Why would anybody take long?

Citation for published version (APA):

Published in:
host publication

Citing this paper
Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.
**Why would anyone take long?**

David Denison

---

**Introduction**

---

**Word class problem**

- Draft revisions of *long* in *Oxford English Dictionary*
- Problem examples include
  - I won’t be long.
  - I won’t take long.
- *OED* layout requires PoS labels.
- But do we?
  - as SP/W or AD/R
  - as linguists

---

**Structure of talk**

- Review straightforward uses of *long*
- Discuss two possible boundaries/changes:
  - Adj – Adv
  - Adj – N / Pron
- Discuss theoretical status of word class and word class vagueness
- Sketch Construction Grammar account

---

**Headwords for long in OED²**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headword</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long adj.</td>
<td>and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long adv.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long adv.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long prep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-long suffix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length n.</td>
<td>'length'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Adjective and Adverb**

---
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**long adj. in OED – selected senses**

1. Great in spatial measurement OE-
   long low rowing boats
2. Having a certain spatial extension OE-
   about a quarter of an inch long
3. Great in serial extent or duration (OE) ME-
   long letters
4. Having a great extent or duration OE-
   her long twilight of decrepitude and decay
5. Too long, lengthy, tedious ME-
   He is apt to be long in his descriptions.

56 lang-/long_ _ADJ occurs 357× in YCOE (incl. cp and spl)

---

**long adv. in OED – selected senses**

1. For or during a long time OE-
   Jet ic mei longe libben; We have long been expecting a packet.
2. a. The suppression of the qualified adj., adv., or phrase, in expressions
   like to be long about one’s work, causes the adv. long to assume the
   character of an adj. compl. = ‘occupying a long time,’ ‘delaying long.’ C1290-
   b. not to be long for this world 1822-
3. At/from/to a far distant time a1400-
   long since; long after (X); but he cut his teeth long before me
4. Throughout the period specified (ME) eModE-
   the whole summer long; all day long

10 lange/longe _ADV occurs 608× in YCOE (incl. cp and spl)

---

**Adverb > Adjective?**

---

**Problem 1**

c1275 þe king sende his sonde after Brien þa wes to longe.
c1300 Sumdel þe pope was anuyd þat he hadde i-beo so
longe [rhyme onder-fonge].
a1425 Lunet þare stode in þe thrang, Until Sir Ywaine
thoght hir lang.
2008 I have to go out, ‖ but I won’t be very long.

• OED currently places this pattern s.v. long adv.1 2a
  because of explicit morphology of earliest two.
• Editors proposed (Mar 2014) moving all but first two to
  long adj., with a cross-reference between the entries.

---

**Penn Treebank**

• The Penn Parsed Corpora from ME onwards tag long as
  Adjective regardless of context, sometimes within NP-MSR
  brackets:

  LONG is always treated as an adjective. See NP measure phrases
  for the conventions concerning adjectives used as measure
  phrases.

  a long_ _ADJ story_N
  five_NUM feet_NS long_ _ADJ
  not_NEG long_ _ADJ behind_ _ADV
  to_TO have_HV dwelled_VBN here_ _ADV the_D longest_ _ADJS

Santorini (2001)
Adj, ‘function’ = measure NP
but did not last long

( (IP-MAT (CONJ but)
  (NP-SBJ *con*)
  (DOId did)
  (NEG not)
  (VB last)
  (NP-MSR (ADJ long)) (.
  ))
  (ID AUSTEN-180X,175.333))

Why Adj in Penn Parsed corpora?
• Most measure phrases of time are NPs (all night) or PPs (for ten years), but function of PPs not labelled.
• Long in measure NPs varies with the NP (a) long time, therefore treat as elliptical with missing Noun head, whether the actual noun time or an abstract placeholder noun with that general meaning.
• But e.g. briefly is parsed as (ADVP (ADV briefly))

Adj or Adv?
• What is the evidence for Adj vs. Adv, and has the PoS changed over time?
• OED implies that original Adv long was adjunct modifying such constructions as be about one’s work, be at a task.
• Ellipsis of (usually) a PP left long as complement of be.
• This slot is more often filled by AdjP than by AdvP.
• If long is here an Adj, it is a predicative-only Adj.
• Predicate-only adjectives recognised in English linguistics as a subclass, though in Hengeveld’s typological classification, only attributive use is criterial for a class of adjectives.

Semantics
• Long = a long time, but the latter is less a predicative complement than an adverbial. The sentence
  Person X will be a long time (at this task)
doesn’t mean that X is themself a period of time: it means that X will be at the task for a long time.
• Rough semantic equivalence may suggest a similar grammatical function but needn’t mean the same word class (cf. He’s miserable/a misery).
• On those grounds, both long and a long time would be adverbials in clause structure, and hence long (by itself) an Adv.

Vagueness in PoS assignment
• I have argued that there are now dozens of former nouns which in some contexts and for some speakers cannot be assigned a unique word class.
• For speakers who have both N and Adj entries in their lexicon for the underlined words,
  a powerhouse song
  This is rubbish.
the word classes here are underdetermined.
• Neither speaker/writer nor addressee/reader needs to worry, and the linguist cannot decide in non-arbitrary way.
Adj ~ Adv vagueness with long?

- The morphology doesn’t help after eME
- In some cases it is a moot point whether long is predicated of an NP (like Adj) or modifies the verb (like Adv).
- Because relevant uses of long are post-verbal, word class of long affects the phrasal projection but arguably not the tree structure (of non-abstract Cambridge Grammar type).

Noun? Pronoun?

long n. (s.v. Adj.¹ headword)

1. Phrases with prepositions variously OE/ME/ModE-preposition long; before long; for long; at the longest
2. a. Without prep. ‘much time’ 1488-
   Der sone, this lang qhar has thow beyne?
   I do not think it will take long to …
   b. It was/is/will be long before/until/etc. (OE) ME-
   As it was long before he could be persuaded to

4-8. long ‘long note, long syllable, long block’
     (masonry), etc. – routine elliptical formations

Problem 2

- The following patterns are treated by OED s.v. long n.
  B.1-2:
  - before long
  - for long
  - this/that long
  - it will be long before

- Why label them as nouns?

Against a noun analysis

- Morphology is like Adj/Adv and unlike N
  - Inflects for comparison in these constructions, but not for plural: before any/much longer
    at the longest
  - it will be longer before
- Syntax is like Adj/Adv and unlike N
  - Allows premodification by so, how, very, too, this/that ‘very’:
    before very long
    after too long
    How long will it be?

Against a noun analysis

- Long doesn’t have normal noun distribution.
- Complements of a preposition can be any XP, even if NP is the default expectation:
  - before the game NP
  - for real; as new AdjP
  - before now; until very recently AdvP
  - from beyond the grave PP
  - by trying harder VP
Against a noun analysis

- *Long* doesn't have either morphology or syntax of a noun.
- (nor the semantics)
- Most parsimonious analysis of *before long* is as PP containing AdvP:
  \[ \text{PP} \text{ before}_P [\text{AdvP long}_{Adv}] \]
  with *long* as Adverb.
- So also Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 569).

Against a pronoun analysis

- Note at beginning of draft *OED* entry for *long* n. says:
  It may perhaps be analysable as a pronoun which always
  stands for the noun phrase 'a long time'; cf. similar
  constructions at *more* pron.
- But *more* can be a Determiner.
- All D (except *a, the, every*) have predictable alternative role
  as head of NP (traditionally, Pronoun).
- *And* *long* is never a Determiner:
  NP a *long time* is functionally an adverbial. Sharing a
  function (if true) doesn't imply sharing same word class.

Further claims of nownhood

- The verb *take* is normally transitive, with NP object.
  Does this make *long* a noun in *won't take long*?

long n. in *OED*

1. Phrases with prepositions variously OE/ME/ModE-
   umbe long; before long; for long; at the longest
2. a. Without prep. 'much time' 1488-
   Der sone, this lang quhar has thow beyne?
   I do not think it will take long to ...
   b. It was/is/will be long before/until/etc. (OE) ME-
      As it was long before he could be persuaded to

- The verb *take* is normally transitive, with NP object.
  Does this make *long* a noun in *won't take long*?

Against a noun analysis

- No, though more troubling than PP data, and also found with
  ?transitive *have, need, spend* and *give*.
- Morphology is like Adj/Adv and unlike N
  - Inflects for comparison in these constructions, but not for plural:
    *This won't take any longer; The form-filling took (the) longest.*
  - Syntax is like Adj/Adv and unlike N
  - Allows premodification by *so, how, very, too, this/that* 'very':
    *It didn't need very long; We won't spend that long.*
  - Verb *take* not *always* transitive (take against, take off, take sick).

But ...

- Some V + *long* idioms do marginally allow a passive:
  ?Longest was taken by the form-filling.
  How long was spent filling in forms?
- *how long* = AdvP internally but behaving a bit like NP externally
- Because this only occurs in relation to these idioms, probably no
  need to argue for a mixed category.
- *CE* also
  *Tomorrow never comes;*
  *When shall we meet? Tomorrow should be OK*
- Functional slot of subject most often and readily filled by NPs,
  but can sometimes be filled by another class.
Further evidence of PoS
• PPs can occur in the same slot as the alleged NP:
  Will it take long?
  It should only take until next Thursday.
  This too argues against a noun analysis of long.
• Parallel Danish data suggests that long is an adverb:
  Hvor længe tog det at komme igennem det?
  how long took it to come through it
  Umlauted længe adv. is clearly distinct from lang adj.
• (Thanks to Sten Vikner, in comments at SHES and later communication.)

Danish going the same way?
• Both trans. and intr. verbs occur with period of time as NP:
  Det vil ikke vare/tage lang tid 'it won't last/take a long time'
• Intr. verb also fine + længe adv.¹ :
  Det vil ikke vare længe 'it won't last long'
• Trans vb. with inanimate subjects starting to appear = længe, but odd:
  ?'Det vil ikke tage længe 'it won't take long'
• Corpus examples all show reduced salience of adverb as 'object', either
  through fronting of hvor længe 'how long' or by indirect object
  intervening. (Cf. English data on previous slide; corpus work needed!)
• Only tage 'take' found so far in corpus, and never with human subject.,
  but bruge 'use' (i.e. 'spend time') with human subject sounds possible.
  ¹Native umlauted form of adv., but Ger. Länge n. ?secondary source.

Sten Vikner (pers. comm., 29 May 2014)

Constructions

Closing remarks
• Only sketched possible diachronic derivation. Need
  series of synchronic networks, if enough data
  available.
• The long material demonstrates (i) partial
  recategorisation, (ii) vagueness.
• Clear decategorisation in take long, but not in a
  grammaticalisation context.
• Word classes are not primitives, merely a useful
  heuristic (both for users and for linguists).
• Is there good psycholinguistic evidence for word classes
  in mental lexicon / constructicon?
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Questions

- What is added value of CxG?
- Focus on construction rather than words allows for underspecification of word classes
- Network model with multiple inheritance. Psychologically more plausible than algorithmic model designed for elegance and parsimony
- Valid to use 21C Danish data to corroborate early English developments?
- NB. usage-based model of English

References


Presentation available

- slides online at http://tinyurl.com/DD-download
- work-in-progress
- comments very welcome, but please don't quote

Thank you!