

final version in:

H. Härtl (ed., 2013), *Interfaces of Morphology*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (studia grammatica 74), 91-106.

## **Reflexivization and intensification in syntax and lexicon**

*Karin Pittner*

### 1. Introduction

Reflexivization and intensification are closely related concepts, which are expressed by the same means in a number of languages, e.g. in English. German, on the other hand, uses different expressions for them, as far as syntax is concerned.

- (1) a. She corrected herself. (reflexivization)  
a.' Sie korrigierte sich.
- b. The queen herself was there. (intensification)  
b.' Die Queen selbst war da.

While English and German have developed different means and strategies for reflexivity in syntax, the means for word-internal reflexivization and intensification are strikingly similar. Word-internally, both English and German use the same means to express reflexivity and intensification, namely *self/selbst*.

In this paper, we will first take a look at the different means for reflexivization in section 2 and the types of intensification in section 3, before word-internal reflexivization and intensification are discussed in section 4.

### 2. Reflexivization in English and German

English and German use different means for reflexivation. German *sich* is a reflexive pronoun which may be used for dative and accusative in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular and plural. For other forms, personal pronouns are used reflexively. After the English equivalent of *sich* had disappeared, English reflexive pronouns were formed by personal pronouns in combination with intensifying *self*.

However, the means for reflexivation in English and German are not as completely disparate as it seems. The means of the other language may be marginally used. German has the possibility to reinforce a reflexive pronoun or personal pronoun in reflexive use with intensifying *selbst*. Indeed, this is nearly obligatory when the pronoun is in genitive case as in the following example.

- (2) Lena Meyer-Landrut hat keine große Stimme – eine Entdeckung ist sie trotzdem: als Performerin ihrer selbst. (Süddeutsche Zeitung 28.Mai 2010, p. 11)  
'Lena Meyer-Landrut has no great voice – she is nevertheless a discovery: as a performer of herself.'

In English, on the other hand, a personal pronoun may be used reflexively in colloquial language:

- (3) a. I'm gonna get me a gun (Cat Stevens)  
b. I'm gonna brew me a cup of tea. (König/Gast 2009: 158)

Also, if pragmatically no other interpretation is possible, English uses personal pronouns instead of reflexive pronouns as in the following sentences (cf. König/Gast 2009: 153):

- (4) a. John did not have any money on him.  
b. She has a week full of work before her.

Whereas German has separate expressions for reflexivization and intensification, English uses the same expressions.

Moreover, in German the reflexive pronoun is used with inherently reflexive verbs (such as *sich schämen*, *sich erholen*) and as a marker of derived intransitivity which may be considered a medium marker (*die Tür öffnete sich* – *the door opened*). English has only a few inherently reflexive verbs (e.g. *to pride oneself*, *to absent oneself from*, *to avail oneself of*) and no medium marker. These differences in the use of reflexive pronouns may be due to their greater grammaticalization in German, where reflexive pronouns have less semantic and phonological substance than English reflexives have (cf. König/Gast 2009:149).

With regard to the means for intensification and reflexivization, languages fall into three types (König/Gast 2006):

- 
- **Type I:** complete identity of intensifiers and reflexives (e.g. English, Mandarin)
  - **Type II:** differentiation of intensifiers and anaphors, which can often be combined (e.g.. German *sich /selbst*, Italian *stessi/si*)
  - **Type III:** partial identity of intensifier and reflexive marker which share morphological material (e.g. Dutch *zich/zichself*, scandinavian languages)

Intensifiers in type III languages often are the result of a combination of a pronoun and an intensifier as it is the case in English.

### 3. Intensification in syntax

That intensifiers are identical with reflexive pronouns in a number of languages can be taken as evidence that identification and reflexivization are closely related concepts. The common core of both lies in the expression of ‚identity‘ (cf. König/Gast 2006, Gast 2006).

In a number of languages, the intensifier agrees with its noun, e.g. in person, number and gender, as it does in English:

- (5)        a. The Queen herself was there  
               b. He did it himself

Intensifiers can be used either adnominally or adverbially with an inclusive and an exclusive interpretation. German uses *selbst* and its colloquial variant *selber* for this purpose.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Selber* and *selbst* were inflected forms of the same stem, but today are seen as two separate stems which do not inflect. Originally, *selber* was a strongly inflected nominative form, and *selbst* a genitive form *selb(e)s*, to which *-t* was added (DWB vol. 16, sp. 432 und 485).

Intensification shares some characteristics with focus particles. Siemund (2000:238) describes intensifiers as “operators which structure sets of entities into a central element (the focus value) and peripheral elements related to it”. He holds this description also as applicable for the adverbial uses. While the scope and focus is restricted to an NP in adnominal use, “adverbial intensifiers, by contrast, have scope over the sentence they are contained in”. (2000:238)

The category of German *selbst* has been controversially discussed. Either it is described as a focus particle in all its uses (Primus 1991, König/Siemund 1996, Duden 2009) or there is a differentiation between a use as focus particle and as an adverb (Zifonun et al. 1997, Eckardt 2001, Hole 2002).

In the following, it is argued that intensifiers in their adverbial uses are best categorized as adverbs belonging to different adverbial classes with regard to their scope and distribution. German *selbst* (like span. *mismo*, frz. *même*) has a use as focus particle, which is nearly synonymous to *sogar*. Its nearest English equivalent is *even*.

- (6) a. Selbst Bill Gates könnte das nicht bezahlen.  
b. Even Bill Gates could not pay for this.

As a focus particle, *selbst* occurs adjacent to the focussed constituent to its left. It is an additive/inclusive particle which includes at least one of the possible alternatives to the focus value and indicates that the focus value ranges high on a scale of unexpectedness. The focus particle *selbst* will be of no further interest in this article. We will concentrate on intensifiers which can occur either adnominally or adverbially with an inclusive or an exclusive reading (Siemund 2000, König/Gast 2006 und 2009:142).

- (7) a. Er selbst/selber konnte ihr nicht helfen. (adnominal centering)  
a'. He himself could not help her.  
b. Er ist selbst/selber ein Alkoholiker. (adverbial inclusive)  
b'. He is an alcoholic himself.  
c. Sie erledigte alle Aufgaben selbst/selber. (adverbial exclusive)  
c'. She completed all the tasks herself.

The intensifier in its adnominal use indicates a central role of the noun phrase. In its inclusive reading, the intensifier indicates that the proposition is valid for an alternative referent (usually of the subject NP), whereas in its exclusive reading alternative referents are excluded.

König/Siemund (1996) argue that the intensifier in these three uses is a focus particle because it relates to alternatives and interacts with the focus-background of the sentence. These intensifiers have some characteristics, however, which are untypical for focus particles. They bear the nuclear accent, while the focussed constituent has no accent. Usually, a focus particle bears no accent, whereas the NP bears a focus accent. Moreover, German *selbst/selber* may stand alone in the prefield (i.e. the position before the finite verb in verb-second clauses), which is not possible for focus particles, but for ad-

verbs. It can also occur as the complement of a preposition as e.g. in *die Tür öffnete sich von selbst* ('the door opened by itself'), which would also be unusual for a focus particle. And last but not least, its meaning contribution changes with its position in the sentence, which is typical for adverbs but not for focus particles. In the following it will be argued that exclusive and inclusive intensifiers are best described as adverbs belonging to different adverbial classes with different base positions.

The meaning contribution of intensifiers is seen by various authors (Eckardt 2001, Hole 2002 and König/Gast 2006) in expressing the identity function ( $ID(x) = x$ ). Since it is under normal circumstances not informative to state that an element is identical to itself, this can explain the obligatory accent on the intensifier. The meaning component of identity becomes relevant only by the focus accent which signals possible alternatives and gives pragmatic prominence to the referent of the NP in question.

Siemund (2000) assumes that adverbial intensifiers have the sentence in its scope. In accord with the assumption made by several authors (e.g. Frey & Pittner 1998; Frey 2003) that adverbs have different scope and different base positions reflecting that scope it will be shown that exclusive and inclusive intensifiers belong to different adverbial classes.

### 3.1 Adverbial exclusive intensification

A sentence with an exclusive intensifier presupposes that from all persons that might carry out an action the one referred to by the focussed constituent is the most affected and involved one and therefore the central one.<sup>2</sup> The focussed constituent may be either the responsible or interested party, a beneficiary or maleficiary (cf. Siemund 2000:260).

For a reading in which intensifiers exclude possible alternatives, such alternatives have to be possible. Siemund (2000:186) sees the „transferrability“ of a situation as a precondition for exclusive intensifiers, which he defines as follows. „What transferability indicates is whether a situation is inalienably tied to one particular referent or whether it can be passed on to another referent.“ This often means that an action carried out by the subject referent may be delegated to another person. In these cases, the exclusive intensifier can be paraphrased by 'alone' or 'without assistance'. If a situation is not transferrable, no exclusive interpretation is possible, as in the following example:

- (8) a. Er schnarcht selbst/selber (only inclusive)  
a.' He snores himself.

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. The presupposition of exclusive *selbst* as formulated by König/Siemund (1996:292): „Ein Satz mit exklusivem *selbst* präsupponiert, dass von allen in einer bestimmten Situation zur Debatte stehenden Personen die von der Fokuskonstituente bezeichnete Person von der durch den Satz ausgedrückten Handlung am stärksten betroffen wird und somit zentral ist.“ (cf. also Siemund 2000)

Transferrability need not always take the form of delegation of an action, but can also lie within the range of permitting. It may even consist in an alternative activity of the focus referent as in the following example (cf. Siemund 2000: 238f.):

- (9) a. Es geht schneller, wenn du selbst hingehst, aber du kannst dich auch per Post bewerben.  
b. It is quicker to go there yourself but you can also apply by post.

According to Siemund (2000:234), exclusive intensifiers are possible only with animate, agentive referents, not with experiencer subjects, which allow only an inclusive reading:

- (10) a. Ich habe Pavarotti selbst gehört. (only inclusive)  
b. I have heard Pavarotti myself.

In certain cases, however, experiencer can occur with an intensifier in exclusive reading.

- (11) Anna hat Maria beschimpft. Peter hat das selbst gehört.  
Anne has scolded at Mary. Peter did himself hear this.

Siemund (2000: 255, fn. 1) argues that the experiencer has characteristics of an agent in examples like this. It can be objected that *hören/hear* in contrast to *zuhören/listen* implies no active participation. Rather perception verbs exhibit a special kind of transferability: perceptions must not be first hand, but can be reported by others and are in this way transferrable. The second sentence in (11) fits into the sequence, if Peter heard the scolding himself, but not if somebody told him about it.

The meaning contribution of exclusive intensifiers has been controversially discussed. Some authors hold that the intensifier does not make a contribution to the truth-conditional meaning of a sentence (Primus 1991), whereas others hold the opposite view (e.g. Edmondson/Plank 1978). Let us consider the following example:

- (12) a. Fast jeder Promi schreibt seine Biografie.  
a.' Nearly every VIP writes his biography.  
b. Fast jeder Promi schreibt seine Biografie selbst.  
b.' Nearly every VIP writes his biography himself.

There is a clear difference in meaning between the a- and the b-sentences: the (b)-sentences entail the (a)-sentences, but not the other way round. This hints at a difference in truth-conditional meaning between the two sentences. The following example from a German TV interview (Reinhold Beckmann questioning Peer Steinbrück, 12.4.2010) points in the same direction:

- (13) a. Sie schreiben ein Buch. [...] Schreiben Sie das Buch selbst?  
b. 'You are writing a book. [...] Are you writing the book yourself?'

The question in(13) would be irrelevant, if the proposition it contains were exactly the same as the proposition in the preceding assertive clause.

To sum up, exclusive intensifiers express the direct participation of the subject referent in an event. They stress the identity of the participant with the subject referent giving it thereby pragmatic prominence and excluding possible alternatives.

### 3.2 Adverbial inclusive intensification

Intensifiers with an inclusive interpretation have often been compared to additive focus particles like German *auch* and English *also* and *too*. An inclusive interpretation is possible if a situation is repeatable. Repeatability occurs in combination with indefinite *aktionsarten*, definite object NPs pattern with exclusive intensifiers, indefinite object NPs with inclusive ones (cf. Siemund 2000: 184f.).

If an action is transferrable, but not repeatable, only an exclusive reading is possible, as in (14a). If a situation is not transferrable and repeatable, an inclusive reading is triggered, as in (14b). If the situation is transferrable and repeatable, both interpretations are possible in principle, as in (14c) and (14d), cf. Siemund (2000:184ff.).

- (14)
- a. Der Bischof taufte das Mädchen selbst. (exclusive)
  - a.' The bishop christened the little girl himself
  - b. Das Mädchen musste selbst niesen. (inclusive)
  - b.' The girl had to sneeze herself.
  - c. Der Präsident hält die Rede selbst (exclusive)
  - c.' The president holds the speech himself.
  - d. Der Präsident hält selbst eine Rede. (inclusive und exclusive)
  - d.' The president holds a speech himself.

The position of exclusive *selbst/selber* corresponds to the base position of manner adverbials (process-oriented adverbials according to Frey & Pittner 1998, Frey 2003), which have a base position adjacent to the verb in final position in German.<sup>3</sup>

- (15)
- a. Er hat selbst einen Film produziert. (inclusive)
  - a.' He has himself produced a film
  - b. Er hat einen Film selbst produziert. (exclusive)
  - b.' He has produced a film himself. (exclusive or inclusive)

In German, the different base positions of the intensifiers can be tested with the indefinite pronoun *was*, which may not scramble and therefore can serve as an indicator of the base

<sup>3</sup> Already König/Siemund (1996:290) assume a position of exclusive *selbst* after all objects and other adjuncts.

position of arguments. This test shows that the intensifier has a base position behind the object in an exclusive interpretation, but before object in an inclusive interpretation.

- (16) a. Er hat selbst was repariert. (inclusive)  
'He has himself something repaired.'  
b. Er hat was selbst repariert. (exclusive)  
'He has something himself repaired.'

The exclusive intensifier is preceded by other adjuncts:

- (17) a. Ich habe ein Auto selbst schon mal repariert (inclusive)  
'I have a car myself once repaired'  
b. Ich habe ein Auto schon mal selbst repariert (exclusive)  
'I have a car once myself repaired'

The exclusive intensifier can occur in the scope of negation, whereas the inclusive intensifier has scope over negation (cf. Huddleston et al. 2002: 1498, König/Gast 2009:145):

- (18) a. Er hat das Auto nicht selbst repariert. (exclusive)  
a.' He did not repair the car himself.  
b. Ich mag das Bild selbst nicht. (inclusive)  
b.' I don't like the picture myself.

Wide focus is possible, if the intensifier and the verb carry an accent, which again corresponds to the behaviour of manner adverbials (cf. Pittner 1999:162):

- (19) a. [er hat das Auto SELBST repaRIERT]<sub>F</sub>  
b. er hat das Auto [SELBST]<sub>F</sub> repariert

While exclusive intensifiers exhibit a base position close to the final verb, the base position of inclusive intensifiers is higher in the sentence, namely after the highest ranking argument and before objects. This corresponds to the base position of event-internal adverbials, which are c-commanded by the highest ranking argument they are related to (cf. Frey/Pittner 1998)

- (20) a. weil Hans selbst Lehrer ist  
'because Hans himself teacher is'  
b. \*weil selbst Hans Lehrer ist



Inclusive *selbst* must occur on the surface after the argument it is related to and may not be topicalized, which shows the close relation of the intensifier to its argument:<sup>4</sup>

- (21) a. Hans ist selbst Lehrer.  
b. \*Selbst ist Hans Lehrer. (\* with an inclusive reading)

In contrast to exclusive *selbst*, the inclusive intensifier may occur higher than other scope bearing elements like negation or focus particles.

- (22) a. Hans ist selbst nicht Lehrer/\*nicht selbst Lehrer. (\*with an inclusive reading)  
b. Hans ist selbst nur Lehrer/\*nur selbst Lehrer. (\*with an inclusive reading)

The function of inclusive *selbst* is not to modify an event, rather it lies on a textual level. Its meaning is often considered to be closely related to the meaning of the additive focus particle *auch/also*, but there are clear differences:

- (23) a. Er ist auch kein Alkoholiker.  
a.' He is also no alcoholic.  
b. Er ist selbst kein Alkoholiker.  
b.' He is himself no alcoholic.

In (23a) there must be somebody else, who is not an alcoholic (*auch* as an additive focus particle), but not in (23b). Thus (23b), but not (23a) is felicitous in the following context:

- (24) a. Er ist zwar ständig beruflich mit Alkoholproblemen konfrontiert, doch er ist selbst/#auch kein Alkoholiker.  
b. He is in his profession continually confronted with alcohol problems, but he is himself/#also no alcoholic.

For the interpretation von (23b), intonation is decisive. If the nuclear accent is placed on *selbst*, it has an inclusive meaning corresponding to (23a). If however there is a further accent on *kein*, the meaning is not inclusive. Siemund (2000) explains (23b) as an instance of I-topicalization and considers it as a variant of adnominal *selbst* (cf. the next section).

---

<sup>4</sup> Siemund (2000:181) states that for inclusive intensifiers the same restrictions apply as for adnominal intensifiers. The NP they relate to must be definite,, it cannot occur when the NP is indefinite an can neither be interpreted generically nor specifically. (\* *A minister will be surprised himself*)

Inclusive intensifiers often require accomodation. Siemund (2000: 260) states that „inclusive intensifiers typically occur in sentences which give the premise, reason or explanation for another proposition in the previous or following discourse“. Additional context is needed to accomodate inclusive intensifiers, whereby pragmatic inferences are generated. Siemund (2000:261) suggests that “inclusive intensifiers can be analyzed as operators which identify two referents with respect to a conditional schema of the form, if p, then q.” According to him, the “felicity conditions of inclusive intensifiers require that there is such a conditional schema salient in discourse”.

- (25) Liz wears glasses herself. => Liz cannot drive in the dark..  
 Conditional schema: If somebody wears glasses s/he cannot drive in the dark.

The raisonnement in connection with inclusive intensifiers is not yet completely understood. As Siemund (2000:262) notes, future research has to establish „why adverbial inclusive intensifiers produce precisely those implicatures which can be described as consequences of the situations described by their host sentences“.

### 3. 3 Adnominal intensification

Adnominal intensifiers establish a relation to alternatives for the referent of the NP they are adjoined to.

- (26) a. Die Queen selbst war da.  
 B. The Queen herself was present.

The kind of alternatives is determined by the NP, e.g. the alternatives to the queen must be from her surroundings.

Adnominal intensifiers can only modify definite descriptions (cf. Siemund 2000:259):

- (27) a. \*Manche Leute selbst waren da.  
 a.' \*Some people themselves were present.  
 b. \*Eine Frau selbst erledigte das.  
 b.' \*A woman herself got that done.

Indefinite NPs can only be modified by an intensifier, if they allow a specific or generic interpretation. It must be possible to consider the referent of the NP as central in a certain way. König/Siemund (1996:284, 2000:46) formulate the following conditions for NPs that are modified by an intensifier:

- (28) a. X has a higher position than Y in a hierarchy of the real world  
 b. X is in a specific situation more important than Y

- 
- c. Y is identified in relation to X
  - d. X is the perspectivized center of the text

The following example illustrates the first two conditions:

- (29) [The anti-Greek campaign might become a problem for the elections.]  
 Dass **auch die Bundeskanzlerin selbst** derlei befürchtet, bewies Angela Merkel am Montag im CDU-Präsidium. (Süddeutsche Zeitung 28.4.2010, p. 5)  
 ‘That the chancellor herself fears this Angela Merkel proved on Monday in the CDU-presidency.’

The chancellor has a higher position than other members of the party in parliament and she is more important in this particular situation. This example also shows that adnominal *selbst* can be combined with a focus particle.

A difference in the semantics of the adnominal intensifier and the homonymous focus particle *selbst* consists in the additive meaning of the focus particle:

- (30) a. Die Queen selbst war da, aber sonst niemand.  
 a.’ The Queen herself was there, but nobody else.  
 \*Selbst die Queen war da, aber sonst niemand.  
 b.’ \*Even the queen was there, but nobody else.

As already mentioned Siemund describes instances of adnominal intensifiers (*selbst??*), which exhibit the intonation contour typical for I-topicalization (s. Büring 1997; Jacobs 1997). Edmondson/Plank (1978) speak of „role reserval“, because the same referent occurs in different roles.

- (31) a. Lucrezia poisoned Lorenzo, and was herself poisoned by Cesare. (agent → patient)  
 b. Lucrezia vergiftete Lorenzo und wurde selbst von Caesar vergiftet.

In 31(a) *herself* in English is disambiguating. Siemund shows that the same effect may occur without *self* (2000:175), if a topic accent is present (S-topic according to Büring 1997):

- (32) a. Paul insulted Mary. [<sub>T</sub> HE] was insulted by [<sub>F</sub> FRED].  
 b. Paul beschimpfte Maria. . [<sub>T</sub> Er] wurde von [<sub>F</sub> FRED] beschimpft.

Siemund’s analysis is based on the intonation contour typical for I-topicalization as well as the typical adversative implicature (cf. Siemund 2000:177f. for details). He sees a center and periphery in these sentences on a more abstract level, with the topic being the center (‘what the sentence is about’) and the predicate as periphery.

---

By subsuming cases like these under adnominal intensifiers, he presupposes adnominal intensifiers to be able to appear without an explicit head as well as in distance to the noun phrase they relate to. He argues that these cases can be transformed into sentences with adnominal intensifiers (cf. 2000:85ff. for further arguments).

- (33) a. Paul insulted Mary. He himself was insulted by Fred.  
b. Paul beleidigte Maria. Er selbst wurde von Fred beleidigt.

A distance position as well as topicalization is possible for adnominal *selbst*, if there is a double focus. The cases of I-topicalization exhibit characteristics similar to adnominal intensifiers.

### 3.4. Conclusions

While intensifiers share some characteristics with focus particles, there are clear differences. Intensifiers always bear sentential stress, whereas focus particles usually remain unstressed. Moreover, the interpretation of intensifiers varies according to their position and scope which is characteristic for adverbials. Exclusive intensifiers pattern with manner adverbials (process-oriented adverbials) which occupy a base position adjacent to the verb in final position. Inclusive intensifiers have a base position in front of objects and have scope over negation thus patterning with event-internal adverbials which are related closely to the highest ranking argument and c-commanded by it.

## 4. Word-internal reflexivization and intensification

As already noted in the introduction, the close relationship between reflexivization and intensification becomes evident also in their word-internal expressions which are the same both in English and German. Since the means for word-internal reflexivization and syntactic reflexivization are different, reflexivization can be used to delimitate the boundary between syntax and the lexicon. German *selbst* and English *self* occur word-internally as exclusive intensifiers and as markers of reflexivization. German *selbst* has also a centering

use similar to the adnominal intensifier. German *selber* may occur word-internally as an exclusive intensifier (cf. Pittner 2010).

#### 4.1 Centering intensifiers

The English reflexive pronouns can be considered as combinations of pronouns plus an adnominal intensifier.

In German, *selbst* may occur word-internally with a function similar to the adnominal intensifier. The *Rückläufiges Deutsches Wörterbuch* by Muthmann (2001:889) lists the elements *daselbst*, *hiersebst*, *hieselbst*, *woselbst*, *dortselbst*, which are the combination of an adverb and the intensifier, and *ebendasselbst*, *ebendortselbst*, which are a combination of a focus particle with an adverb and an intensifier. These formations show that “adnominal” intensifiers can also be combined with elements other than nouns or pronouns.

#### 4.2 Exclusive intensifiers

Exclusive intensifiers stress that an action is carried out by the external argument itself. In order to be a relevant information, it is a necessary precondition that the action is usually not carried out by the external argument. König/Vezzosi (2004:225) note “a general tendency of using intensifiers in nominal compounds only for other-directed situations”.

- (34) a. Selbstanzeige, Selbstanklage, Selbstliebe, Selbstverachtung, Selbstverteidigung, Selbstzerstörung...  
b. self-accusation, self-contempt, self-love, self-defense, self-destruction,...

Exclusive *selber/selbst* operates on an agent or experiencer provided by the second part of the compound. The colloquial variant *selber* may occur in this function word-internally. *Selber-* and *Selbst-*compounds may co-occur in some instances (examples from IDS-corpora)

- (35) Selberläufer/Selbstläufer, Selberstreicher/Selbststreicher, Selberspieler/Selbstspieler

In present-day German, *selber* occurs word-internally only in an exclusive function. An exception is the use by Jean Paul of *selber* in reflexive function, which may be considered idiosyncratic:

- (36) selberdünkel, -genügsamkeit, -hasz, -mord, -opferung, -retter, -sucht, -

---

täuschung, -verlag, -zünder  
 selberballenbinderin, selberbelachung, selberentzweiung, selbergefrieren, selberentzünden, selbergiftmischer, selbersattheit, selberwürdigung  
 (all according to DWB)

Today, *.selber* occurs reflexively only in the formations *Selberlebensbeschreibung* und *Selberlebensbeschreiber*, which can be traced back to Jean Paul.

The formations with *selber* in present-day German are mainly ad hoc-formations which have not been lexicalized apart from a few exceptions. The comprehensive dictionary *Deutsches Universalwörterbuch* only lists *Selbermachen*. The IDS-corpora contain around 400 formations, many of which are nominalized infinitives (cf. Pittner 2010).

- (37)
- a. nominalized infinitives:  
 Selbermachen, Selberdenken, Selberkombinieren, Selber-Färben, Selberlesen, Selberbasteln, Selberkochen, Selberputzen, Selbernähen, ...
  - b. phrasal compounds:  
 Selber-Schlag-Aktion, Selber-Back-Aktion, Selberbauverfahren, Selbermachgeschichte, Selbermachshow, Selber-Föhn-Konzept, Selber-Pflück-Angebote, Selber-Schuld-These,...
  - c. adjectival and nominalized participles:  
 selberdesignte, selberkreierte, Selbergekochtes, Selbergebackenes, Selbergenähtes, Selbergestricktes,...
  - d. compounds:  
 Selberbastler, Selbermacher, Selberzahler, Selber-Studierer, Selberhelfer, ...  
 Selberbastler-Möbel, Selberspieler-Habitus

Most of these word formations have a very low frequency. Around 260 of the 400 lexical items occur only once, another 60 only twice, and 30 only three times. A frequency of over 100 tokens is found only with *Selbermachen* (929 tokens), *Selberpflücken* (110 tokens), *Selberlesen* (107 tokens) und *Selberbasteln* (101 tokens). These numbers hint at a low degree of lexicalization of the formations with *selber*, which are often ad hoc-formations with a colloquial flavour.

### 4.3 Reflexivization

First of all, the question is whether there is word-internal reflexivization at all. Edmondson and Plank (1978:394) formulate the question “why it is not the pronoun that shows up in complex words but invariably the intensive or emphatic element alone”, Their

answer is that “intensification proper rather than reflexivization is the concept that is crucially relevant there”.

Pronouns usually do not occur within lexemes, and reflexivization is usually expressed by pronouns. Fleischer (1993) considers formations with *selbst* as an exception to the rule that pronouns do not occur word-internally. We, on the contrary, see word-internal *selbst* as an indicator of its non-pronominal nature.

Starting from a general definition of reflexivization, that a predicate is reflexive whenever two of its arguments have the same referent, i.e. whenever there is co-reference between two arguments, it seems reasonable to assume word-internal reflexivization when the argument structure of nouns is taken into consideration. It is well known that deverbal nouns may inherit the arguments of the verb. And *selbst/self* can be used in a compound to indicate co-reference between two arguments of the second part of the compound.

We posit the following hypothesis:

- (38) If a language has different expressions for reflexivization and intensification, intensification is used for word-internal reflexivization.

This holds not only for German, but also e.g. for Dutch, Russian and Polish. Some languages, especially those which do not use composition intensively, appear to avoid these formations and use phrases instead, like French and Spanish (*self-consciousness* – *conscience de soi* – *seguridad en sí mismo*. *Self-contempt* – *mépris de soi-même*, *deprecio de sí mismo*) and Rumanian (*self-praise* – rum. *lauda de sine*). Alternatively, a formation with the prefix *auto-* may be used.

In type I languages, where intensification and reflexivization are expressed by the same means, word-internally often a shortened form is used, like in English and Mandarin:

- (39) English: self-love, self-portrait, self-reliance, self-consciousness etc.  
Mandarin: ziliàn / zì'ài (self-love), zihuàxiàng (self-portrait) zìshā (self-Murder/suicide), zìxìn (self-confidence)  
But: zìwǒzhǔzhāng (self-assertion) zìwǒyìshì (self-esteem)  
zìwǒqīngshì (self-contempt) ,zìwǒbiǎoyáng (self-praise)<sup>5</sup>

English uses the non-pronominal part of the reflexive/intensifier. It may be assumed that this is a cross-linguistic tendency. In Mandarin, the reflexive pronoun/intensifier is combined from *zì* und *jì* which could both be used separately as reflexive pronoun in earlier stages. *Zì* was always co-referent with the subject and locally bound, *jì* was long-distance bound or could be free (cf. Yu 2000:103). The reflexive marker *zìwo* which can occur word-internally is always locally bound if it occurs in syntactic structures. It is possibly a

<sup>5</sup> My thanks goes to Mi Liu for the examples from Mandarin.

cross-linguistic tendency that word-internally reflexive pronouns are used which are locally bound if they occur in syntactic structures.

*Selbst/self* word-internally expresses reflexivization, which in syntax is expressed by reflexive pronouns. Thus, the means employed for reflexivation can provide insights into the syntax- morphology border. In German, nominalised infinitives of inherently reflexive verbs are not formed with *selbst* but with the reflexive pronoun *sich*: *Sich-Entrüsten*, *Sich-Einfügen*, *Sich-in-Szene-Setzen* (examples from Fleischer 1995:542). Occasionally, *sich* can be omitted in nominalised infinitives of inherently reflexive verbs, if there is no non-reflexive variant of the verb it could be mixed up with, e.g. *Räuspfern* and *Sehnen*. The fact that not *selbst*, but *sich* occurs in nominalized infinitives, shows that nominalized infinitives are conversions from verbal phrases.

*Sich* may also occur in certain derivations, hinting at a phrasal base. *Insichnahme* and *Ansichnahme*,<sup>6</sup> for instance, are derivations by means of the nominal suffix *-e*, the basis of these derivations being the verb phrases *an sich nehm-* and *in sich nehm-*.

In English, *self* may occur within verbs as a reflexive marker:

- (40) The rocket self-destroys. (cf. König/Gast 2009:155)

This is due to back-formation of the verb from the noun *self-destruction*.

To sum up, *selbst/self* may occur word-internally as a marker of reflexivity and as a centering or exclusive intensifier. Intensifiers and intensifying parts of reflexive pronouns are used word-internally to express reflexivity, pronouns do not occur word-internally on account of their anaphoric functions. Also, inclusive intensifiers do not occur word-internally due to their textual functions.

## 5. Summary

Reflexivization and intensification are related concepts which are expressed by the same means in a number of languages. English is a case in point, whereas German uses diffe-

<sup>6</sup> Both words occur in a quote from a lecture given by Heribert Prantl: „Die Insichnahme ist die intensivste Form der Ansichnahme.“ (quoted from *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 30.4./1./2.5.2010, S. VI/1)



rent means for the expression of reflexivization (the reflexive pronoun *sich* and personal pronouns) and intensification (*selbst* and its colloquial variant *selber*).

Intensifiers are best described as adverbial expressions belonging to different adverbial classes with regard to their scope and base position. Exclusive intensifiers pattern with manner adverbials (process-oriented adverbials) which take a base position adjacent to the verb in final position, whereas inclusive intensifiers pattern with event-internal adverbs which are c-commanded by the highest ranking argument.

Word-internally, both English and German use the same means for the expression of reflexivization and intensification, namely *self/selbst*, which may occur as a centering or an exclusive intensifier. Due to their textual functions, inclusive intensifiers do not occur word-internally.

As in a number of languages, reflexivization within lexemes is expressed by intensifiers or intensifying parts of reflexive pronouns. The cross-linguistic validity of some observations concerning word-internal reflexivization made in the last section of the paper remains to be proved by future research.

## Bibliography

- Büring, D. (1997): *The Meaning of Topic and Focus. The 59th Street Bridge Accent*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Dimroth, C. (2004): *Fokuspartikeln und Informationsgliederung im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Duden (2007): *Deutsches Universalwörterbuch*. 6., überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.
- Duden (2009): *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. 8., überarbeitete Auflage. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.
- DWB (2004): *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Elektronische Ausgabe der Erstbearbeitung von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm. Frankfurt/Main.
- Eckardt, R. (2001): Reanalysing *selbst*. *Natural Language Semantics* 9: 371-412.
- Edmondson, J. A. & F. Plank (1978): Great Expectations: An intensive self analysis. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 2: 373-413.
- Eisenberg, P. (2006): *Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik. Bd. 2: Der Satz*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Fleischer, W. (1993): Zur Wortbildungsaktivität des Lexems »selbst«. In: G. Jäger, K. Gommlich & G. M. Shreve (eds.), *Text and Meaning*. Institute for Applied Linguistics.

- tics, Kent State University, Kent (Ohio), 35-40 (= Kent Forum on translation studies, 1).
- Fleischer, W. (1995): Zur Wortbildungsaktivität reflexiver Verben. In: H. Popp (ed.), *Deutsch als Fremdsprache. An den Quellen eines Faches. Festschrift für Gerhard Helbig zum 65. Geburtstag*. München: iudicium, 533-544.
- Frey, W. (2003): Syntactic conditions on adjunct classes. In: E. Lang, C. Maienborn & C. Fabricius-Hansen (eds.), *Modifying Adjuncts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 163-209.
- Frey, W. & K. Pittner (1998): Zur Positionierung von Adverbialen im deutschen Mittelfeld. *Linguistische Berichte* 176: 489-534.
- Frey, W. & K. Pittner (1999): Adverbialpositionen im deutsch-englischen Vergleich. In: M. Doherty (ed.), *Sprachspezifische Aspekte der Informationsverteilung*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 14-41. (studia grammatica)
- Gast, V. (2006): *The Grammar of Identity. Intensifiers and Reflexives in Germanic Languages*. London: Routledge
- Hole, D. (2002): Agentive *selbst* in German. In: G. Katz, S. Reinhard & P. Reuter (eds.): *Sinn & Bedeutung*. VI. Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Gesellschaft für Semantik University of Osnabrück, 133-150.
- Huddleston, R. & G. Pullum (2002): *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, J. (1997): I-Topikalisierung. *Linguistische Berichte* 168: 91-133.
- Kemmer, S. (1993): *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- König, E. & V. Gast (2006): Focussed assertion of identity: A typology of intensifiers. *Linguistic Typology* 10: 223-276.
- König, E. & V. Gast (<sup>2</sup>2009): *Understanding English-German Contrasts*. Berlin: Schmidt.
- König, E. & P. Siemund (1996): *Selbst*-Reflexionen. In: G. Harras & M. Bierwisch (eds.), *Wenn die Semantik arbeitet. Festschrift für Klaus Baumgärtner*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 277-302.
- König, E. & P. Siemund (1999): Intensifiers and reflexives: A typological perspective. In: Z. Frajzyngier & T. S. Curl (eds.), *Reflexives. Form and Functions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 41-74.
- König, E. & L. Vezzosi (2004): The role of predicate meaning in the development of reflexivity. In: W. Bisang, N. Himmelmann & B. Wiemer (eds.) (2004): *What Makes Grammaticalization? - A Look from its Fringes and its Components*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 214-244.
- Leys, O. (1973): Das Reflexivpronomen: Eine Variante des Personalpronomens. In: H. Sitta & K. Brinker (eds.): *Studien zur Texttheorie und zur deutschen Grammatik. Festgabe für Hans Glinz zum 60. Geburtstag*. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 223-242.
- Muthmann, G. (<sup>3</sup>2001): *Rückläufiges deutsches Wörterbuch. Handbuch der Wortausgänge im Deutschen mit Beachtung der Wort- und Lautstruktur*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Mutz, K. (2004): Zur Argumentstruktur der deverbalen Ableitungen von *auto-*. In: R. Kailuweit & M. Hummel (eds.), *Semantische Rollen*. Tübingen: Narr, 355-374.
- Pittner, K. (1999): *Adverbiale im Deutschen. Untersuchungen zu ihrer Stellung und In-*

- 
- terpretation*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Pittner, K. (2010): *Selber* und *selbst* als Wortbestandteile. *Muttersprache* 1/2010: 1-9.
- Pittner, K. (2012): *Selbst*-Analysen: Wortarten und wortinterne Funktionen. In: B. Rothstein (ed.), *Nicht-flektierende Wortarten*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 148-169.
- Plank, F. (1979): Zur Affinität von *selbst* und *auch*. In: H. Weydt (ed.), *Die Partikeln der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 269-284.
- Primus, B. (1991): *Selbst* – Variants of a Scalar Adverb in German. In: J. Jacobs (ed.), *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik. Linguistische Berichte. Sonderheft 4*, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 54-88.
- Siemund, P. (2000): *Intensifiers in English and German. A comparison*. London: Routledge.
- Stanescu, S. (2006): Von *Fremd* und *Selbst*. Zur Reflexivität im Deutschen und Rumänischen. In: E. Breindl, L. Gunkel & B. Strecker (eds.), *Grammatische Untersuchungen, Analysen und Reflexionen. Festschrift für Gisela Zifonun*. Tübingen: Narr, 241-257.
- Wilss, W. (1997): Zusammensetzungen mit *selbst* in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. *Muttersprache* 107: 330-338.
- Yu, W. X.-F. (2000): *Chinese Reflexives*. Leuven et al.: Peeters.
- Zifonun, G., L. Hoffmann & B. Strecker et al. (1997): *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. 3 Volumes. Berlin/New York.

IDS-corpora, Archive of written language, provided by the Institut für Deutsche Sprache in Mannheim.