



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Non-iconic reduplications in Eastern Gbe and Surinam

Aboh, E.; Smith, N.

DOI

[10.1515/9783110343977.241](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110343977.241)

Publication date

2015

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Surviving the Middle Passage

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/in-the-netherlands/you-share-we-take-care>)

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Aboh, E., & Smith, N. (2015). Non-iconic reduplications in Eastern Gbe and Surinam. In P. Muysken, & N. Smith (Eds.), *Surviving the Middle Passage: the West Africa-Surinam Sprachbund* (pp. 241-260). (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs; Vol. 275). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110343977.241>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Non-iconic reduplications in Eastern Gbe and Surinam

Enoch Aboh & Norval Smith

1. Introduction

The Surinam Creoles appear to have at least six types of non-ideophonic reduplication. Four of these – augmentative, iterative and diminutive verbal formation, and distributive plural noun formation – we will not discuss here, as their iconicity is so strong that they could not really ever be taken as “proof” of any direct substratal connection (cf. Kouwenberg and LaCharité 2003). Further, no definitive survey of iconic reduplicative (or repetitive) processes in the Eastern Gbe languages has been made. In this paper, then, we will restrict ourselves to an examination of two types of reduplication process occurring in the Surinam Creole languages, and address the question as to whether these are to be connected with reduplication processes occurring in Eastern Gbe languages. The two non-iconic reduplication processes dealt with hereunder are (non-productive) verbal noun formation, and adjective formation. Summary descriptive treatments of these exist for Sranan (Smith 1990; Adamson and Smith 2003), Saramaccan (Bakker 1987; Alleyne 1987), and Ndyuka (Huttar & Huttar 1997; Migge 2003).

The structure of this article will be as follows: first, we will take as our starting-point the existing analysis of Gun (Eastern Gbe) non-iconic reduplications by Aboh (2004a, 2005c, 2007a, 2007b). In this work, verbal and predicate reduplication is conditioned by syntactic configuration. Under the view taken by Aboh, “syntactic reduplications” appear to display a uniform structure. Only the surface syntactic structures are given below, as it is these that determine whether reduplication takes place. For a more detailed justification of these structures the reader should consult this work (sections 2, and 3). After discussing reduplication in Gungbe, we move onto similar

structures in the Surinam Creoles to see to what extent they could be accounted for in terms of adstrate transfer (section 4).¹

2. Syntax-driven verbal reduplication in Gun

It is a well-known fact that the Gbe languages (like most Kwa languages) display SVO/SOV alternations in finite clauses. However, the OV pattern is also found in non-finite contexts such as verbal nominalization. As we show in this paper, verbal or predicate reduplication is conditioned by the OV context. We start with VO/ OV in finite clauses.

2.1. Finite clauses

In finite clauses, the unmarked SVO word order is used with perfective verbal structures. In these structures, the verb always occurs in its bare form (see Aboh 2004a chapters 2 and 5)

- (1) *súrù ɖà núsónú ná mì* G
 Suru **cook** soup for me
 ‘Suru **cooked** soup for me’

Under various aspectual conditions, however, SOV word order occurs. Example (2a) is a progressive sentence. Here the object precedes the verb, which precedes the beneficiary. These constructions also involve a sentence-final particle represented by a floating low tone in Gungbe. On the other hand, the prospective example in (2b) indicates that these constructions may involve an aspect marker that intervenes between the fronted object and the verb. This is evidence that object fronting does not serve case licensing. Observe, for instance that the preverbal position can also host certain adverbs (2c). Finally, the possibility of inserting the prospective marker between the fronted object (or phrase) indicates that there is, within the OV structure, an INFL-related position for marking aspect (see Aboh 2004a chapters 5 and 6, 2005c, 2007a for discussion).

1. Examples will be identified as source by the following letter codes: G = Gun, F = Fon, Sa = Saramaccan, Sr = Sranan

- (2) a. *sùrù tò núsónú dǎ ná mì`* G
 Suru PROG soup **cook** for me PRTL²
 ‘Suru is **cooking** soup for me’
- b. *sùrù tò núsónú na dǎ ná mì`* G
 Suru PROG soup PROS **cook** for me PRTL
 ‘Suru is **about to cook** soup for me’
- c. *sùrù tò dǎdǎ na zǎn`* G
 Suru PROG slowly PROS walk PRTL
 ‘Suru is **about to start walking slowly**’

Starting with SVO, Aboh (2004a chapters 2, 5, and 6, 2005c, 2007a, 2007b) proposes that these OV structures result from object fronting to some position to the left of the prospective marker. The question therefore arises what the nature of this position is.

This question is related to the fact that, in these structures, reduplication has to take place if for, any reason, neither the object nor the prospective marker precede the verb. There are a number of such conditions. For instance, if an intransitive verb has no object in the progressive, reduplication is mandatory, as in (3).

- (3) *àvún to gbí-gbò`* G
 dog PROG **bark.bark** PRTL
 ‘A dog is **barking**’

A second condition is when the object is pronominal. In this case, the object clitic *follows* the verb, so that there is once again no pre-verbal object. Therefore the verb reduplicates, as in (4).

- (4) *sùrù tò dǎ-dǎ è ná mì`* G
 Suru PROG **cook-cook**_{3SG} for me PRTL
 ‘Suru is **cooking** it for me’

A third condition is when the object is fronted under focus or questioning. Sentence (5) illustrates this.

- (5) a. *é-té wè sùrù tò dǎ-dǎ ná mì`* G
 thing-Q FOC Suru PROG **cook-cook** for me PRTL
 ‘What is Suru **cooking** for me?’

2. Under Aboh (2004, chapter 6) this particle is a nominalizer.

- b. *núsónú wè sùrù tò d̩i-d̩à ná mì `* G
 soup FOC Suru PROG **cook.cook** for me PRTL
 ‘Suru is **cooking** SOUP for me.’

However, even if any of the above conditions applies reduplication still does not take place if the prospective marker *ná* is present. This is shown in (6) where the object is focused, but the sentence includes the prospective marker and reduplication is blocked.

- (6) *núsónú wé sùrù tò ná d̩à ná mì `* G
 soup FOC Suru PROG PROS **cook** for me PRTL
 ‘Suru is just about to **cook** SOUP for me.’

It therefore appears from these data that there is a position to the left of the prospective marker *nà* that must be overtly realized by a phrase (e.g. the object, or an adverb). This produces the O-(*nà*)-V orders illustrated above. When no phrase can occur in this position, an INFL element (i.e. prospective *ná*) must immediately precede, leading to the order *ná*-V illustrated by example (6). However, the verb must reduplicate in the absence of *ná*. This produces the VV structures in (3), (4), and (5).

2.2. More on the structure of finite clauses

As argued in Aboh (2004a chapter 6, 2005c, 2007a), the interaction between the preverbal object position, the INFL *ná*, and the reduplicated verb is comparable to subject-verb relations in which an INFL element (e.g. an affix on the verb) licenses an unpronounced subject (e.g. in pro-drop languages). Under this description, the position left adjacent to the prospective marker *na* is a subject position, which when empty, requires verb reduplication.

The argumentation goes as follows: OV sequences involve the structure in (7) where an aspect verb (e.g. *tò*) selects for FP whose head F° encodes the sentence-final particle (e.g. the floating tone in (2)). F° selects for a small clause IP, where I°, sometimes realized by the prospective marker *ná*, takes a VP as its complement. The subject position of this small clause, [Spec IP], is subject to the EPP and must be overtly realized. In Gbe, this requirement is achieved by object fronting.

- (7) ...[_{AspP} *tò* [_{FP} [F° ` [_{IP} Object [_I *ná* [_{VP}...*t*_{object}...]]]]]]]

When the object is missing, extracted, or cliticized, a null expletive (EXPL) is inserted in [Spec IP]. This expletive element is licensed under spec-head configuration either by the prospective marker under I^o, which qualifies as a proper INFL element, or by the verb that raises to I^o (in simple OV orders).

Recall that in Gungbe, and more generally in Gbe, the verb always occurs in its bare form, and the language does not tolerate subject pro-drop. This means that in situations where the subject position of the small clause is filled by an expletive, the language must find some way to license this empty element. Aboh (2004a, 2005c, 2007a) proposes that verb reduplication serves this purpose in the Gbe languages. This means that the reduplicated part of the verb functions as an inflectional morpheme that licenses the null expletive. A partial representation is given in (8).

(8) ... tò [FP [F ` [IP Expl [I VV [VP t_v...t_o]]]]]

Under the partial representation in (8), the sentences illustrated above are assigned the structures in (9).

- | | | | |
|-----|---------------|---|---|
| (9) | a. [= (2a)] | [_{AspP} tò [FP [IP núsónú [I qà | G |
| | b. [= (3)] | [_{AspP} tò [FP [IP ∅ [I gbí-gbò | G |
| | c. [= (4)] | [_{AspP} tò [FP [IP ∅ [I qì-qà -è | G |
| | d. [= (5a/b)] | [_{AspP} tò [FP [IP ∅ [I qì-qà | G |
| | e. [= (6)] | [_{AspP} tò [FP [IP ∅ [I na [VP qà | G |

We will not discuss these structures further, and the reader is referred to Aboh (2004a chapters 2, 5, and 6, 2005c, 2007a) where VO, OV, VV, and OVV structures are discussed in detail. Assuming that verbal (or predicate) reduplication is primarily determined by the factors described above, let us now look at instances of nominalizations in Gungbe where a reduplicated verb follows the object.

2.3. Nominalizations

A nominalized verbal structure shares some of the features observed in the previous section, but there are also differences, as pointed out in Aboh (2005c, 2007a). The presence of an object does not impede the occurrence of a reduplicated verb. However, the presence of a prospective marker does have this effect. Compare the sentences under (10).

- (10) a. [àzón wì-wà] wè nò jró sùrù G
 work do-do FOC HAB please Suru
 ‘Suru likes WORKING’
- b. sùrù gbé [àzón wì-wà] G
 Sururefuse work do-do
 ‘Suru refused to work.’
- c. [àzón ná wà òn] má jró sùrù G
 work PROSP do now NEG please Suru
 ‘Working now does not please Suru.’

These nominalizations can appear in the same positions as DPs: in subject position (10a,c) and in object position (10b). Three additional facts are worth noting: (i) nominalization implies OV order, (ii) the verb reduplicates even though preceded by an object, (iii) reduplication does not appear in the presence of the prospective marker.

If it is true that verbal reduplication is conditioned by OV contexts as described above, one might wonder why the verb still reduplicates in (10a–b) leading to OVV sequences as opposed to the OV sequences described before. Yet, the blocking effect of the prospective marker in (10c) indicates that these OVV structures are parallel to cases of object fronting to the clausal periphery, as illustrated by the contrast between (5b) and (6). Taking this parallel seriously, Aboh (2005c, 2007a) explains OVV structures in terms of object fronting to a position different from the subject position of the small clause where it normally lands in simple OV structures. More specifically, it is argued that, unlike simple OV sentences where the object occurs in [Spec IP], OVV structures arise from object preposing to [spec FP]. As in the case of wh-extraction or focusing, this forces the insertion of a null expletive in [Spec IP] that must be licensed under spec-head by the reduplicated verb. As previously mentioned, insertion of the prospective marker blocks reduplication. Given this analysis, the sequences in (10) can be partially represented as in (11).

- (11) a. [FP àzón [F [IP I] wì-wà wè nò jró sùrù G
 work do-do ...
- b. sùrù gbé [FP àzón [F [IP I] wì-wà] G
 work do-do
- c. [FP àzón [F [IP I] na wà òn má jró sùrù G
 work PROSP do

As argued for in Aboh (2005c), movement of the object to [spec FP] creates a theme-activity articulation comparable to a topic-comment structure. This is illustrated by the opposition between ‘to do work’ and ‘working’, which corresponds to the structures in (12a) and (12b) respectively.

- (12) a. *wà àzón* b. *àzón wì-wà* G
 do work work do.do
 ‘to work’ Lit. ‘work doing’ (= ‘working’)

2.4. Summary

The discussion in these sections shows that while iconic reduplication could be analyzed as a mere morphological process that enables the language to enrich the lexicon, non-iconic reduplication may arise due to a requirement of syntax. In this respect, we have shown that verbal (or predicate) reduplication in Gbe serves to license an empty subject position. In this regard, the reduplicant behaves like an inflectional morphological element. With this description in mind, let us now turn to reduplicated adjectives.

3. Reduplicated adjectives

These only appear in attributive contexts. In Gungbe, they follow the noun, in contradistinction to the situation in the Surinam Creole languages (see section 6).

- (13) a. *àvún kì-kìló ló* G
 dog big-big DET
 ‘the big dog’
 b. *kpò-tín xú-xú ló* G
 wood-stick dry-dry DET
 ‘the *dried* stick’ [= ‘the stick that has been dried’] [= end-state
 of process]
 c. *àzón síén-síén* G
 work difficult-difficult
 ‘a difficult work’

The reduplicated attributive adjectives in (13) clearly derive from verbs (or predicates). Indeed, in their predicate usage, these elements occur to the right of the DP, and are not reduplicated, as is illustrated in (14).

- (14) a. *kpò-tín ló (*xú-)xú* G
 wood-stick DET dry
 ‘the stick is dry’ [= ‘the stick is in a dry state’]
- b. *àzón (*síén-)síén* G
 work difficult
 ‘work is difficult/work is generally difficult’

Note the relative positions of the property items and the determiner in (13b) and (14a). In (13b) the property item precedes the determiner, indicating that the whole construction is within the DP, while in (14a) the property item is external to the DP, and functions as the main verb.

Examples of non-reduplicated property items in (14) are clearly verbs in Gun. The verbal nature of these non-reduplicated predicates is also indicated by the fact that they combine with TMA markers (15a), they undergo predicate cleft (15b), and finally, they reduplicate when put in the progressive (15c). Again, such reduplication is blocked by an intervening prospective marker (15d).

- (15) a. *kpò-tín ló ná nò xú* G
 wood-stick DET FUT HAB dry
 ‘the stick will often dry’
- b. *xú kpò-tín ló xú* G
 dry wood-stick DET dry
 ‘the stick is DRY’
- c. *kpò-tín ló tò xú-xú`* G
 wood-stick DET PROG dry.dry PRTL
 ‘the stick is drying up/ the stick is getting dry’
- d. *kpò-tín ló tò na (*xú-)xú`* G
 wood-stick DET PROG PROS dry.dry PRTL
 ‘the stick is starting to drying up’

These examples clearly confirm that Gungbe reduplicated attributive adjectives derive from verbs. In this regard, examples in (15c–d) are interesting because they indicate that reduplication of these verbs also occurs in OV contexts where no object (or phrase) can occur in the preverbal position, which we identified as a subject position of a small clause that has been

selected by an aspect verb (see sections 2.2. and 2.3). In addition, though we use the term progressive to describe sequences like (15c), it is important to note from the interpretation that the intended meaning of this construction refers to a state, and is similar in that sense to a passive.

4. Adjectives structured

Given this last observation, it is reasonable to extend our analysis of verbal (or predicate) reduplication to reduplicated attributive adjectives. Aboh (2007a) adopts this reductionist hypothesis, and assumes that the structures underlying reduplicated adjectives in Gungbe are similar to those we have already noted previously.

Kanye (1994) and Aboh (2005b) have observed that clauses can be selected by determiners to form relative clauses. The latter proposes that the small clause which determines both OV and (O)VV structures in Gbe can be selected by a determiner to form a ‘mini relative clause’. Under this approach the surface structure of the sequence in (13a), can be represented as in (16), where the modified noun phrase starts out as the only argument of the predicate adjective, but functions as the head of the ‘mini relative clause’ and raises to [spec FP]. As in the case of (O)VV structures, this forces the insertion of a null expletive in [Spec IP] that is licensed thanks to verbal reduplication.³

- (16) [DP [FP àvún [F [I **kì-kí** [VP t_{ki}]]] [D ló]] G
 dog big-big DET
 ‘the big dog’

It is worth noting that like the example in (15c), this sequence describes a state that is assigned to the modified noun, hence the attributive function.

If we grant the idea that the sequence FP can be selected by various elements including certain aspect verbs or auxiliaries and determiners, we observe the following parallels in structure.

- (17) a. (finite “OV” structure with Object) G
 [_{AspP} tò [FP [F ` [IP núsónú [I dǎ [VP
 Aspect Object Verb

3. See Aboh (2004, chapters 3, 4) for the syntax of DPs in Gungbe.

- b. (finite “OV” structure with Prospective marker)
 [AspP tò [FP [F ` [IP Ø [I na [VP dâ] G
 Aspect --- Aspect Verb
- c. (finite “OV” structure with neither object fronting nor
na insertion)
 [AspP tò [FP [F ` [IP Ø [I gbí-gbò [VP] G
 Aspect --- Verb-Verb
- d. (non-finite verbal noun structure)
 [AspP gbé [FP àzón [F [IP Ø [I wì-wà [VP] G
 NP --- Verb-Verb
- e. (attributive adjective structure)
 [DP [D [FP àvún [F [IP Ø [I **ki-kló**] G
 NP --- Verb-Verb

It is clear from this description that the common factor among the reduplicated cases is the presence of a null-element in [Spec IP] preceding the (inflected) verb. This makes the context of verbal (predicate) reduplication in Gbe quite specific and therefore possible to use as a test in the search for adstrate influence. We will now turn to the Surinam Creoles to find out whether the findings in Gbe extend to these languages as well.

5. The Surinam Creoles

We will first examine the case of reduplicated verbal nouns in the Surinam Creoles. Then we will turn to reduplicated adjective formation, from the point of view of Saramaccan. The three Surinam Creoles, Saramaccan, Ndyuka and Sranan, seem to differ little in their reduplications, so this seems to be a reasonable approach.

All three languages have two main types of non-iconic reduplication: a) a non-productive de-verbal nominalization process, and b) a fully productive adjectivalization process, largely based on verbs. The verbs that form the basis of both morphological processes cover a larger domain than in European languages, as most simple adjectival notions are represented in the Surinam Creoles by stative verbs. In this, they resemble Fongbe and Gungbe closely. In the Surinam Creoles there are also a very few non-reduplicated adjectives, as is the case in the Gbe languages.

5.1. Non-productive reduplicated verbal nouns

These forms were first examined in Smith (1990). The very non-productivity of these formations is indicated by their progressive phonological reduction over the years. The first element of the reduplication is now sometimes maximally reduced to the first part of a geminate consonant in Sranan.

(18) Sranan reduplicated nouns

a.	18 th century	19 th century	20 th century	gloss
	<i>baribari</i>	<i>babari</i>	<i>b(a)bári</i>	tumult
	<i>si(bi)sibi</i>	<i>sisibi</i>	<i>s(i)síbi</i>	brush
	<i>waiwai</i>	<i>wawai</i>	<i>w(a)wái</i>	fan
b.	<i>kosikosi</i>	<i>koskosi</i>	<i>koskósi</i>	curses
	<i>krasikrasi</i>	<i>kras(i)krasi</i>	<i>kraskrási</i>	rash
	<i>gritgriti</i>	<i>gritgriti</i>	<i>gritgriti</i>	grater

The list of such de-verbal nouns in Sranan and Saramaccan is fairly short. Table 1 is probably a fairly complete list. It is important to restrict this list to non-iconic cases. Some of the cases could in fact be interpreted as iterative. We have identified some possible iterative cases, and have marked these with asterisks. A number of these refer to implements whose use requires iterated movements.

The main types of verbs involved can be classified as in Table 2. The main types corresponding to one-, two-, and three-argument predicates are given in the fourth column. Less frequent types are put in brackets. The term “Result” corresponds most closely to the meaning of the verb itself, representing the end-state of the process represented in the verbal meaning. These are thus the forms that most closely resemble verbal nominalizations in Gbe. The reader will recall that these forms always involve reduplication. It is not entirely clear whether these nominalizations in the Gbe languages are solely (morpho)syntactic, or whether lexicalizations are involved in some cases.

However, it is equally clear that no morphosyntactic processes of reduplication are involved in the deverbal nominalizations that we see in the Surinam Creoles, whatever their relationship to some Gbe model might have been. A Gbe model involving deverbal nominalizing reduplication would, however, still seem to be the most likely source of these forms. This is supported by the fact that the 18th century form *maemaè*, unlike all other forms contained in the table, only occurs in a reduplicated form.

Table 1. Reduplicated de-verbal nouns in the Surinam Creoles

Sranan	Sr. base	Ndyuka	Saramaccan	gloss
<i>b(a)bári</i>	<i>bári</i>	<i>babali, bali bali</i>		tumult*
<i>bronbrón</i>	<i>brón</i>	<i>boonboon</i>	<i>bèbè < bè</i>	yolk
<i>djompodjómbo</i>	<i>djómbo</i>			burnt crust
<i>dorodóro</i>	<i>dóro</i>			grasshopper*
<i>Fonfón</i>	<i>fón</i>	<i>fonfon</i>	<i>fumm fumm 18c.</i>	sieve*
<i>Freyfréy</i>	<i>fréy</i>	<i>feefee</i>		blow, beat- ing
<i>gritgriti 19c.</i>	<i>gríti</i>	<i>hei hei < hei</i>		fly
<i>Kankán</i>	<i>kán</i>	<i>kankan</i>		grater*
<i>kap'kapoe 19c.</i>	<i>kápu</i>			hill
<i>kofukofu 19c.</i>	<i>kófu</i>			comb
<i>Koskósi</i>	<i>kósi</i>			machete
<i>kosokóso</i>	<i>kóso</i>	<i>kosokoso</i>		cuff (blow)
<i>kottikotti 18c.</i>	<i>kóti</i>			curse
<i>krabkrábu</i>	<i>krábu</i>			cough
<i>krabbo-krabbo 18c.</i>	<i>krábu</i>			slice
<i>kraskrási</i>	<i>krási</i>	<i>kaasikaasi</i>	<i>kasikaási 'sore'</i>	scrapings*
<i>lauláu</i>	<i>láu</i>	<i>lawlaw 'crazy person' leilei 'herbal sedative' < lei</i>		rake*
			<i>maemaè 18c.</i>	rash
<i>moimói</i>	<i>mói</i>	<i>moimoi 'gift'</i>		folly
<i>n(a)nái</i>	<i>nái</i>	<i>nanai(n)</i>	<i>nainai 18c.</i>	grilling- frame
<i>njanján</i>	<i>nján</i>	<i>nyanyan</i>	<i>njanjá(n) papiápapia</i>	finery
<i>sakasáka</i>	<i>sáka</i>	<i>sakasaka 'crumbs'</i>		needle
<i>sekséki</i>	<i>séki</i>	<i>sekeseke</i>	<i>shekiseksi sp. seed 18c.</i>	food
<i>s(i)síbi</i>	<i>síbi</i>	<i>sisibi</i>		gossip
<i>ta(i)tái</i>	<i>tái</i>			dregs
<i>títéi</i>	<i>tái</i>	<i>tetei < tei</i>	<i>tatái</i>	rattle*
<i>tjatjári</i>	<i>tjá(ri)</i>	<i>tyatya(I)i</i>		broom*
<i>w(a)wái</i>	<i>wái</i>	<i>wawai</i>	<i>wawái</i>	bundle
				rope
				headpad
				fan*

The unreduplicated form corresponds to a Fon verb, *mè* ‘grill, roast’. The reduplicated *mèmè*, would be a Fongbe nominalization, meaning ‘grilling’. This clearly indicates that the change of meaning from that of a morpho-syntactically forecastable nominalization to a lexicalized result noun must have taken place in the early history of the Surinam Creole languages.

Some differences among the various creole languages can also be identified in the table of forms. A distinction can be drawn between Sranan and Ndyuka on the one hand and Saramaccan on the other.

Table 2. The main types of reduplicated verbal noun

Verb	Internal Argument	External Argument	Verbal Noun
<i>kóso</i> ‘cough’		Theme	Result, (Theme)
<i>láu</i> ‘crazy’			
<i>fréy</i> ‘fly’			
<i>fón</i> ‘beat’	Theme	Agent	Result, (Theme, Instrument)
<i>nján</i> ‘eat’			
<i>tjári</i> ‘carry’			
<i>gríti</i> ‘grate’	Theme, Instrument	Agent	Instrument, (Result)
<i>kán</i> ‘comb’			
<i>nái</i> ‘sew’			

Sranan and Ndyuka are closely related – Ndyuka derives from a form of Plantation Sranan spoken in the 18th century. Saramaccan can be assumed (see Smith (2002) for more on this point) to be the result of a mixture involving Sranan and some form(s) of Portuguese and/or Portuguese Creole spoken on Jewish plantations. This mixture was the language referred to as Djutongo (‘Jewish language’) in the colonial literature. It is of relevance for the history of these formations that where the base word in Sranan has been replaced in Saramaccan, the reduplicated form is lacking as well. Examples of this are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Sranan reduplications replaced in Saramaccan. N.B. Port. = Portuguese

Sranan base	Sranan redup.	Saramaccan verbal base	Saramaccan noun	Noun meaning
<i>kán</i>	<i>kankán</i>	<i>pénti</i> (Port.)	<i>pénti</i>	comb
<i>brón</i>	<i>bronbrón</i>	<i>tjumá</i> (Port.)	<i>tjumá-alísi</i>	burnt rice-crust
<i>síbi</i>	<i>s(i)síbi</i>	<i>baí</i> (Port.)	<i>basóo</i> (Port.)	brush

5.2. Adjectives in the Surinam Creoles

The reduplicated adjectives in the Surinam Creoles occur in a number of syntactic contexts. We will mention three main contexts. Additional types occur in complex morphological formations involving derivational and compound formations, which we will not discuss here. The first context we will illustrate is that of attributive adjectives.

(19) Attributive adjectives in Saramaccan⁴

- a. *dĩ lái-lái góni*
DET load-load gun
'the loaded gun' (Bakker 1987)
- b. *dĩ deé-déé koósu*
DET dry-dry cloth
'the dry/dried cloth' (Bakker 1987)
- c. *dĩ latjá-latja páu*
DET split-split wood
'the split wood' (Bakker 1987)
- d. *dĩ síki-síki wómi*
DET sick-sick man
'the sick man' (Alleyne 1987)
- e. *dĩ lánzá-lánza wómi*
DET long-long man
'the tall man' (Alleyne 1987)
- f. *dĩ bígi-bígi wósu*
DET big-big house
'the big house' (Alleyne 1987)

Note the difference of semantic effect depending on whether the verbal base is a state verb, or a non-stative verb. In the latter case the reduplicative adjectives have a passive meaning. The precise nature of this is difficult to capture. Bakker (1987) qualifies it as "a kind of past participial meaning". Alleyne (1987) refers to it as a "stative adjective".

The passive sense is clearly evinced in examples (19a/c), which are derived from non-stative action verbs. Examples (19d–f) are derived from English quality items which are stative verbs in Saramaccan (though plain adjectives in English), and so cannot have passive meanings. Example

4. Note that we have not indicated tonal sandhi in the Saramaccan examples.

(15b) can be interpreted in either way, leading to a certain ambiguity between the meanings ‘dry’ and ‘dried’.

The second type we will illustrate is that of predicative adjectives.

(20) Predicative adjectives

- a. *dĩ b́áta dế logo-logo*
 DET bottle LOC.CP round-round
 ‘the bottle is round’ (Bakker 1987)
- b. *a dế náki-náki a goón*
 3SG.NOM LOC.CP knock-knock LOC ground
 ‘he is lying beaten down to the ground’ (Bakker 1987)
- c. *a bi dế táí-tái ku búí*
 3SG.NOM PAST LOC,CP tie-tie INST string
 ‘he was tied with string’ (Bakker 1987)
- d. *dĩ físi dế kúá-kúa*
 DET fish LOC.CP fresh-fresh
 ‘the fish is fresh’ (Bakker 1987)
- e. *a dế kándi-kándi n'-en bédí líba*
 3SG.NOM LOC.CP lie-lie LOC-3SG bed top
 ‘he is lying on bed’ (De Groot 1977)

Once again, we observe the difference in sense between the stative and non-stative adjectives.

The third context that reduplicated adjectives occur in is in post-nominal position (21a–c), in which case they receive a resultative interpretation. Such adjectives can also be focussed by fronting (21 d/e).

(21) Resultative adjectives

- a. *dá mi dĩ páu latjá-latja*
 give 1SGDET wood split-split
 ‘give me the wood split’ (Bakker 1987)
- b. *nóo i sa njám-en kúá-kúa*
 and 2SGIRR eat-3SG.OBJ fresh-fresh
 ‘You’ll eat it fresh’ (De Groot 1977)
- c. *dĩ pikí wómi tá njá dĩ gaán físi kúá-kúa*
 DET little man PROG eat DETbig fish raw-raw
 ‘The little man is eating the big fish raw’ (Haabo 2002)
- d. *kúá-kúa a tá njá dĩ gaán físi*
 raw-raw 3SGPROG eat DET big fish
 ‘he eats the big fish RAW’ (Haabo 2002)

This movement results in prenominal adjective placement in Saramaccan and English as opposed to the Gbe languages, where adjectives are strictly postnominal.⁵ Here we find influence from both the adstrate and superstrate. The context for reduplication is given by the same conditions as in Gbe, while the adjective-noun order comes from English.

6. The origin of predicative adjectives in the Surinam Creoles

The question has not been answered of what the model is for the predicative structures in the Surinam Creoles. Note these are either passive in meaning if the reduplicated verb is an action verb, or express a meaning similar to quality predicates if it is not.

- (25) a. *dĩ b́áta dẽ logo-logo*
 DET bottle LOC.CP round-round
 ‘the bottle is round’ (Bakker 1987)
- b. *a bi dẽ táí-táí ku búí*
 3SG.NOM PAST LOC.CP tie-tie INST string
 ‘he was tied with string’ (Bakker 1987)

Note also that this paradigm is parallel to aspects of the paradigm of non-reduplicated verbs.

- (26) a. *mi síki* Sr
 1SG sick
 ‘I am sick’
- b. *a óso f́érfi* Sr
 DET house paint
 ‘the house is painted’

The parallel lies herein, that each predicate has only one argument in these examples. In each of the paradigms, the second example is an action verb, which normally has an agent as its external argument, and a theme as its internal argument. This is illustrated in (27).

5. In this paper, we only consider deverbal prenominal adjectives in English (see also Kayne 1994).

- (27) *nórfu férfi a óso* Sr
 Norval paint DET house
 ‘Norval painted the house’

As soon as the agent is omitted, the path to a passive reading is opened. In this case, *óso* is inanimate so that no other reading would be possible. The theme gets raised to subject position. Kahrel (1987) claims that such one-argument structures become (derived) statives, thus changing the interpretation of the concomitant TMA markers to that applicable with underlying statives like *siki*.

Immediately the question arises of the meaning difference between the two types of structure.

- (28) a. N_{theme} V
 b. N_{theme} LocCp VV

This is not always easy to determine. Alleyne (1987) gives a number of contrasts.

- (29) a. *a dǽdǽ*
 3SG dead
 ‘he is dead’, ‘he has died’ (Alleyne 1987)⁶
 b. *a dǽ dǽdǽ-dǽdǽ*
 3SG LOC.CP dead-dead
 ‘he is dead’ (i.e. having died some time ago) (Alleyne 1987)
- (30) a. *dí boon jasa kaa*
 DET flour bake already
 ‘the flour has already been baked’ (Alleyne 1987)
 b. *dí boon dǽ jasa-jasa kaa*
 DET flour LOC.CP bake-bake already
 ‘the flour is already baked’ (Alleyne 1987)

In (30) we can observe that the translations suggest the difference in English between the verbal participle and a de-verbal adjective.

Parallel to these usages it must be noted that we also have similar prenominal paradigms.

6. The third gloss given by Alleyne – ‘he has been made dead’ is actually an instantiation of the homophonous causative verb *dǽdǽ* ‘to make dead’.

- (31) a. *dǐ dǐdǐ wómi*
 DET dead man
 b. *dǐ dǐdǐ-dǐdǐ wómi*
 DET dead-dead man
 ‘the dead man’ (a/b) (Alleyne 1987)
- (32) a. *dǐ latjá páu*
 DET chop wood
 b. *dǐ latjá-latja páu*
 DET chop-shop wood
 ‘the chopped wood’ (a/b) (Alleyne 1987)

Alleyne could not get his informants to distinguish these pairs in meaning. Bakker (1987) did discover a temporal difference, which is possibly to be related to the distinction in (29).

To turn back to a possible Gbe model for these structures, let us look again at sentences (2a/3) repeated here as (33a/b).

- (33) a. *súrù tò núsónú **dà** ná mì `* G
 SuruPROG soup **cook** for me PRTL⁷
 ‘Suru is **cooking** soup for me’
- b. *àvún tò **gbí-gbò** `* G
 dog PROG **bark.bark** PRTL
 ‘A dog is **barking**’

Note that (29a) is a two-argument verb. What happens if an action has its agent unexpressed. Note that this is often not possible in Gun, but that examples do occur.

- (34) a. *àvò lò tò bí-bò ` tò àkpótín ló m̀* G
 cloth DETPROG fold-fold PRTL LOC trunk DETin
 ‘the cloth is folded [i.e. in a folded state] in the trunk’
- b. *míngbán ló tò tí-tá*
 lamp DETPROG light.light
 ‘the lamp is lit [i.e. in a lit state]’

Here we observe a number of things. In the absence of an agent the theme noun becomes the subject. The verb is no longer interpreted as an action verb, but as a state verb, as Kahrel (1987) claims for Saramaccan. And the

7. Under Aboh (2004, chapter 6) this particle is a nominalizer.

verb receives a passive interpretation, similarly to the reduplicated Saramaccan cases in (21b, 22b, 26b).

One lexical difference exists – in Gun *tò* is the progressive marker (homophonous with and of the same origin as *tò*, the locative copula), while in Saramaccan *dɛ* is the locative copula (and the progressive marker is *tá*). However, in one of the antecedent components of Saramaccan, Sranan, the coastal plantation creole language, the verbal element used with the reduplicated forms is the locative copula *de*, which in earlier records of Sranan,^s is indeed homophonous with the progressive marker *de*. This latter has since been reduced to *e*, in both Sranan and Ndyuka. Note that in Fon *dò* also has the same two functions. We are tempted to conclude that this difference – between progressive marker and locative Copula – was not relevant for earlier forms of the Surinam Creoles.

In any case, the parallels between structures like (30) in Gun, and (26b) etc. in Saramaccan and Sranan are very strong.

7. Conclusion

We conclude that both types of reduplication in the Surinam Creoles are derived from the Gbe adstrate. However, the basis for this statement is different in the two cases. In the first case, the unproductive verbal nouns, the most significant evidence is an isolated case of reduplication that descends from a Gbe (Fon) verbal noun.

In the case of reduplicated adjectives, these can be morphosyntactically derived. The reduplications are similarly explained to those in the Gbe languages, although the distribution of reduplication is different. The patterns have been significantly influenced by the superstrate language – English.