Double 'again'-markers

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) <u>A «recursive» interpretation</u>: the primary meaning is applied to the stem twice consecutively:

♣ cf. RUSSIAN (see Nedjalkov 2002)

(1) nača-l za-sypa-t^j (begin-PST INCH-sleep-INF) 'he began to fall asleep (lit. began to [begin to sleep])'

● 2) <u>A «redundant» interpretation</u>: 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) <u>An «iconic» interpretation</u>: 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-ŋan-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 <u>Multiple Exponence (= extended exponence, ME)</u>:

    - 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:

  ● INFLECTION: marker 1 'meaning A'+ marker 2 'meaning A'= 'meaning A'
  ● DERIVATION: marker 1 'meaning A1' + marker 2 'meaning A2' = 'meaning A1' / 'meaning A2' / 'meaning A1/2' / 'meaning A3'

♣ Cf. (Letučiy 2009) on the double reciprocal construction in RUSSIAN:
celovat^j-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.:

  ^{OK}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;

pressuposition: event V has already taken place before (NB <u>it does not matter, how many times</u>).

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 в RNC):

(4) Teper^j ostalas^j *pere-pere-delka* v Sojuzpise, i moj garderob polnost^jju 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 repetitition, 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) Ɂentons   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: Ɂeł- 'back', + Ɂełuł- 'again':
(9) Ɂeł-xʷúy 'He went back' – Ɂełuł-əɁíłən '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
● BANTU LANGUAGES: 'again'-markers (+reversive, intensive) on *-uC* and *-uCuC*, cf. Dammann 1959; Schadeberg 1982.
- 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   ʔemk'
     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)

	q- + *χab*
N of examples	30
% of the sum of the uses of *q-* and *χab*	3,14% (of 955)
% of the uses of *q-*	3,53% (of 849)
% of the uses of *χab*	28,3% (of 109)

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) <u>a reditive affix + a repetitive lexeme</u>

● UDIHE (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 ña 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) <u>a reditive affix + a repetitive affix</u>:

● 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) <u>a repetitive affix + a reditive lexeme</u> – ??? (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).

● <u>A special case</u> 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 *-je'ʔe* 'again' in the context of the lexeme *bony-* 'more'.

(14) **bony**-'hỹ txu'xũija-**je'ʔe**-da-mỹ
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)
- *pere + zanovo ≈ pere-*:

(15) *Zanovo pere-*stroit^j <$^{???}$*zanovo* postroit^j, ^{OK}*pere-*stroit^j > i rasširit^j obvetšaluju bol^{j}nicu v B. Sundyre.
[RNC] – cf. ^{OK}*zanovo postroit^j* snesennuju bol^{j}nicu
'To renovate (lit. zanovo pere-build / $^{???}$zanovo build / ^{OK}pere-build) and to enlarge a dilapidated hospital in B. Sundyrj' – cf. ^{OK}lit. *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 *kwajteī* and *nakwaauneeī* (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) **kwajteī nakwaauneeī** 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-či   xukču-xəri
   road   side-DAT-OBL-P.3SG   sleep-CV.NSIM   1SG-DIR   attack-IMP

'Tomorrow when I <u>will be standing (as usual)</u> 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

- ....

References

Caballero G., Harris A. A working typology of multiple exponence // Kiefer et al. Current Issues in Morphological Theory. John Benjamins. 2012.

Carlson Barry F. A grammar in Spokan: a Salish language of eastern Washington. Ann Arbor: UMI. 1972.

Daeleman Jan. Notes grammaticales et lexique du Kiholu. München: Lincom. 2003.

Dammann Ernst. 1957. Studien zum Kwangali: Grammatik, Texte, Glossar. Hamburg: De Gruyter.

Dammann, Ernst. 1959. Inversiva und Repetitiva in Bantusprachen. Afrika und Übersee, 43. P. 116–127.

Duff-Tripp, Martha. 1997. Gramática del idioma yanesha' (amuesha). Lima, Perú: Inst. Lingüístico de Verano.

Flier M. S. Syntagmatic constraints on the Russian prefix pere- // Issues in Russian Morphosyntax [UCLA Slavic Studies 10]. Columbus: Slavica. 1984.

Guillaume, Antoine. 2008. A grammar of Cavineña. Berlin.

Heath, Jeffrey. 1999. A grammar of Koyraboro (Koroboro) Senni: the Songhay of Gao, Mali. Köln: Köppe.

Johnston, Raymond Leslie. 1980. Nakanai of New Britain: the grammar of an Oceanic language. Canberra: Dept. of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian Natl. Univ.

Kabuta, Ngo S. 1998. Het Cilubà werkwoord: morphologie. Gent: RECALL.

Kemmer, Susanne. 1993. The middle voice. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kiseleva, K. L., Pajar D. (Eds.) 1998. Diskursivnye slova russkogo jazyka: opyt kontekstno-semanticheskogo opisanija. M.

Kulikov, Leonid. The «second causative»: A typological sketch // Comrie B., Polynsky M. (Eds.) Causatives and Transitivity. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1993. P. 121–153.

Kung, Susan S. 2007. A descriptive grammar of Huehuetla Tepehua. Ann Arbor: UMI.

Lyutikova E., Bonch-Osmolovskaya A. A very active passive // Kulikov et al. (Eds.) Case, Valency and Transitivity. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 2006.

Lyutikova, Ekaterina and Anastasia Bonch-Osmolovskaya. A very active passive: functional similarities between passive and causative in Balkar // Kulikov, Leonid, Andrej Malchukov, Peter de Swart (Eds.) Case, valency and transitivity. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 2006.

Matthews P.H. Morphology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1974.

McGregor, William B. 1990. A functional grammar of Gooniyandi. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 2002. Notes on the typology of principal types of inceptive predicates : three types of phasal inceptives (inchoatives, ingressives, initives); two non-phasal types (iteratives proper and adverbial iteratives) // Philologie, Typologie und Sprachstruktur. Frankfurt a. M. S. 137–156.

Nikolaeva, Irina and Maria Tolskaya. 2001. A grammar of Udihe. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nikolaeva, Irina, Elena Perekhvalskaya and Maria Tolskaya. 2003. Udeghe texts. Osaka: ELPR.

Olawsky, Knut J. 2006. A grammar of Urarina. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rahilina E.V. Grammatika ošibok: v poiskah konstant // Danijel' i dr. (Red.) Jazyk. Konstanty. Peremennye. Sbornik pamjati A.E. Kibrika. SPb.: Aletejja. 2014. S. 87–95.

Ray, Sidney H. 1931. A grammar of the Kiwai language, Fly Delta, Papua: with a Kiwai vocabulary. Port Moresby: Baker.

Rusakova M.V. Russkie diminutivy: morfologičeskij, sintaksičeskij, leksičeskij analiz // Rusakova M.V. Elementy antropocentričeskoj grammatiki russkogo jazyka. M. 2013. S. 354–370.

Schadeberg Th. C. Les suffixes verbaux separatifs en Bantou // Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika, 4. 1982. P. 55–66.

Shluinsky A.B. Tipologija predikatnoj množestvennosti: kolichestvennye aspektual'nye značenija. Diss. PhD thesis. M.: MGU. 2005.

Smeets, Ineke. 2008. A grammar of Mapuche. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Soukka, Maria. 2000. A descriptive grammar of Noon: a Cangin language of Senegal. München: LINCOM.

Stoynova, N.M. Pokazateli refaktiva. M. 2013.

Tatevosov S.G. Mnozhestvennaja prefiksacija i anatomija russkogo glagola // Kiseleva i dr. (Red.) Korpusnye issledovanija po russkoj grammatike. M.: Probel-2000. 2009.

Tovena, Lucia M. and Marta Donazzan. 2008. On ways of repeating // Recherches linguistiques de Venciennes, 37. P. 85–112.

Voort van der, Hein. 2004. A Grammar of Kwaza. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wälchli, Bernhard. 2006. Typology of light and heavy 'again', or the eternal return of the same // Studies in Language 30 (1). P. 69–113.

Xu Zh., Aronoff M. A Realization Optimality-Theoretic Approach to Blocking and Extended Morphological Exponence // Journal of Linguistics, 47. 2011. P. 673–707.
Young, Robert W. 2000. The Navajo verb system: an overview. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.