Chapter 7
The element selv ‘self’ in nominalizations

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

In the remainder of this introductory section the main facts concerning nominalizations containing the element selv ‘self’ will be introduced. Section 7.2 will contain more detailed description of the different functions of the element selv ‘self’ in nominalizations. Section 7.3 offers a cross-linguistic perspective on the use of reflexives and intensifiers in nominalizations and also takes a brief look at the diachronic aspects of word formation processes and lexicalization. Finally, in section 7.4, the exact status of word-internal uses of selv ‘self’ will be discussed (i.e. is it an intensifier or a reflexive, or something else?) and a possible analysis of selv ‘self’ in nominalizations will be outlined. For expository reasons an alphabetically ordered list of all the morphologically complex words containing the element selv ‘self’ occurring in one of the most comprehensive Danish-English dictionaries has been placed in Appendix I.
The element *selv* ‘self’ occurs in a number of derived nouns, see (1).

(1)  
a. *selvrespekt* ‘self-respect’  
b. *selvanalyse* ‘self-analysis’  
c. *selviagttagelse* ‘self-observation’  
d. *selvbedrag* ‘self-deception’  
e. *selvforsvar* ‘self-defense’

The nouns listed in (1), are all derived from verbal stems, see (2).

(2)  
a. *respektere* ‘to respect’  
   =>  *respekt* ‘respect’  
b. *analyser* ‘to analyze’  
   =>  *analyse* ‘analysis’  
c. *iagttage* ‘to observe’  
   =>  *iagttagelse* ‘observation’  
d. *bedrage* ‘to deceive’  
   =>  *bedrag* ‘deceit’  
e. *forsvare* ‘to defend’  
   =>  *forsvar* ‘defense’

The verbal meanings of the words in (2) are preserved in their respective nominalizations in (1). The element *selv* ‘self’ occurring at the first part of these nominalizations could thus potentially be interpreted as receiving the theta-role associated with the direct object of the verbs in (2). In other words, the meanings of the nominalizations in (1) correspond roughly to the meanings of the corresponding reflexive clauses in (3). As also shown in (3), the external theta-role of the verbs forming the base of the nominalizations in (1) can be expressed by an optional possessor phrase.

(3)  
a. *Peter bedrager sig selv.*  
   \(\approx\)  *Peters selvbedrag*  
b. *Peter respekterer sig selv.*  
   \(\approx\)  *Peters selvrespekt*  
c. *Peter iagttager sig selv.*  
   \(\approx\)  *Peters selviagttagelse*  
d. *Peter analyserer sig selv.*  
   \(\approx\)  *Peters selvanalyse*  
e. *Peter forsvarer sig selv.*  
   \(\approx\)  *Peters selvforsvar*  
   ‘Peter respects/analyzes/etc. himself.’  
   ‘Peter’s self-respect/etc..’

At first glance, the close correspondence between clauses and nominalizations illustrated by the examples in (3) may appear to indicate that the element *selv* ‘self’ functions as a reflexive element inside nominalizations in the same way that the reflexive pronoun *sig (selv)* functions as a reflexive element in full clauses. However, as will be proposed in section 7.4, one may also analyze the *selv* element in nominalizations to be an intensifier adjoining to a \(\emptyset\) reflexive.
7.2 Different uses of the morpheme selv ‘self’ in derived nouns and adjectives

In this section, different uses of the morpheme selv ‘self’ in derived nouns and adjectives will be described. Two main uses can be distinguished: (i) what appears to be “reflexives” uses, which we will argue are really adnominal intensifiers, discussed in section 7.2.1, and (ii) “exclusive” adverbial uses, discussed in section 7.2.2. Finally Section 7.2.3 contains a brief discussion of idiomatic expressions.

7.2.1 Word-internal selv ‘self’ appears to behave as a “reflexive”, yet it really is an adnominal intensifier

As mentioned in section 7.1, the close correspondence between clauses and nominalizations illustrated by the examples in (3) may at first glance appear to suggest that the element selv ‘self’ functions as a reflexive element inside nominalizations in the same way that the reflexive pronoun sig (selv) functions as a reflexive element in full clauses. Almost all of the nominalizations in which the element selv ‘self’ appears to function as a reflexive are derived from anti-reflexive verbs, see (4)-(6).

(4) a. selvbedrag  ‘self-deception’
    b. selviagttagelse  ‘self-observation’
    c. selvkritik  ‘self-criticism’

(5) a. bedrage  ‘to deceive’ (anti-reflexive)
    b. iagttage  ‘to observe’ (hidden neutral)
    c. kritisere  ‘to criticize’ (hidden neutral)

(6) a. Peter bedrager *sig/sig selv/Marie.
    Peter deceives REFL/REFL self/Marie  ‘Peter deceives himself/Marie.’
    b. Peter iagttager #sig/sig selv/Marie.
    Peter observes REFL/REFL self/Marie  ‘Peter observes himself/Marie.’
    c. Peter kritiserer #sig/sig selv/Marie.
    Peter criticizes REFL/REFL self/Marie  ‘Peter criticizes himself/Marie.’
The nominalizations in (4) are based on the verbs in (5) whose anti-reflexive or hidden neutral nature is illustrated by the examples in (6). The anti-reflexive meaning of these predicates generates a presupposition of representational non-identity of their arguments. Therefore adnominal intensification of the simple reflexive is necessary to mark the reflexive as representationally non-identical to its antecedent. In other words, though the instances of selv ‘self’ in (4) appear to function as reflexives, they are really adnominal intensifiers intensifying a word-internal Ø-reflexive (see the analysis proposed in section 7.4 below).

There are, however, also a few of examples of such nominalizations derived from neutral verbs, see (7)-(9).

(7) a. selvforsvar ‘self-defense’
   b. selvforsørgende ‘self-supporting, independent’

(8) a. forsvar ‘defend’ (neutral, transitive verb)
   b. forsørge ‘support’ (neutral, transitive verb)

(9) Peter forsvarer/forsørger sig/sig selv/Marie.
   Peter defends/supports REFL/REFL self/Marie
   ‘Peter defends/supports himself/Marie.’

The nominalization in (7a) is based on the neutral verbs in (8) whose neutral nature is illustrated by the examples in (9). As expected there are no self-nominalizations based on “grooming” verbs, e.g. *selvvaskning ‘self-washing’.

---

1 See analysis of intensified reflexives in chapter 3.

2 The only apparent exception is adjectives like selvrensende ‘self-cleaning/automatically cleaning’. In this derived adjective, however, the element selv seem to derive from the adverbial adjunct of sig selv ‘by itself/automatically’, see (i), rather than from a reflexive pronoun, see (ii).

(i) Øven kan rense sig af sig selv.
   oven-the can clean-INF REFL of REFL self
   ‘The oven can clean itself automatically/by itself.’

(ii) Øven rensede sig (selv).
   oven-the clean-PAST REFL self
   ‘The oven cleaned itself.’
There are, however, somewhat unexpectedly, a couple of nominalizations based on inherently reflexive verbs, in which the element selv ‘self’ seems to play the role of reflexive, see (10)-(12).

(10) a. selvbesindelse ‘collectedness, self-communion; self-reflection’  
b.  selvudvikling  ‘self-development; spontaneous evolution (medical terminology)’

(11) a. besinde sig  ‘collect oneself’ (inherently reflexive)  
b. udvikle sig  ‘develop’ (inherently reflexive/transitive)

(12) Peter besinder sig/*sig selv/*Marie.  
Peter collects REFL/REFL self/Marie  
‘Peter collects himself/Marie.’

The nominalizations in (10) are based on the inherently reflexive verbs in (11) whose inherently reflexive nature is illustrated by the examples in (12). The fact that an inherently reflexive verb like besinde sig ‘collect oneself’ is able to form nominalizations with selv- is rather surprising. As discussed in chapter 4, there is ample evidence in favor of assuming the sig occurring with (most) inherently reflexive verbs to be a non-thematic grammatical marker rather than a theta-role receiving nominal argument. That is, besinde sig ‘collect oneself’ is assumed to have been reanalyzed as an intransitive verb unable to assign more than one theta-role. In contrast, the verbs in (5) and (8) are transitive verbs assigning two theta-roles and there is evidence that in nominalizations based on these verbs, the element selv receives the internal theta-role, see (13) and (14).

(13) a. Peters kritik af sig selv.  
‘Peter’s criticism of REFL self’  
b. Peters kritik af Marie.  
‘Peter’s criticism of Marie.’

‘Peter’s self-criticism of REFL self’  
‘Peter’s self-criticism of Marie.’

Alternatively, as proposed in section 7.4, it is a Ø-reflexive to which the intensifier selv is adjoined which receives the theta-role from the verbal stem.
In (13a,b) both theta-roles of the deverbal noun *kritik* ‘criticism’ are assigned: one to the possessor phrase *Peters* ‘Peter’s’ and the other to the nominal expression in the prepositional complement *af __* ‘of __’. Likewise, in (14c) both theta-roles of the deverbal noun *kritik* ‘criticism’ are assigned: one the possessor phrase *Peters* ‘Peter’s’ and the other to the element *selv* ‘self’. The examples in (14a,b) can be construed as evidence that the internal theta-role of the verbal stem *kritik*- in the nominalization *selvkritik* ‘self-criticism’ has been assigned to the element *selv*-. That is, the ungrammaticality of (14a,b) can be explained as a consequence of the DPs in the prepositional complement *af __* ‘of __’ in (14a,b) receiving no theta-role, since the two theta-roles of the deverbal noun *kritik* ‘criticism’ have already been assigned to other elements.

However, if it is assumed that the element *selv*- in nominalizations always receives a theta-role from the verbal root it is prefixed to, then how do we explain the presence of *selv* in nominalizations based on inherently reflexive verbs (see (10a,b))? As discussed below, there are even cases of *selv*-compounds based on intransitive verbs. But in those cases, e.g. *selvdød* ‘self-dead (used to describe animals which have died of disease or other natural causes rather than having been killed)’, the element *selv* is interpreted as an adverbial phrase meaning ‘by itself, automatically, spontaneously, etc’ rather than as an argument. Note that it is possible to adopt a similar adverbial analysis of *selv* in the compound *selvbesindelse* ‘collectedness, self-communion; self-reflection’ (10a). By consistently analyzing self-nominalizations based on inherently reflexive verbs (of which there is no more than a handful out of the total of 235 compounds listed in Appendix I) as adverbial *self*-nominalizations we arrive at the generalization that reflexive self-nominalizations only can be formed on the basis of anti-reflexive and neutral verbal stems, see list of self-nominalization in Appendix I. The term
‘reflexive self-nominalizations’ refers to deverbal nominalizations in which selv appear to function as the internal argument (but, as we argue, really is an adnominal intensifier). In contrast, the term ‘adverbial self-nominalizations’ refers to deverbal nominalizations in which selv functions as an adverbial.

### 7.2.2 Word-internal selv ‘self’ behaving as an adverbial

Some transitive verbs are not, or only marginally, compatible with reflexive scenarios. In nominalizations of such verbs the selv element tends to take on an adverbial meaning ‘on one’s own, by oneself, without help, all alone, etc.’, see (15). In other words, the occurrence of the element selv in the complex noun in (15) should not be interpreted as the direct object of the verbal element bygge ‘build’ but rather as the manner adverbial selv ‘by himself, etc.” occurring sentence-finally in the example in (16).

(15)  
   selvbygger
   ‘person who builds his house with his own hands.’

(16)  
   Peter byggede huset (helt) selv.  (‘exclusive’ adverbial use of selv ‘self’)
   Peter built house-the all self
   ‘Peter built the house (all by) himself.’

Other examples of adverbially used word-internal instances of the element selv are listed in (17) which contain adjectivizations/nominalizations based on the intransitive verbs listed in (18).

(17)  
   a.  selvød    self-dead
       (Adjective used to describe animals which have died of disease, old age or other natural causes rather than having been killed)
   b.  selvklatrende    self-climbing
       ‘(bot.) climbing, creeping, trailing (plant)’

(18)  
   a.  dø    intr. ‘die’
   b.  klatre    intr. climb, clamber
The adjectivizations/nominalizations in (19) are based on the transitive verbs listed in (20).

But unlike (15), the element selv here means ‘by itself, automatically’ rather than ‘all by itself, without help.’

(19) a. selvspillende  self-playing
     (adj. used to describe a piano which can play by itself/automatically)
 b. selvbindere  self-bind-er
     (adj. used to describe hay-raking machine which binds the hay into bundles on its own/automatically)
 c. selvhævende  self-rising
     ‘self-rising (fx flour)’
 d. selvlukkende  self-closing
     ‘self-closing (fx door)’

(20) a. spille (et instrument)  ‘play (an instrument’
 b. binde (hø)  ‘bind (hay)’
 c. hæve
   (i) tr. ‘raise (fx one’s arms; one’s glass); lift, lift up’
   (ii) intr. ‘swell, tumefy; (dough) rise’
 d. lukke  ‘close (a door/gate/window/etc.)’

The main difference between (16), which allows exclusive adverbial selv, and (21a), which doesn’t, lies in the nature of the predicate. Bygge ‘build’ in (16) is a causative transitive predicate. In this case the exclusive selv can associate with the agentive subject Peter.

(21) a. *Dejen hævede (helt) selv.  (Compare (21a) and (16))
     dough-the rose all self
     ‘The dough rose all by itself.’
 b. Dejen hævede (helt) af sig selv.
     dough-the rose all of REFL self
     ‘The dough rose all by itself’

Since the verb hæve ‘rise’ in (21) is unaccusative, it does not assign any AGENT theta-role. Hence exclusive adverbial selv can not be used and the phrase af sig selv ‘of REFL self’ is found instead.

7.2.3 Problematic cases

It is unclear how to characterize the exact function/meaning of selv ‘self’ in the more or less idiomatic adjectival/nominal compounds in (22)-(26).
Most of these ‘problematic’ cases are usually NOT deverbal nominalizations but rather compounds based on non-verbal nominal or adjectival roots which do not take arguments, or express actions (hence cannot take either adnominal, or exclusive adverbial selv). The adjectives klog ‘wise, intelligent’ and retfærdig ‘just, righteous’ in (22-23) do not allow internal arguments. It is thus impossible to suggest that in the self-compounds in (22a) and (23a,b) the element selv functions as an internal argument. The self-compounds in (24-26) seem even more idiosyncratic.

In at least one case the adnominal intensifier selv and its suppletive form in possessive constructions, egen own’, can occur in the same compound without changing the meaning, see (27).

\[
\begin{align*}
17.e\text{genrisiko} & = \text{selvrisko} \\
\text{own-risk} & \quad \text{self-risk} \\
\text{‘own risk’} & \quad \text{‘own risk’ (in insurance terminology)}
\end{align*}
\]

The words in (27) are interesting since they may potentially be used as evidence that selv ‘self’ and egen ‘own’ are suppletive variants of the same element, an assumption which is crucial to the analysis defended in this dissertation, see section 3.3.5 in chapter 3 for more discussion of the possessive intensifier egen ‘own’.
Another set of idiomatic uses of selv is given in (28), where it may be possible to argue that the selv in the compound in (28a) corresponds to the complex reflexive in the idiomatic phrase in (28c) though the exact analysis of both (28a) and (28c) remains to be worked out.

(28) a. selv sagt self-said adj. ‘self-evident, obvious, plain’
b. sige vt. say
c. det siger sig selv it says REFLEX self
 ‘It is obvious/it goes without saying/etc.’

7.3 Cross-linguistic perspective on use of intensifiers in derived words

In this section it will be argued that while word-externally (syntactically) used adnominal intensifiers have the same basic properties in most languages (i.e. as markers of representational non-identity, markers of contrastive focus, etc., see (29), word-internally used intensifiers seem to display a great deal more cross-linguistic variation which are mainly due to the effects of lexicalization and blocking.

(29) Typological survey of different uses of adnominal intensifiers4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Adnom. inten.</td>
<td>kongen selv</td>
<td>the king</td>
<td>himself</td>
<td>le roi (lui-)même</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Complex refl.</td>
<td>sig selv</td>
<td>[Ø himself]</td>
<td>[HIMSELF/O himself]</td>
<td>[soi-même/lui-même]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Prosodic inten.</td>
<td>sig selv</td>
<td>[Ø himself]</td>
<td>[SOI/ soi-même]</td>
<td>[O ziji]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Doppelgänger-mark</td>
<td>ham selv</td>
<td>[him] himself</td>
<td>[(lui)] lui-même</td>
<td>[(ta) ziji]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Inten. pron./logophor</td>
<td>selv</td>
<td>himself</td>
<td>lui-même</td>
<td>ziji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Exclus. adv. int.</td>
<td>selv</td>
<td>himself</td>
<td>[lui-même]</td>
<td>ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Inclus. adv. int.</td>
<td>selv</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>même</td>
<td>lian _ ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Add. focus part.</td>
<td>selv</td>
<td>*himself/self</td>
<td>*même/moi</td>
<td>*ziji/zi-/ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Nominal uses</td>
<td>selv</td>
<td>very/actual</td>
<td>même</td>
<td>'same (kind of)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Deverbal compounds</td>
<td>selveste</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.1. French

The nominal intensifier used to mark non-guise-identity in French is –même, see (30).

---

4 See chapter 2 for examples illustrating the different uses of intensifiers referred to in this table.
(30) Use of –même to mark non-guise-identity.
   a. Il travaille contre soi*(-même). (anti-reflexive predicate)
   b. Il travaille pour soi(-même). (neutral predicate)

Even though the adnominal intensifier –même is used to mark non-guise-identity in the same way is the adnominal intensifier selv in Danish the Fr. morpheme is not used as the first part of any derived nouns and adjectives. It apparently only occurs in one compound, i.e. the adverb mêmement ‘likewise; especially’. This clearly shows that the morpheme used as adnominal intensifier in a given language does not necessarily behave the same way in derived nouns and adjectives. In French the prefix auto- (derived from the Greek reflexive/intensifier autos ‘self’) is more productive than it is in the Germanic languages and thus is able to take over some of the functions of –même in derived nouns and adjectives, see (31).

(31) Nominalizations in auto-
Danish: French:
   a. selvanklager auto-accusateur *même-accusateur
      self-accuser auto-accuser
   b. selyforksvar auto-défense *même-défencse
      self-defense auto-defense
   c. selvportraet auto-portrait *même-portrait
      self-portrait auto-portrait
   d. selvplageri auto-punition *même-punition
      self-torture auto-punishment

The examples in (32) and (33) illustrate that Germanic self-nominalizations often correspond to French nominalizations in which the internal argument is relegated to a prepositional complement.

(32) Paraphrases with PP + soi-même
Danish: French:
   a. selvbebrejdelse grief contre soi-même
   b. selvbegrensning limitation de soi-même
   c. selvkritik critique de soi-même/autocritique
Paraphrases with PP + soi(--même)

Danish:  French:

a. selvbehag  contentement de soi, ??complaisance de soi
    auto-complaisance
b. selvtilfreds  content de soi[--même]
c. selvforsvar  défense de soi-même/autodéfense

The word-internal distribution of soi and soi-même in nominalizations of the types illustrated here seem to neatly follow the word-external distribution of soi and soi-même and of lui and lui-même with non-contrastive prepositional predicates. That is, anti-reflexive predicates require the complex forms lui-même/ soi-même, see (30a) and (32), while neutral predicates allow both simple soi/lui and complex lui-même/ soi-même, see (30b) and (33). Finally, notice that in neither French nor Danish is it possible to form compounds with the reflexives se and sig, e.g. *se-punition, *sig-plageri. Indeed, it seems to be impossible to find ‘true’ reflexives used in compounds in this way in any language. The absence of nominalizations with incorporated reflexive pronouns may be due to a constraint on what kind of elements may undergo incorporation. That is, being DPs, reflexive pronouns cannot incorporate, while the morpheme selv being an N is allowed to incorporate.

7.3.2 Chinese

In Modern Mandarin Chinese the reflexive pronoun and the intensifier appear to have the same form, i.e. ziji 自己 ‘self’, see (34).

(34) a. 張三恨自己。  Zhangsan hen ziji.
    Zhangsan hates self
    ‘Zhangsan hates himself.’
b. 張三自己恨李四。  Zhangsan ziji hen Lisi.
    Zhangsan self hates Lisi
    ‘Zhangsan himself hates Lisi.’
Like French –\textit{mêmes, ziji 自己 ‘self’ does not seem to be used in derived nouns and adjectives. Instead, the morphemes \textit{zi 自 ‘self’ and \textit{ji 己 ‘self’, which both have the basic meaning ‘self’, are used independently}^5, see (35) and (37). In Classical Chinese both \textit{zi 自 ‘self’ and \textit{ji 己 ‘self’ could be used as independent words. The word \textit{zi 自 ‘self’ was mostly used as a verbal prefix, and was therefore usually only used as local reflexive. \textit{ji 己, on the other hand, could be used both as local and as long-distance reflexive. In Classical Chinese the noun \textit{shen 身 ‘body’ was also used as emphatic reflexive/adnominal intensifier}^6. All three words now occur in the Modern Chinese counterparts of English/Danish words containing the element \textit{selv ‘self’}, see (35)-(37).

(35) \textit{zi 自 ‘self’ + verb} \textit{7 8}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{zi-bei 自卑 ‘self-abasement’}
\item \textit{zi-qi 自欺 ‘self-deception’}
\item \textit{zi-ai 自愛 ‘self-love’}
\item \textit{zi-wei 自衛 ‘self-defense’ (see (49a-b))}
\end{enumerate}

(36) \textit{verb + shen 身 ‘self, body’}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{hu-shen 護身 ‘self-defense’}
\item \textit{fang-shen 防身 ‘self-defense’}
\end{enumerate}

(37) \textit{verb + \textit{ji 己 ‘self}}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{zhi-ji 知己 ‘know oneself’}
\item \textit{zhi-ji 知己 n. ‘bosom/intimate friend, be intimate/close’}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Note incidentally, that \textit{ziji 自己 ‘self-self’ is often wrongly assumed to be mono-morphemic, see chapter 6 for more discussion of the intensifier \textit{ziji 自己 ‘self-self’.}}}
\footnote{As in \textit{wu shen 吾身 (lit.) ‘I body’ = ‘I myself’.}
\footnote{\textit{zi 自 ‘self’ + verb is a frequently found type of self-compound in Modern Chinese. The prefix \textit{zi 自 ‘self’ is only found in a few, idiomatic, constructions which are not based on deverbal nouns, e.g. \textit{zi-wo 自我 (lit. ‘self-me’) ‘self; oneself; ego’}.}
\footnote{Note that verbal compounds containing \textit{zi 自 ‘self’ abound in Chinese (e.g. \textit{zi-sha 自殺 ‘(lit.) self-kill, commit suicide’ but are almost non-existing in Danish, as well as the other Germanic languages. There is only one verbal compound containing \textit{selv ‘self’ in the entire list in Appendix I.}}}
\end{footnotes}
The formation of many of the nominalizations now found in modern Chinese, e.g. (35-37), occurred long time ago at a time when *ziji* 自己 as reflexive/intensifier had not yet been formed. It could therefore be argued that the existence of such nominalizations in the lexicon is now blocking the productive formation of compounds containing *ziji* 自己, e.g. *ziji-ai* 自己愛 ‘self-love’, compare with (35c).

7.3.3 Summary

The above minotypological survey of the behavior of the word-internal uses of intensifiers shows that the elements occurring (word-externally) as reflexives/intensifiers in clausal constructions need not be identical to the ones occurring in same functions word-internally. Furthermore, even if the same elements are used there is no guaranty that they will behave the same way when used word-internally as when used in clausal constructions. The fact, that the element *selv* ‘self’ appear to behave as a reflexive word-internally does therefore not constitute any strong evidence in favor *selv* being a reflexivizing element.

7.4 Outline of analysis of *selv* ‘self’ in derived nouns and adjectives

In this section it will be proposed that word-internal *selv* and word-external *selv* should be analyzed in the same way, i.e. either as an adnominal intensifiers adjoining to a simple reflexive or as an adverbial phrase modifying a predicate.

The distribution of the word-external adnominal intensifier with difference verb types is given in (38).

(38) a. Neutral predicates: sig / sig selv / DP
b. Anti-reflexive: *sig / sig selv / DP
c. Inherently reflexive: sig / *sig selv / DP
(39) Neutral predicates:
   a. \textit{Peter forsvarer sig selv.}
   b. \textit{Peter forsvarer sig.}
      ‘Peter defends REFL / REFL self.’

As stated in (38a) and illustrated in (39a,b) selv-adjunction to the simple reflexive sig is optional with neutral predicates like \textit{forsvare} ‘defend’. Likewise in ‘reflexive’ nominalizations based on neutral predicates the presences of the element \textit{selv} is optional, see (40a,b).

(40) Neutral predicates:
   a. \[ [[\emptyset \text{ selv}] [\text{forsvar}]] \] ‘self-defense’
   b. \[ [[\emptyset] [\text{forsvar}]] \] ‘defense (of oneself unless otherwise specified)’

As shown in (40), we assume nominalizations of neutral verbs like \textit{forsvar} ‘defense’ and \textit{selvforsvar} ‘self-defense’ to contain a \emptyset reflexive which may or may not be intensified by the adnominal intensifier selv. Even when the intensifier selv is not present the nominalization still has a reflexive reading (see (41(i)) below) as its default reading. Only when a non-reflexive argument is overtly present (e.g. \textit{His defense of Mary}) is a non-reflexive reading possible.

(41) The USC football team had a problem with their defense.
   (i) their defense (of themselves)

Now let’s turn to the anti-reflexive predicates. As stated in (38b) and illustrated in (42a,b) selv-adjunction to the simple reflexive sig is mandatory with anti-reflexive predicates like \textit{kritisere} ‘criticize’.

(42) Anti-reflexive predicates:
   a. \textit{Peter kritiserer sig selv.}
   b. \textit{Peter kritiserer *sig.}
      ‘Peter criticizes REFL / REFL self.’

Likewise in ‘reflexive’ nominalizations based on anti-reflexive predicates the presence of the element selv is mandatory, see (43a,b).
(43) Anti-reflexive:
   a.  [[[Ø selv] [kritik]]]    ‘self-criticism’
   b.  *[ [[Ø] [kritik]]]     ‘criticism (of somebody other than oneself
                               unless otherwise specified)’

As shown in (43), in nominalizations based on anti-reflexive verbs the Ø reflexive has to be
intensified to get the reflexive reading. When the intensifier selv is not present the
nominalization cannot have a reflexive reading, see (44(i)).

(44) a.  The USC football team had a problem with their criticism.
        *(i) their criticism of themselves
        ok(ii) their criticism of someone else/other teams

b.  The USC football team had a problem with their selfcriticism.
        ok(i) their criticism of themselves
        *(ii) their criticism of someone else/other teams

That is, the default reading of nominalizations of anti-reflexive verbs is a non-reflexive
reading, see (43b), and to obtain the reflexive reading the intensifier must be adjoined to the
word-internal Ø reflexive.

The fact that a few (only one or two) nominalizations of inherently reflexive verbs
allow the optional presence of selv, see (45a,b), constitutes a potential problem for this
analysis.

(45) Inherently reflexive:
   a.  [[[Ø selv] [besindelse]]]
        self collectedness
   b.  [[[Ø] [besindelse]]]  
        collectedness
   c.  besindelse af sig selv  >>  selvbesindelse
        collectedness of REFL self  >>  ‘collectedness’

As indicated in (38c) inherently predicates do not allow the complex reflexive. Consequently
one would expect the nominalizations of such verbs to exclude the presence of the adnominal
intensifier selv. A possible way out might be to assume the selv in (45a) to be an adverbial
modifier rather than the adnominal intensifier adjoined to a Ø reflexive, see (45c).
As already mentioned in section 7.3.1 above, in neither French nor Danish is it possible to form compounds with the reflexives *se and *sig, e.g. *se-punition, *sig-plageri. Indeed, it seems to be impossible to find ‘true’ reflexives used in compounds in this way in any language, see (46).

(46) Generalization:
True reflexives (e.g. Dan. sig, Fr. se, Ger. sich, etc.) do not occur in nominalizations, e.g. Fr. *se-punition, Dan. *sig-plageri

Since reflexives cannot be used in compounds, it has been suggested that the element selv functions as a reflexive word-internally. In this section, we have outlined an alternative analysis based on the assumption that word-internal reflexives are phonologically unrealized elements that may or may not be intensified by the adnominal intensifier selv. As suggested above, this analysis makes it possible to unify the account of both word-external and word-internal occurrences of the adnominal intensifier selv. In addition to its use as an adnominal intensifier, the element selv can also be used as an adverbial modifier. Again, the word-internal uses mirror the word-external uses, see (38) vs. (39), and (41c) vs. (43b).