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Today I will talk about reflexive constructions in the Romance languages. What I propose to show is that there is a cross-linguistic tendency for languages to alternate cyclically between two formal reflexive marking patterns, and that the Romance languages may be in the midst of undergoing one phase of that cycle.

I. What are reflexives? According to Faltz (1985:3-4), a reflexive construction as a "simple clause that expresses a two-argument predication, the arguments being a human Agent or Experiencer on the one hand and a Patient on the other," where the Agent/Experiencer and the Patient are the same referent. Nearly every language has a grammatical device, which I'll call a Reflexive Marker (RM), that serves to equate the reference of Agent/Experiencer and Patient arguments. Romance RMs are clitic object pronouns. Some are borrowed from the ranks of normal oblique personal pronominal clitics (e.g., Sp., Ptg., Cat., Fr. me, Rum. mă, It. mi), although a unique RM—invariant for person and number (based on the Latin reflexive pronoun SE)—is found in the third person. The following sentences display how Romance RMs work in reflexive clauses.

(1)

a. Maria se golpeó en la frente. (Spanish)
   Mary RM hit on the forehead
   'Mary hit herself on the forehead.'

b. Je me vois dans la glace. (French)
   I RM see in the mirror
   'I see myself in the mirror.'

c. Maria si guarda al-lo specchio. (Italian)
   Mary RM looks in-the mirror
   'Mary looks at herself in the mirror.'

II. Polyfunctional Reflexive Markers: A Cross-Linguistic Typology. In many languages, RMs are called upon to perform a wide variety of non-reflexive functions. Even English—whose reflexive system is the least versatile of the 125-plus languages sampled by Geniušienė (1987)—allows RMs to do more than signal Agent-Patient equivalence. For instance, in (2) Behave yourself, little boy! the addressee is not being asked to perform an action on himself. Neither does the RM contrast with a direct object: (3) *Behave your little brother!
The impossibility of a literal reflexive reading is even more conspicuous when the subject is inanimate:

(4) The problem manifested itself when the pressure increased.

The very existence of an RM like itself, which refers to an inanimate entity, and is hence non-Agentive by definition, reveals that not all reflexive constructions describe actions that can be literally initiated by the subject. Of course the subject may be a personified object as in

(5) The alarm clock rang itself right off the nightstand.

The kinds of constructions that RMs enter into recur in many unrelated languages. These constructions can be divided into two groups, productive constructions (those in which the addition of an RM to the verbal nexus modifies the meaning in predictable ways), and unproductive constructions (idiomatic constructions in which the effect of the RM is unpredictable). The productive constructions include reciprocals, reflexive benefactives/datives, decausatives, passives and impersonals, as exemplified below. (The following data are from Geniusiene 1987:317, 321, 337, 267.)

(6) Reciprocal

Pima naa-pa?an"a-ya
they RM -helped -PL
'They helped each other.'

(7) Benefactive/Dative

No -no?ma ni-k -no -maka.
my -RM I -it-myself-give
'I give it to myself.'

(8) Decausative

Ovi ava -utu -Ø.
Door-NOM open -RM -PRES
'The door opens.'

(9) Passive

Leder -en skrive -s av redaktør-en.
editorial-ART writes-RM of editor -ART
'The editorial is (being) written by the editor.'

(10) Impersonal

Çamur-un icinden yürü -n -mez.
mud -GEN inside walk -RM -NEG
'One does not walk in mud.'

Of the non- or semi-productive reflexive constructions, the least productive is a class of verbs traditionally called reflexiva tantum ('exclusively reflexive'): these verbs must be accompanied by an RM even though their meanings have nothing to do with self-directed physical activity. Geniusiene (1987:299) reports the following from Serbo-Croatian: bojat se 'be afraid', smejati se 'laugh', diviti se 'be surprised' (cf. *bojat, *smejati, *divit). Other verbs--
including intransitives—do undergo a shift in meaning with the addition of a RM, but the direction of the derived meaning is idiosyncratic. For instance, adding the suffixal RM -en to Chuvash üs 'grow' (intransitive) produces üs-en 'turn out well' (Geniušienė 1987:339).

III. Polyfunctional RMs in Romance. Most of the known extra-reflexive uses of RMs attested in the world's languages are found in Romance. Some of these uses—especially reciprocal reflexives and dative/benefactive reflexives—are commonly attested extensions of Indo-European RMs (e.g. Spanish David y Ana se vieron en el vestíbulo 'David and Ana saw each other in the foyer;' Rumanian Ion își pune o întrebare 'Ion asks himself a question.'). Romance RMs are also enlisted as markers of passive, decausative, and impersonal constructions, as shown in (11), (12) and (13).

(11) Passive
a. (Spanish)
   El mitín se ve muy bien desde el balcón.
   'The demonstration can be seen very well from the balcony.'

b. (French)
   Les cuisses de grenouilles se mangent avec les doigts.
   'Frog legs should be eaten with the fingers.'

c. (Italian)
   Questi ragionamenti non possono capirsi.
   'These arguments cannot be understood.'

(12) Decausative
a. (Spanish)
   La provincia se extiende hasta el mar.
   'The province extends to the sea.'

b. (French)
   Le rideau se lève.
   'The curtain rises.'

c. (Italian)
   Il vetro si è rotto.
   'The glass broke.'

(13) Impersonal
a. Se come bien allí. (Spanish)

b. Si mangia bene là. (Italian)

c. Se minca bine acolo. (Rumanian)
   'One eats well there.'

Romance reflexive verbs of body motion, grooming or personal care, and emotional or mental state/experience are often reflexiva tantum. The following are a few representative examples from Spanish, Italian and French.
Spanish | Italian | French
---|---|---
estasiarse | estasiarsi | s'extasier 'become ecstatic'
arrepentirse | pentirsi | se repentir 'repent'
afiebrarse | affebbrecitarsi | s'enfiévrer 'take fever'
quejarse | lagnarsi | --- 'complain'
mofarse | --- | se mugar 'ridicule'
obstenerse | astenersi | s'abstenir 'abstain'
arrodillarse | inginocchiarsi | s'agenouiller 'kneel down'
fugarse | --- | s'enfuir 'flee'
ausentarse | assentarsi | s'absenter 'to become absent'

Under certain conditions, some Romance verbs of emotion, mental state and motion through space involve a contrast between a base and a reflexive form. For example, in most Romance languages 'be/become happy' is expressed by attaching an RM to a transitive root meaning 'gladden' (e.g., Sp. alegrarse, Cat. alegrar-se, It. rallegrarsi, Fr. se réjouir, Rum. a se bucura). Many reflexive verbs that indicate a change in body posture are formed in like manner: from a transitive stem meaning 'to seat' we get reflexive Sp. sentarse, Ptg. sentar-se, Cat. asseure'se, It. sedersi, Fr. s'asseoir 'sit down'. Reflexive verbs from these lexical classes may also be derived from an intransitive base. For instance, every Romance language has a reflexively-marked intransitive verb for expressing 'to go away': Sp. ir-se, Ptg. ir-se, Cat. anar-se'n, It. andarsene, Fr. s'en aller, Rum. a se duce. It is safe to say that, perhaps with the exception of the Baltic languages, no other language group squeezes so many uses out of its reflexive morphology.

IV. Two-Form Reflexive Languages. Most of the world's languages have a single RM or reflexive paradigm (e.g. English). Some languages, however, employ two formally distinct RMs. Faltz (1985) and Haiman (1983) noticed that in such languages one of the RMs has more phonological substance and/or is morphosyntactically more independent vis-à-vis the verb than the other. Haiman calls these RMs "light" and "heavy," and the languages that host them "two-form languages."

Light and heavy RMs are typically found in complementary distribution. Heavy RMs are limited to reflexive constructions, while light RMs appear in the range of non-reflexive functions performed by RMs illustrated above. Let's call the latter group of sentences "extended reflexive constructions." A surprising typological fact is that light marking also occurs with verbs describing actions of grooming and personal care such as washing, shaving and dressing, actions that one might think constitute the most typical kind of reflexive actions. Light RMs also encode actions that
involve change in body posture (bending, stretching, sitting, turning, etc.).

Clear illustrations of light vs. heavy RM distribution can be found in Russian, an Indo-European language, and Hungarian, a Finno-Ugric language. (The following data are from Faltz 1985, Haiman 1985, Geniušienė 1987, and Kemmer 1988.) Russian has a heavy pronominal RM, sebja, and an etymologically related light affixal RM, -sja.

(15) RM distribution in Russian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brit'-sja</td>
<td>'shave'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>razodet'-sja</td>
<td>'undress'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odet'-sja</td>
<td>'get dressed'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadit-sja</td>
<td>'sit down'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hagibats-sja</td>
<td>'bend, kneel down'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myt'-sja</td>
<td>'wash'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house-NOM builds-light-RM</td>
<td>'He sees himself'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Dver otkryla -s' (Decausative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dorr-NOM open-PERF-light-RM</td>
<td>'The door opened'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An apparent exception is found in (16/b), where the heavy form sebja occurs with a grooming verb. This is possible because the identity of the Patient is being emphasized (cf. the unmarked sentence in (16/a)).

(16) a. Ja kaźdyj den' moju-sja. 'I wash every day.'

b. Ja myl sebja. 'I washed myself [not someone else].'

Hungarian displays a parallel distribution of RMs, including a heavy RM in grooming expressions (cf. (18/a) and (18/b)). Hungarian illustrates the fact the RMs in two-form languages need not be historically related.

(17) RM distribution in Hungarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fésül-köd</td>
<td>'comb one's hair'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mosa-kod</td>
<td>'wash'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vet-köz</td>
<td>'undress'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emel-ked</td>
<td>'rise, get up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levág-ód</td>
<td>'throw oneself down'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Heavy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Látja</td>
<td>magat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg. sees heavy-RM</td>
<td>'He sees himself.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Diachronic Cycles of Reflexive Marking. Kemmer (1988) argues that Latin was also a two-form reflexive language. According to Kemmer, the paradigm of personal oblique pronouns (mē, tē, sē, etc.) were heavy RMs while the affixal -r element in so-called "deponents" (passive verb forms with active meanings) was the light RM. The pronominal forms were limited to true reflexive constructions (from Hatcher 1942).

(19) a. Suspendant omnēs nunc iam sē haruspicēs!
   hang-SUBJ-3pl. all-NOM-3pl. now now heavy-RM soothsayers-
   NOM-3pl
   'Let all the soothsayers hang themselves right now!' (Plautus)

b. Sē ex nāvī prōīcit.
   Heavy-RM from ship-DAT-3sg. throw-PERF-3sg.
   'He threw himself from the ship.' (Caeser)

The -r forms occur in the same lexical categories as light RMs in other languages:

(20)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lavor</td>
<td>'wash' (int., from lavō, tr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>induor</td>
<td>'dress'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revertor</td>
<td>'turn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genibus nitor</td>
<td>'kneel' (lit. 'support oneself by the knees')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lucror</td>
<td>'to gain, profit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proficīscor</td>
<td>'depart'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ũrascor</td>
<td>'be angry'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gueror</td>
<td>'complain'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fatēor</td>
<td>'confess'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meditor</td>
<td>'ponder'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amor</td>
<td>'be loved'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evolution of Romance from Latin illustrates a common diachronic development that two-form languages follow. Kemmer (1988) hypothesizes that there is a diachronic cycle whereby two-form languages become one-form and vice-versa. This thesis is clearly born out by the historical trajectory of Latin: as deponent (-r) forms die out by the end of the Empire period they are replaced by the heavy form. The Romance languages are (at least by traditional standards) one-form languages. As a one-form language becomes a two-form language, a new heavy RM arises that ousts the old RM from its domain in true reflexive constructions; the old RM becomes a light RM. At this point the language resembles Russian,
'Maria washed her hands / put on her coat / scratched her ear / touched her nose.'
c. Maria se arrepintió (*a si misma). 'Maria repented.'
d. Juan se (sentó / arrodilló / tiró, etc.) (*a si mismo). 'John sat down / kneeled / threw himself'.

(28) Catalan
a. Primer vesteixo a la nena, i després em vesteixo (*a mi mateix).
   'First I dress the little girl, and then I dress myself.'
b. Sempre em perdeixo (*a mi mateix). 'I always get lost.'

I will postpone mention of the treatment of reflexive grooming actions in French until the next section. Here it suffices that French, like all Romance languages, does not permit the emphatic with extended reflexives.

(29) Marie se imagine Paul (*a lui-même).
    'Marie thinks of Paul.'

The sentences in (24-28) show that the semantic boundary between true reflexives and extended reflexives has begun to take on formal correlates. It is too early to tell whether this tendency will lead to the replacement of clitic RMs by emphatics in true reflexives.

VI. Intermediate Stages. Italian and Brazilian Portuguese display a more advanced stage in the reflexive cycle. In these languages, the emphatic can occasionally perform the reflexive function by itself, although it still retains some vestigial emphatic force, perhaps more so in B. Portuguese than in Italian.

(30) Italian
a. Maria si guarda.
   b. Maria guarda se stessa.
      'Mary looks at herself.'

(31) B. Portuguese
a. Maria se olha no espelho.
   b. Maria olha a si mesma no espelho.
      'Maria looks at herself in the mirror.'

What is more, in Italian the ipse-based emphatic is not pleonastic: the clitic RM and the emphatic may not co-occur.

(32) Maria si (guarda/lava le mane) (*se stessa).
    'Maria looks at herself / washes her hands.'

As we would expect, the clitic RM (as an emerging light form) is acceptable with grooming verbs, but not so the emphatic.

(33) Italian
a. Giovanni si rade. 'Giovanni shaves.'
   b. ?Giovanni rade se stesso. 'Giovanni shaves himself.'
c. *Io metto la camicia a me stesso. 'I put on my shirt.'
d. ?Maria veste se stessa. 'Maria dresses herself.'

B. Portuguese is more difficult to analyze, because both the clitic RM and the emphatic are barred from some grooming constructions.

(34) B. Portuguese
   a. Eu (*me) pentei o meu cabello.
   b. Eu pentei o meu cabello (*a mi mesmo).
      'I combed my hair.'
   c. Eu me pentei.
      'I combed myself.'

The same thing happens with some French verbs of grooming, although French—unlike B. Portuguese—does not allow the emphatic to function as an RM (cf. (26)).

(35) French
   a. Marie (*se) met met ses chaussures (elle-même).
      'Marie puts on her shoes (herself).

VII. Complete Reanalysis of the Emphatic as a Heavy Reflexive Marker. Finally, we come to a dialect in which a bona-fide two-form reflexive system has developed. The dialect is the Sursilvan variety of Rheto-Romanche, spoken along the upper Rhine valley (data from Stimm 1973). In Sursilvan Romanche the *ipse-emphatic has been completely bleached of its emphatic content and has now been reanalyzed as a heavy RM. The new heavy RMs are the post-verbal tonic pronouns memez 'myself', tetez 'yourself, sesez 'him-/her-self', etc. These are derived historically from a fusion of the clitic RM plus an autochthonous emphatic mez that arose during the Middle Ages (< me + ipsu): memez = mei + mez; sesez = sei + sez, etc.

Meanwhile, the series of clitic RMs have become affixes and the third person forms have replaced all others (a process known as "paradigm spread").

(36) Paradigm spread of the clitic RM in Sursilvan

---

1 Incidentally, paradigm spread of the clitic RM has occurred elsewhere in Romance as well. Complete levelling is attested in other Swiss Romanche dialects, Milanese, Bergamesque, the Venetian dialects of Istria (Fiume), possibly Vegliote and in some registers of Français Populaire (Wunderli 1989, Stimm 1973). Partial extension of the 3rd-person clitic into persons 3 and 4 of the reflexive paradigm is even more widespread; it has been reported for the dialects of Rome, all of Northern Italy and Italian Switzerland, Venetian, Campidanese Sardinian, Occitan and Catalan, including Valencian (e.g., Cat. anem-se'n! 'let's go!'; aneu-se a rentar! 'Go wash up [you all]!').
Hungarian and Latin: the new heavy RM is limited to true reflexives and the old RM is constrained to extended constructions.

I submit that the diachronic process I have just described—i.e., a shift from a one-form to a two-form language—is taking place in modern Romance, although this process is still in a nascent stage. If this is so, we might expect the following: (a) there should be a new heavy RM whose range is limited to true reflexive constructions; (b) this new RM should be off-limits in extended reflexive constructions; (c) the old RM should appear in extended constructions; (d) since the cross-linguistic tendency is for reflexive grooming to take light RMs, the new heavy RM should be precluded from such constructions.

The data I present here show that this renovating process has been completed in at least one Romance dialect, and that there is evidence that some stages of this process are underway in other dialects.

Cross-linguistically, it is frequently the case that emphatics become reanalyzed (or "grammaticalized") as new (heavy) RMs. In other words, emphatics lose their original emphatic force and assume a new (reflexive) function. I hypothesize that the new (or emerging) heavy Romance RM is an example of a grammaticalized emphatic. The emphatic in question is the syntactically pleonastic reflex of Late Latin *ipsi(si)mu(m) 'very self' (or of an intensified compound form *met-ipsi(si)mu(m)): Spanish mismo, Portuguese mesmo, Catalan mateix, French même. (It. stesso comes from *ipse-istum 'that very thing'). These can intensify any NP. In (21) the role of the emphatic pronouns is to contrast the referent of the subject with that of some other potential referent.

(21) Subject emphasis

a. Spanish
   El general mandó que todos se mataran, pero él mismo no se mató.
   'The general ordered everyone to kill himself, but he [himself] did not.'

b. Catalan
   Joan s'afeita ell mateix.
   'John himself shaved [i.e., it was not someone else who shaved.]

When the scope of the emphatic is an object that is coreferential with the subject, the emphatic teams up in a phrase with a stressed (disjunctive) RM. The pleonastic nature of emphatics with reflexives is illustrated in (22) with examples from Spanish, French and Catalan (respectively):
(22) a. Yo me veo (a mi mismo).
    b. Je me vois (moi-même).
    c. Jo em veig (a mi mateix).
    'I see myself.'

It makes sense for RMs to have their roots in emphatics since—as we have already seen in the Russian and Hungarian data—one function of RMs is to emphasize that the Patient is oneself and not another person. In (23) the reflexive emphatic emphasizes the Patient aspect of the Ego in a reflexive sentence.

(23) a. Spanish
    'Ella se mató a sí misma (pero no a él).'
    'She killed herself, but not him.'
    b. Catalan
    'Joan s'afeita a ell mateix.'
    'John shaved himself [and not someone else].'

VI. Nascent Stages of the Renovation Process. Spanish, Catalan and French represent the least developed stage in the renovation cycle. In these languages the "old" clitic RM (se, me, etc.) must still be used for true reflexives, and the emphatic force has not been bleached from the emphatic form. Furthermore, the emphatic is still syntactically pleonastic—it can not perform the reflexive function independently of the clitic RM.

(24) Spanish
    a. María se mira (a sí misma).
    b. *María mira a sí misma.
    'Maria looks at herself.'

(25) Catalan
    a. Maria s'esta mirant (a ella mateixa).
    b. *Maria esta mirant (a) ella mateixa.
    'Maria is looking at herself.'

(26) French
    a. Marie s'attaque (a elle-même).
    b. *Marie attaque a elle-même.
    'Marie attacks herself.'

But significantly, In Spanish and Catalan the emphatic is infelicitous or marginally acceptable with verbs of grooming or body motion, and is categorically unacceptable with other extended reflexives.

(27) Spanish
    a. María se peinó (?a sí misma). 'Maria combed herself.'
    b. María se lavó las manos / puso el abrigo / rascó la oreja / tocó la nariz (?a sí misma).
Sursilvan Romanche is a perfect example of a two-form reflexive language: the new emphatic-derived (heavy) RM is confined to true reflexives while the affixal light marker can only appear in extended patterns. In (37/a), se- is ungrammatical with the true reflexive action 'see oneself', but just fine with grooming reflexives and other extended reflexives.

(37) Light marking in Sursilvan
   a. *Jeu sevesel el spieghel.
      'I see myself in the mirror.'
   b. Jeu selavel on cuschina.
      'I wash (myself) in the kitchen.'
   c. Setila en dabot e nue! 'Dress quickly and come!'
   d. Mo buca seludei! 'Don't boast!'

And in (38) the heavy pronominal RM is acceptable (or not) in precisely the reverse situations.

(38) Heavy marking in Sursilvan
   a. *Jeu lavel memez on cuschina.
      'I wash (myself) in the kitchen'.
   b. Jeu vesel memez el spieghel.
      'I see myself in the mirror.'
   c. Admiras ti tetezza?
      'Do you admire yourself?'

VIII. Summary and Conclusion. It would be premature to predict whether Sursilvan signals the direction her sister Romance tongues will follow, but there are enough commonalities among Romance reflexive marking patterns to enable us to speak of a Romance-wide tendency towards reflexive renovation. In this talk I have only touched on the formal consequences of this process. More interesting are the following questions: (a) what motivates the renovation cycle? (b) what is it about the semantics of grooming verbs that warrant their separate formal treatment vis-à-vis true reflexives? (c) should reflexive grooming expressions be considered extended reflexives? (d) what is the semantic relationship between extended reflexives and true reflexives? Especially unclear at this stage of development in Romance is the status of grooming verbs. Grooming verbs apparently occupy a semantic frontier zone between true and extended reflexives. It is therefore natural to find inconsistencies and exceptions in the way these actions are formally mapped. For example, while Italian generally does not allow the
emphatic/heavy-RM form stessò in this context (cf. *Io metto la camicia a me stesso 'I put on my shirt'), witness
(39)
  a. Giovanni si pullisce.
  b. Giovanni pullisce se stesso.

In Spanish, too, some grooming verbs allow reflexive emphasis.

(40) Juan se afeitó / vistió (a sí mismo).
    'Juan shaved / dressed (himself).'

It appears that the nature of certain adverbials also influences the choice of reflexive marking, as the following sentences from Italian display.

(41) Italian
  a. ?Maria veste se stessa. 'Maria dresses herself.'
  b. Maria veste sempre se stessa di rosso / la domenica.
    'Maria always dresses herself in red / on Sundays.'

Finally, in B. Portuguese a contrastive context can elicit an emphatic RM where it would otherwise be prohibited

(42) B. Portuguese
  a. Pentei o cabello della, e depois eu pentei o meu.
  b. Pentei o cabello della, e depois eu pentei a mi mesmo.
    'I combed her hair, and then I combed mine.'
  c. *Pentei o cabello della, e depois eu me pentei.
    'I combed her hair, and then I combed myself.'

By way of final summary, I have included the following chart displaying the relative status of RMs in the languages studied here.

(43) Functional distribution of Romance reflexive markers.
    (IPSU stands for any emphatic marker)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages Represented</th>
<th>Type A</th>
<th>Type B</th>
<th>Type C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Languages Represented</td>
<td>Spanish, French (?)</td>
<td>Italian, B. Portuguese</td>
<td>Rheto-Romanche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of SE</td>
<td>necessary for all true reflexives and for some extended reflexives</td>
<td>alternates with emphatic in some true reflexives; necessary for some extended reflexives</td>
<td>necessary for some extended reflexives and for verbs of grooming and personal care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on SE in reflexive constructions</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>may not appear with emphatic</td>
<td>may not appear with some true reflexives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of IPSU</td>
<td>pleonastic and emphatic</td>
<td>may mark some true reflexives independently of SE; vestiges of emphatic function remain independent marker of true reflexives; no emphatic force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Range of IPSU</td>
<td>limited to true reflexives (but not necessary)</td>
<td>limited to true reflexives (but not necessary)</td>
<td>necessary for true reflexives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on IPSU</td>
<td>marginal with verbs of grooming &amp; personal care; unacceptable with extended reflexives</td>
<td>marginal with verbs of grooming &amp; personal care; unacceptable with extended reflexives</td>
<td>unacceptable with verbs of grooming &amp; personal care AND extended reflexives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm Spread?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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