Chapter 8
Conclusion

In this dissertation we have presented an account of simple and complex reflexives and pronouns based on the proposal that binding and intensification should be clearly separated. The two modules overlap in the case of complex reflexives and pronouns which are here analyzed as adnominally intensified forms of their simple counterparts. That is, we proposed that the descriptive generalizations in (1)-(4) are best accounted for within a framework which separates binding and intensification into the independent modules summarized in (5) and (6) respectively.

(1) Simple reflexives (e.g. Dan. sig):
are bound by subject in local domain (=minimal tensed clause) (chapter 3, section 3.2.4)

(2) Simple pronouns (e.g. Dan. ham):
are subject-free in local domain (=minimal tensed clause) (chapter 3, section 3.4.1)

(3) Complex reflexives (e.g sig selv) are found in the following contexts:
a. anti-reflexive predicates (chapter 3, section 3.3.2.1)
b. hidden neutral predicates (chapter 3, section 3.3.2.3)
c. contrastive contexts (with neutral predicates) (chapter 3, section 3.3.2.5)
d. doppelgänger-effects (chapter 3, section 3.3.2.7)
   (i) statue-readings (section 3.3.2.7.1)
   (ii) qua-sentences (section 3.3.2.7.2)
(iii)  strict (and sloppy) readings in VP ellipsis (section 3.3.2.7.3)

e.  stress-carrier

(i)  after unstressed prepositions (ex. (144), section 3.3.6.1)

(ii)  meta-linguistic contexts (with inherently reflexive) (chapter 4, section 4.3.3, ex. (91))

(4)  Complex pronouns (e.g. ham selv) are found in the following contexts:

a.  inherently contrastive predicates (chapter 3, section 3.4.2, ex. (167-8))

b.  contrastive contexts (with neutral predicates) (section, 3.4.2, ex. (169)

(5)  Binding theory (see chapter 3):

a.  Principle A, see (chap. 3, sect. 3.2.4, (25-28))

b.  Principle B, (chap. 3, sect. 3.2.4, (25-28))

(6)  Theory of intensification (see chapter 2):

Contrastiveness condition on adnominal intensification:

A nominal expression (DP, pronoun, reflexive, etc.) can only be intensified adnominally if it can be contrasted with other expressions in the context in which it is found. (chapter 2, ex. (2/62))

The syntactic binding principles in (5a) and (5b) account for the distribution of reflexives and pronouns in (1,3) and (2,4) respectively. The pragmatic/semantic principle of contrastiveness in (6a) is the basis of the account of the distribution of the intensifier selv in the contexts listed in (3) and (4).
The approach to binding and intensification proposed here has a number of important consequences for linguistic theory in general, see (7), and for the analysis of Danish in particular, see (8).

(7) **Consequences for binding theory:**
   a. intensification and binding are independent modules of the grammar
   b. binding is a purely syntactic phenomenon
   c. unified account of possessive and argument reflexives
   d. doppelgänger-effects (statue-readings, qua-sentences, strict reading in VP ellipsis, etc.) and anti-reflexivity (the triggering of adnominal intensification of reflexives with certain predicates as well as in other semantically/pragmatically anti-reflexive contexts (e.g. resultatives, ECM, and possessive constructions)) can be unified.

(8) **Consequences for analysis of Modern Danish (and similar languages):**
   a. *sig* not anti-local
   b. *sig selv* is not mandatorily local (cf. *his own*).
   c. complex reflexives, e.g. *sig selv*, are intensified reflexives.
   d. *ham selv* is not a logophor but an intensified object pronoun.
   e. *han selv* is not a special kind of anaphor (cf. Bickerton 1986) but an intensified subject pronoun.
   f. *selv* ‘self’ is not a reflexivizing particle which falls under binding theory (e.g. Reinhart and Reuland 1993), but an intensifier which falls under the module of intensification.
g. *egen* ‘own’ is the suppletive variant of *selv* ‘self’.

h. the possessive reflexive *sin* ‘POSSREFL’ is a morphological variant of *sig* ‘REFL’ and falls under the same principle A of the binding theory (in contrast, Reinhart and Reuland (1993) have to assume *sin* to be fundamentally different from *sig*, since in their analysis reflexives have to be arguments of predicates),

In chapters 5 and 6 similar approaches to English and Mandarin Chinese were put to the test, see (9)-(11).

(9) **Consequences for analysis of Modern English:**

a. English has Ø-reflexives (≈ Dan. *sig*)

b. English *x-self* forms are not reflexives but ALWAYS intensifiers

c. English have both simple and complex reflexives, i.e. Ø vs. Ø himself

d. The distribution of simple (i.e. Ø) and complex reflexives (i.e. Ø himself) in Modern English mirrors that of simple (i.e. *sig*) and complex reflexives (i.e. *sig selv*) in Danish, see (3)

d. Locally free *himself* is not a logophor but an intensified object pronoun

e. *he himself* is not a special kind of anaphor (cf. Bickerton 1986) but an intensified subject pronoun (cf. McKay 1991)

f. *-self* is not a reflexivizing particle which falls under binding theory (e.g. Reinhart and Reuland 1993), but part of complex intensifiers, i.e. the *x-self* forms, which falls under the module of intensification

g. *own* is the suppletive variant of the adnominal intensifier *himself*
Consequences for the analysis of the evolution of English reflexives and intensifiers:

a. Old English (OE) locally bound pronouns (e.g. he, washes him,) were replaced by Ø-reflexives in Early Modern English (EME) (e.g. he, washes Ø).

b. The fact that the loss of locally bound pronouns took place across the board explains the loss of the pronoun in OE he rested him which turned into he rested Ø in EME and ME. That is, Eng. Ø-reflexive occurs where Dan. has simple sig, e.g. han hvilte sig ‘he rested’.

c. OE self fused with its associate him and was reanalyzed as an adnominal intensifier adjoined to a Ø-reflexive, e.g. he washed Ø himself.

d. After emerging as the new intensifier EME x-self replaced the simple OE intensifier seolf in all contexts (e.g. Ø himself, Peter himself, etc.)

e. Since intensifier-adjunction to simple reflexives is motivated by semantic/pragmatic factors (e.g. predicate meaning, presuppositional context) rather than a need to disambiguate between disjoint reference and coreference, the fact that it also happens in the 1st and 2nd persons is no longer a mystery.

Consequences for analysis of Mandarin Chinese:

a. Chinese has Ø-reflexives (≈ Dan. sig)

b. 自己 ziji is not a reflexive but ALWAYS an intensifier

c. Chinese have both simple and complex reflexives, i.e. Ø vs. Ø ziji

d. the distribution of simple (i.e. Ø) and complex reflexives (i.e. Ø ziji) in Chinese mirrors that of simple (i.e. sig) and complex reflexives (i.e. sig selv) in Danish, see (3)

e. complex reflexives, e.g. Ø ziji, are intensified reflexives
f. Locally free ziji is not a logophor but an intensified object pronoun.

g. 他自己 ta ziji in subject position is not a special kind of anaphor but an intensified subject pronoun.

h. Locally bound ta ziji is an intensified Ø-reflexive, Ø ta ziji.

i. 自己 ziji is not a reflexivizing particle which falls under binding theory (e.g. Reinhart and Reuland 1993), but rather an intensifier which falls under the module of intensification.

One of the main lessons to be learned from the analysis defended here is that the conventional wisdom of traditional grammars cannot always be taken for granted. Just because Eng. x-self forms and Ch. ziji have traditionally been considered to be first and foremost reflexive anaphors this does not have to be taken for a good-given truth. Traditional grammarians were inclined to look for matches to categories found in Latin grammar. Since Latin has overt reflexive pronouns (which differ morphologically from object pronouns), and since Modern English x-self forms and Chinese ziji do occur in many contexts where Latin reflexives are found, it is not surprising that x-self forms were taken to be reflexive pronouns. However, as we have seen in chapter 5 and 6, there is a large body of data which suggest that Ø-reflexives are the true Eng. and Ch. counterparts of Romance (and Latin) reflexives and that x-self forms and ziji are really intensifiers.

Finally, the present dissertation stresses the need for comprehensive accounts which take the interaction between several different modules into account. The behavior of elements like Dan. sig, selv, and sig selv, is extremely complex exactly because they are found at the intersection of many different modules, e.g. intensification, binding, focus, phonology, argument structure of predicates, etc. A central theme of this dissertation has been to show
that many current accounts of binding fail to recognize the importance of taking intensification into account when explaining the behavior of complex reflexives (e.g. Dan. sig selv) and pronouns (e.g. Dan. ham selv), see chapter 2-3. We have also shown that correct understanding of the thematic status of reflexive elements is a necessary prerequisite of any binding theory, see chapter 4. Finally, we have shown that the role played by stressability and non-contrastive stress is crucial to prosodically motivated instances of complex reflexives. Narrow accounts of binding phenomena that are limited to only to strictly binding related principles are thus likely to have correspondingly limited descriptive and explanatory adequacy. The best way to improve our understanding of both binding and intensification (as well as the other modules mentioned here, i.e. focus, argument structure, prosody, etc.) lies in the development of multi-modular models that are able to capture complex modular interaction. It is our hope that by developing an alternative comprehensive approach to binding and intensification, which differ radically from current mainstream theories of binding, the present dissertation constitutes a small step in this direction.