The diachrony and productivity of re-duplication – a reprise
Instead of an introduction

Bernhard Hurch
University of Graz

The second Conference on Reduplication - which took place in fall 2007 - was part of the *Graz Reduplication Project*[1] at the Institut für Sprachwissenschaft of the University of Graz. For various reasons we decided to edit the papers presented at the conference into two different volumes. We received an offer from the editors of the journal *Morphology* to edit a monothematic issue with a selection of the conference papers. That selection was made to focus primarily on topics of diachrony and productivity. For the remaining group of papers, we sought an easier, cheaper, and less commercial distribution than is usual for conference proceedings, with the disideratum of keeping the volume accessible to the linguistic public. The *Grazer Linguistische Studien*, the working papers of the Institute seemed to be the ideal place. Thus, half of the conference papers can be found in *Morphology* issue 19.2 (2009): 107-287, and the rest here. We kindly thank all the authors of both volumes, as well as all other presenting and non-presenting participants of the conference for their willingness to pass their written versions on to us.

In the study of reduplication, which has seen an intense revival over the last two to three decades, the topics of diachrony and productivity have received far too little attention. The revived interest in reduplication has led to a shift of attention away from individual segments towards bigger units in prosody, both within phonological and morphological analysis. For analysts of various theoretical persuasions, reduplication seemed to provide ideal data with which to emphasize the non-segmental nature of phonological and morphological relations.

As was common in the linguistics of the 90's, the empirical evidence examined in relation to reduplication was rather thin and oft repeated. In many occasions the reader is not told whether examples, intended to prove a theoretical point, are productive or lexicalized; whether the unreduplicated *simplicia* of apparently

---

reduplicated forms exist in their own right; or whether certain forms happen merely to be the simple remnants of isolated expressive forms. There has not yet been enough light cast on the question of the origin and historical development of reduplication. Theories proposing parallels between the origin and development of reduplication and regular grammaticalization processes seemed promising at a first glance, but have since been seen to be too simplistic. We, therefore, urged participants in the second Graz conference not only to address the subject of diachrony and reduplication, but also to provide broad empirical support for their claims. We are proud to present such an extensive collection here. We are deeply convinced that each single paper is an important piece of scholarly work in its own right. The narrowness of the topic did not always make our choices easy, but we needed to keep the respective volumes as coherent as possible.

We would like to thank the long list of reviewers who helped us to produce the two volumes. In the journal *Morphology* Veronika Mattes and I wrote a short introduction delineating what we envisioned as the frame of the project.

For the sake of completeness, the contributions to the issue of *Morphology* are listed below:

- Henning ANDERSEN: Reduplication in Slavic and Baltic: loss and renewal
- Sabrina BENDJABALLAH & Chris REINTGES: Ancient Egyptian verbal reduplication: typology, diachrony, and the morphology-syntax interface
- Nicolas EVANS: Doubled up all over again: borrowing, sound change and reduplication in Iwaidja
- Larry HYMAN: The natural history of verb-stem reduplication in Bantu
- John PETERSON & Utz MAAS: Reduplication in Kharia - The masdar as a phonologically motivated category
- Laurie REID: On the diachronic development of C_1V_1- reduplication in some Austronesian languages
- Hein VAN DER VOORT: Reduplication and repetition of person markers in Guaporé isolates

The present issue of the *Grazer Linguistische Studien* (GLS) is also symbolic, in the sense that it represents a re-launching of the working papers of the Institute which originally began publication over a quarter of a century ago. Along with the authors and reviewers, I would like to thank everyone who contributed to making this issue possible. Two collaborators who at different stages supported me in the organization of the conference are Veronika Mattes, who helped in the editing of the *Morphology* volume, and thus indirectly contributed to the present one, and Ursula Stangel who reviewed some of the papers included here. Last but not least, the editorial work, as well as the re-launching of the *GLS* would not have been possible without the unfailingly professional and always supportive help of Claudia Math.

Graz, December 2009   Bernhard Hurch