

# The Typology of Double Object Constructions in Guadeloupean Creole

Erin Karnatz  
University at Buffalo  
ekkarnat@buffalo.edu

April 15, 2024

This paper offers a typological take on the kinds of constructions that obtain with ditransitive verbs in Guadeloupean Creole. There is significant crosslinguistic variation in how ditransitive verbs are expressed in different languages [2]. They can either be used within (1) Double Object Constructions (DOC), (2) Indirect Object Constructions (IOC) and/or (3) Serial Verb Constructions (SVC). English-based Creoles of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans unsurprisingly feature DOCs given the constructions availability in the lexifier. However, other English-based creoles, such as those spoken in Indonesia or Melanisia, do not utilize DOCs. Similarly, DOCs are available in French-based Creoles, like Guadeloupean (1), even though only IOCs are licensed in French (2)-(3).

- (1) GC. I   ba   Mari on kado  
      3SG give Mary IND gift  
      ‘S/he gave Mary a gift’
- (2) Fr. \*Il   a   donne Marie un   cadeau  
      3SG.M AUX give   IND   Mary INDF gift  
      ‘He gave Mary a gift’
- (3) Fr. Il    a   donne un cadeau à    Marie  
      3SG.M AUX give   IND gift    PREP Mary  
      ‘He gave a gift to Mary’

Guadeloupean Creole additionally presents the typical IOC where the indirect object is introduced by a preposition (4); a construction that may alternate with a DOC (5) as in English.

- (4) I   fè   sa   pou   mwen  
      3SG make that PREP 1SG  
      ‘S/he made that for me’
- (5) I   fè   mwen sa  
      3SG make 1SG   that  
      ‘S/he made me that’ or  
      ‘S/he did this to me’

Along with these two constructions, Guadeloupean also inherits SVCs from its African roots. SVCs occupy a special class within ditransitive constructions since they constitute a linguistic strategy to integrate an additional argument (6). As such, non-*give* verbs participating in Guadeloupean SVCs are not necessarily ditransitive initially. They may be intransitive or transitive integrating a recipient into its internal arguments. Indeed only a semantically defined class, namely animate recipients and beneficiaries, are generally integrated within the *bay*-SVCs in Guadeloupean.

- (6) I   fè   sa   ban mwen  
      3SG make that give 1SG  
      ‘S/he made that for me’

Our take here differs from previous analyses where *bay* is assumed to have grammaticalized into a preposition in Guadeloupean Creole [1, 3]. The existence of (5) vs (6) supports the SVC analysis where *ban mwen* in (5) is semantically a recipient or a beneficiary while in (5) *pou mwen* can be read as a causee. In fact, the preposition *pou* can select other kinds of arguments including non-animates and temporal. Syntactic operations that usually determine monoclausality of (5) like fronting or cliticization, are either not sufficient or do not provide a clear diagnosis. TAM marking, on the other hand, provide a better diagnostic for monoclausality. As such Guadeloupean patterns with English in being a mixed type language [2] where both DOCs and IOC are possible while also featuring African-like SVCs, highlighting its hybrid nature.

## References

- [1] Hector Poulet Danièle Bernini-Montbrand Ralph Ludwig and Sylviane Telchid. *Dictionnaire Créole/Français; avec un lexique français-créole et un abrégé de grammaire (4th ed)*. Orphie, 2012.
- [2] Susanne Michaelis and Martin Haspelmath. “Ditransitive constructions: Creole languages in a cross-linguistic perspective”. In: *Creolica* (2003), pp. 1–16.
- [3] Susanne Maria Michaelis et al., eds. *APiCS Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, 2013. URL: <http://apics-online.info>.