Chapter 1
Introduction

This dissertation presents an approach to adnominal intensifiers and simple and complex reflexives and pronouns based on the idea that intensification and binding constitute separate modules of the grammar. While the separation of intensification and binding into different modules is hardly controversial, the question of where exactly to draw the dividing line is far from trivial, especially in the case of complex reflexives and complex pronouns. It will be argued that most current accounts of binding (e.g. Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Huang and Liu (2001), among others) are misguided in that they often take what are really adnominal intensifiers for reflexive elements. In addition to achieving a descriptively and explanatorily more adequate account of intensified reflexives and pronouns, the approach defended here also has the advantage of being able to achieve a unified account of all types of intensified nominal expressions, be they intensified DPs (e.g. Dan. Peter selv ‘Peter himself’), intensified reflexives (e.g. Dan. Peter hader sig selv ‘Peter hates REFL self’), or intensified pronouns (e.g. Dan. Peter sagde at Mary dansede med alle andre end ham selv ‘Peter said that Mary danced with everyone except him self.’) - something current approaches to binding and intensification are unable to do. Though most of the data is from Danish, in chapter 5 and 6 it will be shown that the analysis presented here can be extended to English and Chinese. Finally, besides proposing a new articulation of binding and intensification the present proposal also has consequences for each of these modules individually. In contrast to predicate-based approaches to binding (e.g. Reinhart & Reuland 1993), we call for a nominal approach to binding in which binding is defined as the interaction of intrinsic properties of nominal expressions and syntactic locality constraints. We also argue that the Danish reflexive sig (= Dutch zich, Norwegian seg, etc.) is not an anti-local anaphor specialized for
long-distance binding, thus falsifying those binding theories which crucially rely on this assumption. Finally, concerning intensification, we argue that the semantic contribution of adnominal intensifiers (e.g. Danish selv, Eng. \textit{himself}) is not similar to that of scalar focus particle (cf. Eckardt 2001) or reducible to centrality-effects (cf. by König (1997) and Siemund (2000)), but rather very similar to that of contrastive focus which - depending on the context - may or may not involve scalar ordering of focus-generated alternatives.

1.1 The failure of most current binding theories to correctly separate binding and intensification

The main problem with most existing analyses of binding is that they do not take into account the fact that in many languages the elements which serve as reflexives are either identical to the elements serving as adnominal intensifiers, e.g. English \textit{himself}(1), Chinese \textit{ziji} ‘self’ (2), and French \textit{lui-même} ‘him-same’ (3), or partially overlaps with adnominal intensifiers, e.g. the Danish complex reflexive \textit{sig selv} ‘REFL self’ (4a) which is composed of the simple reflexive \textit{sig} ‘REFL’ (4b) plus the adnominal intensifier \textit{selv} ‘self’ (4c). In the examples in (1-4) bold has been used for expository reasons to highlight the elements functioning as adnominal intensifiers/reflexives$^1$.

(1) \begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Peter hated himself.} \quad (\text{himself} = \text{reflexive})
\vspace{0.1cm}
b. & \quad \text{Peter himself attended the conference.} \quad (\text{himself} = \text{intensifier})
\end{align*}

(2) \textbf{Mandarin Chinese:}
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{張三恨自己。} \quad (\text{ziji} = \text{reflexive})
\vspace{0.1cm}
& \quad \text{Zhangsan hen ziji.}
& \quad \text{Zhangsan hate self}
& \quad \text{‘Zhangsan hates himself.’}
\end{align*}

$^1$ See chapters 5-6 for analyses of English and Chinese based on the assumption that \textit{himself} and ziji \textit{自己} ‘self-self’ always function as intensifiers.
b. 張三自己參加會議。 (ziji = intensifier)  

Zhangsan ziji canjia huiyi. 
Zhangsan self attend conference. 
Zhangsan himself attended the conference.

(3) French:
a. Pierre est jaloux de lui-même.  (lui-même = reflexive) 
Peter is jealous of him-same 
‘Peter is jealous of himself.’
b. Pierre lui-même a assisté à la conférence. (lui-même = reflexive) 
Peter him-same has participated to the conference 
‘Peter himself participated in the meeting.’

(4) Danish:
a. Peter vaskede sig selv. (sig selv = complex reflexive) 
Peter washed REFL self 
‘Peter washed himself.’
b. Peter vaskede sig. (sig = simple reflexive) 
Peter washed REFL 
‘Peter washed (himself).’
c. Peter selv deltog i mødet. (selv = intensifier) 
Peter self participated in meeting-the 
‘Peter himself participated in the meeting.’

From the beginning of modern formal linguistics till the present day, most binding theoretical accounts of reflexives have tended to ignore the formal identity of intensifiers (1-3b) and reflexives (1-3a), or in the case of Danish, the identity of intensifiers (4c) and a sub-part of complex reflexives (4a). If mentioned at all, intensifiers have usually been assumed to be totally unrelated to reflexives. That is, the fact that reflexives and intensifiers often have the same (or partially identical) phonetic realization has in many cases either been overlooked or tacitly assumed to be a historical accident not worth investigating.

In the mid-nineties a number of researchers began to (re-)discover\(^2\) the close links between intensifiers and reflexives and the important interactions of intensification and

\(^2\) Already in the 1971 article “Reflexive and Emphatic” J. A. Moyne observed that one of main problems besetting generative treatments of reflexives is “the general neglect of the emphatic, often confusing it with the reflexive.” (Moyne 1971:145). While the analysis presented here is very different from Moyne’s we agree with him that intensifiers and reflexives are elements of very different nature which should not be confused and that a number of problems of current approaches to binding are due to the failure to properly identify when a given element is used as an intensifier and when it is a reflexive. Unfortunately, Moyne’s call for more research on intensifiers seems to have gone unheeded until recently. See also the early typological study by Moravcsik (1972 ).
binding evident in the peculiar behavior of complex reflexives. Among these, McKay (1991), Baker (1995), Zribi-Hertz (1995), Veraart (1996), König and Siemund (1999), and Siemund (2000) have provided the inspiration for many of the insights on which the analysis presented here is based. Baker (1995) proposes to analyze what looks like locally free reflexives in English as intensified object pronouns. In a similar vein, McKay (1991) had suggested to analyze complex pronominal forms like *he himself, she herself*, etc. as intensified subject pronouns rather than as a special kind of anaphoric expression, as proposed by Bickerton (1987) and Iatridou (1986). We agree that adopting these proposals makes it possible to correctly separate intensification and binding into independent modules of the grammar. That is, a syntactic principle B accounts for the distribution of pronominals (e.g. *he, him*) while the distribution of intensifiers (e.g. *himself*) is subject to the semantic and pragmatic principles of intensification. At the end of his paper Baker (1995) suggests that this analysis may be extended to the analysis of complex reflexives in German. Stated in the terminology of this dissertation, his idea is basically that the complex reflexive *sich selbst* ‘REFL self’ is formed from its simple counterpart *sich* ‘REFL’ by the same process of adnominal intensification which is responsible for the formation of intensified DPs, e.g. *der König selbst* the king self ‘the king himself’ (see König and Siemund (1999) for an analysis of German along those lines). One of the goals of the present dissertation is to show that by adopting this approach it becomes possible to unify the account of all adnominally intensified expressions, be they reflexives, pronouns or DPs – something previous accounts of binding and intensification are unable to do. The present dissertation is thus in part an attempt to flesh out the research project outlined at the end of Baker (1995): “The aim of such work would be to gain a much clearer picture than now exists of the essential nature of locality, discourse prominence, and contrast, considered as individual subsystems of grammar, and also a better understanding of
the ways in which they interact to produce the extremely complex phenomena that we encounter in actual language use.” (Baker 1995:99). That is, we argue that the so-called complex reflexives (e.g. Danish *sig selv* ‘REFL self’ are best analyzed as adnominal intensified counterparts of the simple reflexive (e.g. Dan. *sig* ‘REFL’). By relegating reflexives anaphors and intensifiers to different modules it becomes possible to adopt a nominal approach to binding theory in which the distribution of anaphors (e.g. *sig*) and pronouns (Dan. *ham* ‘him’) follow from the interaction of lexical properties of nominal expressions and syntactic principles (e.g. LGB-style principles A and B). In contrast, the distribution of the adnominal intensifier *selv* ‘self’ is accounted for by the semantic/pragmatic principles of intensification. That is, adnominal intensifiers (e.g. Dan. *selv* ‘self’ as used in *Peter selv* ‘Peter himself’), will be given a Roothian focus-based analysis (cf. Rooth 1992). In brief, the main idea consists in analyzing ALL the elements highlighted in bold in the examples in (1-4) as adnominal intensifiers.

### 1.2 Independence of binding and intensification in Danish

In this section, we show that due to its morphologically transparent articulation of intensification and binding, Danish is particularly well suited to test the proposals defended here. As illustrated in (1-3), in many languages, including English, the mutual independence of binding and intensification is obscured by what appears to be a total morphological overlap between the elements uses as intensifiers and reflexives, see (5).
(5) System of intensification of nominal expressions in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple/Unintensified</th>
<th>Complex/Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reflexive</td>
<td>himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subj. pronoun</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Obj. pronoun</td>
<td>him, himself (&lt; him, himself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DP</td>
<td>the king, himself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other languages, e.g. the Mainland Scandinavian languages, Dutch, German etc., have morphologically distinct realizations of intensifiers and reflexives, e.g. the Danish intensifier selv ‘self’ and the simple reflexive sig ‘REFL’, see (6).

(6) System of intensification of nominal expressions in Danish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple/Unintensified</th>
<th>Complex/Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reflexive</td>
<td>sig ‘himself/herself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subj. pronoun</td>
<td>han ‘he’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Obj. pronoun</td>
<td>ham ‘him’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DP</td>
<td>kongen ‘the king’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in (5-6) the English system of nominal expressions is more opaque than the Danish system. The English form himself translates into four different expressions in Danish, viz. the simple/unintensified reflexive sig ‘REFL’, the complex/intensified reflexive sig selv ‘REFL self’, the intensified pronoun ham selv ‘(him) himself’, and the adnominal intensifier selv ‘himself’. Figure 1 below further illustrates the mutual independence of the reflexive sig ‘REFL’ and the intensifier selv ‘self’ in Danish as well as their ‘overlap’ in the so-called complex, viz. intensified, reflexive sig selv ‘REFL self’. The examples in figure 1 illustrate most of the different uses of sig ‘REFL’ and selv ‘self’ in figure 1 and (6a-d).

---

3 The system in (5) represents the standard analyses of nominal expressions in English in which himself in (5a) is assumed to be an anaphor (e.g. Peter washed himself) and himself in (5c) to be a logophor/Locally Free Reflexive(LFR) (e.g. Peter said that Mary danced with everybody except himself). In contrast, as indicated in (5c), we follow Baker 1995 in assuming the latter use of himself to derive from an underlying intensified pronoun him himself. See chapter 5 for more detailed discussion of intensified pronouns in English. We also analyze himself in (5a) and (1a) as an intensified Ø reflexive, Peter hated Ø himself. See chapter 5 for more detailed discussion of intensified Ø reflexives. See also section 1.12 where this alternative analysis English is summarized in the table in (53).
Figure 1. The intersection of the intensifier *selv* ‘self’ and the reflexive *sig* ‘REFL’ and the independence of intensification and binding.

---

Examples illustrating the different uses of *selv* and *sig* in Figure 1:

(i)  *Peter selv løste opgaven.*  
    Peter self solved problem-the  
    ‘Peter *himself* solved the problem.’

(ii) *Selv Peter løste opgaven.*  
     self Peter solved problem-the  
     ‘Even Peter solved the problem.’

(iii) *Peter løste opgaven selv.*  
      Peter solved problem-the self  
      ‘Peter solved the problem *himself.*’

(iv)  *Peter havde selv løst opgaven.*  
     Peter had self solved problem-the  
     ‘Peter had *himself* solved the problem.’

(v)   *Peter sagde at Marie dansede med alle andre end ham selv.*  
     Peter said that Marie danced with all other than him self  
     ‘Peter said that Marie danced with everybody except (him) *himself.*’

((a)+(i))  *Peter vaskede sig selv.*  
        Peter washed REFL self  
        ‘Peter washed *himself.*’

(a)     *Peter vaskede sig.*  
        Peter washed REFLE  
        ‘Peter washed.’
(b) *Laéerne løsnede sig, munden blev større.*  
   lips-the loosen REFL mouth-the became bigger  
   ‘The lips parted, the mouth grew bigger.’

(c) *Peter slog sig.*  
   Peter hit REFL  
   ‘Peter got hurt (accidentally).’

(d) *Peter skammer sig.*  
   Peter shames REFL  
   ‘Peter is ashamed.’

After setting up the independence of intensification and binding as the main hypothesis to be tested, we walk through all the cases of overlap between these modules (e.g. the different uses of intensified reflexives *sig selv*, intensified pronouns *ham selv* ‘him self’, and intensified R-expressions *Peter selv* ‘Peter himself’) as well as all the different uses of *selv* and *sig* on their own.

The core function of the element *selv ‘self’* is as a marker of adnominal intensification, e.g. sentence (i) in figure 1. The core function of the element *sig ‘REFL’* is as a reflexive pronoun, e.g. sentence (a) in figure 1. The behavior of *selv ‘self’* and *sig ‘REFL’* is thus determined by different parts of the grammar, viz. the modules of intensification and binding respectively. As figure 1 indicates, even when *sig* and *selv* come together to form the so-called complex reflexive *sig selv*, see ((a)+(i)) above, these two elements still fall under two different modules of the grammar.

Besides their core functions, both *selv ‘self’* and *sig ‘REFL’* have a number of other uses. The sentences in (ii)-(iv) illustrate the use of *selv ‘self’* as an additive scalar focus particle similar in meaning to English *even* (ii), as a manner adverbial meaning ‘by oneself, without help’ (iii), and as a quantifier-floated adnominal intensifier which is usually interpreted similarly to an inclusive particle meaning ‘also, too’ (iv). As will be shown in chapter 2, one of the advantages of the focus-based analysis presented here is that it allows for the potential unification of both core- and non-core uses of the element *selv ‘self’*. 
The sentences in (b)-(d) illustrate the non-reflexive uses of the reflexive sig ‘REFL’ in middle constructions, deagentive unaccusative predicates and inherently reflexive predicates.

The main distinction between reflexive and non-reflexives uses lies in their thematic status: reflexive sig is a theta-marked argument merging in argument position of a transitive predicate, see (a) in Figure 1, while non-reflexive sig (b-d) is non-thematic since it merges with the small v of unaccusative (forms of) predicates. Reflexive uses of simple reflexives, e.g. Dan. sig ‘REFL’, will be treated in chapter 3 where we also argue that sentences like (v) support analyzing so-called “logophors” (e.g. Dan. ham selv ‘him himself’) as adnominally intensified pronouns (cf. McKay 1991). Non-thematic uses of reflexive elements will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4.

1.3 Revisiting the analysis of simple and complex reflexives in Danish

Since Faltz’s (1977,1985) observation that complex reflexives have a tendency to be locally bound while simple reflexives allow for long-distance binding, most accounts of reflexives have aimed to explain the correlation between the morphological form of reflexives and locality constraint within the binding theory. Faltz’s difference between simple and complex reflexives has been claimed to be found in Danish, see (7).

(7)^a  a. Peter, afløste *sig, / sig, selv.
Peter replaced REFL / REFL self
‘Peter, replaced himself.’

b. Peter, bad Hansk afløse sig, sig selv.
Peter asked Hans replace REFL / REFL self
‘Peter, asked Hans to replace him.’

In the binding literature, examples like (7a,b) have been adduced as evidence that the simple reflexive sig is anti-local and specialized for LD-binding while the complex reflexive sig selv requires a local antecedent. That is, Danish has been used to support the theory that the
morphological complexity of anaphors interacts directly with locality. Indeed, most current
theories of binding assume that the correlation between morphological complexity and locality
should be encoded in the binding principles themselves. Vikner (1985) proposes that simple
\( \text{sig} \) is an anti-local anaphor while \( \text{sig} \; \text{selv} \) is a complex anaphor in which presence of \( \text{selv} \) has
the direct effect of restricting the binding domain of the anaphor. According to the proposal
defended here, Vikner’s view is misguided in several ways. First, his approach does not take
the uses of \( \text{selv} \) ‘self’ as an intensifier, e.g. (4c) into account. Second, there is strong evidence
in favor of assuming theta-marked simple \( \text{sig} \) to be a locally bound theta-role receiving
reflexive - thus falsifying claims that \( \text{sig} \) is an anti-local anaphor specialized for long-distance
binding, see (8a,b).

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{(8) a. } \text{Peter} & \text{vaskede} & \text{sig}_i \; / \; \text{sig}_i \; \text{selv}. \\
& \quad \text{Peter} & \text{washed} & \text{REFL} \; / \; \text{REFL self} \\
& \quad \text{‘Peter, washed (himself).’} \\
& \text{b. } \text{Peter} & \text{bad Hans} & \text{vaske} & \text{sig}_{ik} \; / \; \text{sig}_{ik} \; \text{selv}. \\
& \quad \text{Peter} & \text{asked Hans} & \text{wash} & \text{REFL} \; / \; \text{REFL self} \\
& \quad \text{‘Peter; asked Hans to wash him/himself.’}
\end{align*}
\]

In Reinhart & Reuland’s (1993) terminology, the simple vs. complex distinction is referred to
as a distinction between (simple) SE-anaphors and (complex) SELF-anaphors. They propose a
predicate-centered binding theory in which SELF is a reflexivizing element whose function is
to reflexive-mark predicates that are not lexically reflexive. That is, they argue that it is \( \text{selv} \)
‘self’ rather than \( \text{sig} \) ‘REFL’ which is the true reflexive element. In order to maintain this
view, they are forced to assume that simple \( \text{sig} \) can be locally bound only when occurring as
argument of inherently reflexive predicates, i.e. predicates which are lexically marked for
reflexivity. As a consequence, they have to stipulate the existence of double entries for all the
predicates which allow both locally bound simple reflexives and non-coreferential DPs as
internal arguments, e.g. \( \text{vaske} \) ‘wash’ in (8a,b). In other words, Reinhart & Reuland’s (1993)

\[\text{We adopt the convention of using the star symbol “*” to indicate the an example is ungrammatical. For examples}\]
analysis relies on an unwarranted stipulation of lexical ambiguity. To account for the fact that both the simple reflexive $\text{sig}$ and the complex reflexive $\text{sig selv}$ can be found in sentences like (8a) they need to stipulate the existence of two synonymous verbs meaning ‘wash’ differing only in the feature [+/-inherently reflexive]. In section 1.5 we argue that no such stipulation is necessary if $\text{sig selv}$ is analyzed as the adnominally intensified version of $\text{sig}$.

To account for the LD-binding of $\text{sig}$ we adopt a Pica-style analysis based on successive cyclic movement of $\text{sig}$, first to the most local TP and then, potentially, to higher TP’s at LF (cf. Pica 1984, 1986, and Jakubowicz 1994). However, in contrast to Pica who argues that it is the morpho-syntactic properties of $\text{sig selv}$ which makes LD-binding impossible we suggest that the apparent locality constraint on $\text{sig selv}$ is an epiphenomenal result of adnominally intensifying $\text{sig}$. That is, we follow König and Siemund (1999:63-4) in assuming that $\text{sig selv}$ is an intensified reflexive whose semantic and syntactic properties can be explained as deriving compositionally from the properties of its constituent parts, i.e. the simple reflexive $\text{sig}$ ‘REFL’ and the adnominal intensifier $\text{selv}$ ‘self’.

The sentence in ((a)+(i)) in figure 1 above thus illustrated the overlap of the modules of binding and intensification which gives rise to the so-called complex reflexive $\text{sig selv}$ ‘REFL self, himself’. Unlike Reinhart & Reuland’s (1993) predicate-centered approach to binding we propose a nominal approach in which binding is defined as the interaction of intrinsic properties of nominal expressions and syntactic locality constraints (cf. Chomsky 1981), see (9-10).

(9) a. An anaphor is bound in a local domain.
   b. A pronominal is free in a local domain.

which are merely pragmatically or semantically deviant/infelicitous the sharp symbol “#” is used.

5 “[I]n many European languages (i.e. Norwegian seg selv, Spanish sí mismo, Russian sam sel’ja, Italian sé stesso, etc.) [SELF anaphors] are combinations of an SE anaphor and an adnominal intensifier, whose overall meaning is simply a function of that of the two components.” (König and Siemund 1999:63-4).
Binding Domain:
Alpha is a binding domain for beta if and only if alpha is the minimal category (i.e. the smallest DP or IP/S) containing beta, a case-licensor of beta, and a SUBJECT accessible to beta.

The binding theory outlined here will be developed in more detail in chapter 3.

1.4 Adnominal intensification

Before we move on to showing how predicate meaning influences intensifier-adjunction to simple reflexives (see section 1.5), we need a theory of adnominal intensification. We argue that the semantic contribution of adnominal intensifiers (e.g. Danish selv, Eng. himself) neither always involves scalar ordering of focus alternatives (cf. Eckardt 2001) nor is reducible to centrality-effects (cf. König 1997 and Siemund 2000), but is rather very similar to that of contrastive focus which - depending on the context - may or may not involve scalar ordering of focus-generated alternatives.

Unlike the focus particle selv ‘even’, the adnominal intensifier selv ‘himself’ does not presuppose that the proposition is true for at least one other element in the focus-generated set of alternatives, see (11a) vs. (11b). This presupposition is sometimes referred to as the existential presupposition/implicature. At this point no attempt has been made to distinguish between presupposition and implicature. The two terms are used interchangeably without difference in meaning in the rest of this dissertation.

(11)  a. *Det var selv biskopen der holdt gudstjenesten. (selv ≈ even)
     It was self bishop-the who held service-the
     ‘*It was even the bishop who held the service.’

   b. Det var biskopen selv der holdt gudstjenesten. (selv ≈ himself)
     It was bishop-the self who held service-the
     ‘It was the bishop himself who held the service.’

The example in (11a) shows that the focus particle selv ‘even’ cannot occur in clefts, which imply uniqueness, because that would lead to a contradiction of the so-called existential
implicature. Since the adnominal intensifier selv ‘himself’ can occur in clefts, see (11b), we therefore conclude that it does not evoke this existential implicature which is mandatory with the focus particle even. The examples in (12)-(13), which contain predicates presupposing uniqueness, further confirm this difference between even and the adnominal intensifier.

(12) a. #Selv Dronningen gav nytårsstalen. (selv ≈ even)
   even queen-the gave new-years-speech-the
   ‘#Even the Queen delivered the New Year’s Speech.’
   b. #Even the President delivered the inaugural speech.

(13) a. Dronningen selv gav nytårsstalen. (selv ≈ himself)
   queen-the self gave new-years-speech-the
   ‘The Queen herself delivered the New Year’s Speech.’
   b. The President himself delivered the inaugural speech.

According to standard analysis of focus particles, the semantic contribution of even involves both the existential implicature illustrated (11) and a scalar implicature which orders the focus alternatives on a scale of expectedness. That is, in a sentence like Even the King came to the meeting the scalar implicature would rank the King lower on a scale of likelihood than any of its focus-generated alternatives, e.g. the Queen, the prince, the bishop, etc. Eckardt (2000) suggests that the semantic contribution of adnominal intensifiers is identical to that of the focus particle even except for the absence of existential implicature. We argue that this analysis of the semantic contribution of adnominal intensifiers in on the wrong track. While it is true that DPs adnominally intensified by selv often refer to entities which are remarkable/unexpected in a given context, this is by no means always the case, see (14-15).

(14) A very powerful earthquake struck the center of Rome and the Vatican.
   a. The Pope himself perished in the rubble.
   b. #Even the Pope perished in the rubble.

(15) We do not live in the suburbs any more.
   a. We live in Paris itself.
   b. #We even live in PARIS.
Given that an earthquake does not differentiation between people of high and low status or prominence there is no reason to expect the Pope to be less likely to perish in an earthquake than any other person living close to the epicenter, see (14a). Likewise, in (15a) the place name Paris is not intensified because it denotes an unexpected or remarkable location, but simply because it is contrasted with another location, viz. the suburbs. Notice that in both cases the adnominal intensifier is perfectly acceptable while the focus particle even, which always carries with it a scalar implicature, see (14b) and (15b), is not. We take this as evidence that the scalar implicature of even is NOT an integral part of the semantic contribution of adnominal intensifiers. We therefore conclude that the semantic contribution of the adnominal intensifier involves neither existential nor scalar implicatures and therefore is similar to plain focus, see (16-17). The formula highlighted in bold indicates a proposition.

\[(16)\]
\[\text{a. } [\text{The king himself}]_F \text{ came to the meeting.}\]
\[\text{b. } [\text{The king}]_F \text{ came to the meeting.}\]

\[(17)\]
\[\text{a. Ordinary semantic value of (16a):}\]
\[\text{if the king came to the meeting.}\]
\[\text{b. Focus semantic value of (16a):}\]
\[\text{came-to-the-meeting(x) } | \text{ x } \in D_e\]
\[\text{‘the queen came to the meeting’,}\]
\[\text{‘the prince came to the meeting’, etc.}\]

Like plain focus, the basic semantic contribution of adnominal intensification consists in contrasting the referent of the focused/intensified expression with a contextually determined set of alternatives, see (17b). The contrastiveness condition on intensification in (18) captures the fact that intensification can only occur in contexts in where the generation of contrast sets of focus-alternatives is possible.

\[\text{Notice that the existential implicature may be responsible for the unacceptability of (15b). The focus particle selv ‘even’ presupposes that the proposition is true for at least one other member of the set of alternatives. That is, in this case, the presupposition is that we lives in one or more places in addition to Paris (e.g. Rome, London, etc.).}\]
15

Contrastiveness condition on adnominal intensification:
A nominal expression (DP, pronoun, reflexive) can only be intensified adnominally if it can be contrasted with other expressions in the context in which it is found.

As shown in section 1.5, unlike the conditions on intensification proposed by Baker (1995:79-80), König (1997), Siemund (2000:154), the existence of (18) is supported by evidence from the distribution of complex reflexives.

1.5 Predicate meaning and intensification of reflexives

In this section, we outline how the analysis of intensification proposed above can account for the interaction between predicate meaning and adnominal intensification of reflexives. One of the important contributions of the present dissertation consists in proposing a new view of the interaction between predicate meaning and the choice between simple/unintensified and complex/intensified reflexives. Early versions of the binding theory (e.g. Chomsky 1981) usually had very little to say about the interaction of predicate meaning and reflexives. Binding theories which do take predicate meaning into account usually encode the different behavior of predicates with binary lexical features (e.g. Reinhart & Reuland 1993, and Zribi-Hertz 1995). Zribi-Hertz (1995) showed that non-contrastive prepositional predicates in French differ with respect to whether the element used as adnominal intensifier (lui)-même ‘(him-)same’ is or is not adjoined to the locally bound pronoun in sentences like (19-21).

(19) Pierre est fier de lui/ lui–même/Marie.
Pierre is proud of him/him-same/Marie ‘Peter is proud of himself/Marie.’

(20) Pierre est jaloux de *lui/ lui–même/Marie.
Pierre is jealous of him/him-same/Marie ‘Peter is jealous of himself/Marie.’

This presupposition clashes with the expectation that, under normal circumstances, most people live in only one place.
Pierre est hors de lui/*lui-même/*Marie. (inherrntly reflexive predicate)

Pierre is outside him/him-same/Marie
‘Peter is besides himself/Marie (of joy/anger/etc.).’

Zribi-Hertz (1995) suggests that the different behavior of predicates is encoded lexically with
the feature [+/-disjoint reference]. R&R (1993) also resorts to lexical marking to account for
the different behavior of predicates, i.e. [+/-inherently reflexive]. In contrast, the proposal
defended here assumes no binding-specific lexical features. Instead, adnominal intensification
of reflexives is assumed to be determined by pragmatic and semantic features of the governing
predicate plus those of the discourse context in which it occurs. That is, predicate meaning is
just one among many contextual factors which may influence adnominal intensification of
reflexives.

As mentioned in section 1.4, we propose a focus-based analysis of adnominal
intensification. The intensifier selv ‘self’ is associated with focus and evokes a contextually
defined set of alternatives to its associate, i.e. the host DP to which it is adjoined. Unlike the
focus particle selv ‘even’, the adnominal intensifier selv ‘self’ does not obligatorily involve
scalar ordering of alternatives. That is, it is the surrounding context which determines whether
or not the alternatives are ordered (with the associate DP being defined as the end-point of a
contextually defined scale) or whether the associate is simply singled out as ‘prominent’.

When adjoined to the reflexive sig, the intensifier, because of its meaning, will be compatible
with some predicates (22), obligatory with others (23), and impossible with still others (24).
Descriptively, predicates can thus be divided into three types determined by the distribution of
different kinds of nominal expressions in argument position: (i) those which can take as direct
object the unintensified reflexive sig, the intensified reflexive sig selv and DPs, (ii) those
which can take sig selv and DPs but not unintensified sig, and (iii) those which can only take
unintensified sig, see (22-24). The terms “neutral”, “anti-reflexive” and “inherrntly reflexive”
does not imply that we assume the existence of lexically determined predicate-classes. That is, these three terms denote distributional classes rather than lexically defined classes. As discussed in chapter 3 and 4, in certain predicates can change from an anti-reflexive to a neutral predicate depending on the larger context. König & Siemund (1999) also distinguish between different predicates classes. What he calls “other-directed” verbs corresponds more or less to what is referred to as “anti-reflexive” verbs here. See also Larsen (1997) who uses similar terms to refer to different verb-types.

(22) **“Neutral” predicates:**

a. Peter vasker sig / sig selv / bilen.
   Peter washes REFL / REFL-SELF / car-the
   ‘Peter washes himself / the car.’

b. Peter tørrer sig / sig selv / Marie.
   Peter dries REFL / REFL-SELF / Mary
   ‘Peter dries himself / Mary.’

(23) **“Anti-reflexive” predicates:**

a. Peter misunde *sig / sig selv / Marie.
   Peter envies *REFL / REFL-SELF / Mary
   ‘Peter envies himself / Mary.’

b. Peter mistænker *sig / sig selv / Marie.
   Peter suspects *REFL / REFL-SELF / Mary
   ‘Peter suspects himself / Mary.’

(24) **“Inherently reflexive” predicates:**

a. Peter dukkede sig / *sig selv / *Marie.
   Peter ducked RELF / *REFL-SELF / *Mary
   ‘Peter ducked (*himself) / *Mary.’

b. Peter tog en kniv med sig / *sig selv / *Marie.
   Peter took a knife with RELF / *REFL self / *Mary
   ‘Peter took a knife with him/*himself/*Mary.’

We argue that it is the meaning of the predicates in (22-24) - in combination with pragmatic factors and world-knowledge - which determines whether sig can occur alone in object position or whether intensification by selv is necessary. The predicates in (24) are semantically “inherently reflexive” in that they are only compatible with reflexive scenarios,
i.e. one cannot duck anybody but oneself⁷. The predicates in (23) are “anti-reflexive” in that they carry with them the presupposition that their arguments refer to (representationally) different entities, i.e. under normal circumstances it is highly unexpected for anyone to suspect himself of a crime or to envy himself. Finally, the predicates in (22) are “neutral” in the sense that they evoke no such presuppositions and consequently allow all types of direct objects. Thus, these examples illustrate that selv-intensification of reflexives follows the pattern of selv-intensified DPs by occurring only in contexts which allow for the generation of contrast sets of alternatives, thus satisfying the contrastiveness condition on adnominal intensification (18). The sentences in (24) involve predicates whose semantics excludes anything but the simple reflexive sig as internal object. Hence, since they violate (18), adnominal intensification is impossible. This analysis of complex reflexives as intensified nominal expression allows for the unification of the analyses of adnominally intensified DPs, e.g. Peter selv ‘Peter himself’ (4c), and intensified reflexives like sig selv in (22-23a,b).

1.6 Intensification and the meaning difference between simple and complex reflexives

Since Jackendoff’s (1992) paper “Madame Tussaud meets the binding theory” called attention to the fact that nominal expressions can be used to refer to statues or other types of representations of their normal referents, it has often been noted that simple and complex reflexives differ with respect to whether or not they can be used to refer to representations of the individual denoted by the antecedent. First consider the instances of locally bound sig and sig selv in (25).

⁷ The question whether the sig in dukke sig in (24a) above is a theta-role receiving argument of a transitive verb or a non-thematic sig marking unaccusativity of the predicate will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4. That is, are “inherently reflexive” verbs true transitive verbs, assigning two theta-roles, whose selection restrictions disallow anything but locally bound anaphors as internal arguments, or are they intransitive/unaccusative predicates. While most previous accounts assume that all “inherently reflexive” verbs are intransitive/unaccusative predicates, we propose that there are both transitive and unaccusative “inherently reflexive” verbs.
Imagine Bill Clinton visiting the wax museum. He notices a statue of himself with an unshaven face. Since he doesn’t like the look of the statue he takes out a razor and starts to shave it.

(a) Bill Clinton, barberede sig.
(b) Bill Clinton, barberede sig, selv.

Bill Clinton shaved RELF/REFL self
‘Bill Clinton shaved (himself).’

The sentence with the simple reflexive sig in (25a) can only have the interpretation in which the real Clinton shaves himself (i.e. the real Clinton), see (26a). It cannot have the so-called statue-reading, see (26b), in which the real Clinton shaves a statue of Clinton. In contrast, the sentence with the complex reflexive sig selv in (25b) can have both reading (26a) and (26b).

(a) Clinton<real> shaves himself<real>.
(b) Clinton<real> shaves himself<statue>.

We argue that the semantic difference between simple/unintensified and complex/intensified reflexives is a consequence of intensifier-adjunction. As described in section 1.4, adnominal intensification automatically generates a set of alternative referents for the associate of the intensifier. In the case of the complex reflexive sig selv it is the focus-generated set of alternative semantic values for sig (triggered by adnominal intensification) that licenses statue-reading in wax-museum contexts, e.g. (25b) (see also chapter 3, section 3.3.2.7.1 for more discussion of the link between adnominal intensification of reflexives and the availability of statue-readings). In its unintensified/simple form sig behaves as a variable which has to be referentially identical to its binder. In other words, adding selv to sig allows for the latter to refer to a statue/representation of its antecedent, see (25b). Thus the present approach achieves a (semantically and morphologically) fully compositional analysis of complex reflexives. Note that a similar proposal is found in König & Siemund (1999:48).

Furthermore since the anti-reflexive predicates, which require complex reflexives, see (23), all presuppose the non-identity (or at least the non-representational identity) of their arguments, we are now able to unify the account of anti-reflexivity (23) and so-called doppelgänger-
effects as illustrated by the availability of statue-readings of sig selv in (25). This unification of the analyses of anti-reflexivity and doppelgänger-effects in terms of adnominal intensification is one of the main contributions of the present dissertation.

1.7 Logophoricity and intensified pronouns

In this section we outline how the compositional analysis of reflexives based on the independence of intensification and binding (see sections 1.3 to 1.6) may be extended to the analysis of simple and complex subject and object pronouns.

Let’s begin by looking at simple/unintensified and complex/intensified subject pronouns. McKay (1991) argues that he himself is not a new kind of anaphor (pace Bickerton 1987). Using our terminology, McKay essentially proposes that he himself is an adnominally intensified pronoun. Syntactically, it behaves like its unintensified counterparts he and him in that it is subject to Principle B of the binding theory. Pragmatically, it is subject to the same semantic/pragmatic condition, i.e. (18), as other intensified nominal expressions. In this sense, McKay (1991) is the forerunner of Baker (1995) as well as the present dissertation. We thus share McKay’s conclusion that “he himself is grammatical whenever he is grammatical, and the same range of antecedent relationships is grammatically possible, though he himself requires a relevant contrast or comparison for pragmatic appropriateness” (McKay 1991:370-371). McKay uses the example in (27) to show that he himself is not a special kind of anaphoric expression, but simply an intensified pronoun which is subject to principle B.

(27) A: Mary, has been concerned about her friends. Susan said that several were going to fail the course, and Susan might be right. But Mary should think more about her own work. How will Mary do on the exam?
B: I don’t know, but Susan says that she/she/she herself/she herself will pass.

More precisely, McKay’s example in (27) falsifies Bickerton’s (1987) claim that he himself behaves like an anaphor in that it “cannot have an antecedent outside the sentence if there is a
possible antecedent inside”. McKay’s main contribution is thus to show that, given the right context, *he himself* can be bound by a sentence-external antecedent in spite of the presence of a potential antecedent inside the sentence. That is, the pronominal nature of subject pronouns is not affected by adnominal intensification. In other words, binding and adnominal intensification are independent of each other.

So far we have seen that adnominal intensification of reflexives and subject pronouns is independent of the binding properties of these elements. Taking the independence of binding and intensification to its logical conclusion we argue that it can be extended to object pronouns as well. That is we propose that the complex pronoun *ham selv* ‘him self/him himself’ in the Danish sentences (28-29) should be analyzed as intensified versions of their simple counterpart, i.e. *ham* ‘him’.

(28) a. *Jon, vil giftes med en kvinde som er stolt af #ham, selv.*
   Jon wants marry-PASS with a woman who is proud of him / him self
   ‘Jon wants to get married to a woman who is proud of him.’

   b. *Kongen troede at ingen kunne lide #ham, selv.*
   king-the thought that nobody could like him / him self
   ‘The king thought that nobody liked him.’

(29) a. *Jon, plejede at hate folk som var anderledes end ham, selv.*
   Jon used to hate people who were different than him / him self
   ‘Jon used to hate people who were different from himself.’

   b. *Carl, sagde at Marie havde snakket med alle andre end ham, selv.*
   Carl said that Marie had talked to all others than him / him self
   ‘Carl said that Marie had talked to all others than himself.’

While the distribution of the pronominal *ham* ‘him’ is determined by the syntactic principle B of the binding theory, i.e. pronouns have to be free from binding by a subject within the tensed clause, see (9b), the distribution of the element *selv* is determined by the semantic-pragmatic principle of the module of intensification, i.e. (18).

In (29) both the unintensified pronoun *ham* ‘him’ and the intensified pronouns *ham selv* ‘him self’ are allowed. In contrast, the sentences in (28) do not seem to license
intensifier-adjunction of the pronominal *ham* ‘him’ in an out-of-the-blue context. Adopting similar proposals by Zribi-Hertz (1989), Safir (1992), and König and Siemund (1999) we suggest that this difference is determined by the properties of the governing expressions. Since the expressions *anderledes end* ‘different than’ and *andre end* ‘other than’ in (29) are inherently contrastive they are able to license intensifier-adjunction to the pronoun. Lacking this ‘inherently contrastive’ quality the expressions *stolt af* ‘proud of’ and *lide* ‘like’ in (28) are unable to do so. Once again we show that the distribution of different kinds of nominal expressions (e.g. reflexive anaphors *sig* ‘REFF’, pronouns *ham* ‘him’, and r-expressions *Peter*) follows from syntactic principles of the binding theory, in this case principle B, while the distribution of the element *selv* is determined by the semantic-pragmatic principles of the module of intensification.

1.8  **Possessive reflexives, pronouns and intensifiers**

One of the main strengths of the analysis proposed here is that it can be straightforwardly extended to intensified possessive reflexives and pronouns, which constitute a major problem for predicate-based approaches to binding, e.g. Reinhart & Reuland (1993).

The Danish system of nominal expressions in possessor position is given in (30). Notice that except for the suppletive form of the intensifier, see (31), and the different case forms (assuming *sin* ‘POSSREFL’ to be the genitive form of the accusative/dative form *sig* ‘REFL’) this system is exactly the same as the one found in argument position, compare (30) with the system of argument DPs given in (6) in section 1.2.

---

8 As noted by Zribi-Hertz (1989) among others, there are a number of sentences which do not appear to have “inherently contrastive” predicates but still require “logophors” (i.e. *himself*) rather than pronominal (*him*). These and other related issues (e.g. the definition of what constitutes an “inherently contrastive predicate”) will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3.
Danish nominal expressions in possessor position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple/unintensified</th>
<th>Complex/intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reflexive</td>
<td>sin ‘his/her/one’s’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pronoun</td>
<td>hans ‘his’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. DP</td>
<td>kongens ‘the king’s’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suppletive variants of the adnominal intensifier in Danish:

- a. Argument position: selv ‘himself’
- b. Possessor position: egen ‘own’

Unlike English, Danish has a possessive reflexive, i.e. sin ‘his/her/one’s’, in addition to the possessive pronouns hans ‘his’. The distribution of simple and complex possessive reflexives and possessive pronouns follow the same general pattern as the distribution of simple and complex reflexives and pronouns in argument position. That is, like their argument position counterparts (i.e. sig ‘him, her, one’ and ham ‘him’) the distribution of simple forms, e.g. sin “POSSRELF’ and hans ‘his’, is constrained by the principles A and B of the binding theory. Sin (like sig) is a reflexive and must be bound by a subject in a local domain (38a) and hans ‘his’ (like ham ‘him’) is a pronoun which must be free in its local domain, i.e. the minimal tensed clause, here indicated with square brackets (32b).

The sentences in (33a,b) illustrate the fact that both simple/unintensified and complex/intensified possessive reflexives may be LD-bound out of infinitival clauses.

Peter, bad Hans vaske sin+hund.
Peter asked Hans wash POSSREFL dog
‘Peter, asked Hans, to wash his+hund dog.’

Peter, lod forældrene sove i sin+egen seng mens han, selv sov på sofaen i stuen.
Peter let parents-the sleep in POSSREFL own bed while he self slept on sofa-the in living room-the
‘Peter, let his, parents sleep in his own bed while he, himself slept on the sofa in the living room.’
Though LD-binding of the simple possessive reflexive *sin* is more common, LD-binding of intensified possessive reflexives is not excluded, see (33b). That is, the adjunction of the intensifier *egen* ‘own’ does not affect the LD-potential of the possessive reflexive *sin*. Once again, adnominal intensification of reflexives does not affect locality constraints.

The examples in (34-36) illustrate that Danish possessive reflexives *sin* and *sin egen* exhibit the same overall distributional pattern as the argument reflexives *sig* and *sig selv* with respect to “neutral”, “anti-reflexive” and “inherently reflexive” constructions/sentences.

(34) “Neutral” constructions:

a. *Peter vasker sin /sin egen / John’s tegnebog.*
   Peter washes POSREF /POSREF own/ John’s wallet.
   ‘Peter washes his / his own / John’s wallet.’

b. *Peter hader sin /sin egen / John’s mor.*
   Peter hates POSREF /POSREF own/ John’s mother.
   ‘Peter hates his / his own / John’s mother.’

(35) “Anti-reflexive” constructions:

a. *Peter er *sin /sin egen / John’s fjende.*
   Peter is *POSREF /POSREFL own/ John’s enemy.
   ‘Peter is his / his own / his enemy.’

b. *Peter stjæle *??sin / sin egen / John’s tegnebog.*
   Peter stole *??POSREF/ POSSREF own / John’s wallet.
   ‘Peter stole his / his own / John’s wallet.’

(36) “Inherently reflexive” constructions:

a. *Han var ved at gaa ud af sit /?* sit eget/*Peters gode skind af glæde.*
   he was about to go out of POSREF/?*POSREF own/Peter’s good skin of happiness
   ‘He nearly jumped out of his good skin of sheer happiness.’

b. *Han hyttede sit / ??sit eget /*Peters skin.* (cont. bet. a/b)
   he savede POSREF/ ??POSREF own/*Peter’s skin
   ‘He saved his own life.’

The contrast between (34) and (35) shows that it is the semantic/pragmatic make-up of the sentence which triggers intensifier-adjunction to *sin*. Based on the meanings of the predicates *vaske* ‘wash’ and *stjæle* ‘steal’ and world knowledge, native speakers know that for a given individual *x*, the proposition *x washes x’s wallet* is pragmatically OK. The proposition *x steals
x’s wallet, however, is pragmatically odd; stealing is per definition an “anti-reflexive” activity; people do not consciously steal their own belongings. Indeed, “anti-reflexivity” or “other-directedness” is an integral part of the meaning of the predicate stjæle ‘steal’, i.e. given normal circumstances the expectation is that people would not steal their own things. Hence, since anti-reflexive sentences of the type DP₁ stole POSSREFLᵢ’s DP presuppose the (representational) non-identity of the referents of the possessive reflexive and its antecedent, intensification of the possessive reflexive sin is necessary to mark the (representational) non-identity. The examples in (36) show that Danish also have “inherently reflexive” possessive constructions (usually of idiomatic nature) which – due to their semantics - disallow all but the simple unintensified reflexive possessive sin, see (18).

We therefore conclude that the distribution of Danish simple and complex possessives (sin and sin egen) in “neutral”, “anti-reflexive” and “inherently reflexive” constructions follow the same general pattern as the simple and complex argument reflexives sig and sig selv. This constitutes a major obstacle for analyses of binding which are based on the notions of co-argumenthood, e.g. Reinhart and Reuland (1993). It seems rather implausible to maintain that the difference between (34a) and (35b) should derive from the a lexical feature, e.g. Reinhart and Reuland’s [+/-inherently reflexive], or Zribi-Herts’s [+/- Disjoint reference], distinguishing between the predicates vaske ‘wash’ and stjæle ‘steal’. The structural relationship between the reflexives (i.e. sin and sin egen) and their antecedent has to be assumed to be the same all the sentences in (34-36). And yet, the sentences differ as to whether they allow the simple possessive reflexive or not. While this difference can be accounted for in terms of focus and presuppositions as illustrated above, it seems impossible to account for it in terms of any kind of predicate-centered ‘reanalysis’ or ‘lexical ambiguity’ account which only applies to co-argument binding.
1.9 Refuting anti-locality

The account of the interaction between predicate/sentence meaning and intensification of reflexives outlined in section 1.5 and 1.8 above leads us to refute the standard account of $\textit{sig}$ in Danish (Norwegian, Dutch, etc.) which is based on the assumption that thematic $\textit{sig}$ is an anti-local anaphor which can never be locally bound (cf. Holmberg, (1984), Vikner (1985), etc.). That is, the binding theory proposed here does allow simple reflexives to be locally bound. Rather than being due to any inherent anti-locality of the simple reflexive $\textit{sig}$, it is semantic or pragmatic factors which conspire to prevent local binding of unintensified reflexives in certain cases, e.g. anti-reflexive predicates (23) and (35). As shown above, intensifier-adjunction to simple reflexives is determined not by the binding theory but by the module of intensification and follows directly from semantic and pragmatic properties of the predicates and the larger context. In other words, anti-locality as an intrinsic property of simple reflexives does not exist; or, at least not in Dutch, Danish and the other Mainland Scandinavian languages.

Although we do reject the idea that $\textit{sig}$ is anti-local, we still acknowledge the existence in Danish of two different uses of unintensified $\textit{sig}$: (i) $\textit{sig}$ used as a thematic reflexive pronoun as in (37), (ii) $\textit{sig}$ used as a non-thematic grammatical marker of unaccusativity as in (38-40).

\begin{itemize}
  \item (37) a. \textit{Peter vaskede sig.}
  b. \textit{Peter vaskede sig selv.}
  c. \textit{Peter vaskede Hans.}
  \begin{verbatim}
  Peter vaskede REFL / REFL self / Hans
  \end{verbatim}
  \begin{quote}
  ‘Peter washed (himself)/Hans.’
  \end{quote}

  \item (38) \textbf{Deponent $\textit{sig}$-verbs:}

  a. \textit{Peter opførte sig / *sig selv / *Hans godt.}
  \begin{verbatim}
  Peter behaved REFL/REFL self/Hans well
  \end{verbatim}
  \begin{quote}
  ‘Peter behaved well.’
  \end{quote}

  b. \textit{Peter skammer sig / *sig selv / *Hans.}
  \begin{verbatim}
  Peter shames REFL/REFL self/Hans
  \end{verbatim}
  \begin{quote}
  ‘Peter is ashamed.’
  \end{quote}
\end{itemize}
Deagentive unaccusatives (inanimate subject) with transitive counter-parts:

   door-the opened REFL/REFL self/window-the
   ‘The door opened.’

b. *Døren lukkede sig / *sig selv / *vinduet.
   door-the closed REFL/REFL self/window-the
   ‘The door closed.’

(40) Deagentive unaccusatives (animate subject) with transitive counterparts:

a. *Peter slog sig (på bordkanten).
   Peter hit REFL on table-edge-the
   ‘Peter got hurt (on the edge of the table).’

b. *Peter brændte sig (på ovnen).
   Peter burned REFL on oven-the
   ‘Peter got burned on the oven.’

The *sig in (37a) is thematic. That is, it merges in object position of the transitive verb vaske
‘wash’ from which it receives the THEME theta-role. In this respect it is no different from the
direct object DP *Hans in (37c) or the intensified reflexive *sig selv in (37b). In contrast, the *sig
in (38-40) does not receive any theta-role. The verbal predicates in (38-40) are either lexically
unaccusative, e.g. *skamme ‘shame’ and *skynde ‘hurry’ in (38), or unaccusative predicates with
transitive counterparts, e.g. *åbne ‘open, lukke close’, *slå ‘hit’, and *brænde in (39-40). The
transitive counterparts of these verbs are given in (41).

(41) a. *Peter åbnede døren.
   Peter opened door-the
   ‘Peter opened the door.’

b. *Peter lukkede døren.
   Peter closed door-the
   ‘Peter closed the door.’

c. *Peter slog sig/sig selv/Hans med en kølle.
   Peter hit REFL/REFL self/Hans with a club
   ‘Peter hit himself/Hans with a club.’

d. *Peter brændte sig/sig selv/Hans med en cigaret.
   ‘Peter burned himself/Hans with a cigarette
   ‘Peter burned himself/Hans with a cigarette.’

Rather than assuming the existence of two different *sig’s we attribute the difference between
(37) vs. (38-40) to differences with respect to where in the derivation *sig initially merges. As
mentioned above, the *sig in (37) merges in object position of the verb where it receives the
internal theta-role. This option is not available for the unaccusative predicates in (38-40) where it is the subject which initially merges in object position receiving the unique theta-role of the predicate before it moves up to the subject position. We propose that in these cases sig does not receive any theta-role since it merges directly with the small v of the vP projection responsible for the voice properties of the predicate.

While we do acknowledge that two different uses of sig must be recognized we strongly disagree with the claim that thematic sig is anti-local (cf. Vikner (1985), Lidz (2001), etc.) or that it may only be locally bound by predicates which are lexically marked as [+inherently reflexive] (cf. Reinhart & Reuland (1993)). That is, we argue that thematic sig can be locally bound with certain predicates, e.g. neutral predicates like vaske ‘wash’ in (37).

Both Vikner’s and Reinhart & Reuland’s approaches run into problems with (37a). In order to account for the absence of overt reflexive marking (by the element selv ‘self) in (37a) R&R have to assume that vaske ‘wash’ is lexically [+inherently reflexive] in (37a) but not in (37b,c). Since there is no independent evidence for the existence of double entries for the verb vaske ‘wash’ such a stipulation is best avoided. Indeed, as shown in (42) the only difference in meaning between (37a) and (37b) is due to the adnominal intensification of sig, see (42a) vs. (42b).

(42)  

a.  Peter vaskede sig.  
    ([+agentive], intentional event, [-contrast])  
b.  Peter vaskede sig selv.  
    ([+agentive], intentional event, [+contrast])  
c.  Peter vaskede Hans.  
    ([+agentive], intentional event, [-contrast])  
d.  Peter vaskede Hans selv.  
    ([+agentive], intentional event, [+contrast])

  Peter washed REFL/REFL self/Hans/Hans self
  ‘Peter washed (himself)/Hans (himself).’

Since in our analysis the difference between (42a) vs. (42b) and (42c) vs. (42d) follows from the theory of adnominal intensification, there is no need for the ad hoc stipulation that Danish has double lexical entries for neutral predicates like vaske ‘wash’. Vikner’s anti-locality approach does not fare much better. Basically, his proposal consists in assuming that local sig
is “some sort of detransitivising element that somehow prevents the assignment of the theta-role that would otherwise have been assigned to the subject” (Vikner 1985:50, footnote 8). This analysis correctly predicts the non-agentive nature of the sentences with simple *sig* in (38-40), i.e. these sentences are not compatible with purpose clauses (e.g. ‘in order to’) or adverbials like *deliberately*. However, it has trouble explaining why both purpose clauses, e.g. ‘in order to’, and adverbials like *deliberately* are ok in (37a). In contrast, the analysis proposed here correctly predicts that (37a) and (42a) should have agentive subjects since *vaske* is assumed to remain the same transitive verb in all of (37a-c) and assign both an AGENT theta-role (to the external argument *Peter*) and a THEME theta-role (to the internal object *sig*).

In chapter 4 a number of additional syntactic and semantic tests will be adduced to support our proposal that thematic *sig* is neither anti-local nor needs to be reflexive-marked by *selv* ‘self’ to be locally bound. Finally, notice that in addition to avoiding unnecessary proliferation of lexical entries for neutral predicates it also makes it possible to assume the existence of only one *sig* which may merge in different positions in the derivation: (i) in object position in the case of thematic *sig*, see (43a), and (ii) in the *v* of the voice projection *vP* in the case of non-thematic *sig*, see (43b).

(43) a. **Thematic sig:**

```
     / \ 
    .... V' 
   /   \ 
  V  sig
```

b. **Non-thematic sig:**

```
     / \ 
    .... v' 
   /   \ 
  /   \ VP
 sig v  / \ 
   / \ 
  V  ....```
1.10 Self-nominalizations

In chapter 7 the use of the element selv ‘self’ in nominalization will be discussed. It has been argued that selv ‘self’ functions as a reflexive in nominalizations such as selvrespekt ‘self-respect’. That selv ‘self’ should function as a reflexive in nominalizations (rather than the simple reflexive sig ‘REFL’, e.g. *sig-respekt ‘REFL-respect’) has been taken as evidence in favor of analyzing selv ‘self’ as a reflexivizing element (cf. Reinhart and Reuland (1993)) and could thus potentially be construed as an argument against the analysis defended here, namely that binding of reflexives (i.e. sig) and the distribution of intensifiers (i.e. selv) are controlled by two separate modules of the grammar. In chapter 7 these issues will be discussed and an alternative analysis will be proposed in which the element selv ‘self’ is consistently assumed to be an intensifier even in its word-internal uses.

1.11 Unification of all uses of adnominal expressions

Before moving on to exploring the consequences of extending the present analysis to English and Mandarin Chinese, let us first summarize some its main advantages. First of all, unlike current versions of binding theory (e.g. Reinhart & Reuland (1993), Lidz (2001), Huang & Liu (2001), etc.) the present approach provides a morphologically fully transparent articulation of interaction between intensification and binding: nominal expressions (be they DPs, reflexives, or pronouns) to which selv ‘self’ has been adjoined, see (44) are all intensified in the same way and have to obey the contrastiveness condition on intensification (18).

(44) System of intensification of nominal expressions in Danish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unintensified</th>
<th>Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reflexive</td>
<td>sig ‘himself/herself’</td>
<td>sig selv ‘himself/herself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subj. pronoun</td>
<td>han ‘he’</td>
<td>han selv ‘he himself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Obj. pronoun</td>
<td>ham ‘him’</td>
<td>ham selv ‘him himself/himself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DP</td>
<td>kongen ‘the king’</td>
<td>kongen selv ‘the king himself’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, the present analysis avoids unwarranted proliferation of lexical entries. Most other approaches to binding and intensification all rely on the assumption of either (i) double lexical entries for neutral predicates (e.g. Reinhart & Reuland (1993)), or (ii) double/multiple lexical entries for intensifiers (e.g. Vikner (1985), Reinhart & Reuland (1993), or both. In the present approach selv is ALWAYS an intensifier and thus falls under the binding-independent module of intensification. The different subparts of complex reflexives (e.g. sig selv ‘REFL self’) and pronouns (han selv ‘he himself’) thus fall under different modules, see (45).

(45) Independence of binding and intensification of intensified nominal expressions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Binding:</th>
<th>Intensification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Intensified reflexives:</td>
<td>sig (principle A (9a))</td>
<td>selv (contrastiveness condition (18))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Intensified pronouns:</td>
<td>ham (principle B (9b))</td>
<td>selv (contrastiveness condition (18))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Intensified DPs:</td>
<td>Peter (principle C)</td>
<td>selv (contrastiveness condition (18))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, unlike Reinhart & Reuland’s (1993) predicate-centered approach to binding we propose a nominal approach in which binding is defined as the interaction of intrinsic properties of nominal expressions and syntactic locality constraints, e.g. principle A and principle B, see (9a,b) and (45a,b).

1.12 Extending the analysis to Modern English

The cross-linguistic applicability of the analysis defended here is demonstrated by showing how it can be extended to reflexives, pronouns and intensifiers in Modern English. We argue that the proposal in (46) make it possible to analyze the system of intensified and unintensified nominal expressions as having the same degree of morphological transparency as the Danish system in (44), see (47).

(46) a. English x-self (e.g. himself, herself, etc.) are not reflexive anaphors but ALWAYS adnominal intensifiers (e.g. the king himself).
    b. Modern English has Ø-reflexives, e.g. Peter, washes Ø.
    c. What looks like locally bound reflexives, e.g. Peter replaces himself, are really locally bound adnominally intensified Ø-reflexives, e.g. Peter, replaces Ø, himself (cf. Siemund 2000 for an outline of a similar analysis)
What looks like locally free reflexives (also called “logophors”) are really intensified pronominals whose pronominal part is not realized phonetically (due to a phonological deletion rule), e.g. *Peter, said that Mary danced with everyone but [him] himself.* (The square brackets contains the phonetically unrealized pronominal).

### System of intensification of nominal expressions in Modern English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unintensified</th>
<th>Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a.</strong> Reflexive</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong> Subj. pronoun</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c.</strong> Obj. pronoun</td>
<td>him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d.</strong> DP</td>
<td>Peter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We propose to consistently analyze *himself* as an intensifier everywhere it occurs. Such an analysis becomes possible if we assume the existence of a Ø reflexive in English. By assuming that the internal argument position of the verb *wash* in (48) is filled by a Ø reflexive in (48a(ii)) and an intensified Ø reflexive, i.e. Ø *himself*, in (48a(iii)), we are able to unify the account of intensified and unintensified reflexives in Danish and English: in both languages the intensified forms of the reflexive pronouns are formed by the same process of intensifier adjunction which is responsible for intensification of DPs like *Peter selv* ‘Peter himself’ and which is subject to the contrastiveness condition (18).

### Neutral verbs:

- a. *He, washes* *him, / Ø, / Ø, himself.*
- b. *Han, vasker* [ham, / sig, / sig, selv.]

### Anti-reflexive verbs:

- a. *He, suspects* *him, / *Ø, / Ø, himself.*
- b. *Han, mistænker* [ham, / *sig, / sig, selv.]

### Inherently reflexive verbs:

- a. *He, rests* *him, / Ø, / *Ø, himself.*
- b. *Han, hviler* [ham, / sig, / *sig, selv.]

We argue that the data in (48-50) show that English Ø-reflexives, e.g. *Peter, washed Ø,* correspond to unintensified reflexives in Danish, e.g. *Peter, vaskede sig,* ‘Peter washed’. The English x-self form reflexives can thus be viewed as intensified versions of the unintensified Ø-reflexives, e.g. *Peter washed Ø, himself ≈ (Dan.) Peter vaskede sig selv ‘Peter washed*
REFL self”. Furthermore, the fact that, to a large extent, the distribution of *himself* follow that of the adnominal intensifier *selv* in Danish also supports our claim that English x-self, e.g. *himself, herself, ourselves*, etc., are always intensifiers – never reflexives; just like *selv ‘self*’ in Modern Danish, and *self* in Old English.

In a similar vein, the neutralization of the morphological distinction between intensified pronouns and intensified reflexives in English (both appearing to be realized as *himself*), can be explained by assuming the existence of a deletion rule which erases redundant pronominal elements. Since the English intensifier *himself* is morphologically specified for the same features as the pronoun *him*, the intensified pronoun resulting from the adjoining the former to the latter would end up being overtly marked twice for the same features. With such a rule it now becomes possible to analyze locally free instances of *himself* (also called “logophors”) as intensified pronouns, e.g. [him]*himself*, on a par with their Danish counterparts, e.g. *ham selv ‘him himself*, see (51) and (52). The pronominal enclosed in square brackets e.g. [him]*himself*, indicates the morpheme deleted by the morphological reduction rule. This notation will be used hereafter to refer to the morphologically reduced intensified object pronouns.

(51)  Peter said that Mary danced with everyone except [him] *himself*.

(52)  Peter sagde at Marie dansede med alle andre end *ham, selv*.

Peter said that Mary danced with all others than him self
‘Peter said that Mary danced with everyone except himself.’

---

9 The fact that reduction of intensified pronouns applies to accusative/dative forms (e.g. *him himself* > [him] *himself*) but not to nominative forms (e.g. *he himself*) may be taken as indication that: (i) case features matters, or (ii) phonological identity (i.e. haplology) is at play. Both of hypothesis (i) and (ii) run into problems with forms like [us] *ourselves* and [you] *yourself* where the pronouns differ from the adjoined intensifiers in both case (us/you are accusative vs. our/your which are genitive, etc.) and phonological realization. As these examples illustrate, the relevant reduction rule is not fully understood at this point. See chapter 5 for more discussion of English intensifiers. Note also that Mandarin Chinese, which does not distinguish overtly between subject and object pronouns (e.g. *Ta, hen ta, ‘he hates him’), does not allow subject pronouns to be intensified by complex intensifiers (e.g. *Ta taziji hen wo ‘he himself hates me’). This may be construed as evidence supporting both (i) and (ii). See chapter 6 for more discussion of intensifiers in Mandarin Chinese.
In both languages the intensified object pronouns are composed of a pronominal + the
adnominal intensifier. The only difference is that the pronominal part of the English
intensified pronoun is rendered inaudible by the morphological reduction rule (51), while it is
phonetically realized in Danish (52). See chapter 5 for further discussion of these and other
issues related to the analysis of Modern English.

1.13 Historical evolution of English reflexives and intensifiers

In the second half of chapter 5 we argue that the account of Modern English proposed above
makes it possible to understand hitherto unexplained facts in the evolution of intensifiers and
reflexives from Old English into Modern English, see (53).

(53)  a.  The Old English intensifier self was fused with pronouns to form the
     compound x-self intensifiers, e.g. him+self >> himself.
     b.  Old English lost locally bound pronouns and developed Ø-reflexives to
     replace them, e.g. Peter, washed him, >> Peter, washed Ø.

b.  The formation of x-self forms also took place in the 1st and 2nd persons (this is
unexpected in most traditional accounts which assume that the initial
motivation for adnominal intensification of locally bound pronouns in Old
English was to disambiguate between disjoint reference and coreference
readings).

As shown in (54) Old English had a morphologically simple intensifier self but lacked
morphologically specialized reflexives, using locally bound pronominals instead (54a).

(54)  Stage one: system of intensification of nominal expressions in Old English10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unintensified</th>
<th>Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Locally bound pron.</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subject pronoun</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Locally free pronoun</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DP</td>
<td>the king</td>
<td>the king self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 For ease of exposition, the forms in this table are adapted forms which have been made to be as similar as
possible to Modern English forms by ignoring certain aspects of Old English morphology and spelling. The Old
English intensifier self was overtly marked for case agreement. Though it has been argued that case plays an
important role in the historical evolution of intensifiers and reflexives in English (cf. Farr (1905), and E. van
Gelder (2000), among others) case has not been included here. See chapter 5, section 5.3 for more discussion of
the role of case in the evolution of intensifiers and reflexives in English.
(55) System of intensification of nominal expressions in Modern English (= (47)).

Unintensified               Intensified
a. Reflexive   Ø               Ø  himself
b. Subject pronoun he           he  himself
   c. Object pronoun him          [him]  himself (<him himself)
d. DP           Peter           Peter  himself

The sentences in (56) illustrate local binding of pronominals in Old English. They also illustrate how predicate meaning affects intensifier-adjunction (killing is an other-directed/anti-reflexive activity while defending is neutral).

(56)¹¹
a. Hine, he, beweradhan mid wæpnum. (Old English)
   him he defended with weapons
   ‘He, defended himself, with weapons.’

b. Hannibal, ... hine, selfe mid atre acwealde. (Old English)
   Hannibal him self with poison killed
   ‘Hannibal killed himself with poison.’

In chapter 5 we argue that assuming the system of intensified and unintensified nominal expressions in Modern English to be as outlined in (55), allows us to explain the evolution of the Old English (54) into Modern English in a rather straightforward way as a consequence of replacement of locally bound pronouns with Ø-reflexives at a certain point in history, compare (54a) and (55a). As a result of the substitution of locally bound pronouns with Ø-reflexives, in Old English the form him self was reanalyzed as an intensifier.

1.14 Extending the analysis to Mandarin Chinese

In chapter 6 we argue that the analysis based on the independence of intensification and binding can be extended to reflexives and intensifiers in Mandarin Chinese. The Chinese intensifier element ziji 自 己 ‘self-self’ has a great deal in common with Modern English himself and it will be shown that these similarities can be used to argue that the Ø-reflexive analysis of Modern English proposed in chapter 5 may be extended to Chinese. First, like the
English adnominal intensifier *himself* (57) the Chinese adnominal intensifier 自己 *ziji* also appears to be able to function as a reflexive anaphor, see (58).

(57) 皇帝自己來了。  
*Huang-di ziji lai-le.*  
emperor self-self come-PERF  
‘The emperor himself came.’  

(58) 皇帝恨自己。  
*Huang-di hen ziji.*  
emperor hate self-self  
‘The emperor hates himself.’

However, as discussed above, the peculiar properties of *ziji* and *himself* when allegedly used as reflexives, compared with reflexive anaphors in other languages, e.g. Danish *sig*, Dutch *zich*, French *se*, follow from the fact that they are ALWAYS adnominal intensifiers, which have long been *mistakenly* assumed to be reflexive anaphors. The differences between, elements like Chinese *ziji* and English *himself* (which are both ALWAYS intensifiers) and true reflexives like Danish *sig* and Dutch *zich* are illustrated by the fact is that *ziji* and *himself* do not have any of the non-reflexive uses (e.g. reciprocal, middles, medio-passives, unaccusatives, deponent verb, etc.) displayed by simple reflexive elements many other languages, e.g. Dan. *sig*, Ger. *sich*, see (59b-e).

---

Typological survey of reflexive and non-reflexive uses of reflexive elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Danish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. reflexive</td>
<td>ziji</td>
<td>himself</td>
<td>se/soi</td>
<td>sich</td>
<td>sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. reciprocal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>sich</td>
<td>-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. middle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>sich</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. medio-pass.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>sich</td>
<td>-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. deponent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>sich</td>
<td>-s/sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. intensifier</td>
<td>ziji</td>
<td>himself</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, as shown in (59f), both English *himself* and Chinese *ziji* can function as intensifiers, something the reflexives in Danish, French, German and Russian are unable to do, see (59f). So except for the reflexive uses, Chinese *ziji* and English *himself* are basically in complementary distribution with the Danish reflexive *sig* (as well as with Ger. *sich*, Fr. *se*, Russian *-sja*). On the other hand, as discussed in chapter 2, section 2.9, Chinese *ziji* and English *himself* display most of the uses of the Danish intensifier *selv*, see (60).

Typological survey of different uses of adnominal intensifiers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Danish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Adnominal intensifier</td>
<td>guo-wang (ta) ziji the king <em>himself</em> le roi (lui-)mème</td>
<td>kongen <em>selv</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Complex reflexive</td>
<td>Ø ziji</td>
<td>Ø <em>himself</em></td>
<td>soi-mème/lui-mème</td>
<td><em>sig</em> <em>selv</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Doppelgänger-marker</td>
<td>Ø ziji</td>
<td>Ø <em>himself</em></td>
<td>soi-mème</td>
<td><em>sig</em> <em>selv</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Intensified pron/logop.</td>
<td>[ta] ziji / ta ziji [him] <em>himself</em></td>
<td>[lui] lui-mème</td>
<td><em>ham</em> <em>selv</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Exclusive adverb. inten.</td>
<td>ziji</td>
<td><em>himself</em></td>
<td>lui-mème</td>
<td><em>selv</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We take the complementary distribution of *ziji* and *himself* vs. *sig*, see (59), as well as the similar distribution of *ziji* and *himself* vs. *selv*, see (60), as strong support of the assumption that both *ziji* and *himself* always are intensifiers rather than reflexive anaphors. The apparent reflexive uses of *ziji* and *himself* in (58)/(59a) can be explained if we assume that Chinese and English both have Ø-reflexives which can be intensified by the adnominal intensifiers *ziji* and *himself* respectively, see Ø *himself* and Ø *ziji* in (60a). In other words, the absence of non-thematic uses of *ziji* and *himself* plus their consistent behavior as intensifiers provide strong

---

12 Danish has two reflexive elements: (i) the ‘free form’ reflexive *sig ‘REFL’*, and (ii) the bound morpheme –*s* which is a medio-passive/reciprocal suffix derived historically from an encliticized form of the Old Norse reflexive pronouns *sik ‘REFL’*. A similar situation obtains in Russian which also have two reflexive elements: (i) the ‘free form’ reflexive *sebja ‘REFL’*, and (ii) the bound morpheme –*sja* which is also a middle/reciprocal suffix derived historically from an encliticized form of *sebja ‘REFL’*. 
support for the analysis of intensified and unintensified nominal expressions in Chinese, outlined in (61).

(61) Systems of intensified and unintensified nominal expressions in Chinese, Danish and English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple/unintensified</th>
<th>Complex/intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reflexives</td>
<td>(i) Chinese Ø</td>
<td>Ø ziji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Danish sig</td>
<td>sig selv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) English Ø</td>
<td>Ø himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Obj. Pron.</td>
<td>(i) Chinese ta</td>
<td>(ta) ziji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Danish ham</td>
<td>ham selv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) English him</td>
<td>[him]₁₄ himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Subj. Pron.</td>
<td>(i) Chinese ta</td>
<td>ta ziji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Danish han</td>
<td>han selv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) English he</td>
<td>he himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DPs</td>
<td>(i) Chinese huang-di</td>
<td>huang-di ziji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Danish kejseren</td>
<td>kejseren selv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) English the emperor</td>
<td>the emperor himself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of Chinese outlined in (61), which yields a morphological transparent system of adnominal intensification, is based on the hypotheses listed in (62).

(62) a. Chinese ziji is not a reflexive anaphor but rather an adnominal intensifier (e.g. huangdi ziji ‘the emperor himself’).

b. Chinese has Ø-reflexives, e.g. Peter, shu Ø [de] tou ‘Peter combed Ø₁₄’.

c. What looks like locally bound reflexives, e.g. Peter, hen ziji, ‘Peter hates himself’, is really locally bound adnominal intensively intensified Ø-reflexives, e.g. Peter, hen Ø, ziji ‘Peter hates Ø, himself’.

d. What looks like locally free reflexives (also sometimes called “logophors”) is really adnominal intensively intensified pronouns, e.g.: Peter 說 Mary 跟除了(他)自己了以外所有的人跳舞。

\[Peter, shuo Mary gen chu-le (ta) ziji yi-wai suo-you de ren tiao-wu\]

P say M with except he self-self INST-outside that-have DE people dance ‘Peter, said that Mary danced with everyone except [him] himself.’

¹₃ The material enclosed in square brackets is assumed to have been rendered phonologically zero by a morphological deletion rule which will be discussed in more detail in chapter 5 and 6.

¹₄ As discussed in chapter 6, the clearest evidence for the existence of Ø-reflexive in Mandarin Chinese are found in inalienable constructions in which the Ø-reflexive occurs in possessor position:

| i | a. 張三梳小孩子的頭。 |
|   | Zhangsan, shu xiao haizi, de tou. |
|   | Zhangsan comb small child DE head |
| b. 張三梳自己子的頭。 |
|   | Zhangsan, shu Ø, ziji de tou. |
|   | Zhangsan comb self-self DE head |
| c. 張三梳頭。 |
|   | Zhangsan, shu Ø, [de] tou. |
|   | Zhangsan comb Ø head ‘Zhangsan combs the child’s/his (own) head.’ |
In addition to exploring the pros and cons of adopting the analysis outlined above for Mandarin Chinese, chapter 6 will also contain discussion of whether Chinese allows for adnominal intensification of PRO or if sentences like (62d) should be analyzed as having intensified Ø subject pronouns.

1.15 Conclusion

The main proposals of the approach to binding and intensification advocated in this dissertation are summarized in (63).

(63) Main proposals:

a. Binding and intensification belong to separate modules of the grammar.

b. Adnominal intensification is subject to pragmatic/semantic factors, should be given a focus-based account, see (18).

c. A nominal rather than a predicate-based approach to binding is necessary. The distribution of nominal expressions is determined by the interaction of the feature properties of nominal expressions and syntactic locality constraints (principles A and B), see (9)-(10).

d. Complex reflexives are intensified nominal expressions on a par with intensified DPs. That is, we propose a unified analysis of all uses of adnominal intensifiers (e.g. Dan. kongen selv ‘the king himself’, and sig selv ‘REFL self’ ≈ Eng. the king himself, Ø himself, etc.).

e. Intensification of simple reflexives is determined by a combination of:
   (i) pragmatics, i.e. background knowledge of participants in the utterance situation, and
   (ii) predicate meaning.

f. (1e) leads to a tripartite typology of predicates:
   (i) anti-reflexive predicates, which presuppose (representational) non-identity of their arguments,
   (ii) inherently reflexive predicates, which presuppose identity of their arguments, and
   (iii) neutral predicates, which evoke no such presuppositions.

Additional results of the analysis proposed here are listed in (64).
(64)  a. Contrary to what is often proposed in the literature, the simple reflexive sig ‘REFL’ in Danish (= Dutch zich, Nor. seg, etc.) is not-anti-local.

b. Local sig can be a true theta-role receiving anaphor.

c. Unification of reflexive and non-reflexive uses of sig: the same element is used in both cases but it merges in different places in the derivation: reflexive, theta-marked sig merges as internal argument of the predicate, non-reflexive sig merges with the head of the vP projection responsible for the diathesis of the sentence. In terms of its feature composition it is the same sig in both cases.

As mentioned throughout this introductory chapter many of the ideas presented in this dissertation have been proposed before. However, they have rarely been elaborated in any detail and they have never before been put together to form a coherent and comprehensive framework. Furthermore, the cross-linguistic validity of the analysis of intensification and binding presented here has been illustrated by outlining how it can be extended to both Modern English and Mandarin Chinese. Finally, the Ø-reflexive analysis of modern English proposed here receives further support from the fact that it makes it possible to explain the historical evolution of intensifiers and reflexives.