

DANIEL HOLE

Spell-bound? Accounting for unpredictable *self*-forms in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter stories

Abstract: This paper propagates a twofold approach to unpredictable *self*-forms in argument positions. Partly adopting results arrived at by Baker (1995) and König and Siemund (2000), I argue that these forms should be analyzed as pronominals combining with the identity function. While the semantic contribution of the identity function amounts to nil, there are various semantico-pragmatic functions that may be fulfilled by it. These functions include: the encoding of a perspectivizing/logophoric function, the encoding of adnominal intensification, the favouring of an otherwise disfavoured anaphoric relation, and the exclusion of certain restricted readings in quantificational structures. Moreover a phonological factor disavouring the use of unpredictable *self*-forms is identified: *self*-forms tend not to occur at the right boundary of neutral intonation phrases. All arguments are illustrated with attested data, the bulk of them from J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter stories (vol. I-IV).

1. Introduction

Self-forms as in (1) have been a problem in English linguistics for many years now.¹

- (1) a. *Rumours were flying from student to student like highly contagious germs: who was going to try for Hogwarts champion, what the Tournament would involve, how the students from Beauxbatons differed from themselves.* (HP4:208)
- b. *Remember F. X. Toole? His story about a boxing cut-man was one of four first-times-in-print last spring. [...] As for himself, Toole drove up from Hermosa Beach recently to visit the Bay Area with his son.* (WWW²)
- c. *This was exactly what Harry had been hoping for. He slipped his wand back into his robes, waited until Cedric's friends had disappeared into their classroom, and hurried up the corridor, which was now empty of everyone except himself and Cedric.* (HP4:298)
- d. *Even Muggles like yourself should be celebrating, this happy, happy day!*

* The financial support from the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (Ko 497/5) is gratefully acknowledged. I would also like to thank Insa Gülzow, Ekkehard König, Peter Siemund, and especially Volker Gast, for discussing various parts of this paper with me. Indira Ghose and Ruth Wishart have helped me to correct the Appendix. The usual disclaimer applies.

¹ Corpus examples are used whenever possible. The Harry Potter stories as a main source of data were chosen for several reasons. This single-author corpus is fairly large; this allows for comparisons of parallel examples without having to take into account differences in style. The corpus is, on the whole, not very elaborate in style; this underpins the relevance of the observed phenomena in ordinary prose. And, of course, Harry Potter is fun.

² Source: <http://www.webdelsol.com/ZYZZYVA/sp00.note.htm>; April 2, 2002.

(HP1:10)

- e. *Harry and Ron exchanged panic-stricken looks, they threw the Invisibility Cloak back over themselves and retreated into a corner.* (HP2:193)

(2) states two properties that set such *self*-forms apart from the common reflexive pronouns of English.

- (2) a. Replacing the *self*-forms by simple pronouns does not lead to ungrammaticality.
 b. Apart from reference to a contextually given entity, some highly context-dependent kind of extra meaning is signalled.

In the more typical cases, the use of *self*-forms in argument positions is guided by strict syntactic principles: (i) reflexive pronouns must be used if the *self*-form in argument position and the subject of the clause have the same referent (see (3a)); (ii) reflexive pronouns may not be used otherwise (see (3b)).

- (3) a. *Hagrid_i drew himself_i/*him_i up proudly.* (HP1:50)
 b. *Lockhart hadn't mended Harry's bones. He had removed them(*selves).* (HP2:130)

I will have nothing to add to the discussion of *self*-forms in contexts in which their (non-)use leads to ungrammaticality (cf. for instance the important traditions within generative grammar going back to Chomsky 1981, 1986 or Reinhart & Reuland 1993). I will only deal with those contexts in which speakers have a choice between the use of simple pronouns and *self*-forms. All examples in (1) are of this kind. I will refer to this kind of *self*-forms as “unpredictable *self*-forms”.³

In the main part of this paper (section 3) I will identify the factors determining the choice between plain pronouns and *self*-forms in contexts such as illustrated in (1). Before doing so I will review some proposals that have been made to get a grip on the problem of such ‘spell-bound’ *self*-forms (section 2).

2. Some previous accounts

It was noticed long ago that sentences with syntactically unpredictable *self*-forms often involve the encoding of thought, speech or perception from the perspective of a conscious protagonist. Those protagonists are identical to the referents referred to by

³ There are quite a few competing terminological traditions in this area. The term ‘untriggered reflexives’ emphasizes the contrast to *self*-forms that are (syntactically) triggered in the relevant configuration, while it involves the equivocal mention of reflexivity. This is also true of the expression ‘locally free reflexives’. The expression ‘creeping reflexives’ reflects the (doubtful) intuition that such uses of *self*-forms are actually gaining ground in English. ‘Logophor’ stresses a component of meaning particularly relevant in examples like (1a) that I will elaborate on in detail in sections 2. and 3.1.

the *self*-forms in the linguistic representations of their thoughts, utterances, or perceptions.⁴ Take (4) as an example.

- (4) *Harry watched the Hermione in the pumpkin patch throw the Invisibility Cloak over himself and Ron.* (HP3:292)

Harry sees something, and he is one of the persons being acted upon in the event he perceives (the situation is such that, by using a magic hour-glass, Harry has gone back in time and sees himself doing what he did some hours ago). The use of *himself* makes it clear that the event is presented from Harry's perspective.

Many African languages (e.g. Ewe, Igbo, Mundang, Tuburi, among many others; cf. Stirling 1993: ch. 6) have specialized 'logophoric' pronominal markers or 'logophors' to encode referents of this kind.⁵ The technical term for these pronominals is 'logophoric pronouns' or 'logophors'; the whole phenomenon of the linguistic encoding of thought, speech or perception from the perspective of a conscious protagonist is called 'logophoricity' (Hagège 1974, Clements 1975). The unpredictable *self*-form in (4) is clearly logophoric in this sense. Reinhart and Reuland (1993: 672f.) apply the term 'logophor' to all unpredictable *self*-forms in English. Consider (5):

- (5) *He [Harry] slipped out of bed and wrapped the Cloak around himself.* (HP1:150)

(5) does not represent the content of Harry's mind, but still researchers such as Reinhart and Reuland (1993) speak of logophoric uses. I will return to the problem of delimiting logophoricity in section 3.1. At this point we only need to be aware of the fact that only a subset of all unpredictable *self*-forms is easily accounted for in terms of logophoricity.

König and Siemund (2000) reassess the pertinent data from the perspective of their research into phenomena of intensification (König 1991, 2001; Siemund 2000). Different kinds of intensifying *self*-forms in English are exemplified in (6).

- (6) a. adnominal intensification:
Gilderoy Lockhart seemed to think he himself had made the attacks stop. (HP2:175)
 b. adverbial intensification:
Dobby is making them himself, sir! (HP4:356)

(6a) is an adnominal use of intensifying *himself*, in (6b) *himself* forms a constituent with the predicate; the contribution of *himself* in (6b) is similar to that of *alone* or

⁴ Except for section 3.5 I will, for reasons of limitations of space, entirely neglect unpredictable *self*-forms marked for first or second person. I still believe that, once their specific speech-act involvement is sufficiently explicated they integrate easily with everything I will put forward in the following.

⁵ Traditional grammars of Ancient Greek characterize the same phenomenon, especially in the Attic dialect, as 'indirect reflexivity'.

without help. In the works of König and Siemund the function of intensifiers is characterized as marking the nominals they belong to as ‘central’, thereby establishing a contrast of centre and periphery between discourse entities. Take (6a) as an example. Since Gilderoy Lockhart is a character who always considers himself the most important or central person, the (mocking) use of the adnominal intensifier in (6a) is natural. Intensifiers are adjuncts, i.e. they do not occupy argument positions. However, König and Siemund (2000) adopt Quirk et al.’s (1985: 359) and Baker’s (1995) idea that unpredictable *self*-forms that occur in argument positions are really intensifiers attached to covert or incorporated pronominal heads. In this tradition one would argue that, in terms of semantic composition, (4) is like (7a), with *pro* representing the phonetically empty pronominal head of the sequence pronoun + intensifier. (7a) may then be paraphrased as (7b), and this sentence appears to mean the same thing as (4).

- (7) a. *Harry watched the Hermione in the pumpkin patch throw the Invisibility Cloak over [pro himself] and Ron.*
 b. *Harry watched the Hermione in the pumpkin patch throw the Invisibility Cloak over [Harry himself] and Ron.*

This is indeed a large step ahead, because it now becomes perceivable how *self*-forms in argument positions can receive interpretations that are parallel to those observable with adnominal intensifiers. To make the picture complete we must be aware of the fact that König and Siemund consider the logophoric use of *self*-forms as a special kind of intensifying use: generally, intensifiers mark the nominal to which they attach as central, and logophors denote a central referent, so the argument goes, because the subject of consciousness is of course central. Hole (2002) proposes that the general centrality intuition observed by König and Siemund to be relevant for the interpretation of adnominal intensifiers can be derived at minimal theoretical cost from more basic concepts: intensifiers in German or English denote the identity function, i.e. they take the referents of the nominals to which they attach as semantic arguments and map them to themselves. The semantic import of this amounts to nil, but if focusing, encoded by the usual stress on the intensifier, enters the picture we get what we need: focusing means that alternatives to the asserted value are taken into consideration. Possible alternatives to the identity function are functions that take the referent of the head nominal as their argument and map it onto something different from the head noun. This mechanism is illustrated in (8).

- (8) a. *He [Harry] sat up and Hagrid’s heavy coat fell off him. [...] Hagrid himself was asleep on the collapsed sofa [...]. (HP1:49)*
 b. the identity function applied to Hagrid:
 ID(Hagrid) = Hagrid
 c. alternative function applied to Hagrid (in this context):
 HEAVY-COAT-OF(x)HEAVY-COAT-OF(Hagrid) = Hagrid’s thick black coat

In (8a) Hagrid is contrasted with his heavy coat. The description of the scene moves from Harry, who had been covered by Hagrid’s coat, to Hagrid himself. Thus the use

of *himself* allows for the shift from Harry to Hagrid in the description while establishing a textual link between the two elements *Hagrid's heavy coat* [covering Harry] and *Hagrid himself*. There is a great variety of other contextually plausible relations contrasting with the identity function. Two more examples are given in (8c').⁶

- (8) c'. other possible alternative functions depending on the context
 DRAGON-RAISED-BY(Hagrid) = Norbert the Norwegian Ridgeback Dragon
 STUDENTS-OF(Hagrid) = {Harry, Hermione, Ron, Draco, Crab, Goyle, ...}

Adopting the simple analysis of intensifiers as lexicalizations of the identity function means we have to pay a price: while König and Siemund regard logophoricity as a phenomenon which, by definition, involves centrality of the logophoric centre and can therefore easily be tied to intensification conceptually, the identity-function account must tell a different story.

There is one area where König and Siemund's analysis runs into problems. If all unpredictable *self*-forms are really intensifiers with covert or incorporated pronominal heads, and if intensifiers always presuppose a contrast with an alternative value, all uses of unpredictable *self*-forms should be found in contexts of contrast. This is contrary to fact, as is conceded by König and Siemund themselves. Zribi-Hertz (1995: 338ff.) presents examples in which no plausible contrast is evoked in the presence of unpredictable *self*-forms (cf. (9)).

- (9) a. *John couldn't resist the hunger for revenge which filled himself.*
 b. *Slowly, strangely, consciousness changes, and Petworth can feel the change taking place inside himself.*

In (9a), there is nobody apart from John who could be filled with hunger for revenge; the feeling Petworth in (9b) experiences is not contrasted with a feeling he might perceive in somebody else. Thus one of König and Siemund's general conditions on the use of intensifiers, namely the contrastivity of unpredictable *self*-forms, is clearly absent in quite a few cases. König and Siemund acknowledge this problem, but they do not try to tackle it.

3. The semantics, pragmatics and prosody of the identity function

I will now move on to present my own proposal. There are two sides to this proposal, a semantic one, and a usage-based one. The semantic part of the proposal is fixed and probably identical for all cases: unpredictable *self*-forms invariably involve the identity function, i.e. a referent is mapped onto itself. The usage-based part has several aspects: if some semantic device that does not change the meaning is applied – and this holds

⁶ For details concerning the compositional treatment of the adverbial-exclusive or agentive use of intensifiers as illustrated in (6b) see Hole (2002).

for the identity function –, then there should better be some pragmatic or other gain that justifies the use of such a phonologically prolix device.⁷ The reverse also occurs: an unpredictable *self*-form that could well be justified for its pragmatic surplus is disfavoured because of an interfering phonological preference.

(10) is a list of advantages that may be achieved by using syntactically unpredictable *self*-forms. (11) is a condition disavouring an otherwise justified use of an unpredictable *self*-form. In sub-sections 3.1 through 3.5 I will elaborate on each of these effects.

- (10) a. An unpredictable *self*-form ensures a perspectivizing reading.
 b. An unpredictable *self*-form signals adnominal intensification.
 c. An unpredictable *self*-form ensures co-reference with an otherwise disfavoured antecedent.
 d. An unpredictable *self*-form ensures an appositive reading.
- (11) The non-use of an unpredictable *self*-form facilitates the realization of a low right boundary tone in a prosodic phrase.

3.1 Unpredictable *self*-forms and perspectivization

This section deals with those cases in which the use of an unpredictable *self*-form signals the fact that the relevant referent is the subject of consciousness or the logophoric centre from whose perspective an eventuality is encoded. In the second part of this section those cases that do not necessarily involve the representation of a protagonist's mind, but which still pattern with clearly logophoric uses, are integrated into the analysis.

Let us start with some clear examples of logophoric uses of unpredictable *self*-forms.

- (12) a. *Rumours were flying from student to student like highly contagious germs: who was going to try for Hogwarts champion,[...] how the students from Beauxbatons differed from themselves.* (HP4:208)
 b. *Harry saw Moody's magical eye travel over Snape, and then, unmistakably, onto himself.* (HP4:409)
 c. *Harry [...] registered one fact: each of these wizards had his wand out, and every wand was pointing right at himself, Ron and Hermione.* (HP4:116)

In (12a) the referents referred to by *themselves* are those persons in whose minds the rumours concerning the Beauxbatons students are represented. The sequence of tenses (*were flying, was going to try, would involve, differed*) makes it clear beyond doubt that speech or mind content is reported. *Himself* in (12b) refers to Harry, who feels that Moody's magical eye, which can move independently of the other eye, is directed towards him. Once more, the complement of *saw* is clearly intended as a

⁷ The two theoretical components of an invariant lexical core on the one side, and its different uses on the other, are shared by Zribi-Hertz's (1995) proposal. All the details are divergent, though.

representation of Harry's mind. The same is true of (12c). In none of these sentences is the use of the *self*-form obligatory. Why are they used then?⁸ Note that it will not do to say that the *self*-forms transform the relevant clauses into mind representations. Quite clearly, logophoric readings for the relevant clauses are strongly favoured even before the hearer or reader gets to the point where the *self*-forms are parsed. Quite in accordance with what Stirling (1993) or König and Siemund (2000) have stated, the *self*-forms are thus not to be taken as the triggers of the logophoric interpretations, but rather as forms being compatible with logophoric contexts. Logophoric utterances may, in the spirit of Stirling, generally be characterized as utterances whose truth-conditions are evaluated in a model that is restricted by an additional logophoric condition. Take (12b) as an example. We naturally take the adverb *unmistakeably* to relate to Harry's being sure about the direction of Moody's glance. Moreover, if later on it turns out that Moody had actually not looked at Harry, it is not the narrator that must be held responsible for asserting something that is false, but Harry. This is so because logophoricity shifts the responsibility of assertion away from the narrator/speaker to the logophoric centre, i.e. Harry.

The reader may ask now: where do unpredictable *self*-forms enter the picture? If *him* instead of *himself* were used in (12b), *unmistakeably* likewise preferably relates to Harry's judgement, so *self*-forms are not a prerequisite of logophoricity (cf. (12b')).

- (12) b'. *Harry saw Moody's magical eye travel over Snape, and then, unmistakably, onto him.* (HP4:409)

My suggestion is that the use of *himself* in a possibly logophoric context leaves no other choice but to interpret the referent of the *self*-form as the logophoric centre. Applied to (12b) this means that *unmistakeably* must refer to Harry's being sure, but it need not necessarily do so in (12b'). In terms of the identity function assumed to be present in all unpredictable *self*-forms, we may make the statement in (13).

- (13) Unpredictable *self*-forms in logophoric contexts map the relevant referent onto itself inasmuch as it is the logophoric centre.

Let us now turn to the other kind of perspectivization involving the use of unpredictable *self*-forms. What sets these cases apart is the fact no thoughts or utterances of protagonists are encoded, but still, if compared to simple pronoun uses, an intuition of perspectivization persists. These are the uses that have figured prominently in the discussion on syntactically untriggered reflexives. Some examples are given in (14).

- (14) a. *He made sure Myrtle had her glasses well covered before hoisting himself*

⁸ The reader may impatiently wait for me to mention the contrastive component present at least in (14b) and (14c). This phenomenon will be taken care of in section 3.3. If it can be conceded that *themselves* in (14a) can be read without any sentence-level accent (if *differed* is stressed, for instance), the argument of this section will go through.

out of the bath, wrapping the towel firmly around himself and going to get the egg. (HP4:401)

- b. *Harry and Ron exchanged panic-stricken looks, they threw the Invisibility Cloak back over themselves and retreated into a corner.* (HP2:193)
- c. *He [Harry] was still having trouble with the Shield Charm, though. This was supposed to cast a temporary, invisible wall around himself that deflected minor curses.* (HP4:529)

For reasons to become clear shortly, I will call such uses of unpredictable *self*-forms ‘somatophoric’ from now on. Note first that, contrary to the logophoric cases above, the narrator perspective is maintained in (14).⁹ The intuition concerning these *self*-forms does not centre around the report of the content of somebody’s mind or speech, but rather around some spatial configuration in which the referent referred to by the unpredictable *self*-form constitutes the point of reference for the location of some other entity. Test configurations in this domain always involve the location of some object with respect to some other object that has an inherent orientation. Take a look at (15).

- (15) *The goalkeeper could not see the ball because the defending players in the wall were hiding it behind them(*selves).*

Imagine some situation in a soccer match in which the defending players forming the wall are actively hiding the ball from the goalkeeper. We know that the players forming the wall face in the same direction as the goalkeeper, so for (15) to make sense the ball must be in front of the defending players. From the perspective of the goalkeeper this means however that the ball is behind the wall. In this setting the use of an unpredictable *self*-form is impossible, because this would imply that the ball is hidden behind the defending players’ backs. This shows that the use of a somatophoric *self*-form restricts the interpretation of the relative location of some other entity to a setting which identifies the point of reference with the referent of the unpredictable *self*-form.

A major obstacle for a satisfactory theory of logophoricity and related phenomena has been to explicate the analogy, or even underlying identity, of logophoricity and somatophoricity. I would like to propose now that the notional components of logophoricity and somatophoricity can be matched as demonstrated in Table 1.

⁹ For (14a) one may argue that the complement of *made sure* is logophoric, but the following two predications clearly are not.

LOGOPHORICITY	SOMATOPHORICITY
mind of a conscious protagonist	body of a conscious protagonist
content of the mind	spatial areas definable in terms of and surrounding the body
identity of the referent of the logophoric pronoun and the validator	identity of the referent of the somatophoric pronoun and the deictic centre

Table 1: Matching the notional ingredients of logophoricity and somatophoricity

The anchor of logophoricity in the real world is the mind of someone who figures as a participant in an eventuality that is encoded linguistically; the anchor of somatophoricity in the real world is the body of someone who figures as a participant in an eventuality that is encoded linguistically. The encoded logophoric eventuality is the content of the mind; the encoded somatophoric eventuality is what happens or holds in the spatial sphere definable in relation to the body. The referent of the logophoric pronoun is identical with the one responsible for the ascription of a truth-value, the validator; the referent of the somatophoric pronoun is the one figuring as the point of reference, i.e. that participant whose space-time location is necessary to define the exact meaning of the relational expression dependent on it. This model explains the similarities and differences between logophoricity and somatophoricity by postulating a conceptual and linguistic analogy between mind content and the space surrounding the human body. Since these two entities are different, the empirical testing grounds for each kind of ‘phoricity’ are different. Logophoric centres can be identified by testing who is to be held responsible for the ascription of a truth value to an assertion (cf. the interpretation of *unmistakeably* in (12b)). Somatophoric centres can be identified with the help of test configurations as in (15). The two different kinds of ‘phoricity’ are moreover predicted to occur in different kinds of structural contexts. Logophoricity is predicted to be relevant in contexts in which a protagonist is reported to think, speak, etc. Somatophoricity is predicted to be relevant in contexts in which a protagonist is reported to act in space or form part of a spatial configuration. This entails in turn that logophoric *self*-forms will typically be found in complement clauses, and somatophoric *self*-forms in PP’s.

As regards the formal implementation of somatophoricity and unpredictable *self*-forms I assume that the proposal made for logophoricity carries over. What I will not go into here in any detail is the matter whether somatophoricity and logophoricity are just two aspects of one overarching phenomenon, or whether a somatophoric identity function ought to complement the logophoric variant of the identity function. The fact that somatophoric *self*-forms are only used relating to conscious protagonists speaks in favour of unifying both concepts in the end.¹⁰

¹⁰ I would like to thank Pia Päiviö for insisting on this point.

3.2 Unpredictable *self*-forms and intensification

Recall from section 1. that the identity function has an important use as a device to trigger intensification. By adding an intensifier to a nominal as in *the president himself*, the (central) president is related to other (peripheral) referents such as *his ministers* or *his representative*. This effect arises because the stressed identity function relates to (contextually given) alternative functions that do not map the president onto himself, but rather onto someone or something definable in terms of the president. English strongly disfavours sequences of pronouns and intensifiers in non-subject positions such as *him himself*. Baker (1995) and König and Siemund (2000) have taken this as support for their assumption that many uses of unpredictable *self*-forms should really be analyzed as simple pronouns plus adnominal intensifier. I do not have anything to add to this analysis, but from our perspective something else has to be shown. König and Siemund remain somewhat vague with respect to the question whether all unpredictable *self*-forms in argument positions are intensifiers and logophors at the same time. I have taken a more reductionist stance here: according to my proposal the invariant part of all unpredictable *self*-forms is the identity function, and matters of contrast or perspectivization enter the picture only secondarily. It would therefore be desirable to find purely intensificational uses of unpredictable *self*-forms that are completely void of logophoric or somatophoric components. My corpus does not include any examples that could beyond any doubt be claimed to have this property. Still I have found three such attested examples in other places. They are presented in (16) through (18).

- (16) [...] *several of Mr. Carmody's students competed in Kuk Sool Won™ tournaments in San Francisco and Sacramento [...]. As for himself, Mr. Carmody competes regularly in regional tournaments in San Francisco [...].* (www¹¹)
- (17) *Remember F. X. Toole? His story about a boxing cut-man was one of four first-times-in-print last spring. [...]. As for himself, Toole drove up from Hermosa Beach recently [...].* (www¹²)
- (18) *At that point, the passenger-to-be produced her UWC pass and [...] it was accepted as valid for both herself and the pilot.* (BNC: CCC 1424)

In (16) the intensifier relates Mr Carmody to his students, and in (17), the story written by F.X. Toole is related to the author himself. Not the slightest logophoric or somatophoric component is present in these examples. The situation in (18) is such that someone who wants to fly somewhere in a private plane needs permission to do so. In the end she gets the permission for herself and the pilot belonging to her. The use of the intensifier reflects the fact that the two travellers-to-be are related in such a way that the pilot is her pilot, or the pilot she has brought along, or the pilot to fly her plane. This is a prototypical setting for the use of an adnominal intensifier. I take the

¹¹ Source: <http://www.hmbksw.com/new/about.html>; April 2, 2002.

¹² Source: <http://www.webdelsol.com/ZYZZYVA/sp00.note.htm>; April 2, 2002.

data in this section as sufficient proof that unpredictable *self*-forms in argument position can serve the pure function of adnominal intensifiers with incorporated or covert pronominal heads.

3.3 Unpredictable *self*-forms and co-reference with otherwise disfavoured antecedents

One use of unpredictable *self*-forms exists that serves a function similar to that of grammaticalized reflexive pronouns, but outside the syntactic domain of a local predication that restricts the syntactic scope of reflexive binding. To see this, turn to (19).

- (19) a. *This was exactly what Harry had been hoping for. He slipped his wand back into his robes, waited until Cedric's friends had disappeared into their classroom, and hurried up the corridor, which was now empty of everyone except himself and Cedric.* (HP4:298)
- b. *Harry knew Ron had been about to ask about Sirius. [...] However, discussing him in front of Ginny was a bad idea. Nobody but themselves [Harry, Hermione, Ron] and Professor Dumbledore knew about how Sirius had escaped, or believed in his innocence.* (HP4:55)

Both examples would, on identical readings, be grammatical if simple pronouns were used. But there is one important difference. The constructions that the *self*-forms (or the alternative simple pronouns) are used in usually require the arguments to be stressed or focused. The stress facts are as follows: *everyone except himSELF and CEDric* or *everyone except HIM and CEDric*; *nobody but themSELVES and Professor DUMbledore* or *nobody but THEM and Professor DUMbledore*. Take a closer look at (19a) now. A focused *self*-form is used, but an intensifier reading is implausible: Cedric and Harry are two participants in a situation, and it is not the case that Cedric is identified via an alternative to the identity function, as would have to be the case with an intensifying use as treated in the previous section. The *self*-form serves a different function here: it allows the pronominal to fulfil the constructional focusing requirement while allowing the pronominal stem to remain unstressed. If the pronominal stem were stressed as in the variant of (19a) without the *self*-form, the strongly preferred interpretation for the stressed pronoun would be reference to somebody other than Harry, and probably this would be a deictic use of the pronoun. The relevant intuition is crystal clear: the use of a *self*-form allows for a stress somewhere on the argument without triggering the disjoint-reference or deictic interpretation that would be preferred for a plain stressed pronoun. To add to the plausibility of this, let me at least briefly elaborate on the interplay of stress and focus. A focus must contain a stressed syllable, but not all syllables constituting a focus must be stressed. This means that a stress on *-self* in an unpredictable *self*-form may either mark focus only on *-self*, or on the whole *self*-form. We thus get two different

configurations of stress and focus for *self*-forms with incorporated or covert heads. They are depicted in (20).

- (20) a. him[SELF]_{FOCUS} or pronoun + [identity function]_{FOCUS}
 b. [himSELF]_{FOCUS} or [pronoun + identity function]_{FOCUS}

I claim that (20a) is the configuration necessary to account for the intensifying uses of unpredictable *self*-forms as treated in the preceding section 3.3. (20b) is the configuration relevant here: the whole *self*-form with the incorporated or covert pronominal head is in focus, but the pronominal stem is unstressed. This allows language users to fulfil constructional focusing requirements, and to evade the triggering of stress-related disjoint reference or deictic interpretations for stressed pronominal stems at the same time. The fact that this mechanism works so well is again a consequence of *-self* being semantically void: the referent of the pronominal is mapped onto itself.

The relevant cases in which this mechanism is at work are not always pure in the sense that there is only one reason to use an unpredictable *self*-form. Often logophoricity/ somatophoricity and cases like the ones treated here overlap. This is not to be taken as an argument against the present proposal, though, such that my classification of cases could be said not to be mutually exclusive. This effect is, on the contrary, predicted: the semantic device applied (the identity function with its ‘phoricity’ variants) is univocal in all cases, it is just its pragmatic use that is manifold. Pragmatic functions, however, are not necessarily clear-cut: two or more pragmatic functions can be fulfilled by a single semantic device.

3.4 Unpredictable *self*-forms and restrictive vs. appositive readings

The phenomena discussed in the previous sections have, from different perspectives and in different arrangements, all been discussed in the literature. The observations to be treated here have, to the best of my knowledge, never been dealt with before. They involve the use of attributive *like*-phrases. To see the point, turn to (21).

- (21) *Even Muggles like yourself should be celebrating, this happy, happy day!*
 (HP1:10)

Muggles are humans that are not wizards. Sentence (21) is uttered by a wizard on the occasion of a happy day for the wizarding world: Voldemort, the most evil wizard in the world, has suffered a serious defeat. The addressee is Mr Dursley, Harry’s uncle, himself not a wizard. A paraphrase of the sentence might be *Even Muggles – and you are a Muggle – should be celebrating this happy, happy day!* Compare this with the version of (21) with a plain pronoun in (21’).

- (21’) *Even Muggles like you should be celebrating, this happy, happy day!*

A licit paraphrase of (21') would be *Even (those) Muggles that are like you should be celebrating this happy, happy day!* This version implies that only a subset of all Muggles, namely those that belong to Mr Dursley's kind, ought to celebrate, whereas in (21) the *like*-phrase does not necessarily restrict the set of all Muggles. In contradistinction to the restrictive reading of the *like*-phrase in (21'), the reading in (21) is appositive or exemplifying. This difference is truth-conditionally relevant: In (21) it is sufficient to be a Muggle to be in the class of those entities that should celebrate; in (21') one has to be a Muggle of the Dursley kind to qualify. Another example involving an appositive *like*-phrase, but this time with a different behaviour, is provided in (22)/(22').

(22) *'My dear Professor, surely a sensible person like yourself can call him [Voldemort] by his name? All this "You-Know-Who" nonsense [...].'* (HP1:14)

(22') *'My dear Professor, surely a sensible person like you can call him [Voldemort] by his name? All this "You-Know-Who" nonsense'*

(22') does not necessarily receive an interpretation to the effect that sensible persons of the specific kind of the addressee, i.e. Prof. McGonagall, ought to call Voldemort by his real name. Both in (22) and in (22') an appositive reading is available which implies that Professor McGonagall is just an instance of the otherwise unrestricted class of sensible persons. My proposal to account for the differences in interpretations starts out from the following important empirical generalization: the observed effect of necessarily differing interpretations only surfaces if the nominal preceding the *like*-phrase does not comprise more than one content morpheme. Consider (23) to see this.

- (23) a. *Even Muggles like you should be celebrating.*
 b. *Even NON-wizards like YOU should be celebrating.*

(23a) is restricted to the subset interpretation, while (23b) is easily assigned an appositive reading. In view of the fact that *Muggle* and *non-wizard* are synonymous this is a most interesting effect. I argue that it is triggered by the ability of *pre-like* polymorphemic nominals to have an internal information structure. In (23b) one of the notions forming the "non-wizard" notion, namely negation, is focused, and speaking sloppily we may say that *YOU* in (23b) relates back to the antecedent focus *NON*. Returning to (22)/(22') now, we may say that (22') is ambiguous because *a sensible person* is a morphologically complex expression, just like *non-wizard*, but unlike *Muggle*. Since it is *self*-forms, and not simple pronouns, that constitute the major concern of this paper, I cannot go into any detail here as regards the mechanisms at work in the restrictive cases such as (23a). The relevant facts are summarized in Table 2.

EXAMPLE	MAKE-UP	INTERPRETATION
<i>Muggles like yourSELF</i>	simplex NOM + <i>like</i> + <i>self</i> -form	appositive interpretation preferred
<i>Muggles like YOU</i>	simplex NOM + <i>like</i> + pronoun	restrictive interpretation only
<i>a non-wizard like yourSELF</i>	complex NOM + <i>like</i> + <i>self</i> -form	appositive interpretation preferred
<i>a non-wizard like YOU</i> <i>a sensible person like YOU</i>	compl. unfocused NOM + <i>like</i> + pronoun	restrictive interpretation only
<i>a NON-wizard like YOU</i> <i>a SENSible person like YOU</i>	compl. partially focused NOM + <i>like</i> + <i>self</i> -form	appositive interpretation

Table 2: Interpretations of *like*-phrases with simple pronouns and with *self*-forms

3.5 Unpredictable *self*-forms and preferred intonation contours

The last factor influencing the use of unpredictable *self*-forms that I have identified concerns a phonological fact, or rather the interplay of phonology and semantics/pragmatics. This factor does not make the use of a *self*-form more likely as the factors discussed above do, it rather disfavours the use of a *self*-form that would be justified on other grounds. To see what I mean take a first look at the pair of examples in (24) that is syntactically and semantically entirely parallel in the important respects.

- (24) a. *Harry and Ron exchanged panic-stricken looks, they threw the Invisibility Cloak back over themselves and retreated into a corner.* (HP2:193)
 b. [...] *he [Lucius Malfoy] swung his cloak around him [...].* (HP2:249)

The syntactic and semantic parallels between (24a) and (24b) are striking, but still a *self*-form is used in (24a), while (24b) has a simple pronoun in the directional PP. Clearly (24a) is somatophoric (see section 3.1), but this will not help us to account for the difference because (24b) is likewise somatophoric. What, then, determines speakers' choices between the two forms in comparable cases? I propose it is a soft constraint disavouring *self*-forms at the right boundary of a neutral intonation phrase. The argument requires two prosodic ingredients: lexical stress patterns, and boundary tones of intonation phrases.

It is generally agreed upon that any two adjacent syllables in English can be evaluated with regard to relative prosodic strength. If such an evaluation is done for single words lexical stress patterns are arrived at. The word *president*, for instance, has a relatively strong initial syllable, followed by a relatively weak syllable, followed by a relatively strong syllable. Since there is a hierarchical organization of stress assignment, the strong initial syllable receives the main stress on the word level, but on the lowest level *-dent* is a strong syllable with a minor accent as well. These stress patterns persist in connected speech, but they are augmented and partially superseded

by the stress assignment of larger prosodic units. I mark the single strongest syllable of a word with a grave accent: *prèsidènt*. *Self*-forms have a non-initial strongest syllable or word level accent: *x-sèlf*.

The second prosodic ingredient concerns intonation phrases. Pierrehumbert (1980) has introduced the notion we are interested in here: the low boundary tone L%. L% occurs at the right boundary of a neutral intonation phrase as in the reply of the minimal discourse *Where's the paper? – On the sofa*. L% is realized as a low pitch. In the word *sofa* the low pitch of L% coincides with a lexically weak syllable. The case is different if we substitute *bed* for *sofa*. In our altered reply the syllable *bed* bears word stress and sentence stress. At the same time it bears the L% tone of a right intonation phrase boundary. This is realized as a sequence of a dynamic high pitch accent, plus a low pitch accent, both on a single syllable. In the original reply this sequence is distributed over the two syllables of *sofa*. That L% is really there is easily seen if we convert the reply into a question: *On the sofa?/On the bed?* In this case H%, a high boundary tone, replaces L%, and the pitch on *-fa* or the right half of *bed* remains high.

Returning to the matter of unpredictable *self*-forms I would like to claim now that speakers will, all else being equal, tend to avoid prosodic contours that force them to squeeze a lexical (high pitch) accent and a low boundary tone L% into a single syllable. But this is precisely what is required if a *self*-form is the last word in a sentence ending in L%: *himsèlfL%* forces speakers to realize both a high pitch and a low pitch consecutively on *-self*. The use of a completely unstressed pronoun cliticized to a stressed preposition avoids this dispreferred pattern. The string *aróund himL%* will only require the realization of the low boundary tone on the last syllable. To test this hypothesis I have extracted from my corpus all those examples in which an unpredictable *self*-form does not bear a focal accent or sentence stress. The relevant examples are listed under (i) in the Appendix. Except for one case (ia), none of the relevant *self*-forms coincides with a low boundary tone at the end of a sentence. What we do find are high boundary tones (comma intonation) or *self*-forms followed by unstressed syllables within a single intonation phrase. (ii) in the Appendix lists a convenience sample of examples (drawn from the Harry Potter books as well) with pronouns in comparable contexts that could be converted into *self*-forms without changing grammaticality. With a single exception (iid) all of these unstressed pronouns occur in sentence-final position, or at the right boundary of an intonation phrase. I take this distribution as encouraging support for the integration of a phonological preference component into a complete account of the distribution of unpredictable *self*-forms.

4. Conclusions

I have presented an analysis of unpredictable *self*-forms in argument positions which takes as its starting point the strict separation of two different ingredients: lexical meaning, and pragmatic function. I have aimed at showing that the lexical meaning of unpredictable *self*-forms amounts to the identity function, applied to a covert or incorporated pronominal head. I have distinguished four different justifications that

explain why it is reasonable to use such a semantically vacuous expression, and I have pointed out a phonological factor disfavouring its use. Instead of summarizing the details here, I would rather like to point to one more aspect of my analysis. It concerns the distribution of unpredictable *self*-forms: it ought to have become obvious that generalizing over the distribution of unpredictable *self*-forms is probably impossible. These forms appear in argument positions, to be sure; but a positive structural or semantic generalization covering logophoricity/somatophoricity, intensification, and the anaphoric relationship with disfavoured antecedents, seems to me to be impossible. Unpredictable *self*-forms do not form a natural class. The pragmatic component of my proposal makes this follow: the semantically void mechanism gets to be used under the most diverse conditions, as long as it is possible to make sense of the relatively prolix structure of the argumental *self*-form in terms of pragmatic function. What would have to be shown now is that the theory does not overgenerate: is it possible to come up with more pragmatic functions that might be argued to be candidates for being parasitic on unpredictable *self*-forms? And if so, do such uses really occur, or does our theory predict uses that are actually excluded? Well aware of the fact that the discovery of over-generation has often been a fatal blow for otherwise attractive theories, I will, for the time being, abide by the Hogwarts motto *Draco dormiens numquam titillandus*: ‘Never tickle a sleeping dragon’.

Sources

- BNC The British National Corpus (accessible at <http://www.hcu.ox.ac.uk/BNC/>)
- HP1 J.K. Rowling (1997). *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone*. London: Bloomsbury. [Paperback]
- HP2 J.K. Rowling (1998). *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. London: Bloomsbury. [Paperback]
- HP3 J.K. Rowling (1999). *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. London: Bloomsbury. [Paperback]
- HP4 J.K. Rowling (2000). *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. London: Bloomsbury. [Hardcover]

Works Cited/Literaturverzeichnis

- Baker, Carl L. (1995). “Contrast, discourse prominence, and intensification, with special reference to locally free reflexives in British English,” *Language* 71: 63-101.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986). *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Clements, George N. (1975). “The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: Its role in discourse,” *Journal of West African Languages* 10: 141-177.
- Hagège, Claude (1974). “Les pronoms logophoriques,” *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 69: 287-310.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1967). “Notes on transitivity and theme,” *Journal of Linguistics* 3: 199-244.

- Hole, Daniel (2002). "Agentive *selbst* in German," G. Katz, S. Reinhard and P. Reuter, eds. *Sinn und Bedeutung 6, Proceedings of the sixth meeting of the Gesellschaft für Semantik, Osnabrück, Germany, October, 2001*.
- Huang, Yan (2000). *Anaphora: A Cross-linguistic Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huang, C.-T. James and C.S. Luther Liu (2000). "Logophoricity, attitudes and *ziji* at the interface," Peter Cole, Gabriella Hermon and C.T. James Huang, eds. *Syntax and Semantics 33. Long-distance Reflexivization*. New York: Academic Press, 141-196.
- König, Ekkehard (1991). *The Meaning of Focus Particles: a comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.
- König, Ekkehard (2001). "Intensifiers and Reflexive Pronouns," Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher and Wolfgang Raible, eds., *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 747-760.
- König, Ekkehard and Peter Siemund (2000). "Locally free *self*-forms, logophoricity and intensification in English," *English Language and Linguistics* 4.2: 183-204.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet (1980). "The phonology and phonetics of English intonation," Ph.D. thesis, MIT.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland (1993). "Reflexivity," *Linguistic Inquiry* 24.4:657-720.
- Sells, Peter (1987). "Aspects of logophoricity," *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 445-479.
- Siemund, Peter (2000). *Intensifiers. A Comparison of English and German*. London: Routledge.
- Stirling, Lesley (1993). *Switch-reference and Discourse Representation Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zribi-Hertz, Anne (1995). "Emphatic or reflexive? On the endophoric character of French *lui-même* and similar complex pronouns," *Journal of Linguistics* 31, 333-374.

Appendix

- (i) a. *He [Harry] slipped out of bed and wrapped the Cloak around himself.* (HP1:150)
 b. *Harry and Ron [...] threw the Invisibility Cloak back over themselves and retreated into a corner.* (HP2:193)
 c. *Drawing their cloaks more closely around themselves, they [Harry, Ron, Hermione] set off [...].* (HP4:235)
 d. *Harry [...] pulled the Invisibility Cloak back over himself and crept back downstairs [...].* (HP4:283)
 e. *He made sure Myrtle had her glasses well covered before hoisting himself out of the bath, wrapping the towel firmly around himself and going to get the egg.* (HP4:401)
 f. *Pulling the Cloak back over himself Harry straightened up [...].* (HP4:406)
 g. *He [Harry] was still having trouble with the Shield Charm, though. This was supposed to cast a temporary, invisible wall around himself that deflected minor curses.* (HP4:529)
- (ii) a. *Draco [...] saw the cabinet right in front of him.* (HP2:44)
 b. *[...] he [Harry] busied himself with piling all seven of Lockhart's books in front of him, so that he could avoid looking at the real thing.* (HP2:77)
 c. *[...] and Hermione and that Ravenclaw Prefect were found with a mirror next to them.* (HP2:215)

- d. [...] *he* [Lucius Malfoy] *swung his cloak around him and hurried out of sight.* (HP2:249)
- e. *He* [Frank] *turned to look behind him, and found himself paralysed with fear.* (HP4:17)
- f. *The stranger* [Moody] [...] *pulled a plate of sausages towards him, raised it to what was left of his nose and sniffed it.* (HP4:164)
- g. *They* [Harry, Ron, Hermione] [...] *shut the door behind them.* (HP4:235)
- h. *'There must be something,' Hermione muttered, moving a candle closer to her.* (HP4:422)
- i. *Harry was staring unblinkingly ahead of him, trying to discern shapes through the gloom [...].* (HP4:430)
- j. [...] *Karkaroff had drawn himself up, clutching his furs around him, looking vivid.* (HP4:487)
- k. [...] *Harry [...] gripped his wand tightly in his hand, thrust it out in front of him, and threw himself around the headstone [...].* (HP4:575)
- l. *Harry let go of the Cup, but he clutched Cedric to him even more tightly.* (HP4:583)