

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF REDUPLICATION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Begimkulova Dilobar Bakhtiyor kizi
Karshi State University, Karshi, Uzbekistan
e-mail: begimkulovadilobar@gmail.com

Abstract

This article discusses reduplication in English and Uzbek languages as a phono-morphological phenomenon. It studies the interpretation of the concept of reduplication, its degree of investigation and classification principles comparatively in English and Uzbek linguistics.

Keywords: reduplication, reduplicative unit, reduplicatives, base, reduplicant, pair words, repeated words, prototypical classification of reduplication.

Introduction

Reduplication is a morphological process in which the root or stem of a word or a part of it is repeated. Reduplication is found in a wide range of languages and language groups with different levels of linguistic productivity. It is one of the characteristic features of many languages of the world language system.

In the past, along with clippings, acronyms, and blends, reduplicatives were generally excluded from English grammars and major theoretical morphological works, or else they were marginalised to a peripheral role in morphology. However, a growing number of corpus-based research studies on reduplication demonstrate that the use of reduplication in English is more prevalent than generally believed, and its usage is spreading among native and non-native English speakers.

Background to the Topic

So far, reduplication has been investigated only individually by scholars. At the end of the 19th century, there was a general tendency to study various aspects of reduplication in Indo-European languages. Researchers have studied reduplication on a comparative historical, cross-linguistic, and monolingual scale. The findings made it possible to carry out research in the system of areally and genealogically unrelated languages.

Literature Review

The first book dealing with reduplication was written by August Friedrich Pott in 1862. He studied reduplication in many languages. In his work, he collected thousands of reduplicative units under various thematic headings. After Pott's extensive work, Henry B. Wheatley compiled the first dictionary of reduplicative words in English in 1866. The dictionary contains more than six hundred reduplicative forms. The most extensive monographic work devoted to the in-depth analysis of reduplication was created by Nils Thun in 1963. More than 1700 reduplicative units are arranged under different semantic groups. However, the recent, large-scale investigations on the topic were carried out by Merline Barbaresi (2008), Elisa Matiello (2013), Sharon Inkelas, and Chery Zoll (2005), from the point of view of extralinguistic morphology.

To contrast, the Uzbek language largely manifests reduplicative-like units called pair-words (juft so'zlar) and repeated-words (takror so'zlar). The term "reduplication" is only applied to repeated words in some recent studies. In Uzbek linguistics, Azim Hajiyeu (1965), R. Kongurov (1966), N. Abdurahmonov (1963), S. Mahmudova (2021), E. Mamatov (2008), etc. have studied the linguistic nature of pair and repeated words as a word formation phenomenon in Uzbek language. Although formally and functionally they correspond to reduplicatives in world linguistics, they are not characterised by this name.

Results and Discussion

The terminology for reduplication is varied and heterogeneous. In linguistic literature, such terms as "reduplication", "gemination", "doubling", "duplication", "reiteration", "repetitive constructions", "reduplicative compound words", "repetition compounds", and "isosyllabic constructions" were widely used in the early studies. Nils Thun considers "reduplication" to be the most appropriate of the above terms. However, recent studies widely use the term "reduplication".

The reason for terminological inaccuracies can be attributed to the lack of a typological generalisation of this phenomenon in different language systems around the world and the lack of study of the morphemic nature of reduplicatives.

In reference to the constituent parts, the terms "replicatum" and "replican", or "base" and "reduplicant", are used in sources. In most cases, the replicatum/base comes first on the left, and the replicant/reduplicant comes second on the right (*easy-peasy, child-shmild, puzzled-wuzzled, fifty-fifty*). This is typical of the Uzbek language too. For example, *agar-magar, tapir-tupur, amal-taqal, qiyshiq-miyshiq*.

There are three different cases of graphic representation of reduplicatives: written as a one-word (Eng. *bonbon, couscous, nitwit, ragtag*; Uzb. *bobo, girgir, dada, jag'jag'*), written separately (Eng. *bling bling, ping pong, stinky pinky, zig zag*; no Uzbek examples found), and separated by a hyphen (Eng. *criss-cross, hotsy-totsy, mingle-mangle, nitty-gritty, silly-billy*; Uzb. *bosar-tusar, maza-matra, erta-indin, ulay-bulay, ashqol-dashqol, baqir-chaqir*).

As defined by Carl Rubino (2005), reduplication is the systematic repetition of phonological material within a word for semantic or grammatical purposes. Reduplicatives are formed by repetition of the material without change, through complete repetition (Eng. *goody-goody, zero-zero, chow-chow, glut-glut*; Uzb. *elas-elas, zir-zir, tilim-tilim, yor-yor*), through vowel alternation (Eng. *mish-mash, criss-cross, mingle-mangle, flim-flam*; Uzb. *jaz-juz, lash-lush, qotgan-qutgan, yalt-yult*), through consonant alternation (Eng. *hocus-pocus, hubble-bubble, boogie-woogies, puzzled-wuzzled*; Uzb. *baqir-chaqir, hash-pash, chalkash-malkash, miri-siri*), through changes of other sound patterns (Eng. *creepy-crawly, even-Steven, jeepers-creepers, slang-whang*; Uzb. *achib-bijib, mast-alast, kam-ko'st, latta-putta*), or increase in one consonant on the right (Eng. *easy-peasy, itty-bitty, owlie-wowlie, okey-dokey, argle-bargle*; Uzb. *apil-tapil, alg'ov-dalg'ov, alvir-shalvir, aloq-chaloq*).

Reduplicative units may exhibit two, one, or no meaningful bases. Examples of reduplicatives with two meaningful bases in English, *artsy-craftsy, girly-girly, sing-song, walkie-talkie*, and in Uzbek, *aniq-tiniq, ul-bul, eson-omon, qovoq-dimog'*; with one meaningful base in English, *killer-diller, super-duper, culture-vulture, roly-poly*, and in Uzbek, *qari-qartang, bola-baqra, mast-alas, quda-anda*; or without any meaningful components in English, *blah-blah, Humpty Dumpty*, and in Uzbek, *alaq-chalok, aldam-*

qaldam, apir-shapir, uvali-juvali. In the case of three, the components are pseudo-morphemes made up for the purpose of arousing humour, laughter, and mockery.

Due to the rhyming feature of certain types of compound words in English, they can be confused with reduplicates. For example, the compound words *flower power, blackjack, brain drain, cookbook, fat cat*, and such derived words as *dismiss, undone, kingling* are similar to reduplicatives in terms of form and construction. However, we cannot call the above-derived words reduplicatives. They contain affixes, -*miss, un-*, and -*ling*, which are very productive in the language. Nils Thun calls the following two forms, compound words with rhyming characteristics and derived words, "false reduplicatives."

Some recent research papers discuss the extra-grammaticality of English reduplicatives since they exhibit certain irregularities and unsystematicities in terms of pattern formation. Extra-grammatical morphology deals with morphological operations that cannot be described by regular morphological rules. Reduplicatives, along with these morphological operations, are difficult to explain because of their irregular mechanism of formation. Therefore, they are generally neglected by morphologists and grammarians. Mark Aronoff called reduplication "oddities" [1994:20], Laurie Bauer called it "unpredictable formations" [1983:232], and Sergio Scalise called them "minor word-formation processes." [1986:98].

Reduplication, as a way of word formation, forms a new word by repeating the root, a syllable, or the whole word. If compared with compound words, unlike reduplicatives, they are entirely predictable. For example, in *part-time*, two independent words are combined to form a compound word, and there is a subordinative relationship between its components. In the literature on word formation, reduplication is excluded from the domain of productivity since it is not rule-governed. However, only one (*tick-tock, puzzled-wuzzled*) or both parts (*artsy-craftsy*, formed from the words *art* and *craft*) can have an independent meaning, and they share no subordinate relationship. Taken together, they form a whole.

On the contrary, most researchers believe reduplicatives to be of morphological operation and agree that reduplication is an independent way of word formation (among this group of scientists - F.I.Rozhansky, G.B.Antrushina, O.Y. Kryuchkova, F.R. Minlos, E. Sapir, D. Tannen, N. Thun and etc.) [Begimkulova D: 52].

In Uzbek linguistics, the two main ways of word formation—affixation and composition—are distinguished. Forming new words by pairing and repeating, i.e., reduplication, is seen as a syntactic method in some sources (S. Rahimov and B. Umurkulov (2003)). Others consider it either a secondary way of word formation or a subtype of composition (R. Sayfullayeva et al. (2010)).

So, as we have seen, there are disputes in both languages over the word-forming potential of reduplicates.

In terms of types of reduplicative, it can be noted that the first prototypical classification of reduplication was proposed by Otto Jespersen, and the classification is based on the phonetic features of the formation of reduplicates.

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; [1942:174]

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 [1976:186–187].

In relatively modern studies at the phono-morphological level, Minkova Donka (2002), Karl Rubino (2005), Sharon Inkelas and Cheryl Zoll (2005), Shanti Nadarajan (2006), Sharon Inkeles (2006), and Elisa Matiello (2013) distinguished two main groups of reduplication. There are two types of reduplication: total reduplication (hereafter TR) and partial reduplication (hereafter PR).

In the prototypical classification proposed by Otto Jespersen, it is emphasised that the initial consonant, a vowel, or the kernel is repeated. In this regard, in relatively modern literature, the tendency to divide reduplicates into TR and PR has increased. However, in each of these groups, there are subgroups of reduplication, the full scale of which cannot be marked. The dynamic process of coinage of neologisms in English does not allow the classification to remain stable.

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 reduplicates 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 Otto Jespersen's prototypical classification. 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.

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.

Conclusion

Admittedly, reduplication is very diverse. Because of the diversity of their forms, it was not possible to subject them to a certain generalising rule from a morphological point of view. Reduplication is not only phonetic but also shows characteristics of morphological and lexical levels.

References

1. Abdurahmonov N. Hozirgi zamon o'zbek tilida juft so'zlar sostavi masalasi. — Alisher Navoiy nomidagi Samarqand davlat universitetining asarlari: Samarqand, 1963. — 50 b.
2. Aronoff Mark. Morphology by itself: stems and inflectional classes. — USA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 1994. — 134 p. P-20.
3. Barbaresi Merlini Lavinia. Extra-grammatical morphology: English reduplicatives // Words in Action: Diachronic and Synchronic Approaches to English Discourse. — Genova: ECIG, 2008. — P. 228–241.
4. Bauer Laurie. English Word-formation. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. — 311 p. P-232.
5. Begimkulova Dilobar Bakhtiyor kizi. Comparative analysis of phonological formation of reduplication in English and Uzbek languages // Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal 2022, no. 2 (2022): 51-61.
6. Hojiyev Azim. O'zbek tilida qo'shma, juft va takroriy so'zlar. — T.: 1965, — 143 b.

7. Inkelas Sharon & Zoll Cheryl. Reduplication: Doubling in morphology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. — 254 p.
8. Inkelas Sharon. Reduplication // Encyclopedia of language and linguistics. — Elsevier: Oxford, 2006. — P. 417-419
9. Jespersen Otto. A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, Part IV: Morphology. — Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1942. — 570 p. P-74.
10. Mattiello Elisa. Extragrammatical morphology in English: abbreviations, blends, reduplicatives and related phenomena. — Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013. — 340 p.
11. Pott August Friedrich. Doppelung (Reduplikation, Geminatio) als eines der wichtigsten Bildungsmittel der Sprache. — Lemgo/Detmold: Meyer, 1862. — 304 p.
12. Rahimov S., Umurqulov B. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. — Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2003. — 220 b.
13. Sayfullayeva R.R, Mengliyev B.R, Boqiyeva G.H, Qurbonova M.M, Yunusova Z.Q, Abuzalov M.Q. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. — Toshkent: Fan va Texnologiya, 2010. — 404 b.
14. Scalise Sergio. Generative morphology. Holland: Foris Publications, 1986. — 237 p. P-98.
15. Thun Nils. Reduplicative Words in English: A Study of Formations of the Types Tick-tick, Hurly-burly and Shilly-shally. — Uppsala: Carl Bloms, 1963. — 347 p.
16. Wheatley Henry B. A dictionary of reduplicated words in the English Language. — London: 13, 1866. — 104 p.
17. Қўнғуров Р. Ўзбек тилида тасвирий сўзлар. — Т.: Фан, 1966. — 154 б.
18. Маҳмудова С., Бердиалиев А. Ўзбек тилида окказионал сўз ясаши. Тошкент: Фан зиёси, 2021. — 158 б.
19. Немис ва ўзбек тилларида жуфт сўзлар [Матн]: ўқув қўлланма; муҳаррир А. Э. Маматов; Ўзбекистон Республикаси Олий ва ўрта махсус таълим вазирлиги, Мирзо Улугбек номидаги Ўзбекистон миллий университети. — Тошкент: Университет, 2008. — 52 б.