

13 Evaluative Morphology in Pidgins and Creoles

Barbara Turchetta

1 Introduction: evaluative devices and world view

Evaluative morphology in pidgins and creoles shows different patterns mainly due to internal developments rather than substrate influences. The two kinds of languages, far from being considered as a typological cluster, have no specific genetic affiliation and their morphological characteristics are frequently attributed to typological areas, including other genetically unrelated languages spoken in multilingual contexts of the present or of the past. In general terms, when considering evaluation and perception as two cognitive mechanisms working in any human experience of the world, it is plausible to offer a cultural interpretation of some of the morphological devices related to semantic motivations. In such a perspective, we claim that in general, evaluative devices in languages are the result of the speakers' evaluation of physical and external phenomena, linked to human perception. The given framework of a direct evaluation of human experience in generating evaluative devices in pidgins and creoles is particularly evident, having a rather recent genesis and being strictly linked to pragmatic forces of speech. In this perspective, we will show how evaluative strategies might fall within semantic and structural categories which are definitely larger than those observable in other natural languages, where language growth and change do not undergo the terrific and fast developments which are visible in contact languages.

Languages offer a wide range of morphological devices due to the evaluation of physical characteristics sorted by human beings as elements of distinction. Language categories are oriented to world views and depend on cultural assets sustaining the use of languages. This is very clear in some widely documented cases, such as in the explanation of sub-differentiation in several classes of prefixes for nouns in Bantu languages; most of them are attributable to cultural differentiations of physically relevant distinctions, such as human beings versus animals (related to an animacy scale), fluid substances versus solid ones, countable versus uncountable substances and so on. Evaluative morphology in itself is also strictly linked to the human perception of physical elements, social distinctions and cultural evaluations; it is connected to a speaker-oriented process of evaluation of his or her direct experiences. Subjective commitment is probably the basis for the development of such a category in newborn languages, such as jargons and unstable pidgins, where such a semantic need is perceived and satisfied by pragmatic strategies firstly and grammatical strategies lastly, merging in a later stage of development during pidgin stabilisation.

To discuss all these issues we will consider a wide but non-extensive range of linguistic phenomena, mainly belonging to reduplication and redoubling, which can be described

as evaluative strategies. We will also try to discuss some other morphosyntactic strategies which are used to transmit the semantic values of speakers' commitment in the evaluation of phenomena and entities, as in the case of lexical reduplication and verbal serialisation.

Literature devoted to pidgins and creoles distinguishes three categories of evaluation strategies responding to similar distinctions normally identified in other languages. Although these languages show a clear tendency to isolation and a lack of affixation, the distinction is made among the reduplication of lexical items, the redoubling of morphemes and the repetition of words. We will use the same terminology and discuss the feasible boundary between reduplication and redoubling in pidgin and creole languages, where lexical units may also work as grammatical morphemes depending on the phrasal context.

The present contribution aims to offer an account of evaluative phenomena in this class of languages. Contact languages are a large category which is not universally accepted as such by scholars working on language interference, language contact, multilingual assets and so on. Some scholars tend to consider pidgins (both unstable and stable ones) within the same category, including second language varieties and mixed languages. In this perspective creoles display a different scale of morphological complexity, showing derivational devices. It does not matter whether pidgins and creoles are or are not included in a common linguistic category; they are widely spoken where language contact has had a deep influence, involving typologically and genetically unrelated languages for long periods, where substrates might or might not have included European languages. It is for this reason that they represent a group of languages where pragmatic strategies and language variation represent a vivid propulsive force in language change.

2 The typological quest: is evaluative morphology attested in pidgins and creoles?

Evaluative functions in pidgins and creoles are not performed by morphological means specifically devoted to them; these languages do not respond to the widely attested tendency to express evaluation through peculiar morphological strategies. In order to sustain such a strong position, we will briefly look at the scientific debate on these languages in terms of typological characteristics. None of the typological elements traditionally chosen to distinguish pidgins and creoles from other languages would work in an effective and convincing way. Nonetheless, grouping them within a cluster necessarily implies a clear tendency to share some typological characteristics.

Various scholars who have more recently been investigating the matter would not readily consider pidgins and creoles as part of a homogenous category: contact languages are far from being declared a language type. Scholars in the past have shown a common attitude to observing creoles and pidgins in a sociolinguistic (identity-oriented) perspective, as being dependent on the lexifier languages. This attitude was common for decades after Goodman (1964) and Valdman (1978) produced their works on Caribbean creoles. The two scholars focused on the historical evidence of a strict connection between European languages and mother tongues in the pre-colonial and colonial periods, and their goal consisted in studying substandard varieties of European languages as a language substrate of Caribbean creoles. When turning to more recent attitudes in a similar perspective, pidgins and creoles are often considered as a cluster of languages grouped together thanks to a list of relevant common factors: a non-phylogenetic origin, a strict connection to substrate languages, a constant and fast development due to the communicative pressure of speakers in multilingual settings, and a vitality which is constantly at risk, thanks to the language policies

excluding them. McWhorter (1998; 2005) has made a meaningful contribution to the expansion of this kind of attitude; he has mainly focused on the definition of the category of creole languages as such being typologically distinguishable from other language types. According to his strong position (opinion), the absence of inflectional affixation, tone and rich derivational morphology distinguishes the creole type from other language types.

As a matter of fact, most scholars considering the creole grammars as simple grammars had mainly worked on contact languages with a strong substrate influence of European languages. McWhorter himself worked on a database made up of a sample of eight creoles which are spoken in areas of the world where European trade and colonial policy have strongly influenced language contacts in the last centuries. Different scholars have shown that when observing other contact languages, such as creoles in Africa with African substrates, the three elements which were usually absent in the alleged creole type are in fact actually present. Klein (2006) described tone in Kituba, a creole of the Central African Republic with a Kongo substrate, and Labov (1990) and Siegel (1987) have shown how the absence of inflectional morphology does not imply language simplicity. Moreover, descriptive works on non-European creoles have shown a strong presence of inflectional and derivational morphology, as is the case for Juba Arabic (Versteegh 1984; Avram 2011).

Derivational morphology and inflectional morphology have also been used as elements to distinguish different steps within a scale of language contact development, distinguishing earlier phases and later phases where creoles and expanded pidgins are located. Bakker's (1994) comparison between source languages and pidgins aims at demonstrating the inflectional and derivational richness of the former in comparison with the morphological reduction of the latter. A similar position was assumed by the same author (Bakker 2003) when working on the absence of evaluative morphology in pidgins in comparison with derivational strategies in creoles.

Different pidgins and creoles might show similar strategies for expressing evaluative semantic content, especially in iconic pragmatic strategies occurring in speech. Such strategies might not necessarily correspond to functional categories which would be morphologically fixed in their structural systems. Iconicity is often considered as one of the most distinguishable characteristics of pidgins, especially in their first phases of evolution, where pragmatic strategies and context-induced interpretation work constantly to disambiguate meaning (Givón 1989). Nevertheless, specialists in pidgin and creole studies have demonstrated that iconicity does not play a dominant role in pidgin and creole morphology.

Affixation, conversion, reduplication and compounding dominate expanded pidgin and creole grammars, being the most relevant characteristics effectively grouping creoles into a typological class (Bakker, Daval-Markussen, Parkvall and Plag 2011). Most of the cases we are discussing in order to show how evaluative strategies work in pidgins and creoles will show the dominant role of reduplication. Relevant studies on reduplication as a formal category in pidgins and creoles show its role in fulfilling more than simply evaluative needs (Kouwenberg 2003; Aboh, Smith and Zribi-Hertz 2012a).

Among the formal categories for evaluative morphology which have been defined (cf. Grandi and Körtvelyessy, this volume) the semantic categories most represented in pidgins and creoles are the following: quantitative in size, mass, weight; diminution and augmentation in a scale; intensification and attenuation of phenomena.

In terms of morphological strategies for conveying evaluative contents, pidgins and creoles mainly show reduplication as the most frequent. As a matter of fact, these languages tend to isolation, and isolated languages generally reiterate lexical items (adjectives, adverbs, verbs) for either lexical or grammatical purposes; when duplicating lexical

units, they become unpredictable in the semantic effects they create. Because of this, we will discuss the lexical use of reduplication and the redoubling of morphemes as distinct, since the authors we mention clearly underline such a distinction, though the distance between syntactical behaviour and functional meaning is not always distinguishable. The reduplication of lexical items and the redoubling of morphemes within a word context are far from being two distinct phenomena in pidgins and creoles. Consider the following example from West African Pidgin English:

- (1) *plenti* > *plentiplenti* a. 'richness' > 'great richness' / b. 'very' > 'very much'
go > *gogo* a. 'go' > 'wandering' / b. FUT > far FUT

The two examples can be interpreted as either a reduplication of lexical items or a redoubling of morphemes. The former case would offer a semantic interpretation, as given under (a), while the latter would rather offer a functional reading, as under (b), where grammatical functions are given. As highlighted by Forza (2011), reduplication in general is a formal phenomenon and involves grammatical encoding anyhow, no matter whether the origin is iconic.

In fact, it has been observed that many languages have reiterations for different lexical categories in some contexts, with non-iconic readings resulting. It is often assumed that lexical strategies imply iconicity (as in contact languages at a jargon stage) while morphological strategies fall within a grammar. To sustain non-iconic readings of lexical strategies, Aboh, Smith and Zribi-Hertz (2012b, 8) discuss the lexical use of reiteration for non-iconic purposes in Maori, which is neither a pidgin nor a creole language, where there is no clear boundary between the reiteration of lexical items on the one hand, and reduplication on the other. These authors' suggestion confirms that the distinction is weak and useless in languages with a strong tendency to isolation, whether pidgins, creoles or any other language:

- (2) *ka mare-mare tonu ia*
 TMA cough-cough-CNT still 3SG
 'he coughed many times'

The reiteration of the verb acquires a continuative value in (2), and a similar function is predictable in many expanded pidgins, where repetition of the main verb would indicate a continuing action, an aspectual value normally brought to the same languages by aspect markers:

- (3) West African Pidgin English:
pikin de komot-komot laik dat
 boy(s) PROG come out-come out like DEM
 'Boys are coming out'
- (4) Plantation Pidgin Fijan (Siegel 1987, 105):
vakatolu tiko yani ke, vakatolu
 3 times stay DIR there 3 times
tiko tiko tiko tiko tiko vakavanua
 stay stay stay stay stay village.style
 'Three times I stayed there – I kept staying like a villager'

3 Evaluative morphology and substrate languages in pidgins and creoles

When talking about pidgins and creoles of the Atlantic area, substrate transfer from Niger Congo languages is one of the most popular topics through which to establish a strict connection with the structural matrix of African languages. Niger Congo languages are considered to be responsible for the formation of early contact languages in the area during the first centuries of commercial exchanges between Europe, America and Africa. We will not discuss this relatively strong assumption, which characterised most of the many scientific works on the pidgin and creole heritage of the Atlantic area. Our aim is to discuss syntactic and morphological strategies for conveying evaluative meanings, and we will concentrate on that. Nonetheless, special attention must be given to the general attitude shown by some authors who consider iconicity as an internal factor of pidgin development, and non-iconic constructions as part of an African matrix in many pidgins and creoles in Africa and the Americas; African substrates are normally assumed to be the core elements of a typological area defined as ‘Atlantic’ (Alleyne 1980). It must be noted that studies focused on substrate phenomena for other pidgin and creole languages without a European linguistic heritage hardly discuss iconicity or substrate languages in such terms, and tend to concentrate more on what the new grammar brings rather than on what it has inherited from other languages. If we take into account Niger-Kordofanian languages which might have played a role in the substrate heritage of pidgin and creole languages of the Atlantic area, there are very few typological features in common.

Kouwenberg and LaCharité (2003) discuss reduplication in the framework of African languages’ morphological substrate as being the origin of the development of reduplicative processes in Caribbean creoles. In their words, ‘reduplication is overwhelmingly iconic’ (Kouwenberg and LaCharité 2003, 9) as a process involved in the development of a contact language and linked to universals of language growth. On the other hand, non-iconic reduplication should be influenced by similar processes in West African substrate languages, where it seems to be a morphological productive device. According to this perspective, iconic strategies of reduplication in pidgins and creoles should derive from inner language changes, while non-iconic strategies would be part of substrate inheritance. Examples are given (Kouwenberg and LaCharité 2003, 9):

- (5) Iconic:
- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| a. Berbice Dutch Creole | <i>nangwa</i> ‘long’ | <i>nangwa-nangwa</i> ‘very long’ |
| b. Papiamentu | <i>kayente</i> ‘hot’ | <i>kayente-kayente</i> ‘very hot’ |
| c. Saramaccan | <i>langa</i> ‘long’ | <i>langa-lang</i> a ‘very long’ |
- (6) Non-iconic:
- | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|---|
| a. French Creole | <i>blanch</i> ‘white’ | <i>blanch-blanch</i> ‘whitish’ (DIM) |
| b. Jamaican Creole | <i>laaf</i> ‘to laugh’ | <i>laaf-laaf</i> ‘inclined to laughter’ |
| c. Ndyuka | <i>bai</i> ‘to buy’ | <i>bai-bai</i> ‘bought’ |

Non-iconic reduplication holds an evaluative function in only some of the examples in (6) ((6c) does not express any evaluative function), whereas in the examples in (5), which are interpreted by the two authors as iconic, evaluative intent is certainly present. We would therefore conclude that iconic reduplication is semantically transparent and non-iconic reduplication is complex, or at least visible at a more abstract level from the semantic point of view. According to Kouwenberg and LaCharité, iconic strategies (where a speaker’s

evaluative intention is clear) are unmarked and attributable to universals of language, while productive non-iconic reduplication strategies belong to a more grammatically structured level of language. When effectively comparing non-iconic reduplication in pidgin and creole languages with West African languages, it is not easy to sustain such an affirmation.

West African languages show a widely diffused pattern in reduplicating different categories of words (mainly nouns and verbs) to express regular or customary activities, intensity or other degrees in evaluation. When considering the following comparative data offered by Mutaka and Tamanji (2000, 288–9) on Cameroonian Pidgin English and a presumed substrate language (Bafut), the boundary between iconic and non-iconic motivations seems to be vague:

(7) Cameroonian Pidgin English:

à dé fàin fàin
1SG COP well well
'I am very well'

na wàkàwáká woman
COP walk walk woman
'she is a harlot'

I dón finis kwátakwátá
3SG PST finish complete complete
'it is completely finished'

(8) Bafut:

á fímfíi
3SG dark-dark
'it is extremely dark'

á sá?ánsà?à
3SG long-long
'it is very long'

Sùù ti i nti i
S. walk-walk
'Suh travels a lot'

The complexity of reduplication and redoubling strategies that we can observe in pidgins and creoles of the Atlantic area is far below that observable in West African languages. The grammar of repetition reaches sophisticated levels in some of the languages normally taken as substrates of contact languages; highly structured African morphosyntactic strategies are not visible in pidgins and creoles of the same area. West Atlantic, Kwa and Kru languages of the Niger-Kordofanian phylum (where most creolists working on substrates look for evidence) use reiteration of lexical items or morphological redoubling for aspect and focalisation, the latter being a strategy absent in pidgins and creoles. In some other languages of the same phylum, such as Nupe (a Bengue-Congo language of Central Nigeria), reduplication has to do only with focusing (Kandybowicz 2008).

Aboh et al. (2012a, 30) offer a sharp contribution in delimiting the role of substrate languages in the formation of reduplication strategies for evaluative purposes. These authors observe that reduplication in Suriname creoles derives partially from the substrate

influence of Gbe languages. They discuss non-iconic reduplication in Eastern Gbe languages (Fongbe and Gungbe) and Suriname creoles (Sranan and Saramaccan) in a historical perspective; Suriname creoles and Gbe languages share a common non-iconic reduplication pattern transforming the meaning of reduplicated items from process/event to state/result. In Suriname creoles this partially derives from substrate influence from Gbe languages (Aboh et al. 2012a, 30):

- (9) Saramaccan:
dí kúja mandú
 DET calabash ripe
 ‘The calabash ripens’
dí kúja de mandú mandú
 DET calabash COP ripe ripe
 ‘The calabash is ripe’

A similar semantic difference is found in Gungbe (Aboh et al. 2012a, 30):

- (10) Gungbe:
 a. *àvún lɔ kú tò kɔ-me*
 dog DET die COP ground-in
 ‘The dog died on the ground’
 b. *àvún lɔ tò kú-kú tò kɔ-me*
 dog DET DET die-die COP ground-in
 ‘The dog was lying dead on the ground’

The copula in Gungbe introduces a progressive aspect, state of affair and results. The state of affair or result in (10b) is given by the verbal reduplication.

4 Derivational evaluative morphology merging in creoles

We stated in the previous section that most theories proposing the supposed ‘simplicity’ of pidgin and creole morphology concentrate on what these lack rather than on what is attested in them. More recent works on creole morphology have strongly criticised the notion of semantic transparency in contact languages, talking about ‘the semantic transparency myth’ (Kouwenberg and LaCharité 2011) as a dominant view of derivational morphology of creole languages diffused in creolistics until the end of the last century. Farquharson (2007) widely supports Kouwenberg and LaCharité’s position, taking into account more recent studies on creole morphology; his analysis of a significant samples of contact languages represents a meaningful contribution to discrediting the traditional point of view on their grammatical poverty.

Creole morphology is mainly based on affixation, reduplication, compounding and zero-derivation. Creoles show a different balance of the four strategies to convey grammatical information, whereas pidgins might reach different levels of morphological stability, depending on their evolutionary scale and level of stabilisation. At a jargon stage, a pidgin might present more pragmatic than grammatical strategies to convey meaning, being nonetheless an effective means of communication. Affixation is a frequent strategy for the TMA systems both of creoles and of stable and expanded pidgins. Prefixation and suffixation in

nouns are more frequent in creoles of the Caribbean and Pacific areas, the latter being also the area where two expanded pidgins are spoken, namely Tok Pisin and Bislama, showing a particularly rich morphology in nouns, pronouns and the TMA system.

Stable and expanded pidgins, together with creoles, share common morphological features. Contiguous morphology is the most preferred, with a total lack of infixation and separate morphosyntactic constituents. Another typological characteristic of these languages is represented by a common avoidance of combinations of derivational and inflectional morphemes. The former category is definitely extensively attested present in creoles, especially with nominal bases.

Pidgins and creoles in fruitful sociolinguistic circumstances are vital languages and may change very fast. They develop quite impressively in grammar, especially when they represent a relevant cultural point of reference for speakers (in terms of the speakers' identity). It has been observed that derivation is one of the first mechanisms to merge with new productive morphemes, often as the product of grammaticalisation processes. A good example is given by the new Jamaican Creole suffix *-sha* attached to verbs and nouns, which is probably derived from *she* and now works for 'exceeding person' with an augmentative meaning in nouns and an iterative meaning in verbs (Farquharson 2007):

- (11) *beg* 'to beg' > *begiisha* 'a woman who is always begging'
laaf 'to laugh' > *laafiisha* 'a person who laughs a lot'

We have discussed the role of iconicity in lexical reduplication as being central in semantic enrichment. Redoubling is also an iconic strategy in pidgins and creoles. When denoting a semantic content, it conveys plurality, uncertain quantity or uncountable quantity. Redoubling as a word-formation device is more frequent in non-expanded pidgins; in stable pidgins and creoles, more strategies conveying the same functional meanings occur. When redoubling is used for large quantities it may occur as such in a language, the single form being totally absent in the lexicon. The examples in (12) show the three conditions:

- (12) West African Pidgin English:
bonbon (<*bon*) 'more than one bone'
sansan (<**san*) 'sand' [uncountable]
pispis (<**pis*) 'leftovers' [uncertain quantity]

Grammatical functions of redoubling will be discussed in the next section to show the way the strategy conveys evaluative functions, being an effective part of pidgin and creole grammars.

The redoubling of grammaticalised lexemes or the reduplication of lexical items are part of a widely diffused pattern in pidgins and creoles: compounding. It is a quite frequent strategy for creating new words for new meanings, when a creole or pidgin language expands its dominion of use. It is also possible to work etymologically on the origin of a large part of their lexicon, indicating the original lexemes which fused to create a new meaning in the new word. Metaphor is the semantic strategy working on some of the original meanings of words in a compound. The following examples are by Farquharson (2007, 26):

- (13) Jamaican Creole:
washbeli (< wash-belly) 'the last child born'

legobiis (< let-go-beast) ‘an unruly person’
waakfut (< walk-fut) ‘pedestrian’

Conversion or zero-derivation is the basic strategy allowing multifunctionality in pidgin and creole lexicon. The lexical and semantic chain starts from a verb with some semantic restriction. Unergative and intransitive verbs seem by far the most frequent categories of the first item chain:

- (14) West African Pidgin English:
wak ‘to walk > walk’
luk ‘to look > look > sight’

5 Augmentative and diminutive reduplication and redoubling

Redoubling is the most frequent strategy registered in pidgins and creoles for evaluative functions. Literature devoted to pidgin and creole morphology (Kouwenberg 2003) distinguishes between repetition (two identical words co-occurring) and reduplication (lexical morpheme repetition within a single word). No matter which strategy is chosen, it must be taken into account that pidgins and creoles are far from being considered inflectional languages, where evaluative morphology undergoes the same derivative constructions which are visible in European languages, partly responsible in some pidgins and creoles of substrate inheritance. Contact languages normally present isolated morphemes or crystallised forms, where grammatical morphemes within the sequence of a word are not productive. As stated before, some contact languages are particularly rich in grammatical information; the redoubling of morphemes can be effectively considered as the product of a derivational process, though not precisely coinciding with what is traditionally considered as such. As we have already pointed out, it is not easy to put a clear boundary between lexical reduplication and morphological redoubling in such languages with a strong tendency to isolation. For this reason, we will leave terminological distinctions apart; let us consider some examples discussed by different authors to show how reduplication works in pidgins and creoles to convey evaluative meaning. As stated before, pidgins and creoles cannot be considered to be part of a homogeneous category of languages and reflect the influence of different substrates, areal phenomena and interference from the native or second languages of their speakers. Because of this, we can only focus on common characteristics of the languages which share at least one of these variables.

Reduplication is generally the most frequent device in many pidgins and creoles with an augmentative meaning:

- (15) Creole from Martinica:
sé pwason-an piti-piti
 DEM fish-DET small-small
 ‘this fish is very small’
- (16) West African Pidgin English:
A laik-am fain-fain
 1S like-DET well-well
 ‘I like it very much’

A sharp differentiation was made for creole languages of the Caribbean area by Kouwenberg and La Charité (2005), who studied reduplication strategies in Caribbean creoles, mainly focusing on iconicity as an unmarked interpretation of the phenomenon, including the four common patterns: iteration, augmentation or distribution and multiplication. In their examples from Jamaican Creole (2005, 534–5):

- (17)
- | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Iterative | <i>tiif</i> ‘to steal’ | <i>tiiftiif</i> | ‘to steal repeatedly’ |
| Augmentative | <i>fek</i> ‘to be light’ | <i>fekfek</i> | ‘to be very light’ |
| Multiplicative | <i>saka</i> ‘bag’ | <i>sakasaka</i> | ‘many bags’ |

Caribbean creoles show a clear distribution of meaning for iconic reduplication of nouns, adjectives and verbs. The three categories convey different semantic meanings, namely augmentative for adjectives (18), iteration for verbs (19) and multiplication for nouns (20). All examples are from Sranan:

- (18) *a no pikinpikin swakiswaki man yu o toki*
 COP NEG small-small weak-weak man 2SG IRR take
fu go strey boto
 COMP go compete boat
 ‘you would not use really small and weak men to compete in a boat race’
- (19) *ma te mi ma ben de na libi dan a ben*
 but time 1SG mother TNS COP LOC life then 3SG TNS
yepiyepi mi
 helphelp 1SG
 ‘but when my mother was alive she would help me’
- (20) *mi mu lay sakasaka udu tya kom na oso*
 1SG OBL load bag-bag wood carry come LOC house
 ‘I must carry the wood home with a lot of bags’

Caribbean creoles are certainly the richest in terms of morphological and syntactic complexity; they also show a wide spectrum of sociolinguistic varieties and a wide expansion of the lexicon.

Kouwenberg and La Charité (2005) have shown too that in some Caribbean creole languages the same strategy may convey a diminutive meaning. It is the only clear counter-example among all the other cases where reduplication conveys an augmentative meaning, and because of that it is worth mentioning.

The iconic principle of reduplication, as indicated by Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 128), works on the statement ‘more of form stands for more of content’, where the semantic redoubling would give more strength to the redoubled word. In the following example from Jamaican Creole, the semantic reinforcement seems clear:

- (21) *red* ‘red’ > *rediredi* ‘strongly red’

Nevertheless, Kouwenberg and La Charité (2005) have noticed that reduplication of colour names in Jamaican Creole might also convey a dispersive meaning, where reference is made to a non-homogeneous dispersion of the dye. In their examples:

- (22) [yellow] *yalayala* 'yellowish'
 [black] *blakiblaki* 'black-spotted, sooty'
 [red] *redredi*¹ 'red-spotted, reddish'
 [green, unripe] *griinigriini* 'green-spotted, greenish, unripe in places'

The redoubling of morphemes within a word boundary has been seen as a peculiar characteristic of creoles only by Bakker (2003). The strong position is assumed in analysing a sample of eight pidgins and creoles which all have a European language as a substrate inheritance, taking into account that the morphology of creoles shows a higher degree of derivation strategy than does that of pidgins. We have already discussed the strong tendency of pidgins and creoles towards isolation. Isolating morphemes hardly distinguish their functional role between grammatical and lexical morphology, a difference we can disambiguate only in some sentence contexts.

For the sake of clarity and to justify redoubling as part of derivational processes, we will discuss some cases related to morphological repetition where reduplication works either in predicates or in nouns, either with an evaluative function or for other semantic purposes.

Peter Bakker and Mikael Parkvall (2005) distinguished nineteen functional uses of reduplication in pidgins and creoles, whereby only eight of them could be attributed to an evaluative process; when distinguishing again between strict evaluation in terms of gradualness and the aspect functions of verbs, the group reduced to four (Bakker and Parkvall 2005, 512–13):

Verbs:	intensive/augmentative 'to v a lot'	[evaluation of gradualness]
	aspectual 'to v continuously/regularly'	
	spatial distributive 'to v in several places'	
	attenuating 'to v a bit'	[evaluation of gradualness]
Nouns:	distributive 'various N'	
	totality 'every N'	
ADJ:	intensifying 'very ADJ'	[evaluation of gradualness]
	attenuating 'somewhat, little ADJ'	[evaluation of gradualness]

Consider reduplicated verbs with an iterative, habitual and distributive function, as shown by the Juba Arabic examples below. They can all be considered a case limit when merging redoubling strategies with evaluative functions only. Aspect in verbs would have an evaluative meaning, being linked to the event evaluation in terms of characteristics rather than being anchored to objective information such as the passing of time would be.

Predicates work in a quite distinct way in creoles with high morphological density. Juba Arabic is one of them, being a widely diffused creole in an area where Nilo-Saharan languages are spoken as a first or second language by speakers who fluently dominate Arabic creole. Juba Arabic (spoken in South Sudan) together with Nubi (spoken in Kenya and Uganda) and Turku (spoken in Chad and northeast Nigeria) emerged in the mid-nineteenth century through the expansion of military occupation by the Egyptian army with troops of different linguistic origins (Miller 2003) Since then, Juba Arabic has only been exposed to any substrate influence in a limited way (Classical or Standard Arabic). From a morphological point of view, the three creoles almost totally lack productive inflectional and derivational patterns which are very common in several colloquial varieties of Arabic. This

might be a reason which prompts and is compensated for by the richness of the redoubling strategy, which is very frequent in the language. A corpus of Juba Arabic discussed by Miller (2003) clearly shows the reduplication pattern in predicates and nouns, though not all occurrences have a morphological status.

Augmentative (23) and distributive (24) meanings can be attributed to noun reduplication as follows (Miller 2003, 290–1):

(23) *grús-grús-grús ligó wén fi zamán zey dé*
 money-money-money find where LOC time like DEM
 ‘where is such a big amount of money to be found at this time?’

(24) *úmon bi-gáta-gáta hita-hita-hita*
 3PL TMA-cut-cut piece-piece-piece
 ‘they cut [the meat] in very small pieces’

Example (24) shows both verb and noun reduplication, a strategy used to intensify the distributive interpretation.

Adjectives, adverbs and quantifiers show similar morphological behaviour. Modifiers actually seem to be particularly productive in reduplication in Juba Arabic. Intensive/augmentative meaning is often conveyed, a common pattern in several Niger-Kordofanian and Nilo-Saharan languages:

(25) *Majúb yaú sukún-sukún-sukún úwo bi-kátulnás sedíd*
 M. TOP hot-hot-hot 3S TMA-kill people strong
 ‘Majub was very tough, he killed a lot of people’

Continuative connotation with intensification is also a common semantic function for redoubling. In this sense, as in the meaning shown in (25), the repetition of words does have a grammatical function, as in morpheme redoubling. The continuative is shown in the Juba Arabic example (26) (Miller 2003, 291) and in West African Pidgin English (27) (personal data):

(26) Juba Arabic:
Úman baadín bi-kélem kalám de biráá- biráá- biráá
 3PL after TMA-discuss matter DEM slowly-slowly-slowly
 ‘then they discuss the matter very quietly [taking their time]’

(27) West African Pidgin English:
dis graun na so-so kata-kata
 DEM world be like this-like this confusion-confusion
 ‘the world will always be a great confusion’

The redoubling of morphemes is also registered in numerals and more frequently in verbs. In the latter, a TMA prefix occurs once, followed by the reduplicated stem (Miller 2003, 293) with an intensive meaning:

(28) Juba Arabic:
namán beljik wósulu fi Réjaf úman dósoman-dósoman sedíd

when Belgian arrive in R. 3PL fight-fight strong
 ‘When the Belgians arrived in Rejaf they fought a lot’

Derivational suffixes conveying evaluative meaning are rarely reported in pidgins and creoles. We have seen the strategy is present in only some Caribbean creoles. Finney (2002, 9) describes reduplication with iterative function (a common pattern in pidgins and creoles) and compound reduplication with evaluative purposes in Krio:

- (29) Krio:
ben ‘bent’
ben ben ‘twisted’
čuk ‘stab’
čuk čuk ‘stab all over’

A different strategy for conveying the evaluation of events is offered by verbal serialisation. The syntax of serial verbs is quite a common pattern in pidgin and creole languages, though it conveys different semantic values from one language to another.

Degree-marking meaning is one of the four major groups of meanings defined by Muysken and Veenstra (1994, 290) for serial constructions in pidgins and creoles. Prototypes of meaning for such a category would be *pass* (comparative, excessive) or *suffice* (enough), as in the examples below:

- (30) São Tomé Creole:
n kume pasa
 1SG eat exceeding
 ‘I am a big eater’
- (31) Angolar:
tuba ka tobe pata
 rain HAB rain exceeding
 ‘It always rains too much’
- (32) West African Pidgin English:
yu tok pas fo taim
 1SG talk exceeding COMP time
 ‘You talk passing over the time → You are a great talker’

All the examples given and discussed show the different applications of the reduplication, redoubling, repetition and serialisation of verbs in pidgins and creoles. In considering the wide application of such strategies for different semantic purposes, we would not consider evaluative constructions as a distinct natural class. Similar morphological strategies are used both for evaluative functions and for other functional purposes, such as aspect in verbs and plural in nouns. Therefore, evaluative morphology as such is hardly distinguishable as a functional and typological category in languages of this kind, being part of larger formal categories where evaluation and gradualness are but two of the several semantic functions of language units. Multifunctionality is actually and effectively a clear characteristic of languages generated in multilingual contexts. Moreover, it seems that the universal tendency to express evaluative meaning through the use of derivational morphology or any

other strategy (as in pidgins and creoles with reduplication) does not necessarily imply the expression of opposing meanings, such as 'small' versus 'big', 'bad' versus 'good' and so on. It is this that distinguishes most pidgins and creoles from any other natural language.

Note

1. The difference in form from *rediredi* in (21) can be explained by a syllabic erosion which is frequent in reduplication.