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1. Introduction

Papiamentu\(^1\) is a creole language spoken by approximately 260.000 people, living mostly on the islands of Curacao, Bonaire and Aruba, a few miles off the coast of Venezuela, and by Antilleans living in Holland. In 1499 the Spanish conquered the so-called Leeward Islands, but soon declared it *islas inútiles*, 'useless islands', in 1513. Around that time, the Spanish deported the native Arawak population of the islands to the mainland of Hispaniola to work in the mines. In 1526 an attempt was made to repopulate the island, but it remained fruitless.

The Dutch took possession of Curacao in 1634, soon followed by the conquest of Aruba and Bonaire in 1636 and the islands have been under Dutch administration since then, except for two periods of English occupation (1800-1803 and 1807-1816). After the Dutch conquest, the Spanish and the repopulated Indians were evacuated to Venezuela leaving only 75 Indians on the island (Martinus 1996: 4). From around 1650 on, the Dutch used Curacao as a slave depot, importing large numbers of African slaves to the island. In 1675, for example, 3,500 slaves were imported, while ten years later, in 1685 the number of imported slaves was as high as 20,000. In later periods (1710-1715) the number of imported slaves per year declined to approximately 3,500 to 4,000 and between 1715-1750 only 500-600 slaves a year were imported. Many of the slaves were transported from Curacao and sold on the mainland. The slaves that stayed on the island were employed mainly as domestic slaves.

The earliest reference to what might have been (a predecessor of) Papiamentu is found in the diary of a priest, Padre Schabel, who mentions a 'broken Spanish', dating from 1705 (Kouwenberg and Muysken 1995: 205). The first known written attestation of the language dates from 1767 on a Jewish trading ship named *Awa pasa harina*, 'water has surpassed the flour; bad times' (Martinus 1996: 9). The earliest more extensive text is a letter written by a Sephardic Jew to his lover in 1775. Around this period Curacao was inhabited by a mixture of Dutch colonialists, African slaves and Portuguese-speaking Jews that came to Curacao after the Dutch lost their Brazilian colony in 1654.

The lexicon of modern Papiamentu seems to be highly influenced by Spanish, but this is still a subject of discussion. Some authors provide evidence that Papiamentu developed from an early Portuguese creole (Goodman 1987, Smith 1987, Maurer 1986), while others suggest Spanish as its lexifier (Maduro 1966). Since it is not the aim of this study to make claims about the origin of the lexicon of Papiamentu, I will not discuss this any further. What

\(^1\) Due to differences in spelling on the islands, the language is called Papiamentu on Curacao and Bonaire and Papiamento on Aruba. Here I will use the Curacao spelling.
is clear is that the lexicon of Papiamentu is largely based on Iberian languages with some words derived from Dutch and very few from African languages.

One of the main points agreed upon in creole studies is that creoles have emerged from language contact during a fairly short period of time, although there remains discussion on whether they developed over a period of only one or several generations. The situations of language contact in which creoles emerged, typically involved one socially powerful language from which the creole adopted the major part of its vocabulary, called the superstrate or lexifier language. The phonology and morphosyntax, however, differ from that of the lexifier language. The language(s) with which the lexifier came into contact is/are usually called the substrate language(s). Over the years, various theories about creole genesis have been proposed, a few of which will be discussed here.

Theories focusing on the European language, the superstrate, suggest that in situations where creoles emerged, people from different linguistic backgrounds started learning the European language in their new environment. However, the language that these people ended up speaking was not the same as the European lexifier. Naro (1978) suggested that this was due to the fact that the Europeans used a simplified version of their language when speaking to the second language learners. Although this 'foreigner talk' is accepted as a factor in creole genesis, it is no longer used as an explanatory concept. Another possible explanation within the theories focusing on the superstrates is the imperfect second language learning theory. According to this theory, creoles are the crystallization of a phase in the process of second language learning (Schumann 1978, Andersen 1983). It is debatable if the second language learners actually consider the European language as the target language and this learning process may involve negotiation. Sarah G. Thomason argues that "in most cases there is probably no serious effort to learn the lexifier language as a whole: instead, the learning process is one in which the people in the new contact situation learn to communicate with each other by deploying the new vocabulary with grammatical structures they hope will be understood by their interlocutors" (Thomason 2001: 180).

Another theory focused on European input is the Monogenesis Theory, which was most popular in the 1960's and early 1970's. This theory accounts for creoles spoken in the Atlantic region only and claims that all of them were derived from a Portuguese Pidgin that was used for communication between European traders and Africans on the West African Coast. Although weaker versions of this hypothesis (Hull 1979, Hancock 1986) have been proposed later, the original Monogenesis Theory is no longer being discussed as a possible explanation of creole genesis.
Theories focusing on non-European input emphasize the role of the substrate languages in creole genesis. Substratistivists claim that the differences in phonology and morphosyntax between creoles and their lexifier languages are due to transfer from substrate languages. Those creolists who are working on Atlantic creoles argue that the languages spoken on the West African coast left traces in the creoles that were formed when these languages came into contact with European languages. This is also known as the Afro-Genesis Hypothesis. More recently, a stronger version of this hypothesis has been suggested under the name of relaxation. Lefebvre's Relexification Hypothesis suggests that adults formed creoles by replacing their lexicon by that of the European language, leaving the semantic and syntactic information of their native language intact.

A different approach, the universalist approach, suggests that universal aspects of the innate human linguistic capacity can account for the similarities found in creoles and pidgins. Although there are several approaches within the universalist tradition, the best known, and most discussed, theory is Bickerton's Language Bioprogram Hypothesis. In 1984 he published an article, named *The language bioprogram hypothesis*, that was based on his book *Roots of Language* (1981). Bickerton limits his discussion to those creoles that arose (1) out of a pidgin that had not existed for more than a generation and (2) in a population where no more than 20 percent were speakers of the dominant language (Bickerton 1981: 4). Since he limits his research to creoles that were formed abruptly, he claims that the pidgins they arose from were not fully developed languages, but rather simplified version without systematic grammar. Speakers would import lexical items into the grammar of their native language. In the situations where such a pidgin was spoken, normal language transmission was disrupted. The children born of pidgin-speaking parents had no other option than to learn the pidgin, although it was "quite unfit to serve as anyone's primary tongue" (Bickerton 1981: 5). According to Bickerton, the first generation that learned the pidgin as a mother tongue (the point where the pidgin becomes a creole) had to expand the pidgin in order to get to an adequate language. The syntactic rules that could not be learned from the parents, because of the lack of these rules in the pidgin, had to be formulated by the children themselves. Bickerton claims that they did this on the basis of an innate bioprogram. He accounts for the similarities found in creole languages by arguing that children in different places where creoles emerged formulated the same rules, because the bioprogram provided them with the necessary structures.

In general, the shortage of socio-historical data about the situations in which creoles emerged as well as the limited amount of documentation on early creole languages make it
hard to formulate a theory that can account for the differences and similarities in creoles. The theories mentioned above have provided useful insights and have all been criticised. Mufwene (1986, 1990) tries to reach a compromise in his Complementary Hypothesis, in which substrate as well as superstrate influence is recognised as playing a role and the bioprogram may be the mechanism that selects the features that eventually appear in the creole. He argues that "the adequacy of the universalist hypothesis in accounting for world-wide common features of pidgins and creoles does not rule out the role of substrate influence in the genesis and development of these languages" (Mufwene 1986: 145).

One of the syntactic characteristics shared by many creoles is the presence of serial verb constructions. However, serial verb constructions also appear in non-creole languages (e.g. Twi, Yoruba) and not all creoles have serial verb constructions (e.g. Philippine Creole Spanish, Hawaiian Creole English). The earliest observation on serial verb constructions was made by Christaller (1875), when he distinguished 'essential combinations' and 'accidental combinations' in Twi. Other early sources that refer to phenomena similar to serial verb constructions are Westermann (1930), who mentioned 'verbal combinations' in Ewe and Ansre (1966), who labels verbal constructions that have lost their verbal characteristics as 'verbid', to name just a few. What struck these early writers on serial verb constructions was the possibility to express something by means of a verb that in a European language would be expressed by other syntactic categories. Westermann characterized verb serialization as "a row of verbs one after another … [in which] the verbs stand next to each other without being connected" (Westermann 1930: 126). Although this gives a general idea of what serial verb constructions are, it is not sufficient and this will be discussed later in chapter 2.

Much debate remains about the structure of serial verb constructions. The surface structure is generally presented something like the following format.

\[
NP_1 \ V_1 \ NP_2 \ V_2 \ (XP)\ldots
\]

\[
(X = N, P)
\]

(Veenstra 1996: 73)

In this structure, \(NP_1\) is the subject and \(NP_2\) is the (optional) object. Since I will not discuss the syntactic properties of serial verb constructions in detail in this study, I present this format only as a general structure. In chapter 2 the characteristics of serial verb constructions will be further discussed.
Returning now to Papiamentu, some observations on the language have to be made. Papiamentu is a SVO language that has serial verb constructions, but not the *give* constructions (see 2.1). There are five TMA markers in Papiamentu that precede the verb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMA Markers</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ta</td>
<td>present, progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tabata</td>
<td>imperfective past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>perfective, past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>future, potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kouwenberg and Muysken 1995: 213)

As observed by Kouwenberg and Muysken, the tense markers may have an aspectual meaning as well. In this study TMA markers will be glossed as TENSE, without further specification on the exact meaning, unless the authors that provided the particular example used another gloss.

In Papiamentu, there are two aspectual categories that can be marked by inflection, that is the participle and the gerund. Participle forms can be formed following an Iberian or Dutch pattern. The Dutch pattern involves prefixation of *he-* or *di*, or of the reduced forms *e*- or *i-* , and the Iberian pattern involves stress shift to the last syllable for bi-syllabic verbs and no change in stress pattern for longer verbs. Although there are some exceptions, in general the Dutch pattern is applied to the verbs of Dutch origin and the Iberian pattern to verbs of Iberian origin. The gerund can be expressed by suffixation of *–ndo*, on verbs ending on the vowels *–a, -e* or *–i*. This pattern is of Iberian origin, but Dutch verbs ending in these vowels can also take this suffix.

The only author, so far encountered, that writes specifically on serial verb constructions in Papiamentu is Edward H. Bendix (1972). He proposes a semantic analysis, mostly based on the time referred to by the verbs in a serial construction. In this study, his analysis will be compared to that proposed by Sebba (1987). Sebba's classification is based primarily on the fact that in some cases the serial verb construction refers to a single action, whereas in the other cases it refers to a series of actions. This seems to be similar to the analysis that Bendix proposes for Papiamentu. Since Sebba claims that his analysis is applicable to other languages as well, showing serial verb constructions are a cross-linguistic phenomenon, it should apply to Papiamentu also.

In chapter 2, I will discuss the phenomenon of serial verb constructions and then give an outline of the theory proposed by Sebba in order to get a clear idea of his viewpoint. Then,

---

in the third chapter, I will turn to Papiamentu to get an overview of the possible constructions and the interpretations of these structures by Bendix and Sebba. I will present the classification proposed by Bendix, discuss some grammaticalised serial verb constructions and discuss Sebba's view on Papiamentu. In chapter 4, I will analyse the serial verb constructions in Papiamentu based on my informants' insights, keeping in mind the classification of Bendix and the analysis proposed by Sebba. I will point to the possible connection between serial verb constructions and coordinate structures and suggest that there may be a shift in the meaning of serial verb constructions in Papiamentu, due to the (re)introduction of coordinate structures.

3 I would like to thank Charlotte Luckmann, Clifton and Phaidra Nahar for their cooperation and insights.
2. Serial verb constructions

2.1 Syntactic characteristics of serial verb constructions

The definition of serial verb constructions given in the introduction can best be seen as a working definition. The exact definition of serial verb constructions is still disagreed upon. Since the constructions that are generally accepted as being serial verb constructions show a wide range of variety, some authors prefer to present a list of characteristics rather than trying to formulate a precise definition. The following six characteristics are those proposed by Mark Sebba, based on Nylander (1981), Voorhoeve (1975) and Jansen, Koopman and Muysken (1978).

a) They have only one overtly expressed (syntactic) subject;
b) They contain two or more verbs without overt markers of coordination or subordination;
c) The actions expressed by the verbs are either simultaneous or consecutive, and all verbs are interpreted as having the same tense;
d) Negation, whether marked once or more than once, applies to the whole string;
e) Tense, aspect, mood and polarity (or whichever of these a particular language has) are either marked only once in the string, or else each verb in the string is marked as having the same tense, aspect, mood and polarity as V1;
f) Either: the semantic subject of Vi is the subject of Vi+1, or: the object of Vi is the semantic subject of Vi+1.

(Sebba 1987: 86-87)

Some of these characteristics are generally accepted, others are disagreed upon. Most authors (Muysken and Veenstra 1995, Veenstra 1996, Lord 1993) on this subject agree that serial verb constructions are series of verbs that have only one expressed subject, share tense, mood aspect and polarity and are not connected by any markers of coordination or subordination. An additional characteristic proposed by Muysken and Veenstra (1995) is that there is no intervening pause possible. By this, they mean that in a serial verb construction no intonation break should be possible, as is the case for example in an enumeration of events. They also state that at most, one expressed direct object can appear in a serial verb construction. However, in later work, Veenstra does not include this characteristic any more (Veenstra 1996: 74).
Carol Lord (1993), discussing the historical change of serial verb constructions in non-creole languages, introduces serial verb constructions as structures that have characteristics (c), (d), (e) and (f), but questions the fact whether this type of construction can or cannot contain overt markers of coordination. She bases this on Twi verb sequences in which the verbs, except the first one, have a sequential prefix \( a\)-, but seem to be serial verb constructions. "However, the meanings communicated by the Twi structures are comparable to meanings communicated elsewhere and in related languages by verb sequences without overt connectives. This makes the 'no overt connectives' criterion look rather arbitrary" (Lord 1993: 1-2). Since Lord focuses on historical change, she argues that "the choice of features we decide to rule in or out of our syndrome's definition is not crucial" (Lord 1993: 3). Nevertheless, it is questionable whether broadening the definition of a concept that is already hard to define will lead to a better understanding of it. The subject of connectives will be returned to in chapter four, when I discuss the difference in meaning between structures with and without coordination marker in Papiamentu.

2.2 Semantic characteristics of serial verb constructions

From a semantic point of view, serial verb constructions can hardly be seen as a homogeneous class. The following are examples\(^4\) of different types of serial constructions typically discussed in the literature, which clearly show a variety in what is expressed by the serial verbs.

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad \text{E-l a bula bay} \quad \text{(Papiamentu, Muysken and Veenstra 1995: 289)} \\
& \quad 3SG \ASP \text{fly go} \\
& \quad \text{"He flew away."} \\
(2) & \quad \text{Kofi teki a nefi koti a brede} \quad \text{(Sranan, Sebba 1987: 89)} \\
& \quad \text{Kofi take the knife cut the bread} \\
& \quad \text{"Kofi cut the bread with the knife."} \\
(3) & \quad \text{El-a-kaba kome} \quad \text{(Papiamentu, Bendix 1972: 55)} \\
& \quad 3SG-TENSE-finish eat \\
& \quad \text{"He finished/has finished eating."} \\
(4) & \quad \text{Me-wo sika me-seeŋ no} \quad \text{(Twi, Lord 1993: 143)} \\
& \quad 1SG-have money \ 1SG-surpass him \\
& \quad \text{"I have more money than he has."}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^4\) In the examples from other authors, their spelling and glossing is left unchanged, I have only adapted the punctuation. In examples where no gloss was provided, I added it where I was able to. The Papiamentu examples differ in spelling due to different norms. The examples that were proposed by my informants are spelled according to their suggestions.
The examples (1) to (4) show that serial verb construction can serve numerous functions. Muysken and Veenstra (1995) propose the following list of functions that can be executed by serial verb constructions, roughly in the order of frequency of appearance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>go</th>
<th>direction away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>locational</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>direction towards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surround</td>
<td>around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argument</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>benefactive, dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>take</td>
<td>instrumental, comitative, object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>say</td>
<td>finite complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspectual</td>
<td>finish</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>return</td>
<td>iterative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be</td>
<td>continuative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree</td>
<td>pass (NP)</td>
<td>comparative, excessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suffice</td>
<td>enough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Muysken and Veenstra 1995: 291)

One semantic characteristic referring to the time frame of an action described by a serial verb construction is the one already mentioned in the section above; they can describe two (or more) actions that are either simultaneous or consecutive. Lord (1993) adds to this that in Mandarin Chinese, serial verb constructions can also describe alternative actions. The actions expressed by a serial verb construction display a different relationship than those in for example an enumeration or coordinate structure. One semantic characteristic is that two verbs in a serial construction express one proposition. If two or more actions are involved, the verbs can be interpreted as different parts or aspects of one single event. However, the notion of 'single event' is, according to Givón (in Lefebvre 1991: 140), hard to define and linguists usually base their definition of 'single event' on grammatical structure instead of semantic interpretation.

Given the variety of readings that a serial verb construction can display, Veenstra constructs the following scale of possible readings.
The possible readings proposed by Veenstra may not be easily separated and may be overlapping categories. The two extremes of this scale, the distinction between structures that describe a single action and structures that describe a series of actions is exactly the starting point for Sebba to base his analysis of Sranan serial verb constructions on.

2.3 Analysis of serial verb constructions by Sebba (1987)

Mark Sebba (1987) presents an analysis of serial verb constructions based on Sranan. He first describes several earlier attempts to define serial verb constructions and concludes that none of them adequately explains the phenomenon. Then, he describes Sranan serial verbs, "their nature, their syntax and their semantics" (Sebba 1987: 39). After having looked at a number of possible syntactic analyses for his Sranan data, Sebba concludes that none of the suggestions so far are completely satisfactory. Therefore, he elaborates a different type of analysis, which will be discussed here.

The first observation he makes is that the constructions found in Sranan are not all of the same type. He shows that a certain type of serial verb construction seems to be a coordinate serial verb structure, their distinguishing characteristic being that they "refer to several actions, more or less simultaneous, as opposed to a single action, described by other series" (Sebba 1987: 110).

(5) Kofi naki Amba kiri en
Kofi hit Amba kill him/her
"Kofi struck Amba and killed her."

(Veenstra 1996: 89)
(6) Kofi naki Amba kiri
"Kofi struck Amba dead."

These examples show that there is a difference in interpretation between the two. Whereas (5) describes a series of events, (6) is interpreted as one single event. This interpretation of (5) suggests that an underlying coordinate structure is involved. There is further evidence for assigning this coordinate structure to (5). Sebba shows that a non-reflexive pronoun can only be an anaphor of a preceding NP in the same clause when coordination is involved. Since in (5) *en* refers to Amba, this is a further indication that this should be classified as a type of coordinate construction.

Other authors also observe the distinction that not all serial verb constructions belong to a single class. Lord (1993), for example, notes that serial constructions can either refer to two events that could be interpreted as separate actions or to other temporal relations. "In some serial constructions the two events are temporally discrete and separable, as in [he buy bread eat], where there could be a time lapse between the buying and the eating. But with other verb combinations, other temporal inferences are possible" (Lord 1993: 237). Whether these constructions can all be called serial verb constructions remains a subject of debate. Baker (1991) suggests that maybe not all types of constructions are proper serial constructions.

The literature on SVCs has shown that the constructions … probably do not form a single natural class of phenomena. For example, some examples seem to be instances of a clause embedded in the matrix clause with no overt complementizer …. Others are potentially coordination structures with no overt conjunction. Still others seem to be a distinctive construction type, which we may call the serial verb construction proper. (Baker, in Lefebvre 1991: 81-82)

In this section I will only describe the analysis proposed by Sebba and not continue the discussion on whether the coordinate type should be interpreted as a serial verb construction or not. The possible relationship between coordinate structures and serial verb constructions is further discussed in chapter four.

Comparing Sranan serial constructions with its English counterparts, Sebba (1987: 110-111) concludes that the constituent structure of the coordinate serial constructions shows four characteristics. First of all, the whole serial construction seems to be a constituent, as shown by the possibility to delete the whole series in (7).
Suma musu go na wowowo bay krosi? – Mi musu  
"Who must go to the market and buy clothes? I must."

Furthermore, an NP after either V₁ or V₂ is not movable. Sebba proposes that it can be illustrated that this type of serial verb constructions involves some sort of coordination, according to the Coordinate Structure Constraint (Ross 1968) that prohibits the extraction of either verb's object from a coordinate structure, as is exemplified by (8)-(10).

*Suma Kofi sutu _ kiri Kwaku?  
who

The third characteristic is that TMA is marked external to both verbs and their complements, as was already mentioned in section 2.1. Finally, a slight pause or "comma intonation" is possible after the object of V₁ in these coordinate serial verb constructions.

Based on these characteristics, Sebba suggests that the underlying coordinate structure is the one presented in figure 1.

Figure 1. Underlying syntactic structure of coordinate serial constructions according to Sebba (1987: 111)
The serial verb constructions referring to a single action cannot be analysed in the same way. Although they have a number of characteristics in common, not all subordinate serial verb constructions display the same features. The ones they share are mentioned here. As in the coordinate serial constructions, the series of verbs of the subordinating type is in itself a constituent. Secondly, the objects of verbs in the series, and PP's may be moved under questioning or relativisation, as shown by examples (12) and (13).

(12) San Kofi tyari _ go gi Amba?  
    what Kofi carry go give Amba?  
    "What did Kofi bring Amba?"

(13) Suma Kofi fringi a tiki trowe naki _?  
    who Kofi throw the stick eject hit  
    "At whom did Kofi throw the stick?"

However, it is impossible to move a verb leftward together with its complement.

(14) *Go na skoro Kofi ben lon  
    go LOC school Kofi T/A run

Furthermore, according to Sebba, the last verb and its complement PP or NP are subject to right node raising, as shown by example (15).

(15) Kofi tyari a buku, ma Mary tyari a patu, go na ini a oso  
    Kofi carry the book but Mary carry the pot go LOC in the house  
    "Kofi brought the book, and Mary the pot, into the house."

In contrast with the serial constructions of the coordinating type, a third person non-reflexive pronoun must refer to a NP outside the clause in a subordinating serial construction. In example (16) *en can neither refer to Kofi nor to tiki.

(16) Kofi fringi a tiki naki *en  
    Kofi throw the stick hit him  
    "Kofi threw a stick and hit him."

In subordinating serial constructions, the object of the first verb can be interpreted as the subject of the following verbs. This argument sharing can be shown by example (17) where *a
tiki is the object of fringi, but the subject of fadon en naki, since it is the stick that falls and hits Amba, rather than Kofi.

(17) Kofi fringi a tiki fadon naki Amba  
Kofi throw the stick fall hit Amba  
"Kofi threw the stick down at Amba" (and hit her)

Finally, each V₁ may subcategorise for a V₁+₁, limiting the number of possible verbs that can appear in V₂ position.

According to Sebba, the subordinating serial constructions can, despite of their differences, be analysed as a unified class, of which the underlying structure is the one presented in figure 2.

Figure 2. Underlying syntactic structure of subordinate serial constructions according to Sebba (1987: 111)

In later years, other suggestions have been made, arguing against subordination as the underlying structure of serial verb constructions. Apart from coordination and subordination, there is the possibility of adjunction. Muysken and Veenstra (1995: 294-296) argue against subordination based on a comparison between Sranan (head-initial language) and Ijọ (head-final language) and Veenstra (1996) argues that serial verb constructions are adjunction structures. Since in this study I focus on surface structure and will compare the analyses of Bendix and Sebba, because they seem to be pointing to the same direction, I will not expand any further on the other possible analyses of serial verb constructions, but move to a description of serial verb constructions in Papiamentu, based on Bendix's classification and Sebba's analysis.
3. Serial verbs in Papiamentu

3.1 Analysis proposed by Bendix (1972)

Although a serial verb construction is supposed to express one proposition, different temporal relationships between the verbs in a series are possible. According to Lord (1993: 237) the order of the verbs is typically iconic with respect to temporal order. "The action, event or state named by the first verb typically precedes that of the second verb, insofar as the two are separable pragmatically" (Lord 1993: 237). However, it is possible that there is no overlap in time and that there is a slight pause between the two events. Bendix (1972) states that it is not always clear what exactly is the relationship between the verbs. "It may be a subjective projection by the speaker and involve a physical link or a causal chain, often leading to some expected end point or result, or the actor's state of intention extending through the parts with a goal in mind" (Bendix 1972: 12).

The possible, but not necessary, overlap in time referred to by the verbs, is the starting point for Bendix to base his classification on. He proposes the two semantic characterizations presented below, based on which he distinguishes three classes of verb constructions.

(1) (i) The time referred to by a verb phrase does not begin before the time referred to by any preceding verb phrase,
(ii) a state expressed by a verb phrase or resulting from an action expressed by a verb phrase extends at least to the beginning of the action or state of an immediately following verb phrase (and may extend on into the latter)

(2) The time referred to by a verb phrase does not begin later than the end of the time referred to by an immediately preceding verb phrase (i.e., the time referent of a verb phrase at least forms an uninterrupted sequence with the time referent of an immediately preceding verb phrase and may extend back into the latter).

(Bendix 1972: 11)

Class 1 constructions are marked for both characterisations (1) and (2), whereas class 2 constructions are only marked for (1) and class 3 constructions are marked for neither. Only class 1 and class 2 constructions can be analysed as serial verb constructions, since class 3 constructions have an overtly expressed conjunction marker and are thus coordinated sentences. All three classes will be discussed here shortly.
Class 1 is marked for both characterisations. This means that (1i) the verb order is iconic with respect to temporal order, (1ii) the state expressed by V₁ extends at least till the beginning of the time referred to by V₂ and (2) the time of V₂ begins during V₁, forming an uninterrupted sequence. This type of serial verb constructions expresses different (simultaneous and/or sequential) parts of a single action and can be further divided into five subclasses. The first subclass consists of series that express different simultaneous parts or facets of one single action, containing three VP positions. All three of them can be filled, as in example (18), or the third position may be left unfilled.

(18) bula pasa den zjalusi bay paden
     fly pass in blinds go inside
     "fly in(side) through the blinds (in that direction)"

Serial constructions of the second subclass also express different simultaneous parts or facets of one single action, but have no more than two verbs, because the complement of the second verb closes the sequence and leaves no possibility for filling the third position. Example (19) is a serial verb constructions of the second subclass and shows how riba Lomba di Cha Tiger specifies the end point of subi, making it completive.

(19) bula subi riba Lomba di Cha Tiger
     jump ascend up back of Cha Tiger
     "jump and get up on Cha Tiger's back"

The third subclass involves, usually two, simultaneous actions that are unmarked for inceptive or completive and have a durative interpretation, as shown in (20).

(20) (E tabata-) kana busk'è
     3SG TENSE walk search-it
     "He/she was walking searching for it."

Subclass four consists of series that express simultaneous parts or facets of an action. Most often one of the actions is a more basic one and the other one expresses the manner in which it is performed or the purpose of the first action. Bendix presents example (21) as a serial verb construction of subclass four. However, the distinction between subclass three and four is not defined very precisely.
kana zoya  
walk rock  
"walk with a sway or waddle"

The last subclass of class 1 serial verb constructions contains constructions of other types that may not all distinguish class 1 and class 2. Most constructions of this subclass involve a connected sequence of actions with the successive VP's expressing the successive parts or facets of the action, as in example (22) or a sequence in which the final VP expresses the end point and is marked as perfective, as in (23).

bula kai lora para  
jump fall roll stop  
"[the spring] jumps, falls, rolls and stops"

sali para den balkon  
exit stand in balcony  
"go out and stand on the balcony"

As already mentioned, class 2 serial constructions are marked for the semantic characterization (1), but not for (2). This means that these serial constructions share the features (1i) and (1ii), but not (2) with class 1 constructions. So in class 2 constructions the verb order is iconic with respect to temporal order (1i), and the state expressed by V₁ extends at least till the beginning of the time referred to by V₂ (1ii) with class 1 constructions, but there may be an interruption between the times referred to by both verbs. Bendix claims that the distinction between class 1 and class 2 constructions can best be illustrated by contrasting a pair of examples like (24) and (25), class 1 and class 2 constructions respectively.

his'e benta den awa  
lift-it throw in water  
"fling it into the water"

his'é bent'é den awa  
lift-it throw-it in water  
"lift it and throw it in the water"

In (24) the object of both verbs is e, 'it', but it appears in the surface structure only after the first verb. In example (25) e is expressed twice, after both verbs, which according to Bendix's informants indicates that there can be a temporal discontinuity. Similar examples provoked
interpretations that class 2 constructions put strong emphasis on the separate actions, whereas in class 1 constructions there is a resultant relationship between the two actions.

Class 3 constructions are coordinate structures that cannot be considered serial constructions. This class is marked for neither characterization 1 nor 2 and is created by Bendix only for purposes of discussion. Coordinate conjunctions that involve subject NP's with identical reference with only the first one appearing in surface structure are, however, relevant to the discussion of serial verb constructions. Whereas (26) is clearly interpreted as one action, and (27) involves an interrupted sequence, (28) is interpreted as involving two actions separated by a break in time. According to Bendix the conjunction i, 'and', "is not marked for continuity of action or state, which is what characterizes serial-verb strings" (Bendix 1972: 31).

(26) M'a-his'e para  
1SG-TENSE-lift-it stop  
"I stood it up."

(27) M'a-his'è par'é  
1SG-TENSE-lift-it stop-it  
"I lifted it and stood it up."

(28) M'a-his'è i(m'a-) par'é  
1SG-TENSE-lift-it and (1SG-TENSE-) stop-it  
"I lifted it and (then) stood it up."

With respect to intransitive verbs, ambiguity may arise in certain cases. Example (29) shows how a serial verb construction consisting of two intransitive verbs can be interpreted as a class 2 construction, either an emphatic reading (i) or purpose reading (ii), but also as a class 1 construction that expresses one single action (iii) and the manner in which it is performed.

(29) lanta papyà  
rise speak  
(i) "get up and speak"  
(ii) "get up to speak"  
(iii) "get up (while) speaking"

So far, all constructions presented here can be considered serial verb constructions. I will now discuss several serial constructions in Papiamentu that cannot be analysed in the same way and may not be proper serial constructions.
### 3.2 Grammaticalised combinations of serial-like strings

Some of the examples in the data seem to be of yet a different type of serial verb construction or maybe not classifiable as proper serial constructions at all. First there are constructions with *kaba*, 'finish', that can appear in both V\(_1\) and V\(_2\) position.

- **(30)** Nos a kaba kome
  
  1PL TENSE finish eat
  
  "We finished eating."

- **(31)** Nos a kome kaba
  
  1PL TENSE eat finish
  
  "We have already eaten."

In (30) *kaba* can be interpreted as a verb, forming a serial construction with *kome*, but in (31) another explanation is needed. According to Kouwenberg and Muysken (1995: 215), *kaba* may have been a serial verb earlier, but in modern Papiamentu it should be treated as an adverb. This is further illustrated by the adverbial use of *kaba* in (32) and its use as a conjunction in (33).

- **(32)** Bo a tende kaba di Brand Bonus polis?  (Kouwenberg en Muysken 1995: 215)
  
  2SG TENSE hear already of Brand Bonus policy?
  
  "Have you heard already about the Brand Bonus policy?"

- **(33)** Nos a bai kome, kaba nos a bai balia
  
  1PL TENSE go eat afterwards 1PL TENSE go dance
  
  "We went to have dinner and afterwards we went dancing."

Since Sebba (1987: 72) points to the same phenomenon in Sranan, where the verb *kaba* can still occur in V\(_1\) position, but *kba* in V\(_2\) position can not be interpreted as a verb, it seems like a plausible solution that it is the same in Papiamentu.

The verb *bay*, 'go', in V\(_1\) position can occur without a following NP that indicates the direction of the movement. Bendix states that in this case *bay* is a possible tense marker for definite future and actual movement is not necessarily involved.

- **(34)** E ta-bay hasy'ë
  
  3SG TENSE go do-it
  
  "She is going to do it."
As shown in the translation of example (34) *bay* in this case marks definite future, while example (35) is interpreted as the hypothetical or conditional future.

Apart from this, *bay* in V₂ position, without NP indicating the direction of movement, can be a duration marker, as Bendix shows with the following examples.

(35) L(0) e hasy'è
FUT 3SG do-it
"She will/would/most likely will do it."

(36) filosofia bay
philosophise go
"philosophise on"

(37) sigi kanta ketu bay
continue sing quietly go
"continue to sing quietly on"

The opposite also occurs, but then with *dal*, 'strike'. *Dal* in V₁ position can indicate the punctuality of an event.

(38) dal e porta sera
strike the door close
"strike/throw/slam the door shut"

Bendix states that although some of these verbs may still be seen as extensions of independent verbs, they should be considered complementising verbs and not serial verb constructions.

As shown in the examples above, certain verbs seem to have undergone reanalysis. Lord (1993: 3) argues that this historical reanalysis is possible along a continuum from lexical function to grammatical function. "Lexical verbs typically name events, processes, actions, or states. Over time, speakers may come to employ a verb for other functions, and the verb's loss of verbal semantic content can be described in terms of "bleaching" or "desemanticization" process" (Lord 1993: 3). This seems what has happened in Papiamentu as well. *Kaba* has lost its function as a verb and is being used as an adverb instead, not only in V₂ position in a serial construction, but also as a proper adverb as in example (33). In (34) such a shift can account for the interpretation of *bay* as a future tense marker and in (36) and (37) as an aspect marker for duration. In the same way, *dal*, in (38) can be analysed as an aspect marker for punctuality.
3.3 Analysis of Papiamentu by Sebba

Sebba claims that his analysis is applicable to the universal phenomenon of serial verb constructions and tries to show this with examples from Akan (Twi/Fanti), Anyi-Baule, Yoruba, Ijo, Saramaccan, Papiamentu and Mandarin Chinese. One of the arguments for distinguishing a coordinate and a subordinate type of serial verb constructions was the difference in meaning between (5) and (6), repeated here as (39) and (40).

(39) Kofi naki Amba kiri en
Kofi hit Amba kill him/her
"Kofi struck Amba and killed her."

(40) Kofi naki Amba kiri
"Kofi struck Amba dead."

This contrast seems to be identical to what happens in Papiamentu, as can be seen in examples (41) and (42).

(41) M'a tir'é mat'é
1sg-TENSE-shoot-3SG kill-3SG
"I shot (him) and killed him."

(42) M'a-tir'e mata
1sg-TENSE-shoot-3SG kill
"I shot him dead."

However, Sebba bases this possible similarity on interpretation only, not on the syntactic characteristics of the two types of serial verb constructions that he proposed earlier.

In Papiamentu, take-constructions can be formed with two different verbs, *tuma* and *kohe*. At first sight they seem to have different functions; *tuma* is being used in instrumental constructions and *kohe* in subordinating take-constructions. However, *kohe* can also occur in constructions that seem to be instrumental as in (43).

(43) El a kohe e hacha kap e palu
3SG TMA take the axe cut the tree

(44) El a kohe e hacha i kap e palu
"He took the axe and cut the tree."
It's counterpart with conjunction *i*, is shown in (44) and has the same meaning according to Sebba's informants. Therefore, Sebba does not draw any conclusions about take-constructions in Papiamentu.

The give-constructions analysed by Sebba for Sranan have no Papiamentu counterparts. Sebba claims that this is due to the fact that Papiamentu has several "canonical" prepositions that can be used in a wider range of contexts than their Sranan counterparts. This indicates that "Papiamentu thus seems to use prepositions in preference to serialising strategies in certain cases, where Sranan does the opposite" (Sebba 1987: 179).

With respect to motion verb constructions and double-go constructions, Papiamentu shows the same pattern as Sranan. In both languages there is ambiguity between the purpose reading and the actual reading. This ambiguity in constructions with motion verbs was already pointed to in section 3.1 and the example is repeated here as (45). Example (46) shows the same ambiguity between purpose reading and actual reading in double-go constructions.

(45) lanta papya
rise speak
(i) "get up and speak"
(ii) "get up to speak"
(iii) "get up (while) speaking"

(46) Un amigu di-mi a-bin mi kas, bin puntra-mi pa nos bay kunuku,
a friend of-1SG TENSE-come 1SG/POS house, come ask-1SG for 3PL go farm,

bay wak kabaynan$^5$

"A friend of mine came to my house to/and asked me whether we could go to the farm to/and watch the horses."

Finally, Sebba mentions lexical idioms in Sranan, "expressions involving serialisation, whose meaning cannot be derived from the meanings of the parts in isolation" (Sebba 1987: 197). He claims that Papiamentu has these expressions as in (47) and (48).

(47) grita + pidi/hari/kumindá/kanta/yora
yell + request/laugh/greet/sing/cry
"yell for, laugh out loud, etc."

$^5$ Emphasis added in order to make clear which were the constructions under discussion here.
However, this seems to be a rather strong claim, since the meaning of these 'compounds' can be easily derived from the meanings of the two verbs.

So far, this has been a description of the serial verb constructions in Papiamentu, keeping in mind the distinction of class 1 versus class 2 constructions proposed by Bendix and the coordinate versus subordinate distinction proposed by Sebba. In the next chapter, I will discuss whether these two distinctions can be seen as semantic and syntactic counterparts of each other.
4. Analysis of serial verb constructions in Papiamentu

4.1 Classification of Papiamentu serial verb constructions: class 1

Although Sebba points to some similarities between Sranan and Papiamentu, his analysis of the Papiamentu data is based mainly on interpretation of the examples by Bendix's informants. As shown in section 2.4, the syntactic analysis that Sebba proposes for Sranan makes him claim that there are two types of serial constructions, the coordinate type and the subordinate type, but no syntactic evidence is provided for this analysis in Papiamentu. In this section, I will try to elaborate on this syntactic evidence in Papiamentu. The examples are based on Bendix (1972) or were formulated with help of my informants.

According to Bendix, class 1 serial verb constructions are those in which the verb order is iconic with respect to temporal order (1i), the state expressed by V₁ extends at least until the beginning of the time referred to by V₂ (1ii) and the time of V₂ begins during V₁, forming an uninterrupted sequence. Since class 2 events are not marked for the second semantic characterisation that Bendix mentions, these can be interpreted as interrupted sequences with a possible pause between the two events. Bendix claims that the actions expressed by the verbs in class 1 serial verb constructions are more closely related than those expressed by a class 2 construction. This seems to correspond to Sebba's classification of coordinate serial verb constructions, that express two separate actions, and subordinate serial constructions that express one single event. If this is true, than the same movement rules that Sebba proposes for subordinate serial constructions should apply to the examples that Bendix classifies as class 1 serial verb constructions.

Subclass 1 and 2 of Bendix's class 1 serial verb constructions consist of series of verbs that express different simultaneous parts or facets of one single action. These can be constructions with all three VP positions filled (subclass 1) or only the first two positions filled with V₂ closing the sequence (subclass 2). Since the verbs express parts or facets of a single action, these should be analysed as subordinate constructions. Thus, according to Sebba's analysis it should be possible to move objects of verbs under questioning, but it is impossible to move a verb with its complement leftward, nor can the order of the verbs be changed. My informants accordingly accepted example (49a) and (49b), but not (49c) and (49d). When rejecting (49d), they proposed (49e) instead, using the gerund form to be able to change the order of the verbs and to emphasize the action of the second verb. As we shall see, this replacement happened in all cases with subordinate serial verb constructions, either to a gerund or a participle.
The serial verb constructions that Bendix classifies as subclass 3 are series that express two simultaneous actions unmarked for inceptive or completive, that can be interpreted as durative actions. These can be analysed as coordinate or subordinate serial constructions, depending on whether they express several actions or just one single event. As shown by examples (50) and (51), in these constructions it is possible to move the objects of the verbs under questioning, but it is not possible to move the verb with its complement leftward, nor can the order of the verbs be changed.

(50)  a. E tabata kana buska konenchi
      3SG TENSE walk search rabbit
      "He walked searching for the rabbit."

   b. Ki e tabata kana buska? – konenchi
      What 3SG TENSE walk search – rabbit
      "What did he search walking? – the rabbit."

   c. *Buska konenchi e tabata kana
   d. *E tabata buska konenchi kana
   e. E tabata buska konenchi kanando

(51)  a. El-a sinta den e stul piska dolfein
      3SG-TENSE sit in the chair fish dolphin
      "He sat in the chair fishing for dolphins."

   b. Den ki el-a sinta piska dolfein? – den e stul
      in what 3SG-TENSE sit fish dolphin – in the chair
      "In what was he sitting fishing for dolphins? – in the chair."

   c. Kí el-a sinta den e stul piska? – dolfein
      what 3SG-TENSE sit in the chair fish – dolphin
      "What was he fishing for sitting in the chair? – dolphins."
Examples (50) and (51) show that the movement rules that Sebba proposes for subordinate serial constructions also apply to the series that Bendix classifies as subclass 3. The examples seem to be interpreted as single events, without clear distinction between the two actions.

According to Bendix, subclass 4 serial verb constructions are series of verbs that express simultaneous parts or facets, where one is a more basic action and the other one expresses the manner in which it is performed. These should all be subordinate serial constructions since they describe one single event. The following example was used by Sebba as a compound whose meaning cannot be derived from the meanings of the parts in isolation.

In chapter 3 it was already mentioned that this is not a very strong claim and I will use it here as an example of a subclass 4 serial constructions, since it was presented as such by Bendix.

(52)  a. El-a grita kumindá bo
    3SG-TENSE yell greet you
    "He greeted you yelling."

    b. Kén el-a grita kumindá? – Abo
    who 3SG-TENSE yell greet – you
    "Who did he greet yelling? – you."

    c. *Kumindá bo el-a grita
    d. *El-a kumindá bo grita
    e. El-a kuminda bo grità

My informants accepted (52a) and (52b), but not (52c) and (52d). This indicates that (52a) can be analysed as a subordinate serial construction.

Bendix distinguishes a subclass 5 for a variety of other types of strings, not accounted for so far. He claims that it may not be clear whether they are class 1 or class 2 serial verb constructions, since "there may be vagueness as to whether the actions expressed by contiguous verb phrases may overlap" (Bendix 1972: 19). One example of a subclass 5 construction is (53), that it is a series with a final verb phrase giving the endpoint of the action.

(53)  a. El-a sali para den balkon
    3sg-tense exit stand in balcony
    "He went out and stood on the balcony."
b. *Den kí el-a sali para? – e balkon
   in what 3SG-TENSE exit stand – the balcony
   "On what did he go and stand? – the balcony."

c. *Para den balkon el-a sali

When presented with this example, my informants said that (51b) as well as (51c) is not grammatical. It is therefore most likely that this example should be interpreted as a subordinate serial verb construction.

Also belonging to this subclass are constructions with instrumental function. Sebba's informants accepted the following sentence.

(54)     El-a tuma e kuchu korta e karni         (Sranan, Sebba 1987: 171)
   3SG-TENSE take the knife cut the meat
   "He cut the meat with the knife."

When presented with example (55a) two of the three informants did not accept it as the correct form and proposed (55b) instead. However, (55b) does not necessarily mean that the fish is actually cut.

(55)     a. *El-a tuma e machete korta e piska
   3SG-TENSE take the machete cut the fish

   b. El-a tuma e machete pa korta e piska
   3SG-TENSE take the machete for cut the fish
   "He took the machete in order to cut the fish."

c. Kí el a tuma pa korta piska? – e machete
d. Pa korta kí el a tuma e machete? – e piska
e. Pa korta e piska el a tuma e machete
f. Pa korta kua piska el a tuma e machete? – esaki

Since in (55b) there is a conjunction *pa, 'in order to', it cannot be interpreted as a serial verb construction. Instead, it is a purpose clause and does not mean that the fish was actually cut. Without further research on why Sebba's informants accepted (54) and two my informants did not accept (55a), it is impossible to draw conclusions on this type of serial verb constructions.

So far, the movement rules that Sebba proposed as characteristics for subordinate serial constructions seem to apply to Bendix's class one serial verb constructions. Although nothing can be concluded about subclass 5 without further research, the other subclasses all seem to be subordinating serial verb constructions.
4.2 Classification of Papiamentu serial verb constructions: class 2

In the previous section, constructions of Bendix's class 1 serial constructions were analysed. These seemed to correspond to what Sebba classified as subordinating serial verb constructions. However, when we analyse Bendix's class 2 constructions, things become more complicated.

Bendix claims that it may not always be clear what can be interpreted as a class 1 or a class 2 construction, and that differences in intonation and juncture may be what separates the two classes. Then he argues that "[a] clear case of Class 2 would seem to be the appearance of co-referential object noun phrases in surface structure after their respective verbs" (Bendix 1972: 24). Whereas object sharing is a characteristic often discussed in literature on serial verb constructions, as was also mentioned in section 2.1 when defining serial verb constructions, it is the fact that the object is expressed twice what makes these cases distinct. As shown in chapter 2, Sebba claims that these constructions should be interpreted as coordinate serial constructions, contrasting (56) with (57).

(56) his'e benta den awa
    lift-it throw in water
    "fling it into the water"

(57) his'é bent'é den awa
    lift-it throw-it in water
    "lift it and throw it in the water"

(58) solo ta-kima-bo mata
    sun TENSE-burn-2SG kill
    "the sun burns you to death"

(59) solo ta-kima-bo mata-bo
    sun TENSE-burn-2SG kill-2SG
    "the sun burns and kills you"

Bendix's informants claimed that (56) and (57) described slightly different situations. "[I]n [57] there may be a pause in the action and one can see the man lift it and walk to the water and then throw it in, whereas in [56] he remains where he is and performs one continuous action" (Bendix 1972: 24-25). When asked to contrast (58) and (59), it was said that, compared to (58), (59) puts strong emphasis on the action.

An interesting observation with respect to the relationship between coordination and serial verb constructions was made by my informants when presented with (60) and asked if
they could contrast the three sentences, they claimed that only (60c) was different and was said to express two separated actions, whereas (60a) and (60b) were considered synonymous.

(60)  
a. El a his'e benta den awa  
b. El a his'e bent'e den awa  
c. El a his'e i bent'e den awa

Even when they were told the difference that was indicated by Bendix's informants, they claimed that there was no difference between the interpretation of (60a) and (60b) with respect to time reference, but stated that (60b) does slightly emphasise the separate actions. However, according to them, the only clear difference in interpretation is (60c), that clearly refers to two separate actions. This indicates that for my informants *i* is indeed not marked for continuity of action or state, as was observed by Bendix, but that the interpretations of (60b) and (60c) are closer to one another than for Bendix's informants.

4.3 Historical view on coordinated constructions and serial verb constructions

In the previous section it was shown that the interpretation of serial verb constructions with co-referential object pronouns used to be close to the interpretation of conjoined structures, but this seems to be changing. This possible connection between serial verb constructions and coordinated or conjoined sentences is not uncommon. Lord (1993: 102-103) claims that other scholars (Hyman 1975, Schachter 1974, Givón 1975) have pointed to the possibility that conjoined structures are the historical origin of serial verb constructions in Kwa languages and examines this herself with respect to Twi. In modern Twi, both serial verb constructions of the type [NP VP VP] and conjoined sentences of the type [S CONJ S], with conjunction *na*, 'and', can be found. However, the sequence [NP VP *na* VP] is ungrammatical and also not mentioned by earlier writers on Twi (Christaller 1875, 1881, Riis 1854). Riis does mention that in late 19th century Twi sentences could be connected by way of coordination, without an expressed conjunction. "This appears to be the case, when the particular relation, existing between the sentences, is by itself manifest from the ideas expressed in them" (Riis 1854: 103). Therefore, Lord suggests that in Twi there was a historical change as presented in (61) with (61a) being the earliest structure in the historical development of Twi, (61b) the intermediate structure and (61c) the serial verb construction.
According to Lord, the semantic superfluity of the conjunction and the redundancy of the subject pronoun in the second clause could have played a role in the phonological erosion of these elements.

In Bendix (1994), he seems to be pointing to a similar connection between the coordinated structures and serial verb constructions in Papiamentu. In the following examples that Bendix classified under the head 'Derivation?' he shows the range of possibilities in Papiamentu. Only (62a) is glossed here, the other ones are only accompanied by a translation.

(62)  

(a) El-a-his'é i el-a-bent'é  
3SG-TENSE-lift it and 3SG-TENSE-fling it  
"S/he lifted it and s/he flung it."

(b) El-a-his'é i bent'é  
"S/he lifted it and flung it."

(c) El-a-his'é bent'é  
"S/he lifted it (and) flung it."

(d) El-a-his'é benta  
"S/he flung it away."

These sentences include the direct object repetition that led us to the problem in the first place. This can also be represented as in (63).

(63)  

(a) NP₁ VP NP₂ CONJ NP₁ VP NP₂  
(b) NP₁ VP NP₂ CONJ Ø VP NP₂  
(c) NP₁ VP NP₂ Ø Ø VP NP₂  
(d) NP₁ VP NP₂ Ø Ø VP Ø

One has to observe that the order that Bendix prefers is slightly different to the one Lord proposes for Twi. Recall that in Twi it was the conjunction that was dropped first and then the subject pronoun of the second clause, whereas the order in (63) suggests that the subject NP of the second clause was dropped first and then the conjunction marker. If we can interpret Bendix's 'derivation' as a historical process, the order in (63) seems to be the right one, since this is consistent with the fact that in Papiamentu the sequence [ NP₁ VP NP₂ CONJ VP NP₂] is...
grammatical and in Twi it is not. If there has been a historical change than this would seem to be the right order in which the change has happened.

Although Bendix points to the possible relationship between coordinated sentences and class 1 serial verb constructions and all that is grammatical in between, there is no evidence that supports the view that these serial verb constructions actually have historical origins in coordinated structures in Papiamentu. Bendix argues that constructions with conjoined sentences by i, 'and', are a 'modern' style Papiamentu, with or without repetition of the subject noun phrase (pronominalised) and TMA-marker. A collection of tape-recorded folkloric texts points in the same direction. On the tapes, speakers in their eighties do not use i as a conjunction marker in this way. "Here i tends to be used very sparingly, with rather more specialized functions, such as conjoining conditional clauses or together with sentence adverbs, e.g. i tox 'and still' " (Bendix 1972: 30).

Assuming that the conjoining of sentences with use of i is indeed a more modern/standardized phenomenon and that i was used more sparingly before, it seems that the historical development pointed at by Lord and the derivation process pointed at by Bendix, did not take place in Papiamentu. Without further historical evidence, we can only say that serial verb constructions seem to have always existed in Papiamentu and were not derived from coordinated structures. Furthermore, the differences in interpretation of (60a) contrasted with (60b) between Bendix's informants and my informants lead to the suggestion that the (re)introduction of i may have caused a shift in interpretation of (60b). The interpretation of (60b) as two separate actions is no longer necessary, because this can be expressed by using the conjunction. Therefore, the interpretation of (60b) is closer to the interpretation of (60a) in modern Papiamentu. This is, however, a tentative suggestion and more research is needed in order to draw conclusions on this matter.
5. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to compare Bendix's semantic analysis of serial verb constructions in Papiamentu to the analysis that Sebba claims to be applicable cross-linguistically, based on Sranan data. Sebba's theory claims that serial verb constructions can be of the 'coordinate' type or 'subordinate' type. The coordinate type of serial verb constructions typically involves several, more or less simultaneous, actions. This type of serial verb construction shares characteristics with coordinate conjunctions, such as constraints on the extraction of the objects from a coordinate structure. Sebba shows that they are subject to the Coordinate Structure Constraint, since neither verb's object may be moved. The 'subordinate' type of serial verb constructions refers to one single event only and does not have these constraints on object movement. The objects of verbs in this type of constructions, as well as PP's, may be moved under questioning or relativisation, but it is not possible to move a verb leftward together with its complement.

Bendix's analysis is a more semantic one and is based on the time referred to by the verbs in a serial verb construction. Based on two semantic characterizations, he distinguishes three classes, two of which can be considered serial verb constructions. Class 1 serial verb constructions describe (a series of) actions in a continuous timeframe, whereas class 2 serial verb constructions allow a temporal break between the actions in the series. As suggested in the introduction, both analyses seem to be similar and therefore the syntactic characteristics that Sebba proposes should be applicable to Papiamentu.

Although Bendix distinguishes five subclasses, all class 1 serial verb constructions have in common that they refer to one event, consisting of two or more actions that happen simultaneously, without a possible temporal break. The data in section 4.1 show that all class 1 constructions discussed in this study show the same pattern that Sebba found in Sranan. For all class 1 constructions that were presented to my informants, they did accept the examples in which the objects of the verbs were moved under questioning, but not the examples in which the verbs were moved leftward together with their complement. Based on this evidence, we can conclude that Bendix's class 1 constructions are of the subordinate type proposed by Sebba.

According to Bendix, class 2 serial verb constructions are those that refer to several actions with a temporal break between them. The data in section 4.2 show that Bendix's informants interpreted the serial verb constructions with a co-referential object pronoun as stressing the separate actions and allowing a pause in the action compared to the constructions
with only one expressed object pronoun. However, my informants did not completely share this opinion and claimed rather that both constructions should be interpreted as synonymous. They did claim that there was a clear difference between both types of serial verb constructions and the equivalent structures with two conjoined sentences with conjunction *i*.

In order to get a better view on the relationship between serial verb constructions and conjunctions, historical evidence was discussed in section 4.3. Since there seems to be no evidence that in Papiamentu conjoined sentences with *i* are the historical origin of serial verb constructions, we can at this point only assume that *i* is a recent phenomenon. One of the questions that this raises is if the introduction of the conjoined sentences with *i* have led to a shift in interpretation of the serial verb constructions. If the serial verb construction with co-referential object pronouns was the way of expressing two different actions, than the introduction of *i* might have made this interpretation redundant, therefore causing a shift of the interpretation of class 2 serial verb constructions towards the single action interpretation that was given by my informants. In the light of the present data this is, however, only a tentative suggestion and further research is needed in order to draw conclusions on this matter.
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