Features of Echo Words in Kyrgyz

ODAGIRI, Nami
Kansai University

AKMATALIEVA, Jakshylyk
JSPS Research Fellow / Niigata University

This paper discusses the features of echo words (EW) observed in colloquial Kyrgyz. Since previous studies have provided only general descriptions of this phenomenon, an overall picture of EW in Kyrgyz is still lacking. Using data from interviews with language consultants and field notes of naturally occurring conversations, this paper presents the following three new findings regarding the features of Kyrgyz EWs. (i) Phonological features: There are large individual differences in the choice of the first sound for the subsequent element, and no clear-cut rules are to be found. However, certain possible constraints and communicative tendencies are observed. (ii) Features in the word formation process: Word formation process of EWs in Kyrgyz is highly productive, in terms of forming EWs from various parts of speech and foreign words. It is possible to attach suffixes to EWs. Following nouns, verb-based *-(I)p* converbial forms are the most productive. (iii) Semantic features: Nuances going beyond generalizing the meaning are only present when the context is clear. EWs do not immediately carry negative nuances, but semantic constraints may discourage the creation of EWs themselves.

Keywords: echo words, Kyrgyz, paired words, reduplication, Turkic

1. Introduction*

ODAGIRI, Nami and AKMATALIEVA, Jakshylyk. 2024. "Features of Echo Words in Kyrgyz". In Norikazu Kogura and Kumiko Sato (eds.). *Aspects of Turkic Languages II: Information Structure and Knowledge Management*. pp.49–70. https://doi.org/10.15026/0002000299

* This paper is an extended version, with substantial additions and revisions, of oral presentations given at the 4th Meeting of the Society of Japan-Kyrgyz Culture Studies (January 30, 2023, online via Zoom) and at the 166th Meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan (June 17, 2023, Senshu University, Kanda Campus). The authors express their sincere gratitude to the participants of the meetings for their valuable comments, and to the language consultants for their cooperation in this research. Furthermore, we would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions. This study was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP22KJ1442.

This paper discusses the features of echo words (EWs), as observed in colloquial Kyrgyz.

Kyrgyz belongs to the Northwestern (Kipchak) branch of the Turkic languages, and is spoken in the Kyrgyz Republic in Central Asia, as well as in Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region in China, Afghanistan, Turkey, and elsewhere, with over 4.8 million speakers worldwide. Phonetic and lexical differences mark a divide into dialect groups, either northern and southern or northern, southwestern, and southeastern; the standard language is based on the northern dialect in both cases (Biyaliev 2003: 4, Oruzbaeva 1997: 286–7). According to Shōgaito (1988: 1417–8), Kyrgyz vowel harmony is among the most developed among the Turkic languages, and it is a major feature of the language. Due to vowel harmony and consonant alternation (assimilation and dissimilation), suffixes have numerous allomorphs. The vowel and consonant system of Kyrgyz is as follows. Vowels: *a, e, ï, i, o, ö, u, ü, aa, ee, oo, öö, uu, üü*, consonants (sounds in brackets are used only for loan words): *p, b, t, d, k, g, q, (c), č, (šč), j, (f), (v), s, z, š, (ž), y, (χ), ʁ, m, n, ŋ, l, r*.

Kyrgyz EWs are classified as paired words (PWs), which is a type of complex word. Complex words are defined as those containing two or more root morphemes, seen as lexicalized phrases that express a unified meaning (Oruzbaeva 1987: 98). They are classified into four types, including those that could be regarded as compounds, one of which are PWs (Oruzbaeva 1987: 98–103, Zaxarova 1987: 94–95).

PWs are distinguished from other types of complex words in that their components are equivalent and are in a coordinative relation, belonging to the same part of speech (Oruzbaeva 1987: 100), and by the typographic use of hyphens[1] (Abduvaliev 2008: 26–27).

According to Oruzbaeva (1987: 100–102), PWs can be characterized, first, by having a generalizing and collective meaning, and second, by being often expressive and having various nuances. PWs are further divided into the following three types. The following descriptions on the three types are based on Oruzbaeva (1987: 100–102).

(i) Repetition: The repetition of a single word in a similar or different form emphasizes the meaning.

(1) *kün* 'day' → *kün-dön–kün-gö*
day-ABL–day-DAT
'Day by day' (Oruzbaeva 1987: 100)

[1] En dashes are used for EWs in the examples in this paper to distinguish it from hyphens at morphological boundaries.

(ii) Generalizing PWs: For this variety, in some, both elements have independent meanings and can each be used alone (e.g., (2a)); in some, one of the elements has lost its meaning in modern Kyrgyz (but its cognate may have a meaning in another modern Turkic language) and is used only as a component of the PW in question (e.g., (2b)); and in some, neither element is used alone, and they are both only used as components of the PWs (e.g., (2c)).

(2) a. *ata* 'father' + *ene* 'mother' → *ata–ene* 'parents'
b. *uruš* 'fight, quarrel' + *keriš* (?) → *uruš–keriš* 'every kind of fight and quarrel'
c. *ürüŋ* (?) + *baraŋ* (?) → *ürüŋ–baraŋ* 'predawn time'

(Oruzbaeva 1987: 101–102)

(iii) Rhyming PWs or reduplication. In this type, the first element is a word that has independent meaning, and the following one is a rhyming reduplication of the preceding. If the original word begins with a consonant, the consonant is replaced in the following element. If the original word begins with a vowel, a consonant is added. The following element must have the same number of syllables, the same vowels, and the same final consonants as the first element, as well as having its own, separate stress.[2]

(3) a. *nan* 'bread' → *nan–**p**an* 'bread etc.'
b. *kant* 'sugar' → *kant–**m**ant* 'sugar etc.'
c. *otun* 'firewood' → *otun–**s**otun* 'firewood etc.'

(Oruzbaeva 1987: 102)

As per the above descriptions, more than one type of PW is associated with reduplication or repetition. However, in this paper, we define EWs as those that are formed by the phonological operation to the initial syllable of the original word as described in (iii) above. While Kamei et al. (1996: 1084–5) describe EWs as a word formation method that is widely encountered across South Asian languages, it is also characteristic of Turkic languages in general (Johanson 1998: 50, 2002: 31, Oruzbaeva 1987: 102).

In Section 2, we clarify the points identified by the previous studies on Kyrgyz EWs and the remaining issues. The summarized findings of the study will also be presented. In Section 3, we describe how linguistic data for this study were collected. Subsequently,

[2] The initial consonant of the subsequent element of an EW is indicated in bold. Other glossing principles are mainly drawn from Ebata and Akmatalieva (2022).

Section 4 presents the findings of this study on the features of Kyrgyz EWs in each subsection, namely, phonological (4.1), word-formation (4.2), and semantic (4.3) features.

2. Literature review and the findings of the study

EWs have a peripheral position in Kyrgyz grammar. For example, Iinuma (1995), a Kyrgyz grammar book written in Japanese, does not provide any description of EWs. Previous studies by local researchers have given only generalized descriptions of EWs, and an overall picture of EWs in Kyrgyz remains wanting.[3]

The points identified by previous studies, and issues remaining are summarized in the following Table 1.

Table 1 Points identified by previous studies and issues remaining

Points identified	Issues remaining
Previous studies imply (Abduvaliev 2008) or clearly state (Oruzbaeva 1980; 1987) that the first sound of the subsequent element is selected from the set of *m-*, *p-*, and *s-* (e.g., (3)).	Unclear how the first sound is selected out of the three.
Although EWs from nouns are the most common (e.g., (3)), EWs can be formed with other parts of speech (e.g., adverbs and converbs; Oruzbaeva 1980; 1987).	Unclear how productive the word formation process of Kyrgyz EWs is. Few examples other than nouns are given. Unclear whether and how EWs can be inflected.
EWs express a generalizing meaning (e.g., (3)), sometimes containing such nuances as pejorative, depreciative, ironic, diminutive, and so on (Oruzbaeva 1987).	Unclear under which conditions such nuances are contained.

From the above, this paper presents the following three new findings on the features of Kyrgyz EWs.

(i) Phonological features: There are large individual differences in the choice of the first sound for the subsequent element, and no clear-cut rules are to be found. However, certain possible constraints and communicative tendencies are observed.

(ii) Features in the word formation process: Word formation process of EWs in Kyrgyz is highly productive, in terms of forming EWs from various parts of speech and foreign words. It is possible to attach suffixes to EWs. Following nouns, verb-based *-(I)p* converbial forms are the most productive.

[3] Kubo (1997), which describes the echo word reduplication in Khalkha Mongolian, claims that the echo word reduplication in various languages has not been widely studied, in particular, with respect to its location in the organization of the grammar.

(iii) Semantic features: Nuances going beyond generalizing the meaning are only present when the context is clear. EWs do not immediately carry negative nuances, but semantic constraints may discourage the creation of EWs themselves.

3. Data collection

All data used in this paper for which sources are not indicated were collected by the authors in the following manner. All of the consultants were from northern Kyrgyzstan and spoke the dialect that is the basis of standard Kyrgyz.

(i) Interviews with language consultants

- Survey 1

Interviews conducted by the first author in Kyrgyzstan and online (February 2016 and September 2022). A questionnaire was prepared to extract vocabulary, drawing mainly from Yudaxin (1965), a Kyrgyz-Russian dictionary. The consultants were asked to create an EWs based on each word.

Approximately 100 words were included in the questionnaire: Kyrgyz nouns and other parts of speech, loan words of Russian origin, Japanese place names and so on. Of these, 40 nouns were extracted based on their initial sounds, such that words beginning with all Kyrgyz phonemes were included.

The composition of the 40 nouns is as follows: 29 Kyrgyz nouns (including some words of Arabic or Persian origin but excluding those of Russian origin); five nouns of Russian origin beginning with a phoneme that cannot stand at the beginning of a word in Kyrgyz; and six nouns of Russian origin beginning with a phoneme used only in loan words.

This survey was conducted with three native speakers (Consultants A–C), including the second author.

- Survey 2 (follow-up survey to Survey 1)

Conducted for Consultant C in Survey 1 (July 2023). For one base word, three EWs beginning with *m-*, *p-*, and *s-* were prepared by the author in advance, and the consultant was asked to choose the one he/she disapproved. This survey was conducted on all 40 nouns from Survey 1, which were extracted based on their initial sounds.

- Survey 3

Interviews conducted by the second author in Kyrgyzstan (August 2022). Consultants were asked to tell about themselves and their daily lives, using such words as *nan–**p**an* and *čay–**p**ay* (i.e., EWs, see examples (3) and (8)), where possible. A total of 38 EWs were obtained.

- Survey 4

Discussion-style interviews conducted online by both authors with five native speakers (including the second author) in January 2023. The main questions asked concerned the possibility of attaching suffixes to EWs and matters related to the semantic aspects of EWs.

(ii) Examples from naturally occurring conversations

The first author noted the examples of EWs she encountered during her stay in Kyrgyzstan (about one month per year in 2016–2018). A total of 32 EWs were obtained.

4. Discussion

In this section, the features of Kyrgyz EWs are clarified in accordance with the three issues identified in Section 2.

4.1. Phonological features

In this subsection, the phonological features of Kyrgyz EWs are presented. Large individual differences (4.1.1), and certain constraints and tendencies (4.1.2) are revealed.

4.1.1. Individual differences

The surveys conducted by this study confirm that the initial sounds for the subsequent elements are generally *m-*, *p-*, and *s-*, as found previously (see Table 1 in Section 2). In Survey 1, we found cases where all consultants selected the same sound, and cases where *m-*, *p-*, and *s-* were all possible for a single base word, as shown in the following example (4).

(4) EWs for *idiš* ‘tableware’

A: *idiš–ayak* (This example is not classified as an EW but as a generalizing PW meaning ‘every kind of tableware’ (see Section 1). The consultant did not use EWs like *idiš–**m**idiš*.)

B: *idiš–**m**idiš*

C: *idiš–**p**idiš*, *idiš–**s**idiš*

Table 2 below classifies the EWs produced by consultants A–C in Study 1 from 29 Kyrgyz nouns according to the initial sounds of the subsequent elements. The total number of EWs produced does not add up to 29, as the consultants created more than one EW per word in some cases.

Table 2 EW initial sounds based on 29 Kyrgyz nouns

	A	B	C
m-	1[4]	3	0
p-	14[5]	5	15
s-	10	17	14
EW is not possible	0	4	3
Another type of PW instead of EW provided	8	2	2

Consultant A had the most *p-* (14 cases), and B has the most *s-* (17 cases), while C had about the same number of *p-* and *s-* (15 and 14 cases, respectively), indicating that there are large individual differences. Conversely, all three share a low number of *m-* initials. Additionally, A had many examples of responses with other types of PWs (eight cases).

Table 3 below shows the results of Table 2 above, further broken down by the initial sound of the preceding element.

Table 3 EW initial sounds based on 29 Kyrgyz nouns, by initial sound of preceding element

Initial sound of the preceding element	Initial sound of the subsequent element	A	B	C
vowel (14 words)	*m-*	0	2	0
	p-	12	3	9
	s-	3	8	6
	EW is not possible	0	2	1
	Another type of PW instead of EW provided	1	0	0
consonant (15 words)	*m-*	1	1	0
	p-	2	2	6
	s-	7	9	8
	EW is not possible	0	2	2
	Another type of PW instead of EW provided	7	2	2

While Consultant A seemed to prefer a *p-* initial when the preceding element began with a vowel (12 cases), no other clear-cut tendencies were detected.

Thus, a great deal of individual variation was seen in the selection of the initial sounds for subsequent elements, and no clear-cut rule seemed to be apparent.

[4] Includes one example where EWs for the word in question usually cannot be made but the consultant dared to make an EW for the sake of the survey.
[5] Same as note 4 above.

4.1.2. Constraints and tendencies

However, the following discussion, based on results in addition to those of Survey 1, suggests certain restrictions and tendencies as presented in (i)–(vii).

(i) Complete repetition is avoided. When creating EWs for words beginning with *m-*, *p-*, or *s-*, identical sounds are avoided in the subsequent word.

(5) EW of *salat* 'salad' **salat–**s**alat*

Note that complete repetition, as in example (5), is not acceptable as an EW, but Abduvaliev (2008: 26) lists it as a type of PW, which strengthen the meaning of the word in question.

(6) a. *čoŋ–čoŋ* (emphasis by repetition of 'big')
b. *mašine–mašine* (emphasis by repetition of 'car')
(Abduvaliev 2008: 26)

(ii) The selection of certain sounds was avoided if it would result in the production of another meaning. For example, when creating an EW with *tuz* 'salt,' *s-* was avoided for the initial sound of the subsequent element, as the EW will sound the same as adding the abessive suffix *-sIz*, meaning 'without salt,' as in the following example (7).

(7) *tuz-suz*
salt-ABE
'without salt'

(iii) Lexicalized forms were preferred over other possible forms. While EWs are mainly encountered in colloquial Kyrgyz, some examples, such as *nan–**p**an* (EW for bread) in example (3a) and example (8) below, are frequently met with and are found in dictionaries, such as the orthographic dictionary Karasaev (2009).

(8) EW for *čay* 'tea' *čay–**p**ay* (Karasaev 2009)

(iv) Avoidance of *m-* (case 1). As noted in (i), complete repetition is avoided in the formation of EWs. In addition, *m-* tended to be avoided when [m] is present in the preceding element, even beyond the initial sound. The following example (9) shows cases that all consultants found unacceptable in Survey 4.

(9) a. EW of *nan* ‘bread’ **nan–**m**an*
The preceding element is pronounced [nam] due to assimilation.
b. EW of *alma* ‘apple’ **alma–**m**alma*

Note that in Karachay-Balkar, also, like Kyrgyz, part of the Northwestern (Kipchak) branch of the Turkic languages, *alma-**m**alma* is listed in Tenišhev et al. (1989: 54), a dictionary.

Thus, the succession of [m] is avoided in the formation of Kyrgyz EWs. According to one consultant in Survey 4, the most common form is *nan–**p**an*, as for example in (9a), and it is also listed in the orthographic dictionary; in addition, and *nan–**s**an* may be possible, but *nan–**m**an* is not possible. Alternatively, in the case of *čay–**p**ay* (EW of tea, see example (8)), which is also listed in the orthographic dictionary, this consultant reported that *čay–**s**ay* and *čay–**m**ay* are both possible.

(10) shows cases where the subsequent element begins with *m-*, and at least one consultant deemed it unacceptable.

(10) a. **čïmïn–**m**ïmïn* ‘fly (insect)’
b. **kiyim–**m**iyim* ‘clothing’

Note that, as in example (11), unlike the case with [m], it is possible to make the initial sound of the subsequent element *s-* when the preceding element contains [s].

(11) a. *boorsok–**s**oorsok* ‘fried bread’
b. *noski–**s**oski* ‘socks (Russian word)’
c. *piyaz–**s**iyaz* ‘onion’
The preceding element is pronounced [piyas] due to assimilation.
d. *darbïz–**s**arbïz* ‘watermelon’
The preceding element is pronounced [darbïs] due to assimilation.

As for *p-*, as shown in example (12), we found several unacceptable cases where the preceding element contained [p]. There may be restrictions on *p-* as well, though perhaps not as restrictive as that for *m-*.

(12) a. **kitep–**p**itep* ‘book’
b. **top–**p**op* ‘ball’
c. **nopitok–**p**opitok* ‘drinks (Russian word)’
d. **yubka–**p**yubka* ‘skirt (Russian word)’ [b] is pronounced [p] due to assimilation.

(v) Avoidance of *m-* (case 2). Where the constraints i) and iv) are not met, i.e., even if the preceding element does not contain [m], *m-* may not be preferred for the initial sound of the following element. As shown in Table 2, in Survey 1, the omission of *m-* was common to all consultants A–C. In Survey 2, which was conducted as a follow-up to Survey 1, Consultant C reported all EWs beginning with *m-* were unacceptable for 29 Kyrgyz words. Of these 29 words, while 8 contained [m] (including those whose final consonant become [m] through assimilation), the remaining 21 did not. In addition, in Survey 3, there were no cases out of 38 (of which the preceding element contained [m] in seven cases), where the initial sound of the subsequent element was *m-*.

Regarding EWs in other Turkic languages, the initial sound of the subsequent element may be *m-* only, in what is sometimes called m-reduplication (e.g., Armoskaite and Kutlu (2015) for Turkish). The reason that *m-* is sometimes avoided in Kyrgyz EWs needs to be clarified in future study.

(vi) Preference for *m-*. It is noteworthy that, conversely, *m-* is preferred in some other cases. As noted, in Study 2, Consultant C found *m-* to be unacceptable for all 29 Kyrgyz words. However, for other words in the questionnaire, i.e., nouns beginning with phonemes that cannot stand at the beginning of a word in Kyrgyz and nouns beginning with phonemes that are used only in loan words (11 words in total), there were three cases for which *m-* was possible. Moreover, in all three of these cases, in fact nothing other than *m-* was acceptable.

(13) a. *yaščik–**m**yaščik* ‘box’
b. *yolka–**m**yolka*[6] ‘fir tree’
c. *ščyotka–**m**yotka*[7] ‘brush’

As noted in Table 2, in a total of four cases, *m-* was selected as the initial sound for the EWs based on 29 Kyrgyz nouns in Survey 1. Specifically, these cases were the following.

(14) a. *gozo–**m**ozo*[8] ‘a type of cotton’
b. *ooz–**m**ooz* ‘mouth’
c. *idiš–**m**idiš* ‘tableware’
d. *kašïk–**m**ašïk* ‘spoon’

[6] In Survey 1, the consultant answered *yolka-**p**yolka*.
[7] In Survey 1, the consultant indicated that the creation of EW was not possible.
[8] Basically, EWs for this word are not likely to be created, as this word is not commonly used and its meaning was unknown to the consultants. However, one consultant dared to make an EW for the sake of the survey.

For other words included in the Survey 1 questionnaire, in particular, Russian loan words that begin with a phoneme that cannot stand at the beginning of a word in Kyrgyz, Russian loan words that begin with a phoneme that is used only in loan words, other Russian vocabulary, English and Japanese vocabulary with Cyrillic writing, etc., a total of 21 examples were obtained (or 31, if the cases in which more than one consultant provided the same form beginning with *m-* for a single word are counted separately). Some of these examples are shown below.

(15) a. Russian words
*ǰurnal–**m**urnal* ‘magazine’, *tsïrk–**m**ïrk* ‘circus’, *salat–**m**alat* ‘salad’,
*kul’tura–**m**ul’tura* ‘culture’[9]
b. English words
*feysbuk–**m**eysbuk* ‘Facebook’, *vatsap-**m**atsap* ‘WhatsApp’
c. Japanese words
*suši–**m**uši* ‘sushi’, *geiša–**m**eiša* ‘geisha’, *Tokio–**M**okio* ‘Tokyo’,
*Kioto–**M**ioto* ‘Kyoto’, *Osaka–**M**osaka* ‘Osaka’[10]

In the field notes of naturally occurring EWs encountered in conversation, six cases of words beginning with *m-* were found among the 32 cases, but all were foreign words (Russian words or words of English origin borrowed via Russian).

(16) a. *kolyaska–**m**olyaska* ‘stroller’ (two cases)
b. *kola–**m**ola* ‘cola’
c. *garnitur-**m**arnitur* ‘set of furniture’
d. *gostinitsa–**m**ostinitsa* ‘hotel’
e. *kontsert–**m**ontsert* ‘concert’

Thus, *m-* tends to be preferred for foreign words relative to Kyrgyz words. Note that all the above examples in (16) have *k-* and *g-* beginnings for the preceding elements. Similarly, in example (14), *m-* was possible for Kyrgyz words with initial consonants *k-* and *g-*. Further investigation is needed to determine whether this is a coincidence and whether we can assume that *m-* is more likely to be selected in the case of *k-* and *g-*.

[9] There is also the example of *kul’tur-**m**ul’tur*, with the final [a] dropped as a result of phonological modification.
[10] These examples do not mean that *m-* is obligatory. For example, there are other possible EWs for *Osaka*: *Osaka-**P**osaka* and *Osaka-**S**osaka*.

(vii) Other possible constraints. The following are unacceptable examples for 29 Kyrgyz words in Survey 2 that cannot be explained by constraints and tendencies (i)–(vi) above (except in the case where the creation of an EW was deemed unacceptable for the word in question).

(17) a. **bal–**p**al* 'honey'
b. **šakek–**s**akek* 'ring'

Further investigation is necessary to determine whether the combinations of labial *b-p* and coronal *š-s* tend to be avoided.

To summarize 4.1, despite the large individual differences, we have presented seven possible constraints and tendencies in the choice of initial sounds for subsequent elements. The most frequent constraints are for *m-* and *p-*, and the least frequent is for *s-*. This would account for the fact that *s-* was the most common initial used in Survey 1 (see Table 2) and in the examples from naturally occurring conversations (18 of 32 cases).

4.2. Features of the word formation process

In this subsection, we describe the features of the word formation process, showing how productive the process is (4.2.1) and how suffixes are attached to the components of EWs, focusing on nouns (4.2.2) and verbs (4.2.3).

4.2.1. Productivity

The results of this study indicate that the process of word formation of EWs in Kyrgyz is highly productive. As noted in previous studies, the most common part of speech in EWs is the noun (see Table 1 in Section 2). In Surveys 1 and 2, EWs were produced in almost all cases where they were based on Kyrgyz nouns. Nevertheless, in some cases, EWs could not be created. In that EWs are observed mainly in colloquial Kyrgyz, the authors selected words commonly used in daily life in the questionnaire. However, to cover words beginning with all phonemes, words with abstract meanings, words that are not commonly used, and words whose meanings were unknown to the consultants were also included. In many cases, EWs could not be created for such words (see (14a) and note 8).

As indicated in 4.1.2, EWs can be produced for nouns in foreign languages, including in Russian, which is widely used in Kyrgyz society. EWs using Russian not only yielded examples in the interviews but were also identified in the field notes of naturally occurring conversations. The following are examples beyond the initial *m-* cases shown in 4.1.2.

(18) a. *noski–**p**oski* ‘socks’
b. *pečen’e–**s**ečen’e* ‘cookie’

4.2.2. Inflection of noun EWs

It is possible to attach suffixes to EWs. As shown in the following example (19), there are both cases where suffixes are only attached to the subsequent element and those where they are attached to both elements.

(19) possessive suffixes
a. attached to the subsequent elements only
*üy–**p**üy-ü* *bar* *beken?*
House–EW-POSS.3 exist EVID.Q
‘Does he seem to have his own house or something?’

b. attached to both
*üy-ü–**p**üy-ü* *bar* *beken?*
House-POSS.3–EW-POSS.3 exist EVID.Q
‘Does he seem to have his own house or something?’

(20) case suffixes
a. genitive
*toy–**p**oy-dun* *art-ï-nda*
banquet–EW-GEN back-POSS.3-LOC
‘at the back of a banquet hall or something’

b. dative
*čay-ga–**p**ay-ga* *kara-gïla*
tea-DAT–EW-DAT look-IMP.2PL
‘Don’t hesitate to have some tea and others.’

c. plural + ablative
*ǰüzüm–**p**üzüm-dör-dön* *ǰe-y-biz*
grape–EW-PL-ABL eat-PRS-1PL
‘We eat grapes and other fruits.’

However, the consultants showed varying degrees of acceptance of a suffix to the preceding element. The most controversial examples included the plural suffixes. As in

example (21a) below, plural suffixes following the subsequent element were highly acceptable, and examples were found in naturally occurring conversations in the field notes, while those that fell after the preceding element were less acceptable.

(21) attachment of plural suffixes to the EW of *alma* 'apple'
  a. *alma–**s**alma-lar*
     apple–EW-PL
  b. **alma-lar–**s**alma-lar*
     apple-PL–EW-PL
     (According to one consultant, this may sometimes be possible in colloquial speech.)

Note that Survey 3 yielded the following example.

(22) *baldar–**s**aldar*
  children–EW
  'children etc.'

The word for 'child' is *bala*, and its plural, formed in the usual way, should be produced with the addition of the plural suffix *bala-lar*, but this is rarely heard in Kyrgyz, and the plural form of *bala* is lexicalized as *baldar*. Therefore, *baldar* can be taken as a single unit, and it is possible to make it into EW as it is.

Let us compare the way in which plural suffixes are attached to EWs with that for generalizing PWs (see Section 1). In the case of nouns of generalizing PW, suffixes are only attached to the subsequent element (example (23b–c)). However, if both elements are words that have independent meaning and can be used alone, it is possible to simply make them parallel as the plural of two nouns instead of a PW (example (23d)).

(23) a. *ata–ene* 'parents' (see example (2a))
  b. *ata–ene-ler*
     parents-PL
     'some pairs of parents'
  c. **ata-lar–ene-ler*
     father-PL–mother-PL
  d. *ata-lar*, *ene-ler*
     father-PL mother-PL
     'fathers and mothers'

For EWs, conversely, subsequent elements do not carry meaning alone. In surveys conducted by the authors where the collection method was closer to naturally occurring conversations (Surveys 3 and 4, and field notes), most of the cases only had a plural suffix attached to the subsequent element. Taking the EW as a unit, it is more natural to only attach the suffix to the second element.

4.2.3. Inflection of verb EWs

A variety of examples were identified for parts of speech other than nouns, although these varied in acceptability relative to nouns. Following nouns, verbs in converbial form were the most productive. Indeed, we even found examples of productive converbs of a type that have not been mentioned in previous studies (*-(I)p* converbial form).

(24) *örük–**s**örük-tör-dü* *ter-ip–**s**er-ip*
apricot–EW-PL-ACC gather-CVB–EW-CVB
'gathering (and doing something) apricots and other fruits'

In most cases with this *-(I)p* converbial form, *s-* is selected as the initial sound for the subsequent element. Certain examples, such as (25), are frequently used and can be found in dictionaries.

(25) *epte-p–**s**epte-p*
manage-CVB–EW-CVB
'somehow' (Yudaxin 1965; Karasaev 2009)

As for verbs that begin with *s-*, the subsequent element begins with *p-*. This is probably due to the constraint (i) (complete repetition is avoided) and (v) (avoidance of m-) presented in 4.1.2.

(26) a. *sog-up–**p**og-up*
beat-CVB–EW-CVB
'beating and doing something'
b. *sïylaš-ïp–**p**ïylaš-ïp*
respect-CVB–EW-CVB
'respecting and doing something'

Note that, the aforementioned examples (25) and (26) show that [p] can be consecutive at the boundary between the preceding and following elements, in contrast with the case of (12), where the succession of the sound was unacceptable. This may be because the suffix

attached to the preceding element in (25) and (26) ends in [p], and the original word of the EW does not contain [p].

In only one case was the initial sound of the preceding element not *s-* but that of the subsequent element was *p-*.

(27) *kač-ïp–**p**ač-ïp*
escape-CVB–EW-CVB
'escaping and doing something'

As noted in the examples above, it is most common for a verb EW to have both preceding and subsequent elements in the *-(I)p* converbial form. Although it is still possible to have the subsequent element in a different conjugated form, as in the example (28) below, the consultants consider it to be unnatural. They rather preferred another version without verb EWs, as in (29).

(28) possible but unnatural examples
a. *Örük-tör-dü* *ter-ip–**s**er-di-m.*
apricot-PL-ACC gather-CVB–EW-PST-1SG
'I gathered (and did something) apricots.'
b. *Örük-tör-dü* *ter-ip–**s**er!*
apricot-PL-ACC gather-CVB–EW
'Gather (and do something) apricots!'
c. *Örük-tör-dü* *ter-ip–**s**er-e-m.*
apricot-PL-ACC gather-CVB–EW-PRS-1SG
'I gather (and do something) apricots.'

(29) a. *Örük-tör-dü* *ter-di-m.*
apricot-PL-ACC gather-PST-1SG
'I gathered apricots.'
b. *Örük-tör-dü* *ter!*
apricot-PL-ACC gather
'Gather apricots!'
c. *Örük-tör-dü* *ter-e-m.*
apricot-PL-ACC gather-PRS-1SG
'I gather apricots.'

Although other forms apart from *-(I)p* are possible, few examples were obtained. Example (30) shows an *-A* converbial form.

(30) *Ešik-te* *birööö* *kel-e* *ǰat-ïptïr,*
outside-LOC someone come-CVB AUX-EVID.3
üstöl-dün *üst-ü-ndö-gü* *idiš-ter-di*
table-GEN top-POSS.3-LOC-NMLZ tableware-PL-ACC
*al-a–**s**al-a* *koy-du-m.*
take-CVB–EW-CVB put-PST-1SG
'I hastily cleared the dishes off the table because it looked like someone was coming outside.'

Oruzbaeva (1980: 113) provides the following examples of EWs with verbs. Neither element is in a converbial form, but it is in the present finite verb form (*-A*).

(31) a. *bar-a-m–**s**ar-a-m*
go-PRS-1SG–EW-PRS-1SG
'I go and do something'
b. *al-a-t–**s**al-a-t*
take-PRS-3–EW-PRS-3
'he takes and does something'

(Oruzbaeva 1980: 113)

However, when the authors presented example (31) to some consultants and asked them to create example sentences with these forms, all of them said they did not use these and that they seemed strange. It is not clear whether this is due to individual, dialectal, or generational differences, and this requires further investigation.

Note that, unlike the case of nouns (see (19)), the attachment of suffixes to the preceding element is obligatory. This could be due to a constraint in the way that complex verbs in general are formed in Kyrgyz, including EWs. According to Kudaybergenov (1987: 220–222), in Kyrgyz, complex verbs that are formed from two verbs are based on the combination of the preceding element in a converbial form such as *-(I)p*, *-A/y*, etc., with the subsequent element in any conjugated or unconjugated form, including lexicalized complex verbs (e.g., (32a)), cases where the subsequent element is an auxiliary verb (e.g., (32b)). Examples (32c) and (32d) show cases where both elements share the same morphological form, making a combination of repeated or semantically similar bases, which are found almost exclusively in converbial forms.

(32) a. *ište-p* *čïk*
work-CVB go out
'work out'

b. *ayt-ïp* *ǰür*
say-CVB walk
'to tell at length,' where the verb ǰür 'to walk, go' has lost its lexical meaning completely

c. *bara–bara*
go-CVB–go-CVB
'over time'

d. *kïzar-ïp–tatar-ïp*
blush-CVB–grow pale-CVB
'blushing deeply'

(Kudaybergenov 1987: 220–222)

Therefore, such verb EWs without a suffix attached to the preceding element, as shown below in (33), are deemed unacceptable.

(33) a. **örük-tör-dü* *ter–**s**er-ip*
apricot-PL-ACC gather–EW-CVB

b. **Örük-tör-dü* *ter–**s**er-di-m.*
apricot-PL-ACC gather–EW-PST-1SG

To summarize 4.2, we have shown that the word formation process of Kyrgyz EWs is highly productive. The most productive are EWs from nouns, followed by verb-based *-(I)p* converbial forms. EWs can be inflected; however, the degree of acceptance of a suffix to the preceding element of noun EWs varies among individuals, while it is obligatory for verb EWs.

4.3. Semantic Features

In this subsection, the semantic features of Kyrgyz EWs are described. Examples of EWs without (4.3.1) and with negative nuances (4.3.2) are examined.

4.3.1. Examples of EWs without negative nuances

Previous studies have indicated that, while EWs usually carry generalizing meanings, they can sometimes contain pejorative, depreciative, ironic, or diminutive nuances (see Table 1 in Section 2). Where can these nuances be encountered, and can EW alone contain these nuances? For example, Yudaxin (1965), a Kyrgyz-Russian dictionary, lists an EW *ïr-**m**ïr* as an example of the headword *ïr* 'song, poem.' The Russian translation given in the dictionary shows the diminutive form for 'poem (*stiški*),' with the note "pejorative." Kamei et al. (1996: 1084–5) note that the semantic functions of EW,

regardless of language, although the examples given are mainly from Indian languages, particularly from southern Dravidian languages, are as follows: 1) to indicate a generalizing meaning, 2) to indicate another hypernym, 3) to indicate uncertainty, 4) to carry a disparaging nuance, and 5) to indicate semantic depravity. Ebata (2002) points out that EWs in Sakha, another Turkic language, also have these characteristics.

However, examples such as (34) and (35) below and when EWs are shown alone, are used only in a generalizing sense.

(34) *Nami–**S**ami-ler* *kel-iptir.*
PSN–EW-PL come-EVID.3
'It looks like Nami and others have come.'

(35) *Altïn–**p**altïn* *bar* *beken?*
Gold–EW exist EVID.Q
'Is there seems to be gold or something?'

In example (35), according to several consultants, the EW of gold by itself does not present the impression of particularly poor quality but rather contains a nuance of 'expensive things, including silver as well as gold.'

Note the difference in meaning between the case where the plural suffix *-lAr* is attached and the case where EW are used, as follows.

(36) a. *nan-dar*: mainly used when there is more than one loaf of bread
bread-PL
b. *nan–**p**an*: used when there are various types of bread (including fried bread etc.)
bread–EW
c. *nan–**p**an-dar*: used when there is a lot of bread of all kinds
bread–EW-PL

4.3.2. Examples of EWs with negative nuances

The negative nuances, such as those seen in the English expressions "what's-his/her-name" or "thingy" appear only when the context is clear, as shown in examples below. The context for example (37) is that the person was disgusted, and in (38), the person considered that gold was not necessary for him/her, even though others may consider it valuable. This expressive function of EWs is especially common when referring to things or people that are usually considered valuable or authoritative.

(37) *Iy, J̌akšïlïk–**S**akšïlïk-tar taǰat-tï.*
Gee, PSN–EW-PL disgust-PST.3
'Gee, J̌akšïlïk and those damned people disgusted me.'

(38) *Altïn–**p**altïn maga kereg-i ǰok.*
gold–EW I. DAT necessity-POSS.3 no
'I don't need gold or any of that stuff.'

Thus, EWs may not immediately contain a negative nuance by themselves. However, even when no phonological constraints, as presented in 4.1.1, are met, there are cases where the creation of an EW itself may be avoided for semantic reasons. For example, one consultant was reluctant to create an EW for *ata* 'father,' to avoid the appearance of disrespect, while it was possible to do so for *kïz* 'daughter.' In addition, this consultant made no EW for *Manas*, the hero of a traditional epic poem and a symbol of Kyrgyzstan, because this figure is too important for the Kyrgyz people.

In Survey 1, Consultant A tended to try to make EWs for words even when they are not actually used in daily life (see Table 2—there the consultant was able to make an EW in all cases). In addition, Consultant A provided many examples of responses for another type of PW (see Table 2—eight examples of other types of PWs were given). Thus, as indicated in example (4), if an EW and a generalizing PW (*idiš–ayak*, 'tableware') shared the same preceding element (*idiš*), the generalizing PW may be preferred over the EW. This could be related not to phonological constraints but to semantic aspects, i.e., that EWs can carry negative nuances, depending on the context.

Furthermore, as noted in 4.2.1, it was often impossible to create EWs for words with abstract meanings, those that were not in common usage, or for which the consultant did not know the meaning. In other words, in the formation of EWs, it is in some cases important for the speaker to understand the meaning of the original word and to be able to visualize it concretely.

To summarize 4.3, we have shown how Kyrgyz EWs can contain negative nuances going beyond generalizing meanings depending on contexts. While an EW alone does not necessarily carry a negative nuance, certain semantic constraints may discourage the creation of EWs itself to avoid the appearance of disrespect, or encourage the usage of another type of PW instead of an EW.

5. Concluding remarks

EWs are found mainly in colloquial Kyrgyz and have not received sufficient attention in Kyrgyz grammar. Their (i) phonological, (ii) word-formation, and (iii) semantic features were identified. As noted in the previous sections, the choice to make or not to make an EW, and which initial sound to select for the subsequent element involves various aspects, including both phonological and semantic considerations.

Issues for further study identified in this paper are summarized as follows.

First, some phonological constraints (avoidance of *m-* and combinations of labial *b-p* and coronal *š-s*) were not fully explained. To identify phonological rules for EWs more rigorously, it might be necessary to conduct a survey using non-words (see Köylü (2020), a study of emphatic reduplication in Turkish) to eliminate cases where EWs cannot be created, due to semantic constraints.

Second, in some cases, examples from previous studies were deemed unnatural by the language consultants. Individual, dialectal, or generational differences require further consideration. Comparisons with other Turkic languages would also be relevant in this regard.

Abbreviations

ABE	abessive
ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
AUX	auxiliary
CVB	converb
DAT	dative
EVID	evidential
EW	echo word
GEN	genitive
IMP	imperative
ITER	iterative suffix
LOC	locative
NMLZ	nominalizer
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PRS	present
PSN	personal name
PST	past
PW	paired word
Q	question
SG	singular

References

Abduvaliev, I.. 2008. *Kïrgïz tilinin morfologiyasï*. Biškek.

Armoskaite, Solveiga and Ethan Kutlu. 2015. “Turkish m-reduplication: A case of similative number”. *Turkic Languages* 18. pp.271–288.

Biyaliev, K. A.. 2003. *Kïrgïzskiy yazïk*. Biškek: Raritet Info.

Ebata, Fuyuki. 2002. “Paired words in Sakha (Yakut)”. In *Proceedings of the 124th meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan*. pp.208–213. [in Japanese].

Ebata, Fuyuki and Jakshylyk Akmatalieva. 2022. *A contrastive approach to Turkic languages: Sakha, Tyvan, and Kyrgyz*. Niigata University, Faculty of Humanities, Asian Link Research Center. [in Japanese].

Iinuma, Eizo. 1995. *An introduction to the Kyrgyz language*. Tokyo: Besuto-sha. [in Japanese].

Johanson, Lars. 1998. “The structure of Turkic”. In Lars Johanson and Éva Á. Csató (eds.). *The Turkic languages*. London: Routledge. pp.30–66.

———. 2002. *Structural factors in Turkic language contacts*. London: Routledge.

Kamei, Takashi, et al. (eds.). 1996. “Echo words”. *The Sanseido encyclopedia of linguistics 6*. Tokyo: Sanseido. pp.1084–1085. [in Japanese].

Karasaev, X. K.. 2009. *Kïrgïz tilinin orfografiyalïk sözdügü*. Biškek: Mamlekettik til ǰana entsiklopediya borboru.

Köylü, Yılmaz. 2020. “Abstract knowledge of emphatic reduplication in Turkish”. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Turkic and Languages in Contact with Turkic*. Linguistic Society of America. pp.86–96. DOI: 10.3765/ptu.v5i1.4780.

Kubo, Tomoyuki. 1997. “Reduplication Meduplication in Khalkha Mongolian”. *GENGO KENKYU* 112. pp.66–97.

Kudaybergenov, S.. 1987. “Slovoobrazovanie glagola”. In O. V. Zaxarova, et al. (eds.). *Grammatika kirgizskogo literaturnogo yazïka 1: Fonetika i morfologiya*. Frunze: Ilim. pp.209–231.

Oruzbaeva, B. O.. 1980. “Tataal sözdör”. In S. Kudaybergenov (ed.). *Kïrgïz adabiy tilinin grammatikasï*. Frunze: Ilim. pp.100–116.

———. 1987. “Slovoobrazovanie”. In O. V. Zaxarova, et al. (eds.). *Grammatika kirgizskogo literaturnogo yazïka 1: Fonetika i morfologiya*. Frunze: Ilim. pp. 95–105.

———. 1997. “Kirgizskiy yazïk”. In E. R. Tenišev, et al. (eds.). *Yazïki mira: tyurkskie yazïki*. Biškek: Izdatel’skiy dom Kïrgïzstan. pp.286–298.

Shōgaito, Masahiro. 1988. “Kyrgyz language”. In Takashi Kamei, et al. (eds.). *The Sanseido encyclopedia of linguistics 1*. Tokyo: Sanseido. pp.1416–1422. [in Japanese].

Tenišhev, E. R., et al.. 1989. *Karačaevo-balkarsko-russkiy slovar’. Moskva: Russkiy yazïk*.

Yudaxin, Konstantin K.. 1965. *Kirgizsko-russkiy slovar’*. Moskva: Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya.

Zaxarova, O. V.. 1987. “Morfemika”. In O. V. Zaxarova, et al. (eds.). *Grammatika kirgizskogo literaturnogo yazïka 1: Fonetika i morfologiya*. Frunze: Ilim. pp.87–95.