Deriving multiple exponence in creole word formation

Background and aims: While morphological approaches to reduplication, as found in Inkelas&Zoll (2005), obtain their descriptive and theoretical insights from partial reduplication patterns, very little attention has been given to the grammatical properties of full reduplication. The bias against full reduplication is made explit in Katamba (1993), who claims that phenomena where the entire word is repeated, is 'nothing more than constituent copying' and therefore too 'simple and theoretically unchallenging' for morphological analysis. Contrary to this view, the literature has shown that full reduplication is morphologically more complex (Kouwenberg 2003, Luís 2019). This study lends further support to this claim with evidence from Kriyol, a Portuguese-based creole spoken in Guiné-Bissau, in which fully reduplicated verbs undergo a significant range of morphological operations. Crucially, they also exhibit non-optional and fully superfluous multiple exponence (ME). As defined by Caballero and Harris (2012), ME is "the occurrence of multiple realizations of a single feature, bundle of features, or derivational category in more than one position in a domain". Fully superfluous multiple exponence is problematic for linguistic theory and has been claimed not to exist (Stiebels 2015). The focus of this study will be to explore an analysis of ME on reduplicated verbs and show that, while redundant marking constitutes effectively a challenge to morphological theory, the mismatches between form and meaning can be accommodated within Construction Morphology (Booij 2010).

Full reduplication and multiple exponence: The doubling of identical parts raises an important methodological question, namely whether the two parts give rise to one morphologically complex lexeme or to a syntactic string comprising two identical words (Gil 2005). In Kriyol, fully reduplicated verbs constitute genuine lexemes: they can be semantically non-compositional and serve as input to morphological processes. In (1b), the meaning of the reduplicated form cannot be derived from the meaning of its parts. In (2b), conversion induces change of category and leftward migration of stress, and in (3b) the reduplicated form carries a participle suffix.

(1) a. *falá* 'say'   b. *fala fála* 'rumours'
(2) a. *djumna djumná* "always arrive too soon" b. *djumna djúmna* "running competition"
(3) a. *dana daná* "destroy"   b. *dana daná-du* "destroyed"

The relevant data for our study is shown in (4b), where the reduplicated verb undergoes causativisation carrying the causative suffix *-nta* both on the base and on the reduplicant. While the suffix is morphologically repeated, the semantics of the causative suffix is not reduplicated. As such, the reduplicated form in (4b) and the non-reduplicated form in (5b) share on property, namely that they only allow a non-reduplicated reading of the causative.

(4) a. *ianda ianda* "walk all over the place"
     b. *ianda-nta inanda-ntá* "cause to walk all over the place"
(5) a. *iandá* "walk"   b. *inanda-ntá* "cause to walk"

Indicating that the causativised reduplicated verb constitutes one single verb form is the fact that it can undergo participle formation (6) like reduplicated verbs in (3).

(6)   *ianda-nta inanda-nta-du* "was made to walk all over the place"

Given that the same causative marker is realized in more than one position within a word domain, it will be argued that (4b) and (6) illustrate an instance of non-optional multiple exponence (ME). In line with Caballero & Harris' (2012) taxonomy of multiple exponence, we further claim that ME in Kriyol is "fully superfluous" (rather than "partially superfluous" or "overlapping") since both causative makers express exactly the same feature.

Analysis: Since very little attention has been paid in the literature to the interaction between ME and full reduplication (Caballero&Inkelas 2013), this study explores an account within Construction Morphology (Booij 2010). The goal will be to capture the morphological complexity of full reduplication and also the form-meaning mismatch observed on causativised reduplicated verbs. Following insights formulated in Booij (2010), we propose the general schema shown in (7) in which the reduplicant and the base are coindexed. The coindexation captures the observation that both sub-constituents are members of one single lexeme and mapped onto a non-compositional meaning carrying the index j.

(7) $[[V]_i [V]_i]_{V,j} \Leftrightarrow [RED_i]_j$

For reduplicated verb forms which have undergone Past Participle formation, we will assume the unification of two schemas (8).

(8)   VV reduplication: $[[V]_i [V]_i]_{V,j} \Leftrightarrow [RED_i]_j$
        Past Participle formation: $[[V]_j du]_{V,k} \Leftrightarrow [PASS_j]_k$

However, to account for the causativised reduplicated verb must be analysed without reduplicating the meaning of the causative to capture the mismatch between the morphological structure and semantics. The causativisation schema proposed for reduplicated verbs is shown in (9) which maps two causative markers in the morphology with one causative meaning in the semantcs.

(9)   VV reduplication: $[[V]_i [V]_i]_{V,j} \Leftrightarrow [RED_i]_j$
        Causative formation $[[V]_i nti [V]_i nti]_{V,j} \Leftrightarrow [CAUSE_j]_k$

References

Booij, G. 2010. *Construction Morphology*. Oxford: OUP. **Caballero, G & Harris, A.** 2012. A working typology of multiple exponence. In: F. Kiefer et al. (eds.) *Current issues in morphological theory: (Ir)regularity, analogy, and frequency*, 163–188. Amsterdam: Benjamins. **Caballero, G. & Inkelas, S**. 2013. Word Construction: Tracing an Optimal Path Through the Lexicon, Morphology 23, 103–143. **Inkelas, S. & Zoll, C.** 2005. *Reduplication: Doubling in Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **Katamba, F.** 1993. *Morphology*. London: Macmillan. **Gil, D.** 2005. "From Repetition to Reduplication in Riau Indonesian". *Studies on Reduplication* ed. by Bernhard Hurch in collaboration with Veronika Mattes, 31–64. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. **Kouwenberg, S.** Ed. 2003. *Twice as Meaningful*. London: Battlebridge. **Luís, A.** 2019. Morphological Theory and Creole Languages. In Jenny Audring & Francesca Masini (eds) The Oxford Handbook of Morphological Theory, 455-475. Oxford: OUP. **Stiebels, B.** 2015. Control. In T. Kiss & A. Alexiadou. Eds. Syntax: Theory and Analysis, 412-446. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.