

Understanding the figure of *sayyid*: The NSM definition of the traits of a pre-Islamic Arabic honorable man *

Bartosz Pietrzak
Jagiellonian University in Krakow
Poland
bartosz.pietrzak7@gmail.com

ملخص:

في الجاهلية، دلت المفرد "سَيِّد" عموماً على زعيم قبلي أو قائد. توقع المجتمع من مثل هذا الشخص طريقة التصرف الخاصة التي عرّفها الجاحظ بقائمة الخصال الستة المشهورة. في المقالة، يُعتبر تنفيذ هذه الخصال وتمثيلها في التصرف نموذجاً نمطياً لميثاق الشرف العامل في مجتمع العرب ما قبل الإسلام. التصويرية الأصلية لميثاق الشرف هذا تُوصف في التفاصيل من خلال تعريف مفاهيم هذه الخصال الستة الذي تُستخدم فيه مفردات اللغة - المعرفة الدلالية الطبيعية "NSM". "NSM" هي منهجية تعريفية من الممكن أن نراها من أحسن أو أدق أدوات التعريف الشفاف ثقافياً للمفاهيم الخاصة بثقافة معينة. في المقالة، تم طرح تعريفات NSM بناءً على الاستطلاع الذي جرى في مرحلتين. أولاً، حُلّت تعريفات مقدّمة في قواميس اللغة العربية الفصحى المؤلفة في القرون الوسطى. ثم عُدّت النتائج في رصد سياقات الاستعمال للمفردات العربية الدالة على الخصال الستة في الشعر الجاهلي. نتيجة لذلك، في المقالة، تُقدّم تعريفات NSM للمفردات العربية التالية: جود (وسخاء) ونجدة وصبر وحلم وبيان، كما ولمفهوم ميثاق الشرف أو التصرف المثالي في مجتمع العرب الجاهليين. في استنتاجات البحث، تم النقاش في موضوعين: الخصوصية الثقافية للمفاهيم المحلّة والنقد لمنهجية تعريف NSM وكفاءتها في تعريف المفاهيم الخاصة ثقافياً.

Abstract

The lexeme *sayyid* was used in pre-Islamic Arabic society in reference to a tribal chief or a leader. Such a person was expected to behave in a certain way, which was defined by al-Jahiz in a form of six character traits. In this paper, I argue that realization of these traits – their enactment in life – could be considered as following the code of honor persisting in the society of Arabs of al-Jahiliyya. By rendering the definition of the concepts of these traits, I aim to depict, in detail, honorable behavior as it was conceptualized by pre-Islamic Arabs. In my definition of the concepts, I use the terms of the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM), being the most culture-transparent tool for explicating culture-specific concepts. I posit my explications based on two analyses. First, I analyzed definitions proposed in medieval Classical Arabic dictionaries. The acquired data was later refined in a study on contexts of the use of lexical items denoting the aforementioned character traits and associated modes of behavior. As a result, I explicate the meaning of the following Classical Arabic concepts: *zūd*, *naẓda*, *ṣabr*, *ḥilm*, *bayān*. On the basis of the posited explications, I proposed a definition of the pre-Islamic Arabic code of honor. In the conclusion, I discuss the cultural specificity of analyzed

*The article presents the results of the research project *Conceptualization of the figure of sayyid in pre-Islamic Arabic society. A Cultural Linguistic study*, which was financed by the National Science Centre, Poland (project no. 2020/37/N/HS3/01976). I would like to express my gratitude to the anonymous reviewers of this paper whose invaluable suggestions contributed to enhancing the form and the content of this article.

vocabulary, as well as the critique of NSM as a sufficient tool for culture-specific concepts explication.

Key words: Classical Arabic; Early Arabic Poetry; character trait; Natural Semantic Metalanguage; conceptual metaphor; conceptual metonymy; honorable behavior

1 Introduction

In some contexts of Islam, the *sayyid* is a person who can trace back their origins to the Prophet Muḥammad, enjoying because of that certain respect and veneration (Morimoto, 2012). Before Islam, however, the lexeme *sayyid* was first and foremost used in reference to a tribal chief or lord, from whom the tribe members expected certain behaviors (‘Alī, 1993). This behavior could be defined as the realization of some personal traits, often collectively referred to by an umbrella term of *murū’a* “manliness” – the quality of being a complete man (Pellat, 1983). Although historical literature provides many possible listings of these traits (Pellat, 1983), their most famous set was proposed in the 9th c. by al-Jahiz, and consists of the following six qualities: *saḥā* “generosity,” *naẓda* “bravery,” *ṣabr* “patience,” *ḥilm* “sound judgment, moderation, forbearance,” *tawāḍu* “humbleness,” and *bayān* “eloquence” (‘Alī, 1993).

I suggest considering this set of character traits as a model for a certain type of behavior. Whilst a character trait doesn’t necessarily translate to conduct (cf. Wierzbicka, 2012), it can be considered as an ideal for a particular behavior, which can be realized by its possessor. Perhaps originally, the possession of the aforementioned traits was a *sine qua non* requirement of being considered a candidate for *sayyid* ‘tribal chief’. In other words, one can see them as encoding the ideal behavior expected from that figure. With time, however, by means of a metonymy, the concept of *sayyid* began to serve as a model for a man who, while not being a tribal chief, was a good candidate for that position. Such a man excelled in admirable ideal conduct that could be seen, I believe, as a kind of code of honor persisting in the society of pre-Islamic Arabs. Consequently, one can assume that the character traits of a good candidate for a tribal chief can be considered as a model for certain behavior that entitled someone to be referred to as *karīm* “honorable or noble one.” The intention of this paper is to provide a fair explication of the concepts of these character traits as well as of the model for that particular behavior of a *karīm* “honorable, noble” man.

The focus of my study was on the cultural perception of the ideal or honorable behavior persisting among pre-Islamic Arabs, i.e., the inhabitants of Arabian deserts and semi-deserts living in so-called al-Jahiliyya, 100-150 years before Islam. Because of that I chose to focus on so-called Classical Arabic that was originally a formulaic variety of Arabic language employed by pre-Islamic poets in their oral poetry composition. As such, this linguistic idiom might be considered as the vehicle of transmission for original pre-Islamic Arabic cultural conceptualizations (cf. Zwettler, 1978). Thus, the major source of observations I will present in this paper belongs to the corpus of Early Arabic Poetry, i.e., the existing record of pre-Islamic Arabic oral tradition (Zwettler, 1978).

Following Pellat (1983), I will omit the trait of *tawāḍu* ‘humbleness,’ which seemingly, ended up in the set proposed by al-Jahiz because of later attempts to adjust the pre-Islamic Arabic code of honor to Islamic morality. All in all, the intention of my paper is to characterize the ideal behaviors associated with the figure of *sayyid*, which served as a base for mapping this role schema onto the concept of IDEAL NOBLE HONORABLE BEHAVIOR.

2 Natural Semantic Metalanguage

The Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) is a methodology developed by Anna Wierzbicka (1992), Cliff Goddard (2008) Goddard and numerous other researchers (e.g., Gladkova, 2010; Goddard and Wierzbicka, 1994,

2002; Habib, 2011; Levisen, 2013; Peeters, 2006 on the basis of the conception proposed by Polish scholar Andrzej Bogusławski in 1960' (Wierzbicka, 1992). It aims at rendering a definition of any concept or expression in universal, simple terms, so as to ensure a fair comparison of the semantic content encoded in different languages (Habib, 2019). The terms used in NSM, known as semantic primes, have been found to be simple (in the sense that they cannot be explicated further using simpler concepts) and universal (i.e., have exact equivalents in all (or most of) languages) (Habib, 2019). Because of that, NSM explications avoid circularity and/or ambiguity. Up to date, NSM-associated scholars managed to identify 65 of such semantic primes. Their English exponents – the way they are lexicalized in English – were presented by Goddard and Wierzbicka (2014). The Arabic exponents of semantic primes were proposed by Habib (2011, 2019, 2020, 2021).

In the explication of the concepts of the aforementioned honorable traits, resorting to NSM seems necessary as some of the elements of the Islamic Arabic code – such as *ḥilm* “sound judgment, moderation, forbearance” – are highly culturally specific and, as a result, the sheer translation of their meaning into English is rather unsatisfying and sometimes even confusing. This said, the NSM methodological frame is not flawless (see, e.g., Blumczyński, 2013). In this paper, I will also add to this critique by pointing towards some incidental insufficiencies of NSM in rendering definitions, enabling fine delimitation between near-synonyms, or even a description of culturally specific content – the tasks for which it is generally employed (cf. Travis, 1997).

Despite that, I will pursue using NSM in rendering my definitions. This is because my goal is not to translate or propose an as-close-as-it-is-possible translation of five Arabic words listed by al-Jahiz (cf. Blumczyński, 2013). My intention is to provide a fair culture-transparent explication of CA concepts epitomizing certain culture-specific expectations as for the honorable conduct persisting in the society of al-Jahiliyya Arabs. I must admit that NSM – despite all its flaws – is still the best method for positing such an explication since probably, it “is the most advanced attempt in contemporary semantics to establish an inventory of universal primitive concepts” (Geeraerts, 2010, p. 128) [cursive added]

3 State of the art

The NSM methodology has been employed within the studies on Arabic language chiefly by Sandy Habib, whose research concerns mostly the explication of Arabic and Hebrew religious concepts (Habib, 2014, 2017, 2018). Habib was also the researcher who proposed the list of Arabic exponents of the semantic primes (Habib, 2011, 2019, 2020, 2021). Moreover, NSM was also employed by Nader Al-Jallad (2010) in a paper regarding the definition of Arabic SHAME-related concepts. Up to date, no NSM research has been conducted on the conceptualizations encoded in Classical Arabic, especially based on data derived from the corpus of Early Arabic Poetry.

When it comes to character traits like those I intend to examine in my paper, only English and Polish concepts of COURAGE and BRAVERY have been studied within the frame of NSM. These have been explicated by Wierzbicka (1992, 2012). In general, it seems NSM researchers have rarely attempted to explicate concepts of character traits or certain modes of behavior. An example of a study of this kind was the paper by Travis (1997) on English concepts of KINDNESS.

Similarly, the HONOR-related concepts seem to have also been neglected in that methodological schema. It seems that so far, only the Polish concept of HONOR has been explicated (Wierzbicka, 1992).

4 Research procedure

In my study, I analyzed materials that can be seen as the closest possible representation of the language of pre-Islamic Arabs and the conceptualizations encoded in it. Thus, I studied the meaning of units of the lexicon of Classical Arabic (CA), which as the language of Early Arabic Poetry, is the only sufficiently recorded variety of Arabic language employed by Arabs of al-Jahiliyya. I'm fully aware that CA was not the native tongue of any of those people (cf. Zwettler, 1978; however, I assume that the conceptualizations encoded in its lexicon can be considered as the closest approximation of the elements of the pre-Islamic (pan-)Arabic conceptual system.

Thus, in my study, I employed two data sources. First, I studied definitions of the analyzed vocabulary presented in the following medieval Classical Arabic dictionaries (CAD): *Kitāb al-‘ayn* (KtA) by al-Ḥalīl Ibn Aḥamd († 786), *Kitāb zamharat al-luxa* (AlG) by Ibn Durayd († 933), *Aṣ-ṣiḥāḥ* (AsS) by al-Jawharī († 1003), *Maqāyis al-luxa* (MqL) by Ibn Fāris († 1004), and *Lisān al-‘Arab* (LsA) by Ibn Manẓūr († 1311). These definitions were reformulated into NSM explications. They were consequently verified in an analysis of contexts of the use of the examined lexical items in the corpus of Early Arabic Poetry (CEAP), consisting of ca. 280,000-word tokens.

I choose the aforementioned sources due to their relative relevancy in the study of the original pre-Islamic Arabic lexical semantics. CAD compilers were known to employ al-Jahiliyya poetry as a golden standard in their explication efforts, whereas CEAP might be considered as the record for the oral pre-Islamic tradition as it was recorded during the *tadwīn* period in the 8th-10th century (Zwettler, 1978). In both cases, perhaps, one can have doubts as to the originality or authenticity of the sources, yet they are admittedly as authentic as it gets in respect to the sources for studies on pre-Islamic Arabic conceptualizations (cf. Bauer, 2010; Zwettler, 1978).

For my analysis, based on the aforementioned sources, I selected the lexical items presented in the table below (Tab. 1.). The table also contains information about their frequencies within CEAP. The items in the table should be considered as lexemes, i.e., they stand for clusters of textual forms such as different nominal/adjectival (e.g., plural) and verbal (aspectual, modal etc.) forms.

Table 1: Analyzed lexical items referring to selected concepts of the HONORABLE TRAITS of the *sayyid*

Concept of a trait	Lexemes		Number of occurrences (normalized word count per 10k)			Section
GENEROSITY- HOSPITALITY	saḥāʾ		3 (0.11)	4 (0.14)	135 (4.78)	4.1.
		saḥī	0 (0)			
		saḥīya	1 (0.04)			
	zūd		42 (1.49)	131 (4.63)		
		zawād	21 (0.74)			
		zāda-yazūd	68 (2.41)			
COURAGE	naẓda		19 (0.67)	38 (1.34)	4.2.	
		naẓd, naẓīd, naẓīd	19 (0.67)			
ENDURANCE-PATIENCE	ṣabr		54 (1.91)	90 (3.18)	4.3.	
		ṣabūr, ṣābir	36 (1.27)			
ḥilm ("sound judgement, moderation, forbearance")	ḥilm		70 (2.48)	85 (3.01)	4.4.	
		ḥalīm	15 (0.53)			
ELOQUENCE	bayān		12 (0.42)	12 (0.42)	19 (0.67)	4.5.
		bayyin	0			
	faṣāḥa		0	6 (0.21)		
		faṣīḥ	6 (0.21)			
	balāra		1 (0.04)	1 (0.04)		
		balīr	0			

5 Results

All the explications presented in the following sections define concepts of character traits that can be considered as epitomizing certain type of behavior. This behavior in toto is consequently proposed to constitute the code of behavior expected from a *sayyid*-tribal chief and at large from a man of honor, a *karīm* man. The explications define first and foremost a concept of someone behaving in a certain way and referred to as such by a relevant adjective/noun (someone is X). The link between this way of behaving and the concept of a trait was established either via a metonymic extension of a category ACTION into the category TRAIT, or via a causal relationship between a TRAIT and an ACTION. The difference between an ACTION and a TRAIT was well discernable in

the CEAP, where some items functioned in the context as a verbal noun indicating an ACTION, and others were used instead to denote a TRAIT imposing onto the agent a certain way of performing an ACTION. Therefore, the explications are structured either by a metonymic model – as in case of *zūd* (*saḥā'*), *naẓda*, and *ṣabr* – or by the causal one – in case of *ḥilm* and *bayān*. In both cases, I explicate the inner quality of a given character trait using the metaphor of BEING OF A TRAIT/QUALITY IS HAVING A TRAIT/QUALITY INSIDE that can be observed in the CEAP (cf. Pietrzak, 2022). In the case of the causal models (i.e., in the explications of *ḥilm* and *bayān*), I supplemented this metaphor with the statement of causality in the form of because of this something, this someone is like this.

What is quite important is that all the following scripts are actions performed (and expected to be performed) by men. Nevertheless, in the presented explications, I do not resort to the use of the semantic molecule man[M]. Although the extent to which women followed or could follow the code consisting of these behaviors is difficult to determine, the data from CEAP indicates that such behavior like *ṣabr* was not only enacted by women (cf. t33:28), but also expected from them (cf. t34:22).

5.1 GENEROSITY

In the set of the traits proposed by al-Jahiz, *saḥā'* “generosity” stands as its first element. This might suggest some prominence of the concept of GENEROSITY within the whole script of the honorable behavior embodied in this set. This prominence can be clearly observed in the semantic development of the concepts of *karam* and *karīm*. Although most likely, their original signification was that of GENEROSITY, in the course of time they seem to have begun to metonymically signify concepts of HONORABILITY/NOBILITY-EXCELLENCE; the evidence can be found in the contexts of use of the lexemes *karam* and *karīm* in CEAP (Pietrzak, 2022). In other words, GENEROSITY was an essential – perhaps stereotypical – element of the code of HONORABLE BEHAVIOR, prominent enough to serve as a metonymic model pars-pro-toto for its conceptualization (Pietrzak, 2022).

In CEAP, the lexeme *saḥā'* is quite rare. This indicates that it was a rather less salient profile of the concept of GENEROSITY. The CAD all agree on defining it via another concept: *zūd* (KtA2: 228; AsS: 524; LsA14: 457), which, in the contrary, is much more abundant in the corpus. It should be read as an indication of its greater salience for the users of CA, and its intuitiveness. The evidence for the latter can be found in CAD, which seem to have a problem providing any direct explication of what *zūd* meant (cf. KtA1: 272; AlG: 451), or at least provide a circulatory definition by explicating it as *saḥā'* (LsA3: 166). Nevertheless, the frequency of *zūd* in CEAP made me decide to treat it as a more general concept of GENEROSITY, whereas *saḥā'* as its profile. Perhaps, it served for bringing the focus onto a stereotypical or idealized sub-scene of generosity (giving possessions away to others), being the concept of generosity of the extent of the total distribution of one's wealth (cf. MqL3: 146; AsS: 524; LsA14: 458).

The data from CEAP suggests that the verb *zāda-yazūd* – of which *zūd* is a derived verbal noun – refers to the action of GIVING AWAY MUCH/A LOT. It seems to be further profiled into two scenarios: GIVING MUCH WATER (about the sky/rain etc.) and GIVING AWAY MUCH TO OTHER (=BEING GENEROUS), both being delimited by a set of different derivatives (*zawd* “heavy rain” and *zawd* or *zā'id* “heavy, copious (about the rain)” vs. *zūd* “generosity” and *zawād* “generous”). This suggests that the most important element of the script of GENEROSITY is GIVING AWAY something to other people. This ‘something’ is rather elusively defined as a gift or donation from one's possession, as in (1). In CEAP, *zūd* is first and foremost an act of GIVING AWAY, yet sometimes it is used also in the sense of a trait (i.e., someone could do something with *zūd*), which made one share their possession with others, as in (2).

1. *nubbi 'tu 'anna l-zūda min-hum ḥalīfatun yazūdūna fī yabsi z-zabībi wa-fī l-qatfi*
I was told that the generosity (*zūd*) follows them: they are generous (*yazūdūna*) when the raisin is dry and when it is [fresh and ready] to be harvested (cf. t39:320).
2. *'urazzī fawādila dī bahẓatin mina n-nāsi yazma 'u ḥazman wa-zūdā*
From among all people, I hope for gifts from the owner of splendor, who has both the good judgment

and the generous nature (*zūd*) (cf. t19:60).

Thus, GENEROSITY meant simply sharing all one had with others. It seems also to have covered the concept of HOSPITALITY. In other words, a generous man could not refuse to host someone, and he was expected to share all his belongings with the guest. Such a custom is well-described within the historical literature (e.g., ‘Alī, 1993), as well as found in CEAP, as in (3).

3 *fa-’innī zabānu l-kalbi baytī muwaṭṭa’un ’azūdu ’idā mā n-naḥsu ṣaḥḥa ḍamīru-hā*

Truly, I am a coward of a dog – my house is [so often] visited [by guests] – I am generous (*’azūdu*), even when my soul’s conscious [tries to] be meager (cf. t19:89)

The fact that a generous man shared all that he had with another must have resulted in the existence of a stereotypical ideal sub-scene of GENEROSITY, namely giving away to another so much that one loses his wealth at all. As I mentioned, it appears that the lexeme *ṣaḥā’* was actually a lexical means of singling out this sub-scene, referring by that to a particular profile of GENEROSITY. This sub-scene might have been a tool that served EAP poets to highlight their generosity in eulogies, as in (4) or in (5), frequently employing a figure of the complaining wife as the herald of one’s great generosity.

4 *qā’ilatin ’ahlakta bi-l-zūdi māla-nā wa-naḥsa-ka ḥattā ḍarra naḥsa-ka zūdu-hā*

She was saying: Due to the generosity (*zūd*), you made us lose our possessions and your soul! [Since you were generous so much] that your soul was damaged by its [own] generosity (*zūd*) (cf. t19:46).

5 *fa-lam tada ’i s-suyūfu la-nā ’aduwwan wa-lam yada ’i s-ṣaḥā’u ladayya mālā*

And [our] swords did not leave us any [more] enemy [to fight with], and [our] generosity (*ṣaḥā’*) did not leave me any possessions (cf. t37:127).

All in all, the NSM explication of pre-Islamic Arabic concept of *zūd*-GENEROSITY might be represented as a definition of what it means to be *zawād* “generous”. I described the metonymic extension of the action of GENEROSITY into the character trait of BEING GENEROUS as a statement of shared knowledge (g. & h.). In h., I included the element sometimes, since in CEAP, *zūd* first and foremost indicated behavior and not a character trait. Consequently, one can propose a following explication:

Someone is *zawād*

- a When people think about this someone, they can think like this:
- b This someone has some things
- c At many times, this someone wants other people to have many of these things
- d Because of that, this someone does something
- e Because of it, other people can have many of these things
- f These other people can think like this: ‘this someone is a very good someone’
- g Because of that people can think like this: ‘something is inside of this someone’
- h These people can sometimes say what this thing is with the word *zūd*.

5.2 *Nazda*-COURAGE (?)

The second element of the script of HONORABLE BEHAVIOR I'd like to discuss is the concept referred to by the lexeme *nazda*. Although often translated as the English courage, it is in fact a conceptually rich notion and its semantic development seems to have arisen from some metaphoric and metonymic mappings. The original meaning of *nazda* seems to be derived from the lexeme *nazd*: "hill, the elevation of the terrain (AlG; 451; MqL5: 391)", and it can be seen as metaphorically conceptualizing HARSHIP, DISTRESS (i.e., something difficult to go through using the simile of a physical elevation, cf. MqL5: 391). This signification of distress, hardship, a difficult situation, or a challenge can be found in CAD definitions (AsS: 1117; LsA3: 511, 512), as well as in several instances in CEAP, such as (6).

- 6 *ka-laytin 'abī šiblayni yaḥmī 'arīna-hu 'iqā huwa lāqā nazdatan lam yu'arridi*
Abu Šiblayni protects his lair like a lion, and while encountering a hardship (*nazda*), he does not withdraw out of fear (cf. t22:26).

Such *nazda* seems to have been further elaborated as the action of overcoming such a difficult, challenging situation, and eventually as a character trait or the ability to do so. In other words, CA *nazda* meant [α] a challenging state of affairs, [β] an action of rising up to it and overcoming it, and [γ] an inner predisposition to do so. The significations [β] and [γ] might be seen as further metonymic extensions of the category. They are all attested in CEAP, [β] in such lines as (7), in which *nazda* occurs in the plural, and [γ] in such as (8).

- 7 *'uṭnī 'alay-ka bi-mā 'alimtu wa-mā sallafta fī n-nazadāti wa-d-dikri*
I do praise you for what I know – for what you have left behind in [all those] instances of [your] courage (*nazadāt*) and in [that what is worth] remembering (cf. t22:31).

- 8 *wa-man kāna ṣallāban bi-'aqlin wa-nazdatin fa-dū l-ḡaddi 'amri l-ma 'īṣati ṣālību-h*
Thus, the one who excels in intellect and in courage (*nazda*), surpasses in the matters of life the one, who [only] has [a noble] ancestor (cf. t37:37).

As for the script of HONORABLE BEHAVIOR, the most significant concept referred to by *nazda* is the meaning [β], i.e., the concept of overcoming obstacles, the distressing situation. A man doing so could be referred to in CA by several nominal forms such as *nazd*, *nazid*, or *nazīd*, instances of which, in CEAP, are very rare. Nevertheless, based on the overall corpus data on *nazda*, I was able to point towards some specifics of this action. Thus, *nazda* meaning rising up to a challenge can occur in two different settings. First, a man can overcome distress that has befallen him personally, meaning he performs actions which means he survives it – as in (6). Second – as in (9) – he could perform *nazda* to assist someone who was going through a difficult situation. In fact, the latter scenario seems to be quite prominent and gives rise to yet further extensions of the category into meaning the readiness to support.

- 9 *wa-lā tatrukan-hu mā ḥayīta li-mu 'ḡamin wa-kun raḡulan dā nazdatin wa-'afāfi*
Due to the great matter, do not desert him as long as you live; be [then] a man of courageous assistance (*nazda*) and virtue! (cf. t24:56).

To define the concept of *nazda*, I decided to explicate separately the meaning [α] and the meanings [β] and [γ]. The first of my explications presents the definition of *nazda*₁, i.e., the concept of HARSHIP or DISTRESS. It can be rendered as follows:

*nazda*¹

- a Something can happen

- b People can say what this thing is with the word *naẓda*
- c It can be like this:
- d Someone thinks like this: ‘Very bad things happen. If I do not do something, something very bad can happen to me’

The second explication defines the concept of *naẓda*² that can be understood as being *naẓid*, i.e., possessing certain inner strength to face *naẓda*¹-HARDSHIP-DISTRESS. The explication I rendered below uses the concept of *naẓda*1 as a semantic molecule. As in the case of the explication of *ẓūd*, I added the NSM statement defining the metonymic extension from ACTION (i.e., OVERCOMING DISTRESS) to TRAIT (i.e., BEING ABLE TO OVERCOME DISTRESS). This element captures the polysemic nature of the lexeme *naẓda*.

someone is *naẓid*

- a When something like *naẓda*1M happens to this someone, this someone thinks like this: ‘I do not feel bad because of this something. I want to think like this: I can do some things. Because of that, nothing very bad can happen to me’
- b When something like *naẓda*^{1M} happens to someone else, this someone thinks like this: ‘This someone else feels bad because of this something. I do not feel bad because of this something. I want to think like this: I can do some things. Because of that, nothing very bad can happen to this someone else’
- c Because of that people can think like this: ‘something is inside of this someone’
- d These people can sometimes say what this thing is with the word *naẓda*.

5.3 *Ṣabr*: ENDURANCE and PATIENCE

The concept of *ṣabr* is structured by a conceptual metaphor of (FORCEFUL) RESTRAINT which might be deduced from CAD entries (KtA2: 376; AlG: 312; AsS: 631; LsA4: 506-7). Originally then, the lexeme *ṣabr* was a verbal noun referring to an action of restraining someone, as is still the case in some places in CEAP (cf. t28:180).

Metaphorically, however, it referred to a certain action, which eventually served as a model for a character trait. This action could be seen as (FORCEFUL) RESTRAINT of oneself from reacting in a certain way while facing certain circumstances. This reaction, I believe, could be described as giving up or submitting oneself to negative consequences inflicted by those circumstances. Depending on the nature of these circumstances, this reaction was profiled in at least two ways.

First, most prominently, *ṣabr* belonged to a script of NON-GIVING UP/NON-DISENGAGING/HOLDING ON, while facing some sort of calamity. The calamity schema could be elaborated here in many ways: it could be a natural misfortune as in (10), a battle, poverty, separation from a lover (including their death), or even ingratitude as in (11). The concept of *ṣabr* would then roughly translate to the English PERSEVERANCE or ENDURANCE.

- 10 *wa-ṣabrun ‘alà d-dahri fī ruz’i-hi (...)*

Thus, while facing bad [fortune] in its tragedy, [he] endures (*ṣabr*) (...) (cf. t28:167)

- 11 *‘uḥibbu banī ‘absin wa-law hadarū damī maḥabbatan ‘abdin ṣādiqī l-qawli ṣābiri*

I would have [still] loved [my clan] Banū ‘Abs – even if they had left my blood unretaliated. [I would have loved them] with the love of an enduring (*ṣābir*), honest slave (cf. t21:86)

Less frequently – in 8 contexts only – *ṣabr* referred to behavior one could understand as PATIENCE or TOLERANCE. It means the ability to restrain oneself from ACTING IMMEDIATELY, without a delay, as in (12).

This verse describes *ṣabr* as PATIENCE in one's advances towards a woman, which aimed to avoid offending her and thus failing in achieving the goal (cf. t28:34-5).

- 12 *ṣabran barīda bna rayṭin 'inna-hā raḥimun ḥubtum bi-hā fa-'anāḥat-kum bi-za'zā'i*
 Baxīd Ibn Rayṭ, [approach her] with patience (*ṣabr*) since she is [your] kin. You sinned with her, so she has knocked you down with clamor (cf. t17:162).

In my interpretation, both profiles of *ṣabr* could be explicated in the same manner as RESTRAINING ONESELF from a reaction, which is always the easiest possible reaction to given circumstances, yet it must surely result in a failure in attaining some goals. In the case of *ṣabr*-PATIENCE, it is quite evident. Yet *ṣabr*-ENDURANCE can also be understood in the same way. Here, the goal of an action is to manifest one's strength while facing challenges – of different kinds – reinforcing by that their social status. Naturally, the easiest reaction to those challenges is disengagement from facing them; yet this would inevitably result in lowering one's repute as someone who could not stand a trial.

Eventually, *ṣabr*, as a concept of an action, served as a metonymic model for a character trait, which in CEAP is sometimes conceptualized in terms of MASS, as in (13).

- 13 *wa-lā ta'dī 'azā'an ba'da ṣaḥrin fa-qad ṭuliba l-'azā'u wa-'īla ṣabrī*
 (Oh, my crying eye), do not pass over Ṣaḥr in consolation, [since] any consolation and comfort has been [forever] removed, and [all] my endurance (*ṣabr*) is exhausted (cf. t33:43)

The explication of *ṣabr* must define first and foremost a script of an action that was referred to by the verb *ṣabara-yaṣbir*. Thus, the explication should start from describing the behavior of *ṣabr* as being *ṣābir*, i.e., doing *ṣabara-yaṣbir*. Similarly to the concepts of *zūd* and *naẓda*, I included *ṣabr* in the explication as what people could use to refer to a character trait of someone enacting this type of behavior.

someone is *ṣābir*

- a This someone thinks like this:
- b Something very bad happened to me
- c I feel very bad
- d At the same time, I do not want other bad things to happen to me because of this very bad thing
- e Because of this, I want to think like this: 'after some time, I will feel something good. I want to live like I lived before this very bad thing happened.'
- f Because of that people can think like this: 'something is inside of this someone'
- g These people can sometimes say what this thing is with the word *ṣabr*.

As we can see, the explication does not contain the description of the metaphoric model *ṣabr* IS (FORCEFUL) SELF-RESTRAINT, which seems crucial for a satisfactory description of the concept of *ṣabr*.

5.4 *Ḥilm*

The concept of *ḥilm* is perhaps the most difficult to explicate by means of a definition in conceptually "full-blown" terms. For instance, E. Lane defined *ḥilm* as "Forbearance; clemency; the quality of forgiving and concealing offences; or moderation; gentleness; deliberateness; a leisurely manner of proceeding, or of deportment, &c.; patience, as meaning contr. of hastiness; gravity; staidness; sedateness; calmness (cf. Lane, 1968a)."

As one can see, it is then a concept of a trait with many characteristics. In fact, it is *ḥilm* that provides the best case for advocating for the use of NSM in the explication of some Arabic meanings.

In contrast to the previously analyzed concepts, *ḥilm* is primarily a CHARACTER TRAIT. In other words, *ḥilm* is something that makes someone behave in a certain way. As a character trait, it is something closely related to *ʿaql*, i.e., reason or intelligence (LsA12: 169), which was perhaps a concept of a sense that holds someone back from behavior that might be fatal (or at least unprofitable) for them (cf. LsA11: 548). Consequently, *ḥilm* is linked to the avoidance of foolishness – *ḡahl* – which occurs in CEAP as its most frequent antonym. Moreover, as in (14), *ḥilm* is a trait – quite like a kind of wisdom – that is associated with maturity or even old age. It is the ability to perform an action that is acquired alongside intelligence in the course of a man's personal development.

- 14 *wa-inna safāha š-šayḥi lā ḥilma ba ʿda-hu wa- ʿinna l-fatā ba ʿda s-safāhati yaḥlumi*
Truly, after the foolishness of an old man, no wisdom (*ḥilm*) will ever come. A young man, however, can get wiser after being foolish (cf. t22:78)

A man, who behaves with *ḥilm*, was referred to as *ḥalīm*, and his behavior can be characterized by the manner known as *ʿanāʾī* that is frequently used in CAD in defining *ḥilm* itself (cf. KtA1: 351; AlG: 565; AsS: 278). The concept of *ʿanāʾī*, I believe, might be understood as deliberateness in proceeding. In other words, acting with *ʿanāʾī* is acting at the right time, or waiting for the right moment (cf. LsA14: 58-60). In the case of *ḥalīm*, this “leisurely manner of proceeding, or of deportment” is a result of his *ʿaql*-intelligence – deliberating over matters before reacting to them. As a consequence, a *ḥalīm* man undertakes an action in the most suitable moment, as in (15), or even disengages from it completely when realizing its futility, as in (16). Moreover, he is not easily agitated, angered, or upset, as in (17), and easily forgives, as in (19).

- 15 *wa-qul li-bni ʿabbāsin turā-ka muḥawwifan bi-ḡahli-ka ḥilmī ʿinna-nī ʾayru ʾāfili*
Tell [ʿAbdallāh], son of ʿAbbās: in your ignorance, my calmness (*ḥilm*) will appear to you as dreadful. Truly, I am not someone who forgets [offenses] (cf. t40:106).
- 16 *fa- ʿin šī ʿtum ʿan-nī nahītum safīha-kum wa-qāla la-hu dū ḥilmi-kum ʿayna taḡhabu*
If you wish [to have peace of mind] with me, stop listening to the fool from among you, to whom the man possessing [all] of your sound judgment (*ḥilm*) had said: where are you going? (cf. t20:17).
- 17 *hal li-l-ḥalīmi ʿalā mā fāta min ʿasafin ʿam hal li-ʿayšin maḡā fī d-dahri min ḡalafi*
Shall a wise man (*ḥalīm*) be sad because of what has gone? Can life passing with time [get back] what is already behind? (t14:111)
- 18 *(al-ʾāfīlu ...) bi-ta ʿammudin min-hu wa-ḥilmin ḡīna yabṣī l-ḥilma rāḡih*
(He was a man who always used to forgive) in his deliberateness and wisdom (*ḥilm*), [since] when he was resorting to wisdom (*ḥilm*), it was a great (*ḥilm*) (cf. t33:26)

All of the aforementioned elements were included in the following explication. I included in it the statement (k. & l.) that *ḥilm* is the character that is responsible for making one behave like *ḥalīm*.

someone is *ḥalīm*

- a This someone can be like this:
- b If this someone wants to do something, this someone thinks like this:
- c I know some moments are bad to do this something.
- d Because of that I do not do this, if the moment is bad.

- e Because of that this someone can do this something in some other time. This someone can not do this something.
- f If other people do bad things to this someone, this someone thinks like this:
- g I know this: ‘When people do not think much, they can do bad things to other people’
- h Because of that I do not want to do bad things to these people because of this something bad they did to me.
- i I want to think like this now: After some time, I will feel good. Because of this, I want to live as I lived before these people did this bad thing to me
- j Because of this, this someone does not do something bad to these people.
- k Because of that people can think like this: ‘Something is inside of this someone. Because of this something, this someone is like this’
- l These people can say what this thing is with the word *hilm*.

5.5 ELOQUENCE

The last of the traits listed by al-Jahiz to be defined is the notion of *bayān* “eloquence”, which occurs in CEAP in rarity. It seems to have been a concept of a trait – characterizing either an act of speech, as in (19), or as in (20), someone, i.e., their ability to speak in a certain way. A speech or someone of *bayān* was *bayyin*, meaning that they were intelligible to others. As it is implied in (20), it also indicated a certain admirable way of speaking.

- 19 *nadimtu ‘alā lisānin fāta min-nī fa-layta bayāna-hu fī zawfī ‘ikmi*
I did regret the speech which was uttered by me! Oh, how much I’d love to have seen its eloquence (*bayān*) [hidden at that time] at the bottom of a camel-purse (cf. t39:347).
- 20 *tafāqadtum ‘alāma haṣawtumū-nī wa-lam ‘aḏlim wa-lam ‘uḥlas bayānī*
You have lost track of each other! Why have you [decided to] satirize me when I wasn’t ill-treating [you], and my eloquence wasn’t robbed away (cf. t38:315).

CAD defines *bayān-bayyin* by providing its (near)-synonyms: *faṣāḥa-faṣīḥ*, and *balāra-balīr*, which occurred in only 7 contexts in CEAP. They seem to have denoted two profiles of ELOQUENCE. *Faṣāḥa* was a concept of ELOQUENCE meaning the ability to produce clear speech without mistakes or errors, whereas *balāraa* profiled ELOQUENCE as the ability of satisfactory transposition of one’s intended meaning (*ma’nā*) from one’s mind to the minds of their interlocutors. Nevertheless, in the essence, they both meant more or less the same as *bayān*: a characteristic of one’s speech or one’s ability of speech as intelligible to everyone and by that as admirable and – perhaps – pleasurable. Therefore, the NSM explication of these three concepts can be explicated as follows:

someone is *bayyin/faṣīḥ/balīr*

- a This someone can be like this:
- b When this someone want to say something to other people, this someone says it
- c When people hear it, people can always know very well what this someone thought
- d Because of that, people think something very good about this someone
- e Because of that people can think like this: ‘Something is inside of this someone. Because of this something, this someone is like this’
- f These people can say what this thing is with the words: *bayān, faṣāḥa, balāra*.

The explication does not define differences in profiling observable in the sets of concepts *bayān-bayyin*, *faṣāḥa-faṣīḥ*, and *balāra-balīr*. It was not impossible to describe these differences in terms of NSM. Nevertheless, in my opinion, such description would be quite cumbersome. Therefore, I decided to depict the profiling differences discernable between the aforementioned sets by representing the metaphoric mapping structuring the analyzed concepts. Thus, *bayān* as ELOQUENCE means simply a characteristic of speech/someone in terms of a metaphor of SEPARATION-DISCONNECTION. This basic meaning of *bayān* is still present in CEAP (t13:40) and it actually lent a structure to two concepts: that of UNDERSTANDING-COMPREHENDING (cf. t14:25; t22:25; t24:35) and that of being COMPREHENSIVE, CLEAR, INTELLIGIBLE. In both cases, the metaphor depicts the act of COMPREHENSION in terms of SEPARATING EVIDENCE into smaller units. In other words, to COMPREHEND is to ANALYZE – DISMANTLE – the given evidence. Similarly, to SPEAK CLEARLY is to speak in a way that presents the evidence in the form of comprehensible pieces – is to speak as if we dismantle the evidence for someone to facilitate their comprehension of it.

The concept of *faṣāḥa* is, however, structured by the metaphor of PURITY, more precisely by [MILK] PURITY, LACK OF FROTH [IN MILK] (cf. KtA3: 323; AIG: 541-2; AsS: 890; LsA2: 244). In other words, a *faṣīḥ* man is someone who speaks in the way free from faults, errors of any kind – and perhaps, in a pleasant, melodic manner – which could be indicated by the ironic use of this lexeme as the attribute of a gurgling crow (t38:19; t14:48). Such a man's speech is as agreeable and delightful as much as milk without the froth.

On the other hand, *balāra* clearly connects to the concept of REACHING a goal, i.e., the satisfactory transportation of what the speaker bore into the minds of his interlocutors (LsA8: 500). Thus, as *balāra*, ELOQUENCE was simply the ability to REACH THE POINT while uttering a speech.

5.6 Sayyid-tribal chief and pre-Islamic Arabic honorable behavior

Al-Jahiz listed the aforementioned character traits – *zūd*, *naẓda*, *ṣbr*, *bayān*, and *ḥilm* – as defining certain expectations as for a tribal chief, referred to by the lexeme *sayyid*. This lexical item occurs in CEAP in 119 contexts, indicating predominantly either a tribal chief, or a (war/battle-time) leader, or simply an aristocrat or a tribal noble (i.e., a *ṣarīf*). Nevertheless, in at least 29 contexts, it definitely signifies a man who could be called *karīm*, i.e., an honorable, noble – and by that excellent, perfect – man (cf. Pietrzak, 2022). More precisely, in my interpretation, it seems that in such contexts, as in (21), the use of *sayyid* implies that the man excelled in honorable behavior, rather than that he was simply honorable or noble. In other words, in those contexts, the lexeme *sayyid* referred to someone who while not being a tribal chief himself met all the requirements to become one.

- 21 *sumaḥā'u l-faqrī 'aẓwādu l-rinā sādatu š-šībi maḥāriqu l-murud*
(They are) of benevolent poor, and of generous rich, and of greatly honorable (*sāda*) old men, and of exceptionally generous youth (cf. t07:141).

This could mean that, with time, the expectations formulated for the *sayyid*-tribal chief became an encoding of the general code of honor persisting in the society of pre-Islamic Arabs, rather than a code of behavior for their leaders only. This meaning extension seems to have followed the metonymic model, in which a part of a role schema – social stereotypical expectations – was referred to by its totum, the whole role schema of *sayyid*-TRIBAL CHIEF.

Although the concept of *sayyid* seems to have rather encoded the perception of someone who proved to be honorable in an exceptional way, I believe that in general the expectations embedded in the character traits mentioned by al-Jahiz could be interpreted as the bare minimum of honorable behavior. This is because, in the context of honor and honorability, the minimum and the maximum are in fact indistinguishable (cf. Peristiany, 1965; Stewart, 1994). The ideal of conduct is what is expected at all times. In pre-Islamic Arabic society, the man who was *ẓawād*, *naẓid*, *ṣābir*, *bayyin*, and *ḥalīm*, could be called *karīm* “honorable or noble”, and the one who excelled in these modes of action, might have been styled as *sayyid*.

Therefore, in my understanding, the pre-Islamic Arabic concept of HONORABLE CONDUCT might be ex-

plicated using the major pieces of the explications presented earlier in this article. In other words, in order to define who a *karīm*-honorable/noble man was, one could describe general pre-Islamic Arabic expectations as for his conduct in specific situations. Thus, while being rich, a *karīm* man must have been generous (*ḡawād*); while facing distress, he had to be able to rise to a challenge (*naḡid*) and to be persistent (*ṡābir*); while talking, he needed to be eloquent (*bayyin*); and lastly, in all matters – especially while dealing with others – he should have been forbearing and wise (*ḡalīm*). For that reason, I posit the following explication of the concept of *karīm*-HONORABLE/NOBLE MAN that epitomizes the ideal type of behavior.

Someone is: *karīm* (i.e., they act in an honorable/noble way)

- This someone can be like this:
- When this someone does things, people can think of this someone like this:

[*ḡawād*]

- When this someone has many things, this someone wants other people to have many of these things
- Because of that, this someone does something
- Because of it, other people can have many of these things

[*naḡid*]

- When something like *naḡda*^{1M} happens to this someone, this someone thinks like this: ‘I do not feel bad because of this something. I want to think like this: I can do some things. Because of that, nothing very bad can happen to me’
- When something like *naḡda*^{1M} happens to someone else, this someone thinks like this: ‘This someone else feels bad because of this something. I do not feel bad because of this something. I want to think like this: I can do some things. Because of that, nothing very bad can happen to this someone else’

[*ṡābir*]

- When something very bad happened to this someone, this someone thinks like this:
- I feel very bad
- At the same time, I do not want other bad things to happen to me because of this very bad thing
- Because of this, I want to think like this: ‘after some time, I will feel something good. I want to live like I lived before this very bad thing happened.’

[*ḡalīm*]

- When this someone wants to do something, this someone thinks like this:
- I know some moments are bad to do this something.
- Because of that I do not do this, if the moment is bad.
- Because of that this someone can do this something in some other time. This someone can not do this something.
- When other people do bad things to this someone, this someone thinks like this:

- I know this: ‘When people do not think much, they can do bad things to other people’
- Because of that I do not want to do bad things to these people because of this something bad they did to me.
- I want to think like this now: After some time, I will feel good. Because of this, I want to live as I lived before these people did this bad thing to me
- Because of this, this someone does not do something bad to these people.

[*bayyin*]

- When this someone want to say something to other people, this someone says it
- When people hear it, people can always know very well what this someone thought
- Because of that, people think something very good about this someone

6 Conclusions

In the conclusion of my paper, I would like to discuss two issues: the cultural specificity of the analyzed concepts and the overall performance of the NSM approach in defining culturally specific meanings.

6.1 Cultural specificity of the honorable traits of *sayyid*

At the very first glance, one can notice that the concept explicated in the previous sections could pose some difficulties while translating them to English – maybe except for the concepts of *zūd* and *saḥā*, which could be more or less correctly matched with the conceptual content of English generosity. Nevertheless, a close look at these notions might make us realize that there is a significant difference between a pre-Islamic Arabic and English meanings. This difference lays in the imagery employed in their conceptualization in form of metaphors: *zūd* is frequently mediated by the concept of WATER (cf. t21:201; t38:92), and *saḥā* is structured by the concept of SPREADING OUT (cf. MqL3: 146), i.e., giving away one’s possession in great numbers.

The remaining concepts are rather culturally specific. *Naẓda* is a script of behavior, which cannot be rendered simply as English courage (cf. Lane, 1968b) or bravery. This might be observed by comparing the definition I proposed in the section 4.2. with NSM explications of these concepts and their Polish cognates proposed by Wierzbicka (1992). Her explications aimed to prove that there is a certain culture-based specificity of English and Polish concepts (Wierzbicka, 1992) that translates into the fact that they are not easily replaceable in translation. I believe that the culture-specificity of *naẓda* can be traced back to the social construct of ‘*aṣabiyya*, the binding-together tribal spirit of mutual support, which was at the core of the social constitution of pre-Islamic Arabs (‘Alī, 1993). Thus, what was admired in a man – and what was expected from him on every occasion – was his efficiency and ability to rise up to a challenge, especially while assisting someone to whom he pledged alliance or with whom he was bound together by common ‘*aṣabiyya*.

Ṣabr is yet another example of a concept shaped by the characteristics of pre-Islamic Arabic life – the life led in a harsh and inhospitable environment. It must have been a virtue to be ENDURING and PATIENT in this life, since such qualities translated into increasing the survival chances not only of the man himself, but of his whole tribe or clan. What is quite interesting from a comparative point of view, is that the concept of *ṣabr* might be partially similar to that of courage. This is because, as noted by Wierzbicka (1992, 2012), this English concept also indicates some extent of ENDURANCE while facing a long-lasting calamity, such as an illness.

6.2 NSM as the method for defining culture-specific meaning

As I said, I decided to employ NSM methodology due to my conviction of the high culture-specificity of the analyzed vocabulary. I wanted to provide descriptions of the concepts of *sayyid* and his behavior with the

utmost care for culture-transparency, so as to arrive at the understanding as close to the native perception of pre-Islamic Arabs as possible. What I presented in the previous sections proves, I believe, that in fact NSM meets the standards I posed for my definitions. Nevertheless, it is not perfect and fully satisfactory explanation of conceptual content referred to in language.

In my opinion, in some instances, NSM does not ensure what it is seemingly designed for. Namely, it does not work as a precise tool for near-synonyms meaning delimitation, or even for describing the culture-specificity of certain concepts. The failure of NSM in explaining the difference between near-synonyms was evident in the case of the description of the profiles of ELOQUENCE (section 5.5.). Of course, the difference in that case could be explicated in terms of NSM after all, yet such an explication would be quite tiresome – both to construct and to comprehend. A much easier and more intuitive way of delimiting between these concepts proved to be the description of metaphoric models.

The inability of NSM in the proper assessment of culture-specificity was visible in two cases – *saḥā'* (section 4.1) and *ṣabr* (section 5.3.). In both cases, the characterization of conceptual metaphors also turned out to be valuable. I don't think that an NSM-styled explication can fairly capture the sense of *saḥā'*, i.e., the generosity at the extent of giving away all of one's possession in the simile to spreading things out. Of course, one can render a definition of *saḥā'* that will depict this imagery in terms of semantic primes. Nevertheless, will such a definition be decently intelligible? Similarly, can one include in the NSM explication of *ṣabr* the metaphoric notion of PHYSICAL (FORCEFUL) RESTRAINT, which is essential for the proper description of this concept? Again, it is doable – yet, I believe, comprehensibility of such an explication will be highly reduced.

Therefore, to sum it up, I maintain my conviction that NSM methodology serves well as a tool for defining culture-specific concepts. Nonetheless, in certain cases, it seems to require some assistance that can be provided, for instance, by the methods of Culture Linguistics – especially by describing conceptual metaphors and metonymies. By that, I believe, meaning can be described in a way that is culturally transparent and yet precise and detailed.

All in all, following the conviction that “more comprehensive knowledge of al-Jahiliyya can afford better understanding of some [Islamic] phenomena” (Dziekan, 2008, p. 81), I believe that the conclusions I presented regarding the detailed description of pre-Islamic *sayyid* and a certain code of behavior associated with this figure might turn out to be crucial for the understanding of the later – Islamic – development of the notion of *sayyid* into the concept of a descendant of the Prophet Muḥammad.

Sources

Classical Arabic Dictionaries (CAD)

- KtA = Al-Ḥalīl ibn Aḥmad (2003): *Kitāb al-‘ayn murattab^{an} ‘alā ḥurūf al-ma‘zam*, vol. I-IV, Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-‘ilmiyya.
- AlG = Ibn Durayd (1987): *Kitāb zamharat al-luxa*, Bayrūt: Dār al-‘ilm li-l-malāyīn.
- AsS = Al-Ğawharī (2009): *Aṣ-ṣiḥāḥ. Tāz al-luxa wa-ṣiḥāḥ al-‘arabiyya murattab tartīb^{an} alfabā‘īy^{an} wifq awā‘il al-ḥurūf*, Al-Qāhira: Dār al-ḥadīṭ.
- LsA = Ibn Mandūr (2009): *Lisān al-‘Arab*, vol. I-XV, Beirut: Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyah.
- MqL = Ibn Fāris (1979): *Maqāyis al-luxa*, vol. I-VI, Dimašq: Dār al-Fikr.

Poetry compilations (*dawāwīn*)

- t07 = Ṭarafa Ibn al-‘Abd (2000), Bayrūt: Al-Mu‘assasa al-‘Arabiyya li-d-Dirāsāt wa-n-Našr.

- t13 = ‘Adī Ibn Zayd (1965), Baydād: Šarikat al-Ğumhūriyya li-n-Našr wa-ṭ-Ṭab’.
- t14 = Bišr Ibn Abī Ḥāzim (1994), Bairūt: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī.
- t17 = an-Nābiṣa aḍ-Ḍubyanī (1996), Bairūt: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya.
- t19 = Ḥātim aṭ-Ṭā’ī (1994), Bairūt: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī.
- t20 = ‘Urwa Ibn al-Ward & as-Samaw’ al (1982), Bayrūt: Dār Bayrūt liṭ-Ṭibā’a wa-n-Našr.
- t21 = ‘Antara Ibn Šaddād (1996), Bairūt: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī.
- t22 = Zuhayr Ibn Abī Sulmā (-), Bairūt: Šarikat Dār al-Arqam Ibn Abi al-Arqam.
- t23 = Ṭufayl (1997), Bairūt: Dār Šādir.
- t24 = Abū Ṭālib (1994), Bairūt: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī.
- t28 = al-A‘šā (-), al-Qāhira: Maktabat al-Adab bi-l-Gamāmīz.
- t30 = Labīd Ibn Rabī’a (1993), Bairūt: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī.
- t33 = al-Ḥansā’ (2014), Bairūt: Dār al-Ma‘rifa.
- t37 = Caliph Ali (-), al-Qāhira: Dār Ibn Zaydūn.
- t38 = Ḥassān Ibn Ṭābit (2010), Bairūt: Al-Maktaba al-‘Ašriyya.
- t39 = al-Ḥuṭay’a (1958), Al-Qāhira: Šarikat Maktabat wa-Maṭba‘at Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa-Awaladihi bi-Miṣr.
- t40 = Caliph Mu‘āwiya Ibn Abī Sufyān (1996), Bayrūt: Dār Šādir.

References

- Al-Jallad, N. (2010). “The concept of shame in Arabic: bilingual dictionaries and the challenge of defining culture-based emotions”. In: *Language Design* 12, pp. 31–57 (cit. on p. 132).
- ‘Alī, Ġawwād (1993). *Al-Mufaṣṣal fī Tā’rīḥ al-‘Arab qabl al-‘Islām, Vol. IV*. Baghdad: Baghdad University Press (cit. on pp. 131, 135, 143).
- Bauer, T. (2010). “The Relevance of Early Arabic Poetry for Qur’anic Studies Including Observations on Kull and on Q 22:27, 26:225, and 52:31”. In: *The Qur’ān in Context - Historical and Literary Investigations*. Ed. by A. Neuwirth, M. Marx, and N. Sinai. Leiden & Boston: Brill (cit. on p. 133).
- Blumczyński, P. (2013). “Turning the tide: A critique of Natural Semantic Metalanguage from a translation studies perspective”. In: *Translation Studies* 6.3, pp. 261–276 (cit. on p. 132).
- Dziekan, M. M. (2008). *Dzieje kultury arabskiej*. Warszawa: PWN (cit. on p. 144).
- Geeraerts, D. (2010). *Theories of lexical semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (cit. on p. 132).
- Gladkova, A. (2010). “The Exponents of Eleven Simple, Universal Concepts in Three Semitic Languages”. In: *Culture & Psychology* 16.2, pp. 267–285 (cit. on p. 131).
- Goddard, C. (2008). *Cross-Linguistic Semantics*. John Benjamins Publishing (cit. on p. 131).
- Goddard, C. and A. Wierzbicka (1994). *Semantic and Lexical Universals: Theory and Empirical Findings*. John Benjamins Publishing (cit. on p. 131).
- (2002). *Meaning and Universal Grammar – Theory and Empirical Findings*. John Benjamins Publishing (cit. on p. 131).
- (2014). *Words and Meanings: Lexical Semantics across Domains, Languages and Cultures*. Oxford University Press (cit. on p. 132).
- Habib, S. (2011). “Angels can cross cultural boundaries”. In: *RASK, International Journal of Language and Communication* 34, pp. 49–75 (cit. on p. 132).

- Habib, S. (2014). "Dying in the cause of God: The semantics of the Christian and Muslim concepts of martyr". In: *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 34.3, pp. 388–398 (cit. on p. 132).
- (2017). "The Meaning of 'Angel' in English, Arabic, and Hebrew". In: *The Semantics of Nouns*. Ed. by Z. Ye. Oxford University Press, pp. 89–119 (cit. on p. 132).
- (2018). "Heaven and hell: A cross-linguistic semantic template of supernatural places". In: *RASK, International Journal of Language and Communication* 48, pp. 1–36 (cit. on p. 132).
- (2019). "NSM Substantives: The Arabic and Hebrew Exponents of Six Simple, Universal Concepts". In: *International Journal of Arabic Linguistics* 5.2, pp. 188–207 (cit. on p. 132).
- (2020). "The Exponents of Eleven Simple, Universal Concepts in Three Semitic Languages". In: *International Journal of Arabic Linguistics* 6, pp. 68–90 (cit. on p. 132).
- (2021). "On the Universality of Good, Bad, Big, and Small". In: *International Journal of Arabic Linguistics* 7.1, pp. 51–60 (cit. on p. 132).
- Lane, E. (1968a). *An Arabic-English Lexicon, Vol. II*. Beirut (cit. on p. 138).
- (1968b). *An Arabic-English Lexicon, Vol. VIII*. Beirut (cit. on p. 143).
- Levisen, C. (2013). *Cultural Semantics and Social Cognition: A Case Study on the Danish Universe of Meaning*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton (cit. on p. 132).
- Morimoto, K., ed. (2012). *Sayyids and Sharifs in Muslim Societies: The Living Links to the Prophet*. London & New York: Routledge (cit. on p. 131).
- Peeters, B., ed. (2006). *Semantic Primes and Universal Grammar: Empirical evidence from the Romance languages*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing (cit. on p. 132).
- Pellat, C. (1983). "Ḥawla mafhūm al-murū'a 'inda qudamā' al-'arab". In: *Al-Kamil* 4, pp. 1–17 (cit. on p. 131).
- Peristiany, J. G., ed. (1965). *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson (cit. on p. 141).
- Pietrzak, B. (2022). *The Concept of Honor in the Language of Early Arabic Poetry. A Cultural Linguistic Study*. Berlin: Peter Lang (cit. on pp. 134, 141).
- Stewart, F. H. (1994). *Honor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (cit. on p. 141).
- Travis, C. (1997). "Kind, considerate, thoughtful: A semantic analysis". In: *Lexikos* 7, pp. 130–152 (cit. on p. 132).
- Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition. Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*. New York: Oxford University Press (cit. on pp. 131, 132, 143).
- (2012). "Polskie słowa-wartości w perspektywie porównawczej. Część II. Prawość i odwaga". In: *Etnolingwistyka* 24, pp. 19–46 (cit. on pp. 131, 132, 143).
- Zwettler, M. (1978). *The Oral Tradition of Classical Arabic Poetry: Its Character and Implications*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press (cit. on pp. 131–133).