Enriching and Developing Methods of Arabic Language

طرق إثراء وتطوير اللغة العربية

Dr. Fadl Allah Ismail Ali
د. فضل الله إسماعيل علي

مستخلص:

يوضح الباحث في هذه الدراسة بأن اللغة العربية لغة متميزة وغنية ولها طرقها وأساليبها في تطوير نفسها. ومما يزيد من تميزها أنها عاشت لأكثر من ألف عام وهى محفوظة وفي تطور مستمر، ويركز البحث على دراسة ثراء وتطور اللغة العربية من خلال دراسة هذه الطرق كخطوة مهمة نحو فهم مواكبة هذه اللغة للمصطلحات القانونية التي ما زالت تحتاج للصياغة والتكوين من جهة وايضاً لمواكبتها للمصطلحات القانونية الجديدة التي تفرض نفسها في المستقبل من جهة أخري.

Abstract

As in the case of all other languages, Arabic has its own methods to enrich and develop itself. It has done so over the centuries notwithstanding the fact that it has lived for one millennium and a half essentially unchanged. It is important in this research to study briefly the main enrichment and development methods of Arabic, as a step towards understanding how Arabic can cope firstly with those legal

terms for which no equivalents have been yet formulated and, secondly with new terms, including English derivations, originally or consequentially legal, which present themselves in future for translation.

1. Al-Qiyas

Qiyas (analogy) is the clearest language development method, as well as the most sought after and cherished by past linguists[1]. Yet, it is probably playing its most important role during the philological revival that is taking place in our own days[2]. It is the analogical method which has played a major role in the configuration of the Arabic language, and is the basis on which we built all grammar rules, word moulds, and meanings of some Arabic terms. Basically, it enables lexical items and then deriving from them other lexical items that are morphologically similar to the lexical items of the first group. It also means studying the existing words and their derivatives, then trying to formulate rules on that basis to enable similar derivation from other existing roots that so far have no derivatives. Thus, if we have A and B, but also A1 as and existing derivative of A, then the process of creating B1 that is similar to A1 in structure is based on Qiyas. This method is well established as a reliable tool to meet the demands placed on Arabic especially these days as a result of the constant development which is taking place in the various areas in the Western World and the need to come up with referential lexical items. But, this is only a secondary stage of proper Qiyas, which is the process of formulating the Arabic grammar based on the linguistic behavior of Arabs in the past, given the allege grammaticality of their speech in the old times, in sharp contrast with the spoken Arabic of today.

---

[1]Anis. almojam alwasit, Cairo:Dar Alfikr, 1978.p7.
[2] Stetkevych. the modern Arabic literary language. Chicago: University Chicago press, 1970.p3.

The study of the history of Qiyas, especially during the Abbasid era, is a fascinating one, as each of the two schools of grammarians in Basra and Kufa tried to establish their rules for Qiyas as the more valid ones, and where each school tried to discredit words established by the other school. The Kufa grammarians were more liberal in their quest for new words, and as such the accepted analogy on the basic of little similarity or rare prior usage. It should be remembered that for any words established by the Qiyas method to succeed approval of the masses should be obtained through accepted and prolonged usage.

It is important to mention that grammarians have classified words for the sake of acceptance into four categories:

    a. Words those are consistent analogically and by prior usage.

    b. Words that are consistent analogically but not by prior usage.

    c. Words those are consistent by prior usage but not analogically.

    d. Words those are consistent neither analogically nor by prior usage.[3] explains that the first category is definitely acceptable, and that the fourth category is definitely unacceptable, neither by the old grammarians of Basra and Kufa nor by the contemporary grammarians and linguists. Furthermore, words of the third category will have to be acceptable because to they had been used but are against the rules of Qiyas is paradoxical, given that the rules of Qiyas themselves modeled on the speech of those Arabs who had been heard to utter them. So that crux of the question really is only to what extent we can accept words that only conform to the rules of Qiyas although they had never been used by Arabs. This is an important question for translators faced with the problem of the lack appropriate terminology.

---

[3]Anis. Op. cit. Pp. 22-27.

But regardless of the linguistic rivalry between Basra and Kufa, the work accomplished by such grammarians like Al-Farisi (died A. H. 337) and Ibn Jinni (died A. M. 392))[4] had the merit of

> "*having placed the language under the creative and moulding authority of reason, delivering it from the exclusive domain of tradition where the attitude of man to his language could only be that blind submission and pious reverence*"[5].

Stetkevych notes that it is thanks to those grammarians that fingers of the Nahda (Renaissance) in the Arab World have discussed and applied the analogical method in its different aspect (1970: p.5). It is also that in their path translators, terminologists and linguistic these days should continue to walk in search for appropriateness of expression and meaning.

2. Al-Ishtiqaq

Al-ishtiqaq (derivation) is the second method of language development and is closely related to Qiyas, in the sense that Qiyas is a prerequisite for Ishtiqaq, for Ishtiqaq is the grammatical basic which enables this process and makes the derived words acceptable by linguists. It is the main language enriching method in Arabic:

> "*Derivation from existing Arabic roots has always been considered the most natural way of growth for the language. Arabic has been called the language of Ishtiqaq, and this ability to grow from its own essence has given the language its rare homogeneousness, which is the pride of Arab writers and philologists and which they are zealous to project.*"[6].

Al-Maghribi notes that in some ways the language is like a sociological organism whose growth an evolution are similar to those a people or nation; in the Arabic case, the nation formed itself out of two

---

[4] Ibn Jinni, Abu′L-Fath ‹Uthman. Al-Khawa′i. an-Najjar, Muhammed ‹Ali (ed). Cairo, Dar al-Kutub al-Misriyya. 3 vols. Vol. 1 (1371/1952 ed.), (1374/1955 ed.).

[5] Stetkevych. the modern Arabic literary language. Chicago: University Chicago press (1970).

[6] Mubarak,M. Fiqh Alluga.Damascus: Damascus University Press. *1960: P p.61-6.2*

elements and along two paths: al-tawlud and al-tajannus, the former being the natural increase of the Arabic elements. Likewise, the Arabic language has emerged and grown through the growth of originally Arabic words (tawalud) and the latter being the assimilation of non-Arabic elements (tajannus), a term that refers to ishtqaq, and ta'rib that is arabization.

Ishtiqaq started as a result of the awareness by the old Arabic grammarians of the relation between lexical items which have similar phonetic and semantic qualities[7]. Anis explains that the relations thus gathered explained to them what constituted the root and what constituted the addition, a notion that was emphasized when orientalists started to study Semantic languages and found great similarities in both roots of words and the additions, that is derivational tools, across those languages. Here I should briefly explain different categories of Ishtiqaq (derivation):

   a. The small derivation, where the radical consonants are not changed but are retained and built upon, thus the radical consonants of the original lexical item and the derived item are still in the same order. An example is جمد ----- متجمد --- جامد (Jamuda, Jamid, mutajmmid). The three main, or radical consonants, namely ج ، م and د (that is J, m and d) continue to be in the same order, but other letters, either consonant or vowels or both, are introduced to new words with different meanings.

   b. The larger derivation: this is the category referred to by Mubarak[8] as metathesis (galb), although[9] considers the large derivation and galb as two separate categories. He defines galb as being in reference to what some linguists claim that some lexical clusters of three sounds can acquire one meaning regardless of the order of these sounds in the cluster. An example is the word نجد (najd,

---

[7] Anis. Op. cit. p.62.
[8] Mubarak. Op. cit .Pp.86-89.
[9] Anis. Op. cit. Pp. 62-69.

but only three letters in Arabic, namely n, j, and d, with a being a tashkil symbol, that is accentuation), which is claimed to maintain the same meaning, namely strength, valour and similar traits, regardless of the way these letters are arranged or of whether they are interspersed with letters or accentuations.

c. The largest derivation: Also called ideal, which means root transformation, this category deals with words that have the same meaning but differs is only one letter.

Of special significance to Arabic translators is the simple derivation which is instrumental in building up the Arabic lexicon. I have earlier given as an example of how the profuse of the product of derivation can be the work of Hassan Fahmi (cf. 62), who derived 196 lexical items from the root Sahara (to melt, liquefy, fuse). Derivation, however, has to meet several criteria before it can be successfully executed. The suitability of the root conformity to established moulds are the two main criteria.

> *"Such vast possibilities of derivation, however, are limited in one way which reflects the substance and nature of Arabic, since, according to classical rules, derivation should be made from verbal roots only, thus the verb lies formally at the basic of the Arabic Isthiqaq."[10]*.

Yet, these have been subject to change or relaxation due firstly to the need for new lexicon in Arabic that cannot conform to the strict rules of derivation, and secondly due to the strong influence of newspapers and periodicals which do not hesitate to coin their own derivations, many of which are not grammatically sound but continue to be used and thus gain legitimacy. One such term is خصخصة (Khaskhasah), for 'privatization'. This word does not exist in the Arabic lexicon. Yet, a small number of journalists have been consistently using

---

[10] *Stetkevych.* Op. cit. *p.7.*

the word, either believing that it is a correctly derived term, or hoping that regular use over time might legitimize it as a term of economics.

Although derivation has to be based on verbs, this rule has been breached- and continues to be breached – for the two reasons mentioned in the preceding paragraph. For examples, Rajulun mudarham (the man has many dirhams, that is a rich man), are objectively and verbal derivatives from the noun dirham (currency unit)[11].

Another example is provided by Stetkvych[12] as an instance of derivations that have overstepped the classical limits of Qiyas. He pointed out that tamazhaba is a secondary verbal derivation from primarily derived noun mazhab. This means that mazhab was primarily correctly derived from a verbal root zahaba ('to go' etc). This verb, however, acquires as different meaning when followed by its primarily derived noun. Thus zahaba mazhhaba means 'to follow', adopt, embrace a teaching, a religion, etc; to be a disciple of s.o., follow s.o.'s teachings (Wher, 1979: p. 316), with mazhab being the 'religion' or 'teaching'. Tamazhaba actually encapsulates the concept conveyed by zahaba mazhaba and is based on a noun root, in a secondary derivation process.

Correctly analyzed, however, the term can be said to have been ultimately derived form a verb, zahaba. This is so because it is the view of Arabic philologists that:

> *"Abstract nouns which implicitly refer to verbal ideas of action or state are derived from ground verbs containing these ideas. The same is true of concrete nouns denoting the agent or the effect of an act; even onomatopoeic concrete nouns would have to be excluded from the no derived category. All the verbal derivation referring to such nouns are not recognized as stemming from them but rather as sharing one common root."* [13].

---

[11] Anis.Op.cit. p.65.
[12] *Stetkevych.* Op. cit. p.8.
[13] Ibid. p.9.

Thus we have a situation where the persistent among Arabic philologists maintain a 'closed door' policy for derivation from non-verbal roots they are prepared to accept such derivations only if they can be traced back to a verb. This is a very restrictive attitude but even accepting this restriction, it is clear that the possibilities of noun derivation through a secondary process are much more numerous and diversified than those of verbal derivation. Stetkevych notes that derivations of the latter category are theoretically limited to the standard fifteen moulds (1970: p. 10). It is this restriction that compels users of Arabic, especially when faced with new complex concepts, to venture into derivations from concrete nouns. A lot of work has been by several Arabic linguists, including AL-Iskandari, whose findings were published in the Majallat Majma' al-lughah al'-Arabiyyah (Journal of Royal Academy of Arabic Language, 1934: Pp.1: 236-268), but the official philological attitude represented by the Academy remained none the less reluctant: analogical attitude represented by the Academy remained none the less reluctant: analogical derivation from concrete nouns became sanctioned in scientific language only' [14].

When we move to the restrictions placed on the possibilities of deriving specific moulds from verb or noun roots, we find a similar situation. Here, again, purists maintain that derivations could be modeled only after what was heard by Arabs in the past, thus disallowing not only new moulds but also derivations according to the existing moulds if such derivations do not already exist. Anis notes that there are many derivations which can theoretically be formed according to established moulds but which do not exist in authentic Arabs texts; that there is a big difference between what we are allowed to derive and what have actually been derived and used by Arabs in the past (1978: p. 63). He explains that some verbs may not have ism fa;il (present participle) or ism maf'oul (past participle) in existence now, but this

---

[14] *Stetkevych. Op. cit. p.7.*

does not mean that we cannot derive them at some latter stage when we may have a need for them. He adds that one should not e under the impression that verbs or masdars (verbal nouns) were coined contemporaneously with their derivational forms, and the language may continue for centuries to have a verb or masdar only until the need arises for some derivatives.

> *"Simple derivation is simply a means of expanding the language to suit the need of writers; it is used by language academies to express new ideas, thus enabling the language to keep abreast with the development that takes place in society."* [15].

Examples of existing derivations based on established moulds include the following:

Root (verb	Mould	Derivation (noun, adjective)
daraba (struck)	Fail	dãrib (strider)
wagafa (stopped)	maf'il	mawqif (stop, station)
jahara (spoke loudly)	mif'ãal	mijhãar (loudspeaker)
nasaba (attributed to)	maf'oul	mansoub (attributed to)
thallaja (froze)	fa'allah	thallãjah (freezer)
istakhraja (extracted)	mustaf'al	mustakhraj (extracted document, material, etc)
istasara (scored victory)	mufta'il	muntasir (victorious)
intahaza (took opportunity)	ifti'aliyyah	intihãziyyah (opportunism)
gassama (divided)	fi'lah	qismah (division)
grana (couple, joined)	fa'ilah	qarinah (coupler)
haraq (burnt)	mif'alah	mihraqa (incinerator)
qatta'a (cut up)	mufa'aal	muqatta; (cut up)

---

[15] Anis. Op. cit p..62.

ishtaraka (principated)	ifti'aliyyah	ishtrãkiyyah (socialism)
nashata (activated)	taf'il	tanshit (activation)
bayyana (given formation)	istif'al	istibyan (questionnaire)
aqsa (ousted)	if'al	Iqsa (ousting)
qatta'a (cut up)	taf'il	Taqti' (cutting up to small pieces)
'abada (worshipped)	istaf'al	Ista'bad (made.s.o. worship him; enslaved)

The above table illustrates the great potential that Arabic has, as a built-in mechanism, to derive new terms based on existing ones. If we were to take advantages of this potential, translators would be able to solve a great deal of their problems. It is important to bear in mind Anis' argument, namely that derivations on the basis existing moulds can be created to meet a need (1978: p.63). It is also important to realize that despite the work of the Arabic language academies since the beginning of this century, which in the main have tried to maintain the purity of the Arabic language besides approving neologisms, according to Stetkevych [16] 'translators and journalists, taken together, have thus far produced and fixed in live usage many more neologisms than the academies'. He predicts that with the continuation of the healthy growth of modern Arabic, the time should come when the Arab academies will be able to assume only a natural normative role, one of watchfulness over the purity of a language which will not be of their making in the narrow sense' [17].

The question to be asked here is: at what stage are translators allowed to form derivations that have not been heard of in the Arabic language? To answer this question a few points have to be taken into consideration:

---

[16] *Stetkevych.* Op. cit. *p.7.*
[17] *Ibid.*p.7.

1. The Academy of Arabic Language has sanctioned derivation from concrete nouns in scientific language (Majallat Majam' al-Lughah al-Arabiyyah, 1934: 1.235). One may wonder whether under pressure from translators and other influential language users the academics will be prepared to sanction such derivations in other special subject languages.

2. A blend attempt has been made in dealing with affixes when translating English terms into Arabic. In translating the names of chemical compounds into Arabic from English in Egypt, the suffixes have been retained as in the English equivalents but in a arabised form. Thus sulphuric is kabritik and sulphurous in kabritoz, with – ik and –oz being the arabised forms of –ic and –ous respectively. The same applied to ferrous and ferric (hadidoz and hadidik). The same principle has been adopted also in Iraq, given that in both countries translation was made from English. This was not adopted by other Arab countries; such as Syria, perhaps because the translation was from French rather than English [18].

3. The existing English-Arabic Legal Dictionary is still inadequate. It does not contain all the terms, which are innately legal or used in a legal sense. There is thus a need to look elsewhere for solutions.

4. The Arabic and English legal environments are different despite the similarity of the general principles that govern them. Accordingly, legal terms in one environment may not necessarily be applicable or relevant to the other. Hence, it is not always possible to look for help in the Arabic legal terms regardless of whether they were developed before and after Islam. Referring to this point, Faruqi makes the following statement: "Many terms of the Islamic Doctrine which have no equivalent in English, have been omitted from several famous English law dictionaries]. Examples are: 'awl, bainunah, gharouka, ghilab, hadd, mohatarah, mufawwidah,

---

[18] Al-Samman, W. At-Ta,rib fi al- ,Ulum al-Tibiyyah : Nazrah fi Mashakil Haza Al-Ta,rib. In Majallat Al-Adab2. Beirut 1975.

mukhala'ah, and nashizah. For the benefit of Arab law and…have supplied adequate definition for them….." (Faruqi, 1991: preface to English Arabic Law Dictionary).

5. Translators who are driven by a need for derived terms to lack of existing ones should be very familiar with the Arabic morphological rules. The table of moulds given above is not an exclusive one. But at the same time, not all verbs can form any of the derived noun moulds. Derivation is strictly regulated by several factors, including the number of the original verb letters, compliance with the built-in meaning of the mould itself. Thus for nouns made up of three original letters there are ten moulds, while nouns made up of four original letters can take the form of any six moulds, those made up five original letters can have four moulds and so on (Ghalayini, 1974: Pp. 6-8). Besides, a mould like taf'il has the embedded meaning of exaggeration or deliberate action, while istif'al suggests an act of creation or extraction or similar, and mif'alah and mif'aal are used for machine or tool names (hence tibsalah for facsimile machine base on mif'alah).

As an example of translators' efforts to generate new terms through the principles of ishtiqaq (derivation) and qiyas (analogy), based on an existing root, I will refer to a personal experience. Deeming is a term that was introduced a few years ago by ministry of social welfare. In simple terms, it means that for the purpose of assessing people's eligibility to certain types of pensions the ministry deems that those people's funds deposited in banks earn a specific interest rate; notwithstanding the fact these funds may have been deposited in non-interest-bearing accounts. If we were to apply the derivational method we would have: I'tabara (deemed) (conforms to the itfa'ala mould) leads by analogical derivation to the noun I'tibãr (deeming) (conforms to the ifti'ãl derivational mould. I'tibãr, however, is more widely used as a direct equivalent of 'considering' or 'consideration'. It is perhaps more advisable to arrive at another term that is not so common to provide a

referential meaning to another term that encapsulates a new concept. Another derivational process in thus utilised: i'tabara (deemed) (conforms with the ifta'a;a mould) lead by anagogical derivation to the noun I'tibãriyyah (deeming) (conforms with the I'tibãriyyah derivational mould, like in intihãziyyah in the above table).

Although the derivation is grammatically sound, it was initially believed that, because it has not been heard of and because of its difference to the commonly used word I'tibãr, the term should be discounted as inappropriate. This was the opinion of several Arabic translation practitioners and students; I'tibãriyyah does not exist in the Arabic English bilingual dictionaries, either general or specialized (economics, finance, legal). It exists, however, in the highly respected monolingual Arabic dictionary Muhit-ul-Muhit, and is defined thus:

> *'I'tibariyyah, in the language of philosophers, refers to something that does not exist outside the mind, and may be used to refer to hypotheses, thus called holistic matters'.(Ul-Bastani, 1987: p.572)*

What makes I'tibãriyyah well qualified as a legal term in Arabic, apart from the perfectly suited definition provided by Ul-Bastani, its state of low-usage or no usage which, ironically, initially triggered opposition to its use. This is so because the term, if consistently used by all Arabic translators, will eventually become a term of what Sagar calls a special subject language' (1990: p.18) In this respect, translators may have to assume the role of terminologists as well. But according to Sager (1990: p. 60) terminologists must also be aware of the gradual evaluation of terms.

> *"The evaluation of concepts is accompanied by stages of naming, a process which is called terminologization. In the development of knowledge the concepts of science and technology like those of other disciplines undergo changes; accordingly their linguistic forms are flexible until a concept*

is fully formed and incorporated in the knowledge structure".[19].

In the case of 'deeming', however, the concept seems to have been set in a final form, the only possible development being in extent of its application, which may expanded to include bank accounts for all taxpayers and not only for pensioners. Accordingly, the linguistic form can be said to have attained its final stage. Terminologization is a term of that can be applied to the time taken and process needed to fix term usage. Just like journalists make possible the use of certain terms that are initially thought of as 'odd' or 'daring' but which eventually become acceptable as part of the language lexicon, translators can have a similar role but with more regard to the grammatical integrity of the language. Al-Naht

Naht (or blending) is a word building method in Arabic that in a way has an effect opposite to that of derivation. While the latter aims at building new, longer lexical terms for existing ones, blending tries to compound and compact two or more existing lexical items. From Anis' discussion of blending (1978: Pp. 86-94), the following observations can be made:

1. Blending was more used by Arabs in the part than it is now. It was mainly used to shorten long segments of speech, mainly of religious nature. Thus basmalah (بسملة)instead of Bism Allah al-rahman al- Rahim, (بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم) (In the Name of God the Merciful, the Compassionate); Sal'am (صلعم) for Sala Allahu 'Alayhi wa Sallam (صلى الله عليه وسلم) (Peace be Upon Him); and so on.

2. Arab linguists who have discussed blending have provided as examples too many words that they mistakenly believed were

---

[19] Sager ET. Al. English special language, London: Longman. 1990.

formed through blending. Blending remains a very restricted rule for word building. The majority of philologists prohibit Arab to blend words these days. In this respect, they follow what can be called a 'closed door' policy. Even the Academy of the Arabic Language has not been keen to allow blending, notwithstanding the fact that a few of its members have demonstrated the need for blends especially for medical terminology.

3. Most blends are either verbs or verbal nouns (masdars). Besides, they are often made of four original letters (tashkil sings are not counted). Thus, حمدل (hamdala, but only four letters written in Arabic, these being the consonants, with all vowels implied as accentuation diacritics, that is tashkil) for قول الحمد لله ('quwl al-hamdu lillah', that is 'saying than be to Allah')

4. Due to the confusion that has accompanied the study of this linguistic phenomenon in Arabic, there are no clear rules for blending, although some linguists suggest it can be executed on the basis of analogy.

5. Anis himself believes that blending is sometimes necessary, because it helps in enriching the language lexicon. Thus Anis allows it with moderation provided it is done in accordance with old tradition (analogy). He gives as an example of what he believes to be an acceptable blend to word 'anfami' derived from anfi, that is nasal fammi, that is oral.

6. Blending in Arabic is not like haplology in the 'European languages', which prefer clipped rather than the original, longer forms of words, such as van for caravan, or cab for cabriolet. Anis notes that more developed languages have succeeded in shortening their words, while those still in a primitive state tend to use longer words.

Although the last statement cannot be substantiated (German has many long words, but German cannot be said to be a primitive

language) the fact is that there has been a very strong trend in many languages to use blending. Another observation is that while blends about in Arabic mainly in the area of religion, in English (and perhaps other European languages) they are mainly in the other special subject languages, especially those of science and technology. This can be due to the preoccupation of Arabs with the study and interpretation of the Holy Quran and Sunnah (Prophet Mohammad's – P.B, U.H- sayings and traditions), as can be evidenced by the large amount of technical and scientific literature produced in English. In both cases there has been a need for shorter lexical forms of existing terms.

Translators should be aware of the existence of a possibility, albeit limited, to form new words in Arabic by blending. Ba'alabaki [20] seems to have translators most in mind when he complied his general English –Arabic dictionary, Al-Mawrid. His emphasis was no providing equivalents made of single words rather than definition by explanation or groups of words that make it difficult for translators to use, to this end; he did not hesitate to use the blending method, especially for the English compound terms in the technical fields. Let us look at these examples provided by Ba'alabaki:

Hydrolyze   يحملئ، يحلل بالماء

(Two words, a verb and a noun, analyze and water, have been blended and shortened)

Hydrolysis   الحلمأة: التحليل بالماء

التحلمؤ : التحلل بالماء

(Both equivalents are generated by blending two nouns, analysis and water. The first, however, is formed according to the mould fa'lalah, which suggests doing by inducement by someone or something, thus we have 'subjecting to hydrolysis', the second equivalent, however, is

---

[20] Ba'alabaki , M. Al- Mawrid – A modern English – Arabic Dictionary, Beirut: Dar al- 'llm li al-Malayin .1978.

formed according to the mould tamaf'ul, which is used to indicate self-change or self-doing, thus we have 'undergo hydrolysis'.

electromagnetic   كهرطيسي

(Here two longer Arabic word, a noun and adjective, namely كهرباء 'electricity' and مغناطيسي 'magnetic', have been blended and shortened, leaving out seven of the original letters).

Electromotive   حركيكهربائي

In this example two words have been blended but not shortened. The resultant term is odd for several reasons: it is longer than either constituent; it is equal length to the two constituents combined; it simply represents two words joined together, which is simply not Arabic. English compound terms such as workforce, overcharge or upstream, where two (or more) words are simply joined together without any further modification, are alien to Arabic. Blending is more similar to the frequent and highly productive method of clipping or shortening used in English, a particular case of which is that of compounding and simultaneous clipping or shortening used in English, a particular case of which is that of compounding and simultaneous clipping, such as stagflation from stagnation plus inflation, and bionic from biological plus electronic [21].

Ba'alabaki (1978; preface)[22] concedes that despite his reliance on several existing English Arabic dictionaries and on the glossaries produced by the Academy of the Arabic Language in Cairo, the demand to find equivalents for an increasing influx of English terms remained overwhelming. He had to resort to ijtihad, which is individual effort and discretion, and in doing so had to employ the methods of transliteration, translation, derivational and blending.

---

[21] Sager Et al. Op.cit . p.79.
[22] Ba'alabaki . Op.cit .

Of note is that, in his dictionary of scientific and technical terms,[23] uses the above blend words (although he used كهرومغنطيسي Kahromaghnatisi, instead of Ba'alabaki's more daring كهرطيسي، Kahratisi, for electromotive. This is obviously in line with the argument provided above. But like in the case of I'tibariyyah, for deeming, discussed earlier in this chapter, these blend words have to be consistently used by users in the particular fields in order to gain popularity and become part of special subject language terminology. This should not be a difficult task, given the small corpus of users of such languages.

The implication of blending on legal terminology, however, is not great and judging by the behavior of laws and legal terminology over the centuries there is nothing to suggest that the situation will change. I have reviewed both Osborn's Concise Law Dictionary [24] and Faruqi's Law Dictionary English-Arabic (1991) for blends. It can be safely stated that no blends (compounding and clipping simultaneously) exist in the latter dictionary. It is always possible, however, that new areas of knowledge or human activity that might become subject of legislation may introduce some blends to the language of law. But even assuming this is a possibility in English, Arabic translators cannot safely and confidently create new blends of the almost 'closed door' policy on blends notwithstanding the fact that they have do so for syntactic more than semantic or terminology reasons. This is so because compound terms in Arabic are often interspersed with preposition; this impedesthe flow of the sentence especially when there are many modifiers around the term. For instance، حلمأه halmaah (blend word for hydrolysis), which

---

[23] Al-khatib, A.S. Wadʿu'l-Mustalahati'l-ʿIlmiyyati wa tatawwaru'l-Lughah", al-Lisanu'l-ʿArabi9. (1972).

[24] Bruke, J. (Ed.). Osborn's, Concise Law Dictionary. London: Sweet & Mawell .1976.

otherwise would be تحليل الماء tahlil bi alma', ('chemical reaction with water'), where the two nouns are separated by a preposition.

3. Al- Irtijal

Irtijal (or coining) is very closely associated with borrowing and arabization. This makes dealing with this topic quite an extensive task. Anis notes that Arabic philologists in the past were confused and undecided as to the true meaning of irtijal, and that often it meant simply the invention of words that are new, either in meaning, or in form, and thus different to the existing Arabic lexical items and do not coincide with the forms, or moulds, of such items [25]. He adds that on rare occasion's philologists called inventions items that were in fact formed through the accepted derivational processes in Arabic in some other cases, word-forming techniques such as blending or borrowing. Furthermore, a large number of assumed coined words were in fact not coinages, but rather original Arabic words that had been adopted by other language communities then re-introduced into Arabic with light differences. But there is no doubt that some words are actually invented, but their usage was restricted temporally or spatially, although some of them gained more popularity but remained the domain of what can be called slang. Only a limited number of slang words actually find their way to the proper lexicon [26].

The totality of Anis's argument can be summed up by saying that he undermined the nation that irtijal has enriched the Arabic language. His conclusion is that the Arabic lexis is not subject to a disorderly development process, it rather enjoys an immunity that was imposed by previous Arabic philologists, as a result of which coined words have no hope of acceding to the pedestal of classical lexicon. Due to the rarity of coinages in all languages, and due to the scant influence coining plays

---

25 Anis.Op.cit.p.95.
26 Ibid.p.107.

in the development of languages, most temporary researchers believe that coining is the least important method of language enrichment [27].

4. Al-Ta'rib (Arabisation)

This term refers to the adoption by the Arabic language of foreign terms after subjecting them to various processes that Arabic philologists have formulated. This method is also known as borrowing and assimilation, and is one of the most important tools that have contributed to the rapid modernization of the Arabic language (Badi, 1982: p. 315)[28]. Ta'rib, however, as a solution to the urgent need for adequate modern terms in science, literature and everyday life has at no stage gained unanimous acceptance.

> "*Even though the translators of the school established by Muhammad Ali of Egypt used foreign terminology with great profusion, it was clear almost from the beginning that many of those crude neologisms were bound to disappear, and that ta'rib as such was not going to be the main source of the growth of the language".* [29]

Most Arabic philologists have exhaustively discussed arabization, but most of them actually took a middle-of-road stand as to whether to give arabization their undiminished support or to reject it outright. All of them, however, have conceded that arabization, as a word-formation tool, is an important as analogy and derivation. On the first end of the scale there is opinion that arabization is a process which has its roots in the very origins of the Arabic language, in some of its best poetry and even in the Holy Quran, , therefore, "neither contaminates nor degrades the language, and arabized words should be recognized and treated as permanent values" [30]. In modern times, the need for arabization has been explained and defended in terms of maintaining the Arabic

---

[27] Anis.Op.cit.p.108.

[28] Badi. EmilFiqh Alluga Wa Khasisha(second edition). Beirut. (1986).

[29] Ibid. p215.

[30] Stetkevych. Op.cit. p. 57.

language as medium of education, especially of technical and scientific education, rather than restoring to foreign languages as a medium for instruction. The purity of the language, in some instance, did not rank prominently in discussing arabization; the main deriving force was to keep the foreign languages away from the Arab schools and universities.

> "*What is important is the Arabic language should maintain its status as a medium of scientific thought and expression, and that no foreign language should replace it in education, learning and research. The foreign language should rather be a support, a back up tool for the Arabic language".* [31]

Sibawayh, one of the most famous Arabic philologists, is a representative of a very liberal view of arabization, perhaps because he was of non-Arabic origin. For him, arabization is a very board concept, and "comprises all the foreign vocabulary used by the Arabs, however distant from the original morphological moulds of Arabic language some of it might be" *".* [32].

Sibawayh and many others talk about the transformation process that borrows words should be subjected to before they can be assimilated, or Arabized [33]. The great support for arabization has also led to a more daring attitude towards the concept, especially when some notable Arabic philologists have eve tried to do away with the adaptation process as a necessary step for the acceptance of arabised terms. Al-Maghribi made it clear that his position with respect to ta'rib was the reverse of that the Arabs-whereas they seldom let a foreign word retain its original form, he would rarely change it in accordance with the patterns of the Arabic language.

> "*Thus, we pronounce telegraph, telephone, automobile, theatre, program and may similar words, almost as they come*

---

[31] *Anis.* Op.cit..*p.7.*
[32] *Badi* Op.cit. *p.215*.
[33]Anis. Op.cit . Pp. 126-127 and Badi .Op.cit . Pp. 215-230.

down in their pronunciation, yet we term them as arabicises."[34].

It should be noted that arabization started well before Islam, and that even the Holy Quran contains a number of words of non-Arabic origins [35]. Arabization then acquired a greater impetus during the Abbasid era, when the translation movement intensified (Hassan 1966; Pp. 10-11) then at the beginning of the nineteenth century, in the aftermath of French occupation of Egypt, Arab intellectuals made huge efforts to develop and enrich the Arabic language. They considered it to be instrumental to exit the situation of cultural educational decadence in the Arab World, and found that arabization was one of the best methods to attain their objective (Mourad 1978; pp. 19037). It was against this background that Al-Maghribi showed this great enthusiasm for the principle of arabization almost without restrictions.

Some Arabic philologists have adopted a more rigid and discriminating approach to the assimilation of foreign vocabulary. They believe that the purity of the language demands a strict observance of the moulds that is quwalib, as only these moulds can actually arabize a foreign word. This is the view of Al-hariri, according to whom "the Arabic criterion is that, whenever a foreign noun is arabicised, it is referred in type and form to similar Arabic words" [36].

But against the liberal views of Sibawayh, the moderate views of Al-Maghribi and slightly more restrictive views of Al-Hariri, there have also been some Arabic grammarians and philologists who have criticized the arabization movement, or at least limited its role to temporary one. According to Stetkevych, some Arabic philologists have maintained that "these neologisms should be eliminated from the organism as soon as there were created or derived Arabic terms capable

---

[34] Almaghribi A . Kitab al-Ishatigqaq wa al-Tarib (second Edition). Cairo: 1947.

[35] Anis. Op.cit. p. 109.

[36] Al-Hariri, Abu Muhamad al-Qasim Ibn 'Ali. Kitab Durrat al-Ghawwas fi 'A wham al – Khawas. Leizsig, Thorbecke :1971.

of replacing them" [37]. According, the hierarchical position and literary value of such temporary neologisms would be the lowest possible. It important to note that analogy, or qiyas, represents a challenge to arabization, in the sense that purists have maintained that as long as borrowed words do not conform to one of the quips moulds they were doomed either to a temporary acceptance or to no acceptance at all. Stetkevych notes that "even through many foreign words entered the Arabic language, the number of words which do not adhere to the qiyas of the philological moulds is insignificant", and that[t] he construction of derived forms from such foreign moulds is generally considered as illicit" (1970; pp. 60-61). Al-Najm and Al-Rawi [38] further note that the speed with which new terms are being coined [in the foreign language] for new concepts and inventions necessitates the utilization of faradization, because the urgency of the matter does not make waiting for the language specialized committees to meet and decide on these terms a viable solution. According, faradization should be allowed as a temporary step in process for creating terms to enable the Arabic language to keep abreast with the scientific development. In other words, "arabization terms are sometimes a temporary step employed by translators driven by the necessity for quickly translating foreign scientific publications" [39].

Of interest is that borrowing of foreign terms through arabization has always been a by-product of translation requirements. This happened during the translation boom during the reign of Muhammad Ali of Egypt, then more recently following the independence of most of the Arab countries and their attempt to reform their educational systems and reintroduce Arabic as a medium of instruction (Khury 1964; p 7), or

---

[37] Stetkevych. Op.cit. p. 57.
[38] Al-Najm, A.A. & al-Rawi, . al-Mustalahu'l-Ilmi bayna at-Tarjamati wa't-Taʿrib", al-Lisanu'l-ʿArabi 32:85-100 .1989.
[39] Al-Najm, A.AA. m Scientific Translation. Mosul: Mosul University 1983.

to find equivalents for the huge influx of the new inventions in the technical and scientific fields [40].

Anis [41] provides an extensive discussion of arabization. He firstly notes that borrowing terms is an activity that can be either individual or collective. Borrowings affected by individuals, however, do not remain the domain of only those individuals but may be later becomes the property of a larger group and, consequently, the whole language group. He also notes that it is not easy to determine who was the person or group who borrowed and use a foreign term. Only rarely can we tell who the first person to borrowed term was.

Anis also notes that, in most cases, borrowed terms undergo a transformation process to make them easier for pronunciation and for acceptance by the borrowing language. In form, mainly when they can easily be pronounced by members of the receiving language community or when people are inclined to use terms in their foreign form as a symbol of power or simply out of admiration. In the latter cases, the foreign terms may coexist with terms of the same meaning in the receiving language but only temporarily. At the end only one of them usually dominates and pushes the other term into disuse.

The gist of Anis' argument is that he supports the attitude of the Arabic Language Academy, which allows the use of foreign words only when necessary and provided that such use is done according to the classical arabization methods. He explains that the restriction is essential for the preservation of the purity of the Arabic language from a deluge of foreign words, and for the maintenance of the literary heritage of Arabs and of their Holy Book, which was revealed in pure Arabic language [42].

Apart from the question of arabization as a process, is also the question of acceptance of individual terms derived through that process,

---

[40] Al-Najm & Al-Rawi. Op.cit. p. 89.
[41] Anis. Op.cit. pp 117-131.
[42] Anis. Op.cit. p 131.

especially in comparison with terms created through the process of ishtiqaq (derivation) or even direct translation Stetkevych notes that most Arab writers prefer the method of ishtiqaq. He makes the point that the decisive factor in the configuration of the modern Arabic language, as far as vocabulary is concerned, is the acceptance that neologism attain (1970; p. 63). To Taymur, this acceptance is determined not by the broad masses of the Arabic-speaking peoples, but by the educated sector of society, which he describes as the true depository of the modern Arabic language (Taymur 1956; pp. 11-14). This view is not shared by other Arab linguists, however. Al-Najm and Al-Rawi, for instance, observe that the repeated use of terms by the masses is the criterion which would dictate whether such terms gain validity or not, regardless of whether they are arabized or translated. While "telephone" has been assimilated into Arabic in its foreign form without any transformation and is more popular than the translated هاتف (hatif), the foreign word "automobile" has failed to achieve similar popularity and the translated equivalent سيارة (sayyarah) is the accepted term in classical and slang Arabic. The choice in both cases is dictated by "usage" time; and the development of the linguistic taste of the nation" [43].

Al-Najm and Al-Rawi [44] report on the results of a study they conducted to prove the high level of acceptance of arabization as opposed to translation. In the study, 300 Iraqis were asked to indicate their preference for arabization or translation in relation to 120 terms used for car parts. The results indicated that 85% of those surveyed, mainly representing people involved in the car maintenance and related trades, preferred and did actually use the arabized terms, and that the 15% of people who used the translated terms were actually bureaucrats. All-Najm and Al-Rawi provide an interesting explanation for the results. Cars and car parts were introduced to Iraq in the 1920s along

---

[43] Al-Khatib Op.cit. p.7.
[44] Al-Najm and Al-Rawi. Op.cit .pp. 91-98.

with the English terms for these parts. Arabic language committees and academies were not quick enough to provide Arabic equivalents for these terms, and as a result the English terms gained popularity instead in the absence of any competition. When the Arabic terms were produced it was too late for the masses to change their attitudes to usage, and the newly arabized terms became the domain bureaucrats only.

Transliteration, of which arabization is an example, thus an important tool to enrich language, although some languages are tolerant towards this principle than others. Most words in Turkish and over fifty percent of words in Persian are of Arabic origin [45]. English and French have borrowed many words from a large number of languages. In the realm of science, Arabic has borrowed a large number of words from the various languages too, and in many cases they have been fully adapted into Arabic and become fully accepted through inflections, derivation and other grammatical processes. "Galvanize" for instance is

ومغلفن (mugalvan), and thus "to galvanize" is يغلفن (yugalvin) and "galvanizing" is غلفنة (galvanah).

The question is: Can we adopt this method in solving our legal terminology problems? To answer this question we have to navigate very carefully through the view presented in the above discussion, especially through the laid down by the Cairo Arabic Academy as explained by Anis, namely that arabization may be employed only when necessary. According to the Academy, Arabic scientific terms can be produced firstly with preference to old Arabic terms to new ones, unless the new terms have become popular, and secondly by accepting some foreign terms when necessary. The English legal lexicon is rich with a host foreign terms, including Latin and French. The same cannot be said about Arabic, although it should be stated that the transformation

---

[45]Anis . Op.cit. p. 120.

process which borrowed terms undergo on Arabic makes their origin almost always obscure. It perhaps suffices to say that the قانون (qanun), that is law, is derived from the Greek 'Kanon''', for canon law. One can assume that at some stage Arabs borrowed a Greek word when they thought there was a need to do so.

5. Conlusion

Several questions can be posed at the conclusion of this discussion.

1. Are Arabs, or Arabic speakers in any country, not justified in doing what their ancestors did many centuries ago, given that the circumstances insofar as need is concerned are the same?

2. Besides, given that the first users of borrowed, transliterated terms are rarely known, and that such terms gain popularity by general usage and acceptance, are translators in Sudan, for instance, not allowed to employ the method of arabization to solve their translation needs for their local community?

3. Using the arabized terms 'telefon', 'galvana' and 'qanun' (for telephone, galvanized and canon respectively) as precedents, can a translator use 'Kavit', 'fawadir' or solisur' (for caveat voire dire and solicitor respectively), given that the Arabic academies may not be fully aware of the difficulties encountered by translators of legal texts in Sudan and perhaps in other English-speaking countries with Arabic-speaking communities?

4. Is it possible for a group of prominent, experienced Arabic translators to assume the role of a limited-scope, limited mandate of Arabic academy in Sudan to provide solutions for transition problems and for the English – speaking community living in Sudan?

5. Are the Arabic translators and teachers in Sudan allowed to build on the Arabic legal terminology used by the majority of the Arabic- speaking community, which is mostly arabized, to create

'temporary' equivalents for some legal terms pending a more permanent solution by the Arabic academies in the Arab World?

References

1. **Albastani** .Algamos Almuhit- Beirut: 1987
2. **Al-Hariri**, Abu Muhamad al-Qasim Ibn 'Ali . Kitab Durrat al-Ghawwas fi 'A wham al – Khawas. Leizsig, Thorbecke:1971.
3. **Al-khatib, A.S.** (1972), "Wadˤu'l-Mustalahati'l-ˤIlmiyyati wa tatawwaru'l-Lughah", al-Lisanu'l-ˤArabi9:
4. **Almaghribi** A . Kitab al-Ishatigqaq wa al-Tarib (second Edition). Cairo: 1947.
5. **Al-Najm, A.A. & al-Rawi** (1989), "al-Mustalahu'l-Ilmi bayna at-Tarjamati wa't-Taˤrib", al-Lisanu'l-ˤArabi 32:85-100.
6. **al-Najm, A.AA.** (1983)m Scientific Translation. Mosul, Mosul, University.
7. **Al-Samman**, W. At-Ta,rib fi al- ,Ulum al-Tibiyyah : Nazrah fi Mashakil Haza Al-Ta,rib. In Majallat Al-Adab2. Beirut: 1975.
8. **Amrit Tiwan**. TheEssential Guide to Kowledge Management: E-Business and CRM Application.Prentice Hall PTR, Upper saddle River: 2001.
9. **Anis.** almojam alwasit. Cairo, Dar Alfikr,1978.
10. **Bʾaʾalabaki , M**. Al- Mawrid – A modern English – Arabic Dictionary. Beirut: Dar al- 'llm li al-Malayin,1978.
11. **Badi, Emil**. Fiqh Alluga Wa Khasisha(second edition), Beirut: 1986.
12. **Bruke, J.** (Ed.). Osborn's, Concise Law Dictionary. London: Sweet & Mawell, 1976.
13. Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Tutorial. Available from: [www.crmt](). Accessed 18/6/2011.
14. **D.Millington** (1988), "System Analysis and Design for Computer Application" EWP, India.

15. **Faruqi, H. S.** (1991) Faruqi's law dictionary English –Arabic Beirut: libraire du Liban.
16. **Humphrey** (1989), "Management the Software Process", Addison Wesley.
17. **Ibn Jinni,** Abu′L-Fath ‹Uthman. Al-Khawa′i. an-Najjar, Muhammed ‹Ali (ed). Cairo, Dar al-Kutub al-Misriyya. 3 vols. Vol. 1 (1371/1952 ed.), (1374/1955 ed.).
18. **James Kadle & Donalde Yeates** (2001) "Project Management for Information system", Orentice Hall, Malaysia.
19. **Kimberly Caplan and James L. S.anders**, (1999) "Building International Security Standard", IEEEIT Pro, Vol, 1 No.2.
20. **Majallat Majam'** al-Lughah al-Arabiyyah, 1934: 1.235). Cairo.
21. **Malhotra Yogesh,** (1998) "Knowledge Management, Knowledge Organizations and Knowledge Workings: A view from the lines",{www.document},-URL: http://www.brint.com/interview/maeil.htm
22. **Michael J.Power, David Adame, and Harland D. Mills**, (1988), "Comuter Information Systems Development: Analysis and Design", Research Adminstration, Saudi Arabia.
23. **Mubarak,M.**(1960) Fiqh Alluga, Damascus University Press.
24. **OECD** (2003) "A Framework Document for Information Society Measurements and Analysis" DSTI/ICCP/IIS, Paris {www.document}.
25. **Patiricia B. Seybold with Ronni T. Marshak** (1998) "How to Create a profitable Business Strategy for the Internet and Beyond", Crown Business, New York.
26. **Paul Dorsey and Peter Koletzle**(1997), "Oracle Designer 2000Handbook", Tata Mc Grew Hill.
27. **Sager ET. Al**, (1990), English special language, London: Longman.
28. **Stetkevych,** (1970) the modern Arabic literary language, Chicago: University Chicago press.

29. **Tom Tobin**, (2003), ''The case for Knowledge Management in CRM'', Gartner Inc. URL: www.serviceware.com.