

Reduplication in Palauan

Urbanczyk (1999) argues that root/stem faithfulness constraints account for the realization of more than one reduplicative shape in a single language and root reduplicants allows more marked and faithful structures than affix reduplicants. Palauan reduplication shows some phenomena which look like problems for this claim.

Palauan has two types of reduplication: CVCV reduplication (1) and Cə reduplication (2).

(1) CVCV reduplication

{	mərɛ́bək	"grope at"	{	məsúʔəd	"talk harshly"
{	mə <u>r</u> ə <u>b</u> ərɛ́bək	"grope around for in the dark"	{	mə <u>s</u> ə <u>ʔ</u> əsúʔəd	"always talk harshly"

(2) Cə reduplication

{	mətəgói	"be talked to"	{	məʔúu	"shady"
{	mə <u>t</u> ə <u>g</u> ói	"easy to talk to"	{	mə <u>ʔ</u> ə <u>u</u>	"fairy shady" (Josephs 1990)

Based on Finer's (1986) observation that CVCV reduplication and Cə reduplication show different morphological patterns, I propose that CVCV reduplicants are stems and Cə reduplicants are affixes. Urbanczyk (1999) argues that root/stem reduplicants must be larger than affix reduplicants, because of the root/stem faithfulness constraints. Since Cə reduplicants allow only one mora, but CVCV reduplicants allows more, the argument that CVCV reduplicants are stems and Cə reduplicants are affix is compatible with Urbanczyk's analysis.

Interestingly however, when we examine the shape of the reduplicants, we find that the default vowel [ə] appears in the CVCV stem reduplicants, but it never appears in the Cə affix reduplicants. Since the default vowel [ə] is less marked in Palauan than other full vowels, it looks that the affix reduplicant allows more marked structure than the stem reduplicant, which contradicts with Urbanczyk's analysis.

Another problematic case is found in the reduplicated imperfective forms. The imperfective marker is a [+son] feature, and it coalesces with the first consonant of the stem in the unreduplicated form (3). When it appears in the reduplicated form, the first consonant of the CVCV reduplicant is coalesced (4), but the first consonant of the Cə reduplicant is not (5).

(3) Imperfective Unreduplicated form

{	déɛl	"nail (N)"	{	bóɛs	"gun"
{	məlɛ́ɛl	"nail (V)"	{	omóɛs	"shoot"

(4) Imperfective CVCV stem reduplicative form

{	túb	"spit(N)"	{	bále	"slingshot"
{	mə <u>l</u> ə <u>b</u> túb	"keep spitting"	{	om <u>ə</u> l <u>ə</u> báleʔ	"play around with a sling shot"

(5) Imperfective Cə affix reduplicative form

{	bəkál:	"sailing(N)"	{	ʔələ́bəd	"anything to
{	om <u>b</u> ə <u>k</u> ál:	"sail around"	{	mə <u>ʔ</u> ə <u>l</u> ə <u>b</u> əd	"keep hitting" (Josephs 1975)

The faithfulness constraint (Uniformity BR) is violated in the CVCV stem reduplicative forms but not in the Cə affix reduplicative forms. So, the stem reduplicants are less faithful than the affix reduplicants, and this phenomenon looks showing a contradiction with Urbanczyk's analysis.

I argue that these apparent problematic cases are accounted for by the interactions of the constraints and I show not only that it actually follows Urbanczyk's analysis, but also that the root/stem constraints are crucial to explain the Palauan reduplication phenomena.