
A constructionist approach to the distinction between reduplication and repetition: A case study of Turkish

Yui Suzuki
The University of Tokyo

1 Background

In this paper I explore the similarities and differences between two iterative processes in Turkish: reduplication (a morphological process) and repetition (a syntactic process). More specifically, I conduct wordhood tests on deontic and emphatic iterations in Turkish from a Construction Morphology (CxM) perspective (Booij 2010; Booij 2018; Audring & Masini 2018) and argue that CxM successfully captures the similarities and differences between the two types of Turkish iteration discussed here.

1.1 Reduplication and repetition

Both reduplication and repetition refer to iteration of linguistic forms (Gil 2005; cf. Inkelas & Zoll 2005; Rubino 2005; Downing & Inkelas 2015; Inkelas & Downing 2015; Finkbeiner & Freywald 2018; Urdze 2018). However, they are different in terms of wordhood: whereas reduplication is a morphological process that yields a word, repetition is a syntactic process that produces a phrase.

1.2 Phenomena

As mentioned above, in this paper I compare two types of iteration in Turkish: **deontic iteration** and **emphatic iteration**. There is little research on these two types of iteration, though brief descriptions of deontic and emphatic iterations are found in Yaman (2017: 67) and Lewis (2000: 234), respectively.

In deontic iteration, the iteration of a past tense verb is used to express deontic mood, i.e., ‘had better’, as in (1). In contrast, in emphatic iteration, the iteration of an inflected verb fulfils an emphatic function, as in (2).

- (1) *Ev-im-e gel-dí-n gel-di-n (yoksa yemek kal-ma-yacak).*
house-1SG-DAT come-PST-2SG come-PST-2SG otherwise meal remain-NEG-FUT
‘You **had better come** to my house (nothing will be left of the meal).’
- (2) *Ev-im-e gel-dí-n gel-dí-n (ama ben-i bul-ama-dı-n).*
house-1.SG-DAT come-PST-2SG come-PST-2SG but 1SG-ACC find-POSS-PST-2SG
‘You **did come** to my house (but you couldn’t find me).’

As can be seen in the examples above, a fully inflected verb may be used in both types of iteration. However, in Turkish deontic iteration, only a past tense verb can be used; in contrast, any tense can be used in emphatic iteration.

The two types of iteration are similar in that they have conventionalized meanings, deontic mood and emphasis, that cannot be derived from the constituents of the whole. For example, although the past tense suffix is used in deontic iteration, it does not describe a past event.

Importantly, some observations show that these two types of iteration have different wordhood statuses, suggesting that deontic iteration is an instance of reduplication and emphatic iteration an instance of repetition. For example, in cases of deontic iteration, the two verbs cannot be interrupted by another element (see (3)). In contrast, in cases of emphatic iteration, the two verbs can be interrupted by another element (see (6)). This indicates that deontic iteration results in the formation of a morphological word and is therefore a type of reduplication. In contrast, emphatic iteration results in the formation of two morphological words and is therefore a type of

repetition. By investigating these two types of iteration, we can explore the similarities and differences between reduplication and repetition.

1.3 Theoretical framework

To capture the similarities and differences between Turkish reduplication and repetition, I adopt a constructionist approach (Goldberg 2006, Hilpert 2014) and specifically use the framework of Construction Morphology (CxM) (Booij 2010, Booij 2018, Audring & Masini 2018). CxM is SIGN-BASED and WORD-BASED (Audring & Masini 2018). In this approach, constructions are signs, that is, conventionalized pairings of form and meaning. The generalization of the form-meaning is represented by a schema, which may be abstract or partially/fully specified.

In addition, CxM is word-based rather than morpheme-based. Word-based approaches take the word, not the morpheme, as the smallest lexical entry. Constructions include both simplex words and complex words as conventionalized pairings of form and meaning on the word level.

There have been a number of CxM analyses of reduplication (Booij 2010; Booij 2018), and these have argued that the holistic meaning of reduplication is analyzed by a schema at a word level (e.g., total reduplication with a plural meaning in Malay (Booij 2018: 285)). However, few studies have been analyzed both reduplication and repetition in a unified way (cf. Nagaya 2020), a gap this paper hopes to begin to address.

2 Research questions

The present study addresses the following two research questions:

- **Descriptive question:** What are the similarities and differences between deontic iteration and emphatic iteration in terms of form and meaning?
- **Theoretical question:** How can CxM, a word-based constructionist theory of morphology, capture the similarities and differences between deontic iteration and emphatic iteration, or more generally reduplication and repetition?

3 Methodology

To answer the research questions above, I conducted wordhood tests on deontic and emphatic iterations in Turkish following Gil's (2005) framework for distinguishing between reduplication and repetition: stress, the size of a copy, the number of copies, interruptibility, and meaning.

4 Wordhood tests

In this section, I investigate the wordhood of Turkish deontic and emphatic iterations. CxM framework assumes that constructions have a tripartite parallel structure (Booij 2010: 6): phonological, morpho-syntactic, and semantic. Thus, I describe deontic and emphatic iterations in terms of these three structures.

4.1 Deontic iteration

- **Phonological properties:** Stress is assigned only to the final syllable of the first element (1).
- **Morpho-syntactic properties:** A fully inflected verb with the past tense suffix *-di* is used for the iteration. The two verbs cannot be separated by inserting another element, such as the particle *ya*, as in (3). In addition, the number of copies is limited to two. See (4).

- (3) **Beşiktaş-a* *git-ti-m* *ya* *git-ti-m.*
Beşiktaş-DAT go-PST-1SG PARTICLE go-PST-1SG
Intended: 'I had better go to Beşiktaş.'
- (4) **Ödev-i* *yap-tı-n* *yap-tı-n* *yap-tı-n.*
homework-ACC do-PST-2SG do-PST-2SG do-PST-2SG
Intended: 'You had better do your homework.'

- **Semantic properties:** Deontic iteration results in conventionalized and unpredictable meanings. It is productive and can be used with a variety of verbs.

4.2 Emphatic iteration

- **Phonological properties:** Stress is assigned to the final syllable of both elements (2).
- **Morpho-syntactic properties:** A fully inflected verb is iterated whether the verb is past tense or not. The two verbs can be separated by inserting another linguistic form, as in (5). The number of copies is not limited to two, as in (6).

(5)	<i>Beşiktaş-a</i> Beşiktaş-DAT 'I did go to Beşiktaş.'	<i>git-ti-m</i> go-PST-1SG	<i>ya</i> PARTICLE	<i>git-ti-m.</i> go-PST-1SG
(6)	<i>Ödev-i</i> homework-ACC 'You did do your homework.'	<i>yap-tı-n</i> do-PST-2SG	<i>yap-tı-n</i> do-PST-2SG	<i>yap-tı-n.</i> do-PST-2SG

- **Semantic properties:** The emphatic iteration fulfils an iconic yet conventionalized pragmatic task, i.e., emphasis. This iteration is very productive and can be used with a variety of verbs.

4.3 Summary

Table 1 summarizes the results of the wordhood tests I conducted to compare the two types of iteration discussed here.

Table 1: Results of wordhood tests

Level	Wordhood test	Deontic iteration	Emphatic iteration
phonology	stress	one	two or more
morpho-syntax	size of a copy	fully inflected verb	
	interruptibility	uninterruptible	interruptible
	number of copies	only two	two or more
semantics	meaning	conventionalized	
		deontic mood (non-iconic)	emphasis (iconic)

5 Analysis

On the phonological level, deontic iteration results in a single phonological word, while emphatic iteration results in a phrase. In Turkish, a phonological word has one and only one stress. As deontic iteration results in a form with only one stress, this supports the finding that this type of iteration produces a single phonological word. In contrast, in emphatic iteration, stress is assigned to each verb, indicating that this type of iteration results in a phrase composed of more than one phonological word.

As for morpho-syntactic structure, the wordhood tests described above indicate that Turkish deontic iteration results in the formation of a single morphological word that is uninterruptible (see (4)); in contrast, emphatic iteration results in the formation of a phrase that is interruptible (see (7)). Morphological words cannot be interrupted; syntactic phrases may be interrupted by another element. Additionally, Turkish deontic iteration results in forms that are restricted in terms of copies (see (3)), while Turkish emphatic iteration does not have a restriction on number of copies (see (6)). Morphological processes are non-recursive; syntactic processes are recursive (Matthews 1991: 213).

Thus, both phonologically and morpho-syntactically, there is evidence to support the claim that deontic iteration is an instance of reduplication, and that emphatic iteration is an instance of repetition. Interestingly, in terms of semantic structure, both deontic and emphatic iterations

result in conventionalized meanings which cannot be directly derived from the parts of the construction.

Based on these claims, I propose the schemas for Turkish deontic and emphatic iterations shown in (7) and (8), respectively. The phonological, morpho-syntactic, and semantic structures are represented from left to right.

(7) $\langle [\omega]_i \leftrightarrow [[V_j\text{-PST-SBJ}] \sim [V_j\text{-PST-SBJ}]]_i \leftrightarrow [\text{had better SEM}_j \text{ soon}]_i \rangle$

(8) $\langle [\omega_i \ \omega_i \ (\omega_i)]_k \leftrightarrow [[V_j\text{-TENSE-SBJ}]_i [V_j\text{-TENSE-SBJ}]_i ([V_j\text{-TENSE-SBJ}]_i)]_k \leftrightarrow [\text{do SEM}_j]_k \rangle$

6 Discussion

We are now in a position to answer the questions raised in Section 2. Descriptively, the schemas in (7) and (8) serve to describe the similarities and differences between the two types of iteration. Theoretically, a CxM approach maintains the distinction between reduplication and repetition, yet still captures the similarities between these types of iteration. Both phonologically and morphologically, deontic iteration forms one word and is thus a type of reduplication resulting in a morphological construction; emphatic iteration forms a phrase and is thus a type of repetition resulting in syntactic construction. Additionally, both types of iteration have conventionalized meanings as a whole and can therefore be analyzed as constructions with iterative forms showing different word properties. To conclude, CxM is useful for describing and analyzing reduplication and repetition in a unified way.

References

- Booij, Geert. 2010. *Construction morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Booij, Geert (ed.). 2018. *The construction of words: advances in construction morphology*. Cham: Springer.
- Downing, Laura J. & Sharon Inkelas. 2015. What is reduplication? Typology and analysis part 2/2: the analysis of reduplication. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 9(12). 516–528.
- Finkbeiner, Rita & Ulrike Freywald (eds.). 2018. *Exact repetition in grammar and discourse*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Gil, David. 2005. From repetition to reduplication in Riau Indonesian. In Bernhard Hurch (ed.), *Studies on reduplication*, 31–64. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at work: the nature of generalization in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Göksel, Ashl & Celia Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish: a comprehensive grammar*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Hilpert, Martin. 2019. *Construction grammar and its application to English*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Inkelas, Sharon & Cheryl Zoll. 2005. *Reduplication: doubling in morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inkelas, Sharon & Laura J. Downing. 2015. What is reduplication? Typology and analysis part 1/2: the typology of reduplication. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 9(12). 502–515.
- Lewis, Geoffrey. 2000. *Turkish grammar*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Masini, Francesca & Jenny Audring. 2018. Construction morphology. In Jenny Audring & Francesca Masini (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of morphological theory*, 365–389. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matthews, P. Hugoe. 1991. *Morphology*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagaya, Naonori. 2020. Reduplication and repetition from a constructionist perspective. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 34. 259–272.
- Rubino, Carl. 2005. Reduplication: form, function and distribution. In Bernhard Hurch (ed.), *Studies on reduplication*, 11–29. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Urdze, Aide (ed.). 2018. *Non-prototypical reduplication*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Yaman, Ertuğrul. 2017. *Türkiye türkçesinde zaman kaymaları*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.