

Word-Formation and Reduplication in Standard Arabic: A New Distributed Morphology Approach

Abstract

The current paper aims to capture the properties of reduplication within the distributed morphology model (Halle and Marantz, 1993, 1994; Embick and Noyer, 2007; Siddiqi, 2009; Embick, 2010). Taking Standard Arabic (SA) as a representative, the article shows that SA, like many other languages, has both full and partial reduplication. Full reduplication repeats entire stems while partial reduplication doubles part of it. Rather than the available two analyses, i.e. the readjustment approach (Raimy, 2000; Frampton, 2009) and the affixation approach (Haugen, 2008, 2010, 2011; Haugen and Harley, 2010), the current paper provides a novel approach to the phenomenon of reduplication in the world languages. It argues that root consonants and vowels should be decomposed into non-phonetic distinctive features that undergo late insertion at PF. These non-phonetic distinctive features are supplied with sound items at PF in the same fashion that the terminal nodes with morphosyntactic features are fed with vocabulary items. This approach serves three purposes. It accounts for speech errors, captures the non-concatenative morphology in Semitic languages, and allows the reduplicant form to copy all the distinctive features of the roots, yielding instances of full reduplication. Instances of partial reduplication can be generated by root-sensitive impoverishment rules which target and delete some of the features of the stem or the reduplicant form.

Keywords: reduplication, Standard Arabic, distributed morphology, sound items, impoverishment rule.

1. Introduction 26

Reduplication is a morphological process in which a stem, segment, or syllable are repeated (Raimy, 2000; Inkelas & Zoll, 2005; Haugen, 2008 among others)¹. It can be full or partial. Full reduplication repeats full stems as in (1) from Halkomelem (cf. Shaw, 2004), whereas partial reduplication doubles only a part (a sound, two sounds, or a syllable, etc) of the stem as in (2) from Agta (cf. Healey, 1960).

- | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---------------------|---------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----|
| 1. | a. | [q ^w él] | ‘to speak’ | → | [q ^w él-q ^w él] | ‘talkative’ | 33 |
| | b. | [k ^w ól] | ‘to capsize’ | → | [k ^w ól-k ^w ól] | ‘likely to capsize’ | 34 |
| | | | | | | | 35 |
| 2. | a. | [φurab] | ‘afternoon’ | → | [φu-φurab] | ‘late afternoon’ | 36 |
| | b. | [ŋaŋaj] | ‘a long time’ | → | [ŋa-ŋaŋaj] | ‘a long time (in years)’ | 37 |
| | | | | | | | 38 |

There are many grammatical or rhetorical purposes for reduplication (Haspelmath, 2013). The primary use of reduplication is pluralization as in Agta in (3) (cf. Raimy, 2000) and Dakota in (4) (cf. Shaw, 1980).

- | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|--------|---------|---|------------|-----------------|----|
| 3. | a. | pusa | ‘cat’ | → | pu-pusa | ‘cats’ | 42 |
| | b. | kaldin | ‘goat’ | → | kal-kaldin | ‘goats’ | 43 |
| | c. | takki | ‘leg’ | → | taktakki | ‘legs’ | 44 |
| | d. | uffu | ‘thigh’ | → | uf-uffu | ‘thighs’ | 45 |
| | | | | | | | 46 |
| 4. | a. | hāska | ‘tall’ | → | hāska-ska | ‘tall (plural)’ | 47 |
| | b. | waŋte | ‘good’ | → | waŋte-ŋte | ‘good (plural)’ | 48 |
| | | | | | | | 49 |

Reduplication can also be used for intensifying events, as in Gunu in (5a) (cf. Rekanga, 1989), Mbukushu in (5b) (cf. Fisch, 1998) or Yao in (5c) (cf. Ngunga, 2000).

- | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|-------|-------------|---|-------------|------------------------|----|
| 5. | a. | bela | ‘lie’ | → | bela-bela | ‘lie continually’ | 53 |
| | b. | kwata | ‘touch’ | → | kwata-kwata | ‘touch everything’ | 54 |
| | c. | lima | ‘cultivate’ | → | lima-lima | ‘cultivate frequently’ | 55 |
| | | | | | | | 56 |

¹ Abbreviations used in this article are as follows: DM=Distributed Morphology; LF=Logical Form; MS=Morphological Structure; PF=Phonetic Form; SA=Standard Arabic; SI(s)=Sound Item(s); VI(s)=Vocabulary Item(s).

In contrast to the above uses of reduplication (i.e. multiplication and intensity), reduplication can also express the opposite function, namely diminution or attenuation, as in Mainland Comox in (6) (cf. Watanabe, 1994), or as in Ndyuka and Sranan in (7) (cf. Kouwenberg & LaCharité, 2005).

- | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|--------------------|------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| 6. | a. | supaju | ‘ax’ | → | suspaju | ‘little ax’ | 61 |
| | b. | ʔaltx ^w | ‘room’ | → | ʔaʔltx ^w | ‘little room’ | 62 |
| | c. | tala | ‘money’ | → | tatla | ‘little money’ | 63 |
| | | | | | | | 64 |
| 7. | a. | lon | ‘to run’ | → | lon-lon | ‘to be kind of running’ | [Ndyuka] 65 |
| | b. | ferfi | ‘to paint’ | → | ferfi-ferfi | ‘to paint a bit’ | [Sranan] 66 |
| | | | | | | | 67 |

As far as Standard Arabic (SA) is concerned, reduplication is employed for intensity and emphasis (Procházka, 1993; Elzarka, 2005; Maas, 2005; Abu-Mansour, 2015). Full stems can be reduplicated in SA as in (8). These examples are instances of full reduplication.

8. Full Stem Reduplication

- | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------------|---|--------------------|----|
| a. | xarxar | (cf. xar+xar) | ‘bubble’ | 72 |
| b. | tamtam | (cf. tam+tam) | ‘mumble’ | 73 |
| c. | yamyam | (cf. yam+yam) | ‘babble’ | 74 |
| d. | zaqzaq | (cf. zaq+zaq) | ‘chirp’ | 75 |
| e. | t ^ʕ aʔt ^ʕ aʔ | (cf. t ^ʕ aʔ+t ^ʕ aʔ) | ‘lower one’s head’ | 76 |
| f. | kamkam | (cf. kam+kam) | ‘cover’ | 77 |
| g. | s ^ʕ ars ^ʕ ar | (cf. s ^ʕ ar+s ^ʕ ar) | ‘scream’ | 78 |
| h. | ħas ^ʕ ħas ^ʕ | (cf. ħas ^ʕ +ħas ^ʕ) | ‘manifest’ | 79 |
| i. | fad ^ʕ fad ^ʕ | (cf. fad ^ʕ +fad ^ʕ) | ‘disclose’ | 80 |
| j. | waswas | (cf. was+was) | ‘suspect’ | 81 |
| | | | | 82 |
| | | | | 83 |
| | | | | 84 |

Partial reduplication also exists in SA where part of the stem is doubled while the rest thereof is deleted. In (9), the first CV of the stem is deleted, whereas, in (10), the final VVC of the reduplicant form is the one being erased².

² In this paper, we follow Clements & Keyser’s (1983) linear model of CV phonology in treating long vowels as VV. We also follow previous approaches such as Raimy (2000), Frampton (2009), Haugen

9. Partial Stem Reduplication (the 1st CV of the stem → ∅) 88

a.	ʕaram+ram	(cf. ʕaram+[ʕa]ram)	‘very numerous’	89
b.	yaʕam+ʕam	(cf. yaʕam+[ya]ʕam)	‘very unjust’	90
c.	ʕarak+rak	(cf. ʕarak+[ʕa]rak)	‘very experienced’	91
d.	kaðab+ðab	(cf. kaðab+[ka]ðab)	‘big liar’	92
e.	ʕasʕab+sʕab	(cf. ʕasʕab+[ʕa]sʕab)	‘very hard’	93
f.	damak+mak	(cf. damak+[da]mak)	‘very sweeping’	94
g.	ʕalaʕ+laʕ	(cf. ʕalaʕ+[ʕa]laʕ)	‘very tall’	95
h.	ħarak+rak	(cf. ħarak+[ħa]rak)	‘very quick’	96
i.	hawal+wāl	(cf. hawal+[ha]wāl)	‘very scared’	97
j.	yaʕam+tʕam	(cf. yaʕam+[ya]tʕam)	‘very deep’	98

10. Partial Stem Reduplication (2nd VVC of the reduplicant form → ∅) 100

a.	mar+mari:s	(cf. mar[i:s]+mari:s)	‘a very hard land’	102
b.	mar+mari:r	(cf. mar[i:r]+mari:r)	‘a very empty land’	103
c.	mar+mari:t	(cf. mar[i:t]+mari:t)	‘a very empty land’	104
d.	qar+qari:r	(cf. qar[i:r]+qari:r)	‘a stomach sound’	105

Given that “all syllables in Arabic require an onset” (Watson, 2002:65), we 107
 assume that the obliterated parts in (9) are syllables but those in (10) are not. The first 108
 rhotic sound [r] in the words in parenthesis in (10) should function as the onset of the 109
 following deleted parts, not as the coda of the preceding /ma/ or /qa/. Because this [r] 110
 is preserved in (10), the deletion process must have applied only to part of the 111
 syllable, namely VVC. 112

In this paper, we will develop a distributed morphology approach to account 113
 for full and partial reduplication in the world languages, using SA as a representative. 114
 We assume that reduplication behave uniformly in all the world languages. Because 115
 the reduplicant form borrows all (or a number of) sounds from roots and stems as 116
 original sources, we will begin our analysis with a discussion of the formation of 117
 roots, stems, and words in SA. Understanding the root/stem/word formation in SA 118
 helps in capturing reduplication facts in Arabic as well as other languages. 119


(2008, 2010, 2011) and Haugen and Harley (2010) which assume that the reduplicant form is syntactically left adjoined to the stem (see section 3.2). Thus, in light of syntactic linearization, we claim that the deletion in (9) affects the stem, but it affects the reduplicant form in (10).

The organization of the paper will be as follows. We will lay out the framework of DM in section (2) focusing on the tools that can be of use in developing our approach. We will move from there to present our approach in section (3) showing that it can account for word formation as well as reduplication in SA. Concluding remarks will be given in section (4).

2. DM Framework

Based on earlier realizational theories of morphology (Kiparsky, 1973; Anderson, 1992), Distributed Morphology (DM) is developed as a unified piece-based framework that modulates both morphosyntactic and morphophonological phenomena via the Chomskyan generative Y-model as shown in (11). Rather than listing sound/meaning correspondences of words in the lexicon, DM, as its name suggests, distributes the lexical properties among three grammatical components (Halle and Marantz, 1993, 1994; Embick and Noyer, 2007; Embick and Marantz, 2008; Siddiqi, 2009; Embick, 2010). The first component, known as List A, provides the syntax with the basic formatives which include roots and morphosyntactic features, which in turn undergo the common syntactic operations such as Merge, Move and Copy, in the sense of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky, 1995, 2000, 2001, 2004 et seq). Given that DM is a late insertion approach, the second component, namely List B, contains phonological material that realizes terminal nodes at PF. The third component, List C, interprets the terminal nodes at LF. These interpretations proceed convergently and yield the intended meaning of the final structure.

11. Grammar Architecture of Distributed Morphology




As represented in (11), every derivation sets out with a selection of language-particular roots as well as feature bundles. Feature bundles are drawn from Universal Grammar (Embick and Marantz, 2008:5); every language selects the required features from a group called Universal Feature Inventory (Embick, 2015: 32). This selection is known as the numeration or the lexical array in the Chomskyan terms. In DM, however, roots are not categorially labelled; they are only notated with the symbol $\sqrt{}$ (cf. Pesetsky, 1995). They are later categorized according to the Categorization Assumption in (12) (cf. Marantz, 1997, 2007).

12. Categorization Assumption: Roots cannot appear without being categorized; roots are categorized by combining with category-defining functional heads. (Embick and Noyer, 2007: 296).


The Categorization Assumption in (12) ensures that a root never appears in a bare form but as a member of the well-known lexical categories such as nouns, verbs, adjectives etc. Thus, the derivation of the noun *glory* and the adjective *glorious* will be formed from the same category-neutral root $\sqrt{\text{GLORY}}$. The only difference follows from the merging of the former with the nominal functional head *n* as in (13a) and the

merging of the latter with the adjectival functional head *a* as in (13b) (cf. Embick and Marantz, 2008:22).

13. a. The noun *glory*



b. The adjective *glorious*



In (13), the root $\sqrt{\text{GLORY}}$ is a noun or an adjective based on its relationship with the category-defining head with which it is combined, either *n* or *a*. The nominal head *n* in (13a) is spelled out as $[-\emptyset]$ (i.e. null) whereas the adjectival head *a* in (13b) is realized as $[-\text{ous}]$.

After the syntax builds a well-formed structure out of List A, the structure is handed off from Spell-Out to both PF and LF. At PF, language-specific operations may apply in a stage called Morphological Structure (MS). These operations include lowering, merging, raising, impoverishment (i.e. feature deletion), fusion (i.e. grouping the features of two nodes into one node), and fission (i.e. splitting the feature bundle on one node into two nodes). These operations eventually alter the structure and the feature content in deference to the language's morphophonological constraints.

After MS, Vocabulary Items (VIs) from List B (aka the vocabulary) are accessed and given to the terminal nodes (aka positions of exponence) in the structure.

These VI are phonological strings and they fill the terminal nodes in a competition- 182
based manner. They vary cross-linguistically. The competition between the VIs is 183
regulated via the Subset Principle (Halle, 1997), which is a reformulation of Kiparsky 184
1973's Elsewhere Condition. According to the Subset Principle, the most highly 185
specified VI is more eligible to insert into a terminal node than less specified 186
candidates. To illustrate, the most specified VI /-t/ is inserted in the context of [+past] 187
feature for the verb *learn* yielding *learnt* before the less specified or the elsewhere 188
case /-id/ is chosen. At LF, the same correspondence between the VI and the features 189
is held in a model-theoretic fashion yielding a compositional interpretation for the 190
whole derivation. 191

To sum up, DM is a competition-based approach where List A feeds the 192
syntax with formatives such as roots and affixes. The syntax operates on these 193
formatives via the common processes: Merge, Move and Copy. At Spell-Out, the 194
syntactic structure is sent to PF and LF. The roots and affixes are supplied with 195
phonological candidates at PF, and they are associated with their semantic interpretive 196
candidates at LF. 197

3. Word Formation and Reduplication in SA 198

In this section, we will provide a unified account to both word formation and 199
reduplication in SA. The issue of word formation will be explored in section (3.1.) 200
whereas that of reduplication will be addressed in section (3.2). 201

3.1. Word Formation in SA 202

Prior to the discussion of reduplication, it is important to explore how roots, 203
stems and words are formed in SA. The understanding of Arabic word formation will 204
make the phenomenon of reduplication easy to capture. For word formation, SA, like 205
many other Semitic languages, has a non-concatenative morphology, sometimes 206

known as discontinuous morphology, introflexion (Watson, 2000:126; Haspelmath, 2002:22) or root-pattern morphology (Ryding, 2005:45). In other words, SA draws on three or four consonants in each root, and incorporates them within fixed vocalic templates. This morphological mechanism is productive in SA and it does not only derive new lexical categories but it also conveys grammatical functions. As shown in (14), the consonants of the triconsonantal root *k-t-b* are always maintained, but they interlock with different vocalic templates to derive lexical categories such as nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs.

14. Word	Template	Translation	Lexical Category
a. kita:b	CiCa:C	‘book’	Noun
b. kataba	CaCaCa	‘wrote’	Verb
c. maktu:b	maCCu:C	‘written’	Adjective
d. kita:bat-an	CiCa:Cat-an	‘in a written form’	Adverb

The same root *k-t-b* can also be integrated within other templates as in (15) for word inflection, i.e. to express number (plural vs. singular) as in (15a,b), aspect (perfective vs. imperfective) as in (15c,d) or voice (active vs. passive) as in (15e,f).

15. Word	Template	Translation	Function
a. kita:b	CiCa:C	‘book’	singular
b. kutub	CuCuC	‘books’	plural
c. kataba	CaCaCa	‘wrote’	perfective
d. yaktubu	yaCCuCu	‘write’	imperfective
e. kataba	CaCaCa	‘wrote’	active
f. kutiba	CuCiCa	‘be written’	passive


Until now, DM practitioners remain silent regarding the integration of consonants and vowels within words in Semitic languages (see e.g. Arad, 2003, 2005; Kramer, 2006; Tucker, 2011; Wallace 2013; Kastner, 2019 among others). In contrast,

in languages that have concatenative morphology such as English, the categorization
of words is simply conducted via prefixes or suffixes as in (16) and (17) respectively.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------------------|---|----------------------|-----|
| 16. | a. | blaze (noun) | → | ablaze (adjective) | 240 |
| | b. | witch (noun) | → | bewitch (verb) | 241 |
| | c. | slave (noun) | → | enslave (verb) | 242 |
| | | | | | 243 |
| 17. | a. | vapor (noun) | → | vaporous (adjective) | 244 |
| | b. | vaporous (adjective) | → | vaporousness (noun) | 245 |


However, this is not the case in SA non-concatenative morphology, where
prefixation or suffixation do not suffice for word derivation. Rather, vowels must
interlock with the consonants of the root in an intricate way, i.e. the root *ktb* becomes
kataba ‘wrote’, *kita:b* ‘book’, *maktu:b* ‘written’ or *kita:batan* ‘in a written form’ as in
(14). The Arabic literature presents some attempts to deal with this issue. For
instance, Alqarni (2015: 96) proposes that the category-defining head, proposed by
Marantz’s (1997, 2007) categorization assumption in (12), bears the vocalic template
in which the root consonants can incorporate. Thus, the root *ktb* can be *kita:b* ‘book’
(a noun) by merging with the template CiCa:C found on the head *n* in (18a), or it can
be *kataba* ‘wrote’ (a verb) by being combined with the template CaCaCa on the
verbal head *v* in (18b).

18. a. The noun *kita:b* ‘book’ 257



b. The verb *kataba* ‘wrote’

260



261

By merging the root with the template under the category-defining head, either (CiCa:C) or (CaCaCa), words in SA are formed. Alqarni (2015), however, did not go further to explain exactly how the root consonants replace these Cs in each template, and what mechanism in the DM approach can do so. The picture becomes more complicated if we know that the templates (CiCa:C) and (CaCaCa) in (18a,b) are not the only Arabic templates that make nouns or verbs out of roots. There are many different templates for nouns as in (19) and many others for verbs as in (20). Some of these templates have different vowels as well as fixed consonants such as *mu-* for nouns in (19d) and such as *ʔa-* or *ʔin-* for verbs in (20c,d).

19.	roots	template	examples (nouns)	271
a.	ktb	CiCa:C	kitab ‘a book’,	272
	ʕql		ʕiqā:l ‘a headband’	273
				274
b.	qtl	Ca:CaC	qa:til ‘a killer’	275
	xm		xa:tim ‘a ring’	276
				277
c.	rsl	CaCu:C	rasu:l ‘a messenger’	278
	ʕll		ʕalu:l ‘a camel’	279
				280
d.	ħrb	<u>mu</u> Ca:CaC	muħa:rib ‘a fighter’,	281
	fʕl		mufa:ʕil ‘a reactor’	282
	etc.			283
				284
				285

20.	roots	template	examples (verbs)	286
a.	ktb	CaCaCa	kataba ‘wrote’,	287
	qrʔ		qaraʔa ‘read’	288
				289
b.	qnʕ	CaCuCa	qanuʕa ‘got satisfied’,	290
	xlsʕ		xalusʕa ‘concluded’	291
				292
c.	xrdʒ	ʔaCCaCa	ʔaxradʒa ‘drove out’,	293
	ʕln		ʔaʕlana ‘announced’	294
				295
d.	ʔlq	ʔinCaCaCa	ʔinyalaqa ‘become closed’	296
	dmdʒ		ʔindamadʒa ‘got combined’	297
	etc.			298

Although more than one template can be applied to one root, see (14) and (15) 299
above, the data in (19) and (20) shows that, generally speaking, every root is 300
associated with a specific template. Consider the following examples where the root 301
ʕln can only appear in the verbal template ʔaCCaCa but not in the other verbal 302
templates in (21). 303

21.	roots	template	examples (verbs)	304
	ʕln	ʔaCCaCa	ʔaʕlana ‘announced’,	305
		*CaCaCa	*ʕalana	306
		*CaCuCa	*ʕaluna	307
		*ʔinCaCaCa	*ʔinʕalana	308

For these reasons, Alqarni (2015) proposes that every root merges with a 309
category-defining head bearing its appropriate template. In other words, these 310
templates are VIs that appear under the category-defining head when their relevant 311
roots appear in their domain. Thus, all the templates above will be vocabulary items 312
for nouns as in (22) or for verbs as in (23) below. 313

22. Template Vocabulary Items for Nouns 314

CiCa:C	↔	n __	{√ktb, √ʕql etc}	315
Ca:CaC	↔	n __	{√qtl, √xtm etc}	316
CaCu:C	↔	n __	{√rsl, √ðll etc}	317
muCa:CaC	↔	n __	{√hrb, √ffl etc}	318
The list goes on.				319
				320
				321

23. Template Vocabulary Items for Verbs 322

CaCaCa	←→	v __	{√ktb, √qrʔ etc}	323
CaCuCa	←→	v __	{√qnʕ, √xlsʕ etc}	324
ʔaCCaCa	←→	v __	{√xrdʒ, √ʕln etc}	325
ʔinCaCaCa	←→	v __	{√ʕlq, √dmdʒ etc}	326
The list goes on.				327

Although every root is now associated with its template, the question remain 328
 unanswered regarding how these radical consonants appear in a discontinuous format 329
 and how the vowels can be interspersed between them. Our objective in this paper is 330
 to develop a theory-driven approach to lead such derivations within the DM 331
 framework. 332

To do so, we will make use of the phonological feature theory and incorporate it 333
 into the DM framework. Phonological feature theory is an approach in cognitive 334
 science that represents mental sounds with formal features (Hayes, 2009: 70). 335
 According to this theory, a sound can be mentally represented using a bundle of 336
 features. For example, the sound /f/ can be represented with distinctive features that 337
 can collectively define it, such as [+consonantal +continuant +labiodental –voice]. 338
 For the vowel /u/, it can be represented with other relevant features that contribute to 339
 its realization, such as [–consonantal +voice +high –low +back –front +round]. 340


We will take advantage of this phonological feature theory and propose that the 341
 root consonants and the templatic vowels in SA, and other languages, enter the 342
 syntactic component as distinctive features such as [±consonantal], [±continuant], 343
 [±sonorant], [±voice], [±labial] etc. Thus, for the noun *kita:b* ‘book’ to be formed in 344
 SA, the root sounds *ktb* appear as bundles of features under the root node as 345
 demonstrated in (24a) whereas the vowels appear under the nominal head *n* as in 346
 (24b). 347

348

24. a. the root [k t b]

349

√



350

b. the templatic vowels [i a:]

351

n



352

The representations in (24) are sets of features that can collectively define each sound in the word *kita:b*. For our purposes, it is not a matter of concern that some of the features in each set in (24) are redundant and non-essential for the pronunciation of the given sound. We assume that each sound must enter the syntax with as many features as required to be pronounced at PF.

Note that this is not contra the basic principles of the syntactic theory that the syntax cannot deal with phonological information. The featural representations in (24) are not phonological in the first place, neither are they pronounced. They are simply formal representations of information, similar to the representations of the morphosyntactic features [\pm pl], [\pm def], etc. Given that the latter representations can

enter the syntactic computations and can be manipulated, we assume that the formal 363
representations in (24) can also be operated on by the syntax. These distinctive 364
features in (24) will be pronounced only after they are shipped off to PF. 365

Before discussing how these features are pronounced at PF, it is important to 366
address the controversy of the DM community over the realization of roots in 367
comparison to morphosyntactic features. This will help us find a foothold for our 368
approach. Recall from section (2) that List A consists of morphosyntactic features and 369
roots. Morphosyntactic features are part of universal grammar, and they include [+pl], 370
[+f], [+past], [+def] etc. That is, Arabic and English have the same set of 371
morphosyntactic features such as [+pl], [+f], [+past], [+def]. As far as roots are 372
concerned, they are language-particular; every language has its own set of roots, i.e. 373
the root *klb* ‘dog’, for example, is particular to the Arabic language, whereas the root 374
move is part of the English root inventory. 375

There is a consensus between the DM theorists that the morphosyntactic 376
features are realized via VI completion as discussed in section (2). However, there are 377
three proposals on how and when the roots are phonologically realized. The first 378
proposal argues that roots enter the syntax phonologically realized (Embick, 2000; 379
Embick and Halle, 2005; Embick and Noyer, 2007; Borer, 2014). That is, an English 380
word such as *map* is already phonologically realized as [mæp] in List A. Thus, the 381
syntax takes [+pl] (with no phonological information) and [mæp] (with its 382
phonological information) and applies to them its operations such as Move, Merge, 383

and Copy. In other words, there is no late insertion for roots. Late insertion applies
only to morphosyntactic features³.

The second proposal argues that all the elements of List A that enter the
syntax, be they morphosyntactic features or roots, must be subject to late insertion, i.e.
they must receive their phonological content at PF. As argued by Marantz (1995: 16).

There are two basic reasons to treat “cat” and all so-called lexical roots as we
treat inflectional affixes, and insert them late. . . . First, it’s extremely difficult
to argue that roots behave any differently from affixes with respect to the
computational system. No phonological properties of roots interact with the
principles or computations of syntax, nor do idiosyncratic Encyclopedic facts
about roots show any such interactions (Marantz, 1995: 16).

Put differently, all the elements of List A must enter the syntax devoid of any
information, be it phonological or semantics. The phonological and semantic
information that can distinguish *cat* from *dog* is irrelevant to syntax and should not be
present on the terminal nodes of the roots. Thus, roots should appear as the abstract
symbol $\sqrt{}$ in the syntactic structure. However, according to Marantz (1995), the only
available features that can enter the syntax and can be placed on root nodes are
semantic, e.g. [\pm count], [\pm animate]. These features can help resolve the competition
of which root is more suitable to enter into a given node at PF. As shown in (25), if
there is a configuration where the head D has the article ‘a’, which requires a single
count noun, and the root has [+count] and [+animate], the root at PF can be realized
by *cat* as in (25b), but not *rice* as in (25c) because the latter is [-count] and [-animate].

³ An early version of this proposal comes from Halle (1990, 1997). Halle argues that there should be two types of morphemes in DM: concrete and abstract. Concrete morphemes are those that have a fixed underlying phonological representation such as *dog*, *red*, *car* etc and any bound morphemes such as *-ness* and *un-* etc. Abstract morphemes are those that have surface representations different from the underlying ones, such as the verb *be* (*is*, *am*, *are*, *was*, *were*, *be*, and *been*) and all the variants of suffixes for plural (such as *-s*, *-z*, and *-Iz*) or for past (such as *-d*, *-t*, and *-id*). According to Halle, concrete morphemes should enter the syntax fully realized and cannot be subject to late insertion. Abstract morphemes should be subject to competition in the light of the Subset Principle (Halle, 1997).

25. a. [DP [D a [nP [n [√ [+count] [+animate]]]]]] 406
- b. [DP [D a [nP [n [√ cat]]]]] 407
- c. *[DP [D a [nP [n [√ rice]]]]] 408

Given that there are many English roots that can have the features [+count], 409
 [+animate] such as *dog*, *lion*, *man*, etc, and they can compete with the word *cat* to 410
 enter in the same root node in (25a), Marantz (1995) submits that, at PF, any root with 411
 enough information is eligible for insertion into the root node based on the speaker's 412
 intention. Thus, at PF, *cat*, *dog*, *lion*, *man* etc are all candidates for insertion. Many 413
 scholars regard this as the weakest point in Marantz's proposal (e.g. Pfau, 2000, 2009; 414
 Acquaviva, 2008; Harley, 2014). If all the roots that have the features [+count] and 415
 [+animate] can insert in the node in (25a), one might inquire about their semantic 416
 interpretation at LF. In the syntactic theory, PF cannot access LF because they are 417
 impenetrable to each other (Chomsky, 1995). In light of Marantz's proposal, the word 418
cat may be inserted into the root node at PF, and the semantic interpretation of *dog* 419
 could be given to the root at LF, given the inaccessibility between the two branches 420
 (Harley, 2014). To avoid this problem, Marantz (1995) requires that LF must know 421
 what is going on at PF. He said: 422

Late insertion involves making a specific claim about the connection between 423
 LF and semantic interpretation. LF can't by itself be the input to semantic 424
 interpretation. If "cat" is inserted in the phonology at a node at which "dog" 425
 could just as well have been inserted – and if, as we assume, the difference 426
 between "cat" and "dog" makes a difference in semantic interpretation – then 427
 the phonological representation, specifically the choice of Vocabulary items, 428
 must also be input to semantic interpretation (Marantz, 1995: 17). 429

A group of scholars, i.e. who represents the third position, defies Marantz's 430
 proposal on this theoretical problem. They argue that the root node must not be an 431
 abstract symbol √ which makes a long list of roots eligible for insertion. Rather, roots 432
 must be more specified in the syntax so that only one root can win the competition 433

(see e.g. Pfau, 2000, 2009; Acquaviva, 2008; Siddiqi, 2009; De Belder, 2011; Harley, 2014).

These scholars deprive roots from both semantic and phonological information, but they make them specific by adding index notations to them when they enter the syntax. Thus, roots can enter the syntax with a hypothetical numerical address such as $\sqrt[250]$, $\sqrt[147]$ or $\sqrt[19]$. At PF, only roots with the same address can insert into their relevant nodes. For instance, if the root *cat* is associated with the number 147, it would be the only competitive root that can insert into $\sqrt[147]$ at PF. These numerical indexes help in resolving the issues arising from Marantz's proposal because both PF and LF can now relate $\sqrt[n]$ to its relevant phonology and semantics.

Our approach seeks a compromise between these three approaches: the first approach which argues that roots must enter the syntax phonologically realized, and the second two approaches which argue that roots should be stripped of any phonological and semantics information until PF and LF. Our approach states that every root enters the syntax with the formal representations of the sounds it contains, as shown in (24a) for the root [ktb] and (27b) for the vocalic template [ia:]. As stressed earlier, these features are not phonological, but they are like abstract morphosyntactic features, in that the syntax can manipulate both of them as non-phonological atoms.

This proposal is appealing as it serves many purposes. First, it renders all the information in List A into features: morphosyntactic (e.g. [+pl], [+f], [+past]) and non-phonetic distinctive features (e.g. [+nasal], [+consonantal], [+labial] etc). Recall that Embick and Marantz (2008:5) claim that morphosyntactic feature bundles in DM are derived from Universal Grammar. Similarly, non-phonetic distinctive features

come from Universal Grammar. The feature [+nasal] is universal in that it appears in
all nasal sounds in the world languages. The same applies to vowels which are [-
consonantal] cross-linguistically. As put by Mielke (2008: 31), the universality of
distinctive features follows from the fact that

features in two languages which refer to the same acoustic feature are
fundamentally the same. Thus, the feature [high] in Turkish is fundamentally
the same as the feature [high] in Russian ... the universality of the distinctive
features (in spoken languages) is a direct consequence of the universality of
the human vocal tract (Mielke, 2008: 31).

In other words, our approach gains importance from the fact that all the features
in List A are now drawn from Universal Grammar.

The second advantage of our approach follows from the fact that all these
features in List A will be supplied with their phonological content in a unified
fashion. That is, given that morphosyntactic features (such as [+sg], [+pl] etc) are
supplied with phonological VIs at PF, we propose that, at PF, the distinctive features
of the root consonants and vowels in (24) are also fed with Sound Items (SIs). To
illustrate, if /ɪd/ and /s/ are VIs that are associated with [+past] and [+present]
respectively as in (26), we propose that the phonemes /k/, /t/, /b/ are SIs linked to their
respective features as in (27).

26. VI list

/ɪd/ \longleftrightarrow [+past]

/s/ \longleftrightarrow [+present]

27. SI List

/k/ \longleftrightarrow [-continuant +dorsal, -voice]

/t/ \longleftrightarrow [-continuant +coronal -voice]


/b/ \longleftrightarrow [-continuant +labial +voice]

Under this account, we will have a unified and governed theory of insertion in
DM. Sound insertion (akin to vocabulary insertion) undergoes the same competition
principles such as the Subset Principle (Halle, 1997). Like VIs, SIs compete with each

other for insertion, and the strongest candidate is the one that matches the maximum
number of the available distinctive features on the node.

The third advantage of our approach follows from the fact that it can derive all
words in the world languages: the word formation in non-concatenative root-pattern
languages such as SA, and that in concatenative languages such as English. To derive
the noun *kita:b* ‘book’, we propose that the root \sqrt{ktb} enters the syntax as
demonstrated in (28). Note that these features in (28) are only representative, i.e. we
do not bring all the required features for these sounds for space limitations.

28. Root /ktb/



Given that grammatical features such as [+past], [+pl] etc are borne by
terminal nodes, we assume that these distinctive features appear as bundles under sub-
terminal nodes within the root node. These sub-terminal nodes can be a result of
Copy, where the node of the root copies itself two or three times to accommodate the
feature bundle of each consonant and vowel, or as an alternative, the root node
undergoes a fission operation twice (if the root consonants are three) or thrice (if they
are four). Both proposals yield similar results. At PF, different phonemes (or SIs) as
in (29) will compete for insertion into the root sub-terminal nodes in (28) above,
yielding the root \sqrt{ktb} ‘write’ in (30).


29. List of SIs

/k/ \longleftrightarrow [+dorsal –voice]


/t/ \longleftrightarrow [+coronal –continuant –voice]

/b/	←→	[+labial +voice]	511
/n/	←→	[+nasal +coronal, +voice]	512
/m/	←→	[+labial +nasal +voice]	513
/i/	←→	[-consonantal +high +front]	514
/a:/	←→	[-consonantal +front +low +long]	515
etc			516

30. 517
518




As the structure is built from bottom up, the root $\sqrt{\text{ktb}}$ will be categorized as a noun by merging with a nominal head n . Given that the main assumption in the literature that the head n bears templatic vowels (Alqarni, 2015), we assume that the head n (bearing [_i_a:_]) will also be endowed with distinctive features for these vowels as shown in (31). These vocalic features represent the nominal template within which the consonants /ktb/ will be incorporated. All these distinctive features will undergo sound insertion at PF, yielding [i-a:-k-t-b].



The main concern at this point is how to conglomerate the roots within the
 vocalic template on the head *n*. Otherwise, the resulting structure in (31) will yield
 *[ia:ktb], as opposed to the desirable output [kita:b] ‘book’. We take it for granted
 that the root moves from its original position to the head *n* and adjoins to it. In SA,
 words are derived by head-to-head affixal movements. For example, the dual noun
 phrase [ʔal-kita:b-at-a:ni] ‘the two styles of writing’ is derived via successive head-to-
 head movements as shown in (32) below.

32.



In (32), the root $\sqrt{\text{ktb}}$ first moves to the head n and forms [kita:b] in a way that will be discussed momentarily. The noun [kita:b] will continue rising to Gen to combine with the feminine marker [-at] generating [kita:b-at] ‘a style of writing’. From Gen, the complex heads proceed towards Num and attach to the dual suffix [-a:ni] yielding [kita:b-at-a:ni] ‘two styles of writing’. Finally, the adjoined heads land on D for the definite article [ʔal] ‘the’. Note that if every head moves from bottom up and adjoins to the left of the higher heads, the final output will be *[kita:b-at-ani-ʔal] where the definite article [ʔal] ‘the’ is unfavorably suffixed to the whole word. The wanted form is [ʔal-kita:b-at-a:ni] where the definite article has a prefixal nature.

To subvert this problem, we resort to DM-based tools proposed by Embick and Noyer (2007:319), namely Local Dislocation Rules. These rules manipulate the linear order of affixes. We propose local dislocation rule (33) to switch the order between the complex heads [kita:bata:ni] ‘two styles of writing’ and the definite article [ʔal] ‘the’.

33. Local Dislocation Rule
 $\sqrt{+n+\text{Gen}+\text{Num}}^D \rightarrow D^{\sqrt{+n+\text{Gen}+\text{Num}}}$

Thus, the ill-formed word *[kita:b-at-ani-ʔal] in (34a) will undergo an affixal reordering via rule (33), resulting in the correct form in (34b).

34. a. *[kita:b^at^a:ni^ʔal] before local dislocation rule
b. [ʔal^kita:b^at^a:ni] after applying rule (36).

However, it should be known that Embick and Noyer (2001) take issue with rules such as (33). Local Dislocation Rules should switch only the positions of string-adjacent elements, i.e. [ʔal] ‘the’ and the closest affix to it in (34a), namely the dual suffix [a:ni]. To achieve the objective of rule (33), Embick and Noyer (2001, ft 9) draws on Sproat’s (1985) proposal that rebracketing may apply to these affixes before

the dislocation rule takes place. In other words, affixes undergo a rebracketing operation and appear in different units. Thus, (34) should be revised as in (35).

35. a. [kita:b^at^a:ni^?al] rebracketing
b. [[kita:b^at^a:ni]^?al] applying rule (36).
c. [[?al]^kita:b^at^a:ni]] final result

The single unit [kita:b^at^a:ni^?al] in (35a) should first undergo rebracketing and become two units [[kita:b^at^a:ni]^?al] as in (35b). These two units can therefore be reordered, yielding the wanted form [[?al]^kita:b^at^a:ni]] in (35c) where the definite article appears word-initially.

Taking these operations into account, we propose that the root-pattern derivation in SA (or any Semitic languages) proceeds similarly. After the root adjoins to the left of the nominal head *n*, the result will be as shown in (36) where the vowels follow the root consonants.

36. k^t^b^i^a:


At this stage, we induce rebracketing and local dislocation rules to order the consonants and vowels at hand. These rules will re-apply multiple times so as to produce the well-formed word *kita:b* ‘book’. This can be accomplished in the step-by-step illustration in (37), where the rules re-apply until the final result is derived.

37. a. [k^t^b^i^a:] rebracketing (ill-formed word)
↓ ↓
b. [k^t^[b^i]^a:] dislocation rule
↓ ↓
c. [k^t^[i^b]^a:] rebracketing
↓ ↓
d. [k^[t^i]^b^a:] dislocation rule
↓ ↓
e. [k^[i^t]^b^a:] rebracketing
↓ ↓
f. [k^i^t^[b^a:]] dislocation rule
↓ ↓
g. [k^i^t^a:^b] final output (well-formed word)


In summary, all the root-pattern formation can be accomplished via the steps
 above. Unlike earlier works that do not discuss the derivation of root-pattern
 morphology at great length, our proposal is now theoretically formalized via three
 operations from DM: root sound features, rebracketing and dislocation rules. The
 latter two operations are independently motivated in DM and can be carried over to
 our approach.

Extending our proposal to other languages as a unified theory for root
 realization, it can also derive concatenative morphology more straightforwardly. For
 the English word *vaporous* in (38), the root and the category defining heads will be
 endowed with distinctive features as in (39) and will eventually receive appropriate
 SIs at PF.

38. The adjective *vaporous*



39.



In other words, we can simply replace these consonants and vowels in (38)
 with representative features that are spelled out by SIs at PF. In sum, this is the fourth

advantage of our approach, i.e. it can account for both concatenative and non- 623
concatenative morphologies. 624

The fifth advantage of our approach follows from its ability to account for 625
metathesis cases that occur at the sentence level as in (40) (cf. Rudy, 1988: 7). 626


- | | | | |
|--------|--|---|------------|
| 40. a. | May I sew you to another sheet ? | (cf. May I show you to another
seat). | 627
628 |
| b. | Braid of glass | (cf. Blade of grass). | 629 |
| c. | By Merest Dozen | (cf. My Dearest Cousin). | 630
631 |

Note that these sounds are distributed beyond the boundaries of words, unlike 632
the metathesis cases within word boundaries such as *ask-aks* or *prescribe-perscribe*. 633
Unless there are distinctive features in the syntax, other approaches would not be able 634
to expect examples such as (40a) where the first sounds of the words *show-seat* are 635
wrongly switched as in *sew-sheet* across the clause. For (40a), we can simply argue 636
that the numeration collects all the distinctive features required to pronounce all the 637
relevant roots in the clause, e.g. *show*, *seat*, etc: the features of /ʃ/ (i.e. [+consonantal 638
+continuant -anterior, +distributed]) for the word *show* and those of /s/ (i.e. 639
[+consonantal +continuant +anterior, +distributed]) for the word *seat*. However, for a 640
reason or another, the syntax distributes the feature bundles of /ʃ/ and /s/ mistakenly 641
beyond their word boundaries. That is, the sound /ʃ/ which should be part of the root 642
show is wrongly put along the feature bundles of the root *seat*, whereas the sound /s/, 643
which should be part of the word *seat*, is put among the features of the root *show*, 644
hence the metathesis cases in (40a), namely *sew* and *sheet*. Thus, and unlike other 645
approaches, our approach therefore makes perfect predictions regarding metathesis 646
cases at the sentential levels. 647

Our approach can also account for other speech errors within word boundaries. 648
 Consider the speech error in (41) made by English-speaking children and that in (42) 649
 made by African American speakers. 650

41. I fount a pek for the pram. (cf. I found a peg for the pram). 651
 42. You can aks him. (cf. You can ask him). 652

The available DM-based approaches account for the occurrences of the natural 653
 mistakes in (41) and (42) by resorting to readjustment rules in the phonology part 654
 after Vocabulary Insertion (see Haugen, 2016, for a severe criticism of readjustment 655
 rules). In contrast, our current approach can account for these mistakes by adopting 656
 the tenets in DM such as impoverishment rules and dislocation rules. Consider the 657
 word *peg* that is wrongly pronounced as *pek* in (41). The feature bundles of the word 658
peg will enter the syntax as follows. 659



At PF, English SIs will compete to insert into the above nodes. Consider a 668
 subset of the English SIs in (44). 669

44. A List of English SIs 670
 /p/ \longleftrightarrow [+labial -voice] 671
 /e/ \longleftrightarrow [+front -low -high] 672
 /g/ \longleftrightarrow [+dorsal +voice -continuant] 673
 /k/ \longleftrightarrow [+dorsal -continuant] 674
 etc 675


Prior to the sound insertion stage, the right-hand terminal node that bears the features [+consonantal, +dorsal, -continuant, -voice] in (43) will undergo an impoverishment rule such as the one in (45).

45. Impoverishment Rule

[+voice] → ∅ / __ [+coronal, +consonantal -continuant etc] #


After [+voice] feature is erased by rule (45), the VI /g/ in (44) will not be eligible for discharging the features on the right-hand node in (43). That node does not have the feature, i.e. [+voice] any longer as shown in (46) below. Thus, the VI /t/ in (44) will rather win the competition yielding the word *pek*.

46.



Concerning the pronunciation of the word *ask* as *aks*, the word *ask* undergoes the SI insertion as shown in (47).

47.




	705
	706
Afterwards, the last two SIs [s*k] undergo a local dislocation rule as in (48)	707
below, resulting in <i>aks</i> .	708
48. Dislocation Rule	709
[s*k] → [k*s] / a__#	710
	711
In the section to follow, our approach can also explain reduplication facts in	712
SA and many other languages. This is the sixth and final advantage.	713
3.2. Reduplication in SA	714
	715
Reduplication has been cast in various models such as Optimality Theory	716
(McCarthy & Prince, 1995; Kim, 2008; Zukoff, 2012; Downing & Inkelas, 2015	717
among others), Paradigm Uniformity Theory (Gouskova, 2004; Kirchner, 2013),	718
Functional Discourse Grammar (Schwaiger, 2018), and DM (Raimy, 2000; Frampton,	719
2009; Haugen, 2008, 2010, 2011; Haugen and Harley, 2010). Unlike the current work	720
which couches Arabic reduplication within DM, previous works present Arabic	721
reduplication from descriptive or optimality theoretic point of views (see e.g.	722
Procházka, 1993; Elzarka, 2005; Maas, 2005; Abu-Mansour, 2015). In this paper, and	723
for space limitations, we will not review the whole literature on Arabic reduplication,	724
which we find irrelevant to our approach. Rather, we will address the available DM-	725
based approaches showing their drawbacks and flaws, and showing how our approach	726
is superior to them.	727
In the DM literature, two approaches are put forward to tackle the issue of	728
reduplication (Haugen, 2011): (i) readjustment approach and (ii) affixation approach.	729
The readjustment approach claims that there is a null affix that represents the	730

reduplicant form (henceforth, shortened to reduplicant). This null affix triggers a readjustment operation to the stem after the vocabulary insertion takes place (Raimy, 2000; Frampton, 2009). As for the affixation approach, it proposes that a special VI (called reduplicative affix, reduplicant or RED) is added to the syntactic structure so as to discharge certain features which are fed with phonological content from the stem (Haugen, 2008, 2010, 2011; Haugen and Harley, 2010).

Consider example (49) from Hiaki (also known as Yaqui, Uto-Aztecan). The reduplicant *peu*, in bold, functions as a habitual aspect, and appears on the left side of the root *peu* ‘butcher’. Under the affixation approach, Haugen and Harley (2010) propose that this reduplicant appears under the node Asp(RED) as in the simplified tree in (50). During the vocabulary insertion, this suffix will realize features with phonological content from the stem *peu*, yielding *peu-peu*.


49. aapo maso-m **peu-peu**-ta
 3.SG deer-PL RED-√butcher-TR
 ‘S/he is always butchering deer’

50. Affixation Approach (Haugen and Harley, 2010)



The readjustment approach takes a different path. It proposes that the reduplicant *peu* in (49) is realized as a null affix as shown in (51). After vocabulary insertion, this null affix triggers readjustment rules to effect changes to the root *peu* making two copies of it.

51. Readjustment Approach (Raimy, 2000; Frampton, 2009)



As is clear from the above structures, both approaches are not clear as to how this reduplicant affix obtains the required part of the stem or the whole thereof. Under the adjustment approach, however, Raimy (2000) proposes a looping mechanism to derive such reduplicant forms. For the example in (49), the looping mechanism will proceed as in (52). In Raimy's terms, the notation # and % mark the beginning and the end of the string respectively.

52. #→p→e→u→%

Linearizes to #→p→e→u→p→e→u→%

Yet, this kind of derivation suffers from theoretical drawbacks. Although the readjustment rules are still active within the DM theory, some scholars consider them as conceptually problematic because they are process-based mechanisms within a piece-based model (see Haugen, 2016). Second, the looping mechanism in (52) needs to be independently motivated to avoid prosodic issues (Frampton, 2009), not to mention that it may lead to an infinite number of loops. It is not clear where this loop stops and where it starts in the phonological word. Haugen (2011), for instance, notes that this looping mechanism makes wrong predictions in deriving other forms of reduplication in Hiaki. As for the affixation approach, it proposes that reduplicants are VIs which compete to insert into the RED node. However, this approach does not either address how the RED affix becomes a copy of the stem. In other words, both

approaches do not provide a clear-cut derivation that ensures that the reduplicant must be phonetically similar to the root in a relative way.

In this paper, we adhere to the earlier two approaches in that the reduplicant is adjoined as an affix in a separate head close to the root. However, we differ in the way the reduplicant is realized. Under our approach, the derivation of full stem reduplication in SA in (8) above, some of which are reproduced in (53) below, will be as sketched in (53d) for example (53a).

53.

a. tamtam

(cf. tam+tam)

‘mumble’

b. xarxar


(cf. xar+xar)

‘bubble’

c. yamyam


(cf. yam+yam)

‘babble’
- d. Representation of (53a)



In (53d), the sound features of the root are still unmerged with the templatic vowel [a], which is the only vowel in this template. After the root-to-n movement takes place, the features on the root consonants are combined with the vowel of the nominal template, yielding the simplified structure in (54).

54.



In (54), the organization of the root sound features of *tam* is accomplished. For the reduplicant to appear, we propose that the reduplicant node copies the exact sound features on the newly derived word. Thus, at PF, the head *n* (i.e. RED) in (54) will copy the sound features of *tam*. This can be accomplished via Feature Copying proposed by Embick and Noyer (2007:309) in (55).


55. Feature copying. A feature on node *X* in the narrow syntax is copied onto node *Y* at PF.

Given that features are borne by nodes, Feature copying is a DM-based tool that enables a node to copy the features found on another adjacent one. Thus, for reduplication to be held, we assume that the sound features of the root will therefore be moved from their subterminals to dissociated nodes under *n*(RED). These dissociated nodes are also introduced to the DM theory by Embick (1997, 1998).

56. Dissociated Node: A node is dissociated if and only if it is added to a structure under certain conditions at PF.

After the reduplicant copies the features of the root as shown in (57), all the features will be supplied with their sound items (namely [t], [a], [m]) during sound insertion, yielding the reduplicated form /*tamtam*/.

57.



Let us now examine the derivation of the partial reduplication in (9) and (10) recited in (58) and (59) below. In SA, the final VVC of the reduplicant is sometimes deleted as in (58). In other times, the first CV of the stem is removed instead as in (59).

58. *The Removal of the Final VVC from the Reduplicant*


- a. mar+mari:s (cf. mar[i:s]+mari:s) ‘a very hard land’
 b. mar+mari:r (cf. mar[i:r]+mari:r) ‘a very empty land’

59. *The Removal of the First CV from the Stem*

- a. ʃaram+ram (cf. ʃaram+[ʃa]ram) ‘very numerous’
 b. yaʃam+ʃam (cf. yaʃam+[ya]ʃam) ‘very unjust’

Let us tackle the first phenomenon where the final VVC of the reduplicant is removed. The analysis will follow straightforwardly where the reduplicant copies the features from the root as shown in (60) for example (59a).

60.




Before the Vocabulary Insertion, we propose that the final VVC of the reduplicant undergoes an impoverishment rule which deletes all the features of [i:] and [s]. As we have discussed in section (2), impoverishment rules can intervene to delete parts of the node content such as features. These rules are well-established in the DM literature (Bonet, 1991; Harley, 1994, Harris, 1997; Noyer, 1997, 1998). Therefore, we can implement an impoverishment rule as given in (61), where the roots are listed for this rule to be evoked.

61. Features of Final VVC $\rightarrow \emptyset$ [RED___ $\sqrt{\text{mrs}}$ $\sqrt{\text{mrr}}$ $\sqrt{\text{mrt}}$ $\sqrt{\text{qrr}}$ etc] 844

Given that this behavior is only attested in the roots listed in rule (61), and the root $\sqrt{\text{mrs}}$ is available in (61), the last two sound features under the n(RED) head will be deleted, hence unpronounced, as shown in (62).

62. 849



Structure (62) produces /mar-mari:s/ ‘a very hard land’ as given in (58a). 851

We carry the same analysis over to the other phenomenon where the first CV of the stem is deleted. However, we need a different impoverishment rule as in (63) where certain roots are listed for the rule to apply. 854

63. Features of First CV $\rightarrow \emptyset$ [RED___ $\sqrt{\text{r}}\text{m}$ $\sqrt{\text{y}}\text{f}\text{m}$ $\sqrt{\text{r}}\text{k}$ $\sqrt{\text{k}}\text{ðb}$ etc] 855

856


Thus, the representation of the adjective *ɬaramram* ‘very numerous’ in (59a) 857

will be as follows. Notice that the features of the first CV are now erased, thus 858

unrealized. 859

64. 860

861



862

863

As shown from the above derivation, all the reduplication facts in SA can be 864

captured via our approach that decomposes root consonants and vowels into sound 865

features that are fed with phonological content (i.e. SIs) at PF. We assume that this 866

approach can simply account for other full or partial reduplication facts in other 867

languages discussed in the introduction. As an illustration, consider the reduplication 868

facts in (65) from Agta (cf. Raimy, 2000). 869

65. a. pusa ‘cat’ pu-pusa ‘cats’ 870

e. kaldin ‘goat’ kal-kaldin ‘goats’ 871

f. takki ‘leg’ taktakki ‘legs’ 872

g. uffu ‘thigh’ uf-uffu ‘thighs’ 873


874

In Agta, the stem is reduplicated, with the deletion of the final CV. To capture 875

this data, we can simply propose that the RED node copies all the distinctive features 876

from the stem /pusa/ in (65a) as shown in (66). 877

66. 878




879
880

Later, the impoverishment rule in (67) intervenes and deletes the final CV
from the RED head before these features are supplied with SIs as illustrated in (68).

67. Features of Final CV $\rightarrow \emptyset$ [RED___ $\sqrt{\text{pusa}}$ $\sqrt{\text{kaldin}}$ $\sqrt{\text{takki}}$ $\sqrt{\text{uffu}}$ etc]

883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891

68.



92
893

In other words, there is nothing special about reduplication facts in all those
languages; they will be no different from the forms in SA. Language-particular
impoverishment rules are, however, needed to intervene and delete only the targeted
sounds or part of the feature bundle in every language.

897
898
899

4. Conclusion

The paper contributes to the theory of DM, by proposing an approach that
 accounts for reduplication and both concatenative and nonconcatenative morphology.
 The approach is not only in harmony with the basic tenets of the DM model, but it
 also provides new insights to realizational theories of morphology. It argues that root
 consonants and templatic vowels should be decomposed into abstract distinctive
 features. These features enter the narrow syntax and they are organized via local
 dislocation rules to derive both concatenative morphology in English and non-
 concatenative root-pattern morphology in SA and other Semitic languages. We
 provided evidence that this approach can resolve the issues between the DM theorists
 regarding the realization of roots. This approach provides a unified theory of root
 realization by rendering the information in List A into features from Universal
 grammar, and subjecting them to the same principles of competition at PF. It also
 accounts for speech errors and metathesis cases at the clause levels. For reduplication,
 this approach proposes that the distinctive features of the root are copied from one
 node to another via Feature Copying. At PF, and after these features are realized by
 SIs, akin to the Vocabulary Insertion, two copies of the same root are pronounced,
 hence full reduplicant forms. For partial reduplication, the sound features will
 undergo impoverishment rules; thus, only part of the stem or the reduplicant is
 pronounced. We assume that this approach can be carried over to all languages that
 include full or partial reduplication, and it can make better predictions than the two
 available approaches such as readjustment and affixation approaches.

922

References	923
Abu-Mansour, Mahasen. 2015. A study of internal reduplication in Makkan Arabic. <i>Journal of Asian and African Studies</i> , 9, 29-30.	924 925 926
Acquaviva, Paolo. 2008. Roots and lexicality in distributed morphology. Retrieved at https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/000654 (on the 20th of March, 2019).	927 928
Alqarni, Muteb. 2015. The Morphosyntax of Numeral-Noun Constructions in Modern Standard Arabic. PhD Dissertation, University of Florida.	929 930
Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. A-Morphous Morphology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press	931 932
Arad, Maya. 2003. Locality constraints on the interpretation of roots: The case of Hebrew denominal verbs. <i>Natural Language and Linguistic Theory</i> , 21, 737–778.	933 934
Arad, Maya. 2005. Roots and Patterns: Hebrew Morphosyntax. Berlin: Springer.	935
Bonet, Eulalia. 1991. Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance. PhD dissertation, MIT.	936 937
Borer, Hagit. 2014. Wherefore roots? <i>Theoretical Linguistics</i> 40 (3/4), 343-359.	938
Chomsky, Noam. 1995. The Minimalist Program. Cambridge, Mass: MIT press.	939
Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In: Roger Martin, David Michaels, Juan Uriagereka and Samuel Keyser (eds), <i>Step by Step: Essays in Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik</i> , pp. 89–155. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.	940 941 942 943
Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In: Michael Kenstowicz (ed), <i>Ken Hale: a Life in Language</i> , pp. 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.	944 945
Chomsky, Noam. 2004. Beyond explanatory adequacy. In: Adriana Belletti (ed), <i>Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 3</i> , pp.104–131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.	946 947 948
Clements, George & Samuel Keyser (1983). <i>CV Phonology: A Generative Theory of the Syllable</i> . Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.	949 950 951
De Belder, Marijke. 2011. Roots and affixes: Eliminating lexical categories from syntax. Brussels: HU Brussel, Utrecht University.	952 953 954
Downing, Laura J., and Sharon Inkelaar. 2015. What is Reduplication? Typology and Analysis Part 2/2: The Analysis of Reduplication. <i>Language and Linguistics Compass</i> , 9(12), 516– 528.	955 956 957 958

Elzarka, Dina. 2005. Gemination and other consonant doubling in Arabic morphology. In Hurch Bernhard (ed), <i>Studies on Reduplication</i> (pp. 395-430). Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.	959 960 961
Embick, David and Alec Marantz. 2008. Architecture and blocking. <i>Linguistic Inquiry</i> 39(1), 1-53.	962 963
Embick, David and Noyer, Rolf. 2001. Movement operations after syntax. <i>Linguistic Inquiry</i> , 32(4), 555– 595.	964 965
Embick, David and Rolf Noyer. 2007. Distributed morphology and the syntax/morphology interface. In: Gillian Ramchand and Charles Reiss (eds), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces</i> , pp. 289-324. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.	966 967 968 969
Embick, David, and Morris Halle. 2005. On the status of stems in morphological theory. In <i>Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2003</i> , ed. by Twan Geerts, Ivo van Ginneken, and Haike Jacobs, 59–88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.	970 971 972 973
Embick, David. 1997. <i>Voice and the Interfaces of Syntax</i> . PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.	974 975 976
Embick, David. 1998. <i>Voice Systems and the Syntax/Morphology Interface</i> . MITWPL 32: <i>Papers from the UPenn/MIT Roundtable on Argument Structure and Aspect</i> , 41–72	977 978 979 980
Embick, David. 2000. Features, syntax, and categories in the Latin perfect. <i>Linguistic Inquiry</i> , 31(2), 185–230.	981 982
Embick, David. 2010. <i>Localism versus Globalism in Morphology and Phonology</i> . Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.	983 984
Embick, David. 2015. <i>The Morpheme: A Theoretical Introduction</i> . Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton	985 986
Fisch, Maria. 1998. <i>Thimbukushu Grammar</i> . Windhoek: Out of Africa Publisher.	987
Frampton, John. 2009. <i>Distributed Reduplication</i> . Cambridge, MA: MIT Press	988
Gouskova, Maria. 2004. Minimal Reduplication as a Paradigm Uniformity Effect. In Vineeta Chand, Ann Kelleher, Angelo J. Rodríguez & Benjamin Schmeiser (eds.), <i>The Proceedings of the 23rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics</i> , (pp. 265–278). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.	989 990 991 992
Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection. In: Samuel Keyser and Ken Hale (eds), <i>The view From Building 20</i> , pp. 111–76. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.	993 994 995

Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz. 1994. Some key features of distributed morphology.	996
In: Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley and Tony Bures (eds), MIT Working Papers In	997
Linguistics 21: Papers on Phonology And Morphology, pp. 275–88. Cambridge,	998
Mass.: MIT Press.	999
Halle, Morris. 1990. An approach to morphology. Proceedings of NELS, 20, 150–	1000
185.	1001
Halle, Morris. 1997. Distributed Morphology: Impoverishment and Fission. MIT	1002
Working Papers in Linguistics, 30, 425-449.	1003
Harley, Heidi. 1994. Hug a tree: Deriving the morphosyntactic feature hierarchy. In	1004
Andrew Carnie and Heidi Harley (eds), MITWPL 21: Papers on phonology and	1005
morphology, (pp. 275-288). Cambridge: MITWPL.	1006
	1007
Harley, Heidi. 2014. On the identity of roots. Theoretical Linguistics 40 (3), 225-276.	1008
	1009
Harris, James. 1997. Why <i>n'ho</i> is pronounced [li] in Barceloni Catalan. In Benjamin	1010
Bruening, Yoonjung Kang and Martha McGinnis (eds), MITWPL 30: Papers at the	1011
Interface (pp. 451-479). Cambridge: MITWPL.	1012
Haspelmath, Martin. 2002. Understanding Morphology. New York: Oxford	1013
University Press.	1014
Haspelmath, Martin and the APiCS Consortium. 2013. Functions of reduplication. In	1015
Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath, Magnus Huber (eds.)	1016
The Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures. Oxford: Oxford University	1017
Press.	1018
Haugen, Jason D. 2008. Morphology at the interfaces. Reduplication and Noun	1019
Incorporation in Uto-Aztecan. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing	1020
Company.	1021
Haugen, Jason D. 2010. Review of John Frampton's Distributed Reduplication.	1022
Language 86(4): 953-957.	1023
	1024
Haugen, Jason D. 2011. Reduplication in Distributed Morphology. In Proceedings of	1025
the 4th Arizona Linguistics Circle Conference (ALC 4), ed. by Jessamyn Schertz,	1026
Alan Hogue, Dane Bell, Dan Brenner, and Samantha Wray, 1–27. Coyote Papers 18.	1027
Tucson: University of Arizona, Department of Linguistics.	1028
Haugen, Jason D. 2016. Readjustment: Rejected? In: Danial Siddiqi and Heidi Harley	1029
(eds), <i>Morphological Metatheory</i> , pp. 303-342. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John	1030
Benjamins Publishing Company.	1031
Haugen, Jason D. and Heidi Harley. 2010. Head-marking inflection and the	1032
architecture of grammatical theory: Evidence from reduplication and compounding in	1033
Hiaki (Yaqui). Ms, Oberlin College and the University of Arizona.	1034

Hayes, Bruce. 2009. <i>Introductory phonology</i> . Blackwell Publishing.	1035
Healey, Phyllis M. 1960. <i>An Agta grammar</i> . Manila: Republic of the Philippines Bureau of Printing.	1036 1037 1038
Inkelas, Sharon and Cheryl Zoll. 2005. <i>Reduplication: Doubling in Morphology</i> . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.	1039 1040
Kastner, Itamar. 2019. Templatic morphology as an emergent property: Roots and functional heads in Hebrew. <i>Natural Language and Linguistic Theory</i> , 37(2), 571-619.	1041 1042 1043
Kim, Eun-sook. 2008. Multiple Patterns of Reduplication in Nuuchahnulth: A Templatic Approach. <i>Second Language Research</i> , 44(1): 63-94.	1044 1045
Kiparsky, Paul. 1973. Elsewhere in phonology. In Stephen Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, <i>A Festschrift for Morris Halle</i> , pp. 93-106. New York: Holt.	1046 1047
Kirchner, Jesse Saba. 2013. Minimal reduplication and reduplicative exponence. <i>Morphology</i> , 23(1), 227-243.	1048 1049
Kouwenberg, Silvia & Darlene LaCharité. 2005. Less is more: Evidence from diminutive reduplication in Caribbean Creole languages. In Bernhard Hurch (ed.), <i>Studies on Reduplication</i> , pp. 533-546. Berlin & New York: Mouton De Gruyter.	1050 1051 1052
Kramer, Ruth. 2006. Root and pattern morphology in Coptic: Evidence for the root. In Colin Davis, Amy Rose Deal, and Youri Zabbal (eds), <i>Proceedings of NELS 36</i> , (pp. 399–412). Amherst, MA: GLSA	1053 1054 1055 1056
Maas, Utz. 2005. Syntactic reduplication in Arabic. In Hurch Bernhard (ed), <i>Studies on Reduplication</i> (pp. 395-430). Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.	1057 1058
Marantz, Alec. 1995. “Cat” as a phrasal idiom: consequences of late insertion in Distributed Morphology. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.	1059 1060
Marantz, Alec. 1997. Cat as a phrasal idiom: Stem suppletion, or the arbitrariness of the sign. Paper presented at the Université de Paris VIII.	1061 1062
Marantz, Alec. 2007. Phases and words. In Sook-Hee Choe (ed), <i>Phases in the theory of grammar</i> , pp. 191–222. Seoul: Dong In.	1063 1064
McCarthy, John J. and Alan Prince. 1995. Faithfulness and reduplicative identity. In Beckman, Jill, Laura Walsh Dickey and Suzanne Urbanczyk (eds.) <i>Papers in Optimality Theory</i> . University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18. Amherst: University of Massachusetts. pp. 249-384.	1065 1066 1067 1068
Mielke, Jeff. 2008. <i>The Emergence of Distinctive Features</i> . Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.	1069 1070
Ngunga, Armindo. 2000. <i>Phonology and Morphology of the Ciyao Verb</i> . Stanford: California, CSLI Publications.	1071 1072

Noyer, Rolf. 1997. Features, Positions and Affixes in Autonomous Morphological Structure. Garland Publishing, New York. .	1073 1074 1075
Noyer, Rolf. 1998. Impoverishment theory and morphosyntactic markedness. In Steve Lapointe, Diane K. Brentari, and Patrick Farrell (eds), Morphology and its relation to phonology and syntax (pp. 264-285). Stanford: CSLI.	1076 1077 1078
Pesetsky, David. 1995. Zero Syntax: Experiencers and Cascades. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.	1079 1080
Pfau, Roland. 2000. Features and categories in language production. PhD Dissertation, Frankfurt am Main: Johann Wolfgang Goethe University .	1081 1082
Pfau, Roland. 2009. Grammar as processor: a distributed morphology account of spontaneous speech errors. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.	1083 1084
Procházka, Stephan. 1993. Some remarks on the semantic function of the reduplicated quadrilateral verbs (structure fa3fa3a). In Devenyi, Kinga, and Tamas Ivanyi (eds.), Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Lexicology and Lexicography 1, pp. 97-103. Budapest: Eotvos Lorand University & Csoma de Koros Society.	1085 1086 1087 1088
Raimy, Eric. 2000. The Phonology and Morphology of Reduplication. Berlin-New York: Nouton de Gruyter.	1089 1090
Rekanga, J. P. 1989. Essai de Grammaire Gunu. PhD dissertation. Universite Libre de Bruxelles.	1091 1092
Rudy, Stephen. 1988. Major Works 1976-1980: Completion (vol. 1). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.	1093 1094
Ryding, Karin. 2005. A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.	1095 1096
Schwaiger, Thomas. 2018. The derivational nature of reduplication: Towards a Functional Discourse Grammar account of a non-concatenative morphological process. Word Structure, 11(1), 118-144.	1097 1098 1099
Shaw, Patricia A. 1980. Theoretical Issues in Dakota Phonology and Morphology. New York: Garland Publishing.	1100 1101
Shaw, Patricia A. 2004. Reduplicant order and identity: Never trust a Salish CVC either?. In Dale Kinkade, Donna Gerdts & Lisa Matthewson (Eds.), Studies in Salish linguistics in honor of M. Dale Kinkade. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics (Vol. 17). Missoula, MT: University of Montana.	1102 1103 1104 1105 1106
Siddiqi, Daniel. 2009. Syntax within the Word: Economy, Allomorphy, and Argument Selection in Distributed Morphology. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.	1107 1108 1109

Sproat, Richard. 1985. On deriving the lexicon. PhD, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.	1110
Tucker, Matthew. 2011. The Morphosyntax of the Arabic verb: Toward a unified syntax-prosody. In Morphology at Santa Cruz: Papers in Honor of Jorge Hankamer.	1111
Santa Cruz, CA: Linguistics Research Center Publications.	1112
	1113
Wallace, Katherine. 2013. A Concatenative Approach to Semitic Templatic Morphology. Ms., NYU. lingbuzz/002299.	1114
	1115
Watanabe, Honore. 1994. A Report on Sliammon (Mainland Comox) Phonology and Reduplication. MA thesis, Hokkaido University.	1116
	1117
Watson, Janet C. E. 2002. Phonology and morphology of Arabic. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.	1118
	1119
Zukoff, Sam. 2012. The Phonology of Verbal Reduplication in Ancient Greek: An Optimality Theory Approach. MA thesis, University of Georgia.	1120
	1121
	1122
	1123
	1124
	1125
	1126
	1127
	1128
	1129