This paper will discuss pseudo-coordination in Danish and in Afrikaans, in particular positional pseudo-coordination, which is used, firstly, with a meaning very close to the one expressed by the English progressive tenses (Danish/Afrikaans *He lies and sleeps* ≈ English *He is sleeping*) and, secondly, also with a speaker-oriented affective meaning also evident in English *went and constructions* (*He went and forgot his password*). Based on a combination of the analyses in Ramchand (2008) and Cinque (1999, 2004), we will show that many of the seemingly quirky properties of this construction can be derived by assuming that the two verbs are forced to share a single clausal domain (much like an auxiliary verb and a main verb in these languages), which means that significant parts of the functional structure are not available to one of the two verbs (cf. Kjeldahl 2010). This fact, we argue, also plays a role in the presence of a speaker-oriented outermost vP-edge that appears to be available, subject to parametric variation, in languages exhibiting structures which require multiple verbs to be merged within the lexical domain (see i.a. also Tsai 2010 on Chinese, Kandybowicz 2013 on Nupe).
1. Pseudo-coordination is different from coordination

1.1 One or two events/states

Consider two coordinated clauses with two different subjects:

(1) a. Da. Peter spiser og Jan læser avis.  
   
   Peter eats and John reads newspaper

If the subject of the two clauses is the same, it is possible to pronounce it only once:

(2) a. Da. Peter spiser og læser avis.  
   
   Peter eats and reads newspaper

Nevertheless, this is a 'real' coordination, where the two verbs describe two events/states. This can be seen from the fact that it is possible to underline that the two events/states occur at the same time:

(3) Da. Peter både spiser og læser avis.  

   Peter both eats and reads newspaper

(4) a. Da. Peter spiser og læser avis samtidigt.  
   
   Peter eats and reads newspaper simultaneously

Compare this to the construction we want to focus on today, the so-called pseudo-coordination (PC). Here, the two verbs describe one single event/state, not two, which is why it cannot be underlined that the two events/states occur at the same time:

   
   Peter sits and reads newspaper

(6) Da. * Peter både sidder og læser avis.  

   Peter both sits and reads newspaper

   
   Peter sits and reads newspaper simultaneously

Pseudo-coordination is sometimes seen as a subcase of what is called hendiadys (from Greek ἕν διὰ δύο, 'one through two'), and some articles and grammars refer to hendiadys rather than pseudo-coordination, including one of the earliest discussions of pseudocoordination data: Poutsma (1917).
1.2 Extraction

In a coordination structure, it is not possible to extract e.g. the object from the second conjunct (cf. the coordinate structure constraint, Ross 1967).

(8) a. Da. Peter skriver breve og Jan læser avis. COORDINATION

Peter writes letters and John reads newspaper

(9) a. Da. * Hvad skriver Peter breve og Jan læser ____? COORDINATION
b. Af. * Wat skryf Piet briewe en Jan lees ____?

What writes Peter letter and John reads

Even if the two conjuncts share a subject, this is not possible:

(10) a. Da. * Hvad for bøger spiser Peter og læser ____? COORDINATION
b. Af. * Watter boeke eet Piet en lees ____?

What (for) books eats Peter and reads

In pseudo-coordinations, extraction is possible from what might look like the second conjunct:

(11) a. Da. Hvad for bøger sidder Peter og læser ____? PSEUDOCOORDINATION
b. Af. Watter boeke sit Piet en lees ____?

What (for) books sits Peter and reads

1.3 Verb second

Pseudo-coordinations and proper coordinations also react differently to Verb Second (V2) (see Vikner 1995 and many, many others). In the case of ordinary coordination, it makes a difference whether the conjuncts have complements or not. If neither conjunct has a complement, both verbs combined by the coordinating conjunction move to C°:

(12) Derfor synger og løber han aldrig i weekenden

Therefore sings and runs he never in the weekend

The same thing happens if both verbs share an internal argument:

(13) Derfor synger og spiller han aldrig sine sange mere.

Therefore sings and plays he never his songs anymore

When the first conjunct does not have a complement, but the second one does, it is however ungrammatical to move both verbs into the C°-position, instead only the first verb moves.

(14) a. * Derfor sang og læste han en bog.

Therefore sang and read he a book
b. Derfor sang han og læste en bog.

Therefore sang he and read a book
If the first conjunct has a complement, only this verb moves into the C-head, regardless of the nature of the second conjunct:

(15) Derfor sang han en sang og læste en bog.

*Therefore sang he a song and read a book*

Pseudo-coordinated structures on the other hand react differently to Verb Second. Since V₁ is always an intransitive verb, we cannot test examples parallel to those in (13) and (15). We can only have cases like (12) and (14). Under V₂, you get the same result, whether V₂ has an internal argument or not:

(16) a. Derfor sidder hun ikke og arbejder.

*Therefore sits she not and works*

b. Derfor sidder hun ikke og læser sin bog.

*Therefore sits she not and reads her book*

Without going into the details of an analysis of proper coordination, this could indicate that (12) is an instance of coordination of heads, a type of coordination that may only take place when there is no internal argument. Whether (13)–(15) then are cases of VP-coordination or of CP-coordination with deletion of identical elements is not crucial, the fact is, they cannot be V°-coordination.

In Danish (as opposed to in Afrikaans, de Vos 2005:135), it is not possible to move both verbs to C°:

(17) * Derfor går og synger hun aldrig i weekenden.

*Therefore walks and sings she never in the weekend*

Intended: 'Therefore she’s never singing on weekends'

2. Pseudo-coordination is different from auxiliary constructions

Even though the previous subsections supported the view that pseudo-coordination is not a case of coordination but rather of subordination, the following subsections will show that pseudo-coordination is very different from ordinary auxiliary verb constructions.

2.1 Repetition of the first verb

As pointed out by Vagstad (2010: 45, 48), a repetition of an auxiliary verb construction repeats the auxiliary verb, and cannot replace the auxiliary by the general pro-verb do:

(18) a. Da. Peter har læst avis.

*Peter has read newspaper*


b. Af. Dit het Jan ook.

*That has Jan too.*


b. Af. Dit doen Jan ook.

*That does Jan too.*

(= he is doing it right now, or he does it regularly)
In a repetition of a pseudo-coordination, the first verb cannot be repeated, but it can be replaced by the general pro-verb *do*:

(21) a. Da. Peter *sider* og læser avis.  


    b. Af. Dit doen Jan ook.  

2.2 Parallel forms

The extraction examples in (11) above can also be used to show why pseudo-coordination is called pseudo-coordination rather than something entirely different. The point is that a certain amount of coordination is still required, e.g. the two verbs must always show identical inflectional morphology (which is easier to show in Danish than in Afrikaans):

(24) a. Da. Hvad *for bøger* side Peter og læser?  
    b. Af. Watter *boke* sit Piet en *lees*?  

(25) Da. Hvad *for bøger* sad Peter og læste?  

(26) a. Da. Hvad *for bøger* vil Peter side og læse?  
    b. Af. Watter boke *sal* Piet *sit* en lees?  

(27) a. Da. Hvad *for bøger* har Peter side og læst?  
    b. Af. Watter boke *het* Piet *sit* en lees?  

(28) a. Da. Sid nu og læs din bog!  
    b. Af. *Sit nou en* lees jou boek!  

Notice that some constructions may not observe this requirement of identical inflectional morphology, and yet still have other properties in common with pseudo-coordination, e.g. the one single event/state property. Consider first a clear case of subordination, the so-called rationale clauses:

(29) Da. a. Sten var *i* Cambridge for at snakke med Theresa, ...  
    b. Sten *has often been* to Cambridge for to talk.inf to Theresa
The *for at*-clauses describe the reason for setting out, and therefore they may be cancelled, i.e. the above examples can be completed as follows:

\[(30) \text{Da. a. } \ldots \text{ but she had not time} \]
\[(30) \text{Da. b. } \ldots \text{ but she has never had time} \]

Consider now the following examples which are presumably not examples of pseudo-coordination (in spite of the presence of the coordinator *og*), because the second verb, *snakke* 'talk', is in the infinitive:

\[(31) \text{Da. a. } \text{Sten was to Cambridge and talk.INF to Theresa} \]
\[(31) \text{Da. b. } \text{Sten has often been to Cambridge and talk.INF to Theresa} \]

Nevertheless the being in Cambridge and talking to Theresa is considered as one event in (31), as can be seen from the impossibility of cancelling the part of clause after the coordinator *og*:

\[(32) \text{Da. a. } \ldots \text{ but she had not time} \]
\[(32) \text{Da. b. } \ldots \text{ but she has never had time} \]

One more fact worth mentioning about Afrikaans is that only the first of the two verbs can (optionally) have the past participial prefix *ge-* (Donaldson 1993:226, de Vos 2005:149), which is otherwise obligatory in the perfect form:

\[(33) \text{a. Af. Watter boeke het Piet gelees?} \]
\[(33) \text{b. Af. * Watter boeke het Piet lees?} \]
\[(34) \text{a. Af. Watter boeke het Piet sit en lees?} \]
\[(34) \text{b. Af. * Watter boeke het Piet gesit en lees?} \]
\[(34) \text{a. Af. * Watter boeke het Piet sit en gelees?} \]
\[(34) \text{b. Af. ?? Watter boeke het Piet gesit en gelees?} \]

One more fact worth mentioning about Afrikaans is that only the first of the two verbs can (optionally) have the past participial prefix *ge-* (Donaldson 1993:226, de Vos 2005:149), which is otherwise obligatory in the perfect form:

\[(33) \text{a. Af. Watter boeke het Piet gelees?} \]
\[(33) \text{b. Af. * Watter boeke het Piet lees?} \]
\[(34) \text{a. Af. Watter boeke het Piet sit en lees?} \]
\[(34) \text{b. Af. * Watter boeke het Piet gesit en lees?} \]
\[(34) \text{a. Af. * Watter boeke het Piet sit en gelees?} \]
\[(34) \text{b. Af. ?? Watter boeke het Piet gesit en gelees?} \]

\[\text{a. Af. * Watter boeke het Piet sit en gelees?} \]
\[\text{b. Af. ?? Watter boeke het Piet gesit en gelees?} \]

\[\text{What (for) books has Peter sat and read}\]

### 2.3 The pseudo-coordinator

Of course one of the features that sets pseudo-coordination apart from ordinary auxiliary verb constructions is the presence of the pseudo-coordinator. It turns out, however, that it is not always obligatory. Some Norwegian dialects drop the coordination, but keep the two parallel finite forms:

\[(35) \text{No. Han sat las.} \]
\[\text{He sat.PAST read.PAST} \]
\[\text{'He was reading.'} \]
\[(\text{Norwegian dialect, Faarlund et. al 1997:535})\]

It is of course an open question whether this is an example of pseudo-coordination.
In Afrikaans, a distinction is traditionally drawn between so-called *direct* and *indirect linking verbs* (Donaldson 1993, Ponelis 1993, de Vos 2005), with *indirect linking verbs* being the class of verbs that participate in pseudo-coordination ('indirect' simply means by means of the coordination *en*), cf. most of the Afrikaans examples above, plus

*Peter sits and reads newspaper*

(37) Af. Piet staan en vertel ons wat ons moet doen.  
*Peter stands and tell us what we must do*

(38) Af. Jan le en kla oor sy probleme.  
*Jan lies and complains about his problems*

(39) Af. Marie loop en koop ’n CD.  
*Marie walks and buy a CD*

*loop* also occurs as a *direct linking verb*, i.e. without the pseudo-coordinator *en*:

(40) Af. Marie loop koop ’n CD.  
*Marie walks buy a CD*

The *direct linking verb* use is the only option for motion (as opposed to future) *gaan* ('go'):

(41) Af. Marie gaan koop ’n CD.  
*Marie goes buy a CD*  ('Marie goes and buys a CD.')

The directional verbs *gaan* and *loop* are the most grammaticalised. One sign of this is that you can’t ever add *ge-* to them, cf. the discussion of (33) & (34) above:

(42) a. Af. Marie het ’n CD loop koop.  
   *Marie has a CD walked bought*  ('Marie has gone out and bought a CD.')

   *Marie has a CD gone bought*  ('Marie has gone and bought a CD.')

   c. Af. Marie het ’n CD gaan koop.  
   *Marie has a CD gone bought*  ('Marie has gone and bought a CD.')

   *Marie has a CD gone bought*  ('Marie has gone and bought a CD.')

### 2.4 Other languages

Pseudo-coordination is found not only in many Germanic languages (including Yiddish), but also in Slavonic (including Bulgarian) and in Romance (including various Italian dialects):

(43) Yi. Dos zits ikh un trakht ___ – hot bere gezogt, –  
*That sit I and think – has Bere said, –*

   ... vi azoy me ken do elektrifitsirn dem hoyf.  
   *how so one can there electrify the court.*


(Notice the extraction in the above example.)
(44) Bu. Sedi i čisti po cjal den v kāšti.  
Sits and cleans along whole day in home  
'She cleans the house all day long.'  
(Kuteva 1999:195, (6))

The following examples from various dialects of Italian show that pseudo-construction is found in Romance, and they also illustrate different degrees of grammaticalisation: Northern Salento dialects have inflected forms of the first verb (v1), whereas Southern Salento dialects have an uninflected form of v1, as well as deletion of the (pseudo-)coordination (after it has triggered initial consonantal doubling, *ddormu*).

(45) It. Taranto  
    Stoche a ppaghe  
    *I stand and I pay*  
    'I'm paying.'  
    (Italian dialect from Taranto, Ledgeway 2015: 4, (9))

(46) It. Lecce a.  
    Sta  
    *Stand I sleep*  
    'I'm sleeping.'

    b.  
    Sta  ddurmianu  
    *Stand they slept*  
    'They were sleeping'  
    (Italian dialect from Lecce, Ledgeway 2015: 2, (4))

It is of course an open question whether (46)a,b are examples of pseudo-coordination, given that just like (31) above, they do not observe the requirement of identical inflectional morphology.

So it seems (, for the Afrikaans cases at least, that you don’t need identical morphology to have a pseudo-coordination; so that raises an interesting question about how completely fundamental this consideration, which has historically been flagged up so much (notably also in Carden & Pesetsky 1977, Bjorkman 2011).
3. Possible meanings of pseudo-coordination

3.1 The aspectual meaning of positional pseudo-coordination

(47) a. En. She looked at him. He smiled. SIMPLE PAST
    b. Fr. Elle le regarda. Il sourit. PASSÉ SIMPLE

(48) a. En. She looked at him. He was smiling. PAST PROGRESSIVE
    b. Fr. Elle le regarda. Il souriait. IMPARFAIT

(Vikner & Vikner 1997: 267-268)

In (47)a,b, he only started smiling when she looked.
In (48)a,b, he had already started smiling before she looked.

(49) a. Da. Hun ser på ham. Han smiler. SIMPLE PRESENT
    b. Af. Sy kyk vir hom. Hy glimlag. SIMPLE PRESENT

She looks at him. He smiles.

(50) a. Da. Hun ser på ham. Han sidder og smiler. PSEUDOCOORDINATION
    b. Af. Sy kyk vir hom. Hy sit en glimlag. PSEUDOCOORDINATION

She looks at him. He sits and smiles.

(49)a,b are ambiguous as to whether he only starts smiling when she looks or he has already started smiling before she looks.
(50)a,b are unambiguously progressive, however: He has already started smiling before she looks.

(47) and (48) are past tense, as French does not have this aspectual distinction in the present tense.
(49) and (50) are present tense, as Afrikaans does not have a simple past tense.

3.2 Psychological interpretation of (directional) PC

(51) a. Da. Det gik hen og regnedes på hendes bryllupsdag. PRESENT
    It went over and rained on her wedding day
    b. Af. Dit het gaan staan en reën op haar trouwdag. PRESENT
    It has gone stand and rain(ed) on her wedding day

(a = Kjeldahl 2010: 57, (92))

(52) a. Da. Blomsterne gik hen og visnede. PSEUDOCOORD.
    Flowers-the went over and wilted
    b. Af. Die blomme het gaan staan en verwelk PSEUDOCOORD.
    The flowers have gone stand and wilt(ed).

(a = Kjeldahl 2010: 56, (91))

("directional" in Danish)
(both "directional" gaan and "positional" staan in Afrikaans, BUT gaan and staan both obligatory)

(can take psychological modifiers like Da. minsandten 'indeed', sørme 'sure, indeed', desværre 'unfortunately', heldigvis 'luckily', Af. immers 'after all', vir jou 'for you').
4. The structure of pseudo-coordinations

We build on Kjeldahl (2010), who proposes that pseudo-coordinations involve two verbs which share a single functional structure (cf. Bjorkman 2011, in press, for a similar idea, and also Cardinaletti & Guasti 2004 on Marsalese).

From Kjeldahl (2010: 82) some questions that this proposal raises:

(a) What and where is the pseudo-coordinator?
(b) Where is v1 (and what kind of element is it)?

4.1 On the pseudo-coordinator

(54) | Danish          | finite complementiser | infinitival marker | coordinating conjunction | pseudo-conjunction |
     |                 | atfin                 | atinf               | conjunction            | conjunction        |
     | a. orthography | at                    | at                  | og                     | og                  |
     | b. unmarked usage | [æt]                  | [æ]                 | [æ]                    | [æ]                  |
     | c. emphatic usage | [æt]                  | [æt]                | [æt]                   | ([æt])              |

The behaviour of the pseudo-coordinator mirrors that of the infinitive marker in Danish and Afrikaans:

(55) a. Sw. Maria lovade att inte läsa boken.
     b. Da. Marie lovede ikke at læse bogen.
     c. No. Marie lovet ikke å lese boken.
     Maria promised (to) not (to) read book-the
     (Johnson & Vikner 1994:78 (45), based on Holmberg 1986:154, (46b-d))

(56) a. Marie probeer om (*te) weg te loop.
     Mary try INF.C to away to walk
     ‘Mary tries to walk away.’

b. Marie probeer om (*te) koerant te lees.
     Mary try INF.C to newspaper to read
     ‘Mary ties to read the newspaper/do some newspaper reading.’
i.e. the infinitive marker must be V-adjacent.

The same seems to be true for pseudo-coordinating [ɔ] and en:

(57)

a. Hy sit en oorweeg deeglik sy opsies.
   he sit and consider thoroughly his options
   ‘He is considering his options thoroughly.’

b. Hy sit en oorweeg sy opsies deeglik.

c. Hy sit deeglik sy opsies en oorweeg

d. Hy sit sy opsies deeglik en oorweeg

… with an interesting complication:

(58)

a. ?Hy sit en deeglik sy opsies oorweeg. [uns scrambled VP]

b. *Hy sit en sy opsies deeglik oorweeg. [scrambled VP with obj to right of en]

c. *Hy sit en deeglik oorweeg sy opsies. [VO impossible within VP]

d. *Hy sit en sy opsies oorweeg deeglik. [impossible OV-fronting past Adv]

e. *Hy sit deeglik en sy opsies oorweeg. [only on a thorough-sitting reading]

f. ?Hy sit sy opsies en deeglik oorweeg. [scrambled VP with obj to left of en]

The generalization that seems to hold: en must either immediately precede the verb OR it must immediately precede the left edge of the VP, which is the portion of the verbal extended projection that is associated with v2 in Kjeldahl’s (2010) analysis (see again her Figure 4 above).

- It is very plausibly a highly bleached and thus featurally underspecified element that does not therefore c-select a specific complement (this appears to be a property of co-ordinators more generally).
- Biberauer (2014, nearly completed): acategorial elements which don’t c-select and can’t be c-selected themselves must be last out of their Lexical Array. This predicts that they will always be peripheral/edge elements …
  - So we can account for the Danish and Afrikaans V-adjectancy facts by appealing to Marantz (2001).
  - But the VP-edge option is somewhat surprising as VP is not usually thought of as a phase (pace Fox & Pesetsky 2005). But maybe the extraordinary nature of the v2P (=VP) is precisely what en is marking here?

4.2 On the location of v1 and the nature of this element

For Kjeldahl (2010), this verb is necessarily within the vP-domain.

- Given the progressive meaning associated with the basic pseudo-coordination structure (see section 3.1), this is plausible (cf. i.a. Cinque 1999, Harwood 2013, 2015 on the locus of ProgP)
- Thus v1 is a species of v, and, moreover, one located at the left edge of vP (cf. Harwood on the phasal status of ProgP [at least in some languages] – Being progressive is just a phase …)
- This latter point suggests a way in which we might understand the subjectification effects discussed above: recent work suggests that some speaker- (and possibly also hearer-) oriented properties may be located at the left-edge of the vP-domain.
5. Evidence for the vP-phase edge as a speaker-oriented domain

- The idea that there is a speaker-/hearer-oriented domain at the outermost edge of CP is well-established (cf. i.a. Speas & Tenny 2003, Hill 2007, 2013, Giorgi 2010, Haegeman & Hill 2014, and much work by Halldór Sigurðsson, Martina Wiltschko and colleagues)
- The idea that some speaker- (and possibly also hearer-) oriented properties may be located within the vP-domain has also recently entered the discussion in a range of different contexts.
- The starting point for this type of thinking may be Belletti (2004)’s work on the low Focus domain, which was one of the first suggestions that it might be productive to think in terms of (clausal) phasal domains that are structured in parallel (cf. i.a. Poletto 2012 and Cognola 2014 for recent applications and extensions of this idea).
- Below are some examples of the types of phenomena that might be viewed as indicative of a speaker-oriented vP-edge:

5.1 West Germanic modal particles
(see i.a. Struckmeier 2014, and also Cardinaletti 2011, and Bayer & Obenauer 2011 for recent discussion).
- a common observation: modal particles are only possible in languages with a Mittelfeld (cf. i.a. various papers by Werner Abraham)
  … which is not actually true:

(59) a. They will *sommer* walk away and then what will we do?
    b. We have *mos* all seen what kind of problem that will lead to.

(South African English)

- In the traditional Germanic literature, modal particles are frequently used as a diagnostic for object scrambling:

(60) a. Er hat *ja doch* ein Buch gekauft.
    he has MP a book bought
    ‘He has after all bought a (non-specific) book.’
    b. Er hat ein *Buch ja doch* gekauft.
    he has a/one book MP bought
    ‘There is a (specific)/one book that he did after all buy.’

- If it is correct that this type of scrambling is within the vP-domain (thus contrasting with so-called I-topicalisation), modal particles mark the edge of vP.
- They are unambiguously speaker-oriented elements (many of which feature very frequently in imperatives … which may be the reason why even very young children have an astonishingly good sense of their pragmatic import! See also below on the more general (possible) relevance of imperatives).
- And they are stackable in a way which recalls what is possible with speaker-oriented particles in languages which have a lot of these, e.g. Cantonese (cf. i.a. Li 2006, Sybesma & Li 2007, much recent work by Sze-Wing Tang):

(61) Dieser Satz enthält *ja doch wohl* viele Partikel.
    this sentence contain.3SG MP MP MP many particles
    ‘This sentence contains many particles, doesn’t it?’

(Struckmeier 2014)
5.2 Imperatives, or a reinvented theoretical proposal from the 1960s: Ross’s Performative Hypothesis within vP

“Light” performative hypothesis (Alcazar & Saltarelli 2014:113):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{CP} \quad \text{A} = \text{Speaker} \\
&\text{vP} \quad \text{B} = \text{Addressee} \\
&[\text{IF}] \quad \text{C} = \text{Performer} \\
&\text{v*} \quad \text{prescribe} \\
&\text{v'} \quad \text{vP} \\
&\text{B/C} \quad \text{v'} \\
&\text{v} \quad \text{VP}
\end{align*}
\]

5.3 English do-support and negative auxiliaries in particular

- Do-support has traditionally been connected with the (Last Resort) realization of Tense
- Duffield (2007, 2013): do realizes both Tense and Assertion (Polarity)
- Biberauer & Roberts (2015): contracted negative auxiliaries appear to occupy a lower position than auxiliaries of other types (including, with the exception of do, their positive counterparts).

Consider the following, where the allegedly-probably frame is intended to isolate the Mood-Evidential head:

\[(63)\] According to our latest readings, the Higgs Boson allegedly might/?B may/could/should/?R, *B must/?R,*B can/will/?B,R would probably exist.

\[(64)\] According to our latest readings, the Higgs Boson . . .


b. . . . allegedly might/?B may/could/should/?R,*B must/?R,*B can/will / ?R,*B would probably not exist.

5.4 Marking emphasis in Nupe (Niger-Congo)

- Nupe has two main strategies for marking emphatic polarity (≠ general Focus; this more like Verum Focus).

\[(65)\] a. *Musa gí kinkere ni:*

Musa eat scorpion NI:
‘(I assure you) Musa DID eat the scorpion.’

b. *Musa gí kinkere à ni:*

Musa eat scorpion NEG NI:
‘(I assure you) Musa DID NOT eat the scorpion.’
c. *Musa gí kinkere gí.*
Musa eat scorpion eat
‘(Apparently) Musa DID eat the scorpion.’

d. *Musa gí kinkere gí à.*
Musa eat scorpion eat NEG
‘It is not true that (apparently) Musa DID eat the scorpion.’

(Kandybowicz 2013:51)

- The *ni:* structures express strong affirmation; the verb-doubling structures weaker affirmation. Consider also their interaction with speaker-oriented adverbs:

(66) a. *Wótákílà Musa gí kinkere.*
perhaps Musa eat scorpion
‘Perhaps Musa ate the scorpion.’

b. #*Wótákílà Musa gí kinkere ni:.*
perhaps Musa eat scorpion *ni:*
‘(I assure you) Perhaps Musa DID eat the scorpion.’

c. *Wótákílà Musa gí kinkere gí.*
perhaps Musa eat scorpion eat
‘Perhaps Musa DID (apparently) eat the scorpion.’

- *Ni:* can be shown to be an element located in the CP-domain (cues to this include location after the negative element which can be shown to be located within TP [cf. Laka’s (1990/1994) PolP], and also after Focus). The structure that Kandybowicz proposes is:

(67)

- Verb-doubling can be shown to take place and remain within the vP-domain. Kandybowicz proposes the following structure:
(68)

The vP-edge can more generally shown to be relevant in the domain of predicate-doubling (cf. also Afrikaans; Biberauer 2012)
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