**International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation**
ISSN: 2617-0299 (Online); 2708-0099 (Print)
DOI: 10.32996/ijllt
Journal Homepage: al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijllt

IJLLT

AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

# Reduplication in Palestinian Arabic: Full Patterns and the Status of Partial Forms

**Amal Masoud Saleh Abu Khalil**
*Department of Linguistics, Central Institute of Indian Languages, University of Mysore, Manasagangothri, Mysuru, India*
**Corresponding Author:** Amal Masoud Saleh Abu Khalil, **E-mail**: amelabukhalil@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

Reduplication occurs in many languages, but identifying it in Arabic is not always straightforward because repeated sounds may have more than one source. The present study investigates full reduplication in Palestinian Arabic and reconsiders a group of forms that were initially treated as partial reduplication. The data were obtained from 73 native speakers of Palestinian Arabic between the ages of 30 and 70. Participants first completed a questionnaire in which they provided words, meanings, and information about use. Semi-structured interviews were then used when further explanation or additional examples were needed. The study follows a qualitative descriptive approach, with Morphological Doubling Theory providing the theoretical basis for the analysis. Full reduplication was clearly found in the data. Thirty-two forms showed repetition of the same $C_1VC_2$ sequence. The repeated sequence, however, did not behave in exactly the same way in every word. In forms such as daqdaq and fakfak, it can be linked to material that carries meaning on its own. Words such as saḥsaḥ, namnam, and jaʿjaʿ behave differently because the repeated sequence is not independently used with the meaning of the whole word. The inflected forms of fakfak also show that a reduplicated word can enter the regular verbal morphology of Palestinian Arabic. When the ten candidate partial forms were examined again, they did not show the same structural relationship. Some, such as baḥbūḥ and farfūš, appear to come from words that already have a reduplicative structure. In several of the remaining forms, it was difficult to identify exactly what had been copied from the proposed base. The remaining forms were therefore treated cautiously, with some retained as possible or borderline cases and others lacking sufficient evidence for a partial reduplicative analysis. The analysis also separates morphological reduplication from gemination, rhyming and echo expressions, discourse repetition, and cognate verb–noun constructions when no morphological copying can be demonstrated. The full forms also differ in meaning. In some words, reduplication is associated with an action that continues or happens repeatedly. In others, the form describes intensity or a particular state or change of state. These meanings were interpreted from the individual words and the contexts provided by the participants. On the evidence available here, full reduplication is much more clearly established than partial reduplication in Palestinian Arabic. More data are needed before the structure and productivity of partial reduplication can be described with the same confidence.

## KEYWORDS

Palestinian Arabic; reduplication; full reduplication; partial reduplication; Morphological Doubling Theory; morphological integration

## ARTICLE INFORMATION

**ACCEPTED:** 3 September 2026 **PUBLISHED:** 3 October 2026 **DOI:** 10.32996/ijllt.2026.9.10.10

### 1. Introduction

Reduplication is found in many languages, but languages do not necessarily use it in the same way. In its simplest form, some part of a linguistic expression is repeated, and that repetition contributes to the meaning of the resulting form. Depending on the language, it may mark meanings such as plurality, repeated action, continuation, intensity, or attenuation (Rubino, 2005; Inkelas & Downing, 2015). The amount of material repeated also varies. Sometimes a whole base is copied, while in other cases only a syllable, consonant, or another part of the base appears again. This variation has made reduplication relevant to both morphological and phonological analysis. Arabic adds an interesting case to this cross-linguistic picture because repetition occurs within a morphological system in which consonantal roots, word patterns, and gemination already play an important role. Arabic studies have approached reduplication from different directions. McCarthy and Broselow (1983), for instance, examined its internal structure in Levantine Arabic. Modhaffer and Challavenkata (2019) later concentrated on total reduplication in Classical Arabic and Modern Standard Arabic, while Abu-Abbas and Alomari (2024) examined full reduplication as it occurs in spoken Jordanian Arabic. The differences among these studies suggest that the form and use of reduplication need to be examined within the Arabic variety in which they occur.

Definitions of reduplication differ somewhat according to what researchers regard as the relevant unit of repetition. Moravcsik (1978) treats it broadly as a construction in which linguistic material occurs more than once and the repetition corresponds to a meaning distinction. Rubino (2005) places greater emphasis on word formation, defining reduplication in terms of repeated phonological material used for a grammatical or semantic purpose. He distinguishes full reduplication, where the whole base is repeated, from partial reduplication, where only some of its material is copied. Inkelas and Downing (2015) also emphasize the relation between the copied material, usually called the *reduplicant*, and the form that supplies it, the *base*. These accounts differ in scope, but one point is especially useful for the present study: phonological repetition alone is not enough to establish reduplication. There must be a defensible relationship between the repeated material and a base, and the repetition must have a role in the formation or interpretation of the expression.

This distinction matters particularly in Arabic. A word containing the same consonant more than once cannot automatically be classified as reduplicative. Arabic morphology permits consonantal recurrence for reasons that may have little to do with copying, and gemination creates an additional difficulty. The borderline between reduplication and other types of consonant doubling has therefore received specific attention in Arabic morphology (El Zarka, 2005). For the Palestinian Arabic forms considered in this study, the first question is consequently not simply whether something is repeated. The analysis asks what has been repeated, whether an identifiable base or morphological unit can be established, and whether the repeated material participates in the formation of the expression. This is particularly relevant to partial reduplication because the copied material may be quite small. Earlier work on Levantine Arabic, for example, describes internal reduplication in which a single consonant from the base is copied inside the derived form (McCarthy & Broselow, 1983).

Arabic research has not treated reduplication from a single perspective. McCarthy and Broselow (1983) were mainly concerned with the structure of internal reduplication in Levantine Arabic. Their analysis links the copied consonant to the structure of the base and discusses meanings such as intensity and pejoration. Igaab (2010) approached the phenomenon from a contrastive perspective, comparing reduplication in English and Arabic and distinguishing between full and partial patterns. Her treatment of Arabic includes forms in which the whole base is repeated as well as expressions showing only partial phonological correspondence. This classification is useful for comparison with the Palestinian data, although the present study applies stricter criteria before treating phonological recurrence as morphological reduplication. Modhaffer and Challavenkata (2019) move away from these classifications by looking specifically at total reduplication in Classical Arabic and Modern Standard Arabic. Their corpus contains nine structural patterns and eleven functions, and the two varieties do not use them with the same frequency: serial ordering is prominent in Classical Arabic, whereas intensification is more frequent in Modern Standard Arabic. Spoken Jordanian Arabic offers another point of comparison. Abu-Abbas and Alomari (2024) based their analysis on language used by native speakers in different settings, including everyday interaction. One recurring use in their data is intensification, although the interpretation of a reduplicated form can change with the situation in which it is spoken. Their discussion also shows that repetition can carry a speaker's attitude, as in cases expressing annoyance or exaggeration. The study deals only with full reduplication and leaves partial reduplication for future investigation. This limitation is directly relevant to the present study because the Palestinian Arabic data include forms that appear to involve partial copying.

Palestinian Arabic raises questions that these studies do not fully answer. Everyday speech contains forms in which all or part of a base appears to recur, but superficially similar expressions need not have the same morphological status. Some may be productive reduplicative formations, whereas others may belong to established lexical patterns, involve gemination, or simply contain phonological resemblance. The difficulty is greater with partial forms because only a small amount of material may be repeated. As a result, assigning an example to "partial reduplication" before establishing the relation between its components risks treating resemblance as morphological evidence. The problem addressed in this study is therefore twofold: determining which Palestinian Arabic forms can reasonably be analysed as reduplication and, once they have been identified, explaining how the repeated material is organized and what it contributes to meaning.

This problem also points to a gap in the existing Arabic literature. Work on Levantine Arabic has provided important evidence for internal reduplication (McCarthy & Broselow, 1983), while studies of Classical and Modern Standard Arabic have described total reduplication in detail (Modhaffer & Challavenkata, 2019). Research on Jordanian Arabic has recently supplied naturally occurring evidence for the productivity and functions of full reduplication, but partial reduplication was left outside the scope of that study (Abu-Abbas & Alomari, 2024). What remains less clear is how full and partial reduplication pattern together in Palestinian Arabic and, more specifically, what kinds of partial forms occur in Palestinian data. There is also a practical analytical gap: a classification of Palestinian examples needs to show why a proposed reduplicative form belongs to that category rather than relying only on visible or audible repetition. Addressing that issue is necessary before the structural types and functions of Palestinian Arabic reduplication can be described reliably.

Against this background, this study examines full and partial reduplication in Palestinian Arabic. It has five objectives:

To identify the forms of full and partial reduplication found in the Palestinian Arabic data.

To describe how the base and repeated material are structured in these forms, including relevant morphological and phonological features.

To examine whether recurring structural patterns emerge among the candidate partial reduplicative forms in Palestinian Arabic.

To examine the meanings and pragmatic uses associated with the identified reduplicative forms in context.

To distinguish morphological reduplication from Palestinian Arabic expressions in which repetition or phonological resemblance results from another source.

Based on these objectives, the study addresses the following research questions:

What forms of full and partial reduplication occur in the Palestinian Arabic data?

What morphological and phonological patterns characterize the reduplicative forms identified in the data?

What structural patterns, if any, emerge among the candidate partial reduplicative forms in Palestinian Arabic?

What semantic and pragmatic functions do the identified reduplicative forms perform in their contexts of use?

How can morphological reduplication be distinguished from Palestinian Arabic expressions in which repetition or phonological resemblance results from another source?

The study contributes to the description of Palestinian Arabic by examining both full and partial reduplication within a single dataset. Its treatment of partial reduplication is deliberately data-driven: the analysis does not begin by assuming that Palestinian Arabic must reproduce categories reported for other Arabic varieties. Instead, the classification is based on recurring relationships among Palestinian bases and their repeated material. This makes it possible to compare Palestinian patterns with earlier descriptions of Levantine and Jordanian Arabic while still allowing the Palestinian evidence to diverge where applicable. The study also gives particular attention to borderline examples that may display phonological resemblance without necessarily involving a reduplicative morphological process. By explaining why individual forms are included in or excluded from the analysis, the study avoids treating phonological resemblance as sufficient evidence of reduplication. The resulting description should therefore contribute Palestinian data to the study of Arabic morphology and provide evidence for later comparisons of reduplication across Arabic varieties.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 Research Approach

A qualitative descriptive approach was used to examine reduplication in spoken Palestinian Arabic. The analysis starts from the forms provided by the participants and considers how recurring material is related to the structure and meaning of each form. Both full and partial reduplication are examined, but repetition of sounds alone is not taken as enough evidence for assigning an example to either category. For each item, the analysis looks for a possible base, identifies what material recurs, and considers the meaning reported in context. Forms that resemble reduplication only in their sound pattern are discussed separately when no morphological relationship can be established. This is particularly relevant to borderline cases, since repeated consonants, gemination, and rhyme may produce surface patterns that resemble reduplication without necessarily involving the same morphological process.

### 2.2 Participants

The study involved 73 Palestinian Arabic speakers, both men and women, aged between 30 and 70. Participants under 30 were not included. The choice of this age range was related to the nature of the expressions being investigated. Some of the forms collected for the study are familiar to older speakers but appear to be less common in the speech of younger Palestinians. Including speakers up to the age of 70 therefore helped preserve examples that might otherwise have been missed.

Participants were asked about words and expressions they knew in Palestinian Arabic and how these expressions were typically used. They also explained the meanings and, when needed, provided examples of situations in which particular forms could be heard. The examples they provided were collected first and analyzed afterwards. In other words, an expression was not counted as reduplication simply because a speaker mentioned it; its structure still had to be examined before it was placed in one of the analytical categories.

### 2.3 Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected first through a questionnaire and then through semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire asked participants to provide Palestinian Arabic words and expressions containing repeated material and to explain their meanings and use. The interviews followed this stage and were used mainly when a form needed further explanation or when additional examples were useful for understanding its structure.

The resulting dataset contained a range of expressions showing different kinds of repetition. At this stage, candidate forms were not immediately classified as reduplication. Instead, each expression was initially examined for an identifiable base or morphological unit and for recurring material that could be related to it through copying. Forms involving rhyme, consonant gemination, or other types of phonological resemblance were retained for closer examination, since these features could arise from reduplication but could also have another structural explanation.

### 2.4 Criteria for Identifying Reduplication

A form was included in the analysis when its structure showed that linguistic material had been repeated from an identifiable base or morphological unit. In full reduplication, the whole unit recurs in the resulting form. The unit itself does not always have to occur independently with a lexical meaning. Some Palestinian Arabic forms contain a meaning-bearing unit, while in others a semantically empty $C_1VC_2$ unit is repeated to form a meaningful $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ word. Partial reduplication was treated more cautiously. A form was considered a possible case when only part of an identifiable base or morphological unit appeared

again in the resulting word. No particular type of partial reduplication was assumed prior to examining the data. Instead, the candidate forms were compared to identify any recurring structural patterns.

Phonological resemblance alone was insufficient to classify a form as reduplication. For example, a rhyming expression was included only when the repeated material could be related to an identifiable base or morphological unit. Repeated consonants were approached in the same way, particularly when gemination or another Arabic morphological pattern could account for their occurrence. Meaning was also considered in the analysis. Meanings such as intensity or repetition could support a reduplicative interpretation, but the formal relationship between the base and copied material remained necessary for the classification.

Borderline cases were retained for separate examination rather than assigned directly to either the full or partial category. This was particularly relevant to rhyming expressions and other forms in which the surface structure suggested repetition but the relationship between the proposed base and repeated material remained uncertain. Examining these examples separately made it possible to distinguish formal copying from phonological resemblance and to explain why individual forms were included in or excluded from the reduplicative analysis.

### 2.5 Data Analysis

The collected forms were analyzed qualitatively with attention to their morphological structure, phonological shape, and meaning in context. The analysis began by identifying a possible base or morphological unit for each form and examining which part of it, if any, recurred in the resulting expression. Forms in which the whole base was repeated were classified as full reduplication. When only part of the base was copied, the form was examined as a possible case of partial reduplication. Partial forms were then compared to determine whether recurring structural patterns could be identified in the Palestinian Arabic data. The subtypes were therefore derived from the forms themselves rather than imposed in advance.

The meaning and use of each form were examined alongside its structure. Participants' explanations and contextual examples were used to determine what the reduplicated form contributed to the expression, such as repetition, intensity, continuity, or other meanings found in the data. Where the context suggested an additional pragmatic effect, this was also considered. Semantic and pragmatic functions were recorded only when they were supported by the participants' explanations or by the contexts in which the forms were reported.

Forms that did not provide sufficient evidence of a base–copy relationship were kept outside the main categories of full and partial reduplication. These included borderline examples in which the apparent repetition could instead be related to rhyme, gemination, or another type of phonological resemblance. Such examples were not discarded, since they were useful for showing where the boundary between reduplication and formally similar Palestinian Arabic expressions becomes less clear. They were examined separately and the reason for their inclusion or exclusion from the reduplicative analysis was stated for each relevant pattern.

### 2.6 Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary. Before taking part, participants were told that their responses and the examples they provided would be used for this research. Their names were not recorded in the study, and material obtained from the questionnaires and interviews was kept anonymous. Participants could also choose whether or not to provide particular examples. The study reports the linguistic forms collected from them without identifying the individuals who contributed them.

## 3. Theoretical Framework

This study uses Morphological Doubling Theory (MDT) as the basis for analysing the Palestinian Arabic forms (Inkelas & Zoll, 2005). Under MDT, reduplication involves a morphological relation between two parts of a construction, not simply the repetition of sounds. The two parts are linked by their grammatical and semantic properties, even when their phonological forms are not fully identical. This point is particularly relevant to the present data, since the recurrence of similar sounds alone is not enough to classify a Palestinian Arabic form as reduplicative.

A later formulation by Inkelas (2008) distinguishes morphological doubling from phonological duplication. Morphological doubling is motivated by morphology and contributes to the meaning or grammatical interpretation of the resulting form, whereas phonological duplication serves a phonological purpose. This distinction is useful for the present study because Palestinian Arabic contains forms in which sounds or consonants recur without necessarily representing a reduplicative morphological relationship. The analysis therefore considers the relationship between the proposed base and repeated material, together with the structural and semantic contributions of repetition, rather than relying on phonological resemblance alone.

MDT has also been applied to Arabic reduplication. Abu-Abbas and Alomari (2024), for example, use morphological doubling to analyze reduplicative forms in Jordanian Arabic. Their study shows that morphological doubling can account for productive reduplicative formations in a spoken Arabic variety and for meanings and pragmatic effects associated with them. Their analysis, however, concentrates on full reduplication and explicitly leaves partial reduplication for further investigation. This makes the framework particularly relevant to the present study, which examines both full and partial reduplication in Palestinian Arabic.

In applying MDT to the Palestinian Arabic data, the study does not assume that every repeated sequence represents morphological doubling. The framework is used together with the identification criteria described in Section 2.4. For each

candidate form, the analysis asks whether an identifiable base or morphological unit can be established, what material is repeated, and whether the repetition contributes to the structure or interpretation of the resulting expression. Forms displaying rhyme, gemination, or other kinds of phonological resemblance are therefore not classified as reduplication unless the analysis supports a reduplicative relationship. This application of the framework also allows partial reduplication to be examined without assuming its structural subtypes in advance.

## 4. Analysis and Results

### 4.1 Classification of the Palestinian Arabic Data

The analysis of the Palestinian Arabic data did not support treating all forms showing phonological recurrence as instances of reduplication. In particular, phonological repetition or similarity was not treated as sufficient evidence for reduplication. Each form was reconsidered in relation to the material that recurs, the possibility of identifying a base or repeated morphological unit, and the contribution of that repetition to the resulting expression. This procedure produced a distinction between forms that provide relatively clear evidence of reduplicative structure, forms that remain analytically uncertain, and expressions whose similarity is better treated as a different type of morphological or phonological pattern.

The clearest reduplicative forms occur where a segmental sequence is repeated in a recognizable pattern. Forms such as *daqdaq, rajraj,* and *sabsab*, for example, display repetition of the same segmental material, while their reported uses involve meanings such as continued knocking, trembling, and cursing. The data provide contextual examples for these meanings rather than presenting the forms in isolation. Other forms with the same surface pattern require greater caution because the apparent base is not equally transparent. They are therefore not classified as reduplication solely on the basis of their $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ shape.

A second group consists of forms considered as candidates for partial reduplication. The data include *baḥbūḥ, naʿnūʿ, farfūš, karmūš, maqraqad, manʿanaš, dabdūb, mraṭoḥ, mnaṭoṭ,* and *mlaġoṣ*. These forms do not all provide the same evidence for copying. Forms such as *naʿnūʿ* and *dabdūb* show relatively transparent recurrence of segmental material, whereas the relationship is less evident in forms such as *karmūš* and *mlaġoṣ*. Consequently, the category of partial reduplication is not treated as a predetermined list. Its internal patterns are established only where the data support a relationship between repeated material and a proposed base.

The analysis also separates geminated forms from the core reduplicative classification. This group includes words such as *jammaʿ, kassar, kaððab, ʿajjan, šahhad, naṭṭar,* and *raqqaʿ*. In these examples, consonant doubling is observable, but the data themselves do not establish that the doubled consonant results from a reduplicative copying operation. These forms are therefore excluded from the core reduplicative categories at this stage and treated as cases requiring an account in terms of Arabic gemination and morphological structure rather than being labelled reduplication simply because a consonant occurs twice.

Rhyming expressions form another analytically distinct group. Examples include *maḥndaq mbandaq, saq wa-naq, šaṭ wa-maṭ, šaṭ wa-naṭ, laḥālī labālī, yijuḥ w-yifuḥ, ḥils mils,* and *ḥāyṣ lāyṣ*. The original descriptions themselves show that the relationship between the members of these pairs varies: in some cases both elements are assigned meanings, while in others one element is reported to have been created primarily to rhyme with the other. These expressions are therefore retained as reduplication-like or rhyming formations rather than being automatically incorporated into morphological reduplication. Their inclusion in the analysis is nevertheless important because they demonstrate precisely why phonological resemblance cannot serve as the sole criterion for identifying reduplication in Palestinian Arabic.

### 4.2 Full Reduplication

The Palestinian examples classified here as full reduplication repeat the same $C_1VC_2$ sequence, giving the pattern $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$. In some words, the first $C_1VC_2$ sequence can be connected with an independent form and meaning. In others, it is not used independently, although the whole word has an established meaning in Palestinian Arabic. This does not necessarily place the latter examples outside reduplication. A similar distinction is made by Abu-Abbas and Alomari (2024) for Jordanian Arabic. They discuss cases in which a meaningful monosyllabic morpheme is repeated as well as forms built by repeating a $C_1VC_2$ sequence that has no independent meaning. In both cases, repetition produces the $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ pattern. Such cases can also be accommodated within Morphological Doubling Theory, since Inkelas and Zoll (2005) analyse reduplication in morphological terms and do not require every repeated element to function as an independent lexical item.

Table 1: Full Reduplication in the Palestinian Arabic Data

| Reduplicated form | Repeated unit | Structural pattern | Meaning in the Palestinian Arabic data |
|---|---|---|---|
| kankan | kan | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | hide something, usually money |
| taštaš | taš | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | become thoroughly soaked |
| daqdaq | daq | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | keep knocking continuously |
| rajraj | raj | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | tremble |
| marmar | mar | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | torment |
| farfar | far | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | keep wandering |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| maḫmaḫ | maḫ | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | keep thinking about or planning something |
| sabsab | sab | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | curse or abuse |
| dasdas | das | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | do something secretly |
| maṭmaṭ | maṭ | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | delay intentionally |
| fašfaš | faš | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | swell or become fluffed up |
| rašraš | raš | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | splash or spray |
| fakfak | fak | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | untie or unscrew |
| hazhaz | haz | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | shake |
| ṭamṭam | ṭam | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | cover up, particularly a scandal |
| laqlaq | laq | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | talk too much |
| jarjar | jar | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | drag or pull |
| šamšam | šam | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | smell/sniff repeatedly |
| rabrab | rab | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | gain weight |
| halhal | hal | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | appear after a long absence |
| falfal | fal | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | become enraged |
| saḫsaḫ | saḫ | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | laugh hysterically |
| laḥlaḥ | laḥ | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | move/get moving |
| laḫlaḫ | laḫ | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | keep stirring |
| baẓbaẓ | baẓ | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | waste money ostentatiously |
| taḫtaḫ | taḫ | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | remain in prison for a long time |
| latlat | lat | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | talk repeatedly or inappropriately about others |
| ḫamḫam | ḫam | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | become rotten |
| qabqab | qab | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | peel off |
| nahnah | nah | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | become overcooked |
| jaʿjaʿ | jaʿ | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | speak loudly or nonsensically |
| jaʾjaʾ | jaʾ | $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ | become dirty |
| | | | |

The forms in Table 1 share a clear formal characteristic: the same $C_1VC_2$ sequence occurs twice within the lexical form. The Palestinian Arabic examples nevertheless differ in the status of this repeated unit. In forms such as *daqdaq, sabsab, fakfak, jarjar,* and *šamšam*, the repeated material can be related relatively transparently to a meaning-bearing element. In other forms, including *saḫsaḫ, nahnah,* and *jaʿjaʿ*, the individual $C_1VC_2$ sequence does not need to function as an independent lexical item for the complete form to receive a reduplicative analysis. A comparable distinction is reported for Jordanian Arabic, where semantically empty syllables can be doubled to produce meaningful lexical forms. Abu-Abbas and Alomari (2024), for example, analyse forms such as *saxsax* and *baḥbaḥ* in this way and show that the resulting forms can subsequently participate in ordinary Arabic derivational and inflectional morphology.

The Palestinian Arabic data provide similar evidence of morphological integration. The form *fakfak*, for example, is not restricted to an isolated reduplicated citation form. The data contain inflected forms such as *fakfakit, fakfakat, fakfakti, fakfaktu,* and *fakfakna*, as well as present-tense forms based on the same lexical structure. This behaviour is important because it shows that the reduplicated form can serve as a morphological base to which the regular grammatical morphology of Palestinian Arabic applies. Comparable morphological integration has also been reported in Jordanian Arabic, where reduplicated forms can provide bases for further verbal, nominal, and adjectival formation (Abu-Abbas & Alomari, 2024).

The meanings associated with full reduplication are not uniform. A noticeable group involves repetition or continuation of an activity. For example, daqdaq refers to continued knocking, farfar to continued wandering, rašraš to repeated spraying or splashing, and lahlah to continued stirring. In the examples given by participants, daqdaq described knocking that went on until the people inside woke up. Rašraš was used for spraying perfume several times. Repetition of an action, however, is not the only meaning found in the data. Rajraj described someone trembling violently with fear, and taštaš was used for someone who became thoroughly soaked by rain. The semantic contribution of full reduplication in Palestinian Arabic therefore cannot be reduced to simple repetition; the data also point to continuity, intensity, change of state, and expressive meanings whose interpretation depends on the lexical item and its context.

**4.3 Reanalysis of the Candidate Partial Reduplicative Forms**

The forms considered as candidates for partial reduplication require a more cautious analysis than the full reduplicative forms discussed in the previous section. Partial reduplication normally involves the copying of only part of a base rather than the repetition of the base in its entirety. In Levantine Arabic, McCarthy and Broselow (1983), for example, describe internal reduplication in which part of a root is copied within the resulting form. Their analysis therefore provides an important

criterion for the present data: the presence of recurring consonants or syllables is not sufficient by itself to establish partial reduplication. A partial analysis requires evidence that identifiable material from a base has been copied in the formation of the resulting word.

The Palestinian Arabic data contain ten forms that were initially considered possible examples of partial reduplication. These are *baḥbūḥ, naʿnūʿ, farfūš, karmūš, maqraqad, manʿanaš, dabdūb, mraṭoḥ, mnaṭoṭ,* and *mlaġoṣ*. At the initial stage of analysis, phonological recurrence and morphological change were treated as possible indicators of partial reduplication. Re-examination of the forms, however, shows that they do not provide equally strong evidence for a partial copying process. Table 2 therefore presents them as candidate partial reduplicative forms and distinguishes between possible partial copying, derivation involving a reduplicative base, and forms for which a reduplicative analysis cannot be established from the present data.

Table 2: Reanalysis of Candidate Partial Reduplicative Forms

| Form | Proposed relationship | Evidence of copying | Revised analysis |
|---|---|---|---|
| baḥbūḥ | related to baḥbaḥ | recurrent /b-ḥ/ material, but the proposed source is itself reduplicative | derivation involving a reduplicative base |
| naʿnūʿ | related to naʿnaʿ | recurrent /n-ʿ/ material with vocalic modification | borderline form |
| farfūš | related to farfaš | recurrent /f-r/ material, but farfaš already contains reduplicative structure | derivation involving a reduplicative base |
| karmūš | related to karmaš(a) | no clear copied constituent can be isolated | partial reduplication not established |
| maqraqad | related to qaraqad | internal consonantal recurrence is present, but the base–copy relationship is unclear | borderline form |
| manʿanaš | related to naʿaš | some segmental recurrence, but no unambiguous reduplicant can be identified | borderline form |
| dabdūb | related to dubb 'bear' | /d-b/ material recurs within a modified morphological pattern | Possible expressive/diminutive formation involving reduplication |
| mraṭoḥ | related to raṭoḥ | no clear copied constituent can be established | partial reduplication not established |
| mnaṭoṭ | related to naṭṭ/ naṭ | recurrence of /ṭ/ is present, but gemination and derivation provide competing explanations | borderline form |
| mlaġoṣ | related to laġas/laġoṣ | no identifiable copying operation is demonstrated | partial reduplication not established |

The reanalysis produces a different picture from the initial assessment of these forms. In particular, *baḥbūḥ* and *farfūš* should not automatically be treated as independent cases of partial reduplication. The data relate these forms to *baḥbaḥ* and *farfaš*, respectively. Since the proposed bases already contain recurrent consonantal material, the change from *baḥbaḥ* to *baḥbūḥ* or from *farfaš* to *farfūš* may represent further derivation from a reduplicative base rather than a new operation of partial copying. The distinction is important because morphological derivation from an already reduplicated form does not necessarily constitute another reduplicative process.

Dabdūb is another form whose classification is not entirely straightforward. In the Palestinian data, speakers related it to dubb 'bear' and used it when referring to a chubby person. The repeated material in the word points towards reduplication, although the form may involve more than simple partial copying. A useful comparison comes from Syrian Arabic, where De Blasio (2023) analyses dabdūb 'little bear, teddy' as a reduplicative formation combined with the faʿlūl pattern. The Palestinian use is similar enough to make this comparison relevant, especially because both forms are expressive. However, the available Palestinian examples do not show that dabdūb was formed simply by copying part of dubb. It is therefore treated here as a reduplicative formation whose precise morphological structure requires some caution.

*Naʿnūʿ contains recurring consonantal material, but its structure is not as transparent as the full reduplicative forms discussed above. The Palestinian examples do not reveal a clear segment of the word that can be identified as a base and then matched with a copied part. Naʿnūʿ is consequently included among the borderline cases rather than assigned directly to partial reduplication. The same problem arises with maqraqaḍ, manʿanaš, and mnaṭoṭ. Their repeated or similar segments are noticeable, yet this similarity can be explained in more than one way, including ordinary morphological or phonological*

*processes. Karmūš, mraṭoḥ, and mlaġoš are even less suitable for a reduplicative analysis: in the present data, no identifiable portion of these words functions as a base from which another portion can reasonably be analysed as copied. They are therefore discussed as formally similar expressions, not as members of the partial reduplication category.*

This reanalysis has an important consequence for the description of Palestinian Arabic. The data provide strong evidence for full reduplication, but the evidence for partial reduplication is considerably more restricted. The earlier claim that partial reduplication is more prevalent than full reduplication is therefore not maintained in the present analysis. Instead, the Palestinian forms show a continuum ranging from clear full morphological doubling to derived and expressive formations containing recurrent material, with a smaller set of forms whose status as partial reduplication remains less certain. This distinction avoids treating every instance of internal phonological recurrence as reduplication and allows the classification to reflect the morphological evidence available for each form.

### 4.4 Borderline and Reduplication-Like Formations

Not all forms containing repeated or similar phonological material in the Palestinian Arabic data can be treated as morphological reduplication. Several groups initially appeared to be reduplicative because they contain consonant doubling, rhyme, or the repetition of related lexical material. However, when the forms are examined according to the criteria adopted in this study, the relationship between a base and copied material cannot always be established. These examples are therefore retained as borderline or reduplication-like formations rather than included with the full reduplicative forms discussed in Section 4.2. Their inclusion in the analysis is important because they show why phonological recurrence alone cannot determine the morphological status of a Palestinian Arabic expression.

#### 4.4.1 Gemination and Consonant Doubling

The original classification included a group described as "stress-based reduplication." Forms such as *jammaʿ, kannaz, kassar, kaððab,* and *ṭabbaḥ* were placed in this category because one of their consonants is geminated and the resulting forms may express meanings involving intensity or emphasis. The earlier analysis consequently associated consonant doubling with reduplication.

The present analysis does not retain "stress-based reduplication" as an independent type. Gemination creates phonological repetition within the word, but the repetition of a consonant does not by itself demonstrate a morphological copying operation. This distinction is particularly important in Arabic, where consonant doubling interacts with the language's morphological system and therefore cannot automatically be interpreted as reduplication. El Zarka (2005) similarly discusses gemination and consonant doubling as phenomena located at the borderline of reduplication in Arabic morphology. From the perspective adopted in the present study, a geminated consonant provides evidence of phonological recurrence, but additional evidence is required to establish a base–reduplicant relationship.

For this reason, the geminated forms are excluded from the core reduplicative classification. This does not imply that gemination has no semantic or morphological function in Palestinian Arabic. Rather, the available evidence does not require these forms to be analysed as morphological doubling. Their meanings of intensity or emphasis cannot independently establish reduplication because semantic intensification and formal copying are separate analytical questions.

#### 4.4.2 Rhyming and Echo Formations

A second group consists of paired expressions whose components resemble one another phonologically. The Palestinian Arabic data include expressions such as *saq wa-naq, šaṭ wa-maṭ, šaṭ wa-naṭ, laḥālī labālī, ḫoš boš, ḥāyṣ lāyṣ, ḫaṣ naṣ, ʿaṭṭāl baṭṭāl,* and *ʿāṭil bāṭil*. These expressions may initially appear reduplicative because the members of each pair share part of their phonological structure. The data show that many of the pairs have similar syllabic shapes while differing in their initial consonants.

The formal similarity is clear, but it does not necessarily result from morphological copying. In some expressions, both members are recognizable lexical items, whereas in others one member appears to have been selected or formed partly because of its phonological compatibility with the other. The description of *ḥāyṣ lāyṣ* in the data, for example, identifies *ḥāyṣ* as a meaningful form while describing *lāyṣ* as a form created to match its rhyme. Such expressions are better treated cautiously as rhyming or echo formations unless an identifiable copying operation can be demonstrated.

This interpretation is also relevant to previous work specifically concerned with Palestinian Arabic. Issa (2019) examines imitative sequents in the Palestinian dialect, providing a more appropriate point of comparison for expressions in which phonological parallelism or rhyme links two components. In the present study, these expressions are therefore retained because they represent an important feature of Palestinian Arabic word play and expressive language, but they are not counted as confirmed instances of morphological reduplication. Their treatment, separately from full reduplication, prevents rhyme from serving as sufficient evidence of morphological doubling.

#### 4.4.3 Discourse Repetition and Cognate Constructions

The data also contain cases in which a complete lexical expression is repeated in conversation. Examples include *ibn ʿammak ibn ʿammak?* 'your cousin, your cousin?', *ṣāḥibtak ṣāḥibtak?* 'your friend, your friend?', and *btiʿrifu btiʿrifu?* 'you know him, you

know him?'. In the recorded examples, the second speaker repeats the expression to seek confirmation or to question the first speaker's intended precise interpretation.

These examples differ from lexical forms such as *daqdaq* and *fakfak*. In the latter, doubling is part of the internal morphological structure of a lexical form. In *ibn ʿammak ibn ʿammak?* by contrast, an already-formed expression is repeated in discourse for communicative purposes. The examples are therefore treated here as discourse repetition rather than as evidence for the morphological full reduplication described in Section 4.2. The distinction does not deny the functional importance of repetition in Palestinian Arabic conversation; it simply separates discourse-level repetition from word-forming morphological doubling.

A related distinction is required for constructions such as *rūḥ irkuḍ rakḍ* 'go run quickly', *darasat … dirāse* 'studied … study', and the combinations involving *bakā/ibkī … bukā* and *liʿib … liʿib*. The original analysis treated the noun accompanying the verb as a reduplicant and associated the construction with emphasis or intensification. The two elements, however, are morphologically related lexical forms rather than a base and a copied constituent created through reduplication. Their formal and semantic relationship may contribute to emphasis in the utterance, but this does not provide sufficient evidence for morphological doubling. They are consequently treated as cognate verb–noun constructions and excluded from the core reduplicative category.

These cases show why repeated sounds cannot always be taken as evidence of reduplication in Palestinian Arabic. The source of the repetition has to be considered first. A doubled consonant, for example, may result from gemination rather than copying. Similarly, the resemblance between the two words in a rhyming expression may simply be part of the way the pair is formed. The conversational examples discussed above present a different situation: speakers repeat an already complete expression, usually to question or confirm what has just been said. The verb–noun examples are different again: the two words are related morphologically, but one is not formed by copying part or all of the other. Some of these forms express emphasis or intensity, just as reduplicated forms sometimes do, but similarity in meaning does not make the processes identical. For the purposes of this study, they are therefore kept outside the main category of morphological reduplication unless a copying relationship can be demonstrated.

**4.5 Semantic and Pragmatic Functions**

The full reduplicative forms in the Palestinian Arabic data do not express a single meaning. Their interpretation varies according to the lexical item and the context in which it occurs. The clearest recurring functions in the data involve repetition or continuity of an action, intensity or degree, and the description of states or changes of state. Some forms also carry an expressive evaluation of the person, action, or situation being described. These functions are not assigned on the basis of reduplicative structure alone; they are identified from the meanings and contextual examples provided with the forms.

Repetition and continuity are particularly clear in a number of verbal forms. *Daqdaq*, for example, refers to continued knocking, as in *ḍal yidaqdiq la-ḥatta ṣaḥḥānā* 'he kept knocking until we woke up'. The same sense appears in *rašraš*, which occurs in a question about repeatedly spraying perfume. Forms such as *farfar* 'keep wandering' and *laḷlaḷ* 'keep stirring' show a comparable association with an activity extending over time. In these examples, reduplication is closely connected to the way the event is presented: the action is not understood as a single, punctual occurrence but as something repeated or ongoing.

Other forms emphasize the degree or intensity of a state. *Taštaš* describes someone who has become thoroughly soaked, and the example in the data refers to arriving home soaked by the rain. *Rajraj* is used to denote trembling and occurs in contexts describing violent trembling caused by fear. Forms such as *saḳsaḳ* 'laugh hysterically' likewise express more than the simple occurrence of an action. Here the reduplicated word contributes to an interpretation in which the action or state is experienced to a marked degree.

A further group describes a resulting state or a change affecting a person or object. *Fašfaš*, for example, is used to describe wood swelling after being left in water, while *nahnah* describes food that has become overcooked. These examples differ from *daqdaq* and *rašraš* because repeated performance of an action is not their most obvious interpretation. What is prominent instead is the condition reached by the referent. The data therefore suggest that the contribution associated with full reduplication cannot always be paraphrased as 'do X repeatedly'.

Some reduplicated forms are also strongly expressive. *Ṭamṭam*, for instance, is used in the data for covering up a story when a scandal is about to occur. *Laqlaq* describes talking too much, while *jaʿjaʿ* is used for loud or nonsensical speech; in the context, the speaker tells another person to stop because the speech has become annoying. In cases like this, the lexical meaning already carries an evaluative element. The form does not merely identify an action but helps present it as excessive, undesirable, or otherwise noteworthy in the immediate context.

Some of these uses have also been reported in Jordanian Arabic. Abu-Abbas and Alomari (2024), for example, identified repetition, intensity, and continuity as functions of full reduplication. Similar meanings occur in the Palestinian examples, but they are not equally relevant to every word. With *daqdaq*, the context makes continuation central to the meaning: the knocking goes on until somebody wakes up. *Taštaš* is different. Its example describes how wet the speaker became after being caught in the rain, so degree is more important than repetition. The negative tone of *laqlaq* and *jaʿjaʿ* stems mainly from their meanings and their use in the examples. The function of a reduplicated form must therefore be interpreted from the individual word and its context rather than predicted from its structure alone.

The examples also make one point clear about the relationship between structure and meaning. All the forms classified in Section 4.2 have the same $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ structure, but this does not confer exactly the same interpretation on them. In *daqdaq*, the action continues; in *taštaš*, the speaker describes an extreme state of being wet; and *jaʿjaʿ* refers to loud, annoying speech. The repeated structure is therefore compatible with several meanings in the Palestinian data. What a particular form expresses still depends on the word itself and on the situation in which it is used.

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1 Full Reduplication and Morphological Integration

The clearest reduplicative pattern in the Palestinian Arabic data is the $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ structure discussed in Section 4.2. The recurrence of this pattern across a relatively large set of lexical items suggests that full reduplication is not limited to an occasional expression. More importantly, the repeated $C_1VC_2$ unit does not have the same lexical status in every example. In forms such as *daqdaq, sabsab,* and *fakfak*, it can be related relatively easily to meaningful linguistic material. Other forms do not provide an independently meaningful $C_1VC_2$ unit. This difference does not prevent them from belonging to the same structural pattern.

This finding is consistent with the analysis proposed for Jordanian Arabic by Abu-Abbas and Alomari (2024). Their account distinguishes between the doubling of a meaning-bearing monosyllabic morpheme and cases in which a semantically empty $C_1VC_2$ unit is doubled to form a meaningful word. The Palestinian data make the same distinction useful. It allows forms to be examined on the basis of their morphological structure without requiring every repeated unit to exist independently as a lexical word. This point is particularly important for the present study because requiring an independent meaning for every $C_1VC_2$ sequence would exclude a substantial part of the Palestinian pattern for the wrong reason.

*Fakfak* is particularly useful here because the data show how the word is used across different grammatical forms. Alongside *fakfak*, speakers produced *fakfakit, fakfakat, fakfakti, fakfaktu,* and *fakfakna*, as well as present-tense forms. The repeated part of the word remains recognizable throughout these changes. In other words, speakers can inflect *fakfak* in much the same way as other Palestinian Arabic verbs. Abu-Abbas and Alomari (2024) report similar behaviour in Jordanian Arabic, where reduplicated words are also used in further inflectional and derivational forms.

Morphological Doubling Theory helps explain why this evidence matters. Inkelas and Zoll (2005) do not define reduplication simply as the visible repetition of phonological material. Their approach places the morphological relationship at the centre of the analysis. The Palestinian forms fit this view particularly well when the complete reduplicated word enters further morphological processes. In *fakfak*, for example, the $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ structure remains identifiable while person, gender, number, or tense marking changes around it. The morphological integration of the form therefore provides stronger evidence for its morphological status than phonological similarity alone.

The Palestinian findings also extend the comparison beyond Jordanian Arabic. Earlier work on Levantine Arabic demonstrated that copying can interact with Arabic morphological structure rather than operating as unrestricted repetition (McCarthy & Broselow, 1983). The present data point in the same general direction, although the dominant pattern examined here is full rather than internal reduplication. Taken together, these studies suggest that reduplication in spoken Levantine varieties should be examined as part of the morphological system of the variety concerned. In Palestinian Arabic, the repeated $C_1VC_2$ structure and its ability to participate in ordinary inflection provide the strongest evidence for such an analysis.

### 5.2 The Status of Partial Reduplication

Partial reduplication proved more difficult to establish than full reduplication in the Palestinian Arabic data. Ten forms had initially been considered candidates for this category, including baḥbūḥ, naʿnūʿ, farfūš, karmūš, and dabdūb. The initial assessment relied largely on the recurrence of consonantal material together with changes in the shape or grammatical behaviour of the resulting word. Once the forms were reconsidered in terms of a base and the material copied from it, however, they did not all behave in the same way.

The difference is especially clear in *baḥbūḥ* and *farfūš*. Both can be related to forms that already contain recurrent consonantal material, *baḥbaḥ* and *farfaš*. Treating the later forms as new cases of partial reduplication would therefore require evidence that another copying operation takes place when *baḥbūḥ* or *farfūš* is formed. The present data do not demonstrate such an operation. A more cautious interpretation is that these words are derived from bases that already have a reduplicative structure. This preserves the connection with reduplication without treating every morphological change affecting a reduplicated word as a new instance of reduplication.

Other candidates present a different problem. *Naʿnūʿ* and *dabdūb* contain conspicuous recurrent consonantal material, so their association with reduplicative morphology cannot simply be dismissed. At the same time, their structures do not provide the same transparent base–copy relationship found in the full $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ forms. *Dabdūb*, for example, is connected in the data with *dubb* 'bear', while the complete word is used for a chubby person. Forms of this kind are better kept analytically open than used as unquestionable examples of partial reduplication.

This result is relevant to earlier work on Levantine Arabic. McCarthy and Broselow (1983) describe internal reduplication in which copied material can be identified in relation to a base. Their analysis shows that partial copying is possible in Levantine Arabic, but its existence elsewhere in the dialect group does not mean that every Palestinian form containing internal

recurrence must receive the same analysis. The Palestinian examples have to provide evidence for the relationship themselves. In the present data, that evidence is much clearer for full reduplication than for the candidate partial forms.

The finding also complements the recent study of Jordanian Arabic by Abu-Abbas and Alomari (2024). Their investigation concentrates on full morphological reduplication and leaves partial reduplication for subsequent research. The Palestinian data show one reason why the partial category deserves separate investigation: its boundaries are less straightforward. A word may contain repeated consonants because it is related to an already reduplicated base, because another derivational pattern is involved, or because its phonological shape happens to contain recurrent material. Identifying partial reduplication therefore requires more than locating repeated segments inside the word.

For this reason, the present data do not support the claim that partial reduplication is more prevalent than full reduplication. That interpretation was based on treating forms such as farfūš, manʿanaš, and mlaġoṣ as examples of partial reduplication. Reanalysis reduces the number of forms that can reasonably be considered candidates for this category. This does not show that Palestinian Arabic lacks partial reduplication. It shows instead that the current dataset provides limited evidence for it and that stronger examples are needed before its structural patterns and productivity can be described with confidence.

### 5.3 The Boundary between Reduplication and Similar Formations

One of the main difficulties in analysing the Palestinian Arabic data was deciding how much weight should be given to phonological repetition. Several forms initially looked reduplicative because a consonant was doubled, two words rhymed, or related words occurred next to one another. The analysis in Section 4.4 showed that these similarities can have different sources. As a result, the presence of repeated sounds was treated as a reason to investigate a form, rather than as sufficient evidence for classifying it as reduplication.

Gemination illustrates the problem particularly well. The geminated forms contain consonant doubling and may also express intensity. Neither property, however, establishes that part of a base has been copied. El Zarka (2005) draws attention to precisely this borderline in Arabic, where gemination and other kinds of consonant doubling can resemble reduplication without necessarily receiving the same morphological analysis. The Palestinian examples support the need for this distinction. Their gemination is linguistically relevant, but the present data do not provide enough evidence to analyse it as morphological doubling.

Rhyming expressions raise a related issue for a different reason. Pairs such as *saq wa-naq* and *ḥāyṣ lāyṣ* have obvious phonological parallelism, but resemblance between the members of a pair does not establish a base–reduplicant relationship. The Palestinian data themselves show that these expressions depend heavily on rhyme and conventional pairing. This makes Issa's (2019) treatment of imitative sequents in Palestinian Arabic especially relevant. Rather than forcing such pairs into morphological reduplication, they can be recognized as part of a neighbouring expressive pattern in the dialect.

The conversational repetitions and cognate verb–noun constructions make the boundary clearer from another direction. Repeating *ibn ʿammak* in a question involves the recurrence of exactly the same linguistic material, yet the repetition takes place after the expression has already been formed. Its function belongs to the interaction between speakers rather than to the internal formation of a new lexical item. Likewise, a verb and its related noun may occur together for emphasis without one being created by copying the other. These examples show why the amount of repeated material, even when it is a whole word, cannot determine the classification on its own.

This distinction fits the central assumption of Morphological Doubling Theory (Inkelas & Zoll, 2005): morphological reduplication cannot be reduced to phonetic identity between two pieces of linguistic material. For the Palestinian data, this means asking how the repeated material participates in the formation of the word and not simply whether two sequences sound alike. The distinction also explains why the study retains borderline examples instead of deleting them from the analysis. They identify the points at which reduplication comes into contact with other morphological, phonological, and discourse processes in Palestinian Arabic, while keeping the category of morphological reduplication analytically restricted.

### 5.4 Form and Meaning in Palestinian Arabic

The Palestinian Arabic data show that sharing a reduplicative structure does not require words to share a single semantic function. The full forms analysed in this study have the same basic $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ organization, yet their meanings vary considerably. In *daqdaq*, continuation is prominent because the action of knocking continues over time. *Taštaš*, by contrast, describes the degree of a resulting state, while *jaʿjaʿ* carries a noticeably negative evaluation of loud or nonsensical speech. The structural similarity among these words is therefore clearer than any single meaning that could be assigned to the pattern as a whole.

This variation helps explain why context was necessary in analysing the forms. A gloss gives only part of the information. The example accompanying *rašraš*, for instance, shows repeated spraying of perfume, making recurrence important to its interpretation. The example for *ṭamṭam* instead concerns concealing a story when a scandal is expected, and its interpretation depends heavily on the situation being described. Context therefore helps identify what is prominent in the use of an individual reduplicated word without requiring that prominence to be attributed to the reduplicative structure alone.

Abu-Abbas and Alomari (2024) found several of the same functions in Jordanian Arabic, including repetition, intensity, and continuity. The Palestinian examples overlap with these findings, but individual words show the functions differently. *Daqdaq*,

for example, describes an ongoing action, whereas *taštaš* describes how thoroughly someone becomes wet. In *jaʿjaʿ*, the negative sense is already part of the description of loud or nonsensical speech. These differences make it difficult to assign one general meaning to the $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ pattern. The meaning of each form has to be considered together with the way speakers use that particular word.

The relationship between form and meaning in Palestinian Arabic is consequently best described at the level of individual reduplicated forms as well as at the level of the broader pattern. The $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ structure identifies a recurring morphological organization in the data, but it does not predict one fixed interpretation. This allows the structural analysis and the semantic analysis to support each other without assuming a one-to-one correspondence between them.

## 6. Conclusion

This study examined full and partial reduplication in Palestinian Arabic with particular attention to the relationship between repeated material and the form from which it is derived. The analysis showed that the clearest pattern in the data is full reduplication with a $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ structure. This pattern occurs across a substantial group of forms and includes cases in which the repeated $C_1VC_2$ unit is meaning-bearing as well as cases in which it does not function independently with the meaning of the complete word. The behaviour of forms such as *fakfak* under ordinary verbal inflection provides additional evidence that these reduplicated words are integrated into Palestinian Arabic morphology.

The ten forms considered as candidates for partial reduplication did not remain together as a single category after reanalysis. *Baḥbūḥ* and *farfūš*, for example, can be traced to *baḥbaḥ* and *farfaš*, which already contain recurrent material. They are therefore better understood as later formations from reduplicated words rather than as new cases of partial copying. *Naʿnūʿ* and *dabdūb* still show features that may involve reduplicative morphology, but their structure is less transparent than the $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ pattern found in the full forms. Other candidates could not be linked convincingly to a copied part of a base. For this reason, the present data do not support the conclusion that partial reduplication is more frequent than full reduplication. Partial reduplication may occur in Palestinian Arabic, but the forms collected here are not sufficient to describe it as a regular or highly productive pattern.

The findings also show the importance of separating morphological reduplication from expressions that resemble it on the surface. Geminated forms, rhyming and echo expressions, conversational repetition, and cognate verb–noun constructions all contain some type of recurrence, but the recurrence does not necessarily result from morphological copying. Keeping these formations outside the core reduplicative category makes it possible to describe their similarity to reduplication without assuming that they are produced by the same process. This distinction addresses one of the main analytical problems of the study: repeated phonological material alone cannot determine morphological classification.

The meanings of the full forms also differ from word to word. *Daqdaq* describes knocking that continues for some time, whereas *taštaš* describes someone becoming thoroughly wet. *Saḍsaḍ* refers to hysterical laughter, and *jaʿjaʿ* has a negative sense when it describes loud or nonsensical speech. These examples share the $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ structure, but they do not share one fixed meaning. The interpretation of each form comes partly from the word itself and partly from the situation in which speakers use it.

Taken together, the findings support an analysis of Palestinian Arabic reduplication in which morphological structure, rather than surface repetition alone, provides the basis for classification. Morphological Doubling Theory (Inkelas & Zoll, 2005) offers a useful framework for this distinction because it allows the analysis to focus on the morphological relationship involved in reduplication while separating it from phonological resemblance. The study consequently provides a restricted but well-supported account of reduplication in the present data: full reduplication is clearly represented and morphologically integrated, whereas partial reduplication remains a more limited and analytically complex area that requires further evidence.

7. Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

The study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. The data were obtained from 73 Palestinian Arabic speakers between the ages of 30 and 70. This age range was selected because some of the expressions investigated were expected to be more familiar to older speakers, but excluding speakers under 30 means that the study cannot show whether the same reduplicative forms are used in the same way by younger Palestinians. The findings therefore describe the forms provided by the participants in this study rather than the full range of reduplication across all age groups in Palestinian Arabic.

The evidence for partial reduplication was more limited in this study. The data included 32 clear examples with the full $C_1VC_2$–$C_1VC_2$ structure. Ten other forms had originally been considered possible examples of partial reduplication, but their analysis was less straightforward. When these ten forms were examined more closely, several did not show clear evidence that part of a base had been copied. Some could instead be related to words that already had a reduplicative structure, while others remained uncertain. The data are therefore sufficient to discuss individual partial candidates, but not to give a complete description of partial reduplication in Palestinian Arabic.

Future research could address this issue by collecting data specifically designed to locate possible partial reduplicative forms. Rather than beginning with predetermined subtypes, researchers could gather a larger number of candidate words and examine the relationship between each word and its proposed base. Particular attention should be given to forms in which

only a consonant, syllable, or other part of the base appears to recur. Comparing such examples with geminated words, rhyming expressions, and forms derived from already reduplicated bases would help determine which patterns involve morphological copying and which have another explanation.

Age is another useful direction for further investigation. Including younger Palestinian speakers alongside the age groups represented in the present study could show whether particular reduplicated words are being maintained, replaced, or becoming less frequent across generations. Future work could also compare Palestinian Arabic with neighbouring Levantine varieties. The similarities already observed with Jordanian Arabic, together with earlier evidence of internal reduplication in Levantine Arabic, make such comparison particularly relevant. A larger comparative dataset could help determine which reduplicative patterns are widely shared across Levantine Arabic and which are more characteristic of individual varieties.

Finally, future studies would benefit from a larger body of naturally occurring spoken data. Questionnaires and interviews are useful for eliciting forms and obtaining speakers' explanations of their meanings, but recordings of spontaneous interaction could show how reduplicated words behave in everyday discourse without being directly elicited. Such data would be particularly valuable for examining pragmatic effects and for determining how frequently individual forms actually occur in contemporary Palestinian Arabic.

**Statements and Declarations**

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**References**

Abu-Abbas, K. H., & Alomari, A. R. (2024). *Morphological reduplication in Jordanian Arabic: Form and function. Cogent Arts & Humanities, 11*(1), 2353985. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2353985

De Blasio, E. (2023). *Diminutives in Syrian Arabic*. *Rhesis. International Journal of Linguistics, Philology and Literature, 14*(1), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.13125/rhesis/5775

El Zarka, D. (2005). *On the borderline of reduplication: Gemination and other consonant doubling in Arabic morphology*. In B. Hurch (Ed.), *Studies on reduplication* (pp. 369–394). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110911466.369

Igaab, Z. K. (2010). *Reduplication in English and Arabic: A contrastive study*. *Journal of Education College for Women for Humanistic Sciences, 1*(1), 3–24.

Inkelas, S. (2008). *The dual theory of reduplication. Linguistics, 46*(2), 351–401. https://doi.org/10.1515/LING.2008.013

Inkelas, S., & Downing, L. J. (2015). What is reduplication? Typology and analysis part 1/2: The typology of reduplication. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 9*(12), 502–515. https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12166

Inkelas, S., & Zoll, C. (2005). *Reduplication: Doubling in morphology*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511627712

Issa, K. A. Y. (2019). الإتباع في اللهجة الفلسطينية المحكية [Imitative sequents in Palestinian dialect]. □□□ □□□□ *51* ,□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, 115–141. https://doi.org/10.33685/1317-000-051-008

McCarthy, J. J., & Broselow, E. (1983). *A theory of internal reduplication*. *The Linguistic Review, 3*(1), 25–88. https://doi.org/10.1515/tlir.1983.3.1.25

Modhaffer, M., & Challavenkata, S. (2019). Patterns and functions of total reduplication in Classical Arabic and Modern Standard Arabic: A corpus-based study. *Linguistik Online, 94*(1), 83–99. https://doi.org/10.13092/lo.94.5434

Moravcsik, E. A. (1978). Reduplicative constructions. In J. H. Greenberg (Ed.), *Universals of human language: Vol. 3. Word structure* (pp. 297–334). Stanford University Press.

Rubino, C. (2005). Reduplication. In M. Haspelmath, M. S. Dryer, D. Gil, & B. Comrie (Eds.), *The world atlas of language structures* (pp. 114–117). Oxford University Press.