

## Syntactic and Textual Repetition of Elements

### Types of reduplication

Reduplication is a morphological process which repeats the morphological base entirely or only partially (cf. Haspelmath 2002: 274), e.g.

IND	kanak	kanak	LAT	te-tig-i
	child	child		RED-touch:PST-1S
	children			I have touched

The common definition of reduplication (as being a repetition of a morphological base; cf., e.g., Haspelmath 2002: 274) restricts the phenomenon of reduplication to morphology. It does not account for the doubling of linguistic forms at other levels of grammar. However, reduplication can also be seen "as a formal linguistic device that can be used at all levels of linguistic structure" (Maas 2005: 395; cf. also Pott 1862). With regard to the bases used, there are, however, different forms of reduplication. For reduplication research, it is therefore vital to distinguish the different levels of doubling operations, in order to define, as well as to distinguish, between reduplication processes and other forms of doubling. The choice of different technical terms (e.g. reduplication, iteration, re-iteration, repetition, and doubling) often has as its purpose the capability of being able to distinguish between these different types.

A still stricter definition of reduplication would only include inflectional reduplication, i.e., only a reduplication which serves a clear-cut grammatical function, is to be considered an 'actual' form of reduplication, thereby excluding lexical reduplicate forms. Inflectional reduplication, is however probably the most uncommon of all forms of reduplication. Inflectional reduplication is manifested either as a full reduplication or as a partial reduplication, i.e., the copying of only a part of the base.

Lexical reduplication is then more often encountered. Lexical reduplication can still be productive, in that the reduplication regularly serves to express specific semantic (or pragmatic) categories, e.g. a reduplicative word class changing operation. In some languages, a less strict distinguishment is made between derivational and inflectional operations, thus rendering lexical reduplication an almost inflectional process, such as the reduplication of verbs in order to express some lexical or aspectual value.

Word formation processes can nonetheless lead to lexicalization – which is the formation of new words in a language, whereby the reduplicative process itself is no longer "applied", since only the result of the word formation process is lexically stored (cf. Aronoff 1976).

On a systemically higher level, identical words or phrases can be juxtaposed. This level may well be termed syntactic reduplication, or 'repetition' (Gil 2005: 31). By selecting the term 'repetition', Gil distances syntactic reduplication from 'reduplication' (proper). By definition, this type of reduplication does not serve lexical or inflectional purposes, and does not form new words. Its syntactic status might be called an apposition or a coordination of structures. This type of reduplication is the most frequent in the languages of the world. We can distinguish mere repetitions from repetitions which are joined by a conjunction (syndetic and asyndetic reduplication, Stolz 2008).

Finally, on the level of the text, we find various strategies involving repetition of elements (as well as the avoidance of repetitions).

### Repetition of elements or structures in texts

The repetition of words and phrases is a frequent phenomenon in probably all languages of the world. Repetitions of any kind usually serve rhetorical purposes. They indicate that there is a similarly regular relation between formal and content-related entities, usually expressing a relation of equivalence, but sometimes also of opposition (de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 63).

The term for repetitions in a text is 'recurrence' (cf. Plett 1975, de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 57ff.); recurrence serves to put the focus on the speaker's viewpoint.

FRE Il a marché longtemps, longtemps, longtemps, avant d'arriver. (Vittrant & Robin 2007: 77)

GER Reiten, reiten, reiten, durch den Tag, durch die Nacht, durch den Tag. Reiten, reiten, reiten. (Rilke 1899)

TIB hthung hthung! ('drink drink!')

If the repetition is performed by the dialogue partner, it often serves to express surprise or a viewpoint conflict which may go as far as rejection; it is also used to overcome interruptions in discourse (de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 58f.).

Partial recurrence (de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 60f.) is the repetition of lexemes in different forms, e.g., as a verb and as a noun; it serves to refer to a previously activated event or object, cf.

GER Sie **wanderten** viele Stunden [...]. Von der langen **Wanderei** ermüdet [...]

ENG He **caught** many **fish** [...] Tired from **fish-catching** [...]

Parallelism (de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 61f.) is the repetition of syntactic structures with different content. It serves to express similar events and places the focus on their similarity or quick succession. This rhetorical figure is often used with three events, cf.

GER Er stürmte hinein, nahm das Geld, und rannte wieder hinaus.

ENG He [= the king of England] has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns. (American Declaration of Independence, quoted in de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 61)

LAT veni, vidi, vici. (Gaius Iulius Caesar)<sup>1</sup>

Parallelisms can also involve repetitions of lexemes, as in the following example:

ENG Our **repeated** Petitions have been answered only by **repeated** injury. (American Declaration of Independence, quoted in de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 62)

Strangely enough for iconicity research, the opposite of parallelism, 'chiasmus' can have the same effect.

---

<sup>1</sup> As in this example, alliteration is a sub-morphemic type of reduplicative structure which is popular in certain written styles, e.g. OHG "welaga nu, waltant got, quad Hiltibrant, wewurt skihit!".

### Repetition of elements or structures in clauses

In the Tibetan language, there is a very popular pattern involving two verb forms (Vollmann 2006); the first is a causative or agent-oriented form, and the second is either the resultative or the 'modal' form.<sup>2</sup> The meaning of these constructions has been termed 'conative', i.e., it implies that **someone** tried to do something, but **it** did not happen. Consider the following examples in Lhasa Tibetan and in Themchen (North-Eastern dialect, north of Xining and the Blue Lake).

TIB	ngas	dkar yol	bcag pa yin te	chag ma song/
	ŋɛ̀ è	kā ajø ø	tʃāk-pa-ji n-te	tʃʰāk-ma-so ŋ
	1:ERG	cup	break-NS-CONJ-CONN	break-NEG-PFV:DISJ
	<i>I [tried to] break the cup, but [it] did not break. (Tournadre 1996: 204)<sup>3</sup></i>			

THE	rta mgrin gyis	dkar yol	bcag thal ra	ma chag thal/
	ʃtamdzən-γə	karu	ptɕʰaχ-tʰa-ra,	ma-tɕʰaχ-tʰa.
	Tamdrin-ERG	cup	break-NVOL:EVID-CONC	NEG-break:PFV-NVOL:EVID
	<i>Tamdrin [tried to] break the cup, but [it] did not break. (602b) (Haller 2004: 129)</i>			

Similar words ('partial recurrence') which are used in one clause (such as 'Der Trinker trinkt einen Trunk.') are unusual in German, as Maas (2007: 1f.) points out. He attributes this behaviour to the classical rhetoric heritage of the Latin tradition which normatively avoids such similarities which are termed 'pleonasm' (Maas 2007: 6f.). On the other hand, 'folk'-attributed styles of Latin had such forms ('flumen fluit', = figura etymologica). Spoken variants often include such forms, e.g., Yiddish: 'Ich hab dich eine Frage zu fragen'. Tibetan dialects also give many examples such as (Kham) 'zama za', 'to eat (food)', and 'pleonasm' are normal in Arabic, Maltese (Maas 2007: 13, 23), and Hebrew; consider the Hebrew example:

HBW	ha-'anak	tsaxak	tsaxok	'afel
	DEF-giant	laugh:PRET:3S:M	laughter	dark
	<i>The giant laughed [a laughter] darkly. (Stolz 2007: 64)</i>			

### Word repetitions

In contrast to lexical and inflectional reduplication as well as to pleonastic constructions, European languages (in general) more readily permit word repetitions (cf. Stolz 2006).

ENG This was **very, very** good, grandgrandfather!

GER Das war **ur-ur**-super, Ururgroßvater!<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> 'Modal' is a term proposed by Haller (2004) for the so-called 'imperative'; obviously, it does not only have imperative meaning.

<sup>3</sup> cf. also Kelzang Gyurme (1992: 255): <ngas dkar yol bcag pa yin/ yin na'ang chag ma song/> ('J'ai cassé la tasse, mais elle ne s'est pas cassée.').

<sup>4</sup> This is, of course, a (wrong) example of a morphological recursion (of a bound morpheme). It is possible only in the grandfather context and as intensive elative with the prefix 'ur-'. This prefix behaves strangely also in another respect: 'ur-ig' is a singular example of a suffix attached to a prefix.

We will, however, thereby rapidly discover that, in many cases, a coordinative conjunction or some other syntactic (case) relation has to be employed. Stolz (2008) has therefore introduced the distinction between syndetic and asyndetic reduplications (repetitions).

ENG He rode on and on. (Stefanowitsch 2007: 35)

GER Jahr für Jahr gehen die Preise in die Höhe.

GER Er suchte und suchte, aber er fand ihn nicht.

FRE Peu à peu, il s'est accoûtumé.

TIB yin dang yin. (lit. 'be-and-be') So be it! For sure!

Lindström (1999) discusses 'contrastive reduplication' by identifying one specific function of syntactic repetition in a variety of languages, e.g.<sup>5</sup>

SWE Du har en ny blus.

2 have INDEF new blouse

Ny och ny, jag köp-te den i vaaras.

new and new 1 buy-PST DEIX ILL spring

*You've got a new blouse. – New is relative, I bought it last spring.*

POL Nowa jak nowa, kupilem ja w zeszłym roku.

new like new I bought her last year

*New is relative, I bought her in last year*

This approximates the tautology form (which are, pragmatically, considered violations of the conversational maxim of quantity (cf. Grice 1975), thereby introducing an indirect speech act), such as

GER Es gibt Lehrer und Lehrer

DUT Er zijn leraren en leraren

There are teachers and teachers.

*There are different kinds of teachers, real ones and problematic ones.*

GER Geschäft ist Geschäft.

ENG business is business

*Business is tough, unethical, etc., as the definition says.*

---

<sup>5</sup> examples from <http://linguistlist.org/issues/5/5-300.html>

GER Entweder er kommt oder er kommt nicht.

Either he comes or he comes not

*Whether he is coming or not, I don't really care.*

In summary, it can be said that these syntactic forms are most often used to express pragmatic categories, such as relativizing an earlier statement or pointing to an attitude of a speaker.

Wälchli (2005, 2007) discusses so-called co-compounds, i.e., exocentric compounds of the reduplicative (dvandva), synonymic, antonymic, and enumerative types which are especially common in the East of the Eurasian continent, cf. Indian Engl. 'wife-children', 'mother-father' (Rushdie 1995: 403, quoted in Wälchli 2007: 84); Tibetan ཕམ་མ་ <pha ma> 'parents', ཡག་ལྷོ་སྐྱོ་སྐྱོ <yag nyes> 'quality' (lit. 'good-bad'); 父母 /fu4 mu3/ 'father and mother, parents'; Tok Pisin 'su.soken' 'legwear', 'rit.rait' ('read-write') 'learnedness' (Mühlhäusler 1979: 377, quoted in Wälchli 2007: 85). Co-compounds imply a close relatedness between two connected words – juxtapositions or exocentric compounds. In other respects, these may possibly exist between the syntactic and morphological level.

### Syntactic repetition and morphological reduplication

How can repetition be distinguished from reduplication? In the first instance, reduplication can be deemed a morphological process, whereas repetition is a syntactic process (cf. Gil 2005). In other words – and according to Kouwenberg (2003) – repetition is composed of two identical words, whereas reduplication is one word consisting of two identical parts. Huttar & Huttar (1997) therefore emphasize that a reduplicated word has one intonation pattern, whereas repetition consists of two prosodically, phonologically, and semantically distinct forms; they also distinguish 'recursion' from both reduplication and repetition for entities greater than a word. Gil (2005) attempts to enumerate a list of distinctions for the two phenomena. The criteria for distinguishing between repetition and reduplication are as follows (Gil 2005: 33, 37):

crit	repetition	reduplication
1 unit of output	greater than word	equal to or smaller than word
2 communicative reinforcement	present or absent	absent
3 interpretation	iconic or absent	arbitrary or iconic
4 intonational domain of output	within one or more intonation group	within one intonation group
5 contiguity of copies	Contiguous or disjoint	contiguous
6 number of copies	two or more	usually two

In some languages, at least, there may however be a gradual intersection between morphological reduplication and the syntactic repetition of elements. In Italian, syntactic repetitions such as 'bella bella' have a slightly more grammaticalized meaning; it is similar to the elative ('very beautiful', cf. 'molto bella'), but it has a more specific morphopragmatic function (emotive expressivity) (cf. Goddard & Wierzbicka 1999: 148ff.). The application of such rules is again probably restricted by pragmatics; the form 'presto presto!' would directly translate as 'schnell

schnell!' into German, whereas German 'schön schön' ('fine fine') would rather indicate disinterest or the desire to pass on to a new topic.

The distinction between reduplication and repetition may be considered straightforward in some languages, and slightly less in others, but it is also difficult to identify in some languages. This occurs mainly in languages, where no clear distinctions are shown as to what the word is in that language.

When the identification of words and word boundaries is clear and straightforward, the distinction between repetition and reduplication is correspondingly clear and unambivalent. However, in those cases when the identification of words and word boundaries is problematical, the distinction between repetition and reduplication may also be fraught with difficulties. (Gil 2005: 31)

In summary, doubling strategies are to be found on various levels of grammar: A few examples can be found of a recursive application of morphological rules (German 'Ururgroßvater', 'grand-grand-father'), (morphological) reduplication (Indonesian 'kanak-kanak', 'children'), (syntactic) repetition (German 'Schnell, schnell!', 'Quick, quick!'), and, finally, rhetorical figures of an entire or partial repetition of larger linguistic units (phrases). Reduplication and repetition may be connected to one another on a sliding scale, i.e., there are examples of elision between these two phenomena.

Repetitive techniques are formal techniques related to the semantic techniques of content-related repetitions such as paraphrases on the text level and synonymic compounds in word formation.

## Abbreviations

DUT	Dutch	LAT	Latin
ENG	English	OHG	Old High German
FRE	French	POL	Polish
GER	German	SWE	Swedish
HBW	Hebrew	THE	Themchen Tibetan
IND	Indonesian	TIB	Tibetan

## References

- Ammann, Andreas and Aina Urdze (eds.) 2007. *Wiederholung, Parallelismus, Reduplikation. Strategien der multiplen Strukturanwendung*. (Diversitas Linguarum 16) Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Aronoff, Mark. 1976. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gil, David. 2005. 'From Repetition to Reduplication in Riau Indonesian'. In Hurch, 31-64.
- Goddard, Chris & Anna Wierzbicka. 1999. 'Kapitel 6: Sprache, Kultur und Bedeutung: Kulturvergleichende Semantik'. In Pörings, Ralf & Ulrich Schmitz (eds.) *Sprache und Sprachwissenschaft. Eine kognitiv orientierte Einführung* (narr studienbücher). Tübingen: Narr.
- Grice, Paul. 1975. 'Logic and Conversation'. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics. Vol 3*. New York: Academic Press.
- de Beaugrande, Robert Alain & Wolfgang U. Dressler. 1981: *Einführung in die Textlinguistik* (Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft 28). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Haller, Felix. 2004. *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Themchen. Sprachwissenschaftliche Beschreibung eines Nomadendialektes aus Nord-Amdo* (Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung 14). Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

- Haspelmath, Martin. 2002. *Understanding Morphology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hurch, Bernhard (ed.) 2005. *Studies on Reduplication*. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 28) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Huttar, Mary and George Huttar. 1997. 'Reduplication in Ndyuka'. In Arthur Spears and Donald Winford (eds.) *The Structure and Status of Pidgins and Creoles: Including Selected Papers from the Meeting of the Society of Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 495-414.
- Kelzang Gyurme (skal bzang 'gyur med). 1992. *Le clair miroir. Grammaire tibétaine*. (Traduction, adaptation et commentaires de Heather Stoddard et Nicolas Tournadre). Editions Prajña.
- Kouwenberg, Silvia (ed.) 2003. *Twice as Meaningful*. London: Battlebridge Publications.
- Lindström, Jan. 1999. *Vackert, vackert! Syntaktisk reduplikation i svenskan. (Beautiful, beautiful! Syntactic reduplication in Swedish.)* Ph.Diss.
- Maas, Utz. 2005. 'Syntactic Reduplication in Arabic'. In Hurch, 395-429.
- Maas, Utz. 2007. 'Syntaktische Reduplikation: stilistische Ressource vs. grammatische Form. Sprachbau-differenzen in semitischen und indoeuropäischen Sprachen'. In Ammann & Urdze, 1-28.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter. 1979. *Growth and Structure of the Lexicon of New Guinea Pidgin*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Plett, Heinrich. 1975. *Textwissenschaft und Textanalyse*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meier.
- Pott, August Friedrich. 1862. *Doppelung (Reduplikation, Geminatio) als eines der wichtigsten Bildungsmittel der Sprache, beleuchtet aus Sprachen aller Welttheile*. Lemgo & Detmold: Meyer.
- Rilke, Rainer Maria. 1899. *Die Weise von Liebe und Tod des Cornets Christoph Rilke (1899/1906)*. München: Juncker.
- Rushdie, Salman. 1981/1995. *Midnight's Children*. London: Vintage.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol. 2007. 'Wortwiederholung im Englischen und Deutschen: eine korpuslinguistische Annäherung'. in: Ammann & Urdze, 29-46.
- Stolz, Thomas. 2006. '(Wort-)Iteration: (k)eine universelle Konstruktion'. In Kerstin Fischer & Anatol Stefanowitsch (eds.) *Konstruktionsgrammatik. Von der Anwendung zur Theorie*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 105-132.
- Stolz, Thomas. 2007. 'Das ist doch keine Reduplikation! Über falsche Freunde bei der Suche nach richtigen Beispielen'. In Ammann & Urdze, 47-80.
- Stolz, Thomas. 2008. 'Total Reduplication: Syndetic and Asyndetic Patterns in Europe'. In *GLS* (to appear).
- Tournadre, Nicolas. 1996. *L'ergativité en tibétain moderne. Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée* (Bibliothèque de l'Information Grammaticale 33). Paris-Louvain: Peeters.
- Vittrant, Alice & Françoise Robin. 2007. 'Réduplication dans les langues tibéto-birmanes: l'exemple du birman et du tibétain'. In *Faits de Langues* 29: 77-98.
- Vollmann, Ralf. 2006. 'Kausativ/Resultativ-Verbpaare im Tibetischen und 'konative' Konstruktionen'. In *GLS* 65: 125-150.
- Wälchli, Bernhard. 2005. *Co-compounds and Natural Coordination* (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wälchli, Bernhard. 2007. 'Ko-komposita (im Vergleich mit Parallelismus und Reduplikation)'. In Ammann & Urdze, 81-108.