

**Poster Presented at Phonology 2013, UMass Amherst, November 10, 2013**

**Notes:**

1. Progressive Reduplication in Saisiyat was first documented in Zeitoun and Wu (forthcoming). My own fieldwork has mostly agreed with their findings, with one exception: when phonotactic constraints prevent order-disrupting reduplication, the result is CV- reduplication in Zeitoun and Wu and suppletion with the portmanteau morpheme [ka] ‘AF+Prog’ in my fieldwork. Progressive Reduplication always occurs with the Agent Focus (AF) infix [-om-].

CV- Reduplication	/ʃβət,om,RED/ ‘hit-AF-Prog’	[ʃo] <sub>R</sub> .[ʃ-om-.βət] <sub>B</sub>
Suppletion	/ʃβət,om,RED/ ‘hit-AF-Prog’	[ka-ʃ.βət]

2. In addition to O-Contiguity, SYLL-PROX-BR must dominate BR-MAX and BR-MAX<sub>ROOT</sub> to account for the minimality of the copy: if more than a single consonant is copied, not all the Base and Reduplicant correspondents can be tautosyllabic. Ranking BR-MAX<sub>ROOT</sub> over O-CONTIGUITY prevents the infix consonant from being copied instead of the root consonant.

Input	Winner	Losers	SYLL- PROX-BR	BR- MAX <sub>ROOT</sub>	BR-MAX	O-CONTIG
/RED.om,kaat/	[k] <sub>R</sub> [o-k-m-a.at] <sub>B</sub>	[k] <sub>R</sub> [om-.ka.at] <sub>B</sub>	W			L
		[ko] <sub>R</sub> [k-o.m-a.at] <sub>B</sub>	W		L	L
		[ka] <sub>R</sub> [k-o.m-a.at] <sub>B</sub>	W	L	L	L
		[m] <sub>R</sub> [om-.ka.at] <sub>B</sub>		W		L

3. Similar patterns of order-disrupting reduplication have been described in Pima (Uto-Aztecan: Arizona) by Riggle (2006), and Lushootseed (Salish: Washington) by Urbanczyk (1996) and Struijke (2000).

**Selected References**

- Gouskova, M. 2003. Deriving economy: Syncope in optimality theory. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. ROA-610.
- Kennedy, Robert. 2005. A formal replacement for reduplicative anchoring. Unpublished Ms., [http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/faculty/rkennedy/papers/kennedy\\_proximity.pdf](http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/faculty/rkennedy/papers/kennedy_proximity.pdf).
- Lunden, S.L. Anya. 2004. Reduplicant Placement, Anchoring and Locality. Unpublished Ms., University of California, Santa Cruz.
- McCarthy, John. 2003. OT constraints are categorical. *Phonology* 20: 75-138.
- Nelson, Nicole. 2003. Asymmetric anchoring. Ph.D. Dissertation, Rutgers University
- Riggle, Jason. 2006. Infixing Reduplication in Pima and its Theoretical Consequences. *NLLT* 24/3, 857-891.
- Spaelti, Philip. 1997. Dimensions of variation in multi-pattern reduplication. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Steriade, Donca. 1995. Underspecification and markedness. In J. Goldsmith (ed.), *The handbook of phonological theory*: 114–174. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Struijke, Caro. 2000. Existential faithfulness: A study of reduplicative TETU, feature movement, and dissimilation. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Urbanczyk, Suzanne. 1996. Patterns of reduplication in Lushootseed. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth and Chen-huei Wu. 2005. Saisiyat reduplication revisited. *Concentric* 31.2:31-56.
- Zoll, Cheryl. 1994. Subsegmental parsing: Floating features in Chaha and Yawelmani. In J. Merchant, J. Padgett & R. Walker (eds.), *Phonology at Santa Cruz* 3: 47–56.