



# INTERNAL LOCALISATION NN ADV REDUPLICATION IN SICILIAN

Giuseppina Todaro, Florence Villoing, Philippe Gréa

## ► To cite this version:

Giuseppina Todaro, Florence Villoing, Philippe Gréa. INTERNAL LOCALISATION NN ADV REDUPLICATION IN SICILIAN. Colloque International de Morphology, Dec 2012, Bordeaux, France. hal-01439761

**HAL Id: hal-01439761**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01439761>**

Submitted on 18 Jan 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# INTERNAL LOCALISATION NN<sub>ADV</sub> REDUPLICATION IN SICILIAN

Giuseppina Todaro, Florence Villoing & Philippe Gréa

Università Roma Tre / CLLE-ERSS, CNRS & Université Toulouse 2

Jean Jaurès, Université Paris 8 Saint-Denis, Université Paris Ouest

Nanterre

## Abstract

This article proposes a classification of reduplicative structures in Sicilian and provides a detailed analysis of one such structure, which forms adverbs through complete reduplication of nominal lexemes or word forms (NN<sub>adv</sub>). We show that this construction is part of the basic morphology of Sicilian. This subject is of interest for two reasons. First, Sicilian morphology is only rarely addressed in the linguistic literature, and Sicilian itself is always treated only from a dialectological or philological point of view. Moreover, this article proposes a morphological analysis of NN<sub>adv</sub> reduplication, which is a rare phenomenon in Romance languages, and has consequently never been the object of an in-depth study, particularly not from a lexicalist perspective. While the literature on reduplication cross-linguistically highlights semantic values associated with plurality, verbal aspect, intensity, repetition and expressiveness, this article shows that reduplication can express a locative meaning.

## 1. Introduction

Reduplication is one of the morphological lexeme-formation processes available in Sicilian, but is only rarely addressed in the literature, and then only from a syntactic perspective (Caracausi 1977, Leone 1995, Sgarioto 2005, Amenta 2010). In this article, we present a classification of reduplicative structures in Sicilian and provide a more detailed formal, categorial and semantic analysis of a rare morphological reduplication rules those forming internal localisation adverbs through nominal reduplication (1):

- (1)     [[strata]<sub>N</sub>-[strata]<sub>N</sub>]<sub>Adv</sub><sup>1</sup>  
           street-street  
           ‘in the street’

This study is particularly original in several points:

- (i) Sicilian is one of the few Romance languages (along with Sardinian, cf. Floričič 2011), which presents multiple morphologically productive reduplicative rules. Although reduplication exists in many languages (Mel’čuk 1996-97), it is typically considered a basic morphological process in Austronesian languages, ancient African languages of the Niger-Congo family or in Creoles (Kouwenberg 2003), but not in Indo-European languages, where it is rarely found (see overview in Wiltshire & Marantz 2000).
- (ii) The reduplication rules studied in Sicilian are considered as being part of constructional morphology, whereas the general tendency in morphological studies of reduplication involves inflexional morphology (Thornton 2009).

From a morphological perspective, the present study differs from recent studies of reduplication in both formal and semantic terms, since:

- morphological reduplication constructions in Sicilian involve only complete reduplication, which is frequently considered trivial and uninteresting, both empirically and theoretically (Katamba 1993, Lieber 1992) compared to partial reduplication, which has drawn much more attention in morphological studies (possibly attributing an affixal status to the reduplicated element, depending on its position in the word (Matthews 1991, Spencer 1991));
- semantic properties of reduplication have drawn less attention in the literature than morpho-phonological (cf. templatic morphology (Marantz 1982)) and prosodic properties (McCarthy & Prince 1990). Since Sicilian NN<sub>adv</sub> reduplication produces quite original semantic values compared to those typically observed for this type of process (plurality, verbal aspect, intensity, repetition, expressiveness) (Mel’čuk 1996-97, Wiltshire & Marantz 2000).

This paper is organized as follows: we first define **reduplication** as a morphological process, distinguishing it from the syntactic process, which we term **reiteration** (2.1). We use the tests proposed by Gil (2005) to identify

---

<sup>1</sup> We use orthographic transcription (that evokes Italian spelling but not for the phonetic peculiarity of Sicilian), since phonetic transcription is not relevant for the present analysis.

the boundary between the two levels in which the juxtaposition of two otherwise autonomous forms occurs (morphology and syntax). Next, we propose a theoretical analysis that places reduplication among word-formation rules, although distinct both from derivation and compounding (2.2). Section 3 is devoted to reduplication in Sicilian: we propose a classification of reduplication constructions (3.2) based on the data presented in (3.1). Finally, in section 4, we analyse one of the most common reduplication constructions ( $NN_{adv}$ ), which forms adverbs through complete reduplication of a noun. We present the categorial (4.1), morpho-syntactic (4.2) and semantic properties (4.3.) of this construction. In particular, we show that this reduplication rule forms dynamic (4.3.1) and static (4.3.2) internal localisation relations.

## 2. Reduplication

The structures formed by the repetition of the same linguistic form (or part thereof), repeated twice or more, is known by a variety of terms in the literature (reduplication, repetition, reiteration, iteration, doubling). These terms refer to a series of heterogeneous phenomena, both formally (complete vs. partial reduplication) and in terms of the linguistic level involved (phonology, morphology, syntax). In what follows, we try to provide the arguments that characterize this phenomenon on the morphological level. We will keep the term reduplication to account for the morphological processes, involving a constructional (2) or an inflectional (3) phenomenon, that builds lexemes or words through complete (2, 3) or partial (4) reduplication of the base (Anderson 1992, Lieber 1992, Katamba 1993, Booij 2010, Wiltshire&Marantz 2000).

- (2) Italian  
 La bambina mangia un **lecca-lecca** alla fragola  
 DET little girl eat.3SG DET lick-lick PREP(ART) strawberry  
 ‘The little girl licked a strawberry lollipop’
- (3) Sranam  
 saka **saka-saka**<sup>2</sup>  
 bag bag.PL
- (4) Ilocano  
 píngan **píngpíngan** dálan **daldálan**<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Exemple from Aboh, Smith, Zribi-Hertz 2012.

<sup>3</sup> Exemple from Gleason 1955.

plate          plate.PL                      road          road.PL

We distinguish between *reduplication* and *reiteration*, reserving the latter term for syntactic repetition (or *syntactic emphasis*, *iconic function*, Forza 2011, Aboh, Smith, & Zribi-Hertz (eds) 2012 (introduction), Moravcsik 1978:301), as in (5-6).

- (5) Italian  
 Correva,      correva,      ma non riusciva      a      raggiunger-la  
 run.IPFV.3SG run.IPFV.3SG but NEG manage.IPFV.3SG PREP catch-her  
 ‘He ran, he ran, but he couldn’t catch her’
- (6) Italian  
 Mi guardava      con quei suoi occhi neri      neri  
 REFL look.IPFV.3SG PREP DET.PL POSS.PL eyes      black.PL black.PL  
 ‘He/she looked at me with her/his black-black eyes’

## 2.1 The external boundaries of reduplication: criteria distinguishing morphological reduplication and syntactic reiteration

In order to differentiate between the morphological process (our *reduplication*) and the syntactic process (our *reiteration*, *repetition* in Gil 2005), we adopt the criteria proposed by Gil (2005) to establish the boundary between syntactic and morphological phenomena.

Criterion	Repetition	Reduplication
1. Unit of output	greater than a word	equal to or smaller than a word <sup>4</sup>
2. Communicative reinforcement	present or absent	absent
3. Interpretation	iconic or absent	arbitrary or iconic
4. Intonational domain of output	within one or more intonation group	within one intonation group

<sup>4</sup> We do not accept the possibility of having a unit smaller than a word as output, since as a morphological process, reduplication cannot produce units larger or smaller than the word level.

5. Contiguity of copies	contiguous or disjoint	contiguous
6. Number of copies	two or more	usually two

**Table 1: Criteria distinguishing reduplication and reiteration (Gil 2005)**

In the next sections, we analyze examples from (2-6) above in accordance with five criteria:

- domain (2.2.1)
- interpretation and communicative function (2.2.2)
- phonology (intonational domain) (2.2.3)
- contiguity and written form (2.2.4)
- number of copies (2.2.5).

#### 2.2.1 Domain

The output of reiteration (*repetition* in Gil 2005) should involve units larger than a word, whereas reduplication should involve lexemes and word-forms. In (5), (6), the output is larger than a word, therefore is the result of a syntactic operation (in Gil's 2005 terms). In contrast, in (2-4), the output is found within word boundaries. To test this hypothesis, we can apply the insertion test, which examines whether lexical material can be inserted in the middle of the output string. If the example remains grammatical after insertion, we are dealing with a syntactic unit; if it is ungrammatical, the output is a lexical unit (as illustrated below with one example for each type).

##### a. Insertion of lexical material into the output in (6)

- (7) Italian  
 Mi guardava con quei suoi occhi neri **proprio** neri  
 REFL look.3SG PREP DET.PL POSS.PL eyes black.PL so black.PL  
 'She looked at me with her black, so black eyes.'

##### b. Insertion of lexical material into the output in (2)

- (8) Italian  
 \* La bambina mangia un lecca e lecca alla fragola  
 DET little girl eat.3SG DET lick and lick PREP(ART) strawberry  
 'The little girl eats a strawberry lollypop.'

The application of this test demonstrates that (7) involves a syntactic

operation, which creates syntactic units, while (8) involves a morphological operation forming a new lexeme which cannot be broken up by syntax. Thus, morphological reduplication is not the iteration of a word but the iteration of a lexical item before it becomes available to syntactic processes, which obviously operate on a higher level of language (Forza 2011).

### 2.2.2 Interpretation and communicative function

These two criteria are based on the semantics of the output. The intention to generate *communicative reinforcement* or an iconic interpretation (Kouwenberg, S. (ed) 2003) suggests that the process under discussion may be a syntactic operation (for a critical analyses of iconicity see Aboh, Smith & Zribi-Hertz 2012). If the intention and the interpretation are different, then the process involved is morphological reduplication. Examples (5-6), repeated here (an every time) for convenience in (9-10), show communicative strengthening (insistence that underlines the recurrence or long duration of the action (9) or of the particular property (10)) and the interpretation is iconic (repetition of the action in (9) and the amplification of the quality in (10)).

- (9) Italian  
Correva, correva, ma non riusciva a raggiunger-la  
run.IPFV.3SG run.IPFV.3SG but NEG manage.IPFV.3SG PREP catch-her  
'He ran, he ran, but he couldn't catch her'

- (10) Italian  
Mi guardava con quei suoi occhi neri neri  
REFL look.IPFV.3SG PREP DET.PL POSS.PL eyes black.PL black.PL  
'He/she looked at me with her/his black-black eyes'

In contrast examples (2-3), repeated here in (11-12), show no communicative strengthening, but a real specific sense (action → object (11), plurality (12)).

- (11) Italian  
La bambina mangia un lecca-lecca alla fragola  
DET little girl eat.3SG DET lick-lick PREP(ART) strawberry  
'The little girl licked a strawberry lollipop'

- (12) Sranam  
saka saka-saka  
bag bag.PL

### 2.2.3 *The intonational domain criterion*

The intonational criterion is based on the assumption that the phonological form of a word forms a single intonational domain, while a syntactic unit may correspond to several intonation domains. This is a criterion that can reinforce the others (although it can be difficult and subjective, in a complex word to distinguish a primary stress, especially in a reduplicate or a compound item). Every Italian speaker would clearly feel the intonational and accentuation difference between the reduplicated nominal in (13) and the imperative form in (14):

- (13) [[lecca]<sub>V</sub>-[lecca]<sub>V</sub>]<sub>N</sub>  
lick-lick  
'lollipop'

- (14) lecca(!) lecca!  
lick(!) lick!  
'lick (!) lick!'

The sequence in (13) is a reduplicate word (a lexeme), while the sequence in (14) is a sentence, the repetition of an order, a repeated imperative form (a syntactic structure) that contains a longer pause between the two parts.

### 2.2.4 *Graphical contiguity*

Elements which are a part of the same lexical unit show a certain degree of contiguity at the phonological level as well as at the graphic level (but we shall see that the written form remains quite arbitrary). If there is no contiguity and the elements are separated, then we are dealing with more than a single lexical item. Contiguity, which is even evident on the written form, exists between the input components in (15), but not in (16), where the two forms are even separated by a comma (in writing) or a long pause (in oral). As it involves the written form, this point is also a rather arbitrary parameter, mentioned only as a strengthening criterion.

- (15) Italian  
La bambina mangia un lecca-lecca alla fragola  
DET little girl eat.3SG DET lick-lick PREP(ART) strawberry  
'The little girl licked a strawberry lollipop'

- (16) Italian  
Correva, correva, ma non riusciva a raggiunger-la  
run.IPFV.3SG run.IPFV.3SG but NEG manage.IPFV.3SG PREP catch-her



‘He ran, he ran, but he couldn’t catch her’

The example in (15) can have three different representations in written Italian language: *lecca lecca*, *lecca-lecca*, *leccalecca* (Thornton-2007). Anyway Italian speakers conceive that as a single word, while in (16) the two elements are certainly separated by a comma and conceived of as two different words.

#### 2.2.5 Number of copies

This criterion is based on the recursivity of the operation. Since reiteration is a recursive process, the ability to repeat the operation several times (and thus to have the base form repeated at least three times) is an argument in favor of the hypothesis that it is a syntactic process. However, a non-recursive operation, that is, if repetition of the operation (having at least three copies of the base form) creates an ungrammatical output, is an argument in favor of the hypothesis that it is morphological reduplication.

- (17) Italian  
Correva, correva, correva ma non riusciva a  
raggiunger-la  
run.IPFV.3SG run.IPFV.3SG run.IPFV.3SG but NEG manage.IPFV.3SG PREP  
catch-her  
‘He ran, he ran, he ran, but he couldn’t catch her’

- (18) Italian  
\*La bambina mangia un lecca-lecca-lecca alla fragola  
DET little girl eat.3SG DET lick-lick-lick PREP(ART) strawberry  
‘\*The little girl licked a strawberry lick-lick-lick’

The example in (17) indicates that a syntactic operation is involved, while in (18), a prototypical syntactic feature such as recursivity makes the sentence ungrammatical.

#### 2.2 Internal boundaries of morphological reduplication

The aim of this article is not only to show, through the analysis of semantic nuances, that reduplication in Sicilian is a morphological rather than a syntactic process, as assumed in the literature (Caracausi 1977, Leone 1995, Sgarioto 2005, Amenta 2010), but also to show, through the examination of morphological reduplication cross-linguistically, that this phenomenon cannot be classified either as derivation or as compounding. In some analyses which do not view morphological reduplication as a distinct morphological

process, this phenomenon has been analysed as a type of derivation (Aronoff 1976, Inkelas&Zoll 2005, Scalise-Bisetto 2008) or a type of compounding (Bauer 2003).

(i) In derivational morphology, every affixal operation is associated with a specific function. Thus, the Italian suffixal rule represented by *-mente* (like Fr. *-ment*, Eng. *-ly*) always forms adverbs. An affix is a non-autonomous phonological form that is associated with a specific semantic meaning and a lexical category. In contrast, the type of affixes referred to in the discussion of reduplication have neither a specific shape nor their own semantic value. In other words, the supposed reduplicative affixes are not affixes in the sense that they are not phonological units, while derivational affixes are stable phonological representatives of morphological rules.

(ii) Compounding is, by definition, a process that selects two different lexemes. The analysis of reduplication as a type of compounding can therefore apply only to complete reduplication and cannot be applied to partial reduplication, since one of the components involved is not lexeme. In addition, compounding, by definition, selects two distinct lexemes.

We therefore conclude that neither derivation nor compounding can include reduplication as a subtype. Consequently, we propose the hypothesis that reduplication is an autonomous morphological process, alongside derivation and compounding:

(19) Morphological rules of word formation



### 3 Reduplication in Sicilian

Sicilian employs both (syntactic) reiteration and (morphological) reduplication. In this context, we present only reduplicative constructions. Below, we outline our data collection (3.1), present a classification of structures (3.2) and analyze the categorical (3.3) and morpho-phonological (3.4) properties involved. The semantic properties are discussed in section 4.

#### 3.1 The data

The absence of a large-scale corpus limits studies on the morphology of Sicilian. In fact, as it is fundamentally a spoken language, written production is very limited. For example, the only analysis of word formation in Sicilian (Emmi 2011) uses a corpus that dates from the first

decades of the 20th century (based on theatrical texts and poems). The data used here are derived from a corpus of units from dictionaries and works in Sicilian Philology, Dialectology and linguistics, and from a field survey of speakers of varied generations (n=20, aged 18-80).

Speakers were interviewed using a questionnaire (based on testing Italian/Sicilian translations) with two objectives in mind: (i) to verify the presence and availability of reduplicative forms; (ii) to analyse the semantic value of these forms. Although the most tested variety in our data was Western Sicilian (Trapani, Palermo) (our examples are in this variety too), the phenomenon is attested on the entire island and in Southern Italy as well (Rohlfs 1969).

### **3.2 Classification of reduplicative structures in Sicilian**

Sicilian has three reduplication rules forming lexical units.

#### **1) Verb reduplication forming adjectives: VV>A (intensification)**

- (20) [[cala]<sub>V</sub>-[cala]<sub>V</sub>]<sub>A</sub>  
 go down-go down  
 'goes down easily'

Context:

'stu vinu è           **cala-cala**  
 DET wine be.3SG go down-go down  
 'it's good wine, it goes down easily, it's sweet, easy to drink'

This kind of morphological rule produces adjectives that can, in some cases, have the syntactic position of a noun.

- (21) [[palla]<sub>V</sub>-[palla]<sub>V</sub>]<sub>A</sub>  
 talk-talk  
 'person who talks too much / glib talker'

Context:

- (22) Claudio è           **palla-palla**  
 Claudio be.3SG talk-talk  
 'Claudio speaks too much'

- (23) Claudio è           **un palla-palla**  
 Claudio be.3SG DET talk-talk  
 'Claudio is someone who speaks a lot/too much'

In (22) *palla-palla* occupies the syntactic position of an adjective (after a verb), in (23) the reduplicative form (*palla-palla*) occupies a nominal position (after a determiner).

## 2) Noun reduplication forming adjectives: NplNpl>A

- (24) ['mpuddri]<sub>N</sub>-['mpuddri]<sub>N</sub><sub>A</sub>  
 pimple.PL-pimple.PL  
 'pimply'

Context:

Avi      a      facci      **'mpuddri-'mpuddri**  
 have.3SG DET face      pimple.PL-pimple.PL  
 'His face is pimply'

## 3) Nominal reduplication forming adverbs: NN>Adv (internal localisation)

- (25) [[miccato]<sub>N</sub>-[miccato]<sub>N</sub>]<sub>Adv</sub>  
 market-market  
 'at the market, in the market, moving in the market'

Context:

Ti      ciccava      **miccato-miccato**  
 REFL search.IPFV.1SG market-market  
 'I looked for you in the market /everywhere in the market'

## 4 Sicilian Morphological reduplication NN>Adv

NN<sub>Adv</sub> reduplication is a morphological rule (cf.2.1.) that forms (i) a lexical unit (e.g., no insertion possible between the nouns, single primary stress, no recursivity) in a different category from its base and (ii) a specific meaning expressing internal location, which does not correspond to the reiteration of the nominal base, as would be expected of a syntactic construction.

### 4.1 Categorical Properties

The morphological operation can be formalised as NN > Adv, indicating the output is an adverb, as indicated by the following criteria.

– The adverb is uninflected (so, its number does not depend on the syntax of the sentence).

- (26) a. U    picciriddu    ioca        casa-casa  
         DET little boy    play.3SG house-house  
         ‘The little boy plays all over the house’
- b. I        picciriddri    iocano    casa-casa  
             DET.PL little boy.PL    play.3PL house-house  
             ‘The little boys play all over the house’

In this case, although the sentence is in the plural, the adverb *casa-casa* ('house-house') retains the same form and the sentence can be ambiguous. Thus, it can mean 'all the little boys are in the same home', but can also have a distributive interpretation referring to different homes, 'every little boy is in his own home' (although this is quite forced and not the first interpretation, it is possible in a clear context).

– The adverb is (usually) used to semantically modify the meaning of a verb, but may also modify an adjective, another adverb or an entire sentence (Beccaria 2004). Thus, *casa-casa* semantically modifies the verb in (26.a) and (26.b), rather than the noun (as would an adjective), by adding localization information on where the action takes place, and by adding a dynamic dimension, which will be analyzed below. Syntactically, the NN-reduplicated adverb is equivalent to a prepositional spatial locative in another language, as in Fr. *à la maison* 'at home' in (27).

- (27) Je suis à la maison  
      ‘I’m at home’

However, removing the reduplicated form in (26a) leads to ungrammaticality.

- (28) \*U    picciriddu    ioca        casa  
         DET little boy    play.3SG house  
         ‘\*The boys play house’

Consequently, reduplication falls under the category Adv, since the only way to rescue the grammaticality of (28) is to add a preposition, forming a PP with a similar function to replace the reduplication.

- (29) I        picciriddri    iocano    n        casa  
         DET.PL little boy.PL    play.3PL PREP house  
         ‘The little boys play at home’

But, as shown below (sect. 4.3.), the semantic value of reduplication is more than a simple locative Adv (such as in *n casa* 'at home').

#### 4.2 Morpho-phonological properties

NN<sub>Adv</sub> reduplication in Sicilian involves complete reduplication: the base noun is fully reduplicated. In most cases, the nominal base is typically a lexeme (26), but may also be a form inflected for plural number (30). The inflected input form can be analyzed here as what Booij (1996) calls *inherent inflection*, rather than *contextual inflection*. Compare (30) and (31).

(30) U   dutturi   va       casi-casi  
       DET doctor go.3SG house.PL-house.PL  
       'The doctor goes from house to house'

(31) I   duttura   vannu   casi-casi  
       DET doctor.PL go.3PL house.PL-house.PL  
       'The doctors go from house to house'

This comparison shows that the inflection of the reduplicated input is not determined by the syntax of the sentence. Therefore, the inflected input adds a specific semantic value (=from one place to another), sometimes corresponding to *pluralia tantum* (34).

(32) [[casa]<sub>N</sub>-[casa]<sub>N</sub>]<sub>Adv</sub>  
       house-house  
       'at home, in the house, inside the house'

(33) [[casi]<sub>N</sub>-[casi]<sub>N</sub>]<sub>Adv</sub>  
       house.PL-house.PL  
       'from house to house'

Context:

Vinni   i   so   cosi   firriannu   casi-casi  
   sell.3SG DET POSS thing.PL go.PROG house.PL-house.PL  
   'He sells things going from house to house'

(34) [[terri]<sub>N</sub>-[terri]<sub>N</sub>]<sub>Adv</sub>  
       ground.PL-ground.PL  
       'on the ground, in the country'

Context:

Cecca   u   so   atto   terri-terri  
   look.3SG DET POSS cat ground.PL-ground.PL  
   'He's looking for his cat in the grounds, in the country'

#### 4.3 Semantic properties: internal localisation

From a semantic point of view, NN > Adv reduplication marks a localisation relation between a *landmark* (an anchoring entity) and a *trajector* (an entity to be located) (Talmy 1983, 1985, Langacker 1987). The landmark corresponds to the reduplicated N. The trajectory is generally located within the boundaries of the landmark. We are thus dealing with a relationship of internal localisation (Aurnague 1996, 1997).

To illustrate, the trajector in the following sentences (the bird in (34) and Peter in (35)) is located within the boundaries of the landmark, the tree and the market respectively.

- (34) L' aceddru è/svulazza arvulu-arvulu  
DET bird be.3SG/flutter.3SG tree-tree  
'The bird is in the tree/ flutters in the tree'

- (35) Petru era miccatu-miccatu  
Peter be-IPFV.3SG market-market  
'Peter was in the market/went round the market'

When the landmark is designed as one-dimensional, reduplication is likely to mark a carrier relationship, similar to that expressed by the Fr. preposition *sur* / Eng. *on* (Vandeloise 1986, chap. XI).

- (36) L' aceddru è ramu-ramu  
DET bird be.3SG branch-branch  
'The bird is on the branch/ moves on the branch'

When a one-dimensional landmark is within the scope of a verb of motion, the semantic value of reduplication approximates that of a complex preposition such as Fr. *le long de* / It. *lungo* (it.).

- (37) Caminanu binariu-binariu  
walk.3PL rail-rail  
'They walked along the railway'

In this case, the localisation relation is no longer internal: the trajectory and the landmark are disjoint. These first observations are sufficient to show the polysemic character of NN > Adv reduplication in Sicilian. Below, we distinguish the different semantic values available to this process.

##### 4.3.1 Dynamic localisation

In the first configuration, the trajector is a mobile entity which moves within the landmark. Following Borillo (1998: 37ff), we define this as a dynamic spatial relationship involving a change of location (rather than a change of place<sup>5</sup>). In (34-36), for example, the bird and Peter are not only located relative to the landmark, but also seen as moving within the limits of the tree, the market, the branch or the rails. Under these conditions, the use of a stative predicate is generally prohibited, as in (38).

- (38)   <sup>?</sup>Petru rormi       sempi casa-casa  
           Peter sleep.3SG always house-house  
           ‘Peter always sleeps all over the house’

This shows how the presence of an animate subject and a reduplicative form bring a dynamic interpretation that conflicts with a stative verb like *ròrmiri* (‘to sleep’). The only way to interpret this utterance is to multiply the sleeping activity and attribute different locations to different occurrences.

The dynamic value of the reduplicated locative is confirmed by an additional argument. In Italian, the preposition *per* marks dynamic internal localisation (there is no equivalent in English or French that carries the same meaning). Compare (39.a) with (39.b).

- (39)   a. Il   bambino gioca   per casa  
           DET child       play.3SG for house  
           ‘The child plays in various locations in the house/ all over the house’  
        b. Il   bambino gioca   a/in casa  
           DET child       play.3SG at/in house  
           ‘The child plays in the house/at home’

In (39.b), the preposition indicates only localisation without movement, as in French/English.

In Sicilian, the dynamic interpretation which involves the children's

---

<sup>5</sup>       A movement involving a change of location remains within the boundaries of the landmark (e.g. *Peter runs in the garden*). A change of place crosses the boundary between two different landmarks (e.g. *Peter goes out in the street*).



movement in the location *casa* ('house') arises only with the reduplicative structure *casa-casa*.

- (40) U picciriddro ioca casa-casa  
DET child play.3SG house-house  
'The child plays at home, all over the house'

In order to specify only the location of the subject within the landmark in Sicilian, a preposition should be used, as in (41)

- (41) U picciriddro ioca n casa  
DET child play.3SG PREP house  
'The child is playing in the house'

#### 4.3.2 Static localisation

The second option involves static localisation. However, there are three interpretations that are likely to accompany the localisation relation, depending on the nature of the landmark, the trajector and the relations between them. These readings are not mutually exclusive and several interpretations may simultaneously arise in the same context.

##### 4.3.2.1 Vague localisation

One interpretation provides vague localisation.

- (42) Petru è ciumi-ciumi  
Peter be.3SG river-river  
'Peter is (somewhere) in the river / not far in the river'
- (43) Petru si cuccao voscù-voscù  
Peter REFL lie down.PST.3SG forest-forest  
'Peter is lying down (somewhere) in the forest'

In (42), the landmark can be one-dimensional (along the river). But it differs from (37) by the presence of a stative verb (*be*, as opposed to *walk* in (37)). The idea of movement is present in (37), but disappears in (42) in favor of a single vague localization: Peter is somewhere by the river. The reduplication in (43) implies that the speaker does not know the exact location of the trajector (Peter), although it remains within the limits of the landmark (the forest).

##### 4.3.2.2 Incongruity

A second interpretation highlights the inappropriate nature of the trajector's

location.

- (44) Petro si fīci na casa muntagna-muntagna  
Peter REFL do.PST.3SG DET house mountain-mountain  
'Peter built his house somewhere on the mountain'

There are two simultaneous interpretations in this example: (i) vague localisation, as we do not know the precise location of the house, and (ii) incongruity, as the location chosen for the house is considered inappropriate. Other examples illustrate the incongruity interpretation.

- (45) A pianta è scala-scala  
DET plant be.3SG stair-stair  
'The plant is in the middle of the staircase (in the way)'

In (45), the inappropriateness of the trajector's presence on the stairs may result from an incongruity between the function associated with the staircase (allow passage) and the presence of the plant. However, this interpretation remains in examples where the presence of the trajector is natural and should not pose particular problems (46).

- (46) Petro è assittato casa-casa  
Peter be.3SG sitting house-house  
'Peter is sitting in the middle of the house'

Thus, example (46) is only acceptable if Peter is in the way, blocking the passage.

#### 4.3.2.3 Homogenous distribution

A final semantic value related to static localisation involves utterances in which the trajector is an inanimate mass noun (47)-(48) or a plural inanimate count (49). In this case, localisation is interpreted as homogenous distribution of the trajector on the landmark.

- (47) A rrina è casa-casa  
DET sand be.3SG house-house  
'The sand is all over the house'
- (48) U fangu è muru-muru  
DET mud be.3SG wall-wall  
'The mud is (spattered) all over the wall'
- (49) I chiova sunnu muru-muru

DET.PL nail.PL be.3PL wall-wall  
'The nails are all over the wall'

This third interpretation is explained by the non-delimited character of the mass and plural trajectors, or more precisely, by the fact that they are not intrinsically delimited. In this, they contrast with count nouns, which are conceived of as mobile (4.1), vaguely localized (4.2.1) or even incongruously localized (4.2.2). As count nouns, such trajectors have intrinsic boundaries and thus cannot be homogeneously distributed without losing their wholeness (at least in the singular). Example (50) illustrated a reading akin to *along* with a dynamic sense (provided by the motion verb). When the trajector is a mass or plural noun and the verb is stative, the "along" reading denotes static localization.

- (50) U sangu è corda-corda  
DET blood be.3SG wire-wire  
'The blood is spread along the wire'

- (51) L' aceddri sunnu corda-corda  
DET bird.PL be.3PL wire-wire  
'The birds are sitting along the wire'

## 5 Conclusion

This article proposes a classification of reduplicative structures in Sicilian and provided a detailed analysis of one of the most productive of these structures, which forms adverbs through complete reduplication of nominal lexemes or word-forms (NN<sub>adv</sub>). We have argued for a morphological rather than a syntactic analysis of this construction, and presented the variety of semantic values with which it is associated, by highlighting the relationship of internal location which they share, as well as the polysemic values (dynamic vs. static location). This study therefore opens a typological perspective in the study of morphological reduplication and provides new empirical data to the semantic study of spatiality. Our new examination of reduplicative constructions reveals the specificity of Sicilian, with respect to Italian for example, and has thus contributed to its consideration as a language in its own right. We hope to have opened the door to new research on this language, research which is largely non-existent today, within this type of approach. The collection of data and the establishment of a corpus seem to be a necessary first step in this process.

## References

- Aboh, E., Smith, N., Zribi-Hertz, A. (eds). 2012. *The morphosyntax of reiteration in creole and non-creole languages*, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Amenta, L. 2010. "La reduplicazione sintattica in siciliano" *Bollettino del Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani*, 22, 345-358.
- Anderson, S. R. 1992. *A-Morphous Morphology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Aronoff, M. 1976. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Aronoff, M. & Fudeman, K. 2004. *What is Morphology?*, Blackwell Publishing-Fundamentals of Linguistics.
- Aurnague, M. 1996. "Les noms de localisation interne: Tentative de caractérisation sémantique à partir de données du basque et du français." *Cahiers de Lexicologie*, 69.
- Aurnague, M., Vieu L., & Borillo A. 1997. "La représentation formelle des concepts spatiaux dans la langue." in M. Denis (ed.), *Langage et cognition spatiale*. Paris: Masson.
- Bauer, L. 2003. *Introducing linguistic morphology* (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Beccaria, G. L. 2004. *Dizionario di linguistica e di filologia, metrica, retorica*, Torino, Einaudi.
- Booij, G. 2010. *Construction Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Borillo, A. 1998. *L'espace et son expression en français*, Paris, Ophrys.
- Caracausi, G. 1977. "Ancora sul tipo 'camminare riva riva'." *Bollettino del Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani*, 13, 383-396.
- Floričič, F. 2011. "On Reduplicated Imperatives in Sardinian", *8th Mediterranean Morphology Meeting*, Cagliari (14-17 september 2011)

- Forza, F. (2011) Doubling as a Sign of Morphology: A Typological Perspective, *Journal of Universal Language* 12-2, 7-44.
- Fradin, B. 2003. *Nouvelles approches en morphologie*, Paris, Puf.
- Gil, D. 2005. "From Repetition to Reduplication in Riau Indonesian." *Studies on Reduplication*, B. Hurch (ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 31-64.
- Gleason, H.A. 1955. *Wordbook in descriptive linguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston (Revised edition: 1967).
- Haspelmath, M. 2002. *Understanding Morphology*, London, Arnold.
- Inkelas, S, Zoll, C. 2005. *Reduplication: Doubling in Morphology*, with Cheryl Zoll, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Katamba, F. 1993. *Morphology*, Palgrave.
- Kleiber G. 2009. "Remarques sur la sémantique du nom espace", *SCOLIA*, n. 24, 9-22.
- Kouwenberg, S. (ed) 2003. *Twice as meaningful. Reduplication in Pidgins, Creoles and other contact languages*, London: Battelerbidge Press.
- Langacker, R. W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical Prerequisites* (Stanford University Press ed. Vol. 1). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lieber, R. 1992. *Deconstructing Morphology: Word Formation in Syntactic Theory*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago/London.
- Leone, A. 1995. Profilo di sintassi siciliana, *Materiali e ricerche dell'Atlante Linguistico della Sicilia*, 3, Palermo: CSFLS.
- McCarthy, J. J. & Prince A. 1990. "Prosodic morphology and templatic morphology." in M. Eid and J. McCarthy, (eds.), pp. 1-54.
- 1995. "Faithfulness and reduplicative identity." in University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in *Linguistics* 18: *Papers in Optimality Theory*. Jill Beckman, Suzanne Urbanczyk and Laura Walsh Dickey

- (eds). pp. 249–384.
- Marantz, A. 1982. “Re reduplication”, *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Summer, 1982), pp. 435-482. MIT Press.
- Mel’čuk, I. 1996-1997. *Cours de morphologie générale*, 5 volumes, Montréal, Presses de l’Université de Montréal-CNRS Editions.
- Moravcsik, E. A. 1978. “Reduplicative Constructions” in Greenberg, J. H., et al. *Universals of Human Language*. Volume 3: *Word Structure*, Stanford University Press.
- Rohlfs, G. 1969. *Grammatica storica dell’italiano e dei suoi dialetti*, vol. II, *Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Scalise, S. & Bisetto, A. 2008. *La struttura delle parole*, Il Mulino.
- Sgarioto, L. 2005. “‘Caminari riva riva’: su un fenomeno di reduplicazione nominale in siciliano”, *Quaderni di Lavoro dell’ASIS*, 5, 36-49, Padova.
- Spencer, A. 1991. *Morphological Theory*, Oxford & Cambridge, Blackwell.
- Talmy, L. 1983. “How language structures space”. In Herbert Pick and Linda Acredolo, eds., *Spatial orientation: Theory, research, and application* 225–282. New York: Plenum Press.
- 1985. “Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms”. In Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language typology and syntactic description*. Vol.3  
Grammatical categories and the lexicon 36–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thornton, A. M. 2009. “Italian verb reduplication between syntax and the lexicon”, *Italian Journal of Linguistics/Rivista di linguistica*, 21/1, 2009, pp. 235-261.
- Vandeloise C. 1986. *L’espace en français*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil.
- Wiltshire, C. & Marantz, A. 2000. “Reduplication”, *Formale Prozesse* 57, VIII, 557-567. in *Morphologie / Morphology. An International*

*Handbook on Inflection and Word formation*, Geert Booij, Christian Lehman and Joachim Mugdan (eds.) (2000/2004). Berlin: de Gruyter.).