

Romanica Cracoviensia 15 (2015): 30–55
doi: 10.4467/20843917RC.15.003.4000
www.ejournals.eu/Romanica-Cracoviensia

Iwona Piechnik
Jagiellonian University
in Krakow

REDUPLICATIVE SYLLABLES IN ROMANCE LANGUAGES

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the reduplications in Latin and in Romance languages. While in Latin there were only reduplications of monosyllables, Romance languages have a lot of polysyllabic (mostly disyllabic) reduplications. This development could arise due to a bigger expressivity of vulgar Latin mixed with vernacular languages and to their contacts with other languages: Germanic (mostly English and German), Celtic, Slavic, Turkic and Hungarian, in which the polysyllabic reduplication is the most common.

KEY WORDS: reduplication, repetition, doubling, Latin, Romance languages, monosyllables, polysyllables, syllables.

With a special dedication to Mikolaj Nkollo

The repetition of sounds occurs in all languages of the world, doubling segments of audible material: natural sounds and animal cries, but also words and clauses. Of course, some languages use it more intensively than the others, e.g. Afro-Asiatic, Austronesian and Niger-Congo languages have the highest frequency of reduplication (Štekauer et al. 2012: 323 and passim). At the onomatopoeic level, “it is interesting to note how often reduplication serves as a common denominator even in cases when languages disagree in the choice of phonemes” (Anderson 1998: 113). Thus reduplication is one of the most universal phenomena that we can see in everyday life, e.g. for learning words by children or expression of diminutive meanings. Also in many languages, “there are kin terms that are formed by a reduplicative CVCV, CVC or VCV pattern, such as *mama*, *papa*, *ata* and the like. It appears that this is most common for parental terms” (Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 216).

In this study, we would like to analyse the evolution of (semi-)reduplicative or redundant polysyllabic words in Romance languages by comparison to Latin (classical and vulgar) and their neighbouring languages. Our aim is to look at a morphological process in word-formation: a reduplicated word is a lexicalised unit in language, born in a euphonious way, a kind of compound, although in general it is neither a combination of lexemes nor of real morphemes (but we agree with Inkelas and Zoll (2005) that reduplication results from the repetition of “abstract morphemes” rather than the phonological copying of a string of segments).

We have to emphasise that reduplication is not a simple repetition, thus we don't speak here about irreversible binomials, which are rather simple collocations of words, or about fortuitous or stylistic repetition of two words or of their parts emphatically

(even in stuttering¹). The question is not about rhetorical repetitions either: epizeuxis and anadiplosis. Moreover, there is no question about grammatical patterns, that is: pluralisation or frequency or gradation in size or intensity, as it occurs in some languages, especially in Bantu languages in Africa or in Austronesian languages, e.g. in Rapa Nui, language of Easter Island, in which whole words and initial or final syllables are duplicated.

Our perspective will only be morphophonemic and prosodic. We put semantic questions aside, because many studies are mostly focused on meanings in reduplicative words. For us, the most important relation between such elements is the length of a euphonic, repetitive construction.²

Regarding the phenomenon of reduplication, Romance languages have a rather modest tradition. In European languages, English and German are leaders in the rich tradition of rhyming compounds (or “rhyming jingles”, according to the term of Liberman 2009), in particular. This phenomenon is very productive in these languages. Liberman underlines the emphasis in the creation of rhyming compounds and says, that the “language is always at play” (ibidem: 55), but also he states: “we cannot know too much about the origin of such words” (ibidem: 56). So, maybe some languages are at play more than others? However, tendencies vary in languages:

culturally determined fluctuations in the frequency of allomorphs of special morphemes, with competitors supported or hampered by secondary semantic-phonetic associations and with conventionalization of amended reference, have played a role in the rise of reduplication in the history of given languages. This suggestion can be countered with a doctrine of multiple causation, including iconic or grammatical analogies involving normal morphemes (Landar 1961: 246).

The reduplication can be of different types. E.g. according to André (1978: 9–10), we can classify them as follows:

I) total reduplication (as a kind of echo), which appears to be the most common pattern of reduplication:

1) of a word, e.g.: Fr. *bonbon*, *cucu* (written also *cucul* < *cul* [ky], Lat. *iamiam*, *quisquis*. André reserves the term “reduplication” only for this type of redoubling.

2) of the word’s root: Fr. *murmure*, Lat. *girgillus*, Ital. *mamma*,

II) total reduplication with the variation of an element:³

1) consonantal (i.e. rhyming reduplication), e.g. compounds in English (*Humpty-dumpty*, *hibber-gibber*, *hotchpotch*, *hodgepodge*, *ragbag*, *super-duper*) or in German (*Kuddelmuddel*, *Schickimicki*, *Techtelmechtel*, *Heckmeck*, etc.),

2) vocalic (i.e. ablaut reduplication): Lat. *cicuta*, *tuxtax*; Eng. *chit-chat*, *mingle-mangle*; also in binomials: *odds and ends*, *bits and bobs*,

3) with addition of an initial consonantal element (echo-word): Eng. *itsy-bitsy*, Germ. *Alerbaler*, Rom. *aure-maure*, Hung. *irul-pirul*,

¹ However, Landar states that “stuttering has something to do with reduplication as a productive process” (Landar 1961: 246).

² For a really rich source of information and bibliography, see: <http://reduplication.uni-graz.at/>.

³ In this point, we do not agree with André; thus in this study, we consider this type as generally partial reduplication.

III) partial or broken reduplication: Lat. *gurgēs, bilbire, grex*, but also in verbal forms: *sisto, pepigi*,

IV) tautological reduplication in asyndetic groups: Lat. *purus putus, sanus sartus, sanus salvus, sator sartor, siccus sobrius*, etc., – their elements can exist separately as independent words.

Reduplicative constructions are omnipresent in languages. The whole words or their parts are redoubled in almost all languages of the world, but in different proportions (see a cross-linguistic study by Moravcsik 1978). Some languages have a lot of redoubled words (English or German), while others do not like such constructions very much. Of course, because there are different types of reduplication, some languages prefer their own way to compose new words, cf. Turkic languages (Stachowski 2014) or North-American languages (Landar 1961).

Some reduplicated compounds became internationalisms, or at least Europeanisms, e.g. *hip-hop, tip-top, ping-pong, mish-mash, zigzag, tick-tack, tam-tam, multikulti, hocus-pocus, abracadabra, simsalabim*, etc. However they do not exist with the same popularity, e.g. *mish-mash* is found in French as an Anglicism, in German (*Mischmasch*), Polish (*miszmasz*), Czech (*mišmaš*), Hungarian (*mismás*), but not in Italian nor Spanish.

Here, we will take a look at reduplication in Romance languages and their Latin mother.

LATIN

In Latin, reduplication had a few functions:

- 1) in grammar (inflection), it served mainly to create preterit (perfective) forms, and this phenomenon is an archaic Indo-European feature descended from the Proto-Indo-European perfect (see e.g. Niepokuj 1997: 97, 140). However, Ernout observes, that Latin forms tended towards simplification by analogy:

Le parfait à redoublement était normal en indo-européen dans les verbes radicaux, comme le prouve l'exemple du grec et du sanskrit; mais tandis que le grec a développé cette forme au point de l'étendre aux verbes dérivés, le latin n'en a conservé que des traces, et encore a-t-il confondu dans un même groupe d'anciens parfaits proprement dits (type *meminī*, gr. μέμνημι) et des aoristes à redoublement (type *tetigī*, gr. τεταγών), primitivement distincts pour le sens comme pour la forme (Ernout 1935: 299).

Thus, let's compare some verbs in present and in perfect forms with reduplication (total or partial one): *cadō : cecidī, caedō : cecidī, canō : cecinī, currō : cucurrī, discō : didicī, dō : dedī, fallō : fefellī, mordeō : momordī (memordī), pangō : pepigī, parcō : pepercī, pariō : peperī, pēdō : pepēdī, pellō : pepulī, pendeō : pependī, pendō : pependī, poscō : poposcī, pungō : pupugī, tangō : tetigī, tendō : tetendī, tondeō : totondī, tundō : tutudī*.⁴

⁴ The same phenomenon in Greek, e.g.: λείπω : λέλοιπα, κλέπτω : κέκλοφα, etc.; in Sanskrit, e.g.: बुध् (budh): बुबुध् (bubudh), श्रि (śri/çri) : शिश्रि (śiśri/çiçri), etc.; or in Gothic, e.g. *haitan : haihait, laikan: lailaik, maitan : maimait*, etc. For more see Juret 1937: 12–13; Meillet 1917: 138–141 passim; Meillet 1930: 31, 50 passim, Whitney 1950: 222–223, 287n. For Vedic see Hopkins 1893.

In some verbs, double consonantal stems (*s* + occlusive) were simplified in reduplication (*s* disappears): *scindō* : *scicidī* (< **sci-scid-ī*), *spondeō* : *spopondī* (< **spo-spond-ī*), *stō* : *stetī* (< **ste-st-ī*); while *sistō* : *stetī* (*stītī*) is an exception, because of the reduplication of *s* in present and of *t* (in perfect) (see Ernout 1935: 302),

Reduplicative consonants are also in some rare forms in present: *bibō* : *bibī* and *dedō* : *didī*.

We can see that in the above forms of simple verbs, only monosyllables are redoubled.

Moreover, Latin preferences for simplicity and uniformity tended to reject reduplicated verbal forms, especially in prefixed derivatives:

Aussi la langue au cours de son évolution a-t-elle tendu à éliminer le type à redoublement dans ces conjugaisons (...). La tendance générale du latin est d'uniformiser les trois conjugaisons à voyelle longue *-āre*, *-ēre*, *-īre*, la troisième étant considérée comme le réceptacle des archaïsmes et des anomalies.

Le redoublement est réservé aux verbes simples, et tend à disparaître dans les formes à préverbes, où se sont développés des parfaits analogiques (en *-ē-*, *impēgī* en face de *pepigī*, en *-ū-*, *occinū* en face de *cecinī*, en *-sī-*, *compunxī* en face de *pupugī*). Ces formes sont issues de **im-pepigī*, **oc-cecinī*, **compupugī* devenus par haplogogie (...) **im-pigī*, **oc-cinī*, **com-pugī*; puis comme ces nouveaux parfaits n'étaient plus suffisamment caractérisés, ils ont été remplacés par des formes nouvelles qui emprunteraient à d'autres types une caractéristique plus nette, d'où *impēgī*, *occinū*, *compunxī*. Quelques-uns de ces parfaits sont ensuite passés des composés dans le verbe simple, ce qui a encore contribué à la disparition du redoublement (Ernout 1935: 300–301).

We can find more examples of such a simplification: *spondeō* : *spopondī*, but *respondeō* : *respondī*; *scindō* : *scicidī*, but *abscindō* : *abscidī*, *discindō* : *discidī*, etc.⁵

▪ 2) in word formation to create new words, mainly expressing onomatopoeias or endearment, but also neutral meanings. Moreover, the similar tendency for simplicity is seen: Latin redoubled only monosyllabic words and onomatopoeias as well as monosyllabic parts of words:

Total reduplication

a) whole monosyllabic stems/words: *iamiam*, *quisquis*, *quoquo*, *quotquot*, *tete* (< *tu*), however this phenomenon occurs quite rarely,

b) onomatopoeic stems, which are often accompanied by an additional element (in the majority of cases it is a suffix), e.g.: *bubulus*, *cacare*, *cicindela*, *cuculus*, *cucumis*, *cucurbita*, *farfara*, *furfur*, *lallo/lallare*, *mamma*, *murmur*, *paparium*, *pappa*, *pipio*, *pipio/pipiare*, *pupus*, *susurrus*, *quisquiliae*, *tata*, *tintin(n)(i)are/tintin(n)ire*, *titillare*, *titina*, *turtur(illa)*, *ulula(re)*, *upupa*, etc.

There are also Latin words from Greek: *burburismus* < Gr. βουβουρισμός, *gargarisare* < Gr. γαργαρίζειν, *purpura* < Gr. πορφύρα, *barbarus* < Gr. βάρβαρος, etc., and have counterparts in other languages, e.g. Sansk. बर्बर (*barbarah*) 'who mumbles, stammers; stranger; barbarian', etc.

Partial reduplication

a) simple monosyllables: *aha*, *atta*, *attat*, *babae*, *dida*, *papae*, *puppa*, *titta*, *tuxtax*,

⁵ However, there are some exceptions, e.g. *prostō* : *prostitī*.

b) monosyllables as stems with additional segments (mainly suffixes), e.g. *balbus*, *baubari* / *baudari*, *bilbire*, *buttutti*, *cicaro*, *cicuta*, *drindrio*, *gurges*, *gurgulio*, *hinnire*, *mamilla*, *palpari*, *palpito*, *papilla*, *pipo/pipare*, *pullulare*, *pupilla*, *sibilare*, *titubare*, etc.⁶

As we can see, the reduplication occurs in the initial monosyllables that start mainly with a consonant (except *ulula* and *upupa*). Sometimes it is total, sometimes it is partial (i.e. broken) and contains deformations. In many words, we can find onomatopoeias (however some of them lost their onomatopoeic character) or imitations (e.g. animals, artificial sounds, etc.). Some of them belong to spontaneous and childish language or to conversational interjections (Marouzeau 1946: 341, André 1978).

▪ 3) Besides the reduplication in Latin inflection or word formation, we can mention a stylistic phenomenon that we can find in some Late Latin literary texts: total repetition of whole words, e.g.: *bene bene*, *bonis bonis*, *fortis fortis*, *malum malum*, *malus malus* in Commodianus' (the 3rd–4th c.) writings (Grandgent 1907: 32, § 55)⁷. A similar phenomenon is used in tautological pairs of alliterative words which, in majority of cases are isosyllabic and seem rhyming, e.g.: *plenius planius*, *pollens potens*, *ponte ponto*, *purus putus*, *sanus sartus*, *siccus sobrius*, etc. but there are also irregular examples: *primo postromo*, *probus pudicus*, *rex regnum*, *sacra sacrificia*, etc. (see a large list in Wölfflin 1933). Similar constructions appear even in juridical or administrative language: *manu mancipio*, *donum datum donatum dedicatumque*, or in invocations: *quod felix faustum fortunatumque*, in proverbs: *mense maio male nubent*, and finally we can mention also the famous phrase: *Veni, vidi, vici* (Nespoulos 1983: 31–32). Moreover, there is a famous Latin quasi-adverbial construction *nolens volens*, which has its English counterpart: *willy-nilly*. Finally, we have to quote a recent Latin construction *urbi et orbi* (the 19th century).

But these expressions cannot be considered as reduplicative compounds. The only example of polysyllabic repetition that we can classify as a kind of word (functioning as interjection) is *butubatta* in Platus' language and *buttubatta* by the poet Naevius who lived in the 3rd c., however this "word" is still of unclear origin and seems a playful coinage (see Kruschwitz 2012: 33–34).

Another interesting stylistic tendency was to form parallel series of words: classical and Late Latin writers preferred semantic, i.e. synonymic repetition, e.g. *firma et stabilis* or *firmi stabilisque*. It mainly concerned adjectives that formed pairs and shared a similar meaning. This phenomenon still developed in post-Latin world: Robert Politzer says that the synonymic repetition "is generally characteristic of Late Latin and early Romance" (Politzer 1961: 487) and that this "device seems to have mushroomed in the early Middle Ages, where it can be traced through the medieval Latin rhetoric and texts, as well as the early vernacular literatures" (Politzer 1961: 484). The synonymic repetition occurred not only in literature (e.g. *La chanson de Roland*, or other less known texts, cf. Smith 1983, Löfstedt 1976, Vallet 1977), but also in non-literary texts, such as legal text in which the "binominal style" comes from the "desire to be

⁶ Marouzeau (1946: 342–343) suggests also that some other words can have onomatopoeic origin, e.g. *calculus*, *cicatrix*, *cicer*, *cincinnus*, *cucuma*, *cucumis*, *curculio*, *dardana*, *gingiua*, *papauter*, *tutulus*, *ueruex*, etc., but, of course, their reduplication can be fortuitous. Adams (2007: 538–540) indicate some regional words, especially *ubuppa*, which can be an Africanism.

⁷ This type of repetition occurs mainly in modern Italian, what we will observe below.

exact, (...) even when the second word adds little to the meaning” (Politzer 1961: 486). The author states that the explanation of the increase of this phenomenon is in

the Germanic-Romance and Latin-Romance bilingualism or quasi-bilingualism which characterized the linguistic situation of the Romance countries in the centuries preceding the emergence of written Romance. This bilingualism, which resulted in the acceptance of Germanic words in Romance languages and the creation of ‘learned’ vocabulary, not only furnished many of the synonyms used in synonymic repetition, but laid the foundation for the effectiveness of such repetition as a stylistic device. (...) Many of the doublets contain one term which has no direct popular descendant in Romance and must have been the learned or ‘prestige’ member of the binominal, while the other is continued in Romance and must have been the popular member, the one that was more widely understood and carried the real meaning of the phrase (Politzer 1961: 487).

Moreover, we can call Romans very conservative as far as their language form is concerned. We know that Latin language games were very limited: they were rather stylistic than morphological:

D’abord les jeux de langage et les manipulations verbales sont moins développés dans la Rome antique qu’auparavant en Grèce (...) De nombreux types de jeux n’existent pas en latin (ainsi la contrepèterie), et souvent ceux qui existent n’ont pas de dénomination propre, preuve qu’ils ne sont pas bien reconnus.

Ensuite ces jeux de langage interviennent principalement dans les vers, ce qui s’explique, sans doute, par le fait que le rythme du vers possède pour une oreille latine, même peu cultivée, une valeur incantatoire dont nous n’avons plus guère idée. D’autre part, de tout temps la virtuosité formelle s’exprime de préférence dans le cadre métrique. (Wolff 2001 : 333)

Romans were focused on aestheticism and order, even in a language. Words were used more like vehicles for the meaning that had importance as the famous (rhyming!) proverb stated: *Nomen omen*. Words carried a powerful meaning, and Romans seemed very superstitious about this side of the language, which they kept with precaution: “la valeur d’exorcisme de la répétition de sonorités allitératives et de syllabes identiques est bien attestée dans la magie” (Wolff 2001: 330). Of course, in some texts, one can find a few examples of the compound adjectives, constructed on the basis of the Greek model, but generally, the world of words remained intact:

Il apparaît que les Romains sont plutôt réfractaires au ludisme verbal gratuit (...). En revanche, ils ne répugnent pas à dépasser la fin assignée en premier lieu aux lettres et aux mots, quand la chose se justifie ou s’explique. Ils admettent notamment qu’un énoncé ait plusieurs niveaux de signification, et c’est même là une des bases des craintes superstitieuses (Wolff 2001 : 334).

This attitude explains why Latin preferred to play with phrases or, better, with verses and metrics, but not with single words or morphemes as meaningful units. As far as Latin word-formation is concerned, only monosyllables were reduplicated. Sometimes, mainly in poetry, whole disyllabic words were occasionally redoubled, however they did not constitute of lexicalised items. Of course, the so called “Vulgar Latin” which existed in many versions in different social and geographical places seems less

restricted and “mathematical”⁸. Now we can see different blends of Latin and local substrates in Romance languages that show interesting tendencies on the matter.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES⁹

■ FRENCH

Some of the reduplicated segments are children’s words or repeated onomatopoeias expressing iterative meanings. Here, we quote not only words, but also adverbial idioms that have already been lexicalised.

Monosyllables

a) total reduplication: *baba, barbare, bébé, bibi, blabla(bla), bobo, bonbon, boui-boui, caca, cancan*¹⁰, *chichi, chouchou, coco, coin-coin, concon, coucou, couscous, cracra, cricri, crinclin, cucul, cui-cui, dada, dare-dare, dodo, dondon, doudou, fifi, flafa, flonfon, fofou / fofolle, froufrou, gaga, glinglin, glouglou, gnangnan, gnognot, gogo, grigri, hip-hip, jojo, joujou, kifkif, kiki, lolo, loulou, lulu, mémé, mimi, murmure, nana, néné, nénette, nounou, ouah ouah, passe-passe, pin-pon, pioupiou, papa, pépé, pépée, pipi, planplan, pompon, pousse-pousse, quinquin, ronron, sosot, sou-sou, tac-tac-tac, tam-tam, tchin-tchin, tata, teuf-teuf, titi, tintin, toc-toc, tonton, toto, touche-touche, toutou, train-train, tran-tran, très-très, trou-trou, tsoin-tsoin, tutu, yéyé, you-you, zizi, zinzin, zozo, yéyé, yoyo, youyou, etc.*

We can also mention a rhyming adverbial idiom: (*à la*) *saint-glinglin*, although its monosyllables are not symmetrically set up.

In many cases, for onomatopoeic use, these redoubled segments represent iterative sounds. Other segments have rather diminutive meanings, but also they may decrease the strength of the full form of an adjective, e.g. *foufou* ‘light-headed’ < *fou* ‘mad’ (Morin 1972: 98), or to intensify the meaning, e.g. *très-très* ‘very-very’ < *très* ‘very’.

In the majority of these examples, syllables are open. Indeed, Pohl (1964–1965: 216) observes: “Les mots français formés d’une seule double syllabe fermée sont peu nombreux et plusieurs d’entre eux sont d’origine étrangère”, e.g. French *kifkif* (*kif-kif*) from Arabic (‘like-like’ or ‘as-as’).

The class of reduplicated monosyllables (‘echo-words’) is open and very productive in French, mostly in colloquial language. We have to note also, that monosyllabic total reduplication is very productive in French childish language as well as in slang (*argot*), which often uses apocope and aphaeresis, e.g.: *coco* < *communiste*, *cracra* < *crasseux*,

⁸ Carnoy (1917b), describing the reduplication of consonants in Vulgar Latin (a spontaneous and emphatic phenomenon which occurred very often in this language), states: “we thus have reasons to believe that Vulgar Latin was very creative and very emotional, as is, after all, generally the case with popular languages” (Carnoy 1917b: 47). Similar observations are in Meillet (1928: 166–169 and Juret 1937: 13–14). These tendencies to expressivity of Vulgar Latin flourished in early Romance languages and are still visible in modern Romance languages, although rather in pronunciation (see for French: Frei 2011 (1929), and for Italian: Spitzer 1922).

⁹ Here, we do not distinguish variants of Romance languages and their dialects.

¹⁰ In the meaning ‘danse’ it comes from Fr. *canard* ‘duck’. In the meaning ‘rumours, gossip’ it comes directly from Lat. *quanquam* ‘although’ – almost exactly reduplicated word which became perfectly reduplicated in French.

dicdic < *indicateur de police*, *fanfan* < *enfant*, *gengen* < *argent*, *leurleur* < *contrôleur*, *ziczic* < *musique*, *zonzon* < *prison*, etc.

b) total reduplication with an additional element: *bébête*, *bibine*, *béni-oui-oui*, *bobonne*, *Bubul*, *cacarder*, *chochette*, *cocotte*, *fifille*, *gnognotte*, *mémère*, *mimique*, *moumoune*, *moumoute*, *mumuche*, *nanar*, *nounours*, *nénette*, *papaphar*, *pépère*, *pépette*, *popote*, *popotin*, *poupoule*, *quéquette*, *raplapla*, *riquiqui*, *rococo*, *rototo*, *scrogneugneu*, *tacatac*, *tête-à-tête*, *tétère*, *titiller*, *tralala*, *tutur*, *zézayer*, *zozoter*, etc.¹¹

Some of the reduplications are of onomatopoeic origin, while others are one redoubled word in order to represent a symmetrical movement or symmetrical relation. The Latin tradition to repeat monosyllables is continued: sometimes whole words (*bonbon* < *bon*, *nounours* < [*un*] *ours*), but in the majority of cases these redoubled monosyllables (alone or with an additional element) come from initial syllables, e.g. *dodo* < *dormir*, *joujou* < *jouer/jouet*, *pipi* < *pisser*, in childish language; rarely from final syllables, e.g. *toto* < *auto*.

This phenomenon of the monosyllabic reduplication occurs also very often in French culture in affectionate language among relatives and friends in order to create diminutive, hypocoristic forms. It can be the total reduplication, e.g. *jojo* < *joli* ‘pretty’, *fifi* < *fil* ‘son’, or with an additional element and this type is very productive, e.g.: *fifille* < *fil* ‘daughter’, etc. Scullen (2002) states that the first reduplicated syllable is open: C(C)V, but the second can take a consonant. The author gives also rare (hardly known) examples: *gégé* < *général*, *gnégnée* < *araignée*, *phantphant* < *éléphant*, *soso* < *socialiste*, *titi* < *artilleur*, and *baballe* < *balle*, *gogomme* < *gomme*, *jujupe* < *jupe*, *popomme* < *pomme*, *siesiette* < *assiette*, *tatasse* < *tasse*, *véverre* < *verre*, etc.¹²

The same in first names: *Cri-cri/Chrichri* < *Christine*, *Jojo* < *Joseph*, *Lili* < *Liliane*, *Lulu* < *Lucien*, *Mimi* < *Michel*, *Fifi* < *Philippe*, etc. And it may also occur with middle or final syllables, e.g. *Bébert* < *Albert/Gilbert*, *Dédé* < *André*, *Gégène* < *Eugène*, *Lolotte* < *Charlotte*, *Titine* < *Christine*, *Toto* < *Antoine*, *Nanard* < *Bernard*, *Nini* < *Véronique*, etc. (for more examples, see e.g. Plénat 1984, 1991, 1999).¹³ Diez (1851: 398) noted in French dialects such examples of diminutives mostly in the first syllables: *Babarpe* < *Barbara*, *Bébèle* < *Isabelle*, *Chachale* < *Charles*, *Dédéfe* < *Joseph*, *fréfrère* < *frère*, *cocoche* < *cochon*, *boboche* < *bosse*, etc.¹⁴

c) partial reduplication (exchange of vowel or consonant): *bim-bam(-boum)*, *clic-clac*, *cocu*, *cric-crac*, *cric-croc*, *dodu*, *flic-flac*, *flic-floc*, *fric-frac*, *maman*, *micmac*, *nanan*, *pêle-mêle*, *pif-paf(-pouf)*, *pique-nique*, *ric-rac*, *tic-tac*, *tirelire*, *trictrac*, *vau-l'eau*, *zigzag*, etc. Some of them exist only in derivative forms: *chuchoter*, *roucouler*, *zinzinuler*, etc.

¹¹ In the examples like *bébête*, *mémère*, *pépère* and *véverre*, the reduplication is not quite total, because of the difference between *é* [e] and *ê/è* [ɛ], but here we consider them equally.

¹² Scullen (2002: 184) notices also an interesting thing: *fil* ‘son’ > *fifi*, but not **fifils*, although *fil* ‘daughter’ > *fifille*. Similarly: *frère* ‘brother’ cannot undergo reduplication (**fréfrère*).

¹³ The second productive way to create hypocoristic forms of first names is apocope. They are mostly disyllabic, e.g. *Domi* < *Dominique* (see Plénat & Solares Huerta 2006). However, monosyllabic apocopated forms occur rarely in French, but very often in English.

¹⁴ Diez points out that such diminutive forms do not occur in Italian and Spanish. However we can find them in Portuguese, what we will see below.

d) partial reduplication with and additional element: *bric-à-brac*, *cancaner*, *hallali*, *papouille*, *patapouf*, *patatras*, *rantanplan*, *ratatouille*, *ric-à-rac*, *tatine*, *tatouille*, etc.

Polysyllables

a) total reduplication: *areu areu*, *guili-guili*, *gouzi-gouzi*,

b) partial reduplications: *bredi-breda*, *cahin-caha*, *charivari*,¹⁵ *couci-couça*, *mamie/mammy*, *méli-mélo*, *papi/papy*, *patati-patata*, *prêchi-prêcha*, *taratata*, *tati/tatie*, *tohu-bohu*, etc.

Darmesteter (1894: 236) says that dialects in France are very rich in such formations and he gives examples from West-North: *bari-bara*, *bouli-boula*, *bourin-boura*, *bredique-bredoque*, *mochi-mora*, *rif-raf*, *ni rim ni ram*, *berdif-berdouf-berdaf*, etc.

We can find a few borrowings: *coco*, *hip-hop*, *papaye*, *patate*, *ping-pong*, *tam-tam*, *tchin-tchin*, *tohu-bohu*, *tsé-tsé*, *yéyé*, *yoyo*, *youyou*, *fifty-fifty*, etc.

Some reduplicative stems also occur in derivation (sometimes without original reduplicated combination): *boubouler*, *cocotter*, *susurrer* (< Lat.), *ululer* (< Lat.), *zézayer*, *zozoter*, etc.

Reduplicated polysyllables (mostly disyllabic) are in French quite numerous and developed rather independently from Latin. Probably, it occurred thanks to the Germanic influence and language games in literature in the 15th–16th centuries (especially Rabelais whose vivid and rhyming neologisms are famous).

Let's note that in French, like in other Romance languages, some words are repeated in order to represent a gradation in time, e.g. *grand-grand-père*, *arrière-arrière-grand-père*, *avant-avant-hier*, *après-après-demain*, etc. These words can not only be redoubled, but also repeated many times.

In the partial reduplication of monosyllables and polysyllables, we can often see an apophony *i-a* (e.g. *flic-flac*, *patati-patata*).¹⁶ This alternation is visible in other Romance languages and, in general, in Indo-European languages (see Pohl 1964–1965, Diez 1851, Grammont 1970, Carnoy 1917a).¹⁷

Sometimes whole words are repeated, but this phenomenon is syntactical, e.g. *ami ami*, *joli joli*, *copain copain*, *donnant donnant*, *moitié moitié*, *vite vite*, etc. These pairs are not lexicalised, so it is simply a syntactical (or rather stylistic) repetition; hence we don't call it reduplication.

In French, there are also rhyming binomials, which are rather monosyllabic: *comme que comme*, *coûte que coûte*, *du tac au tac*, *les tops et les flops*, *au fur et à mesure*. Or not quite as rhyming, but still monosyllabic: *ses cliques et ses claques*, *peu ou prou*, etc.

■ SPANISH

About Spanish reduplicative words, we have an excellent study by Paul M. Lloyd (1966) who was probably the pioneer in this subject. See also Rodríguez Guzmán (2011), who quotes a lot of onomatopoeic combinations, some of them became lexicalized

¹⁵ It is interesting, that it comes from Latin *caribaria* 'headache', and this from Greek.

¹⁶ This alternation occurs often also in binomials, e.g.: *deci delà*, *deçà delà*, *par-ci par-là*, etc. But other alternations are possible too, e.g. *de bric et de broc*. Sometimes, we can also observe a trio: *i-a-u*, e.g. *bim-bam-boum* ou *pif-paf-pouf*.

¹⁷ Carnoy (1917a) tried to show a phonosymbolic value of such vocalic alternations still in Vulgar Latin.

words (Rodríguez Guzmán 2011: 130), which we will also quote here. The Spanish inventory of repetitive words is very rich.

Monosyllables

a) total reduplication: *borbor*, *chachachá*, *chocho*, *chun-chun*, *cucú*, *guagua*, *ronrón*, *runrún*, *tic-tic*, *tran-tran*, *trun-trun*, *trus-trus*, *tuntún*, *yuyu*, *zunzún*, etc.

b) partial reduplication: *chischás*, *chucho*, *cuco*, *flim flam*, *flin-flon*, *gago*, *lelo*, *memo*, *pimpampum*, *rinrán*, *ris-rás*, *tamtan*, *tictac*, *zazo*, *zigzag*, etc.

c) with an additional element: *gárgara*, *pelele*, *retintín*, *telele*, *titillar*, etc.

Here, we have to mention also hypocoristic forms of the first names that we can classify under three types: 1) total reduplication (*Coco* < *Socorro*, *Meme* < *Mercedes*, *Nana* < *Susana*, *Viví* < *David*, etc.), 2) partial reduplication, which is the most popular (*Checho/Queco* < *Sergio*, *Lela* < *Adela*, *Memo* < *Guillermo*, *Tita* < *Cristina*, *Tuto* < *Arturo/Augusto*, etc.), 3) with an additional element at the end (*Pipina* < *Josefina*, etc.). For more examples, see Plénat 2003.

Some monosyllabic repetitions of onomatopoeic origin occur mostly or only in derived words, e.g. *cacarear*, *cuchichear*, *borbotar*, *murmurar*, *ronronear*, *tartamudear*. They can be total or partial.

Polysyllables

a) total reduplication: *bullebulle*, *chano chano*, *correcorre*, *gorigori*, *picapica*, *riqui-riqui*, *roco-roco*, *taca-taca*, *tampa-tampa*, *tapa-tapa*, *tepe-tepe*, *tucu-tucu*, *zápele-zápele*, *zarra-zarra*.

b) partial reduplication: *ajilimójili*, *china-chana*, *chipa-chapa*, *chipichape*, *chipli-chapla*, *chipala-chápala*, *chirlo-mirlo*, *gila-jala*, *pichí-pichá*, *recotín-recotán*, *regulín-regulán*, *rifa-rafa*, *rifarrafa*, *rifirrafe*, *ringo-rango/ringorrango*, *riquirraque*, *socoquín-sococán*, *tambarimba*, *timbirimba*, *tipa-tapa*, *tipi-tapa*, *típili-tápala*, *tiqui-taca*, *tiquis-miquis*¹⁸, *trica-traca*, *tricala-trácala*, *trípala-trápala*, *trípali-trápala*, *triqui-traque*, *trochemoche*, *zimbili-zámbala*, *zimpi-zampa*, *zimpli-zampla*, *zipizape*, *zíquirri-zácarra*, *zirri-zarra*, *zírripi-zárrapa*, *zírriqui-zárraca*, *zirrís-zarrás*, *zurdiburdi*¹⁹, *zurdiburi*, *zuriburdi*, *zurriburri*, *zurriburu*.

c) with an additional element at the beginning or between two “pairs” which lose their “mirror image”, according to Lloyd, e.g.: *chá(n)-charas-máncharas*, *ciquiricata*²⁰, *erre-que-erre*, *rembamaramba*, *rongacatonga*, *teque-que-teque*, *tetelememe*, *tintirintín*, *trícolo-traco*, *zagalagarda*, etc.

Lloyd quotes also a few words found in Aragon and Navarre. They are based mostly on independent morphemes and have two suffixes (diminutive + verbal): *tontín-tonteando*, *malín-maleando* (or *malimalaindo*), *garri-garreando*, *cojín-cojeando* (or *coji-cojeando*).

Moreover, we can find a lot of polysyllabic reduplications in Spanish riddles, e.g. “*Tinguili-tinguili*, está arriba, *tóngolo-tóngolo*, está abajo, si *tinguili-tinguili* se cayera, *tóngolo-tóngolo* se lo comiera” (Serna 2001: 40).

¹⁸ From Lat. *tibi mihi*, with a suffixoid -s.

¹⁹ This word and three others are probably related to the Basque *zurriburu*, „but even here an expressive origin is possible” (Lloyd 1966: 139).

²⁰ Lloyd assumes that it can be a mixture of *cirimonia* and *acato*.

As we can see, the commonest reduplication in Spanish is polysyllabic and contains the *i-a* alternation (that occurs in other Romance and Indo-European languages). Some reduplicative polysyllables have variants with the endings *-li/-la*, *-pi/-pa*, *-qui/-ca*. An exact rhyme is not very important nor alternation of the initial consonant. Lloyd (1966: 140) points out that in Spanish reduplicative words, the “consonants favored” are the voiceless occlusives /p, t, k/, the affricate /č/ and the vibrants /r/ (short and long variants).

In Spanish, there are also syntactic repetitions, that we can call simply reduplications, because they appear occasionally,²¹ e.g. *guapa-guapa*, *café-café*, *días y días*, *libros y libros*, *dale que dale*, *anda que te anda*, or the type of verbal antepositions: *entender*, *entiendo* o *saberlo*, *lo sabe*, etc. (see Escandell Vidal 1991: 72–78).

Moreover, in Spanish we can find a lot of binomials (also called “twins”). They rhyme completely, e.g. *oro y moro*, *oxte y moxte*, *su alma en su palma* (see Morawski 1927, 1929, 1937); or partially with the frequent alternation *i-a*, e.g.: *aquí-acá*, *allí-allá*, *así o asá*, *caco y cuco*, *de pe a pa*, *del tingo al tango*, *del timbo al tambo*, *de la Ceca a la Meca*, *ni fu ni fa*, *por aquí y por allá*, etc. They are probably more numerous than in French. Most of them are polysyllabic.

Finally, we also have to mention a phenomenon typical for Spanish: *jitanjáfora*²² – a kind of nonsense utterance with word-play, where reduplications, alliterations and assonances occur very often. The meaning is not so important (in most cases, words are neologisms without a precise semantic background), because the main role is for euphonious combinations of sounds. It can be compared to the poem *Jabberwocky* by Lewis Carroll. For more, see Eguren Gutiérrez (1987).

■ CATALAN

Monosyllables

a) total reduplication²³: *bobò*, *boi-boi*, *bub-bub*, *bum-bum*, *but-but*, *cloc-cloc*, *coco* (< *onclo*), *coc-coc*, *fofo*, *fru-fru*, *gloc-gloc*, *gluc-gluc*, *gug-gug*, *iaia* (< *àvia*), *mama*, *mèu-mèu*, *ning-ning*, *nono*, *nonó*, *non-non*, *nyam-nyam*, *nyau-nyau*, *nyec-nyec*, *nyeu-nyeu*, *nyic-nyic*, *oi-oi*, *papa*, *papà* (< French *papa*), *pipi*, *pipí*, *piu-piu*, *pom-pom*, *quic-quic*, *rau-rau*, *rum-rum*, *taf-taf*, *tam-tam*, *tatà*, *tau-tau*, *toc-toc*, *txutxú*, *viu-viu*, *xau-xau*, *xim-xim*, *xiuxiu*, *xup-xup*, *zing-zing*, *zub-zub*, *zum-zum*, etc.

b) partial reduplication: *caco*, *coca*, *clic-cloc*, *cric-crac*, *cuca*, *dida*, *flist-flast*, *fofo*, *lelo*, *ning-nang*, *nyanyo*, *nyenyó*, *nyonya*, *papu*, *pupa*, *pif-paf*, *pim-pam*, *ping-pong*, *popa*, *tic-tac*, *tric-trac*, *trip-trap*, *tris-tras*, *xip-xap*, *xuixo*, *zig-zag*, *zim-zam*, *zis-zas*, etc. Most of them are of onomatopoeic origin. However, there are also a lot of hypocoristics: *conco* < *onclo*, *tates* < *sabates*, *teta* < *germaneta*, etc. (see Cabré Monné 2002: 912).

c) partial reduplication with an additional element: *babau*, *cacau*, *cocou*, *cricric*, *cucut*, *frifrit*, *gadagang*, *nonou*, *nyanyo*, *nyonya*, *patapam*, *pataplaf*, *pataplam*, *puput*, *quiquic*, *titit*, *titiu*, *tutut*, etc. Maybe, we can include in this section also: *badabam*,

²¹ Above, we could see a similar construction in French, it exists also in Portuguese, but we can find the same phenomena abundantly in Italian (see below).

²² The word was invented by Mariano Brull (1891–1956), a Cuban poet whose main interest was to play with words and their sounds.

²³ We do not differentiate vowels: *a-à*, *o-ò*, *o-ó*, *u-ù*, *i-í*.

barrabum, catacrac, catacloc, catatxoc, marrameu, pataplof, patapuf, patapum, patatrap, patatxaf, etc. (Cabré Monné 2002: 915–916), but in these examples it's difficult to discern a real reduplication (except vowels in the majority of cases): they are rather prefixed onomatopoeias (*cata-*, *pata-*, etc.).

Moreover, like in French, in Catalan there are symmetrical lexicalised adverbial idioms: *de bo de bo*, *a poc a poc*, *fet i fet*, etc. Their elements are monosyllabic that become more expressive, when they are repeated in polysyllabic combinations.

Also, first names in hypocoristic forms are reduplicated monosyllables (which have been truncated from an original full form): *Nina* < *Caterina*, *Noni* < *Jeroni*, *Quico* < *Cisco*, *Toti* < *Jordi*, etc., as some others can be only monosyllabic: *Pep* < *Josep*, *Quic* < *Frederic*, *non* < *son*, etc.

Polysyllables

a) total reduplication: *bitllo-bitllo*, *catxoc-catxoc*, *cricric-cricric*, *elis-elis*, *gara-gara*, *gori-gori*, *leri-leri*, *nyigo-nyigo*, *passa-passa*, *pica-pica*, *poti-poti*, *tol-le-tol-le*, *xano-xano*, etc.

b) partial reduplication: *badabim-badabam*, *balandrim-balandram*, *banzim-banzam*, *baliga-balaga*, *barliqui-barloqui*, *barrija-barreja*, *barrim-barram*, *barrip-barrop*, *barrija-barreja*, *cataclac-catacroc*, *catacric-catacroc*, *catric-catrac*, *catric-catrec*, *corimori*, *corre-corrents*, *farrigo-farrago*, *garranyiu-garranyau*, *nyigui-nyogui*, *patim-patam*, *patapim-patapam*, *patatim-patatam*, *patrip-patrap*, *patxip-patxap*, *pengim-penjam*, *ringo-rango*, *xerric-xerrac*, *xino-xano*, *xirimiri*, *ziga-zaga*, etc.

As far as the reduplication with an addition element is concerned, Cabré Monné (2002: 911) says that it occurs mainly in folk tales, placing it among syntactical occurrences. She quotes two sentences with examples: *camina que caminaràs*, *balla que balla*.

Finally, we have to mention that the purely syntactic repetition occurs in Catalan too: repeated words are rather polysyllabic: *treballa treballa*, *bonica bonica*, *fusta fusta* (Cabré Monné 2002: 911).

In Catalan, polysyllables are quite numerous. The frequency of the alternation *i-a* is similar to Spanish, French and other languages.

■ PORTUGUESE

Monosyllables

a) total reduplication: *baba*, *babá*, *bebé*, *bobo*, *bobô*, *bombom*, *bumbum*, *caca*, *caicai*, *chacha*, *chachachá*, *chichi*, *chocho*, *coco*, *cocó*, *dada*, *dadá*, *dóidói*, *fifi*, *gogo*, *gogó*, *iaiá*, *ioió/oiô*, *loló*, *mama*, *miau-miau*, *momo*, *múrmur*, *nana*, *papa*, *papá*, *pépé*, *pipi*, *piu-piu*, *põe-põe*, *pópó*, *rói-rói*, *tatá*, *tau-tau*, *teté*, *titi*, *tintim*, *titi*, *totó*, *tutu*, *vavavá*, *vóvó*, *vuvu*, *xexé*, *xixi*, *zão-zão*, etc. Most of them are of onomatopoeic origin or are the initial syllables of words serving as points of departure in familiar or childish language. For more examples of this type and others see a rich Brazilian corpus and study by Melo de Castro et al. 2001.

Diminutive forms of first names are based on monosyllables too: *Cacá* < *Carlos*, *Cici* < *Cecília*, *Didi* < *Benedita/Waldir*, *Dudu* < *Eduardo*, *Janjão* < *João*, *Lili* < *Alice*, *Lulu* < *Luis*, *Mimi* < *Emília*, *Vavá* < *Valter*, *Zeze/Zezinho* < *José*, etc. They can be initial, internal or final.

In childish language, we can find the reduplication of internal syllables: *mimi* < *dormir*, *nhanhá* < *sinhá*, *nhonhô* < *senhor*, or final ones, e.g. *vovó/vovô* < *avó*, etc. Also with phonetic modifications and the very popular diminutive suffix: *dindinho* < *padrinho*.

b) total reduplication with an addition element: *murmúrio*, *sussurro*, *sururu*, etc.

c) partial reduplication: *chinfirim*, *gagão*, *mamãe*, *pepa*, *zunzum*, etc.

d) partial reduplication with an additional element: *cicio*, *farfalha*, *papai*, etc.

Polysyllables: only total reduplication: *agarra-agarra*, *bate-bate*, *beija-beija*, *bole-bole*, *bule-bule*, *canta-canta*, *cheira-cheira*, *coça-coça*, *corre-corre*, *corrói-corrói*, *empurra-empurra*, *esconde-esconde*, *esfrega-esfrega*, *fecha-fecha*, *fedede-fedede*, *foge-foge*, *gile-gile*, *gira-gira*, *lambe-lambe*, *leva-leva*, *lufa-lufa*, *luze-luze*, *marche-marche*, *mata-mata*, *mela-mela*, *mexe-mexe*, *mija-mija*, *murre-murre*, *oba-oba*, *pega-pega*, *pisca-pisca*, *pinga-pinga*, *pula-pula*, *puxa-puxa*, *quebra-quebra*, *range-range*, *raspa-raspa*, *reco-reco*, *rela-rela*, *rema-rema*, *roça-roça*, *rola-rola*, *ruge-ruge*, *serra-serra*, *teco-teco*, *tange-tange*, *ticotico*, *tiquetique*, *treme-treme*, *troca-troca*, *vira-vira*, *zirra-zirra*, etc. Many of these words are in use mostly in Brazil: they come from verbs (e.g. *empurrar*, *esfregar*, *fugir*, *mexer*, *rugir*, *pegar*, *quebrar*, etc.) in the form of the 3^d pers. sing. in the indicative. Note that they are reduplicated disyllables (the 2^d syllable is always open) which, in this new form, become nouns (in neutral register).²⁴ This derivational process is typically Brazilian and is very lively and productive (see Couto 1999 and Araújo 2002). However one has to admit the possibility that Brazilian Portuguese has a stronger tendency to creolization under the influence of Indian and African languages (see e.g. Araújo 2002: 80).

There are no examples of partial reduplication with polysyllables!

Moreover, there are also reduplicative borrowings (repeated monosyllables, in the majority of cases) that come mainly from French: *cancã* (< Fr. *can-can*), *chuchu* (< Fr. *chouchou*), *gagá* (< Fr. *gaga*), *lulu* (< Fr. *loulou*), *mamã* (< Fr. *maman*), *papá* (< Fr. *papa*), *pingue-pongue* (< Eng. *ping-pong*), *pompom* (< Fr. *pompon*), *tiquetaque* (< Fr. *tic-tac*), *ziguezague* (< Fr. *zigzag*), etc.

And let's mention a tendency to use binomials of monosyllabic verbs with the adverb of negation: *és-não-és*, *vai-não-vai*, *sai-não-sai*, etc.

Finally, we can say that in general, in European Portuguese, the most common reduplication is monosyllabic, and in Brazilian Portuguese it is polysyllabic.

■ ITALIAN

In Italian, the most common reduplication is initial, but also internal:

Monosyllables, mainly with additional elements:

a) total reduplication: *arzigolare*, *chicchiarata*, *chicchiari*, *cicisbeo*, *cucuma*, *cucuzza*, *peperone*, *pipistrello*, *riboboli*, *titillare*, etc.

b) partial reduplication: *chiacchierata*, *chiacchiere*, *torototela*, *torototà*, etc.

Already in the so called macaronic Latin (mixing medieval and Renaissance Italian with Vulgar Latin), we can find a lot of examples of monosyllabic reduplication: *tich*

²⁴ Let's note also that of course, in Portuguese, like in other Romance languages, the epizeuxis (syntactic repetition) is very frequent too, e.g.: *lindo lindo* 'very beautiful', *rico rico* 'very rich', etc.

toch, buf bof, squarquarare, cicigare, tichi tich tichi toch, day day, bau bau, qua qua, cro cro, cu cu, che che, gnao gnao, be be, mucchiacchia, bre bre, etc. (see more in Paoli 1959).

Polysyllables: total reduplication: *arraffa arraffa, battibatti, bolli bolli, cammina cammina, ciappa ciappa, compra compra, copia copia, corricorri, firma-firma, fuggi-fuggi, leccalecca, mangia mangia, parla-parla, piangi piangi, pigia pigia, piglia piglia, ruba ruba, scappa scappa, scozza-scozza, serra serra, spara spara, spendi spendi, spingi spingi, stringi stringi, tira tira, vendi vendi, etc.* All these quoted words are action nouns created on the basis of repeated verbal forms which lose their syntactic character being lexicalized. Anna M. Thornton (2008, 2009, 2010) assumes that these repeated forms in Italian are “descriptive imperatives” (or “narrative imperatives”) in “metaphorical usage”. Following Spitzer’s (1951–1952) observations, Thornton states that often “instances of descriptive imperative are commands or exhortations used to direct sailing or battlefield maneuvers” (Thornton 2009: 237). These constructions have been attested already in the quotations of Neapolitan speech in the 15th century. Such words can be written as a single word or with a hyphen, but most of them have a blank space between. These Italian lexical constructions having syntactic origins are exceptional in Romance languages and are certainly a post-Latin invention that appears occasionally.

Besides Italian, we can take a look at various dialects in Italy:

Diez (1851) quotes quite exactly total reduplication of monosyllables: *babà, bibì, bobò, brobrò, bubù, buba, boba, gogò, lolò, loulou, popò, etc.*, and only a few of partially redoubled polysyllables, e.g. *gnignóon-gnignera, lillóon-lillera, ruffa-raffa, tippe-tappe, etc.*

Pohl (1964–1965: 213–214) analysed reduplicative words in a dictionary of one of the Italian dialect of Salentin in the Terra d’Otranto. He found there:

- monosyllables in total reduplication: *pi-pi-pi, piu-piu, prr-prr, puć-puć, pus-pus, etc.*
- polysyllables in total reduplication: *papapapa, papuddi-papuddi, pare-pare, pèri-pèri, pèzzi-pèzzi, pinguli-pinguli, pipi-pipi, pirrudi-pirrudi, pisse-pisse, pizzica-pizzica, prefatte-prefatte, pucia-pucia, pusa-pusa, pussi-pussi, etc.*

There are no partial reduplications here! Everything is very symmetrical. The explanation of this phenomenon is that people remaining closer to nature, use reduplication more often and more abundantly than others, so rural dialects in the country use generally more ludic vocabulary (Pohl 1964–1965: 214). We can see it, for example, in many African languages and other languages, which are spoken in not yet very industrialized societies.

Finally, as far as Italian is concerned, in this language a lot of repetitions are emphatic occasional constructions, not lexicalized words. Besides fortuitous rhymes in such expressions like *tutti frutti*, we can distinguish two types of non-morphological repetitions in Italian: “syntactic reduplication” (juxtapositional repetition of words for different purposes, especially for intensification or diminution, e.g. *bella bella* ‘very beautiful’) and “clausal reduplication” (repetition of clausal parts or of whole clauses). They can be ranged among syntactic-pragmatic means of expression. Their main purpose is to intensify interactions. It seems that both types express Italian emotionality.

We do not take it into account in this study, but we have to emphasise that the range of this phenomenon is the largest in the Italian communication culture, more frequent in the South than in the North of Italy (see Rainer 1983, Wierzbicka 1986 & 1991, Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi 1994).

■ ROMANIAN

In Romanian, reduplication seems a weak feature. Most of the indigenous repetitions (words or adverbial idioms) are of onomatopoeic origin. Except well known internationalisms *ping-pong* and *tam-tam*, there are also quite numerous reduplicative borrowings, in the majority of cases they come from Turkic, but also Bulgarian or Modern Greek.

Monosyllables

Total reduplication: *baba, cioc-cioc, fiş-fiş, ham-ham, ham-hám, mama, papa, pîş-pîş, tam-tam, ţîr-ţîr, ţurţur*, etc.

Total reduplication with an additional element: *chichineaţă, chichirez, chichiţă, cinci, ciuciulete, cocoş, get-beget, guguş, haide-hai, lemn-nelemn, şoşon, titirez, toto-dată, tutui, tutuială, tutuire, tutun, tutunărie, tutungerie, tutungiu, ţâţâi, ţâţâit, ţâţână, ţinţi*, etc. Sometimes these supplements are combined with nouns: *chichivară, ţiţivară, ciuciucîlţ*, etc. Ciobanu and Hasan (1970) call such combinations “interjections + substantives”.

Partial reduplication: *aţâţat, buba, ceac-pac* (< Tc. *çatpal*), *cîr-mîr, dârdâi, hîr-mîr, hîrţ-scîrţ, huiduí, măr-păr, ping-pong, sus-pus, tic-tac, ţac-pac, ţarţam, ţilp-ţalp*, etc.

Partial reduplication with an additional element: *chiţivară, ţinţivară*, etc.

Polysyllables

Total reduplication: *icri-icri, nani-nani, scîrţa-scîrţa, scîrţai-scîrţai*.

Total reduplication with an additional element: *aure-maure*.

Partial reduplication: *calea-valea, cerceii-babei, chichiri-michiri, chirchiriţă-mirchiriţă, cigă-migă, cinci-opinci, ciugurele-mugurele, dinum-danum, gîrâ-mîră, halea-balea, halea-malea, harababură, handra-mandra, hara-para, harcea-parcea, hurduz-burdúz, hurduf-burdúf, icru-icri, mărac-sărac, mierte-fierte, nitam-nisam / (ne)tamnesam, sărac-mărac, sărata-murata, sarta-ferta, sorcova-morcova, şahăr-mahăr, tace-face, trapa-leapa, talmeş-balmeş, ţangăr-mangăr, techer-mecher, terchea-berchea, terică-merică, tiriş-grăpiş, treanca-fleanca, treancă-fleancă, trendy-flendy, tura-vura, turturea-guguşea*, etc.

We did not find examples of the partial reduplication with an additional element, however in hypocoristic names of characters in fairy tales, we can see a lot of rhyming forms which are often asymmetrical because of supplementary syllables, e.g.: *Chira-Chiralina, Kyra Kyalina / Kira Kiralina* (novel by Panait Istrati and film), *Inii-Diniia, Riţa-Veveriţa, Rujalina-Lina, Sanda-Lucsandra, Stan-Bolovan, Tic-Pitic*, etc.

There are also mixed types: *dafin-trandafir, hodoronc-tronc, sora-soarelui, trei-fraţi-pătaţi*, etc. Here, we can mention also a kind of diminutive-superlative: *mic micuţ* ‘very small’, *plin plinuţ* ‘all full’ (Dębowiak 2011: 93).

There are also rhyming binomials: *fel de fel, cine ştie cine, ţine-de-bine*, etc.

In comparison with other Romance languages, Romanian reduplication is rather faint, especially in totally reduplicated monosyllables as well as totally reduplicated polysyllables.

However, it is worth noticing that in many examples above, the phonic aspect of reduplication plays the crucial role in Romanian: there are affricate and fricative consonants (maybe as an echo of Slavic onomatopoeic influence), especially in monosyllabic reduplications. Undoubtedly, they strengthen their expressivity.

We can conclude that Romance languages differ among themselves. The results were very surprising: Italian reduplicative words (mono- and polysyllables) were six times more numerous than the French ones.²⁵

POSSIBLES INFLUENCES OF NEIGHBOURS

Since we showed that Latin used mostly monosyllabic repetitions, while Romance languages use very often not only monosyllabic reduplication, but also polysyllabic one, we ought to demonstrate briefly this morphological feature in neighbouring languages which could possibly influence them.

• Germanic

As far as Germanic languages are concerned, the tendency to reduplicate is very old and dates back to an old Germanic habit to use alliterations and assonances in speech and in literary texts (e.g. in Old English *Beowulf* or in Old Norse sagas). In West Germanic reduplicative words, the sound symbolism and rhyme seem to be the chief factors in their formation, and they are very common, especially in popular usage. Wood (1911) makes a typology of classes, on the basis of examples from English, German, East Friesian, and their dialects. We can follow his scheme:

1) repetition of the same form:

a) monosyllabic: *bye-bye, choo-choo, how-how, pum-pum, Gackgack, Kappkapp, giffgiff*, etc.

b) disyllabic: *kirrie-kirrie, shally-shally, talky-talky*, etc.

2) repetition with ablaut – the most common series is *i-a*, but it can also be *i-o*, or *u* [A]-*a*. This type is very popular not only in English, but also in German (Bzdęga 1965: 132–176), and may exist in combination of two independent words (e.g. *jingle-jangle* < *jingle* + *jangle*, or only in compounds (e.g. *shilly-shally*). It can be:

a) monosyllabic: *chim-cham, ding-dong, flip-flap, hip-hop, Fickfack, fickfackfuck, liflaf*, etc.

²⁵ As far as the reduplication is concerned, we can mention also Creole (i.e. Neo-Romance) languages, in which this feature is very visible in the so-called ideophones, but their origin is in African languages (see e.g. Bartens 2000, Kabore 1993, Kouwenberg 2003, Kouwenberg & LaCharité 2004). Creole reduplication expresses similarity, diminution, attenuation or intensity, augmentation and quantity, for example in such French-based languages: a) reduplication of whole words (only adjectives, adverbs and nouns), e.g. *blanch* ‘white’ > *blanch-blanch* ‘whitish’, Fr. *trop* > *tro-tro*, Fr. *bien* > *byen-byen*; sometimes with an additional word, e.g. Fr. *vieux* > *vyé bon vyé* ‘very old’, etc.; b) reduplication of expressions, e.g. Fr. *tout près* > *toupré-toupré*; sometimes with an additional word, e.g. Fr. *en adoration* > *annadorasyon kon annadorasyon* ‘en admirant’, etc.; c) repetition of onomatopoeic ideophones, e.g. *djendjen, kap-kap, kiya-kiya-kiya, klik-klak, nip-nap, bip-bap*, etc. (see e.g. Piechnik 2012; for Portuguese-based Creoles see Couto 2000; for a general perspective see Aboh, Smith & Zribi-Hertz 2012). However, because of their heterogeneity and long prevalence of oral communication, we have to treat Creole languages separately.

b) disyllabic: *dilly-dally*, *niddy-noddy*, *muxter-maxter*, *teeter-totter*, *Bisibäsi*, *Bittibetti*, *balitsche-balatsche*, *Bungelbangel*, *Fibbelfubbel*, *lirilari*, etc.

3) iterative compounds of synonymous words, which do not necessarily rhyme, although it occurs very often:

a) monosyllabic: *bam-bosh*, *cram-jam*, *flapdoodle*, *hoblob*, *Hutzbutz*, etc.

b) disyllabic: *creepy-crawly*, *howdy-towdy*, *humpty-dumpty*, *teeny-weeny*, etc.

Here, we can find also asymmetrical combinations of syllables: *ram-scallion*, *Halje-travalje*, *Holtertolterig*, *Hoesteproesten*, *splatter-dash*, *Ukkedop*, etc.

4) rhyming compounds: with the same vowel; in this type, Wood (1911: 170) classifies those compounds which have a rhyming element that is not a word by itself in English, but Bzdęga (1965: 70–123) gives more examples in German. This type is very common, especially in English and in German:

a) monosyllabic: *cag-mag*, *hobnob*, etc.

b) disyllabic: *churchy-wurchy*, *coxy-roxy*, *dimmy-simmy*, *helter-skelter*, *higgledy-piggledy*, *hurly-burly*, *itsy-bitsy*, *piggy-wiggy*, *Alerbaler*, *Buntjeruntje*, *Dunkelmunkel*, *konkelen-fonkelen*, etc.

Here, it should be emphasized that in English the disyllabic type is very productive, and now we have already new words that Wood was unable to know, e.g. *boogie-woogie* (1930s) or *talkie-walkie/walkie-talkie* (1940s), etc. And examples of the monosyllabic reduplication: *black-jack* (1980s), or *jet-set* (1960s). Moreover, they became internationalisms.

For English, there are numerous studies on this subject, see e.g. Wheatley 1866, Thun 1963, Wang 2005, Benczes 2012, Mattiello 2013: 141–168, etc.; for German see an excellent study by Bzdęga (1965) who distinguishes 9 types of reduplicative structures.

Let's note also that in English, we can find "double" reduplications, i.e. synonymic and alliterative ones with a preposition in the middle, e.g. *might and main*, *part and parcel*, etc.

Regarding the reduplication, we have to mention also binomials, which occur in the majority of languages (see e.g. Malkiel 1959 or Masini 2006), but West Germanic languages have an exceptional tendency to create rhyming or alliterated constructions. Once more, we have to underline this tendency in English: *my way or the highway*, *name & shame*, *out & about*, *pump & dump*, or *forgive & forget*, *friend or foe*, *lock & load*, etc.²⁶ This tendency exists also in German language: *Handel & Wandel*, *Hülle & Fülle*, *Rand & Band*, *Rat & Tat*, *Saft & Kraft*, *Sein & Schein*, or *frank & frei*, *Haus & Hof*, *Feuer & Flamme*, *Luft & Liebe*, *Land & Leute*, etc.²⁷ Or in Bavarian: *Lug und Trug*, *Saus und Braus*, *rank und schlank*, *Stock und Stoa*, *Brod und Budda*, etc.²⁸

Moreover, in the Germanic kinship terminology, we can find a lot of words which testify a tendency to reduplicate kin words, as we can still see in Scandinavian languages, e.g.: *farfar* 'father's father' = paternal grandfather' or *mormor* 'mother's mother = maternal grandmother' in Swedish, Danish, Norwegian²⁹; the word for grand-

²⁶ For more see: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siamese_twins_%28linguistics%29 (10.4.2015)

²⁷ See also: <http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zwillingsformel> (10.4.2015).

²⁸ <https://bar.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zwuilingsfoame> (10.4.2015).

²⁹ This is the reduplication of short forms of *fader* (> *far*) and *moder* (> *mor*).

children is less perfectly reduplicated for flexional reasons: *barnbarn* (Swedish), *børnebørn* (Danish), *barnebarn* (Norwegian), *barnabarn* (Faroese), *barnabörn* (Icelandic), while in Swedish the word for grandson is *sonson* ‘son’s son’ and for granddaughter is *dotterdotter* ‘daughter’s daughter’, which is similar to the Anglo-Saxon *sunasunu* and *dohotordohotor* (Pfeffer 1987: 116), however in other contemporary Scandinavian languages, we have one general word both for grandson and granddaughter, that is ‘child’s child’: *barnebarn* (Danish, Norwegian) and *barnabarn* (Icelandic).³⁰

Of course, in English, the syntactical or sequential repetitions of two words are popular too (see Persson 1974).

As we can see, Germanic word-formation uses the reduplication and compounding very often.³¹

• Celtic

Celtic languages used reduplication to indicate many functions.

In his grammar of the Scottish Gaelic, Calder (1923) begins his chapter on reduplication this way: „The repetition of a word (of part thereof) has always been a feature of the Gaelic language” (1923: 16) and he gives many examples as evidence of this statement. Among others, we can quote:

- grammatically conditioned reduplication of prepositions, e.g. *ann an* (*ann am* before *b, f, m, p*) ‘in-in’ (*an* is a reduplication of *ann*): *ann an toll* ‘in a hole’, *ann am bogsa* ‘in a box’ (cf. Mark 2003: 683)

- „to give point and elegance to prose and poetry” (Calder 1923: 16), mainly with an additional element between the two repeated words, e.g. *beag is beag* ‘little and little’ / *beag air bheag* ‘little on/by little’ = ‘little by little’; however it is rather a syntactical repetition, not a reduplication.

In another Goidelic language, Irish, we can find examples of reduplication too: *cogar mogar* ‘whisper whisper’ = ‘hugger-mugger’ (maybe the Irish form is of English origin), *an fear ceannann céanna* ‘the man exact same’ = ‘the very same man’; or with an additional element in the middle: *amach is amach* ‘out and out’.

Among Brittonic languages, we can first mention Breton in which, there are many ways to intensify the meaning of adjectives, however Eugène Chalm in his grammar emphasises: „La façon de rendre le français *très* se fait généralement en redoublant le mot, surtout pour les mots d’une syllabe ou deux” (Chalm 2008: 188). He gives an example of reduplication of *skuizh* ‘tired’: *skuizh-skuizh* ‘very tired’ and of triplication *skuizh-skuizh-skuizh* ‘very very tired’. Other examples, that we can quote: *kozh-kozh* ‘old-old’ = very old; *braz-braz* ‘tall-tall’ = ‘very tall’.

However, in Breton repetition can occur with additional elements too:

³⁰ The contemporary analytic construction with *grand* in English and German has been borrowed from French (Goody 1983: 266).

³¹ However, as far as Germanic grammar is concerned, the formation of perfect tenses by reduplication was still present in those languages (as continuation of this phenomenon in Indo-European languages in early stage), what we can find still in Gothic, while in its sisters this feature disappeared leaving only some marks (see e.g. Jasanoff 2007).

- with a privative prefix *di* ‘non-, de-, ex-, without’: *chañch-dichañch* / *cheñch-dicheñch* ‘change-pref.-change’ = ‘(always) changing’
- with a conjunction *ha* ‘and’: *berr-ha-berr* ‘short-and-short’ = ‘briefly, in short’, etc. (see Schapansky 2012: 1264, Favereau 2000).

In Welsh we can find reduplication too, e.g. the most known is: *tŷ bach bach* ‘house small-small’ = ‘a very small house’³².

Celtic languages reduplicated rather full words, both monosyllabic and polysyllabic ones.

• Slavic, Turkic, Hungarian

Those languages could have contacts mainly with the Romanian language.

As far as Slavic languages are concerned, Voinov (2012) demonstrates rhyming paired words, e.g.: *зоголь-моголь*, *плакса-вакса* and *девочка-приневочка*, etc. Let’s note that they are polysyllabic echo-segments.

In Turkic languages, reduplications are well known: see Müller (2004). In one of the newest works dedicated to this issue, Stachowski (2014) discusses the so-called “C-type” reduplications, i.e. first syllable repetitions, e.g. in Turkish *bejaz* ‘white’ > *bembejaz* ‘snow-white’, etc.

For more Slavic and Turkic influences see, for example, the very interesting book by Mark R.V. Southern (2005) who examines relationships between Yiddish and other languages in contact from the perspective of the transmission of reduplicative features.

And finally, we have to mention two studies by Alf Grannes (1973 and 1996) who examines an interesting reduplication (mostly polysyllabic one): consonant + *m-*, e.g. in Turkish *et-met*, *çocuk-mocuk*, etc. He shows, how this type spreads in different languages and states, that its origin could be Turkish. Indeed, Plähn (1987) who describes items such as *хуйня муїня* in Russian, and Graur (1963) quotes a lot of such examples in Romanian: *aure-maure*, *chichiri-michiri*, *chirchiriță-mirchiriță*, *cigă-migă*, *ciugurele-mugurele*, *cîr-mîr*, *hîr-mîr*, *gîră-mîră*, *handra-mandra*, *sărac-mărac*, *sărata-murata*, *sorcova-morcova*, *șahăr-mahăr*, *techer-mecher*, *terică-merică*, *țangăr-mangăr* (Graur 1963: 19–20) and Aromanian: *bacal-macal*, *hangi-mangi*, *kemurgi-memurgi*, *mumgi-memgi*, *sare-mare*, *zahăre-mahăre* (Graur 1963: 22).

Here we can see mostly polysyllabic items. Let’s note they often are very similar to their Turkish cognates, e.g. Rom. *techer-mecher* (< Tc. *teker-meker*), as other Turkish reduplicative items in Romanian are, e.g. Rom. *harcea-parcea* (< Tc. *parça-parça*).

And in Romanian, we can find also Bulgarian and Greek reduplicative words, e.g. Rom. *nitam-nisam* / (*ne*)*tam-nesam* (< Bg. *ни там, ни сам*), or Rom. *serta-ferta* (< MGr. *σέρτα-φέρτα*), etc.

Finally, let’s take a look at Hungarian. It seems that this language prefers polysyllabic reduplications too. At least, there are fewer monosyllables: some monosyllabic words’ repetitions are lexicalized: *egy-egy* ‘each; few’ (< *egy* ‘one’), *már-már* ‘almost’ (< *már* ‘already, yet’) and *más-más* ‘different’ (< *más* ‘other, another, different’), or truncated: *iafia* ‘sonny’ (< *fia* ‘son’), or with an additional element: *haddelhadd* ‘rumpus,

³² But note that to tell ‘a small house’ in Welsh it is better to use the adjective *bychan* ‘small, little; slight’, hence *tŷ bychan*, because *tŷ bach* is the standard euphemism for ‘toilet’, as dictionaries caution (e.g. King 2007: 30, 224, 490).

free-for-all' (< *hadd* 'let'), but all other combinations are partially reduplicated: *cseng-bong*, *csip-csup*, *dül-fül*, *gizgaz*, *locspocs*, *nyimnyám*, *óg-móg*, *ripsz-ropsz*, *súg-búg*. However there are a lot of disyllables: lexicalized word's repetitions: *addig-addig* 'so far' (< *addig* 'until, till; this/that far') and, above all, partial reduplications: *ákom-bákom*, *ámul-bámul*, *bicebóca*, *bűvös-bájos*, *ciróka-maróka*, *csecsebecse*, *csihi-puhi*, *csillog-villog*, *csireg-csörög*, *csiribiri*, *csonkabonka*, *csúszómászó*, *dínomdánom*, *dirib-darab*, *dirmeg-dörmög*, *fidres-fodros*, *gidres-gödrös*, *giling-galang*, *girbegörbe*, *girbe-görbén*, *girbe-gurba*, *hébe-hóba*, *hetet-havat*, *hímez-hámoz*, *hórihorgas*, *immel-ámmal*, *ingóbingó*, *irgum-burgum*, *irul-pirul*, *izeg-mozog*, *izzé-porrá*, *lárifári*, *mendemonda*, *mézesmázos*, *retyerutya*, *sebbel-lobbal*, *sűrög-forog*, *szuszimuszi*, *tarkabarka*, *tutyimutyi*, *úszómászó*, *zanabana*, *zenebona*, *zireg-zörög*; and rare examples of trisyllables: *ágózik-bogózik*, *diriblés-darablás* (see Kiss & Pusztai 2003: 183, 379, 622–623, 730).

CONCLUSIONS

Starting from Latin, Romance languages had internal conditions to develop reduplication in word-formation, but mainly in repetition of monosyllables (as well as in syntactical repetition of whole words). As far as polysyllabic reduplication is concerned, it is mainly disyllabic and this is a rather post-Latin phenomenon. Romance languages have been probably influenced mainly by Germanic languages. This very old feature is very common still in English and German.

Such a situation concerns mainly the French language, in which the influence from neighbours can be the strongest. In comparison to its sisters, French have more types of redoubled compound words than other Romance languages. Moreover, the tendency to reduplicate occurred in Celtic languages, but mainly in repetition of words. Indeed, Stankiewicz, analyzing emotiveness in different languages tells:

Expressive "Sprachbünde" are not coterminous with boundaries circumscribed by genetic relationship. French and English have more similarities in their emotive subsystems than French and Italian (Stankiewicz 1972: 260).

The polysyllabic reduplication is not very common in other Romance languages as they did not have strong contacts with the Germanic languages. We see this less in Italian and in Portuguese: these languages prefer monosyllables.

In Romanian Slavic, Turkic and Hungarian influences are possible too. In those languages, reduplication concerns mainly polysyllables.

In neo-Romance languages, i.e. in Creole languages, the tendency to redouble audible segments or words came from African languages, in which the use of ideophones and onomatopoeic elements is very common.

And finally we have to note, that in Romance languages only reduplicated monosyllabic words can be derived and inflected, e.g. French *bonbon* > *bonbonnière*, *cancan* > *cancaner/cancanier*, *chouchou* > *chouchouter*, *froufrou* > *froufrouter/froufroutement*, *glouglou* > *glouglouter*, *pompon* > *pomponner*, *ronron* > *ronronner*, *zigzag* > *zigzaguer*; Catalan *xiuxiu* > *xiuxiuejar*, or Port. *chacha* > *chachada*, *zunzum* > *zunzunar*, etc. This fact can prove the old tendency to monosyllabic reduplication in

neo-Latin languages and shows that polysyllabic reduplication is still a kind of foreign feature in these languages.

Besides the lexical reduplication, in all Romance languages, there is a tendency to repeat whole words (polysyllabic in the majority of cases) in an emphatic way to intensify the meaning. Probably such a tendency is the commonest and strongest in Italian (*presto presto*, *lungo lungo*, etc.). However, two repeated words remain independent, so this practice is syntactical; hence we do not call it reduplication.

On the other hand, all Romance languages have binomials whose elements, in the majority of cases, are monosyllabic too.

Of course, our deliberations are only hypothetical, but our aim was to show some tendencies in Latin and Romance languages, and finally in their neighbours.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES OF EXAMPLES

- ABOH ENOCH Oladé, SMITH Norval, ZRIBI-HERTZ Anne, 2012, *The Morphosyntax of Reiteration in Creole and Non-Creole Languages*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- ADAMS James Noel, 2007, *The regional diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ALLEN Andrew S., 1984, French reduplication limits the arbitrariness of the sign, (in:) *Papers from the XIIth Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3–13
- ANDERSON Earl R., 1998, *A grammar of iconism*, Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; London: Associated University Presses.
- ANSCOMBRE Jean-Claude, 1985, Onomatopées, délocutivité et autres blablas, *Revue Romane* 20/2: 169–204.
- ANTOINE Gérald, 1985, Usage de la “(ré)duplication” dans le français, surtout parlé, contemporain, (in:) *Mélanges de langue et de littérature françaises offerts à Pierre Larthomas*, Paris: École normale supérieure de Jeunes filles, Coll. de l’ENSJF 26: 1–14.
- ARAÚJO Gabriel, 2002, Truncamento e reduplicação no português brasileiro, *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos* (Belo Horizonte), 10/1: 61–90.
- ANDRÉ Jacques, 1978, *Les mots à redoublement en latin*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- BARTENS Angela, 2000, *Ideophones and sound symbolism in Atlantic Creoles*, Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- BENCZES Réka, 2012, Just a load of gibber-gibber? Making sense of English rhyming compounds, *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 32/3: 299–326.
- BZDEGA Andrzej Zdzisław, 1965, *Reduplizierte Wortbildung im Deutschen*, Poznań: PTPN.
- CABRÉ MONNÉ Teresa, 2002, Altres sistemes de formació de mots, (in:) *Gramàtica del català contemporani*, vol. 1: *Introducció, fonètica, morfologia*, Joan Solà et al. (eds.), Barcelona: Empúries, 889–932.
- CALDER George, 1923, *A Gaelic Grammar containing the parts of speech and the general principles of phonology and etymology*, Glasgow : MacLaren.
- CARNOY Albert, 1917a, Apophony and rhyme words in Vulgar Latin onomatopoeias, *The American Journal of Philology* 38/3: 265–284.
- CARNOY Albert, 1917b, The reduplication of consonants in Vulgar Latin, *Modern Philology* 15/3: 31–52.
- CHALM Eugène, 2008, *La grammaire bretonne pour tous*, Lannuon: An Alarc’h Embannadurioù.

- CIOBANU Fulvia, HASAN Finuța, 1970, *Formarea cuvintelor în limba română*, vol. I, București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.
- COUTO Hildo Honório do, 1999, A reduplicação em português, *Lusorama* 40: 29–40.
- COUTO Hildo Honório do, 2000, A reduplicação nos crioulos portugueses, (in:) *Crioulos de base lexical portuguesa*, Ernesto D’Andrade, Maria A. Mota, Dulce Pereira (org.), Lisboa: Associação Portuguesa de Linguística, 61–80.
- DAHL Östen, KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM Maria, 2001, Kinship in grammar, (in:) *Dimensions of Possession*, Irène Baron, Michael Herslund and Finn Sørensen (eds.), Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 201–225.
- DARMESTER Arsène, 1894, *Traité de la formation des mots composés dans la langue française comparée aux autres langues romanes et au latin*, 2. éd., vue corr., et en partie refondue, avec une préf. par Gaston Paris, Paris: Émile Bouillon.
- DEBOWIAK Przemysław, 2011, Quelques remarques sur les diminutifs en portugais et en roumain, *Romanica Cracoviensia* 11: 90–98.
- DEVOTO Giacomo, OLI Gian Carlo, 2004, *Dizionario della lingua italiana*, a cura di Luca Serianni e Maurizio Trifone, Firenze: Le Monnier.
- Diccionari de la llengua catalana*, 2007, Institut d’Estudis Catalans, Barcelona: Institut d’Estudis Catalans.
- Diccionario de la lengua española*, 1997, Real Academia Española, Madrid: Espasa Calpe, t. 1–2.
- Dicionário da língua portuguesa*, 2008, Porto: Porto Editora.
- Dicionário universal: língua portuguesa*, 1999, Lisboa: Texto Editora.
- DICKEY Eleanor, CHAHOUD Anna (eds.), 2010, *Colloquial and literary Latin*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române: DEX*, 1996, Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică “Iorgu Iordan”, București: Univers Enciclopedic.
- DIEZ Friedrich, 1851, Geminatio und Ablaut im Romanischen, *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache* 3/3: 397–405 (reprinted in idem, *Kleinere Arbeiten und Recensionen*, Hermann Breyman (Hrsg.), München: Oldenbourg, 1883, 178–183).
- DOSTIE Gaétane, 2007, La reduplication pragmatique des marqueurs discursifs. De là à là là, *Langue Française*, 154: 45–60.
- DRESSLER Wolfgang U., MERLINI BARBARESI Lavinia, 1994, Italian word reduplication, (in:) idem, *Morphopragmatics. Diminutives and intensifiers in Italian, German and other languages*, Berlin – New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 510–528.
- EGUREN GUTIÉRREZ Luis Javier, 1987, *Aspectos lúdicos del lenguaje: la jitanjáfora, problema lingüístico*, Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- ERNOUT Alfred, 1935, *Morphologie historique du latin*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- ESCANDELL-VIDAL Mictoria V., 1991, Sobre las reduplicaciones léxicas, *Lingüística Española Actual* 13/1: 71–84.
- FAVEREAU Francis, 2000, *Geriadur ar brezhoneg a-vremañ: brezhoneg/galleg galleg/brezhoneg. Dictionnaire du breton contemporain: bilingue*, Montroules-Morlaix : Skol Vreizh.
- FRÉDÉRIC Madeleine, 1985, *La répétition: étude linguistique et rhétorique*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- FREI Henri, 2011 (1929), *La grammaire des fautes*, Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Garzanti Italiano*, 2010, Milano: Garzanti Linguistica.
- GEORGE Kenneth, 1983, Redoublement lexical, procédé intensif, *Le français dans le monde* 180: 63–65.
- GHOMESHI Jila, JACKENDOFF Ray, ROSEN Nicole, RUSSELL Kevin, 2004, Contrastive focus reduplication in English (The salad-salad paper), *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22/2: 307–357.
- GIRAULT Hervé, 2006, Entre créativité lexicale et connivence culturelle: le traitement des prénoms en argot, *Revue d’Études Françaises* 11: “L’argot: un universel du langage?": 69–83.

- GOODY Jack, 1983, *The development of the family and marriage in Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GRAMMONT Maurice, 1970, Onomatopées et mots expressifs, *Revue des langues romanes* XLIV: 97–158.
- Gran diccionario de la lengua española: diccionario de uso*, 1995, Madrid: Sociedad General Española de Librería.
- GRANDGENT Charles H., 1907, *An introduction to Vulgar Latin*, Boston: D.C. Heath & Co.
- GRANNES Alf, 1973, *Zajciki-majciki; turki-murki*: an example of linguistic interference between the Turkic language Karachai (Northern Caucasus) and Russian, in the spoken Russian of a Karachai woman, *Orbis: Bulletin International de Documentation Linguistique* 22: 526–534.
- GRANNES Alf, 1996, Le redoublement de type turc à m- initial dans les langues des Balkans et du Caucase, (in:) idem, *Turco-Bulgarica: articles in English and French concerning Turkish influence on Bulgarian*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- GRAUR Alexandru, 1963, *Etimologii Românești*, București: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romîne.
- HAMMER Françoise, 1997, Iconicité et reduplication en français, *Folia linguistica* 31: 285–300.
- HLADKÝ Josef, 1998, Notes on reduplicative words in English, *Brno Studies in English* 24: 33–78.
- HOPKINS Edward Washburn, 1893, Vedic reduplication of nouns and adjectives, *The American Journal of Philology* 14/1: 1–40.
- HURCH Bernhard (ed.), 2005, *Studies on Reduplication*, Berlin-Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- INKELAS Sharon, ZOLL Cheryl, 2005, *Reduplication: doubling in morphology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- JASANOFF Jay H., 2007, From reduplication to ablaut: the class VII strong verbs of Northwest Germanic. *Historische Sprachforschung* 120: 241–284.
- JURAFSKY Daniel, 1996, Tendencies in the semantics of the diminutive, *Language* 72: 533–578.
- JURET Étienne-Abel, 1937, *Formation des noms et des verbes en latin et en grec*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- KABORE Raphaël, 1993, *Contribution à l'étude de l'idéophonie*, Paris: INALCO.
- KABORE Raphaël, 1998, La reduplication, *Faits de langues* 11–12: 359–376.
- KING Gareth (ed.), 2007, *Modern Welsh dictionary: A guide to the living language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KISS Jenő, PUSZTAI Ferenc (szerk.), 2003, *Magyar nyelvtörténet*, Budapest: Osiris.
- KOUWENBERG Silvia (ed.), 2003, *Twice as meaningful: reduplication in pidgins, creoles and other contact varieties*, London: Battlebridge.
- KOUWENBERG Silvia, LACHARITÉ Darlene, 2004, Echoes of Africa: reduplication in Caribbean Creole and Niger-Congo languages, *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 19/2: 285–331.
- KRÖLL Heinz, 1990–1991, Beitrag zu den Reduplikationen im Portugiesischen, *Lusorama* 11: 31–39 & 15: 25–44.
- KRUSCHWITZ Peter, 2012, How to avoid profanity in Latin: An exploratory study, *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 68: 9–38.
- LANDAR Herbert, 1961, Reduplication and morphology, *Language* 37/2: 239–246.
- LIBERMAN Anatoly, 2009, *Word origins... and how we know them: etymology for everyone*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LIPSKI John M., 1995, Spanish hypocoristics: Towards a unified prosodic analysis, *Hispanic Linguistics* 6: 387–434.
- LLOYD Paul M., 1966, Some reduplicative words in colloquial Spanish, *Hispanic Review* 34: 133–142.
- LÖFSTEDT Leena, 1976, La Reduplication synonymique de Jean de Meun dans sa traduction de Vegece, *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 77: 449–470.
- MALKIEL Yakov, 1959, Studies in irreversible binomials, *Lingua* 8: 113–160.
- MARANTZ Alec, 1982, Re reduplication, *Linguistic Inquiry* 13/3: 435–482.

- MARK Colin B.D., 2003, *The Gaelic-English dictionary*, London: Routledge.
- MAROUZEAU Jacques, 1946, Le redoublement expressif en latin, *Latomus* 5/1–2: 341–343.
- MASINI Francesca, 2006, Binomial constructions: inheritance, specification and subregularities, *Lingue e Linguaggio* 5/2: 207–227.
- MATTIELLO Elisa, 2013, *Extra-grammatical morphology in English: abbreviations, blends, reduplicatives, and related phenomena*, Berlin-Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- MAYERTHALER Willi, 1977, *Studien zur theoretischen und zur französischen Morphologie: Reduplikation, Echowörter, morphologische Natürlichkeit, Haplologie, Produktivität, Regeltelescoping, paradigmatischer Ausgleich*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- MEILLET Antoine, 1917, *Caractères généraux des langues germaniques*, Paris: Hachette.
- MEILLET Antoine 1928, *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*, Paris: Hachette.
- MEILLET Antoine, 1930, *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*, Paris: Hachette.
- MELO DE CASTRO Anne Glaucy, DE OLIVEIRA Maria Lourdes A., DE AZEVEDO Neila da C.B.C., DE ALENCAR TEIXEIRA Sulema, DA SILVA PINTO Wandilma, 2001, *Reduplicação silábica das palavras*, Monografia do curso de Pós-Graduação em Língua Portuguesa, departamento de Letras da Universidade Federal do Acre in Rio Branco: www.filologia.org.br/monografias/caderno_de_pos_graduacao_ufac/republicacao_silabica_das_palavras.htm (summer 2015).
- MORAVCSIK Edith, 1978, Reduplicative constructions, (in:) *Universals of human language*, Joseph Greenberg (ed.), vol. 3: *Word structure*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 297–334.
- MORAWSKI Joseph, 1927, Les formules rimées de la langue espagnole, *Revista de Filología Española* XIV: 113–133.
- MORAWSKI Joseph, 1929, Les formules apophoniques en espagnol et en roman, *Revista de Filología Española* XVI: 337–365.
- MORAWSKI Joseph, 1937, Les formules allitérées de la langue espagnole, *Revista de Filología Española* XXIV: 121–161.
- MORIN Yves Charles, 1972, The phonology of echo-words in French, *Language* 48/1: 97–108.
- MÜLLER Hans-Georg, 2004, *Reduplikationen im Türkischen: Morphophonologische Untersuchungen*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag.
- NESPOULOS Pierre, 1983, Giovanni Pontano, théoricien de l'art de plaisanter, le *De sermone*, (in:) *Influences latines en Europe*, Georges Soubeyrie (éd.), Toulouse-LeMirail: Université de Toulouse-LeMirail, 5–39.
- NIEPOKIJ Mary, 1997, *The development of verbal reduplication in Indo-European*, Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.
- PAOLI Ugo Enrico, 1959, *Il latino maccheronico*, Firenze: Le Monnier.
- PERSSON Gunnar, 1974, *Repetition in English*, part I: *Sequential repetitions*, Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- PFEFFER Georg, 1987, The vocabulary of Anglo-Saxon kinship, *L'Homme* 27/103: 113–128.
- PIECHNIK Iwona, 2012, Le Petit Prince et ses cousins créoles (Guadeloupe, Martinique, Guyane française, Réunion), (in :) *Le Petit Prince et les amis au pays des traductions. Études dédiées à Urszula Dąbbska-Prokop*, Joanna Górniewicz, Iwona Piechnik, Marcela Świątkowska (éds), Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2012, 239–273.
- PLÄHN Jürgen, 1987, ХУЙНЯ-МУЙНЯ и тому подобное, *Russian Linguistics* 11/1: 37–41.
- PLÉNAT Marc, 1982a, Toto, Guiguite, Fanfa et toute la famille, *Cahiers de grammaire* 4: 95–166.
- PLÉNAT Marc, 1982b, Quatre notes sur la morphologie des hypocoristiques à redoublement, *Cahiers de grammaire* 5: 79–134.
- PLÉNAT Marc, 1984, Toto, Fanfa, Totor et même Guiguite sont des ANARs, (in :) *Forme sonore du langage. Structure des représentations en phonologie*, François Dell, Daniel Hirst, Jean-Roger Vergnaud (dir.), Paris: Hermann, 161–181.
- PLÉNAT Marc, 1991, Remarques sur la structure de la rime en français standard, *Linx* 3 (hors-série: *Études de linguistique française à la mémoire d'Alain Lerond. Les «français»: français dialectaux, français techniques, états de langue, français standard*), 261–288.

- PLÉNAT Marc, 1999, Prolégomènes à une étude variationniste des hypocoristiques à redoublement en français, *Cahiers de Grammaire* 24: 183–219.
- PLÉNAT Marc, 2003, L'optimisation des attaques dans les hypocoristiques espagnols, *Langages* 152: 78–101.
- PLÉNAT Marc, SOLARES HUERTA Pancho, 2006, *Domi, Seb, Flo* et toute la famille (Lettre à Jean-Pierre Maurel sur les hypocoristiques français formés par apocope), *Cahiers de grammaire* 30: 339–357.
- POHL Jacques, 1964–1965, *Hocus pocus, hurluberlu, tutu, Tutur et tic tac*. Contribution à une étude de morphologie expressive, *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles*, XVII: 206–238.
- POLITZER Robert L., 1961, Synonymic repetition in Late Latin and Romance, *Language* 37/4: 484–487.
- PONS I GRIERA Lúdia, 1987, Xinxinxina, trap-trap. Aspectos de a motivació fonètica en català, (in:) *Studia in honorem prof. M. de Riquer*, Carlos Alvar et al. (eds.), Barcelona: Quaderns Crema, t. II: 165–77.
- RAIMY Eric, 2000, *The phonology and morphology of reduplication*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- RAINER Franz, 1983, *Intensivierung im Italienischen*, Salzburg: Institut für Romanistik der Universität Salzburg.
- RAINER Franz, 1988, La reduplication française du type *fi* fille d'un point de vue diachronique, (in:) *Atti del XXI Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza*, vol. 1: *Grammatica storica delle lingue romanze*, Giovanni Ruffino (éd.), Tübingen: Niemeyer, 279–289.
- RIO-TORTO Graça Maria, 1998, Mecanismos de produção lexical no português europeu. *Alfa: revista de linguística* (São Paulo) 42 (n° especial): 15–32.
- RODRÍGUEZ GUZMÁN Jorge, 2011, Morfología de la onomatopeya. ¿Subclase de palabra subordinada a la interjección?, *Moenia* 17: 125–178.
- SANDMANN Antônio José, 1989, *Formação de palavras no português brasileiro contemporâneo*, Curitiba: Scientia et Labor.
- SCHAPANSKY Nathalie, 2012, Part I: Compounding in Breton grammatical and logical head, *Lingua* 122: 1253–1267.
- SCHAPIRA Charlotte, 1988, Le redoublement expressif dans la création lexicale, *Cahiers de Lexicologie* 52: 51–63.
- SCHLÖMER Anne, 2002, *Phraseologische Wortpaare im Französischen: »sitôt dit, sitôt fait« und Vergleichbares*, Berlin-Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- SCHWAIGER Thomas, 2015, Reduplication, (in:) *Word-formation: An international handbook of the languages of Europe*, Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen, Franz Rainer (eds.), Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, vol. 1: 467–484.
- SCULLEN Mary Ellen, 2002, New insights into French reduplication, (in:) *Romance Phonology and Variation: Selected papers from the 30th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Gainesville, Florida, February 2000*, Caroline R. Wiltshire & Joaquim Camps (eds.), Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins, 177–189.
- SERNA Marcos de la, 2001, *Libros de las adivinanzas y acertijos. La más completa antología de adivinanzas de todos los temas y todas las épocas, para aprender y divertirse solo o en compañía*, Barcelona: Robinbook.
- SKODA Françoise, 1982, *Le redoublement expressif: un universal linguistique. Analyse du procédé en grec ancien et en d'autres langues*, Paris: Société d'études linguistiques et anthropologiques de France, n° spécial 15.
- SMITH Pauline, 1983, Le redoublement de termes et les emprunts linguistiques dans la traduction en France au 16^{ème} siècle: Henri Estienne et François de Belleforest, *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 47/185–186: 37–58.
- SOUTHERN Mark R. V., 2005, *Contagious couplings: transmission of expressives in Yiddish echo phrases*, Westport: Praeger.
- SPITZER Leo, 1922, *Italienische Umgangssprache*, Bonn & Leipzig: Schroeder.

- SPITZER Leo, 1951–1952, Sur quelques emplois métaphoriques de l'impératif. Un chapitre de syntaxe comparative, *Romania* LXXII: 433–478 & LXXIII: 16–63.
- STACHOWSKI Kamil, 2014, *Standard Turkic C-type reduplications*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- STANKIEWICZ Edward, 1972, Problems of emotive language, (in:) *Approaches to semiotics*, The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 239–264.
- ŠTEKAUER Pavol, VALERA Salvador, KÖRTVÉLYESSY Lívía, 2012, *Word-formation in the world's languages: a typological survey*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- STERIADE Donca, 1988, Reduplication and syllable transfer in Sanskrit and elsewhere, *Phonology* 5: 73–155.
- STIVERS Tanya, 2004, *No no no* and others types of multiple sayings in social interaction, *Human Communication Research* 30/2: 260–293.
- STOLZ Thomas, STROH Cornelia, URDZE Aina (eds.), 2011, *Total reduplication: the areal linguistics of a potential universal*, Berlin-Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- THORNTON Anna M., 2008, Italian verb-verb reduplicative action nouns, *Lingue e Linguaggio* 7: 209–232.
- THORNTON Anna M., 2009, Italian verb reduplication between syntax and the lexicon, *Rivista di Linguistica* 21/1: 235–261.
- THORNTON Anna M., 2010, Il tipo *fuggifuggi*, (in:) *Actes du XXV^e Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, Maria Iliescu, Heidi Siller & Paul Danler (eds.), Tübingen: Niemeyer, 527–536.
- THUN Nils, 1963, *Reduplicative words in English: a study of formations of the types tick-tack, hurly-burly and shilly-shally*, Uppsala: Carl Bloms Boktryckeri.
- VALLET Robert, 1977, A propos des redoublements d'expression dans la prose de Jean Lemaire de Belges, *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 41/163–164: 383–398.
- VOINOV Vitaly, 2012, Rhyming reduplication in Russian paired words, *Russian Linguistics* 36/2: 175–191.
- WANG Shih-ping, 2005, Corpus-based approaches and discourse analysis in relation to reduplication and repetition, *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 505–540.
- WHEATLEY Henry Benjamin, 1866, *A Dictionary of reduplicated words in the English Language*, London-Berlin: Asher.
- WHITNEY William Dwight, 1950, *A Sanskrit grammar, including both the classical language, and the older dialects, of Veda and Brahmana*, London: G. Cumberlege.
- WIERZBICKA Anna, 1986, Italian reduplication: cross-cultural pragmatics and illocutionary semantics, *Linguistics* 24/2: 287–315, reprinted in 1991 in eadem, *Cross-cultural pragmatics. The semantics of human interaction*, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- WOLFF Étienne, 2001, Les jeux de langage dans l'Antiquité romaine, *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* 3: 317–334.
- WÖLFFLIN Eduard von, 1933, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, Leipzig: Georg Olms Verlag.
- WOOD Francis A., 1911, Iteratives, blends, and "Streckformen", *Modern Philology* IX/2: 157–194.
- ZERLING Jean-Pierre, 2000, Structure syllabique et morphologique des mots à caractère onomatopéique et répétitif en français : étude phonétique, *Travaux de l'Institut de phonétique de Strasbourg* 30: 115–162.