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Abstract

This paper deals with a Latin reflexivization strategy distinct from other reflexive constructions. It consists of first and second person pronouns which are used to emphasize the first and second person referents in Old Latin comedy by certain emphasizing elements like -met in egomet or -te in tüte. The form and function of these emphasizing personal pronouns has not been observed and described yet. Moreover, the grammatical, semantic and pragmatic status of this reflexivization strategy has hitherto been unknown. The elements -met and -te are likely to be derived from suffixes which have an identifying and emphasizing function similar to German selbst ‘self’. Reflexivization here obviously is connected to focalization, a typologically well-known relationship.
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1. Problem

Since in Latin the grammatical category person is inherent in the verb form, the usage of personal pronouns of the first and second person is constrained in certain ways. For example, in Old Latin comedy the juxtaposition of the pronouns is the normal case, because the first and second persons refer to the actors in lively, everyday discourse (cf. Hofmann & Szantyr 1965: 173). In this genre, however, we also encounter pronouns that are extended by an element, e.g. egomet, tüte. These elements are suffixes and not clitics, as they are not syntactically free, do not function at phrase or clause level and do not belong to closed classes, etc. Bearing in mind that the texts of Old Latin comedy are metrically bound, one could argue that forms like egomet, tüte are used out of metrical considerations, if a polysyllabic form is needed instead of the bisyllabic ego or the monosyllabic tü. It is striking, however, that egomet, tüte, etc. are most often used in connection with simple pronominal forms of the first and second person.

The main purpose of this paper is to present a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic analysis of the “focus pronouns” within reflexive constructions vis-à-vis other syntactic constructions. To this end, some of the properties of these reflexive constructions will be presented in what follows. In section 2, the history of the elements -met and -te will be presented. Section 3 gives an overview of various reflexivization strategies based on typological findings while section 4 introduces to the construction under investigation, namely reflexivization with “focus pronouns”. Section 5 discusses the semantic notion of control.
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properties with respect to reflexive constructions, section 6 deals with verbal semantics, and section 7 demonstrates the relevance of the semantic roles hierarchy, i.e. the Theta Hierarchy for the phenomenon at issue.

2. History of the suffixes -met and -te

As for the history of the suffixes -met and -te the morpheme -met also occurs in the accusative nōs-met ‘us’, the second element of which is comparable to the Old Indic ablative asmāt ‘from us’ < *ns-med/ī (Ancient Greek ἡμέτερος ‘ours’; Klingenschmitt 2005: 307). The corresponding Latin form could have been an ablative *nōs-met with substitution of the continuation of *ns by nōs as in the accusative plural nōs. In accordance with this accusative plural nōs the ablative form *nōs-met was interpreted as a variant of the accusative plural. Then the ablative function was abandoned in the form nōs-met, since the dative plural nōbis took over this function. The original ablative morpheme -met in the accusative plural nōs-met besides nōs was reanalyzed as emphasizing morpheme and conferred to other cases of the personal pronoun of the first person and to other pronouns; compare mihi-met ‘me’, tūti-met ‘you’, nōs-met ‘you’ (pl), rarely ipse-met ‘himself’.

In contrast to this, the second morpheme in tū-te is not so clear. Since final -e originates in -e, -i, -o and perhaps -u, there are different possibilities of derivation: locative particle(?) -ē as in tūi-met (cf. above), doubling of tū ‘you’ to *tū-tū ‘you’, the same element -iō as in Umbrian, South Picenian esto- ‘this’ (cf. Latin iste ‘this’ < *esto with i- adapted from is ‘he’ (Meiser 1998: 163) or -te as in Varro’s Augural Formula eus te (Klingenschmitt 2005: 214). In any case, the second element in the disyllabic form was considered an emphasizing morpheme like the element -met. Compared with the shorter forms ego and tū the longer ones are iconicly interpreted as reinforced pronouns to express emphasis.

3. General account on the various reflexivization strategies

In order to embed the Latin reflexivization strategy with “focus pronouns” in a wider context we will now take a look at reflexivization in general. Following Hopper & Thompson (1980: 277), Kemmer (1993) assumes that in language evolution grammatical prototypes exist which are more robust than others so that their morphosyntactic markers can be conferred to other semantic domains. As for situation types she distinguishes prototypical two-participant events, prototypical one-participant events, prototypical passive and direct-reflexive events. She further assumes that these situation types form a scale with two-participant events occupying the positive end and one-participant events the negative. Reflexive events are located in between. Though two participant roles are given, these are filled by the same entity. On the whole the “minor elaboration of events” is characteristic of middle situation types (Kemmer 1993: 208). However, the related middle constructions are “non-basic or marked” (Hundt 2007: 76), insofar as “the patient subject takes on a property typically associated with agents: responsibility of a property, or independence of action” (Van Oosten 1984: 129).

As for the special semantics of the middle Kemmer (1993) set up the following typology, working within Langacker’s framework of “Cognitive Grammar” (cf. Kaufmann 2004: 8).
I. Emphatic domain:
a. Emphatic/contrastive 'self': English I did it myself
b. Emphatic reflexive: English I hit MYSELF

II. Reflexive middle: A participant has two participant roles. These roles are nearly indistinguishable.
a. verbs of grooming or body care: German sich waschen, English wash, Latin lusor, Latin se defendere, defendi ‘to defend oneself’
b. verbs of non-translational movement: German sich strecken, English to stretch out, Latin reverter ‘to return’
c. verbs of change in body posture: German sich setzen, English to sit down, Greek πέταεθα ‘to fly’
d. verbs of locomotion: German sich entfernen, Latin convertere ‘to turn’
e. indirect middle: German sich etwas mieten, English to rent a house for oneself, Greek πορεύεθα ‘to provide for oneself’

III. Middle of emotion and cognition: The participant roles are not distinguishable.
a. verbs of emotion: German sich erschrecken, English to get frightened, Latin trāscor ‘to fall into a rage’
b. emotive speech acts: sich beschweren, English to complain, Latin queror ‘to complain’, Greek δῆμεζον ‘to lament’
c. verbs of cognition: German sich überlegen, English to consider, Latin mediāri ‘to meditate’

IV. Reciprocal middle with identification of events and participant roles
a. natural reciprocal events: German sich umarmen, English to embrace, Latin amplexāri ‘to embrace’
b. natural collective events: German sich versammeln, English to assemble

V. Spontaneous and passive situation types and facilitative: no realization of a participant role of a participant is discoverable.
a. spontaneous events: German sich bilden, English to evolve
b. passive events: French Le forge s’allume, English The torch inflames
c. facilitative: German Das Buch verkauft sich gut, English The book sells well.

The difference between these medial situation types and a reflexive active form lies in the fact that the active allows an alternative, non-coreferent patient. An example for such an active situation type is: I look at myself, not at another patient. 'Ich betrachte mich, nicht einen anderen Patiens' (German, cf. KAUFMANN 2004:58).

The comparison of the reflexive construction in Latin with that of Ancient Greek, English and German shows that the development of a middle marker is essentially a process of grammaticalization (KEMMER 1993: 151 ff.). While Ancient Greek continues the inherited active-passive, the corresponding formation in Latin are deponents in -r, i.e. verbs which are active in meaning, but passive or middle in their morphology (Latin sequē ‘to follow’, laeārī ‘to be glad’, mentūrī ‘to conceive’, potīrī ‘to seize’). But in Latin reflexivation is also formed by an active verb + reflexive pronoun (se defendere ‘to defend oneself’), by the passive (defendī) and active verbs with middle meaning (convertere ‘to turn’, delināre ‘to decline’, deflectere ‘to turn away’, insinuāre ‘to delve into’). In the course of time the deponent was replaced by active intransitives in connection with the old reflexive pronouns mé, tē, sē etc. which have reflexes in all of the old and modern Romance languages; cf. Old French se tornier ‘turn’. Also Old and New High German sich etc. is related
to the Latin reflexive pronoun se etc., while in Old and Middle English the simple personal pronouns were used as reflexive pronouns. But longer self-pronouns gained ground in Middle English and the simple forms fell into disuse in the seventeenth century. On the other hand, the new and longer reflexive pronouns were omitted frequently and ergatives like wash, sell, drive with reflexive meaning developed (for the development in more details cf. HUNDT 2007: 129 ff.).

4. Reflexivization with “focus pronouns” in Latin

In what follows the pronouns of the first and second person will be investigated, as they are more readily used reflexively than those of the third person (DOWTY 1980). In Classical Latin, an extended form (tote) occurs only once.

(1) Cicero, Tusculanae Disputationes 2.63

tibi si recta probanti placebis,
2.SG.DAT if right examining approve.2.SG.FUT1

tum non modo te-te viceris …
then not only 2.SG.ACC-EMPH defeat.2.SG.FUT2
‘if you think your decision to be right, approve of it and be content with it, then you will have won over not only yourself …’

One can assume that this reflexive construction belongs to the emphatic domain of the situation types given above. In this case tote is used contrastively and has a contrastive focus.

Among the usual types of reflexivization strategies, Dutch suggests itself as a point of comparison:

(2) Dutch

Max1 hoorde *zich/zichzelf/*hem (‘strong reflexive’)  
Max hear:3.SG.PST *self/himself/*him
‘Max heard himself’ (on this construction cf. REINHART & REULAND 1995; STEINBACH 2002: 184 ff.; EVERAERT 2003: 10)

Here, the object pronoun is extended by an emphizer. The data from Old Latin comedy are different, though. If an emphizer occurs, the expression tends to be ego-net me, i.e. subject personal pronoun plus emphizer + bare reflexive pronoun, as in example (3).

(3) Amphitruo, Li 457

an ego-net me illic reliqui …?
PARTICLE 1.SG.NOM-EMPH 1.SG.ACC there leave.1SG.PF
‘Did I leave myself behind there …?’

A literal translation would be: ‘Did I myself leave me behind?’ Reflexivization here concerns focalization as in (1). But it is the subject pronoun that is highlighted, not the object pronoun.
There is no such emphasis in normal reflexive constructions without emphasizing suffix:

(4) Miles II.i 196 f.
\[\text{Paulisper} \quad \text{tace, dum ego}\]
awhile be silent.2.SG.IMP while 1.SG.NOM
\[\text{mihi consilia in animum convoco}\]
1.SG.DAT advice in heart call.1.SG.PRS
‘Be silent a while, while I call advice in my heart.’

(5) Aulularia II.viii 371 f.
\[\text{Volui animum tandem confirmare hodie}\]
want.1.SG.PF sense finally make.firm today
\[\text{meum ut bene me habere}\]
my that well 1.SG.ACC do.1.SG.SBJ.IMPF
\[\text{filiat nuptiis}\]
daughter’s wedding
‘Now I did want to be hearty to-day, and do the handsome thing for daughter’s wedding.’

Also non-reflexive constructions with “focus pronouns” occur:

(6) Amphitruo, I.i 425 f.
\[\text{nam quod ego-met solus feci,}\]
for what 1.SG.NOM-EMPH alone do.1.SG.PF
\[\text{nec quisquam alius affuit, in tabernaculo}\]
and not anybody else be.present.3.SG.PF in tent
‘for what I did for myself alone in the tent, when nobody else was there’

In fact, egomet is often used in this way in Old Latin:

(7) Amphitruo, I.i 434
\[\text{Quid ego ni negem, qui}\]
why 1.SG.NOM not deny.1.SG.SBJ.PRS who
denied 1.SG.NOM-EMPH be.1.SG.SBJ.PRS
‘How could I not say this, as it is me myself?’

Thus, we can preliminarily say that the semantic and distributional distinction between the reflexive constructions (3) and (4), (5) is focusing or not-focusing of the subject pronoun. (6) and (7) are examples of non-reflexive constructions focusing the subject pronoun. As focusing is indeed a function of the “focus pronoun”, -met and -te cannot be considered as pure metrical fillers.

In German, phrases with the adnominal emphaser selbst are comparable. Selbst functions in this context as focus particle, similar to nur ‘only’ and auch ‘also’ (König 1991; Siemund 2002a; Primus 1991/92: 85: focus adverb). The reason is that selbst interacts with a nominal constituent and evokes alternatives to the semantic value of this constituent (Siemund 2002b: 187f.; Featherston & Sternewald 2003: 41; Siemund 2003: 481–483). The problem, however, is that emphizers in German always have to bear focal accent. Thus the apparent focus particles seem to be in focus themselves. In this respect Eckardt (2001: 381) characterizes the focal meaning of adnominal selbst in connection with proper names
as a function of the type \(<c, e>\), that is as an ‘identity function’ that maps individuals to individuals. For the Latin combinations of the type *egomet me*, however, Hölle’s (2007: 27ff.) analysis of agentive *selbst* is especially relevant, as he connects it with reflexivity. He compares (8a), which contains an agentive emphaser, with (8b), an adnominal emphasis:

(8a)  *John baked the cake himself.*

(8b)  *John*

The only difference between (8a) and (8b) is that the domain in (8a) is *VoiceP*, whereas in (8b) it is *DP*. But in Old Latin we are obviously dealing with a combination of the two types (8a) and (8b). The suffixes *-met* and *-te*, respectively, denote the identity function by focusing, and fuse together with *ego* and *tū*, respectively, to form a prosodic word.

To scrutinize the focus function more thoroughly we will now take a look at the semantics of reflexive constructions as a whole.

5. Control properties

For the present purpose, the notion of control as used by Comrie (1989: 62) is decisive: “a high degree of animacy is necessary for a noun phrase to be interpreted as having a high control …” In the following discussion control will be considered as a semantic notion in the sense that an agent of the situation has more or less control of the result of the situation. As for the verbs of the active and medial situation types the constraints on control of *activa tantum* and *medio tantum* have to be taken into consideration (Kaufmann 2004: 51):
(9) Unmarked control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicate control</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation control</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control properties imposed by the verb</td>
<td>animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predicate control means that the participant who is represented by the argument of the highest *relatum* position or theta role (see below) controls the situation. He determines whether this situation occurs and how long it lasts. But predicates, the arguments of which are sortally restricted to animate individuals, may assign predicate control or not; cf. *walk*, *work* and *forget*, *die*, respectively. In contrast to this, situation control is ontologically motivated: The controller of a situation is the participant who – due to his sortal control properties (human, animate etc.) – has ontological control over the situation.

With *activa tantum* we have canonical control characteristics, i.e. a verb with high sortal control properties has both predicate and situation control; for example Ancient Greek *vōōhō* 'I am ill', *ōōhōhō* 'I hear' (KAUFMANN 2004: 118). *Media tantum*, on the other hand, are verbs that show inherently deviant and therefore marked control characteristics. While in active situation types (viz. reflexivized transitive verbs) only the argument of the first position of the relation exhibits control properties, in medial situation types both positions are connected with control properties. Thus, the low distinctiveness of thematic roles follows from the fact that one of the properties which is usually assigned to the argument in first position (viz. the agent) is assigned to the argument in second position (viz. the patient; cf. KAUFMANN 2004: 58). Compare with this the encoding of the direct-reflexive “body-activity-verb” *to wash oneself*:

(10) direct-reflexive (situation) controller = y (patient); x = y

[KAUFMANN 2003: 142]

In this case only a human patient – and not a shirt – has the control properties which are necessary for a washing situation. Up to this point it is to be kept in mind, that in middle systems situation control is not only assigned to the agent, but also to the patient. It is exactly in such cases that a non-canonical situation controller occurs.

To anticipate the semantics of verbs with “focus pronouns”, as specified below, the reflexive is a non-canonical situation controller also with verbs of acquisition or verbs of the type *to serve*. For the reflexive has a benefactive role and is involved in control like the agent. The case is different with reflexive verbs of speaking such as *to mumble* and *to be silent*. According to KEMMER (1993: 269) those verbs could be classed with emotion middles; cf. speech acts like *denounce*, *lament* etc. But in the sense of *to mumble* (away) *to oneself* (German 'vor sich hinnurmen') and German *vorsich hüschweigen* the reflexives could be considered as adjuncts (cf. ENGELBERG 2000: 128). They denote involvement of the agent and consequently are non-canonical situation controllers themselves. Situation control is missing also with verbs of cognition, as internal cognitive processes cannot entirely be consciously governed (cf. KAUFMANN 2004: 52); cf. KEMMER’s (1993: 269) “cognition middle” (*know*, *suppose*, *think* etc).
6. Verbal semantics

6.1. Active situation type

Now we proceed to the verbal semantics of the reflexive construction with “focus pronouns”. Reflexive actives occur with the type *ego met me* in Old Latin. Here, the reflexive pronoun contrasts with an independently referring NP in object position. But the agent is emphasized: The contrastive focus picks out this element as prominent new information here: *I myself have deceived myself, not another person.*

(11) Aulularia IV.ix 724

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\textit{ego-met} & \textit{me} \\
\text{1.SG.NOM-EMPH} & \text{1.SG.ACC}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{defraudavi} \]

‘I myself have deceived myself.’

Similarly: *I myself obey myself, not another person:*

(12) Mercator V.ii 853

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\textit{idem} & \textit{ego-met} \\
\text{1.SG.NOM-EMPH} & \text{1.SG.ACC}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{mihi oboedo} \]

‘With respect to that I obey myself.’

Even deponent verbs (*Media tantum*) occur with reflexive pronouns in active situation types. However, the semantic roles in (13) are different from those in (11) and (12): *I myself delay myself, it is not another person that delays me.* The contrastive focus on *ego met* does not exclude another patient, but another agent.

(13) Mercator V.ii 930

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\textit{ego-met} & \textit{me} \\
\text{1.SG.NOM-EMPH} & \text{1.SG.ACC}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{moror.} \]

‘I delay myself.’

In any case, verbs like ‘to deceive’, ‘to obey’ have no inherent reflexive role.

6.2. Medial situation type

The medial situation types differ from this mode of usage. For them, a *minor elaboration of events* is characteristic and an alternative, non-coreferent patient is excluded, as mentioned above. Along with that goes a low distinctiveness of participant roles. But there is an intergradation, as for instance with verbs of the type to acquire something for oneself with an optional reference to the agent. KEMMER’s indirect middle type. Cf. PLAUTUS:

(14) Truculentus IV.iii 843

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\textit{tu-te} & \textit{sumpsisti} \\
\text{2.SG.NOM-EMPH} & \text{tibi.}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{take.2.SG.PF} \]

‘You have taken it for yourself.’

Similarly with benefactives (*dativus commodi*):

(15) Curcilio I.1 9

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\textit{tu-te} & \textit{tibi} \\
\text{2.SG.NOM-EMPH} & \text{puer es}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{take.2.SG.DAT} \]

‘You act like a servant for yourself.’
Here, one participant takes two thematic roles, which concern the same referent: *You have taken it for yourself, and not for another person*. However, the emphasized element is not the object pronoun, but the subject pronoun like in the active situation types.

There is no overlap of thematic roles with cognitive verbs, though, and the subject pronoun is emphasized, too. This emphasis cannot be explained by contrastive focus; an analysis of *-met* as metrical filler does not work either, because this suffix has a clearly emphasizing function in other contexts. However, the special semantics of the middle might be decisive here. As mentioned above, the middle constructions are “non-basic or marked”, as the “patient subject” takes on agent properties such as responsibility of a property, or independence of action. This markedness might be expressed by the “focus pronoun” in (16):

(16) Aulularia II. viii 379 f.
\[
\text{deinde} \text{ ego-} \text{met} \quad \text{me=}\text{cum} \quad \text{cogitare} \\
\text{then} \quad 1.\text{SG.} \text{NOM-EMPH} \quad 1.\text{SG.} \text{ABL=}\text{with} \quad \text{think.}\text{INF} \\
\text{intervias} \text{ occepi:} \\
\text{on.the.way} \quad \text{start.}1.\text{SG.}\text{PF} \\
\text{‘Then I started to think to myself on the way:’}
\]

Another comparable medial type are verbs of speaking that are used to denote soliloquies:

(17) Miles III.i. 714
\[
\text{ego-} \text{met} \quad \text{me=}\text{cum} \quad \text{mussito} \\
1.\text{SG.} \text{NOM-EMPH} \quad 1.\text{SG.} \text{ABL=}\text{with} \quad \text{mumble.}1.\text{SG.}\text{PRS} \\
\text{‘I mumbled to myself:’}
\]

The verb “to be silent” in the sense of German *vor sich hinschweigen* probably belongs to this group as well (cf. above):

(18) Epidicus V.i. 651
\[
\text{Quod} \quad \text{boni} \quad \text{est} \quad \text{id} \quad \text{tacitus} \\
\text{what} \quad \text{good} \quad \text{be.}3.\text{SG.}\text{PRS} \quad \text{this} \quad \text{discrete} \\
\text{taceas} \quad \text{tu-}\text{te} \quad \text{te=}\text{cum} \\
\text{conceal.}2.\text{SUBJ.PRS} \quad 2.\text{SG.} \text{NOM-EMPH} \quad 2.\text{SG.} \text{ABL=}\text{with} \\
\text{‘What’s the use of discreetly keeping this to yourself?’}
\]

To sum up so far: With verbs of cognition, speaking and being silent the suffixes *-met* and *-te* in reflexive constructions denote non-canonical control. In other reflexive constructions they are used as emphasers.

But why is it the subject pronoun that is emphasized in reflexive constructions? This can best be described as a consequence of its position within the theta-grid. To describe this in more detail we will partially follow the framework of Lexical Decomposition Grammar (LDG).

7. Theta hierarchy

LDG provides a principled account for phenomena in which predicates and/or arguments are added to a base verb (or noun). Four levels of representation are assumed, each having its own structural properties: Conceptual Structure (CS), Semantic Form (SF),
Theta Structure, and Morphology/Syntax (MS), and a set of principles that constrain the mappings between these levels. While the Conceptual Structure contains all extralinguistic knowledge relevant for the interpretation of linguistic expressions, the Semantic Form comprises all the semantic information that is grammatically determined. For the exceptional position of the subject pronoun in reflexive constructions argument linking is significant. In LDG linking is conceived as a mapping operation, inasmuch as the position of the arguments in the argument hierarchy determines their syntactical realization. The highest individual argument is linked to subject, the lowest to direct object (Joppen & Wunderlich 1995). The possible structural linkers (agreement affixes, pronominal affixes, and clitics on the head, as well as morphological case on the dependent) are encoded by means of the abstract case features [+hr] (there is a higher theta role), and [+Ir] (there is a lower theta role), for example dative: [+hr, +Ir], accusative: [+hr], nominative [+Ir].

Before this description can be adapted to the Latin reflexive constructions with “focus pronouns”, it must be noted that the personal pronoun that is extended by an emphizer always precedes the reflexive pronoun and stands in subject position. To this type we can compare varieties of English, in which self-forms occur only in subject position:

(19) Irish English

*How is herself? ‘How is your wife?’* [Siemund 2003: 225]

In a.c.i.-constructions, however, it is the accusative that receives the emphizer in Old Latin:

(20) Captivi II.iii 428

Nec me secus umquam ei

and not 1.sg.acc differently ever him

facturum quicquam quam me-met mihi.

make.3.pcp.fut anything than 1.sg.acc-emph 1.sg.dat

‘And that I will never treat him differently from myself.’

But if the reflexive has an emphizer, the personal pronoun necessarily has one, too:

(21) Amphitruo, II.i 607

[Amph.] *Quis te verberavit?*

who 2.sg.acc hit.3.sg.pf

[Sos.] *Ego-met me-met.*

1.sg.nom-emph 1.sg.acc-emph

[Amph.] ‘Who hit you?’

[Sos.] ‘I myself hit myself.’

Thus, the features [+hr] and [+Ir] are relevant for the emphasis of pronouns in reflexive structures (cf. on this Kaufmann 2003: 146). For the suffixes -met and -te are only obligatory with the argument of the highest theta role, if they are used in reflexive constructions; otherwise they are optional. We have to bear in mind that the Latin reflexive structures are characterized by non-canonical control. Yet pronouns for speaker and addressee always have sorial control, i.e. the control properties that are necessary for the cited verbs apply only to animate individuals. Thus, -met and -te in “focus pronouns” with the highest case role denote exactly this property in reflexive structures. If there is special emphasis, the reflexive pronoun, which is the non-canonical controller, can be supplied with an emphizer as well.
8. Conclusions

After having given an overview over the semantics of the middle and the development in Latin the pronominal forms *egomet* and *tute* in reflexive constructions were investigated. An interpretation of -met and -te as metrical fillers is out of question, as these suffixes have real semantic functions. Mostly these pronouns function as contrastive focus both in reflexive constructions and in active constructions, wherefore these pronouns were called "focus" pronouns. But there are instances where this interpretation does not make sense. Here, the markedness of the "patient subject" in reflexive constructions is emphasized, namely with verbs of cognition, speaking and being silent. For in middle systems situation control is not only assigned to the agent, but also to the patient. Thus, one can assume that the primary function of the suffixes -met and -te in reflexive constructions was to denote non-canonical control. Secondarily in indirect middle types, where the two participant roles are clearer than in other reflexive constructions, these suffixes were reanalyzed as focusing elements and from there referred to other reflexive constructions with focused material.

As for their prehistory, the suffixes -met and -te themselves arose by reanalysis. In the accusative nōs-met 'us' the suffix -met is inherited from Indo-European and then propagated throughout the paradigm of the personal pronoun especially of the first person\(^1\). The interpretation as emphizer was caused by the coexistence of *ego* and *egomet* etc., whereby the longer forms were iconically considered as emphasis of the shorter ones. Also the longer form tute besides tū could be interpreted as an emphizer, though its origin remains unclear. In any case, *egomet* and *tute* were grammaticalized as emphizers and proved to be adequate expressions to denote focus and control functions in reflexive constructions.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABL</th>
<th>ablative</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>nominative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphizer</td>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>PTCP</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>imperfactive</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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