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ABSTRAK

Ṣifat musyabbahah (SM) merupakan subkelas nomina Bahasa Arab, yang dimunculkan oleh para tata bahasa klasik Bahasa Arab, yang bentuk dan maknanya tidak teratur. Tulisan ini bertujuan untuk mengkategorikan SM melalui pendekatan kelas kata lintas-bahasa. Data berupa SM bebas konteks dan SM terikat konteks yang diperoleh dari buku-buku tata bahasa Arab, serta korpus dan kamus daring Bahasa Arab. Kemudian, data dianalisis dengan pendekatan kelas kata lintas-bahasa, yaitu integrasi analisis sintaksis, morfologi, dan leksikal. Hasilnya ialah SM dapat dikategorikan ke dalam 6 jenis SM yang meliputi 1) SM dalam arti sempit, 2) SM sebagai bentuk/wazan antara ism fā'il dan ism maf'ūl, 3) SM sebagai inkorporasi nomina absolut, 4) SM sebagai leksikalisasi metaforis, 5) SM sebagai istilah kekerabatan dan kategori sosial, dan 6) ism non-SM.

Kata kunci: Ṣifat musyabbahah, gramatika tradisi Arab, pengkategorian, kelas kata lintas-bahasa

INTRODUCTION

Ṣifat musyabbahah (SM) is one of important subjects in Arabic grammar that have irregular word-form and meaning. In this section, it will be presented what SM is, the problems, and research focus.

Notions of SM and the problems

Definition of SM

SM is one of Arabic noun subclasses. Generally, SM is defined based on potential to be noun attribute, derivation, and abstraction of lexical features. For example, Al-Yamaniy & An-Nūr (2016:1) who elaborated various definitions of SM from various classical Arabic grammatical literatures1 stated that:

'‘The essence of Ṣifat musyabbahah is a derivative attributive noun, which is derived from intransitive verb in order to relate an event to an attributed-for

---

1 written by e.g. Ibn Hisyām, Ibnu Mālik, Sībawaih, Ibn Sirāj, Asymūniy, ’Abbās Ḥasan
noun (*maṣūf*), to indicate a state or habituateness, nor continuousness or progressiveness.

The definition of SM may differ from one grammarian to others. The difference is in terms of derivation. Al-Gulayainy (1993:185) claimed that SM is not only derived from intransitive verb, but may also be derived from transitive verb, e.g. 'Most-merciful' and 'All-Knowing'. On the other hand, Ad-Dahdah (1996:84) mentioned that SM is derived from gerund (*maṣdar*), not from verb.

Aziz (2009:17-18) said that the classical Arabic grammarians paid much attention to declinable noun (*ism mutaṣṣarif*) which has action of declension ('aman) like verb. This noun is distinguished from other types of declinable nouns which may also have inflective operation like verb. This noun is called *ṣifat*. The term *ṣifat* may refer to both function and meaning. When referring to functions, *ṣifat* is interpreted as nouns that may be employed as attributive functions in attributive noun phrases (*tarkib wasfiyy*). Conversely, when referring to meaning, *ṣifat* is interpreted as ism with the meaning of "properties". Furthermore, this type of ism is called *ṣifat al-musyabbahah* bi l-fa’îl or *bi-ism l-fa’îl* because it is like *ism fâ’il* in term inflective operation, i.e. to nominativize subject (li-raf’îl fâ’il). In addition, Arabic grammarians more discussed morphological and syntactic characteristics of SM and ignored lexical characteristics.

**SM-patterns**

SM has various word-patterns (*wazn*). Al-Gulayainy (1993:186-191) mentioned four primary SM-patterns, which involving *ṣifat* and mentioned other various SM-patterns as outcome from morphophonological process. On the other hand, Mustarīḥiy (2003) mentioned four types of SM-patterns consisting of a) 18 types of SM-patterns, b) like active participle-pattern, e.g. *ṣāli‘* ('wide'), c) like passive participle-pattern *ṣāli‘* ('crazy'), d) and attached to frozen noun-pattern (*ism jāmîd*). In addition, Mustarīḥiy also mentioned that the SM may also be patternized empirically in four radical (*rubâ’îy*), e.g. 'ṣīrīm', 'ṣīrīm', 'furious (of wind), and in other noun-patterns such as absolute noun and gerund intended as *ṣifat*. From all SM-patterns which are mentioned already, no exclusive pattern for SM.

Each of SM-patterns overlap with other noun subclasses. Pattern *ṣīrīm* for example, is noun-pattern used for both SM and elative-noun (*ism tafidil*). Pattern *ṣīrīm* for another example, is not only used for SM, but also for gerund, common noun, excessive noun and broken plural noun, e.g. 'departure', 'pure wine', 'Most-miserable', 'servants'.

Several SM’s have more than single pattern. For examples from Munawwir (1997),

| SM pattern | gloss |
|------------|-------|
| ظَعِينَةُ وَفَحْي | ‘difficult’ |

2 i.e. gerund (*ism masdar*), active participle (*ism fâ’il*), passive participle (*ism maf’ul*).
3 viz. [e.g. ‘beautiful’, e.g. ‘old’], [e.g. ‘dumb’], [e.g. ‘well’], [e.g. ‘happy’], [e.g. ‘dirty’], [e.g. ‘narrow’], [e.g. ‘crazy’], [e.g. ‘replete’], [e.g. ‘forbidden’], [e.g. ‘full’], [e.g. ‘brave’], [e.g. ‘unfair’], [e.g. ‘abundant’], [e.g. ‘right’], [e.g. ‘the free’], [e.g. ‘cruel’]
4 e.g. [e.g. ‘lion’ in ‘brave man’, literally. (lit.) ‘man like a lion’}
The linguistic phenomena in the examples were not much explained by grammarians. Al-Gulāyainiy (1993:190) mentioned that is SM ṭaḥāir, ṭalīḥr, and ṭaṭāḥr are single SM. According to him, this variation is a result of the morphophonological process. This claim may be applied to data 1-3, whereas data 4-6 aren’t very precise. Another possibility is that different patterns allow different categories. For example, mishāf and mašul may be categorized as an excessive adjective (ṣigaḥ mubālagah) whose noun and verb are as part of its word-patterns.

**Derivation of SM**

As mentioned already, SM is derived from verb. This notion causes three problems. Firstly, it is related to transitivity. Some grammarians believed that SM is only derived from intransitive verbs. However, other grammarians (Al-‘Ubaidiy & Al-Jamīliy, 2012; Al-Maṣārawah Invalid source specified, Al-Gulāyainiy, 1993) said that SM can be derived from transitive verbs. The first grammarians group considered what is derived from transitive verbs is not SM, but excessive adjective. Secondly, there are SM’s which is asymmetrical to their verb-pattern. SM-triliteral should be derived from triliteral verb, but there are SM-triliteral derived from augmented-verb (fi‘l mazīd) instead. For example, ṭarāz ‘rock’ is derived from ṭażr ‘to be hard like rock’. Lastly, there are SM’s which verbs don’t be found as derivational axis, e.g. ʿlāma ‘abundant’.

**Syntactic Behavior**

As mentioned already, SM is one of ṣifat or ism ṣifat. This categorization was based on possibility of functioning as ṣifat (attributive function) in tarkīb wasfiyy (attributive noun phrase), e.g.

| No. | Example | Meaning |
|-----|---------|---------|
| 1.  | fasādun kabirun |
|     | mischief sing, indef. masc. nominative great sing, indef. masc. nominative |
|     | <mauṣūf> <ṣifat> |
|     | ‘great mischief’ |
| 2.  | uswatun hasanatun |
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Tarkīb wasfīy is a syntactic structure consisting of mauṣūf (attributed-for) and ṣifat (attribute). The words fasādun, uswatun, aš-ṣafha are mauṣūf, while SM’s kabirun, uswatun, aš-ṣafha are ṣifat. Ad-Dāhādāh (1996: 338) explained that ṣifat is a noun modifying mauṣūf, while mauṣūf is a noun referring to things, proper nouns, or ideas. Ṣifat must be agree with mauṣūf regarding number (singular, dual or plural), gender (masculine or feminine), definiteness (definite or indefinite), dan case (nominative (marfū’), accusative (mašūb), genitive (majrūr)). Al-Gulāyainiy (1993: 97) stated that mauṣūf decides grammatical category of ṣifat. There are 15 rules of agreement between mauṣūf and ṣifat as mentioned by Dror (2013:56).

Ṣifat is not only filled by SM, but also can be filled by other noun subclasses, viz. active participles, passive participles, elative nouns, the excessiveness, relative nouns (ism mašūb), as well as gerunds and absolute nouns (ism jāmid) referring to ṣifat (properties) (Al-Gulāyainiy, 1993: 97-98). For examples,

(1) \(<\text{ism fā’il}>\)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rajulun} & \quad \text{qātilun} \\
\text{man} & \quad \text{kill (er/ing)}
\end{align*}
\]
‘a killer man’ or ‘man who killing’

(2) \(<\text{ism maf‘ūl}>\)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rajulun} & \quad \text{maqṭulun} \\
\text{man} & \quad \text{killed}
\end{align*}
\]
‘a killed man’ or ‘man who is killed’

(3) \(<\text{al-mubālagah}>\)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ar-rajiḍu} & \quad \text{al-qāṭilu} \\
\text{man} & \quad \text{murderer}
\end{align*}
\]
‘The murderer man’

(4) \(<\text{ism tafḍīl}>\)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ar-rajiḍu} & \quad \text{a’zamū} \\
\text{man} & \quad \text{great}
\end{align*}
\]
‘The greatest man’

(5) \(<\text{maṣdar}>\)

\begin{align*}
\text{example} \quad \text{sing. indef. fem. nominative} & \quad \text{excellent} \quad \text{sing. indef. fem. nominative} \\
\text{<mauṣūf>} & \quad \text{<ṣifat>}
\end{align*}

‘an excellent example’
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| rajulun | 'adlun | 'a farimanded man’ |
|---------|--------|-------------------|
| man | sing, indef. masc. nominative | farimanded | sing, indef. masc. nominative |

(6) <ism mansūb>

| rajulun | lubnāniyyun | 'a Lebanese man’ |
|---------|-------------|-----------------|
| man | sing, indef. masc. nominative | Lebanese | sing, indef. masc. nominative |

(7) <ism jāmid>

| ra`aitu | [qā` idan] | [asadan] |
|---------|------------|----------|
| see verb perf. singular | [commander] | [lion] |
| sing, indef. masc. accusative | sing, indef. masc. accusative |

‘I saw [a brave commander]’ literally (lit.). ‘I saw [a commander like a lion]’

It should be noted that (5) and (7) was listed by Mustarīhiy (2003) as SM.

Besides functioning as ṣifat, SM has ‘āmal (action of declension) or can be ʿāmil (active element of declension). This notion can be found within section talking about ‘āmal as-ṣifat al-musyabbahah, viz. sintactic behaviour of SM causing changes of iʿrāb to word(s) within a clause or phrase. Al-Gulāyainiy (1993: 282-283) mentioned four types of SM action’s of declension, viz.

1. nominativizes passive element (maʿmūl) because of like subject of verbal clause (fāʿil),
   e.g. ‘Ali has a good manner’
2. accusativizes passive element because of like object of verbal clause (maṣfūl bīl)
   e.g. ‘Ali has a good manner’
3. genitivizes passive element because of annexational phrase (tarkīb iḍāfiyy),
   e.g. ‘Ali has a good manner’
4. accusativizes passive element of specifying contraction (ḥāl),
   e.g. ‘Ali is good in term of manner’.

In addition, SM is not the only noun subclass which has ‘āmal. However, there are others like that, i.e. ism fāʿil, ism mafʿūl, ism tafḍīl, mubālagah, and maṣdar. Except maṣdar, all are ṣifat.

**Lexical features**

The lexical meaning of SM is less mentioned. It was claimed that some SM’s tendencically have specific lexical features. For example, the pattern ḍafʿal’s a SM-pattern which indicates colors [such as لَحْوَةٍ ‘red’, لَبْىٓةٍ ‘black’], defects [such as لَبْآع ‘blind’, لَبْآع ‘lame’], and ornaments [‘āmil ‘coloured with black-mascara’] (Al-Gulāyainiy, 1993: 186). Nevertheless, SM which means defect doesn’t always use SM-pattern لَحْوَةٍ ‘blind’, e.g. ‘blind’ can also be in the pattern لَحْوَةٍ, viz. لَحْوَةٍ. The pattern لَحْوَةٍ is the only pattern that is always mentioned as a specimen of the SM-pattern which has regularity of meaning. As for the other SM-patterns, they had never been claimed to have a regularity of meaning.

---

5 viz. sets of rules regarding changes to the end of words marking various syntactic cases
Problem statements and Research focus

SM is Arabic noun subclass grammatical rule that was given by traditional Arabic grammarians to accommodate other derivative nouns which may be distributed as šifat, but it cannot be classified as ism fā’il, ism maf‘ūl, ism tafḍīl dan ṣīghah mubālagah. This notion causes three problems in the application. Firstly, functioning as šifat is main criteria, so that any ism functioning as šifat must be classified as SM, e.g. the word asadun ‘lion’ which classified as SM. The second is the problem of derivation (isytIQāq). SM is claimed as a derivative noun, viz. that is derived from verb or infinitive verb/gerund. In the application, it is found that there are SM’s that are asymmetrical against their’s verb-pattern, and that there are SM’s that they don’t have fi’il or maṣdar as derivational axis. This shows that SM is derived neither fi’il nor maṣdar, but derived from consonant-roots and affixes. This also applies to other Arabic open classes. The third problem is related to SM-pattern. SM no has specific word-pattern and has various word-patterns that each overlaps with other noun subclasses. Moreover, several SM’s have more than single pattern.

The lexical meaning of SM is less mentioned. Some lexical features of SM that was mentioned by grammarians have not been able to cover all of ism claimed as SM. The lexical features mentioned only indicate to adjectives. In fact, there are SM’s that have lexical features other than adjectives.

As mentioned already, the urgency of this research is that the study of the lexical features of SM was rather ignored. In fact, the study of word classes, or parts of speech, needs to pay attention to the semantic aspects which are then integrated with morphological and syntactic studies (Goddard and Wierzbicka, 2014:1). Therefore, the objective in this study is to analyze SM based on the parts of speech approach, viz. the integration between syntactic and morphological analysis, and lexical feature analysis. The purpose of this analysis is to categorize SM which has various lexical features.

PARTS OF SPEECH

SM is one of Arabic word subclasses. Word classes or parts of speech, such as verbs, nouns, and adjectives, are categorizations of words that have similarities of grammatical behavior (Kridalaksana, 2008). Parts of speech is universal property of human languages that can be identified to all human languages, although the principles of categorizations and results are different.

Cross-linguistically, parts of speech can be identified on two principles, viz. similarity of syntactic function and lexical meaning (Dixon & Aikhenvald, 2004). Syntactically, noun and verb classes are obligatory for all languages. This is because both fill the functions in the three types of basic universal clause as follows.

Basic clause types (Dixon & Aikhenvald, 2004: 6)

| Clause type   | Nucleus          | Core arguments                  |
|---------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Transitive    | Transitive predicate | Transitive subject (A) and transitive object (O) |
| Intransitive  | Intransitive predicate | Intransitive subject (S)       |
| Copula        | Copula predicate (copula verb) | Copula subject (CS) and copula verb complement (CC) |
Each clause consists of one predicate and core arguments, viz. subject, object and complement. The term predicate was originally used in Greek to identify all functions other than the subject. In modern linguistics, the term predicate refers to verbs, both transitive and intransitive verbs, and nonverbs which are considered as verbs. For example, (is) big is a nonverbal predicate in the English clause, the house is big. The core argument is a slot that must present in a clause construction. The subject argument is a core argument that must be presented in all clause types. The object argument only presents in a transitive clause and the copulative complement argument only present in copulative clauses. The subject and object can be identified as noun or noun phrase (NP). Whereas copulative complement can be identified as nouns and sometimes identified as parts of a verbal phrase (copulative verb + NP). Analysis of word classes through clauses only focuses on nouns and verbs. This makes both classes as obligatory categories in all languages.

The identification of word classes also needs to involve lexical semantic identification. Dixon & Aikhenvald (2004: 3-5) suggested three types of semantic words, i.e. nouns, verbs and adjectives.

"Semantic types with concrete reference are always linked to the noun class-these include HUMANS (e.g. 'boy'), body and other PARTS (e.g. 'eye', 'leg'), FLORA (e.g. 'tree', 'leaf'), FAUNA (e.g. 'rat', 'fly') CELESTIAL (e.g. 'sun'), ENVIRONMENTAL (e.g. 'water', 'forest'), and ARTEFACTS (e.g. 'gun', 'house')."

......

"Semantic types always associated with the verb class include MOTION (e.g. 'run', 'take', 'throw'), REST (e.g. 'sit', 'put', 'hold'), AFFECT (e.g. 'hit', 'burn', 'build'), GIVING (e.g. 'give', 'trade'), ATTENTION (e.g. 'see', 'hear'), and SPEAKING (e.g. 'tell', 'shout', 'ask')"

......

... “semantic types typically associated with the word class adjective;
1 DIMENSION-'big', 'small', 'long', 'tall', 'short', 'wide', 'deep', etc.
2 AGE- 'new', 'young', 'old', etc.
3 VALUE-'good', 'bad', 'lovely', 'atrocious', 'perfect', 'proper(real)', etc. (And also words such as 'odd', 'strange', 'curious', 'necessary', 'crucial', 'important', 'lucky').
4 COLOUR-'black', 'white', 'red' etc.

......

5 PHYSICAL PROPERTY-'hard', 'soft', 'heavy', 'wet', 'rough', 'strong', 'clean', 'hot', 'sour', etc. And sub-class referring to corporeal properties, e.g. 'well', 'sick', 'tired', 'dead', 'absent'.
6 HUMAN PROPENSITY- 'jealous', 'happy', 'kind', 'clever', 'generous', 'cruel', 'proud', 'ashamed', 'eager', etc.
7 SPEED- 'fast', 'quick', 'slow', etc.

......

8 DIFFICULTY- 'easy', 'difficult', 'though', 'hard', 'simple', etc.
9 SIMILARITY-'like', 'unlike', 'similar', 'different(strange)', 'other', etc.
10 QUALIFICATION-'definite', 'true', 'probable', 'possible', 'likely', 'usual', 'normal', 'common', 'correct', 'appropriate', 'sensible', etc.
11 QUANTIFICATION- 'all(whole)', 'many', 'some', 'few', 'only', 'enough', etc.
12 POSITION- 'high', 'low', 'near', 'far/distant', 'right', 'left(strange)', 'northern', etc.
13 CARDINAL NUMBER. (In some language these constitute a separate word class) And 'first', 'last' (together with other ordinal numbers)."

On modern/western linguistics perspective, SM was usually compared with adjectives (Abu-Chacra, 2007; Badawi et al., 2004; Haywood & Nahmad, 1962; Wright, 1981). Unfortunately, the comparation did not considered tertium comparationis because it did not take into account the differences in structural typology between Arabic and European languages.
SM was compared with adjectives because SM must be functioning as an attribute/sifah and most of the lexical features of SM are adjectives.

Adjectives are part of the main classes together with verbs and nouns. Not all languages, as well as Arabic, have an adjective class independently. The grammatical characteristics of adjectives can be similar to nouns, or be similar to verbs, or similar to nouns and verbs, or not similar to verbs and nouns (Beck, 2002).

Nevertheless, Dixon & Aikhenvald (2004) said that adjectives can be cross-linguistically identified by the following criteria.

1. Adjectives can be functioning as attribute in noun phrases.
2. When functioning as intransitive predicate, adjectives can be intransitive verbs or noun complements of copulative verbs.
3. In several languages, adjectives can be identified in comparative constructions.
4. In several languages, adjective can be functioning as adverbs, or modifying verbs, which sometimes may be accompanied by morphological process.

Dixon & Aikhenvald (2004) also claimed that “the recognition of word classes in a language must be on the basis of internal grammatical criteria for that language”.

**METHOD**

This study aims to categorize SM based on the parts of speech approach. Hence, the data of this study are context-free SM and context-bound SM (phrase or clause) which were sourced from Arabic grammar books written by e.g. Al-Gulayainiy (1993), Ad-Dahdah (1996), As-Saqiy (1977), Hassan (1985), Nahlah (1994), and the specific works about SM written by e.g. 'Aziz (2009) Mustarh (2003) and Al-Yamaniy & An-Nur (2016). Data used in that works were limited, viz. mostly they was sourced from Al-Qur'an because it was the main corpus of Arabic grammar (Haywood & Nahmad, 1962). Therefore, the data were expanded by way of predicting a SM-pattern with a specific root and then searching it into Arabic online corpus and dictionaries. For example, it was found that the root بَرَضَ ḍrb ‘to hit/beat’ has SM بَيْرَيضَ darībun ‘to be beaten’ after it predicted and searched various possible SM-patterns against root ḍrb, such as ḍarbun, *ḍarbānu, *ḍarabun, dan *ḍaribun.

Data analysis in this study included syntactic, lexical, and morphological analysis. The first is syntactic analysis. Each noun which claimed as SM must be functioning as sifah in ṭarkīb usfiy. As for the principle of ‘amal, it doesn’t need to be applied because nouns which have ‘amal include ism maṣdar, while it is not be included within ism sifah.

The second is meaning principle. The meaning what is meant is not stativeness (ṣābitah) because this concept is abstract. What is meant by meaning is the lexical meaning which covers lexical meaning of adjectives, nouns, and verbs.

The third is morphological analysis, viz. SM-pattern, verb-pattern of SM, and lafdil possibility. The analysis of SM-patterns is observing presence or absence of word-pattern دُلُوُّ and شَيْخُ within a SM-subclass because both are identically word-pattern of ism fā’il and ism maq‘ūl. The derivation analysis of SM is identifying verb-pattern as an axis of derivation, i.e triliteral or others, as well as the transitivity of it’s verb. the potential of SM has a paradigmatic
The research resulted 6 types of SM as follows.

**Type 1: SM in narrow sense**

The use of this label followed “adjectives in the narrow sense” given by Dixon & Aikhenvald (2004: 1). The characteristics of type 1 are which a) must be functioning as *ṣifat*, b) has lexical features of adjective, c) is derived from intransitive verb and passive verb, d) allows word-pattern and in classhood, e) mostly has paradigmatic relation with *ism tadfil*. Each of characteristics, except a), are explained as follows.

The type 1 is SM’s which theirs classhood has adjective lexical features, viz. colour [e.g. *white*, *red*, *blue*, *black/dark*, *yellow*, ‘bright’, ‘quenched’, ‘green’, ‘fawn’, etc.], dimension [e.g. ‘small’, ‘tall’, ‘thin’, ‘long’, ‘wide’, etc.], age [e.g. ‘new’, ‘modern’, ‘past’], value [e.g. ‘lovely’, ‘good’, ‘rich’, ‘valuable’, ‘honourable’, etc.], speed [e.g. ‘slow’, ‘fast’, etc.], physical property [e.g. (for animate) ‘having leprosy’], ‘having a) must be functioning

---

7 cf. *Syntactic Behavior* for explanations and examples
8 cf. Dixon & Aikhenvald (2004: 3-5)
This type is not allowed to be derived from transitive verb. However, it is only derived from transitive triliteral verb in pattern exactly [e.g. ‘to be well’, ‘to be lovely’, ‘to be far’], mostly [e.g. ‘to become wide’, ‘to become fast’, ‘to become red’] and rarely [e.g. ‘holy’, ‘barren’, ‘satisfied’]. It is also derived from triliteral verb which it is firmly in passive verb-pattern such as ‘to be grieving’ and ‘to be crazy’ which derived for ‘grieving’ and ‘crazy’.

In this classhood, type 1 is allowed SM-pattern [e.g. ‘secure’, ‘absent’, ‘firm’, ‘envious’, etc.] and SM-pattern [e.g. ‘crazy’, ‘unconscious’, ‘distressed’, ‘reasonable’] which both must be distinguished from ism fā’il [e.g. ‘grateful ones’, ‘witness’, ‘creator’, ‘knower’, etc.] and ism maf’ūl [e.g. ‘preserved’, ‘be eaten’, etc.]. Some SM-pattern may be claimed as ism fā’il as well [e.g. ‘righteous ones’, ‘envious’, ‘patient ones’, ‘infidel’, etc.]. In addition, the word-pattern doesn’t only indicate SM and ism fā’il, but also ism ‘adad tartībi (cardinal number) for two to ten and ism mansūb (relative noun) without ya` nisbah [e.g. ‘milked’] (Ad-Dahdāh, 1996: 473).

Most of type 1 have tafḍīl-pattern, e.g. ‘more/most lovely’, ‘better/the best’, ‘faster/fastest’, etc. The restriction is that if SM of this type is in pattern and doesn’t accept comparaion meaning, e.g. ‘living (thing)’, ‘dead’, etc.

Type 2: SM as alternative word-pattern between ism fā’il and ism maf’ūl

The characteristics of type 2 are which a) must be functioning šifat, b) has lexical features of verbs, c) is generally derived from transitive verb, d) is not allowed word-pattern and in classhood because both are ism fā’il and ism maf’ūl, e) a little has paradigmatic relation with ism tafḍīl. Each of characteristics, except d), are explained as follows.

The type 2 must be functioning as šifat. The underlined elements below, for examples, are type 2 of SM functioning as šifat which is as part of tarkib wasfiyy in the brackets.

1. [Fmə lābi` An ʿajā`a ʿalā il-xibīf]
   - and hastened to entertain them with [a roasted calf]

2. [Waḍallāk tāmbiqāyyuḥa ʿalā il-xibīf]
   - And lofty palm trees having [fruit arranged] in layers

3. [Waḥattāba`a mu`akKN al-šūbīṭ al-rājīm]
   - And (moreover) We have guarded them from every [cursed devil]

4. [Rājīm al-xibīf] ʿalā il-ḵᵛātīn
   - [A man sitting] on the chair

* see Type 1: SM in narrow sense, paragraph “In class hood, type 1 is allowed SM-pattern ...” for examples and explanations
The type 2 is SM’s which theirs classhood has verb lexical features[^10], viz. motion [e.g. ‘threwed away’, ‘follower’, ‘getting in’, etc.], rest [e.g. ‘ceased’, ‘sleepyhead’], ‘(someone) waking up’, ‘sitting (ones)’, etc.], affect [e.g. ‘captivated’, ‘be wronged’, ‘creature lit. be created’], ‘murdered’, ‘which be slaughtered’, etc.], giving [e.g. ‘servant’, ‘fly’, ‘helper’, etc.], attention [e.g. ‘all-seeing’, ‘all-hearing’, ‘witness’, ‘beloved or believing’, ‘praised’, ‘famed’, etc.], speaking [e.g. ‘non-arab literally (lit.) speaking Arabic ones inarticulately’, ‘fluent’, ‘damned’, ‘praiseworthy lit. be praised’, ‘prophet lit. messenger’, etc.].

This type is only allowed to be derived from transitive verb, viz. which has in pattern most of [e.g. ‘mow’, ‘roast’, ‘hit’, etc.], some of [e.g. ‘follow’, ‘guard’, ‘praise’, etc.] and none of [e.g. ‘tend’]. When derived from transitive verb, SM indicates either passive meaning or active. If it is active, SM is often accompanied by meaning of excessiveness (mubālagah).

A few of type 2 has *tafdīl*-pattern. Especially, they are which have lexical features of attention or indicate degree of continuum, e.g. ‘most/more beloved’, ‘most/more merciful’, ‘most/more wrong’, ‘most/more knowing’, ‘most/more eloquent’, etc.

**Type 3: SM as absolute noun incorporation**

The characteristics of type 3 are which a) must be functioning as *ṣifat*, b) has lexical features of nouns, c) is derived from denominal verbs and sometimes has no verbs as derivational axes, d) isn’t predictable in SM-patterns, e) has no paradigmatic relation with *īsm tafdīl*. The following examples illustrates how SM type 3 is derived.

| Absolute noun | SM | Verb |
|---------------|----|------|
| ‘body’        | بدن | بدن |
| ‘obese lit. having a big body’ | ببدن | ‘to be obese’ |
| ‘belly’       | بطن | بطن |
| ‘distended’   | مختال | ‘to be distended’ |
| ‘stomach pain, heartburn’ | مختال | ‘to be distended’ |
| ‘breasts’     | ثدي | ثدي |
| ‘(of a woman) having large breast, busty, plump’ | ثدي | ‘to be distended’ |
| ‘body’        | جسم | جسم |
| ‘bodied’      | ملتحم | ‘to be bodied’ |
| ‘brain, cerebrum’ | دماغ | ‘to be braining’ |
| ‘tear’        | ماء | ماء |
| ‘maudlin, tearfully sentimental’ | ماء | ‘(of tears) to drip’ |

[^10]: Dixon & Aikhenvald (2004: 3-5)
| Arabic | English | English |
|--------|---------|---------|
| سم | ‘head’ | ‘to head’ |
| رجل | ‘foot or leg’ | ‘to be on foot’ |
| شعر | ‘hair’ | ‘to be hairy’ |
| شعر و أشعة | ‘armour’ | ‘to be bearded’ |
| عقل | ‘intellect’ | ‘to be intelligent, grown-up’ |
| عقل و عقل | ‘intellectual’ | ‘to be intelligent, grown-up’ |
| عين | ‘eye’ | ‘to be big and lustrous eyes’ |
| عين | ‘eye’ | ‘to be big and lustrous eyes’ |
| عين | ‘eye’ | ‘to be big and lustrous eyes’ |
| دم | ‘milk’ | ‘to breast-feed’ |
| دم | ‘milk’ | ‘to breast-feed’ |
| صدر | ‘meat, flesh’ | ‘to be meaty, fleshy’ |
| صدر | ‘meat, flesh’ | ‘to be meaty, fleshy’ |
| باز | ‘arts’ | ‘to make a bread’ |
| باز | ‘arts’ | ‘to make a bread’ |
| باز | ‘arts’ | ‘to make a bread’ |
| روغن | ‘perfume’ | ‘to be fragrant, use perfume’ |
| روغن | ‘perfume’ | ‘to be fragrant, use perfume’ |
| روغن | ‘perfume’ | ‘to be fragrant, use perfume’ |
| سائل و كحل | ‘kohl or mascara’ | ‘to be coloured with black-mascara’ |
| سائل و كحل | ‘kohl or mascara’ | ‘to be coloured with black-mascara’ |
| سائل و كحل | ‘kohl or mascara’ | ‘to be coloured with black-mascara’ |
| حجر و حجر | ‘stone, rock’ | ‘to be black muddy’ |
| حجر و حجر | ‘stone, rock’ | ‘to be black muddy’ |
| حجر و حجر | ‘stone, rock’ | ‘to be black muddy’ |
| شجر و شجرة | ‘tree, wood’ | ‘woody, (of an area of land) covered with trees’ |
| شجر و شجرة | ‘tree, wood’ | ‘woody, (of an area of land) covered with trees’ |
| شجر و شجرة | ‘tree, wood’ | ‘woody, (of an area of land) covered with trees’ |

Generally, the SM-pattern of type 3 may be different with its noun-pattern. Whereas, which has SM-pattern similarly with its noun-pattern is *jasadun* as mentioned in the examples. SM-patterns of classhood cannot predictable. In classhood, type 3 is allowed SM-pattern *تَفَكَّرَ.*
e.g. ‘heartburn’. However, not all with the pattern belong to this type because it is more strongly claimed to be *ism maf’ul* than SM. For example, ‘(at) fixed times’ is *ism maf’ul* because derived from transitive verb ‘to fix time of’. The verb is denominal verb derived from noun ‘time’. Though type 3 may also allow SM-pattern, it can be claimed as *ism fā’il*. This is because the SM has other pattern with same meaning, such as *bādinun, badīnun, mībdānum* are single SM with same meaning ‘obese’, lit. ‘body with overweight’.

On derivational perspective, SM of type 3 can be derived from verb-triliteral, verb-augmented (*māzūd*), and verb-less. This indicates that type 3 is derived from noun, not from verb. This also weakens the notion that SM should be formed from verb. Likewise, the verbs of the examples above are derived from noun. This linguistic phenomenon is termed as noun incorporation, viz. “a construction in which a noun stem is combined with a verb to form a new, morphologically complex verb” (Sapir 1911 cited Mithun & Barbara, 2000: 916)

The Arabic incorporation of noun was discussed by Glanville (2018) on his work entitled *The Lexical Semantics of the Arabic Verb*. In general, incorporation was defined by him as the incorporation of various lexeme into single word-form. In the incorporation, consonant root is lexical feature core of the word-form, such as *kātibun* ‘writer’ that is incorporation of lexeme *k-t-b* ‘to write’ and *ā-i* ‘agent’. In another discussion, Glanville (2018: 64-65) explained denominal incorporation that is forming a verb with nominal root. He gave some examples of nominal root incorporated with verb-pattern *ifta’ala* as follows.

| Arabic  | English |
|---------|---------|
| عنق     | ‘neck’   |
| تاج     | ‘beard’  |
| سروة   | ‘robe, garment’ |
| كوف     | ‘blanket, cover’ |
| جزيرة   | ‘custom, norm, habit’ |
| عادة    | ‘to embrace’ |
| أبوذُخْرَ | ‘to grow a bread’ |
| أزندى   | ‘to get dressed, wear’ |
| افتراز   | ‘to cover up’ |
| الأطراف | ‘to take as a profession’ |
| اعتاد    | ‘to get accustomed to’ |

Denominal verb with pattern *ifta’ala* is incorporation a noun to a verb having complex semantic structure, viz. noun as an semantic object and pronoun as semantic agent and recipient (reflexive). This explanation applies to all verbs in the example above except the verb *انتقَلَ*.

Based on the explanations, it can be deduced that type 3 is morphological incorporation of noun into adjective (read SM) which is generally with morphological process. Semantic features incorporated into tipe 3 are complicated and difficult to be formulated. As for the examples, the semantic features that appear most often are *having + noun (parts of body) + big/much*, such as *ذَبَق ‘having a big body’ or ‘obese’.*

**Type 4: SM as lexicalization of metaphor**

The characteristics of type 4 are which a) must be functioning *ṣifat* because of *tasybīh* (metaphor), b) has lexical features of nouns, c) is derived from denominal verbs and often has no verbs as derivational axises, d) is in same pattern with its noun-pattern, e) has no paradigmatic relation with *ism tafīl*.

Type 4 of SM are absolute noun functioning as *ṣifat* in *tarkīb wasfiy*, such as *سَيْف* ‘lion’, *حمض* ‘donkey’, *نَبْت* ‘pearls’ in the following example.

(1)
Rajulun asadun
man lion
<mausuf> <ṣifat>
‘a brave man’ (like a lion)

Rajulun himārun
man donkey
<mausuf> <ṣifat>
‘a stupid man (like donkey)

kalāmun durarun
words pearls
<mausuf> <ṣifat>
‘words of wisdom’ (like pearls)

The underlined elements above are absolute noun having lexical content fauna and artefact. They are functioning as ṣifat which aims to explain similarity of characteristic or behaviour between ṣifat and mauṣuf. In Arabic tradition, these phrases construction are encoded as “tasybih”.

Etymologically تَسْبِيحُ tasybih is to similarize. Tasybih, according to Al-Jārim & Amīn, (1999: 20), is to explain one thing or some things with another one because of one similar characteristic or more. Tasybih can be counterparted with term “metaphor” in western linguistics tradition. Metaphor is defined by Lakoff & Johnson (2003) as “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another”. According to Bauer (2000), metaphor is one way of making new words by giving a new meaning to an old word. The metaphor commonly used in human language make it possible to create new lexeme and this phenomenon was named lexicilation of metaphor (Bauer, 2000: 833). So, the word asadun, for Arabs, is reused to symbolize braveness”, himārun to “stupidity”, and durarun to “valuableness”. These examples at least prove this lexicalization. It also may be investigated through presence of denominal verb within Arabic dictionaries. For examples, we can find denominal verb asada and ẓaiba within Arabic-Indonesian dictionary Al-Munawwir (1997, 23 and 436) as below this paragraph. However, not all metaphorical SM’s have a verb-form.

(In English)
- to become confused because seeing a lion
- to become (or be similar with) a lion (in character)
- lion
- the brave, the intrepid
Type 5: SM as term of kinship and social category

The characteristics of type 5 are which a) a few may be functioning as šifāt, b) has lexical features of kinship term and social category, c) is derived from denominal verbs and is often not found the verbs as the derivational axis, d) is in same pattern with its noun-pattern, e) has no paradigmatic relation with ism tafālī.

The following table provides examples of SM type 5 and available feminine forms, and the verbs as derivational axises.

| SM | Verb |
|----|------|
| ‘woman’ | ‘to be sole’ |
| ‘single, unmarried, sole’ | ‘to be sole’ |
| ‘widow/widowed’ | ‘to be widowed’ |
| ‘husband-wife’ | ‘to become lawfull’ |
| ‘mistrness, concubine, secret lover’ | ‘to get a concubine’ |
| ‘friend’ | ‘to be friend with’ |
| ‘adopted son’ | ‘to confess as adopted son’ |
| ‘man’ | ‘to marry’ |
| ‘husband-wife’ | ‘to predate’ |
| ‘ancestor, predecessor’ | ‘to be Mr. – Mrs.’ |
| ‘Mr. – Mrs.’ | ‘to be Mr. – Mrs.’ |
| ‘tribe’ | ‘to be young man-woman’ |
| ‘young man-woman’ | ‘to get old’ |
| ‘old man – woman’ | ‘to be related by marriage’ |
| ‘related by marriage’ | ‘to be friend with’ |
| ‘friend’ | ‘to be childish’ |
| ‘child’ | ‘to be friend with’ |
| ‘friend’ | ‘to hostile’ |
| ‘enemy’ | ‘to be live with, to be companied’ |
| ‘companion’ | ‘to be young man/woman’ |
| ‘boy-girl’ | ‘to be friend with’ |
| ‘tribe’ | ‘to be related by marriage’ |
Not all nouns within the table above has been realized as *ṣifat*. Only a few can be functioning as *ṣifat*, e.g. *yatīm* ‘orphan’, *ṣayyib* ‘widow’, and *aduwwun* ‘enemy’:

| Arabic | English | Verb
|--------|---------|--------|
| عَذَابُ [طَفِيلٍ تَنُفِّشُ عَنْهِ] | ‘leader’ | ‘to become a leader’ |
| وَلَدٌ | ‘child’ | ‘to beget, give birth’ |
|孤儿َةَ - بَيْسَمَةٌ | ‘orphan, fatherless’ | ‘to be an orphan’ |

Categorizing the nouns into SM may be caused by lexical related to, word-pattern, having feminine-form, and overlapping with type 1 which have lexical feature “age”. The first is meaning related to. Analogically, any word that denotes the meaning of the term kinship and social category is classified as SM. Secondly, some of type 5 have similar word-pattern with major SM-pattern, such as * yatīmَ ْ عَنْهِ فَنَفُولَ* . Thirdly, some may be feminized with suffix *تَاءُ تَنِيَّةٌ مَرْبُوْتَةَ* . Fourthly, some classhhood of type 5 also contain lexical content “age”, such as *walad* ‘child’, *šabiyyun* ‘youth/child’, *fatā* ‘youth’, *syābbun* ‘youth’, *unsā* ‘woman (an adult human female)’.

**Type 6: Ism non-SM**

The characteristics of type 6 are which a) must not be or may be functioning as *ṣifat*, b) has lexical features of absolute noun, c) is derived from denominal verbs and the verb is not often found, d) is in same pattern with SM-pattern, e.g. * دَعَمََ فَنُولَ فَنُولَ* , e) none has paradigmatic relation with *ism tafsil*.

It is said that type 6 must not be functioning *ṣifat* because this type is restricted as *ṣifat*. Meanwhile, it said that it may be functioning as *ṣifat* because any ism may be functioning as *ṣifat* through metaphorical mechanism as type 4. So, this type is called with ism non-SM because that its syntactic behavior is so. The following provides examples of SM type 6 and available verbs as derivational axises.

| SM | Verb |
|---|---|
| artefacts | | |
| حَصِبَّةُ | ‘prison’ | ‘to imprison’ |
| رَجِيحٌ | ‘pure wine’ | |
| سَبِيلٌ | ‘way’ | |
| صَرِطٌ | ‘path, way’ | |
| أَرْيَنُ | ‘couch’ | |
‘iron’ ‘to become strong, like an iron’
‘lead, tin’ ‘to be tinning’
‘evening, afternoon’ ‘- - - - - -’
‘dark night’ ‘- - - - - -’
‘evening’ ‘- - - - - -’
‘dark night, darkness’ ‘(of night) to be dark’

b) flora
‘a bitter thorny plant’ ‘- - - - - -’

c) environment
‘rainstorm’ ‘to be raining down’
‘a smokeless flame’ ‘- - - - - -’

d) body and other parts of human
‘pus’ ‘to purulent’

e) onomatopoeia
(1) (the) slightest sound ‘- - - - - -’
‘sigh’ ‘to heave sigh’
‘sob’ ‘to heave sob’

Some ism non-SM may be functioning as *badal* within *tarkīb badaliy* that it is similar construction with tarkīb waṣfiy. Al-Gulāyainiy (1993: 238) defined *tarkīb badaliy* as *tarkīb* consisting of *mubdal minhu* ‘substituted-for’ and *badal* ‘substitute’. Meanwhile, Badawi et al. (2004: 123) counterparts *tarkīb badaliy* with apposition in English, for examples;

(1)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
| \text{al-aqlāmu} & r-рашµу \\
| \text{pen} & \text{lead} \\
| \text{plur. def. fem. nominative} & \text{sing. def. fem. nominative} \\
| \text{<Mubdal minhu>} & \text{<badal>} \\
| \text{pencils lit. 'lead pen'} & \\
\end{array}
\]

(2)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
| \text{as-sikatu} & l-хµadіdu \\
| \text{road} & \text{iron} \\
| \text{sing. def. fem. nominative} & \text{sing. def. masc. nominative} \\
| \text{<Mubdal minhu>} & \text{<badal>} \\
| \text{The railway lit. the iron road'} & \\
\end{array}
\]

Both stuctures above are *tarkīb badaliy* consisting of *badal*, *ar-рашµу* ‘lead’ and *l-хµadіdu* ‘iron’, and *mubdal minhu*, *al-aqlāmu* ‘pen’ and as-sikatu ‘road’. Badal and *mubdal minhu* must be agree in term definity and declension, but not in others. The grammatical meaning
of both tarkīb badaliy above is to characterize, viz. that material substance of mubdal minhu is come from badal.

Badawi et. al. (2004: 123) explained that characterizing material substance in classical Arabic can be expressed by either badaliy (apposition) or idāfiy (annexation). Both structures have been preserved within modern written Arabic. Another similar example found in the Qurʾān is as follows.

(3) ﻣﺎ’ ﺍء ﺺَﺪِﻳﺪَ<Mubdal minhu><badal>
Mā`in ṣadidin
water pus
‘pus water’

The classhood of type 6 include classhood of type 5 that they cannot be functioning as ṣifat. The basic difference between type 6 and type 5 is whether or not it can be feminized.

CONCLUSION

SM was oftencounterparted with adjectives by Western grammarians because the prominent lexical and grammatical features of SM is similar to adjectives. Nevertheless, SM is not similar exactly to adjective because SM has various lexical features other than adjectives and has grammatical features of noun as other Arabic nouns. In addition, the universality of adjectives in cross-linguistic studies of word classes is skeptical because not all languages have adjectives as an independent word class as well as Arabic.

SM is one of Arabic derivative noun subclasses that was given by traditional Arabic grammarians to accommodate other derivative nouns which can be functioning as ṣifat ‘noun attribute’ and have ‘amal. But, it cannot be classified as ism fā’il, ism maf’ūl, ism tafḍīl dan ṣigah mubālagah. In other words, SM is “a trash class” of other Arabic derivative nouns. It also shows that traditional Arabic grammar emphasized a morphosyntactic paradigm. This is understandable because the categorization of Arabic word classes must be on the basis of internal Arabic grammatical criteria. Therefore, as a result, SM has complexities of word-forms and lexical meanings.

The complexity of the SM notions can be fixed by the elaboration of modern linguistics especially about parts of speech and SM notions as internal grammatical criteria. The elaboration suggests five principles of categorization, i.e. a) be functioning as ṣifat, b) lexical features c) the derivation of SM, d) SM-patterns, e) paradigmatic relation with tafḍīl. The application of five principles results in six types of SM, viz. 1) SM in a narrow sense, 2) SM as alternative word-pattern between ism fā’il and ism maf’ūl, 3) SM as absolute noun incorporation, 4) SM as lexicalization of metaphor, 5) SM as a term of kinship and social category, 6) ism non-SM.
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