

Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu  
Instytut Językoznawstwa

**A TYPOLOGY  
OF BICONSTITUENT HYPOTACTIC ADJECTIVAL SYNTAGMS  
IN MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC**

Marcin Michalski

Promotor: prof. dr hab. Jerzy Bańczerowski

Poznań 2008

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	6
ABBREVIATIONS.....	7
PRINCIPLES OF TRANSLITERATION AND GLOSSING .....	8
SUMMARY IN POLISH: STRESZCZENIE.....	10
<b>0. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>0.1. Aim .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>0.2. Method .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>0.3. Object of study: Modern Written Arabic.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>0.4. Historical view .....</b>	<b>28</b>
0.4.1. Adjective: a historical view.....	28
0.4.1.1. Western tradition .....	28
0.4.1.2. Arab tradition.....	33
0.4.1.3. Arabic adjective in Western studies .....	37
0.4.2. Qualification and syntagm: a historical view.....	39
<b>PART 1. HYPOTACTIC SYNTAGMS .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>1.1. Theoretical principles .....</b>	<b>51</b>
1.1.1. Word .....	51
1.1.2. Qualification and types of syntactic relations.....	57
1.1.3. Morphosyntax of a hypotactic syntagm .....	59
1.1.4. Morphological categories of the Arabic nouns.....	65
1.1.5. Semantics of a hypotactic syntagm .....	70
1.1.6. Phrasal qualification .....	78
1.1.7. Paratactic constituents .....	78
<b>1.2. Some difficulties related to the notion of qualification .....</b>	<b>80</b>
1.2.1. Qualification between the subject and the basic predicate.....	82
1.2.2. Qualificator qualifying more than one qualificatum .....	86

<b>1.3. Syntagmal properties and syntagmal dimensions .....</b>	<b>87</b>
1.3.1. Dimension 1. Qualificational status of the adjective.....	87
1.3.2. Dimension 2. Partiorative membership of the co-constituent of the adjective	88
1.3.3. Dimension 3. Intracategory differentiation of the adjectival constituent.....	89
1.3.4. Dimension 4. Kind of morphological indicators .....	90
1.3.5. Dimension 5. Linear order of the constituents.....	91
1.3.6. Dimension 6. Linear contiguity of the constituents.....	92
1.3.7. Dimension 7. Syntactic function of the adjective <i>in statu qualificatoris</i> .....	93
1.3.8. Dimension 8. Syntactic function of the adjective <i>in statu qualificati</i> .....	94
1.3.9. Dimension 9. Degree of the requiredness of the qualifier of the adjective.	95
 <b>PART 2. THE ARABIC ADJECTIVE .....</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2.1. Arabic adjective according to Arabists.....</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2.2. Adjectives in MWA and in Classical Arabic .....</b>	<b>102</b>
2.2.1. Major differences between adjectives and substantives.....	104
2.2.2. Problems related to the definition of the adjective in MWA .....	107
2.2.3. Definition of the adjective.....	114
2.2.4. Subcategories of the adjective .....	117
 <b>PART 3. THREE KINDS OF NON-PREDICATIVE TAUTOPTOTIC NOMINAL SYNTAGMS .....</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>3.1. Hypotaxis .....</b>	<b>125</b>
3.1.1. Attribution .....	125
3.1.1.1. Adjectival attribution .....	125
3.1.1.1.1. Discussion of adjectives with limited gender and number concord	128
3.1.1.1.2. Seemingly hypotactic adjectives.....	134
3.1.1.1.3. Linear contiguity of attributive adjectives.....	135
3.1.1.1.4. Adjectives qualifying substantives after cardinal numerals .....	135
3.1.1.2. Substantival attribution .....	139
3.1.1.2.1. Substantival attribution with suffixally substantivized adjectives (SSA).....	143
<b>3.2. Apposition.....</b>	<b>143</b>
3.2.1. Substantival apposition.....	144
3.2.1.1. Adjectival attribution or Substantival apposition? .....	149
3.2.2. Adjectival apposition.....	151
<b>3.3. Parataxis .....</b>	<b>156</b>
3.3.1. Proper adjectival parataxis .....	157
3.3.2. Adjectival juxtaposition .....	157

3.3.4. Substantival parataxis.....	158
<b>PART 4. SECONDARY FUNCTIONS OF ADJECTIVES .....</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>4.1. Adjectives as basic predicates .....</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>4.2. Adjectives as secondary predicates .....</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>4.3. Adjectives as extended predicates .....</b>	<b>165</b>
<b>4.4. Adjectives as exclamative predicates .....</b>	<b>166</b>
<b>4.5. Substantivization .....</b>	<b>167</b>
4.5.1. Anaphoric substantivization.....	169
4.5.2. Antegenitival substantivization.....	170
4.5.3. Suffixal substantivization (SSA) .....	174
4.5.4. Independent substantivization.....	176
4.5.6.1. Simple independent substantivization.....	178
4.5.6.2. Independent substantivization with syntactic and semantic surplus .....	182
4.5.6.3. Independent substantivization: specific cases .....	185
4.5.6.4. Independent substantivization: idiomatic cases.....	187
<b>4.6. Adjectives as adverbials.....</b>	<b>188</b>
<b>PART 5. REMAINING ADJECTIVAL SYNTAGMS .....</b>	<b>190</b>
<b>5.1. Qualifying adjectives as recta of genitival rection .....</b>	<b>190</b>
5.1.1. Adjectives in the genitive as recta of substantives .....	190
5.1.1.1. Adjectives as qualifiers of ‘special substantives’ .....	191
5.1.1.2. Antegenitively or suffixally substantivized adjectives as genitival qualifiers.....	193
5.1.2. Adjectives in the genitive as recta of triconsonantal prepositions.....	195
<b>5.2. Predicative syntagms .....</b>	<b>196</b>
5.2.1. Basic predicative syntagms .....	197
5.2.2. Extended predicative syntagms .....	199
5.2.3. Participles derived from extended predicative verbs.....	203
5.2.4. Predicative syntagms with antegenitively or suffixally substantivized adjectives as subjects .....	203
5.2.5. Secondary predicative syntagms.....	204
5.2.5.1. Secondary predicate in comparative constructions .....	211
<b>5.3. Adjectives qualified by a possessum-designating substantive (AQPoss) .....</b>	<b>212</b>

5.3.1. Adjectives qualified by a possessum-designating substantive in the genitive (AQPossG) .....	213
5.3.2. Adjectives qualified by a possessum-designating substantive in the accusative (AQPossA) .....	222
5.3.2.1. Elativ AQPossA.....	222
5.3.2.2. Positival AQPossA .....	226
5.3.5. Inalienable possession and the AQPoss .....	227
<b>5.4 Sententioid syntagm (SS).....</b>	<b>232</b>
<b>5.5. Adjectival adverbials .....</b>	<b>242</b>
<b>5.6. Antegenitival adjective .....</b>	<b>246</b>
5.6.1. Antegenitival Adjective: Positive.....	246
5.6.2. Antegenitival Adjective: Elative.....	252
5.6.2.1. Antegenitival elatives with indefinite qualifiers .....	252
5.6.2.2. Antegenitival elatives with definite qualifiers.....	254
5.6.2.3. Antegenitival elative: a non-classical construction.....	258
5.6.3. Antegenitival elative qualified by an accusative substantive .....	259
5.6.4. Antegenitival elative qualified by a prepositional phrase .....	260
5.6.5. Antegenitival adjective and attributive adjective: a comparison.....	261
<b>5.7. Suffixally substantivized adjective qualified by a substantive.....</b>	<b>265</b>
5.7.1. SSA qualified by accusative substantive.....	265
5.7.2. SSA qualified by a prepositional phrase .....	266
<b>5.8. Direct object of participial adjectives.....</b>	<b>266</b>
<b>5.9. Internal object.....</b>	<b>268</b>
<b>5.10. Other accusativ qualifiers with rection.....</b>	<b>270</b>
<b>5.11. Prepositional qualifiers of non-substantivized adjectives.....</b>	<b>271</b>
<b>5.12. Passive participles of intransitive verbs (PPIV).....</b>	<b>273</b>
<b>5.13. Adverbial qualifiers with lexical junction.....</b>	<b>278</b>
<b>5.14. From adjectival syntagms to compound words.....</b>	<b>278</b>
<b>PART 6. TYPOLOGY .....</b>	<b>282</b>
<b>6.1. Dimension 1. Qualificational status of the adjective.....</b>	<b>283</b>
<b>6.2. Dimension 2. Partiorative membership of the co-constituent of the adjective.....</b>	<b>283</b>

6.3. Dimension 3. Intracategory differentiation of the adjectival constituent .....	284
6.4. Dimension 4. Kind of morphological indicators .....	285
6.5. Dimension 5. Linear order of the constituents .....	287
6.6. Dimension 6. Linear contiguity of the constituents .....	288
6.7. Dimension 7. Syntactic function of the adjective <i>in statu qualificatoris</i> .....	289
6.8. Dimension 8. Syntactic function of the adjective <i>in statu qualificati</i> .....	290
6.9. Dimension 9. Degree of the requiredness of the qualifier of the adjective.....	291
6.10. Discussion .....	292
7. CONCLUSIONS .....	296
8. CORPUS LIST .....	298
9. BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	299

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The idea of writing this study emerged from conversations I had with my dissertation supervisor, Prof. Dr hab. Jerzy Bańczerowski, Institute of Linguistics, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, who has continued to provide encouragement and sage advice throughout the whole period of my work. My first thanks go to him.

Special thanks are due to Prof. Dr hab. Andrzej Zaborski, Institute of Oriental Philology, the Jagiellonian University in Cracow, to whom I am profoundly indebted for his exceptional support of the idea in all its stages and guidance.

I thank Jamila Oueslati, MA, who has devoted much of her time and energy for discussing with me the Arabic syntax, and Mr. Ahmad Rady, who assisted me with language data directly from Egypt. I also wish to thank Brady W. Moore III, MA, and Aleksandra Matulewska, PhD, for reading significant chunks of this manuscript and making valuable suggestions on its form. I gratefully acknowledge the help of those who shared their knowledge of their native languages with me. I thank my colleagues from the Institute of Linguistics, Adam Mickiewicz University, for providing a stimulating intellectual environment to work in.

I also wish to express my truest gratitude to my parents.

Above all, I owe my deepest thanks to Asia, without whom nothing would be possible.

I thank all those who have directly or indirectly contributed to this dissertation. Any mistakes and inconsistencies are solely my responsibility.

## ABBREVIATIONS

A	accusative
Adj	adjective
AQPoss	adjective qualified by a possessum-designating substantive
AQPossA	adjective qualified by a possessum-designating substantive in the accusative
AQPossG	adjective qualified by a possessum-designating substantive in the genitive
D	definite article
DU	dual
F	feminine
G	genitive
I	indefinite article
M	masculine
mph	morphological
N	nominative
NG	neutralized gender
NH	non-human gender
NN	neutralized number
P	pronoun
PART	particle
PL	plural
PP	prepositional phrase
PPIV	passive participle derived from an intransitive verb
PREP	preposition
qm	qualificatum
qr	qualificator
RC	relative clause
S	substantive
SI	singular
SS	sententioïd syntagm
SSA	suffixally substantivized adjective
V	verb

## 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<sup>1</sup>:

ا، ي	ā	ض	ḍ
ب	b	ط	ṭ
ت، ة	t	ظ	ẓ
ث	ṯ	ع	‘
ج	ǧ	غ	ǧ
ح	ḥ	ف	f
خ	ḫ	ق	q
د	d	ك	k
ذ	ḏ	ل	l
ر	r	م	m
ز	z	ن	n
س	s	ه	h
ش	š	و	w, ū
ص	ṣ	ي	y, ī
		ء، أ، و، ئ	’

The definite article is transliterated as it is pronounced, i.e. with assimilation. The *waṣla*-vowel is written on the preceding word without hyphen, not on the definite article (e.g. *a* in *mina l-bayti* or *i* in *daḥalati 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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. Punctuations 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 *yadhabu*).

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

### TIPOLOGIA

#### DWUSKŁADNIKOWYCH PRZYMIOTNIKOWYCH 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 są brane 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 wyekscerpowane zostały z korpusu zawierającego teksty prozą, 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 językoznawczej 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 prymarnie funkcję przydawki. Rozdział 0.4.1.2.: W tradycji arabskiej terminem najbliższym terminowi ‘przymiotnik’ jest *ṣifa* 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 *ṣifa*, 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 konkretne 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* (rozdzielając 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).

**Część 1. Syntagmy hipotaktyczne.** W pracy wykorzystywany jest aparat pojęciowy w znacznej części oparty na teorii J. Bańcerowskiego. Rozdział 1.1.1.: Termin *wyraz* rozumiany jest jako najmniejsza jednostka języka przenosząca kompletne znaczenie leksykalne i semiczne. Określenie, czy daną jednostkę języka należy traktować jako wyraz, czy jako jednostkę niższego rzędu, wchodzącą w skład wyrazów, może być problematyczne. W niniejszej pracy czasowniki, które mogłyby być traktowane jako czasowniki posiłkowe, czyli takie, które wyrazami nie są, np. *kāna* ‘być’, z racji tej, iż wykazują one liczne cechy typowe dla wyrazu, traktowane są jako wyrazy.

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 sygnifikują, 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 sygnifikuje znaczenie szersze. Rozdział 1.1.3.: Nierównorzędność 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 juncji 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, męski, żeński i nieosobowy w liczbie mnogiej), kategoria liczby (liczba pojedyncza, podwójna i mnoga) oraz kategoria przypadku (mianownik, dopełniacz i biernik).

Rozdział 1.1.5.: Wyrazy wchodzące w skład syntagmy hipotaktycznej desygnują dwa różne fragmenty rzeczywistości pozajęzykowej. Wyrazy te są wobec siebie nierównorzędne. 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 predyktywnej 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 predyktywnych 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 *qualificatum*, *qualificator* 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) Wewnątrzkatégorialne 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 linearny 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 stopniowości). 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 rzeczownikiem wchodzącym 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 do 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 linearny – przy jednoczesnej niemożności zmiany szyku w syntagmie,

traktowane 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: określoności (stanu), rodzaju, liczby i przypadku. 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.

**Część 3. Trzy rodzaje niepredykatywnych tautoptotycznych syntagm nominalnych.** Możliwe jest wyróżnienie trzech rodzajów niepredykatywnych syntagm nominalnych, których oba składniki są w tym samym przypadku. Zgodność ta nie zawsze wynika z kongruencji (czyli zgody) – która nie zachodzi w syntagmach parataktycznych – dlatego na ich określenie użyty został termin „syntagmy tautoptotyczne”. Termin „syntagmy nominalne” obejmuje syntagmy złożone z nominalnych części mowy: rzeczownika i przymiotnika. W wyniku zastosowania kryterium przemienności szyku, a także odwołania się do innych wyznaczników (np. do zmiany znaczenia), wyróżnione zostały trzy rodzaje takich syntagm: hipotaktyczne, apozycyjne i parataktyczne.

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 3.1.1.1.1.: Niektóre przymiotniki, należące do ściśle określonych kategorii, nie wykazują zgody w liczbie i rodzaju z kwalifikowanym przez siebie wyrazem. Rozdział 3.1.1.1.2.: 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 3.1.1.1.3.: Przymiotnik nie musi pozostawać w linearnej ciągłości z kwalifikowanym przez siebie rzeczownikiem. Rozdział 3.1.1.1.4.: Przymiotnik, który kwalifikuje rzeczownik będący *qualificatorem* liczebnika może przybierać różną liczbę, zgadzając się z liczebnikiem albo rzeczownikiem. Problematiczna jest tu kwestia, czy *qualificatum* przymiotnika jest liczebnik czy rzeczownik, 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 sufiksальной, tzn. sufigowany 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.

**Część 4. Sekundarne funkcje przymiotnika.** Przymiotnik, oprócz funkcji atrybutywnej, która jest jego funkcją *prymarną*, może spełniać także funkcje *sekundarne*.

Rozdziały 4.1.-4.4.: Pod wieloma względami różnica między przymiotnikiem a rzeczownikiem użytym w funkcji predykatu jest zneutralizowana. Nominalna część mowy użyta 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, eksklamatywnego i sekundarnego.

Rozdział 4.5.: Wyróżnia się cztery typy substancywizacji, 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 substancywizacji anaforycznej przymiotnik użyty jest bez *qualificatum*, które jednak znane jest dzięki swemu wcześniejszemu wystąpieniu w tekście. Rozdział 4.5.2.: W substancywizacji antegenetywalnej przymiotnik kwalifikowany jest przez rzeczownik w dopełniaczu, nabywając w ten sposób określone własności składniowe charakterystyczne dla rzeczownika. Rozdział 4.5.3.: W substancywizacji sufiksальной do przymiotnika sufigowany jest zaimek osobowy reprezentujący rzeczownik, który wystąpił wcześniej w tekście. Rozdział 4.5.4.: W substancywizacji niezależnej przymiotnik użyty jest bez konieczności lub możliwości wystąpienia towarzyszącego rzeczownika. Substancywizacja 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 odprzymiotnikowy 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 substancywizacji antegenetywalnej lub sufiksальной. Również przymiotnik atrybutywny ma formę

dopełniacza, jeśli poprzedzony jest przyimkiem trzyspółgłoskowym, np. *qabla* ‘przed’. 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 desygnujący tzw. *possessum* „nieodłączne” i jednocześnie kwalifikować rzeczownik desygnujący jego *possessora*. Przymiotniki należące do subkategorii *positivus* kwalifikowane są przez rzeczowniki w dopełniaczu (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 *naʿt 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 określoności (stanu) i przypadku 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 adverbialnej może kwalifikować nie tylko czasownik, lecz także imiesłów, *nomen verbale*, a nawet rzeczowniki nie derywowane od czasowników. Rozdział 5.6.: Przymiotniki w substancywizacji antegenetywalnej zwane są przymiotnikami antegenetywalnymi. Mogą to być przymiotniki należące do subkategorii *positivus*, jak i te należące do subkategorii *elativus*. Oprócz obligatoryjnego kwalifikatora w dopełniaczu, mogą one posiadać dodatkowe kwalifikatory w bierniku lub w postaci wyrażenia przyimkowego. Rozdział 5.7.: Przymiotniki w substancywizacji sufiksальной mogą być kwalifikowane przez rzeczowniki w bierniku lub przez wyrażenia przyimkowe. Rozdział 5.8.: Przymiotniki będące imiesłowami czynnymi od czasowników tranzytywnych lub imiesłowami biernymi od czasowników ditranzytywnych

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 rekcji 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 imiesłowem 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.: *Qualifier* przymiotnika w syntagmie opartej na junkcji 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.

**Część 6. Typologia.** Typologia przedstawiona jest w postaci listy typów syntagmalnych otrzymanych w wyniku poklasyfikowania syntagm przymiotnikowych pod względem dziewięciu wymiarów syntagmalnych. Każdy typ syntagmalny otrzymuje nazwę odzwierciedlającą cechę syntagmalną, która go wyznacza. W konsekwencji zastosowania sześćdziesięciu cech syntagmalnych, otrzymano sześćdziesiąt typów syntagmalnych. Każdej syntagmie można przyporządkować jej charakterystykę syntagmalną, tzn. zbiór cech syntagmalnych, które dana syntagma wykazuje pod względem wszystkich dziewięciu wymiarów. Charakterystyki syntagmalne pozwalają porównywać syntagmy ze sobą i obliczać ich syntagmalną odległość od siebie wyrażoną w liczbie wymiarów, pod względem których się różnią. Cechy syntagmalne mogą być badane pod względem kombinowalności z innymi cechami. **Część siódmą** stanowi podsumowanie pracy i zakończenie.

## 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. Bańcerowski. 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. *'idā'atu l-ḥabari l-mutasarri'atu 'amdan ḥaṭa'un*, '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 'Usāma 'Isbir, one by 'Aḥmad 'Umar and one by 'Aḥmad Raḡab

as well as one non-fiction work by Ġūzif 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 Naġib Maḥfūz, 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. Bańcerowski 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’, *ġamī*‘ ‘all’, *ba‘d* ‘some’,
- (ii) demonstrative pronouns such as *hādā* ‘this’, *‘ulā’ika* ‘those’ etc.,
- (iii) relative pronouns such as *man*, *mā*, *lladī* 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<sup>2</sup>.

### 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

---

<sup>2</sup> Despite these differences, clauses form syntagms with words. E.g. they might be interpreted as qualifiers, as in the following example:

<i>‘anā</i>	<i>muta’akkid-at-u-n</i>	<i>‘anna-ka</i>	<i>ta’rifu</i>
1.SG	sure-F.SI-N-I	that-2.M.SI	know

‘I am sure that you know’ (‘Arabī 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<sup>3</sup>. This regional variation normally concerns vocabulary, but local dialects often influence the syntax too. Therefore it is a very interesting task to investigate and

---

<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>4</sup>, 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<sup>th</sup> to the 10<sup>th</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup> 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 disintinguishing 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  $\pm N$  and  $\pm V$  (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 ‘deategorized’). 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‘l* (‘verb’) and *ḥarf* (which can be translated as ‘particle’)<sup>5</sup>. 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-Ġalāyīnī (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

---

<sup>5</sup> 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 Sībawayhi’s work *ṣifa* and *ism* are kept apart (1974: 313), because primarily *ṣifa* was a syntactic category and could not be compared with *ism* or *fiʿl* (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 “ṣifa”, “waṣf”, “waṣafa”, und “naʿt” 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 *ṣifa* in Arab grammars, because it has a similar function. Thus, the *ṣifa* is distinguished partly on functional and partly on syntactic criteria. As Diem puts it, whether *ṣifa* means an adjective or an attribute, depends on the context (1974: 314). According to Sībawayhi, words which can function as *ṣifa* include: *ʾasmāʾ al-fāʿil* (active participles<sup>6</sup>), *ʾasmāʾ al-mafʿūl* (passive participles), *ṣifāt mušabbaha* (the so-called ‘assimilated’ adjectives, which are the most typical adjectives), other nouns (not belonging to any of the above categories), *ʾafʿāl* (verbs), *ḥurūf al-ğarr* (prepositional phrases), *ʾasmāʾ mubhama* (demonstrative pronouns), *ʾalāmat al-muḍmar* (roughly: a quantifier, e.g. *kulluhum* ‘all of them’), numerals and the exceptive particle *ʾillā* (Mosel 1975, I: 295). But what is quite important, for Sībawayhi *ṣifa* meant also a property that is inherent in a word, independent of its syntactic usage. This is evident from his example *ʾatānī l-yawma qawiyyun* ‘A strong [i.e. a strong man] approached me today’, where he demonstrates that the *ṣifa* (*qawiyyun* ‘strong’) used in the subject function is a ‘weak’ construction, that is acceptable but not as good as *ʾatānī l-yawma rağulun qawiyyun* ‘A strong man approached me today’ (Mosel 1975, I: 325 ).

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

---

<sup>6</sup> 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'imun* 'Zayd [is] standing'), without being a *ṣifa* (Guillaume 1992: 62-63). There were attempts to introduce a special term for the attribute, *naʿt*, especially in the work of Ibn al-Sarrāġ (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 *ṣifa* is used to denote a lexical class or a syntactic function (Guillaume 1992: 64)<sup>7</sup>. However, a distinction between *naʿt* and *ṣifa* can be seen in some contemporary Arab grammar books<sup>8</sup>.

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' muštaqqa*), due to its morphology (Guillaume 1992: 67). Also the difference was noted (by Ibn Ya'īš) 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 *ṣifa* was presented in a grammar of Arabic very widely used across the Arab world, i.e. in Al-Ġalāyīnī (2002 [1912]). According to this author, *ism* divides into *mawṣūf* ('the described [one]') and *ṣifa* ('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 dāti š-šay'i wa ḥaqīqatihi. wa huwa mawḍū'un li tuḥmala 'alayhi ṣ-ṣifatu: ka raġul wa baḥr wa 'ilm wa ġahl* 'the described noun (*mawṣūf*) is what indicates the substance and essence

<sup>7</sup> Let us also remark that there was another, Kufan, meaning of the term *ṣifa*, equivalent to the Baṣran terms *zarf* and *maḥall*, which means roughly 'locative adverbial' (Owens 1989: 226).

<sup>8</sup> E.g. in Badr al-Dīn and Al-ʿAmrāwī (1997), where *naʿt* is a linguistic term, while *ṣifa* means 'a property'. In this book one reads: *an-naʿtu huwa t-tābi'u [...] l-mukammilu matbū'ahu bi bayāni ṣifatin min ṣifātihi [...]* 'the *naʿt* is a modifier agreeing in case which complements the noun with which it agrees by specifying one of its properties (*ṣifa*)' (1997: 8).

of a thing. It [the described noun – MM] is given<sup>9</sup> in order for a description to be applied to it'<sup>10</sup>. As for *ṣifa*, he gives the following definition: *wa l-ismu ṣ-ṣifatu: mā dalla 'alā ṣifati šay'in min al-'a'yāni wa l-ma'ānī, wa huwa mawḏū'un li yuḥmala 'alā mā yuḥṣafu bihi* 'the description noun (*ṣifa*) is what indicates a [describing] feature of a thing that can be concrete or abstract, and it is given<sup>11</sup> in order to be applied to what it characterizes' (p. 74). Then he enumerates seven categories of words that can function as a *ṣifa*<sup>12</sup>. Further, in the chapter on *tawābi'*, (p. 560), he introduces *na't* (which, as he remarks, is also called *ṣifa*). This *na't* he defines syntactically: *mā yudkaru ba'da smin li yubayyina ba'da 'aḥwālihi 'aw 'aḥwāla 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 *na't* are a different set of those able to be a *ṣifa*, e.g. they include clauses. There is some more inconsistency: in yet another place the usage of the term *ṣifa* suggests that being a *ṣifa* or not is something inherent to a word (cf. our previous remark on Sībawayhi): in the chapter on nominal morphology (p. 177-179), when dealing with patterns of nouns, Al-Ġalāyīnī characterizes each pattern in terms of its capability of functioning as an *ism* and/or as a *ṣifa*. While most patterns are productive for both *ism* and *ṣifa*, the pattern *fa'lalil* (i.e.  $C_1aC_2C_3aC_4iC_5$ ) yields, according to Al-Ġalāyīnī only *ṣifas*. However, the explanation of his example, *ḡaḥmariš*, as *al-'aḡūz al-kabīr wa l-mar'atu s-samḡatu* 'old, big; an ugly woman' suggests that *ḡaḥmariš* 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-Daḥḏāḥ divides *ism* into *mawṣūf* 'the described [noun]' and *ṣifa* according to the differences *fi d-dalālati* 'in the semantics'. *Mawṣūf* is what *yusammā bihi šaḥṣun 'aw ḥayawānun 'aw*

<sup>9</sup> The expression "is given" translates here the Arabic participle *mawḏū'un*, derived from the verb *wuḏi'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-waḏ'*, i.e. 'the science of "positing"' dealing with the problem of classification of words, was discussed by Weiss (1976).

<sup>10</sup> All English translations of passages from Sībawayhi's text are ours.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. footnote 9 above.

<sup>12</sup> There seems to be no unanimity among Arab grammarians as to what these categories are. Al-Ġalāyīnī's categories are different than those allowed by Sībawayhi. Yet another set of categories able to function as a *ṣifa* is given in some newer grammars, e.g. in that of Ibn Ḥammūda (n.d: 279).

*šay'un 'aw ma'nan: tāhūn* '[what] names a person, an animal, a thing or a concept (lit. 'meaning'), [e.g.]: a mill'. As for *šifa*, it *tašruhu ḥāla l-mawšūfi: 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-Aqtasch (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. Krahl'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 Górska (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 *dū* ('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 Killean (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' (*paralambánesthai* 'to be taken together') (Robins

1974: 37). 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 transparent, Alexandre fils de Philippe, un corps qui est transparent, 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 *syntagme* 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 "eingeengt" "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 explicitly formulated in Bańcerowski (1980) and Bańcerowski 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 Bańcerowski 1994: 25). Bańcerowski'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)<sup>13</sup>. 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 šāra n-na‘tu mağrūran miṭla l-man‘ūti li ‘annahumā 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 ‘*amal*, which literally means ‘work, exercise, doing, action’, and corresponding concepts of ‘*āmil* ‘working’ and *ma‘mūl* ‘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

---

<sup>13</sup> 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)<sup>14</sup>.

On the other hand, it will be more difficult to find in classical Arab grammar 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 *rağulun ḥasanu l-wağhi* 'a man handsome of face' (which is an example of 'formal annexation') *aş-şifatu taqa'u 'alā l-ismi l-'awwali tumma tuwşiluhā 'ilā l-wağhi* (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-wağhi*' 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 *taqa'u* (lit. 'falls') and *tuwşilu* (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: *'anna l-ḥusna fī l-ma'nā li l-wağhi* 'as far as the meaning is concerned, *ḥusn* ('handsomeness') refers to *al-wağh* ('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 rağulin zarīfin* ('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 'annaka lam turidi l-wāḥida mina r-riğāli llađīna kullu wāḥidin minhum rağulun wa lākinnaka 'aradta l-wāḥida mina r-riğāli llađīna kullu wāḥidin minhum rağulun zarīfun* '[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.

---

<sup>14</sup> The classical Arab theory of government (*'amal*) is widely discussed in Bohas et al. (1990, 57-72). An encyclopedic view may be found in Rybalkin (2006).

‘composite’. According to Al-Ġalāyīnī’s grammar, there are five types of *murakkab*: (i) *murakkab ’idāfi*, 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 t̄āniyatuhumā muwḍiḥatan ma‘nā l-’ulā* ‘every two words the second of which elucidates the meaning of the first’. It is divided into *murakkab waṣfi*, i.e. the adjectival attribution, *murakkab tawkīdī*, i.e. a noun emphasized by another noun (e.g. *al-qawmu kulluhum* ‘the people all of them’) and *murakkab badalī*, which is more or less equivalent to apposition; (iii) *murakkab ‘atfi*, i.e. a combination of two words by means of a conjunction; (iv) *murakkab mazġī*, i.e. a compound word, and (v) *murakkab ‘adadī*, i.e. a numeral composed of two words (2002 [1912]: 14-15)<sup>15</sup>.

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, Górska 1991, Waldmann 1989<sup>16</sup>; 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 ‘slovoščetanie’, understood as ‘gruppa slov v predložení 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

<sup>15</sup> 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.

<sup>16</sup> 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 annectieren 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 relative 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.)<sup>17</sup>. 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)<sup>18</sup>. Wright termed

---

<sup>17</sup> In the subsequent paragraphs, we use emphasis in bold in order to mark the terms which are of interest to us.

<sup>18</sup> De Sacy understood this construction differently from the most later Western Arabists. In e.g. *sarī'u l-ḥisābi* "prompt de calcul" he saw the equivalent of *dū sur'ati l-ḥisābi* "possesseur de la promptitude du calcule" (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 kaṭīru (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 **określa** ten wyraz”) (1994: 410)<sup>19</sup>. 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, (‘**objasnjajuščee**’) the noun in the nominative (1963: 351). Diem (1998) uses terms such as ‘syntaktischer und semantischer **Bezug** des *naʿt*’ (scil. des Adjektivs), e.g. (1998: 32-33). In his description, apart from concepts such as ‘sich beziehen’ (e.g. “semantisch **bezieht** sich das *naʿt* 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 *naʿt* vermittelte **Eigenschaft** gewöhnlich nicht nur für [...]”, p. 33),

---

<sup>19</sup> 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‘t* ausgedrückt sind” and “ist das *man‘ūt* von einer vom *na‘t* 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<sup>20</sup>.

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 Świdziński (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

---

<sup>20</sup> Likewise in works written by the Arabs themselves. E.g. According to Al-Daḥḍāḥ (1990), in the *na't sababī* ('indirect attribute') the adjective *yatba'u mā qablahu lafẓan wa 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-'Amrāwī (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 llaḍī yadullu 'alā ma'nā fī smin ba'dahu, wa hādā l-ismu lahu rtibātun bi l-man'ūti* '[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 Bańcerowski in (1997a) and (1997b)<sup>21</sup>. 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” (Bańcerowski 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

---

<sup>21</sup> In these works the term *dicton* 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 rection<sup>22</sup>.

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 (semic). 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<sup>23</sup>.

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 *tahta* ‘under’ in *tahta 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 *taḥti* in *min taḥti s-sarīri* ‘from under the bed’, which behaves like a full substantive (with a hypothetical meaning ‘the space under something’). Yet no nominative form of it exists (*\*tahtu* or *\*tahtun*). Thus, *taht-*, being inflectionally limited (its inflectional paradigm being defective) will not be

---

<sup>22</sup> 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 *tumma* ‘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).

<sup>23</sup> Heine and Kuteva (2002) list four main mechanisms involved in grammaticalization: “(a) desemantization (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 *min taḥti* will be treated as a complex preposition.

The case of *ḥāriḡa* is a more complicated one as there exist the word *ḥāriḡun* ‘external; the external space’, with complete lexical and grammatical meaning. This word can be used in e.g. *fī ḥāriḡi l-waṭani* ‘outside the homeland’ lit. ‘in the external space of the homeland’. Etymologically, this word is related to the active participle of the verb *ḥaraḡa* meaning ‘to go out; to go beyond’. The preposition-like *ḥāriḡa* is in obvious relationship with this word. The case is not isolated, there are other examples: *dāḥila* ‘inside’, *naṭiḡata* ‘as a result of’ (cf. *naṭiḡatun* ‘result’), *makāna* ‘instead of’ (cf. *makānun* ‘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 *buq‘atun* ‘place, site, spot’ a preposition *\*buq‘ata* with the meaning ‘instead’, analogously to *makānun* and *makāna*. 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. *ka-* in *baytuka* ‘your house’, or *-hā* in *ra’aytuḥā* ‘I saw her’. Some scholars were inclined to treat them as words for functional reasons (cf. Gabučjan and Kovalev 1968). This seems, however not justified. We prefer to treat these pronouns as suffixes. Thus, *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. *huwa* ‘he’, is a word, then the expression *fīhi* ‘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 mut‘abun* ‘that he is tired’ a word is needed to be the subject of *mut‘abun*. This is the word ‘*annahu*. Also articles will be treated as affixes. Conjunctions do not have the status of a word either<sup>24</sup>.

Expressions such as *ġayr* ‘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 *ġayru* 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*, *ṣāhib* (expressing a possessor) will be treated as words, due to their syntactic freedom. In this context Kovalev and Šarbatov (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

---

<sup>24</sup> 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. *ḥasanu l-waḡhi* 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 *mudāf* ‘*ilayhi*, i.e. the qualifying substantive in the genitive, replaces the *tanwīn*, 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-māli* ‘capital’, lit. ‘head of money’, with its plural *ru’ūsu l-’awmāli* lit. ‘heads of moneys’, is composed of two words, each of them inflecting separately. Only the form *ar-ra’smālu* can be treated as a single word, with the plural *ar-rasāmīlu* (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 Bańczerowski, 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 \**makūnun* (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<sup>25</sup>. Therefore they will be treated as words.

---

<sup>25</sup> In fact, *makānun* was used as a *terminus technicus* by some classical Arab grammarians to denote what is normally known as *ḥabar 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 (Bańcerowski et al. 1982: 236-237 and Bańcerowski 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 too 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** (Bańcerowski 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 Bańcerowski:

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

“the qualifier 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” (Bańcerowski 1997a: 1162).

A consequence of these facts is that a hypotactic syntagm is a hyponym “with respect to its constituent qualificatum” (Bańcerowski 1997: 1162)<sup>26</sup>.

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 qualifier in one syntagm can be a qualificatum in another syntagm. Also, a word which is a qualificatum in one syntagm can be a qualifier in another syntagm. That is to say that a word can be *in statu qualificati* and *in statu qualificatoris* at the same time (Bańcerowski 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

---

<sup>26</sup> Cf. also Bańcerowski 1980: 66-70

(*black, intensely*) ‘right-overlapping’. Thus, the qr of syntagm<sub>1</sub> which is ‘left-overlapping’ with respect to syntagm<sub>2</sub> is the qm of syntagm<sub>2</sub><sup>27</sup>.

### 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<sup>28</sup>. 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<sup>29</sup> 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**<sup>30</sup>. Motion can be of two principal kinds. Therefore, group (i) splits into two subgroups:

---

<sup>27</sup> These two terms will be used in chapters 1.3.8. and 1.3.9.

<sup>28</sup> In Bańcerowski (1980: 102) the term ‘semic connexity’ is used.

<sup>29</sup> It should be remarked here that different grammatical categories may be morphologically marked in the same way (a phenomenon which is called ‘syncretism’).

<sup>30</sup> 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)<sup>31</sup>. 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 **rektion** (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<sup>32</sup>. This type of unity between words consisting in the absence of morph indicators will be referred to as **lexical junction** (cf. Bańczerowski 1988: 54).

It is important here to distinguish rektion from what Bańczerowski treats as ‘lexical junction’. In his article (1997a) rektion 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 (*związek przynależności*, cf. Bąk 1989 [1977]: 384). Thus, in Bańczerowski’s

---

<sup>31</sup> 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.

<sup>32</sup> 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 'aṭwalu 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. *fī 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 be therefore 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. *baḥata 'an* 'to look for'), while in others this link can be weaker (*ḡalasa fī l-bayti* 'to sit in the house' or *ḡalasa '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<sup>33</sup>. It should, however, be remarked that whether in e.g. *mubtadi'un ṣabāḥan* 'beginning in the morning' the accusative case of *ṣabāḥan* 'in the morning' should be interpreted as governed by *mubtadi'un* 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. Bał 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

---

<sup>33</sup> 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. *ǧiddan* 'very', which cannot be treated as an inflectional form, i.e. the accusative case, of *ǧiddun* '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 *ǧālisun 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:

*'asālib-u      ġayr-u      mašrū'-at-i-n*  
 ways.NH.PL-N-I    reverse-N      legal-NH.PL-G-I  
 'illegal ways' lit. 'ways other than legal' (Ġazīra 3/4/04, 2, Ġaymatu l-'amni...) /1/

there is no qualification between *'asālibu* 'ways' and *mašrū'atin* 'legal' 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:

*ḥarakat-u-n      sarī'-at-u-n*  
 movement.F.S-N-I    quick-F.S-N-I  
 '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:

*M-tu                      a-na-ki-soma                      ki-tabu*  
 CLASS1-man      CLASS1-PRES-CLASS7-read      CLASS7-book  
 '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 qualificator’ in Bańcerowski 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 rection are working in opposite directions:

Azerbaijani:

*siz-in tələbə-niz*

2.PL-G student.SI-2.PL

‘your (pl.) student’ (apud Širaliev and Severtjan 1971: 222) /4/

In this example *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:

*meinem Vater sein Haus*

my.M.SI.DATIVE father POSS.3.M.SI house

‘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<sup>34</sup>.

---

<sup>34</sup> 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**<sup>35</sup>. 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. *'afḍalu rağulin* '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. Gätje 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 rağulin* '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:

---

<sup>35</sup> 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 ġadīdun* ‘a new house’. Also substantives and adjectives that are predicates are mainly indefinite, e.g. *al-baytu ġadīdun* ‘The house is new’. In formal annexations, e.g. *raġulun ʔawīlu 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. *raġulun ġarību l-miṣyati 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. *ʔakbaru* in the above example *ʔakbaru raġulin*.

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 *ʔafḍalu r-riġāli* ‘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-raġuli ʔawīli l-qāmati* ‘with the man tall [of] height’<sup>36</sup>.
- (iii) it receives a pronominal suffix. E.g. *baytuhu* ‘his house’ is definite because it has the pronominal suffix *-hu* ‘his’ or *ʔafḍaluhum* ‘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-raġuli ġarībi l-miṣyati 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 *ʔanā* ‘I’, or attached to a preposition (as *ma‘-ī* ‘with me’).

---

<sup>36</sup> The existence of this construction results in neutralization of the opposition Definite : Indefinite. E.g. *raʔaytu r-raġula ʔawīla l-qāmati* ‘I saw the man tall of height’ vs. *raʔaytu raġulan ʔawīla 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-raġulu ʔawīlu 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 qayyimātun* ‘valuable books’ vs. *risālatun qayyimātun* ‘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:

*min ḥarazāt-i-n bīd-i-n*  
of pearls.NH.PL-G-I white.M.PL.-G-I  
‘of white pearls’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, *Maktabu l-’ūzūni...*)<sup>37</sup> /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.

*salāḡiqat-u-n kūniyy-at-u-n*

---

<sup>37</sup> 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”.

Sejjuks.M.PL-N-I of:Konya-NH.PL-N-I  
'the Sejjuks of Konya' ('Arabī 5/04/ 56) /8/

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<sup>38</sup>.

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.:

*ḥāliṣ-u*      *l-mawaddat-i*  
pure.NG.NN-N    D-love.F.S-G  
'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.

---

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Cantarino (1975, 2: 55). According to Kouloughli, such form "reflète sans doute une perception du pluriel comme un tout global, non individué" (1994:112).

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 qualifiers. They are replaceable by plural pronouns. Examples:

*wa mina l-ḥībīz-i l-mutaḥallif-īna*  
 and from D-hippies.M.PL-G D-left:over.M-PL.G  
 ‘and from the left-over hippies’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 7) /10/

*al-Ḥimīr-u l-ḥumr-u*  
 D-Khmer.M.PL-N D-red.M.PL-N  
 ‘Khmer Rouge’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 112)<sup>39</sup> /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

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. also *ḡamā’atun muttaḥidūna* 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 *buyūtī '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 attractant. E.g. in example /12/:

*qāla r-raʿīs-u            l-muntahiy-at-u            wilāyat-u-hu*  
 said    D-president.M.SI-N    D-ending-F.SI-N            term-of-office.F.SI-N-3.M.SI  
 ‘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-raʿīsu*.

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

*hādā l-ḥall-u            huwa    l-wahīd-u*  
 this    D-solution.M.SI-N    3.M.SI    D-only.M.SI-N  
 ‘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” (Bańcerowski 1980: 65). The primordial distinction between quiddities and qualities finds “a reflection in the concepts of argument and predicate” (Bańcerowski 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 Bańcerowski puts it,

“Signative space is dynamic<sup>40</sup>. [...] 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) quidditified, or
- (ii) qualitatified.

These two operations depend thus on how the entity in question is being signated”. (Bańcerowski 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‘ğibuhu l-‘amalu l-ğayyidu* ‘Good work pleases him’ and *Yu‘ğibuhu l-‘amalu* ‘Work pleases him’, with the omission of *l-ğayyidu* ‘good’. But we cannot say: *\*Yu‘ğibuhu l-ğayyidu* \*‘Good pleases him’ (unless ellipsis is

---

<sup>40</sup> The term *signation* used here by Bańcerowski denotes the relation between lingual signs and the corresponding entities of extralingual reality they stand for (Bańcerowski 2000: 6).

intended). We can also say: *Hādā kitābun ḡayyidun ḡiddan* ‘This is a **very good** book’ and *Hādā kitābun ḡayyidun* ‘This is a **good** book’, with the omission of *ḡiddan* ‘very’. We cannot, however, say: *\*Hādā kitābun ḡiddan* \*‘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. *waladun ṭayyibun* ‘a good boy’ can be the subject in a sentence because *waladun* ‘a boy’ may. Since *waladun* ‘boy’ may not be an adjectival attribute (cf. *\*hādā kitābun waladun* \*‘this is a boy book’), one cannot say *\*Hādā kitābun waladun ṭayyibun* \*‘This is a good boy book’ either<sup>41</sup>.

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 *kitāba l-waladi* in the sentence *’urīdu kitāba l-waladi* ‘I want the boy’s book’ only the word *l-waladi* can be enquired about without much difficulty: *kitāba man turīdu?* ‘Whose book do you want?’ lit. ‘Book [of] whom [you] want?’. A possible question about *kitāba* will have a much more elaborate form, e.g. *mādā turīdu wa huwa li l-waladi?* ‘What do you want that is the boy’s?’ (Note that by the question *mādā turīdu?* it is enquired about the whole syntagm and the answer to it is *kitāba l-waladi*, not the word *kitāba*). The situation is similar in syntagms based on concord: out of the syntagm *waladan ḡayyidan* in the sentence *’arā waladan ḡayyidan* ‘I see a good boy’, only the word *ḡayyidan* can be enquired about without difficulty: *’ayya waladin tarā?* ‘Which/What boy do you see?’. A

---

<sup>41</sup> 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 dolgozó ember* ‘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 ḡayyidun?* ‘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<sup>42</sup>. 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/:

*šahṣ-u-n*      *wāḥid-u-n*  
 person.M.SI-N-I    one.M.SI-N-I  
 ‘one person’ /14/.

Here, either of its constituents can be dropped and a grammatical expression remains, e.g. *qāma wāḥidun* ‘One has stood up’ or *qāma šahṣun* ‘A person has stood up’. It seems that it is *wāḥidun* that agrees in gender and number with *šahṣun* and not the other way round. What is more, *qāma wāḥidun* is rather elliptical (with *šahṣun* understood from the context). Thus, it would be *šahṣun* which is the qualificatum and the representative although its ‘representativeness’ would not be so conspicuous as e.g. in *waladun ṭayyibun*. 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 ṭayyibun*.

Let us now consider another Arabic syntagm:

*ḥamsat-u*      ‘ašḥāṣ-i-n

<sup>42</sup> 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 'ašḥāšin*. 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<sup>43</sup>? 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 *'ašḥāšun ḥamsatun*, in analogy to /14/, which is fully synonymous with *ḥamsatu 'ašḥāšin*, yet in which it is *'ašḥāšun* 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 podróżnych* 'both travellers', the quantifier is the movent, namely the regens, i.e. it requires that *podróżni* stand in the genitive case (admittedly, these rules, recommended e.g. in the prescriptive work by Kocharński et al. 1989: 197, are not always observed). If motion were to reflect qualification, in the way that the movent is the qualificatum,

---

<sup>43</sup> 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 qualificator, 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 (mover) 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-ḥāliṣ-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:

*ḥāliṣ-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’, *ma‘a ḥāliṣi l-mawaddati* ‘with the pure [of] love’, *‘aqṣidu 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-mumattilat-u l-‘afḍal-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 mumattilatin*  
 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 *ra’aytu 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 *‘ayy-* (with feminine nouns usually *‘ayyat-*

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 *ʿayy-* behaves like a substantive which requires the genitive case from the substantive, e.g.:

*ʿayy-u rağul-i-n?*  
 what-N man.M.SI-G-I  
 ‘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)<sup>44</sup>. In French there are similar syntagms with possessive pronouns, exemplified by *la mienne de lampe*<sup>45</sup>, 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

<sup>44</sup> Not confirmed by a Sardinian native speaker consulted.

<sup>45</sup> The example is taken from a novel by A. Maalouf, *Les Échelles du Levant*, Paris: Grasset, 1996, p. 103.

meaning ‘the best actress’, he may choose between /18/ and /19/, i.e. between *al-mumattilatū l-’afḍalu*, with *mumattilat-* ‘actress’ as quiddity, and *’afḍalu mumattilatin*, with *’afḍalu* ‘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 ḡiddan* ‘a very interesting book’, apart from the qualification between words, we can establish qualification between the word *kitābun* ‘book’ and the syntagm *mumti’un ḡiddan* ‘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 ‘sententoid 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.:

*fī buldān-i                    š-šarq-ayni    l-'awsaṭ-i    wa    l-'adnā*  
 in countries.NH.PL-G    D-east-M.DU.G    D-middle.M.SI-G    and    D-near.M.SI-G  
 ‘in the countries of the Middle and Near East’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 47) /21/

*fī buldāni                    š-šarqi                    l-'adnā                    wa    l-'awsaṭi*  
 in countries.NH.PL-G    D-east-M.SI.G    D-near.M.SI.G                    and    D-middle.M.SI-G  
 ‘in the countries of the Near and Middle East’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 55) /22/

The word *aš-šarq* ‘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‘bi*), qualified by paratactically bound adjectives expressing separate properties (‘Kuwaiti’ and ‘Palestinian’), One adjective expresses a property shared by these entities (‘Muslim’):

*li mašā‘ir-i                    š-ša‘b-i                    l-kuwaytiyy-i    wa    l-filasṭīniyy-i    l-muslim-i*  
 for feelings.NH.PL-G D-people.M.SI-G    D-Kuwaiti-M.SI-G and    D-Palestinian.M.SI-G D-Muslim.M.SI-G  
 ‘for the feelings of the [two] Muslim peoples, the Kuwaiti and the Palestinian’ (Riyād 21/4/04, 1, *Al-‘islāmīyyūna l-kuwaytīyyūna...*) [instead of *š-ša‘bayni... l-muslimayni*] /23/.

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 qualificator that qualifies a qualificatum composed of two paratactically bound substantives. This happens, for instance, if one property is assigned to two or more entities:

*ṣundūq-i n-naqd-i wa l-bank-i d-duwaliyy-ayni*  
fund.M.SI-G D-money.M.SI-G and D-bank.M.SI-G D-international.M-**DU**.G  
'the International Monetary Fund and World Bank' lit. 'the Fund of the International Money and Bank' ('Ahrām 22/01/03, 11, *Dawru Miṣra l-fā'ilu...*) /24/.

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

*mina l-'abṭāl-i wa l-baṭalāt-i l-ġarbiyy-ina*  
against D-heroes.M.PL-G and D-heroines.F.PL-G D-Western.M-**PL**.G  
'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:

*li ḥall-i            qadāyā            l-miṭṭaqat-i    š-šā'ik-at-i            l-'uḥrā*  
 for solution.M.SI-G    questions.NH.PL.G    D-region.F.SI-G    D-problematic-NH.PL-G    D-other.NH.PL.G  
 'for the solution of other problematic questions of the region' (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 3,  
*Sa'ūd al-Fayṣal...*) /26/

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:

*'ayyām-u            l-ḡihād-i            wa n-nafy-i            wa l-fidā'-i            l-maḡīd-at-u*  
 days.NH.PL-N            D-struggle.M.SI-G            and D-exile.M.SI-G            and D-sacrifice.M.SI-G            D-glorious-NH.PL-N  
 '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-maḡīdat-i*, 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'ahḥirun bi sababi ḍ-ḍabābi* 'He is late because of the fog' it is not certain whether the PP *bi sababi ḍ-ḍabābi* 'because of the fog' qualifies the adjective *muta'ahḥirun* 'late' or the whole sentence, i.e. the qualification obtains between the PP as qr and the predicative syntagm *'innahu muta'ahḥirun*. 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'ahḥiran bi sababi ḍ-ḍabābi* 'I reproached a man [who was] late because of the fog', then the PP clearly qualifies the adjective *muta'ahḥiran*. 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.:

*lā haqq-a qānūniyy-a-n li 'Isrā'īl-a*  
no right.M.SI-A legal.NG.NN-A-I for Israel.F.SI-G  
'there is no right **legally** for Israel' (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 1, *Yahūdu Lībiyā...*) /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. Bańcerowski 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 Bańcerowski (1993: 16) where one reads: "[...] it is obvious that the relation of predication [...] is reducible to the relation of determination (viz. qualification – MM)". In Bańcerowski's theory, the predicate qualifies the subject (cf.

Bańczerowski et al. 1982: 239). 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)<sup>46</sup>. “By the

---

<sup>46</sup> 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-muḥāḍaratu 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-muḥāḍarata ṣa‘batun* ‘I said that the lecture was difficult’ cannot be reduced either to *\*Qultu ‘inna l-muḥāḍarata* ‘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<sup>47</sup>. The third test, that of asking questions about each constituent, gives the following results: when enquiring about the subject, the question *māḍā ṣaʿbun?* ‘What is difficult?’ or more frequently *mā huwa ṣ-ṣaʿbu* ‘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 ṣaʿbatun*. The predicate agrees with the subject in number and gender. The subject is the movent, scil. attractant, and the situation resembles that of attributive syntagms, where the qualified substantive is also the attractant (cf. *al-muḥāḍaratu ṣ-ṣaʿbatu* ‘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)<sup>48</sup>. 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

---

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Bloomfield’s statement that “[...] *John ran* is neither a nominative expression (like *John*) nor a finite verb expression (like *ran*)” (1933: 194).

<sup>48</sup> 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 accusative qualifiers 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. *’anna l-muḥāḍarata ṣa’batun* ‘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-mudīri ḡazīlu š-šukri* ‘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)<sup>49</sup>. 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 *’inna* 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:

Po 6.1. Within a sentence each qualificator qualifies exactly one qualificatum (1997a: 1171).

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

*’inna Husnī ‘Allām raḡa’a mina l-ḡariḡ-i sakrān-a*  
 that H.A.M.A returned from D-outdoors.M.SI-G drunk.M.SI-A.I  
 ‘that Husni Allam returned from outside drunk’ (Mīr 75) /32/

<sup>49</sup> 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 *raf*). Two opposite hypotheses were elaborated by them. One, attributed to the Kūfan school of grammar, proposed the *tarāfu*, which can be rendered in English as ‘mutual nominative rection’. The opposite view, represented by the Baṣran school, advocated the *ibtidā*-explanation, according to which the nominative case on both subject (*mubtada*) and nominal predicate (*ḡabar*) 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 *Ḥusnī* ‘*Allām* and the verb *raġa‘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*<sup>50</sup>. 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 **Adjectivo-qualificatorial**, or simply **Adj-qualificatorial**. For instance, the syntagm in /33/ is an Adj-qualificatorial syntagm:

---

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

*ʾağal-u-n ʾtawīl-u-n*  
term.M.SI-N-I long.M.SI-N-I  
'a long term' /33/

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

*ʾtawīl-u l-ʾağal-i*  
long.M.SI-N D-term.M.SI-G  
'long-termed' lit. 'long of term' /34/

the adjective is the qualificatum. Such syntagms will be termed **Adjectivo-qualificatal**, or **Adj-qualificatal**. The property of being an Adj-qualificatal syntagm will be called **Adj-qualificatality**. Syntagms with both adjectival qualifier 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/:

*dāhib-u-n sarīʿ-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**<sup>51</sup> **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:

---

<sup>51</sup> The term 'partiorative' means 'related to the parts of speech' (from Latin *partes orationis*).

(Co-constituency with S, Co-constituency with V, Co-constituency with P, Co-constituency with N, Co-constituency with Adj, ...)

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 Elative qualificativity. Syntagms having an elative as their qr will show Elative qualificatoriness. Syntagms having a positive adjective as their qm will show Positive qualificativity. Syntagms having a positive adjective as their qr will show Positive qualificatoriness.

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: Elative qualificativity with elative qualificatoriness, Positive qualificativity with positive qualificatoriness, Elative qualificativity with positive qualificatoriness, Positive qualificativity with elative qualificatoriness.

Consequently, the dimension will contain the following properties:

(Elative qualificativity, Positive qualificativity, Elative qualificatoriness, Positive qualificatoriness, Elative qualificativity with elative qualificatoriness, Positive qualificativity with positive qualificatoriness, Elative qualificativity with positive qualificatoriness, Positive qualificativity with elative qualificatoriness, ...)

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 positive 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)<sup>52</sup>. 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,

---

<sup>52</sup> In Bańczerowski (1988: 54) the term *semantic connexity* is used to denote this relation.

Gender- and number-concordiality,  
Nominativo-rectinality with gender- and number-concordiality  
Prepositional-rectinality with gender- and number concordiality,  
Accusativo-rectinality with gender-concordiality,  
Accusativo-rectinality with gender- and number-concordiality,  
Lexico-junctionality, ...}

Examples:

*dahabū musri'īna* '[they (masc.)] departed, hurrying' is a syntagm showing Accusativo-rectinality with gender-and number-concordiality.  
*al-baytu kabīrun* 'the house [is] large' is a syntagm showing Nominativo-rectinality 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 rectinality and concord simultaneously and of a weaker coherence if a syntagms shows only rectinality.

### 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 qualificator and syntagms in which the qualificator 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 discontinuous. The following properties will be distinguished:

(Obligatory contiguity, Optional discontinuity, Obligatory discontinuity, ...)

Examples:

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

Optional discontinuity: *ʾarḥaṣu minhu* ‘cheaper than it’,

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

If a syntagm could be classed as optionally discontinuous 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 discontinuity. E.g.:

*silāḥ-u-n      bāliḡ-u   l-quwwat-i   wa t-taʾīr-i*  
weapon.M.SI-N-I   extreme   D-power.F.SI-G   and D-impact.M.SI-G  
‘weapon of extreme power and impact’ lit. ‘weapon extreme of power and impact’  
(Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 6, *Al-ʾIḥwānu*) /36/

The syntagm *bāliḡu t-ta'tīri* will not be considered discontinuous, neither optionally nor obligatorily, because its discontinuity 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 discontinuity can be. It will only be signalled that discontinuity 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<sup>53</sup>, Qr-basic predicativity, Qr-extended predicativity, Qr-secondary predicativity, Qr-exclamative predicativity, Qr-predicatoidity<sup>54</sup>, Qr-direct objectivity, Qr-indirect objectivity, Qr-internal objectivity, Qr-adverbiality, ...}

---

<sup>53</sup> 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.

<sup>54</sup> The term Qr-preicatoidity 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 kabīrun* ‘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] ‘āğiluhu* ‘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;

*ṭawīlu l-’ağali* ‘long-term’, lit. ‘long of term’ takes the property Indefiniteness 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 subjectoids<sup>55</sup>. Words with these syntactic functions can be qualificata, thus, in contrast to 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<sub>1</sub> which is ‘left-overlapping’ with respect to syntagm<sub>2</sub> is the

---

<sup>55</sup> A subjectoid is the qualificatum within the sententoid syntagm, discussed in chapter 5.4.

qm of syntagm<sub>2</sub>). 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<sup>56</sup>, 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:

[*istiṭmārun*] *ṭawīlu l-’ağali* ‘[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 (*istiṭmārun, ṭawīlu*) functions as the attribute of the word *istiṭmārun*.

*ḥayru l-birri* [*’āğiluhu*] ‘the best of charity [is the quick of it]’ takes the property of Qm-subjectivity, since its qm, *ḥayru*, functions as the subject.

### 1.3.9. Dimension 9. Degree of the requiredness of the qualificator of the adjective

The dimension of **degree of the requiredness of the qualificator of the adjective** permits us to characterize adjectival syntagms in terms of the degree to which a qualificator 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

---

<sup>56</sup> 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 syntagm<sub>1</sub> which is ‘left-overlapping’ with respect to syntagm<sub>2</sub> is the qm of syntagm<sub>2</sub>).

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-rağulu*] *ṭ-ṭawīlu l-qāmati* ‘[the man] tall of height’ is a syntagm showing Optional qm-qualifiedness because its qualifier, *l-qāmati* ‘of height’, can be removed without making its left-overlapping syntagm, viz. *ar-rağulu ṭ-ṭawīlu* ‘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-rağulu*] *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-rağulu 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 substantivization, 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 *’ālatun 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 distinguish 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 substantival 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. *šabiyyun kātibun* ‘a writing boy’). He says that there is no conversion effected between *al-mağribiyyu* in *al-mağribiyyu s-sā'ihu* (‘the travelling Moroccan’) and *as-sā'ihu l-mağribiyyu* (‘the Moroccan traveller’) because “any morphological markers are lacking”. The term *šifa* 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 ‘putešestvujuščij 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 d-ḍaḥḥāku* – 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 substantival 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 reversibility 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 *rağulun-ğamīlun* (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 Sībawayhi 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 *baʿīd*, 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)’ (*Munğid* 2002: 533<sup>57</sup>), 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 *şaqīlun* ‘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. *rağulun rağīlun* ‘a [very] manly man’ (*Munğid* 2002: 251<sup>58</sup>), *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. *dimuqraṭiyyun* ‘democratic’, *kombyūtiryyun* ‘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.

---

<sup>57</sup> The definition is *an-nāqatu l-qawīyyatu* ‘[the] strong she-camel’.

<sup>58</sup> The definition is: *şadīdun şulbun* ‘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 *’Aḥmadu* ‘Ahmad’, *Bayrūtu* ‘Beirut’, physical objects like *baytun* ‘house’, *ḥaḡarun* ‘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.

*ḡalas-a*      *’Aḥmad-u*  
sat            Ahmad.M.SI-N  
‘Ahmad sat down’ /1/

The word *’Aḥmad* is the subject here. On the other hand, we find words that seem to be adjectives (intuitively, at least), e.g. *sābiqun* ‘former’ or *kumbyūtiriyyun* ‘related to computers’, *maḥḍun* ‘pure’, *baḥṭun* ‘pure’, *ra’īsun* ‘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/,

*lā*    *yuhibbu*    *l-lawn-a*      *l-wardiyy-a*  
not   likes            D-colour.M.SI-A    D-pink.M.SI-A  
‘[he] does not like the pink colour’ /2/

the word *l-wardiyya* is the attribute of the word *l-lawna* ‘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. *huwa l-mudīru ’Aḥmadu* ‘this is director Ahmad’. Other examples are: *luḡatun maṣḍarun* ‘source language’, *dawlatun ’uḍwun* ‘member state’. These possible constructions should be taken into account and further differences should be looked for. One of them is that words

*maṣdar* ‘source’ and *‘udwun* ‘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.:

‘*ayy-a-n* *mina* *l-lawn-ayni* *taqṣidu?* – *‘aqṣidu* *l-wardiyy-a*  
 which-A-I of D-colour.M.-DU.G you:mean I:mean 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:

*Miṣr-u* *balad-u-n* *‘arabiyy-u-n*  
 Egypt.F-N country.M.SI-N-I Arab.M.SI-N-I  
 ‘Egypt is an Arab country’ /4/

and

*tazawwaġat* *min* *‘arabiyyin* *ġaniyyin*  
 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*<sub>1</sub> conveying the adjectival meaning (cf. German ‘arabisch’ or Polish ‘arabski’) and the word ‘*arabiyyun*<sub>2</sub> 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 *ḥağarun* 'a stone' is more fit to be termed a 'substantive' than *taqīlun* 'heavy' is, but it is difficult to define the adjective and the substantive in an exact manner. The expression *mişriyyun* can mean both 'an Egyptian' or 'Egyptian'. What is more, the word *muslimun* seems to be a substantive ('a Muslim'), an adjective (in *dawlatun muslimatun* '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" (*Munğid* 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 *mişriyyun* 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 *ḥağirun* in *Munğid* is explained as "al-makānu l-kaḫīru l-ḥiğārati", '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 *ṣifa*, 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<sup>59</sup>, 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 *rafiqun* ‘a friend’. All these nouns follow the same pattern:  $C_1aC_2iC_3un$ . 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. *ṭayyibun* ‘good’, and substantives designate the bearers of these properties, one has to deal with such concepts as *ḥibun* ‘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 *uḍwun* ‘member’ or *ḡuz’un* ‘part’, which are not ontologically independent. On the other hand, there are words that on the grounds of the

---

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Gai (1983).

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-Ġāḥiẓ's book *Al-Buḥalā'* '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 (*maṣḍars*), or proper names, allow derivations by means of the *nisba*-ending: *-iyy-*, e.g. *qahrūn* '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. *ḍahābun* '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): *qaṭ'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 *miṣriyyun* 'Egyptian' cannot, whereas there are putative substantives, which can be graded, e.g. *šā'irun* 'poet', *ḥaṭībun* 'rhetor', *raġulun* 'man', the comparative forms of which are listed in dictionaries: *'aš'aru* 'a better poet', *'aḥṭabu* 'a better rhetor' (Munġid 2002: 186) and *'arġalu* '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<sup>60</sup>. 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

---

<sup>60</sup> 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). Bańczerowski 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 *ṣifa*), 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:

“Unter Berücksichtigung grammatischer und semantischer Kriterien definieren wir als Adjektiv jedes Wort, das in einem Syntagm der Struktur [Artikel - Nomen Artikel - Nomen] (al-bait al-kabīr “das große Haus”, ad-dirāsa al-iqtisādīya “die ökonomische Studie”)

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

in einem Syntagm der Struktur

[Artikel - Nomen Artikel -Nomen Artikel - Nomen<sub>Gen.</sub>] (aṣ-ṣabī al-azraq al-‘aynayn “der blauäugige Knabe”, al-ittifāqīya aṭ-ṭawīlat al-aḡal “das langfristige Abkommen”)<sup>61</sup>

– 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” [adlā‘ al-

---

<sup>61</sup> 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.

murabba‘ “die Seiten des Quadrats”]. Die Definition berücksichtigt nicht Konstruktionsbesonderheiten des Elativs” (Krahl 1985: 23-24).

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 *Labīduni š-šā‘iru* ‘Labid the poet’ and in ‘*Amruni ḍ-ḍaḥḥāku* ‘the giggly Amr’ or ‘Amr the Giggler’ (1963: 118). According to Krahl’s definition, both of these syntagms 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 Labīdun* ‘the poet Labid’, it is hardly acceptable to do so with a syntagm based on adjectival attribution and to say: \**aḍ-ḍaḥḥāku* ‘*Amrun* ‘the giggler Amr’<sup>62</sup>. The reason for the non-grammaticality of this construction lies in the fact that *ḍaḥḥākun* can function only as an attribute, in other words, it is adjectival in its nature.

As for the semantics of the two syntagms 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 substantival 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 ‘eine einem Gegenstand innewohnende 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.

---

<sup>62</sup> For the Arabic idea of apposition, expressed in the notions of *badal* and ‘*atf bayān*’ see e.g. Al-Galāyīnī (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 *Labīduni š-šā'ir/aš-šā'iru Labīdun*, 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<sup>63</sup>.

The noun which can be qualified by an adjective as defined above is a **substantive**<sup>64</sup>.

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

---

<sup>63</sup> 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".

<sup>64</sup> Diem (1974: 326) remarks that Kisā'ī, the principal grammarian of the Kūfan school, defined *ism* as what can receive a *šifa* ('*al-ismu mā wušifa*'). Gätje, in turn, cites from Ibn Ya'īš a relative clause that is said to be qualified by an adjective: *šā'anī llaḏī 'indaka l-'āqilu* '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:

*nisbat-u*            *d-duyūn-i*        *l-maškūk-i*        *bi*        *taḥṣīl-i-hā*  
percentage.F.SI-N    D-debts.NH.PL-G    D-doubted.NG.NN-G    in        collection.M.SI-G-3.NH.PL  
‘the percentage of debts whose collection is doubted’ (Ḥayāt 28.07, 11, *Istiḥdāru...*) /9/

*fi l-muʿassasat-i* [...]    *l-mustadʿā*        *ʿalay-hā*  
in D-institution.F.SI-G        D-accused.NG.NN.G    against-3.F.SI  
‘in the accused institution’ lit. ‘accused against it’ (Dustūr 1/4/04, 2, *Maḥkamatu l-ʿadli...*) /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 *faʿūl* in active sense, or
- (ii) follows the pattern *faʿīl* in passive sense, or
- (iii) follows the pattern *mifʿāl*.

Example:

*min ṣadīqat-i-hā*            *l-ladūd-i*            ʿAmrīkā  
from friend.F.SI-G-3.F.SI    D-staunch.NG.NN-G    America.F.G  
‘from her staunch friend America’ (Al-Mitāq 20/4/2004, 10) /12/

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

*imraʿat-u-n*        *ḥāmil-u-n*  
woman.F.SI-N-I    pregnant.NG.NN-N-I  
‘a pregnant woman’ /13/.

3. A noun is an adjective if it can qualify a preceding noun and follows the pattern *ʿafʿal* with comparative or superlative meaning, i.e. it does not have

the feminine form of the pattern *fu‘lā*, which is absolutive then<sup>65</sup>, 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 *ḥayrun* ‘better; the best’ shall be included here, as elatives with comparative or superlative meaning, yet with a non-typical form. Example:

*ṭā’irat-u-n*      **’asra‘-u**  
 plane.F.SI-N-I      quicker.NG.NN-N  
 ‘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 qualificator resulting in constructions with synonymous meaning. The loanword can be an older one, e.g.

*’umlat-u-n*      **ṣāġ-u-n**  
 currency.F.SI-N-I      regular.NG.NN-N-I  
 ‘standard currency’ (from Turkish *sağ* ‘healthy, correct’) /15/

or newer, e.g.: *mūf* ‘mauve’, *bīġ* ‘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:

*qahwat-u-n*      **turkiyy-u-n**  
 coffee.F.SI-N-I      Turkish.NG.NN-N-I  
 ‘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:

---

<sup>65</sup> Semantically different from absolutes but formally and syntactically similar is *’āḥar* ‘other’ (and its feminine form *’uḥrā*).

*li mulāḥaqat-i l-ʾafkār-i kabīr-i-hā wa ṣaḡīr-i-hā*  
 to pursuit.F.SI-G D-thoughts.NH.PL-G big.NG.NN-G-3.NH.PL and small.NG.NN-G-3.NH.PL  
 ‘to the pursuit of thoughts, big and small’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 139) /17/

By virtue of our definition, such words as *šattā* ‘all’ or *ʾaḡmaʿa* ‘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<sup>66</sup>. 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-

---

<sup>66</sup> 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]’.

Ayoubi et al. count elatives, along with ‘Egregationsnomina’, approximatives and numerals, among quantitatives. Quantitatives, in turn, along with adjectives (including participles), adverbs, prepositions and substantives are subcategories of ‘Nomen’ (2001: 5). El-Ayoubi et al. observe that “Der Elativ ist kein Adjektiv, wurde jedoch in MHA [*Modernem Hocharabisch* – MM] immer mehr an die Wortart des Adjektivs angepaßt, ohne in sie voll integriert zu sein” (2001: 253). 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 *ʾafʿal*, then also adjectives showing full concord in gender and number (with the feminine form *faʿlāʾ* and plural *fuʿl*), 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 *afʿal* 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 *ʾaṣḡaru* in *dawlatun ʾaṣḡaru* ‘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 *ʾafʿalu* pattern, yet they will be considered relative elatives on the grounds of their meaning and syntax, which are identical with that of *ʾafʿalu*-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<sup>l</sup>ā*. They will be called **absolute elatives**. Absolute elatives usually exist in pairs designating antonyms, e.g. '*ulyā* 'the upper.F.SI' vs. *suf<sup>l</sup>ā* 'the lower.F.SI' (cf. Grotzfeld 2000 and Wehr 1953: 21-24). They form a restricted class of words<sup>67</sup>.

Semantically different from other elatives but formally and syntactically similar to them is the adjective '*āḥaru* 'other' (feminine: '*uḥrā*'). Its morphosyntactic behaviour is sometimes like that of absolute elatives, sometimes like that of relative elatives. Also '*awwalu* 'first' (feminine: '*ūlā*'), which semantically is an ordinal numeral, is an elative, with partly relative, partly absolute morphosyntax<sup>68</sup>.

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. '*allāhu* '*akbaru* cannot be interpreted as 'God is greater', as it means rather 'God is very great' or 'the greatest'. Cf. other examples:

<i>kānati</i>	<i>r-riḥlat-u</i>	<b>'ašbah-a</b>	<i>bi riḥlat-i</i>	<i>s-Sindibād-i</i>
was	D-journey.F.SI-N	similar.NG.NN-A	with journey.F.SI-G	D-Sindbad-G
'the journey was <b>very similar</b> to the journey of Sindbad' ('Umar 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.:

<sup>67</sup> Cantarino says that they are used in expressions equivalent to proper names as in *al-qurūnu l-wuṣṭā* '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 absolute elatives and proper names. It can simply be said that some proper names include absolute elatives.

<sup>68</sup> Ordinal numerals with the meaning 'the first' are, historically, comparatives or superlatives also in other languages, e.g. German *erst* was the superlative of *eh* (Drosdowski et al. 1997: 163), and Polish *pierwszy* was the comparative form of *pierwy* (Bańkowski 2000, 2: 561).

*ṣaḥṣ-u-n murīb-u-n [...], 'akṭar-u mayl-a-n 'ilā l-badānat-i*  
 person.M.SI-N-I strange.M.SI-N-I more.NG.NN-N tendency.M.SI-A-I to D-obesity.F.SI-G  
 ‘a strange person [...], **rather tending** [lit. ‘**rather strong** in tendency’] to obesity’  
 (‘Ālam al-fikr, 46) /19/

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.:

*bi l-‘ālam-i l-ḥāriḡiyy-i l-mutaqaddim-i wa l-‘ašadd-i ta’fīr-a-n*  
 with D-world.M.SI-G D-external.M.SI-G D-progressing.M.SI-G and D-strongest.NG.NN-G impact.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘with the external world, progressing and **extremely influential**’ lit. ‘**extremely strong** in impact’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 20)<sup>69</sup>. /20/

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

*al-‘ahamm-u min dālīka ‘anna ‘iḡmāliyy-a...*  
 D-more:important.NG.NN-N than this that total.M.SI-A  
 ‘And [what is] **more important** than that is that the total of...’ (‘Ahrām 22.01.03, 28,  
 ‘Alāmatu stīfhāmin) /21/

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

*manṭiq-u l-‘aqwā*  
 logic.M.SI-N D-stronger/strongest.NG.NN.G  
 ‘the logic of the **stronger**’ or ‘of the **strongest**’ (Al-Mitāq 20/4/2004, 8) /22/

What is important about elatives is that they are neutralized, or ambivalent, with respect to ‘diathesis’. As they are formed directly from roots, and not from corresponding positive adjectives, the question whether an elative is active or passive is irrelevant, or, to put it differently, an

<sup>69</sup> 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<sup>70</sup>. One of the examples given by Wehr is *'ahdā mina n-nağmi*, which he renders as ‘den Weg besser weisend als die Sterne’, as opposed to *'ahdā mina l-qaṭā* ‘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:

*'aṣḥaba* [...] *'amr-a-n* *'ahwağ-a* *'ilay-hi* *min* *'ayy-i* *waqt-i-n* *maḍā*  
 became thing.M.SI-A-I needed.NG.NN-A to-3.M.SI than any-G time.M.SI-G-I passed  
 ‘[it] has become a thing [that is] **more necessary** than ever before’ (‘Ahrām 22.01.03, 10, *'Ayna l-ḥaḥiqatu...*) [cf. the verb *iḥtāğā* *'ilāyhi* ‘he needed it’, lit. ‘he needed to it’] /22/.

It seems that the elative is qualified by the prepositional phrase in a way analogous to how the corresponding positive is, viz. *muḥtāğan '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 *munḥafidun* ‘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

<sup>70</sup> 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’<sup>71</sup>. 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 99<sup>72</sup>,
- (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 *-at-*. 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.:

<i>ru‘ūs-i</i>	<i>‘amwāl-i</i>	<i>l-bunūk-i</i>	<i>s-sittat-i</i>	<i>l-‘āmm-at-i</i>
capitals.NH.PL-G	moneys.NH.PL-G	D-banks.NH.PL-G	D-six.M.PL-G	D-public-NH.PL-G
‘of the capitals of the 6 public banks’ (‘Ahrām 29/1/03, 1, <i>Mubārak yu‘akkidu...</i> ) /23/				

<sup>71</sup> Bartnicka, who studied the relationship between adjectives and participles in Polish, speaks of ‘adjectivization of participles’ (1970).

<sup>72</sup> 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.:

*ma‘a ṣudūr-i l-‘adad-i s-sittimi‘at-i*  
 with edition.M.SI-G D-issue.M.SI-G D-six:hundred-G  
 ‘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:

*hāḍihi l-‘utun-u l-ḥamsumi‘at-u*  
 these D-sheasses.NH.PL-N D-five:hundred-N  
 ‘these 500 she-asses’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 210) /25/

*ḥilāla s-sā‘āt-i l-‘arba‘-i wa l-‘iṣrīna l-māḍiy-at-i*  
 within D-hours.NH.PL-G D-four.F.PL-G and D-twenty.G D-past-NH.PL-G  
 ‘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 *tamyīz*, e.g. *ḥilāla l-‘arba‘i wa l-‘iṣrīna s-‘atan*. The construction discussed here seems not to be described in grammars of MWA. Badawi et al. give an example of it, *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 TAUTOPTOTIC 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 qualifier 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*<sup>73</sup>. 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<sup>74</sup>. E.g. some expressions which traditionally would be interpreted as appositions, here will be treated as substantival attributions.

---

<sup>73</sup> 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’.

<sup>74</sup> 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:

*qaḍiyyat-u l-mumarridāt-i l-bulḡāriyy-āt-i*  
issue.F.SI-N D-nurses.F.PL-G D-Bulgarian-F.PL-G  
'the issue of Bulgarian nurses' (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 19, *Mīn yalli dafa'*?) /1/

*ra'īs-ā l-wuzarā'-i s-sābiq-āni*  
presidents.M-DU.N D-ministers.M.PL-G D-former.M-DU.N  
'the [two] former Prime Ministers' (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 6, *At-tawāfuqu*) /2/

Examples with the absolutive elatives:

*qiyām-u minṭaqat-i t-tiḡārat-i l-ḥurr-at-i l-'arabiyy-at-i l-kubrā*  
existence.M.SI-N zone.F.SI-G D-trade.F.SI-G free-F.SI-G D-Arab-F.SI-G D-great.F.SI.G

‘the coming into being of the Great Arab Free Trade Zone’ (‘Arab al-Yawm 29/4/04, 2, *An-Nāṣir yad‘ū ‘ilā ...*) /3/

*at-tağārib-u*      **‘alā l-qaradat-i l-‘ulyā**  
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*    *yağidūna*    **ḥulūl-a-n**      **muṭlā**  
perhaps-3.M.PL    find      solutions.NH.PL-A-I    ideal.NH.PL.A.I  
‘perhaps they will find ideal solutions’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, *Maḍārru ‘ašī‘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<sup>75</sup>. Nevertheless, they will be treated as adjectives here. Examples:

*ṭabīb-u-n*      **ğarrāḥ-u-n**  
doctor.M.SI-N-I    surgeon.M.SI-N-I  
‘a surgeon doctor’ /6/

*aš-šu‘arā’-u*    **l-waššāḥ-ūna**  
D-poets.M.PL-N    D-muwashshaha:writing.M-PL.N  
‘muwashshaha-writing poets’ (Kallās 14) /7/

*‘ayyām-a*    *r-ra’īs-i*      **l-‘asīr-i**      *Şaddām Husayn*  
days.NH.PL-A    D-president.M.SI-G    D-captive.M.SI-G    Saddam.G Husayn.G  
‘the days of the captive president S.H.’ (‘Arab al-Yawm 29/4/04, 1, *Būš yuṭliqu ‘ināna...*) /8/

*wazīr-a-n*    *mas’ūl-a-n*      *wa*    *mudarris-a-n*    **‘adīb-a-n**  
minister.M.SI-A-I    responsible.M.SI-A-I    and    teacher.M.SI-A-I    learned.M.SI-A-I  
‘a responsible minister and a learned teacher’ (Ṭaqāfī 9/11/04, 4, *Takrīmu l-mubdī‘ina*) /9/

*‘an*    *ṭarīq-i*    *ṣuhufīyy-i-n*    **ṣadīq-i-n**  
through    way.M.SI-G    journalist.M.SI-G-I    friend.M.SI-G-I  
‘through a journalist-friend’ lit. ‘a friend journalist’ (Mīr 186) /10/

*ğamā‘at-a*    *l-‘iḥwān-i*      **l-muslim-īna**  
group.F.SI-A    D-brethren.M.PL-G    D-Muslim.M-PL.G  
‘the group of Muslim Brethren’ (Ar-Ra’y 1, *Al-Fāyiz: lā tasāhula...*) /11/

<sup>75</sup> According to Cantarino (1975, 2: 71) they would be “nonrestrictive appositives”, i.e. substantives modifying substantives (he gives the example *bā’i‘un ḡawwālun*). 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.:

*ar-raʿīs-u*      **ʿasīr-u**      *l-ḥarb-i*  
 D-president.M.SI-N    prisoner.M.SI-N    D-war.F.SI-G  
 ‘the president, prisoner of war’ /12/

*aṭ-ṭabīb-u*      **ḡarrāḥ-u**      *l-qalb-i*  
 D-doctor.M.SI-N    surgeon.M.SI-N    D-heart.M.SI-G  
 ‘the doctor, a heart surgeon’ lit. ‘surgeon of the heart’ /13/

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.:

*bi*    *kull-i*    *ṭiqat-i*      ***l-ʿālim-i***      ***l-ḥabīr-i***  
 with    all-G      confidence.F.SI-G    D-scholar.M.SI-G    D-expert.M.SI-G  
 ‘with all the confidence of an experienced scholar’ (Mīṭāq 20/4/04,13) /14/

Here, *ḥabīr* is qualifiable by a substantive in the genitive only if the meaning of *ḥabīr* 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 *nisba*-adjectives expressing nationalities qualifying appellativa, e.g.:

*ʿilā*    *ʿašiqqāʿ-i-kumu*      ***l-ʿirāqiyy-īna***  
 to    brothers.M.PL-G-2.M.PL    D-Iraqi.M-PL.G  
 ‘to your Iraqi brothers’ (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 2, *Aṣ-Ṣadru yuṭālibu...*) /15/

The order of the nominal constituents in these syntagms seems to be reversible but such reversed order seems not very natural. No example of a syntagm analogous to a hypothetical *ʿilā l-ʿirāqiyyīna ʿašiqqāʿikum* ‘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.

### 3.1.1.1.1. 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'ūlun* in active meaning:

*wadʿ-u*            ***ḥuṭṭat-i-n***    ***ṭamūḥ-i-n***            *li ʾinšāʾ-i...*  
 invention.M.SI-N    plan.F.SI-G-I    ambitious.NG.NN-G-I    for creation.M.SI-G  
 'invention of an ambitious plan for creating...' (ʿAhrām 29/01/03, 28, *Ḥuṭṭatun li ʾinšāʾi...*) /16/

*min natāʾiğ-i*            ***l-ḥarb-i***    ***ḍ-ḍarūs-i***  
 of    results.NH.PL-G    D-war.F.SI-G    D-fierce.NG.NN-G  
 'of the results of the fierce war' (ʿAhrām 22/01/03, 12, *Qaḍiyyatu s-sāʿati*) /17/

***maʿa mraʾat-i-n***    ***ḥaqūd-i-n***  
 with    woman.F.SI-G-I    malicious.NG.NN-G-I  
 'with a malicious woman' (ʿUmar 34) /18/

Adjectives following the pattern *faʿīlun* in passive meaning and *miğbārun*: no examples occurred in the corpus.

Adjectives designating typically female properties<sup>76</sup>:

*imra'at-u-n hāmīl-u-n*  
 woman.F.SI-N-I pregnant.NG.NN-N-I  
 ‘pregnant woman’<sup>77</sup> /19/

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

*ḥuṭūṭ-u-n multawīy-at-u-n ḥanūn-u-n*  
 lines.NH.PL-N-I winding-NH.PL-N-I gentle.NG.NN-N-I  
 ‘winding, gentle lines’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 106) /20/

*wāṣalat Miṣr-u masā'iy-a-hā d-da'ūb-a ...*  
 continued Egypt.F.SI-N efforts.NH.PL-A-3.F.SI D-tireless.NG.NN-A  
 ‘Egypt continued its tireless efforts’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 32, Muškilātun ḡawhariyyatun) /21/

A tendency to analogy is visible in that forms with the pattern *fa'ūlatun* instead of *fa'ūlun* 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 *fa'īl* in passive sense still prevails (1973: 212). Examples with no neutralization include:

*'anna laday-nā ḥuṭṭat-a-n ṭamūḥ-at-a-n*  
 that with-1.PL plan.F.SI-A-I ambitious-F.SI-A-I  
 ‘that we have an ambitious plan’ (‘Arab al-Yawm 29/4/04, 2, Al-maliku: 'ayyu ḥulūlin...) /22/

*ḡuhūd-a sumuww-i waliyy-i l-'ahd-i d-da'ūb-at-a*  
 efforts.NH.PL-A highness.M.SI-G successor.M.SI-G D-commitment.M.SI-G D-tireless-NH.PL-A  
 ‘the tireless efforts of [His] Highness Crown Prince’ (lit. ‘successor of the commitment’) (Ġazīra 3/4/04, 2, Waliyyu l-'ahdi yabḥaṭu...) /23/

<sup>76</sup> 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 (*ṣay'un*), which has masculine gender (Mosel 1975: 335).

<sup>77</sup> If used with gender concord (*imra'atun hāmīlatun*), the construction means ‘a woman carrying something’). No example of attributive use occurred in the corpus. There was however the following predicative syntagm:

*Nikūl Riṣī...hāmīlun*  
 ‘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, *qatīl* is ‘asesinado/a’ (‘killed’) but *qatīlatun* is ‘una muerta’ (‘a murdered woman’); *kaḍūb* is ‘mentiroso/a’ (‘untruthful’) but *kaḍūbatun* ‘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: ‘*aḡūzun* almost always means ‘an old woman’ and *murḍi*’ always means ‘wet nurse’, though without the feminine ending.

3. Adjectives that follow the pattern *afʿal* 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-ʾaʿzam-u*

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

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

*al-muškilat-u l-ʾakbar-u*

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

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

The absence of concord in number is exemplified in:

*fi l-buldān-i l-ʾaḡnā*

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

‘in the richest countries’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, *Maḍārru ʾašiʿati...*) /26/

In syntagms with masculine substantives as qualificata the concord neutralization is not visible. This is, for instance, the case in /27/:

*ğadā l-ʾUrdunn-u l-balad-a l-ʾaḥlā wa l-ʾağmal-a*  
 became D-Jordan.M-N D-country.M.SI-A D-most:lovely.NG.NN.A and D-most:beautiful.NG.NN-A  
 ‘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-qāʾid-u l-ʾaʿlā li l-quwwāt-i l-musallaḥ-at-i*  
 D-commander.M.SI-N D-highest.M.SI-N for D-forces.NH.PL-G D-armed-NH.PL-G  
 ‘the Chief Commander of the Armed Forces’ (Ra’y 2, *Qāfilatu musāʿadātin...*) /28/

With the feminine form *l-qāʾidatu* ‘the female commander’, however, the adjective would change its form to *l-ʿulyā*. One should also remember here that absolutive elatives form a closed class, i.e. not all elatives have the feminine form *fuʿlā*.

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, \**ṣ-ṣulbā* and \**š-šuddā* for the following examples, do not exist:

*ʾan takūna qaḍīyyat-u Filasṭīn-a l-ğawzat-a l-ʾaṣlab-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-ʾaṣadd-i ḍarar-a-n ʿalā ṭ-ṭabaqat-i l-wāqiy-at-i*  
 D-substance.F.SI-G D-strongest.NG.NN-G harm.M.SI-A-I to D-layer.F.SI-G D-protective-F.SI-G  
 ‘[of] the substance [extremely] harmful to the protective layer’ lit. ‘[of] the substance strongest in harm...’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, *Maḍārru ʾaṣiʿati...*) /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 stīfā'-a uḡūr-i-n 'a'lā min tilka llatī...*  
 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...' (Ra'y 1, 'I'lānun hāmmun) /31/

*tamrīn-a-n wāḥid-a-n tawīl-a-n tumma tamrīn-ayni 'aqṣar-a*  
 exercise.M.SI-A-I one-M.SI-A-I long.M.SI-A-I then exercise.M-DU.A.I shorter.NG.NN.A.I  
 'one long exercise, then [two] shorter exercises' (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 20, Ar-rāḥatu...) /32/

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

*al-'ahamm-u min dālīka 'anna 'iḡmāliyy-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 ...' ('Ahrām 22/01/03, 28,  
 'Alāmatu stīfhāmin) /33/

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

*fa l-ḡumhūr-u l-birāzīliyy-u lladī huwa 'aqrab-u 'ilā l-wilāyāt-i*  
 and D-people.M.SI-N D-Brazilian.M.SI-N which 3.M.SI closer.NG.NN-N.I to D-states.NH.PL-G

*l-muttaḥid-at-i qtiṣādiyy-a-n wa taqāfiyy-a-n*  
 D-united-NH.PL-G economic.NG.NN-A-I and cultural.NG.NN-A-I  
 'The Brazilian people, which is **fairly close** to the USA economically and culturally...  
 ('Ālamal-fikr, 49) /34/

Here, the relative *'aqrabu* was used as the predicate instead of being used as an attribute, since *fa l-ḡumhūru l-birāzīliyyu l-'aqrabu 'ilā...* 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. *'umlatun ṣāḡ* 'standard currency' (from Turkish *sağ* 'healthy, correct') or newer, e.g. *mūf* 'mauve', *bīḡ* 'beige' (from English). Another example is:

*al-fatāt-u l-mūdirn*<sup>78</sup>

D-girl.F.SI-N D-modern.NG.NN.N

‘the modern girl’ (from Badawi et al. 2004: 106) /35/

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:

*bi l-qiṣṣati l-kārīh#*

with D-haricut.F.SI-G D-carré.M.SI.G

‘with the *carré* haircut’ i.e. ‘bob haircut’ (ʿAḥbār 17/1/03, 13, *Aš-šaʿru l-mustaʿāru...*) /36/

because /36/ has a synonymous equivalent in *qiṣṣati l-kārīh*, where *l-kārīh* 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:

*qahwat-u-n turkiyy-u-n*

coffee.F.SI-N-I Turkish.NG.NN-N-I

‘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:

*ʿilā ʿihyāʾ-i ḥaflat-i zifāf-i-n ʿaw zaffat-i-n baladiyy-i-n*

to animation.M.SI-G celebration.F.SI-G wedding.M.SI-G-I or wedding.F.SI-G-I popular.NG.NN-G-I

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

---

<sup>78</sup> 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 bunny* ‘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 mas’ūl-a-n kūriyy-a-n ḡanūbiyy-a-n ṭalaba...*  
 but official.M.SI-A-I Korean.M.SI-A-I Southern.M.SI-A-I requested  
 ‘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-muḥaqqiq-i l-yahūdiyy-i l-’almāniyy-i*  
 by D-investigator.M.SI-G D-Jewish.M.SI-G D-German.M.SI-G  
 ‘by the German-Jewish investigator’ (Ṭaqāfi 9/11/04, 6, *Intihārun ḡayru...*) /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.:

*bāb-u*    *ḥuġrat-i-n*    *waḥīd-at-i-n*    *maftūḥ-u-n*  
door.M.SI-N    room.F.SI-G-I    only-F.SI-G-I    open.M.SI-N-I  
'the open door of the only room' (Liṣṣ 23) /41/.

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

*li madīnat-i-n*    *ġāmi'iyy-at-i-n*    *li l-banāt-i*    *ġadīd-at-i-n*  
of town.F.SI-G-I    academic-F.SI-G-I for    D-girls.F.PL-G    new-F.SI-G-I  
'of a new academic campus for girls' (Riyāḍ 24/4/04, 2, *Al-'amīru 'Abdullāh...*) /42/

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

*ḍimna*    *t-tafāṣīl-i*    *rubbamā*    *l-mumill-at-i*  
inside    D-details.NH.PL-G    perhaps    D-boring-NH.PL-G  
'in perhaps boring details' (Mītāq 20/4/04, 5) /43/.

### 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.:

*sittūna rağul-a-n*  
 sixty.N man.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘sixty men’ /44/.

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’at-u rağul-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’at-a wa tamān-īna ’asīr-a-n ġazā’iriyy-a-n*  
 killed four.M.PL-A and eighty-A prisoner.M.SI-A-I Algerian.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘[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-ṭalāṭat-i qurūn-i-ni l-māḍiy-at-i*  
 on course.M.SI.G D-three.M.PL-G centuries.NH.PL-G-I D-past-NH.PL-G  
 ‘in the course of the past 3 centuries’ (Ṭaqāfī 9/11/04,9, ‘Abqariyyatu l-ḥayālī...’) /47/

*’inna fī s-Sūdān-i mi’at-a milyūn-i fiddān-i-n ṣāliḥ-at-i-n (or ṣāliḥ-at-a-n)*  
 that in D-Sudan-G hundred.SI-A million.SI-G fiddan.M.SI-G-I good-NH.PL-G-I (good-NH.PL-A-I)  
 ‘in Sudan there is a hundred million good feddans’ (’Ahrām 29/01/03, 13, ‘Anāṣiru l-quwwati...’) /48/

*ḥilāla l-’arba’īna ‘ām-a-ni l-māḍiy-at-i (or l-māḍiy-at-a)*  
 during D-fourty.G year.M.SI-A-I D-past-NH.PL-G (D-past-NH.PL-A)  
 ‘during the past forty years’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 93) /49/

*fa mina t-ṭalāṭata ‘ašara milyūn-a yahūdiyy-i-ni l-muwazza’-īna fī l-‘ālam-i...*  
 and from D-thirteen.M.SI.G million.SI-A Jew.M.SI-G-I D-dispersed.M-PL.G in D-world.M.SI-G  
 ‘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 attractant 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'ata* 'hundred', or in of genitive, agreeing with the counted substantive, *fiddānin*. 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-attractant: the numeral or the counted substantive. Grammars of Arabic present contradictory data in this respect. For instance, Corriente gives the example *'arba'ūna rağulan mu'minīna* 'fourty believing men', where the plural adjective clearly agrees in case, the accusative, with the substantive (2002: 132). Cantarino, in turn, gives the example *fī l-'iṣrīna 'awi t-ṭalātīna sanatani l-'aḥīrati* '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 'āmani l-'aḥīrati* '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-māḍiyat-* in /49/, qualifies the numeral, *l-ʿarbaʿīna*, not the substantive, *ʿāman*<sup>79</sup>.

One more detail should be taken into consideration here. In /50/, the form of the adjective *l-muwazziʿīna* is used only for adjectives qualifying human substantives. How can this adjective, then, be a qualifier 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.:

*kun mina s-sabʿat-i r-rābiḥ-īna*  
 be of D-seven.M.PL-G D-winning.M-PL.G  
 ‘be [one] of the winning seven!’ (Ar-Ra’y 2, advertisement) /51/

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/:

*ḡuriḥa 16 [sittata ʿašara] šaḥṣ-a-n ʿāḥar-īna*  
 were:wounded sixteen.M.N person.M.SI-A-I other.M-PL.G.I  
 ‘16 other persons were wounded’ (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 2, *At-taḥālufu yadʿū...*) /52/

<sup>79</sup> However, Blau cites an example where the adjective does not have the definite article: *al-ʿašarata malāyīna 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/:

*hunāka* 12 [*itnā* ‘*ašara*] *muttāham-a-n* ‘*āḥar-a* *mawqūf-īna*  
 there twelve.M.N suspect.M.SI-A-I other.M.SI-A.I arrested.M-PL.A.I  
 ‘there are 12 other suspects arrested’ (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 2, *Qāḍī ṣ-Ṣadru...*) /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. *ḥāl* – 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 adjectival 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.M.N D-son.M.SI-N  
 ‘Bush Junior’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 1, *Al-’ismā’u l-maṭlūbu...*) /54/

Examples of substantival attributions without concord in gender are given in what follows:

*ğa‘ala-hā madīnat-a-n namūdağ-a-n*  
 it:made-3.F.SI city.F.SI-A-I model.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘it made her a model city’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 31, *Wamḍātun*) /55/

*lan tuwğada l-fatāt-u l-kuḥ-u<sup>80</sup> lī*  
 no will:be D-girl.F.SI-N match.M.SI-N for.1.SI  
 ‘there will be no girl convenient for me’ (Mīr 101) /56/

*‘aṣbahati l-yawm-a ‘arḍ-a-n būr-a-n*  
 became D-day.M.SI-A earth.F.SI-A-I fallow.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘has become today a fallow land’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 22, *Talātatu ‘ālāfi fiddānin...*) /57/

*mina l-kumbyūtir-i l-lawḥat-i*  
 of D-computer.M.SI-G D-tablet.F.SI-G  
 ‘of the tablet PC’ (‘Ahrām 22.01.03, 21, *Tuṣībā tu‘linu...*) /58/

Examples of substantival attributions showing no concord in number:

*bayna l-muslim-īna s-sunnat-i wa š-šī‘at-i*  
 among D-Muslims.M-PL.G D-Sunna.F.SI-G and D-Shia.F.SI-G  
 ‘among Sunni and Shia Muslims’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 7)<sup>81</sup> /59/

*yastanidu ‘ilā ‘aḥğār-i-n ‘asās-i-n ġadīd-at-i-n*  
 rests on stones.NH.PL-G-I foundation.M.SI-G-I new-NH.PL-G-I  
 ‘rests on new foundation stones’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 12) /60/

*wa lā bi l-ḥulūl-i l-wasaṭ-i*  
 and not with D-solutions.NH.PL-G D-middle.M.SI-G  
 ‘nor with compromises’ lit ‘middle solutions’ (Šarq ‘Awsaṭ, 17/05/03, 20, *Ar-ru‘ā...*) /31/

<sup>80</sup> The word *kuḥ* can be graded, as the following example shows: *‘illā ‘idā kāna l-‘aḥḍatu huwa l-‘akfa‘a* ‘only if the younger is the **fitter**’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 14, *Lā yağūzu taḥaṭṭī*). But in our study, gradability was rejected as a criterion for adjectivality. Thus, despite being gradable, the word *kuḥ* is not treated as an adjective.

<sup>81</sup> 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 qualifier in substantival attribution can be used without a qualified substantive. The same holds also for *būrun* ‘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-‘uḏwu* ‘the Member State’, one can also find the following:

*ad-dawlat-u*      *l-‘uḏw-at-u*      *llatī tatarā*’*asu mağlis-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.euomedrights.net/pages/214/page/language/3>) /62/

It seems that the process of adjectivization of the substantive *‘uḏwun* ‘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 *kattābun* or *kātibun*), e.g. *namūdağun* ‘model’, *‘uḏwun* ‘member’ or *‘abun* ‘father’ are always treated as substantives. Here we can also include qualifying nouns which follow the pattern of the verbal noun (*maṣḏar*) in what the Arab grammarians called *wasf bi-l-maṣḏar* ‘description by means of *maṣḏar*’. The classical example is *nisā’un ‘adlun* ‘just women’ lit. ‘women-justice’ (Al-Ġalāyīnī 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)<sup>82</sup>. E.g.:

*waḏa‘a sumuww-u-hu*      *l-ḥağar-a*      *l-‘asās-a*  
 laid:down majesty.M.SI-N-3.M.SI      D-stone.M.SI-A      D-foundation.M.SI-A  
 ‘His Majesty laid down the foundation stone’ (Riyāḏ 24/4/04, 1, *Al-‘amīru ‘Abdullāh...*) /63/

VS.

*wa ḥağar-a*      *l-‘asās-i*  
 and stone.M.SI-A      D-foundation.M.SI-G  
 ‘and the stone of foundation’ (Riyāḏ 24/4/04, 2, *Al-‘amīru Abdullāh...*) /64/

<sup>82</sup> 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 iṣ-Šerif* ‘Jerusalem’ (lit. ‘the noble sanctuary’, also *Quds iṣ-Šerif*” [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’ (Raġab 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-naḥīl-i l-bilāstīk-i**

phenomenon.F.SI-N D-palms.M.SI-G D-plastic.M.SI-G

‘the phenomenon of plastic palms’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 10, *Min qarībin*) /67/

VS.

**nastawridu naḥīl-a l-bilāstīk-i**

we:import palms.M.SI-A D-plastic.M.SI-G

‘we import palms [made] of plastic’ (ibidem) /68/<sup>83</sup>

Words such as *naḥsun*, ‘aynun, *dātun*, meaning ‘the same’, as well as ‘iddatun ‘various, several’ *šattā* and *ġamī* ‘all’ may function as qualifiers 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 [...] ’ahdāf-u-n ’iddat-u-n**

for company.F.SI-G-I goals.NH.PL-N-I number.F.SI-N-I

‘the company has various goals’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 27, ‘*Inšā’u šālātin...*) /69/

**mina l-maġmū’āt-i ’ayn-i-hā**

from D-groups.NH.PL-G same-G-3.NH.PL

‘from the same groups’ (Šarq 2, *Al-Bašmarkatu l-yadu...*) /70/

**fi buqā’-i-n šattā**

in places.NH.PL-G-I all.G

‘in all places’ (Mītāq 20/4/04,13) /71/

---

<sup>83</sup> Also synonymous adjectival attributions are correct: *al-ḥaġaru l-’asāsiyyu*, *as-sikkatu l-ḥadīdiyyatu* and *an-naḥīlu l-l-bilāstikiyyu*.

### 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 qualifiers 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:

*li mulāḥaqat-i l-ʿafkār-i kabīr-i-hā wa ṣaġīr-i-hā*  
 to pursuit.F.SI-G D-thoughts.NH.PL-G big.NG.NN-G-3.NH.PL and small.NG.NN-G-3.NH.PL  
 ‘to the pursuit of thoughts, big and small’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 139) /72/

*fī-hi l-maġallāt-u l-ʿarabiyy-at-u ʾakṭar-u-hā wa ʾaḥsan-u-hā*  
 in-3.M.SI D-magazines.NH.PL-N D-Arabīc-NH.PL-N most.NG.NN-N-3.NH.PL 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 suffixally substantivized adjectives to substantives used in substantival attribution can be seen in constructions with the word *ġamīʿ* ‘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:

*qad kataba ʾamlāk-a-hu ġamīʿ-a-hā bi sm-i maʿbūdat-i-hi*  
 PART bequeathed properties.NH.PL-A-3.M.SI all-A-3.NH.PL to name.M.SI-G ladylove.F.SI-G-3M.SI  
 ‘[he] had bequeathed all his properties to [the name of] his ladylove’ (‘Umar 40)

Cf. the non-grammaticality of *\*kataba ʾamlākahu l-ġamīʿata*, with *ġamīʿ* 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<sup>84</sup>. 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 *ra'ā Būš ra'īsa l-wilāyāti l-muttaḥidati* 'he saw Bush, the president of USA' can be reduced to *ra'ā ra'īsa l-wilāyāti 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)<sup>85</sup>. Quite frequently, substantival appositions involve proper names. E.g.:

*min Lubnān-a      masqaṭ-i      ra's-i-hi*  
 from Lebanon.M-G      place of fall.M.SI-G      head.M.SI-G-3.M.SI  
 'from Lebanon, place of his birth' lit. 'the place of fall of his head' (Arabī5/04, 168) /75/

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

*qālati l-muhandisat-u Ṭanā' ad-Dīb mudīr-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' (Ahrām 29/01/03, 15, Muḥāfaẓatu l-Ġīzati...) /76/

<sup>84</sup> 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.

<sup>85</sup> On the contrary, the expression *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 (*al-'abu Būš* means 'Father Bush') and neither of the two words can be omitted without information loss.

*nāfiq-u-n*      *bi sm-i*      *l-quwwāt-i*      *l-būlandiyy-at-i* ...  
 spokesman.M.SI-N-I    in name.M.SI-G    D-forces.NH.PL-I    D-Polish-NH.PL-G

*l-liftinānt#* *kūlūnīl#*      *R. S.*  
 D-lieutenant:colonel.M.SI.N    RS.M.N

‘a spokesman of Polish forces, lieutenant colonel R.S.’ (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 2, *At-taḥālufu yad‘ū...*) /77/

Examples of appositions which do not involve proper nouns include:

*bi š-šayb-i*      *‘alāmat-i*      *l-waqār-i*  
 with D-gray:hair.M.SI-G    sign.F.SI-G    D-dignity.M.SI-G  
 ‘with gray hair, sign of dignity’ (Maqhā 90) /78/

*‘alā tarwat-i-hi*      *ṭ-ṭabī‘iyy-at-i*      *l-bitrūl-i*  
 on wealth.F.SI-G-3.M.SI    D-natural-F.SI-G    D-oil.M.SI-G  
 ‘on its natural wealth, oil’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 10, *Qiṣṣatu mawtin...*) /79/

Examples showing the reversibility of the word order:

*al-‘āṣimat-u*      *Baḡdād-u*  
 D-capital.F.SI-N    Baghdad.F-N  
 ‘the capital Baghdad’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 1, *Taqārīru mina l-Bintāḡūn...*) /80/

*‘ilā Ṭulayṭilat-a*      *l-‘āṣimat-i*  
 to Toledo.F-G    D-capital.F.SI-G  
 ‘to Toledo the capital’ (Kallās 33) /81/

*Yuwānā Frūtskā*      *safīrat-u*      *Būlandā*      *fi l-Qāhirat-i*  
 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, *Būlandā tataṭalla‘u...*) /82/

*as-safīr-u*      *l-‘amirīkiyy-u*      *bi l-Qāhirat-i*      *Dīfid Wūlš*  
 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 *aḍ-ḍaḥḥāku* ‘Amrun ‘the laugher Amr’ is grammatically well formed and means roughly the same as ‘Amruni ḍ-ḍaḥḥāku ‘the laughing Amr’, it means that the word *ḍaḥḥāku* 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<sup>86</sup>. 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:

*wikālat-u l-ʿanbāʾ-i s-sūriyy-at-u Sānā*  
 agency.F.SI-N D-news.NH.PL-G D-Syrian-F.SI-N Sana.F.N  
 ‘the Syrian news agency Sana’ (Liwāʾ 7/4/04, 1, *Tašdīdun ʿalā l-ʿiḍādi...*) /84/

Examples of titles and similar labels:

*an-nāʾib-u ʿĀn Klūyd ...*  
 D-representative.M.SI-N AK.F.N  
 ‘the MP Ann Clwyd’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 2, *Mabʿūtātun brīṭāniyyatun...*) /85/

*ḥayāt-u ḥālīd-i d-dīkr-i Hārūn-a r-Rašīd-i*  
 life.F.SI-N eternal.M.SI-G D- mention.M.SI-G Harun.M.G ar-Rashid.M-G  
 ‘the life of the always remembered (lit. ‘eternal in memory’) Harun ar-Rashid’ (Mīr 209) /86/

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

*as-sayyidat-u qarīnat-u-hu*  
 D-lady.F.SI-N spouse.F.SI-N-3.M.SI  
 ‘Ms his spouse’ (ʿAnwār 3/5/04, 2, *Raʿīsu Tšīkiyā...*) /87/

*bi l-ʾiḥwat-i l-muwāṭin-īna*  
 with D-brothers.M.PL-G D-citizen.M.PL.G  
 ‘with brothers citizens’ (Raʿy 1, *ʾIḷānun 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:

<sup>86</sup> According to Cantarino (1975, 2: 69, fn. 15), “titles or degrees accompanying a name [...] should rather be considered as part of the proper name”.

*bi r-raʿīs-i Allīndī raʿīs-i ġumhūriyyat-i Tšīlī*  
 with D-president.M.SI-G Allende.M.G president.M.SI-G republic.F.SI-G Chile.F.G  
 ‘with President Allende, the president of the Republic of Chile’ (Mīṭāq 20/4/04, 13) /89/.

Words that can be used as titles and similar labels include: *al-marḥūmu* ‘the late’, *aṣ-ṣadīqu* ‘friend’, *al-ʾaḥu* ‘brother’, *ar-rafiḥu* ‘comrade’, *as-sayyidu* ‘Mr’, *ad-duktūru* ‘Doctor’, *al-ḥāġġu* ‘Hajj’, but also other substantives, which are less formal labels, e.g.:

*al-mutanabbiʾ-u Ḥāmīm ibn-u Mannillāh*  
 D-prophesying.M.SI-N Hamim.M.N son.M.SI-N Mannillah.M.G  
 ‘the false prophet Hamim, son of Mannillah’ (ʿAhrām 29/01/03, 28 *At-taʿāwunu...*) /90/

*ʾanna ʾawlād-a l-ġaniyy-i t-tariyy-i Ğanāb Ḥanī yaktubūna...*  
 that children.M.PL-A D-richman.M.SI-G D-wealthy:man.M.SI-G Ğ.H.M.G. write  
 ‘that the children of the richman, the Croesus Ğanāb Ḥanī write...’ (ʿUmar 70) /91/.

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

*baʿda ġad-i-ni l-ʾarbiʿāʾ-i*  
 after tomorrow.M.SI-G-I D-Wednesday.M.SI-G  
 ‘after tomorrow Wednesday’ (Ar-Raʾy 1, *Al-maliku: ʾiqāmatu...*) /92/

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

*taʾwīdāt-i l-fiʾat-i «ġ» [ġīm#]*  
 compensations.NH.PL-G D-category.F.SI-G C#  
 ‘compensations of category C’ (Dustūr 1/5/04, 1, *Badʾu ṣarfī...*) /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.:

*qaddama Hildā l-yahūdiyy-a ka 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, *Intihārūn ġayru...*) /94/

In contrast to:

*fi l-'almāniyy-i Hīḡil*

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

'in the German Hegel' (Mīṭāq 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:

*bi kulliyat-i Dār-i l-'Ulūm-i Ğāmi'at# l-Qāhirat-i*

in department.F.SI-G House.F.SI-G D-sciences.NH.PL-G university.F.Si? D-Cairo.F.SI-G

'in the department *Dar al-Ulum* [House of Sciences], the University of Cairo'

(ʿAhrām 29/01/03, 28, *Munāqašatu ḡādiri...*) /96/

which are basically composed of two syntagms, the second of which (*Ğāmi'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 *bi kulliyati Dāri l-'Ulūmi*.

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

*fi dīsambir-a kānūn-a l-'awwal-i l-mādī*

in December.M.SI-G Kanun.M.SI-G D-first.M.SI-G D-last.M.SI.G

'in last December, Kanun the First' (Riyāḡ 24/4/04, 1, *Hukmun bi s-siḡni...*) /97/.

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

*kāna [...] šā'ir-a-n 'adīb-a-n 'āšiq-a-n li l-'adab-i*

he:was poet.M.SI-A-I homme:de:lettres.M.SI-A-I lover.M.SI-A-I to D-literature.M.SI-G

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

Here we have two problems. First: is *'adīban* an adjective in the sense 'learned' and being an attribute of *šā'iran*, or a substantive in the sense 'homme des lettres'? Second, is *'āšiqan* an adjective in the sense 'loving' and being an attribute of *šā'iran* 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:

*al-kātib-u s-sā’ih-u*  
D-writing.M.SI-N D-travelling.M.SI-N /99/

*as-sā’ih-u l-kātib-u*  
travelling.M.SI-N D-writing.M.SI-N /100/

In the glossing, only working translations with participles are given for the time being. *Kātibun* 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 *sā’ihun* ‘traveller, tourist’ vs. ‘travelling’. Let us discuss the possible meanings of /99/ and /100/:

**Ex. /99/:** *al-kātibu s-sā’ihu* can mean: ‘a writer travelling’, esp. if *sā’ih* will have a prepositional phrase or an adverbial as a qualifier, as in the sentence:

*wa kāna hādā l-kātibu s-sā’ihu* (‘abra l-mašriqi) ‘āmadāka Yūlyūš Sūfatskī  
‘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 *al-kuttābu s-sā’ihūna*, e.g.

*wa min al-kuttābi s-sā’ihīna* ‘abra l-mašriqi fī l-qarni t-tāsi’a ‘ašara Bayrūn wa Sūfatski wa Flūbīr  
‘**Writers travelling** across the East in the 19th cent include Byron, Słowacki and Flaubert’.

In the singular, the syntagm *al-kātibu s-sā'ihu* 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-suyyāhu*:

*'uḥibbu qirā'ata l-mudakkirāti li l-kuttābi s-suyyāhi*  
 'I like reading memoirs of **writers-travellers**'

The order of the constituents can be reversed:

*'uḥibbu qirā'ata l-mudakkirāti li s-suyyāhi 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-suyyāhi* and *s-suyyāhi l-kuttābi* is basically the same, only the point of view differs slightly.

**Ex. /100/:** *as-sā'ihu l-kātibu* can mean 'a (currently) writing traveller', esp. if *al-kātibu* has a prepositional phrase or a direct object as a qualifier, as in the sentence:

*fa 'arafa 'anna s-sā'iḥa l-kātiba (risālatan fī ḡilli l-ḥā'iṭi) huwa r-raḡulu llaḏi baḥaṭa 'anhu*  
 '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-suyyāhu* (or *as-suwwāhu*) *l-kātibūna*. 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 qiblata li kulli sā'iḥin kātibin*  
 'The East was the mecca for every **writer-traveller**'

In the plural this syntagm would have the form: *as-suyyāhu l-kuttābu*, 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 murta'idūna ḥā'inūna* ‘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, *murta'idūna* in our example, does not get substantivized so as to be attributively qualified by the second, *ḥā'inūna*. 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 ḥā'inūna murta'idūna*.

In most cases this phenomenon concerns adjectives designating humans. A substantive such as *raḡulun* ‘a man’, *nāsun* ‘people’ or *imra'atun* ‘a woman’ etc. can be inserted so as to be attributively qualified by the adjectives. Examples include the following pairs:

*yakūnūna* *ʾawwal-a* *l-murtaʿid-īna* *l-ḥāʾin-īna* *l-fārr-īna*  
 are first.NG.NN-A trembling.M-PL.G D-treacherous.M-PL.G D-fleeing.M-PL.G  
 ‘[they] will be the first **trembling, treacherous, fleeing** [people]’ (Mīṭāq 30/12/03, 12) /101/

VS.

*ʾanna-hum ḥāʾin-ūna* *murtaʿid-ūna* *ḥāʾif-ūna...*  
 that-3.M.PL treacherous.M-PL.N trembling.M-PL.N scared.M-PL.N of  
 ‘that they are **treacherous, trembling, scared...**’ (Mīṭāq 30/12/03, 12) /102/

Cf. *ʾawwala n-nāsi l-murtaʿidīna l-ḥāʾinīna* and *ʾannahum nāsun ḥāʾinūna murtaʿidūna*.

*ʾilā turkiyyat-i-n* *ʾağūz-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-ʾağūz-i* *t-turkiyy-at-i*  
 around house.M.SI-G D-old:woman.F.SI-G D-Turkish-F.SI-G  
 ‘around the house of the Turkish old woman’ (Liṣṣ 157) /104/

Cf. *ʾilā mraʾatin turkiyyatin ʾağūzin* and *bayti l-marʾati l-ʾağūzi t-turkiyyati*.

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

*ʾanna l-muʿalliq-īna* *l-ʾamīrkiyy-īna*  
 that D-commentators.M-PL.A D-American.M-PL.A  
 ‘that American commentators’ (Šarq 14/4/04, 1, *Al-Fallūğatu... wa mā ʾadrāka...*) /105/

because it cannot be changed to *ʾanna l-ʾamīrkiyyīna 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:

*al-mu'tadil-ūna*      *l-muslim-ūna*  
D-moderate.M-PL.N      D-Muslim.M-PL.N  
‘moderate Muslims’ /106/

vs.

*al-muslim-ūna*      *l-mu'tadil-ūna*  
D-Muslim.M-PL.N      D-moderate.M-PL.N  
‘Muslim moderates’ /107/.

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-mu'tadilūna l-muslimūna* ‘moderate (,) Muslim people’ or *an-nāsu l-muslimūna l-mu'tadilūna* ‘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-muslimūna l-mu'tadilūna*, or, with the order reversed, that they are ‘Muslim/Islamic *qua* moderates’ in *al-mu'tadilūna l-muslimūna*. The reversal of the linear order of these words causes no change in meaning, there is only a change in perspective,

however slight<sup>87</sup>. 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/:

*al-mufattiṣ-ūna*      *d-duwaliyy-ūna*  
 D-inspectors.M-PL.N      D-international.M-PL.N  
 ‘international inspectors’ /108/

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

---

<sup>87</sup> The perspective differs more conspicuously when a possible opposition (antonymy) is involved, cf. *al-mu’tadilīna l-muslimūna wa l-yahūdu* ‘Muslim and Jewish moderates’ vs. *al-muslimūna l-mu’tadilīna wa l-mutaṭarrifūna* ‘moderate and extremist Muslims’.

*modern Muslims* the word *modern* is the qualificator 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 *mu‘tadilūna* 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-filasṭīniyy-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-filasṭīniyyūna l-munāḍilūna*  
 ‘the fighting Palestinians’

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

*al-filasṭīniyy-ūna l-munāḍil-ūna ḍidda l-iḥṭilāl-i*  
 D-Palestinian.M-PL.N D-fighting.M-PL.N against D-occupation.M-SI-G  
 ‘Palestinians fighting against the occupation’ /110/

Here, the word order cannot be reversed to yield:

\**al-munāḍilūna ḍidda l-iḥṭilāli l-filasṭīniyyūna*

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

*ar-riḡāl-u l-filasṭīniyy-ūna l-munāḍil-ūna ḍidda...*  
 D-men.M-PL-N D-Palestinian.M-PL.N D-fighting.M-PL.N against  
 ‘the Palestinian men fighting against...’ /111/

Cf. the non-grammaticality of \**ar-riġālu l-munāḍilūna ḍidda l-iḥtilāli l-filasṭīniyyūna*

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** against...*)<sup>88</sup> 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:

*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 substantive it qualifies, while the unqualified adjective *bogaty* 'rich' is placed nearer to it.

*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.

---

<sup>88</sup> 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/:

*’ilā manzil-i-n faḥm-i-n mu’allaf-i-n min ṭābiq-ayni*  
to flat.M.SI-G-I luxurious.M.SI-G-I composed.M.SI-G-I of storey.M-DU.G  
‘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: *’ilā manzilin mu’allafin min ṭābiqayni* (pause), *faḥmin...*

What distinguishes it from adjectival juxtaposition is that proper adjectival parataxis sometimes can be syndetic<sup>89</sup>. 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.: *’ilā manzilin faḥmin, manzilin mu’allafin min* etc.

### 3.3.2. Adjectival juxtaposition

This construction, also based on parataxis, differs from proper adjectival parataxis in some semantic and syntactic respects<sup>90</sup>. 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/:

*li fti’āl-i fitnat-i-n sunniy-at-i-n šī’iyy-at-i-n*  
to fabrication.M.SI-G civil:war.F.SI-G-I Sunni-F.SI-G-I Shiite-F.SI-G-I

<sup>89</sup> 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 (*kutub qadīmah wa ḥadīṭah* “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).

<sup>90</sup> 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 *fitnatin sunniyyatin wa fitnatin šī‘iyyain* ‘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 sunniyyatun* ‘a Sunni civil war’ or *fitnatun šī‘iyyatun* ‘Shiite civil war’ would mean something else<sup>91</sup>. Another example is:

*‘inna miḥwar-a-n siyāsiyy-a-n sūriyy-a-n ʾirāniyy-a-n lubnāniyy-a-n yusāʿidu...*  
that axis.M.SI-A-I political.M.SI-A-I Syrian.M.SI-A-I Iranian.M.SI-A-I Lebanese.M.SI-A-I supports  
‘that the Syrian-Iranian-Lebanese political axis supports...’ (Šarq ʾAwsaṭ, 17/05/03,  
20, *Liqāʾun...*) /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.:

*qāmūs-u-n ʿarabiyy-u-n būlandiyy-u-n*  
dictionary.M.SI-N-I Arabic.M.SI-N-I Polish.M.SI-N-I  
‘an Arabic-Polish dictionary’ /118/.

### 3.3.4. Substantival parataxis

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

*ʾinna š-šayḥūḥat-a māḍin, dākirat-u-n*  
that D-old:age.F.SI-A past.M.SI.N.I memory.F.SI-N-I  
‘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.

---

<sup>91</sup> 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, intuitively near that adjectives also function as predicates. This is not their typical, but secondary function<sup>92</sup>.

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/:

‘*Ā*’*ī*š*at*-*un*      *š**aqrā*’-*u*  
Aisha.F-N      blonde.F.SI-N.I  
‘Aisha is [a] blonde’ (BQ 20) /1/

---

<sup>92</sup> 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/:

‘*Ā’išat-un šaqrā’-u tuši’u hālat-a-n...*  
 Aisha.F-N blonde.F.SI-N.I radiates halo.F.SI-A-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 *šaqrā’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 *šaqrā’u* is an adjective, then this clause may be the predicative clause of ‘*Ā’išatun*’, thus the meaning is: ‘Aisha is blonde, [she] radiates ...’<sup>93</sup>. 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 ‘*Ā’išatun šaqrā’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-A-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’).

<sup>93</sup> 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/:

'anna-nī maǧnūn-u-n yumārisu ḥarakāt-i-n ḡunūniyy-at-a-n  
 that-I maniac.M.SI-N-I carries:out moves.NH.PL-A-I maniacal-NH.PL-A-I  
 'that I am a maniac who carries out maniacal movements' (Mīr 200) /4/

it does not have to follow that the predicate noun *maǧnūnun* 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<sup>94</sup>. The solution we will adopt will be similar to that proposed in Al-Jabbār 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/:

'Amr-un šarīf-u-n  
 'Amr.M-N honorable.M.SI-N-I  
 'Amr is honorable' /5/

the word *raǧulun* can be inserted as to yield:

'Amr-un raǧul-u-n šarīf-u-n  
 'Amr.M-N man.M.SI-N-I honorable.M.SI-N-I  
 'Amr is an honorable man' /6/

In other cases such an operation is not possible, cf. \*'Amrun raǧulun za'īmun \*'Amr is a leader-man'. Therefore, in /5/ the predicate noun should be considered an adjective, while in \*'Amrun raǧulun za'īmun it cannot (1985: 39). This proposal seems to be quite useful. It also reflects

<sup>94</sup> Note that the notional difference between *huwa kātibun* 'he is a writer', with a substantive, and 'he is writing', with an adjective lies in their meanings: 'constant' vs. 'transitional' occupation and that such criteria are rather of no use. Such a distinction is absent in many other cases, as in *huwa 'arabiyyun* 'He is Arab' or 'He is an Arab'.

the difference between *kātibun* ‘writer’ and *kātibun* ‘writing’. A construction ‘*Amrun rağulun 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 rağulun 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 mut‘abatun* ‘The girl is tired’ one can say *al-fatātu fatātun mut‘abatun* ‘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 *šay’un* 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’ (Maqhā 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.:

*fa n-naqd-u hunā naqd-u-n binā'iyiyy-u-n*  
 and D-criticism.M.SI-N here criticism.M.SI-N-I constructive.M.SI-N-I  
 ‘and the criticism here is constructive criticism’ (Ṭaqāfi 9/11/04, 5, *Al-'ibdā'u bayna n-naqdi...*) /9/

Substantives with a general sense, such as *'amrun* ‘thing, matter’ or *šay'un* ‘thing’, are also used:

*'inna sa'y-a maǧmū'at-i-n mina l-ʾašḥāṣ-i li farḍ-i nafs-i-hā*  
 that effort.M.SI-A group.F.SI-G of D-persons.M.PL-G to imposition.M.SI-G self-G-3.F.SI  
*'alā bāqī 'abnā'-i š-šā'b-i 'amr-u-n marfūḍ-u-n*  
 upon remaining.NG.NN.G sons.M.PL-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’ (Ḥayāt 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 *mas'alatun* as predicate:

*hādihi mas'alat-u-n ṭawīl-at-u-n*  
 this question.F.SI-N-I long-F.SI-N-I  
 ‘This is a long question’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 157) /11/

can be used instead of *hādihi l-mas'alatu ṭawīlatun* ‘This question is long’, with *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. *'amrun* ‘thing’, this predicate noun will be taken to be an adjective (cf. Bolinger’s ‘reference modification’), e.g.:

*'anna s-salām-a fi l-miṭṭaqat-i 'asāsiyy-u-n*  
 that D-peace.M.SI-A in D-region.F.SI-G fundamental.M.SI-N-I  
 ‘that peace in the region is [the] fundamental [thing]’ (Liwā' 7/4/04, 2, *'Anẓimatun '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.:

*wa ḥīna kānat fī l-madrasati kāna ṣawtuhā yaḥṭaniqu ḥīna yuḥlabu minhā 'an taqra'a. **ṭawīlatun wa mumtali'atun**, ša'run 'aswadu kaṭīfun wa ṭawīlun, [...]*

'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' (Maqhā 64) /13/

*zarīfun wa muḥfidun 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/

*'āša 'azib-a-n lam yatazawwağ*

he:lived unmarried.M.SI-A-I not got:married

'He lived as bachelor [who] did not get married' ('Arabī 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:

*uḥruḡ maṭrūd-a-n min hāḏā l-makān-i t-ṭāhir-i*  
 go:away outcast.M.SI-A-I from this D-place.M.SI-G D-pure.M.SI-G

‘go away as an outcast from this pure place’ or ‘go away, being cast out,...’ (Mīr33)/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 ‘aziban* ‘he lived as an unmarried man’ and *uḥruḡ ‘insānan maṭrūdan* ‘go away as an cast-out man’ are less conceivable than *huwa raḡulun ‘azibun* ‘he is an unmarried man’ or ‘*anta raḡulun maṭrūdun* ‘you are a cast-out man’, the latter being constructions with adjectives as attributive qualifiers of basic predicates. The latter constructions can be used as a test for adjectivity 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:

*‘āša wa huwa ‘azib-u-n*  
 he:lived and 3.M.SI unmarried.M.SI-N-I  
 ‘he lived and he [was] unmarried’ /17/

with ‘*azibun* functioning as the predicate. Since it is grammatical to say ‘*āša wa huwa raḡulun ‘azibun*, the noun ‘*aziban* will be treated as an adjective. The same holds for *maṭrūdan* of /16/, cf. *uḥruḡ wa ‘anta ‘insānun 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 qualifiers 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'tabaru murtakib-a-n li ġarīmat-i*  
 he:is:regarded committing.M.SI-A-I PREP crime.F.SI-G  
 'is regarded as the perpetrator of/committing the crime [of]' (Arabī 5/04, 82) /18/

*laysa naġāḥ-u huṭṭat-i l-iḥtilāl-i fi l-'Irāq-i 'akīd-a-n*  
 is:not success.M.SI-N plan.F.SI-G D-occupation.M.SI-G in D-Iraq.M-G sure.M.SI-A-I  
 'The success of the plan of the occupation in Iraq is not sure' (Mitāq 20/4/2004, 7) /19/

In /18/, the word *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. *yu'tabaru šaḥṣan murtakiban li ġarīmati ...* '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. *laysa naġāḥu [...] naġāḥan 'akīdan* '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.:

*yā la-ka min ġabiyy-i-n*  
 oh PREP-2.M.SI of stupid.M.SI-G-I  
 'How stupid you are!' (Karnak 19) /20/

*yā la-ka min mut'ab-i-n*  
 oh PREP-2.M.SI of tired.M.SI-G-I  
 'How tired you are!' (Liṣṣ 92) /21/

In both cases, the nouns *ġabiyyin* and *mut'abun* are potential attributive adjectives, cf. *yā laka min raġulin ġabiyyin* 'What a stupid man you are!'

and *yā laka min 'insānin mut'abin* ‘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 *'atānī l-yawma qawiyyun* ‘a strong [one] approached me today’, which he described as one in which a *ṣifa* used in the subject function is a ‘weak’ construction, i.e. acceptable but not as good as *'atānī l-yawma rağulun qawiyyun* ‘a strong man approached me today’ (Mosel 1975, I: 325 ). Another classical Arab grammarian, Ibn Ya‘īš, studied the different forms of plural adjectives and substantives and noticed that when used as, or instead of, a substantive, the *ṣifa* has broken plural (Guillaume 1992: 69)<sup>95</sup>.

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. *iḥtiyāṭiyyun* ‘a substitute’, *'irhābiyyun* ‘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

---

<sup>95</sup> 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. accusative 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) antegenitively,
- (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 antegenital 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<sup>96</sup>. 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 *kto? 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-ʿawwalu* ‘the former’, *l-ʿaḥīru* or *l-ʿāḥaru* ‘the latter’ etc. Example:

---

<sup>96</sup> This is Cantarino’s “apparent substantival usage” of adjectives (1975, 2: 61-64). However, he considers also such examples as *ʿummu l-luḡāti l-ʿisbāniyyati wa l-ʿiṭāliyyati wa l-burtuḡāliyyati* to be examples of this use, with which we must disagree since, for us, this is normal adjectival attribution.

*bayna wiğdān-ayni l-ʾawwal-u mursil-u-n wa l-ʾāḥar-u mustaqbil-u-n*  
 between consciousness.M-DU.G D-first.NG.NN-N sending.M.SI-N-I and D-other.M.SI-N receiving.M.SI-N-I  
 ‘between two consciousnesses, [out of which] one is sending and the other is receiving’ (Ṭaqāfi 9/11/04, 5, *Al-ʾibdāʿu bayna n-naqdi...*) /22/

Frequently, the preposition *min* with a corresponding pronominal suffix is used, if the antecedent is plural, e.g.:

*istaḥdamati l-kanīsat-u r-rūmāniyy-at-u ʾasliḥat-a-hā,*  
 used D-church.F.SI-N D-Roman-F.SI-N weapons.NH.PL-A-3.F.SI  
*r-rūḥiyy-at-a min-hā wa l-māddiyy-at-a*  
 D-spiritual-NH.PL-A of-3.NH.PL and D-material-NH.PL-A  
 ‘the Roman Church used its weapons, both **spiritual** and **material**’ (ʿArabī 5/04, 120) /23/

One example has been found in the corpus with an adjective in neutralized gender and number:

*ʾŪrubbā hiya l-ʾaqdam-u [...] fī rawābiṭ-i-nā s-sayyiʾ-i min-hā*  
 Europe.F.N 3.F.SI D-oldest.NG.NN-N in ties.NH.PL-G-1.PL D-bad.NG.NN-G of-3.NH.PL  
*wa l-ḥasan-i*  
 and D-good.NH.NN-G  
 ‘Europe is the oldest [...] in [terms of] ties with us, [both] bad and good’ (Riyād 1, *Li naktub ʿaqdan ḡadīdan...*) /24/

Sometimes a demonstrative pronoun is additionally used in such constructions before the adjective, e.g.:

*al-ʾamrād-i l-muzmin-at-i wa tilka n-nāḡim-at-i ʿani ṭ-ṭufayliyyāt-i*  
 D-diseases.NH.PL-G D-chronic-NH.PL-G and those D-resulting-NH.PL-G from D-parasites.NH.PL-G  
 ‘of chronic diseases and those resulting from parasites’ (ʿArabī 5/04, 173f). /25/

#### 4.5.2. Antegenital substantivization

Antegenital substantivization enables an adjective to be qualified by a substantive in the genitive case without a formal annexation (*ʾiḍāfa*

*lafziyya*) resulting from this<sup>97</sup>. 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<sup>98</sup>. Adjectives substantivized in this way will be referred to as ‘antegenitival adjectives’.

Antegenitival adjectives never occur alone<sup>99</sup>: 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.:

*bayt-u            ’akbar-i            malikat-i-n*  
house.M.SI-N    greatest.NG.NN-G    queen.F.SI-G-I  
‘the house of the greatest queen’ /26/

- (iii) they have no degree modifiers. Cf. /27/:

\**ğazīl-u            š-šukr-i            ğiddan*  
profuse.NG.NN-N    D-thanks.M.SI-G    very  
‘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

---

<sup>97</sup> This construction overlaps with Cantarino’s subtype of “real substantival usage” (1975, 2: 66 and 107-108).

<sup>98</sup> 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).

<sup>99</sup> But cf. suffixally substantivized adjectives (chapter 4.5.3.).

native speakers *ğazīlu š-šukri* is equivalent to *ʾağzalu 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. *\*ʾakaltu ġayra laḏīdi ʔ-ʔaʿāmi* ‘I ate the non-delicious food’<sup>100</sup>.

Indications that the antegenitival adjectives do not completely change to substantives include the following:

- (i) they cannot be qualified in adjectival attribution, e.g. *ʾakbaru* in *ʾakbaru rağulin* cannot be qualified by an adjective, cf. the non-grammaticality of:

*\*ʾakbar-u rağul-i-n wasīm-u-n*  
 biggest.NG.NN-N man.M.SI-G-I handsome.M.SI-N-I  
 ‘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 *maḥd* does not mean the same as the attributive, cf.:

---

<sup>100</sup> This again may be explained by the superlative meaning conveyed by antegenitively substantivized adjectives, since *ğayru* rather does not occur with comparative or superlative elatives, cf. *\*ğayru ḡayrin* ‘not better’ or *\*ğayru ʾaḡsana* ‘idem’.

*maḥd-u*      *ʾiḍāfat-i-n*  
 mere.NG.NN-N    annexation.F.SI-G-I  
 ‘mere annexation’ (and nothing else) /29/

vs.

*ʾiḍāfat-u-n*      *maḥd-at-u-n*  
 annexation.F.SI-N-I    pure-F.SI-N-I  
 ‘pure annexation’ (a grammatical term) /30/.

Some words that could appear to be antegenitival adjectives are in reality substantives because they are never used attributively, e.g. *sāʾir*, *ḡamīʿ*, *kāffat* and *šattā*, all having the meaning ‘all’:

*min sāʾir-i*    *ʾanḥāʾ-i*      *ʾŪrubbā*  
 from all-G    parts.NH.PL-G    Europe.F.G  
 ‘from all parts of Europe’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 162) /31/

*fi šattā*    *ʾaṭrāf-i-hi*  
 in all.G    parts.NH.PL-G-3.M.SI  
 ‘in all its parts’ (Mīr 200) /32/

The adjectives *kaṭīr*, *ʿadīd* and *qalīl* are normally not substantivized in this way. However, there are examples which run against this rule, e.g.:

*yaddaʿī dūna kaṭīr-i*      *mubālaḡat-i-n*      *ʾiḡādat-a*  
 he:claims without much.NG.NN-G    exaggeration.F.SI-G-I    command.F.SI-A

*l-luḡat-i*      *l-ʾiḡlīziyy-at-i*  
 D-language.F.SI-G    D-English-F.SI-G  
 ‘he claims without much exaggeration [to have] the command of English’ (Mīṭāq 30/12/03, 3) /33/

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 qualifier 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 *ḥāmisahum* ‘the fifth of them’ and *li ’akbarihim* ‘to the biggest of them’, respectively, are used as predicates:

*kānū ’arba’at-a riḡāl-i-n wa kāna ḥāmis-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 ’akbar-i-him ’ašadd-u t-ta’īr-i*  
 for biggest.NG.NN-G-3.M.PL strongest.NG.NN-N D-influence.M.SI-G  
 ‘The biggest of them has the strongest influence’ (Ḥayāt, 2/08/07, 20, *Mu’ašširu l-’ashumi...* ) /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 pursuit.F.SI-G D-thoughts.NH.PL-G big.NG.NN-G-3.NH.PL and small.NG.NN-G-3.NH.PL  
 ‘to the pursuit of thoughts, big and small’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 139) /36/

In examples /37/-/39/ the SSAs function as subjects:

*ʾağ̃āba-hu ʾakbar-u-hum fi s-sinn-i*  
 answered-3.M.SI biggest.NG.NN-N-3.M.PL in D-age.M.SI-G  
 ‘the oldest of age answered him’ (Maqhā 92) /37/

*wafada ʾakṭar-u-hum ʿalā ʾIsbāniyā...*  
 came most.NG.NN-N-3.M.PL onto Spain.F.G  
 ‘most of them came to Spain’ (Kallās 37) /38/

*li ʾakṭar-a min sabab-i-n ʾawwal-u-hā ʾanna qaḍāyā*  
 for more.NG.NN-G.I than reason.M.SI-G-I first.M.SI-N-3.NH.PL that problems.NH.PL.A.I

*l-ʾiṣlāḥ-i [...] wa t̃ānī-hā ʾanna tilka l-ʾistirāṭīḡiyyat-a...*  
 D-reform.M.S-G and second.M.SI-N-3.NH.PL that this D-strategy.F.SI-A  
 ‘for more than one reason, the first [being] that the problems of the reform... and the second that this strategy...’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 6) /39/

In /40/ the SSA is an adverbial:

*kānat ʾaḡṭār-u l-ḥurūb-i fi-hi [...] ʿalā ʾašadd-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 relatives, belonging to a restricted group, such as *kubrā* ‘biggest’, *ṣuḡrā* ‘smallest’, *ʾūlā* ‘first’, may inflect for gender even when suffixally substantivized, e.g.:

*infaḡarat ṣuḡrā-nā bi l-bukāʾ-i*  
 burst:out youngest.F.SI-3.PL with D-weeping.M.SI-G  
 ‘the youngest of us burst into tears’ (ʿArabī 5/04, 178) /41/

Note that concord between SSAs such as *ʾaḡlabu* ‘most’ or *ʾakṭaru* ‘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.:

*ʾaḡlab-u-hā [scil. al-ʾiṣābāti] kāmin-at-u-n*  
 most.NG.NN-N-3.NH.PL hidden-NH.PL-N-I  
 ‘most of them [scil. injuries] are hidden’ (ʿArabī 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<sup>101</sup>. 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.:

*‘āmil-u-n*      *‘amal-a-n*      *ḡayyid-a-n*  
 working.M.SI-N-I    work.M.SI-A-I    good.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘working a good work’ i.e. ‘working well’

For *‘āmilun* ‘worker’, we can list the following properties, absent in the word meaning ‘working’:

---

<sup>101</sup> 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 intuitively clear substantives used with prepositional phrases, e.g.:

*al-qā'im-u*            *bi*    *l-'a'māl-i*    *l-filasṭīniyy-u*  
 carrying:out.M.SI-N-I    with    D-tasks.NH.PL-G    D-Palestinian.M.SI-N  
 'the Palestinian chargé d'affaires' (Arab al-Yawm 29/4/04, 2, *Al-maliku: 'ayyu ḥulūlin...*) /43/

and, on the other hand, there are intuitively clear adjectives qualified by adjectives in attribution, e.g.:

*al-mu'ḡabūna*    *l-'adamiyy-ūna*    *bi 'Adūlf Hitlir*  
 D-pleased.M-PL.N    D-nihilist.M-PL.N    by A.H.M-G  
 'nihilistic admirers of Adolf Hitler' (Mītāq 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<sup>102</sup>.

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 *šahṣun '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 ḡayyidan* \*'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:

---

<sup>102</sup> 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.

*bayād-u-hā nāṣi'-u-n li kull-i mu'min-i-n bi 'urūbat-i-hi*  
whiteness.M.SI-N-3.F.SI evident.M.SI-N-I for all-G believing.M.SI-G-I in Arabness.F.SI-G-3.M.SI  
‘its whiteness is evident for every [person] believing in his Arabness’ (Al-Mitāq  
20/4/2004, 2, *Al-'arḥabīlu n-nāṣiriyyu*) /46/

*'adad-a l-mustafid-īna mina l-mablağ-i*  
number.M.SI-A D-benefitting.M-PL.G from D-amount.M.SI-G  
‘the number of beneficiaries of the money’ (al-'Arab al-Yawm 29/4/04, 1, *Tawzī'u*  
29 milyūni...) /47/

*hākaḏā yaḑ'alu muwḥiṣ-u l-qalb-i*  
so does desolated.M.SI-N D-heart.M.SI-G  
‘a [man] with desolated heart acts in this way’ (Liṣṣ 27) /48/

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:

*lā yu'abbirūna 'ani l-'akṭar-i ġinan wa 'innamā l-'akṭar-i 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-Mitāq 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/:

*qad fašila man hum 'afḏal-u min-hu*  
PART failed who 3.M.PL better.NG.NN-N than-3.M.SI  
‘those who are better than him have failed’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 20, *'Uyūnun...*) /50/

But substantivized elatives as subjects are also possible, though rare:

*'inna 'akbar-a min-ki yatazawwağna 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 *'inna man hunna 'akbaru 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.:

*li mu'tariḍ-i-n 'an ya'tariḍa bi l-qawl-i 'inna...*  
 for opposing.M.SI-G-I that he:opposes with D-opinion.M.SI-G that  
 'let an opposer oppose with the opinion that...' (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 9, *Li-man yuṣawwitu...*)/52/

However, in such participles syntactic surplus is also possible:

*fa kānū kullamā ra'aw-nī ṣāḥa ṣā'iḥ-u-hum:...*  
 and were everytime they:saw-1.SI shouted shouting.M.SI-N-3.M.PL  
 'and whenever they saw me, a shouter from among them shouted...' (Mīr 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. *?kullu ṣāḥibin* 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.:

*mina l-muqarrar-i l-intihā'-u min-hā fi yanāyir-a...*  
 from D-decided.M.SI-G D-termination.M.SI-N of-3.F.SI in January.M-G  
 'its completion is planned for January' (ʿAhrām 29/01/03, 27, *Ḥuṭṭatun mutakāmilatun...*)/54/

In accordance to what has been said above, the expression *mina l-muqarrari*, 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:

*tamma*                    ***t-tālī***  
 was:accomplished D-following.M.SI.N  
 ‘the following has been accomplished’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 26) (= *tamma mā yalī*  
 ‘what follows has been accomplished’) /55/

*maḍati l-ʿumūr-u*            *min*            ***sayyiʿ-i-n***    *ʿilā*    ***ʿaswaʿ-a***  
 went            D-affairs.NH.PL-N            from            bad.M.SI-G-I            to            worse.NG.NN-G.I  
 ‘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-munqidi* ‘an... in the sense ‘it is redeeming that...’. Frequently a word such as *šay* ‘thing’ must be inserted:

*hal tastaḥīʿu*    *ʿan tuqīma*            *zill-a*            ***šayʿ-i-n***    *muʿwağğ-i-n?*  
 PART you:can            that you:straighten            shadow.M.SI-A            thing.M.SI-G-I crooked.M.SI-G-I  
 ‘can you straighten the shadow of a crooked thing’ (Lişş 169) /57/

instead of simply \**zilla muʿwağğin* \*‘the shadow of a crooked’. Idiomaticity seems to be decisive 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.:

*maʿa mafhūm-i*    *ğiyāb-i*            ***š-šahşiy-i***  
 with            concept.SI-G            absence.M.SI-G            D-personal.M.SI-G  
 ‘with the concept of absence of [what is] personal’ (Ṭaqāfi 9/11/04, 5, *Al-ʿibdāʿu bayna n-naqdi...*) /58/

In many cases adjectives of this type are not subjected to substantivization but left in their predicate function, e.g.:

*bi*    *ḍarūrat-i*            *fīʿl-i*            *kull-i*            ***mā huwa mumkin-u-n***  
 with            necessity.F.SI-G            doing.M.SI-G            all-G            what 3.M.SI possible.M.SI-N-I  
 ‘with the necessity of doing all that is possible’ (Liwāʿ 7/4/04, 1, *Širāk yastaqbilu...*) /59/

instead of the questionable *?kulli mumkinin*. With elatives, this construction may be used in order to preserve the indefinite state and comparative meaning:

*fī l-ḡa‘bat-i l-‘amrīkiyy-at-i mā huwa ‘aḥṭar-u [...] min ...*  
 in D-quiver.F.SI-G D-American-F.SI-G what 3.M.SI more:dangerous.NG.NN-N.I 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:

*wa ‘id bi-him yanālūna ‘ab‘ad-a min dālika*  
 and PART PREP-3.M.PL obtain more:remote.NG.NN-A.I than this  
 ‘and they get [something] more remote than that’ (*Ḥasāratun muwḡi‘atun*, Tišrīn 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.:

*nāziḥ-ū l-Fallūḡat-i*  
 refugees.M-PL.N D-Falluja.F-G  
 ‘the refugees of Falluja’ (Riyāḍ 24/4/04, 1, *Nāziḥū l-Fallūḡati...*) [syntactic surplus: no preposition ‘an, usually occurring with *nāziḥun*, derived from the verb *nazaḥa* ‘an ‘to emigrate from’] /62/

*ma‘a muwāṭin-īna ‘aw muqīm-īna ‘aḡānib-a*  
 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 yaḥruḡu...*) [syntactic surplus: capability of having adjectival attributes] /63/

*al-mu‘ḡabūna l-‘adamiyy-ūna bi ‘Adūlf Hitlir*  
 D-pleased.M-PL.N D-nihilist.M-PL.N by A.H.M-G  
 ‘nihilistic admirers of Adolf Hitler’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 7) [idem] /64/

*bi tazwīd-i muttaḥiq-ī l-qarār-i bi ma'lūmāt-i-n*  
 by supplying.M.SI-G adopting.M-PL-G D-decision.M.SI-G with information.NH.PL-G-I  
 'by supplying the decision-makers with information' (Dustūr 1/4/04, 2, *Al-ḡami'iyyatu l-'ilmiyyatu...*) [syntactic surplus: capability of being qualified by a substantive in the genitive] /65/

In what follows, some examples of substantivization with syntactic and semantic surplus are given:

***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/

***mulḥaq-u-n*** 'askariyy-u-n  
 attaché.M.SI-N-I military.M.SI-N-I  
 'military attaché (from *mulḥaqun* 'attached') /67/

***al-qā'im-u*** *bi l-'a'māl-i l-filasṭīniyy-u*  
 carrying:out.M.SI-N-I with D-tasks.NH.PL-G D-Palestinian.M.SI-N  
 'the Palestinian chargé d'affaires' ('Arab al-Yawm 29/4/04, 2, *Al-maliku: 'ayyu ḥulūlin...*) (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: *al-'aswadu* cannot be simply understood as 'what is black, a black thing'<sup>103</sup>. The word *'aswadu* ('black') means e.g. 'pupil (of the eye)', but usually it is accompanied by the qualifier 'of the eye, viz. *'aswadu l-'ayni*. A grain of black coal dust in the eye will not be called *'aswadu* or *'aswadu l-'ayni*. Neither with animals involved is there any predictability: *'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

<sup>103</sup> However, the proverb *mā kullu bayḍā'a ṣaḥmatun 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 *bayḍā'* and *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.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. the hackneyed English example with *blackbird*, which does not have to black.

substantivized adjectives denoting two things similar in some respect. But, for instance, *al-ʿaswadāni* lit. ‘the two black things’ are in fact not black: this word can mean either ‘dates and water’ or ‘scorpion and snake’<sup>104</sup>.

Examples:

*tarnū ʿilā l-baʿīd-i*  
 she:looks to D-distance.M.SI-G  
 ‘she is looking into distance’ (Maqhā 22) [Cf. *baʿīdun* ‘far, distant’] /69/

**ʿāmil-u-n**  
 factor.M.SI-N-I  
 ‘factor’ [Cf. *ʿāmilun* ‘working’] /70/

*al-ḥāsib-u l-ʿāliyy-u*  
 D-counter.M.SI-N D-automatic.M.SI-N  
 ‘computer’ (Riyāḍ 24/4/04, 1, *Al-ʿamīru ʿAbdullāh...*) [Cf. *ḥāsibun* ‘counting’] /71/

*bayna muḡtaṣabat-i Ġūš Qaṭīf wa maʿbar-i...*  
 between usurped:area.F.SI-G G.Q.M.G and passage.M.SI-G  
 ‘between the usurped land and the passage...’ (ʿAnwār 3/5/04, 1, *Maqtalu 5 ʿIsrāʿīliyyīna...*) [Cf. *muḡtaṣabatun* ‘usurped, violated’ (feminine)] /72/

*ʿilā s-sābiʿ-i mina š-šahr-i l-ḥāliyy-i*  
 to D-seventh.M.SI-G of D-month.M.SI-G current.M.SI-G  
 ‘to the 7th of the current month’ (Dustūr 1/5/04, 1, *Badʿu ṣarfī...*) /73/

Some substantives formed in this way may be used as proper names, e.g. *al-ʿāšīru 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 *ḥusām* ‘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. *ṯāniyatun* ‘second [the unit of time]’ (from ‘second [ordinal numeral]’) under the influence of Latin *secunda*; *mawḍūʿun* ‘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/:

*‘ābir-u-n*                      *šāhib-u-n*  
 passer-by.M.SI-N-I    pale.M.SI-N-I  
 ‘a pale passer-by’ (Maqhā 38) [Cf. ‘*ābirun* ‘passing by’] /74/

the noun *‘ābirun* is a substantive, while *šāhibun* is an adjective. The word order cannot be reversed to yield \**šāhibun ‘ābirun* because the adjective *šāhibun* has not been substantivized in the necessary way, whereas *‘ābirun* 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 *kaṭīr* ‘much, many’, *adīd* ‘id.’, *mazīd* ‘more’ and *qalīl* ‘little, few’. An example of a substantivized *kaṭīr* is given in /75/:

*ta‘ǧizu*    *l-qīṭa‘-u*                      *l-qawiyy-at-u* ‘*an*    *fīl-i*                      *l-kaṭīr-i*  
 are:unable    D-pieces.NH.PL-N    D-strong-NH.PL-N from    doing.M.SI-G D-    much.M.SI-G  
 ‘strong pieces cannot do much’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 182), /75/

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:

*wa yastaṭī‘u*    ‘*an*    *yaṣna‘a*    *š-šay’-a*                      *l-kaṭīr-a*  
 and is:able                      that    it:makes                      D-thing.M.SI-A    D-much.M.SI-A  
 ‘and [he] is able to do a great deal’ (Mītāq 30/12/03, 2) /76/

The substantivized *kaṭīr* can be qualified by a *min*-phrase. It may have neutralized gender and number even when relating to humans, as in /77/:

*ʾilḥāq-i*      *ḍ-ḍarar-i*      *bi l-kaṭīr-i*      *mina l-ʾUrdunniyy-īna*  
 inflicting.M.SI-G    D-harm.M.SI-G    to D-much.NG.NN-G    of    D-Jordanian.M-PL.G  
 ‘[of] inflicting harm to many Jordanians’ (‘Arab al-Yawm 29/4/04, 1, *Tawzīʿu 29 milyūni...*) /77/

Nonetheless, it may also inflect for number and gender as in /78/:

*yaʿrifu-hu l-kaṭīr-ūna*      *mina*      *l-ʿarab-i*  
 know-3.M.SI    D-many.M-PL.N    of      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:

*fi raʿy-i*      *l-kaṭīr-īna*  
 in opinion.M.SI-G      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-ʿadīdu*      *mina l-muʾallafāt-i*      *fi ʿilm-i*      *l-iḡtimāʿ-i*  
 D-much.NG.NN-U      of      D-works.NH.PL-G      in science.M.SI-G      D-society.M.SI-G  
  
*d-dīniyy-i*      *l-mukarras-u*      *li l-ʾislām-i*  
 D-religious.M.SI-G      D-devoted.NG.NN-G      to D-Islam.M.SI-G  
 ‘a number of works on science of religious sociology devoted to Islam’ (ʿAyyāmu l-frankūfūniyyati, 10) /80/

There are also graded forms of substantivized *kaṭīr* and *qalīl*, i.e. substantivized *ʾakṭar* and *ʾaqall*, e.g:

*fi ʾakṭar-a*      *min minṭaqat-i-n*      *fi l-ʿālam-i*  
 in more.M.NG.NN-G.I      than region.F.SI-G-I      in D-world.M.SI-G  
 ‘in more than one region of the world’ (ʿAnwār 3/5/04, 2, *Laḥūd ʾaʿraba ʿan...*) /81/

*yatamannā 'an yun'ama bi 'aqall-a min-hu*  
 he:wishes that he:be:favoured with less.NG.NN-G.I than-3.M.SI  
 'he wishes to be favoured with less than this' (Ra'y 2, *Lan yamurrū*) /82/

#### 4.5.6.4. Independent substantivization: idiomatic cases

Some substantivized adjectives are used as set expressions and can be discussed in terms of idiomaticized 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 ġundiyy-a-n 'amīrkiyy-a-n 'alā l-'aqall-i*  
 130 soldier.M.SI-A-I American.M.SI-A-I on D-least.NG.NN-G  
 'at least 130 American soldiers' (Liwā' 7/4/04, 1, *Taqārīru mina l-Bintāgūn...*) /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 *hāṣṣatan* in /84/:

*'anna l-'i'lām-a 'āmm-at-a-n wa d-dirāmā t-tilifizyūniyy-at-a*  
 that D-media.M.SI-G general-F.SI-A-I and D-drama.F.SI.A D-of:television-F.SI-A

*hāṣṣ-at-a-n la-hā dawr-u-n*  
 specific-F.SI-A-I for-3.F.SI role.M.SI-N-I  
 '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-'āḥaru* 'other' and its feminine form *al-'uḥrā* after personal pronouns of respective gender (*huwa* and *hiya*) in the sense 'also, as well, too'. E.g.

*taqaddamat hiya l-'uḥrā bi mašrū'-i [...]*  
 stepped:forward 3.F.SI D-other.F.SI.N with project.M.SI-G  
 'it, as well, put forward the project of...' (Mīṭāq 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.:

*ġālib-a-n mā yaqtaḍī naṣṣ-u-n mina l-masrah-i ...*  
 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...’ (Ṭaqāfi 9/11/04,6,*Intiḥārun ġayru...*) /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 *sarī’an* ‘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 (*maṣḍar*) or another adjective. Verbs, verbal nouns and adjectives are thus interpreted as regents<sup>105</sup>.

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

<sup>105</sup> 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 *sarīʿ-an* ‘quickly’, *baṭīʾ-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<sup>106</sup>. 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:

---

<sup>106</sup> 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 z-zarīfa* ‘Oh, kind Ali!’ (from Corriente 2002 [1980]: 258; also Al-Ġalāyīnī 2002[1912]: 531), or the so-called *na‘t maqṭū‘* (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-‘aẓīmu* or *l-‘aẓīma* ‘Praise to God, the Great’, instead of *l-‘aẓīmi* (Al-Ġalāyīnī 2002 [1912]: 565).

- (i) constructions with adjectives as qualifiers and recta of ‘special substantives’,
- (ii) constructions with antegenitively or suffixally substantivized adjectives qualifying substantives as genitival attributes.

### 5.1.1.1. Adjectives as qualifiers of ‘special substantives’

By the term ‘special substantives’ we will refer to words of special function, such as *ḡayr-* ‘other than’, *šibh-* ‘quasi-, -like’, *niṣf-* ‘semi-’ and *ḡidd-* ‘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 qualifiers in the genitive case<sup>107</sup>.

The ‘special substantives’ are not lexically independent. The words *ḡayr-* 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 relatives, 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):

*ʿasālib-u ḡayr-u mašrūʿ-at-i-n*  
 ways.NH.PL-N-I reverse-N legal-NH.PL-G-I  
 ‘illegal ways’ (Ġazīra 3/4/04, 2, Ġaymatu l-ʿamni...) /1/

*al-qānūn-u l-ḡadīd-u ḡayr-u l-munḡaz-i baʿdu*  
 D-law.M.SI-N D-new.M.SI-N reverse-N D-completed.M.SI-G yet  
 ‘the new law not completed yet’ (ʿAnwār 3/5/04, 2, Ṣadmatun rāfaqat...) /2/

<sup>107</sup> 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.

*qunbulat-u-n šibh-u nawawiyy-at-i-n*  
 bomb.F.SI-N-I like-N nuclear-F.SI-G-I  
 ‘a quasi-nuclear bomb’ (Šarq 14/4/04, 1, *Al-Fallūğatu... wa mā ‘adrāka...*) /3/

A ‘special substantive’ may also function as the predicate, as in /4/:

*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 *‘asālību ġayru mašrū‘atin* of /1/, we can distinguish the following biconstituent hypotactic adjectival syntagms:

- (i) (*‘asālību, ġayru*) with concord in case;
- (ii) (*ġayru, mašrū‘atin*) with genitival rection.

Of interest to us is syntagm (ii), in which the adjective is the qualifier.

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’<sup>108</sup>. 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.:

*al-mumārasāt-i d-ḍidd# ṭabī‘iyy-at-i*  
 D-activities.NH.PL-G D-opposite# natural-NH.PL-G  
 ‘unnatural activities’ (Al-Mīṭāq 20/4/2004, 7) /5/

*al-‘amākin-u d-ḍayyiq-at-u l-ḡayr-u muhawwā-t-i-n*  
 D-places.NH.PL-N D-confined-NH.PL-N D-reverse-N aired-NH.PL-G-I  
 ‘[the] confined unaired places’, lit. ‘the confined places **the other than** the aired’  
 (from Badawi et al. 2004: 235, their translation<sup>109</sup>) /6/

<sup>108</sup> Krahl discusses these constructions under the term *Zusammenrückungen* (1985: 55)

<sup>109</sup> Note that the adjective qualifying *l-ḡayr* is indefinite (with *-in*) according to Badawi et al. Likewise in examples in e.g. Polotsky (1978: 171): *l-ḡayri musarraḥin* ‘illicit’ (lit. ‘not allowed’) and Gätje (1970: 233): *al-ḡayru 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 qualificator is a substantive, while in constructions with ‘special substantives’ the qualificatum is a substantive and the qualificator 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 rağulin* ‘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-ğayru l-* was permitted by the Language Academy of Cairo in 1969.

### 5.1.1.2. Antegenitively or suffixally substantivized adjectives as genitival qualifiers

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 qualifiers 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 wağhi*, respectively:

*ta’mīr-u*      *rābi’-i*      *ṭā’irat-i-n*      *min* *ṭīrāz-i...*  
 repair.M.SI-N    fourth.NG.NN-G    plane.F.SI-G-I    of    type.M.SI-G  
 ‘the repair of the fourth plane of the type...’ (Ahrām 29/01/03, 26, *Tahsīnu ġūdati...*) /7/

---

Corriente gives yet another example: *al-’ašyā’u l-ğayru ṭ-ṭābitati* ‘cosas inseguras’, i.e. ‘the non-fixed things’ with the article prefixed to both *ğayr* and the adjective (2002 [1988]: 235).

*fī waǧh-i ʿaʿtā quwwat-i-n fī š-šarq-i l-ʿawsaṭ-i*  
 in face.S.I-G haughtiest.NG.NN.G power.F.SI-G-I in D-east.M.SI-G D-middle.M.SI-G  
 ‘in the face of the haughtiest power in the Middle East’ (ʿAnwār 3/5/04, 2, *Al-Ḥuṣṣ: ʿAmīrkā...*) /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 antegenitively or suffixally substantivized or does not qualify one of the ‘special substantives’. Therefore in /9/

*wazn-u l-ḥafīf-i*  
 weight.M.SI-N D-light.M.SI-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 *ḥafīf* is an adjective. Krahl, for instance, treats this word as an adjective, probably due to its semantics<sup>110</sup>. However, its use in this construction as well as the possibility of it being qualified by a substantive in the genitive, as in /10/:

*wazn-u ḥafīf-i d-dubābat-i*  
 weight.M.SI-N light.M.SI-I D-fly.F.SI-G  
 ‘flyweight’ (after Krahl 1985: 16, also fn. 19) /10/

show that *ḥafīf* is independently substantivized. Also nouns with the foreign suffix *-īk* used in chemical terminology are of the same kind, e.g.:

*ḥāmid-u z-zaytīk-i*  
 acid.M.SI-N D-oleic.M.SI-G  
 ‘oleic acid’ (cf. Krahl 1985:48f, also fn. 67) /11/

This genitive construction is more frequent than the synonymous adjectival attribution *al-ḥāmiḍu z-zaytīku*. Cf. also the following construction with an indication of a date:

<sup>110</sup> Cf. also Badawi et al. (2004: 116).

*yawm-u t-tāmin-i min dī l-ḥiğğati*  
 day.M.SI-N D-eighth.M.SI-G of dū l-ḥiğğā  
 ‘the eighth of (lit. ‘the day of the eighth of’) [the month] *dū l-ḥiğğa...*’ (‘Ahrām  
 29/01/03, 28, ‘*Idā ḥağğā r-rağulu...*) /12/

Here, too, the word *t-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<sup>111</sup>.

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-ğusaymāt-u tahta d-darriyy-at-i*  
 D-particles.NH.PL-N under D-atomic-NH.PL-G  
 ‘subatomic particles’ (‘Arabī 3/04, 142) /13/

*al-ʾašīʿat-u fawqa l-banaḥsağiyy-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 tahta milimitriyy-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,

<sup>111</sup> 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. *tahşuʿuriyyun* ‘subconscious’ from *tahta ş-şuʿuri* ‘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 *mā*, usually translated into English as ‘what’:

*al-ḥiqbat-u mā ba‘da ṣ-ṣinā‘iyy-at-i*  
 D-stage.F.SI-N PART after D-industrial-F.SI-G  
 ‘the post-industrial stage’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 26) /16/

The particle *mā* may also receive the definite article:

*al-ʾaṣī‘at-u l-māfawqa l-banaḥsaḡiyy-at-i*<sup>112</sup>  
 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 d-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 d-darriyyati* 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.

<sup>112</sup> 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 kabīrun* ‘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      ḡamīl-u-n*  
and D-love.M.SI-N    beautiful.M.SI-N-I  
‘and love is beautiful’ (Raḡab 7) /18/

*Nikūl Rītšī      ḥāmīl-u-n*  
N.R.F.N          pregnant.NG.NN-N-I  
‘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<sup>113</sup>. E.g.:

---

<sup>113</sup> In many descriptions of this construction, the pronoun is treated as a copula. The pronoun with indefinite predicates is very rare.

*al-fannān-u huwa l-mas'ūl-u 'an maḥabbat-i n-nās-i li l-fann-i*  
 D-artist.M.SI-N 3.M.SI D-responsible.M.SI-N for love.F.SI-G D-people.M.PL-G to D-art.M.SI-G  
 'it is the artist that is responsible for the people's love for art' (Ṭaqāfī 9/11/04, 9,  
*Iḥtiṣārātun šadīdatun...*) /20/

In /20/, the substantive *al-fannānu* 'the artist' is the topic, *huwa* is the subject of the comment while *l-mas'ūlu* 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'ūlu*, 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 attachment to a particle belonging to the group of particles which traditional Arab grammar terms together as *'inna wa 'aḥawātuhā* '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.), *lākinna* 'but', *la'alla* (and *'alla*) 'perhaps' and *layta*, expressing optativity. Examples:

*kay ya'īya l-fard-u 'anna 'amn-a-hu munāṭ-u-n bi-hi*  
 that know D-individual.M.SI-N that security.M.SI-A-3.M.SI depending.M.SI-N-I on-3.M.SI  
 'that [every] individual knows that his security depends on him' (Ġazīra 3/4/04, 2,  
*Ġaymatu l-'amni...*) /21/

*qultu 'inn-ī ḥāriḡ-u-ni l-yawm-a mina s-siġn-i*  
 I:said that-1.SI coming:out.M.SI-N-I D-day.M.SI-A from D-prison.M.SI-G  
 'I said that I have come out of prison today' (Liṣṣ 27) /22/

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:

*mal'ūn-at-u-ni l-'arḍ-u llatī 'anbatat-ki fī ṭīn-i-hā*  
damned-F.SI-N-I D-earth.F.SI-N which begot-2.F.SI in soil.M.SI-G-3.F.SI  
‘damned is the earth that has begot you in her soil’ (Mīr 129) /23/

*'arwa'-u min dālika 'i'lān-u-ki li mawt-i zawġ-i-ki*  
stranger.NG.NN-N.I than this declaration.M.SI-N-2.F.SI of death.M.SI-G husband.M.SI-G-2.F.SI  
‘stranger than this is your declaration about your husband’s death’ (Maqhā 41) /24/

### 5.2.2. Extended predicative syntagms

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*, *'ašbaḥa*, *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’, *zanna* ‘to be believed’ etc. belong here.

Examples:

***kānati*** *l-ma'rakat-u siyāsiyy-at-a-n bi mtiyāz-i-n*  
 was D-conflict.F.SI-N political-F.SI-A-I with distinction.M.SI-G-I  
 ‘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-I and was fifth.NG.NN-A-3.M.PL  
 ‘they were four men and he was the fifth of them’ (‘Umar 97) /26/

*huwa laysa ḡarīb-a-n 'ani l-'asmā'-i*  
 3.M.SI is:not strange.M.SI-A-I from D-ears.NH.PL-G  
 ‘it is not strange to ears’ (Mīṭāq 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’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 12, *Al-baṭālatu 'ilā...*) /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.: *ḡa'ala*, *ḥawwala*, *šayyara* ‘to change [something]’, *taraka* ‘to leave’;
- (ii) *verba sentiendi*, e.g.: *zanna*, *i'tabara*, *ra'a*, *ḥasiba* ‘to consider’<sup>114</sup>, *waḡada*, *'alfā* ‘to find’, *'aḥassa* ‘to feel’;
- (iii) *verba voluntatis*, e.g.: *'arāda*, *šā'a* ‘to want’, *faddala* ‘to prefer’.

Examples:

***ḡa'ala*** *l-'ibārāt-i ḥāliyy-at-a-n tamāman mina l-ḥissiyyat-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, *Abqariyyatu l-ḥayāli...*) /29/

<sup>114</sup> 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’.

*hanīn-u-hu*                      *llaḍī 'aḥassa-hu*    *marāḍiyy-a-ni*    *l-'āna*  
 tenderness.M.SI-N-3.M.SI    which he:felt-3.M.SI    morbid.M.SI-A-I    now  
 'his tenderness which he now felt morbid' (Maqhā 97) /30/

*sayağ'alu min taḥqīq-i*            *hāḍihi l-'ahdāf-i* [...] *'aṣ'ab-a*    *wa 'aṣ'ab-a*  
 it:will:make from realisation.M.SI-G these    D-goals.NH.PL-G harder.NG.NN-A.I and harder.NG.NN-A.I  
 '[it] will make the realisation of these [...] goals harder and harder' (Arabī 5/04, 159) /31/

## 1b. extended predicate in PP.

*'anna l-ğamā'at-a l-'ūrūbiyy-at-a laysat bi*    *'aqall-a*            *min ṣadīqat-i-hā*  
 that D-group.F.SI-A D-European-F.SI-A is:not    PREP    less.NG.NN-A.I    than friend.F.SI-G-3.F.SI  
 'that the European Community is not less than its friend' (Mītāq 20/4/2004, 10) /32/

*waṣafa* [...] *l-Mālikī*                      *nsihāb-a*                      *t-Tawāfuq-i*                      *bi l-mutawaqqa'-i*  
 described    al-Mālikī.M.N                      withdrawal.M.SI-A                      D-Tawāfuq.M.SI-G                      as D-expected.M.SI-G

*wa ġayr-i*            *l-mufaği'-i*  
 and reverse-G            D-surprising.M.SI-G  
 'Al-Maliki described the withdrawal of at-Tawāfuq as expected and unsurprising'  
 (Ḥayāt 2.8.07, 2, «Ġabhatu t-tawāfuqi»...) /33/

## 2. Extended predicative syntagms with participles.

### 2a. extended predicate in the accusative:

*yusdiru ṣaḥīr-a-n* [...] *tārik-a-ni*                      *s-samak-a*    *ḥāṣi'-a-n*  
 he:utters snore.M.SI-A-I                      leaving.M.SI-A-I    D-fish.M.SI-A    submissive.M.SI-A-I  
 'he utters a snore, leaving the fish submissive' (Umar 113) /34/

*ta'ahhala l-'amrīkiyy-u*                      *'Andī Rūdīk*    *al-muṣannaḥ-u*    *'awwal-a*                      *'ilā...*  
 qualified    D-American.M.SI-N    A.R.M.N                      D-seeded.M.SI-N                      first.NG.NN-A.I    to  
 'the American A.R., seeded first, qualified for...' (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 17, *Hingiz 'ilā d-clawri...*) /35/

### 2b. extended predicate in PP:

No examples occurred in the corpus. The following example /36/, invented by us, is a reformulation of /33/:

*qāla l-Mālikī*    *wāṣif-a-ni*                      *nsihāb-a*                      *t-Tawāfuq-i*                      *bi l-mutawaqqa'-i*  
 said al-Mālikī.M.N describing.M.SI-A-I                      withdrawal.M.SI-A                      D-Tawāfuq.M.SI-G                      as D-expected.M.SI-G  
 'al-Maliki said, describing the withdrawal of Al-Tawāfuq as expected' /36/.

### 3. Extended predicative syntagms with verbal nouns.

#### 3a. extended predicate in the accusative.

*bi kawṅ-i-hā l-ʿabraz-a*

by being.M.SI-G-3.F.SI D-most:outstanding.NG.NN-A

‘by [virtue of] its being the most outstanding’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 1, *Tiqatun ḡadīdatun...*) /37/

*li ḡaʿl-i salālāt-i hāʿulāʿi [...] ʿabraz-a*

to making.M.SI-G dynasties.NH.PL-G those.G most:conspicuous.NG.NN-A

*ʿanāṣir-i l-muḡtamaʿ-i l-ʿandalusiyy-i*

components.NH.PL-G society.M.SI-G D-Andalusian.M.SI-G

‘to make their dynasties the most conspicuous elements of the Andalusian society’ (Kallās 37) /38/

*bi waṣf-i-him ḡāmiḍ-īna wa ḡarīb-ī l-ʿaṭwār-i*

by description.M.SI-G-3.M.PL obscure.M-PL.G and strange.M-PL.G D-modes.NH.PL-G

‘by describing them as obscure and strange in manners’ (Ālam al-fikr, 53) /39/

#### 3b. extended predicate in PP.

*lā yaṣiḥḥu waṣf-u stiḡwāb-i-hi bi l-hazliyy-i*

not is:correct description.M.SI-N interrogation.M.SI-G-3.M.SI as D-ridiculous.M.SI-G

‘the description of his interrogation as ridiculous is not true’ (Āhrām 29/01/03, 30, *ʿAzmatu l-minaṣṣati...*) /40/

*ʿanna taḥwīl-a l-fātūrat-i ʿilā ṣahriyy-at-i-n tuḥaffifu l-ʿibʿ-ā...*

that changing.M.SI-A D-invoice.F.SI-G to monthly-F.SI-G-I eases D-burden.M.SI-A

‘that changing the invoice to [a] monthly [one] eases the burden’ (Ḥayāt 2.8.07, 11, *Lubnānu yadfaʿu...*) /41/.

Within the above constructions one can distinguish biconstituent adjectival syntagms composed of:

- (i) the verb and its qualifier, in group (1), e.g. (*kānati, siyāsiyyatan*) in /25/,
- (ii) the participle and its qualifier, in group (2), e.g. (*tārikani, ḥāṣiʿan*) in /34/,
- (iii) the verbal noun and its qualifier, in group (3), e.g. (*kawṅihā, ʿabraza*) 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:

*'uslūbiyyat-u Māykil Rīfātīr al-musammā-t-u l-'uslūbiyyat-a l-binyawiyy-at-a*  
 stylistics.F.SI-N M.R.M.G D-called-F.SI-N D-stylistics.F.SI-A D-structuralist-F.SI-A  
 'the stylistics of M.R. called structuralist stylistics' (Ālam al-fikr, 70) /42/

*'insān-u-n mamsūḥ-u-n ḥarūf-a-n*  
 man.M.SI-N-I changed.M.SI-N-I lamb.M.SI-A-I  
 '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 'iyyā-hā bi l-mazā'im-i*  
 describing.M.SI-A-I PREP-3.NH.PL as D-allegations.NH.PL-G  
 'describing them as allegations' (Ġazīra 3/4/04, 1, Sūriyā tanfī...) /44/

*min ḥarat-i l-yahūd-i fī Miṣr-a l-musammā-t-i bi š-Šawādīliyyat-i*  
 from quarter.F.SI-G D-Jews.M.PL-G in Cairo.F-G D-called-F.SI-G as D-Šawādīliyya.F.SI-G  
 'from the Jewish quarter in Cairo called aš-Šawādīliyya' (Ālam al-fikr, 45) /45/.

### 5.2.4. Predicative syntagms with antegenitively or suffixally substantivized adjectives as subjects

A particular type of predicative syntagms is that in which an antegenitively or suffixally substantivized adjective functions as the subject. Their predicates include prepositional phrases, with pronouns or substantives. In /46/, the antegenitively substantivized adjective *ḡazīlu* 'profuse' functions as the subject, while the pronoun attached to the preposition *lakum* 'for you' is its predicate:

*la-kum*      **ğazil-u**      *š-šukr-i*  
 for-2.M.PL    profuse.NG.NN-N    D-thanks.M.SI-G  
 ‘Thanks a lot’ lit. ‘for you the profuse [of] thanks’ /46/

In /47/, the subject is the antegenitively substantivized adjective *ḥayru*, while its predicate is the suffixally substantivized adjective ‘*āğiluhu*:

**ḥayr-u**      *l-birr-i*      ‘*āğil-u-hu*  
 best.NG.NN-N    D-charity.M.SI-G    quick.NG.NN-N-3.M.SI  
 ‘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 qualifier. 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<sup>115</sup>. The substantive or personal pronoun designating this entity will be referred to as the

---

<sup>115</sup> 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 baṭalan* ‘Muhammad died a hero’, or a verbal noun (*maṣḍar*), e.g. *ğā’a Muḥammadun rakḍan* ‘Muhammad came, running’. Also verbs can function as the *ḥāl*, e.g. *ğā’a Muḥammadun yarkuḍu* ‘Muhammad 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 rasmiyyan* ‘He wrote to me officially’ is an example of a *ḥāl*, because, it is argued’ *rasmiyyan* defines the way in which “he wrote to me”. This however, will appear to be false when the subject is feminine: *katabat li rasmiyyan*, not *rasmiyyatan*.

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<sup>116</sup>. The former case is exemplified in /48/, where the word with verbal properties is the finite verb *taḍammanat*, while the latter is exemplified in /49/:

*taḍammanati r-risālat-u munāšadat-a [...] muṭammin-at-a-n ʿāliy-a-ni l-ḥirṣ-a*  
 contained D-letter.F.SI-N request.F.SI-A appreciating-F.SI-A-I high.NG.NN-A-I  
 D-concern.M.SI-A  
 ‘the letter contained a request of [...], while highly appreciating the concern’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 2, *Laḥūd: al-qimmatu...*) /48/

*ʿanna-nī ʿaḍāb-u-hum muḡassad-a-n*  
 that-1.SI torture.M.SI-N-3.M.PL incarnated.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘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:

*wa taḍammanati r-risālatu munāšadata [...] wa hiya muṭamminatun ʿāliyani l-ḥirṣa*  
 ‘and the letter contained [...], and **it is/was appreciating** the care’

<sup>116</sup> 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/:

'inna **Husnī 'Allām** rağa'a mina l-hāriğ-i **sakrān-a**  
 that H.A.M.A returned from D-outdoors.M.SI-G drunk.M.SI-A.I  
 'that H. A. returned from outside drunk' (Mīrāmār 75) /50/

'alayhi 'ās-u d-dīnār-i **mukabbar-a-n** bi šakl-i-n 'ağīb-i-n  
 on-3.M.SI ace.M.SI-N D-diamond.M.SI-G enlarged.M.SI-A-I with form.M.SI-G-I strange.M.SI-G-I  
 'on it was the diamond ace, enlarged in a very strange way' (Sīra 62) /51/

The antecedent may be a direct object, as in /52/, or an indirect object, as in /53/:

tamannaytu 'an 'arā l-'alam-a 'āriy-a-n mina l-'asmā'-i  
 I:wished that I:see D-flag.M.SI-A stripped.M.SI-A-I of D-names.NH.PL-G  
 'I wished I could see the flag stripped of the names' (Maqhā 69) /52/

'utīra 'ala ġuṭat-i-him mumazzaq-at-a-n bi r-raşāş-i  
 it:was:stumbled upon bodies.NH.PL-G-3.M.PL torn-NH.PL-A-I with D-bullets.M.S-I  
 'their bodies have been found, torn with bullets' (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 8, *Kābūl tarfūdu...*) /53/

The antecedent may be a genitival qualificator, e.g.:

'iṣrār-u-n 'alā duḥūl-i wazīr-i [...] maḥmūl-a-n 'alā l-'a'nāq-i  
 insisting.M.SI-N-I on entrance.M.SI-G minister.M.SI-G carried.M.SI-A-I on D-necks.NH.PL-G  
 'insisting on the entrance of the Minister [...] carried on the shoulders' ('Anwār 3/5/04, 2, «Şadmatun» rāfaqat...) /54/

Note that in /54/ the relevant word with verbal properties is *duḥūli* 'entrance', not *'iṣrārūn* 'insisting'. This means that the property of 'being carried', expressed by *maḥmūlan*, characterizes the minister only as long as he is entering, not as long as there is insistence.

The antecedent may be the predicate:

'anna-nī 'aḍāb-u-hum muğassad-a-n  
 that-1.SI torture.M.SI-N-3.M.PL incarnated.M.SI-A-I  
 'that I am their torture incarnated' (Sīra 94) /55/

The antecedent may be represented by a pronoun suffixed to a verb, such as *-hu* ‘him’ in /56/:

*wa ʿardaw-hu qatīl-a-n*  
 and they:stroke-3.M.SI dead.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘and they stroke him dead’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 4, Ġaza: *musallahūna...*) /56/

or by a pronoun suffixed to a verbal noun, such as *-ī* ‘I; my’ in /57/:

*sabab-a qaḍāʾ-ī l-waqt-a ḥāriġa ḥidmat-ī ḡālis-at-a-n*  
 reason.M.SI-A spending.M.SI-1.SI D-time.M.SI-A outside work.F.SI-1.SI sitting-F.SI-A-I  
 ‘the reason for my spending time out of my duty sitting’ (Ṭaqāfi 9/11/04, 9, *Ṣayḍun min ʿaġli Yāsmīn*) /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:

*lawwahā bi yad-ay-himā li l-ʿummāl-i 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’ (ʿUmar 126) /58/

or a verbal noun:

*tumma l-inhiyār-u fawqa l-ʿarḍ-i muwalwil-a-n*  
 then D-fall.M.SI-N on D-earth.F.SI-G lamenting.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘than the fall to earth [with] lamenting’ (Raġab 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:

*ʿidā raʿā ʿuntā-hu fī ḥiḍn-i raġul-i-n ġarīb-i-n*  
 if he:saw woman.F.SI.A-3.M.SI in lap.M.SI-G man.M.SI-G-I strange.M.SI-G-I  
*ḡālis-ayni ʿalā kanabat-i-n*  
 sitting.M-DU.G-I on couch.F.SI-G-I  
 ‘if he sees his wife on the lap of a strange man, [while the two are] sitting on a couch’ (Raġab 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:

*wa lammā lam tasma*‘ *ṣawt-a-n* *ṣaraḥat: – lā! ... lā!*  
and when not she:heard voice.M.SI-A-I she:cried no no

*tumma muḥāṭib-at-a-n* *’Ismā’īl-a:*  
then addressing-F.SI-A-I Ismael.M.A

‘And as she heard no answer, she cried: – No! No! Then, **addressing** Ismail: ... (Kamak 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.:

*qāla ṣawt-u-n yāfi’-u-n* *multadd-a-n* *bi l-ḥadīṭ-i*  
said voice.M.SI-N-I juvenile.M.SI-N-I taking:pleasure.M.SI-A-I in D-conversation.M.SI-G  
‘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/:

*kānat zawġat-ī wāqif-at-a-n* *’alā l-bāb-i* *mustā’-at-a-n*  
was wife.F.SI-1.SI standing-F.SI-A-I at D-door.M.SI-G annoyed-F.SI-A-I  
‘my wife was standing at the door, annoyed’ (Maqhā 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.:

ʾašāra ḡalālat-u-hu [...] ʾilā ʾanna [...] **muʾakkid-a-n** ḡalālat-u-hu ʾanna...  
 pointed:out majesty.F.SI-N-3.M.SI to that stressing.M.SI-A-I majesty.F.SI-N-3.M.SI that  
 ‘and his Majesty pointed out [...] that [...], stressing [his Majesty] that...’ (Ar-Ra’y 1,  
*Al-maliku: ʾiqāmatu...*) /64/

Another non-typical construction is that with the secondary predicate placed before its antecedent with no repetition of the latter. Example:

ʿadat ʾilā ʿAmmān-a ʾamsi **qādim-at-a-n** min ʾiqlīm-i Kūsūfū  
 returned to Amman.F-G yesterday coming-F.SI-A-I from province.M.SI-G Kosovo.G  
**maḡmūʿat-u-n** min dubbāt-i-n  
 group.F.SI-A-I of officers.M.PL-G-I  
 ‘a group of officers returned yesterday to Amman, coming from the Kosovo province’ (Ra’y 2, *Maḡmūʿatun 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, (*Ḥusnī, sakrāna*), which is composed of the antecedent and its secondary predicate and, secondly, (*raḡaʿa, sakrāna*), which is composed of the word with verbal properties and the secondary predicate.

In /51/ there is only one biconstituent adjectival syntagm: (*ʾāsu, 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-ʿalama, ʿāriyan*), 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<sup>117</sup>. Example:

*Al-'amīr-u 'Abdullāh muftatiḥ-a-ni l-mu'tamar-a l-'ālamīyy-a*  
 D-prince.M.SI-N Abdullah.M.N opening.M.SI-A-I D-congress.M.SI-A D-global.M.SI-A  
 'Prince Abdullah opening the world congress' (Riyād, 21/04/04, 1, headline) /66/.

### **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.:

*ḡā'a r-riḡāl-u rākiḍ-īna*  
 came.3M.SI D-men.M.PL-N running.M-PL..A  
 'The men came running' /67/

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 *ḡā'ū rākiḍīna* '[They] came running', or if the subject precedes the verbal predicate, as in *ar-riḡālu ḡā'ū rākiḍīna* '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).

<sup>117</sup> 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 accusative qualifiers). However, sometimes such a word is absent (e.g. in /51/) yet the accusative 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-dīnāri 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:

*al-madīnat-u muḏā'-at-a-n 'aǧmal-u*                      *min-hā*    *muḏfa'-at-a-n*  
 D-city.F.SI-N illuminated-F.SI-A-I more:beautiful.NG.NN-N.I    from-3.F.SI    extinguished-F.SI-A-I  
 '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, *muḏā'tan* 'illuminated', qualifies the substantive *al-madīnatu* 'the city', while the other, *muḏfa'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 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 *'aktar* is not sure):

فلان عالم أكثر منه ذكي (Kouloughli 1994: 116, with no transliteration given)

*fulān-u-n*      *‘ālim-u-n*      *’aktar-u?*      *min-hu*      *ḍakiyy-u-n*  
so:and:so.M.SI-N-I    knowledgable.M.SI-N-I    more.NG.NN-N?.I than-3.M.SI    smart.M.SI-N-I  
‘so-and-so more knowledgable than smart’ /69/<sup>118</sup>.

In another example, taken from El-Ayoubi et al., which is similar to Kouloughli’s (despite substantives being used in it), the word *’aktar* is in the accusative:

*wa Fadwā*      *daḥiyyat-u-n*      *’aktar-a*      *min-hā*      *ḡallād-u-n*  
and Fadwā.F.N    victim.F.SI-N-I    more.NG.NN-A.I    than-3.F.SI    oppressor.M.SI-N-I  
‘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/ (*’aktar* in the accusative) and in /68/ (the adjective in the accusative) (Cantarino 1975, 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 **A**djectives **Q**ualified by a **P**ossessum-designating substantive). The possessum-designating substantive may be either in the genitive or in the accusative. Consequently, we will distinguish:

---

<sup>118</sup> 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) ‘relative 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’<sup>119</sup>. 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/<sup>120</sup>:

---

<sup>119</sup> 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 ġayr ḥaqīqiyya* and *’idāfa lafẓiyya*. Similarly to other scholars, in our work we adopt a narrower meaning of the term *’idāfa lafẓiyya*, but it should be borne in mind that classical Arab grammarians applied this term also to constructions such as *ḍāribu Zaydin* ‘the [one] hitting Zayd’ lit. ‘the hitter of Zayd’ (cf. Diem 1986: 248-249).

<sup>120</sup> 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 *\*as-sa’atu n-niṭāqi*. In some descriptions, however, the AQPossG,

*wāsiʿ-at-u n-niṭāq-i*  
 wide-F.SI-N D-range.M.SI-G  
 ‘wide-ranging (FEM)’ lit. ‘wide of range’ /71/

*al-wāsiʿ-at-u n-niṭāq-i*  
 D-wide-F.SI-N D-range.M.SI-G  
 ‘wide-ranging (FEM)’ lit. ‘wide of range’ /72/.

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.:

*ʿatārat ʿidānat-a-n wāsiʿ-at-a n-niṭāq-i*  
 it:provoked condemnation.F.SI-A-I wide-F.SI-A D-range.M.SI-G  
 ‘[it] provoked wide-ranging condemnation’ lit. ‘[it] provoked condemnation wide in range’ (Dustūr 1/5/04, 1, *Faḍīḥatu siġni...*) /73/

AQPossGs may be used in independent substantivization, e.g.:

*hākadā yaʿalu muwḥiṣ-u l-qalb-i*  
 so does desolated.M.SI-N D-heart.M.SI-G  
 ‘[one] with desolated heart acts in this way’ (Liṣṣ 27) /74/

### Definiteness of the qualifier

Although generally the qualifier is definite, there are also isolated expressions in which it is indefinite. One of them is that with *ʿahd* ‘knowledge’ used as the qualifier, e.g.:

---

or ‘formal annexation’ is confused with ‘proper’, or ‘true annexation’, i.e. ‘iḍāfa ḥaqīqiyya’, which has, besides, also different semantic properties. Reckendorf classes e.g. *qalīlu l-humūmi* ‘wenig der Sorgen’, i.e. ‘der wenig Sorgen hat’ along with *dasīsu ʿadāwatīn* ‘Geheimes von Feindschaft’, i.e. ‘geheime Feindschaft’ (1895-98: 128). Danecki lists e.g. *fī qadīmi z-zamāni* ‘in old times’ along with e.g. *kaḥīru l-kalāmi* ‘garrulous’ lit. ‘much of words’ (1994: 410-411) and Buckley gives *kibāru l-fannānīna* ‘the greatest artists’ along with *qabiḥātu l-wuġūhi* ‘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 *fī qadīmi z-zamāni* and *kibāru l-fannānīna* as what they term ‘adjectival iḍāfa’ or ‘formal status constructus’, respectively. In reality, they are instances of ‘true annexation’ with substantivized adjectives, discussed by us in chapter 5.6.

*rağma ʿanna-hu qadīm-u ʿahd-i-n bi l-ʿIskandariyyat-i*  
 despite that-3.M.SI old.M.SI-N knowledge.M.SI-G-I in D-Alexandria-F.G  
 ‘despite that he is well-experienced (lit. ‘old of knowledge’) in Alexandria’ (Mīr 148) /75/.

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.:

*ʿanna-hā nāqiṣ-at-u ʿaql-i-n*  
 that-3.F.SI short-F.SI-N mind.M.SI-G-I  
 ‘that she is short of mind’ (Rağab 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. *?an-nāqiṣatu ʿaqlin*.

### More than one qualifier of the adjective

An AQPossG may be qualified by more than one possessum-designating substantive, e.g.:

*kāʾināt-u-n qawiyy-at-u l-binyat-i wa l-badan-i*  
 creature.NH.PL-N-I strong-NH.PL-N D-construction.F.SI-G and D-body.M.SI-G  
 ‘creatures strong in construction and body’ (ʿArabī 5/04, 164) /77/

Killean gives an example with two paratactically bound qualifiers, linked asyndetically, which seems to be rather exceptional:

*al-maṣāʿid-u d-dāʾib-at-u ṣ-ṣuʿūd-i l-hubūt-i*  
 D-elevators.NH.PL-N D-constant-NH.PL-N D-ascension.M.SI-G D-descension.M.SI-G  
 ‘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.:

*qad yakūnu l-biyūn-u muwğab-a š-šahnat-i 'aw sālib-a-hā*  
 PART is D-pion.M.SI-N positive.M.SI-A D-charge.F.SI-G or negative.M.SI-A-3.F.SI  
 ‘a pion can positive or negative in charge’ (‘Arabī 3/04, 144) /79/

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:

*al-ʾazʿar-u: al-qalīl-u š-šar-i l-mutafarriq-u-hu*  
 D-bald.M.SI-N D-scarce.M.SI-N D-hair.M.SI-G D-rare.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<sup>121</sup>:

*maʿhad-a-n ʾamrīkiyy-a-n [...] ṭibbiyy-a wa tahḏībiyy-a l-ʾamal-i*  
 institute.M.SI-A-I American.M.SI-A-I medical.M.SI-A and educational.M.SI-A D-work.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:

*hāḏihi l-māddat-u qarīb-at-u š-šabah-i min murakkabāt-i l-ʾamfītāmīn-i*  
 this substance.F.SI-N close-F.SI-N D-similarity.M.SI-G from compounds.NH.PL-G D-amphetamine.M.SI-G  
 ‘this substance is very similar [lit. ‘close in similarity to’] to amphetamine compounds’ (‘Arabī 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.:

<sup>121</sup> This kind of construction, known as *ʾiqhām*, was discussed by Schub (1984).

*kāna* [...] *muta‘addid-a l-ihtimāmāt-i t-taqāfiyy-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’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 201) /83/

*rağul-u-n* [...] *zāhir-u l-wağh-i wa ma‘ālim-i l-ğism-i l-ħariğiyy-at-i*  
 man.M.SI-N-I visible.M.SI-N D-face.M.SI-G and traits.NH.PL-G D-body.M.SI-G D-external-NH.PL-G  
 ‘a man with visible face and external traits of the body’ lit. ‘visible in face and  
 external traits’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 18, «<sup>?</sup>*lānātu r-ru‘bi*»:...) /84/

### Number of the qualifying possessum-designating substantive

The qualifying possessum-designating substantive is singular if it is a *singulare tantum*, e.g.:

*suwar-a-n ‘amrikiyy-at-a ş-şan‘-i*  
 images.NH.PL-A-I American-NH.PL-A D-production.M.SI-G  
 ‘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’ (Mīṭāq 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.:

*aş-şarikāt-u l-muta‘addid-at-u l-ğinsiyyat-i*  
 D-companies.NH.PL-N D-numerous-NH.PL-N D-nationality.F.SI-G  
 ‘multinational companies’ (Mīṭāq 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‘ā-hu ma‘şüb-a l-‘ayn-ayni*  
 he:saw-3.M.SI covered.M.SI-A D-eye.F-DU.G  
 ‘he saw him with covered eyes’ (i.e. ‘he saw that he was blindfold’) (Rağab 8) /88/

Cf. also the two following examples. The number of *ḥağm* ‘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:

*al-yābāniyy-ūna* [...] *ṣiğār-u* *l-ḥağm-i* ‘*amāliqat-u* *l-fi‘āl-i*  
D-Japanese.M-PL.N small.M.PL-N D-size.M.SI-G gigantic.M.PL-N D-deeds.NH.PL-G  
‘the Japanese [...] are small in size, gigantic in deeds’ (‘Umar 109) /89/

25 [*ḥams-i-n wa ‘iṣrīna* ] *ṭā’irat-a-n* *muḥtalif-at-a* *ṭ-ṭirāzāt-i* *wa l-‘aḥğām-i*  
five.F-G-I and twenty.G plane.F.SI-A-I various-NH.PL-A D-types.NH.PL-G and D-sizes.NH.PL-G  
‘[of] 25 planes of various types and sizes’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 27 *Ḥuṭṭatun 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.:

*sa’ala bi ṣawt-i-hi* *ğalīz-i* *n-nabarāt-i*  
he:asked with voice.M.SI-G-3.M.SI harsh.M.SI-G D-accents.NH.PL-G  
‘he asked with his voice, harsh in tone’ (Liṣṣ 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 AQPossG<sup>122</sup>.

### 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

<sup>122</sup> 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/:

*Zayd-un      kaṭīr-u      l-māl-i*  
 Zayd.M.SI-N    much.M.SI-N    D-wealth.M.SI-G  
 ‘Zayd has much wealth’ lit. ‘Zayd is abundant in wealth’ /92/

According to Diem, the adjective *kaṭīrun* used in the above example cannot be understood as being restricted in its ‘Geltungsbereich’ “da ein Satz wie \**Zaydun kaṭīrun* ‘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 *wāsi‘atu n-niṭāqi* (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’)<sup>123</sup>. Other similar instances can be adduced here in which the adjective seems not to ‘refer’ to the possessor-designating substantives, e.g.:

*’ilā l-ḥayy-i      [...] l-musdal-i      s-satā’ir-i*  
 to D-district.M.S-G      D-lowered.M.S-G    D-curtains.NH.PL-G  
 ‘to the district with [...] lowered curtains’ (‘the district lowered as far as curtains are concerned’?) (Sīra 27) /93/

*imra’at-a-n      dāniy-at-a      š-šayḥūḥat-i*  
 woman.F.SI-A-I    imminent-F.SI-A    D-old.age.F.S-G

<sup>123</sup> As Diem remarks, this was also the way the classical Arab grammarians viewed these semantic relations. According to Sībawayhi (d. 793), in the sentence *Hādā ḥasanu l-waḡhi* ‘This is (someone) of handsome face’ (lit. ‘handsome of face’) *’anna l-ḥusna fī l-ma’nā li l-waḡhi* “as far as the meaning is concerned, *ḥusn* (‘handsomeness’) refers to *l-waḡhi* (‘face’)” (Sībawayhi 1991: I, 195). Also Jebali seems to support Diem’s view (2005: 7).

‘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 *\*rağulun kaṭīrun*. El-Ayoubi et al. introduced the concept of ‘auxiliary adjectives’:

“Einige Adjektive, die keine qualitative Bedeutung haben, sondern auf graduierende Funktion eingeschränkt sind, verlangen eine obligatorische Ergänzung, die gewöhnlich in einem spezifizierenden Genitivannex besteht; man kann sie in Analogie zum semantisch entleerten Hilfsverb (Auxiliarverb) als Auxiliaradjektive bezeichnen. Das sind Adjektive wie أحاديّ [ʿuḥādiyy – M.M] “nur einen Aspekt aufweisend”, بالغ [bāliġ – M.M] “beträchtlich”, وشيك [wašīk – M.M] ‘kurz bevorstehend’ (...)” (2001: 176f).

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/:

*ʿātār-u-n      bāliġ-at-u      l-ḥuṭūrat-i*  
 effects.NH.PL-N-I extreme-NH.PL-N      D-danger.F.SI-G  
 ‘extremely dangerous effects’ lit. ‘effects extreme in danger’ (from El-Ayoubi et al. 2001: 177) /95/

*ḥuṭūrat-u      l-ʿātār-i      bāliġ-at-u-n*  
 danger.F.SI-N      D-effects.NH.PL-G      extreme-NH.PL-N-I  
 ‘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. *ʿadīm* ‘deprived of..., -less’). Otherwise it remains unclear how one should tell whether e.g. the adjective *ʿarabiyyu-* ‘Arab’ in *huwa ʿarabiyyu l-ʿašli* ‘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 określa 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/

*al-ʿidānat-u                      wāsiʿ-at-u   n-niṭāq-i*  
 D-condemnation.F.SI-N    wide-F.SI-N    D-range.M.SI-G  
 ‘the condemnation is wide-ranging’ lit. ‘wide of range’ /97/

may not be grammatical unless /98/ is grammatical:

*niṭāq-u                      l-ʿidānat-i                      wāsiʿ-u-n*  
 range.M.SI-N    D-condemnation.F.SI-G    wide.M.SI-N-I  
 ‘the range of the condemnation is wide’ /98/.

Indeed, one can often encounter the same meaning expressed in both ways:

*ṭalīq-u                      l-yad-i*  
 free.M.SI-N    D-hand.F.SI-G  
 ‘qui a les coudées franches’, lit. ‘free in hand’, i.e. ‘having freedom of movement’  
 (Reig 1999 [1983], n. 3357) /99/

vs.

*ʿinna yad-a-hu                      ṭalīq-at-u-n                      fī ʿan...*  
 that    hand.F.SI-A-3.M.SI    free-F.SI-N-I                      in that  
 ‘his hand is free to [do something]’ (Mīṭāq 20/4/04,13) /100/.

By contrast, if one takes e.g. *rağulun* ‘man’ as the possessor-designating substantive, the adjective *baḥīlun* ‘stingy’ and *mālun* ‘money’ as the possessum-designating substantive, then the expression *\*rağulun baḥīlu l-māli* is not grammatical. The reason for this is that the expression *\*al-mālu baḥīlun* ‘the money is stingy’ is not grammatical. In this case, a preposition is necessary, cf. *baḥīlun ʿalā l-māli* ‘stingy about money’<sup>124</sup>. We will return to this problem in chapter 5.3.5.

<sup>124</sup> 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-ʿakkālu l-fawākihi* ‘(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.:

*al-’insān-u (...)*    *l-fāqid-u*            *d-dakirat-i*  
 D-man.M.SI-N    D-losing.M.SI-N    D-memory.F.SI-G  
 ‘the man who lost (his) memory’ lit. ‘the man losing of memory’ (‘Arabī 18),

where *\*ad-dākiratu fāqidatun* ‘the memory is losing’ is not grammatical. One should expect *l-mafqūdu d-dākirati* (with *l-mafqūdu* meaning ‘lost’) but it seems that it is not used.

must be used with the relative followed and qualified by an indefinite, singular possessum-designating substantive in the accusative. In Arab linguistic tradition, this substantive is called *tamyīz* ‘specification’<sup>125</sup>. In the following example, corresponding to that in /73/, this substantive is *niṭāqan* ‘range’:

*ʿidānat-u-n                      ʿawsaʿ-u              niṭāq-a-n*  
 condemnation.F.SI-N-I    wider.NG.NN-N    range.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘a wider-ranging condemnation’ lit. ‘a condemnation wider in range’ /101/

A genitival qualifier, such as in the AQPossG, cannot be used with relatives because then an expression with a meaning different from the intended would result. Thus e.g. *ʿidānatun ʿawsaʿu n-niṭāqi* would mean ‘condemnation, the widest range’.

In the AQPossA, the adjective governs the accusative case of its qualifier, 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 *ʿidānatun*) 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-ʿidānati ʿawsaʿu* ‘the range of the condemnation is wider’ can be formed.

By virtue of being a relative relative, the adjective has neutralized gender and number. E.g.:

*fi l-ʿatfāl-i              l-ʿaqall-i              ḥaḡm-a-n    wa    l-ʿaqall-i              ṭūl-a-n*  
 in D-children.M.PL-G D-least.NG.NN-G    size.M.SI-A-I    and D-least.NG.NN-G    height.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘in children with the smallest body and height’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 173) /102/

<sup>125</sup> The Arabic term *tamyīz*, 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/:

*fī qaḍāyā*      *ʾuḥrā*      *qad takūnu*      *ʾaktar-a*      *ǧiddiyyat-a-n*  
in issues.NH.PL.G.I    other.NH.PL.G.I    PART are      more.NG.NN-A.I    importance.F.SI-A-I  
‘in other issues that might be more important’ (Miṭāq 20/4/04, 6) /103/

An AQPossA can have more than one qualifier, e.g.:

*ad-duwal-a*      *l-ʾaktar-a*      *ǧinan*      *wa quwwat-a-n*  
D-countries.NH.PL-A    D-more.NG.NN-A    wealth.M.SI.A.I      and power.F.SI-A-I  
‘countries most potent in wealth and power’ (Al-Miṭāq 20/4/2004, 8) /104/

With two or more paratactically bound adjectives, the qualifier can occur after the last one or be repeated after each of them. Thus one can say *ʾaqallu ʾaw ʾakbaru ḥaǧman* ‘smaller or bigger in size’ or *ʾaqallu ḥaǧman ʾaw ʾakbaru ḥaǧman* ‘smaller in size or bigger in size’. However, unlike in the AQPossG, the qualifier cannot be replaced by a pronominal suffix. For instance, it is incorrect to say \**ʾaqallu ḥaǧman ʾaw ʾakbaruḥu* ‘smaller in size or bigger in it’. Neither can the qualifying substantive be replaced by a prepositional phrase equivalent to the accusative: the expression \**ʾaqallu ḥaǧman ʾaw ʾakbaru ʾiyyāhu* is incorrect as well.

The AQPossA can be used in independent substantivization, e.g.:

*lā yuʿabbirūna ʿani l-ʾaktar-i*      *ǧinan*      *wa ʾinnamā l-ʾaktar-i*      *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) /105/

### Other qualifiers of the AQPosA

If used in the comparative meaning, the relative 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’:

*yaǧʿalu l-ʿunṣur-a*      *d-dirāmiyy-a*      *ʾaqall-a*      *ʾahammiyyat-a-n*  
it:makes    D-element.M.SI-A    D-dramatic.M.SI-A    lesser.NG.NN-A.I    importance.F.SI-A-I

*min sard-i*      *l-ʾaḥdāt-i*  
than narration.M.SI-G    D-events.NH.PL-G  
‘[it] makes the dramatic element less important than the narration of events’ (Ṭaqāfi 9/11/04, 6, *Intihārun ḡayru...*) /106/

### Qualification of the possessum-designating substantive

The possessum-designating substantive may be qualified by PPs, e.g.:

*kāna*    *ʾadʿaf-a*            *l-ḡamīʿ-i*    *ruʿb-a-n*    *mina l-mawt-i*  
he:was    weakest.NG.NN-A    D-all-G            fear.M.SI-A-I    of            D-death.M.SI-G  
'he was fearing death the least of all' ('Arabī 5/04, 84) /107/

The AQPossA is usually used (i) if there exists no relative 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 relative exists. Thus e.g. the meaning expressed by /108/:

*z-zaʿīm-i*            *l-ʾakṭar-i*            *qurb-a-n*            *min riʾāsat-i*  
D-leader.M.SI-G    D-most.NG.NN-G    proximity.M.SI-A-I    from presidency.F.SI-G  
'of the leader closest to the presidency of...' (Ḥayāt 208/07, 2, 4 *murašṣahīna...*) /108/

could be expressed by /109/:

*z-zaʿīm-i*            *l-ʾaqrab-i*            *min riʾāsat-i*  
D-leader.M.SI-G    D-closest.NG.NN-G    from presidency.F.SI-G /109/

### 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 *ʾakṭaru*, *ʾaqallu* and *ʾašaddu*. Other elatives are used rather infrequently and a certain number of them occurs in set phrases. The fact that two 'intensifiers', viz. *ʾakṭar* and *ʾašadd*, and two 'diminishers', viz. *ʾaqall* and *ʾadʿaf*, have almost monopolized the position of the relative 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 *ʾakṭaru* 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 relative as the predicate. What is also important, these units are always inflected for case and state and have their own rection. Relatives 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 'anna hādā l-ism-a      yūnāniyy-u-n 'aṣl-a-n*  
 for that this D-name.M.SI-A Greek.M.SI-N-I origin.M.SI-A-I  
 'because this name is Greek in origin' ('Arabī 5/04, 70) /110/

Some of set phrases involving a positive AQPossA would sound rather archaic in MWA, e.g. *ṭayyibun riḥan* 'pleasant in scent'.

One could also speak of the AQPossA with participial adjectives derived from verbs such as *izdāda* 'to increase' or *qalla* 'to decrease'. These verbs are qualified by *tamyīz*-substantives. With participles derived from them, the *tamyīz*-substantives could be interpreted as the possessum-designating substantives qualifying the participles. E.g. from *llaḍī yazdādu sū'an* 'which is worsening' lit. 'increases in evil' one could imagine a corresponding construction with the active participle, i.e. *muzdādun sū'an* '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-waġhi* ‘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 ḡamīlu t-tawbi* ‘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 d-darbi* ‘Zayd pflegt fest zuzuschlagen’;
- d) “die Relation der Verwandtschaft, besonders der Aszendenz”, e.g. *Zaydun ‘irāqiyyu l-‘ummi* ‘Zayd ist mütterlicherseits Iraker’;
- e) “Darüber hinaus können verschiedene sonstige Possessa den Genitiv einer uneigentlichen Annexion (i.e. AQPossG – M.M.) bilden, ohne daß sie eindeutig einer der oben genannten Relationen zugewiesen könnten, z.B. *māl* ‘Vermögen’ und *dār* ‘Haus’ im Sinne von ‘Hauswesen’”, e.g. *Zaydun ma‘mūru d-dāri* ‘Zayd hat ein blühendes Hauswesen’.

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 *‘idānatan* 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 *si‘ru l-kitābi raḥīṣun* ‘the price of the book is cheap’ and *al-kitābu raḥīṣun* ‘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 raḥīṣun* ‘a cheap book’ means the same as *kitābun raḥīṣu s-si‘ri* ‘a book cheap in price’. Another example is *rağulun ṭawīlun* ‘a tall man’, which means the same as *rağulun 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. *rağulun ṣağīrun kabīru r-ra’si* ‘a little man with a big head’ (lit. ‘a man little, big of head’)<sup>126</sup>.

Let us here recall what Wehr pointed out with respect to the meaning of the relative. By virtue of not being derived from the positive adjective but directly from the root the relative is neutralized with respect to diathesis. The relative form signifies generally “stärker mit (...) behaftet, sich mehr auszeichnend durch (...)”. Cf. the meaning of the relative *’ahdā* in the examples given by Wehr: *’ahdā mina n-nağmi* ‘den Weg besserweisend als die Sterne’ and *’ahdā mina l-qaṭā* ‘besser geleitet als die Flughühner’ (Wehr 1953: 55). Likewise, *’aḥwağū* can “in zwei Richtungen ausgelegt werden”: either as ‘more in need’ or as ‘more needed’. This is so because the general meaning of *’ahdā* is ‘more characterized by proper guiding’ and that of *’aḥwağ* is ‘more characterized by need’, without it being

<sup>126</sup> 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/:

<i>Zayd-un</i>	<i>kaṭīr-u</i>	<i>l-māl-i</i>
Zayd.M.SI-N	much.M.SI-N	D-wealth.M.SI-G
‘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)<sup>127</sup>.

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*:

“**1a** said of hair: of a flaxen, golden, light auburn or pale yellowish brown colour. **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-raġulu 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

---

<sup>127</sup> 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:

hě	se	pódas	nípsei
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 *raḡul* (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 zdarzenia* 'a spring abundant in events' but not \**wiosna obfita* 'an abundant spring'<sup>128</sup>.

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 *raḡulun ṭawīlun* '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 *raḡulun 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 ṣaḡīrun* is understood as 'a small book', i.e. it is synonymous with *kitābun ṣaḡīru l-ḥaḡmi* 'a book small in size', although e.g. *ṣaḡīru l-ḥurūfi* 'small-print' lit. 'small of letters' is also grammatical. This means that *ṭawīlun* and *ṣaḡīrun* 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 *raḡulun ṭawīlu l-bāli* or *kitābun ṣaḡīru l-ḥurūfi*.

An example from Polish could be *trudne zadanie* 'a difficult task', which means *trudne do rozwiązania* '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 otworzenia*) and not e.g. difficult to paint (*trudne do malowania*). Again, the reason for this seems to be that normally a door is

---

<sup>128</sup> 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: \**zdarzenia 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 *rağulun 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-ḥağmi* ‘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:

*ʿanna š-Šāwīš Ḥasbullāh kāna ʿanīq-a-n fī malābis-i-hi*  
 that Š.Ḥ.M.A was elegant.M.SI-A-I in clothes.NH.PL-G-3.M.SI  
 ‘that Š.Ḥ. was elegant in his way of dressing’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 19, *Firqatu Ḥasbullāh...*) /112/

*bi kaʿābat-i-n ʿablağ-a fī ʿiṣāḥ-i-hā ʿan ʿayy-i tafağğūʿ-i-n*  
 in despondency.F.SI-G-I intenser.NG.NN-G in expression.M.SI-G-3.F.SI than any-G grief.M.SI-G-I  
 ‘in a despondency intenser in expression than any grief’ (Mīr 77) /113/.

Synonymous syntagms with the AQPossG and the AQPossA, i.e. *ʿanīqa l-malābisi* and *ʿablağa ʿiṣāḥan*, 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 *naʿt sababī*<sup>129</sup>. Below, an example is given with the syntagm in question emphasized in bold:

*li r-raʿīs-i*                      ***l-muntahiy-at-i***                      ***wilāyat-u-hu***  
 for D-president.M.SI-G    D-ending-F.SI-G                      term:of:office.F.SI-N-POSS.3.M.SI  
 ‘for the president whose term of office is ending’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 8, *Turkiyā: taḥdīdu...*) /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 *l-muntahiyati wilāyatuhu*, has the following characteristics: the adjective *l-muntahiyati* is a participle and agrees in gender and number with the substantive *wilāyatuhu*. The substantive is always in the nominative case. The adjective agrees in state and case with the substantive preceding it, *li r-raʿīsī*<sup>130</sup>, yet it cannot be said to qualify it. What it qualifies is the substantive in the nominative, following the adjective, in /114/ *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/:

*li r-raʿīs-i*                      *llaḍī tantahī*                      ***wilāyat-u-hu***  
 for D-president.M.SI-G    which is:ending.F.SI                      term:of:office.F.SI-N-3.M.SI  
 ‘for the president whose term of office is ending’ /115/

The participle *l-muntahiyati* in /114/ corresponds to the verb *tantahī* in /115/, from which it was derived. The substantive *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:

<sup>129</sup> Blau (1999), following Bergsträsser (1975 [1928]: 145) stresses the *apo koinou* character of this construction (i.e. the adjective referring to both substantives). For a discussion of the term *sabab* used in Arab grammar see Carter 1985.

<sup>130</sup> 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<sup>131</sup> 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 ‘sententoid syntagms’, i.e. showing some properties of sentences. Analogously, the substantive which is the qualificatum within a sententoid syntagm will be called ‘subjectoid’ and the participial adjective which is its qualificator will be called ‘predicatoid’<sup>132</sup>. Sententoid 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

---

<sup>131</sup> Basic predicative syntagms are meant here, since only such can be reasonably compared with the SS.

<sup>132</sup> In his work devoted to these constructions, Diem (1998) used terms taken from Arab linguistics: *na't* ‘the adjective’ to refer to the adjective, and *marfū'*, 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 *na't* and our ‘subjectoid’ corresponds to his *marfū'*.

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’<sup>133</sup>.

In MWA, the adjective is almost always a participle, either active or passive derived from transitive verbs but not passive derived from intransitive verbs<sup>134</sup>.

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-raʿīsi*). It must be stressed here that this concord between the predicatoid (*l-muntahiyati*) and the substantive qualified by the SS (*li r-raʿīsi*) 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<sup>135</sup> 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

---

<sup>133</sup> 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. Bańcerowski.

<sup>134</sup> 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).

<sup>135</sup> 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)<sup>136</sup>.

Below, the exemplifications of the four possibilities are given:

(i) The pronominal suffix attached to the subjectoid is exemplified in /116/<sup>137</sup>:

*li r-raʿīs-i*                      *l-muntahiy-at-i*                      *wilāyat-u-hu*  
for D-president.M.SI-G    D-ending-F.SI-G                      term:of:office.F.SI-N-POSS.3.M.SI  
‘for the president whose term of office is ending’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07,8, *Türkiyā: tahdīdu...*) /116/

In this example, *wilāyatuhu*, the subjectoid, bears the pronominal suffix. The word *l-muntahiyati* is the predicatoid.

(ii) The pronominal suffix attached to a substantive qualifying the subejctoid is exemplified in /117/

*bi z-zāhirat-i*                      *l-murād-i*                      *stišrāf-u*                      *mustaqbal-i-hā*  
with D-phenomenon.F.SI-G    D-intended.M.SI-G                      examination.M.SI-N                      future.M.SI-G-3.F.SI  
‘with the phenomenon the examination of whose future is intended’ (‘Arabī 5/04,25) /117/

In this example, the subjectoid is *stišrāfu*. It is qualified by *mustaqbalihā*, which bears the pronominal suffix. The word *l-murādi* is the predicatoid.

(iii) The pronominal suffix attached to a preposition and qualifying the predicatoid is exemplified in /118/<sup>138</sup>:

*li ruqʿat-i*    *l-ʿarḍ-i*    *l-mawğūd-i*    *fī-hā*    *n-nabāt-u*  
of piece.F.SI-G    D-land.F.SI-G    D-found.M.SI-G    in-3.F.SI    D-vegetation.M.SI-N  
‘of the piece of the land in which there is vegetation’ lit. ‘in which vegetation is found’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 124) /118/

<sup>136</sup> There are also SSs in which the subjectoid is a clause, e.g.:

*ar-risālat-u*                      *l-mutawaqqaʿ-u*                      *ʿan yusallima-hā*                      *Būš*                      *li Šārūn*  
D-letter.F.SI-N                      D-expected.NG.NN-N                      that he:hands-3.F.SI                      Bush.M.N                      to Sharon.M.G  
‘the letter which Bush is expected to hand to Sharon’ (Raʿy 1, *ʿAnbāʿun ʿan ḍamānātīn...*)

Here, the subjectoid has the form of the clause *ʿan yusallimahā Būš li Šārūn*. The pronominal suffix *-hā*, representing the qm of the SS, is attached to the verb of this clause.

<sup>137</sup> It is Diem’s type 1.1. (1998: 24-60).

<sup>138</sup> Diem’s type 2.1. (1998: 71-95).

In this example, the predicatoid *l-mawğūdi* 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-luğāt-u l-maktūb-u bi-hā kull-u naşş-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’ (Ṭaqāfi  
 9/11/04, 9, ‘Abqariyyatu l-ḥayāli...)/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<sup>139</sup>. 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 muştarik-i-n [...] ’ilğā’-u hādīhi l-ḥidmat-i [...]*  
 is:possible to any-G user.M.SI-G-I cancellation.M.SI-N this D-service.F.SI-G  
*bi muwğab-i ṭalab-i-n ḥaṭṭiyy-i-n yataqaddamu bi-hi ladā [...]*  
 by strength.M.SI-G demand.M.SI-G-I written.M.SI-G-I he:submits with-3.M.SI at

*l-minṭaqat-i l-hāṭiṭiyy-at-i t-tābi’-i la-hā*  
 D-area.F.SI-G D-telephonic-FM.SI-G D-belonging.M.SI-G to-3.F.SI  
 ‘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-muştariku* could be used here as the subjectoid. Also the personal pronoun *huwa* ‘he’ could be used, but the latter is unusual<sup>140</sup>.

(iv) A combination of (iii) with (i) is showed in /121/<sup>141</sup>:

*fī l-ğudrān-i l-manqūš-i ’alay-hā tāriḥ-u-hā*  
 in D-walls.NH.PL-G D-engraved.M.SI-G on-3.NH.PL history.M.SI-N-3.NH.PL  
 ‘in the walls into which their history was engraved’ (Mīr 18)/121/.

<sup>139</sup> 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”.

<sup>140</sup> 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.

<sup>141</sup> Diem’s type 4.1. (1998: 134ff).

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.:

*istiqdām-i*      *l-muğannas-īna*      *li qtirā‘-i*      *fī ġayr-i*  
 bringing.M.SI-G      D-naturalized:citizens.M-PL.G      to voting.M.SI-G      in reverse-G

*l-‘amākin-i*      *l-musağğal-at-i*      *‘asmā’-u-hum*      *fī-hā*  
 D-places.NH.PL-G      D-registered-NH.PL-G      names.NH.PL-N-3.M.PL      in-3.NH.PL

‘[of] making the naturalized citizens come to vote at places other than those where their names are registered’ (‘Anwār 3/5/04, 2, *Şadmatun rāfaqat...*) /122/

Here, the predicatoid *l-musağğalati* is qualified by *fīhā*, i.e. the word with the pronominal suffix *-hā* representing the word *l-‘amākinī* ‘places’, while the subjectoid *‘asmā’uhum* bears the pronominal suffix *-hum* representing the word *l-muğannasīna* ‘naturalized citizens’<sup>142</sup>.

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<sup>143</sup>.

### 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<sup>144</sup>. It seems to agree with respect to these categories with the qualificatum of the SS instead, e.g.:

<sup>142</sup> It seems that Diem did not describe such cases in (1998).

<sup>143</sup> El-Ayoubi et al. give the following expression as an example of a substantivized SS (in their terminology: *Satzadjektiv*):

*wa l-ğadīr-u*      *dīkr-u-hu*      *‘anna...*  
 and D-worth.M.SI-N      mention.M.SI-3.M.SI      that  
 ‘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-ğadīru bi d-dīkri* lit. ‘worth of mentioning’.

<sup>144</sup> Cf. Diem (1998: 82 and 121-122).

*fī l-maʿhad-i l-muqarrar-i ʿizālat-u-hu*  
 in D-institute.M.SI-G D-decided.M.SI-G abolishment.F.SI-N-3.M.SI  
 ‘in the institute the abolishment of which is decided’ (ʿAhrām 22/01/03, 11, ʿIlgāʿu  
*l-masğidi*) /123/

instead of the expected:

*l-muqarrar-at-i ʿizālat-u-hu*  
 D-decided-F.SI-G abolishment.F.SI-N-3.M.SI

Such non-classical concord may happen also if the subjectoid is absent,  
 e.g.:

*ʿanna l-kitāb-a yanbağī ʿan yunqala [...] li ʿanna-hu yuṭrī*  
 that D-book.M.SI-A it:is:needed that it:be:translated for that-3.M.SI enriches

*l-luğat-a l-manqūl-at-a ʿilay-hā*  
 D-language.F.SI-A D-translated-F.SI-A to-3.F.SI  
 ‘that the book should be translated [...] because it enriches the language translated  
 into’ (Ṭaqāfī 9/11/04, 4, *Ad-duktūr ʿAḥmad...*) [instead of *yuṭrī l-luğata l-manqūla*  
*ʿilayhā*] /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-luğata*, 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 (*ʿalwānuhā*) and the qualificatum of the SS (*ʿaṣāʿira*) are  
 non-human plurals:

*bi širāʿ-i [...] ʿaṣāʿir-a muḥtalif-i-n ʿalwān-u-hā*  
 with buying.M.SI-G juices.NH.PL-G.I various.M.SI-G-I colours.NH.PL-N-3.NH.PL  
 ‘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:

*al-film-u mu'ağğal-u-n 'arḍ-u-hu mundu 3[talāt-i] sanawāt-i-n*  
 D-film.M.SI-N postponed.M.SI-N-I screening.M.SI-N-3.M.SI since three.F-G years.NH.PL-G-I  
 'the screening of the film has been being postponed for 3 years' ('Ahrām 22/01/03,  
 24, «*Dayl as-samaka*»...) /125/

The expression *mu'ağğalun 'arḍuhu* in /125/ may be interpreted either as an SS functioning as the predicate of *al-filmu* or as an inverted nominal sentence functioning as the comment to the topic *al-filmu*. A topic-comment construction without inversion, *al-filmu 'arḍuhu mu'ağğalun...* '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)<sup>145</sup>.

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:

[*alā l-iktimāl-i*]                      ***l-ʿānif-i***                      ***d-dīkr-i***  
on    D-completion.M.SI-G.    D-foregoing.M.SI-G    D-mention.M.SI-G  
‘on the previously mentioned completion’ (Ṭaqāfi 9/11/04,9, *Abqariyyatu l-ḥayālī...*) /126/

[*al-ʾinḡāzāt-i*]                      ***s-sābiq-i***                      ***dīkr-u-hā*** .  
D-achievements.NH.PL-G    D-foregoing.M.SI-G    mention.M.SI-N-3.NH.PL  
‘[of] the previously mentioned achievements’ (ʿAhrām 29/01/03,27, *ʾInṣāʾu ṣālātīn...*) /127/

In both syntagms the substantive is the same, viz. *dīkr* ‘mention’. In the AQPossG the adjective is *ʿānif*, while in the SS it is *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 *dīkr* ‘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

<sup>145</sup> 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 ġarībin* ‘in a strange manner’<sup>146</sup>, MWA also has a special category, which we have discussed in chapter 4.6. We have assumed that words such as *sarī’an* ‘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 accusative rection 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:

*’an nantaqida-hu mawḍū’iyy-a-n*  
 that we:criticize-3.M.SI objective.NG.NN-A-I  
 ‘that we criticize it objectively’ (Al-Miṭāq 20/4/2004, 11) /128/

*sawfa tatawaṭṭadu ’akṭar-a mina s-sābiq-i*  
 PART it:will:strengthen more.NG.NN-A.I than D-past.M.SI-G  
 ‘it will strengthen more than before’ (Ālam al-fikr, 74) /129/

---

<sup>146</sup> 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.:

*sarī'-a-n ittaḥḍa l-qayyim-ūna 'alā l-ḥadaṭ-i mawqī'-a...*  
 quick.NG.NN-A-I adopted D-supervisor.M-PL.N over D-EVENT.M.SI-G attitude.M.SI-A  
 'quickly the supervisors of the event adopted the attitude [of...]' (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 9,  
*Al-ḥāriḡu dā'u...*) /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<sup>147</sup>. What is more, there are sentences without a verbal nor adjectival predicate, yet with an adverbial, which then qualifies the predication, e.g.:

*lā ḥazr-a wa lā 'iqṣā'-a dustūriyy-a-n wa qānūniyy-a-n*  
 no oppression.M.SI-A and no exclusion.M.SI-A constitutional.NG.NN-A-I and legal.NG.NN-A-I  
 'There is constitutionally and legally no oppression or exclusion' (Mītāq 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: (*lā ḥazra, dustūriyyan*), i.e. ('there is no oppression', 'constitutionally'), with a clause as its qualificatum.

Adverbials qualifying adjectives are exemplified in what follows:

*luḡat-u-n ḡadīd-at-u-n kulliyy-a-n*  
 language.F.SI-N-I new-F.SI-N-I complete.NG.NN-A-I  
 'a completely new language' (Mītāq 20/4/04,12) /132/

*huwa 'aqrab-u 'ilā l-wilāyāt-i l-muttaḥid-at-i qtiṣādiyy-a-n*  
 3.M.SI closer.NG.NN-N.I to D-states.NH.PL-G D-united-NH.PL-G economic.NG.NN-A-I  
 'it is closer to the USA economically' ('Ālam al-fikr, 49) /133/

*ruḡām-u-hā muḍī'-u-n 'akṭar-a min faraḡ-ī*  
 marble.M.SI-N-3.F.SI shiny.M.SI-N-I more.NG.NN-A.I than joy.M.SI-1.SI  
 'its marble is more shiny than my joy' (Sīra 93) /134/

<sup>147</sup> Cf. Kuryłowicz'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 *'aktara* could be rephrased into a construction with the AQPossA (see chapter 5.3.2.1.), viz. *ruḥāmuḥā 'aktaru 'iḍā'atan* lit. 'its marble is more in shining', which is considered more correct and closer to Classical Arabic<sup>148</sup>. 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.:

*yamliku 'adadiyy-a-n 'akbar-a ḡayš-i-n fī l-‘ālam-i*  
 it:has quantitative.NG.NN-A-I biggest.NG.NN-A army.M.SI-G-I in D-world.M.SI-G  
 'it has, quantitatively, the biggest army in the world' (Ḥayāt 208/07, 8, *Da'wātun 'ilā...*) /135/

It seems that in some constructions the adverbial can be said to be expressing the agent, e.g.:

*min mawqi'-'i-n muhaymin-i-n wa mad'ūm-i-n 'amrikiyy-a-n*  
 from position.M.SI-G-I prevalent.M.SI-G-I and supported.M.SI-G-I American.NG.NN-A-I

*wa li 'anna kull-a dālika marfūd-u-n 'arabiyy-a-n*  
 and for that all-A this rejected.NG.NN-N-I Arab.NG.NN-A-I  
 'from the prevalent attitude, supported by the Americans and because all this is rejected by the Arabs' (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 32, *ḥisābātu l-iqtisādāti...*) /136/

Adjectival adverbials can qualify substantives, e.g.:

*'allā taqilla [...] 'an marrat-ayni 'usbū'iyiyy-a-n*  
 that:not is:lower than time.F-DU.G weekly.NG.NN-A-I  
 'that it [...] is not lower than two times per week' (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 14, *Mutāba'atun ḡāddatun...*) /137/

*'alā mudīr-i Bank-i l-Qāhirat-i [...] sābiq-a-n*  
 against director.M.SI-G bank.M.SI-G D-Cairo.F-G former.NG.NN-A-I  
 'against the former director of the Bank of Cairo' (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 22, *Al-qabḍu 'alā mudīri...*) /138/

Frequently, they qualify verbal nouns:

<sup>148</sup> E.g. MECAS (1965: 48).

*‘alā kayfiyyat-i [...]* ***mu‘ālağat-i-hā*** ***’i‘lāmiyy-a-n***  
 on quality.F.SI-G treatment.F.SI-G-3.F.SI related:to:media.NG.NN-A-I  
 ‘on the quality of its [...] treatment by the media’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 29) /139/

*lam ta‘ni bi munāqaşat-i-hi ’aktar-a*  
 not she:intended with arguing.F.SI-G-3.M.SI more.NG.NN-A.I  
 ‘[she] did not intend to argue with him [any] more’ (Karnak 27) /140/

Syntagms with adverbials qualifying verbal nouns are often synonymous with those based on adjectival attribution, e.g.: the syntagm *mu‘ālağatihā ’i‘lāmiyyan* of /139/ seems to be synonymous with *mu‘ālağatihā l-’i‘lāmiyyati*. 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<sup>149</sup>. Cf. the two syntagms both encountered in one and the same text:

*ad-dawrāt-i t-tadrībiyy-at-i llatī tahdifu ’ilā tatqīf-i ’a‘dā’-i*  
 D-courses.NH.PL-G D-training-NH.PL-G which aim at educating.M.SI-G members.M.PL-G

*l-wahdāt-i l-ḥizbiyy-at-i [...]* ***siyāsiyy-a-n*** [...]  
 D-units.NH.PL-G D-of:parties-NH.PL-G political.NG.NN-A-I  
 ‘[of] training courses that aim at educating the members of party units politically’  
 (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 31, ḍammu 12 ’alfa...) /141/

In the above example, the verbal noun *tatqīf-i* is qualified by the adverbial adverb, while in the following one, it is qualified by the attributive adjective:

*al-marḥalat-a l-’ulā min barnāmağ-i t-tatqīf-i s-siyāsiyy-i*  
 D-stage.F.SI-A D-first.F.SI.A of programme.M.SI-G D-education.M.SI-G political.M.SI-G  
 ‘the first stage of the programme of political education’ (ibidem) /142/

<sup>149</sup> 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.

*tadrīb-u-hum tadrīb-a-n mutafawwiq-a-n*  
 training.M.SI-N-3.M.PL training.M.SI-A-I excellent.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘training them [with] an excellent training’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 27 ’Inşā’u şālātīn...)

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-ġasaq-u yantasiġu šafif-a-n*  
 D-dusk.M.SI-N weaves:itself transparent.M.SI-A-I (not: NG.NN-A-I)  
 ‘dusk weaves itself transparent’ (Maqhā 107) /143/

It can only be inferred from the fact that adjectives such as *šafif* ‘transparent’ are not used as adverbials that this is a construction with a secondary predicate.

## 5.6. Antegenital adjective

Let us recall that the term ‘antegenital adjectives’ denotes adjectives used in antegenital substantivization (see chapter 4.5.2.). Antegenital adjectives, whether positive or relative, 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. Antegenital Adjective: Positive

Antegenital positive adjectives are positive adjectives used in antegenital 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 qualifier 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.:

*bi ṣarīḥ-i l-‘ibārat-i*  
 with true.NG.NN-G D-word.F.SI-G  
 ‘with a true word’ lit. ‘with the true of word’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 4) /144/

*ḥāliṣ-u l-mawaddat-i wa t-taqdīr-i*  
 pure.NG.NN-N D-love.F.SI-G and D-respect.M.SI-G  
 ‘pure love and respect’ (Šarq 14/4/04, 2, *Al-Ḥarīrī yubriqu muḥanni’an...*) /145/

*wa la-nā kabīr-u l-‘amal-i fī ‘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 muwāṭṭin...*) /146/

If the substantive is a countable one, it must be in the plural form<sup>150</sup>, e.g.:

*li bulūḡ-i raft‘-i l-marākiz-i*  
 for reaching.M.SI-G elevated.NG.NN-G D-positions.NH.PL-G  
 ‘for reaching elevated positions’ (Mītāq 30/12/03, 7) /147/

*li ‘uqūd-i-n ma‘a muḥtalif-i d-duwal-i*  
 for pacts.NH.PL-G-I with various.NG.NN-G D-countries.NH.PL-G  
 ‘for pacts with various countries’ (Riyād 24/4/04, 1, *Li naktub ‘aqdan ḡadīdan...*) /148/

According to Fassi Fehri (1999), such “prenominal adjectives can occur in a series”, e.g.:

*ḡayyid-u qadīm-i 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:

<sup>150</sup> A countable substantive in the singular is also possible, e.g. in ‘*azīzu 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 idiomatized to a great extent.

*fi ḡanūbiyy-i      šarqiyy-i      ’Āsiyā*  
 in Southern.NG.NN-G    Eastern.NG.NN-G    Asia.F.G  
 ‘in South Eastern Asia’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 161) /150/

The definiteness of the genitival qualificator can also be expressed by a pronominal suffix, e.g.:

*li tu’riba [...] ‘an fā’iq-i      taqdīr-i-hā      wa      ḥtirām-i-hā*  
 for expresses    of    high.NG.NN-G    esteem.M.SI-G-3.F.SI and    respect.M.SI-G-3.F.SI  
 ‘to express [...] her highest esteem and respect’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 2, *As-sifāratu l-maḡribiyyatu...*) /151/

Constructions with an indefinite substantive are possible as well:

*bidūni sābiq-i      ’inqār-i-n*  
 without    previous.NG.NN-G    warning.M.SI-G-I  
 ‘without previous warning’ (Sīra 69) /152/

*lam yu’ṭi-hā    l-mu’arriḡ-ūna      kabīr-a      ’ināyat-i-n*  
 not    gave-3.NH.PL    D-historian.M-PL.N    great.NG.NN-A    attention.F.SI-G-I  
 ‘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<sup>151</sup>. The genitival qualificator may be indefinite singular, e.g.:

*ta’mīr-u      rābi’-i      tā’irat-i-n      min    ḡirāz-i...*  
 repair.M.SI-N    fourth.NG.NN-G    plane.F.SI-G-I    of    type.M.SI-G  
 ‘the repair of the fourth plane of the type...’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 26, *Tahsīnu ḡūdlati...*) /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.:

---

<sup>151</sup> 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.

*huwa t-ānī*                      *'ahamm-i*<sup>152</sup>                      *markaz-i-n*  
 3.M.SI second.NG.NN-N    most:important.NG.NN-G    center.M.SI-G-I

*li t-tafkīr-i*                      *fi l-‘ālam-i*  
 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, *Sirru ra’si l-māli*) /155/

The qualificator may be definite plural:

*dafanat-hu Kātrīn Bār*                      *sādis-u*                      *zawġāt-i-hi*  
 buried-3.M.SI K.B.F.N                      sixth.NG.NN-N                      wives.F.PL-G-3.M.SI

‘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.:

*fi ġarbiyy-i*                      *l-‘Andalus-i*  
 in Western.NG.NN-G            D-Andalus-G

‘in the Western part of al-Andalus’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 13) /157/

*fi ġanūbiyy-i*                      *šarqiyy-i*                      *‘Āsiyā*  
 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.:

*‘alā masāfat-i 35 [ħamsat-i-n wa talāfīna] kilūmitr-a-n ġarbiyy-a l-Fallūġā*  
 on distance.F.SI-G five.M-G-I and thirty.G kilometre.M.SI-A-I Western.NG.NN-A D-Falluja.F.G  
 ‘at a distance of 35 kilometres to the west of Falluja’ (Liwā’ 7/4/04, 1, *Taqārīru min-a l-Bintāġūn...*) /159/

Syntagms with the numeral inflected for gender are less frequent:

<sup>152</sup> Badawi et al. write: “Inflection here on *‘af‘al* أفعل 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: *‘ihdā ‘akbar# dūri 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 *i* of the genitive.

*al-ʿarqām-u tağʿalu Barlīn-a tālīt-at-a ʿaktar-i l-mudun-i*  
 D-numbers.NH.PL-N make Berlin.F-A third-F.SI-A most.NG.NN-I D-cities.NH.PL-G  
*l-ʿūrubiyy-at-i šaʿbiyy-at-a-n*

D-European-NH.PL-G popularity.F.SI-A-I

‘numbers make Berlin the third most popular European city’ (ʿArabī 5/04, 45) /160/

A specific construction with ordinal numerals, which have lost their ordering meaning (Łacina 1989: 44), are scientific names of chemical compounds:

*rābiʿ-u?*<sup>153</sup> *ʿiṭīl-i-n*  
 fourth.NG.NN-N ethyl.M.SI-G-I

‘tetraethyl’ (from Łacina 1989: 44, our vocalization) /161/

*tānī ʿūksīd-i l-karbūn-i*  
 second.NG.NN-N oxide.M.SI-G D-carbon.M.SI-G

‘carbon dioxide’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, *Maktabu l-ʿūzūni...*) /162/

The adjectives *kaṭīr*, *qalīl* 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 *min*, see chapter 4.5.6.3.). However, the following examples show that exceptions do occur:

*ʿusrat-u l-kulliyyat-i tanʿā bi mazīd-i l-ḥuzn-i wālidat-a ...*  
 family.F.SI-N D-faculty.F.SI-G announces:death with much.NG.NN-G D-sorrow.M.SI-G mother.F.SI-A  
 ‘the family of the Faculty with great sorrow announces the death of the mother of...’  
 (ʿAhrām 29/01/03, 33, obituary)<sup>154</sup> /163/

*dūna kaṭīr-i mubālağat-i-n*  
 without much.NG.NN-G exaggeration.F.SI-G-I

‘without much exaggeration’ (Mītāq 30/12/03, 3) /164/

El-Ayoubi et al. classed the use of *kaṭīr* 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,

<sup>153</sup> 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. *rābiʿ# ʿiṭīl*). Yet we will vocalize it so as to reflect the canonical rules.

<sup>154</sup> Note that here *mazīd* does not mean ‘more’ (as in constructions with *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:

*mamnū<sup>c</sup>-u?*                      *d-duḥūl-?*  
 prohibited.NG.NN-N?      D-entry.M.SI-?  
 ‘no entry’ lit. ‘prohibited entrance’ /165/

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 *mamnū<sup>c</sup>uni d-duḥūlu* and be equivalent to *ad-duḥūlu mamnū<sup>c</sup>un* (with the adjective glossed M.SI instead of NG.NN). However, some native speakers see in them an AQPossG (as in *daḥaltu makānan mamnū<sup>c</sup>a d-duḥūli* lit. ‘I entered a place forbidden [in terms] of entrance’). We however prefer to treat this construction as one of particular character<sup>155</sup>. 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.:

*min kibār-i l-mas’ūl-īna n-nīmsāwīyy-īna*  
 of great.M.PL-G D-official.M.PL.G D-Austrian.M.PL.G  
 ‘of senior Austrian officials’ (Ġazīra 2, *Walīyyu l-‘ahdi yabḥaṭu...*) /166/

*quḏāmā l-muṣṭarik-īna*  
 old.M.PL.N D-participant.M.PL.G  
 ‘the old participants’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 15, *Aṣ-ṣayfu yuḥriḡu...*) /167/

<sup>155</sup> Other languages also have specific constructions with ‘non-canonical’ syntax for brief informations. E.g. Spanish *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 *informado* and *conforme* and the substantive *el cliente* there seem to be no attribution or predication like one in a sentence. Another example from Spanish is: *prohibido el paso* ‘No entry’, lit. ‘Prohibited the passage’.

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-ʿasātīdati* ‘the **senior** professors’ with *ʿasātīdatunā 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*  
 commanders.M.PL-G-I    military.M-PL.G    American.M-PL.G    senior.M.PL-G-I  
 ‘[of] senior American military commanders’ (Liwā’ 1, *Taqārīru mina l-Bintāgūn...*) /168/

## 5.6.2. Antegenital Adjective: Elative

In contrast to the foregoing chapter, in the discussion of the antegenital elative, no distinction will be made between syntagms involving substantives designating human and non-human entities. Syntagms with antegenital elatives will be divided into: (i) syntagms with indefinite qualifiers and (ii) syntagms with definite qualifiers.

### 5.6.2.1. Antegenital elatives with indefinite qualifiers

Antegenital 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 ʿağmal-u*                      *kalimat-i-n*    *fī hāḍihi*    *l-luğat-i*  
 3.F.SI    most:beautiful.NG.NN-N    word.F.SI-G-I    in this                      D-language.F.SI-G  
 ‘it is **the most beautiful** word in this language’ (ʿĀlam al-fikr, 80) /169/

*taşmudu*    *baldat-u*                      *l-Fallūğat-i* [...] *ʿarwaʿ-a*                      *şumūd-i-n*  
 defies                      village.F.SI-N                      D-Falluja.F-N                      most:marvellous.NG.NN-A                      defiance.M.SI-G-I  
 ‘the village of Falluja shows the most marvellous defiance’ lit. ‘defies [...] [with] the most marvellous defiance’ (ʿAnwār 3/5/04, 2, *Al-Ḥuşş: ʿAmīrkā...*) /170/

*hādā ḥayr-u      šī‘ār-i-n      fī l-ḥayāt-i*  
 this best.NG.NN-N      motto.M.SI-G-I      in D-life.F.SI-G  
 ‘this is the best motto in life’ (Karnak 35) /171/

Both the adjectives and their qualifiers can have paratactic constituents, as is shown by the following example:

*yušakkilu ‘akbar-a      wa ‘aqwā      da‘m-i-n      wa musānadat-i-n*  
 it:forms      biggest.NG.NN-A      and strongest.NG.NN.A      aid.M.SI-G-I      and support.F.SI-G-I  
 ‘[it] constitutes the biggest and strongest aid and support’ (Liwā’ 2, *Laḥūd: al-qimmatu...*) /172/

Probably under the impact of dialects, a construction with elatives qualified by *wāḥid* (feminine: *wāḥida*) ‘one’ is sometimes used with the meaning ‘the ...st one’, e.g.:

*ḥattā šahidtu mawt-a      ‘āḥir-i      wāḥid-at-i-n*  
 until I:saw      death.M.SI-A      last.NG.NN-G      one-F.SI-G-I  
 ‘until I saw the death of the last of them’ (Liṣṣ 130) /173/

The qualifying substantive can also be dual or plural:

*‘an ‘ahamm-i      šā‘ir-ayni      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/

*tarāḡa‘a [...] ‘ilā ‘adnā      mustawayāt-i-n      fī 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’ (Ḥayāt 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.:

*‘alā ‘aṣḡar-i      masāḥat-i-n      mumkin-at-i-n*  
 on      smallest.NG.NN-G      surface.F.SI-G-I      possible-F.SI-G-I  
 ‘on the possibly smallest surface’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 9, *Mātat ḥarīṭatu...*) /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<sup>156</sup>.

Examples of countable plural and dual substantives as qualifiers include:

*turğimat* [...] *'ilā 'aktar-i l-luğāt-i l-ḥayy-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’ (Ṭaqāfi 9/11/04, 9,  
 ‘*Abqariyyatu l-ḥayāli...*) /177/

*huwa 'atwal-u s-sifr-ayni*  
 3.M.SI longer.NG.NN-N D-book.M-DU.G  
 ‘it is the longer of the [two] books’ (Kallās 61) /178/

Uncountable singular substantives as qualifiers are exemplified below:

*li 'āḥir-i n-nitāğ-i l-'ibdā'iyi-i*  
 of recent.NG.NN-G D-production.M.SI-G D-literary.M.SI-G  
 ‘of the recent literary production’ (‘*Ayyāmu l-frankūfūniyyati* 8) /179/

*fī 'aqṣā šimāl-i l-bilād-i*  
 in furthest.NG.NN.G D-north.M.SI-G D-country.M.SI-G  
 ‘in the very far north of the country’ (Ḥayāt 208/07, 8, *Al-ğayšu 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.:

<sup>156</sup> 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.).

*ʿanta ʾahamm-u mā laday-ya fi hāḏihi l-ḥayāt-i*  
 2.M.SI most:important.NG.NN-N what at-1.SI in this D-life.F.SI-G  
 ‘you are the most important [thing] for me in this life’ (Liṣṣ 35) /181/

Note the following construction with the meaning ‘the most, at [one’s] most’:

*al-baṣamāt-u s-siyāsiyy-at-u [...] tazharu ʾaktar-a mā tazharu*  
 D-influences.NH.PL-N D-political-NH.PL-N appear most.NG.NN-A what appear

*fi qānūn-i l-intihābāt-i*  
 in law.M.SI-G D-elections.NH.PL-G  
 ‘political influence [...] appears at its most [visible] in the electoral law’ (ʿAnwār 3/5/04, 2, *Al-baṣamatu s-siyāsiyyatu...*)<sup>157</sup> /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<sup>158</sup>), which emphasizes the superlative grade of the adjective. E.g.:

*an-nabātāt-u ʾabʾad-u mā takūnu ʿan kaww-i-hā*  
 D-plants.NH.PL-N farthest.NG.NN-N what are from being.M.SI-G-3.NH.PL

*kāʾināt-i-n salbiyy-at-a-n*  
 creatures.NH.PL-A-I harmful-NH.PL-A-I  
 ‘plants are as far as possible from being harmful creatures’ (ʿArabī 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”)<sup>159</sup>, e.g.:

<sup>157</sup> Cf. Badawi et al. (2004: 523).

<sup>158</sup> 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).

<sup>159</sup> We have said in chapter 4.5.2. that an antegenital 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 genitively qualified, or not.

*bi 'uslūb-i-n 'ab'ad-a mā yakūn-u 'ani t-tafsīr-i waḥḥan 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 explicaton 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 relative, by virtue of being neutralized with respect to number, does not indicate what is the intended quantity of the entities designated by the genitival substantive<sup>160</sup>. The number may be inferable from the context. E.g. in /185/ singular meaning is intended:

*nihāyat-i 'aḥwal-i l-ḥurūb-i l-'ifrīqiyy-at-i*  
 end.F.SI-G longest.NG.NN-G D-war.NH.PL-G D-African.NH.PL-G  
 '[of] the end of the longest of the African wars' (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 1, 'Anān yaḥruḥu...) /185/

Plural meaning should be understood in /186/:

*maḡmū'at-a-n min 'anqā wa 'a'zam-i rumūz-i-hā*  
 group.F.SI-A-I of most:exquisite.NG.NN-G and greatest.NG.NN-G symbols.NH.PL-G-3.F.SI  
 'a group of its most exquisite and greatest symbols' (Al-Mīṭāq 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/:

*yunaḥḥidūna 'aswa'-a s-sīnāryūhāt-i llatī rasamat-hā 'Amīrkā*  
 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-Bašmarka l-yadu...) /187/

Here, both readings, either with singular or plural, are equally possible.

<sup>160</sup> According to Kouloughli, such constructions are even triply ambiguous: 'aḡmalu l-banāti, 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 would simply say 'aḡmalu mā fi l-banāti instead (1994: 144).

### Antesubstantival elatives with absolutive meaning

Some elatives, which belong to a limited group (comprising e.g. *kubrā* ‘big; biggest’, *ʿulā* ‘first’) inflect for gender even though they are antegenitively substantivized. It seems that they always convey absolutive meaning. E.g.:

*kānat ʿulā ǧazawāt-i-hi maʿa zawġat-i Wahġāna*  
was first.F.NN.N conquests.NH.PL-G-3.M.SI with wife.F.SI-G Wahġān  
‘his first conquest was with the wife of Wahġān’ (‘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:

*tatasābaqu kubrā š-šarikāt-i [...] l-ʿamrīkiyy-at-i ʿawi l-faransiyy-at-i li...*  
vie biggest.NH.PL.N D-companies.NH.PL-G D-American-NH.PL-G or D-French-NH.PL-G to  
‘the biggest American and French companies compete [in order] to...’ (‘Ahrām  
29/01/03, 26, Markazun ġadīdun...’) /189/

Such absolutive elatives inflected for number can have endings typical of human adjectives<sup>161</sup>, 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.:

*munḍu zaman-i kubrayāt-i š-šuhuf-i*  
since time.M.SI-G great.F.PL-G D-newspapers.NHPL-G  
‘since the era of the great newspapers’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 4) /190/.

### Antegenitival elatives functioning as subjects

If an antegenitival relative functions as a subject, the concord between it and the predicate may reflect its neutralized gender and number, e.g.:

*ʿanna ʿaġlab-a hādīhi l-ʿaflām-i ġayr-u mudablaġ-i-n*  
that most.NG.NN-A these D-films.NH.PL-G reverse-N dubbed.NG.NN-G-I  
‘that most of these films are not dubbed’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 49) /191/

<sup>161</sup> Cf. Cantarino (1975, 2: 475) and Badawi et al. (2004: 252).

However, concord *ad sensum*, i.e. with the predicate *ġayru mudablaġin* agreeing in gender and number with *'aflāmun*, i.e. the qualifier of the relative, is also possible.

### 5.6.2.3. Antegenitival relative: a non-classical construction

Perhaps a separate construction, which is evidently non-classical, should be distinguished, viz. that in which the relative 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 relative could be interpreted as qualifying this adjective or RC. The construction is exemplified in what follows:

*satakūnīna 'aktar-a mra'at-i-n maḥsūd-at-i-n fi l-'ālam-i*  
 you:will:be most.NG.NN-A woman.F.SI-G-I envied-F.SI-G-I in D-world.M.SI-G  
 ‘you will be the most envied woman in the world’ lit. ‘the most of envied women’  
 (from El-Ayoubi 2001: 294) /192/

Here, the property expressed by the adjective *maḥsūdatin* ‘envied’ seems to be emphasized by the relative *'aktara* ‘the most’, as to produce the sense ‘the most envied’. The following example has a similar structure:

*'akbar-u dawlat-i-n muntahik-at-i-n li l-qarārāt-i d-duwaliyy-at-i*  
 biggest.NG.NN-N state.F.SI-G-I violating-F.SI-G-I PREP D-decisions.NH.PL-G D-international-NH.PL-G  
 ‘the state violating international decisions the most’ lit. ‘the biggest of violating countries’ (Al-Mītāq 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 accusative substantive (see chapter 5.6.3.). In fact, they could be rephrased as the latter. Cf. *'aktaru mra'atin ḥasadan* lit. ‘the most of woman in envy’ as the equivalent of the expression of /192/ and *'akbaru 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.:

*ʾanā ḥayr-u man yaqraʿu dāḥila raʾs-i-ka*  
 1.SI best.NG.NN-N who reads inside head.M.SI-G-2.M.SI  
 ‘I am the one who reads best in your head’ lit. ‘the best of those who read’ (Liṣṣ 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 qualifier of the elative being definite and plural. The qualification and function of the accusative qualifier 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 qualifier of the adjectives designates its possessor. E.g.:

*huwa ʾasraʿ-u qtiṣādāt-i l-ʿālam-i numuww-a-n*  
 3.M.SI quickest.NG.NN-N economies.NH.PL-G D-world.M.SI-G development.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘it is the quickest developing economy in the world’ lit. ‘the quickest of the world’s economies in terms of development’ (ʿArabī 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.:

*hiya 'ašadd-u mā takūnu wuḍūḥ-a-n*  
 3.F.SI strongest.NG.NN-N what is brightness.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘she is the brightest thing [that can be]’ (Rağab 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.<sup>162</sup>, with *mustawan* as the indefinite genitive substantive qualifying the elative:

*ya'īšu fi 'akṭar-i mustawan taḥalluf-a-n*  
 he:lives in most.NG.NN-G standard.M.SI.G.I backwardness.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘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<sup>163</sup>, e.g.:

*'ašbaḥat 'ašaqq-a 'awqāt-i-n 'alay-nā*  
 they:became most:difficult.NG.NN-A times.NH.PL-G-I for-1.PL  
 ‘[they] became the most difficult times for us’ (Karnak 75) /198/

*min 'abhağ-i d-duwal-i fi l-karam-i wa l-faḍl-i*  
 of most:splendid.NG.NN-G D-countries.NH.PL-G in D-generosity.M.SI-G and D-opulence.M.SI-G  
 ‘out of countries most splendid in [their] generosity and opulence’ (Kallās 42) /199/

<sup>162</sup> Another example of it, although in a different context, is given in El-Ayoubi et al. on p. 265.

<sup>163</sup> It seems that since absolute elatives are usually not qualified by PPs, the same should hold for antegenitival absolute elatives. However, Holes adduces an example which shows the opposite: *kubrāyātu l-banāti fi 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 adjectival attribution. Let us show it at the following examples:

*bi*    *ṣarīḥ-i*            *l-ʿibārat-i*  
with   true.NG.NN-G    D-word.F.SI-G  
‘with a true word’ lit. ‘with the true of word’ (Mītāq 20/4/04, 4) /200/

The above syntagm seems to be synonymous with the following:

*bi*    *ʿibārat-i-n*    *ṣarīḥ-at-i-n*  
with   word.F.SI-G-I    true-F.SI-G-I  
‘with a true word’. /201/

The attributive adjective in the latter, *ṣarīḥatin*, corresponds to the antegenitival adjective in the former, *ṣarīḥi-*, while the qualified substantive in the latter, *ʿibāratin*, corresponds to the the qualifying genitive substantive in the former, *l-ʿibārati*.

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”<sup>164</sup>. 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:

*Kātrīn Bār    sādīs-u    zawġāt-i-hi*  
 K.B.F.N        sixth.NG.NN-N    wives.F.PL-G-3.M.SI  
 ‘Katherine Parr, his sixth wife’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 82) /202/

*Kātrīn Bār    zawġat-u-hu    s-sādīs-at-u*  
 K.B.F.N        wife.F.SI-N-3.M.SI    D-sixth-F.SI-N  
 ‘Idem’ /203/

Yet certain meanings must be expressed by syntagms with adjectival attribution and cannot be expressed by an antegenitival adjective. E.g.:

*kāna    r-raġul-a    t-tānī    fi l-Qā’idat-i    ’Ayman az-Zawāhirī*  
 was        D-man.M.SI-A    D-second.M.SI-A    in D-Qaeda.F.SI-G    A.Z.M.N.  
 ‘The man number two in al-Qaeda was Ayman Az-Zawahiri’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 8, *Al-Qā’idatu tad’ū..*) /204/

In this sense, one would rather not say:

*kāna    tānī    raġul-in ....*  
 was        second.NG.NN.A    man.M.SI-G-I

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/:

<sup>164</sup> She adduces similar examples from French, involving adjectives and substantives:  
*un enfant charmant – un enfant bijou – un bijou d’enfant*  
*une femme horrible – une femme monstre – un monstre de femme* (Wierzbicka 1986: 385).

*al-ḥarb-u l-‘ālamīyy-at-u l-‘ulā*  
 D-war.F.SI-N D-global-F.SI-N D-first.F.SI-N  
 ‘World War Two’ /205/

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 t-tānīy-at-u*  
 D-group.F.SI-N D-second-F.SI-N  
 ‘Group Two’ [in football] (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 17, *Lubnānu ya‘buru...*) /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-‘ulā llatī ḥaraġa fī-hā l-muntaḥab-u*  
 after D-match.F.SI-G D-first.F.SI.G which came:out in-3.F.SI D-team.M.SI-N  
*l-‘irāqīyy-u muta‘ādil-a-n*  
 D-Iraqi.M.SI-N drawing.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘after the first match, from which the Iraqi team came away with a draw’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 17, *Fiyirā yu‘akkidu...*) /207/

is not synonymous with /208/:

*ba‘da ‘awwal-i mubārātī-n ḥaraġa fī-hā l-muntaḥab-u*  
 after first.NG.NN-G D-match.F.SI-G came:out in-3.F.SI D-team.M.SI-N  
*l-‘irāqīyy-u muta‘ādil-a-n*  
 D-Iraqi.M.SI-N drawing.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘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 entails semantic indefiniteness. In /209/, the syntagm *tānī mubārātin*, though with the substantive formally indefinite, is semantically definite:

*li ḥasārat-i-n qāsiy-at-i-n fī tānī mubārāt-i-n rasmiyy-at-i-n*  
 to defeat.F.SI-G-I severe-F.SI-G-I in second.NG.NN.G match.F.SI-G-I official-F.SI-G-I  
 ‘to a severe defeat in the second official match’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 17, *Šūstir yu’ribu...*) /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, *’ahamma ’ilāqatin* and *l-’ilāqatu l-’ahammu*, encountered in one and the same text:

*’inna ’ahamm-a ’ilāqat-i-n tunā’iyy-at-i-n li Brīṭāniyā hiya ma’a*  
 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-’ilāqat-u l-’ahamm-u*  
 D-states.NH.PL-G D-united-NH.PL-G what 3.F.SI D-relation.F.SI-N D-most:important.NG.NN-N  
*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?’ (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 8, *Brāwn qad yad’ū...*) /210/

Cf. also /211/ and /212/, both expressing the same meaning of superlativity, yet by means of the two different kinds of syntagms:

*laqab-u ’afdāl-i lā’ib-i-n*  
 title.M.SI-N best.NG.NN-G player.M.SI-G-I  
 ‘the title of the best player’ (Mağalla 33) /211/

*ğā’izat-u l-muntaḥab-i l-’afdāl-i*  
 award.F.SI-N D-team.M.SI-G D-best.NG.NN-G  
 ‘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 qualifier, either of the

adjective or of the substantive<sup>165</sup>, a syntagm with the antegenitival elative is used, e.g.:

*ʿilā ʿağmal-i mraʿat-i-n fī l-ʿālam-i*  
 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:

*ʿilā l-marʿat-i l-ʿağmal-i fī l-ʿālam-i*  
 to D-woman.F.SI-G D-most:beautiful.NG.NN-G in D-world.M.SI-G /214/

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. *ʿağmalu n-nisāʿi*<sup>166</sup>.

## 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.

### 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.:

<sup>165</sup> This was noted by Wehr, in whose wording this is “engere Umschreibung der Gültigkeit der Qualität” (Wehr 1953: 16).

<sup>166</sup> For proposal of possible answers see Holes (2004 [1995]: 211) and El-Ayoubi et al. (2001: 273).

*bi 'aḥṭar-i*                      *l-'asliḥat-i*                      *wa*                      *'ašadd-i-hā*                      *fatk-a-n*  
with most:dangerous.NG.NN-G    D-weapons.NH.PL-G    and                      powerful.NG.NN-G-3.NH.PL    destruction.M.SI-A-I  
‘with the most dangerous and most powerfully destructive weapon’ (Šarq 14/4/04, 1, *Al-Fallūḡatu... wa mā 'adrāka...*) /215/

*'Absāl-u*                      *'ašḡar-u-humā*                      *sinn-a-n*  
Absāl.M.N                      youngest.NG.NN-N-3.DU                      age.F.SI-A-I  
‘Absal is the younger of age of them two’ (Kallās 84) /216/

### 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*                      *fī s-sinn-i*  
answered-3.M.SI    oldest.NG.NN-N-3.M.PL    in D-age.F.SI-G  
‘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 qualificator interpretable as its direct object in the accusative case<sup>167</sup>. 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.

<sup>167</sup> 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.:

*qad ustušhida munaffid-a-ni l-'amaliyyat-a*  
 PART he:died:as:martyr carrying:out.M.SI-A-I D-action.F.SI-A  
 'he died as a martyr, [while] carrying out the action' ('Anwār 1, *Maqtalu 5*  
 'Isrā'iliyyīna...)/219/

If the direct object is a personal pronoun, it is suffixed to the preposition 'iyyā:

*hazzat ra's-a-hā dā'iy-at-a-n 'iyyā-ya 'ilā l-iḡṡāh-i*  
 shook head.M.SI-A-3.F.SI calling-F.SI-A-I PREP-1.SI to D-frank:declaration.M.SI-G  
 'she shook her head, calling me to be frank' (Mīr 213)/220/

The following is an example with an active participle of a ditransitive verb. The participle has two direct objects:

*ḡaddadat kutlat-u l-Wafā'-i [...] i'tibār-a-hā [...] muḡammil-at-a-n*  
 renewed block.F.SI-N D-Wafā'.M.SI-G opinion.M.SI-A-3.F.SI charging-F.SI-A-I  
**'iyyāhu mas'ūliyyata**  
 PREP-3.M.SI responsibility.F.SI-A  
 'the Wafā' block re-stated its opinion [...] while charging him with the responsibility  
 [of] ...' (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 7, *Al-Wafā'u li l-muqāwamati...*)/221/

The variety (ii) can be exemplified as follows:

*lā yakūnu [...] mufawwad-a-ni ttiḡād-a qarār-i-n*  
 not it:is authorized.M.SI-A-I adoption.M.SI-A decision.M.SI-G-I  
 '[it] is not authorized [to] adopt the decision of...'  
 (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 8, *Kābūl tarfuḡu...*)/222/

*al-fatāt-u [...] l-maslūb-at-u š-šaraf-a*  
 D-girl.F.SI-N D-deprived-F.SI-N D-honour.M.SI-A  
 'the girl deprived [of] honour' (Mīr 192)/223/

In /222/, the passive participle of the ditransitive verb *fawwada* 'to authorize somebody to something' has the direct object *ttiḡāda*. In /223/,

the passive participle of the ditransitive verb *salaba* ‘to deprive somebody of something’ has the direct object *š-šaraḥa*.

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.:

*rağul-u-n muḥīr-u-n li l-ihtimām-i*  
 man.M.SI-N-I arousing.M.SI-N-I PREP D-interest.M.SI-G  
 ‘an interesting man’ lit. ‘a man arousing interest’ (Liwā’ 2, ‘Anḏimatun ‘arabiyyatun...’) /224/

*bi šī‘ārāt-i-n mu‘ādiy-at-i-n li l-‘amrikiyy-īna*  
 with slogans.NH.PL-G-I hostile-NH.PL-G-I PREP D-American.M-PL-G  
 ‘with anti-American slogans’ lit. ‘slogans treating Americans in a hostile way’  
 (‘Arab al-Yawm 1, Buš yuḥliqu ‘ināna...’) /225/

## 5.9. Internal object

The term ‘internal object’ denotes a syntactic function occupied by substantives which primarily are qualificators of the verb<sup>168</sup> 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.:

*‘ilā l-‘alwān-i l-mantūr-at-i naṭr-a-n*  
 to D-colours.NH.PL-G D-dispersed-NH.PL-G dispersion.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘to widely dispersed colours’ lit. ‘to colours dispersed a dispersion’ (Ṭaqāfi 9/11/04, 8, Bayna t-ta‘biriyyati...) /226/

<sup>168</sup> This is what in Arab grammar is termed *maḥūl muḥlaq*. 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 qualificator. In the latter case the internal object ceases to be indefinite. E.g.:

*kāna mutaqqaf-a-n taqāfat-a-n faransiyy-at-a-n*  
 he:was educated.M.SI-A-I education.F.SI-A-I French-F.SI-A-I  
 ‘he was educated in the French manner’ lit. ‘he was educated the French education’  
 (‘Arabī 5/04, 194) /227/

*‘ādat-u-n zawǧīyy-at-u-n qadīm-at-u-n qidam-a ḥtirā‘-i l-ǧayb-i*  
 custom.F.SI-N-I matrimonial-F.SI-N-I ancient-F.SI-N-I ancientness.M.SI-A invention.M.SI-A D-pocket.M.SI-G  
 ‘a matrimonial custom as ancient as [the ancientness of] the invention of the pocket’  
 (Raǧab 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 ǧadīd-a-n kull-a l-ǧiddat-i*  
 it:is:not new.M.SI-A-I all-A D-newness.F.SI-G  
 ‘it is not completely new’ lit. ‘not new [with] the whole of newness’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 75) /229/

*‘aǧwā’-i-n ǧadīd-at-i-n muḥtalif-at-i-n kull-a l-iḥtilāf-i*  
 milieus.NH.PL-G-I new-NH.PL-G-I various-NH.PL-G-I all-A D-variation.M.SI-G  
 ‘[of] new very varied milieus’ lit. ‘varied with all variation’ (‘Arabī 5/04, 164) /230/

It can also be an elative, usually *‘ašadd* ‘strongest’, qualified by the cognate verbal noun, e.g.:

*kāna ǧālīliyū [...] ḥadīr-a-n ‘ašadd-a l-ḥadār-i*  
 was Galileo.M.N cautious.M.SI-A-I strongest.NG.NN-A D-caution.M.SI-G  
 ‘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-ḥadār-u ‘ašadd-a l-ḥadār-i*  
 D-caution.M.SI-N strongest.NG.NN-A D-caution.M.SI-G  
 ‘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:

*rağul-u-n*      *qā'im-u-n*      *'ikrām-a-n*      *la-hā*  
 man.M.SI-N-I    standing:up.M.SI-N-I    honour.M.SI-A-I    for-3.F.SI  
 'a man standing up in her honour' /233/

does not fulfil the condition for the AQPossA because a sentence like \**'ikrāmu r-rağuli qā'imun* 'the honour of the man is standing up' is non-grammatical.

In the above example the qualifier of the adjective expresses aim: *'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/:

*ğunūd-u-n*      *hārib-ūna*      *rakḍ-a-n*  
 soldiers.M.PL-N-I    fleeing.M-PL.N-I    run.M.SI-A-I  
 'soldiers fleeing at a run' /234/

In the following example, the qualifier expresses content:

*ğardal-u-n* [...]    *malī'-u-n*      *talğ-a-n*  
 bucket.M.SI-N-I    full.M.SI-N-I    ice.M.SI-A-I  
 'a bucket full of ice' (Lişş 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 qualifiers in prepositional phrases governed by the adjectives, their qualifiers in the accusative will be interpreted as recta of the adjectives. By contrast, syntagms with qualifiers having the accusative form but no synonymous syntagms with qualifiers 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 qualifiers of non-substantivized adjectives

Non-substantivized adjectives can be qualified by prepositional phrases. In contrast to antegenitively and suffixally substantivized adjectives discussed in chapters 5.6.4. and 5.7.2., which allowed such a qualification only for relatives, a non-substantivized adjective can be qualified in this manner irrespective of whether it is an relative or a positive. Below, we provide only a short list of examples but their repertory is much larger.

Examples with substantival qualifiers in the PP:

*mawādd-u*                      *wadūd-at-u-n*    *li*    *l-'ūzūn-i*  
 substances.NH.PL-N.I    friendly-NH.PL-N-I    to    D-ozone.M.SI-G  
 'ozone-friendly substances' (Ḥayāt 2/08/07, 14, *Maḍārru 'ašī'ati...*) /236/

'*alā* *l-ḥiṭābāt-i*    *l-muwaqqa'-at-i* *min* *wazīr-i*                      *š-šabāb-i*  
 on    letters.NH.PL-G    D-signed-NH.PL-G    by    minister.M.SI-G    D-youth.M.PL-G  
 'on the letters signed by the Minister of Youth' (Ahrām 29/01/03, 28, *Ḥuṭṭatun li 'inšā'i...*) /237/

'*Ūrubbā*    *hiya* *l-'aqdam-u* [...]    *fī* *rawābiṭ-i-nā*    *s-sayyi'-i*                      *min-hā*  
 Europe.F.N    3.F.SI. D-oldest.NG.NN-N    in    ties.NH.PL-G-1.PL    D-bad.NG.NN-G    of-3.NH.PL  
*wa*    *l-ḥasan-i*  
 and    D-good.NH.NN-G

‘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’ (Riyāḍ 24/4/04, 1, *Li naktub ‘aqdan ḡadīdan...*) /238/

Examples with adjectival qualifiers in the PP:

*al-ʿamn-u*      *fi l-ʿUrdunn-i*      *ḡaṭṭ-u-n*      **ʿakṭar-u**      *min ʿaḡmar-a*  
 D-security.M.SI-N      in D-Jordan.M-G      line.M.SI-N-I      more.NG.NN-N.I      than red.M.SI-G.I  
 ‘security in Jordan is a line [which is] more than red’ (Ra’y 2, *Lan yamurrū*) /239/

*ʿanna*      *ʿilāqat-a*      *d-duktūr-i* [...] *kānat*      **ʿakṭar-a**      *min ʿiḡābiyy-at-i-n*  
 that      relation.F.SI-A      D-doctor.M.SI-G      was      more.NG.NN-A.I      than positive-F.SI-G-I  
 ‘that the doctor’s relation was more than positive’ (ʿAhrām 29/01/03, 30, *ʿAzmatu l-minaṣṣati...*) /240/

Examples with pronominal qualifiers in the PP:

*kay yaʿiya l-fard-u*      *ʿanna*      *ʿamn-a-hu*      ***munāṭ-u-n***      ***bi-hi***  
 that know      D-individual.M.SI-N      that      security.M.SI-A-3.M.SI      depending.M.SI-N-I on-3.M.SI  
 ‘that [every] individual knows that his security depends on him’ (Ġazīra 2, *Ġaymatu l-ʿamni...*) /241/

*nuḡūm-u*      *s-samāʿ-i*      **ʿaqrab-u**      **ʿilay-hā**      *min-nī*  
 stars.NH.PL-N      D-sky.F.SI-G      closer.NG.NN-N      to-3.F.SI      than-1.SI  
 ‘the stars of the sky are closer to her than I [am]’ (Mīr 208) /242/

*li ruqʿat-i*      *l-ʿarḍ-i*      ***l-mawḡūd-i***      ***fi-hā***      *n-nabāt-u*  
 of piece.F.SI-G      D-land.F.SI-G      D-existing.M.SI-G      in-3.F.SI      D-vegetation.M.SI-N  
 ‘of the piece of the land in which there is vegetation’ (ʿArabī 5/04, 124) /243/

The specialized preposition *ʿiyyā* 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*      ***dāʿiy-at-a-n***      ***ʿiyyā-ya***      *ʿilā l-ifṣāḡ-i*  
 shook head.M.SI-A-3.F.SI      calling-F.SI-A-I      PREP-I.SI      to D-frank:declaration.M.SI-G  
 ‘she shook her head, calling me to be frank’ (Mīr 213) /244/

### Word order and linear contiguity

Usually, the prepositional qualifier linearly follows its qualificatum. Yet, for stylistic purposes, in some cases the order is reversed, e.g.:

*maḍat baġtatan 'ilā d-dāḥil-i wa l-ġamī'-u bi t-ṭarab-i sakārā*  
 she:passed suddenly to D-inside.M.SI-G and D-all.PL-N with D-joy.M.SI-G drunk.M.PL.N.I  
 'suddenly she went inside and [there] all were drunk with joy' (Mīr 102) /245/

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 discontinuous, e.g.:

*Al-Manāwī al-mu'ayyid-u bi šiddat-i-n li t-ta'rib-i*  
 Al-Manāwī.M.N D-supporting.M.SI-N with strength.F.SI-G-I PREP D-Arabization.M.SI-G  
 'Al-M., strongly supporting Arabization' ('Arabī 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 qualifiers<sup>169</sup>. 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 d-ḍayfi* 'I welcomed the guest' and the passive *ruḥḥiba bi d-ḍayfi*, 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. *ḡušiya* '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 qualifiers

<sup>169</sup> 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 *mad‘uwwun* ‘invited (M.SI)’ is derived from the passive verb *du‘iya* ‘[he] was invited’. Therefore it may be used as an attributive or predicative qualifier of the substantive *ḍ-ḍayfu* ‘the guest’, which corresponds to the subject of the passive verb *du‘iya* in a sentence *du‘iya ḍ-ḍayfu* ‘the guest was invited’. Thus, one can say *aḍ-ḍayfu mad‘uwwun* ‘the guest is invited’ or *aḍ-ḍayfu l-mad‘uwwu* ‘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 fī 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/:

*at-taslīfāt-i*

D-credits.NH.PL-G

*l-maškūk-i*

D-doubted.NG.NN-G

*fī-hā*

in-3.NH.PL

‘[of] suspected credits’ lit. ‘credits [that it is] doubted about them’ (Ḥayāt 2/8/07, 11, *Istihdāru ...*) /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 taḥṣīli 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 *taḥṣīli* ‘collection’ as S1, which, in turn, is qualified by *d-duyūni* ‘the debts’ as S2. The participle derived from the verb, viz. *mašūkūn* ‘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 *taḥṣīlun* ‘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/:

*ad-duyūn-i l-mašūk-i bi taḥṣīl-i-hā*

D-debts.NH.PL-G D-doubted.NG.NN-G in collection.M.SI-G-3.NH.PL

‘[of] the debts the collection of which is doubted’ (Ḥayāt 2.8.07, 11, *Istihdāru ...*) /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.:

*ʿanna l-yahūd-a l-lībiyy-īna muraḥḥab-u-n bi-him*

that D-Jews.M.PL-A D-Libyan.M-PL.A welcome.NG.NN-N-I with-3.M.PL

‘that the Libyan Jews are welcome’ (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 1, *Yahūdu Lībiyā...*) /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/:

*ʿanna l-kitāb-a yanbağī ʿan yunqala [...] li ʿanna-hu yutrī*

that D-book.M.SI-A it:is:needed that it:be:translated for that-3.M.SI enriches

*l-luġat-a l-manqūl-at-a 'ilay-hā*  
 D-language.F.SI-A D-translated-F.SI-A to-3.F.SI  
 ‘that the book should be translated [...] because it enriches the language translated into’ (Ṭaqāfī 9/11/04, 4, *Ad-duktūr 'Aḥmad...*) /250/

In this SS, the passive participle is qualified by the PP *'ilayhā* and agrees in state and case with the qualificatum of the SS<sup>170</sup>. 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/:

*lam yakun masmūḥ-a-n la-nā bi muwāḡahat-i-hi*  
 not was allowed.NG.NN-A-I to-1.PL with opposition.F.SI-G-3.M.SI  
 ‘it was not allowed to us to oppose it’ (‘Ahrām 22.01.03, 13, ‘*Amalu l-mutaqqafi...*)  
 [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/:

*muwāḡahat-u-hu lam yakun masmūḥ-a-n bi-hā*  
 opposition.F.SI-N-3.M.SI not it:was allowed.NG.NN-A-I with-3.F.SI /252/

A PPIV may also function as a secondary predicate, e.g.:

*saqaṭā maḡṣiyy-a-n 'alay-himā*  
 they:fell.DU covered.NG.NN-A-I over-3.DU  
 ‘they two fell down fainting’ lit. ‘being covered upon’ (Liṣṣ 162) [from the verb *ḡuṣiya* ‘alayhi ‘to faint’]. /253/

<sup>170</sup> 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 relative *'aḥwağ*, qualified by a PP *'ilayhi*:

*'aṣbaḥa* [...] *'amr-a-n* ***'aḥwağ-a*** ***'ilay-hi*** *min* *'ayy-i* *waqt-i-n* *maḍā*  
 became thing.M.SI-A-I needed.NG.NN-A-I for.3.M.SI than any-G time.M.SI-G-I passed  
 '[it] has become a thing [that is] more necessary [lit. 'more needed to'] than ever  
 before' ('Ahrām 22/01/03, 10, 'Ayna *l-ḥaḳīqatu*...). /254/

It seems that the relative was used with a PP qualifying it in a way similar to a synonymous PPIV with a PP, *muḥtāğan 'ilayhi* 'needed' lit. 'needed to' The relative *'aḥwağ* is cognate to the PPIV *muḥtāğan*, therefore we will discuss it here. Since relatives are neutralized in terms of diathesis, and *'aḥwağ* 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 qualifiers other than the obligatory PP. These qualifiers include other PPs, e.g. the agent phrase, as showed in the following example:

*'iğmāliyy-u* *qīmat-i* *l-'uqūd-i* *t-taṣḍiriyy-at-i* ***l-muṣarraḥ-i***  
 total.M.SI-N value.F.SI-G D-contracts.NH.PL-G D-of:export-NH.PL-G D-permitted.NG.NN-G  
*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 *ṣarraḥa bi* 'to permit'] ('Ahrām 22/01/03, 17, *Irtifā'u taklifati*...) /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* *ḍawī* ***l-mağniyy-i*** ***'alay-him***  
 to relatives.M.PL.G D-harmed.NG.NN-G on-3.M.PL  
 'to the relatives of the victims' (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 2, *Qāḍī ṣ-Ṣadru*...) [from the verb  
*ğanā '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.:

*ʿanna-hu qarīb-u-n ǧidd-a-n mina n-naṣṣ-i llaḏī...*  
 that-3.M.SI close.M.SI-N-I gravity.M.SI-A-I from D-text.M.SI-G which  
 ‘that it is very close to the text which...’ (Ḥayāt 8/4/04, 1, *Ḥaddām li Šīrāk...*) /258/

*bi ṣiyāǧat-i-n fanniyy-at-i-n muḥtalif-at-i-n tamām-a-n*  
 with composition.F.SI-G-I artistic-F.SI-G-I different-F.SI-G-I completeness.M.SI-A-I  
 ‘with a completely different artistic composition’ (Ṭaqāfi 9/11/04, 8, *Ḥarakatu r-raḡsi...*) /259/

*fī l-qānūn-i l-ǧadīd-i ǧayr-i l-munǧaz-i baʿdu*  
 in D-law.M.SI-G D-new.M.SI-G reverse-G D-completed.M.SI- yet  
 ‘in the new law, not completed yet’ (ʿAnwār 3/5/04, 2, «*Ṣadmatun*» *rāfaqat...*) /260/

As it can be seen, these qualifiers include modifiers of degree, viz. *ǧiddan* ‘very’ and *tamāman* ‘completely’, and time, viz. *baʿdu* ‘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.

*sikirtīr# ‘āmm-u? muḥāfazat-i Maṭrūḥ*  
 secretary.M.SI# general.M.SI-N? province.F.SI-G Maṭrūḥ.G  
 ‘the secretary general of the province Maṭrūḥ’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 31, *Ḥaqqu r-raddi...*) /261/

*mudīr# ‘āmm-u? l-‘abniyat-i t-ta‘līmiyy-at-i*  
 director.M.SI# general.M.SI-N? D-buildings.NH.PL-G D-educational-NH.PL-G  
 ‘the general director of educational buildings’ (‘Ahrām 22/01/03, 11, *Fī marḥalati...*) /262/

Parallely, classical constructions in the form of regular syntagms are used, with a corresponding adjective functioning as the attribute, cf. the following example:

*as-sikirtīr-u l-‘āmm-u li l-muḥāfazat-i*  
 D-secretary.M.SI-N D-general.M.SI-N for D-province.F.SI-G  
 ‘the secretary general of the province’ /263/

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, *muḥāfazati*, 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 ‘?’)<sup>171</sup>. 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

<sup>171</sup> Wehr showed that the compound word behaves like one word and can accept genitival qualifiers (Wehr 1943: 38, from Blau 1973: 197). Note the vocalization of the example adduced by Blau: *mudīr(u) ‘āmm(u) l-lāḡi’ina* ‘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<sup>172</sup>.

There are also examples without a genitive qualifier but showing no concord in state between the ‘substantival’ and the ‘adjectival’ components, e.g.:

*ʿilā mudīr-i l-muḥābarāt-i l-farīq# ʿawwal-i?* Saʿd Ḥayr  
 to director.M.SI-G D-intelligence.NH.PL-G D-lieutenant.M.SI# first.M.SI-G S.Ḥ.  
 ‘to the director of the intelligence service, lieutenant general S.Ḥ.’ lit. ‘first lieutenant’ (Šarq 14/4/04, 1, *Al-ʿUrdunnu yakšifu ʿan...*)<sup>173</sup> /264/

*li s-sayyid-i l-liwāʿ# mutaqaʿid-i?*  
 to D-mister.M.SI-G D-admiral.M.SI# retired.M.SI-G-I?  
 ‘to Mr. Retired Admiral...’ (ʿAhrām 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<sup>174</sup>:

*raʿīs-u maḡlis# maḡalliyy-i? l-muḥāfazat-i*  
 president.M.SI-N council.M.SI# local.M.SI-G? D-province.F.SI-G  
 ‘president of the local council of the province’ (ʿAhrām 29/01/03, 28 *Ḥuṭṭatun li ʿinšāʿi*) /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/:

*fi mašrūʿ-i-hā š-šarq# al-ʿawsatiyy-i*  
 in project.M.SI-G-3.F.SI D-east.M.SI# D-medial.M.SI-G  
 ‘in its Middle Eastern projects’ (Mītāq 20/4/2004, 4) [from *aš-šarqu l-ʿawsatu* ‘the Middle East’] /267/

<sup>172</sup> I owe these remarks to Prof. Zaborski.

<sup>173</sup> Note the vocalization of the example adduced by Blau: *al-farīq(u) awwal(u)* ‘the lieutenant general’ (1973: 197).

<sup>174</sup> For that matter, Krahl (1985: 73, fn. 101) gives the technical term *rasm bayānī az-zaman wa ʿd-ḡaḡt* ‘Zeit-Druck-Diagramm’ as an example.

However, the article may be attached only to the first component:

*al-‘ilāqāt-i l-‘amrīkiyy-at-i l-‘arabiyy-at-i ‘awi š-šarq# ‘awsatiyy-at-i*  
D-relations.NH.PL-G D-American-NH.PL-G D-Arab-NH.PL-G or 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.:

*miṭla [...] n-numūr-i š-šarq# ‘āsiyawīyy-at-i*  
like D-tigers.NH.PL-G D-east.M.SI# Asian-NH.PL-G  
‘like East-Asian tigers’ (‘Ahrām 29/01/03, 30, *Ad-duktūru Surūr...*) /269/

with the adjective derived probably from *šarqu* ‘Āsiyā ‘the East of Asia’. However, it is also possible that the basis for this neologism was the adjective *‘āsiyawīyyun* ‘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 *‘anklū-saksūniyy-* ‘Anglo-Saxon’ (Mītāq 20.4.04,15), *‘iṭāsūriyy-* ‘Italo-Syrian’ (Mīr 117) or *sūsiyū-tārīḥīyyi-* ‘socio-historic’ (‘Ālam al-fikr, 7) will be treated as words, not syntagms. In all examples, the article *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 Q<sub>r</sub>-fronted syntagms, which will therefore be marked by the sign ‘*Q*’ after the qualificator, which indicates that the syntagm occurred as Q<sub>r</sub>-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-qualificativity:

{(ʔağmalu, kalimatīn)	‘the most beautiful word’	/5.169/,
(ʔaqrabu, ʔilayhā)	‘closer to her’	/5.242/,
(wāsiʔatu, n-niṭāqi)	‘wide-ranging’	/5.73/,...}

### Adjectivo-qualificatoriality:

{(l-mumarridāti, l-bulḡāriyyāti)	‘[of] the Bulgarian nurses’	/3.1/,
(kānat, siyāsiyyatan)	‘was political’	/5.25/,
(Nīkūl, ḥāmīlun)	‘Nicole is pregnant’	/5.19/,
(minhā, mutfaʔatan)	‘than [it being] extinguished’	/5.68/,
(ʔiʔlānuki, ʔarwaʔu)⊃	‘your declaration is stranger’	/5.24/, ...}

### Bi-adjectivity:

{(ḡadīdatun, kulliyyan)	‘completely new’	/5.132/,
(ʔaktara, min ʔiḡābiyyatin)	‘more than positive’	/5.240/,
(tānī, ʔahammi [markazīn])	‘the second most important [centre]’	/5.155/,...}

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

### Co-constituency with S:

{(ʔağmalu, kalimatīn)	‘the most beautiful word’	/5.169/,
{(l-mumarridāti, l-bulḡāriyyāti)	‘[of] the Bulgarian nurses’	/3.1/,,
(al-ḥubbu, ḡamīlun)	‘love is beautiful’	/5.18/, ...}

### Co-constituency with V:

{(ʔan nantaqidahu, mawḏūʔiyyan)	‘that we criticize it objectively’	/5.128/,
(turḡimat, ʔilā ʔaktari [l-luḡāti])	‘was translated into most [languages]’	/5.177/,
(raḡaʔa, sakrāna)	‘[he] returned drunk’	/5.50/, ...}

### Co-constituency with P:

{(huwa, l-masʔūlu)	‘he is responsible’	/5.20/,
--------------------	---------------------	---------

( <i>munāṭun, bihi</i> )	‘depending on him’	/5.241/,
( <i>minhā, mutfa’atan</i> )	‘than [it being] extinguished’	/5.68/, ...}

#### Co-constituency with N:

{( <i>al-’arba’īna, l-māḍiyati</i> )	‘the past forty’	/3.49/,
( <i>mina s-sab’ati, r-rābiḥīna</i> )	‘of the winning seven’	/3.51/, ...}

#### Co-constituency with Adj:

{( <i>ḡadīdatun, kulliyyan</i> )	‘completely new’	/5.132/,
( <i>’aktara, min ’iḡābiyyatin</i> )	‘more than positive’	/5.240/,
( <i>tānī, ’ahammi [markazīn]</i> )	‘the second most important [centre]’	/5.155/,...}

### 6.3. Dimension 3. Intracategory differentiation of the adjectival constituent

#### Elatival qualificativity:

{( <i>’aḡmalu, kalimatīn</i> )	‘the most beautiful word’	/5.169/,
( <i>’aqrabu, ’ilayhā</i> )	‘closer to her’	/5.242/,
( <i>’aktaruhum, wafada</i> ) <sup>⊕</sup>	‘most of them came’	/4.38/,...}

#### Positival qualificativity:

{( <i>munāṭun, bihi</i> )	‘depending on him’	/5.241/,
( <i>wāsi’atu, n-niṭāqī</i> )	‘wide-ranging’	/5.73/,
( <i>sādisu [zawḡātihi], dafanathu</i> ) <sup>⊕</sup>	‘the sixth [of his wives] buried him’	/5.156/,
( <i>kabīru [l-’amali], lanā</i> ) <sup>⊕</sup>	‘we have great [hope]’	/5.46/, ...}

#### Elatival qualificatoriality:

{( <i>turḡimat, ’ilā ’aktari [l-luḡāti]</i> )	‘was translated into most [languages]’	/5.177/,
( <i>’alā l-qaradati, l-’ulyā</i> )	‘on the higher apes’	/3.4/,
( <i>’i’lānuki, ’arwa’u</i> ) <sup>⊕</sup>	‘your declaration is stranger’	/5.24/,...}

#### Positival qualificatoriality:

{( <i>l-mumarrīdāti, l-bulḡāriyyāti</i> )	‘[of] the Bulgarian nurses’	/3.1/,
( <i>ta’mīru, rābi’i [tā’iratin]</i> )	‘the repair of the fourth [plane]’	/5.7/,
( <i>minhā, mutfa’atan</i> )	‘than [it being] extinguished’	/5.68/,

(*al-ḥubbu, ǧamīlun*) ‘love is beautiful’ /5.18/,...}

**Elatival qualificativity with elatival qualificatoriality:**

{(*ʾaǧḍaru, bi ʾaǧmali* [*kalimatin*]) ‘worthier of the most beautiful [word]’  
cf./5.239/, /5.169/  
(*ʾašaddu* [*t-taʾtīri*], *li-ʾakbarihim*)<sup>⊕</sup> ‘the biggest of them has the strongest  
[influence]’ cf. /4.35/, ...}

**Positival qualificativity with positival qualificatoriality:**

{(*fī ǧanūbiyyi, šarqiyyi* [*ʾĀsiyā*]) ‘in South Eastern [Asia]’ /5.150/,  
(*sādisu* [*zawǧātihī*], *šābbatun*) ‘the sixth [of his wives] is young’ cf. /5.156/ ...}

**Elatival qualificativity with positival qualificatoriality:**

{(*ʾaktara, min ʾiǧābiyyatin*) ‘more than positive’ /5.240/,  
(*ʾaǧlabuhā, kāminatun*) ‘most of them are hidden’ /4.42/,...}

**Positival qualificativity with elatival qualificatoriality:**

{(*tānī, ʾahammi* [*markazin*]) ‘the second most important [centre]’ /5.155/,  
(*sādisu* [*zawǧātihī*] *ʾašgaru*) ‘the sixth [of his wives] is younger’  
cf. /5.155/, ...}

## 6.4. Dimension 4. Kind of morphological indicators

**Prepositional-rectinality:**

{(*min ʾabhaǧi, fī l-karami*) ‘most splendid in generosity’ /5.199/,  
(*ʾaktara, min ʾiǧābiyyatin*) ‘more than positive’ /5.240/,  
(*l-maškūki, bi taḥṣīlihā*) ‘whose collection is doubted’ /5.248/,  
(*ʾaqrabu, ʾilayhā*) ‘closer to her’ /5.242/,  
(*laysat, bi ʾaqalla*) ‘is not less’ /5.32/,  
(*taʾtīrun, li ʾakbarihim*)<sup>⊕</sup> ‘the biggest of them has influence’ cf. /4.35/,  
(*ʾašaddu* [*t-taʾtīri*], *li-ʾakbarihim*)<sup>⊕</sup> ‘the biggest of them has the strongest  
[influence]’ cf. /4.35/, ...}

**Nominativo-rectinality:**

{( <i>Nikūl</i> , <i>ḥāmilun</i> )	‘Nicole is pregnant’	/5.19/,
{( <i>i‘lānuki</i> , <i>’arwa‘u</i> ) <sup>⊃</sup>	‘your declaration is stranger’	/5.24/,
{ <i>anna l-yahūda</i> , <i>muraḥḥabun</i> [ <i>bihim</i> ])	‘that the Jews are welcome’	/5.249/, ...}

**Accusativo-rectinality:**

{( <i>munaffidani</i> , <i>l-‘amaliyyata</i> )	‘carrying out the action’	/5.219/,
{ <i>ḥaḍīran</i> , <i>’ašadda</i> [ <i>l-ḥaḍari</i> ])	‘extremely cautious’	/5.231/,...}

**Genitivo-rectinality:**

{( <i>’aḡmalu</i> , <i>kalimatin</i> )	‘the most beautiful word’	/5.169/,
{( <i>tānī</i> , <i>’ahammī</i> [ <i>markazin</i> ])	‘the second most important [centre]’	/5.155/,
{ <i>ḡayru</i> , <i>mašrū‘atin</i> )	‘illegal’	/5.1/,
{ <i>wāsi‘atu</i> , <i>n-niṭāqi</i> )	‘wide-ranging’	/5.73/,...}

**Gender-concordiality:**

{( <i>‘āmani</i> , <i>l-māḍiyatu</i> )	‘the past years’	/3.49/,...}
--	------------------	-------------

**State-, gender-, number- and case-concordiality:**

{( <i>l-mumarriḍāti</i> , <i>l-bulḡāriyyāti</i> )	‘[of] the Bulgarian nurses’	/3.1/,
{ <i>alā l-qaradati</i> , <i>l-‘ulyā</i> )	‘on the higher apes’	/3.4/, ...}

**State-, gender- and number-concordiality:**

{( <i>al-ḡusaymātu</i> , <i>taḥta ḍ-darriyyati</i> )	‘subatomic particles’	/5.13/,...}
--	-----------------------	-------------

**State-, gender- and case-concordiality:**

{( <i>šahṣan</i> , <i>’āḥarīna</i> )	‘other persons’	/3.52/,...}
--------------------------------------	-----------------	-------------

**State-, number- and case-concordiality:**

{( <i>al-’arba‘īna</i> , <i>l-māḍiyati</i> )	‘the past forty’	/3.49/,...}
--	------------------	-------------

**State- and case-concordiality:**

{( <i>al-quwwatu</i> , <i>l-’a‘zamu</i> )	‘the most potent power’	/3.24/,
{ <i>ḥuṭṭatin</i> , <i>ṭamūḥīn</i> )	‘[of] an ambitious plan’	/3.16/,...}

#### Gender- and number-concordiality:

{(sittata ‘ašara [šahšan], ‘aḥarīna)	‘sixteen other [persons]’	/3.52/
(wilāyatuhu, l-muntahiyati)⊃	‘whose term of office is ending’	5.114/,...}

#### Nominativo-rectinality with gender- and number-concordiality:

{(al-ḥubbu, ḡamīlun)	‘love is beautiful’	/5.18/
(‘aḡlabuhā, kāminatun)	‘most of them are hidden’	/ 4.42/, ...}

#### Prepositional-rectinality with gender- and number concordiality:

{(waṣṣfuhu, bi l-hazliyyi)	‘its description as ridiculous’	cf. /5.40/
(yā laka, min ḡabiyyin)	‘How stupid you are!’	/4.20/,...}

#### Accusativo-rectinality with gender-concordiality:

{(ḡā‘a [r-riḡālu], rākiḏīna)	‘[the men] came running’	/5.67/,...}
------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------

#### Accusativo-rectinality with gender- and number-concordiality:

{(bi waṣṣfihim, ḡāmiḏīna)	‘by describing them as obscure’	/5.39/
(kānat, siyāsiyyatan)	‘[it] was political’	/5.22/
(al-maḏīnatu, muḏā‘atan)	‘the city illuminated’	/5.68/
(al-muṣannafu, ‘awwala)	‘seeded first’	/5.35/
(minhā, mutfa‘atan)	‘than it [being] extinguished’	/5.68/,...}

#### Lexico-junctionality:

{(ḡarībun, ḡiddan}	‘very close’	/5.258/
(l-munḡazi, ba‘du)	‘[not] completed yet’	/5.260/
(‘alwānuhā, muḡtalifin)⊃	‘multicoloured’	/5.124/,...}

## 6.5. Dimension 5. Linear order of the constituents

#### Qm-frontedness:

{(‘aḡmalu, kalimatīn)	‘the most beautiful word’	/5.169/
(l-mumarriḏāti, l-bulḡāriyyāti)	‘[of] the Bulgarian nurses’	/3.1/
(‘an nantaqidahu, mawḏū‘iyyan)	‘that we criticize it objectively’	/5.128/
(wadūdatun, li l-‘uzūni)	‘ozone-friendly’	/5.236/

( <i>Nīkūl, ḥāmilun</i> )	‘Nicole is pregnant’	/5.19/,
( <i>huwa, l-mas’ūlu</i> )	‘he is responsible’	/5.20/, ...}

**Qr-frontedness:**

{( <i>ittahada, sarī’an</i> )}	‘quickly [they] adopted’	/5.130/,
( <i>’akbara, ’adadiyyan</i> )	‘quantitatively the biggest’	/5.135/,
( <i>mağmū’atun, qādimatan</i> )	‘a group, coming’	/5.65/,
( <i>sakārā, bi ṭ-ṭarabi</i> )	‘drunk with joy’	/5.245/,
( <i>’ilānuki, ’arwa’u</i> )	‘your declaration is stranger’	/5.24/,
( <i>kabīru [l-’amali], lanā</i> )	‘we have great [hope]’	/5.46/,
( <i>wilāyatuhu, l-muntahiyati</i> )	‘whose term of office is ending’	/5.114/,...}

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

**Obligatory Contiguity:**

{( <i>’ağmalu, kalimatīn</i> )}	‘the most beautiful word’	/5.169/,
( <i>wāsi’atu, n-niṭāqi</i> )	‘wide-ranging’	/5.73/,
(( <i>fī ḡanūbiyyi, šarqiyyi</i> [’Āsiyā])	‘in South Eastern [Asia]’	/5.150/,
( <i>wilāyatuhu, l-muntahiyati</i> )	‘whose term of office is ending’	/5.114/,...}

**Optional Discontiguity:**

( <i>l-mumarriḍāti, l-bulḡāriyyāti</i> )	‘[of] the Bulgarian nurses’	/3.1/,
( <i>’aqrabu, ’ilayhā</i> )	‘closer to her’	/5.242/,
( <i>al-ḥubbu, ḡamīlun</i> )	‘love is beautiful’	/5.18/,
( <i>laysat, bi ’aqalla</i> )	‘is not less’	/5.32/, ... }

**Obligatory Discontiguity:**

{( <i>’ašaqqa</i> [’awqātīn], <i>’alaynā</i> )	‘the most difficult [times] for us’	/5.198/,
( <i>bābu [ḥuḡratīn], maftūḥun</i> )	‘the open door [of the room]’	/3.41/, ...}

## 6.7. Dimension 7. Syntactic function of the adjective *in statu qualificatoris*

### Qr-attributivity:

{( <i>l-mumarridāti, l-bulgāriyyāti</i> ) ( <i>‘alā l-qaradati, l-‘ulyā</i> )	‘[of] the Bulgarian nurses’ ‘on the higher apes’	/3.1/, /3.4/,
{( <i>ta‘mīru, rābi‘i [tā‘iratin]</i> ) ( <i>ḡayru, mašrū‘atin</i> )	‘the repair of the fourth [plane]’ ‘illegal’	/5.154/, /5.1/, ... }

### Qr-basic predicativity:

{( <i>al-ḥubbu, ḡamilun</i> ) ( <i>‘arwa‘u, ‘i‘lānuki</i> )	‘love is beautiful’ ‘your declaration is stranger’	/5.18/, /5.24/, ... }
--	---	--------------------------

### Qr-extended predicativity:

{( <i>laysat, bi ‘aqalla</i> ) ( <i>kānat, siyāsiyyatan</i> )	‘is not less’ ‘was political’	/5.32/, /5.25/, ... }
--	----------------------------------	--------------------------

### Qr-secondary predicativity:

{( <i>raḡa‘a, sakrāna</i> ) ( <i>minhā, mutfa‘atan</i> )	‘[he] returned drunk’ ‘than [it being] extinguished’	/5.50/, /5.68/, ... }
---	---	--------------------------

### Qr-exclamative predicativity:

{( <i>yā laka, min ḡabiyyin</i> )	‘How stupid you are!’	/4.20/, ... }
-----------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------

### Qr-predicatoidity:

{( <i>wilāyatuhu, l-muntahiyati</i> ) <sup>⊃</sup>	‘whose term of office is ending’	/5.114/, ... }
--	----------------------------------	----------------

### Qr-direct objectivity:

{( <i>lam yu‘tīhā, kabīra [‘ināyatin]</i> ) ( <i>yušakkilu, ‘akbara [da‘min]</i> )	‘did not paid much [attention] to it’ ‘[it] constitutes the biggest [support]’	/5.153/, /5.172/, ... }
---	---	----------------------------

### Qr-indirect objectivity:

{( <i>turḡimat, ‘ilā ‘aktari [l-luḡāti]</i> ) ( <i>li tu‘riba, ‘an fā‘iqi [taqdīrihā]</i> )	‘was translated into most [languages]’ ‘to express her highest [esteem]’	/5.177/, /5.151/, ... }
--	---	----------------------------

### Qr-internal objectivity:

{(*tašmudu*, *ʾarwaʿa* [*šumūdin*]) ‘[it] shows the most marvellous defiance’ /5.170/,...}

### Qr-adverbiality:

{(*yadda*ī, *dūna kaḫiri* [*mubālağatin*]) ‘[he] claims without much [exaggeration]’  
/4.33/,

(*kānat*, *ʿalā ʾašaddihā*) ‘[they]were at their strongest’ /4.40/,

(*ʿan nantaqidahu*, *mawḏūʿiyyan*) ‘that we criticize it objectively’ /5.128/, ...}

## 6.8. Dimension 8. Syntactic function of the adjective *in statu qualificati*

### Qm-attributivity:

{([*ʾidānatan*] *wāsiʿata*, *n-niṭāqi*) ‘wide-ranging [condemnation]’ /5.73/,  
([*fi l-ʾatfāli*] *l-ʾaqalli*, *ḥağman*) ‘[in children] with the smallest bodies’ /5.102/,  
([*taʿmīru*] *rābiʿi*, *ṭāʾiratin*) ‘[the repair] of the fourth plane’ /5.154/,...}

### Qm-basic predicativity:

{([*ʾanna l-yahūda*] *murahḥabun*, *bihim*) ‘[that the Jews are] welcomed’ /5.249/,  
([*l-māddatu*] *qarībatu*, *š-šabahi*) ‘[the substance is] close in resemblance’  
/5.82/, ...}

### Qm-extended predicativity:

{([*yakūnu*] *muwğaba*, *š-šahḥnati*) ‘[it may be] positive in charge’ /5.79/,  
([*kāna*] *ʾağhalahum*, *bi funūni*) ‘[he was] the most ignorant of them in the arts  
[of]’ /5.218/

### Qm-secondary predicativity:

{([*ar-risālatu*] *mutamminatan*, *al-ḥirṣa*) ‘[the letter] appreciating the concern’ /5.48/,  
([*qāla*] *multaḏḏan*, *bi l-ḥadīti*) ‘[it said,] taking pleasure in conversation’ /5.62/,...}

### Qm-predicatoidity:

{([*n-nabātu*] *l-mawğūdi*⊕, *fihā*) ‘in which there is [vegetation]’ /5.118/,...}

### Qm-direct objectivity:

{([*yušakkilu*] *’akbara*, *da‘min*) ‘[it constitutes] the biggest aid’ /5.172/,  
{([*lam yu‘fihā*] *kabīra*, *‘ināyatin*) ‘[did not paid] much attention [to it]’ /5.153/, ...}

### Qm-indirect objectivity:

{([*turğimat*] *’ilā ’aktari*, *l-luğāti*) ‘[was translated] into most languages’ /5.177/,...}

### Qm-internal objectivity:

{([*tašmudu*] *’arwa‘a*, *šumūdin*) ‘[shows] the most marvellous defiance’  
/5.170/, cf. /5.231/,  
{([*ḥadīran*] *’ašadda*, *l-ḥadāri*) ‘extremely cautious’ /5.231/,...}

### Qm-adverbiality:

{([*yadda‘ī*] *dūna kaṭīri*, *mubālağatin*) ‘[he claims] without much exaggeration’  
/4.33/, ...}

### Qm-subjectivity:

{([*sādīsu*] [*zawğātihī*], *dafanathu*)⊕ ‘the sixth [of his wives] buried him’ /5.156/,  
( [*kabīru*] [*l-‘amali*], *lanā*)⊕ ‘we have great [hope]’ /5.46/, ...}

### Qm-subjectoidity:

{([*wilāyatuhu*, *l-muntahiyati*)⊕ ‘whose term of office is ending’ /5.114/,...}

## 6.9. Dimension 9. Degree of the requiredness of the qualificator of the adjective

### Optional qm-qualifiedness:

{([*luğatun*] *ğadīdatun*, *kulliyyan*) ‘[a] completely new [language]’ /5.132/,  
{([*kāna*] *ḥadīran*, *’ašadda* [*l-ḥadāri*]) ‘[he was] extremely cautious’ /5.231/,  
{([*ğayru*] *l-munğazi*, *ba‘du*) ‘[not] completed yet’ /5.260/,

([*kāna*] **'ağhalahum**, *bi funūni*)      '[he was] the most ignorant of them in the arts  
[of...]' /5.218/, ...}

#### Obligatory qm-qualifiedness:

{([*'idānatan*] **wāsi'ata**, *n-niṭāqi*)      'wide-ranging [condemnation]'      /5.73/,  
([*yadda'ī*] **dūna kaḫiri**, *mubālağatin*)      '[he] claims without much [exaggeration]'  
/4.33/,  
([*n-nabātu*] **l-mawğūdi**∪, *fiḥā*)      'in which there is [vegetation]'      /5.118/,  
([*'anna l-yahūda*] **muraḥḥabun**, *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.:      (**'ağmalu**, *kalimatin*) 'the most beautiful word'.  
**in:** *hiya 'ağmalu 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.

Ex. 2.: (*wilāyatuhu, l-muntahiyati*)<sup>U</sup> ‘whose term of office is ending’.  
**in:** *li r-rağuli l-muntahiyati wilāyatuhu* ‘for the president whose term of office is ending’.

- Dim 1: Adjectivo-qualificatoriality.
- Dim 2: Co-constituency with S.
- Dim 3: Positival qualificatoriality.
- Dim 4: Gender- and number-concordiality.
- Dim 5: Qr-frontedness.
- Dim 6: Obligatory contiguity.
- Dim 7: Qr-predicatoidity.
- Dim 8: Indefinibility.
- Dim 9: Indefinibility

Ex. 3.: (*wilāyatuhu, muntahiyatun*) ‘his term of office is ending’

- Dim 1: Adjectivo-qualificatoriality.
- Dim 2: Co-constituency with S.
- Dim 3: Positival qualificatoriality.
- Dim 4: Nominativo-rectionality with Gender- and number-concordiality.
- Dim 5: Qm-frontedness.
- Dim 6: Optional discontinuity.
- Dim 7: Qr-basic predicativity.
- Dim 8: Indefinibility.
- Dim 9: Indefinibility.

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 *\*(yaduhu, t-tūlā)* exemplified in the *\*li r-rağuli t-tūlā yaduhu*, 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-qualificatoriality.
- Dim 2: Co-constituency with S.
- Dim 3: Elatival-qualificatoriality.
- 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 syntagms, such as *(wilāyatuhu, l-muntahiyati)* of our Ex. 2, which differ from the non-grammatical *\*(yaduhu, t-tūlā)* only with respect to Dim 3, it may be said that the property ‘Elatival-qualificatoriality’ is not combinable with the remaining properties included in the syntagmal characterization of *(wilāyatuhu, 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 rection 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.

## 8. CORPUS LIST

### Literary works:

- Kallās: Kallās, Ğūzīf. 2004. *'Anāšīd min al-firdaws al-mafqūd*. Dimašq: Dār Ṭlās.  
Karnak: Maḥfūz, Nağīb. No date. First publ. 1974. *Al-Karnak*. Al-Qāhira: Maktabat Mišr.  
Lišš: Maḥfūz, Nağīb. No date. First publ. 1961. *Al-lišš wa al-kilāb*. Al-Qāhira: Maktabat [Mišr.  
Maqhā: 'Isbir, 'Usāma. 2002. *Maqhā al-muntaḥirīn*. Dimašq: Dār at-Takwīn.  
Mīr: Maḥfūz, Nağīb. No date. First publ. 1967. *Mīrāmār*. Al-Qāhira: Maktabat Mišr.  
Rağab: Rağab, Aḥmad. 1997. *Ḍarba fī qalbi*. Al-Qāhira: Dār 'Aḥbār al-Yawm.  
Sīra: 'Isbir, 'Usāma. 1996. *As-sīra ad-dīnāriyya*. Dimašq: Dār al-Madā.  
'Umar: 'Umar, 'Aḥmad. 2003. *Šārlz Ibn Dīkinz*. Dimašq: Manšūrāt Wizārat at-Taqaḥfa.

### Press:

- 'Aḥbār: Al-'Aḥbār (Cairo), 17.01.2003.  
'Ahrām: Al-'Ahrām (Cairo), 22.01.2003 and 29.01.2003.  
'Ālam al-Fikr: 'Ālam al-Fikr (Kuwait), no. 1, vol. 33, 7-9/2004 (pp. 5-90, 139-172).  
'Anwār: Al-'Anwār (Beirut), 3.05.2004.  
'Arab al-Yawma: Al-'Arab al-Yawma (Amman), 29.04.2004.  
'Arabī: Al-'Arabī (Kuwait), 5/04 (May 2004).  
'Ayyām al-Frankūfūniyya / *Les journées de la francophonie*, Damascus, mars-avril 2004.  
Dustūr: Ad-Dustūr (Amman), 1.05.2004.  
Ġazīra: Al-Ġazīra (Al Riyadh), 3.04.2004.  
Ḥayāt: Al-Ḥayāt (London), 8.05.2004 and 2.08.2007.  
Liwā': Al-Liwā' (Beirut), 7.04.2004.  
Mītāq: Al-Mītāq (Damascus), 30.12.2003 and 20.04.2004.  
Ra'y: Ar-Ra'y (Amman), 12.04.2004.  
Riyād: Ar-Riyād (Al Riyadh), 21.04.2004.  
Šarq: Aš-Šarq (Beirut), 14.04.2004.  
Šarq 'Awsaṭ: Aš-Šarq al-'Awsaṭ (London), 17.05.2003.  
Taqaḥfi: At-Taqaḥfi (Damascus), 9.11.2003.  
Tišrīn: Tišrīn (Damascus), 9.11.2003.

### Randomly accessed sources:

- 'Abyaḍ 'Aswad: 'Abyaḍ wa 'Aswad (Damascus), 3.05.2004.  
'Arabī: Al-'Arabī (Kuwait), 3/04 (March 2004).  
'Ayyārī: Al-'Ayyārī, Šāliḥ. 1987. *Fī š-šī'r al-'ibrī wa aš-šahyūnī al-mu'āšir*. [Dimašq: Dār Ṭlās.  
BQ Maḥfūz, Nağīb. *Bayna al-qaṣrayn*. No date. First publ. 1956. [Al-Qāhira: Maktabat Mišr.  
Mağalla: Mağallat al-Ma'lūmāt (Damascus). 2-8.02.2000.

## 9. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al-Aqtasch, A. 1986. *Die Genus- und Numeruskongruenz im klassischen Arabisch*. Erlangen-Nürnberg: Dissertation.
- Al-Daḥdāḥ, A. 1990. *Mu'ğam qawā'id al-'arabiyya al-'ālamīyya*. Bayrūt: Maktabat Lubnān.
- Al-Ġalāyīnī, M. 2002. *Ġāmi' ad-durūs al-'arabiyya*. Şaydā/Bayrūt: Al-Maktaba al-'Aşriyya. [1st edn 1912.]
- Al-Ġāzim, 'A., 'Amīn, M. 1975. *Al-Naḥw al-wāḍiḥ fī qawā'id al-luġa al-'arabiyya*. Vols. 1-3. Al-Qāhira/Bayrūt: Dār al-Ma'ārif.
- Al-Jabbār, A., Leach., P. 1985. "The elusive adjective: a problem in word-class assignment in Arabic." *Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics*, University of Leeds, 3, 23-42.
- Al-Khatīb, A. 1971. *A New Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms. English-Arabic*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban.
- Alpatov, V.M. (ed.). 1990. *Časti reči. Teorija i tipologija*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Al-Qur'ān al-Karīm* (n.d.). Al-Qāhira: Dār al-Manār.
- Apresjan, J. D. 1974. *Leksičeskaja semantika. Sinonimičeskije sredstva jazyka*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Nauka.
- Asher, R. (ed.). 1994. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Vols. 1-10. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Ayoub, G., Bohas, G. 1983. "Les grammariens arabes, la phrase nominale et le bon sens." In: Versteegh (ed.) 31-48.
- Badawi E., Carter M.G., Gully A. 2004. *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Badr al-Dīn, Ḥ., Al-'Amrāwī, M. 1997. *Muḥāḍarāt fī al-naḥw al-'arabī*. Al-Qāhira: Dār al-Taqāfa al-'Arabiyya.
- Bąk, P. 1989. *Gramatyka języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna. [1st edn 1977.]
- Baker, M. C. 2003. *Lexical Categories: Verbs, Nouns and Adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bańcerowski, J. 1980. *Systems of Semantics and Syntax. A Determinational Theory of Language*. Warszawa/Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Bańcerowski, J. 1988. "A contribution to the theory of concord." In: Basaj et al. (eds.) 53-69.
- Bańcerowski, J. 1993. "A theory of predicative structure. Insights from Japanese and Korean." *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 27, 5-26.
- Bańcerowski, J. 1994. "A proposal for syntactic categorization." *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Opolskiego. Filologia Rosyjska* 33, 19-32.
- Bańcerowski, J. 1997a. "A theory of rection." In: Hickey and Puppel (eds.) 1159-1182.
- Bańcerowski, J. 1997b. "Aspects of general morphology. A tentative axiomatic approach." *Studia Germanica Posnaniensia*, 33, 13-46.
- Bańcerowski, J. 2000. "Is linguistic semantics axiomatically tangible? (A tentative approach)." *Scripta Neophilologica Posnaniensia*, 2, 3-26.
- Bańcerowski, J., Pogonowski, J., Zgółka, T. 1982. *Wstęp do językoznawstwa*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.
- Bańkowski, A. 2000. *Etymologiczny słownik języka polskiego*. Vols 1-2. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Baranov, H. K. 1958. *Arabsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyh i nacional'nyh slovaroj [1st edn 1957.]
- Bartnicka, B. 1970. *Adiektywizacja imiostów w języku polskim*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Basaj M., Borek, H. etc. (eds.) 1988. *Wokół języka. Rozprawy i studia poświęcone pamięci Profesora Mieczysława Szymczaka*. Wrocław/Warszawa/Kraków/Gdańsk/Łódź: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

- Bateson, M. C. 1967. *Arabic Language Handbook*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Beeston, A. F. L. 1968. *Written Arabic. An Approach to the Basic Structures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beeston, A. F. L. 1970. *The Arabic Language Today*. London: Hutchinson University Library.
- Beeston, A. F. L. 1975. "Some features of Modern Standard Arabic." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20, 62-68.
- Beeston, A. F. L. 1978 "Some points of Arabic syntax." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 23, 56-63.
- Belkin, V. M. 1968, "O haraktere leksičeskoj sinonimii v arabskom literaturnom jazyke." In: Kovalev and Gabučan (eds.) 69-79.
- Belkin, V. M. 1975. *Arabskaja leksikologija*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta.
- Belova, A. G. 1985. *Sintaksis pis'mennyh tekstov arabskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Bergsträsser, G. 1975. *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen*. München: Max Hueber Verlag [1st edn. 1928.]
- Bhat, D. N. S. 1994. *The Adjectival Category: Criteria for Differentiation and Identification*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bhatt, C. 1990. *Die syntaktische Struktur der Nominalphrase im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Blachère, R. 1946. *Éléments de l'arabe classique*. Paris: G.P. Maisonneuve & Cie.
- Blau, J. 1973. "Remarks on some syntactic trends in MSA." *Israel Oriental Studies* 3, 172-231.
- Blau, J. 1976. "Some additional observations on syntactic trends in MSA." *Israel Oriental Studies* 6, 158-190.
- Blau, J. 1981. *The Renaissance of Modern Hebrew and Modern Standard Arabic. Parallels and Differences of Two Semitic Languages*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- Blau, J. 1999. "Werner Diem, *fa-waylun li-l-qāsiyati qulūbuhum, Studien zum arabischen adjektivischen Satz*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 1998, ISBN 3-447-04043-2, pp. xi+203." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 23, 334-341.
- Bloch, A. 1965. *Die Hypotaxe im Damaszenischem-Arabischen. Mit Vergleichen zur Hypotaxe im Klassisch-Arabischen*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Bloch, A. 1986. *Studies in Arabic Syntax and Semantics*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Blohm, D. (ed.). 1989. *Studien zur arabischen Linguistik. Wolfgang Reuschel zum 65. Geburtstag*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR. Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Bocheński, J. 1949. "On the syntactical categories." *The New Scholasticism* 23, 257-280.
- Bohas, G., Guillaume, J.-P., Kouloughli, D. E. 1990. *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Bolinger, D. 1967. "Adjectives in English: attribution and predication." *Lingua* 18, 1-34.
- Bosson, G. 1979. "Typologie der Hypotaxe." *Folia Linguistica* 13, 33-54.
- Bouchard, D. 2002. *Adjectives. Number and Interfaces: Why Languages Vary*. Amsterdam etc: Elsevier.
- Bravmann, M. 1953. *Studies in Arabic and General Syntax*. Le Caire: Imprimerie de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Bravmann M.M. 1968. *The Arabic Elative: A New Approach*. Leiden: Brill.
- Brockelmann, C. 1913. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*. Vol. II. *Syntax*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.
- Brockelmann, C. 1985. *Arabische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie. [First published as *A. Socins Arabische Grammatik*, 9. durchgesehene und verbesserte Auflage v. C. Brockelmann, 1925, Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.]
- Broendal, V. 1933. "L'autonomie de la syntaxe." *Journal de Psychologie Normale et Pathologique* 30, 217-224.
- Buckley, R. 2004. *Modern Literary Arabic. A Reference Grammar*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban.
- Bühler, K. 1990. *Theory of Language. The Representational Function of Language*. Transl. D.F. Goodwin. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [Originally *Sprachtheorie*, Jena/Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer Verlag, 1934.]

- Bzdega, A.Z. 1980. *Das Adjektiv im Polnischen und Deutschen. Versuch einer Konfrontation.* Wrocław/Warszawa/Kraków/Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich/Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Cantarino, V. 1974-75. *Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose.* Vol. 1 (1974), Vols. 2-3 (1975). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Carter, M. G. 1972. "‘Twenty dirhams’ in the *Kitāb* of Sībawaihi." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 35, 485-496.
- Carter, M. G. (ed.). 1981. *Arab Linguistics. An Introductory Classical Text With Translation and Notes.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Carter, M. G. 1985. „Term *sabab* in Arabic Grammar.” *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 15, 53-66.
- Caspari, C. P. 1887. *Arabische Grammatik.* Halle a.S.: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. [5th edn. by A. Müller. 1st edn. 1859.]
- Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures.* The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, N. 1970. "Remarks on nominalization." In: Jacobs, Rosenbaum (eds.) 184-221.
- Comrie, B. 1981. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology.* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Comrie, B. 1987 (ed.). *The World's Major Languages.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Corriente, F. 2002. *Gramática árabe.* Barcelona: Herder. [1st edn 1980.]
- Cowan, D. 1968. *An Introduction to Modern Literary Arabic.* Cambridge: The University Press.
- Croft, W. 1990. *Typology and Universals.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Croft, W. 1991. *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: the Cognitive Organization of Information.* Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Czapkiewicz, A. 1979. "Die kopulativen Zusammensetzungen im modernen Arabisch." In: Fleischhammer (ed.) 1979, 73-83.
- Danecki, J. 1994. *Gramatyka języka arabskiego.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog.
- Danecki, J. 2000. *Współczesny język arabski i jego dialekty.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog.
- Danecki, J., Kozłowska, J. 1996. *Słownik arabsko-polski.* Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Darski, J. 2004. *Linguistisches Analysemodell. Definitionen grundlegender grammatischer Begriffe.* Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- de Groot, A. V. 1957. "Classification of word-groups." *Lingua* 6, 113-157.
- de Sacy, S. A. I. 1810. *Grammaire arabe à l'usage des élèves de l'Ecole Spéciale des Langues Orientales Vivantes.* Vols 1-2. Paris: L'Imprimerie Impériale.
- de Saussure, F. 1980. *Cours de linguistique générale.* Ed. Ch. Bally, A. Sechehaye, T. de Mauro. Paris: Payot. [1st edn Ch. Bally, A. Sechehaye, 1916.]
- Denz, A. 1982. "Die Struktur des Klassischen Arabisch." In: Fischer (ed.) 58-82.
- Diem, W. 1974. "Nomen, Substantiv und Adjektiv bei den arabischen Grammatikern." *Oriens* 23, 312-332.
- Diem, W. 1986. "Alienable und inalienable Possession im Semitischen." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 136, 2, 227-291.
- Diem, W. 1998. *Fa-waylun li-l-qāsiyati qulūbuhum. Studien zum arabischen adjektivischen Satz.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1977. "Where have all the adjectives gone?" *Studies in Language* 1, 19-80.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1993. "Adjectives." In: Asher (ed.) Vol. 1: 29-35.
- Drosdowski, G. (ed.). 1997. *Duden: Etymologie. Herkunftswörterbuch der deutschen Sprache.* Mannheim/Leipzig/Wien/Zürich: Dudenverlag.
- Drozdík, L. 1989. "Word-class shift of multiword units in the lexicon of Modern Written Arabic." *Asian and African Studies* 24, 27-35.
- Edzard, L. 2001. "Adjektive und nominalisierte Relativsätze im Semitischen: Versuch einer Typologie." In: Zaborski (ed.) 39-52.
- El-Ayoubi, H. 1973. *Untersuchungen zur Wortstellung in der heutigen arabischen Sprache.* Erlangen-Nürnberg: Dissertation.

- El-Ayoubi, H., Fischer, W., Langer, M. 2001. *Syntax der arabischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. Teil I, Band 1. *Das Nomen und sein Umfeld*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Fassi Fehri, A. 1976. "Relatives et adjectifs en arabe: le problème de la détermination." *Lingua* 38, 125-152.
- Fassi Fehri, A. 1993. *Issues in the Structure of Arabic Clauses and Words*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Fassi Fehri, A. 1999. "Arabic modifying adjectives and DP structures." *Studia Linguistica* 53, 2, 105-154.
- Ferguson, C. A. 1977. "Diglossia". In: Giglioli (ed.) 232-251. [First published *Word* 15, 1959, 325-340.]
- Fischer, W. 1965. *Farb- und Formbezeichnungen in der Sprache der altarabischen Dichtung*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Fischer W. (ed.). 1982. *Grundriß der arabischen Philologie*. 1982 Band I: Sprachwissenschaft. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Fischer, W. 1987. *Grammatik des Klassischen Arabisch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. [1st edn 1972.]
- Fleisch, H. 1947. *Introduction à l'étude des langues sémitiques. Éléments de bibliographie*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Fleisch, H. 1956. *L'arabe classique. Esquisse d'une structure linguistique*. Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique.
- Fleisch, H. 1961. *Traité de linguistique arabe*. Vol. 1. *Préliminaires, phonétique, morphologie nominale*. Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique.
- Fleisch, H. 1994. "Arabic linguistics." In: Lepschy (ed.) Vol. 2: 164-184.
- Fleischhammer, M. (ed.). 1979. *Arabische Sprache und Literatur im Wandel*. Halle (Saale): Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg.
- Frei, H. 1939. "Sylvie est jolie des yeux." In: *Mélanges Bally* 185-192.
- Gabučjan, G. M. 1972. *Teorija artiklja i problemy arabskogo sintaksisa*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Gabučjan, G. M., Kovalev, A. A. 1968. "O probleme slova v svete faktov arabskogo literaturnogo jazyka." In: Kovalev, Gabučjan (eds.) 40-51.
- Gai, A. 1983. "The substantival-adjectival plurals of participles in Arabic." *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 10, 79-85.
- Gai, A. 1995. "The category 'Adjective' in Semitic Languages." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 40, 1-9.
- Gätje, H. 1965. "Strukturen der Genitivverbindung. Untersuchungen am arabischen Genitiv." *Die Sprache* 11, 61-73.
- Gätje, H. 1970. "Zum Begriff der Determination und Indetermination im Arabischen." *Arabica* 17, 225-251.
- Gätje, H. 1973. *Zur Syntax der Determinationsverhältnisse im Arabischen*. Hamburg: Deutsches Orient-Institut.
- Gätje, H. 1979. "Probleme semantischer Identität und Diversität in der arabischen Nationalgrammatik." *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 3, 7-27.
- Gaudefroy-Demombynes M., R. Blachère. (n.d.). *Grammaire de l'arabe classique*. Paris: G.-P. Maisonneuve [1st edn 1937-1938].
- Giglioli, P. P. 1977. *Language and Social Context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Goes, J. 1999. *L'adjectif. Entre nom et verbe*. Paris/Bruxelles: Duculot.
- Gołąb, Z., Heinz, A., Polański, K. 1968. *Słownik terminologii językoznawczej*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Górska, E. 1991. *Multiattributive Nominal Phrases in Modern Written Arabic*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.
- Górska, E. 2000. *Studium kontrastywne składni arabskich i polskich współczesnych tekstów literackich*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Graffi, G. 2001. *200 Years of Syntax. A Critical Survey*. Amsterdam etc.: John Benjamins.
- Grande, B. M. 1963. *Kurs arabskoj grammatiki v sravnitel'no-istoričeskom osveščeenii*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoj Literatury.
- Grotzfeld, H. 2000. "Rabī' al-'awwal and Nahr el-kibīr. The notion of dichotomy and its expression in Arabic." *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 38, 7-14.

- Guillaume, J.-P. 1988. "Le discours tout entier est nom, verbe et particule. Elaboration et constitution de la théorie des parties du discours dans la tradition grammaticale arabe." *Langages* 92, 25-49.
- Guillaume, J.-P. 1992. "Le statut de l'adjectif dans la tradition grammaticale arabe." *Histoire, épistémologie, langage* 14, 1, 59-74.
- Harris, Z. 1951. *Methods in Structural Linguistics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Retitled *Structural Linguistics*.]
- Hartmann, R. 1974. *Untersuchungen zur Syntax der arabischen Schriftsprache. Eine generativ-transformationelle Darstellung*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hawkins, J. A. (ed.). 1988. *Explaining Language Universals*. Oxford/Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell.
- Heine, B., Kuteva, T. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heinz, A. 1983. *Dzieje językoznawstwa w zarysie*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Hjelmslev, L. 1963. *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*. Transl. F.J. Whitfield. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press. [Originally *Omkring Sprogteoriens Grundlæggelse*. København: Luno, 1943.]
- Hickey, R., Puppel, S. (eds.). 1997. *Language History and Language Modelling: a Festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on His 60th Birthday*. Vol. 2. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hockett, C. F. 1958. *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: The Macmillian Company.
- Holes C. 2004. *Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions and Varieties*. Washington: Georgetown University Press. [1st edn. London/New York: Longman, 1995.]
- Ibn-Ḥammūda A. (Benhamouda) (n.d.). *Morphologie et syntaxe de la langue arabe/Qawā'id aṣ-ṣarf wa an-naḥw fī al-luġa al-'arabiyya*. Al-Ġazā'ir: Aš-Šarika al-waṭaniyya li an-našr wa at-tawzī'.
- Jacobs, J., Rosenbaum, P. (eds.). *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Waltham, Mass: Ginn.
- Jacobs, J., von Stechow, A., Sternefeld, W., Vennemann, T. (eds.). 1995. *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*. 2. Halbband. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Jackendoff, R. 1977. *X-Syntax: a Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jankowski, H. 1987. *Détermination participiale dans les langues ouraliennes et altaïque choisies*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Jankowski, H. 1991. "Word Order in Iraqi Arabic." *Lingua Posnaniensis* 32-33, 109-112.
- Jebali, A. 2005. "La modification adjectivale en arabe à la lumière de la grammaire adaptative." *Corela*, vol. 3, n°. 2. <http://edel.univ-poitiers.fr/corela/document.php?id=782> (consulted on 10/06/2007).
- Jespersen, O. 1965. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. New York: Norton Library. [1st edn London: Allen and Unwin, 1924.]
- Jodłowski, S. 1964. *Substantywizacja przymiotników w języku polskim*. Wrocław/Warszawa/Kraków: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich. Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Jodłowski, S. 1971. *Studia nad częściami mowy*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Johnstone, B. 1987. "Parataxis in Arabic: modification as a model for persuasion." *Studies in Language* 11, 85-98.
- Jušmanov, N. V. 1928. *Grammatika literaturnogo arabskogo jazyka*. Leningrad: Leningradskij Vostočnyj Institut imeni A. S. Eņukidze.
- Justice, D. 1987. *The Semantics of Form in Arabic in the Mirror of European Languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kaczmarkowski, M. 1985. *Nominalne grupy syntaktyczne łaciny okresu klasycznego*. Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski.
- Kahle, E. 1975. *Studien zur Syntax des Adjektivs im Vorklassischen Arabisch*. Erlangen: H. Lüling.

- Karolak, S. 1972. *Zagadnienia składni ogólnej*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Karolak, S. 1993. "Rząd (składnia rządu, rekcja)." In: Polański (ed.) 503-505.
- Kihm, A. 2005. "Adjective phrase." In: Versteegh (ed.) 12-16.
- Killean, C. G. 1970. "The false construct in modern literary Arabic." *Al-Našra* 4, 2, 2-17.
- Klemensiewicz, Z. 1948. *Skupienia czyli syntaktyczne grupy wyrazowe*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Kochański, W., Klebanowska, B., Markowski, A. 1989. *O dobrej i złej polszczyźnie*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Kouloughli, D. E. 1994. *Grammaire de l'arabe d'aujourd'hui*. Paris: Pocket.
- Kovalev, A. A., Gabučjan, G. M. (eds.). 1968. *Arabskaja filologija. Sbornik statej*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta.
- Kovalev, A. A., Šarbatov, G. Š. 1969. *Učebnik arabskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Nauka.
- Krahl, G. 1985. *Das arabische Adjektiv und die Substantiv-Adjektiv-Gruppe – Eine Untersuchung zur Wortbildung*. Leipzig: Unpublished Dissertation B, Karl-Marx-Universität.
- Krahl, G. 1989. "Die innere Klassifizierung der arabischen Adjektive." *Asian and African Studies*, 25, 117-123.
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1960. *Esquisses linguistiques*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1960a. "Les structures fondamentales de la langue: groupe et proposition." In: Kuryłowicz 1960, 35–40. [First published in *Studia Philosophica* 3, 1948, 203-209.]
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1960b. "Dérivation lexicale et dérivation syntaxique. Contribution à la théorie des parties du discours." In: Kuryłowicz 1960, 41-50. [First published in *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 37, 1936, 79-92.]
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1960c. "Le problème du classement des cas." In: Kuryłowicz 1960, 131-150. [First published in *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 9, 1949, 20-43.]
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1971. "Zdanie a czasownik." In: Lewicki (ed.) 1971, 56-59. [Originally "Proposition et verbe", *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 9, 1949, 76-79.]
- Łacina, J. 1989. *Współczesna specjalistyczna terminologia arabska i procesy słowotwórcze na przykładzie słownictwa z dziedziny chemii, fizyki i techniki*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.
- Łacina, J. 1997. *Słownik arabsko-polski*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.
- Langer, M. 1988. "Die uneigentliche Genitivverbindung (al-iḏāfa ġayr al-ḥaḳīqīya) im modernen Hocharabisch (Neuarabisch)." In: Reuschel (ed.) 78-93.
- Lecomte, G. 1976. *Grammaire de l'arabe*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. [1st edn 1968.]
- Lehmann, C. 1983. "Rektion und syntaktische Relationen." *Folia Linguistica* 17, 339-378.
- Lepschy, G. C. (ed.). 1994. *History of Linguistics*. Vol. 1: *The Eastern Tradition of Linguistics*. Vol. 2: *Classical and Medieval Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Lewicki, A. M. (ed.). 1971. *Problemy składni polskiej. Studia, dyskusje, polemiki z lat 1945-1970*. [s.l.]: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Lewicki, A. M. 1993. "Determinacja." In: Polański (ed.) 116-117.
- Martinet, A. 1970. *Podstawy lingwistyki funkcjonalnej*. Transl. L. Zawadowski. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe [Originally *Éléments de linguistique générale* (Paris: Colin, 1960); *A Functional View of Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962); *La linguistique synchronique. Études et recherches* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965).]
- Matthews, P. H. 1981. *Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, P. H. 2007. *Syntactic relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mélanges Bally*. 1939: *Mélanges de linguistique offerts à Charles Bally*. Genève: Georg et Cie.
- MECAS. 1965. *The MECAS Grammar of Modern Literary Arabic*. Beirut: Khayats.
- Mel'čuk, I. 1988. *Dependency Syntax. Theory and Practice*. Albany: SUNY Press.

- Mel'čuk, I. 2003. *Dependency in Linguistic Description*.  
<http://www.olst.umontreal.ca/pdf/Dependency.pdf> (consulted on 1/12/2007).
- Merx, A. 1889. *Historia artis grammaticae apud Syros*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Meyer, M. L. G. 2000. *Determination in der englischen Nominalphrase: eine korpus-linguistische Studie*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Milewski, T. 1971. "Stanowisko składni w obrębie językoznawstwa." In: Lewicki (ed.) 17-36. [First published in *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego*, 11, 1952, 74-92].
- Misz, H. 1967. *Opis grup syntaktycznych dzisiejszej polszczyzny pisanej*. Bydgoszcz: Bydgoskie Towarzystwo Naukowe.
- Mološnaja, T. N. 1985. *Adektivnye slovosocetanija v slavjanskih i balkanskih jazykah*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Monteil, V. 1960. *L'arabe moderne*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Mosel, U. 1975. *Die syntaktische Terminologie bei Sibawayh*. Vols 1-2. München: Dissertation.
- Motsch, W. 1973. *Syntax des deutschen Adjektivs*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. [1st edn 1964.]
- Munğid 2002: Al-Munğid fi al-luğa wa al-'a'lām*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Mašriq. [39th edn.]
- Ouhalla, J., Shlonsky, U. (eds.). 2002. *Themes in Arabic and Hebrew Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Owens, J. 1984a. "The noun phrase in Arabic grammatical theory." *Al-'Arabiyya* 17, 47-86.
- Owens, J. 1984b. "Structure, class and dependency: Modern linguistic theory and the Arabic grammatical tradition." *Lingua* 64, 25-62.
- Owens, J. 1989. "The syntactic basis of Arabic word classification." *Arabica* 36, 211-234.
- Paradela Alonso, N. 2005. *Manual de sintaxis árabe*. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid [1st edn. 1998].
- Penguin 2001. *The New Penguin English Dictionary*. Consultant editor: R. Allen. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Pogonowski, J. 1981. *An Axiom System for Hypotaxis*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Pogonowski, J. 1982. "Jerzy Bańcerowski, Systems of Semantics and Syntax. A determinational theory of language. Warszawa-Poznań PWN. 1980, pp. 162." *Lingua Posnaniensis* 25, 121-131.
- Pogonowski, J. 1993. *Combinatory Semantics*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Polański, K. (ed.). 1993. *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Polotsky, H. 1978. "A point of Arabic syntax: the indirect attribute." *Israel Oriental Studies* 8, 159-173.
- Reckendorf, H. 1895-98. *Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen*. Leiden: Brill.
- Reckendorf, H. 1921. *Arabische Syntax*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Reig, D. 1999. *Dictionnaire arabe français/français arabe*. Paris: Larousse-Bordas. [1st edn Paris: Larousse, 1983.]
- Reuschel, W. (ed.). 1988. *Das Moderne Hocharabisch. Ausgewählte theoretische Probleme*. Leipzig: Karl-Marks-Universität.
- Ries, J. 1894. *Was ist Syntax? Ein kritischer Versuch*. Marburg: N.G. Elwert.
- Robins, R. H. 1974. *A Short History of Linguistics*. Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press.
- Roman, A. 1990. *Grammaire de l'arabe*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Rybalkin, V. " 'Amal." In: Versteegh (ed.) 67-74.
- Ryding, K. C. 2005. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ryding, K., Versteegh, K. 2007. "'Idāfa." In: Versteegh (ed.) 294-298.
- Safarewicz, J. 1971a. "Uwagi o podstawowych strukturach językowych." In: Lewicki (ed.) 45-50.
- Safarewicz, J. 1971b. "O predykatywnej funkcji słowa osobowego." In: Lewicki (ed.) 51-55.
- Saloni, Z., Świdziński, M. 1987. *Składnia współczesnego języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe. [1st edn. 1981, Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski.]

- Sanctius Brocensis, F. 1986. *Minerva seu de causis linguae Latinae*. Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: Frommann-Holzboog. [Reprint of the original edn. 1587. Salamanca: Renaut].
- Schachter, P. 1985. "Parts-of-speech systems." In: Shopen (ed.) Vol. 1, 3-61.
- Schmidt, F. 1961. *Logik der Syntax*. Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften.
- Schub, M. B. 1984. "‘Iqḥām: the annexation of a binominal to a genitive: a deviation from Semiticity in syntax?" *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 13, 86-91.
- Schulz, E. 2004. *Modernes Hocharabisch: Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Seiler, H. 1960. *Relativsatz, Attribut und Apposition*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Seiler, H. 1983. *Possession as an Operational Dimension of Language*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Semenov, D. V. 1941. *Sintaksis sovremennogo literaturnogo arabskogo jazyka*. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Shopen, T. (ed.). 1985. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Vols 1-3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sībawayhi 1991. *Kitāb Sībawayhi*. Vols 1-5. Edn. 'A. M. Hārūn. Bayrūt: Dār al-Ġil.
- Siloni, T. 2002. "Adjectival constructs and inalienable constructions." In: Ouhalla, Shlonsky (eds.) 161-187.
- Širaliyev, M. Š., Sevortjan, E. V. (eds.). 1971. *Grammatika azerbajdžanskogo jazyka. (Fonetika, morfologija i sintaksis)*. Baku: Elm.
- Suleiman, M. Y. 1990. "Sībawayhi's 'Parts of Speech' according to Zajjāji: a New Interpretation." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 35, 245-263.
- Suleiman Y. (ed.). 1999. *Arabic Grammar and Linguistics*. Surrey: Curzon.
- Szumska, D. 2006. *Przymiotnik jako przyłączone wyrażenie predykatywne*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Szupryczyńska, M. 1980. *Opis składniowy polskiego przymiotnika*. Toruń: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Tesnière, L. 1966. *Éléments de syntaxe structurale*. Paris: Klincksieck. [1st edn 1959.]
- Testelec, J. G. 1990. "Nabljudenija nad semantikoj opozicij "imja/glagol" i "suščestvitel'noe/prilagatel'noe" (k postanovke problemy)." In: Alpatov (ed.) 77-95.
- Thompson, S. A. 1988. "A discourse approach to the cross-linguistic category 'adjective'." In: Hawkins (ed.) 167-185.
- Troupeau, G. 1983. "Les 'partes orationis' dans le *Kitāb al-'Uṣūl* d'Ibn al-Sarrāj." In: Versteegh (ed.) 143-152.
- Trubetzkoy, N. 1939. "Le rapport entre le déterminé, le déterminant et le défini." In: *Mélanges Bally* 75-82.
- Tucker, G. H. 1998. *The Lexicogrammar of Adjectives. A Systemic Functional Approach to Lexis*. London/New York: Cassell.
- Ullmann, M. 1985. *Arabische Komparativsätze*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ullmann, M. 1989. *Adminiculum zur Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Ullmann, M. 2005. Die Relativierung der Genus-Verbi-Opposition auf der Ebene der Partizipien. Ein Beitrag zur arabischen Lexikographie. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Vendler, Z. 1968. *Adjectives and Nominalizations*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Versteegh, C. H. M. 1977. *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking*. Leiden: Brill.
- Versteegh, C. H. M. 1978. "The Arabic terminology of syntactic position." *Arabica* 25, 261-281.
- Versteegh, C. H. M. (ed.). 1983. *The History of Linguistics in the Near East*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Versteegh, K. (ed.). 2006-2008. *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* Vol. 1. (2006), Vol 2. (2007), Vol 3. (2008). Leiden: Brill.
- Vol'f, E. M. 1978. *Grammatika i semantika prilagatel'nogo. Na materiale ibero-romanskih jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Waldmann, A. 1989. "Genitivverbindung oder Präpositionalgruppe – eine strukturell-semantische Untersuchung an der arabischen Nominalgruppe." In: Blohm (ed.) 29-39.

- Waltisberg, M. 2005. "Diem, Werner: *Fa-waylun li-l-qāsiyati qulūbuhum. Studien zum arabischen adjektivischen Satz*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 1998. 203 Seiten, Leinen. ISBN: 3-447-04043-2." *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 44, 101-108.
- Watson, J. 1999. "The syntax of Arabic headlines and news summaries." In: Suleiman (ed.) 161-181.
- Watson, J. C. E. 2002. *The Phonology and Morphology of Arabic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Watson, J. C. E. 2006. "Adverbs." In: Versteegh (ed.) 20-25.
- Wechsler, S., Zlatić, L. 2003. *The Many Faces of Agreement*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language Information.
- Wehr, H. 1943. "Entwicklung und traditionelle Pflege der arabischen Sprache der Gegenwart." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 97, 16-46.
- Wehr, H. 1953. *Der arabische Elativ*. Wiesbaden: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz.
- Wehr, H., Cowan, J. M. 1974. *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. [1st edn 1961.]
- Weiss, B. 1976. "A theory of the parts of speech in Arabic: a study of 'ilm al-waḍ'." *Arabica* 32, 23-36.
- Wells, R. S. 1947. "Immediate constituents." *Language* 23, 81-117.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1986. "What's in a noun? (or: how do nouns differ in meaning from adjectives?)." *Studies in Language* 10, 353-389.
- Wild, S. 1982. "Die arabische Schriftsprache der Gegenwart." In: Fischer (ed.) 51-57.
- Wilmet, M. 1986. *La détermination nominale. Quantification et caractérisation*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Wright, W. 1962. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. Vols 1-2. Cambridge: The University Press. [1st edn 1862.]
- Yushmanov, N. V. 1961. *The Structure of the Arabic Language*. Transl. M. Perlmann. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics of the Modern Language Association of America. [Originally *Stroj arabskogo jazyka*, Leningrad: Gosudarstvennyj Universitet, 1938.]
- Zaborski, A. 1982. *Dialekt egipski języka arabskiego. Kurs praktyczny*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.
- Zaborski, A. 1995. „Janusz Danecki, Gramatyka języka arabskiego, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog 1994, str. 597." *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 51, 133-148.
- Zaborski, A. (ed.). 2001. *New Data and New Methods in Afroasiatic Linguistics: Robert Hetzron in memoriam*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Zaborski, A. 2006. "Article, Definite." In: Versteegh (ed.) 187-189.