CHAPTER 3

Reduplication in Andean Languages

Katja Hann§ and Pieter Muysken

The goal of the paper is to discuss typological similarities and differences in an areally defined sample of languages, the Andean languages, with respect to reduplication. After giving a definition of reduplication and presenting and justifying our sample, we first compare their formal features, then compare their functional features, and finally discuss degrees of similarity and differences using an areal and typological approach. In our final section some Neighbor-Net examples are presented in support of this.

1 Introduction

For the following description of reduplication strategies in Andean languages, we apply the definition of reduplication as proposed by the Graz Reduplication Project at http://reduplication.uni-graz.at/:

a reduplicative construction is a set of at least two linguistic forms F and F’ in a paradigmatic, i.e. non-suppletive morphological relation in which F’ contains a segment or a sequence of segments, which is derived from a non-recursive repetition of (a part of) F. Reduplication exists if a specific grammatical form makes systematic use of reduplicative constructions.

As the overall goal of the paper is to discuss typological similarities and differences in a specific sample of languages with respect to reduplication, we will begin our article with an overview of formal reduplication features in the languages under consideration. In section 2.1, we will discuss full reduplication of lexical roots, thereby also addressing the behavior of grammatical markers in reduplication, before turning to instances of partial reduplication in section 2.2. In the following section 3, we will present functional features of reduplication, starting with a discussion of iconic features of reduplication (see section

---

1 This particular definition is used in all contributions to this volume and, in accordance with that, we, too, adopt it for the present paper.
before proceeding to some less iconic functions in section 3.2. We will conclude our paper with a comparison of both formal and functional reduplication features and we will discuss language clusters that arise from this typological approach to reduplication (see section 4).

Apart from proposing language clusters based on typological similarities and differences with regard to reduplication features, one of the more specific outcomes of the article is the suggestion that reduplication patterns may be linked to the typological organization of a language (see section 2.2). Another outcome is the claim that neither Aymara nor closely related Jaqaru make productive use of partial reduplication, as is proposed in the *World Atlas of Language Structures* online (WALS). Instead, it is suggested that both languages have only full reduplication (see section 2.2). Finally, we argue that reduplication in the Andean languages is not the default mechanism to convey a certain meaning, which, instead, is affixation, but that reduplication often bears a particular connotation and is used to express e.g. a special type of plural.

The linguistic data for the present paper is mainly taken from the literature. Among the main works are Adelaar (1977) on Tarma Quechua and Hogg (2004) on the Cuzco variety, Hardman's work (1966; 1974; 1983; 1986) on Aymara and Jaqaru as well as the research of Adelaar and van de Kerke on Pukina as published in 2009 and via the webpage of Leiden University (see [http://www.unileiden.net/ore/](http://www.unileiden.net/ore/)). For Cholón, we relied mainly on the dissertation of Alexander-Bakkerus (2005), while for Leko we referred to van de Kerke (2009). Information on Shuar was provided by Beuchat and Rivet (1909) and Gnerre (1999). Finally, the data for Kallawaya and Uru were taken from the authors' own research (see Hannß 2008, on Uru; Hannß and Muysken, in prep., on Kallawaya). General works on Andean and Amerindian languages include Adelaar and Muysken (2004) and *Lenguas de Bolivia*, edited by Crevels and Muysken (2009). We are aware of the fact that a fuller account of the members of the Quechua language family is ideally needed since the family harbors more variation than we can show here. Furthermore, a number of other languages from the area have not been treated here, notably Mochica, Atacameño and Mapuche (on Mapuche, see Zúñiga and Díaz-Fernández, this volume). However, we hope that the survey presented here is already interesting in its own right.

Please note that this enumeration is by no means exhaustive and does not cover every single work used for our database. For a complete overview, please see the works in the list of references below.