

Prosodies in Tohono O’odham Reduplication

In this paper, I show that the Tohono O’odham language makes use of every prosodic shape argued for in many accounts of prosodic morphology and shows evidence for certain patterns attested in other languages, such as a “filler” consonant, vowel lengthening, and consonant lengthening. The complication in all this is that there are several subpatterns that have at least two possible analyses in terms of which is the base and which is the reduplicant. This paper clarifies where such ambiguity occurs, as well as the implications for that in a description of the language, as well as theoretical models of reduplication. The end result is that we have a more detailed notion of the reduplicative processes in Tohono O’odham, a positive outcome augmenting the many studies focusing on plural reduplication (Hill and Zepeda 1992, 1998; Fitzgerald 2000; Miyashita 2004; Riggle 2006).

Plural reduplication has been the focus of most studies in reduplication. However, as Hill and Zepeda (1998) and Miyashita (2004) show, the “norm” in reduplication is complicated by the fact that the basic pattern of reduplicating a CV/C also allows for “heavy” plurals (vowel lengthening, so CV: as the reduplicant) and “collateral” reduplication (two syllable or foot reduplication). The data in (1) illustrates this; (1a) represents the basic pattern, (1b) heavy plurals, (1c) collateral reduplication (with its ambiguous analysis), and (1d) distributive reduplication with consonant gemination.

(1)	<u>Base</u>	<u>Reduplication</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
a.	kúí tókǵ	kú-kui tó-tǵi	'mesquite tree' 'cotton'
b.	máḍ táḍ	má:-maḍ tá:-taḍ	'woman's child' 'foot'
c.	kadó:di	kakdódodi	'marble (Sp, ágata)
d.	<u>hódai</u>	hóhhodài	'rock, stone'

The forms in (1a-b) illustrate the reduplicant having the shape of a syllable and a heavy syllable. The first form in (1c) suggests two possible analyses for the reduplicated portion, the medial contiguous string, kaka|sǵisida or a noncontiguous string kaka|sǵisida. This neatly illustrates the analytic problem. Note that the competing analyses also offer differing loci of reduplication: prefixal vs. infixal (cf. Riggle 2006).

The differing prosodies employed in Tohono O’odham reduplication inform us about the phonological structure of the language overall. This paper will sort out these conflicting notions and see how they assist in a description and analysis of the language, thus providing a broader frame of reference for deciding prefixation versus infixation, and contiguous versus noncontiguous reduplicants.