## On Invariant Prominence

## J. Howell

It is uncontroversial that languages have linguistic units which exist solely to signal prominence: e.g. pitch accents or discourse particles. In this talk, we consider whether a language may have a linguistic unit which exists solely to *be* prominent.

Our focus is a construction called the adnominal emphatic reflexive (e.g. himself in the DP he himself). We reject the claim by an increasing number of scholars (e.g. Eckardt 2001, Hole 2002, Gast 2006, Constantinou 2014) that the adnominal emphatic reflexive (henceforth AER) in English and related languages is invariably focused.

Drawing on contrasts like the Associate Provost and the Provost himself in (1), these authors propose that what himself contributes semantically is an identity function; it is invariantly focused in order to evoke a set of (ranked) discourse alternatives (e.g. {Associate Provost, Deans, Chairs, ...}; and it always has prosodic prominence. We formalize their semantics in the ~ notation of Rooth (1992).

- (1) The Provost himSELF will chair the committee, not just the Associate Provost.
- (2) [the Provost [himself]<sub>F</sub> will chair the committee ]  $\sim$  ]

We present empirical evidence from 235 naturally-occurring examples and laboratory-elicited examples from more than 30 speakers. In addition to cases like (1), English speakers need not place sentence focus on AER *himself* and, under the appropriate discourse context, English speakers may place sentence focus on any part of an utterance containing AER *himself*. Focus is in most cases realized with a nuclear pitch accent; in Figure 1 this is schematized for several focus configurations with a topline F0 contour.

Following König (1991), Siemund (2000) and Bergeton (2004), we instead analyze the AER as a focus-sensitive operator with DP-scope. Alternatives of the operator are ranked according to a contextually-salient ordering relation; this is the pragmatic contribution of the AER. In addition, we allow that a second focus operator at the clause level may associate with a focus on the AER: this gives us the reading which Eckardt and others wish to capture (cf. 3,4).

- (3) [ [ the Provost ] $_{F1} \sim 1$  ] [himself] $_{F2}$  will chair the committee]  $\sim 2$
- (4) a.  $[[himself(x)]]^f = [[\lambda x_e.[x=x]]]^f = {\lambda x_e.[x=x]} | u \in D < ee >$

the set of functions from x to other individuals

b.  $[[himself(the Provost)]]^{f,g} = \{Assistant-to(the Provost),\}$ 

NOMINEE-OF(the Provost), WIFE-OF(the Provost) etc.}

## References

Bergeton, Uffe. 2004. The Independence of Binding and Intensification: Volume 1. PhD Dissertation: USC.

Constantinou, H. (2014). Intensifiers: Meaning and Distribution. PhD Dissertation: UCL.

Eckardt, Regine. 2001. Reanalyzing 'selbst'. Natural Language Semantics 9.

Gast, Volker. 2006. The Grammar of Identity: Intensifiers and Reflexives in Germanic Languages. Routledge: Florence, KY, USA.

Hole, Daniel. 2002. Agentive selbst in German. In: Katz, G., Reinhard, S. & Reuter, P., eds. Sinn und Bedeutung 6.

König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The Meaning of Focus Particles: A Comparative Perspective*. London: Routledge.

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75-116.

Siemund, Peter. 2000. Intensifiers in English and German: A Comparison. Routledge: NY.

Figure 1

