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1 Introduction

1.1 The puzzle

- The reconstruction of reflexivity in PIE has been hampered by the variety of formal devices used in reflexive contexts in the different IE languages
  - ...and partially by the implicit or explicit assumption that PIE must have had one single original “reflexive construction”
- At the same time, much progress has been made in the study of the function and reconstruction of middle morphology (e.g., Rix 1988, Jasanoff 2003, Villanueva Svensson 2003, Meiser 2009, Luraghi 2012, Cotticelli Kurras and Rizza 2013, Grestenberger 2014, 2016) and of the reflexive/anaphoric stem *s(u)e- (e.g., Petit 1999, 2001, Puddu 2005, 2007, Viti 2009)
- But few (systematic) attempts at connecting these two (e.g., Cotticelli Kurras and Rizza 2013), and vastly different opinions on their original functions/distribution, e.g.:

  “Il apparaît en effet que le réfléchi indo-européen de thème *s(e)u-e- était un réfléchi général, indifférent à la personne et au nombre.”
  (Petit 1999: 407)

  “[W]e can conclude that *se-, originally simply marked the coreference with a previously expressed element. It is probable that there was no dedicated reflexive marker in Indo-European.”
  (Puddu 2007: 264)

  “Late PIE: the middle voice covers the entire spectrum of reflexivity, but some reflexive functions receive extra marking.”
  (Cotticelli Kurras and Rizza 2013: 11)

The older Indo-European languages with an active/non-active (“middle”) voice distinction employ several reflexivization strategies, which can be divided into three broader and cross-linguistically well-attested categories:

1. Reflexivization through middle/non-active voice morphology only for body action verbs and “inherent reflexives”
2. Middle morphology on the verb + a “weak” reflexive pronoun or particle
3. Active morphology + a (weak or strong) reflexive pronoun

Goals of today’s talk:
• To argue that 1) must be reconstructed for PIE, but only for inherently reflexive, body action and body part NP construction verbs. It was not a “general” strategy to form reflexive predicates
• 2) or 3) must be reconstructed for forming reflexive predicate to transitive and ditransitive verbs
  – Crucially, pragmatic “weakening” or “strengthening” of one or the other strategy alone cannot explain why these different reflexivization strategies co-occur synchronically and differ according to the argument structure of the different predicate types
  – Since the goal is to study the interaction between verbal morphology and reflexive pronouns, the focus is on languages which preserve the PIE active/non-active (“middle”) distinction (specifically, Hittite, Tocharian, Vedic, Greek, Latin)
  – The focus is on reflexive predicates (cf. Reinhart and Reuland 1993), specifically direct reflexives

2 Preliminaries
2.1 Uses of middle morphology
Canonical contexts of non-active/“middle” morphology in Indo-European (& languages with a similar voice system, including languages with a Romance se-type reflexive marker), Klaiman 1991, Kemmer 1993, Embick 1998, Kaufmann 2007, Alexiadou and Doron 2012, Luraghi 2012, Alexiadou et al. 2015, etc.):

(1) a. Anticausatives
b. Reflexives/reciprocals
c. Self-benefactives/“indirect reflexives”
d. Dispositional/generic constructions
e. Passives (Mediopassives)

= voice syncretism: in “Greek-type languages”, “a Voice head is spelled out with non-active morphology [...] if it lacks a specifier.” (Alexiadou et al. 2015 based on Embick 1998, 2004).

→ non-active morphology marks lack of an external argument (= agent), but is not valency-reducing itself

(2) Spell-Out condition on non-active morphology (Alexiadou et al. 2015: 101–2)
Voice → Voice[NonAct]/ _ No DP specifier

“For the morphological realization of Voice, the non-projection of the external argument as a specifier is a necessary and sufficient condition to yield a non-active form, independently of whether Voice has semantic impact or not.” (Alexiadou et al. 2015: 101–2) → “expletive Voice”

• active morphology = “elsewhere”
• ... and therefore conveniently also emerges when Voice is missing, e.g., in obligatorily active unaccusatives & statives → activa tantum

2.2 Typology of pronouns & pronominal clitics
2.2.1 Weak vs. strong pronouns
Cardinaletti and Starke 1999 distinguish three types of pronouns that differ w.r.t. to morphosyntactic, prosodic and semantic properties:
Cardinaletti and Starke\textsuperscript{1999}’s typology of structural deficiency

a. strong pronouns: strong, phrases (Slovak jemu, It. lui ...)
b. weak pronouns: deficient, phrases (Slovak ono, Olang-Tirolean es ...)
c. clitic pronouns: deficient, heads (Slovak mu, It. lo ...)

Weak pronouns must occur in a case position at S(urface)-structure

For reflexive pronouns, an additional criterion is whether or not they include Person and Number features, that is, whether they agree with an antecedent for all or some of the antecedent’s morphosyntactic features.

2.2.2 Competition for insertion

Kiparsky\textsuperscript{2002, 2012}, Safir\textsuperscript{2004} choice of reflexive form depends on the availability of pronominal forms in particular domains, i.e., is 1) form-dependent (which forms are available in any given language) and 2) domain-dependent.

Form to Interpretation Principle (FTIP, Safir\textsuperscript{2004}):
If x c-commands y, and z is not the most dependent form available in position y with respect to x, then y cannot be directly dependent on x.

Hierarchy of dependent forms (adapted from Safir\textsuperscript{2004}):
se-self ➔ pronoun-self ➔ se ➔ pronoun ➔ R-expression

Cf. Petit\textsuperscript{2001}, Puddu\textsuperscript{2005, 2007}, Cotticelli, Kurras and Rizza\textsuperscript{2013} on the feature typology of reflexive markers in the older IE languages.

2.2.3 Pronominal structure

Déchaine and Wiltschko\textsuperscript{2002, 2017}, Reuland\textsuperscript{2011} decompositional approach to pronominal structure.

- Functional structure correlates with distributional properties (argument, predicate, etc.) and morphosyntactic features (Person/Number)

(7) a. DP b. DP c. φP d. φP e. NP
PRON\textsubscript{D} φP PRON\textsubscript{D} φP SEφ NP SEφ NP SELF\textsubscript{N}
NP

a. Engl., Gm., It. ... Gk., Skt., Hitt. etc. personal pronouns (I, you, he/she/it ...)
b. Engl. my-self, your-self, etc., Greek ἐσθοφ, ἠυτόν, etc.
D. Fr. se, It. si ... Lat. sē, Hitt. -z(a), Ved. tanū- (?), Toch. A āncâm (?)
e. Engl. one ... Ved. tanū- (?), Toch. A āncâm (?)

(7-a-b) ≈ strong pronouns, (7-c-d) ≈ weak pronouns

3 Inherent reflexives & body action verbs in IE languages

3.1 Simple inherent reflexives

Reflexivization through middle/non-active voice morphology only is possible for a restricted class of verbs (body action verbs, "inherent reflexives") in the older IE languages, cp. Engl. shower, shave (without -self); the same holds for inherently reciprocal verbs (e.g., fight, compete...).
Can be media tantum

   (i) *waššiyari ‘clothes him-/herself’ (also with -za)
   (ii) *parkuyatati ‘cleaned himself’ (KUB 24 8 i31, Neu 1968: 138)
   (iii) *warput- ‘wash’? (2sg.ipv.mid. *warput- ‘wash yourself!’ for *warphut, Neu 1968: 190f.)
   (iv) šuppiyahāhāti ‘cleaned himself’ (KBo III 16 III 11; also with -za)

b. Vedic
   (i) śúmbhate ‘adorns oneself’ (śumbhāti ‘adorns, makes beautiful’)
   (ii) pávate ‘purifies him/-herself’ (punāti ‘purifies’)
   (iii) neniktē “washes him-/herself” (e.g. RV 9.71.3d)

c. Greek (cf. Allan 2003: 88ff.)
   (i) λο΄ υομαι ‘wash myself, bathe’ (λο΄ υω ‘wash sth.’)
   (ii) κοσμο῀ υμαι ‘adorn myself’ (κοσμ΄ εω ‘arrange, adorn’)
   (iii) αἰσχ΄ υνομαι ‘am ashamed’ (cp. Gm. sich schämen)

d. Latin:
   (i) lavor ‘wash myself’ (lavō ‘wash (sth.)’)
   (ii) alor ‘nourish myself’ (alō ‘nourish’)
   (iii) induor ‘dress (myself), put on (+acc)’ (induō ‘put on (+acc)’)

   (i) lik(ā) ‘wash (off )’: lyikštār/likštār ‘washes him-/herself’ (pres. VIII)
   (ii) sānāpā ‘anoint’: sonoptār ‘anoints him-/herself’ (pres. I)
   (iii) wās- ‘dress, put on clothes’: yāskemā ‘they put on clothes’ (pres. IXa); wastār ‘dresses (onself’; subj. I)

(9) PK AS 6B a6(CET oM, cf. Malzahn 2010: 102):  

sonopitār likštār wāstsimma krenta yāssitār  
anoint.3SG.IPF.MID wash.3SG.IPF.MID clothes.OBL beautiful.OBL clothe.3SG.IPF.MID

“He anoints himself, washes himself, [and] puts on beautiful clothes.”

Modern IE languages that continue the active/non-active voice system of the older IE languages also allow body action verbs and other “inherent reflexives” to be marked with non-act. morphology alone:

(10) a. Modern Greek
   (i) plenome ‘wash myself’
   (ii) xtenizome ‘comb myself’

b. Modern Albanian
   (i) lahem ‘wash myself, bathe’
   (ii) thahem ‘I dry myself’

3.2 Reflexivization through middle alone?

Despite what we have seen in section 3.1., non-active morphology by itself cannot reflexivize any given predicate in languages like Modern Greek and Albanian

– Except for “naturally reflexive” verbs (body action verbs, etc.), which do not fall under Reinhart and Reuland (1993)’s Condition B: “a reflexive predicate is reflexive-marked”
– Evidence that non-active/“middle” morphology by itself is not valency-reducing

(11) Modern Greek reflexives: non-active morphology + reflexive prefix afto- ‘self’. If afto- is missing, the interpretation can only be passive (ex. from Embick 1998).
a. afto-katastrafo-me
   SELF-destroy-1SG.NACT
   “I destroy myself”

b. O Yanis katastraf-ik-e
   the Yanis destroy-PAST.NACT-3SG
   ‘Yanis was destroyed/*destroyed himself’

This suggests that it is the *afto*-morpheme that introduces reflexivity in these predicates, and not the non-active morphology — confirmed by older IE languages, where “middle” morphology alone does not reflexivize prototypically transitive predicates such as:

(12) a. Hitt. karštari, Toch. B kārsnāṭār ‘is/gets cut’, not *‘cuts him-/herself’ (< *kers)
   b. Gk. ὑξίνετα ‘is/gets killed’, not *‘kills him-/herself’ (< *gabhēn)
   c. Hitt. damaštari, Gk. ὅξινετα ‘is/gets tamed’, not *‘tames him-/herself’ (< *demhē)

- So why do we find non-active/“middle” morphology in *afto*-reflexives? — because it marks the absence of an external argument (≈ an agent)
- This implies an “unaccusative analysis” of reflexives in Greek-type languages, as proposed by e.g.,
- Inherent reflexives = unaccusatives

(13) Embick (1998)’s analysis of inherent reflexives: unaccusative verbs whose internal argument moves to subject position
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3.3 Body part reflexives

Body part reflexives (body action verb reflexives with an inalienably possessed direct object) are analyzed here as a subclass of inherent/body action reflexives, along the lines of Rooryck and Vand den Wyngaerd (2011: 189) as an ‘inalienable spatiotemporal stage of its possessor-antecedent”, cf. Grestenberger (2015). Examples:

(14) Vedic (translations from Jamison and Brereton 2014)
a. RV 9.15.4a–b:
   ēśā śṅgāṇi dōḍhuvac chiṣ-i-te yūḥ-yo vṛṣā
   This.NOM horns.ACC shaking sharpen-3SG.PRES.MID of.the.herd bull.NOM
   “This one, the bull of the herd, sharpens his horns, ever shaking them, ...”

b. 6.71.1a–b:
   uṭ u ṣyā devāḥ savitā hirAnyāyā bāhū ayaṁ-ṣa
tup PART this.NOM god.NOM Savitar.NOM golden.ACC.DU arms.ACC.DU raise-3SG.AOR.MID
   “Up has this god Savitar raised his two golden arms”

c. 10.8.6c–d:
   divī mūrdhānaṁ dadhi-ṣe suarasāṁ jihvām agne
   sky.LOC head.ACC place-2SG.PERF.MID sun.winning.ACC tongue.ACC Agni.VOC
cak-ṣe havyāvaham
   make-2SG.PERF.mid oblation.conveying.ACC
“In heaven you have **set your head**, which wins the sun, and you have **made your tongue** to be the conveyor of oblations, **o Agni.**”

(15) Greek: *Od.* 2, 261–2:

Τηλέμαχος ... ξέραξ νιψάμενος πολλής ὀλὸς εὐχετ’

Telemachus hands.ACC wash.AOR.PTCP.MID grey.GEN seawater.GEN pray.3SG.IPF.MID

Αθήνη

Athena.DAT

“Telemachus ..., **having washed his hands** with the grey seawater, prayed to Athena.”

(16) Tocharian B: THT 107 b4 (CToM):

नाश्चलया लयास व्रेनता पो लाइकाते

swim.3SG.PRET.ACT limbs.OBL rags.OBL all wash.3PL.PRET.MID

“He bathed and **washed all of his limbs** [and] rags.”

Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd (2011): Body part reflexives are unaccusatives with an R(elational)P containing both the possessum (= the body part NP)

(17) a. savitā ... bāhū ayansta ...

“Savitā raised his arms”

b. XP

\[
\text{VP} \rightarrow \text{RP} \rightarrow \text{V} \rightarrow \text{POSSESSUM} \rightarrow \text{R} \rightarrow (\text{PP}) \rightarrow \text{POSSESSOR} \rightarrow \text{savitā}
\]

- Body-part reflexives are analyzed as lacking an external argument/agent (the subject = possessor), therefore non-active morphology is predicted in these constructions by (2) (“non-active morphology marks lack of an external argument”)

4 Direct reflexives (Coargument reflexives)

4.1 Middle + weak reflexive

Middle morphology on the verb + a “weak” reflexive clitic/pronoun (underspecified for Person, ?Number)

- **Vedic**: Middle-marked verbs + *tanú*- f. ‘body’ > SELF (Kulikov 2007, Grestenberger 2015)
- Agrees with antecedent for Number; ACC case
- But indifferent to Person
- (post-Rigvedic Sanskrit uses *ātmān*- ‘soul’ > Hindi reflexive *apne* ‘self’ instead of *tanú*-)
Vedic

a. RV 1.147.2:

vandárus te tanvāṁ vande agne
praiser.NOM your SELF.ACC praise.1SG.PRES.MID Agni.VOC

“As your praiser, I praise myself, o Agni.”

b. RV 1.147.4d:

ānu mṛksṭa tanvāṁ duruktaḥ
PRVB injure.3SG.AOR.MID SELF.ACC slanders.INSTR

“May he injure himself with (his) slander.”

c. RV 7.104.17b:

āpa druḥā tanvāṁ gūhanānā
behind deception.INSTR SELF.ACC hide.PRES.PTCP.MID.NOM.F

“Hiding herself behind deception.”

d. RV 3.1.1:

agne tanvāṁ juṣasva
Agni.VOC SELF.ACC enjoy.2SG.IPV.MID

“O Agni, enjoy yourself!”

e. RV 10.8.3:

āruṣir ... rtāsya yónau tanvō juṣanta
reddish.NOM.PL order.GEN womb.LOC SELF.ACC.PL enjoy.3PL.PRES.MID

“The reddish [flames] (...) enjoy themselves in the womb of order.”

Some evidence that number agreement with the antecedent was given up later in Vedic and tanvāṁ was generalized (Kulikov 2007: 1419), e.g.:

(19) RV 10.169.3a:

yā devēṣu tanvāṁ aīrayanta
who NOM.PL. gods.LOC SELF.ACC move.3PL.IPF.MID

“... who gave themselves to the gods.”

Tocharian: middle morphology + :

- Toch. B: complex reflexive ūaņ-aśm ‘SE-SELF’; ūaň < *s(e)ne-ne, aśm < *h₂en(h₁)tmen-, cf. Ved. ātmā-. Translates BHS ātmana.
- Both insensitive to Person/Number of antecedent

Tocharian B

a. PK NS 54 b5 (CEToM):

läklentäšem klautkentsa ūaņ-aśm no sü
with.suffering.OBL manner.OBL.PERL SE-SELF.OBL but this.NOM

mrauskastrā
be.disgusted.CAUS.PRES.3SG.PRET.MID
“Because of the instances of sufferings this one makes himself to feel an aversion [to the world].”

b. Toch B: THT 64 a5 (CEToM):

\[ \text{mā su nt= ālyekāśco ʂaŋ-aŋm ẓāltār} \]

not this.NOM EMPH others.ALL SE-SELF.OBL praise.3SG.PRES.MID

“No-one praises himself before the others, then.”

c. Toch. B: PK NS 25+26 a3:

\[ \text{ʂaŋ-aŋm cāmpim yātāssi po cmelane} \]

SE-SELF.OBL be.able.to.1SG.OPT.ACT tame.INF all births.LOC

“May I be able to tame myself in all births”

(21) Toch. A

a. A9 a1 (CEToM):

\[ \text{kipyo sruksāt āncām sām pekant} \]

shame.INSTR kill.3SG.PRET.MID SELF.OBL this.NOM painter.NOM

“Out of shame the painter killed himself.”

b. A 394 b1 (CEToM):

\[ \text{ṣā= āncām risāt nātswa-[]} \]

SE SELF.OBL leave.3SG.PRET.MID starve.INF

“He left himself to starve; he gave himself up to starvation”

4.2 Active + weak refl

Active morphology + weak or clitic reflexive pronoun.

- **Hittite** “Wackernagel” clitic -z(a) (/-t/ < PA *-ti) famously polyfunctional and occurs with active and middle morphology from the earliest texts on (Boley 1993, Josephson 2003, Cotticelli Kuras and Rizzi 2011)
- -z(a) is underspecified for Person, Number, Case (no DAT/ACC distinction), does not affect verbal morphology and needs a subject antecedent (Cotticelli Kuras and Rizzi 2011)
- Occurs in direct reflexive ((22-a-c)) and indirect reflexive contexts ((22-d))

(22) a. KUB 33.120 i 38:

\[ \text{n=aš=za munnaittat} \]

PART=he.NOM=ZA hide.3SG.PRET.MID

“And he hid himself.”

b. KUB 16.34 i 8-9:

\[ \text{warpanzi=ma=wa=z} \]

UL wash.3PL.ACT-but-QUOT-ZA not

“But they do not wash themselves”

c. KUB 29.1 i 3-34 (OH/NS):

\[ \text{kinuna=ṣmaš=za LUGAL-uš labarnaš ulanun} \]

now=you.DAT.PL=ZA king-NOM labarna.NOM unite.1SG.PRET.ACT

“Now I, the labarna, have united (ulanun) myself (-za) to you (-ṣmaš)” (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 358)
d. KUB 30.10 obv. 16-17 (OH/MS):

NINDA-an=za wemiyanun ... wātar=ma=z wemiyam

bread-ACC=ZA find.1SG.PRET.ACT water-PART=ZA find.1SG.PRET.ACT

“I found for myself bread ... I found for myself water” (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 359)

- **Vedic**: middle morphology in reflexive constructions drops out of use in later stages of Vedic and classical Sanskrit (Hock (2006))/becomes “optional”; examples are already found in the RV, e.g.:

(23) a. RV 8.96.15b:

ádha drapsó ... -ádhārayat tanvām ...

Then Drapsa.NOM sustain.3SG.IPF.ACT SELF.CCC

“Then Drapsa (...) asserted himself ...”

b. 3.51.11b:

suté ní yacha tanvām

Soma.LOC PRVB direct.2SG.PRES.IPV.ACT SELF.ACC

“Direct yourself (= stay close) to the Soma!”

4.3 Active + strong refl

Active morphology + case-marked pronoun that agrees for Person (and Number?)

- **Hittite**: besides -z(a) (section 4.2.), Hittite also uses the dative personal pronouns in the plural in indirect and direct reflexive contexts (Boley 1993, Hoffner and Melchert 2008, cf. Old English):

(24) a. Hatt. iii 4 (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 358):

nu=nnas DUMU.NITA.MES DUMU.MUNUS.MES iyawen

PART=us.DAT sons daughters make-1PL.PRET.ACT

“and we begat for ourselves sons (and) daughters”

b. KUB 16.16 i 28:

warpanzi=ma=wa=šmas ŪL

wash.3PL.PRES.ACT=but=QUOT=them.DAT not

“But they do not wash themselves”

- **Greek**: Homer shows use of personal pronouns in reflexive contexts for 1st & 2nd person, (25-a-b), (Schwyzer 1939-71, Petzl 2001, Vití 2009, etc.) and 3rd person in non-direct reflexive (non-coargument) contexts, (25-c), (Vití 2009, Kiparsky 2012)

- Mostly with active morphology (but cf. (25-a))

(25) Greek

a. Il. 10.378:

αὖθις ἐγὼν ἐμὴ λύσομαι

then I.NOM me.ACC release.1SG.PRES.MID

“then I released myself”

b. Od. 8.221:

ἐμὴ φημι πολὺ προφερέστερον εἶναι

me.ACC declare.1SG.PRES.ACT much more.excellent be.PRES.INF
“I declare myself to be the best”

c. *Il. 15.574:*

 ámbλαν ματήνας

around him ACC glancing AOR PTCP ACT

“glancing around himself”

- 3rd person coargument reflexives obligatorily take αὐτόν ‘self’: ἔε/έ αὐτόν, ἔε/έ αὐτῆν, etc., (26-a-b)
- ... or just αὐτόν, αὐτήν without the 3rd person pronoun, (26-c).
- This construction takes active morphology and is generalized in post-Homeric Greek

(26)

a. *Il. 20.171:*

 ἐ’ ἐποτρυνεὶ μαχέσασθαι

3SG PRON ACC PART SELF ACC M urge 3SG PRES ACT fight PRES INF MID

“He stirs himself up to fight”

b. *Il. 14.162:*

 εὗτων ἀυτήν

well adorn AOR PTCP ACT ACC F 3SG PRON ACC SELF ACC F

“Having well adorned herself”

c. *Od. 4.247:*

 ἄλλῳ δ’ αὐτόν φωτι κατακρυπτών ἐπινέει

other DAT PART SELF ACC M man DAT hide under PRES PTCP ACT NOM M make like

“and he made himself look like another man” (“he made himself hidden under another man”)  

- **Latin:** active morphology + accusative personal pronouns for the 1st & 2nd person; active + reflexive se for 3rd person (sg. & pl.), e.g., [Viti 2009]
  - ≈ Ancient Greek/Homer; se can be used in logophoric and other long-distance contexts as well

(27) **Latin**

a. *Plaut. Tri. 1.2.92:*

 dedisti-ne hoc facto ei gladium, qui se give 2SG PERF ACT PART this ABL deed ABL him DAT sword ACC whereby REFFL

 occideret?

 kill 3SG IPF SUBJ ACT

“Haven’t you given him through these deeds a sword with which he shall kill himself?”

b. *Cic. Tul. 29.5* [Viti 2009]:

 Si [...] ego me ad iudicem sic defendam

 if INOM 1SG PRON ACC to judge ACC thus defend 1SG FUT ACT

“If I shall defend myself like this before the judge.”

5 **Discussion & conclusion**

- Reconstruction of middle-marked inherently reflexive, body action, and body part NP verbs (section 3) for PIE seems straightforward
- For reflexives from canonically transitive verbs, two main strategies are attested:
a. middle morphology + weak reflexive: Vedic, Tocharian
b. active morphology + strong reflexive: Hittite (?), Greek, Latin
c. (active morphology + weak reflexive: clearly secondary in Vedic, but may be old in Hittite)

- In each case, (a) arose from verb$_{\text{mid}}$ + body part NP as the result of a cross-linguistically well-documented grammaticalization type. These constructions have morphologically “middle” verbs for independent reasons (section 3.3).
- → suggests that (b) may have been the older strategy for reflexivizing canonically transitive agentive verbs, and that these reflexives had an external argument & the pronoun/SE-element was a case-marked internal argument
  - Because of the extremely common development of an intensifier/emphatic particle > reflexive, the question of the form of the reflexive pronoun has not been addressed here. But if (b) is reconstructed, this would suggest active morphology + (some form of) *s(e)ye- at least for the 3rd person
  - Or all persons (Petit 1999, 2001)? But cf. van Gelderen (2000) on reflexives in the history of English: 3rd person was the first to use SELF regularly

- Either way, there is no reason to assume that pragmatic “strengthening” of middle morphology in reflexives took place: if (b) is reconstructed, because there was no middle morphology; if (a) is reconstructed, because middle morphology is independently justified by the body part NP construction.
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