Palestinian Arabic Reflexives

Mutaz Ayesh

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

1. Introduction

PALESTINIAN ARABIC is a dialect of Arabic spoken in the geographical area of Historic Palestine, which is today a part of Israel and the occupied Palestinian territories. It is also spoken by Palestinian refugees who were forcibly evicted from that area in 1948 and their descendants in the surrounding countries of Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria, among others. Palestinian Arabic (PA) is very diverse, mainly in phonology. This diversity is typically geographical such that one speaker could possibly identify another's birthplace simply from their respective variety.

The aim of this paper is to investigate and explore several aspects of reflexive pronouns in PA. In section 1, a brief introduction to PA is provided, and in section 2 the predictions of Binding Theory on PA are tested. In section 3 PA reflexive pronouns' sensitivity to linguistic elements of perspective is explored, and finally section 4 discusses additional uses of PA reflexive pronouns.

1.1 The pronominal system of PA

Palestinian Arabic is a nominative-accusative language where pronouns take both nominative and accusative forms, as shown in Table I. In the urban variety of Palestinian Arabic (which will be the focus of this paper), second and third person pronouns are gendered (masculine and feminine), while the first-person singular pronoun and plural pronouns are gender-neutral. Accusative and genitive pronouns generally take the form of a bound morpheme that agrees in number, person, and gender with the antecedent with which it is coindexed.

Reflexive pronouns in PA take the shape of either *ħa:l* or *nafs* which literally mean "state" and "soul", respectively. They act as bases that bind to the genitive form of the same person-number-gender to form the proper reflexive of that person-number-gender. These two reflexive bases are distinct, and their differences will be tackled later in section 4.

	Nominative	Accusative	Genitive	Reflexive
1SG	?ana	-ni	-i	ħa:li/nafsi
2SG.M	?inta	-ak	-ak	ħa:lak/nafsak
2SG.F	?inti	-ek	-ek	ħa:lek/nafsek
3SG.M	huwwe	-o	-o	ħa:lo/nafso
3SG.F	hijje	-ha	-ha	ħa:lha/nafsha
1PL	?iħna	-na	-na	ħa:lna/nafsna
2PL	?intu	-kom	-kom	ħa:lkom/nafskom
3PL	humme	-hom	-hom	ħa:lhom/nafshom

Table I: The pronominal system of Urban Palestinian Arabic.

1.2   The data

The sentences that I collected and investigated below are divided between being direct translations to PA of other sentences that appear in papers that discussed the various subjects that this paper tackles such as Al-Momani's (2015), Charnavel's (2021), and Bassel's (2018), and being created specifically for the purpose of this paper. The grammaticality judgments were checked with several PA speakers for reliable conclusions. The sentences are fully transcribed in IPA; double consonants represent long consonants (geminates) while consonants followed by /ˤ/ are emphatic.

2.   Binding Theory and PA

Binding Theory is a theory of syntax that aims to explain the distribution of noun phrases (NPs) and to identify the syntactic relationship that can or should exist between nouns and pronouns. It also seeks to predict and explain the distribution of both overt and covert NPs. Overt NPs include nouns such as proper and common nouns and names, in addition to pronouns and anaphors (reflexive pronouns). Covert NPs on the other hand include syntactic NPs that are not phonologically uttered, such as the subject of non-finite clauses called big-pro (PRO), the case-marked subject of a finite clause called little-pro (pro), and traces of NPs when syntactic movement takes place.

Binding Theory has three main conditions, which will be explained below. I will test the predictions and conditions of this theory on PA NPs.

2.1   Conditions A and B

Condition A requires anaphors to have an antecedent (a noun to which it refers) preceding it in the same minimal sentence that contains it. For this condition to be satisfied, the anaphor needs to be c-commanded by the antecedent with which it agrees in person, gender, and number, so that they co-refer.

Condition B of Biding Theory concerns the distribution of pronouns. Simply put, pronouns need to be unbound in the minimal sentence that contains them, and hence they are predicted to be in a complementary distribution with anaphors based on this theory. A pronoun may have an antecedent with which it is coindexed, however it should not be local, or it should not c-command said pronoun.

The sentence in (1) contains the reflexive pronoun *ħa:l-i* 'myself'. It is a grammatical sentence, and it can be said based on this theory that the antecedent "I" (which is concealed inside the verb *ʃufet* or as a hidden little-pro) precedes the reflexive pronoun and c-commands it. They both match in gender and number and thus they

successfully co-refer. Therefore, it can be said that the antecedent binds the reflexive pronoun. The sentence in (2) however is ungrammatical since the same antecedent of the reflexive pronoun *ħa:l-ha* 'herself' does not agree with the reflexive in gender and number. Moreover, the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (3) is due to the existence of a reflexive pronoun as the subject. This further strengthens the claim that a reflexive pronoun cannot exist freely in a sentence, and that it requires an antecedent to precede and c-command it and hence bind it.

(1) ʃuf-et   ħa:l-i   bi-l-mra:je.

     see.PST-1SG.NOM   self-my   in-DET-mirror

     'I saw myself in the mirror.'

(2) *ʃuf-et   ħa:l-ha   bi-l-mra:je.

     see-past-1SG.NOM   self-her   in-DET-mirror

     '*I saw herself in the mirror.'

(3) *ħa:l-i   ʃuf-et   bi-l-mra:je.

     self-my   see.PST-1SG.NOM   in-DET-mirror

     '*Myself I saw in the mirror.'

In the sentence in (4), the reflexive pronoun *ħa:l-i* 'myself' is ungrammatical because the antecedent (in this case, 'I') with which it co-refers is not found in the local domain; the antecedent is in the main IP while the reflexive pronoun falls in the CP. This constitutes an obstacle to the c-command relationship that must exist between the antecedent and the reflexive pronoun, hence the ungrammaticality of the use of a reflexive can be attributed to that it is unbound and violates Condition A. The bound pronoun morpheme *-ni* 'me' makes sentence grammatical as per Condition B because it must be unbound in its local domain by the antecedent with which it co-refers.

(4) buset$_1$ l-wlad$_2$ lamma   ʕabatˤ-u:$_2$ -ni$_1$ / *ħa:li$_1$.

     kissed.1SG.NOM   the-boys   when   hugged-3PL.NOM   -me   / *myself

     'I kissed the kids when they hugged me/*myself.'

Moreover, sentence in (5) exemplifies another classic example of Condition B. The pronoun -o 'him' is coindexed with the antecedent *Zaid*, and *Zaid* does not c-command the pronoun and hence does not bind it, mainly since they are both in two different phrases, making it a grammatical sentence. Compare with the sentence in (6) in which the pronoun -o 'him' is c-commanded by and coindexed with the antecedent *Zaid* that is in the same clause, giving rise to ungrammaticality and a violation of Condition B. To make (6) grammatical, the reflexive pronoun must be used instead.

(5) IP[Zaid$_1$ bifakker   CP[ʔinno   IP[Hind   biħibb-o$_1$]]].

     IP[Zaid   thinks   CP[that   IP[Hind   loves-him]]]

     'Zaid$_1$ thinks that Hind loves him$_1$.'

(6) Zaid$_1$ ntaqad   -o$_{*1}$ /   ħa:l-o$_1$.

     Zaid   criticized   -him   /   self-his

     'Zaid$_1$ criticized him$_{*1}$/himself$_1$.'

Pronouns and reflexives in NP positions further show that they are in complementary distribution in PA. In (7), it is ungrammatical for the antecedent *Mohammad* and the pronoun -o inside the NP to be coindexed, while co-indexation is allowed with the reflexive pronoun. This ungrammaticality is in line with the fact that the antecedent is too close to the pronoun that generally must be free in its local domain (which is the NP in this situation rather than the IP or CP), and hence it cannot bind it.

(7) Zaid$_1$ biħibb [NP ʔusˤasˤ   Mohammad$_2$ ʕann   -o$_{*2/1}$ /   ħa:l-o$_{2/*1}$]

     Zaid   likes   [NP stories   Mohammad   about   -him   /   self-his   ]

     'Zaid$_1$ likes Mohammad's$_2$ stories about him$_{1/*2}$ / himself$_{2/*1}$.'

To conclude, the data above suggests that Conditions A and B are in line with the distribution of pronouns in PA and can explain the distribution of pronouns and

reflexive pronouns. Condition B was especially able to explain the distribution of pronouns and anaphors inside NPs since the head noun in noun phrases behaves as an antecedent in a local domain, but Condition A could not account for the possibility of employing a reflexive pronoun inside NPs which the antecedent is not in them.

2.2   Condition C

Condition C requires referring expressions (R-expressions) such as nouns and proper names to be free in every domain. In (9a), *ʔinn-o* 'that' contains a non-referential masculine singular pronoun *-o*. Even though the pronoun precedes the R-expression *Jamil*, the sentence is grammatical because they are not coindexed and because the pronoun is non-referential. If they were to be coindexed, ungrammaticality arises as in (10), which completely violates Condition C in that a pronoun c-commands and is coindexed with an R-expression, and hence binds it.

(8)

a. | Samira | ʔa:l-at | ʔinn-o | Jamil | katab | kta:b. |
    |--------|---------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
    | Samira.F | said-3SG.F.NOM | that-3SG.M | Jamil | wrote.M | book |

    'Samira said that Jamil wrote a book.'

b. | Samira | ʔa:l-at | *ʔinn-o_1 | Jamil$_1$ | katab | kta:b. |
    |--------|---------|------------|-----------|-------|--------|
    | Samira.F | said-3SG.F.NOM | that-3SG.M | Jamil | wrote.M | book |

To conclude, the data above suggests Condition C's requirement of R-expressions to be free in their local domain is applicable on PA.

2.3   Conclusions

It transpires that Binding Theory is successful in explaining the distribution of proper nouns, pronouns, and anaphors in PA, and correctly accounted for it. In addition, it accurately predicted most of the sentences' grammaticality or the lack thereof.

3.   Perspective and Logophoricity

Charnavel (2020) defines logophoricity as a concept that describes linguistic elements sensitive to perspective. Pronouns that were later called "logophoric pronouns" (or logophors for short) were first identified by Hagège (1974) in West-African languages, where specific distinct pronouns were used in indirect discourse to refer to the person whose perspective is reported. It was claimed that such pronouns exist in other languages such as English, which Pollard and Sag (1992) and Baker (1995) vaguely called "exempt reflexives" and "locally free reflexives" respectively, because they have the same morphological form as regular reflexives but without a local antecedent that binds them contrary to the predictions of Condition A of Binding Theory. Based on Binding Theory, we expect to find regular pronouns in these positions, but in English it has been shown that regular and reflexive pronouns are either interchangeable or that an additional semantic layer is added to the use of one or the other, especially when that logophoric position is found in spatial prepositional phrases.

In some African languages such as Ewe, there exist distinct pronouns that are sensitive to the perspective of a subject. They were later termed "logophoric pronouns." (Clements, 1975) In English however, a confusion arises from the fact that reflexive pronouns and potentially logophoric pronouns have the same morphological form. In this section I aim to investigate the interaction between the reflexive system of PA and perspective and to explore the presence or absence of logophoric pronouns in PA.

In this paper, I investigate two elements that are sensitive to perspective: the thoughts and feelings of the perspectival center, and its deictic space.

3.1   Thoughts, feelings, and perspective

The pair of sentences in 1 show the licensing a reflexive pronoun alongside the regular pronoun in (1a) and the unacceptability of it in (1b). It is shown that in (1a) the

thoughts of the subject "Mary" are reported, and that a use of a reflexive "herself" is acceptable, while in (1b) where the thoughts of Mary are not reported, the use of a reflexive is unacceptable. The fact that the sentence is grammatical with a reflexive when Mary is the center of perspective supports the approach of Kuno who hypothesizes that the use is licensed due to Mary being the center of perspective.

(1)

    a.   According to Mary$_1$, John is a little taller than her$_1$/herself$_1$.

    b.   As for Mary$_1$, John is a little taller than her$_1$/*herself$_1$.

<div align="right">(Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd, 2007:(32a-b))</div>

In PA however, that is not the case as both sentences are ungrammatical when the reflexive pronoun *ħa:lha* 'herself' is introduced instead of the bound regular one *-ha* 'her' as a complement to the preposition *min* 'than'. The sentence is ungrammatical despite the reporting of her thoughts, and the ungrammaticality remains when Mary's perspective was not embedded as in (2b).

(2)

    a. ħasab   ħaki   Mary$_1$,   John Ɂatˤwal min -ha$_1$ / *ħ:al-ha$_1$.

       according_to   speech Mary ,   John taller   than -her   / self-her

       'According to Mary$_1$, John is a little taller than her$_1$/*herself$_1$.'

    b. bi-n-nisbe   la-Mary$_1$,   John ʃwaj Ɂatˤwal min -ha$_1$ / *ħ:al-ha.

       in-the-relation to-Mary ,   John little taller   than -her   / self-her

       'As for Mary$_1$, John is a little taller than her$_1$/*herself$_1$.'

A similar example in (3) in which the thoughts of the speaker are reported using "as for me" shows the ungrammaticality of using the reflexive *ħa:li* 'myself' instead of the bound regular pronoun *-i* 'me' as a complement to the preposition *la-* 'to'. These

examples are in line with Tawfiq's (2009: 114) findings from Modern Standard Arabic
which show that a reflexive pronoun cannot precede its antecedent in any way.

(3) bi-n-nisbe $ʔil-i_1$ / $*la-ħa:l-i_1$, $ʔana_1$ ma   nʕazamet

in-the-relation   to-me   /   to-self-my , I   NEG   was_invited.1SG

'As for me / *myself, I was not invited.'

Additionally, I tested in (4) if the reporting of feelings such as excitement would
license the use of a reflexive as a logophor. In (4a), the grammatical option of the
sentence employs the accusative form -o 'him', but once a reflexive *ħa:lo* is introduced
instead, as in (4b), the sentence is deemed ungrammatical. This contradicts the
predictions of Reinhart & Reuland (1993) of licensing reflexives in coordinated phrases.

(4)

a. $Sari_1$ tħammas   ʕaʃa:n   l-malike $ʕazm-at-o_1$

Sari   got_excited.M   because   the-queen   invited-3SG.F.NOM-him

$huwwe_1$ / $*ħa:l-o_1$ w-Sally.

he   self-his   and-Sally

'$Sari_1$ got excited because the queen invited him_1 / $*himself_1$ and Sally.'

Another instance where regular and reflexive pronouns are interchangeable in
English is directly addressing the addressee like in (5). The flexibility of saying both
"scientists like you" and "scientists like yourself" that is allowed in English does not
translate to PA, where only the first option is allowed; in 5 the second-person singular
pronoun -ak "you" is grammatical while the reflexive *ħa:lak* is not.

(5) ʕulama:ʔ   zajj $-ak_1$ / $*ħa:l-ak_1$ humme   hadijje

scientist.PL.M   like   -2SG.M /   self-your COP.3PL.M.PRES   gift

min   rabb-na.

from   god -1PL.

'Scientists like you / *yourself are a gift from God.'

Moreover, the first sentence in (6) contains a representational noun and reports the seeing of a picture of oneself from the perspective of the subject, Mary. This demonstrates another case where the use of a reflexive is blocked in PA. The flexibility in using the reflexive as a logophor in English is also attested in Hebrew, as shown in the second sentence taken from Bassel (2018: 14), where she claims that the interchangeability in Hebrew does not necessarily suggest a logophoric environment.

(6)

a. Mary$_1$ ʃa:fat   sˤu:ra   ʔil-ha$_1$ / *la-ħa:l-ha$_1$

   Mary   see.3SG.F   picture.SG.F.INDEF for-her   / for-self-her

   'Mary$_1$ saw a picture of her$_1$/*herself$_1$.'

b. miri$_1$ ra'ata   tmuna   šel   -a$_1$ / acma$_1$.

   Miri   see.3SG.F.PST   picture.SG.F.INDEF of   hers / herself

   'Miri saw a picture of hers/herself.'   (Bassel, 2018, p. 14)

There are several conclusions that are valid for all the findings above. So far, it is evident that PA is not in any way sensitive to perspective especially when the thoughts or feelings of the perspectival center are reported. It is safe to say thus far that it is ungrammatical to use the reflexive *ħa:l* as a logophor in all the environments where the logophoric *self* in English is allowed.

3.2   Space and perspective

Spatial prepositions are useful to test the logophoricity of reflexives because they add information based on the perspective of the subject of the reported event. Their use in testing logophoricity was studied by Charnavel (2021), Bassel (2018), and Rooryck and Wyngaerd (2007), and below I am going to attempt to test how reflexive pronouns in PA behave under both location and direction prepositions individually. In this section, I will be applying the animacy test that Charnavel detailed in her paper.

The aim of this test is to distinguish reflexives that are locally bound from logophors since logophors require a perception-holding epithet.

Location prepositions are prepositions that illustrate the static location of a person or a thing. Such prepositions include *under*, *next to*, *behind*, *in front of*, *inside*, *on*, and *in*, among others. I will be investigating the first five prepositions below and the behavior of reflexives as their complements. On the other hand, direction prepositions are different to location prepositions in that they embed an element of directionality in their lexical semantics. They usually accompany verbs that are dynamic or include an element of movement. Such prepositions include *around*, *towards*, *inside*, and *through*, among others. In my sentences in PA later, I tested the first two.

The sentence in (7a) below shows the unacceptability of a reflexive *ħa:lo* 'himself' coindexed with the antecedent Sami as a complement for the location preposition *taħt* 'under', and the exclusiveness of the third-person singular masculine bound pronoun -*o*. An identical situation exists in (8a) as well with the location preposition *wara* 'behind' where the same reflexive cannot complement the preposition. A similar judgment to the previous examples for the use of a reflexive pronoun exists in (9) and (10) too with the location prepositions *ʒamb* 'next to' and *ʔuddam* 'in front of' respectively. For the sake of comparison, (7b) and (8b) show the English counterparts of the same two location prepositions, where the reflexives are licensed with an additional semantic layer of physical proximity and contact.

(7)

    a.   Sami$_1$ ħat^ʕ l-ħra:m   taħt   -o$_{1/2}$ /   *ħa:l-o$_1$.

         Sami.M put.PST   the-blanket   under -3SG.M /   self-his

         'Sami$_1$ put the blanket under him$_{1/2}$ / *himself$_1$.'

    b.   Zelda examined the floor under her/herself.

<div align="right">(Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd, 2007:(12a-b))</div>

(8)

    a.   Salem$_1$ xabba   l-luʕbe   wara   -a$_{1/2}$ / *ħ:al-o$_1$.

          Salem.M   hide.PST   the-game   behind   -him   / self-his

          'Salem$_1$ put the game behind him$_{1/2}$ / *himself$_1$.'

    b.   John hid the book behind him/himself.

                            (Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd, 2007:(13a-b))

(9)   Mary$_1$ ʃa:fat   ħajje   ʒamb   -ha$_{1/2}$ / *ħa:l-ha$_1$.

       Mary   saw-3SG.F   snake.INDEF next_to   -her   / self-her

       'Mary$_1$ saw a snake next to her$_{1/2}$ / *herself$_1$.'

(10) Jude$_1$ ħatˤ-atˤ   tˤ-tˤanʒara   Ɂuddam   -ha$_{1/2}$ / *ħ:al-ha$_1$.

       Jude.F   put-3SG.F   the-cooker   in_front_of   -her   / self-her

       'Jude$_1$ put the cooker in front of her$_{1/2}$ / *herself.'

    Several conclusions arise from the previous sentences. So far, there is a persistent pattern of a complete absence of sensitivity in PA towards perspective. In summary, location prepositions in PA behave in an identical manner to the sentences that I presented in subsection 3.1; reflexive pronouns are completely blocked from being complements of location prepositions, and only a bound regular pronoun can fill that position. An interesting finding that arises from this subsection is the ambiguity that the bound pronoun produces. The bound pronoun can be coindexed with the antecedent and hence refer to it, but it can also be a free pronoun and refer to another entity that is not necessarily mentioned in the sentence. This is due to the fact that the bound pronoun does not need to be bound by an antecedent, unlike a reflexive pronoun which usually requires a binder that is mentioned earlier, as per Condition A.

    Contrary to the 10 previous sentences, in (11), the direction preposition *ħawale:n* 'around' licenses the use of the reflexive *ħa:lo* 'himself', that is coindexed with the antecedent Sami and agrees with it in number and gender, as a grammatical

complement, in addition to the bound regular pronoun. The sole difference between these two options is that the regular pronoun can potentially act as a free pronoun and hence refer to any other entity other than the antecedent.

(11) $Sami_1$ laff   l-ħram   ħawal-e:$_{1/2}$ /   ħawale:n   ħa:l-o$_1$.

Sami.M   wrapped.M   the-blanket   around-him   /   around   self-his

'$Sami_1$ rolled the blanket around him$_{1/2}$/himself$_1$.'

The same can be said regarding the sentence in (12), where the direction preposition *b-ittiʒa:h* 'towards' (literally, 'in the direction of'') licenses the use of the third-person singular feminine reflexive *ħa:lha* as a grammatical complement to it, in addition to the bound regular pronoun, to refer to the antecedent Suzy.

(12) $Suzy_1$ rama-t   tˤ-tˤa:be   b-ittiʒa:h   -ha$_{1/2}$ /   ħa:l-ha$_1$.

$Suzy_1$ threw-F.SG   the-ball   in-direction   -her   /   self-her

'$Suzy_1$ threw the ball towards her$_{1/2}$/herself$_1$.'

It is important to note that contrary to the element of physical contact that *self* in English can demonstrate that a regular pronoun cannot (Kuno, 1987), no element of physical contact is added in PA when a reflexive pronoun is used.

There are a few new findings that arise from these new findings. It is noteworthy that the licensing of a reflexive pronoun as a complement to the direction preposition creates a process of *disambiguation*. As I mentioned earlier, the regular pronoun can in a weak reading potentially refer to an entity that is not the antecedent, so it leaves an ambiguous interpretation of the prepositional phrase as a whole. However, the use of a reflexive pronoun leaves no place for ambiguity due to the fundamental nature of a reflexive that generally needs to be coindexed with a previously mentioned antecedent. As a result, the use of a reflexive in these positions constitutes a stronger assertion that the perspective being reported is that of the antecedent only.

Since a reflexive generally needs to be coindexed with a previously mentioned antecedent, that leaves us with the question if the examples in (13) and (14) are instances of a normal local binding explained by Binding Theory or of true logophoricity. To test that, I employed the animacy test in (13) and (14) where I used the same two direction prepositions *ħawale:n* and *b-ittiʒa:h*. This test distinguishes between normal reflexives and logophoric reflexives because the latter require subjects of consciousness. In (13), the subject of the sentence is the inanimate *tˁ-tˁajjara* 'the plane', and the reflexive pronoun in this example, *ħa:lha* 'herself', is licensed alongside the regular pronoun *-ha* 'her'. In (14), the same situation takes place with the inanimate subject is *l-madfaʕ* 'the canon', and its respective reflexive *ħa:lo* 'himself'.

(13) ʔitˁ-tˁajjara$_1$ laff-at   r-ra:je   ħawale:-ha$_{1/2}$ /   ħawale:n   ħa:l-ha$_1$.
      the-plane.F wrapped-F.SG the-banner around-her   /   around   self-her
      'The plane$_1$ wrapped the banner around it$_{1/2}$/itself$_1$.'

(14) l-madfaʕ$_1$ ʔatˁlaq   qaza:ʔef   b-ittiʒa:h   -o$_{1/2}$ /   ħa:l-o$_1$
      the-canon.M   fired   shells.INDEF in-direction   -him   /   self-his
      bsabab   xatˁaʔ   tiqani
      due_to   error.INDEF   technical
      'The canon$_1$ fired shells towards it$_{1/2}$/itself$_1$ due to a technical error.'

Even though the licensing of a reflexive pronoun in direction preposition might appear like a suggestion at logophoricity in PA, it is concluded from the animacy test that the reflexive pronoun is not a logophoric one, and that is simply explained by local binding by the antecedent. Nouns like 'the plane' or 'the canon' cannot be subjects of consciousness, and therefore their perspective cannot be reported or conveyed by a reflexive that is coindexed with them.

To sum up 3.2, location prepositions did not allow a reflexive pronoun to be their complement, and their sole complement can only be the bound regular pronoun. On the other hand, direction prepositions allowed a reflexive pronoun to be their complement alongside the bound regular pronoun. When these prepositions were tested using the animacy logophoricity test that Charnavel suggested, they failed, and hence the conclusion is that they are locally bound reflexives rather than logophoric reflexives that display the perspective of their antecedent. Bassel (2018) had similar findings in Hebrew, where the licensing of the Hebrew reflexive *acmi* is inconsistent and concluded that it has no logophoric function in Hebrew. Bassel also concluded that its variability across spatial PPs is a result of a structural source rather than a logophoric one.

3.3   Conclusions

In this section I investigated perspective in the reflexive system of Palestinian Arabic. I examined two elements of perspective that are the thoughts and feelings of the perspective holder, and the deictic space of the perspective holder using both location and direction spatial prepositions. I also marginally compared the distribution of the PA reflexives to the English ones in certain instances. Based on the grammaticality of the sentences in PA, and the judgments that arose from them, I attempted to answer the question whether logophoric reflexives exist in PA.

The sentences showed that reflexive pronouns were blocked completely in two instances: when the thoughts and feelings of the perspective holder were reported, and when the spatial preposition used was a location one such as *under* and *above*. However, reflexive pronouns were licensed only as complements to directional prepositions, such as *around* and *towards*, alongside the bound regular pronoun. The mere inconsistency in the licensing of the use of a reflexive constitutes a solid indicator that PA is insensitive to perspective. However, to further explore if the licensed reflexives constituted instances of logophoricity, I applied the animacy test which states

that inanimate antecedents cannot license a reflexive, but that was not the case in PA which allowed reflexive complements to direction prepositions in both animate and inanimate subjects. This further strengthens that PA is insensitive to perspective, and that logophoricity, based on the findings of this paper, is not present in PA. Therefore, I conclude that that PA is insensitive to perspective and is stricter when it comes to binding based on the total ungrammaticality of the use of reflexive *ħa:l* in places where the regular pronoun is the only option, and that Binding Theory can successfully explain that ungrammaticality.

4. More Reflexives

In the previous two sections, the predictions of Binding Theory on PA were tested and the relationship between PA reflexives and perspective was explored. In this section, I will further explore two more aspects of PA reflexives which are reflexive intensifiers and reflexive pronouns inside prepositional phrases (PPs).

4.1 Reflexive intensifiers

In their study of adverbial intensifiers in Arabic, Omar and Alotaibi (2017) categorized intensifiers into three categories: adverbial, reflexive, and other specific expressions. Common intensifiers in PA are found in the first two categories; adverbial intensifiers include the modifiers *kti:r* 'a lot, very', *(ʕan)ʒadd* 'very', among others, while reflexive intensifiers in PA come inside DPs as adjuncts. In this subsection I will investigate reflexive intensifiers and explore their semantic contribution.

Throughout the first three sections, *nafs* did not appear in any example, and that is because *ħa:l* is the standard reflexive pronoun in PA. In this section, *nafs* will play an important role as an intensifier.

4.1.1 Adjectival *nafs*

PA *nafs* plays two roles in PA. As mentioned earlier, it acts as a base to which a genitive suffix containing the grammatical features of person, number, and gender attaches and henceforth forms a reflexive pronoun. *Nafs* is also an adjective that means "same"; a similar case exists in French where French *même* can mean "same" or act as a reflexive pronoun. Even though adjectival *même* must match with the noun that it modifies in terms of number, in PA adjectival *nafs* does not change at all, as seen in (1) where the noun that it modifies is a masculine singular ('the boy') and in (2) where it is a feminine plural ('the dishes').

(1)   nafs   l-walad   ʔaʒa   l-jo:m.

      same   the-boy   came.3SG.M   the-day

      'The same boy came today.'

(2)   l-jo:m   tˤabax-na   nafs   tˤ-tˤabx-a:t.

      the-day   cooked-1PL   same   the-dish-F.PL

      'Today we cooked the same dishes.'

4.1.2   Reflexive *nafs*

English, among many other languages, exhibits a polysemy between the reflexive anaphor and the intensive modifier, as illustrated below. In (3a), "herself" is an essential argument of the predicate "escorted", while in (3b) "herself" is an adnominal adjunct. I will check if such polysemy exists in PA as well.

(3)

    a. The Queen escorted herself out.

    b. The Queen herself came to party.

In (1) and (2), *nafs* is a fixed modifier and precedes the noun it modifies. However, *nafs* is also a reflexive intensifier that must match with the noun it succeeds and refers to in gender and number. The addition or removal of an intensifier does not affect the truth conditions of the sentence at all; however, its semantic contribution is thought to be the activation of a set of alternatives for the entity it refers to, and the emphasis that the individual is a prominent member in the set it activated.

This can be seen very well in (4a), where *nafs-ha* 'herself' acts as an intensifier that emphasizes the fact that the queen came to a party. Interestingly, in English 'herself' can be an adnominal adjunct to the noun 'queen' as in (4b), and it can also be an adverbial adjunct as in (4c) which gives rise to the meaning 'the queen came alone', however that does not take place in PA.

(4)

   a. l-malike   nafs-ha   ʔaʒa-t   ʕa-l-ħafle.

      the-queen   self-her   came-3SG.F   to-the-party

      'The queen herself came to the party.'

   b. The queen herself came to the party.

   c. The queen came to the party herself.

    In (5) the semantic contribution of intensifiers is very evident. The intensifier *nafs-ha* 'herself' emphasizes the fact that the body cells specifically are getting affected from the chemotherapy and hence triggers a set of alternatives such that ALT(body cells) = {body cells, cancerous cells} of which the body cells are the prominent member. Similarly, in (6) –taken from Cohen (2009) in English and translated to PA– *nafs-o* 'himself' triggers a set of alternatives to *l-qa:dˤi* 'the judge' which consists of both the judge and the suspects, however the judge is the emphasized member.

(5) xala:ja   l-ʒisem   nafs-ha   ʕam   tmu:t   min

     cells.F   the-body   self-her   PROG die.3SG.F.SBJV   from

     l-ki:mo.

     the-chemotherapy.

     'The body cells themselves are dying from the chemotherapy.'

(6) l-qa:dˤi   nafs-o   mumken   yku:n   muzneb.

     the-judge.SG.M soul-his   may   be.3SG.M.SBJV   guilty.SG.M

     'The judge himself may be guilty.'   (Cohen, 2009: (1a))

    Additionally, (7) shows a conversation between two people in which they talk about a person that they cannot stand. Speaker 2 especially emphasizes his dislike of that person by using *nafs-i* 'myself' to say that he cannot stand him even though he does not know him.

(7) Speaker 1:   ha:d   l-ʔinsa:n   ʔana   mish   tˤa:jʔ-o.

                    this   the-human.M I   NEG   stand-him

                    'This human, I cannot stand him.'

    Speaker 2:   ʔana   nafs-i   mish   tˤa:jʔ-o   maʕʔinn-i

                    I   self-my NEG   stand.M-him even_though-1SG.NOM

                    baʕraf-o-ʃ.

                    know.1SG-him-NEG.

                    'I myself cannot stand him even though I don't know him.'

In subsection 4.1, I showed that the reflexive base *nafs* means the adjective "same" if it precedes a noun. In addition, it was evident that it solely plays the role of a reflexive intensifier succeeding a noun in PA. As an adjunct, the reflexive intensifier triggered alternatives to the noun it modified and partook in emphasizing specifically that noun.

4.2   Reflexive pronouns inside PPs

Once reflexive pronouns complement some prepositions, they give rise to various meanings. In this subsection, the use of PA prepositions *min* 'from', *b-* 'in, inside', and *la-* 'to, for' with reflexive pronouns will be investigated and the way that they as one unit produce various meanings will be examined.

In (4c) I presented an example which does not occur in PA in which a reflexive pronoun can give the meaning "alone" in English if it is adverbial. In (8) below, the meaning of "alone" can be obtained using a reflexive in PA using the preposition *b-* 'in' and the reflexive *nafs*, which in this example is the reflexive pronoun *nafs-ha* 'herself' that matches in gender and number with the noun *sitti* 'my grandma'. The same preposition can be used in conjunction with *ħa:l* this time in (9) to virtually mean the same thing of leaving someone alone. Interestingly, the reflexive pronoun is not

c-commanded or bound by the subject, which constitutes a very rare occurrence in which and a reflexive refers to and is coindexed with the object (in this case "her") and not the subject and the generally respected Condition A is violated. Additionally, it is interesting that in (8) *nafs* is acceptable while *ħa:l* is not, while in (9) the opposite is true.

(8) sitt-i   ħadˤdˤar-at   l-ʔakel   b-   nafs-ha   / *ħa:l-ha.

   grandma-my   prepared-3SG.FEM   the-food   in-   self-her   / self-her

   'My grandma prepared the food herself.'

(9) ʔutruk-ha   b-   ħa:l-ha!   /   *nafs-ha!

   leave.IMP-her   in   self-her   /   self-her

   'Leave her alone!'

Another PA preposition is *la-* 'to'. In a similar manner to the preposition *b-*, when *la-* is joined with a reflexive pronoun it yields a meaning that the subject is alone or doing the activity alone, as seen in the set in (10). The subject "she" is sitting by herself in (10b) where *la-ħa:l-ha* is added, but it is not when *la-ħa:l-ha* is not in (10a). Similarly, in (11) *la-ħa:l-hom* produces the meaning that the organizers organized the meeting on their own.

(10)

   a. hijje   ʔa:ʕd-e.

      she   sit.APRT-SG.F

      'She is sitting.'

   b. hijje   ʔa:ʕd-e   la-ħa:l-ha.

      she   sit.APRT-SG.F   to-self-her

      'She is sitting by herself.'

(11) nazˤzˤam-u   l-ʔiʒtima:ʕ   la-ħa:l-hom.

   organized-3PL.NOM   the-meeting   to-self-their

   'They organized the meeting alone.'

Furthermore, *la-* and a reflexive pronoun can also behave as an intensifier if it is adnominal, as shown in (11). The removal of *la-ħa:l-o* does not change the general meaning of the sentence or its truth conditions, which further strengthens that its function is semantic and that it behaves like an intensifier that emphasizes the subject. This is an important difference between this example and the others, since reflexives in the others add new information and their removal changes the meaning.

(12) <u>Context</u>: two students talking about studying another major at college.

t-taxasˤsˤos	la-ħa:l-o	sˤiʕeb,	fa	ki:f	law	tne:n?
the-major.M	to-self-his	hard,	so	how	if	two?

'The major is hard on its own, imagine if there were two?'

An interesting case of *la-* is the ambiguity it could trigger if it is interpreted literally. In (12), *la-ħa:l-ha* could mean either "on her own" similar to the previous examples of *la-*, but it could also mean "for herself" if *la-* has a compositional contribution to the overall meaning, henceforth making "herself" an additional argument of the predicate "buy".

(13)
l-mara	ʔa:l-at	ʔin-ha	raħ	tiʃtri
the-woman	said-3SG.F	that-3SG.F.NOM	FUT	buy.3SG.F.SBJV
l-ward	la-ħa:l-ha			
the-flowers	to-self-her.			

'The woman said that she is going to buy the flowers herself / for herself'

Min 'from' is another preposition that has a widespread use with reflexive pronouns. *Min* and a reflexive pronoun yield a very distinctive meaning that underlies a factor of unexpectedness or undesirability. In (13) the speaker describes the decision to cancel the party as unexpected using *min ħa:l-o*. A similar example is shown in (14) where the speaker describes another lady's bringing of food to the party as unsolicited.

23

(14) huwwe   min   ħa:l-o   qarrar   jilɣi   l-ħafle

He   from   self-his decided.3SG.M   cancel.3SG.M.SBJV   the-party

'He decided to cancel the party unannounced/unexpectedly/without discussing the

matter with us.'

(15) hijje   min   ħa:l-ha   ʒa:b-at   ʔakel   ʕa-l-ħafle.

she   from   self-her   brought-3SG.F   food   to-the-party

'She brought food to the party (without being asked to).'

It is important to note that in the examples (9) through (14), *nafs* cannot substitute *ħa:l* and that such substitution makes the sentence ungrammatical. This is another indication that the reflexive base *nafs* is generally restricted to being an intensifier, and that *ħa:l* is the regular reflexive base that occurs in almost all other reflexive positions.

4.3   Conclusions

In this section, I further examined additional uses of reflexive pronouns in PA. In subsection 4.1 the role of the reflexive base *nafs* as an intensifier in PA was investigated. It was revealed that it is the sole adnominal intensifier in PA. In subsection 4.2, I studied and explored reflexive pronouns inside PPs and the meanings that they yield as one unit. In most examples *ħa:l* was the only grammatical reflexive base.

An important conclusion that arose from this section is that *ħa:l* and *nafs* are never interchangeable. *Nafs* acts primarily as a reflexive intensifier while *ħa:l* occurs in nearly all other reflexive instances. Since the two reflexive bases have two different linguistic functions, it can be safely said that the polysemy that takes place in English between reflexive pronouns and reflexive intensifiers does not occur in PA in the literal sense that the same *self*-forms play both roles.

5.   Conclusion

In this paper I explored several aspects of Palestinian Arabic reflexive pronouns. In section 1, I introduced Palestinian Arabic and its pronominal system, and described the data that I discussed throughout the paper. In section 2, the predictions of Binding Theory and its application on PA were tested, and it was concluded that Binding Theory was able to account for the distribution of nouns, pronouns, and reflexive pronouns in PA. In section 3, I investigated perspective in the reflexive system of PA using two elements of perspective that are thoughts and feelings of the perspectival center and its deictic space using location and direction prepositions. In section 4, I tackled more facets of PA reflexives such as reflexive intensifiers and reflexive pronouns inside PPs and concluded that *nafs* and *ħa:l* are never interchangeable, and that the former's main function is as an adnominal intensifier while the latter's takes place in essentially all other reflexive instances.

6. References

1. Al-Momani, Islam. 2015. Disjoint Reference in Modern Standard Arabic. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 4*(8), 256-267.

2. Bassel, Noa. 2018. Logophoricity: The Hebrew Perspective.

3. Baker, C.L. 1995. Contrast, Discourse Prominence, and Intensification, with Special Reference to Locally Free Reflexives in British English. *Language* 71. 63-101.

4. Charnavel, Isabelle. 2021. Logophoricity, Perspective, and Reflexives. Annual *Review of Linguistics* 7. 131-155.

5. Clements, George. 1975. The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10. 141-177.

6. Diab, Basma. 2019. Anaphoricty and Logophoricity in Egyptian Arabic (EA): A Minimalist Approach. *Journal of Scientific Research in Arts* 20. 357-392.

7. Kuno, Susumu. 1987. *Functional syntax: Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy*. University of Chicago Press.

8. Omar, Abdulfattah., Alotaibi, Mansour. (2017). Geographic Location and Linguistic Diversity: The Use of Intensifiers in Egyptian and Saudi Arabic. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 7. 220-229.

9. Tawfiq, Randa. 2009. Anaphors in Modern Standard Arabic Syntax with Reference to Modern Syntax Theories. Amman: Middle East University for Graduate Studies. (MA thesis).