

# REFLEXES OF IBERO-ROMANCE REFLEXIVE CLITIC + VERB COMBINATIONS IN PAPIAMENTU: THEMATIC GRIDS AND GRAMMATICAL RELATIONS

Pieter Muysken

## 0. Introduction

In this paper I present a preliminary study of the Papiamentu reflexes of Ibero-Romance reflexive 'clitic + verb' combinations. I limit myself to contemporary Papiamentu, treating variation present only superficially and ignoring historical development entirely. The contemporary system is complex enough as it is to merit a detailed analysis. And even within this system I do not attempt to be complete, focusing on the reflexives selected by a verb and neglecting e.g. reflexives internal to noun phrases of the type *he himself*.

The reason I use the unwieldy circumlocution 'reflexes of Ibero-Romance reflexive clitic + verb combinations' rather than simply discussing Papiamentu reflexives is that in both Ibero-Romance and Papiamentu such morphemes are used outside of canonical reflexive contexts (i.e. *primary reflexives* as described in Faltz 1977).

Reflexives in creole languages raise the entire array of issues that have been under discussion in the field in recent years; namely, how lexical reconstitution of a grammatical morpheme class proceeds: through contributing elements from substrate languages, the influence of a linguistic bioprogram, the gradual transformation of superstrate patterns, or through the process of grammaticalization of content words? In addition, they may link creole studies to the mainstream of theoretical linguistics, where the distribution and properties of reflexives have been a central issues for many years.

Speaking in terms of loss and reconstitution, the problem raised by Papiamentu reflexives is the following. In Portuguese and Spanish – the languages that have provided most of the lexicon for Papiamentu – we find constructions such as (1):

- |                                      |            |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| 1a) <i>Eu me vejo no espelho.</i>    | Portuguese |
| 'I see myself in the mirror.'        |            |
| b) <i>Maria se corta en la mano.</i> | Spanish    |
| 'Mary cuts herself in the hand.'     |            |

Ibero-Romance reflexive clitic forms are the following:

2)	1 pers.	<i>me</i>	<i>nos</i>
	2	sg. <i>te</i>	pl. <i>os</i>
	3	<i>se</i>	<i>se</i>

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

For Papiamentu no less than seven different forms replaced the Ibero-Romance clitics:

- 3a) *pañá* < Port. *pano*, SP *pañó* 'cloth'
- b) *kurpa* < Port. *corpo*, SP *cuerpo* 'body'
- c) null reflexive
- d) possessive + *kurpa*
- e) object pronoun
- f) object pronoun + *mes* < Port. *mesmo* 'self, precisely'
- g) possessive pronoun + *mes*

In sections one through five I will discuss these forms. In six I look at some of the variation encountered in their use. In seven I attempt a grammatical analysis, and in eight I raise some theoretical issues from a comparative perspective. Does the use of body reflexives (*kurpa*) reflect African influence, older vernacular forms of the superstrate, or grammaticalization of content elements? What does the use of bare object pronouns as reflexives imply for the bioprogram hypothesis? I will not be able to answer these questions conclusively, and indeed, some will probably never be answered. However, the perspective of the Papiamentu system in its complexity suggests that any historical explanation has to be rooted in an understanding of the relation between the various components of the system.

The proper analysis of Papiamentu reflexives, I would like to argue, confirms the claim in a growing number of studies that classification in terms of [ $\pm$ anaphoric] utilized in Chomsky's (1981) Binding Principles needs to be complemented with a number of specific lexical characterizations of referential elements. Examples of such studies are Hellan's detailed treatment of Norwegian anaphora (1988) and the insightful analysis of Dutch reflexives in Everaert (1986). This claim is in accordance with the lexical learning theory in which variation between languages is linked to specific lexical items. In addition, the paper confirms the idea, most vocally expressed by Williams in a series of recent publications, that there is an intricate relation between the binding properties of certain anaphoric elements and the thematic complex in which they find themselves. What follows now is a *catalogue raisonné* of the different forms encountered.

### 1.0. 'Paña' and 'kurpa' Inherent Complements

A first group of reflexives involves what may be called inherent complement constructions (Nwachukwu 1985). These may be thought of as directly represented in the lexicon in that they are limited to specific lexical items and an idiomatic interpretation is frequent. Moreover, (one of) the internal thematic role(s) is lexically linked to a specific lexical item, which is incorporated into the lexical representation as a single invariant noun:

- 4a) [V *kurpa* ]  
 b) [V *paña* ]

In (4a,b), the elements *kurpa* and *paña* do not have independent reference, but must be thought of as clitics on the verb. Individually, the item *paña* 'clothes' is limited to verbs of dressing, as might be expected:

- 5) *paña* 'clothes'  
*mi ta bisti paña* 'I dress (myself).'  
*mi ta kita paña* 'I undress.'  
*mi ta troka paña* 'I change my clothes.'

In Ibero-Romance these verbs are marked with *se* and related forms.

More productive is *kurpa* as in (6) (a number of other relevant cases are presented in Appendix 1):

- 6) *kurpa*<sup>1</sup>  
*mata kurpa* 'exert oneself; ?kill oneself'  
*mata* 'kill'  
*sofoká kurpa* 'exert oneself'  
*sofoká* 'stifle'  
*kaña kurpa* 'get drunk'  
*kaña* 'make drunk'

However, the forms in (6) should not be confused with the lexically unrestricted 'possessive + *kurpa*' reflexives to which we will return shortly.

### 2.0. Null Reflexives

The group of verbs with null forms in Papiamentu corresponding to verbs with a reflexive clitic in Ibero-Romance do not form a coherent class. In (7) we find a group of verbs whose internal argument could be analyzed as being lexically coindexed with each respective external argument.

- 7) *peña* 'comb oneself'  
*feitá* 'shave (oneself)'  
*baña* 'bathe (oneself)'  
*diskulpá* 'excuse oneself'  
*deskansá* 'rest'

In the case of (8), using the framework of Zubizarreta (1985), the external argument has been absorbed so that the object, the internal argument, appears as the subject of the construction. She calls this *anti-causativization*:

- 8) *plama* 'disperse'  
*separá* 'split (oneself) off'

Note additionally that in both (7) and (8), the verbs can also all be used transitively.

For another group of verbs we may simply say that they have been reanalyzed as intransitives. There is no reason to assume that the verbs in (9) have two syntactic arguments, even though in Ibero-Romance they are marked reflexive:

- 9) *kibuká* 'be wrong'  
*komportá* 'behave'

A final group of null forms corresponds to the impersonal passive use of *se* in Ibero-Romance, which has been extensively discussed in the generative literature:

- 10) *Ta bendé flor.*  
 'Flowers are sold (here).'
- 11) *Tabata toka bon musika.*  
 'They played good music.'
- 12) *Aki ta drecha tayer.*  
 'Tires are fixed here.'

That this possibility is limited to generic contexts such as signs and announcements (Muller 1983) is shown by the ungrammaticality or unacceptability of (13) and (14):

- 13) \**Ta bendé e flor.*  
 'The flowers are sold (here).'
- 14) ?*Tabata toka e musika di Edgar Palm.*  
 'They played the music of Edgar Palm.'

I take the empty subject in (10) to (12) to be a third person null pronoun, an interpretation which is contextually determined and licensed by a null reflexive element on the verb. In my analysis, it should be stressed, the reflexive clitic has not simply disappeared in these cases. Rather, I assume that it has been replaced by a phonetically zero element. This assumption would explain the limited distribution of zero subjects in Papiamentu.

### 3.0. Possessive + 'kurpa'

A form which needs to be distinguished from the bare *kurpa* reflexives in (6) above is the highly productive 'possessive pronoun + *kurpa*' construction. The forms are given in (15):

- |                     |                    |                   |              |
|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| 15) <i>mi kurpa</i> | 'myself'           | <i>nos kurpa</i>  | 'ourselves'  |
| <i>bo kurpa</i>     | 'yourself'         | <i>boso kurpa</i> | 'yourselves' |
| <i>su kurpa</i>     | 'oneself, himself' | <i>nan kurpa</i>  | 'themselves' |

Note that the possessive rather than a simple pronoun is used for the third person singular, where the simple pronoun would have been *e* rather than *su*.

This type of reflexive is used primarily with transitive verbs indicating a physical action. Some examples encountered in texts are given in (16) (other cases are listed in Appendix 2):

- 16) *hinka su kurpa* 'insert oneself'  
*tira su kurpa* 'throw oneself'  
*tapa su kurpa* 'cover oneself'  
*lastra su kurpa* 'drag oneself'  
*pega su kurpa* 'hit oneself'

In section 7 below I will argue that the pattern in (16) indicates that 'possessive + *kurpa*' reflexives are the realization of the notion 'body' in the Lexical Conceptual Structure of the expression and this corporeal element is coindexed with a higher argument.

In continuing with the distribution pattern, 'possessive + *kurpa*' reflexives also occur with a few verbs which can only be used reflexively:

- 17) *skapa su kurpa* 'escape'  
*soda su kurpa* 'sweat oneself'

These need to be considered exceptions in the analysis given here since it is a bit more difficult (though not impossible) to argue that their lexical semantics contains a bodily internal argument. In addition, the reflexive pattern can be used with a few verbs that do not primarily indicate physical actions, but are more figurative:

- 18) *yuda su kurpa* 'help oneself'  
*sisti su kurpa* 'serve/stuff oneself'  
*duna su kurpa* 'give oneself'  
*siña su kurpa* 'teach yourself'  
*gaba su kurpa* 'glorify oneself'

An example is (19):

- 19) *E ta kana bai bini sin duna su kurpa sostego.*  
 'He walks back and forth without giving himself rest.'

However, the unacceptability of examples such as (20) shows that this usage is semantically restricted in the sense assumed above:

- 20) *??M'a siña mi kurpa ingles.*  
 'I taught myself English.'

There are likewise a number of cases where 'possessive + *kurpa*' shows up inside a prepositional phrase:

- 21) *E ta kita nan for di su kurpa.*  
 'He takes them off himself/his body.'  
 22) *nèchi na su kurpa*  
 'neat with oneself'

Carden (1988) notes that 'body' reflexives cannot occur inside of PPs in Mauritian Creole, and construes this as an argument for substrate influence from Malagasy. While 'possessive + *kurpa*' may be rare in PPs, it is certainly not ungrammatical.

#### 4.0. Object Pronouns

Bare object pronouns are used primarily with inherent reflexives. Unlike verbs with *kurpa*, these pronouns do not have a corresponding transitive form with the same meaning, and they generally do not refer to physical actions:

23)	<i>sinti e X</i>	'feel X'
	<i>haña e</i>	'find oneself'
	<i>gana e</i>	'reach, find oneself'
	<i>okupá e</i>	'occupy oneself'
	<i>imagina e</i>	'imagine oneself'
	<i>komportá e</i>	'behave oneself'
	<i>duna e kuenta</i>	'take into account' (lit. 'give oneself account')
	<i>diskulpá e</i>	'excuse oneself'
	<i>kompromete e</i>	'commit oneself'
	<i>establese e</i>	'establish oneself'
	<i>dediká e</i>	'dedicate oneself'

Such forms are particularly frequent in second person singular contexts, probably because there cannot be any confusion about the distinction between pronominal and anaphoric usage:

24)	<i>figurabo kiko a pasa</i>	'imagine what happened'
	<i>pèrmitibo</i>	'allow yourself'
	<i>drentá bo</i>	'do come in'
	<i>sinta bo</i>	'do sit down'
	<i>hasibo X</i>	'make yourself X'

We also find bare pronoun reflexives in prepositional phrase contexts. In (25) is found a complement clause with an intervening subject:

25)	<i>Yegando palasio Shon Arey a larg'e bini serka djé.</i>	
		'Reaching the palace the King let him come near him(self).'

This is not necessary, however, as can be seen from (26) and (27), although admittedly the last example is idiomatic:

26)	<i>El a tira un bista ront di djé.</i>	
		'He threw a glance around him(self).'
27)	<i>El a kai abau for di djé.</i>	
		'He fell down in a faint (lit. outside of himself).'

While the distribution of bare pronoun reflexives in PPs remains to be determined, it should remain clear that they are ungrammatical in object position with ordinary transitive verbs, as I will show below.

For the time being I will assume that the rare cases of 'bare pronoun + *mes*' reflexives are emphatic variants of the forms just described:

28)	<i>E ta komport'e (mes).</i>	
		'He behaves himself.'
29)	<i>E no ta ekspres'e (mes) bon.</i>	
		'He does not express himself well.'
30)	<i>E ta kana bai bini papiando den djé mes.</i>	
		'He walks back and forth talking in himself.'

The verbs in (28) and (29) are inherently reflexive, and resemble the verbs in (23). Case (30) resembles (26) and (27).

### 5.0. Possessive + 'mes'

Contrary to 'object pronoun + *mes*' reflexives, 'possessive pronoun + reflexives' are quite frequent. Indeed, in many sources they are listed as the only Papiamentu reflexive. *Mes* presumably is derived from Portuguese *mesmo*, as in:

- 31) *eu mesmo* 'I myself'  
*isso mesmo* 'that precisely'

In Portuguese this form does not occur in reflexives (although in Spanish it does in emphatic reflexives):

- 32) \**Eu vejo me mesmo no espelho.*  
 'I see myself in the mirror.'

Cases of 'possessive + *mes*' resemble English reflexives rather closely. They have the classical distribution described for English anaphors in the familiar generative literature. Consider first (33) and (34), where in object position only the reflexive form, and not the bare object, is possible.<sup>2,3</sup>

- 33a) *Mi ta weta mi mes.*  
 'I look at myself.'  
 b) \**mi*
- 34a) *Mi ta hunga ku mi mes.*  
 'I play with myself.'  
 b) \**ku mi*

Now take (35), which shows that these anaphors cannot be bound outside of their clause:

- 35a) \**Bo ta kere ku Wancho ta hunga ku bo mes.*  
 'You believe that John plays with yourself.'  
 b) (\**Bo ta kere ku bo mes ta hunga ku Wancho.*  
 'You believe that yourself play with John.'

(35b) is only grammatical in the reading where *bo mes* means 'you yourself'.

Examples such as (36) show that 'possessive pronoun + elements' must be bound by a c-commanding element, which *e ladron* 'the thief' is not:

- 36) *E ladron su smak a bolbe drent 'él\*su mes p'e bai horta.*  
 'The thief's taste came back to him/himself for him to go and steal.'

Turning now to a characterization of the context in which 'possessive + *mes*' occurs, we find that the same class of inherently reflexive verbs that took object pronoun reflexives also takes *su mes*:

- 37) *adaptá su mes* 'adapt oneself'  
*haña su mes* 'find oneself'  
*imagina su mes* 'imagine oneself'  
*expresa su mes* 'express oneself'  
*retirá su mes* 'withdraw'  
*dirigí su mes* 'direct oneself'  
*registrá su mes* 'register'  
*ekiboká su mes* 'make a mistake'

In addition, *su mes* occurs in a few fixed expressions:

- 38) *loleá su mes* 'make an asshole of oneself'  
*hasi su mes malu* 'hurt oneself'  
*hasi bofón di su mes* 'make a fool of oneself'  
*hasi su mes sokete* 'act stupid'

The most general use of *su mes* is with transitive verbs, however, which do not imply a physical action. A few examples are given in (39):

- 39) *weta su mes* 'look at oneself'  
*yuda su mes* 'help oneself'  
*mira su mes* 'see oneself'  
*riska bo mes* 'put oneself to risk'  
*korta su mes* 'cut oneself'  
*kondená su mes* 'condemn oneself'  
*puntra su mes* 'ask oneself'  
*organisá su mes* 'organize oneself'  
*wak su mes* 'look at oneself'

In PPs, *su mes* can occur adverbially, as in (40), or in subcategorized PPs, as (41):

- 40) *bisa den su mes* 'say in oneself'  
*di den su mes* 'say in oneself'  
*pensa den su mes* 'think by oneself'  
*hasi un kos kontra su mes* 'do something against oneself'
- 41) *konfiansa den su mes* 'confidence in oneself'  
*kórda riba su mes* 'remember oneself'

Clearly the 'self' in (40) and (41) is not the physical 'self'.

We will describe and analyse the use of 'possessive + *mes*' in small clauses in section 7.

### 6.0. Variation

The attentive reader will have noticed that there are quite a few cases where one verb may take several reflexive forms. I have not systematically explored the variation resulting from this, neither in trying to establish whether it is stylistic, diachronic, or social, nor to see which verbs exactly can take more than one form. The following is only a first approximation of the options available, including an indication of the semantic characteristics of the verb classes involved:

	<i>O</i>	<i>kurpa</i>	<i>su kurpa</i>	<i>su mes</i>	<i>e</i>
physical					
inherent	some	some			
physical					
transitive		idiom	many		
non-physical					
inherent	some			many	many
non-physical					
transitive				many	

Table 1: Verb types and reflexive forms.

In several cases, the choice of a different reflexive element leads to a meaning change:

- 42) *Mi ta goza (a)mi mes/(b)mi na mi fiesta.*  
 a) 'I amuse myself at my party.'  
 b) 'I am impressed by myself at my party.'
- 43) *mata su kurpa* 'kill oneself'  
*mata kurpa* '(preferably) exert oneself'

However, Table 1 suggests that there is no overlap between physical verbs and non-physical ones in their selection of reflexive forms. But this is not correct. In fact, *kurpa* is the marked term, used when the body is involved, and *mes* the unmarked form. Consider the following examples:

- 44) *El a hoga su mes/su kurpa/\*e na lama.*  
 'He has drowned himself in the sea.'
- 45) *Bo a yuda bo mes/bo kurpa.*  
 'You have helped yourself.'
- 46) *M a mira mi mes/mi kurpa/\*mi na spil.*  
 'I saw myself in the mirror.'
- 47) *Mi ta sinti \*mi/mi mes/mi kurpa dor di e dekho.*  
 'I feel myself through the blanket.'

In (44) to (47) both forms are possible since it is possible to perceive the object as a general entity coreferential with the subject and as the body of the subject, in which case anaphoric binding is a type of whole-part relation.

It is not impossible that the *kurpa* reflexives antedate the *mes* reflexives in the history of Papiamentu. In any case, they may be disappearing from the modern language, but this remains to be documented.<sup>4</sup>

### 7.0. Grammatical analysis

I will now turn to a preliminary grammatical analysis of the array of forms encountered. Before turning to the status of *su kurpa*, the main issue I would like to discuss, I should briefly recapitulate what has been said about the different cases of lexically conditioned reflexives.

Leaving aside the issue of bare pronouns in prepositional phrases in (26)-(27) (for which I have no account available), I would like to claim that all instances of *paña*, *kurpa*, null reflexives, and bare object pronoun reflexives, MUST be specified as part of the lexical entry of the verbs involved, and that *su mes* and *su kurpa* MAY be specified as such. The latter is the case when they are part of an idiomatic expression:

- 48) *laga su kurpa vir* 'let oneself go'  
*lolea su mes* 'make an asshole of oneself'

Neither the verbs *vir* nor *lolea* exist independently in Papiamentu (both are derived from Dutch etyma, incidentally). For these cases, then, the lexical entry looks as in (49):



- 53) *x* moves sharp object *y* through part of substance *z*.

In those cases where substances *z* are interpreted as coreferential with *x* and hence as the body of *x*, *z* may be spelled out as 'possessive + *kurpa*', where the possessive marks the coindexation relationship.

Evidence for this view of *su kurpa* (as opposed to a more general account that says that the use of *su kurpa* is simply triggered by action verbs involving the body) comes from inalienable possession cases. Consider (54) and (55):

- 54) *M'a korta mi mes/\*mi kurpa na mi man.*  
'I cut myself in the hand.'  
55) *Mi ta dal mi mes/\*mi kurpa na mi kabes.*  
'I hit myself on the head.'

Here *mi mes* is possible and *mi kurpa* excluded, even though both *korta* 'cut' and *dal* 'hit' are eminently physical verbs. We can explain this by assuming that in these cases the *z* of (53) is the hand, respectively the head, and hence *kurpa* cannot be the realization of anything. *Mi mes* is possible since this can be an ethical dative or experiencer, being thematically unrestricted.

The analysis of *su kurpa* as a realization of the coindexed part of the Lexical-Conceptual Structure of predicates explains the fact that it is limited to verbs marking a physical action, which is the result I wanted to aim for. Let us now consider the implications of the analysis for small clause complements.

Consider first (56), where the target reflexive is in a non-subject position:

- 56) *Mi a mira un kulebra serka di mi/\*mi mes>(\*mi kurpa.*  
'I saw a snake near me.'  
(I saw a snake near my body (as in a dream)')

Given that binding must be strictly local and the 'snake' intervenes as a possible subject, we predict correctly that *mi mes* is ungrammatical, and the same holds for *mi kurpa* except in the non-coindexed 'dream' reading in parentheses.

But now look at (57) where the target reflexive is in subject position:

- 57) *Mi a mira mi mes>(\*mi kurpa kai.*  
'I saw myself fall.'  
(I saw my body fall (as in a dream)')

Here *mi mes* is possible, and *mi kurpa* only in the same non-coindexed 'dream' reading as (56). Notice that *kai* 'fall' is certainly physical enough, but what is needed apparently is that the argument expressed by *mi kurpa* be a part of the same Lexical-Conceptual Structure as the subject of *mira* 'see', which it is not.<sup>6</sup> The act of 'seeing' is one thing, the act of 'falling' yet another, and each has its own Lexical-Conceptual Structure. These contrasts can all be explained by the assumptions I have made previously.

I will conclude by drawing attention to an aspect of my analysis which has bothersome implications for the Theta-Criterion, particularly for the idea that each element is assigned a thematic role only once. The analysis I presented works for small clause-taking predicates such as *mira* 'see' and *tende* 'hear' (exemplified in

footnote 6). It does not work for '*sinti* + NP' in the 'have a feeling' reading nor for *laga* 'let' and *hasi* 'make'. Consider first (58a) (=50a) and (58b):

- 58a) *Mi ta sinti mi mes/\*mi kurpa un tiki tristo.*  
'I feel a bit sad.'
- b) *Mi ta sinti mi mes/mi kurpa un tiki laf.*  
'I feel a bit weak.'

When we replace a non-physical adjective like *tristo* 'sad' in (58a) by a physical one such as *laf* 'weak' in (58b), *mi kurpa* suddenly becomes acceptable. Presumably, then, the contrast between (58a) and (58b) can be explained by assuming that *laf* but not *tristo* can be predicated of, and hence assign an external role to *mi kurpa* (Williams 1989).

Given (57), however, we have to assume that *mi kurpa* is part of the Lexical-Conceptual Structure of, and hence receives a thematic role from, the matrix predicate *sinti*. Thus we are forced to the position that small clause subjects of certain matrix verbs receive two thematic roles at once: from their predicate and from the matrix verb. The same analysis is needed for (59) and (60):

- 59a) *Edgar a laga su kurpa slip.*  
'Edgar let himself slip.'
- b) *Haime a laga su kurpa kai.*  
'Haime let himself fall.'

The reflexive expression *su kurpa* presumably receives a thematic role both from *laga* 'let' and *slip* 'slip' or *kai* 'fall'. A similar result holds for causative complements with *hasi*:

- 60) *hasi su kurpa ridiculo*  
'make oneself ridiculous'

Thus Papiamentu reflexives turn out to pose interesting problems for the theory of grammar, some of which I have been able to point to here.

To recapitulate some of the points of the grammatical analysis:

- (A) There is a class of null reflexive clitics, for which verbs may be lexically specified.
- (B) Other forms function reflexively as part of a 'clitic + verb' complex as well: *pañá*, *kurpa*, bare pronouns. In addition, 'possessive + *mes*' and 'possessive + *kurpa*' reflexives can be lexically specified.
- (C) Contrary to the other forms, however, 'possessive + *mes*' and 'possessive + *kurpa*' reflexives can occur freely, without being lexically specified. The 'possessive + *mes*' reflexives are thematically free, and the 'possessive + *kurpa*' reflexives occur as instantiations of a coreferential element referring to the body in a Lexical-Conceptual Structure representation.
- (D) Verbs such as *sinti* 'feel', *laga* 'let', and *hasi* 'make' somehow assign a thematic role to the subject of their small clause complement.

### 8.0. A Comparative Perspective

In this final section I will draw some tentative conclusions more directly relevant to the field of creole studies. We must be grateful to Guy Carden and William Stewart for having brought the importance of creole reflexive systems to the attention of the field. Several languages have been under scrutiny up until now.

Reflexives in Haitian Creole have been analyzed by Carden & Stewart (1988) from a historical perspective. These scholars have argued on the basis of Haitian data – particularly bare pronoun reflexives – that creoles do not develop as full-fledged languages in one generation. From an entirely different perspective, Déchaine & Manfredi (1988) present data which diverge from those of Carden & Stewart, and try to interpret the complex binding facts of Haitian from the perspective of the version of the binding theory proposed by Williams in a series of recent publications (e.g. 1989).

Corne (1988) has looked at Mauritian Creole verb classes and the reflexives formed with them. On the basis of this he wants to conclude that the bare pronoun reflexives so crucial to Carden & Stewart's historical argument are a late development. Carden & Stewart (1989) argue against this interpretation, reacting on the basis of a primarily quantitative reexamination of the historical sources. Corne (1989) returns to the issue and Carden (1988) raises the possibility that substrate influence needs to be invoked to account for the *lekor* 'body' reflexives in Mauritian.

These are the only two cases that have received extended treatment so far. 18th century Negerhollands reflexives have been studied by Muysken & van der Voort (1991), who argue – *contra* Carden & Stewart – that early Negerhollands reflexives constituted a complex and well-developed system, independent of the Dutch of the same period. Muysken & Smith (in preparation) raise the issue whether the reflexives in the English creoles are really simply reflexes of the colonial language system, or are autonomous reconstitutions as well. For Sranan and Saramaccan, the reflexives do not match the English system morphophonologically, and in addition 'pronoun + *self*' forms interact with bare reflexive pronouns and 'pronoun + *skin*' forms suggest something different from simple inheritance. Both in early Negerhollands and in early Sranan (A. Bruyn 1989), there appears to be a contrast between bare pronoun reflexives, with inherently reflexive verbs, and lexically unrestricted 'pronoun + *self*' reflexives. This contrast resembles the one described above for Papiamentu, but needs to be studied more systematically.

Although no serious comparison of these systems has been attempted so far, a number of general observations can be made:

- (1) The creole reflexive systems are often widely different, as far as we can tell, from the systems of the colonial lexifier languages.
- (2) In many creoles there is an alternation, possibly linked to verb classes, between bare pronouns, 'pronoun + *self*' reflexives, and *body* reflexives.

- (3) The systems in some cases have undergone profound changes, which may still be reflected in variation in the contemporary languages.

From the preliminary study of Papiamentu presented above, some specific points emerge:

- (4) Papiamentu resembles Ibero-Romance far less than many creolists assume.
- (5) It has developed a system of clitics involving bare nouns and bare object pronouns.
- (6) If it is true that there are null reflexive clitics, this suggests that there was at some point in the emerging – presumably cliticless – pidgin a group of speakers bilingual in both pidgin and Ibero-Romance. This group, and a possible candidate is the Sephardic community, was able to reinterpret a number of cases of Ibero-Romance reflexives, sketched in (7), (8), and (10)-(12) above, in terms of a null reflexive system.
- (7) While there are Old French antecedents for the reflexive use of *lekor* in some French creoles, there is no evidence, e.g. in New World Spanish, for *cuervo* ever being used reflexively. If we take *kurpa* to be a calque from some African reflexive element, however, we must still account for the fact that its use is not general, but limited to a specific set of contexts. Even if it were a substratum feature, it underwent a very specific interpretation in the system.
- (8) The apparent complexity of the system, with so much lexical specification of individual forms, may reflect different temporal layers of superstrate influence in the language. At the same time the profusion of forms attests to the robustness of the pronoun/anaphor distinction made in the Binding Theory.

#### NOTES

\* Papiamentu reflexives have been briefly and partially described by Birmingham (1973) and Joubert (1988), among others, but have not been analyzed in any detail. Most of the data in this paper come from a variety of printed sources listed in the references section. I am grateful to Haime Jones and Frank Martinus Arion for additional information and judgements on sentences discussed in sections 6 and 7. Earlier versions of this paper were presented in workshops in Utrecht and Amsterdam, where I received useful comments as well. I wish to thank the audience at the workshop in Chicago, and particularly Alexander Caskey, Marta Dijkhoff, and my discussant Jan-Terje Faarlund for insightful comments. Finally, I am grateful to Martin Everaert for discussions on the way of representing different types of reflexives. I apologize for the errors of interpretation and representation that undoubtedly remain.

1. This single form *kurpa* also occurs with some adjectives:

- i) *será di kurpa* 'constipated; stubborn'
- ii) *doño di kurpa* 'in shape'

2. In this paper, I will not discuss reciprocals. (i) and (ii) give some indication of their distribution:

- i) *nan ta stima otro*  
'They love each other.'
- ii) *\*nan*

3. In addition to 'self', *mes* can mean something like 'own':

- i) *Trata na konta ku bo mes palabra kiko a pasa.*  
'Try to say in your own words what happened.'

4. Thus traditional narrative contains many more *kurpa* reflexives than modern newspaper prose. Before we jump to conclusions from this, however, we should note that traditional narrative describes many more physical actions than most newspaper prose.

5. It remains to be explored to what extent this phenomenon is related to the fact that 'possessive + *kurpa*' is frequently used in Papiamentu experiencer constructions:

- i) *su kurpa ta due.*  
'it hurts him'; 'he is lazy'  
ii) *mi kurpa a drecha un poko.*  
'I feel better.'  
iii) *mi kurpa a kuelkohe rel.*  
'I shivered.'

6. Similar examples include (i)-(iii):

- i) *mi no ta mira mi/mi mes/\*mi kurpa den e rol di Hamlet.*  
'I do not see myself in the role of Hamlet.'  
ii) *mi ta tende mi bos/mi mes bos/?mi mes/?mi/\*mi kurpa ariba kaset.*  
'I hear my (own) voice/myself on the cassette.'  
iii) *mi ta tende mi mes/mi/\*mi kurpa kanta na radio.*  
'I hear myself singing on the radio.'

#### REFERENCES

- Baart, W.J.H. 1983. *Cuentanan di Nanzi*. Amsterdam: Rodopi  
Birmingham, J.C. 1970. *The Papiamentu language of Curaçao*. Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia.  
Bruyn, Adrienne. 1989. De nominale constituent in 18de-eeuws Sranan: Een beschrijving van grammaticale elementen en morfosyntactische processen. M.A. thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam.  
Carden, Guy. 1988. The Mauritian Creole *lekor* reflexive: Substrate influence on the target-location parameter. Ms., University of British Columbia.  
Carden, Guy & William A. Stewart. 1988. Binding theory, bioprogram, and creolization: Evidence from Haitian Creole. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 3:1-68.  
Carden, Guy & William A. Stewart. 1989. Mauritian Creole reflexives: A reply to Corne. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 4:65-102.  
Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.  
Corne, Chris. 1988. Mauritian Creole reflexives. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 3:69-94.  
Corne, Chris. 1989. On French influence in the development of Creole reflexive patterns. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 4:103-114.  
Cuervo, R.J. 1867-72(1955). *Apuntaciones críticas sobre el lenguaje bogotano*. Bogotá: Publicaciones del Instituto Caro y Cuervo, Bogotá.  
Déchaine, Rose-Marie & Victor Manfredi. 1988. Binding domains in Haitian. University of Massachusetts and Harvard, ms.  
Everaert, M. 1986. *The syntax of reflexivization*. Dordrecht: Foris  
Faltz, L.M. 1977. *Reflexivization. A study in universal syntax*. Ph.D. diss., University of California at Berkeley.  
Goilo, E.R. 1972. *Papiamentu textbook*. 4th ed. Aruba: De Wit Stores N.V.  
Hellan, L. 1988. *Anaphora in Norwegian and the theory of grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.  
Joubert, S.M. 1988. *Vokabulario di uso Papiamentu-Hulandes*. Curaçao: Sede di Papiamentu.  
Kany, C.E. 1963. *American-Spanish syntax*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Lauffer, P. 1970. *Mi Lengá; di prome tomo*. Curaçao.  
 Lauffer, P. 1974. *Mi Lengá; di dos tomo*. Curaçao.  
 Nwachukwu, P.A. 1985. Inherent complement verbs in Igbo. *Journal of Language* 3:61-74.  
 Williams, Edwin. 1989. The anaphoric nature of  $\theta$ -roles. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:425-456.  
 Zubizarreta, M.-L. 1985. The relation between morphophonology and morphosyntax: The case of Romance causatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:247-289.

#### APPENDIX 1: Other verb + 'kurpa' combinations

<i>gloria kurpa</i>	'cross oneself'
<i>gloria kurpa ku awa bendita</i>	'anoint oneself'
<i>gloria</i>	'glorify'
<i>lanta kurpa</i>	'get up'
<i>lanta</i>	'lift up'
<i>horka kurpa</i>	'hang oneself'
<i>horka</i>	'hang'
<i>kita kurpa</i>	'get out'
<i>kita</i>	'take off'
<i>deskansá kurpa</i>	'rest'
<i>deskansá</i>	'rest' (tr.)
<i>kohe/kue kurpa</i>	'learn a lesson from something'
<i>kohe/kue</i>	'take'
<i>defendé kurpa</i>	'defend oneself'
<i>defendé</i>	'defend'
<i>kansa kurpa</i>	'tire oneself out'
<i>kansa</i>	'wear out'
<i>yuda kurpa</i>	'make out; get by'
<i>yuda</i>	'help'
<i>nèk kurpa</i>	'get burnt; suffer through carelessness'
<i>nèk</i>	'obstruct'
<i>salba kurpa</i>	'get saved; escape'
<i>salba</i>	'save'
<i>sera kurpa</i>	'get constipated; be stubborn'
<i>sera</i>	'close'
<i>saka kurpa</i>	'get out'
<i>saka</i>	'take out'

#### APPENDIX 2: Other verb + possessive + 'kurpa' combinations

<i>primi su kurpa</i>	'press oneself'
<i>sosegá su kurpa</i>	'rest'
<i>grawatá su kurpa</i>	'scratch oneself'
<i>skonde su kurpa</i>	'hide'
<i>drecha su kurpa</i>	'freshen oneself up'
<i>kansa su kurpa</i>	'tire oneself'
<i>laba su kurpa</i>	'wash oneself/one's body'
<i>kuida bo kurpa</i>	'take care of yourself'
<i>salba su kurpa</i>	'bring oneself into safety'

<i>bati su kurpa</i>	'beat oneself; get drunk'
<i>hoga su kurpa</i>	'drown oneself '
<i>dal su kurpa na X</i>	'walk into X' (cf. <i>dal</i> 'hit against')
<i>seka su kurpa</i>	'dry oneself (with a towel)'
<i>kansa su kurpa</i>	'tire oneself '
<i>defendé su kurpa</i>	'defend oneself '
<i>mata su kurpa</i>	'kill oneself '
<i>benta su kurpa</i>	'throw oneself '
<i>sirbi bo kurpa</i>	'serve yourself, as you please'

Pieter Muysken  
Institute for General Linguistics  
University of Amsterdam  
Spuistraat 210  
1012 VT Amsterdam  
The Netherlands