

Reduplication of Affixes

Competing theories of reduplication make different predictions about whether or not affixes are amongst the constituents that can serve as reduplicative targets or bases, but unambiguous cases of affix-targeting reduplication seem to be rare (if attested at all). Inkelas & Zoll (2005) explicitly include *affix* as a potential reduplicative target in Morphological Doubling Theory (1), while Shaw (2005), working within Base-Reduplicant Correspondence Theory, does not include *affix* amongst her potential morphological bases (i.e., word, stem, or root). However, adding *affix* to Shaw's list of morphological categories (MCats) would be consistent with the spirit of her Constituent Base Hypothesis (2).

We seek to clarify the question of affixes serving as targets for reduplication by proposing an explicit definition of *affix reduplication*:

Affix reduplication: when an unambiguous affix is targeted for full or partial reduplication (i.e., semantically-motivated phonological copying), with the key criterion for identification being that the semantic contribution of the reduplicative copying (multiplicity, pluractionality, etc.) applies to, qualifies, or enhances *the meaning of the affix*.

This definition differentiates true affix *reduplication* from a variety of other kinds of affix *repetition*, including: semantically unmotivated *doubling* (Ryan & Schuh 2010); semantically unmotivated (whole or partial) *copying* (Zimmermann 2012); *multiple exponence* (Caballero & Harris 2012); *inflectional hypercharacterization* (“a repetition of the (original) meaning of a more central affix by a more peripheral affix”, e.g., Breton pluralized diminutives (Dressler et al. 2014)); and affixal *recursion* (Lander & Letuchiy 2010).

Most previously identified cases of potential affix reduplication do not actually involve the targeting of affixes, but, rather, affixes reduplicating due to their position at a stem edge. For example, Mayo (Uto-Aztecan) has a derivational prefix, *hi-*, denoting unspecified objects, which can be added to transitive verbs to detransitivize them (3a-b). Prefixal habitual reduplication can apply to such intransitivized verbs by copying the prefix, but the semantic contribution of the reduplication applies to the entire verb as a stem or word (3c), rather than indicating “multiple objects”, etc., as might be expected if reduplication specifically targeted the *hi-* prefix (3d).

Cases of real, unambiguous affix reduplication are apparently difficult to find. However, we present two cases from unrelated Indigenous languages of North America: Hiaki (Yaqui; Uto-Aztecan) and Nuxalk (Bella Coola; Salishan). In Hiaki, as also for verb roots/stems, a number of affixes may be reduplicated to indicate habituality of the specific meaning denoted by the affix (Escalante 1990) (4). Nuxalk has a progressive prefix, *ʔaɕ-*, that can be targeted by multiple reduplication patterns, including a CVC- pattern (‘iterative’) to indicate what Davis & Saunders (1972) call the *continuative* (5a), and a CV pattern with a fixed-segment coda *n* (CVn-, ‘potential’) they call the *potential continuative* (5b).

We thus suggest that affix reduplication, even if rare, seems to be possible, as predicted by MDT, and as is accommodatable in Shaw's theory by including *affix* as a potential MCat base. We conclude by calling for more typological studies into affix reduplication by using our proposed definition and criteria in order to identify more unambiguous cases.

Reduplication of Affixes

Examples

(1) **Thesis of Morphological Targets** (Inkelas & Zoll 2005: 25)

A reduplication construction calls for morphological constituents (**affix**, root, stem, or word), not phonological constituents (mora, syllable, or foot). [emphasis added]

(2) **Constituent Base Hypothesis** (Shaw 2005: 167)

The Base in a Reduplicant-Base correspondence relation is a constituent, i.e.:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| a. Morphological Category (MCat): | Word, Stem, Root |
| b. Prosodic Category (PCat): | Prosodic Word, Foot, Syllable, Nucleus, Mora |
| c. Prosodic Head (PHead): | HeadFoot, σ' = FootHead, Nuc = σ Head, Head μ |
| d. Canonical Category: | Canonical Root = [CVC], Canonical Stem = [CVCV] |

(3) **Mayo reduplication: Coincidental copying of prefix as part of verb stem** (Hagberg 1993: 234)

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| a. <i>chúp.na.ke</i> | 'will harvest (trans.)' |
| b. <i>hí.chup.na.ke</i> | 'will harvest (intrans.)' |
| c. <i>hí.hi.chup.na.ke</i> | 'will always harvest' |
| d. * <i>hí.hi.chup.na.ke</i> | *'will harvest many (unspecified) things' |

(4) **Suffix reduplication for habitual action in Hiaki (Yaqui)** (Escalante 1990: 78-9)

- a. **Reduplication of suffix: -sae 'directive'**
inepo *a=nok-sas-sae*
1.SG.NOM 3.SG.ACC=speak-**RED**-directive
'I [always] tell him to speak up'
- b. **Reduplication of suffix: -'ii'aa 'desiderative'**
inepo *a=nok-'ii-'ii'aa*
1.SG.NOM 3.SG.ACC=speak-**RED**-desiderative
'I would like him to talk (more).'
- c. **Reduplication of suffix: -taite 'inceptive'**
inepo *a=nok-ta-taite*
1.SG.NOM 3.SG.ACC=speak-**RED**-Inceptive
'He starts to talk (hesitates).'
- d. **Reduplication of suffix: -vae 'prospective'**
inepo *a=nok-vav-vae*
1.SG.NOM 3.SG.ACC=speak-**RED**-prospective
'From time to time he wants to talk; he gets the urge to talk.'

(5) **Reduplication of the progressive prefix in Nuxalk** (Saunders & Davis 1972: 1-2)

- | | |
|---|------------------------|
| a. ?aɕ-?aɕ-lis-ic | Continuative |
| RED-PROG-push-SUFFIX | |
| 'I am pushing it without stopping' | |
| b. ?an-?aɕ-lis-ic | Potential continuative |
| RED-PROG-push-SUFFIX | |
| 'I am pushing it without stopping, but not now' | |

Selected References

- Escalante, Fernando. 1990. Voice and Argument Structure in Yaqui. PhD dissertation, University of Arizona.
- Hagberg, Lawrence R. 1993. An Autosegmental Theory of Stress. PhD dissertation, University of Arizona.
- Haugen, Jason D. 2009. What is the base for reduplication? *Linguistic Inquiry* 40.3: 505-514.
- Inkelas, Sharon and Cheryl Zoll. 2005. *Reduplication: Doubling in Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- Shaw, Patricia A. 2005. Non-adjacency in reduplication. In Bernhard Hurch (ed.), *Studies on Reduplication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 161-210.