

## Non-morphological reduplication in Torau

This paper presents data demonstrating that the reduplicant in Torau (Oceanic) is not a prefix but a proclitic, casting into question assumptions that reduplication involves morphological affixation, and that the resulting string of reduplicant + base forms a morphological word.

Inflectional reduplication in Torau is entirely regular phonologically and functionally. The reduplicant has the form of a minimal prosodic word (MinWd) in the language (comprising a bimoraic monosyllabic foot, as in Ilokano (McCarthy & Prince 1995:333-334)). However, in Torau reduplication targets the initial CV of the base, with the V lengthening to satisfy the requirement for bimoraicity, as in (1). The initial syllable of the base cannot be regarded as the target, since when the base has a heavy initial syllable (potentially satisfying MinWd), only the first V is copied, then lengthened, as in (2). (Palmer 2007) This means that there is a mismatch between the template of the reduplicant (MinWd) and the targeted template of the base (a CV sequence not forming any prosodic unit).

- (1) *ka.de.ki* ‘tell stories’ → *kaa≈ka.de.ki* ‘telling stories’  
(2) *kai.si* ‘carry’ → *kaa≈kai.si* ‘carrying’

McCarthy & Prince (1995:335) treat MinWd reduplicants on a base that is itself a prosodic word as “external morphology”: an affix that is applied outside the prosodic word, resulting in a PrWd+PrWd compound in which the first PrWd takes its formal content from the other. In this view the reduplicant is a “free-standing prosodic word” (McCarthy & Prince 1998:287). Torau does not conform to this generalisation. Although the reduplicant satisfies MinWd through lengthening in (1) and (2), no lengthening occurs when the base is vowel-initial, as in (3). Lengthening is blocked by the presence of a following V, revealing that the reduplicant and base form a single prosodic word.

- (3) *ose* ‘paddle’ → *o≈ose* ‘paddling’

However, the Torau verb complex contains a single immediate preverbal adverb position that may be filled by one of a closed set of adverbial forms. When this position is filled, it is the adverb that is the base and host of reduplication, not the verb, as in (4). Nonetheless, the reduplicant’s functional scope remains over the V modified by ADV, not over ADV.

- (4) a. *mala kaisi* ‘somewhat carry’ → *maa≈mala kaisi* ‘somewhat carrying’ (\**mala kaa≈kaisi*)  
b. *boo kaisi* ‘previously carry’ → *boo≈boo kaisi* ‘previously carrying’ (\**boo kaa≈kaisi*)  
c. *aru kaisi* ‘always carry’ → *a≈aru kaisi* ‘always carrying’ (\**aru kaa≈kaisi*)

The data in (4) show that the reduplicant in Torau does not attach morphologically to a V, but to a larger constituent, a V’, and is therefore a clitic. The Torau reduplicant further satisfies 5 of Zwicky and Pullum’s (1983) criteria from clitic hood (the sixth, Critereon 6, does not apply). Morphological theory assumes that a reduplicant is affixed to its base (McCarthy & Prince 1998:285-286), and that the reduplicant may not be separated from the base by another morpheme. In other words, that the reduplicant + base form a single morphological word. In Torau, reduplicant + base form a single phonological word, but are not treated by the syntax as a single word. They could be argued to form a single morphological word in the sense that the reduplicant cannot be separated from its phonological base, even if that is ADV. However, for data like (4), the reduplicant is separated from the head of its host, and from the form over which it has functional scope. Torau reduplication therefore poses problems for the notion of morphological word.