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Just like coordination and other parallel structures, echo-reduplication creates a potential environment for affix suspension. If you can echo-reduplicate a unit which includes affixes, these affixes may be added both in the original and in the echo (i), or they may be suspended in one of them – presumably in the original, regularly coming first in this kind of construction (ii).

(i)  STEM-AFFIX  echoSTEM-AFFIX
(ii)  STEM  echoSTEM-AFFIX

For examples from real life consider Bengali (Indo-Aryan, Indo-European), where the echoing unit – a stem, word, or phrase, with this pattern thus circumscribed prosodically rather than morphologically (Fitzpatrick-Cole 1994, 1996) – has a retroflex plosive as its onset:

(1)  i.  ʰbari-r  ᵑari-r
    house-GEN  house-GEN
  ii.  bari  ᵑari-r
    house  house-GEN
    ‘of houses and such’

(2)  i.  mer-e-čʰ-i  ᶟer-e-čʰ-i
    beat-PERF-PRES-1PL  beat-PERF-PRES-1PL
  ii.  mer-e  ᶟer-e-čʰ-i
    beat-PERF  beat-PERF-PRES-1PL
    ‘we have beat (someone) and such’

In the case of case-inflected nouns (1), suspension seems the preferred option, while with tense- and agreement-inflected verbs (2), what follows after the perfective suffix, itself forming part of the stem, can equally well be spelled out or suspended.
Hindi (Indo-Aryan, Indo-European; Keane 2005), on the other hand, appears to categorically resist affix suspension in echo-reduplication (with /v/ as the echoing onset), both of inflectional and of derivational affixes:

(3)  i.  laṛk-e  vaṛk-e  
     boy-PL  boy-PL  
 ii.  *laṛk  vaṛk-e  
     boy  boy-PL  
     ‘boys and such’

(4) i.  laṛak-pan  vaṛak-pan  
     boy-HOOD  boy-HOOD  
 ii.  *laṛak  vaṛak-pan  
     boy  boy-HOOD  
     ‘boyhood and such’

Stems, however, permit suspension:

(5) i.  duudh-vaalaa  vuudh-vaalaa  
     milk-man  milk-man  
 ii.  duudh  vuudh-vaalaa  
     milk  milk-PL  
     ‘milkmen and such’

In the same linguistic area, Kannada (Dravidian; Keane 2007) licenses the suspension of inflectional affixes (6), as well as of derivational ones and of stems in compounds; the fixed segments in echo-reduplication here include both the onset consonant and the vowel./gi(i)/:

(6) i.  baagil-annu  giigil-annu  
     door-ACC  door-ACC  
 ii.  baagil  giigil-annu  
     door  door-ACC
‘doors and such’

Tamil (Dravidian; Keane 2007) is more reluctant to suspend in echo-reduplications (echo beginning in /ki/), with infinitive suffix even more averse to suspension than case suffixes:

(7)  i.  cennai-kku  kinnai-kku  
     Chennai-DAT  Chennai-DAT

  ii.  ?cennai  kinnai-kku  
       Chennai  Chennai-DAT  
       ‘to Chennai and the like’

(8) i.  pați-kka  kiți-kka  
       study-INF  study-INF

  ii.  *pați  kiți-kka  
       study  study-INF  
       ‘to study and such’

Questions for us:

(a)  Do we also get such suspension in echo-reduplication where this pattern is not phonologically, but morphologically circumscribed? Turkish is a relevant language: it echo-reduplicates morphological units (morph. words only), not phonological stems/words/phrases. That is, do we get both, (i) and (ii), or only (ii), with no tampering of morphological words once they have been echo-reduplicated?

(i)  tabak-dan  mabak-dan  
     plate-ABL  plate-ABL

(ii) tabak  mabak-dan  
     plate  plate-ABL  
     ‘from plates and such’
(b) How does suspension in echo-reduplication correlate with suspension in coordinative and perhaps other constructions in the languages concerned? Presumably, echo-reduplicating constructions are tighter, more compound-like, than e.g. coordinations. Does this favour or disfavour suspension?
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