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1. Introduction

General question
- What licenses doubling in syntactic reduplication?
- Rule-based frameworks (e.g., Travis 2001, Kobele 2006): Syntactic reduplication is to be described as a copying process, triggered by some abstract reduplication feature in syntactic structure.
- Constructionist frameworks (e.g., Jackendoff 2008, Zwarts 2013): Syntactic reduplication is to be described as a constructional schema that directly maps meaning onto form, with an identity requirement imposed on the open slots.

Purpose of the talk
- In my talk, I take the German construction N hin, N her (‘N here, N there’) as a test case to evaluate different approaches to syntactic reduplication.

N hin, N her is a juxtaposition of two strings [N+hin], [N+her], (lit. hin ‘thither’; her ‘thither’)
The fillers are bare nouns or nominals in the nominative case (‘nominals’ = maximal projections of N under a DP-analysis, cf. Huddleston et al. 2002)

Syntax
- N hin, N her is a juxtaposition of two strings [N+hin], [N+her], (lit. hin ‘thither’; her ‘thither’)
- The fillers are bare nouns or nominals in the nominative case (‘nominals’ = maximal projections of N under a DP-analysis, cf. Huddleston et al. 2002)
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Semantics

- N hin, N her is the antecedent in a concessive conditional construction by which a speaker conveys that a certain state of affairs P is irrelevant for the truth of another state of affairs Q.

(10) Regardless P, Q

Pragmatics

- N hin, N her does not have illocutionary force on its own. The larger construction to which it is juxtaposed mostly is an assertion, but other illocutions are possible as well.


- Feelings here, feelings there, do you have any evidence for that?

• N hin, N her allows for a number of different interpretations

(12) Concessive usage (‘P, anyway Q’)

Mindestlohn hin, Mindestlohn her, unser Hauswein bleibt weiterhin gewohnt günstig. (https://www.facebook.com/LaCasitaAhaus)

‘Minimum wage here, Minimum wage there, our house wine will continue to be a bargain.’

(13) Concessive conditional (fatalistic) usage (‘It’s no use’)

Context: Secretary of Labor Valeriano Gómez announced in Santander, northern Spain, on Tuesday that the minimum wage will be raised by 1.5 to 2.5 percent in 2012.

Mindestlohn hin, Mindestlohn her. Was will der Arbeitnehmer denn machen, wenn der Boss weniger zahlt? (http://www.spanien-treff.de/topic/1182-mindestlohn-soll-in-spanien-erh%C3%B6ht-werden/)

‘Minimum wage here, minimum wage there. What can the employee do (after all) if the boss pays less?’

(14) Mock (derogatory) usage (‘What you say about X is pointless’)


‘Ananda Marga is in Sanskrit a tatpurusha compound, i.e. the first constituent is in a case relation with the second constituent. How one translates this, whether as a genitive ‘way of blessedness’, or as an accusative, as ‘way to blessedness’, or whether one assumes yet another case relation, is a question of interpretation.’

‘Grammar here, grammar there, it’s very easy to see which of the interpretations is misleading: A mission which is in that big trouble can hardly be a ‘way of blessedness’.

Summary

- N hin, N her exhibits a number of specific, more or less peculiar formal restrictions.
- The crucial question is how the syntactic features map into the construction’s specific semantic meaning and usage potential.
- A comprehensive analysis should be able to account not only for the grammatical properties of the construction, but also for its restricted interpretational range.

3. The problem of (non-)identity

Problem

- Identity of the nominals in N hin, N her is not mandatory

(15) Energiewende hin, Atomstrom her – den Haushaltser in erster Linie die Finanzen. (Mannheimer Morgen, 17.01.2014)

‘Energy revolution here, nuclear power there – homeowners are primarily interested in how much it costs.’

(16) Verbot hin, Gerichtsentscheid her – demonstrieren will die linke Szene am Tag der Arbeit auf jeden Fall. (Die tageszeitung, 26.04.2001)

‘Ban here, court decision there – the leftists are going to demonstrate on Labor Day at any rate.’

Basic question

- Is N hin, N her an instance of syntactic reduplication, or is the (optional) identity of the two nominals licensed by some other process?
- For a process of syntactic reduplication to apply, the doubling must yield some kind of grammatical or semantic effect (e.g., Lindström 1999, Travis 2001, Ghomeshi et al. 2004, Maas 2005, Stolz 2009).

(17) He sleeps and sleeps. (‘He sleeps longer than usual’)

(18) He sleeps and snores. (‘He sleeps and he snores’)

- Both the identical and the non-identical variant of N hin, N her convey the same general irrelevance interpretation (regardless P, Q).
- Consequently, the irrelevance meaning cannot be assumed to be brought about solely by the (optional) doubling of the nouns.

How to deal with the (non-)identity of nominals in N hin, N her?

1) One-construction assumption: We might assume one single construction whose arguments may or may not be identical. Under this assumption, a copy analysis seems to be ruled out immediately, as it cannot account for the non-identical variant of the construction.

2) Two-construction assumption: Alternatively, we might assume two different independent constructions. We may then maintain a copy analysis for the construction with identical nouns, while we have to analyze the non-identical cases differently.

- A problem for assumption 1) is that the two variants are near-synonymous and structurally parallel, suggesting a close interrelation between them.
- In spite of this problem, I will assume for the moment that we have two different constructions.
This allows us to focus on the variant with identical nouns, for which we want to examine different analyses.

If it turns out that a copying analysis is warranted for the identical variant, we may still try to derive the non-identical variant via additional assumptions from the identical variant.

If it turns out that a copying analysis is not warranted for the identical variant, it suggests itself that we should seek for an alternative solution.

4. Phrase structural status of *N hin, N her*

**Claim**

- *N hin, N her* is an instance of syntactic coordination with phonologically empty conjunction.

**Evidence**

- *N hin* is not part of *N her*, and *N her* is not part of *N hin* (no subordination)
- There is a non-reduplicative variant of the construction with overt disjunction


'Smoking ban here or there: The US-tobacco giant Philip Morris International sold a good 5 percent more cigarettes in the first quarter than the year before.'

- A coordinative connector may be inserted optionally into *N hin, N her*


'Law here and law there, say Franz Schmiedbauer, Monika Saler and Brigitte Költringer, but: Sometimes common sense takes precedence over law.'

- In German, there are a number of adverbial connectors that occur pairwise in syntactic coordination with empty conjunction (cf. Pasch et al. 2003)

(22) a. *Weder kann er es noch will er es.*

neither can he it nor wants he it

b. *Weder kann er es noch er will es.*

neither can he it nor he wants it

'Neither is he able to do it nor does he want to do it.'

- Another parallel case are paired, reduplicative adverbs that occur within coordinate structures (in these cases, the conjunction may or may not be overtly realized)

(23) Mal/bald/teils war sie hungrig, (und) mal/bald/teils (war sie) durstig.

'Sometime/partly she was hungry, (and) sometime/partly (she was) thirsty'

(24) *Mal/bald/teils war sie hungrig, [in the relevant reading]*

'Some time/partly she was hungry.'
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5. A copying approach to N hin, N her

In focus: N hin, N her in its identical variant

Question

• Can the doubling in N hin, N her be analyzed as a rule-based, syntactic copying operation?

Instances of bare noun + Adv must be treated differently

(29) Geld her!

money ADV

‘Give me the money’

(b) Adv as head?

• Adverbs normally do not subcategorize for (bare) nouns

• Apart from the usage as particles with verbs of location, hin/her appear with adverbial PPs, or in word pairs

• In the usage with PPs, the adverb is a non-head

• In the word pair usage, one might consider taking the adverbs as heads, for reasons of syntactic distribution (adverbial usage)

(30) a. Das Zimmer lag zur Straße hin.

‘The room was situated towards the street ADV’

b. *Das Zimmer lag hin.

c. Das Zimmer lag zur Straße.

‘The room was situated towards the street’

(31) hin und her, hin und zurück; hin und wieder

‘here and there’; ‘back and forth’, ‘now and then’

• In structures such as (29), it is suggestive to take the adverb as the element which selects the noun, not vice versa

Potential phrase structures of YP

(32) AdvP

NP

(33) NP

Adv

Summary

• N hin, N her can be taken as an instance of a conjunction phrase &P.

• However, the internal phrase structure analysis of the conjuncts faces a number of problems.

5.1 Copying approaches to syntactic reduplication

General

• Copy Theory of Movement (Chomsky 1995): Traces are unpronounced copies of a moved constituent

• Syntactic reduplication results from the spelling out of multiple positions in a movement chain

(34) Coll. Dutch (Barbiers 2008)

Wij, denk je dat ik gezien heb?

who think you who I seen have

‘Who do you think I have seen?’

• Multiple spell-out is often assumed to be licensed by an abstract RED feature that needs to be checked

• RED is responsible for the potential meaning effects resulting from the reduplication

• Travis (2001) differentiates between two types of syntactic reduplication

1) “phonological reduplication” (= head movement)

2) “syntactic reduplication” (= spec-filling)

Type 1 (“phonological reduplication”) = Head movement

• RED is the head of a functional phrase and takes as its sister a head

• The need for feature checking triggers head movement, which sets up the appropriate environment for the reduplication

• RED is the final position for the copied constituent

Example: The case of Contrastive Focus Reduplication

(Ghomeshi et al. 2004; e.g., salad-salad ‘lettuce, not tuna salad’)

• An abstract CR (= ‘contrastive reduplication’) morpheme heads a functional phrase and takes a lexical phrase XP as its complement

• The CR morpheme has the features [+prototypical, +contrast] and triggers head-movement of the adjacent X0

• The copy of X0 merges with CR

(35) CRP

CR

XP

CR

X0

X

copy
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\[\text{Type 2 ("syntactic reduplication") = Spec-filling}\]

- RED is the head of a functional phrase, but there is no movement
- The head “creates a copy” (Travis 2001: 7) of its phrasal sister which then appears in the Spec position of the functional phrase
- RED is not the final position for the copy

\[\text{(36) } \begin{array}{c}
\text{QP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{Q} \\
\text{XP} \\
\text{copy} \\
\end{array} \]

[\(\text{Q}\) is the RED morpheme, with \(\text{Q}\) symbolising ‘quantity’, as a salient semantic effect of reduplication]

Phrasal movement: A high base-generated topic moves to the Spec-position of a higher functional projection (Grohmann/Nevins 2004 on shm-reduplication in English)

- shm-reduplication expresses topicalization and pejoration
- The topic expression (\(\text{money}\)) is moved from the topic projection to the pejoration projection; multiple spell-out results in reduplication
- The second copy cannot be realized identically to the first due to a restriction on the level of PF

\[\text{(37) } \begin{array}{c}
\text{PejP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{Pej} \\
\text{XP} \\
\text{copy} \\
\end{array} \]

A different alternative: Post-syntactic phonological copying (Müller 2011 on NPN constructions, e.g., \(\text{Buch auf Buch}\) ‘book upon book’)

- This analysis is inspired by Frampton’s distributed theory of reduplication (cf. Frampton 2009)
- Idea: NPN cannot be assigned syntactic structure; rather, it is the result of a post-syntactic phonological copying process
- \(\text{Buch auf Buch}\) is syntactically an instance of a regular phrase \([NP]\) (auf Buch)
- The overt output \(\text{Buch auf Buch}\) is delivered by phonological copying triggered by a RED feature optionally assigned to \(P\)
- Procedure: A transcription mechanism generates new positions to the left of the preposition which are associated with the segments of \(\text{Buch}\). The segments of \(\text{Buch}\) are copied to the left side, resulting in the phonological realization \(\text{Buch auf Buch}\).

5.2 Application to \(N\) hin, \(N\) her

\[\text{(38) Analysis 1: Head movement}\]

\[\text{Problems}\]

- This analysis gives us the wrong output, as it generates phrases like \(\text{Krieg Krieg her}\).
- Thus, it can derive doubling of the noun, but it cannot derive the adverb \(\text{hin}\) that intervenes in between the two nominal copies.
- Aside from that, the head-movement analysis can only be applied to instances of \(N\) hin, \(N\) her that feature nouns, not to extended nouns (nominals).

\[\text{(39) Analysis 2: Spec-filling}\]

\[\text{Problems}\]

- While this analysis correctly predicts that the whole conjunct is copied, it results in the erroneous output \(\text{Krieg her Krieg her}\) (or, alternatively, \(\text{Krieg hin Krieg hin}\)).
- Thus, it cannot account for the distinctness of the adverbs, at least not without substantial additional assumptions.

\[\text{(40) Analysis 3: Phrasal movement to a higher functional projection}\]
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Problems
- This analysis falsely predicts that Krieg hin alone can appear in topic position (*Krieg hin, es muss eine gute Show werden)
- This analysis only accounts for left-peripheral cases, not for right-peripheral or parenthetic usages of N hin, N her
- It cannot explain where hin comes into the picture in the first place (it is not part of the given discourse topic)

(41) Analysis 4: Post-syntactic phonological copying
- One might assume that the regular syntactic structure of the construction is [N Adv], with the adverb as the head.
- RED attaches to the head, triggering a post-syntactic process of phonological copying of the segments of N to the right of Adv (with Adv being in the truncation domain).

Problems
- The output would be Krieg hin Krieg (or Krieg Krieg her).
- If we assume that the whole sequence, including the adverb, is copied, we must assume some kind of additional process by which the second instance of hin is deleted and substituted by her (see the Spec-filling analysis above).

Taken together,
- A copying analysis is faced with a number of technical and theoretical problems that mainly result from the fact that we have intervening material between the doubled objects.
- More generally, the rule-based approach cannot account for the idiosyncratic features of the construction, e.g., binarity and irreversibility.

Conclusion
- If the copying approach cannot provide us with a convincing analysis of the identical N hin, N her variant, we cannot build our analysis on copying and then try to derive the non-identical cases via additional assumptions.
- We have to seek for a different analysis.

6. A constructionist approach to N hin, N her

6.1 Constructionist approaches to syntactic reduplication

General
- A constructionist approach (e.g., Jackendoff 2008, Jacobs 2008) does not seek to derive the semantics of the reduplication construction compositionally.
- Rather, it conceives of the construction as a schematic idiom with specific grammatical properties which is associated non-compositionally with a certain semantic meaning.

The case of NPN (Jackendoff 2008; e.g., student after student, book upon book)
- NPN is a constructional idiom
- Main argument: NPN “violates standard principles of phrase structure” (Jackendoff 2008: 8)
  - it is unclear what syntactic category NPN is, as the adjunct positions in which NPN can appear are categorically unselective
  - the internal structure of NPN is puzzling, as prepositions normally do not take bare nouns as their complements, nor as their specifiers

(42) Constructional schema
- Meaning:  MANY Xs IN SUCCESSION
- Syntax:  \([, N_0/NP_{min}, P, N_0/NP_{min}, Adv_j, N_0/NP_{min}, Adv_k]\)
- Phonology:  \(P_i hin, P_i her\)

Parallels to MDT (Morphological Doubling Theory, Inkelas & Zoll 2005)
- (e.g. Warlpiri (Indonesian) pluralization kara ‘monkey’, kara-kara ‘monkeys’)
  - Reduplication is the insertion of two identical or semantically equivalent morphological constituents into the slots of a morphological doubling schema
  - The meaning of the construction as a whole is some function of the meaning of the daughters; the two slots are independent of each other

(43)   \[    \]
      \[    \] \[F_i\]   \[    \] \[F_i\]

6.2 Application to N hin, N her
- N hin, N her is a syntactic schema with two open slots for whose fillers identity is required.
- This schema is directly associated with the meaning representation of the construction.

(44) Meaning:  REGARDLESS X i , Q
- Syntax:  \([, N_0/NP_{min}, Adv_j, N_0/NP_{min}, Adv_k]\)
- Phonology:  \(P_i hin, P_i her\)

Advantages of a constructionist approach
- The constructionist approach captures the idiosyncratic aspects of the construction, i.e. the non-compositional meaning constitution, the binarity and the irreversibility.
- The syntactic variability of N0/NPmin does not pose a problem to the theory as construction grammar does not strictly separate lexicon and syntax.
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A constructionist analysis does not need to assume abstract features or empty categories.
More generally, the construction analysis fits the intuition that N hin, N her is a frozen phraseological pattern.

Disadvantages of a constructionist approach
A constructionist approach does not make any attempt to explain the specific features of this construction. Rather, it takes the construction to be just an arbitrary form-meaning pairing.
This runs counter to the intuition that both the doubling and the choice of adverbs in this construction are not arbitrary, but meaningful, albeit in a not completely straightforward way.
From a theoretical point of view, the major argument against constructionist approaches is that they simply stipulate all features. As Müller (2011: 220) puts it: “Der Anspruch ist geringer, und somit auch die Gefahr des Scheiterns” (‘low claims, low risk’) (but see Jacobs 2015).

An alternative approach
I would like to suggest an approach to N hin, N her that is essentially constructionist, but goes beyond it in seeking to explain why the construction has exactly the shape it has.

7. An approach from discourse to grammar
(cf. also Finkbeiner 2015, Finkbeiner, in prep.)

General problem

- If N hin, N her is a case of syntactic reduplication, it should be possible to assign to this process some identifiable grammatical or semantic effect.
- However, we have seen that speakers convey the same irrelevance meaning by both the identical and the non-identical variant.
- Thus, the irrelevance meaning cannot straightforwardly be taken to be the result of a reduplication process.

Aims

- An account of N hin, N her should be able to describe both variants in a uniform way.
- This uniform account should be able to distinguish between idiosyncratic aspects and regular aspects of the construction.

My approach in a nutshell

- Synchronically, N hin, N her is a grammatical construction in the sense of Jackendoff (2008), as represented in (45).
- However, not every aspect of this construction is arbitrary, or idiosyncratic.
- If one takes into account pragmatic factors and a diachronic perspective, one can motivate both the doubling and the appearance of the adverbs hin and her.
- Thus, what I would like to add to a constructionist view of N hin, N her is the attempt to derive its meaning via a historical-pragmatic perspective.

What licenses doubling in N hin, N her?

- The doubling in N hin, N her is based on an operation of utterance repetition, rather than an instance of syntactic (or phonological) reduplication.

Reduplication vs. Repetition

- Reduplication is a restricted, obligatory process located within the domain of grammar.
- Repetition is a stylistic option used by speakers to reach certain discursive effects (cf. Maas 2007, Stolz 2007, Stolz et al. 2011).
- The effects of reduplication are on the level of grammatical functions or denotational semantics, such as tense/aspect, number, intensification, modification.
- The effects of repetition are on the level of speaker attitude, emotion and illocution, such as emphasis or agreement/disagreement.
- Thus, if I say “A fox, a fox is in the garden!” (Sperber/Wilson 1995), I don’t convey, say, that there are two foxes in the garden, but I put emotional load into the speech act performed.

Arguments for a repetition analysis

- The functions of N hin, N her are primarily on the level of pragmatics and discourse. That is, the overall irrelevance meaning of N hin, N her is a meaning aspect clearly related to speaker attitude and illocution, because it allows for stance taking in discourse.
- N hin, N her can be used similarly to mock repeats (Tannen 1987, Israeli 1997, Bamford 2000). Mock repeats are repetitions by which a speaker conveys that she is annoyed with what the discourse partner is saying.
- Both mock repeats and N hin, N her operate on topics, towards which a speaker conveys a subjective stance.

(46) Morgen, morgen (wenn ich das schon höre), du hast schon vor Wochen versprochen, dein Zimmer aufzuräumen!
‘Tomorrow, tomorrow (I can’t believe you are saying that), you promised to clean up your room weeks ago!’

(47) Gefühle hin, Gefühle her, hast du dafür auch Belege?
‘Feelings here, feelings there, do you have any evidence for that?’

- From a repetition analysis, it follows readily that the doubled noun only contributes once to the computational system. A linguistic expression that is repeated does not undergo changes in its structural composition or denotational semantics (cf. Knowles 1979). Thus, if I say “A fox, a fox is in the garden”, this is not an instance of uttering the syntactic structure a fox a fox. Rather, I make use twice of the NP a fox.
- The fact that the adverbs in N hin, N her are not identical is not a counter-argument against a repetition analysis. It is clear that repetitive utterances may contain material that is not repeated, e.g. “A fox, a dangerous fox, a fox as red as blood is in the garden!”

The diachronic perspective

- A repetition analysis would predict that the doubling in N hin, N her is totally free, i.e. that we will not find any formal-grammatical restrictions.
- However, we have formal restrictions, e.g., on the category of the filler-element, on the reversibility of the conjuncts, and on the number of conjuncts.
- We can account for the formal restrictions of N hin, N her by assuming that the construction is a piece of ‘frozen discourse’, i.e. a result of a grammaticalization process (Dieuwald 2006, Hilpert 2009). As such, it is not a free discourse option any longer.
- Thus, we are dealing essentially with a phenomenon of language change, which originates in a discursive repetition strategy, but results in a syntactically restricted, partly conventionalized pattern.
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A pragmatic approach can account for the constitution of the general irrelevance meaning of N hin, N her. A comparison between an actual and a historical corpus may provide empirical evidence for this assumption. A pragmatic account allows us to treat both the identical and the non-identical variant as instances of one and the same construction.

• The non-identical variant can be treated as a pragmatically motivated, creative modification of the basic (identical) pattern applied by speakers to achieve certain stylistic effects (beyond the irrelevance meaning).
• It is a general option of language users to override grammatical restrictions for the purpose of specific stylistic needs.
• Many German native speakers have the intuition that the identical variant is (historically) the prime variant, whereas the non-identical variant is a modification of this pattern.
• Actual usage data reveal that many utterances of non-identical N hin, N her in fact aim at specific stylistic effects, e.g., to catch the attention of the reader by establishing a contrast, as in the following example.

(48) Dackel hin, Katze her: Viele Tierhalter im Kreis Altenkirchen schwärmen eher für exotische Vögel, Reptilien oder Spinnen. (Rhein-Zeitung, 22.06.2007)

2) A pragmatic approach can account for the constitution of the general irrelevance meaning of N hin, N her.

• A motivation for the appearance of hin and her— and not, say, oben ‘up’ and unten ‘down’— lies in the lexical semantics of the deictic expressions hin and her, which incorporates reference to the speaker.
• Relative to the position of the speaker, hin and her point into two opposite directions.
• Together with the repetition of the nominal, an interpretation evolves under which the object referred to by the nominal is turned around and looked at from different, maximally contrasting, i.e. directly opposite perspectives.
• Hin and her thus can be conceptualized as contributing an aspect of exhausting the set of potential alternatives.
• This is in direct connection with the resulting irrelevance aspect (none of the potential preconditions P will influence the truth of Q).

3) A pragmatic account allows us to derive the usage possibilities of the construction via an interaction between constructional semantics and general pragmatic principles.

• The different interpretations in (12)-(14) may be derived via an interplay of an underspecified semantic meaning and additional conversational implicatures that arise in context.
• Given the relevant contexts and general pragmatic principles of relevance and quantity, hearers may infer the relevant intentions of the speaker, be it a concessive meaning, a concessive conditional meaning, or a mock interpretation.
• A purely constructionist account, by contrast, which does not differentiate between semantic and pragmatic aspects of meaning, is forced to either pose different constructions for all different usage patterns, or posit only one irrelevance construction, neglecting the differences in use/interpretation illustrated in (12)-(14).

From repetition to coordination

• Under the analysis sketched so far, N hin, N her originates in repetition of a word or a string, but results in a grammaticalized coordinate structure. How can we account for the path from (utterance) repetition to (syntactic) coordination?
• A basic assumption would be that for a discourse entity to grammaticalize, it needs to have syntactic structure.
• The syntactic format that is most suitable for a binary object with two equal strings is coordination.
• One might hypothesize that the repetitive utterance makes parasitic use of the coordinate syntactic format.
• This process may be facilitated by the pairwise occurrence of the adverbs, which fits well with a binary coordinate format.
• Such an analysis would correctly predict that once the construction is grammaticalized, all kinds of fillings of its slots are possible.
• This follows from the fact that syntactic coordination— but not repetition— allows not only for semantically distinct conjuncts, but also for categorically distinct conjuncts (e.g., Lein und ohne den Mantel ausziehen ging er die Treppe hinauf) Quietly and without taking off his coat he went upstairs), cf. (49).

(49) Orwell hin, online her - die Schlüsselfrage beim Ausbau der digitalen Infrastruktur lautet: Kriegen wir ein Distributionsnetz oder ein Kommunikationsnetz? (Süddeutsche Zeitung, 27.08.1996) 'Orwell here, online there – the key question regarding the development of the digital infrastructure is: Are we going to get a network for distribution or for communication?'

Knowles (1979: 654) remarked that processes of iteration are not ‘linguistic’ in the narrow sense of being “reflexes of the formal system of rules we call ‘grammar’, but are in fact special stylistic phenomena, though based on linguistically defined data.”

One may well take also the reverse to be possible: That the special stylistic uses via frequent usage, or “entrenchment”, may take their way back into the “formal system of rules we call ‘grammar”, thereby making use of regular grammatical formats.

---

2 A comparison between an actual and a historical corpus may provide empirical evidence for this assumption. I had to leave this for the future.