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Veronika Mattes’s volume is a revised and expanded version of her dissertation submitted to the University of Graz in 2007. It is a culmination of an extensive literature review of multiple Philippine languages and two fieldwork trips to the Bikol Peninsula, supported by two reduplication projects at the University of Graz and the University of Bremen.

The Bikol Peninsula of Southeastern Luzon Island, Philippines, is home to a variety of Austronesian dialects collectively referred to as ‘Bikol(ano)’. All dialects of this language, as well as sister Philippine languages, are particularly rich in both inflectional and derivational reduplication. The analysis in this book mostly stems from the Legazpi dialect in which recordings of spontaneous speech and elicitation sessions were collected. In addition to the corpus M generated, she extracted all reduplicated forms attested in Mintz and Del Rosario Britancio’s (1985) dictionary and verified every entry with at least two speakers.

The book is divided into six chapters and an appendix. Ch. 1 sets the stage for M’s interest in the topic and outlines the format of the book. Ch. 2 provides a grammar sketch of the Bikol language aimed at helping the reader maneuver through the copious examples throughout the book. In Ch. 3, M discusses reduplication in general, defining the topic with respect to the scope of her analysis. In Chs. 4 and 5, M presents the results of her study, productive reduplication in Ch. 4 and lexicalized reduplication in Ch. 5. In Ch. 6, she provides a synopsis of the major issues, then details the corpora and fieldwork annotations in the appendix.

Of particular value to this volume is her excellent treatment of Bikol phonology and morphosyntax. This includes an introduction to the Bikol phoneme inventory and morphophonemic processes the readers must understand to navigate the examples. These include nasal assimilation, stress, *h*-epenthesis, and the status of the phonemes /t/ and /l/. Her examples are written in a current orthography that has not been universally standardized.

In her treatment of the Bikol lexicon, M introduces the concept of an open class of categorically indistinct content words, mostly disyllabic in nature, from which both nouns and verbs can be derived via morphological processes, and a closed class of function words. Following Naylor (2006) and Himmelmann (2007), M justifies considering bare roots in Bikol to be ontological nominals that must derive verbal meanings by affixation of tense/aspect/modality (TAM) markers or voice morphology. Her analysis of Bikol grammatical relations is largely adopted from Himmelmann 1987, where the syntactically privileged argument with respect to the predicate is called the ‘predicate base’, referred to by various terms by other linguists, including subject/nominative argument, pivot, absolutive argument, focus, and trigger. The term ‘predicate base’ has not stuck for Philippine languages. Even Himmelmann (2007) has reverted to using the term ‘subject’, although other terms may more adequately cover this concept without discourse or syntactic implications, for example, Lehmann’s (1984:355) Ausrichtungsmarkierung ‘orientation/alignment marking’ and Rubino’s (2006) ‘orientation’.

Bikol is categorized as an agglutinating language with some inflectional features like syncretism and fusion. It is a predicate-initial language with no copula, no agreement marking, and no grammatical gender. M succinctly and accurately summarizes Bikol syntax as having an ‘alternating sequence of content and function words. Each argument is preceded by a phrase marker and each marker is connected with its head by a linker’ (17–18).

Inflectional reduplication is immediately apparent in the paradigms M illustrates in her discussion of voice and TAM morphology. An interesting part of her study for Philippine specialists concerns the omission of TAM and voice morphology ‘when the speaker and addressee share enough background knowledge’ (22–23). This insight offers a refreshing perspective rarely seen from grammarians and typologists who do not feed their analyses from spontaneous spoken discourse data.

The grammatical analysis closes with a word on derivational affixes and a section on nonobligatory number marking. M discusses three different mechanisms that indicate plurality, two of them involving reduplication: the free form *mga* (pronounced [maŋá]), which serves as ‘the gen-
eral plural marker for actions, things, states, etc. that can be associated with any kind of word form or phrase’ (27); infixal \{Vr\} reduplication for plural actors, undergoers, or experiencers; and full reduplication ‘for plurality of the action or the property itself’ (27). M indicates that words without plural marking are neutral with respect to number. Plural marking is used as a derivational means of emphasizing or disambiguating the plurality of entities, events, or states. In the following example (from p. 27), the plurality of fish is not marked by \(mga\) or the predicate of the first sentence, but is overtly reinforced in the predicate of the second sentence.

(1) \(\text{Nag-mata su sira’. Nag-r\{al\}ampaw sa dagat.}\)

\(\text{begn.agent.voice-wake PB.spec fish beg.av-}[\text{pl}].\text{jump.over LOC sea}\)

‘The fish woke up. (They) jumped over the sea.’

In Ch. 3, M defines the scope of her study, affirming that Bikol has all of the types of reduplication mentioned in previous studies, that is, lexical and productive reduplication and pure reduplication, as well as reduplication in combination with fixed segments (affix-reduplicant hybrids). She shows that ‘lexical and productive, grammatical and extragrammatical reduplication have quite a number of similarities … [and] should be included in a universally valid concept of reduplication’ (33). Three phenomena are excluded in her study: (i) phonological/prosodic doubling, (ii) syntactic repetition, and (iii) recursive affixation such as the German \(ur-\) prefixation \(ur\cdot ur\cdot\) \(\text{großmutter} ‘\text{great-great-grandmother’.}\)

M exemplifies reduplication types on both the formal and functional levels (Rubino 2005) and shows how Bikol has a rich inventory compared to other related languages. Bikol has exact reduplication and reduplication with fixed segments, for example, \(-Vr\)- and \(\text{Culu}\)-, which vary on the productivity spectrum from completely fossilized to highly productive. M also reports that reduplicated words denoting sounds (see Rubino 2001) are also rarely used by younger speakers in urban environments. M proposes that Spanish and English might be responsible to a certain degree for the reduction of reduplication, providing evidence of how the Bikol and Tagalog comparative construction uses the Spanish calque with \(mas\) as opposed to the reduplicative constructions found in some Northern Luzon languages.

Formally speaking, Bikol distinguishes five productive reduplication types: (i) \(CV\)-reduplication for imperfective aspect, (ii) infixal \(-Vr\)-reduplication for plural (with alternative \(CV\)-reduplication for \(ma\)- derivations), (iii) initial \(CV\)-reduplication on numbers with a limiting function, (iv) full reduplication, and (v) \(\text{Curu}\)-reduplication, the latter two forms being highly polysemous, reflecting plurality, imitation, attenuation, diminution, and so on. M also characterizes a separate kind of full reduplication with a restricted domain, constrained by root type. This type of reduplication, used for intensification, can only be applied to bisyllabic bases with the structure \(C_1V_1C_2V_2(C_3)\). M observes that ‘all these reduplicative types can be combined with each other and with other affixations multiple times’ (61).

M provides her readers not only with well-documented descriptions of Bikol reduplication as it is used today, but also with diachronic evidence of certain inflectional forms. She contrasts the \(CV\)-reduplicant used in imperfective Bikol reduplication with its CVC-counterpart in Northern Luzon languages, preserved from Proto-Extra Formosan, and introduces the debate about the \(CV\)-reduplicant’s origin. Her discussion of the plural actor infix reduplicant \(-Vr\)- helps to affirm a typological characteristic that infixed consonants are usually sonorants or liquids, since the other two infixes in Bikol involve nasal consonants, for example, \(-in\)- and \(-um\)-.

Bikol contrasts with the more widely studied Tagalog in that it has two reduplicants with ‘fixed segmentism’, where the reduplicative morpheme contains segments that are invariant rather than copied. These affixes are the plural actor \(-Vr\)-infix and the plural/diminutive \(\text{Curu}\)-prefix, where the base-initial consonant is copied, followed by \(uru\).

M employs the term ‘pluractional’ to describe the function of full reduplication, as opposed to verbal or nominal plurality. Pluractional subsumes iterativity, reversativity, and distributivity, as well as the diminutive nuance. Full reduplication encodes plurality of the events themselves as opposed to plurality ‘in’ the events expressed by imperfective \(CV\)-reduplication or the \(-Vr\)-morpheme expressing the plurality of actors. She shows how fully reduplicated forms are subject to all other morphological and syntactic procedures. They undergo regular affixation and can appear in any syntactic position. She refers to Hurch’s (2005:719) concept of ‘preventive dissimilation’
when discussing the phonotactic constraints on full reduplication. Full reduplication is blocked by bases consisting of three or more syllables, bisyllabic bases with initial or internal consonant sequences, and bases consisting of two identical syllables, citing the three lexicalized exceptions found in Mintz 2004: lambi’-lambi’ ‘wattle, flesh hanging down from the throat or head of fowl’, parte-parte ‘proportionally’, and samba-samba ‘praying mantis’. M also speculates that Bikol speakers may be reanalyzing the Curu-prefix as \( CV_{ru} \) or \( CV_{r}V \), citing instances where her consultants accept variants such as bara-banggi and baru-banggi for the regular form buru-banggi ‘every night’.

M could not confirm Mintz’s (1971) assertion that there are prosodic variations with full reduplication that correspond to different meanings; however, she does brilliantly illustrate how Bikol speakers disambiguate this polysemy through context and the use of particles. Mintz (1971:149–50) posits different stress patterns for intensive and diminutive repetition of ‘adjectives’. Intensive repetition puts the main stress on the first syllable of the second constituent (gútom-gútom ‘very hungry’, panó’-pánó ‘very full’), whereas diminutive repetition has a parallel accent pattern (búta-búta ‘feigning blindness’, bangóg-bangóg ‘feigning deafness’). Although varying stress patterns were attested in the data, no systematic prosodic distinction of meanings could be observed.

M provides us with an impressive treatment of the nature of the reduplicative patterns in Philippine languages, of iconicity, and of the distribution of both numeric and semantic reduplication types. The appendix includes copious examples classified and exemplified in six different ways: bisyllabic reduplicated roots, lexical partial reduplication, lexical full reduplication, echo words, productive partial reduplication, and productive full and Curu-reduplication. In her investigation of reduplicated forms in the Mintz and Del Rosário Britanico (1985) dictionary, M collected a substantial amount of data that can be applied to improve existing Bikol dictionaries.

The book concludes with possible further research directions, including a longer-term study of L1 acquisition of a complex reduplicative system and a larger-scale systematic crosslinguistic study of reduplication. Scholars interested in reduplicative phenomena, and Philippine languages in general, are highly encouraged to acquaint themselves with this rich study.
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