

MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL



MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL

<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>



DIACHRONIC RINCPLES OF CLASSIFICATION OF REDUPLICATION

Dilobar B. Begimkulova

Independent researcher

Karshi State University

Karshi, Uzbekistan

E-mail: begimkulova9092@mail.ru

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: reduplication, reduplicative unit, reduplicatives, reduplication proper, ablaut reduplication, rhyming reduplication, shm-reduplication, onomatopoeic reduplicatives, base, reduplicant, prototypical classification of reduplication.

Received: 28.04.23

Accepted: 30.04.23

Published: 02.05.23

Abstract: This article examines reduplication in the English language as a phono-morphological phenomenon. It studies the interpretation of the concept of reduplication and its degree of investigation in English linguistics. Additionally, the status of reduplication in the language system, the phonological and morphological aspects of their classification, and the linguistic features of their language expression are analyzed. Several approaches to the classification of reduplication from a diachronic point of view and our own classification are suggested in the work. The ideas have been proven by discussing a number of specific examples and their meanings.

INTRODUCTION

According to the phono-morphological approach, reduplication is an independent word formation method that involves repetition of a part (either exactly or with alternation of vowels or consonants) or the whole word itself. Reduplicatives or reduplicates are obtained by this method. Reduplication is a comparatively recent pattern of word formation in the lexicographical records.

So far, consensus has not been achieved over the classification of reduplication among linguists because of its irregular mechanism of formation. The variety of reduplicative patterns makes it impossible for scholars to study them as a homogeneous group. Scholars have suggested different classifications, ranging from as simple as a dual division up to more complex taxonomies. In this regard, we first find it necessary to dwell on the diachronic approaches to the classification of reduplication.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

According to the fundamental dichotomy of the classification of reduplication, diachronically, there are two main approaches to its classification. As to the first approach, reduplicatives (also called repetition, reiteration, gemination, duplication, and doubling) are generated through the change of one (or several in sequence) phonemes of a word. For example, *helter-skelter*, *tick-tack*, etc. In the second approach, *helter-skelter* creates a rhyme, and *tick-tack* involves a vowel change, similar to the phenomenon of Indo-European ablaut (sing, sang, sung). Therefore, *helter-skelter* and such other reduplicates are called rime words, and *tick-tack* and other similar units are called ablaut words. [15:4]

Nils Thun discusses which of these two approaches (reduplication or rime/ablaut) is more appropriate. He considers the latter naming (rime words and ablaut words) more appropriate than the former. He believes that the term 'reduplication' (duplication of a simple unit based on phonemic change) cannot fully cover all cases. For example, *tick-tick*. Such forms cannot form a rhyme, which necessitates a separate third for the rime/ablaut classification. Ph. Aronstein fills this need and proposes three terms. These are 'reduplication proper' (*tom-tom*), 'reduplication formed by sound change or ablaut reduplication' (*bibble-babble*), and 'rhyming reduplication' (*hurly-burly*) (in German respectively "reine Reduplication", "Reduplication mit verändertem Vokal" or "ablautende Reduplication" and "reimende Reduplication").

Both descriptive-terminological approaches have their own merits. M. Muller, G. Kirchner, and H. Marchand approved the terms rime/ablaut. Unlike them, E. Eckhard uses the term "alliteration" (*Starbiem*) instead of "ablaut".

Nils Thun provides valuable information about the first use of the term reduplication (and several other terms referring to reduplication) [15:5]. According to the author, this term was first used in the 1960s in the works by A.F. Pott ("Doppelung (Reduplication, Gemination) als eines der wichtigsten Bildungsmittel der Sprache, leuchtet aus Sprachen aller Welththeile") and H.B. Wheatley ("Dictionary of Reduplicated Words in the English Language"). Later, the term 'reduplication' appears in the works of W.Wundt (*Verdoppelung*), O. Weise (*Wortdoppelung*), R. Brandstetter (*Reduplication*), C. Lopez (*Reduplication*), F. Kocher (*Reduplikationsbildungen*), J. Gonda (word duplication), E. Nida (reduplication), O. Jespersen (reduplicative compounds), H. Koziol (*Silbenverdoppelung*), R.W. Zandvoort (repetition compounds), etc.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Thus, a prototypical classification of reduplication appears. Of course, regardless of the variety of terms, the classification is based on a general principle [5:174]:

1. Kernel repeated with no change: boo-boo;
2. Kernel repeated with a change of initial consonant: hocus-pocus;
3. Kernel repeated with a change of vowel: mish-mash;

This prototypic classification of O. Jespersen relies on the morphological characteristics of reduplicatives. Roger Kingdon offers his classification based on the nature of their stress patterns. In his book "The Groundwork of English Stress" (1967), Roger Kingdon includes reduplicative compounds in a large group called "imitative compounds" and divides them into several subgroups according to the number and stress of their constituent parts [7:186–187].

A question arises here. Is it possible to develop a general classification taking into account both formation and stress features? L. Bauer et al. (1980) and J.M. Dienhart pay attention to this issue and study the idea thoroughly. The researchers comprehensively study the relationship between form and stress and, at the same time, provide interesting information about a number of other linguistic regularities of reduplicatives.

In the on-going debate regarding the basic questions of which units are examples of reduplicatives and which are not, there are contradictions and uncertainties. Sometimes contradictory definitions compete with each other. Opinions on defining the restrictions and limitations of reduplication also differ significantly. Because of this, it has become almost impossible to generalize different points of view.

Nevertheless, J.M. Dienhart first tries to filter the units that are assumed to be reduplicative into these three prototypical groups in order to determine their membership in the reduplicative category. At first glance, says the author, this seems to be an easy task: it is not a problem to distinguish one class from another because the classes are mutually exclusive. He believes that grouping them into classes can be done depending on the nature of the phonological relations between the constituents of the reduplicative unit—the kernel and the reduplicant. However, it is necessary to first understand what units are considered "reduplicatives".

If the first prototypical group of reduplicates is formally X_1X_2 , which means $X_1=X_2$, then this group includes not only words like *boo-boo* but also expressions like *arf-arf*, sounds like *bang-bang*, nursery words like *mama*, *papa*, proper nouns like *Lulu*, borrowings like *bonbon*, *couscous*, and repeated words such as *fifty-fifty*.

Similarly, if in the prototypical example of *hocus-pocus* (CVCV), vowels remain unchanged and consonants change, then compound words such as *brain drain*, *night light*, *cookbook*, *payday*, and simple words such as *bozo*, *hobo* can be included in the group.

In the CVCV construction of the third group, where, on the contrary, consonants remain unchanged and vowels change, along with prototypical examples such as *mish-mash*, *dilly-dally*, such words as *see-saw*, *ship-shape*, *baby*, *khaki*, and *Nina* must be included in the group. However, not all of the above examples meet the description of reduplicativeness. For this reason, J.M. Dienhart offers the "narrow view", "broad view," and "very broad approach" to find a solution to this problem.

As for the "narrow view", the base and/or the reduplicant is a meaningful unit. For example, *jeepers-creepers* (base - nonsense part), *fiddle-faddle* (reduplicant - nonsense part), and *argle-bargle* (base and reduplicant - nonsense parts). *Fifty-fifty*, *even-steven*, *flip-flop*, and such other words do not count as reduplicatives because both parts are meaningful words. In the "broad view," the base and/or reduplicate may be meaningful or meaningless words. According to the "very broad view", the base can not only be a word but also a syllable. This approach far more expands the list of reduplicatives since it covers such words as *yoyo*, *kiwi*, and *Nina*.

However, J.M. Dienhart was skeptical about these three approaches and stated that each of them has its own shortcoming. For example, according to the "very broad view", *Zulu*, *viva*, *baby*, *khaki*, *Nina*, *puppy*, *weenies* meet the definition of reduplicative (as well as Jespersen and Flexner's definition), but none of them has undergone a reduplicative process. It is argued that they were generated simply by phonological coincidence. In the "narrow view", what exactly is meant by the "meaningless part" is under question. Logically, meaningful words are words included in standard dictionaries. However, there are also units that were once meaningful but have changed their form under the influence of time and become meaningless. For example, *shilly-shally* (derived from "Shall I? Shall I?"), *willy-nilly* (derived from "Will ye, nill ye?", i.e., Will you or will you not?). Additionally, *hi-fi*, *lit-crit*, etc., which are considered to be made up of meaningless parts, are in fact abbreviations of the words *high - fidelity*, *literary criticism*. Therefore, we cannot call them meaningless parts either. The combination of *hara-kiri* (belly + cut) from the Japanese language became *hari-kari* and later *hurry-curry* under the influence of phonological changes.

J.M. Dienhart cites enough such examples. The scholar, therefore, relates the solution to form and not solely to meaning. For this, we should focus on phonologically random forms, says the scientist, and suggests two different filters to distinguish reduplicatives from random phonological forms. ("The Single Phone Condition" and "The Affix Condition"). These two filters take a more objective approach to distinguishing reduplicatives.

With regard to the phonological formation and classification of reduplicatives, Jespersen, I. Arnold, Y. Kryuchkova, H. Marchand, D. Minkova, J.M. Dienhart, M. Barbaressi, Sh.Inkelas, E. Mattiello, N. Thun, and others proposed their classification. Each of the classifications is distinctive in certain ways.

I. Arnold [17:129–131] classifies reduplicatives into the following three groups: reduplicative compounds proper, ablaut reduplicative compounds, and rhyming reduplicative compounds. The author's classification did not cover all cases of reduplicatives, that is, there is no mention of the cases of shm-reduplication and addition of extra syllables to the base (*cloppety-clop*, *clickity-click*).

At the phonomorphological level, relatively modern studies distinguish two main groups of reduplication. For example, Sh. Nadarajan, Sh. Inkelas and Ch. Zoll, E. Mattiello, D. Minkova, and

many other scientists divided reduplicatives into two large types: Total Reduplication (TR) and Partial Reduplication (PR).

There has been much debate as to whether these two types are two distinct independent groups or whether PR is a derivative of TR. A number of scholars believe that PR is a form of phonological erosion and assimilation of TR. However, the division of reduplicatives into types such as TR and PR cannot cover all their forms.

Although these new terms and classifications are not found in early studies of reduplicatives, the definitions given to them do not negate the three cases in O. Jespersen's prototypical classification.

B.A. Makarenko also distinguishes two types of reduplication, full repetition (duplication) and partial repetition (reduplication), and simple repetition types that are considered only a syntactic tool and are not considered a word formation method. B.A. Makarenko analyzes the word formation and stylistic aspects of reduplication, but its grammatical aspects and its importance as a means of expressing grammatical content are not considered at all.

In language systems where reduplication is considered a form of word formation, it is closely connected to onomatopoeia. Merlini Barbaresi, and Elisa Matiello determine onomatopoeia as the third distinct type of reduplication. This group comprises reduplicatives imitate sounds produced in the environment and nature, as well as by humans, animals, and birds.

Later in the years, the tendency to divide reduplicatives into TR and PR in relatively modern literature has started to increase. In order to justify our opinion, we will present the evidence in chronological order.

The definition given by Beccaria and Barbero [1994:603] clearly states that the repetition occurs in whole or in part. The authors considered TR a syntactic strategy and PR a morphological strategy.

Russian linguists Vasilyeva, Vinogradov, and Sachranovich [16:98–99] define PR as a phonetic phenomenon and limit it only to the repetition of the initial syllable. In Russian, they found out that TR (povtor) exists, which only serves to strengthen the meaning. Three years later, the Russian linguist Jartseva [1998:408] attributed reduplication as a morpho-phonological phenomenon and described it as repetition of the initial syllable (PR) or the whole root (TR).

Helmut Gluck (2000) also classified reduplication into TR and PR in his "Metzler Lexikon Sprache," in which the term "Reduplication" was used to refer to PR and "Reiteration" to TR. However, the definition of reduplication in this dictionary is more ambiguous. The definition can cover units formed by the repetition of any initial segment or syllable. The definition of reiteration explains it as a lexical phenomenon involving repetition of lexemes [4: 321].

As Bußmann depicts [2002: 553–554], reduplication is the repetition of the initial or final parts of the root or the whole word with a certain phonetic change or without any change to express

morphosyntactic categories. This definition complements the above definitions, that is, doubling occurs not only at the beginning of the word, but also at the end.

Bergenholtz and Mugdanlar (1979:65) noted in their research that in PR, parts of the base are sometimes repeated on the right, sometimes on the left, and sometimes inside the base. The important aspect of the work is that inflexional PR was not found in any of the previous works or dictionaries. In TR, it is stated that the base is repeated entirely.

Wiltshire and C. Marantz, in their book "International Handbook of Morphology," state that reduplication is a phenomenon similar to affixation. However, the interesting thing is that affixation includes TR: "In exact total reduplication, the reduplicating affix repeats the entire phonological form of the base" [8: 558]. In a sense, two different events are treated as part of the same process.

The bulk of the studies claim the possibility or necessity of dividing reduplication into TR and QR, but reviewing the examples, it is not difficult to assume that PR has an advantage over TR. But no source says that PR is more important or superior than TR. However, it must be admitted that when reduplication is mentioned, the paradigmatic examples are mainly PT units, such as *okay-dokay*, *super-duper*, *helter-skelter*, *mish-mash*, *riff-raff*, etc.

Thus, by summarizing the classifications proposed by O. Jespersen, M. Barbaresi, E. Matiello, J.M. Dienhart, N. Thun, and a number of other scientists named above, we can classify the phenomenon of reduplication in English as follows:

In English, reduplication can be divided into two major types, TR and PR. TR involves complete repetition of the base. For example, *bling-bling*, *bonbon*, *goody-goody*, *girly-girly*, etc. Here, base and reduplicant correspond to each other. TR has a narrower range of distribution and is less productive than PR.

The classification of PR is more problematic than that of TR due to heterogeneous patterns. PR involves partial repetition. The root undergoes a phonetic or morphological change. For example, *argy-bargy*, *boogie-woogie*, *chit-chat*, *roly-poly*, *hocus-pocus*, *humpty-dumpty*, *riff-raff*, etc. Evidently, a partial change occurs in the vowel or consonant sound of the word; in some cases, there is an addition of an extra sound (*argy-bargy*, *easy-peasy*, *itsy-bitsy*, *owlie-wowlie*).

To further classify PR, we relied on a common classification in which PR is divided into three types: ablaut reduplicatives, rhyming reduplicatives, and shm-reduplicatives.

The diagram below shows the classification that we presented above, that is, the classification that we proposed.

Reduplication:

1. Total reduplication
2. Partial reduplication
 - a) Ablaut reduplicatives

- b) Rhyming reduplicatives
- c) Shm-reduplication

CONCLUSION

Admittedly, reduplication is very diverse, and reduplicatives are not always recorded in dictionaries due to the fact that they are mainly characteristic of the oral communication style.

To conclude, reduplication was initially considered a unique phonological phenomenon with several phonetic and prosodic regularities, and the initial classifications were also based on the phonological features of its formation. Because of the diversity of their forms, it was not possible to subject them to a certain generalizing rule from a morphological point of view. Subsequently, the role of reduplication in the formation of new words is determined and developed as a separate word formation method. Reduplication is not only phonetic but also shows characteristics of morphological and lexical levels.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Barbaresi, Merlini, Lavinia, (2008). *Extra-grammatical Morphology: English Reduplicatives. In Words in Action: Diachronic and Synchronic Approaches to English Discourse. Studies in Honour of Ermanno Barisone, John Douthwaite, and Domenico Pezzini (eds.), 228–241. Genova: ECIG.*
- [2]. Bauer, Laurie, (1983). *English Word-formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [3]. Dienhart, John M., (1999). *Stress in Reduplicative Compounds: Mish-mash or Hocus-pocus?* American Speech 74 – Pp. 37.
- [4]. Glück, Helmut (2000): *Metzler Lexikon Sprache*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- [5]. Jespersen, Otto, *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, Part IV: Morphology*. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- [6]. John, Ayto. *The Oxford Dictionary of Slang* (Oxford Paperback Reference) / John Ayto — Oxford University Press, 2000
- [7]. Kingdon, Roger. 1967. *The Groundwork of English Stress*. London: Longman. (First published in 1958.)
- [8]. Marantz, Alec and Caroline Wiltshire. 2000. Reduplication. In Geert Booij, Christian
- [9]. Marantz, Alec. 1982. Re reduplication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:483–545.
- [10]. Marchand, Hans, (1969). *The Categories and Types of Present-day English Word-Formation*. Munchen: Verlag C.H. Beck. Second edition. Pp. 545
- [11]. Mattiello, Elisa, (2013) *Extragrammatical Morphology in English: Abbreviations, Blends, Reduplicatives and Related Phenomena*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston – Pp. 340.

- [12]. Minskova, Donka, (2002). *Ablaut Reduplication in English: The Criss-crossing of Prosody and Verbal Art*. English Language and Linguistics 6 (1): 133-169
- [13]. Pott, August Friedrich (1862): *Doppelung (Reduplikation, Geminatio) als eines der wichtigsten Bildungsmittel der Sprache/beleuchtet aus Sprachen aller Welttheile durch Aug. Friedr. Pott*. Lemgo/Detmold: Meyer.
- [14]. Sepir, Edward, (1993) *Language. Introduction to The Study of Speech*. In: Selected works on linguistics and culturology. Moscow.
- [15]. Thun, Nils (1963) *Reduplicative Words in English: A Study of Formations of the Types Tick-tick, Hurly-burly and Shilly-shally*. Uppsala: Carl Bloms.
- [16]. Natalija Vladimirovna; Vinogradov, Viktor Alekseevic & Sachnarovic, Aleksandr M. (1995): *Kratkij slovar lingvisticskich terminov*. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.
- [17]. Zwicky, Arnold M., and Geoffrey K. Pullum 1987 Plain morphology and expressive morphology. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, Jon Aske, Natasha Beery, Laura Michaelis, and Hana Filip (eds.)
- [18]. <http://www.english-corpora.org>
- [19]. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English [Electronic source], 2021. — URL: <http://www.global.longmandictionaries.com>
- [20]. Oxford Learner's Dictionary [Electronic source], 2021. — URL: <http://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com>
- [21]. The Free Dictionary by Farlex // [Electronic source], 2021. — URL: <http://www.thefreedictionary.com>