Chapter 5
Independence of intensification and binding in English:
synchronic and diachronic perspectives

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter we argue that the analysis of Danish based on the independence of intensification and binding presented in chapters 1-4 can be extended to Modern and Old English as well as to the evolution of reflexives and intensifiers between these two stages of the language. The analysis of Modern English which will be presented in section 5.2 is summarized in (1).

(1) a. English x-self forms (e.g. himself, herself, etc.) are not reflexive anaphors but rather adnominal intensifiers (Eng. x-self ≈ Dan. selv ‘self’), see (2a).
b. Modern English has Ø-reflexives (Eng. Ø ≈ Dan. sig ‘REFL’), see (2b-e).
c. What looks like locally bound reflexives is really locally bound adnominally intensified Ø-reflexives, (Eng. Ø x-self ≈ Dan. sig selv ‘REFL self’), see (2b,c,e).
d. The distribution of unintensified and intensified Ø-reflexives is controlled by the same semantic/pragmatic factors which control the distribution of sig and sig selv in Danish, e.g.:

   (i) Predicate meaning:
       1. Anti-reflexive predicates require Ø himself, (2c).
       2. Neutral predicates can take either Ø or Ø himself, (2b).
       3. Inherently reflexive predicate require Ø, see (2d).

   (ii) Doppelgänger-effects:
       Statue-readings require intensified Ø himself, see (2e).

c. What looks like locally free reflexives (or “logophors”\(^1\)) are really intensified object pronouns whose pronominal part is not realized phonetically (due to a morpho-/phonological deletion rule) (Eng. [him]\(^2\) himself ≈ Dan. ham selv ‘him self’), see (2f).

d. Complex subject pronouns (e.g. he himself, I myself, etc.) are intensified subject pronouns, not as special kind of anaphor (cf. McKay 1991) (Eng. he himself ≈ Dan. han selv ‘he self’), see (2g).

\(^1\) The term “logophor” is used here informally to refer to the intensified object pronoun ham selv in Danish and the corresponding English cases of non-locally bound /him/ himself. Strictly speaking Danish ham selv and English [him] himself are not a logophors but intensified pronouns, see chapter 3, section 3.4.3 for a more detailed discussion of ham selv in Danish and the notion of logophoricity.

\(^2\) Square brackets are used to indicate the phonetically unrealized pronominal.
(2)  
a. *The king, himself came to the meeting.*
b. *The king, washed Ø, Ø, himself / DP.*
c. *The king, suspected *Ø, Ø, himself / DP.*
d. *The king, rested Ø, Ø, himself / *DP.*
e. *Bill Clinton, shaved *Ø, Ø, himself / *DP.*
f. *The king, said that the orchestra could not play with anyone other than [him] himself as conductor.*
g. *He himself passed the exam.*

The assumptions in (1) makes it possible to unify the analysis of intensifiers and reflexives in English and Danish, see examples in (3) which show that the distribution of Danish selv, sig, sig selv, ham selv, and han selv mirrors that of English himself, Ø, Ø himself, [him] himself, and he himself.

(3)  
a. Kongen selv kom til mødet.  
\(\approx(2a)\)

‘The king himself came to the meeting.’

b. Kongen, vaskede sig, sig, selv / DP.  
\(\approx(2b)\)

‘The king, washed REFL / REFL self / DP’

c. Kongen, mistænkte *sig, sig, selv / DP.  
\(\approx(2c)\)

‘The king suspected *REFL self’

d. Kongen, hvilte sig, *sig, selv / *DP.  
\(\approx(2d)\)

‘The king rested REFL self’

e. Bill Clinton, barberede *sig<statue>, sig<statue>, selv.  
\(\approx(2e)\)

Bill Clinton shaved REFL / REFL self ‘Bill Clinton, shaved *REFL self’

f. Kongen, sagde at orkestret ikke måtte spille med andre end ham, selv som dirigent.  
\(\approx(2f)\)

‘The king said that the orchestra could not play with others than himself as conductor’

g. Han selv bestod eksaminen.  
\(\approx(2g)\)

‘He himself passed the exam.’

The English x-self forms are consistently analyzed as adnominal intensifiers whose distribution are determined by contrastiveness condition of the module of intensification just like the Danish intensifier selv ‘self’, see chapters 2-3. Likewise, the behavior of the English Ø-

\(^3\) **Bold italics** are used here only for purposes of highlighting and does not necessarily indicate stress.
reflexive mirrors that of sig ‘REFL’ in Danish, see chapters 3-4. Finally, [him] himself and he himself are analyzed as intensified pronouns whose pronominal parts fall under principle B of the binding theory while the intensifier part, i.e. himself, fall under the contrastiveness condition on intensification. These parallels between the Danish and English systems of reflexives, pronouns, and intensifiers is summarized in (4)-(5).

(4) Nominal expressions in Danish:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple/Unintensified</th>
<th>Complex/Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reflexive</td>
<td>sig ‘himself/herself/oneself’</td>
<td>sig selv ‘himself/herself/oneself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pronoun</td>
<td>ham ‘him’</td>
<td>ham selv ‘him himself/himself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. DP</td>
<td>kongen ‘the king’</td>
<td>kongen selv ‘the king himself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Intensifier</td>
<td>selv ‘self’ (uninflected particle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Nominal expressions in English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple/Unintensified</th>
<th>Complex/Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reflexive</td>
<td>himself</td>
<td>Ø himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pronoun</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>[him] himself (him himself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. DP</td>
<td>the king</td>
<td>the king himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Intensifier</td>
<td></td>
<td>himself (inflected for gender, number and person)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in (6), form a superficial point of view the English system of pronouns and intensifiers appears to have a much higher degree of morphological opacity that the Danish system.

---

4 As mentioned above the terms “simple” and “complex” are used interchangeably with the terms “unintensified” and “intensified”. Although from the point of view of this paper the terms “unintensified” and “intensified” are more correct, the terms “simple” and “complex” occasionally serves as more convenient theory-neutral terms.

5 While English has an intensified form of subject pronouns which can be analyzed as a combination of pronoun + adnominal intensifier, e.g. he himself, the corresponding form for the object pronoun, which would be him himself, is extremely rare and is generally not accepted by native speakers. Note, however, that some native speakers do accept intensified object pronouns. More discussion of the form him himself can be found in Bickerton (1987), Iatridou (1987), and McKay (1991). The following example passage from Boyce (1979/2001:115) Zoroastrians. Their Religious Beliefs and Practices contains the only attested instance of the full form him himself that I have been able to locate, see (i).

(i) In his inscriptions Kirder has little to say of doctrinal matters, being concerned rather with observances, church discipline, conversions, and the discouragement of infidels. He proclaims, however, the existence of heaven and hell, and the latter part of the inscription at Sar-Mashad (l.57 ff.) is taken up with an account, only partly legible, of a vision of the hereafter seen by him himself (Boyce 1979/2001:115)

6 The English intensifier has 8 frequently found forms: myself, yourself, ourselves, yourselves, himself, herself, itself, themselves. In addition, two less frequently found forms exist: oneself, ourself. The latter is the, now somewhat outdated, intensifier corresponding to the royal we (cf. Siemund, 1999:8).
Morphological opacity of English vs. transparency of Danish:
Eng. *himself* ≈ Dan. *sig selv*, *sig selv*, *ham selv*

One of the main advantages of the analysis outlined in (1) is that it enables us to analyze the system of intensified and unintensified nominal expressions in English as having the same degree of morphological transparency as the Danish system in (5), see the tables in (7) and (8) which spell out the complete English pronoun systems as analyzed here.

(7) Simple (i.e. unintensified) pronouns and reflexives in Modern English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Acc./Dat.</th>
<th>Reflexive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st, sing.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd, sing.</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd, sing. masc.</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd, sing. fem.</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>her</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd, sing. neut.</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st, plur.</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd, plur.</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd, plur.</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) Complex (i.e. intensified) pronouns and reflexives in Modern English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Acc./Dat.</th>
<th>Reflexive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st, sing.</td>
<td>I myself</td>
<td>[me/myself]</td>
<td>Ø myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd, sing.</td>
<td>you yourself</td>
<td>[you/yourself]</td>
<td>Ø yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd, sing. masc.</td>
<td>he himself</td>
<td>[him/himself]</td>
<td>Ø himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd, sing. fem.</td>
<td>she herself</td>
<td>[her/herself]</td>
<td>Ø herself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd, sing. neut.</td>
<td>it itself</td>
<td>[it/itself]</td>
<td>Ø itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st, plur.</td>
<td>we ourselves</td>
<td>[we/ourselves]</td>
<td>Ø ourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd, plur.</td>
<td>you yourselves</td>
<td>[you/yourselves]</td>
<td>Ø yourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd, plur.</td>
<td>they themselves</td>
<td>[them/theirselfs]</td>
<td>Ø themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5.3. deals with on the historical development of both the element -self, which is the adnominal intensifier in most Germanic languages, and the Modern English *x-self* forms (e.g. *himself*, *herself*, etc.). It will be shown that the assumptions that Modern English has Ø-reflexives and that the *x-self* forms are ALWAYS intensifiers provide the key to a number of

---

7 Although the forms *you yourself*, *it itself*, and *you yourselves* are perfectly acceptable, they seem to appear only in subject position and never in object position.

8 The form *it itself* does seem a bit odd. The same seems to be true for the intensified form of the third person neuter pronoun *det selv* ‘it itself’ in Danish. Note that intensifier adjunction to [-animate] DPs is perfectly acceptable. It thus cannot be a constraint prohibiting intensifier-adjunction to [-animate] DPs which is at play.
hitherto unsolved problems related to the evolution of Modern English complex intensifier *x-self* (e.g. *himself, herself*, etc.) from the simple intensifier *seolf* in Old English.

Finally section 5.4 concludes the chapter by providing a summary of the main results obtained and their consequence for linguistic theory. While the analysis of English outlined above has the advantage of enabling an elegant unification of the account of intensified and unintensified pronouns and reflexives in Danish and English, it also raises a host of questions, a number which will be addressed in the following sections. One of the most recalcitrant problems is the existence of unstressed *himself* with anti-reflexive verbs. If *himself* is assumed always to be an intensifier and if intensifiers are always stressed (as has been claimed in the literature (cf. Siemund (2000) among others) then the existence of sentences like (9) with unstressed himself constitutes a potential problems.

(9) *Peter suspects himself.*

As discussed in section 5.2.4, this and other facts, lead us to the conclusion that the *Ø*-reflexive hypothesis may be better suited to account for earlier stages of Modern English than the language of present day native speakers.

### 5.2 Intensifiers, *Ø*-reflexives and intensified pronouns in Modern English and the independence of intensification and binding

This section is divided into three parts. First, in section 5.2.1 the analysis of simple and complex reflexives (e.g. *Ø vs. Ø himself*) in English outlined above is discussed in more detail. Section 5.2.2 parallels section 4.5 in chapter 4 by surveying the different reflexive and non-reflexive use of *Ø*-reflexives in English (e.g. reciprocals, middles, etc.). Section 5.2.3 takes a closer look at the analysis of simple and complex pronouns (e.g. *he/him* vs. *he himself/[him]himself*). Finally, in section 5.2.4 the results of the present analysis are summarized.
5.2.1 Binding of Ø-reflexives in different contexts: testing the independence of binding and intensification in Modern English

In this section, the descriptive and explanatory adequacy of the analysis of English Ø-reflexives presented above will be put to the test by taking a closer look at the behavior of simple and complex reflexives (i.e. Ø, and Ø himself) in different syntactic positions. That is, we discuss Ø-reflexives as direct objects (section 5.2.1.1), Ø-reflexives in resultative constructions (section 5.2.1.2), Ø-reflexives in ECM constructions (section 5.2.1.3), inalienable possession and the absence of Ø-reflexives in possessive constructions (section 5.2.1.4), Ø-reflexives in prepositional predicates and PPs (section 5.2.1.5), and, finally, the potential problem posed by unstressed x-self forms in object positions (section 5.2.1.6).

5.2.1.1 Locally bound Ø-reflexives in argument position: complex reflexives = a sub-type of adnominal intensification

According to the analysis of English proposed above, the distinction between the English simple and complex reflexives Ø and Ø x-self is assumed to be of the same kind as the distinction between the simple (unintensified) reflexive sig in Danish and its complex (intensified) counterpart sig selv. One would therefore expect to find distribution of simple and complex reflexives in object position of “neutral”, “anti-reflexive” and “inherently reflexive” predicates in English to correspond to the distribution of simple and complex reflexives in Danish. The examples in (10-12) support this prediction.

(10) Anti-reflexive verbs: (i) pron.: (ii) unint. refl. (iii) int. refl.
    a. He, suspects *himi / *Øi / Øi himself.
    b. Han, mistænker *hami / *sigi / sig selv.
       he suspects him REFL REFL self

See chapter 3, sections 3.3.2.1-3 for definitions of the terms “anti-reflexive”, “neutral” and “inherently reflexive”.

(11) **Neutral verbs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>Reflexive DPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>He washes</td>
<td><em>ham</em> / Ø / Ø</td>
<td>Ø, <em>himself</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Han vasker</td>
<td><em>ham</em> / sig / sig</td>
<td>sig, selv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(12) **Inherently reflexive verbs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>Reflexive DPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>He rests</td>
<td><em>him</em> / Ø / *Ø</td>
<td>*Ø, <em>himself</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Han hviler</td>
<td><em>ham</em> / sig / sig</td>
<td><em>sig, selv</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HE rests | him | REFL | REFL self |

Based on examples such as (10-12) we conclude that predicate meaning influences the choice of Ø vs. Ø *himself* in the same way as it influences the choice of *sig* vs. *sig selv* in Danish. The predicates disallowing unintensified Ø-reflexives, exemplified in (10), are anti-reflexive in that they presuppose (representational) non-identity of their arguments. The predicates in (11) are neutral since they are compatible with both reflexive and non-reflexive scenarios. Finally, the predicates in (12) are inherently reflexive in that they require the argument DPs to be coreferential\(^{10}\). Intensifier-adjunction is thus clearly sensitive to semantic/pragmatic factors: (i) it is only allowed when contrast with other entities is possible (cf. Baker 1995), see (10-1c,d) vs. (12c,d), (ii) intensifiers adjoin to Ø-reflexives with anti-reflexive predicates since these presuppose the (representational) non-identity of their arguments.

In following seven sections (5.2.1.1-7) we address the question of how far the equations Eng. Ø ≈ Dan. *sig* and Eng. Ø Dan. *x-self* ≈ sig *self* can be pushed. That is, do all semantically anti-reflexive predicates in English require the complex form of the reflexive Ø *himself*? Do all semantically inherently reflexive predicates in English require the simple form of the reflexive Ø? And do all neutral verbs allow both the simple and complex form of the Ø-reflexive, i.e. both Ø and Ø *himself*?

---

\(^{10}\) The thematic status of simple reflexives with inherently reflexive predicates is sometimes difficult to determine. See chapter 4 for discussion of tests used to determine whether a given use of a simple reflexive is thematic or non-thematic.
5.2.1.1. Anti-reflexive predicates

The theory proposed here predicts that semantically anti-reflexive predicates in Danish, which allow only complex reflexives (e.g. *sig selv) and DPs in object position and do not allow simple unintensified reflexives (e.g. *sig), should have English counterparts which likewise allow only complex reflexives (e.g. *Ø himself) and DPs and disallow the simple unintensified reflexive (i.e. *Ø).

The list of Danish anti-reflexive predicates and their closest English equivalents in (13) was arrived at by flipping through a large Danish-English dictionary. Based on the verbs listed in (13) it seems possible to conclude that Danish anti-reflexive predicates (i.e. *sig / sig selv / DP) always have anti-reflexive English counterparts (i.e. *Ø / Ø himself / DP). No exceptions to this generalizations were found. That is, none of the English predicates in (13) allow Ø-reflexives; e.g. *Peter insulted Ø cannot mean ‘Peter insulted himself, etc.

(13) Anti-reflexive predicates in Danish and their English equivalents:

a. absolve
   ‘absolve, give absolution’
b. adlyde
   ‘obey (fx one’s superior’s)
c. adoptere
   ‘adopt’
d. afbryde
   ‘interrupt’
e. affærdige
   ‘dismiss, brush aside’
f. afhøre
   ‘examine (witness), interrogate’
g. aflaste
   ‘relieve the pressure on; releive (for from)’
h. aflever
   ‘deliver’
i. afløse
   ‘relieve (the guard), replace, succeed to’
j. bønfalde
   ‘implore, beseech, entreat’
k. efterfølge
   ‘follow (upon), succeed, follow’
l. eje
   ‘own’
m. eskortere
   ‘escort’
n. forfølge
   ‘persecute’
o. forføre
   ‘seduce’
p. frygte
   ‘fear’
q. invitere
   ‘invite’
r. jage
   ‘hunt, stalk’
s. kvæle
   ‘choke, suffocate, strangle, asphyxiate’
t. kværke
   ‘throttle (=kill)’
u. lagre
   ‘store; season mature (wine, cheese)’
v. lede X i fristelse
   ‘lead X into temptation’

5.2.1.1.2 Inherently reflexive predicates

Clear cases of English inherently reflexive predicates seem very hard to find. Duck ø and its
Danish counterpart dukke sig ‘duck’ is one of the few plausible pair of cognate inherently
reflexive predicates we have been able to find, see (14).

(14) Danish: English:
   a. Peter dukkede sig Peter ducked ø
   b. *Peter dukkede sig selv *Peter ducked ø himself
   c. *Peter dukkede DP *Peter ducked DP

And yet, how can we be sure that duck is really a dyadic “inherently reflexive” predicate rather
than simply a common intransitive (unaccusative) verb. It is difficult to find objective criteria
for deciding whether the English verbs frolic and gambol, which translate the Danish
“inherently reflexive” predicate boltre sig, true “inherently reflexive” predicates rather than
simple intransitive predicates, see (15).

(15) boltre sig ‘frolic gambol’
    ~ sig frolic ø / gambol ø
    *~ sig selv *frolic ø oneself / *gambol ø oneself
    *~ DP *frolic DP / *gambol DP

Other potentially true inherently reflexive predicates in English include overeat, see (16) and
acquire, see (17c).

(16) foræde sig ‘overeat’
    ~ sig overeat ø
    *~ sig selv *overeat ø oneself [TEST]
    *~ DP *overeat FP

(17) anskaffe sig noget ‘acquire __ something’
    ~ sig noget acquire ø something
    *~ sig selv noget * acquire ø oneself something
    *~ DP noget * acquire DP something
There are basically two types of mismatches between Danish inherently reflexive predicates and their potential counterparts in English. The first is illustrated by the verbs in (18) and the second by the verbs in (19).

(18) \textit{opføre sig}  \\
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{opføre sig}  \textsc{behave (oneself)}
\item \textit{*opføre sig selv}  \textsc{behave Ø oneself}
\item \textit{*opføre DP}  \textsc{*behave DP}
\end{itemize}

(19) \textit{se sig gal på nogen}  \\
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{se sig gal på nogen}  \textsc{*see Ø mad at somebody}
\item \textit{*se sig selv gal på nogen}  \textsc{see Ø oneself mad at somebody}
\item \textit{*se DP gal på nogen}  \textsc{*see DP mad at somebody}
\end{itemize}

The Danish predicates in (18) and (19) both behave as “inherently reflexives” in that they allow only \textit{sig} in object position. Their English counterparts, however, ‘misbehave’ in that they do not allow DPs, see (18c) and (19c) in spite of the fact that they allow the intensified reflexive \textit{Ø oneself}. This is a violation of the contrastiveness condition on adnominal intensification, see (62) in chapter 2, repeated here as (20).

(20) \textbf{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. (= (62), chapter 2)

If we assume English \textit{himself} to always behave as an intensifier, then the English examples in (18-9b) constitute blatant counterexamples to the condition in (20). As shown in chapter 3, section 3.3.6 counterexamples to (20) in Danish can be explained as being due to prosodic factors, i.e. the lack of stressability of \textit{sig} which leads to prosodic reinforcement by adnominal intensification when prosodic rules dictate that this element must have non-contrastive word-stress. See section 5.2.1.5 below for a similar account of the exceptions to (20) in English.

As mentioned above, it is very hard to establish with certainty that English has true inherently reflexive predicates at all. Even if we assume that English has some true inherently reflexive predicates, it still seems safe to say that they are rarer in English than in Danish. In
(21) is listed a few predicates which are inherently reflexives in Danish but which do not seem to have inherently reflexive English counterparts.

(21) a. *foreløbe sig i __* ‘fall in love with __’
   b. *skamme sig* ‘be ashamed’
   c. *skynde sig* ‘hurry, be in a hurry’
   d. etc...

Note furthermore that in Danish simple *sig* also has a number of non-reflexive uses, see (22).

(22) a. *Døren lukkede sig.*
   door-the closed REFL
   ‘The door closed.’
   b. *Døren åbnede sig.*
   door-the opened REFL
   ‘The door opened.’
   c. *En lille pøl dannede sig.*
   a small puddle formed REFL
   ‘A small puddle formed.’

In section 5.2.2.2 we discuss the possibility of analyzing English middles such as *close* and *open* in (22a) as involving non-reflexive use of Ø-reflexives.

5.2.1.1.3 Neutral predicates

The list of Danish and English neutral predicates in (23) was established by flipping through a large Danish-English dictionary\(^\text{12}\).

(23) Neutral predicates in English and Danish denoting grooming activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Danish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. <em>bade</em></td>
<td><em>bade</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>barbere</em></td>
<td><em>barbere</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <em>børste</em></td>
<td><em>børste</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. <em>forklæde</em></td>
<td><em>forklæde</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. <em>klæde _ på</em></td>
<td><em>klæde _ på</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. <em>klæde _ af</em></td>
<td><em>klæde _ af</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. <em>klæde _ ud som</em></td>
<td><em>klæde _ ud som</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. <em>klo _ (på ryggen)</em></td>
<td><em>klo _ (på ryggen)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. <em>tørre</em></td>
<td><em>tørre</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. <em>vaske</em></td>
<td><em>vaske</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neutral predicates in Danish and English: verbs denoting mental state:

a. bekymre ≈ worry
b. ængste ≈ worry

Neutral predicates in Danish and English: non-translational movement:

a. bøje ≈ bend
b. strække ≈ stretch
c. dreje _ (rundt) ≈ turn _ (around)
d. flytte ≈ move
e. vende _ (om) ≈ turn _ (round/over)

Neutral predicates in Danish and English: verbs denoting internal change:

a. ændre ≈ change
b. forandre ≈ change
c. forbedre ≈ improve
d. forberede ≈ prepare
e. forvandle _ til noget ≈ turn _ into something

While all the verbs listed in (23-6) behave as neutral predicates in both languages (i.e. allowing Ø/sig, Ø himself/sig selv, and DP in argument position), there is also a number of mismatches between the two languages. That is there is a number of “neutral” predicates in Danish which have no straightforward English equivalents taking intensified reflexive pronouns. As discussed below, these cases do not necessarily have to be considered as counterexamples to the proposed parallelism between Danish and English. It is indeed quite normal for two different languages to lexicalize the same or similar concepts in different ways, see (27).

Neutral predicates in Danish with no direct English equivalent:

frisere “dress somebody’s hair”

~ sig dress/do one’s hair
~ sig selv dress/do one’s own hair
~ DP dress/do DP’s hair

The verb frisere in (27) has no transitive counterpart in English and has to be paraphrased as ‘do __’s hair’.

13 The term “non-translational movement” is from Kemmer’s (1995, 1993) classification of “middle verbs” into different semantic classes.
There is, however, a different set of mismatching predicates which are potentially more problematic, i.e. Danish neutral predicates with English equivalent which do not allow Ø-reflexives, see (28).

(28)  **English equivalents of Danish neutral predicates which do not allow simple Ø-reflexives:**

a. beskytte  ‘protect’
   ~ sig (mod)  *protect Ø (against)
   ~ sig selv (mod) protect Ø oneself (against)
   ~ DP (mod)  protect DP (against)

b. ernære  ‘support, live on/by, feed’
   ~ sig  *support Ø  Peter fed Ø on onions
   ~ sig selv support Ø oneself  Peter fed Ø himself on/with onions
   ~ DP  support DP  Peter fed DP with onions

c. etablere  ‘establish’
   ~ sig (som tandlæge)  *establish Ø as a dentist  /set Ø up as a dentist’
   ~ sig selv (som tandl.) establish Ø oneself as a dentist /set Ø oneself up as a den
   ~ DP (som tandl.) establish DP as a dentist   /set DP up as a dentist

d. fornøje sig  ‘amuse, enjoy’
   ~ sig  *amuse Ø/ *enjoy Ø
   ~ sig selv  amuse Ø oneself / enjoy Ø oneself
   ~ DP  amuse DP / enjoy DP

e. forsyne  ‘provide, procure, get’
   ~ sig (med)  *provide Ø (with vegetables)  / get Ø (vegetables)
   ~ sig selv (med) provide Ø oneself (with vegetables) / get Ø oneself (veg.)
   ~ DP (med)  provide DP (with vegetables) / get DP (veg.)

f. hænge  ‘hang’ (compare w. lynche ‘lynch’ which is “anti-reflexive)
   ~ sig  *hang Ø
   ~ sig selv  hang oneself
   ~ DP  hang DP

g. isolere  ‘isolate, withdraw’
   ~ sig  *isolate Ø
   ~ sig selv  isolate oneself
   ~ DP  isolate DP
   ~ sig  withdraw Ø  (dic: he withdraws from other people)
   ~ sig selv  withdraw Ø oneself
   ~ DP  withdraw DP

h. more  ‘amuse, enjoy’
   ~ sig  *amuse Ø  / *enjoy Ø
   ~ sig selv  amuse Ø oneself  / enjoy Ø oneself
   ~ DP  amuse DP  / enjoy DP (different meaning)

i. mure X inde  ‘immure’
   ~ sig inde  *immure Ø
   ~ sig selv inde  immure Ø oneself
   ~ DP inde  immure DP
All the Danish predicates in (28) are neutral, but their closest equivalents in English behave as anti-reflexives. Should they therefore be considered counterexamples to the proposed theory of English reflexive? Let us first consider the case Danish predicate *hænge* ‘hang’ in (28f) and the cognate English predicate *hang*. The Danish verb is neutral and its English counterpart behaves as an anti-reflexive predicate. Rather, than a serious counterexample we take this to be an idiosyncratic fact of the two languages. As discussed in chapter 3, verbs that, under normal circumstances, allow only DPs and complex reflexive (but not simple reflexives) can be divided into true anti-reflexives, and ‘hidden neutrals’, see (29).

(29) a. Anti-reflexive predicates: semantically presupposed representational non-identity, non-cancelable by context.

Examples:  
- *afløse* ‘relieve (the guard), replace, succeed to’
- *efterfølge* ‘succeed’
- *mistænke* ‘suspect (sby. of doing sth.)’
- *misude* ‘envy, be envious of’

b. ‘Hidden neutrals’: pragmatically implied/presupposed representational non-identity, cancelable by context.

Examples:  
- *koge* ‘boil’
- *dolke* ‘stab’
- *filme* ‘film, shoot’
- *förgylde* ‘gild’

The group of predicates in (29a) consists of predicates which can never change status from anti-reflexive to neutral no matter what context is imagined. The second group consists of predicates which may change status depending on the context, e.g. *koge* ‘boil’. Cross-linguistically we predict that in any language which has a distinction between anti-reflexive” and neutral predicates, the predicates belonging to group (29a) will invariably classify as anti-reflexives. The predicates in (29b), on the other hand, may behave as neutral by default in one language, while “anti-reflexive” by default in another. The Danish verb *lynche* ‘lynch’, for example, while close to *hænge* ‘hang’ in meaning behaves as an anti-reflexive predicate, just like its English counterpart *lynch*, see (30).
Furthermore, due to slight meaning differences and differences in usage it may in many cases be difficult to determine which out of several candidates is the closest English counterpart of a Danish predicate, e.g. (28c) *ernære* which translates into English as either ‘support’, ‘live on’ or ‘feed’. Depending which one of these translations is chosen as THE English counterpart of this Danish predicate, we end up with either a mismatch or a match. Examples such as these illustrate the relative uselessness of the whole project of finding English ‘counterparts’ of Danish predicates. A better approach would be to simply consider each language separately in order to see if any language internal counterexamples turn up. Under this second approach, none of the ‘mismatches’ in (28) above would count as counterexamples. All they would allow us to conclude is that Danish seems to have a greater number of “neutral” predicates than English.

### 5.2.1.1.4 Non-optionality of intensifier-adjunction to Ø-reflexives with prototypical neutral predicates: focus and doppelganger-effects

The similarities between the English Ø-reflexive and the Danish reflexive *sig* are not limited to the sensibility to predicate meaning illustrated in (10-12). Like *sig*, which has to be intensified every time it is focused, the English Ø-reflexive also cannot be focused without being adnominally intensified. That is, the choice of unintensified Ø-reflexive vs. intensified Ø *himself* in (31a,b) is not optional, as often claimed, since it depends on focus, e.g. (31b-,c,d) can answer the question *Who did Peter wash?*, but (31a) cannot.

(31) Peter, washes ___.  a. Ø  b. Ø, himself  c. him$_{i/z}$  d. Mary$_z$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(30)</th>
<th>lynche</th>
<th>‘lynch’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>lynche sig</em></td>
<td><em>lynch Ø</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lynche sig selv</td>
<td>lynch Ø oneself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lynche DP</td>
<td>lynch DP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As discussed in chapter 3, section 3.3.2.5, the focus-sensitivity of Ø vs. Ø himself is also found in Dan. sig vs. sig selv, e.g. (32b,c,d) but not (32a) can answer the question Who did Peter wash?

(32) Peter, vasker ___. a. sig  b. sig selv  c. ham

5.2.1.1.5 Ditransitives

The difference between (33), (34) and (35) shows that even for ditransitive predicates it is the semantics of the predicate which determines whether it behaves as an anti-reflexive, neutral predicate or inherently reflexive predicate.

(33) Neutral di-transitive predicates:
   a. bygge ‘build’
      bygge sig et hus build Ø a house
      bygge sig selv et hus build Ø oneself a house
      bygge DP et hus build DP a house
   b. købe ‘buy’
      købe sig et hus buy Ø a house
      købe sig selv et hus buy Ø oneself a house
      købe DP et hus buy DP a house

(34) Anti-reflexive ditransitive predicates:
   sælge ‘sell’
   *sælge sig et hus *sell Ø a house
   sælge sig selv et hus sell Ø oneself a house
   sælge DP et hus sell DP a house

(35) Inherently-reflexive ditransitive predicates:
   anskaffe sig noget ‘acquire __ something’
   ~ sig noget acquire Ø something
   *~ sig selv noget * acquire Ø oneself something
   *~ DP noget * acquire DP something
5.2.1.6 Linking Doppelgänger-effects and anti-reflexivity

In this section we show that intensifier-adjunction to simple $\emptyset$-reflexives in English take place in the same contexts where intensifier-adjunction to simple sig takes place in Danish, i.e. the contexts in (36).

(36) Complex reflexives (e.g. $\emptyset$ himself):
   a. anti-reflexive predicates
   b. hidden neutral predicates
   c. contrastive contexts (with neutral predicates)
   d. ‘doppelgänger-effects’ (with neutral predicates):
      (i) statue-readings
      (ii) qua-sentences
      (iii) strict (and sloppy) readings in VP ellipsis

In sections 5.2.1.1 and 5.2.1.3 above anti-reflexive (containing presuppositions of (representational) non-identity) and hidden neutral predicates (which together with background assumptions about the world generate expectations of (representational) non-identity)) were shown to trigger intensification of simple reflexives. In section 5.2.1.1.4 contrastive contexts were identified as another trigger of intensification of simple unintensified $\emptyset$-reflexives with neutral predicates. In this section a number of other contexts triggering intensification of simple reflexives with neutral predicates will be discussed, namely wax museum contexts (statue-readings), qua-sentences, and strict readings of reflexives in VP-ellipsis constructions.

As was the case for Danish, discussed in chapter 3 section 3.3.2.7, we argue that all these intensification triggering contexts, see (36d(i-iii)), involve some kind of ‘doppelgänger-effects’, i.e. (representational) non-identity of the reflexive and its antecedent.

5.2.1.6.1 X-self as marker of statue-readings

The adnominal intensifiers himself and selv are used as marker of statue-readings in the same way in Danish and English. The English and Danish intensified reflexives ($\emptyset$ himself/sig selv)
in (37-8b) can have both readings in (39a,b) while their unintensified counterparts (Ø/sig) in
(37-8a) only have the reading in (39a).

(37) \[ \text{Peter, washes } \_\__. \]
    a. Ø, himself
    b. Ø, himself

(38) \[ \text{Peter, vasker } \_\__. \]
    a. sig, selv
    b. sig, selv

(39) a. ‘Peter<real> washes Peter<real>.’
    b. ‘Peter<real> washes Peter<statue> (statue-reading)

5.2.1.6.2 Qua-sentences

As argued in chapter 3 section 3.3.2.7.2, the qua-sentences in (40-1) illustrate the motivation
for analyzing dobbelgänger-effects in terms of representational identity/non-identity rather
than in terms of referential identity. Again the distribution of intensified and unintensified
reflexives is the same in English and Danish.

(40) a. ??*Peter, working as barber, shaved.
    b. Peter, working as barber, shaved himself.

(41) a. ??*Peter, i egenskab af barber, barberede sig.
    Peter in quality of barber shaved REFL
    ‘Peter, qua barber, shaved.’
    b. Peter, i egenskab af barber, barberede sig selv.
    Peter in quality of barber shaved REFL self
    ‘Peter, qua barber, shaved himself.’

In order to facilitate the processing of the above qua-sentence they should be read in a context
where a group of soldiers are lost in a forest for weeks. In order to maintain a certain level of
hygiene the platoon leader picks Peter to function as camp barber and immediately orders him
to shave everybody in the camp including himself. In this context, (40-1b) is clearly preferred
over (40-1a).
5.2.1.6.3 VP-ellipsis and the sloppy vs. strict reading of reflexives

In chapter 3, section 3.3.2.7.3, we argued that the strict identity reading of reflexives in VP-ellipsis constructions is due to doppelgänger-effects, i.e. it involves representational non-identity. The examples in (42-3) illustrate the difference between simple and complex reflexives with respect to the availability of strict and sloppy reading in ellipsis constructions. Again, the distribution of simple and complex reflexives is the same in English (42) and Danish (43).

(42)  
   a. Peter washed Ø and so did Hans.  (only sloppy)  
   b. Peter washed Ø himself and so did Hans.  (both sloppy and strict)

(43)  
   a. Peter vaskede sig og det gjorde Hans også.  (only sloppy)  
      ‘Peter washed REFL and it did Hans also’  
   b. Peter vaskede sig selv og det gjorde Hans også.  (strict and sloppy)  
      ‘Peter washed REFL self and it did Hans also’

5.2.1.7 Summary

In the previous sub-sections of section 5.2.1 we have discussed the behavior of locally bound Ø-reflexives occurring as internal arguments of verbal predicates. According to our assumption that binding and intensification constitute separate modules of the grammar we predict the binding behavior of Ø-reflexives to follow from principle A as formulated in chapter 3, while intensification of reflexives (i.e. the distribution of complex reflexives, e.g. Dan. sig selv and Eng. Ø x-self) should follow from the principles of intensification, i.e. the principle of contrastiveness as formulated in chapter 2. We argue that this approach to binding and intensification can successfully account for the distribution of simple and complex reflexives found in the contexts summarized in the descriptive generalizations in (44-5).
(44) Simple reflexives (e.g. Eng. Ø ≈ Dan. sig.):
   a. Neutral predicates (section 5.2.1.1.3)
   b. Inherently reflexive predicates (section 5.2.1.1.2)

(45) Complex reflexives (e.g. Eng. Ø himself ≈ Dan. sig selv):
   a. anti-reflexive predicates (section 5.2.1.1.1)
   b. hidden neutral predicates (section 5.2.1.1.3)
   c. contrastive contexts (with neutral predicates) (section 5.2.1.1.4)
   d. doppelgänger-effects (with neutral predicates):
      (i) statue-readings (section 5.2.1.1.6.1)
      (ii) qua-sentences (section 5.2.1.1.6.2)
      (iii) strict (and sloppy) readings in VP ellipsis (section 5.2.1.1.6.3)

In the following sections the distribution of simple and complex reflexives in resultatives (section 5.2.1.2), ECM constructions (section 5.2.1.3), and possessive constructions (section 5.2.1.4) will be discussed. Section 5.2.1.5 presents a phonological account of the distribution of complex reflexives in prepositional predicates which explains intensification of reflexives with certain PPs a consequence of the inability of simple reflexives (which behave phonologically like clitics) to carry stress on their own.

While there are some apparent “exceptions” to the correspondence between sig and Ø these are either due to lexical differences (e.g. lack of exact semantic correspondence between predicates in two languages, cf. the discussion of neutral predicates in section 5.2.1.1.2), or can be explained by reference to other aspects of grammar or language use (e.g. phonetic factors: Ø-reflexives behave differently from overly realized clitics, etc., see sect. 5.2.1.5 below). The remaining set of more recalcitrant counterexamples is fairly restricted and does, in our opinion, not in itself warrant abandoning the viability of the general approach binding and intensification proposed here.
5.2.1.2 Resultatives and the Ø-reflexive analysis of English

If the Ø-reflexive is the English equivalent of simple unintensified sig in Danish, then one would expect to find it in same type resultative constructions as the ones found in Danish, see (46-8).

(46)  
| a.  | *Peter arbejdede sig rig.       |
| b.  | *Peter arbejdede sine forældre rig. |
| c.  | *Peter arbejdede sig selv rig.   |

Peter worked REFL/REFL self/his parents rich  
‘Peter worked himself/his parents rich.’

(47)  
| a.  | *Peter drak #sig under bordet.   |
| b.  | *Peter drak Hans under bordet.   |
| c.  | *Peter drak sig selv under bordet. |

Peter drank REFL/REFL self/Hans under table-the  
‘Peter drank himself/Hans under the table.’

(48)  
| a.  | *Peter dansede sig til verdensmesterskabet. |
| b.  | *Peter dansede #sine forældre til verdensmesterskabet. |
| c.  | *Peter dansede #sig selv til verdensmesterskabet.  |

Peter danced REFL/REFL self/his parents to the world championship  
‘Peter danced himself/#his parents to the world championship.’

The English counterparts of (46-8) are given in (49-51). As shown in (49a), (50a) and (51a), contrary to expectations, English resultatives of the neutral and inherently reflexive types do not allow the Ø-reflexive. This constitutes a potential problem for the analysis proposed here, which is based on the assumption that the English Ø-reflexive corresponds to the Danish simple/unintensified reflexive sig ‘REFL’.

(49)  
| a.  | *Peter worked *Ø rich.           |
| b.  | *Peter worked his parents rich.  |
| c.  | *Ø himself rich.                 |

(50)  
| a.  | *Peter worked *Ø across the ocean. |
| b.  | *Peter worked #his parents across the ocean. |
| c.  | *Ø himself across the ocean.      |

(51)  
| a.  | *Ø to the word championship.     |
| b.  | *his parents to the world championship. |
| c.  | *Ø himself to the world championship. |
At this point, we have no fully-fledged solution to this problem. A possible solution may come from comparison with Romance languages, which lack (or have only very few) resultative constructions\(^{14}\) of the type exemplified in (46-51), see the French example in (52).

(52) *Pierre se travaille riche.
   Peter REFL works rich

The grammatical constraints barring reflexives in resultatives in French, see (52), may also be responsible of the absence of unintensified Ø-reflexives in English resultative constructions. As discussed in more detail in section 5.2.1.5, phonological constraints on the distribution of certain types of clitics and zero-elements may also be at play. In other words, the absence of unintensified Ø-reflexives in resultative constructions does not necessarily constitute a fatal problem for the present analysis since it be explainable as being due to other modules of the grammar (i.e. phonology, etc.).

### 5.2.1.3 ECM constructions the Ø-reflexive analysis of English

If the Ø-reflexive is the English equivalent of simple unintensified sig in Danish, then one would expect to find it in same type ECM constructions as the ones found in Danish, see (53-54).

(53) a. Peter anså sig for at være intelligent.
    b. Peter anså sine forældre for at være intelligente.
    c. Peter anså sig selv for at være intelligent.

Peter considered REFL/REFL self/his parents for to be intelligent

(54) a. Peter anså #sig for at være død.
    b. Peter anså sine forældre for at være døde.
    c. Peter anså sig selv for at være død.

Peter considered REFL/REFL self/his parents for to be dead

The English counterparts of (53-4) are given in (55-6). As shown in (55a) and (56a) such ECM constructions do not allow the Ø-reflexive. This constitutes a potential problem for the

---

\(^{14}\) Cf. Lidz & Williams (2002).
analysis proposed here, which is based on the assumption that the English Ø-reflexive corresponds to the Danish simple/unintensified reflexive sig ‘REFL’.

(55) a. Peter considered *Ø (to be) intelligent.
    b. Peter considered his parents (to be) intelligent.
    c. Peter considered Ø himself (to be) intelligent.

(56) a. Peter considered *Ø (to be) dead.
    b. Peter considered his parents (to be) dead.
    c. Peter considered Ø himself (to be) dead.

As in the case of the resultative constructions discussed in the previous section, the grammatical constraints responsible for the absence of unintensified Ø-reflexives in English resultative constructions may be unrelated to both binding and intensification. As discussed in more detail in section 5.2.1.5, interference of phonological constraints on the distribution of certain types of clitics and zero-elements may be to blame. In other words, the absence of unintensified Ø-reflexives in resultative constructions does not necessarily constitute a fatal problem for the present analysis since it be explainable as being due to other modules of the grammar (i.e. phonology, etc.).

5.2.1.4 Adnominal intensifiers in possessive constructions

If, as assumed here, reflexives and pronouns are in complementary distribution then the local domain must be defined differently in Danish and English. In English the possessive pronoun his can be locally bound, see (58c). This is not possible in Standard Modern Danish, where the locality difference between pronouns and reflexives is maintained in possessive constructions, see (57a) vs. (57b).

(57) a. Peter; vaskede sin\textsubscript{z} pung.
    b. Peter; vaskede hans\textsubscript{z} pung.
    c. Peter; vaskede Marie’s\textsubscript{z} pung.
Peter washed POSSREFL/his/Mary’s wallet
If, as argued above, Ø-reflexives are the equivalent of unintensified sig in Danish, then it would be natural to expect English Ø-reflexives to be able to occur in possessor position just like the Danish possessive reflexive\(^{15}\) sin ‘POSSREFL’ in (57a,b). As shown in (58a,b), this is not the case. We do not, however, consider this mismatch in the distribution of possessive reflexives and pronouns in Danish and English to constitute a serious problem for the present approach since it can be explained quite simply a following from a morphological differences between the two languages. Languages differ with respect to how many and which grammatical categories are captured overtly by the morphology. While the morphology of Danish and Latin differentiate overtly between possessive reflexives and possessive pronouns, languages such as English and French do not. Whatever the linguistic principles are which are at plays in determining the overt morphology of a language, they do not directly affect the present approach to binding and intensification proposed here. The difference between the binding domains for hans in Danish and his in English is thus a problem which any binding account has to address and thus does not necessarily constitute a specific argument against the proposal defended here.

---

\(^{15}\) To add to the confusion, there are Danish dialects in which the locality difference between reflexives and pronouns is neutralized in possessive position, see (ia-b), but maintained in argument position, see (iia-b).

(i) Danish Dialect (overlap of sin and hans):
   a. *Peter, vaskede sin\(_{i/z}\) pung.
   b. *Peter, vaskede hans\(_{i/z}\) pung.
      Peter washed POSSREFL/his wallet

(ii) Danish Dialect (complementarity of sin and hans):
   a. *Peter, vaskede sig\(_{i/z}\).
   b. *Peter, vaskede ham\(_{i/z}\).
      Peter washed REFL/him

(ii) Micro-parametric variation: DPs containing a subject constitute a local domain for Binding of anaphors:
   a. English \(\text{YES}\)
   b. Standard Danish \(\text{NO}\)
   c. Dial. Danish \(\text{YES/NO ???}\)
5.2.1.4.1 Absence of inalienable possession in English

In this section we argue that the differences between English and Danish with respect to inalienable possession, i.e. the fact that Danish allows inalienable possession of the type illustrated in (59) while English does not (60), do not constitute a serious problem for the present approach to binding and intensification.

(59) Inalienable possession in Danish:

   Peter vaskede hænderne.

   Peter washed hands-the

   \textsuperscript{\textit{\textbullet}}(a) ‘Peter washed his own two hands.’ \textsuperscript{(inalienable)}

   \textsuperscript{\textit{\textbullet}}(b) ‘Peter washed the hands (of the body he was dissecting).’ \textsuperscript{(alienable)}

(60) Absence of inalienable possession in English:

   Peter washed the hands.

   \textsuperscript{\textit{\textbullet}}(a) ‘Peter washed his own two hands.’ \textsuperscript{(inalienable)}

   \textsuperscript{\textit{\textbullet}}(b) ‘Peter washed the hands (of the body he was dissecting).’ \textsuperscript{(alienable)}

As discussed in chapter 3, section 3.3.2.6, we follow Vergnaud & Zubizarreta in assuming that the inalienable possessed DPs in (59a), contains an empty possessor argument. That is, the readings in (59a) vs. (59b) are obtained by the representations in (61a) and (61b) respectively\textsuperscript{16}.

(61) a. \textit{Peter, vaskede hænderne}(x)

   Peter, washed hands-the(x)

b. \textit{Peter, vaskede hænderne}

   Peter, washed hands-the

If inalienable possession is analyzed as binding of phonetically unrealized possessor arguments (i.e. \textit{Ø}-reflexives), and if English is assumed to have \textit{Ø}-reflexives, then why does English not allow inalienable possession as shown in (60a)? While this question may, at first, seem to constitute a serous problem for the present approach, it most likely is not. Languages simply differ (parametrically) with respect to whether (and where) they allow inalienable possession. French, which is similar to English in that it does not have possessive reflexives

\textsuperscript{16} Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992) suggest that \textit{hænderne}(x) is derived from \textit{hænderne} by a lexical redundancy rule.
(e.g. in the sentence *Pierre, mange son/i/z pain* ‘Peter, eats his/i/z bread’ *son/sa* ‘his, her’ is ambiguous in the same way as English *his*), patterns with Danish in allowing inalienable possession, see (62).

(62) **Inalienable possession in French:**
*Pierre lave les bras.*

\( \text{ok} \) (a) ‘Peter washed his own two hands.’  (inalienable)
\( \text{ok} \) (b) ‘Peter washed the hands (of the body he was dissecting).’  (alienable)

As this cross-linguistic data indicates, the presence/absence of inalienable possession in a given language is independent of the presence/absence of Ø-reflexives in argument position. French does not have Ø-reflexives (having *se* ‘REFL’ in the contexts where Danish has *sig and English Ø), but it still allows inalienable possession. Furthermore, in spite of the fact that Danish has a possessive reflexive (which is different from the possessive pronoun) it still allows inalienable possession.

5.2.1.5 **Ø-reflexives in PPs and prepositional predicates in English**

In chapter 3 section 3.3.6 we argued at length that phonological factors (i.e. non-contrastive sentences stress, etc.) interfere with the distribution of simple and complex reflexives in certain prepositional predicates. In this section we argue that the absence of simple unintensified Ø-reflexives in prepositional predicates can be explained along similar lines. The Ø-reflexive analysis of Modern English proposed here predicts that the Ø-reflexive should behave like the simple unintensified reflexive *sig* ‘REFL’in Danish. As shown in (63-5) this predication is supported by the behavior prepositional predicates in English.
(63) Prepositional verbs in English and Danish:

| a. | tale til | ‘speak to’ |
| b. | pege på | ‘point to/at’ |
| c. | dromme om | ‘dream about’ |
| d. | lytte til | ‘listen to’ |
| e. | sigte på | ‘aim at’ |
| f. | Hans peger på | *sig / sig selv / bilen. |
| | | Hans is pointing at *Ø / Ø himself / the car |

(64) Prepositional nouns in English and Danish:

| a. | et billede af | ‘a picture of’ |
| b. | en beskrivelse af | ‘a description of’ |
| c. | en hyldeste til | ‘a tribute to, an homage to’ |
| d. | en bog om | ‘a book about’ |
| e. | en evaluering af | ‘an evaluation of’ |
| f. | . . . en evaluering af | *sig / sig selv / bilen. |
| | | . . . an evaluation of *Ø / Ø himself / the car |

(65) Prepositional adjectives in English and Danish:

| a. | sikker på | ‘sure of’ |
| b. | interesseret i | ‘interested in’ |
| c. | optaget af | ‘occupied by’ |
| d. | tilfreds med | ‘satisfied with’ |
| e. | glad for | ‘pleased with, like’ |
| f. | forskellig fra | ‘different from’ |
| g. | Peter er tilfreds med | *sig / sig selv / bilen. |
| | | Peter is satisfied with *Ø / Ø himself / the car |

In both English and Danish, most prepositional constructions allow complex reflexives but exclude simple unintensified reflexives. There is, however, a number of mismatches between the languages. As mentioned in chapter 3 section 3.3.6, a small group of prosodically heavy prepositions (‘snake’-prepositions) do allow simple sig, e.g. bag ‘behind’ in (66a).

(66) a. Han plantede flaget bag sig / sig selv / Mary
b. He planted the flag behind *Ø / Ø himself/ Mary

The Danish verb+PP construction plante X bag Y ‘plant X behind Y’ in (66a) behaves as a neutral construction. Assuming parallelism between Danish sig and English Ø-reflexives, we would expect the English verb+PP construction plan X behind Y to behave similarly. As the ungrammaticality of the Ø-reflexive in the English example in (66b) shows this prediction does not hold. While in (63-5) the absence of simple unintensified Ø-reflexives in can be
argued to be due to the same prosodic factors excluding simple unintensified sig in Danish, the mismatch between English and Danish illustrated in (66) points to a difference between English Ø-reflexives and Danish sig.

That prosodic explanation of the absence of Ø-reflexives with certain prepositions is supported by the difference between unstressable se ‘REFL’ and stressable soi ‘REFL’ in French: only the the latter is found in prepositional predicates, see (67)

(67) 

a. Pierre est fier de soi.
   b. *Pierre est fier de se.
   ‘Peter is proud of himself.’

Like its English counterpart, the simple Ø-reflexive, the French reflexive clitic se ‘REFL’ also never occurs with any prepositions, see (68).

(68) Pierre a planté le drapeau derrière *se /soi-(mêne).
   Peter has planted the flag behind SE / SE-(same)
   ‘Peter planted the flag behind himself.’

As discussed in chapter 3, section 3.2.4, the differences between Danish sig and French se follow from the fact that the former is syntactically independent prosodically bound word, which does not form a morphological constituent with its host verb, while the latter fuses morphologically with the verb with which it does form a constituent. The fact that English Ø-reflexives behave like French se in never occurring with prepositions, indicate that they may be of the same nature, i.e. clitics which need to fuse morphologically with a verbal host with which they then form a constituent.

The above data show that in many cases where the similarities between Dan. sig and Eng. Ø break down Ø actually patterns with the French reflexive clitic se ‘REFL’. The leads us to the conclusion that Ø-reflexives have more in common with Romance reflexive clitics.

---

17 As shown here, it unintensified Ø-reflexives can only be found with verbal predicates. Notice that the same generalization holds for Ø-reciprocals, see (i-ii)

(i) 

a. Peter and Mary kissed Ø / each other.
than with Mainland Scandinavian sig/seg and Dutch zich. For the cases where Fr. se and Eng. Ø display different behaviors (e.g. ECM construction (where French se is ok while English Ø-reflexives are excluded)), we tentatively suggest that these are due to the morpho-syntactic peculiarities of phonologically unrealized elements.

5.2.1.6 Potential problem: stressed and unstressed forms of *himself*

It has often been claimed that the uses of x-self forms as reflexives and intensifiers can be distinguished based on stress. X-self forms used as adnominal intensifiers are stressed, as opposed to x-self forms used as reflexive anaphors which are unstressed. Siemund (2000:82-3, (3.173)) proposed the generalization in (69).

(69) **English x-self is ambiguous between:**
  a. a reflexive anaphor, which is unstressed (x-self) and
  b. an intensifier [...], which is stressed (x-SELF).

According to Siemund (2000), the assumption that x-self forms are ambiguous as indicated in (69) makes it possible to reduce binding conditions to (70).

(70) a. An anaphor (i.e. unstressed x-self) is bound in co-argument position.
  b. A pronominal is free in a co-argument position.

Siemund, following Baker (1995)\(^{18}\), suggests that locally free x-SELF forms should be analyzed as intensified Ø-pronouns, e.g. (71).

(71) *John believes that letter was sent to everyone but [him,] himself.*

This analysis is based on the assumption that *himself* is stressed in sentences like (71) but not in sentences like (72).

(72) *Peter envious Ø, himself.*

\(^{18}\) Baker (1995) in turn is inspired by the analysis of certain instances of locally free himself as deriving from underlying *him himself* proposed in Ross (1970).
While there appears to be a tendency for *x-self* forms to be stressed in (3) but not in (4), we will argue that this does not warrant the jump to the conclusion (69) that adnominal intensifiers are always stressed while anaphors are not. Siemund himself acknowledges this and cites a number of counterexamples, see (73)

(73) a. John noticed a picture of himself in the post office.
    b. Bill likes stories about himself.

In spite of the fact that the *x-self* forms in (73) are predicted by Siemund to be intensifiers intensifying Ø-pronouns by Siemund, they are nevertheless perfectly ok with out stress. Rather than abandoning the analysis of the *x-self* forms in (73) as intensified Ø-pronouns, we suggest to save the analysis by questioning the very generalization that adnominal intensifiers ALWAYS have to be stressed. Rather than being an intrinsic property of intensifiers, stress placement is determined by a number of factors, e.g. focus structure of the sentence, non-contrastive sentence stress, stressability of lexical elements (e.g. Dan. *sig*, Fr. *se* and English Ø-reflexives, are all unable to carry stress and thus have to be lexically reinforced to host stress, see section 3.3.6). That this account stands a better chance of unraveling the mysteries of the interactions between stress placement and intensification is suggested by the fact that, as observed in Siemund (2000:83), in the German translations of (73) the reflexive *sich* can occur without the intensifier *selbst*. In contrast, the Danish translations of (73) would require *sig* to be intensified by adjunction of *selv*. As argued in chapter 3, section 3.3.619, this difference between Danish and German follow from the fact that Danish *sig* is unstressable while German *sich* is stressable. As argued in 5.2.1.5, English Ø-reflexives have to be intensified (but not necessarily contrastively stressed) in sentences like (73) for prosodic reasons, i.e. just like Danish *sig*, they cannot carry non-contrastive sentence stress on their own and thus have to be adnominally intensified to do so, see also chapter 3, section 3.3.6. The question of

---

19 And as suggested in Siemund (2000).
whether this approach necessitates the assumption of two different kinds of intensifiers: (i) intensifiers whose presence is semantically motivated, and (ii) intensifiers whose presence is prosodically motivated, is discussed in section 3.3.6. For now, suffice it to say that the relationship between stress and intensification is far from clear and certainly not clear enough to warrant the assumption that all adnominal intensifiers must be contrastively stressed. Awaiting further, more conclusive, research on the matter we tentatively assume that the generalization that adnominal intensifiers MUST have stress (cf. 1b) is too strong. As argued here, the interrelations between stress and the distribution of adnominal intensifiers is far too complex to be captured by the simple generalization that intensifiers must be stressed. Indeed, to proceed from the assumption that intensifiers must be stressed as a god-given fact, amounts to taking the solution to the problem under investigation as one’s point of departure. The whole point of the present dissertation is to show that the dividing line between intensifiers and reflexives is far from clear and that a great deal of misunderstandings have been generated by mistaking traditional assumptions about what is a reflexive and what is an intensifier for solid facts. If, as proposed here, all instances of x-self forms in English are adnominal intensifiers, then the assumption that intensifiers are all mandatorily stressed must be wrong and should be revised. Logically, there is no way to decide which assumption (that all intensifiers must be stressed, or that all x-self forms are intensifiers) is correct. It is, of course, an empirical question which must be decided by looking at the facts. At this point, while the final answer is still up for grasp, we hope to have presented enough data to show that the assumption that all x-self forms are intensifiers is at least as plausible as, if not more plausible, than the assumption that x-self forms are ambiguous between unstressed reflexives and mandatorily stressed intensifiers. Furthermore, we hope to have called attention to the need to distinguish between non-contrastive stress\textsuperscript{20} contrastive stress.

\textsuperscript{20} As discussed in chapter 3, section 3.3.6, all bi-moraic words are assumed to required (by phonological rules
5.2.2 Non-reflexive uses of Ø-reflexives in English

Pushing the equivalence of English Ø-reflexives and Danish sig to the extreme, we should expect to find a large degree of degree similarities in their non-reflexive uses. In this section we argue that Ø-reflexives function the same way as simple sig in reciprocal constructions (section 5.2.2.1), middles (section 5.2.2.2), and (deponent) inherently reflexive verbs section 5.2.2.3).

5.2.2.1 Reciprocals

The observation that in many languages (e.g. Romance languages and German) the simple unintensified reflexive (se/si/sich) can be used as both reciprocal and reflexive can be used to bolster both our analysis of Ø-reflexives in Modern English, see (74).

(74) a. [Peter and Mary], kissed Ø / each other.

b. [Peter and Mary], fought Ø / each other.

See chapter 4, section 4.5.2 for discussion of the use of the reflexive suffix –s, which is derived from an encliticized reflexive –sik, to form reciprocal forms of certain verbs in Danish.

The evolution of Ø-reciprocals in Modern English can also be used bolster our analysis of the historical development of self-intensifiers, see also section 5.3 below. In the same way Old English (OE) locally bound pronouns were replaced by Ø-reflexives in Early Modern English (EME), see (75a), so were also locally bound pronouns with reciprocal readings replaced with Ø-reciprocals, see (75b).

governing the prosodic structure of words and sentences) to have some form of stress. In contrast, mono-moraic clitics (e.g. Danish sig, French se, etc.) must be intensified (i.e. phonologically fortified by addition of phonological material, e.g. by adunction of selv in Danish, and by segmental fortification of mono-moraic se to bi-moraic soi in French). As argued in chapter 3, section 3.3.6, if, for some reason, the prosodic rules governing non-contrastive stress require that non-contrastive stress fall on a clitic, then the clitic must be phonologically fortified to be able to carry stress. Consequently, this form of intensification (e.g. Dan. sig selv) does not necessarily require the intensifier to be contrastively stressed.
(75) | Old English: | >> | (Early) Modern English: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>Locally bound sing. pron.</strong></td>
<td>&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>Ø-reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He, washed him,</td>
<td>&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>He, washed Ø, (himself).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He washed himself’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>Locally bound plur. pron</strong></td>
<td>&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>Ø-reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They, kissed them,</td>
<td>&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>They, kissed Ø,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘They kissed Ø/each other.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, locally bound expressions in Old English (be they reflexive or reciprocal) were all realized as pronouns. The change from OE to EME can thus be capture saying that locally bound pronominals turned Ø-anaphors in EME, see (76).

(76) | a. (OE) pronominal reciprocals >> (EME) Ø-reciprocals |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. (OE) locally bound pronouns &gt;&gt; (EME) Ø-reflexives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This kind of evidence illustrates the close affinity between reflexives and reciprocals and provides additional support for the analysis of the assumption that Modern English has Ø-anaphors (which are functionally equivalent to Dan. sig, Fr. se and Ger. sich) as well as for the historical evolution of Ø-reflexives/reciprocals proposed in section 5.3.

### 5.2.2.2. Middles

Danish and French use simple unintensified reflexives (i.e. sig and se) to form deagentive inchoatives, see åbne sig/s’ouvrir ‘(unintentionally) open’ (77b) and (79b) which is derived from the original causative transitive form of the verb åbne/ouvrir ‘(intentionally) open something’ in (77a) and (79a). The sentences in (78) illustrate that similar causative-inchoative pairs an be found in English, where the simple unintensified Ø-reflexive functions as Fr. se and Dan. sig.

(77) | a. Peter åbner døren. | (agentive causative transitive) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter opens door-the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Peter opens the door.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Døren åbner sig.</td>
<td>(deagentive inchoative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>door-the opens REFL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The door opens.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2.3 Inherently reflexive/deponent verbs

The sentences in (80-1) illustrate typical deponent inherently reflexive verbs in Danish and English, i.e. verbs which only allow simply unintensified reflexives in object position.

(80) a.  
Peter anskaffede sig et hus.

Peter acquired Ø/Ø self a house
‘Peter acquired (*himself/*Mary) a house.’

b.  *Peter anskaffede sig selv et hus.

c.  *Peter anskaffede Marie et hus.

While in Danish the presence of the simple reflexive is beyond doubt since it is phonetically realized, the existence of an unintensified Ø-reflexive in (81a) is harder to prove. Keyser and Roeper (1992) claim to have found a binding-independent way to decide whether a given predicate has zero arguments. According to them, predicates which can take the prefix re-, can have a zero argument, e.g. re-acquire. In contrast, predicates which cannot take the prefix re-do not have zero arguments, e.g. *re-come, *re-arrive.

5.5.2.4 Summary

The fact that English Ø-reflexives pattern with overt unintensified reflexives in German, Danish, and French supports the argument that they are functionally equivalent, see (82).
As shown in chapter 2, English x-self forms have more in common with adnominal intensifiers (e.g. Dan. selv, Ger. selbst, Fr. (lui-)même), see (83).

Combined, the evidence summarized in (82-3) provide strong support for the analysis based on the assumptions that English has Ø-reflexives and that English x-self forms are ALWAYS intensifiers.

5.2.3 Intensified and unintensified pronouns in English

In this section we propose an account of simple and complex pronouns in English, e.g. he himself and him himself/[him] himself, based on the assumption that complex pronouns are formed by adjunction of the adnominal intensifier himself, in the same way as intensified DPs, e.g. the king himself. Both subject and object pronouns fall under the same principle B of the binding theory, i.e. they have to be locally free. Furthermore, simple and complex pronouns behave alike with respect to the binding theory. Any differences between them are assumed to follow from the module of intensification rather than from binding related factors. As mentioned in the introduction, the present analysis thus builds on and extends similar ideas expressed in earlier work by Ross (1970), Zribi-Hertz (1989,1995), McKay (1991), Baker (1995) and König & Siemund (1999) and others.
5.2.3.1 Intensified subject pronouns

Our analysis of intensified subject pronouns, e.g. *he himself* and Dan. *han selv* ‘he self’, as formed by a general, binding independent process of adnominal intensification has already been presented in chapter 3, section 3.4.2 and will therefore not be repeated here.

5.2.3.2. Intensified object pronouns

In this section we argue that the analysis of intensified object pronouns in Danish, e.g. *ham selv* ‘him self’, see (85), can be extended to English, see (84).

(84) *Peter i said that Mary danced with everyone except [him]himself.*
(85) *Peter sagde at Marie dansede med alle andre end ham selv.*

Peter said that Mary danced with all others than himself

‘Peter said that Mary danced with everyone except himself.’

In both languages the intensified object pronouns is composed of a pronominal + the adnominal intensifier. The only difference is that the pronominal part of the English intensified pronoun is made inaudible by some process of haplological reduction, while it is phonetically realized in Danish. In Danish, the complex pronoun *ham selv* ‘himself’, e.g. (3d), can be straightforwardly analyzed as an intensified form of the object pronoun *ham* ‘him’, see (3e). While English has an intensified form of subject pronouns which can be analyzed as a combination of pronoun + adnominal intensifier, e.g. *he himself*, the corresponding form for the object pronoun, which would be *him himself*, is extremely rare (though not unattested) and is generally not accepted by native speakers. Instead of *him himself*, the reduced form *himself* is usually used \(^{21}\) \(^{22}\). See chapter 3, section 3.4.2 for discussion of the semantic/pragmatic principles governing the distribution of intensifier-adjunction to object pronouns.

\(^{21}\) Note that English Dialects vary with respect to their use of locally free *himself*. According to Baker (1995), American English speakers use stressed *HIM* in many cases where British English speakers would use *himself*. While this has later been shown by Siemund (2000) to be to strong a claim, it is nevertheless true that dialects differ substantially with respect to their use of locally free *x-self*.
5.2.3.3 Summary: binding of intensified and unintensified pronouns

While only a rough sketch, the analysis of intensified pronouns in English outlined above, suggest that it may be possible to extend the analysis of Danish pronominals presented in chapter 3, section 3.4 to English, and thus supports the viability of the particular separation of binding and intensification proposed here.

5.2.4 Conclusion

In the above sub-sections of section 5.2 we have discussed the cross-linguistic viability of the analysis binding and intensification in Danish proposed in chapter 2-4, by showing to what extent it can be extended to account for similar phenomena in Modern English. While a number of differences between the two languages were noted, e.g. the absence of simple unintensified Ø-reflexives in ECM constructions and resultatives, we argued that similarities outweighed the differences. We also argued that most differences can be accounted for by reference to factors not related to either binding or intensification, e.g. prosodic differences.

22 It is to the best of my knowledge still an open question why English does not allow intensified object pronouns, i.e. why do forms like */??me myself, */??him himself tend to be shunned by native speakers. Haplology might be a plausible account of the absence of the forms him himself, her herself, them themselves but seems to run into trouble with forms like me myself and us ourselves. Baker (1995) suggests that the absence of intensified object pronouns might be a consequence of his prominence condition (see (100) in section 3.5.1). If intensifier-adjunction is sensitive to syntactic prominence and if subjects are assumed to be syntactically more prominent than objects then it follows that only nominal expressions in subject position can be intensified. Such an account, however, is unable to explain why Danish allow intensified object pronouns and reflexives and why, even in English, sentence like Mary wrote a letter to the King himself are ok in the right context.

Notice that Chinese and French display a similar tendency to avoid overly redundant forms. Both French and Chinese have both simple and complex forms of the adnominal intensifier, i.e. Fr. même and lui-même, see (i) and Ch. ziji and ta ziji, see (ii).

(i) Le roi même / Le roi lui-même (French)
   the king self   the king him-same
   ‘The king himself’ ‘The king himself’
(ii) Huang-di ziji / Huang-di ta ziji (Chinese)
    emperor self   emperor him self
    ‘The emperor himself’ ‘The emperor himself’

While both the complex and the simple form of the intensifier can be used to intensify DPs, only the simple form can be used to intensify pronouns, see (iii) and (iv).

(iii) Lui-même / Lui lui-même (French)
    him same   him him-same
    ‘him same’ ‘him him same’
(iv) ta ziji / *ta ta ziji (Chinese)
     him self   him him self
     ‘him self’
between overt (sig) and non-overt reflexive elements (Ø-reflexives), inalienable possession, etc. All in all, in spite of the fact that the analysis of English outlined here may have raised more questions that it answers, we hope to have shown that this approach is at least a viable alternative which deserves to be explored further. In the following section, we show that the Ø-reflexive analysis of English presented here allows for interesting new solutions to hitherto unanswered questions concerning the historical development of reflexives and intensifiers from Old English (OE) to Early Modern English (EME) and eventually Modern English.

5.3 **Historical development of English intensifiers**

The Germanic languages have had intensifiers of the *self*-type for as long back as historical records go. For this reason very little is known for certain about the early historical development of *self*-type intensifiers. Section 5.3.1 provides a brief summary of current theories of the historical development of Germanic intensifiers. Similarly, section 5.3.2 contains an overview of previous accounts of the historical development of Modern English *x-self* forms. In section 5.3.3 it is argued that the assumptions that English has Ø-reflexives and that the compound *himself* is always an intensifier provide the key to a coherent, unified account of a number of the hitherto unanswered questions concerning the development of the Modern English *x-self* form intensifiers. Finally, section 5.3.4 summarizes the results and concludes section 5.3.

5.3.1 **The historical development of the Germanic/Modern Danish intensifier *selv***

In (86a) are listed various cognates of *selv* ‘self’ in other Germanic languages and in (86b) the reconstructed Germanic form can be found.
(86)²³ (a) Cognates of selv in the Germanic languages²⁴:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>selv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>själv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Danish</td>
<td>staf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Norse</td>
<td>sjalfr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faroese</td>
<td>sjálvur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian (bokmål)</td>
<td>selv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian (nynorsk)</td>
<td>sjøl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>-self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old English</td>
<td>se(o)lf, sylf, self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>selbst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old High German</td>
<td>selfp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>silba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Reconstruction form of Common Germanic origin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>selba-</em>, *selban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In many languages the morphological material of which the intensifiers (as well as reflexive elements) are made can be shown to derive from expressions for ‘body parts’, see (87).

(87)²⁵

| Language          | Form         | Meaning                  |
|-------------------|--------------|
| a. Georgian       | tviton       | ‘body’                   |
| b. Okinawan       | du:na        | ‘body’                   |
| c. Arabic         | nafs         | ‘soul’                   |
| d. Hausa          | ni daikana   | ‘I with my head’         |
| e. Hungarian      | maga         | ‘seed’                   |
| f. Japanese       | ji-sin       | ‘own body’               |
| g. Haitian Creole | têt-Emile    | (lit.) ‘head Emile’ = ‘Emile himself’ |
| h. Classical Chinese | | ‘body’ |

According to E. König (1996:10), the cross-linguistic evidence in (87) provides support for Grimm’s suggestion that German selb-st originally derived from the possessive construction si-lib ‘his body’, see (88).

(88) selv (Dan.) <<< *selba- (Germ.) <<< *si + *lib-, *liba

‘his’ + ‘life, body’


²⁴ Cf. Siemund (1999:22) ‘A notable exception is Yiddish, which has lost SELF and uses aleyn (cf. E. alone) as the intensifier.’ The loss of self-type intensifiers in Yiddish could, perhaps, by due to influence from neighboring Slavic languages also have adnominal intensifiers meaning ‘alone’, e.g. Russian sam ‘alone, himself’.

Based on this kind of data König furthermore suggests that intensifiers play a prominent role in the historical developments of reflexive pronouns, see the path of grammaticalization illustrated in (89).

\[(89)^{26} \text{body parts} \rightarrow \text{intensifiers} \rightarrow \text{reflexive anaphors}\]

König thus takes intensifiers to be the (missing) link between words for body parts and reflexive anaphors. The fact that intensifiers and reflexives are closely related historically in many languages does not contradict our basic assumption that binding and intensification belong to separate modules of the grammar. Instead, as discussed in the following section, it helps us understand why their synchronic functions have a strong tendency to overlap.

### 5.3.2 Previous account of the evolution of the Modern English self-forms

Modern English reflexives and intensifiers constitute a typical example of apparent convergence of the formal realization of intensifiers and reflexives and can thus be used to illustrate the urgent need to relegate binding and intensification to separate modules of the grammar. Indeed, we argue that it is the failure to correctly separate binding and intensification that has prevented earlier accounts from arriving at a unified analysis of the evolution of Modern English x-self forms. To the best of our knowledge, all the existing studies of the historical development of the compound self-forms are based on the assumption that these elements function as reflexive pronouns in Modern English. As argued in the previous sections, there is plenty of data indicating that this assumption may be wrong. That is, as argued in chapter 5, Modern English has clitic-like Ø-reflexives which may be intensified by adjunction of the appropriate x-self adnominal intensifier, e.g. Ø himself, Ø ourselves, etc. In other words, the x-self forms are never true reflexives but rather consistently function as adnominal intensifiers in all contexts.

---

Before we develop our analysis of the evolution of Ø-reflexives and self-form in Modern English let us first briefly summarize the status quo of the history of English himself. Basically most (if not all) existing analyses agree that the desire to disambiguate between coreference readings and disjoint reference readings of local pronouns was (one of) the main motivation for the development of the ME self-forms. In this respect, Siemund’s (1999:25-30) account is quite representative

Old English did not have reflexive pronouns and thus used personal pronouns instead. This yielded a situation in which third person personal pronouns were ambiguous between coreference and disjoint reference interpretations, see (90).

\[(90)^{28}\]
- a. *hine he beweradh mid waepnum* [ÆGram 96.11]
  ‘he defended himself with weapons’
- b. *dha\(^{29}\) behydde Adam hine & his wif eac swa dyde* [Gen 3.9]
  ‘and Adam hid himself and his wife did the same’

According to most traditional accounts the intensifier seolf ‘self’ was added to the ambiguous local pronouns for the sake of disambiguation, see (91-2).

\[(91)^{30}\]
- a. *se Hælende sealde hine sylfne for us\(^{31}\)* [ÆLet 4 1129]
  ‘The Saviour gave himself for us.’
- b. *He [Moses] sceawode hine selfne, & pinsode, dha dha him dhuhte dhæt he hit doon ne meahte, …* [CP 7.51.14, translation provided]
  ‘He contemplated himself, and thought that he could not do it, …’

\[(92)\]
- a. *he … seldh Gode his æhta, & hine selfne diobule* [CP 44.327.23.]
  ‘He gives his possessions to God and himself to the devil.’

---

\(^{27}\) There is a large number of very interesting and valuable studies of the history of English reflexives all which deserves to be mentioned in this context, e.g. van Gelderen (2000), Keenan (1994, 2003), Penning (1875), Farr (1905), Ogura (1989), and many others. Unfortunately, spaces considerations prevents us from discussion all these works here.

\(^{28}\) This example is from Siemund 1999, (2.44).

\(^{29}\) The letter sequences ‘dh’ and ‘th’ are used here to transcribe the Old English letters for the voiced and voiceless (inter-)dental fricatives respectively.

\(^{30}\) These examples are from Siemund 1999 (2.45-6).

\(^{31}\) Bold face is added to Siemund’s examples to help the reader locate the relevant intensified expressions. The numbers of Siemund’s examples have also been modified to fit into the present context.
While this account seems to be very intuitive, it cannot be the whole story, since, as Siemund observes, not all intensified object pronouns were locally bound, see (93). This indicates that disambiguation of local pronouns was not the only function of intensifiers. As argued in chapter 2 and 3 above, we argue that intensifier adjunction to locally bound elements is due to other semantic factors (i.e. presupposed representational non-identity) rather than directly linked to binding and that such an account allows for the potential unification of all used of intensifiers.

(93)

32 Be dhæm cwædh se ædhel lareow sanctus Paulus: Ic wille dhæt ge sien wise to gode & bilwite to yfele. Ond eft be dhæm cwædh Dryhten dhurh hine selfne to his gecorenum: Beo ge swa ware sua sua nedran & sua bilwite sua culfran. [CP 35.237.18, translation provided]

‘Therefore the noble teacher St. Paul said: “I wish ye to be wise for good and simple for evil. And again, the Lord spoke about the same thing through himself to his elect: “Be cunning as adders and simple as pigeons.”

While the traditional disambiguation account seems very persuasive, we thus argue that it is false since it is based on wrong assumptions. Siemund himself admits that such disambiguation accounts run into a number of problems. Notably, they do not explain why the fusion of self and pronominal elements also took place in the first and second persons where there could be no ambiguity between coreference and disjoint reference. As discussed in Siemund (1999:25-30), “analogy” has often been adduced as answer to the question of why self-adjunction happened in the 1st and 2nd (cf. Penning (1875:13)). In contrast, the analysis proposed here provides a straightforward explanation of why the self-forms emerged in the 1st and 2nd persons as well as in the 3rd person. In a nutshell, our proposal is that self-adjunction to pronouns in OE was not primarily motivated by a need to disambiguate between coreference and disjoint reference but rather by a need to adnominally intensify locally bound simple

32 This example is from Siemund 1999 (2.47).
pronominals occurring in object position of anti-reflexive or ‘hidden neutral’ verbs, e.g. (91-2). That is we propose that *self*-adjunction to locally bound pronominal in OE follows the same pattern as *selv*-adjunction to simple reflexives with anti-reflexive predicates in Modern Danish (e.g. *Jeg mistænker *mig / mig selv ‘I suspect *me / me self’), see discussion of Danish reflexives in chap. 3.

Another problem encountered by previous accounts is the lack of explanations for why the compound *self*-forms came to be used as adnominal intensifiers (e.g. ME the King *himself*) and why the OE simple intensifier *self* was abandoned. The examples in (9) below show that Old English used the simple form *self* as adnominal intensifier. If that is the case, then why did OE abandon the use of *self* as adnominal intensifier in favor of the *self*-forms, which according to standard account developed as a complex reflexive pronoun?

(94) a. *se cyning sylfu* [GD 14.131.3]
   ‘the king *himself*

   b. *Swa swa Crist sylf cwædh* [ÆLet 3 173]
   ‘as Christ *himself* said’

As discussed below, this problem becomes much easier to understand once we realize that the *self*-forms did NOT develop as complex reflexive pronouns but rather were adnominal intensifiers right from the first moment the pronominal and the adjoined *self* fused into one word.

Finally, let us take a closer look at an often overlooked aspect of Old English, which we, following suggestions by Siemund (2000), believe to be crucial to the development of Ø-reflexives in Modern English. Old English had obligatory pronouns in many contexts where Modern Danish, German and French have non-thematic reflexives, i.e. with deponent inherently reflexive verbs, see Old English examples in (95) and German and Danish examples in (96), see also the discussion of non-reflexive uses of Ø-reflexives in section 5.2.2 above.

---

33 This example is from Siemund 1999 (2.48).
(95)  a.  …dhæt dhu dhin scamige, Sidon
    ‘…that you be ashamed, Sidon.’
 [CP 52.409.33]
 b.  hit is cyn dhæt we ure scomigen
    ‘It is appropriate that we be ashamed’
 [CP 52.407.15]
 c.  he gereste hine on dhone sefothan dæg
    ‘He rested on the seventh day.’
    [Gen 2.2]

(96) a.  Nero wandte sich /*sich selbst an Paul.  (German)
    ‘Nero turned to Paul.’
 b.  Er schämt sich/*sich selbst.  (German)
    ‘He was ashamed.’
 c.  Peter skammede sig/*sig selv.  (Danish)
    ‘Peter was ashamed.’
 d.  Peter hvilte sig/*sig selv.  (Danish)
    ‘Peter rested.’

Siemund (1999:25-30) draws attention to an often overlooked aspect of the evolution of Modern English, namely the loss of locally bound pronouns in object position of verbs like the ones exemplified in (95). He also suggests that we need to take the question “why English did not start anew to develop pronouns with these functions” into consideration. As will be shown below, the single assumption that at a certain point in history a recent ancestor of Modern English developed a Ø-reflexive, provides the key to a coherent, unified account of all the four questions raised in the passages from Siemund (1999) quoted above and summarized in (97).

(97) Questions concerning the development of the x-self forms in Modern English:
    (a) Why was the fusion of pronoun and self not confined to the third person, but was extended to the first and second persons? This remains a mystery for all the disambiguation accounts since no ambiguity arises in these cases.
    (b) Why did the newly developed self-compound forms also come to be used as intensifiers?
    (c) Why did English abandon its original intensifier self? Since Old English self was used in much the same way as its modern equivalent and there seems to have been no obvious reason to replace it with a new intensifier.

34 These OE examples as well as the German examples in (96) are from Siemund (2000).

35 The absence of intensified forms of the reflexive in these examples is, of course, due to the fact that they involve inherently reflexive predicates.
(d) Why were the pronouns in the usages in (95) abandoned and, once they were lost, why English did not start anew to develop pronouns with these functions?

5.3.3 A new account of the evolution of the Modern English self-forms

In the following we will outline an alternative picture of the evolution of the English system of reflexives and intensifiers which provides new answers to the questions listed in (97). As will be shown, the problem with most of these questions is that they are based on the wrong basic assumptions and consequently make us ask the wrong questions. Oversimplifying the immense complexity of the evolution of Modern English somewhat we have decided to cut the period from spanning from Old English to Modern English into three stages: (i) Old English, (ii) Early Modern English, and (iii) Modern English. For ease of presentation a few other simplifications have been made as well, see (98).

(98) Simplifications adopted in the following sections:
(a) In order to facilitate comparison between different stages, Modern English spelling and morphology has been used even in the Old English examples.
(b) Case complications have been ignored. That is, the fact that first and second person forms (i.e. myself, yourself, ourselves, yourselves) are composed of a pronoun in the genitive plus self whereas the third person forms (i.e. himself, herself, itself, themselves) are composed of pronouns in accusative or dative case plus self has been ignored.

5.3.3.1 Stage one: intensification and binding in Old English

Old English was a language without morphologically specialized reflexive pronouns. This meant that pronouns could do double duty as either reflexives or pronouns. See the example in (90), repeated in (99).

(99) *hine*/*he, beweradh mid wæpnum*  
‘he, defended *himself/him*, with weapons’  
[ÆGram 96.11] (=Siemund 1999, (2.44))

As shown in (99), locally bound pronouns were potentially ambiguous between coreference and disjoint reference readings. According to most existing accounts of the evolution of x-self
forms (see section 5.3.2), *self* was adjoined to locally bound pronouns to disambiguate in favor of coreference readings, see (92) repeated in (100).

(100)  *Hannibal, ... hine/*z selfne mid atre acwealde*

‘Hannibal, killed *himself,* with poison.’

(=Siemund 1999 (2.46b))

Unlike, (99) where the pronoun is ambiguous, (100) tend to have only the coreference reading of the locally bound object pronoun *hine* ‘him’. In contrast to the standard accounts, according to which disambiguation was the main motivation for *self*-adjunction to local pronouns, we argue that *self*-adjunction was motivated by a need to mark representational non-identity of the antecedent and the locally bound pronoun with anti-reflexive (or “hidden” neutral predicates, e.g. (100)) in exactly the same was as *selv*-adjunction to simple reflexives in Modern Danish, see chapter 3. The distribution of Danish pronouns and reflexives (e.g. *ham* ‘him’, *sig* ‘REFL 3 person’, *mig* ‘me’) with these different verb types is illustrated in (101)-(102).

(101)  **Modern Danish third person singular pronoun *ham* ‘him’:**

a.  *Peter; mistænkte ham*/*z.*

‘Peter, suspected him*/*z.*’

(b)  *Peter; vaskede ham*/*z.*

‘Peter, washed him*/*z.*’

c.  *Peter; hvilte *ham*/*z.*

‘*Peter rested him.*’

(102)  **Modern Danish third person singular reflexive *sig* ‘REFL’:**

a.  *Peter mistænkte *sig/sig*/*z. selv.*

‘Peter, suspected himself*/*z.*’

(b)  *Peter vaskede *sig/sig*/*z. selv.*

‘Peter, washed himself*/*z.*’

c.  *Peter; hvilte *sig/sig*/*z. selv.*

‘*Peter rested *??himself.’

Unlike Old English, Danish has a distinction between reflexives (e.g. *sig* ‘REFL’) and pronouns (e.g. *ham* ‘him’). As discussed in chapter 3, the distribution of *sig* and *ham* fall under principle A and principle B respectively: *sig* ‘REFL’ is an anaphor which must be bound in a local domain (viz. the tensed clause), and *ham* ‘him’ is a pronoun which must be free in the same local domain. As (101c) shows, inherently reflexive verbs do not allow pronouns in
object position. See section 3.3.2.2 in chapter 3 for discussion of the semantics of inherently reflexive predicates and of the reasons why unintensified reflexives are required in such cases, see (102c). In contrast, Old English allowed pronouns in such positions, see (95).

Note furthermore, that in spite of the fact that sig ‘REFL’ in (102a) is not ambiguous between a co-referential and a disjoint reference reading, the presence of the intensifier selv ‘self’ is still mandatory as a marker of presupposed representational non-identity with anti-reflexive predicates. Note also that selv-intensification of sig is optional with neutral predicates in (102b) and impossible with inherently reflexive predicates in (102c). This distribution of selv clearly shows that selv-intensification of reflexive is not triggered by a need for disambiguation in Modern Danish, but rather by the semantics of the predicate: anti-reflexive predicates require intensification of reflexives to mark the reflexive reading (in contexts which presuppose representational non-identity, see section 3.3.2.1 in chapter 3) and selv-intensification is excluded with inherently reflexive predicates since in those contexts generation of a contrast set of alternatives is blocked by the meaning of the predicate which presupposes the identity of its arguments. Our analysis of the evolution of himself in Modern English is based on the assumption that in Old English self-intensification functioned like selv-intensification does in Modern Danish, i.e. it was triggered more by a need to license representational non-identity than by a need to disambiguate. The first person examples in (103) further corroborate this account of Modern Danish.

(103) Modern Danish first person pronoun/reflexive mig ‘me’:

a. Jeg mistænker *mig/mig,i/z selv.
   ‘I suspect myself/i/z selv.’
   (anti-reflexive predicate)

b. Jeg vasker mig,i/*mig,i/*z selv.
   ‘I wash Ø/myself/i/*z selv.’
   (neutral predicate)

c. Jeg hviler mig,i/*/*mig selv.
   ‘I rest (*myself).’
   (inherently reflexive predicate)
Danish does not distinguish between pronouns and reflexives in the first and second persons. In spite of this fact, no ambiguity is – for obvious pragmatic reasons - possible. But even so, the presence of selv is still mandatory with anti-reflexive verbs, optional with neutral verbs, and impossible with inherently reflexive verbs, see (103a) and (103c) above. As the examples in (103) illustrate the fact that the creation x-self forms took place in 1st and 2nd persons as well as in the 3rd person is no mystery in the account proposed here which, consequently, does not need to recur to vague notions of ‘analogy’.

Note that the semantic/pragmatic approach of intensification proposed here stands a better chance of explaining why self-adjunction to locally bound pronouns did not always result in unambiguously coreferential readings, see (93) repeated in (104).

(104) Be dham cwædh se ædhela lareow sanctus Paulus: Ic wille dhaet ge sien wise to gode & bilwite to yfele. Ond eft be dhaem cwædh Dryhten dhurh hine selfne to his gecorenum: Beo ge swa ware sua sua needran & sua bilwite sua culfran. [CP 35.237.18, translation provided]

‘Therefore the noble teacher St. Paul said: “I wish ye to be wise for good and simple for evil. And again, the Lord spoke about the same thing through himself to his elect: “Be cunning as adders and simple as pigeons.”’ (=Siemund 1999 (2.47))

The examples (105)-(106) illustrate the predictions this approach makes for the interpretation of locally bound object pronouns with the three main types of predicates, i.e. anti-reflexive predicates (e.g. suspect), see (105a) and (106a), neutral predicates (e.g. wash), see (105b) and (106b), and inherently reflexive predicates (e.g. rest), see (105c) and (106c). Note that the some of the OE data in (105) are based on extrapolations rather than attested examples. Of the sentences in (105), we only have attested examples corroborating the judgments in (105c). The judgments in (105a,b) are based on the behavior of other typical anti-reflexive/’hidden’ neutral predicates (e.g. give and kill in 91-2) and other typical neutral predicates (e.g. defend in (90)). Needless to say, more careful and exhaustive studies of the behavior of different verb types in OE is still needed. At this point the analysis of OE presented here is thus more an
outline of a new approach than a fully-fledged analysis whose empirical coverage has been carefully researched.

(105) Stage one: unintensified locally bound 3rd person pronouns in Old English:

a. Peter; suspected him. (anti-reflexive) (compare with (100))

b. Peter; washed him. (neutral) (see (99))

c. Peter; rested him. (iner reflex.) (= (95c))

(106) Stage one: unintensified locally bound 1st person pronouns in Old English:

a. I; suspected me. (anti-reflexive) (compare with (100))

b. I; washed me. (neutral) (see also (99))

c. I; rested me. (iner reflex.) (see (95c))

As shown in (105a), anti-reflexive predicates are predicted to require self-adjunction to the simple pronouns in order to mark the presupposed representational non-identity. This also applies to the “hidden” neutral36 predicate acwealde ‘kill’ in (100). Neutral predicates, which evoke no presuppositions concerning the representational identity of their arguments, may or may not display self-adjunction, see (105b) and (99). Finally, the since they presuppose identity of their arguments, inherently reflexive predicates do not allow non-coreferential DPs in object positions. Therefore, since no focus-based contrast set of alternatives can possibly be generated, non-coreferential readings of locally bound object pronouns is not allowed, see (105c).

The examples in (107)–(108) illustrate how the intensifier-adjunction to simple pronouns function to license representational non-identity, viz. in the cases of the anti-reflexive predicates in (107-8a,d). Note also that, since intensification requires that the generation of a contrast of alternatives to the referent of the adnominally intensified nominal expression, intensification of simple pronouns in object position of inherently reflexive verbs

36 See section 6.3. for a definition of “hidden” neutral predicates.
is under no circumstances allowed, see (107-8c,f). Finally, intensification of simple pronouns with neutral verbs is optional, see (107-8b,e).  

(107) **Stage one: intensified locally bound 3rd person pronouns in Old English:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensified pronouns</th>
<th>Unintensified pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Peter, suspected him/?z self.</td>
<td>d. Peter, suspected him/?z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Peter, washed him/?z self.</td>
<td>e. Peter, washed him/?z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Peter, rested him/?z *self.</td>
<td>f. Peter, rested him/?z.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(108) **Stage one: intensified locally bound 1st person pronouns in Old English:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensified pronouns</th>
<th>Unintensified pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I, suspected me/?z self.</td>
<td>d. I, suspected me/?z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I, washed me/?z self.</td>
<td>e. I, washed me/?z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I, rested me/?z *self.</td>
<td>f. I, rested me/?z.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(109) **Stage one: intensified and unintensified DPs and subject pronouns in Old English:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensified</th>
<th>Unintensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. the king self, etc.</td>
<td>c. the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. he self, I self, etc.</td>
<td>d. he, I, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this stage the primary function of *self*-adjunction was not to disambiguate third person pronouns but to mark representational non-identity with in anti-reflexive contexts, cf. the Modern Danish examples in (102a) and (103a). Note also the existence of examples like (8), which bear witness to the fact that even intensification of third person pronouns was not always triggered by a desire to disambiguate. In other words, we propose that the so-called disambiguating function is derivative of the primary intensifying function illustrated by the contrast between (107b) and (107e). Note that at this stage we assume that there still has been no fusion of *him+self*. The fact that *self*-intensification was motivated by a need to license coreference scenarios which would otherwise be infelicitous with anti-reflexive predicates, e.g. (107a,d) and (108a,d), and not by a need to disambiguate third person pronouns, neatly explains why the intensification took place with first and second person pronouns as well as with third person pronouns. That is, question (97a) is no longer a mystery. Indeed, it is now clear that (97a) was the wrong question to ask in the first place. The system of intensified and

---

37 As discussed in chapter 3, section 3.3.2.5, intensifier-adjunction to simple reflexives with neutral predicates is never truly optional, but rather dependent on focus and other discourse factors.
unintensified nominal expression in Old English (stages one and two) is summarized in the table in (110).

(110) **Stage one: system of intensification of nominal expressions in Old English:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unintensified</th>
<th>Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Loc. bound pr.</td>
<td>him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subj. pronoun</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Obj. pronoun</td>
<td>him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DP</td>
<td>the king</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 1, Old English had a morphologically transparent and fully compositional system of intensification in which all kinds of nominal expressions (DPs and pronominals) were intensified through the same process of *self*-adjunction. In this respect Old English is similar to Modern Danish, see the table in (111).

(111) **System of intensification of nominal expressions in Modern Danish:**

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

5.3.3.2 **Stage two: intensification and binding in Early Modern English**

The schemas in (112)-(114) summarize the changes which took place between Old English (OE) and Early Modern English (EME). In EME the locally bound pronouns of OE were replaced by Ø-reflexives while locally free pronouns remained, see ((112-3), and the OE intensifier *self* has been replaced by *himself* as intensifier across the board, see (114).

(112) **The evolution of adnominal intensifiers:**

| (OE) self | >> |
| (EME) himself | |

(113) **The evolution of locally bound pronouns:**

| (OE) him | >> |
| (EME) Ø-reflexive | |
The evolution of locally free pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>EME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three changes in (112-4) is all that is needed to account for how the Early Modern English system of binding and intensification, see (115), evolved out of Old English. Notice that the Ø-reflexive analysis proposed here allow us to account for EME as having the same kind of morphologically compositional system of intensification as the ones found in Old English and Modern Danish, see (110-1), repeated as (116-7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(115) Stage two: System of intensification of nominal expressions in Early Modern English:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unintensified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subj.pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Obj.pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(116) Stage one: System of intensification of nominal expressions in Old English:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unintensified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Loc. bound pr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subj.pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Obj.pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(117) System of intensification of nominal expressions in Modern Danish:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unintensified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subj. pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Obj. pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, the Ø-reflexive approach allows us to account of the evolution of the EME system in (115) from the OE system in (116) without stipulating any shift from one type of system to another. Basically the morphological compositionality of the system of intensification remains same modulo a change in the form of the adnominal intensifier from the simple x-self form to the complex x-self forms. Furthermore, a new reflexive pronoun,  

---

38 Notice that this change from simple to complex form of the intensifier closely mirrors the (still ongoing) change of the older simple intensifier –mème into the complex intensifier lui-même in Modern French, e.g. le roi même ‘the king self’ >> le roi lui-même ‘the king himself’. Notice also the close parallels in behavior between the clitic-
the $\emptyset$-reflexive was introduced to replace the locally bound pronouns in OE. We argue that these two changes are intimately connected. That is, we claim that the analysis proposed here can explain the link between the loss of locally bound pronouns and the formal change of the adnominal intensifier from *self* to *himself*, see questions (b-d) in (118).

First let us illustrate the changes described in (118-121) with concrete examples.

(118) **The evolution of unintensified locally bound pronouns:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Early Modern English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ??*Peter, suspected him$_i$</td>
<td>*Peter, suspected $\emptyset$,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. *Peter, washed him$_i$</td>
<td>*Peter, washed $\emptyset$,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. *Peter, rested him$_i$</td>
<td>*Peter, rested $\emptyset$,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. *Peter, took a knife with him$_i$</td>
<td>*Peter, took a knife with $\emptyset$,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(119) **The evolution of intensified locally bound pronouns:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Early Modern English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. *Peter, suspected him$_i$, self.</td>
<td>*Peter, suspected $\emptyset$, himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. *Peter, washed him$_i$, self.</td>
<td>*Peter, washed $\emptyset$, himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. *Peter, rested him$_i$, self.</td>
<td>*Peter, rested $\emptyset$, himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. *Peter, took a knife with him$_i$, self.</td>
<td>*Peter, took a knife with $\emptyset$, himself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(120) **The evolution of unintensified locally free pronouns:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Early Modern English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. *Peter, suspected him$_z$.</td>
<td>*Peter, suspected him$_z$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. *Peter, washed him$_z$.</td>
<td>*Peter, washed him$_z$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. *Peter, rested him$_z$.</td>
<td>*Peter, rested him$_z$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. *Peter, took a knife with him$_z$.</td>
<td>*Peter, took a knife with him$_z$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(121) **The evolution of unintensified locally free pronouns:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Early Modern English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ...*Peter, [...] except him$_z$, self.</td>
<td>...*Peter, [...] except (him)$_z$, himself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples in (118-9) illustrate the consequences of the shift from locally bound pronouns to $\emptyset$-reflexives. As shown, the distribution of unintensified and intensified forms is the same in both stages of the languages, i.e. anti-reflexives (due to the presupposition of

---

As mentioned above, these OE “examples” are based in large part on extrapolations from similar data. More work is needed to find attested examples for all these judgments.
representational non-identity) require intensification, see (118a) and (119a), neutrals are compatible with both intensified and unintensified forms, see (118b) and (119b), and inherently reflexives are only compatible with unintensified forms, see (118c-d) and (119c-d). The only unexpected judgment is ungrammaticality of (118d) with simple unintensified Ø-reflexive. However, this “exception” can be explained as a consequence of the clitic-like behavior of Ø-reflexives, i.e. clitics can only occur in direct argument-positions (cf. Fr. *Pierre est fier de *se/soi ‘Pierre is proud of REFL’). Since the Ø-clitic cannot is barred in (188d) for morphological reasons, and since the inherently reflexive semantics of the expression take a knife with __ excludes intensifier-adjunction, the personal pronoun him is the only overt realization offered by the morphology of the language. Note that Danish has simple unintensified sig in such expressions, see chapter 3, section 3.3.6.

The examples in (120-1) illustrate the fate of locally free pronouns in OE. Unlike locally bound pronouns, locally free pronouns remained unchanged in EME. Likewise, adnominal intensification of pronouns took place in the same environments in OE and EME, i.e. with in contrastive contexts, e.g. Peter [said that Mary danced with everybody] except himself, see (121b). Note that in EME locally free intensified pronouns could take the form him himself, her herself, us ourselves, etc. which is banned for phonological reasons (i.e. possibly haplology) in most versions of Modern English. These forms thus clearly show that the form of the intensifier had changed from self to himself. Note also that the total absence of examples like (122) in the history of English, is a witness to the fact that the change locally bound him >> Ø-reflexive took place simultaneously with (or just prior to but not after) the change self >> himself.

(122) *Peter washes/suspects him, himself.
In other words, the evolution of OE into EME must have taken place as follows. First the simple intensifier began to be adjoined to locally bound pronouns in OE to mark representational non-identity in anti-reflexive contexts. Since the majority of verbs are either anti-reflexive or “hidden” neutral predicates this happened in a large number of contexts. Hence the combination *him+self* came to be associated with reflexive readings and, as a consequence, the unintensified pronouns, e.g. *him*, etc., came to be associated with non-reflexive, disjoint reference readings. As a certain point the association between unintensified pronouns and disjoint reference readings became so strong that the deletion of locally bound pronouns was enforced, e.g. pronouns could no longer be used with inherently reflexive predicates. Thus the Ø-reflexives were created. And at the same time the combination *him+self* was reinterpreted as an adnominal intensifier, see (123). As mentioned above, the emergence of *himself* as intensifier is corroborated by the simultaneous emergence of intensified (locally free) pronouns of the form *him himself*, and intensified DPs of the form *the king himself*.

(123) The creation of compound ’reflexives’/intensifiers:

*him+self, me+self, etc. => himself, myself*40, etc. (=’reflexives’/intensifier which could only be used in contrastive contexts)

(123) illustrates the fusion of *him+self, me+self*, etc. into the so-called compound intensifiers *himself, myself*, etc., which took place fusion between OE and EME. The compound x-self forms which arose through this fusion process have a very peculiar and somewhat surprising property: they are never found in inherently reflexive contexts (which is exactly the kind of context where one would expect to find reflexives rather than pronouns, see Danish examples in (125)), see (124).

(124) *Peter took a knife with him/*himself.*

---

40 As mentioned above, we do not take the case complications into account here.
Peter took a knife with him/*himself.’

The fact that the $x$-self forms are found mainly in contrastive situations confirms our analysis of them as adnominal intensifiers. That is, they have the same meaning contribution and (to a large extent) the same distribution as the simple intensifier selv ‘self’ in Danish and the simple intensifier self in Old English, see (125-7).

The assumption that English developed $Ø$-reflexives is also necessary to explain why sentences like (126a) are bad, while its OE and Modern Danish/Dutch counterparts in (126b,c) are ok.

(126)  a. $I$ shave *me.
        b. Jeg barberer mig. (Danish)
        ‘I shave me.’
        c. Ich scheere mich. (Dutch)
        ‘I shave me.’

The examples in (127-132) illustrate that correspondence between English $Ø$-reflexives and simple unintensified reflexives in Danish, column (iii) in (127-132). Note that while both Danish and English distinguish between 3rd person pronouns and reflexives, compare columns (i) and (iii) in (127-129), only English distinguish formally between 1st (and 2nd) person pronouns and reflexives, i.e. me vs. $Ø$-reflexive, see column (i) and (iii) in (130-132). As shown in columns (i) and (iii) in (130-132) Danish 1st and 2nd person pronouns and reflexives share the same formal expression, e.g. mig ‘me’ in columns (i) and (iii) in (130-132).

(127)  Anti-reflexive verbs:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(i) pron.:</th>
<th>(ii) $Ø$-pron.</th>
<th>(iii) unint. refl.</th>
<th>(iv) int. refl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>$I$, suspect</td>
<td>*me$^i_i$ /</td>
<td>*$Ø_z$ /</td>
<td>*$Ø_i$ /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Jeg, mistænker (mig)</td>
<td>*$Ø_z$ /</td>
<td>*mig$^i_i$ /</td>
<td>mig$^i_i$, selv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(128)  Neutral verbs: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(i) pron.:</th>
<th>(ii) $Ø$-pron.</th>
<th>(iii) $Ø$-pron.</th>
<th>(iv) int. refl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>$I$, wash</td>
<td>*me$^i_i$ /</td>
<td>$Ø_z$ /</td>
<td>$Ø_i$ /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Jeg, vasker (mig)</td>
<td>*$Ø_z$ /</td>
<td>mig$^i_i$ /</td>
<td>mig$^i_i$, selv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(129) **Inherently reflexive verbs:**
a. *I, rest* "me" / *Ø" / "Ø / *Ø, myself.
b. *Jeg, hviler* (mig,) / *Ø" / mig / *mig, selv.

(130) Anti-reflexive verbs:
(i) pron.: (ii) Ø-pron. (iii) unint. refl. (iv) int. refl.
e. *He, suspects* "him" / *Ø" / *Ø" / Ø, himself.
f. *Han, mistænker* "ham" / *Ø" / sig / sig, selv.

(131) **Neutral verbs:**
a. *He, washes* "him" / Ø" / Ø / Ø, himself.
b. *Han, vasker* "ham" / Ø" / sig" / sig, selv.

(132) **Inherently reflexive verbs:**
a. *He, rests* "him" / *Ø" / *Ø / *Ø" / Ø, himself.
b. *Han, hviler* "ham" / *Ø" / sig" / *sig, selv.

Assuming the English system of intensified nominal expressions to follow the Danish pattern illustrated in (127-132), yields the picture of Early Modern English given in (133)-(135). Just like the simple Danish reflexive sig is intensified by intensifier adjunction (e.g. sig selv), so the simple English reflexive Ø is intensified by adjunction of the appropriate form of the complex intensifier himself (e.g. Ø himself).

(133) **Stage two (third person):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensified reflexives:</th>
<th>Unintensified reflexives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Peter, suspects Ø, himself.</td>
<td>d. Peter, suspects Ø, himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Peter, washes Ø, himself.</td>
<td>e. Peter, washes Ø, himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Peter, rests Ø, himself.</td>
<td>f. Peter, rests Ø, himself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(134) **Stage two (first person):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensified reflexives:</th>
<th>Unintensified reflexives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. I, wash Ø, myself.</td>
<td>e. I, wash Ø, myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I, rest Ø, myself.</td>
<td>f. I, rest Ø, myself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(135) **Stage two (intensified DPs, subject pronouns):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensified expressions:</th>
<th>Unintensified expressions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. the king himself</td>
<td>c. the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. he himself, I myself, etc.</td>
<td>d. he, I, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the neat compositional character of the system of intensified and unintensified nominal expressions of EME illustrated in (115) is perfectly paralleled in the modern Danish
system in (117). That is, in both systems the difference between intensified and unintensified forms is signaled by the presence/absence of the adnominal intensifier selv/himself. EME differs from Modern English in that it allows for intensified object pronouns, e.g. him himself (= Dan. ham selv ‘him himself’). That these intensified pronouns are pronominal expressions is demonstrated by the fact that they obey principle B, i.e. they cannot be locally bound, see (136)-(139), in this sense they behave like their Danish counterparts in (138)-(139).

(136) Stage two (third person pronouns)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensified pronouns:</th>
<th>Unintensified pronouns:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Peter; suspects him₃/z himself.</td>
<td>d. Peter; suspects him₃/z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Peter; washes him₃/z himself.</td>
<td>e. Peter; washes him₃/z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Peter; rests *him₁/₂ *himself.</td>
<td>f. Peter; rests *him₁/₂.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(137) Stage two (first person pronouns)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensified pronouns:</th>
<th>Unintensified pronouns:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. He; suspects me₃/z myself.</td>
<td>d. He; suspects me₃/z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. He; washes me₃/z myself.</td>
<td>e. He; washes me₃/z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. He; rests *me₁/₂ *myself.</td>
<td>f. Peter; rests *me₁/₂.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that, unlike Old English, EME does not allow simple unintensified pronouns in object position of inherently reflexive verbs, see (136c,f) and (137c,f). We now see that question (97c) (i.e. ‘Why were the pronouns in the usages in (95) abandoned and, once they were lost, why English did not start anew to develop pronouns with these functions?’) asks the wrong question. English did develop a new kind of pronominal element to replace the simple pronouns in object position of inherently reflexive verbs, viz. the simple unintensified Ø-reflexive which thus can be seen as the English counterpart of the simple unintensified reflexive sig in Danish, see tables 3-4. The examples in (138)-(139) illustrate the distribution of intensified and unintensified forms of the 1st and 3rd person pronouns in Modern Danish.

As described above, close comparison of the English stage four pronominal system in and the Danish system in (127)-(132) reveals one interesting difference. While English chose

41 The judgments in (56-59) are based on the assumption that these sentences are placed in the appropriate ‘logophoric’ contexts where the intensified pronouns are bound by a non-local antecedent referring to a subject of consciousness (cf. Zribi-Hertz (1989), Kuno (1987), Huang & Liu (2001), etc.).
to replace all (i.e. 1st, and 2nd person forms as well as 3rd persons forms) locally bound simple pronouns with the zero reflexive, Danish chose (at some point in history) to live with a system in which the reflexive and pronominal forms in the 1st and 2nd persons are formally identical, compare the ungrammatical sentence *I wash me* in (128a) versus the grammatical sentence *jeg vasker mig* ‘(lit.) I wash me’ in (128b). Notice also that the same form *mig* ‘me’ of the personal pronoun is used in the non-reflexive sentence in (139e). Furthermore notice that Modern Danish does not have zero reflexives, compare (128a) and (128b). This fact strongly supports the hypothesis that English zero reflexives correspond to Danish simple unintensified reflexives (i.e. Eng. Ø reflexive = Dan. *sig* ‘REFL’, *mig* ‘mereflexive’, *dig* ‘youreflexive’). See also chapter 4, section 4.4.2 for a late-insertion analysis of 1st and 2nd person forms in Danish.

(138) Modern Danish third person pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensified pronouns:</th>
<th>Unintensified pronouns:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>Peter, suspects him</em>ₚₛᴸ himself.’</td>
<td>‘<em>Peter, suspects him</em>ₚₛᴸ.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>Peter, vasker ham</em>ₚₛᴸ selv.</td>
<td>e. <em>Peter, vasker ham</em>ₚₛᴸ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>Peter, washes him</em>ₚₛᴸ himself.’</td>
<td>‘<em>Peter, washes him</em>ₚₛᴸ.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. *Peter hviler *ham selv.</td>
<td>f. *Peter hviler *ham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>Peter, rests him</em>ₚₛᴸ *himself.’</td>
<td>‘<em>Peter, rests Ø</em>ₚₛᴸ.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(139) Modern Danish first person pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensified pronouns:</th>
<th>Unintensified pronouns:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. <em>Han, mistænker mig</em>ₚₛᴸ selv.</td>
<td>d. <em>Han, mistænker mig</em>ₚₛᴸ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>He, suspects me</em>ₚₛᴸ myself.’</td>
<td>‘<em>He, suspects me</em>ₚₛᴸ.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>Han, vasker mig</em>ₚₛᴸ selv.</td>
<td>e. <em>Han, vasker mig</em>ₚₛᴸ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>He, washes me</em>ₚₛᴸ myself.’</td>
<td>‘<em>He, washes me</em>ₚₛᴸ.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. *Han, hviler *mig selv.</td>
<td>f. *Han, hviler *mig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘*He, rests <em>me</em>ₚₛᴸ *myself.’</td>
<td>‘*Peter, rests <em>me</em>ₚₛᴸ’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the change to Ø-reflexives is necessary to explain the fact that the sentence *I shave me* (cf. Ger. *Ich scheere mich*, Dan. *Jeg barberer mig*, in (126)) was ok in OE but has become impossible in Modern English.
As illustrated by (136)-(137) and (115), stage two (EME) is represented by Older Modern English (e.g. Jane Austen’s English\(^{42}\)) which does allow intensified object pronouns (e.g. *him himself*). Later, in stage five, a morphological redundancy rule eliminated such forms.

### 5.3.3.3 Stage three: intensification and binding in Modern English

Stage five is characterized by the introduction of a morpho-(phono-)logical rule\(^{43}\) banning repetition of person, number and gender features in intensified object pronouns: *him himself* => [him] *himself, me myself* => [me] *myself*, etc., see the table in (140).

(140) System of intensification of nominal expressions in stage five (=Modern English).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unintensified</th>
<th>Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reflexive</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>himself</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subj. pronoun</td>
<td><em>he</em></td>
<td><em>himself</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Obj. pronoun</td>
<td><em>him</em></td>
<td>[him] <em>himself</em> (&lt;<em>him himself</em>)(^{44})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DP</td>
<td>the king’</td>
<td>the king <em>himself</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3.3.4 Additional evidence from the evolution of pronominal reciprocals into Ø-reciprocals

The observation that in many languages (e.g. Romance languages and German) the simple unintensified reflexive (*se/si/sich*) can be used as both reciprocal and reflexive is highly relevant to our analysis of the historical development of *self*-intensifiers and Ø-reflexives in Modern English. In the same way OE locally bound pronouns were replaced by Ø-reflexives in EME so were also locally bound pronouns with reciprocal readings, see (141a), replaced with Ø-reciprocals, see (141b).

---

\(^{42}\) See Baker (1995) for a detailed description of Jane Austen’s English.

\(^{43}\) Cf. Siemund’s (1999:81) rule:

“If two expressions E1 and E2 form a complex expression Ec, and if the semantic features of E1 are a subset of those of E2, then E1 is superfluous and can be dispensed with.”

\(^{44}\) The fact that the form *him himself* is extremely rare (but not unattested) in present-day Modern English indicates that the change from Early Modern English to Modern English took place fairly recently and that for some speakers (esp. of conservative versions of British English) this changes has yet to be fully implemented.
(141) a. (OE) *They, kissed them,*
   ‘They kissed Ø/each other.’
   >> b. (EME) *They, kissed Ø,*
   ‘They kissed (each other).’

(142) (OE) pronominal reciprocals
>> (EME) Ø-reciprocals

This kind of evidence illustrates the close affinity between reflexives and reciprocals and
provides additional support for the analysis of the historical evolution of Ø-reflexives/reciprocals proposed above.

5.3.4 Summary

The above discussion of the development of Modern English (ME) *himself* has shown that the
assumptions that:

(i) ME has Ø-reflexives which are functionally equivalent of Dan. *sig*, Fr. *se*, Ger. *sich*, etc.
(ii) ME x-self forms of the type *himself* are always intensifiers.
(iii) predicate meaning (presupposed representational non-identity) affects the
distribution of intensified and unintensified reflexives (e.g. Dan *sig* vs. *sig selv*,
and Eng. Ø vs. Ø x-self).

The above approach to the evolution of x-self forms and Ø-reflexives offer interesting new
answers to all of the hitherto unanswered questions listed in (97) and repeated in (143),
concerning the evolution of the compound intensifiers/reflexives *himself* in Modern English.

(143) Questions concerning the development of the x-self intensifier in Modern English:

(a) Why was the fusion of pronoun and *self* not confined to the third person, but was
extended to the first and second persons? This remarkable in so far as no ambiguity
arises in these cases.
(b) Why did the newly developed compound form also come to be used as an intensifier?
(c) Why did English abandon its original intensifier *self*? Old English *self* was used in
much the same way as its modern equivalent and there seems to have been no obvious
reason to replace it with a new intensifier.
(d) Why were the pronouns in the usages in (95) abandoned and, once they were lost, why
English did not start anew to develop pronouns with these functions?

As discussed above, question (143a) is asked in the wrong way to begin with. Since the
adjunction of *self* to pronouns in Old English was not primarily motivated by a need for
disambiguation (but rather by a need to mark representational non-identity in anti-reflexive,
see (91-2), or inherently contrastive contexts, see (93), it is not at all surprising but, indeed, expected that the fusion of pronoun and self should be extended to the first and second persons. Indeed, as shown be the Danish examples discussed above, even in the absence of ambiguity (between coreference and disjoint reference readings) selv-adjunction to pronouns and reflexives is still necessary to mark representational non-identity with anti-reflexive and ‘hidden neutral’ predicates. There is therefore nothing remarkable in the fact that the fusion of self and pronoun was took place across the board regardless disambiguation issues.

As for questions (143b) and (143c) the answer lies in the Ø-reflexive approach. As argued in section 5.3.3.2, the fact that the combination him+self came to be associated with reflexive readings lead to the unintensified pronouns being associated with non-reflexive, disjoint reference readings. At a certain point the association between unintensified pronouns and disjoint reference readings became so strong that the deletion of locally bound pronouns was enforced, e.g. pronouns could no longer be used with inherently reflexive predicates. Thus the Ø-reflexive were created. And at the same time, the combination him+self was reinterpreted as an adnominal intensifier.

The tables in (144-147), neatly summarizes the account of historical development of reflexives and intensifiers in Modern English and its parallels to the system of intensification of nominal expression in Modern Danish.

(144) Stage one: system of intensification of nominal expressions in Old English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unintensified</th>
<th>Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Loc. bound pr.</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subj.pronoun</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Obj.pronoun</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DP</td>
<td>the king</td>
<td>the king</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage two: system of intensification of nominal expressions in Early Modern English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unintensified</th>
<th>Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. pronoun</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. pronoun</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>the king’</td>
<td>the king’ himself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage three: system of intensification of nominal expressions in Modern English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unintensified</th>
<th>Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. pronoun</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. pronoun</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>(him) himself (&lt;him himself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>the king’</td>
<td>the king’ himself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

System of intensification of nominal expressions in Modern Danish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unintensified</th>
<th>Intensified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>sig ‘himself/herself/etc.’</td>
<td>sig selv ‘himself/herself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. pronoun</td>
<td>han ‘he’</td>
<td>han selv ‘he himself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. pronoun</td>
<td>ham ‘him’</td>
<td>ham selv ‘him himself/himself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>kongen ‘the king’</td>
<td>kongen selv ‘the king himself’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the question in (143d) receives a straightforward explanation if we assume that the pronouns in object position of inherently reflexive verbs were replaced by Ø-reflexives.

Further evidence for the existence of Ø-reflexives is provided by the Ø/himself alternations found with neutral predicates, see (68).

Neutral verbs:

a. I wash Ø / Ø myself.

b. Jeg vasker mig/ mig selv.

Rather than being optional (as is often claimed in the literature), the alternation between simple unintensified reflexive and complex intensified reflexive is motivated by the same semantic/pragmatic factors (i.e. contrastive focus, doppelgänger-effects, anti-reflexivity, etc.) in both English and Danish (i.e. Eng. Ø vs. Ø myself = Dan. mig ‘me’ vs. mig selv ‘me self’).

Only the assumption that English have Ø reflexives allows for the unification of the analysis reflexives and intensifiers in English and Danish. Indeed, this assumption is, as we have argued above, the very key which unlocks that mysteries surrounding the evolution of the compound forms of the intensifier himself in Modern English.
5.4. **Conclusion**

While potentially raising more questions than it answers, we hope that the analysis of English intensifiers and reflexives outlined above has convincingly shown that the analysis of Danish based on the independence of intensification and binding presented in chapters 1-4 can be extended to both Modern and Old English. The articulation of binding and intensification proposed here has far reaching consequences for our understanding of both modules. First, in contrast to both traditional grammars and modern linguistic accounts of binding, English x-self forms are not ambiguous between intensifiers (e.g. *Peter himself*) and reflexives (*Peter succeeded himself*), but rather ALWAYS function as intensifiers. In this respect, Eng. x-self forms have more in common with the Danish intensifier *selv* than with the simple reflexive *sig*, see (149).

(149) **Typological survey of different uses of adnominal intensifiers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Adnom. inten.</td>
<td>the king <strong>himself</strong></td>
<td>kongen <strong>selv</strong></td>
<td>le roi (lui-)<em>même</em></td>
<td>der König <strong>selbst</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Complex refl.</td>
<td>Ø <strong>himself</strong></td>
<td>sig <strong>selv</strong></td>
<td>soi-<em>même</em></td>
<td>sich <strong>selbst</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Doppelgänger-mark</td>
<td>Ø <strong>himself</strong></td>
<td>sig <strong>selv</strong></td>
<td>soi-<em>même</em></td>
<td>sich <strong>selbst</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Inten. pron./logophor</td>
<td>[him] <strong>himself</strong></td>
<td>ham <strong>selv</strong></td>
<td>[lui] lui-<em>même</em></td>
<td>ihn <strong>selbst</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Exclus. adv. int.</td>
<td><strong>himself</strong></td>
<td>selv</td>
<td>lui-<em>même</em></td>
<td>Selbst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Inclus. adv. int.</td>
<td><strong>himself</strong></td>
<td>selv</td>
<td>lui-<em>même</em></td>
<td>Selbst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the existence of Ø-reflexives in Modern English finds support in the fact that they have largely the same distribution as simple unintensified reflexives in Danish, see (150).

(150) **Typological survey of reflexive and non-reflexive uses of reflexive elements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. reflexive</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>sig</td>
<td>se/soi</td>
<td>sich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. reciprocal</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>sich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. middle</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>sig</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>sich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. inh.relf/depon.</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-s/sig</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>sich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the advantages of the Ø-reflexive analysis of English is that locally free reflexives no longer constitute potential exceptions to principle A. That is, the distribution of anaphors (Ø-reflexives and reciprocals, both Ø-reciprocals and *each other*) is now limited to the local domain (principle A), while pronominals have to be free in the same domain. Finally, as
discussion in section 5.3, the $\emptyset$-reflexive analysis of Modern English allows for a more straightforward analysis of the evolution of reflexives and intensifiers.