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1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with a class of function words in pidgin and creole languages that can contribute to the still on-going debate about the role of universal and substratum features in creole formation, as well as to the debate about gradual versus abrupt creolization: reflexives. As we will see below, these tend to be innovative in creoles with respect to their lexifier languages. While content words are often reflexes of the lexemes of the colonial languages, for function words, and particularly for reflexives, there is a much more indirect correspondence.

Reflexives in creole languages raise all the issues that have been under discussion in the field in recent years: how does the lexical reconstitution of a grammatical morpheme class proceed: through contributing elements from substrate languages, the influence of a linguistic bioprogram, the gradual transformation of superstrate patterns, or through processes of grammaticalization of content words? In addition these issues may link creole studies to the mainstream of theoretical linguistics, where the distribution and properties of reflexives have been central issues for many years (Chomsky, 1981; Reinhart and Reuland, 1991).

Earlier accounts, typified by such survey studies as Holm (1989), were mostly focussed on the forms the reflexives took and on their possible resemblance to the superstrate languages, with some reference to the substrate issue. Reflexives are often found to consist of two parts, as seen in (1):

(1) a. ko li (body-3) MARTINICAN
  her/himself (cf. Fr. 'se/soi-même')

b. en srefi (3-self) SRANAN
  her/himself (cf. Eng. 'himself')

c. my yet (1-head) TOK PISIN
  myself (cf. Eng. 'myself')

The nature of these complex forms will be discussed in much detail below.

The orientation of the work in this area has changed due to the publication of Carden and Stewart's seminal article from 1988. They argue on the basis of the distribution of the reflexives in Haitian dialects, coupled with some scant diachronic data, that early Haitian had bare pronoun reflexives. This raises the issue of whether early creoles are fully natural languages, since this may go against universal grammatical principles (defined in Chomsky's Binding Theory, 1981), or rather resemble the pidgins from which they are derived.
Corne's work on Mauritian reflexives (1988; 1989) introduced a new dimension into this research: different sets of verbs often select different reflexive forms. Thus there is an intimate link as well with verb semantics and the way it is reflected in the argument structure and subcategorization frame of verbs.

A dimension which needs to be explored further is to what extent principles of discourse organization influence the distribution of reflexive forms in those cases where several different forms are possible with a single verb.

The state of the work on reflexives in creoles is such that only an account in terms of a number of propositions is possible at the present time.

2. Diversity among the creoles

Creole languages exhibit a fair variety of reflexive structures. This section represents a preliminary attempt to classify the forms found. Due to lack of data, we will restrict ourselves to a small number of creole languages here, so we do not wish to pretend that our conclusions are in any way definitive.

In (2) we present an overview of the different types of reflexive forms encountered in the languages of the world.

(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>definition</th>
<th>example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>3rd person pronoun</td>
<td>Haitian <em>li</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>1st/2nd person pronoun</td>
<td>French <em>melle</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>reflexive pronoun</td>
<td>French <em>se</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>pronoun + identifier</td>
<td><em>himself</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>possessive + identifier</td>
<td><em>myself</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>body word ('body', 'head', 'skin')</td>
<td>Fon <em>wu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>pronoun + body word</td>
<td>Saram. <em>en sikin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>pronoun + identifier + body word</td>
<td>Saram. <em>en seei sikin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>possessive + body word</td>
<td>Papiamentu <em>su kurpa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>verb + reflexive affix</td>
<td>Quechua <em>riku-ku-n</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>verb + body incorporation</td>
<td>Bini</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 1 the distribution of these forms over a number of creoles is presented:
TABLE 1: Distribution of types of reflexives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>BE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. 3pro</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. 1/2pro</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. refl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. pro + id</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. poss + id</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. pro + body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. pro + id + body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. null</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. verb + refl af</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. verb + body inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(HT = Haitian, MA = Mauritian, SR = Sranan, SA = Saramaccan, PA = Papiamentu, AN = Annobon, NE = Negerhollands, BE = Berbice)

The most frequent forms are bare pronouns, pronoun + identifier combinations, and null forms. Only a few of the possibilities attested in the languages of the world are not attested in creoles.

3. Overlap

In several creoles a number of competing forms exist, partially overlapping in use. We will illustrate this with two examples. The first concerns contemporary Papiamentu (Muysken, 1993). In Papiamentu no less than seven different forms have replaced the Ibero-Romance clitics:

(3) a. paña < Port. pano, Sp. paño 'cloth'
    b. kurpa < Port. corpo, Sp. cuerpo 'body'
    c. null reflexive
    d. possessive + kurpa
    e. pronoun
    f. pronoun + mes < Port. mismo 'self, precisely'
    g. possessive pronoun + mes

Examples for the principal reflexive forms are given in (4):
(4) a. peña 'comb oneself'
    feita 'shave (oneself)'

   b. sofoká kurpa 'exert oneself'
    sofoká 'stifle'

   c. yuda su kurpa 'help oneself'
    sisti su kurpa 'serve/stuff oneself'

   d. weta su mes 'look at oneself'
    yuda su mes 'help oneself'

   e. sinti e tristo 'feel sad'
     haña e 'find oneself'

In (4a) we find the null reflexive, in (4b) the bare body word. The latter is limited to
a specific set of, often idiomatic, expressions. (4c) illustrates the pronoun + body
word construction, and (4d) the pronoun + identifier construction. In (4e), finally,
there is a bare pronoun.

Of course, these forms are not all usable interchangeably. In table 2 a rough
outline of their distribution is given, along the dimensions [+ physical action] ((n-
phys.) and [inherent (inh.) versus transitive (tr.)]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>kurpa</th>
<th>pro + kurpa</th>
<th>pro + mes</th>
<th>pro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identifier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phys.inh.</td>
<td></td>
<td>some</td>
<td>some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phys.tr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>idiom</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-phys.inh.</td>
<td></td>
<td>some</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-phys.tr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Papiamentu, *mes* can be used as an identifier, in addition to being a reflexive, but
*kurpa* cannot:

(5) a. mi mes ta hunga
    'I myself am playing.'

   b. * mi kurpa ta hunga

The main factor in the choice between *mes* and *kurpa* as reflexives seems to be
whether the verb expresses a physical action or not. With some verbs both forms are
possible:
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(6)  
el a hoga su mes/su kurpa na lama  
'He has drowned himself in the sea.'

(7)  
bo a yuda bo mes/?bo kurpa  
'You have helped yourself.'

In other constructions, only *mes* is possible. These are principally cases where the 'self' is purely mental or figurative:

(8)  
m'a ekiboka mi mes/*mi kurpa  
'I made a mistake.'

(9)  
el a hasi su mes/*su kurpa sokete  
'He made himself out to be stupid.'

(10)  
el a lolea/hode su mes/*su kurpa  
'He made an asshole of himself.'

In cases such as (11), which is purely corporeal, *kurpa* but not *mes* is possible:

(11)  
el a dal su kurpa/*su mes na un palo  
'He walked into a pole.'  
(lit. 'he walked himself into a pole')

We will return to the use of bare pronoun forms below.

The distribution in Papiamentu is not dissimilar to that in Mauritian, as described by Corne (1988; 1989). The following four categories and distributions are distinguished by Corne:

(12)  
null inherent reflexives  
pronoun inherent reflexives / transitive verbs / datives preferred  
pro + *mem* transitive verbs; prepositional phrases preferred  
pro + *lekor* physical action verbs

Mauritian *lekor* has a distribution very much like Papiamentu *kurpa*. We will see below that the same holds for bare pronoun and null forms.

A partially different picture is suggested by 18th century Negerhollands (Muysken & van der Voort 1991). Some examples are given in (13):

(13)  
a. Object reflexive  
wies ju selv na die Priester (Mat 8, 4)  
show yourself to the priest
b. Object reflexive third person singular
... ha openbaar sie selv ... (Mat 2, 19)
TNS reveal himself

c. Adverbial Prepositional Phrase reflexive
Partie van die Skriftgeleerden ha seg bie sender selv
Part of the Pharisees said among themselves (Mat 9, 3)

d. Small Clause Prepositional Phrase reflexive
en Jesus ha ruep sie twaelf Disciplen na sie (Mat 10, 1)
and Jesus TNS call his twelve disciples to REFL

e. Inherent reflexive
maer die Volk ha verwonder sender (Mat 8, 27)
but the people TNS marvel them

In Table 3 it is made clear that there are considerable differences amongst the different contexts where the selv forms occur most frequently:

**TABLE 3:** Distribution of selv over different contexts in Negerhollands (van der Voort and Muysken 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>IO</th>
<th>ADVPP</th>
<th>SCPP</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun + selv</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forms with selv are very common in direct object position and particularly in adverbial phrases, but much less so elsewhere.

4. Analyticity

Reflexives are formed with the analytic word formation procedures characteristic of creole lexical extension in general. This statement needs no further comment here, given the examples presented.

5. The role of the lexifiers

For French lexifier creoles the colonial lexifier can only have played a limited role. The reflexives in the English-based creoles are not directly inherited from the lexifier model, either (cf. Smith, 1987). Unlike the question words in the colonial lexifier languages, which tend to be uniformly mono-morphematic in structure (i.e.
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consist of one meaning-bearing element), as in (14), reflexive pronouns in these languages are different in their morphological structure (cf. 15):

(14) ENGLISH: who what when where etc.
DUTCH wie wat wanneer waar etc.
FRENCH: qui que quand ou etc.
PORTUGUESE: quem que quando onde etc.

(15) ENGLISH myself himself herself etc.
DUTCH me(zelf) zich(zelf)
FRENCH me se se etc.
PORTUGUESE me se se etc.

Speaking in terms of loss and reconstitution, the problem raised by reflexives is the following. In Portuguese and in Spanish - the languages that have provided most of the lexicon for Papiamentu - we find constructions such as (16):

(16) a. Eu me vejo no espelho. (Portuguese)
   'I see myself in the mirror.'

b. Maria se corta en la mano. (Spanish)
   'Mary cuts herself in the hand.'

Ibero-Romance reflexive clitic forms are the following:

(17) me nos
te os etc.
se se

As was the case with the other clitic pronouns, reflexive clitics were lost in the process of genesis of Papiamentu, perhaps in a phase when the language existed only as a rudimentary second language pidgin. The question is of course what replaced them.

Superstrate explanations are inadequate also. If superstrate influence were the proper explanation in most cases, then we would expect the following patterns in French and English lexifier creoles:

(18) French-based 1st/2nd Pronoun 3rd Reflexive Pronoun
English-based Possessive + Pronoun +
Identifier Identifier
Substandard English also has possessive + identifier for the 3rd person: *theirselves, hisself.*

In fact we observe the pattern in Table 4:

**Table 4:** Reflexives in various French and English-based Creole languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English-based</th>
<th>French-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pron</td>
<td>Pron+Idnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sranan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saramaccan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican (?)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Louisiana</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayenne</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Haiti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Pron = pronoun; Idnt = identifier)

The most striking fact that springs to the eye here is the uniformity among the various systems. There is quite obviously no question of any major superstrate influence. The analytic constructions Pron+Idnt (*himself*), Pron+Body/Body+Pron (*li-ko/ko-li*) - and to a lesser extent Pron+Head/Head+Pron (*li-tet/tet-li*) - are shared between English-based and French-based creoles.

There are two possible cases of superstrate influence to be discerned. The first concerns the use of the bare Oblique pronoun as a reflexive in Seychellois and some other French-based creoles. This differs slightly from the French facts in that the third person form is also an Oblique pronoun rather than a true reflexive form as in French, but we could put this down to a regularization of the system, removing what is a minority pattern in French.

(26) Seychellois

...i bey li partu

'...(he) washes himself all over.'
More striking is the use of the Pron.+Ident. pattern in certain English-based creoles. Once again we have a difference in the overall pattern, however, but this time in the majority of cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflexives in English, Saramaccan, and Sranan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fact only the two patterns indicated with an '=' sign are equivalent, and then only if we ignore the fact that plurality is marked in English reflexives. The significant differences in the pattern of Personal Pronouns are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Sranan</th>
<th>*Sranan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s Pron.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>*ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss.</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>*mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ident.</td>
<td>my-self</td>
<td>mi-srefi</td>
<td>*mai-srefi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s Pron.</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>ju/i</td>
<td>ju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss.</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>ju/i</td>
<td>*juwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ident.</td>
<td>your-self</td>
<td>ju-srefi</td>
<td>*juwa-srefi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p Pron.</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>wi/u</td>
<td>wi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>us</td>
<td>wi/u</td>
<td>*osi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss.</td>
<td>our</td>
<td>wi/u</td>
<td>*owa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ident.</td>
<td>our-selves</td>
<td>wi-srefi</td>
<td>*owa-srefi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Sranan reflexives were cognate with their English congeners we would have expected the non-occurring phonetic forms in the *Sranan column (cf. Smith 1987 for details of phonetic developments in the Surinam creoles). This suggests that
neither substrate nor superstrate can in themselves offer an acceptable explanation of more than a small part of these phenomena, morphologically speaking.

There were, it should be mentioned, cases of 'body' reflexives in Old French (Einhorn, 1974:69), but there is no reason to assume that there is a historical link between these and the 'body' reflexives in the Caribbean creoles:

(19) por lor cors deporter
    'to amuse themselves'

Notice finally that the forms in (20) correspond to each other, but not directly to a European model.

(20) a. Papiamentu su mes, e mes

b. Negerhollands sie-self, am-self

6. Grammaticalization

One may hypothesize that self-type forms developed as discourse markers and slowly developed into a grammatical formative. This use of self is illustrated with an example from Quechua:

(21) a. Xwan pay-ta riku-n
    Juan he-AC see-3
    'Juan sees him/*himself.'

b. Xwan pay-lla-ta-tak riku-n
    Juan he-DEL-AC-EMP see-3
    'Juan sees himself/just him especially.'

(AC = accusative; DEL = delimitative; EMP = emphatic)

The evidence for grammaticalization so far is limited, however. We will consider four cases here, namely Negerhollands, Papiamentu, Saramaccan, and Sranan.

Did Negerhollands self evolve from an emphatic highlighter to a non-discourse-oriented anaphoric marker? Consider first the data in Table 7. Here two periods in the early history of Negerhollands are contrasted, 1780 and 1800 (Van der Voort & Muysken, 1994). While the percentage of self forms (marked with S) increases in this period, it does so more for 1st and 2nd persons, where grammatical disambiguation is not needed, than for 3rd persons, where it is.
TABLE 7: The relation between the person of the pronoun and the presence of self (in parentheses the non-sie 3rd person forms) in Negerhollands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 S</td>
<td>48 = 33 %</td>
<td>19 = 46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>250 (229)</td>
<td>59 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 S</td>
<td>107 = 30 % (51 = 15 %)</td>
<td>34 = 36 % (27 = 29 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I = period around and before 1780; II = period around and shortly after 1800)

A similar question can be posed for Papiamentu. Did Papiamentu kurpa evolve from an inalienably possessed body noun to a freely occurring anaphor? The form kurpa is mostly used with physical action verbs, taken in the widest sense of the word:

(22) E ta kana bai bini sin duna su kurpa sosiego.
'He walks back and forth without giving himself rest.'

(23) E ta kita nan for di su kurpa.
'He takes them off himself/his body.'

(24) ?? M'a siña mi kurpa ingles.
'I taught myself English.'

Notice, however, that it cannot be used together with another inalienably possessed noun:

(25) a. M'a korta mi mes/*mi kurpa na mi man.
'I cut myself in the hand.'

b. Mi ta dal mi mes/*mi kurpa na mi kabes.
'I hit myself on the head.'

Here man 'hand' is inalienably possessed by the subject. Even though the action is quite physical, kurpa is impossible. We can interpret this contrast by assuming that kurpa itself is an inalienably possessed element, and hence blocked in (25a). When the anaphor and the antecedent are not co-arguments of the same predicate, kurpa cannot be used either:
(26) Mi a mira un kulebra serka di mi/*mi mes/(*)mi kurpa.
'I saw a snake near me (near my body (as in a dream))'

(27) Mi a mira mi mes/(*)mi kurpa kai.
'I saw myself fall.'
('I saw my body fall (as in a dream)')

Body part (which take the form en-sinkii) reflexives in Saramaccan (Bolle & de Ruiter, 1993) are quite limited in their occurrence:

(28) a. Janį ta si wan peentju f'enį
John sees a picture of himself.

b. *Janį ta si wan peentju f'en-sinkiiį

(29) a. Janį jei en-seeį ta fan
John heard himself speak.

b. *Janį jei en-sinkiiį ta fan

In Sranan skin and bere 'belly' reflexives are also limited, although we do find some 18th century cases:

(30) a. a no kan sheki hem skin (1783)
he can't move

b. mi membre dätti na mi belle
I thought by myself ...

7. Bare pronoun forms

Is there evidence for a pidgin or early creole generalized bare pronoun reflexive (as argued by Carden & Stewart 1988) or are the bare pronouns a late development under the influence of superstrate reflexive clitic systems (Corne 1988)? Again, several languages provide relevant evidence on this point.

The following data show that in present-day Papiamentu bare pronoun reflexives are clitics occurring with lexically specified verbs, and even there only with specific meanings:

(31) a. Mi ta sinti mi/mi mes/*mi kurpa un tiki tristo.
'I feel a bit sad.'

b. Mi ta sinti *mi/mi mes/mi kurpa dor di e deklo.
I feel myself through the blanket.'
With the two possibilities in (31a) the two following structures correspond:

(32) a. Mi ta sinti+mi [pro(anaphoric) un tiki tristo].
   b. Mi ta sinti [mi mes un tiki tristo].

Some of the verbs taking bare pronoun reflexives are listed below; the verbs are generally inherently reflexive verbs denoting an abstract action:

(33)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sinti e X</td>
<td>feel X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haña e</td>
<td>find oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gana e</td>
<td>reach, find oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okupá e</td>
<td>occupy oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imagina e</td>
<td>imagine oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komportá e</td>
<td>behave oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duna e kuenta</td>
<td>take into account (lit. give oneself account)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diskulpá e</td>
<td>excuse oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kompromete e</td>
<td>commit oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establese e</td>
<td>establish oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dediká e</td>
<td>dedicate oneself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice also that these verbs are often part of the more 'educated' vocabulary, almost certainly not dating from the early stages of the creole. Another factor worth taking into consideration is the fact that many of these verbs contain more than two syllables: perhaps their weight favors a light reflexive object pronoun.

A similar situation holds in 18th century Negerhollands (cf. Table 8), where the bare pronoun reflexive are all inherent reflexives:

**TABLE 8:** Verbs taking an inherent reflexive (those marked with an asterisk in Table 5 below, have also been attested as zero-reflexive in Negerhollands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bedink</td>
<td>think, (re)consider (lit: think by oneself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bekeer *</td>
<td>convert oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beweeg</td>
<td>stir, move (lit: stir oneself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boek *</td>
<td>stoop, lean down (lit: to lean oneself down)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draej/dreij *</td>
<td>turn oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erger</td>
<td>get annoyed at (lit: to irritate oneself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keer *</td>
<td>turn oneself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... etc. etc.
The data from 18th century Sranan (Bruyn, in prep.) merit much closer investigation; however, a similar picture emerges:

(34) da zo mi za beri dem zomma di kili den srefi
    it is thus I will bury the people who kill themselves.

This quotation from van Dyk (+ 1760) indicates that reflexives based on English 'self' were present in the oldest known substantial body of textual material in one of the Surinam creoles - in this case Sranan. There are also bare pronoun reflexives, but often with verbs that take an inherently reflexive direct object in the meaning intended:

(35) a. mi gi mi abra na hem (1783)
    I give myself (over) to him.
    b. bunne jorka kibri hem
    the good ghost hides himself

However, in this context self reflexives are not excluded:

(36) wan libisomma membre, takki, hem kann helpi hem srefi, a kori hem srefi (1783)
    someone who thinks he can help himself is deceiving himself

As for 20th century Sranan, Adamson (1993) has argued that with a certain class of verbs bare pronouns can function as reflexive objects. Thus en in (35a) can be interpreted both as a reflexive and as a referential pronoun, non-coreferential with the subject:

(37) a. Johnj syi enj/j ini a spikri.
    John saw himself in the mirror.
    b. Johnj syi ensrefij/*j ini a spikri (non-emph. reading).

The reflexive ensrefi in (35b) can only be interpreted as coreferential with the subject. Adamson (1993) argues that reflexive en in (35a) is in fact an object clitic on the verb.

The Saramaccan data (Bolle & de Ruiter, 1993) suggest that this same development has not taken place there. In (36a) en can only be interpreted non-coreferentially:

(38) a. Janj si enj/j
    John saw him.
    b. Janj si en-sinkii/en-seei
8. Substrate

There is also quite a variety of forms to be found in the various (potential) substrate languages:

(39) GBE (FON): wu ('body')
     BINI: gb ('body')
     TWI: me ho etc. ('my body')
     YORUBA: ara mi etc. ('body my')

(Segurola, 1963)

If the form of the reflexives in the creole languages were purely a question of substrate or superstrate influence we would expect clear evidence one way or the other, taking the great variety of morphological structures into account.

Let us first consider substrate influence. We will only analyse those cases where we appear to have some evidence for particular West African languages having played a major role in the formation of particular creoles. Can we observe direct substrate influence in the reflexive formation in such languages? The following languages represent such cases:

(40) Creole Language | Substrate Language
----------------------|---------------------
Berbice Dutch         | E. Ijo (Kalabari)   | (Smith et al. 1987)
Saramaccan/Sranan     | Gbe (Fon)           | (Smith 1987; Bakker 1987)
Haitian               | Gbe (Fon)           | (Lefebvre 1986)
Annobonese            | Bini               | (Ferraz 1970)

Let us consider these cases one by one.

(41) Berbice Dutch       | Kalabari
Pron + selfu             | bu 'body'

Here there is no correspondence whatsoever.

(42) Saramaccan          | Fon
Pron + set ('self')      | wu 'body'
Pron + sinkii 'body' (< skin)

(43) Haitian             | Fon
kadav + Pron 'corpse'    | wu 'body'
kor + Pron 'body'
Here there is a partial semantic correspondence between Haitian and Saramaccan on the one hand, and Fon on the other.

The only case involving a complete equivalence (i.e. morphological, etymological-phonological and semantic) of these four is the last, that of Annobonese/Bini. The cases of Haitian and the Surinam creoles, here represented by Saramaccan, are semantically equivalent, but not equivalent either phonologically or morphologically. Overall the claim for substrate influence is not particularly strong for reflexives. The evidence for an African basis for the body reflexives is not very strong at present, but cannot be plausibly denied.

What does the use of bare object pronouns as reflexives imply for the bioprogram hypothesis?

(a) There is no Ibero-Romance reflex for Papiamentu *kurpa*, as there is for French creole *kor*.
(b) No body-part reflexives in Berbice Dutch.
(c) Some West-African languages (e.g. Ewe) do not have body-part reflexives; this needs to be studied in much more detail.
(d) The absence of grammaticalization of Papiamentu *kurpa* and Saramaccan *sinkii* pleads against direct calquing.

Note that in cases where we can identify both substrate and superstrate the N is lexically supplied in one of three ways:

(45) a. the superstrate form
    b. the substrate form
    c. the substrate form reinterpreted or relexified in the superstrate language

In Saramaccan we have for instance examples of options a. and c. Note that where we have the actual substrate form, as in the case of Annobonese, this is associated with the morphological pattern of the substrate language - in this case the form 'body' alone - as forecast by recent versions of the Language Biogram Hypothesis incorporating the Lexical Learning Hypothesis.

We can summarize the alleged substratum cases as in Table 9:
Note that it is conceivably a frequent historical semantic process that reflexives develop from inalienable possessives through the use of words with the meanings 'head' or 'body'. This does not necessarily imply that it is the default case that reflexives should be expressed by such words. So, all in all, the explanation of the causation of creole reflexive forms is much more complex than might have been expected. Different factors require to be taken into consideration when these are being analysed.

The influence of universals in reflexives seems to be restricted to one aspect of morphosyntax. For this influence to even be present it is necessary for the substrate item not to have been inherited. It also appears that we have to reckon with the effects of relexification. However, extrapolating once again here from the very small amount of clear cases at our disposal we appear to have a situation where
relexification lexically does not have maintenance of the morphosyntactic pattern associated with it. This does not augur well for much of the more grammatical interpretation of substratist claims.

We suggest, in line with the ideas of Bickerton (1981), and to a lesser extent, those of Seuren and Wekker (1986), that the unexplained morphosyntactic patterns derive from universal aspects of the internalized grammar of the early speakers of the relevant creole languages.

It might be remarked that while the analytic type of reflexive appears to be dominant in creole languages, the order of the two constituents is not invariable. However, recent versions of Bickerton's Language Bioprogram Hypothesis regard syntactic constituency as universal, but the order of constituents as language-specific. Note that the universal structure of reflexives would then be: [Pronoun, N]. The problem remains of how the lexical filling of the N is to be defined.

The Papiamentu case suggests that there are complex semantic motivations for the choice of either the identifier or inalienable possessive reflexive. If the use of kurpa derives from some African pattern, it was not simply a case of relexifying an African form, but a complex process of reinterpretation of African pattern to fit the [Pronoun, N] mould.

9. Conclusion

The above survey of creole reflexive systems has of necessity been incomplete. It has yielded some preliminary answers, but it has led to further questions as well. Before we can state a more definite set of conclusions, a number of issues need to be looked into. These include:

(a) The relation between reflexive formation and the formation of other systems of grammatical morphemes, e.g. quantifiers. These resemble the compound-like transparent question words of many creoles.

(b) To what extent are the systems found simply the result of the only word formation rules that these languages have available? To answer this question we must study the relation between the morpho-syntactic processes involved in function word formation and those involved in word formation in general. Are we dealing with compound formation, affixation, or phrase formation? Would the difference have syntactic implications? This very important set of questions can only be answered once we know more about the morphology of creoles.

(c) The reflexive systems of the Portuguese and Spanish-based creoles, about which sufficient information is still lacking. If they are not transparent, and do not particularly resemble the related colonial languages, by what principles are they formed?
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Most of all a thorough diachronic analysis of binding phenomena in the various stages of a single well-documented creole such as Sranan, is called for.
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