

DISTRIBUTION AND ANALYSIS OF ADVERBIAL EMPHATIC REFLEXIVES IN ENGLISH*

Dennis Ryan Storoshenko
Yale University

1. Introduction

In this paper, I consider an emphatic use of reflexive pronouns in English. As a means of introduction, consider the dialogues in (1) and (2):

- (1) A: Did Mary have help getting that money?
B: No, she earned that money **herself**.
- (2) A: Can you lend me some money?
B: No, I'm broke **myself**.

In both cases, Speaker B has ended her sentence with a reflexive pronoun. Unlike run-of-the-mill reflexive pronouns in argument positions, there is no sense of a reflexive action being undertaken by the subject of Speaker B's sentences. Furthermore, and less-widely discussed, is the fact that the reflexives in (1) and (2) have distinct meanings. Specifically, the reflexive in (1) conveys the meaning that the speaker carried out the action with no outside help, whereas in (2), Speaker B is using the reflexive to signal a shared plight between herself and her interlocutor. These almost opposite readings are labelled as the *exclusive* and *inclusive* readings, respectively (König and Siemund 2000a). In this paper, I examine existing accounts of the derivation of these forms, ultimately coming to the conclusion that these emphatic reflexive pronouns should be considered to be adverbials through and through, rather than displaced nominal modifiers.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 summarises the existing literature on these reflexives, followed by a more in-depth discussion of relevant data in Section 3. Seeking to find more examples in actual usage, Section 4 discusses the use of these emphatic reflexives in a recent segment of the Corpus of Historical American English. The details of the proposed new analysis are laid out in Section 5, along with one final wrinkle in the data which leads to shaping that analysis. Finally, a brief conclusion and outline of future work is presented in Section 6.

2. Prior Analyses

In this section, I begin by looking at discussions of the uses of reflexive pronouns demonstrated in (1) and (2).

2.1 80s Flashback

Rather than considering the issue of the meaning of the reflexive pronouns which appear in sentence-final non-argument positions, most early literature on the subject appears to be more concerned with the syntactic derivation of those

* Thanks to the audience members at the CLA conference for their helpful discussion and suggestions with regard to this work. This research is funded by SSHRC Postdoc Fellowship 756-2010-0677. All errors are my own.

forms. For example, Quirk et al. (1985) address this issue with only a passing reference to the kind of alternation seen in (3):

- (3) a. He **himself** is a member.
b. He is a member **himself**.

For their purposes, the key fact to note is that the emphatic reflexive has two possible positions, either immediately adjacent to its antecedent in the subject position, or in the sentence-final position, with no discussion of a meaning contrast between the two structures.

In his discussion of the compound *he himself*, Bickerton (1987) also makes a reference to the existence of forms such as (3b), though he does not provide a full paradigm of possible forms with equivalent meanings:

- (4) a. John **himself** did it.
b. I gave it to Bill **himself**.
c. John gave it to Mary **himself**. (Bickerton 1987, ex 1)

His only comment on the derivation of (4c) is that the reflexive pronoun should be considered to be displaced, having originated as the more complex *John himself*, essentially a modified version of something like (4a). The reason behind this is that otherwise *himself* would have no theta role. In terms of meaning, Bickerton is clear in his assertion that the meanings of both be synonymous with “John and no one but John”, though this is not the case, as it is easy enough to conceive of a scenario in which the *it* of (4c) refers to some object (a book for example) that John is merely one in a series of people who gave it to Mary.

The importance of (4b) is to note that it is possible for the emphatic pronouns to be attached to non-subjects. However, Bickerton notes that this is not possible then the non-subject is an accusative pronoun:

- (5) * John_i says that Mary saw him **himself**_i. (Bickerton, 1987, ex 2b)

König and Siemund (2000a) cite examples showing that structures such as (5) are not categorically impossible, though they concede that they are exceedingly rare. In König and Siemund (2000b), this phenomenon is attributed to a redundancy in the fact that historically, *himself* was on its own an emphatic form of the third person masculine accusative, marking an unexpectedly reflexive instance of a typically other-directed activity.

Setting the issue of *he himself* aside for the moment, by introducing the notion of a subject/object asymmetry, Bickerton’s work does point the way to a crucial fact about the sentence-final emphatic reflexives:

- (6) a. John gave Mary **herself** the book.
b. * John gave Mary the book **herself**.

While (4b) establishes that non-subjects can take the emphatic reflexive, (6b) shows that the emphatic cannot be displaced from a non-subject position to the end of the sentence. Thus, any analysis of the sentence-final emphatic reflexives, in addition to capturing the meaning contrast between exclusives and inclusions, will need to either adapt Bickerton’s extraposition analysis to account for the

fact such an extraposition is not possible from non-subject positions, or find an explanation along the lines of subject-oriented binding.

2.2 State of the Art

In more recent work, there is acknowledgement of the two distinct meanings, but the notion that the sentence-final position is somehow derived remains. As noted above, the meaning contrast between the inclusive and exclusive is described in König and Siemund, though a full account of the derivation of the two forms is given in Gast (2006).

Gast's approach is semantically driven, based on the assumptions that the emphatic reflexive is base-generated as a part of its antecedent DP, and that the meaning contrast between the exclusive and the inclusive hinges on whether or the reflexive pronoun is interpreted above or below T^0 . The first of these assumptions is justified by the claim that the reflexive pronoun in this case can only be licensed locally, similar to Bickerton's claim that the reflexive pronoun must be extraposed because it cannot have been assigned a theta role in its surface position. The difference between Gast and Bickerton being that while Bickerton assumes the reflexive to have moved, we will see shortly that Gast employs a stranding analysis to derive the same effect. A key consequence of this analysis is that both the inclusive and the exclusive are treated as having the same underlying origin.

The second assumption, that the meaning contrast hinges on the position relative to T^0 , derives from Gast's semantic analysis. Without getting into too much detail, he claims that the difference between the exclusive and inclusive readings is best captured in event semantics. Firstly, Gast claims that the reflexive pronoun itself is focused in these uses, and that while its regular semantic value will be a simple identity function, the focus semantic value of the reflexive pronoun will be an alterity function returning any referent but its argument (the antecedent). T^0 enters the picture as the position for Davidsonian event-variable binding. Thus, the exclusive reading derives from cases where the focused reflexive is interpreted within the bound event (below T^0) whereas the inclusive reading results when the reflexive pronoun is interpreted outside the scope of event binding. This yields a comparison between different events, rather than a comparison between different permutations of a single event.

To capture the meaning difference while maintaining the idea that the reflexive pronouns are base-generated with their antecedents, Gast proposes that they can be stranded, just like subject quantifiers. By taking this step, Gast is also able to account for the fact that the sentence-final emphatic reflexives can only have subject antecedents: the proposed derivation toward the sentence-final position is available only for subject DPs. So, for the exclusive readings, the derivation proceeds in the following stages: first, the reflexive is stranded at [Spec, ν P], as in standard quantifier stranding. Then, the remainder of the VP domain undergoes a leftward movement to T^0 , after which the stranded reflexive becomes the rightmost element of the sentence, and remains crucially below T^0 . For the inclusive reading, the whole DP moves leftward, across T^0 to [Spec, TP]. From here, the antecedent raises to an even higher specifier position, once again leaving the reflexive stranded. Then, the remainder of the VP material undergoes a PF-motivated "heavy shift" to a position in between the raised antecedent and the stranded reflexive. These two derivations are schematised in (7) and (8).

- (7) Exclusive derivation
 John_i [mowed his lawn]_j [_{vP} [_{t_i} himself] _{t_j}].
- (8) Inclusive derivation
 John_j [moved his lawn]_k [_{TP} [_{t_j} himself]_i [_{vP} _{t_i} _{t_k}]].

There are, however, a number of problems with this analysis. First of all, both derivations make use of a leftward shift of VP material to different positions higher up in the syntactic tree, with no explicit syntactic motivation, other than serving as a means to an end, getting the stranded reflexive to appear to be sentence final. A natural prediction of this analysis is that stranded quantifiers should also appear in this sentence final position, but this is clearly not the case:

- (9) a. The boys **all** entered the room.
 b. *The boys entered the room **all**.

Similarly, adverbs which can precede stranded quantifiers cannot precede a reflexive pronoun which should be in the same position at [Spec, vP]:

- (10) a. The boys suddenly **all** entered the room.
 b. *John suddenly **himself** mowed the lawn.
 c. *John mowed the lawn suddenly **himself**.

(10b) shows the stranded reflexive before Gast's proposed VP movement, while (10c) shows the final stage of his analysis. In either case, the sentence is ungrammatical, or at the very least is incompatible with an exclusive reading, which should be possible under Gast's analysis. This clear lack of parallelism between the emphatic reflexive pronouns and stranded quantifiers, combined with the lack of external motivation for all the other leftward movements required, all add up to significant challenges to Gast's analysis.

Beyond all that, it is worth taking a step back to consider the function of the emphatic reflexives. Gast's semantic analysis is quite correct in tying these reflexive pronouns to event variables, as they are indeed most clearly seen as drawing comparisons between different possible or actual permutations of the same event. This being the case, it seems odd to treat them as essentially adjectival elements, modifiers of a DP around which the rest of the sentence has moved. Given their event-modifying nature, it stands to reason that these should be adverbial modifiers, directly adjoined to the clausal spine.

Finally, another strong prediction of Gast's analysis is that if a subject DP is carrying an emphatic reflexive, there should not be a sentence-final emphatic reflexive anteceded by the same DP. However, consider (11):

- (11) a. The King **himself** ties his own shoes **himself**.
 b. Even the King ties his own shoes without getting someone to help or do it for him.

As Gast predicts the inclusive and the exclusive versions of the emphatic reflexive to originate from within the subject DP, his analysis cannot generate cases like (11a), which are clearly possible. With this final piece of evidence, Gast's proposal that both emphatic reflexives have a single origin based upon a

stranding analysis appears all but untenable. Given that the most natural reading for (11a) treats the sentence-final emphatic as exclusive, this can be taken as proof that the exclusive emphatic is not derived inside the subject DP. This does not yet constitute evidence that the inclusive emphatic is similarly not derived via stranding. In the next section, I move on to consider the relationship between the emphatic reflexive and other modifiers, a next logical step in building a new analysis.

3. Interactions with Other Elements of the Sentence

In this section, I consider the interactions between the emphatic reflexives and other elements of the sentence. Specifically, I look at their interactions with predicate types, sentential negation, and adverbs.

Looking first at the issue of predicate selection, it appears that the exclusive reading for the sentence-final emphatic reflexive is restricted to agentive predicates only:

- (12) a. John mowed his lawn **himself**.
 b. ? John saw the Queen **himself**.
 c. * John is a member of that club **himself**.

(12a), an agentive transitive appears to be the canonical use of the exclusive reading. In (12b), the sentence itself is grammatical, though there is a confound here in that the meaning is somewhat different. In (12b), the sentence is only acceptable if *himself* is interpreted as synonymous with *alone*, rather than the meaning of “with no outside help”. Attempting to apply the latter reading to (12b) is infelicitous at best, and all but impossible for (12c). Conversely, interpreting all the sentences of (12) with the inclusive reading for *himself* is possible. While it requires a bit more pragmatic effort to do so with (12a), it is not impossible to conceive of a scenario where John is being likened to other individuals who also mowed their lawns. Paraphrasing *himself* as *also* in (12b) and (12c) is not problematic at all. So, while the exclusive reading appears restricted to only agentive predicates, the inclusive reading can be used in any sentence.¹

To try explaining this contrast in terms of Gast’s analysis, an immediate possibility is that the exclusive reading would not be available for non-agentive predicates because they lack the low stranding position below T^0 from which that reading is derived. However, we can show this is not the case, as quantifiers can indeed be stranded low with non-agentive predicates:

- (13) a. The boys have **all** seen the Queen.
 b. The boys are **all** members of that club.

That quantifiers can be stranded low in these predicates suggests that it should be possible for the exclusive reading to be derived under Gast’s analysis. If it

¹ For most speakers, the inclusive reading is most readily available for stative predicates as in (12c) rather than an agentive such as (12a), though an inclusive reading is still possible. At this time, it is simplest to explain this phenomenon as resulting from the fact that (12a) is ambiguous, whereas (12c) is not, and that when such an ambiguity exists, there is a preference to resolve it in the direction of the exclusive rather than the inclusive.

were the case that the exclusive reading is derived under Gast's stranding analysis, we should not observe the effects in (12), the low stranding position being available. Having observed these effects, we can now be even more certain that the exclusive reading is not derived via stranding. This will need to be taken into account in the eventual analysis.

A second interaction which will need to be taken into account is the interaction between the emphatic reflexives and sentential negation. Providing a secondary motivation for Gast's analysis is the observation in Gast and Siemund (2006) that the two different readings take different scopes with respect to negation:

- (14) a. John didn't mow his lawn **himself**. (And neither did Bill.)
 b. John is not a member of that club **himself**. (And neither is Bill.)

First looking at (14a), the crucial observation is that the sentence does not entail that John's lawn was not mowed. Rather, the sentence merely means that John did not do so with no outside help, and the continuation makes it clear that likewise, Bill's lawn may have been mowed, but again he did not do so alone. Conversely, (14b) means not only that John is not a member of the club, but that he is not alone in not being a member. What this means is that the exclusive reading is interpreted within the scope of negation, as the event itself is not negated, only the meaning contribution of the emphatic reflexive. With the inclusive, the comparison is clearly between other negated events, suggesting that the inclusive emphatic is over the scope of negation.

Lastly, it can be shown that the emphatic reflexives take on different meanings depending on their relative position to other adverbs at the right periphery:

- (15) a. I write a report **myself** every week.
 b. I write a report every week **myself**.

The first example, (15a), is most naturally an exclusive reading, with the speaker meaning that he writes a report on his own on a weekly basis. (15b), on the other hand, most naturally has an inclusive reading, with the speaker expressing that he also writes a report on a weekly basis, the discourse context having presumably already established there to be other weekly report writers. So, it appears that the meaning can be permuted depending on the proximity of the reflexive pronoun to the extreme right edge of the sentence.

In sum, there are two important findings from this section. First, the discussion on the relation between the emphatic reflexives and predicates provides yet another counter-argument to Gast's syntactic analysis of the exclusive, while bringing to light the fact that there will need to be some contrast between agentive and non-agentive predicates. The negation and adverb co-occurrence facts point to the exclusive reading being associated with a relatively low position, while the inclusive should be in a relatively high position. Taking these two together suggests that whatever this low position for the exclusive reading is, that position should be closely related to the predicate, though the inclusive position should be available regardless of the predicate. So, while the stranding analysis for exclusives and the idea that the inclusive and the exclusive are formed from the same base-generated positions, have both been shown to be untenable, we can clearly see that the end result of Gast's analysis

is on the right track in that the relative interpreted positions of the two emphatic readings is essentially correct. To find further support for this high versus low dichotomy, and to look for any new co-occurrence facts, I turn in the next section to looking for examples of these emphatic reflexives in text.

4. Corpus Evidence

To find “natural” examples of these sentence-final emphatic reflexives, a study of the 2009 timeslice of the Corpus of Historical American English (Davies 2010) was carried out. Consisting of both text and spoken data, this should provide an accurate sampling of how these reflexive pronouns are used in contemporary usage.

Overall, the 2009 segment of the corpus contains over two million words, out of which a total of 3386 reflexive pronouns were found. These were then classified according to their position and function. Because the surrounding text can be easily examined, each example can be placed in its proper context such that the classifications can be made with a high degree of confidence. Out of all the instances of the reflexive pronouns found, 208 were classified as having the inclusive meaning, and 97 an exclusive meaning. Some of these were immediately adjacent to their antecedents, but the majority were sentence final. However, the most illuminating cases are those where the reflexive pronoun is neither adjacent to its antecedent, nor at the extreme right edge of the sentence. Exclusive and inclusive examples from the corpus are given in (16) and (17), respectively:

- (16) a. The cops think the man started the fire **himself** in order to break into your apartment.
 b. ...the short brown hair he cuts **himself** every couple weeks with electric clippers.
- (17) a. She'd struggled with most of them **herself** these past two years.
 b. She was going to a medical seminar **herself** in a few weeks.

As shown in (16), the exclusive reflexive can precede a variety of adjuncts, including temporal, instrumental, and causal. Conversely, (17) indicates that the reflexives with the inclusive reading can only precede temporal adjuncts. However, a further detail is worth noting in that there is a contrast between the temporal adjuncts which typically follow the two types of reflexives. In (16b), we see *every couple of weeks*, which defines a set of time points over which an action is iterated, much as in (15a). Other examples were similar, in that they defined specific points in time where an event takes place. On the other hand, the temporal adjuncts in (17) are reference times, rather than event times. More importantly, there were no instances of any other type of adjunct following an emphatic reflexive with an inclusive reading.

Overall, the findings from this corpus examination support the general claim that the exclusive reflexive is in a lower syntactic position than the inclusive one. Furnished with these new examples though, known differences between the different types of adjuncts (instrumental, event time, reference time, etc...) can be used to fine-tune the details of the analysis.

5. Proposed Analysis

Summing up the findings of the previous three sections, it is safe to say that the facts lean toward an analysis of both the inclusive and exclusive which has these reflexives base-generated in adverbial positions, but those positions are going to differ for the two readings. While both the exclusive and the inclusive appear to be subject-oriented, the exclusive appears to come with a further restriction on the theta-role of that subject, preferring agents, whereas the inclusive reading is tied more simply to subjecthood. Additionally, there is a battery of evidence showing that the inclusive correlates to a higher syntactic position than the exclusive. In going forward, it is first worth setting some groundwork on the syntax of the right periphery.

Frey (2003) defines several classes of right peripheral adjuncts for Germanic languages, with the crucial observation that these tend to occur in a fixed order. Three of these classes are of particular relevance to the matter at hand. First, there are the event-internal adjuncts, a class which subsumes temporal, locative, and instrumental adjuncts. Frey shows that these occupy a position c-commanded by [Spec, ν P]. Secondly, there are subject-oriented sentence adjuncts, which are generated in a position c-commanding [Spec, ν P], but they are in turn c-commanded by the final position of the sentential subject. These are typically adverbs such as *stupidly*. Finally, the analysis will need to account for frame adjuncts, which is the categorisation Frey uses for reference time adjuncts, shown to be important in distinguishing the two types of reflexives. These frame adjuncts are described as generated in a base position c-commanding [Spec, ν P], as well as non-sentence adjuncts. With these categories in mind, it is now possible to use the observations from Sections 3 and 4 to build an analysis.

5.1 Exclusive Emphatics

The simpler of the two to define will be the exclusive emphatic. As we have already seen, these must occur to the left of instrumental and event-time adjuncts, meaning that they must be below the event-internal adjuncts in the right periphery. Knowing that event-internal adjuncts must be c-commanded by [Spec, ν P], it then follows that the exclusive emphatic must similarly be c-commanded by that same position. Indeed, as Gast's semantic analysis hinges on the notion that the exclusive emphatic modifies a single event, it is not a stretch to simply add the exclusive emphatic to the class of event-internal adjuncts.

To capture the additional theta-role restriction, it is most natural to consider this to be an adjunct to ν P, available only when the ν^0 head assigns an agent theta role. The necessary binding relation between the reflexive pronoun and its antecedent can be forged immediately within the ν P domain, consistent with the ideas that active ν P forms a phase (Chomsky 2005) and that phases constitute binding domains (Canac-Marquis 2005). This relatively low position also easily accounts for the observed negation scope facts, assuming that negation is above the ν P domain.

5.2 Inclusive Emphatics

At first glance, the inclusive emphatics would seem to be most at home among the subject-oriented sentence adjuncts, in that they must be higher than ν P, though still c-commanded by the sentential subject. Problematic here though is the fact that we have seen these occurring to the left of, and therefore lower

than, reference time adjuncts, which Frey claims should not be higher than the subject-oriented sentence adjuncts. If indeed the inclusive emphatic is one of these adjuncts, then this will need to be accounted for.

In beginning to do so, it is worth looking at another claim that Frey makes with regard to the subject-oriented sentence adjuncts. He states that in English, these are only possible in the right periphery with a distinct intonation. Normally, these should be left-adjoined, appearing between the subject and main verb:

- (18) a. John had **stupidly** mowed his lawn with an electric mower.
b. John had mowed his lawn with an electric mower, **stupidly**.

Indeed, for (18b) to be at all felicitous, a very distinct intonation on the final adverb is needed. As for the sentence-medial position, the inclusive emphatic does have a corpus-attested parallel:

- (19) She had **herself** been a somewhat typical woman in those early years.

This position, available only for the inclusive emphatic, has not gone unnoticed in the literature. Gast makes the claim that this medial position is only available when auxiliary verbs are present, and gives the following pair:

- (20) a. I really know that **myself**.
b. *I really **myself** know that. (Gast 2006, ex 4.92)

Permuting *really* and *myself* in (20b) will of course yield a grammatical sentence, though such a string would be just as easily generated if the reflexive were part of the more complex *I myself*. The problem here is that inserting an auxiliary does not do anything to help (20b):

- (21) a. *I have really **myself** known that.
b. I have **myself** really known that.

To the extent that (21b) is felicitous, it is definitely preferable to (21a). So, Gast's examples on their own do not conclusively show that an auxiliary verb is required, it being impossible to construct the crucial datum, a version of (21b) that lacks an auxiliary verb, but shows conclusively that the emphatic reflexive is not part of the sentential subject. (20b) is an attempt to do so, though (21a) suggests that there may be other reasons beyond the lack of an auxiliary making the example ungrammatical. Setting these difficulties aside for the moment, it's worth looking at Gast's derivation for examples such as (19). He derives these merely by eliminating the leftward stylistic shift of the VP material in his derivation of the inclusive cases from (8):

- (22) She_k had_j [_{TP} [_{t_k} herself]_i t_j t_i been a somewhat...

While this does yield the correct string order, no reason is given as to why the auxiliary verb has any effect on the availability of this leftward move. If anything, one would expect that the presence of an auxiliary verb would outright block such a shift if there were any relation between the two, but this is clearly not the case:

- (23) She had been a somewhat typical woman in those early years **herself**.

The corpus example, and others like it, can easily be modified to place the emphatic at the end of the sentence, not even needing as much heavy intonation as adverbs such as *stupidly*. Given that this leftward movement of the VP already seems questionable, it becomes even more so when the movement apparently remains possible, though only optional, when what appears to be the landing site is occupied. In fact, the data more strongly suggest that the inclusive emphatic originates in this medial position and moves rightward, rather than the rest of the sentence moving leftward over the reflexive pronoun.

This is an avenue worth exploring, as the corpus evidence bears out Gast's claim, even if the crucial example cannot be constructed: all instances of the medial inclusive emphatic came in sentences that contained auxiliary verbs. To better show that this medial position is parasitic on the presence of an auxiliary, it's worth stepping back and pointing out that other adverbs in this position are possible (and permutable) without an auxiliary:

- (24) a. John stupidly suddenly stepped to the right.
b. John suddenly stupidly stepped to the right.

When auxiliaries enter the picture, we see that any relative ordering seems possible (though (23a) may require distinct intonation):

- (25) a. Jane **cleverly** had been jumping to the left.
b. Jane had **cleverly** been jumping to the left.
c. Jane had been **cleverly** jumping to the left.

However, the same is not possible with the emphatic reflexive. For the reasons discussed above, a counterpart to (25a) will be grammatical with an emphatic reflexive, but it would merely be an example of *Jane herself*. Still, there is a contrast between the other two examples:

- (26) a. Jane had **herself** been jumping to the left.
b. *Jane had been **herself** jumping to the left.

Here, it is not possible to place the emphatic reflexive after both auxiliaries, it must follow the first one. At this point, at least some distinction between the inclusive reflexive and other adverbs has been found. Also, for the sake of completeness, we again have evidence that quantifier stranding does not show the same behaviour:

- (27) a. The boys had **all** been stepping to the right.
b. The boys had been **all** stepping to the right.

Clearly, Gast's analysis of these cases again does not square with all the observed facts. However, there is one similarity between the inclusive emphatic and cases of quantifier stranding (not to mention adverb placement) which makes an analysis exceedingly difficult:

- (28) a. The boys should **all** be stepping to the right.

- b. The boys should **themselves** be stepping to the right.
- (29) a. The motorists are **both** being questioned.
 b. The motorists are **themselves** being questioned.

The observation here is that this position is available immediately after the first auxiliary verb, regardless of what that auxiliary verb may be.

Given that it is not possible to link this position to any fixed aspectual or modality head, the simplest solution would be to posit the existence of a head immediately below T^0 with an available specifier position. To fit with Gast's analysis that the inclusive emphatic is interpreted at a position above the existential binding of an event variable, that role could be assigned to the functional head in question. Similarly, this head would take a position above negation. Lacking any overt content, this head remains virtually undetectable in the syntax, though it would presumably be on the path of head movement for auxiliaries on the way to T^0 . A restriction could then be seen on the specifier position such that only when any overt material has moved through that head could the specifier be occupied. In this way, we capture the fact that auxiliary verbs are required in order for the inclusive emphatic to emerge in this medial position. In fact, it is worth noting that not all auxiliary verbs are created equal in this regard, and having the inclusive emphatic following a modal auxiliary with no following instance of *be* or *have* appears degraded:

- (30) ? The boys should **themselves** step to the right.

In comparison to (28b), there is definitely something degraded about (30). Under the assumption that modals are generated higher than other auxiliaries, this could then be explained in that there is nothing in the newly-proposed head position supporting the overtly-occupied specifier.

The most conclusive piece of evidence against the stranding analysis would be to show that the subject DP can still contain an emphatic reflexive pronoun while there is also a medially-positioned inclusive emphatic. (28) is an attempt to construct such an example:

- (31) The King **himself** has **himself** been implicated.

At first glance, (31) appears redundant in the repetition of the reflexive pronoun. What is needed is to place the sentence in a context where each of the emphatics carries a different meaning. To do so would require a context in which there have been a number of individuals implicated in some scandal, but that out of some other set of likely individuals, it was the King of all people who was also implicated. To the extent that this is a possible reading, it is now possible to conclusively state that neither the inclusive nor the exclusive emphatic can have originated as nominal modifiers.

Thus, the conclusion is that the inclusive emphatics appearing in the medial position reveal the base-generation position of these emphatics, though that position can only be occupied when the newly-proposed head position hosts either an auxiliary verb, or the trace of one. Otherwise, the inclusive emphatic must evacuate this position by way of a rightward shift, much as other adverbs do. Given that these are obligatorily focused elements, the necessary special intonation needed to motivate such a shift is already present. Finally, by

proposing this extra position in the midfield, slightly lower than other sentence adjuncts, we have a potential explanation for the fact that while we expect the inclusive emphatic to be in a relatively high position at the right periphery, it remains unexpectedly low compared to the reference time frame adjuncts, which were found to be the only adjuncts able to appear higher in the right periphery.

6. Conclusion and Future Directions

In this paper, I have argued that rather than being seen as displaced nominal modifiers, emphatic reflexives should be seen as adverbial elements, attaching directly to the clausal spine. In so doing, I have sketched a possible syntactic account for the two different readings of these emphatics, the inclusive and the exclusive, capturing their observed behaviours with respect to predicate selection, and interactions with negation and other modifiers. The proposed analysis manages to do so without relying on a syntax that incorporates otherwise un-motivated movements. The tradeoff though is that in the case of the inclusive emphatic, a new covert functional head in the syntax had had to be proposed. A goal for future work is thus to find independently-motivated evidence for this head.

A further goal of future work is to gather more empirical data on the judgements of native speakers with respect to these emphatic forms. A key weakness of the existing analyses is that they rely on relatively scant data, and the reported judgements do not always jive with those of naïve native speakers. This is an area ripe for psycholinguistic testing, to get clearer ideas on both the syntactic generalisations gleaned from the corpus study, and the semantic claims, particularly with respect to negation, which underlie this analysis.

References

- Bickerton, Derek. 1987. *He himself*: anaphor, pronoun, or...? *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(2): 345-348.
- Canac-Marquis, Réjean. 2005. Phases and binding of reflexives and pronouns in English. In *Proceedings of the HPSG05 Conference*, ed. Stefan Muller, 482-502.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, eds. Robert Friedin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria L. Zubizarreta, 133-166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Davies, Mark. 2010. *The Corpus of Historical American English (COHA): 400+ Million Words, 1810-2009*. Online resource: <http://corpus.byu.edu/coha>.
- Frey, Werner. 2003. Syntactic conditions on adjunct classes. In *Modifying Adjuncts*, eds. Ewald Lang, Claudia Maienborn, and Catherine Fabricius-Hansen, 163-209. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gast, Volker. 2006. *The Grammar of Identity: Intensifiers and Reflexives in Germanic Languages*. New York: Routledge.
- Gast, Volker and Peter Siemund. 2006. Rethinking the relationship between SELF-intensifiers and reflexives. *Linguistics* 44(2):348-381.
- König, Ekkehard and Peter Siemund. 2000a. Locally free *self*-forms, logophoricity, and intensification in English. *English Language and Linguistics* 4(2):183-204.
- König, Ekkehard and Peter Siemund. 2000b. The development of complex reflexives and intensifiers in English. *Diachronica* 17(1):39-84.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik, and David Crystal. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.