

Abstract

In Standard Arabic (SA) two complementary kinds of reflexives can be distinguished. The first type is bound reflexives, where they have their antecedents within the domain of their clauses. The other type is non bound reflexives, which are termed in this study as Long distance reflexives (LDRs). LDRs have their antecedents outside their clause, which are always the subjects of their matrix Ss. LDRs in Standard Arabic exist in two constructions: a) prepositional phrases and b) comparative clauses. The present study investigates the different distributions of LDRs in SA and suggests a semantic model that can account for these distributions.

1.0 Objectives of the research

The feature of Long Distance Reflexives (LDRs) is a universal feature that can be traced in many different languages including Standard Arabic (SA) among them .An LDR is not usually bound by an antecedent within the boundary of its domain. However, although the LDR is not anteceded in its clause, it is bound by an antecedent that usually the NP that functions as the subject of its matrix S. Accordingly, the term 'long distance reflexive ' refers to the particular nature of that particular type of reflexives that have their antecedents across the boundaries of

their clauses. In SA, LDRs can be observed in two constructions:
a) prepositional phrases constructions and b) comparative constructions.

The present study focuses on this feature of LDRs in SA and provides an analytical survey for their distributions in these two constructions. To provide this analysis , the study suggests a model that can systematically account for the mechanism of LDRs in SA.

1.1 Distributions of LDRs in SA

In SA, the reflexive pronoun is presented by the word "nafs" , (self) which is followed by a personal pronoun. This pronoun is inflected for number and person to agree with the antecedent to which it is bound¹ The reflexive in SA has the following syntactic features (a) it requires a binding relation with an antecedent, (b) both the reflexive and its antecedent exist in the same clause, (c) the reflexive must be c-commanded by its antecedent, and (d) the reflexive must agree with its antecedent in features of number , person and gender, distribution with the pronoun, that is the. In the following examples:-

1- Zalama rrajul-u nafsa-hu
did unjust def. man-nom himself
(lit). The man did unjust for himself.

2- Zalamat il-bint-u nafsa-haa.
did unjust def. girl-nom herself.
(lit) The girl did unjust for herself.

3- Zanna rrajul-u ?anna jaara-hu yufjib-u nafsah-u.

1 2 1* /2

thought def-man –nom that neighbor-his likes himself.

(lit) The man thought that his neighbor likes himself.

The reflexive pronouns are clause bound by their antecedents which exist in the same clause. Morphologically, reflexives show markers of person, number and gender to agree with their antecedents. The reflexive, moreover, is not allowed to be anteceded outside its domain.

LDRs , on the other hand , are in complementary distributions with bound reflexives. The syntactic features of LDRs can be summarized as follows : (a) they are free in their clauses, (b) they are not to be bound by an antecedent if there is any in their clause, and (c) they are bound by antecedents which are always the subjects of their matrix Ss. This can be shown in the following examples:-

4- ?ista?jara ssaid-u al-xaadim-a li-nafsi-hi.

1 2 1 / 2*

hired def-master-nom. Def- servant-acc .for himself.

(lit) The master hired the servant for himself.

5- tu?jibb-u il bint-u ?uma-haa ?akθara min nafsi-haa.

1 2 1 / 2 *

like def.girl-nom def.mother more than herself.

(lit) The girl likes her mother more than herself.

In (4) , the reflexive ` li- nafsi-hi` (for himself), is not bound by the antecedent `?al-xaadima` (the servant) though it exists in the same clause of the reflexive . And is bound by the antecedent `?a-ssayed` (the master) which is the subject of the matrix S and does not exist with the reflexive in the same domain. The same case is also observed in (5) where the reflexive is bound by ` ?al ?umm-u` , (the mother), the subject of the matrix S. In both of the example above, the coindexing between the reflexive pronoun and the antecedent that is in its domain is barred and renders ungrammatical reading. Also, we can observe that though the two NPs in (4) and (5) have the same features of gender, person and number but the coindexing of the reflexive and the antecedent in the subject matrix S is only acceptable reading.

Distributions of bound reflexives in SA can be accounted for by the condition (A) of the Binding Theory (Chomsky 1980, 1981, 1986)² As the condition (A) states, the anaphor , including the ,reflexive, must be bound in its governing category. In studies conducted on both classical as well as colloquial Arabic, the distributions of reflexives are justified within the premises of the condition (A) of the Binding Theory. Abdul-Ghany (1980) concludes that the distributions of bound reflexives in Classical Arabic can be accounted for by the condition (A) of the binding Theory. The same conclusion has been confirmed by Agameya

(1988) . She asserts the fact that bound reflexives in Colloquial Cariene Arabic can be accounted for by the cognition (A) of the Binding Theory.

Different from bound reflexives, LDRs are similar in their distributions to pronominals. Both should be free in their clauses. However, though pronominals may or may not be bound by an antecedent in the matrix S, the LDR must be bound by the antecedent which occupies the subject position of the matrix S. Condition (B) of the Binding Theory which can justify the distributions of pronominals can not provide an account for the distributions of LDRs. As it is referred to above, a pronoun may or may not be bound by an entity in the matrix S, as the condition states, but with LDRs the case is different. The LDR must be free and not to be anteceded within its clause, at the same time it must be coindexed with the subject of the matrix S, otherwise unacceptable reading will result , as examples (4-5) show. Thus, the adoption of a syntactic approach to justify the feature of LDRs in SA .

The above examples reflect the inadequacy of the condition (A) of the Binding Theory to account for the reflexive- antecedent relationship as shown in (4) and (5). This inadequacy is due to the fact that the condition is a condition on intrasentential reflexives not on intersentential ones. In other words , the distributions of LDRs are not to be accounted for within a syntactic framework such as the principles of the binding theory.

LDRs in SA are not in complementary distributions with the bound reflexives. At the same time, they are similar to pronominals in the fact that they are to be free in their domain. However, where pronominals may or may not corefer to an entity in the higher clause, LDRs are to be coindexed with the subject of the matrix S to render grammatical and acceptable reading.

2-The model of analysis

The discussion surveyed in (1-2) has shown that there are similarities as well as dissimilarities between the LDR on one hand and both the bound reflexive and pronominals on the other hand. The LDR is different from the bound reflexive in the sense that it is free in its clause. But, it is similar to the bound reflexive in the sense that it must be bound by an antecedent. Similarly, the LDR is identical to the pronominal in the sense that it must be free in its clause. But, it is different from the pronominal in the sense that it must be obligatorily coindexed with an antecedent outside its clause ; the subject of its matrix S. So, it can be said that the LDR has the syntactic features[+anaphoric] and [+ pronominal]

Moreover, as said in (1-2) , The LDR is a universal feature which is common in many languages. languages such as English, French, Icelandic, Chinese and Japanese reflect this feature of LDR. Kuno (1989) refers to examples of LDRs in English that challenge the syntactic framework of the BT. Examples of pictures NPs and snake sentences³ , he argues, cannot be

accounted for by the statement of the condition (A). Instead, he proposes an analytical framework based on a functional approach⁴. Zribi-Hertz (1989) introduces a bazaar of LDRs in English which represent counter examples to the condition (A). She suggests a number of principles to account for the distributions of LDRs⁵. These principles pertain to discourse not to syntax. Reinhart and Reuland (1993) agree that examples of LDRs, as represented in the pictures NPs and snake sentences introduce a violation of the condition (A). As these examples cannot be justified syntactically, she argues that the condition (A) should be modified to be not a condition on anaphors, but to be rather a condition on the predicate; i.e. the verb and its arguments⁶. Cole and et. al (1990, 1996 1998) point out that the feature of LDR are found in some Chinese dialects. In Japanese and Icelandic languages. Sells (1987) investigates the same feature of LDRs in different dialects of Chinese, Icelandic and Japanese languages. He suggests an analytical approach that is based on the concept of logophoricity.⁷

The model which is suggested in this study and adopted in the analysis of LDRs consists of a condition which is subdivided into two premises which can be stated as follows:-

- (6) In prepositional phrases constructions and comparative constructions, the LDR can be anteceded with the subject of the matrix S iff:-
 - (A) The verb in the matrix S denotes the physical or the mental state of the matrix S subject.

(B) No other antecedent whose physical or mental state intervenes between the LDR and matrix S subject antecedent.

The model as formulated above is different from the other approached surveyed above in many different aspects. First, the present model is basically semantic. It concentrates on the semantic content of the predicate of the clause. It is observed in the data of analysis in SA that the predicate denotes the actions, mental and physical states of the antecedent of the LDR. Second, the model states the condition when the reflexive pronoun becomes an LDR, as stated in (6-A). Third, the model, as well, states the condition when the reflexive pronoun is a bound reflexive, as stated in (6-B). Accordingly, the model as stated in two principles, can be applied either on bound reflexives or LDRs.

3- Data Analysis

This section deals with the distributions of LDRs in CA in both prepositional phrases and comparative constructions . The investigation conducted in this section investigates the validity of the suggested model in providing an account for the distributions of LDRs in SA.

3.1 LDRs in prepositional phrases constructions

Prepositional phrases in CA are phrases that are headed by prepositions such as `li` (for), `?ila` (to) or `fan` (about). In these constructions, the reflexive which follows these

himself

(lit) the master left the servant speaking about himself

9-A) yaṣhad-u ll-qaaDi ṣmaam rraṣiis-a bi llḥaḥi ṣala

1

2

Witness def.judge-nom front def.president about

nafsihi

1 / 2*

himself

(lit) the judge said the truth in front of the president even about himself.

B)ṣakara rraṣiis-u ll-qaaDi-a li-qawli-hi illḥaḥa

1

2

Thanked def.president-nom. def.judge-acc. for saying-

The truth

ṣala nafsi-hi.

1* / 2

on himself.

(lit) The president thanked the judge for saying the truth on himself.

10- A) ṣaaḥara muḥammad -un ṣṢadiiq-a ṣala nafsi-hi

1

2

1 / 2*

Preferred Mohamed-nom. Def.friend-acc. on himself.

(lit) Mohamed preferred his friend to himself.

B) laaḥaZa muḥammad-un ṣanna ṣṢadiiq-a ṣaaḥara

noticed Mohamed-nom. that def-friend-acc. prefer
 l-xayr-a li- nafsi-hi

1* / 2

def.goodness for himself.

(lit) Mohamed noticed that the friend preserved the
 goodness for himself.

we can observe the following :- a) they are not bound by antecedents that are in their domains, b) they are bound by antecedents that are in the subject position of their matrix Ss .The distributions as shown above, can be accounted for by condition (6) . The verbs in (6-a -10-a) reflect either a mental or physical state of the antecedent of the LDR. In other words, the antecedent ` s feeling or attitude is dominant in these examples. In (7-a) the verb (?axbara), conveys a physical movement of telling on the part of the speaker. In (8-a), the verb (istaxlaSa) indicates the sense of possession on the part of the antecedent. In (9-a) the verb (yaʃhadu) also expresses the mental state of the antecedent concerning his readiness to tell the truth or to tell what he has said. Similarly, , the verb in (10- a) (?aaθara) denotes the sense of preference on the part of the speaker. In all these cases, the reflexives are not to be bound as principle (6-a) states . Accordingly, they are LDRs and to be bound by the subjects of their matrix Ss. Meanwhile, if we try to impose a coindexing relation between these LDRs and NPs which exist in their domains the result will give unacceptable

readings. This unacceptability, as the rule (7-a) states, is due to the fact that the NP2, which is the nearest to the reflexive, has no mental or physical participation which allows it coindex with the reflexive in its domain.

However, the case is different in (7b -10b). Coindexing between the NPs and the reflexives are not permitted and render unacceptable readings. The verbs that follow NPs1 denote mental and physical activities on the part of those NPs1 which allow them to be the antecedents of the reflexives , as principle (6-a) states. However, there is a mental or a physical state which intervenes between the subject of the matrix S and the LDR. So, coindexing is blocked between the reflexive and NP1 and is permitted with NP2. In (7-b) , the mental state is represented by the same verb `yatahadaθu`. In (8b), the verb `yatahadaθu` represents the mental or the physical state of the speaker. In (9-b) and (10-b), the verbs `lu-qawli-hi` and `?aaθar` do the same function of introducing the mental and the physical states of the NP2. Accordingly, the intervention of these new mental or physical states, the reflexives in the above examples are to be bound and to have their antecedents within their domains.

To summarize, reflexives in CA can be LDRs and to antecede with NPs in subject positions of their clauses when the mental or physical states of these NPs are represented. But this relation of

(lit) The mother loves her daughter more than herself.

13- yajib-u ?an yantaqida l-?aakim-u l-wazeer

1 2

should that criticize def.ruler-nom. def. minister

?akθara min nafsih.

1 / *2

more than himself

(lit) The ruler should criticize the minister more than
himself .

The reflexives in these examples are LDRs as they antecede with the subjects of the matrix Ss , not the NPs that exist in their domains. Distributions of LDRs can be also accounted for by condition (6-b) , repeated her for convenience:-

14-b. In SA, LDR is permitted to antecede with the matrix S subject iff no antecedent with an expressed mental or physical state intervenes between both of them.

In (12), The verb ` tufibu` reflects the mental state of the subject `?a-?um-u` while the other NP ` ?ibnata-ha` does not reflect any mental or physical state. Accordingly, the reflexive `nafsih` is an LDR and can antecede with the matrix S subject, which is `?al-?um`. The same case is observed in (13). The verb `yantaqid-u` reflects a physical and mental state related to the subject `?al-haakim`.The second NP ` ?al-waziir-a` does not reflect any state whether mentally or physically. So, the reflexive `nafsih` as an LDR can antecede with NP1 which exists as the subject of the matrix S , not the NP2.

However, reflexives can be bound when a mental or a physical state intervenes between the matrix subject and an LDR. This can be shown in the following examples :-

14- Yuriidu I-ʔab-u ʔakθara mima yuriidu ʔaxiih-hi

1

2

Want def.father-nom. more than want brother-his
finafsi-hi

*1 / 2

Self-him.

(lit) The father wants more than his brother wants for himself.

15- yudaafiʔa I-muʔaami ʔan al-muttaham-i

1

2

Defened def. lawyer about ef. criminal-acc

ʔakθara mima yudaafiʔ-u I- muttaham-u ʔan nafsi-hi

2

*1 / 2

more than defend def. criminal about himself.

(lit) The lawyer defends the criminal more than the criminal defends himself.

In these examples, the reflexives is separated from the subject of the matrix S by a mental or physical state presented by the NP2. thus, coindexing of the reflexive and with NP1 is banned; whereas, coindexing with NP2 is permitted. As principle (6-b)

states, the reflexive is to be bound by the nearest antecedent to it since that NP has an expression of mental or physical state.

As a conclusion, condition (6) with its two sub-principles (a) and (b) is adequate enough to account for the distributions of both in bound reflexives and LDRs in SA.

4. CONCLUSION

This study is an attempt to investigate the feature of LDRs in SA and to provide an account of its distributions. The study concentrates on two constructions of SA : prepositional phrases and comparative constructions. These two constructions reflect the feature of LDRs.

To achieve this purpose, a condition for analysis is proposed and adopted for the analysis of this feature. The condition is basically semantic. It is based on the semantic content of the verb. It is noticed that the verb which denotes a physical action or a mental state of that NP is apt to be the antecedent of an LDR. The condition falls into two premises. The first premise states when the reflexive in SA is to be considered as an LDR. The second premise shows when the reflexive is to be bound in its domain.

In section (3), the applicability of the rule has been conducted. The application of the condition proves its validity and adequacy of the suggested condition in providing an account of the feature of LDR in SA. The suggested condition proves its generality as it answers the questions of how and why a reflexive in SA can or

cannot be bound. So, the condition is more general and powerful than other conditions and models suggested for the analysis of LDRs in many different languages , as surveyed in section (2) of this study .

Endnotes

1- See Abdul Ghani (1981) FOR THE REFLEXIVES IN Standard Arabic and Agameya (1988) for reflexives in Colloquial Cariene Arabic.

2- Chomsky (1980, 1986) states his Binding principles on the distributions of anaphors, pronouns and lexical expressions. His condition on anaphors, reflexives and reciprocals states that 'an anaphor must be bound in its governing category.'

3- Kuno (1989) refers to the inadequacy of the condition (A) of the Binding theory to account for the distributions of reflexives that exist unbound in their clauses. He introduces his pictures NPs examples where reflexives are not bound in their clauses. Of these examples (his (3-1,3-2),162):-

1- a- John showed Mary a picture of himself.

*b-John showed Mary a picture of him.

1

2

2- a- John bought from Mary a picture of himself.

*b-John bought from Mary a portrait of him.

4- Kuno (ibid.) proposes a semantico -syntactic principles that can account for the unbound reflexives in English which is used to filter out sentences 'in which a weak controller for control of anaphors has been chosen over a much stronger potential controller for coindexing.'

5- Zribi-Hertz (1989) introduces principles related to discourse grammar to account for LDRs, such as 'subject of consciousness' and 'point of view'. Subject of consciousness is "a semantic property which is assigned to the referent whose thoughts or feelings, optionally expressed in speech and conveyed by a portion of the discourse." The domain of point of view is defined by Zribi -Hertz as " a portion of discourse which involves one and only one narrative point of view."

6- To account for sentences as the following: - a) I saw a snake near *myself / me b) I saw a snake next to herself / her, Reinhart and Reuland (1993) suggest the following rule (p. 678):-

A) A reflexive- marked syntactic predicate is reflexive

b) A reflexive semantic predicate is reflexive marked

7- 'Logophoricity' is a term which was introduced in studies related to African languages. The logophoric pronoun is distinguished from the other pronouns in the sense that the antecedent of the former pronoun must be the one "whose speech, thoughts, feelings or general state of consciousness are reported." More recently, the same notion of logophoricity has been used to account for reflexives which are free in their clauses. For further details about the notion of logophoricity see Clements (1875) and Sells (1987)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adul Ghany, M.K. (1981), Government Binding in Classical Arabic. Ph.D. Dissertation, university of Texas, Austin.
- Agameya, A.(1988), NP Movement and Government Binding In Spoken Egyptian Arabic. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cairo, Egypt.
- Chomsky, N. (1980), " On Binding". *Linguistic Inquiry* 11,1-46.
- _____ (1981), Lectures On Government and Binding.
Foris , Dordrexht
- _____ (1986) Barriers. MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Clements, G.N. (1975), "The logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: its role In Discourse." *Journal of West African Languages* 2, 141- 177.
- Cole, Peter and Chengchi Wang. (1996), "Antecedents and Blockers of Long distance Reflexives". *Linguistic Inquiry* 27: 357-390.
- Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon and Li-May Sung. (1990), "Principles and Parameters of Long Distance Reflexives." *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:1-22
- Cole, Peter and G. Hermon. (1998), "Long Distance Reflexives in Singapore Malay: An apparent Typological anomaly". *Linguistic Typology* 2,1 (Spring 1998).
- Kuno,Susumu. (1989), Functional Syntax : Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy. Chicago: Chicago university press

Reihart, T., & Reuland, E. (1993), Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry*,
24(4) : 657-720.

Sells, Peter. (1987), "Aspects of Logophoricity." *Linguistic Inquiry*,
18(3) : 445 – 479.

Zribi-Hertz, Anne. (1989), " anaphor binding and narrative Point
Of View: English Reflexive Pronoun in Sentence and
Discourse". *Language*, 65 (4): 695-727.
