

DANIEL HOLE (Berlin)

Intensifiers in Mandarin Chinese*

Summary

Intensifikatoren wie dt. *selbst/selber*, türkisch *kendi* oder engl. *x-self* sind Fokuspartikeln, die die Alternativmenge eines Fokuswertes strukturieren: der Fokuswert stellt das Zentrum der Alternativenmenge dar, die relevanten Alternativen bilden die Peripherie (KÖNIG 1991, BAKER 1995). Es lassen sich übereinzelsprachlich vier Gebrauchsweisen von Intensifikatoren nachweisen, ein adnominaler Gebrauch wie in *der Kanzler selbst*, ein adverbial-exklusiver wie in *den Kuchen selbst backen*, ein adverbial-inklusive wie in *selbst die Antwort wissen* und ein attributiver wie in *sein eigenes Haus* (der indogermanische Suppletivismus im attributiven Gebrauch ist nicht die typologische Norm). Syntaktisch sind alle Intensifikatoren Adjunkte.

Mandarin-Chinesisch verwendet als allgemeinsten Ausdruck für Intensifikation *ziji*, welches aus der syntaktischen Diskussion über Reflexivität gut bekannt ist (vgl. z. B. HUANG & TANG 1991, PAN 1997). Im adnominalen Gebrauch lassen sich Restriktionen bezüglich des Animatheitsstatus des Fokusreferenten für *ziji* und spezifischere Varianten nachweisen. Eine typologische Besonderheit ist die Sensitivität einzelner adnominaler Intensifikatoren für thematische Relationen und eventuell auch für noch spezifischere Situationsrollen. Im adverbial-exklusiven Gebrauch besteht für Intensifikation eine (universelle) Beschränkung auf agentive Sachverhalte. Mandarin weist ein nach Körperteilen/Instrumenten variiendes reiches System spezifischer lexikalischer Varianten zum Ausdruck adverbialer Intensifikation auf. Die Möglichkeit der Delegierbarkeit einer Handlung scheint den Gebrauch eines weiteren adverbialen Intensifikators zu beschränken. Auch das attributive Intensifikationssystem ist in typologisch auffälliger Weise lexikalisch ausgebaut: Neben *ziji* kommen spezifischere Lexeme zur Anwendung, deren Gebrauch auf bestimmte inalienable Besitzverhältnisse beschränkt ist. Den adverbial-inklusive Gebrauch von Intensifikatoren kennt das Chinesische nicht.

Der zumindest diachron, eventuell aber auch partiell synchron einzufordernde Zusammenhang von Intensifikation und Reflexivität wird als Problem formuliert und der üblichen Konzentration auf den reflexiven Gebrauch von *ziji* in der generativen Literatur gegenübergestellt.

1. Introduction

This paper is a case study on intensifiers in Mandarin Chinese.¹ It adopts the framework developed by KÖNIG and KÖNIG & SIEMUND (cf. KÖNIG 1991, KÖNIG & SIEMUND 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, SIEMUND 1997). The following introduction will make the reader familiar with the main topics of intensifier syntax and semantics, mostly illustrated by English data, and only occasionally alluding to the Mandarin case or other languages. Section 2 is concerned with

* The research on which this paper is based was supported by a grant from the DFG (Ko 497/5-2) within the *Schwerpunktprogramm „Sprachtypologie“*.

¹ I would like to thank LIU HSIN-YUN, ZHANG JIE and ZHANG NING for their help with the data and for their patience. I am also indebted to ECKEHARD KÖNIG, PETER SIEMUND and ZHANG NING for discussing various points concerning this paper with me. Of course, any remaining mistakes are my fault.

adnominal intensifiers in Mandarin. Section 3 deals with the exceptionally rich system of adverbial intensifiers in Mandarin. Part 4 reviews possessive intensifiers that translate as *own* into English; this sub-system displays a high level of lexical diversity, too. Section 5 establishes the descriptive and explanatory link between reflexivity and intensification in Mandarin as a desideratum of linguistic research. The last part aims at summarizing the main findings in a way that facilitates quick reference.

(1) is a prototypical English example involving intensification, i. e. *himself* is not used as a reflexive pronoun or anaphor, but rather as an intensifier:

- (1) *The director himself will attend the meeting.*

In languages that do not distinguish between reflexive pronouns and intensifiers by having distinct lexemes for each, as is the case in English, the main formal difference between the two is that reflexive pronouns are arguments, whereas intensifiers are adjuncts. In (1), *himself* has been adjoined to *the director*, thereby forming a complex constituent of the same syntactic category as *the director* alone. Other languages, among them languages as diverse as German and Modern Hebrew, neatly distinguish between the expression of reflexivity and intensifiers (cf. German *sich* vs. *selbst/selber*). KÖNIG (1991) proposes an analysis of intensifiers in terms of focus particles, thereby deriving the non-projecting character of intensifiers from the more general syntactic class to which they belong. Mandarin behaves like English with respect to the encoding of intensification and reflexivity: both may be expressed by the default element *ziji*:

- (2) *Laowang kanjian -le ziji.*²
 Laowang look.at -ASP SELF
 'Laowang has seen himself.'
- (3) *Jingli ziji hui lai.*
 manager SELF will come
 'The manager himself will come.'

According to the semantic analysis in KÖNIG (1991), intensifiers relate a central focused referent to a periphery of possible alternative values. The property of relating the focus value to a set of possible alternative values is a consequence of the membership of intensifiers in the class of focus particles, but the structuring of the set into a centre and a periphery is the distinctive property of intensifiers. This focus reasoning predicts that (1) will only be felicitous if the director can be related to other people and if the director is somehow central with regard to these alternative values. In the case of a director, it is easy to think of an alternative, since a director is necessarily at the top of some real-world hierarchy and, e. g., his secretary is easily construed as a peripheral alternative. KÖNIG, incorporating findings from BAKER 1995, explicates the relation between the centre *x* (the focus referent) and the periphery set *Y* containing the alternative values $y_1 \dots y_n$ as instantiated by one of four more specific relations (cf. (4)). (5) gives one example for each sub-case.

² The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: ASP – aspect marker; ATTR – enclitic deriving prenominal modifiers; BA – preposition allowing preverbal direct objects; CL – classifier; CN – particle: contrary to norm; COLL – collectivizing clitic; DEM – demonstrative; PRT – (sentence final) particle; SELF – intensifying element.

- (4a) x has a higher rank than y on a real-world hierarchy.
- (4b) x is more important than y in a specific situation.
- (4c) y is identified relative to x (kinship terms, part-whole, etc.).
- (4d) x is the subject of consciousness, centre of observation, etc. (logophoricity).

- (5a) *The Pope himself does not know what to do.*
- (5b) *Most of the passengers suffered light injuries. The driver himself was killed.*
- (5c) *Adam's wife was picking apples, Adam himself was peeling them.*
- (5d) *He was not particularly tall, a little taller than Jemima herself perhaps [...].*
(A. FRASER. *A Splash of Red*)

Note that the grouping of the uses into four sub-cases is meant to be a convenient categorizing aid giving some content to the rather abstract centre-periphery relation. It does not preclude a possible unifying analysis.

A restriction that limits the use of adnominal intensifiers in many languages is the animacy status of the focus referent. English adnominal *x-self* is not sensitive to this constraint (cf. *The place itself is fine; the weather is the pain*), but Chinese intensifiers distinguish different animacy degrees (cf. 2.1). Another factor that may license the selection of a particular intensifier among several possibilities is the high social rank of the focus referent (cf. German *höchstpersönlich*, *höchstselbst*, Swedish *självaste*). Mandarin does not have such a distinction for adnominal intensifiers, but one of the adverbial intensifier lexemes, *qinzi*, often invites an inference that leads to a related effect (cf. 3.2., English intensifiers inflect for person and number, while in other languages, e. g. German, intensifiers do not display morphosyntactic agreement. Mandarin trivially belongs to the second class, since it is an isolating language.

Adverbial intensifiers can be analyzed as VP adjuncts in many languages, and the data in section 3 corroborate this analysis for Mandarin; i. e. Mandarin has a fixed position for adverbial intensifiers, and they cannot crop up in various positions as is the case in German:

- (6) *Der Koch hat (selbst) die Blaubeeren (selbst) gesammelt.*
'The cook has picked the blueberries himself.'

Just like in the adnominal use, adverbial intensifiers as in (6) relate a central focus referent (in this case: *der Koch* 'the cook') to a periphery of alternative values (in (6) this might be a professional berry picker, or some hierarchically subordinate colleague of the cook). This kind of intensifier evokes implicatures to the effect that the action was performed without help, and within the overall situation, the agent is regarded as responsible for the action denoted by the sentence. In the case at hand, picking the blueberries to use them afterwards, e. g. to fry blueberry pancakes, is the relevant overall situation. In the context of picking blueberries for use in professional cooking, the cook is clearly the central responsible referent. In many cases the responsibility of the focus referent in the overall situation goes along with a beneficiary or a maleficiary role of the agent.³ With responsibility in a given situation being a requirement for focus referents of adverbial intensifiers, it comes as no surprise that only

³ I will not attempt a more thorough treatment of these observations in terms of presuppositions. For a survey of relevant phenomena and possible more formal treatments cf. KÖNIG & SIEMUND 1996a and SIEMUND 1997, ch. 8.

agentive predicates and predicates of intended perception may combine with this class of intensifiers.

Adnominal intensifiers, on the other hand, can be used irrespective of the type of predicate with which the focused participant combines. In (7a/b) it is merely the kinship relation defining her brother via Mary that establishes the centrality of Mary with respect to her brother, the rest of the two examples does not play a role whatsoever in establishing the centre-periphery relation. Therefore, adnominal intensifiers combine just as readily with arguments of agentive verbs (cf. (7a)) as with arguments of stative verbs (cf. (7b)).

(7a) *Mary's brother will take care of the kids. Mary herself will do the shopping.*

(7b) *Mary's brother is sick. Mary herself is as vigorous as a mountain climber.*

English is among the languages that have a third use of intensifiers, illustrated by (8):

(8) A: *Could you lend me some money?* – B: *I'm a little short myself.*

This use of intensifiers goes along with the same presuppositions that make up the meaning of additive focus particles like *too* or *also*, plus some requirement of a special context (cf. SIEMUND 1997). Since the use of intensifiers does not exist in Chinese, I will not be concerned with it any more in this paper, except for another short remark at the end of section 3.

Possessive intensifiers like *own* in English are not as regularly suppletive in many languages as they are in Indo-European, i. e. they have the form of adnominal intensifiers, typically augmented by some modifier-deriving morphology. Mandarin constitutes such a case, with the default intensifier *ziji* figuring in the most common cases in which *own* would be used in English. For the detailed analysis of certain more specialized Mandarin expressions, cf. section 4.

2. Adnominal use

2.1. Basic contrasts

Adnominal intensification in Mandarin may be expressed by one of at least three distinct lexical items. I will present each item in the context of a sentence, supplemented by a crude approximation of the relevant restrictions of use first. Each item will then be discussed in greater detail below.

Ziji is the most general adnominal intensifier in Mandarin. *Ziji* is well-established in the literature on anaphors and reflexivity, but its intensificational use has seldom been investigated (for an exception cf. PAN 1997). As is true for all other adnominal intensifiers, it is inserted to the right of an NP/DP:⁴

⁴ I will not take a clear stance in this paper as to the existence of DPs as they have been adopted in Generative Grammar. I do subscribe, though, to the existence of some functional category or even several functional categories above NP (cf. e. g. CHENG 1997 for projections above NP in Mandarin and LI 1996 for a number projection, in particular.) The matter of whether intensifiers combine with Ns, with NPs, or with some higher functional projection, will be addressed below.

- (9) *Buzhang ziji hui lai huanying women.*
 minister SELF will come welcome we
 'The minister himself will come to welcome us.'

Inanimate NPs/DPs may be intensified by *benshen*, but not by *ziji*.

- (10) *Keshi dianying benshen/*ziji que hai kanbudao.*
 but film SELF/SELF but still cannot.see
 [Already now you can see the posters all over the city]
 'But the movie itself is not yet on show.'

Benren is an intensifier that can only be used with NPs/DPs denoting human referents:

- (11) *Buzhang benren hui lai huanying women.*
 minister SELF will come welcome we
 'The minister himself will welcome us.'

The structure of adnominal intensification in these sentences is very similar to the English counterparts: in (9) *ziji* 'SELF' is adjoined to the NP/DP *buzhang* 'minister', thereby forming a complex constituent of the same syntactic category as *buzhang* 'minister' alone. What *ziji* contributes semantically is that peripheral alternative values to the focus value *buzhang* 'minister', e. g. his secretary, are taken into consideration, exactly as in the English translation. Many languages constrain the use of intensifiers to entities that figure highly on the animacy hierarchy. Such a constraint holds for Mandarin too:

- (12) *Zai lüzhou (*ziji) you zugou -de shui.*
 at oasis SELF exist enough -ATTR water
 'In the oasis (itself), there is enough water.'

PAN 1997: 12f claims that *ziji* does not conform to a general animacy restriction, contrary to what has just been stated. His collection of attested counterexamples covers different uses of *ziji*, with an arguably intensificational adnominal instance of *ziji* being present in only one case. This example, however, cannot be taken as a serious challenge to the claim of an animacy restriction for the focus referent of intensifying *ziji*:

- (13) *Zhongguo gongchan-dang hai neng kao shei?*
 China communist-party still can depend.on who
Yao chuangchao gongchan-dang -de weilai, kongpa ye zhi
 want create communist-party -ATTR future afraid also only
neng kao ta ziji.
 can rely.on it SELF
 'Who else can the Chinese communist party depend on? I'm afraid it can only depend on itself to create its future.'

In (13), the Communist Party can very plausibly be argued to be a metaphorically human referent. A formal piece of evidence in support of this analysis is provided by the question word *shei* 'who' in the question preceding the sentence containing *ziji*. *Shei*, as its English

counterpart, can only be used to ask for human referents. PAN's other examples, except for one sentence, all constitute attributive uses of *ziji* (expressed by adjectival *own* in English) which will be discussed below. His example involving a clearly reflexive use of *ziji*, though not an intensifying one, is also susceptible of a personificational analysis:

- (14) *Yueliang na wu-yun lai zhegai ziji.*
 moon take dark-cloud come cover SELF
 'The moon covered herself with dark clouds.'

In sum, PAN's alleged counterexamples cannot be taken as strong enough evidence to dismiss the animacy restriction for *ziji* in general, and for *ziji* as an adnominal intensifier, in particular. I will return to this issue in 4.

With the inanimate entity *lüzhou* 'oasis' intensification expressed by *ziji* 'SELF' is impossible (15a); but there is another element, namely *benshen*, which can fulfil the intensifying function for inanimate referents (15b).⁵

- (15a) *Lüzhou (*ziji) you zugou -de shui.*
 oasis SELF have enough -ATTR water
 'In the oasis (itself), there is enough water.'
- (15b) *Lüzhou benshen you zugou -de shui.*
 oasis SELF have enough -ATTR water
 'In the oasis itself, there is enough water.'

Ben originally means 'root', but it has a derived deictic use in compounds that locates the referent of the compound head in the deictic centre (cf. *ben-guo* 'root-country', i. e. 'this country, one's own country', *ben-hang* 'root-profession', i. e. 'this profession, one's own profession'). The difference between a *ben*-compound used for intensification and other *ben*-compounds used to indicate the deictic proximity of the compound head obviously involves a diachronic mapping process from the notion of deictic proximity of the head noun referent onto the notion of pragmatic centrality of the focus referent with respect to alternative values, but I have not investigated the time depth of this phenomenon. Thus *ben*-compounds used for intensification necessarily adjoin to focused elements, whereas deictic *ben*-compounds are neutral with respect to focus semantics. The compound head *-shen* originally means 'body', a very common source to develop into an element (co-)expressing intensification.

(16) shows that the cut-off point on the animacy hierarchy for the use of *ziji* is not centred around the feature [\pm HUMAN]. With animals that are conceptualized as animate, the use actually varies:

⁵ There is evidence pointing to a bigger difference between *ziji* and *benshen* in terms of syntax than can be seen from (15a/b). *Lüzhou* 'oasis' in (15a) is fine with the preposition *zai* 'at' preceding it, while (15b) would be ungrammatical with that preposition added. I will not investigate this matter any further here, but an account of these data would most probably dwell on different uses of the verb *you*, here glossed as 'have'. Intuitively, we are dealing with a possessive use of *you* at least in (15b); (15a) with *zai* 'at' seems to be an instance of existential *you* 'exist'.

- (16) *Zhe-jian shi gen gou ziji/benshen wu guan, shi zhuren-de cuowu ba!*
 DEM-CL affair with dog SELF/SELF not.have relation is owner-ATR fault PRT
 'This doesn't have anything to do with the dog itself, it's the owner's fault!'

The element *benren*, on the other hand, is confined to uses with human head nouns:

- (17) *Buzhang benren hui lai huanying women.*
 minister SELF will come welcome we
 'The minister himself will come to welcome us.'

- (18) *Zhe-jian shi gen gou (*benren) wu guan, shi zhuren-de cuowu ba!*
 DEM-CL affair with dog SELF not.have relation is owner-ATTR fault PRT
 'This doesn't have anything to do with the dog (itself), it's the owner's fault!'

This fact comes as no surprise if we consider the internal make-up of *benren*: *ren* as an independent word means 'person, man'.

In sum, the basic patterns of Mandarin adnominal intensifiers are very much like their English counterpart in terms of syntax. Semantically, more distinctions are made in Mandarin. In 2.3 the difference between *ziji* and the *ben*-compounds will be addressed again.

2.2. Adnominal intensification and quantification

Indefinite reference of NPs/DPs can crosslinguistically be shown to block intensification, cf. the ungrammaticality of **A politician himself is a liar* or **Ein Politiker selbst ist ein Lügner*. Quantified NPs/DPs like **five students themselves/*some students themselves/*all students themselves* are generally excluded, too. Definite plural referents are allowed, however: *The students themselves think they are lazy*. The generalization for Chinese is that any kind of syntactically projecting expression of quantification or determination is excluded, unless we are dealing with definite singular reference expressed by one of the two demonstrative words of Mandarin: *zhe* for proximal deixis, and *na* for distal deixis (19b). Affixation of the collectivizing definite plural suffix seems to be possible in at least some cases (19c). Note that this is not an exception to the generalization which excludes syntactically projecting plural markers from combining with intensified NPs, if we assume Ns with *-men* to have no internal syntactical structure.⁶ To my knowledge, *ziji* and *ben*-compounds behave exactly parallel in this respect, so I will only give the relevant data for *ziji*.

⁶ There is, however, a problem with *men*-plurals and intensification in Mandarin. My consultants do not agree entirely on the grammaticality of strings like (19c). I still refrain from giving *men*-plurals a special treatment here, since there are examples with clearly good *men*-plurals going along with an intensifier (I would like to thank ZHANG NING for pointing this out to me):

(i) I wanted to take the children out to go to some fun place, and their parents agreed, but ...

haizi-men ziji bu yuanyi qu.
 child-COLL SELF not want go
 '... the children themselves didn't want to go.'

So if there is something that rules out the string "N-*men* + intensifier" in some cases, we will search for this factor in the elements or the structure surrounding the string in question, but not within it.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(19a) <i>buzhang ziji.</i>
minister SELF
'the minister himself'</p> <p>(19b) <i>na-ge buzhang ziji</i>
DEM-CL minister SELF
'that minister himself'</p> <p>(19c) <i>buzhang-men ziji</i>
minister-COLL SELF
'the ministers themselves'</p> | <p>(20a) <i>*yi-ge buzhang ziji</i>
1-CL minister SELF
'*a minister himself'</p> <p>(20b) <i>*yi-xie buzhang ziji</i>
1-couple minister SELF
'*some ministers themselves'</p> <p>(20c) <i>*mei-ge buzhang ziji</i>
each-CL minister SELF
'*each minister himself'</p> |
|---|---|

However, the constraint banning projecting quantifiers does not prevent bare nouns with *ziji* from receiving an unequivocally plural interpretation in some cases, as long as it is definite; cf. (21), taken from PAN (1997: 202):

- (21) *Pinglun zhe-pian wenzhang -de hao-huai haishi liu gei duzhe ziji ba!*
evaluate this-CL article -ATTR good-bad better leave to reader SELF PRT
'(We'd) better leave it to the readers themselves to evaluate the quality of this paper.'

Here a singular reading for *duzhe* 'reader' is not available, an observation my consultants state unanimously. It is important to note in this context that bare nouns in Mandarin are not generally restricted to receiving a plural or singular definite interpretation. A wide variety of interpretations is in fact possible:

- (i) indefinite singular or plural reference / indefinite reference to a mass:
- (22) *Zhuozi -shang you shu.*
table -on exist book
'There are books / there is a book (/ "there is some amount of books") on the table.'
- (ii) definite singular or plural reference / definite reference to a mass / generic reference:
- (23) *Gou wo yijing kan-guo.* (LI & THOMPSON 1981: 86)
dog I already see-ASP
'I have already seen the dog(s).'
'I have already seen dogs before.'

A number of factors determines the interpretation in each case, with the relative position of the bare noun with regard to the verb probably being the most important one (for a recent account of this phenomenon cf. TSAI 1996). The conclusion, then, is that intensifiers restrict the possible interpretations of bare nouns to definite singular or plural reference, with indefinite reference and generic readings generally being excluded.

⁷ One of my consultants thinks (21) should be changed slightly to make it grammatical:

(21') *Pinglun zhe-pian wenzhang -de hao-huai-de renwu haishi liu gei duzhe ziji/benren ba!*
evaluate this -CL article -ATTR good-bad-ATTR task better leave to reader SELF/SELF PRT
'(We'd) better leave the task of evaluating the quality of this paper to the readers themselves.'

The additional headnoun in (21') does not alter the structure in any way that might be relevant here, so I will leave the matter of the grammaticality of (21) undecided. The reader is free to choose either of (21) or (21') as her preferred variant.

Returning to the question of how intensifiers interact with quantifiers and determiners in Mandarin, it seems safe to say that *ziji* and *benren* adjoin to the highest projection within the syntactic realization of the argument. Within a DP approach it is a matter of debate whether bare nouns in Mandarin are actually embedded in a phonologically empty determiner structure (with more empty functional categories like a classifier phrase and a numeral phrase intervening), or whether bare nouns can receive a referential interpretation without being embedded in a DP at least in some cases in some languages (cf. CHIERCHIA 1997 who assumes such a situation to hold for Mandarin "generalized bare arguments"). I will assume that the different quantificational and determinational readings of bare nouns in Mandarin are the result of vagueness and not of structural ambiguity. The level where the vagueness disappears is surely above the NP/DP level within the syntactical structure, and possibly the mapping of a nominal concept expressed by a bare noun in Mandarin onto a referential type is not a matter of structural configuration alone.

2.3. Adnominal intensifiers and thematic relations

In the discussion on the selectional restrictions governing the use of adnominal intensifiers, we have only referred to ontological categories so far: the focus referent of *ziji*'s head noun conforms to an animacy constraint, *benren* combines with nouns denoting humans, and *benshen* can be used to intensify nouns denoting inanimate referents. There are basically two sets of data that make thematic relations appear more relevant for the treatment of *ben*-compounds. First consider the minimal pairs in (24)–(25) (examples adapted from PAN 1997: 203):

- | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------------------------------|----------------|------------|------------|---------------|----------------|
| (24a) | Laowang | <i>ziji</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>-le</i> | <i>Lisi</i> | <i>yixiar.</i> |
| | Laowang | SELF | hit | -ASP | Lisi | once |
| | 'Laowang himself hit Lisi once.' | | | | | |
| (24b) | *Laowang | <i>benshen</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>-le</i> | <i>Lisi</i> | <i>yixiar.</i> |
| | Laowang | SELF | hit | -ASP | Lisi | once |
| | 'Laowang himself hit Lisi once.' | | | | | |
| (25a) | Laowang | <i>ziji</i> | <i>jiu</i> | <i>you</i> | <i>wenti.</i> | |
| | Laowang | SELF | PRT | have | problem | |
| | 'Laowang himself has problems.' | | | | | |
| (25b) | ?Laowang | <i>benshen</i> | <i>jiu</i> | <i>you</i> | <i>wenti.</i> | |
| | Laowang | SELF | PRT | have | problem | |
| | 'Laowang himself has problems.' | | | | | |

While *benshen*, the intensifier introduced before as combining with NPs/DPs denoting inanimate referents, cannot be used with the subject of a clearly agentive verb (*da* 'to hit', (24b)), it is not really bad when used with the human subject of a stative predicate like *you* *wenti* 'have problems' (25b).⁸ If only the ontological status of the referent were criterial, we

⁸ This is not to say that the questionable status of (25b) is ignored. The crucial point is that the difference in grammaticality judgements between (24a/b) and (25a/b) was easily reproducible with all the native speakers I have consulted. I have not investigated the reasons for the marginal status of (25b), though.

would not be able to explain the differences in grammaticality between (24a) and (24b) as opposed to (25a) and (25b), since Laowang is clearly a human being in all cases. At least for *benshen* it seems necessary to resort to a constraint that is grounded in thematic roles. The constraint seems to be that *benshen* only combines with UNDERGOERS.⁹

The examples in (26)–(28) present another puzzling contrast concerning a difference between a *ben*-compound and *ziji*. (26) is a rather complex relevant example taken from PAN 1997: 202 (cf. footnote 7), but it has the advantage of being attested; (27) and (28) are made-up:

- (26) *Pinglun zhe -pian wenzhang -de hao-huai haishi liu gei duzhe*
 evaluate this -CL article -ATTR good-bad better leave to reader
*ziji/*benren ba!*
 SELF/SELF PRT
 '(We'd) better leave it to the readers themselves to evaluate the quality of this paper.'
- (27) Yesterday the kitchen of this restaurant was examined by the local authorities. It turned out that the kitchen equipment was intolerably dirty, but ...
 ... *chushizhang ziji/*benren chuanzhe feichang ganjing-de yifu.*
 ... chef SELF/SELF wear extremely clean-ATTR clothes
 '... the chef himself was wearing very clean clothes.'
- (28) All the other cooks were wearing dirty clothes, but ...
 ... *chushizhang ziji/benren chuanzhe feichang ganjing-de yifu.*
 ... chef SELF/SELF wear extremely clean-ATTR clothes
 '... the chef himself was wearing very clean clothes.'

Let us look at the simpler cases in (27) and (28) first. In (27), *ziji* is fine, while *benren* is bad. (28), although the clause we are concerned with is identical with its counterpart in (27), allows either of *ziji* or *benren*. The only possible conclusion is that we are dealing with two different extra-sentential contexts, one of them excluding *benren*, one of them allowing it. *Ziji* behaves neutral with respect to this factor. What, then, is this factor? One hypothesis might be that *benren* limits the alternative values of the focus referent to humans. This might appear plausible, particularly when we recall that *-ren*, the head of the compound *ben-ren*, means 'person, man'. Since the kitchen equipment is not human, this would explain why *benren* may not be used. Another line of reasoning might lead us to assume that *benren* only contrasts the focus value with other values that could figure in the same role in the same kind of situation as is encoded by the open sentence: thus other cooks are good alternatives to a chef with respect to wearing clean clothes (28), but kitchen equipment cannot be thought of as being a possible alternative value, simply because ovens and pots do not wear anything (27). (26), despite its complex structure, helps us to decide in favour of the second hypothesis, or at least it clearly rules out the first possibility: (26) with *benren* is bad, although the alternative values of the focus value 'readers' are humans too. But how can our putative con-

⁹ I am adopting the terminology established by FOLEY & VAN VALIN 1984. The concepts of ACTOR and UNDERGOER make it possible to refer to agent-like roles and to patient-like roles, respectively, with a single cover term each.

straint be applied to (26) so that it rules out *benren*? First note that the main verb of (26), *liu* (*gei*) 'leave (to)', selects the focused readers as a goal argument. The thing that is to be left to the readers is „[the task] to evaluate the quality of this paper” (*pinglun zhe-pian wen-zhang-de haohuai*). The whole sentence is a polite request with a covert addressee. The adverb *haishi* 'better, or ... rather' makes it unequivocally clear that a competing proposal is part of the common ground, most probably an evaluative statement concerning the article in question, uttered by a person who is not a common reader. So the possible class of addressees of (26) comprises everyone who has to do with articles and reading them, except the common readers; i. e. professional writers, publishers, or critics. So professional writers, publishers and critics are possible addressees of (26), and also possible ACTORS of leaving a task to the common readers. Now the reason for the blocking of *benren* becomes perceivable: the inherent other-directedness of *liu* (*gei*) 'leave (to)' makes the addressees and subject professionals of (26) be bad alternative values in opposition to the readers, because the task transfer or authority transfer expressed by the verb must not have identical referents for the source and the goal. Thus *benren* is not good in (26), because the possible alternative values of the goal referents already have their role in the event: they are the sources or the ACTORS, and the action they perform cannot be directed toward themselves. *Ziji*'s requirements are looser: it does not presuppose that the alternative values of the focus value should be possible participants in the same role of the same situation, it is sufficient if the alternatives are peripheral with respect to the focus value in some relevant centre-periphery relation. In this case the centre-periphery relation is established between the (central) readers who are considered naturally apt to criticize the article and the (peripheral) professionals, who are readers only in the second place, but professionals making the article available for reading in the first.

If this generalization can be kept up against the background of more data – and it is definitely in need of further support –, the difference between *ziji* and *benren* in Mandarin would instantiate a functional split in the expression of intensification that has not been observed so far.

3. Adverbial intensifiers

3.1. Centrality in a situation

(29) illustrates the adverbial use of *ziji*:

- (29) A: *Could you do my washing for me?*
 B: *Ni weishenme bu ziji/*benren xi ne?*
 you why not SELF/SELF wash PRT
 B: 'Why don't you do your washing yourself?'

Ziji can be used as an adverbial intensifier, while *ben*-compounds do not have such a use. In the adverbial use alternative agents or experiencers are the alternative values for the asserted value; in (29) B is the alternative agent of washing A's clothes. A's centrality that makes the use of *ziji* felicitous in this case is given by the relation of possession holding between A and his clothes: with respect to the clothes to be washed A is more central than B, because the dirty laundry is A's, and not B's.

(30) and (31) demonstrate that, in accordance with crosslinguistic observations and theoretical predictions, the responsibility of the focus referent for the denoted overall situation allows for predicates of intended perception as in (30), but not for stative verbs as in (31):

- (30) *Wo zuotian ziji kan -le nei -bu dianying.*
 I yesterday SELF see -ASP DEM -CL movie
 'Yesterday I saw that movie myself.'
- (31) *Laowang zuotian (*ziji) you wenti.*
 Laowang yesterday SELF have problem
 'Yesterday Laowang had problems (*by himself).'

3.2 Possible delegation

Mandarin has a special adverbial intensifier indicating that the referent had the option to delegate the action expressed by the sentence in which the intensifier is used, but he or she has not made use of this option. This element is *qinzi*, as illustrated by (32). With this in mind, consider the contrast in (33), a sentence a mother might say to her elder child.

- (32) *Ni kan, ta ziji/qinzi ca -le diban.*
 you see (s)he SELF/SELF wipe -ASP floor
 'Look, (s)he wiped the floor himself/herself!'
- (33) *Ni kan, xiao didi ziji/*qinzi chi -le wanfan.*
 you see little younger.brother SELF/SELF eat -ASP supper
 'Look, your little brother has eaten supper himself!'

Ziji is possible in (33), since the little brother, in obvious contrast to his sibling, has eaten without help. The little brother's centrality is given by the very fact that he has eaten without help, thereby not taking advantage of the assistance he might possibly have received from his mother, who is the peripheral referent. The ungrammaticality of *qinzi*, on the other hand, arises from the fact that one cannot delegate the act of eating: either one eats oneself, or one does not eat at all. Another closely related analysis would state a requirement of inherent authority holding for the agent, if *qinzi* is to be used. Something along these lines seems to be the case with *personally* in English. Under this analysis the impossibility of *qinzi* in (33) would follow from the lack of inherent authority of small children. Since the possibility of delegating an action is tightly intertwined with the notion of authority, I find it difficult to decide which notion is more basic. In the light of examples like (35) and (36) to be discussed below, I will stick to the notion of possible delegation.

The requirement of possible delegation of the denoted action that holds for *qinzi* is also relevant when a predicate of intended perception as in (34a) is used:

- (34a) *Laowang zuotian qinzi kan -le nei -bu dianying.*
 Laowang yesterday SELF see -ASP DEM -CL movie.
 'Laowang saw that film himself yesterday.'

- (34b) *Laowang huran (*qinzi) kanjian -le Laozhang.*
 Laowang suddenly SELF see -ASP Laozhang
 'Laowang suddenly saw Laozhang (*himself [\neq too]).'

Although it seems less usual to delegate perception, *qinzi* may be used in (34a). This can be accounted for if we assume that, in the case of (34a), the alternative for Laowang would have been to make somebody else go and see the movie in order for this person to report to Laowang what she has seen. This line of thought is supported by (34b): the sentence makes clear that Laowang just happened to see Laozhang without having looked for him. This kind of nonvolitional, unintended perception cannot be delegated, and thus *qinzi* may not be used in (34b). It may be noted that the meaning component of possible delegation invites rank or politeness inferences in many cases.

- (35) *Ta zuotian qinzi xie -le nei -feng xin.*
 (s)he yesterday SELF write -ASP DEM -CL letter
 '(S)He wrote the letter himself/herself yesterday.'
- (36) *Zhe -ge dangao shi wo qinzi gei ni zuo -de.*
 DEM -CL cake is I SELF for you make -ATTR
 'I baked this cake for you myself.'

The fact that common people usually do not have the option to delegate the writing of letters invites the inference that the referent of *ta*- '(s)he' in (35) is a person of high rank who could rely on a secretary to write his or her letters, but who actually chose not to do so in the case at hand. The use of *qinzi* in (36) expresses esteem for the beneficiary, who is also the addressee: since I could have bought a cake in a bakery, my baking of the cake is an indicator of my respect for the addressee/beneficiary.

3.3. Incorporated instruments

For another range of distinctions that has been lexicalized in the domain of Mandarin adverbial intensification, now consider (37) and (38):

- (37) *Wo zongshi ziji/qinshou ba xin dakai.*
 I always SELF/SELF BA letter open
 'I always open letters myself.'
- (38) *Nei -wei mingxing bing mei you qinshou/qinbi xie ta-de zizhuan.*
 DEM -CL star CN not have SELF/SELF write he-ATTR autobiography
 'The movie star did not write his autobiography himself.'

(37) and (38) illustrate the fact that in special contexts very specific adverbial intensifiers may be used: Instead of choosing the unspecific adverbial option *ziji*, speakers uttering (37) may just as well use the word *qinshou*, the second syllable of which, *-shou*, means 'hand'. So (37) translates as *I always open letters with my own hands* into English, with the proviso added that this English translation does not render the word form *qinshou* with an element

of the same internal make-up as its Mandarin counterpart, since *with my own hands* is a PP, and not a word. In (38), *qinshou* '(with one's) own hands' is supplemented by another option *qinbi* meaning '(in one's) own hand-writing' (*bi* 'brush/writing implement').

Since the full range of possible intensifying adverbial expressions that are specialized in a similar way can be given in a short list (see below), we can conclude that these forms are underived lexical items, though with a transparent internal make-up. Any attempt to extend this pattern to further obvious candidates results in ungrammaticality or the creation of impossible words: **qinzu* or **qinjiao*, e. g., with *zu* and *jiao* both meaning 'foot' cannot be used to modify the verb *ti*- 'to kick', and **qinzu* and **qinjiao* are not even possible words in Mandarin.

The full list of specialized adverbial intensifiers is given in (39a-e), with one example accompanying each compound that has not been mentioned before. (40) is a sentence showing that even with existing compounds the productive use departing from conventionalized adverb-predicate pairings is impossible.

(39a) *qinshou* '(with one's) own hands'

(39b) *qinbi* '(in one's) own hand-writing'

(39c) *qinkou* '(spoken with one's) own mouth'

Zhe shi ta qinkou shuo -de!
DEM is (s)he with.own.mouth say -ATTR
'That's what (s)he said herself/himself!'

(39d) *qinyan* '(with one's) own eyes'

Wo qinyan kandao -le na-ge chehuo
I with.own.eyes see -ASP DEM-CL accident
'I saw that accident with my own eyes.'

(39e) *qiner* '(heard with one's) own ears'

Wo qiner tingjian ta shuo ni-de huai hua.
I with.own.ear hear (s)he say you-ATTR bad speech
'I heard him/her telling bad things about you with my own ears.'

(40) *Wo (*qinkou) ba nei-zhang zhi chui-zou-le.*

I with.own.mouth BA DEM-CL paper blow-away-ASP/PRT
'I blew the sheet of paper away (with my own mouth).'

Adverbial-inclusive uses of intensifiers as in *Sorry, I can't give you any money; I'm broke myself* do not exist in Mandarin. A near-equivalent is expressed by a combination of adnominal *ziji* with adverbial *ye* 'also':

(41) A: Could you lend me ten pounds?

B: *Bao-qian, wo ziji ye mei you qian.*
sorry I SELF also not have money
'I am sorry, but I myself don't have money either.'

For a detailed account of adverbial-inclusive intensification and the difference with regard to adnominal intensification + *also/too/either* cf. SIEMUND 1997, ch. 7.

4. Possessive intensifiers and inalienability

English, together with other Indo-European languages, has a special lexeme for the possessive case of intensification as in *I have a key of my own/I have my own key*. The form *own* has no parallel in Mandarin.

- (42) *Wo you wo ziji -de yaoshi.*
 I have I SELF -ATTR key
 'I have a key of my own/my own key.'

Ziji as the most common intensifier can be used in contexts where *own* is used in English. The enclitic form *-de* glossed as 'ATTR' serves to make words and phrases of great formal diversity available as prenominal attributive expressions. Thus it is not surprising that the possessive form of the intensifier is not suppletive in Mandarin since the device that derives attributive expressions is so productive and suppletion is entirely untypical of Mandarin as an isolating language. But the lack of suppletion does not exclude the existence of an optional more specialized form as in (43b):

- (43a) *Tamen shi ni ziji *(-de) haizi ma?*
 they are you SELF -ATTR child PRT
 'Are these your own children?'
- (43b) *Tamen shi ni -de qinsheng haizi ma?*
 they are you -ATTR 1st.grade.related child PRT
 'Are these your own children?'

The alternative to *ziji* given in (43b) is only applicable to first-grade blood relations. So parents have their *qinsheng haizi*, and children have their *qinsheng fumu* with *haizi* meaning 'children' and *fumu* meaning 'parents'; but there is no such thing as a **qinsheng ayi* (*ayi* 'aunt').

A second optional and very specialized expression denoting possessive intensification is *qinshen* 'own-body'. It may be used to modify either the word *jingli* 'experience' or the word *ganshou* 'feelings'.

- (44) *Na shi wo-de qinshen jingli/ganshou.*
 DEM IS I-ATTR own experience/feelings
 'That is my own experience./These are my own feelings.'

Qinshen serves an obvious intensifying function: It is often the case that we want to contrast the first-hand quality of our experience or feelings with competing second-hand evidence presented by others. Thus having special lexemes for these cases of possessive intensification alongside of the emphasis of first-grade blood relations conveyed by *qinsheng* is motivated functionally in itself. But, what is more, the two specialized expressions of pos-

sessive intensification *qinsheng* and *qinshen* cover a non-arbitrary conceptual domain: both clearly involve possessed items that belong to central types of inalienable possession.¹⁰ The typical syntax going along with the variants of possessive intensifiers allows some non-trivial and non-circular generalization concerning iconicity: *Qinshen* and *qinsheng* tend to be adjoined to their head nouns without *-de*, the clitic deriving attributive expressions, intervening: the conceptual closeness of possessor and possessum in the inalienable possession type is reflected by the preferably unmediated adjoining of *qinshen* and *qinsheng* to their respective head nouns. *Ziji*, on the other hand, cannot combine with the possessum noun without *-de*: here the underspecification of the alienability type of the possessum goes along with an obligatory *-de* clitic (cf. (43a)). Note that this explanation is non-circular since the category of inalienable possession is established independently by the fact that there exist two distinct lexemes to express this type of possession. So the generalization does not just rest on the syntactic facts alone.

As was mentioned above, PAN (1997) claims that animacy of the focus referent is not criterial for the use of *ziji*. PAN's case of adnominal intensification could be shown to involve personification. Perhaps the same can be done for his possessive examples (PAN 1997: 12):¹¹

- (45) *Dan jian yi-dao jinqiao-de bai-shi gong-qiao zai jinzhi-de*
 but see 1-CL beautiful-ATTR white-stone arch-bridge at still-ATTR
shui-miao-shang tou-xia ziji-de dao-ying.
 water-surface-on throw-down SELF-ATTR reverse-shape
 'Suddenly I saw a beautiful white stone arch-bridge throwing its own mirror image on the water.'
- (46) *Mei yi-ge gongyuan dou you ziji-de dongtian.*
 each 1-CL park all have SELF-ATTR winter
 'Each park has its own winter.'
- (47) *Guanggaopai wei bieren zhengde liyi, rongyu, que xisheng ziji-de shenqu.*
 billboard for others earn benefit fame but sacrifice SELF-ATTR body
 'Billboards earn benefits and reputation for others, but sacrifice their own bodies.'

¹⁰ "Experience" and "feelings" are less prototypical with regard to inalienability than kinship terms, and one might ask why body parts do not seem to play a role in the triggering of specialized possessive intensifiers. However, the collection of papers in CHAPPELL & MCGREGOR (eds. 1996) shows that statements of universals of (in)alienability referring to the ontological classes of the possessed items are usually empirically inadequate. Therefore the possibility that Mandarin should group first-grade blood relations and an "experience/feelings" class, and only these two, together, cannot be excluded on independent grounds. Furthermore, the discussion of specialized adverbial intensifiers *did* make reference to certain body parts (cf. 3.3). A simple reasoning to account for this split in the expression of inalienability would be to say that bodyparts often figure as instruments with a peripheral status in situations and propositions, so they are lexicalized as adverb(ial)s. Kinship relations, by virtue of involving human beings, have possessors with argument status, so specialized possessive intensifiers are like adnominal modifiers, and not like adverb(ial)s. The cross-categorical intensification marker of inalienability seems to be *qin-*.

¹¹ It is not quite clear to me whether all of the following examples may plausibly be analyzed as involving intensification. It might well be necessary to rely on a purely syntactic account of anaphoric binding in the spirit of Generative Grammar to account for cases like (46) (cf. e. g. the papers in KOSTER & REULAND 1991, and, for Mandarin in particular, HUANG & TANG 1991 and HUANG & LIU 1997).

The use of *gongqiao* 'bridge' in (45) is clearly an instance of personification because the subject is the agent argument of *tou-xia* 'throw down'. (The degree to which this personificational metaphor has been conventionalized in the context of 'shadow-throwing' may be a matter of debate, but it remains a metaphor as long as we do not wish to assume that there are two homophonous *tou* 'throw' verbs, one of them agentive, the other one non-agentive.) The billboard in (47) has several clearly human attributes: it earns benefits and reputation, it sacrifices itself, and it has a body, so the case seems to be clear. The case of parks each having their own winters is not as striking (46), but at least it allows a metaphorical interpretation involving personification. It is also possible, however, to interpret these data, and especially the case in (46), as evidence for a neutralization of the animacy requirement usually holding for referents in the case of possessive *ziji*. I will leave this matter for future research.

5. Intensification and reflexivity

With the exception of PAN 1997, the discussion of *ziji* within the generative framework centres entirely around its use as a reflexive pronoun. It is uncontroversial that *ziji* allows long-distance binding, i. e. that *ziji* as an anaphor may find its antecedent outside the minimal domain it is contained in: This effect is shown in (48):

- (48) Ta_i *zhidao* $Laowang_j$ *bu* *xihuan* $ziji_{i\bar{j}}$
 (s)he know Laowang not like SELF
 'She knows that Laowang does not like her/himself.'

Mandarin shares this property with many other languages, among them languages as unrelated as Turkic languages, Scandinavian languages and Caucasian languages. It has never been claimed, and it does not seem to be plausible, to entirely reduce *ziji*'s reflexive use to its intensifying function. There are, however, sets of data that are usually discussed under the heading of anaphoric binding which should be investigated in the light of focus semantics and intensification. In particular, the 'complex form of the anaphor', i. e. *ta ziji* '(s)he SELF', is open to such a reconsideration. Following PICA 1985, it is generally held that *ta ziji* as a complex anaphor must be locally bound. PAN points out that *ta ziji* is usually interpreted as evoking alternatives, and that it is only under very specific semantic and configurational conditions that *ta ziji* may be interpreted as a mere anaphor without expressing intensification (PAN 1997: 18). (49) is an example in which these conditions are not met and in which, according to the generalisation that complex anaphors must be locally bound, only local (clause-mate) binding should be possible. This prediction is not borne out in (49).

- (49) Ta_i *zhidao* $Laowang_j$ *bu* *xihuan* [ta $ziji_{i\bar{j}}$]
 (s)he know Laowang not like (s)he SELF
 'She_i knows that Laowang_j does not like herself_i/himself_j.'

(49) does allow for an interpretation in which the matrix subject and *ta ziji* corefer. Thus the strict locality constraint that is usually assumed to hold for the 'complex anaphor' might, in the contexts in which it seems to be active, actually turn out to be an essentially by-product of the intensifying semantics of *ziji* in (49). PAN 1997 has shown that the locality con-

straint of *ta ziji* does not hold generally, and this is to be expected if we are dealing with an essentially pragmatic category.

Another important semantic concept that needs to be taken into account is logophoricity and matters of perspective-taking. HUANG & LIU 1997 have developed an analysis of long-distance binding effects in purely logophoric terms for Mandarin, and it should be tested whether this analysis may be subsumed under a more general analysis of intensification.

The literature, again with the exception of PAN 1997, does not mention the uses of *ben*-compounds that translate as anaphors into English. It should be of great interest to investigate the question whether these uses have an information structural side to them or whether they may be used as non-contrastive anaphors like *ziji*. It would be particularly interesting to search for reflexes of their special behaviour as intensifiers in their (probably) historically derived use as anaphors. A last function of *ben*-compounds mentioned by PAN 1997, ch. 7, which awaits to be accounted for within a comprehensive study of Mandarin reflexivity and intensification is their non-reflexive bound-variable use that translates as *the respective person/thing* and the like into English.

With this interlacing of polysemy, vagueness and homonymy in the area of Mandarin reflexivity, intensification and variable binding in mind, it would seem a dubious enterprise to try to account for any of these areas without at least mentioning the others. Yet I will not attempt to give a more comprehensive survey of these phenomena in this paper.

6. Summary and outlook

Tables 1 through 3 give an overview of the whole range of intensifying expressions in Mandarin that have been treated in this paper. The relevant constraints are assembled in the top half of each table, the intensifier lexemes are given in italics in the lower half. To ensure readability, the investigated domain has been split up into three distinct tables. It is in principle possible, though, to state all relevant facts in a single table. So the cost of readability is the fact that the identity of constraint types governing the different uses is slightly obscured. The numbers in most constraint boxes refer to the relevant examples in the present paper.

Wrapping up our findings concerning the expression of intensification in Mandarin, we can say that intensification in Mandarin generally follows the same principles as comparable elements in other languages, especially with regard to their adjunct syntax. Some relevant semantic restrictions, among them the requirements of animacy and humanness of the relevant referent with most intensifiers, and the blocking of most varieties of overt quantification, are instances of crosslinguistically relevant phenomena. The absence of an adverbial-inclusive use of intensifiers similar in meaning to *also* is no surprise, since all the languages that could be shown to allow such a use up to now are European languages.

The restriction disallowing adnominal *benren* in contexts in which the peripheral referents cannot be thought of as having the same role as the focus referent seems to be rather language-specific. (Its areal relevance should be checked, however, to avoid a typological bias towards European languages.) Likewise, the lexical splits that go along with the expression of certain sub-types of inalienable possession are a peculiarity of Mandarin that still await to be equated with similar phenomena in other languages; even more so, since Mandarin is not a language in which inalienability is a key concept of lexical or grammatical categorization. The array of adverbial intensifiers referring to particular instruments or organs involved in actions is not without precedence, but the degree to which these expressive means

Adnominal Intensifiers			
Constraints	CENTRALITY	Focus referent: CENTRE Alternative referent(s): PERIPHERY	
	TYPE OF PERIPHERY	UNSPECIFIED	alternative referents are possible participants in the same role as the focus (26)–(28)
	ANIMACY	UNSPECIFIED (15b), (16), (25b)	ANIMATE (10) HUMAN (18)
	THEMATIC ROLE	UNDERGOER (24)	UNSPECIFIED (9), (16), (21)
Expressions		<i>benshen</i>	<i>ziji</i> <i>benren</i>

Table 1: Adnominal intensifiers in Mandarin

Adverbial Intensifiers			
Constraints	CENTRALITY	Focus referent: CENTRAL in the overall situation Alternative referent(s): PERIPHERY	
	THEMATIC ROLE	ACTOR	
	ANIMACY	HUMAN	ANIMATE
	POSSIBLE DELEGATION	DELEGATION POSSIBLE (32), (33)	UNSPECIFIED (32), (33)
Expressions		<i>qinzi</i> hand/use of the hand(s) <i>qinshou</i> brush/hand-writing <i>qinbi</i> <i>ziji</i> mouth/speech production <i>qinkou</i> eye/visual perception <i>qinyan</i> ear/acoustic perception <i>qiner</i>	

Table 2: Adverbial intensifiers in Mandarin

Possessive Intensifiers			
Constraints	CENTRALITY	CENTRALITY of FOCUSED POSSESSOR	
	ANIMACY	HUMAN POSSESSOR	UNSPECIFIED? ANIMATE? (45), (46), (47)
	INALIENABILITY	EXPERIENCE/ FEELING (44)	KINSHIP (1st grade) (43b) UNSPECIFIED (42), (43a)
Expressions		<i>qinshen(-de)</i>	<i>qinsheng(-de)</i> <i>ziji-de</i>

Table 3: Possessive intensifiers in Mandarin

have been lexicalized is rather outstanding. Finally, the large area of overlap between intensification, reflexivity and certain kinds of variable-binding in Mandarin not only persists as a challenge to general theories of information structure and reference-tracking, but it awaits a purely descriptive coverage in the first place.

References

- BAKER, C. L. (1995): Contrast, discourse prominence, and intensification, with special reference to locally free reflexives in British English, in: *Language* 71, 63–101.
- CHAPPELL, HILARY & WILLIAM MCGREGOR (eds.) (1996): *The Grammar of Inalienability. A Typological Perspective on Body Part Terms and the Part-Whole Relation*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- CHENG, LISA LAI-SHEN (1997): *Possessor NPs*. Paper presented at the Workshop on sentence structure and information structure in Mandarin Chinese at ZAS, April 7, 1997. Berlin.
- CHIERCHIA, GENNARO (1997): *NP structure and Semantic Variation*. Paper presented at the LSA Workshop on Semantic Variation, July 1997. Cornell University, Ithaca.
- FOLEY, WILLIAM A. & ROBERT D. VAN VALIN, JR. (1984): *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- HUANG, C.-T. JAMES & C.-C. JANE TANG (1991): The local nature of the long-distance reflexive in Chinese, in: JAN KOSTER & ERIC REULAND (eds.), *Long-distance anaphora*. Cambridge New York: Cambridge University Press, 263–282.
- HUANG, C.-T. JAMES & C.-S. LUTHER LIU (1997): *Anaphoricity and Logophoricity in Mandarin Chinese*. Paper presented at the Long-distance Reflexives Workshop, July 5–6 1997, Cornell University.
- KÖNIG, EKKEHARD (1991): *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A Comparative Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- KÖNIG, EKKEHARD & PETER SIEMUND (1996a). *Emphatische Reflexiva und Fokusstruktur*, in: INGER ROSENGREN (ed.), *Sprache und Pragmatik* 40. Lund: Lunds Universitet.
- (1996b): *Selbst-Reflexionen*, in: GISELA HARRAS & MANFRED BIERWISCH (eds.), *Wenn die Semantik arbeitet. Festschrift für Klaus Baumgärtner*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 277–302.
- (1996c). On the development of reflexive pronouns in English: A case study in grammaticalization, in: UWE BÖKER & HANS SAUER (eds.), *Anglistentag 1996 Dresden. Proceedings*, Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 95–108.
- LI, AUDREY (1996): *A Number Projection*. Ms. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- LI, CHARLES N. & SANDRA THOMPSON (1981): *Mandarin Chinese. A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- PAN, HAIHUA (1997). *Constraints on Reflexivization in Mandarin Chinese*. New York/London: Garland.
- PICA, PIERRE (1985). Subject, Tense and Truth: Towards a Modular Approach to Binding, in: JACQUELINE GUÉRON, HANS-GEORG OBENAUER & J.-Y. POLLOCK (eds.), *Grammatical Representation*, Dordrecht: Foris, 259–291.
- SIEMUND, PETER (1997): *Intensifiers: A Comparison of English and German*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Berlin: Freie Universität.
- TSAL, WEI-TIAN DYLAN (1996): *Subject specificity, raising modals and extended mapping hypothesis*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Referential Properties of Chinese Noun Phrases. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong.

DANIEL HOLE
Institut für Englische Philologie
Freie Universität Berlin
Goßlerstraße 2–4
14195 Berlin
hole@zedat.fu-berlin.de