Chapter 2  
Intensification

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is dedicated to the theory of intensification. Basing the discussion mainly on Danish and English data, we propose a focus-based analysis of adnominal intensifiers, e.g. *himself* and *selv* ‘self’ in (1).

(1) **Intensified DPs:**
   
a. *Peter selv deltog i mødet.*
   Peter self partook in meeting-the
   ‘Peter himself attended the meeting.

   b. *Peter himself attended the meeting.*

The semantic contribution of adnominal intensifiers has been previously thought to involve scalar ordering of focus alternatives (as argued by Eckardt 2001), or to be reducible to centrality-effects (as argued by König (1997) and Siemund (2000)). Instead, we propose that it is similar to that of focus, which – depending on the context - may or may not involve scalar ordering of focus-generated alternatives. In certain respects, the present analysis is close to Baker (1995), whose analysis of adnominal intensification is based on prominence and contrastiveness. But unlike Baker (1995) whose analysis includes both a prominence and a contrastiveness condition on intensification, we propose to reduce the analysis of intensification to a single condition, viz. the contrastiveness condition in (2).

(2) **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.

---

1 As noted by Siemund (2000:16), adnominal intensifiers such as English *himself*, Danish *selv*, German *selbst*, etc., are not the only expressions used as intensifiers in these languages. Indeed, these languages all have a number of expressions which can be used for the purpose of emphasis or intensification, see (i), (ii), which are based on Siemund (2000:16, (2.28) and (2.29)), and (iii).

   (i) English: *personally, in person, in itself, x-self*, etc.
   (ii) German: *persönlich, höchstpersönlich, in Person, an sich, leibhaftig, in sich, von sich aus*, etc.
   (iii) Danish: *personlig ‘personally’, i egen person ‘personally, in person’, i sig selv ‘in itself’, etc.

Needless to say, a comprehensive theory of intensification would have to include all these expressions. However, this would far exceed the scope of the present dissertation.
The analysis of the morphology, syntax and semantics of adnominal intensifiers is presented in section 2.2. The advantage of the analysis of adnominal intensification proposed here is that it can be extended to uses of *selv* ‘self’ which have usually been considered to be different from adnominal intensifiers, see (3a, ii-iv).

(3) Different uses of *selv*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>adnominal intensification</strong></td>
<td><strong>selv in secondary predication constructions</strong></td>
<td><strong>selv as a noun</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. intensified DPs</td>
<td>(7) (sect. 2.3)</td>
<td>(9) (sect. 2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. intensified reflexives</td>
<td>(4) (chap. 3, section 3.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. intensified pronouns</td>
<td>(5) (chap. 3, section 3.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. q-floated intensifier</td>
<td>(6) (sect. 2.2.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>selv</em> in secondary predication constructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. scalar additive focus particle ‘even’</td>
<td>(8) (sect. 2.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. <em>selv</em> as a noun</td>
<td>(9) (sect. 2.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. adjectival forms of the intensifier</td>
<td>(10) (sect. 2.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. <em>selv</em> in nominalizations</td>
<td>(11) (sect. 2.7, chap. 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in (3a), we propose to unify as cases of adnominal intensification a number of uses of *selv* ‘self’ hitherto analyzed as different phenomena. Most importantly, in chapter 3 we argue that the so-called complex reflexives (3a,ii), e.g. Dan *sig selv* ‘REFL self’, see (4), and complex pronouns (3a,iii), e.g. Dan. *ham selv* ‘(him) himself’, see (5), should be analyzed as intensified nominal expressions on a par with intensified DPs (3a,i), e.g. Dan. *Peter selv* ‘Peter himself’, see (1).

(4) **Intensified reflexives:**

*Peter mistænkte sig selv.*

‘Peter suspected himself.’

(5) **Intensified pronouns:**

*[..] på onsdag flyver Jakobsen til Malaysia for at forhandle, hvad der ifølge ham, selv kan blive til kontrakter på 300 km kystsikring. (JP July 20, 2003)*

on Wednesday flies Jakobsen to Malaysia for to negotiate what there according-to him self can become to contracts on 300 km coast securing ‘Wednesday Jacobsen flies to Malaysia to negotiate what according to (him) himself could turn into contracts for 300 km coast securing.’

Since intensified reflexives and pronouns are dealt with in detail in chapter 3, they will only be mentioned cursorily in the remainder of this chapter, which focuses more on the other uses of …
intensifiers. For example, in section 2.2.5 we argue that what has been referred to as an “inclusive adverbial intensifier” (cf. König (1997)) meaning ‘also, too’, compare (6a-b) and (6c), should be analyzed as a quantifier-floated adnominal intensifier (3a,iv).

(6) **Quantifier-floated adnominal intensifiers:**
   a. *Peter, var [t, selv] blevet nomineret til en Oscar.*
      
      ‘Peter had himself been nominated for an Oscar.’
   b. *Peter, had [t, himself] been nominated for an Oscar.*
   c. *Peter had also been nominated for an Oscar.*

In addition to showing that the phenomena in (3a,i-iv) are all instances of adnominal intensification falling under the contrastiveness condition in (2), we propose that the analysis of intensification presented here has the potential to be extended to all the non-adnominal uses of *selv* ‘self’, see (3b-f). Cross-linguistically the elements used as adnominal intensifiers are also frequently found in a number of other uses, e.g. as so-called “exclusive adverbial intensifiers” meaning ‘by oneself, without help’ (3b), see Eng. *himself* and Dan. *selv* in (7), and as additive scalar focus particles meaning ‘even’ (3c), see Fr. *même* ‘same’ and Dan. *selv* in (8).

(7) **Intensifiers in secondary predication constructions (“exclusive adverbial selv”):**
   a. *Peter skrev stilen selv.*
      
      ‘Peter wrote the essay himself.’
   b. *Peter wrote the essay himself.*

(8) **Intensifiers used as scalar additive focus particles ‘even’:**
   a. *Selv Peter kom.*
      
      ‘Even Peter came.’
   b. *Même Pierre est venu.*
      
      ‘Even Peter came.’

In section 2.3 we propose that what has sometimes been referred to as an exclusive adverbial intensifier meaning ‘by oneself, alone’ (7a-b) is in fact the intensifier *selv* occurring in a secondary predication construction (3b). In section 2.4 we propose to analyze the intensifier
selfv ‘himself’ and the focus particle selv ‘even’ (8a-b) as the same element which assumes different properties when occurring in different positions.

In sections 2.5 and 2.6, the nominal and adjectival uses of selv (3d-e), illustrated in (9)-(10), will be argued to be morphological variants of the same intensifier element selv ‘self’.

(9) **Nominal uses of intensifiers:**
Selvet er en central del af psyken.
self-the is a central part of psyche-the
‘The self is a central part of the psyche.’

(10) **Adjectival uses of intensifiers:**
Selve huset er ikke meget værd.
self house-the is not much worth
‘The house itself isn’t worth much.’

Detailed treatment of the use of the element selv in nominalizations (3f), briefly described in section 2.7, will be postponed till chapter 7, where we argue that word-internal uses of selv follow the same pattern as the adnominal intensifier (3a), see (11a), or as selv used in secondary predication constructions (3b), see (11b).

(11) **Intensifiers in nominalizations:**
a. selvrespekt
self-respect
‘self-respect’
b. selvbygger
self-builder
‘person building a house by himself/herself’

Section 2.8, completes the survey by listing and briefly discussing a few idiomatic uses of the element selv ‘self’. Finally, in section 2.9 a mini typological survey of the ranges of uses of intensifier elements in Danish, English, French, and Chinese, is given.

In brief, as summarized in section 2.10, the contribution of this chapter is threefold. First, in section 2.2, we propose a focus-based analysis of adnominal intensification based on the contrastiveness principle in (2). Second, in sections 2.2.5-6, we claim that many
phenomena which have hitherto been considered unrelated, i.e. (3a,i-iv), can be accounted for within this analysis of adnominal intensification. Third, in sections 2.3-8, we suggest that the lexicon contains only one element selv ‘self’ which can take on different syntactic functions (and yield different semantic contributions) when found in different positions in the derivation, i.e. (3b-c). This proposal makes it possible to unify the analysis of both adnominal (3a,i-iv) and the so-called non-adnominal uses (3b-f) of the intensifier selv ‘self’ in Danish.

2.2    Adnominal intensification

In this section the main focus will be on adnominal intensification of full lexical DPs. After going through the morphological, syntactic and semantic characteristics of adnominal intensifiers, a focus-based analysis of adnominal intensification will be proposed. The rest of this section is organized as follows. First in section 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 the morphology and syntax of adnominal intensification will be discussed. Then, in section 2.2.3, a semantic analysis of adnominal intensifiers will be outlined.

2.2.1    The morphology of adnominal intensification

This section provides a brief description of the basic morphological properties of adnominal intensifiers in Danish and English. English intensifiers are in association with a DP with which they display agreement in the phi-features, i.e. person, number and gender, see (12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(12)</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Danish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><em>I myself</em></td>
<td><em>jeg selv</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><em>you yourself</em></td>
<td><em>du selv</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td><em>we ourselves</em></td>
<td><em>vi selv</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td><em>them themselves</em></td>
<td><em>de selv</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td><em>the king himself</em></td>
<td><em>kongen selv</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td><em>Maria herself</em></td>
<td><em>Maria selv</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Danish, the intensifier *selv* ‘self’ is morphologically invariable and it does not decline to match the features of the nominal element that it is intensifying, as shown in (12).

Of the Scandinavian languages, Norwegian (bokmål) behaves like Danish in that it has uninflected intensifiers of the German type. In contrast, Swedish and Icelandic inflect their intensifiers. See the Swedish examples in (13) in which the adnominal intensifier *själv* ‘self’ displays agreement in gender and number.

(13)² a. *Hon är godheten själv.*
   she is goodness-the self-SING-COMMONGENDER
   ‘She is kindness itself.’

b. *Barnet själv-t sa ingenting.*
   child-the self-SING-NEUTR said nothing
   ‘The child himself said nothing.’

c. *Barnen själv-a bestämde.*
   children-the self-PLUR decided
   ‘The children themselves decided.’

According to typological surveys (cf. Siemund 2000:10-11), intensifiers with overtly marked agreement (e.g. English *himself*, French *lui-même*, Russian *sam-*, etc.) are more frequent than morphologically invariable intensifiers (e.g. Danish *selv*, French *-même*, German *selbst*, etc.)³.

The above discussion of the morphology of intensifiers naturally leads us to the question what class of linguistic expressions adnominal intensifiers belong to. While in the Slavic and Romance languages adnominal intensifiers tend to display adjectival behavior, intensifiers in the Germanic languages primarily⁴ behave as adnominal adjuncts (e.g. Ger. *selbst*, Dan. *selv*). These differences are witnessed by the fact that, Germanic intensifiers tend

---

² These Swedish examples are adapted from Siemund, 2000:8 and pp. 17-22.

³ In Old English the intensifier *seolf* ‘self’ displayed overt case and number agreement. See chapter 5, section 5.3. for more discussion of intensifiers in Old English, and the (hotly debated) role of case agreement in the evolution of intensifiers and reflexives.

⁴ Note, however, that, as discussed in section 2.6, Danish also has pre-nominal, inflected adjectival intensifiers, e.g. (i):

(i) *Selve dronningen*
   self-e queen-the
   ‘the queen herself’
to allow nominal uses\(^5\), see the Danish examples in (14), while Romance intensifiers tend to allow adjectival uses but disallow nominal uses, see the Spanish examples in (15).

(14)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. \textit{Selvets begred}
  self-the-POSS concept
  ‘the conception of self (/the ego)’
  \item b. \textit{Selvet er en central del af psyken.}
  self-the is a central part of psyche-the
  ‘The self is a central part of the psyche.’
  \item c. \textit{Kun levende væsner kan have et selv.}
  only living creatures can have a self
  ‘Only living creatures can have a self.’
\end{itemize}

(15)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. \textit{el mismo coche}
  the same car
  ‘the same car’
  \item b. \textit{la misma casa}
  the same house
  ‘the same house’
  \item c. *el mismo/*la misma
  the self
\end{itemize}

In (14c) the Danish intensifier \textit{selv} occurs as a noun preceded by the indefinite article \textit{et} ‘a (neut., sing.).’ The sentences in (14a-b) further illustrate that \textit{selv} behaves just like any other noun by taking the suffixal definite article –\textit{et} ‘the (neut., sing.)’, see (14a-b), and the suffixal –\textit{s} genitive, see (14a). These facts have sometimes been adduced as evidence supporting the classification of \textit{selv} as a nominal expression. In contrast, the Spanish examples in (15a-b) have been taken to show that Spanish intensifiers are a special kind of adjectives which cannot be used as nouns meaning ‘the self’, see (15c). However, rather than entering the somewhat futile debate about what word-class the element \textit{selv} ‘self’ belongs to, we simply take the

---

\(^5\) In Modern English it is a subpart of the adnominal intensifier, i.e. –\textit{self}, rather than the entire complex intensifier, e.g. \textit{himself}, which is used independently as a noun, see (i). See section 2.5 for more discussion intensifiers used as nouns.  
(i) \textit{The *oneself/*himself/self is a central part of the psyche.}
element *selv* ‘self’ to be a morpheme/root which can assume nominal, adjectival, or adverbial properties depending on where in the derivation it is inserted\(^6\).

### 2.2.2 The syntax of adnominal intensification

In this section the syntax of the use of the adnominal intensifier *selv* ‘himself’ with full lexical DPs will be described in some detail. The discussion of adnominal intensification will be structured around the questions in (16).

(16) **The syntax of adnominal intensification:**
   a. Are there any constraints as to what syntactic positions intensified nominal expressions may occur in?
   b. What is the exact nature of the syntactic relation (i.e. complementation, adjunction, etc.) between the adnominal intensifier *selv* ‘himself’ and its associate, i.e. the DP which it is intensifying?

#### 2.2.2.1 Possible syntactic positions of adnominally intensified nominal expressions

Let us now turn to the question of whether there are any constraints as to what syntactic positions intensified nominal expressions may occur in. The answer seems to be no: apparently nominal expressions intensified by adnominal *selv* can occur in the same range of syntactic positions as their unintensified counterparts, see the Danish examples in (17)-(23):

(17) **Intensified nominal expressions in subject position:**

_Dronningen selv holdt talen._

queen-the self held speech-the

‘The Queen herself held the speech.’

(18) **Intensified expressions in direct object position:**

_Jeg kom ikke til at interviewe kansleren selv; jeg kom kun til at tale med hans kone._

I came not to to interview chancellor-the self; I came only to to talk to his wife

‘I did not get to interview the chancellor himself; I only got to talk to his wife.’

---

\(^6\) In this respect we differ from Safir (1996) who argues that the distinction between SELF- and SAME-type intensifiers is crucial to understanding the semantic differences between, for example, Germanic type SELF-intensifiers, which tend to behave as nouns, and Romance type SAME-intensifiers which tend to behave as adjectives.
(19)  Intensified nominal expressions in indirect object position:

\[ \text{Jeg gav ikke Dronningen selv blomsterne; jeg gav dem til hendes kammerpige.} \]

I gave not Queen-the self flowers-the; I gave them to her chamber-maid
‘I didn’t give the Queen herself the flowers; I gave them to her maid.’

(20)  Intensified nominal expressions as objects of prepositions:

\[ \text{Jeg gav blomsterne til Dronningen selv.} \]

I gave flowers-the to Queen-the self
‘I gave the flowers to the Queen herself.’

(21)  Intensified nominal expressions in clefts:

\[ \text{Det var Dronningen selv, som modtog os.} \]

it was Queen-the self who received us
‘It was the Queen herself who received us.’

(22)  Intensified nominal expressions in topicalizations:

\[ \text{Dronningen selv så vi ikke. Vi så kun prinsene.} \]

Queen-the self saw we not we saw only princes-the
‘The Queen herself we didn’t see. We only saw the princes.

For DPs in possessor position the intensifier selv ‘himself’ assumes the suppletive form egen
‘own’, see (23).

(23)  Argument DPs : Possessor DPs:

a. Form of intensifier: selv     egen
   ‘self, himself’   ‘own’

b. Example kongen selv     kongens egen hund
   king-the self     king-the-POSS own dog
   ‘the king himself’   ‘the king’s own dog.’

Adnominal intensification in possessive constructions will be discussed in more detail in
chapter 3, section 3.3.5. Though there are subtle differences between egen ‘own’ and selv
‘self’, we will argue that they are not due to lexical differences between these two forms, but
rather are parasitic on the specific syntactic and semantic properties of possessive
constructions. The only arguments inside nominalizations which are intensified are Ø-
elements, see discussion in chapter 7 where we argue that nominalizations such as selvrespekt
‘self-respect’ in (11a) above contain a Ø-reflexive intensified by the adnominal intensifier selv
‘self’.
As the above descriptive survey shows, selv may intensify different types of nominal expressions occurring in a wide range of syntactic positions, e.g. subject, direct object, indirect object, prepositional complement, possessor position, etc. This leads us to conclude that there are no significant syntactic constraints as what positions intensified nominal expressions may occur in (cf. Siemund (2000)).

2.2.2.2 The syntactic relation between intensifier and its focus: adjunction

Adnominal selv forms a constituent with the DP it modifies. This can be shown by fronting the whole constituent in a cleft construction as in (24).

(24) Det var Kongen selv, der loftede klaveret.
    It was king-the self who lifted the piano
    ‘It was the King himself who lifted the piano.’

Secondly, Danish is a V2 language. This means that in root sentences, only one constituent can precede the verb. Dronningen ‘the Queen’ and selv in (19a) in section 2.2.2.1 must therefore belong to the same constituent, the subject DP. This kind of evidence leads us to conclude that selv must be some kind of adnominal modifier forming a syntactic constituent with its associate. But it still does not tell us whether it is an adjectival modifier, an adjunct or something else.

Unlike regular adjectives, which in Danish are always pre-nominal, see (25), selv must occur after the full DP which it is modifying, see (26).

---

7 We have already seen examples of adnominally intensified full lexical DPs (17-23), pronouns (5,12), and reflexives (4). Intensification of traces was illustrated in (6a-b) and will be discussed in more detail in section 2.2.5 below. The only nominal expression which appear to resist intensification is PRO. In section 2.2.4 we suggest that this may be due to either semantic or syntactic constraints (i.e. the PRO theorem).

8 Note however, that some exceptions to this generalization do exist. Edmondson and Plank (1978) observed that intensifiers cannot felicitously adjoin to DPs which are vocative, subject of imperatives, or predicate nominals in identity sentences. While we agree with these facts, we argue that they follow from semantic/pragmatics factors, viz. the contrastiveness condition on intensification discussed in section 2.2.3.2.2, rather than syntactic constraints.

9 See L. Sanchez (1995:167) who analyzes Spanish intensifiers, e.g. mismo, as adjectives “that may select DPs or VPs as their syntactic complements and receive an adnominal or an adverbial interpretation.”
Furthermore, notice that *selv, unlike adjectives, can modify definite DPs, proper names, pronouns and even reflexives. All this clearly shows that *selv does not behave like an adjective in Danish.

In Danish, restrictive relative clauses and PPs are placed after the DP they modify, see (27a-b), as are DP complements, see (27c).

(27) a. skuespilleren som havde modtaget prisen  
    actor-the who had received award-the  
    ‘the actor who had received the award’

b. dronningen med den gyldne krone  
    queen-the with the golden crown  
    ‘the queen with the golden crown.’

c. dronningen af Sverige  
    queen-the of Sweden  
    ‘the queen of Sweden’

As illustrated in (28), the different post-nominal modifiers in (27) do not all display the same behavior with respect to adnominal *selv.

(28) a. skuespilleren som havde modtaget prisen selv  
    actor-the who had received award-the self  
    ‘the actor who had received the award himself’

In Danish the definite article can be realized in two ways: (I) as a suffixal determiner –en/-et ‘the’, or (II) as a free standing determiner den/det ‘the’. The determiner den/det ‘the’ is always used when the noun is modified by an adjective, see (25a). Unmodified head nouns and head nouns modified by relative clauses or PPs take the suffixal form of the determiner, see (27a-c). When a simple unmodified noun is preceded by the determiner den/det, the latter is usually interpreted as a demonstrative ‘this/that’ as in (26b). In an out-of-the-blue context, like (26), a noun preceded by a demonstrative is usually interpreted deictically. Given the fact that intensifiers usually only modify DPs whose referent has been introduced earlier in the same situation/discourse, the sentence in (26b) sounds rather odd.

Needless to say, this example has an acceptable reading in which the intensifier *selv functions as an ‘exclusive’ adverbial intensifier modifying the VP of the relative clause: ‘The actor who had received the award all by himself, without help from anybody else’.

---

10 In Danish the definite article can be realized in two ways: (I) as a suffixal determiner –en/-et ‘the’, or (II) as a free standing determiner den/det ‘the’. The determiner den/det ‘the’ is always used when the noun is modified by an adjective, see (25a). Unmodified head nouns and head nouns modified by relative clauses or PPs take the suffixal form of the determiner, see (27a-c). When a simple unmodified noun is preceded by the determiner den/det, the latter is usually interpreted as a demonstrative ‘this/that’ as in (26b). In an out-of-the-blue context, like (26), a noun preceded by a demonstrative is usually interpreted deictically. Given the fact that intensifiers usually only modify DPs whose referent has been introduced earlier in the same situation/discourse, the sentence in (26b) sounds rather odd.

11 Needless to say, this example has an acceptable reading in which the intensifier *selv functions as an ‘exclusive’ adverbial intensifier modifying the VP of the relative clause: ‘The actor who had received the award all by himself, without help from anybody else’.
b. *dronningen med den gyldne krone selv
queen-the with the golden crown self
‘the queen with the golden crown herself’

c. dronningen af Sverige selv
queen-the of Sweden self
‘the queen of Sweden herself’

If a DP is already modified by a restrictive relative clause or a PP of the with-type then it cannot felicitously be intensified by selv, see (28a-b). However, if a DP takes a complement of the of-type then it can be intensified by selv, see (28c). The examples in (27) and (28) indicate that selv is in complementary distribution with post-nominal prepositional adjuncts of the med-type and restrictive relative clauses[^13]. On the basis of such facts it seems plausible to suggest that selv also has the syntactic status of a post-nominal adjunct modifying DPs[^14]. Given that selv forms a constituent with the DP, it must be the highest element in the DP, see (29).

(29)[^15] The structure of DPs intensified by selv:

```
  DP
 /     \
DP   selv
 /     \ self
N   D  ‘himself’
 king -en
  ‘the king’
```

[^12]: This example, as well as the one in (28b), is ambiguous. In principle, the intensifier selv ‘self’ could be interpreted as taking Sverige ‘Sweden’ rather than dronningen af Sverige ‘the queen of Sweden’ as its associate. Due to overt morphological agreement between intensifiers and their associates, English usually avoids this kind of ambiguity, e.g. the people of Iraq themselves (from Business Week Feb 2003). Ambiguity only occurs when the embedded DP and the matrix DP share the same features, e.g. the discussion of the issue itself (continued for several hours) (from Siemund (2000:157) example (6.94a)).

[^13]: Cf. Everaert (1986:37-38) who observed the same pattern in Dutch: “it appears that a post-nominal quantifier like zelf occupies the same position as met/zonder-PP-complements and restrictive relatives”.

[^14]: Note that PPs and relative clauses do not behave alike with respect to adjunct-stacking. As shown in (i) sequences of PP-relative clause are ok while sequences of relative clause+PP are not.

(i) a. The man with glasses who was bald.
b. *The man who was bald with glasses.

[^15]: Some researchers now believe that natural languages never use right-adjunction of the type illustrated in (29). The question whether right-adjunction is among the structures available to natural languages seems to be orthogonal
While stacking of adjuncts yields unacceptable structures in (28a-b) where the intensifier selv is the last in a series of adjuncts, it appears to be possible to construct acceptable examples involving adnominal intensifiers and adjunct-stacking, provided that the intensifier precedes the other adjunct, see (30).

(30)  *Dronningen selv sammen med prinserne loftede klaveret.
Queen-the self together with princes-the liftede piano-the
‘The Queen herself, together with the princes, lifted the piano.’

Notice, however, that in this respect the PP sammen med ‘together with’ behave differently from the other constructions involving PPs and relative clauses in (27), see (31).

(31)  a.  *skuespilleren selv som havde modtaget prisen
actor-the self who had received award-the
‘the actor himself who had received the award’

b.  */ok16dronningen selv med den gyldne krone
queen-the self with the golden crown
‘the queen herself with the golden crown.’

c.  *dronningen selv af Sverige
queen-the self of Sweden
‘the queen herself of Sweden’

The contrast between (30) and (31), which are all unacceptable, indicates that the PP sammen med ‘together with’ is different from the adjuncts in (31a-b) and the prepositional complement in (31c). This difference is further confirmed by the examples in (32) and (33).

(32)  *Dronningen selv loftede klaveret sammen med prinserne.
Queen-the self liftede piano-the together with princes-the
‘The Queen herself lifted the piano together with the princes.’

(33)  a.  *skuespilleren selv kom til mødet som havde modtaget prisen
actor-the self came to meeting-the who had received award-the
‘the actor himself came to the meeting who had received the award’

b.  *dronningen selv satte sig på tronen med den gyldne krone
queen-the self sat REFL on throne-the with the golden crown
‘the queen herself sat down on the throne with the golden crown.’

16 Notice that this sentence is ok when the PP with the golden crown is interpreted as a secondary predication construction on a par with, for example The Queen sat down on the throne wearing her regal robe.
Based on the above examples we conclude that the PP *sammen med ‘together with’ in (30) and (32) is used as a VP-adverbial or secondary predicate (which can either precede or follow the VP) rather than as an adnominal adjunct. Hence, it does not constitute a counter-example to the generalization that PPs adjunct and relative clauses are in complementary distribution with the adnominal intensifier *selv ‘self’.

### 2.2.2.3 Unified analysis of adnominally intensified expressions

Adopting a modified version of Longobardi’s (1994) analysis of nominal expressions we assume that all nominal arguments are projections of a head D constituent. This approach makes it possible to arrive at a unified account of the syntax of nominal expressions, see (34).\(^{17}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(34)} & \quad \begin{cases} \\
\text{a.} & \left[ \text{DP} \left[ \text{N} \text{kong} \right] \left[ \text{D} \text{-en} \right] \right] \quad \text{‘the king’} \\
\text{b.} & \left[ \text{DP} \left[ \text{N} \text{konger} \right] \left[ \text{D} \text{Ø} \right] \right] \quad \text{‘kings’} \\
\text{c.} & \left[ \text{DP} \left[ \text{D} \text{ham} \right] \right] \quad \text{‘him’} \\
\text{d.} & \left[ \text{DP} \left[ \text{D} \text{sig} \right] \right] \quad \text{‘REFL’}
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

The structures in (34a) and (34b) illustrate the syntax of DPs with overt and null determiner respectively. Pronouns and reflexives are assumed to behave as determiners, i.e. they are assumed to head their own DPs, see (34c) and (34d)\(^{18}\). In addition to making it possible to

---

\(^{17}\) As mentioned above, Danish has both post-nominal and pre-nominal articles, see (i-ii).

(i) \textit{Hus-et}

House-the

(ii) \textit{Det store hus}

the big house

The question of which order is the basic order of article and noun and which is the derived order seems unrelated to the issues discussed here. Hence, although it may be more correct to assume the post-nominal articles in (34) to be derived via movement from a pre-nominal determiner position, for ease of exposition we have decided to ignore these complications in the structures given here.

\(^{18}\) As work by Postal (1966), Abney (1987), Longobardi (1994), and Uriagereka (1995) have shown, there is evidence that pronouns may function as determiners, e.g. the examples in (i-ii) below (from Radford (1997:154,(79a,b))).
arrive at a unified analysis of the syntax of nominal expressions, this approach has the advantage of enabling us to unify the account of adnominal intensification. As discussed above, intensified nominals such as *kongen selv* ‘the king himself’ are best analyzed as simple adjunction structures, see (35a).

(35) a. \[[DP [DP [N kong] [D -en]] [selv]] \] ‘the king himself’
   b. \[[DP [DP [N konger] [D Ø]] [selv]] \] (??)‘kings themselves’
   c. \[[DP [DP [D ham]] [selv]] \] ‘him self’
   d. \[[DP [DP [D sig]] [selv]] \] ‘REFL self’

As shown in (35c) and (35d) the complex pronoun *ham selv* ‘him self’ and the complex reflexive *sig selv* ‘REFL self’ can be analyzed as intensified DPs having the same syntax as intensified R-expressions. In other words, syntactically all types of nominal expressions, e.g. full lexical DPs, subject pronouns, object pronouns, possessive pronouns, and reflexive pronouns, behave alike with respect to adnominal intensification.

2.2.3 Semantic and pragmatic aspects of adnominal intensifiers

The literature on intensifiers contains a number of different proposals of how to best capture the semantic and pragmatic properties of intensifiers some of which are listed in (36).

(i) \[[IP [DP [D We] [N psychologists]] [I' [I don't] [VP [V trust] [DP [D you] [N linguists]]]]]]

(ii) \[[IP [DP [D We]]] [I' [I don't] [VP [V trust] [DP [D you]]]]

19 Due to the unique indentifiability requirement on adnominal intensification, discussed in section 2.2.3.2.1, bare plural nominals like *konger* ‘kings’ usually cannot be felicitously intensified by adjunction of the intensifier *selv* ‘self’. As observed in Edmondson & Plank (1978:381), only if the indefinite DP is given a specific interpretation is intensification possible in such cases.

20 This generalization begs the question whether non-overt nominal expressions like, for example, traces and PRO can be adnominally intensified. Traces do seem to be able to undergo intensification, see discussion of q-floated intensifiers in section 2.2.5, and fronted intensifiers in section 2.2.6. For discussion of the absence of adnominally intensified PRO, see section 2.4, as well as chapter 5 (for English), and chapter 6 (for Chinese). See also chapters 5 and 6 for discussion of intensification of Ø-reflexives (i.e. phonologically unrealized reflexive pronouns) in English and Chinese.
In section 2.2.3.1 a focus-based, non-scalar account of the semantic contribution of adnominal intensifiers will be proposed. In section 2.2.3.2 semantic constraints on intensified DPs will be discussed.

### 2.2.3.1 The semantic contribution the adnominal intensifier selv ‘himself’

In Danish, as well as in German and French, the element used as adnominal intensifier, i.e. Dan. selv, Ger. selbst, and Fr. -même, can also be used as an additive, scalar focus particle similar to the particle *even* in English. In all three languages the adnominal intensifier is post-nominal while the focus particle ‘even’ is pre-nominal, compare the (a) and (b) examples in (37)-(39).

#### (37) Danish:

- a. *Kongen selv holdt en tale.*   
  king-the self held a speech
  ‘The king himself delivered a speech.’

- b. *Selv visevært en tale.*  
  self janitor held a speech
  ‘Even the janitor delivered a speech.’

#### (38) German:

- a. *Der König selbst hielt eine Rede*\(^{21}\)  
  the king ‘self’ held a speech
  ‘The king himself delivered a speech.’

- b. *Selbst der Hausmeister hielt eine Rede.*  
  even the janitor held a speech
  ‘Even the janitor gave a speech.’

---

\(^{21}\) The German and French examples in (38a-b) and (39a-b) are adapted from Eckhardt (2000:1(1), (2)).
Inspired by the overt similarity between the two uses of the intensifier elements illustrated in (37-39) a number of researchers have proposed to analyze the adnominal intensifier as a scalar focus particle similar to ‘even’. In the following, we argue that such analyses are misguided and that adnominal intensifiers should be given a non-scalar, focus-based analysis.

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 (40a) vs. (40b).

(40)  
(40)  

\begin{align*}  
\text{(40a)} & \quad *\text{Det var selv biskoppen der holdt gudstjenesten. (focus particle)} \\
& \quad \text{It was self bishop-the who held service-the} \\
& \quad \text{‘*It was even the bishop who held the service.’} \\
\text{(40b)} & \quad \text{Det var biskoppen selv der holdt gudstjenesten. (intensifier)} \\
& \quad \text{It was bishop-the self who held service-the} \\
& \quad \text{‘It was the bishop himself who held the service.’} \\
\end{align*}

The example in (40a) shows that the focus particle selv ‘even’ cannot occur in clefts which presuppose uniqueness because that would lead to a contradiction of the so-called existential presupposition it always evokes, see (44b). Since the adnominal intensifier selv ‘himself’ can occur in clefts, see (40b), we therefore conclude that it does not evoke this existential presupposition which is mandatory with the focus particle even. The examples in (41)-(42), which contain predicates presupposing uniqueness, further confirm this difference between even and the adnominal intensifier.

\[22\] In certain conservative registers of French, the complex adnominal intensifier lui-même can be found to alternate with the simple intensifier même. That is, this example can also be realized without lui, i.e. Le roi même a prononcé le discours. See Martin (1975) and Anscombre (1973) for more discussion of lui-même and même as intensifiers.
According to Eckardt (2000) the semantic contribution of adnominal intensifiers can be captured by the analysis given in (43) which is identical to the analysis she proposes for the focus particle *even*, except for the absence of the existential presupposition/implicature, compare (43) with the analysis of *even* in (44). As mentioned in chapter 1, 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.

(43) **Analysis of the adnominal intensifier *himself*:**

\[
\text{himself} + S
\]

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. Assertion: | \([[[ S ]]^o] = [[[ S ]]^f \setminus [[[ S ]]^o]]\)
| b. Scalar implicature: | \(\forall p \in \{[[[ S ]]^f \setminus [[[ S ]]^o]]\}: [[[ S ]]^o] <_c p\) |

(44) **Analysis of the additive focus particle *even*:**

\[
even + S
\]

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. Assertion: | \([[[ S ]]^o] = [[[ S ]]^f \setminus [[[ S ]]^o]]\)
| b. Scalar implicature: | \(\forall p \in \{[[[ S ]]^f \setminus [[[ S ]]^o]]\}: [[[ S ]]^o] <_c p\)
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We argue that the analysis of adnominal intensifiers in (43) is on the wrong track. While it is true that DPs adnominally intensified by selv often refer to entities occurring in propositions which are unexpected or remarkable in a given context, this is by no means always the case, see (45-46).

(45) 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.

(46) 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. Likewise, in (46) 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 (44b(i)), is not. We take this as evidence that the scalar implicature in (43b) is NOT an integral part of the semantic contribution of adnominal intensifiers.

Based on the examples discussed above, we conclude that the semantic contribution of the adnominal intensifier involves neither a scalar implicature (44b(i)), nor an existential implicature, (44b(ii)), and is thus different from the focus particle even, which has both these implicatures. The semantics of adnominal intensification is similar to that of focus, see (47a)-(48).

(47) a. [The king himself]_f came to the meeting.
   b. The king came to the meeting.

Ordinary semantic value of (47a):
[[ [The king himself]_f came to the meeting]]^o = 1 iff the king came to the meeting.
b. **Focus semantic value of (47a):**

\[
[[ \text{[The king himself]} \text{ came to the meeting} ]]^f = \{ \text{came-to-the-meeting}(x) \mid x \in D_c \}
\]

\`the queen came to the meeting`,

\`the prince came to the meeting`,

Like 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 (48b). That is, in addition to having the same truth conditions as (47b), the sentences in (47a) also tells us that the king is contrasted with a contextually defined set of alternatives who also did (or might have) come to the meeting. The generation of a set of alternatives gives rise to contrastiveness condition on adnominal intensification which will be discussed in section 2.2.3.2.2.

### 2.2.3.2 Semantic and pragmatic constraints on adnominal intensification

In section 2.2.2.1-2 syntactic constraints on adnominal intensification were discussed. In this section, semantic/pragmatic constraints on adnominal intensification will be discussed, namely the “unique identifiability” (section 2.2.3.2.1) and “contrastiveness” (section 2.2.3.2.2) conditions.

#### 2.2.3.2.1 Unique identifiability

Since Moravscik (1972) and Edmondson and Plank (1978) it has been generally known that a DP modified by an adnominal intensifier must have certain referential properties. However, the exact formulation of this constraint still seems to elude the community of researchers working on intensification.

Examples like (49) and (50) seem to indicate the existence of a constraint requiring adnominally intensified DPs to be definite.
(49)  a.  *The LA philharmonic is looking for a truly gifted violinist himself.
    b.  *A truly gifted violinist himself would never miss note.

(50)  a.  The Queen herself showed up to the conference.
    b.  I meet the Queen herself at the conference.

However, as Edmondson and Plank (1978:382) observed, things are not that simple. In certain cases formally definite DPs, i.e. DPs preceded by the definite article the, cannot be felicitously intensified either, see (51c).

(51)  a.  We wanted to call the doctor.
    b.  We wanted to call the doctor himself.
    c.  *We wanted to call the doctor himself, but we didn’t know any.

In (51a) the DP the doctor is ambiguous between a specific reading (referring to a contextually identifiable individual) and a non-specific reading (referring to any doctor). By adding the adnominal intensifier, as in (51b), the reading of the doctor as non-specific is excluded. Hence, in (51c) adnominal intensification is not felicitous. These examples clearly show that formal definiteness alone is not enough to qualify a DP for adnominal intensification.

In the preceding we have showed that certain definite DPs cannot be intensified. As the example in (52) shows, in certain cases, even indefinite DPs can be intensified.

(52)  A:  All Cretans lie.
    B:  Where did you hear that?
    A:  a.  A Cretan himself told me.
        b.  Cretans themselves told me.

Based on this and similar examples Edmondson and Plank (1978) concluded that indefinite DPs may allow adnominal intensification if they are interpreted as having a specific reference. Does this mean that specificity is the correct generalization? While a large number of examples can be adduced in support of this hypothesis, e.g. (53a), the existence of examples like (53b), from Siemund (2000:162(6.105)) seems to refute it.

23 For discussion of this example, as well as its consequences for the theory of intensification, see Edmondson and Plank (1978:382) and Siemund (2000:156(6.90)).
(53)  a.  *Unicorns themselves exist.
    b.  Man himself is a product of his environment.

It may be possible to explain the difference between (53a) and (53b) as following from a semantic difference between the DP *unicorns*, which is an indefinite plural DP, and the DP *man*, which can be argued to refer to a specific species (i.e. homo sapiens) which can be contrasted with other species (e.g. cat, dogs, spiders, etc.)\(^{24}\).

Siemund (2000), who discusses these problems in great detail, concludes that the relevant constraint on adnominal intensification should be formulated as in (54).

(54)  **Unique Identifiability Condition:**
    In order to be successfully intensified by an adnominal intensifier a DP “must denote a uniquely identifiable referent where referent can be understood in the broadest sense of the word.” (Siemund (2000:154, 170(6.137))

As it stands this constraint is still formulated in rather vague terms. It is thus clear that more works needs to be done to arrive a more precise understanding of the linguistic principles involved\(^{25}\). At the end of the following section we argue that the condition in (54) may not be necessary since it can be shown to follow from the contrastiveness condition on intensification.

2.2.3.2.2  **Prominence, centrality or contrastiveness**

In the previous section referential constraints on DPs undergoing adnominal intensification were discussed. In this section, semantic and pragmatic prominence conditions on intensification will be investigated in some detail and it will be shown that different constraints formulated in terms of prominence, centrality and contrastiveness, as well as the Unique Identifiability Condition discussed above, see (54), can be subsumed under one contrastiveness requirement.

\(^{24}\) As suggested to me by R. Pancheva (p.c.), the choice of verb might also be (partially) responsible for the unacceptability of (53a). Hence, although it also includes the expression *unicorns themselves*, the sentences in (i) below does seem better than (53a):

(i)  *Unicorns themselves are but a product of our imagination.*
It has long been noticed that there is a strong tendency for adnominal intensifiers to modify DPs which denote prominent individuals of high status\textsuperscript{26}, see (55).

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(55)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{dronningen selv}  
\textit{queen-the self}  
\textit{‘the Queen herself’}
\item \textit{biskoppen selv}  
\textit{bishop-the self}  
\textit{‘the bishop himself’}
\item \textit{statsministeren selv}  
\textit{prime minister-the self}  
\textit{‘the prime minister himself’}
\item \textit{præsidenten selv}  
\textit{president-the self}  
\textit{‘the president himself’}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

Data such as (55) has lead to the formulation of different prominence or centrality requirements on adnominal intensification. Baker (1995) proposes the following condition on the use of intensive NPs.

\textbf{(56) Baker’s (1995) Condition of Relative Discourse Prominence:}  
Intensive NPs can only be used to mark a character in a sentence or discourse who is relatively more prominent or central than others.

The notion of prominence is intended to cover both cases of lexical prominence, e.g. (55), and case of contextually defined prominence, e.g. (57). According to Baker (1995:79), the sentences in (57a) and (57b) both involve contrasting the custodians with other employees. Inspite of these similarities, intensification of the DP \textit{the custodians} is only acceptable in (57a), but not in (57b).

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(57)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{All of the employees of that company will have to appear before the grand jury}, where they will be asked what they know about the alleged illegal trash disposal. \textit{The custodians (themselves) will testify late Thursday afternoon, the other employees} on Friday.
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{25} For more detailed discussion of these issues, see Edmondson & Plank (1978) and Siemund (2000).

\textsuperscript{26} Cf. Keenan (1994) who observes this tendency for the adnominal intensifier \textit{se(o)lf} in Old English. Cf. also Moravesik (1972).
b. All of the employees of that company will have to appear before the grand jury, where they will be asked what they know about the alleged check-kiting scheme. The custodians (??themselves) will testify late Thursday afternoon, the other employees on Friday.

The examples in (55) exemplify cases of expressions which, by their meaning alone, tend to refer to high-status individuals (e.g. kings, presidents, etc.) who, under normal circumstances, are prominent in most contexts. In contrast, Baker’s example in (57) contains an intensified DP, i.e. the custodians, denoting low status individuals. Nevertheless, the example in (57a) is ok since, in the given context, the DP the custodians can be construed as referring to a contextually prominent group of individuals. According to Baker (1995:80), “the much greater naturalness of the intensive in [(57a)] as compared to that in [(57b)] follows directly from our perception that custodians are much more likely to play a central role in an episode of illegal trash disposal than in an episode of check-kiting”. Baker therefore claims that these examples strongly support the existence of his prominence condition on intensification.

König’s (1998) notion of centrality, see (58), is similar to Baker’s (1995) prominence condition.

(58) König’s (1998) Conditions for the use of adnominal intensifiers:
Adnominal intensifiers relate a center X (=referent of the focus) to a periphery of alternative values, such that:
1. X has higher rank than Y in a real-world hierarchy.
2. X is more important that Y in a specific situation.
3. Y is identified relative to X (kinship terms, part-whole, etc..)
4. X is the subject of consciousness, center of observation, etc..

The examples in (59a-d) illustrate the different kinds of centrality defined in (59a-d).

(59) a. The Pope himself is against this view.
b. Nobody cared about the fans when the fire broke out, but the rock star himself was quickly whisked away.
c. Lucy’s sister is more intelligent then Lucy herself.
d. Jemina guessed that Pompey had chivalrous doubts about leaving her in the gaunt building, with only Tiger, now in a restless mood, as company. She herself had no such fears.

27 The centrality condition in (58) as well as the examples in (59) are from König (1997).
Siemund (2000:154) who adopts a version of König’s centrality requirement, admits that the existence of this constraint is very difficult, if not impossible, to test since “given a sufficient amount of adequate context or some imagination on the part of the decoder, almost any referent can be thought of as being central and hence associated with another referent which forms its periphery” (Siemund (2000:154)). The elusive nature of the prominence and centrality requirements in (56), (58), as well as the virtual impossibility of constructing any example which clearly violate these constraints indicate that we would be well advised to look for a better formulation of the constraint or perhaps a different constraint altogether. McKay (1991) offers a possible solution, see (60).

(60) McKay’s (1991:368) constraints on adnominal intensification:
In order to be successfully intensified by an adnominal intensifier a DP must have
a. “a clearly indicated referent”, and
b. “a relevant contrast or comparison class”

The constraint in (60a) corresponds to the unique identifiability requirement discussed in the previous section. The contrastiveness requirement in (60b) offers an interesting alternative to the prominence and centrality requirements proposed by Baker (1995) and König (1997). Baker (1995) suggests that we need both the prominence requirement in (56) and a contrastiveness requirement which he formulates as in (61).

(61) Bakers’ (1995:77) contrastiveness condition:
“Intensive NPs are appropriate only in contexts in which emphasis or contrast is desired”

In the following, we argue that only McKay’s contrastiveness condition (60b) is needed. Furthermore, using evidence from inherently reflexive constructions we show that, unlike the prominence and centrality requirements, solid evidence for the existence of a contrastiveness requirement, as formulated in (62), can be found.

(62) 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.
Zribi-Hertz (1995:349-350) uses the incompatibility of intensification with inherently reflexive constructions such as (63-64) as evidence supporting a scalar analysis of intensifiers. In contrast, we propose to account for the absence of intensified DPs in inherently reflexive constructions as a consequence of the contrastiveness condition (62).

(63)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{Bill is out of his mind.} \\
b. & \text{*Bill is out of John’s mind.} \\
c. & \text{*Bill is out of your mind.} \\
d. & \text{*Bill is out of his own mind.}
\end{align*}

(64)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{Bill took a knife with him.} \\
b. & \text{*Bill took a knife with John.} \\
c. & \text{*Bill took a knife with you.} \\
d. & \text{*Bill took a knife with himself.}
\end{align*}

Due to the inherently reflexive meaning of the constructions in (63-64), only expressions which are coreferential with the subjects are allowed. That is, the pronouns his and him, which have to be coreferential with the subject, see (63-64a), cannot be replaced by any other expressions, see (63-64b-d). Hence no contrast set can be generated and, as a consequence, these constructions are unable to satisfy the contrastiveness condition in (62).

Since it appears to be impossible to construct solid, unambiguous violations of König’s centrality condition and Baker’s prominence condition, we conclude that they are not needed. On the other hand, the existence of data like (63-4) clearly supports the assumption of a contrastiveness constraint as (62). Indeed, it seems possible to derive prominence and centrality phenomena from the contrastiveness condition in (62). Intensification of a DP is thus very similar to focus. Just like focus it triggers the generation of a set of alternatives which are contrasted with the intensified expression. Depending on the context, the relationship between the associate of the intensifier and the focus-generated contrast set may or may not be ordered in terms of prominence or centrality. In other words, centrality and
prominence are not essential parts of the process of intensification itself, but simply different interpretations which intensification may get in different contexts.

At this point we have identified two conditions on adnominal intensification: the unique identifiability condition (54) and the contrastiveness condition (62). It seems very likely that these two conditions are connected and that they may potentially be further reduced to even more general underlying principles. Detailed comparison of focus and adnominal intensification reveals a link between unique identifiability and contrastiveness. Intensification always involves the generation of a contrast set of alternatives to the referent of the associate of the intensifier. In order to generate such a contrast set one must be able to (uniquely) identify the referent of the associate. However, while is possible to subsume the unique identifiability condition (54) under the contrastiveness condition (62) in this way, for ease of exposition we will still continue to refer to the condition in (54) when testing different uses of intensifiers.

2.2.4 Is adnominal intensification of PRO possible?
As shown in (65) PRO resists adnominal intensification. In this section we discuss three possible explanations of this fact.

28 Cf. Siemund (2000:170) who also speculates that unique identifiability and centrality may somehow be “intimately connected.”
29 At first glance, Danish sentences like (i) may appear to falsify the claim that PRO cannot be adnominally intensified:

(i) *Peter lovede os selv at skrive en artikel om skolesystemet.
   a. Peter promised us to write an article about school-system-the
      ‘Peter himself promised us to write an article about the school system.’
   b. Peter promised us [us self] to write an article about school-system-the
      ‘Peter promised us ourselves to write an article about the school system.’
   c. Peter promised us [PROVP self VP to write an article about school-system-the]
      ‘Peter promised us to write an article about the school system himself.’
   d. *Peter promised us [PRO self] to write an article about school-system-the

However, as the glosses in (ia-d) shows, the fact that (i) is grammatical is not necessarily proof that PRO can be intensified. The sentence in (i) is multiply ambiguous. The element selv can be either: (I) a q-floated adnominal intensifier intensifying the matrix subject (ia), (II) an adnominal intensifier intensifying the pronoun os ‘us’ (ib), or,
If, as argued in 2.2.2.3, all nominal expressions (DP, pronouns, reflexives, traces, etc.) can be intensified in the same way by adjunction of the adnominal intensifier, one has to answer the question why PRO disallows intensification. That is, why is (65b) ungrammatical? Based on our analysis of intensification in (66) we have to argue that, with respect to the syntax of intensifier-adjunction, intensification of PRO is ok. That is, by itself, (67) should be syntactically well-formed.

Furthermore, since our analysis of English reflexives proposed in chapter 5 is based on the assumption that phonologically zero elements may be adnominally intensified, we cannot explain (65b) simply by assuming the existence of a constraint banning adnominal intensification of phonologically unrealized elements.31

Since it not the syntax of intensifier-adjunction which is responsible for the ungrammaticality of (65), it has to be due to something else. In the following, three different hypotheses will be discussed: (i) an explanation based on the contrastiveness condition on adnominal intensification, (ii) an explanation based on the assumptions about the lexical properties of PRO, and (iii) an explanation based on the PRO-theorem.

It seems very tempting to explain the absence of intensified PRO in terms of the contrastiveness condition on adnominal intensification (62). As the data in (69-71) show, the

(III) a pre-verbal exclusive adverbial intensifier meaning ‘without help, all by oneself’ which is adjoined to the VP (ic).

30 It might be claimed that a sentence like (i), shows that PRO may be intensified.

(i)  Bill promised PRO to write the essay himself.

We argue that such an account of (i) is not possible and that the occurrence of himself in (i) is an exclusive adverbial intensifier with the meaning ‘by himself, without help form others, etc.’ which attaches to the VP of the embedded clause rather than to the DP containing PRO. See 2.3 for more discussion of the use of intensifiers as ‘exclusive’ manner adverbials.
PRO constructions in (69) appear to violate the contrastiveness condition in the same way as inherently reflexive constructions (70-71) by not allowing for the creation of a contrast set.

(69)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Bill hopes PRO to win the election.
\item b. *Bill hopes John to win the election.
\item c. *Bill hopes you to win the election.
\item d. *Bill hopes [PRO himself] to win the election.
\end{enumerate}

(70)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Bill is out of hi_{i/#z} mind.
\item b. #Bill is out of John’s mind.
\item c. #Bill is out of your mind.
\item d. #Bill is out of his own mind.
\end{enumerate}

(71)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Bill, took a knife with hi_{i/#z}.
\item b. #Bill took a knife with John.
\item c. #Bill took a knife with you.
\item d. #Bill took a knife with himself.
\end{enumerate}

While the unacceptability of (69) and (70-71) appear to be due to violations of the contrastiveness condition in (62), the ultimate reasons why these sentences fail to generate contrast sets are probably different. In the case of the inherently reflexive expressions in (70-71) the failure to generate contrast sets, and thus meet the requirements of (62), is due to the semantics of these expressions. Syntactically there is nothing wrong with (70b-d) and (71b-d). It is the meaning of these sentences which exclude the possibility of commutation of his and him with any other expressions. Since it is semantic rather than syntactic factors which are responsible for the unacceptability of (70-71c-d), these sentences have been marked with the symbol “#”, indicating semantic or pragmatic anomaly, rather than “*” which is reserved for syntactic anomaly.

In the case of the PRO sentences in (69), however, the failure to generate contrast sets, and thus meet the requirements of (69), may be due to syntactic contraints. Overt DPs have to

\[31\] The analysis of “inclusive selv” as a a-floated adnominal intensifier, proposed in section 2.2.5, is also based on the assumption that DP-traces can be adnominally intensified. See also discussion of fronted selv in section 2.2.6.

\[32\] Note that this sentence may be acceptable to certain speakers when himself is analyzed as a q-floated adnominal intensifier modifying the matrix subject DP Bill, see section 2.2.5 for more discussion of q-floated intensifiers.
have case, while the PRO-theorem requires PRO to be caseless (or have null-case, depending on analyses). As shown in (72-73), the ungrammatical sentences in (69b-d) can be saved by providing case-assigners for the subjects of the embedded clauses.

(72)  a.  Bill hopes that he will win the election.
       b.  Bill hopes that John will win the election.
       c.  Bill hopes that you will win the election.
       d.  Bill hopes that he himself will win the election.

(73)  a.  Bill hopes for him to win the election.
       b.  Bill hopes for John to win the election.
       c.  Bill hopes for you to win the election.
       d.  Bill hopes for himself to win the election.

In (72) nominative case is assigned to the embedded subject by the finite T projection. In (73) accusative case is provided by the preposition *for*. Thus the impossibility of generating a set of alternatives to the referent of PRO in (65b/69d) is due to the fact that case-constraints require overt DPs and PRO to be in complementary distribution. However, regardless of the different reasons for failure to satisfy (62), the ungrammaticality of (69d) and (70-71d) all appear to be reduced to violations of this contrastiveness principle.

On closer inspection, however, this account may not be as successful as it seems. Since the contrastiveness condition is of semantic nature, there is no reason why generation of a contrast in (69) should not possible. After all, the sentences in (72-73), clearly show that semantically the contrast sets can be created once the syntax allows it.

Let us now turn to another, perhaps more promising, account of the absence of intensified PRO, which is based on the assumption that PRO is incompatible with intensification. As noted by Chierchia (1989) and others, PRO is always given a DE SE reading and is always interpreted as a bound variable. That is, while (72a) and (73a) can be given both DE SE and DE RE readings, (69a) can only be DE SE. The difference between DE SE and DE RE readings can be captured by the semantic paraphrases in (74).
(74) a. John hopes that $\lambda x [x$ wins the election] (DE SE, PRO, (69-70))
b. John, hopes that he wins the election (DE RE, non-PRO, (72-73))

The DE SE reading in (74a) establishes a relation between John and a property, in this case the property of winning the election. In contrast, since the paraphrase in (74b) does not imply self-ascription of any property, it is ambiguous between DE SE and DE RE readings. Assuming PRO to be lexically specified to require a bound-variable interpretation may then explain the incompatibility of PRO and adnominal intensification. Note, however, that in order to avoid the false prediction that PRO can have a DE RE reading when bound by a quantified expression (e.g. [Every candidate], hopes PRO to be elected) it is necessary to assume that PRO must be bound by the $\lambda$-operator in the closest Comp.

Finally, an even simpler way to explain the apparent absence of adnominally intensified PRO, consists in assuming that adnominal intensification of phonological zero elements turns these elements into overt DPs which must have non-null case. Since PRO is per definition in a case-less (or null-case) position, intensification of PRO via intensifier-adjunction would necessarily lead to violations of case-requirements. See also discussion of the possibility of adnominally intensifying PRO in English and Chinese in chapters 5 and 6 respectively. Notice that this account would not run into any problems with $\emptyset$-reflexives in English and Chinese, since these all occur in case-positions. Furthermore, this account needs no extra stipulations, but follows directly from the PRO-theorem. If this last, case-based account of the absence of intensified PRO is correct then it constitutes a potentially powerful argument against current analyses of PRO as receiving zero Case.

At this point the third explanation seems to be the most straightforward in that it does not require any ad hoc stipulations. In the long run it may be worth while exploring the potential relationship between DE SE and PRO. However, doing so is beyond the scope of the present dissertation.
2.2.5 *Selv* used as q-floated adnominal intensifier

In this section we demonstrate how the analysis of intensification proposed above can be used to unify the account of two uses of *selv* which have hitherto been assumed to be of very different nature, viz. the adnominal intensifier and what has been called the “inclusive adverbial intensifier”. The terms “inclusive” and “exclusive” adverbial uses of *selv* were introduced by Ekkehart König to refer to what he takes to be different adverbial uses of intensifiers. The use of the intensifier *himself* in the sentence *Peter had himself written an essay* is “inclusive” in the sense that it presupposes the inclusion of Peter into the set of individuals who have written essays. The use of *himself* in the sentence *Peter had written the essay himself* is exclusive in that it excludes all agents but Peter, i.e. Peter wrote the essay without help/all alone.

When the intensifier *selv* is placed sentence-medially, i.e. right after the inflected verb or auxiliary, it is usually interpreted as the so-called inclusive adverbial *selv* ‘too, also’, see (75).

(75)  *Læreren havde selv skrevet en stil.*
      teacher-the had self written an essay
      ‘The teacher had himself written an essay.’

Although *selv* in this usage has the appearance of an adverbial element we propose to analyze it as being derived from an adnominally intensified DP. That is, we propose that the *selv* in (75) is ‘floated’ in the same sense that the quantifier *alle* ‘all’ in (76) is stranded by quantifier-floating (cf. Sportiche (1988)), see (77) which gives the syntactic tree for the sentences in (75-76).

(76)  *Eleverne havde alle skrevet en stil.*
      Pupils-the had all written an essay
      ‘The pupils had all written an essay.’
As shown in (77) q-floated selv is syntactically derived from adnominal selv. The existence of this derivational relationship is supported by the fact that the interpretation of selv in this usage is closely related to the meaning of adnominal selv. The adjunction of selv to a DP, e.g. *the teacher himself had written an essay*, may serve to emphasize the teacher’s involvement in the event and to contrast it with the other potential agents (i.e. his students, his wife, etc.). The quantifier-floated selv in (75)/(77) appears to have the same semantic contribution. As mentioned in section 2.2.3.2.1, the distribution of adnominal selv is limited the unique identifiability constraint on the DP which is being intensified, see (54)\footnote{As mentioned in section 2.2.3.2.2 the unique identifiability condition (54) can be subsumed under the contrastiveness condition (62). In other words, the unique identifiability condition does not exist. If we continue to refer to the unique identifiability condition, it is therefore only for ease of exposition.}. The examples in (78-83) illustrate that quantifier-floated selv also displays the same identifiability effects and thus has more in common with adnominal selv than with selv used as an “exclusive” manner adverbial.

(78) *Ingen selv pudsede skoene.*  
   nobody self polished shoes-the  
   ‘*Nobody himself polished the shoes.’

(79) Statsministeren selv pudsede skoene.  
   prime minister-the self polished shoes-the  
   ‘The prime minister himself polished the shoes.’
While adnominal selv displays specificity effects in that it can only adjoin to a DP denoting a specific or uniquely identifiable referent, see (78) vs. (79), selv used as an “exclusive” adverbial does not, see (80) and (81) which are both fine. The question is now whether or not quantifier-floated selv is subject to the same unique identifiability constraint. On the basis of the proposed analysis of quantifier-floated selv, see (77), we predict that sentences with q-floated selv should display some sort of identifiability effects. The examples in (82) and (83) offer evidence in favor of this hypothesis.

(82) a. ??/*Ingen pudsede selv skoene. (q-floated selv)
nobody polished self shoes-the
‘*Nobody polished himself the shoes.’
b. Statsministeren pudsede selv skoene. (q-floated selv)
prime minister-the polished self shoes-the
‘The prime minister himself polished the shoes.’

(83) a. *Ingen er selv en klovn. (q-floated selv)
nobody is self a clown
‘*Nobody is himself a clown.’
b. Statsministeren er selv en klovn. (selv q-floated)
prime minister-the is self a clown
‘The prime minister is himself a clown.’

The fact that the sentences in (82a) and (83a) are both infelicitous indicates that q-floated selv is subject to the unique identifiability constraint. We take this as evidence that q-floated selv is an adnominal intensifier which is stranded when its associate moves to a higher position, see (77). That (82a) seems slightly more acceptable to some speakers than (85a), is due to the nature of the predicate. In (82) the predicate pudske sko ‘polish shoes’ is compatible with agent-oriented adverbs, while in (83) the predicate være en klovn ‘be a clown’ is not. This
means that in (82) selv can be forced to be read as an exclusive adverbial, which is compatible with indefinite subjects, while such a reading is excluded by the non-agentive predicate in (83). The impossibility of combining exclusive adverbial selv with non-agentive predicates is illustrated by the sentence in (84).

(84) ??Statsministeren er en klovn selv.
prime minister-the is a clown self

As already mentioned exclusive adverbial selv is a manner adverbial which usually occurs predicate-finally. While such a predicate-final exclusive adverbial selv is ok with the agentive predicate pudse sko ‘polish shoes’, as shown by (81), it is quite infelicitous in (84).

Unlike the exclusive manner adverbial selv ‘all by oneself’, the q-floated selv ‘too, also’ does not imply uniqueness of the agent, see the example in (83b) which contains a predicate which is incompatible with manner adverbials. The meaning of (83b) is not incompatible with scenarios in which people other than the prime minister are clowns. In fact, (83b) seems to imply the existence of a set of propositions of the form ‘x is a clown’, i.e. the focus generated contrast set, in which at least one proposition other than ‘The prime minister is a clown’ (i.e. the foreign minister is a clown, the secretary is a clown, etc.) is also true. In other words, (83b) implies the inclusion of the proposition ‘the prime minister is a clown’ into the non-empty set of true propositions of the form ‘x is a clown’. In this respect, the meaning of the inclusive selv ‘also, too’ seems to be similar to the meaning of the additive particle også ‘also’, compare (83b) and (85).

(85) Statsministeren er ogsaa en klovn.
prime minister-the is also a clown
‘Peter is also a clown.’

Like q-floated selv ‘too, also’, the additive focus particle også ‘also’ is also usually placed immediately after conjugated verb or auxiliary (unlike the exclusive manner adverbial selv ‘all by oneself’ which is VP final), see (86).
Note, however, that inclusive *selv* and the additive focus particle *også* ‘also’ can co-occur in the same sentence, see (87).

\[(87)\] Statsministeren er også selv en klovn.
prime minister-the is also self a clown
‘The Prime minister is also a clown himself.’

The fact that inclusive *selv* and the additive focus particle *også* ‘also’ can co-occur in the same sentence is a strong indication that they do not fulfill exactly the same semantic function(s). Otherwise, such co-occurrence would be impossible. The ‘additive’ aspect of the meaning of inclusive *selv* seems to indicate that it might somehow be related to the pre-nominal additive focus particle *selv* ‘even’, discussed in the previous section, which also evokes additivity. However, unlike the additive focus particle *selv* ‘even’, q-floated *selv* does not necessarily evoke a scale of expectedness. Nor does it seem to involve the same kind of additivity. The presence of additivity can be tested using clefts, see (88).

\[(88)\]
a. Det var dronningen selv, som var blevet nomineret til en Oscar.
   it was queen-the self who was become nominated to an Oscar
   “It was the Queen herself who had been nominated for an Oscar.”

b. (?) Det var dronningen, som selv var blevet nomineret til en Oscar.
   it was queen-the self who was become nominated to an Oscar
   It was the Queen who had herself been nominated for an Oscar.

c. *Det var selv dronningen, som var blevet nomineret til en Oscar.*
   it was queen-the self who was become nominated to an Oscar
   *It was even the Queen who had been nominated for an Oscar.

Cleft-constructions presuppose uniqueness and are thus incompatible with additive focus particles like *selv* ‘even’ in (88c). In contrast, since the adnominal intensifier *selv* does not presuppose additivity, it is fine in cleft-constructions like (88a). If q-floated *selv* is basically a stranded adnominal intensifier, then it should also be compatible with cleft-constructions. As shown in (88b) this prediction seems to be borne out by the facts. The sentences in (88b) may be slightly odd, but it is far from being just unacceptable as (88c). In other words, the
apparent additivity of q-floated selv is not part of its lexical make-up (as in the case of the additive, scalar focus particle selv ‘even’), but rather contextually evoked and may be overridden by the context.

Further evidence supporting the hypothesized derivational relationship between adnominal selv and q-floated selv is provided by the examples in (89-91), which illustrate the possible combinations of adnominal selv, q-floated selv and “exclusive” adverbial selv within a single sentence.

(89)  Statsministeren selv pudsede skoene selv.  (adnominal selv + “exclusive” selv)
prime minister-the self polished shoes-the self
‘The prime minister himself polished the shoes without help from any one.’

(90)  Statsministeren pudsede selv skoene selv.  (q-floated selv + “exclusive” selv)
prime minister-the polished self shoes-the self
‘The prime minister himself polished the shoes without help from any one.’

(91)  #Statsministeren selv pudsede selv skoene.  (adnominal selv + q-floated selv)
prime minister-the self polished self shoes-the
‘The prime minister himself (himself) polished the shoes.’

Combinations of adnominal selv and “exclusive” adverbial selv, and of q-floated selv and “exclusive” adverbial selv are both fine, see (89) and (90). However, combinations of adnominal selv and q-floated selv are infelicitous (or at best highly redundant and very odd), see (91). The generalization seems to be that one instance of “exclusive” selv can be combined with one instance of adnominal selv (q-floated or not), but two instances of adnominal selv cannot be combined in one sentence (even if one is q-floated and the other is not). This incompatibility of adnominal selv and q-floated selv confirms the hypothesized derivational relationship between the two.\(^{34}\)

A further indication that sentence-medial, q-floated selv is derived from the adnominal intensifier comes from stress placement. While the post-nominal adnominal intensifier is

\(^{34}\) In this respect we differ from Siemund (2000) who claims that it is possible to construct grammatical sentences containing all three types of intensifiers, i.e. adnominal plus inclusive and exclusive adverbial intensifiers.
always stressed (e.g. kongen SELV ‘the king HIMSELF’), the additive focus particle is always unstressed (e.g. selv KONGEN ‘even the KING’). As illustrated in (92), q-floated selv is necessarily stressed.

(92) a. *Peter er SELV en klovn.
   Peter is self a clown
   ‘Peter is HIMSELF a clown’

   b. ??PETER er selv en klovn.
      Peter is self a clown
      ‘PETER is himself a clown’

   c. ??Peter er selv en KLOVN.
      Peter is self a clown.
      ‘Peter is himself a CLOWN.’

Again, this may be taken as support for the hypothesis that q-floated selv is derived from the adnominal intensifier, which is also stressed.

In the present state of the language q-floated selv-constructions seem to be found more often than non-q-floated adnominal selv-constructions which tend to be found most often with a simple unmodified DPs (e.g. Stalin, Jesus, the Pope, etc.)\(^\text{35}\). In contrast, q-floated selv-constructions can be found with any type of DP regardless of their complexity, see (93) vs. (94).

(93) a. *Manden (*som var skaldet) selv kom til festen.
   man who was bald self came to party-the
   ‘The man who was bald himself came to the party’

      the old man with blue trousers self came to party-the
      ‘The old man with blue trousers himself came to the party’

(94) a. *Manden som var skaldet kom selv til festen.
   man-the who was bald came self to party-the
   ‘The man who was bald himself came to the party’

\(^\text{35}\) Another factor to be taken into consideration is that fact that non-q-floated selv-constructions tend to be found most often with a restricted set of DPs denoting high status individuals (e.g. the king, the bishop, the president, Jesus, etc.). See also the discussion of lexically defined prominence, e.g. (55), in section 2.2.3.2.2. It is also not impossible that heavy DP-effects or similar processing factors might be (partly) responsible for these differences between adnominal intensifiers in-situ and q-floated intensifiers. This might explain why q-floated selv is preferred with DPs with long post-nominal modifiers.
As discussed in section 2.2.2.2, examples such as (93) seem to indicate a difference with respect to stacking options. Simple DPs, e.g. (93a,b) without the post-nominal relative clause/PP, can be adnominally intensified without any problems. In contrast DPs modified by post-nominal relative clauses/PPs can only be intensified via a q-floated selv, compare (93) vs. (94).

Syntactically the intensifier selv behaves very much like the quantifier alle ‘all’ which also has both a pre-nominal adjectival form and a post-nominal appositional form. The post-nominal quantifier alle ‘all’ modifying direct and indirect object pronouns is illustrated by the sentences in (95).

(95) a. Læreren roste os alle. 
   teacher-the praised us all.
   ‘The teacher praised us all.’

   b. Peter gav dem alle en krone.
   Peter gave them all a crown (=monetary unit in Denmark).
   ‘Peter gave them all a crown.’

Just as the intensifier selv has a pre-nominal adjectival form (i.e. selve, see section 2.2.6), the quantifier alle also has a pre-nominal adjectival form (i.e. al, alt, alle), see (96).

(96) a. Alt oksekødet er udsolgt.
   all beef-the is sold out.
   ‘All the beef is sold out.’

36 The sentences in (95a,b) involve object shift of the personal pronouns os ‘us’, and dem ‘them’. Sentences in which the DO and IO are lexical DPs (which cannot object shift), would have pre-nominal quantifiers in situ, e.g. (ia-b).

   (i) a. Læreren roste alle eleverne.
       teacher-the praised all pupils-the
       ‘The teacher praised all the pupils.’

   b. Peter gave alle børnene en krone.
       Peter gave all children-the a crown
       ‘Peter gave all the children a crown’.

This indicates that the quantifier alle in (95a-b), may not, in fact, be a post-nominal adjuncts, but rather pre-nominal quantifiers which have become ‘floated’ when their associates (i.e. the personal pronouns os ‘us’, and dem ‘them’) moved to a higher position due to object-shift.
b. Jeg inviterede alle mine venner.
I invited all my friends
‘I invited all my friends.’

c. Du får al den hjælp(common) du behøver.
you get all the help you need
‘You’re getting all the help you need.’

As already illustrated by the example in (76), alle may be q-floated just like selv, compare also (97a,b) and (97c).

(97) a. Eleverne bestod alle eksamen.
pupils-the passed all exam-the
‘The pupils all passed the exam.’
b. Vi er alle tilfredse med resultatet.
we are all satisfied with result-the
‘We are all satisfied with the result.’
c. Vi er selv tilfredse med resultatet.
we are self pleased with result-the
‘We are ourselves pleased with the result.’

With the above analysis of q-floated intensifiers in mind, let us now turn to ambiguous sentences in which selv can be read as either an adnominal intensifier modifying the direct object, see (98i) and (99i), a q-floated selv, see (99ii), or an “exclusive” adverbial selv (98ii) and (99iii).

(98) Peter malte muren selv.
Peter painted wall-the self
(i) ‘Peter painted the wall itself.’ (adnominal selv)
(ii) ‘Peter painted the wall himself.’ (“exclusive” adv. selv)

(99) Peter malte den selv.
Peter painted it self
(i) ‘Peter painted it itself.’ (adnominal selv)
(ii) ‘Peter himself painted it’ (q-floated selv)
(iii) ‘Peter painted it himself.’ (“exclusive” adv. selv)

The first reading (98i), in which selv is an adnominal intensifier modifying the internal object DP muren ‘wall-the’, is illustrated in (100).
While in (99) selv may have both an “exclusive” (99iii) and a q-floated reading (99ii) in addition to the adnominal reading, in (98) selv can only be either adnominal (98i) or “exclusive” (98ii). These differences between (98) and (99) can be shown to follow from Mainland Scandinavian (MSc.) object shift. The sentences in (101) illustrate how the placement of negation can be used to test whether object shift has taken place or not.

(101) a. *Peter malte muren ikke selv.
Peter painted wall-the not self
‘Peter didn’t paint the wall himself.’

b. *Peter malte muren ikke selv.
Peter painted wall-the not self

For the analysis of MSc. object shift and sentence structure in general we follow Holmberg & Platzack (1995). In Danish, Norwegian and Swedish, certain types of objects may be object-shifted, i.e. they may precede the negation words and similar predicate adjuncts, see (101c). In MSc., as opposed to Icelandic, object-shift is restricted to personal pronouns, see (101b) vs.
(101c). We assume that object shifted pronouns have moved out of their argument positions to spec-\(v\)P (cf. Platzack and Holmberg (1995:143) who take shifted object to be left-adjointed to the predicate). In other words, if the negation \(ikke\) ‘not’ is adjoined at the outer left edge of the predicate then the fact that the pronoun \(den\) ‘it’ in (101c) can precede it while the DP \(muren\) ‘the wall’ cannot shows that Danish object pronouns can shift while full DPs cannot\(^{37}\).

Holmberg and Platzack (1995:143) observed that object shift is subject to certain restrictions. First of all, shifted objects never crosses the main verb. This means that object shift only happens after overt movement of the main verb out of the predicate (i.e. \(v\)P) has taken occurred. Given that auxiliary verbs block verb-movement, object shift is never found in clauses with auxiliary verbs. The Danish sentences in (102-103) support this analysis.

(102)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Peter havde (ikke) malt muren selv.} & \text{ (“exclusive” selv)} \\
& \text{ Peter had (not) painted wall-the \textbf{self}} & \text{ (“exclusive” selv)} \\
& \text{‘Peter had not painted the wall himself.’} & \\
\text{b. } & \text{Peter havde (ikke) selv malt muren.} & \text{ (q-floated selv)} \\
& \text{ Peter had (not) self painted wall-the} & \text{ (q-floated selv)} \\
& \text{‘Peter himself had not painted the wall.’} & \\
\text{c. } & \text{*Peter havde muren (ikke) malt.} & \text{ (q-floated selv)} \\
& \text{Peter had wall-the (not) painted} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

(103)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Peter havde (ikke) malt den selv.} & \text{ (“exclusive” selv)} \\
& \text{ Peter had (not) painted it self} & \text{ (“exclusive” selv)} \\
& \text{‘Peter had not painted it himself.’} & \\
\text{b. } & \text{*Peter havde (ikke) selv malt den.} & \text{ (q-floated selv)} \\
& \text{Peter had (not) self painted it} & \text{ (q-floated selv)} \\
& \text{‘Peter himself had not painted it.’} & \\
\text{c. } & \text{*Peter havde den (ikke) malt.} & \text{ (q-floated selv)} \\
& \text{Peter had it (not) painted} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Compare (101c) where object shift is allowed with (103c) where the auxiliary \(havde\) ‘had’ blocks object shift. The examples in (102-3) also illustrate the fact that auxiliaries help disambiguate between q-floated \(selv\) (which is stranded in the \(VP\)-internal subject position), see (102-3b) and the predicate-final manner adverbial, i.e. “exclusive” \(selv\) in (102-3a).

\(^{37}\) As for the movement rule responsible for object shift, H&P propose that “it is a “mixed rule”, exhibiting a particular mix of properties of A-movement and A-bar movement”(H&P, p.142). Since the exact nature of this rule
Finally, the main vs. embedded clause contrast in object shift can also be used to disambiguate between different uses of selv ‘self’. Since in MSc. movement of the verb out of the predicate only takes place in main clauses, it follows that object shift is also is restricted to main clauses, see (104).

(104) a. * . . . at Peter malte ikke muren selv.
   . . . that Peter painted not wall-the self
b. . . . at Peter ikke malte muren selv. ("exclusive" selv)
   . . . that Peter not painted wall-the self
   ‘... that Peter didn’t paint the wall himself.’
c. * . . . at Peter malte den ikke selv.
   . . . that Peter painted it not self
d. . . . at Peter ikke malte den selv. ("exclusive" selv)
   . . . that Peter not painted it self
   ‘... that Peter didn’t paint it himself.’

Given what we know about object shift, the placement of the negation and MSc. sentence structure in general, it is now fairly easy to explain why selv in (99) is ambiguous between either q-floated selv, or “exclusive” adverbial selv, while in (98) it can only be an “exclusive” adverbial intensifier (in addition to the adnominal reading which both sentences have). The structural ambiguity of (99) has been teased apart in (105-6), (105) showing the structure underlying the q-floated reading, and (106) showing the structure underlying the exclusive adverbial reading of selv.

is not important for the purposes of the present analysis of selv we simply refer the reader to H&P (1995).
The structures in (105-6) is based on Platzack & Holmberg (1995). In their analysis, “Act” is a functional projecting head encoding voice which is “situated inside the predicate, taking VP as a complement and taking the external argument of the verb as its specifier” (p. 20). In currently used terminology “vP” and “TP” have replaced the now obsolete “ActP” and “IP”, but otherwise the structure in (105-6) are the same as the ones proposed by Platzack and Holmberg. In the object shift constructions “the verb has moved out of the VP, first to Actο, then to Iο and eventually to Cο” and the “object pronoun [..] is left-joined to the predicate, i.e. ActP” (ibid. pp. 143, 140).
Let us briefly summarize the findings of this section. The analysis of adnominal selv, q-floated selv and exclusive adverbial selv proposed above enables us to correctly predict:

(i) that the sentence in (98) cannot have the q-floated so-called “inclusive” reading but only the “exclusive” one.
(ii) that the sentence in (99) can have both the “inclusive” and the “exclusive” readings, see (105) and (106).
(iii) that adnominal selv and q-floated selv cannot felicitously be combined in the same sentence; since they are really both instances of adnominal intensification, see (91).
(iv) that exclusive adverbial selv can be combined with adnominal selv or q-floated selv in the same sentence.

Multiply ambiguous sentences like (99) illustrate one of the main challenges faced by anyone researching the grammar of intensification: the need to clearly distinguish between different uses of intensifiers. The fact that in many sentences the element selv is multiply ambiguous makes it very difficult to get consistently reliable judgements. Further adding to this difficulty is the fact that grammaticality judgments of sentences containing intensifiers are usually highly susceptible to discourse- and pragmatic contexts.

The above analysis of the so-called inclusive adverbial selv as a q-floated adnominal selv illustrates one of the goals of this dissertation: to reduce as many seemingly different uses of intensifiers as possible to the same underlying principles. In this case, what was formerly believed to be an adverbial use of the element has been shown to be an instance of adnominal intensification falling under the contrastiveness condition (62). It also shows that DP-traces may be adnominally intensified.

### 2.2.6 Fronted selv

As shown in (107) and (108), the adnominal intensifier selv may be fronted.

(107) a. *Jeg SELV tør aldrig modsige ham.* (adnominal selv, in situ)

I self dare never contradict him
‘I myself dare never contradict him.’
b. Kongen SELV har ringe magt.  
king-the self has slight power
‘The king himself has little power.’

(108) a. SELV tør jeg aldrig modsige ham.  
self dare I never contradict him
‘I myself dare never contradict him.’
b. SELV har kongen ringe magt.  
self has king-the slight power
‘The king himself has little power.’

Such instances of fronted selv should not be confused with the pre-nominal scalar, additive focus adverb selv ‘even’, see the examples in (109)39.

(109) a. Selv JEG tør aldrig modsige ham.  
even I dare never contradict him
‘Even I dare never contradict him.’
b. Selv KONGEN har ringe magt.  
even king-the has slight power
‘Even the king has little power.’

Both the Danish sentences and their respective English translations in (108-9) are adapted from Allan et al. (1995:169). The authors of this descriptive grammar of Danish appear to assume fronted selv to be derived from the post-nominal adnominal intensifier by a productive syntactic process of fronting. While we agree with this assumption, we also realize the need for independent tests to exclude the possibility of fronted selv being derived from the scalar, additive focus particle ‘even’. Just like in the case of q-floated selv, discussed in section 2.2.5, different tests can be applied: (i) the so-called unique identifiability constraint on adnominal intensification, and (ii) relative stress placement, i.e. does stress fall on the element selv itself or on the expression it is in construction with?

Since we know that the element selv is stressed when used as adnominal intensifier, e.g. kongen SELV ‘the king himself’ in (107b), the fact that fronted selv is stressed, see (108), could be taken as an indication that fronted selv is an instance of the adnominal intensifier.

39 See section sect. 2.4. for more discussion of the scalar, additive focus adverb selv ‘even’.
However, this argument is rather weak since the stress on fronted *selv* can also be argued to follow from general properties of the process of fronting, i.e. all fronted elements are stressed.

The examples in (110) are intended to test whether fronted *selv* (110a) is subject to the same unique identifiability constraint as adnominal intensification (110b).

(110) a. */??Selv har en konge ringe magt.
self has a king slight power
‘A king himself has little power.’

b. */??En konge selv har ringe magt.
a king self has slight power
‘A king himself has little power.’

c. Selv en konge har ringe magt.
even a king has slight power
‘Even a king has little power.’

The unacceptability of (110a) suggests that we are correct in assuming that fronted *selv* derives from the adnominal intensifier *selv* ‘himself’ (110b) rather than from the additive focus particle *selv* ‘even’, which is ok with indefinite DPs, see (110c). We therefore conclude that fronted *selv* is sub-case of adnominal intensification.

Interestingly, the examples in (108), as well as all the other examples of fronted *selv* mentioned in Allan et al. (1995) all contain a negative element: “*Selv* in this position usually has negative connotations and therefore tends to occur with a negation (*ikke* ‘not’; *aldrig* ‘never’, etc.)” (Allen et al (1995:169). This peculiarity of fronted *selv*, viz. that it appear to be possible only in negative sentences, may be related to the fact that in the Slavic languages, adnominal intensifiers, which, incidentally, are pre-nominal, e.g. Russian *sam DP* ≈ (Eng.) *DP himself*, may be interpreted as additive focus particles with the meaning ‘even’ only when occurring in negative sentences, i.e. downward entailing environments. It may therefore be possible to analyze fronted *selv* as an intermediary case, between the post-nominal adnominal intensifier and pre-nominal scalar, additive focus particle ‘even’. In section 2.4 we suggest

---

40 This generalization and the potential consequences for the analysis of fronted *selv* in Danish were brought to my attention by R. Pancheva (p.c).
that the differences between *selv* used as pre-nominal additive scalar focus particle and *selv* used as post-nominal adnominal intensifier follow from syntactic differences (i.e. post- vs. pre-nominal position). If this is indeed the case, then the fact that fronted instances of the adnominal intensifier *selv* should have some properties of the scalar, additive focus particle ‘even’ (viz. the fact that it is only found in downward entailing environments (just like pre-nominal *cam* ‘alone, himself, even’ in Bulgarian when used as scalar additive focus particle ‘even’)) should come as no surprise. In other words, it might be possible to use the similarities between fronted *selv* in Danish and the additive scalar focus particle *cam* ‘alone’ in Bulgarian to bolster the argument that syntactic position matters, i.e. the same element *selv* takes on different properties post-nominally and pre-nominally.

### 2.2.7 Adnominal intensification: unification of different sub-cases

At this point two of the “threefold” goals of this chapter mentioned on page 4 have been achieved. That is, we have proposed a focus-based analysis of adnominal intensification, see (62) in section 2.2.3.2.2, and shown that the different uses of *selv* listed in (111) are all instances of adnominal intensification and thus fall under the condition in (62).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(111)</th>
<th>Adnominal Intensification:</th>
<th>Example:</th>
<th>Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>intensified DPs</td>
<td>(1), (14)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>intensified reflexives</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.1, chap. 3, sect. 3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>intensified pronouns</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.1, chap. 3, sect. 3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>q-floated intensifier</td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>fronted <em>selv</em></td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.2.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the third goal, viz. the unification of all uses of *selv* – both adnominal and non-adnominal – remains and will be dealt with in the following sections as summarized in (112).
2.3  Selv in secondary predication constructions

In this section we argue that what has often been referred to as the “exclusive” adverbial use of the intensifier selv, see (113), should be analyzed as a secondary predication construction.

(113)  Peter reparerede bilen selv.
       Peter repaired car-the self
       ‘Peter repaired the car himself’

Syntactically, this particular use of selv appears to behave like a manner adverbial adjoining to the VP. Semantically, its effect is to exclude all but the referent of the subject DP as agent of the predicate in the sentence. Hence the term “exclusive” adverbial intensifier. In this respect, selv functions very much like the particle alene ‘alone’. Both alene ‘alone’ and selv can be modified by the element helt ‘all, completely’, see (114a,b).

(114)  a.  Peter reparerede bilen helt selv.
       Peter repaired the car completely self
       ‘Peter repaired the car all by himself.’
       b.  Peter reparerede bilen helt alene.
       Peter repaired the car completely alone
       ‘Peter repaired the car all alone.’

Further support for assuming the instances of selv in (113-114) to be manner adverbials comes from sentences like the ones in (115a-b) which show that neither selv in the meaning ‘all (by) oneself’ nor alene ‘alone’ can occur sentence-medially but must occur predicate-finally, or outside the predicate, to be more exact\(^\text{41}\). The examples in (116) also illustrate that the manner adverbial hurtigt ‘fast’ behaves in the same way.

---

\(^{41}\) The similarities between selv and alene ‘alone’, is further bolstered by the fact that in certain languages, e.g. Russian and Bulgarian, the element used as adnominal intensifier actually means ‘alone’, e.g. Russ. sam ‘alone, x-
Like *alone 'alone', *selv usually occurs predicate-finally. Notice that the exclusive manner adverbial *selv 'all by oneself' and *alone 'alone' share the “exclusive” meaning with the focus particle *kun 'only', see (117).

(117) a. Kun Peter reparerede bilen.
Only Peter repaired car-the
‘Only Peter repaired the car.’

The common meaning component of exclusive *selv ‘(by) himself’, the adjective *alone ‘alone’, and the focus particle *kun ‘only’ (in these sentences) then, consists in identifying the agent of the predicate as unique.

Finally, as already mentioned in section 2.2.5, sentence-final *selv can lead to a structural ambiguity between a reading as adnominal intensifier and a reading as exclusive manner adverbial, see (118a).

42 Note that sentence medial *selv is not impossible, e.g. *Peter havde *selv malt huset ‘Peter had himself/also painted the house’, but that it is not interpreted as an exclusive manner adverbial ‘by oneself, all alone’. As shown in section 2.2.5, this sentence-medial *selv should be analyzed as a q-floated adnominal intensifier.
(118) a. Peter barberede kongen selv.
   Peter shaved king-the self
   (i) ‘Peter shaved the king himself.’ (selv = adnominal intensifier, modifying the DP kongen ‘king-the’ to which it is adjoined)
   (ii) ‘Peter shaved the king all by himself.’ (selv = exclusive manner adverbial modifying the VP)

b. Peter barberede kongen helt selv.
   Peter shaved king-the completely self
   ‘Peter shaved the king all by himself.’

As shown in (118b) the insertion of the adverbial modifier helt ‘completely, all’ between the DP kongen ‘the king’ and the element selv has the effect of disambiguating in favor of the exclusive adverbial reading of selv. See section 2.2.5 for further discussion of other ways (insertion of negation, object shift, relative placement of auxiliaries, etc.) to disambiguate between different uses of selv.

2.4 Selv used as scalar additive focus particle meaning ‘even’

Typological studies have shown that in many languages, the same element which is used as adnominal intensifier is also used as scalar additive focusing adverb (cf. König (1998)). While English uses two different words for these functions (i.e. even and himself), Danish, German, French, Persian, Bulgarian and Russian can use the same word in both cases, compare the (a) and (b) examples in (119-124).

(119) English:
   a. The king **himself** delivered the speech. (adnominal intensifier)
   b. **Even** the janitor delivered a speech. (scalar additive focus particle)

(120) Danish:
   a. Kongen **selv** holdt talen.
      king-the self held speech-the
      ‘The king himself delivered the speech.’
   b. **Selv** viseværten holdt en tale.
      self janitor held a speech
      ‘Even the janitor delivered a speech.’
German:

a. Der König **selbst** hieß die Rede. (adnominal intensifier)
   the king self held the speech
   ‘The king himself delivered the speech.’

b. **Selbst** der Hausmeister hieß eine Rede. (additive focusing particle)
   even the janitor held a speech
   ‘Even the janitor gave a speech.’

French:

a. Le roi (lui-)**même** a prononcé le discours. (adnominal intensifier)
   the king him self has pronounced the discourse
   ‘The king him-self has delivered the speech.’

b. **Même** le concierge a prononcé le discours. (additive focusing particle)
   even the janitor has pronounced the discourse
   ‘Even the janitor has delivered a speech.’

Persian:

a. **Xod-e** pâdeshâh dar in jalaseh sherkat kard. (adnominal intensifier)
   self king in this meeting participated
   ‘The king himself participated in this meeting.’

b.**Xod-e** pâdeshâh **ham** dar in jalaseh sherkat kard. (focusing particle)
   self king also in this meeting participated
   ‘Even the king participated in this meeting.’

   (i) **Xod-e** pâdeshâh **ham** dar in jalaseh sherkat kard. (focusing particle)
   even king also in this meeting participated
   ‘Even the king participated in this meeting.’

   (ii) **Hatta** pâdeshâh (**ham**) dar in jalaseh sherkat kard. (focusing particle)
   even king also in this meeting participated
   ‘Even the king participated in this meeting.’

Bulgarian:

a. Samijat kral dojde na sâbranieto.
   self-the king came to meeting-the
   The king himself came to the meeting.’

b. Samijat kral ne dojde na sâbranieto.
   self-the king not came to meeting-the
   ‘Even the king did not come to the meeting.’

---

43 The German and French examples in (121a-b) and (122a-b) are adapted from Eckhardt (2000:1, (1), (2))

44 As illustrated in (i), in Persian the morphologically simple element **xod** appears to be used both as reflexive and as adnominal intensifier.

   (i) **Pâdeshâh az** **xod-es**h bad-es**h** mi-âgad. (reflexive)
   king from self-3SG BAD-3SG PROG-âgad.(bad âmadan ‘to dislike)
   ‘The king hates himself.’

   In the literature on Persian **xod** has often been analyzed as a simple reflexive. Alternatively, it would, at least theoretically, be possible to analyze it as an adnominal intensifier adjoined to a zero reflexive, **xod Ø**. Whether such an analysis is compatible with the facts of Persian is beyond the scope of the present chapter. See chapter 5 for
As shown in (120), in Danish the scalar additive focus particle *even* (= Dan. *selv Peter* ‘even Peter’) and the adnominal intensifier *himself* (= Dan. *Peter selv* ‘Peter himself’) have the same overt morphological realization. Furthermore, adnominal intensifiers and *even* both involve association with focus. *Even* also obligatorily involves evocation of a contextually determined scale on which the value of the expression that is the focus of *selv* is ranked as the least expected/most remarkable/etc. In contrast, whether adnominal intensifiers evoke scalar ranking of their associates with respect to a contrast set of alternatives depends on the context. In that respect adnominal intensification is similar to contrastive focus. Another semantic difference between the adnominal intensifier and *even* lies in the existential presupposition of *even* which is not shared by the adnominal intensifier. That is, while (119-124b) presuppose that somebody other than the janitor also delivered a speech, (119-124a) do not evoke any such presupposition, i.e. the king may or may not have been the only individual who delivered the speech.

The sentences in (123b(i)) and (123b(ii)), illustrate the fact that, in Persian, the meaning of the additive focus particle *hatta* ‘even’ can be expressed by a combination of the adnominal intensifier *xod* ‘self’ and that additive particle *ham* ‘also, too’. Given that one of the main semantic difference between the adnominal intensifier and the scalar additive focus particle ‘even’ is the presence of an existential presupposition with ‘even’, this should come as no surprise.

Notice the interesting correlation between syntactic position and the difference between the use of intensifiers as adnominal intensifiers and additive focus particles: in German, Mainland Scandinavian and French, intensifiers function as adnominal intensifiers in post-nominal position and as additive focus particles when in they occur in pre-nominally
position, see (120-122a) vs. (120-122b). As illustrated by the Bulgarian examples in (124), in the Slavic languages intensifiers are always pre-nominal both when interpreted as adnominal intensifiers, as in (124a), and when interpreted as scalar additive focus particles, as in (124b). Interestingly, the reading of intensifiers as scalar additive focus particles can only be obtained in downward-entailing environments. That is, without the negations ‘not’ the element sam ‘self’ in (124b) would be interpreted as adnominal intensifiers\(^{45}\) and not as scalar additive focus particles.

In addition to the above examples illustrating the close synchronic relationship between focusing particles and intensifiers, there is also ample historical data showing that these elements are intimately related. Indeed, diachronic studies of German have established that the use of *selbst* as additive focusing particle developed from the adnominal intensifier *selbst* around 1700 (cf. Eckhardt (2000))\(^{46}\). Siemund (2000) notes a number of similarities between the German adnominal intensifier *selbst ‘himself’* and the additive scalar focus particle *selbst ‘even’* and concludes that they “are basically the same word, simply subject to slightly different (syntactic, semantic, pragmatic) patterns of use” (Siemund, 2000:ch.5). A similar approach to the similarities between intensifiers and additive focus particles will be adopted here. That is, we suggest that the different behavior of the intensifier *selv* and the

\(^{45}\) A similar connection between pre-nominal position and dependence on the presence of a negation is also found with “fronted selv” in Danish, see section 2.2.6. Investigating this relationship between negation and the use pre-nominal intensifiers as scalar additive focus particles may potentially lead to very interesting results. However, since it falls outside the scope of this dissertation we will simply leave it for further research.

\(^{46}\) The example in (i), from S. Kierkegaard (1843) *Frygt og Bøven*, illustrates a transitional stage of early Modern Danish in which *selv* could be used post-nominally with the meaning ‘even’.  

(i)  
\[a. \quad \text{Hun […] kan […] bringe stene selv til at græde […]} \]
\[\text{She can bring stones self to to cry} \]

‘She can make stones themselves cry’ or ‘She can make even stones cry’

Examples like (ii) below seem to indicate that the focus particle *even* may be used as a post-nominal particle similar to the intensifier *x-self*.

(ii)  
\[\text{Mary even came to the meeting.} \]
focusing particle *selv* may potentially be accounted for by assuming that the same morpheme *selv* takes on different functions when it occurs in different syntactic positions.\(^{47}\)

### 2.4.1 Syntax of the scalar, additive focus particle *selv* ‘even’

In English the adnominal intensifier *himself* and the scalar additive focus particle *even* are two different words. In Danish, however, the same element *selv* is used in both meanings. One way to tell the two uses apart is the placement of *selv* with respect to the nominal expression serving as its associate. As shown in the examples (119-125), the adnominal intensifier follows immediately after its associate, which has to be a nominal expression, i.e. a DP. In contrast, when used as scalar additive focus particle, *selv* immediately precedes its associate, which can be either a DP as in (126a), a pronoun as in (126b), a PP as in (148c), a CP as in (126d-e).

(126)  

\[ \text{a. } Selv \text{ Peter var i stand til at løse problemet.} \]  
\[ \text{even Peter was in state to to solve problem-the} \]  
\[ \text{‘Even Peter was capable of solving the problem.’} \]

\[ \text{b. } Selv \text{ ham ville hun gerne kysse.} \]  
\[ \text{even him would she willingly kiss} \]  
\[ \text{‘She was willing to kiss even him.’} \]

\[ \text{c. } Han \text{ betalte selv for hende.} \]  
\[ \text{he paid even for her} \]  
\[ \text{‘He paid even for her.’} \]

\[ \text{d. } Selv \text{ når det regner er han glad.} \]  
\[ \text{even when it rains is he happy} \]  
\[ \text{‘He is happy even when it rains.’} \]

\[ \text{e. } Selvom \text{ Janet er englænder, taler hun flydende dansk}\]  
\[ \text{even-if Janet is Englishman speaks she fluent Danish} \]  
\[ \text{‘Although she’s English, Janet speaks fluent Danish.’ (Allan et al. (1995:472)} \]

---

Note, however, that the intensifier reading of *even* in (ii) requires a specific stress pattern.

\(^{47}\) See also Eckardt (2001), and Martin (1975) for other analyses attempting unification of the same uses of *selbst* in German and *même* in French.

\(^{48}\) Danish has two conjunctions meaning ‘though, although, even though’ which can be used alternatively in most contexts: *skønt* and *selvom*. While *skønt* is monomorphic, *selvom* is clearly a compound consisting of *selv* ‘even’ + the conjunction *om* ‘if, whether’. While these two words can generally be used interchangeably they do differ in one respect: “Both *selvom* and *skønt* can be used for factual utterances, but for hypothetical statements, *selvom* is generally used” (Allan et al. (1995:473)).
Note that unlike English even, Dan. selv (as well as Ger. selbst and Slavic sam) cannot have verbal associates, see (127) vs. (128).

(127)  *Peter even BIKE\_D around the block.

(128)  *Peter selv CYKLE\_DE rundt om blokken.

Peter even BIKE\_D around about block-the

The Danish counterpart of Eng. even when used with verbal associates is endog ‘even’, see (129).

(129)  Peter endog CYKLE\_DE rundt om blokken.

Peter even BIKE\_D around about block-the

‘Peter even BIKE\_D around the block.’

Another difference between the post-nominal adnominal intensifier selv ‘himself’ and the pre-nominal (or rather ‘pre-focal’, i.e. preceding its associate) additive focus particle selv ‘even’ is stress-placement. Being a focus particle, selv ‘even’ is associated with focus. This focus is realized phonetically as stress on the associate of selv ‘even’, i.e. on the constituent following the focus particle, see (130a).

(130)  a.  Selv PETER løste opgaven.

‘Even Peter solved problem-the.’

b.  Peter SELV løste opgaven.

‘Peter himself solved problem-the.’

In contrast, in constructions involving the adnominal intensifier selv ‘himself’ it is the element selv which is stressed, see (130b). It could, perhaps, be argued that the difference in stress placement between constructions involving adnominal intensification and constructions involving the focus particle selv ‘even’ is merely a phonological phenomenon which follows from the fact that in Danish constituent stress fall on a prominent constituent-final sub-constituent. If that is the case, then the difference in stress placement should be considered as a side-effect of the post-nominal vs. pre-nominal placement.

From this point of view the
crucial difference between the adnominal intensifier use of the element *selv* and its use as an additive focus particle is syntactic rather than prosodic.

### 2.4.2 Semantics of the scalar, additive focus particle *selv* ‘even’

Descriptively the different theories of focus particles in the literature agree that the main semantic contribution of *selv* used as the scalar, additive focus particle *selv* ‘even’ consists in evoking two implicatures. The so-called existential implicature captures the additivity of *selv* ‘even’ by requiring the proposition to be true for at least one of the members of the focus-generated contrast set of alternatives to the referent of the associate of *selv*. The second implicature is responsible for ranking the truth of the proposition lower on a scale of probability than the truth of any of the alternative propositions in the contrast set. In the following we present an analysis of *selv* ‘even’ closely inspired by Karttunen and Peters (1979) and Eckardt (2001). First consider the sentences in (131) and (132).

(131) a. *Even the king came to the meeting.*
   
   *Selv kongen kom til mødet.*
   
   even king-the came to meeting-the
   ‘Even the king came to the meeting.’

(132) *The king came to the meeting.*

As far as truth conditions are concerned the sentence in (131a), and its Danish equivalent in (131b), and the sentence in (132) are equivalent. In other words, the word *selv* ‘even’ plays no role in determining the truth conditions and, as a consequence, (131) and (132) express the same proposition. However, this does not mean that the presence of *even* in (131) contributes nothing to the meaning of the sentence. According to Karttunen and Peters (1979), the semantic import of the particle *even* can best be captured in terms of conventional implicatures. In addition to asserting that the that king came to the meeting the sentence in (132) also allow the hearer to conclude that the speaker believes in the truth of (133a-b).
(133)  a. Other people besides the king came to the meeting.
    b. Of the people under consideration, the king is the least likely to come to the meeting.

The sentences (133a) and (133b) represent what is usually referred to as the existential and scalar implicatures of *even*, respectively. Following Grice, these implicatures can be defined as conventional (rather than conversational) since they do not arise from the interaction of general conversational principles (e.g. cooperation principle, etc., see Grice (1975)), and the specific properties of the sentences themselves and their surrounding contexts. Being conventional, these implicatures cannot be overridden by the context, see (134).

(134) #Even the king came to the meeting but no one else did.

The fact that (134) constitutes a contradiction thus witnesses the conventional nature of the existential implicature expressed in (133a). Notice, however, that since the propositions in (133) are implicated rather than asserted (as is (132)), their falsity is judged less detrimental to the communication process than the falsity of (132). That is, in situations where the proposition in (132) is false uttering (131) would be considered as act of lying, or miscommunication. In contrast, in situations where (133a,b) are false, uttering (131) would be judged less harshly. In such cases the speaker would likely be considered to have uttered a sentence which is at least partially true. Rather than blaming the speaker for misrepresenting the truth the hearer might simply correct his misconceptions by uttering either (135) or (136)⁴⁹.

(135) Well yes, he did come to the meeting; but that is just as one should expect.

(136) Well yes, he did come to the meeting; but, in fact, he was the only one who showed up.

⁴⁹ Karttunen and Peters mention yet another test to distinguish between what is asserted and what is merely conventionally implied by a given sentence: “The distinction between these two aspects of meaning in (153) can be brought out even more clearly by considering the meaning of complex sentences such as (i), which contains (153) in an embedded position”(Karttunen and Peters (1979)).

(i) I just noticed that even the king came to the meeting.

“Sentence (i) says that the speaker has just noticed that the king came to the meeting. It does not mean that he has just noticed that other people came to the meeting or just noticed that the king is the least likely person to have come. In (i), the meaning of *notice* applies only to the proposition expressed by (132) - not to (133a) or (133b) or to the conjunction of (132) and (133).” (ibid. p. 13, numbers of examples changed fit present context)
In contrast, in situations in which (132) is false, it would be impossible to correct the mistake of the speaker of (131) by uttering (137).

137) *Yes, you wouldn’t expect the king to have come to the meeting; as a matter of fact, he didn’t come.*

The insights of the Karttunen & Peters (1979) summarized above, form the basis for the analysis of *selv* ‘even’ proposed here. First consider the following sentences which illustrate the similarities between focus and the additive focus particle *even*, see (138a,b).

138) a. [The king]$_f$ came to the meeting.
   b. Even [the king]$_f$ came to the meeting.

Both sentences in (138) contain a focused element, i.e. [The king]$_f$. According to Rooth’s (1992) theory of focus, the meaning of any sentence containing a focused element comprises an ordinary semantic value, i.e. the proposition expressed by the sentence, see (139), and a focus semantic value, i.e. a contrast set, see (140). As shown in (140), the contrast set generated by focus is a set of propositions of the type *x came to the meeting* in which the focused element has been replaced by entities taken from the set $D_e$.

139) Ordinary semantic value of 138a,b):
   a. $[[\text{The king}]_f \text{ came to the meeting}]^o$
      $= 1$ iff the king came to the meeting.
   b. $[[\text{Even [the king]}_f \text{ came to the meeting}]^o$
      $= 1$ iff the king came to the meeting.

140) Focus semantic value of (138a,b):
   a. $[[\text{The king}]_f \text{ came to the meeting }]^f$
      $= \{ \text{came-to-the-meeting}(x) \mid x \in D_e \}$
   b. $[[\text{Even [the king]}_f \text{ came to the meeting}]^f$
      $= \{ \text{came-to-the-meeting}(x) \mid x \in D_e \}$

For the formalization of *even* we will adopt a slightly modified version of the analysis proposed in Eckardt (2001) which uses Rooth’s ordinary and semantic values primitives, see (141) and (142).

---

50 The set $D_e$ is usually assumed to be constrained pragmatically to contain only those entities which are ‘relevant’ in a given context.
(141) Analysis of the additive focus particle even\textsuperscript{51}.

\textit{even} + S

\textbf{a. Assertion:} \([[[S]]]^{o}\)

\textbf{b. Scalar implicature (i)} \(\forall p \in [[[S]]]^{f} \setminus \{[[[S]]]^{o}\}: [[[S]]]^{o} < p\)

\textbf{Existential implicature (ii)} \(\exists p \in [[[S]]]^{f} \setminus \{[[[S]]]^{o}\}: p = 1\)

(142) Scale of expectedness (Eckardt (2000)):

Let \(<_{c}\) be an ordering of propositions according to their probability or expectedness in a given context c. ("p \(<_{c}\) q" reads like "p is less expected, less probable, more surprising than q")

Analyzing (138b) according to (141a) we first determine the assertion expressed by (160b) to be its ordinary semantic value, see (143).

(143) Assertion of (160b) = Ordinary semantic value of (138b):

\([[[The\ king]_{f}\ came\ to\ the\ meeting\ }]^{o}\ = \ 1\) iff the king came to the meeting.

Next, given the focus semantic value of (138b), see (144), and the formalization of the scalar implicature in (141b(i)) and (142), we can capture the scalar implicature of (138b) as in (145).

(144) Focus semantic value of (138b):

\([[[\text{Even} [\text{the king}]_{f}\ came\ to\ the\ meeting]]]^{f}\)

\(= \{\text{came-to-the-meeting}(x) \mid x \in D_{c}\}\)

‘the queen came to the meeting’,
‘the prince came to the meeting’,
‘the butler came to the meeting’

(145) Scalar implicature of (138b):

\(\forall p \in \{\{\text{came-to-the-meeting}(x) \mid x \in D_{c}\}\}\setminus\{\text{came-to-the-meeting}(\text{the king})\}:\)

\text{came-to-the-meeting(}\text{the king})\text{ is less likely than } p\)

(145) can be paraphrased as follows: for all propositions p belonging to the set of propositions of the type ‘x came to the meeting’, where x \(\neq\) the king, the proposition ‘the king came to the meeting’ is less likely to be the case than p, see also (168).

(146) “For all alternatives of the king, it would have been more probable for them to come to the meeting”

= “It would have been less surprising, had the queen come to the meeting”

“It would have been less surprising, had the prime minister come to the meeting”

“It would have been less surprising, had the arch-bishop to the meeting”, ......

\textsuperscript{51} The analysis of even given here is essentially the same as the one proposed in Eckardt (2001).
Finally, the existential implicature of (138b) can be captured using the formalization in (141b(ii)), see (147).

(147) “Existential” implicature of (138b):
\[
\exists p \in \{ \{\text{came-to-the-meeting}(x) \mid x \in D_e\} \setminus \{\text{came-to-the-meeting}(\text{the king})\}\} : p = 1
\]

(147) says that among the propositions p belonging to the set of propositions of the type ‘x came to the meeting’, where \(x \neq \text{the king}\), there is at least one true proposition, i.e. there is at least one other individual besides the king who came to the meeting. Semantically, the difference thus lies in the two implicatures of even, see (145) and (147), neither of which is shared by the adnominal intensifier. That is, while (138b) presupposes that somebody other than the king also came to the meeting, the sentence in (138a) does not evoke any such presupposition, i.e. the king may or may not have been the only individual coming to the meeting. This difference between the adnominal intensifier and the focus particle is illustrated by the clefts (which presuppose uniqueness) in (148).

(148) a. *Det var selv Peter der kom for sent.
  it was even Peter who came for late
  ‘It was even Peter who was late.’
  b. Det var Peter selv der kom for sent.
  it was Peter self who came for late
  ‘It was Peter himself who was late.’

In section 2.2.3.2.1 the so-called unique identifiability constraint on adnominal intensification (i.e. only definite nominal expressions or nominal expression which refer to specific or uniquely identifiable entities may be adnominally intensified) was mentioned. The sentence in (149a) shows how this constraint blocks adnominal intensification of indefinite DPs. In contrast, the sentence in (149b) shows that this constraint does not affect the distribution of the scalar additive focus particle selv ‘even’.

(149) a. *En student selv løste opgaven.
  a student self solved problem-the
  ‘A student himself solved the problem.’
b. *Selv en student løste opgaven.*

   even a student solved problem-the
   ‘Even a student solved the problem.’

Summing up, we conclude that while both the scalar additive focus particle *selv* ‘even’ and the adnominal intensifier *selv* ‘himself’ are associated with focus and generate contrast sets of alternatives, they differ in that former carries with it two conventional implicatures, viz. (145) and (147), while the latter has none. Exactly what explains the differences between these two homophonic elements is still unknown. It seems likely that part of the answer to this question is to be found in the fact fact that the intensifier is located after its associate while the focus particle is pre-associate. While it is obviously too early to reach any conclusion we assume that it might be possible to explain the differences between the focus particle *selv* ‘even’ and the adnominal intensifier *selv* ‘himself’ as following from their syntactic differences. That is, we suggest that the different behavior of the intensifier *selv* and the focusing particle *selv* may potentially be accounted for by assuming that the same morpheme *selv* takes on different functions when it occurs in different syntactic positions\(^{52}\). Beyond these speculations we have, at this point, no satisfying account of the exact relationship between the focus particle *selv* ‘even’ and the adnominal intensifier *selv*. Since this topic is orthogonal to the main proposal of this dissertation, we leave it for further research.

### 2.5 *Selv* used as a noun.

Like its English counterpart the Danish word *selv* may be used as a noun by itself, see (150a-150b).

(150) a. *selvets begred*

   self-the-POSS concept
   ‘the conception of self (/the ego)’

\(^{52}\) Cf. Siemund (2000:ch. 5) who proposed the same analysis.
b. *Selvet er en central del af psyken.*

self-the is a central part of psyche-the

‘The self is a central part of the psyche.’

c. *Kun levende væsner kan have et selv.*

only living creatures can have a self

‘Only living creatures can have a self.’

In (150c) selv occurs as a noun preceded by the indefinite article. The sentences in (150a-b) show that selv behaves just like any other noun by taking the suffixal definite article –et53, see (150a-b), and the s-genitive, see (150a). Not all languages allow adnominal intensifiers to be used as nouns. As observed in Safir (1996), in the Romance languages intensifiers are derived from adjectival bases, e.g. French même ‘same’. In these languages it is often the first person singular personal pronoun (e.g. Fr, moi ‘me’/‘self’)54 which is used as the noun meaning ‘self’ rather than the adnominal intensifier, see (151c)55. Unlike English, which does not allow this use of the first person singular pronoun (e.g. *one’s own me/I vs. one’s own self*), Danish allows both the pronoun and the intensifier to be used nominally with the same meaning, compare (151a) and (151b)56.

53 ‘In Danish the definite article (or end article) singular is added to the end of the noun as an affix: -en for common gender nouns and –et for neuter nouns’ (Allan et al. 1995:54). Note that selv is considered a neuter noun, selv-et ‘the self’.

54 According to the Dictionary Robert, the use of the first person pronoun moi ‘me’ as noun was first attested in 1583.

55 Note, however, that le même ‘the self’ is an accepted concept in philosophical jargon (cf. Ricoeur’s Le Même et l’Autre).

56 In some instances, it appears that even the possessive intensifier egen ‘own’ may be used nominally meaning ‘one’s inner self, etc.’, see (ia) and (ib).

(i) a. *Hvilken forunderlig, forjætningsfuld Tid var det ikke, hvor sælsmot ikke med Øren at høre sin Sjæls uytdelige, londomsfulde Hvisken klinge frem i Virkelsøgdenes Luft, som vildt udfordrende Lartoner, som Brag af Kolleslag paa Tempelmure, som Hvin af Davidsstene paa Flugt mod Goliathspander og som sejerssikker Fanfare. Det var som at høre sig selv tale i fremmede Tunger, med fremmed Klarhed og fremmed Magt om det, der var Ens dybeste, inderste eget.* (J.P.Jacobsen (1880) Niels Lyhne, p. 65) [...] which was one’s deepest innermost own

‘[...] which was one’s deepest, innermost self.’

b. *[...] der var Ens dybeste, inderste selv.*

which was one’s deepest innermost self

‘[...] which was one’s deepest, innermost self.’

In (ia) the word egen ‘own’ is used with the meaning ‘(inner)self’. (ib) shows that egen ‘own’ can be replaced with selv ‘self’ without changing the meaning of the sentence. This example, thus supports the assumption that selv
a. One should protect one’s own self/*I.

b. Man bor værne om ens eget jeg/*mig/selv.
   one ought protect about one’s own I/self
   ‘One should protect one’s own self.’

c. Chacun doit protéger sa propre *je/moi/*me/*même/personne.
   everyone ought protect his own me/same/person
   ‘Everyone ought to protect his own self/person.’

The fact that intensifiers may be used as nouns has been used as an argument in favor of
classifying them as nominal expressions. However, rather than entering the somewhat futile
debate about what word-class it belongs to we simply take the element selv ‘self’ to be a
morpheme/root which can be made into a noun, adjective, or adverb in different contexts. As
will be discussed in chapter 3, we will argue that the French intensifier –même, which, unlike
selv, clearly has adjectival origins, should also be analyzed as a root which can take on the
characteristics of different word-classes depending on its syntactic position. That is, cross-
linguistically intensifiers share a number of core-properties despite their different historical
origins and the particular range of morphological realizations (adjective, noun, particle, etc.)
which they happen to have.

2.6 Adjectival forms of selv: selve and selveste

In addition to the uninflected, post-nominal, appositional intensifier selv, Modern Danish also
has an inflected, pre-nominal, adjectival form of the intensifier, i.e. selve, which is used

---

57 The fact that Danish uses the subject form of the first person personal pronoun in these cases rather than the
object pronoun mig ‘me’), while French uses the emphatic object pronoun moi ‘ME’ rather than either the subject
pronoun je ‘I’ or the non-emphatic object pronoun me ‘me’, is probably due to phonological factors, i.e.
stressability. The French subject pronoun je ‘I’ cannot be stressed on its own (In the colloquial language the
stressed form of je is moi-je ‘ME-I’ ≈ ‘I myself’), while moi can. Since nouns have non-contrastive word-stress, it
is thus to be expected that moi is preferred over je in nominal uses.
immediately preceding a noun\(^{58}\) (in the definite form) to emphasize the latter very strongly\(^{59}\), see (152)-(154).

(152)  *Selv huset er ikke meget værd.* (house=core vs. rest of property=periphery)
       self house-the is not much worth
       ‘The house itself isn’t worth much.’

(153)  *Selv biskopen kommer paa besøg.*
       self bishop-the comes on visit
       ‘The bishop himself is paying a visit.’

(154)  *Vi bor i selve København.* (Copenhagen=core vs. suburbs=periphery)
       we live in self Copenhagen
       ‘We live in Copenhagen itself.’

When used with nouns denoting places or inanimate objects pre-nominal, adjectival *selve* always has an core-periphery reading, with the DP modified by *selve* being the core, e.g. (152) and (154). As shown by the translations of the examples in (152-154), the semantic contribution of this adjectival form of *selv* is thus very close to that of the adnominal intensifier\(^{60}\).

Post-nominal *selv* and pre-nominal *selve* differ in that *selve* imposes a much stronger specificity constraint on its complement DPs. Compare the grammatical sentences in (156) with the ungrammatical sentence in (155).

(155)  *Selv en sjællænder har fortalt mig det.*
       self a Zealander has told me it
       ‘A Zealander himself told me.’

---

\(^{58}\) The element *selv* can be combined with the adj. *samme* “same” in the somewhat idiomatic expressions *selvsamme* adj. ‘self-same, the very same’ and *selvanden* adv. ‘with one other (person):

(i)  *Den selvsamme dag, holdt han op med at ryge.*
       The self-same day, hold he up with to smoke
       ‘The very same day, he stopped smoking.’

See chapter 7, section 7.3.3 for more discussion of idiomatic use of *selv* ‘self’ in nominalizations.

\(^{59}\) The examples in (152-4) are adapted from similar examples in Allan, Holmès and Lundskær-Nielsen (1995:170ff).

\(^{60}\) Indeed, in Icelandic adnominal intensifiers are pre-nominal adjectival forms which may adjoin to full lexical DPs as well as pronouns and reflexives:  (Icel.) *sjalva sig* ≈ (Dan.) *sig selv*, (Icel.) *sjalva Peter* = (Dan.) *Peter selv*. 

En sjællænder selv har fortalt mig det.
A Zealander himself told me.

While adnominal selv can be adjoined to indefinite DPs which have specific reference, adjectival selve cannot under any circumstances take an indefinite DPs as its complement. Furthermore, unlike adnominal selv, adjectival selve cannot modify pronouns, e.g. *selve jeg ‘self me’, *selve ham ‘self ham’ vs. jeg selv ‘I myself’, ham selv ‘him him self’, etc. Finally, pre-nominal, adjectival selve is restricted to a small class of nouns denoting individuals of high social status, compare (157a) and (157b).

(157) a. ??*Selve Peter kommer på besøg.
   self Peter comes on visit
   ‘Peter himself is paying a visit.’
   b. Selve biskoppen/Dronningen/præsidenten kommer på besøg.
   self bishop-the/Queen-the/president-the comes on visit
   ‘The bishop himself is paying a visit.’

Being an adjective selve may take the so-called morphological superlative by adding the superlative suffix –ste, i.e. selveste see (158-159)\(^{61}\). This superlative form implies an even higher degree of intensification and is used exclusively with nouns referring to individuals of high status, e.g. the Queen, the King, the prime minister, etc. That is, unlike the post-nominal invariable adnominal intensifier selv and the basic form of the pre-nominal adjectival intensifier selve which can take both animate and inanimate (e.g. huset selv ‘the house itself’ ≈ selve huset ‘the house itself’ in (152)) associates, the superlative form selveste is compatible only with [+human] nominal associates referring to high status individuals\(^{62}\).

\(^{61}\) Cf. Allan et al. (1995:105): ‘Danish adjectives possess a basic (positive) form which is inflected according to number, gender and species […], a comparative form which is uninflected and a superlative form which is inflected according to species alone. […] The endings –ere, -est are added to the basic form.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pæn ‘nice’</td>
<td>penere ‘nicer’</td>
<td>pænest ‘nicest’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjectives which cannot form the comparative and superlative forms by adding the endings –ere, -est use the words mere ‘more’ and mest ‘most’ for form periphrastic comparative and superlative forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intelligent ‘intelligent’</td>
<td>mere intelligent ‘more intelligent’</td>
<td>mest intelligent ‘most intelligent’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We were invited to dinner with the managing director himself.

The Queen herself welcomed us.

Unlike selv, selve and the superlative selveste occur in pre-nominal position, i.e. the normal position for a Danish adjective. As for the syntactic analysis of selve and selveste, two solutions come to mind; one could treat them either as adjuncts to DP (cf. Browning (1993) and Bernstein (1991,1993)) or as heads selecting DPs as their complements (Sanchez (1995)). Here the latter solution will be adopted for selve/selveste. In contrast, as already discussed, the post-nominal intensifier selv is best analyzed as a DP adjunct. Cross-linguistically intensifiers either behave as adjectives (e.g. French même, Spanish mismo, etc.) or as DP-adjuncts (e.g. German selbst, Chinese ziji, etc.). While in the Slavic and Romance languages the adnominal intensifiers tend to display adjectival behavior, intensifiers in the Germanic languages can behave either like adjectives (e.g. Swedish själva) or uninflected appositional intensifiers (e.g. Ger. selbst). From a typological perspective Danish is thus interesting in that it has both adjectival and appositional forms of the adnominal intensifier.

The fact that adjectival forms of selv, i.e. selve and selveste, can be shown to be subject to the principle of unique identifiability (and thus appears to be subject to the principle of contrastiveness as well, although this cannot be rigorously tested since selve cannot attach to reflexives in Danish), is a strong indication that selve and selveste are but different morphological realizations of the intensifier selv. Cross-linguistic evidence from Swedish and Icelandic, which both have adjectival intensifiers, confirms this analysis. Although an

---

Note that Spanish also have what looks like a superlative form of the adjectival intensifier mismo ‘himself’, viz. mismísimo, which appear to function exactly like selveste in Danish:

(i) Elisa habló con el mismísimo Papa.

Elisa talk with the same-SUPERLATIVE Pope

(= Sanchez, L. (1994:480(6)))
interesting question in itself, the different behavior of the adjectival uses of selv, i.e. selve and selveste, does bear directly on the issues discussed in this dissertation and will not be treated in any more detail here.

2.7  Selv ‘self’ in nominalizations

As its counterparts in other Germanic languages the element selv may occur as part of compounds. The majority of such compounds are deverbal nominalizations in which the element selv appear to function as the direct object, see (160a-c).

(160) Deverbal compound nouns containing selv.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Corresponding verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>selvbedrag</td>
<td>bedrage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selviagttagelse</td>
<td>iagttage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selvkritik</td>
<td>kritisere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has been argued that in these cases selv should be seen as the word-internal counterpart of reflexive pronouns. However, in chapter 7 we will argue that it is both possible and theoretically more advantageous to consistently analyze such word-internal uses of selv as adnominal intensifiers intensifying phonetically unrealized reflexives, see (161).

(161) a. [Ø selv] [bedrag]]

(162) a. Peter bedrager sig selv.
Peter deceives REFL self
‘Peter deceives himself’

Since the verb bedrage ‘deceive’ is anti-reflexive, it requires the intensified form of the reflexive, see (162a) vs. (162b). In order to have a reflexive reading, nominalizations based on this verb thus have to have intensified Ø-reflexives, see (161a) vs. (161b).

‘Elisa talked to the Pope himself.’
While the in examples in (160a-c) above selv may be argued to function as a kind of word-internal version of the reflexive pronoun sig ‘REFL’, such an analysis is clearly not possible in (163a-c) where selv/self- seem to function as interpreted as an exclusive adverbial intensifier meaning ‘by oneself’.

(163) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Corresponding verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>selvbygger</td>
<td>bygge ‘to build’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-storage</td>
<td>to store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-cleaned 63</td>
<td>to clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-cleaning</td>
<td>to clean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above examples we conclude that word-internal intensifiers can be either: (i) adnominal intensifiers (160a-c),(161a), (ii) exclusive adverbial intensifiers (163a-c). So far we have not come across any evidence suggesting that word-internal selv may function as either additive scalar focus particle, or any of the other uses of selv discussed above. See chapter 7 and appendix I for a more detailed analysis of self-nominalizations based on the account of intensifiers proposed here.

### 2.8 Idiomatic uses of the element selv

Finally, in the interest of completeness, it should be mentioned that the element selv also occurs in a number of idiomatic expressions, see (164-165).

(164)  

A:  

* Tak for i aftes.  

thank for in evening  

‘Thank you for (the party, etc.) last night.’

---

63 The word self-cleaned is used (and coined?) by Barbara Ehrenreich in her (2001) book *Nickel and Dimed*, p. 91: “I have never employed a cleaning person or service [...] Partly this comes from having a mother who believed that a self-cleaned house was the hall-mark of womanly virtue”.

---
While some of these may potentially be accounted for in terms of the uses of selv described in sections 2.2-8 above, e.g. the use of selv in (165a,b), which seems to be somehow related to the exclusive adverbial intensifier, we will leave the exact analysis of the remaining idiomatic cases for further study.\(^{65}\)

2.9 Cross-linguistic perspective on the range of uses of intensifiers.

The table in (166) summarizes all the uses of the element selv in Danish described in sections 2.2-8\(^{66}\). It also includes a mini typological survey showing the ranges of uses corresponding intensifiers have in English\(^{67}\), French and Chinese\(^{68}\).

\(^{64}\) Note that this use of the PP af sig selv ‘by REFL self’ could potentially be adduced as evidence in favor of arguing for a hidden preposition in secondary predication constructions, e.g.: Peter painted the house [PP [P’ [P O] himself]]).

\(^{65}\) The list examples of idiomatic uses of selv in Danish given here is far from exhaustive. Due to space limitations only a few example sentences are provided here.

\(^{66}\) Fronted selv described in section 2.2.6 has not been included in the table, since it seems to be derived from the normal post-nominal adnominal intensifier by general syntactic processes (of fronting) and thus do not deserve to be included separately in a typological survey.

\(^{67}\) Examples illustrating the different uses of the adnominal intensifiers of the x-self form in English can be found in chapter 5.

\(^{68}\) Examples illustrating the different uses of the adnominal intensifier 自己自己 ‘self-self’ in Chinese can be found in chapter 6.
Typological survey of different uses of adnominal intensifiers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Adnominal int.</td>
<td>kongen selv</td>
<td>the king <strong>himself</strong></td>
<td>le roi (lui-)<strong>mème</strong></td>
<td>guo-wang (ta) <strong>ziji</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Intensified reflexive</td>
<td>sig selv</td>
<td>Ø <strong>himself</strong></td>
<td>soi-<strong>mème</strong>/lui-<strong>mème</strong></td>
<td>ta <strong>ziji</strong>/ Ø <strong>ziji</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Intensified pronoun</td>
<td>ham selv</td>
<td>(him) <strong>himself</strong></td>
<td>(lui) lui-<strong>mème</strong></td>
<td>(ta) <strong>ziji</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. “Exclusive adverbial”</td>
<td>selv</td>
<td><strong>himself</strong></td>
<td>lui-<strong>mème</strong></td>
<td><strong>ziji</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Q-floated adnom. inten.</td>
<td>selv</td>
<td>himself</td>
<td>lui-<strong>mème</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Scalar add. focus part.</td>
<td>selv</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>mème</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Nominal uses</td>
<td>selv/jeg</td>
<td>self/*I</td>
<td>*mème/moi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Positive adjective</td>
<td>selv</td>
<td>very/actual</td>
<td><strong>mème</strong> 'same (kind of)'</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Superlative adjective</td>
<td>selveste</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Self-nominalizations</td>
<td>selv</td>
<td>*himself/self</td>
<td>*mème/auto-/sui-/etc..</td>
<td>*ziji/zi-/ji</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The typological survey or intensifiers in (166) shows that the element **selv** in Danish has a wider range of uses than its counterparts in most other languages. Though such cross-linguistic data should be used with great caution, it still provides a rough indication of how far attempts of unifying all the uses of intensifiers like **selv** may be pushed. Although the element **selv** can be used in all the ways listed in (166a) through (166j) this is not the case for its counterparts in English, French and Chinese. Only the first 4 uses, i.e. (166a-d) seem to be representative of the range of core uses of intensifiers cross-linguistically.

2.10 Conclusion

The contribution of this chapter can be divided into three parts. First, in section 2.2 we have shown that the semantic contribution of adnominal intensification is similar to that of focus (i.e. both involve the generation of a contrast set of alternatives) and is subject to the contrastiveness condition as formulated in (62), repeated here as (167).

(167) **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.

Second, in sections 2.2.5-7 we have shown that all the different uses of **selv** listed in (168a,i-v) below can be explained as subtypes of adnominal intensification falling under principle (167).
**Different uses of selv:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. adnominal intensification</td>
<td>(1), (14)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. intensified DPs</td>
<td>(1), (14)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. intensified reflexives</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(chap. 3, section 3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selv in nominalizations</td>
<td>(160), (163d)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.7, chap. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. intensified pronouns</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(chap. 3, section 3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. q-floated intensifier</td>
<td>(6), (77)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. fronted intensifier</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. selv in secondary predication constructions</td>
<td>(7), (113)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selv in nominalizations</td>
<td>(163a-c)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.7, chap. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. scalar additive focus particle ‘even’</td>
<td>(8), (120b)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. selv as a noun</td>
<td>(9), (150)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. adjectival forms of the intensifier</td>
<td>(10), (152-4)</td>
<td>(sect. 2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. idiomatic uses of selv</td>
<td>(164-5)</td>
<td>(section 2.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of superficial differences we have shown that it is possible to unify the analysis of selv occurring in constructions involving intensified DPs (189a,i), q-floated intensifiers (168a,iv), and fronted intensifiers (168a,v). We furthermore aim to unify the analysis of adnominal intensification and complex reflexives (168a,ii), see chapter 3, section 3.3, and complex pronouns (168a,iii), see chapter 3, section 3.4, and to show that this unification can only be achieved if binding and intensification are assumed to belong to different modules of the grammar. Within this approach, binding theory deals with the interaction between intrinsic properties of nominal expressions and purely syntactic locality principles, e.g. principle A and B, while the theory of intensification consists of pragmatic and semantic constraints on the distribution of intensifiers. The argument is that this modular approach combined with the focus-based theory of intensification proposed here stand a better chance at unifying the different uses of adnominal intensifiers listed in (168ai-v) than the predicate-based approaches to binding which assume selv to be a reflexivizing particle (cf. Reinhart & Reuland).

Third, in sections 2.3-2.8 we have illustrated the fact that the element selv occurs in a large number of different contexts with what sometimes seems to be very different syntax and semantics, see (168b-g). In spite of these differences, we have argued that it is possible to unify the analysis of all the uses of the intensifier selv. As shown in (168), there are only five
basic uses of the word *selv*, i.e. as adnominal intensifier (168a), in secondary predication constructions ("exclusive" adverbial) (168b), as a scalar additive focus particle (168c), as a noun (168d), and as an adjective (168e). As argued briefly in section 2.7 and in more detail in chapter 7, the instances of *selv* found in nominalizations can be shown to be reducible to either intensified zero reflexives (168a,ii,(1)) or word internal secondary predication (168b,(1)). As for the idiomatic uses of *selv* in (168g) discussed in section 2.8, they are presumably ultimately be reducible to one or the other of the three main uses of *selv*.

Of the five basic uses (168a-e), the nominal and adjectival uses (168d-e) can be accounted for as deriving from the intensifier *selv* by regular processes of word formation. At first glance, the use of *selv* as an exclusive manner adverbial/secondary predication (168b) seems to be very different from the adnominal intensifier. However, it may be possible to analyze it as an intensifier too. Rather than being adjoined to a DP as the adnominal intensifier, it is a subject/agent oriented adverbial adjoined to the VP, i.e. it takes agentive subjects as its associates and contrasts them with other potential agents.

Finally, as discussed in section 2.4 there is ample historic evidence that the use of *selv* as a focus particle (168c) evolved from the adnominal intensifier. We believe that it may be possible to account for the differences between them by assuming that they are basically the same morpheme *selv* ‘self’ which takes on different semantic properties when occurring in different syntactic positions (cf. Siemund 2000, chap. 5). In other words, although we do not develop it in detail here we do believe it is ultimately possible to arrive at a unified account of all uses of the intensifier *selv* ‘self’ in (168).

It is, however, the use of *selv* ‘self’ as an adnominal intensifier (168a,i-v) which is the main focus of this dissertation. In this chapter we have shown that (168i,iv,v) all fall under the same principle (167). Chapter 3 will be devoted to showing that complex reflexives (e.g. Dan.
"sig selv ‘REFL self’) and pronouns (e.g. Dan. han selv ‘he himself’) are analyzable as intensified nominal expressions which also fall under the contrastiveness principle (167).