In this squib I discuss an unusual type of reduplication in which the reduplicant varies not only in terms of its phonemic composition but also in terms of its prosodic shape. The variability in the shape of the reduplicant results from a grammar that does not impose any constraint particular to the shape of the reduplicant per se. Further, I demonstrate that even in cases where the reduplicant is shape invariant, this shape may also arise from a grammar that does not impose a constraint on the form of the reduplicant. In both cases all relevant aspects of the reduplicant’s realization arise from constraints that apply to the language in general.

1 Templatic Reduplication

In the theory of word formation, the program of Prosodic Morphology (McCarthy and Prince 1986) has established that grammatical categories, usually in the domain of root-and-pattern and reduplicative morphology, are often expressed by invariant prosodic shapes or templates. The central claim of the program, known as the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis, is that these ‘‘[t]emplates are defined in terms of the authentic units of prosody: mora (µ), syllable (σ), foot (F), prosodic word (PrWd)’’ (McCarthy and Prince 1995b:318).

There are two well-documented species of templatic specification: templatic specification of the affix and templatic specification of the base. Templatic specification of the affix is found in ordinary reduplication, where the morphology imposes an invariant shape on the reduplicative affix (Marantz 1982). In Ilokano, for example, the morphological category carrying the meaning ‘covered/filled with a Noun’ is expressed by prefixing a reduplicant specified to be a light syllable, as in (1a). Compare this with the heavy syllable template of the reduplicant in the plural, as in (1b). Data are drawn from McCarthy and Prince 1995b; McCarthy and Prince cite Hayes and Abad 1989 as their source.
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(1) a. Affix $\sigma_\mu$. Base $si + \sigma_\mu + base$

- bu.ne$\tilde{n}$ si-bu-bu.ne$\tilde{n}$ 'carrying a buneng'
- jya.ket $\tilde{ }$ si-jya-jya.ket 'wearing a jacket'

b. Affix $\sigma_{\mu u}$. Base $\sigma_{\mu u} + base$

- pu.sa $\tilde{ }$ pus-pu.sa 'cats'
- kal.di$\tilde{n}$ $\tilde{ }$ kal-kal.di$\tilde{n}$ 'goats'

The second species of templatic specification, base templaticism, is illustrated in (2). In forming the plural and diminutive forms of Arabic nouns, the morphology imposes a light-heavy bisyllabic template, an iambic foot, on the (left side of the) singular noun base, as shown by the boldface portions of the forms (McCarthy 1979, 1993, McCarthy and Prince 1990).

(2) Singular | Plural | Diminutive
---|---|---
Hukm | Hakaam | Hukaym ‘judgment’
Inab | Yanab | Yunayb ‘grape’
Shaagil | Sawaagil | Suwaygil ‘engrossing’
Jundub | Janaadib | Junaydib ‘locust’

Note, however, that the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis does not state that every morphological category has a templatic target. Rather, the claim is that if there is a templatic target, then that target should be expressible in terms of the units of prosody. As expected, then, there are also cases where the morphology specifies no template at all. As an illustration, consider the different shapes of some verbal stems in Yawelmani Yokuts, given in (3) (McCarthy and Prince 1995b, Archangeli 1991). The heavy $\sigma$ and iamb foot shapes, shown in the second and third columns, are instances of templaticism imposed on the left side of the output (in boldface).

(3) No template | Heavy $\sigma$ | Lamb
---|---|---
Shapes of biliterals | CVC | CvCvC | CvCvC
- c’um | c’uum | c’uumu ‘devour’
Shapes of triliterals | CvvCC | CvvCC | CvvCC
- Hiwt | Hiwtt | Hiwit ‘walk’

Prince (1990) argues that the system instantiates a third option, the CvC(C) shape shown in the first column, which “is just the minimal prosodic expression of the Yawelmani root” (p. 383). For the verbs that appear in the first column, then, the morphology itself imposes no template at all, a state of affairs known as a-templaticism (McCarthy 1993). Other examples of a-templaticism have been argued to exist in Arabic, Akkadian, Chaha (McCarthy 1993), and Modern Hebrew (Bat-El 1989, 1994).

All examples of a-templaticism reported so far are cases where the morphological constituent with no templatic specification is a (part of a) base. It is interesting to ask whether lack of templatic specification is found with reduplicative affixes as well. A possible case, pointed out by McCarthy (1993), is total reduplication (emphasis in italics mine): ‘The most obvious, almost trivial case of a-templatic prosodic
morphology is total reduplication . . . like the Indonesian plural: harian-
harian ‘newspapers’, keruhasan-keruhasan ‘riots’. In total re-
duplication, unlike partial reduplication, there is copying of segments
but no templatic limitation on the canonical form of the result’’ (p.
190). Note, however, that in total reduplication, although invariance
in the reduplicant’s form cannot be identified in terms of prosodic
units, it could be identified in terms of morphological units: the re-
duplicant is a copy of the morphological constituent ‘‘base’’ or
‘‘stem.’’ This can be expressed formally in various ways, and indeed
total reduplication has sometimes been analyzed as whole-morpheme
reduplication (see, e.g., McCarthy 1982, Marantz 1982).

We must ask then whether there are any nontrivial and more
robust cases of a-templatic reduplication. A genuine instance of what
we seek to identify must be such that no shape invariance of the affix
can be found in terms of either prosodic or morphological units. In
the next section I argue that such cases of a-templatic reduplication
do exist, and I show how the surface properties of these reduplicants
could emerge from the interaction of a small set of simple constraints.

2 A-Templatic Reduplication in Temiar Verbal Morphology

Temiar [tmæer] is one of the main Austroasiatic languages of Malaysia
(Benjamin 1976). It belongs to the Central Aslian (or Senoic) branch
of Mon-Khmer, a group of about twenty languages with rather intricate
morphological systems. In the verbal morphology of Temiar, there
are two aspects, the simulactive (SIM) and continuative (CONT). Each
aspect exhibits two patterns, one for a biconsonantal base and another
for a triconsonantal base (‘‘.’’ stands for syllable boundary; copies of
consonants are shown in boldface). The forms in (4) are in
the active voice.

(4) Biconsonantal Triconsonantal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Base</th>
<th>c₁ vc²</th>
<th>c₁ . c² vc³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kɔɔw</td>
<td>‘to call’</td>
<td>s.łɔɡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gɔl</td>
<td>‘to sit down’</td>
<td>s.маaɲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rec</td>
<td>‘to eat’</td>
<td>s.łuoneksi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Simulfactive</td>
<td>c₁a,c₁ vc²</td>
<td>c₁a,c² vc³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka, kɔɔw</td>
<td></td>
<td>sa.łɔɡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ga, gɔl</td>
<td></td>
<td>sa.маaɲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra, rec</td>
<td></td>
<td>sa.łuconexion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Continuative</td>
<td>c₁c²,c₁ vc²</td>
<td>c₁c³,c² vc³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kw,kɔɔw</td>
<td></td>
<td>sɡ.łɔɡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl,gɔl</td>
<td></td>
<td>şɲ.маaɲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rɲ,rec (Southern Temiar)²</td>
<td></td>
<td>sh.łuconexion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ For past theoretical treatments of Temiar see McCarthy 1982, Broselow
for mine, and abstracting away from the details of their contemporary theoretical
frameworks, all past analyses stipulate the shapes of the Temiar reduplicants
Let us begin by noticing an important property of the simulactive and continuative forms concerning the locus of affixation. In all forms, some affixal material, /a/ in the simulactivs or a copy of a consonant in the continuatives, appears immediately to the left of the final syllable of the base. I propose to capture this robust property of Temiar morphology with a constraint from the Generalized Alignment theory of McCarthy and Prince (1993a), requiring that the right edge of the affix be aligned with the left edge of the stressed syllable of the base, denoted as $\hat{s}$ (stress is always final), as in (5). $\text{Aff}$ ranges over the set \{SIM, CONT\}. ((5) is henceforth called $\alpha$-\textsc{head}, where \textsc{head} is meant to indicate the syllabic head of the PrWd.)

\begin{equation}
(5) \text{ALIGN(Aff, R, } \hat{s}, \text{ L)} \text{ The right edge of an Affix must be aligned with the left edge of the stressed syllable.}
\end{equation}

Two other constraints that I employ in the following analysis are given in (6). They are the two basic constraints that formalize reduplication in the Correspondence Theory of McCarthy and Prince (1995a). $\text{MAX}^{\text{BR}}$ demands copying of all base (B) segments, and $\text{DEP}^{\text{BR}}$ requires every segment in the reduplicant (R) to be a copy of some base segment.

\begin{equation}
(6) \text{MAX}^{\text{BR}} \quad \text{Every segment of B has a correspondent in R.}
\text{DEP}^{\text{BR}} \quad \text{Every segment of R has a correspondent in B.}
\end{equation}

It is to be kept in mind that an independent set of these two constraints holds for the Input/Output correspondence relation, namely, $\text{MAX}^{\text{IO}}$ and $\text{DEP}^{\text{IO}}$. For the development and some applications of Correspondence Theory, see McCarthy and Prince 1995a.

\subsection{Continuative}

Consider first the continuative aspectual paradigm. Two relevant forms, repeated from (4), are $\text{k\textsc{coc}}$w 'to call' $\rightarrow$ $\text{kw.k\textsc{coc}}$w and $\text{s.l\textsc{og}}$ 'to lie down' $\rightarrow$ $\text{sg.l\textsc{og}}$. Clearly, both continuative outputs obey $\alpha$-\textsc{head}: a copied consonant, shown in boldface, always appears aligned with the left edge of the final syllable. In what follows I assume that the continuative affix is lexically specified as a reduplicative morpheme. The goal is to show that this is all that needs to be said about the affix; that is, no template is necessary.

An interesting observation about the continuative patterns is that only consonants are copied; that is, the vocalism of the base is never copied. This reflects a well-known property of Temiar and of Mon-Khmer languages in general, whereby full vowels are disallowed in prefinal positions. I return to the formal expression of this property by positing templates. I am not interested here in comparing past analyses with the present one. See Gafos 1995 for explicit comparisons.

\footnote{Voiceless stops do not occur as codas of prefinal syllables because they become voiced in Northern and nasalized in Southern Temiar (Benjamin 1976: 143). See Gafos 1995 for relevant discussion.}
below. First, some examples of words containing vowelless prefinal syllables, also known as ‘minor’ syllables as opposed to the unique final stressed ‘major’ syllable of each word, are given in (7b–f). The form in (7a) consists of just a major syllable. In the rest of the forms, the segments parsed in minor syllables appear in boldface.

\[(7) \begin{align*}
    &a. \text{deek} & \text{‘house’} \\
    &b. \text{t.lek} & \text{‘to teach’} \\
    &c. \text{br.caa?} & \text{‘to feed’} \\
    &d. \text{cb.niib} & \text{‘going’} \\
    &e. \text{sn.g.log} & \text{‘knot’} \\
    &f. \text{k.rn.waak} & \text{‘frame’}
\end{align*}\]

Minor syllables have a simple structure. They can consist of one or two consonants: C, as in (7b), or CC, as in (7c). According to Benjamin (1976), in the former case the C is the onset of the syllable, and in the latter case the first C is the onset and the second C is the coda (complex onsets and codas are disallowed). Following standard representational assumptions and adopting the terminology of Prince and Smolensky (1993:sec. 6.2), I assume that syllables always have a daughter Nuc node: the universally undominated constraint Nuc (‘Syllables must have nuclei’) enforces the presence of the Nuc position. I also follow Prince and Smolensky in assuming that the Nuc position may be empty, as is the case with minor syllables in Temiar. For example, the minor syllable .br. is composed of an Ons node associated to /b/, an empty Nuc node, and a Cod node associated to /r/.

Returning to the Mon-Khmer generalization that full vowels are disallowed in prefinal syllables, it suffices, for current purposes, to assume the constraint *PREFINAL-V in (8), which simply states that generalization. This generalization is just another instance of the tendency of languages to reduce the number of vowel contrasts in unstressed positions. See Hayes 1995:23 for a list of representative languages, and also Steriade 1995, Beckman 1995, and—specifically for the Southeast Asian languages Burmese, Kammu, and Temiar—Gafos 1996b for proposals on how to express such generalizations formally. I emphasize that *PREFINAL-V is used as a cover name for the set of constraints that may lie behind the Temiar and Mon-Khmer generalization.

---

3 Temiar and other Senoic languages (like Semai and Jah-Hut) share the property, not found in the rest of Mon-Khmer, of having a large number of bisyllabic words with phonologically specified penultimate vowels (e.g., halab ‘to go downriver’, sindul ‘to float’, Benjamin 1976:170). These verbs show an impoverished morphology, their combinatorial possibilities being limited to the prefixation of a clitic (e.g., bɔ-halab). Nevertheless, they are lexical exceptions to the prosodic regularity expressed by *PREFINAL-V whose proper treatment is a difficult issue, and they will have to remain outside of the scope of the present analysis.
(8) \( \* \text{Prefinal-V} \) Prefinal (= unstressed) vowels are not allowed.

Noting that the continuative affix is invariantly realized in all forms with a copy of at least one base consonant, as in \( sl \cdot log \) derived from \( \{ \text{cont,RED}, sl \cdot log \} \), one might suggest that it should be some sort of consonantal infix. However, this fact is a manifestation of the generalization just pointed out. Indeed, if the affix were realized by a copy of a vowel, a prefinal syllable with a vowel would be created, violating \( \* \text{Prefinal-V} \).

In formal terms, the situation is expressed in tableau (9). Candidate (9a) realizes the affix with a copy of the base vowel \( \alpha \), a violation of \( \* \text{Prefinal-V} \), whereas (9b) attempts to copy everything but the vowel, incurring more violations of another constraint, \textit{Markedness}, than those of the optimal candidate in (9c). \textit{Markedness} can be seen for the moment as a constraint penalizing the mere presence of segments in the output.

(9) Continuative of triconsonantals; \( \* \text{Prefinal-V} \) and \textit{Markedness}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONT\text{RED}, sl \cdot log</th>
<th>* Prefinal-V</th>
<th>Markedness</th>
<th>Max\text{\textsuperscript{nr}}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. sl \cdot log</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. s. lg \cdot log</td>
<td>*******<em>!</em></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. er \cdot sg \cdot log</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the candidate \( s. lg \cdot log \), with the affix unrealized, would best satisfy \textit{Markedness}. This candidate is excluded, however, because of a superordinate constraint, \textit{Real-\( \mu \)}, dictating that the reduplicative morpheme (or any affix) must be realized. An equivalent requirement is implicitly assumed in the “generalized template” approach of McCarthy and Prince (1994), where a generalized templatic requirement is imposed on affixes (and hence on reduplicants as well), as in \textit{Affix} \( \preceq \sigma \). An unrealized reduplicative affix would satisfy this constraint. Thus, the independent constraint \textit{Real-\( \mu \)}, requiring morpheme realization, is necessary. See also Raimy and Idsardi 1997 and Samek-Lodovici 1992 for other analyses that employ an equivalent requirement.

Consider next the continuative biconsonantals, \( kw.k\cdot ow \). In the candidates of tableau (10), the placeholder symbol “-” indicates the position of the minor syllable nucleus so as to make clear the syllabic roles of the copied consonants. For example, in (10a) /\( w \)/ is placed in the coda position of the minor syllable as required by \( \alpha \cdot \text{Head} \). The candidate in (10a) realizes the affix with a copy of a base consonant placed in the coda position of an onsetless syllable, causing a fatal violation of \textit{Ons}. The second candidate, (10b), provides an onset by copying a base consonant but fails to align that consonant with the left edge of the major syllable: /\( k \)/, being in the onset position of its minor syllable, is separated from the left edge of the major syllable.
by the empty Nuc node of the minor (indicated by ‘‘_’’). The optimal candidate in (10c) satisfies both ONS and \( \alpha \)-HEAD by copying two base consonants.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{CONTRED, k\textsubscript{cow}} & \text{ONS} & \text{\( \alpha \)-HEAD} & \text{MARKEDNESS} & \text{MAX\textsubscript{BB}} \\
\hline
a. \_w.k\textsubscript{cow} & \_! & & **** & ** \\
b. k\_k\textsubscript{ow} & \_! & & **** & ** \\
c. \_\_w.k\textsubscript{cow} & & & **** & * \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

2.2 Simulfactive

As with the continuative, I will assume that the simulfactive affix is lexically specified as a reduplicative morpheme, which furthermore includes in its lexical specification (input) the vocalism /a/ (henceforth, a\textsubscript{RED}). I show below that this is all that needs to be said about this affix.

Consider first the simulfactive of biconsonantal bases, \( \{a\text{RED, k\textsubscript{cow}}\} \rightarrow ka.k\text{cow} \) (see (4b)). In contrast to the other simulfactive output of triconsonantal bases, exemplified by \( sa.l\text{og} \), affixation of /a/ in the former is accompanied by a copy of a base consonant. The situation is depicted in tableau (11). The suboptimal candidate in (11) fails to provide an onset for the prefinal syllable. That onset is present in the optimal candidate, incurring an extra Markedness violation.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{a\textsubscript{RED, k\textsubscript{cow}}} & \text{ONS} & \text{MARKEDNESS} & \text{MAX\textsubscript{BB}} \\
\hline
a. a.k\text{cow} & \_! & **** & *** \\
b. \_\_k\text{ak\textsubscript{cow}} & & **** & ** \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

In the case of triconsonantals, shown in tableau (12), ONS is not at stake because the base already contains a consonant that can serve that role. The lower-ranked Markedness is now decisive and suppresses copying of “unnecessary” segments.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{a\textsubscript{RED, s\textsubscript{olg}}} & \text{ONS} & \text{MARKEDNESS} & \text{MAX\textsubscript{BB}} \\
\hline
a. s.la.l\text{og} & & \_! & *** \\
b. \_\_sa.l\text{og} & & **** & **** \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\(^4\) Alignment, then, between the affix and the base syllable is strict in the sense that no syllabic constituent, segmentally filled or empty, may intervene between them.

\(^5\) Evidently *P\text{REFINAL-V} is violated in all simulfactives, which have /a/
This completes the main part of the analysis of the Temiar active aspect morphology. To sum up: The simulfactive and continuative affixes are reduplicative morphemes. The only difference between the two is that the simulfactive affix includes in its lexical specification the vowel /a/. These affixes illustrate precisely the type of affixation we seek: they are reduplicative and have no templatic requirement.

3 Invariance without a Template

It is a striking property of the Temiar affixes that they are realized with copies of isolated segments of the base in various shapes and quantities. The continuative, for instance, copies one or two consonants of the base. No obvious template exists for this affix, and indeed it was shown that no such template is necessary. I now show that even when the shape of the reduplicant is invariant, that fact does not necessarily imply the presence of a template.

I must first elaborate on an aspect of the Temiar analysis that leads to the analytical detail needed for the goals of this section. Recall that in Temiar the constraint ONS is satisfied by copying (e.g., ka.kɔw). An alternative to copying would be epenthesis of an unmarked consonant /ʔ/, as in ʔa.kɔw. The epenthetic glottal stop /ʔ/ would be chosen on the basis of the Markedness Hierarchy (herefore MARKEDNESS), *PL/LAB, *PL/DOR >> *PL/COR >> *PL/PAR (Prince and Smolensky 1993, Smolensky 1993, Lombardi 1996), because it incurs one violation of the lowest-ranked constraint *PL/PAR. Recall, however, that because of the correspondence relation between the reduplicant and the base, the constraint DepBR requires that all segments in the affix have a correspondent in the base. The ranking DepBR >> MARKEDNESS ensures that copying and not epenthesis is the optimal way to provide the prefinal syllable with an onset.\(^6\)

\(^6\) A minor issue is what determines the choice of the copied consonant(s). In all forms where copying takes place, the generalization that stands out is that copied consonants have the same syllabic role as their correspondents in the base, a well-known property of reduplication (Steriade 1988). The constraint responsible for this generalization is S-ROLE, "A segment in the Reduplicant and its correspondent in the Base must have identical syllabic roles" (McCarthy and Prince 1993b), which I assume to be undominated in Temiar.

\(^7\) Note that /a/, the segment in the input of the simulfactive affix, has no correspondent in the base; hence, it incurs a violation of DepBR. This implies the ranking MaxAffix >> DepBR, ensuring that /a/ surfaces in the output despite the violation of DepBR.
The final case of reduplicative a-templaticism illustrates a refinement of this ranking schema. The data come from the formation of the Tübatulabal telic stem from the atelic, shown in (13) (Alderete et al. 1996).

(13) **Monosyllabic reduplication in the Tübatulabal telic**

a. pi:ñin → ?i:-pi:ñin ‘he is snoring’
b. pitita → ?i-pitita ‘to turn over’
c. ?o:m → ?o:-?o:m ‘to string beans’
d. to:yan → ?o:-doyan ‘he is copulating’
e. toha → ?o:-doha ‘to hunt’
f. le:win → ?e:-le:win ‘to pack it’

The telic involves partial reduplication, in which the reduplicant is monosyllabic, beginning with a default glottal stop and followed by a copy of the first base vowel. I will focus chiefly on the monosyllabic nature of the reduplicant, putting aside the issue of the voicing alternation in the base-initial C and the vowel length in the reduplicant. Both of these are discussed by Alderete et al. (1996), and if the authors are right in claiming that they are systematic properties of the language, not particular to telic reduplication, then what seems arbitrary about the telic reduplicant is that it begins with a /ʔ/ and that it is always monosyllabic. Especially the latter property would seem to necessitate a templatic analysis (e.g., employing a constraint like \( \text{RED} \leq \sigma \)).

On closer scrutiny, however, the relevant aspects of the telic reduplicant are derivable. There are no on-setless syllables in Tübatulabal; hence, following Alderete et al. (1996), the presence of the consonant in the reduplicant can be attributed to \( \text{ONS} \). However, the means of \( \text{ONS} \) satisfaction are different from those in Temiar. In Tübatulabal the markedness hierarchy is ranked higher than \( \text{DEP}^{BR} \), and more accurately, higher than \( \text{DEP}^{BR} - C \), because the consonant emerges as the default /ʔ/, but the vowel is always a copy of the base vowel: hence the ranking \( \text{DEP}^{BR} - V >> \text{MARKEDNESS} >> \text{DEP}^{BR} - C \), shown in tableau (14) (only the relevant part of the Markedness Hierarchy is shown as the example includes only coronal and glottal consonants). The other rankings in (14), that is, \( \text{ONS} >> \text{MARKEDNESS} >> \text{MAX}^{BR} \), are the same as those met in the Temiar analysis. Finally, for all constraints except \( \text{ONS} \), violations are indicated not by the usual ‘*’ but by the segment incurring the violation. Undominated \( \text{REAL} - \mu \) is not shown in the tableau.

---

8 The analysis departs here from that of Alderete et al., who ascribe the emergence of a default C versus the copying of a V to the ranking \( \text{MAX}^{BR} - V >> \text{MARKEDNESS} >> \text{MAX}^{BR} - C \). This ranking predicts that all vowels of a base are copied in the case of a disyllabic base. For instance, the telic of /toyan/ is falsely predicted to be *[ʔoː]ʔa-doyan]. The analysis in the text solves this problem.
Emergent monosyllabism of the reduplicant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Ons</th>
<th>Dep \textsuperscript{BR}-V</th>
<th>*Cor</th>
<th>*Phar</th>
<th>Dep \textsuperscript{BR}-C</th>
<th>Max \textsuperscript{BR}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. do:-doyan</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>d.y.n</td>
<td>d.y.a,n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. do:-doyan</td>
<td>d!,d.y.n</td>
<td>y,a,n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. do:-doyan</td>
<td>d.y.n</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>d.y.a,n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. do:-doyan</td>
<td>d.y.n</td>
<td>?,!*?</td>
<td>?,?</td>
<td>d.y.n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidate (14a) violates Ons fatally. (14b) incurs a more serious violation of markedness than the optimal (14c); and (14d) loses to (14c) because *Phar \textsuperscript{BR} \gg Max \textsuperscript{BR}. It is the latter ranking that derives the invariantly monosyllabic shape of the reduplicant.\(^9\) To conclude: Invariance in the shape of a reduplicant does not necessarily imply the presence of a corresponding templatic requirement.

### 4 Comparison with Other Approaches

It is worth pointing out some recent interesting proposals of a similar but also crucially different character. Most notably, Urbanczyk (1996a,b), developing proposals by McCarthy and Prince (1994), argues for replacing reduplication-specific templates such as RED = σ by ‘generalized templates’ of two sorts: (a) morphological templates that state whether the reduplicant is an Affix or a Root (RED = Affix or RED = Root), and (b) independent requirements ascribed to Affixes and Roots such as Affix \leq σ. The latter species of constraints, crucially employed in these proposals (e.g., Urbanczyk 1996a:430), states an upper bound on the size of Affix, and hence of the reduplicant as well. Clearly, then, templates are employed. Broadly speaking, however, insofar as these proposals attempt to derive the shapes of reduplicants from independent and presumably language-wide regularities, they concur with the present aims. Nevertheless, the point of the squib should be clear: there are cases of reduplication where no templatic requirement whatsoever is necessary. Such cases are instances of true reduplicant a-templaticism in the same sense of the term as originally coined by McCarthy (1993) for bases.

### 5 Summary and Conclusion

I have argued that there are nontrivial cases of reduplicant a-templaticism, where no templatic requirement is stated on the shape of the reduplicant.

\(^9\) In some cases, the reduplicant surfaces with a coda consonant, as in \textit{\textipa{un-dumu:ga}} ‘to dream’. Alderete et al. analyze these cases by assuming that the coronal nasal is a copy of the base /n/ (place assimilated to the following stop). Though Markedness (here *Cor) \textsuperscript{BR} \gg Max \textsuperscript{BR}, the coronal specification of the nasal is shared with the following stop, and hence no additional violation of *Cor is incurred by copying an extra base consonant. Note the invariance: the reduplicant is always monosyllabic.
reduplicative affix. Furthermore, what seem to be clear cases of templatic reduplication may also reduce to a templaticism. The reductionist approach in deriving a reduplicant’s shape in this squib takes into account constraints of segmental markedness, general constraints on prosody, and an independently necessary morpheme realization constraint (REAL-µ). As one of the reviewers remarks, reduplicant a-templaticism is a large issue. Further work should seek to provide a better estimate of its empirical extent and develop its implications for morphophonology.
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In this squib I present evidence against the syntactic accounts of the second-position effect in Serbo-Croatian (SC) (see, among others, Franks and Progovac 1994, Cavar and Wilder 1994b, Progovac 1996, Roberts 1994, Halpern 1992, 1995, Schütze 1994). Most of these syntactic accounts of the second-position effect crucially assume that in overt syntax SC clitics are found in a cluster adjoined to each other and very high in the tree, allowing enough space for at most one element to precede them. Considering the behavior of SC clitics in VP-ellipsis, I show, however, that in overt syntax clitics need not be adjoined to each other and that each clitic may be located in a separate maximal projection. I further show that these new facts fit nicely into Bošković’s (1995a,b, 1997a,b) account of the second-position effect.
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