> **Contrastive reduplication**
> *Looking at some of the properties of contrastive reduplication as observed by Ghomeshi et al. (2004).*

1 The basic phenomenon

We've all heard it, probably used it, a kind of clarifying construction that usually means something like "the prototypical thing, not one of the slightly non-prototypical things one might otherwise have called by this name."

(1)   a. The car isn't MINE-mine, it's my parents'.
         b. I'm up, I'm just not UP-up.
         c. Oh, we're not LIVING TOGETHER-living together.

2 The semantics of CR

Normally, there is a certain amount of leeway in what we're willing to accept as a referent for a word. A tuna salad or a green salad are both salads, a minivan and a cargo van are both vans. Still, there is a kind of "prototype" for a salad and a van, the former not containing tuna, and the latter being big, industrial, and boxy.

This is a kind of contrastive construction, and the contrast seems to be between the prototypical and other possible interpretations. So, among the things that we might call a "salad," we're singling out the prototypical one, to the exclusion of the non-prototypical ones.

CR can apply to things other than nouns, like verbs, adjectives, prepositions. These are the examples they give, though note that shortly they're going to call the second one something slightly different.

(2)   Are you LEAVING-leaving?

(3)   I'm not NERVOUS-nervous.

(4)   I'm up, but not UP-up.

By virtue of the fact that it contrasts prototypical reference from non-prototypical reference, there must be a certain breadth of potential reference in order to be contrastable like this. Just from a semantic standpoint, then, we expect (and find) that "functional" things like *the* and *be* can't do this. (Except maybe to the extent that there is some kind of contrast that can be established, e.g., between 'is and never has been' and 'is now.')

(5)   * I didn't (just) read the book, I read THE-the book.

(6)   * There IS-is nothing going on between us.

Hypothesis 1 *CR requires that a contrast set be able to be established.*

   To test that, consider prepositions. Prepositions come in at least two types (and perhaps there are types in between)—those that are basically function words, and those that have some deeper semantic content on the basis of which a contrast set could be established. But they are all prepositions, all of the same syntactic category. So, if what matters is the ability to create a contrast set, then different prepositions should behave differently.

(7)   a.   I was sitting across from your husband at dinner.
        b.   Really?
        c.   Well, not ACROSS-across, but close by.

(8)   a.   I wasn't exactly ABOARD-aboard. I was kind of hanging on to the mirror.
        b.   I wasn't exactly UNDERNEATH-underneath, I was kind of hanging on to the mirror.

(9)   a.   Did you go to Montréal?
        b.   * Well, not TO-to.

(10)   a.   Was the cake made of chocolate?
        b.   * Well, not exactly OF-of (chocolate).

   And, even with proper names, if a contrast set can be created (e.g., the Johns that we know), then CR is possible.

(11)   Oh that's BEACON-STREET-Beacon-Street!

(12)   It might have been me, but it wasn't ME-me.

2.1   Literal meaning

(13)   Just COFFEE-coffee, no double meanings.

2.2   Intensified meaning

(14)   I'm not NERVOUS-nervous.

2.3 Value-added meaning

(15)   We're not LIVING TOGETHER-living together.

(16)   We're only LIVING TOGETHER-living together.

Are these really ambiguous? They note (citing Larry Horn for the observation) that "innuendo-laden" meanings take on a special intonation. Is that required to differentiate these?

(17) a.   I've been invited to go bowling tonight.
      b.   BOWLING-bowling?

2.4 The obvious one

(18) a.   Did you check out the leak in the bathroom?
      b.   What leak?
      c.   The LEAK-leak.

3 Slack regulators

They (citing Lasersohn) compare this to things like *exactly* and *perfectly*, which regulate the slack ("sláck regulators"—as opposed to be "slack régulators").

It might be worth noting here that this might be seen as kind of the opposite thing that *any* does.

4 Contrastive focus and CR-Contrastive focus

(19) a.   Who did you give the book to?
      b.   I didn't give the book to JOHN, . . .
      c.   I didn't give the book to JOHN-John, . . .

In the first case, the book went to an alternative, somebody other than John—e.g., Bill. In the second, the book went to an alternative, but it must be someone apart from the canonical John who is also named John.

5 CR in other languages

There are some examples in the paper, I won't re-typeset them here. And they don't all seem to be quite the same as what we're looking at in English.

Italian, Persian, Japanese, Russian.

6 The scope of CR—what gets copied?

What gets copied is not always the same:

(20) a. . . . and here are the GLOVE-gloves.

      b. I don't LIKE-HIM-like him.

      c. ? I don't LIKE-like him.

      d. We weren't SLEEPING-TOGETHER-sleeping-together.

      e. * We weren't SINGING-TOGETHER-singing-together.

6.1 Smaller than a word

Inflectional morphology (regular plurals, regular past tense) can often fail to be copied.

(21) a. We're not one of those COUPLE-couples.

      b. I barely talked to him. Not TALK-talked.

(22) a. Not sports fans, FANS-fans.

      b. You CRIED-cried?

This doesn't happen with irregulars, though.

(23) * I saw some GOOSE-geese crossing the road.

(24) * I have never SEE-seen a movie star.

Derivational morphology (often category-changing, e.g., *relation* to *relationship*) also seems to copy necessarily.

(25) * We're not in a RELATION-relationship.

They give the following example as one that shows that *-ing* need not always copy, though I think it's probably not actually CR.

(26) I like wind-surfing, not SURF-surfing.

(27) I like wind-surfing, not SNOW-surfing.

(28) I like red curry, not GREEN curry.

(29) I like wind-surfing, not SURFING-surfing.

Conclusion: The scope of CR has a certain amount of optionality—it can apply to a whole word, with or without regular inflectional affixes.

7   CR and object pronouns

It's at least possible. They say it's optional only for some.

(30)   I know him, but I don't KNOW-HIM-know-him.

(31)   I know him, but I don't KNOW-know him.

It also doesn't seem to work with non-pronouns (in that case, you only copy the verb.)

(32)   * I know Sid, but I don't KNOW-SID-know-Sid.

(33)   * I know Bartholomew, but I don't KNOW-BARTHOLOMEW-know-Bartholomew.

Why? Well, perhaps it has to do with the prosodic organization. The pronoun *cliticizes* onto the verb, like *n't* in *didn't*. Though they actually leave this kind of vague, pointing out that if you stress the pronoun, it's still ok.

(34)   Does he LIKE-THEM-like-them?

(35)   Does he LIKE-'EM-like-'em?

Even over and above that, it's probably not just phonology, since it is supposed to be the case that *a* in *date a linguist* is phonologically cliticized to *date*, but you can't repeat *date a*. Nor, though, can you repeat *a linguist*. The *a* is just not able to participate in this.

(36)   * I wouldn't DATE-A-date-a linguist.

(37)   * I wouldn't date A-LINGUIST-a-linguist.

8   Discontinuous idioms

They look at discontinuous idioms as a way to convince themselves that what is required here isn't really prosody—at least what differentiates between stressed and unstressed pronouns also holds in the middle of a discontinuous idiom, meaning that it isn't just about the stress.

Idioms do seem to be kind of fragile. There's a set that have been used since at least the 80's in Linguistics examples, but a lot of them are not very current. I think *take X to task* wasn't that familiar to people, though in the paper they didn't try any others. Specifically the kind they were interested in were ones where the *X* was in the middle (hence "discontinuous").

- *take NP into account*

- *send NP to the showers*

- *have NP over a barrel*

- *rain on NP's parade* (perhaps also ok *rain on the parade of everyone John has every met?*)

- *know NP from Adam*

- *drop NP a line*

- *give NP the time of day*

- *haul NP over the coals*

- *get NP across*

Sometimes you can insert certain things.
Kick the proverbial bucket.
I located a pretty long list of idioms here: http://www.hum.uit.no/a/svenonius/papers/ParticlesId
So, does that help with their (50)? Maybe.

(38)   a.   RAIN-ON-HIS-PARADE-rain-on-his-parade.
       b.   * RAIN-ON-JOHN'S-PARADE-rain-on-John's-parade.
       c.   * RAIN-rain on John's parade.
       d.   * rain on John's PARADE-parade.

9   The generalization

Trying to find something in common, they observe that unstressed pronouns are closed-class items (though I really don't see how stressed pronouns are open-class), like un-stressed prepositions (again, same comment—isn't it more about the lexical content than the stress?). What they want is to say that they're all like inflectional morphology. Hmm. And unlike derivational morphology and idiom bits, which they say is not semantically transparent.

They want to say that the biggest thing that can be copied is essentially V′ in old terminology (VP for those who have been through Syntax I recently and have a distinction between VP and *v*P). That is, the point in the phrase structure just below the subject. The smallest thing is the lexical head (i.e. *glove* within *gloves*).

(Check out subject-containing idioms, though, they only check the kind that is an entire clause, like *My goose is cooked.*, which doesn't work. If there are such idioms, perhaps there aren't. I didn't see any on Svenonius' handout.)

Syntactically, they want to suggest that maybe *-ing* is a bit like this, but not sure. Kannada too has something that seems to be variable with respect to the syntactic size of the thing it attaches to.

Footnote 12 mentions *GREEN TEA green tea*, and let me throw in there *BIG RED BOOK big red book*, which I think would work. So, it seems like things that adjoin to the left should be part of what is maximally copied. They also have *ALL DONE all done*. Not sure. How about *DONE WELL done well*?

Here's what they come up with:

(39) The generalization about CR

    a. The scope of CR is either X^0 or XP^{min}.

    b. The scope of CR must include a full lexical item, to whose meaning the semantic effect of CR is applied.

    c. In addition to a single contentful lexical item, the scope of CR may include only noncontrastive functional/grammatical morphemes.

Note that their example (which they highlight in fn. 14) of *GIVE IT give it to him* doesn't really match the syntactic constituency you might have come up with in Syntax I. How is the judgment? They said that not everybody accepts this. Is that a valid defense?

10 Footnote 15

Footnote 15 is kind of interesting, where they draw a parallel with *real* and *really*— the idea being that CR can occur more or less in the same places, except maybe that *really* has another possibility (*My goose is really cooked* but not **My goose is COOKED cooked.*). They don't pursue this further because it "is more difficult to work out in the parallel architecture model."

They say that this comes up again in section 6.

The resulting generalization is

(40) a. CR can adjoin below the X^0 level, provided its sister is a contentful lexical item.

    b. In addition to a single contentfullexical item, the scope of CR may include only noncontrastive function/grammatical morphemes.

    c. The adjunction structure of CR cannot be dominated by any node licensed by a lexical entry (or a node that is coindexed with a constituent in the semantics).

11   Prosodic considerations

Prosodic well-formedness can affect the acceptability.

(41)   PEACHES-peaches > ?PEACH-peaches

(42)   APPLES-apples = APPLE-apples

I tend to think that one has more to do with the "chp" in the middle, though. Like the *WALKED-walked* example they had somewhere. That doesn't explain *VOTED-voted* > *VOTE-voted*, though.

In any event, they suggest that it is preferable to have parallel prosodic structure between the copy and the original.

Some other preferences too, initial stress is better than non-initial stress.

(43)   Prosodic constraints on CR
  a. The reduplicant preferably contains the same number of syllables as the prosodic constituent containing the base of CR [for some speakers].
  b. The scope of CR should not be too long [for many speakers].
  c. The scope of CR preferably has early main stress rather than late main stress [for a few speakers].

Also, contrastive stress likes to be at the end, so often if you can, you'll elide whatever would come after it.

(44)   a. It's not like INSTANT instant [glue]
  b. Well, I'm not FAMILIAR-familiar [with them].
  c. I barely talked to him. Not TALK-talked [to him].

12   A couple of notes about analysis

We might treat the copy as the realization of an abstract prefix, parallel to the Japanese *ma* prefix, that just borrows its phonology from nearby. This is a fairly common view for other reduplicative phenomena.

For next time. It's probably a bit much to read a whole paper for each class.

References

Ghomeshi, Jila, Ray Jackendoff, Nicole Rosen & Kevin Russell. 2004. Contrastive focus reduplication in English (the SALAD-salad paper). *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22: 307–357.