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Abstract

A new approach to the interaction of binding and intensification is advanced. While most current approaches to (e.g. Reinhart&Reuland 1993, Huang&Liu 2001, among others) take the selv element in so-called SELF-anaphors (e.g., Dan. *sig selv*) to be itself a reflexive, we argue that it is in fact an adnominal intensifier (cf. Baker 1995, and König&Siemund 2000). Thus we achieve a unified account of all types of intensified nominal expressions, be they intensified DPs (e.g., Dan. *Peter selv* ‘Peter himself’), intensified reflexives (e.g., Dan. *Peter hader sig selv* ‘Peter hates REFRL self’), or intensified pronouns (e.g., Dan. *Peter sagde at Mary dansede med alle andre end ham selv* ‘Peter said that Mary danced with everyone except himself.’) - something most current approaches to binding and intensification are unable to do. In contrast to predicate-based approaches to binding (e.g. Reinhart&Reuland 1993), we call for a nominal approach in which binding is defined as the interaction of intrinsic properties of nominal expressions and syntactic locality constraints. We also argue that the Danish reflexive *sig* (= Dutch *zich*, Norwegian *seg*, etc.) is not an anti-local anaphor specialized for long-distance binding, thus falsifying those binding theories which crucially rely on this assumption.

Finally, concerning intensification, we argue that the semantic contribution of adnominal intensifiers (e.g. Danish *selv*, Eng. *himself*) is not similar to that of scalar focus particle (cf. Eckardt 2001) or reducible to centrality-effects (cf. König (1997) and Siemund (2000)), but rather very similar to that of contrastive focus, which - depending on the context - may or may not involve scalar ordering of focus-generated alternatives. The analysis is extended to English and Chinese where *himself* and *ziji* ‘self-self’ are argued always to be intensifiers (≈ Dan. *selv*) modifying Ø-reflexives (≈ Dan. *sig*), e.g. *Peter, shaved Ø, himself*. We show that this analysis provides answers to hitherto unanswered questions related to the evolution of Modern English
reflexives and intensifiers from Old English which had a monomorphemic *self* intensifier and no reflexive pronouns.