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1. Introduction

The aim of this article is to present the typology of reduplication in English and to look into its correlation with general slang as a style of linguistic expression. The article will also attempt to demonstrate the metaphorical nature of reduplication-based compounds falling into the domain of slang. Reduplication in English as a morphological process falls into the category of compounding and reveals diverse characteristics. The characteristics of reduplication will be exemplified by its categories as presented in this article. This article is also concerned with lexicographical aspects of linguistic research as scientific research into reduplication presupposes the gathering, dissection and analysis of linguistic data bases comprising a variety of reduplication-based compounds.

Studies in reduplication fall into the field of morphology. In many languages reduplication is part of inflectional morphology. This type of reduplication is responsible for grammatical functions such as tense or plurality. If one studies Tagalog, reduplication will naturally surface as the most common linguistic feature and a phenomenon consisting of the repetition of the whole or part of a word [see Blake 1917: 426-428]. In this particular language reduplication is a prominent mechanism responsible for diverse grammatical functions, such as tenses, superlatives of adjectives, plural forms, additional vividness in time relations, and a general intensifying idea. Blake (1917) distinguishes between partial and full reduplication and refers to it as “a bone and sinew of the language” giving rise to many grammatical categories and finding its highest development in Tagalog. Reduplication is responsible for future tense formation in this language – the first syllable is repeated and added to a root form as a prefix. That is...
why we have pasok=enter, papasok=will enter, gawa=make, gagawa=will make and kain=eat, kakain=will eat [see Lardiere 2006: 69-71]. This is partial reduplication. In this type of reduplication only part of a root word is copied. Future tense forms of Tagalog are determined by initial syllables of the root words, which become morphemes with a specific meaning. R.H. Robbins [1999: 202] observes that this is a common morphological process in Malay and Sudanese, where repetition (reduplication) of the entire word is a process responsible for forming plural noun forms. This is why in Malay we have kapal=ship and kapalkapal=ships, and in Sudanese sirim=ant and sirimsirim=ants. These are instances of complete reduplication. Partial and complete reduplication denote diminution and duration, intransitivity, depreciation and intensification in Hawaiian, Motu and Tongan, respectively [see Okamura 1996: 3-4].

Likewise, in numerous other languages such as Turkish, Persian, Nepalese, Burmese, Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese, Khmer and Malay reduplication accounts for grammatical functions such as plurality, emphasis, changes in the grammatical category of a word and may be regarded as part of the machinery of the grammar of language. It also exists in Slavonic languages and serves the purpose of intensifying the meaning.

Reduplication in English is part of derivational morphology and falls into the category of compounding [see Matthews 1974: 38]. In English it accounts for derivations, i.e. new word coinages. Reduplication in English is viewed from the perspective of word formation [see Okamura 1996: 7]. Hence, it is part of derivational morphology. Additionally, reduplication in English may also be approached from the vantage point of traditional descriptive linguistics, where a language is described as used at a particular time. In this respect, to describe and categorize a morphological phenomenon, such as reduplication, it is necessary for a language researcher to provide enough language data and analyse it in order to come up with relevant conclusions. Thus, gathering citational evidence and building up language data bases can be described as a cornerstone of any language analysis falling into the field of traditional descriptive linguistics or lexicography. Language data bases are a departure point for description, analyses, categorisation and drawing conclusions with regard to meaning, functions and themes of language phenomena and expressions.

In this article theoretical assumptions will be amply supported by citational corroborations, which will provide the best illustration for the units or entries that comprise language data bases. The citational corroborations presented in this article can be referred to as citational or textual evidence. The former comes from literature, fiction, magazines and newspapers, the latter originates from films, talk shows, radio broadcasts and real-life conversation acts. The context provides a further explanation of the meaning presented in square brackets next to the lexical item concerned, which is in bold print.

2. Reduplication – definition and typology

In linguistics reduplication is defined as a morphological process by which a stem or a root of a word, or part of it, is repeated. R.H. Robbins (1990) says that reduplication is “a particular type of grammatical function, whereby a part or the whole of the
root form is repeated in the same word, which is found in a number of languages to a varying extent”. The morphological process of doubling sound, word, or word element is also applied for lexical purposes in many languages of the world, including English. Lardiere (2006) describes reduplication as a process that copies a subset of the phonemes of each individual root. Blake (1917) views reduplication as a common linguistic phenomenon consisting of the repetition of the whole or part of a word, which is found to a certain extent probably in all languages. Widawski (2003) defines reduplication as exact or non-exact doubling of a sound to create a new word. He views it as part of compounding and is the first to observe that reduplication is commonly used in slang due to its rhyming rap-like sound. Adopting Widawski’s nomenclature, which seems to be the most straightforward, we can distinguish between exact and non-exact reduplication. In exact reduplication the whole word is repeated to make an independent, meaningful compound. The following citational corroborations provide an illustration of this prototypical type of reduplication:

- “It’s a small boo-boo [=an error]. Don’t excite yourself.” – Ewart James, 1987
- “Used to an extravagant lifestyle of chi-chi [=excessively cute] restaurants and jet-set holidays, journalist Rosamund Witcher and her boyfriend of three years were forced to change their ways when credit crunch hit home.” – You Magazine, 2009
- “Anyone want din-din [=dinner, any meal]?” – Ewart James, 2001
- “The matter is hush-hush [=secret, undercover] so we must meet to talk it over, not now on the phone.” – John Fletcher, 2008
- “With his INF ‘zero-zero [=no nuclear weapons on both sides]’ and START proposals, Reagan indicated his desire to move ... On the Soviet side, there was total rejection of Reagan’s ‘zero-zero’...” – John David Lees, Michael Turner, 1988

In non-exact reduplication a word is partially repeated – we can observe consonant or vowel sound alteration and the rhyming effect in the following examples illustrating the second type of reduplication. Vowel variations tend to indicate the changing or growing intensity of sounds, processes or actions. Study this citational evidence:

- “I’ll have an itsy-bitsy [=tiny, insignificant] piece. I’m too fat and in need of a diet” – Miles Binney, 2009
- “In this hilarious but carefully documented checklist of Clinton flip-flops [=changes of opinion], and reversals on such issues as taxes, deficits, the military, key administration ...” – Edward P. Moser, Bill Clinton, 1994
- “For a delicious Roll Pudding, or ‘roly-poly [=type of dessert],’ make a crust as for baking-powder biscuit, adding only an extra lump of butter.” – Emma Whitcomb Babcock, 2008
- “This is a new French word I have learnt, meaning, I am told, a combination of hanky-panky [=dishonesty, deceitfulness, sexual misconduct], jiggery-pokery [=underhand scheming or behavior, dishonest business or trickery] and skulldrudgery.” – James May, 2009

Triplication and quadruplication are less prototypical variants of exact and non-exact reduplication. For these particular variants of reduplication the term cloning
would seem more appropriate. It implies a growing intensity of sounds and actions. Triplication is often based on sound symbolism. A word tries to look like the action or process it denotes. The signifying comes closer in form to the signified. In case of triplication and quadruplication the form of the signifying attempts to imitate the form of the signified even more. This also pertains to prototypical reduplication but in triplication and quadruplication it is particularly conspicuous. The following citational evidence is an illustration of this derivational phenomenon and shows that there is an exact and non-exact type of triplication:

- “Why all this **blah-blah-blah** [=gibberish, incessant chattering; onomatopoeic; it can be repeated many times].” – Ewart James, 1987
- “The Beckhams are always so **la-di-da** [=affectedly fashionable or stylish].” – John Fletcher, 2008
- “**Okey-dokey-artichokey** [=yes, OK; an exclamation!] I’ll do that!” – Tony Thorne, 1998
- “Mr. Vitti’s been detained. Apologies all around. **Baraby-baraba-baraboo** [=incessant chattering, gibberish, nonsense] and then you say you are a new consigliere...speeaking for Mr. Vitti.” – Analyse This, film, 1999.
- “That’s not a bad little **rub-a-dub-dub** [=a pub] you’ve got there, mate.” – Ewart James, 2001

Quadruplication, even more powerfully than triplication, stresses the intensity or repetitive nature of sounds or actions. It may also serve the purpose of denoting nonsense and imprecision. In discourse quadruplications or multiple reduplications generate the feeling of suspense, apprehension or anxiety. The effect is achieved by multiple repetitions of a sound pattern constituting a deliberate exaggeration which can be endowed with additional meanings. The citational evidence listed below also indicates that a distinction between exact and non-exact quadruplication can be made:

- “Uh! uh! uh! . . . [Spoken] I could have done much better . . . Can’t you feel that something’s coming up . . . uh! uh! uh! uh! . . . ah! ah! ah! ah! [=exclamation of excitement] . . .” – Lisa A. Lewis, 1992
- “Hordes of humanity in the vast square. . . **Ticktick, tick ticktick . . ticktick, tick tick- tick** [=sound of a clock]. . .” – Hairenik Weekly, 1971
- “He was wrong. ‘**Rat-a-tat-a, rat-a-tat-a, rat-tat, rat-tat** [=sound of the drum].’ Every time he paused, the drum beat loudly. ‘**Rat-a-tat-a, rat-a-tat-a,** . . .” – Geraldine Elliot, 1981
- “. . . **clickety-click clickety- clack clickety-clack clickety-click** [=sound of a train] down the long rails towards Venice while I disappeared up invisible rails towards the Sun” – Adam Gopnik, 2004
- “One of the young men pretended to hold up the instrument, adding out the side of his mouth, **wang, wang, wang, wang** [=sound of the harmonica].” – Jeff Biggers, 2006

Intensifying reduplication is another type reduplication where words are repeated not to form a novel lexical item but to perform a grammatical function. It is a clear case showing that reduplication is a productive process although it has been rarely mentioned as a grammatical phenomenon [see Ghomeshiet et al. 2004: 308-309]. In-
tensifying reduplication may appear with verbs, nouns, adverbs, prepositions or pronouns as illustrated by the following citational examples given in the monograph entitled *Contastive Focus Reduplication in English* (2004):

- “Let’s go and *win, win, win*.”
- “All Sandy thinks about is *sex, sex, sex*.”
- “Prices are going *up, up, up!*”
- “It’s *mine, mine, mine!*”
- “All I think about is *you, you, you*.”

The interesting constraint is that three items are needed (exact triplication) when reduplication appears in sentence final position and is not followed by an object or adverbia l. When a reduplicated word is followed by an object or when a modifier is repeated in sentence internal position we observe another constraint – the reduplicated word is repeated twice (exact reduplication), as illustrated by the following examples from *Contrastive Reduplication in English* (2004):

- “You are a *sick, sick* man.”
- “You are *really, really* sick.”

Any use of a word or phrase in a sentence frequently leaves some room for imprecision, vagueness or ambiguity, especially if it appears in the opening sections of a conversational act [see Ghomeshi et al. 2004: 308-309]. Contrastive focus reduplication is a way to eliminate imprecision from conversation acts and serves the purpose of singling out a number of semantic extensions to a verb, noun, adjective or narrowing them down to the central or prototypical meaning of the lexical items. Consider the following citational evidence:

- “Stiles: Let’s have a drink to toast your new life, Harold.[Stiles begins filling Harold’s glass from a metal flask.]Harold: Oh, a *DRINK-drink.* [Later...]
  Harold: It was a *DRINK-drink.* [Harold passes out.]” – *Duct Tape Forever*, film, 2002
- “Hey kid, thanks for the escort. [looks embarrassed] I don’t mean *ESCORT-escort.*” – Neon Rider, TV show, 1995
- “Livvie: Then what’s the problem? The falls are really beautiful this time of year, and we can cross over to Toronto. I took out plenty of cash.Rafe: OK, don’t get me wrong. The getting married part – that’s what we both want. But leaving town? Livvie: Why not? I mean, I only lived here a few years. It’s not my *HOME-home, and it’s not really your home, either.*” – *Port Charles*, TV series, 2003

It is common in colloquial discourse when two participants in an act of conversation know more than one individual or place with the same name. Contrastive focus reduplication is a way to select the right referent, the one that both interlocutors know:

- “So did you go to the cinema with *Dave-Dave, or with Dave?*” – Ghomeshi, Jackendoff, 2004
• “Oh, that’s Beacon-Street–Beacon-Street.” (uttered by a person being given directions, who has just realized that beacon Street in West Newton is a continuation of the well-known Beacon Street in Boston) – Ghomeshi, Jackendoff, 2004

Compounding, back-clipping and implied reduplication are derivational processes behind the formation of Cockney rhyming slang expressions. Compounding is a common process in Cockney rhyming slang word formation: compounds are words consisting of elements that could function independently of each other as separate lexical items. Rhyming slang often uses proper names that are compounds or compounds and phrases referring to everyday human experiences. Jonathon Greene in Cassel’s Dictionary of Slang (2006) provides a plethora of examples illustrating the formation and use of rhyming slang. The next step in rhyming slang word formation is back-formation or back-clipping, which is a common process in general slang. It has been observed [see Widawski 2003: 145-150] that many slang words get clipped once enough syllables are given to make a slang word intelligible. The same process abounds in cryptic rhyming slang, where the second component of a compound is often dropped. The first component is enough to provide a metaphorical reference. This process may also be described as implied reduplication as a rhyming slang expression exists because it is associated with another one that rhymes with it. The following example illustrates the simple mechanism behind Cockney rhyming slang word formation and illustrates the notion of implied reduplication.

Jimmies = shoes

Jimmy Choo rhymes with shoe

Choo – shoe is here a reduplicative pair accounting for rhyming association.

The users rely on association and rhyme to communicate in Cockney rhyming slang. That is why reduplication in this type of slang functions at the implied level. The following citational examples include common Cockney rhyming slang expressions which date back to 19th and early 20th centuries. They belong to the core of rhyming slang lexicon. Some of them may not be in popular use nowadays but are perfectly recognisable by native speakers of English. Consider the following citations illustrating rhyming slang expressions denoting forms of money:

• “...any mention of rhyming slang acts upon your correspondent as a shot of cocaine...’Bees,’ in this ancient code, means ‘bees and honey,’ which means ‘money.’” – Jean Strouse, 1949
• “Bread, meaning money comes from the rhyming slang bread and honey, which rhymes with money” – Jeremy Smith, 2006
• “STOP THIEF, beef. SUGAR AND HONEY, money. SUGAR CANDY, brandy. TAKE A FRIGHT, night, THREE QUARTERS OF A PECK, the neck.” – John Camden Hotten, 2009
• “Fiddley-did. Obs. Rhyming slang for ‘quid’, the sum of one pound; ...” – Joan Hughes, 1989
• “UK, 1942 sky diver noun a five-pound note; the sum of 5 pounds.” – Eric Partridge, Tom Dalzell, Terry Victor, 2007
• “...apples and pears stairs, Ayrton Senna a tenner, ie a ten-pound note (from Ayrton Senna, a Brazilian racing driver), babbling brook a cook (used in Australia), Barnet Fair the hair arry White shite.” – Michael Munro, 2007

• “A pub breakfast costs less than a deep-sea diver [=a five Pound note; deep-sea diver rhymes with fiver=five Pound note] for sure.” – Andrew Donnegan, 2008

• “A French loaf [=four Pounds Sterling; rhyming slang that depends on backslang to make a connection; ruof-or roaf is backslang for four. French loaf rhymes with roaf=four]? For that?” – Ewart James, 1988

• “Did you give me back the Lady Godiva [=five Pounds Sterling, a five pound note; Lady Godiva rhymes with fiver=five Pounds Sterling] I lent you the other day?” – Andrew Donnegan, 2008

• “Is that all you can manage? One miserable saucepan lid [=a one pound coin; saucepan lid rhymes with quid=one pound]?” – Ewart James, 2001

• “That will cost you a Pavarotti [=10 pounds; tenor (Luciano Pavarotti) rhymes with tenner=10 pounds; also Ayrton Senna and Tony Benner], you know.” – Tony Thorne, 2007

• “That will cost you a Placido [=10 pounds; tenor (Placido Domingo) rhymes with tenner=10 pounds].” – Tony Thorne, 2007

Schm-reduplication evidently conveys the aspect of mockery and ridiculing. The first component of a reduplicative compound in itself is normally endowed with a positive meaning. The process of pejoration comes into action when the original component is paired with its schm- variant. The influence of Yiddish upon English saliently manifests itself through this category of reduplication. The following examples will be a vivid illustration of this semantic process:

• “‘Yes,’ she said. ‘The loser must take a shot and lose an item of clothing.’ Jake tossed the towel across the washstand, his eyes pinned on her breasts. ‘Interesting. And what about playing for money?’ ‘Money-schmoney! ...’” – Julie Miller, Jule McBride, Carrie Hudson, 2009

• “But, hey . . . boss, schmoss. What has either one of us got to prove here?” – Erika Ritter, 2009

• “The Devil’s language Japanese in one easy lesson ... language, schmanguage.” – Rick Kennedy, 1988

• “‘Oh, sex, schmex,’ I said. ‘I have aspirations, dreams, goals, wants, needs, wishes, desires.’ ‘Sure,’ he said. ‘Me too. I’m a human being.’ ” – Tama Janowitz, 1996

• “9. Marriage, schmarriage. Although there are well over two million marriages a year in the us, only 52.1% of adult females and 52.6% of adult males were married (and not separated) in 2000, according to the US census.” – Nolo, 2006

• “... death, schmeath, ha!... cool it.” – Dean Vinka, 2003

• “It’s a new age. We girls don’t marry unless we’re in love. Can’t you get that through your head?” ‘Love, schmove,’ said Mrs. Balkan.” – Daniel Fuchs, Jonathan Lethem, 2006
• “Oh, Mother, schmother! Let her worry about it. Anyway, it’ll give her a vicarious thrill if she does come in.” – Norma Klein, 1972

3. Reduplication and its correlation with general slang

Reduplication-based compounds are an integral part of slang lexicon. The best and most precise definition of general slang was provided by Widawski in The Anatomy of American Slang (2003: 3):

Slang is an ever-changing, highly expressive style of language. It consists of novel words or standard words used with new meanings that are considered informal and often vulgar. They are used primarily in spoken language in place of standard words, usually to convey some extra information, usually psychological, sociological or rhetorical in nature. The psychological (or behavioral) element includes such information as emotional states, humour, familiarity and secrecy. The sociological element includes solidarity or group identification, distancing, alienation and rebellion against the existing order. The rhetorical element includes informality, conciseness, deliberate vagueness and forcefulness of expression.

Reduplicative compounds bear out the rhetorical function of slang, which can be illustrated by the functions of reduplicative expressions connected with onomatopoeia, iconicity or sound symbolism. Deliberate vagueness and forcefulness of expression are yet another function of general slang conspicuous in reduplication-based linguistic expressions. Consider the following citations:

• “‘Click, click, clack [=sound of crickets]’ Lead-footed crickets echoed through the frigid stillness ... ‘Click, click, clack,’ it persisted like a cantankerous grandfather clock.” – Brandon Wilson, 2004

• “Clippety-clop, clippety-Clop [=repetitive sound and movement], carrying Baby Jesus home. Back to Joseph’s carpenter shop ... Little brown donkey with Jesus atop, Clippety-Clop,...” – Marjorie Ainsborough Decker, 1991

• “How teeny-weeny [=small, minute] is teeny-weeny? Opinions differ. It’s like trying to measure a person. If somebody calls you “big”, it could mean three things...” – Russ Walter, 1994

• “As soon as they were outside and had closed the trailer door Alison slugged Renser on the arm then pulled him to her, ’you are bad, bad, bad,’ she said laughing softly and seductively as she nuzzled his face and kissed him” – Robert Dingas, 2003

• “LES$ HANKY-PANKY [=mystery, trickery, mischievous activity] IN THE BOARDROOM. Will the Sarbanes-Oxley Act reduce the corporate fraud and misstatement of financial information evident in Enron.” – Robert A. Cooke, 2004

• “Making Sense of Insurance Mumbo-Jumbo [=chaotic, incomprehensible, convoluted discourse]. Your insurance needs are determined by which of these categories you fall under: single, married couple with no kids.” – Robert K. Heady, Christy Heady, Hugo Ottolenghi, 2005
4. Metaphorical nature of reduplication-based rhyming slang

As with general slang, rhyming slang expressions are metaphorical in their nature. Implied reduplication is the underlying principle behind the formation of Cockney Rhyming slang, which is always metaphorical as one principle, notion or idea is expressed in terms of another. The breakthrough work of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson *Metaphors We Live By* (1980) proves that metaphors should not be associated primarily with poetic imagery or rhetorical loftiness but are everyday language devices. Metaphors that we use reflect our conceptual system and play a vital part in how we define and perceive the reality around us. *Metaphors We Live By* is a milestone research work in cognitive linguistics that views metaphors as an integral part of language. Metaphors applied in ordinary language are determined by the apparatus of human perception. Numerous scholarly works in the domain of metaphors followed suit. E.C. Way (1991) described diverse theories on the metaphoricity of language. The considerations presented in her work revolve around the creed saying that metaphorisation of language can be accounted for by cognitive science. The following citational evidence presents the metaphorical character of slang expressions based on classic and implied reduplication:

- “...chop shop [=CARS are MEAT metaphor], (Informal) a garage in which stolen cars are dismantled to get parts for resale.” – Albert Morehead, Philip D. Morehead, Loy Morehead, 2006
- “Last August 10, about twenty fat-cat [=influential businessman; HUMAN BEING is ANIMAL metaphor] businessmen surfaced for a quiet, but apparently productive, luncheon at the White House hosted by President Carter.” – New York Magazine, 1978
- “If you want to send someone an e-mail, just click on his or her e-mail address. A fax calls for a click on their fax number. If you want to send a letter by snail mail [=slow, traditional postal service; DELIVERY VEHICLES are ANIMALS metaphor], your contact program address book provides their address...” – Marilyn Sullivan, 2003
- “Using rhymes, such as cockney rhyming slang on the body, e.g. head/crust of bread, mouth/north and south [=mouth; PARTS OF THE BODY are GEOGRAPHICAL DIRECTIONS metaphor].” – Diana Bentley, 1999
- “I was surprised to see the large number of printed circulars addressed to the Rector by quack-quack [=telling nonsense; HUMAN LANGUAGE is ANIMAL SOUND metaphor] advertisers.” – Edward Bradley, 1865
• “In 2001 Stella McCartney launched a range of clothes decorated by rhyming slang slogans such as ‘raspberry ripple’ [=nipple; PART OF THE BODY IS FOOD] (nipple). Since one theory has it that Cockney rhyming slang may have originated in the London underworld, ...” – Joe Kerr, Andrew Gibson, 2003

• “…the notion that most women have two nearly identical breasts: the pair, the twins, twin peaks, twofers, matched set, easts and wests [=breasts; PARTS OF THE BODY are GEOGRAPHICAL DIRECTIONS], ... Second, there are slang words that imply the doubleness of breasts through reduplication …” – Mark Steven Morton, 2003

• “Kenya was thinking she was sorry she’d eaten that extra doughnut that morning at the Nut Hut [=lunatic asylum; HUMAN BRAIN is TYPE OF FRUIT metaphor] because it might come back up and that would shame her as a black woman police officer” – Charlaine Harris, 2001

Also consider citational corroborations presenting the use of metonymy and synecdoche as special cases of metaphor. Metonymy, which is at times defined as a kind of metaphor, is another figuration device visible in rhyming slang implied reduplication-based compounds. Metonymy is the application of the name of one object or concept for that of another to which it is related or of which it is part. Metonyms, like metaphors, are automatic and unconscious associations or connections between two concepts. The frequently used metonymy is ATTRIBUTE FOR THE WHOLE metonymy as in “God is Love”. Synecdoche is a figure of speech in which a part is used for the whole or the special for the general. The frequently used synecdoche is “God’s finger” where PART FOR THE WHOLE figuration is conspicuous. In “I see ten sails” meaning “I see ten ships” THE SPECIAL FOR THE GENERAL figuration is evident. Metonymy and synecdoche operate within single domains and in this respect they differ from metaphors. Prototypical metaphors cross different domains. In contemporary linguistics the demarcation line between metonymy and synecdoche may be blurred as PART FOR THE WHOLE synecdoche may be classified as metonymy. The following list of corroborative examples illustrates this type of figuration:

• “Matter of fact, he got like five or six bitches in his stable makin’ that shit do what it do. And that shit wit [=stupid person] Tamia, I don’t really know how true it is, but word to life this ain’t the only nigga sayin’ it.” – The Kat Trap, 2009

• “As the race cars lined up on the pit road for qualifying, I waited for STP to appear. The boss man and a couple of sticker lickers [=traffic police officer], dressed in STP attire, started passing through the line of cars.” – Don Finke, Nikki Finke, 2010

• All but deserted now, the site of the community is marked by a small cemetery. According to local sources, ... The name for Still Hill [=cemetery] is thought to be descriptive, as is Lone Tree Hill” – Esther M. Swift, 1977

• “Although an expression takes on a different meaning when used as rhyming slang, there is often an amusing link between ... bell ringers [=fingers] ‘fingers’, tumble down the sink ‘drink’, and total wreck (for the person who signs it) ‘cheque.’ “ – Peter Wright, 1981

• “1990 brace face [=person wearing braces] noun, any person wearing an orthodontic brace US.” – Tom Dalzell, Eric Partridge, 2008
5. Implications for further research in reduplication

The typology of reduplication as presented in this article proves that it is a productive language mechanism rather than a set of finite lexical items. Corpus linguistics lends itself to continuing research into reduplication as a productive mechanism enlarging the body of citational and textual evidence. Linguistic corpora are collection of linguistic data, either written texts or a transcription of recorded speech, which can be used as a starting-point for linguistic analysis description or as a means of verifying hypotheses about a language (corpus linguistics). Linguistic descriptions which are ‘corpus-based’ as well as numerous examples of real-life usage of reduplicative compounds may constitute a cornerstone of a reduplication-centred lexicographical unit. This database of reduplication-based compounds in context will be a solid basis for compiling a dictionary of reduplication in English. However, the objections raised especially by generative grammarians, who point to the limitations of corpora (e.g. that they are samples of performance only, and that one still needs a means of projecting beyond the corpus to the language as a whole), will have to be taken into account as observed by Crystal (2003). Computer corpora such as ARPA Continuous Speech Recognition Corpus or SPIDRE Speaker Identification Corpus constitute modern tools which will speed up the process of data gathering and dictionary compiling. While collecting the citational evidence it is imperative that a researcher should indicate whether a lexical item is used literally, metaphorically or perhaps metonymically. Such additional information should be included in the description of the meaning of a lexical item.
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Summary

Reduplication in English – typology, correlation with slang and metaphorisation

The aim of this article is to analyse reduplication in English as a productive word formation mechanism and to have a closer look at the types of reduplication-based compounds existing in the English language. It is the intention of the author to demonstrate that reduplication in English is a productive mechanism rather than merely a finite set of lexemes. Reduplication will be viewed as an integral part of slang lexicon. The article also deals with the metaphorisation of reduplication-based compounds and suggests directions of further research in the domain of reduplication. The article strives to approach reduplication as a language phenomenon falling into the scope of research of descriptive linguistics and lexicography. Theoretical assumptions are borne out by citational corroboration illustrating authentic language use.
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