

Review of: "The Reduplication that Denotes Ethnomathematical Signification: Exemplification from the Bidayuh Somu Language"

Marina Magalhães¹

¹ Universidade de Brasília

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

p.2

"The language reflexive pronoun formation, as a case to perform, contradicts the English language suffix -self/-selves as in the word themselves. In this language, the reflexive pronoun is formulated by attaching the prefix goni- to pronouns. The instance is gonidat, which is equivalent to themselves (Bunau, 2021)."

Why does the English example contradict that of the Bidayuh Somu language? It seems to be the same formation process, with the only difference that in English it is a suffix and in Bidayuh Somu it is a prefix that forms the reflexive pronoun.

p.4

"This type of reduplication is applied by repeating the root or base totally. The elements of affix applied to this noun total reduplication are morphemes {tiN-}, {puN-}, and the prefix /si-/. Moreover, the total reduplication of the nouns in the language signifies 'plurality'. Please look at the examples in the following Table 1."

It would be important to know the difference between nouns that indicate plurals formed by reduplication and those formed by affixation. For example, what are the differences between using "jars" like /payat-payat/ and /tipayat/?

p.4

"The ethnomathematical signification of this noun total reduplication, besides plurality, is specifically 'group', 'all', and 'each.' "

What you mean is that it is only through the process of reduplication that the language presents these specific meanings?

p.7

"Based on Table 4, the reduplication in example number 1 is the root repeating syllable, and the one in number 2 is repeated and repeating syllables. The repeated syllable is the prefix /bu-/, and the repeating one is the root /gona/ 'drum'."

It is not very clear to the reader the difference between "repeated syllables" and "repeating syllables". I suggest the

insertion of a footnote to clarify the reason for calling the reduplication of roots one way and the reduplication of affixes another.

p.9

“An ordinal word is a word number that does not show its actual quantity but signifies the order or sequence of the quantity (Asmah, 2009). This ordinal partial reduplication employs the morpheme {kuN-} as the element to root. Moreover, this type of ordinal partial reduplication signifies the meaning ‘total quantity’. In the following Table 8 is the example collected from the language:”

Based on this explanation, the gloss in Table 8 is wrong. /idu/ should be glossed as ‘second’ and not “two”. Second is an ordinal number, and two is a cardinal number. The same applies to ‘five’ and ‘nine’.

p.11

“The reduplication with phoneme changes is the reduplication with phoneme variations (Akinbo, 2023; Avram, 2011). The variation can be vowel or consonant changes as repeating syllables. The process of this reduplication type is similar to internal modification morphology to signify plurality for nouns, as found in the English word /feet/ that is internally modified from the lexeme /FOOT/.”

The comparison with English is not very good, as the morphological process that occurs in foot/feet is called alternation and only occurs with vowels (never with consonants), following a pattern. Thus, the same alternation occurs in goose/geese, tooth/teeth, following a vowel alternation pattern associated with the meaning ‘plurality’.

p.12

“In complex word structures like reduplication, the affixes are prefixes that are initial, infixes that are insertions, and suffixes that are finals.”

Since there are no infixes or suffixes involved in the reduplication of this language, I think this sentence is unnecessary.

General observations:

I suggest adding a table at the end summarizing all the reduplication processes described and their meanings.