

THE  
SOCIOPRAGMATICS  
OF ATTITUDE  
DATIVES IN  
LEVANTINE  
ARABIC

**Youssef A. Haddad**





# The Sociopragmatics of Attitude Datives in Levantine Arabic

*For every refugee and every child in a war zone,  
May you find a home!*

THE SOCIOPRAGMATICS  
OF ATTITUDE DATIVES IN  
LEVANTINE ARABIC

---

Youssef A. Haddad

EDINBURGH  
University Press

Edinburgh University Press is one of the leading university presses in the UK. We publish academic books and journals in our selected subject areas across the humanities and social sciences, combining cutting-edge scholarship with high editorial and production values to produce academic works of lasting importance. For more information visit our website: [edinburghuniversitypress.com](http://edinburghuniversitypress.com)

© Youssef Haddad, 2018  
Edinburgh University Press Ltd  
The Tun – Holyrood Road, 12(2f) Jackson’s Entry, Edinburgh EH8 8PJ

Typeset in Ehrhardt MT by  
Servis Filmsetting Ltd, Stockport, Cheshire, and  
printed and bound in Great Britain

A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978 1 4744 3407 2 (hardback)  
ISBN 978 1 4744 3408 9 (webready PDF)  
ISBN 978 1 4744 3409 6 (epub)

The right of Youssef Haddad to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, and the Copyright and Related Rights Regulations 2003 (SI No. 2498).

# Contents

---

Preface	vii
Abbreviations and Other Notes	ix
1 Introduction	1
1 Putting things in perspective	1
2 Attitude dative constructions: an overview	3
2.1 Topic/affectee-oriented ADs	4
2.2 Speaker-oriented ADs	8
2.3 Hearer-oriented ADs	10
2.4 Subject-oriented ADs	12
3 Purpose and significance	14
4 Data sources	16
5 A roadmap	21
2 Attitude Datives in Social Context – The Analytic Tools	23
1 Introduction	23
2 ADCs and context	28
2.1 The sociocultural context	29
2.2 The situational context	29
2.3 The co-textual context	31
2.4 ADs in context	32
3 ADs and evaluation	33
4 ADCs and the stancetaking stage model	37
4.1 Theory of stance	37
4.2 The stage model	39
4.3 ADCs in the stancetaking stage model	44
5 Putting it all together	46
6 Conclusion	51

3	Speaker-Oriented Attitude Datives in Social Context	53
1	Introduction	53
2	SP-ADCs as directives	57
2.1	SP-AD directives and hierarchical authority	58
2.2	SP-AD directives and reciprocal authority	78
2.3	SP-AD directives and knowledge authority	83
3	SP-ADCs as representatives	85
3.1	SP-AD representatives as second-person complaints	87
3.2	SP-AD representatives as third-person complaints	91
4	Conclusion	96
4	Hearer-Oriented Attitude Datives in Social Context	98
1	Introduction	98
2	HR-ADs, attention grabbing, and hearer engagement	100
3	HR-ADCs as commissives: recognizing the hearer as an authority	102
4	HR-ADCs as representatives	109
4.1	HR-AD representatives as first-person bragging	109
4.2	HR-AD representatives as third-person praise and criticism	113
5	Conclusion	129
5	Subject-Oriented Attitude Datives in Social Context	131
1	Introduction	131
2	SUBJ-ADCs as representatives	133
2.1	SUBJ-AD representatives about insignificant events	133
2.2	SUBJ-ADCs about surprising events	140
3	SUBJ-ADCs as directives	144
3.1	SUBJ-AD directives as requests	144
3.2	SUBJ-ADCs as suggestions	148
3.3	SUBJ-ADCs as challenges	153
4	Conclusion	155
6	Final Remarks	156
	Bibliography	158
	Index	167



# Preface

---

I first came across the topic of non-core arguments in 2010 when I attended a talk on personal datives in Southern American English at the Arizona Linguistics Circle 4 in Tucson. A personal dative is an optional pronoun that is coreferential with the subject in a sentence: for example, *me* in *I wanna hear me a sad song* (from Toby Keith's country song 'Get My Drink On'). I realized then, somewhat to my own surprise, that personal datives also exist in my native variety of Lebanese Arabic. Given my background in syntax, I immediately began to wonder: how are personal datives licensed in a position where reflexive pronouns are expected? I went on to analyze the syntax of personal datives, as well as other types of non-core arguments that are licensed in Lebanese Arabic, and before long I found myself delving into the pragmatic functions of these datives and the attitudinal contributions they make to utterances. That was when I started to refer to them as 'attitude datives'.

For my syntactic and pragmatic analyses, I initially relied on constructed examples, elicited examples, and attested data that I collected during fieldwork. Four points became clear in the process. First, attitude datives are not unique to Lebanese Arabic, and are in fact a regional feature of Levantine Arabic (that is, Jordanian, Lebanese, Palestinian, and Syrian Arabic) in general. They are also licensed in most, if not all, other Arabic dialects; however, cross-dialectal variations become more apparent once one moves outside the Levant.

Second, the pragmatic contributions of attitude datives depend crucially on who is saying what to whom, where, when, and to what end. This means that syntactic and semantic accounts of these datives may successfully answer questions about their distribution and overarching meanings, but may not capture the wide range of meanings and functions that they can bring to an interaction. Instead, we need an analysis that goes beyond the sentence level, examining the social functions of a sizeable corpus of attitude datives as they are employed in situated utterances. I quickly realized that elicited examples and a small number of attested data in limited settings just would not do the trick.

Third, at least in Levantine Arabic, these datives are notoriously inconspicuous. In fact, I had hardly noticed their existence prior to the talk in Arizona. Language users are very sensitive to their effect, and yet they are hardly aware that they are a feature of their own speech. When I point out to native speakers that they have just used one of these optional datives, they are often surprised and entertained. Importantly, when I continue to ask about the intended meaning of the dative, or why the speaker had used it, she or he is usually unable to provide a clear answer. In this respect, these datives stand in stark contrast with other pragmatic phenomena that speakers are able to explain metapragmatically. For example, native speakers of Lebanese Arabic are often able to explain quite adequately why they add a curse word to an utterance, or why they occasionally swear in English or French instead of in Arabic. Attitude datives prove to be more difficult to tap into metapragmatically.

Fourth, these datives are not easy to translate into other languages. For example, they are often ignored in movie subtitles and in translations of literary works that use colloquial Arabic. This may be the case either because they pass unnoticed, or because the translator is not able to find an equivalent in the target language.

These four points led me to conduct a study on attitude datives in their social contexts, focusing primarily on Levantine Arabic. The last two points are especially relevant to the topic of teaching an Arabic dialect as a foreign language. Native instructors of a Levantine variety of Arabic intuitively know how, where, when, and with whom to use attitude datives, but they may struggle to teach them, or about them, effectively. A systematic analysis of the social functions of these datives may make this task easier.

This work would not have been possible without the support of my institution, the University of Florida. I am especially thankful for the two Humanities Scholarship Enhancement Fund awards I received in the summers of 2012 and 2014, and for a sabbatical leave in 2016–17. I am also grateful to Sara Court, Hamed Al-Jaraadat, Virginia LoCastro, and Iman Al-Ramadan for reading earlier versions of this book and for all their input. I thank Aida Bamia, two anonymous reviewers, and the audience at the 31st Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics in Oklahoma for valuable feedback. I am grateful to Wendy Lee for copy-editing the book. Laura Williamson, Richard Strachan, Joannah Duncan, Rebecca Mackenzie and the rest of the Edinburgh University Press team were also wonderful; I thank them for their promptness and professionalism.

Finally, I owe a lot to my family and friends for being so loving and supportive throughout the whole process. I thank God for seeing me through it all. ‘Thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me’ – they always have.

# Abbreviations and Other Notes

---

## Abbreviations of Arabic varieties

JOR	Jordanian Arabic
LEB	Lebanese Arabic
PAL	Palestinian Arabic
SYR	Syrian Arabic

## Other abbreviations and symbols

1SG	first person singular
ACC	accusative
D	dative
INTER	interjection
NEG	negation
POSS	possessive marker
PROG	progressive
Q	question
VOC	vocative
.	final intonation
,	continuing intonation
?	rising/question intonation
!	exclamatory intonation
(.)	short pause
...	ellipsis
((laugh))	researcher comments
<stretch of talk>	words or phrases that may not be properly identified

### Some remarks about the gloss and translation as used in this book

- All linguistic data are presented in International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) characters. Data from Facebook are additionally included as snapshots of the original posts, all of which were available for public viewing at the time of research. Most data from TV shows, movies, and plays are also available as audiovisual files on a companion website <https://edinburghuniversitypress.com/haddad>.
- Pronouns: Levantine Arabic – and Arabic in general – does not have neutral versus feminine/masculine pronouns or agreement. For the sake of clarity, however, when a pronoun or agreement morphology is linked to a neutral entity, I gloss it as ‘it.’
- Prepositions: The same Levantine Arabic preposition may have different English meanings in different contexts, and vice versa (different Levantine Arabic prepositions in different contexts may translate into the same English preposition). The gloss tries to capture the English meaning. For example, the Lebanese Arabic preposition *ʕa-* in *ʕa-l-tʕa:mle* ‘on-the-table’ is glossed as ‘on,’ while *ʕa* in *ʕa-l-madrase* ‘on-the-school’ is glossed as ‘to.’
- Verb agreement: Arabic, including Levantine Arabic, is a subject pro-drop language with rich verbal agreement. In the examples, if the subject is present, verbs are glossed only as verbs: for example, *na:dya ʔakalit* ‘Nadia ate.’ If the subject is dropped and context is not enough to determine who the subject is, the gloss includes agreement in the form of subject/nominative pronouns: for example, *ʔakalit* ‘she.ate.’
- The English translation of the Levantine Arabic examples tries to provide a general sense of their truth conditions without trying to capture their pragmatic nuances. Discussion of relevant pragmatic contribution is provided in the text.

### Remark on feature films, plays, series, and talk shows

All of the audiovisual materials from films, plays, and so on that I use for this study, including materials obtained from my personal collection, were accessible on Youtube at the time of research. Most materials were made publicly available on Youtube by the production companies or TV stations that originally produced them. In order to facilitate access to the data and provide the reader with a feel as to how the attitude dative constructions I examine sound in context, I have prepared trimmed 5- to 50-second videos of most examples. These are available on a companion website <https://edinburghuniversitypress.com/haddad>.

A video may start 1 or more seconds before the actual example and may continue 1 or more seconds beyond it.

## Introduction

---

### I Putting things in perspective

One of the most powerful scenes that I have ever experienced in an American movie is from the 1996 adaptation of John Grisham's 1989 novel, *A Time to Kill*. Jake Brigance, a white lawyer played by Matthew McConaughey, is giving his closing argument during the trial of Carl Lee Hailey (Samuel Jackson), an African American man whose ten-year-old daughter had been raped by two white supremacists in 1980s Canton, Mississippi. Hailey, driven by the thought that the rapists may not be convicted, had shot the two men dead and was now on trial for their murder, with Brigance as his lawyer.

In his closing argument, Brigance starts addressing the all-white jury by saying, 'Now I wanna tell you a story. I'm gonna ask y'all to close your eyes while I tell you this story. I want you to listen to me. I want you to listen to yourselves.' He goes on to describe the rape of a ten-year-old girl, in reference to what happened to Hailey's daughter: 'This is a story about a little girl walking home from the grocery store one sunny afternoon,' he says. 'I want you to picture this little girl. Suddenly a truck races up. Two men jump out and grab her.' He goes on to describe in ruthless detail what happened to the little girl. Choked up, he wraps up with: 'Now imagine she's white.' He wins the case, and Carl Lee Hailey is found not guilty.

This last directive, *Now imagine she's white*, instructs the jury to look at the tragic incident from a different perspective. It instructs the jury, the rest of the people in the courthouse, and even the viewers of the movie to attend to the tragic story in a special way, through a specific filter. In Verhagen's (2005; 2010: 9–10) terms, the directive functions as a perspectivizer via which the lawyer and the jurors engage in cognitive coordination in an attempt by the former to influence the latter's 'thoughts, attitudes, or even immediate behavior.' The perspectivizer renders the rape story a perspectivized thought. A perspectivized thought is not only informative but also argumentative (see Verhagen 2010).

A perspectivizer like the one just described does not occur in a vacuum. To be effective in its intended function – namely, influencing the hearer’s thoughts and actions – it needs to be informed by elements of the context. These include the type of activity the speaker and hearers are involved in, the identities of the speaker and hearers, and the sociocultural background, including underlying values, beliefs, and norms. This is so even if the expression means to challenge some or all of these elements. Brigance and the jurors in the above scene are involved in the closing argument of a trial for murder. Brigance is a white man addressing a group of white people, and as such he invokes a shared in-group membership. The expression may have been perceived differently and served a different function if the lawyer were an African American man addressing a white jury. In addition, this perspectivizer makes sense only in the sociocultural context that is invoked in the movie, where an African American person may not receive a fair trial in the southern United States, a sentiment expressed by Brigance himself.

Fortunately, most of our daily interactions do not address issues that are nearly as intense or as tragic as the one just described. Still, no matter how trivial the topic of interaction may be, social actors often employ perspectivizers in order to influence other social actors’ thoughts and actions. And while the perspectivizer in the above movie scene is rather explicit and presents an alternate reality, not all perspectivizers need to be characterized in the same way. In fact, they are often quite subtle, taking the form of pragmatic markers (for example, *well* and *you know* in English) that do not contribute to or alter the reality of the at-issue content of utterances. These markers do, however, make a pragmatic contribution that may be textual (organizational) or interpersonal (relational, attitudinal) (Halliday 1970; Brinton 1996; Culpeper and Haugh 2014).

This study is concerned with optional pronouns that serve as interpersonal pragmatic markers in four Levantine Arabic dialects: Syrian, Lebanese, Jordanian, and Palestinian (listed in order of emphasis). These pronouns take the form of dative clitics. I refer to them as attitude datives (ADs), and to the utterances that they are embedded in as attitude dative constructions (ADCs). Like other interpersonal pragmatic markers, ADs serve two broad functions: first, an attitudinal function whereby a speaker uses an AD to express a stance toward the at-issue content or the main message of her<sup>1</sup> utterance and toward any underlying values and beliefs, and/or, second, a relational function, in which case an AD is used to manage (affirm, maintain, challenge, and so on) relationships between the interlocutors (see Brinton 1996: Chapter 2 and Beeching 2016: Chapter 1, as well as work cited there). This study will focus on the sociopragmatics of ADs, or their use ‘in human communication as determined by the conditions of society’ (Mey 2001: 6). Four types of AD are licensed in Levantine Arabic; Section 2 of this chapter provides an overview of these datives. Section 3 highlights the purpose and significance of the study. Section 4 lists the data sources, states some of their characteristics, and discusses the motivations behind the choices. Section 5 provides a brief roadmap of the rest of the study.

## 2 Attitude dative constructions: an overview

When speakers express a thought via a simple sentence, their utterance typically consists of a predicate and its participants. For example, the English sentence *Michelle built a treehouse for her sons* describes a building event and relates it to three participants, also known as arguments. These are Michelle, the treehouse she built, and her sons. These participants are core arguments in the sense that they contribute to the truth conditions of the utterance; as such, they are important components of its meaning. The utterance is considered true if there is a building event, Michelle is its agent, a treehouse is its theme (that is, the participant that underwent a change of state), and the sons are the beneficiaries and recipients. Any change to these arguments alters the truth conditions of the utterance. For example, if the agent is Fiona instead of Michelle, the result is a different utterance with different truth conditions.

In addition to core arguments, languages may license non-core arguments. These are optional pronominal elements that may be added to utterances without altering their main content. English, French, Hebrew, and Hungarian are only a few examples of such languages, as (1) through (4) illustrate. The boldface pronouns in these examples are non-core arguments. A speaker may use these pronominal elements in order to express an attitude toward the at-issue content of her utterance by presenting it from a specific perspective. For example, by using the non-core argument *him*, the speaker in (1) assumes that ‘the action expressed has or would have a positive effect on the subject’ (Horn 2008:181) and she invites the hearer to view it from the same perspective. Structurally, non-core arguments are usually dative clitics or weak pronouns. In terms of register, they normally occur in informal interaction.

### 1. English

He’s gonna buy **him** a pick-up for his son.

Adapted from Horn (2013: 164 (23a))

### 2. French

Je **te** **me** vais **te** **me** vous lui  
 I **you.D** **me.D** go **you.D** **me.D** you.all.D him.D  
 faire passer un sale quart d’heure . . .  
 make pass a dirty quarter-hour . . .  
 ‘I’m gonna make him spend a lousy quarter-hour . . .’

Adapted from Jouitteau and Rezac (2007: 98; (9))

### 3. Hebrew

hem kol ha-zman mitxatnim **li** .  
 they all the-time marry **me.D** .

‘They are getting married on me all the time (and it bothers me).’

Adapted from Borer and Grodzinsky (1986: 179; (9a))

## 4. Hungarian

Ez meg mi-t csinál itt nek-em ?  
 this and what-ACC does here D-1SG ?

'And what (the hell) is this one doing here?'

Adapted from Rákosi (2008: 413; (2))

Arabic also licenses non-core arguments or what I call attitude datives (ADs). These are mentioned briefly in Brustad (2000: 359–61) and Holes (2016: 435–7). ADs in Arabic share similar structural, semantic, and pragmatic characteristics with non-core arguments in other languages. That is to say, they are optional clitics (more specifically, they are pronominal enclitics that attach to the end of a verbal element), they do not alter the truth conditions of utterances, and they serve pragmatic, attitudinal and/or relational functions.

The first extensive analysis of these datives is Al-Zahre and Boneh's (2010) article on coreferential dative constructions (or constructions with subject-oriented ADs) in Syrian Arabic, followed a few years later by Al-Zahre and Boneh (2016). Other publications on the topic include Haddad (2013, 2014, 2016, to appear) on Lebanese Arabic. Speakers of Levantine Arabic make use of four types of AD. I present an overview of these four types in the next subsections. For each type, I provide examples from the four dialects collectively referred to as Levantine Arabic, and I highlight the overarching meaning contribution of each type.

## 2.1 Topic/affectee-oriented ADs

Speakers may use an AD to designate its referent as a topic (the one we are talking about) and/or as an affectee (someone that has been affected positively or negatively by an action or a behavior). ADs that are used for this purpose are topic/affectee-oriented ADs (or TOP/AFF-ADs). The ADs in boldface in (5) through (8) belong to this category.<sup>2</sup> By using a TOP/AFF-AD, the speakers in these examples characterize the AD referent as a topic and as an individual who has been negatively affected by the at-issue content of the utterance. In (5), (6), and (8), the speakers invite the hearers to view the AD referents in the same way, while intending to invoke the hearers' empathy. In (7), there is no hearer since the speaker is soliloquizing. Note that example (8) also contains a subject-oriented AD in italics; this type of AD will be discussed in Section 2.4.<sup>3</sup>

5. Context: Abu Draa is a farrier who works for Abu l-Nar. He explains to his boss how his sisters, all now married and with families to take care of, argue every day about whose turn it is to take care of his sick mother. He also complains how he is caught in the middle of it all with no solution in sight.

ʔalla: waki:l-ak mʔadʕi:n-li: yya:ha: kil yo:m  
 God sponsor-your they.spend-me.D it every day  
 ʕala: ʔinti lyo:m do:r-ek w-ʔinti lyo:m do:r-ek  
 on you today turn-your and-you today turn-your



'Believe me, they argue [me] every day about whose turn it is (to take care of our mother).'

From *ba:b l-ha:ra* 'the neighborhood gate' – Season 1 – Episode 12 – 00:30:20 – SYR



1.5

6. Context: Three murders have taken place in a rich household. The victim of the third murder is a butler called Jalil, who has worked for the family for thirty years. Jalil's boss addresses the detective, Mr. Kammun, expressing how devastated she is.

monsieur kammu:n fu: ʕam-bis'i:r fi:-na: ?  
Mr. Kammun what PROG-happen to-us ?

...

?atalu:-Ina: ʒali:l! ma: le:?u: yi?itlu: ?illa: ʒali:l?  
they.kill-us.D Jalil! NEG they.consider kill except Jalil?

'Mr. Kammun, what is happening to us? They killed [us] Jalil! Why would they even consider killing Jalil?'

From *Meryana* – Episode 10 – 00:00:45 – LEB



1.6

7. Context: A woman sees her husband standing in front of a mirror, getting dressed up and wearing cologne. She becomes concerned that he might be seeing another woman. She soliloquizes:

we:n ra:yeh ha-l-zalame w-bizabbit<sup>c</sup>-li:  
where going this-the-man and-dressing.up-me.D  
b-ha:l-o? ya: hasert-i:!  
with-self-him? VOC heartbreak-my!

'Where is this man going and getting [me] dressed up? Poor me!'

From *nahafa:t ʕaylitna*: 'our family anecdotes' – *mawʕed yara:mi*: 'a love date' – 00:02:15 – JOR



1.7

8. Context: A woman complains about how irresponsible her brother is.

bada:l ma: huwwa ?a:ʕed yitsakkaʕ w-yiʕfa? . . .  
instead that he keep.on wasting.time and-have.affairs . . .  
yla:ʔi:-lo ʕayle ?aw ʕamle yt<sup>c</sup>alleʕ min-ha:  
let.him.find-him.D job or work earn from-it  
mas<sup>c</sup>ru:f-o . ʕa:t<sup>c</sup>er yiktib-li: ha-l-ʕe:ka:t min ye:r  
pocket.money-his . smart he.write-me.D these-the-checks without  
ras<sup>c</sup>i:d, w-ʔana: lli: ?asadded ʕe:ka:t-o .  
funds, and-I who pay checks-his .

'Instead of wasting all his time getting involved in love affairs, he should find [*him*] a job or something to do to earn his pocket money. He is only good at writing [me] checks without funds, and I am the one who ends up paying off his checks.'

From *l-mi:ra:θ* 'the inheritance,' a novel by Sahar Khalifeh (1997: 70) – PAL

Note that the utterance in (6) contains one AD linked to the first instance of the verb 'to kill.' Alternatively, the utterance could contain an AD linked to the second verb only, to both, or to neither, with no change in meaning. Pragmatically, the first

instance of the verb ‘to kill’ plus the AD depicts the speaker and her family as victims because of the loss they have endured. The second instance focuses solely on the murdered butler as the victim.

Other TOP/AFF-ADs are possessively construed ADs. Like the ADs in (5) through (8), these depict their referent as a topic, affectee, and/or object of empathy. In addition, the referent is also interpreted as a possessor of an argument, which could be the subject, an object, or an object of preposition. The utterances in (9) through (12) are examples from the four different varieties of Levantine Arabic. In (9), in addition to portraying the father as an affectee, the AD marks him as the possessor of the argument ‘head.’ In (10), the AD maintains its referent as a topic and refers to him as the possessor of ‘brothers.’ In (11), the speaker uses an AD to characterize herself as an affectee and as the possessor of ‘face.’ In (12), the mother uses an AD to characterize her son as an affectee (in her view, cutting his pants into shorts must make him happy) and as the possessor of the pair of jeans. Structures like these are normally referred to as possessive dative constructions and are analyzed as a distinct category derived syntactically via movement (Lee-Schoenfeld 2006; Deal 2013) or semantically via binding (Hole 2004, 2005). In Haddad (2016), I show that the interpretation of ADs like the ones in (9) through (12) is not arrived at syntactically or semantically but rather pragmatically, and that they belong to the category of TOP/AFF-ADs.

9. Context: A man explains how his father died.

wiʔiʕ ʕle-e lo:h nha:s . . . ʃaʔʔ-allo  
 fell on-him slab copper . . . split-him.D  
 ra:s-o min wara: w-ma: ʔdirna: naʕmil-lo  
 head-his from behind and-NEG we.could do-him.D  
 ʃi: .  
 anything .

‘A slab of copper fell on him and split [him] his head from behind, and we weren’t able to save him.’



1.9 From *ba:b l-ha:ra* ‘the neighborhood gate’ – Season 1 – Episode 5 – 00:20:40 – SYR

10. Context: A wife is talking about her husband:

huwwe byaʕrif ʔinno bhibb-o  
 he know that I.love-him  
 . . .  
 bas ma: bhibb-illo ʔixwe:t-o .  
 but NEG I.love-him.D siblings-his .

‘He knows that I love him, but I do not love [him] his siblings.’



1.10 From *El Professeur* ‘the professor’ – 00:26:15 – LEB

11. Context: A woman explains to her neighbor how she underwent four different plastic surgery procedures to make her look like a number of celebrities.

ʔult-ullu la-l-dokto:r ʔismaʕ , ʔana:  
 I.said-him.D to-the-doctor listen , I

biddi: ʕuyu:n ʔasʕa:la w-xdu:d ʔelissa:  
 want eyes Asala and-cheeks Elissa  
 w-ʕafa:yef hayfa: , w-biddi: tʕidd-illi:  
 and-lips Haifa , and-I.want lift-me.D  
 wiʕʕ-i: mitil sʕaba:h .  
 face-my like Sabah .

‘I said to the doctor, listen, I want Asala’s eyes, Elissa’s cheeks, and Haifa’s lips; and I want you to lift [me] my face to be like Sabah.’

From *nahaʕa:t ʕaylitna*: ‘our family anecdotes’ – *tanfi:x* ‘inflating’ – 00:02:50 – JOR

  
1.11

12. Context: A mother explains to her son how she converted his ripped jeans into shorts.

ʕima:d ya:mma: , ʕazzalet xaza:nt-ak  
 Imad mom , I.cleaned.up closet-you  
 lage:t-lak fi:-ha: bantʕalo:n mmazu:ʕ .  
 I.found-you.D in-it pair.of.pants ripped .

...

gasʕsʕet-o ʕort . . . gasʕsʕet-lak yya: ʕort yamma: .<sup>4</sup>  
 I.cut-it shorts . . . I.cut.you.D it shorts mom .

‘Imad, my son, I cleaned up your closet and found a pair of ripped jeans in it. I cut them into shorts. I cut [you] them into shorts, son.’

From *watʕan ʕa watar* ‘a nation on a string’ – *l-ʕa:ʔila* ‘the family’ – 00:03:40 – PAL

  
1.12

Before I move to speaker- and hearer-oriented ADs, a point is in order. TOP/AFF-ADs may take the speaker or hearer as a referent, as some of the above examples show. This alone may suggest that they qualify as speaker-oriented or hearer-oriented ADs rather than TOP/AFF-ADs. How can we tell the difference? Context, which is central to this study, is one way to tease apart TOP/AFF-ADs from the other two types. Consider (8) above one more time. In this case, the speaker depicts herself as an affectee of her brother’s irresponsible behavior because she ends up having to clean up his mess every time he writes a bad check. If the same sentence is uttered by a stranger – for example, a neighbor – who is not affected by the brother’s behavior but who considers himself as cultural police, the same AD will be considered a speaker-oriented AD.

Importantly, the pragmatic function of a first- or second-person TOP/AFF-AD does not change if the utterance in which it occurs is paraphrased into the third person. That is, the referent of the AD will still be portrayed as topic, affectee, and/or object of empathy, regardless of whether it refers to the speaker, hearer, or a third party. Observe (6) again. If I am a neighbor of the family who has suffered the murder of their butler, I may use (13) as a paraphrase of (6) without any change in the function of the AD; that is, the third-person AD, just like its first-person counterpart, portrays its referent as a topic, affectee, and object of empathy. By the same token, if I am an acquaintance of the woman and her irresponsible brother in (8) above, I may tell a friend about them by using the utterance and the AD in (14) to characterize the sister as a topic, affectee, and object of empathy. Whether a TOP/AFF-AD is used

to refer to a third party, the speaker, or the hearer, its function does not change. This is not true of speaker- and hearer-oriented ADs, as we will see shortly.<sup>5</sup>

13. ʔatalu:-**lun**            ʒali:l !  
 they.kill-**them.D**    Jalil !  
 ‘They killed [**them**] Jalil!’

14. ja:t'er    yiktib-la:            ha-l-ʃe:ka:t            min ʔe:r  
 smart    he.write-**her.D**    these-the-checks    without  
 ras'i:d ,    w-hiyye lli:    tsadded    ʃe:ka:t-o .  
 funds ,    and-she who    pay            checks-his .  
 ‘He is only good at writing [**her**] checks without funds, and she is the one who ends up paying off his checks.’

## 2.2 Speaker-oriented ADs

A speaker may use a speaker-oriented AD (SP-AD) to characterize herself as a form of authority in relation to the hearer and/or the at-issue content of her utterance. The utterances in (15) through (18) are examples.

15. Context: A man visits his sister and her family to check on them. He asks about his brother-in-law. The woman replies with clear annoyance that her husband is on the roof feeding the pigeons. The brother, as well as the whole extended family, is unhappy with the fact that the woman’s husband is preoccupied with raising pigeons instead of running his business as a barber. The brother answers with much indignation:

hallaʔ    msakkir    dikka:nt-o    w-milithi:-**li**:  
 now    he.closed    store-his    and-preoccupied-**me.D**  
 bi-l-hama:m            fo:ʔ !  
 with-the-pigeons    up    !

‘He is keeping his store closed and wasting [**me**] his time on taking care of the pigeons on the roof!’



1.15 From *ba:b l-ha:ra* ‘the neighborhood gate’ – Season 1 – Episode 6 – 00:08:30 – SYR

16. Context: The speaker is a private tutor who is homeschooling the son of the Lebanese President and First Lady. In this scene, he explains an academic concept, and he says to the child:

yalla:    ʔe:di: ,    ʒallis-li:            ʔaʃidt-ak ,  
 go.on    Edy ,    straighten.up-**me.D**    sitting.posture-your ,  
 w-sammiʃ-li:    lli:    ʔilt-o ,    habi:bi  
 and-recite-me.D    that    I.said-it ,    sweetheart

‘OK, Edy, sit [**me**] straight and recite to me what I just said, sweetheart.’



1.16 From *l-sayyida l-ʔa:niya* ‘the second lady’ – 00:06:15 – LEB

17. Context: A man posing as a businessman tries to con an unexperienced young man into handing him all of his own and his parents' money so that he can invest in the stock market on their behalf. When the young man explains that he wants to look for a job instead, he receives the following answer:

inte da:yer                    tdawwer-li:    ʕala:    wað'i:fe . . .  
 you    going.around    look-me.D    for    job . . .  
 ʕumra:    ya:    habi:b-i:    l-wað'i:fe    ʕabbaʕit  
 has.it.ever    VOC    darling-my    the-job    satisfied  
 hada: ?  
 anyone ?

'I can't believe you are going around looking [me] for a job. My good man, has a job ever made anyone rich?'

From *ʔabu: ʕamma:d* 'Abu Awwad' – Season 1 – Episode 9 – 00:07:20 – JOR



1.17

18. Context: A woman complains about her brother, whom she considers a loser.

ʕa:mel    ha:l-o    riʕza:l    kbi:r    w-byihki:    ʔalya:z .  
 pretending    self-his    man    great    and-speak    riddles .  
 bala:    ʔillet    ʕaʔel    w-ʔillet    zo:ʔ .  
 without    lack    wisdom    and-lack    manners .  
 ʔaʕed    bala:    ʕaʔle    wala:    ʕamle    w-da:yer  
 sitting    without    job    nor    work    and-going.around  
 ʕamel-li:                    ʕiva:ra:    w-ʔays    w-layla  
 pretending-me.D    Guevara    and-Qays    and-Leila

'He pretends to be a great man, and he speaks in an enigmatic way. Enough with this stupidity and lack of manners. He passes his time jobless, going from one place to another pretending [me] he is Guevara (Ernesto Guevara, the Argentine Marxist, also known as Che) and Qays and Layla (the Arabic pragmatic equivalent of Romeo and Juliet).'

From *l-mi:ra:θ* 'the inheritance,' a novel by Sahar Khalifeh (1997: 70) – PAL

The speakers in the above examples may also be characterized as affectees. However, affectedness is not a necessary component of the meaning/pragmatic contribution, and even when it is part of the pragmatic function of the AD, it is not the primary one.<sup>6</sup> Importantly, when a SP-AD is replaced by a third-person dative (or when the whole SP-ADC is paraphrased into the third person), the AD loses its pragmatic function as a profile of authority; instead, it is understood as solely characterizing its referent as an affectee. For example, if I say (19) about the brother in (15) above, the AD will only portray its referent, the brother, as affected by the behavior of his sister's husband. The brother is no longer characterized as a form of authority, which in (15) takes the form of cultural police, as we will see in Chapter 3.

19. zo:z            ʔixt-o            msakkir            dikka:nt-o  
 husband    sister-his    he.closed    store-his

w-milithi:-lo                      bi-l-hama:m !  
 and-preoccupied-him.D    with-the-pigeons !  
 ‘His brother-in-law is keeping his store closed and wasting [him] his time on taking care of the pigeons.’

### 2.3 Hearer-oriented ADs

Hearer-oriented ADs (HR-ADs) reference the hearer, as their name indicates, and are used to mark the hearer’s involvement or engagement with the at-issue content of an utterance and/or with the speaker as an in-group member. This engagement may take different forms, as we will see in Chapter 4. Examples (20) through (23) are from Syrian, Lebanese, Jordanian, and Palestinian Arabic, respectively.

20. Context: Abu l-Nar is a farrier who owns a business in a poor neighborhood in early twentieth-century Damascus, a time when electricity had not yet reached every house. He is impressed with the concept of electricity. He describes to his friend, Idaashari, how a street light near the house of his employee Abu Draa lights up not only the street but also Abu Draa’s house.

l-ku:ra:n              wa:sʕel    la-nisʕ              be:t-o              la-ʔabu: dra:ʕ  
 the-electricity    reach    to-middle    house-his    for-Abu Draa

...

l-baladiyye              bi-l-ħa:ra                      mrakbe    lamba  
 the-municipality    in-the-neighborhood    installed    light  
 ʕa-l-ħe:tʕ    l-ʕa:li: .              ʔawwal ma:    bitlayyel    l-dinye ,  
 on-the-wall    the-high .    once that    get.dark    the-world ,  
 w-biʕaʕlu:-lak                      ha-l-lamba ,              bithiss    wa-kaʔanno  
 and-they.turn.on-you.D    this-the-lamp ,    you.feel    and-as.if  
 be:t-o              sʕa:r              nha:r    ya:              raʕul !    ya:              ʔax-i:  
 house-his    became    day    VOC    man !    VOC    brother-my  
 ʕaylet    ha-l-ku:ra:n                      hayy    bitmaxwel !  
 thing    this-the-electricity    this    be.hard.to.fathom !

‘Electricity reaches the very house of Abu Draa. The municipality in his neighborhood installed a streetlight on the high wall (surrounding the neighborhood). As soon as it gets dark they turn on [you] the light, and you feel as if it is daytime inside his house, man! Brother, this electricity thing is hard to wrap one’s head around!’



1.20 From *ba:b l-ħa:ra* ‘the neighborhood gate’ – Season 1 – Episode 12 – 00:47:10 – SYR

21. Context: A Facebook post complains about sectarianism in Lebanon and how some individuals adopt animal imagery to describe themselves as leaders in their respective sects.

naʔlan              ʕan    libne:ni:    ya:dʕib    fi:    twiter ,  
 according to    Lebanese    angry    on    Twitter ,  
 byitʕlaʕ-lak              wa:had    msammi:    ha:l-o    ʔasad  
 emerge-you.D    one    calling    self-his    lion

l-sunna , w-l-te:ni: nimr l-ʃi:ʕa , w-wa:had  
 the-Sunna , and-the-second tiger the-Shia , and-one  
 fahad l-masi:hiyyi:n , w-hayde:k ziʔib l-dru:z .  
 leopard the-Christians , and-that wolf the-Druze .  
 fi: maze:l kil tʕa:yfe tdʕibb haywa:ne:t-a: ?  
 is.it possible every sect put.away animals-its ?

‘According to an angry Lebanese on Twitter: There emerges [you] a man calling himself the lion of the Sunna, and another calling himself the tiger of the Shia, and yet another calling himself the leopard of the Christians, and that one calls himself the wolf of the Druze. Could every sect please put away its animals?’

نقلا عن لبناني غاصب في تويتر

يطلعلك واحد مسمي حاله أسد السنة، و الثاني نمر الشيعة، و واحد فهد  
 المسيحيين، و هيدك ذئب الدرور... خيي في مجال كل طائفة تضب حيواناتها؟

22. Context: Abu Awwad has just woken up after having been seriously sick. He tells his daughter:

btaʕferfi: , ya: naʒa:h, hlimit-litʃ hilim  
 you.know , VOC Najah, I.dreamt-you.D dream  
 biwaggif ʃaʕr l-ra:s!  
 make.stand hair the-head !

‘You know what, Najah, I had [you] such a dream, it makes one’s hair stand on end!’

From *ʔabu: ʕamwa:d* ‘Abu Awwad’ – Season 1 – Episode 5 – 00:11:50 – JOR



1.22

23. Context: A Palestinian man complains on Facebook about women who keep changing boyfriends.

biʒu:z kil sine bitsʕa:hib-lak kam  
 is.it.appropriate every year she.date-you.D a.few  
 wa:hed ʒda:d bas mni:h mi:ʃa:n taʕref  
 individual new only well in.order.to she.know  
 mi:n l-ʔasʕi:l fi:-hum ? kul ʕa:m  
 who the-of.good.family among-them ? every year  
 w-intu ʔasʕa:yel !  
 and-you.all of.good.families !

‘Is it appropriate that a woman should date [you] a few new men every year just to figure out who among them comes from a good family? What a ridiculous excuse!’

بجووز كل سنة #بتصاحبك كم واحد جداد بس منيح مشان تعرف مين #الاصيل  
 فيهم  
 كل عام وانتو اصايل

Again, a HR-AD may characterize its referent as an affectee, but this characterization is not a necessary or primary component of its function. If a HR-AD is replaced with a third-person AD, its pragmatic function as marking hearer engagement

disappears. If an affectee reading is possible, it applies; otherwise, the utterance sounds pragmatically awkward. For example, a conservative person may say (24) about a young woman and use the AD *-lun* ‘them.D’ to reference the young woman’s parents. Example (24) replicates part of the utterance in (23) but uses a third-person AD instead of a HR-AD. The AD in this case may only characterize the parents as affectees. It does not invoke the parents’ engagement; in fact, the parents may not be aware at all of their daughter’s behavior.

24. biʒu:z                    kil    sine   bitsʰa:hib-**lun**        kam   wa:had ?  
 is.it.appropriate    every   year   she.date-**them.D**   a.few   individual ?  
 ‘Is it appropriate that a woman should date [**them**] a few new men every year?’

## 2.4 Subject-oriented ADs

Subject-oriented ADs (SUBJ-ADs) refer to the subject of the predicate in an utterance. A speaker uses a SUBJ-AD to characterize an event or a behavior as either insignificant/minor or significant/shocking based on her expectations of and familiarity with the subject. Numbers (25) through (28) are examples. They all mark the depicted events as insignificant or of low cost compared to the potential gain. There is more on this in Chapter 5.

25. Context: Two young men have been guarding the neighborhood all night. They both hold other daytime jobs as well. Around dawn, one man tells another:  
 ʔinte   fu:t   nam-**lak**        sa:ʕte:n    hallaʔ ,  
 you   go.in   sleep-**you.D**   two.hours   now ,  
 tʰiliʕ        l-sʰibih .  
 came.up   the-morning .

‘Go in and sleep [**you**] for a couple of hours now. It is almost morning.’



1.25 From *ba:b l-ha:ra* ‘the neighborhood gate’ – Season 1 – Episode 30 – 00:23:00 – SYR

26. Context: A man gives his friend advice about a new tire-repair and oil-change business. He goes on to say:

le:ʃ    laʔ ?    walla:    masʰlaha    mhimme !  
 why   not ?   by.God   business   important !  
 container   tasʰli:ħ   dwe:li:b   ʕa-l-autostrad ,  
 container   repair   tire        on-the-highway ,  
 fxat-**lak**    zu:ra   ʔidde:m-o    w-lahhi?        ʕa-ʃiyil  
 dig-**you.D**   pit   in.front.of-it   and-keep.up   with-work  
 ya:        mʕallim .  
 VOC   master .

‘Why not? It is a great business. Have a tire-repair stand set up on the highway, dig [**you**] a pit in front of it, and keep up with the work, man, if you can.’



1.26 From *El Professeur* ‘the professor’ – 01:23:00 – LEB



27. Context: A man asks an acquaintance who is travelling to the USA to take a few items to relatives of his who live there. When the acquaintance explains that his bags are already full, the man says:

niftirid<sup>6</sup> yaʕni:<sup>7</sup> dafaʕt-illak ʔakam dina:r  
 let's.suppose this.mean you.paid-you.D a.few pounds  
 zya:det miza:n? tʕab ma:-ana: wa:xd-ak  
 additional weight? OK for-I taking-you  
 ʕa-l-matʕa:r bi-bala:f.  
 to-the-airport for-free .

‘Let’s suppose that you ended up having to pay [you] a few pounds for additional weight. So what? I am taking you to the airport for free.’

From *ʔabu: ʕamma:d* ‘Abu Awwad’ – Season 1 – Episode 6 – 00:25:15 – JOR

 1.27

28. Context: A woman soliloquizes about her single sister-in-law, Nahla, who is not willing to support her brother (the speaker’s husband) financially, even though she has the means.

law ʔinn-ek mni:ha w-hanu:ne , ka:n  
 if that-you good and-compassionate , you.would  
 ʔilti:-lo xid-lak ʔirʕe:n w-ʕtiri: ʕiʔʔa  
 say-him.D take-you.D two.pennies and-buy apartment  
 nsiter fi:-ha: ʔinte w-l-wla:d w-ʔim ʕya:l-ak .  
 take-shelter in-it you and-the-children and-mother kids-your .

‘If you were a good and compassionate person, you would say to him: Take [you] this small amount of money and buy an apartment, a living space for you, your children, and the mother of your children.’

From *l-mi:ra:θ* ‘the inheritance,’ a novel by Sahar Khalifeh (1997: 118) – PAL

In all four SUBJ-ADCs, the dative references the hearer. The sentences may be paraphrased in such a way that the AD references the speaker or a third party instead, as (29), which is a paraphrase of (27), illustrates. In either case, the SUBJ-AD maintains its pragmatic function. That is, the event in (29) is still portrayed as insignificant in relation to the subject.

ʔiftirid<sup>6</sup> yaʕni: dafaʕt-illi:/dafaʕ-lo/  
 suppose this.mean you.paid-me.D/you.paid-him.D  
 ʔakam dina:r . . .  
 a.few pounds . . .

‘Suppose that I/he ended up having to pay [me/him] a few pounds . . .’

How, then, do we tease apart SUBJ-ADs from the other three types of AD? SUBJ-ADs have two distinctive features. First, if an AD references the subject, it may only function as a SUBJ-AD.<sup>8</sup> This is true even when the subject is also the speaker or hearer. For a dative to be interpreted as a TOP/AFF-, SP-, or HR-AD, its reference may not simultaneously be the subject. Second, constructions with

a SUBJ-AD obligatorily contain an adverb or an indefinite object in the form of a vague measure, such as *sa:ʕte:n* ‘two hours/a couple of hours’ in (25) and *ʔakam dina:r* ‘a few pounds’ in (27) (Al-Zahre and Boneh 2010: 10; Haddad 2014: 70). No such restriction applies to the other types of AD.

### 3 Purpose and significance

The main purpose of this study is to provide a sociopragmatic analysis of ADs like the ones we have just encountered in four varieties of Levantine Arabic: namely, Syrian, Lebanese, Jordanian, and Palestinian Arabic, in this order of emphasis. Sociopragmatics is the study of language in its social and cultural context (Leech 1983; Thomas 1983). It investigates the relation between communication and contextual factors; it ‘aims to show how social and cultural factors are brought to bear in language practices, and how they influence pragmatic strategies which are manifested by linguistic forms in particular communicative contexts’ (Aijmer and Anderson 2012: 1).

This study is an empirical investigation of the social functions of ADs and of the ‘specific “local” conditions’ on their use, as Leech (1983: 10) would put it, whereby ‘use’ is ‘essentially the function of the linguistic form in communicative interaction’ (LoCastro 2012: 19). The study deals with ADCs as social action carried out by language users as social beings in their social context (see Mey 2001; LoCastro 2012). It starts with the premise that language use is ‘sensitive to features of the context’ (Schiffrin 1987: 4, cited in Aijmer 2013: 10) and that pragmatic markers like the ADs under examination ‘do not have a fixed meaning but a meaning potential’ that is activated and negotiated in situated use (Aijmer 2013: 12, drawing on Norén and Linell 2007); see also Fraser (1996) and Beeching (2016). The study has four goals:

- to provide as thorough a picture as possible of the phenomenon of ADs in Levantine Arabic by presenting and discussing ample data from a variety of sources; these include soap operas, movies, plays, talk shows, and other audiovisual material
- to explain the meaning contribution of ADs as they are used in particular interactions and examine their attitudinal and relational functions as interpersonal pragmatic markers in their social contexts
- to examine the contextual factors that inform and are informed by the use of ADs
- to put forth a model that captures the cognitive coordination that the speaker and hearer engage in when an AD is used.

The study, to use Culpeper and Haugh’s (2014: 11) words, is ‘knowingly ethnocentric’ in that it focuses on Levantine Arabic to the exclusion of other languages. This constitutes a positive move when viewed from the perspective of Hanks, Ide, and Katagiri (2009). In their introduction to the *Journal of Pragmatics*

special issue (volume 41) 'Towards an Emancipatory Pragmatics,' Hanks et al. write:

It is our shared conviction that pragmatics as an analytic enterprise has been dominated by views of language derived from Euro-American languages and ways of speaking . . . While these research traditions have enriched the field of pragmatics, they also have tended to rely uncritically on the common sense of speakers of modern Western languages, with the attendant premises of individualism, rationality, and market economy. That is, while they are presented as general models of rational language use, they in fact rely heavily on the native common sense of their authors and practitioners. (1–2)

A sociopragmatic analysis of ADs in Levantine Arabic is a departure from what Hanks et al. call 'views of language [that are] derived from Euro-American languages and ways of speaking.'

Research on ADs and non-core arguments in general has, to date, focused predominantly on their role as conventional implicature contributors and on their syntactic and semantic characteristics (for example, Rákosi 2008; Bosse, Bruening, and Yamada 2012; Haddad 2014), with little attention having been paid to their pragmatics; exceptions include Horn (2008, 2013) and Haddad (2013). To my knowledge, there has been no systematic account of the sociopragmatics of non-core arguments as interpersonal pragmatic markers. These markers are used variably in different situations; they interact with elements of the context in order to serve certain functions. In Mey's (2001: 29) words, '[o]ur understanding of utterances like these depends crucially on the worlds in which their speakers live.' A sociopragmatic approach is appropriate in that it means to account in a systematic way for the variability of these markers, the contextual factors they interact with, and the different functions they serve.

Although this study does not deal with the topic of learnability and first- or second-language acquisition, I should point out that a sociopragmatic approach to non-core arguments is important from a learnability point of view. As Mey (2016) maintains, 'language is more than sounds and grammar rules: It is primarily a way of dealing with the world' (19–20). When people learn a language, they learn more than its grammar and lexicon; they also learn how to use language 'meaningfully, appropriately, and effectively (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986 a, b)' (Ochs 1996: 408). This, according to Ochs, means that language learners need to learn not only the structure and mental representation of linguistic forms, but also the rules that inform who may use them, with whom, where, when, and for what purpose, all within the larger sociocultural context. This study takes these rules into account; it means to account for the phenomenon of ADs in Levantine Arabic by focusing on the social and contextual factors that inform their use and that are informed by it. In this sense, it contributes to recent research, such as Aijmer (2013) and Beeching (2016), that underscores the vital role that sociolinguistic factors (for example, social identity and types of social activity) play in the use of pragmatic markers and the influence of context on their function and meaning.

#### 4 Data sources

The focus on Levantine Arabic to the exclusion of other varieties is informed by the observation that the ADs in the four varieties of Arabic under examination behave uniformly in terms of their structure, meaning contribution, and social functions. An ADC that is judged as grammatically acceptable and pragmatically felicitous in one Levantine variety is considered equally readily acceptable by speakers of other Levantine varieties.<sup>9</sup> Preliminary examination shows that this is not necessarily true of other varieties of Arabic. For example, as I mention in Haddad (to appear), unlike SUBJ-ADs in Lebanese Arabic, as well as the other Levantine varieties, Egyptian and Moroccan Arabic SUBJ-ADs may not co-occur with core arguments in the form of recipients or beneficiaries, as (30) and (31) illustrate. The asterisks indicate that the sentences will be ungrammatical if the arguments between parentheses are pronounced. The same sentences are judged as acceptable in Levantine Arabic, with or without the parenthetical material. In Egyptian and Moroccan Arabic, a SUBJ-AD behaves like a reflexive pronoun, an observation that seems to apply to the Eastern Arabic dialects of Bahrain also, as Holes (2016: 436–7) remarks. If this is correct, then SUBJ-ADs in Levantine Arabic are at least syntactically and semantically different from similar datives in other dialects. Other informal observations based on elicitation seem to indicate that other structural, semantic, and pragmatic differences exist with other ADs as well. All this has led to the decision to focus on the sociopragmatics of ADs in Levantine Arabic, deferring the examination of ADs in other varieties until another occasion.

30. Egyptian Arabic (Usama Soltan, personal communication)

ʔahmad ʔiʔtra:-luh ʔami:s<sup>s</sup> gedi:d  
 Ahmad bought-him.D shirt new  
 (\*l-ʔibn-u) ʔimba:rih  
 (\*for-son-his) yesterday  
 ‘Ahmad bought [him] a new shirt (\*for his son) yesterday.’

31. Moroccan Arabic (Hamid Ouali, personal communication)

ħməd ʃra-lu qamiʒa ʒdida  
 Ahmad bought-him.D shirt new  
 (\*l-bənt-u) lbarəħ  
 (\*for-daughter-his) yesterday  
 ‘Ahmad bought [him] a new shirt (\*for his daughter) yesterday.’

The vast majority of Levantine Arabic ADCs in this study come from soap operas, movies, plays, talk shows, and Facebook. Levantine Arabic is not a single dialect, nor are any of the Levantine varieties. I use the term Levantine Arabic as an umbrella term that encompasses the four dialects of Arabic under examination. I use the terms Syrian, Lebanese, Jordanian, and Palestinian Arabic to characterize the data based on the country of origin of their source. For example, if an example comes from a Syrian show, I label it as a Syrian Arabic example.

In selecting the shows, I have paid special attention to the nationality of the actors, making sure that a Syrian show features Syrian actors, a Jordanian show features Jordanian actors, and so on. I have excluded shows that do not meet this requirement. For example, one Palestinian show called *l-tayri:ba* ‘alienation’ features Syrian actors playing the role of Palestinian characters. Although data from this show may not be problematic for the purpose of this study, I have excluded them because shows like *l-tayri:ba* may place actors outside the comfort zone of their own dialects and thus may allow minimal improvisation as the actors get into their characters (see below for why this is important). As for the data obtained from Facebook, I label a post as Syrian, Lebanese, and so on based on the reported nationality of the Facebook user.

All of the audiovisual materials that I use for this study, including most materials obtained from my personal collection, were accessible on Youtube at the time of research. In order to facilitate access to the data and provide the reader with a feel of how the ADCs I examine sound in context, I have prepared trimmed 5- to 50-second videos of most examples; these audiovisual files are available on a companion website <https://edinburghuniversitypress.com/haddad>. A video may start 1 or more seconds before the actual example and may continue 1 or more seconds beyond it. The following is a list of the audiovisual sources, other than Facebook, that I consulted for this study:

- The Syrian data come from two sources:
  - the soap opera *ba:b l-ha:ra* ‘the neighborhood gate’
  - the soap opera *l-fus<sup>u</sup>:l l-ʔarbaʕa* ‘the four seasons.’
- The Lebanese data come from a variety of sources. These include:
  - the soap opera *Meryana*
  - the talk show *ʔaħmar bi-l-xat<sup>ʕ</sup> l-ʕari:d<sup>ʕ</sup>* ‘a red line with a thick stroke’
  - the documentary show *taħqi:q* ‘investigations’
  - other plays and movies, mainly by playwrights George Khabbaz and Ziad al-Rahbani and by movie directors Nadine Labaki, Assad Fouladkar, and Philip Asmar.
- The Jordanian data come from three sources:
  - the soap opera *ʔabu: ʕawwa:d* ‘Abu Awwad’
  - the TV show *ha:l l-dunya:* ‘this is life’
  - the animated TV show *nahafa:t ʕaylitna:* ‘our family anecdotes.’
- The Palestinian data comes from three sources:
  - the 1997 novel *l-mira:θ* ‘the inheritance’ by Sahar Khalifeh<sup>10</sup>
  - the comedy show *wat<sup>ʕ</sup>an ʕa-matar* ‘a nation on a string’
  - the comedy series *mafri:ʕ tamfi:r* ‘a saving project.’

The analysis of the different types of AD in subsequent chapters will always start with data from the first season of the Syrian soap opera *ba:b l-ha:ra* ‘the neighborhood gate’ before providing further examples from other shows and varieties. The Syrian show is about daily life in a neighborhood (*ha:ret l-d<sup>ʕ</sup>abeʕ* ‘the neighborhood of the hyena’) of early twentieth-century Damascus, Syria. At the time, Syria was

under the French mandate. The storyline in the thirty-three episodes of Season 1 revolves around two threads: first, the theft of gold coins from a resident of the neighborhood and ensuing attempts to find the perpetrator, and second, the infiltration of a spy who works for the French and who tries to stymie efforts by leaders of the community to support the Palestinians in fighting for independence from British control. Around these two threads, all types of events and subplots are featured in the show, ranging from family feuds to arranged marriages, and from storytelling to street fights.

ADCs from *ba:b l-ha:ra* ‘the neighborhood gate’ are an ideal choice for this study for a number of reasons. First, as I mentioned in the previous section, ADCs are common in informal conversations. They are featured in a variety of activities, ranging from household-related activities (for example, conversations around the dinner table, arguments between husband and wife) to workplace-related activities (for example, buying and selling events, visits to the doctor). The Syrian show contains an abundance of these activities and a wealth of data that may otherwise be very hard to access during fieldwork. For example, conversations between husband and wife or between a police chief and a suspect, as well as cases of individuals soliloquizing, are too private to be accessible during fieldwork.

In addition, because the show is about early twentieth-century Damascus, it goes to great lengths to highlight the cultural values, beliefs, and norms considered by the show’s writers and producers to be characteristic of Damascene communities of the time. Expectations are often articulated in a way that is not common in shows about contemporary communities and events. For example, at different points in the show, characters explicitly state social expectations of different groups. The following are some expectations of women, men, and community members of the era as presented in the show: women must always cover their faces in public, must obey their husbands, and must be good cooks; men must be brave, must control their wives and children, and must not cry; neighborhood residents must be courteous, must come to each other’s aid when needed, and must behave in accordance with their socio-economic status. These sociocultural values and beliefs are important for the sociopragmatic analysis of ADCs. The fact that they are articulated in a show about a specific community at a specific time in history allows the researcher to address them as relevant to the context of the show’s storyline, without generalizing over a whole population and thus without the risk of stereotyping.

It is important to note that the aforementioned values and beliefs, and the way they are depicted in the show, may or may not be completely accurate historically, and in fact some of them have been criticized for exactly that. For example, in a 2007 newspaper article, Rima Nazzal criticizes the show for portraying women as objects and for not highlighting the important roles that women historically played in early twentieth-century Syria. For the purpose of the sociopragmatic analysis presented in this study, however, the important question is: how do the sociocultural values, beliefs, and norms that the members of the community in the show live by inform, and how are they informed by, the use of ADs? The question assumes that the values and beliefs apply to the community in the show only and thus interact

only with the language used there. It does not assume that they apply to all Syrians, Levantine Arabic speakers, or Arabs of all times. Asking the above question is similar to asking the following one about the movie *A Time to Kill*, discussed in Section 1: how does the use of the lawyer's directive *Now imagine she's white* interact with the sociocultural background depicted in the movie? The question does not deal with the accuracy or ubiquity of the sociocultural background. Even if the movie is in some respect historically accurate, it would be wrong to generalize or assume, based solely on the movie, that no African American may receive a fair trial in the southern states of the USA or that white Americans are incapable of empathizing with a fellow African American citizen.

Using *ba:b l-ha:ra* 'the neighborhood gate' as a baseline serves another purpose as well. It allows for comparison with television shows from different times and with different sociocultural backgrounds to examine how these differences are reflected in the use of ADs. This is where the other audiovisual materials become relevant. In addition to providing data from different dialects, thus showing how prevalent the phenomenon under study is across dialects in Levantine Arabic, the inclusion of additional materials allows us to demonstrate how a different set of sociocultural values and beliefs may lead to variation in who may use ADs, with whom, where, when, and to what end. For example, if a type of AD may be used as a display of authority, one would expect restrictions on its use by women in the public sphere in a strictly patriarchal context, but not so much in an egalitarian context. We will later see that this prediction is correct.

Of course, the study could have focused only on one show. However, this would have meant a focus on one Levantine dialect, overlooking the fact that the phenomenon is prevalent in the Levant as a region. In addition, since *ba:b l-ha:ra* 'the neighborhood gate' is about early twentieth-century Damascus, focusing only on this show would raise the question as to whether the ADs that feature in the dialogs of the show are representative only of the language used at that time alone. This is why I also provide examples from a Syrian show about contemporary Syrian families: *l-fus'u:l l-ḡarbaḡa* 'the four seasons.'

I have also been sure to select Jordanian shows that were produced in different times. Main Jordanian TV stations, such as Roya TV and the Jordan Radio and Television Corporation, are located in the Jordanian capital, Amman, and their casting is likely to include Ammani residents. As research by Al-Wer indicates, the dialect of Amman has been in the process of formation. Amman historically had no dialect of its own. Most of its older residents 'affiliate themselves with the towns and villages of their forefathers,' while '[t]he youngsters . . . call themselves . . . "Ammanis"' (Al-Wer 2007: 55). Al-Wer adds that the coinage of the term 'Ammani' is indicative of the formation of a distinctive urban identity and dialect. In order to make sure that ADs in Jordanian Arabic have not been affected in the process, I have included data from three Jordanian shows: one from the 1980s entitled *ḡabu: ṡamma:d* 'Abu Awwad,' and two recent shows, *ha:l l-dunya*: 'this is life' and *nahafa:t ṡaylitna*: 'our family anecdotes.' Close examination of these shows indicates that the phenomenon of ADs has been robust in the dialect over time.

Finally, unlike ADCs that come from talk shows and Facebook, data that come from soap operas, movies, and plays may be considered too scripted to be valid for analysis as naturally occurring data. There are three reasons why this issue should not undermine the quality of the data as far as ADCs are concerned. First, all ADCs used in the shows sound natural to native speakers; they judge them as something they would also use in similar contexts. Second, the scripts of soap operas, plays, and movies are written for the purpose of relating a story and not as a manifestation of a specific type of construction. ADs, just like intonation or facial expressions, are employed in interaction not as an end in themselves but as subservient to the purpose and function of communication.

Here I should mention that social actors are rarely aware that they use these ADs at all. In interviews with native speakers, when I ask about these ADs or point out that they have just used an AD, more often than not there is a eureka moment. Even when social actors become aware of the fact that they use ADs, they are hardly able to explain why they use them or to articulate their effect.

I mentioned above that I exclude from this study data that come from shows in which actors use a dialect other than their own. This brings me to the third reason why the use of soap operas, movies, and plays as sources should not undermine the quality of the data as far as ADCs are concerned. That reason is improvisation, which is not uncommon in these shows. In an interview on Alsharjah TV with the actor Abbas l-Noury, who plays the role of Abu Esam in *ba:b l-ha:ra* ‘the neighborhood gate,’ he comments that the actors in the show would often improvise the dialog when filming (from a 2009 online article).<sup>11</sup> This observation was confirmed to me independently during an exchange with the actress Laila Sammur, who plays the role of Fawziyye in the same show. When I asked Ms. Sammur if she could share with me the script of one or more episodes of the show, she answered that most of the time the actors were not given scripts but instead broad guidelines, and the dialogs were mostly improvised.

Further support for the role of improvisation in these shows, especially as related to ADs, comes from the utterances in (32) and (33). Both examples are from the Lebanese play *El Professeur* ‘the professor,’ directed by George Khabbaz. When asked whether the actors in his plays were allowed to improvise, Mr. Khabbaz explained that they did so minimally. He added that he was normally rather strict about the script and that he would ask the actors to follow the written dialog. Mr. Khabbaz kindly shared with me the script of *El Professeur*, which I compared to the actors’ actual performance. The two in fact match almost word for word, except for the use of ADs! For example, the ADs in (32) and (33) are featured in the recorded performance but not in the written dialog.

32. Context: Two employees in a shoe store, along with the fiancé of one of the employees, are playfully putting on an act during work hours. Each is pretending to be a different character. While they are acting, the boss walks in. He says in a rather bossy tone:

law btit<sup>h</sup>laʕu:-li:            min l-faxs<sup>h</sup>iyye    inta w-iyyeha:  
if    you.get.out-me.D    of    the-character    you    and-her



w-kil wa:had biru:h ʕa-ʃiyl-o bku:n mamnu:n ʕayn-kun  
 and-each one go to-work-his I.be thankful eye-your

‘If you could cut [me] out the act and go back to work, I would be very grateful.’

From *El Professeur* ‘the professor’ – 00:10:30 – LEB



1.32

33. Context: A woman complains about an acquaintance named Adelle; she believes that Adelle is full of herself. She says:

ha:ʒ ssit ʔade:l re:ʕit-li: mne:xi:r-a:  
 enough Ms. Adelle raising-me.D nostrils-her

‘Enough with Ms. Adelle acting [me] like she is so important.’

From *El Professeur* ‘the professor’ – 00:50:35 – LEB



1.33


The comments by the Syrian actors about improvisation and examples like (32) and (33) suggest that when actors get into character, they seem to use the datives under examination, as informed by the identity of their character and the type of activity that their character is involved in, among other things. This is so even if the ADs are not in the written dialog and even if the director is strict about the actors’ adherence to the script.

## 5 A roadmap

The rest of the study is organized as follows. Chapter 2 identifies and discusses the analytic tools that are relevant to the sociopragmatic analysis of ADs. These include the elements of the context that interact with the use of ADs and the nature of evaluation that is linked to them. The chapter also puts forth a model that tries to capture the perspectivizing function of ADs and the cognitive coordination that they invoke between the speaker and the hearer. The chapter uses examples of TOP/AFF-ADs in order to illustrate the nature of the analytic tools and the working of the model. TOP/AFF-ADs have been analyzed in more detail in Haddad (2014, 2016), so Chapter 2 is not meant to replicate the analysis presented there. Rather, the discussion of these ADs in Chapter 2 is only for the purpose of making the discussion concrete.

Chapters 3, 4, and 5 discuss SP-, HR-, and SUBJ-ADs, respectively. The chapters present plenty of examples of these ADs and analyze their function in a systematic way. They also highlight the elements of the context that interact with these ADs and the nature of evaluation that they bring about.

## Notes

1. Here and throughout this study, I refer to a generic speaker as ‘she’ and to a generic hearer as ‘he.’
2. A  following the source of an example signifies the availability of an audio-visual file for that example on a companion website <https://edinburghuniversitypress.com/haddad>.

3. A note about the names used in the examples: we will come across many names that begin with *ʔim/ʔum* (Im/Um) and *ʔabu:* (Abu). These mean ‘the mother of’ and ‘the father of,’ respectively. In the Arab world, they are used as teknonyms to refer to an adult by referencing her or his eldest son. If a man is not married, he may still be addressed as, say, *ʔabu: kari:m* ‘father of Karim,’ with the assumption that his eldest son will be named Karim. This is especially the case if the man’s father’s name is Karim and he plans to name his future son after his father. Finally, *ʔim/ʔum* and *ʔabu:* may also be used to refer to a salient characteristic that a person may have. For example, *ʔabu: dra:ʕ* ‘Abu Draa’ in (5) is referred to as such probably because he has strong arms; *dra:ʕ* means ‘arm.’ In this sense, if we know that *xdu:d* means ‘cheeks,’ the term *ʔabu: xdu:d* may be used to describe or refer to a person with chubby cheeks, just as the term *cachetón* is used in Colombian Spanish, and perhaps other varieties, to describe a person with big *cachetes* ‘chubby cheeks.’
4. The use of *yamma:* ‘mom’ by the mother to address her son is an instance of a reverse-role vocative, whereby an older relative uses her or his kinship role to address a younger relative. For example, a father may address his daughter or son as ‘dad,’ and an aunt may address her niece or nephew as ‘aunt.’ See Rieschild 1998.
5. TOP/AFF-ADs maintain their function in reported speech as well. However, I do not deal with reported speech in this study for two main reasons. First, the remaining three types of AD are rarely used in reported speech. Second, on the rare occasions that ADCs are reported, they are stated as direct speech, whereby the reporter uses the speaker’s exact words and even gestures and facial expressions. That is, the reporter tries to deliver the AD, the structure it is embedded in, and the attitude it expresses exactly as the speaker has said or would say them. See (28) in this chapter and (32) in Chapter 3.
6. It is not uncommon for pragmatic markers to fulfil a variety of functions and to do so simultaneously (Beeching 2016: 5). Often, however, a certain function may be foregrounded or backgrounded in an interaction (Aijmer 2013: 10).
7. The word *yaʕni:* is often used as a filler.
8. This is an interesting point from a structural/syntactic perspective, as well as in relation to the syntax–pragmatic interface and the differences between subjecthood and other elements of the left periphery. However, I defer this topic for another occasion.
9. One structural difference exists between Lebanese and Palestinian Arabic, on the one hand, and Syrian and perhaps Jordanian Arabic, on the other hand. Only the former allow ADs to cliticize to the different forms of *ka:n* ‘to be’; see example (6) in Chapter 4. This is not possible in Syrian Arabic, as Al-Zahre and Boneh (2016) observe. It does not seem to be possible in Jordanian Arabic either. This structural difference is minor, however, and does not have any sociopragmatic repercussions.
10. The novel is in Standard Arabic, but the interaction among the characters is in Palestinian Arabic.
11. <http://alasn.me/articles/view/10983/> (accessed on August 24, 2016).