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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQPoss</td>
<td>adjective qualified by a possesum-designating substantive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQPossA</td>
<td>adjective qualified by a possesum-designating substantive in the accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQPossG</td>
<td>adjective qualified by a possesum-designating substantive in the genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>definite article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>indefinite article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mph</td>
<td>morphological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>neutralized gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>non-human gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN</td>
<td>neutralized number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>prepositional phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPIV</td>
<td>passive participle derived from an intransitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qm</td>
<td>qualificatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr</td>
<td>qualificator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>relative clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>substantive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>sententioid syntagm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>sufixally substantivized adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRINCIPLES OF TRANSLITERATION AND GLOSSING

Examples are cited in the form (case and state) in which they occur in the original text. If a fragment of a text was omitted, the sign [...] is used to indicate it. The following symbols are used in transliteration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ا</th>
<th>ã</th>
<th>ض</th>
<th>ð</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ط</td>
<td>ŧ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت،ة</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>ŧ</td>
<td>ع</td>
<td>ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>ġ</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>ġ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ħ</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>ĥ</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ه</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>ی</td>
<td>y, ĭ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The definite article is transliterated as it is pronounced, i.e. with assimilation. The wasla-vowel is written on the preceding word without hyphen, not on the definite article (e.g. a in mina l-bayti or i in dañalati l-bayta). Proper names are left with no inflectional ending, as these tend to be neither written nor pronounced. Their gender and case is marked in glossing. In transliteration capital letters for proper names are used for the sake of ease of reading, even though Arabic writing system does not have

---

1 Strictly speaking, the Arabic written are neither transcribed nor transliterated or, to put it differently, the transliteration is “actually a mix of transcription and transliteration” (Zaborski 2006: 187). Latin letters with diacritics rather stand for how the written text should be read.
them. Punctuation marks (incl. quotations marks) are generally disregarded.

Verbs are not divided into morphemes nor glossed in order to avoid complications with introducing additional symbols. For the proper understanding of the present study simple translation into English shall be considered sufficient.

The division into morphemes is indicated only as far as it is possible. E.g. *buyūtun* ‘houses’ is divided as *buyūt-u-n* and glossed as “houses.NH.PL-N-I”, the features ‘non-human’ and ‘plural’ being indicated after dots, both being expressed in the stem *buyūt*-. If one Arabic unit needs to be translated by means of two English units, the latter are linked by means of a colon (e.g. he:goes stands for *yądhabu*).

The suffix *-n* (*tanwīn*) is rendered as the indefinite article, although the correspondence is not full. There are definite substantives which have this suffix, e.g. *Muḥammadun*, on one hand, and indefinite substantives and adjectives, which do not have it, on the other, e.g. *’aswadu* ‘black’ and ‘a Black’. In such cases indefiniteness is indicated directly (after a dot) after the case.

Every example is annotated as to the source it was excerpted from. The information contains the abbreviated title (see Corpus list for full titles), date (of the issue of the newspaper), page and the beginning of the heading of the article (for journalistic texts). For ease of cross-reference, every example has a number, placed between slashes after the information on its source. Literal, or rather more literal translations (indicated by ‘lit.’), which are sometimes employed, are to be taken as working translations, provided only for an approximated indication of grammatical relations. If examples are quoted from other descriptive works, the system of transliteration adopted in this study is always used.
SUMMARY IN POLISH: STRESZCZENIE

TYPOLOGIA
DWUSKŁADNIKOWYCH PRZYMIOΤNIKOWYCH SYNTAGM HIPOTAKTYCZNYCH
WE WSPÓŁCZESNYM LITERACKIM JĘZYKU ARABSKIM

Rozdziały 0.1.-0.3: Celem rozprawy jest przedstawienie propozycji typologii dwuskładnikowych przymiotnikowych syntagm hipotaktycznych we współczesnym literackim języku arabskim. Termin „dwuskładnikowa syntagma przymiotnikowa” oznacza, że tylko takie syntagmy sąbrane pod uwagę, które składają się z dwóch wyrazów (składników), z których przynajmniej jeden jest przymiotnikiem. Typologia bazuje na wymiarach syntagmalnych, względem których syntagmy mogą być charakteryzowane i porównywane ze sobą.

Praca ma charakter synchroniczny i deskryptywny. Syntagmy opisywane w pracy wyekszerpowane zostały z korpusu zawierającego teksty proz, głównie artystyczne i prasowe, pochodzące z okresu 1961-2007 i powstałe przeważnie we wschodniej części świata arabskiego.

Rozdział 0.4.1.1: Prace językoznawcze poświęcone w szczególności kategorii przymiotnika pojawiły się w europejskiej tradycji językznawczej w wieku dwudziestym. Próby zdefiniowania tej części mowy, zwłaszcza w kontekście odróżnienia jej od rzeczownika, podejmowane były na różne sposoby, np. jako wyraz wyrażający jedną jakość lub cechę, jako hierarchicznie sekundarna część mowy lub jako wyraz spełniający prymarne funkcję przydawki. Rozdział 0.4.1.2: W tradycji arabskiej terminem najbliższym terminowi ‘przymiotnik’ jest šifa dosł. ‘cecha’, który jednak z przymiotnikiem utożsamiany być nie może. Od samego początku powstania gramatyki arabskiej do czasów współczesnych termin ten stosowany był na określenie zarówno pewnej kategorii leksykalnej nominalnych części mowy, jak i funkcji składniowej, w jakiej mogą występować w zdaniu. Te dwa sposoby rozumienia terminu šifa, leksykalny i składniowy, wynikają m.in. z faktu, że w języku
arabskim, tak klasycznym, jak i współczesnym, nie ma morfologicznego rozróżnienia wewnątrz kategorii wyrazów nominalnych, które pozwoliłyby jednoznacznie stwierdzić, czy dany wyraz jest przymiotnikiem, czy nie. Rozdział 0.4.1.3.: Problem przymiotnika w języku arabskim pojawia się także w zachodnich pracach językoznawczych na ten temat, gdzie ta część mowy rozumiana jest na różne sposoby. Wielu badaczy, podobnie jak gramatycy arabscy, uznaje, że jedynie konkretnie użycie w tekście pozwala stwierdzić, czy dany wyraz jest przymiotnikiem.

Rozdział 0.4.2.: Idea syntagmy, lub grupy syntaktycznej, pojawiła się w językoznawstwie europejskim z końcem wieku XIX. De Saussure rozumiał pod pojęciem syntagmy wszelki znak złożony, czyli także wyraz, złożony z tematu i sufiksu. Bloomfield posługiwał się terminem fraza (rozróżniając frazy endo- i egzocentryczne). Trubeckoj wyróżnił trzy główne typy syntagm: socjatywne (współrzędne), determinatywne (podrzędne) i predykatywne. Wchodzenie wyrazów w związki między sobą badane było w językoznawstwie z różnych perspektyw (należy tu wspomnieć m.in. analizę składników bezpośrednich i gramatykę zależności). W teorii przedstawionej przez Bańczerowskiego kwalifikacja rozumiana jest jako relacja między dwoma wyrazami, z których jeden kwalifikuje drugi, tzn. zawęża jego zakres oznaczania, a rozszerza znaczenie. W ten sposób powstaje syntagma hipotaktyczna o zakresie oznaczania węższym i o znaczeniu szerszym niż wyraz, który jest w niej wyrazem kwalifikowanym, czyli qualificatum.

Arabska tradycja gramatyczna wytworzyła koncepcje, które w pewien sposób podobne są do koncepcji obecnych w językoznawstwie europejskim. Posługuje się ona np. pojęciem murakkab odnoszącym się do złożonych jednostek językowych. Już autor pierwszej gramatyki arabskiej opisywał język przy użyciu pojęć takich jak zgoda i rekcja między wyrazami. Jeśli chodzi o opisy języka arabskiego dokonywane przez językoznawców zachodnich, wydaje się, że nie stosuje się w nich jednolitego aparatu pojęciowego związanego z syntagmami lub determinacją (kwalifikacją).

Rozdział 1.1.2.: Wyrazy, jako językowe znaki proste, nie są w stanie samodzielnie służyć komunikacyjnym celom języka, gdyż ich zakres oznaczania jest w wielu przypadkach zbyt szeroki, natomiast ich znaczenie, które sygnifikuje, zbyt wąskie. Trudność ta jest przewyższona dzięki możliwości tworzenia znaków złożonych, czyli syntagm hipotaktycznych. W syntagmie hipotaktycznej jeden ze składników, *qualificatum*, jest kwalifikowany przez drugi składnik, *qualificator*, czyli jego zakres oznaczania jest zawężany. Syntagma powstająca z ich połączenia ma zakres oznaczania węższy, a signifikuje znaczenie szersze. Rozdział 1.1.3.: Nierównorządność składników w syntagmie hipotaktycznej może być sygnalizowana w wykładnikach morfologicznych wyrazów wchodzących w skład syntagmy. Wykładniki te mogą przyjmować trzy główne postacie: rekcji (rzędu), kongruencji (zgody) i junkcji leksykalnej (przynależności). Rozdział 1.1.4.: Dla współczesnego literackiego języka arabskiego można wyróżnić cztery kategorie morfologiczne, względem których można charakteryzować nominalne części mowy (nie uwzględniając zaimków osobowych). Są to: kategoria stanu (określoność i nieokreśloność), kategoria rodzaju (męski i żeński w liczbie pojedynczej, mężczyzny, żeński i nieosobowy w liczbie mnogiej), kategoria liczby (liczba pojedyncza, podwójna i mnoga) oraz kategoria przypadka (mianownik, dopełniacz i biernik).

Rozdział 1.1.5.: Wyrazy wchodzące w skład syntagmy hipotaktycznej desygnowują dwa różne fragmenty rzeczywistości pozajęzykowej. Wyrazy te są wobec siebie nierównorządne. Wyraz nadrzędny, najczęściej będący
*qualificatum*, wykazuje następujące właściwości: brak podatności na redukcję, determinowanie własności składniowych całej syntagmy i brak możliwości stanowienia odpowiedzi na naturalne i niezłożone pytania.

W niektórych przypadkach, w zależności od języka i pewnych określonych czynników, ten sam fragment rzeczywistości może w syntagmach synonimicznych być desygnowany jako *qualificator* lub jako *qualificatum*.

Rozdział 1.1.6.: Kwalifikacja frazowa łączy syntagmy z wyrazami lub syntagmy z syntagmami. Pewne konstrukcje języka arabskiego, np. takie, w skład których wchodzi tzw. ‘syntagma sentencjoidalna’, są opisywalne tylko przy zastosowaniu pojęcia kwalifikacji frazowej. Rozdział 1.1.7.: W pracy nie są uwzględnione syntagmy paraktatyczne, choć w wielu przypadkach mogą one mieć wpływ na składnię i morfologię syntagm hipotaktycznych.

Rozdział 1.2.1.: Syntagmy predykatywne są szczególnym przypadkiem syntagm hipotaktycznych. Żaden z dwóch składników syntagmy predykatywnej z orzeczeniem nominalnym nie wykazuje jednoznacznie własności, które zazwyczaj charakteryzują *qualificatum* (brak podatności na redukcję, determinowanie własności składniowych całej syntagmy, brak możliwości stanowienia odpowiedzi na naturalne i niezłożone pytania). W syntagmach predykatywnych podmiot analizowany jest jako *qualificatum*, natomiast orzeczenie jako *qualificator*. Rozdział 1.2.2.: W teorii J. Bańczerowskiego przyjmuje się, że w granicach zdania każdy *qualificator* może kwalifikować tylko jedno *qualificatum*. Zauważa się jednak, że w niektórych konstrukcjach jeden *qualificator* mógłby być interpretowany jako kwalifikujący dwa wyrazy.

Rozdział 1.3.: Syntagmom, jako obiektom językowym, można przyporządkować cechy, zwane w niniejszej pracy *własnościami syntagmalnymi*. Własności syntagmalne, które dają się ze sobą sensownie porównywać, tzn. są homogeniczne, pogrupowane są w zbiory zwane tu *wymiarami syntagmalnymi*. Zaproponowano dziewięć następujących wymiarów syntagmalnych, w oparciu o które przeprowadzona została typologia:
(i) Status kwalifikacyjny przymiotnika w syntagmie: Wymiar ten pozwala charakteryzować syntagmy pod względem tego, czy przymiotnik funkcjonuje w nich jako *qualification, qualiﬁcatum* lub oba jednocześnie.

(ii) Kategoria części mowy, do której należy współskładnik przymiotnika w syntagmie: Wymiar ten pozwala charakteryzować syntagmy pod względem tego, do jakiej części mowy należy wyraz, który wraz z przymiotnikiem tworzy syntagmę.

(iii) Wewnętrzkategoriowe zróżnicowanie przymiotnika występującego w syntagmie: Wymiar ten pozwala charakteryzować syntagmy pod względem tego, czy przymiotnik będący jej składnikiem należy do subkategorii *positivus* czy do subkategorii *elativus*.

(iv) Rodzaj wykładników morfologicznych: Wymiar ten pozwala charakteryzować syntagmy pod względem wykładników morfologicznych wskazujących, że dwa wyrazy tworzą razem syntagmę.

(v) Porządek linearne składników w syntagmie: Wymiar ten pozwala charakteryzować syntagmy pod względem linearnego porządku *qualificatora* i *qualificatum*.

(vi) Linearna kontynualność syntagmy: Wymiar ten pozwala charakteryzować syntagmy pod względem możliwości, niemożliwości lub konieczności wystąpienia innego wyrazu pomiędzy składnikami syntagmy.

(vii) Funkcja syntaktyczna przymiotnika występującego jako *qualificator*: Wymiar ten pozwala charakteryzować syntagmy pod względem funkcji syntaktycznej, jaką spełnia przymiotnik, który w syntagmie jest *qualificatorem*.

(viii) Funkcja syntaktyczna przymiotnika występującego jako *qualificatum*: Wymiar ten pozwala charakteryzować syntagmy pod względem funkcji syntaktycznej, jaką spełnia przymiotnik, który w syntagmie jest *qualificatum*.

(ix) Stopień wymagalności *qualificatora* przymiotnika: Wymiar ten pozwala charakteryzować syntagmy pod względem obligatoryjności lub fakultatywności wystąpienia wyrazu kwalifikującego przymiotnik funkcjonujący w syntagmie jako *qualificatum*. 
Część 2. Przymiotnik w języku arabskim. Rozdział 2.1.: W literaturze arabistycznej przymiotnik ujmowany jest na różne sposoby. Badacze zauważali brak poważniejszych różnic morfologicznych między przymiotnikiem a rzeczownikiem (nie uwzględniając stopniowalności). Problem ten ujmowano także jako możliwość użycia danego wyrazu w funkcji rzeczownika lub przymiotnika. Grande utrzymywał, że nawet w konkretnym użyciu w tekście niemożliwe jest rozstrzygnięcie, czy ma się do czynienia z przymiotnikiem w funkcji przydawki, czy z rzeczownikiemchodzącym w skład apozycji. Dla niektórych arabistów własnością wyróżniającą przymiotniki jest zdolność do atrybutywnego kwalifikowania innych wyrazów. Rozdział 2.2.: W porównaniu z wcześniejszymi stadiami języka, we współczesnym języku arabskim przymiotnik jest kategorią bardziej wykrystalizowaną. Daje się w nim zauważyć więcej wyrazów funkcjonujących wyłącznie jako przydawki i wykazujących pełną zgodność w rodzaju i liczbie z wyrazem kwalifikowanym. Z kolei w języku klasycznym i przedklasycznym często można mówić o rzeczownikach, które, nie zmieniając swej formy, kwalifikowały inne rzeczowniki w apozycji. Rozdział 2.2.1.: Mimo znacznego podobieństwa, przymiotniki i rzeczowniki we współczesnym literackim języku arabskim różnią się od siebie pod względem własności składniowych (te pierwsze z większą swobodą funkcjonują jako przydawki, te drugie – jako argumenty, tj. podmiot i dopełnienia), a także, choć w mniejszym stopniu, morfologicznym (w liczbie mnogiej). Tylko te pierwsze własności, składniowe, mogą być użyte to jednoznacznego rozgraniczenia przymiotników od rzeczowników. Rozdział 2.2.2.: Wyodrębnienie przymiotnika wewnątrz nominalnych części mowy jako różnego od rzeczownika w języku arabskim nie jest możliwe w oparciu wyłącznie o kryteria pojęciowe, morfologiczne lub derywacyjne. Można jednak wyodrębnić klasę wyrazów, które powinno nazwać się przymiotnikami, bazując głównie na kryterium syntaktycznym. Rozdział 2.2.3.: Zdolność pewnych wyrazów należących do nominalnych części mowy do kwalifikowania innych wyrazów z tej kategorii w syntagmach atrybutywnych na drugiej pozycji – biorąc pod uwagę porządek linearly – przy jednoczesnej niemożności zmiany szyku w syntagmie,
trakтовane jest jako główny wyznacznik przymiotnikowości tych wyrazów. W definicji przymiotnika ważną rolę odgrywa też kryterium morfologiczne. Przymiotnik zgadza się z kwalifikowanym rzeczownikiem w czterech kategoriach: określeności (stanu), rodzaju, liczby i przypadka. Dają się jednak wyróżnić określone kategorie wyrazów, które są przymiotnikami niewykazującymi zgody co do rodzaju i liczby z kwalifikowanymi wyrazami. Rozdział 2.2.4.: Do kategorii przymiotnika należą także elatiwy, które stanowią szczególną subkategorię przymiotnika, wyróżniającą się swą semantyką (przenoszą one znaczenie komparatywności i superlatywności) oraz morfologią (wykazują ograniczoną zgodę pod względem liczby i rodzaju). Przymiotnikami są także imiesłowy.


Rozdział 3.1.: Nominalne syntagmy hipotaktyczne obejmują atrybucję przymiotnikową i atrybucję rzeczownikową. Rozdział 3.1.1.: Atrybucja jest rodzajem syntagmy, w której niemożliwa jest zmiana linearnego porządku składników. Na podstawie kryterium zgodności w liczbie i rodzaju qualificatora z qualificatum wyróżnia się atrybucję przymiotnikową i atrybucję rzeczownikową. Rozdział 3.1.1.1.: Niektóre przymiotniki, należące do ściśle określonych kategorii, nie wykazują zgody w liczbie i rodzaju z kwalifikowanym przez siebie wyrazem. Rozdział 3.1.1.2.: Niektóre syntagmy z pewnych względów mogłyby być interpretowane jako składające się z hipotaktycznych przymiotników. W pracy niniejszej takie syntagmy traktuje się
jednak jako parataktyczne. **Rozdział 3.1.1.3.**: Przymiotnik nie musi pozostawać w linearnej ciągłości z kwalifikowanym przez siebie rzeczownikiem. **Rozdział 3.1.1.4.**: Przymiotnik, który kwalifikuje rzeczownik będący *qualificatorem* liczbnika może przybierać różną liczbę, zgadzając się z liczbikiem albo rzeczownikiem. Problematyczna jest tu kwestia, czy *qualificatum* przymiotnika jest licznikiem czy rzeczownikiem, czy może oba te wyrazy jednocześnie. **Rozdział 3.1.1.2.**: Atrybucja rzeczownikowa tym głównie różni się od przymiotnikowej, że jej *qualificator*, będący rzeczownikiem, nie zgadza się z *qualificatum* co do zgody i rodzaju. **Rozdział 3.1.1.2.1.**: Szczególnym przypadkiem atrybucji rzeczownikowej jest taka, w której *qualificator* jest przymiotnikiem w substantywizacji sufiksalnej, tzn. sufugowany jest do niego zaimek osobowy.

**Rozdział 3.2.:** Nominalne syntagmy apozycyjne obejmują apozycję rzeczownikową i apozycję przymiotnikową. Wyróżniającą własnością apozycji (z pewnymi wyjątkami) jest możliwość przemienności szyku jej składników. **Rozdział 3.2.1.:** Apozycje rzeczownikowe są to apozycje, w których oba człony są rzeczownikami. Apozycje rzeczownikowe, w których jednym z członów jest rzeczownik będący tytułem, oficjalną nazwą itp., cechują się nieprzemiennością szyku jej składników. **Rozdział 3.2.1.1.:** Odróżnienie atrybucji przymiotnikowej od apozycji rzeczownikowej może być rzeczą problematyczną. Jest to jednak możliwe przy użyciu testu polegającego na zmianie linearnego szyku składników i identyfikacji zachodzących przy tym zmian w znaczeniu danej syntagmy. **Rozdział 3.2.2.:** Apozycja przymiotnikowa składa się z dwóch przymiotników i związana jest z substantywizacją dwóch parataktycznie połączonych przymiotników atrybutywnych.

**Rozdział 3.3.:** Nominalne syntagmy parataktyczne obejmują przymiotnikowe syntagmy parataktyczne właściwe, przymiotnikowe syntagmy jukstapozycyjne i rzeczownikowe syntagmy parataktyczne. Syntagmy parataktyczne mogą być odróżnione od hipotaktycznych w oparciu m.in. o możliwość zastosowania spójnika lub poprzez wykazanie, że oba ich składniki kwalifikują ten sam wyraz.

Rozdziały 4.1.-4.4.: Pod wieloma względami różnica między przymiotnikiem a rzeczownikiem użytym w funkcji predykatu jest zneutralizowana. Nominalna część mowy użыта jako predykat traktowana jest jako przymiotnik, a nie rzeczownik, jeżeli wykazuje przynajmniej potencjalną zdolność do kwalifikowania jako przydawka. Rozwiązanie to przyjęto dla czterech rodzajów predykatów: podstawowego, rozszerzonego, eksklatywnego i sekundarnego.

Rozdział 4.5.: Wyróżnia się cztery typy substantivewizacji, która rozumiana jest w sposób synchroniczny jako użycie wyrazu będącego w myśl zaproponowanej definicji przymiotnikiem w funkcji syntaktycznej typowej dla rzeczowników – chodzi tu o funkcje podmiotu i dopełnień. Rozdział 4.5.1.: W substantivewizacji anaforycznej przymiotnik użyty jest bez *qualificatum*, które jednak znane jest dzięki swemu wcześniejszemu wystąpieniu w tekście. Rozdział 4.5.2.: W substantivewizacji antegenetywnej przymiotnik kwalifikowany jest przez rzeczownik w dopełniaczu, nabywając w ten sposób określone własności składniowe charakterystyczne dla rzeczownika. Rozdział 4.5.3.: W substantivewizacji sufiksalnej do przymiotnika sufigowany jest zaimek osobowy reprezentujący rzeczownik, który wystąpił wcześniej w tekście. Rozdział 4.5.4.: W substantivewizacji niezależnej przymiotnik użyty jest bez konieczności lub możliwości wystąpienia towarzyszącego rzeczownika. Substantializacja niezależna może być (i) prosta, (ii) z nadwyżką składniową lub (iii) z nadwyżką składniową i semantyczną. Rozdział 4.6.: Ponadto sekundarną funkcją przymiotnika jest kwalifikowanie czasownika, imiesłowu i *nomen verbale*. Tzw. przysłówek opdresszymionikowy traktowany jest jako funkcja syntaktyczna, a nie część mowy.

Część 5. Pozostałe syntagmy przymiotnikowe. Rozdział 5.1.: Przymiotnik może być *qualificatorem* w dopełniaczu jeśli kwalifikuje tzw. ‘rzeczowniki specjalne’ (np. *gayr* ‘inny niż’) lub jest użyty w substantivewizacji antegenetywnej lub sufiksalnej. Również przymiotnik atrybutywny ma formę
dopelnicza, jeśli poprzedzony jest przyimkiem trzspółgłoskowym, np. qabla ‘przęd’. Rozdział 5.2.: Syntagmy predykatywne dzielą się na syntagmy predykatywne podstawowe (tj. niezawierające czasowników typu kāna ‘być’), rozszerzone (tj. zawierające czasowniki typu kāna ‘być’), esklamatywne i sekundarne (tj. takie, w których przymiotnik w bierniku wyraża własność, która jest prawdziwa dla obiektu, o którym mówi się w zdaniu, jednocześnie ze stanem rzeczy wyrażonym przez to zdanie). Rozdział 5.3.: Przymiotnik może być kwalifikowany przez rzeczownik desgnowujący tzw. possesum „nieodłączne” i jednocześnie kwalifikować rzeczownik desgnowujący jego possessora. Przymiotniki należące do subkategorii positivus kwalifikowane są przez rzeczowniki w dopelniczu (tzw. „idafa formalna”), natomiast odpowiadające im przymiotniki subkategorii elativus kwalifikowane są przez rzeczowniki w bierniku. Rozdział 5.4.: W konstrukcji zwanej tu „syntagmą sentencjoidalną” (w terminologii arabskiej na’t sababī) występuje podwójna zgoda przymiotnika, który w tej syntagmie funkcjonuje jako qualificator: w kategoriach rodzaju i liczby zgadza się ze swoim qualificatum, wraz z którym stanowi „syntagmę sentencjoidalną”, natomiast w kategoriach określeności (stanu) i przypadka zgadza się on z rzeczownikiem kwalifikowanym przez całą „syntagmę sentencjoidalną”. W tym ostatnim wypadku przymiotnik wykazuje zgodę z rzeczownikiem, którego nie kwalifikuje. Rozdział 5.5.: Przymiotnik użyty w funkcji adwerbialnej może kwalifikować nie tylko czasownik, lecz także imiesłów, nomen verbale, a nawet rzeczowniki nie derywowane od czasowników. Rozdział 5.6.: Przymiotniki w substantywizacji antegenetywalnej zwane są przymiotnikami antegenetywalnymi. Mogą to być przymiotniki należące do subkategorii positivus, jak i te należące do subkategorii elativus. Oprócz obligatoryjnego kwalifikatora w dopelniczu, mogą one posiadać dodatkowe kwalifikatory w bierniku lub w postaci wyrażenia przyimkowego. Rozdział 5.7.: Przymiotniki w substantywizacji sufiksalnej mogą być kwalifikowane przez rzeczowniki w bierniku lub przez wyrażenia przyimkowe. Rozdział 5.8.: Przymiotniki będące imiesłowami czynnymi od czasowników tranzytwnych lub imiesłowami biernymi od czasowników ditranzytwnych
 mogą być kwalifikowane przez dopełnienie bliższe. **Rozdział 5.9.** Przymiotnik może być kwalifikowany przez tzw. „biernik wewnętrzny”, który zazwyczaj jest rzeczownikiem pokrewnym temu przymiotnikowi, w stanie nieokreślonym i w bierniku. **Rozdział 5.10.** Inne kwalifikatory przymiotnika w bierniku oparte na reakcji obejmują okoliczniki sposobu, zawartości, i celu. **Rozdział 5.11.** Przymiotnik może być kwalifikowany przez wyrażenia przyimkowe zawierające rzeczownik, zaimek osobowy sufigowany do przyimka lub inny przymiotnik. **Rozdział 5.12.** Przymiotnik będący imiestowem biernym od czasownika intranzytywnego wykazuje szczególne własności składniowe. Nie zgadza się on co do liczby i rodzaju z wyrazem, który kwalifikuje. Ponadto jest on obligatoryjnie kwalifikowany przez wyrażenie przyimkowe zawierające zaimek osobowy reprezentujący wyraz kwalifikowany przez przymiotnik. **Rozdział 5.13.** *Qualificator* przymiotnika w syntagmnie opartej na juncji leksykalnej to taki wyraz, który należy uznać za nieodmienny. Wyrazy takie to m.in. określenia czasu i stopnia. **Rozdział 5.14.** Pewnych jednostek ze względu na ich własności morfologiczne i syntaktyczne nie można traktować jako syntagmy. Mimo że daje się w nich wyróżnić komponent rzeczownikowy i komponent przymiotnikowy, wykazują one więcej cech wyrazów niż syntagm.

0. **Introduction**

0.1. **Aim**

The aim of this study is to propose a typology of biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms in Modern Written Arabic (henceforth MWA), i.e. to present a list of ‘syntagmal types’, of which biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms used in texts are realizations. The term ‘biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms’ means that we will be interested in types of syntactic structures which are constructed of two words, or constituents (hence: *biconstituent*), out of which one qualifies the other (is bound with it by the relation of *hypotaxis*). Only syntagms with at least one constituent being an adjective will be taken into account, hence the term *adjectival*. The term ‘adjectival syntagms’ will be understood in a sense wider than in the traditional usage (where it denotes syntagms in which the adjective is only the qualified constituent).

The character of this study is strictly descriptive. By analysing and describing possible grammatical combinations of adjectives with other words, the monograph concerns a fragment of the syntax of this language. It is a necessary step to a fuller syntactic description of MWA. A systematic study of this fragment of syntax based on the concept of qualification is not available yet. The syntax of adjectives is, of course, dealt with in any grammar of MWA, usually at length. Yet it seems that a work devoted in its entirety to the study of the adjectival syntagms is needed.

Another reason for undertaking this work is the fact that texts, both journalistic and literary, show that a number of rules, usually of normative character, comprised in grammars and study books, do not reflect the real state of today’s MWA: there are some new phenomena concerning the syntax of Arabic adjectives that are not accounted for in grammars. This is so due to the fact that MWA is a living language, which, in spite of
convictions of more traditionalist grammarians, is developing and changing not only in its vocabulary but also in syntax. Its grammar is not identical to that of Classical Arabic and is changing. The causes of these changes are of various character and cannot be discussed here. Suffice it to say that the impact of other languages (Arabic dialects, English, French), the need for new means of expressions related to dramatic technological and social changes (new expressions needed for new concepts), as well as the potential that is hidden in the language itself make MWA change.

The author of this study hopes that it will serve as a useful tool for any person who desires to learn MWA and is interested in a more detailed analysis of this part of its syntax. The description of the syntax of the adjective represented in the typology of adjectival syntagms proposed by us can be used by students of Arabic looking for a systematic model of combinations of the adjectives with other words, which, as said above, is not always complete and up-to-date in grammars.

What is also of great importance is the fact that a language-internal typology can be useful for cross-linguistic studies. The dimensions proposed for the typology of the syntagms in MWA can in most cases be used in a typology for another language. Such language-internal typologies are the first and necessary step to a cross-linguistic comparison. And as was pointed by Hjelmslev, a typology of languages should be the aim of linguistics as a science (from Bossong 1979: 33).

The principal aim of the typology required a clear separation of the adjective from other nouns (or: nominal words). This constituted a separate problem in this study since adjectives themselves are rather an elusive part of speech. Not infrequently is their status as a separate part of speech denied by some linguists. At the same time, intuitions suggest that they do form a separate category. Often the important difference is neglected between the category of adjectives in Classical Arabic, where it was less prominent, and that in MWA, where it seems to have crystallized to a more significant degree. The present study aims at establishing a set of criteria which should be helpful in separating adjectives as a specific part of speech within the words of MWA.
0.2. Method

The object of our study are biconstituent syntagms, which we conceive of as grammatical combinations constructed of two words. To this purpose, we will adopt the concept of word proposed by Prof. J. Bańczewski. Further, we will apply his theory of qualification (also termed theory of determination), which features the concept of hypotactic (subordinative) syntagms. Morphosyntactic indicators of the relation of qualification will be of great importance for the typology of syntagms.

The typology will only take account of biconstituent syntagms. Therefore all syntagms composed of more than two constituents will be omitted in the description. Consequently, when devising the typology, we will not deal with relations obtaining in larger syntagms. This means that we will not ask questions about whether it would be correct to say e.g. ʾiḍāʿatu l-ḥabari l-mutasariʿatu ʿamdan ḥataʿun, ‘the hasty broadcasting of the news deliberately is a mistake’, which Fassi Fehri (who adduced this example) claims to be incorrect (1999: 146), although each of the biconstituent syntagms comprised in this large syntagm taken in isolation would be correct.

The typology will include only adjectival syntagms, that is to say syntagms composed of an adjective and another part of speech or composed of two adjectives. To do this, we have to have a definition of the adjective at our disposal which will allow us to determine whether a given word is an adjective or not. To this aim, we will attempt to provide a definition of the adjective which will be suitable and useable for the description of Arabic but not necessarily for another languages. This should do justice to the observation made by J. Kuryłowicz: “Il n’est pas permis de choisir arbitrairement les critères d’opposition, ils doivent être formels, c.-à-d. dicté par la langue elle-même” (1960c [1949]: 150).

The definition should allow us to identify adjectival syntagms in the corpus of written texts of MWA. Originally, it was intended for the corpus to comprise texts of around the year 2000. It splits into two major groups: literary texts and journalistic texts. The former comprise novels and short stories by authors from the Eastern part of the Arab world. Two fiction books by Ḫusayn ʿIsbir, one by Ṭāhir al-ʿUmar and one by Ṣāḥib Raḥab
as well as one non-fiction work by Ǧūzif Kallās are included. However, we deemed it necessary to extend the corpus by some literary texts which are generally acknowledged to have been written in a very good style and enjoy much prestige among Arabs themselves. Therefore we modified the temporal limitation originally assumed and added four novels by Naḥīb Mahfūẓ, whose language is considered not only correct but also as very natural and worthy of imitation. Thus, the temporal scope of our data, as far as literary texts are concerned, reaches from 1961 to 2003. Their volume is more than 1200 pages. The second part of the corpus consists of journalistic texts. They are taken from newspapers and magazines published in various places of the Eastern part of the Arab world (plus London). They range in date from 2000 to 2007. Above this, some syntagms have been excerpted from randomly read texts, e.g. non-fiction works, information booklets, or scientific and scholarly magazines.

As it can be seen, the corpus comprises texts written in the area ranging from Egypt to Saudi Arabia. No texts from Maghreb countries were included. If they were, perhaps some constructions differing from those of Eastern parts would appear (cf. El-Ayoubi et al. (2001: XVIII and 172).

In the present monograph no statistical investigation of the data was intended. However, we have tried to characterize the syntagms in terms of their frequency insofar as we have tried to note that some constructions appear infrequently or seem quite exceptional.

Besides original texts, which were used extensively as the source of our material, we also took advantage of the information comprised in linguistic descriptions of MWA: grammars, text books, and linguistic publications. We were primarily interested in recent studies, although older works were also consulted. In some cases, native speakers of Arabic were consulted, in order to provide evidence for syntagms that are not, or not sufficiently, attested.

The next step towards a typology is to propose a set of properties by which syntagms can be characterized. The absence of these properties or their presence in particular syntagms will group some syntagms with others, on one hand, and distinguish some types of syntagms from others, on the other. Establishing that a given syntagm has or does not have a specific property will be used for classing syntagms into syntagmal types.
For this purpose we propose a number of syntagmal properties which can be assigned to syntagms. Properties that are comparable with one another (or, in other words, that are homogenous) will be grouped into one set, which we will term a syntagmal dimension (cf. Bańczerowski et al. 1982: 134-139). These syntagmal dimensions will be applied to syntagms described and the typology of the latter will be presented.

The repertory of parts of speech adopted for the needs of this study includes: adjective, substantive (both discussed in Parts 2 and 3), verbs, pronouns (pronouns attached to prepositions are treated as pronouns). Due to spatial limitations of this study the description and typology will not include:

(i) quantifiers such as *kull ‘all*, ǧamī ‘all’, *ba’d ‘some’,
(ii) demonstrative pronouns such as *hādā ‘this’, ‘ulā’ika ‘those’ etc.,
(iii) relative pronouns such as *man, mà, llađi etc.*, 
(iv) cardinal numerals from 3 onwards, which will be discussed only as qualificata of the adjectives in attributive syntagms,
(v) clauses, which are linguistic units differing in many respects from words.

0.3. Object of study: Modern Written Arabic

Under the term Modern Written Arabic (MWA) we understand the contemporary written language that is widely used in all Arab countries as the language of literature, press, and official communication. Its grammatical rules are based on Classical Arabic (language of the Quran and classical Arab literature), but in reality it is often very different from it. Especially its vocabulary makes it a separate language. As all Arabic speaking people learn dialectal (vernacular) varieties of Arabic as their

---

2 Despite these differences, clauses form syntagms with words. E.g. they might be interpreted as qualificators, as in the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'anā</th>
<th>mutu'aššid-at-u-n</th>
<th>'anna-ka</th>
<th>ta'rifu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>sure-F.SI-N-1</td>
<td>that-2.MSI</td>
<td>know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I am sure that you know’ (‘Arabî 139)

The adjective here is not qualified by a word (’annaka) but by the clause ’annaka ta'rifu etc.
first language, MWA is always acquired at school, there are no native
speakers of this language – in this regard MWA is a ‘dead language’
(Zaborski 1995: 133). MWA is primarily written, and only secondarily
spoken, viz. on television and on the radio, and in public, political and
religious speeches. The use of MWA and the use of dialects are
complementary, which means that there are communicational situations in
which only MWA can be used and others in which MWA is normally not
used or if it is, it appears “artificial, archaic or even unintelligible”
(Zaborski 1982: 5). This situation is probably the archetypical case of
diglossia (see Ferguson 1977 [1959]).

Despite the fact that for many native Arabs mastering MWA presents
considerable difficulties, this language cannot be considered a dead
language: it is constantly developing and changing although its primarily
written character keeps the speed of changes at a rather low level.
Notwithstanding, these changes in MWA, as compared with Classical
Arabic, with which it shares nearly the entire grammar, concern not only
vocabulary but syntax as well.

To this is related the question of language norms and language usage.
On one hand, as a primarily written language, MWA should be prone to
normative regulations issued by academies of the Arabic language. This,
however, appears not to be the case. It rather seems that in some cases the
academies have to adjust their view to the real usage (cf. Blau 1981). In
most cases, however, their activities and proposals are frequently very
distant from the language practice (Danecki 2000: 46). Today there is no
sanctioned norm of the modern Arabic. Only Classical Arabic can be
considered to be such a norm (Danecki 1994: 14). This means, in most
Arabs’ view, that the normative rules, codified by grammarians in the 8th
and 9th centuries, should be observed in today’s language (Zaborski 1995:
134).

It should also be underscored that MWA, used in an area reaching from
Morocco to Iraq, is subject to regional diversification, which, it seems,
cannot be checked in the future by the common, shared past\(^3\). This regional
variation normally concerns vocabulary, but local dialects often influence
the syntax too. Therefore it is a very interesting task to investigate and

\(^3\) Cf. El-Ayoubi (2001: XVIII) about lexical and syntactic diversification.
describe a fragment of this language with a view to finding some possible innovations (which, in theory should not, but in reality must happen). Here, it is of great importance to be cautious about discovering and proclaiming innovations: a construction not attested in classical grammars and texts does not have to be a harbinger of a new trend, but simply a linguistic error. Another question is: when does a construction cease to be an error and begin to be in common usage?

Another problem is related to the Arabic writing system. A written text, which is not vocalized\(^4\), when read aloud by various Arabic speakers, can acquire different forms: it can be read with all inflectional endings, it can be read without them, or the endings can be read only in some places. Speakers with better language awareness and better education will commit fewer mistakes than those for whom reading is a significant challenge. Therefore, the study of a text written in MWA requires from the examiner knowledge of how to read this text. This knowledge is usually acquired from grammars and text books, which are always of normative character. It may happen that this ideal knowledge does not correspond with the way people really read it (e.g. canonically, the case of the adjective in the so-called ‘indirect attribute’ should agree with the case of the substantive which precedes it. Yet some Arabic native speakers, if asked to read it, put the adjective in the nominative case, which, according to grammars, is an error). It is an important methodological question which cannot be avoided: how far should the researcher try to force a clearly irregular, non-canonical construction into classical norms, which were laid down for a language used in the period from the 8\(^{th}\) to the 10\(^{th}\) centuries? It is significant that in the most recent description of MWA (Badawi et al. 2004) a sign # was used if “an authentic CA [Classical Arabic – MM] case ending cannot be determined, usually in situations where no-one ever would supply a vowel anyway” (p. 5). Indeed, recourse to reading by native speakers seems necessary. In our work, if there are grammatical (and normative) rules applicable to a construction, they will be given right of precedence over the realization in reading (which deserves a separate

\(^4\) It is a characteristic feature of Arabic writing system that short vowels and some consonants conveying grammatical (semic) meaning are not written (exceptions are school books, the Quran, and editions of classical literature). They are almost always easily inferable from the context, if the reader’s language competence is sufficient.
study). Our notation will in some places be different from that in Badawi et al. (e.g. 2004: 256), where in ‘iḥdā ’akbar# dūri we prefer to see normal annexation and vocalize the construction fully as: ‘iḥdā ’akbari dūri. In cases where the inflectional vowel is uncertain, it will be marked with a question mark.

0.4. Historical view

Before we venture to propose a definition of the adjective, let us review how this concept was conceived of throughout the history of linguistics. This will be followed by a survey of various approaches to the concept of syntagm and qualification (or similar concepts).

0.4.1. Adjective: a historical view

The adjective as a separate category of words is known in both Western and Arab linguistic traditions. Yet each of them sees it in a different way. Let us start with the Western tradition, in which this concept has been subjected to numerous definitions, interpretations and studies. Arab grammars see it in a more unified way.

0.4.1.1. Western tradition

In Europe, the adjective as a separate category of words was not known in the antiquity. Plato in his Cratylus and the sophists distinguished onoma and rhema, the latter category, into which also adjectives were assigned, meaning actually ‘predicate’, thus constituting a logical (or syntactic) category, not a part of speech. Consequently, adjectives were not distinguished from verbs. Aristotle in his Categories speaks of the redundant epithete from the point of view of rhetoric (Goes 1999: 12). In
Greek grammars, the ambivalence of noun-adjectives was noted, but adjectives were not distinguished from substantives. For Dionisios Thrax, the adjective was very similar to what it was for Aristotle, a noun adjuncted (epi-tithémenon) to other nouns and expressing blame or a praise (Goes 1999: 13). The term adiectivum/adiectio appears in the writings of grammatici latini, who distinguished it from epitheton as being necessarily adjuncted to another noun and expressing not only qualities but also quantities (Goes 1999: 13). For Priscian, the adjectives are adjoined to substantives, which signify a substance, in order to indicate a quality or a quantity, scil. an accident (Goes 1999: 14). In the Middle Ages Peter Helias and Thomas of Erfurt distinguished “adjectival nouns” from “substantive nouns” (Robins 1974: 95). The next important step was made by the Port Royal grammar of 1660, which described attributive adjectives as containing judgments able to be expressed in relative clauses (Goes 1999: 18-23, Bolinger 1967: 2). The logical character of the Port Royal school continued in the writings of G. Girard, C. Ch. Du Marsai, and N. Beauzée, who distinguished the adjective as the word whose chief function is qualifying (cf. Goes 1999: 24 and Robins 1967: 126-127).

In the 19th century not much attention was devoted to the concept of the adjective in general. But the definition proposed by H. Paul can be adduced here as saying “Das adj. bezeichnet eine einfache oder als einfach vorgestellte eigenschaft, das subst. schliesst einen komplex von eigenschaften in sich” (quoted from: Jespersen 1965 [1924]: 74fn. 2). The problem of a delimitation between adjectives and substantives was studied e.g. by Jespersen and Kuryłowicz. According to Jespersen (1965 [1924]: 72-81), who accepts Paul’s definition, “on the whole substantives are more special than adjectives, they are applicable to fewer objects than adjectives, in the parlance of logicians, the extension of a substantive is less, and its intension is greater than that of an adjective. The adjective indicates and singles out one quality, one distinguishing mark, but each substantive suggests, to whomever understands it, many distinguishing features by which he recognizes the person or thing in question”. Jespersen proposed a hierarchy of functions (“three ranks”, 1965, chapter 7), based on defining (qualifying, or modifying), and being defined. Adjectives were secondary in this hierarchy, they defined substantives, which were primary, and were
defined by adverbs, which were tertiary. But they themselves could also act as primaries. A similar stance was adopted by Kuryłowicz (1960b [1936]), who distinguished a primary and a secondary function of words, the primary function of the adjectives being attributive.

The semantics of adjectives was investigated by various scholars, usually in combination with their function. Bolinger (1967) discussed the difference between attributive and predicative adjectives, rejecting the reducibility of adjectives to relative clauses, and investigated the referent modification and reference modification by means of adjectives. Vendler (1968) studied the same issue for English, adding to this also the problem of coordination of adjectives (p. 121-134) viewed from the semantic perspective. The work of Vol’f (1978) presents an analysis of the semantics of adjectives in Spanish and Portuguese. A syntactic description of the Polish adjective was made in Szupryczyńska (1980). Tucker (1998) described the English adjective from the functional perspective, while Goes (1999) presented a study of the French adjective using the concept of prototype.

Considerable attention was also devoted to adjectives within the generativist approach. Descriptions of the adjective for particular languages within this framework were undertaken (e.g. Motsch 1973 [1964] for German). Hartmann’s work (1974) included parts concerning Arabic adjectives. Within the generativist school the category of adjective was distinguished as one of the major lexical categories along with nouns, verbs and prepositions in Chomsky (1970), who used the concept of features $\pmN$ and $\pmV$ (the adjectives having the features: $[+V, +N]$). This was modified in Jackendoff (1977), who characterized (English) adjectives as $-subj$, i.e. unable to have subjects and as $-obj$, i.e. whose complements may not “include a surface NP direct object after the head” (1977: 32).

The problem of establishing convincing criteria allowing a delimitation of adjectives from substantives was an important issue in other scholars’ work. Jodłowski (1971) pointed out that a word which is termed ‘substantive’ (‘rzeczownik’) does not indicate a thing (‘rzecz’) but the ‘conceiving of’, or ‘interpreting’, of a fragment of the reality as a thing. An adjective, in turn, indicates adjectivity, i.e. adjectival interpreting of a property, which can also be conceived of substantively (1971: 26). Dixon
(1977) analysed languages with a small number of adjectives using the idea of “semantic types”. He understood the non-universal class of adjectives as a set of lexical items, distinguished on morphological and syntactic grounds from the universal classes Noun and Verb, and investigated their grammatical behaviour in comparison with that of Noun and Verb. For him, semantically, an adjective describes some important but non-criterial property of an object. The semantics of adjectives as distinct from that of substantives was studied by Wierzbicka (1986), who investigated the notional difference between the noun and the adjective, using the concept of ‘kind’ (1986: 360). In contrast to substantives (in her terms ‘nouns’), which “embody concepts which cannot be reduced to any combination of features” and “stand for categories which can be identified by means of a certain positive image, or a certain positive stereotype, but an image which transcends all enumerable features” (1986: 361), adjectives express single properties. A “single property is seen as not very suitable as an exclusive basis for categorization” (1986: 365). While concentrating on semantics, she also asks the question about languages which have no morphological distinction between adjectives and substantives. She argues that “The absence of morphological differences between words for dogs and jugs on the one hand and word for good, small or black on the other, doesn’t indicate an absence of significant semantic differences [...]. The difference in the semantic structure between “nouns” and “adjectives” can be expected to be reflected somewhere in the syntactic behaviour of the two hypothetical classes, so that the difference in meaning will be reflected in some aspects of the grammatical behaviour, if not in the grammatical form” (1986: 381). Thompson in (1988) investigated what she called ‘Property Concept Words’ (p. 168) in spoken discourse in English and Mandarin Chinese. She distinguished adjectives which are grammatically attributive but functionally are predicates (p, 174), and noticed that “the two major functions of adjectives are their referent-introducing function and their predicating function. The referent-distinguishing function turns out to be an extremely rare function in actual conversation language, a fact which is contrary to expectation and which could not have been arrived at by examining one’s intuitions” (p. 178). Thus, according to her, “Property Concept Words share the
predicating function with Verbs, and the referent-introducing function with Nouns” (p. 177). In the study by Schachter (1985), in which he dealt with the category of adjectives, the primary criteria are of grammatical (“the word’s distribution, its range of syntactic functions, and the morphological or syntactic categories for which it is specifiable”, p. 3), not semantic nature. In his discussion of various types of languages he speaks of adjectival-noun languages, “in which adjectival meanings are expressed primarily by nouns”, i.e. “by nouns that designate an object (or objects) embodying a specified quality” (Schachter 1985: 17). In other words, “nouns with adjectival meanings are not grammatically distinguished from other nouns either in their use as predicates or in their use as modifiers” (p. 18). Croft (1991), in turn, explains the distinction of nouns (substantives), verbs and adjectives using the semantic distinction between things, actions and properties, as well as the pragmatic distinction between referring, predicating, and modifying. Bhat (1994) investigates adjectives as a distinct category and also as subcategories of other categories. He argues that modifying is the most characteristic function of adjectives and this is where “adjectives show the maximum number of differentiating morphosyntactic and semantic characteristics (i.e. characteristics which differentiate them from nouns, verbs and adverbs)” (1994: 91). He also analyses the “secondary or extended usage” of adjectives, which then lose some of their differentiating characteristics (become ‘decategorized’). Baker (2003) criticized the approach of Croft (1991) and Bhat (1994) for using the concept of prototypical functions and remarked that “these functionalist approaches are not vulnerable to the discovery of simple counterexamples” (p. 12). He also disagreed with the accepted generativist point of view that adjectives have the features [V+, N+]. In contrast to this, he holds that the “adjective is essentially the ‘default’ category. It appears in a nonnatural class of environments where neither a noun nor a verb would do, including the attributive modification position, the complement of a degree head, resultative secondary predicate position, and adverbial positions” (p. 21). Thus, the adjective is −N, −V. (2003: 21). For Baker, the use of adjectives as modifiers results from the “derived properties of adjectives, not basic defining ones” (p. 191), since adjectives simply do not have syntactic properties which verbs and substantives have (specifiers and
referential index, respectively) and that prevent them from functioning where adjectives can.

In Szumska (2006) the adjective in Polish was analysed as an ‘adjuncted predicative expression’. The term ‘adjective’ was also used by Darski (2004) as a ‘mnemonic help’ for his “Wortklasse 15” (2004: 178-179), defined, along with other Wortklassen, on the grounds of syntax not confined to the limits of a particular sentence and with the use of the tests of the omissibility of words from utterances and the tests of asking questions about words (Erfragbarkeit) to be defined as a Wortklasse.

Some comparative and typological work has also been done on adjectives in various languages. Bzdęga (1980) carried out a comparison of German and Polish adjectives in terms of morphology and syntax. In Jankowski (1987), hypotactic syntagms involving participles in Uralic and Altaic languages were investigated. Also the typological work by Mološnaja (1985) should be mentioned, in which she analysed adjectival syntagms (with adjectives functioning as qualificata) in selected Slavic and Balkanic languages.

0.4.1.2. Arab tradition

From Sībawayhi onwards, (d. around 798), who is considered to be the founder of the original Arab grammar, the Arab grammarians distinguished three parts of speech: ism (‘noun’), fi’il (‘verb’) and ḥarf (which can be translated as ‘particle’). This tripartite division was based mainly on morphological criteria, to which then semantic and syntactic, and even phonological evidence was added (for discussions and surveys see Owens 1989; Diem 1974; Weiss 1976; Troupeau 1983; Suleiman 1990). This division is preserved in modern traditionally oriented Arab grammars of Arabic, e.g. in Al-Ḥalāyīni (2002 [1912]: 10-12).

What is traditionally, but often erroneously, translated as ‘adjective’, viz. ṣifa or na‘t, was not distinguished as a subcategory of ism. Diem

---

5 Merx (1889: 152) as first pointed out that the Arabs could have borrowed the tripartite division from Aristotle (from Versteegh 1977: 67). The question of Greek influence on Arab linguistic tradition is discussed in Versteegh (1977). Interestingly, another Arab grammarian, al-Mubarrad (d. 898), believed that the tripartite division was universal (Guillaume 1988: 30).
writes that in Sibawayhi’s work šifa and ism are kept apart (1974: 313), because primarily šifa was a syntactic category and could not be compared with ism or fi‘l (1974: 315). It was only its application, or function, in which an ism could be used in order to specify another ism. Mosel explains it in the following way: “Die Termini “šifa”, “waṣf”, “waṣafa”, und “na‘t” bezeichnen einen Satzteil, der als Qualifikation eines vor ihm stehenden anderen Satzteiles fungiert” (only if the latter is an ism) (1975, I: 287).

Also what for Western grammars is a relative clause with an indefinite antecedent and no relative pronoun is termed a šifa in Arab grammars, because it has a similar function. Thus, the šifa is distinguished partly on functional and partly on syntactic criteria. As Diem puts it, whether šifa means an adjective or an attribute, depends on the context (1974: 314). According to Sibawayhi, words which can function as šifa include: ’asmā’ al-fā‘il (active participles), ’asmā’ al-maf‘ūl (passive participles), šifāt mušabbaha (the so-called ‘assimilated’ adjectives, which are the most typical adjectives), other nouns (not belonging to any of the above categories), ’af‘āl (verbs), ḥurūf al-ḡarr (prepositional phrases), ’asmā’ mubahama (demonstrative pronouns), ‘alāmat al-muḍmar (roughly: a quantifier, e.g. kulluhum ‘all of them’), numerals and the exceptive particle ’illā (Mosel 1975, I: 295). But what is quite important, for Sibawayhi šifa meant also a property that is inherent in a word, independent of its syntactic usage. This is evident from his example ’atānī l-yawma qawīyyun ‘A strong [i.e. a strong man] approached me today’, where he demonstrates that the šifa (qawīyyun ‘strong’) used in the subject function is a ‘weak’ construction, that is acceptable but not as good as ’atānī l-yawma raḡulun qawīyyun ‘A strong man approached me today’ (Mosel 1975, I: 325).

For Al-Zamaḥšarī (d. 1144) šifa was an ism (‘noun’) that denotes a certain manner of being of a substance (Guillaume 1992: 61). It is classed among the so-called tawābi‘ (lit. ‘followers’), i.e. modifiers agreeing in case. This definition was made more specific by Ibn Ya‘īs (d. 1254), who commented on Al-Zamaḥšarī’s work and noted that it is not sufficient, because on one hand, also a clause or a circumstantial prepositional phrase

---

6 The translations are working translations because, obviously, there can be no strict correspondence between grammatical terms used in both linguistic traditions.
may carry out this function, while on the other hand, also ḥabar (the predicate) denotes a certain manner of being of the substance (e.g. Zaydun qā’īmun ‘Zayd [is] standing’), without being a ṣifā (Guillaume 1992: 62-63). There were attempts to introduce a special term for the attribute, na‘t, especially in the work of Ibn al-Sarrāʾ (d. 929), but this attempt was not successful, because apparently the Arab grammarians felt no need for such a distinction, as the context always permits one to determine whether the term ṣifā is used to denote a lexical class or a syntactic function (Guillaume 1992: 64). However, a distinction between na‘t and ṣifā can be seen in some contemporary Arab grammar books.

Classical Arab grammarians made also use of morphological criteria, which were applied when dealing with synonymy. The numerous synonyms for sayf ‘sword’, which is a non-derived word, could be analysed as adjectives used in substantivized meaning as derived words (’asmā’ muṣṭaqqa), due to its morphology (Guillaume 1992: 67). Also the difference was noted (by Ibn Ya‘īṣ) between the generally broken plurals of substantives and generally suffixal plural of adjectives (Guillaume 1992: 68). Much interest was also shown in the relationship between the verb and the adjective, especially the participles, both in terms of grammatical properties (morphology, syntax) and meaning (cf. Guillaume 1992: 69-73).

Let us now present how the concept of ṣifā was presented in a grammar of Arabic very widely used across the Arab world, i.e. in Al-Ḡalāyīnī (2002 [1912]). According to this author, ism divides into mawṣūf (‘the described [one]’) and ṣifā (‘description, feature’) (p. 74). What follows in his work, suggests a semantic differentiation between these two categories: fa l-ismu l-mawṣūfu: mā dalla ‘alā dāṭi š-šay‘i wa ḥaqiqatihi. wa huwa mawdū‘un li tuḥmala ‘alayhi ṣ-ṣifatu: ka raḡul wa bahr wa ‘ilm wa ǧahl ‘the described noun (mawṣūf) is what indicates the substance and essence

---

7 Let us also remark that there was another, Kufan, meaning of the term ṣifā, equivalent to the Baṣrīan terms ẓarf and maḥall, which means roughly ‘locative adverbial’ (Owens 1989: 226).

8 E.g. in Badr al-Dīn and Al-ʿAmrāwī (1997), where na‘t is a linguistic term, while ṣifā means ‘a property’. In this book one reads: an-na‘tu huwa t-tābi‘u [... l-mukammilu maḥāḥu bi bayyini ṣifātu min šifātihi [... ‘the na‘t is a modifier agreeing in case which complements the noun with which it agrees by specifying one of its properties (ṣifā)’ (1997: 8).
of a thing. It [the described noun – MM] is given\(^9\) in order for a description to be applied to it\(^10\). As for \(\text{ṣifā}\), he gives the following definition: \(\text{wa l-ismu ṣ-ṣifātu: mā dalla ‘alā ṣifāti šay‘in min al-‘a‘yānī wa l-ma‘ānī, wa huwa mawḍū‘un li yuhmala ‘alā mā yuwsafu bihi ‘the description noun (ṣifā) is what indicates a [describing] feature of a thing that can be concrete or abstract, and it is given\(^11\) in order to be applied to what it characterizes’}\) (p. 74). Then he enumerates seven categories of words that can function as a \(\text{ṣifā}\)\(^12\). Further, in the chapter on \(\text{tawābi‘}\), (p. 560), he introduces \(\text{na‘t}\) (which, as he remarks, is also called \(\text{ṣifā}\)). This \(\text{na‘t}\) he defines syntactically: \(\text{mā yuḍkaru ba‘da smin li yubayyina ba‘da ‘ahwālihi ‘aw ‘ahwāla mā yata‘allaqu bihi ‘what comes after a noun (ism) in order to specify some of its properties or the properties of what is related to it’. The enumerated categories able to function as \(\text{na‘t}\) are a different set of those able to be a \(\text{ṣifā}\), e.g. they include clauses. There is some more inconsistency: in yet another place the usage of the term \(\text{ṣifā}\) suggests that being a \(\text{ṣifā}\) or not is something inherent to a word (cf. our previous remark on Sibawayhi): in the chapter on nominal morphology (p. 177-179), when dealing with patterns of nouns, Al-‘Alaynī characterizes each pattern in terms of its capability of functioning as an ism and/or as a \(\text{ṣifā}\). While most patterns are productive for both ism and \(\text{ṣifā}\), the pattern \(\text{fa‘lalīl}\) (i.e. \(C_1aC_2C_3aC_4iC_5\)) yields, according to Al-‘Alaynī only \(\text{ṣifas}\). However, the explanation of his example, \(\text{ḡahmariš, as al-‘aḡūz al-kabīr wa l-mar‘atu s-samḡatu ‘old, big; an ugly woman’ suggests that ḡahmariš can be used also as a substantive (‘a woman’), not only as an adjective. In newer grammars, substantives and adjectives are sometimes treated as distinct on the grounds of semantics, e.g. Al-Daḥdāḥ divides ism into mawsūf ‘the described [noun]’ and \(\text{ṣifā}\) according to the differences fi d-dalālati ‘in the semantics’. Mawsūf is what yusammā bihi šaḥṣun ‘aw ḥayawānun ‘aw

\(^9\) The expression “is given” translates here the Arabic participle mawḍū‘un, derived from the verb wudu‘a ‘to be put down, to be posited’, which in the Arab grammatical tradition means “to have a certain meaning, to have been invented (for a certain role in the system of speech)” (Versteegh 1978: 266). The Arab theory of ‘ilm al-wadā‘, i.e. ‘the science of “positing”’ dealing with the problem of classification of words, was discussed by Weiss (1976).

\(^{10}\) All English translations of passages from Sibawayhi’s text are ours.

\(^{11}\) Cf. footnote 9 above.

\(^{12}\) There seems to be no unanimity among Arab grammarians as to what these categories are. Al-‘Alaynī’s categories are different than those allowed by Sibawayhi. Yet another set of categories able to function as a \(\text{ṣifā}\) is given in some newer grammars, e.g. in that of Ibn Ḥammūdā (n.d: 279).
šay’un ‘aw ma’nān: ṭāḥūn ‘[what] names a person, an animal, a thing or a concept (lit. ‘meaning’), [e.g.]: a mill’. As for ʃīfa, it tašrūhu ḥāla l-mawṣūfī: kabīrun ‘[it] specifies (lit. ‘explains’) the state of the described [noun, e.g.]: large’ (Al-Daḥdāḥ 1990: 80).

Finally, let us mention that a distinction is made in classical Arab grammar between adjectives modifying definite and indefinite substantives. In the former case, the term tawḍīḥ (lit. ‘elucidation’) is applied, while in the latter the term taḥṣīṣ (lit. ‘specification’) is used (e.g. in Badr al-Dīn and Al-ʿAmrāwī 1997: 8-9).

0.4.1.3. Arabic adjective in Western studies

The tripartite division of the parts of speech in Arabic (first, in Hebrew) was first noticed by Francesco Sanchez de las Brozas (Sanctius) (1554-1628), who rendered them into Latin as nomen, verbum and dictio consignificans. (Sanctius Brocensis 1986 [1587], from: Jodłowski 1971: 55). De Sacy, while noticing that the adjectives resemble the substantives in Arabic more than in other languages, used the definition based on the Port Royal logic: “L’adjectif est destiné à ajouter au nom qui désigne un être par l’idée de sa nature une qualité qui est commune à des êtres des différentes natures” (1810, I: 228). European Arabists such Caspari (1887 [1859]) and Wright (1962 [1862]) adopted the original Arab division as well as subdivisions and the terminology. Also the two fundamental descriptions of Classical Arabic syntax by Reckendorf (1895-98 and 1921) used in great part the terminology and divisions laid down by the Arabs (cf. the passage on the attributive adjective in 1921: 57, where it is called tābi‘ or maḥmūl).

The adjective in pre-Classical Arabic was studied by Kahle, who in (1975) investigated the syntactic function of the adjective, its modification, syndesis or asyndesis of paratactic adjectives, and linear order and congruence of specific adjectival patterns. Fischer’s work (1965), in turn, concerned Classical Arabic. He investigated the morphological and syntactic characteristics of the elative and distinguished for it a separate part of speech, ‘Prädikativ’, which is a nominal part of speech opposed to
adjectives and substantives, whose typical syntactic function is the
predicate (1965: 146). According to Fischer, only later on did the
‘predicative’ get assimilated to other adjectives. As far as adjectival
morphology is concerned, the works of Wehr (1953) and Bravmann (1968)
on the elative and that of Gai (1983) on participles should be mentioned.
The problem of the article and the category of state in Classical Arabic,
also in relation to adjectives was studied by Gabučjan (1972) and Gätje
(1970, 1973), while that of concord in gender and number was studied by
Al-Aqṭasch (1986). Diem (1998) presented an extensive study of the so-
called indirect attribute (‘adjektivischer Satz’, in his terminology), one of
the constructions typical of the Arabic adjective.

As far as Modern Written Arabic is concerned, a description of the
syntax of the adjectives in their attributive function was included into the
study of Arabic syntax by Semenov (1941). The comprehensive
description of the Arabic syntax by Cantarino (1974-1975) included in its
second volume parts devoted to the adjective. The texts excerpted by
Cantarino are those from before 1945. Kralh’s work (1985) concerned the
syntax of the adjective in MWA in nominal groups with the inclusion of
lexical and syntactic innovations. The study by Görbska (1991), dealing
with multiattributive nominal phrases in MWA, included also some aspects
of the linear order of adjectives in these syntagms. The syntax of MWA
was also studied and described within the generativist paradigm. Here we
can mention the works of Hartmann (1974) and, as related particularly to
the adjective, of Fassi Fehri (1976), (1993) and (1999). A detailed study of
the syntax of nominal parts of speech in Arabic, including the adjective,
based on original texts of literary and journalistic character, is the work of
El-Ayoubi, Fischer and Langer (El-Ayoubi et al. 2001). The description,
using a corpus of texts written after 1950, is organized in accordance with
the concept of the ‘Vorfeld der Nominalgruppe’ and ‘Nachfeld der
Nominalgruppe’. The adjective, being an autonomous part of speech, (pp.
131-189) is treated as a category separated from the elative (pp. 253-301),
which is classed among quantitatives, along with ‘Egregationsnomina’
(e.g. kull, ’ayy), approximatives (mitl, siwā) and numerals (p. 230). The
adjective as a category was distinguished on the grounds of the semantic
and morphological properties (pp. 132-137). The category of adjective was
enlarged, on functional grounds, by including into it the construction with ḏū ḏū (‘das adjektivische Demonstrativum’, p. 143). In the most recent and up-to-date study of MWA, based on real language situations ranging from literary and journalistic texts to short public information texts (Badawi et al. 2004) one can also find parts devoted to constructions involving adjectives.

There is a number of works in which Classical Arabic is not kept apart from MWA, since their authors were concerned with constructions shared by these two varieties of Arabic. Here we can mention works in which special attention was devoted to the syntax of the Arabic adjective used in constructions expressing possession, which was the object of studies by Killeen (1970), Polotsky (1978), Carter (1985), Diem (1986), Langer (1988) and Siloni (2002). In chapter 11 (289-361) of his work, Justice (1987) dealt with the issue of ‘specification’ in Arabic, including that of the adjectives. The adjective, its meaning and function, was the topic of the article by Al-Jabbār and Leach (1985), who dealt with its status as a separate class. Jebali in (2005) applied to Arabic adjectives the analysis proposed by Bouchard (2002). In the Semitic perspective, Edzard (2001) analysed nominalized verb phrases and relative clauses, “die de facto die Funktion von Adjektiven erfüllen” (2001: 41), focussing his interest on modern Ethiopic languages. As far as text books dealing with the syntax of the adjective are concerned, one should specially mention here the handbook of Arabic syntax written by Paradela Alonso (2005 [1998]). An encyclopedic discussion of the Arabic adjective can be found in Kihm (2006) and Fischer (2006).

0.4.2. Qualification and syntagm: a historical view

The fact that the words somehow adjust themselves to, or are adjusted by, words with which they come into a grammatical relationship was remarked very early. In the Greek linguistic tradition, Apollonius Dyscolus (2nd cent AD) should be mentioned, who devoted his attention to katallēlōtēs and akolouthiā (‘concordial relations’) and ‘relationship of constituent structuring’ (paralambánêsthai ‘to be taken together’) (Robins
Yet the idea of qualification (being close to modification or determination), which can be introductorily presented here as a relation obtaining between two lingual signs, in which one restricts the range of designation while expanding its signification (meaning), only with difficulty could be traced back to the Greek linguistics, e.g. to Aristotle and his idea of predication. Likewise only to a little extent could it be identified e.g. in the grammar of Priscian (fl. 500 AD), who wrote that adjectives are adjoined to substantives, which signify substances, in order to indicate a quality or a quantity, scil. an accident (Goes 1999: 14). Perhaps somewhat closer to the concept to be used by us in our study is the idea presented in Logique ou l’Art de Penser by A. Arnauld and P. Nicole in 1662. Its authors introduced the idea of “termes complexes qui composent dans notre esprit une idée totale”, examples of “termes complexes” being un homme prudent, un corps transparant, Alexandre fils de Philippe, un corps qui est transparant, Alexandre qui est fils de Philippe (from Gätje 1970: 226f). Yet despite notions of linguistic units being combined one with another (e.g. Ries’ concept of Wortgefüge, comprising both sentences and non-sentential word structures introduced in Ries 1894, from: Heinz 1983: 213), still there was no clear idea of what is today known as hypotaxis (or subordination) or composite language signs.

In the year 1916 the Cours of F. de Saussure was published. In its Part II, chapters 5 and 6, it introduced the concept of syntagm as a composite language sign. Under this term de Saussure understood not only combinations of two words but also that of a stem and a suffix. In his words, “la notion de syntagme s’applique non seulement aux mots, mais aux groupes de mots, aux unités complexes de toute dimension et de toute espèce” (1980 [1916]: 172). De Saussure also discussed the nature of relations between the units composing a syntagm, which he understood as typically unable to exist one without another (p. 176). Also for Martinet syntagms included combinations of two linguistic units (monemes) resulting in what we understand as one word (1970 [1960]: 117-118).

An idea of composite language signs of an order different than that introduced by de Saussure (and adopted by his followers), and at the same time much closer to the definition of hypotactic syntagms assumed in the
present work, can be found in Bloomfield (1933). Bloomfield speaks of phrases (1933: 178) and resultant phrases, which are composed of two (or more) free forms, i.e. of linguistic units not smaller than what we will understand as a word and could be consequently compared to what we will refer to as syntagms. These resultant phrases can be exocentric (if belonging to a form-class other than that of any constituent) or endocentric constructions (1933: 194). In the latter case, the word which belongs to the same form-class as the resultant phrase is called ‘head’, the other member is called ‘attribute’. Endocentric constructions are either co-ordinative or subordinative (1933: 195). Bloomfield’s idea was followed by other American structuralist linguists, including Harris (1951) and Hockett (1958). In 1947 Wells introduced the concept of ‘immediate constituents’ (Wells 1947), thus initiating a new stream in the analysis of words combined one with another into composite expressions.

The problem of the relationships between two words constituting a composite language sign was discussed by linguists representing European structuralism, e.g. in the article of Trubetzkoy (1939), who distinguishes two main types of syntagms based on qualification (in his terms: determination), i.e. ‘syntagmes sociatifs’, (based on co-ordination), and ‘syntagmes déterminatifs’, (based on subordination). In contrast to Bloomfield’s view, for Trubetzkoy the predicative syntagms were a third type of constructions, characterized by formal properties which distinguished them from the two other remaining types (1939: 76). Hjelmslev in (1963 [1943]) distinguished three principal types of syntagmatic dependency in linguistic structures: interdependences, determinations and constellations (1963 [1943]: 24). Within these three types of relations, determination could be considered the closest one to qualification, though it still remains different from it, since it obtains also between units other than words and is defined chiefly on the grounds of the mutual connotation of its both constituents. De Groot in (1957) conducted a trichotomic classification of word groups into predicative groups, coordinative groups and non-coordinative groups (from Graffi 2001: 273). In the European structuralism, a very important stream was the dependency grammar, linked to the name of its founder Tesnière and his work (1966 [1959]). According to this approach, words (or terms) are
analysed as subordinated to one another, the superior term being the *régissant*, which governs (*régit*) the subordinated word (or term) (Tesnière 1966 [1959]: 13). This idea was then modified and further developed in works of various scholars (e.g. Mel’čuk 1988).

Sometimes the term ‘grammatical determination’ is distinguished from the term ‘logical determination’ (e.g. in Schmidt 1961, similarly, but in terms of ‘semantics’ and ‘syntax’ in Gołąb et al. 1968: 124). About the relations between the subject and the predicate Schmidt writes: “[...] erkennt man, daß die grammatische Determination des Verbs durch das Subjekt (nach Person und Numerus) mit der logischen Determination des Gegenstandes durch das Prädikat keineswegs zusammenfällt, vielmehr die eine umgekehrt wie die andere gerichtet ist: Das Subjekt determiniert das Prädikat grammatisch, und das Prädikat determiniert mit seiner inhaltlichen Bedeutung die vom Subjekt bezeichnete Bedeutung logisch” (Schmidt 1961: 20). In 1960 Seiler pointed out that in all discussions on ‘determinant’ and ‘determinatum’ (concepts related to that of ‘qualification’) “Es gibt keine wirkliche Definition dieser Begriffe” (Seiler 1960: 9). As he remarked, neither in Trubetzkoy (1939) was it said to which realities the terms ‘déterminant’ and ‘déterminé’ referred. Usually, says Seiler, “das rein Semantische” plays the most important role: the determinatum is “näher bestimmt” oder “eingeeengt” “in seiner Bedeutung” by the determinant (1960: 9). His own solution consisted in introducing two concepts: one, of more syntactic nature, was the relation between the nucleus (or representative) and the satellite of a syntagm (1960: 9) and the other, of semantic character, was that of *class* and *selector* (1960: 19f). The idea of the relation of determination (later re-named as ‘relation of qualification’) was explicitely formulated in Bańczerowski (1980) and Bańczerowski et al. (1982: 237-250), who himself sees ideas related to his in Bocheński (1949). Bocheński wrote: “We define *determines* as follows: the symbol *x* determines the symbol *y* if and only if what is meant by *x* is a property of what is meant by *y* [...]” and “If and only if *x* determines *y*, we shall say that *x* is an operator of *y* and *y* the argument of *x* [...]” (from Bańczerowski 1994: 25). Bańczerowski’s concept of the relation of qualification (in his earlier works called *determination*) between two lingual signs resulting in a hypotactic syntagm and based on the ideas of
restricting the range of designation and expanding the signification of a sign, was elaborated in Bańczerowski (1988), (1993) and (1997a), where also theories concerning closely related concepts, viz. that of concord (1988) and rection, were proposed (1997a). Bańczerowski, using the concept of the relation of ‘extended hyponymy’ (1980: 67), says that a hypotactic syntagm is a hyponym “with respect to its constituent qualificatum” (1997: 1162). Hypotaxis was also the object of interest of Pogonowski, who in (1982) and (1993) observed that extended hyponymy cannot be understood as the inclusion of denotations of expressions (Pogonowski uses the term ‘denotation’ in the sense of Bańczerowski’s ‘designation’), explaining that “One of the reasons for this is that the concept of denotation for complex expressions is not well defined in linguistics” (Pogonowski 1993: 43). Instead, he bases his understanding of extended hyponymy on “the content of expressions rather than on their denotation”, assuming that “the native speaker can always decide, given two meaningful expressions of his language, what the content relationships between them are” (1993: 44). In (1981) and (1993), Pogonowski proposes an axiom system for hypotaxis.

Let us now go on to discuss possible parallels in classical Arab linguistics and, subsequently, to ask the question about how these relations were conceived of in Western studies of Arabic.

The idea of concord and rection was present in the Arab linguistic tradition from the very beginning. The concept of tawābi (which is the plural form of tābi ‘following; follower’) concerns modifiers which ‘follow’ the modified word in case. As Sībawayhi explains it, fa șāra n-na’tu maqrūran mitla l-man‘ūti li ʿannahumā ka l-ismi l-wāḥidi ‘and the attribute has changed to the genitive case like the described noun because both are as one noun’ (Sībawayhi 1991, I: 421). Likewise, the concept of ʿamal, which literally means ‘work, exercise, doing, action’, and corresponding concepts of ʿāmil ‘working’ and maʿmūl ‘worked upon’ which are of crucial importance in the grammatical conceptions of Sībawayhi and his followers, very well correspond to the ideas of rection (or government), regens and rectum, respectively. What is more, Owens

---

13 These ideas will be presented in more detail in chapter 1.1.
shows that in his description Sībawayhi used structures very similar to those of contemporary dependency structures (Owens 1984: 53ff)\textsuperscript{14}.

On the other hand, it will be more difficult to find in classical Arab gramar a parallel to the concept of qualification to be used in our work. Admittedly, some similar concepts may seem to be present already in Sībawayhi’s work but the similarity may be only apparent. When one reads that in the expression raḡulun ḥasanu l-wāḡhi ‘a man handsome of face’ (which is an example of ‘formal annexation’) aṣ-ṣifatu taqaʿu ‘alā l-ismi l-ʼawwali ẓumma tuwšīluhā ʾilā l-wāḡhi (Sībawayhi 1991, I: 195), it is not sure what realities Sībawayhi meant since the expression can be translated as ‘the adjective refers to the first noun and then you connect it to l-wāḡhi’ or ‘the property belongs to the first noun and then your transfer it to the face’, because classical Arab grammarians in their terminology did not distinguish clearly between words and things these words designate. It is therefore not clear whether by taqaʿu (lit. ‘falls’) and tuwšīlu (lit. ‘you connect’) Sībawayhi meant a relation and an operation, respectively, between words (i.e. of lingual character) or between extralingual objects. In turn, in another place he stresses that what he means is meaning, not form: ʿanna l-ḥusna fī l-maʿnā lī l-wāḡhi ‘as far as the meaning is concerned, ḥusn (‘handsomeness’) refers to al-wāḡh (‘face’)’ (Sībawayhi 1991: I, 195). However, that the idea of restricting the designation and extending the signification was not completely unfamiliar to Sībawayhi might be seen in the explanation he provided for the concord in bi raḡulun ẓarīfīn ‘(at a nice man)’, which are ka l-ismi l-wāḥidi ‘like one noun’. Sībawayhi’s explanation is as follows: ka l-ismi l-wāḥidi min qibali ṣannakā lam turidi l-wāḥida mina r-riḡālī llaḏīnā kullu wāḥidin minhum raḡulun wa lākinnakā ʿaradta l-wāḥida mina r-riḡālī llaḏīnā kullu wāḥidin minhum raḡulun ẓarīfūn ‘[they are] like one noun because you do not mean the one of the men out of whom each is a man, you mean the one of the men out of whom each is a nice man’ (Sībawayhi 1991, I: 422).

What is more, the expression ka l-ismi l-wāḥidi ‘like one noun’ could be distantly associated with the concept of a ‘composite sign’. Arab grammarians who followed Sībawayhi used the concept of murakkab, lit.

\textsuperscript{14} The classical Arab theory of government (ʿamal) is widely discussed in Bohas et al. (1990, 57-72). An encyclopedic view may be found in Rybalkin (2006).
‘composite’. According to Al-Ǧalāyīnī’s grammar, there are five types of *murakkab*: (i) *murakkab ʿidāfī*, i.e. the annexation, composed of a noun and a noun in the genitive case which qualifies it; (ii) *murakkab bayānī*, which is defined as *kullu kalimatayni kānat ṭāniyatuḥumā muwdiḥan maʿnā l-ʿālā* ‘every two words the second of which elucidates the meaning of the first’. It is divided into *murakkab wasfī*, i.e. the adjectival attribution, *murakkab tawkādī*, i.e. a noun emphasized by another noun (e.g. *al-qawmu kulluhum* ‘the people all of them’) and *murakkab hadalī*, which is more or less equivalent to apposition; (iii) *murakkab ʿatfī*, i.e. a combination of two words by means of a conjunction; (iv) *murakkab mazǧī*, i.e. a compound word, and (v) *murakkab ʿadādī*, i.e. a numeral composed of two words (2002 [1912]: 14-15)\(^{15}\).

As for Western studies of Arabic, it seems that no special theoretical framework related to qualification was formulated and applied within them. Syntagms in MWA (under various denominations) have been the object of interest of many Arabists (e.g. El-Ayoubi et al. 2001, Diem 1998, Gätje 1965, Gór ska 1991, Waldmann 1989\(^{16}\); also grammars devoted special chapters to them, e.g. Badawi et al. 2004: 101-305), yet, to our knowledge, no work on Arabic is available in which Arabic syntagms were investigated from the qualificational point of view. In the works we have been able to consult, only brief and general remarks on the idea of syntagms (or ‘groups’) and qualification (or similar concepts) were made. Thus, for instance, in Cantarino one reads that “the adjectival appositive does not represent a new constituent of a sentence but must be considered as a single syntactical unit together with the substantive to which the adjective refers. From the point of view of its meaning, the adjective’s function is either restrictive (determinative) or non-restrictive (qualitative), according to whether it delimits the modified noun or simply adds new aspects or a description to it” (Cantarino 1975, II: 48). In his work, Grande (1963) introduces the concept of ‘slovosočetanie’, understood as ‘gruppa slov v predloženii obedinennyh meždu soboj po smyslu i po grammatičeskoj forme i neposredstvenno sledujuščih odno za drugim’ (1963: 433). But this concept is not really used for representing

\(^{15}\) As it can be seen, the concepts of types (i) and (ii) resemble to some extent that of the hypotactic syntagm, while type (iii) is similar to the paratactic syntagm.

\(^{16}\) Cf. also the works concerning the syntax of adjectives mentioned in chapter 0.4.1.3.
qualificational relations within Arabic syntagms in Grande’s work. El-Ayoubi et al. (2001), who investigated nouns in MWA from the point of view of their ‘Umfeld’ (‘Vorfeld’ and ‘Nachfeld’ being understood in terms of linear position with respect to the noun), provided the following information about ‘Adjektivgruppe’: “Das Vorfeld der Adjektivgruppe wird von Approximativen [...] eingenommen, die das Adjektiv im Genitiv annekten und als Pseudopräfixe fungieren. Das Nachfeld der Adjektivgruppe wird von Graduenten und Spezifikationen [...] besetzt. Graduenten steigern oder mindern die Bedeutung des Adjektivs. [...] Spezifikationen definieren den semantischen Bereich des Adjektivs” (El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 16). In Badawi et al. (2004), the term ‘modifier’ is explained in the glossary as “an element that makes another element more specific such as adjective modifying noun, or the article” (2004: 775).

However, of necessity, discussions of relations showing, at least to some extent, qualificational character have been undertaken, especially with respect to constructions in which it was difficult to establish such relations and which required from the Arabists making explicit statements on them. Such ‘touchstones’ for what concepts Arabists would use in order to refer to what we are investigating as qualification were, as it seems, constructions involving adjectives, e.g. the so-called ‘formal annexation’, ‘indirect attribute’, or the elative followed by a substantive in the genitive. Let us present here what terminological apparatus these constructions were described with. It can be said right now that, generally, the terminology related to morphosyntax, including concepts such as rection (government) or concord (agreement, congruence), was widely taken advantage of. What seems to have been lacking are clearly shaped concepts about designation and signification (see chapter 1.1.2.)17. Thus e.g. de Sacy, when discussing the FORMAL ANNEXATION, wrote: “Le génitif s’emploie aussi comme déterminatif d’un adjectif; mais il faut alors faire attention que l’adjectif renferme implicitement un nom qui sert de véritable antécédent au terme conséquent exprimé par le génitif” (de Sacy 1810, II: 42).18 Wright termed

---

17 In the subsequent paragraphs, we use emphasis in bold in order to mark the terms which are of interest to us.
18 De Sacy understood this construction differently from the most later Western Arabists. In e.g. sur’u l-hisābi “prompt de calcul” he saw the equivalent of ḍū sur’atī l-hisābi “possesseur de la promptitude du calcul” (de Sacy 1810, II: 42).
it “a restrictive or limitative genitive” (1962 [1862], II: 221). Brockelmann (1913) described it as the genitive of “Hinsicht, für die, oder des Bereichs, für den eine Eigenschaft gilt; dabei wird diese sehr oft von einer Sache, der sie gilt, auf deren Besitzer übertragen” (1913, II: 252). Reckendorf referred to it (actually to one of its subtypes) as ‘Genitiv der Spezialisierung’ (1921: 187-188). Similarly, Jušmanov spoke of substantives in the genitive used with adjectives “dlja pojasnenija” (‘for clarification’, 1928: 129), while Fischer used the expression ‘spezifizierender Genitiv’ (1987 [1972]: 164). Diem in (1986) rejected this interpretation of ‘Genitiv des Geltungsbereichs’ for ‘semantic’ reasons, which, as he showed at the example Zaydun kāfīru (l-māli) ‘Zayd ist viel...’ make the “Verbindung von Individuativum und Massenadjektiv ungrammatikalisch” (1986: 250). Langer uses the expression “Modifikatoren” of the adjective “die seinen quantitativen oder qualitativen Aspekt spezifizieren” (1988: 79). In Cantarino’s words, “The adjective is [...] in agreement with its governing noun, although it logically refers to the genitive it governs” (1975, II: 109). According to Danecki (1994), the adjective is determined (“jest określany”) by the word in the genitive following it, but at the same time it is this adjective that determines this word (“jednocześnie to przymiotnik określony ten wyraz”) (1994: 410). Paradela Alonso (2005 [1998]), when discussing this construction, writes that “el adjetivo de estas idafas se refiere siempre al término anterior” (2005 [1998]: 37), while elsewhere she writes that the word following is the subject of this adjective (p. 41).

The general image of the terminology used for describing the so-called INDIRECT ATTRIBUTE does not appear to be much clearer or systematic. Thus, Grande characterizes the adjective occurring in it as agreeing in case with the determined noun (‘s opredeljaemym’) and explaining, or specifying, (‘objasnjaŭščee’) the noun in the nominative (1963: 351). Diem (1998) uses terms such as ‘syntaktischer und semantischer Bezug des na’t’ (scil. des Adjektivs), e.g. (1998: 32-33). In his description, apart from concepts such as ‘sich beziehen’ (e.g. “semantisch bezieht sich das na’t primär auf [...]”, p. 32), other relations of rather extralingual character are referred to. They include ‘gelten’ (said of a ‘property’, e.g. “gilt die vom na’t vermittelte Eigenschaft gewöhnlich nicht nur für [...]”, p. 33),

19 He was probably referring to the two senses of ‘determination’ mentioned above.
‘zutreffen’, (e.g. “eine für das marfū‘ zutreffende Eigenschaft in mehr oder weniger hohem Maße auch für das man‘ūt berechtigt ist”, p. 33). On p. 81 one reads: “partizipiert das man‘ūt an Eigenschaften oder Umständen des marfū‘, die vom na‘īt ausgedrückt sind” and “ist das man‘ūt von einer vom na‘īt gemachten Aussage über das marfū‘ in irgendeiner Weise betroffen”. It is important to remark that Diem described what he called “split” (‘gespalten’) congruence of the adjective in terms of “die inhärenten Bereiche der Kongruenz (Genus und Numerus)” and “die weniger inhärenten Bereiche der Kongruenz (Kasus und Determination)” (Diem 1998: 32). With respect to this construction, Paradela Alonso says that the adjective in this construction is a complex adjective which “en realidad está adjetivando a una subparte [...] de su calificado primero o aparente” (‘in reality describes a quality of a subpart of its first or apparent qualificatum’, 2005 [1998]: 43). El-Ayoubi et al. (2001) use terms such as Bezugsnomen and Abhängigkeit vom Bezugsnomen when referring to morphosyntactic relations. They also speak of a subject of an ‘Adjektivgruppe’ which is not identical to its ‘Bezugsnomen’, with reference to semantic relations (2001: 186). Badawi et al., with respect to the adjective in the same construction, distinguish between ‘structurally qualifies’ and ‘logically qualifies’, while using also the expression ‘qualifies only indirectly’ (2004: 114). In Jebali’s view (2005), “Cet adjectif ne porte pas sur le nom qu’il qualifie, mais sur un autre nom que a un certain rapport avec celui-là” (2005: 9). Kihm, in turn, puts it the following way: the adjective shares the accusative case with the preceding noun, but agrees in gender and number with the noun which it modifies (Kihm 2006: 14). Fischer explains the relationships obtaining in the ‘indirect attribute’ by saying that “The adjectival clause has a two-fold reference: on the one hand it agrees in gender with its subject, on the other hand in case and definiteness/indefiniteness with its reference noun” (Fischer 2006: 20).

Finally, let us mention the expression ‘afḍalu r-riḡāli ‘the best of the men’, which is a construction with an elative followed by a genitive substantive and was discussed by Corriente (2002 [1980]) in terms of “inflexiones del elativo [...] rigiendo nominalmente al nombre en pl. que en realidad califican” (‘inflectional forms of the elative that nominally
govern the noun in the plural which in reality they qualify’, 2002 [1980]: 245). Of more general nature are the words expressed by Fischer about the adjectives as a category: “Adjectives refer to a noun (substantive) which they qualify” (Fischer 2006: 16).

Generally, one can say that the terms exemplified above refer rather to relations between properties and objects, or between properties and objects on one side and words on the other, not to relations between words as lingual signs. Consequently, these terms are not of strictly linguistic character. Admittedly, concepts related to ‘restricting’ have been used, yet without the meaning intended by the authors being properly elucidated by them. As it could be seen, observations like the one that Arabic adjectives sometimes ‘refer’ to (or qualify ‘structurally’ or ‘grammatically’) what they do not ‘qualify’ (‘logically’) – to use the terms discussed above – have not contributed to terminological precision in the Western studies of Arabic.

Finally, let us mention some works, whose number, however, due to the spatial limitation of this work, will be highly unrepresentative, concerned with describing syntagms (also called ‘syntactic groups’, ‘word groups’ etc.) in selected languages, not necessarily from a qualificational point of view. Descriptions of syntactic groups in Polish were presented in Klemensiewicz (1948) and Misz (1967). The latter description was modified in Saloni and Šwidziński (1987 [1981]: 238-259). Szupryczyńska (1980) presented a study of the syntax of the Polish adjective. A study of participial syntagms in ten Uralic and Altaic languages with the addition of Japanese was presented by Jankowski in (1987), who in his description made use of the concept of determination (qualification). In this study, syntagms in each of the languages investigated are divided into (i) subjective syntagms, (ii) objective syntagms and (iii) possessive syntagms. The already mentioned work by Mološnaja (1985) also concerned

---

20 Likewise in works written by the Arabs themselves. E.g. According to Al-Dahdah (1990), in the na’t sababi (‘indirect attribute’) the adjective yathu′u mā qablahu lafsan wā mā ba′dahu ma′nān ‘follows in form’ (lit. ‘in expression’) what is before him and in meaning what is after him’ (1990: 191). Cf. also Badr al-Dīn and Al-‘Amrāwi (1997), where a terminological difference between ‘indicating a meaning’ and ‘describing’ can be noticed. Thus, one reads there that the adjective in this construction huwa ilaqā yadullu ‘alā ma’nā fi smin ba′dahu, wa hadhā l-ismu lahu rtabītan bi l-manītāt ‘[it] is what indicates a meaning in the noun [which is] after it, and this noun has a connection with the described [noun]’ (1997: 15).
adjectival syntagms. Criteria used in her study were: the category of part of speech of the qualifier, type of prepositional rection, grammatical form of the qualifier and the linear order of the constituents (1985: 15). Also some meanings conveyed by different types of syntagms were distinguished (p. 22). A description of “nominal groups” in Classical Latin as well as a discussion of the concept in general (including a list of definitions of this and related concepts) can be found in Kaczmarkowski (1985). French nominal phrases were investigated e.g. in Wilmet (1986), while for English one can mention e.g. Meyer (2000) and for German e.g. Bhatt (1990).
PART 1. HYPOTACTIC SYNTAGMS

1.1. Theoretical principles

1.1.1. Word

We have already briefly introduced the concept of a biconstituent syntagm as a structure composed of two words. In order to be able to decide what is a syntagm and what is not we have to be able to distinguish between words and language units lesser than words on one hand and between words and language units larger than words on the other. The former problem consists in distinguishing words from prepositions, suffixes and articles. The latter – in distinguishing words from syntagms.

Before any discussion, let us introduce the concept of word. It will be understood in accordance with the concept proposed by Bańczerowski in (1997a) and (1997b). A word is conceived of as “a minimal unit of syntax and a maximal unit of morphology”. It is a language unit conveying complete lexical and semic (grammatical) meaning, the latter of which is indicated in “relatively systematic ways”, which can be “desinential, affixal, adpositional, stem-alternating, suprasegmental, distributional or auxiliary” (Bańczerowski 1997a: 1165). Accordingly, e.g. the Arabic expression fī l-kitāb-i ‘in the book’ shall be treated as one word, not two words. Its semic meaning (that of inessivity and definiteness) is conveyed in the preposition fī and the affix -i (inessivity) and the definite article l- (definiteness). Its lexical meaning (‘being a book’) is conveyed by means of the stem kitāb-. The prepositions alone do not convey any lexical meaning, they only co-occur with the inflectional ending (in our example the genitive suffix -i) in order to convey the grammatical (semic) meaning.

In this place it must be stressed that the concept of word adopted in the present study is different from that traditionally used in the majority of

---

21 In these works the term dictum is used. It must be noticed here that linguists have proposed many definitions of the term word (or similar concepts). A discussion of this problem can be found in Darski (2004: 63-71), where also Darski’s definition of Wortformen is given.
grammars (also those of Arabic), where e.g. prepositions are treated as words exerting their own reaction\textsuperscript{22}.

It is not infrequent for a word to lose an amount of its lexical meaning and begin to be used in a specialized and restricted function, with a meaning gradually becoming grammatical (semantic). This process is called grammaticalization and can be exemplified for English in the expression *instead of*, which comes from the prepositional phrase *in stead of* ‘in place of’, from Old English *in sted of* ‘in place of’ (Penguin 2000: 727) and has acquired the meaning ‘as a substitute or alternative’ (Penguin 727). In Modern English the word *stead* meaning ‘place’ has a very restricted use. In Polish the expression *wbrew* ‘against (one’s will)’ comes from the prepositional phrase *w brew* ‘into the brow’. Today it functions as a preposition meaning ‘against’, which requires the dative case (e.g. *wbrew ojca*, with the substantive in the genitive is non-grammatical). Thus, *wbrew ojcu* should be treated as one word, whereas for the older stages of Polish, where *brew* was used as a substantive, it would be analysed as two words\textsuperscript{23}.

We shall now proceed to discuss some prepositions which show a number of substantival properties, which could suggest that they should be treated as separate words. We mean here such expressions as *tahtā* ‘under’ in *tahtā s-sarīri* ‘under the bed’ or *ḥāriḡa* ‘outside’ in *ḥāriḡa l-waṭani* ‘outside the homeland’. Arabic has not a word *taht-* which has a lexical meaning of its own. Admittedly, there is also an apparent genitive form *tahtī* in *min tahtī s-sarīri* ‘from under the bed’, which behaves like a full substantive (with a hypothetic meaning ‘the space under something’). Yet no nominative form of it exists (*tahtū* or *tahtun*). Thus, *taht-* , being inflectionally limited (its inflectional paradigm being defective) will not be

\textsuperscript{22} E.g. Matthews 1981: 78, also Chomsky 1970, where preposition was one of the four major syntactic categories along with noun, verb and adjective. The Arabist Beeston considered the preposition *bi* ‘with, by’ to be a word, because it functions like *humma* ‘then’ and *alā* ‘on’, and they are “unquestionably counted as separate words in Arabic linguistic feeling” (1970: 30). Cf. also the discussion in Belkin (1975: 15-17).

\textsuperscript{23} Heine and Kuteva (2002) list four main mechanisms involved in grammaticalization: “(a) desemanticization (or ‘semantic bleaching’) – loss in meaning content, (b) extension (or content generalization) – use in new contexts, (c) decategorialization – loss in morphosyntactic properties characteristic of lexical or other less grammaticalized forms, and (d) erosion (or ‘phonetic reduction’) – loss in phonetic substance” (2002: 2).
treated as a substantive and, consequently, as a word. The expression \textit{min tahtti} will be treated as a complex preposition.

The case of \textit{h\textdegree ri\textdegree ga} is a more complicated one as there exist the word \textit{h\textdegree ri\textdegree gun} ‘external; the external space’, with complete lexical and grammatical meaning. This word can be used in e.g. \textit{fi h\textdegree ri\textdegree gi l-wa\textdegree tani} ‘outside the homeland’ lit. ‘in the external space of the homeland’. Etymologically, this word is related to the active participle of the verb \textit{h\textdegree ra\textdegree ga} meaning ‘to go out; to go beyond’. The preposition-like \textit{h\textdegree ri\textdegree ga} is in obvious relationship with this word. The case is not isolated, there are other examples: \textit{d\textdegree \text{\textdegree hila} ‘inside’}, \textit{nat\textdegree \text{\textdegree gata} ‘as a result of’} (cf. \textit{nat\textdegree \text{\textdegree gatun} ‘result’}), \textit{mak\textdegree na} ‘instead of’ (cf. \textit{mak\textdegree\textdegree un ‘place’}). As it can be seen, the meanings of these words are not very much detached from the related substantives or adjectives. Their grammaticalization seems not to be much advanced. Therefore they are borderline cases, hence, problematic cases: no cogent justification can be found for counting them among prepositions or among substantives in special functions. What suggests treating them as prepositions is that they belong to a closed class: they cannot be freely formed. For instance, one cannot make from \textit{buq\textdegree atun ‘place, site, spot’} a preposition *\textit{buq\textdegree ata} with the meaning ‘instead’, analogously to \textit{mak\textdegree\textdegree un} and \textit{mak\textdegree na}. Such units must be looked up in a dictionary, since their meanings are fairly predictable but their existence is not. Therefore we will treat them as prepositions, although being aware of some arbitrariness of this decision.

Another controversy concerns personal pronouns, in functions analogous to oblique cases of substantives, which cannot stand freely but have to be attached to other words, e.g. \textit{ka- in baytuka ‘your house’}, or \textit{-h\textdegree a} in \textit{ra\textdegree\textdegree ytu\textdegree h\textdegree a} ‘I saw her’. Some scholars were inclined to treat them as words for functional reasons (cf. Gabu\textdegree jan and Kovalev 1968). This seems, however not justified. We prefer to treat these pronouns as suffixes. Thus, \textit{baytuka} will be one word. A question also arises about personal pronouns suffixed to prepositions. We will adopt that since a freely standing personal pronoun in the nominative, e.g. \textit{huwa ‘he’}, is a word, then the expression \textit{fihi ‘in him}’ is one of its inflectional forms. Therefore we will treat the combination of a preposition with a suffixed pronoun as one word. There is another argument in favour of this analysis: in the
sentence *ad-danbu* ‘alayha ‘The blame is upon her’, ‘alayhā ‘upon her’ is the predicate, a constituent of a predicative syntagm. Since only words can be constituents of a syntagm, ‘alayhā must be treated as a word, not as a morpheme. The situation is similar with some particles to which pronouns are suffixed, such as *’anna* ‘that’. The expression *’annahu* ‘that he’ will be treated as one word, more specifically, as a pronoun attached to the particle. Likewise, while in the foregoing example a word was needed for a predicate of *ad-danbu*, in *’annahu mu’tabun* ‘that he is tired’ a word is needed to be the subject of *mu’tabun*. This is the word *’annahu*. Also articles will be treated as affixes. Conjunctions do not have the status of a word either.²⁴

Expressions such as *gayr* ‘other than, un-’, *šibh* ‘similar to, quasi-’, which are used in combination with adjectives will be treated as words since each of them has a meaning of its own and is fully inflected (its syntax is not substantially restricted). Sporadically, some symptoms of a grammaticalization of *gayru* can be noticed, but this is a separate phenomenon and will be discussed in due course.

Also other expressions whose function is rather specialized and meaning abstract, such as *dū*, *šāhīb* (expressing a possessor) will be treated as words, due to their syntactic freedom. In this context Kovalev and Šharbatov (1969: 293) speak of ‘word-forming particles’, yet, as Belkin argues, they show no properties of ‘bound forms’ (1975: 23).

The second of the two problems raised at the beginning of this chapter was the distinguishing of the words and the syntagms. For some Arabists, the construction known as ‘formal annexation’ should be treated as a word (cf. Gabučjan and Kovalev 1968: 41). We think that treating them as one word is not justified, yet what should be borne in mind is that in some realizations of these constructions some components, such as *katīru*–‘having much’, or *’adīmu*–‘having none’ might appear to be de-lexicalized (grammaticalized) to a considerable extent. However, we think that in spite of these symptoms of grammaticalization, both components of formal annexations can be relatively easily analysed in isolation in terms of complete lexical and grammatical meaning. As Belkin puts it, formal

²⁴ Contrary to Beeston, for whom “it can be taken as certain that words such as the coordinating functional *wa* ‘and’, and the preposition *bi* ‘in/ by’, are words in every sense” (1970: 30).
annexations (e.g. hasanu l-wağhi lit. ‘handsome of face’) are free compositions of words, not compound adjectives, i.e. independent lexical, and consequently, semantic units, despite the fact that some of them are translated into other languages as compound adjectives (Belkin 1975: 25). Here we should remark that Gätje (1979: 17) considered the possibility that even the true annexation was an Einzelwort because the muðāf ’ilayhi, i.e. the qualifying substantive in the genitive, replaces the tanwîn, which is an integral part of most indefinite substantives. We however, agree with Belkin in that analytic constructions should not be treated as (compound) words (1975: 24). The expression ra’su l-mâli ‘capital’, lit. ‘head of money’, with its plural ru’ûsu l’awmâli lit. ‘heads of moneys’, is composed of two words, each of them inflecting separately. Only the form ar-ra’smâlu can be treated as a single word, with the plural ar-rasâmîlu (p. 25).

It also seems that it is more justified to treat numerals from 11 to 99 (e.g. ‘aḥada ‘ašara ‘11’, tis’ata ‘ašara ‘19’) as words than to analyse them as syntagms.

What remains to be discussed is the way ‘auxiliary verbs’ in MWA shall be treated in this study. According to the definition of word proposed by Báńczerowski, auxiliaries should not be treated as words (e.g. 1997: 1161). Thus e.g. the English expression John is singing is composed of two words: John and is singing, in which the unit is, along with the suffix -ing, is only an auxiliary expression, conveying the semic meaning of person, number, tense, voice and Aktionsart, whereas the unit sing- conveys the lexical meaning [‘to produce musical sounds by means of the voice’] (Penguin 2000: 1306). Auxiliary verbs are usually more or less defective, that is to say their inflectional paradigm is not complete. Their phonetic form is often reduced, due to their frequent use. It seems, however, that assuming the same solution for MWA will make the description more obscure than interpreting auxiliary verbs (such as kāna ‘to be’) as words will. The reason for this is that their syntactic behaviour is, with only insignificant exceptions, identical to that of other verbs and their phonetic form is never reduced. They show concord in gender and exert rection. The most visible difference between them and other verbs is that they do not form some participial forms: there is no *makûnun (a potential passive
participle of *kāna nor *muṣbiḥun (a potential active participle of *aṣbaḥa ‘to become’), although this restriction is rather of pragmatic than grammatical nature. Therefore they will be treated as words.

25 In fact, *makānun was used as a terminus technicus by some classical Arab grammarians to denote what is normally known as ḫabar kāna, i.e. the predicate after the verb kāna.
1.1.2. Qualification and types of syntactic relations

One of the characteristic features of human languages is that they have both simplex signs and composite signs. In order for any language to be able to serve its aim, communication, it must use composite signs. One reason for this is that the range of designation of some simplex signs is too narrow, i.e. they say too little, whereas the range of designation of others is too wide, i.e. they say too much (Bańczerowski et al. 1982: 236-237 and Bańczerowski 1997a: 1162). Combining simplex signs into composite ones permits us to solve both problems. If the range of designation of a simplex sign is too narrow to refer to a wider fragment of the extralingual reality, the speakers use a composite sign. Thus, e.g. in English there is no simplex sign which could refer to a cat and a mouse at the same time (with the exception of some anaphoric use of words). The sign the cat says to little as well as the sign the mouse says too little. Only a composite sign resulting from the combination of both is able to serve this aim. This type of combining simplex signs into composite ones is called parataxis (or coordination). On the other hand it may happen that a simplex sign has a range of designation which is too broad, i.e. it refers to a fragment of reality which is too wide with respect to the speaker’s communicative intention. E.g. in English, if a speaker means cats that are black, he or she will not find a simplex sign (one word) which would have the suitable range of designation. The range of designation of the simplex sign has to be narrowed, and this is made by means of creating a composite sign of a specific type. In English this is black cats (or cats that are black). As a result, this composite sign does not refer to all possible cats any more, but only to the black ones. This type of combining simplex signs into composite ones is called hypotaxis (or subordination).

The two words combined by means of hypotaxis are bound by the relation of qualification (Bańczerowski 1997a: 1162; cf. also 1980, esp. 65ff). The qualified word will be referred to as the qualificatum, or qm. The qualifying word will be referred to as the qualificator, or qr. As a result of the combination based on hypotaxis, a composite sign composed of the qualificatum and the qualificator comes into being. This object is termed a hypotactic syntagm. Words which constitute a syntagm are its constituents.
Syntagms composed of two constituents will be referred to as **biconstituent syntagms**. Syntagms based on parataxis are termed paratactic syntagms.

The relation of qualification has very important consequences for the meaning (signification) and for the range of designation of the words bound by this relation and of the resulting hypotactic syntagm. According to Bańczerowski:

“the qualificator expands (broadens) the total meaning (significatum) of its qualificatum, whereby the total meaning of the resultant syntagma includes that of its constituent qualificatum” [...] 

“the qualificator restricts (narrows down) the radius (range) of designation of its qualificatum, whereby the designation radius of the resultant syntagma is included in that of its constituent qualificatum” (Bańczerowski 1997a: 1162).

A consequence of these facts is that a hypotactic syntagm is a hyponym “with respect to its constituent qualificatum” (Bańczerowski 1997: 1162)\(^{26}\).

Obviously, biconstituent syntagms are not maximal composite signs of any language since there can be syntagms composed of more than two words. This is possible because a word which is a qualificator in one syntagm can be a qualificatum in another syntagm. Also, a word which is a qualificatum in one syntagm can be a qualificator in another syntagm. That is to say that a word can be *in statu qualificati* and *in statu qualificatoris* at the same time (Bańczerowski 1997a: 1163; cf. also 1980: 86 where terms *in statu determinato* and *in statu determinante* were used). For instance, in the triconstituent syntagm *intensely black eyes* we can distinguish two biconstituent syntagms: (*eyes, black*) and (*black, intensely*), with the qm given first and the qr second. As it can be seen, the word *black* is *in statu qualificatoris* in the former syntagm while it is *in statu qualificati* in the latter. If we continue using the notation with the qm preceding the qr, the qualificational structure of *intensely black eyes* can be represented as (*eyes, black, intensely*). Somewhat metaphorically, we can say that the two biconstituent syntagms discussed here overlap each other on the word *black*, the syntagm (*eyes, black*) being ‘left-overlapping’ and the syntagm

---

\(^{26}\) Cf. also Bańczerowski 1980: 66-70
(black, intensely) ‘right-overlapping’. Thus, the qr of syntagm₁ which is ‘left-overlapping’ with respect to syntagm₂ is the qm of syntagm₂.

### 1.1.3. Morphosyntax of a hypotactic syntagm

Hypotactic syntagms can be analysed and described with respect to their formal properties. In many cases these properties additionally indicate that the two constituents are combined into one syntagm. The way how it is signalled that the constituents are bound into a syntagm can be of various kinds, that is to say, various **morphological indicators**, or **mph indicators**, can be used to signal this connection. That the mph indicators signal a connection between the constituents within a syntagm results from the fact that they indicate a specific grammatical category which is required by one of the constituents from the other. Accordingly, hypotactic syntagms can be divided into two groups:

(i) syntagms in which one constituent requires a certain category (or certain categories) from the other constituent and this is reflected in the morphological form of the latter and

(ii) syntagms in which neither of the constituents requires a specific grammatical category from the other constituent.

The relation between the constituents of syntagms of group (i) will be termed **motion**, and that between the constituents of syntagms of group (ii) will be termed **non-motion**. Motion can be of two principal kinds. Therefore, group (i) splits into two subgroups:

---

27 These two terms will be used in chapters 1.3.8. and 1.3.9.
28 In Bańczerowski (1980: 102) the term ‘semic connexity’ is used.
29 It should be remarked here that different grammatical categories may be morphologically marked in the same way (a phenomenon which is called ‘syncretism’).
30 We have decided to introduce this term for the needs of this work, in order to fill the terminological gap which would not permit us to refer to rection and concord by means of one common term. Likewise, the terms ‘attrahent’ and ‘attractum’ (introduced below) needed to be invented in order for us to be able to refer to the words bound by the relation of concord by means of concise denominations.
(a) syntagms in which motion consists in **concord** (agreement). In such syntagms, constituent A requires that constituent B belongs to a certain category to which constituent A also belongs and this is marked morphologically. In other words, constituent B agrees with constituent A in certain grammatical categories, which is marked morphologically. Constituent A will be termed the **attrahent**, constituent B will be termed the **attractum**.

(b) syntagms in which motion consists in **rection** (government). In such syntagms, constituent A requires that constituent B belongs to a certain category to which constituent A does not belong and this is marked morphologically. In other words, constituent A governs the category of constituent B (different from its own category), which is marked morphologically. Constituent A will be termed the **regens**, and constituent B will be termed the **rectum**.

Regents and attrahents will be referred to by means of a general term **movents**, while recta and attracta by the term **mota**.

The syntagms of group (ii), based on non-motion, have no morphological indicators showing their unity, the latter usually being ensured by virtue of the lexical properties of its constituents.** This type of unity between words consisting in the absence of mph indicators will be referred to as **lexical junction** (cf. Bańczerowski 1988: 54).

It is important here to distinguish rection from what Bańczerowski treats as ‘lexical junction’. In his article (1997a) rection is also identified in such syntagms as *(he broke, as a joke)* in *He broke the window with a stone as a joke* (1997a: 1174), or *(he approved, with hesitation)* in *He approved of my decision, with hesitation* (p. 1175), which, according to the Polish grammatical tradition would be considered lexical junction *(zwiazek przynaleznosci, cf. Bak 1989 [1977]: 384)*. Thus, in Bańczerowski’s

---

31 The term concord is used here to refer both to the relations within non-predicative syntagms and to predicative syntagms. This is different from Kihm (2005: 14), who follows Wechsler and Zlatić (2003) and uses ‘concord’ for the former and ‘agreement’ for the latter type of relation.

32 Frequently, suprasegmental properties (such as intonation) and linear properties (such as word order) play an important role in constituting the unity of a syntagm. Yet they will be left outside the scope of our interest since for many reasons they seem irrelevant here. Let us only remark that MWA is a language in which word order, although fixed to a certain degree, plays rather a marginal role in establishing syntactic relations between words. Syntactic functions, such as object or subject, are signalled primarily by inflection, cf. *qatala Zaydun* ‘Zayd killed’ vs. *qatala Zaydan* ‘he killed Zayd’. English, in turn, uses word order to signal syntactic relations while inflection plays rather a marginal role.
approach, rection has a broader meaning and this will be also adopted in the present work.

In distinguishing rection from lexical junction we could use two types of criteria: meaning and form. Let us start with discussing the meaning. It could be proposed that rection is operative only when a word is required to be present in order to avoid an elliptical utterance. E.g. *huwa 'akbaru* ‘he is bigger’ is elliptical because there is someone compared with. Thus, the syntagm *'akbaru minnī* ‘bigger than me’ in *huwa 'akbaru minnī* ‘he is bigger than me’ would be based on rection. In turn, the expression *hiya 'atwatu bintin* ‘she is the tallest girl’ is rather complete and would not be considered elliptical. But it might be deemed elliptical if a further modification, e.g. *fi l-bayti* ‘in the house’ would appear, because otherwise, without it, we have not the complete information. Thus, deciding when an expression is elliptical or not is not free from arbitrariness. This criterion cannot therefore be used here.

Let us now present a possible differentiation on the grounds of the form. This criterion seems to be much more useful than that based on meaning. In Arabic, the case of the qualifier is governed by the qualificatum (and not the other way round). E.g. some verbs are very closely linked to a specific case (e.g. *baḥaṭa 'an* ‘to look for’), while in others this link can be weaker (*galasa fi l-bayti* ‘to sit in the house’ or *galasa 'amāma l-bayti* ‘to sit in front of the house’ etc). In our study we will not differentiate these two possibilities and both will be treated as rection. It should, however, be remarked that whether in e.g. *mubtadi'ün šabāhan* ‘beginning in the morning’ the accusative case of *šabāhan* ‘in the morning’ should be interpreted as governed by *mubtadi'ün* or as being the fixed, uninflected form of an adverb, depends on what is assumed for the description. Analogous cases in Polish would, traditionally, be analysed as ‘lexical junction’, because adverbs are treated as uninflected (cf. Bąk 1989 [1977]: 383). Yet for Baker (2003: 231-234) it seems justified to treat adverbs (in English ending in *-ly* and, we may add, in Polish ending in *-o or -e*) as

---

33 Other approaches suggest that since the concepts of ‘strong rection’ and ‘weak rection’, usually used in such cases, are too intuitional, it is better to speak of accomodation and its direction (Karolak 1993: 505). The concept of accomodation was used, for instance, in the description of the syntax of Polish by Saloni and Świdziński (1987 [1981]).
special forms of adjectives used as modifiers of verbs. This is also suggested in Karolak (1993: 504).

Lexical junction will be therefore restricted to such words which do not inflect (e.g. ‘amsi ‘yesterday’) or can be considered as uninflected, as they have become delexicalized to a considerable degree and got detached from their original meaning (e.g. ġiddan ‘very’, which cannot be treated as an inflectional form, i.e. the accusative case, of ġiddun ‘seriousness’ any more). All remaining hypotactic syntagms which are not instances of concord will be described as based on rection. Thus syntagms dāhibun sarī’an ‘going quickly’ and ġālisun fī l-bayti ‘sitting in the house’ will both be treated as based on rection.

Qualification and morphological indicators

It is crucial to note that mph indicators are usually easy to identify without resort to the intuitions of a native speaker. The type of mph indicators can be determined by an observer who solely considers the form and recognizes its type using his or her metalinguistic knowledge. This linguistic knowledge can be, and in most cases is, unfamiliar to native speakers. Thus, researchers equipped with such a metalinguistic theoretical apparatus can be, and in most cases are, likelier to identify the type of mph indicators than native speakers are.

In contrast to this, the relation of qualification is not directly observable by an external researcher who has no insight into the meaning conveyed by a syntagm. The relation of qualification, both its existence between words and its direction (i.e. which word is the qm and which word is the qr) must be enquired about from a native speaker or a researcher possessing competence of a given language nearly as good as a native speaker’s. In some cases, establishing the existence and direction of qualification can be difficult.

We can now briefly discuss how qualification and mph indicators are interrelated. Four possibilities should be taken into account here:

(i) qualification without mph indicators. In such cases we are dealing with lexical junction. Cf. the above examples and the English syntagm good work. However, one should remember that in syntagms such as
good work the linear order can be considered to be a morphological indicator of qualification.

(ii) mph indicators without qualification.

The existence of mph indicators does not need necessarily point to qualification between two words. E.g. in the Arabic expression:

\[ \text{'asālību 'ways' and mašrū'atīn 'legal'} \text{ although these two words show concord with respect to state, number and gender.} \]

(iii) qualification with mph indicators such that the movent is the qm and the motum is the qr. E.g.:

Arabic:
\[ \text{'a quick movement' /2/} \]

The attrahent is the qm. The attractum is the qr. (cf. ‘regens qua qualificatum’ in Bańczerowski 1997a: 1171). Thus, we can say that the movent is the qm here, while the motum is the qr.

(iv) qualification with mph indicators such that the movent is the qr and the motum is the qm. E.g.:

Swahili:
\[ \text{‘The man is reading the book’ /3/} \]

There are two movents: mtu and kitabu. Both are attrahents. Mtu requires that the verb has the affix a- and kitabu requires that the verb has the affix -ki-. We are interested in kitabu, since it, being a movent, is also the qr of
anakisoma (cf. ‘regens qua qualifier’ in Bańczerowski 1997a: 1171). Thus, we can say that the movent is the qr here, while the motum is the qm.

Besides the four possibilities discussed above, one can also imagine complex combinations. E.g. in Azerbaijani, we have a syntagm where both concord and rectio are working in opposite directions:

Azerbaijani:

\[
\text{siz-in } \text{tələbə-niz} \\
2.\text{PL-G student.SI-2.PL} \\
\text{‘your (pl.) student’ (apud Şiraliev and Sevortjan 1971: 222) /4/}
\]

In this examplem sizin can be considered to be a movent (attrahent) because it requires from the word tələbə the suffix -niz, agreeing with it in person and number (the second person plural). But also tələbə can be considered to be a movent (regent) because it requires siz to be in the genitive case. Consequently, we are confronted with a situation where both constituents of a syntagm can be treated as movents. A similar situation can be found in the following example:

Substandard German:

\[
\text{meinem } \text{Vater } \text{sein } \text{Haus} \\
\text{my.M.SI.DATIVE father POSS.3.M SI house} \\
\text{‘my father’s house’ /5/}
\]

Here, the word Vater can be considered to be a movent (attrahent), because it requires that the possessive pronoun sein is in the masculine singular form of the third person, thus producing concord with Vater. But also Haus can be considered to be a movent (regent) because it requires that the substantive Vater stands in the dative case\(^{34}\).

\(^{34}\) Note that both the Azerbaijani and the Substandard German examples are possessive expressions. As Seiler observes, “Combinations of case marking on POSSESSOR and person agreement of POSSESSUM with POSSESSOR [...] are fairly widespread among languages” (Seiler 1983: 71).
1.1.4. Morphological categories of the Arabic nouns

In MWA, nouns, i.e. nominal parts of speech such as substantives, adjectives and non-suffixed pronouns can be characterized with respect to four categories: state (definiteness), gender, number and case. In order for us to be able to describe various kinds of syntagms, we have to introduce briefly how these morphological categories are signalled. We will be interested more in the form than in the meaning, thus, e.g. the question what it actually means that an Arabic substantive is definite and whether its definiteness would be reflected in a translation into another language which marks this category morphologically, will not concern us here.

**State (Definiteness)**

The term state, or definiteness, has two meanings: it may refer to the formal indicators of definiteness, e.g. the article al (then the morphological category is meant), or to the notional property of being known from the context or of being the only element of a set, e.g. the Sun (then, semantic category is meant). In Arabic, some words are morphologically indefinite, but notionally (semantically) definite, e.g. `afdalu ra’ulun ‘the best man’ (see El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 266-267) or Muḥammadun ‘Muhammad’. It is so due to their semantics, i.e. the superlative meaning and a proper name, respectively. Besides, adjectives, which do not refer to entities, do not have their own character in terms of semantic definiteness but usually agree with the substantive they qualify (cf. Gäyte 1973: 19), thence they are better characterizable in terms of formal properties. Therefore we will be interested only in the formal properties, without saying whether an expression is notionally (semantically) definite or not. The expression ‘akbaru ra’ulun ‘the biggest man’ will be classed as indefinite. An exception will be made for proper names. Thus, Muḥammadun will be classed as definite by virtue of its being a proper name.

From the formal point of view we may say that a word which is not a proper name can be either indefinite or definite. A word is indefinite if:

---

35 For personal pronouns, a fifth category, the person, should also be distinguished.
(i) it is not made definite, e.g. an adjective that is an attribute of an indefinite substantive such as baytun ǧādīdu n ‘a new house’. Also substantives and adjectives that are predicates are mainly indefinite, e.g. al-baytu ǧādīdu n ‘The house is new’. In formal annexations, e.g. rağulun ǧawīlul l-qāmati ‘a man tall of height’, the substantive which qualifies the adjective, here: l-qāmati ‘[of] height’, does not make it definite. Neither does a pronominal suffix, e.g. rağulun ǧarību l-miṣyaṭi sarī’uhā ‘a man strange and quick in his manner of walking’, lit. ‘a man strange of walking and quick of it’.

(ii) if it is qualified by an indefinite word in the genitive case. E.g. ’akbaru in the above example ’akbaru rağulin.

A word is definite if:

(i) it has the definite article al-. E.g. an adjective that is an attribute of a definite substantive is definite, such as l-kabīru in al-baytu l-kabīru ‘the big house’.

(ii) it is qualified by a definite word. Then, it cannot receive the definite article al- (double definiteness is avoided). E.g. adjectives such as in ’afdalul r-riḡāli ‘the best [of] the men’ are definite Here also will be counted the non-canonical formal annexation, where the adjective does not receive the definite article although it is an attribute of a definite substantive. It is so because the adjective is treated as made definite by the qualifying substantive in the genitive, e.g. ma’a r-rağulul ǧawīlul l-qāmati ‘with the man tall [of] height’.

(iii) it receives a pronominal suffix. E.g. baytuḥu ‘his house’ is definite because it has the pronominal suffix -hu ‘his’ or ’afdaluhum ‘the best [of] them’. Here we should add the construction which is possible in theory, yet did not occur in our corpus, namely that of formal annexation in which the substantive qualifying the adjective is replaced by the suffix, and the adjective is treated as made definite by it, e.g. ma’a r-rağulul ǧarību l-miṣyaṭi sarī’ihā lit. ‘with the man strange in walking and quick of it’.

(iv) it is a proper name,

(v) it is a personal pronoun (whether freely standing, as ’anā ‘I’, or attached to a preposition (as ma’-ī ‘with me’).

---

36 The existence of this construction results in neutralization of the opposition Definite : Indefinite. E.g. ra’aytu ǧawīlul l-qāmati ‘I saw the man tall of height’ vs. ra’aytu rağulan ǧawīlul l-qāmati ‘I saw a man tall of height’. This may lead to ambiguity, since, if the adjective is in the nominative case, one cannot be certain if the construction is attributive or predicative: ar-rağulul ǧawīlul l-qāmati may mean ‘the man is tall of height’ (reading with indefiniteness) but also ‘the man tall of height’ (reading with definiteness by definite annexation).
Gender

In our description of nouns in MWA we will assume the existence of three genders: masculine (M) and feminine (F) for all three numbers, and, additionally, non-human (NH) which is distinguished only in the plural. NH refers to the gender of words referring to entities which are not human beings or to human beings which are not treated as human beings. The form of NH is identical to F singular. E.g. kutubun qayyimatun ‘valuable books’ vs. risālatun qayyimatun ‘a valuable letter (F)’ Substantives and adjectives which are NH in the plural, in the singular will be either M, or F. Human substantives remain M or F in the plural. Such a division entails an apparently strange conclusion that one and the same substantive has different genders, depending on its number. We, however, prefer this solution to the one in which both feminine and masculine non-human plural substantives are said to take adjectives which are feminine singular.

It should be noted here that, mainly for stylistic reasons, sometimes non-human plural substantives can take adjectives used normally with human substantives. E.g:

\[ \text{min ḥarazāt-i-n .bid-i-n} \]
\[ \text{of pearls.NH.PL-G-I  white.M.PL-G-I} \]
\[ \text{‘of white pearls’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, Maktabu l-‘üzūni...)}^{37} /7/ \]

On the other hand, plural masculine substantives designating human beings may take adjectives which are NH in their form. For the sake of clarity of description we will not take this into consideration. Thus, e.g.

\[ \text{salāğiqt-u-n  kūniyy-at-u-n} \]

---

37 Blau (1973: 209) observes that “in CA [Classical Arabic – MM] colours referring to the plural of irrational beings stand in the plural, rather than in the feminine singular, as do most adjectives in this syntactic environment”. He adds that “As a rule the use of the feminine plural prevails, due to the trend of standardization, in accordance with the behaviour of other adjectives”. But Beeston (1975: 65f) disagrees with him by saying that “in pre-Islamic poetry, it is virtually a universal rule that adjectives, no matter whether colour terms or otherwise, show plural forms when referring to pluralities… The use of the feminine singular concord with ‘irrational’ substantives is a neologism in Arabic which only gradually won its way to becoming the norm”. He adds that “The appearance of plural colour-adjectives referring to irrationalia in MSA [Modern Standard Arabic – MM] simply demonstrates that this particular class of adjective has proved more resistant than others to the change”. 
will not be listed separately in our typology, although it could be considered to be a separate kind of syntagm, because it has a different type of concord.^

There are sporadic adjectives which, although qualifying a masculine substantive, have the feminine suffix -atu- as in rab’atun 'of medium height'. We will not consider this a feminine form but treat it as an exceptional masculine form. Therefore, syntagms involving such adjectives will not be listed separately in our typology.

We will also introduce the notion of neutralized gender, or NG. This occurs in some adjectival constructions discussed in chapter 3.1.1.1.1. and in adjectives occurring in antegenitival substantivization (chapter 4.5.2.), e.g.:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ḥāliṣ-u} & \text{l-mawaddat-i} \\
\text{pure.NG.NN-N} & \text{D-love.F.S-G} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘pure love’ (lit. 'the pure of love') /9/

Such adjectives will not be considered to be masculine. Their form never changes into feminine with a feminine substantive, since it never alternates with a feminine form. Neutralized gender is always associated with neutralized number (see below) and vice versa.

**Number**

There are three numbers in Arabic: *singular* (SI), *dual* (DU) and *plural* (PL). We will, however, add also the fourth category, that of neutralized number (NN). It is distinguished in regard to adjectives but not substantives. This concept is similar to that of neutralized gender (cf. example /9/). Their number is only seemingly singular. This singular form does not result from their following a singular substantive but because this is their only form, which never alternates with the dual or the plural. Neutralized number is always associated with neutralized gender and vice versa.

---

There is a subcategory of substantives, traditionally referred to as collectives, which, morphologically, are singular, but syntactically behave like plurals. They require the plural form of their adjectival, pronominal and verbal qualificators. They are replaceable by plural pronouns. Examples:

\[ wa \quad \text{mina} \quad l-\text{hībīz-i} \quad l-\text{mutaḥallīf-īna} \]
and from D-hippies.M.PL-G D-left:over.M.PL.G
‘and from the left-over hippies’ (Miꗝq 20/4/04, 7) /10/

\[ al-\text{ḥimīr-u} \quad l-\text{ḥumr-u} \]
‘Khmer Rouge’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 112) /11/

In our study, they will be treated as masculine plurals.

**Case**

There are three cases in Arabic. Their traditional denominations, as inadequate as they may be for other purposes, will be adopted here: nominative (N), genitive (G) and accusative (A). No special account will be taken of the so-called diptotic nouns. In this regard we will assume syncretism and describe such nouns according to their syntactic properties, even though they are not fully reflected in morphology.

**Accidental concord**

We will now introduce the concept of **accidental concord**. Accidental concord takes place if an adjective only appears to agree with a substantive. This happens for two reasons:

(i) an adjective is uninflected for a certain category but its form morphologically co-incides with an inflected form. E.g. the pattern of the neutralized gender of ‘akbaru ‘bigger’ in baytī ‘akbaru min... ‘my house is bigger than...’ seems to be masculine and the adjective seems to agree with

---

39 Cf. also ǧama‘atun mutahidīna given by Kouloughli (1994: 111), with a substantive which is morphologically feminine singular.
the masculine *baytī*, because it is identical to the pattern of the masculine in e.g. *'aswadu* ‘black’ in *baytī* *'aswadu* ‘my house is black’. The same example can be used for illustrating accidental concord in number. In *baytī* *'akbaru*... there seems to be concord in number. But in *buyūṯī* *'akbaru min* ‘my houses are bigger than...’ it is evident that there is none.

(ii) the reason for the morphological form of an adjective may be identified incorrectly, i.e. as agreeing with a substantive that is not its attractent. E.g. in example /12/:

```
qāla r-ra‘īs-u l-muntahiy-at-u wilāyat-u-hu
‘the president whose term of office is ending said...’ /12/
```

the nominative case of *l-muntahiyatu* only accidentally agrees with *wilāyatuhu* because *wilāyatuhu* is always in the nominative in this construction. In reality, *l-muntahiyatu* stands in the nominative here because the whole syntagm *l-muntahiyatu wilāyatuhu* is the predicate of *ar-ra‘īsu*.

Accidental concord with respect to state will be also assumed for predicative syntagms with definite predicates, such as:

```
hādā l-ḥall-u huwa l-wāḥid-u
‘This solution is [the] only [one]’ lit. ‘This solution, it [is] the only [one]’ /13/
```

In /13/, the definite state of the pronoun *huwa*, which is the subject, and that of the adjective, which is the predicate, do not depend on each other.

### 1.1.5. Semantics of a hypotactic syntagm

The idea standing behind the formation of composite signs is that speakers of a language identify a fragment of extralingual reality (it can be an individual or an abstract object, an event or a relation etc.) as a quiddity and then characterize it, i.e. identify a quality which they associate with this object. In this way, language “organizes our reality or universe of
information” (Bańczerowski 1980: 65). The primordial distinction between quiddities and qualities finds “a reflection in the concepts of argument and predicate” (Bańczerowski 2000: 7). It can be said that language may interpret an individual physical object (e.g. a dog) as prior to its property (e.g. vicious in a vicious dog) or, equally, it can be the property (e.g. viciousness) which is linguistically “prior” to its bearer (e.g. of the dog in the viciousness of the dog). As Bańczerowski puts it,

“Signative space is dynamic40, [...] By means of signation quiddities and qualities are identified as well as called into existence, whereby a dynamic organization is imposed upon extralingual reality, which is constantly structured and restructured. What is more, one and the same extralingual entity may be either:

(i) quidditifed, or
(ii) qualitifed.

These two operations depend thus on how the entity in question is being signated”. (Bańczerowski 2000: 8).

Although it seems that the identification of an individual concrete object precedes, notionally, the identification of its property (which is abstract), language is by no means forced to reflect such a possible precedence in its constructions. In other words, what ontologically is an abstract being, a property of something which exists physically, may be expressed in language as a quiddity which is characterized by a quality (cf. the above example the viciousness of the dog). Hypotactic syntagms, which are the linguistic means of designating these fragments of the extralingual reality, are composite signs composed of two words, which are its constituents. These constituents are opposed to each other in many respects. Let us subject this to a more detailed discussion.

**First**, in many cases, one of the constituents can be omitted while the remaining one is still able to function as a language unit. Thus we can say: Yu'gibuhu l-'amalu l-ğayyidu ‘Good work pleases him’ and Yu'gibuhu l-'amalu ‘Work pleases him’, with the omission of l-ğayyidu ‘good’. But we cannot say: *Yu'gibuhu l-ğayyidu *‘Good pleases him’ (unless ellipsis is

40 The term *signation* used here by Bańczerowski denotes the relation between lingual signs and the corresponding entities of extralingual reality they stand for (Bańczerowski 2000: 6).
intended). We can also say: ْہذَا ِکتابُن ْغَيْيِدَن ْغِدَدَان ‘This is a very good book’ and ْہذَا ِکتابُن ْغَيْيِدَن ‘This is a good book’, with the omission of ْغِدَدَان ‘very’. We cannot, however, say: ْہذَا ِکتابُن ْغِدَدَان ‘This is a very book’. The procedure of omitting one of the constituents is actually a substitution test in which a zero element is substituted for a word.

As we can see, the non-omissible constituent of a syntagm co-incides with what we interpret as the qualificatum of the syntagm. The other one, which is droppable, is its qualificator.

Second, the non-omissible constituent of a syntagm is also that which determines the syntactic features of the whole syntagm. This means that if it is a substantive, the whole syntagm may have functions that substantives have and it cannot have functions that substantives do not have. E.g. ِکتابُن ْتَيْيِبَان ‘a good boy’ can be the subject in a sentence because ِکتابُن ‘a boy’ may. Since ِکتابُن ‘boy’ may not be an adjectival attribute (cf. ْہذَا ِکتابُن ِکتابُن ْتَيْيِبَان ‘this is a boy book’), one cannot say ْہذَا ِکتابُن ِکتابُن ْتَيْيِبَان ‘This is a good boy book’ either.41

A third feature that distinguishes the two constituents of a hypotactic syntagm from each other is that one of them can be enquired about by a question more natural and less complex than the other can. Thus, out of the syntagm ِکتابُن ْل-ْوَلادِي in the sentence ْعُرِّدُ ِکتابُن ْل-ْوَلادِي ‘I want the boy’s book’ only the word ْل-ْوَلادِي can be enquired about without much difficulty: ِکتابُن ْمَن ْعُرِّدُ؟ ‘Whose book do you want?’ lit. ‘Book [of] whom [you] want?’ A possible question about ِکتابُن will have a much more elaborate form, e.g. ْمَاذَا ْعُرِّدُ ْوَا ْهُوْاء ْل-ْوَلادِي؟ ‘What do you want that is the boy’s?’ (Note that by the question ْمَاذَا ْعُرِّدُ it is enquired about the whole syntagm and the answer to it is ِکتابُن ْل-ْوَلادِي, not the word ِکتابُن). The situation is similar in syntagms based on concord: out of the syntagm ِکتابُن ْغَيْيِدَان in the sentence ْعَرَّ ِکتابُن ْغَيْيِدَان ْغَيْيِدَان ‘I see a good boy’, only the word ْغَيْيِدَان can be enquired about without difficulty: ْعَايْنَا ِکتابُن ْتَرَأ؟ ‘Which/What boy do you see?’.

41 As Jankowski shows in his study (1987), this analysis based on distribution of the syntagms and its constituents may be insufficient for some syntagms: as an example he uses a Hungarian syntagm composed of a substantive qualified by a participle (a ْلَوْزْجُوْ ْبِمْر ‘l’homme travaillant’), the distribution of which “est équivalente non seulement à la distribution de son constituant principal […] mais aussi à celle de son constituant déterminant subordonné” (1987: 38).
possible question about waladan will be man tarā wa huwa ġayyidun? ‘What can you see that is good?’, i.e. its form is more elaborate or even clumsy.

Thus, as we have shown, at least in some hypotactic syntagms, there is a constituent which (i) cannot be omitted, (ii) lends the syntagm its syntactic properties and (iii) cannot be enquired about or if it can, questions about it (i.e. questions to which it is the answer) are of elaborate form or clumsy. If the syntagm is based on rection, it is the regens. If it is based on concord, it is the attrahent. Let us call it the **representative** of the syntagm\(^{42}\). It seems that it coincides with the qualificatum, not with the qualificator, yet we will return to this question in the context of predicative syntagms in chapter 1.2.1.

Let us now analyse other Arabic expressions, in which identifying the representative seems to be more complicated. Let us consider /14/: 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{šaḥṣ-} & \text{-u-}n \quad \text{wāḥid-} & \text{-u-}n \\
\text{person.M.SI-N} & \quad \text{one.M.SI-N} \\
\text{‘one person’ /14/}.
\end{align*}
\]

Here, either of its constituents can be dropped and a grammatical expression remains, e.g. qāma wāḥidun ‘One has stood up’ or qāma šaḥṣun ‘A person has stood up’. It seems that it is wāḥidun that agrees in gender and number with šaḥṣun and not the other way round. What is more, qāma wāḥidun is rather elliptical (with šaḥṣun understood from the context). Thus, it would be šaḥṣun which is the qualificatum and the representative although its ‘representativeness’ would not be so conspicuous as e.g. in waladun ġayyibun. In /14/, ‘person’ is treated as a quiddity and ‘being one’ is treated as a quality, although this is less evident than it was in the expression waladun ġayyibun.

Let us now consider another Arabic syntagm:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ḥamsat-} & \text{-u} \quad \text{’aṣḥās-} & \text{-i-}n \\
\text{person.} & \quad \text{gender.}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{42}\) Our term “representative” and Kuryłowicz’s “le membre constitutif” used in Kuryłowicz (1960a [1948]) shall not be treated as synonyms. According to Kuryłowicz, in sentences the predicate is “le membre constitutif” but at the same time it is the qualificator (in his terms “le déterminant”). This analysis different from ours results from the fact that Kuryłowicz assumed that the predicate qualifies (determines) the subject and not *vice versa*. This assumption will not be adopted in our work (see discussion in chapter 1.2.1).
Here, there is only one possibility of omission: ra‘aytu ḥamsatan or ra‘aytu l-ḥamsata ‘I saw [the] five’ (with the addition of the suffix -n, or the definite article, respectively; it remains to be seen if this addition is of any importance) but not *Ra‘aytu ’aṣḥāsin. Here, if any of the constituents should be deemed to be the representative, the numeral is the better candidate. Is it then the qualificatum? Is it so that speakers of Arabic first identify the number of something and only then specify what entities they mean? It seems that in order to count something, we need something to count before (and, of course, a counting system). But not in order to think of it or express it. It can be argued that lingually it can be irrelevant whether the representative of a syntagm is an object (person) or its property (being one in number), since one language may use different constructions to express the same state of affairs. Cf. here ’aṣḥāsun ḥamsatun, in analogy to /14/, which is fully synonymous with ḥamsatu ’aṣḥāsin, yet in which it is ’aṣḥāsun that is the representative. This means that in some cases the same thing can be lingually captured in two ways: whether it is ‘person’ multiplied by ‘five’ or ‘five’ multiplied by ‘person’, the output is the same, because a person being two or a set of two in terms of persons is the same.

What changes is only the lingual apprehension of it. The following question arises: in how far do languages have a choice between these two possibilities?

In Polish, a choice analogous to that discussed above seems to be restricted to quantifiers such as numerals or quantifying pronouns, such as oboje ‘both’. Let us start with the quantifier oboje ‘both’. With a proper name, e.g. oboje Kowalscy ‘both Mr and Mrs Kowalski’ the quantifier is the motum, namely the attractum, i.e. it agrees with Kowalscy in case and gender (perhaps one could also speak of concord in number). But with an appellativum, e.g. oboje podróźnych ‘both travellers’, the quantifier is the movent, namely the regens, i.e. it requires that podróźni stand in the genitive case (admittedly, these rules, recommended e.g. in the prescriptive work by Kochański et al. 1989: 197, are not always observed). If motion were to reflect qualification, in the way that the movent is the qualificatum,

---

43 Cf. the discussion for English in Matthews (1981: 154ff).
we would have to say that in one case the range of designation of *oboje*, in the other that of *Kowalscy*, is narrowed. If we prefer to assume that the quantifier *oboje* is, by virtue of its semantics, always the qualifier, then we will have to say that in *oboje Kowalscy* the movent is the qm (*Kowalscy*), while in *oboje Kowalskich* the movent is the qr (*oboje*).

A similar situation can be observed in Polish syntagms with cardinal numerals. The expressions *dwaj podróżni* ‘two travellers’ (the quantifier is the attractum) and *dwóch podróżnych* ‘idem’ (the quantifier is the regens, or at least it seems so) are cases analogous to the above ones. The situation here is, however, more complex, because in the nominative, both directions of motion are possible (either *dwaj podróżni* or *dwóch podróżnych*), in the genitive (*dwóch podróżnych*) the quantifier *dwóch* can be interpreted either as the regens (movent) or as the attractum (motum), in the dative (*dwóm podróżnym*) and instrumental (*dwoma podróżnymi*) only the quantifier is the attractum, *ergo* the motum. (cf. *związki mieszane*, i.e. ‘mixed unions’ in Bąk 1989 [1977]: 382).

In Polish, these are exceptional syntagms, involving words with highly irregular syntax such as numerals (see e.g. Bąk 1989 [1977]: 382). It seems that in Polish this freedom of associating quiddities with qualificata and qualities with qualificators on one hand, or quiddities with qualificators and qualities with qualificata on the other, is possible only in constructions with quantifiers such as numerals or pronouns. In MWA, however, this is possible also with adjectives. In this language, there is a concordial syntagm in which the substantive designating an object is the movent while the adjective is the motum:

```
al-mawaddat-u l-ḥālis-at-u
D-love,F,SI-N  D-pure,F,SI-N
'pure love' /16/
```

The object (‘love’) is here captured as a quiddity and its property (‘purity’) is the quality. Yet in the following expression with rection:

```
ḥālis-u l-mawaddat-i
pure,NG,NN,N  D-love,F,SI-G
'pure love' lit. 'the pure of love' /17/
```
it is the property of ‘purity’ that is captured as a quiddity, while the bearer of this property, viz. ‘love’ is lingually apprehended as a quality.

What are the representatives of these syntagms? In /16/ the representative is al-mawaddatu. When inflected, it determines the morphological form of the adjective. It may also stand alone with l-ḥāliṣatu dropped (the syntactic functions of al-mawaddatu l-ḥāliṣatu and of al-mawaddatu are the same). In /17/ the representative seems to be ḥāliṣu, since it is inflected (laka ḥāliṣu l-mawaddati ‘the pure [of] love is for you’, maʿa ḥāliṣi l-mawaddati ‘with the pure [of] love’, ʿaqṣidu ḥāliṣa l-mawaddati ‘I mean the pure [of] love’) while l-mawaddati remains unchanged. However, this representative is not ‘complete’, since we cannot say laka l-ḥāliṣu ‘for you [the] pure’ (with the necessary addition of the article). Such an expression is non-grammatical even if an ellipsis is intended (with l-mawaddati understood from the context). Despite this restriction, it is ḥāliṣu which is the representative in /17/. It is also justified to treat this word as the qualificatum.

Similarly to examples /16/ and /17/, in Arabic one can say:

\[ al\text{-}mumāṭḥilat\text{-}u \text{ l-}‘afḍal\text{-}u \]
D-actress.F.SI-N D-best.NG.NN-N

‘the best actress’ /18/.

which in terms of motion is analogous to al-mawaddatu l-ḥāliṣatu in /16/, or

\[ ‘afḍalu \text{ mumāṭḥilatin} \]
best.NG.NN-N actress.F.SI-G

‘the best actress’, lit. ‘the best [of] actress’ /19/

which in terms of motion is analogous to ḥāliṣu l-mawaddati in /17/. Here, too, ‘afḍalu is not a full representative: it rather cannot stand alone (since raʾaytu l-‘afḍala ‘I saw the best [one]’ has a non-feminine meaning). Despite this restriction, it is ‘afḍalu which is the representative in /19/. It is also justified to treat this word as the qualificatum.

The fact that MWA has a capability of expressing an object as a quality and its property as a quiddity, can be additionally demonstrated with the use of the interrogative pronoun ʿayy- (with feminine nouns usually ʿayyat-
is used), which is used for enquiring about a property of an entity. In Polish, an interrogative pronoun is used which morphosyntactically behaves like an adjective in that it agrees with the substantive (denoting the entity about whose property it enquires) in gender, number and case (e.g.: *jaki chłopiec?* ‘what boy?’ *jaka dziewczyna?* ‘what girl?’). Yet the Arabic *'ayy-* behaves like a substantive which requires the genitive case from the substantive, e.g.:

*'ayy-u rağul-i-n?*  
‘what man?’ /20/

The above expression can be translated literally as ‘what of man?’ rather than ‘what man?’.

Similar, though not identical, situations can be found in English, e.g. *a devil of a man* and in French, e.g. *un si drôle de nom* (Jespersen 1965 [1924]: 99). Such constructions are, according to Mel’čuk, ‘quite productive’ in Sardinian: *una ruja de mákkina* ‘a red car’, *sa manna de ampulla* ‘the big bottle’ (Mel’čuk 2003: 30)\(^{44}\). In French there are similar syntagms with possessive pronouns, exemplified by *la mienne de lampe*\(^{45}\), which native speakers class as a “populaire” and emphatic equivalent of the more frequent *ma lampe à moi*.

So far we have been trying to show that language expressions (being components of the lingual world) do not have to reflect in only one way the relations between objects and properties that can be predicated of these objects (being relations of the extralingual world). We will assume that the same content in terms of objects, their properties and relations between them (all being components of the extralingual world) can be expressed in various ways in various languages and even within one and the same language. In Arabic, as we have showed, the meaning ‘persons’ being ‘five in number’, can be expressed by identifying the object (‘persons’) as a quiddity and then associating it with its number as a quality, or by first identifying the number as a quiddity, and then characterizing it with what is counted as a quality. Similarly, if an Arabic speaker intends to express the

\(^{44}\) Not confirmed by a Sardinian native speaker consulted.

meaning ‘the best actress’, he may choose between /18/ and /19/, i.e. between *al-mumattilatu l-’afdalu*, with *mumattilat-* ‘actress’ as quiddity, and *’afdalu mumattilatin*, with *’afdalu* ‘the best’ as quiddity. Which of the two fragments of the extralingual reality, ‘the best’ or ‘actress’, will be designated by the qualificatum may be conditioned by some particular factors. These factors may be of cognitive, pragmatic, stylistic, or even rhythmic character.

1.1.6. Phrasal qualification

Qualification is not restricted to qualification between words. It may also obtain between syntagms and words or between syntagms and syntagms. Thus, e.g. in the expression *kitābun mumti’un giiddan* ‘a very interesting book’, apart from the qualification between words, we can establish qualification between the word *kitābun* ‘book’ and the syntagm *mumti’un giiddan* ‘very interesting’ (Cf. the concept of *phrasal determination* in Bańczerowski 1993: 7-8).

The idea of qualification between syntagms and words seems very useful for describing the syntax of MWA. For instance, constructions involving the so-called ‘indefinite attribute’, which we will term a ‘sententioid syntagm’, will turn out to be describable only in terms of this relation (see discussion in chapter 5.4.).

It should also be added that syntagms could also be interpreted as going beyond the scope of a sentence. E.g. between ‘king’ and ‘reign’ of the two sentences *This is a good king. During his reign the country thrived* a relationship of qualification could be determined. Such ‘distant syntagms’, however, will not be dealt with in this study.

1.1.7. Paratactic constituents

In our work we will not discuss issues related to parataxis. Let us, however, mention some basic problems which will be disregarded here. Before, we should point out that paratactic syntagms will manifest
properties suggesting that, for instance, in graphic representations of the qualificational structure of an utterance comprising them they could be treated as single inseparable units (Bańczerowski et al. 1982: 243).

**Paratactically bound adjectives qualifying one substantive**

Two properties being expressed by means of paratactically bound adjectives can be assigned to two entities, which can be expressed by means of one substantive, e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fi buldān-i} & \quad \xi-\text{šarq-ayni} \quad l'-\text{awsaṭ-i} \quad \text{wa} \quad l'-\text{adnā} \\
\text{in countries NH.PL-G} & \quad \text{D-east M.DU.G} \quad \text{D-middle M.SI-G} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{D-near M.SI-G} \\
\text{‘in the countries of the Middle and Near East’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 47) /21/}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fi buldāni} & \quad \xi-\text{šarqi} \quad l'-\text{adnā} \quad \text{wa} \quad l'-\text{awsaṭi} \\
\text{in countries NH.PL-G} & \quad \text{D-east M.SI.G} \quad \text{D-near M.SI.G} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{D-middle M.SI-G} \\
\text{‘in the countries of the Near and Middle East’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 55) /22/}
\end{align*}
\]

The word aš-šārqa ‘the East’, as it can be seen, may be either dual, as in /21/ (which is considered to be more correct) or singular, as in /22/. In the former construction concord in number between the adjectives and the substantive can be determined only *ad sensum*, i.e. the quantity of the singular adjectives must be taken into consideration, and then, as being two, the ‘logical’ concord becomes visible. In /22/, each adjective agrees in number with the qualified substantive separately.

Compare also the following example, where again two entities are expressed in one word (š-ša‘bī), qualified by paratactically bound adjectives expressing separate properties (‘Kuwaiti’ and ‘Palestinian’), One adjective expresses a property shared by these entities (‘Muslim’):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{li mašā‘ir-i} & \quad \xi-\text{ša‘b-i} \quad l-\text{kwaytiyy-i} \quad \text{wa} \quad l-\text{filastīniyy-i} \quad l-\text{muslim-i} \\
\text{for feelings NH.PL-G} & \quad \text{D-people M.SI-G} \quad \text{D-Kuwaiti M.SI-G} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{D-Palestinian M.SI-G D-Muslim M.SI-G} \\
\text{‘for the feelings of the [two] Muslim peoples, the Kuwaiti and the Palestinian’ (Riyād 21/4/04, 1,\textit{Al-islāmiyya l-kwaytiyya}... instead of š-ša‘bayni... l-muslimayni} /23/.
\end{align*}
\]

We will not be interested in how paratactic adjectives are linked to one another. The question whether and when they are linked syndetically will not concern us in the present study.
Paratactically bound substantives qualified by one adjective

We will not be concerned with syntagms in which there is one adjectival qualifier that qualifies a qualificatum composed of two paratactically bound substantives. This happens, for instance, if one property is assigned to two or more entities:

\[
\text{ṣundūq-i n-naqd-i wa l-bank-i d-duwaliyyayni}
\]


‘the International Monetary Fund and World Bank’ lit. ‘the Fund of the International Money and Bank’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 11, Dawru Miṣra l-fāʻi lu...) /24/.

Here, the adjective does not form a syntagm with \(\text{ṣundūqi } [...]\) \(\text{d-duwaliyyayni}\) nor \(\text{l-banki } [...]\) \(\text{d-duwaliyyani}\) but only with both of them at the same time: \(\text{ṣundūqi } [...]\) \(\text{wa l-banki d-duwaliyyayni}\).

Paratactically bound substantives may be of different gender. If they designate human beings and are qualified by one adjective, the adjective has the masculine gender, e.g.:

\[
\text{mina l-‘abṭāl-i wa l-‘abtalāt-i l-‘arbiyy-ina}
\]


‘against the Western heroes and heroines’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 52) /25/.

This and related questions will not be taken into consideration in the description and the typology of the adjectival syntagms in this study.

1.2. Some difficulties related to the notion of qualification

Before discussing two more specific issues that require a more precise treatment, a few general difficulties will be presented here. The first one concerns the problem of identifying attribution in some Arabic texts as intended by their authors. This, in some conditions, may not be easy, for instance if two adjectives of the same gender and number (or of non-human and feminine gender, which are formally identical) follow a substantive qualified by another substantive in the same gender and number (or of non-human and feminine gender) in the genitive case, as in:
Here, only from lexical considerations is qualification recognizable because an alternative reading ‘for the solution of the questions of the other problematic region’, although syntactically possible, makes little sense. In the next example, two readings are possible, for the reason mentioned above but also due to uncertainty about the inflectional ending on the adjective, which is not marked in writing. Thus, one reading is:

\[ \text{'ayyām-u l-ḡīhād-i wa n-nafy-i wa l-fidā‘-i l-maḡid-at-u} \]

‘the glorious days of struggle, exile and sacrifice’ (Karnak 46) /27/

with the adjective in the nominative and qualifying ‘ayyāmu ‘days’. The second reading is with the adjective in the genitive l-maḡidat-ī, qualifying the three paratactically bound substantives in the genitive. The entire expression means then ‘and the days of the glorious struggle, [glorious] exile and [glorious] sacrifice’. Semantics does not favour either of the readings, both are equally acceptable.

Another issue is that if we are dealing with sentences, there can happen expressions which qualify the whole sentence rather than only the predicate (cf. Kuryłowicz (1960a [1948]: 38). E.g. in ‘innahu muta‘aḥḥirun bi sababi ḏ-ṣabābī ‘He is late because of the fog’ it is not certain whether the PP bi sababi ḏ-ṣabābī ‘because of the fog’ qualifies the adjective muta‘aḥḥirun ‘late’ or the whole sentence, i.e. the qualification obtains between the PP as qr and the predicative syntagm ʿinnahu muta‘aḥḥirun. It is justified to say that it qualifies both the adjective and the sentence. Yet if we take a similar construction which is not predicative, e.g. lumtu raḡulan muta‘aḥḥiran bi sababi ḏ-ṣabābī ‘I reproached a man [who was] late because of the fog’, then the PP clearly qualifies the adjective muta‘aḥḥiran. Therefore we will assume that such PPs qualify the predicate adjectives in sentences. The qualification of the whole sentence, being phrasal, will not concern us here. However, it will be necessary to assume that the sentence as a whole is
qualified in cases with adverbials qualifying sentences without an adjectival or a verbal predicate, e.g.:

\[
\text{lā ḥaqq-ā} \quad \text{qānūniyy-ā-n} \quad \text{li ʿIsrāʾil-ā}
\]


‘there is no right legally for Israel’ (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 1, Yahūdū Libiyā...) /28/.

1.2.1. Qualification between the subject and the basic predicate

The establishing of the fact that the relationship between the subject and the predicate in predicative syntagms is a specific type of union between words can be traced back to Aristotle, who, in his logic, distinguished between subject (hypokeímenon) and predicate (katēgoroúmenon) (Heinz 1983: 31). Grammatically, the distinction of these two functions in terms of syntax was ‘foreshadowed’ in the works of Apollonius (Robins 1974: 37). This relation is doubtless of a specific nature and is tightly linked to the construction of a sentence (cf. Bańczerowski et al. 1982: 297).

The subject and the predicate form a composite sign, therefore one can speak of predicative syntagms as syntagms in which one constituent is the subject and the other is the predicate. The question of the relation between both constituents within a predicative syntagm has been subjected to much debate, especially in terms of its similarity with or difference from attributive syntagms. For Jespersen, between the substantive and its attribute, as in a barking dog, there is the same subordination as between the subject and its predicate, as in the dog barks (1965 [1924]: 97). Also according to Kuryłowicz

“le sujet (la) rose est déterminé par le prédicat est rouge, tout comme dans le groupe la rose rouge le substantif (la) rose est déterminé par l’attribut (adjectif épithète) rouge. Ensuite la subordination de rouge par rapport à (la) rose est la même dans le groupe et dans la proposition” (1960a [1948]: 37).

Such an interpretation is also assumed in Bańczerowski (1993: 16) where one reads: “[...] it is obvious that the relation of predication [...] is reducible to the relation of determination (viz. qualification – MM)”. In Bańczerowski’s theory, the predicate qualifies the subject (cf.
This is also assumed in Pogonowski (1993: 62) and in most traditional grammars of Polish (cf. Bąk 1989 [1977]: 375). Also in the present study, we will treat the subject as the qualificatum of its predicate.

The view presented above and assumed for the purpose of our study is not held by all linguists. According to Tesnière (1966 [1959]: 102-103), for instance, the subject depends on the verb, which is the ‘régissant’ of the entire verb phrase. From this, in connection with Tesnière’s opinion that “le sens du subordonné porte sur celui du régissant dont il dépend” (1966 [1959]: 42), it could be perhaps inferred that the subject qualifies the verb. Yet another opinion is represented by Trubetzkoy (1939), who writes: “nous doutons fort que le sujet et le prédicat puissent être considérés comme déterminé et déterminant” (1939: 75). He adduces “exemples qui prouvent que dans les langues de structures les plus différents le rapport entre sujet et prédicat n’est pas conçu comme un rapport entre déterminé et déterminant” (1939: 76). Consequently, he distinguishes predicative syntagms as a particular type, along with determinative syntagms and sociative syntagms (in our terminology: hypotactic and paratactic syntagms, respectively). He is followed by Seiler (1960), who goes even further and says that a sentence, when stripped of its subject (e.g. Cato dixit > dixit), does not cease to be a sentence, while a syntagm, when stripped of one of its constituents, does cease to be a syntagm (1960: 9f). As he observes, the existence of a sentence is independent from the existence of both subject and predicate and consequently, it should be inferred, in his view a sentence does not have to be a syntagm at all. Also Safarewicz (1971a) represents the view that a sentence cannot be spoken of in terms of qualification (in his terminology determination). According to him, a syntagm (he uses the equivalent term group) is a “complete structure which consists of two terms combined by means of a relation of determination or apposition”. A sentence, in turn, is “a complete structure which comprises an indicator of the judgement” (1971a: 47, translation – MM).46 “By the

---

46 This approach, based on the distinction of structures with a formal indicator of the judgement and without it was criticized by Kuryłowicz (1971 [1949]), who argued for a functional criterion rather than a formal one in distinguishing groups, i.e. non-sentential syntagms, from sentences. In fact, the existence of the judgment component, i.e. assertion concerning a state of affairs, is frequently adduced as the defining element of the sentence. For Gätje (1973), a sentence (a predicative construction) was a construction
middle of the twentieth century”, says Matthews, “it was common to see neither subjects nor verb as subordinate” (2007: 15-16). Matthews adduces the analyses of Harris (1951, chapter 16), in which the equal or symmetrical status of these two constituents was at least implied. Similarly, the analysis of the sentence/utterance by Chomsky (1957: 26) into an NP and a VP is, as Matthews suggests, an analysis without a head (i.e. with NP and VP being equal).

Let us now analyse a basic predicative syntagm, i.e. one with no verb such as kāna ‘to be’ or laysa ‘not to be’, with respect to the three criteria we have applied for non-predicative hypotactic syntagms, i.e. (i) the omissibility of one of the constituents, (ii) the capability of one of the constituents to lend the syntagm its syntactic properties, and (iii) the ease with which a constituent can be enquired about. Since we are interested in adjectival syntagms, only such will be subjected to this analysis. Let al-muhādaratu ṣa’batun ‘The lecture is difficult’ be our example. It is a nominal sentence, with an adjective functioning as the predicate and with no verb such as kāna ‘to be’. It is evident, that the two first criteria cannot be applied to this type syntagm without difficulty: neither of the constituent can be dropped. The second test reflects somehow the results of the first one. Attributive syntagms were subjected to it by being inserted into ‘frames’ within which one could determine which syntactic functions a constituents can have. Sentences can be used in some syntactic functions and are then called clauses. Let us then try to replace clauses by either of the constituents of the basic predicative syntagm analysed here. We will see that Qultu ’inna l-muhādarata ṣa’batun ‘I said that the lecture was difficult’ cannot be reduced either to *Qultu ’inna l-muhādarata ‘I said that the lecture’ or to *Qultu ’inna ṣa’batun ‘I said that difficult’. Thus, neither

where the judgment (‘Urteil’) was combined with a truth assumption (‘Wahrheitsanspruch’, p. 22), while in attributive constructions this judgement is only, but always, potential – it is assumed by the speaker to be already made or capable of being made (‘das Urteil als bereits gefällt oder als fällbar’, 1973: 21). Also for Bossong (1979: 34), in hypotaxis (“Determinativrelation”) the assertion is blocked (“Assertionsblockierung”) but, as he puts it, the Assertabilitätsfaktor is presupposed. These approaches evoke the Port Royal grammar, in which attributive adjectives were described as those that can always be transformed into predicates of relative clauses. However, Bolinger in (1967) showed that such a transformation is not always possible (cf. the main reason, which cannot be rephrased as *The reason which is main (1967: 2).
of the constituents represents the predicative syntagm in this regard\(^\text{47}\). The third test, that of asking questions about each constituent, gives the following results: when enquiring about the subject, the question *māḍā ᵇa‘bun?* ‘What is difficult?’ or more frequently *mā huwa š-ša‘bu* ‘What is [the] difficult?’ can be used. When enquiring about the predicate, the question *kayfa l-muḥāḍaratu?* ‘What is the lecture like?’ can be used. It can thus be said that either of the constituents of the predicative syntagm can be enquired about with the same ease.

In conclusion, it appears that in all three tests neither of the constituents of a predicative syntagm showed itself to be more suitable for a representative of the syntagm than the other. The features of predicative syntagms showed in the three tests conducted above distinguish them from non-predicative, including attributive, syntagms.

Let us now try to identify the mph indicators in the predicative syntagm, at the example of *al-muḥāḍaratu ᵇa‘batun*. The predicate agrees with the subject in number and gender. The subject is the movent, scil. attrahent, and the situation resembles that of attributive syntagms, where the qualified substantive is also the attrahent (cf. *al-muḥāḍaratu š-ša‘batu* ‘the difficult lecture’). But should the question of the state of the subject be raised, then the predicate could be interpreted as the movent: the notion of rection was based on the requirement by one constituent that its co-constituent must have a specific category, different than its own. Since the subject in an MWA sentence has always to be definite (exceptions are rare in Classical Arabic and almost absent in MWA), while the predicate does not, one could venture to say that the predicate governs the definite state of the subject. Then, it would be justified to treat the predicate as the movent (regent)\(^\text{48}\). We, however, will not assume this analysis.

Moreover, one should note that both constituents of a predicative syntagm, as long as no ‘external’ regents are at work, are in the same case: the nominative. This coincidence of cases should not be interpreted as

---

\(^{47}\) Cf. Bloomfield’s statement that “[...] *John ran* is neither a nominative expression (like *John*) nor a finite verb expression (like *ran*)” (1933: 194).

\(^{48}\) There are other hypotactic syntagms in which a specific property with respect to the category of state is required to be expressed in a constituent. Here one could think of accusatival qualificators such as the adjectival adverbial or the so-called *tamyīz*-substantive qualifying an adjective. In our work, however, we will assume that rection only concerns the category of case.
concord, since it is too easily abolished because ‘external’ regents can change the case of the subject to the accusative, e.g. ʾanna l-muḥādaratā ṣaʿbatun ‘that the lecture is difficult’. However, the case of the predicate always remains the nominative. In syntagms with prepositional phrases functioning as predicates, e.g. li l-mudīrī gāzīlu š-šukrī ‘Many thanks to the director’, the predicate again must stand in a particular case, viz. in the genitive after the preposition. Therefore we will assume that in basic predicative syntagms the subject governs the case of the predicate (of course, only if the latter is a noun)\(^\text{49}\). By contrast, the case of the subject will be treated as its ‘default case’ resulting from the absence of any regens. If, however, the subject is preceded by ʾinna or another particle of this kind, its case could be said to be governed by the particle.

1.2.2. Qualificator qualifying more than one qualificatum

Let us here discuss one of the postulates proposed by Bańczerowski for his theory of qualification, which is as follows:


It seems, however, that in some constructions one word might be interpreted as qualifying two qualificata. E.g. in the following example:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{ʾinna} & \text{Husni ʿAllām} & \text{rağaʾa} & \text{mina l-ḥārīg-i} & \text{sakrān-a} \\
\text{that} & \text{H.A.M.A} & \text{returned from} & \text{D-outdoors,M.SI-G} & \text{drunk,M.SI-A.I} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘that Husni Allam returned from outside drunk’ (Mir 75)/32/

\(^{49}\) This question was also discussed by classical Arab grammarians, who looked for the cause of the subject and its nominal predicate both being in the nominative case (Arabic ʾarf). Two opposite hypotheses were elaborated by them. One, attributed to the Kūfī school of grammar, proposed the tarāfuʿ, which can be rendered in English as ‘mutual nominative rection’. The opposite view, represented by the Bašrān school, advocated the ʿibtidāʿ-explanation, according to which the nominative case on both subject (mubtadaʿ) and nominal predicate (ḥabar) was due to “the lack of any phonetically representable governing element, which amounts to a governing element devoid of phonetical representation” (Bohas et al. 1990: 60; a discussion of this problem can be found there, pp. 60-72 ).
the adjective *sakrāna* ‘drunk’ might be taken as the qualifier of both the subject *Husnī ‘Allām* and the verb *rağ'a'a* ‘returned’. This construction will be discussed in more detail in chapter 5.2.5.

### 1.3. Syntagmal properties and syntagmal dimensions

Syntagms can be characterized by properties which will be termed *syntagmal properties*. In order to carry out a categorization of the biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms and to present a typology of them, we will take into account a certain set of the syntagmal properties. Syntagmal properties which can be reasonably compared with one another, i.e. are of the same nature, or homogeneous, belong together and can be grouped in sets called *syntagmal dimensions* (i.e. parameters). Every syntagmal dimension should contain the property Indefinibility since at times it may be impossible to decide which property a particular syntagm takes. A syntagm will be said to show this property with respect to a certain dimension if it cannot be characterized by any other property of this dimension. Let us now go on to discuss the syntagmal dimensions we propose for the purpose of our typology of biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms in MWA.

#### 1.3.1. Dimension 1. Qualificational status of the adjective

The dimension of *qualificational status of the adjective* shall reflect the distinction between syntagms with an adjectival qm, those with an adjectival qr and those with both adjectival qr and qm. Syntagms in which the adjective is the qualifier will be termed *Adj-qualificatorial*, or simply *Adj-qualificatorial*. For instance, the syntagm in /33/ is an Adj-qualificatorial syntagm:

---

50 The better shaped term ‘syntagmatic’ is used in the linguistic tradition in another sense, as opposed to ‘paradigmatic’, and cannot be employed here.
The term 'long-term' /3/.

The property of being an Adj-qualificatorial syntagm will be called **Adj-qualificatoriality**. In turn, in the syntagm in /34/,

\[ \text{tawîl-u} \quad \text{l-}'aḡal-i \]


‘long-termed’ lit. ‘long of term’ /34/

the adjective is the qualificatum. Such sytagms will be termed **Adj-qualificatal**, or **Adj-qualificatal**. The property of being an Adj-qualificatal sytagm will be called **Adj-qualificatality**. Syntagms with both adjectival qualificator and adjectival qualificatum will be termed **bi-adjectival**. The property of being a bi-adjectival syntagm will be called **Bi-adjectivality**. A bi-adjectival syntagm is exemplified in /35/:

\[ \text{ḏâhib-u-n} \quad \text{sari‘-a-n} \]

going.M.SI-N-I quick.NG.NN-A-I

‘going quickly’ /35/

Thus, with respect to the dimension in question, every adjectival syntagm will take one of the following properties:

(Adj-qualificatoriality, Adj-qualificatality, Bi-adjectivality, ...)

### 1.3.2. Dimension 2. Partiorative membership of the co-constituent of the adjective

The dimension of **partiorative**\(^{51}\) **membership of the co-constituent of the adjective** permits adjectival syntagms to be characterized with respect to the part of speech to which the co-constituent of its adjectival constituent belongs. Adjectival syntagms may take one of the following properties:

---

\(^{51}\) The term ‘partiorative’ means ‘related to the parts of speech’ (from Latin *partes orationis*).
It is evident, that syntagms showing Bi-adjectivality with respect to Dimension 1 will always show the property of Co-constituency with Adj with respect to Dimension 2.

1.3.3. Dimension 3. Intracategory differentiation of the adjectival constituent

The category of adjective is divided into two major subcategories, elative and positive (for a discussion see chapter 2.3.4.). To which of these two subcategories the adjectival constituent of a syntagm belongs will be reflected in the dimension of intracategory differentiation of the adjectival constituent.

Syntagms having an elative as its qm will show Elatival qualificatality. Syntagms having an elative as their qr will show Elatival qualificatoriality. Syntagms having a positive adjective as their qm will show Positival qualificatality. Syntagms having a positive adjective as their qr will show Positival qualificatoriality.

Bi-adjectival syntagms will be characterized with respect to the intracategory differentiation of their qm and qr, which are both adjectives. Thus, the following properties will be added to this dimension: Elatival qualificatality with elatival qualificatoriality, Positival qualificatality with positival qualificatoriality, Elatival qualificatality with positival qualificatoriality, Positival qualificatality with elatival qualificatoriality.

Consequently, the dimension will contain the following properties:

(Elatival qualificatality, Positival qualificatality, Elatival qualificatality, Positival qualificatoriality, Elatival qualificatality, Elatival qualificatality with elatival qualificatoriality, Positival qualificatality with positival qualificatoriality, Elatival qualificatality with positival qualificatoriality, Positival qualificatality with elatival qualificatoriality, ...)

Positive adjectives can be further subdivided into participial adjectives, i.e. positive adjectives that are participles, and non-participial adjectives,
i.e. the remaining positive adjectives. The former can be divided into passive participial adjectives and active participial adjectives. Both active and passive participial adjectives are divisible into those derived from transitive verbs and those derived from intransitive verbs. However, this further characterization of positival adjectives will not be used in our typology of syntagms.

1.3.4. Dimension 4. Kind of morphological indicators

The dimension of kind of morphological indicators concerns the intrasyntagmal relations between the constituents. The two constituents can be bound to form a syntagm in various ways (cf. the two types of motion distinguished earlier). The fact that the constituents of a syntagm are bound by rection or concord accounts for saying that this syntagm has the property of Rectionality or Concordiality, respectively. In order to reflect various kinds of rection and concord, various kinds of rectionality and concordiality will be distinguished for this dimension. Some syntagms will show more than one kind of concord or concord with rection simultaneously. For these reasons, corresponding syntagmal properties will be added. This dimension will also contain the property of Lexico-junctionality, which will characterize syntagms based on lexical junction. Thus, every adjectival syntagm may have one of the following properties:

{Prepositional-rectionality,
Nominativo-rectionality,
Accusativo-rectionality,
Genitivo-rectionality,
Gender-concordiality,
State-, gender-, number- and case-concordiality,
State-, gender- and number-concordiality,
State-, gender- and case-concordiality,
State-, number- and case-concordiality,
State- and case-concordiality,

---

52 In Bańczerowski (1988: 54) the term semantic connexity is used to denote this relation.
Gender- and number-concordiality,
Nominativo-rectionality with gender- and number-concordiality
Prepositional-rectionality with gender- and number concordiality,
Accusativo-rectionality with gender-concordiality,
Accusativo-rectionality with gender- and number-concordiality,
Lexico-junctionality, ...}

Examples:

dahabū musriʿīna ‘[they (masc.)] departed, hurrying’ is a syntagm showing Accusativo-rectionality with gender-and number-concordiality.
al-baytu kabīrun ‘the house [is] large’ is a syntagm showing Nominativo-rectionality with gender- and number-concordiality.

Hypotactic syntagms may be compared with one another as to whether their qualificata are movents or mota. Since in all syntagms analysed in our study the qualificatum turns out to be always the movent, there is no possibility of differentiating them in that regard.

Syntagms can also be compared with one another with respect to the extent in which their mph indicators show their coherence. Thus, for instance, one can speak of a stronger coherence if a syntagm shows rectionality and concord simultaneously and of a weaker coherence if a syntagms shows only rectionality.

1.3.5. Dimension 5. Linear order of the constituents

With respect to the dimension of linear order of the constituents, one can distinguish syntagms in which the qualificatum linearly precedes the qualifier and syntagms in which the qualifier linearly precedes the qualificatum. The former will be called Qm-fronted syntagms, the latter – Qr-fronted syntagms. Thus, the dimension contains the following properties:

(Qm-frontedness, Qr-frontedness, ...)
Examples:

*kitābun muhimmun* ‘an important book’ is a Qm-fronted syntagm;

*muğaddadan qāla* ‘again he said’ is a Qr-fronted syntagm.

In our typology, syntagms will be characterized with respect to this dimension depending on how they were used in the texts of the corpus analysed by us. However, each syntagm could also be described in terms of obligatory and optional linear order of its constituents. The dimension of linear order would then require a modification.

### 1.3.6. Dimension 6. Linear contiguity of the constituents

The dimension of **linear contiguity of the constituents** reflects the possibility or necessity of inserting a word between the two constituents of a syntagm and thus making it linearly discontiguous. The following properties will be distinguished:

(Obligatory contiguity, Optional discontiguity, Obligatory discontiguity, ...)

Examples:

Obligatory contiguity: *ṭawīlu l-‘aḡali* ‘long-term’ lit. ‘long of term’,

Optional discontiguity: *‘arḥaṣu minhu* ‘cheaper than it’,

Obligatory discontiguity: *kitābu* [...] *l-muhimmu* ‘the important book’. In this syntagm the word *kitābu* has no suffix expressing indefiniteness, wherefore it must have a substantival qualificator in the genitive case following it directly, e.g. *kitābu* [l-‘ustādī] *l-muhimmu* ‘[the professor’s] important book’.

If a syntagm could be classed as optionally discontiguous by virtue of the possibility of inserting a paratactic co-constituent of the qr between the qm and the qr, we will not consider it discontiguity. E.g.:

*silāh-u-n  bālīq-u l-quwwat-i  wa t-ta’ʃr-i*


‘weapon of extreme power and impact’ lit. ‘weapon extreme of power and impact’ (Hayāt 2/08/07, 6, Al-‘Īhwānū) /36/
The syntagm bālīgu t-ta’īri will not be considered discontiguous, neither optionally nor obligatorily, because its discontiguity is caused or can be caused only by a paratactic co-constituent of the qr.

When characterizing syntagms, we will not be interested in how distant their discontiguity can be. It will only be signalled that discontiguity is possible. The permissible distance between the constituents of a syntagm, which may be of one or more words, should be the object of a separate study.

1.3.7. Dimension 7. Syntactic function of the adjective in statu qualificatoris

Every adjectival syntagm can be characterized with respect to the syntactic function of its adjectival qualifier. Thus, the dimension of syntactic function of the adjective in statu qualificatoris will be proposed here. The properties concerning the syntactic function of the adjective in statu qualificatoris, e.g. functioning as attribute, extended predicate etc., will be extended so as to refer to syntagms.

Since the subject does not qualify any other word in a sentence, in other words, it is the qualificatum absolutum (cf. Bańczerowski et al. 1982: 247 and 270), dimension 7 will not contain the property of Qr-subjectivity. The same holds for what we will refer to as a ‘subjectoid’, which is the qualificatum absolutum in a ‘sententioid syntagm’ (cf. chapter 5.4).

The dimension proposed here shall contain the following properties:

\{Qr-attributivity\[^53\], Qr-basic predicativity, Qr-extended predicativity, Qr-secondary predicativity, Qr-exclamative predicativity, Qr-predicatoidity\[^54\], Qr-direct objectivity, Qr-indirect objectivity, Qr-internal objectivity, Qr-adverbiality, ...

[^53]: Qr-attributivity does not refer only to adjectives qualifying in adjectival attribution as presented in chapter 3.1.1.1. It also refers to adjectives qualifying as genitive attributes, discussed in chapter 5.1.1.2.

[^54]: The term Qr-predicatoidity means that the adjective in statu qualificatoris is the predicatoid. The latter is discussed in chapter 5.4. devoted to the construction which we term a sententioid syntagm (SS).
Examples:

baytun kabîrun ‘a large house’ is a syntagm showing Qr-attributivity, since the adjective which is the qualificator functions as an attribute in adjectival attribution;

ḥayru [l-birri] ʿāgiluhu ‘the best [of charity is] the quick [of] it’ is a syntagm showing Qr-predicativity, since the adjective which is the qualificator functions as the predicate;

ṭawîlu l-ʾaḡali ‘long-term’, lit. ‘long of term’ takes the property Indefinibility with respect to this dimension since it is a syntagm with no adjective in statu qualificatoris.

1.3.8. Dimension 8. Syntactic function of the adjective in statu qualificati

The dimension of syntactic function of the adjective in statu qualificati to be presented here will in many respects be similar to Dimension 7, with the difference that it will allow us to class adjectival syntagms with respect to the syntactic function of its adjectival qualificatum. The properties concerning the syntactic function of the adjective in statu qualificati, e.g. functioning as attribute, extended predicate etc., will be extended so as to refer to syntagms.

Adjectives may function as subjects and subjectoids55. Words with these syntactic functions can be qualificata, thus, in contrast do Dimension 7, the dimension will contain two additional properties, that of Qm-subjectivity and that of Qm-subjectoidity.

In order for a syntagm to be characterized with respect to Dimension 8, it is necessary to establish what syntactic function its adjective in statu qualificati has. In most cases, namely with the exception of syntagms with their qualificata being subjects or subjectoids, this can be made only by taking into consideration the qualificatum of the syntagm which is ‘left-overlapping’ with respect to the syntagm to be characterized. (We introduced this term at the end of chapter 1.1.2. Let us recall here that the qr of syntagm_1 which is ‘left-overlapping’ with respect to syntagm_2 is the

55 A subjectoid is the qualificatum within the sententioid syntagm, discussed in chapter 5.4.
qm of syntagm). Thus, the syntagmal properties of Dimension 8 are properties going beyond the scope of a particular biconstituent syntagm. The latter statement does not concern syntagms the qualificata of which are subjects or subjectoids: their qualificata are never *in statu qualificatoris* in other syntagms, therefore such syntagms do not have ‘left-overlapping syntagms’.

The dimension proposed here shall contain the following properties:

\{Qm-attributivity\^[56], Qm-basic predicativity, Qm-extended predicativity, Qm-secondary predicativity, Qm-exclamative predicativity, Qm-predicatoidity, Qm-direct objectivity, Qm-indirect objectivity, Qm-internal objectivity, Qm-adverbiality, Qm-subjectivity, Qm-subjectoidity, ...\}

Examples:

\[\text{istiṭmārun}\ tawīlu l-ʔaḡali} ‘[a] long-term [investment]’, lit. ‘[an investment] long of term’ takes the property Qm-attributivity since it is a syntagm with the adjective *in statu qualificati* which in the left-overlapping syntagm (\text{istiṭmārun}, \text{tawīlu}) functions as the attribute of the word \text{istiṭmārun}.

\[\text{ḥayru l-birri} [‘āḡiluhu] ‘the best of charity [is the quick of it]’ takes the property of Qm-subjectivity, since its qm, \text{ḥayru}, functions as the subject.

1.3.9. Dimension 9. Degree of the requiredness of the qualifier of the adjective

The dimension of **degree of the requiredness of the qualifier of the adjective** permits us to characterize adjectival syntagms in terms of the degree to which a qualifier of the adjective is obligatory or only optional. Only adjectivo-qualificatal and bi-adjectival will take a definite property with respect to this dimension, while adjectivo-qualificatorial...

\^[56] Qm-attributivity does not refer only to adjectives used in adjectival attribution as presented in chapter 3.1.1.1. It also refers to adjectives used as genitive attributes, discussed in chapter 5.1.1.2.
syntagms will always take the property of Indefinibility. Similarly to Dimension 8, the syntagmal properties of Dimension 7 are properties going beyond the scope of a particular biconstituent syntagm, because the degree of the requiredness of the qualifier of the adjective can be established only by taking into consideration its left-overlapping syntagm. (Let us recall here that the qr of syntagm₁ which is ‘left-overlapping’ with respect to syntagm₂ is the qm of syntagm₂).

For the present dimension, we will propose the following properties:

\{Optional qm-qualifiedness, Obligatory qm-qualifiedness, ...\}

A syntagm that shows **Optional qm-qualifiedness** is an adjectivo-qualificatal or a bi-adjectival syntagm from which the qualifier can be removed, without its left-overlapping syntagm being thus made non-grammatical. E.g. [ar-raḡulu] ṭ-tawīlū l-qāmatī ‘[the man] tall of height’ is a syntagm showing Optional qm-qualifiedness because its qualifier, l-qāmatī ‘of height’, can be removed without making its left-overlapping syntagm, viz. ar-raḡulu ṭ-tawīlū ‘the tall man’, non-grammatical. Removing the qualifier of a syntagm may cause a change in the meaning of its left-overlapping syntagm. However, we will not take this into consideration.

A syntagm that shows **Obligatory qm-qualifiedness** is an adjectivo-qualificatal or a bi-adjectival syntagm from which the qualifier cannot be removed, without its left-overlapping syntagm being thus made non-grammatical. Thus e.g. the syntagm [ar-raḡulu] l-kaṭīru l-māli lit. ‘[the man] abundant in wealth’, i.e. ‘a wealthy man’ shows Obligatory qm-qualifiedness since if its qualifier, l-māli ‘[of] wealth’, was removed, its left-overlapping syntagm would be non-grammatical, cf. *ar-raḡulu l-kaṭīru.

Dimension 9 could be elaborated so as to reflect a more precise differentiation within the requiredness of the qualifier of the adjective, e.g. by taking into consideration semantic and syntactic completeness of the syntagms (cf. e.g. ‘semantic rection’ and ‘syntactic rection’ in Apresjan (1974: 155).
PART 2. THE ARABIC ADJECTIVE

This part of the dissertation will begin with a short survey of how the adjective was conceived of as a part of speech by Western grammarians and Arabists. It will be visible that there is much discord on this issue since, as it seems, almost every author understands adjective in his way. Having done this, we will discuss three traditionally applied criteria that rather cannot be used for setting a separate class of adjectives and, subsequently, we will propose our own definition of the Arabic adjective.

2.1. Arabic adjective according to Arabists

The principal difficulty in defining the Arabic adjective consists in distinguishing it from another subcategory of nouns, viz. from substantives.

In their grammar of Arabic, Gaudefroy-Demombynes and Blachère (n.d. [1937-38]) did not introduce a general definition of adjective, apparently assuming the intuitional notion of it as distinct from substantives. In Blachère (1946) adjectives were introduced as a class of nouns able to be used both as substantives and as adjectives that were distinguished by the fact of having no proper gender and adopting the gender of the substantive to which they refer (1946: 32 and 64). Fleisch (1956), who was dealing with the morphology of Arabic, showed that there is no delimitation between adjectives and substantives to be found in their morphology (1956: 48) nor in their declination (1956: 29, also 1961: 269-276). For Lecomte (1976 [1968]), adjectives are those nouns which have ‘vocation qualificative dominante’ (1976 [1968]: 66). While all these authors grouped adjectives and substantives together on the grounds of their common morphology, Bateson (1967) saw the class of adjectives as differing from other classes in their morphology. She wrote: “There is some morphological justification for setting up a class of adjectives on the
basis of the partial specialization of derivational forms, the ease with which feminine endings may be applied, and the specialization of plurals [...]” (1967: 43). But Belkin (1975) remarks that participles, *nisbas* and *ṣifāt mušabbaha* (i.e. classes distinguished principally on morphological grounds) may be distinguished as adjectives or substantives on the criterion of lexical use. In substantivation, Belkin remarks, their meaning frequently becomes complex. He observes that the word *kātib* can be realized in three types of grammatical context: verbally, as in *huwa kātibun risālatan* ‘He is writing a letter’, adjectivally, as in *‘alatun kātibatun* ‘a writing machine’, and substantivally, as in *kātibun mašhūrun* ‘a famous writer’ (1975: 82).

Gätje (1973), who was dealing with determination of Arabic words (‘definiteness’ in our terms), argues that “die Kategorie des Substantivs nicht bloß von europäischen oder einheimischen Grammatikern an die arabische Sprache herangetragen worden ist, sondern sich in ihr selbst relevant erweist” (1973: 10). For him, “Das reine Adjektiv, das nicht substantiviert ist, unterscheidet sich vom Substantiv im Prinzip durch das Fehlen der ontologischen Selbständigkeit” (1973: 11). According to him, a determined (i.e. definite) adjective would change automatically to a substantive (1973: 22). Determination of adjectives is feasible only through “Substantivierung oder durch unmittelbare Anlehnung an ein appellatives Substantiv” (1973: 45). Fischer, who in (1965) investigated the morphological and syntactic characteristics of the elative in Classical Arabic, went even further than Gätje. Not only did he distinguished adjectives from substantives but also argued that the elative should be kept apart from the category of the remaining adjectives (1965: 142), due to its specific morphological (such as the lack of congruence in gender and number) and syntactic properties. He proposed the existence of the predicative (‘Prädikativ’), i.e. a nominal part of speech (opposed to adjective and substantive), whose typical syntactic function is the predicate (1965: 146). Elatives were, originally and primarily, predicatives. Only in later stages of the language did they come to get assimilated to other adjectives. Also Krahl (1985) treated adjectives as a separate word class and later in (1989) proposed a further subclassification of this class.
Also according to Al-Jabbār and Leach (1985) adjectives formed a separate category. These authors “allow for adjectives to be a sub-class of a major word-class, rather than – as in English perhaps – a major word-class in their own right”. (1985:35). According to them “From the point of view of syntactic class (original emphasis – MM) there is in Arabic clearly a phrase class, used predicatively or attributively, which is to be distinguished from other phrase classes such as NP, Prep P and Adv P and to some extent from VP in as much as its head may be modified for degree, extent and/or intensity; the lexeme supplying the head may also be accompanied by optional or obligatory complements (typically of the Pre P type), according to sub-class” (1985: 36). Showing the similarity of adjectives and verbs, they argue “that verbal and adjectivals can be looked upon as modifiable sub-members of a ‘super-class’ of predicatives” (1985: 38). Adjectives are those nominals which are ‘controlled for gender’ (p. 39). Additionally, derivational criteria are proposed.

In Gai’s view, who in (1995) wrote on Semitic languages generally, being an adjective does not result from the function in the sentence but is an inherent trait of a word. “The adjective, like the substantive (and any other part of speech), does not change its identity in different syntactical situations. Consequently, an adjective which functions alone, without a qualified noun, remains an adjective; it does not become a substantive because of that” (1995: 7). For Gai, the identifying criterion for the adjective in Arabic is the capability of functioning as the second member of improper annexation (p. 5). In El-Ayoubi et al. (2001) the adjective as a category was distinguished on the grounds of the semantic and morphological properties (pp. 132-137). The category of adjective was enlarged, on functional grounds, by including into it the construction with dū (‘das adjektivische Demonstrativum’, p. 143). Badawi et al. (2004) use notional definitions in order to introduce the class of adjectives: They define the noun (i.e. substantive in our terminology) as “word denoting thing, place, person, concept” (p. 775) and the adjective as “word or syntactic unit [...] specifying an attribute of a noun” (p. 770). In some works on Arabic, adjectives and substantives seem to be distinguished only on the grounds of the translation into the language of the author (e.g. in a reference grammar by Ryding 2005: 60 and 115).
The view of Grande (1963) and Beeston (1968, 1970) will be presented here in more detail. Grande (1963) speaks of the impossibility of any differentiation between adjectives and substantives because there are no morphological markers which would distinguish an adjectival declination from a substantive one. Besides this, he remarks that what we compare to adjectives in other languages, may signify either a property or an object (kātibu l-‘idārati ‘clerk [lit. ‘writer’] of an administration’ vs. ṣabiyyun kātibun ‘a writing boy’). He says that there is no conversion effected between al-maġribiyyu in al-maġribiyyu s-sā‘iḥu (‘the travelling Moroccan’) and as-sā‘iḥu l-maġribiyyu (‘the Moroccan traveller’) because “any morphological markers are lacking”. The term ṣifa does not put a given word irreversibly in one category, it rather characterizes one and the same word in different manners, depending on its syntactic role, or on its relation to other words (1963: 117). On p. 119 he renders the two above expressions into Russian as ‘marokkanskij putešestvennik’ and ‘puteševstvujuščij marokkanec’ (both attributions) vs. ‘marokkanec-putešestvennik’ and ‘putešestvennik-marokkanec ’(both appositions). However, to us it seems that, if understood naturally, both Arabic constructions are attributions but with different meaning (for a discussion see below chapter 3.2.1.1.). What is more, Grande tries to show that Labīduni š-šā‘iru may be translated as ‘Labid the poet’ but also ‘veščij Ljabid’, Zayduni n-nağğāru as ‘Zayd the carpenter’ but also ‘stoljarničajuščij Zejd’ and, conversely, ‘Amruni q-ḏaḥḥāku – which to us seems to be an adjectival phrase – not only as ‘smešlivyj Amr’ ‘laughing Amr’ but also as ‘hohotun Amr’. Thus, claims Grande, a noun’s position after another noun and agreeing with it in case is not sufficient to speak of substantive appositions or of adjectival attributions. He adds that between expressions like kitābun ḥasanun ‘a good book’ and Labīduni š-šā‘iru there is no difference from the grammatical point of view (p. 118). However, as we will show in the subsequent parts of this work, there is one: it is shown in the reversiblity of the word order. Grande says that ḥasanun and kabīrun can be termed adjectives only because they have the function of attributes (p. 118). But we will disagree here: ḥasanun never functions as something else than an attribute or a predicate. Grande is followed in his view by Testelec (1990), who remarks that in Arabic, as in
other languages where adposition (‘priloženie’) is little differentiated morphologically and syntactically from attribution, grammatical traditions join substantives and adjectives in one part of speech (e.g. in Sanskrit). He adduces his rendering of raḡulun-ḡamīlun (usually translated as ‘a handsome man’) as ‘čelovek-krasavec’ (1990: 82).

According to Beeston (1968) ‘It is not […] possible to give a linguistically adequate definition of the Arabic adjective in purely functional terms; all that can be said is that some qualifiers behave structurally in the manner described in § 1:13 [they can be subjected to proper annexation, i.e. be qualified by a substantive in the genitive in a specific way – MM] and are then classed as nouns, while others behave in a different manner, as described in § 1:11 [they qualify other nouns with concord – MM], and are then termed adjectives” (1968: 7). Thus, he proposes a sort of syntactic environments that can serve as frames for distinguishing substantives from adjectives. He adds that “There are […] no words in Arabic which can be said to function exclusively as adjectives: any adjective can in principle be made to function as a noun”. Thus, “an adjectival use can only be present when the word qualifies a preceding noun […] or is employed as a predicate” (1968: 30, repeated also in 1970: 34). This seems to us rather too categorical, because there are nouns which do not function as substantives, e.g. šahriyyun ‘monthly’ kulliyyun ‘holistic’, ‘amāmiyyun ‘frontal’, tārīhiyyun ‘historic(al)’. What is more, as showed above, constructions with some nouns such as kabīrun in the subject function were grammatically ‘weak’, i.e. only passable, for Sibawayhi and are weird in MWA. Beeston’s view is modified in Beeston (1970), where a proposal can be found that “the identification of words as adjectives is possible only on a functional basis, since their morphological structure is in no way distinctive” (1970: 31). It is also remarked that “since substantives and adjectives are distinguishable only by function, not by morphological shape, it may be impossible when quoting a word out of context to assert that it is either one or the other, this being determinable only by the syntactic context” (1970: 34).
2.2. Adjectives in MWA and in Classical Arabic

Before we propose a definition of the adjective which will be used for the purpose of the typology of the adjectival syntagms, let us briefly discuss the question whether there is any difference between nouns that could be classed as adjectives in MWA and nouns that could be classed as adjectives in Classical or Pre-Classical Arabic.

Kahle, who investigated the syntax of the adjective in Pre-Classical Arabic (1975) did not make any enquiry into the “nature” of the adjective and its relationship to the substantive. He employed a syntactically oriented definition of the adjective: what distinguishes an adjective from other parts of speech is its ability to have an attributive function (p. 4). He also devoted attention to substantivization of adjectives, which consists in dropping (‘Weglassen’) the substantive to which the same adjective is frequently assigned as an attribute (1975: 135). The relationship between those two types of nouns in the older varieties of Arabic is different for Beeston. According to him there is a probability that

“in the most primitive stage of the language, the relationship between two terms which later came to be felt as one between substantive and adjective, was envisaged in a different way, namely as a coordination of two substantives with parity of status, comparable with what in European grammar would be termed an appositional relationship, as in ‘William the conqueror’ (though unlike the looser type of apposition expressed by ‘William, a conqueror’)” (Beeston 1970: 44).

He goes on writing, that

“in ancient Arabic, the further one goes back, the more instances one can find where the term which later feeling would identify as an adjective is not gender-differentiated to match the gender of the ‘substantive’; the ‘adjectival’ term *ba‘id*, without gender differentiation, would therefore in ancient times have to be evaluated as an appositional ‘a remote thing’ (retaining its own inherent gender status) rather than the adjective ‘remote’” (1970: 45).

It can be added here that in these older stages of Arabic, some ‘adjective-like’ words were epithets so strongly associated with some specific types of objects, that these objects needed not be mentioned. Thus e.g. there were many names, used lavishly in the classical poetry, for a she-camel,
e.g. ‘ansun ‘a strong (she-camel)’ (Munqid 2002: 533\textsuperscript{57}), designating its attributes by which it was recognizable. Likewise, there were many synonymous denominations for the sword, which actually were its epithets, such as muhannadun ‘made in an Indian manner’ or šaqīlun ‘polished’. Today these substantivized epithets, as we may call them, are familiar only to people versed in classical literature (that it was so in the ancient times too is highly probable).

On the other hand, what shows a possible distinction of the adjective and the substantive in Classical Arabic is that it had words, arguably adjective-like, derived from a particular root, and words, arguably substantive-like, derived from the same root, the latter words being qualified by the former, which emphasized one specific feature: e.g. raḡulun raḡilun ‘a [very] manly man’ (Munqid 2002: 251\textsuperscript{58}), nahārun ‘anharu ‘a wonderful day’ (Wehr, Cowan 1974 [1961]: 1003), i.e. ‘a day having the property of being a day intensified to a great degree’.

It seems that the category of adjective in MWA is much more crystallized than it was in Classical Arabic. MWA appears to have more words that function only as adjectives. A great number of them is being coined or borrowed from other languages. Here, particularly the nisba category should be mentioned, e.g. dimuqraṭīyyun ‘democratic’, kombyūtīyyun ‘related to computer’. The process of substantivization is more restricted and, consequently, more conspicuous, which means that it is more felt than it probably was in Classical Arabic. Also, as it will be showed, the area of concord in gender and number between the substantive and its adjectival attribute is expanding, i.e. more words show this concord than it was the case in Classical Arabic. Yet in order for us to be able to discuss it, we will now go on to introduce some criteria which should allow us to delimit adjectives from substantives.

\textsuperscript{57} The definition is an-nāqatu l-qawiyyatu ‘[the] strong she-camel’.

\textsuperscript{58} The definition is: šadīdun šulbun ‘strong, firm’.
2.2.1. Major differences between adjectives and substantives

Although probably every grammar of Arabic uses the term ‘adjective’, few of them venture a definition of it and none of them gives a satisfactory one, especially one allowing to distinguish it from the substantive. In spite of this it is evident that MWA has words which undoubtedly are substantives, leaving the question of a possible definition of the substantive aside. The substantives include e.g. proper names, such as Ṭḥām ‘Ahmad’, Bayrūtu ‘Beirut’, physical objects like bāṭun ‘house’, ḥā’aran ‘stone’, or the word for the abstract concept of ‘thing’, ṣay’un. In a sentence, these words can have specific syntactic functions: those of subjects and objects. E.g.

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{ḡalās-a} & \text{'Ṭḥām-u} \\
\text{sat} & \text{Ahmad.M.SI-N} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Ahmad sat down’ /1/

The word Ṭḥām is the subject here. On the other hand, we find words that seem to be adjectives (intuitively, at least), e.g. ẓābiqun ‘former’ or kumbyāṭiriyun ‘related to computers’, māḥdun ‘pure’, bāḥṭun ‘pure’, ṛaʾīṣun ‘main’. They are usually not used as subjects or objects in a sentence. They rather function as attributes for words functioning as subjects and objects. E.g. in /2/,

\[
\begin{array}{lllllll}
\text{lā} & \text{yuḥibbu} & \text{l-lawn-a} & \text{l-wardiyy-a} \\
\text{not} & \text{likes} & \text{D-colour.M.SI-A} & \text{D-pink.M.SI-A} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘[he] does not like the pink colour’ /2/

the word l-wardiyya is the attribute of the word l-lawn ‘the colour’.

Besides the examples of different usages of Arabic nouns showed above there are other possibilities. Thus, it is possible for a word which commonly is considered a substantive to have a function that appears to be attributive, e.g. ḥuwa l-mudīru Ṭḥām ‘this is director Ahmad’. Other examples are: luğāṭun maṣdarun ‘source language’, dawlatun ‘udwun ‘member state’. These possible constructions should be taken into account and further differences should be looked for. One of them is that words
mašdar ‘source’ and ‘uḏwun ‘member’, which function as attributes, show no concord in gender with their qualificata, while other words do.

On the other hand, it is possible to find a sentence with wardiyyun being a subject or object, i.e. having a function which we have characterized as reserved for substantives, e.g.:

\[
\text{'ayy-a-n} \text{ mina } l\text{-lawn-ayni} \text{ tāqšidu? – 'aqšidu} \text{ l-wardiyy-a}
\]

\[
\text{which-A-I} \text{ of } \text{D-colour.M.-DU.G} \text{ you:mean I:mean } \text{D-pink.M.SI-A}
\]

‘Which one of the two colours do you mean?’ – ‘I mean the pink one’ /3/.

Yet there is again a restriction: the putative adjective l-wardiyya can be used here only if a substantive to which it refers had been mentioned before. Consequently, one should take into consideration the occurrence of adjectives without the explicit presence of the substantives they refer to.

Between these two categories of words there is a vast repertory of nouns which appear to have syntactic properties of both adjectives and substantives. They can freely occur in both functions: ‘arabiyyun ‘Arab (adj. and subst.)’, baḥīlun ‘a niggard; stingy’, kātibun ‘a writer; writing’ are such nouns. This is shown at the following examples:

\[
\text{Miṣr-u} \text{ balad-u-n} \text{ 'arabiyy-u-n}
\]

\[
\text{Egypt,F-N country.M.SI-N-I Arab,M.SI-N-I}
\]

‘Egypt is an Arab country’ /4/.

and

\[
\text{tazawwaqat} \text{ min 'arabiyyin ganiyyin}
\]

\[
\text{she:married from Arab,M.SI-G-I rich,M.SI-G-I}
\]

‘She married a rich Arab’ /5/.

Three conclusions can be drawn here:

1. Some nouns have a ‘double nature’: they can function both as an adjective and as a substantive (e.g. ‘arabiyyun). Most of these words have no features which would allow to draw any distinction between them except their syntactic behaviour.

However, some of them differ not only in their syntactic behaviour. Thus, kātibun when used as a substantive, i.e. as a subject or object, has normally the plural kuttābun and means ‘writers’, whereas if used as an
adjectival, strictly speaking participial, attribute, its plural is *kātibūna*. Thus there is *hum kuttābun* ‘They are writers’ vs. *hum kātibūna* ‘They are writing’. These words, which differ morphologically, also have different syntactic behaviour: *kātibūna* is more suitable to function as an attribute than *kuttābun* is. Thus, it turns out that there is a difference. One should note the following then:

2. In some cases, there are two different but homophonous words: there is the word ‘*arabiyyun*$_1$ conveying the adjectival meaning (cf. German ‘arabisch’ or Polish ‘arbski’) and the word ‘*arabiyyun*$_2$ conveying the substantival meaning (cf. German ‘Araber’ and Polish ‘Arab’) and so forth. This distinction is indicated in European dictionaries but not in the Arab ones. Following this approach, some adjectives become substantivized, i.e. they occur in typically substantival functions, in other words, they acquire substantival syntactic properties (which may be accompanied by various morphological properties, e.g. different plural forms for participle adjectives and correspondent substantives).

However, in many cases, especially with non-participial adjectives used in one syntactic function which is considered neither typically adjectival nor substantival, viz. the predicate (according to Kuryłowicz it is a typically verbal function, 1960b [1936]), it seem to be impossible to tell whether one is dealing with a substantive or an adjective. E.g. *huwa baḥīlun* and *hum buḥalā’u* may be rendered into English as ‘he is stingy/they are stingy’ or ‘he is a niggard/they are niggards’. Consequently, for some cases one may have to admit that:

3. The question of a distinction of adjectives and substantives is irrelevant for the Arabic language, which does not distinguish between them, sometimes even syntactically. The question: is *baḥīlun* in the above sentence a substantive or an an adjective may be unanswerable. To sum up, the substantival or adjectival character of some nouns in Arabic manifests itself in various ways but sometimes the difference is neutralized or, maybe, it would be more appropriate to say, absent. This will be analysed in more detail in the subsequent chapters.
2.2.2. Problems related to the definition of the adjective in MWA

Arabic nouns, i.e. nominal parts of speech, corresponding roughly to 'asmā' of the Arab linguistic tradition, are problematic since one usually has the feeling that e.g. the word ḥaḡaruṅ ‘a stone’ is more fit to be termed a ‘substantive’ than ṭaqīluṅ ‘heavy’ is, but it is difficult to define the adjective and the substantive in an exact manner. The expression miṣriyyun can mean both ‘an Egyptian’ or ‘Egyptian’. What is more, the word muslimuṅ seems to be a substantive (‘a Muslim’), an adjective (in dawlatuṅ muslimatuṅ ‘a Muslim country’) and a participle, because etymologically it goes back to the verb 'aslama ‘to become Muslim, to surrender [to God]’, thus it may mean ‘surrendering to God’. Dictionaries made by and for Arabs do not distinguish between potential ‘substantives’ or ‘adjectives’, thus. e.g. al-muslimu is defined as “al-muttabi’u dīna l-’islāmi” (Munjīd 2002: 347) ‘the follower of’ or ‘following the religion of Islam’, with both English translations being equally correct, whereas it is not known whether the main part of the definiens, al-muttabi’u, is an adjective or a substantive. Western dictionaries do provide such information, although the method adopted seems to depend on the nature of the distinction between adjectives and substantives in the language of a particular dictionary. Thus e.g. in the Arabic-English dictionary by Wehr and Cowan miṣriyyun is translated both as an adjective, “Egyptian; Cairene”, and as a substantive, “an Egyptian; a Cairene” (Wehr, Cowan 1974 [1961]: 912), probably because it is a common practice to distinguish these two categories in English dictionaries. The same holds for Arabic-Russian (e.g. Baranov 1958 [1957]) and Arabic-Polish dictionaries (Łacina 1999 and Danecki, Kozłowska 1996). Reig, in turn, translates the same word as “égyptien” (1999 [1983], No 5098), without specifying whether it is a substantive or an adjective or both, possibly because the distinction is not so conspicuous in dictionaries of French. Sometimes a discrepancy occurs in translations of some words between Arab and Western dictionaries. E.g. the word ḥaḡiruṅ in Munjid is explained as “al-makānu l-kaṭīru l-ḥiḡārati”, ‘a place abundant in stones’ (2002: 119), while in Wehr, Cowan (1974 [1961]: 157) it is an adjective “stony, petrified”.
There are four major criteria for distinguishing parts of speech: morphological, notional, derivative and syntactic. The first three can be subsumed into a class of context-free criteria (see Jodłowski 1971: 165-175 for the discussion of the contextual and what he terms as “lexicographical” definitions of parts of speech). They fail as a means of distinguishing adjectives from substantives in Arabic. This seems to have been already noticed by classical Arab grammarians, who, when speaking of *ism* and *sifa*, referred to their function in a sentence, or to their syntactic use. The last type of criteria, syntactic, is a context-bound criterion, which allows to distinguish adjectives on the grounds of the syntactic function they can have. Let us briefly discuss the difficulties related to the context-free definitions.

While the morphological criterion is very useful for separating Arabic verbs from nouns, it is of no use within the category of morphologically indistinguishable nouns because, at least in the singular, no putative adjective, such as *kabīrun* ‘big, large’, would have any particular morphological features which would permit to distinguish it from putative substantives, such as *wazīrun* ‘a vizier’ or *rafīqun* ‘a friend’. All these nouns follow the same pattern: $C_1\alpha C_2\iota C_3\eta$un. Also their inflectional endings are the same. This is unlike in e.g. Polish but quite similar to e.g. Latin, Spanish or Finnish (cf. Jespersen 1965 [1924]: 72). Note that the fact that at least some adjectives inflect for the category of degree, i.e. can be graded, is not taken into account here and will be discussed further.

The notional criterion, although seemingly illuminating, is practically useless, not only in Arabic. Because if one assumes that adjectives designate properties, cf. *tayyibun* ‘good’, and substantives designate the bearers of these properties, one has to deal with such concepts as *ṭībun* ‘goodness’ which are properties but doubtless substantives. This is so because properties can be notionally identified as objects, be they abstract, and, consequently, linguistically expressed in substantives. Some linguists claim that adjectives differ from substantives in being ‘ontologisch unselbständig’ (Gätje 1973: 11), but there are also undisputed substantives, such as *ʿudwun* ‘member’ or *ġuzʿun* ‘part’, which are not ontologically independent. On the other hand, there are words that on the grounds of the

---

notional criterion should be treated as adjectives but in reality designate independent objects. Thus e.g. it is not justified to see in the Arabic titles of Molière’s play Al-Baḥīl ‘The Miser’ or Al-Ḡāḥiẓ’s book Al-Buṣalā’ ‘The Misers’ words designating only properties, since both titles rather designate concrete persons characterized by these properties.

The **derivational** criterion would require from adjectives to be derived from bases different than those from which substantives are derived or to be the bases for a derivation of words different than those which are derived from substantives. While this difference does exist to some extent in Arabic, it does not seem to be sufficient. Admittedly, some very good candidates for substantives, e.g. verbal nouns (maṣdars), or proper names, allow derivations by means of the *nisba*-ending: -iyy-, e.g. qahrun ‘coercion’ > qahriyyun ‘coercive’, Miṣru ‘Egypt’ > miṣriyyun ‘Egyptian, related to Egypt’. However, as it is usual with derivational processes, not all substantives are able to do this, e.g. ḍahābuñ ‘departure’ yields no *ḍahābiyyun. On the other hand, there are cases of adjectives that undergo this type of derivation, i.e. “adjectivizing an adjective” takes place as Drozdík puts it (1989: 30), of course only in derivational terms. Drozdík gives the example from Al-Khatib (1971: 197): qat’un nāqiṣun ‘ellipsis’, lit. ‘incomplete section’, with the adjective nāqiṣ ‘incomplete’, the latter being enlarged by the *nisba*-suffix and resulting in nāqiṣiyyun ‘elliptic’. Another example he adduces from the same source (Al-Khatib 1971: 382) is naqqāliyyun ‘portable’ from naqqāl with the same meaning (Drozdík 1989: 30, fn. 2).

Another check, using the properties from the border between inflection and derivation, thus seemingly more regular and exceptionless, is that of forming the comparative. In some grammars, gradability is the distinctive feature of adjectives (cf. Danecki 1994: 307). But in reality not all adjectives are able to form the comparative, e.g. the *nisba*-adjectives, such as misriyyun ‘Egyptian’ cannot, whereas there are putative substantives, which can be graded, e.g. šā’irun ‘poet’, ḥaṭībuñ ‘rhetor’, raḡulun ‘man’, the comparative forms of which are listed in dictionaries: ’aš’aru ‘a better poet’, ’aḥṭabu ‘a better rhetor’ (Munqid 2002: 186) and ’aṛɡalu ‘more manly’ (p. 251). It should be noticed here that in such cases it is only one of the properties of their designata which undergoes gradation (for a
discussion of substantives with degree modifiers see e.g. Bhat 1994: 25-28).

Let us now consider the syntactic criterion. The discussion in chapter 2.2.1. shows that there are contexts in which it seems impossible to tell if a noun is an adjective or a substantive. Despite these difficulties, dispensing with a distinction between adjectives and substantives in Arabic would bring rather more harm than profit. It is evident that, at least in Modern Written Arabic, such a distinction does exist. It also seems to be reflected in the native speakers’ language awareness. It exists in the syntactic behaviour, which corresponds to the semantics of both categories. Therefore, it seems justified to look for a definition of the adjective in the syntax, namely, in the syntax of attribution (cf. the solutions adopted in Kahle 1975 and Krahl 1985). Kuryłowicz’s opinion should be recalled here as requiring that the criteria of opposition should be “dictated” by the language itself (1960c [1949]: 150). It is our conviction that in MWA such criteria for adjectives are dictated by syntax, specifically, that of attributive constructions. The attribute is the primary syntactic function of the adjective, while that of the substantive is to be an argument: subject or object (cf. Kuryłowicz 1960b [1936]). We agree with Krahl, who says that the Arabic adjective is a separate part of speech syntactically, while morphologically, it is one but with reservations (Krahl 1985: 23). Resorting to formal, though, admittedly, not necessarily syntactic, criteria was also advocated by Jespersen, who wrote: “we cannot make the complexity of qualities or specialization of signification a criterion by which to decide whether a certain word is a substantive or an adjective: that must be settled in each case by formal criteria varying from language to language” (1965 [1924]: 81). Relating adjectives as a part of speech to attributes (or, in other terms, noun modifiers) as a syntactic function was a constitutive element of reasoning in such works as Croft (1991) and Bhat (1994). In the book by Darski (2004), the syntactic criterion for defining word classes (Wortklassen or Wortarten) was adopted with the condition

60 Kuryłowicz says: “Il existe un rapport entre la valeur lexicale d’une partie du discours et ses fonctions syntaxique” (1960b [1936]: 41). This correspondence is, of course, restricted and varies from language to language. As Jespersen puts it, “We cannot, of course, expect to find any sharp or rigid line of demarcation separating the two classes in the way beloved by logicians: language makers, that is ordinary speakers, are not very accurate thinkers” (1965 [1924]: 81).
that its employment should not be limited to the scope of the sentence (2004: 147).

Some linguists, however, reject the possibility of defining the adjective as a part of speech with the use of syntactic criteria. Broendal, for instance, argued that morphology and syntax must be kept clearly apart and that “les Parties du Discours ne comportent pas, malgré ce qu’exprime ce terme démodé, de définition à base syntaxique” (1933: 219). Bączeworski et al. suggest that in establishing parts of speech, resort to the syntactic properties of words should be reduced ‘to the necessary minimum’ (1982: 269). According to Baker (2003: 194), “it is wrong to make the ability to modify nouns the defining or characteristic property of the category adjective. It is well known that English has adjectives that cannot be used as attributive modifiers”. Moreover, he argues, “It is not even clear that the attributive use of adjectives is the most common one statistically”. “Some functions of adjectives”, he admits, “are doubtless more common than others, but no use constitutes such an overwhelming majority that it is certain to hold the key to the category as a whole. This suggests that it is wrong to build a theory of adjectives around the property of noun modification” (2003: 195).

It is trivial to say that a universal definition and concept of adjectives does not exist. Every language will have different classes of parts of speech. However, they could be termed using the same name if, as Schachter puts it, it would “reflect universal semantic considerations” (1990: 4). The category of words delimited by the definition we are going to present, based on attribution, will actually be a category of ‘attributivizable nouns’ (the Arab grammarians would say: ‘asmā’ that can be used as ṣifā), but terming them ‘adjectives’ is fully justified.

We will begin with a context-bound definition of the adjective: attribution will be the most important function carried out by adjectives. We cannot use the formulation “typically” carried out, because adjectives must be sharply delimited from substantives, i.e. the adjectives must not be a group centered around a prototype, with more and less typical members, but a clear-cut category of words. The next step will be to find a difference that will exclude words that function as attributes but for some reasons should be treated as substantives. Then, adjectives which have ‘secondary
functions’, i.e. non-attributive ones, will be discussed. That they should yet be treated as adjectives shall be evident from the fact that they still retain the attributive potential in some cases (viz. in the predicate function), or, in other cases, as we will show, while unable to function as attributes, they show more adjectival than substantival features. All this results from the fact that these words have something in their semantic nature, or adjectival character, which allows them to carry out the syntactic function of the attribute or, in some cases, does not allow them to have the syntactic function of full substantives.

Before we propose our definition, let us present Krahl’s, which is as follows:

– kasus-, status-, genus- und numeruskongruent die letzte Position,

– kasus, status-, genus- und numeruskongruent die mittlere Position besetzen kann,

– eine einem Gegenstand innewohnende Eigenschaft oder ein Merkmal in Bezug auf einen anderen Gegenstand bezeichnet,

– bei Nichtvorhandensein semantischer Restriktionen gradationsfähig ist und die Bildung von Antonymen zuläßt.

Damit wird nicht ausgeschlossen, daß manche Wörter, die nach dieser Definition Adjektive sind, unter anderen Konstruktionsbedingungen als Substantive aufzufassen sind (murabba’ = Adjektiv “quadratisch”, bei Besetzung der Position 3 im Syntagm Nomen - Artikel - Nomen = Substantiv “Quadrat” [aḍlāʿ al-

61 The fact that only adjectives can function as the first component of formal annexation was considered by Gai to be the defining property of adjectives (Gai 1995). However, it should be remarked here that besides true adjectives, this position may also be occupied by participles. On the other hand, not all adjectives and not all participles may occur in it.
In our view, this definition needs to be expanded. Let us confront it with what Grande says about the impossibility of distinguishing two different structures in *Labîduni š-šā‘iru* ‘Labid the poet’ and in ‘Amruni ʿa-ḥāḥāku ‘the giggly Amr’ or ‘Amr the Giggler’ (1963: 118). According to Krahl’s definition, both of these syntagsms would have adjectives as their second constituents. We, however, prefer to argue that only the latter is an adjectival syntagm, while the former has a substantive as its second constituent. It is the word order which is able to show it: while it is correct to reverse the word order in a syntagm with two substantives and to say: *aš-šā‘iru Labîdun* ‘the poet Labid’, it is hardly acceptable to do so with a syntagm based on adjectival attribution and to say: *aṭ-ḥāḥāku* ‘Amrun ‘the giggler Amr’\(^{62}\). The reason for the non-grammaticality of this construction lies in the fact that ḥāḥāku can function only as an attribute, in other words, it is adjectival in its nature.

As for the semantics of the two syntagsms given by Grande, let us recall that he accepted two interpretations of the word šā‘irun: ‘poet Ljabid’ and ‘veščij Ljabid’, the latter being the active participle from the verb ša’ara ‘to feel, to know’. Yet we strongly doubt that in MWA the word šā‘irun would be understood as having this participial meaning. If so, it would rather mean just ‘knowing’, but not ‘feeling poetically’. Therefore our opinion is that Grande’s readiness to accept both adjectival and substantive interpretation, based on flexibility of meaning, was unjustified. The fragments of Krahl’s definition referring to semantics do not help here either, since being a poet may be easily analysed as ‘einem Gegenstand innenwohnende Eigenschaft’. In fact, it seems that the two last components of it, concerning the inherent property and gradability, should be used only as additional checks.

---

\(^{62}\) For the Arabic idea of apposition, expressed in the notions of *badal* and ‘*atf bayān* see e.g. Al-Galayini (2002 [1912]: 570).
2.2.3. Definition of the adjective

The definition of the adjective in MWA we are going to propose here makes use of the following syntactic properties of words within syntagms:

(i) word order,
(ii) syndeticity or asyndeticity,
(iii) a word’s capability of functioning as qualificator or qualificatum,

and the following morphological property:

(iv) concord in gender and number.

DEFINITION.

The category of adjectives comprises nouns which:

(i) can be placed linearly after nouns in order to qualify them and agree with them in state, number, gender and case, and
(ii) inflect for gender, i.e. acquire the gender of the noun they qualify, and
(iii) cannot be placed linearly before nouns, because then appositions, such as Labūdun š-šā'ir/aš-šā'iru Labūdun, or non-grammatical constructions, such as *kabīrun baytun, arise.
(iv) What is more, every noun which only qualifies and is never qualified in this way is an adjective, e.g. ladūd, which qualifies in this way, as in ‘aduwwun ladūdun ‘mortal enemy’ but is never qualified in this way.\(^{63}\)

The noun which can be qualified by an adjective as defined above is a substantive.\(^{64}\)

The category of adjective also comprises a specific and well definable class of nouns which do not fulfil the criterion of gender and number concord. Below we present six categories of adjectives which are exempted from this criterion. These adjectives as well as syntagms

\(^{63}\) Note that in our definition the notion of attribution is used to define the adjective. In Cantarino (1975, 2: 47f), the notion of adjective is used to introduce the “adjectival or attributive apposition”.

\(^{64}\) Diem (1974: 326) remarks that Kisā‘i, the principal grammarian of the Kūfân school, defined ism as what can receive a šīfa (‘al-ismu mā waṣifa’). Gätje, in turn, cites from Ibn Ya‘iš a relative clause that is said to be qualified by an adjective: ġa‘ani ḫaḍt ‘indaka l-tāqīlu ‘zu mir kam derjenige, der bei dir war, der Einsichtige’, which Gätje describes as “ein Fall der nicht gerade geläufig ist” (1970: 244).
involving them will be discussed in more detail in chapters 3.1.1.1.1. and 5.12:

1. A noun is an adjective if it is a passive participle derived of an intransitive verb (PPIV) and if it can:
   (i) qualify a preceding noun and agree with it with respect to state and case, and
   (ii) be qualified by a prepositional phrase.

Examples:

\[ \text{nisbat-u} \quad d\text{-duyun-i} \quad l\text{-mašk-k-i} \quad bi \quad taḥṣil-i-hā} \]
\[ \text{percentage.F.SI-N} \quad \text{D-debts.NH.PL-G} \quad \text{D-doubted.NG.NN-G} \quad \text{in collection.M.SI-G-3.NH.PL} \]
\[ \text{‘the percentage of debts whose collection is doubted’ (Hayā 28/07, 11, Istihḍāru...)} /9/ \]

\[ \text{fil l-mu’assasat-i [...] l-mustad‘ā} \quad ʿalay-hā \]
\[ \text{in D-institution.F.SI-G} \quad \text{D-accused.NG.NN-G} \quad \text{against-3.F.SI} \]
\[ \text{‘in the accused institution’ lit. ‘accused against it’ (Dustūr 1/4/04, 2, Maḥkamatu l-cadli...)} /10/ \]

2. A noun is an adjective if it can qualify a preceding noun without agreeing with it with respect to gender and number and:
   (i) follows the pattern \( fa‘āl \) in active sense, or
   (ii) follows the pattern \( fa‘il \) in passive sense, or
   (iii) follows the pattern \( mif‘āl \).

Example:

\[ \text{min ṣadiqat-i-hā} \quad l\text{-ladād-i} \quad ʿAmrikā} \]
\[ \text{from friend.F.SI-G-3.F.SI} \quad \text{D-staunch.NG.NN-G} \quad \text{America.F.G} \]
\[ \text{‘from her staunch friend America’ (Al-Mīṭāq 20/4/2004, 10)} /12/ \]

   (iv) or designates typically female properties. E.g.:

\[ \text{imra’at-u-n} \quad ḥāmil-u-n} \]
\[ \text{woman.F.SI-N-I} \quad \text{pregnant.NG.NN-N-I} \]
\[ \text{‘a pregnant woman’ /13/}. \]

3. A noun is an adjective if it can qualify a preceding noun and follows the pattern \( ’af‘al \) with comparative or superlative meaning, i.e. it does not have
the feminine form of the pattern *fu‘lā*, which is absolutive then\(^{65}\), nor the feminine form *fa‘lā*’ (and at times plural *fu‘l*), which is then a special form for expressing physical and psychic properties. Also the nouns *šarrun* ‘worse; the worst’ and *hayrun* ‘better; the best’ shall be included here, as elatives with comparative or superlative meaning, yet with a non-typical form. Example:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{tā‘irat-u-n} & \text{‘asra‘-u} \\
\text{plane.F.SI-N-I} & \text{quicker.NG.NN-N} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘a quicker plane’ /14/.

4. A noun is an adjective if it can qualify a preceding noun without agreeing with it with respect to gender and number and

(i) is a loanword, and

(ii) cannot be used as a genitival qualifier resulting in constructions with synonymous meaning. The loanword can be an older one, e.g.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{‘umlat-u-n} & \text{şāg-u-n} \\
\text{currency.F.SI-N-I} & \text{regular.NG.NN-N-I} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘standard currency’ (from Turkish *sağ* ‘healthy, correct’) /15/

or newer, e.g.: *müf* ‘mauve’, *biğ* ‘beige’ (from English).

5. A noun is an adjective if it can qualify a preceding noun without agreeing with it with respect to gender and number and designates a species or style indication. Most frequently, such a noun is a *nisba*. Example:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{qahwat-u-n} & \text{turkiyy-u-n} \\
\text{coffee.F.SI-N-I} & \text{Turkish.NG.NN-N-I} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Turkish [style] coffee’ (from Badawi et al. 2004: 105) /16/.

6. A noun is an adjective if it can qualify a preceding noun and has neutralized gender and number and a suffix expressing the number and gender of the qualificatum is attached to it. Example:

---

\(^{65}\) Semantically different from absolutives but formally and syntactically similar is *‘āhar* ‘other’ (and its feminine form *‘ahirā*).
By virtue of our definition, such words as šattā ‘all’ or ṣaºma‘a ‘all’ are excluded from the category of adjectives.

It is important to underscore here that the definition we have proposed allows us to resort to the context-bound usage of a noun for determining whether a noun taken without a context is an adjective or not. In reality, our definition enables us to tell which nouns can be used as adjectives, i.e. have ‘adjectival potential’ or ‘adjectival capability’. Having this special feature distinguishes some nouns, which we term ‘adjectives’, from other nouns which do not have it, and which will be termed ‘substantives’. Words which are adjectives on the grounds of our definition may have functions which, following Kuryłowicz (1960b [1936]), we call ‘secondary’. These secondary functions of the adjective in MWA will be discussed in Part 4.

2.2.4. Subcategories of the adjective

As it was already said in chapter 1.3.3. on the Dimension of the intracategory differentiation of the adjectival constituent, the category of adjectives divides dichotomically into positive adjectives, i.e. positives, and elative adjectives, i.e. elatives. The positives may be participles, in which case they will be referred to as participial adjectives. The remaining positive adjectives are non-participial adjectives. Let us discuss here the question of treating elatives and participles as adjectives as well as that of their specific features.

Elative

In several works on Arabic grammar the elative is not considered to be an adjective (e.g. El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 253 and 264; Fischer 1965). El-

---

66 The term ‘elative’ should not be confused with the homophonous term ‘elative’, also used in linguistic literature, referring to the grammatical category of the direction ‘out of [something]’.

Fischer postulated the existence (for Classical Arabic) of three nominal parts of speech: substantive, adjective and predicative (‘Prädikativ’), the latter of which is closely associated with elatives (1965: 142-155). The elative is, in turn, an adjective according to Cantarino, although “it has developed special patterns of agreement with the noun which it modifies” (1975, 2: 468).

We have adopted this broader notion of the adjective as including the elative. The lack of full integration into the category of adjective, which is shown in the restricted concord in gender and number, should not prevent one from recognizing its adjectival character, shown in all remaining respects.

The elative itself is not a homogeneous category. Should it be defined as including all nouns following the pattern ḍafḍal, then also adjectives showing full concord in gender and number (with the feminine form fa‘lā’ and plural fa‘l), designating physical and psychic properties would be treated as elatives. We, however, will not treat them as elatives but as positive adjectives instead.

We will assume that the category of elatives include adjectives which follow the pattern fa‘al and are used in the comparative or superlative sense, i.e. a standard of comparison is mentioned or at least implied. They will be called relative elatives (following Cantarino 1975, 2: 472, fn. 89). They show no concord in gender and number, i.e. their gender and number are neutralized (NG and NN). The word ḍaḍḍarу in dawlatun ḍaḍḍaru ‘a smaller state’ is a relative elative, used in the comparative sense. There are also two nouns which do not meet the requirement of form, i.e. do not follow the ḍafḍal pattern, yet they will be considered relative elatives on the grounds of their meaning and syntax, which are identical with that of ḍafḍal-elatives. These are ḥayrun ‘better; the best’ and šarrun ‘worse; the
worst’. They should be, however, always distinguished from homophonous substantives meaning ‘good’ and ‘evil’, respectively.

The category of elatives also includes adjectives which follow this pattern but are used in the absolute sense, i.e. there is no standard of comparison, the meaning is ‘excellency or superiority in an absolute manner’ (Cantarino 1975, 2: 472, fn. 89) and have the feminine form of the pattern fu'lā. They will be called absolutive elatives. Absolutive elatives usually exist in pairs designating antonyms, e.g. ‘ūlyā ‘the upper.F.Si’ vs. suflā ‘the lower.F.Si’ (cf. Grotzfeld 2000 and Wehr 1953: 21-24). They form a restricted class of words.67

Semantically different from other elatives but formally and syntactically similar to them is the adjective ʾāḥaru ‘other’ (feminine: ʿuhrā). Its morphosyntactic behaviour is sometimes like that of absolutive elatives, sometimes like that of relative elatives. Also ʾawwalu ‘first’ (feminine: ʿūlā), which semantically is an ordinal numeral, is an elative, with partly relative, partly absolutive morphosyntax.68

As rightly noticed by Wehr (1953), whether a relative elative receives the definite article or not does not always directly reflect the opposition superlative vs. comparative, respectively, known in most modern European languages. While such a correspondence does obtain in most cases, examples of an indefinite relative elative without comparative meaning can be found easily. E.g. ʿallāhu ʾakbaru cannot be interpreted as ‘God is greater’, as it means rather ‘God is very great’ or ‘the greatest’. Cf. other examples:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
kānātī & r-riḥlat-ū & ʾašbah-ā & bi riḥlat-ī \\
was & D-journey.F.Si-N & similar.NG.NN-A & with journey.F.Si-G \\
& & & D-Sindbad-G
\end{array}
\]

‘the journey was very similar to the journey of Sindbad’ (ʿUmar 109) /18/

In other contexts it seems that relative elatives can be rendered in English as adjectives with the modifier ‘rather’ or ‘fairly’, e.g.:

---

67 Cantarino says that they are used in expressions equivalent to proper names as in al-qurānā l-wustā ‘the Middle Ages’ or ar-radhatu l-kubrā ‘the main lobby’ (1975, 2: 473). Yet it seems that there is no special semantic connexion between absolutive elatives and proper names. It can simply be said that some proper names include absolutive elatives.

68 Ordinal numerals with the meaning ‘the first’ are, historically, comparatives or superlatives also in other languages, e.g. German erst was the superlative of eher (Drosdowski et al. 1997: 163), and Polish pierwszy was the comparative form of pierw (Bafiński 2000, 2: 561).
On the other hand, that an elative is definite by virtue of bearing the definite article does not necessarily confer on it the superlative meaning. As observed by Cantarino, “The belief of both Arab and Western grammarians that the article gives the meaning of a superlative to the elative is not correct. In certain positions, the article is required not by the meaning but by the actual grammatical function of the elative” (1975, 2: 468). E.g.:

\[
\text{bi l-`alam-i l-`arigiy-i l-mutaqaddim-i wa l-`a`add-i ta`fir-a-n}
\]

With the external world, progressing and extremely influential lit. ‘extremely strong in impact’ (Moon al-fikr, 20) /20/

Rather infrequently, a definite elative is clearly comparative, with the standard of comparison expressed in a min-phrase, e.g.:

\[
\text{al-`ahamm-u min `alika anna `i`gma`liyy-i...}
\]

And [what is] more important than that is that the total of...’ (Ahrām 22.01.03, 28, ‘Alāmatu stifhāmin) /21/

Sometimes both senses, comparative and superlative, can equally be read:

\[
\text{manṭiq-u l-`aqwā}
\]

The superlative sense, ‘the most influential’, is not allowed by the context, as no other worlds were compared with the world spoken of.
elative may be used in both meanings\textsuperscript{70}. One of the examples given by Wehr is ‘ahdā mina n-naḫmi, which he renders as ‘den Weg besser weisend als die Sterne’, as opposed to ‘ahdā mina l-qāṭā ‘besser geleitet als die Flughühner’ (Wehr 1953: 55). Since ‘ahdā is directly derived from the root h-d-y conveying the meaning of ‘guidance’ (cf. the substantive hudan ‘guidance’), and not from the active participle hādin ‘guiding’ or the passive one mahdiyyun ‘guided’, the meaning of ‘ahdā is: ‘stärker mit hudan behaftet, sich mehr auszeichnend durch hudan’, which makes both active and passive reading possible (Wehr 1953: 55). This feature is showed also by the elatives in MWA. In our corpus, however, one example occurred which shows that the author of the text felt a need to specify the diathesis of the elative, viz. the passive, by a prepositional phrase, which normally is absent:

\begin{verbatim}

‘[it] has become a thing [that is] more necessary than ever before’ (‘Arām 22.01.03, 10, ‘Arna ḫaqīqatu...) [cf. the verb ihtāğa ‘ilāyhi ‘he needed it’, lit. ‘he needed to it’] /22/.
\end{verbatim}

It seems that the elative is qualified by the prepositional phrase in a way analogous to how the corresponding positive is, viz. muḥtiḏan ‘ilayhi ‘needed’, lit. ‘needed to it’.

**Participle**

From the syntactic point of view there is no objection to treating participles as a subcategory of adjectives. This is also the opinion expressed explicitly e.g. in El-Ayoubi et al. (2001: 5). Yet it should be observed that some participles have somehow got ‘detached’ from the verbs they are derived from. Thus e.g. the participles munḥafiḏun ‘low’ and ‘ālin ‘high’ are not always associated with the verbs inḥafaḍa ‘to sink, to be lowered’ and ‘alā ‘to be high, to rise’. E.g. the expression si‘run ‘ālin ‘a high price’ has no synonymous expression with a relative clause with the corresponding verb ya‘lū since si‘run ya‘lū means ‘a price which rises’ rather than ‘a price which is high’. What is more, some participles which have detached themselves from their verbal bases cannot take the so-called

\textsuperscript{70} Wehr discusses this ambivalence in terms of ‘transitivity’ and ‘intransitivity’ (1953: 55).
internal object, i.e. cannot be qualified by a cognate verbal noun in the accusative. Thus *aš-ša’aru l-musta’āru ‘artificial hair’, lit ‘borrowed hair’ cannot be qualified by isti‘āratan ġayyidatan to yield *aš-ša’aru l-musta’āru isti‘āratan ġayyidatan *a hair borrowed a good borrowing*71. Such participles frequently are semantically modified in comparison to ‘true’ participles. E.g. *mu’āq ‘handicapped’, lit. ‘hindered’ is not a true participle of the verb ‘a’āqa ‘to hinder’, because there is no agent conceivable that could have hindered the person (except, possibly, nature or God). Such an agent is usually conceivable in cases where the participle retains its normal relationship to the verb.

**Numeral**

According to our definition of the adjective, some numerals should be treated as adjectives. These include:

(i) ordinal numerals from 1 to 10,
(ii) first components of compound ordinal numerals from 11 to 9972,
(iii) cardinal numerals 1 and 2.

Cardinal numerals from 3 to 10 could be treated as agreeing in gender with the qualified substantive if one assumed the so-called ‘gender polarity’ (cf. Badawi et al. 2004: 260-262), which means that a substantive which in the singular is masculine is qualified by a numeral with the feminine suffix -ат-. If this kind of description were assumed, as well as that such numerals show inherent plural number, they could be said to agree in state, gender, number and case with the plural substantives they qualify in attribution, e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ru‘ās-i} & \quad \text{‘amwāl-i} & \quad \text{l-bunāk-i} & \quad \text{s-sittat-i} & \quad \text{l-‘āmm-at-i} \\
\text{capitals.NH.PL-G} & \quad \text{moneys.NH.PL-G} & \quad \text{D-banks.NH.PL-G} & \quad \text{D-six.M.PL-G} & \quad \text{D-public-NH.PL-G} \\
\text{‘of the capitals of the 6 public banks’} & \quad \text{‘of the moneys of the 6 public banks’} & \quad \text{‘of the D-banks of the 6 public banks’} & \quad \text{‘of the six M-plants of the 6 public banks’} & \quad \text{‘of the D-public of the 6 public banks’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

71 Bartnicka, who studied the relationship between adjectives and participles in Polish, speaks of ‘adjectivization of participles’ (1970).
72 These ‘compound numbers’ will be treated as words which should not be divided.
However, for the purpose of the present monograph, we will not consider numerals to be adjectives with the exception of those of group (i), the syntax of which is typically adjectival. Neither will be treated as adjectives numerals used as ordinal numerals which agree with the substantives in state and case but not in gender and number, e.g.:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
ma'\text{a} \text{ ğu\text{d}ür-i} & l-'\text{adad-i} & s-\text{sittimi'at-i} \\
\text{with edition.M.SI-G} & D-\text{issue.M.SI-G} & D-\text{six:hundred-G}
\end{array}
\]

‘with the edition of the 600th issue’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 209) /24/

What should be pointed out here, quite marginally, is that the same construction has come recently to be used not in the ordering sense, as ordinal numbers, but in the quantitative sense, as cardinal numbers. Such constructions are against classical rules. Examples include:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
h\text{ādīhi} & l-'\text{utun-u} & l-\text{ḥamsumi'at-u} \\
\text{these} & D-\text{sheasses.NH.PL-N} & D-\text{five:hundred-N}
\end{array}
\]

‘these 500 she-asses’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 210) /25/

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{ḥilāla} & s-\text{sā'at-i} & l-'\text{arba'at-i} & wa & l-'\text{išrīna} & l-\text{mādiy-at-i} \\
\text{within} & D-\text{hours.NH.PL-G} & D-\text{four.F.PL-G} & \text{and} & D-\text{twenty.G} & D-\text{past-NH.PL-G}
\end{array}
\]

‘within the last 24 hours’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 2, 109 qatlā...) /26/.

According to canonical rules, the counted object should be expressed by a substantive in the accusative case, the so-called \textit{tamyīz}, e.g. \textit{ḥilāla l-'arba'i wa l-'išrīna sā'atan}. The construction discussed here seems not to be described in grammars of MWA. Badawi et al. give an example of it, \textit{al-mašāhidu l-17 allatī sajjalahā} (2004: 257), and another on p. 262, where they observe that ‘the number is in apposition’, without however taking special notice that this usage does not conform to classical rules.
PART 3. THREE KINDS OF NON-PREDICATIVE TAUOPTOTIC NOMINAL SYNTAGMS

In this part of the work, we will be concerned with the differentiation of non-predicative syntagms in which the adjective, occupying the second position, functions as the qualificator of the substantive occupying the first position with which it agrees in state, gender, number (with restrictions, if applicable) and case – we will call such type of qualification *adjectival attribution* – from other syntagms composed of two nouns which agree, or seem to agree, with each other in some respects. Since the property which is shared by all such syntagms is that their constituents always stand in the same case, we will refer to them as *tautoptotic syntagms*\(^{73}\). Only non-predicative syntagms will concern us here.

The presentation of such a differentiation is, in fact, a necessary comment supplementing the definition of the adjective presented above because there are syntagms in MWA which only apparently are based on adjectival attribution but, if one examines them in more depth, they turn either not to involve adjectives but substantives, or not to be based on attribution at all.

We will divide the non-predicative tautoptotic nominal syntagms into three major kinds, in accordance with the nature of the syntactic and semantic relations obtaining between their constituents. We think that in MWA these relations are of complex nature and require a thorough analysis. These relations are: *hypotaxis*, *parataxis*, which have been introduced in chapter 1.1.2., and *apposition*. Apposition will for us be a kind of relation lying somewhere in between hypotaxis and parataxis. It seems that it cannot be classed as a subtype of either. It will become clear that we understand the terms in a different way than various linguists may understand\(^ {74}\). E.g. some expressions which traditionally would be interpreted as appositions, here will be treated as substantival attributions.

---

\(^{73}\) We do not use the term ‘case-concordial’ here, which should be reserved only for hypotactic syntagms. ‘Case-concordial syntagms’ are thus a subset of ‘tautoptotic syntagms’.

\(^{74}\) It is a separate issue that many linguists understand them intuitively, without giving any definitions.
3.1. Hypotaxis

The relation of hypotaxis has been introduced and discussed in chapter 1.1.2. In the present chapter we will distinguish and discuss two kinds of syntagm based on hypotaxis: *adjectival attribution* and *substantival attribution*.

3.1.1. Attribution

Syntagms involving *adjectival attribution* and those involving *substantival attribution* can be distinguished from each another on the grounds of the definition of the adjective we proposed above, the concord in gender and number being the most important differentiating factor. What they have in common is that in both kinds of attribution there is no possibility of reversing the linear order of the constituents. In our study, attribution is defined in terms of this property.

3.1.1.1. Adjectival attribution

Adjectives, defined as above, form with the substantives they qualify hypotactic attributive syntagms. Examples of such syntagms are:

- *qadiyyat-u l-mumarridät-i l-bulğäriyyät-i*
  - ‘the issue of Bulgarian nurses’ (Hayāt 2/08/07, 19, Mīn yālli dafa‘?) /1/

- *raʔs-dä l-wuzarâ-i s-sâbiqâni*
  - ‘the [two] former Prime Ministers’ (Hayāt 2/08/07, 6, At-tawāfuqu) /2/

Examples with the absolutive elatives:

- *qiyyâm-u minṭaqat-i t-tiğarat-i l-hûr-at-i l-‘arabiyy-at-i l-kubrā*
‘the coming into being of the Great Arab Free Trade Zone’ (‘Arab al-Yawm 29/4/04, 2, An-Nāšir yad‘ā ‘ilā ... ) /3/

at-tağārib-u ‘alā l-qaradat-i l-‘ulūyā
D-experiments.NH.PL-N on D-apes.NH.PL-G D-higher.NH.PL.G
‘experiments on the higher apes’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 145) /4/

‘alla-hum yaḍidūna ḥulūl-a-n muṭlā
‘perhaps they will find ideal solutions’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, Maṭāru ‘aṣī‘ati...) /5/

There exist nouns which fulfil our criteria of being an adjective, but according to other criteria, such as the capability of functioning as arguments, they could be treated as substantives. Nevertheless, they will be treated as adjectives here. Examples:

ṭābīb-u n ḡarrāḥ-u n
‘a surgeon doctor’ /6/

aš-šu‘arā‘-u l-waṣṣāḥ-ūna
‘muwashshaha-writing poets’ (Kallās 14) /7/

‘ayyām-a r-ra‘īs-i l-‘astr-i Ṣaddām Husayn
‘the days of the captive president S.H.’ (‘Arab-al-Yawm 29/4/04, 1, Būṣ yuṭliqu ‘ināna...) /8/

wazīr-a n mas‘ūl-a n wa mudarris-a n ḍāḥib-a n
‘a responsible minister and a learned teacher’ (Taqāf 9/11/04, 4, Taḥrímu l-mudāhīna) /9/

‘an ṭariq-i ṣuḥufiyy-i-n ṣadīq-i-n
‘through a journalist-friend’ lit. ‘a friend journalist’ (Mīr 186) /10/

ġamā‘at-a l-‘iḥwān-i l-muslim-īna
‘the group of Muslim Brethren’ (Ar-Ra‘y 1, Al-Fāyīz: lā tasāhula...) /11/

75 According to Cantarino (1975, 2: 71) they would be “nonrestrictive appositive”, i.e. substantives modifying substantives (he gives the example bā‘i‘un ǧawwālin). But his classification is not based on an explicit distinction of adjectives and substantives.
If these nouns are qualified by a substantive in the genitive without a formal annexation resulting, they shall be treated as functioning as substantives and the syntagm will be a substantival apposition (see Ch 3.2.1.), e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
ar-ra'is-u & \quad 'asir-u & \quad l-\text{harb}-i \\
\text{D-president.M.SI-N} & \quad \text{prisoner.M.SI-N} & \quad \text{D-war.F.SI-G} \\
\text{‘the president, prisoner of war’} & & /12/
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
at-\text{tabib}-u & \quad \text{\textit{garran}-u} & \quad l-qalb-i \\
\text{D-doctor.M.SI-N} & \quad \text{surgeon.M.SI-N} & \quad \text{D-heart.M.SI-G} \\
\text{‘the doctor, a heart surgeon’} & \quad \text{lit. ‘surgeon of the heart’} & /13/
\end{align*}
\]

It should be noted that many of these nouns cannot be qualified by a substantive in the genitive or if so, their meaning changes. E.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
bi & \quad kull-i & \quad \text{tiqat}-i & \quad l-\text{\textit{alam}-i} & \quad l-\text{\textit{habir}-i} \\
\text{with} & \quad \text{all-G} & \quad \text{confidence.F.SI-G} & \quad \text{D-scholar.M.SI-G} & \quad \text{D-expert.M.SI-G} \\
\text{‘with all the confidence of an experienced scholar’} & & /14/
\end{align*}
\]

Here, \textit{\textit{habir}} is qualifiable by a substantive in the genitive only if the meaning of \textit{\textit{habir}} is ‘a specialist’, i.e. an acknowledged one, possibly with a certificate. It is not qualifiable in this manner when having the meaning ‘experienced’. Of course, in many cases it is difficult to tell whether the noun is qualifiable by a substantive in the genitive or not. These must be considered as border cases.

Another problem is how to distinguish adjectival attributions from what we will call substantival appositions. The problem appears to be especially conspicuous with \textit{niseba}-adjectives expressing nationalities qualifying appellativa, e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
'\text{il}a & \quad '\text{asiquq}-i-kumu & \quad l-\text{\textit{iirajiy}-ina} \\
to & \quad \text{brothers.M.PL-G-2.M.PL} & \quad \text{D-Iraqi.M-PL.G} \\
\text{‘to your Iraqi brothers’} & \quad (\text{Hayat 8/4/04, 2, A-\text{-\textit{Sadru yu\text{\textdag}-libu...}}}) & /15/
\end{align*}
\]

The order of the nominal constituents in these syntags seems to be reversible but such reversed order seems not very natural. No example of a syntagm analogous to a hypothetical ‘\textit{\textit{il}a l-\text{\textit{iirajiy}-ina} \text{a\textit{siqq}-ikum ‘to the
Iraqis, your brothers’ occurred in our corpus. Therefore we prefer to treat them as adjectival attributions. Admittedly, there is some arbitrariness in this decision. This problem will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3.2.1.1.

3.1.1.1. Discussion of adjectives with limited gender and number concord

Let us now discuss in more detail adjectives that show restrictions with respect to concord in gender and number, mentioned in chapter 2.2.3. The constructions listed there in group (1) are fairly complex and will be discussed in chapter 5.12. in order not to obscure the picture of other syntagms with adjectival attribution. Let us then start with discussing adjectives of group (2).

2. First, we give examples with syntagms in which the qualificata of the adjectives are feminine, in order to show the neutralization of gender:

Adjectives following the pattern fa‘ülun in active meaning:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wa'd'-u} & \quad \text{ḥuṣṣat-i-n} & \quad \text{tamāḥ-i-n} & \quad \text{li 'inšā'i-...} \\
\text{invention.M.SI-N} & \quad \text{plan.F.SI-G-I} & \quad \text{ambitious.NG.NN-G-I} & \quad \text{for creation.M.SI-G} \\
\text{‘invention of an ambitious plan for creating...’} & \quad (\text{’Ahrām 29/01/03, 28, Ḥuṣṣatun li ’inšā'i...}) /16/ \\
\text{min natā’iğ-i} & \quad \text{l-ḥarb-i} & \quad ḍ-قاتل-i \\
\text{of results.NH.PL-G} & \quad \text{D-war.F.SI-G} & \quad \text{D-fierce.NG.NN-G} \\
\text{‘of the results of the fierce war’} & \quad (\text{’Ahrām 22/01/03, 12, Qaḍiyatu s-sā’ati}) /17/ \\
\text{ma’ā mra’at-i-n} & \quad ḥaqūd-i-n \\
\text{with woman.F.SI-G-I} & \quad \text{malicious.NG.NN-G-I} \\
\text{‘with a malicious woman’} & \quad (\text{’Umar 34}) /18/ \\
\end{align*}
\]

Adjectives following the pattern fa‘ülun in passive meaning and miğbärun: no examples occurred in the corpus.
Adjectives designating typically female properties:\(^{76}\):

\[\text{imra'at-u-n} \quad \text{hāmil-u-n}\]

woman.F.SI-N-I \quad pregnant.NG.NN-N-I

‘pregnant woman’\(^{77}\) /19/

In the following, examples are given with plural qualificata as to show the neutralization in number:

\[\text{hūṣūf-u-n} \quad \text{multawiy-at-u-n} \quad \text{ḥanūn-u-n}\]

lines.NH.PL-N-I \quad winding-NH.PL-N-I \quad gentle.NG.NN-N-I

‘winding, gentle lines’ (‘Arabi 5/04, 106) /20/

\[\text{wāsalat} \quad \text{Miṣr-u} \quad \text{masāʾiy-a-hā} \quad \text{d-daʿāb-a} \ldots\]

continued Egypt.F.SI-N \quad efforts.NH.PL-A-3.F.SI \quad D-tireless.NG.NN-A

‘Egypt continued its tireless efforts’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 32, Muṣkilātun ḡawhariyyatun) /21/

A tendency to analogy is visible in that forms with the pattern \(faʿūlatun\) instead of \(faʿūlun\) in active sense are used and that the use of such feminine forms with \(-atun\) with words designating typically female properties was permitted by the Academy of Cairo (Blau 1981: 174-175). But according to Blau, the form \(faʿil\) in passive sense still prevails (1973: 212). Examples with no neutralization include:

\[\text{ān-nā} \quad \text{ḥūṭāt-a-n} \quad \text{ṭamūḥ-at-a-n}\]

that with-1.PL \quad plan.F.SI-A-I \quad ambitious-F.SI-A-I

‘that we have an ambitious plan’ (‘Arabal-Yawm 29/4/04, 2, Al-malikā: ‘ayyu ḥulūlin...) /22/

\[\text{gūḥūd-a} \quad \text{sumuww-w-i} \quad \text{waliyy-i} \quad \text{lʿahd-i} \quad \text{d-daʿāb-at-a}\]

efforts.NH.PL-A \quad highness.M.SI-G \quad successor.M.SI-G \quad D-commitment.M.SI-G \quad D-tireless-NH.PL-A

‘the tireless efforts of [His] Highness Crown Prince’ (lit. ‘successor of the commitment’) (Ḡazīra 3/4/04, 2, Waliyyu lʿahdi yahṣaṭu...) /23/

---

\(^{76}\) Sibawayhi looked for an explanation of this lack of concord by trying to interpret this construction in a fairly little feminist way: he took these adjectives as referring to a thing (šayʿun), which has masculine gender (Mosel 1975: 335).

\(^{77}\) If used with gender concord (\(imraʿatun hāmilatun\), the construction means ‘a woman carrying something’). No example of attributive use occurred in the corpus. There was however the following predicative syntagm:

\[\text{Nikāl Rūšī...ḥāmilun}\]

‘Nicole Richie [is]...pregnant’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 19, heading).
According to Corriente (2002 [1988]: 77), if such an adjective is substantivized, it inflects for gender. Thus, writes Corriente, qatîl is ‘asesinado/a’ (‘killed’) but qatîlatun is ‘una muerta’ (‘a murdered woman’); kaḍûb is ‘mentiroso/a’ (‘untruthful’) but kaḍûbatun ‘una mentirosa’ (‘a deceitful woman’). This seems to be due to the fact that without a qualified substantive, the gender must be expressed in the adjective. Yet let us remark that there are numerous exceptions to this rule: ‘aḡûzûn almost always means ‘an old woman’ and murði‘ always means ‘wet nurse’, though without the feminine ending.

3. Adjectives that follow the pattern af‘al and are relative elatives, i.e. have comparative or superlative meaning and there is a standard of comparison, at least implied (see chapter 2.2.4.) will be discussed in what follows.

**Relative elatives with superlative meaning (usually definite)**

Here, as above, we will chiefly provide examples of syntagms with feminine substantives as qualificata in order to demonstrate the absence of concord in gender. Let us start with definite substantives. The adjective, then, usually has superlative meaning:

\[hiya \ l-quwwat-u \ l-‘aţam-u\]

*3.F.SI D-power.F.SI-N D-most:potent.NG.NN-N*

‘it is the most potent power’ (Mîtáq 20/4/04,12) /24/

\[al-μuškilat-u \ l-‘akbar-u\]

*D-problem.F.SI-N D-biggest.NG.NN-N*

‘the biggest problem’ (‘Abyād-Aswad 40) /25/

The absence of concord in number is exemplified in:

\[fi \ l-buldān-i \ l-‘aţānā\]

*in D-countries.NH.PL-G D-richest.NG.NN.G*

‘in the richest countries’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, Maḍārū ‘aši‘atī...) /26/

In syntagms with masculine substantives as qualificata the concord neutralization is not visible. This is, for instance, the case in /27/:
Jordan became the most lovely and beautiful country’ (Ra’y 2, Lan yamurrū) /27/

However, with the feminine l-mamlakata ‘kingdom’ instead of l-balada, the adjective would not change its form, and the neutralization of concord would be visible. Another difficulty is that relative elatives, being neutralized in gender and number, cannot be distinguished from masculine absolutive elatives, as in:

al-qā’id-u l-‘alā li l-quwwāt-i l-musallaḥ-at-i
‘the Chief Commander of the Armed Forces’ (Ra’y 2, Qāfilatu musā‘adātin...) /28/

With the feminine form l-qā’idatu ‘the female commander’, however, the adjective would change its form to l-‘ulyā. One should also remember here that absolute elatives form a closed class, i.e. not all elatives have the feminine form fi‘lā.

For some elatives neutralized in gender and number, however, one should probably also postulate absolutive meaning, i.e. with no comparison involved. The forms typical of relative elative, i.e. without concord, are used because the necessary absolutive forms, *š-šulbā and *š-šuddā for the following examples, do not exist:

’an takūna qaḍiyat-u Filasṭīn-a l-ḡawzat-a l-‘ašlab-a
that is issue.F.SI-N Palestine-G D-nut.F.SI-A D-hardest.NG.NN-A
‘that the issue of Palestine is the [very] hard nut’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 9, Mātat ḥarīṭatu...) /29/

al-māddat-i l-‘ašadd-i ḏarar-a-n ‘alā ṭ-faqāt-i l-wāqiyy-at-i
‘[of] the substance [extremely] harmful to the protective layer’ lit. ‘[of] the substance strongest in harm...’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, Maḏārru ’aṣi‘ati...) /30/

Relative elatives with comparative meaning (usually indefinite)
The comparative meaning of the elatives is usually made visible by phrases with the preposition min ‘from, than’, but it may also be inferable from context. E.g.:
"inna stifâ-á 'ugár-i-n 'a'lâ min tilka llaft... "
that payment.M.SI-A wages.NH.PL-G-I higher.NG.NN.G.I than those which
'that the payment of wages higher than those which...' (Râ'y 1, 'Ilânun hâmmun) /31/

tamrîn-a-n wâhid-a-n tawil-a-n tumma tamrîn-ayni 'aqår-a
'one long exercise, then [two] shorter exercises' (Hayât 20807, 20, Ar-râḥatu...) /32/

It seems that there are also definite elatives which could be taken as comparatives:

al-'ahamm-u min ǧâlika 'anna ʾigmâliyy-a-
D-more:important.NG.NN-N than this that total.M.SI-A
'[what is] more important than that is that the total of ...' (ʾAhrām 22/01/03, 28,
ʿAlâmatu stifhâmin) /33/

However, normally, if one wants to qualify a definite substantive with an elative in comparative sense, one has to resort to predication:

fa l-ġumhûr-u l-birázîliyy-u llaḏî huwa 'aqrab-u 'ilâ l-wilâyât-i

l-muttaḥid-at-i qtišâdiyy-a-n wa taqâfiyy-a-n
'The Brazilian people, which is fairly close fairly close fairly close fairly close to the USA economically and culturally...
(ʿÂlam al-fikr, 49) /34/

Here, the elative 'aqrabu was used as the predicate instead of being used as an attribute, since fa l-ġumhûru l-birázîliyyu l-qrabu 'ilâ... would rather mean: 'the Brazilian people, closest to...'.

4. The next class of adjectives showing restricted concord to be discussed here, i.e. those which are loanwords and cannot be used as genitival qualifiers resulting in constructions with synonymous meaning, is not very numerous. Such adjectives of non-Arabic origin can be older ones, e.g. 'umlâtun šâğ 'standard currency' (from Turkish sağ 'healthy, correct') or newer, e.g. mûf 'mauve', bîğ 'beige' (from English). Another example is:
The qualifying noun in /35/ is an adjective because this construction has no synonymous equivalent in *fatātu l-mūdirn, i.e. with the substantive in the genitive. By contrast, the qualifying noun in /36/ is not an adjective but a substantive:

\begin{align*}
&\text{bi} \quad l-qışsatî \quad l-kārîh# \\
&\text{with} \quad D\text{-haricut.F.SI-G} \quad D\text{-carré.M.SI.G}
\end{align*}

‘with the carré haircut’ i.e. ‘bob haircut’ (‘Aḥbār 17/1/03, 13, Aš-ša'ru l-musta'āru...)/36/

because /36/ has a synonymous equivalent in qışsatî l-kārîh, where l-kārîh is a substantive in the genitive (cf. chapter 3.1.1.2.).

5. The last category of adjectives with restricted number and gender concord, i.e. adjectives designating a species or style and most frequently being nisbas, can be exemplified as follows:

\begin{align*}
&qahwat-u-n \quad turkiyy-u-n \\
&\text{coffee.F.SI-N-I} \quad \text{Turkish.NG.NN-N-I}
\end{align*}

‘Turkish [style] coffee’ (from Badawi et al. 2004: 105) /37/

In Badawi et al., this example is classed along with others as designating “food items” and “fashion styles”. Note that the expression qahwatun turkiyyun does not mean ‘coffee from Turkey’ but ‘in Turkish style’. Similarly, in /38/ the wedding in a popular or traditional fashion does not have to take place in a popular district:

\begin{align*}
&'ilā 'ihyâ’-i \quad ħaflat-i \quad zifāf-i-n \quad 'aw zaффat-i-n \quad baladiyy-i-n \\
&\text{to animation.M.SI-G} \quad \text{celebration.F.SI-G} \quad \text{wedding.M.SI-G-I or wedding.F.SI-G-I} \quad \text{popular.NG.NN-G-I}
\end{align*}

‘to perform [at] the celebration of the wedding or “the popular wedding”’ (Hayāt 2/08/07, 19, Firqatu Ḥasballāh...)/38/

78 Badawi et al. leave l-mūdirn with no inflectional ending, which means that, normally, none would be pronounced here. Classical rules on concord cannot be applied here. However, it seems justified to assume that this word is in the same case its qualificatum, even though there are no mph indicators showing this.
It is probable that such syntagms without concord are modelled on dialectal Arabic. Their source could be syntagms with adjectives designating colours, which, e.g. in the Egyptian Arabic dialect, do not inflect for gender or number, e.g. *badla bunni* ‘a brown suit’ (Zaborski 1982: 77).

### 3.1.1.1.2. Seemingly hypotactic adjectives

It could be argued that in some syntagms based on adjectival attribution involving two adjectives, the first adjective is qualified by the second, consequently, that the syntagm composed of the two adjectives is a hypotactic one. The semantics shows that they are not equal in their semantic status. Yet in reality, syntactically, they both agree with their qualificatum in state, gender, number and case, i.e. are paratactic to each other. Thus, e.g. in /39/:

*lākinna masʾāl-a-n kāriyy-a-n ǧanūbiyy-a-n ṭalaba...*


‘but a South Korean official, who has requested...’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 8, Kābūl tarfuḍu...) /39/

we are not dealing with a “Korean official” and a “southern official” at a time. This is a “South Korean official”, i.e. his “Koreanness” is southern. Then, the official is characterized by this southern Koreanness. An analogous problem is exemplified in /40/:

*bi l-muḥaqiq-i l-yahūdiyy-i l-ʾalmānīyy-i*


‘by the German-Jewish investigator’ (Ṭaqāfī 9/11/04, 6, Intiḥārun ṭayru...) /40/

where the investigator is characterized by “German Jewishness”. It seems that semantic relations obtaining in such syntagms are fairly complex and deserve a separate study. We will content ourselves with merely signalling this phenomenon and will not distinguish such constructions as a special kind of adjectival, i.e. bi-adjectival, syntagm. We will treat such constructions as paratactically connected adjectives.
3.1.1.1.3. Linear contiguity of attributive adjectives

An attributive adjective has to be separated from its qm if the latter is qualified by a substantive in the genitive, e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bāb-u</td>
<td>room.F.SI-G-I</td>
<td>door.M.SI-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥugráfico-i-n</td>
<td>only-F.SI-G-I</td>
<td>room.F.SI-G-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waḥidat-i-n</td>
<td>open.M.SI-N-I</td>
<td>‘the open door of the only room’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Otherwise it usually follows its qualificatum immediately. A syntagm can be made linearly discontiguous by the insertion of other words, too, as in the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>li maḍīnat-i-n</td>
<td>academic-F.SI-G-I</td>
<td>town.F.SI-G-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gāmi‘iyyat-i-n</td>
<td>for D-girls.F.PL-G</td>
<td>ali-banāt-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l-banāt-i</td>
<td>new-F.SI-G-I</td>
<td>‘of a new academic campus for girls’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not infrequent to find attributive adjectival syntagms made discontiguous by a modifying particle, e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḍīmna</td>
<td>inside D-details.NH.PL-G</td>
<td>‘in perhaps boring details’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-tafāṣil-i</td>
<td>perhaps D-boring-NH.PL-G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rubbāmā</td>
<td>‘the open door of the only room’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.1.1.4. Adjectives qualifying substantives after cardinal numerals

In the present chapter we will be concerned with the problem of adjectives qualifying substantives after cardinal numerals. Two issues will be discussed here: the number of the qualifying adjective and the identification of its qualificatum.

Let us begin by describing some relevant constructions. If the cardinal numeral is one between 11 and 99, or a compound numeral ending in 11 to 99, then the counted object is expressed by a singular substantive in the accusative qualifying the numeral, e.g.:
If the cardinal is a hundred, a thousand or a million, or a compound numeral ending in one of them, the counted object is expressed by a singular substantive in the genitive qualifying the numeral, e.g.:

\[ mi\prime at-u ra\u0161ul-i-n \]
\[ hundred.SI-N man.M.SI-G-I \]
\[ ‘hundred men’ /45/ \]

In both cases the substantive may be qualified in adjectival attribution. The number of the qualifying adjective is not determined in a fixed way. It may be singular, as to agree with the number of the substantive, as in /46/:

\[ qatala ‘arba\prime at-a wa ṭamān-in\a’a ‘astr-a-n ḡaza\prime triyy-a-n \]
\[ ‘[he] killed 84 Algerian prisoners [of war]’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 189) /46/ \]

But the number of the adjective can also be plural as to manifest what is termed ‘concord ad sensum’, i.e. not with the form of the substantive, which morphologically may be singular, but with the real quantity of the counted objects, e.g.:

\[ ‘alā madā t-talātāt-i qurūn-i-ni l-mādiyy-at-i \]
\[ ‘in the course of the past 3 centuries’ (Ṭaqāfī 9/11/04, 9, ‘Abqariyyatu l-ḥayāli...’) /47/ \]

\[ ‘inna fi s-Sūdān-i mi’at-a milyūn-i fiddān-i-n ṣāliḥ-at-i-n (or ṣāliḥ-at-a-n) \]
\[ ‘in Sudan there is a hundred million good feddans’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 13, ‘Anāširu l-quwwati...’) /48/ \]

\[ ḥilālā l-‘arba\prime īna ‘ām-a-ni l-mādiyy-at-i (or l-mādiyy-at-a) \]
\[ ‘during the past fourty years’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 93) /49/ \]

\[ fa mina t-talātātā‘ašara milyūn-a yahūdiyy-i-ni l-muwazza\prime ūna fi l-‘ālam-i... \]
\[ ‘from the 13 million Jews dispersed in the world...’ (‘Ayyārī 31) /50/ \]
Yet it can be argued that in these examples the adjective agrees with the numeral, not with the substantive. Then, the plural concord would be understandable, since the numeral conveys the meaning of plurality. Let us then examine if there are any indicators of the adjective qualifying the numeral.

We will start with the concord in case. In /47/ it is certain that the adjective is in the genitive because both the numeral and the counted substantive are in this case. But we do not know which one is the attrahent of the adjective. In examples /48/ and /49/ the inflectional ending (-u, -i, or -a) is not written and must be inferred from the context. Most probably, it would not be pronounced either. There are two possibilities: in /48/ it can be either -an of the accusative, agreeing with the numeral mi'a'ta ‘hundred’, or in of genitive, agreeing with the counted substantive, fi'dānīn. In /49/ it can be either -i of the genitive, agreeing with the numeral (l-'arba'īna ‘fourty’), or -a, the accusative, agreeing with the substantive (‘āman ‘year’). In the example /50/ the inflectional ending is indicated: -ī- in -īna shows that this is either the genitive or the accusative (the uncertainty is due to syncretism), but, as in /47/, we do not know what is the case-attrahent: the numeral or the counted substantive. Grammars of Arabic present contradictory data in this respect. For instance, Corriente gives the example ’arba'īna ra'gulān mu'mīnīna ‘fourty believing men’, where the plural adjective clearly agrees in case, the accusative, with the substantive (2002: 132). Cantarino, in turn, gives the example fi l-'išrīna 'awi l-talātīna sanatānī l-'aḥirāti ‘during the last twenty or thirty years’ (1975, 2: 52), where the plural adjective clearly agrees in case, the genitive, with the numeral. The same morphological properties also characterize the example given by Badawi et al.: ḥilāla l-15 ‘āmanī l-'aḥirāti ‘during the last 15 years’ (2004: 262). It is not clear which solution should be chosen. Classical grammars do not account for such cases while Arabic speakers tend to not pronounce these endings.

In the examples of our corpus it cannot be seen from the inflectional ending of the adjectives whether they agree in case with the numeral or with the substantive. What can be seen, though, is that in examples where the adjective is plural, it always agrees in state with the numeral, not with the substantive, e.g. in /49/. From this we could infer that the adjective, e.g.
l-mādiyat- in /49/, qualifies the numeral, l-’arba‘īna, not the substantive, ‘āman’.

One more detail should be taken into consideration here. In /50/, the form of the adjective l-muwazzī’īna is used only for adjectives qualifying human substantives. How can this adjective, then, be a qualificator of a numeral? The answer is that it can because there are numerals referring to human entities, and which are treated as substantivized, e.g.:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\textit{kun} & \textit{mina} \text{ } s-sab‘at-i \quad r-rābih-īna \\
\text{be} & \text{of} \quad \text{D-seven.M-PL-G} \quad \text{D-winning.M-PL-G} \\
\text{‘be [one] of the winning seven!’} & \text{(Ar-Ra’y 2, advertisement) /51/}
\end{array}
\]

Such numerals can be qualified by adjectives that have the form proper to nouns referring to human beings. Therefore it is no wonder that in /50/ the adjective qualifies the numeral and has the form used for nouns designating human entities. This is the option that will be adopted for our typology of the adjectival syntagms.

What remains to discuss is the following question: does the adjective not qualify the substantive at all in such cases? The answer is that there is still concord in gender with the substantive (admittedly, in /48/ and /49/ the substantives are M.SI, while the adjectives are NH.PL, yet still, the substantives are non-human). Therefore we are inclined to say that in constructions with a plural adjective, the adjective qualifies both the numeral and the substantive (note that in the latter case there is no concord nor rection, thus, the syntagm will be based on gender concord only). Should this opinion be assumed, this would be an instance of one word qualifying more than one qualificatum.

There is another construction worth discussing, represented in /52/: 

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\textit{ġuriṭa} 16 & \textit{sittata ‘ašara} \quad sḥṣṣ-ṣ-n \quad ‘aḥṣr-īna \\
\text{were:wounded sixteen.M,N} & \text{person.M.SI-A-I} \quad \text{other.M-PL.G.I} \\
\text{‘16 other persons were wounded’} & \text{(Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 2, At-ṭaḥāluftu yad‘ū...)} /52/
\end{array}
\]

79 However, Blau cites an example where the adjective does not have the definite article: al-‘ašaratā malā‘īna līrat(i) lubnāniyyat(i), and says this is so that ‘the article attached to the number suffices to determine not only the counted noun, but also an adjectival attribute following the counted noun and referring to it (1973: 186).
Here, the concord relations are different: we do not know whether the adjective agrees with the numeral in state. This concord might be accidental, because the counted substantive is indefinite as well and it might be it that makes the adjective indefinite. The more so that the adjective agrees with the substantive in case, the accusative. However, the adjective agrees with the numeral in gender (according to gender polarity) and number (since numerals are inherently plural). Therefore, again, we will identify here qualification (i) between the adjective and the substantive and (ii) between the adjective and the numeral.

Finally, let us discuss example /53/:

*hunäka 12 [išnâ ‘ašara] muttaham-a-n 'āhar-a mawqūf-lna*


‘there are 12 other suspects arrested’ (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 2, Ḥādī ṣ-Ṣadr...) /53/

Here, we have two qualifying adjectives. Both agree in case, the accusative, with the substantive (the numeral is in the nominative), yet the first adjective is singular, while the second is plural. Unless the second is taken to be a secondary predicate, i.e. ḫāl – and we see no reason why it should be so – this is a specific example of two paratactic adjectives qualifying the same substantive, but differing from each other in that one shows concord in form, and the second – concord *ad sensum*.

### 3.1.1.2. Substantival attribution

Tautoptotic hypotactic syntagms with two nouns which do not fulfil the criteria for adjecival attribution and within which the linear word order is not reversible will be said to be based on substantival attribution. For short, we will say that such syntagms are substantival attributions. In substantival attributions the second noun is a substantive. Let us remark that some syntagms based on what we understand as substantival attribution, traditionally would be interpreted as appositions. An example of substantival attribution showing concord in gender is given in /54/:

*Būš al-ibn-u*


‘Bush Junior’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 1, Al-ʾismā’u l-mаṭlūbu...) /54/
Examples of substantival attributions without concord in gender are given in what follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
g\text{a'ala-hā} & \quad \text{madīnāt-a-n} & \quad \text{nāmuqāţ-a-n} \\
\text{it:made-3.F.SI} & \quad \text{city.F.SI-A-1} & \quad \text{model.M.SI-A-1} \\
\text{‘it made her a model city’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 31, Wamdātun) /55/}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
l\text{an tuwqāda} & \quad \text{l-fatāţ-u} & \quad \text{l-kuf’-u}\text{80} & \quad \text{lī} \\
\text{no will:be} & \quad \text{D-girl.F.SI-N} & \quad \text{match.M.SI-N} & \quad \text{for.1.SI} \\
\text{‘there will be no girl convenient for me’ (Mīr 101) /56/}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{‘aşbāḥaţi} & \quad \text{l-yawm-a} & \quad \text{‘ard-a-n} & \quad \text{būr-a-n} \\
\text{became} & \quad \text{D-day.M.SI-A} & \quad \text{earth.F.SI-A-1} & \quad \text{fallow.M.SI-A-1} \\
\text{‘has become today a fallow land’ (‘Ahrām 2201/03, 22, Ṭalāţatu ʾalāfi fiddānin...) /57/}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mina} & \quad \text{l-kumbyāţir-i} & \quad \text{l-lawḥat-i} \\
\text{of} & \quad \text{D-computer.M.SI-G} & \quad \text{D-tablet.F.SI-G} \\
\text{‘of the tablet PC’ (‘Ahrām 22.01.03, 21, Tūšībā tu‘linu...) /58/}
\end{align*}
\]

Examples of substantival attributions showing no concord in number:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{baynā} & \quad \text{l-muslim-īna} & \quad \text{s-sunnat-i} & \quad \text{wa ź-šī’at-i} \\
\text{among} & \quad \text{D-Muslims.M-PL.G} & \quad \text{D-Sunna.F.SI-G} & \quad \text{and D-Shia.F.SI-G} \\
\text{‘among Sunni and Shia Muslims’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 7) /59/}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
yastanidu & \quad \text{‘ilā} & \quad \text{‘ahqār-i-n} & \quad \text{‘asās-i-n} & \quad \ gastro-\text{at-i-n} \\
\text{rests on} & \quad \text{stones.NH.PL-G-1} & \quad \text{foundation.M.SI-G-1} & \quad \text{new-NH.PL-G-1} \\
\text{‘rests on new foundation stones’ (Mītāq 20/4/04,12) /60/}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
wā lā & \quad \text{bi} & \quad \text{l-ḥulûl-i} & \quad \text{l-wasqat-i} \\
\text{and not} & \quad \text{D-solutions.NH.PL-G} & \quad \text{D-middle.M.SI-G} \\
\text{‘nor with compromises’ lit ‘middle solutions’ (Śarq’ Awsat, 17/05/03, 20, Ar-ru‘ā...) /31/}
\end{align*}
\]

---

80 The word kuśu can be graded, as the following example shows: ‘illā ‘iḍā kāna l-‘ahdātu huwa l-‘akfā’a ‘only if the younger is the fitter fitter fitter fitter (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 14, Lā yaqūzu taḥṣif). But in our study, gradability was rejected as a criterion for adjectivality. Thus, despite being gradable, the word kuśu is not treated as an adjective.

81 Admittedly, as-sunnatu and aš-šī’atu, originally singular and meaning ‘tradition’ and ‘faction’, respectively, are today felt as plurals, i.e. as collectives. These words, like many other substantives that can function as the qualificator in substantival attribution can be used without a qualified substantive. The same holds also for būrūn ‘fallow land’.
Note that in very few cases the gender of the substantive may be made feminine. Thus, while it is more frequent to see *ad-dawlatu l-‘udwu* ‘the Member State’, one can also find the following:

(ad-dawlat-u  l-‘udw-at-u  llati tatara’ asu ma’ glis-a...)

D-state.F.SI-N  D-member.F.SI-N  which presides council.M.SI-A

‘the Member State which presides the Council’

(http://www.euromedrights.net/pages/214/page/language/3) /62/

It seems that the process of adjectivization of the substantive ‘ud’wun ‘member’ is under way here.

What makes distinguishing adjectival attribution from substantival attribution easier is the fact that nouns of Arabic origin that are not derived following typical adjectival and participial patterns (such as *kattabun* or *kä’tibun*), e.g. *namüdaqun* ‘model’, ‘ud’wun ‘member’ and ‘abun ‘father’ are always treated as substantives. Here we can also include qualifying nouns which follow the pattern of the verbal noun (*mašdar*) in what the Arab grammarians called *wašf bi-l-mašdar* ‘description by means of *mašdar*’. The classical example is *nisā’un* ‘adlun* just women’ lit. ‘women-justice’ (Al-Γalāyīnī 2002 [1912]: 563).

Moreover, a syntagm should be deemed a substantival attribution if it is synonymous with a construction with the second substantive in the genitive case. Such constructions were already discussed by Arab grammarians (cf. Gätje 1973: 49)\(^82\). E.g.:

(wađa’a sumuww-u-hu  l-ħağar-a  l-’asās-a)


‘His Majesty laid down the foundation stone’ (Riyāḍ 24/4/04, 1, *Al-’amiru ‘Abdullāh...*) /63/

vs.

(wa  ħağar-a  l-’asās-i)

and stone.M.SI-A  D-foundation.M.SI-G

‘and the stone of foundation’ (Riyāḍ 24/4/04, 2, *Al-’amiru Abdullāh...*) /64/

---

\(^82\) These construction should probably be related to those described by Yushmanov (1961 [1938]) and Grotzfeld (2000). According to Yushmanov (1961 [1938]: 70) “[...] the dialects show a tendency to turn the adjective into the “genitive” of the noun [...] ; thus, along with *il-hudūm il-humr* ‘the red garments’, one can say *hudūm il-humr*, and along with *il-Quds iš-Šerīf* ‘Jerusalem’ (lit. ‘the noble sanctuary’, also *Quds iš-Šerīf*” [original underlining – MM]. Grotzfeld (2000) as well observes this phenomenon in dialects. But he notices that such constructions occurred already in preclassical Arabic (2000: 11).
as-sikkat-u l-ḥadīd-u
D-road.F.SI-N D-iron.M.SI-N
‘railway’ lit. ‘iron road’ (Rāgāb 20) /65/

vs.

sikkat-u l-ḥadīd-i
road.F.SI-N D-iron.M.SI-G
‘railway’ (Krahl 1985: 70) /66/

zāhirat-u n-naḥil-i l-bilāštik-i
‘the phenomenon of plastic palms’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 10, Min qarībin) /67/

vs.

nastawridu naḥil-a l-bilāštik-i
we:import palms.M.SI-A D-plastic.M.SI-G
‘we import palms [made] of plastic’ (ibidem) /68/ 83

Words such as nafsun, ʿaynun, dātun, meaning ‘the same’, as well as ʿiddatun ‘various, several’ šattā and ǧamīʿ ‘all’ may function as qualificators in substantival attributions. They are not adjectives because they never show gender concord. They are substantives since their syntax shows substantival properties. They are, for instance, qualifiable by substantives in the genitive. Examples of their use in substantival attribution include:

li šarikat-i-n [...] ʿahdāf-u-n ʿiddat-u-n
for company.F.SI-G-1 goals.NH.PL-N-I number.F.SI-N-I
‘the company has various goals’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 27, ‘Inšāʾu ṣālātin... ) /69/

mina l-maḡmūʿāt-i ʿayn-i-hā
from D-groups.NH.PL-G same-G-3.NH.PL
‘from the same groups’ (Šarq 2, Al-Bašmarkatu l-yadu...) /70/

ft buqāʿ-i-n šattā
in places.NH.PL-G-1 all.G
‘in all places’ (Mīṭaqq 20/4/04,13) /71/

83 Also synonymous adjectival attributions are correct: al-ḥaḍārū l-ʿasāsiyyu, as-sikkatul-ḥaddiyyatu and an-naḥṣū l-l-bilāṣṭikiyyu.
3.1.1.2.1. Substantival attribution with suffixally substantivized adjectives (SSA)

In chapter 4.5.4. we will introduce the concept of suffixally substantivized adjectives (SSA). Attributions with SSAs as qualificators will be treated as substantival attributions, not adjectival ones. This is justified by the fact that SSAs do not show gender and number concord with their qualificata. The number and gender of the qualificata is expressed in the pronominal suffix instead. Examples:

\[
\text{li mulāḥaqat-i } l-\text{afkār-i } \text{kabīr-i-hā} \text{ wa } \text{ṣaḡr-i-hā}
\]

\[
\text{to pursuit.} \text{F.SI-G} \text{ D-thoughts.} \text{NH.PL-G} \text{ big.NG.NN-G-3.NH.PL} \text{ and small.NG.NN-G-3.NH.PL}
\]

‘to the pursuit of thoughts, big and small’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 139) /72/

\[
\text{fi-hi } l-\text{maḡāllāt-u } l-\text{arabiyy-at-u } \text{ṣaḡr-u-hā} \text{ wa } \text{ḥṣan-u-hā}
\]

\[
\text{in-3.M.SI} \text{ D-magazines.} \text{NH.PL-N} \text{ D-Arabic-NH.PL-N} \text{ most.NG.NN-N-3.NH.PL} \text{ and best.NG.NN-N-3.NH.PL}
\]

‘and in it there are most of the Arabic magazines, and the best of them’ (from Cantarino 1975, 2: 72) /73/.

The similarity of sufixally substantivized adjectives to substantives used in substantival attribution can be seen in constructions with the word ġamī‘ ‘all’, which shows syntactic behaviour similar to SSA but is never used in attribution without a suffix. Example of this word used in substantival attribution:

\[
\text{qad kataba } \text{amlāk-a-hu } \text{ġamī‘-a-hā} \text{ bi sm-i } \text{ma‘būdat-i-hi}
\]

\[
\text{PART bequeathed properties.} \text{NH.PL-A-3.M.SI} \text{ all-A-3.NH.PL} \text{ to name.} \text{M.SI-G} \text{ ladylove.} \text{F.SI-G-3.M.SI}
\]

‘[he] had bequeathed all his properties to [the name of] his ladylove’ (‘Umar 40)

Cf. the non-grammaticality of *kataba ʿamlākahu l-ġamī‘ata, with ġamī‘ used as an adjective in adjectival attribution.

3.2. Apposition

In our study tautoptotic syntagms composed of two nouns whose word order can be reversed (at times, some additional conditions may have to be fulfilled) with no change in meaning involved will be said to be based on
apposition. For short, we will simply call such syntagms appositions\textsuperscript{84}. We will distinguish substantival and adjectival appositions.

### 3.2.1. Substantival apposition

Syntagms composed of two substantives whose order can be reversed (some restrictions will be explained further) will be called substantival appositions in our study. It appears that in most substantival appositions each of the substantive can be omitted. Then, an expression results which is grammatically correct, only a loss of meaning takes place. This loss of information can be retrieved either from the context or the hearer’s/reader’s knowledge about the world, cf. the apposition \textit{ra’ā Buš ra’īsa l-wilāyāti l-muttaḥidati} ‘he saw Bush, the president of USA’ can be reduced to \textit{ra’ā ra’īsa l-wilāyati l-muttaḥidati} ‘he saw the president of USA’, with no substantial information being lost, because, as Bühler says, apposition takes place “where the same thing is named twice differently” (1990 [1934]: 351)\textsuperscript{85}. Quite frequently, substantival appositons involve proper names. E.g.:

\begin{quote}
\textit{min Lubnān-a masqat-i ra’s-i-hi}
‘from Lebanon, place of his birth’ lit. ‘the place of fall of his head’ (\textit{Arabi} 5/04, 168) /75/
\end{quote}

Withing a substantival apposition, both members do not have to agree in gender or state, e.g.:

\begin{quote}
\textit{qālati l-muhandisat-u Ṭanā’ ad-Dīb muḍīr-u hay’at-i...}
said D-engineer.F.SI-N Ṭanā’ ad-Dīb director.M.SI-N organization.F.SI-G
‘Engineer Ṭanā’ ad-Dīb, director of the organization... has said’ (\textit{Ahrām} 29/01/03, 15, \textit{Muhāfazatu l-Ǧizāti...}) /76/
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{84} Cantarino (1975: II, 67-77), whose classification differs in many basic points from ours, distinguishes also between restrictive and nonrestrictive appositions, a distinction which we will consider irrelevant.

\textsuperscript{85} On the contrary, the expression \textit{ra’ā Būš al-‘aba} ‘he saw Bush Senior (lit. ‘Bush the father)’ is not a substantival apposition but a substantival attribution: the word order cannot be reversed (\textit{al-‘aba Būš} means ‘Father Bush’) and neither of the two words can be omitted without information loss.
Examples of appositions which do not involve proper nouns include:

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
bi & š-šayb-i & 'alāmat-i & l-waqār-i \\
\end{array}
\]

with D-gray:hair,M.SI-G sign,F.SI-G D-dignity,M.SI-G

‘with gray hair, sign of dignity’ (Maqh 90) /78/

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
'alā & tarwat-i-hi & t-ṭabī‘yyat-i & l-bitrāl-i \\
\end{array}
\]


‘on its natural wealth, oil’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 10, Qiṣṣatu mawtin...) /79/

Examples showing the reversibility of the word order:

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
al-'āşimat-u & Bağdād-u \\
\end{array}
\]

D-capital.F.SI-N Baghdad,F-N

‘the capital Baghdad’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 1, Taqārīru mina l-Bintağūn...) /80/

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
'ilā & Tulayṭīlat-a & l-'āşimat-i \\
\end{array}
\]

to Toledo,F-G D-capital,F.SI-G

‘to Toledo the capital’ (Kallās 33) /81/

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
 Yuwānā Frāṭskā & saṣirat-u & Bālandā fi l-Qāhirat-i \\
\end{array}
\]

YF.F.N. ambassador,F.SI-N Poland,F.G in D-Cairo,F-G

‘Joanna W.[ronecka], Poland’s ambassador in Cairo’ (‘Ahrām 29/1/03, 1, Bālandā tataṭallā’u...) /82/

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
 as-saṣir-u & l-'amirikīyy-u & bi l-Qāhirat-i \\
\end{array}
\]

D-ambassador,M.SI-N D-American,M.SI-N in D-Cairo,F-G D.W.M.N

‘The American Ambassador in Cairo, David Welch’ (‘Ahrām 29/1/03, 1, Mubārak yastaqbilu...) /83/.

Consequently, according to our idea of apposition and attribution, if for a native speaker the expression \( ad-dāhḥāku \) ‘Amrun ‘the laugher Amr’ is grammatically well formed and means roughly the same as ‘Amruni ḏ-dāhḥāku ‘the laughing Amr’, it means that the word \( dāhḥāku \) is not only
an adjective any more, but that it has become a substantive. It seems, however, that there may be many problematic borderline cases.

A specific case of apposition are syntagms composed of proper names and titles and similar labels. Their specific feature is that they show fixed word order, the title going first. Let us also mention that frequently, with names of organizations or institutions, where an apposition would be used in, say, English, MWA uses genitival constructions, e.g. wikālatu Rūytirz ‘the Agency of Reuters’. But appositions do occur:

\[
\text{wikālat-}u \quad l\text{-}^\text{anbā\text{'}-}i \quad s\text{-}sūriyy\text{-}at\text{-}u \quad Sānā
\]

agency.F.SI-N \quad D-news.NH.PL-G \quad D-Syrian.F.SI-N \quad Sana.F.N

‘the Syrian news agency Sana’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 1, \textit{Tašdidun ‘alā l\text{-}i\text{’}dādi...}) /84/

Examples of titles and similar labels:

\textit{an-nā\text{'}ib-}u \quad ‘Ān Klāyd ...

D-representative.M.SI-N \quad AK.F.N

‘the MP Ann Clwyd’ (\textit{Ḥayāt} 2/08/07, 2, \textit{Mab’ūṭatun bṛṭāniyyatun...}) /85/

\textit{hayāt-}u \quad ḥālid-ī \quad d\text{-}dikr-ī \quad Hārūn-\text{-}a \quad r\text{-}Rašīd-ī


‘the life of the always remembered (lit. ‘eternal in memory’) Harun ar-Rashid’ (\textit{Mīr} 209) /86/

Titles may be used with appellativa, e.g.:

\textit{as-sayyidat-}u \quad qarīnati\text{-}hu


‘Ms his spouse’ (\textit{ʻAnwār} 3/5/04, 2, \textit{Ra\text{’}isu Tšikiyā...}) /87/

\textit{bi} \quad l\text{-}lḥwat-ī \quad l\text{-}muwāṭin-īna

with D-brothers.M.PL-G \quad D-citizen.M-PL.G

‘with brothers citizens’ (\textit{Ra\text{’}y} 1, \textit{‘Flānun hāmmun}) /88/

Sometimes the same word can be used both as a title and as the denomination of a function, the latter following the proper name:

\footnote{According to Cantarino (1975, 2: 69, fn. 15), “titles or degrees accompying a name […] should rather be considered as part of the proper name”}
Words that can be used as titles and similar labels include: *al-marḥumu* ‘the late’, *aṣ-ṣadiqu* ‘friend’, *al-ʿaḫu* ‘brother’, *ar-rafīqu* ‘comrade’, *as-sayyidu* ‘Mr’, *ad-duktūru* ‘Doctor’, *al-ḥāǧǧu* ‘Hajj’, but also other substantives, which are less formal labels, e.g.:

\[
\text{al-mutanabbi'-u} \quad \text{Ḥāmim} \quad \text{ibn-u} \quad \text{Mannillāh}
\]


‘the false prophet Hamim, son of Mannillah’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 28 *Ar-tāʿawunu…* ) /90/

\[
\text{‘anna ‘awlād-a} \quad \text{l-γaniyy-i} \quad \text{t-ṯariyy-i} \quad \text{Ḡanāb Ḥanī yaktabūna…}
\]


‘that the children of the richman, the Croesus Ḥanāb Ḥanī write…’ (‘Umar 70 ) /91/.

Also substantives such as ‘tomorrow’, ‘today’ and ‘yesterday’ with their explanatory names of week days form substantival appositions with a fixed word order:

\[
\text{ba’dàta} \quad \text{ġad-i-ni} \quad \text{l-ʿarbiʾā-i} \\
\text{after} \quad \text{tomorrow.M.SI-G-I} \quad \text{D-Wednesday.M.SI-G}
\]

‘after tommorow Wednesday’ (Ar-Raʾy 1, Al-maliku: *iqāmatu…* ) /92/

As appositions should also be classed expressions such as in /93/:

\[
\text{taʾwīdāt-i} \quad \text{l-fiʿat-i} \quad \text{«g» [ḡīm#]}
\]

compensations.NH.PL-G D-category.F.SI-G C#

‘compensations of category C’ (Dustūr 1/5/04, 1, *Badʾu ʿṣarfi…* ) /93/

where a letter, number or symbol are apposed to a substantive and designate a type, a category, or a model.

The *nisbas* with proper names including nationalities, attitudes, professions and occupations should be treated as substantives because they can also be preposed, e.g.:

\[
\text{qaddama} \quad \text{Hilda} \quad \text{l-yahūdiyy-a} \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{fatāt-i-n...}
\]

he:showed Hilda.F.A D-Jewess.F.SI-A as girl.F.SI-G-I

‘showed Hilda, the Jewess, as a girl…’ (Ṭaqāfī 9/11/04, 6, *Intiḥārun ġayru…* ) /94/
In contrast to:

\textbf{fī l-`almāniyy-i Hīgil}

in D-German.M.SI-G Hegel.M.G

‘in the German Hegel’ (Miṭāq 20/4/04,15) /95/

Obviously, these rules do not apply to nouns which have become integral parts of names.

Appositions do not include expressions such as:

\textbf{bi kulliyat-i Dār-i l-`Ulûm-i Ġāmi‘at# l-Qāhirat-i}


‘in the department Dar al-Ulum [House of Sciences], the University of Cairo’

(‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 28, Munāqašatu ḥādirī...) /96/

which are basically composed of two syntagms, the second of which (Ġāmi‘at# l-Qāhirati) is an additional comment, i.e. a parenthesis. In English translation, it could be placed in brackets. It is obvious that its syntactic status is not equal to \textit{bi kulliyati Dāri l-`Ulûmi}.

Substantives followed by explicative synonyms, e.g. Semitic names of months in /97/, should probably not be treated as appositions:

\textbf{fī disambir-a kānūn-a l-`awwal-i l-mādī}


‘in last December, Kanun the First’ (Riyāḍ 24/4/04, 1, Ḥukmun bi s-siºni...) /97/.

At times it may be difficult to distinguish adjectival attribution from substantival apposition, e.g.:

\textbf{kāna [...] šā‘ir-a-n `adib-a-n `āšiq-a-n li l-`adab-i}


‘[he] was a poet, an homme des lettres, fond of literature’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 78) /98/

Here we have two problems. First: is `adīban an adjective in the sense ‘learned’ and being an attribute of šā‘īran, or a substantive in the sense ‘homme des lettres’? Second, is `āšīqan an adjective in the sense ‘loving’ and being an attribute of šā‘īran or `adīban, or, perhaps a third substantive
meaning ‘lover of’? Such problems do not seem to have any convincing solutions. In the following section, however, we will consider one.

3.2.1.1. Adjectival attribution or Substantival apposition?

Let us here consider a kind of syntagm that, depending on the context, may be interpreted as an adjectival attribution or substantival apposition. The following examples will be used:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{al-kātīb-ū} & \quad \text{s-sā’īḥ-ū} \\
\text{D-writing.M.St-N} & \quad \text{D-travelling.M.St-N /99/}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{as-sā’īḥ-ū} & \quad \text{l-kātīb-ū} \\
\text{travelling.M.St-N} & \quad \text{D-writing.M.St-N /100/}
\end{align*}
\]

In the glossing, only working translations with participles are given for the time being. \textit{Kātībun} has two meanings: one is translated into English as the substantive ‘writer’, and means ‘a person who writes books, articles, etc as an occupation; an author’ (Penguin 2000: 1627), the second one is a participle and means: ‘who is writing something at a given moment’. An analogous distinction holds for \textit{sā’īḥun} ‘traveller, tourist’ vs. ‘travelling’. Let us discuss the possible meanings of /99/ and /100/:

\textbf{Ex. /99/:} \textit{al-kātību} \textit{s-sā’īhu} can mean: ‘a writer travelling’, esp. if \textit{sā’īḥ} will have a prepositional phrase or an adverbial as a qualifier, as in the sentence:

\[\text{wa kāna hādā l-kātību s-sā’īhu} \quad \text{‘abra l-mašriqi} \quad \text{‘āmaḍāka Yūlyūṣ Sūfatskī} \]
\[
\text{‘and this writer travelling (across the East) in that year was Juliusz Słowacki’}
\]

The linear word order of the constituents of this syntagm cannot be reversed without changing the meaning. Consequently, the syntagm is an adjectival attribution. Its plural is \textit{al-kuttābu} \textit{s-sā’īḥūna}, e.g.

\[\text{wa min al-kuttābi} \quad \text{as-sā’īḥīna} \quad \text{‘abra l-mašriqi} \quad \text{fī l-qarnī r-tāṣī‘a} \quad \text{‘aṣara Bayrūn wa Sūfatskī wa Flūbir}
\]
\[\text{‘Writers travelling across the East in the 19th cent include Byron, Słowacki and Flaubert’}.
\]
In the singular, the syntagm *al-kātibu s-sāʾiḥu* is homophonous with the syntagm meaning ‘a writer-traveller’, i.e. ‘a writer who liked travelling or did a significant number of journeys, which, as a rule, had an impact on or a relation to his writings’. Its plural is *al-kuttābu s-suyyāḥu*:

"'uḥibbu qirāʾata l-muḥakkirāti li l-kuttābi s-suyyāḥi"

‘I like reading memoirs of writers-travellers’

The order of the constituents can be reversed:

"'uḥibbu qirāʾata l-muḥakkirāti li s-suyyāḥi l-kuttābi"

‘I like reading memoirs of travellers-writers’

Consequently, this would be a substantival apposition. The meaning of the two syntagms *l-kuttābi s-suyyāḥi* and *s-suyyāḥi l-kuttābi* is basically the same, only the point of view differs slightly.

**Ex. /100/:** *as-sāʾiḥu l-kātibu* can mean ‘a (currently) writing traveller’, esp. if *al-kātibu* has a prepositional phrase or a direct object as a qualificator, as in the sentence:

"fa ʿarafa ʿanna s-sāʾiḥa l-kātiba (risālātān fī ẓilli l-ḥāʾiṭi) huwa r-raḡulu llaḍī baḥaqa ʿanhu"

‘then he knew that the traveller writing (a letter in the shadow of the wall) was the man he had been looking for’

The plural of this syntagm is: *as-suyyāḥu* (or *as-suwwāḥu*) *l-kātibān*. The word order cannot be reversed without changing the meaning. This syntagm is thus an adjectival attribution.

In the singular this syntagm is homophonous with the syntagm meaning ‘a traveller-writer’ i.e. ‘a traveller who writes books, articles etc.’, e.g. in the sentence:

"al-mašriqu kāna qiblatan li kulli sāʾiḥin kātibin"

‘The East was the mecca for every writer-traveller’

In the plural this syntagm would have the form: *as-suyyāḥu l-kuttāбу*, which was already discussed above. The word order of this syntagm is
reversible without a change in its meaning. Consequently, the syntagm is a substantival apposition.

In this section we have attempted to show that it is not justified to see in syntagms only juxtaposed nouns that can be treated both as substantives or both as adjectives as was suggested e.g. by Grande. The test of commutation confirmed this in some selected cases. One could also test the linearly second constituents for a capability of being qualified by substantives in the genitive. It seems that similar results would be arrived at.

3.2.2. Adjectival apposition

In this chapter we will discuss another kind of syntagm, which will be called adjectival apposition. Adjectival apposition takes place when two, or more, adjectives are apposed to each other and neither of them seems to qualify the other. In other words, the linearly second adjective seems not to modify the semantics of the first. This is due to the fact that the apposed adjectives go back to an underlying construction in which they are in proper paratactic relation to each other (see chapter 3.3.1.) and qualify the same substantive, usually with a general meaning ‘a human being’, ‘a person’, or less frequently ‘a thing’, ‘a matter’. A syntagm composed of a substantive and two, or more, adjectives which qualify it, such as: nāsun murtaʿidūna ḥāʾinūna ‘quivering, treacherous people’, when stripped of the substantive, changes into a sequence of two, or more, adjectives, which – usually – retain their non-hypotactic relation to each other, i.e. the first of them, murtaʿidūna in our example, does not get substantivized so as to be attributively qualified by the second, ḥāʾinūna. This idea is corroborated by the fact that their order can be easily reversed, just like it can be reversed in the syntagm with the explicit substantive, cf. nāsun ḥāʾinūna murtaʿidūna.

In most cases this phenomenon concerns adjectives designating humans. A substantive such as rağulun ‘a man’, nāsun ‘people’ or imraʿatun ‘a woman’ etc. can be inserted so as to be attributively qualified by the adjectives. Examples include the following pairs:
'yakūnāna ʿawwal-a l-murtaʿid-ina l-ḥāʾin-ina l-fār-r-ina
‘[they] will be the first trembling, treacherous, fleeing [people]’ (Miṭāq 30/12/03, 12) /101/

vs.

ʿan-nāsi l-murtaʿidīna l-ḥāʾinīna and ʿannahum nāsun ḥāʾinūna murtaʿidīna.

‘ilā turkiyyat-i-n ʿagūz-i-n...
to Turkish:woman.F.SI-G-I old.NG.NN-.G-I
‘to an old Turkish woman’ (Liṣṣ 102) /103/

vs.

ḥawla bayt-i l-ʿagūz-i t-turkiyy-at-i
‘around the house of the Turkish old woman’ (Liṣṣ 157) /104/

Cf. ʿilā mraʿatīn turkiyyatin ʿagūzīn and bayti l-marʿatī l-ʿagūzi t-turkiyyāti.

In adjectival appositions, no semantic difference arises when the word order is reversed. Thus, /105/ is not an adjectival apposition:

‘anna l-muʿalliq-īna l-amārkiyy-īna
that D-commentators.M-PL.A D-American.M-PL.A
‘that American commentators’ (Šarq 14/4/04, 1, Al-Fallūṭatu... wa māʾadrīka...) /105/

because it cannot be changed to ʿanna l-ʿamārkiyyīna l-muʿalliqīna ‘that the commenting Americans’. The latter expression does not convey the meaning of commenting as professional occupation, while that of /105/ does.

The fact that in MWA the difference between adjectival attribution and adjectival apposition is not indicated formally, generates problems, since in many cases it is difficult, or even impossible, to distinguish an adjectival attribution from adjectival apposition. Cf. the following:
The English translations provided here are quite arbitrary as every syntagm may have two interpretations and two meanings.

The interpretation with an adjectival apposition could be elucidated in the following way: one can always form a synonymous construction composed of a substantive with a general meaning and the two nouns functioning as attributive adjectives qualifying this substantive, while being paratactically connected to each other, viz. *an-nāsu l-muʿtadilīna l-muslimīna* ‘moderate (,) Muslim people’ or *an-nāsu l-muslimīna l-muʿtadilīna* ‘Muslim (,) moderate people’. The meaning is that these people are at once both Muslims and moderates. They may be moderates because they are Muslims or in spite of their being Muslims. They may be Muslims because they are moderates or in spite of their being moderates. Such distinctions do not matter here. Being Muslims and being moderates is not related to each other in adjectival apposition. It could even be possible that these people are ‘extreme Muslims’ but according to other criteria remain ‘moderates’, e.g. are moderate politicians. In other words, they are not moderate *qua* Muslims nor Muslim or Islamic *qua* moderates. The word order can be reversed here.

The interpretation with adjectival attribution is possible because nothing, except possibly some context, prevents us from interpreting these syntagms as adjectival attributions based on hypotaxis, as reflected in the English translations. The meaning of these syntagms then is that the people in question are ‘moderate *qua* Muslims’ in *al-muslimīna l-muʿtadilīna*, or, with the order reversed, that they are ‘Muslim/Islamic *qua* moderates’ in *al-muʿtadilīna l-muslimīna*. The reversal of the linear order of these words causes no change in meaning, there is only a change in perspective,
however slight. Also their English translations can be used as synonyms, with the same meaning. It turns out that in syntagms like this word order does not matter substantially. This is probably also due to lexical reasons. These two syntagms in hypotactic, i.e. attributive interpretation can be compared with /108/:

\[
\begin{align*}
al-mufattiš-ūna & \quad d-duwaliyy-ūna \\
D-\text{inspectors.M-PL.N} & \quad D-\text{international.M-PL.N} \\
\text{‘international inspectors’ /108/}
\end{align*}
\]

The syntagm in /108/, although both its nouns designate human beings, cannot have the word order reversed to *ad-duwaliyyūna l-mufattišūna. Neither can an explicit substantive an-nāsu be inserted here, except at the price of a change in meaning, cf. an-nāsu l-mufattišūna d-duwaliyyūna ‘international people searching’.

Perhaps what we are discussing here as adjectival appositons could be also classed as special cases of adjectival attribution where the change in order does not change substantially the meaning but only the perspective. This would, however, be problematic since we have defined adjectival attribution as not allowing a reversal of the word order without a change in meaning.

While it could be argued that in each case adduced above an interpretation with adjectival attribution, i.e. with a substantive qualified by an adjective, should be preferred as the only possible, we think that this would distort the true syntactic and semantic relations obtaining in syntagms of this kind and that introducing a concept of ‘adjectival apposition’ is fully justified.

There is another facet of this problem, namely that both nouns in /106/ and /104/ are of equal status from the semantic point of view: as in English: ‘moderate’ and ‘Muslim’, both designate certain beliefs and convictions. However, it is not clear if they are of equal status from syntactic point of view. In English, the syntactic status of the relevant nouns is related to what part of speech they belong to. That in the syntagm

\[
\begin{align*}
al-mu\text{‘tadilišūna} & \quad l-muslimūna wa l-yahūdu \quad ‘\text{Muslim and Jewish moderates’ vs.}\ al-muslimūna l-mu\text{‘tadilišūna} wa l-mutatarrifīna \quad ‘\text{moderate and extremist Muslims’}.
\end{align*}
\]

The perspective differs more conspicuously when a possible opposition (antonymy) is involved, cf. al-mu\text{‘tadilišūna} l-muslimūna wa l-yahūdu ‘Muslim and Jewish moderates’ vs. al-muslimūna l-mu\text{‘tadilišūna} wa l-mutatarrifīna ‘moderate and extremist Muslims’.

\[87\] The perspective differs more conspicuously when a possible opposition (antonymy) is involved, cf. al-mu\text{‘tadilišūna} l-muslimūna wa l-yahūdu ‘Muslim and Jewish moderates’ vs. al-muslimūna l-mu\text{‘tadilišūna} wa l-mutatarrifīna ‘moderate and extremist Muslims’.
modern Muslims the word modern is the qualifier and an adjective is reflected in a twofold way: in the linear order, viz. the qr goes first, and by the plural morpheme, viz. the substantival qm has -s in the plural, the adjectival qr has not. Since every word must belong to a part of speech, speakers are forced by the grammar of their language to choose one of the two options: either they decide to use ‘moderate’ as a substantive with -s in the plural and going second and ‘Muslim’ as an adjective without -s and going first or vice versa: the meaning is substantially the same. Arabic speakers must make another choice: either they make muslimūna precede muʾṭadilūna or vice versa. The linear order, which is usually the indicator of the syntactic status of a word, is irrelevant in this case or it is only a question of perspective or style. Let us now discuss another syntagm:

\[
al-munāḍil-ūna  l-filasṭiṭiyy-ūna
\]

D-fighter.M-PL.N D-Palestinian.M-PL.N
‘the Palestinian fighters’ /109/

The word order can be reversed so as to yield:

\[
al-filasṭiṭiyyūna  l-munāḍilūna
\]

‘the fighting Palestinians’

However, if the noun munāḍilūna is qualified, e.g. by a prepositional phrase, it must go second:

\[
al-filasṭiṭiyy-ūna  l-munāḍil-ūna  qidda  l-iḥtilāl-ī
\]

‘Palestinians fighting against the occupation’ /110/

Here, the word order cannot be reversed to yield:

\[
*al-munāḍilūna  qidda  l-iḥtilāli  l-filasṭiṭiyyūna
\]

The same restriction holds when filasṭiṭiyyūna munāḍilūna are used as attributes of a substantive, as in /111/:

\[
ar-riḡāl-u  l-filasṭiṭiyy-ūna  l-munāḍil-ūna  qidda...
\]

‘the Palestinian men fighting against...’ /111/
Cf. the non-grammaticality of *ar-riḡālu l-munāḍilīna ḍidda l-iḥṭilāli l-
filaṣṭiniyyūna

It seems that there might be a rule which obtains not only in Arabic, according to which an adjective, if qualified e.g. by a prepositional phrase, either moves to the linearly opposite side of the substantive it qualifies (as in English Palestinian men fighting fighting fighting fighting against...)

88 or, if it remains at the same side, it is placed linearly further from the substantive than the unqualified adjective. In other words, while the unqualified adjective remains at its normal side or closer to the substantive, the qualified adjective does not. Cf. two examples from Polish:

\[
\text{zabity wczoraj bogaty bankier}
\]

killed yesterday rich banker

‘a/the rich banker killed yesterday’ /113/

In /113/, the qualified adjective zabity ‘killed’ has to be placed further from the subjective it qualifies, while the unqualified adjective bogaty ‘rich’ is placed nearer to it.

\[
\text{bogaty bankier zabity wczoraj}
\]

rich banker killed yesterday

‘id.’ /114/

In the synonymous construction given in /114/, the qualified adjective zabity has to be placed after the substantive it qualifies, which is a position where it normally does not appear when unqualified.

3.3. Parataxis

In paratactic syntagms (introduced in chapters 1.1.2. and 1.1.7.), each of their constituents is separately governed by the same word that they qualify. Their syntactic status is equal, which means that neither of them qualifies the other. In this chapter Proper adjectival parataxis, Adjectival juxtaposition and Substantival parataxis will be discussed.

88 But see Bolinger 1967: 4 on change in meaning in such expressions.
3.3.1. Proper adjectival parataxis

We distinguish ‘proper adjectival parataxis’ as being semantically and syntactically distinct from ‘adjectival juxtaposition’ (see chapter 3.3.2.). Let us show its properties at ex. /112/:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{‘ilā } & \text{ manzil-i-n } \text{ faḥm-i-n } \text{ mu’allafl-i-n } \text{ min } \text{ ṭābiq-aayni} \\
\text{to } & \text{ flat.M.SI-G-I } \text{ luxurious.M.SI-G } \text{ composed.M.SI-G-I } \text{ of } \text{ storey.M.DU.G} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘to a luxurious flat, composed of two storeys’ (Maqhā 91)/115/.

The linear order of the constituents can be reversed. The reversal may seem prohibited, but only for stylistic, not semantic reasons. Thus, the order of the adjectives in /115/ could be reversed, with a pause inserted:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{‘ilā } & \text{ manzilin } \text{ mu’allaflin } \text{ min } \text{ ṭābiqayni} \text{ (pause), } \text{ faḥmin...} \\
\end{align*}
\]

What distinguishes it from adjectival juxtaposition is that proper adjectival parataxis sometimes can be syndetic\(^{89}\). But more important and decisive than the possibility of syndesis is that in proper adjectival parataxis the adjectives can be separated and each of them can be made to qualify the same repeated substantive, e.g.: \(\text{‘ilā manzilin faḥmin, manzilin mu’allaflin min etc.}\)

3.3.2. Adjectival juxtaposition

This construction, also based on parataxis, differs from proper adjectival parataxis in some semantic and syntactic respects\(^{90}\). It is never syndetic. This is due to the fact that the adjectives here constitute one concept, which is valid only with the presence of all of them, e.g. the expression in /116/:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{li } & \text{ fit‘āl-i } \text{ fitnat-i-n } \text{ sunniy-at-i-n } \text{ ḩiyy-at-i-n} \\
\text{to } & \text{ fabrication.M.SI-G } \text{ civil:war.F.SI-G-I } \text{ Sunni-F.SI-G-I } \text{ Shiite-F.SI-G-I} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{89}\) According to Blau (1976: 181), “parallel adjectives, as a rule, are asyndetically connected. This is not always observed in MSA”. But Beeston remarks that this rule “deserves some expansion”: adjectives are linked with asyndesis “if totally and synchronically applicable”, but “with syndesis if partially or diachronically applicable (\(\text{kutub qadimah wa ḥadītah “old and new books”, ihtimām nāmin wa wānin “waxing and waning interest”}\)). But in predicative position all post-Quranic Arabic admits either asyndesis or syndesis” (1978: 62).

\(^{90}\) Cantarino classed it among “adjectival or attributive apposition” (1975, 2: 50).
‘to a fabrication of a Sunni-Shiite civil war’ (Šarq 2, Al-Bašmarkatu l-yadu...) /116/

means that this is a conflict involving both Sunnis and Shiites simultaneously. One cannot say here fitnatun sunniyyatin wa fitnatun ši’iyyatin ‘a Sunni civil war and a Shiite civil war’ with the conjunction wa ‘and’. This is so because one cannot conceive of the civil war as characterized only by one of the properties: fitnatun sunniyyatin ‘a Sunni civil war’ or fitnatun ši’iyyatin ‘Shiite civil war’ would mean something else91. Another example is:

‘inna mihwar-a-n siyasiyy-a-n sariyy-a-n ‘Iraniyy-a-n lubnaniyy-a-n yusidu...’
‘that the Syrian-Iranian-Lebanese political axis supports...’ (Šarq ’ Awsat, 17/05/03, 20, Liq’un...) /117/

In most instances of adjectival juxtaposition, the order of the adjectives can be reversed. However, the word order may be viewed as meaningful by some speakers (e.g. in the ‘Arab-Israeli’ or ‘Israeli-Arab’ conflict). In other cases it is meaningful for all speakers as in the titles of dictionaries or in translations, e.g.:

qamus-u-n ‘arabliyy-u-n bulandlyyy-u-n
‘an Arabic-Polish dictionary’ /118/.

3.3.4. Substantival parataxis

Substantival parataxis may be asyndetic or syndetic, e.g.:

‘inna š-sayhat-a madin, dakiwat-u-n
‘that old age is the past, the memory’ (Maqhā 89) /119/.

Substantival parataxis is distinguished from substantival apposition by that its both constituents do not name the same thing twice differently.

91 Not infrequently, a hyphen is used between the two adjectives in order to mark this special relation.
PART 4. SECONDARY FUNCTIONS OF ADJECTIVES

The primary syntactic function of the adjective is attribution. Its secondary syntactic functions comprise:

(i) predicate,
(ii) extended predicate,
(iii) secondary predicate,
(iv) exclamative predicate,
(v) subject and object (which are typically substantival functions),
(vi) adverbial.

In the present chapter the secondary functions (i)-(iv) will be discussed. Point (v) will be discussed in chapter 4.5 devoted to substantivization while point (vi) will be the object of our interest in chapter 4.6.

4.1. Adjectives as basic predicates

We have defined adjectives principally on the grounds of their capability of functioning as attributes. The idea is, however, intuitionnally near that adjectives also function as predicates. This is not their typical, but secondary function\(^\text{92}\).

In most, if not all, cases of syntagms with basic predicates, it is difficult to tell whether one is dealing with a substantive or an adjective functioning as the predicate. E.g. /1/:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{'Aisha} & \text{is [a] blonde} \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^{92}\) Kuryłowicz’s idea of secondary function is associated with some kind of specific morphological indicator of it. Syntactic derivation should be accompanied by formal change, the addition of a syntactic morpheme to a word or word group. In Arabic, it is difficult to find a formal marker of the derivation of an adjective used as a subject or object. Yet one can see this indicator in what Kuryłowicz refers to as a change in syntactic environment (“différence d’entourage syntaxique ou de conditions syntaxiques”. (1960b [1936]: 42).
can be interpreted as ‘Aisha is blonde’ but also as ‘Aisha is a blonde’. This may seem only a question of translation into languages which distinguish adjectives from substantives to an extent greater than MWA does, such as English, in which articles are used only with substantives. In fact, any opposition between adjectives and substantives in the predicate function may seem **neutralized** (cf. Fischer 1965). Yet the discovery of this fact does not allow to close the discussion.

Predicates in constructions such as /1/ can be followed by relative clauses, as in /2/:

\[ 'Αϊσατ-υν \ Šαqrα'-υ \ tuši'˘u hālat-a-n... \]
\[ Aisha.F-N \ blonde.F.SI-Ν.Ι \ radiates.halo.F.SI-Α-I \]

‘Aisha is [a] blonde [who] radiates a halo [of ...]’ (BQ 20) /2/

Here, the relative clause tuši'˘u hālatan may be interpreted in two ways: (1) if šaqra’u is a substantive, then it can be a RC to it, thus the meaning is ‘Aisha is a blonde, who radiates...’; or (2) if šaqra’u is an adjective, then this clause may be the predicative clause of ‘Αϊσατun, thus the meaning is: ‘Aisha is blonde, [she] radiates ...’93. The problem is that, being unable to tell if the predicate noun is an adjective or not, we cannot decide whether a predicative syntagm such as ‘Αϊσατun šaqra’u is an adjectival syntagm or not and whether it deserves including into the typology of adjectival syntagms to be proposed subsequently.

To solve this problem, let us try to use some properties of the relative clauses. There are relative clauses, referring to a noun functioning as the predicate, in which the verb does not agree in person with the predicate noun (the third person), but with the pronoun, as in:

\[ 'anā \ l-qātil-u \ lā 'afhamu \ šay'-a-n \]
\[ 1.SI \ D-killing.M.SI-N \ not.I:understand \ thing.M.SI-Α-I \]

‘I am the murderer, I don’t understand’ (Liṣṣ 92) /3/

But this does not necessarily mean that l-qātilu is an adjective (cf. Bloch 1986 on the so-called ‘direct and indirect relative clauses’).

---

93 A third option, with a RC to an adjective seems little convincing.
Likewise, from the fact that the verb of the relative clause agrees in person with the predicate noun (the third person), but not with the pronoun as in /4/:

\[\text{\`anna-n\text{-}I m\text{a\~n\text{n\~un}}-u-n \text{ yun\text{\d{a}risu}\hspace{1em} harak\text{"}at-i-n \hspace{1em} \text{\d{u}n\text{\d{u}n}iyy-at-a-n}}\]


‘that I am a maniac who carries out maniacal movements’ (Mir 200) /4/.

It does not have to follow that the predicate noun ma\~n\text{n\~un} is a substantive. So, answering the question about “what the RC refers to” does not help.

Still, we have to look further for a language-internal solution, i.e. for a difference shown in MWA between possible adjectival or substantival character of such predicate nouns. Obviously, this difference must not be sought in translations into other languages or in notional interpretations of the predicate nouns. The solution we will adopt will be similar to that proposed in Al-Jabb\~ar and Leach (1985: 39). They observed that in some cases a substantive with a general meaning can be supplied before the predicate noun, which then becomes its attribute, as in /5/:

\[\text{\`Amr-un \hspace{1em} \text{\d{a}r\text{\d{u}ul-u-n} \hspace{1em} \text{\d{a}r\text{\d{u}ul-u-n} \hspace{1em} \text{\d{a}r\text{\d{u}ul-u-n} \hspace{1em} \text{\d{a}r\text{\d{u}ul-u-n}}}}}}\]

\[\text{Amr.M-N \hspace{1em} honorable.M.SI-N-l} \]

‘Amr is honorable’ /5/

The word ra\~gul\text{\d{u}l} can be inserted as to yield:

\[\text{\`Amr-un \hspace{1em} ra\~gul-u-n \hspace{1em} \text{\d{a}r\text{\d{u}ul-u-n}} \hspace{1em} \text{\d{a}r\text{\d{u}ul-u-n}} \hspace{1em} \text{\d{a}r\text{\d{u}ul-u-n}} \hspace{1em} \text{\d{a}r\text{\d{u}ul-u-n}}}}\]

\[\text{Amr.M-N \hspace{1em} man.M.SI-N-l \hspace{1em} honorable.M.SI-N-l} \]

‘Amr is an honorable man’ /6/

In other cases such an operation is not possible, cf. *\`Amrun ra\~gul\text{\d{u}l} za\text{\text{"}imun} *‘Amr is a leader-man’. Therefore, in /5/ the predicate noun should be considered an adjective, while in *\`Amrun ra\~gul\text{\d{u}l} za\text{\text{"}imun} it cannot (1985: 39). This proposal seems to be quite useful. It also reflects

---

\[94 \text{Note that the notional difference between huwa k\text{"}atibun \text{\text{"}he is a writer}, with a substantive, and \text{\text{"}he is writing}}, with an adjective lies in their meanings: \text{\text{"}constant} vs. \text{\text{"}transitional} occupation and that such criteria are rather of no use. Such a distinction is absent in many other cases, as in huwa \text{\text{"}arabiyyun \text{\text{\text{"}He is Arab} or \text{\text{"}He is an Arab}.} \]
the difference between kātibun ‘writer’ and kātibun ‘writing’. A
construction ‘Amrun raḡulun kātibun in the sense ‘Amr is a writer-man’
does not exist. There is only a construction with kātibun interpreted as
‘writing’, i.e. with the participial sense. Admittedly, one would not
normally use the construction ‘Amrun raḡulun kātibun ‘Amr is a [currently] writing man’ to express the meaning ‘Amr is writing’, yet the
possibility itself of such an adjectival rephrasing of the predicate allows us
to treat this word as an adjective.

We will add to Al-Jabbār and Leach’s “check” that in many cases it is
possible to repeat the word functioning as the subject, instead of inserting a
substantive with a general meaning. One restriction is, however, that this is
not feasible if the subject is a proper name. Thus for al-fatātu mutʿabatun
‘The girl is tired’ one can say al-fatātu fatātun mutʿabatun ‘The girl is a
tired girl’. For non-human entities, this test is better than Al-Jabbār and
Leach’s, since substantives with general meanings, such as šayʿun and
’amrun, do not go well with adjectives that are plural. Thus, the predicate
in /7/

$kānat$ $malāmiḥ-u-hum$ $bāriz-at-a-n$
were traits.NH.PL-N-3,M.PL conspicuous-NH.PL-A-I
‘their traits were conspicuous’ (Maqāḥ 103) /7/

can be demonstrated to be an adjective since it can be the attribute of
malāmiḥa in /8/:

$kānat$ $malāmiḥ-u-hum$ $malāmiḥ-a$ $bāriz-at-a-n$
were traits.NH.PL-N-3,M.PL traits.NH.PL-A,I conspicuous-NH.PL-A-I
‘their traits were conspicuous traits’ /8/

Generally, with subjects being substantives designating non-humans, the
distinction between substantives and adjectives in the predicate functions
is by far easier than with those designating humans. In /7/ bārizatan cannot
be a substantive, since it is never used in independent substantivization (see chapter 4.5.4), i.e. it is not used as a subject or object.

Let us remark here that a construction with a predicate being a
substantive identical to the subject substantive and qualified by an
attributive adjective is preferred in some situations to an adjective standing
in the predicate function alone. One deals then with “referent modification” (cf. Bolinger 1967 and Zendler 1968), e.g.:

\[
\textit{fa} \ n-naqd-u \ \textit{hunā} \ \textit{naqd-u-n} \ \textit{binā’iyy-u-n}
\]

and \(\text{D-criticism.M.SI-N} \ \text{here criticism.M.SI-N-I} \ \text{constructive.M.SI-N-I}\)

‘and the criticism here is constructive criticism’ (\(\text{Taqāfī 9/11/04, 5, Al-’ībdā’u bayna n-naqdi...}\) /9/

Substantives with a general sense, such as \(\text{’amrun} \ ‘\text{thing, matter}’ \) or \(\text{šayun} \ ‘\text{thing}’\), are also used:

\[
\textit{‘inna sa’y-a} \ \text{maγmū’at-i-n} \ \text{mina} \ l-’ašhāṣ-i \ \text{li fard-i} \ \text{nafs-i-hā}
\]

that \(\text{effort.M.SI-A} \ \text{group.F.SI-G} \ \text{of D-persons.M.PL-G to imposition.M.SI-G} \ \text{self-G-3.F.SI}\)

\(\text{‘alā bāqī} \ \text{‘abnā’-i} \ \text{s-šaβ-b-i} \ \text{‘amr-u-n} \ \text{marfūd-u-n}\)

upon remaining.NG,NN.G \ D-nation,M.SI-G \ thing.M.SI-N-I \ rejectable.M.SI-N-I

‘that a group of people intends to impose themselves upon the remaining sons of the nation is a rejectable thing’ (\(\text{Ḩayāt 8/4/04, 2, Aṣ-Ṣadru yuṭālibu...}\) /10/

A substantive may be the predicate instead of being the subject. A corresponding demonstrative pronoun functions as the subject then, e.g. the following expression, with \(\text{mas’alatun} \) as predicate:

\[
\text{hāḍihi} \ \text{mas’alat-u-n} \ \text{ṭawīl-at-u-n}
\]

this \(\text{question.F.SI-N-I} \ \text{long-F.SI-N-I}\)

‘This is a long question’ (\(\text{‘Arabī 5/04, 157}\) /11/

can be used instead of \(\text{hāḍihi l-mas’alatu ṭawīlatun} \ ‘\text{This question is long}’\), with \(\text{l-mas’alatu} \) as subject.

Similarly to how we treated examples /5/ and /6/ with a substantive designating a human being, in sentences with non-human subjects where the predicate noun could be the attribute of a substantive being the repeated subject substantive or of a substantive with a general meaning, e.g. \(\text{’amrun} \ ‘\text{thing}’, \) this predicate noun will be taken to be an adjective (cf. Bolinger’s ‘reference modification’), e.g.:

\[
\text{‘anna} \ \text{s-salām-a} \ \text{fī l-minṭaqat-i} \ \text{’asāsiyy-u-n}
\]

that \(\text{D-peace.M.SI-A} \ \text{in D-region.F.SI-G} \ \text{fundamental.M.SI-N-I}\)

‘that peace in the region is [the] fundamental [thing]’ (\(\text{Liwā’ 7/4/04, 2, ’Anzimatum ‘arabiyyatun...}\) /12/
Nominal sentences with implied subjects

Another problem are constructions which may be interpreted as nominal sentences with implied subjects. They could be treated as constructions with a predicate of an unexpressed subject, which is easily inferable from the context. Such constructions are chiefly used for introducing new characters in narratives. Their use seems to be restricted to literary works. E.g.:

\[\text{wa ḥīna kānat fī l-madrasati kāna ẓawtuhā yaḥtaniqu ḥīna yuṭlabu minhā 'an tawtratun wa muntall'atun, ša'run 'aswadu kaṭifun wa tawilun, [...]}\]

‘and when she was at school, her voice used to get choked when they asked her to read. [She was] tall and round. [Her] hair [was] black, dense and long’ (Maqāh 64)/13/

\[\text{zarifun wa musdun wa ḥā'inun} \]

‘[he is] agreeable, useful and treacherous’ (Mīr 89)/14/

Such constructions occurred already in classical Arabic poetry, which was rich in descriptions of women or animals, the properties of which were expressed by such loose constructions, with the subject sometimes never mentioned explicitly before. In our typology of adjectival syntagms we will not treat such constructions as special cases.

4.2. Adjectives as secondary predicates

The question of adjectives functioning as secondary predicates (the term being equivalent to ‘circumstantial qualifier’ or ‘ḥāl’, discussed in chapter 5.2.5.) is very similar to the one discussed above. Yet finding a solution to it seems to be more difficult. E.g. in /15/

\[\text{‘āṣa ʿazib-a-n lam yatazawwaḡ} \]

he:lived unmarried.M.SI-A-I not got:married

‘He lived as bachelor [who] did not get married’ (ʿArabī 5/04, 168)/15/

the noun ‘aziban does not appear to be either a substantive or an adjective. Possible translations into English, e.g. ‘he lived as a bachelor, who did not
get married’ or ‘he lived unmarried, did not get married’ must not suggest a solution. Another example is:

\[
\text{uhrūq maṭrūd-a-n min ḥādā l-makān-i ẓ-ṭāhir-i}
\]

‘go away as an outcast from this pure place’ or ‘go away, being cast out, ...’ (Mīr 33) /16/.

Unlike with basic predicates, it will be rather difficult here to insert a substantive with a general meaning to which the noun could be an attributive adjective. Thus, ‘āša raḡulan ‘azibān ‘he lived as an unmarried man’ and uhrūq ḫinsānān maṭrūdān ‘go away as an cast-out man’ are less conceivable than ḥuwa raḡulun ‘azibūn ‘he is an unmarried man’ or ‘anta raḡulun maṭrūdun ‘you are a cast-out man’, the latter being constructions with adjectives as attributive qualificators of basic predicates. The latter constructions can be used as a test for adjectivality because every secondary predicate expressed by means of a noun in the accusative case can be freely rephrased into a clausal construction introduced by wa, with the noun changing to the basic predicate of the personal pronoun referring to what was previously the ‘antecedent’ of the secondary predicate. That means that one can say:

\[
\text{āša wa ḥuwa ‘azib-u-n}
\]

‘he lived and he [was] unmarried’ /17/

with ‘azibūn functioning as the predicate. Since it is grammatical to say ‘āša wa ḥuwa raḡulun ‘azibūn, the noun ‘azibān will be treated as an adjective. The same holds for maṭrūdān of /16/, cf. uhrūq wa ‘anta ḫinsānān maṭrūdun.

4.3. Adjectives as extended predicates

In chapter 5.2.2. we will introduce the concept of extended predicate as the syntactic function of qualificators of verbs, participles and verbal nouns derived from them, that can be understood as expressing various meanings basing on predication. Thus verbs of being, changing, becoming, remaining, appearing will be extended predicative verbs. Also in the
function of extended predicate the opposition between adjectives and substantives is not evident at first glance. Cf. the following examples:

\[
yu\textbar abaru \textit{murtakib-a-n} \textit{li} \textit{gar\textbar mat-i} \\
\textit{‘is regarded as the perpetrator of/committing the crime [of]}(\textit{‘Arab\textbar i 5/04, 82})/18/
\]

\[
\textit{laysa na\textbar h\textbar ah-u} \textit{hu\textbar tat-i} \textit{l-i\textbar h\textbar til\textbar l-i} \textit{fi l-‘Ir\textbar a\textbar q-i} \textit{‘ak\textbar id-a-n} \\
\textit{‘The success of the plan of the occupation in Iraq is not sure’ (M\textbar \textbar \textbar 20/4/2004,7)}/19/
\]

In /18/, the word \textit{murtakiban} can and will, for the purpose of our study, be interpreted as an adjective, because it can function as an adjectival attributive of a substantive with a general meaning, cf. \textit{yu\textbar abaru ša\textbar h\textbar san murtakiban li \textit{gar\textbar mati} ... ‘is regarded as a person committing the crime of’}. In /19/, the predicate noun may be used as the attribute of the substantive being the repeated subject substantive, cf. \textit{laysa na\textbar h\textbar hu [...] na\textbar g\textbar h\textbar an ‘ak\textbar idan ‘the success of [...] is not a sure success’}.

4.4. Adjectives as exclamative predicates

Some exclamative constructions in MWA can be treated as special cases of sentences, with the adjectives functioning as predicates, which we will refer to as ‘exclamative predicates’. The adjectival “potential” of some nouns functioning as exclamative predicates can be demonstrated by inserting a substantive with a general meaning. E.g.:

\[
y\textbar a\textbar ka \textit{min gabiyy-i-n} \\
\textit{‘How stupid you are!’ (Karnak 19)}/20/
\]

\[
y\textbar a\textbar ka \textit{min mut\textbar ‘ab-i-n} \\
\textit{‘How tired you are!’ (Li\textbar ss 92)}/21/
\]

In both cases, the nouns \textit{gabiyyin} and \textit{mut\textbar ‘abun} are potential attributive adjectives, cf. \textit{y\textbar a\textbar laka min ra\textbar g\textbar ulin gabiyyin ‘What a stupid man you are!’}
and yā laka min ʾinsānin mutʿabin ‘What a tired man you are!’. Therefore, we will consider them to be adjectives.

As for qualification obtaining in such syntagms, we will assume that it is the pronoun, attached to the preposition, that is qualified by the adjective. As for mph indicators, the adjective is the rectum of the pronoun, with respect to its case after the preposition min, as well as its attractum, with respect to gender and number. Thus, these syntagms will be treated as showing both rection and concord.

4.5. Substantivization

The use of the adjectives in syntactic functions typical of substantives was remarked by Arab grammarians from the very beginning. Sībawayhi adduced an example ʾatānī l-yawma qawiyyun ‘a strong [one] approached me today’, which he described as one in which a šifa used in the subject function is a ‘weak’ construction, i.e. acceptable but not as good as ʾatānī l-yawma raḡulun qawiyyun ‘a strong man approached me today’ (Mosel 1975, I: 325 ). Another classical Arab grammarian, Ibn Yaʿīš, studied the different forms of plural adjectives and substantives and noticed that when used as, or instead of, a substantive, the šifa has broken plural (Guillaume 1992: 69).95

The term ‘substantivization’ should be employed with great care, as it suggests that the adjectival character of a word is original, primary, diachronically earlier, with respect to the substantival one, which would be the result of a more or less recent change. While there is a great number of substantives which almost certainly are relatively recently derived from adjectives, e.g. ihtiyāṭiyun ‘a substitute’, ʾirḥābiyyun ‘a terrorist’, however, asking questions about the diachronic priority of many other cases, such as kātibun ‘a writer’ or ‘writing’ is doomed to failure. It has been even claimed that in the past, Arabic had only substantives (Beeston

95 The morphology of the plural number of adjectives which have undergone substantivization was investigated in GAI (1983).
1970: 45), some of which came to be used as attributes and specialized in this function. Consequently, one must say that an opposite process would have taken place: the adjectivization of substantives. This is why we use the term substantivization without referring to diachronic processes that caused it. What we mean by substantivization is a synchronic relation between nouns defined as substantives and nouns defined as adjectives. No assumption is made that all adjectives are historically prior with respect to substantives although some observations about the direction of the diachronic process may be made.

The problem of how to decide what is still an adjective and what has already changed to a substantive was discussed e.g. by Jespersen (1965: 74) and Jodłowski (1964), while semantic implications of substantivization of an adjective have been discussed e.g. by Wierzbicka (1986). What interests us here is how nouns which are classed as adjectives on the grounds of our definition can be used in their secondary syntactic functions typical of substantives.

In his work on substantivization of adjectives in Polish, Jodłowski speaks of “substantivization of function” (1964: 62-65). This means that an adjective is used in a syntactic function typical of substantives. The adjective does not cease to be an adjective. It retains its adjectival syntactic properties, e.g. accusatival rection in case of transitive participles, and does not acquire all substantival syntactic properties, e.g. it cannot be qualified attributively by other adjectives or by substantives in the genitive. According to Jodłowski, its adjectival semantics also remains unchanged (1964: 63).

Taking his proposals into consideration and elaborating them, we will propose the following division. An adjective can be substantivized in four ways:

(i) anaphorically,
(ii) antegenitivally,
(iii) suffixally and
(iv) independently.

The first three are dependent substantivizations, i.e. adjectives used in dependent substantivization always require a concomitant substantive or,
in group (iii), a suffix referring to it. In the fourth type, the adjective does not need any concomitant substantive, therefore it is called ‘independent substantivization’.

Syntagms involving words used in anaphoric substantivization and independent substantivization will not be dealt with in our typology of hypotactic adjectival syntagms. Only syntagms with adjectives used in antegenitival and suffixal substantivization will be included into it. All four types of substantivization are discussed in what follows.

**4.5.1. Anaphoric substantivization**

Anaphoric substantivization takes place when an adjective is used without a substantive to which it refers, and which has been mentioned earlier in the text. The substantive is not repeated for the sake of brevity or style.

The difference between anaphoric and independent substantivization can be exemplified by the use of Polish interrogative pronouns: substantives resulting from independent substantivization are enquired about by means of *któ? co?*, while anaphorically substantivized adjectives are enquired about by means of *jaki?:*

*Czym jedziemy, osobowym czy pośpiesznym?*
‘What are we taking, a stopping train or a fast train?’

vs.

*Jakim pociągiem jedziemy, osobowym czy pośpiesznym?*
‘What train are we taking, a stopping (train) or a fast (train)?’

Anaphoric substantivization is a matter of syntax and virtually every adjective can be subjected to it. The most frequent cases concern adjectives which locate the substantives with respect to their linear sequence in the text, e.g. *l-μawwalu* ‘the former’, *l-μahīru* or *l-μāharu* ‘the latter’ etc.

Example:

---

96 This is Cantarino’s “apparent substantival usage” of adjectives (1975, 2: 61-64). However, he considers also such examples as *‘ummu l-luğāti l-‘isbāniyyati wa l-‘īrāliyyati wa l-hurtuğāliyyati* to be examples of this use, with which we must disagree since, for us, this is normal adjectival attribution.
between two consciousnesses, [out of which] one is sending and the other is receiving’ (Taqâfî 9/11/04, 5, Al-‘ibdâ‘u bayna n-naqdi... ) /22/

Frequently, the preposition min with a corresponding pronominal suffix is used, if the antecedent is plural, e.g.:

\[
\text{istahdamati} \quad l-kantsat-u \quad r-rūmāniyy-at-u \quad ’asliḥat-a-hā, \]
\[
\text{used} \quad D\text{-church.F.SI-N} \quad D\text{-Roman-F.SI-N} \quad \text{weapons.NH.PL-A} - 3.F.SI
\]

\[
r-rūḥiy-at-a \quad min-hā \quad \text{wa l-māddiyy-at-a}
\]
\[
D\text{-spiritual-NH.PL-A} \quad \text{of-3.NH.PL} \quad \text{and D-material-NH.PL-A}
\]

‘the Roman Church used its weapons, both spiritual and material’ (‘Arabî 5/04, 120) /23/

One example has been found in the corpus with an adjective in neutralized gender and number:

\[
’Urubbā \quad hiya \quad l-’aqdam-u \quad [...] \quad \text{fi rawābīt-i-nā} \quad s-sayyi‘-i \quad min-hā
\]
\[
\text{Europe.F.N} \quad 3.F.SI \quad D\text{-oldest.NG.NN-N} \quad \text{in ties.NH.PL-G} - 1.PL \quad D\text{-bad.NG.NN-G} \quad \text{of-3.NH.PL}
\]
\[
\text{wa l-ḥasan-i}
\]
\[
\text{and D-good.NH.NN-G}
\]

‘Europe is the oldest [...] in [terms of] ties with us, [both] bad and good’ (Riyād 1, Li naktub ‘aqdan ḡadīdan...) /24/

Sometimes a demonstrative pronoun is additionally used in such constructions before the adjective, e.g.:

\[
al-’amrād-i \quad l-muẓmin-at-i \quad \text{wa tilka} \quad n-nāǧim-at-i \quad ’ani \quad t-ṭuḥayliyyāt-i
\]
\[
D\text{-diseases.NH.PL-G} \quad D\text{-chronic.NH.PL-G} \quad \text{and those} \quad D\text{-resulting-NH.PL-G} \quad \text{from D-parasites.NH.PL-G}
\]

‘of chronic diseases and those resulting from parasites’ (‘Arabî 5/04, 173f). /25/

### 4.5.2. Antegenitival substantivization

Antegenitival substantivization enables an adjective to be qualified by a substantive in the genitive case without a formal annexation (‘iḍāfa
lafṣiyya) resulting from this\textsuperscript{97}. This is a specific kind of syntagm where the adjective, instead of following the substantive, precedes it and, in most cases, has neutralized gender and number\textsuperscript{98}. Adjectives substantivized in this way will be referred to as ‘antegenitival adjectives’.

Antegenitival adjectives never occur alone\textsuperscript{99}: the substantive in the genitive is obligatory. Without it, a non-grammatical construction originates. Although antegenitival adjectives do not behave like adjectives in some respects, there is strong evidence that they remain adjectives as they retain some adjectival properties.

Indications that they are not full adjectives any more from the syntactic point of view include the following:

(i) they are qualified by substantives in the genitive and no formal annexation results;
(ii) they do not qualify substantives attributively; they can stand in the genitive case and qualify other substantives, e.g.:

\begin{verbatim}
bayt-u  'akbar-i  malikat-i-n
\end{verbatim}

‘the house of the greatest queen’ /26/

(iii) they have no degree modifiers. Cf. /27/:

\begin{verbatim}
*gažîl-u  š-šukr-i  ǧiddan
profuse.NG.NN-N  D-thanks.M.SI-G  very
\end{verbatim}

‘very profuse [of] thanks’ /27/

The latter feature is probably due to the fact that in such constructions the adjectives acquire superlative or at least intensifying meaning. For some

\textsuperscript{97} This construction overlaps with Cantarino’s subtype of “real substantival usage” (1975, 2: 66 and 107-108).

\textsuperscript{98} With respect to this construction, Beeston says the following: “alternative to the noun plus adjective structure is one in which the logically qualifying concept is expressed by a noun annexed to the logically qualified concept: kibāru l-kuttābi (‘great ones of writers’)” (1968: 31). Jankowski, in turn, when referring to similar constructions in modern Arabic dialects, speaks of “neutralization and loss of grammatical markers of gender and number in displaced adjectives and numerals” (emphasis ours, 1991: 112).

\textsuperscript{99} But cf. suffixally substantivized adjectives (chapter 4.5.3.).
native speakers ǧazîlu š-šukri is equivalent to ʿaḡzalu š-šukri ‘the most profuse thanks’, with the elative.

(iv) they do not inflect for gender and number (with very few exceptions, which are rather idiomatic).

Another non-adjectival characteristic of antegenitival adjectives is that no substantives can be thought of which could be attributively qualified by them in synonymous constructions. Compare also the discussion in Fassi Fehri (1999: 115f), who argues that such phrases are (in his theoretical framework) nominals, more specifically: “prenominal adjectives”. He remarks that such adjectives admit no preadjectival negation, which is “possible with postnominal, but not prenominal adjectives” (1999: 116 fn 23), cf. *akaltu ǧayra laḏidi ɪ-taʾami ‘I ate the non-delicious food’\(^{100}\).

Indications that the antegenitival adjectives do not completely change to substantives include the following:

(i) they cannot be qualified in adjectival attribution, e.g. ʿakbaru in ʿakbaru raḡulin cannot be qualified by an adjective, cf. the non-grammaticality of:

\[
\text{*akbar-u raḡul-i-n wasım-u-n}
\]


‘the handsome biggest man’ /28/

(ii) they cannot be qualified by relative clauses. Relative clauses always refer to the substantives in the genitive.

It should be noted that in some exceptional cases antegenitival adjectives have lost or modified their original meaning, which they retain when attributive. The antegenitival maḥḍ does not mean the same as the attributive, cf.:
Some words that could appear to be antegenitival adjectives are in reality substantives because they are never used attributively, e.g. sā’īr, ḡamī‘, kāffat and šattā, all having the meaning ‘all’:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{min } & \text{sā’īr-i } \text{‘anḥā’i } \text{‘Urubbā} \\
\text{from } & \text{all-G } \text{parts.NH.PL-G } \text{Europe.F.G} \\
\text{‘from all parts of Europe’} & (‘Arabi 5/04, 162) /31/
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fi } & \text{šattā } \text{‘atrāf-ı-hi} \\
\text{in } & \text{all.G } \text{parts.NH.PL-G-3.M.SI} \\
\text{‘in all its parts} & (Mīr 200) /32/
\end{align*}
\]

The adjectives kaṭīr, ʿadīd and qalīl are normally not substantivized in this way. However, there are examples which run against this rule, e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yadda’ı } & \text{düna } \text{kaṭīr-i } \text{mubālağat-i-n } \text{‘iğādat-a} \\
\text{he:claims without } & \text{much.NG.NN-G } \text{exaggeration.F.SI-G-I } \text{command.F.SI-A}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{l-luğat-i } & \text{l-‘ıngliziy-yat-i} \\
\text{D-language.F.SI-G } & \text{D-English-F.SI-G} \\
\text{‘he claims without much exaggeration [to have] the command of English’} & (Miṭāq 30/12/03, 3) /33/
\end{align*}
\]

It seems that antegenitival substantivization is possible only for some subclasses of adjective. As it was seen, it was most frequent with non-participial adjectives. As for participles, passive participles of intransitive verbs as well as active participles of transitive verbs do not undergo this type of substantivization. In turn, passive participles of transitive verbs and active participles of intransitive verbs do.
4.5.3. Suffixal substantivization (SSA)

What is the definite genitival qualificator in constructions with antegenitival adjectives can be replaced by a suffixed pronoun attached to the adjective. This pronominal suffix represents then one or more aforementioned substantives and expresses its or their gender and number. What results from this suffixal substantivization is a **suffixally substantivized adjective (SSA)**, which, with few exceptions, is neutralized in gender and number. These two categories, however, are expressed in the suffixed pronoun. SSAs can be used attributively, i.e. in substantival attribution (as subjects and objects), as adverbials, or as predicates. Thus, e.g., in /34/ and /35/, the words ħāmisahum ‘the fifth of them’ and li ṭakbarihim ‘to the biggest of them’, respectively, are used as predicates:

\[
kānū ’arba‘at-a riḡāl-i-n wa kāna ħāmis-a-hum
\]

were four.M.PL-A men.M.PL-G-I and was fifth.NG.NN-A-3.M.PL

‘they were four men and he was the fifth of them’ (‘Umar 97) /34/

The pronominal suffix *-hum* of /34/ represents the substantive riḡālin ‘men’.

\[
li ṭakbar-i-him ṭašadd-u t-ta‘īr-i
\]


‘The biggest of them has the strongest influence’ (Ḥayāt, 2/08/07, 20, Mu‘ašširu l-‘ašumi...) /35/

The pronominal suffix *-him* of /35/ represents the substantive muštarikīna ‘participants’ mentioned earlier in the text.

In /36/, the SSAs kabīrihā and ṣaḡīrihā are used attributively to the substantive l-‘afkārī:

\[
li mulāḥaqat-i l-‘afkār-i kabīr-i-hā wa ṣaḡīr-i-hā
\]


‘to the pursuit of thoughts, big and small’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 139) /36/

In examples /37/-/39/ the SSAs function as subjects:

‘the oldest of age answered him’ (Maqhā 92) /37/

wafada ’akṭar-u-hum ‘alā ’Isbāniyā...
came most-NG.NN-N-3.M.PL onto Spain.F.G

‘most of them came to Spain’ (Kallās 37) /38/

li ’akṭar-a min sabab-i-n ’awwal-u-hā ’anna qaḍāyā

l-‘islāh-i [...] wa tānī-hā ’anna tilka l-’istirātigiỵyat-a...

‘for more than one reason, the first [being] that the problems of the reform... and the second that this strategy...’ (Miṭāq 20/4/04, 6) /39/

In /40/ the SSA is an adverbial:

kānat ’aḥṭār-u l-hurūb-i fi-hi [...] ’alā ’ašadd-i-hā
were risks.NH.PL-N D-wars.NH.PL-G in-3.M.SI on strongest.NG.NN-G-3.NH.PL

‘the risks of wars in it were at their strongest’ (Kallās 97) /40/

Some elatives, belonging to a restricted group, such as kubrā ‘biggest’, suğrā ‘smallest’, īlā ‘first’, may inflect for gender even when suffixally substantivized, e.g.:

infağarat suğrā-nā bi l-bukā’-i

‘the youngest of us burst into tears’ (‘Arabi 5/04, 178) /41/

Note that concord between SSAs such as ’ağlabu ‘most’ or ’akṭaru ‘id.’, semantically close to quantifiers, which function as subjects and adjectives as predicates can be logical, or ad sensum, i.e. reflecting the gender and number of the suffixed pronoun, e.g.:

’ağlab-u-hā [scil. al-’išābāti] kāmin-at-u-n
most.NG.NN-N-3.NH.PL hidden-NH.PL-N-i

‘most of them [scil. injuries] are hidden’ (‘Arabi 5/04, 175) [instead of kāminun] /42/
Here, the predicate adjective reflects the gender and number of -hā, although kāminun would also be correct.

Finally, let us remark here that in many contexts the suffixally substantivized adjective can be used interchangeably with an anaphorically substantivized adjective.

### 4.5.4. Independent substantivization

Under the term ‘independent substantivization’ we understand the use of a noun which, taken out of context, would be an adjective according to the definition proposed in chapter 2.2.3. but in an actual text has a syntactic function typical of substantives, e.g. subject or object. Let us present it using the word ‘āmilun as an example. It can be seen that this word, in expressions ‘āmilun [‘alā] ‘working [on sth]’ and ‘āmilun ‘a worker’, shows different characteristics. First, the two words differ from each other with respect to their semantics: the word meaning ‘worker’ has semantic surplus with respect to the adjective, in this case a participle, since it signifies not only a man who is working or works, but also is employed with a contract and is paid for it, belongs to a social class etc. The second difference lies in syntax. Thus, e.g., for the word meaning ‘working’ we can give e.g. the following syntactic properties which are absent in the word meaning ‘worker’. They are as follows:

(i) the capability of occurring with the PP ‘alā ‘on [something]’,
(ii) the capability of taking degree modifiers, and
(iii) the capability of being qualified by an internal object, e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{‘āmil-} & -u-n \quad \text{‘amal-} & -a-n \quad \text{gayyid-} & -a-n \\
\text{working.M.SI-N} & -I \quad \text{work.M.SI-A} & -I \quad \text{good.M.SI-A} & -I \\
\text{‘working a good work’} & \text{ i.e. ‘working well’}
\end{align*}
\]

For ‘āmilun ‘worker’, we can list the following properties, absent in the word meaning ‘working’:

---

This is Cantarino’s “real substantival usage” of adjectives (1975: 64-67)
(i) the capability of being qualified by attributive adjectives, and
(ii) the capability of being qualified by substantives in the genitive.

However, resorting to these syntactic properties is sometimes of no use, because on one hand there are intuitionally clear substantives used with prepositional phrases, e.g.:

\[
\text{al-qā’im-u} \quad \text{bi} \quad l’-a’māl-i \quad \text{l-filaṣṭīniyy-u}
\]

\[\text{carrying:out.M.SI-N-I} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{D-tasks.NH.PL-G} \quad \text{D-Palestinian.M.SI-N}\]

‘the Palestinian chargé d’affaires’ (‘Arabal-Yawm 29/4/04, 2, Al-maliku: ‘øyyu ḥulūlin...) /43/

and, on the other hand, there are intuitionally clear adjectives qualified by adjectives in attribution, e.g.:

\[
\text{al-mu’qabūn} \quad l’-adamiyy-ūnā \quad \text{bi} \quad ʾAdūlf Hitlir
\]

\[\text{D-pleased.M.PL.N} \quad \text{D-nihilist.M.PL.N} \quad \text{by} \quad \text{A.H.M-G}\]

‘nihilistic admirers of Adolf Hitler’ (Miṭāq 20/4/04, 7) /44/.

For all these reasons, we will introduce an alternative division, which is as follows:
A noun which according to the definition proposed in chapter 2.2.3. is an adjective:

(i) is said to be used in simple independent substantivization if it is used without, or instead of, a substantive which it could qualify in attribution and shows no syntactic properties typical of substantives and no semantic surplus with respect to the corresponding adjective used attributively.

(ii) is said to be used in independent substantivization with syntactic surplus if it is used without, or instead of, a substantive that it could qualify in attribution and shows syntactic properties typical of substantives. It has no semantic surplus with respect to the corresponding adjective used attributively.

(iii) is said to be used in independent substantivization with syntactic and semantic surplus if it is used without, or instead of, a substantive that it could qualify in attribution and shows syntactic properties typical for substantives. Additionally it has semantic surplus with respect to the corresponding adjective used attributively. This semantic surplus must consist in more than just conveying the general meaning human or thing. If the same noun is not used in substantivization but as an adjectival attribute, a change in meaning takes place. Thus qā’imun bi l’-a’māli ‘a chargé d’affaires’ is an instance of independent substantivization with syntactic and semantic surplus while
qā’imun bi l-‘a‘māli ‘[a person] carrying out the duties’ is an instance of simple independent substantivization.\(^{102}\)

By ‘syntactic properties typical of substantives’ referred to above we mean principally the capability of being qualified in adjectival attribution and by a substantive in the genitive.

According to the above criteria, ‘āmilun ‘alā ‘[someone] working on [something]’ has no semantic surplus, as its designation is the same as that of the adjective in šaḥṣun ‘āmilun ‘alā ‘a person working on [something]’. It is also able to function as adjectival attribute (rağulun ‘āmilun ‘alā... ‘a man working on sth’). Therefore it is an instance of simple independent substantivization. By contrast, the word ‘āmilun in the sense ‘worker’ shows semantic surplus with respect to the corresponding adjective used attributively. What is more, it can be qualified by a substantive in the genitive, cf. ‘āmilu maṣna‘in ‘a factory worker’, which justifies treating it as independently substantivized with semantic and syntactic surplus.

Let us also remark that for participles, semantic surplus usually is accompanied by a syntactic detachment from the verbs they are derived from. Thus e.g. participles showing semantic surplus with respect to the corresponding adjective used attributively cannot be qualified by the internal object, cf. the non-grammaticality of *mulḥaqun ‘askariyyun ’ilḥaqan ḍayyidan *‘a firmly attached military attaché’.

4.5.6.1. Simple independent substantivization

Within simple independent substantivization adjectives referring to human beings and those not referring to human beings can be distinguished as two major groups. First, the adjectives referring to human beings will be presented. The following examples may be adduced here:

\(^{102}\) El-Ayoubi et al. distinguish “lexikalische und spontane Substantivierung” (2001: 155), the former corresponding roughly to our simple independent substantivization and the latter to that with syntactic and semantic surplus.
In elatives substantivized in this manner the gender and number is always neutralized and it is only the context which permits to determine the number and gender intended:

\[
\text{lā yuʿabbirūna 'ani l-ʿakṭar-l ʿginan wa ʿinnamā l-ʿakṭar-l faqr-a-n}
\]

not they:stand for D-most.NG.NN-G richness,M.A.I and but D-most.NG.NN-G poverty,M.SI-A-I

‘they do not represent the richest but the poorest’ (Al-Miṭāq 20/4/2004, 9) /49/.

It seems, however, that elatives are rarely substantivized. Relative clauses with elatives as predicates are used instead substantivized elatives as subjects, as in /50/:

\[
\text{qad faštāla man hun ʿafḍal-u min-hu}
\]


‘those who are better than him have failed’ (Hayāt 2/08/07, 20, ‘Uyunun...) /50/

But substantivized elatives as subjects are also possible, though rare:

\[
\text{ʿinna ʿakbar-a min-ki yatazawwaṣna kull-a yawm-i-n}
\]

that older.NG.NN-A than-2.F.SI get:married all-A day.M.SI-G-I

‘[those who are] older than you get married every day’ (from Cantarino 1975, 2: 470) [instead of ʿinna man hunna ʿakbaru minki...] /51/

A specific and very clear case of this kind of substantivization is the one of a participle used in connection with the verb it was derived from, e.g.:
However, in such participles syntactic surplus is also possible:

\[
\text{fa k\={a}n\={u} kullam\={a} ra\‘aw-n\={i} s\={a}\={h}a s\={a}\‘i\={h}-u-hum;}\ldots
\]

\[
\text{and were everytime they:saw-1.SI shouted shouting.M.SI-N-3.M.PL}
\]

\[
\text{‘and whenever they saw me, a shouter from among them shouted...’ (M\={i}r 13) /53/}
\]

It seems that not every adjective can undergo this kind of substantivization. It seems that it would be strange to say e.g. \(\text{kullu s\={a}\={h}ibin} \) intended to mean ‘every pale man’.

Let us also remark that simple independent substantivization allows two adjectives to occur in adjectival apposition (discussed in chapter 3.2.2.). Being used in this kind of substantivization is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for adjectives to form an adjectival apposition

As we have said above, simple independent substantivization may concern adjectives referring to non-human entities, such as ‘thing’, ‘issue’, ‘matter’. Frequently, the adjective conveys the meaning of modality, i.e. the attitude of a speaker as regards a certain matter. Usually, the adjective is a participle. In this case only the masculine singular, or neutralized, form of the adjective is used.

In most cases of this kind of substantivization it is possible to form synonymous constructions with the adjective functioning as the attribute of a substantive with a general meaning such as ‘amrun ‘thing, matter’. This, however, is not always felt as natural. However, if the substantivized adjective is a participle, it is always possible to form corresponding relative clauses with verbs from which the participle was derived, e.g.:

\[
\text{mina l-muqarrar-i l-intih\={a}‘u min-h\={a} fi yan\={a}\={y}ir-a...}
\]

\[
\]

\[
\text{‘its completion is planned for January’ (‘Ahr\={a}m 29/01/03, 27, \text{\=H}u\={t}\text{\=t}atun mutak\={a}milatun...) /54/}
\]

In accordance to what has been said above, the expression \text{mina l-muqarrar}i, lit. ‘of the planned’, of example /54/ is synonymous with
mim-mā qurrira ‘of what was planned’. The situation is similar in /55/, though not in /56/, where the adjectives are not participles:

\begin{align*}
tamma & \quad t-tālī \\
\text{was:acconmplished} & \quad \text{D-following.M.Si.N} \\
\end{align*}

‘the following has been accomplished’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 26) (= tamma mā yalī ‘what follows has been accomplished’) /55/

\begin{align*}
maḍati & \quad l-‘umūr-u \quad \text{min} \quad \text{sayyi’-i-n} \quad 'ilā \quad \.triplet{aswa’-a} \\
\text{went} & \quad \text{D-affairs.NH.PL-N} \quad \text{from} \quad \text{bad.M.Si-G-1 to} \quad \text{worse.NG.NN-G.1} \\
\end{align*}

‘the affairs have changed from bad to worse’ (‘Arabī 3/04, 139) /56/

It seems that not every adjective can undergo this kind of substantivization. E.g. one could hardly say *mina l-munqi l-an... in the sense ‘it is redeeming that’. Frequently a word such as šay ‘thing’ must be inserted:

\begin{align*}
\text{hal tastaṭī’u} \quad ‘\text{an tuqīma} \quad \text{žill-a} \quad \text{šay’-i-n} \quad \text{mu’wağğ-i-n?} \\
\text{PART} \quad \text{you:can} \quad \text{that you:straighten} \quad \text{shadow.M.Si-A} \quad \text{thing.M.Si-G-1} \quad \text{crooked.M.Si-G-1} \\
\end{align*}

‘can you straighten the shadow of a crooked thing’ (Lišş 169) /57/

instead of simply *žilla mu’wağğin *‘the shadow of a crooked’. Idiomaticity seems to be decisive here. Not all features are considered here. Not all features are considered by speakers of MWA as capable of being expressed by a substantivized adjective.

The meaning conveyed by adjectives substantivized in this way can also be an abstract concept. Here, too, the neutralized gender is used, e.g.:

\begin{align*}
\text{ma’} & \quad \text{mafhūm-i} \quad \text{giyāb-i} \quad \text{š-xaḥṣiyy-i} \\
\text{with} & \quad \text{concept.Si-G} \quad \text{absence.M.Si-G} \quad \text{D-personal.M.Si-G} \\
\end{align*}

‘with the concept of absence of [what is] personal’ (Tāqāfī 9/11/04, 5, Al-’ibdā’u bayna n-naqdi...) /58/

In many cases adjectives of this type are not subjected to substantivization but left in their predicate function, e.g.:

\begin{align*}
\text{bi} & \quad \text{darūrat-i} \quad \text{fi’l-i} \quad \text{kull-i} \quad \text{mā huwa mumkin-u-n} \\
\text{with} & \quad \text{necessity.F.Si-G} \quad \text{doing.M.Si-G} \quad \text{all-G} \quad \text{what 3.M.Si possible.M.Si-N-1} \\
\end{align*}

‘with the necessity of doing all that is possible’ (Liwā’7/4/04, 1, Šrīk yastaqabilu...) /59/
instead of the questionable ʔ kulli munkinin. With elatives, this construction may be used in order to preserve the indefinite state and comparative meaning:

\[
\text{fi } l-\text{ğa’bat-i } \ l-\text{’amrīkiyy-at-i } mā \ huwa \ ’ahṭar-u [...] \ \text{min } ... \\
\text{in D-quiver.F.SI-G } \text{D-American-F.SI-G } \text{what } 3,M.SI \text{ more:dangerous.NG.NN-N.I } \text{than }
\]

‘in the American quiver there is something [...] more dangerous than ...’ (Mītāq 20/4/04,11) /60/

A specific variety of simple independent substantivization of adjectives designating non-human objects is that involving comparative elatives, in the sense ‘something more [...] than’, e.g:

\[
\text{wa } ’id \ \text{bi-him } \text{yanāli‘na } \’ab’ad-a \ \text{min } ḡālika \\
\text{and PART } \text{PREP-3,M.PL } \text{obtain } \text{more:remote.NG.NN-A.I } \text{than this }
\]

‘and they get [something] more remote than that’ (Ḥasāratun muwqī’atun, Ṭisrīn 9/10/2003, 6) /61/

4.5.6.2. Independent substantivization with syntactic and semantic surplus

Let us begin this chapter by adducing examples of substantivizations involving only syntactic surplus, i.e. with no semantic one. First, words referring to human beings are listed, e.g.:

\[
\text{nāziḥ-ū } \ l-\text{Fallūqat-i} \\
\text{refugees.M-PL-N } \text{D-Falluja.F-G }
\]

‘the refugees of Falluja’ (Riyāḍ 24/4/04, 1, Nāziḥū l-Fallūqati...) [syntactic surplus: no preposition ‘an, usually occuring with nāziḥun, derived from the verb nazaḥa ‘an ‘to emigrate from’]/62/

\[
\text{ma’ā muwāṭin-īna } \ ’aw \ \text{muqīm-īna } \ ’āğāni-b-a \\
\text{with compatriots.M-PL.G or resident.M-PL.G foreign.M-PL.G.I }
\]

‘with compatriots or foreign residents’ (Riyāḍ 21/4/04, 1, Fa’nūnū ｙaḥrūqū...) [syntactic surplus: capability of having adjectival attributes]/63/

\[
\text{al-mu’ğabūnā } \ l-\text{’adamiyy-īna } \text{bi } \’\text{Adūl Hitlir} \\
\text{D-pleased.M-PL.N } \text{D-nihilist.M-PL.N } \text{by A.H.M-G }
\]

‘nihilistic admirers of Adolf Hitler’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 7) [idem] /64/
In what follows, some examples of substantivization with syntactic and semantic surplus are given:

\[\text{nā'ib-u-n} \]
member:of:parliament.M.SI-N-I
‘deputy, member of parliament’ (not ‘[a person] representing [a person]’; from nā’ibun ‘representing’) /66/

\[\text{mulḥaq-u-n} \]
attaché:M.SI-N-I military.M.SI-N-I
‘military attaché (from mulḥaqun ‘attached’) /67/

\[\text{al-qā‘im-u} \]
bi l-‘a’māl-.i l-filaṣṭīniyy-u
‘the Palestinian chargé d’affaires’ (‘Arab al-Yawm 29/4/04, 2, Al-maliku: ’ayyu ḫulālin...) (from al-qā‘imu bi l-‘a’māli ‘carrying out the duties’) /68/

Substantives resulting from independent substantivization with syntactic and semantic surplus can also refer to non-human objects. The meaning of such substantives is not predictable: \textit{al-‘aswadu} cannot be simply understood as ‘what is black, a black thing’\textsuperscript{103}. The word \textit{‘aswadu} (‘black’) means e.g. ‘pupil (of the eye)’, but usually it is accompanied by the qualifier ‘of the eye, viz. \textit{‘aswadu l-‘ayni}. A grain of black coal dust in the eye will not be called \textit{‘aswadu} or \textit{‘aswadu l-‘ayni}. Neither with animals involved is there any predictability: \textit{‘aswadu} means ‘a snake’, but it does not mean ‘a raven’, which is black, even proverbially black. Furthermore, Classical Arabic is known for its conventionalized duals: pairs of

\textsuperscript{103} However, the proverb \textit{mā kullu baydā‘a šahmatun wa lā kullu sawdā‘a tamratun} should be translated as ‘not every white thing is a piece of fat and not every black thing is a date’ (from Monteil 1960: 297), i.e. the feminine forms \textit{baydā‘} and \textit{sawdā‘} mean ‘something white’ and ‘something black’, i.e. with no semantic surplus. Yet there is still a semantic surplus: they mean ‘a white piece’ and ‘a black piece’ respectively, i.e. something small that can be seen.

\textsuperscript{103} Cf. the hackneyed English example with \textit{blackbird}, which does not have to black.
substantivized adjectives denoting two things similar in some respect. But, for instance, *al-’aswadâni* lit. ‘the two black things’ are in fact not black: this word can mean either ‘dates and water’ or ‘scorpion and snake’\(^{104}\).

Examples:

\begin{align*}
\text{tarnū } & \text{'ilā } \text{l-baʾid-i} \\
\text{she:looks to} & \text{ D-distance.M.SI-G} \\
\text{‘she is looking into distance’} & \text{(Maqhā 22) [Cf. *baʾidun* ‘far, distant’] /69/} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{'āmil-u-n} & \\
\text{factor.M.SI-N-I} & \\
\text{‘factor’ [Cf. *'āmilun* ‘working’] /70/} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{al-ḥāṣib-u } & \text{l-’āliyy-u} \\
\text{D-counter.M.SI-N} & \text{ D-automatic.M.SI-N} \\
\text{‘computer’ (Riyāḍ 24/4/04, 1, *Al-’amīru* ‘Abdullāh...) [Cf. *ḥāṣibun* ‘counting’] /71/} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{bayna } & \text{muğtaşabat-i } \text{Ǧūš Qaṭīf } \text{wa maʾar-i}... \\
\text{between} & \text{ usurped:area.F.SI-G G.Q.M.G and passage.M.SI-G} \\
\text{‘between the usurped land and the passage...’} & \text{(‘Anwār 3/5/04, 1, *Maqtalu* 5 \text{’Isrāʾiliyyīna...) [Cf. *muğtaşabatun* ‘usurped, violated’ (feminine)] /72/} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{'ilā } & \text{s-sābiʿ-i } \text{mina š-šahr-i } \text{l-ḥāliyy-i} \\
\text{to} & \text{ D-seventh.M.SI-G of} \text{ D-month.M.SI-G current.M.SI-G} \\
\text{‘to the 7th of the current month’ (Dustūr 1/5/04, 1, *Badʾu ʿṣarfi.../) /73/} \\
\end{align*}

Some substantives formed in this way may be used as proper names, e.g. *al-ʿāširu min ramaḍāna* ‘the Tenth (day) of Ramadan’ (name of a town in Egypt) or form constant epithets, e.g. for God: *al-Ḥayyu* ‘the Living’. Many such constructions may not be felt any more to be related to adjectives, which usually are no more in use. Thus e.g. *ḥusāmun* ‘sword, sword edge’ is derived from *ḥusāmun* ‘sharp’ as in *sayfun ḥusāmun* ‘a sharp sword’ (Belkin 1968: 76). Within independent substantivization with syntactic and semantic surplus, substantivizations which are loan translations may be distinguished, e.g. *jāniyatun* ‘second [the unit of time]’ (from ‘second [ordinal numeral]’) under the influence of Latin *secunda*; *mawdūʿun* ‘theme’ (from ‘laid down’) under the influence of Greek *thema*. 
Finally, we should remark that independent substantivization with syntactic and semantic surplus is a matter of the vocabulary of a given language. Only some adjectives undergo this process. They usually appear in dictionaries as separate entries. That a word is substantivized with syntactic and semantic surplus can be well observed in adjectival attributions. For instance in the adjectival attribution in /74/:  

\[
\text{'abir-u-n} \quad \text{\ddashib-u-n}
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{passer-by.M.SI-N-I} \quad \text{pale.M.SI-N-I} \\
\text{'a pale passer-by' (Maqhà 38) [Cf. 'abirun 'passing by'] /74/}
\end{align*}

the noun 'âbirun is a substantive, while šâhibun is an adjective. The word order cannot be reversed to yield *šâhibun 'âbirun because the adjective šâhibun has not been substantivized in the necessary way, whereas 'âbirun has. Adjectives that have undergone independent substantivization with semantic surplus have given rise to new words, viz. substantives.

4.5.6.3. Independent substantivization: specific cases

In this chapter some specific cases of substantivization will be discussed. They concern nouns such as ka\d{f}ir ‘much, many’, ‘adid ‘id.’, maz\d{i}d ‘more’ and qalil ‘little, few’. An example of a substantivized ka\d{f}ir is given in /75/:  

\[
ta\d{g}izu \quad l-qita\d{a}-u \quad l-qawiyyat-u  \quad \text{fi'l-i} \quad l-ka\d{f}r-i
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{are:unable D-pieces.NH.PL-N} \quad \text{D-strong-NH.PL-N from doing.M.SI-G D- much.M.SI-G} \\
\text{'strong pieces cannot do much' ('Arabì 5/04, 182), /75/}
\end{align*}

In many, though not all cases, synonymous constructions can be formed with the adjective qualifying a substantive with a general meaning, usually šay’un ‘thing, matter’. Having this general sense, this substantive is uncountable and can be qualified by adjectives meaning ‘much’ and ‘little’. Cf. the following example:

\[
\text{wa yasta\d{f}i'u  \ 'an  ya\d{n}a'a  \ s-šay\d{a}-a  \ l-ka\d{f}r-a}
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{and is:able that it:makes D-thing.M.SI-A} \quad \text{D-much.M.SI-A} \\
\text{‘and [he] is able to do a great deal’ (Mîjâq 30/12/03, 2) /76/}
\end{align*}
The substantivized *kašîr* can be qualified by a *min*-phrase. It may have neutralized gender and number even when relating to humans, as in /77/: 

\[ \text{’ilhāq-i} \quad \text{d-} \text{darar-i} \quad \text{bi} \quad l-\text{kašîr-i} \quad \text{mina} \quad l-’Urdunniyy-īna \]

inflicting.M.SI-G \quad D-harm.M.SI-G \quad to \quad D-much.NG.NN-G \quad of \quad D-Jordanian.M-PL.G

‘[of] inflicting harm to many Jordanians’ (‘Arab al-Yawm 29/4/04, 1, Tawżī’u 29 milyūni...) /77/

Nonetheless, it may also inflect for number and gender as in /78/: 

\[ \text{ya’rifu-hu} \quad l-\text{kašîr-ūna} \quad \text{mina} \quad l-‘arab-i} \]

know-3.M.SI \quad D-many.M-PL.N \quad of \quad D-Arabs.M-PL-G

‘many Arabs know it’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 58) /78/

If not qualified by a *min*-phrase, it must be inflected in order to express the gender and number: 

\[ fī \quad rā’y-i \quad l-\text{kašîr-īna} \]

in opinion.M.SI-G \quad D-many.M-PL.G

‘in the opinion of the many’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 5) /79/

Normally, these substantivized adjectives are not qualified by attributive adjectives. However, one example, rather strange and exceptional, did occur in the corpus: 

\[ al-‘adīdu \quad \text{mina} \quad l-mu’allaftāt-i \quad fī \quad ‘ilm-i \quad l-iğiṭimā‘-i \]

D-much.NG.NN-U \quad of \quad D-works.NHL-PL.-G \quad in \quad science.M.SI-G \quad D-society.M.SI-G

\[ d-\text{diniyy-ī} \quad l-\text{mukarras-ū} \quad li \quad l-‘islām-ī} \]

D-religious.M.SI-G \quad D-devoted.NG.NN-G \quad to \quad D-Islam.M.SI-G

‘a number of works on science of religious sociology devoted to Islam’ (‘Ayyāmu l-frankūfūniyyati, 10) /80/

There are also graded forms of substantivized *kašîr* and *qalîl*, i.e. substantivized ’akṭar and ’aqall, e.g: 

\[ fī \quad ’akṭar-ā \quad \text{min} \quad \text{miṭaqat-īn} \quad fī \quad l-‘alam-ī} \]

in more.M.NG.NN.G.I \quad than \quad region.F.SI.G-I \quad in \quad D-world.M.SI-G

‘in more than one region of the world’ (‘Anwār 3/5/04, 2, Lāḥūd ’a’raba ‘an...) /81/
4.5.6.4. Independent substantivization: idiomatic cases

Some substantivized adjectives are used as set expressions and can be discussed in terms of idiomatized substantivized adjectives. It seems that this phenomenon concerns only cases of independent substantivization. No constructions synonymous with them can be formed in which the adjective would qualify a substantive attributively. Thus e.g. the expression ‘alā l-’aqalli ‘at least’ lit. ‘on the least’ in /83/:

\[130 \, \text{gundiyyα-n} \, \text{‘amūrkiyyα-n} \, \text{‘alā l-’aqalli} \]

\[130 \, \text{soldier.} \, \text{American.} \, \text{on} \, \text{D-least.} \, \text{NG} \]

‘at least 130 American soldiers’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 1, Taqārīru mina l-Bintāğūn...) /83/

has no synonym in a hypothetical expression *‘alā l-qadri l-’aqalli* lit. *‘on the least measure’. Likewise it is impossible to propose synonymous expressions of this kind for ‘āmmatan and ḥāssatan in /84/: 

\[‘\text{‘anna l-‘}lām\text{-a} \, ‘\text{‘amm\,-a} \, ‘\text{wa d-dirāmā} \, ‘\text{t-tilifizyūniyy\,-a} \]
\[\text{D-media.} \, \text{general-} \, \text{D-drama.} \, \text{D-televisio\,-A} \]

‘the media, generally, and tv drama specifically, have a role in...’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 46) /84/

Of rather idiomatic character is also the use of al-‘āharu ‘other’ and its feminine form al-‘uhrā after personal pronouns of respective gender (huwa and hiya) in the sense ‘also, as well, too’. E.g.

\[taqaddamat \, hiya \, ‘\text{‘uhr\,-a} \, ‘\text{bi mašrū\,-i} \]
\[\text{stepped:} \, \text{3.} \, \text{D-other.} \, \text{with project.} \, \text{G} \]

‘it, as well, put forward the project of... ’ (Mītāq 20/4/2004, 10) /85/
Also expressions *kaṭīran mā* ‘frequently’, *ġāliban mā* ‘generally’ and *nādiran mā* ‘rarely’ could be treated as idiomaticized substantivized adjectives, e.g.:

\[ \text{ği}lîb-a-n \quad mā \text{ yaqta™î naṣṣ-u-n \text{ mina \ l-masra™-i \ldots} } \]

*general,NG.NN-A-I PART requires text,M.SI-N-I from D-theatre,M.SI-G*

‘generally, a text requires from the theatre...’ (Taâqîfi 9/11/04,6,Intihârun ḡayru...) /86/

### 4.6. Adjectives as adverbials

In the present monograph, what is traditionally analysed as the adverb derived from the adjective, i.e. a separate part of speech, will be treated as the adverbial, i.e. a syntactic function of the adjective. We mean here expressions such as *sar̸ān* ‘quickly’, *ḥadītan* ‘recently’ and *kaṭīran* ‘much’. The adjectives used in this function are neutralized in gender and number. Their case is always the accusative and its state is indefinite. This will be considered to be the form an adjective has if it qualifies a verb, a verbal noun (*maṣdar*) or another adjective. Verbs, verbal nouns and adjectives are thus interpreted as regents\(^{105}\).

The idea that some adverbs could be treated as special cases to adjectives was advocated e.g. by Baker (2003), who argues that “adjectives *can* merge with all these categories [verb phrases and adjective phrases – MM] – except that in these environments we normally call them adverbs”. According to Baker, “That adverbs belong to the same category as adjectives is indirectly confirmed by the fact that a language without the latter does not have the former either” (p. 232). Also in Karolak (1992: 504) is a similar view hinted at. Admittedly, treating the adverb as one of the secondary syntactic functions of the adjective may not be free of controversy yet it seems that assuming this view for a description of MWA is justified at least to some extent. In this respect, Watson’s opinion can be quoted here as saying: “Classical Arabic has few words that function solely as adverbs. More often, a word with a basic nominal or adjectival

---

\(^{105}\) Also the neutralized gender and number as well as the indefinite state of the adjective could be interpreted as a result of rection. However, we will not assume this for the purpose of our description.
function may be used as an adverbial in certain syntactic contexts” (Watson 2006: 21). Elsewhere, she says: “Adjectives which may function as manner adverbs include *sarī*-an ‘quickly’, *baṭī*-an ‘slowly’ [...]” (2006: 23).
PART 5. REMAINING ADJECTIVAL SYNTAGMS

Up to now, only a few biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms have been discussed in detail, viz. those based on adjectival attribution. Also various kinds of predication and exclamation have been briefly introduced. In this part we will discuss the remaining syntagms\(^{106}\). The description presented below will serve as the basis for the typology to be proposed in Part 6.

5.1. Qualifying adjectives as recta of genitival rection

In the present chapter constructions will be discussed in which the adjective in the genitive case qualifies the preceding substantive. The following constructions will be presented:

(i) adjectives in the genitive as recta of substantives,
(ii) adjectives in the genitive as recta of triconsonantal prepositions.

5.1.1. Adjectives in the genitive as recta of substantives

Adjectives in the genitive as recta of substantives occur in two kinds of constructions:

\(^{106}\) Constructions used in Classical Arabic and described in grammars of this language but not occurring in MWA (or if so, then only as quotations) will not be dealt here. Such constructions are e.g. adjectives qualifying substantives in the vocative use, where no concord in case is required, e.g. Yā ‘Aliyyu ʿ-ṣ zarifa ‘Oh, kind Ali!’ (from Corriente 2002 [1980]: 258; also Al-Ǧalāyīnī 2002[1912]: 531), or the so-called naʿt maqṭīt (lit. ‘severed adjective’), with the adjective not agreeing in case with the substantive described (as classical grammar says, due to the adjective being governed by an implicit regens) e.g. Al-ḥamdu li llāhi l-ʿaẓīmu or l-ʿaẓīma ‘Praise to God, the Great’, instead of l-ʿaẓīmi (Al-Ǧalāyīnī 2002 [1912]: 565).
5.1.1.1. Adjectives as qualificators of ‘special substantives’

By the term ‘special substantives’ we will refer to words of special function, such as ġayr- ‘other than’, šibh- ‘quasi-,-like’, nisf- ‘semi-’ and ġidd- ‘extremely’, that, if used attributively, agree in case with the substantive they qualify. Then, they form with it a substantival attribution. They may also be used as predicates. Adjectives are their qualificators in the genitive case.107

The ‘special substantives’ are not lexically independent. The words ġayr- and šibh- are translated into English as ‘not-’, ‘un-’ and ‘semi-’, ‘quasi-’, respectively, yet more adequately they should be understood as ‘the reverse of’ and ‘the like of’, respectively. They could be conceived of in terms of auxiliary words, however, they are inflected for case and exert genitival rection, i.e. they have syntactic characteristics of full substantives. Therefore we will treat them as words (as defined in chapter 1.1.1.). Above that, their use is not restricted to idiomaticized expressions (they do not appear with elatives, though). Cf. the following examples (in order to show the case relations, examples /1/-/3/ are given with the substantives in the nominative, i.e. not in the original form how they were found in the corpus):

107 The expression ‘special substantives’ is used here for lack of a better term. Other denominations, e.g. ‘miscellaneous determiners’ used by Badawi et al. (2004: 232ff) or ‘Modifikatoren des Adjektivs’ used by El-Ayoubi et al. (2001: 146ff) suggest an analysis contrary to ours, viz. with the adjectives being determined or modified by these substantives.
A ‘special substantive’ may also function as the predicate, as in /4/: 

\[ \text{wa 'inna-nī ġidd-u mustağrib-at-i-n} \]
and that-1 SI gravity-N surprised-F SI-G-I

‘and I am very surprised’ (Mīṭāq 30/12/03, 15) /4/

Qualification within these constructions can be identified as follows: e.g. in the triconstituent syntagm ‘asālibu ġayru maśrū'atin of /1/, we can disntinguish the following biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms:

(i) (‘asālibu, ġayru) with concord in case;
(ii) (ġayru, maśrū'atin) with genitival rection.

Of interest to us is syntagm (ii), in which the adjective is the qualificator.

It should be noted here that the article, instead of being attached to the qualifying adjective conforming to the classical usage, may be attached to a ‘special substantive’\(^{108}\). Perhaps this phenomenon might be understood in terms of ‘special substantives’ being reduced to prefixes. In such cases, the inflectional endings, which normally would not be pronounced, are difficult to determine. E.g.:

\[ \text{al-mumārasāt-i ġ-didd# jābī'līyy-at-i} \]
D-activities.NH.PL-G D-opposite# natural-NH.PL-G

‘unnatural activities’ (Al-Mīṭāq 20/4/2004, 7) /5/

\[ \text{al-'tamākin-u ġ-dayyiq-at-u l-ġayr-u muhawwā-t-i-n} \]

‘[the] confined unaired places’, lit. ‘the confined places the other than the aired’ (from Badawi et al. 2004: 235, their translation\(^{109}\)) /6/

---

\(^{108}\) Krahl discusses these constructions under the term \textit{Zusammenrückungen} (1985: 55)

\(^{109}\) Note that the adjective qualifying l-ġayru is indefinite (with -in) according to Badawi et al. Likewise in examples in e.g. Polotsky (1978: 171): l-ġayri musarrāhin ‘illicit’ (lit. ‘not allowed’) and Gätje (1970: 233): al-ġayru ḥasanin ‘der Unschöne’ (lit. ‘not beautiful’). In reality, the correctness of the indefinite inflectional ending is probably impossible to determine because classical grammarians did not provide rules for constructions they did not know.
Badawi et al. write that such constructions might have been modelled on unreal, i.e. formal, annexation. We, however, consider it rather impossible since formal annexation has a completely different structure: in a formal annexation the qualificatum is an adjective and the qualifier is a substantive, while in constructions with ‘special substantives’ the qualificatum is a substantive and the qualifier is an adjective, thus it is the reverse. What is more, in formal annexation the second component is always definite, while it is not the case in constructions with the ‘special substantives’. We are inclined to say that the irregular constructions with the ‘special substantives’ have arisen in analogy to such ’idāfa constructions as al-mi’atu raḡulin ‘the hundred men’, where both components are substantives and the first one, despite being qualified by a substantive in the genitive, bears the definite article.

Generally, prefixation of these substantives is a phenomenon which is classed as rather substandard language by native speakers. It seems to be influenced by dialect usage. But according to Blau (1973: 181), the construction al-ḡayru l- was permitted by the Language Academy of Cairo in 1969.

5.1.1.2. Antegenitively or suffixally substantivized adjectives as genitival qualificators

Adjectives used in antegenitival or suffixal substantivization (see chapters 4.5.2. and 4.5.3.) are similar to substantives in that they may function as genitival qualificators of substantives. Thus, for instance, the adjectives rābi‘i ‘the fourth’ in /7/ and ’a’tā ‘haughtiest’ in /8/ are in the genitive case and qualify they recta, ta’mīru and fī waḡhi, respectively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ta’mīr-u</th>
<th>rābi‘-i</th>
<th>tā’irat-i-n</th>
<th>min</th>
<th>fīrāz-i...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

‘the repair of the fourth plane of the type...’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 26, Tāhsīnū ḡālaṭi... /7/)

Corriente gives yet another example: al-‘ašyā’u l-ḡayru l-tābiṭati ‘cosas inseguras’, i.e. ‘the non-fixed things’ with the article prefixed to both ḡayr and the adjective (2002 [1988]: 235).
**fi wağh-i ’aṭâ** quwwat-i-n **fi š-šarq-i** l-’awsat-i
‘in the face of the haughtiest power in the Middle East’ (’Anwâr 3/5/04, 2, Al-Ḥusṣ: ʾAmîrkâ...) /8/

In our description we will reject the existence of syntagms composed of a substantive qualified by an adjective in the genitive case if the adjective is not antegenitivally or suffixally substantivized or does not qualify one of the ‘special substantives’. Therefore in /9/

\[
\text{wazn-}u \quad \text{l-ḥafif-}i
\]
‘the light weight’ lit. ‘weight of light’ /9/

the second constituent will be treated as a substantive, resulting from the independent substantivization of an adjective. The syntagm /9/ will be not be treated as adjectival but as bi-substantival, despite the fact that taken out of context ḥafif is an adjective. Krahl, for instance, treats this word as an adjective, probably due to its semantics\(^{110}\). However, its use in this construction as well as the possibility of it being qualified by a substantive in the genitive, as in /10/:

\[
\text{wazn-}u \quad \text{ḥafif} \quad \text{d-dubâbat-}i
\]
‘flyweight’ (after Krahl 1985: 16, also fn. 19) /10/

show that ḥafif is independently substantivized. Also nouns with the foreign suffix -\(_{-}ik\) used in chemical terminology are of the same kind, e.g.:

\[
\text{ḥāmîd-}u \quad \text{z-zaytîk-}i
\]
‘oleic acid’ (cf. Krahl 1985:48f, also fn. 67) /11/

This genitive construction is more frequent than the synonymous adjectival attribution **al-ḥāmîdu** **z-zaytîku**. Cf. also the following construction with an indication of a date:

---

\(^{110}\) Cf. also Badawi et al. (2004: 116).
yawm-u  ū-tāmin-i  min  ḍī l-hīğāti
‘the eighth of (lit. ‘the day of the eighth of’) [the month] ḍī l-hīğā...’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 28, ‘Īdā ḥaġĝā r-raġulu...) /12/

Here, too, the word ū-tāmini shall be considered to be a substantive.

5.1.2. Adjectives in the genitive as recta of triconsonantal prepositions

Some adjectives stand in the genitive case without genitival rection being exerted upon them by the substantive they qualify. Instead, their genitive case results from the fact that they are preceded by certain triconsonantal prepositions.111

In order to show the case relations, the examples below are given with the substantives in the nominative, i.e. not in the original form in which they occurred in the corpus:

\[ al-ḡusaymāt-u  \ tāhta  ḡ-ḍarrīyy-at-i \]
D-particles.NH.PL-N  under  D-atomic-NH.PL-G
‘subatomic particles’ (‘Arabī 3/04, 142) /13/

\[ al-ʕašī‘-at-u  \ fawqa  l-banafṣāğiyy-at-i \]
D-rays.NH.PL-N  over  D-violet-NH.PL-G
‘ultra-violet rays’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, ...Wa ḥikāyātun...) /14/

\[ diqqat-u-n  \ tāhta  milīmitriyy-at-i-n \]
precision.F.SI-N-I  under  millimetric-NH.PL-G-I
‘submillimetric precision’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 148) /15/

The prepositions which can appear in this specific function are those termed as zarf in Arabic linguistic tradition. Their characteristic feature is that they have three radical consonants and terminate in -a, as if in the accusative. In contrast to ‘special substantives’ (discussed in 5.1.1.1.), which, if used attributively, agree with the qualified substantive in case,

111 See also Krahl 1985: 56. Here we should also mention adjectives resulting from fragments of morphemes (e.g. syllables) being prefixed to other morphemes. This operation is called naḥt, and was known already to classical grammarians. E.g. taḥṣīʿūriyyun ‘subconcious’ from taḥṣā š-ṣuʿūrī ‘under the feelings’. For more examples see Czapkiewicz (1979: 77f), Belkin (1975: 125-127); Krahl (1985: 50-51) and Badawi et al. (2004: 756-762).
the prepositions in question always retain the same final vowel -a, thus
cannot be treated as inflecting. The adjectival component will be analysed
as standing in the genitive case, as is usual for nouns after prepositions.
Yet it seems that in practice inflectional endings are not pronounced and
could be considered indeterminate.

Some adjectives originating in this manner are preceded by the particle
ma, usually translated into English as ‘what’:

\[
\text{al-ḥiqbat-u mā ba'da ṣ-ṣinā'iy-y-at-i}
\]

D-stage,F.SI-N PART after D-industrial-F.SI-G

‘the post-industrial stage’ (‘Arabi 5/04, 26) /16/

The particle ma may also receive the definite article:

\[
\text{al-‘ašā‘at-u l-māfawqa l-banafašiyy-at-i}^{112}
\]

D-rays,NH.PL-N D-PART.over D-violet,NH.PL-G

‘ultra-violet rays’ (‘ālam al-fikr 146) /17/

Since we assumed that prepositions, also those having three radical
consonants and ending in -a, are not words in our understanding, the
expressions under discussion, such as taḥta ḏ-darriyyati, will be treated as
particular words and not as syntagms. These words, composed of the
preposition and the adjective, qualify preceding substantives. The
expression al-ḡusaymātu taḥta ḏ-darriyyaṭi is thus a biconstituent
syntagm. Such syntagms will have the characteristic feature of the lack of
case concord between the qualified substantive and the qualifying
adjective, the latter being always in the genitive case.

5.2. Predicative syntagms

In this chapter, predicative syntagms will be discussed. We will present
them in the following order: (i) basic predicative syntagms, (ii) extended
predicative syntagms and (iii) secondary predicative syntagms.

\footnote{Badawi et al. (2004) vocalize the ending of the adjective in an analogous example with # on p. 109
and with -i on p. 760, where they, however, add that “the inflection is probably indeterminate here”.
}
5.2.1. Basic predicative syntagms

By the term ‘basic predicative syntagms’ we will refer to predicative syntagms in which no verb, no cognate participle or a verbal noun expressing predication or a relation based on it is used. The expression *baytī kabīran* ‘My house is large’ is a basic predicative syntagm but not *baytī kāna kabīran* ‘My house was large’ is not. Predicative constructions involving verbs, cognate participles, or verbal nouns will be described as extended predicative syntagms in chapter 5.2.1.

The problem of distinguishing predicate adjectives from predicate substantives was discussed in chapter 4.1. Let us now discuss the problem of predicate adjectives in more detail.

The rules governing the gender and number concord are the same as in attributive syntagms. The most simple kind of a basic predicative syntagm is that with both subject and predicate in the nominative case. In chapter 1.2.1. we assumed that the subject governs the nominative case of the predicate, while itself being ungoverned. Usually, the predicate is indefinite. E.g.:

*wa l-ḥubb-u ǧamil-u-n*

and D-love.M.SI-N beautiful.M.SI-N-1

‘and love is beautiful’ (Raḡab 7) /18/

*Nīkūl Rīṭī huṭmil-u-n*

N.R.F.N pregnant.NG.NN-N-1

‘Nicole Richie is pregnant’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 19, headline) /19/

If it should be stressed that the predicate is known or the only one (i.e. if the sentence has the sense: *it is X that...*), the predicate receives the definite article *al-* . In such cases, a personal pronoun functions as the subject of the adjectival predicate. The resulting sentence is then the comment of the topic, which is a word represented by the pronoun. E.g.:

---

113 In many descriptions of this construction, the pronoun is treated as a copula. The pronoun with indefinite predicates is very rare.
al-fannânu huwa l-mas’ûlu ‘an maḥabbat-i n-nâs-i li l-fann-i
‘it is the artist that is responsible for the people’s love for art’ (Ṭaqâfî 9/11/04, 9,
Iḥtiṣârâtun šadidatun...) /20/

In /20/, the substantive al-fannânu ‘the artist’ is the topic, huwa is the subject of the comment while l-mas’ûlu is its predicate. In our study, we will not posit qualification between the topic and the predicate of its comment although it might be argued that some distant qualification binds these two words.

It seems that it would be unjustified to speak of concord in state between the subject and predicate in basic predicative syntagms being comments, as in huwa l-mas’ûlu, as this concord appears to be rather accidental. Also in sentences where both subject and predicate are indefinite we will treat this situation as accidental concord and, consequently, disregard it in our typology of syntagms.

The subject of a simple predicative syntagm (as well as in extended predicative syntagms, see below) can stand in the accusative case due to its attachement to a particle belonging to the group of particles which traditional Arab grammar terms together as ‘inna wa ‘aḥawâtuḥâ ‘the particle ‘inna and its sisters’, i.e. ‘those having similar properties’. They include: ‘inna, ‘anna ‘that’ (also with prepositions: li ‘anna ‘because’, ma’a ‘anna ‘despite’ etc.), lâkinna ‘but’, la’alla (and ‘alla) ‘perhaps’ and layta, expressing optativity. Examples:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kay ya’iya l-fard-u} & \quad \text{‘anna ‘ann-a-hu} & \quad \text{munâţ-u-n} & \quad \text{bi-hi} \\
\text{that know} & \quad \text{that security.M.SI-A-3.M.SI} & \quad \text{depending.M.SI-N-I on-3.M.SI} & \quad \text{‘that [every] individual knows that his security depends on him’ (Ḡaymatu l-‘annî...) /21/}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qultu ‘inn-i ḥâriq-u-ni} & \quad \text{l-yawm-a mina} & \quad \text{s-siğ-i} \\
\text{I:said that-1.SI coming:out.M.SI-N-I} & \quad \text{D-day.M.SI-A from} & \quad \text{D-prison.M.SI-G} & \quad \text{‘I said that I have come out of prison today’ (Lişṣ 27) /22/}
\end{align*}
\]

Syntagms involving such constructions will not be taken special account of in the typology to be proposed subsequently.

The predicate may precede the subject, mainly for emphasis:
The term ‘extended predicate’ refers to nouns having the syntactic function of qualifiers of verbs, of participles and of verbal nouns derived from them, that can be understood as expressing various meanings based on predication. Thus, verbs of change, becoming, remaining, appearing as well as that of negation (laysa) and praeterity and futurity (kāna) will be referred to as ‘extended predicative verbs’. Extended predicates are their qualifiers. An extended predicate can be in the accusative case or it can be a prepositional phrase.

Extended predicative syntagms can be divided into the following varieties:

1. Extended predicative syntagms with finite verbs:
   1a. with the extended predicate in the accusative,
   1b. with the extended predicate in PP,
2. Extended predicative syntagms with participles:
   2a. with the extended predicate in the accusative,
   2b. with the extended predicate in PP.
3. Extended predicative syntagms with verbal nouns.
   3a. with the extended predicate in the accusative,
   3b. with the extended predicate in PP.

Let us now exemplify these constructions:

1. Extended predicative syntagms with finite verbs.
   1a. extended predicate in the accusative:
This group comprises syntagms with verbs which traditional Arab grammar terms *kāna wa 'aḥawātuhā* lit. ‘the verb *kāna* and its sisters’, i.e. ‘those having similar properties’. They include: *kāna* ‘to be’, *laysa* ‘not to be’, *šāra*, *'asbaḥa*, *bāta*, *amsā*, all meaning ‘to become’, *mā zāla* ‘to remain’ and other. Also syntagms with passive *verba sentienti* such as *u'tubira* ‘to be considered’, *'unna* ‘to be believed’ etc. belong here.

Examples:

**kānati**  
*l-ma'arakat-u*  *siyāsiyy-at-a-n*  *bi*  *mtiyāz-i-n*  
was  
‘the conflict was political par excellence’ (*'Anwār* 3/5/04, 1, *Mufāga'ātu l-farzi...*) /25/

**kānū**  
*’arba’at-a*  *riḡāl-i-n*  *wa*  *kāna*  *ḥāmis-a-hum*  
were  
four.M.PL-A  men.M.PL-G-1  and  was  
‘they were four men and he was the fifth of them’ (*'Umar* 97) /26/

**huwa**  
*laysa*  *garib-a-n*  *‘ani*  *l-’asmā‘-i*  
3.M.SI  is: not  strange.M.SI-A-1  from  
D-ears.NH.PL-G  
‘it is not strange to ears’ (*Mītāq* 20/4/2004, 10) /27/

**tu’tabaru**  
*nisbat-u*  *l-baṭālat-i*  *l-ḥāliyy-at-u*  *l-‘adnā*  
is:considered  rate.F.SI-N  D-unemployment.F.SI-G  D-present-F.SI-N  D-lowest.NG.NN-A  
‘the present unemployment rate is considered [to be] the lowest’ (*Hayāt* 2/08/07, 12, *Al-baṭālatu 'īlā...*) /28/

Extended predicates in the accusative case are also used as qualifiers of:

(i) verbs expressing a change of something or the absence of change, e.g.: *ga’ala*, *ḥawwala*, *ṣayyara* ‘to change [something]’, *taraka* ‘to leave’;

(ii) *verba sentiendi*, e.g.: *zanna*, *i’tabara*, *ra’ā*, *ḥasiba* ‘to consider’ /29/, *waġada*, *’alfā* ‘to find’, *’ahassa* ‘to feel’;

(iii) *verba voluntatis*, e.g.: *arāda*, *šā’a* ‘to want’, *faḍḍala* ‘to prefer’.

Examples:

**ga’ala**  
*l-’ibārāt-i*  *ḥāliyy-at-a-n*  *tamāman*  *mina*  *l-ḥissiyat-i*  
it:made  
D-words.NH.PL-A  devoid-NH.PL-A-I  completely  of  
D-sensuality.F.SI-G  
‘[it] made words completely devoid of sensuality’ (*Ṭaqāfi* 9/11/04, 9, *’Abgariyyatu l-ḥayāli...*) /29/

---

/25/ In classical Arab grammar, they belong to the group called *zanna wa ’aḥawātuhā*, i.e. ‘the verb *zanna* and its sisters’, i.e. ‘having similar properties’.
201

1b. extended predicate in PP.


wa ʿayr-i l-muṭafāq‘-i and reverse-G D-surprising.M.SI-G

‘Al-Maliki described the withdrawal of at-Tafawuq as expected and unsurprising’ (Hayāt 2.8.07, 2, «Ḡabhatu t-tawāfuqī»...) /33/

2. Extended predicative syntagms with participles.
2a. extended predicate in the accusative:


2b. extended predicate in PP:

No examples occurred in the corpus. The following example /36/, invented by us, is a reformulation of /33/:

3. Extended predicative syntagms with verbal nouns.

3a. extended predicate in the accusative.

*bi* *kawn-i-hā*  *l-’abraza*
by being.M.SI-G-3.F.SI  D-most:outstanding.NG.NN-A
‘by [virtue of] its being the most outstanding’ (Liwā‘ī’7/4404,1, *Tiqattun ǧulidatan...*) /37/

*li*  *ğa‘t-i*  *salālāt-i*  *hā’ulā‘i* [...]  *’abraza*
to making.M.SI-G dynasties.NH.PL-G  those.G  most:conspicuous.NG.NN-A
‘anāṣīr-i  *l-muqtama‘-i*  *l-’andalusiyy-i*
‘to make their dynasties the most conspicuous elements of the Andalusian society’ (Kallās 37) /38/

*bi*  *wasf-i-him*  *gāmiḍ-ina*  *wa*  *ğarib-i*  *l-’atwār-i*
‘by describing them as obscure and strange in manners’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 53) /39/

3b. extended predicate in PP.

*lā*  *yāṣīhu*  *wasf-u*  *stiḡwāb-i-hi*  *bi*  *l-hazliyy-i*
‘the description of his interrogation as ridiculous is not true’ (‘Āhrām 29/01/03, 30, ‘Azmatu l-minaṣṣati...) /40/

‘anna  *taḥwil-a*  *l-fāṭīrat-i*  *’īlā*  *ṣahriyy-ati-n*  *tuḥaffifu*  *l-‘ib‘-a...*
‘that changing the invoice to [a] monthly [one] eases the burden’ (Ḥayāt 2.8.07, 11, *Lubnānu yadfa‘u...) /41/.

Within the above constructions one can distinguish biconstituent adjectival syntagms composed of:

(i)  the verb and its qualificator, in group (1), e.g. (*kānati*, *siyāsiyyatan*) in /25/,
(ii)  the participle and its qualificator, in group (2), e.g. (*tārikani*, *ṭāsi‘an*) in /34/,
(iii)  the verbal noun and its qualificator, in group (3), e.g. (*kawnihā*, *’abraza*) in /37/.
5.2.3. Participles derived from extended predicative verbs

In the previous chapter we have introduced the concept of extended predicative verbs. In the present one we will give some examples of syntagms composed of a participle derived from an extended predicative verb and a substantive qualifying it. The qualifying substantive may be in the accusative:

\[
\text{\'uslūbiyyat-u Māykil Rīfātir al-musamāt-u l-\'uslūbiyyat-a l-binyawiyy-at-a}
\]


‘the stylistics of M.R. called structuralist stylistics’ (\'Ālam al-фик, 70) /42/

\[
\text{\'insān-u-n mamsūh-u-n ḥarāf-a-n}
\]


‘a man [who has] changed into a lamb’ (\'Umar 119) /43/

The qualifying substantive may also be expressed as a prepositional phrase:

\[
wāṣīf-a-n \text{ 'iyyā-hā bi l-mazā'im-i}
\]


‘describing them as allegations’ (\'Ālam al-fic, 3/4/04, 1, Sūriyā tanfī...) /44/

\[
\text{min ḥārat-i l-yahūd-i fi Miṣr-a l-musamāt-t-i bi š-Šawādīlīyyat-i}
\]


‘from the Jewish quarter in Cairo called aš-Šawādīlyya’ (\'Ālam al-fík, 45) /45/.

5.2.4. Predicative syntagms with antegenitivally or suffixally substantivized adjectives as subjects

A particular type of predicative syntagms is that in which an antegenitivally or suffixally substantivized adjective functions as the subject. Their predicates include prepositional phrases, with pronouns or substantives. In /46/, the antegenitively substantivized adjective ġazīlu ‘profuse’ functions as the subject, while the pronoun attached to the preposition lakum ‘for you’ is its predicate:
In [47], the subject is the antegenitivally substantivized adjective ḥayru, while its predicate is the suffixally substantivized adjective ‘āgiluḥu:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ḥayr-} & \text{l-birr-} & \text{‘āgil-u-} \text{hu} \\
\text{best,NG,NN-N} & \text{D-charity,M,SI-G} & \text{quick,NG,NN-N-3.M,SI}
\end{array}
\]

‘the best [of] charity is the quick [of it]’ (Liṣṣ 50) [47].

Since these are basic predicative syntagms, their subjects are the qualificata. The subjects are regents with respect to their predicates. The subjects are in the nominative case as their ‘default case’. They, however, may be governed by the particle ‘inna (or one of this type), which requires the accusative.

5.2.5. Secondary predicative syntagms

Secondary predicative syntagms are syntagms with a secondary predicate as their qualificator. The term secondary predicate is used here to refer to what is traditionally known as the ‘circumstantial qualifier’ or what the Arab grammar terms the ḥāl (from ḥāl ‘state, condition’). We understand it as a syntactic function of an adjective which designates a property of an entity expressed by a usually definite substantive, a personal pronoun or an implied subject of a finite verb\(^{115}\). The substantive or personal pronoun designating this entity will be referred to as the

---

\(^{115}\) According to grammars of Classical Arabic, the ḥāl can be an adjective, usually participle (because it is a transitory property), a substantive, e.g. māta Muḥammadun ṣadālan ‘Muḥammad died a hero’, or a verbal noun (maṣdar), e.g. gā’a Muḥammadun ṭakādan ‘Muḥammad came, running’. Also verbs can function as the ḥāl, e.g. gā’a Muḥammadun yarkūḍa ‘Muḥammad came [and he] is running’. We, however, will understand the secondary predicate in a narrower sense, namely, as one in the form of an adjective.

In some Western grammars, even adverbials are interpreted as ḥāl-constructions, e.g. in MECAS (1965: 101), kataba li rasmīyyan ‘He wrote to me officially’ is an example of a ḥāl, because, it is argued’ rasmīyyan defines the way in which “he wrote to me”. This however, will appear to be false when the subject is feminine: katabat li rasmīyyan, not rasmīyyatan.
antecedent of the secondary predicate. The secondary predicate is an
indefinite adjective in the accusative case which agrees in gender and
number with its antecedent.

The syntactic function discussed here is termed ‘secondary predicate’
since it is carried out by a word designating a property which additionally
characterizes an entity spoken of in a sentence but, for some reasons,
cannot be expressed by an attributive adjective. This property predicate
holds simultaneously with a state of affairs expressed by (i) a word with
verbal properties, i.e. a finite verb, a participle, or a verbal noun, or (ii) a
nominal sentence. The former case is exemplified in /48/, where the
word with verbal properties is the finite verb ta'ammanat, while the latter
is exemplified in /49/:

\[
\text{ta'ammanat } \text{r-risālat-u munāšadat-a} [...] \text{muṣāmin-at-a-n } \text{āliy-a-ni l-ḥirṣ-a}
\]

\[
\]

\[
\text{D-concern.M.SI-A}
\]

‘the letter contained a request of […], while highly appreciating the care’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 2, Lahūd: al-qimmatu…) /48/

\[
\text{‘anna-nī } \text{‘aqāb-u-hum } \text{muḡassad-a-n}
\]

\[
\]

‘that I am their torture incarnated’ (Sīra 94) /49/

Every secondary predicate can be rephrased as a basic predicative syntagm
with the subject being a pronoun representing the antecedent and the basic
predicate being an adjective corresponding to the secondary predicate. Such a basic predicative syntagm is bound with the sentence containing the
word with verbal properties or with the nominal sentence by the
conjunction wa ‘and’. Thus, example /48/ can be rephrased as:

\[
\text{wa ta'ammanati r-risālatu munāšadata [...] wa hiya muṣāminatun ‘āliyani l-ḥirṣa}
\]

‘and the letter contained […] and it is/was appreciating the care’

---

116 Baker (2003: 219f) uses the term “depictive secondary predicate” for such expressions. Schmidt (1961: 62) analyses the similar Latin sentence Socrates venenum laetus hausit as having two predicates. According to Blau, the constructions with secondary predicates are used “when trying to imitate the
category of adverbials in SAE” (1973: 127).
The antecedent may have any syntactic function. Sometimes, it seems to be formally absent, but it is always inferable from the context. It may also be expressed by a suffixed pronoun.

The antecedent as the subject is exemplified in /50/ and /51/:

'\(\text{'inna} \ 
\text{Husnî} \ \text{‘Allâm} \ \text{ra\'a} \ \text{mina} \ l\text{-\‘ha\‘rīg\'-i} \ \text{sakr\’a\-'a} \)\n
that \ H.A.M.A \ returned \ from \ D-outdoors.M.SI-G \ drunk.M.SI-A.1

‘that H. A. returned from outside drunk’ (\(\text{Mîrāmār} \ 75\) /50/)

'\(\text{\‘alayhi} \ \text{\‘ās\'-u} \ d\text{-\‘dīnār\'-i} \ \text{mukabbar\-'a\-'n} \ \text{bi} \ Šakl\-'i\-'n} \ \text{\‘a\‘qīb\-'i\-'n} \)\n

‘on it was the diamond ace, enlarged in a very strange way’ (\(\text{Sīra} \ 62\) /51/)

The antecedent may be a direct object, as in /52/, or an indirect object, as in /53/:

'\(\text{tamannaytu} \ \text{\‘an} \ \text{\‘a\‘rā} \ l\text{-\‘alam\-'a} \ \text{\‘ārīy\-'a\-'n} \ \text{mina} \ l\text{-\‘asmā\-'i} \)\n
I:wished \ that \ I:see \ D-flag.M.SI-A \ stripped.M.SI-A.1 \ of \ D-names.NH.PL-G

‘I wished I could see the flag stripped of the names’ (\(\text{Maqhā} \ 69\) /52/)

'\(\text{\‘utīra} \ \text{\‘ala} \ \text{\‘u\‘tā\‘ṣ\-'i\-'him} \ \text{mumazzaq\-'a\-'n} \ \text{bi} \ r\text{-\‘a\‘ṣā\-'i} \)\n
it:was:stumbled \ upon \ bodies.NH.PL-G-3.M.PL \ torn.NH.PL-A.1 \ with \ D-bullets.M.SI-1

‘their bodies have been found, torn with bullets’ (\(\text{Hāyat} \ 2008/07, 8, \text{Kābūl tarfu™u...}\) /53/)

The antecedent may be a genitival qualificator, e.g.:

'\(\text{'īsrār\-'u\-'n} \ \text{\‘alā} \ \text{du\‘hūl\'-i} \ \text{wāzīr\-'i} \ \text{[...]} \ \text{māh\‘mūl\-'a\-'n} \ \text{\‘alā} \ \text{l\-'a\‘nāq\-'i} \)\n
insisting.M.SI-N-I \ on \ entrance.M.SI-G \ minister.M.SI-G \ carried.M.SI-A.1 \ on \ D-necks.NH.PL-G

‘insisting on the entrance of the Minister [...] carried on the shoulders’ (\(\text{‘Anwār} \ 3/5/04, 2, «\text{Šadmatun}» \ rāfaqat...\) /54/)

Note that in /54/ the relevant word with verbal properties is \text{du\‘hūl\'-i} ‘entrance’, not \text{'īsrār\-'u\-'n} ‘insisting’. This means that the property of ‘being carried’, expressed by \text{māh\‘mūl\-'a\-'n}, characterizes the minister only as long as he is entering, not as long as there is insistence.

The antecedent may be the predicate:

'\(\text{\‘anna\-'nī} \ \text{\‘a\‘qā\‘b\-'u\-'hum} \ \text{mu\‘gassād\-'a\-'n} \)\n
that-1.SI \ torture.M.SI-N-3.M.PL \ incarnated.M.SI-A.1

‘that I am their torture incarnated’ (\(\text{Sīra} \ 94\) /55/)
The antecedent may be represented by a pronoun suffixed to a verb, such as -hu ‘him’ in /56/:

\[
\text{wa } \text{‘ardaw-hu } qatîl-a-n
\]
‘and they stroke him dead’ (Hayāt 2/08/07, 4, Ǧaza: musallahāna...) /56/

or by a pronoun suffixed to a verbal noun, such as -ī ‘I; my’ in /57/:

\[
sabab-a \quad qādā’-I \quad l-waqt-a \quad ḥāriğa ḥidmat-ī \quad ḡālis-at-a-n
\]
‘the reason for my spending time out of my duty sitting’ (Taqāfī 9/11/04, 9, Șaydun min ‘ağli Yāsmîn) /57/.

The antecedent may be formally absent, but then it is usually inferable from a word with verbal properties. This word may be a verb:

\[
lawwaḥā \quad bī \quad yad-ay-himā \quad li \quad l-‘ummāl-i \quad mubtasim-ayni
\]
waved.DU with hand.F-DU.G-3.DU to D-workers.M.PL-G smiling.M-DU.A
‘they both waved with their hands to the workers, smiling’ (Umar 126) /58/

or a verbal noun:

\[
ṭumma \quad l-inhiyār-u \quad fawqa \quad l-‘ard-i \quad muwalwil-a-n
\]
‘than the fall to earth [with] lamenting’ (Rağab 28) /59/

The construction in /59/ may be considered impersonal. However, since the secondary predicate has always the gender and number corresponding to its inferable antecedent, the entity intended can be understood as one with masculine gender and being one in number.

Two antecedents may have different syntactic functions:

\[
‘iḏā \quad ra’ā \quad ‘unğā-hu \quad fi \quad ḥidn-ī \quad raǧul-i-n \quad ḡarīb-i-n
\]
‘if he sees his wife on the lap of a strange man, [while the two are] sitting on a couch’ (Rağab 29) /60/
An antecedent which seems to be absent is usually inferable from the context. Normally, this means that the antecedent has already occurred in a preceding sentence. In /61/, the antecedent of muḥāṭibatan may be inferred to be ‘she’, which is the implied subject of the verb lam tasma‘ ‘she did not hear’ in the preceding sentence:

\[
\text{wa lammā lam tasma‘ sawt-a-n šaraḥat: – là!... là!}
\]

and when not she:heard voice.M.SI-A-1 she:cried no no

\[
\text{ṯumma muḥāṭib-at-a-n ‘Ismā‘il-a:}
\]

then addressing-F.SI-A-1 Ismael.M.A

‘And as she heard no answer, she cried: – No! No! Then addressing Ismail: ... (Karnak 44)/61/

Constructions with an indefinite antecedent occur as well, although according to grammars of Classical Arabic this is not a correct usage, e.g.:

\[
\text{qāla} \text{šawt-u-n yāfī‘-u-n multaḏd-a-n bi l-ḥadīt-i}
\]


‘a juvenile voice said, taking pleasure in conversation’ (Liṣṣ 62)/62/

At times, it may be difficult to distinguish the secondary predicate from the extended predicate, which is also in the accusative case. Thus, in /63/:

\[
\text{kānat zawgāt-i wāqīf-at-a-n ‘alā l-bāb-i mustā‘-at-a-n}
\]


‘my wife was standing at the door, annoyed’ (Maqḥā 103)/63/

the adjective mustā‘atan may be interpreted either as the secondary predicate or as the second of two paratactically bound extended predicates of the verb kānat.

Two specific constructions involving the secondary predicate should be mentioned here. One is that with the antecedent repeated after the secondary predicate. Its use is fairly restricted. In our corpus this construction occurred only in texts suggesting that it conveys some special, probably honorific meaning, e.g.:
Another non-typical construction is that with the secondary predicate placed before its antecedent with no repetition of the latter. Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mağmū'at-u-n min} & \quad \text{qūubbāt-i-n} \\
& \quad \text{group.F.SI-A-I} \quad \text{of} \quad \text{officers.M.PL-G-I}
\end{align*}
\]

‘a group of officers returned yesterday to Amman, coming from the Kosovo province’ (Ra‘y 2, Mağmū'atun min...) /65/

**Qualification in syntagms with secondary predicates**

It is difficult, if not impossible, to establish beyond reasonable doubt what is the qualificatum of the secondary predicate: is it its antecedent or the word with verbal properties, if the latter is at all present? According to Cantarino “The noun in the circumstantial accusative [viz. secondary predicate] primarily modifies a substantive (...)” (1975, 2: 186). Yet the situation seems to be more complex. We will assume that the secondary predicate qualifies both its antecedent and the word with verbal properties, the latter being the case only if the antecedent is the subject. The two qualificata of the secondary predicate may occur both or one of them may be absent.

Thus, for instance, in /50/ we will distinguish the following adjectival syntagms: first, (Husnī, sakrāna), which is composed of the antecedent and its secondary predicate and, secondly, (raḡā‘a, sakrāna), which is composed of the word with verbal properties and the secondary predicate.

In /51/ there is only one biconstituent adjectival syntagm: (‘āsu, mukabbaran), i.e. that composed of the antecedent and its secondary predicate. There is no word with verbal properties.

In /52/ we will distinguish one adjectival syntagm (l-‘alama, ‘āriyan), composed of the antecedent and its secondary predicate. Since the antecedent is the object, the secondary predicate does not qualify the verb.
In examples /57/ and /59/ there are syntagms with verbal nouns qualified by the secondary predicates.

Let us also remark here that MWA has a specific construction which seem to involve a secondary predicate without any word with verbal properties or a nominal sentence. In reality, it is rather a sentence-like construction with the predicate-like adjective in the accusative. Its use is restricted to specific situations, namely, it occurs in newspapers as headlines\textsuperscript{117}. Example:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Al-}ámír-\textit{u} \textit{‘}Abdulláh \textit{muštaṭḥ-\textit{a}-ni} \textit{l-muṭtarm-\textit{a}} \textit{l-‘ālamīyy-\textit{a}}
\item ‘Prince Abdullah opening the world congress’ (Riyádh, 21/04/04, 1, headline) /66/.
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Mph indicators in syntagms with secondary predicates}

Let us now discuss the morphosyntactic indicators in constructions with secondary predicates. It can be seen that both concord and rection are operative here.

First, a few remarks must be made with respect to concord. In Arabic, if the verb precedes a plural subject designating human beings, it does not agree with it in number: the verb is always in the singular, e.g.:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{gā’\textit{a}} \textit{r-riḡāl-\textit{u}} \textit{rākid-\textit{īna}}
\item came.3M.SI D-men.M.PL-N running.M-PL.A
\item ‘The men came running’ /67/.
\end{itemize}

In such cases the secondary predicate does not agree with the verb in number. It, however, agrees with it in gender. If there is no overt subject as in \textit{gā’\textit{ū} rākid-\textit{īna}} ‘[They] came running’, or if the subject precedes the verbal predicate, as in \textit{ar-riḡāl-\textit{u} gā’\textit{ū} rākid-\textit{īna}} ‘The men came running’, then the secondary predicate agrees with the verb in number and gender.

The secondary predicate agrees in gender and number with its antecedent, whether it is a word or a pronominal suffix attached to another word (the latter being exemplified in /57/ above).

\textsuperscript{117}This construction seems to contradict the opinion of Watson, who, with reference to the syntax of headlines of Arabic newspapers remarks that “Arabic does not as yet have a specific syntax which is agrammatical (as opposed to unstylistic) in other contexts” (1999: 180), in contrast to English. Cantarino points out that this construction is also used in stage directions (1975, 2: 189).
As for rection, there is the question of what is the regens of the accusative case of the secondary predicate. One could suppose that while the secondary predicate agrees with its antecedent, it is governed by the word with verbal properties (since the latter has also other accusatival qualifiers). However, sometimes such a word is absent (e.g. in /51/) yet the accusatival rection remains. Therefore we will assume that the accusative case of the secondary predicate is governed by both its antecedent, whether explicit or implicit, and the word with verbal properties. Thus, e.g. in ‘āsu d-dīnārī mukabbaran of /51/ the accusative case of the adjective mukabbaran is governed by the substantive ‘āsu. The adjective is not only its rectum but also its attractum.

5.2.5.1. Secondary predicate in comparative constructions

A specific construction with the secondary predicate is used in order to express a comparison of an entity with itself or a comparison of two of its qualities with each other. Cf. the following example:

\[
\text{al-madinat-u } \text{muḍā’-at-a-n } \text{’aḡmal-u } \quad \text{min-hā } \quad \text{mutfa’-at-a-n}
\]


‘The city illuminated is more beautiful than extinguished’ (from El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 297) /68/

In this example there are two secondary predicates. One secondary predicate, muḍā’tan ‘illuminated’, qualifies the substantive al-madinatu ‘the city’, while the other, mutfa’atan ‘extinguished’, qualifies the pronoun attached to the preposition, min-hā ‘than it’, lit. ‘from it’. The specific character of these secondary predicates lies in that there is no word with verbal properties or a nominal sentence which would express a state of affairs which which the properties designated by the secondary predicates could be considered to be simultaneous.

In this context, some grammars of MWA prescribe different rules. It seems that according to Kouloughli the adjective should not be in the accusative as the secondary predicate, but stand in the nominative case instead. Kouloughli gives the following example (the vocalization of ‘akṭar is not sure):
In another example, taken from El-Ayoubi et al., which is similar to Kouloughli’s (despite substantives being used in it), the word ‘akhtar is in the accusative:

\[
\text{wa Fadwà} \text{ الدحيت}-u-n \text{ 'akhtar-a} \text{ min-hà} \text{ للاد}-u-n
\]

‘Fadwa is more a victim than an oppressor’ (from El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 297) /70/

In this respect, Badawi et al. give a rather atypical example (2004: 247f), Cantarino’s is a mix of the structures used in /70/ (‘akhtar in the accusative) and in /68/ (the adjective in the accusative) (Cantarino1975, 2: 480). In Ullmann’s work (1985), who studied comparison for Classical Arabic, analogous constructions cannot be found. It seems that the reading as in /68/ (thus also in Corriente 2002 [1980]: 245, although with substantives instead of adjectives) is the most correct and classical and should be preferred if possible. However, no examples occurred in our corpus.

5.3. Adjectives qualified by a possessum-designating substantive (AQPoss)

In this chapter we will discuss syntagms involving adjectives qualified by a possessum-designating substantive which, in turn, can qualify, either attributively or predicatively, a possessor-designating substantive. For the sake of brevity, such syntagms will be referred to by the abbreviation AQPoss (standing for Adjectives Qualified by a Possessum-designating substantive). The possessum-designating substantive may be either in the genitive or in the accusative. Consequently, we will distinguish:

118 In the opinion of native speakers we consulted, the construction in /76/ is rather incorrect.
(i) syntagms with adjectives qualified by a possessum-designating substantive in the genitive, or AQPossG, and
(ii) syntagms with adjectives qualified by a possessum-designating substantive in the accusative, or AQPossA.

These denominations, introduced in order to reflect qualification obtaining within these syntagms, will be used in this work instead of the more traditional terms: (i) ‘formal annexation’ and (ii) ‘elative with tamyīz’ (specification), respectively.

The terms ‘possessum-designating substantive’ and ‘possessor-designating substantive’ should be understood as substantives designating, respectively, the possessum and the possessor involved in the relation of possession which, as will be showed subsequently, may be interpreted as inalienable (see discussion in chapter 5.3.5.).

5.3.1. Adjectives qualified by a possessum-designating substantive in the genitive (AQPossG)

The abbreviation AQPossG will stand for syntagms with adjectives qualified by a possessum-designating substantive in the genitive. Until now, we have been using one of its current denominations, viz. ‘formal annexation’119. The possessum-designating substantive, which is the qualificator of the adjective, stands in the genitive and is always made definite by the definite article al- (but see exceptions discussed below). It qualifies the adjective without, however, influencing the adjective’s definiteness. An example with an indefinite adjective is given in /71/, and one with a definite adjective in /72/120:

119 Other terms used in Western grammars include ‘unreal annexation’ (e.g. in Badawi et al. 2004: 111), ‘uneigentliche Genitivverbindung’ (Diem 1986), ‘formal ’idāfa’ (e.g. Paradela Alonso 2005), ‘formal status constructus’ (Danecki 1994: 410) or ‘adjectival idāfa’ (Buckley 2004: 174); they are translations of the Arabic terms ’idāfa ґayr haqiqiya and ’idāfa lafiyya. Similarly to other scholars, in our work we adopt a narrower meaning of the term ’idāfa lafiyya, but it should be borne in mind that classical Arab grammarians applied this term also to constructions such as ḏāribu Zaydīn ‘the [one] hitting Zayd’ lit. ‘the hitter of Zayd’ (cf. Diem 1986: 248-249).

120 That the qualificatum of this syntagm may receive the definite article is one of its characteristics which distinguish this syntagm from the ‘true annexation’, such as e.g. sa’atu n-niṭāqi ‘the width of the range’. Cf. the non-grammaticality of *us-sa’atu n-niṭāqi. In some descriptions, however, the AQPossG,
Besides functioning as a basic, extended, exclamative or secondary predicate, the AQPosG most frequently is an attribute. Then it agrees in state, gender, number and case with its qualificatum, with which it forms a syntagm based on adjectival attribution, e.g.:

\[
\text{'atārat} \quad \text{'idānāt-\textit{a}}-\text{n} \quad \text{wāsī'-\textit{a}}-\text{t-\textit{a}} \quad \text{n-niţāq-\textit{i}}
\]

\begin{itemize}
\item ['it] provoked wide-ranging condemnation lit. ['it] provoked condemnation wide in range' (Dustūr 1/5/04, 1, Faḍīhatu siği...) /73/
\end{itemize}

AQPossGs may be used in independent substantivization, e.g.:

\[
hākādā \ yaf\textit{al}u \quad \text{muwḥiš-\textit{u}} \quad \text{l-qalb-\textit{i}}
\]

\begin{itemize}
\item ['one] with desolated heart acts in this way’ (Lişś 27) /74/
\end{itemize}

**Definiteness of the qualificator**

Although generally the qualifier is definite, there are also isolated expressions in which it is indefinite. One of them is that with ‘\textit{ahd} ‘knowledge’ used as the qualifier, e.g.:

\[
\text{or 'formal annexation' is confused with 'proper ', or 'true annexation', i.e. 'iđāfa ġağiğiyya', which has, besides, also different semantic properties. Reckendorf classes e.g. qalīlu l-humāmi 'wenig der Sorgen', i.e. 'der wenig Sorgen hat' along with dasisu ‘ zadāwatin 'Geheimes von Feindschaft', i.e. 'geheime Feindschaft' (1895-98: 128). Danecki lists e.g. fi qadīmi z-zamānī ‘in old times’ along with e.g. kaṭrū l-kałāmi ‘garrulous’ lit. ‘much of words’ (1994: 410-411) and Buckley gives kībāru l-fannānīna 'the greatest artists' along with qabīhānu l-wuǧāhi ‘ugly faced [women]’ (2004: 175). However, while Reckendorf did not aim at distinguishing precisely between various kinds of the ‘Genitiv der Spezialisierung nach Adjektiven’, Danecki and Buckley did but erroneously classed fi qadīmi z-zamānī and kībāru l-fannānīna as what they term ‘adjectival iđāfa’ or ‘formal status constructus’, respectively. In reality, they are instances of ‘true annexation' with substantivated adjectives, discussed by us in chapter 5.6.}
This expression is rather exceptional (in this form it occurs also in Wehr, Cowan 1974 [1961]: 652). Analogous constructions with the definite qualifier are also correct. Another thing worth noticing is that some writers extend this exceptional usage to cases where the qualifier should be definite, e.g.:

\textit{\‘anna-hā nāqīṣ-at-u ‘āql-i-n}


‘that she is short of mind’ (Ra\'ab 79) /76/

Note that, similarly to /75/, the AQPossG without the article at the qr in /76/ is the predicate. The data in the corpus are not sufficient to tell whether these constructions are used with the definite article attached to the adjective, e.g. \textit{?an-nāqiṣatu ‘aqlin}.

**More than one qualifier of the adjective**

An AQPossG may be qualified by more than one possessum-designating substantive, e.g.:

\textit{kā‘ināt-u-n gawiyy-at-u l-bīnyat-at-u l-bādān-i}


‘creatures strong in construction and body’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 164) /77/

Killean gives an example with two paratactically bound qualifiers, linked asyndetically, which seems to be rather exceptional:

\textit{al-mašā‘id-u d-dā‘ib-at-u š-su‘ūd-i l-hubūt-i}


‘the constantly ascending and descending elevators’ (from Killean 1970: 14) /78/

**Paratactically bound AGPossG**

Two or more paratactically bound adjectives qualified by the same possessum-designating substantive are rather avoided (but see /81/ below). Their shared qualifier is not repeated but replaced by a corresponding pronominal suffix representing it, e.g.:
The suffix does not make the adjective definite. The adjective may receive the definite article *al-* if it is required, as for instance in /80/, where the adjective has to be definite. No example of this construction occurred in our corpus. /80/ is taken from a dictionary:

\[
\text{al-}^\text{az}^\text{ar-u} \quad \text{al-}^\text{qalil-u} \quad \text{š-šar-i} \quad \text{l}^\text{mutafarriq-u-hu}
\]

\[
\text{D-bald.}^\text{M.SI-N} \quad \text{D-scarce.}^\text{M.SI-N} \quad \text{D-hair.}^\text{M.SI-G} \quad \text{D-rare.}^\text{M.SI-N-3.M.SI}
\]

‘bald: having scarce and rare hair’ lit ‘scarce of hair and rare of it’ (definition from Munğid 2002: 298) /80/.

In contrast to the rule exemplified in /79/ above, Cantarino shows that a construction with paratically bound adjectives qualified by one substantive following all of them can also be used:

\[
\text{ma}^\text{had-a-n} \quad \text{^amrikiyy-a-n} \quad \text{...} \quad \text{tibbiyy-a} \quad \text{wa tahlbiyy-a} \quad \text{l}^\text{amal-i}
\]

\[
\text{institute.}^\text{M.SI-A-I} \quad \text{American.}^\text{M.SI-A-I} \quad \text{medical.}^\text{M.SI-A} \quad \text{and educational.}^\text{M.SI-A} \quad \text{D-work.}^\text{M.SI-G}
\]

‘an American institution [...] of medical and educational activity’ (from Cantarino 1975, 2: 107) /81/.

**Other qualifiers of the AQPosG**

Qualifiers of the adjective other than the possessum-designating substantive are rather rare but also occur:

\[
\text{hâjihi l-mâddat-u} \quad \text{qarib-at-u} \quad \text{š-abah-i} \quad \text{min} \quad \text{murakkabât-i} \quad \text{l}^\text{amfithâm-in-i}
\]

\[
\text{this substance.}^\text{F.SI-N} \quad \text{close-F.SI-N} \quad \text{D-similarity.}^\text{M.SI-G} \quad \text{from compounds.}^\text{NH.PL-G} \quad \text{D-amphetamine.}^\text{M.SI-G}
\]

‘this substance is very similar [lit. ‘close in similarity to’] to amphetamine compounds’ (‘Arabî 5/04, 142) /82/.

**Qualifiers of the possessum-designating substantive**

The possessum-designating substantive may be qualified by attributive adjectives, prepositional phrases, substantives in the genitive, or relative clauses. E.g.:

---

/121/ This kind of construction, known as *iqhâm*, was discussed by Schub (1984).
kāna [...] muta’addid-a l-ihtimāt-i  l-taqaṣṣīyy-at-i wa l’-adabiyy-at-i
he:was numerous.M.SI-A D-interests.NH.PL-G D-cultural.NH.PL-G and D-literary.NH.PL-G
‘he had numerous cultural and literary interests’ lit. ‘he was numerous of cultural and literary interests’ (‘Arabi 5/04, 201) /83/

rağul-u-n [...] zāhir-u l-waḡh-i wa ma’ālim-i l-ğism-i l-ḥariqīyy-at-i
‘a man with visible face and external traits of the body’ lit. ‘visible in face and external traits’ (Hayāt 2/08/07, 18, «I’lānāt r-rū’bi…») /84/

**Number of the qualifying possessum-designating substantive**

The qualifying possessum-designating substantive is singular if it is a *singulare tantum*, e.g.:

ṣuwār-a-n  ’amrīkiyy-at-a  ṣ-ṣan‘-i
‘images of American production’ lit. ‘American in production’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 57) /85/

If it is not a *singulare tantum*, it may be plural, especially if plurality is expressed by the adjective such as e.g. *muta’addid*- ‘having many, multi-’. E.g.:

bi  d-duwal-i  l-muta’addid-at-i  l-’alwān-i
with D-states.NH.PL-G D-numerous.NG.NN-G D-colours.NH.PL-G
‘with multicoloured countries’ (Miتاq 20/4/04, 7) /86/

However, plurality expressed by the adjective may be sufficient so that the qualifying genitive substantive can be singular, e.g.:

aš-šarikāt-u  l-muta’addid-at-u  l-ğinṣīyyat-i
D-companies.NH.PL-N D-numerous.NH.PL-N D-nationality.F.SI-G
‘multinational companies’ (Miتاq 20/4/04,15) /87/

If the qualifier designates a concrete entity, its number conforms to the real quantity of the possessed objects. In /88/ the qualifier *l-‘aynayni* is dual, ‘two eyes’, since the possessa of one man are concerned:

ra’a-hu  mašūb-a  l-‘ayn-ayni
‘he saw him with covered eyes’ (i.e. ‘he saw that he was blindfold’) (Raḡab 8) /88/
Cf. also the two following examples. The number of ُhağم ‘size’ in /89/ is singular and in /90/ it is plural, the latter being due to plurality implied by the adjective. In both examples, the possessors, expressed by the qualificata of the adjectives, are plural:

\[\text{al-yābāniyy-ùna [...] šīğar-u l-ḥağm-i \text{ ‘amāliqat-u l-fī‘al-i}}\]


‘the Japanese [...] are small in size, gigantic in deeds’ (‘Umar 109) /89/

\[\text{25 [ḥams-i-n wa ‘išrinà] tā‘irat-a-n mulḥtalif-at-a t-ṭirāzāt-i \text{ wa l-’aḥğām-i}}\]


‘[of] 25 planes of various types and sizes’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 27 Ḥutṭatun mutakāmilatun...) /90/

**The AQPossG without the due definite article**

A specific variety of the AQPossG is one in which the adjective does not bear the definite article although it should be there in order for the adjective to agree with its qualificatum with respect to state. All remaining traits of the AQPossG are retained. E.g.:

\[\text{sa‘ala bi šawt-i-hi ǧaltż-i n-nabarāt-i}}\]


‘he asked with his voice, harsh in tone’ (Lišš 35) /91/.

According to Blau, this phenomenon is due to “the impact of the proper construct (...)” (1976: 181), i.e. genitive constructions other than the AQPossG¹²².

**Qualification within the AQPossG**

The way how we identified the qualification within the syntagm under discussion, i.e. with the adjective qualified by the possessum-designating substantive, resembles the prevalent description, in which, however, no clear terminology was used. Thus, e.g. Wright spoke of “a restrictive or limitative genitive” (1962, II [1862]: 221) and Reckendorf of “Genitiv der Spezialisierung” (1895-98: 127ff and 1921: 147f). Brockelmann described the genitive as the genitive of “Hinsicht, für die, oder des Bereichs, für den

¹²² Kouloughli (1994: 114, ft. 1) writes that this construction was accepted in ancient Arabic, while the one with agreement in definiteness was preferred in modern Arabic. This does not seem to be true.
Eine Eigenschaft gilt” (1913, II: 252). The matter was treated in a similar way by Grande (1963: 329), Kouloughli (1994: 113) and Badawi et al. (2004: 111).

Yet it was pointed out by Diem (1986: 250) that in some cases this construction cannot be interpreted in terms of the restriction of the ‘Geltungsbereich’. He uses the example which we adduce here as /92/:

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{Zayd-un} & \text{ka†ir-u} & \text{l-makh-i} \\
\text{Zayd.M.SI-N} & \text{much.M.SI-N} & \text{D-wealth.M.SI-G} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Zayd has much wealth’ lit. ‘Zayd is abundant in wealth’ /92/

According to Diem, the adjective \textit{ka†irun} used in the above example cannot be understood as being restricted in its ‘Geltungsbereich’ “da ein Satz wie *Zaydun ka†irun ‘Zayd is viel’ wegen der Verbindung von Individuativum and Massenadjektiv ungrammatikalisch ist” (1988: 250). Diem proposes the following interpretation: the adjective “semantically refers” to (“sich [...] semantisch eindeutig [...] bezieht”) the substantive in the genitive, i.e. the possessum-designating substantive (it is the ‘wealth’ that is ‘much’). The same would hold for the syntagm \textit{\textit{wäs}îatu n-ni†āqi} (it is ‘the range’ that is ‘wide’) and other AQPossGs. According to Diem, an exocentric possessive syntagm (in our example: ‘wide-ranging’) qualifies the noun which precedes it (as to yield ‘a wide-ranging condemnation’)\footnote{As Diem remarks, this was also the way the classical Arab grammarians viewed these semantic relations. According to Sibawayhi (d. 793), in the sentence \textit{Hādā hasanu l-wa†}hi ‘This is (someone) of handsome face’ (lit. ‘handsome of face’) ‘\textit{\textit{an}na l-\textit{husn}a l-\textit{ma}nā l-l-wa†}hi ‘as far as the meaning is concerned, \textit{\textit{husn}} (‘handsomeness’) refers to \textit{l-wa†}hi (‘face’)” (Sibawayhi 1991: I, 195). Also Jebali seems to support Diem’s view (2005: 7).}. Other similar instances can be adduced here in which the adjective seems not to ‘refer’ to the possessor-designating substantives, e.g.:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{‘ilā} & \text{l-hayy-i} & \text{[...]} & \text{l-musdal-i} & \text{s-satā’ir-i} \\
to & \text{D-district.M.S-G} & \text{D-lowered.M.S-G} & \text{D-curtains.NH.PL-G} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘to the district with \text{[...]} lowered curtains’ (‘the district lowered as far as curtains are concerned’?) (Sira 27) /93/

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{imra’at-a-n} & \text{dāniy-at-a} & \text{s-\textit{šayhūhat-i}} \\
\text{woman.F.SI-A-I} & \text{imminent-F.SI-A} & \text{D-old.age.F.S-G} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘a woman of imminent old age’ (‘a woman imminent as far as her old age is concerned’?) (Kar 3) /94/

There have been other attempts to solve the problem of such apparently problematic constructions as *raḡulun kaṭīrun. El-Ayoubi et al. introduced the concept of ‘auxiliary adjectives’:


However, we would like to remark that almost every example adduced by these authors can be rephrased as to give the same meaning without any ‘obligatorische Ergänzung’. E.g. the ‘auxiliary adjective’ in /95/ would not be auxiliary in /96/:

\[
\text{‘extremely dangerous effects’ lit. ‘effects extreme in danger’ (from El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 177) /95/}
\]

\[
\text{‘the danger of the effects is extreme’ /96/}
\]

It seems that the set of ‘auxiliary adjectives’ should be restricted only to adjectives which never occur without a complement (e.g. ‘adīm ‘deprived of..., -less’). Otherwise it remains unclear how one should tell whether e.g. the adjective ‘arabiyyu- ‘Arab’ in *huwa ‘arabiyyu l-‘ašli ‘he is Arab by birth’ is auxiliary or not.

Another explanation is proposed by Danecki (1994). According to him, the adjective is determined (“jest określany”) by the word in the genitive following it, but at the same time it is this adjective that determines this substantive (“jednocześnie to przymiotnik określą ten wyraz”) (1994: 410). This explanation seems to be of little help in the problem under discussion.
Leaving aside the problem of what the adjective “semantically refers to”, let us observe that in order for a grammatical AQPossG to result, the following condition must be fulfilled: it should be possible to form a grammatical sentence in which the subject is the possessum-designating substantive qualified by the possessor-designating substantive in the genitive. As for the predicate, it is the adjective corresponding to that of the AQPossG. In other words, expression /97/ may not be grammatical unless /98/ is grammatical:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{al-}^\prime \text{idān}^\prime \text{at-}\text{u} & \quad \text{wāsî}^\prime \text{at-}\text{u} & \quad \text{n-niṭāq-}\text{i} \\
D\text{-condemnation}.\text{F.SI}\text{-N} & \quad \text{wide-F.SI}\text{-N} & \quad D\text{-range}.\text{M.SI}\text{-G}
\end{align*}
\]

‘the condemnation is wide-ranging’ lit. ‘wide of range’ /97/

Indeed, one can often encounter the same meaning expressed in both ways:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nīṭāq-}\text{u} & \quad \text{l-}^\prime \text{idān}^\prime \text{at-}\text{i} & \quad \text{wāsî}^\prime \text{u-}\text{n} \\
\text{range}.\text{M.SI}\text{-N} & \quad \text{D\text{-condemnation}.F.SI}\text{-G} & \quad \text{wide}.\text{M.SI}\text{-N}\text{-I}
\end{align*}
\]

‘the range of the condemnation is wide’ /98/.

By contrast, if one takes e.g. raḡulan ‘man’ as the possessor-designating substantive, the adjective baḥīlun ‘stingy’ and mālun ‘money’ as the possessum-designating substantive, then the expression *raḡulan baḥīlu l-mālī is not grammatical. The reason for this is that the expression *al-mālun baḥīlun ‘the money is stingy’ is not grammatical. In this case, a preposition is necessary, cf. baḥīlun ‘alā l-mālī ‘stingy about money’/124. We will return to this problem in chapter 5.3.5.

---

/124 This question should, however, be investigated in more detail. Some speakers accept constructions with an AQPossG which do not fulfil the condition proposed, e.g. al-’akkālu l-fawākīhi ‘(someone)
What we have shown above is in accordance with Diem’s opinion that the adjective ‘semantically refers to’ (‘sich semantisch bezieht auf’) the possessum-designating substantive. Yet there is not a single morphological indicator showing that the adjective qualifies it. On the contrary, the morphological indicators suggest that the adjective is qualified by it. There might be, however, additional support for Diem’s reasoning: in its semantic structure, the AQPossG is similar to, and sometimes replaceable by the so-called ‘indirect attribute’, which we term an SS, i.e. a ‘sententioid syntagm’, a construction in which the adjective undoubtedly qualifies the possessum-designating substantive. In the final parts of chapter 5.4. we will venture a comparison between the AQPossG and the SS.

5.3.2. Adjectives qualified by a possessum-designating substantive in the accusative (AQPossA)

Syntagms involving adjectives qualified by a possessum-designating substantive in the accusative, AQPossA for short, are semantically and formally related to those involving the AQPossG. The AQPossA has two varieties: (i) one with the elative adjective and (ii) another with the positive adjective, the former being by far more frequent.

5.3.2.1. Elatival AQPossA

If relations similar to those expressed by the AQPossG but with a graded adjective, i.e. a relative elative, are to be expressed, a construction eating [much] fruit’ although *al-fawākihu ‘akkālatun ‘fruit [is] eating’ is not grammatical. These cases should yet be considered as incorrect constructions and can be easily dismissed. More problematic are correct examples which seem not to conform to the condition proposed, e.g.:

\[\text{al-}\text{'insān-u (…) l-fāqīd-u d-}\text{dāqīrat-i}\]
\[\text{D-man,M.SI-N D-losing,M.SI-N D-memory,F.SI-G}\]
\[\text{‘the man who lost (his) memory lit. ‘the man losing of memory’ (‘Arabī 18),}\]

where *ad-dāqīratu fāqīdatun ‘the memory is losing’ is not grammatical. One should expect l-mafqūdu d-dāqīratī (with l-mafqūdu meaning ‘lost’) but it seems that it is not used.
must be used with the elative followed and qualified by an indefinite, singular possessum-designating substantive in the accusative. In Arab linguistic tradition, this substantive is called *tamyîz* ‘specification’\(^\text{125}\). In the following example, corresponding to that in /73/, this substantive is *niṭāqan* ‘range’:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{’idānat-u-n} & \text{’awsa‘-u} & \text{niṭāq-a-n} \\
\text{condemnation.F.SI-N-I} & \text{wider.NG.NN-N} & \text{range.M.SI-A-I} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘a wider-ranging condemnation’ lit. ‘a condemnation wider in range’ /101/

A genitival qualificator, such as in the AQPossG, cannot be used with elatives because then an expression with a meaning different from the intended would result. Thus e.g. *’idānatun* *’awsa‘u n-niṭāqi* would mean ‘condemnation, the widest range’.

In the AQPossA, the adjective governs the accusative case of its qualificator, which, in addition, must be indefinite. The adjective itself can qualify substantives in attribution and predication. In the former case it is the attractum of its qualificatum (in /101/ it is *’idānatun*) with respect to state and case.

Similarly to the AQPossG discussed in 5.3.1., in order for a grammatical AQPossA to result, the following condition must be fulfilled: it should be possible to form a grammatical sentence in which the subject is the possessum-designating substantive qualified by the possessor-designating substantive in the genitive. As for the predicate, it is the adjective corresponding to that of the AQPossA. Thus e.g., /101/ is a grammatical AQPossA because a grammatical sentence *niṭāqu l-’idānati ’awsa‘u* ‘the range of the condemnation is wider’ can be formed.

By virtue of being a relative elative, the adjective has neutralized gender and number. E.g.:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{fi l-’aṭfāl-i} & \text{l-’aqall-i} & \text{ḥaqm-a-n} & \text{wa l-’aqall-i} & \text{ṭul-a-n} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘in children with the smallest body and height’ (*’Arabî 5/04, 173*) /102/

---

\(^{125}\) The Arabic term *tamyîz*, which has a sense broader than that discussed here, can be translated as “specification; distinguishing”. A discussion of the semantics of this construction as well as of related ones, including the AQPossG, can be found in Justice (1987: 289-361).
The AQPossA can be used as a basic, secondary and extended predicate, the latter being exemplified in /103/:

\[ fi \text{ qaḍāyā} \ uhrā qad takūnu 'akṭar-a ġiddiyyat-a-n \]

in issues.NH.PL.G1 other.NH.PL.G1 PART are more.NG.NN-A1 importance.F.SI-A1

‘in other issues that might be more important’ (Miṭāq 20/4/04, 6) /103/

An AQPossA can have more than one qualificator, e.g.:

\[ ad-duwal-a l-'akṭar-a ġinan wa quwwat-a-n \]


‘countries most potent in wealth and power’ (Al-Mīṭāq 20/4/2004, 8) /104/

With two or more paratactically bound adjectives, the qualificator can occur after the last one or be repeated after each of them. Thus one can say 'aqallu 'aw 'akbaru ḥağman ‘smaller or bigger in size’ or 'aqallu ḥağman 'aw 'akbaru ḥağman ‘smaller in size or bigger in size’. However, unlike in the AQPossG, the qualificator cannot be replaced by a pronominal suffix. For instance, it is incorrect to say *'aqallu ḥağman 'aw 'akbaru huhu 'smaller in size or bigger in it’. Neither can the qualifying substantive be replaced by a prepositional phrase equivalent to the accusative: the expression *'aqallu ḥağman 'aw 'akbaru iyyāhu is incorrect as well.

The AQPossA can be used in independent substantivization, e.g.:

\[ lā yu'abbirūna 'ani l-'akṭar-i ġinan wa 'innamā l-'akṭar-i faqr-a-n \]


‘they do not represent the richest but the poorest’ (Al-Mīṭāq 20/4/2004, 9) /105/.

Other qualificators of the AQPosA

If used in the comparative meaning, the elative is frequently qualified by a min-phrase, which expresses the object being the standard of comparison. In /106/ it is min sardi ‘than the narration’:

\[ yağ'alū l-'unsur-a d-dirāmiyy-a 'aqall-a ġahamiyyat-a-n \]


\[ min sard-i l-'aḥdāt-i \]

than narration.M.SI-G D-events.NH.PL-G

‘[it] makes the dramatic element less important than the narration of events’ (Ṭaqāfī 9/11/04, 6, Intiḥārun ġayru...) /106/
Qualification of the possessum-designating substantive

The possessum-designating substantive may be qualified by PPs, e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kāna} & \quad \text{\`aḍḍa'-a} & \quad \text{l-\text{gāmī}'-i} & \quad \text{ru'b-a-n} & \quad \text{mina l-mawt-i} \\
\text{he was} & \quad \text{weakest.NG,NN-A} & \quad \text{D-all-G} & \quad \text{fear.M.SI-A-1} & \quad \text{of} & \quad \text{D-death.M.SI-G}
\end{align*}
\]

‘he was fearing death the least of all’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 84) /107/

The AQPossA is usually used (i) if there exists no elative related to a positive adjective or (ii) if degressive comparison is to be expressed (as in /106/). But it may be used even though a synonymous elative exists. Thus e.g. the meaning expressed by /108/:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{z-za\'im-i} & \quad \text{l-\text{aḍḍa}'-i} & \quad \text{qurb-a-n} & \quad \text{min ri\'āsat-i} \\
\text{D-leader.M.SI-G} & \quad \text{D-most.NG,NN-G} & \quad \text{proximity.M.SI-A-1} & \quad \text{from presidency.F.SI-G}
\end{align*}
\]

‘of the leader closest to the presidency of...’ (Hayāt 20807,2,4 muraššahīna...) /108/

could be expressed by /109/:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{z-za\'im-i} & \quad \text{l-\text{aqrāb}'-i} & \quad \text{min ri\'āsat-i} \\
\text{D-leader.M.SI-G} & \quad \text{D-closest.NG,NN-G} & \quad \text{from presidency.F.SI-G} /109/
\end{align*}
\]

Discussion of a possible grammaticalization of elatives in the AQPossA

A specific trait of the AQPossA which makes it different from the AQPossG is that while in the latter the adjective can be relatively freely chosen, in the AQPossA, at least in MWA, the elatives are usually chosen from a limited set. The most frequent elatives are ‘\text{aḍḍa'}, ‘\text{aqāllu}' and ‘\text{a\text{ṣaddu}'}. Other elatives are used rather infrequently and a certain number of them occurs in set phrases. The fact that two ‘intensifiers’, viz. ‘\text{aḍḍa'} and ‘\text{a\text{ṣadd}}, and two ‘diminishers’, viz. ‘\text{aqāll} and ‘\text{aḍḍa'} have almost monopolized the position of the elative in the AQPossA could be an indication that in this construction they have become grammaticalized. Such grammaticalized units should not be treated as words any more but as auxiliaries instead. However, we think that the process of grammaticalization is not completed, if initiated at all, because in many, if not in all, cases ‘\text{aḍḍa'} and other elatives still retain their lexical meaning so that the whole construction is rephrasable to a construction with the
possessum-designating substantive as the subject qualified by the possessor-designating substantive in the genitive and the elative as the predicate. What is also important, these units are always inflected for case and state and have their own rection. Elatives in the AQPossA rather cannot be said to be affected by any of the four main mechanisms involved in grammaticalization listed in Heine and Kuteva (2002: 2), i.e. desemanticization, extension, decategorialization, and erosion (see footnote 23 in chapter 1.1.1.). Thus, treating them as grammaticalized units is not warranted.

5.3.2.2. Positival AQPossA

Positive adjectives are used in the AQPossA rather infrequently and probably only in set phrases, e.g.:

`li ʿanna ḥādā l-ism-a yūnāniyy-u-n ʿaṣl-a-n`
‘because this name is Greek in origin’ (‘Arabî 5/04, 70) /110/

Some of set phrases involving a positive AQPossA would sound rather archaic in MWA, e.g. `tayyibun rīḥan` ‘pleasent in scent’.

One could also speak of the AQPossA with participial adjectives derived from verbs such as `ʾizdāda` ‘to increase’ or `qalla` ‘to decrease’. These verbs are qualified by `tamyūz`-substantives. With participles derived from them, the `tamyūz`-substantives could be interpreted as the possessum-designating substantives qualifying the participles. E.g. from `illaḍī yazdādu sūʾan` ‘which is worsening’ lit. ‘increases in evil’ one could imagine a corresponding construction with the active participle, i.e. `muzdādun sūʾan` ‘worsening’ lit. ‘increasing in evil’. Such constructions, however, did not occur in our corpus and seem not to be discussed in grammars of MWA.
5.3.5. Inalienable possession and the AQPoss

The divergent opinions represented by scholars as regards the relations in the AQPossG result from the specific semantic conditions which have to be fulfilled in order for a given construction with the AQPossG to be possible. These conditions are related to the nature of the possessive relation between the possessors and their possessa, the most important feature of the necessary relation being the inalienability of possession (see Diem 1986: 251; the fact itself was, however, noted earlier, by Killean 1970). Below we give the list of relations between the possessum and the possessor expressed in the AQPossG as proposed by Diem (1986: 251, with his examples and translations):

a) “die Teil-von-Relation”, e.g. Zaydun ḥasanu l-waḡhi ‘Zayd hat ein schönes Gesicht’;

b) “die Relation des zwar nicht von Natur aus mit Possessor kohärenten, jedoch an oder in ihm befindlichen Dings”, e.g. Zaydun ḍāmilu l-ṭawbi ‘Zayd hat ein schönes Gewand an’;

c) “die Relation der Eigenschaft, des Zustands, der gewohnheitsmäßigen oder als Disposition angelegten Handlung, der körperlichen oder geistigen Manifestation”, e.g. Zaydun šadīdu l-ṭawbi ‘Zayd pflegt fest zuzuschlagen’;

d) “die Relation der Verwandtschaft, besonders der Aszendenz”, e.g. Zaydun ʿirāqiyyu l-ʿummi ‘Zayd ist mütterlicherseits Iraker’;


As it can be seen from the above, the relation of ‘inalienable possession’ should be understood here in a rather broad sense. For instance, in how far can it be said that condemnation, the entity designated by ʿidānatan of /73/ in chapter 5.3.1., possesses another entity, viz. a range? It seems that one is rather dealing here with some meanings being expressed by constructions which are capable of expressing the relation of inalienable possession. Let us discuss it in more detail.
It very frequently happens that, unlike in examples /93/-/94/, in which the adjective could not be used as the unqualified predicate of the possessor-designating substantive (cf. *Zaydun kaṭīrun) in many other cases the adjective may be used as the unqualified predicate of both the possessum-designating substantive and the possessor-designating substantive. The reason for it lies in the fact that a property of an inalienable possessum can in some cases be attributed to its possessor. E.g. a man who has white skin is a white man. The Polish prince Bolesław Kędzierzawy ‘Bolesław the Curly’ was named so because he had curly hair. This, of course, must be relativized to a given language. In Arabic, for instance, one can say siʾru l-kitābi raḥīsun ‘the price of the book is cheap’ and al-kitābu raḥīsun ‘the book is cheap’, whereas in Polish one can only say książka jest tania ‘the book is cheap’, but not *cena książki jest tania ‘the price of the book is cheap’. In some cases it is known that the property of the possessor is primarily that of the possessum, consequently the qualificator designating the latter is not necessary, e.g. kitābun raḥīsun ‘a cheap book’ means the same as kitābun raḥīṣu s-siʾri ‘a book cheap in price’. Another example is raḡulun ṭawīlun ‘a tall man’, which means the same as raḡulun ṭawīlun l-qāmati ‘a man tall in height’. But sometimes a property inherent to a possessum may not be attributable to its possessor as a whole. Cf. raḡulun ṣaḡīrūn kabīru r-raʾsi ‘a little man with a big head’ (lit. ‘a man little, big of head’)

Let us here recall what Wehr pointed out with respect to the meaning of the elative. By virtue of not being derived from the positive adjective but directly from the root the elative is neutralized with respect to diathesis. The elative form signifies generally “stärker mit (...) behaftet, sich mehr auszeichnend durch (…)”. Cf. the meaning of the elative ʾahdā in the examples given by Wehr: ʾahdā mina n-naḡmi ‘den Weg besser weisend als die Sterne’ and ʾahdā mina l-qāṭa ‘besser geleitet als die Flughühner’ (Wehr 1953: 55). Likewise, ʾaḥwaḡu can “in zwei Richtungen ausgelegt werden”: either as ‘more in need’ or as ‘more needed’. This is so because the general meaning of ʾahdā is ‘more characterized by proper guiding’ and that of ʾaḥwaḡ is ‘more characterized by need’, without it being

126 No example of this was found in our corpus but cf. a Spanish one: (...) en ese paupérrimo país del Sudeste Asiático rico en petróleo ‘in this extremely poor country of southeastern Asia rich in oil’ (from La Vanguardia 12/02/2008, 6, Timor Oriental decreta...).
specified whether the entity spoken of is guided or guiding and whether it is in need or needed, respectively.

Perhaps a similar neutralization, but one with respect to the relation of possession, could be proposed for most adjectives, also positives. Let us repeat here the problematic example /92/ as /111/:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Zayd-un} & \text{kaṭīr-u} & \text{l-māl-i} \\
\text{Zayd.M.SI-N} & \text{much.M.SI-N} & \text{D-wealth.M.SI-G} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Zayd has much wealth’ lit. ‘Zayd is abundant in wealth’ /111/

If the adjective kaṭīrun could be taken to mean ‘characterized by plenty’, it could be interpreted in two ways: either as ‘characterized by being many’ or as ‘characterized by having many’, depending on how it is used. If the adjective qualifies without being qualified by a possessum-designating substantive, it is interpreted as ‘characterized by being many’, e.g. al-mālu l-kaṭīru ‘much money’. When it is used as an AQPossG (or an AQPossA in the form of a cognate elative), it is interpreted as ‘characterized by having many’, e.g. in Zaydun kaṭīru l-māli ‘Zayd has much wealth’ lit. ‘Zayd is abundant in wealth’.

The hypothetical property of the neutralization of possessor-possessum relation considered here manifests itself especially clearly if an AQPossG, e.g. Zaydun kaṭīru l-māli, is compared with synonymous expressions in which the possessum-designating substantive functions as the subject and is qualified by the possessor-designating substantive in the genitive case, while the adjective is the predicate, e.g. mālu Zaydin kaṭīrun ‘Zayd’s wealth is great’.

Frei (1939) discusses very similar constructions in Indo-European languages, showing that a sentence like Sylvie a de jolis yeux may have an equivalent in Sylvie est jolie des yeux, the latter being called by him “le type converse” (1939: 185). Frei observes that in order for such a “conversion” to be possible “les deux sujets logiques [i.e. possessor and possessum, in the present example, ‘Sylvie’ and ‘yeux’, since, as Frei interprets it, Sylvie a des yeux and ces yeux sont jolis – M.M.] doivent être conçus comme formant une seule et même substance”. Therefore expressions such as belle de gants or noire de chaussure are not well formed (1939: 188). He adds, however, that as far as moral qualities and
abstract concepts are concerned, such a “conversion” may be applied with almost absolute freedom, which he exemplifies with brave de cœur, froid de parole and libre de mœurs (1983: 188)\textsuperscript{127}.

Let us observe that the phenomenon which we interpret here as adjectives capable of expressing a property of both the possessor and the possessum can, at least in some languages, be reflected in dictionary entries. Cf. a dictionary definition of the English word blond:

“\textit{A} said of hair: of a flaxen, golden, light auburn or pale yellowish brown colour. \textit{B} having blond hair (…)” (Penguin 2000: 144).

It seems, however, that in Arabic this may be not a question of lexis. Arabic dictionaries made by and for Arabs usually do not list differentiations such as that cited above from the dictionary of English. It seems that in Arabic every adjective that designates a property of an inalienable possessum, and entities treated in this way in Arabic, may be interpreted as neutralized with respect to possessum-possessor and, consequently, used as an AQPoss.

Let us now consider some questions related to the degree of the requiredness of the possessum-designating substantive in the AQPoss. It seems that three major groups can be distinguished here.

(1) Some adjectives, if qualifying certain substantives, require a qualifying possessum-designating substantive. E.g. it is not grammatical to say *ar-rağulu l-kaṭīru ‘the man characterized by plenty’. Such an expression is incomplete and it must be specified what the possessum of the man characterized with plenty is. Thus, it can be e.g. al-kaṭīru l-māli ‘characterized by plenty of wealth’ or al-kaṭīru š-ša’ari ‘characterized by

\textsuperscript{127} Rather strangely, in his monograph on possession, Seiler (1983) considers constructions of this kind to be “subvarieties of double case constructions” (1983: 49). “Double case constructions”, as he explains, are those in which possessor and possessum “appear in the same case” (1983: 48), as in the following classical Greek example from the Odyssey 19.356:

hē se pōdas nǐpsei
she PERS.PR feet-ACC wash-FUT
2SG.ACC 3SG

‘she will wash you, viz. the feet; she will wash your feet’ (Seiler 1983: 49, original glossing and translation).
plenty of hair’. We will therefore disagree with Diem’s view that *kaṭīr
cannot ‘refer’ to ṭaḡul (or to Zayd, in his example) since we prefer to say
that it can, on condition that it is qualified. It seems that similar
constructions may be found in other languages, e.g. in Spanish un hombre
escaso de dinero means ‘a man poor in money’ while it is impossible to
say only *un hombre escaso. In Polish one can say wiosna obfita we
zdarnenia ‘a spring abundant in events’ but not *wiosna obfita ‘an
abundant spring’.\(^{128}\)

A similar problem is exemplified in the Polish expression trudne drzwi
‘a difficult door’, which is incomplete as well. It requires specification,
 viz. a qualifier of the adjective, e.g.: drzwi trudne do wyważenia ‘a
door difficult to force in’.

(2) On the other hand, there are adjectives which do not require a
qualifier. Thus e.g. it is understood from the expression ṭaḡulun ṭawīlu
‘a tall man’ that it is his height that is long and not e.g. his hand or
patience. In other words: it is understood that it is synonymous with
ṛaḡulun ṭawīlu l-qāmati ‘a man long of height’, although ṭawīlu l-yadi
‘long of hand’ or ṭawīlu l-bāli ‘long of mind’, i.e. ‘patient’ are also
grammatical. Similarly, kitābun ṣaḡirun is understood as ‘a small book’,
i.e. it is synonymous with kitābun ṣaḡiru l-ḥaḡmi ‘a book small in size’,
although e.g. ṣaḡiru l-ḥurūfī ‘small-print’ lit. ‘small of letters’ is also
grammatical. This means that ṭawīlu and ṣaḡirun already include a
certain meaning which is ‘actualized’ depending on what substantive they
qualify. This meaning is understood unless some other is expressed by the
qualifier, as in ṭaḡulun ṭawīlu l-bāli or kitābun ṣaḡiru l-ḥurūfī.

An example from Polish could be trudne zadanie ‘a difficult task’,
which means trudne do rozwiązywania ‘difficult to solve’, because tasks are
intended for being solved. Also if the Polish expression trudne drzwi
considered above were to be understood without a qualifier of the
adjective, it would be understood as ‘a door difficult to open’ (drzwi
trudne do otwierzenia) and not e.g. difficult to paint (trudne do
malowania). Again, the reason for this seems to be that normally a door is

\(^{128}\) The Polish example is taken from A. Mickiewicz, Pan Tadeusz, XI, 71. Note, however, that unlike in
Arabic constructions, the adjective, obfity ‘abundant’, cannot be used as an unqualified qualifier of the
possessum-designating substantive: *zdarnienia są obfite ‘[the] events are abundant’ is not grammatical.
intended for being opened, not for being painted. Opening is the first thing associated with doors, even more than e.g. closing.

(3) An adjective which is not qualified may be ambiguous in meaning. Thus, e.g. with raḡulun kabīrun one cannot be sure whether kabīrun means ‘old’ or ‘big’. This expression has no meaning which would suggest itself as the one most probable. If a possessum-designating substantive is not added as to yield either kabīru s-sinni ‘old of age’ or kabīru l-hağmi ‘big in size’, there is uncertainty (which can, however, be removed by the context).

Finally, it should be remarked that sometimes adjectives may be qualified by a prepositional phrase with fī ‘in’ instead of a genitive substantive, as in the AQPossG, or an accusative substantive, as in the AQPossA. Cf. the following examples:

\[\text{\'anna š-Šawîš Ḥasbullâh käna \'anîq-a-n fī malābis-i-hi}\]
that Ś.H.M.A was elegant.M.SI-A-I in clothes.NH.PL-G-3.M.SI
‘that Ś.H. was elegant in his way of dressing’ (Ḥayât 2/08/07, 19, Firqatu Ḥasbullâh...)/112/

\[\text{bi ka\'abat-i-n \'ablاغ-a fī \'ifṣâḥ-i-hā \'an \'ayy-i tafa\'ğhu\'i-n} \]
‘in a despondency intenser in expression than any grief’ (Mîr 77) /113/.

Synonymous syntagms with the AQPossG and the AQPossA, i.e. \'anîqa l-malābisi and \'ablaga \'ifṣâhan, respectively, are possible and also grammatical.

### 5.4 Sententioid syntagm (SS)

The construction to be discussed in the present chapter and which we will refer to by the term ‘sententioid syntagm’, or SS, has been known and described under various denominations. It was called ‘indirect attribute’ (e.g. by Polotsky 1978), ‘semantically linked attribute’ (Carter 1981), ‘przydawka przymiotna ograniczająca’ ['restricting adjectival attribute'] (Danecki 1994: 404), ‘adjektivischer Satz’ (Diem 1998), or ‘Satzadjektiv’ (El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 186). In the Arabic terminology the construction is
called \textit{na’t sababi}\textsuperscript{129}. Below, an example is given with the syntagm in question emphasized in bold:

\begin{verbatim}
li r-raʾis-i  l-muntahiy-at-i  wilāyat-u-hu
\end{verbatim}

\begin{itemize}
  \item [for D-president.M.SI-G] D-ending-F.SI-G
  \item [term:of:office.F.SI-N-POSS.3.M.SI]
\end{itemize}

‘for the president whose term of office is ending’ (Hayāt 208/07, 8, Turkiyā: tadbīdhu) /114/

The term which will be employed in our study, ‘sententioid syntagm’, is intended to reflect the specific properties of this kind of syntagm. The syntagm in question, represented in /114/ by \textit{l-muntahiyati wilāyatuhu}, has the following characteristics: the adjective \textit{l-muntahiyati} is a participle and agrees in gender and number with the substantive \textit{wilāyatuhu}. The substantive is always in the nominative case. The adjective agrees in state and case with the substantive preceding it, \textit{li r-raʾisi}\textsuperscript{130}, yet it cannot be said to qualify it. What it qualifies is the substantive in the nominative, following the adjective, in /114/ \textit{wilāyatuhu}.

Without considering the origins and diachronic development of syntagms of this kind, we can state the following:

They have always synonymous equivalents in relative clauses, the verbal predicate of which corresponds to the participle, and the subject to the substantive in the nominative. Thus /114/ is synonymous with /115/:

\begin{verbatim}
li  r-raʾis-i  llaḏī  tantahī  wilāyat-u-hu
\end{verbatim}

\begin{itemize}
  \item [for D-president.M.SI-G] which is:ending.F.SI
  \item [term:of:office.F.SI-N-3.M.SI]
\end{itemize}

‘for the president whose term of office is ending’ /115/

The participle \textit{l-muntahiyati} in /114/ corresponds to the verb \textit{tantahī} in /115/, from which it was derived. The substantive \textit{wilāyatuhu} of /114/ corresponds to the same substantive of /115/.

As for their predicative (sentential) or attributive (non-sentential) character, the following may be observed:

\textsuperscript{129} Blau (1999), following Bergsträsser (1975 [1928]: 145) stresses the \textit{apo koinou} character of this construction (i.e. the adjective referring to both substantives). For a discussion of the term \textit{sabab} used in Arab grammar see Carter 1985.

\textsuperscript{130} Some speakers of Arabic, when asked to read these constructions, put the adjective in the nominative case. Such a reading is non-classical or simply incorrect.
(i) They differ from **predicative** syntagms\(^{131}\) in that:

- the qualifying adjective, i.e. the participle, is not in the nominative but agrees in case with the substantive preceding it. In predicative syntagms the qualifying adjective is always in the nominative.
- the qualified substantive cannot be preceded by the particle 'inna, or a related one, and thus change its case to the accusative, while in predicative syntagms it can.
- the possibility of assertion seems to be absent in the SS, i.e. it cannot be negated, while it is possible in predicative syntagms.

(ii) They differ from **attributive** syntagms in that:

- the qualifying adjective does not agree with the qualified substantive with respect to state and case.
- the qualified substantive is always in the nominative case while in attributive syntagms it may be subject to rection or concord.

(iii) They resemble **predicative** and **attributive** syntagms in that:

- the qualifying adjective agrees with the qualified substantive with respect to gender and number.

We decided to term these syntagms as ‘sententioid syntagms’, i.e. showing some properties of sentences. Analogously, the substantive which is the qualificatum within a sententioid syntagm will be called ‘subjectoid’ and the participial adjective which is its qualifier will be called ‘predicatoid’\(^{132}\). Sententioid syntagms are bi-constituent, but their constituents may also be qualified, thus giving rise to more complex expressions.

It should be noted here that other scholars, e.g. Diem and El-Ayoubi et al., also analysed the syntagm under discussion in terms of its resemblance to the sentence and the attributive syntagm. As a result, they proposed the

\(^{131}\) Basic predicative syntagms are meant here, since only such can be reasonably compared with the SS.

\(^{132}\) In his work devoted to these constructions, Diem (1998) used terms taken from Arab linguistics: *naʿt* ‘the adjective’ to refer to the adjective, and *marfuʿ*, i.e. ‘standing in the nominative case’, to refer to the substantive following the adjective and being always in the nominative. Thus, our ‘predicatoid’ corresponds to Diem’s *naʿt* and our ‘subjectoid’ corresponds to his *marfuʿ*.\[234\]
terms ‘adjektivischer Satz’ and ‘Satzattribut’, respectively. Diem did not claim that the construction in question is a sentence. As he put it, “Die Konstruktionen entsprechen Sätzen” (1998: 14). However, the term he proposed, ‘adjektivischer Satz’, might suggest the opposite. El-Ayoubi et al. speak of the construction as of one which shows only “einen satzartigen Charakter” but which has “ein eigenes Subjekt” and “das Prädikat” (2001: 186). For all these reasons we considered it justified to introduce less misleading terms: ‘sententioid’ with its ‘subjectoid’ and ‘predicatoid’.

In MWA, the adjective is almost always a participle, either active or passive derived from transitive verbs but not passive derived from intransitive verbs.

The SS may be used as a predicate, an extended-predicate, a secondary predicate, or an attribute. It always functions as a phrasal qualifier (cf. chapter 1.1.6). Its attributive use is exemplified in 114/ above. In such an attributive SS, its predicatoid (l-muntahiyati) agrees with respect to state and case with the substantive qualified by the entire SS (li r-raʾīsi). It must be stressed here that this concord between the predicatoid (l-muntahiyati) and the substantive qualified by the SS (li r-raʾīsi) does not mean that these two words are bound by qualification. This is an example of morphological indicators which do not show qualification between two words.

Let us now discuss some other properties of the SS. One of its very important traits is that a pronominal suffix representing anaphorically the qualificatum of the entire SS must be attached to:

(i) the subjectoid, or
(ii) a substantive qualifying the subjectoid, or
(iii) to a preposition and qualify the predicatoid, or

---

133 We owe the remark that a syntagm which is not a sentence cannot be spoken of as having a subject and a predicate to Prof. Bańczerowski.

134 In Classical Arabic also non-participial positive adjectives could be used in the SS. They, however, showed different behaviour with respect to concord (cf. Mosel 1975: 332-333, Danecki 1994: 405; a closer discussion can be found in Diem 1998: 35ff).

135 This pronominal suffix is the “formal realization” of what classical Arab grammarians termed a sabab and what Carter (1985) translated as “semantic link”. According to him, this sabab is a “cohesive device” (p. 59), which requires that “there must be a common element of meaning between the first and second terms of the sentence (broadly, that one can be predicated of the other or stand in annexation with it)”; its function is to “join together otherwise independent sentences or parts of sentences” (p. 60).
(iv) (iii) may be combined with (i) or with (ii).136

Below, the exemplifications of the four possibilities are given:

(i) The pronominal suffix attached to the subjectoid is exemplified in /116/:137

\[
\text{li } r-ra\text{žs}-i \quad l-muntahiy-at-i \quad \text{wilâyat-u-hu}
\]


‘for the president whose term of office is ending’ (Ha’ayat 208/07, 8, Turkish: tarihden...) /116/

In this example, \text{wilâyatuhu}, the subjectoid, bears the pronominal suffix. The word \text{l-muntahiyatı} is the predicatoid.

(ii) The pronominal suffix attached to a substantive qualifying the subjectoid is exemplified in /117/:

\[
\text{bi } z-zährat-i \quad l-murâd-i \quad stišrâf-u \quad \text{mustaqbal-i-hâ}
\]


‘with the phenomenon the examination of whose future is intended’ (‘Arâbi 5/04, 25) /117/

In this example, the subjectoid is \text{stišrâfu}. It is qualified by \text{mustaqbalihâ}, which bears the pronominal suffix. The word \text{l-murâdi} is the predicatoid.

(iii) The pronominal suffix attached to a preposition and qualifying the subjectoid is exemplified in /118/:138

\[
\text{li } ruqåt-i \quad l-\text{‘arş}-i \quad l-mawğüd-i \quad st-hâ \quad n-nabât-u
\]


‘of the piece of the land in which there is vegetation’ lit. ‘in which vegetation is found’ (‘Arâbi 5/04, 124) /118/

136 There are also SSs in which the subjectoid is a clause, e.g.:

\[
ar-risâlat-u \quad l-mutawaqqat-u \quad \text{‘an yusallima-hâ} \quad \text{Bûs li Šârîn}
\]


‘the letter which Bush is expected to hand to Sharon’ (Ra’y 1, ‘Arâbi’un ‘an damânaṭin...)

Here, the subjectoid has the form of the clause ‘\text{‘an yusallima-hâ} Bûs li Šârîn. The pronominal suffix -hâ, representing the qm of the SS, is attached to the verb of this clause.

137 It is Diem’s type 1.1. (1998: 24-60).

In this example, the predicatoid $l$-*mawğudi* is qualified by the pronominal suffix attached to the preposition, *fihā*. The word *n-nabātu* is the subjectoid. In the following example the structure is the same:

```
mahmā ḥtalafati l-.luḡāt-u l-maktūb-u bi-hā kull-u nasṣ-i-n
```

whatever differed.3.NH.PL D-languages.NH.PL-N D-written.M.SI-N with-3.NH.PL all-N text.M.SI-G-I 'much as the languages in which each text was written should differ' (Ṭaqāfī 9/11/04, 9, ‘Abqariyyatu l-ḥayālī...) /119/

Here, the predicatoid *l-maktūbi* is qualified by the pronominal suffix attached to the preposition, *bihā*. The word *kullu* is the subjectoid.

If the pronominal suffix is attached to the preposition and qualifies the predicatoid, the subjectoid may be absent due to its redundancy. However, the subjectoid must be inferable from the context. In such cases, an SS may be said to be elliptical. What remains of it is the predicatoid qualified by the pronominal suffix attached to the prefix:

```
yumkinu li 'ayy-i muštarik-i-n [...] 'ilgā'-u ḥādihi l-ḥidmat-i [...] is:possible to any-G user.M.SI-G-I cancellation.M.SI-N this D-service.FSI-G
```

[l-*mınṭaqat-i* l-*ḥafifyy-at-i* t-*tābi'-i* la-hā]

D-area.FSI-G D-telephonic-FMLSI-G D-belonging.MSI-G to-3.FSI
'every user may cancel this service by means of a written demand he submits in the telephone area he belongs to' (Ḥayāt 2/8/07, 11, Lubnānu yadfa'u...) /120/

The word *al-muštariku* could be used here as the subjectoid. Also the personal pronoun *huwa* 'he' could be used, but the latter is unusual. (iv) A combination of (iii) with (i) is showed in /121/.

```
fi l-ḡudrān-i l-mangāš-i 'alay-hā tārīḥ-u-hā
'in the walls into which their history was engraved' (Mir 18) /121/.
```

139 Diem’s type 2.2.1 (1998: 95-109). Blau (1999: 340, fn. 340), with reference to the origin of this construction, is inclined to “consider this feature to reflect ellipsis of the subject and attribute it to careless language”.

140 Diem’s type 2.2.2. (1998: 109-110). The possibility of the absence of the subjectoid might be interpreted as a property which the SS shares with the sentence, since the latter may consist only of the predicate (scil. verbal predicate), without an explicit subject.

Here, the predicatoid *l-manqūši* is qualified by the pronominal suffix attached to the preposition, ‘*alayhā*. The suffix is also attached to *tārīḥuhā*, the subjectoid.

Sometimes, one pronominal suffix may represent a word other than the qualificatum of the SS, e.g.:

\[
\text{istiqdām-i} \quad l-muḡannas-ina \quad li qṭirā‘-i \quad fi ḡayr-i
\]

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\end{tabular}

\[
l-ʾamākin-i \quad l-musaḡḡal-at-i \quad ʾasmā‘-u-hum \quad fī-hā
\]

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\end{tabular}

‘*[of] making the naturalized citizens come to vote at places other than those where their names are registered’ (*Anwār* 3/5/04, 2, Șadmatun rāfaqat...) /122/

Here, the predicatoid *l-musaḡḡalatī* is qualified by fīhā, i.e. the word with the pronominal suffix -hā representing the word *l-ʾamākinī* ‘places’, while the subjectoid ʾasmā‘uhum bears the pronominal suffix -hum representing the word *l-muḡannasīna* ‘naturalized citizens.’\(^{142}\)

An SS can be used without a substantive that could be considered to be its qualificatum. Such a substantivized use of the SS did not appear in our corpus and it seems that is rather not used in MWA.\(^{143}\)

**Non-classical gender and number concord in the SS**

There are examples of SS used attributively in which the predicatoid does not agree in gender and number with the subjectoid.\(^{144}\) It seems to agree with respect to these categories with the qualificatum of the SS instead, e.g.:

\[
\text{wa} \quad l-ḡadīr-u \quad ǧīkr-u-hu \quad ʾanna...
\]

and \begin{tabular}{llll}
\end{tabular}

‘and [it is] worth mentioning that [...]’ (from El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 188)

However, we can add here that although this construction is in use, it is rather an incorrect form of a substantivized adjective qualified by a PP: *al-ḡadīr tu bi ḍ-ǧīkri* lit. ‘worth of mentioning’.

\(^{142}\) It seems that Diem did not describe such cases in (1998).

\(^{143}\) El-Ayoubi et al. give the following expression as an example of a substantivized SS (in their terminology: *Satzadjektiv*):

\[
\text{wa} \quad l-ḡadīr-u \quad ǧīkr-u-hu \quad ʾanna...
\]

and \begin{tabular}{llll}
\end{tabular}

‘and [it is] worth mentioning that [...]’ (from El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 188)

fi l-maʿhad-i l-muqarrar-i ʾizālat-u-hu
‘in the institute the abolishment of which is decided’ (ʿAhrām 22/01/03, ʿIlgāʾu l-masgidi) /123/

instead of the expected:

l-muqarrar-at-i ʾizālat-u-hu

Such non-classical concord may happen also if the subjectoid is absent, e.g.:

ʾanna l-kitāb-a yanbaʾī ʾan yunqala [...] li ʾanna-hu yuṭrī

l-luqāt-a l-manqūl-at-a ʾilay-hā
‘that the book should be translated [...] because it enriches the language translated into’ (Taqāfī 9/11/04, 4, Ad-dukṭūr ʿAḥmad...) [instead of yuṭrī l-luqāta l-manqūla ʾilayḥā] /124/

In this example, the subjectoid is absent (it would be l-kitābu ‘book’). The predicatoid l-manqūlata agrees in gender and number with the qualificatum of the SS, viz. with l-luqātā, instead of having the gender and number agreeing with l-kitābu, i.e. l-manqūla. Perhaps the absence of the subjectoid was not without influence on this non-classical concord.

However, some examples show that the predicatoid does not agree with the qualificatum of the SS either. In the following example, the gender of the predicatoid appears to be masculine, or rather neutralized, while both the subjectoid (ʿalwānūhā) and the qualificatum of the SS (ʿaṣāʾiʿa) are non-human plurals:

bi širāʾ-i [...] ʿaṣāʾiʿ-ar muḥtalif-i-n ʿalwān-u-hā
‘with the buying of multicoloured juices’ (ʿUmar 121) /124/

Perhaps also the predicatoid of /123/ might be interpreted as having neutralized gender. However, the problem cannot be decided.
The phenomenon of non-classical concord may be interpreted as a tendency to signal the qualification between the SS and its qualificatum in a more intense manner, i.e. by means of concord between the qm of the SS and the predicatoid of the SS with respect to four categories, viz. state, gender, number and case, instead of the classical concord with respect to two categories, viz. state and case.

SS as basic predicate, extended predicate and secondary predicate

An SS may be used as a basic predicate, an extended predicate and a secondary predicate, although there may be uncertainty whether one deals with a predicatively used SS or with an inverted nominal sentence being a comment to the topic. Cf. the following example:

\[
\text{al-film-u } \text{mu'aggi}l\text{-u-n } \text{'ard-u-hu } \text{munu}d\text{u }3[\text{tal}a\text{-}i] \text{ sanaw}a\text{t-i-n}
\]

\[
\]

‘the screening of the film has been being postponed for 3 years’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 24, «Dayl as-samaka»...)/125/

The expression \text{mu'}aggi\text{alun }\text{'ardu}hu\text{ in }/125/ may be interpreted either as an SS functioning as the predicate of \text{al-filmu} or as an inverted nominal sentence functioning as the comment to the topic \text{al-filmu}. A topic-comment construction without inversion, \text{al-filmu }\text{'ardu}hu\text{ mu'aggi}l\text{alun}...

‘As for the film – its screening [has been] postponed...’, seems to be rather avoided in careful MWA.

A comparison between the SS and the AQPossG

Let us present here a brief comparison between the SS and the AQPossG. It seems that each of the two syntagms is used in a certain specialized way and that their functions mostly do not overlap. E.g. the AQPossG is used with the adjective muta'addid ‘having many; multi-’, while the SS is used with the adjective murād ‘wanted, desired’. This distribution seems to be conditioned by semantic factors such as the degree of inalienability of possession: while the AQPossG is used on condition that between the possessor-designating substantive (the qm of the AQPossG) and the possessum-designating substantive (the qr of the AQPossG) the relation of inalienable possession must obtain, the SS is
usually used if between its subjectoid and the qualificatum of the SS there is no such a relation. This can be observed in the examples adduced during the discussion of each of the two syntagms. This finding reflects a generalization made by Seiler, basing himself on data from various languages, saying that expressions of ‘established’, or alienable, possession “were found to be longer, more complex, more explicit, both formally and semantically” (1983: 68), while those of ‘inherent’, or inalienable, possession “are less complex” (1983: 83)\(^{145}\).

Yet it can be observed that there are fields in which the usages of the two syntagms overlap. Let us analyse examples /126/, with the AQPossG in bold, and /127/, with SS in bold:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{'on the previously mentioned completion' (Taşefir 9/11/04, 9, 'Abqariyyetatu Ḥayāli...) /126/} & \quad [\text{‘al-} l-iktīmāl-i] \\
\text{‘[of] the previously mentioned achievements' (‘Abrām 29/01/03, 27, 'Iḥsāʾu ẓālātin...) /127/} & \quad [\text{al-} ‘īnḡāzāt-i] \\
\end{align*}
\]

In both syntagms the substantive is the same, viz. \text{dikr ‘mention’}. In the AQPossG the adjective is \text{‘ānif}, while in the SS it is \text{sābiq}. Both adjectives have the same meaning and can be considered as full synonyms. Although both the AQPossG of /126/ and the SS of /127/ seem to designate the same fragment of the extralingual reality, i.e. the property of ‘having been previously mentioned’, their qualificational structures are different. In the AQPossG the adjective is qualified by the substantive, in the SS the substantive is qualified by the adjective. The same meaning is expressed in two different ways. It appears that the relation between \text{dikr ‘mention’} as possessum and its possessor, viz. what is mentioned (‘completion’ in /126/ and ‘achievements’ in /127/) can be expressed equally well as inalienable and alienable possession in MWA. This agrees with the statement made by Seiler that “Within one and the same language, a possessive relation to one and the same object [...] can be represented as either ‘inalienable’ or

\[145\text{ Note also that the adjective in the AQPossG usually designates properties which are inherent to the possessor, while the adjective in the SS, being a participial, designates rather transitory states.}\]
‘alienable’” (Seiler 1983: 5). If there are more similar cases in MWA remains to be investigated.

5.5. Adjectival adverbials

Besides periphrastic adverbials involving adjectives, such as e.g. bi šaklin ġaribin ‘in a strange manner’\textsuperscript{146}, MWA also has a special category, which we have discussed in chapter 4.6. We have assumed that words such as sarīṭan ‘quickly’ or nādiran ‘rarely’ are only one of the syntactic functions of the adjective and do not belong to a separate part of speech. The morphological form of adjectives which have this function will be interpreted as resulting from the accusatival recition exerted normally by the verb or a word with verbal properties, such as a participle or a verbal noun. Besides standing in the accusative case, adjectives functioning as such adverbials have neutralized gender and number and are always indefinite.

Contrary to what is suggested by the term ‘adverbial’, not only verbs can be qualified by adjectival adverbials. Also non-verbal words, e.g. adjectives or even substantives can be their qualificata.

It seems that the class of adjectives which may function as adverbials is neither closed nor open, i.e. not every adjective can function as an adverbial but it seems that adjectives that can do this appear in language with relatively much freedom. They can be both positives and elatives. Below, examples are presented and discussed.

Adverbials qualifying verbs can be exemplified as follows:

\textit{'an nantaqida-hu mawdā'īyya-n}
that we:criticize-3.M.SI objective.NG.NN-A-1
‘that we criticize it objectively’ (Al-Mīṭāq 20/4/2004, 11) /128/

\textit{sawfa tatawwadu 'akṭar-a mina s-sābiq-i}
PART it:will:strengthen more.NG.NN-A.1 than D-past.M.SI-G
‘it will strengthen more than before’ (‘Ălam al-fikr, 74) /129/

\textsuperscript{146} We will not consider such expressions as a special type in the typology, as they consist of substantives with the meaning ‘manner’, ‘form’, ‘way’ etc. qualified by adjectives in adjectival attribution.
Usually, adverbials follow the word they qualify. However, they may also precede their qualificata, e.g.:

\[
\text{sart}^a\text{-}a\text{-}n \quad \text{ittahada} \quad \text{l-qayyim}^\text{-}\text{ina} \quad \text{‘al} \quad \text{l-hada}^\text{-}\text{at}^\text{-}i \quad \text{mawqi}^\text{-}\text{a}^\text{-}a\ldots
\]


‘quickly the supervisors of the event adopted the attitude [of...]’ (Hayat 2/08/07, 9, Al-\'hara\'lu d\'u\ldots) /130/

Here, it should be remarked that, since verbs express predication, the adverbial, by virtue of its qualifying the verb, could be interpreted as qualifying the entire predication, not the verb (or the predicative adjective) alone\(^{147}\). What is more, there are sentences without a verbal nor adjectival predicate, yet with an adverbial, which then qualifies the predication, e.g.:

\[
\text{l} \quad \text{ha} \quad \text{zr} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{wa} \quad \text{l} \quad \text{‘iq} \quad \text{s} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{dust} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{ri} \quad \text{yy} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{n} \quad \text{wa} \quad \text{qan} \quad \text{an} \quad \text{ni} \quad \text{yy} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{n}
\]


‘There is constitutionally and legally no oppression or exclusion’ (Mi\'aq 20/4/04,15) /131/

In cases where there is a verbal or adjectival predicate, we will assume that the adverbial qualifies it but we will bear in mind that it also qualifies the entire predication. Where such a predicate is absent, the adverbial should be said to qualify the clause, e.g. in /131/ the following syntagm can be distinguished: (l\'a ha\'zra, dust\'u\'riyyan), i.e. (‘there is no oppression’, ‘constitutionally’), with a clause as its qualificatum.

Adverbials qualifying adjectives are exemplified in what follows:

\[
\text{lu\'g} \quad \text{at} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{g} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{n} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{k} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{li} \quad \text{y} \quad \text{y} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{n}
\]


‘a completely new language’ (Mi\'aq 20/4/04,12) /132/

\[
\text{huwa ‘aq} \quad \text{rab} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{‘il} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{l-wili} \quad \text{yi} \quad \text{at} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{l-mutta} \quad \text{hid} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{qi} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{s} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{y} \quad \text{y} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{n}
\]


‘it is closer to the USA economically’ (\'Alam al-fikr, 49) /133/

\[
\text{ru} \quad \text{h} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{m} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{h} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{h} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{m} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{n} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{‘a} \quad \text{g} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{m} \quad \text{m} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{far} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{h} \quad \text{i}
\]


‘its marble is more shiny than my joy’ (\'Sir\a 93) /134/

\(^{147}\) Cf. Kurylowicz’s observation that a word which modifies a verb, modifies the whole sentence (1960b [1948]: 38) and Cantarino’s remark on prepositional phrases (1975, 2: 86).
Note that example /134/ with ‘akṭara could be rephrased into a construction with the AQPossA (see chapter 5.3.2.1.), viz. ruḥāmuhā ‘akṭaru ʿidāʾatan lit. ‘its marble is more in shining’, which is considered more correct and closer to Classical Arabic.¹⁴⁸ Yet in this case, as in many others, this would produce ambiguity with respect to diathesis: the expression could mean both ‘its marble is more shining’ and ‘is more lit up’.

Adverbials can precede the qualified adjective, e.g.:

\[\text{yamliku 'adadiyy-a-n 'akbar-a ţayś-i-n fi l-ţalam-i}\]

‘it has, quantitatively, the biggest army in the world’ (Hayāt 2007, 8, Daʿwātun ‘ilā... ) /135/

It seems that in some constructions the adverbial can be said to be expressing the agent, e.g.:

\[\text{min mawqiţ-i-n muhaymin-i-n wa madjum-i-n 'amrikiyy-a-n}\]


\[\text{wa li 'anna kull-a ḍālika marfūţ-u-n 'arabiyy-a-n}\]

‘from the prevalent attitude, supported by the Americans and because all this is rejected by the Arabs’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 32, hisābātū l-iqtišādātī... ) /136/

Adjectival adverbials can qualify substantives, e.g.:

\[\text{'allā taqilla [...] ţan marrat-ayni 'usbūţiy-y-a-n}\]

‘that it [...] is not lower than two times per week’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 14, Mutāба'atūn ġāddatūn...) /137/

\[\text{'alā mudīr-i Bank-i l-Qāhirat-i [...] sābiq-a-n}\]

‘against the former director of the Bank of Cairo’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 22, Al-qabdū ‘alā mudīri...) /138/

Frequently, they qualify verbal nouns:

¹⁴⁸ E.g. MECAS (1965: 48).
Syntagms with adverbials qualifying verbal nouns are often synonymous with those based on adjectival attribution, e.g.: the syntagm \textit{mu'ala\textasciitilde{}gatih\emph{\textasciitilde{}a} 'i'l\emph{\textasciitilde{}amiyy\emph{\textasciitilde{}a} }of \textasciitilde{}/139/ seems to be synonymous with \textit{mu'ala\textasciitilde{}gatih\emph{\textasciitilde{}a} l-'i'l\emph{\textasciitilde{}amiyy\emph{\textasciitilde{}ayti}. One may suppose that the former construction is preferred when the processual meaning of the verbal noun is to be stressed. But when the process itself is not so important as the concept generally, the substantival interpretation of the verbal noun and the attribution is chosen\textsuperscript{149}. Cf. the two syntagms both encountered in one and the same text:

\begin{itemize}
\item \begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{ad-dawr\emph{\textasciitilde{}at-i t-tadr\emph{\textasciitilde{}ibiyy-at-i llat\emph{\textasciitilde{}t haddifu }'il\emph{\textasciitilde{}a tatt\emph{\textasciitilde{}iff-i }'a'd\emph{\textasciitilde{}d-y-i}
\item \textit{l-wa\textasciitilde{}d\emph{\textasciitilde{}at-i l-\hiz\emph{\textasciitilde{}ibiyy-at-i }siy\emph{\textasciitilde{}siyy-a-n} \textasciitilde{][..]
\item \textit{al-mar\textasciitilde{}halat-a l-'ul\emph{\textasciitilde{}a min barn\emph{\textasciitilde{}ama\textasciitilde{}g-i t-tatt\emph{\textasciitilde{}iff-i s-siy\emph{\textasciitilde{}siyy-y-i}
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

In the above example, the verbal noun \textit{tatt\emph{\textasciitilde{}iff\emph{\textasciitilde{}i} is qualified by the adverbial adverb, while in the following one, it is qualified by the attributive adjective:

\begin{itemize}
\item \begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{al-mar\textasciitilde{}halat-a l-'ul\emph{\textasciitilde{}a min barn\emph{\textasciitilde{}ama\textasciitilde{}g-i t-tatt\emph{\textasciitilde{}iff-i s-siy\emph{\textasciitilde{}siyy-y-i}
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{149} What is more, in the same function, also a construction with internal object (see chapter 5.9.) can be used to qualify verbal nouns, e.g.

\begin{itemize}
\item \begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{tadr\textasciitilde{}ib-u-hum tadr\textasciitilde{}ib-a-n mutafawwiq-a-n
\item \textit{tadr\textasciitilde{}ib\emph{\textasciitilde{}a-n mutafawwiq-a-n
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

It seems to be worth investigating under which circumstances adjectival adverbials, attributive constructions or constructions with the internal object are used.
Finally, let us remark that the adjectival adverbial must not be confused with the secondary predicate. The latter always agrees with the antecedent in gender and number. However, if the antecedent is masculine singular, the difference is formally neutralized, e.g.:

'al-ğasaq-u yantasiğu  šafîf-ı
‘dusk weaves itself transparent’ (Maqhâ 107) /143/

It can only be inferred from the fact that adjectives such as šafîf ‘transparent’ are not used as adverbials that this is a construction with a secondary predicate.

5.6. Antegenitival adjective

Let us recall that the term ‘antegenitival adjectives’ denotes adjectives used in antegenitival substantivization (see chapter 4.5.2.). Antegenitival adjectives, whether positive or elative, have neutralized gender and number (however, some exceptions will be shown). They are qualified by substantives in the genitive case, following them. One of their characteristics is that although substantivized, they cannot be qualified in adjectival attribution.

5.6.1. Antegenitival Adjective: Positive

Antegenitival positive adjectives are positive adjectives used in antegenitival substantivization. With the qualifying substantive they constitute a specific kind of syntagm, which can be divided into two varieties:

(i) syntagms with the qualifying substantive designating a non-human entity and
(ii) syntagms with the qualifying substantive designating a human entity.
Let us begin the discussion with the syntagms of variety (i). It seems that the most frequent syntagm representing it is one with the qualificator being an uncountable substantive in the definite state, usually resulting from the attachment of the definite article *al*-. The adjective has neutralized gender and number. E.g.:

\[
\text{bi šarīh-i} \quad \text{l-‘ibārat-i}
\]
with true.NG.NN-G D-word.F.SI-G

‘with a true word’ lit. ‘with the true of word’ (Miṭāq 20/4/04, 4) /144/

\[
\text{ḥāliṣ-u} \quad \text{l-mawaddat-i} \quad \text{wa} \quad \text{t-taqdīr-i}
\]
pure.NG.NN-N D-love.F.SI-G and D-respect.M.SI-G

‘pure love and respect’ (Ṣarq 14/4/04, 2, Al-Ḥarīrī yubriqu muhanni’an...) /145/

\[
\text{wa la-nā} \quad \text{kabīr-u} \quad \text{l-‘amal-i} \quad \text{fi ‘iṣdār-i}...
\]
and for-1.PL great.NG.NN-N D-hope.M.SI-G in publishing.M.SI-G

‘we have great hope to publish ...’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 17, Ru’yatu muwātīnin...) /146/

If the substantive is a countable one, it must be in the plural form\(^{150}\), e.g.:

\[
\text{li bulūḡ-i} \quad \text{raft‘-i} \quad \text{l-marākiz-i}
\]
for reaching,M.SI-G elevated.NG.NN-G D-positions.NH.PL-G

‘for reaching elevated positions’ (Miṭāq 30/12/03, 7) /147/

\[
\text{li ‘uqūd-i-n} \quad \text{ma‘a muḥṭalif-i} \quad \text{d-duwal-i}
\]
for pacts.NH.PL-G-1 with various.NG.NN-G D-countries.NH.PL-G

‘for pacts with various countries’ (Riyāḍ 24/4/04, 1, Li naktub ‘aqdan ḡadīdan...) /148/

According to Fassi Fehri (1999), such “prenominal adjectives can occur in a series”, e.g.:

\[
\text{ḡayyid-u} \quad \text{qādim-i} \quad \text{l-manāzil-i}
\]
good.NG.NN-N old.NG.NN-G D-houses.NH.PL-G

‘The best of the old (of the) houses’, (from Fassi Fehri 1999: 116f, fn. 23) /149/

The following example encountered in our corpus can also be mentioned here:

\(^{150}\) A countable substantive in the singular is also possible, e.g. in ‘āẓīzū kitābika ‘your dear letter’ lit. ‘the dear of your letter’ (from Corriente 2002 [1980]: 245), yet such expressions are very seldom and seem to be idiomaticized to a great extent.
The definiteness of the genitival qualificator can also be expressed by a pronominal suffix, e.g.:

\[
\text{li tu'riba [...] 'an fā'iq-ı taqdir-i-hā wa ḥtirām-i-hā}
\]

for expresses of high, esteem, and respect.

‘to express [...] her highest esteem and respect’ (Liwa‘ 7/4/04, 2, \textit{As-sifāratu l-mağribiyatu...}) /151/

Constructions with an indefinite substantive are possible as well:

\[
bidānī sābiq-ı 'inḍār-i-n
\]

without previous warning.

‘without previous warning’ (Sīra 69) /152/

\[
lam yuʿti-hā l-muʿarriḥ-ūna kabīr ʿinḍāyat-i-n
\]

not gave-D-pl. historian great attention.

‘historians did not paid much attention to it’ (from Krahl 1985: 15-16, fn. 18) /153/

Here, we shall also mention constructions with ordinal numerals used as antegenitival adjectives \(^{151}\). The genitival qualificator may be indefinite singular, e.g.:

\[
taʿmīr-ı rābīʿ-i ṭāʿirat-i-n min ṭirāz-i...
\]

repair fourth plane of type.

‘the repair of the fourth plane of the type...’ (\textit{Ahrām} 29/01/03, 26, \textit{Taḥṣīnū ǧūdāt}) /154/

An ordinal numeral which itself is an antegenitival adjective can be qualified by another antegenitival adjective. It appears that the latter must be an elative (see chapter 5.6.2.), e.g.:

---

\(^{151}\) Cf. Blau (1973: 185). Kouloughli (1994: 145) remarks that the resulting expression, although grammatically undetermined, is semantically determined, in contrast to an indefinite adjectival attribution, which is both grammatically and semantically undetermined.
\textit{huwa īmāl} 'ahamm-i 152 markaz-i-n
\footnotesize{3.M.SI second.NG.NN-N most:important.NG.NN-G center.M.SI-G-I}
\textit{li} t-tafkīr-i \textit{fi} l-`ālam-i
\footnotesize{for D-thought.M.SI-G in D-world.M.SI-G}

‘it is the second most important center of thought in the world’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 32, \textit{Sirru ra’si l-māli}) /155/

The qualifier may be definite plural:

\textit{dafa`at-hu Kāṭrin Bār} sādis-u zawgāt-i-hi

‘Katherine Parr, his sixth wife buried him’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 82) /156/

Syntagms of this kind may have as their qualificata adjectives designating geographical directions. The resulting expression has the meaning ‘in the ...ern part of...’, e.g.:

\textit{fi} ṣarbiyy-i \textit{l-`Andalus-i}
\footnotesize{in Western.NG.NN-G D-Andalus-G}

‘in the Western part of al-Andalus (‘Ālam al-fikr, 13) /157/

\textit{fi} ṣarbiyy-i \textit{l-`Āsiyā}
\footnotesize{in Southern.NG.NN-G Eastern.NG.NN-G Asia.G}

‘in South Eastern Asia’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 161) /158/

This, however, should not be confused with a construction which is formally similar, but has a different meaning: ‘to the ... of...’, e.g.:

\textit{`ālā masāfāt-i 35 [ḥamsat-i-n waṭalātina] kilūmitr-a-n ṣarbiyy-a l-Fallūgā}

‘at a distance of 35 kilometres to the west of Falluja’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 1, Taqāʾīru min-a l-Bintāğūn...) /159/

Syntagms with the numeral inflected for gender are less frequent:

\footnotesize{152} Badawi et al. write: “Inflection here on \textit{`af`al} أصلم words is regular [...] although pronunciation of case endings is unlikely in practice” (2004: 256) and give the transliteration with indeterminable vowel after the substantive following the numeral: \textit{`iḥdā akbar# dāri l-našri}... (emphasis in original; the same on p. 272). We however, prefer to leave the inflectional vowel as it would be, at least in theory (and in careful speech), i.e. the \textit{i} of the genitive.
A specific construction with ordinal numerals, which have lost their ordering meaning (Łacina 1989: 44), are scientific names of chemical compounds:

\[ \text{rābi'}-u^{153} \quad \text{ṭīl-i-n} \]

fourth.NG.NN-N ethyl.M.SI-G-I
‘tetraethyl’ (from Łacina 1989: 44, our vocalization) /161/

\[ \text{ṭānī} \quad \text{ṭāksīd-i} \quad l-karbūn-i \]

‘carbon dioxide’ (Hayāt 2/08/07, 14, Maktabu l-‘āzūni...) /162/

The adjectives kaḍīr, qaḍīl and mazīd usually do not function as antegenitival adjectives in constructions of this kind (substantives that qualify them are connected with them by means of the preposition \textit{min}, see chapter 4.5.6.3.). However, the following examples show that exceptions do occur:

\[ \text{ḥusrat-u} \quad l-kulliyat-i \tan'ā \quad bi \quad mazīd-i \quad l-ḥuzn-i \quad wālidat-a \ldots \]

‘the family of the Faculty with great sorrow announces the death of the mother of...’
(‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 33, obituary) /163/

\[ dūnā \quad kaḍīr-i \quad mubālaqaṭ-i-n \]

without much.NG.NN-G exaggeration.F.SI-G-I
‘without much exaggeration’ (Mīṭāq 30/12/03, 3) /164/

El-Ayoubi et al. classed the use of kaḍīr as in /164/ as ‘Quantifizierende Adjektive’ used ‘als evaluierende Quantoren’. According to them, such usage seems to be restricted to Northern Africa (2001: 172), however,

---

153 It is possible that Arabic speakers treat these expressions as single words, not syntagms, and the inflectional vowel after the numeral will not be pronounced (scil. ṭābi’# ṭīl). Yet we will vocalize it so as to reflect the canonical rules.

154 Note that here mazīd does not mean ‘more’ (as in constructions with \textit{min}) but ‘very much’. 
example /164/ of our corpus, encountered in a Syrian magazine, could suggest that it is not.

Perhaps a specific variety of this syntagm is one used in information signs. Yet the determination of the syntax in this construction is problematic:

\[
\begin{align*}
mamnūʿ-u & \quad d-duḥūl-? \\
\text{prohibited,NG,NN-N} & \quad D\text{-entry,M,SI-?} \\
\text{‘no entry’ lit. ‘prohibited entrance’ /165/} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Constructions like /165/ are difficult to describe in terms of canonical Arabic grammar. Grammars consulted by us are silent on this issue. Perhaps such syntagms could be interpreted as inverted predications. If so, then /165/ would be vocalized as \(mamnūʿun\ i\ d-duḥūlu\) and be equivalent to \(ad-duḥūlu\ mamnūʿun\) (with the adjective glossed M,SI instead of NG,NN). However, some native speakers see in them an AQPossG (as in \(daḥaltu\ makānan\ mamnūʿa\ d-duḥūli\) lit. ‘I entered a place forbidden [in terms] of entrance’). We however prefer to treat this construction as one of particular character.\(^{155}\) It will be not included in our typology of syntagms.

Finally, let us discuss syntagms involving antegenitival positive adjectives qualified by substantives designating human entities. In such syntagms the substantive must be plural. The adjective may inflect for number. Generally, in MWA this construction is used with the adjective \(kibār\ ‘great’\) in the sense ‘chief, senior’, e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{min } kibār-i & \quad l-masʿāl-ina & \quad n-nimsāwiyy-ina \\
of great,M,PL-G & \quad D\text{-official,M,PL-G} & \quad D\text{-Austrian,M,PL-G} \\
\text{‘of senior Austrian officials’ (Gaẓīra 2, Waliyyu l-ʿahdi yabḥaṭu...)} /166/ \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
qudāmā & \quad l-muštarik-ina \\
\text{old,M,PL-N} & \quad D\text{-participant,M,PL-G} \\
\text{‘the old participants’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 15, Aṣ-ṣayfu yuḥriḡu...)} /167/ \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{155}\) Other languages also have specific constructions with ‘non-canonical’ syntax for brief informations. E.g. Spanish \(\text{Informado y conforme el cliente con los datos del billete}\ ‘The client [is] informed of and agreeing with the conditions of the ticket’ (stamp on a railway ticket). Between the adjectives \(\text{informado}\) and \(\text{conforme}\) and the substantive \(\text{el cliente}\) there seem to be no attribution or predication like one in a sentence. Another example from Spanish is: \(\text{prohibido el paso}\ ‘No entry’, lit. ‘Prohibited the passage’.
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Badawi et al. suggest that there is a difference in meaning between the adjective *kibār* used in constructions of this type and one used in adjectival attribution. They contrast *kibāru l-*ṣātīdati* ‘the *senior* professors’ with *ṣātīdatunā l-kibāru* ‘our *great* teachers’ (2004: 111, emphasis in the original). However, we are of the opinion that the difference, if any, is minimal and not always predictable. This is also suggested by the following example, where *kibār* is used attributively in the same meaning as in /166/:

> qādat-i-n ʿaskariyy-īna ʿamīrkiyyī-na kibār-i-n
> ‘[of] senior American military commanders’ (Livāʾ1, *Taqārāru mana l-Bintāgūn...*) /168/

5.6.2. Antegenitival Adjective: Elative

In contrast to the foregoing chapter, in the discussion of the antegenitival elative, no distinction will be made between syntagms involving substantives designating human and non-human entities. Syntagms with antegenitival elatives will be divided into: (i) syntagms with indefinite qualifiers and (ii) syntagms with definite qualifiers.

5.6.2.1. Antegenitival elatives with indefinite qualifiers

Antegenitival elatives may be qualified by both countable and uncountable substantives. In most frequent cases the qualifying substantive is singular. The meaning of the elative is always superlative. Examples:

> hiya ʿaḡmal-u kalimat-i-n fi hādīhi l-luḡat-i
> ‘it is the most beautiful word in this language’ (ʿĀlam al-fikr, 80) /169/

> tašmudu baldat-u l-Fallūḡat-i [...] ʿarwaʿ-a şumūd-i-n
> ‘the village of Falluja shows the most marvellous defiance’ lit. ‘defies [...] [with] the most marvellous defiance’ (ʿAnwār 3/5/04, 2, *Al-Ḥusṣ: *ʿAmīrka...) /170/
Both the adjectives and their qualifiers can have paratactic co-
constituents, as is shown by the following example:

\[
yu\text{ṣ}akk\text{ū}lu \ 'ak\text{b}ar-\text{a} \ wa \ 'aq\text{w}ā \ da\text{‘}m-i-n \ wa \ mus\text{ā}n\text{ā}d\text{ā}t-i-n
\]


‘[it] constitutes the biggest and strongest aid and support’ (Liwā‘ 2, \textit{Laḥūd: al-qimmatu...}) /172/

Probably under the impact of dialects, a construction with elatives
qualified by \textit{wāḥid} (feminine: \textit{wāḥida}) ‘one’ is sometimes used with the
meaning ‘the ...st one’, e.g.:

\[
\text{ḥattā } \text{sahidtu \ mawt-} a \ '\text{āh}ir-i \ \text{wāḥid-at-i-n}
\]


‘until I saw the death of the last of them’ (Liṣṣ 130) /173/

The qualifying substantive can also be dual or plural:

\[
'\text{an} \ \text{'ahamm-i} \ \text{šā'ir-ayni} \ \text{yahūdiyy-ayni}
\]

about most:important.NG.NN-G poet.M-DU.G.I Jewish.M-DU.G.I

‘about the two most important Jewish poets’ (‘Ayyārī 35) /174/

\[
tārāḡa' \text{a } [...] \ \text{̬ilā } \ '\text{adnā} \ \text{mustawayāt-i-n } fi \ \text{šahr-ayni}
\]

they:fell to lowest.NG.NN.G levels.NH.PL-G-I in month.M-DU.G.I

‘they [...] fell to the lowest levels in two months’ (Ḥayāṭ 2/08/07, 11, Šabaḥu 'azmati... )/175/

Frequently, the qualifying substantive in this syntagm is qualified as well.
Its qualifier may be an adjective, a prepositional phrase or a relative
clause, e.g.:

\[
'\text{alā} \ \text{'asgār-i} \ \text{masāḥat-i-n} \ \text{munkin-at-i-n}
\]

on smallest.NG.NN-G surface.F.SI-G-I possible-F.SI-G-I

‘on the possibly smallest surface’ (Ḥayāṭ 2/08/07, 9, \textit{Māṭat ḥariṭatu...}) /176/
The antegenitival elative may also have qualifiers other than the substantive in the genitive. Such constructions will be discussed in chapters 5.6.3. and 5.6.4.

5.6.2.2. Antegenitival elatives with definite qualifiers

The definiteness of the substantival qualifier of an antegenitival elative may be expressed by the article al- or a pronominal suffix. It may also result from its being qualified by a definite genitival qualifier. The qualifying substantive can be either a countable plural or dual, or an uncountable singular substantive.156

Examples of countable plural and dual substantives as qualifiers include:

\[ \text{tur\text{"}imat} \ldots \text{'il\text{"}a} / \text{'ak\text{"}ar-i} / \text{l-\text{"}u\text{"}g\text{"}at-i} / \text{l-\text{"}hay\text{"}y-at-i} \]
was:translated to most.NG.NN-I D-languages.NH.PL-G D-living.NH.PL-G

‘[it] was translated into the majority of living languages’ (Ṭaqāfī 9/11/04, 9, ‘Abṣariyyatū l-ḥayāli...) /177/

\[ \text{huwa} / \text{'at\text{"}al-u} / \text{s-sifr-ayni} \]

‘it is the longer of the [two] books’ (Kallās 61) /178/

Uncountable singular substantives as qualifiers are exemplified below:

\[ \text{li} / \text{'a\text{"}hir-i} / \text{n-nit\text{"}a\text{"}g-i} / \text{l-\text{"}ibd\text{"}i\text{"}y-i} \]

‘of the recent literary production’ (‘Ayyāmu l-frankūfīniyyati 8) /179/

\[ \text{fi} / \text{'aq\text{"}a} / \text{š\text{"}im\text{"}l-i} / \text{l-bil\text{"}d-i} \]

‘in the very far north of the country’ (Hayāt 20/08/07, 8, Al-ǧayšu s-sirīlānkiyyu...) /180/

A specific variety is one with a relative clause introduced by man ‘that one who’ or mā ‘that which’ and functioning as the genitival qualifier of the adjective. E.g.:

---

156 The qualifying substantive may be replaced by a pronominal suffix anaphorically representing an aforementioned substantive. Then a suffixally substantivized adjective (SSA) results (see chapter 4.5.3.).
Note the following construction with the meaning ‘the most, at [one’s] most’:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{al-baṣamāt-u} & \quad s-\text{siyāsiyy-at-u} \quad \text{taẓharu} & \quad \text{′akṭar-a} & \quad \text{mā} & \quad \text{taẓharu} \\
\text{D-influences.NH.PL-N} & \quad \text{D-political-NH.PL-N} & \quad \text{appear} & \quad \text{most.NG.NN-A} & \quad \text{what} & \quad \text{appear}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{fi qānūn-i} \quad \text{l-intihābāt-i}
\]

in law.M.SI-G \quad D-elections.NH.PL-G

‘political influence [...] appare at its most [visible] in the electoral law’ (Anwār 3/5/04, 2, Al-baṣamatu s-siyyāsiyyatu...) \(^{157}\) /182/

Within this variety, a construction could be distinguished with the RC mā yakūnu (or takūnu, depending on the gender and number of the substantive designating the relevant entity\(^{158}\)), which emphasizes the superlative grade of the adjective. E.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
an-\text{nabātāt-u} & \quad \text{′ab’ad-u} & \quad \text{mā} & \quad \text{takūnu} & \quad \text{′an} & \quad \text{kawn-i-hā} \\
\text{D-plants.NH.PL-N} & \quad \text{farthest.NG.NN-N} & \quad \text{what} & \quad \text{are} & \quad \text{from being.M.SI-G-3.NH.PL}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
kā’ināt-i-n \quad \text{salbiyy-at-a-n}
\]

creatures.NH.PL-A-1 \quad harmful.NH.PL-A-1

‘plants are as far as possible from being harmful creatures’ (Arabī 5/04, 153) \(^{183}\)

An elative qualified in this way may function as an adjectival attribute but only if the substantive qualified by it is indefinite (as observed in El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 271, “nur bei Indetermination des Kernnomens”) \(^{159}\), e.g.:

\[^{157}\text{Cf. Badawi et al. (2004: 523).}\]

\[^{158}\text{However, according to El-Ayoubi et al., due to the formulaic character of this phrase, the agreement is sometimes absent and the standard form of masculine singular is usually used (2001: 272).}\]

\[^{159}\text{We have said in chapter 4.5.2. that an antegenitival adjective, whether positive or elative, cannot qualify attributively. An elative qualified by mā yakūnu etc. would thus be an exception. One could however argue that the phrase mā yakūnu is not a genitival qualificator of the elative. We have not been able to decide it since the inherent lack of the “indefinite article” in the elative does not permit us to say whether with the addition of mā yakūnu the elative becomes definite, ergo is genitivally qualified, or not.}\]
bi ‘uslūb-i-n ‘ab‘ad-a mā yakūn-u ‘ani t-tafsīr-i wafqan li...
in way,M.SI-G-I farthest.NG.NN-G what is from D-explicaton.M.SI-G conforming to
‘in a way [which is] as far as possible from an explication in accordance with...’
(from El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 271). /184/

Neutralization of number

One of the characteristics of syntagms with antegenitival elatives is that
the elative, by virtue of being neutralized with respect to number, does not
indicate what is the intended quantity of the entities designated by the
genitival substantive160. The number may be inferable from the context.
E.g. in /185/ singular meaning is intended:

nihāyat-i ‘atwal-i l-ḥurūb-i l-‘ifrīqiyy-at-i
‘[of] the end of the longest of the African wars’ (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 1, ‘Arān yā şu hu... /185/

Plural meaning should be understood in /186/:

mağmū‘at-a-n min ḍanqā wa ‘a‘zam-i rumūz-i-hā
‘a group of its most exquisite and greatest symbols’ (Al-Mīqq 20/4/2004, 3,
Al-mu‘āmaratu l-kubrā) /186/

Sometimes, however, the context does not permit to identify the number
intended, as e.g. in /187/:

yunaffiḏūna ‘aswa‘-a s-sīnāryūḥāt-i llaṯī rasamāt-hā ḏUmarā
they:realize worst.NG.NN-A D-scenarios.NH.PL-G which drew-3.NH.PL America.F.N
‘[they] are realizing the worst scenario (or: scenarios) that America had drawn’
(Šarq 2, Al-Baṣmarša l-yadu...) /187/

Here, both readings, either with singular or plural, are equally possible.

160 According to Kouloughli, such constructions are even triply ambiguous: ‘aḡmālu l-baṁāti, besides
meaning (i) ‘the most beautiful girl’ and (ii) ‘the most beautiful girls’, can also mean (iii) “ce qu’il y a de
plus beau dans les filles”. However, Kouloughli admits that in the latter case, in Modern Arabic one
Antesubstantival elatives with absolutive meaning

Some elatives, which belong to a limited group (comprising e.g. *kubrā* ‘big; biggest’, *ʾulā* ‘first’) inflect for gender even though they are antegenitivally substantivized. It seems that they always convey absolutive meaning. E.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kānāt} & \quad ʾālā \quad ʾgazawāt-ī-hī & \quad \text{maʿa zawgāt-ī Wahgān} \\
\text{was} & \quad \text{first,F.NN.N} \quad \text{conquests,NH.PL-G-3.M.SI} & \quad \text{with wife,F.SI-G Wahgān} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘his first conquest was with the wife of Wahgān’ (*Umar 37*) /188/

In /189/, the elative should be probably interpreted as having the non-human plural form rather than feminine singular. Consequently, it should be said to inflect for number as well:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tattāsābaqū kubrā} & \quad Š-šarikāt-ī \quad [\ldots] & \quad \text{l-ʾamrīkīyy-at-ī ʾawī l-faransīyy-at-ī li\ldots} \\
\text{vie} & \quad \text{biggest,NH.PL-N} \quad \text{D-companies,NH.PL-G} & \quad \text{D-American-NH.PL-G or D-French-NH.PL-G to} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘the biggest American and French companies compete [in order] to...’ (*Ahrām 29/01/03, 26, Markazun ḍādīdun...*) /189/

Such absolutive elatives inflected for number can have endings typical of human adjectives\(^{161}\), probably because otherwise the context would not permit to identify the number intended. Another explanation could be that idiomaticized expressions are involved here. E.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{munḏu} & \quad \text{zaman-ī} \quad \text{kubrayāt-ī} \quad Š-šuḥuf-ī \\
\text{since} & \quad \text{time,M.SI-G} \quad \text{great,F.PL-G} \quad \text{D-newspapers,NHPL-G} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘since the era of the great newspapers’ (*Miṭāq 20/4/04, 4*) /190/.

Antegenitival elatives functioning as subjects

If an antegenitival elative functions as a subject, the concord between it and the predicate may reflect its neutralized gender and number, e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ʾanna} & \quad ʾāqlab-ā \quad ḥāḍīhi \quad l-ʾaflām-ī \quad ʾgāyr-u \quad \text{mudablaḡ-ī-n} \\
\text{that} & \quad \text{most,NG.NN-A} \quad \text{these} \quad \text{D-films,NH.PL-G} \quad \text{reverse-N} \quad \text{dubbed,NG.NN-G-I} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘that most of these films are not dubbed’ (*Ālam al-fikr, 49*) /191/

---

\(^{161}\) Cf. Cantarino (1975, 2: 475) and Badawi et al. (2004: 252).
However, concord ad sensum, i.e. with the predicate ḡayru mudablāġin agreeing in gender and number with ‘aflāmūn, i.e. the qualifier of the elative, is also possible.

5.6.2.3. Antegenitival elative: a non-classical construction

Perhaps a separate construction, which is evidently non-classical, should be distinguished, viz. that in which the elative emphasizes the property expressed by an adjective qualifying the genitival substantive or by a RC introduced with mā ‘what’ or man ‘who’. Thus, although no mph indicators suggest it, the elative could be interpreted as qualifying this adjective or RC. The construction is exemplified in what follows:

\[
\text{satakūnīnā ʾakṭār-a mraʾat-i-n māhsūd-at-i-n fi l-ʿālam-i}
\]
\[
you:will:be  most.NG.NN-A woman.F.SI-G-I envied-F.SI-G-I in D-world.M.SI-G
\]
\[
\text{‘you will be the most envied woman in the world’ lit. ‘the most of envied women’}
\]
\[
\text{(from El-Ayoubi 2001: 294) /192/}
\]

Here, the property expressed by the adjective māhsūdātin ‘envied’ seems to be emphasized by the elative ʾakṭāra ‘the most’, as to produce the sense ‘the most envied’. The following example has a similar structure:

\[
\text{ʾakṭar-u dawlat-i-n muntahik-at-i-n li l-qarārāt-i d-duwaliyy-at-i}
\]
\[
\]
\[
\text{‘the state violating international decisions the most’ lit. ‘the biggest of violating countries’ (Al-Mīṭāq 20/4/2004, 9) /193/}
\]

The constructions exemplified in /192/ and /193/ seem to be very close in meaning to antegenitival adjectives qualified by an accusatival substantive (see chapter 5.6.3.). In fact, they could be rephrased as the latter. Cf. ʾakṭaru mraʾatin ḥasadan lit. ‘the most of woman in envy’ as the equivalent of the expression of /192/ and ʾakbaru dawlatin intihākan ‘the biggest of country in violating’ as one of the expression of /193/. However, in the first equivalent, it may not be clear whether the woman spoken of is envied or envious. Thus, the non-classical construction in question may in some cases be used in order to remove ambiguity.
Admittedly, the interpretation of /193/ which we gave as literal translation might also be accepted. The expression might be understood as simply ‘the biggest of the violating countries’. However, the existence of cases where such an interpretation is not possible or not intended in a certain context (cf. the non-sensicality of the interpretation ‘you will be the most of the envied women’ for /192/) suggests that this is a separate construction.

This construction is closely related to the one with a relative clause introduced by mā ‘what’ or man ‘who’ and qualifying the elative, e.g.:

\[\text{'anā ḥayr-u man yaqra’u dāḥila ra’s-i-ka} \]
\[1.\text{SI besLN.G.NN-N who reads inside head.M.\text{SI-G-2.M.\text{SI}}}\]
\[\text{‘I am the one who reads best in your head’ lit. ‘the best of those who read’ (Līsī 16)/194/}\]

Disregarding the specific semantic relations obtaining in constructions of this kind, we will not posit qualification between the elative and the adjective qualifying its qualificatum. In our typology of syntagms these constructions will not be treated differently from other syntagms with antegenitival elatives.

5.6.3. Antegenitival elative qualified by an accusative substantive

Antegenitival elatives, but not antegenitival positives, may be qualified by an accusative substantive. This is especially frequent with the genitive qualificator of the elative being definite and plural. The qualification and function of the accusatival qualificator with respect to the elative is the same as described for the AQPossA in chapter 5.3.2.1. The accusative substantive designates a possessum which may be interpreted as inalienable, while the genitival qualificator of the adjectives designates its possessor. E.g.:

\[\text{huwa 'asra‘-u qtiṣādāt-i l-‘ālam-i numuww-a-n} \]
\[\text{‘it is the quickest developing economy in the world’ lit. ‘the quickest of the world’s economies in terms of development’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 186)/195/}\]
Also the phrase mā yakūnu lit. ‘what can be’ can be used as the qualifier of the elative qualified by an accusative substantive, e.g.:

\[
\text{hiya } \text{'ašadd-u mā takānu wuḏāḥ-a-n}
\]


‘she is the brightest thing [that can be]’ (Raḡab 81) /196/

Only infrequently is an accusative substantival qualifier used with the antegenitival adjective qualified by an indefinite substantive in the genitive. We did not encounter any example of it in our corpus. However, cf. one from El-Ayoubi et al.\(^\text{162}\), with mustawan as the indefinite genitive substantive qualifying the elative:

\[
yātīšu fī 'aḵtar-i mustawan tāḥalluf-a-n
\]


‘lives on a most backward standard’ (from El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 267, our emphasis) /197/

5.6.4. Antegenitival elative qualified by a prepositional phrase

Antegenitival elatives, but not antegenitival positives, may be qualified by prepositional phrases\(^\text{163}\), e.g.:

\[
\text{'ašbaḥat } \text{'ašaq-a } \text{'awqāt-i-n 'alay-nā}
\]

they:became most.difficult.NG.NN-A times.NH.PL-G.1 for-1.PL

‘[they] became the most difficult times for us’ (Karnak 75) /198/

\[
\text{min 'abhaḡ-i d-duwal-i fī l-karam-i wa l-faḍl-i}
\]


‘out of countries most splendid in [their] generosity and opulence’ (Kallās 42) /199/

\(^\text{162}\) Another example of it, although in a different context, is given in El-Ayoubi et al. on p. 265.

\(^\text{163}\) It seems that since absolutive elatives are usually not qualified by PPs, the same should hold for antegenitival absolutive elatives. However, Holes adduces an example which shows the opposite: kubrāyātu l-banāti fī s-sinni ‘the oldest ones of the girls’ (2004 [1995]: 211).
5.6.5. Antegenitival adjective and attributive adjective: a comparison

Many, if not all, syntagms with antegenitival adjectives have more or less synonymous correspondents in the form of syntagms based on adjetival attribution. Let us show it at the following examples:

\[ bi \ șarîh-i \ \text{and} \ \ l-‘ibârat-i \]
\[
\text{with} \ \ \text{true.NG.NN-G} \ \ \text{D-word.F.SI-G} \\
\text{‘with a true word’ lit. ‘with the true of word’} \ (\text{Miṭāq 20/4/04, 4}) \ /200/ \\
\]

The above syntagm seems to be synonymous with the following:

\[ bi \ \ ‘ibârat-i-n \ \ șarîh-at-i-n \]
\[
\text{with} \ \ \text{word.F.SI-G-I} \ \ \text{true-F.SI-G-I} \\
\text{‘with a true word’} \ /201/ \\
\]

The attributive adjective in the latter, șarîhätin, corresponds to the antegenitival adjective in the former, șarîhi-, while the qualified substantive in the latter, ‘ibâratin, corresponds to the the qualifying genitive substantive in the former, l-‘ibârati.

The two kinds of syntagms seem to be synonymous. However, it seems that each of them is at times used in different contexts and for different purposes. Below, a brief comparison will be made. Let us begin with the discussion of syntagms involving positive adjectives.

Antegenitival positive and attributive positive: a comparison

The difference between the syntagms with antegenitival positive and the syntagms with attributive positive adjective has, to our knowledge, not been investigated in depth yet. However, some general observations can be made in this regard. The antegenitival substantivization of adjectives which are not ordinal numerals is used “for emphasis” and is “rather stylized and restricted” (Badawi et al. 2004: 110). It is, for instance, often encountered in obituaries and congratulations. According to Wierzbicka (1986: 385, fn. 5), “syntactic reversal between the head and the modifier serves the purpose of giving the property a special semantic
prominence\textsuperscript{164}. Sometimes the best translation of these positive adjectives into English are superlatives, e.g. ‘with the truest word’ for /200/.

As for adjectives that are ordinal numerals, the difference between the two kinds of syntagms appears to be of another nature. Some examples, such as /202/ and /203/, show that both constructions can be used interchangeably, without a change in meaning being produced:

\begin{verbatim}
Kātrīn Bār  sādis-u  zawḡāt-i-hi
‘Katherine Parr, his sixth wife’ (‘Arabi 5/04, 82) /202/

Kātrīn Bār  zawḡat-u-hu  s-sādis-at-u
‘Idem’ /203/
\end{verbatim}

Yet certain meanings must be expressed by syntagms with adjectival attribution and cannot be expressed by an antegenitival adjective. E.g.:

\begin{verbatim}
‘The man number two in al-Qaeda was Ayman Az-Zawahiri’ (Hayāt 2/08/07, 8, Al-Qāʿidatu tadū.) /204/
\end{verbatim}

In this sense, one would rather not say:

\begin{verbatim}
kāna  tānī  raqul-in ....
was  second.NG.NN.A  man.M.SI-G-I
\end{verbatim}

It seems that the meaning that must be expressed by syntagms with attribution is ‘being numbered’, as opposed to ‘being counted’. In other words, what is meant here is occupying a fixed position in a group, which cannot be changed. This position is named by means of a number, which can reflect a fixed hierarchy in space, time or other dimensions, as exemplified in /205/:

\textsuperscript{164} She adduces similar examples from French, involving adjectives and substantives:

\begin{verbatim}
un enfant charmant – un enfant bijou – un bijou d’enfant
\end{verbatim}
Such a fixed position expressed by this kind of syntagm may be established in an accidental way. It remains, however, fixed. E.g.:

al-mağmū'at-u  l-tâniy-at-u
D-group.F.SI-N  D-second-F.SI-N
‘Group Two’ [in football] (Hayāt 2/08/07, 17, Lubnānu ya‘baru...) /206/

Other languages also differentiate such meanings. English has e.g. *the man number two* and *Group Two*, which mean something else than *the second man* and *the second group*. Polish, in turn, has *człowiek numer dwa* ‘the man number two’ and *grupa druga* ‘Group Two’, which mean something else than *drugi człowiek* ‘a/the second man’ and *druga grupa* ‘a/the second group’.

In other contexts, one kind of the two syntagms under discussion is preferred because of the category of state of the substantive, which may influence the meaning. Thus e.g. /207/:

*ba‘da  l-mubārāt-i  l-‘ālā  llati  ḥarağa  fi-hā  l-muntaḥab-u*


*l-‘irāqiyy-u  muta‘ādil-a-n*

‘after the first match, from which the Iraqi team came away with a draw’ (Hayāt 2/08/07, 17, Fiyīrā yu‘akkidu...) /207/

is not synonymous with /208/:

*ba‘da  ’awwal-i  mubārāt-i-n  ḥarağa  fi-hā  l-muntaḥab-u*


*l-‘irāqiyy-u  muta‘ādil-a-n*

‘after the first match from which the Iraqi team came away with a draw’ /208/

because in /207/ the relative clause is non-restrictive, while in /208/ it is restrictive, this difference being closely related to the definiteness or indefiniteness of the substantive -mubārāt-. Yet it must be noted that the
formal indefiniteness does not necessarily entail semantic indefiniteness. In /209/, the syntagm *tānī mubārātīn*, though with the substantive formally indefinite, is semantically definite:

\[
\text{li ḥasārat-i-n qāsiy-at-i-n fi tānī mubārāt-i-n rasmīyy-at-i-n}
\]


‘to a severe defeat in the second official match’ (Hayāt 208/07, 17, Šāsitir yuribu...) /209/

**Antegenitival elative and attributive elative: a comparison**

As far as elatives are concerned, the difference between their use in syntagms with antegenitival elatives and that in syntagms based on attribution seems to be more obscure. It seems that usually both constructions have the same meaning. In spite of differences in formal definiteness, semantic definiteness remains the same. Cf. the two syntagms, *ʾahamma ʾilāqatin* and *l-ʾilāqatu l-ʾahammu*, encountered in one and the same text:

\[
\text{ʾinna ʾahamm-a ʾilāqat-i-n tunāʾiyy-at-i-n li Brīṭāniyā hiya maʿa}
\]

that most:important.NG.NN-A relation.F.SI-G-I bilateral.F.SI-G-I of Britain.F.G 3.F.SI with

l-Wilāyāt-i l-Muttaḥid-at-i [...] mā hiya l-ʾilāqat-u l-ʾahamm-u

li Brīṭāniyā
of Britain.F.G

‘that the most important bilateral relation of Britain is that with the USA’ [...] ‘so what is this most important relation of Britain?’ (Hayāt 208/07, 8, Brāwn qad yadibu...) /210/

Cf. also /211/ and /212/, both expressing the same meaning of superlativity, yet by means of the two different kinds of syntagms:

\[
\text{laqab-u ʾafḍal-i lāʾib-i-n}
\]


‘the title of the best player’ (Mağalla 33) /211/

\[
\text{gāʾizat-u l-muntaḥab-i l-ʾafḍal-i}
\]


‘the award of the best team’ (Mağalla 33) /212/

In certain cases, the syntagm with antegenitival adjective is preferred. Thus for instance, if there is a need for an additional qualificator, either of the
adjective or of the substantive\textsuperscript{165}, a syntagm with the antegenitival elative is used, e.g.:

\textsuperscript{165} This was noted by Wehr, in whose wording this is “engere Umschreibung der Gültigkeit der Qualität” (Wehr 1953: 16).

\begin{verbatim}
\textquotesingle il\textsuperscript{a} \textsuperscript{a}m\textsuperscript{a}l-i \ m\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{a}t-i-n fi l-\textsuperscript{a}lam-i
\end{verbatim}

to most:beautiful.NG.NN-G woman.F.SI-G-I in D-world.M.SI-G
‘to the most beautiful woman in the world’ (‘Umar 60)/213/

rather than one based on adjectival attribution:

\textsuperscript{166} For proposal of possible answers see Holes (2004 [1995]: 211) and El-Ayoubi et al. (2001: 273).

\begin{verbatim}
\textquotesingle il\textsuperscript{a} \textsuperscript{a}m\textsuperscript{a}l-i \ l-\textsuperscript{a}g\textsuperscript{a}mal-i fi l-\textsuperscript{a}lam-i
\end{verbatim}


According to Lecomte, constructions like that in /214/ have “une valeur plus absolue” (1976 [1968]: 108). A more thorough comparison to be made should also include synonymous constructions with antegenitival adjective qualified by definite plural substantive in the genitive, e.g. ’a\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{a}malu n-nis\textsuperscript{a}t\textsuperscript{a}i\textsuperscript{166}.

\section*{5.7. Suffixally substantivized adjective qualified by a substantive}

In this chapter syntagms composed of an SSA (see chapter 4.5.4.) qualified by a substantive will be presented. The qualifying substantive may be either (i) in the accusative case or it may be (ii) a prepositional phrase.

\subsection*{5.7.1. SSA qualified by accusative substantive}

Suffixally substantivized adjectives may be qualified by a substantive in the accusative case. These syntagms are related to antegenitival adjectives qualified by an accusative substantive discussed in chapter 5.6.3. E.g.:
‘with the most dangerous and most powerfully destructive weapon’ (Šarq 14/4/04, 1, Al-Fallūğatu... wa mā ḥadrāka...) /215/

‘Absāl is the younger of age of them two’ (Kallās 84) /216/

‘[he] was the most ignorant of them in the arts of drinking’ (Kallās 95) /218/

5.7.2. SSA qualified by a prepositional phrase

Suffixally substantivized adjective may be qualified by prepositional phrases. E.g.:

‘aḡāba-hu  ‘akbar-u-hum  ft s-sinn-i
‘the oldest one of them answered him’ (Maqhā 92) /217/

kāna [..]  ‘aḡhal-a-hum  bi funūn-i  l-munādamat-i
was    most:ignorant.NG,NN-A-3.M.PL in arts.NH.PL-G D-drinking.F.SI-G
‘[he] was the most ignorant of them in the arts of drinking’ (Kallās 95) /218/

5.8. Direct object of participial adjectives

The syntagms to be discussed here are composed of an adjective which is a participle and its qualifier interpretable as its direct object in the accusative case. When discussing the direct object of the adjective, we will be concerned with:

(i) active participles of transitive verbs,
(ii) passive participle of ditransitive verbs.

---

167 That the direct object is a syntactic category qualifying not only verbal predicates is assumed also in descriptions of other languages. As an example, let us cite here a grammar of Polish: “Przymiotniki odczasownikowe, które swoim znaczeniem zbliżają się do czasowników, mają również dopełnienia” ‘deverbal adjectives which with respect to the meaning are close to verbs have objects as well’ (Bąk 1989 [1977]: 420). In MWA the direct object in the accusative can also qualify verbal nouns of transitive verbs.
The variety (i) is by far the more frequent construction. An adjective qualified in this way usually is an attribute or a secondary predicate. It rather does not occur in basic predicate function. E.g.:

\[
\text{qad ustushida munaffid-a-ni l-`amaliyyat-a} \quad \text{PART he:died:as:martyr carrying:out.MSI-A-1 D-action.FSI-A}
\]

‘he died as a martyr, [while] carrying out the action’ (Anwar 1, Maqtalu 5 1sr-`iliyyina...)/219/

If the direct object is a personal pronoun, it is suffixed to the preposition `iyya:

\[
hazzat ra`-s-a-ha dahiya-`at-a-n `iyya-ya `ilah l-ifshah-i \quad \text{shook head.MSI-A-3-FSI to D-frank:declaration.MSI-G}
\]

‘she shook her head, calling me to be frank’ (MIr 213)/220/

The following is an example with an active participle of a ditransitive verb. The participle has two direct objects:

\[
\text{gaddadat kutlat-u l-Waf`-i [...] `itibar-a-ha [...] muhammiil-at-a-n} \quad \text{renewed block.FSI-N D-Waf` MSI-G opinion.MSI-A-3-FSI charging-FSI-A-1}
\]

`iyyahu mas`aliyyata \quad \text{PREP-3.MSI responsability.FSI-A}

‘the Waf` block re-stated its opinion [...] while charging him with the responsability of [...]’ (Hayat 2/08/07, 7, Al-Waf`u li l-mugawamati...) /221/

The variety (ii) can be exemplified as follows:

\[
lalah yakamu [...] mufawwad-a-ni tihada qarar-i-n \quad \text{not it:is authorized.MSI-A-1 adoption.MSI-A decision.MSI-G-1}
\]

‘[it] is not authorized [to] adopt the decision of...’ (Hayat 2/08/07, 8, Kabul tarfu`u...) /222/

\[
alfatatu [...] l-maslub-at-u sharaf-a \quad \text{D-girl.FSI-N D-deprived-FSI-N D-honour.MSI-A}
\]

‘the girl deprived [of] honour’ (MIr 192)/223/

In /222/, the passive participle of the ditransitive verb fawwada ‘to authorize somebody to something’ has the direct object tihada. In /223/,
the passive participle of the ditransitive verb salaba ‘to deprive somebody of something’ has the direct object š-šarafa.

Syntagms of variety (i) sometimes have synonymous syntagms in which the adjective is qualified by a prepositional phrase. The object phrase is then expressed by means of a li-phrase. This construction is used frequently in set expressions, e.g.:

\[
\text{ragül-u-n muţr-u-n li l-ihtimām-i}
\]


‘an interesting man’ lit. ‘a man arousing interest’ (Liwā’ 2, ’Anzimatun ‘arabiyyatun...) /224/

\[
bı si‘ārat-i-n mu‘ādiy-at-i-n li l-‘amrikiyy-ına
\]

with slogans.NH.PL-G-1 hostile-NH.PL-G-1 PREP D-American.M.PL-G

‘with anti-American slogans’ lit. ‘slogans treating Americans in a hostile way’ (‘Arab al-Yawm 1, Būš yuţliqu ‘ināna...) /225/

5.9. Internal object

The term ‘internal object’ denotes a syntactic function occupied by substantives which primarily are qualifiers of the verb\(^\text{168}\) but may also qualify adjectives, esp. participles. Substantives carrying out this function are usually indefinite accusative verbal nouns cognate to the qualified word but they can also be quantifiers, such as kull ‘all’, qualified in turn by a definite cognate verbal noun.

When unqualified, the internal object is indefinite. Its function is to emphasize the meaning of the adjective, e.g.:

\[
‘iľa l-ţalwān-ı 1-manţur-at-ı naţr-a-n
\]


‘to widely dispersed colours’ lit. ‘to colours dispersed a dispersion’ (Ţaqāfī 9/11/04, 8, Bayna t-ta‘birīyyati...) /226/

\(^{168}\text{This is what in Arab grammar is termed maf‘ūl muţlaq. Western scholars use denominations including ‘accusativus absolutus’ (e.g. Danecki 1994) and ‘absolute object’ (e.g. Badawi et al. 2004)\)}}
However, in the most frequent kind of this construction, the internal object is qualified by an adjective or a definite genitive qualifier. In the latter case the internal object ceases to be indefinite. E.g.:

\[
\text{kāna mūtaqqaf-a-n ṭaqūfat-a-n faransiyy-at-a-n}
\]


‘he was educated in the French manner’ lit. ‘he was educated the French education’

(‘Arabī 5/04, 194) /227/

\[
\text{ādat-u-n zawgiyy-at-u-n qadim-at-u-n qidam-a ḥṭirā'-i l-ḡayb-i}
\]


‘a matrimonial custom as ancient as [the ancientness of] the invention of the pocket’

(Raḡāb 93) /228/

The internal object in the form of a substantive with quantitative meaning qualified by the cognate verbal noun can be exemplified as follows:

\[
laysa ḡadīd-a-n kull-a l-ḡiddar-i
\]

it is not new.M.SI-A-l all-A D-newness.F.SI-G

‘it is not completely new’ lit. ‘not new [with] the whole of newness’

(‘Ālamal-fikr, 75) /229/

\[
\text{aḡwāʾ-i-n ḡadīd-at-i-n muṭalif-at-i-n kull-a l-iḥtilāf-i}
\]


‘[of] new very varied milieus’ lit. ‘varied with all variation’

(‘Arabī 5/04, 164) /230/

It can also be an elative, usually ʿašadd ‘strongest’, qualified by the cognate verbal noun, e.g.:

\[
kāna Ġallūliyyū [... ] ḥādir-a-n ʿašadd-a l-ḥaḍar-i
\]


‘Galileo was extremely cautious’ lit. ‘cautious with the strongest of caution’

(‘Arabī 5/04, 123) /231/

The internal object can also qualify the verbal noun itself, e.g.:

\[
al-ḥaḍar-u ʿašadd-a l-ḥaḍar-i
\]


‘extreme caution’ lit. ‘being cautious with the strongest [of] caution’ /232/

Such a syntagm, however, did not occur in our corpus. It seems that in MWA it is used rather rarely.
5.10. Other accusatival qualifiers with rection

In this chapter we will discuss syntagms composed of an adjective qualified by an accusative substantive which is not a direct object. What is more, these syntagms differ from the AQPossA in that they do not fulfil the condition we proposed in chapter 5.3.2. for a grammatical AQPossA. Let us recall this condition here: in order for a grammatical AQPossA to result, it should be possible to form a grammatical sentence in which the subject is the possessum-designating substantive qualified by the possessor-designating substantive in the genitive; as for the predicate, it is the adjective corresponding to that of the AQPossA. Thus e.g. the following example:

\[ \text{raḡul-u-n} \quad \text{qāʿim-u-n} \quad \text{'ikrām-a-n} \quad \text{la-hā} \]

\[ \text{man.M.SI-N-1} \quad \text{standing.up.M.SI-N-1} \quad \text{honour.M.SI-A-1} \quad \text{for-3.F.SI} \]

\‘a man standing up in her honour’ /233/

does not fulfil the condition for the AQPossA because a sentence like \*\text{‘ikrāmu r-raḡuli qāʿimun} ‘the honour of the man is standing up’ is non-grammatical.

In the above example the qualifier of the adjective expresses aim: \text{'ikrāman} ‘in honour of...’. One can distinguish here other meanings expressed by accusatival qualifiers of this kind, e.g. cause, manner, and content. The qualifier expressing manner is exemplified in /234/:

\[ \text{ḡarud-u-n} \quad \text{ḥarib-ūna} \quad \text{rakḏ-a-n} \]

\[ \text{soldiers.M.PL-N-1} \quad \text{fleeing.M-PL.N-1} \quad \text{run.M.SI-A-1} \]

\‘soldiers fleeing at a run’ /234/

In the following example, the qualifier expresses content:

\[ \text{ḡardal-u-n} \quad \text{malī'-u-n} \quad \text{galḵ-a-n} \]

\[ \text{bucket.M.SI-N-1} \quad \text{full.M.SI-N-1} \quad \text{ice.M.SI-A-1} \]

\‘a bucket full of ice’ (Liṣṣ 41) /235/
Some of these constructions, such as those in /233/ and /234/, are rather infrequently used in MWA. They did not occur in the corpus and therefore examples had to be invented.

Since the syntagms discussed here have synonymous syntagms with qualificators in prepositional phrases governed by the adjectives, their qualificators in the accusative will be interpreted as recta of the adjectives. By contrast, syntagms with qualificators having the accusatival form but no synonymous syntagms with qualificators in other cases, including prepositional phrases, thus showing a fixed morphological form, will be considered as syntagms based on lexical junction (see chapter 5.13.).

5.11. Prepositional qualificators of non-substantivized adjectives

Non-substantivized adjectives can be qualified by prepositional phrases. In contrast to antegenitivally and sufically substantivized adjectives discussed in chapters 5.6.4. and 5.7.2., which allowed such a qualification only for elatives, a non-substantivized adjective can be qualified in this manner irrespective of whether it is an elative or a positive. Below, we provide only a short list of examples but their repertory is much larger.

Examples with substantival qualificators in the PP:

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{mawāddu} & \text{wadūd-at-u-n} & \text{li} & \text{l-\'ażūn-i} \\
\text{substances.NH.PL.-I} & \text{friendly-NH.PL.-I} & \text{to} & \text{D-ozone.M.SI-G} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘ozone-friendly substances’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, Maḍārru ‘aṣti‘ati...) /236/

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{\'alā l-hjiṭābāt-i} & \text{l-\muwaqqāt-at-i min} & \text{waẓīr-i} & \text{s-\şabāb-i} \\
\text{on letters.NH.PL.-G} & \text{D-signed-NH.PL.-G} & \text{by} & \text{minister.M.SI-G D-youth.M.PL.-G} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘on the letters signed by the Minister of Youth’ (‘Ahram 29/01/03, 28, Ḥuṣṣaṭī tī lī 'irādī...) /237/

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{\'Ūrābbā hiya l-\'aqdām-u} & \text{fi ṭrawābīṭ-l-nā} & \text{s-sayyi‘i-i} & \text{min-hā} \\
\text{Europe.F.N} & \text{3.F.SI D-oldest.NG.NN-N} & \text{in ties.NH.PL.-G 1.PL} & \text{D-bad.NG.NN-G of-3.NH.PL.} \\
\text{wa} & \text{l-ḥasan-i} & \text{and} & \text{D-good.NH.NN-G} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘Our oldest ties, both bad and good, are those with Europe’ lit. ‘Europe is the oldest […] in [terms of] ties with us, [both] bad and good’ (Riyād 24/4/04, 1, Li naktub ‘aqdan ǧadīdan…)/238/

Examples with adjectival qualificators in the PP:

al-ʾamn-u fī l-ʾUrdunn-i ḫaṭṭ-u-n ʾakṭar-u min ʾahmar-a
‘security in Jordan is a line [which is] more than red’ (Ra’y 2, Lan yamurrū /239/

ʾanna ʾilāqat-a d-duktūr-i […] kānat ʾakṭar-a min ʾūgbīyy-at-i-n
that relation.F.SI-A D-doctor.M.SI-G was more.NG.NN-A.1 than positive-F.SI-G.1
‘that the doctor’s relation was more than positive’ (ʾAhrām 29/01/03, 30, ʾAzmatu l-minaṣṣati…)/240/

Examples with pronominal qualificators in the PP:

kay yaʿiyya l-fard-u ʾanna ʾamn-a-hu munāṭ-u-n bi-hī
‘that [every] individual knows that his security depends on him’ (Gāzīra 2, Gāyμatu l-ʾamni…)/241/

nuḡūm-u s-samāʾ-i ʾaqrab-u ʾilay-hā min-nī
‘the stars of the sky are closer to her than I [am]’ (Mīr 208) /242/

li ruqʿat-i l-ʾard-i l-mawgūd-i fī-hā n-nabāt-u
‘of the piece of the land in which there is vegetation’ (ʾArabī 5/04, 124)/243/

The specialized preposition ʾiyyā is used in order to preserve the indefiniteness of the participle, especially in constructions with the participle used as secondary predicate, e.g.:

hazzat raʿs-a-hā dāʾiyy-at-a-n ʾiyyā-ya ʾilā l-ifsāḥ-i
‘she shook her head, calling me to be frank’ (Mīr 213) /244/

**Word order and linear contiguity**

Usually, the prepositional qualificator linearly follows its qualificatum. Yet, for stylistic purposes, in some cases the order is reversed, e.g.:
Although usually the qualifying PP immediately follows the qualified adjective, inserting one or more words between them seems to be always possible. As a result, the syntagm is made linearly discontiguous, e.g.:

\[ \text{Al-Manåwî} \quad \text{al-mu’ayyid-u} \quad \text{bi šiddat-i-n} \quad \text{li} \quad \text{t-ta’rîb-i} \]

‘Al-M., strongly supporting Arabicization’ (‘Arabi 5/04, 12) /246/

5.12. Passive participles of intransitive verbs (PPIV)

The syntagms involving passive participles of intransitive verbs (PPIV) to be discussed here derive their specific character from the nature of the intransitive verbs, which show prepositional rection with respect to their qualificators. \(^{169}\) Passive participles derived from such verbs retain this prepositional rection. They always have neutralized gender and number.

Since an intransitive verb has no direct object in the active voice, it has no subject in the passive voice. Cf. the active raḥḥabtu bi ǧ-dāyfi ‘I welcomed the guest’ and the passive ruḥḥiba bi ǧ-dāyfi, with the passive verb ruḥḥiba having no subject, not even an implied one. Let us remark here, too, that there are verbs which, at least in one of their meanings, have only the passive voice, e.g. ǧūṣiya ‘alay-hā ‘she fainted’, lit. ‘(it) was covered over her’.

This lack of subject in passive verbal constructions is reflected in constructions with passive participles. Namely, passive participles derived from transitive verbs may be used as attributive or predicative qualificators

---

\(^{169}\) Diem interpreted these constructions as a type of adjektivischer Satz (our ‘sententioid syntagm’) but this was criticized by Waltisberg (2005: 105f), according to whom the passive participle with a prepositional phrase “ist bloß eine komplexe nominale Konstituente in attributiver Funktion, die nur eine oberflächliche Ähnlichkeit mit den Typen 2.1. bzw. 2.2.1 des nominalisierten Relativsatzes aufweist. Die Konstruktion des Passivpartizips der Präpositionalverben entspricht alles in allem derjenigen der anderen passiven Partizipien” and should not be kept apart from normal passive participles, consequently, not treated as adjektivischer Satz (or SS, in our terminology).
of substantives corresponding to the subjects of the passive verbs from which they were derived. E.g. the passive participle *madʾuwwun* ‘invited (M.SI)’ is derived from the passive verb *duʾiya* ‘[he] was invited’. Therefore it may be used as an attributive or predicative qualifier of the substantive *d-ḏayfu* ‘the guest’, which corresponds to the subject of the passive verb *duʾiya* in a sentence *duʾiya d-ḏayfu* ‘the guest was invited’. Thus, one can say *ad-ḏayfu madʾuwwun* ‘the guest is invited’ or *ad-ḏayfu l-madʾuwwu* ‘the invited guest’. By contrast, passive participles derived from intransitive verbs, cannot be used as attributive or predicative qualifiers of substantives corresponding to the subjects of the passive verbs from which they were derived because such a subject does not exist. However, they can be used as attributive or predicative qualifiers of substantives corresponding to the substantive in the prepositional phrase qualifying the passive verb from which they were derived. But in order to do this, they must be qualified by a prepositional phrase with the pronominal suffix representing the substantive.

E.g.:

In the sentence *šukka fi t-taslīfāti* ‘the credits were doubted’, more literally ‘it was doubted as to the credits’, the passive verb *šukka* is qualified by the PP containing the substantive *t-taslīfāti* ‘the credits’. The passive participle of *šukka*, viz. *maškūkun*, can be used as an attributive or predicative qualifier of the substantive *taslīfātun* ‘credits’, which corresponds to the substantive in the PP qualifying the verb *šukka*. But in order to do this it must be qualified by the prepositional phrase with the pronominal suffix *-hā* representing this substantive. The attributive use of this participle is exemplified in /247/:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>at-taslīfāt-i</strong></th>
<th><strong>l-maškūk-i</strong></th>
<th><strong>fi-hā</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-credits.NH.PL-G</td>
<td>D-doubted.NG.NN-G</td>
<td>in-3.NH.PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘[of] suspected credits’ lit. ‘credits [that it is] doubted about them’ (Ḥayāt 2/8/07, 11, *Istihādaru ...*) /247/

If the verb is qualified by a PP containing a substantive qualified by another substantive, let us refer to them as S1 and S2, respectively, then the passive participle derived from the verb can be used as an attributive or predicative qualifier of a substantive corresponding to S2, but only if
the participle itself is qualified by a PP containing a substantive corresponding to S1 to which the pronominal suffix representing S2 is attached.

E.g.:  
In the sentence šukka bi taḥṣili d-duyūni ‘the collection of the debts was doubted’, more literally ‘it was doubted as to the collection of the debts’, the verb šukka is qualified by a PP containing taḥṣili ‘collection’ as S1, which, in turn, is qualified by d-duyūni ‘the debts’ as S2. The participle derived from the verb, viz. maškūkun ‘doubted’, can be used as an attributive or predicative qualificator of the substantive duyūnun ‘debts’, which corresponds to S2, but only if the participle itself is qualified by the PP containing the substantive taḥṣilun ‘collection’, which corresponds to S1, and to which the pronominal suffix -hā, representing S2, is attached. 
The attributive use of this participle is exemplified in /248/:  

\[
\text{ad-duyūn-i l-maškūk-i bi taḥṣil-i-hā}
\]


‘[of] the debts the collection of which is doubted’ (Hayāt 28.07, 11, Istiḥḍāru ...) /248/

Since, as we said at the beginning of the present chapter, the passive participles have neutralized gender and number, they agree with the substantive which they qualify attributively only with respect to state and case. When qualifying as predicative qualificators, there is no concord at all between them and their qualificata. E.g.:  

\[
\text{‘anna l-yahūd-a l-libiyy-ina muraḥḥab-u-n bi-him}
\]


‘that the Libyan Jews are welcome’ (Hayāt 8/4/04, 1, Yahūdu Libiyā...) /249/.

Syntagms such as (l-yahūda, muraḥḥabun) will be therefore characterized as nominativo-rectional.

A PPIV should not be confused with a predicatoid of an SS. A superficial resemblance may occur if one is dealing with an SS with its subjectoid absent, as e.g. in /124/, which we repeat here as /250/:  

\[
\text{‘anna l-kitāb-a yanbağī ‘an yunqala [...] li ‘anna-hu yuṛī}
\]

In this SS, the passive participle is qualified by the PP 'ilayhā and agrees in state and case with the qualificatum of the SS\(^{170}\). However, the verb from which this participle is derived, i.e. naqala ‘to translate’, is transitive. The subjectoid l-kitābu ‘the book’, corresponding to the subject of a passive sentence, nuqila l-kitābu ‘the book was translated’, is conceivable in this SS, but it has been not explicitly mentioned.

Let us observe here that if a PPIV is to be used as the predicate, sometimes there is a possibility of choosing one of two different constructions. One is a sentence with an impersonal subject and a predicatively used PPIV qualified by a PP containing a substantive, as in /251/:

\[
\text{lam yakun masmūḥ-a-n la-nā bi muwāghat-i-hi}
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{not was allowed.NG.NN-A-1 to-1.PL with opposition.F.SI-G-3.M.SI}
\end{align*}

‘it was not allowed to us to oppose it’ (‘Ahrām 22.01.03, 13, ‘Amalu l-muṭaqqafī...)[from the verb samaḥa bi... ‘to allow something’]. /251/

The other possibility is a topic-comment construction, with the substantive functioning as the topic. The PPIV is then used as the predicate of the comment and is qualified by a PP containing a pronominal suffix representing the topic-substantive, as in /252/:

\[
\text{muwāghat-u-hu lam yakun masmūḥ-a-n bi-hā}
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{opposition.F.SI-N-3.M.SI not its was allowed.NG.NN-A-1 with-3.F.SI /252/}
\end{align*}

A PPIV may also function as a secondary predicate, e.g.:

\[
saqatā maḡšiy-y-a-n ʿalay-himā
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{they-fell.DU covered.NG.NN-A-1 over-3.DU}
\end{align*}

‘they two fell down fainting’ lit. ‘being covered upon’ (Liḥṣ 162) [from the verb ġušiyā ʿalayhi ‘to faint’]. /253/

---

\(^{170}\) In this example, the participle also agrees with it with respect to gender and number, which, as we said in chapter 5.4.6., is non-classical. However, in our corpus we have encountered no example of this kind of construction with classical concord which could be presented here as similar to a syntagm with PPIV.
In our corpus we encountered a construction related to that with PPIV, yet with a non-participial adjective, viz. the elative ‘ahwaḡ, qualified by a PP ‘ilayhi:


It seems that the elative was used with a PP qualifying it in a way similar to a synonymous PPIV with a PP, muḥṭāḡan ‘ilayhi ‘needed’ lit. ‘needed to’ The elative ‘ahwaḡa is cognate to the PPIV muḥṭāḡan, therefore we will discuss it here. Since elatives are neutralized in terms of diathesis, and ‘ahwaḡa means both ‘more needed’ and ‘more in need’, such a qualifying PP was used in /254/ in order to remove ambiguity.

A PPIV can be qualified by qualificators other than the obligatory PP. These qualificators include other PPs, e.g. the agent phrase, as showed in the following example:

‘iğmāliyy-u qimat-i l-‘uqūd-i t-taṣđiriyy-at-i l-muṣarrah-i 
li l-‘Irāq-i bi-hā mina l-‘Umam-i l-Muttaḥid-at-i to D-Iraq.M-G with-3.NH.PL from D-nations.NH.PL-G D-united-NH.PL-G ‘the total value of export contracts permitted to Iraq by the United Nations’ [from the verb šarраḥa bi ‘to permit’] (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 17, Irtifā’u taklīfati...) /256/

Finally, let us remark that PPIVs can be used in independent substantivization. Then, the pronominal suffix attached to the preposition is the only indicator of the gender and number of the designatum of the PPIV, e.g.:

‘ilā dawī l-maḡniyy-i ‘alay-him 
to relatives.M.PL.G D-harmed.NG.NN-G on-3.M.PL ‘to the relatives of the victims’ (Hayāt 8/4/04, 2, Qāḍi ṣ-Ṣadru...) [from the verb ḡanā ‘alā... ‘to harm someone’]. /257/
Here, only from the pronominal suffix -him attached to the preposition is it known that the expression in bold designates more than two victims which are of masculine gender.

5.13. Adverbial qualifiers with lexical junction

In this chapter we will present some adverbial qualifiers which will be described as qualifying the adjectives in lexical junction. Treating them as lexico-junctional qualifiers is justified by the fact that since they have no synonymous correspondents in other cases, including prepositional phrases, they should be considered uninflected. Although some of these qualifiers are substantives, their meaning got detached from the original and became specialized. E.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{‘anna-hu} & \quad \text{qarîb-u-n} & \quad \text{gidd-a-n} & \quad \text{mina} & \quad \text{n-našš-i} & \quad \text{llađi...} \\
\text{that-3.M.Si} & \quad \text{close.M.Si-N-I} & \quad \text{gravity.M.Si-A-I} & \quad \text{from} & \quad \text{D-text.M.Si-G} & \quad \text{which} \\
\text{‘that it is very close to the text which...’} & \quad \text{(Hâyât 8/4/04, 1, Ŧuddâm li Štâk... /258/)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bi} & \quad \text{ṣiyâğa-i-n} & \quad \text{fanniyy-at-i-n} & \quad \text{muḥtalif-at-i-n} & \quad \text{tamâm-a-n} \\
\text{with} & \quad \text{composition.F.Si-G-I} & \quad \text{artistic.F.Si-G-I} & \quad \text{different.F.Si-G-I} & \quad \text{completeness.M.Si-A-I} \\
\text{‘with a completely different artistic composition’} & \quad \text{(Tâqāfî 9/11/04, 8, Ŧarakatu r-raqiś... /259/)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fi} & \quad \text{l-qânn-i} & \quad \text{l-ḡâdîd-i} & \quad \text{gayr-i} & \quad \text{l-munţaz-i} & \quad \text{ba’du} \\
\text{in} & \quad \text{D-law.M.Si-G} & \quad \text{D-new.M.Si-G} & \quad \text{reverse-G} & \quad \text{D-completed.M.Si-} & \quad \text{yet} \\
\text{‘in the new law, not completed yet’} & \quad \text{‘Ânâr 3/5/04, 2, «Şadmatun» râfaqat... /260/}
\end{align*}
\]

As it can be seen, these qualifiers include modifiers of degree, viz. ġiddan ‘very’ and tamâman ‘completely’, and time, viz. ba’du ‘yet’.

5.14. From adjectival syntagms to compound words

In the present chapter we will discuss some constructions which only with difficulty could be considered to be syntagms. It seems justified to treat them as words, more specifically compound words, not syntagms. For this reason they will be not included into the typology of syntagms to be presented in the next part of our study.
That one is dealing with compound words here is visible in the syntactic behaviour of these units, which differs from that of adjectival syntagms. In examples /261/ and /262/ we show compounds in which the ‘substantival’ unit is the first component and the ‘adjectival’ unit is the second. As a result a new substantive comes to being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sikirtr#</th>
<th>‘āmm-u?</th>
<th>muhāfazat-i</th>
<th>Matrūh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘the secretary general of the province Matrūh’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 31, Ḥaaqqur-raddli...) /261/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mudir#</th>
<th>‘āmm-u?</th>
<th>l-‘abniyat-i</th>
<th>l-ta‘limyy-at-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘the general director of educational buildings’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 11, Fi marḥalatii...) /262/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallelly, classical constructions in the form of regular syntagms are used, with a corresponding adjective functioning as the attribute, cf. the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>as-sikirtr-u</th>
<th>l-‘āmm-u</th>
<th>l-muhāfazat-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘the secretary general of the province’ /263/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The components of constructions like these in /261/ and /262/ are unable to be inflected in accordance with Arabic grammar. The first component of the compound, e.g. mudīr- in /262/, is rather uninflected, whence the sign #. If the whole mudīr# ‘āmm- were to be interpreted as a syntagm, the ‘adjectival’ component of the entire construction would be qualified by a substantive in the genitive case, muhāfazati, which normally is impossible since attributive adjectives qualified by substantives always result in an AQPossG. The ‘adjectival’ component could be considered inflected, then it should agree with the ‘substantival’ component, but this is little probable (hence the sign ‘?’)\textsuperscript{171}. In pronunciation, no specific inflectional ending seems to be used in these places. Native speakers tend to be unable to provide an ‘explanation’ to this problem. Although such constructions are widely used, they are controversial from the point of view of normative

\textsuperscript{171} Wehr showed that the compound word behaves like one word and can accept genitival qualificators (Wehr 1943: 38, from Blau 1973: 197). Note the vocalization of the example adduced by Blau: mudīr(u) ‘āmm(u) l-lāgiatan ‘the general director of the refugees’ (1973: 197). Cf. also Badawi et al. (2004: 139).
grammar. Perhaps spoken language was not without influence on the origination of such constructions\textsuperscript{172}.

There are also examples without a genitive qualifier but showing no concord in state between the ‘substantival’ and the ‘adjectival’ components, e.g.:

\begin{verbatim}
'ilā mudīr-i  l-muḥābarāt-i  l-fārīq#  'awwal-i?  Sa'd Ḥayr
\end{verbatim}


‘to the director of the intelligence service, lieutenant general S.H.’ lit. ‘first lieutenant’ (Ṣaqr 14/4/04, 1, Al-'Urdunnu yakṣifu ‘an...)\textsuperscript{173} /264/

\begin{verbatim}
li s-sayyid-i  l-liwāʾ#  mutaqāʾid-i?
\end{verbatim}


‘to Mr. Retired Admiral...’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 33, obituary) /265/

This phenomenon concerns mainly words denoting titles and ranks. But also the following administrative term could be interpreted in the same way\textsuperscript{174}:

\begin{verbatim}
raʾš-u  maḏlis#  maḥalliyy-i?  l-muḥāfazat-i
\end{verbatim}

‘president of the local council of the province’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 28 Ḥuṭṭatun li ḫunṣi?) /266/

Another non-canonical construction is a compound resulting from combining a substantive with an adjective and attaching to the latter the adjectival nisba-prefix -iyy-. As a result, a new adjective comes into being. If the adjective is definite, the article can be attached to both components as in /267/:

\begin{verbatim}
fi mašrūʿ-i-hā  ǧ-šarq#  al-ʿawsaṭiy-i
\end{verbatim}

‘in its Middle Eastern projects’ (Miṭāq 20/4/2004, 4) [from ǧ-šarqu l-ʿawsatu ‘the Middle East’] /267/

\textsuperscript{172} I owe these remarks to Prof. Zaborski.

\textsuperscript{173} Note the vocalization of the example adduced by Blau: al-fāriq(u) awwal(u) ‘the lieutenant general’ (1973: 197).

\textsuperscript{174} For that matter, Krahl (1985: 73, fn. 101) gives the technical term rasm bayānī az-zaman wa 'd-ḍaḡt ‘Zeit-Druck-Diagramm’ as an example.
However, the article may be attached only to the first component:

\[\text{al-}^{\text{i}}\text{ilqät-}^{\text{i}} \quad \text{l-}^{\text{i}}\text{amrikiyy-at-}^{\text{i}} \quad \text{l-}^{\text{i}}\text{arabiyy-at-}^{\text{i}} \quad \text{aawi} \quad \text{š-šarq#} \quad \text{awsafiyy-at-i}\]

\text{D-relations.NH.PL-G} \quad \text{D-American-NH.PL-G} \quad \text{D-Arab-NH.PL-G} \quad \text{or} \quad \text{D-east.M.Si# medial-NH.PL-G}

‘[of] the American-Arab or Middle Eastern relations’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 6) /268/

There are also compound adjectives that seem to have been derived from genitival constructions, e.g.:

\[\text{miṭla [...] n-numūr-i} \quad \text{š-šarq#} \quad \text{āsiyawiyy-at-i}\]

\text{like D-tigers.NH.PL-G} \quad \text{D-east.M.Si#} \quad \text{Asian-NH.PL-G}

‘like East-Asian tigers’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 30, \textit{Ad-duktūru Surūr...}) /269/

with the adjective derived probably from šarqu Šāsiyā ‘the East of Asia’. However, it is also possible that the basis for this neologism was the adjective Šāsiyawiyyun ‘Asian’ to which the substantival component aš-šarq- was prefixed.

Finally, let us remark that also adjectives that are probably patterned after constructions used in European languages and could be considered loan translations, such as Šanklū-šaksūniyy- ‘Anglo-Saxon’ (Mītāq 20.4.04,15), Štūsūriyy- ‘Italo-Syrian’ (Mīr 117) or sūsiyū-šārīḥīyyi- ‘socio-historic’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 7) will be treated as words, not syntagms. In all examples, the article \textit{al}- can be attached only at the beginning, i.e. to the first component.
PART 6. TYPOLOGY

In what follows we will present our proposal of a typology of biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms in MWA. The typology is based on the nine syntagmal dimensions proposed in chapter 1.3. Every syntagmal dimension contains homogeneous syntagmal properties. Every syntagmal property specifies a type, i.e. a category of syntagms that show this property. The typology is presented in the form of a list of syntagmal types, i.e. categories, each of them being specified by one syntagmal property. Since it is impossible to list all syntagms belonging to a given type, only examples of them are presented. The types are arranged in accordance with the dimensions containing properties specifying them. The denomination of a syntagmal property is used to refer to the type specified by it.

Examples of syntagms are given in brackets: (). The qualificatum is given first, the qualificator following it after a comma. This rule is observed also with Qr-fronted syntagms, which will therefore be marked by the sign ‘◊’ after the qualificator, which indicates that the syntagm occurred as Qr-fronted in our corpus. Adjectives are printed in bold. Every example is followed by its English translation. The translation is not intended to reflect the grammatical structure of a syntagm, which has been already discussed in the descriptive part of the dissertation. The place where a syntagm occurred in the descriptive part is indicated after the translation within slashes: the first number is that of Part, the second number, after the dot, is that of the example. Some isolated cases have not been discussed in the descriptive part. Then, a cross-reference to a closely related syntagm is provided by a number within slashes preceded by “cf.”. Words between square brackets are not constituents of exemplified syntagms but are given in order to make them more comprehensible.
6.1. Dimension 1. Qualificational status of the adjective

Adjectivo-qualificatality:

\{('ağmalu, kalimatin) \text{ ‘the most beautiful word’} /5.169/},
\{(‘aqrabu, ’ilayhā) \text{ ‘closer to her’} /5.242/},
\{(wāsi‘atu, n-niṭāqi) \text{ ‘wide-ranging’} /5.73/,...\}

Adjectivo-qualificatoriality:

\{((l-mumarriṭātī, l-bulgāriyyātī) \text{ ‘of the Bulgarian nurses’} /3.1/},
\{(kānat, siyāsiyyatan) \text{ ‘was political’} /5.25/},
\{(Nikūl, ḥāmilun) \text{ ‘Nicole is pregnant’} /5.19/},
\{(minḥā, muṭṭātān) \text{ ‘than [it being] extinguished’} /5.68/},
\{('lānuuki, ‘arwa‘u)Ø \text{ ‘your declaration is stranger’} /5.24/,...\}

Bi-adjectivality:

\{('aḡdidatun, kulliyyan) \text{ ‘completely new’} /5.132/},
\{(‘akṭara, min ‘iḡābiyyatin) \text{ ‘more than positive’} /5.240/},
\{(gāni, ‘ahammi [markazin]) \text{ ‘the second most important [centre]’} /5.155/,...\}

6.2. Dimension 2. Partiorative membership of the co-constituent of the adjective

Co-constituency with S:

\{('ağmalu, kalimatin) \text{ ‘the most beautiful word’} /5.169/},
\{(l-mumarriḍātī, l-bulgāriyyātī) \text{ ‘of the Bulgarian nurses’} /3.1/,...\}

Co-constituency with V:

\{('an nantaqidahu, mawḍā‘iyyan) \text{ ‘that we criticize it objectively’} /5.128/},
\{(turğimat, ’ilā ‘akṭāri [l-ğāti] \text{ ‘was translated into most [languages]’} /5.177/},
\{(rağa‘a, sakrāna) \text{ ‘[he] returned drunk’} /5.50/,...\}

Co-constituency with P:

\{(huwa, l-mas‘ālu) \text{ ‘he is responsible’} /5.20/},
(munḏun, bihi) ‘depending on him’ /5.241/,
(minhā, mufa’atan) ‘than [it being] extinguished’ /5.68/, ...

Co-constituency with N:
{(al-ʾarbaʿina, l-mādiyati) ‘the past fourty’ /3.49/,
(mina s-sabʿati, r-rābiḥīna) ‘of the winning seven’ /3.51/, ...

Co-constituency with Adj:
{(gālidatun, kullīyan) ‘completely new’ /5.132/,
(ʾakṭara, min ʾiĝābiyyatin) ‘more than positive’ /5.240/,
(tāni, ʾahammi [markazin]) ‘the second most important [centre]’ /5.155/,...

6.3. Dimension 3. Intracategory differentiation of the adjectival constituent

Elatival qualificatality:
{(ʾaḡmalu, kalimatin) ‘the most beautiful word’ /5.169/,
(ʾaqrabu, ʾilayhā) ‘closer to her’ /5.242/,
(ʾakṭaruḥum, waflada)  ‘most of them came’ /4.38/,...

Positival qualificatality:
{(munḏun, bihi) ‘depending on him’ /5.241/,
(wāṣiʿatu, n-nilāqi) ‘wide-ranging’ /5.73/,
(sādiṣu [zawḡāṭihi, dafanathu)  ‘the sixth [of his wives] buried him’ /5.156/,
( kabīru l-ʾamali, lanā)  ‘we have great [hope]’ /5.46/,...

Elatival qualificatoriality:
{(turgimat, ʾiṭā ʾakṭari [l-luḡāti)] ‘was translated into most [languages]’ /5.177/,
(ʾalā l-qaradati, l-ʿulūyā) ‘on the higher apes’ /3.4/,
(ʾiʿlānuki, ʿarwaʿu)  ‘your declaration is stranger’ /5.24/,...

Positival qualificatoriality:
{(l-mumarriṭti, l-bulḡariyyāti) ‘[of] the Bulgarian nurses’ /3.1/,
(taʿmiru, rābiʿil [tāʾiratin]) ‘the repair of the fourth [plane]’ /5.7/,
(minhā, mufaʿatan) ‘than [it being] extinguished’ /5.68/,
Elatival qualificatality with elatival qualificatoriality:

\{('ağdaru, bi 'ağmali [kalimatin]) \quad \text{‘worthier of the most beautiful [word]’} \quad \text{cf./5.239/, /5.169/}

\('ašaddu [t-taʾtiri, li-ʾakbarihim) \quad \text{‘the biggest of them has the strongest [influence]’} \quad \text{cf. /4.35/, ...} \}

Positival qualificatality with positival qualificatoriality:

\{('āgnašbiyyi, šarqiyyi [ʾĀsiyā]) \quad \text{‘in South Eastern [Asia]’} \quad /5.150/, 
(sādisu [zawgātihi, šabbatun) \quad \text{‘the sixth [of his wives] is young’} \quad \text{cf. /5.156/ ...} \}

Elatival qualificatality with positival qualificatoriality:

\{('akṭara, min ṭābiyyatin \quad \text{‘more than positive’} \quad /5.240/, 
(ʿağlabuhā, kāminatun) \quad \text{‘most of them are hidden’} \quad /4.42/,...} \}

Positival qualificatality with elatival qualificatoriality:

\{('ānīl, 'ahammi [markazin]) \quad \text{‘the second most important [centre]’} \quad /5.155/, 
(sādisu [zawgātihi] 'aṣgaru) \quad \text{‘the sixth [of his wives] is younger’} \quad \text{cf. /5.155/, ...} \}

6.4. Dimension 4. Kind of morphological indicators

Prepositional-rectionality:

\{('abhaği, fi l-karami) \quad \text{‘most splendid in generosity’} \quad /5.199/, 
('akjara, min ṭābiyyatin) \quad \text{‘more than positive’} \quad /5.240/, 
(l-maškāki, bi taḥṣilihā) \quad \text{‘whose collection is doubted’} \quad /5.248/, 
('aqrabu, ilayhā) \quad \text{‘closer to her’} \quad /5.242/, 
(laysat, bi ʾaqalla) \quad \text{‘is not less’} \quad /5.32/, 
(taʾtirun, li ʾakbarihim) \quad \text{‘the biggest of them has influence’} \quad \text{cf. /4.35/}, 
('ašaddu [t-taʾtiri, li-ʾakbarihim) \quad \text{‘the biggest of them has the strongest [influence]’} \quad \text{cf. /4.35/,...}}
Nominativo-rectionality:

{(Níkūl, hāmilīn) ‘Nicole is pregnant’ /5.19/,
(i’lānūkī, ‘arwa’u) ‘your declaration is stranger’ /5.24/,
(‘ānna l-yahūda, muraḥḥabun [bihīm]) ‘that the Jews are welcome’ /5.249/,...}

Accusativo-rectionality:

{(munaffīdanī, l-‘amaliyya) ‘carrying out the action’ /5.219/,
(ḥaḏiran, ‘aṣadda [l-ḥaḏari]) ‘extremely cautious’ /5.231/,...}

Genitivo-rectionality:

{(‘aḡmalu, kalimatin) ‘the most beautiful word’ /5.169/,
(qānīl, ‘ahammi [markazin]) ‘the second most important [centre]’ /5.155/,
(gayru, mašrū‘atīn) ‘illegal’ /5.1/,
(wāsī‘atū, n-niṭāqi) ‘wide-ranging’ /5.73/,...}

Gender-concordiality:

{‘āmani, l-mādiyyatu) ‘the past years’ /3.49/,...}

State-, gender-, number- and case-concordiality:

{(l-mumarridāti, l-bulḡāriyyāti) ‘[of] the Bulgarian nurses’ /3.1/,
(‘ulā l-qaradati, l-‘ulyā) ‘on the higher apes’ /3.4/, ...}

State-, gender- and number-concordiality:

{(al-ḡusaymātu, taḥta d-ḍarriyyatī) ‘subatomic particles’ /5.13/,...}

State-, gender- and case-concordiality:

{(šaḥsan, ʿāharīna) ‘other persons’ /3.52/,...}

State-, number- and case-concordiality:

{(al-arba’anā, l-mādiyyatī) ‘the past fourty’ /3.49/,...}

State- and case-concordiality:

{(al-quwwawatū, l-‘aẓamu) ‘the most potent power’ /3.24/,
(ḥuṭṭatīn, ṭamāḥīn) ‘[of] an ambitious plan’ /3.16/,...}
Gender- and number-concordiality:

\{(sittata 'ašara [šahsan], 'alḥarīna)\} ‘sixteen other [persons]’ /3.52/,
(wildiyatuhu, l-muntahiyati) ‘whose term of office is ending’ 5.114/,...

Nominativo-rectionality with gender- and number-concordiality:

\{(al-ḥubbu, ǧamilun)\} ‘love is beautiful’ /5.18/,
('aḡlabuhā, kāminatun) ‘most of them are hidden’ / 4.42/, ...

Prepositional-rectionality with gender- and number concordiality:

\{(wasfuḥu, bi l-haziyyi)\} ‘its description as ridiculous’ cf. /5.40/,
(yā laka, min ǧabtyyin) ‘How stupid you are!’ /4.20/, ...

Accusativo-rectionality with gender-concordiality:

\{(ǧā’ [r-riğālu], rākiṭīna)\} ‘[the men] came running’ /5.67/,...

Accusativo-reactionality with gender- and number-concordiality:

\{(bi wasfihim, ǧāmiḍina)\} ‘by describing them as obscure’ /5.39/,
(kānat, stīṣīyyatan) ‘[it] was political’ /5.22/,
(al-madinatu, muḍa’atan) ‘the city illuminated’ /5.68/,
(al-muṣannafu, ‘awwala) ‘seeded first’ /5.35/,
(minhā, muṛa’atan) ‘than it [being] extinguished’ /5.68/,...

Lexico-junctionality:

\{(qarībun, ḡiddan\}) ‘very close’ /5.258/,
(l-munḡazi, ba’du) ‘[not] completed yet’ /5.260/,
(‘alwānumḥa, muḥtaflīn) ‘multicoloured’ /5.124/,...

6.5. Dimension 5. Linear order of the constituents

Qm-frontedness:

\{'aḡmalu, kalimat\} ‘the most beautiful word’ /5.169/,
(l-mumarrdāti, l-bulḡāriyyāti) ‘[of] the Bulgarian nurses’ /3.1/,
(‘an nantaqīdahu, mawī′iyyan) ‘that we criticize it objectively’ /5.128/,
(wadūdatun, li l-‘uzūnī) ‘ozone-friendly’ /5.236/,
(Nîkûl, ħâmilun) ‘Nicole is pregnant’ /5.19/,
(huwa, l-mas‘ûlu) ‘he is responsible’ /5.20/, ...

**Qr-frontedness:**

\{ (ittahaḍa, sarî‘an) \} ‘quickly [they] adopted’ /5.130/,
\{ (‘akbara, ‘adadiyyan) \} ‘quantitatively the biggest’ /5.150/,
\{ (maqmi‘atun, qadimatan) \} ‘a group, coming’ /5.46/,
\{ (sakârâ, bi t-тарabi) \} ‘drunk with joy’ /5.245/,
\{ (‘i‘länuki, ‘arwa‘u) \} ‘your declaration is stranger’ /5.24/,
\{ ( kabîru [l-‘amali], lanâ) \} ‘we have great [hope]’ /5.46/,
\{ (wilâyatu, l-muntahiyat) \} ‘whose term of office is ending’ /5.114/,...

**6.6. Dimension 6. Linear contiguity of the constituents**

**Obligatory Contiguity:**

\{ (‘ağmalu, kalimatin) \} ‘the most beautiful word’ /5.169/,
\{ (wâsi‘atu, n-nilâqi) \} ‘wide-ranging’ /5.73/,
\{ (fi ġanûbiyyi, šarqiyyi [‘Ásiyâ] \} ‘in South Eastern [Asia]’ /5.150/,
\{ (wilâyatu, l-muntahiyat) \} ‘whose term of office is ending’ /5.114/,...

**Optional Discontiguity:**

\{ (l-mumarrîdîtti, l-bulgâriyyatî) \} ‘[of] the Bulgarian nurses’ /3.1/,
\{ (‘aqrabu, ‘ilayhâ) \} ‘closer to her’ /5.242/,
\{ (al-ḥubbu, ġamlun) \} ‘love is beautiful’ /5.18/,
\{ (laysat, bi ‘aqalla) \} ‘is not less’ /5.32/, ...

**Obligatory Discontiguity:**

\{ (‘aṣqqgqa [awqâtîn], ‘alaynâ \} ‘the most difficult [times] for us’ /5.198/,
\{ (bâbu [huğratîn], maftûhun) \} ‘the open door [of the room]’ /3.41/, ...}
6.7. Dimension 7. Syntactic function of the adjective in statu qualificatoris

Qr-attributivity:

\{(l-mumarridāti, l-bulğāriyyāti)\} ‘of the Bulgarian nurses’ /3.1/,
\{('alā l-qaradāti, l-'ulāyā)\} ‘on the higher apes’ /3.4/,
\{(ta'mīru, rābi'i [tā'iratin])\} ‘the repair of the fourth [plane]’ /5.154/,
\{(gayru, mašrū'atīn)\} ‘illegal’ /5.1/,...}

Qr-basic predicativity:

\{(al-hubbū, ġamilun)\} ‘love is beautiful’ /5.18/,
\{('arwa'u, 'i'lānukī)\} ‘your declaration is stranger’ /5.24/,...}

Qr-extended predicativity:

\{(laysat, bi 'aqalla)\} ‘is not less’ /5.32/,
\{(kānāt, siyāsīyyātān)\} ‘was political’ /5.25/,...}

Qr-secondary predicativity:

\{(raġa'a, sakrāna)\} ‘[he] returned drunk’ /5.50/,
\{(minhā, mufta'atān)\} ‘than [it being] extinguished’ /5.68/,...}

Qr-exclamative predicativity:

\{(yā laka, min ġabiyyīn)\} ‘How stupid you are!’ /4.20/,...}

Qr-predicatoidity:

\{(wilāyatuhu, l-muntahiyāti)\} ‘whose term of office is ending’ /5.114/,...}

Qr-direct objectivity:

\{(lam yuṭīhā, kabīra ['ināyatin])\} ‘did not paid much [attention] to it’ /5.153/,
\{(yuṣakki'lu, 'akbara [da'min])\} ‘[it] constitutes the biggest [support]’ /5.172/,...}

Qr-indirect objectivity:

\{(turğimat, 'iša 'akṭāri [l-ṣuğāti])\} ‘was translated into most [languages]’ /5.177/,
\{(li tu'rība, 'an fā'iqi [taqdirihā])\} ‘to express her highest [esteem]’ /5.151/,...}
Qr-internal objectivity:

{(taṣmuḍu, ‘arwa’a [ṣumūdin])} ‘[it] shows the most marvellous defiance’ /5.170/,...

Qr-adverbiality:

{(yadda‘î, dūna kağıri [mubālağatīn])} ‘[he] claims without much [exaggeration]’ /4.33/,

(kānat, ‘alā ‘aṣaddihā) ‘[they] were at their strongest’ /4.40/,

(‘an nantaqidahu, mawḏū‘iyyan) ‘that we criticize it objectively’ /5.128/,...

6.8. Dimension 8. Syntactic function of the adjective in statu qualificati

Qm-attributivity:

{(‘idānātān) wāsī‘ātā, n-nītāqī} ‘wide-ranging [condemnation]’ /5.73/,

(‘īf l-‘āṭfālī, l-‘aqallī, ḥaḡman) ‘[in children] with the smallest bodies’ /5.102/,

(‘īna‘mirūr) rābī‘ī, ṭā‘iratīn) ‘[the repair] of the fourth plane’ /5.154/,...

Qm-basic predicativity:

{(‘anna l-yahūda) muraḥḥabun, bihiim) ‘[that the Jews are] welcomed’ /5.249/,

(‘īn māddattātī) qarībatu, š-šabahi) ‘[the substance is] close in resemblance’ /5.82/,...

Qm-extended predicativity:

{(‘yakīnu) muwḡaba, š-shaḥnati) ‘[it may be] positive in charge’ /5.79/,

(‘kāna) ‘aḡḥalahu, bi funūni) ‘[he was] the most ignorant of them in the arts of’ /5.218/

Qm-secondary predicativity:

{(‘ar-risālatu) mutamminatātīn, al-ḥirṣā) ‘[the letter] appreciating the concern’ /5.48/,

(‘qāla) multaqgān, bi l-ḥadīthī) ‘[it said,] taking pleasure in conversation’ /5.62/,...
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Qm-predicatoidity:
\{\{[n-nabātu] \textit{l-mawğūdi}, fīhā\}\} \quad \text{‘in which there is [vegetation]’} \quad /5.118/...

Qm-direct objectivity:
\{\{[yušakkilu] \textit{akbara}, da\’min\}\} \quad \text{‘[it constitutes] the biggest aid’} \quad /5.172/;
\{\{[lam yu\’tihā] \textit{ka\'bira}, ‘ināyatin\}\} \quad \text{‘[did not paid] much attention [to it]’} \quad /5.153/, ...

Qm-indirect objectivity:
\{\{[turğimat] \textit{ilå kâ\’gari}, l-lu\’gåti\}\} \quad \text{‘[was translated] into most languages’} \quad /5.177/,...

Qm-internal objectivity:
\{\{[taşmudu] \textit{arwa`a}, şumüdin\}\} \quad \text{‘[shows] the most marvellous defiance’} \quad /5.170/, cf. /5.231/,
\{[ha\'diran] \textit{ašadda}, l-\textit{ha\'dari}\} \quad \text{‘extremely cautious’} \quad /5.231/,...

Qm-adverbiality:
\{\{[yadda`l] \textit{dûna ka\’fåri}, mubåla\’gåtin\}\} \quad \text{‘[he claims] without much exaggeration’} \quad /4.33/, ...

Qm-subjectivity:
\{\{sâdisu [zawğåtihi], dafanathu\}\} \quad \text{‘the sixth [of his wives] buried him’} \quad /5.156/,
\{[ka\’båru [l-\’amåli], lanå\}\} \quad \text{‘we have great [hope]’} \quad /5.46/, ...

Qm-subjectoidity:
\{\{wilåyåtu\,h, l-muntåhiyåtå\}\} \quad \text{‘whose term of office is ending’} \quad /5.114/,...

6.9. Dimension 9. Degree of the requiredness of the qualifier of the adjective

Optional qm-qualifiedness:
\{\{lu\’gåtu\,h] \textit{gu\’dåtåtu}, küllyåyan\}\} \quad \text{‘[a] completely new [language]’} \quad /5.132/,
\{[kåna] \textit{ha\’dirån}, \textit{a\’şaddå [l-\’hådåri]}\} \quad \text{‘[he was] extremely cautious’} \quad /5.231/,
\{[ga\’yåru] \textit{l-mun\’gåzi}, ba\’du\} \quad \text{‘[not] completed yet’} \quad /5.260/,
([kàna] ʾaḡhalahum, bi funûnî) ‘[he was] the most ignorant of them in the arts
[of...]’ /5.218/, ...

Obligatory qm-qualifiedness:

{{[ʾidânān] wāṣīʿata, n-niṭâqi} ‘wide-ranging [condemnation]’ /5.73/,
([yaddaʾi] dīnā kafrî, mubālağatin) ‘[he claims without much [exaggeration]’
/4.33/,
([n-nabāʾu] l-mawǧūdî, fîhā) ‘in which there is [vegetation]’ /5.118/,
([ʾanna l-yahūda] muraḫḫabun, bihim) ‘[that the Jews are] welcomed’ /5.249/,...

6.10. Discussion

With respect to each of the nine dimensions every syntagm is characterized by exactly one property. The all nine syntagmal properties that a syntagm shows with respect to the all nine syntagmal dimensions will constitute its syntagmal characterization. As examples, below we present the syntagmal characterizations of three biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms.

Ex. 1.: (ʾaḡmalu, kalimatin) ‘the most beautiful word’.

in: hiya ʾaḡmalu kalimatin ‘It is the most beautiful word’.

Dim 1: Adjectivo-qualificatality.
Dim 2: Co-constituency with S.
Dim 3: Elatival qualificatality.
Dim 4: Genitivo-rectionality.
Dim 5: Qm-frontedness.
Dim 6: Obligatory contiguity.
Dim 7: Indefinibility.
Dim 8: Qm-basic predicativity.
Dim 9: Obligatory qm-qualifiedness.
Syntagms can be compared with one another with respect to their syntagmal characterizations. For instance, all three syntagms exemplified above are similar to one another with respect to Dim 2, since all of them belong to the type ‘Co-constituency with S’. However, each of them is different from the others with respect to Dim 4.

The syntagm of Ex. 2 is similar to the syntagm of Ex. 3 with respect to Dimensions 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9 (the two latter properties being Indefinibility) but it differs from it with respect to Dimensions 4, 5, 6 and 7.

It seems that the similarity of syntagmal characterizations of any two syntagms may be used in order to speak of a syntagmal distance between them. Such distance can be calculated in terms of the number of dimensions with respect to which these two syntagms differ from each other. Thus, for instance, the syntagmal distance between the syntagm of
Ex. 2 and the syntagm of Ex. 1 is 7, while the syntagmal distance between the syntagm of Ex. 2 and the syntagm of Ex. 3 is 4. Consequently, we can say that, with respect to the dimensions we have proposed, the syntagm of Ex. 2 is more similar to the syntagm of Ex. 3 than to the syntagm of Ex. 1.

What is more, the distinguishing of syntagmal characterizations allows us to speak of combinability of syntagmal properties belonging to different dimensions into one syntagmal characterization. It seems that one can speak of the grammaticality or the non-grammaticality of a syntagm in terms of such combinability. A necessary, but not sufficient, condition for every syntagm to be grammatical is that its syntagmal properties must be combinable with one another into its syntagmal characterization. It seems that in order to present such a sufficient condition, a more thorough syntagmal characterization, i.e. involving more dimensions, is needed for every syntagm.

As an example, let us discuss the non-grammaticality of the syntagm *(yaduha, f-ṭūlā) exemplified in the *li r-raḡuli f-ṭūlā yaduha, intended to mean ‘to the man whose hand is very long’, which is non-grammatical. Its syntagmal characterization would be as follows:

```
Dim 1: Adjectivo-qualificartoriality.
Dim 2: Co-constituency with S.
Dim 3: Elatival-qualificartoriality.
Dim 4: Gender- and number-concordiality.
Dim 5: Qr-frontedness.
Dim 6: Obligatory contiguity.
Dim 7: Qr-Predicatoidity.
Dim 8: Indefinibility.
Dim 9: Indefinibility.
```

The non-grammaticality of the syntagm in question can be spoken of in terms of non-combinability of the above syntagmal properties. Since there are syntagsms, such as *(wilāyatuha, l-muntahiyati) of our Ex. 2, which differ from the non-grammatical *(yaduha, f-ṭūlā) only with respect to Dim 3, it may be said that the property ‘Elatival-qualificartoriality’ is not combinable with the remainig properties included in the syntagmal characterization of *(wilāyatuha, l-muntahiyati).
Finally, let us make some remarks concerning the coherence of syntagms reflected in their morphological indicators. The syntagms showing the weakest coherence are those based on lexico-junctionality. The strongest coherence is showed by syntagms with both rection and concord. These are syntagms showing (i) Nominativo-rectionality with gender- and number-concordiality, (ii) Accusativo-rectionality with gender- and number-concordiality and (iii) Prepositional-rectionality with gender- and number-concordiality. These syntagms are those with the qualifiers in the form of basic predicates, extended predicates and secondary predicates. Thus, it can be generalized that the most coherent syntagms are syntagms which are predicative.
7. CONCLUSIONS

The typology presented above is based on theoretical concepts introduced by us in the course of this work. In order to make it possible, we have proposed a definition of the adjective as a class of words distinguished from non-adjectival nouns by virtue of their syntactic properties, although morphological and semantic properties also played a part in the definition. This definition permitted us to identify a homogeneous set of adjectives and to distinguish an adjective from a substantive in any construction encountered in the text. The repertory of adjectival syntagms was enlarged by assuming that what is traditionally analysed as adverbs (de-adjectival adverbs) is only one of the syntactic functions of the adjective. Another enlargement was caused by including antegenitively substantivized adjectives into our typology.

Along with the definition of the adjective, another important prerequisite for this typology was the use of the concepts of morphological indicators and that of the relation of qualification. In some instances, identifying the latter was not easy. It should be stressed here that assuming other solutions for the problematic cases we have discussed would have lead to a differently shaped typology. It is also evident that the results of the typology would be different if the theoretical assumptions made at the onset of the work had been changed. For instance, a different set of syntagmal types would be obtained if rectification concerning the categories of state and gender (e.g. for the adjectival adverbials) had been assumed.

In order to be able to characterize syntagms in a systematic manner, we have proposed a class of syntagmal properties, which can be assigned to syntagms. On the grounds of their homogeneity, the syntagmal properties are classed in syntagmal dimensions. For the purpose of our typology, we have proposed nine such syntagmal dimensions.

The next step on the way towards the typology was the description of biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms (Part 5). The description made with the use of the theoretical apparatus including the concept of qualification made it possible to formulate some new questions concerning
the grammar of MWA and to look at some old of them from a new perspective. From the practical point of view, not only does the descriptive part of this work represent in a systematic way the state of a fragment of MWA in its most recent stage of development, but it also includes a description of some, not necessarily new, grammatical phenomena which, as it seems, have not been duly treated in grammars of MWA or scholarly works. Here we can mention the problem of numerals qualified by adjectives (chapter 3.1.1.1.4.), non-classical gender and number concord in the sententioid syntagm (exs /5.123/ and /5.124/) or the elatival construction described in 5.6.2.3.

In our proposal of a typology of biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms in MWA presented in Part 6 we have distinguished 60 syntagmal properties grouped in 9 dimensions. These properties specified 60 syntagmal types, which we have exemplified with syntagms belonging to them. Next, we have discussed the possibility of characterizing every syntagm by assigning to it one syntagmal property from each of the 9 dimensions, thus presenting its syntagmal characterization. The latter permits syntagms to be compared with one another and to be characterized in terms of syntagmal distance between them. Finally, we have briefly discussed how syntagms differ from one another with respect to their coherence reflected in their morphological indicators.
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