (Daeleman 2003: 34) (-ulul), CHILUBA (Kabuta 1998: 130) (-ulul) – only the reduplicated variant has the meaning ‘again’.
- in some others both variants have the meaning ‘again’:
  ● KWANGALI (Dammann 1957: 74–75): both variants can also be attached to the one and same verb
(10) vara ‘to be born’ – var-ur-a / var-urur-a ‘to be born anew, to be resurrected’

2) Different allomorphs, morphological processes

● NAVAJO (Athapaskan, USA), Young 2000: 42–43: ná- ‘back’ vs. náá- / nááná- ‘again’ (hypothetically from the combination ná-+ ná-);
● YANESHA (Arawakan, Peru), Duff-Tripp 1997:87–88: -err, -err-...-err-, 2 again-affixes are separated from each other with person markers.

2.2. A morphological marker accompanied by a lexical one

● MAPUCHE (Araucanian, Chile), Smeets 2008:
(11) mūchay pun ka nütram-ka-tu-a-fi-n
soon night again conversation-really-REP-NONPST-OBJ-IND.1SG
‘Tonight I will talk to him again’.

▲ A special case:
In some languages ‘again’-markers can be used both as the affix and as a more autonomous unit (e.g., KULANGO (Gur): the suffix -pa and the adverb pa, XUP: the suffix -b’ay and the clitic =b’ay). Such markers with a variable morphological status can also be used together with one and the same verb:

● CAVINEÑA (Tacanan, Bolivia), Guillaume 2008: 684–685: the particle =nuka and the suffix -nuka can be combined in one clause.
The redundant use of a morphological marker plus a lexical one seems to be a very widespread strategy. Why? – Wälchli 2006 (simplified):
- morphological ‘again’-markers are usually «light», not emphatic (following Kemmer 1993 on reflexives) ≈ ‘use it every time when a repetition takes place!’;
- lexical ‘again’-markers are usually «heavy» ≈ ‘use it only if you want to point the repetition out!’

=> It is reasonable, that if the Speaker wants to point the repetition out, he/she has a possibility:
- to use a lexical ‘again’-marker (as the repetition is worth being distinguished),
- to use also a morphological ‘again’-marker (as the repetition takes place).

A first attempt to explicit the intuition about on the prevalence of this strategy – two simplest (and very rough) estimations.

2.2.1. Again-affix + again-lexeme: how widespread across languages?
The grammar descriptions of languages in which morphological ‘again’-markers are attested were looked through (only detailed descriptions, which contain natural illustrative examples – usually 3-10 examples on the ‘again’-marker), 32 languages.

? In how many languages are examples of the morphological marker accompanied by the lexical one attested in the description?

♣ 12 languages (38%): attested (NB underestimated)
Cavineña, Columbia-Wenatchi, Ineseño, Kashinawa, Kwaza, Olutec, Tepehua Huehuetla, Moseten, Udihe, Yuchi, Caquinte, Yandruwandha

♣ 20 languages (62%): not attested
Bandjalang, Bole, Choctaw, Duungidjawu, Hdi, Hidatsa, Jalonke, Matis, Mayali, Mono, Ndut, Nez Perce, Nutka, Piraha, Tanacross, Walapai, Wayana, Yalarnnga, Warekena

2.2.2. Again-affix + again-lexeme: how widespread within a language?
How frequent is the combination of the morphological ‘again’-marker with the lexical one in the languages in which it is possible in principle?

● AGHUL (East Caucasian, Russia): a very productive again-affix q-, the adverb χab:
(12) χab | q-ag.a-j-e mi-s ?emk’
again REP-see.IPF-CONV-COP DEMM-DAT dream
‘She has a dream again’.

Table. Aghul: a combination of the again-affix + the again adverb (text corpus, collected by D.S. Ganenkov, T.A. Maisak, S.R. Merdanova)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>q- + χab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N of examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the sum of the uses of q- and χab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the uses of q-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the uses of χab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However: it seems to be very variable across languages.

2.3. The resulting meaning of the combination of ‘again’-markers
NB ‘again’-markers (including that of a particular language) are usually not fully synonymous. What about the resulting meaning of the combination of two different ‘again’-markers?

Is it of the combination the meaning of one of the markers? Which one?
Is it a new modification of ‘again’-meaning that can be expressed by none of the two markers?

2.3.1. REDITIVE / RESTITUTIVE (‘back / to the initial state’) + REPETITIVE (‘one more time’)

a) a reditive affix + a repetitive lexeme

- UDHE (Tungusic, Russia): in Nikolaeva, Tolskaya 2001: 317 the suffix -gi is postulated to have the repetitive meaning along with the reditive one
  
  however in texts there are only 2 repetitive uses (the total amount – 231 examples of -gi), both of them are in context of the lexical ‘again’-marker:

(13) ge ŋa bi:-mie xai ge:nzi e:-gi:-li
INTJ again be-INF again pregnant become-REP-3SG
‘After a time she was pregnant again’. (Nikolaeva et al 2003, text 17)

b) a reditive affix + a repetitive affix:

- JARAWARA, TEPEHUA HUEHUETLA, SPOKANE (see examples above)
  - the resulting meaning is repetitive;
  - the reditive affix is closer to the initial stem, than the repetitive one.
- The same picture is attested in YANESHA (the same marker doubling): -err – rather reditive and restitutive contexts, -err-err – repetitive contexts among others (Wälchli 2006: 71–72 on the data of the Bible text).
  Cf. also the hypothesis on the combination of two reditive prefixes as the diachronic source of the repetitive one in NAVAJO (see above).

  c) a repetitive affix + a reditive lexeme – ?? (no examples attested)

▲ SO:
- Repetitive + Reditive = Repetitive;
- Reditive is the «inner» marker, Repetitive is the «outer» one.

▲ It can be related to the fact that the reditive meaning is more concrete, lexically restricted and diachronically initial, while the repetitive one is more abstract, fully productive and tends to develop from the reditive one on later stages of grammaticalization (cf. Rosemeyer 2014 on the diachronic development of ‘again’-markers).

- A special case in NAKANAI (Oceanic), Johnston 1980: 46–47: a single ‘again’-marker or a double one according to the control: a non-controlled action – the particle lou ‘again’, a controlled action: rivu ‘back’ + lou ‘again’.

2.3.2. REPETITIVE + ADDITIVE (‘more, also, another’)

- KWAZA (Isolate, Brazil), Voort 2004: 462: the affix -jeʔe ‘again’ in the context of the lexeme bony- ‘more’.

(14) bony-ʔẏ txu’xũja-jеʔe-da-mẏ
again-NOM small eat-REP-1S-VOL
‘I’m going to eat some more (lit. to eat some more again)’.

▲ «Light» (in terms of Wälchli 2006) use of the morphological ‘again’-marker in the additive context (the repetition is marked «automatically», as it is logically takes place, not as there is a reason to point it out).

2.3.3. Two ‘again’-markers with a narrow specific meaning

- RUSSIAN:
  - the «reconstructive» prefix pere- ‘to repeat an action to improve the previous result’ (and some other meanings), cf. e.g. (Flier 1984)
  - the «reconstructive» adverb zanovo ‘to repeat an action to improve the previous result, having canceled this previous result’, cf. (Kiseleva, Paillard 1998)

  (15) Zanovo pere-stroitj ≈ pere-stroitj + zanovo postroitj
  ‘To renovate (lit. zanovo pere-build / ??zanovo build / OKpere-build) and to enlarge a dilapidated hospital in B. Sundyrj’ – cf. OKlit. zanovo build a demolished hospital
2.3.4. A special case: the recursive use or the redundant one?

- URARINA (Isolate, Peru), Olawsky 2006: 174–175: adverbs kwajteǐ and nakwaaneous (frozen forms of the verb ‘to repeat’), their combination in any order is possible
  - one adverb = ‘again (if V has taken place once before)’ vs. two adverbs: ‘again (if V has taken place more than one time before)’
  (16) kwajteǐ nakwaaneous ku-a
    again  again go-3
  ‘... He went (hunting) again’.

? Is this ‘again (again)’ or a special sub-meaning of ‘again’?
NB The use of a (single) ‘again’-marker in the «non-referential» meaning ‘as usual’ is attested across languages, cf.:
(17) čemana mii pokto-i ele-go-j-du-ja-wa
  tomorrow 1SG road-P.REFL.SG stand-REP-PC.NPST-DAT-P.1SG-OBL
  pokto xoldon-do-a-ni ao-ra min-ći xukču-xarí
  road side-DAT-OBL-P.3SG sleep.CV.NSIM 1SG-DIR attack-IMP
  ‘Tomorrow when I will be standing (as usual) on my track, lie down near the track and attack me!’, Nanai (Tungusic, Russia), Avrorin 1986, text 38.165

▲ The meaning ‘again’ is of a such nature, that the borderline between the redundant use and the recursive one is objectively vague.

3. The iconic use of ‘again’-markers

▲ A combination of ‘again’-markers can give an expected iconic semantic shift: reiteration, intensification.
▲ However: not the initial meaning + reiteration / intensification (as e.g. for causatives cf. (Kulikov 1993)), but the ONLY reiteration / intensification
  ♦ Reiteration
  ● RUSSIAN: reiteration (+ emphasis): vnov’ i vnov’, snova i snova, opjat’ i opjat’; the same is in ENGLISH (again and again)
  ◆ Intensification
  ● KIWAI (Trans-New Guinea), Ray 1931: the adverb mina ‘again’; minamina arogo ‘to insist’ (lit. ‘again-again to say’).
  ◆ Nontrivial shifts
  ● GOONIYANDI (Bunaban, Australia), McGregor 1990: 464: the clitic =nyali ‘again’ + the adverb ngambiddi ‘again’ = the frozen expression ngambiddi-nyali ‘every day’
  NB the third potential meaning – Distributive – is not (yet) attested (however attested e.g. for double causative, cf. (Kulikov 1993))

▲ Why Iterativity and / or Intensity?
  - typical «iconic» uses of a double marker
  - however: Reiteration – is it a simple iconicity or a compositional result of the meaning ‘again’ repeated (iteratively = again + again)? On the semantic relations between the meaning ‘again’ and the domain of pluractionality cf. Shluinsky 2005.

5. Concluding remarks
The double ‘again’-markers in more general context of doubling in the domain of derivation
● All potential interpretations are logically possible and attested across languages:
  - the recursive interpretation;
  - the redundant interpretation (multiple exponence in a broad sense)
  - the interpretation with a semantic shift
● The features of the ‘again’-meaning
  The borderline between the recursive interpretation and the redundant one is not clear: to repeat again vs. to repeat something that has been repeated more than once?
The interpretation with a semantic shift: iteratively / intensively – a pure iconicity or compositionally results from the initial meaning ‘one more time’ (repeatedly = one more time + one more time + ...)?

- The redundancy within the derivation =/= redundancy in a strict sense!
- The combination of a morphological derivational marker and a synonymous lexeme is a very widespread case and it is worth a special interest. The explanation in terms of light vs. heavy markers.
- Particular subjects:
  - a diachronically initial spatial meaning (Reditive) + a diachronically secondary, more abstract meaning (Repetitive) => a diachronically secondary, more abstract meaning (Repetitive);
  - a complex interaction of the semantically narrow again-markers with a close, but not identical meaning (zanovo + pere- in Russian).

- NB For a further research: competing interpretations (within a language or across languages) and factors determining the choice
  - how close are the meanings of the markers to each other? (the closer they are => the more probable the redundant interpretation is)
  - how closely does the affix interact with the stem? (the more closely => the less probable the redundant interpretation is)
  - a linear position / syntactic position / position in informational structure .... of the markers
  - ....
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