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Overview. Madurese pronouns and reflexives that contain the morpheme aba’ ‘body’ have an unusual distribution (e.g. see 1-2). I first investigate whether these are binding-exempt anaphors (as described in Cole et al. 2008). I find that these are not binding-exempt, but rather that 2-to-1 relationships between function and form account for their unexpected distribution: aba’ functions as common noun or 1sg pronoun, while aba’eng is 3sg pronoun only; aba’ dhibi’ and aba’eng dhibi’ are ambiguous between reflexive and intensified pronoun. Additionally, 1sg aba’ is licensed under LOGOPHORIC conditions. I discuss the morphology of these forms with respect to a typology of pronouns and reflexives (Cardinaletti & Starke 1994, Dechaine & Wiltschko 2002a, 2002b).

Initial puzzles. 1sg aba’ dhibi’ and 3sg aba’eng dhibi’ are called reflexives in Madurese dictionaries and grammars. Yet aba’ dhibi’ can occur as subject, without a local binder (1):

(1) Amina areh riyah keng tending teros, seddheng aba’ dhibi’ molaeh lagghuh sampe’
   - Amina day this only sleep continue while body self’ start morning until
   - night Neg Red-stop work
   ‘Amina only slept all day, while myself didn’t stop working from morning until night.’

In other clauses, 3sg aba’eng dhibi’ can take either a local or non-local binder (2):

(2) Rika1 taoh jha’ Siti2 aijhelling aba’eng dhibi’1/2/3 neng TV
   - Rika know that Siti see body-Def self’ at TV
   ‘Rika knows that Siti saw herself/ herself on TV.

Background. In related languages such as Peranakan Javanese and Jambi Malay, reflexives that are cognate with aba’ have been cited to support the claim that anaphors can be binding-exempt (cf. Cole et al. 2008, Cole et al. 2015 inter alia). Conflicting analyses for Madurese (e.g. disagreement among Stevens 1968, Davies 2010 and dictionaries) leave open the question of whether aba’ forms are anaphoric, especially in the case of aba’eng, which has very low frequency (e.g. it typically does not occur in 3 person narratives; the language has been reported to lack 3 pronouns).

Aba’= common N or pronoun. To begin, the base form aba’ can occur as either (i) a common noun ‘body’ (3), or (ii) 1sg pronoun. From a c-commanding position, the quantified 1sg pronoun engko’ binds 1sg aba’ in (4), i.e. aba’ must covey with engko’:

(3) aba’ se kene’ (4) Keng engko’ to’ se ngera jha’ aba’ se mennang,
   - body Rel small
   - Only 1sg only who think that 1sg who win
   ‘a small body’ ‘Only I think that it is I who won.’ (cf. Kratzer 1998)

However, the distribution of aba’ is constrained by two factors (note that 1sg pronouns kaulah and engko’ are not subject to the same constraints). First, aba’ cannot occur in object position; but can occur as prepositional object (5) or subject (7). Second, aba’ must be pragmatically licensed by strong emotion or “protest” (5, 7), contrastive focus (4) or other emphasis on the self (6).

(5) Tina ghighbir da’ engko’/kaulah/ aba’. (6) Me’ ce’ aman-na aba’.
   - Tina anger to 1sg
   ‘Tina was angry at me!’ ‘I have a feeling of well-being.’ (Davies 2010:497)
(7) Engko’/kaulah/aba’ tedung. (lit. ‘So very safe, am I.’)
   - 1sg sleep
   ‘I’m sleeping!’

These pragmatic conditions are reminiscent of logophors, but aba’ does not require a verbal trigger or reported discourse context. I propose that (unlike 1sg engko’ and kaulah) 1sg aba’ is a LOGOPHOR that must be licensed by the conditions SELF or POINT OF VIEW (cf. Sells 1987).

Aba’eng = pronoun only. Although aba’eng is composed of aba’ and the definite suffix -eng, this form occurs only as 3sg pronoun, not as a common noun, even though it retains this compositional meaning. Aba’eng also has a different distribution than aba’: it may occur in any position, and does not require logophoric licensing. The low frequency of aba’eng is surprising, as it does not compete with any other 3sg pronouns. I account for this by noting several language-specific properties that make 3sg pronouns unnecessary in most discourse contexts.
**Aba’ dhibi’ and aba’eng dhibi’ = both reflexive and pronoun+intensifier.** Turning to reflexives, I observe that aba’-reflexives and aba’-pronomes do not appear to be in complementary distribution (examples not given due to space limitations). To determine whether there exists a contrast in variable binding, I use strict and sloppy readings under VP ellipsis:

(8) Jimmy ajhelling aba’eng dhibi’ neng kacah, Ali da’iyah kiyah. √ sloppy
    Jimmy look himself at glass Ali so too X strict
    ‘Jimmy looked at himself in the mirror, Ali did too.’

(9) Tina ngoca’ da’ bapa’eng jha’ aba’eng entarra da’ pasar, Amina da’iyah kiyah. √ sloppy
    Tina say to father that she go.Irr to market Amina so too √ strict
    ‘Tina told her father that she would go to the market, Amina did too.’

Only the sloppy reading is available with aba’eng dhibi’ in (8), whereas aba’eng allows both strict and sloppy readings in (9). These are taken as evidence that in Madurese, there exists a contrast between a locally-bound reflexive and a pronoun that is not obligatorily locally bound.

I argue that aba’ dhibi’ and aba’eng dhibi’ are ambiguous between (i) a reflexive, and (ii) a pronoun modified by dhibi’ ‘self’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>reflexive</th>
<th>pronoun + intensifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 sg</td>
<td>aba’ dhibi’</td>
<td>‘myself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 sg</td>
<td>aba’eng dhibi’</td>
<td>‘him/herself’, ‘he himself’, ‘she herself’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independently, dhibi’ occurs as either an adnominal intensifier or adverbal-exclusive intensifier (cf. König and Siemund 2000). When dhibi’ modifies pronouns aba’/aba’eng, the result has the surface form of a reflexive, but behaves as a pronoun: in (1), aba’ dhibi’ is 1sg aba’ intensified by dhibi’, with a reading akin to ‘I myself.’ In (2) the ambiguity results in two readings for aba’eng dhibi’: either a reflexive ‘herself’ or intensified pronoun ‘her (=Rika) herself.’

An additional piece of evidence is that the embedded clause in (1) is not well-formed in isolation or at the beginning of a discourse (10). This is consistent if the logophor aba’ is licensed by contrastive focus in (1), but logophoric conditions are lacking in (10).

(10) *Aba’ dhibi’ molaeh lagghuh sampe’ malem lo’ bu-ambu alakah... body self start morning until night Neg Red-stop work
    ‘I didn’t stop working from morning until night...’
If aba’ dhibi’ in (1) is an intensified 1sg pronoun, its ability to occur as subject, without a local binder, is unexceptional. This analysis also predicts that for a pronoun + intensifier, both strict and sloppy readings will be available under ellipsis, a prediction that is borne out (compare 11 with the unavailability of a strict reading in 8, where the pragmatic mirror context calls for a reflexive):

(11) Tina ngoca’ jha’ aba’eng dhibi’ entarra da’ pasar, Amina da’iyah kiyah. √ sloppy
    Tina say that she go.Irr to market Amina so too √ strict
    ‘Tina said that she herself would go to the market, Amina did too.’

**Conclusion.** Although the morphology of aba’ pronouns and reflexives appears to be transparently composed, placing them in a typology is not straightforward, because there exist ambiguities in form, and because aba’ requires LOGOPHORIC licensing. In this analysis, I show that despite prima facie deviations from expected patterns, the distribution of aba’ pronouns and reflexives is consistent with traditional distinctions between the binding properties of pronouns and reflexives. The low frequency of aba’eng suggests the following hierarchy in Madurese: pro > 1, 2 pronoun > R-expression > 3 pronoun, where pro is preferred over 1 and 2 pronouns, which are preferred over R-expressions, and 3 pronouns are dispreferred, other things being equal.