

Title of presentation: Reduplication in Kimaragang  
Topic: Phonology  
Name of authors: Jim and Nelleke Johansson  
Affiliation: SIL international  
Email address: nelleke\_johansson@sil (contact person) or jim\_johansson@sil.org (Jim is the first author but will not be presenting).

Kimaragang is spoken by approximately 20,000 people in Sabah, Borneo, Malaysia. See also Kroeger (2005)'s general description. This presentation discusses a few aspects of reduplication in Kimaragang, and is based on extensive fieldwork conducted by the first author.

Reduplication in Kimaragang has two suppletive templates with identical semantics: Root Reduplication and CV Reduplication. The choice between Root Reduplication and CV Reduplication is largely phonologically based. Root Reduplication can only occur if the base is a **disyllabic onsetless foot**:

(1) *piondomondom* (pi- RED- ondom) 'keep remembering'.

The reduplicant is inserted before the root. Elsewhere CV Reduplication occurs: inserted before the root if the root is C-initial (2), and infixes into the root if the root is V-initial and trisyllabic or longer (3):

(2) *koboboros* (ko- RED- boros) 'reason for speaking'

(3) *kopiuririmos* (ko- pi- RED- urimos) 'continually feel pain'

We will argue that, since a disyllabic onsetless foot is a marked prosodic unit, this suppletive allomorphy pattern is not 'optimal'. Data from related languages suggest it is the result of historical developments. The synchronic data can be better explained if it is assumed that each template is subcategorized for a base with certain phonological and morphological characteristics rather than in an output-oriented approach.

The **infixing reduplication**, as in (3) above, also occurs in related languages and has often been cited in the theoretical literature, but in Kimaragang it is complicated by the suppletive allomorphic templates. Rather than presenting an alternative prosodic analysis, this presentation seeks to put this phenomenon in perspective of the morphology of the language as a whole.

The examples in (4) illustrate a phenomenon that also exists in Tagalog and other related languages, and has been classified as '**overcopying**' or '**overapplication**' by McCarthy & Prince (2005). They suggest that the root adapts to the reduplicant in order to make base and reduplicant identical in shape. Booij & Lieber (1993), Cole (1994), Downing (1998) and Inkelas & Zoll (2005) all suggest a similar, prosodic analysis, in which the base of reduplication for vowel-initial roots includes the prefix-final consonant in order to provide it with an onset.

(4) *mongingirak* (-um- pong- RED- irak) 'laugh at'  
*pananagos* (pong- RED- tagos) 'clear throat'

We will adopt ideas from the prosodic analysis but show that it works only partly for Kimaragang and that the answer for Kimaragang must be sought in the morphophonemics of the prefix *pong-*.

## Selected references

- Booij, Geert & Lieber, Rochelle. 1993. On the simultaneity of morphological and prosodic structure. In Sharon Hargus & Ellen Kaise (eds.), *Phonetics and phonology 4: studies in lexical phonology*. San Diego: Academic Press. 23–44.
- Cole, Jennifer. 1994. A prosodic theory of reduplication. PhD thesis, Stanford University.
- Downing, Laura. 1998. Prosodic misalignment and reduplication. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1997*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 83–120.
- Inkelas, Sharon & Zoll, Cheryl. 2005. *Reduplication: doubling in morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kroeger, Paul. 2005. Kimaragang. In Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelman (eds.), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London and New York: Routledge. 397–428.
- McCarthy, John & Prince, Alan. 1995. Faithfulness & reduplicative identity. In Jill Beckman, Suzanne Urbanczyk & Laura Walsh Dickey (eds.) *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18: Papers in Optimality Theory*. 249–384. [ROA-60, <http://ruccs.rutgers.edu/roa.html>]