


## Nonlocal Reduplication

Marantz (1982) observed that reduplicative affixes generally copy the string of segments beginning with the edge to which the affix is attached and proceeding into the word. He called this edge-in association.

- (1) **bad**.ba.du.pi - *edge-in association*  


Though Marantz described edge-in association as a tendency, many subsequent researchers have (tacitly or explicitly) assumed that edge-in association is an inviolable principle in reduplication (e.g. McCarthy

and Prince 1996, Kager 1999, Nelson 2003 and many others). This assumption is incompatible with the existence of nonlocal patterns of reduplication where the copied strings are not surface-adjacent. Thus, in order to maintain the assumption, the apparent cases of nonlocal reduplication must be explained away. For example, McCarthy and Prince (1996) claim that absolutive reduplication in Chukchee (e.g. *nute* → *nutenut* ‘land’) is only apparently nonlocal, because the final vowel is deleted by an independent process.

This strategy will not extend to Chukchee’s sister-language Koryak, in which the amount of material that intervenes between the two surface copies may be greater than a single vowel. Consider, at the right, data from Bogoras (1969). There are no independent phonological processes in Koryak that would necessitate the deletion of the entire final syllable in reduplicated forms (e.g. *kilka***kilka** → \**kilkakil*).

<b>gloss</b>	<b>stem</b>	<b>absolute</b>
‘oil’	mítqa	mítqam <b>it</b>
‘fire’	qanga	qángaq <b>an</b>
‘shell-fish’	kílka	kílka <b>kil</b>

intervenues between the two surface copies may be greater than a single vowel. Consider, at the right, data from Bogoras (1969). There are no independent phonological processes in Koryak that would necessitate the deletion of the entire final syllable in reduplicated forms (e.g. *kilka***kilka** → \**kilkakil*).

Even greater spans of unreduplicated material may

<b>gloss</b>	<b>singular</b>	<b>plural</b>
‘crooked’	fayátk-i:	fayat <b>fak</b> -í:
‘sweet’	cámp-i:	cam <b>cap</b> -í:
‘soft’	lowáck-i:	lowác <b>lok</b> -i:
‘dirty’	a-holwak-í:	a-holwa: <b>hok</b> -í:

intervene between the copied surface strings in plural reduplication of adjectives in Creek. Consider, at the right, data from Martin and Mauldin (2000). In these cases the reduplicant occurs as an infix at the right edge of the word but copies the initial CV sequence of the stem. As with Chukchee, there is no obvious way to explain away this apparent exception to edge-in association.

With some degree of ingenuity it might well be possible to analyze these reduplicative patterns as local at some level of analysis. But as the number of ‘apparent’ counterexamples to the principle of edge-in association mounts, so does the burden of explaining them all away. We can achieve a simpler theory of reduplication by abandoning the hypothesis that edge-in association is a universally inviolable principle.

In Correspondence Theory (McCarthy and Prince 1995), edge-in association is often assumed to delineate the ‘base’ -the portion of the output that the reduplicant is obliged to copy. Nonlocal patterns of reduplication can be given a more straightforward analysis if we relax the definition of basehood as in (2).

- (2) The base generalized: Everything in the output that isn’t the reduplicant is the base.

With this notion of the base, the placement of the reduplicant can be generated using whatever constraints determine affix placement in general (e.g. ALIGNMENT). The tendency for reduplicants to copy adjacent material can then be attributed to a locality constraint demanding that only segments that are themselves in B/R-correspondence may come between pairs of corresponding segments in the base and reduplicant.

- (3) **LOCALITY:** For  $x$  and  $x' \in S_1$  such that  $x \mathcal{R}x'$ , if  $y$  intervenes between  $x$  and  $x'$  then  $\exists y' \in S_1$  and  $y \mathcal{R}y'$ .

To complete the analysis, the content of the reduplicant can be selected by B/R-MAX constraints that are indexed to salient elements like stems, edges, and stressed syllables. This paper gives an account of how positional (cf. Beckman 1998) B/R-MAX constraints can interact with ALIGNMENT and LOCALITY to generate nonlocal reduplication in Koryak and Creek. Furthermore I present a brief typology of these constraints under the generalized definition of basehood and show that Marantz’s generalization holds of several rankings. Finally, I suggest that the unattested predictions of this typology (e.g. nonlocal copy of the syllable bearing main stress) are merely accidental gaps resulting from the confluence of the rarity of nonlocal reduplication and reduplication of non-stem-initial material.

## Nonlocal Reduplication

### References

- Beckman, Jill. 1998. *Positional Faithfulness*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Bogoras, Waldemar. 1969. "Chukchee" In: Handbook of American Indian Languages. F. Boas, ed. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40, Part 2. Washington: GPO. pp 631-903.
- Kager, René. 1999. *Optimality Theory*. Cambridge.
- Marantz, Alec. 1982. Re Reduplication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:3, 435-482.
- Martin, Jack B., and Margaret McKane Mauldin. 2000. *A Dictionary of Creek / Muskogee, with notes on the Florida and Oklahoma Seminole dialects of Creek*. Lincoln / London: University of Nebraska Press.
- McCarthy, John. & Alan Prince. 1995. 'Faithfulness and Reduplicative Identity.' In *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics [UMOP] 18: Papers in Optimality Theory*, J. Beckman, L. Walsh Dickey & S. Urbanczyk, eds. GLSA UMass, Amherst. 249-384.
- McCarthy, John & Alan Prince. 1996. *Prosodic Morphology 1986*. Technical Report 32, Rutgers University Center for Cognitive Science.
- Nelson, Nicole. 2003. "Wrong side reduplication is epiphenomenal: evidence from Yoruba" To appear in: *Studies in Reduplication* [tentative title], ed. Bernhard Hurch. Mouton de Gruyter.