

## **The Syntax of Reduplication\***

Lisa deMena Travis

McGill University

### **1 Introduction**

Since Marantz (1982) argued that reduplicative affixes behave morphologically like other affixes, the process of reduplication has been considered the domain of phonologists (see e.g. McCarthy and Prince 1986). In fact we can say that reduplication is central to phonology since it can be used as a probe into the nature of prosodic units and into specific theoretical processes. In this paper I want to take a very different view of reduplication. I will start by arguing that some cases of reduplication must be handled in the syntax but I will conclude that all cases of reduplication are created by syntactic structures. What will remain the same is that reduplication can be used as a probe into the nature of structure as well as the nature of grammatical computation, but this structure will be both syntactic and phonological in nature.

I will mainly be arguing that there are three types of reduplication, though at the end of the paper I will suggest that there is a fourth type to be investigated. The three types that I will be discussing are created by the three different types of syntactic environments given in (1) below.

---

\* Given that reduplication is not central to the research I generally do, I am thankful to those who supplied me crucial data and relevant background information. Those that stand out are Mark Baker, Jonathan Bobaljik, Bill Davies, Jila Ghomeshi, Heather Goad, Lotus Goldberg, Nino Gulli, Jeff Lidz, Diane Massam, Glyne Piggott, Doug Pulleyblank, Jeannot-Fils Ranaivoson, Susi Wurmbrand, audiences at AFLA VI, CLA 2000, SUNY-Potsdam, and the McGill Syntax Projects. This research was supported by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (410-98-0452).