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Daniel Hole, Ekkehard König

Intensifiers and Reflexivity: EUROTYPE vs. ASIATYPE*

So ergibt sich die wunderbare Thatsache, dass eine so seltene Form des Sprachbaues auf einem verhältnismässig engen geographischen Gebiete bei Sprachen zweier ganz verschiedener Stämme wiederkehrt. (von der Gabelentz 1901: 273)

1 Introduction

The idea that languages and speech communities in contact will mutually influence each other dates back further than Trubetzkoy's Sprachbund notion (Trubetzkoy 1930), as the above quote taken from Gabelentz's opus magnum shows. Ever since the days of these scholars the fact that remarkably unrelated languages have remarkable features in common has occupied thoughts of many researchers in the field of linguistics.

In what follows we will investigate intensifiers (German selbst, Russian sam etc.), reflexivity and their interplay from an areal perspective. The two language areas we want to compare are Central Europe on the one hand, and (South-)East-Asia on the other. While the European languages under consideration do not represent "remarkably unrelated" languages, the Asian languages that make up the core of our investigation belong to at least three different language families (Sino-Tibetan, Austronesian, Japanese and Korean).

The paper is organised as follows: section 2 is a short introduction to the forms and functions of intensifier expressions as characterised by König (1991) and in subsequent work; section 3 reviews some relevant notions in the area of reflexive anaphors, long-distance binding and logophoricity; in part 4 each phenomenon is investigated in turn, always contrasting the European case with the (South-)East-Asian situation.

* The research on which this paper is based was partly supported by a DFG grant (Ko 497/5-2) within the Schwerpunktprogramm "Sprachtypologie", which is hereby gratefully acknowledged. Concerning the title of this volume we would like to emphasise that "Linguistik jenseits des Strukturalismus" ("Linguistics beyond structuralism") should, from our perspective, be taken as a methodological stance which reconciles the important insights of structuralist language analysis with more holistic views of linguistic research. We would certainly not endorse a position which denies the lasting achievements of structuralist thought in linguistics.
2 Intensifiers: General outline

Expressions like German selbstselber or persönlich, English x-self in non-argument positions, or Japanese jisin, jitaï or jibun, together with comparable elements in other languages, have long resisted satisfactory classification. A widely used cover term for them did not exist, let alone comprehensive studies of their form and function. Building, for instance, on findings by Moravcsik (1972) or Edmondson & Plank (1978), König (1991) proposed a treatment of these expressions in terms of focus semantics. In subsequent work, Baker (1995) and König & Siemund have further developed the analysis of intensifiers (cf. e.g. Siemund 2000 or König & Siemund 1996b, 1999, 2000).

Intensifiers, being focus particles, always associate with a focused constituent. The focusing yields a set of contextually relevant alternatives to the focus value. Consider (1):

(1) The president himself will testify.

In (1), the use of himself evokes alternatives to the president, perhaps his secretary or his spokesman. This is not surprising, since focusing always relates a focus value to alternative values. What the intensifier does more specifically is to restrict the set of possible alternatives: it may only contain members with regard to which the focus value is central; i.e. the president's spokesman or secretary are good alternatives, but perhaps his spokesman. This structuring of a set in terms of centre and periphery may have the following specific manifestations (cf. Baker 1995).

(2) Adnominal intensifiers relate a centre X (referent of the focus) to a periphery Y of alternative values. At least one of the following four conditions has to be fulfilled:
   a. X has a higher rank than Y in a real-world hierarchy.
   b. X is more important than Y in a specific situation.
   c. Y is identified relative to X (kinship terms, meronymy, etc.).
   d. Y is the subject of consciousness, centre of observation (logophoricity).

The examples below illustrate each of these conditions.

(3) a. The president himself did not know what to do.
   b. Most of the passengers suffered light injuries. The driver himself was killed.
   c. Sarah's mother lives in Boston. Sarah herself lives in Detroit.
   d. He sat down at the desk and opened the drawers. In the right hand one was an envelope addressed to himself. (David Lodge, Changing Places)

The adnominal use of intensifiers as illustrated by the English data above is not the only one available. (4a–c) present three further uses of intensifying expressions.

(4) a. Little Joe baked the cake himself.
   b. Don't tell me how much you had to pay to get your car fixed. I have a car myself.
   c. Will you leave your things in your brother's room or in your own room while you're away?

The adverbial-exclusive use of himself as in (4a) is paraphrasable as alone, without any help, whereas the use of myself in (4b) is very close to the meaning too or also could contribute. In (4c) the attributive intensifier own relates the central possessor, the addressee, to a non-central alternative possessor, in this case the addressee's brother. Note that the fact that attributive own bears no resemblance to the form x-self is an idiosyncratic fact of many European languages. Both own and x-self have clearly intensifying semantics in English. We will return to the matter of suppletion in attributive uses below. With the exception of two minor points in 4.1 and 4.4, we will not be dealing with adverbial uses of the intensifier in this paper. For more detailed information on adverbial intensification see König & Siemund (1996a), Hole (1996) and Siemund (2000).

3 Reflexivity

3.1 Local binding

The most common kind of reflexivity in the world's languages involves the grammaticalised marking of a coreferential relationship between the subject of a clause and some other argument of the same clause. All the languages we will be looking at in this paper express this kind of coreference relation by means of a particular (set of) pronoun(s). (4) and (6) are relevant examples from Mandarin and German.

(4) a. Zhangsan j kanjian Ie zi1j.
       Zhangsan see-ASP SELF
       'Zhangsan saw himself.'
   b. Zhangsan j kanjian Ie ta* i/j
       Zhangsan see-ASP (o)he
       'Zhangsan saw him* i/j.'

The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: 3s–3rd person singular agreement marker; ACC–accusative; ASP–aspect marker; CL–classifier; COMP–complementiser; DAT–dative; FUT–future marker; INST–instrumental; MOD–clitic deriving modifiers; NOM–nominative; REFL–(non-intensifier) reflexive pronoun; SELF–intensifying expression; TOP–topic marker.
Both in the German and in the Mandarin case the well-known effects of reflexive-marking can be observed: The reflexive pronouns in object position in the a-sentences force the coreferential interpretation upon the subject and the object; the object pronouns in the b-sentences, on the other hand, unambiguously pick out referents for the object argument that are different from the subject referents. Accounts of reflexivity differ with respect to how these interpretations can be derived, but the facts of interpretation in themselves are usually not called into question (for different approaches within the generative framework cf. the tradition based on Chomsky 1981 and the recently influential theory as proposed in Reinhart & Reuland 1993).

Another phenomenon belonging to the domain of reflexive-marking is introduced in the next section.

3.2 Long-distance binding and logophoricity

It is common in many languages to use a reflexive pronoun not just in cases in which the coreferring expressions are co-arguments of a single syntactic predicate, but also in cases in which the coreferential expression serving as the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun is an argument of a higher predicate. I.e., reflexive pronouns need not be bound locally in these cases. (6) presents an instance of this phenomenon from Mandarin.

(6) Zhansan renwei Meijun zhidao Malik xihuan zijii/j/k.

Zhangsan (m.) thinks Meijun (f.) knows that Mali (f.) likes him/her/herself.

Phenomena like these are usually discussed under the heading long-distance reflexivisation in the syntax literature (cf. the papers in Koster & Reuland (eds.) 1991 for a crosslinguistic generative perspective). Recent accounts of the Mandarin case include Huang Y. (1994) and Pan (1997a). Another notion that is often used to describe the special effect of long-distance binding is the concept of logophoricity. As Hagège (1974) and other Africanists have pointed out, there are special sets of pronouns in many African languages which are used in clauses that are embedded under verbs of communication, prototypically verbs of saying. The use of a logophoric pronoun as opposed to a normal pronoun indicates that the relevant argument has the same referent as the subject of consciousness of the embedding clause. Consider (7) from Igbo, a Kwa language of West Africa (Stirling 1993: 254).

(7) a. 6ii siri șiri nà 6j byårà.

Hei said that he came.

In (7a), the referents of the two (normal) pronouns must be disjoint; in (7b), the embedded logophoric pronoun must refer to the same person as ő 'he'.

For English, similar phenomena have been observed (Zribi-Hertz 1989, Baker 1995, König & Siemund 1999). (8) is an example showing how a reflexive pronoun which is not locally licensed (the subject of the embedded clause is included in the wh-element) can be licensed by a superordinate subject of consciousness.

(8) And that was exactly it, he thought, nobody cared too much what happened to himself.

In this example, the use of himself as opposed to the – also grammatical – pronoun him fulfills a double function: it lifts the referential ambiguity that could arise by just using him, and it presents the proposition in which himself appears as reported from the point of view of the person referred to. We would like to emphasise, though, that uses of x-self-forms as in (8) should probably not be considered syntactically bound; this follows from the fact that, provided there is context, (8) is also fine without the parenthetical string he thought. Unlike this, the matrix sentence in (6) cannot simply be left out if the coreference interpretation with the matrix subject is to be maintained.

It has been argued that cases of long-distance reflexivisation always involve logophoric effects (Huang & Liu 1997). However, to say that long-distance reflexivisation and logophoricity are really one and the same phenomenon would be premature. Regarding logophoric pronouns on the one hand, and expressions for long-distance binding on the other, a distinction between the two phenomena can be made. Long-distance reflexives, as the term itself makes clear already, are forms prototypically used to mark coindexation of two arguments of a single syntactic predicate, i.e. local binding. In some languages they may also be put to use for long-distance binding. Logophoric pronouns in many African languages, however, have no locally bound use, they are always markers of non-local conindexation. If we reserve the term logophoric pronoun or logophor for the African-type expressions, we will still want to use the general term logophoricity to refer to the semantico-pragmatic effect that also accompanies cases of long-distance

2 Languages with logophoric pronouns differ with respect to the interpretive possibilities for normal embedded pronouns. While both logical options are in principle available, namely (i) unequivocal disjoint reference for two identical pronouns in contexts like (7a) vs. (ii) ambiguity between a coreferential and a disjoint interpretation, Igbo is a language conforming to (i).
binding. This effect, as previously stated, is constituted by the fact that an argument in an embedded clause is overtly marked as being coreferential with the subject of consciousness of the larger syntactic or textual unit.

4 Parameter clusters: EUROTYPE VS. ASIATYPE

Turning now to the contrast between some European languages and (South-) East-Asian languages, we observe an apparent clustering of opposite properties with regard to the interplay of intensifiers and reflexivity on each side. We will review these properties one by one.

Before doing so, some methodological reasoning seems to be in place. The point here is to determine what such a clustering of properties actually tells us, and what it doesn’t. Suppose we observe that some pair of languages shares a set of 20 identical properties. This in itself would not be significant at all. Since every language clearly will have a multitude of 20 properties altogether, any two languages will probably share 20 or more properties. For an overlap of properties to be significant we have to look at subsystems of grammars for which a reasonable estimate of the overall number of properties is available. One such subsystem of grammar is reflexivity and intensification, and the interplay between the two.

In a number of recent articles, König & Siemund have explored the cross-linguistic variability within this subsystem (e.g. König & Siemund 1999, 2000). It turns out that in this domain there are probably less than a dozen clearly distinguishable parameters for which variation across languages can be observed.

Now, suppose two or more languages from a single area display a specific clustering of parameter values in this grammatical subsystem which clearly exceeds the expected probability. In such a case we may speak of a clustering that obviously holds areally and thereby constitutes something like an areal prototype of feature clustering. At least one caveat is, however, necessary. What we have to exclude to be able to make a claim about such an areal prototype is the possibility that the examined parameters are interrelated. Interrelatedness will lead to a situation in which the setting of a parameter for a certain language will, by grammar-internal implications, determine the parameter settings for other properties.

What we have to make sure, then, is that the clustering properties belong to a single grammatical subsystem on the one hand, but that they are also mutually independent enough to allow for independent variation, on the other. Only under such circumstances does the putting forward of an areal prototype make sense.

For this study a clear testing requirement follows. For each two clustering properties that we want to base our presumable prototypes on, at least one language different from our prototypical languages should be attested in which these two properties do not cluster together. We will present those examples in the appendix.

4.1 Intensifiers and reflexive anaphors: formal identity vs. unrelated expressions

Looking at the means by which reflexivity is expressed in the argument positions of predicates, two types may be distinguished: one group of languages uses a reflexive pronoun formally distinct from the intensifier, another group of languages uses the intensifier instead of a particular pronoun.

- Type 1: reflexive anaphor ≠ intensifier (EUROTYPE)
- Type 2: reflexive anaphor = intensifier (ASIATYPE)

The examples in (9) through (11) illustrate this for German (type 1) and Mandarin and Bahasa Indonesia (type 2).

German

(9) a. Der Kanzler selbst wird anwesend sein.
   'The Chancellor himself will be present.'
   b. Der Kanzler ist stolz auf sich.
   'The Chancellor is proud of himself.'

Mandarin

(10) a. Ta ziji hui lai.
   (s)he SELF will come
   'She herself will come.'
   b. Zhangsan kanjian-le ziji.
   Zhangsan see-ASP SELF
   ‘Zhangsan saw himself.’

Bahasa Indonesia (Sneddon 1996: 205 ff.)

   you must look after SELF properly
   'You must look after yourself properly.'
   b. Dia akan menulis buku tentang diri Presiden.
   (s)he FUT write book about SELF president
   '(S)He is going to write a book about the President himself.'

In the German examples there are two different words involved in the expression of a coindexed third person argument (sich) and an adjoined intensifier (selbst/ selber). In Mandarin, ziji is used invariably, and Bahasa has diri in both cases.

Note that English, as can be seen from the translations, does not conform to the European pattern. This is not very surprising, though, since English in general has gone through major restructurings of its language system as a whole and since, in particular, the loss of the Indo-European system of reflexive pronouns.
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Mandarin

(15) Zhangsan kanjian-le [(ta) ziji],
Zhangsan see-ASP (s)he SELF
‘Zhangsan saw himself.’

Korean (Kim 1997)

(16) Cheolsoo-ka [(ku/caki) casin]-ja salanghanta.
Cheolsoo-NOM him/REFL SELF
‘Cheolsoo loves himself.’

It is often the case that the more complex reflexive argument narrows down the domain within which the reflexive argument must find its antecedent (cf. Faltz 1985, Pica 1987 or Koster & Reuland (eds.) 1991). I.e. in cases of contextually possible long-distance binding as presented in the following section, the complex form will, in languages like Mandarin and Korean, only allow for an antecedent within the same clause. Since long-distance binding is impossible in central European languages, this narrowing-down cannot be observed in the prototypical cases of this type. Icelandic, however, displays exactly this phenomenon: *sjálfsérg* must be locally bound, as opposed to *sig* alone, which may be long-distance bound (cf. (i) in the appendix and Thráinsson 1976).

For a case where the same expression may be used both as an intensifier and as a reflexive pronoun, let us turn to Japanese for a moment. (17a-c) provide the relevant data (taken from Ogawa 1998).

(17) a. Taro-wa jibun-wo semeta.
Taro-TOP SELF-ACC criticise
‘Taro is criticising himself.’

b. Taro-wa jibun-de-wa kuruma-wo arawanakkata.
Taro-TOP SELF-INST-VA car-ACC not.washed
‘Taro did not wash the car himself.’

c. Taro-jishin-ja jibun kyouju-wo sonkeishiteiru.
Taro-SELF/SELF professor-ACC honour
‘Taro himself honours the professor.’

(17a) has *jibun* in argument position, thereby expressing coindexation of subject and object. In (17b), *jibun-(dewa)* fulfills the function of an adverbial exclusive intensifier. To express adnominal intensification, *jibun* may not be used; instead, *jishin* adjoins to the head noun in (17c). These data are interesting with respect to the question whether it just happens to be the case that the adverbial exclusive function of the intensifier and the reflexive pronoun function are expressed by

---

Both van der Auwera and Haspelmath assume that the close contact between central European languages which led to Standard Average European must have existed in the second half of the first millennium A.D. While Haspelmath assumes the migration period around 500 A.D. to be most relevant, van der Auwera identifies the heyday of the Franconian Empire in the 8th and 9th century as decisive (’Charlemagne-Sprachbund’).

In Dutch, the reflexive pronoun was lost, but was reintroduced as a loan word from High German.
the same element, with adnominal intensification requiring a different lexical item, or whether this split is systematic. Put differently: would it also be possible for a language to have one lexical item for reflexivity marking and adnominal intensification, while using a different one to express adverbial intensification? We think there is some evidence to answer this question in the negative. Here we can only briefly mention the main points. First, it has recently become clear that the diachronic and synchronic link between adverbial intensification and reflexivity marking may be a lot closer than previously assumed (König & Siemund 1998a). Second, language acquisition data display a big delay as far as the acquisition of adnominal intensifiers is concerned, whereas adverbial intensifiers and reflexivity are attested quite early (König & Siemund 1998b).

However, a word of caution should be added. In contrast to languages in which a particle-like element like Middle English self develops into (part of) a reflexive argument expression, the Japanese case may in the end be different. Note that jibun-de-wa in (17b) is inflected for case. Thus a simple analysis of this form could take jibun to be a nominal element, yielding a case-inflected nominal that is used in adverbial function quite similar to English by-phrases.

4.2 Behaviour in logophoric domains and long-distance binding

Logophoricity as a semantico-pragmatic notion and long-distance binding as a syntactic phenomenon were introduced in section 2.2. There long-distance binding was taken to describe a configuration in which a pronoun which usually expresses reflexivity on the clause level can be used to express coindexation of an argument with an argument of a higher embedding clause. This only happens in logophoric contexts, i.e. contexts in which the reflexivised argument forms part of a proposition that is reported from the psychological perspective of the referent which is encoded by the reflexive. Such configurations typically arise with verbs of communication and perception that take reflexive argument forms part of a proposition that is reported from the psychological perspective of the referent which is encoded by the reflexive. This phenomenon which blocks long-distance binding is noted repeatedly in the literature. In logophoric contexts in which an intermediate subject is marked for second person (e.g. (16) are cases in point.

Neither long-distance Paul/Paola, nor long-distance Maria is a good antecedent of the German and the Italian reflexive pronouns in (18) and (19). On the other hand, all the nominal arguments of the Asian examples in (20) through (23) are possible antecedents of the intensifier-reflexives ziji (Mandarin), jibun (Japanese), casin (Korean) and diri (Singapore Malay).

A phenomenon which blocks long-distance binding is noted repeatedly in the literature. In logophoric contexts in which an intermediate subject is marked for first or second person (e.g. ni 'you' in (24)), subjects higher than the intermediate subject cannot be coindexed with the reflexive. The blocking effect does not conform to the requirement of being logically independent of the other clustering parameters since it is dependent on the possibility of long-distance binding. Nonetheless, since the blocking effect is a characteristic trait of languages with long-distance bound reflexives, we will briefly elaborate on it.

Examples (24) from Mandarin and (25) from Korean are cases in point.

---

* Latin and Icelandic are among the well-known exceptions to type 1; cf. (i) and (ii) in the appendix.
Mandarin
(24) Zhangsan juede nij dui ziji\*ij mei xinxin.
Zhangsan think you to SELF not have confidence
"Zhangsan thinks you have no confidence in *him/myself."

Korean (Kim 1997)
John-NOM I-NOM SELF-ACC hates-COMP thinks
"John, thinks that I hate *him/myself."

According to the regularities of long-distance binding as presented above, it is surprising that in (24) no reading should be available in which the addressee is said to have confidence in Zhangsan. Analogously, we would expect that a situation in which John thinks that he is hated by the speaker should fulfill the truth conditions of (25). But both readings are not available, as can be seen from the starred interpretations. Obviously, intervening first or second person pronouns block long-distance binding. From the point of view of intensifier semantics as introduced in section 2, there is a close link between the blocking effect and logophoricity. If intensifiers always relate to a central participant, the default choice in speech-act terms will always be the speaker or the hearer, i.e. first or second persons. Third person participants can only compete among themselves for centrality, whereas in the presence of pronouns denoting central speech act participants it is the latter which will win in the competition for the status of being the centre of perspective. 7

4.3 The lexical field INTENSIFIER

Languages usually have one default intensifier which can be used in a variety of syntactic and pragmatic contexts. For instance, it is quite common for a language to have an intensifier that can be used both adverbially and adnominally. Also, one and the same default intensifier will often lend itself to a reading in which the high social position of its associated referent is highlighted if the context is appropriate, whereas in other contexts the same intensifier may stress the centrality, possession, or other aspects of a participant in a particular situation. Other intensifiers will be restricted to certain sub-domains of the semantic space and the constructional variants of the default intensifier.

Within this larger context, we observe a striking property of European languages: even though category-changing morphological devices are usually available, possessive intensifiers are not derived from the default intensifier, but are suppletive; i.e. to stress the fact that something is my own house, as opposed to, let's say, my brother's house, the genitival form *myself's is not available in English. (26a-c) give the relevant examples for some continental European languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Italian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dein eigenes Haus</td>
<td>sa propre maison</td>
<td>i miei propri occhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'your own house'</td>
<td>'his/her/its own house'</td>
<td>'my own eyes'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(South)-East-Asian languages typically make use of their general modifier-deriving markers to change the category of the particle or the nominal that is used as the default intensifier into an attributive expression. (27) gives examples from Mandarin and Japanese, and in both cases it is the default intensifier, ziji and jubun respectively, that is involved.

Mandarin
(27) wo ziji-de shu jibun-no ie
I SELF-MOD book SELF-MOD house
'my own book' 'my/your/her... own house'

The two types may be represented as follows.

- Type 1: suppletive possessive intensifiers
- Type 2: possessive forms productively derived from the default intensifier

Two notes should be added. Looking at the German intensifier selbst and its attributive-possessive counterpart eigen one might defend the position that eigen is a suppletive form because selbst/seibier as a particle cannot be the input of any morphological process apart from compounding. This argument is indeed reasonable for German, but it fails for the intensifiers of other languages. Même in French does inflect like an adjective in uses in which it translates as same, and Italian stesso even inflects for gender and number in its uses as an intensifier (cf. les mêmes choses 'the same things' and voi stessi 'you yourselves'). So there seems to be no principled reason why Italian and French should not economise on these extra forms. The fact that formally unrelated forms are used simply seems to be an areal phenomenon. The second proviso concerns the Asian type. Saying that attributive-possessive intensifiers can be productively derived from the default intensifier does not preclude the existence of more specialised possessive intensifiers that do not stand in a derivational relationship with the default form; Mandarin, for instance, has two heavily specialised possessive intensifier...
lexemes for one’s own feelings (qinshen) and for one’s own parents and children (qinsheng) (Hole 1998).

4.4 Derived intransitivity

It has long been observed that the reflexivity markers of many languages enter into a grammaticalisation channel that leads via middles to the expression of the passive voice (Geniušienė 1985, Haspelmath 1990, Kemmer 1993, König & Siemund 2000 among others). The general line of development is depicted in Figure 1.

Figure 1

Some Indo-European languages in Europe are paradigm cases of (parts of) this process. Danish Brevene underskrive-s of chefen ‘The letter is signed by the boss’ may illustrate the Scandinavian outcome of this process, and Spanish Aquí se come bien ‘Here one can eat well’ can be taken as a representative of the Romance development leading to (impersonal) passives. Note that both processes started independently and were arguably not induced by language contact.

It is a striking fact that crosslinguistically this grammaticalisation channel is often entered by reflexive pronouns of the Indo-European type and of morphemes expressing reflexivity as a verbal category (cf. e.g. the Udmurt case in Geniušienė 1985: 319), but not by intensifiers that are used to express reflexivity. I.e., the Asian type of languages studied here does not have derived intransitivity uses of its reflexive expressions, neither to express middles or facilitatives, nor to express the passive voice.

Type 1: reflexive pronoun ⇒ middles/facilitatives ⇒ passives
Type 2: intensifier ⇒ reflexivity marker ⇒ #

(28) and (29) give a row of examples for the German and the Italian case, with German not following the grammaticalisation path of sich any further than to the expression of facilitatives, whereas Italian si goes all the way through to the passive.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflexive</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>Facilitative</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sich sehen</td>
<td>sich drehen</td>
<td>Das Hemd bügelt sich gut.</td>
<td>'see oneself' 'revolve' 'The shirt irons easily.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeder-si</td>
<td>vestir-si</td>
<td>La camisa si stira bene.</td>
<td>‘see oneself’ ‘get dressed’ ‘The shirt irons easily.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ziji</td>
<td>*chuan ziji</td>
<td>*Chenshan rongyi xi ziji.</td>
<td>SELF go see SELF ‘see oneself’ intend.: ‘get dressed’ SELF intende: ‘The shirt washes easily.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chuan</td>
<td>yifu</td>
<td>impersonal passives</td>
<td>‘put on clothes’ ‘get dressed’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In (31), the row starts with the adverbal intensifier use of ziji; the second instance is the by now well-known reflexive use of ziji. The fact that ziji cannot be used as a detransitiviser in middle constructions is illustrated by (32). The verb chuan ‘put on’ cannot combine with ziji to translate as ‘get dressed’ (cf. German sich anziehen ‘REFL put.on’). Note that this is not just due to selectional restrictions of the particular verb chuan in Mandarin; it is rather the case that none of the so-called verb-object constructions that usually subcategorise for an inanimate object argument and of which chuan yifu ‘put on clothes’ is an instance can be detransitivised by using ziji instead of an object argument. The same holds true of the facilitative construction: regardless of the particular transitive verb, using ziji instead of a full-fledged noun phrase never yields the facilitative meaning in Mandarin. To express this kind of diathesis in Mandarin, a zero-derivation parallel to the one found in English This shirt washes well is used (cf. (32)); needless to say that passivising uses of ziji are not available in Mandarin, either.

A statement that covers the relationship between expressive means for reflexivisation and intensification as mirrored in the data above is given in König & Siemund 2000:

(32) If a language uses the same expression both as intensifier and reflexive anaphor, this expression is not used as a marker of derived intransitivity.
Clustered properties: towards areal prototypes

Table 1 below summarizes the phenomena discussed in the preceding sections in a way that shows which properties make up the proposed European type of reflexivity marking and intensification as opposed to its mirror-image, the (South-) East-Asian type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1 (SOUTH-EAST-ASIA)</th>
<th>Type 2 (EURO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity marking</td>
<td>Reflexive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-distance binding</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productively derived possessive intensifiers</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of reflexives restricted to marking coreference</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Reflexivity & Intensifiers; ASIATYPE vs. EUROTYPE

Appendix

The following table shows the mutual logical independence of the properties that have been discussed in this paper. The table itself only gives the names of the languages in which the relevant combinations of properties exist. The languages are cross-referenced with the respective explanations below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflexive pronoun/s</th>
<th>Long-distance binding</th>
<th>Derived possessive intensifiers</th>
<th>No derived reflexive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive pronoun/s</td>
<td>Icelandic (i) Latin (ii)</td>
<td>Lithuanian (iii) Russian (iv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No long-distance binding</td>
<td>Hungarian (v)</td>
<td>Evenki (vi) English (vii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppletive possessive intensifiers</td>
<td>Hungarian (viii) Latin (ix)</td>
<td>English (x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived reflexive pronoun/intensifier</td>
<td>Mongol Man group (N.-Sc.-Sakht.11)</td>
<td>Icelandic (xii) Evenki (xiii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Languages with property clusters different from ASIATYPE or EUROTYPE

Intensifiers and Reflexivity

(i) Reflexive pronoun: sig/edrisin
Intensifier: sjóða
Long-distance binding: Jóni segir að Marli sig y
'John says that Mary loves him/herself.'

(ii) Reflexive pronoun: se/sibí/suus
Intensifier: ipse
Long-distance binding:
[...] Decima legiôn [...] ei gratias egit quod de se t optimum iudicium fecisset [...] tenth legion to him thanked that about SELF excellent opinion formed
'The tenth legion expressed thanks to him for the excellent opinion he had formed of him.' (Caesar, De Bello Gallico, 1.41.2)

(iii) Reflexive pronoun: sav+/case ending
Intensifier: pát/pát
Derived possessive intensifier: tál þá patís dalýkas.
'that his SELF.GEN affair
'That's his own business.' (Senn 1966: 205)

(iv) Reflexive pronoun: sebja
Intensifier: sam
Derived intransitivity: sjá

(v) Reflexive pronoun/intensifier: magá
No long-distance binding (Anna Widmer, p.c.):
Páli azt híat högy Mary szereti magá-t+yj.
Paul that believes COMP Mary loves SELF-ACC
'Paul believes that Mary loves herself/him.'

There is a second reading of this sentence in which magá refers to the addressee. This reading is irrelevant here.

(vi) Derived possessive intensifier: memngi/-menngi. (Nedjalkov 1997: 209)
Cf. intensifier-reflexive:
No long-distance binding:
"The scope of reflexivity is always restricted to the clause, that is, reflexive pronouns cannot refer anaphorically beyond the clause" (Nedjalkov 1997: 111)

(vii) No derived intransitivity: Maryj says that Paulinej loves herself+yj
Maga

(viii) Reflexive pronoun/intensifier: sajád
Suppletive possess. intensifier:
Long-distance binding: cf. (ii)
'Self.

(ix) Long-distance binding: cf. (vii)
Suppletive possess. intensifier: ipsius (gen. of ipse), proprius
No derived intransitivity:
Suppletive possess. intensifier:
-derived reflexive pronoun/intensifier: rū (< 'body')
Derived intransitivity: tā das rū tā
3s.change SELF ASM
Daniel Hole, Ekkehard König

‘He has changed.’ (Kaliko language of the Moru Madi group, taken from Andersen & Goyvaerts 1986: 298)

(xi) derived intransitivity:

(a) medial verbs (infinitive+st (< Old Icelandic -st ‘cliticised reflexive pronoun’), e.g. meidhast ‘get hurt’, speglast ‘be reflected’; mostly non-volitional
(b) reflexive verbs (infinitive+sig/ser/stin), e.g. flita ser ‘hurry up’, speglag sig ‘see oneself in a mirror’; often volitional (Kress 1982: 143)

(xii) long-distance binding:

cf. (i)

(xiii) derived possessive intensifier:

cf. (vi)
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