

# Reduplication in Japanese Pidgin Chinese

LIU Jian, WU Lin

**Key words:** Japanese Pidgin Chinese, reduplication, The first language acquisition

**Abstract:** This paper focuses on the descriptions and analysis of reduplication in Japanese Pidgin Chinese (JPC). Reduplication is usually either totally absent or nonproductive and/or without contrasting simple form in pidgins although it is fairly common and even productive in JPC which makes JPC unusual among pidgins. Nouns, verbs and adjectives from both lexifier and substrate can be reduplicated. In this paper, the first language acquisition mechanism reloading is used to interpret the origin of the reduplication in JPC and the research may shed light on the both pidgin and language acquisition devices.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Definition of Pidgins

Jeff Siegel (2008:1) defines Pidgins as below:

Pidgins and creoles are new languages that develop out of a need for communication among people who do not share a common language—for example, among plantation labourers from diverse geographic origins. Most of the forms in the lexicon of the new language come from one of the languages in the contact situation, called the ‘lexifier’ (or sometimes the ‘superstrate’)—usually the language of the group in control of the area where contact occurs. However, the meanings and functions of the lexical forms, as well as the phonology and grammatical rules of the pidgin or creole, are different to those of the lexifier, and may sometimes resemble those of one or more of the other languages in contact, usually referred to in pidgin and creole studies as the ‘substrate languages’

While Holm (2010:253-4) gave a similar definition focusing on pidgins as below:

Pidgins is a reduced language that resulted from extended contact between groups of people with no language in common. It evolved because they needed some means of verbal communication, e.g. for trade, but no group learned the native language(e.g. Italian, as Italians spoke it among themselves) for social reasons that probably included lack of close contact due to lack of trust. In such situations the people with less power (speakers of substrate languages, by the definition used in creolistics) are more accommodating and do the difficult work of learning the other group's vocabulary. However, those with more power (the superstrate speakers) adopt many of the substrate speakers changes in their language regarding pronunciation, grammar, and the meaning of vocabulary, and no longer try to speak it as they would within their own group. They cooperate with the other group (or groups) to construct an emergency language that will serve their needs,..... By definition, the resulting pidgin is restricted to a limited use (e.g. trade) and it is no ones native language.

At beginning, pidgin languages were disvalued as imperfect baby talk (Bloomfield1933: 472-3) which can be clear from their very names: Broken English, bastard Portuguese, nigger French kombuistaaltje (cookhouse lingo), isikula (coolie language). With later research on pidgins, this point of view was overturned. Hancock(1977) listed up 127 pidgins and creoles and regarded Pidgins as languages which are well-organized. Bickerton(1983:121) pointed out that children have an instinct and constrain such instinct when they learn a language such as English and French as their first language, “Only when they are in the group speaking pidgins, can the instinct for the syntactic models not be constrained because there is no competitive model with it”. Pinker(2004:41)cited the view of Bickerton(1983) and pointed out that creole Languages origin from and reflect that the language is the biologic program of human beings, namely the instinct for languages.

## 1.2 Definition of JPC

JPC is the pidgin derived from the city of Dalian to the whole China and from 1894

to 1945. It spread quickly during the half-century and vanished suddenly when the war ended up. JPC takes Chinese as its' superstrate (lexifier) while Japanese as its' substrate, which means that the forms in the lexicon of the new language come from Chinese while the meanings and functions of the lexical forms, as well as the phonology and grammatical rules of the pidgin come from Japanese. JPC is unusual at this point because normally the people with less power tend to be speakers of substrate languages since they are more accommodating and do the difficult work of learning the other group's vocabulary. But in the case of JPC, the people with less power (Chinese) became the superstrate and the invaders (Japanese) did the difficult work of learning the new vocabulary.

### **1.3 The special phenomenon of Reduplication in JPC**

One feature of JPC is that it contains a plenty amount of reduplications. This feature makes JPC unusual among pidgins again. According to Peter Baker & Mikael Parkvall(2005:514-515) it appears that reduplication is rare in pidgins and reduplication is either totally absent or nonproductive and/or without contrasting simple form. But for JPC nouns, verbs and adjectives from both lexifier and substrate can be reduplicated. Reduplication in JPC is not only with a good quantity but also quite productive. Why is JPC different from the other pidgins? What is the mechanism of its' reduplication? These are the questions the present paper trying to answer.

## **2. A brief review of previous research**

The previous research on JPC is rare though it is of great significance. Most of the existing pidgins studies are based on the Indo-European language (Including English, French, Spanish and Portuguese, and so on) as their lexifier, but there is no possibility that JPC and the well studied pidgins share one origin. It gives JPC a variable in terms of word order, case markers and tense-aspect system, etc., The comparison between the common features of pidgins and the unique feature of JPC is of great significance.

In fact, nevertheless, the special feature of JPC has not gain enough attention yet so far. Sakurai(2015) made a plenty amount of material collection of JPC which provide us a data-base for JPC studies, but he did not go further for summarizing the linguistic law of JPC. Zhang(2011,2017,2018) and Gong(2013,2014a,2014b,2015,2018) discussed some

aspects of JPC from the perspective of colonialism rather than revealing its' inner linguistic regular patterns. Liu(2018,2019a,2019b) are attempts to reorient the field of JPC studies from the perspective of linguistics focusing on negation, case marker and tense-aspect system respectively. Only Sakurai(2015) ,In the previous research, mentioned about reduplication, but in a very limited way without analysis or comparison with other pidgins.

### **3. Phenomenon**

As mentioned above, reduplication is either totally absent (vietnamese Pidgin French) or nonproductive and/or without contrasting simple forms(Russenorsk, Fanagalo, Lingua Franca, Trio-Ndyuka Pidgin ). This appears also true for other pidgins (Peter Bakker& Miikael Parkvall 2005:514). Compared to these pidgins, JPC with a great quantity of reduplications, which is a major feature of JPC. The simple form (base of the reduplication) mainly origins from Chinese while some of them origin from Japanese. The typical simple form is ‘meshi (飯)’ in ‘meshimeshi’ of JPC . The reduplication is productive, which is another feature of JPC. No matter what the origin is, Nouns, verbs and adjectives may undergo duplicating in JPC.

Through observations on the unique features presented in the reduplication of JPC, this paper is based on the documents of Sakurai (2015) including the data from Nakatani Kaji(1925,1926), sorts out the usage of the reduplicated words in pidgins and analyzes the production system in order to reexamine the significance of pidgins.

#### **3.1 Reduplication of Nouns**

In the first phase, we sort out the records of nouns of Nakatani(1925,1926) cited from Sakurai(2015), which are formed as a small corpus. The study on the reduplication of nouns converges on ‘meshimeshi’. The database reflects that the base of ‘meshimeshi’ in JPC origins from substrate (Japanese). But the usage of ‘meshimeshi’ are different from the substrate to the lexifier.

##### **3.1.1 ‘meshimeshi’ from the substrate side**

###### **3.1.1.1 ‘meshimeshi’ as a representatives of vocabulary**

Meshimeshi is the most common reduplication of JPC. In Nakatani(1925), the word

was mentioned as the representatives of vocabulary as below:

「メシメシ進上」「カイカイデガンホーチ」「ターターデポコペン」  
「ニーヤプシンヂャナイカ」。こんな珍妙な言葉は、市内の随處否  
啻に大連のみならず、邦人の居住する中国の地の何處へ行つても日  
中人間に猛烈に使はれてゐる。不自然な言葉、換言すれば所謂国籍  
不明の言葉である。...

(中谷 1925:461)

Because of its widespread use and high frequency, the term of ‘meshimeshi’ has become the representative word of JPC and even remains in Modern Chinese to some extent. In the book of Chogoku sennyu patio nikki, the author records the use of the word today: when he told an old Chinese woman that he is Japanese, the aunty began to say, "Oh, are you Japanese?" Then she suddenly said to him ‘meshimeshi’ as a greeting.

### 3.1.1.2 Change of word class

The base of ‘meshimeshi’ is a Japanese noun ‘飯 (meshi, rice)’. ‘Meshi’ as a noun can not be reduplicated in Japanese. The simple form of ‘meshi’ was used in JPC as what it was in Japanese, which means before being reduplicated, it was used as a noun in JPC. The records of the word usage were remained in Nakatani(1925).

(1) 你的快々の飯幹活

お前早く飯を焚け

(正) 你得快快々兒的做飯

(中谷 1925:491)

(2) 飯幹活完了的、房子掃々

飯を焚いたら部屋の掃除をしろ

(正) 做完了飯把屋子掃一掃

(中谷 1925:535)

In (1)-(2) ‘meshi’ was used as a noun, as it was followed by the verb ‘ganho (幹活)’. ‘ganho’ (sometime in the form of ‘ganhoji’) originally meant to ‘labor,

work’ in Chinese, but in JPC, it was used as the Japanese verb ‘する (do)’ by Japanese grammatical rule. The phrase of ‘meshi ganho’ means ‘cook’ in the form of ‘do the rice’. The simple form of ‘meshi’ is the noun ‘rice’ here in the phrase.

When going through reduplicating, the reduplicated form of ‘meshimeshi’ was used as a verb ‘eat’. The function of reduplication in the case of ‘meshimeshi’ is changing word class.

- (3) 我的まだ飯々沒有、你的快々の飯幹活  
私はまだ飯前だから、お前早く飯を焚け  
(正) 我還沒吃飯哪、你得快快々兒的做飯  
(中谷 1925 : 491)
- (4) 壞了沒有、你的一個飯々看々  
腐つてはみません、貴下一つ召上がつて御覧なさい  
(正) 不能爛、你嗜一個看々  
(中谷 1925 : 496)
- (5) 這個大々新しい、さしみ飯々頂好  
これは非常に新しいから、刺身にして召上がると好いです  
(正) 這是很新鮮的、做生魚片兒吃很好  
(中谷 1925 : 495)
- (6) 這個你的飯々有か。  
これをお前喰べたことがあるか  
(正) 這個你吃過了沒有?  
(中谷 1925 : 527)

It is more clear in (3), the simple form of ‘meshi’ is a noun (rice) and the reduplicated form of ‘meshimeshi’ is a verb (eat). In (4)-(6), the reduplicated form of ‘meshimeshi’ was also found as a verb.

It can be noted that, there are both simple form ‘meshi’ and reduplication ‘meshimeshi’ in JPC. The simple form differs from the reduplication in semantics and syntactic representation. The simple form originates from the substrate (Japanese) while reduplication is used in JPC only. There is no ‘meshimeshi’ in Japanese, neither does in Chinese. Reduplication in the case of ‘Meshimeshi’ functions as word-class-changing.

### 3.1.2 Meshimeshi from the lexifier side

In the available documents, the usage of ‘meshi’ and ‘meshimeshi’ by the lexifier speakers (Chinese) is different from that of substrate (Japanese). For the simple form ‘meshi’, there are two ballads in Chinese, both of which appear in the simple form of ‘meshi’ without reduplicating.

The first record appeared in the early days of Sino-Japanese language contact.

(7) 到了青泥洼 学了日本语

When come to Qingniwa, you will learn Japanese language.

吃饭叫眉西 骂人叫八卡

For eating, you will say meshi and for insulting someone, you will say baka.

(満州事情案内 1936 : 93)

When the second ballad appeared, the JPC had already been stabilized, and ‘meshi’ appeared in the form of simple form, as well as in the act of eating.

(8) ...

開口先說日本話

He opens his mouse and talk in Japanese.

罵人叫巴蛤

He insulting you with the word of baka.

吃飯叫米西<sup>1</sup>

He says meshi for eating

臨走給個大嘴巴

He slaps you on your face as saying good-bye.

(満州事情案内 1936 : 96)

Obviously different from the substrate side, the simple form is used as a verb rather than as a noun for lexifier speakers in (7)-(8). In short, the word presents word-class-changing function of reduplication in the substrate side, but not in the lexifier side.

---

<sup>1</sup> Both mixi and meixi are the pronunciation in the Chinese way of ‘meshi’ and are marked by Chinese character 米西 and 眉西 respectively.

## 3.2 Reduplication of Adjectives

### 3.2.1 Without word-class-changing

The adjective-reduplication without word-class-changing function are the ones from the substrate side. In the available documents, we find 4 Japanese adjectives as the base of reduplication.

- (9) 今天大々寒い寒い、快々の火幹活計  
今日は大へん寒い、早く火をおこせ  
(正) 今天很冷、快々兒的弄火罷  
(中谷 1925 : 491)
- (10) 這個的大々酸ばい酸ばい的、進上しても我的不要よ  
これは馬鹿に酸ばい、呉れても要らないよ  
(正) 這個很酸、你給我也不要  
(中谷 1925 : 496)
- (11) 你呀、這個壞了ぢやないか、大々臭い臭いな  
お前これは腐つてゐるではないか、大へん臭いよ  
(正) 你、這個不是爛了麼、很臭很臭的  
(中谷 1925 : 496)
- (12) 熱い熱いのお茶一個拿來。  
熱いお茶を一杯持つて來い  
(正) 拿一碗热茶来 (中谷译)  
(中谷 1925 : 491)

First of all, the Japanese adjectives in simple forms in (9) - (12) were reduplicated in JPC, which do not change the word class and can exclude the common functions of reduplication, the word-class-changing. Secondly, the creation of the reduplication is not in accordance with the Japanese word formation and does not conform to the Japanese syntax. In the same sentence, the Japanese adjectives can not be reduplicated and the two adjectives can not be put together without morphological change. Here we can see that speakers are consciously using sentences that are not grammatical in their mother tongue. Normally the substrate speakers use the grammar of their mother language when speaking pidgins even though they are not aware. And this explains why the grammar of pidgins



are assemble to the substrate rather than the lexifier. But in this case, the substrate speakers are aware that they are not using the grammar of their mother language. Even though it is not correct in the grammar of Lexifier, they suppose to using the new grammar of the new language. Thirdly, and most importantly, the forms of adjective reduplication are presented in the existing documents, and there is no simple form relative to it, which makes it difficult to judge whether or not the reduplication forms express intensity. Moreover, we can not see the necessity and significance of reduplication in semantic and grammatical functions. That is to say, we can basically think that the form of ‘samuisamui’ can be replaced by a more economical form ‘samui’.

### 3.2.2 With word-class-changing

#### 3.2.2.1 Adjectives-verbs reduplication

In the cases of adjective-reduplication with word-class-changing, the base form are from the lexifier side. We found an example of adjectives reduplicated into verbs: ‘manmande (慢慢的)’ . ‘man (慢)’ is a Chinese adjective. ‘manmande’ is one of the few words in JPC that can find counterpart in Chinese, which means there does exist the reduplicated form ‘manmande (slowly-slowly)’ in Chinese. But it is only in the respect of form. The Chinese word ‘manmande’ is the iteration of ‘man(慢,slow)’ . It modifies the verbs. But in JPC, reduplication converts the word character and made it a verb, of which the semantic is ‘wait’ , and modified by adverbs like ‘tatade (大大的, a lot)’ or ‘shoshode (少少的, a little)’ .

- (13) 你呀、少々慢々的、我的東西買賣

少しお待ち、私は買物がある

(正) 等一等、我要買東西

(中谷 1925 : 498)

- (14) 你的來々の大々慢々的、我的大々慢々的な

お前の来るのは大さう遅い 私は大へん待つたよ

(正) 你來的太晚了、我等着你好半天了

(中谷 1925 : 492)

The basic semantic and usage of ‘manmande’ is used as a verb ‘wait’ (although used

in some particular cases as ‘late’ like the first ‘manmande’ in (14)). From the Chinese adjective ‘man (slow)’ to the JPC verb ‘manmande(wait)’, the function of reduplication here is word-class-changing.

### 3.2.2.2 Adjective- adverb reduplication

The examples of adjectives-adverbs reduplication include ‘tata (大々, largely, sometimes in the form of ‘tatade’ )’ , ‘kaikai (快々, quickly, most of the time in the form of ‘kaikaide’ )’ and ‘tongtong (通々, all, most of the time in the form of ‘tongtongde’ )’ . Take ‘tata’ as the example. ‘da (大)’ is a Chinese adjective. Through reduplicating, the pronunciation changed from ‘da’ to ‘ta’ since the substrate speakers pronounce this Chinese character ‘大’ in this way (ta). Another change happened when going through reduplication, which is the word class was converted from adjective to adverb. The reduplicated form of ‘tata’ means ‘very much’, which modifies adjectives and verbs.

(15) 机的上邊大々的汚い、你的手巾拿來頂好幹活

机の上が大へん不潔だから、お前雑巾を持つて来て拭け

(正) 桌子上很臟了、你拿展布來、好々兒的擦一擦

注意「臟」は不潔。「展布」は雑布。「擦」は拭くこと。

(中谷 1925 : 493)

(16) 大貴沒有、我的大々安い

高くはありません、大へん安いです

プクイアウオーマイデー又一ビエ又イ

(正) 不貴啊我賣的很便便宜

(中谷 1925 : 493-494)

(17) 你的烟草買賣去、外邊的大大留達不行ぢやないか

お前煙草を買いに行つて、何故外で遊んでゐるのか

(正) 你買烟捲兒去、怎麼在外頭要呢

(中谷 1925 : 492)

In (15) - (17), it can be conducted that after the process of reduplication, the meaning of the word changes, from the size (big) to the extent (very much). At the same time, part

of speech has changed from adjective to adverb.

### 3.3 Reduplication of verbs

#### 3.3.1 ‘kankan’

‘kankan (看々, look-look)’ is derived from the Chinese verb ‘kan (看, look)’ and ‘saosao (掃々, clean-clean)’ comes from the Chinese verb ‘sao (掃, clean)’. In Chinese, there is the reduplicated form of ‘看々、掃々’, which is considered to be the repetition of the verbs in simple form rather than reduplication. The function of repetition here is attenuate, such as ‘kankan’, which means ‘have a look, look a bit’. On the other side, there is no simple form of ‘kan、sao’ in JPC, and the reduplicated form of ‘kankan’, ‘saosao’ is used as verbs which with the semantic close to ‘keep an eye on’ or ‘do cleaning’. The grammatical rule of them is similar to the Japanese one. It appears at the end of the sentence and can be negated. It can be added to the form command and connected to perfect aspect. While in the Chinese grammar, the verb repetition is not allowed to present these manifestations.

In short, the reduplication does not function at all here. The reduplicated form functions as well as the simple form. In other words, there is no difference between simple form and reduplication. It seems that the verbs are reduplicated for nonsense.

- (18) 你的ペチカー看々せんから火通同死了ぢやないか  
 お前ペチカーを見ないから火が皆消えてしまつたではないいか  
 (正) 你沒看火爐子、火都減了  
 (中谷 1926 : 538)
- (19) 你的まだ房子掃々沒有か  
 お前まだ部屋を掃除しないのか  
 (正) 你還沒掃屋子麼  
 (中谷 1925 : 489)
- (20) 你的房子掃々完了したら、少々歇歇的、洗澡の火幹活計せい  
 お前部屋の掃除が済んで、少し休んだら、風呂を焚け  
 (正) 你掃完了屋子、歇一會兒、再燒堂子罷  
 (中谷 1925 : 491)

In the above sentences, the restriction of verb repetition (or reduplication if there is) in Chinese has been broken when being conducted into the JPC. In syntactic performance, ‘kankan’ in (18) combines with the negation ‘sen (せん)’ derived from the substrate side and ‘saosao’ in (19) combines with negation ‘meiyou (没有)’ derived from the lexifier side. ‘saosao’ in (20) combines with the lexical perfect aspect ‘kanryoshita (完了した)’, etc., All of these do not conform to the rules of Chinese grammar.

Through these sentences, we find that the verb reduplication in JPC has nothing to do with the Chinese verb reduplication (repetition). The usage of reduplication is in the same way to simple forms for normal Japanese verbs. That is to say, verb reduplication can be replaced by simple forms and the simple form is even more effective. Such reduplication can be seen as redundancy.

### 3.3.2 ‘rairai’

‘rairai’ is different from ‘kankan’ or ‘saosao’. The latter has the original form derived from Chinese, or in other word, the language input. In Chinese, as mentioned above, the verb's repetition functions as attenuate, so in order to ease the tone of the language, the command sentence often takes the form of repetition like ‘kankan’, ‘saosao’ and so on. However, in JPC, ‘kankan, saosao’ were used as common verbs. On the contrary, ‘rairai (来来), come-come’ does not have the original form from Chinese, that is to say, the Japanese speakers has created a reduplicated form of ‘rairai’ without any language input, which means that the reduplication is productive in JPC.

‘rairai’ is also used as a verb in JPC, and its semantic and the grammatical rules it follows correspond to the Japanese verb ‘kuru (来る, come)’, which takes the position of the end of the sentence grammatically.

(21) 你的今天的快快的來々有か

(中谷 1925 : 473)

(22) 今天來々の、壞了沒有

今日來たばかりだから腐つてなんかゐません

(正) 今天纔來的 不能爛

(中谷 1925 : 495)

- (23) 你呀、這個日本來々不是か  
お前これは日本から來たのではないのか  
(正) 這不是從日本來的麼

(中谷 1925 : 496)

- (24) 日本來的不是、上海來々の  
日本から來たものではありません、上海から來たのです  
(正) 不是從日本來的、從上海來的

(中谷 1925 : 496-497)

- (25) 你的來々の大々慢々の、我的大々慢々のな  
お前の來るのは大さう遅い 私は大へん待つたよ  
(正) 你來的太晚了、我等着你好半天了

(中谷 1925 : 492)

The word ‘rairai’ in the form of reduplication in the sentences above is a verb just as its’ simple form, so it can be conducted that the reduplication here does not function as a word-class-changing component. It is certain that the reduplication here has no functions such as intensity or iteration or anything else. For example, in (24), there is no difference no matter if the word is reduplicated or not. It has no reason to choose reduplicated forms instead of simple forms corresponding to Japanese verb ‘kuru’. In terms of semantics, syntax, or iconic, it is impossible to judge that the use of ‘rairai’ is necessary or superior to the unduplicated form ‘lai’.

### 3.4 Summary

Through the example sentences above, we find that except the sentence created by the word ‘meshimeshi’ in substrate, ‘manmande’ and ‘tatade’, there is no reduplication functions as a reduplication. In other words, reduplicated forms are the same to non-duplicated forms in terms of semantics, syntactic, and functions. It seems that there is no need for words to be created in reduplicated forms in the respects including semantic, grammatical and functional, although the word formation mechanism of reduplication is productive.

## 4. Analysis

### 4.1 Form of reduplication in JPC

Normally the form of reduplication can be divided into 2 types:

- Partial reduplication, for instance in Ilocano  
kalding ‘goat’ > kalkalding ‘goats’  
ag-tilmōn ‘swallow’ > ag-tilmotilmōn ‘swallow repeatedly’  
Rūpa ‘face’ > rupanrūpa ‘face to face’
- Full reduplication, for instance in Nukuoro  
gohu ‘dark’ > gohugohu ‘getting dark’  
vai ‘water’ > vaivai ‘watery’

In the respect of form, reduplications in JPC takes the latter one, full reduplication. But in some cases, a redundant form ‘de’ was added to the reduplication. For instance, ‘de’ in ‘manmande’, ‘tatade’ and so on.

### 4.2 Function of reduplication in JPC

#### 4.2.1 No number (plural) function was found in JPC

Normally number (plural) function is the main function of reduplication. Reduplication tends to change the simple to the plural. See the example in the below:

Nouns reduplication in Papago

gogs ‘dog’ > gogogs ‘dogs’

Verbs reduplication in Luisano

lawi ‘to make a hole’ > law-lawi ‘to make two holes/to make a hole twice’

> lawa-lawi ‘to make many holes, more than two’

On the contrary to most reduplications, the number function was not found in reduplication in JPC.

#### 4.2.2 Change of word class

On the contrary to the function of number, the second important function of

reduplication, the word-class- changing function was found in reduplication in JPC. Reduplication converts the nouns into verbs, the adjectives into verbs, and the adjectives into adverbs as in the example sentences mentioned above.

#### **4.2.3 Reduplication for non-sense**

Most of the reduplications in JPC functions as well as the un-reduplicated form, in other word the base. It seems that they were reduplicated for nothing and with non-sense. For instance the reduplication of ‘samuisamui’ in (9), or ‘atsuiatsui’ in (12), or verbs like ‘rairai’ in (21)-(25), etc.,. And it broke the economic laws of language. When the reduplicated form functions the same as the simple one, it is always replaced by the latter one for economic and effective reasons.

The fact is, however, the reduplication in JPC remained in a large quantity even though it is redundant in the respects of semantic, grammatical and functional.

#### **4.3 The distribution of reduplication in JPC**

Through the examples in section 3, it can be conducted that nouns, adjectives and verbs from both the substrate side and the lexifier side can be reduplicated in JPC. It seems that the operation of reduplication is not constrained in JPC.

### **5. Discussion**

In most of the cases in JPC, it seems no necessary to reduplicate a word and the reduplication is uneconomic in some cases. But why the speakers from both sides of substrate and lexifier tend to reduplicate words? What is the mechanism of reduplication in JPC?

#### **5.1 Repetition**

There is a view that the reduplication is the imitation of repetition of Chinese grammar. It seems that it is believed by the pidgin speakers from the substrate side that the meaning of the word is expressed more clearly when repeated for two or more times. For instance, for Akimoto(1970) mentioned it as below, it is repetition rather than reduplication in the case of ‘meshimeshi’.

兵隊支那語と云つてなかなかよく通じる。日本語で二回云ふと通じるらしく彼等はミンパイ（明白）ミンパイ（明白）と云ふ チャカ（這個）チャカ（這個）でブン不行でホワイラー（壊了）でノーテン（腦天）ホワイラー（壊了）でチャカ（這個）チャカ（這個）でテンホー（頂好）だ！大人ミンパイ（明白）ミンパイ（明白）と云ふ

こんな支那語でどの程度通じたであろうか？

（秋元 1970： 109）

But they neglected the fact that there does exist reduplications with the function of word-class-changing, for instance in the case of ‘meshimeshi’, ‘manmande’ and ‘tatasde’ in section 3. Considering of those cases, it is hard or perhaps wrong to conclude that there is no reduplication but only repetition in JPC and the function of repetition in JPC is just for a clearer communication.

## 5.2 Phonological Copy Theory and Morphological Doubling Theory

Most of the studies on reduplication takes phonology as their standpoint. They suggest that the reduplication is a result of the operation of phonological copy (Marantz1982, McCarthy & Prince1986,1995,1999). On the contrary, Morphological Doubling Theory (Sharon Inkelas & Cheryl Zoll2005) argued that the main mechanism of reduplication is morphologically driven rather than phonologically driven. But for reduplication in JPC, the two theory are both no longer in force. In phonological copy theory, reduplication is a process of affixing. While reduplication in JPC is full reduplication as mentioned in 4.1. One can not distinct the reduplicated part from the base part. In other words, no part can be distinct as the affix. In morphological doubling theory, words are reduplicated as the requirement of morphological semantic needs. While most reduplications in JPC are reduplicated for no semantic reasons as well as grammatical and functional reasons (see 4.2).

## 5.3 The first language acquisition mechanism reloading

The studies in the Developmental Linguistics field, through the analysis of the corpus and experimental analysis of infants, observed that after an initial period, babbling



becomes reduplicated and argued that these first productions are the reflection of the child's recognizing and controlling syllables and segments as phonological units. They also proposed several hypotheses on how-language-starts mechanisms, in which prosodic bootstrapping observed that rhythmic elements, for example the reduplication, could help guide infants to distinguish semantics and syntax out of the flow of speech and therefore start their language mechanism. In other words, in the first language acquisition, reduplication is likely a strategy to control rhythm, and through the rhythm of reduplicating, they are preparing to control semantic and syntax.

On the other hand, even though pidgin applies to the second language acquisition according to Bickerton's series studies, there seems no absolute border between the first and second language acquisition. As mentioned in 3.2.1, the substrate speakers are consciously using sentences that are not grammatical in their mother tongue. Normally the substrate speakers use the grammar of their mother language when speaking pidgins even though they are not aware of it. And this explains why the grammar of pidgins are assemble to the substrate rather than the lexifier. But in the case of 'samuisamui', 'suppaisuppai', 'kusaikusai' and 'atsuiatsui', the substrate speakers are aware that they are not using the grammar of their mother language. Even though it is not actually correct in the grammar of Lexifier, they suppose themselves to use the new grammar for the new language in new situation. And this is what we call language creation. It is new, not derived from the substrate, neither from the lexifier. We name the language creation in pidgins the first language acquisition mechanism reloading because even though it is second language for adult speakers, the first language acquisition can be reloaded and revived at least to a small extent. There is no such a definite border between the first and second language acquisition when contacting to a brand-new language.

This paper holds that the first language acquisition reloading applies for reduplication in JPC. If reduplication is necessary for recognizing and controlling syllables and segments as phonological units for children in the first language acquisition, it is also applicable for adults in the situation of pidgin. The acquisition of the new language in pidgin's situation is different from the situation for the adults in the classroom but similar to the first language acquisition for the infants. Everything including syllable, segment and rhythm is new. And it makes the substrate speakers recognize the second language in the same way of their first language acquisition. Before contacting to the new

language, the first language acquisition mechanism had slept in their bodies for many years since grown up. In such a situation, some part of the first language acquisition mechanism can be provoked again. It has been proven by the evidence from the second language acquisition.

## 6. Conclusion

This paper applies the function of reduplication summed up in the field of first language acquisition to the explanations of a large number of reduplications in JPC. It agrees with the views of Bickerton (1977, 1983): Creole applies for the first language acquisition mechanism, and pidgin applies for the second language acquisition mechanism. On this basis, the paper argues that: the boundary limit between the first and second language acquisition is not impossible to break, but the breakthrough is limited. That is to say, most of the reduplications in JPC are applies for the first language acquisition reloading even though most of the left part of JPC applies for the second language acquisition.

## Reference

- Baker, Peter & Parkvall, Mikael. (2005). Reduplication in pidgins and creoles. In Bernhard Hurch (eds) *Studies on Reduplication (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 28)*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, pp.511-532
- Bickerton, Derek. (1977). Pidginization and Creolization: Language Acquisition an Language Universals, In Albert Valdman (eds.) *Pidgin and creole linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, pp. 49-69
- Bickerton, Derek. (1983). Creole Languages. *Scientific American*. 249-1, pp. 116-22
- Bloomfield, Leonard. (1933). *Language*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Hancock, Lan. F. (1977). Appendix: Repertory of Pidgin and Creole Languages. In Albert Valdman(eds.) *Pidgin and creole linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, pp.362-391
- Holm, John. A. (2010). Contact and Change: Pidgins and Creoles. In Raymond Hickey(eds.) *The handbook of language contact*. London: Blackwell, pp.252-261
- Inkelas, Sharon & Cheryl Zoll. (2005). *Reduplication: Doubling in Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Jeff Siegel. (2008). *The Emergence of Pidgin and Creole Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leroy, Marie & Morgenstern, Aliyah. (2005). Reduplication before age two. In Bernhard Hurch(eds) *Studies on Reduplication (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 28)*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, pp.475-492.
- Liu Jian. (2019). Typology of pidgin languages: centered in the Tense-aspect marker “you(有)” in Mongolian Pidgin Chinese and Japanese Pidgin Chinese. *TSUKUBA JAPANESE LINGUISTICS*. 20, pp.37-59
- Pinker, Steven. (2004). Clarifying the logical problem of language acquisition. *Journal of Child Language*. 31-4, pp.949-953.
- 桜井隆 (2012) 「満州ピジン中国語と協和語」『明海日本語』17 明海大学pp.1-15
- 桜井隆 (2015) 『戦時下のピジン中国語—「協和語」「兵隊支那語」など—』三元社
- 張守祥 (2011) 「『満洲国』における言語接触—新資料に見られる言語接触の実態—」『人文』10 学習院大学人文科学研究所pp.51-68
- 劉劍 (2018) 「ピジンとしての「協和語」の文法研究—ケースマーカーを中心に—」. 『中央学院大学社会システム研究所紀要』18-2 中央学院大学社会システム研究所pp.39-51
- 宮雪・尚俠 (2013) 「殖民文化視角下的“協和語”認識」『外國問題研究』208 東北師範大學 pp.3-9
- 宮雪・尚俠 (2013) 「中谷鹿二的協和語觀」『東北師大學報(哲學社會科學版)』271-5 東北師範大學 pp.142-147
- 宮雪 (2014) 『“協和語”研究』東北師範大學博士論文
- 宮雪 (2015) 「侵華日軍與協和語」『社會科學戰線』237 吉林省社會科學院pp.267-270
- 宮雪 (2018) 「洋涇浜協和語與橫濱語」『長春師範大學學報』37-5 長春師範大學pp.72-75
- 劉劍 (2019) 「“協和語”及其否定句句法特征研究」『日語學習與研究』200 對外經濟貿易大學pp.38-45
- 張守祥・王鳳莉・于湘泳 (2017) 「從中日史料的角度再考日偽時期的“太君”用法」『哈爾濱師範大學社會科學學報』2017-5 哈爾濱師範大學pp.82-86
- 張守祥・薄紅昕 (2018) 「清末民初中日語言接觸情形及其演變」『北方論叢』2018-3 哈爾濱師範大學pp.91-96

リュウ ケン／東北財経大学

ゴ リン／厦門大学

(2019年10月25日受理)

【日本語要旨】

## 日中ピジンにおける疊語

キーワード：日中ピジン、疊語、第一言語習得メカニズム

本稿では、日中ピジン（Japanese Pidgin Chinese）における疊語の記述と分析に焦点を当てている。ピジン言語においていえば、疊語は通常、完全に存在しないか非生産的であるのに対し、日中ピジンには大量に存在し、また生産的である。語源からみれば、日本語からの語彙も中国語からの語彙も疊語になる可能性を持っている。また、品詞の面からみれば、疊語は名詞、動詞、形容詞は行き渡っている。本論文では、第一言語習得メカニズムのリロードという観点をを用い、日中ピジンの疊語の特殊性を解釈する。