This is a collection of six papers on reduplication found in languages in and around Indonesia. Early versions of these papers were read and discussed at the two meetings of the research project ‘Descriptive Studies on Indonesian Languages: their variety and similarities’, held in ILCAA, TUFS in 2010 and 2011. The papers deal with languages from various parts of Indonesia and Papua New Guinea. See Map 1 for the areas in which each language or group of languages is spoken.

The first two papers by Utsumi and Inagaki provide an exhaustive description of reduplication in Bantik and Kadorih respectively. These are both understudied languages on which no substantial research has been conducted. The papers are the result of the authors’ extensive field research.

Miyake and Nose deal with Javanese and Tok Pisin respectively. These two languages are relatively well-documented, and already have dictionaries and reference grammars. However, these papers are the first to investigate the functions of reduplication in them based on written sources and their own data.

Yamaguchi’s paper collects data from 12 languages belonging to five language groups, mainly taken from publications of the Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa (Institute for Development and Advancement of Languages) and its regional branch offices in South Sulawesi. He points out that noun reduplication signals diminution in most of the Sulawesi languages (two exceptions being Ledo Kaili and Wotu, in which reduplicated nouns only indicate plurality and variety), whereas this function is not observed in Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia).

Shiohara and Furihata’s paper does not deal with reduplication itself, but examines an infix that indicates plurality. In other Indonesian languages, as shown by the other five papers in this collection, plurality is often indicated by morphological reduplication.

Discussion on the function of morphological reduplication is often made in relation to iconicity, namely, a link between the form and meaning. Cross-linguistically, reduplicated words often indicate a meaning such as plurality, iterative, or intensivity, and that is often analyzed as a reflection of the augmentation of the form (Moravcsik 1978). This is the case in most of the languages dealt with here; for example, a reduplicated noun in Bantik
and a repeated noun in Kadorih indicates plurality, a reduplicated adjective indicates comparative/excessive or plurality in Bantik, intensification or plurality in Javanese, a reduplicated verb indicates plurality of the actor or iterative in Bantik, and a repetitive or continuous aspect in Tok Pisin. However, the opposite function, which can be considered as diminution, is also observed in some languages, such as Kadorih, Javanese, and languages in South Sulawesi.

Reduplication in some languages exhibits functions that are idiosyncratic to the individual language, and this seems to be outside the semantic axis of augmentation/diminution, at least synchronically. For example, a type of verb reduplication is employed in nominalization (e.g. t-a-turubuʔ ‘blanket, cover’ < -turubuʔ ‘cover, close (verb base)’) in Bantik, and a reduplicated word, when it occurs in the sentence initial, indicates concession and/or reproof in Javanese. In these cases, the employment of morphological reduplication seems to be as arbitrary as that of any other linguistic forms, such as affixes or functional words in each language and in other languages.

The papers by Inagaki, Miyake, and Nose target a phenomenon broader than what is generally referred to as morphological reduplication; they deal with not only reduplication as a derivational process, but also a wider range of ‘doubled’ words. Inagaki focuses on the phonological nature of doubled words (duplicated words, as he puts it) in Kadorih. He distinguishes two types of duplication, namely reduplication and repetition, and argues that the former process produces a prosodic word, and the latter forms a phonological or intonational phrase. Prominent in Kadorih is that the latter type of process functions as an indicator of plurality or intensification, and these are typical cross-linguistic functions of morphological reduplication. In Kadorih, when applied to a verb or adjective base, the repetition functions as a device to indicate plural participants and intensification (e.g. meseu meseu ‘(plural actors) paddle’, mosom mosom ‘(very) sour (for many kinds of food)’), while, when applied to a noun base, both types of duplication play a similar function denoting plural entities; patio-pation and pation pation both denote ‘plural stars’, for example.

Miyake and Nose cite the existence of a considerable number of doubled words that are derived from an unattested morpheme (one that cannot be used as an independent word) in Javanese and Tok Pisin, respectively. (This type of doubled word is often called ‘imitative reduplication’ in Indonesian (Sneddon et al. 2010: 25-26). Nose labels it ‘repetition’.) Nose shows that the (ordinary) reduplicated form is often derived from English-based verbs, and that repetition forms are indigenous language-based nouns.

The papers collected here illustrate various aspects of each language, such as its phonology, morphology and syntax by investigating reduplication. They also contribute to a cross-linguistic study of reduplication by providing exhaustive descriptions of
reduplication and related phenomena in each language. Observing the various and intricate functions exhibited in the morphological reduplication of each language will help us guard against making typological generalization regarding this phenomenon.
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Map 1  Geographical distribution of the languages discussed in this issue