

Creole in transition: Contact with Dutch and typological change in Sranan

Kofi Yakpo (The University of Hong Kong)

1 Introduction

Most Surinamese today acquire a heterogeneous variety of Sranan characterized by extensive admixture with Dutch. The analysis of a corpus of contemporary Sranan reveals variation in the expression of spatial relations and the realization of arguments in ditransitive constructions. Both domains feature syntactic rearrangements and semantic changes that replicate Dutch structures. Pattern replication has led to alterations in the frequency and distribution of Sranan elements and structures, as well as innovations with Sranan and Dutch borrowed elements fulfilling new, previously unattested functions. Sranan is undergoing a substantial typological shift from more substrate-oriented Kwa-like structures to ones similar to those found in the West Germanic superstrate Dutch. Society-wide multilingualism involving Dutch, Sranan and often additional languages provides the socio-linguistic backdrop to contact-induced variation and change in Sranan.¹

Voices in Suriname say that Sranan is being fundamentally transformed by contact with Dutch. There is a feeling among Surinamese linguists and language observers that the more monolingual variety of *dipi Sranan*, “elaborate Sranan”, of their parent and grandparent generation is no longer spoken by younger speakers of the urban and peri-urban zone of Paramaribo (e.g. Eersel, p.c.; D. France Oliveira, p.c.; Tjon Sie Fat, p.c.). This variety, they say, is being pushed aside by a heavily mixed variety of Sranan featuring a growing Dutch-derived and a reduced English- and African-derived vocabulary. The general sentiment is that competence in *dipi Sranan* is on the wane, that the “gaps” are being filled with Dutch elements and structures, and that an informal and colloquial register has become generalized as the only one available to many speakers. Sranan seems

¹ I am indebted to Gracia Blanker, Henna Blanker, Renata De Bies, Hein Eersel, Stanley Hanenberg, Jit Narain and D. France Oliveira, without whose support and advice the research on which this study relies could not have been carried out. I owe particular gratitude to our Surinamese collaborating researcher D. France Oliveira, who transcribed the Sranan data. I am also grateful to Soraya Renjaan, who transcribed the Surinamese Dutch corpus. The linguistic annotation of the data was done by me with the SIL software FieldWorks Language Explorer (FLEX). I also wish to thank Bettina Migge for her valuable comments on a first draft of this chapter.

to be undergoing a more far-reaching contact-induced transformation than was the case in preceding centuries. Part of this change coincides with the expansion of plurilingual practices involving Sranan, Dutch, and often, a third Surinamese language like Sarnami, Javanese or Ndyuka (e.g. Migge 2015; Léglise and Migge 2015), and the consolidation of a mixed Sranan-Dutch code as an unmarked norm (Yakpo 2015). Sranan-Dutch mixing patterns that have already been conventionalized in Sranan are carried over, often through holophrastic borrowing and calquing into languages other than Sranan, thus representing manifestations of “second order code-switching” together with these third languages (Meeuwis and Blommaert 1998; Auer 1998a: 16).

The use of plurilingual modes of speaking Sranan however varies between speakers and situations, depending on factors like domain, discourse participants, and so forth. We must also assume that some Sranan speakers acquire and use different styles of Sranan next to each other, some of which are more monolectal and homogenous, while others are more heterogeneous and mixed. Opting for one or the other variety in accordance with pragmatic conventions will therefore constitute an important part of an individual’s plurilingual competence in Sranan. A possible difference between present and past plurilingual practices is that the mixed heterogeneous style is becoming the dominant form in the panoply of available styles while the more homogenous variety is becoming a minority practice with fewer people today learning and making use of it. There is almost certainly also a geographic dimension to the prevalence of these plurilingual practices, which still awaits investigation. Our data seems to indicate, for example, that Sranan spoken in the more rural district of Coronie is on average less interspersed with Dutch than that of urban Paramaribo, and may indeed also be more conservative with respect to the changes described in this chapter.

Various works have shown how features carried over from specific substrates, from the lexifier English, from the colonial superstrate Dutch and internal grammaticalization processes have shaped specific sub-systems of Sranan and the other creoles of Suriname, e.g. the verbal system (Migge 2003; Winford and Migge 2007; Borges et al. 2014, this volume; Essegbey, van den Berg and van de Vate 2013), the copula system (e.g. Arends 1986) and the nominal system (e.g. Bruyn 1995; van den Berg 2014). The analysis of contact-induced change in Sranan in this chapter covers aspects that have not been (fully) explored by previous work (e.g. Essegbey and Bruyn 2002; Yakpo and Bruyn 2015). In this chapter, I provide evidence for typological change in Sranan through contact with Dutch. I focus on two domains, namely (1) the grammar of space (locative constructions), and (2) argument structure (ditransitive constructions). I conclude that change involves the processes of “pattern borrowing” and some “matter borrowing” (Sakel 2007)

from Dutch. The outcomes of these contact processes are alterations of the frequency and the distribution of Sranan elements and combinations of elements. On a whole, the changes confirm the impressions in Suriname about Sranan becoming more Dutch-like. At this point, it is however unclear whether this convergence is reflective of some degree of attrition and shift to Dutch by sectors of the urban population of Paramaribo, or whether the changes are taking place within the context of stable multilingualism.

The data on which this chapter is based was gathered as part of the ERC-funded “Traces of Contact” Project (principal investigator Pieter Muysken) by me, Stanley Hanenberg, and Robert Borges in Suriname between 2010 and 2012 for seven Surinamese languages (Sranan, Ndyuka, Saramaccan, Kwinti, Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese, as well as Surinamese Dutch). The Sranan corpus on its own consists of about 60,000 words of elicited and naturalistic data. Examples from our Surinamese Dutch corpus (about 15,000 words) are also used in this chapter. About 60% of the corpus consists of data obtained via the use of focused elicitations, parallel texts (e.g. Mayer 1969) and director-matcher tasks covering the domains of spatial relations, tense-aspect-mood, grammatical relations and event integration. The remaining 40% consist of more naturalistic data including sociolinguistic interviews and informal conversations.

In section 2, I discuss the plurilingual practices that characterize the linguistic scenario in which the changes described for Sranan have taken place. Section 3 provides a detailed overview of contact-induced developments in the expression of spatial relations, focusing on locative constructions. Section 4 looks at change in ditransitive construction and “transfer events” in particular. Section 5 addresses the outcomes and processes of contact-induced change observed in this study and section 6 concludes this chapter.

2 Plurilingual practices involving Sranan

The contact-induced structural changes described in this chapter are rooted in plurilingual communicative practices that are part of the “normal way of speaking” in Suriname. The typical characteristics of plurilingual speech involving Sranan are the insertion of Dutch content words and free function words, the frequent alternation between Sranan and Dutch clauses and sentences, as well as lexical and structural calquing of Dutch elements and collocations, and vice-versa, of Sranan elements in Dutch stretches of discourse. Much of the admixture of Dutch, even when it occurs on the spur of the moment, follows established routes of morphosyntactic adaptation in Sranan. Likewise, the admixture of

certain (classes of) Dutch elements and collocations in Sranan discourse often occurs with a higher likelihood than others, thereby constituting patterns in a heterogeneous mixed variety of Sranan.

In this section, I will present some of the characteristics of this mixed Sranan code in the mould of which typological change in Sranan is taking place. Code-switching is the most conspicuous plurilingual practice. It plays an important role in the emergence of the heterogeneous Sranan variety that is becoming the norm in Suriname, and probably lies at the origin of some of the structural changes that Sranan has undergone.

The following excerpt stems from a procedural interaction, in which speaker 1 (SP1, male) asks speaker 2 (SP2, female) to relate to him a recipe for the preparation of *afingi*, ‘cassava dumplings’ (Sranan elements are in italics, Dutch elements in bold italics, Eastern Maroon Creole elements in bold italics and underlined):

Excerpt 1:

- SP1 1 *Yu srefi sabi meki en?*
2sg self know make 3sg.indp
‘Do you yourself know how to make it [cassava dumplings]?’
- SP2 2 ***Ja, heel lekker ook.***
yes whole tasty also
‘Yes, (it’s) really good too.’
- SP1 3 *Yu kan taygi mi fa yu e meki en?*
2sg can tell 1sg how 2sg ipfv make 3sg.indp
‘Can you tell me how to make it?’
- SP2 4 *So afingi na **geraspte cassave** san den sma*
so dumpling foc grated cassava what def.pl person
5 *e poti ini wan matapi.*
ipfv put in one cassava.tube
‘So **afingi** is **grated cassava** that people put into a cassava tube.’
- SP1 6 ***Gewoon a switi kasaba?***
just def.sg sweet cassava
‘**Just** the sweet cassava?’
- SP2 7 *Iya, **dan** yu o **rasp** en, te yu **rasp***
yes then 2sg fut grate 3sg.indp temp 2sg grate
8 *en, **dan** yu o poti en ini wan*
3sg.indp then 2sg fut put 3sg.indp in one
9 *matapi fu puru a **vocht uit**,*
cassava.tube prep remove def.sg humidity part

- 10 *fu yu kan droog en uit, dan*
 prep 2sg can dry 3sg.indp part then
- 11 *yu o haal en door wan zeef.*
 2sg fut take 3sg.indp part one sieve
 ‘Yes, **then** you’ll **grate** it, when you’ve **grated** it, **then** you’ll
 put it into a cassava tube to take the **humidity out**, for you
 to **dry** it **out**, then you **run** it **through** a **sieve**.’
- 12 *Te yu haal en door a zeef,*
 temp 2sg take 3sg.indp part def.sg sieve
- 13 *dan ga je het een beetje sprenkelen met een*
 then go you it a bit sprinkle with a
beetje water.
 bit water
 ‘When you’ve **run** it **through** the **sieve**, **then** you’ll **sprinkle**
it a bit with a bit of water.’
- 14 *Dan ga je balletje van maken.*
 then go you little.ball from make
 ‘**Then** you’ll **make** **little balls** **out of it**.’
- 15 *En uit den bal di yu o meke de,*
 and out 3pl ball sub 2sg fut make there
- 16 *dan yu o puu pikin-pikin balletjes.*
 2sg fut remove red-small little.balls
 ‘**And out** of those balls that you’ll **make there**, **then** you’ll
remove lots of **little balls** (from them).’

A first characteristic of the language used in excerpt 1 is that it is, in fact, a trilingual text. SP2, a 23 year old teacher residing in the Surinamese capital Paramaribo self-identifies as a person of Ndyuka (an Eastern Maroon Creole language) stock. There are at least two words that are Ndyuka in form, namely *meke* ‘make’ (line 15), and *puu* ‘remove’ (line 16). The corresponding Sranan forms are *meki* and *puru*. Phonological variation and mixing in a single stretch of discourse between cognate forms like *meki* (Sranan) and *meke* (Ndyuka), as well as the use of forms intermediate between Sranan and Ndyuka and homophonous dia-morphs like *de* ‘there’ (line 15) are characteristic not only for varieties of Sranan used by some Ndyuka speakers. It is also one of the hallmarks of an emerging koiné used in the interior of Suriname and in western French Guiana (see Migge and Léglise 2013; Migge 2015; Borges et al. 2014: 123–130, this volume).

Besides that, excerpt 1 is replete with Dutch elements. This includes alternations at clause boundaries, in which the principal language switches completely

to Dutch (lines 2, and 13–14) and back to a mix of Sranan and Ndyuka (line 15). Beyond that, excerpt 1 features insertions of constituents. We find the inserted clause-peripheral Dutch adverbs *gewoon* ‘just’ (line 6) and *dan* ‘then’ (lines 8, 10) and the Dutch nouns *vocht* ‘humidity’ (line 9), *zeef* ‘sieve’ (line 11) and *bal* ‘ball’ (line 15), all of which are preceded by one of the Sranan determiners *a* ‘def.sg’, *den* ‘def.pl’ and *wan* ‘one’. We also find the insertion of a Dutch noun phrase, namely *geraspte cassave* ‘grated cassava’ as a complement to the Sranan focus marker and identity copula *na* ‘foc’ (line 4). The insertion of Dutch noun-modifier constituents is common where such often conventionalized collocations are also frequent in Dutch-based discourse (cf. Khakimov 2015).

The insertion of verbs follows a conventionalized pattern whereby an invariant inflected Dutch verb form, based on the most frequent form (1sg, 1sg/2sg in inverted questions, imperative) of the most frequently used Dutch TAM category (present tense), is used throughout the Sranan person paradigm in finite (i.e. *rasp* ‘grate’ in line 7, *haal* ‘take’ in lines 11 and 12) and in non-finite contexts alike (i.e. *yu kan droog* ‘you can dry’ in line 10). Sranan speakers also routinely incorporate the separable verbal particles of Dutch verbs in the postposed position following Dutch grammatical norms (the equivalent of English particles like *out* in a collocation like *find out*). These particle verb constructions can involve collocations of two Dutch elements, such as *droog en uit* ‘dry it out’ (Dutch in bold), in line 10. We also find mixed collocations, featuring a Sranan semantic calque of a Dutch verb, followed by a Dutch particle, as in *puru a vocht uit* ‘remove/take the humidity out’ (line 9), where the use of *puru* in this context is calqued on the Dutch verb *haal*- ‘take, remove’.

Excerpt 1 does not contain instances of full calques of Dutch (particle) verbs, but one example found elsewhere in our data is the Sranan collocation *go abra* literally ‘go over’, which replicates the semantics of a corresponding Dutch idiom with the sense of ‘be about’ as in *this story is about X*. The same kind of flexibility with respect to the insertion of particle verbs has been observed for other Surinamese languages, e.g. Ndyuka (Borges 2014a) and Sarnami (Borges et al. 2014: 201–204). The continuum of the insertion of (a) fully Dutch items, hence matter transfer, (b) mixed Sranan-Dutch expressions involving partial calquing and (c) full calques of Dutch expressions and hence the transfer of patterns alone is also characteristic for the mixing of other elements in plurilingual discourse involving Sranan. All in all the insertion of adverbs, nouns and verbs is highly conventionalized and adheres to relatively established norms, in accordance with a grammar of code-switching so to say.

Code-switching involving Sranan is governed by a multitude of factors, ranging from discourse-pragmatic and information-management ones like turn-taking, commenting and framing (e.g. line 2), to memory effects like retrieval or priming.

What is striking regarding excerpt 1 is that such plurilingual practices, whatever their local significance within a given text, are highly conventionalized. This means that Sranan and Dutch, two different ‘languages’, constitute a unitary code to fulfill linguistic functions within a conversation that would be fulfilled by linguistic material, structures, and stylistic devices from a single ‘language’ in a monolectal text. Many of the switching phenomena we can observe are therefore not “interactionally meaningful” (Auer 1998a: 20). They are rather manifestations of the conventionalized mixed code that has come to characterize this unitary use of Sranan and Dutch.

I argue elsewhere that this evolving grammar of mixing as well as the discourse-pragmatic motivations for code-mixing are very similar, and in some cases identical across the languages of Suriname (see Yakpo 2015). Thus, a linguistic area has emerged in Suriname, with Sranan as one of its two cornerstones. This area consists of layers of convergence towards Dutch and Sranan as donor and recipient languages to each other, and donor languages to other languages of Suriname. Many conventionalized patterns and elements ultimately of Dutch origin have entered third languages like Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese via Sranan, where they were already established beforehand. Sranan therefore plays a dual role as a conduit for indirect Dutch influence on other languages of Suriname, while simultaneously exerting direct influence on these languages.

3 Contact-induced change in the expression of spatial relations

In this section, I cover contact-induced change in the grammar of space in Sranan. Sranan features typological specificities in its grammar of space that set it apart from its lexifier English and its superstrate Dutch. These are the existence of postpositional structures featuring locative or relator nouns, the use of a general locative preposition, and serial verb constructions. I will show that contemporary Sranan has undergone profound restructuring and a typological shift away from these characteristics in its grammar of space due to contact with Dutch. The existing literature, cited where relevant, addresses some of the contact-induced changes described in the following. This study is, however, the first work to provide detailed analyses, explore not yet described aspects of these changes, and corroborate claims to change with statistical evidence based on primary data.

Tab. 1 summarizes salient characteristics of locative constructions discussed in the following sections.

Tab. 1: Characteristics of locative constructions.

Characteristic	N	In %	Examples
(a) Complex locative constructions over total of locative constructions	91/1335	6.8%	(1), (5)
(b) Postpositional structures over total of locative constructions	2/1335	0.1%	(1), (6)
(c) General locative preposition marks Source over total of Source-oriented constructions	7/73	9.6%	(6)
(d) General locative preposition marks Goal over total of Goal-oriented constructions	253/398	63.6%	(12), (13)

Tab. 1 seems to indicate that Sranan is undergoing a transformation of its grammar of space, characterized by the demise of complex locative constructions (a); the loss of postpositional structures (b); a low frequency of the general locative preposition in Source-oriented events (c); and a lower than expected frequency of the general locative preposition in Goal-oriented events (d).

3.1 From postpositional to prepositional structures

Earlier varieties of Sranan featured locative constructions involving the simultaneous use of a general locative preposition and a postposed or preposed locative noun. Contemporary Sranan is characterized by the use of locative constructions featuring specific prepositions very similar to corresponding Dutch ones. I argue that contact with Dutch has led to two linked changes in locative constructions. Firstly, the use of postposed locative nouns has been abandoned, and locative nouns are exclusively found in a preposed position before the Ground noun in contemporary Sranan. Secondly, the general locative preposition *na* ‘loc’ only rarely co-occurs with preposed locative nouns in “complex locative constructions”. The dominant type of locative construction found in the data is, instead, a “simplex locative construction”, which features erstwhile Sranan locative nouns functionally converted to Dutch-style prepositions expressing specific topological relations.

Tab. 2 lists the absolute and relative frequencies of simplex locative constructions with each of the five principal locative elements in the corpus.² The four

² Tab. 2 lists the occurrences of locative constructions in which the Ground is explicitly mentioned, hence structures like (1) to (5). An example of a structure in which the Ground is not explicitly mentioned is *a de na tapu* [3sg.sbj cop loc top] ‘It is on top/above.’ Here, the locative element *tapu* is nominal by default and these structures therefore require the use of a relational element like *na*.

Tab. 2: Frequencies of locative elements in simplex constructions relative to complex constructions.

Locative element	<i>ini</i>	<i>tapu</i>	<i>baka</i>	<i>ondro</i>	<i>fesi</i>	Total
Total	531	514	158	23	18	1244
Total in %	94.7%	91.6%	98.1%	88.5%	69.2%	93.2%

most frequent locative elements *ini* ‘in(side)’, *tapu* ‘on/top’ and *baka* ‘behind/back’ occur far less often in complex constructions (5.3%, 8.4%, 1.9%, 11.5% respectively) than in simplex ones (94.7%, 91.6%, 88.5% respectively). The occurrence of the least frequent locative element *fesi* ‘(in) front (of)’ in complex locative constructions (30.8%) as opposed to simplex ones (69.2%) is significantly higher. However, all but one occurrence of the collocation *na fesi* stem from a single, elderly speaker (70+ years), an indication that the variation described in this section probably reflects diachronic change. Tab. 2 therefore seems to point to a shrinkage of the functional scope of the general locative preposition *na*.

Example (1) below involves the elements that make locative constructions in earlier varieties of Sranan differ from those of contemporary Sranan: (i) a locative construction introduced by a general locative preposition (*na* ‘loc’, alternatively realized as *a*), with vague spatial semantics, and employed in motion and stative events alike; (ii) a postpositional locative noun (*tapu*) that specifies the Region of a Ground (*ede* ‘head’); (iii) the Ground noun and the Region noun are linked in a possessive/modifying construction, with the Ground functioning as the possessor/modifier noun and the locative noun functioning as the possessed/modified noun and syntactic head to the construction (Yakpo and Bruyn 2015: 142, 166):

- (1) *A dagu kren na a boy ede tapu*
 def.sg dog climb loc def.sg boy head top
fu no nati skin.
 prep neg wet body
 ‘The dog climbed onto the boy’s head so as not to wet (its) body.’

Very similar constructions in the Niger Congo phylum and the Gbe grouping in particular have been argued to form the template of the Sranan construction (Bruyn 1996; Essegbey 2005; Yakpo and Bruyn 2015). I will henceforth refer to such structures, which involve a general locative preposition *and* a locative noun as “complex locative constructions”. Complex locative constructions featuring postpositional locative nouns like (1) are found in eighteenth century Sranan sources (see Essegbey and Bruyn 2002; van den Berg 2007) and are attested well into the mid-twentieth century (see e.g. Voorhoeve 1953; Voorhoeve 1962). Such constructions are also well documented and still in use in the Maroon Creole languages (for Ndyuka, see Huttar and Huttar 2003: 531; for Saramaccan, see Muysken 1987;

McWhorter and Good 2012: 186). This is additional evidence that the type of locative construction in (1) has undergone change in Sranan and is likely to have been more wide-spread before. In our corpus of contemporary Sranan, such structures have, however, all but disappeared. There are only two instances in the entire corpus. Both instances are produced by the same elderly speaker of 60+ years (cf. example (1) above). In other descriptions of spatial relations, even this speaker instead employs structures like the following one:

- (2) *A kren tapu wan schutting fu kisi*
 3sg.sbj climb on one fence prep get
a froktu.
 def.sg fruit
 ‘He climbed on a fence to get (hold of) the fruit.’

Example (2) above differs from (1) in two respects: (i) the general locative preposition *na* is no longer made use of; (ii) *tapu* is now a prepositional element, hence found before the Ground (*wan schutting*) rather than after it and behaves very much like the English preposition *on* or Dutch *op* (see Yakpo and Bruyn 2015 for a detailed discussion of the morphosyntactic evidence). Locative elements other than *tapu* are also used like prepositions. Compare the use of *ondro* ‘under’ in (3). I refer to structures featuring prepositional uses of erstwhile locative nouns like *tapu* and *ondro* in (2) above and (3) below as “simplex locative constructions”:

- (3) *A poti a sturu ondro a bon.*
 3sg.sbj put def.sg chair under def.sg tree
 ‘He put the chair under the tree.’

It is very likely that Dutch provides the template for simplex locative constructions in Sranan. Prepositional structures are the default option in Dutch for expressing core spatial relations like ‘under’, ‘in’ or ‘on’. Compare (3) above with example (4) below from our corpus of Surinamese Dutch:

- (4) *Een muis slaapt onder de boom.*
 a mouse sleeps under the tree
 ‘A mouse is sleeping under the tree.’ (Surinamese Dutch)

I now discuss an additional aspect of the contact-induced shift to prepositional structures in contemporary Sranan. There is a third logical possibility, intermediate between (1) and (2) above, which is the use of the general locative preposition *na* ‘loc’ in tandem with the *prepositional* use of locative elements like *tapu* and *ondro*. Such structures have been recorded as alternatives to postpositional ones like (1) above in Early Sranan since the eighteenth century (Yakpo and Bruyn

2015: 140–152) and are attested in our corpus as well. Complex locative constructions featuring preposed locative nouns are also given as the only option together with ones featuring postposed locative nouns (i.e. (1)) by the Surinamese linguist van der Hilst (2014: 165). An example follows:

- (5) *A e sidon na tapu a fiets èn*
 3sg.sbj ipfv sit loc top def.sg bike and
a e rey en gwe.
 3sg.sbj ipfv ride 3sg.indp go.away
 ‘She’s sitting on the bike and she’s riding it away.’

There is reason to assume that the prepositional locative element (i.e. *tapu*) in examples like (5) is also a noun-like element, hence a locative noun as in postpositional structures like (1) above. In our corpus of contemporary Sranan, the co-occurrence of the general locative preposition with a prepositional locative element as in (5) is, however, rare. There are however a handful of occurrences of the preposition *nin* ‘in’ (see also Essegbey and Bruyn 2002: 15), a variant of the Sranan preposition *ini* ‘in’. Diachronically, *nin* is a merger of the general locative preposition *na* ‘loc’ and the locative noun *ini* ‘in(side)’, hence a complex locative construction. In contemporary Sranan *nin* is, however, perceived as a mono-morphemic form by speakers and it is therefore counted under simplex constructions in Tab. 2. I now turn to specific developments in the expression of Source, Goal and Place relations providing further evidence for systemic change in the grammar of space of Sranan.

3.2 Changes in the expression of Source, Goal and Place

The expression of Goal, Source and Place in Sranan is characterized by a number of features suggestive of contact-induced change. Sranan has moved away from a more isomorphic system in which the functional elements participating in a spatial description denote one particular aspect of it, to a system featuring portmanteau prepositions. The formal correspondences of these changes are a decline in the use of the general locative preposition in motion events in general, and in Source-oriented relations in particular, and the demise of locative nouns (and hence of complex locative constructions) in Goal, Source and Place relations. Sranan has also borrowed the Dutch Source-oriented preposition *uit* ‘out of, from’ and there is evidence for lexical calquing of the functions of the Dutch preposition *op* ‘on’ onto the equivalent Sranan locative element *tapu* ‘on’.

3.2.1 The expression of Source

The overwhelming majority of speakers in the corpus express Source in a way very similar to Dutch: A single path-incorporating preposition occurs before the Ground noun to mark Source, either *fu* ‘from’ or the Dutch-derived *uit* ‘out of, from’.

Tab. 3 provides the frequencies of the three most frequent prepositions in Source-oriented constructions (and an additional single occurrence of *ini* ‘in’) with the two most common Source-trajectory verbs in the corpus: the intransitive motion verb *komoto* ‘come from’ and the caused-motion verb *puru* ‘remove’). The table shows that Source is mainly marked by *fu* and *uit* with a comparable frequency of 47% and 43% respectively. These two prepositions are therefore each more than four times more common as a means to mark Source than *na* with its roughly 10%. Taken together the prepositions *fu* and *uit* are used in 90% of all instances to mark Source in the corpus.

Tab. 3: Marking of Source in locative constructions.

Verb/Preposition	<i>na</i>	<i>fu</i>	<i>uit</i>	<i>ini</i>	Total
<i>komoto/komopo</i> ‘come from’	4	17	17	1	39
<i>puru</i> ‘remove’	3	17	14	0	34
Total	7	34	31	1	73
Total in %	9.6%	46.6%	42.5%	1.4%	100%

Sranan speakers in our corpus therefore employ Path-incorporating prepositions to mark Source in the overwhelming number of cases in locative constructions whose structure and semantics are very similar to those of Dutch. Compare the Goal-oriented construction in (1) above with the Source-oriented construction in (6) below. In both examples, we find locative constructions introduced by *na*, which is lexically unspecified for Path. Typical for complex locative constructions, we also find a locative noun expressing the Region and heading a possessive construction with the Ground as a possessor.

- (6) *A teki a sani na a tafra tapu.*
 3sg.sbj take def.sg thing loc def.sg table top
 ‘She took the thing from the table.’

Source-oriented constructions like (6) are, however, rare. It is more common to mark a Source by means of the Sranan multipurpose preposition *fu* ‘at, from’ (a reflex of the English preposition *for*), as in (7) or by the preposition *uit* ‘out of, from’ (8), which has been borrowed from Dutch (Essegbey and Bruyn 2002):

(7) *A froktu san komoto fu a bon na*
 def.sg fruit what come.out from def.sg tree foc
wan maka-maka froktu.
 one red-thorn fruit
 ‘The fruit that came off the tree is a thorny fruit.’

(8) *Mi si wan man puru swarfu uit a dosu.*
 1sg see one man remove match out.of def.sg box
 ‘I saw a man remove a match from the box.’

Constructions involving both *fu* and *uit* are highly similar to the corresponding Dutch ones in various ways. For comparison, I provide an equivalent of sentence (8) above from Surinamese Dutch:

(9) *Een persoon pakt een lucifer uit het doosje.*
 a person takes a match out.of the little.box
 ‘A person is taking a match from the little box.’ (Surinamese Dutch)

For one, the locative constructions in both languages share the same linear order, with the preposition *uit* directly followed by the Ground NP (*bon*, *dosu* and *doosje* in (7), (8) and (9) respectively) – there is no additional locative noun. Secondly, the constructions are semantically similar. Sranan and (Surinamese) Dutch both feature portmanteau prepositions which simultaneously encode Path, Region and the Spatial Relation that holds between a Ground and a Figure. This stands in contrast to the serial verb construction in (10) below, where each constituent denotes one particular aspect of the spatial description (Yakpo and Bruyn 2015: 140–141) and where Path is neither part of the meaning of the general locative preposition *na*, nor of the locative noun. It is rather the second verb in the series *puru* ‘remove’ or alternatively, *komoto* ‘come from’ that provides the sentence with (Source) motion semantics.

(10) *A man teki wan swarfu puru/komoto*
 def.sg man take one match remove/come.from
na ini a dosu.
 loc inside def.sg box
 ‘The man took a match from the box.’

Directional serial verb constructions like (10) have been seen as a typological hallmark of Sranan (cf. Bruyn 1995: 241–253; Essegbey and Bruyn 2002; Yakpo and Bruyn 2015). However, the count in Tab. 3 does not contain a single serial verb construction. In addition, our corpus features far more Sources marked by *fu* ‘at, from’ and *uit* ‘out of’ than *na* ‘loc’. I attribute it to contact with Dutch that the vast majority of Source relations is marked by way of these two prepositions rather than *na*, as in (6), or *na* in combination with a serial verb construction, as in (10).

3.2.2 The expression of Goal

The expression of Goal in Sranan also appears to be changing through contact with Dutch. As with Source, the use of complex locative constructions involving locative nouns is very rare. Instead we find locative nouns being used as prepositions indicating specific topological relations (e.g. *ini* ‘in’ and *tapu* ‘on’). However, the use of *na* to mark Goal is still more common than for marking Source. This may point to an emerging Goal-Source asymmetry: Goal and Place are coded by the same markers (i.e. *na* ‘loc’, and specific prepositions like *ini* ‘in’), while Source is marked distinctly from both Goal and Place (i.e. by the path-incorporating prepositions *fu* and *uit*). Tab. 4 shows the frequencies of the four most common Goal marking patterns with the six most common motion verbs. Figures for complex locative constructions (e.g. *na ini*) are given in brackets, simplex constructions (e.g. *ini*) are without brackets:³

Tab. 4: Marking of Goal in locative constructions.

Verb/Pattern	<i>na</i>	(<i>na +</i>) <i>ini</i>	(<i>na +</i>) <i>tapu</i>	∅	Total
<i>go</i> ‘go to’	203	(1) 62	(3) 21	0	290
<i>kon</i> ‘come to’	28	(1) 3	(0) 3	0	35
<i>fadon</i> ‘fall (in/on) to’	9	(0) 9	(4) 25	0	47
<i>waka</i> ‘walk’	6	(0) 5	(0) 3	0	14
<i>doro</i> ‘arrive at’	4	(0) 0	(0) 0	5	9
<i>lon(we)</i> ‘run (off) to’	3	(0) 0	(0) 0	0	3
Total	253	(2) 79	(7) 52	5	398
Total in %	64%	(0.5%) 20%	(1.5%) 13%	1%	100%

The figures in columns 3 and 4 of Tab. 4 show that complex locative constructions are exceedingly rare in the expression of Goal (0.5% and 1.5%, i.e. 3% of the total number of constructions). Speakers overwhelmingly make use of simplex (prepositional) locative constructions. We therefore see the same clear tendency towards simplex prepositional structures already observed with the expression of Source. The following example shows such a Goal-oriented structure, featuring *fadon* ‘fall’:

- (11) *Ma di a du dati, a boy fadon ini*
 but sub 3sg.sbj do dist def.sg boy fall in

³ Tab. 4 includes directional serial verb constructions. Hence locative constructions like *a waka go na foto* [3sg.sbj walk go loc town] ‘he walked to town’ are counted as instances of *go* ‘go to’ (row 1).

a watra.

def.sg water

‘But when he did that, the boy fell in(to) the water.’

The use of *ini* in (11) provides a specific spatial reading. The use of specific prepositions (i.e. *ini* ‘in’ and *tapu* ‘on’) however alternates with the use of the general locative preposition *na*. The latter use is exemplified in sentence (12), uttered by another speaker than (11), yet describing the same scene in the *Frog Story* (Mayer 1969). Tab. 4 (columns 2 and 3) show that both alternatives are equally common with *fadon*, with nine occurrences each:

(12) *Ô, a fadon na watra.*

intj 3sg.sbj fall loc water

‘Oh, he has fallen in(to) the water.’

The variation between the specific preposition *ini* and the general locative preposition *na* is also encountered with the verb *go* ‘go’, where the marking of Goal by *na* is more common (60%) than by the two specific prepositions *ini* and *tapu* together (83/203). The use of the general locative preposition is particularly common with the generic motion verbs *go* ‘go’ and *kon* ‘come’ because they very often feature stereotypical, discursively backgrounded Goals, marked by the general preposition rather than a specific one. Compare (13), where the discovery of the wasp nest is foregrounded, with (14), where there is less of a pragmatic hierarchy between the two clauses:

(13) *Den go a busi, den si wan bigi waswasi nesi.*

3pl go loc forest 3pl see one big wasp nest

‘They went (in)to the forest, (and then) they saw a big waspnest.’

(14) *A go ini a busi, a bari.*

3sg.sbj go in def.sg forest 3sg.sbj shout

‘*todo, todo pe yu de?*’

frog frog where 2sg cop

‘He went into the forest, he shouted, ‘frog, frog, where are you?’

The simplex prepositional locative constructions in (11) and (14) mirror corresponding Dutch ones. Compare the following Goal-oriented construction in Surinamese Dutch, disregarding subject-verb inversion:

(15) *En zo vielen beiden dan in het water.*

and so fell both then in the water

‘And so both fell in(to) the water.’ (Surinamese Dutch)

The parallels between Dutch and Sranan Goal-oriented constructions also extend to semantic aspects. When specific prepositions like *ini* (ex. (11), (14)) *tapu* (ex. (2)) and

ondro (ex. (3)) mark Goals they remain unspecified for Path (allative/motion-to) in their meaning. In this they differ from the Source prepositions *fu* and *uit* (ex. (7) and (8)), which incorporate Path (ablative/motion-from) in their meaning.

Dutch also makes a lexical distinction between Path-incorporating (directional) and static, Place-denoting prepositions (Gehrke 2006). The directional preposition *naar* ‘to’, for example, denotes the end-point of a motion, while the static adpositions *in* ‘in’, *op* ‘on’, *achter* ‘behind’, and *voor* ‘in front of’ only receive a directional reading when they occur with motion verbs or in particular constructions (e.g. when some of them are used as postpositions). Hence the Dutch example in (15) can potentially be interpreted as either static *or* directional, just like the Sranan example (12) above (i.e. ‘fell in the water, not on the river bank’). Contemporary Sranan therefore replicates the Dutch Goal-Source asymmetry in which basic Goal and Place relations can be marked by static prepositions and Source is marked differentially, by directional prepositions.

The question remains, however, why the general locative preposition *na* is still more frequent than other prepositions with the locomotion verbs listed in Tab. 4. The table shows that *waka*, *doro* and *lon/lonwe* feature more Goals marked by *na* on its own (*na* + \emptyset in Tab. 4) than Goals marked by other locative elements. A possible explanation for the strong presence of *na* is reinforcement from Dutch. The Dutch preposition *naar* ‘to(wards)’ and the Sranan preposition *na* are interlingual (near) homophones. There is also a considerable functional overlap between the two prepositions. Both can be used on their own in Goal-oriented constructions involving motion along a Path and up to a (Region of a) Ground. Both prepositions therefore have a strong tendency to co-occur with high frequency motion verbs like ‘go’, ‘come’, and ‘walk (to)’ whose Goals often do not involve containment (i.e. ‘go in’), or contact (i.e. ‘go on’) or other more specific spatial relations (e.g. ‘go under sth.’). The retention of *na* in Goal-oriented constructions as opposed to its demise in Source-oriented constructions might therefore also well be contact-related.

3.2.3 The expression of Place

I now turn to the expression of the spatial relation of Place, where there is also evidence for contact-induced change. Here too, the frequency of simplex locative constructions involving a single specific preposition (e.g. *ini* ‘in’, *baka* ‘behind’) by far outstrips that of complex locative constructions featuring the general locative preposition *na* and a locative noun. Yet, simplex locative constructions for expressing Place relations are also undergoing change: The use of the general locative preposition alone in order to locate a Figure in a stereotypical location (e.g. *na oso* ‘at home’) varies with the use of the preposition *tapu* ‘on’, thus replicating the semantics of the Dutch preposition *op* ‘on’.

Tab. 5: Marking of Place in locative constructions.

Verb/locative element(s)	<i>na</i>	(<i>na +</i>) <i>ini</i>	(<i>na +</i>) <i>tapu</i>	(<i>na +</i>) <i>baka</i>	(<i>na +</i>) <i>ondro</i>	(<i>na +</i>) <i>fesi</i>	Total
<i>de</i> 'be at'	31	(4) 50	(1) 49	(0) 2	(0) 2	(1) 0	140
<i>sidon</i> 'sit'	0	(0) 1	(7) 36	(0) 0	(0) 0	(1) 0	45
<i>tnapu/knapu</i> 'stand'	0	(0) 1	(1) 29	(0) 5	(0) 3	(0) 5	44
<i>didon</i> 'lie'	1	(0) 2	(2) 7	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	12
Total	32	(4) 54	(11) 121	0 (7)	(0) 5	(2) 5	241
Total in %	13%	(2%) 22%	(5%) 50%	(0%) 3%	(0%) 2%	(1%) 2%	100%

Tab. 5 presents a count of Place-oriented constructions involving the four most frequent verbs to participate in such structures in the corpus. Here too, the figures for complex locative constructions are given in brackets, simplex constructions are without brackets. It shows more simplex locative constructions in Place relations than complex ones, continuing the tendency already observed with Source and Goal relations. Simplex prepositional locative constructions are about ten times more frequent than complex ones, both on a whole (79% vs. 8%), and with the most common locative elements *ini* (22% vs. 2%) and *tapu* (50% vs. 5%).

Example (16) features a Basic Locative Construction (Ameka and Levinson 2007), the most frequent type of simplex Place-oriented construction in Tab. 5 (58% of Place relations (140/241), see the first line under the captions). The most frequent Basic Locative Construction involves the locative-existential copula *de* followed by a locative complement introduced by *tapu* 'on', compare (16).

- (16) *Kon un taki yu de tapu a wroko, yu*
 come 1/2pl talk 2sg cop on def.sg work 2sg
ala-dey wroko, sortu tongo yu e taki moro furu?
 all-day work type tongue 2sg ipfv talk more much
 'Let's say if you are at work, at your everyday work, which language do you talk more often?'

The occurrence of *tapu* in the Basic Locative Construction in (16) above is noteworthy. In the example, *tapu* does not literally describe the position of the Figure (*yu* '2sg') in a superior location in relation to the Ground (*wroko* 'work'). In (16), *tapu* instead marks a general or stereotypical location. The marking of non-specific location by way of *tapu* is common in the data. Other examples are *tapu a uku* 'at/on the corner', *tapu a skoro* 'at school', *tapu wan dey* '(on) one day'. The expression of non-specific topological relations is expected to fall within the functional ambit of the general locative preposition *na*, as in the analogous example (17). Other examples of non-specific uses of *na* in Basic Locative Constructions are *de*

na oso ‘be at home’, *de na wroko* ‘be at work’, *de na skoro* ‘be at school’, *de na China* ‘be in China’).

- (17) *Luku doorgaans te mi de na wroko, nanga*
 look throughout temp lsg cop loc work with
mi chef yere, mi e taki Nederlands, af.en.toe
 lsg boss hear lsg ipfv talk Dutch now.and.then
Negerengels.

Sranan

‘Look throughout, when I am at work, with my boss, right, I speak Dutch,
 (and) now and then Sranan.’

The use of *tapu* to mark a non-specific sense is a carry-over from Dutch, where the equivalent element, the preposition *op* ‘on’, fulfills a similar range of functions. Examples are *op werk* ‘at work’, *op de hoek* ‘on the corner’, *op school* ‘at school’, *op een dag* ‘(on) one day’. It is likely that the calquing of such idiomatic uses from Dutch constitutes a port of entry for the use of *tapu* for other stereotypical or non-specific uses in Sranan in contexts that would otherwise require the use of the general locative preposition *na*. Other instances in the data in which *tapu* is used where *na* would otherwise be expected are *tapu wan boto* ‘in a boat’ or *tapu a dyari* ‘in the garden’. Other marginally locative or oblique uses of *tapu* calqued from Dutch found in the data are *stik krosi tapu wan masyin* ‘stitch clothing on/with a (sewing) machine’ and *mi musu gi yu tu piki tapu a aksi dati* ‘I have to give you two answers to that question’.

To conclude, Place-oriented constructions in Sranan are characterized by similar tendencies as Source- and Goal-oriented relations. We find a preponderance of simplex locative constructions, which have become far more frequent than corresponding complex ones. We also find a shrinkage of the functional range of the general locative preposition, and an expansion of *tapu* calqued on similar uses in Dutch. Also noteworthy is the existence of a Goal-Source asymmetry: Place and Goal relations are marked by the same means, namely prepositions with static senses, while Source is marked by motion-incorporating prepositions.

3.3 Conclusion

Contact with Dutch has led to the following changes in the expression of spatial relations in Sranan:

- a) The loss of postpositional structures, the demise of prepositional complex locative constructions and the concurrent consolidation of simplex prepositional structures.
- b) In Source-oriented constructions: The demise of *na*, the borrowing of *uit* from Dutch, and the use of *uit* and *fu* as Path-incorporating prepositions.

- c) In Goal-oriented constructions: The specialization of *na* to marking the Goals of generic motion verbs like *go* ‘go’ and *kon* ‘come’, *waka* ‘walk’, possibly due to convergence with Dutch *naar* ‘to(ward)’. The predominance of non-directional (static) prepositions with more specific meanings with other verbs (e.g. *ini* ‘in’, *tapu* ‘on’, *ondro* ‘under’).
- d) In Place-oriented relations: The emergence of *tapu* ‘on’ as a preposition with a general, non-specific sense through calquing of the functions of the Dutch equivalent *op* ‘on’, and the corresponding shrinkage of the functional range of the Sranan general locative preposition *na*.

The changes manifest in (a) to (d) above and in Tab. 1 show a typological transition in the grammar of space in Sranan. The once dominant pattern in Sranan is one in which (1) prepositions and locative nouns express static relations while directional (serial) verbs alone express motion. This pattern has largely been replaced by one in which (2) portmanteau prepositions can express static *and* motion relations, thus incorporating Path. Pattern (1) is a Kwa, Niger-Congo and areal West African typological one common to Sranan substrate languages like Fon and Kikongo (Heine, Claudi and Hünneymeyer 1991: 140–143; Creissels 2006; Yakpo and Bruyn 2015: 140–152). Pattern (2) is characteristic of Sranan’s West Germanic superstrate Dutch and lexifier English.

A second typological change in the grammar of space in Sranan is the development of a Goal-Source asymmetry (Blake 1977; Nikitina 2009; Pantcheva 2010; Zwarts 2010). The earlier Sranan system is symmetrical, with Goal, Source, and Place being obligatorily marked by the general locative preposition *na* and where necessary, locative nouns. The present system is asymmetrical. Place and Goal are marked by the same elements, namely the general locative preposition *na*, or erstwhile locative nouns like *tapu*, now used as prepositions. In contrast, Source is now almost exclusively marked by the Path-incorporating prepositions *fu* ‘from’ and *uit* ‘out of, from’, the latter having been borrowed from Dutch.

Both typological changes have removed the grammar of space of Sranan away from that of its Niger-Congo substrates and drawn it closer to Dutch. As a consequence, Sranan has become more Germanic in its typological profile.

4 Contact-induced change in ditransitive constructions

In this section, I will focus on developments in argument marking. Specifically, I cover the coding of Theme and Recipient, as well as verbal and prepositional semantics in ditransitive constructions. I argue that contact with Dutch is

responsible for the reanalysis of *gi* ‘give’ as a preposition equivalent to English ‘to’, the virtual absence in the corpus of the *take-give* serial verb constructions, and the high frequency of ditransitive constructions calqued on Dutch structures and semantics. The statistical tendencies present in the corpus may be indicative of ongoing change and possibly constitute a further area of typological alignment with Dutch.

4.1 Double objects, prepositional objects and serial verbs

Contemporary Sranan features ditransitive constructions that are strikingly similar to Dutch ones. Syntactic evidence suggests that the Sranan verb *gi* ‘give’ today functions as a preposition in ditransitive constructions. An erstwhile SVC of the ‘give’ type has been reanalyzed as a Prepositional Object Construction (henceforth POC). Other developments likely to have been caused or reinforced by contact with Dutch are the emergence of a lexical preference for the verb *langa* ‘hand over’ in POCs for the description of literal transfer events, the generally high frequency of Double Object Constructions (henceforth DOCs) and the exclusive use of DOCs in non-literal transfer events.

There are two ways of realizing the two participants of ditransitive events in Sranan. In the monoverbal DOC the Recipient and the Theme are distinguished by word order alone, and the Recipient invariably precedes the Theme, as in (18).

- (18) *A wan nanga redi trui sori a tra*
 def.sg one with red pullover show def.sg other
man wan buku.
 man one book.

‘The one with the red pullover showed the other man a book.’

The bi-verbal serial verb construction (henceforth SVC) features the inverse order. The Theme immediately follows the verb of transfer and the Recipient is marked by the “verb” *gi* ‘give’, as in (19). The categorial status of *gi* ‘give’ in SVCs like (19) below has been the subject of debate in the literature on Sranan. Voorhoeve (1975) and Sebba (1987) assign *gi* an intermediate status between verb and preposition on the basis of distributional evidence. In the meantime, and for clarity of exposition, I will continue referring to constructions like (19) as “SVCs” (in quotes), before addressing the categorial status of *gi* in more detail further below.

- (19) *A man sori a buku gi wan tra man.*
 def.sg man show def.sg book give? one other man
 ‘The man showed the book to another man.’

The frequencies of SVCs and DOCs with the most common transfer and communication verbs in the corpus are summarized in Tab. 6 below.

Monoverbal DOCs featuring *gi* ‘give’ (first line of Tab. 6) constitute the most frequent ditransitive construction, cf. (20). They cater for 47% of all occurrences of ditransitive constructions in the data.

- (20) *Wan yonku-man e gi wan dame tu pata.*
 one young-agn ipfv give? one lady two sports.shoe
 ‘A youngster is giving a lady two sports shoes.’

Tab. 6: Frequencies of ditransitive constructions.

Event type	Verb	Gloss	“SVC”	DOC	Total
Transfer	<i>gi</i>	‘give’	0 (0%)	66 (47%)	66 (47%)
	<i>langa</i>	‘hand (to)’	32 (23%)	0 (0%)	32 (23%)
	<i>fringi</i>	‘fling’	11 (8%)	0 (0%)	11 (8%)
	<i>tya(ri)</i>	‘carry’	4 (3%)	0 (0%)	4 (3%)
	<i>teki</i>	‘take’	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)
	<i>sori</i>	‘show’	1 (1%)	2 (1%)	3 (2%)
	<i>seni</i>	‘send’	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Communication	<i>kari</i>	‘call’	0 (0%)	8 (6%)	8 (6%)
	<i>taygi</i>	‘tell’	0 (0%)	7 (5%)	7 (5%)
	<i>ferteri</i>	‘tell’	0 (0%)	6 (4%)	6 (4%)
Total			51 (36%)	90 (64%)	141 (100%)

The second most frequent construction in Tab. 6 is an “SVC” featuring *gi* as a marker of the Recipient argument. Example (21) is an alternative rendition of (20), provided by a different speaker in response to the same visual stimulus.

- (21) *A boy e langa a susu gi*
 def.sg boy ipfv hand.over def.sg shoe give?
a uma.
 def.sg woman
 ‘The boy is handing (over) the shoe to the woman.’

Tab. 6 contains a large number of ditransitive constructions involving the verbs *langa* ‘hand over’ and *fringi* ‘fling’ as opposed to others like *sori* ‘show’ or *seni* ‘send’. This is partly an artifact of the elicitation, which involved a large number of throwing and handing-over events. It is nevertheless interesting to explore why “SVCs” of the *langa–gi* type (see (21)) are the second most frequent ditransitive construction (23%) after monoverbal DOCs featuring the use of *gi*

alone (as in (20)). This is somewhat unexpected since the literature on Sranan treats *teki-gi* ‘take-give’ sequences as a common structure for marking a Recipient in a ditransitive transfer event in the language (e.g. Sebba 1987: 74). The number of *teki-gi* sequences is, however, very low in the corpus (2% of total ditransitive constructions). When the sequence does occur, *teki* also receives a literal reading. In (22), for example, the Agent ‘goes, takes and gives’ the chair to the Recipient.

- (22) *A heer go teki wan sturu gi a dame.*
 def.sg gentleman go take one chair give def.sg lady
 ‘The gentleman went to take a chair to the lady.’

For the speakers in our corpus, *langa-gi* is therefore the preferred structure for expressing a literal transfer (of an object). The *langa-gi* “SVC” has gone unnoticed in works on Sranan and may be indicative of a change in progress in lexical preference that has been caused by contact with Dutch.⁴

The following two examples stem from our corpus of Surinamese Dutch (cf. Muysken, this volume). Both feature a prepositional object construction (POC), in which the Recipient is marked by the preposition *aan* ‘to’. The semantics and structure of the *langa-gi* string reiterate the most common equivalent Surinamese Dutch structures in the data, namely *geven-aan* ‘give to’ and *overhandigen-aan* ‘hand over to’. The Sranan and Surinamese Dutch structures are also semantically similar in that they both depict literal transfer events. Compare the correspondence in constituent order between the Dutch preposition *aan* ‘to’ in example (23) and the Sranan ‘verb’ *gi* in (21) above.

- (23) *Een meneer overhandigt een schoen aan*
 a gentleman hands.over a shoe to
de vrouw.
 the woman
 ‘A gentleman is handing (over) a shoe to a woman.’
 (Surinamese Dutch)

⁴ Supporting evidence comes, again, from Eastern Maroon Creole (EMC), the more conservative sister language(s) of Sranan. I quote a personal communication with Bettina Migge on the lexically more specialized uses of *langa* in EMC: “*langa* is not very common in natural discourse. If transfer involves movement of the person, people use *tya* ‘carry’. If the Theme is lying next to a person, people usually use *gi* and *langa* when reiterating a request. It seems to me that *langa* also often has the overtone of ‘hand over in order to rid oneself of something’ for example after a quarrel.”

The most common alternative to the use of *overhandigen* in a POC by speakers of Surinamese Dutch in the corpus is a POC featuring the general verb of giving *geven* and a Recipient marked by the preposition *aan*, as in (24).

- (24) *Een meneer geeft een tas aan de andere.*
 a gentleman gives a bag to the other.one
 ‘A gentleman is giving a bag to the other one.’ (Surinamese Dutch)

An alternative construction is also found in the data, in which the Recipient is coded as a (primary) object via word order in a DOC:

- (25) *Hij geeft de man een pot.*
 he gives the man a pot
 ‘He is giving the man a pot.’ (Surinamese Dutch)

This kind of construction is the norm in Dutch in metaphorical (non-literal) transfer events, involving emotional interaction for example, e.g. in light verb constructions like (*give an*) *embrace*, (*give a*) *kiss*, as in (26). I will show in due course that the same holds for Sranan:

- (26) *De man geeft de vrouw een zoen op de wang.*
 the man gives the woman a kiss on the cheek
 ‘The man is giving the woman a kiss on the cheek.’
 (Surinamese Dutch)

In sum, the Sranan “SVC” involving *langa-gi* is very common in literal transfer events, where it immediately follows the use of a monoverbal DOC featuring *gi* in frequency. The *langa-gi* construction is structurally equivalent to two corresponding Dutch constructions namely the POCs *overhandigen-aan* and *geven-aan*.

This raises the question of the syntactic status of *gi* ‘give’ in Sranan “SVCs” like (19) and (21) above. I suggest that *gi* is a preposition in such contexts and that the structures I have so far termed “SVCs” are, in fact, POCs, and I will henceforth continue referring to them as such. The element *gi* manifests a multiplicity of functions and syntactic behaviors that have led authors to assign it the status of verb in some instances and that of preposition in others (Voorhoeve 1975; Jansen, Koopman and Muysken 1978; Sebba 1987). Sebba (1987: 75) assumes that *gi* is a verb when it is used as the second verb in a verb series (the V2) in constructions like (19) and (21) above. However, I do not think that *gi* is *a priori* interpreted as a verb by Sranan speakers in these examples. The element *gi* shows enough preposition-like behavior in other contexts to allow speakers the interlingual identification of *gi* with the Dutch preposition *aan* in “SVCs” like (19) and (21)

above. These structures are characterized by a high degree of “linear equivalence” (Muysken 2000) between Dutch and Sranan.⁵

The only context in which *gi* is unequivocally verbal in Sranan is when it occurs as the only verb of a DOC like (20) above. Tab. 6 above shows that DOCs like (20), which feature *gi* in DOCs as the predicate, are twice as common as those featuring *langa* as the predicate in POCs, as in (21) above. The same speakers often use *gi* DOCs and *langa-gi* POCs interchangeably in literal events of giving as shown in (20) and (21). The larger number of *gi* DOCs in proportion to *langa* POCs is a result of the use of *gi* DOCs in metaphorical or non-literal transfer events in addition to use in literal transfer events, while the *langa-gi* POC can only depict the latter type. The following example features such a metaphorical transfer event with a *gi* DOC, the collocation *gi lala* ‘give nonsense, provoke’:

- (27) *Mi kan de a wroko yu gi mi yu*
 1sg can cop loc work 2sg give 1sg 2sg
lala, mi no meki trobi nanga yu.
 nonsense 1sg neg make trouble with 2sg
 ‘I could be at work, you’d give me your nonsense (and) I (still) wouldn’t
 pick a fight with you.’

Other idiomatic, metaphorical uses of *gi* in the data are collocations like *gi odi* ‘give greetings, greet’, *gi grani* ‘give honor, pay respect’, *gi skoro* ‘give school/classes’, *gi busu* ‘(give a) kiss’, *gi prisiri* ‘give pleasure/enjoyment’, *gi anu* ‘give/shake hands’. The parallels of some of these constructions with their Dutch equivalents are obvious and they are likely to have entered Sranan via calquing. Compare the Dutch collocations *les geven* ‘give classes’, *zoen geven* ‘(give a) kiss’, *plezier geven* ‘give enjoyment’.

Communication verbs, the other class of ditransitive construction covered in Tab. 6, also participate in non-literal transfer events by their very nature. They therefore also exclusively occur in DOCs, compare (28) and (29).

- (28) *Dan fa yu kan kari yu-srefi wan*
 then how 2sg can call 2sg-self one
bus-kondre pikin?
 forest-country child
 ‘Then how can you call yourself a person from the interior?’

⁵ See Sebba 1987 (73–75) for a brief treatment of “prepositional” uses of *gi*. Our corpus also contains many uses of *gi* marking a broader range of animate and inanimate participants beyond Recipient, i.e. Beneficiary (*mi e kieze gi mi eygi taal* ‘I opt for my own language’) Goal (*yu e poti specerijen gi en* ‘you put spices into it’), Stimulus (*yu musu luku tu gi bigisma* ‘you must also look at/watch out for the adults’), and Experiencer (*a nyan switi gi mi* ‘the food is tasty to me’).

- (29) *No dan te yu taygi den yu prijs (...)*
 neg then temp 2sg tell 3pl 2sg price
 ‘No when you tell them your price (...).’

In sum, the speakers in our corpus employ *langa* (in POCs) and *gi* (in DOCs) as transfer verbs in literal transfer events. DOCs featuring *gi* are also employed in descriptions of metaphorical transfer events. The strong presence of *langa* in POCs is seen as a result of calquing of a corresponding Dutch POC featuring *geven* or *overhandigen*. The element *gi* functions as a preposition in these constructions multifunctional in Sranan. The status of *gi* as a preposition in POCs is also a result of contact with Dutch.

4.2 Conclusion

The preceding section has shown that Sranan ditransitive constructions have converged considerably with Dutch ones with respect to their morphosyntax and semantics. Some parallels between Sranan and Dutch are due to typological similarities and not likely to result from contact. For example, both languages have a single generic verb of giving, rather than a composite expression. A further typological overlap between Sranan and Dutch not likely to be contact-induced is Recipient-Theme constituent order in DOCs, rather than vice versa. I have analyzed other similarities between Sranan and Dutch as contact-induced, specifically the following ones:

- a) the use of *gi* as a preposition in ditransitive constructions, rather than a V2 in serial verb constructions (SVCs), mirroring the use of the preposition *aan* in Dutch prepositional object ditransitive constructions (POCs);
- b) the prolific use of *langa* in POCs featuring the Recipient as an object of the preposition *gi* in literal transfer events, calquing the use of *geven (aan)* ‘give (to)’ and *overhandigen (aan)* ‘hand over (to)’ in Dutch;
- c) a tendency to use DOCs featuring *gi* as the only verb in events that do not involve literal giving, covering idiomatic uses in particular, many of which are calqued from Dutch;
- d) a conspicuous absence of ditransitive constructions featuring *teki-gi* ‘take-give’ SVCs.

I conclude that Dutch influence is equally pervasive in this domain of participant marking as it is in the expression of spatial relations, and this holds for both structural and semantic aspects. Dutch influence has also led to “deserialization” (Hajek 2006), the replacement of SVCs by POCs.

5 Processes and outcomes of contact-induced change in Sranan

I have argued that contact with Dutch has made a considerable impact on the (a) grammar of space and (b) the way participant relations are expressed. I have shown that Sranan is undergoing a substantial typological shift with respect to (a), characterized by the demise of postpositional structures and the concurrent rise of Path-incorporating prepositions. This has led to the development of a Goal-Source asymmetry in Sranan of the same kind as found in Dutch, in which Place and Goal can be marked by the same means (by static locative elements) and Source is marked differently (by Path-incorporating prepositions). The former pattern was symmetrical in Sranan with Place, Goal and Source Grounds uniformly marked by *na*.

Changes were also recorded with respect to (b) in the syntax and semantics of ditransitive constructions. Sranan ditransitive constructions have converged considerably with corresponding Dutch ones. Here the principal change is that in transfer events, the Sranan verb *gi* ‘give’ can no longer be seen to function as a second verb in a “give” serial verb construction. Instead, the syntactic properties and semantics of *gi* have been calqued on those of the Dutch preposition *aan* ‘to’ in constructions that pattern closely with Dutch prepositional object constructions (POCs). Notably, serial verb constructions of the *take-give* type, mentioned in the twentieth century literature on Sranan, are exceedingly rare in the data. Double object constructions (DOCs), in which *gi* ‘give’ functions as a main verb are far more common with idiomatic uses than in literal transfer events, this too reflecting a pattern found in Dutch. I conclude that the alignment of Sranan patterns with Dutch ones has progressed quite far. In the domains studied here, Sranan is a creole in transition from a typology characterized by Kwa-like postpositional structures, complex locative constructions, a general locative preposition, and participant-marking SVCs, to a more Germanic type characterized by portmanteau prepositions, DOCs and POCs in line with its superstrate Dutch.

The processes of contact-induced change involve, for one part, a small degree of matter borrowing (e.g. Sakel 2007), i.e. that of the Dutch preposition *uit* ‘out of’. Lexical material is not transferred *ex nihilo* and therefore not only involves the transfer of local meaning (e.g. ‘evacuation’ in the case of *uit*). We have seen that the non-native *uit* also patterns with the constituent order and the distribution of the native item *fu* ‘from’. Accordingly, *uit* is exclusively used as a preposition in Sranan, contrary to a native item like *tapu*, for which

I give evidence of one-time postpositional uses. Equally, *uit* does not co-occur with the general locative preposition *na*, which is, again, possible with native locative elements other than *fu*. Ultimately, this means that Sranan speakers match semantic and morphosyntactic features when transferring and nativizing Dutch elements, and that matter and pattern borrowing (calquing) are inextricably interwoven.

All other changes described in this chapter constitute instances of the transfer of lexical and morphosyntactic *properties*, rather than lexical material per se. This has been referred to in the literature, with varying degrees of overlap in meaning, by terms like “calquing” (Haugen 1950), “pattern transfer” (Heath 1984), “rule borrowing” (Boretzky 1985), “metatypy” (Ross 1996), “grammatical replication” (Heine and Kuteva 2003) and “pattern replication” or “pattern borrowing” (Sakel 2007; Matras 2009) among others. Pattern borrowing involves the carry-over of combinatorial possibilities, that is relational features, extending to constituent order, distributional potential and dependency relations (Yakpo and Bruyn 2015: 170–172). The outcomes of contact-induced change in Sranan are summarized below:

Altered frequency and altered distribution: Elements and structures that were once more constrained in their distribution, relatively infrequent or marginal have become more frequent or central in Sranan or have acquired a wider distributional potential in alignment with Dutch patterns. At the same time, previously more frequent patterns have seen a decrease in frequency. Examples are (a) the typological shift from postpositional to prepositional structures; (b) the decrease in frequency of complex locative constructions and the corresponding increase of simplex locative constructions; (c) the continuing use of the general locative preposition *na* in specific types of Goal-oriented events, next to its demise in Source-oriented events and a shrinkage of use in certain types of Place-oriented ones; (d) the use of Dutch-style POCs and DOCs rather than SVCs.

Innovation: Elements fulfill new, previously unattested functions by exhibiting changes in their lexical meanings, and/or (any combination of) their distributional potential, constituent order, and dependency relations, following Dutch patterns. Instances are (a) the use of erstwhile locative nouns as portmanteau prepositions; (b) the use of *tapu* ‘on’ for expressing non-specific location and with idiomatic uses; (c) the shift from verb to preposition of the element *gi* ‘give’ in ditransitive constructions.

The replication of Dutch patterns in Sranan therefore produces two inter-linked types of outcomes in Sranan in the functional domains described in this chapter. Some of these are innovations, but the greater part consists of alterations of pre-existing patterns.

6 Conclusion

The changes documented in this chapter constitute a typical case of linguistic convergence due to intense contact between the source language Dutch and the recipient language Sranan. Intensity is manifest in the duration of contact – the two languages have been spoken alongside each other for about three and a half centuries – and in the extent of societal multilingualism. Dutch is no longer reserved for the socio-economic elite, as was the case during colonial rule. Multilingualism inclusive of Dutch has increased greatly for ordinary Surinamese (see e.g. Léglise and Migge 2015) due to socio-economic transformations since independence (Yakpo et al. 2015; Yakpo 2015). It is perhaps too early to ascertain whether the structural changes occurring in Sranan are taking part within a scenario of stable multilingualism and language maintenance, or whether convergence with Dutch is symptomatic of an ongoing language shift towards Dutch. In surveys, Sranan boasts a high degree of vitality and is claimed as a home or vernacular language by a large percentage of the population of Suriname (cf. data on language use in SIC 213–2005/02; Léglise and Migge 2015). The vitality of Sranan therefore seems to contrast with that of Surinamese Javanese, where many contact-induced changes seem to be symptoms of language loss and a shift to Sranan and Dutch as primary languages of the Surinamese-Javanese population (cf. Villerius, this volume). This also contrasts with the situation of Sarnami, a language that is generally seen as less threatened by loss and shift than Javanese, but nevertheless seems to be undergoing a shrinkage in speaker numbers in the urban agglomeration of Paramaribo (Marhe, p.c.; Yakpo and Muysken 2014; Hoebal 2015). It can be concluded, however, that essentially, Sranan, like the other languages of Suriname described in this volume, is becoming more Dutch-like. Further investigations would probably confirm the general drift of Sranan towards Dutch in additional domains.

Abbreviations

agn	agentive suffix
comp	complementizer
compl	completive aspect
cop	locative-existential copula
def	definite article
dist	distal demonstrative
doc	double object construction

foc	focus marker/identity copula
fut	future tense
indp	independent/object pronoun
intj	interjection
ipfv	imperfective aspect
loc	general locative preposition
neg	negator
pl	plural
poc	prepositional object construction
prep	general associative preposition
pst	past tense
red	reduplicant
sbj	subject
sg	singular
svc	serial verb construction