

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav jižní a centrální Asie

Filologie - Jazyky zemí Asie a Afriky

Pavel Hons

Reduplicative Constructions in Tamil

Reduplikativní konstrukce v tamilštině

Disertační práce

vedoucí práce – Prof. PhDr. Jaroslav Vacek, CSc.

2010

Prohlašuji, že jsem disertační práci vykonal samostatně s využitím uvedených pramenů a literatury.

V Praze, dne 8.4. 2010, Pavel Hons.....

Acknowledgements

In the first place I would like to thank my teacher prof. PhDr. Jaroslav Vacek, CSc. who guided me while working on this study, read the manuscript and provided a lot of material as well as useful suggestions. He was very helpful and patient during the long process of writing the thesis.

My sincere and heartfelt thanks are due to Dr. P.R. Subramanian from Mozhi Trust, Chennai, who helped me with explanation of difficult examples of reduplication and provided several suggestions. He also guided me through various Tamil dialects and peculiarities of the spoken Tamil.

The thesis would not have been possible without the support of several institutions, namely the Sasakawa Young Leaders Fellowship Fund, Charles University in Prague and Oriental Institute of Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.

Abbreviations

Cz.	Czech
DEDR	Dravidian etymological dictionary
DX	deictic
Eng.	English
expr.	expressive
Fr.	French
INF	infinitive
KTTA	Kriyāviṇ tar̥kālat tamiḷ akarāti
Lat.	Latin
Mrh.	Marathi
onom.	onomatopoeia
PP	past participle
RC	reduplicative construction
Ru.	Russian
Skt.	Sanskrit
T.	Telugu
Ta.	Tamil
TL	Tamil Lexicon
U.	Urdu
V	verb
WP	witnessed past

* an asterisk indicates ungrammaticality of the sentence

??? three question marks indicate a word of uncertain origin or obscure etymology

> indicates "from," i.e. derived from

→ an arrow means "results in"

[] square brackets (i) enclose phonetic symbols (ii) indicate that a part of the text was left out

() parentheses enclose my comments or additions to the text quoted

Transliteration

I follow the most common system of transliteration of Tamil, which can be found, for example, in Tamil Lexicon. In case of examples from other languages I take over the transliteration of the articles and monographs from which I quote.

Vowels		Consonants	
அ	a	க்	k
ஆ	ā	ங்	ñ
இ	i	ச்	c
ஈ	ī	ஞ்	ñ
உ	u	ட்	ṭ
ஊ	ū	ண்	ṇ
எ	e	த்	t
ஏ	ē	ந்	n
ஐ	ai	ப்	p
ஓ	o	ம்	m
ஔ	ō	ய்	y
ஒள	au	ர்	r
		ல்	l
		வ்	v
		ழ்	ḷ
		ள்	ḷ
		ற்	ṛ
		ன்	ṅ
		ஜ்	j
		ஸ்	s
		ஷ்	ṣ
		க்ஷ்	kṣ
		ஹ்	h

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	3
Abbreviations	4
Transliteration	5
Contents	6
0. INTRODUCTION	8
0.1 Structure of the study	10
0.2 Sources of data and the way of stating the Tamil examples	11
0.3 Some basic terms	12
1. REDUPLICATION AND REPETITION	15
2. FROM REPETITION TO REDUPLICATION	21
2.1 Reduplication and grammaticalization	22
2.2 Borderline examples of patterned repetition	25
2.3 Discontinuous repetition	26
2.4 Repetition and emphasis	27
2.5 Figura etymologica	30
2.5.1 First group	31
2.5.2 Second group	32
2.5.3 Third group	33
2.6 Expression of proximity	35
2.7 Reciprocity	35
2.8 Other possible origins of reduplicative constructions	36
2.9 Summary	39
3. ON THE TYPOLOGY OF REDUPLICATION	40
4. REDUPLICATION IN TAMIL	43
5. MORPHOLOGICAL REDUPLICATION	44
5.1 Numerals	44
5.2 Interjections	45
5.3 Intensives	45
5.4 Summary	47
6. BOUND WORD REDUPLICATION	48
6.1 Expressives	48
6.2 Colour terms	53
6.3 Summary	55
7. LEXICAL REDUPLICATION	56
7.1 Identical word reduplication	56
7.1.1 Intensification	57
7.1.2 Iteration	58
7.1.3 Graduality	59
7.1.4 Succession, plurality	60
7.1.5 Distribution	62
7.1.6 Idiomatic meanings	63
7.1.7 Less prototypical and less frequent forms of lexical reduplication	64
7.1.8 Summary	65

7.2. SEMANTIC REDUPLICATION	66
7.2.1 Reduplicative constructions with a single and multiple referent and their functions	67
7.2.2 Synonymity	68
7.2.3 Formal aspects of the pairs	69
7.2.4 Main types of single referent reduplications	71
7.2.4.1 Pairs with one borrowed word	72
7.2.4.1.1 Pairs with the Tamil word in the first position	73
7.2.4.1.2 Pairs with the Sanskrit word in the first position	74
7.2.4.1.3 Both words are of Sanskrit origin	74
7.2.4.1.4 Pairs with borrowings from other languages	75
7.2.4.2 One word comes from a different sphere of Tamil	76
7.2.4.2.1 One word is archaic or highly literary	76
7.2.4.2.2 One word comes from the spoken language or from a dialect	77
7.2.4.3 Pairs describing different aspects	78
7.2.4.3.1 Different degree or intensity	78
7.2.4.3.2 General vs. specific	80
7.2.4.3.3 Smaller vs. bigger	80
7.2.4.3.4 One member of the pair is more emotive, the other member more physical	81
7.2.5 Various less specific types of the pairs	82
7.2.6 Change of meaning	83
7.2.7 Unusual pairs	84
7.2.8 Antonyms	85
7.2.9 Semantic reduplication referring to a group of similar entities	86
7.2.10 Summary	87
7.3 ECHO-TYPE REDUPLICATION	88
7.3.1 Two words that are similar in meaning	90
7.3.2 Two words that are opposite in meaning	93
7.3.3 Two words that are unrelated in meaning	94
7.3.4 Echo words	95
7.3.5 False echo words	97
7.3.6 Alliteration	102
7.3.7 Partly reduplicated expressives	102
7.3.8 Summary	103
8. PHRASAL REDUPLICATION	105
8.1 Reduplication of phrases with no modification	105
8.2 Reduplication of phrases for semantic reasons	106
8.3 Phonetic features of repeated phrases	107
8.4 Summary	108
9. CONCLUSION	109
Desiderata	110
Key words	110
Résumé in English	111
Résumé český	112
References	113
Index of primary sources	113
Secondary sources	115

0. INTRODUCTION

A sentence can be viewed as a set of words combined according to certain rules. It sounds easy but every man who ever tried to learn a foreign language knows what is hidden behind this simple definition. Words have many meanings, rules have exceptions, and paradigms show irregularities to name just a basic few. Judging by the quantity of books written and theories invented, it, however, seems that linguists are puzzled by this intricacy of language no less than language learners. Gradually it has become evident that segmentation of parts of language into neat categories and precise definition of rules is an ideal that we can only more or less approximate to.

This problem has recently been tackled by cognitive linguists¹ from a little bit different point of view. They view language categories not as clearly delimited but as units with fuzzy boundaries that exhibit family resemblance and prototypicality effect. This means that some members of one category are more central than others and membership in a category is conditioned by certain number of common features. It is very clear in the case of lexicon. To use the proverbial example a penguin is somewhat less a bird than say a vulture but it is still a bird for having a lot of common features with the general concept of bird.

This is valid not only for lexicon but also for grammatical categories. For instance diminutives in Italian generally refer to something small, but besides this they can also express affection, poor quality, short temporal duration or reduced strength and intensity. These meanings are expressed by different suffixes that can be added not only to nouns (*-ino*, *-etto*, *-ello*) but also to verbs (*-icchiare*, *-ucchiare*). We can say that the diminutives have no single meaning but still are clearly related to one another (examples taken from Evans and Green 2006, pp. 30–31).

Similarly we can detect typicality effect and family resemblance in the sphere of syntax and phonology. Here, certain nouns and verbs are supposed to be "nounier" and "verbier" than others with regard to ability to be passivised, accept some suffixes or form a tag question (Ibid., pp. 31–33). In phonology certain voiced sounds (*r, m, n*) are found to be more voiced than others (*b, d, g*) on the basis of the research held by Jeri Jaeger and John Ohala (1984). Even paralinguistic features such as stress or intonation can be treated in terms of gradience. We can see it in case of accent, where the increased intensity and length can "convey overtones of awe, amazement, admiration, and many other subtle and elusive shadings in attitude" (Newman 1946, p. 173). Fuzziness in language thus became an important topic in linguistics but, as Jackendoff (2004, pp. 124–125) points out: "[it] must not be treated as a defect in language; nor is a theory of language defective that countenances it. Rather, fuzziness is an inescapable characteristics of the concepts that language expresses."

¹ For an introduction to cognitive linguistics see for example Evans, Vyvyan, and Green, Melanie, 2006, or Croft, William, and Cruse, Alan D., 2004. For cognitive approach to grammar see Langacker, Ronald W., 1991.

The membership in a category is ascertained by means of generalisation and pattern finding ability of human mind. The human mind finds common features in individual instances of language use and builds the structure of the language. Later on it is easy to understand, modify or create new examples of the given category. The cognitive linguists claim that there are common structuring principles that hold even across different aspects of language. Generalisation and pattern finding ability are thus very important principles for learning language as well as for using it.

Once we accept that even fundamental grammatical categories exhibit fuzziness and their boundaries cannot be clearly delimited no one can be surprised that the same proposal can be successfully applied in the sphere of expressive language, namely in the case of reduplication. Repetition or reduplication of certain forms is a very basic device, which is used most probably in every language in the world. Somewhere it occurs rather sporadically, elsewhere the language employs a lot of various reduplicative forms with many lexical meanings and grammatical functions. Very often these constructions have an emotive charge and contribute to the expressive richness of the language. An extensive use of reduplicative expressions is particularly characteristic of the languages of the Indian subcontinent. They can be found in all Indian language families and that is why many authors view reduplication as one of the typical features of the Indian linguistic area (cf. for example Abbi 1994). The lack of such forms in other Indo-European languages in contrast with Indo-Aryan seems to be an evidence for diffusion from Dravidian and Munda language family. Diachronic treatment of this phenomenon will, however, not be possible until we have at our disposal thorough descriptions of reduplication in Indo-Aryan, Dravidian and especially Munda languages.²

The extensive use together with somewhat exotic nature of these constructions caught the attention of many linguists who tried to describe them. Numerous articles and monographs dealing with reduplication from different points of view appeared and now we have at our disposal description of most of this phenomenon at least for the main Indian languages (Tamil, Telugu, Hindi, Bengali and Marathi). Articles on various aspects of reduplication that occur in other languages of the Indian subcontinent have also appeared. Not all the types of reduplication, however, attracted the same portion of attention and many areas still remain unexplored. Certain forms of reduplication have escaped the notice of scholars altogether.

In this study I would like to focus on reduplication in Tamil as a whole and pay attention to all types of reduplication including the less frequent forms. As material I use numerous examples of reduplication drawn from dictionaries, novels and short stories written in contemporary Tamil. The aim of this study is, however, not only a mere description of different types of reduplicative constructions (henceforth RC) in Tamil. I would also like to relate them to each other as I think that they have much in common. I do not see numerous types of reduplication as separate categories, on the contrary I view them as parts of a continuum that have gradually evolved from a mere repetition of certain lexical

² Though the first conclusions have already been drawn. See Anvita Abbi 1992, especially pages 159–164.

or syntactical elements on the one hand and onomatopoeic words, plays on words etc. on the other. Besides central or prototypical types of RCs, i.e. reduplication of the identical word in the very same form to produce the meaning of intensity, iteration, plurality etc., there are also numerous peripheral constructions, which are, however, by many aspects related to the central ones. I assume that some of them have been created by means of analogy, i.e. the well known pattern of repetition of certain elements had been applied to other categories than lexical. The process of reduplication can be very productive and helps the speakers not only to create new forms but also to ascribe to them particular meaning and thus to use their language very vividly.

I thus view reduplication from a broader perspective and try to point out its richness and important role not only on the expressive level but also on the grammatical level and as a word formation process. Special emphasis is laid on transient forms and illustration of wide semantic scope of RCs. For this I try to bring great deal of examples, especially of those types of reduplication that have not yet been fully covered by other authors. In a limited number I present examples of particular types of reduplication from other, especially European, languages as well.

Another aim of the study is to point out the frequency of the occurrence of RCs. It does not bring any exhaustive statistics, but a mere list of the examples is sufficient to show that this phenomenon is far from marginal in Tamil and consequently in all Dravidian languages. Scarcity of examples was one of the major drawbacks of many of the articles about reduplication that came to my hand. The description and comments on RC should be of avail not only for linguists and Tamilists but also for students and teachers of Tamil to help them to understand the language and its expressivity.

0.1 Structure of the study

In the very beginning of the study I introduce the sources and some basic terms relating the phenomenon of reduplication. In (1.) I draw a distinction between simple repetition and reduplication. I try to define both terms as they are often used interchangeably without any discrimination. I understand repetition as a "loose" repetition of a word or phrase, while reduplication is a form that is functionally used in the particular language and consequently has undergone certain process of grammaticalization or lexicalization and has more general meaning. I admit that there are a lot of overlapping or intermediate forms, some of which are closer to repetition, others to reduplication. They nicely document "systematization" of repetition and the transition to more grammaticalized reduplicative forms. I tried to document the fluid transition of repetition to reduplication by examples in (2.). I began with clear examples of repetition with insertion of further words in (2.3). It is followed by examples of repetition with the meaning of emphasis (2.4). Very interesting in this respect are examples of figura etymologica (2.5), which are divided into three groups according to a formal criterion. This section is concluded by examples of expression of proximity (2.6), and reciprocity (2.7).

In (2.8) I briefly deal with possible origins of RCs. As an important source of origin of RCs referring to quantity is proposed repetition, while the origin of qualitative RCs is seen in baby talk, onomatopoeic words and loan words. Very important aspect here is the establishment of the pattern of reduplication, which after taking roots in the language can be productively used as a model for further expressions.

The essence of the study is the classification of reduplication (3.) according to a simple criterion into four respectively six big groups. These six groups are divided into further subgroups, commented upon and the usage of RCs is illustrated by examples. I also pay attention to formal and semantic properties of RCs and to unstable terminology of various types of reduplication where I feel it relevant.

Morphological reduplication (5.) is not very frequent and includes only three smaller subgroups, i.e. numerals, interjections, and intensives.

Between morphological and lexical reduplication is a special group, which I provisionally call bound word reduplication (6.). This group has several distinctive features.

Lexical reduplication is by far the most frequent type of reduplication in Tamil and can be further subdivided into three subgroups: identical word reduplication, semantic reduplication and echo-type reduplication.

Identical word reduplication (7.1), which has many mostly grammatical functions is very productive. Besides typical examples of reduplication of a word without any modification of its form I have also included examples of pairs where there are two different forms derived from one lexical root (7.1.7). Semantic reduplication (7.2) is used to describe the reality very accurately and to create new expressions. I tried to focus on the problem of synonymy and the ways the two words of the pair differ from each other. I found out that besides semantic reasons sociolinguistic aspects also played a role. Echo-type reduplication (7.3) is more emotionally coloured type of reduplication spanning semantic and identical word reduplication. Besides collocation of two semantically similar words there are also pairs where one member of the pair has no meaning by itself and only copies with a small modification the phonetic structure of the base word (7.3.4 and 7.3.5).

Phrasal reduplication (8.) is dealt with only marginally but it yields very interesting information. In many respects phrasal reduplication resembles lexical reduplication, it only employs bigger units.

0.2 Sources of data and the way of stating the Tamil examples

My study is based on Tamil, a Dravidian language spoken mainly in the South of India. I have focused on the contemporary spoken language, which is very rich in dialects. The spoken language, and especially its various dialects, abound with reduplicated words and other emotive expressions and render sufficient material for the study. As the first dictionaries of Tamil dialects have already appeared

on the market, they were the first option. Dictionaries in general are a very good source, because they list many of these expressions since they are frequently used collocations, phrases or idioms. Not all such expressions had, however, been recorded and I have had to resort to other sources as well. A large proportion of the examples have been drawn from various novels and short stories. I also tried to note down a few one time creations as they nicely illustrate productivity of the reduplicative pattern.

The paragraphs that deal with reduplication in Tamil always begin with some introductory commentary, then come examples. The most representative as well as some interesting or rare uses of reduplication are illustrated by whole sentences taken from novels, short stories, dictionaries etc. These sentences are marked by two numbers. The first number refers to the book from which the particular example is taken, the second number refers to the page. The list of the books can be found at the end of the study (Index of primary sources). Thus for example the sentence *piṛaku āyiram āyiram vēru kāriyarkaḷ* 20/85 comes from the book *Puttam viṭu* by Hepsibā Jēsutāsaṅ, page 85. Only a few examples have been provided by myself to demonstrate certain uses of reduplication. These examples are not marked by numbers referring to the book and page.

The English meanings of the words are taken from *Kriyāviṇ taṅkālat tamil akarāti* by Annamalai et al. (2006), DEDR or from Tamil Lexicon if not specified otherwise. I present only the meanings relevant to the item unless other meanings of the given word are important to illustrate its semantic relatedness or broadness. Mostly I have transcribed the colloquial forms of the words in standard Tamil in case of examples. Only the expressions that are typical of spoken Tamil are left in their colloquial form. The sentences that illustrate uses of reduplication are left in the form in which they can be found in the original text.

0.3 Some basic terms

Reduplication can be defined as a process, by which all or part of a form is doubled. Reduplication is predominantly used to convey a grammatical function, such as iteration, plurality, distribution, collectivity, continuative, imperfective, etc., but it can also be used to create new words or expressions, e.g. *tukak* "frog" → *tukaktukak* "wart" (Collins, Collins and Hashim 2001 quoted in Rubino 2005, p. 21). Reduplication is often, but not exclusively, iconic in meaning. It can have some emotional load and that is why speakers use it when they adopt more expressive or figurative tone.³

Reduplicative constructions consist of the **base** and the **reduplicant**. The base is the initial segment, which is copied; the reduplicant is the reduplicated element. Not always can we determine what is base and what is reduplicant. For example the onomatopoeic words in Tamil (*kaṭakaṭavenru*, *maḷamaḷavenru* etc.), where the unreduplicated forms are often not possible, can hardly be segmented into base and reduplicant. The reduplicant, and sometimes even the base, can be considered a bound

³ For an overview of basic forms and functions of reduplicative constructions see for example Rubino (2005).

word as it does not exist by itself, i.e. it appears only in the connection with the other part (base or reduplicant). Rarely both parts are bound words and they occur only together with some another segment, e.g. the quotative word *enru* in case of the above mentioned onomatopoeic words in Tamil. The base is usually copied only once but examples of triplication can also occur, e.g. in Mokilese: *soang* "tight" → *soangsoang* "being tight" → *soangsoangsoang* "still tight" (Harrison 1973, p. 426).

Reduplication can be either **complete** (**full** and **total** are another widespread terms) or **partial**. By complete reduplication I understand reduplication of an element in the identical form, i.e. the base and the reduplicant are completely the same. In partial reduplication only a part of the base is copied or the form of the reduplicant is altered and differs from the form of the base.

Most frequently the reduplicant follows the base. In that case we talk about **progressive** reduplication. Examples of **regressive** reduplication, i.e. the reduplicant precedes the base, are not very frequent but can be found. In Tamil regressive reduplication is represented by the false echo words where the reduplicant is created from the base by alternation of the first syllable and (frequently, but not always) put in front of the base, e.g. *akkam pakkam* "neighbourhood, vicinity" < *pakkam* "side," *icaku picaku* "improperly" < *picaku* "mistake."

If the constituents of an RC are separated by some intervening morpheme we talk about **discontinuous reduplication**. The intervening segment is usually a suffix added to the first member of the pair of, a prefix added to the second member of the pair or particles of various kind, most often connecting particles (*-um* in case of Tamil) or some emphatic particle (*-ē, tāṅ* in Tamil). Inkelas and Zoll (2005, pp. 36–41) talk also about so-called "empty morphs" that have the function of linking the two constituents but do not contribute any specific meaning to the construction. The possibility that the intervening segment is a fully lexical word seems minimal but cannot be altogether excluded.⁴

In a limited number of cases the constituents of the pair may be derived from the identical lexical root but they may differ in the form they acquire in RC. In that case we talk about **reduplication with divergent allomorphy**. For example in Tamil the pair *vantālum varuvāṅ* "he may come" consists of two verbal forms one of which is in the form of concessive and the other is a finite form. The examples that consist of a non-finite and finite verbal form are understandable as there seems to be a restraint on reduplication of finite forms (see further). Divergent allomorphy in reduplication is attested also in other languages, for example in Chechen (Conathan and Good 2000, p. 50, quoted in Inkelas and Zoll 2005, p. 9):

⁴ Inkelas and Zoll (2005, p. 3 and p. 5) present an example from Hebrew and a few examples from Fongbe where a sequence of two verb forms is separated by an inserted noun, e.g.:

sisa~sí wē, Kákú sísa. (It is tremble that Koku did.)
tremble it.is Koku **tremble**

It should, however, be still clarified what function this "doubling" has, how it differs from simple construction, and whether we can really talk about reduplication in the right sense of the word.

1) Ahmad, [ʕa =ʔa ʕiina]_{VP}, dʕa-vaghara

Ahmad [**stay**.**INF** -& **stay**.**PP**]_{VP} DX.V.go.WP

Ahmad stayed (for a while) and left.

An extreme case are pairs, which consist of two forms derived from the same lexical root, one of which is for example a noun and the other a verb or adjective. Such pairs are sometimes called *figura etymologica* and their classification is precarious. Here again some cross-linguistic comparison is needed. In the end I classified these pairs as a kind of repetition for their possibly discontinuous character and other symptoms outlined in the section (**1.**).

1. REPETITION AND REDUPLICATION

Before we start to deal with RCs it is important to distinguish reduplication from another closely related phenomenon, i.e. repetition. Repetition is a very basic quantitative means of expression that can often be distinguished from reduplication only with difficulties as there is not always sharp border between them. It is especially repetition and reduplication of the same word that makes the whole thing problematic. Even other authors do not bring any exact differentiation and usually interchange both terms freely or define them only very loosely. For example Bhaskararao (1977, p. 1) says: "In a conversation or a speech it is common to repeat certain sentences or phrases to bring in special emphasis or to call for attention etc. Besides such a repetition, repetition of nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs is possible signifying a meaning of generality, extension, distributive or repeated action etc. These types of repetitions [...are] called reduplication." Others are more concrete and bring forward at least the most important distinctions in terms of prosody, morphology, semantics (Thun 1963, pp. 26–27) and also pragmatics (Uhlenbeck 1978, pp. 89–90, and especially Gil 2005).

To acquire more tangible conclusions it is important to go through a large corpus of texts as well as records of conversation. Cross-linguistic comparison is also unavoidable in this respect. Such a study is to my knowledge not yet available even though a few case studies are at hand. Based on them as well as on material drawn from Tamil texts I will try to outline at least the most important differences in this very fuzzy area.

From the formal point of view reduplication can be understood as a sequence of two elements that can have an identical form but this identity of form is by no means obligatory. The term indicates that one element is from some aspect like another element or nearly so. My definition of reduplication is quite broad and it includes not only "doubling" of morphemes, words or phrases but also "doubling" of meaning and phonetic structure of the base. Some further segments can be added, usually, to the second member of the pair. There are also cases where a different suffix is added to both members of the pair respectively and it is these examples (compare examples 126–129) that are very close to repetition and lay on the border between the two.

Repetition on the other hand relates to words and elements larger than words. A special case is repetition of meaning by different forms on the word level (2) and on the sentence level (3):

2) "**God he** knows what I shall do."

3) "**The Syrians are a complete nation, standing by itself. And the Syrian nation is not a part of the Arab nation.**" (Koch, 1983b, p. 52)

We can see that the words in (2) are repeated for syntactic reasons while in (3) for semantic reasons. Differentiation between repetition and reduplication on the phrase and sentence level is very treacherous and maybe impossible.

Very important criterion for distinguishing between the two phenomena is the possibility to insert between the constituents of the pair any larger lexical unit, i.e. full lexical word. In case of repetition some intervening elements longer than an affix or a particle (4) can be inserted between the repeated words, which does not seem possible in case of reduplication:

4) *īṅitu īṅitu, ēkāntam īṅitu* [...] 44/71

Sweet, sweet, solitude is (so) sweet.

Equally important seems to be the fact that while reduplication usually consists of two constituents, in case of simple repetition the number of copies of the particular element is practically unlimited. The typical example is calling out of vendors at markets.

Further differences lay in the sphere of meaning and the context in which repetition and reduplication are used. I assume that repetition is used predominantly in the spoken language in dialogues as the speakers by means of repetition of certain words or phrases make their conversation clearer. The main function of repetition is that of emphasis which includes a lot of subtle nuances of meaning. Israeli 1997 rightly argues that the main role of repetition (even though she talks about *syntactic reduplication*) is to establish social relations between the speakers. She talks about "cooperative principle device." The term "cooperative principle" was introduced by Paul Grice who defines it as follows: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice 1975, p. 45). Similarly Deborah Tannen in her interesting article (1987, p. 601) says that: "Sentences and parts of sentences do not occur in isolation: rather, they echo each other in a 'tenacious array of cohesive grammatical forms and semantic values,' and intertwine in a 'network of multifarious compelling affinities.' [...] repetition in conversation can be relatively automatic – and its automaticity contributes to its functions in production, comprehension, connection and interaction. These dimensions operate simultaneously to create coherence in discourse as it builds on interpersonal involvement. Simply put, repetition is a resource by which conversationalists together create a discourse, a relationship, and a world."

By means of repetition of certain words speakers can express their support, promise, permission, reassurance, commands, insistence towards the other speaker or contradiction, disapproval or irrelevance of the item in question (notice that all repeated verbs are finite forms forming very short sentences):

Expression of probability:

5) *oṭaṇē cāmiyārum cērippuḷla tāṇē; ceñcuruppa ceñcuruppa ṇṇu coṇṇāru.* 32/28

Immediately even the priest said: A girl from the slum? **She might have done, she might have done it.**

Expression of permission:

6) "*paṭikkaṭṭum, paṭikkaṭṭum, yāru ippa avaṇa maṛaccikkiṭṭu nikkirāka.*" 52/168

"Let him study, let him study. Who is going to impede him now."

Expression of command:

7) "*oṭu. oṭu. cīkkiram.*" 18/162

"Run. Run. Hurry."

Expression of disapproval:

8) "*eṇṇa coṇṇa...? eṇṇa coṇṇa...? varavara mariyātaiyē illāmē pōkutē...*" 54/460

"What are you saying...? What are you saying...? You are gradually losing respect..."

Expression of assurance:

9) "*oru nimiṣam, oru nimiṣam,*" *eṇṇu oru kural kēṭṭatu.* 2/122

"Just a minute, just a minute (I'll be right there).," someone's voice said.

Besides establishing relations in conversation repetition can be used in the prose style to deliver sense of urgency, wish etc.:

10) *āmpalaippillai, āmpalaippillai ṇṇu orē naccarippu.* 50/166

Constant badgering, **"A boy, a boy."** (Said by a person who strongly wishes a man child)

Very important function of repetition is emphasis and persuasion as Koch (1983b) points out. By repeating the same words or sentences the speaker signals that they are words of importance and the listener should pay attention to them. Speakers can also repeat the same words or sentences when they have difficulty to formulate neatly what they have in minds and try to win time before further statement is made. Speakers may also repeat their words to overcome background noise or to achieve turn-taking in a conversation. All such functions are called *communicative reinforcement* by Gil (2005, p. 34).

Israeli is well aware of the fact that the use of repetition is mostly confined to the dialogues. When she comments upon usage of adjectives and adverbs she says: "It [i.e. reduplication] is not triggered by discourse factors or an interlocutor. The meaning of this reduplication is intensification." (Israeli 1997, p. 591). I have already pointed out that what I understand under the term repetition Alina Israeli calls *syntactic reduplication*. She distinguishes this phenomenon from *simple reduplication* (her term) which is called identical word reduplication in my study.

The exact nuances of meaning of repetition can be guessed from the two words only with difficulties as it is strongly conditioned by the context. On the written level it is utterly impossible. On the spoken level the context is also very important but in this case there are other factors that play a crucial role in delivering the final meaning of the utterance. It is suprasegmental features such as tone, stress, intonation, pitch or rhythm of the speech. By means of them the speakers can communicate to their interlocutors all the above given subtle shades of meaning. Based on intonation one and the same phrase can acquire a lot of different meanings. For example the words "I am coming, I am coming," can be interpreted as assurance, promise, intimidation, expression of support and possibly many others. In case of repetition different intonation patterns can be encountered while only one pattern of intonation seems plausible in case of reduplication. Very important factor is a pause which we can suppose in case of repetition while excluded for reduplication. Suprasegmental features are thus main factors, and indeed in many cases the only possible means of differentiation between repetition and reduplication.

Reduplication on the other hand is used not only in the dialogues but also in the prose and literary language as it conveys a lot of other more general functions that can be achieved independently of whether it is a direct speech or not. I assume that reduplicative constructions have undergone certain process of grammaticalization. They appear in patterns and accomplish a set of meanings that are deducible from their form. It can be said that functionally, RCs form a whole while repetition is a succession of two words between which there is not any relationship.

There also are some syntactic restrictions on the usage of reduplication. The most important one is the restriction of reduplication of finite forms. General validity of this rule is still to be determined but it is valid for Tamil and possibly for the whole Indian linguistic area. To my knowledge there are just a few exceptions. Some Austro-Asiatic and Tibeto-Burman languages, namely Khasi, Gangte and Taizang⁵ employ reduplication of finite forms but as Anvita Abbi (1992, p. 167) suggests "reduplicating the main verb in a sentence is more archaic than verbal adverbs and hence in the process of language evolution it should precede any other verbal reduplication." Reduplication of finite forms can thus be considered a point on the evolution of lexical reduplication from simple repetition (see further).

Reduplication of finite forms seems to be possible also in Telugu. Bhaskararao (1977, p. 5) presents an example *cu:se:nu cu:se:nu* "I continued seeing (or observing, waiting) for sometime" which is a bit problematic as it is isolated from other sentence elements or the context. On the previous page he says that "the non-finite verbs are reduplicated more often than the finite ones" (Ibid., p. 4). In Tamil it is possible to say *pārkkirēṇ, pārkkirēṇ* "I see, I see" but it is an example of simple repetition which is very common in other languages as well. A sentence **nāṇ intap paṭattai niṟaiya nēram pārkkirēṇ, pārkkirēṇ* (lit. I am watching watching at this film for a long time) is ill-formed. On the other

⁵ Cf. Abbi 1990, p. 176 and Abbi 1992, pp. 101–103.

hand I have come across a sentence, where the verb in the form of imperative is repeated to intensify the command:

11) *pantu etaṛkaṭā? aṭaṭā! tāttā mēl paṭap pōkiratu! ataik kaiyil eṭu eṭu!* 44/9

Why are you here with the ball? Watch out! It is going to fall on grandfather. **Do take** it into your hand!

Such constructions are very rare in the written language and based on intonation and evidence given by native speakers I deduce that this is an instance of repetition. Even here certain voice modulation and intonation can express some other nuances of meaning than intensification, for example grievance that the money was not/wil not be sent properly in sentence (10):

12) *avaṇukku vēṇṭiya paṇamellām koṭu koṭu!*

Do give him all the money he needs.

Last but not least instances of reduplication can occur within longer sentences while repetition usually occurs in shorter sentences or it forms an independent sentence by itself. As I have already mentioned repetition is often only a shriek of the speaker who by means of repeating the same words expresses emphasis, concern, fear and so on.

Table 1. Criteria for distinguishing between repetition and reduplication

	Criterion	repetition	reduplication
1.	unit of output	greater than word	equal to or smaller/ <i>bigger</i> than word
2.	communicative reinforcement	present or absent	absent
3.	interpretation	iconic or <i>cooperative</i>	arbitrary or iconic
4.	intonational domain of output	within one or more intonation groups	within one intonation group
5.	contiguity of copies	contiguous or disjoint	contiguous (<i>disjoint by an affix or a particle</i>)
6.	number of copies	two or more	usually two
7.	<i>context</i>	<i>conversation, spoken language</i>	<i>any</i>

The above proposed criteria for distinguishing between repetition and reduplication are summarized in **Table 1**. The Table is taken over from Gil (2005, p. 33) and adjusted by me (italics mine). Gil's article is to my knowledge the most insightful study relating this topic published so far. Though Gil had neatly proposed these distinctive features, he met serious problems when he tried to

apply them to particular examples. The reason is the fuzzy nature of these two phenomena and the merging and overlapping of borderline examples. He presented only a limited number of examples, which he classifies as clear cases of repetition, probable cases of repetition (surprisingly only one example), probable cases of reduplication and clear cases of reduplication. We have no space to follow his argumentation step by step nor can we apply these criteria to each and every type of repetition and reduplication as he did for the number of examples drawn from Tamil texts is very high. Still I tried to stick to these criteria as faithfully as possible when classifying the Tamil examples. It is important to say that I also delimited a great number of examples that lay between "ideal" or prototypical instances of repetition and reduplication. These examples can be found in section (4).

As I have already said more linguistic investigation is needed in this sphere and the above given treatment must not be taken as concluding but only as preliminary. To find sharper borders between the two phenomena will definitely be difficult but it could yield interesting results about the processes that are at work in the language. Some further hints for the differentiation can be found in the following chapters.

2. FROM REPETITION TO REDUPLICATION

It is obvious that a mere repetition of certain words can express a lot of nuances of meaning and examples of repetition can be structured from the semantic point of view. Some words are more prone to be repeated or reduplicated than others. By far most frequently repeated and reduplicated words are nouns and verbs even though adjectives and adverbs can be repeated and reduplicated as well. Semantic charge of particular words plays decisive role here. Words referring to emotions, quality and quantity in particular tend to be repeated very often.

I have already mentioned that in case of repetition it is more difficult to guess the exact meaning of the pair as it is strongly conditioned by the context. Reduplication on the other hand has undergone a certain process of grammaticalization and the meaning of the whole construction is more easily deducible from its form. Compare the following constructions derived from the verb *varu-* "to come":

Neutral expression: *varukirēṇ*. "I come."

Repetition: *varukirēṇ, varukirēṇ*. "I will certainly come."

Given the context (and intonation, stress on the spoken level) its meaning can be promise, reassurance, intimidation etc.

Reduplication:

vantu vantū "keep coming" Expresses iteration as in:

nāṇ tāṇ vantū vantū uṇṇe pākkanumā? Do I have to **keep coming** to see you? 8/156

vantu kintu "to come and so forth" Echo word expressing sarcasm as in:

avaṇ vantū kintu tolaittu viṭap pokirāṇ. He is going to **come and bother**.

vara vara "as it comes and comes → gradually" Expresses graduality as in:

anta malar vara vara vāṭic curuṅki... That flower **gradually** wilted and shrank. 23/894

varavē varātu "will definitely not come" Expresses certainty as in:

kulāy taṇṇitāṇ iṇimē varavē varātu. The tap water will **definitely not come** from now on. 3/23

vantatum varātatum "no sooner than s.o. come" as in:

vantatum varātatumāy eṅkē pōkirāy? Where are you going **no sooner than you came**? 24/18

vantālum varuvā! "she might come" Expresses probability as in:

ava! vantālum varuvā! piccai pōṭa. She **might come** to offer alms. 44/194

It is only natural to propose that due to the extensive use of certain repeated words in certain context the whole construction had gradually acquired more general meaning that was subsequently extended to other lexical items of the given language. This process of grammaticalization is outlined in the following chapter.

2.1 Reduplication and grammaticalization

Grammaticalization⁶ is commonly understood as a process by which a lexical unit changes into a grammatical one. It usually affects both the form and the meaning of the unit. Phonologically the unit loses phonological substance and may become an affix. Semantically it loses (part of) its meaning which is often referred to as "semantic bleaching." It is a gradual process with several points and no firm boundaries. In case of nouns it starts with a lexical noun, then goes to a relational phrase, to adverb, preposition and may finish as a case affix. In case of verbs it starts with a lexical verb, then can go to a phrase, an auxiliary verb and finish as a tense affix. This progression is called "cline" which Hopper and Traugott (1993, pp. 6–7) define as "a natural pathway along which forms evolve, a kind of linguistic 'slippery slope' which guides the development of forms. [...] it is a continuum: an arrangement of forms along an imaginary line at one end of which is a fuller form of some kind – perhaps lexical and at the opposite end a compacted and reduced form – perhaps grammatical."

They differentiate between **cline of grammaticality**: content item → grammatical word → clitic → inflectional affix; and **cline of lexicality**: syntactic phrase → compound → affix → derivational affix (Ibid., p. 7). They argue that during the process of grammaticalization a unit undergoes loss of its meaning but simultaneously this process involves pragmatic strengthening. For example in case of the English auxiliary *to be going to* the process of grammaticalization involves semantic weakening of the notion of moving, while the original implicatures of intention and futurity are strengthened. It can be said that the meaning of a lexical unit changes from a basic meaning into a more abstract one.

The last important feature of grammaticalized forms is high frequency of their occurrence. This high frequency is caused by the growing number of contexts, in which the grammatical morphemes are used and, as Bybee argues,⁷ it is one of the forces that instigate the changes occurring in grammaticalization.

Similar grammaticalizing process can be supposed also in case of reduplication. This process is more visible in certain types of reduplication (identical word reduplication, which in many languages expresses the meaning of iterative or continuative), while less visible or totally excluded in case of other types, e.g. semantic reduplication, where the result is a collocation or an idiom. In case of semantic

⁶ For the detailed treatment of grammaticalization see for example Hopper and Traugott 1993.

⁷ Cf. Bybee 2007, especially the chapter on the role of frequency in the process of grammaticalization (pp. 336–357).

reduplication we can suppose a kind of lexicalization, which is responsible for creation of new words or expressions. The full grammaticalization has been achieved by (at least some forms) of morphological reduplication, which can be understood as a continuation or later stage of reduplication of identical words.

One of the reasons why I assume that lexical reduplication has undergone certain process of grammaticalization is the impossibility to utter certain sentences without reduplicating particular words. Such sentences would be ungrammatical (13a):

13) *arīkē oru kuḷantaikkuk **kataṛak kataṛa** moṭṭai pōṭṭuk koṇṭiruntārkaḷ.* 47/12

They were shaving a child's head **while it wailed** heartbreakingly.

13a) **arīkē oru kuḷantaikkuk kataṛa moṭṭai pōṭṭuk koṇṭiruntārkaḷ.*

Obligatory reduplication can be found in other languages as well (cf. Koul, s.a., p. 3). Anvita Abbi (1985, p. 169) says: "It was observed that in none of the languages are reduplicative constructions merely an extension of meaning of their non-reduplicated counterparts. 'Intensification,' as was noticed, could also be expressed by a non-reduplicated form plus an intensifier morpheme in almost all the languages discussed. Semantic features other than intensification were almost inexpressible by non-reduplicated constructions. In some languages such replacement did give us 'grammatically correct' strings and in some languages not even this. Khasi, Kharia, Hindi, Punjabi, and Gante rigidly use only reduplicated structures for the appropriate meanings."

As refers to the function of these grammaticalized constructions they are naturally connected mostly with some quantification of the meaning, i.e. iteration, intensification, plurality or distribution, but other functions can be found as well. For example Shibaski (2005) traced grammaticalization of verbs to form adverbials in Japanese. During this process certain verbs undergo phonological change and their occurrence increases.

Further, it seems to be possible to explain at least some forms of morphological reduplication as a reduction of complete reduplication: "The reduplication of the verb stem, as used in the Present and Future Tenses (e.g. *Nan dodoto* "I am sleeping", *rerembu* "stabbing", *kəkəndya* "doing"... *Nan dé dodoto* "I shall be sleeping"), is a contracted form of a primitive, now almost obsolete (sic), Frequentative construction, which would sound like this: *Nan doto doto, rembu rembu, kəndya kəndya... Nan dé doto doto. ...*"⁸ Based on this assumption Bybee et al. (1994, p. 167) assert that partial reduplication is a result of phonological erosion and assimilation of completely reduplicated forms. This supposition is supported by the material from Trukese, where morphological reduplication has evolved from complete reduplication, e.g. *nana* "to chatter" → **nananan* → *nannan* "to chatter";

⁸ Spagnolo 1933, p. 141. I was not able to obtain this book and the quotation is taken over from Bybee et al. 1994, p. 165; all parentheses and square brackets theirs.

rara "to knock down, trample down" → **rararar* → *rarrar* "be tramped down." Goodenough and Sugita (1980, pp. xxiv–xxv) assert that it has provided the model for another pattern of reduplication, i.e. doubling of the first syllable with further doubling of the initial consonant: *fáffátán* "to be accustomed to walk," cf. *fátán* "walk," base form – *fátáne*; *pwúppwúnú* "to treat as a spouse," base form – *pwúnúwa*.

Bybee et al. (1994) further argue that from the semantical point of view the lexical reduplication expresses basic meanings corresponding to its iconic character, for example iterative. The morphological reduplication on the contrary expresses more general meanings and may have a greater variety of uses or functions. They have even tried to chart a cline for grammatical morphemes of reduplication which is based on the meanings expressed by instances of lexical and morphological reduplication in various languages. According to them (Ibid., p. 172) there are two possible ways of development in the initial stages of the grammaticalizing process:

ITERATIVE > CONTINUATIVE > PROGRESSIVE >

IMPERFECTIVE > INTRANSITIVE

ITERATIVE > FREQUENTATIVE > HABITUAL >

Morphological change from the diachronic point of view has not received much attention and the process of reduplication even less. Besides the above mentioned works, there is one monograph dedicated to this subject. It is the work by Mary Niepokuj (1997).⁹ She also understands reduplication as a gradual gramaticalization and evolution from originally compound-like forms to an affix or an affix-like form. She proposes three important stages in the development of reduplication, i.e. complete reduplication, vowel copying reduplication (vowel is copied from the base in the affix) and fixed vowel reduplication (vowel is not copied from the base, there is one universal vowel instead, eg. perfect tense in Greek *graph-* → *gégrapha* "I have written;" *leip-* → *léloipa* "I have left"). The fourth possible stage is gemination of the initial consonant, i.e. maximal reduction of the copied element. Based on material from various languages she argues that systems with fixed-vowel are later developments from vowel-copying systems of reduplication. She asserts (Niepokuj 1997, p. 42) that the reason for such development is "the phonetic drive to have a reduced vowel in the reduplicative affix [...and...] the drive toward morphological regularity, toward characterizing a constant semantic value with a constant phonological form." She also takes notice of consonant-fixed reduplication and reduplication with more fixed segments and applies her findings to the development of verbal reduplication in Indo-European languages.

⁹ In this respect Niepokuj mentions one more work, which, however, did not come to my hands. It is: Heine, Bernd and Reh, Mechthild, 1984, *Grammaticalization and reanalysis in African languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

She concludes (Ibid., p. 215) that: “[...] grammaticalization affects reduplicative affixes in much the same way it affects other affixes; by and large, there do not seem to exist diachronic tendencies which are unique to reduplication, or at the very least, any such tendencies are much weaker than other diachronic forces affecting reduplicative affixes.”

The universality of the proposal relating the development of partial reduplication from complete reduplication can, however, not be overestimated. Probably not all cases of partial reduplication can be explain in this way. Elsewhere it really seems to be a basic derivational process that can coexist with other, fuller forms of reduplication (cf. for example Zarka 2005).

2.2 Borderline examples of patterned repetition

In this section I present examples of repetition that stand somewhere between simple repetition and reduplication. These constructions are structured according to a certain pattern, most of them are iconic in their form and express emphasis or intensity but sometimes other nuances of meaning are also present. They can have some expressive load and express the speaker’s attitude towards the particular action or object and thus stand in contrast to neutral expressions of emphasis or intensity by emphatic particles, quantitative adverbs and so on.

Let me first quote a few examples from Javanese. Uhlenbeck (1978) distinguishes in Javanese between lexical, morphological, compensatory-morphological and syntactic duplication (his terms) on the one hand and simple word repetition on the other. He does not say in detail how syntactic reduplication differs from repetition except for the statement that it is of purely syntactic nature, it has typical intonation and it serves for the contrast of the two parts of the sentence or conveys a kind of concessive meaning (Ibid., p. 95):

14) *kaji-kaji, muṅ saṅḍaṅane*

A hadji, O.K., but only as far as his clothes are concerned!

15) *tanj-tanj, wis ṅjalug sarapan*

Hardly is he awake, and he is already asking for breakfast!

16) *ṅuwun paṅapuntěn-ṅuwun paṅapuntěn, lawoṅ muṅ naṅ lambe wae.*

He asks for forgiveness, but it is merely from his lips, i.e. he does not really mean it

17) *kelar-kelaran, niṅ muṅ saḡsen*

So it is lost, but it is only a penny!

The possibility to say the same sentence without doubling the particular word and preserving the same meaning (with less contrast between the two parts and changed intonation in 18a) speaks for a kind of patterned repetition. Here I am not trying to confuse the readers by term jugglery and hairsplitting efforts, I just wanted to point out how treacherous the classification of some examples can be. In this particular case I am convinced that these examples are closer to repetition than to reduplication, based on description outlined in (1.):

18) *mati-mati, koq dadaqan*

He died, but how fast did he go!

18a) *mati, dadaqan*

He died suddenly.

The following chapters include examples from Tamil, which are arranged from those closer to simple repetition to those closer to reduplication.

2.3 Discontinuous repetition

By discontinuous repetition I understand examples in which the repeated word does not follow immediately the base but the two words are separated by some further material. Discontinuous repetition seems to be more frequent than discontinuous reduplication at least as refers the possibility to insert full lexical word(s). Some of them are one time creations, while others follow certain pattern. Very frequently occurring intervening word in Tamil is the finite verb *pār-* "to look." Besides emphasis, here again some other nuances of meaning are possible. Often a sarcastic overtone is present. For instance example (20) is uttered by a father of a girl whose hand had been asked for by a boy of a lower caste. Such a marriage is implausible and the father is enraged by the proposal as well as by the behaviour of the boy and the girl:

19) *pēy aṭiccitu pēy!* 21/116

A **spirit** has assailed him, a **spirit**!

20) *avaṇṇukkup peṇ vēṇumāmē peṇṇu!* 21/119

A **bride**, he wants a **bride**!

21) *ajakaip pārutā ajakai!* 21/85

Look at that **beauty**, (such) **beauty**!

22) *iva nikya nileyep pāru nilaye.* 21/164
Just look the **way** she stands, the **way**.

23) *eṇakku cipāricāṭā paṇṇarē cipāricu, puḷukuṇip payalē!* 2/95
You want to **recommend** me, to **recommend**, you idiot!

2.4 Repetition and emphasis

When the emphatic particle *-ē* is added to the base of repeated numerals the whole pair acquires the meaning "only *given number*":¹⁰

orē oru only one < *oru* one¹¹

iraṇṭē iraṇṭu just two < *iraṇṭu* two

pattē pattu only ten < *pattu* ten

24) *mēl varicaiyiṇ iraṇṭē iraṇṭu paccaricip paṅka!* 50/160
only two baby teeth of the upper row

25) *iṇṇum nālē nālu nāḷ irukkīratu* 54/567
only four days remain

The emphatic particle *-ē* can be added to other word classes as well, most often to the nouns proper. It emphasizes the meaning of the given word. Notice that the whole construction can be embedded in longer utterances and seem to be a bit different from simple equating sentences of the "Life is life" or "Law is law" type, which I do not consider examples of repetition or reduplication. In these sentences one word is the subject and the other word is predicate. Compare for example a simple equating sentence (26a,b) with the emphatic construction further modified by the relative participle (26). On the other hand certain similarity between these two types of sentences can not be denied as they both are used to convey the meaning of emphasis:

aḷakē aḷaku nothing but beauty < *aḷaku* beauty

pākkīyamē pākkīyam true fate < *pākkīyam* one's good fortune

¹⁰ It is interesting to note that Inkelas and Zoll (2005, pp. 36–37) assume that this emphatic *-ē* is an empty linker morph, which does not contribute any specific meaning to the construction. Its function is very clear when the construction with numerals is compared with the following one. It only shows how dangerous the cross-linguistic work with a lot of data drawn from languages that the authors do not know can sometimes be.

¹¹ The English meanings of the words are taken from Annamalai et al. 2006, DEDR or from *Tamil Lexicon*. Most frequently I have transcribed the colloquial forms of the words in standard Tamil.

26) *ataṅ niṅram māṅrukira aḷakē aḷaku.* 21/7

Nothing but beauty of its changing colours.

26a) *āṅālum caṅṅam caṅṅam allavā?* 22/353

But still, law is law, isn't it?

26b) *capittatu capittākiviṅṅatu.* 50/93

Once cursed is cursed forever.

The emphatic long vowel –ē can be used not only with nouns but also with verbs. In that case it is added to the infinitive of a verb, which is followed by the finite form. It means that the two forms differ from each other. Such constructions express strong emphasis connected with some action or being, i.e. that something definitely does (not) exist, come, happen, get possible and so on. I think that these constructions are of the same nature as their counterparts formed from nouns and there is no reason to call them reduplication as Schiffman did.¹² Compare also the examples without the emphasized word (28a, 32a):

kiṅaiyavē kiṅaiyātu definitely not available < *kiṅai-* be available

irukkavē irukkīratu definitely exists < *iru-* to be

27) *itiḷ pātip paṅam tirumpi varum, pāti tirumpavē tirumpātu.* 54/325.

Half of this money will get back, half will **not definitely get back at all.**

28) *āmām, ataṅkum upāyam irukkavē irukkīratu.* 21/182

Yes, **definitely, there is** a solution even for that.

28a) *āmām, ataṅkum upāyam irukkīratu.*

Yes, there is a solution even for that.

29) *kuḷāy taṅṅitāṅ iṅimē varavē varātu pōl irukku inta viṅṅilē [...]* 3/23

It looks like tap water will **definitely not come** to this house from now on...

Similarly, but less frequently, the emphatic particle *tāṅ* can be used with the infinitive and the non-past finite form of the same verb to convey the meaning of emphasis and certainty:

aṅikkat tāṅ aṅippāṅ he will surely beat you < *aṅi-* to beat

¹² Schiffman uses in connection with these examples the term **emphatic reduplication** (1971, p. 69).

30) *oru nāḷ viṭiyat tāṅ viṭiyum eṅṅa nampikkaiyum illāmal pōkavillai.* 21/99

(She) did not lose the hope that one day a brighter future would surely come. (lit. **Dawn, it will really dawn** one day)

31) *nāṅ aṅṅāvakkattukkup pōkāmaliṅṅak kūṭātu. pōkat tāṅ pōvēṅ.* 44/47

I cannot not go to my brother's house. **I will surely go.**

The same meaning can be expressed by addition of the suffixes *-āṅa* or *-āvatu*¹³ to the first member of the pair instead of the emphatic *-ē*:

āttiramāṅa āttiram great anger, nothing but anger < *āttiram* anger

32) *karakāṭṭam, vāṅvēṭikka pākka kūṭṭamāṅa kūṭṭam vantiruntuccām.* 52/72

A **big crowd** had allegedly gathered to see the dance and fireworks.

32a) *kastūri pallait tulakkiviṭṭu ṭaiṅiṅ hāḷil nuḷaintāṅ. nalla kūṭṭam.* 35/24

Kasturi brushed his teeth and entered the dining hall. It was crowded.

33) *avaṅṅam oru kutirai iruntatu. kutiraiyāvatu kutirai!* 26/17

He had a horse. **What a** (wonderful) **horse** it was!

Another possibility is the usage of conditional form *eṅṅāl* after the first member of the pair. The pattern of this construction is *X conditional X*, which literally means "if you say X [really] X." The emphatic particle *tāṅ* can be added to the construction:

mūḷi eṅṅāl mūḷi tāṅ < *mūḷi* bare

34) *avaḷ kaiyum kaḷuttum mūḷi eṅṅāl mūḷi tāṅ.* 21/83

Her neck and hands were **bare, simply bare** (She was wearing no ornaments at all).

Sometimes the phrase *appaṭi oru X* can be added to this construction to even intensify the meaning. Then we get the final pattern *X eṅṅāl X appaṭi oru X*, which literally means "if you say X it is really X, such a X it is":

pañcam eṅṅāl pañcam < *pañcam* hunger; which can be further extended to *pañcam eṅṅāl pañcam appaṭi oru pañcam* as in:

¹³ Suffixes *-āka*, *-āy*, *-āṅa* and *-āvatu* are in fact forms of the verb *āku*- "to become" (infinitive, adverbial participle, relative participle and verbal noun). Together with a noun they form an adverbial, adjectival or noun phrase. Due to their extensive use in this function in Tamil I will call them "suffix" for the sake of simplicity while being well aware of their origin and status.

35) *pañcam eṅṅāl pañcam appaṭi oru pañcam. vāyāla collikkāṭṭa muṭiyāta aḷavukkup pañcam.* 18/109

But when I say famine I really mean famine. It was such a **famine** that it cannot be described by words.

Similar pattern, i.e. *X conditional X* plus an emphatic particle can also be used with verbs:

ōṭṭināl ōṭṭinatu tāṅ if she left, she left (nothing can be done about it...) < *ōṭu-* to run

Very interesting example (36) consists of triplicated finite form of the verb *col-* "to say" for the reason of emphasis. The sentence is from a passage where a boy is describing to his friend his future wife. He says that she is very beautiful, smart etc. and this is not only his opinion but even others say and affirm that. Notice that the last two forms are separated by the word *appaṭi* "like that, so" which resembles example (35). These examples are evidently of the same nature and that is why I hesitate to classify them as reduplication:

36) *tāyār, piḷḷai iranṭu pērum collukirārkaḷ, collukirārkaḷ appaṭi collukirārkaḷ.* 44/67

Both mother and child **say the same thing vehemently.**

2.5 Figura etymologica

Very special case in Tamil is the construction where both words are derived from one lexical root, but one word is a noun, while the other word is a verb or some verbal form. They are a kind of tautological expressions that can have some expressive meaning. The expressive character is more obvious in some cases and (almost) missing in others. Some of these pairs seem to be frequent enough to lose it entirely and have become a kind of set expressions.

Similar constructions can be attested in other language families as well. Compare for example these examples from Czech and Russian. They consist of an adjective and a noun and can have both negative and positive connotation:

Cz. *blbec blbá* (foolish fool), *pejsek pejskovitá* (little doggy dog), *lakomec lakomá* (niggardly niggard)

Ru. *чудо чудное* (marvelous marvel), *беда бедная* (miserly misery), *многое множество* (numerous number)

It is a very productive means of expression in Arabic where it is a marked form standing side by side with neutral constructions. Notice that Maas (2005) uses for these expressions the term **syntactic reduplication**. In Tamil these constructions can be divided into three groups from the formal point of view. To evaluate properly their expressive character and possible nuances of meaning

more research with the help of native speakers and comparison of a greater number of examples are needed.

2.5.1 First group

The constructions of the first group are usually patterned (*oru*) + *Xnoun* + *Xverb*, where *oru* means "one." These constructions convey some nuances of the meaning of the verb used, usually they express brisk and short action, but they can also intensify the meaning or have some idiomatic uses and expressive connotations. They are used predominantly in the spoken language and to render properly their meaning into English is rather difficult. For the lack of other means I translate them by means of "a little" but other ways of translation could be employed. Example (43) is particularly noticeable. Here I took over the translation of G. Geetha (Jesudasan 2007, p. 46).

Sometimes other numerals than "one" are used. It is usually the numeral *nālu* with the meaning "four; a few, some." The numerals *iraṇṭu* "two," *nūru* "hundred" and *āyiram* "thousand" have also been attested. Infrequently there are other qualifiers than numerals in front of the noun (42) or no qualifiers at all.

oru kuti kuti- to jump a little < *kuti-* to jump

oru puraṭṭu puraṭṭu- to turn a little, few times < *puraṭṭu-* to turn

oru taḷḷu taḷḷu- to push a little < *taḷḷu-* to push¹⁴

37) *ētō paḷaiya puttakaṇkaḷaiyāvatu oru puraṭṭup puraṭṭalām enṇa enṇam unṭāyirru.* 21/174

She felt like **turning a few pages** of some old books.

38) *ellāraiyum amaitiyāka irukkumpaṭi oru ataṭṭu ataṭṭiṇār.* 18/112

He **shrieked** and made everybody keep quiet.

39) *cikareṭ muṭiyum taruvāyil irunta pōtu oru peru iluppu iluttut tuṇṭaik kilē pōṭṭu aṇaittēṇ.* 2/146

I **took a long drag** from the butt end of the cigarette, threw it down and stubbed it out.

40) *avaṇai miṇṭum iraṇṭu pēr kaḷiyēṭuttu maṇṭaiyil nālu pōṭu pōṭṭāl kūṭac cariyāyirukkum.* 1/114

It would be only to the good if some men **knocked** his head with their clubs.

¹⁴ From the semantical point of view it is interesting to compare these forms with somewhat similar constructions in Czech, which denote a kind of diminutive meaning:

strčít to push → *postrčít* to push a little → *popostrčít* to push just a little

skočít to jump → *poskočít* to jump a little → *poposkočít* to jump just a little

41) *atukku mukattilē pōy muḷikkavē vekkamāy irukku. āyiram neṇeppu neṇaccuk kiṭṭu irukkum.* 48/28
I would be ashamed to look into her eyes. She will **think thousands of thoughts**.

42) *eṇṇum illāta aḷavukku ārōkkiyam kural eṭuttup perum aḷukai aḷutā!* 18/97
Arokkyam raised her voice and cried like never before. (lit. she **cried a big cry**)

We can see that the whole construction mostly intensifies the meaning of the verb. Notice that also other means are used to achieve even better effect, i.e. change of word order:

43) *iñcē pūccak kātīt tontaravācci. ippa oṇṇu tallip pōṭṭēṇ. [...] veṭṭiniyā oru veṭṭu?* 21/51
There are bugs up here. Such a menace! Just now I knocked one down... Did you **serve it a nice strong blow**?

These constructions can also have some idiomatic meaning. I present here a few examples used predominantly by children and semantically connected with the notion of filling one's belly:

oru kaṭṭuk kaṭṭinēṇ I ate to my fill < *kaṭṭu-* to construct build; to bandage; to fasten, tie

oru piṭṭip piṭṭinēṇ I ate to my fill < *piṭṭi-* to catch, hold

oru veṭṭu veṭṭinēṇ I ate to my fill < *veṭṭu-* to cut, chop, slice

2.5.2 Second group

The pairs of the second group are usually patterned *Xnoun+adverbial suffix + Xverb*. It refers to the increased intensity of the action, but it can have some other connotations as well, e.g. a brisk action (47). In Tamil its expressive function is well documented by example (46) where it stands in contrast to neutral expression with a single finite verb. It is clear that the second sentence extends the meaning of the verb and says what kind of laughter it was. Example (42) strongly resembles the first group as it contains emphasized numeral *oru* but here the noun has the adverbial suffix. Notice that the noun can be reduplicated to achieve even better effect (48). In example (49) the constituents of the pair are separated by a whole sentence. This again strongly speaks for classification of these pairs as repetition:

ōṭṭamāka oṭṭu- tu run very fast, hurriedly < *ōṭu-* to run

tutṭiyāyt tutṭi- to tremble enormously by anxiety < *tutṭi-* to be anxious

44) *āṇā cōttukkum paṭikkum naṭayā naṭakkaṇā teruvu tēyramāri.* 18/157

But for her food and for her share she would wear out streets by her **endless walk**.

- 45) *paiyaṅkaḷ colla muṭiyāta ikkaṭṭil māṭṭikkoṇṭatu pōl taviyāyt tavittuk koṇṭiruntaṅar.* 19/44
The boys were **trembling** as if they got entangled in an enormous dilemma.
- 46) *maḷai peytāl coṭṭa coṭṭak kuḷittuviṭṭu eṅṅaiṭ pārttuṭ cirikkum. cirippāyc cirikkum.* 48/33
If it rains it has bath to its heart's content and laughs at me. It **laughs derisively**.
- 47) *kuṭattai orē tūkkākat tūkki iṭuppil vaittuk koṇṭu viṭuviṭu eṅṅu naṅantāḷ.* 21/107
She briskly lifted (Lit. she **lifted the pot by one lift**) the pot to her waist and hurried away.
- 48) "vēṅum, vēṅum" eṅṅu collik koṇṭu **ōṭṭam oṭṭamāy oṭi** [...] 44/79
"I need it, I need it," he cried and **ran speedily away**...
- 49) *anta nāyō kaḷuttait tonikap pōṭṭuk koṇṭu orē oṭṭamāy uyir tappiyatu tampirāṅ puṅṅiyam eṅṅu oṭi viṭṭatu.*
And the dog, it **showed them a clear pair of heels** thanking god for saving its life. 44/65

2.5.3 Third group

The last group consists of two forms derived from the same lexical morpheme, where one form is a relative participle and the second form is a noun. Thus we get the pattern *Xrelative participle + Xnoun*. The participle can be either positive or negative, which results in different meanings. If the participle is negative it emphasizes the meaning of the verb and its function is quite clear, i.e. it is used for intensification of the meaning.

Notice that there are in fact three words derived from the same root in examples (50, 51 and 52). Notice also that in example (53) the two words are separated by the particle *vaṅṅam* with the meaning "as, in the manner of." A very special case is example (54) where actually two same nouns are connected by the relative participle *illāta* "not having":

pēcāta pēccu a big talk < *pēcu-* to talk

ōṭāta oṭṭam a very fast run < *ōṭu-* to run

- 50) *vaḷakkamākaṭ caṅi ṅāyirukaḷil sṭāmpu vēṭṭaikku alaiyāta alaiṅṅal alaiṅṅavan intat taṭavai viṭṭai viṭṭu veliyē talai niṭṭavillai.* 48/52

Normally he **pursued** his stamp hunt **with great zeal** during weekends but this time he did not show up.

- 51) *kātukaḷ itu varaikkum perrirukkāta pēriṅṅaiṭ perratu pōl kirāṅkiṅa.* 40/100

His ears were stupefied as if they have **never heard anything** like that before.

52) *paṭāta pātu paṭṭu*, *nāṇ cērtta paṇam itu*. 7/883

I struggled a lot and gathered this money. (lit. I **experienced so far unexperienced experience** and ...)

53) *ayyar pallayilittuk koṇṭu avaḷaik keñcāta vaṇṇam keñci* [...] 44/48

Aiyar grinned and **implored her pleadingly**...

54) *avai verum vārtaikaḷtām; āṇāl naṇaṇaṇaveṇṇu collum paṅkaḷiṇṭaiyē oliyillāta oliyāka vantavai pāmpin cīramākap paṭṭatu avaḷukku*. 21/68

They were just words. But they sounded like a snake's hiss to her as they **came in a hushed tone** through clenched teeth.

If the participle is positive it is a bit more difficult to determine the exact meaning of the construction. It seems to have no emotive charge. When it does have some expressive function it is predominantly a negative one, i.e. the action expressed by the verb is done too intensively or only with difficulties:

vāḷnta vāḷvu lived life *vāḷ* < to live

ataṭṭiya ataṭṭu pestered pestering < *ataṭṭu* to say sth. in a sharp tone

55) *āṇāl anta iraṇṭu naparkaḷum tirumpip pōkumpōtu taṅkaḷukku! pārttukkoṇṭa pāṇvaikaḷum ciritta cirippum*
– *appappā!* 21/127

But the way those fellows glanced at each other and **smiled derisively!**

56) *nā maruvātikkāraṇā peḷaikya peḷappaiyā keṭukyē?* 21/100

Are you going to ruin my **livelihood that I struggle for** with respectability?

Similar construction is also possible in case of verbs, where the first form is a negative adverbial participle and the second form is a positive finite form derived from the same lexical morpheme. The whole pair conveys the meaning of something "half done":

57) *nāy tūnkāmal tūnkic cukam kaṇṭu koṇṭiruntatu*. 43/16

The dog was **half asleep** enjoying itself.

58) *ammā iruvarukkumuḷḷa naṭpai tavaṇākap purintu koṇṭirukkīṇāḷ eṇpatai pāṇu kūṇāmal kūṇukīṇāḷ?* 32/121

Or did she want to **imply** that her mother misunderstood the relation that is between them?

2.6 Expression of proximity

Still relatively frequent pattern that can be found in both spoken and literary Tamil is *noun+ōtu noun+āka/-āy* which has the meanings “along with sth.; very close to; as if becoming a sth., one among.” I consider it an example of reduplication as it forms a whole and the two words do not necessarily refer to two or more things but can have only solitary referent as can be clearly seen in examples (59, 61):

cuvarōtu cuvarāka very close to the wall < *cuvar* wall

neñcōtu neñcāka heart to heart < *neñcu* heart

59) *ivvalavu niṇṭa nāṭka/ kaṭṭilōtu kaṭṭilāyk kiṭakka nērum.* 48/30

He will have to stay **bedridden** for so many long days.

60) *iruṇṭa avaṇ mukam iruṭṭōtu iruṭṭāyp piṇṇip piṇainta mātiri iruntatu.* 20/119

His dark face became intertwined **with darkness**.

61) *rāmacāmi kiḷaiyōtu kiḷaiyāyc cērntu maranāy pōl oṭṭik koṇṭāṇ.* 47/34

Ramasami **squeezed up against the branch** as a palm civet.

The suffix *-āka/-āy* might be missing:

62) *talaiyōtu talai vāyōtu vāy vaittu muttamiṭṭu, vayirrai oru taṭṭut taṭṭi [...]* 19/168

Head to head, mouth to mouth, she kissed (me), patted my bell...

The same construction with temporal words means “repeatedly, without stop, all the (specified) time”:

rāttiriyōtu rāttiriyāy night in and night out, all through the night < *rāttiri* night

2.7 Reciprocity

Even though reciprocity in Tamil is sometimes considered as an example of reduplication¹⁵ I again hesitate to include it there for a very simply reason. Constructions that express reciprocity consist of two nouns that usually refer to two objects in certain relation. This relation is on syntactic level expressed by a case suffix plus (in some cases) a postposition (65). This construction is not very distant

¹⁵ Cf. for example Anvita Abbi, 1992, pp. 106–111.

from any construction expressing relation between two different nouns as examples (64a) and (65a) show:

63) *mīṇāvum kastūriyum oruvarai oruvar pārttuk koṇṭārkaḷ*. 35/86

Meena and Kasturi looked at **each other**.

64) *oruttarai oruttar pārttup pēcaṛatē maṛṛavaṇikaḷaippātikkumṇā pārkkāmalē irukkīratutāṇ nallatu*. 54/358

If our looking and speaking to **each other** annoys the others it will be better if we avoid it.

64a) *kumār āyciriyaraip pārttu* [...]

Kumar looked at the teacher...

65) *cila iṭaṅkaḷil inta varṇaṅkaḷ onriṅ mēl onru tiṭappaṭṭirukkīratu*. 5/137

In some places colours were applied **one over another**.

65a) *mēcaiṅ mēl oru puttakam iruntatu*.

There was a book on the table.

2.8 Other sources of origin of reduplicative constructions

We have seen that repetition stood at the origin of many cases of reduplication that refer to the quantity of the object or action. By quantity I understand the expression of plurality, intensity, distribution, iteration, frequency, habituality etc. Such constructions are iconic in their character and the reduplication corresponds to the "quantification" of the meaning in the broad sense of the word. This repetition can gradually grammaticalize and end up as a fully grammatical element as I tried to outline in some of the previous chapters. Based on the contemporary stadium of research it seems to be justifiable to say that the evolution of these RCs is quite straightforward. The link between the form and the meaning of these constructions might decelerate further semantic changes. Mapping of the development of these RCs in greater detail is, however, a task that still needs to be done.

Repetition is, however, by no means the only source of the origin of RCs. There is a great deal of constructions that refer to the quality of the object or action. By quality I understand the expression of the attitude of speakers towards the object or the action, might it be positive or negative, refer to its motion, shape, taste, smell, etc. (for more detailed information on meanings of reduplicative constructions see particular paragraphs on types of reduplication). Here iconicity is less evident even though not totally excluded. These constructions perhaps originate in various sources, namely onomatopoeic words, plays on words, baby talk, nursery rhymes, etc. I assume that in the course of time the pattern of reduplication gets well established in the language and becomes productive. Here

any diachronic treatment is even more problematic as we can only hardly suppose any kind of regular development. Secondly these expressions usually appear only in the spoken language and the chance that they would be found in some old predominantly religious texts is rather low. For the time being let me just outline a few hypothesis. Some more details can be found in particular chapters.

The most conspicuous example are onomatopoeic words. Based on Tamil material we can see that most of the onomatopoeic words are reduplicated and only a small number is non-reduplicated (though they can be reduplicated to express plurality). As far as I could learn, the other languages also prefer reduplicated forms for imitation of sounds. It seems to be only natural to repeat the syllable(s) imitating certain sound, often the sound itself is of such nature that only reduplicated form can imitate it. Some of them can be connected with music – usually imitation of the sound of a musical instrument, e.g. *drnky brnky* or *tydli fidli* in Czech and *twiddle-diddle* or *hurdy-gurdy* in English.

There is another large group of similar constructions that transmit the ways speaker perceive the outer world, i.e. expressives. They can not be connected with any particular sound and refer to a certain feature of an object or the way certain action is done. The association between reduplication and expressives is much more difficult to explain, especially in cases where a particular construction refers to a single rather than repeated action.

Many of these constructions can originate in baby talk. It is a well-known fact that repetition is a basic formative process in the creation of children's first words as it is witnessed in the terms for children's closest relatives or important activities, e.g. *mama, nana, dada, din-din, boo-boo, wee-wee, pee-pee* etc. Notice that all these words are examples of sequences of identical forms. Very active and productive use of reduplication continues also in older age. These words already refer to broader surroundings of children. Renata Blatná (1990, p. 175) presents some nice examples of words in English, Czech and Russian that relate to animals and persons from fairy tales: *cocky-locky, foxy-woxy, goosey-poosey, henny-penny, liony-piony* and *turkey-lurkey* in English; *čertík Bertík, drak Mrak, liška Ryška* in Czech and *Otik-begemotik* or *čížik-pyžik* in Russian. Such words presumably exist in all languages. They are an evidence of playfulness of not only children but also adults as numerous similar examples show (cf. **7.3**).

Mary Niepokuj (1997, pp. 72–73) sees children speech as a possible origin of diminutives that are also often expressed by reduplication. She relates the fact that children often use reduplication with the fact that they often talk about small things. From this association between small size and reduplication could arise usage of reduplicated forms with the meaning of diminutive.

Semantic reduplication can not be seen as only a kind of lexicalization of words with similar meaning. There are definitely other factors that played an important role in establishing this kind of reduplication, namely loan words (see **7.2.4.1**).

As for the origin and classification of the rhyming pairs of the *fuddy-duddy* or *hugger-mugger* type I have enlarged on this point in (**7.3.5**). They belong to the last stage of reduplication process

when speakers already absorbed its pattern. They were originally fully lexical words that have been remodelled to be alike from both phonological and semantic point of view. Sound symbolism, our instinct for rhythm in language, and possibly several other factors might also have played some role in forming these pairs.

We can hypothesize that first there were occasional instances of uses of such pairs and due to their popularity among speakers the pattern of reduplication has been applied to other words as well. The whole idea is nicely summarized by Thun (1983, p. 302): "First, there are the duplications of a very simple type, for instance the repetition of an emotive interjection and the words representing sound and motion. Here there is a form of very concrete symbolism. The second stage would consist of a selective process implying that reduplicatives are more suitable than other words to express certain things and therefore preferred for some purposes. This would account for the spread of reduplication and its establishment as a kind of word-formation. The third stage would imply analogical formation of reduplicatives in sense groups in which they may be said to be 'natural,' the establishment of a pattern, according to which the coining of new expressions could take place. The remodelling of other words into reduplicatives may be taken to prove the strength of the reduplicative type."

Another interesting question is why in some languages is reduplication so productive and employs various forms while in other languages it is only of marginal importance.¹⁶ One of the reasons might be the structure of the language. It seems that reduplication is particularly productive in agglutinative languages. Another reason might be language contact. A very interesting means of expression can easily diffuse within a linguistic area. This would explain great number of reduplicative constructions even in non-agglutinative languages of Indo-European origin within Indian linguistic area. This question is, however, still to be considered.

I admit that this division between qualitative and quantitative constructions is little bit simplistic and there are of course overlapping constructions. Some of the RCs that refer to quality might as well have evolved from complete reduplication after the pattern of reduplication is well established in language. Similar process I propose in case of *malarikamalarika* > *alarikamalarika* (see **7.3.5**). Certain RCs can refer to both quantity and quality of the object. For example echo words refer to set of items, which is expressed iconically by reduplication, these entities are, however, not same or they are of poor quality, which is expressed by the altered initial syllable.

More detailed diachronic treatment as well as cross-linguistic study of reduplication will be possible after we have at our hands very complex and detailed descriptions of RCs in various languages. These descriptions should be based on large corpus of material and focus not only on prototypical examples of reduplication but also on transient examples. Such descriptions can disclose us a lot about the origins, development and function of reduplication.

¹⁶ For the distribution of languages with productive types of reduplication see Rubino (2005).

2.9 Summary

In previous chapters I tried to outline the difference between repetition and reduplication. Instances of repetition and reduplication differ in function and meaning, prosody and context in which they are used. There are, however, not firm boundaries and more research is needed in this respect. There are numerous transient forms that document evolution from loosely connected words to patterned expressions and fully grammaticalized reduplicative constructions. Such constructions are usually iconic in their character and refer to the quantity of the object.

Another large group of RCs refer to the quality of the object or action. Their origin is, however, much more difficult to trace. They might have evolved from various sources after the pattern of reduplication had been well established in the language and became productive.

3. ON THE TYPOLOGY OF REDUPLICATION

The above outlined division into "quantitative" and "qualitative" RCs is only tentative and invented for the sake of showing possible sources of origin of RCs. More elaborated classification of reduplication is needed.

Many linguists have dealt with the problem of reduplication from various points of view. Some of them have focused in their treatments on its functions and ways of usage, others have tried to elucidate its morphemic structure and the ways these forms are, or can be, created. Thus, the designations they use correspond largely to the main focus of their interest and the terminology is therefore unstable and reflects the different attitudes of the particular authors, as well as the wide scope of functions achieved through RCs in various languages. As the meaning or function is not the best starting point for a classification of reduplication, I have decided to divide reduplication into six large groups, according to one simple formal criterion – i.e. what is actually reduplicated. The three conventional groups (even though they might be grouped or named a little differently by various authors) can be extended by three more, which include the reduplication of phrases, or simply a syntactic unit bigger than a word (phrasal reduplication), reduplication of bound words, and those pairs of words that are created for phonetic reasons and are based on the similarity of sounds (echo-type reduplication):

morphological reduplication (the reduplication of a morpheme or part of a word)

bound word reduplication (reduplication of a bound word)

lexical reduplication – the reduplication of a word. It has three major subgroups:

- **identical word** reduplication (the reduplication of a word with no modification of its form)
- **semantic** reduplication (the reduplication of a meaning by way of two phonologically different words)
- **echo-type** reduplication (the reduplication of phonetic structure of a word)

phrasal reduplication (the reduplication of a phrase)¹⁷

It should be stressed again that reduplicative constructions form a continuum with a large number of overlaps and mergers and these six groups can be divided into further subgroups. This is yet another reason why the terminology is so unstable and differs from one author to another. Although we do not want to present here an exhaustive list of all potential designations, it is nevertheless important to point out at least the most important works relating to particular types of reduplication.

¹⁷ A similar classification is outlined by Koch (1983b, p. 52): "To summarize, then, the texts I have examined are characterized by repetition on all levels: phonological, morphological and lexical, syntactic, and semantic. We have seen both repetition of form and repetition of content. The repetition is cohesive, rhythmic, and rhetorical." She talks predominantly about repetition, but she again does not distinguish between repetition and reduplication in the strict sense of the word and numerous examples of reduplication can be found in her article.

The first three groups have been extensively described by many authors and for many languages and they figure in many authors' classifications of reduplication. For morphological reduplication, see for example Victoria Rau 2005; for reduplication of two identical words Anvita Abbi (1980 for Hindi and 1992 for other languages of the Indian subcontinent); for semantic reduplication, Vacek (1989). Steever (1998) refers to the reduplication of two identical words as an iterative compound, Malten (1989) talks about syntactic reduplication. The term syntactic reduplication itself has been employed by several authors in a slightly different sense (cf. Alina Israeli 1997, Mass 2005 and Uhlenbeck 1978).

The **bound word reduplication** includes very special expressions of words, that cannot exist independently and which are appended by a quotative word. It includes the large set of expressives and the small set of colour terms. This group has been created provisionally until the real status of these expressions is ascertained.

The **echo-type reduplication**, seems to have been somewhat disregarded in the past years. It has been dealt with under various names – most frequently as echo words, alternatively semantic reduplication, or it has been neglected altogether with a mere statement that there is a group of rhyming words in a particular language.¹⁸ The reason for this is that echo-type reduplication very often accompanies other kinds of reduplication that are “more obvious.” Often, it is an instrument or process accompanying semantic reduplication, which led the authors to classify the examples differently, or they considered them simply as one of the expressive means of language, without giving them any special name.

The problem had attracted much more attention in the first years of the 20th century, during the great era of comparative Indo-European phonology when the sound change was much debated topic. Conspicuous phonetic similarity of two words forming a pair was discussed under various names, e.g. assimilation/dissimilation, contamination or rhyme. For a short overview of the discussion see Thun (1963, especially pp. 275–282). A thorough description of what I call echo-type reduplication reveals interesting data, not only for a better understanding of a particular language but also of the functioning of language in general. It clearly shows that reduplication can be delimited at the very least as an important word-formative process. I have decided to coin this new term, i.e. echo-type reduplication for the lack of any better term. I was considering also the term phonetic reduplication, which, however, does not do justice to the phenomenon any better. I leave the term echo-type reduplication only as provisional.

¹⁸ For echo-type reduplication in European languages, see especially the monograph by Thun 1963, which also lists other types of reduplication in English and is very extensive. A lot of space is dedicated to the question of rhyme and alliteration. Very nice treatment close to my views can be found in Marchand 1969, pp. 429–439. The treatment is supplemented with examples from English. Further, there is an article by Morawski 1927, which presents a lot of very nice examples of rhyming formulas plus their description in Spanish. For Czech and Russian, see for example Blatná 1990.

The term **phrasal reduplication** is also relatively new. Recently, it was used by Elinor Keane (2004) and the problem of the reduplication of a unit larger than the word has been dealt with in several other articles (cf. Lidz 2000 or Fitzpatrick-Cole 1996). Phrasal reduplication is only a logical extension of lexical reduplication applied to phrases or clauses. We can say that the main features of its three subgroups gain ground in case of longer utterances that exceed the word. Morphological reduplication is logically excluded here as it refers to reduplication of a morpheme or part of a word.

4. REDUPLICATION IN TAMIL

Reduplication is a very frequent phenomenon and can be considered a language universal (cf. Moravcsik 1978). Of course, not all the types of reduplication occur in all languages. There are languages that are very rich in reduplicative constructions, e.g. the languages of the Indian subcontinent or the Bantu languages, a number of Altaic languages etc.; in some other languages reduplication is rather marginal and its objectives are conveyed by some other means (e.g. diminutives etc.). Tamil is very rich in reduplication and uses all six types of reduplication as described above:

Morphological reduplication: *ovvonru* one by one < *oru* one
vevveru various < *veru* different

Bound word reduplication: *kaṭakaṭaveṇal* clattering, rattling, rumbling, clicking
kaṇṇaṅkarēṇal in a jet-black manner

Lexical reduplication

- **identical word reduplication:** *avacara avacaramāka* in a great haste < *avacaram* haste
tēmpit tēmpi aḷutā She wept while sobbing again and again. < *tēmpu-* to sob
teruvukkuṭ teru from street to street < *teru* street
- **semantic reduplication:** *parantu viri-* < (to be spread out + to expand, spread out)
utavi ottācai < (aid, help, assistance + aid, help, assistance)
alaintu tiri- < (to go to and fro, to roam + to walk about, wander)
- **echo-type reduplication:**
aṭakkam oṭukkamāka being humble or modest < (humility, submission, subordination + self-control)
kōṇal māṇal unevenness < (*kōṇal* being crooked, bent, askew + *māṇal* has no meaning by itself)
mēcai kīcai tables and the like < (*mēcai* table + *kīcai* an echo word created from *mēcai*)

Phrasal reduplication:

āḷ māṛri āḷ māṛri kāvaliruppārka! They took turns in guarding. < *āḷ māṛru-* man change
(lit. People changed people changed guarding).
nalla paiyaṅ killa paiyaṅ good boy and so forth < (*nalla* good; *paiyaṅ* boy)

A detailed description of all six groups of reduplication in Tamil, together with all subgroups and overlaps follow in the next sections.

5. MORPHOLOGICAL REDUPLICATION

I define morphological reduplication as a reduplication of a morpheme or a part of a word. Morphological reduplication has been described for a lot of languages where it can have numerous functions. In Yami (Philippine languages) partial reduplication can be used to express for example attenuation *vongtot* "a smell of rotten food" → *mala-vo-vongtot* "smell a little like rotten food"; imperfective *vekeh* "swell" → *mi-ve-vekeh* "swelling"; distributivity *vekeh* "swell" → *mika-veke-vekeh* "full of lumps all over"; collectivity *toing* "spread a disease" → *maka-to-toing* "contagious"; continuation *lingay* "to turn one's head to look" → *ipi-ling-lingay* "take someone sightseeing" and several other meanings (see Rau 2005). In some cases it can be considered a continuation of lexical reduplication, or say fully grammaticalized instances of reduplication as I have shown in one of the previous paragraphs (see 2.1).

In Tamil, morphological reduplication can roughly be divided into following three groups.

5.1 Numerals

The first and smallest group are **numerals** plus possibly a few other words. This way reduplicated numerals have distributive meaning and even here the possibility that they are in fact a reduced form of originally completely reduplicated words can not be altogether excluded:

ovvōṅṅru one by one < *ōṅṅru* one
īrirāṅṅtu two by two < *iraṅṅtu* two
mummūṅṅru by threes < *mūṅṅru* three
nannāṅṅku by fours < *nāṅṅku* four
aiyaintu by fives < *aintu* five
avvāru by sixes < *āru* six
evvēḷu by sevens < *ēḷu* seven
evvēṭṭu by eights < *eṭṭu* eight

66) *cila iṭaṅkaḷil mummūṅṅru paṅkaḷum muḷaittiruntaṅa*. 46/18

In some places (of the mouth) the teeth grew even **by threes**.

A few examples other than numerals could be stated, their number is, however, much limited:

vevvēru various < *vēru* different

5.2 Interjections

Interjections in Tamil are a class or particles that express emotional reaction to the world. Many of the interjections also involve reduplication but there is usually not much difference between reduplicated and non-reduplicated forms in meaning. I present here only a few of them:

aṭā > *aṭaṭā* particle used at the beginning of a sentence to express one's surprise, regret, etc.

aṭē > *aṭēṭē* particle used at the beginning of a sentence to express surprise

aiyō > *aiyaiyō* particle used for expressing shock, fear, grief, outrage, etc.

cē > *cēccē* particle used to express contempt, anger, resentment, etc.

Interjections can be even triplicated or multiplied:

67) **aṭēṭēṭē!** *em makaḷukku āce oṇṇuṇi kāṭṭalēṭā?* 21/170

What! You did not my daughter the glad eye?

68) **aṭaṭaṭaṭa!** *eṇṇa varavēṛppu, eṇṇa varavēṛppu?* 49/82

Oh! What a welcome!

5.3 Intensives

Beisedes reduplication of their full form, a few words can reduplicate only its part – usually the stem, which can be changed morphologically. It results in intensification of their meaning. It is a limited set of words. As I have not been able to find any better designation I call them in accordance with Emeneau (1987) intensives:

cirrañcīru very small < *cīru* small DEDR 1594

ciṇṇaṇcīriya very small < *ciṇṇa* small, little, inferior, mean, low, young DEDR 2594 + *cīru* small DEDR 1594 (here the meaning is intensified by combination of two related words)

taṇṇantaṇiyē (adv.) quite alone, in absolute solitude < *taṇi* singleness; solitude DEDR 3196

neṭṭaneṭiya very long, excessively long < *neṭu* to be long DEDR 3738 (appears also as a reduplicated noun: *neṭṭa*)

neṭumai great length, excessive tallness or height; and a form which seems to be more frequent in modern Tamil:

nīṇṭa neṭiya very long in space and time)

peṇṇamperiya very large < *peru* great DEDR 4411

puttamputiya brand new < *putu*, *putiya* new DEDR 4275

punṇampulari early dawn < *pulari* dawn DEDR 4305

As for the forms *ciṅṅaṅciṅriya*, *peṅṅamperiya*, *puṅṅampulari* and also the colour term *kaṅṅamkariya* (see 6.2) it seems probable that there had been an adverbial suffix *-ṅṅam* which has stopped to be used and which is preserved only in these words (see also Beythan 1943, p. 174). As for the forms *neṅṅaneṅiya*, *taṅṅantaṅi* and *puttamputiya* Zvelebil (1955, p. 456) explains doubling of the consonant by means of phonetic rules that require doubling of the single consonant of a word base followed by another word. Very similar process we can see also in the case of nouns. Number of examples is, however, much smaller:

naṅṅa naṅṅu the very middle < *naṅṅu* middle, centre

veṅṅaveṅṅitu absolute worthlessness < *veṅṅitu* emptiness < *veṅṅu-mai* emptiness

But mere repetition is also possible in this case:

naṅṅu naṅṅuvil in the very middle

Sometimes the same effect is achieved by juxtaposition of two synonymous¹⁹ words:

tolai tūram long distance; remote place < (distance + Skt. *dūra-* remoteness, distance)

naṅṅu mattiyam the very middle/centre < (middle, centre + Skt. *madhya-* middle)

naṅṅu ceṅṅar the very middle < (middle, centre + Eng. centre)

By reduplication of a part of the word the meaning can be intensified even in case of verbs. Only a few examples can be given:

kaṅṅukaṅṅu- to become very black < *kaṅṅu-* to grow black, darken

kuṅṅakkuṅṅi- to be intensely cool and refreshing < *kuṅṅi-* to feel cold, chilly; to be cool, refreshing

naṅṅunaṅṅunku- to tremble greatly, quake with fear < *naṅṅunku-* to shake, shiver, quiver; to tremble through fear

tuṅṅituṅṅi- to be in a great flurry; to fret and fume < *tuṅṅi-* to quiver, tremble, throb, palpitate; to be in a great flurry or agitation

veṅṅaviṅṅar- to become very white < *viṅṅar-* to become white or pale

Worthnoticing examples are:

neṅṅuneṅṅu- / neṅṅuneṅṅuku- to be very long, tall or high < *neṅṅu-* to be long; to become tall

viṅṅiviti- to throb, flutter, quiver with intensity of feeling, to be tremulous < *viṅṅi-* to tremble quiver

¹⁹ I use the words *synonyms* or *synonymous* in a non-technical sense in the study and usually mean descriptive synonyms as explained in (7.2.2).

There are also the expressives *vitirkkuvitirkkeṇal* expr. of "trepidation" and *neṭuneṭeṇal* expr. signifying "tall growth" which seem to lack the notion of intensity. Now the question arises whether it is only an omission of the compilers of the Tamil Lexicon or whether we can consider the morphological process of intensives a bit different from that of expressives (for expressives see 6.1). The latter seems to be the right one as there is a large number of reduplicated expressives which do not signify any intensity of the action but say rather its plurality.

There are also expressions *circila* and *paṛpala* which consist of the base *pal-*, *cil-* and the full adjective *pala* and *cila*. Here intensification is not that obvious but they seem to be formed on the same pattern as the above given words:

circila slight or minor < *cil* some, few, small, slight DEDR 1571

paṛpala many; different, various < *pala* many several, diverse DEDR 3987

Semantically intensives in Tamil can be compared with the similar type in Slavic languages, e.g. *pouhopouhý* "just mere" (lit. merely mere) and *koneckonců* "after all, ultimately" (lit. in the end of ends) in Czech or *давным-давно* "very long time ago" (lit. pastly past) and *белый-бело* "very white" (lit. whitely white) in Russian.

5.4 Summary

We have seen that in Tamil morphological reduplication is not very productive. It consists of a limited set of words, which can be arranged into three groups, i.e. numerals, interjections and intensives.

6. BOUND WORD REDUPLICATION

A very special case is bound word reduplication, which stands somewhere between morphological and lexical reduplication. It consists of a large group of expressives and a subset of colour terms. These words do not occur independently, only in combination with the quotative word *enru*, which is an adverbial participle of the verb *en-* "to say." Occasionally other verbal forms of this verb can be used, e.g. the infinitive *ena*, relative participle *enra*, etc. This implies that the preceding words are not morphemes and the forms of the verb *en-* are not suffixes. Rather these reduplicated words resemble object complement. The impossibility to occur independently and the presence of the verbal form makes these expression very special and that is the reason why I have decided to classify them separately before their status is clarified. Some hints can be found in the following chapters.

6.1 Expressives

In general **expressives** is a term for (often reduplicated) structures that give expression to a psychological state of the speaker, i.e. the way he reflects the outer world (see e.g. Diffloth 1976). The meaning can be related to a sound or some other sensory feeling as taste, touch, smell, motion and sight.

Expressives attempt to transmit a sensation directly through the language. Their conspicuous phonological structure which often violates the rules of phonotactics of the given language contributes to their expressive value. Sometimes it is a close representation of a sound they denote. Annamalai (1968)²⁰ and Morin (1972) explain these violations of phonotactic rules by expressives as a resistance to historical sound changes as it would destroy their onomatopoeic value. It is perfectly true but not all transgressions of phonotactics in Tamil can be explained in terms of resistance to historical process in the language. Right on the contrary, there are a lot of expressives that begin with a retroflex sound or end in a stop or geminate, which is otherwise impossible with native Tamil words. Emeneau and Hart (1993, pp. 75 and 82) assume that these voiced stops in initial position can be reconstructed for South-Dravidian and even for Proto-Dravidian. The conspicuous phonological form is a representation of the expressive character and can be considered a typical feature of these words (cf. for example Bartens 2000, pp. 14–19; Samarin 1970, p. 160).²¹ Another typical feature of expressives is the impossibility to be negated which is probably caused by their close relationship with reality they describe.

As refers to terminology here again it is very unstable and several other designations than expressives have appeared. Some of them are connected with a specific area, e.g. the term

²⁰ Annamalai deals only with the Proto-Dravidian **k-* which before front vowels develops into *c-* in Tamil, Malayam and Telugu. This change, however, does not occur with expressives. Annamalai does not enquire into the functions of expressives, nor does he elaborate on reasons that stand behind this resistance to sound change.

²¹ Nice treatment of the relation between the onomatopoeic words and the sounds they represent can be found in Bhaskararao (1977).

ideophones (see for example Samarin 1971) is used predominantly in connection with African languages. Other terms are motivated by the function of these words. Very frequent term is **onomatopoeia** (see for example Emeneau 1969 or Bhaskararao 1977) which refers to words whose phonological form imitates a sound or sound associated with the thing they denote. It is, however, also used as a general term denoting the group of expressions with some expressive meaning not necessarily confined only to sound. Ullmann (1962, p. 84) distinguishes between **primary** (imitation of a sound) and **secondary** (the sounds evoke a movement or some physical or moral quality) onomatopoeia. We can also encounter such terms as **mimic words** (Abbi 1997, p. 696), **sound symbolism** (see e.g. Hinton et al. 1994) or **imitative words** (Pope 1983, p. 197; Haas 1942). In addition to these terms Alena Oberfalzerová (2009) and Veronika Zikmundová (2002) talk about **iconopoeia**, i.e. expressives that refer exclusively to a shape.

The term expressives seems to be relatively new and includes also other more specific structures. In Tamil several authors distinguish between expressives proper and onomatopoeia (compare with primary and secondary onomatopoeia as defined by Ullmann above; I find the term expressives as a general term for the whole group more convenient). Formally it is not possible to draw a sharp line between these two groups and one particular word can belong to both of them:

tokkuttokkeṇal 1. onom. expr. of creaking noise 2. expr. of rocking, unsteady motion.

pakapakaveṇal 1. onom. expr. of crackling of fire 2. expr. signifying burning or smarting sensation of hunger.

kolakoleṇal 1. onom. expr. of gurgling sound 2. expr. of being loose and soft.

Wiltshire (1999) examined their phonological, syntactic and semantic properties and proposes that expressives (including onomatopoeia) form a distinct word class. She argues that expressives can be isolated from other similar reduplicated structures that also bear some expressive meaning such as colour terms, verb reduplication, echo reduplication, interjections and simple non-reduplicated adverbs and adjectives. The criteria that she applied are as follows:

Syntax: 1) must appear with a form of the quotative verb

2) can appear at any major syntactic breaks within the clause it modifies

Phonology: 3) can/must be reduplicated

4) can violate the usual phonotactics

5) altered reduplication suffixes a copy with a change in the first syllable

Semantics: 6) not lexically discrete

7) limited negation

On the whole I agree with her and accept her conclusions that propose expressives as a distinct word class, but I added to this group also colour terms (see further), which differ from

expressives slightly in the sphere of phonology. Formally expressives can roughly be divided into three categories:

A) non-reduplicated

kōveṇal onom. expr. of bewailing; making loud noise

kaṇīreṇal onom. ringing as of a bell, clanging as sounding brass

pakīreṇal expr. signifying the state of being greatly terrified

B) completely reduplicated without any change in their phonetic shape

kaṭakaṭaveṇal onom. clattering, rattling, rumbling, clicking

paḷapaḷaveṇal expr. signifying glittering or bursting sound

C) partly reduplicated with a change in their phonetic shape

kaccuppicceṇal onom. muttering, speaking indistinctly

kōṇāmāṇāveṇal expr. signifying confusion or disorderliness

An absolute majority of expressives begin with a consonant. The large number of non-reduplicated expressives end in a consonant and refer exclusively to a momentary or punctiliar action, while vowel-final expressives can refer to both single or multiple events (Fedson 1981, p. 56). As Fedson further points out (Ibid., p. 55) the consonant-final expressives can be reduplicated to denote repeated action. Hence, the reduplication is clearly iconic and signifies plurality of the event:

69) *avaṇuṭaiya ammā tiṭireṇru irantu viṭṭā*. 5/58

His mother died **suddenly**.

69a) *ippōtellām iravup poḷutukaḷil tiṭirttiṭireṇru vilittukkoḷkirā*. 18/167

These days she **suddenly and frequently** wakes up at nights.

Another interesting feature of reduplicated expressives is a rather low frequency of long vowels. It is difficult to say why expressives containing a long vowel are so rare. Some of the expressives containing short vowel may be both reduplicated and non-reduplicated with no change in meaning (here I rely on TL):

(*paḷiccup*)*paḷicceṇal* expr. signifying flashing, shining, promptness, rapidity or sharp pain.

(*toppuṭ*)*toppeṇal* onom. expr. signifying falling with a thumping noise or sound of falling blows

I have decided to create a separate group for expressives as their inclusion into morphological or lexical reduplication is a bit problematic. There are certain clues that allow us to consider them words (namely treating of certain real words in similar way – see examples 70 and 72), but the impossibility of their usage without the quotative word *eṇru* is one of strong counter arguments. I do not address this question in great detail and provide only several hints for further considerations.

The origin of these expressions is very often unclear (except the onomatopoeia which originated by imitation of a certain sound) and it is difficult to say how they have come into existence. Some of them seem to be derived from fully lexical words. Consider for example the expressive *valuvalenal* expr. of "smoothness; swiftness." It can be connected with the noun *valu* "error, mistake, failure, lapse" and the verb *valukku*- "to slip; to be slippery."²² Other derivatives are:

valuvalu- to slip; to be slippery, smooth or polished

valuvalenal expr. signifying smoothness; swiftness

valavalavenal expr. signifying slipperiness; wishy-washy talk

valavala- to be slippery, be slack; to babble, to wishy-washy in talk²³

Further examples can be:

kolukoluvenal chubby < *kolu*- to grow fat, to be plump

minukkuminukkenal glimmering, flickering < *minukku*- to polish, brighten *minuriku*- to glitter, shine

Sometimes the relationship is not so straightforward, but the expressive can still easily be derived from a fully lexical morpheme. The process the other way round is also possible (notice that one of important features of expressives is to form verbal and nominal derivatives – see further below):

picipicenal expr. moistness; stickiness; drizzling slightly < *pici*- to work with the thumb and fingers in mixing, to knead; to squeeze or mash between the palms, to crush and separate; to rub, as the eyes; to rub or apply on the skin, as soap

mucumucenal onom. expr. of breathing hard, as when intensely at work; panting, as in running < *muccu* respiration, breath

This is a remarkable, eventhough unfrequent expressive:

vetkuvetkenal Expr. of shame < *vetku*- to be ashamed

The last two examples I would like to point out here is reduplication of a noun and a finite verbal form appended with the quotative verb *enru* and used in the same way as expressives. In example (70) we can see that reduplicated noun *mayakkam* "mental delusion, stupor, aberation of mind; giddiness, unconsciousness" is used to form a statement about someone's state:

²² Many more examples could be quoted, which is not done mainly for the reasons of space. For other examples see Tamil Lexicon.

²³ It is interesting to note that there is also the form *viluvienal* expr. signifying "sliminess, slipperiness."

70) *mayakkam mayakkamenru eppōtum paṭuttuk kiṭappāl*. 41/54

She has always been **very feeble** and bedridden.

Another worthnoticing example is the expression *pōtumpōtumeṇal*, which is the reduplication of the finite verb form *pōtum* < *pōtu*- "to be enough, be sufficient." It is one of the words that are very often repeated in the spoken language as in:

71) *pōtum...! pōtum...! vūṭṭula uḷḷa āṭkaḷ ellōrukkum kuḷikkatukku nītāṇ taṇṇi eṛaccuk kuṭukkaṇumā...?* 54/445

Enough...! Enough...! Is it you who has to pump water for bathing for everyone in the house..?

In the following example the reduplicated word *pōtum* plus the quotative word *eṇru* is used in a somewhat adverbial meaning:

72) [...] *ūrpakkam pōy kuḷittuviṭṭu taṇṇīr tūkkivantu cōrākki, kuḷampu vaittu, kītārikku koṭuttu aṇuppuvataṅku!*
avaḷukkup pōtum pōtum eṇru iruntatu. 52/173

She went to the town, bathed, brought water, cooked rice, prepared sauce and gave it to the goatherd. By that time she felt it was too much for her. (lit. It was **enough enough** for her)

In Tamil the quotative verb *eṇ-* to say is used as a complementizer to mark both direct and indirect quotations and to refer to thoughts, feelings and sensations. Here it is used to quote someone's feelings about (in)sufficiency of something, i.e. "she felt it was enough, too much for her."

Tamil Lexicon (p. 2966) also enlists *pōtumpōtāṇal* expr. of "slight deficiency or insufficiency," which consists of one negative and one positive finite form of this verb. Similar examples can be found in (7.1.7) where two imperatives followed by the quotative *eṇ-* are used to express intensity of some action and in (2.5.3) where a positive and a negative form of the same verb was used to intensify the meaning. These examples show how fuzzy the whole area is and how examples overlap and groups merge one with another. Besides prototypical and central constructions there are also a lot of marginal or less prototypical ones.

The number of examples, which can be connected with a lexical morpheme is, however, limited. It is not possible to find a verb *kiṛu-*, *cullu-*, *turu-* or *paka-* which could be connected with *kiṛukiṇṇal*, *culluccuḷḷeṇal*, *turuturuveṇal* and *pakapakaveṇal*.

Expressives cannot be separated as the non-reduplicated form would no longer give any sense. Contrary to almost all other examples of reduplication they do not allow any other material in between, be it a suffix or a particle of any kind. The whole construction thus strongly resembles a single morpheme.

On the other hand at least the vowel-final expressives can form verbal and nominal derivatives, which function as normal nouns and verbs. There is no shift in meaning apparent:

kirukireṇal expr. signifying being giddy, dizzy; moving rapidly
kirukiru-ttal to be giddy, dizzy; to be confounded, confused, disconcerted
kirukiruppu giddiness, dizziness

muṇumuṇuveṇal expr. signifying muttering, mumbling
muṇumuṇu-ttal to mutter, talk in whispers; to mumble
muṇumuṇuppu grumbling, muttering

73) *ētō vāykkullākavē muṇumuṇuveṇru mantiram collikkoṇṭu* [...] 18/170

While **mumbling** some mantram to himself...

74) *pūtaṇ ivan kātil parkaḷaik kaṭittukkoṇṭu muṭumuṭuttāṇ*. 40/119

Pudan **mumbled** something into his ears through his teeth.

These are only a few of specific features, which made me to classify this large group as a separate category. The problem of expressives is much more complex and deserves more space. It would, however, go beyond the scope of this study and that is why I presented here only a short outline of this issue.²⁴

6.2 Colour terms

Another group of expressions that can be enlisted in a separate category along the expressives are colour terms. First notice that colour terms in Tamil can be reduplicated in terms of complete reduplication. The final meaning is that of distribution:

75) *veḷḷai veḷḷai pūkkaḷ aṅkē irukkiṇṇaṇa*.

Here and there there were **white** flowers.

This reduplication has nothing to do with intensity or emphasis here. There is on the other hand a way how to express the notion of intensive blackness, whiteness etc. Tamil language uses special terms that can be grouped together with expressives, but from which they slightly differ. These terms are limited to four colours only, i.e. black, white, green and red.²⁵ The base word is a conventional word, the origin of the reduplicant is difficult to ascertain but it seems to be derived from the same lexical morpheme by some not anymore productive way limited to only a small set of lexical morphemes. From this point of view they somewhat resemble intensives. Colour terms, however, use the quotative word *eṇru* which the intensives do not:

²⁴ For an overview of expressives see Emeneau 1969 or Malten 1989.

²⁵ Arunachalam 1977, p. 3 gives also the term *mañca/macēl* for the yellow colour, but this term is not included in Tamil Lexicon nor could I find it in other sources.

kaṇṇaṅkaṅṅēl eṅru in a jet black manne
cekkacevēl eṅru expr. of being deep red
paccaipacēl eṅru expr. of deep green colour
veḷḷaiveḷēṅru expr. of being exceedingly white

76) *ciṭṭiyuṭaiya veḷḷaiveḷēreṅra caṭṭai avan kaṅkaḷaik kūca vaittatu.* 2/94

Chitti's **bright white** shirt dazzled his eyes.

For white and green colour there are also the following expressives:

veḷveḷuveṅal expr. signifying extreme whiteness; paleness
pacukupacukeṅal expr. signifying green appearance

Besides these forms three other adjectival forms are encountered. The last form is especially worth noticing as it does not appear in TL nor in KTTA:

kaṇṇaṅkariya very black, jet-black
cekkaccivanta to be deep red
paccaip paciya luxuriantly green

77) *ūraic currilum pala mail vistiraṅattukku paccaip paciya nelvayalkaḷ marakata maitāṅamāka virintu kiṭakkum.*

All around the town **bright green** fields of paddy spread like emerald ground to distance of several miles. 43/13

On the etymological level all these forms can easily be connected with *karu-* (DEDR 1278) "black"; *cem-* (DEDR 1931) "red," *pacu-* "green" (DEDR 3821) and *veḷ-* (DEDR 5496) "white." Tamil lexicon says that these colour terms can also be used non-reduplicated. Then the notion of intensity is usually missing:

kaṅṅēl eṅal expr. signifying intense darkness
cevēṅ eṅal expr. denoting redness
pacēṅ eṅal expr. signifying greenness
pacc eṅal expr. of being green or verdant
veḷēṅ eṅal expr. of appearing white; looking pale²⁶

To say more about this limited set of expressions is, however, difficult.

²⁶ Compare these forms with the non-reduplicated expressives, which ending in *-ēl* and *-ēṅ* as in *carēḷeṅal* onom. expr. of "suddenness, haste," *nerēḷeṅal* expr. of "suddenness," *porēḷeṅal*. There are two more similar affixes *-īṅ* and *-āṅ* as in *paḷīṅeṅal* expr. signifying "gleaming, flashing; crashing, cracking, clanging; throbbing, aching," *paṭīṅeṅal* onom. expr. signifying a "sudden crash or explosion," *ṭapāṅeṅal* Onom. expr. signifying "cracking sound" and *maṭāṅeṅal* onom. expr. signifying "crashing noise."

6.3 Summary

Bound word reduplication is an intermediate group standing between morphological and lexical reduplication. These expressions consist of a reduplicated bound word followed by the quotative word. They have several other specific properties, e.g. the expressives violate the usual phonotactics of the language. Their distinct properties and unclear origin made me to classify them provisionally in a separate category until their real status is clarified.

7. LEXICAL REDUPLICATION

Lexical reduplication is by far the most frequent type of reduplication in Tamil. It can be loosely defined as a reduplication of a word. Based on the preservation/modification of the form and the meaning of both members of the pair the examples of lexical reduplication can be classified into three major subgroups: **identical word reduplication** where the form of the word is preserved and by means of which various, mostly grammatical, meanings can be expressed; **semantic reduplication** where the meaning of the word is the same, but the form is changed and by means of which various subtle semantic notions and connotations can be expressed; **echo-type reduplication** where the form is modified while the meaning can be preserved or modified (somewhere the meaning can be understood only in the whole pair as one or both members of the pair do not carry the meaning by themselves). This subtype of reduplication again expresses various semantic notions as well as expressive connotations. All these groups have further subgroups, which are also described in the following sections.

7.1 IDENTICAL WORD REDUPLICATION

Reduplication of a word in the identical form is a very easy way of expressing iteration, graduality, plurality, distributiveness, intensiveness or emphasis as it simply repeats the stressed word. In other languages it can have several other functions and its usage can be very complex and rich as Anvita Abbi (1990 p. 171) points out: "The various reduplicated structures discussed in the paper cover a wide syntactico-semantic range from aspect (simultaneity, continuity, iteration etc.) to modification (diminution, emphasis, accentuation, distribution, manner etc.) as well as perform important syntactic relations such as anaphora manifested in reflexives and reciprocals."

This type of reduplication is very close to repetition from which it has gradually evolved. During this process it has acquired several more general functions, which distinguish it from a mere repetition. Besides semantic and functional grounds it differs from repetition also formally. Contrary to repetition the whole construction cannot be separated by intervening words and if further particles or case endings are added, they are usually added to the second member of the construction only. There are, however, cases where a certain suffix is added to the first member of the construction. In a limited number of examples a different suffix is added to both members of the construction. By means of addition of these morphemes several other nuances of meaning can be expressed. They are instances of less prototypical forms of lexical reduplication.

In Tamil it is verbs, nouns, adverbs, adjectives, pronouns or numerals that can be reduplicated in this way. There are also instances when the whole phrase is reduplicated to produce one of these meanings. Such examples I classify as phrasal reduplication (see **8.**).

7.1.1 Intensification

When the form refers to a feeling, emotion or state of mind, then the reduplication intensifies the meaning of the given word. Verbs, nouns, adjectives or adverbs can be used in this sense. The second member can be appended with adverbial suffixes *-āy* or *-āka*:

peiriya periya very big < *periya* big
putiya putiya brand new < *putiya* new
tayanikit tayaniki with great hesitation < *tayaniku-* to hesitate, delay
poṭip poṭi very small (like dust) < *poṭi* powder, dust
rompa rompa greatly < *rompa* a lot
ācai ācaiyāka eagerly < *ācai* desire, wish
mēlē mēlē upper and upper → more and more < *mēlē* up

78) *ciṅṅap poṅṅu payantu payantu keḷācula pōyi okkāntā*. 31/122

The little girl entered the class **with great fear** and sat down. (lit. feared feared entered the class and sat down)

79) *rompak kūccappaṭṭut tayanikit tayanikit tāṅ uḷḷē pōṅār*. 54/409

He was very shy and went in only **with great hesitation**.

80) *anti nērattil jaṅṅal arukē [...]* **kuñcuk kuñcu tumpikaḷ paṅakkum**. 48/35

Very small dragonflies flew near the window in the evening time.

81) *avaḷ ācai ācaiyāka aisaic cappi uṟiñcu...* 19/115

She sucked the ice cream **with great relish**.

Notice that besides intensification the reduplication of adjectives can also signify plurality of the qualified noun. Its meaning, i.e. plurality, intensification or distribution in time and space (see below) is conditioned by the context and cannot be ascertained purely on the morphological grounds:

82) *ippōtu intac ciṅṅac ciṅṅa viṣayanikaḷ ellām kūṭa veku tūrattil ceṅṅu maraintu koṅṅuviṭṭaṅa*. 54/73

Now even all these **very small** matters have gone away and lost.

83) *lisikkum itaṅāl putup putup poruppukaḷ*. 21/62

That is why there are **many new** duties even for Lizzy.

The intensified verb is usually in the form of adverbial participle. If the subject of the reduplicated verb is other than the subject of the finite verb it takes the form of infinitive:

84) *an̄kē oru kuḷantaikkuk **kataraḷak kataṛa** moṭṭai pōṭṭuk koṇṭiruntārkaḷ.* 47/12

They were shaving a child's head while it wailed heartbreakingly.

7.1.2 Iteration

This most frequently achieved meaning of reduplication refers to repeated or prolonged action (when relating to physical or mental act). To convey this meaning usually verbs in the form of adverbial participle are used. The subject of the finite verb as well as the reduplicated verb is one and the same. The whole construction can be translated into English by "again and again," "repeatedly" or "to keep doing sth." Alternatively reduplicated words with the meaning "again" can be used to convey the same sense (90, 91).

The exact nuance of its meaning should be understood from the context as the examples given below illustrate:

taṭavit taṭavi touching again and again < *taṭavu-* to touch, stroke

vaitu vaitu to keep reproaching < *va-* to reproach

kuṭittuk kuṭittu to drink excessively < *kuṭi-* to drink

85) *pēyi periya nōṭṭula namma pāvatta **eluti eluti** vaccu kaṭavuḷkiṭṭa kāṭṭumām.* 32/80

The devil reportedly **keeps writing** our sins in a big notebook and than he will show it to god.

86) *takappaṇ **kuṭittuk kuṭittē** cettuppōṇāṇ.* 53/138

Father died by **excessive drinking**. (lit. By drinking and drinking he died.)

87) *iṇru pakalellām kāṭṭil **oḷintu oḷintu** vantēṇ.* 23/949

I **kept hiding** in the forest the whole day. (The verb *varu-* to come is in this sentence an auxiliary verb that indicates that the action has been going on for a certain period of time).

88) *ovvōr aṛaiyākap **pukuntu pukuntu** avarkaḷ veḷiyē vantārkaḷ.* 33/61

They **entered** every room and than went out.

Consider the following example. The short sentences say explicitly in what manner the action took place:

89) *niṇru niṇru naṭantāṇ. ciṛitu naṭantu viṭṭu niṇrāṇ. naṭantāṇ. niṇrāṇ.* 48/15

He walked with **occasional stops** here and there. He walked a little and stopped. He walked. He stopped.

The same meaning can also be expressed by reduplication of the word “again”:

90) *taṇ māṭukalaṭi tēṭiya iṭattilelām marupaṭiyum marupaṭiyum tēṭik koṇṭiruntāṇ.* 52/40

He was searching **again and again** in all the places where he had already searched before.

91) *putitāka vāṅki vanta poruḷai miṇṭum miṇṭum pārppāḷ.* 18/146

She looks at newly bought things **again and again**.

Very often reduplicated adverbial participle can be followed by another verb of opposite meaning to convey the notion of an interrupted action:

92) *ēṇ avaṇ mukam ippaṭi avaḷ kaṇ muṇṇē tōṇṇit tōṇṇi maṅaikiratu?* 21/90

Why does his face **keep flashing** in her mind?

(lit. Why does his face in front of her eye appear appear and disappear?)

93) *ṭiyūp laiṭ aṅaintu aṅaintu erintu koṇṭiruntatu.* 54/532

The tube light **kept turning on** and turning out.

94) *māṭu kaṅkaḷai mūṭi mūṭit tiṅantu koṇṭiruntatu.* 54/606

The cow **kept blinking**. (lit. The cow kept closing and opening its eyes.)

If the subject of the finite verb is different than the subject of the reduplicated verbs, then the reduplicated verbs are in the form of infinitive:

95) [*avaṇ*] *viraṭṭa viraṭṭa ataṇ miṭu iṅkaḷ vantu uṭkārntaṅa.* 54/630

He **kept brushing away** flies that came and sat on (his wound).

7.1.3 Graduality

Reduplication of an infinitive can indicate **graduality or progressiveness**. The subject of the reduplicated verb can be different from the subject of the finite verb, which implies that the action was being done on the background of another action, i.e. expresses **simultaneity**:

āka āka as time goes by < *āku-* become

vara vara step by step, gradually < *varu-* to come

vaḷara vaḷara as one grows < *vaḷar-* to grow

viraivāka viraivāka faster and faster < *viraivāka* fast

96) *kūṭṭam cērac cērak kūttāṭikaḷum mēḷakkārarkaḷum uṛcākam koṇṭārkaḷ.* 18/21
As the crowds **grew and grew**, the dancers and drummers felt even more cheerful.

97) *nāḷ cellac cella [...] oru acaṭṭu ācai avaṇ maṇattil utikkat toṭaṅkiyatu.* 21/101
As days passed a foolish desire rose in his mind.

98) *avaḷaip pārkkaḷ pārkka avaṇukku ācaiṅy iruntatu.* 52/24
The more he **watched** her the more he liked her.

99) *avaḷ vaḷara vaḷara viṭṭu vēlaikaḷum vayaḷ vēlaikaḷum atikamākiṅviṭṭatu.* 52/65
As she **grew** there were more and more works at home as well as in the fields.

The same meaning can also be expressed by a noun plus the suffix *-āka*:

vayaṭāka vayaṭāka as one grows older and older < *vayatu* age

100) *avaṇ mukattiṅ toyvu atikamāka atikamāka māris-ṭerisṅsuṭaiya maṇitavataic cupāvam kaṅkāla nāṭkaḷ aḷavukkuc ceṅṅru koṇṭiruntatu.* 1/52

As **more and more** despondency appeared in his face Morris' and Terence's cruelty reached the degree of Stone Age.

Compare the use of the same verb *niṅai-* "to think" in different forms. In the first example the verb is in the form of adverbial participle and its meaning refers to a repeated action being done for some time. In the second example the verb is in the form of infinitive and the meaning refers to gradual process:

101) *antat tavaṅai niṅaittu niṅaittuḷ pattu varaṣamāka varuntik koṇṭirukkireṅ.* 23/809
Thinking of the mistake I have been feeling sorry for ten years.

102) *avaṅaip paṅṅi niṅaikka niṅaikka varuttamākattāṅ iruntatu.* 54/234
The more I **thought** of him the more sorry I felt for him.

7.1.4 Succession, plurality

Great range of meanings can be achieved by reduplication of nouns. When referring to a countable or uncountable entity, the whole construction acquires the meaning "one after another" or "many of the same." Implication of plurality is stronger in some examples, less visible in others. From the semantical point of view many examples are close to pairs expressing distribution and in certain examples it is

difficult to differentiate between the two. Again the suffixes *-āka*, *-āy* and *-āṇa* or the dative suffix *-(u)kku* can be added. While the suffixes *-āka* or *-āy* are added to the second member of the pair, the dative suffix is added to the first one. Such a construction can have the meaning "one after another" or the meaning "each and every" (108):

alai alaiyāka wave after wave < *alai* wave

niṛam niṛamāṇa of different colours < *niṛam* colour

vārtaikku vārttai word after word < *vārttai* word

103) *varakai muṛam muṛamāka aḷḷik kāṛṛil viṭṭaṇar.* 18/34

They gathered the grain and flung into the air, **muram by muram**.

104) *avaṇ tiṇam anta iṛaicit tuṇṭōṭu kōppai kōppaiyākap paccai ṭi kuṭittāṇ.* 5/33

He drank daily a lot (Lit. **cup after cup**) of plain tea with that piece of meat.

105) *kālaiyilum mālaiyilum kūṭṭam kūṭṭamākat teruvil pōkum paḷḷip piḷḷaika!* [...] 54/435

Crowds of school children that pass through the streets in the mornings and evenings...

106) *tiṇucu tiṇucāṇa camaiyal patārṭṭaṅkaḷ eṇṇikkaiyil aṭaṅkātu.* 47/122

One could not count **various** dishes.

107) *nimiṣattiṛku nimiṣam vayiṛṛiliruntu kaṇamāṇa ētō oṇṇu mēl eḷumpi neṅcaik kaṭaintatu.*²⁷ 45/20

Every other minute something heavy rose from the bell and pressed the heart.

108) *marattukku maram kaḷḷaṇiruppatākap payantu* [...] 44/81

Having been afraid that there was a thief behind every tree...

In some cases reduplication of **numerals** is used to express indefinite plurality:

nūru nūru hundreds, good many, masses < *nūru* hundred

āyiram āyiram thousands, good many < *āyiram* thousand

109) *piṛaku āyiram āyiram vēru kāriyaṅkaḷ.* 21/85

Then **thousands** of other matters.

²⁷ Notice that two numerals connected by the dative suffix can convey the idea "completely, maximum of the given number" as in: *ellārukkumē irupatukku irupatu māṛkkutāṇ pōṭṭuruntārām vāṭṭiyāru* 42/87.

The teacher gave repeatedly everyone the full score.

This is clearly not an instance of reduplication as there can be any other number in the second place of the pair to express the idea *x out of x* as in *irupatukku aintu* "five out of twenty."

7.1.5 Distribution

Distributive meaning of reduplication is also a very common feature in Tamil. Reduplicated nouns, pronouns and numerals can convey this meaning:

avaṇṇ avaṇ he and he respectively < *avaṇ* he

eṇṇeṇṇa what everything < *eṇṇa* what all

aintaintu by fives < *aintu* five

tiṇam tiṇam every day < *tiṇam* day

110) *ellārum avaravar aṛaikkū ḍṭiṇārkaḷ*. 5/27

Everyone went to **their** room. (lit. Everyone went to their their room.)

111) *eṇṇakku maṭṭumillē iṇṇum yāryārukku ellāmō teriyum*. 45/152

Not only me, god knows **who** else knows.

112) *kaikaḷilum kālkaḷilum āru āru viralkaḷ*. 46/59

There were **six** fingers **at** his feet and **at** his hands.

113) *antantak kālattilē atate naṭatti vaccaṇam*. 21/100

Things must be done at proper time. (Lit. **That and that** must be done **at that and that** time.)

114) *ataip pārkkavē kūṭātu eṇṇu tiṇam tiṇam caṇkaḷpam ceytu kolvēṇ*. 48/33

Every day I resolve that I will not look at it.

Reduplicated noun with some spatial meaning plus suffix *-āka* can also denote distribution in space. This sense is perfectly represented by *aṇkaṇikē* – here and there, in particular places < *aṇkē* there:

115) *piṛaku tiṭṭut tiṭṭākap peṇkaḷ uṭkārntu pēcik koṇṭiruntaṇar*. 18/25

Afterwards the women sat about **in groups** and chatted.

116) *puḷḷi puḷḷiyākat terinta harikkēṇ laiṭ veḷiccaṇkaḷil cūṭaṭikkum māṭukaḷiṇ niḷaluruvaṇkaḷ acaintaṇa*. 54/644

Shadows of bodies of bullocks threshing paddy shimmered in the **dots** of light of hurricane lamps **scattered** here and there.

Reduplication of words with temporal meaning and connected with the long vowel $-\bar{a}^{28}$ has also distributive function with the meaning "every." Less frequently this long vowel can be added to words referring to a quality where it has the meaning "thoroughly, wholly." In such cases it can be inferred that his long $-\bar{a}$ was originally a negative marker (see 119 and 120). These constructions strongly resemble examples in (2.5.3):

mācā mācam on a monthly basis, every month < *mācam* month
varuṭā varuṭam on a yearly basis, every year < *varuṭam* year

117) *nī campātikkira tokaiyai nānē mācā mācam uṇakkuk koṭuttuṭarēṇ.* 13/28

Every month I will give you the sum that you earn.

118) *varucā varucam ovvoru moṛamākak koṛacikkittē vantā [...]* 18/41

If they keep on giving us one muram less **every year**...

119) [*avar*] *kuṇā kuṇāṅka! piṇṇāl velippaṭum.* 44/70

(His) **thoroughly good qualities** will be revealed later.

120) *paccaip pāmpuka! ilakaḷōṭṭilaikaḷāyk kiṭantu vēṛumaip paṭātu vāḷum ōr aṭarnta viruṭcakam pōla pāpupunṇiyaṅka! pētā pētam iṇṇik kiṭakkum ippāḷulkamiṇ iṇpātika! [...]* 43/215

Like snakes that cannot be seen when hidden in a dense tree, the pleasures of this vile world where sin and virtue mingle together with **no difference altogether**...

7.1.6 Idiomatic meanings

Due to the frequent use some of these pairs have acquired meaning, which can be derived from the meaning of the reduplicated word but which has been slightly extended or modified. Some of them have constraint on the co-occurrence with lexemes and occur only with a limited set of words:

viṭiya viṭiya for a long time, all through the night (lit. until it dawns) < *viṭi-* to dawn (it is clearly idiomatic as it can be used even in daytime)

paṭittup paṭittu (col-) (to tell) repeatedly, over and over < *paṭi-* to read, study

viḷuntu viḷuntu (carry an action) to an excess; enthusiastically; intensely < *viḷu-* to fall

māṛi māṛi one and then the other, alternately; again and again < *māṛu-* to change

tirumpat tirumpa/tirumpit tirumpi again and again < *tirumpu-* to return, go back, turn

²⁸ Similar constructions are frequent in other Indian languages as well (cf. for example Smékal 1979, pp. 45–54 for Hindi).

121) *itu mātiri oru araimaṇi nēram pēcukiratil uḷḷa tīrupti avaṇḍōṭu viṭiya viṭiya uṭkārntu pēciṇālum ērpaṭuvatillai.*
The contentment from talking like this half an hour I would never get even if I sat and talked to him **for hours**. 54/103

122) *vīṭṭukku vanta āṭkaḷai appaṭi vijuntu vijuntu kavaṇikkirārkaḷ.* 54/380
They **intensely** observed the people that entered the house.

7.1.7 Less prototypical and less frequent forms of lexical reduplication

Besides the above given examples there are another three groups of less frequently occurring patterns that can be considered examples of lexical reduplication. The first RC occurs almost exclusively in the spoken language. It indicates zealous or intensive action. As the pattern is *Xverb stem/imperative + Xverb stem/imperative enru Xverb* this RC is strikingly similar to expressives and it seems possible that expressives stood at the origin of this RC as a model. This hypothesis is supported by the borderland example (125, see also examples 70 and 72). The expressive *miṇumiṇu enru* is frequently used with various verbs signifying shining or glittering, e.g. *pirakāci-, joli-, miḷir-* etc. No wonder it appears also with the verb *miṇṇu-* "to shine, glitter, dazzle." I suppose that expressives that consist of a verb derived from the same root (or the other way round) as the reduplicated expressive part of the construction were the model according to which even other lexical verbs have been patterned. It can, however, also be understood idiomatically as "do do *having said* did it," where the reduplicated imperative is used to emphasize the meaning. Nowadays this pattern is productive and basically any verb denoting action can be used in this way:

tētu tētu enru tētu to search with great efforts < *tētu* to search

123) *antap poṇṇa aṭi aṭi ṇṇu aṭicci kayi kālayellām muṇicci koṇṇuṭṭāṇuvo.* 52/73
They **beated** her **up**, broke her hands and legs and killed her.

124) *narapali koṭuttup poṇka vacci sāmiyattūkkinā pārū, mattām nālē maya koṭṭō koṭṭunṇu koṭṭum.* 18/109
Make a blood sacrifice, cook the offerings and take out the god and you will see. The very next day it will **pour down in buckets**.

125) *araḷip pū, maṇṇaḷākac cūriya oḷiyil miṇumiṇu enru miṇṇik koṇṭiruntatu.* 18/140
Yellow oleanders **gleamed and dazzled** in the sunlight.

There are two more constructions that consist of two different forms derived from the same root and can be considered examples of reduplication as they form a unit and have a grammatical meaning. The first RC is used to express probability. The first member of the pair (it is rather difficult to

say what is the base and what is the reduplicant even though the base seems to be the second member of the pair, i.e. the finite form) in the form of concessive is followed by the finite form in the future tense derived from the same lexical root (to express 60% or more certainty, example 117) or the finite form with the modal suffix *-lām* (to express lesser degree of certainty, example 118).²⁹ Lehmann (1989, pp. 377–378) talks about a “special case of reduplication” and brings forward even an example which I have not come across (127). Here the finite form is in the past tense, which expresses disapproval of the speaker with the action referred to by the following sentence:

vantālum varuvāṅ he will probably come *varu-* to come

vantālum varalām he might possibly come *varu-* to come

126) *tōppil taṅṅuṭaiya akkā iruntālum irukkalām eṅṅu niṅaiṭṭē avvāru ceytāl.* 53/109

She did it thinking that her sister **might be** in the grove.

127) *kumār oru putu caṭṭaiyai vāṅkiṅālum vāṅkiṅāṅ. atē caṭṭaiyai avaṅ ipṭōtu tiṅam pōṭukiṅāṅ.*

Kumar has **bought** a new shirt. **But** now he is wearing the same shirt daily.

A special case is a combination of two verbal forms derived from the same lexical root when one form is concessive based on adverbial participle (the connecting particle *-um* is optional) and the second form is a negative verbal noun. This construction conveys the meaning “as soon as, before, not long time after, just a little of”:

128) *kūlu kuṭittum kuṭikkāmalum arakkapparakka vēlaikku oṭuratukkē nēram cariyāp pōkum.* 33/77

As soon as (they) drink a bit of porridge the time to run to work comes.

129) *vantatum varātatumāy enikē pōkiṅāy?* 24/18

Where are you going, **having just arrived?**

7.1.8 Summary

Identical word reduplication is the most frequent type of reduplication in Tamil, which has probably evolved from a simple repetition as numerous transient constructions show. Most of the constructions are well established examples of reduplication that have undergone certain process of grammaticalization and convey some quantitative meaning. Besides these frequently occurring RCs there are also less typical and less frequent constructions which consist of either two identical forms appended with different suffixes or two different forms derived from one lexical root. They express some more specific meanings.

²⁹ For the degree of certainty see Schiffman 1971, p. 67.

7.2 SEMANTIC REDUPLICATION

A special case of lexical reduplication is the reduplication of two phonologically different words with the same meaning. I call this type of reduplication in accordance with several other authors **semantic reduplication**. Semantic reduplication is a well established type of reduplication, which can be found in many Asian languages, most notably in the languages of the Indian subcontinent, in the Altaic languages, Arabic and probably others. Numerous examples can also be drawn from Slavic or Germanic languages (cf. *first and foremost*, *graft and corruption*, *leaps and bounds*, *null and void* or *ways and means* in English). It is a very productive means of expression that can bear certain load of expressivity. This subject was discussed and defined especially by Jaroslav Vacek, who drew attention to semantic reduplication in Indian languages some years back (while referring to the various earlier descriptions and pointing to the rather diversified terminology used in various traditions). He focused on semantic reduplication in Tamil (Vacek 1994), and marginally also in other Indian languages as a phenomenon of the Indian linguistic area (mainly Sanskrit and Hindi; Vacek 1989), which was a continuation of his earlier study of the phenomenon (particularly its various grammatical functions) in Mongolian (Vacek, Pürev-Očir 1987). A more comprehensive treatment of this phenomenon, however, is a desideratum.

In this paragraph I would like to continue in the work begun by Jaroslav Vacek and focus on different types of semantic reduplication in Tamil. I deal with those pairs of words in which both words (either nouns or verbs) have very similar or one might even say synonymous meaning. I specify the kinds of words constituting these pairs and arrange them into several categories. I will try to find out to what extent the meaning is really synonymous, I briefly touch on formal aspects of the pairs and besides that I also discuss the possible shades of their meaning and function.

A lot of designations relating to this phenomenon appeared. Chatterji (1960) talks about **translation compounds**, Koch (1983a) uses the term **lexical couplets**, Dongare (1975) **synonymic compounds**, Smékal (1979) **semantic pairs**, to name just a few.

Concerning Tamil, Vacek worked with somewhat limited material and assumed that this kind of reduplication may not be so frequent. He sums up about 20 examples mostly from literary and classical Tamil, which is rather a low number. My material shows that this phenomenon is much more frequent, than it might follow from Vacek's material. I have already collected almost 200 such pairs most of which I present in this study.

Concerning the reason for the appearance of these pairs in Tamil (and probably other languages) Vacek proposes two possible explanations. One is based on the sociolinguistic explanation of the origin of synonymous pairs in the context of language contact. The other concerns the stylistic and semantic aspects of synonymous pairing, i.e. its functioning in language. By stylistic aspects he means expressiveness and by semantic aspects the need for accuracy (Vacek 1989, p. 356). I agree

with this proposal even though the scope of meanings of these pairs as well as the sources from which the words constituting these pairs are drawn is much broader (it will be clear from the examples given below). The sociolinguistic aspect can also apply to the pairs in which one word comes from a dialect or archaic language, which is documented in my material below (see **7.2.4.2** or Dongare 1975, p. 252).

7.2.1 Reduplicative constructions with a single and multiple referent and their functions

Semantic reduplication can be divided into two main groups:

A) Both words refer to one and the **same thing, state or action** rather than to two temporally or logically discrete objects or actions: *kūṭṭip perukku-* (to gather up the rubbish with a broom, to sweep + to sweep). They describe it with great accuracy and sense for detail. Often one of the words comes from a foreign language and the native word only translates the foreign one. Based on its semantic charge one of the words may underline certain aspect of the thing or action in question. It adds extra information and highlights some implication. Especially in combination with a foreign word it may refer to a new aspect of something or to a new phenomenon in society. There are also stylistic and pragmatic reasons. The two words may also have different emotive charges and the second word only adds some flavour to the speech or it is used to strengthen the effect of the style. Simply said, these pairs are a stylistic means enhancing the statement and "poetic and dramatic mode of expression, aiming at a forceful and ornamental turn of phrase" (Čermák and Klégr 2008, p. 40).

Another function that can be connected with this kind of reduplication is that of persuasion. For example in Arabic two synonymous words or paraphrased utterances are frequently used to persuade the listener as it is nicely described in noteworthy article by Barbara Koch (1983b).³⁰ It does not seem to be the point in Tamil but still this very interesting point should be taken into consideration.

Last but not least a very marginal reason which could perhaps explain certain uses of some of the pairs is a kind of "hum and haw"ing, hesitation of the speakers, when they are not sure what to say, need some time to find further words or just do not want to go directly to the point. This can be observed in other languages as well and has been brought to perfection in Khasi language.³¹

³⁰ In the abstract of her article (p. 47) she says: "The texts are characterized by elaborate and pervasive patterns of lexical, morphological and syntactic repetition and paraphrase. Repetition is shown to provide far more than ornamental intensification in Arabic prose; rather, it is the key to the linguistic cohesion of the texts and to their rhetorical effectiveness. In contrast to Western modes of argument, which are based on a syllogistic model of proof and made linguistically cohesive via subordination and hypotaxis, Arabic argumentation is essentially paratactic, abductive and analogical. It persuades by making its argumentative claims linguistically present by repeating them, paraphrasing them, and clothing them in recurring structural cadences." She talks about repetition and her observations include examples from various planes of language, but in the article she explicitly says that besides others there are also frequent examples of pairs of synonyms.

³¹ Mondon Barih in his *Khasi-English Course and Grammar* (as quoted in Rabel 1968, p. 257) says: "The Khasi, fond [of expressing] his thoughts in a round about or euphemistic way, generally avoids curtness or directness of language. In Khasi durbars, much studied cleverness is shown in the repetition of synonymous words or phrases, in stringing together all the trains of associations which may occur to the mind but have no direct bearing on the

A special subclass of this type are the pairs that consist of two antonyms but still refer to one object or one actions (see **7.2.8**).

B) The pair refers to a **group of similar entities**: *caṭṭi pāṇai* (earthen vessel, pan + large earthen pot or vessel) → “kitchen utensils.” In most cases we cannot talk about semantic reduplication in the proper sense of the word. They are words belonging to the same semantic field and each designates one item from the field. A pair of such words refers to the particular semantic field as a whole. For this reason I will discuss this latter type of pairs only marginally.

Sometimes it is difficult to say whether there is some closer formal and semantic relation between the two words³² or whether they are just syntagmas or multiple sentence elements. Vacek and Pürev-Očir (1987, p. 372) propose that two important criteria in ascertaining the nature of these pairs are frequency and semantic closeness (synonymity). Other criteria may be (non)ability to reverse the order of the members, functioning of the pair as a unit, i.e. suffixing only the second word. Even here we can talk about continuum and there is a clear tendency that the more frequent and semantically closer the pair is the great probability that the order would be fixed and only the second pair would be suffixed (see further).

7.2.2 Synonymity

Before dealing with the Tamil examples it is necessary to discuss briefly the question of synonymity. It is not easy to find out whether the two words are synonyms or not. They might refer to one thing (or referent) but may still differ in many respects. Very much to the point is the distinction made by John Lyons who differentiates between **descriptive** (or **cognitive**) synonyms on the one hand and **complete** synonyms on the other (Lyons 1992, pp. 148–149). Completely synonymous lexemes are those having the same descriptive, expressive and social meaning. Descriptively synonymous lexemes do not have the same social or expressive meaning. Lyons also talks about **absolute** synonyms. Absolute synonyms are complete synonyms having the same distribution and they are fully synonymous in all their meanings and in all their contexts of occurrence (Ibid., p. 148).

In slightly different words the same view is also expressed by Stephen Ullmann (1962, p. 142): “In ordinary language, one can rarely be positive about identity of meaning, since the matter is complicated by vagueness, ambiguity, emotive overtones and evocative effects; but even there one can occasionally find words which are for all intents and purposes interchangeable [...]. Nevertheless, it is perfectly true that **absolute** synonymy runs counter to our whole way of looking at language. When

subject discussed. Arguing in a circle, with evasions of the point at issue until one gets lost in a labyrinth of words is the characteristic of Khasi debates. In a word, the Khasi is fond of redundancy tautology and verbosity.”

³² Note that several authors call them compounds (Chatterji 1960), which is improbable (cf. Singh 1982).

we see different words we instinctively assume that there must also be some difference in meaning, and in the vast majority of cases there is in fact a distinction even though it may be difficult to formulate. Very few words are **completely** synonymous in the sense of being interchangeable in any context without the slightest alteration in objective meaning, feeling-tone or evocative value." In other words, there are hardly any absolute synonyms to be found.

In fact determining the degree of synonymy is rather difficult. It requires a very good knowledge of the respective language and in some cases it is impossible for a non-native speaker. I could consult several informants but their statements were often quite contradictory and therefore not very reliable. Dialectic variation also plays very important role here. That is why I have to rely mostly on the help of dictionaries and on the examples about which my informants agreed with each other. I am very cautious to call some pairs complete synonyms and assume that absolute majority if not all the words involved exhibit some difference in meaning, might it be emotional, stylistic etc., and can be considered descriptive synonyms. We can suppose a continuum of a juxtaposition of two words merely related in meaning to (perhaps very rare) absolute synonyms.

Here, it is necessary to remark that even though several articles about this phenomenon have already appeared, to my knowledge not many authors tried to find out to what extent these words are really synonymous, complement each other or differ in various contexts. Vacek and Pürev-Očir (1987, p. 372) briefly touched upon this problem in their article about lexical pairs in Mongolian and introduced the term **allo-lexemes**. Some authors also talk about **approximate** or **contextual** synonyms and **full** or **exact** synonyms. Not always, however, do they explain what they mean by these terms and offer only very limited number of examples. For example Dongare (1975, p. 253) seems to use the term exact synonyms in the sense of descriptive synonyms, the term approximate synonyms stands for a pair of words from the same semantic field.

Besides words with synonymous meaning there are also pairs constituted of words with a loose semantic connection (words belonging to the same semantic field, Cf. Vacek and Pürev-Očir 1987, p. 373) of the English "piece and quiet" type and even pairs of words without semantic relation (syntagmas with no immediate semantic relation; Ibid., p. 373). I do not include such pairs into the study, even though pairs included in (7.2.9) can be considered members of the former group.

7.2.3 Formal aspects of the pairs

It is obvious that we cannot view semantic reduplication as a category with a strict delimitation. As the pairs are distributed along the semantic scale their formal aspects also vary. In this paper I will deal with verbs and nouns, which are most widely represented in the material I could use.³³

³³ However, other word classes may occasionally also be reduplicated for semantic reasons, see for example Vacek 1989, p. 350.

Concerning **verbs**, the form is determined by the structure of Tamil. The first verb has usually the form of adverbial participle, the second one is normally inflected. Sometimes the two words can assume the form of infinitive. No lexical element can usually be inserted in between the two verbs, they can, however, sometimes be connected by the particle *-um*:

vimmavum vicikkavum to sob, to have a sob + weep with sobs

uṭaintum citaintum to break, to burst into fragments + to be injured, spoiled, to deteriorate, decay

Noun derivatives of the verbs can be used in the same meaning, sometimes both verbs can be negated. As an example we can mention the pair *aluttuc cali-* "to be weary, tired." This pair occurs mostly in this form, but it can also be found in the reverse order, even though much less frequently. It also appears in the repeated infinitive and negative adverbial participle form *alukkac calikka*, *alukkāmal calikkāmal* or *alukkātu calikkātu*, or as noun derivatives *aluppu calippu*. It is interesting to note, that repetition of either of these two words, e.g. *calittuc calittu* or *aluttu aluttu* can be used instead of *aluttuc cali-* to achieve more or less the same meaning.

Another frequently occurring pairs are *alaintu tiri-* "to wander, roam" and *tullik kuti-* "to jump, leap." These pairs appear almost exclusively in this form only and their order can hardly be reversed. Most of the frequent pairs negate the second word only (e.g. *alaintu tiriyāmal*; the form *alaiyāmal tiriyāmal* is ill-formed and very very rare) and only the second word takes the form of infinitive (e.g. *kūṭṭip perukka* "to sweep," *kiṇṭik kiḷara* "to stir," *karaintu uruka* "to melt").

Nouns can be simply juxtaposed, e.g. *kōlai caḷi* (phlegm, mucus + mucus blown out of the nose, phlegm), or connected by *-um* as in *kēliyum kiṇṭalum* (< Skt. *kelī* fun, jest, joke, pleasantry + Ta. *kiṇṭal* making fun of s.o.). Case endings can mostly be added to the second noun, e.g. *aṇṇa ākāratil* (Skt. *anna-* food or victuals, especially boiled rice + Skt. *āhāra-* food), or eventually to both nouns, e.g. *koṭumaikkum kurūrattukkum* (cruelty, tyranny; severity, harshness + Skt. *krūra-* cruel, fierce, ferocious, pitiless, harsh). The latter pair is, however, infrequent and we can say that there is a clear tendency that the more frequent and semantically closer the pair is the great probability that the order would be fixed and only the second pair would be suffixed. It is exemplified by such pairs as *utavi ottācai* (help), *kōṇip pai* (sack) or *urrār uraviṇar* (relatives):

130) *antak kōṇip paikkujjē irunta vēppaṅkottāika!* [...] 38/47

Seeds of the neem tree that were in that **sack**...

It is not my aim to go through all the pairs here as it would require a lot of space. I just wanted to outline their most conspicuous formal aspects. Some pairs are quite frequent idioms or set expressions while others are new creations or simply two words of similar meaning put side by side. As

for set expressions, the order of the two words cannot usually be reversed, the connecting particle *-um* is not inserted, the case endings or tense markers are added only to the second word. Pairs with fixed order between which nothing can be inserted, seem to be semantically closer and there can be change of meaning of the whole pair (see **7.2.6**). Still I would not consider them compounds and call them syntagmas. I propose that such pairs should be considered examples of reduplication, while new or accidental creations with loose internal structure as well as the pairs of words belonging to the same semantic field are examples of simple repetition.

As to their order, here again, one must reckon with a continuum of subtly graded possibilities, which are conditioned by several factors, e.g. semantic charge of the words, their length (number of syllables), phonological structure and others (cf. for example Malkiel 1959, pp. 142–155).

In every language there is a clear tendency to form pairs of words called **binomials** out of which synonymous pairs are only one part (see Čermák 2007 and 2008, Malkiel 1959). Some of the binomials are nonce-formations while others become fixed and form part of the lexicon. Some languages seem to be more prone to form such pairs while others are not so productive in this respect. Čermák and Klégr (2008) analyzed the language of Shakespeare and found out that out of 362 pairs of words are 50 established (fixed) binomials, 189 are current binomials (semantically and prosodically well-formed, but not recurrent), the rest are near- or quasi-binomials. It shows surprisingly high number of nonce formations (current binomials) which shows the tendency of language to be ornamental and innovative. Even though I do not have any statistics at my disposal for Tamil I am convinced that it would render somewhat similar data, i.e. relatively high number of nonce-formations and certain number of established pairs. I suppose that similar conclusions would be true also for pairs in which aesthetic/prosodic quality was more decisive for formation than the semantic one (see echo-type reduplication **7.3**).

7.2.4 Main types of single referent reduplication

The examples that are presented in this section are arranged according to their nature into bigger groups. In many cases we cannot do only with one criterion and certain pairs could be included in more groups. I also believe that more such groups could be identified. It would, however, require more material to refine the analysis. This is a preliminary classification, which should outline the main characteristics and open the way for a further and more detailed discussion.

7.2.4.1 Pairs with one borrowed word

Pairs in which one word originates from a foreign language are quite frequent. If the borrowing is the first word in the pair, it may imply that the native word was added to translate or explain the first word. That is why Chatterji called such pairs **translation compounds** and dedicated to this feature in Indo-Aryan quite a lot of space (Chatterji 1960, p. 289–302). Pairs with one borrowed word can be found in other languages as well. The number of such examples rapidly grows when a language is in living contact with another language or when another language exercise strong influence on it. Examples are plentiful. A lot of German words were used together with Czech words during the days of Austro-Hungarian empire, when the Czech land was a part of it. In English a lot French words were used side by side with English words during the time of Norman conquest (cf. Jespersen 1982, p. 89). In India there has been a long time contact between Dravidian and Indo-Aryan languages, in the past four hundred years the Indian languages have been strongly influenced by English. There was also an influence of Arabic, Persian, Portuguese or Dutch. Pairs in which a Sanskrit, Persian or English word collocates with a native word are abundant in all Indian languages.

In Tamil besides a few Sanskrit examples, more numerous pairs where we can rightly suspect that the foreign words are really translated by the native ones, are the pairs with an English word in the first position (see 7.2.4.1.4.). Note that most of the lexemes come from the “technical” sphere and here the possibility of simply translating them comes into question very naturally. Many technical things connected with “English culture” are usually called by their English names and the Tamil word is used only in formal context (*pas* for “bus” instead of Tamil *pērunṭu*; *cīṭṭu* for “seat” instead of *irukka*) or hardly ever (*rayil* instead of Tamil *pukai vaṇṭi*). Things like “train” or “bus” are used by Tamils every day so they know these words very well and there is no need to translate them, while other less commonly known words might have been glossed by Tamil words to clarify their meaning.

Translation of a foreign word, however, cannot explain all the examples. Even from the formal point of view we can see that it is very often the native word which forms the base and the foreign word follows. The reason may be, in the Tamil case, that many of the originally Sanskrit words were not felt to be foreign any longer. They have been fully integrated and became a regular part of the Tamil lexical stock. Their appearance alongside the native word acquires stylistic or pragmatic function. For example, using a foreign word can be an expression of (would-be) erudition or belonging to a higher stratum of society. I realized this when I heard one Czech politician say on the radio that the contract should be *průhledný a transparentní* (*průhledný* Cz. transparent; *transparentní*, Lat. transparent); and subsequently that a *racionalní a rozumná odpověď* – “a reasonable answer” can not be given (*racionalní*, Lat. *ratiōnālis* rational + *rozumný*, Czech rational, reasonable). Sometimes a foreign word can have further connotations. For example the Czech word *vehikl* “rattle-trap, old crock” comes from German *Vehikel* “vehicle.” About the same situation in English Jespersen (1982, p. 91–92)

says: "The former (the native word) is always nearer the nation's heart than the latter (the French word), it has the strongest associations with everything primitive, fundamental, popular, while the French word is often more formal, more polite, more refined and has a less strong hold on the emotional side of life."

The foreign word can point to a novel aspect of something or to intensify it, which is one of the general functions of these pairs. For example in Tamil there is a word *varicai* with the meaning "line, row, series." This word can be used in the meaning "queue." But as queuing seems to be introduced by the British in India people often say *kyū varicai* to refer specifically to this social phenomenon. Its usage can also be conditioned by the context. It is perfectly understandable to say *makka! varicaiyil niṅṅārka!* "People were standing in a line" while the sentence *kaṭaikku muṅ oru varicai iruntatu* "There was a line in front of the shop" is not that clear. It is better to say *kaṭaikku muṅ oru kyū varicai iruntatu* "There was a queue line in front of the shop". Pointing to this aspect of these pairs Chatterji (1960, p. 291) says: „These Translation-Compounds often have an intensive force, and sometimes they indicate a particular variety of a thing, the foreign or new word hinting at the novel aspect of it."

An extreme situation is when a foreign word becomes an integral part of a lexical stock to such an extent that it even overshadows the native word. In Tamil it is sometimes the Sanskrit word that is normally used to express a particular meaning, while the Tamil word is felt to be a bit technical or artificial (see the pair *oli cattam* below). In other cases the native word is felt to be too literary or archaic and speakers favour the foreign word (using a foreign word can bear the hallmark of modernity and dandyism). For example on the spoken level the Sanskrit word for "joy, pleasure, delight" *cantōṣam* is preferred to the Tamil word *maṅṅi*.

In Tamil, the pairs most often consist of a Tamil word and its Sanskrit counterpart. It is understandable because Tamil has coexisted with Sanskrit for a very long time. A few examples can be found in which one member of the pair is an English word. The pairs with one English word are still rather rare in literature, but they seem to be quite common in the spoken language. Only very few examples come from some other languages, such as Hindi, Urdu, Marathi etc. There are several loanwords from other Dravidian languages as well. I assume that the foreign origin is in many cases felt and the words differ in their social meaning, nevertheless other reasons stated above for joining the two particular words together are also at play. They can be considered descriptive synonyms according to the definition given in (7.2.2). These pairs are very numerous and new and new ones appear. In Tamil it is a natural and productive means of expression while in English or Czech it might feel redundant.

7.2.4.1.1 Pairs with the Tamil word in the first position

As the Tamil word is in the first position these pairs speak against the possibility that the native word simply translates the foreign one. It rather somewhat extends its meaning by further connotations:

aḷaku cavuntaryam (beauty, comeliness + Skt. *saundarya*- beauty, loveliness, gracefulness, elegance)
aṛikuri camikñai (mark, token, symbol + Skt. *saṃjñā* sign, token, signal, gesture)
kallam kapaṭam (guile, deception, slyness + Skt. *kapaṭa*- fraud, deceit, cheating)
koṭumai kurūram (cruelty, tyranny; severity, harshness + Skt. *krūra*- cruel, fierce, ferocious, pitiless, harsh)
caḷi kapam (*caḷi* mucus blown out of the nose, phlegm + Skt. *kapha*- phlegm)
tollai caṅkaṭam (trouble, difficulty, perplexity + Skt. *saṅkaṭa*- difficulty, trouble, straitened circumstances)
naṭu mattiyam (middle, centre + Skt. *madhya*- middle)

131) *ērkeṅavē nāṅ periya maṅaṭ tollaikajukkum caṅkaṭaṅkajukkum āḷākiyirukkireṅ*. 23/858

Even before I have come through great mental **distress and trouble**.

7.2.4.1.2 Pairs with the Sanskrit word in the first position

The pairs with a Sanskrit word in the first position are surprisingly not that frequent. Besides these two pairs several others can be found, but in those cases the Sanskrit word had already been naturalized and with the great probability its foreign origin did not play role in the forming of the pair:

cātāraṇa vaḷakkamāy (Skt. *sādhāraṇa*- general, common to all, universal + *vaḷakkamāy* usually, habitually)
vacikaram kavarcī (Skt. *vaśikara*- bringing into subjection, subjugating → Ta. attraction, allurement + *kavarcī* captivation, attraction)

7.2.4.1.3 Both words are of Sanskrit origin

Most of these examples come from exclusively literary texts. It is also possible that some of the pairs were borrowed from Sanskrit as a whole:

akaṅkāram āṅavam (Skt. *aḥamkāra*- pride, haughtiness + Skt. *āṅava*- pride, arrogance, egotism)
aṅka avayavam (Skt. *aṅga*- a limb of the body + Skt. *avaya*- a limb, member, part, portion)
aniyāyam akkiramam (Skt. *anyāya*- injustice, wrong action + Skt. *akrama*- injustice)
aṅṅa ākāram (Skt. *anna*- food or victuals, especially boiled rice; bread corn + Skt. *āhāra*- food)
āparaṅam alaṅkāram (Skt. *ābharaṇa*- ornament + Skt. *alaṅkāra*- adornment, decoration; ornament, jewel)
catā carvakālamum (Skt. *sadā* always, every time, continually + Skt. *sarvakālam* at all times, always)
cikiccai cicurūṣai (Skt. *cikitsā* medical attendance, practice or science of medicine + Skt. *śuśrūṣā* reverence, obedience, service > Ta. caring; nursing (esp. the sick and the old; an archaic word not used often)
māṅam rōṣam (Skt. *māna*- honour, dignity; pride, eminence + Skt. *rōṣa*- high sense of honour)
yukti tantiram (Skt. *yukti*- plan, scheme, device + Skt. *tantra*- strategm, scheme, means)

132) *iraṇṭu nāṭkaḷāy aṇṇa ākāram ētumiṇṇi* [...] 52/152

With no **food** for two days...

133) *avarukku vēṇṭiya cikiccaikaḷaiyum cicurūsaikaḷaiyum anta ammāḷ mikka pakti cirattaiyōṭu ceytu* [...]

The woman gave him with great attention the necessary **treatment**... 23/648

7.2.4.1.4 Pairs with borrowings from other languages

Borrowings from other languages than Sanskrit are also frequent. In these days it is mostly English from where these words come. Especially colloquial language is full of English borrowings due to the strong influence of English language in India. Here again some of these borrowings seem to be mere translations of the Tamil words, others specify the meaning of the expression. Note that the English borrowings are predominantly in the first position:

cēr nārkaḷi (Eng. chair + *nārkaḷi* any four-legged seat, as a chair, stool)

ṭic kuḷi (Eng. ditch + *kuḷi* pit, hole, hollow, cavity, dimple, depression, excavation)

paippu kuḷāy (Eng. pipe + *kuḷāy* pipe, tube)

kyū varicai (Eng. queue + row, line)

postu kampam (Eng. post + *kampam* post, pillar)

lāc caṭṭam (Eng. law + law)

ṣāppuk kaṭai (Eng. shop + shop)

paṇam tuṭṭu (*paṇam* wealth, coin, money + Dutch *duit* money of the value of 2 or 4 pies > Ta. money)

cīlkkai vicil (whistle + Eng. whistle)

134) *cīlkkai vicil* oṇṇtu evvaḷavō nēramākiṇṇṭatu. 40/42

The **whistle** stopped long time back.

135) *lāc caṭṭam* pēcaṇavaḷukku iṇimē iṅka vēla keṭaiyātu. 18/40

There will be no work for people who talk about **rules and regulations**.

A very interesting loan word that often enters into semantic pairs with its Tamil counterparts is the word *cāḅku* "sack, gunny bag." It has been borrowed from Dutch and has become very popular probably also because of its similarity with the English word "sack." There are three or four Tamil words of similar meaning that often appear along this word, eventually the Tamil words can combine among themselves:

cāḅku mūṭṭai bags and the like < (Dutch *zak* sack, gunny bag + Ta. bundle, bag, wallet, satchel)

kōṇic cāḅku bags and the like < (Ta. sacks made of jute fibre, gunny bag + Dutch *zak* sack, gunny bag)

cākkup pai a bag; bags < (Dutch *zak* sack, gunny bag + Ta. bag, sack, purse, satchel)
kōṇip pai a bag; bags < (Ta. sacks made of jute fibre, gunny bag + Ta. bag, sack, purse, satchel)

136) *kōṇippai oṇṇil avaikaḷaik koṭṭi* [...] 38/46

She has put them into a **bag**....

137) *antak kākarikaḷaiyellām aḷḷi oru kōṇic cākkukkuḷ pōṭṭuk kaṭṭukirāṇ*. 47/115

He puts all the crows into a **bag** and ties up.

A foreign word can also be used to intensify the meaning of a native word:

naṭu ceṇṭar (Ta. *naṭu* middle, centre + Eng. centre) → the very middle

7.2.4.2 One word comes from a different sphere of Tamil

In these examples one of the words comes from a different sphere of Tamil, i.e. from a dialect, from the spoken language or on the contrary from the highly literary language, etc. In some cases it is an archaic word, nowadays out of use altogether. Note that several words of foreign origin have become a regular part of the Tamil lexical stock and today they are used almost exclusively in the spoken language or in dialects. It can be considered another proof that the reduplicant does not only translate, but often rather underlines or intensifies the meaning of the base.

7.2.4.2.1 One word is archaic or highly literary

Several archaic words have been retained in the usage only in pairs with their colloquial or possibly neutral counterparts. In a few cases literary words come into a pair with colloquial words to form a technical term or some specialized expression. An interesting example is the pair *oli cattam* in which the Dravidian word *oli* is combined with the word *cattam* of Sanskrit origin. The word *oli* usually collocates with rather technical words to form terms such as *oliparappu*- "to transmit, broadcast," *olipeyar*- "to transliterate," *oliperukki* "loud speaker" or *oliyiyal* "phonetics," while the typical collocation for the word *cattam* is *cattam pōṭu*- "to make noise; scold, shout at s.o. for his mistake":

oli cattam (sound, noise, roar + Skt. *śabda*- sound, noise, voice, tone)

kaṇ viḷi (eye + eye) or the form *kaṇ muḷi* (*muḷi* is the colloquial counterpart of *viḷi*)

kalāccāram paṇpātu (culture + culture)

cettu maṭi- (to die + to perish, die)

taḷaittuc celj- (to flourish, thrive, grow luxuriantly; to be overflow with joy; to be abundant; to grow, prosper; + to thrive, flourish, grow well to be fertile; to be abundant; to be cheerful)

palkip peruku- (to increase, as in number or quantity + to increase in numbers, multiply, spread; to abound)
pūcci poṭṭu (insect, beetle, worm or any small reptile + worm; the word is not used in this sense any longer)
mappu mantāram (being overcast or cloudy + cloudiness, murkiness; can not be used independently)
maḷai māri (rain + rain)
mācu maṟu spot, fault (spot, stain, taint; defect, fault, flaw + blemish, fault; stain, spot; mole, freckle)
virintu para- (to expand, to spread out; to open, unfold + to spread, extend, to be diffused)

138) **maḷa māri oṇṇaiyuri kāṇam.** 15/18

No **rain** at all.

139) **otta kalāccārap paṇpāṭṭu amcaṇkaḷ[...]** 39/7

Aspects of integrated **culture**...

7.2.4.2.2 One word is very colloquial or comes from a dialect

Interestingly enough in some cases it is the foreign word, which is felt to be more colloquial or is more frequently used. Several Sanskrit words have become an inseparable part of Tamil vocabulary and found their ways even to Tamil dialects. Due to their extensive use they are felt to be more colloquial than their Tamil counterparts with which they enter into pairs:

anti karukkal (Skt. *sandhi-* twilight, red glow of sunset + darkness, twilight before dawn)

utavi ottācai (aid, help, assistance + aid, help, assistance)

kiṇṭik kiḷaṟu- (to stir; to make or prepare by stirring; to probe, poke + to stir; to make or prepare by stirring; to arouse, kindle, provoke)

kūṭṭip perukku- (gather up-the rubbish with a broom, sweep, bring together, collect; to add, increase + to multiply, increase; to sweep)

kūṭamāṭa ottācai (lending a helping hand + aid, help, assistance)

kōpam āttiram (Skt. *kōpa-* anger, wrath, rage, fury, exasperation + anger (due to frustration); immodest hurry, impulsiveness)

kōḷai caḷi (phlegm, mucus + mucus blown out of the nose, phlegm)

cēkkāḷi kūṭṭāḷi (friend + accomplice, friend)

cēṟu cakati (mud, mire, slush, loam + mud, mire)

poy puḷuku (lie, falsehood, falsity, untruth + obvious lie, bare-faced falsehood; more intensive)

maḷiḷci cantōṣam (joy, pleasure, delight, gladness + Skt. *saṃtōṣa-* satisfaction, contentedness)

miccam mīti left over, remainder, all that remains + sth. left over, sth. that remains, remainder

mūñci mukam (face + face)

vayaḷ kāṭu fields in general (field, esp. paddy field + dry land under cultivation)

vekkai cūṭu (heat + heat, warmth)

vēlai jōli (work, labour, task + T. *tjōli* work, occupation)

vilai kirayam (price, cost, value + Skt. *kraya*- buying and selling, trade > Ta. selling price)

140) *enneṇṇamō poyyap puḷukac colli nampa vaccuppōṭṭā*. 32/21

She told her different **kinds of lies** and made her believe it.

141) *ivaṇurikaḷum uḷḷap pōyi avarukkuk kūṭamāṭayā ottācap paṇṇāpla paṇṇi* [...] 42/100

They also went in and under pretence of **helping** him...

As money is very frequently talked about, we encounter in Tamil quite a lot of pairs consisting of the word "money." I have included them in this section, but I am fully aware that some of these words might have different connotations in various dialects. Some of these pairs may have the meaning "money in general," i.e. cash, coins plus notes etc.:

kācu paṇam (coin, cash, money + money, coin)

callik kācu (coin + money, coin)

cillaṇai kācu (coin, change + coin, cash, money)

paicā kācu (U. *paisā* quarter anna, copper change + coin, cash, money)

paṇam tuṭṭu (wealth, coin, money + Dutch *duit* money of the value of 2 or 4 pies → Ta. money)

Somewhat similar situation is with various terms for relationship:

urrār uṇaviṇar (relatives + relative)

uṇaviṇar currattār (relative + relatives)

uṇavu murai (relation, relationship + relationship by blood or marriage)

contam uṇaviṇar (relationship, relation + relatives)

conta pantam (relationship, relation +relation)

7.2.4.3 Pairs describing different aspects

The second big group includes pairs that describe different aspects of a thing or action. They can be further classified into smaller subgroups according to their nature. The use of these pairs facilitates a very precise and minute description of the respective referent. Zvelebil speaks about intensification of meaning (Zvelebil 1955, p. 455) but intensification is by no means their only function.

7.2.4.3.1 Different degree or intensity

The words in these pairs refer to various degree or intensity of the action or some abstract concept. The second word of the pair may conclude the action:

aṭittu viḷācu- (to beat, hit, strike + to beat severely)

atirntu kuluriku- (to shake, quake, tremble + to be shaken, agitated, to tremble, shudder, quake with fear)

iṭintu takar- (to break, crumble, to be in ruins + to be broken to pieces; to be shattered, crushed, demolished)

uṭaintu citai- (to break, to burst into fragments + to be injured, spoiled, to deteriorate, decay)

kēli kiṅṭal (Skt. *keli* fun, jest, joke, pleasantry; ridicule, derision, mockery + making fun of s.o.)

koṭumai kurūram (cruelty, tyranny, inhumanity; severity, harshness, roughness + Skt. *krūra-* cruel, fierce, ferocious, pitiless, harsh)

taṭuttu niṛuttu- (to hinder, stop, obstruct; to forbid, prohibit + to stop, to put an end to)

tatumpi valji- (to brim; to be filled with, overflow with + to overflow; to trickle)

tatumpi nirampu- (to brim; to be filled with, overflow with + to be filled with, become full)

tavittut tattaji- (to be in distress, to be helpless + to be in distress, to struggle for life)

piṅṅip piṅṅai- to plait, braid, lace, knit, weave, entwine, interweave + to entwine, conjoin, unite)

pīti kalakkam (panic + distress, affliction; terror, dread; perplexity, distraction, bewilderment)

puḷuttu aḷuku- (of vegetables etc. – to be wormy/be worm eaten + to rot, decompose, putrefy)

poy puḷuku (lie, falsehood, falsity, untruth + obvious lie, bare-faced falsehood; more intensive)

142) *iruṅṭa avaṅ mukam iruṅṭōṭu iruṅṭāyp piṅṅip piṅṅainta mātiri iruntatu.* 20/119

His dark face like **intertwined** with darkness.

143) *pāttiraiṅkaḷ kaḷuviṅa taṅṅīrum tatumpi nirampi valjinta taṅṅīrumākak kīlē periya cakatiyāka iruntatu.* 3/66

The water left after washing vessels and the water that **overflowed** from **overflowing** (vessels) get down muddled.

It is interesting to note that there are a lot of pairs semantically connected with drying, fading and wilting. The action usually refers to water and plants but these words can also refer to someone's face, body, and idiomatically also to one's mind, spirits etc. Frequent use of such words in a country with very hot temperature is not surprising. What is more difficult is to find exact nuances of meaning of constructions that combine these words. Not all of them occur frequently and the latter two seem to be semantically closer than the first two pairs:

kāyntu ular- (to wither, to parch, to dry + to become dry, to wither, to be parched up)

taḷarntu tuvaḷ- (to droop, faint, grow weary, enfeebled, infirm or decrepit; to be flexible, tender + to lose firmness, become limp, wilt)

tuvaṅṭu ular- (to lose firmness, become limp, wilt + to become dry, to be parched up)

vaṅṅi ular- (of sources of water – to dry up; get reduced, subside; to become thin + to become dry, to wither, to be parched up)

vāṅṅi vataṅṅiku- (of plants, flowers – to fade, wither, wilt + lose freshness, wilt)

144) *vāṅṅi vataṅṅikiya ilaikaḷuṭaiya tāmaraiṅ koṭikaḷ tuvaṅṅum ularntum kiṅṅantaṅa.* 23/667

The dried and parched lotoses with **wilted and faded** leaves.

7.2.4.3.2 General vs. specific

The order of the words does not seem to be conditioned by their meaning. The word *paṇam* is usually understood as a general term while the word *kācu* has usually the connotation of a small coin. Here the order, however, can be reversed. On the other hand the word *kuppai* means "rubbish" in general, while the word *kūlam* means a more particular thing. The order of this pair is fixed:

alaintu tiri- (to go to and fro, to roam, wander + to walk about, wander, go here and there) [*alai-* can express roaming with some objective]

kācu paṇam (coin, cash, money + money, coin)

kuppai kūlam (sweepings, rubbish, refuse + broken pieces of straw, of hemp; chaff)

cattiram cāvaṭi (Skt. *sattra* house, asylum, hospital + Mrh. *sāvaṭi* inn)

tūci tumpu dust and the like < (dust + dust; fibre, rope)

nēram kālam time < (*nēram* time marked for specific activity + Skt. *kāla-* time (generally))

paci paṭṭiṇi (hunger, appetite, craving for food + fasting, starvation, abstinence)

matippu mariyātai (esteem, respect, regard + respect, token of respect, formality)

mēlam vāṭṭiyam (generally musical instruments; especially two-sided drum + Skt. *vāḍya-* musical instrument)

vāḷi vakai ways and means < (means; manner, method, mode + manner, method; means)

vēli paṭal (hedge, fence + fence or part of it made of bamboo splits or thorny branches)

virutu paricu (award + award, prize) [the word *paricu* has also the meanings "money, gift" and refers to various kinds of prizes]

viḷakkik kaḷuvu- (to clean, brighten, polish, purify; to make clear, explain, elucidate + to wash, cleanse by washing, rinse, purify)

145) *tiṇamum nēram kiṭaikkum pōtēllām vācalmuṇ uṭkārntu pēcuvārkaḷ. pēcciṇ muṭivukku nēram kālam etuvum kiṭayātu.* 18/87

Every day, whenever they had **time** they would sit in front of the house and talk. There was no time or season to end their conversation.

146) *oru pātukāppāṇa eṭattukkum vāḷi vaka illāma teru nāymāri alairēṇ.* 32/77

With no **ways and means** (to find) some shelter I roam the streets like a dog.

7.2.4.3.3 Smaller vs. bigger

Similarly the order of the words in this group is not always smaller + bigger. Thus we can assume that there is something else that plays the role in the order of the words. It may be the length of the words, their rhythm etc. The pair *kūlam kuṭṭai* may refer to a pond or to various pond and pools:

kuḷam kuṭṭai (tank, pond, reservoir + pool, small pond)
koppuk kilai (branch of a tree + branch, bough)
teru vīti (street; highway, public road + Skt. *vīthi* street)
matil cuvar (wall + wall)

147) *erikāvatu oru kuḷam kuṭṭaiyil viḷuntu cākalām pōl irukkīratu.*
I felt like jumping into some **pond** and die.

148) *maḷai pēñcu aṅkaṅka kuḷam kuṭṭaikalla tēṅki nikkīra taṅṅi [...] 42/165*
Water that left in **ponds and pools** after the rain...

7.2.4.3.4 One member of the pair is more emotive, other member more physical

The words *alu-*, *vatai-*, *naṭuṅku-* and *vali* intensify the physical aspect of the respective feeling, while the other verbs are more emotive. The pair *karaintu uruku-* is especially worth noticing. The verb *karai-* refers to dissolving, evaporation or total disappearance of the substance. The verb *uruku-* refers to melting of such substances like ice, metal or butter. Besides that it is often used idiomatically in connection with someone's mind or heart. One would expect that their sequence would be reverse and the pair describe sequence of an action, i.e. melting or liquefying of something and its subsequent disappearance, but it is not the case here. The reverse order is not possible here:

aluttu cali- (to be weary, fatigued, tired, by overwork or care + to be weary, tired; to become exhausted)
karaintu uruku- (to dissolve, as salt or sugar in water + to dissolve with heat, to melt, liquefy, to be fused)
cōrntu acar- (to be weary, exhausted; to faint + to become faint, drowsy)
cōrvu āyācam (fatigue, weariness + physical tiredness; feeling of exhaustion, mental fatigue Skt. *ā-yāsa* effort, exertion)
paṭaṅi naṭuṅku- (of limbs-tremble, shiver + to shake, shiver, quiver; to tremble through fear)
vali vēṭaṅai (pain, ache + Skt. *vetanā* pain, agony)
vāṭṭi vatai- (to vex, afflict, mortify + Skt. *vadh-* to strike, slay, kill, murder, defeat, destroy)

149) *avaḷ kaiyil ais karaintu urukik koṅṅiruntatu. 14/60*
The ice was **melting** in her hand.

150) *avaruṭaiya valatu kāl colla muṭiyāta valiayiyum vēṭaṅaiyum avarukku tantu koṅṅiruntatu. 23/647*
His right leg was giving him unspeakable **pain and agony**.

7.2.5 Various less specific types of pairs

There are more pairs, which also refer to different aspects of something or differ in the emotive charge as indicated in square brackets. However, they do not form any uniform group. One of the words may have a broader meaning than the other. In case of a construction neutral word plus a word with and emotive charge, the word with an emotive marking can modify the meaning of the whole pair as in the first pair:

aṇaittu taḷuvu- (to embrace, hold, clasp in the arms + to clasp, embrace, hug, entwine) the verb *taḷuvu-* implies more affection

ilittuc ciri- (to grin, laugh sheepishly + to laugh)

ūkittu uṇar- (to conjecture, guess, infer + to realize, conceive, imagine) [*ūki-* is more connected with one's own effort, i.e. trying to guess, while *uṇar-* to some impetus from the outside world]

ekirik kuti- (of things - go spinning or bouncing, leap, go beyond one's limit + to jump, leap, spring, bound) [*ekiru-* is more emotive]

empi tāvu- (jump, leap up + to leap, jump, spring) [different jumps]

empik kuti- (jump, leap up + to jump, leap, spring, bound)

kavarntu ilu- (to attract, draw the attention of, captivate; seduce + to attract, draw close)

kuḷantai kuṭṭi (infant, babe + young of animals; child, especially the youngest) while *kuḷantai* is a neutral, the word *kuṭṭi* is more familiar as it is usually associated with animals. The whole pair refers to a group of children of different age.

cikkiramāka viraivāka (haste, speed; intensity, severity, rapidity, acuteness + swiftness, celerity)

tāvik kuti- (to leap, jump + to jump, leap, spring, bound) [different jumps]

tullik kuti- (to leap, frisk, spring up, jump up, to be restive + to jump, leap, spring, bound) [little bit different jumps]

paḷakkavaḷakkam customs and habits < (habit, practice; custom + custom)

vīci viṭṭeri- (throw, fling, hurl + throw) [the word *viṭṭeri-* implies that the whole action was done with haughtiness or indifference]

151) *kuṭumpattōṭa irukkēḷā? āmām... nāṇum eṇ maṇaiviyumtāṇ; kuḷantai kuṭṭi kiṭayātu.* 33/53

Have you got a family? Yes... me and my wife. We have no **children**.

It is desirable to take notice of the context in which these pairs appear. Many of them are fixed expressions that can be used figuratively to enhance the statement. Consider the following sentences:

152) *attaṇai teyvaṇkaḷum aruḷ purintu kalyāṇam niccayamāṇa pōtu maṇam tullik kutittatu.* 14/84

After the marriage was fixed by means of mercy of so many gods [her] mind **leapt** [with joy].

153) *enkiruntō oru cuṇṭeli tullik kutittu oṭṭiru.* 2/108

A mouse came with **pitter-patter** from somewhere.

Jumping is definitely connected with emotions. It can imply happiness, desire or nervousness. See how Tamil writer Imaiyam uses various verbs for tiptoeing and jumping to describe the particular situation. The story tells about poor boys trying to squeeze into *pandal* and take part in the wedding ceremony (of course to get some food). Here using various verbs with similar meaning has stylistic function:

154) "poṇṇu ayakka vantirukkīra ellārayum iṭṭā. oru āḷ tavarappaṭātu," eṇru conṇa tarumakarttāviṇ vārttaiyai oṇṇukkuvīṭap pōṇa kumār kēṭṭuviṭṭu vantu conṇatutāṇ tāmataṁ, iraṇṭē tappaiyākat **tāvik kutittup** pantalukkuḷ aintu pērum vantaṇar. 19/40

"Serve everyone who has come to welcome the bride. No one should be missed." No time elapsed between saying these words to the other boys by Kumar who heard them when going to urinate and the five boys squeezing into *pandal* in **two jumps**.

And a bit further:

155) pantalukku iraṇṭaṭi tūram talli niṇru koṇṭu ekkiyum **empik kutittum** pārttārkaḷ. 19/45

They move two steps away from the *pandal* and tiptoeing and **jumping** looked (what was going on inside).

Another nice example of using idiomatic uses of two verbs comes from Cīruṭaiyāṇ:

156) appā urattuccattam pōṭṭār. mūkku nuṇi viṭaittatu. nerrippōṭṭiṇ narampu rēkaikaḷ **ekirik kutittana**. 11/61

Father shouted loudly. His nostrils widened. Veins on his forehead were **jumping**. (As he was in a rage).

7.2.6 Change of meaning

The following examples are all set expressions, in which a combination of two words similar in meaning yielded a new extended or intensified meaning of the whole pair. The pair *mukki muṇaki-* is a little bit more loose, it allows the forms *mukkāmal muṇakāmal*, *mukkalum muṇakalum* or *mu kkikkoṇṭum muṇakikkoṇṭum*, but the order cannot be reversed.

The change of meaning or its slight extension can be accounted for in many other examples given above, but it is not so obvious. Sometimes the extension of the meaning is caused by the context or figurative use of the pair. The change of meaning of these pairs is conspicuous and the pairs can be considered idioms:

oḷivu maṇaivu withholding information; veil of secrecy < (place of concealment + covert, hiding place, den)

kacakkip piḷi- to squeeze, exploit, extort < (to squeeze + to press – to extract juice, etc.; to squeeze – of wet clothes)

tolai tūram long distance; remote place < (distance + Skt. *dūra-* remoteness, distance)

nūl ilaiyil by a hair's breadth, narrowly < (*nūl* yarn, single twisted thread + *ilai* yarn, cotton thread, string)
muḱki muṅaku- to do sth. with much difficulty < (to strain in order to do sth.; groan + to mutter, murmur, grumble, moan)

157) *vipattiliruntu nūlilaiyil uyir tappinār.* 7/848

He saved his life in accident by a **hair's breadth**.

7.2.7 Unusual pairs

There are some pairs of which the informants did not approve. According to them these words normally do not combine. They seem to be an *ad hoc* creation of the author. It means that beside some frequent idioms, Tamil speakers have great liberty and can combine any two almost identical words just to satisfy their momentary needs of expression. From this we can clearly see that semantic reduplication in Tamil is a productive phenomenon not confined to a few fixed expressions only.

It is noteworthy that most of these pairs come from literary texts, and specifically from the books by Kalki:

iraiñci manrāṭi (to make obeisance to, to pay reverence; to plead for mercy + to pray, entreat, implore, petition)

kuḷittu muḷuku- (to bathe + to bathe the entire body by dipping or pouring)

manrāṭi vēṅṭu- (to pray, entreat, implore, petition, supplicate + to want, desire; to beg, entreat, request)

vēṅṭik keñcu- (to want, desire; to beg, entreat, request + to beg humbly, to entreat, crave, to beseech with supplicating gestures)

vimmavum vicikkavum (to have a sob, sob as a child + to weep with sobs)

158) *pācam akalavataṅku vali iraiṅṅai iraiñci manrāṭuvatu tāṅ!* 23/802

I will **implore and beseech** the god to show me the way to remove this affection.

159) *eṅavē piḱṣūviṭam manrāṭi vēṅṭik kolvataṅkāc civakāmi vāy tīrantā!* 23/918

Therefore Sivagami opened her mouth to **implore and plead for mercy**.

160) *ati kālaiyil eḷuntu kuḷittu muḷuki viṭṭu [...]* 25/38

Early in the morning having got up and **washed**....

Another interesting group are pairs of words derived from the same root. It does not seem probable but still I cannot help comparing them with intensives as described in (5.3):

urṛār uraviṅar (relatives + relative)

kurram kurai (moral or physical blemish, defect, flaw, error + deficiency, imperfection, want, default)

kuṇṇirik kuṇṇuku- to become less, diminish; to feel small + to shorten, narrow down; to feel small
vaḷam vaṇmai (fertility, productiveness, luxuriance; abundance, fullness + fruitfulness, fertility, abundance)
tikkut ticai (Skt. *diś-*, Nom. *dik* point of direction + Skt. *diśā* direction)

7.2.8 Antonyms

Antonyms form a new lexical unit that semantically spans both ends of the semantic area expressed by the two words. These pairs are at one extreme end of a continuum that can be drafted out as follows. At one endpoint there is a sequence of two phonologically distinct words more or less synonymous in meaning, e.g. *kiṇṭi kiḷaru-* (to stir; to make or prepare by stirring + to stir; to make or prepare by stirring; to arouse, kindle, provoke). In the middle there are two words of a similar meaning semantically rather loosely connected, e.g. *naṭantu vantār* "he came walking." The opposite endpoint is represented by a juxtaposition of two antonyms *pōkku varattu* "traffic" (< *pō-* to go *varu-* to come). Pairs that consist of two antonyms are, however, not a very frequent phenomenon in Tamil and only a few examples³⁴ can be quoted:

ēri irāṅku- to visit several places, make visits < (*ēru-* to climb, rise, increase, go up; to get into a vehicle, board; to visit, enter, go to a place + *irāṅku-* to come down; to get off a vehicle, get down)
pōkku varattu traffic < (*pō-* to go + *varu-* to come)
pōy varu- to frequent, attend < (*pō-* to go + *varu-* to come)
varavu celavu receipts and expenditures < (*varavu* income + *celavu* expenditure)
iṇpa tuṇṇam joy and sorrow < (delight, joy, happiness, pleasantness + distress, trouble, sorrow; pain (Cf. Skt. *sukhaduḥkha-*)
mēṭu paḷḷam uneven < (*mēṭu* height; hillock, rising ground + *lowness, depth; hollow, pit, ditch, dimple, depression*)

These pairs are semantically different from a mere juxtaposition of two words that are opposite in meaning. They produce a new semantic unit referring to one phenomenon. Based on its meaning it can enter further units or phrases:

mēṭu paḷḷam → *mēṭu paḷḷamāṇa maitāṇam* uneven ground
varavu celavu → *varavu celavu aṛikkai* the budget statement
 → *varavu celavut tiṭṭam* the budget

161) *anta meyiṇ rōṭṭil iṇṇum pōkkuvarattu ārampikkātātāl* [...] 54/528

As the **traffic** has not begun yet on the main road....

³⁴ I hesitate to include the pair *tāyantai* as it consists of words for two objects. Vacek (1994, p. 147) argues that it forms a general concept, i.e. parents.

Possibly also the pairs *ēṛakkuraiya* and *ēṛattāla* (*ēṛu-* to climb, rise, increase, go up + *kuṛaḥ-* to comedown, get reduced, diminish, lessen; *tāḷ-* to come down, fall, lower, decline) → “approximately, more or less” belong here.

Two antonymous verbs can be used to cover the whole semantic range or for an action that goes from one end to another (cf. examples 81-83):

ēṛa iṛaiḱap pāṛ- to look a person up and down < *ēṛu-* to climb, rise, increase, go up *iṛaiḱu-* to come down, get down, subside

kaṇṇai mūṭṭi tira- to blink < *mūṭu-* to close *tira-* to to open

7.2.9 Semantic reduplication referring to a group of similar entities

These pairs consist of two words that refer to two prominent members of the whole group. These words are clearly not synonyms as they refer to two different members of the group. The semantic dispersion of the two words differs from case to case. Here we have to differentiate between set expressions referring to a group of similar things and accidental juxtaposition of two words referring to two items. The meaning of the former is usually somewhat broader and does not necessarily refer only to the two things. As these pairs are quite numerous,³⁵ I present only a few examples to illustrate this type of reduplication:

ī kocu different insects < (fly; honey bee, beetle + mosquito)

caṭṭi pāṇai cooking utensils, pots and pans < (earthen vessel, pan + large earthen pot or vessel)

cāmāṇ caṭṭi household articles < (U. *sāmāṇ* goods, furniture, articles + earthen vessel, pan)

ceruppu pūts shoes in general < (sandal + Eng. boots)

coṛi ciraṅku skin problems < (itching, tingling + eruption, pimple, itch)

*puḷu pūcc*³⁶ insects < (worm, maggot + insect, beetle, worm or any small reptile)

peṭṭip paṭukkai bags and baggage < (case, trunk + bedding)

malai kuṇṇu hills < (hill, mountain + hill; mountain)

mūṭṭai muṭṭicu bags and baggage < (bundle, that which is tied up, bag, wallet, satchel + small bundle)

162) *itukaḷ (paṛavaikaḷ) nammuṭaiya payir paccaikaḷaik keṭukkum pūccip puḷukkaḷai ellām piṭittut tiṇṇuviṭum.* 47/10

These birds catch and eat various insects that do damage to our crop.

³⁵ Kinship terms as *aṇṇaṇṭampi* (older brother + younger brother) → “brothers, siblings” *pēraṇpētti* (grandson + grand daughter) → “grandchildren” may also be included.

³⁶ These two words are also “synonymous” as the following designations *kampaḷippuḷu* and *kampaḷippūcci* both with the meaning “caterpillar” show.

These pairs are close to pairs formed by antonyms (see **7.2.8**) such as *pōkku varattu* (*pō* "to go" *varu* "to come" → "traffic, transport"). Sometimes their meaning is similar to echo words, e.g. *cāmāṅ kīmāṅ* → "different articles."

7.2.10 Summary

We have seen that semantic reduplication is a frequent and productive phenomenon in Tamil. It seems that besides numerous set expressions almost any two words similar in meaning can be put side by side to underline and intensify the meaning or to highlight some implication. Most of the words are different in some aspect – meaning, origin or emotive charge. Besides the pairs of words closely related in meaning there are also pairs of words that come from the same semantic field and pairs of two antonyms. It clearly shows that semantic reduplication is firmly rooted in the language.

7.3 ECHO-TYPE REDUPLICATION

Echo-type reduplication is another large subgroup of lexical reduplication, which stands somewhat midway between reduplication of two identical words and semantic reduplication (two synonymous words or words of a very similar meaning). It is an example of **partial** reduplication, where the reduplicant copies the phonetic structure of the base word to produce a rhyming pair, usually with some emotive charge. This phonetic similarity seems somewhere only a formal property accompanying pairs of words based on semantic reasons, elsewhere it is the main formative principle of the pair. Generally most frequent types of echo-type reduplication are **ablaut** and **rhyme combinations**. The term ablaut (not very lucky term as it is normally used for a morphological variation of a root vowel in the verb system only) is used for alternation of a root vowel. Such pairs are numerous in English, e.g. *clitter-clatter, drizzle-drazzle, shilly-shally* etc. but rather rare in Tamil, e.g. *kāṭarai-kūṭarai*. Rhyming pairs consist of two elements joined to rhyme. They form major part of pairs in Tamil, e.g. *coccam-piccam, paṭṭi-totṭi, arumai-perumai* etc.; but they are frequent in other languages as well. For English let me mention *lovey-dovey, helter-skelter* or *higgledy-piggledy*.

Based on semantic motivation of the constituents of the pairs, echo-type reduplication is quite a variable group of phenomena, and can be divided into further subgroups. In many cases it accompanies semantic reduplication and seems to be only a supplementary feature as the reduplicant can be used as an independent lexical item (see 7.3.1 and 7.3.2). Elsewhere, it is the only a feature accompanying the formation of collocations. In these examples the reduplicated word has no meaning by itself and only reflects the phonetic structure of the base (see 7.3.4 and 7.3.5).

First of all, there are pairs of fully meaningful words, which have been put together because they sound similar and produce a rhyming pair. Their meanings may complement each other or they can be totally different. These pairs are sometimes called binomials³⁷ and the similarity (or the oppositeness) of meaning and the similarity of sound are two (even though not necessary) of their main characteristics. They both contribute to the attractiveness of the pair. Instead of using a "simple word," speakers use a rhyming pair, which attaches a certain emotional load to their statement and attracts the attention of the listener. It will be seen that alliteration or rhyme is not only an aspect of binomials or pair words, as some authors call these constructions, but it can be extended to other groups of words and can be considered a general principle responsible for creation of new collocations.

Another large group of RCs, where the phonetic parallelism plays an important role, is represented by echo words (the reduplication of a word with an altered initial consonant or syllable).

³⁷ For binomials see for example Malkiel, Yakov 1959 (mostly English), Čermák, František 2007, pp. 414–429 (Czech, English, Swedish, German, French, Finnish and several other languages), Čermák, František 2008 (Czech), Klégr, Aleš 1991 (Czech and English) or Blatná, Renata 1990 (Czech, Russian and English). The respective authors, however, do not concur in the definition of binomials. Some of them explain the term very loosely and include various kinds of pairs often connected very loosely. The reason for that might be lesser number of such expressions in these languages (compared to languages of Indian subcontinent) which leads the authors to grouping together even very different forms.

Here, the second word is a bound word and has no meaning by itself and imitates the phonetic structure of the base. In this, as well as in the following case, we can talk about echo-type reduplication as the main word formation principle.

Last but not least, there are pairs of words that are very similar to echo words. In these pairs also one of the words has no meaning by itself. It is a dummy word that complements the first word only phonologically. The difference between echo words and other examples of phonetic reduplication is that an echo word can be created *ad hoc* from practically any word, according to certain principles, while other examples are not so productive and very often they are set expressions or conventional pairs of words. We come across many such expressions in various proverbs, sayings, and riddles. This, however, does not mean that new pairs do not appear, as can be witnessed almost every day even in other languages. They are the frequent products of colloquial speech as well as of the language used in advertisements. In any newspaper numerous puns, plays on words, alliterations or similes are immediately at hand. In normal speech they heavily depend on the creativity of the speaker. Tamil, and other languages of the Indian subcontinent, seem to be in this respect more productive than say English or Czech.

Very similar treatment of this phenomenon in English can be found in Marchand (1969, pp. 429–439). He distinguishes between three types of pairs (he talks about “phonically varied rhythmic twin form,” p. 429). Pairs motivated by two meaningful signs, e.g. *sing-song* or *walkie-talkie*; pairs only partially motivated by one meaningful sign plus motivation by rhythm and ablaut (or rime), e.g. *chit-chat* or *super-duper*; lastly pairs motivated by rhythm and ablaut (or rime) only, e.g. *flim-flam* or *boogie-woogie* (Ibid., p. 436). On the same page he argues that: “Syntagmas such as *rainbow*, *fatherhood*, *undo* are motivated by the contents of *rain* and *bow*, *father* and *-hood*, *un-* and *do*. This is obviously not the kind of motivation that applies to ablaut and rime combinations. But we may find a motivation by form. It cannot, indeed, be denied that rhythmic doubling and the elements of ablaut and rime do in fact constitute a motivation, and that these aesthetic elements determine the character of the combinations based on them.”

From this brief outline we can see that echo-type reduplication is strongly connected with the expressivity of language and emotional description of the reality is actually its main function. That is why it occurs primarily in colloquial speech. It is heavily used in plays on words, proverbs etc., where it forms longer phrases or sentences (see **8.3**). I do not take these rhymed sayings into account and focus only on such pairs, which are constituted by two words forming a new lexical item or expression. This frequent usage of rhyme, alliteration or assonance even in everyday utterances can be related to the poetic nature of language as it is described for example by Jakobson (1960) or Friedrich (1986).

As the number of examples shows, echo-type reduplication is too strong in evidence, and, therefore, it cannot be left out when considering word formation processes that are at work in language. Besides rhyme another important factor that stands at the origin of these pairs is sound

symbolism. The treatment of this phenomenon goes beyond the frame of this work, some hints can, however, be found in the following chapters. Semantically, these pairs are more distinctive than semantic reduplication. Here more amount of expressivity is felt and the pairs often refer to vagueness, negligence, scarcity or insufficiency of various kind, love and business intriguing, physical appearance and mental qualities of men. There are pairs positive in meaning but most of them are negative.

The study only outlines the problem and offers some suggestions for further research in the case of problematic examples. The proposed etymology of certain obscure pairs might not be exact and should still be the focus for additional consideration.

7.3.1 Two words that are similar in meaning

This group represents the most frequent type of echo-type reduplication. Often, the two words are nearly synonymous and either of them can be used alone in the same context. Sometimes, they come from the same lexical sphere and the meaning of the pair is a combination of the two meanings. The second word only accentuates or complements the meaning of the first word (cf. semantic reduplication 7.2). The intensity of the whole expression is underlined or multiplied by the similarity in sound of the two words, which provokes the attention of the listener and should add more flavour and interest to the speech. Here, echo-type reduplication accompanies semantic reduplication and we can talk about the interplay of sound and meaning that serves an expressive function. Most frequently these pairs are idioms or set expressions. They can be compared with the English *wiggle-waggle* or *teeny-tiny*:

*aṭakkam oṭukkamāka*³⁸ being humble or modest < (humility, submission, subordination + self-control)

aṭaraṭi paṭaraṭi desperate fighting, hard scuffle, confusion < (troubling, oppressing + scattering, beating)

anti canti morning and evening < (twilight + evening dusk)

amayam camayam opportunity < (opportunity, right time + time; both words are derived from Skt. *samaya*-time)

aluṅṅik kuluṅṅu- to shake, tremble < (to move slightly + to shake, jolt)

aluṅṅāmal naluṅṅāmal without remorse < (to move slightly + to grow faint, wilt; to suffer, pine; to lose stiffness)

both verbs should be in a negative form to produce this meaning; to use the verb *kuluṅṅu-* instead of *naluṅṅu-* is also possible

aḷintu oḷintu to get spoilt, to go wrong < (*aḷi-* to perish, be ruined; to decay; to be defeated + *oḷi-* to cease, desist, stop; to decline, become extinct; to die, perish)

aḷuttam tiruttamāka firmly and precisely < (firmness + correction)

araikuṛai the state of being incomplete; sth. left half done < (half + lacking in sth.; flaw, defect; remainder)

arumai perumai worth and merit < (greatness, pre-eminence + greatness, dignity, excellence, nobleness, grandeur)

³⁸ There is also the form *aṭakka cuṭakkam*. It does not seem probable that the word *cuṭakkam* derives from *coṭakku-* "to crack, as the joints, knuckles; to snap, as the fingers; to crack as lice."

iṭṭiṭaikkū muṭṭiṭaikkū when much needed < (smallness, minuteness; obstacle, hindrance impediment + hardship, straits)

iṭukku muṭukku narrow corner < (narrow lane, + corner, narrow winding street)

illātatum pollātatum falsehood and slander < (a word derived from the root *i-* absence, non-existence + bad, vicious, wicked)

iḷukkap paṛikka barely sufficient < (to pull, draw, haul; to lengthen stretch + to pluck, pick; to pull out)

uṇṇāmal tiṇṇāmal without eating at all < (*uṇ-* to eat or drink, take food + *tiṇ-* to eat, to chew, to bite)

uruṭci tiraṭci stockily, muscular < (rotundity, globularity + plumpness)

uruṭṭal miraṭṭal brow-beating; bullying < (to afflict, cause pain; to vex + to threaten; to intimidate)

uruṭṭu puraṭṭu fraud; employing fraudulent means < (fraud + deceit, treachery)

otukku potukkup paṇṇu to embezzle, to conceal property by omitting to insert it in the list or schedule < (that which is apart, separate + omission)

kakkalum vikkalumāy in a dilemma – to hum and haw, to stammer < (vomiting; anything cast out - as from the mouth + hiccup)

karaṭu muraṭu (of an area) uneven; rugged < (low hill + roughness; coarseness)

kaṣṭa naṣṭam difficulties < (difficulty, trouble + loss, damage, injury)

kaṭṭai kuṭṭai rather short < (shortness, low + shortness, dwarfishness)

kulukkimiṇukki dressy girl < (dressy, mincing woman + showy, attractive woman)

kuṇṭala maṇṭalam coiling round < (circle + circle, sphere, orbit; disc; coil)

caṭṭam tiṭṭam codes and regulations < (law, rule, order + plan, scheme, project; rule, canon, standard)

caḷiṭṭup puliṭṭu to become sour (food); to deteriorate (friendship) < (to become stale and sour + to taste sour)

ceṇikal maṇikal dim red colour; dimness, as of the evening twilight or eclipse < (burnt brick, as red; red ochre in lumps; ruby + decaying, fading; dimness, obscurity; darkness, dusk)

coccam piccam remainder, rest < (balance, remainder + remnant)

coṭṭai collai minor defects, faults < (excavation, furrow, cavity + that which is decayed, useless; stigma, flaw in character)

cottai collai wormeaten, rotten < (that which is worm-eaten, decayed + that which is decayed, carious)

cojji pajji various snacks < (a kind of sweet meat prepared with semolina in ghee or milk with cashew nuts, etc. + snack prepared by dipping thin slices of plantain or potato in flour-paste and frying them)

tirukalmuṛukal crookedness, crumpled condition < (*tiruku-* to twist, turn, wring + *muṛuku-* to wriggle, twist)

nalaniki malaniki be distressed, confused; get very slim, be lean < (to grow faint, wilt, to suffer, pine, to lose stiffness + to be confused, bewildered, distressed)

paṭṭi toṭṭi (every) nook and cranny < (hamlet, village; cattle pound + tub, cistern; pound; small village)

paḷakkavaḷakkam customs and habits < (habit, practice; custom + custom)

miccam coccam remainder, remnant, surplus + deficiency, balance, arrears

vattalum tottalumāka being mere skin and bones; being in an emaciated condition < (thin, being skinny + emaciated, weak person or animal)

163) *kajūkō unikaḷuṭaiya arumai perumaikaḷai nālellām kūrik koṇṭiruppā*. 5/119

Kajuko keeps telling **praises** about you all days.

164) *itu pōyi aluṅkāme kuluṅkāme antak kūṭṭa pōyi muṭṭaiyiṭṭu* [...] 31/139

It lays eggs into this nest **without slightest remorse...**

165) *kuralukkuriyavar kaṭṭai kuṭṭaiyāṇa ācāmi*. 34/8

The voice came from a short **roly-poly** man.

166) *ārikukiraampaḷam iluṅkap pariṅka iruppatāl ovvoru celavaiyum yōcittuttāṇ ceyya vēṇṭiyirukkiratu*.

As our income is **niggardly** we have to consider every expenditure. 7/159

167) *nāṇ etu ceytālum nī coṭṭaicolḷai colkiṛāy*. 6/171

Whatever I do you only **reproach** me.

168) *avaruṭaiya māṭukaḷ ellām vattalum tottalumākat tāṇ irukkiṇṇaṇa*. 7/1199

All his cows are mere **skin and bones**.

The following pairs also consist of two words, which are, however, not so close from the semantic point of view. It is difficult to talk about synonymy or similarity of meanings, but still they have something in common. They have been put together to describe various aspects of the object or "phenomenon" referred to. In several cases the origin of one of the words is not clear and can only be guessed at with some degree of certainty. In a few cases one word is obsolete and is not in active use any longer. It has been preserved only in these pairs because people like them and remember them as a whole. Sometimes, an existing word seems to have been "mutilated" to fit with the other word in the rhyming pair. It again points out the superiority of sound over meaning:

araikulayat talaikulaiya very hurriedly < (*arai* waist, loins + *talai* head + *kulai-* to become loose, dishevelled, unravelled → lit. with cloth and hair flying loose)

āñci oñci having rest after finishing all the work < (*āy-* to search, examine, investigate + *ōy-* to cease, come to an end; to become tired, weary, weak; to rest)

ālum pālumāy in vain, uselessly; in a ruined condition < (to sink, dive; to be idle, lazy??? + to go to ruin, to be laid, waste; to become useless)

ārūtal tērūtal consolation and solace < (consolation + consolation)

iṭam taṭam atmosphere of a place < (place + place)

ēlai pālai the poor and the destitute < (*ēlai* the poor + *pālai* probably derived from *pāl-* to be ruined)

kacānki macānki be confused < (to be squeezed, crumpled; to be exhausted, worn out??? + to become confused, to be doubtful)

kāracāram vehemently, heatedly; pungently < (pungency, hot – in taste; savoury + essence)

kārāṭṭam pōrāṭṭam strife, dispute, quarrel < (quarrel, dispute + struggle, confrontation)

kaikku moykku money at the immediate disposal < (*kai* hand + *moy* money presented at the time of

a wedding, etc.???; -*kku* is the dative suffix)

kōpam tāpam rankling, resentment < (anger, wrath, rage, fury, exasperation + sorrow, distress, anguish; not used independently any longer)

cantu pontu nook and corner; by-lane < (narrow street, lane + hole, recess, hollow)

cuti mati knowledge < (Skt. *śruti* the Vedas + intellect)

taṭṭu muṭṭu household articles < (plate; pan; tier + tool, instrument???)

naṇṭa piṇṭal rice over-boiled and made pappy < (*naṇṭal* macerated mass, rice boiled to a pap + *piṇṭam* lump or mass???)

neḷivu cuḷivu ins and outs (of a business); learning or knowing (the ropes) < (*neḷivu* bend, curve, curl; crawling, writhing; suffering + the word *cuḷivu* may perhaps be connected with *cuḷuvu* simple, easy)

pēccu mūccu signs of life, consciousness < (ability to talk, speech + breath)

muṭṭuk kuṭṭu painful menstruation < (*muṭṭu* menses + blow with the knuckles or the fist on the head, cuff???)

vampu tumpu scandal and gossip; unnecessary interference < (idle talk, gossip; scandal + vulgar or slanderous language; not used independently any longer)

169) *ittaṇai nāḷaikkup piṛaku nammuṭaiya cantippu ippaṭik kōpamum tāpamumāy irukkum enṛu nāṇ niṇaikkavillai.*

I did not expect that our meeting after so many days would full of **anger and rage**. 23/765

170) *iraṇṭē varuṭattil viyāpāra neḷivu cuḷivukaḷait terintukoṇṭuvittēr.* 6/229

In two years only he learnt all the **intricacies** of the business.

171) *eppaṭiyāvatu vampu tumpu illāmal kāriyattai muṭṭuvuṭa vēṇṭum.* 6/311

It is important to finish this task without any unnecessary **interference**.

172) *vicēṣam naṭattaṇum ṇā kaikku moykku irukkā?* 29/130

Let's do something, you say, but have you got any **money at hand**?

7.3.2 Two words that are opposite in meaning

The pairs of this subgroup consist of two words that come from the same lexical sphere but are opposite in meaning. The meaning of the whole expression covers the span between the meanings of the two words. Collocations of antonyms can be found in many Asian languages (cf. **7.2.8** for Tamil or Vacek and Pürev–Očir 1987 for Mongolian) and the similarity of sound again only underlines the sappiness of the pair:

allum pakalum day in day out < (night, darkness-not used independently any longer + day)

ēttukīratukkum tūttukīratukkum having considered < (to praise, extol + *tūrru-* in spoken language pronounced as [tūttu] to defame, slander)

kaṇavu naṇavu sleeping and waking < (dream, sleep + wakefulness, reality)

cātaka pātakam good and bad < (favourableness; facility + adverse effect, harm)

nayam payam kindness blended with reproof < (grace, favour; happiness, joy; civility, attention, courtesy + fear, alarm)

viruppu veṛuppu desire, liking wish; love + disgust, aversion; hatred, enmity; dislike, displeasure

173) *veḷināṭṭil vēlaikkuc celvatil uḷḷa cātaka pātakaṅkaḷaip parri yōcittuviṭṭup piṛaku muṭiveṭu*. 7/561

You should take a decision about going to work abroad only after having considered all **pros and cons**.

7.3.3 Two Words that are unrelated in meaning

Even though I have managed to gather only a few examples, they nicely illustrate the case where two words that are unrelated in meaning have been put together to form a new expression. The reason why the two words occur side by side is in relation to the similarity of sound and the subsequent attractiveness of the expression. These expressions stand between the groups of pairs in which the reduplicant has an independent meaning (7.3.1 and 7.3.2) and the groups of pairs in which the reduplicant is a bound word without any independent meaning (7.3.4 and 7.3.5):

aṭṭital tiruttal corrections (in a manuscript) < (to beat, hit, strike etc.??? + to correct - spelling mistakes, printing errors etc.)

ātāḷi pātāḷi din and bustle < (noise, bustle, roar + anything very difficult to unravel???)

ēṅkal tāṅkal at proper time < (shout + enduring, bearing, delaying)

kaṇmaṇ teriyāmal recklessly, blindly < (*kaṇ* eye *maṇ* earth, soil; *teriyāmal* without seeing)

tuṇi maṇi a general term used to refer to clothes (cloth, textile; garments + precious stone; bell, hour???)

naṇṭu ciṇṭu kids < (crab + littleness, smallness, trifle; small vessel; dandruff)³⁹

tūḷku nāḷku hangman's noose and these things < (hangman's noose + tongue???)

vakai tokai sense of discrimination; details < (kind, class, sort; manner, method, ways, means + sum, amount???)⁴⁰

174) *kiṭaikkira iṭattil kaṇmaṇ teriyāmal kuttiṇāṇ*. 40/28

He punched **without looking left or right** anywhere he could.

Here, we can ask whether the respective words, i.e. *maṇi*, *naṇṭu* or *nāḷku* can really be connected with their lexical meanings. They might be just "ill-formed" echo words as we encounter them in 7.3.5. The meaning of the last pair also suggests this possibility:

³⁹ There is also the expression *naṇṭu nacukku* "little children" (crab + that which is small, little).

⁴⁰ The etymology of this expression is unclear. TL says it has come from Telugu *vakatoga*.

175) *tūkku nākkup pōṭṭuṅṅu eṅ viṭṭukku apavātam koṅṅum varavēṅṅām.* 3/59

You should not bring discredit to my house by **hanging** yourself **or doing such things**.

7.3.4 Echo words

Echo words are usually defined as a repetition of a lexical item with the initial consonant or syllable of the reduplicated part altered according to a certain fixed pattern. Every language that uses echo words usually has one syllable reserved for this purpose (for the list of echo constructions in various languages, see Trivedi, 1990). The lexical categories that are most frequently echoed are nouns and verbs, but adverbs, adjectives and even pronouns can be echoed as well. The words are usually bisyllabic, but monosyllabic or polysyllabic words can also be echoed.

From the semantic point of view, echo words refer to a wider set of things of which the base word is the typical example or as Emeneau (1938, p. 113) puts it: "The function of the formation is to refer to a specimen which the speaker does not care to identify from among a hypothesized collection of identical discrete entities of infinite number or from a hypothesized infinite extension of a non-discrete handleable entity." It could be translated "X and the like." Echo words usually have a negative or slightly sarcastic, ironic connotation. That is why they are used predominantly in negative sentences, questions, prohibitions and commands. Arunachalam (1977, p. 8) says in this respect: "So the echo word comes to be spoken when the speaker is habitually somewhat lax to think and choose a word; in the context his idea is clearly understood by the person spoken to, who will substitute the subject or thought as though it were exactly specified."

The second word has no meaning by itself and can be considered a bound word. To my knowledge there is only one example where an echo word has become an independent lexical item. It is the word *kimpaḷam* "regular bribe," which is derived from the word *campaḷam* "salary, pay."

Dravidian languages use the *ki(i)-/gi(i)-* pattern, so typical examples of echo words in Tamil would be:

nouns: *mēcai kīcai* tables and the like; tables and the other pieces of furniture < (*mēcai* table)

verbs: *uḷaittuk kiḷaittu* toil and moil < (*uḷai-* to work hard, toil)

Kean also mentions examples of echo words for adjectives, adverbs, pronouns and whole phrases (Kean, 2001, pp. 93–94):

nalla paiyaṅ killa paiyaṅ good boy and so forth < (*nalla* good; *paiyaṅ* boy)

cantōṣamākak kintōṣamākap pāṭātē Don't sing joyfully etc. < (*cantōṣamāka* joyfully; *pāṭu-* to sing)

Note that loan words can also be echoed (see examples 170 and 171). As the echo words can be easily formed from almost any lexical item, I do not enumerate them here. They are quite frequent and can be found even in novels or short stories written in spoken Tamil. Some authors frequently employ them (Ashokamitran, Bama and others), others use them very rarely.

Here I quote a few sentences to illustrate the way echo words are used to indicate feelings of the speaker. Notice that besides the echo word *urimai kirimai* the author uses another pair *caṭṭam tiṭṭam* of similar meaning:

176) *vacatiyuḷlavarkaḷukkut tāṇē inta nāṭṭulē caṭṭam tiṭṭam ellām. urimai kirimaiṇṇu pēpparlē eḷutip pōṭṭuṭṭu ūrai ēmāttikkittuttiriyarīṅka.* 34/98

Laws are only for the rich ones in this country. You write about rights and justice in newspapers and betray the village.

177) *nī iṇi erikēyāvatu viḷuntu kiḷuntu cettuk kittut tolañci pō, tolañci pōṇṇeṇ.* 21/166

Now you jump into some pit, **die** and get lost, get lost I said.

178) *pōlisāvāvatu kilisāvatu ellōraiṇṇu nallāt teriyum.* 34/86

I know very well all **these policemen**.

179) *tavucca vāyḱku oru cōṭā kiṭā kuṭikka pērukku oru peṭṭikkaṭa kūṭa keṭaiyātu.* 32/188

There is no even a kiosk to get a **soda or something** for a thirsty person.

By means of echo words speakers can signal their attitude towards the topic discussed in the sentence. They are an important part of the expressive means of language and the effect of this RC is achieved largely by its phonetic structure. It has been brought to perfection in Bengali where the manner of echo words formation is more complex. Bengali language uses several patterns for echoing, which can indicate mental attitude of the speaker. According to Ghosh and Sinha (1973) echo words can be divided into neutral, which do not imply any mental attitude and non-neutral, which do have some expressive connotation. The neutral echo words function as generalizers, e.g. *dudh* "milk" can be echoed *dudh ṭudh* "milk and the like." It can also be echoed as *dudh phudh* to express contempt. Ghosh and Sinha distinguish between three patterns:

ph- to express contempt, e.g. *dudh phudh* milk and the like

m- to express a lack of interest, e.g. *luci mucu* bread and the like

š- to express a feeling of tenderness, e.g. *buro šuro* old man and the like

It is not clear from the article, how often these patterns are really used, and whether these three patterns plus the neutral one can be applied to *any* word to get the whole paradigm. It, however,

nicely points out the importance of the phonetic structure of the reduplicative constructions as well as the way various mental attitudes are expressed through them.

Bengali is, however, not the only language, which has developed this complex structure of echo-words. Similar situation can also be found in Awadhi and probably several other languages of the Indian subcontinent. In Awadhi the replacive phonemes can be *w-* which denotes generality, and *s-* which denotes contemptibility (Trivedi 1990, p. 58). Here again sound symbolism or phonaesthetics come into question.

7.3.5 False echo words

Not all authors agree on what constitutes an echo word and what does not. We can come across expressions that look like echo words formally but differ from them in several respects. First of all, it is not always the lexical element that is echoed. The pairs consist of two words, neither of which can be used in the given context independently. They fit somewhere between echo words and expressives.⁴¹ The origin of the words in the following pairs is quite obscure and I have not been able to connect them with any meaningful lexical item. Most of them are taken from dialectal dictionaries and at least some of them can be dialectal counterparts of particular words from literary Tamil. This is something, however, that should be confirmed by a native speaker:

accali puccaliyā to itch all over one's body

acci picci bottom and bowels

aracal puracal in a way one cannot specify, vaguely

alukku pilukku ostentation, showing off

aṭalai muṭalai vain words

āccalpāccalā less than a little, not enough

ālācōlā a type of dance

ātalai mātalai state of confusion or disturbance

āvaṭṭai cōvaṭṭai weariness, exhaustion; this expression can also be found in the form *avaṭṭa covāṭṭa*

kaṇṭānumuṇṭānum household utensils

karavu caravu well built body

kōkku mākku juggling, deceiving

kōlām pūlām to be in a bad condition⁴²

cāppu mūppu bits and pieces

cittup pūttup pō to grasp for breath after hard work

⁴¹ They can be distinguished from expressives in several ways: 1) they are not followed by the quotative word *enru* 2) they differ in meaning 3) onomatopoeia are predominantly bimorphemic or monomorphemic words.

⁴² The word *kōlām* might be connected with Skt. *kolāhala* a loud and confused sound, uproar, great and distinct noise. But even in Sanskrit the origin of the word is unclear.

tattukuttu limited wisdom
tiṅṅu muṅṅu contradiction, contradictory speech
tillu mullu deceit, deceitful words, lies
tōtu mātu money available
naccām puccāṅ remainder
nēkku pūkku ability to say appropriate words when needed
vattā tottā rashness or arrogance in speech

180) *ciccilippu kaṅṅatuṅāla puḷḷaikkū orē accali puccaliyā irukkum pōlirukku.* 28/35

Due to the chicken pox the child's body **itches** all over.

181) *vīṭu pūrā ippaṭiyā kōlām pūlām ṅu vacciruppatu.* 28/142

He maintains the house **with** great **negligence**.

182) *kaiyila oṅṅum tōtu mātu illāmatāṅ cantaiikki pōvula.* 26/163

As I had no **money available** I did not go to the market.

183) *nēkku pūkku teriṅca āḷā pōṅātāṅ avariḱṅṅa camāḷikkalām.* 26/175

He is a **clever** monkey. He will help us.

Secondly, there is a large group of expressions that resemble echo words very closely because they are formed from a fully lexical word, which is echoed by altering its first syllable. The reduplicant has no meaning by itself and both words form a rhyming pair. Here, the difference is in the way the initial syllable is changed. We have seen that an echo word can be formed from practically any lexeme in a largely predictable way. In the case of Tamil, the first syllable will be replaced by *ki-/kī-*, according to the quantity of the first syllable of the echoed word. The following expressions, however, develop a very unique and unpredictable manner of echoing, which is usually not implemented in other cases. Notice, that the reduplicant not always follows the base, in many cases it precedes the base word:

akkam pakkam neighbourhood, vicinity; around < (??? + *pakkam* side; neighbourhood, nearness; place)

acaṅṅu picaṅṅu behaving foolishly, stupidly < (*acaṅṅu* stupidity + ???)

amaḷi tumali great uproar < (*amaḷi* tumult, uproar, bustle + ???)

aṅṅa cuṅṅam humility, modesty < (*aṅṅam* humility, unobtrusive behaviour + ???)

aṅṅaiyūm paṅṅaiyūmāka at any condition, whenever < (??? + *paṅṅai* being bed-ridden)

araṅṅaḷ purāṅṅalāka less than a little, not enough < (??? + *purāṅṅu* to turn, bring to the other side)

alaṅṅa malaṅṅa confusedly < (??? + *malaṅṅu*- to be confused, bewildered, distressed)

alluc cillu paṅṅu to be frittered < (??? + *cillu* broken piece)

aḷḷaiṅṅi taḷḷaiṅṅi unsteady swaying to and fro < (??? + *taḷḷaiṅṅu*- to stagger, falter, be unsteady)

ācāraṅṅi kōcāraṅṅam tradition, habit < (*ācāraṅṅam* moral or ethical codes and practices + ???)

āsti pāsti property < (*āsti* property + ???)
icaku picaku unexpectedly; improperly < (??? + *picaku* failure, mistake, error, blunder; variance, deviation)
iṭakku muṭakku cavil, specious objection < (*iṭakku* vulgar language, cavil, captious speech; rudeness, pertinacity, obstinacy + ???)
ekaṇai opposite to, facing each other < (??? + *mukaṇai* fore part, front)
etirum putirumāka facing each other, contrary to sth. < (*etir* that which is opposite + ???)
elaiyurū kolaiyumā being terrified < (??? + *kolai* murder)
ēṇal kōṇal unevenness, irregularity, crookedness < (??? + *kōṇal* being crooked, bent, askew)
ēppai cāppai that which is useless < (??? + *cāppai* may be connected with *cappai* that which is tasteless or useless)
kāṭarai kūṭarai a disreputable woman < (*kāṭarai* one whose ear has been cut off or mutilated??? + ???)
koṇcam naṇcam the little, itsy bitsy < (*koṇcam* a little + ???)
kōṇiku māṇiku strong and straight < (*kōṇiku* a species of plant in the *Dipterocarpaceae* family + ???)
kōṇal māṇal irregular manner, unevenness < (*kōṇal* being crooked, bent, askew + ???) karainta 137
kūccam nāccam shyness, bashfulness < (shyness, bashfulness, modesty, delicacy + ???)
cākki pākki extra quantity obtained in the bargain, balance < (??? + *pākki* balance, the rest)
cāṭai māṭaiyāy by hints, indirectly < (*cāṭai* hint, gesture + ???)
cūtu vātu guile, cunning < (*cūtu* deceit, cunning + ???)
taṭayam uṭayam ornaments < (*taṭayam* ornaments + ???)
naccu piccu ceaseless trouble; incessant chattering < (trouble, worry; bable + ???)
taḷḷup puḷḷu scuffle, pushing and pulling < (*taḷḷu* pushing + ???)
pōkkiri cākkiri one who has no refuge < (*pōkkiri* one who has no refuge + ???)
virikka marikka ostentatively < (*vir-* to open, unfold, expound + ???)
veḷḷaium caḷḷaiyum white dress or clothes < (*veḷḷai* white + ???; *-um* connecting particle)
lēcu pācu ordinarily < (*lēcu* that which is easy + ???)
jōli kōli work, affair < (work, occupation + ???)

184) *nī cēttu vaccayirukkīra āsti pāsti ellām āṇṭu āḷa āḷu illyēṇṇu ayvuriyā?* 18/52

Are you crying because there is no one to rule over all this **property** you have gathered?

185) *maḷai araṭṭal puraṭṭalāt tāṇ peṇcatu.* 29/45

It rained just a **little**.

186) *maram kōṇku māṇkā vaḷarntirukku.* 29/140

The tree has grown **high and strong**.

187) *inta jōli kōli ṇṇu ellām pēccu vēṇṭām.* 3/44

You don't have to tell (me) what are my **tasks and duties**.

Now the question arises as to how these expressions have come into existence. One possibility is that the expression originally consisted of two lexical words, one of which might have been distorted too much to fit the rhyme or it is simply an archaic word that has stopped being used independently and survives only in the pair.⁴³ Blending of two words or remodelling one word to fit the rhyme and to remove differences between the two members of the pairs were considered important formative processes of reduplicatives (his term) by Thun (1983). As an example he gives the pairs *chatter-watter* (< chatter-water) *cherry-merry* (< cheery+merry) and *slightly-tightly* (< slightly tight). The same opinion is held by Güntert (1914) who considered rhyme as a sole formative principle of such pairs. According to him there are two ways in which these pairs come into existence: 1) originally different words with similar meaning have been remodelled so as to become nearly alike; or on the contrary 2) words which were similar in form have come closer to each other also in meaning (pp. 10–11).

Another possibility is that such a word has never existed and the pairs have been formed in a process very similar to the process of forming echo words (cf. the word *kimpalam* derived from the word *campaḷam* as shown above). This would mean that they are very close to echo words, only they have been formed irregularly. This is quite probable because we can come across many such “ill-formed” echo words, not only in other Indian languages (cf. for example Apte 1968 for Marathi, Mustafa 1979 for Dakkhni, Hettiaratchi 1959 for Sinhalese, Smékal 1979 for Hindi, Bhaskararao 1977 for Telugu, or Goswami 1957 for Kamrupi), but also in other language families that use echo words extensively (cf. for example Leslau 1961 for Ethiopian).⁴⁴ This is especially the case in pairs of words where one of them differs as a result of the loss of the initial consonant and these are quite frequent in Indian languages. Whether or not all these constructions are really “ill-formed” echo words, or, on the contrary, the echo words have evolved from such ill-formed pairs as the pattern of echoing has been gradually “standardized,” is difficult to ascertain. Here, it is important to say that alliteration, reduplication and rhyme as an expressive device are peculiar to Tamil from at least the Sangam age (cf. Sangam poetry). Tamil speakers do not hesitate to use them in a great variety of ways and on plenty of occasions, which could explain the existence of these “ill-formed” echo words.

However, several other explanations relating to the possible origin of these pairs are at hand. We have noticed that it is not always the second word that cannot be etymologized. In the first few examples it is the first word that is a bound word and the two words mostly differ only in the absence of the initial consonant. Consider, for example, the pair *alaṅkamalaṅka*. Interestingly enough, there is another expression *malanīkamalaṅka*, which has exactly the same meaning as *alaṅkamalaṅka* and is

⁴³ Pairs in which one word is archaic and not used independently any longer are not infrequent. We have seen, for example, the pairs *kōpam tāpam* or *allum pakalum* (cf. above).

⁴⁴ Leslau (1961, p. 207) uses the term echo words in a somewhat broader sense and includes: 1) echo-words in which both words have meaning 2) echo-words in which the first word only has meaning 2) echo words in which the second word only has meaning 4) echo-words in which none of the components has meaning by itself, the meaning resulting from the complex. It is evident that the main criterion for him is the phonological shape of the pair and his classification is parallel to the classification of echo-type reduplication as applied in this study.

also very frequent.⁴⁵ It seems to be possible that the word *malaṅka* was originally fully reduplicated, and subsequently the initial consonant was removed so that it sounded better.⁴⁶ In Tamil, lexical reduplication is much more frequent than echo-type reduplication and employs a lot of functions. It would seem that the expressions *parakkapparakka* (confused) and *arakkapparakka* (hurriedly, in a haste) represent a somewhat similar situation. This, however, cannot explain the origin of all the pairs.

Change of a vowel or a consonant may also be, at least in several cases, the reflection of the semantic charge of the pair, i.e. it may be of iconic character. Vowel (somewhere perhaps even consonant) variation represents the sense of "irregularity, unevenness, disorder, diversity" etc. as in the English *helter-skelter*, *pell-mell*, *higgledy-piggledy* or Czech *hala bala*, *cik cak*, *cimpr campr* and *lážo plážo*. According to Carnoy (1918) it goes hand in hand with our instinct for the rhythm in the language (see below 7.3.7).

It is not always necessary that both words should be connected with any meaningful lexical item in the strict etymological sense. The meaningful word can only "reverberate" in the reduplicated word. Thus, the pair *uppuccappu* "taste" consists of the word *uppu* "salt" and the word *cappu*. The latter can perhaps be connected with the verb *cappu-* "to suck, chew":

uppuccappu of food - taste; of speech, etc. - interest < (*uppu* salt + *cappu* may be connected with *cappu-* to masticate, suck, chew; cf. *cappukkoṭṭu-* relish a dish or an item of food by making a click)

The word *cappu* is hardly ever used as a noun in this sense. Nonetheless, the reverberation of this verb and possibly also the verb *cāppiṭu-* "to eat" can be felt in this expression. The whole pair is thus interesting for the speakers because it rhymes and joins two words that can be connected with two meaningful words related to taste and eating.

This pair is currently in use but the Tamil Lexicon (p. 2153) and Catācivam (1966, p. 64) mention a similar older form *nappuccappu*. The origin of the word *nappu* is unclear. It seems possible that there was an expressive, which was gradually changed to fit with meaningful lexical items (for expressives with phonetic change, see the next paragraph). The possibility of the origin from another (e.g. Munda language) should also be taken into account.

Whether or not the other pairs are also examples of a similar process, or the other word has simply been forgotten or distorted too much, is difficult to say. Here I would like to warn against any hasty conclusion. The origin of these pairs must be considered individually if it is to be found at all, as it may differ in various examples.

⁴⁵ There is also the pair *nalaṅki malaṅki* "be distressed, confused" (cf. above).

⁴⁶ In the same way Blatná (1990, p. 177) explains the origin of similar expressions in English, Czech and Russian: Cz. *hala* > **halahala* > *halabala* "messily," Ru. *chala* > *chalachala* > *chalabala* "superficial man," Eng. *hullo* > **hullohullo* > *hullabaloo* "fuss, uproar." Etymological dictionaries only support this thesis.

7.3.6 Alliteration

Besides rhyme the alliteration also plays an important role in formation of certain pairs. They consist of two words similar in meaning and they begin with the same syllable. I have listed here only a few pairs to illustrate the point, more examples can be found in paragraphs above:

kiṇṭik kiḷaru- (to stir; to make or prepare by stirring; to probe, poke + to stir; to make or prepare by stirring; to arouse, kindle, provoke)

kuṇṭum kuḷiyum potholes (hollow, lowness; pool, pond + pit, hole, cavity, depression; tank, pond)

cikkuc ciluku (intricacy, complication; obstacle, impediment + trouble, affliction; perplexity)

tappit tavarī (to err, mistake, blunder, fail + to err, mistake, blunder)

pikkal piṭurikal minor vexations; claims - which one is subject to < (*pikku* trouble, intricacy, perplexity, hindrance???) + annoyance, vexation)

pikkuppīcaku trouble, worry < (trouble, intricacy, perplexity, hindrance + failure, mistake, error, blunder)

mukki muṇaku- to do sth. with much difficulty < (to strain in order to do sth.; groan + to mutter, murmur, grumble, moan)

piṇṇip piṇai- to plait, braid, lace, knit, weave, entwine, interweave + to entwine, conjoin, unite)

vaḷam vaṇmai (fertility, productiveness, luxuriance; abundance, fullness + fruitfulness, fertility, abundance)

7.3.7 Partly reduplicated expressives

The last group of words that seem to make use of phonetic parallelism is partly reduplicated expressives (for the treatment of expressives see 7.3). I have gathered more than 70 examples of such expressives, most of which can be found in the Tamil Lexicon. That is why I do not list them here. In a few cases they can be derived from fully lexical words (or the other way round):

kōṇu- to be bent, curved, crooked, oblique

> *kōṇal* wryness, obliquity, hump, crookedness (a verbal noun derived from the verb *kōṇu-*)

> *kōṇalmāṇal* irregular manner, unevenness < (being crooked, bent, askew + ill-formed echo word?)

> *kōṇāmāṇāveṇal* expr. signifying confusion or disorderliness⁴⁷

Most of them are of onomatopetic character and no connection with lexical words can be established. Several bisyllabic partly reduplicated expressives can be compared with completely reduplicated ones:

ciḷuciḷeṇal onom. expr. of bubbling, as boiling water

ciḷupuḷeṇal onom. expr. of bubbling, as boiling water

⁴⁷ This pair can also be found in the form *kōṇakka māṇakka*.

topputtippeṇal onom. expr. signifying falling with a thumping noise or sound of falling blows
topputtoppeṇal onom. expr. signifying falling with a thumping noise or sound of falling blows

nacunacu- to waver; to be continually drizzling; to be damp; to tease, trouble
nacunaceṇal expr. signifying dampness; toughness, tenacity; troubling, teasing; drizzling; wavering
nacupiceṇal expr. signifying dampness; toughness, tenacity; troubling, teasing; drizzling; wavering

188) *paravaikaḷ ellām kācmūcceṇru kattikkoṇṭu parakkat toṭarikiṇṭṭaṇa*. 41/181

All birds **screeched** and flew away.

It is difficult to say what role the rhyming sound plays in this case. It may be connected with their semantic charge as Carnoy (1918, pp. 112–113) puts it: "The proof of the actual existence of such an instinct for what has been called, by Van Ginneken, a sound accent is easily found in the spontaneous dissimilation in onomatopoeias such as Eng. *dingdong*, *seesaw*, *chitchat*, *tiptop*, and Fr. *zigzag*, *tictac*, *brie et broc*. The same differentiation has been introduced in Eng. *shilly-shally* from shall I, shall I. Such groups are found in all languages. They are onomatopoeias representing movements in which the up and down of the activity is symbolized by high tone and clear vowel alternating with low tone and faint vowel."

Another reason that Carnoy sees behind this variation of vowels and consonants in various pairs is our instinct for balancing rhythm (Ibid., p. 113), which is very close to my view. I assume that the echo type reduplication (the similarity of sound, rhyming) plays here a role very similar to the one in the examples presented above. It allows speakers to attack the subconsciousness of the listener and deliver the information in a special way. The subtle change of the sound adds more flavour to the whole expression.

This, however, needs to be proved in case of Tamil on the basis of a comparison involving completely and partly reduplicated onomatopoeia, something that requires the intuition of the native speaker. For the time being, I leave this question open.

7.3.8 Summary

We have seen that the phonetic pattern of reduplicated structures plays an undeniable role in Tamil, mainly on the expressive level. Besides riddles, anecdotes or plays on words that usually contain a lot of rhymed expressions in all languages, this feature in Tamil appears to be one of the formative principles of the lexicon. It often occurs with semantic reduplication as its accompanying or supplementary feature. Besides "ideal" pairs, in which two lexical words similar in meaning stand side by side and rhyme, there are also pairs of words that differ considerably in meaning, and pairs of words that are totally unrelated in meaning. The reason why they collocate is again their similarity in sound.

This makes them interesting for the listeners and it is the reason why many archaic words have been preserved and are used in these pairs even today. It means that the semantic level has been in many cases subordinated to the phonetic level and the descriptive level has been subordinated to the expressive or emotional level.

This is clearly visible in the case of "false echo words." Here the speaker gives up the effort to find a suitable rhyming word and simply "invents" a "new" word that imitates the phonetic structure of the preceding word. This process is even simplified in the case of echo words that might have gradually evolved from this context. Here, the speaker creates a rhyming pair from, basically, any lexical word by a simple trick, and the effect of its meaning, as well as the understanding of the listener, are guaranteed. By means of these constructions, the speaker acts on the emotions of the listener and wants his speech to be impressive. They are an important part of the expressive means of language and by these constructions speakers express their attitude towards a particular thing. A similar process seems to be at work even in the case of onomatopoeia and expressives, where many words have been created on the same principle. This, however, still needs to be proved.

Echo-type reduplication can thus be considered as another formal subgroup of the reduplicative process. It often accompanies other types of reduplication and it is one of the features responsible for the creation of new collocations. The richness and complexity of the examples calls for further and more elaborate research.

8. PHRASAL REDUPLICATION

In the beginning of the study I divided reduplicative constructions into five bigger groups with regard to what is reduplicated. The following examples show that basic features of lexical reduplication can be applied not only to words but also to phrases or clauses. The assertion that reduplication is a process that involves phonemes, morphemes, words, phrases or sentences can be found in numerous articles but as refers to reduplication of phrases or longer utterances only very few authors documented this assertion with examples. To my knowledge only three authors (Fitzpatrick-Cole 1996, Lidz 2000 and Keane 2005) tackled this problem in a greater detail. They all focused on echo-type constructions and came to different conclusions relating its formation. I do not go into much detail relating formal properties of these RCs and I present here a few more examples to show that formal and semantic properties that were found in case of lexical reduplication are productive not only on the word but also on the sentential level.

8.1 Reduplication of phrases with no modification

We have seen that the most important function of identical word reduplication is iteration and intensification. The following examples illustrate that the same meaning can be delivered even within phrases. The last example is especially noticeable as the reduplicated phrases are separated by a finite verb:

189) *mūccu vāṅki mūccu vāṅki miṇṭum miṇṭum kuṭippārkaḷ.* 18/78

They drank again and again while **breathing deeply**.

190) *aṭutta vaḷai aṭutta vaḷai eṇṇu irupatu naṇṭukaḷukku mēḷ piṭṭāḷ.* 18/142

(She went) **from one hole to another** and caught more than twenty crabs.

191) *pū alampip pū alampip pū mitantatu.* 55/890

Flowers were floating in (the water) while **wabbling** rhythmically (in the current).

192) *koñca nēram viṭṭu koñca nēram viṭṭu kūppiṭṭu varukiṛārkaḷ.* 54/80

They called **while after while**.

193) *naḷuvik koṇṭu naḷuvi koṇṭu pōy viṭukiṛārkaḷ.* 2/132

You just **keep escaping**.

194) *vaḷi kēṭṭu vaḷi kēṭṭu tāmparam varaikkum naṇantē vantēṇ.* 42/141

Asking the way repeatedly I reach Tambaram by walk.

195) *polambikkittu ketakkiyē polampikkittu*. 48/41

You do not do anything else, **just mourning**.

8.2 Reduplication of phrases for semantic reasons

As refers to longer utterances, repeating the same thing in different words for the sake of emphasis, persuasion etc. is to a greater or lesser extent common to speakers of all the languages in this world. Here it is probably impossible to discriminate between mere repetition, reduplication and say paraphrase. It is not my aim to define exactly these categories relating utterances larger than a word as it would require going through more material and perhaps not yield much tangible conclusions.

An extraordinary example to the point is the collocation *paṭṭa pakal* (broad daylight) *veṭṭa veliccam* (bright light) as in *paṭṭa pakalil veṭṭa veliccattil intap paṭukolai naṅantirukkiratu*.⁴⁸ Both parts can be used individually and the whole expression testifies that Tamil has a strong tendency to reduplicate. Note that in (196) a phrase originally Sanskrit words stands side by side phrase consisting of Tamil words. I found this interesting example in Kalki who says it about a lady who nearly drowned:

196) *itu taṅakkup puṅar jaṅmam maṅu piṅappu*.⁴⁹ 23/295

It was for her a **new birth, new birth** (i.e. rebirth)

Other interesting examples of the reduplication of a whole phrase are:

197) *eṅṅa vekkai, eṅṅa cūṭu!*

It is very very hot! (lit. What heat, what a scorcher!) < *vekkai* heat *cūṭu* warmth, heat

198) *neṭṭu vaṅarntu niṅṭu paṅarntu ōṅkit taṅaittirukkum āla viruṅṅam* [...] 23/922

Long grown long spread well growing and flourishing banyan tree...

199) *aṅṅa cantōṅṅam. malivu maṅiṅṅi*. 4/79

Poor happiness. Mean joy.

⁴⁸ "This cold-blooded murder happened in the broad daylight." Annamalai et alia 2006, p. 955.

⁴⁹ The expression *puṅar jaṅmam* comes from Sanskrit while *maṅu piṅappu* is Tamil calque.

8.3 Phonetic features of repeated phrases

Phonetic parallelism plays very important role in the formation of longer utterances as well. Many sayings, proverbs and various plays on words has it as one of the formative principles. They can be found in dictionaries of proverbs and that is why I do not enumerate them here, except for just a few examples:

200) *viṭṭa kuṟai toṭṭa kuṟai* 6/334

The unbroken chain of affinities

201) *ksaṇac cittam ksaṇap pittam* 32/93

One moment smart another moment fool.

202) *ilaittavaṅ eḷḷai vitai koḷuttavaṅ koḷḷai vitai.* 26/285

Everybody should act in accordance with their means.

Notice that the echo-formation by means of the substitution of the first syllable by *ki/kī-* pattern can also be applied to phrase:

nalla paiyaṅ killa paiyaṅ good boy and so forth < (*nalla* good; *paiyaṅ* boy)

But one-time creations are also not infrequent. Schiffman (1971, p. 38) says about the following pair: "This poetical play on words exhibits the rhythmical nature of some puns in Tamil; because Tamil is basically a syllabically oriented language, such puns abound in the plays you are reading":

203) *sinkil cuntaram ṭabbil tantaram* 48/35 and 38

Single Cundaram double cunning.

Such nonce creations that only wait to possibly become lexical units are quite difficult to detect unless one is in everyday contact with the language. They are nonetheless quite common and can be found again in other languages as well (cf. for example the English greeting "See you later, alligator" and the response "In a while, crocodile." Example taken from Rastall 2004, p. 38).

8.4 Summary

I presented here a few examples of reduplication of phrases, but I did not go into great details. The possibility of reduplication of even supralexical elements, however, clearly shows that reduplication cannot be considered exclusively a morphological process similar to affixation or compounding. More research is needed in this sphere.

9. CONCLUSION

We have seen that reduplication is a very productive phenomenon in Tamil. Namely the lexical reduplication is very rich in functions and has three major subgroups, i.e. identical word reduplication, semantic reduplication and echo-type reduplication.

The reduplicative constructions can be roughly divided into constructions referring to quantity and constructions referring to quality. The former ones are considered slightly grammaticalized forms of simple repetition, which have gradually acquired some more general meanings. Typical example of quantitative reduplication in Tamil is the reduplication of identical word, which is used for the expression of plurality, distribution, intensification, iteration, graduality and several other notions.

The latter ones, i.e. qualitative reduplication include namely semantic and echo-type reduplication. They are used for very accurate description of the world, for formation of new words or expressions, and, the echo-type reduplication due to its rhythmical character is often used for an emotive expression of the feelings of the speaker.

Reduplication of phrases can be considered an extension of lexical reduplication. Even within the phrasal reduplication the three major subgroups can be delimited on the same principles as we have seen it in case of lexical reduplication.

Morphological reduplication is somewhere considered highly grammaticalized reduction of complete, i.e. identical word reduplication. In Tamil it is confined to only a few types of constructions.

Bound word reduplication has several specific features. It stands somewhere between morphological and lexical reduplication.

We have seen that besides typical and frequent reduplicative constructions there are many marginal and less prototypical ones, which are, however, very important links and can give us important testimony about the process of reduplication. The great number of examples of RCs nicely document the richness and innovation of the process of reduplication and subsequently of the expressive level of the language.

Desiderata

The formal properties of certain RCs have not been described in great detail for several reasons. This should be amended after more material is amassed. The problem of reduplication of phrases with which I dealt only marginally would also deserve more attention. I almost altogether ignored the diachronic point of view. Going through older texts and comparing the obtained material with the RCs occurring in contemporary Tamil would be a great asset. The last important challenge is cross-linguistic comparison after we have at our disposal detailed description of this phenomenon in other languages. This would yield more general conclusions.

Key words: repetition, reduplication, Tamil, echo-words, expressives, expressivity

Résumé in English

The study deals with the phenomenon of reduplication in contemporary Tamil. In the beginning it tries to distinguish between reduplication and mere repetition. There is no sharp border between the two phenomena as they have much in common and some of the reduplicative constructions have evolved from simple repetition. These constructions underwent certain process of grammaticalization and gradually acquired more general meaning. Other possible sources of the origin of RCs are baby talk, onomatopoeitic words or language contact. Very important aspect here is the establishment of the pattern of reduplication, which after taking roots in the language can be productively used as a model for further expressions.

The main criteria for distinguishing between reduplication and repetition have been put as follows: the form of the units of input/output, number of copies, communicative reinforcement, intonation, possibility of insertion of further segments, meaning and the context in which these constructions occur.

The greater part of the study deals with the reduplicative constructions themselves. First, it classifies them into six big groups according to what is reduplicated: morphological reduplication - reduplication of a morpheme or part of a word; bound word reduplication - a special group of reduplicated bound words appended with the quotative word; lexical reduplication - reduplication of a word, and phrasal reduplication - reduplication of a phrase or sentence. Lexical reduplication can be further subdivided into three major subgroups, i.e. identical word reduplication, semantic reduplication, i.e. reduplication of (nearly) synonyms; and echo-type reduplication, i.e. reduplication of a word with some phonetic change to form a rhyme.

As refers to the typology of reduplication I assume that its neat classification is a difficult task. All the groups have further subgroups with a lot of overlaps and mergers and only vaguely delimited boundaries. It is in full accordance with one of the basic principles of cognitive linguistics, which view language categories not as clearly delimited but as units with fuzzy boundaries that exhibit family resemblance and prototypicality effect. This means that some members of one category are more central than others and membership in a category is conditioned by certain number of common features.

After the classification the study brings detailed description of various RCs with special attention to less frequent and less typical constructions. Some of the RCs can have various meanings and functions, which is documented by examples taken from dictionaries, novels and short stories. The examples are very important asset of the study as a special care was taken to illustrate the productivity and wide semantic scope of reduplicative constructions in Tamil.

Résumé česky

Práce se zabývá reduplikací v tamilštině. Kromě obvyklých typů reduplikace se soustředí především na méně časté typy, které se dosud neobjevily v publikacích ostaních autorů vůbec anebo jen ve velmi omezené míře. Tyto příklady nejen dokreslují celou podstatu reduplikace jako jevu, ale také vypovídají o vztahu jednotlivých typů reduplikace mezi sebou. Dokazují zejména, že jasné ohraničení určitých jazykových jevů je spíše jen přáním některých jazykovědců než platnou realitou. V tomto případě vycházím z principů kognitivní lingvistiky, která nahlíží jazykové kategorie jako ne přesně vymezené, ale jako jednotky vykazující druhovou podobnost a efekt prototypu (*prototypicality effect*). To znamená, že u některých členů dané kategorie se objevuje více typických rysů než u ostatních a jsou tedy pro danou kategorii více typické a reprezentativní. Příslušnost v dané kategorii je pak podmíněna počtem určitých společných rysů.

V úvodu se práce snaží vymezit samotný pojem reduplikace a odlišit reduplikaci od prostého opakování, ze kterého reduplikace často vzniká a se kterým se částečně překrývá. Přestože hranice mezi oběma jevy není nijak ostrá, dají se alespoň typické příklady odlišit na základě intonace, významu, možného důrazu, formě vstupních a výstupních jednotek, počtu opakování, možnosti vložení dalších slov a v neposlední řadě kontextu, ve kterém se oba jevy nejčastěji vyskytují. Mnohé formy reduplikace se vyvinuly z prostého opakování, prodělaly určitou míru gramatikalizace a postupně získaly obecnější význam. To platí zejména o reduplikaci téhož slova, jež se používá k vyjádření plurality, habituálu, frekventativu nebo imperfektu. Dalšími zdroji reduplikativních konstrukcí jsou dětská mluva, onomatopoetické výrazy a jazykový kontakt.

Práce rozděluje reduplikaci v tamilštině na čtyři základní skupiny, podle toho, co se opakuje: morfologickou (opakování částí slov), opakování závislých slov, lexikální (opakování slov) a reduplikaci frází. Lexikální reduplikace je tvořena třemi velkými podskupinami a to: opakování téhož slova, opakování významu pomocí dvou fonologicky odlišných slov a reduplikaci echového typu, kde hraje velkou roli fonetická struktura celé konstrukci tvořící vlastně rým.

Následně se práce věnuje jednotlivým druhům reduplikace, popisuje jejich formální aspekty a především pak významy a funkce. Vše bohatě dokládá pečlivě vybranými příklady ze současné tamilské literatury. Množství příkladů ilustruje produktivitu, inovativnost a bohatost reduplikace coby velmi významné expresivní složky jazyka.

References

Index of primary sources

1. Acōkamittiraṇ, 1977, *18-vatu aṭcakkōṭu*. Chennai: Kalaiñāṇ patippakam.
2. ———, 2005a [1969], *Karainta niḷalkaḷ*. Chennai: Kiḷakku patippakam.
3. ———, 2005b [1973], *Taṇṇīr*. Chennai: Kiḷakku patippakam.
4. ———, 2006a [1984], *Inru*. Chennai: Kiḷakku patippakam.
5. ———, 2006b [1985], *Orraṇ*. Nagercoil: Kālaccuvaṭu patippakam.
6. Annamalai, E., Subramanian, P. R. (eds.), 2004, *Taṅkālat tamīl maraputtoṭar akarāti*. Chennai: Aḷaiyāḷam.
7. Annamalai, E., Ramakrishnan, S. (eds.), 2006 [1992], *Kriyāviṇ taṅkālat tamīl akarāti (tamīl-tamīl-āṅkilam)*. *Dictionary of Contemporary Tamil (Tamil-Tamil-English)*. Chennai: Cre-A (and its second edition 2008).
8. Annamalai, E., and Asher, R.E., 2002, *Colloquial Tamil: The Complete Course for Beginners*. London: Routledge.
9. Ātavaṇ, 2004 [1977], *Kākitā malarkaḷ*. Chennai: Uyirmai patippakam.
10. Catācivam, Mu., 1966, *Olikkurippakarāti (Dictionary of Onomatopoeic expressions)*. Chidambaram: Aḷaku accakam.
11. Cīvākāmi, 2004 [1989], *Paḷaiyaṇa kaḷitalum. Paḷaiyaṇa kaḷital ācīriyar kuṟittu*. Chennai: Marutā.
12. Cīruṭaiyāṇ, Tēṇi, 2001, *Viḷutu*. Chennai: Aṇṇam patippakam.
13. Cūṭāmaṇi, Ār., 1980, *Kaṇṇammā - eṇ cakōtari*. Chennai: Kalaiñāṇ patippakam.
14. ———, 2001, *Kataikaḷ*. Chennai: Rājarājaṇ patippakam.
15. Cūryakāntaṇ, 1989, *Māṇāvāri maṇitarkaḷ*. Chennai: Tākam.
16. Burrow, T., 1984, *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford [Oxfordshire]: Clarendon Press.
17. Iḷāṅkumaraṇ, Irā., 1985, *Iṇaiccol akarāti*. Tinnevely: The South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society.
18. Imaiyaṇ, 2004 [1994], *Kōvēru kaḷutaikaḷ*. Chennai: Cre-A.
19. ———, 2004, *Maṇ pāram*. Chennai: Cre-A.
20. Itayavēntaṇ, Vi. Pā., 2003, *Iruḷ tī*. Chennai: Marutā.
21. Jēcutāsaṇ, Hepsipā, 2005 [1964], *Puttam viṭu*. Nagercoil: Sudarsan Books.
22. Kalki, 2003a [1953], *Alai ocai*. Chennai: Vāṇati patippakam.
23. ———, 2003b [1986], *Civakāmiyiṇ capatam*. Chennai: Vāṇati patippakam.
24. ———, 2002 [1985], *Pārttipaṇ kaṇavu*. Chennai: Vāṇati patippakam.
25. Kumār, Tilīp, 2000, *Kaṭavu*. Chennai: Cre-A.
26. Kumāracuvāmi, Ta. Nā., 1955, *Kaṇyākumāri*. Chennai: Allayaṇs kampaṇi.
27. Kuṇacēkaraṇ, Kaṇmaṇi. 2007, *Naṭunāṭṭu collakarāti*. Chennai: Tamīliṇi.

28. Monier-Williams, M., 1899, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
29. Murukaiyā, Pa., 2004, *Nellai vaṭṭāra vaḷakkuc collakarāti*. Chennai: Amutā patippakam.
30. Paḷaṇiyappā, Cupramaṇiyaṅ, 2006, *Ceṭṭināṭṭu vaṭṭāra vaḷakkuc collakarāti*. Chennai: Tamiliṇi.
31. Pāmā, 2003, *Oru tāttāvum erumaiyum*. Coimbatore: Viṭiyal patippakam.
32. ———, 2004 [2001], *Taḷumpukaḷ kāyaṅkaḷāki*. Coimbatore: Viṭiyal patippakam.
33. Pārttacārati, Intirā, 2000 [1971], *Helikāṭṭarkaḷ kilē iṅṅankiviṭṭaṅa*. Chennai: Kalaiṅṅaṅ patippakam.
34. Pārttacārati, Intirā, 2005, *Kurutippuṅal*. Chennai: Kiḷakku patippakam.
35. ———, 2006, [1973], *Tantira pūmi*. Chennai: Kiḷakku patippakam.
36. Perumāḷ, A. K., 2004, *Nāñcil vaṭṭāra vaḷakku collakarāti*. Chennai: Tamiliṇi.
37. Perumāḷ, Murukaṅ, 2000, *Koriku vaṭṭārac collakarāti*. Chennai: Kuruttu veliyiṭu.
38. Perumāḷ, Murukaṅ (ed.), 2001, *Talit parriya koṅkuc ciṅrukataikaḷ*. Coimbatore: Putumalar patippakam.
39. Perumāḷ, Murukaṅ, 2004, *Pi kataikaḷ*. Chennai: Aṭaiyāḷam.
40. ———, 2005 [1993], *Niḷal murrām*. Nagercoil: Kālaccuvaṭu patippakam.
41. Perumāḷ, Murukaṅ, 2007, [2000], *Kūḷa māṭāri*. Nagercoil: Kālaccuvaṭu patippakam.
42. Pukaḷ, 2002, *Mutti*. Chennai: Cre-A.
43. Rakunāṭaṅ, 2006 [1957], *Pañcum paciyum*. Chennai: New Century Book House.
44. Rājamayyar, B. R., 2001 [1986], *Kamalāmpāḷ carittiram*. Chennai: New Century Book House.
45. Rājanārāyaṅaṅ, Ki., (ed.), 2002, *Ku. Aḷakiricāmi kataikaḷ*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
46. Rājanārāyaṅaṅ, Ki., 2004 [1988], *Ki. Rājanārāyaṅaṅ kataikaḷ*. Tanjavore: Akaram.
47. ———, 2005, *Kuḷantaipparuvak kataikaḷ*. Tanjavore: Akaram.
48. Rāmacāmi, Suntara, 2007 [1964], *Piracātam*. Nagercoil: Kālaccuvaṭu patippakam.
49. Schiffman, H., 1971, *Reader for Advanced Spoken Tamil. Part II: Grammar and Glossary*. Seattle: Institute of International Studies.
50. Subramanian, P.R. (ed.), 2008, *Contemporary Tamil Prose Reader with notes, translation and glossary*. Chennai: Mozhi.
51. *Tamil Lexicon*. Volume I–VI. 1924–36, Madras: University of Madras.
52. Tamilccelvi, Cu., 2003, *Kiṭāri*. Chennai: Marutā.
53. Tēvapārati, 2005, *Cāyarikāla mayakkam*. Chennai: Cantiyā patippakam.
54. Vaṅṅanilavaṅ, 2001, *Vaṅṅanilavaṅ kataikaḷ*. Chennai: Cantiyā patippakam.
55. Vaṅṅatācaṅ, 2001, *Vaṅṅatācaṅ kataikaḷ*. Chennai: Putumaippittaṅ patippakam.
56. Winslow, M., 2001 [1862], *A Comprehensive Tamil-English Dictionary*. New Delhi, Chennai: Asian Educational Services.

Secondary sources

- AARTS, Bas, Denison, David, Keizer, Evelien, and Popova, Gergana (eds.), 2004, *Fuzzy Grammar. A Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ABBI, Anvita, 1980, *Semantic Grammar of Hindi. A Study in Reduplication*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications Private Limited.
- , 1985, Reduplicative Structures: A Phenomenon of the South Asian Linguistic Area. In: Acson, Vaneeta Z. and Leed, Richard L., *For Gordan H. Fairbanks. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication*. No. 20., Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- , 1990, Reduplication in Tibeto-Burman Languages of South Asia. *South Asian Studies* Vol. 28:2, pp. 171–181.
- , 1992, *Reduplication in South Asian Languages. An Areal, Typological and Historical Study*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers.
- , 1994, *Semantic Universals in Indian Languages*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.
- , 1997, Reduplication in Dravidian. In: Subramoniam, V.I. (ed.), *Dravidian Encyclopaedia Vol. III, Language and Literature*. Thiruvananthapura: The International School of Dravidian Linguistics.
- ANNAMALAI, E., 1968, Onomatopoeic Resistance to Sound Change in Dravidian. In: Krishnamurti, Bh. (ed.) *Studies in Indian Linguistics*. Annamalainagar, Poona, pp. 15–19.
- APTE, M.L., 1968, *Reduplication, Echo Word formation, and Onomatopoeia in Marathi*. Poona. Deccan College.
- ARUNACHALAM, M., 1977, Echo-Words in Tamil. *Journal of Tamil Studies*. Vol. 11, pp. 1–10.
- BARTENS, Angela, 2000, *Ideophones and Sound Symbolism in Atlantic Creoles*. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- BLATNÁ, Renata, 1990, Binomiály typu "techtle-mechtle" v češtině, ruštině a angličtině (Binomials of the "techtle-mechtle" type in Czech, Russian and English). *Slavia – časopis pro slovanskou filologii*. Vol. 59:2, pp. 169–182.
- BHASKARARAO, Peri, 1977, *Reduplication and Onomatopoeia in Telugu*. Poona: Deccan College.
- BEYTHAN, Hermann, 1943, *Praktische Grammatik der Tamilsprache*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- BOTHA, Rudolf, 1988, *Form and Meaning in Word Formation. A Study of Afrikaans Reduplication*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- BYBEE, Joan, Perkins, Revere, and Pagliuca, William, 1994, *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- BYBEE, Joan, 2007, *Frequency of Use and the Organization of Language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- CARNOY, Albert J., 1918, The Real Nature of Dissimilation. In: *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*. Vol. XL IX. Ginnand Company, Boston, pp. 101–114.

- COLLINS, Millard A., Collins, Virginia R., and Hashim, Sulfilix A., 2001, *Mapun-English Dictionary*. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- ČERMÁK, František, 2007, Binomiály. (Binomials). In: *Frazeologie a idiomatika - česká a obecná. Czech and General Phraseology*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Karolinum, pp. 414–429.
- , 2008, Binomials: Their Nature in Czech and in General. In: *Phraseologie global - areal - regional. Akten der Konferenz Europhras 2008 vom 13-16.8*. Tübingen, Helsinki: Gunter Narr Verlag, pp. 309–315.
- ČERMÁK, František, and Klégr, Aleš, 2008, Binomials in an Historical English Literary Perspective: Shakespeare, Chaucer, Beowulf. In: Procházka, M., Čermák, J. (eds.), *Shakespeare between the Middle Ages and Modernity. From Translator's Art to Academic Discourse. A Tribute to Professor Martin Hilský*. Praha: Charles University Press, pp. 40–62.
- CHATTERJI, S. K., 1960, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyaya.
- CONATHAN, Lisa, and Good, Jeffrey, 2000, Morphosyntactic Reduplication in Chechen and Ingush. In: Okrent, Arike, and Boyle, John P. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society 36-2: the panels*. Chicago: Chicago: Linguistic Society, pp. 49–61.
- CROFT, William, and Cruse, Alan D., 2004, *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- DIFFLOTH, Gérard, 1976, Expressives in Semai. In: Jenner, P. N., Thompson, L. C., and Starosta, Stanley (eds.), *Austro-Asiatic Studies. Oceanic Linguistic Series Special Publication*. No. 13, pp. 249–264.
- EMENEAU, M. B., 1938, Echo Words in Toda. *New Indian Antiquary* Vol. 1, pp. 109–117.
- , 1969, Onomatopoeics in the Indian Linguistic Area. *Language* Vol. 45:2, pp. 247–299.
- , 1987, Some notes on Dravidian intensives. In: Cardona, G., and Zide, N. H. (eds.) *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, pp. 109–113.
- EMENEAU, M. B., and Hart, Kausalya, 1993, Tamil Expressives with Initial Voiced Stops. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* Vol. 56:1, pp 75–86.
- EVANS, Vyvyan and Green, Melanie, 2006, *Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, London.
- FEDSON, Vijayarani Jotimuttu, 1981, Reduplication and Expressivity in Tamil. In: Arunachalam, M. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference – Seminar of Tamil studies*. Vol. 1. Madras: International Association of Tamil Research, pp. 51–63.
- FITZPATRICK-COLE, Jennifer, 1996, Reduplication Meets the Phonological Phrase in Bengali." *Linguistic Review* Vol. 13, pp. 305–356.
- FRIEDRICH, Paul, 1986, *The Language Parallax: Linguistic Relativism and Poetic Indeterminacy*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- GHOSH, Manjuli, and Sinha, Prabhakar, 1973, On Echo-Words in Bengali. In: Kelkar, Ashok R., Biligir, H. S., Srivasta, R. N., and Kumar, Suresh (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth All-India Conference of Linguistics*. Agra: The Linguistic Society of India, Kendriya Hindi Sansthan, pp. 167–174.
- GIL, David, 2005, From Repetition to Reduplication in Riau Indonesian. In: Hurch, Bernard (ed.) *Studies in Reduplication*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 31–64.
- GOODENOUGH, Ward H., and Sugita, Hiroshi, 1980, *Trukese-English Dictionary*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- GOSWAMI, Upendra, 1957, Onomatopoeic and Echo-Words in Kamrupi. *Indian Linguistics* Vol. 17, pp. 161–164.
- GRICE, Paul H., 1975, Logic and Conversation. In: Cole, P., and Morgan, J. L. (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* Vol. 3., New York: Academic Press, pp. 41–58.
- GÜNTERT, Hermann, 1914, *Über Reimwortbildungen im Arischen und Altgriechischen: eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- HAAS, Mary R., 1942, Types of Reduplication in Thai (with some comparisons and contrasts taken from English). *Studies in Linguistics* Vol. 1:4, pp. 1–6.
- HARRISON, Sheldon P., 1973, Reduplication in Micronesian Languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* Vol. 12, pp. 407–454.
- HETTIARATCHI, D. E., 1959, Echo Words in Sinhalese. *University of Ceylon Review* Vol. 17, pp. 47–50.
- HINTON, Leanne, Nichols, Johanna, and Ohala, John J. (eds.), 1994, *Sound symbolism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HOPPER, Paul J., and Traugott, Elizabeth, 1993, *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- INKELAS, Sharon, and Zoll, Cheryl, 2005, *Reduplication: Doubling in Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ISRAELI, Alina, 1997, Syntactic Reduplication in Russian: A Cooperative Principle Device in Dialogues. *Journal of Pragmatics* Vol. 27, pp. 587–609.
- JAEGER, Jeri, and Ohala, John, 1984, On the Structure of Phonetic Categories. *Proceedings of the 10th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp. 15–26.
- JACKENDOFF, Ray, 2004, Categorization, Fuzziness, and Family Resemblances. In: Aarts, Bas, Denison, David, Keizer, Evelien, and Popova, Gergana (eds.), *Fuzzy Grammar. A Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 109–130.
- JAKOBSON, Roman, 1960, Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In: Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.) *Style in Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 350–377.
- JESPERSEN, Otto, 1982 (10th ed.), *Growth and Structure of the English Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- JESUDASAN, Hephzibah, 2007, *Lizzy's Legacy*. Chennai: New Horizon Media, (translated from Tamil by

- G. Geetha).
- KEANE, Elinor, 2001, *Echo Words in Tamil*. Unpublished D. Phil. Thesis. Merton College, Oxford.
- , 2005, Phrasal Reduplication and Dual Description. In: Hurch, Bernard (ed.) *Studies in Reduplication*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 239–261.
- KLÉGR, Aleš, 1991, A Note on Binomials in English and Czech. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae Philologica 1. Prague Studies in English XIX*, pp. 83–88.
- KOCH, Barbara Johnstone, 1983a, Arabic Lexical Couplets and the Evolution of Synonymy. *General Linguistics 23*, pp. 51–61.
- , 1983b, Presentation as Proof: The Language of Arabic Rhetoric. *Anthropological Linguistics* Vol. 25, pp. 47–60.
- KOUL, Omkar, s.a., *Reduplication in Kashmiri*. <http://www.iils.org/pdf/Reduplication.pdf>
- LANGACKER, Ronald, W., 1991, *Concept, Image, and Symbol. The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- LEHMANN, Thomas, 1989, *A Grammar of Modern Tamil*. Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture.
- LESLAU, Wolf, 1961, Echo-Words in Ethiopic. *Annales d'Ethiopie* Vol. 4, pp. 205–238.
- LIDZ, Jeffrey, 2000, Echo Reduplication in Kannada: Implications for a Theory of Word-Formation. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* Vol. 6:3, pp. 145–166.
- LYONS, John, 1992 [1981], *Language and Linguistics. An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MALKIEL, Yakov, 1959, Studies in Irreversible Binomials, *Lingua* Vol. 8, pp. 113–60.
- MAAS, Utz, 2005, Syntactic Reduplication in Arabic. In: Hurch, Bernard (ed.) *Studies in Reduplication*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 395–429.
- MALTEN, Thomas, 1989, *Reduplizierte Verbstämme im Tamil*. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH.
- MARCHAND, Hans, 1969, *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation: A Synchronic-Diachronic approach*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- MORIN, Yves Ch., 1972, The Phonology of Echo-words in French. *Language* Vol. 48:1, pp. 97–108.
- MORAVCSIK, E. A., 1978. *Reduplicative constructions*. In Greenberg, Joseph H. (ed.), *Universals of language*. Vol. 3. Word Structure. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 297–334.
- MORAWSKI, J., 1927, Les formules Rimées de la Langue Espagnole. *Revista de Filología Española* Vol. 14:2, pp. 113–133.
- NEWMAN, Stanely S., 1946, On the Stress System of English. *Word* Vol. 3:2, pp. 171–187.
- NIEPOKUJ, Mary, 1997, *The Development of Verbal Reduplication in Indo-European*. Washington: Institute for the study of man.

- OBERFALZEROVÁ, Alena, 2009, Onomatopoeia and Iconopoeia – as an Expressive Means in Mongolian. *Mongolo-Tibetica Pragensia '09. Ethnolinguistics, Sociolinguistics, Religion and Culture*. Vol. 2:1, Praha, pp. 29–60.
- POPE, G. U., 1983 (7th ed.), *A Handbook of the Tamil Language*. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.
- RABEL, Lili E., 1968, Redundant Expressions in Khasi. In: Krishnamurti, Bh. (ed.), *Studies in Indian Linguistics: Professor M. B. Emeneau Sastipurti Volume*. Annamalainagar and Poona: Centres of Advanced Study in Linguistics, Deccan College, pp. 257–286.
- RAIMY, Eric, 2000, *The Phonology and Morphology of Reduplication*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- RASTALL, Paul, 2004, Playful English: Kinds of Reduplication. *English Today* Vol. 20, pp. 38–41.
- RAU, Victoria. D., 2005, Yami Reduplication, *Concentric: Studies in Linguistics* Vol. 31:2, pp. 57–87.
- RUBINO, Carl, 2005, Reduplication: Form, function and distribution. In: Hurch, Bernard (ed.) *Studies in Reduplication*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 395–429.
- SAMARIN, William J., 1970, Inventory and Choice in Expressive Language. *Word* Vol. 26:2, pp. 153–169.
- , 1971, Survey of Bantu Ideophones. *African Language Studies* Vol. 12, pp. 130–168.
- SCHIFFMAN, H., 1971, Reader for Advanced Spoken Tamil. Part II: Grammar and Glossary. Seattle: Institute of International Studies.
- SHIBASAKI, Reijirou, 2005, On the Grammaticalization of Verbal Reduplication in Japanese. In: Hurch, Bernard (ed.) *Studies in Reduplication*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 283–313.
- SINGH, Rajendra, 1982, On some "Redundant Compounds" in Modern Hindi. *Lingua* Vol. 56, pp. 345–351.
- SMÉKAL, O., 1979. The Reduplicative Formations and Semantic Pairs in Hindi. *Asian and African Studies. Studia Orientalia Pragensia IX*. Praha, pp. 3–91.
- SPAGNOLO, Lorenzo, M., 1933, *Bari Grammar*. Verona: Missioni Africane.
- STEEVER, Sanford, 1998, *The Dravidian Languages*. London: Routledge.
- TANNEN, Deborah, 1987, Repetition in Conversation: Toward a Poetics of Talk. *Language* Vol. 63:3, pp. 574–605.
- THUN, N., 1963, *Reduplicative Words in English*. Uppsala.
- TRIVEDI, G.M., 1990, Echo Formation. In: Krishan, Shree (ed.), *Linguistic traits across language boundaries (a report of All India Linguistic Traits Survey)*. Calcutta: Anthropological Survey of India. pp. 51–81.
- UHLENBECK, E. M., 1978, *Studies in Javanese Morphology*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- ULLMANN, Stephen, 1962, *Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- VACEK, J., 1989, On Semantic Reduplication in Indian Languages (In the Margin of Language Universals). *Archív Orientální* Vol. 57, pp. 347–358.
- , 1994, On Semantic Reduplication in Tamil. *PILC Journal of Dravidic Studies* Vol. 4:2, pp. 145–150.
- VACEK, J., and Pürev-Očir, B., 1987, Lexical Pairs in Mongolian (Some Theoretical and Practical Problems of Formation and Interpretation). *Archív Orientální* Vol. 55, pp. 370–386.
- WILTSHIRE, Caroline R., 1999, Expressives in Tamil: Evidence for a Word class. In: Singh, Rajendra (ed.), *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 1999*. New Delhi, Thousand Oaks, London: Sage Publications, pp. 119–137.
- ZARKA, Dina E., 2005, On the Borderline of Reduplication: Gemination and Other Consonant Doubling in Arabic Morphology. In: Hurch, Bernard (ed.) *Studies in Reduplication*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 369–364.
- ZIKMUNDOVÁ, Veronika, 2002, "Iconopeia" in Mongolian and Manchu. In *Mongolica Pragensia '02. Ethnolinguistics in Synchrony and Diachrony*. Praha: Triton, pp. 129–149.
- ZVELEBIL, K.V., 1955, On Emphasis and Intensification in Tamil. *Archív Orientální* Vol. 23, pp. 435–464.