

JMS. 5(1968)(70-79)
MFH. 3270

**MEDIAEVAL ARABIC GRAMMAR
AND ITS INFLUENCE
ON LINGUISTIC THEORY AND TERMINOLOGY
IN CONTEMPORARY ARAB SCIENCE**

By LADISLAV DROZDIK

1. THE present stage of scientific thought depends, to a considerable extent, upon results obtained in the past. However, the relation between the present stage of a given scientific discipline and the degree of development of the latter in the past (when speaking about the past we have mostly in mind the civilizatory context of the mediaeval Arab science) is not quite immediate. For the achievements of a particular branch of science depend upon the continuity of national traditions in that field, upon the extent of its interrelations with the World science in the primitive period of its development, and upon other factors.

Scientific disciplines such as mathematics, astronomy, medicine and the like, that is those whose splendid results achieved within the frame of mediaeval Arab science are well known, drew freely upon the scientific thought of European antiquity (in some single cases even upon the best traditions of Hindu civilization, viz. mathematics) and, some centuries later, controlled the development of these branches of science in mediaeval Europe. But, in spite of this, all these fields of knowledge are, for the time being, entirely dependent on the achievements of the European science. With this type of sciences, viz. sciences characterized by a sufficiently long break of creative continuity, the national tradition does not operate in the sense either of a stimulative or in that of a retardative factor. Basically, these branches of science resume contact with the national tradition in an indirect way only, by means of the European (or rather Western, non-Arab) extensions of those remarkable accomplishments which have been attained or, at least, stimulated by the mediaeval Arab science.

On the other hand, however, those branches of science which have preserved their continuity until now and are able, in a certain sense, to adopt some elementary notions of the European science and confront them with the corresponding indigenous notions and related terms, yield a quite different picture. Linguistics, or more explicitly, those fields of the study of language which are represented in the Arab science, belongs to the latter category. In the following we shall try to approach some aspects of

the influence of the traditional grammatical theory and terminology within the scope of mediaeval Arab science on the modern linguistic theory and terminology, as reflected in the Egyptian linguistic publications issued in the period of the last few years. (It seems that the very term 'linguistic' is rather inappropriate in this context because of implying a considerably higher degree of abstraction as to fully correspond to that which is usual in the Arab science of language in our days. It would probably be possible to substitute in most cases, the term 'linguistic' by that of 'grammatical' provided that the extent and assortment of grammatical features would be conceived in the sense of the mediaeval Arab science.)

2. One of the highest degrees of abstraction was reached, by the mediaeval Arabic grammar, in setting the relation between governing ('*amil*) and governed (*ma'mul fīhi*) words. The former can operate as either explicitly expressed ('*amila fīhi lafẓan*) or implied by the context ('*amila fīhi taqḍīran, bit-taqḍīr*). The governing word controls the grammatical form of the governed one constituting, in this way, a relation which underlies the grammatical meaning (*ma'nān*). The whole of interdependencies, conceived in this way, as well as their formal rendering, is termed *i'rāb*.¹ The formal expression of these interdependences is secured, with the governed word, by the set of markers which are usually covered by the term *ḥarakāt al-i'rāb*.² The negation of *i'rāb* is designed by the term *binā'*, in the terminology of indigenous philologists, that is, inflexibility in the sense of *i'rāb*,³ which underlies the basic dichotomy between (1) *al-mu'rabāt* (flexible words), and (2) *al-mabniyyāt* (inflexible words).

Flexible words yield, in turn, a trichotomic division into *marfū'āt*, *manṣūbāt*, and *maḥfūdāt* (or *mağrūrāt*), in the case of nouns, and into *marfū'āt*, *manṣūbāt*, and *mağzūmāt*, in the case of verbs.

The mechanism of *i'rāb*, as defined in the above terms, includes only a part of the possible inflectional manifestations of Arabic, notably the grammatical category of case and that of verbal mood. The first of these categories (viz. case) is, according to the traditional conception of *i'rāb*, superior to all other grammatical categories of the noun, such as number, gender, and grammatical determination. The latter categories operate

¹ Referred to in de Sacy's 'syntaxe désinentielle' and J.Fück's 'Desinential-flexion' (cf. also § 4 of this paper).

² Cf. the Egyptian edition of al-Ḥwārizmī's *Mafātīḥ al-'ulūm* (henceforth *Mafātīḥ*), based on van Vloeten's edition (Leiden 1895), Cairo 1930; pp.29-30; cf. also *wuḡūb al-i'rāb*, ib., 28 ff.; however, the latter does not strictly correspond to *ḥarakāt al-i'rāb* because of its including, in certain contexts, such syntactic notions as *al-mubtada'*, *al-ḥabar*, *al-fā'il*, etc. as well (viz. ib., 31 f.).

³ For the term *ḥarakāt al-binā'* cf., for instance, the Egyptian commentator on *Mafātīḥ*, Muḥammad Kamāladdīn al-Adhamī, *Mafātīḥ*, 29, fn. 1.

merely as modifiers of the particular case ending realizations. The last of the above *i'rāb* categories (viz. verbal mood), is, in turn, superior to all grammatical categories proper to the verbal inflection, such as number, gender, person, etc.

I'rāb, then, does not include introflexional realizations of any of the aforementioned grammatical features, e.g. number distinction rendered by the so called broken plurals (*kitāb* vs. *kutub*), the introflexionally expressed gender differences (*aḥsan* vs. *ḥusnā*), etc. All features of this type are described, as a rule, under the heading of *iṣṭiqāq*.

I'rāb, at the same time, constitutes the most conservative nucleus of the indigenous grammar in reflecting the synthetic linguistic type of Arabic. Although the language of the Qur'an, as demonstrated by the occurrence of constructions exhibiting free word-order (e.g. *innamā yaḥšā llāha min 'ibādihī l-'ulamā'u* (*Fāṭir*, 28),⁴ as well as the language of the pre-Islamic poetry, fully preserve formal features of *i'rāb*, early generations of Iraqi grammarians as early as the beginning of VIIIth century A.D. find it useful to study the language of nomadic tribes. For their language, in preserving formal features of *i'rāb*, was much more conservative than that of sedentary Arabs, the latter exhibiting features speaking in favour of the progressive shift towards analytism.

Indigenous grammar, despite this evident situation, continues considering *i'rāb* as its basic concept from which the whole of its structure is derived, irrespective of the real linguistic evolution. This ignoring of the evolutionary trends in Arabic creates as early as the early Middle Ages a very conservative scientific basis which has greatly contributed to maintaining and deepening divergences between the Classical idiom and the language of everyday usage, by virtue of which we can consider it as a powerful historical factor stimulating the emergence of the modern diglossia as well.

3. The very existence of *i'rāb*, as conceived by indigenous grammarians, brings into being several important problems.

The sum of formal features operating in the inflectional system of *i'rāb* is very frequently designated by one of the following terms: *ḥarakāt al-i'rāb* (viz. fn. 2), *'alāmāt al-i'rāb*,⁵ *zawābir al i'rāb*,⁶ *awāḥir al-kalām lil-i'rāb*,⁷ etc., etc.⁸

⁴ J. Fück, *Arabīya. Untersuchungen zur arabischen Sprach- und Stilgeschichte* (Abh.d.Sächs.Akad.d.Wiss.zu Leipzig, phil.-hist.Kl., Bd. 45, 1). Berlin 1950, p. 2.

⁵ Cf. *al-Āḡurrūmiyyah* (in Brünnow-Fischer's *Arab. Cbrest.*, 5th ed., Leipzig 1948, p. 172). Viz. also the Arabic version of Fück's *Arabīya*: Yūhān Fik, *al-'Arabiyya* (translated into Arabic by Dr. 'Abdalḥalīm an-Naǧǧār), al-Qāhira: Maktabat al-Ḥāngī, 1951, pp. 2, 3, etc.

⁶ Fück (Arabic version), pp. 3, 4, etc.

⁷ Cf. *Maḥāṭib*, 29.

⁸ For other variants viz. § 4 of our study as well.

The notion of *ḥarakāt al-i'rāb* becomes, in many cases, the first notion superior to the single inflectional manifestations of *i'rāb* in the indigenous hierarchy of grammatical notions and, accordingly, it freely substitutes the notion of case. The latter is, as a rule, defined by the sum of its single manifestations, i.e. by the total of desinential morphemes referred to in the Arabic terms *raf'*, *ḥaṣḍ* (*ḡarr*), and *naṣb*. The relation between *ḥarakāt al-i'rāb* and the verbal mood yields a similar picture.

In this connection, it should be said, we do not take into account too specialised conceptional and terminological niceties peculiar to particular authors or grammatical schools. Thus, for instance, *al-Ḥwārizmī* considers *raf'*, *naṣb* and *ḥaṣḍ* to be freely replaceable by (viz. *qad tusammā ayḍān.*) *ḍamm*, *faṭḥ* and *kasr*, in opposition to Basrian philologists who distinguish between both sets of the above terms: the first of them denoting case endings controlled by *'awāmil* in the framework of *i'rāb* (in the case of nouns which will serve as illustrative material for the subsequent statements), the other set representing the so-called *ḥarakāt al-binā'* like those in *naḥnu*, *ayna*, etc.⁹

The extent of *ḥarakāt al-i'rāb* varies considerably with individual authors:

3.1. In a minimum sense, this term includes vowel morphemes of the nominal (viz. case) and verbal (viz. mood) inflection, i.e. those corresponding, in the most generally accepted terminological usage, to *ḍamm*, *faṭḥ* and *kasr* (in the domain of verbal inflection the latter being substituted by *ḡazm*). That part of *i'rāb* which is rendered by means of morphemes constituted by consonantal elements is not taken into account. It should be noted that Arab grammarians, influenced by orthographical features, tend to identify morphemes constituted by long vowels: *-ū*, *-ā*, *-ī* (viz. *wāw*, *alif* and *yā'*) with consonants (viz. *ḥurūf*) as well.

3.2. Maximally, it includes the whole variety of grammatical means pertaining to the rendering of case and verbal mood, that is, with the inclusion of the consonant-constituted morphemes as well. In this case, as is evident, it is possible to treat *ḥarakāt al-i'rāb* as a notion superior to the whole inflectional domain defined by the indigenous terms *raf'*, *naṣb*, *ḥaṣḍ* (*ḡarr*), in the case of nouns, and *raf'*, *naṣb* and *ḡazm*, in the case of verbs.

Similar discrepancies in defining *i'rāb* by means of the indigenous notion of *ḥarakāt al-i'rāb* are allowed by a rather large frame of interpretability of the very terms *ḥaraka* (corresponding, in most cases, to 'vowel') and *ḥarf* (equalling, most frequently, the concept of 'consonant').

As emphasized by J. Cantineau,¹⁰ the term *ḥaraka*, in the interpretation

⁹ Cf. *Maṣāṭīḥ*, 29.

¹⁰ Cf. J. Cantineau, *Études de linguistique arabe. Mémoires Jean Cantineau*, Paris 1960, p. 12.

of Arab grammarians, does not represent a phonic correlate to consonant (*ḥarf*) being rather identified with a certain state of the latter (viz. state of 'motion'), thus contrasting with its state of 'quiescence' (viz. *sukūn*). On the other hand, the term *ḥarf* which can be, in most cases, rendered by the term 'consonant', denotes in the main the graphic symbol of the Arabic alphabet and only secondarily its phonic realization.

When viewed from this angle, an extremely important criterion in defining *ḥurūf* is their occurrence at the line level within a written corpus. It is mostly in virtue of this specific localization that *ḥurūf* can most unambiguously be distinguished from *ḥarakāt*, that is, additional graphic symbols situated at different line levels. Since all *ḥarf*-type symbols are situated at the same line level, including graphic symbols of vowel quantity, (1) the notion of *ḥarf* potentially includes (1.1) the sum of graphic symbols used in expressing consonants as well as their phonic realization, and at the same time, (1.2) the total of graphic symbols pertaining to the notation of vowel quantity jointly with their phonic values; while (2) *ḥaraka* should be identified with (2.1) additional graphic symbols of short vowels with their phonic realization and, in some sources, (2.2) still other additional graphic symbols with their respective phonic values among which is sometimes located rather unfortunately even zero-vowel (*sukūn*, *ǧazm*), so that *ḥaraka* potentially includes even its own negation as well.¹¹

The opposition between vowel and consonant did not get, in the indigenous grammar, any precise definition until now, the terminological distinction between both notions being, in turn, very insufficient. Some sources tend to derive the terms for vowel and consonant from the traditional terminology (viz. *ḥaraka*, *ḥarf*), perceptibly influenced by orthographic features, while other sources try to emphasize the phonic value of these items in a more immediate way.

To the first type the following pairs belong:

ḥurūf mutaḥarrika vs. *ḥurūf sākina*;¹²

¹¹ Cf., for instance, Muḥ. Kamāladdīn al-Adhamī's comments, *Maḥāṭib*, 29, 1.

¹² L. Saisse, I. Chéhata, *Dictionnaire français-arabe* (henceforth DFA), London-New York-Toronto, 2nd ed., new impr. 1955; viz. the entry 'consonne (les consonnes et les voyelles)'. Here, in the state of definiteness and in reverse order relative to our quotation.

Cf. also the study of Ḥamid 'Abdalqādir, member of the Cairene Academy of Arabic Language, *Tunā'iyyat al-uṣūl al-luġawiyya* ('Bilateralism of Roots of the Language'), in *Mağallat Mağma' al-luġa al-'arabiyya* (henceforward MML'A), 11, 113-133 (al-Qahira 1959), p. 113. Here, the author employs the term *ḥarf mutaḥarrik* in a slightly different way, viz. *yatarakkab kull minḥā* (i.e. *min al-mawādd al-luġawiyya*) *min maqta' wāḥid muġlaq ay min ḥarfayn awwalubumā mutaḥarrik*

ḥurūf ṣawtiyya vs. *ḥurūf sākina*,¹³ etc.

To the second:

aṣwāt al-madd (with a further distinction between *al-qaṣīra* and *aṭ-ṭawīla*) vs. *aṣwāt maqta'iyya (ḥurūf)*;¹⁴

ṣawt layyin (*sawt layyin qaṣīr* or *ḥaraka 'ādiya* vs. *ṣawt layyin ṭawīl* or *ṣawt al-madd*) vs. *ṣawt sākin*,¹⁵ etc.

The last pair presents the first hopeful attempts to codify these basic terms at the highest codificative level in the U.A.R. (1962).

Other variants:

ḥarakāt – graphic symbols of short vowels (as against *ḥurūf*);¹⁶

(it should be noted that the criterion of localization of a given graphic symbol relative to the line level or, in other words, the criterion of equivalence of graphic symbols, which was repeatedly emphasized in works of Arab scholars of various periods,¹⁷ continues to be relevant until our days. Thus, for instance, Professor Wafi, while commenting on the proposal to introduce new *ḥarf*-type graphemes for denoting short vowels of the Arabic sound system, speaks about *ḥurūf*);¹⁸

ḥaraka mamdūda – long vowel;¹⁹

ḥaraka qaṣīra (ṭawīla) – short (long) vowel;²⁰

'alāmat al-ḥaraka – graphic symbol of short vowel (in contradistinction to its phonic representation – *haraka*),²¹ etc.

wa ṭānihimā sākin. The term *ḥarf mutaharrik*, as evident from the above quotation, is to be identified with a CV segment (in opposition to the DFA-conceived 'voyelle'). Discrepancies of this kind are numerous.

¹³ G.Š.Šarbatov, *Russko-arabskij učebnyj slovar'*, Moscow, 1964. Cf. entries 'glasnyj (glasnyje zvuki)' and 'soglasnuj II'.

¹⁴ Cf. 'Alī 'Abdalwaḥid Wāfī, *Fiqh al-luġa*, 4th ed., Cairo 1956, pp. 204, 253, 257, etc. (henceforth FL). Besides these items, Wāfī employs terms which have been subsequently codified by the Cairo Academy, such as *al-aṣwāt al-layyina* (or *aṣwāt al-līn*) as against *al-aṣwāt as-sākina* (cf. ib., 16).

¹⁵ *Maġmū'at al-muṣṭalahāt al-'ilmiyya wal-fanniyya-llatī aqarrahā-l-maġma'*, vol. iii, Cairo 1962, pp. 139-40.

¹⁶ Cf. FL, 253.

¹⁷ Miḥā'īl b.Nīqūlā b.Ibrāhīm Ṣabbāġ, *ar-Risāla at-tamma fī kalām al-'amma wal-manāhiġ fī aḥwāl al-kalām ad-dāriġ* (edited by H.Thorbecke, *Miḥā'īl Ṣabbāġ's Grammatik der arabischen Umgangssprache in Syrien und Aegypten*. Nach der Münchener Handschrift hrsg. von H.Thorbecke), Strassburg 188y (hereafter Ṣabbāġ), p. 35: *wal-qā'ida al-muṭṭarida anna kull ḥaraka min aḍ-ḍamma wal-faḥa wal-kasra idā uṣbi'at ṣārat ḥarfan faḍ-ḍamma tuqlab wawan wal-faḥa alifan wal-kasra yā'an*.

¹⁸ Cf. FL, 259.

¹⁹ MML 'A, 10 (1958), 53.

²⁰ MML 'A, 11 (1959), 113.

²¹ *Maġmū'at al-buḥūt wal-muḥāḍarāt (allatī ulqiyat fī mu'tamar al-Maġma' fi d-dawra al-ḥāmisa wal-'iṣrīn)*, Cairo 1960, p. 158.

4. The traditional grammar, as is evident from the preceding pages, did not succeed in creating some of the useful generalizations of certain grammatical categories commonly met with in European-type grammars. The grammatical category of case, for instance, which is one of the basic *i'rāb* categories, is in most cases substituted by the sum of its single representations (viz. *raf'*, *naṣb*, *haḥq* (*ḡarr*). However, this degree of abstraction proves to be, in certain contexts, rather insufficient, especially when confronting the system of scientific notions, as elaborated by the indigenous Arabic grammar, with that of the European or, more generally, Western type grammars. Such cases of confrontation emerge quite necessarily in every attempt to translate works of linguistic interest by non-Arab authors into Arabic, as well as in every attempt to adopt modern linguistic notions by specialists who had received their linguistic training out of the reach of the influence of the Arab science but who make, nevertheless, use of Arabic as a medium of scientific communication.

The lack of a number of clearly defined notions and terms related to them in the mediaeval grammar as well as the lack of well-established terminological units in the present day Arabic grammar lead to numerous incorrespondences in the generality range of the respective terms as compared with their European equivalents. The generality range of the Arabic terms is either slightly higher or, which is the most typical case, slightly lower than that of terms corresponding to them in Western taxonomies of grammatical concepts. The situation is further complicated by the fact that the great majority of terms used varies not only with different authors but even with the same author.

Discrepancies of this kind can be illustrated by the grammatical category of case. Examples are drawn from the Arabic translation of Fück's *Arabīya* and are faced with those corresponding to them in the German original. Page numbers with German quotations are to be identified with the pagination of the German original, those given with Arabic terms refer to *an-Nağğār's* Arabic version.²²

Kasus (plur. (60) – *'alāmāt al-i'rāb* (106);

Kasusendugen (2) – *'alāmāt al-awḥāl* (2);

Kasusendugen (60) – *i'rāb* (106) (however, the term *i'rāb*, on the other hand, frequently corresponds to Fück's term *Desinentialflexion*, the latter being alternatively rendered by still other Arabic equivalents such as *taṣaruf i'rābī* (9, 13, etc.), *taṣaruf bil-i'rāb* (2, 3, etc.), *taṣrīf i'rābī* (11), etc. which, apart from the grammatical category of case, also include at the same taxonomic level that of verbal mood);

Kasusforman (60) – *ḥālāt al-i'rāb* (105) (in opposition to Fück's 'Modusformen' (60) which is rendered by the Arabic *taṣrīf al-af'āl* (105) in an-

²² For the full bibliographical data viz. fn. 4 and 5.

Nağğār's translation);

Kasusformen (viz. die Aufgabe der äusseren – (61) – (*tark*) *al-i'rāb fī awābir al-kalimāt* (107);

Kasussyntax (5) – *aḥwāl al-kalima* (9); etc., etc.²³

The relatively great number of alternative terms related to case seems to bear witness to the fact that this range of generality is not familiar to the grammatical theory in the contemporary Arab science, nor do the separate case values exhibit unambiguous terminological coverings in recent works of Arab scholars, especially in connection with case systems of synthetic languages other than Arabic, i.e. languages whose case systems differ from the Arabic trichotomy. In similar cases, traditional syntactic terms for particular parts of a sentence are, as a rule, called to the rescue, such as:

(in describing the case system of Latin)

nominative – *ḥālat al-fā'il*;

accusative – *ḥālat al-maf'ūl bihi*;

genitive – (*ḥālat al-*)*muḍāf ilayhi*,²⁴ etc.

The use of terms of the above type leads to a dangerous terminological over-load as in the case of *al-fā'il*, for instance. Cf.:

(1) (with reference to Arabic:) subject of a verbal sentence;

(2) (with reference to other languages:) subject in general, agential noun;

(3) nominative (viz. above);

(4) in morphology: active participle.

5. Further complications emerge whenever, apart from a given grammatical category (in the following considerations the grammatical category of case will be used as an illustrative example), another category should be expressed at the same time. It is worthwhile noting, in this connection that singular, in the case of grammatical number, and masculine, in the case of gender, are very frequently treated as implicitly included in the term covering the basic category. The very term 'basic category' is, as a matter of evidence, a highly relative notion because it is a matter of context to decide the question of the respective relevance of grammatical categories under consideration.

In such cases, basically, one of the following methods is usually followed:

(1) all the grammatical categories under consideration, irrespective of

²³ Šabbāğ speaks mostly about *mawāqi'* or *mawāqi' bil-i'rāb*, cf. p. 24, etc.

²⁴ MML'A, 13 (1961), pp. 55-6 (viz. Ramsis Ğirğis, *at-Tamyim wat-tanwīn*, pp. 51-9). The last example (genitive), should in the quoted source, represent the plural, viz. *al-muḍāf ilayhim*, p. 56. (All the examples quoted occur here with reference to the Latin case system).

any aspect of their possible hierarchization, are explicitly expressed by means of autonomous terminological units, case being, as a rule, rendered by

(1.1) terms derived from the traditional *i'rāb*-featured case terminology, e.g. *al-ġam' al-marfū'* – nominative plural,²⁵ etc.;

(1.2) traditional syntactic terms related to particular members of a sentence (using these terms in this context is, nevertheless, rather traditional), e.g. *ġam' al-mudāf ilayhi* – genitive plural,²⁶ etc.;

(2) one expresses, in an explicit way, only the basic category (relative to a given context; in our context it is the grammatical category of case) all other satellite categories being expressed, or rather symbolized, by the corresponding grammatical form of the term covering that basic category, the latter and only the latter being rendered by an autonomous terminological unit, e.g.

al-ǧā'ilūn – nominative plural²⁷ (possibly even gender: masculine); the plural ending *-ūn* is in this case terminologically pertinent (viz. 'plural') in virtue of which we get an opposition between:

al-ǧā'il – nominative singular²⁸ vs. *al-ǧā'ilūn* – nominative plural.

6. Along with the extinction of the synthetic category of case emerges the problem of the fixation of word-order. As early as in the work of Sibawayhi we find frequent allusions to word-order. There is, however, no generalized notion of the latter, the sum of its single manifestations rather being used instead once again. Such a sum is, in the terminology of mediaeval grammar, represented by the bi-componental term *at-taqdīm wat-ta'hīr*. It seems that word-order was, during the whole period of the Middle Ages, and possibly still later, covered by this term which, in view of its features of summation, suggests at the same time a certain abstraction from a concrete word-order scheme.

The translator of Fück's *Arabīya* similarly, as with the category of case, meets serious difficulties once again. Since no better term was at hand, the following units have been used:

²⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 57 (here relative to Amharic).

²⁶ Cf. *ib.*, 55 (with reference to Greek).

²⁷ Cf. *ib.*, 56 (with reference to Latin).

²⁸ In a similar way can be expressed categories of number and gender, together with the grammatical category of person (in verbal inflection) in a context where the latter may be considered as 'basic', e.g. *al-ġā'ib wal-ġā'ibun* (viz. *li-l-ġā'ib wal-ġā'ibīn*) – the 3rd pers. masc. of singular and plural (Ṣabbāġ, *op. cit.*, 21); *al-ġā'iba wal-ġā'ibāt* – the 3rd pers. fem. of singular and plural (*ib.*, 21); *damīr al-muhātibīn* – the pronominal suffix of the 2nd pers. masc. plural (*ib.*, 43).

Nevertheless, we find alternative solutions as well, viz. *damīr ġam' al-mu'annaṭ al-ġā'ib* (*ib.*, 21); *damīr ġam' al-mutakallimīn* (*ib.*, 20), etc. As is evident from the last example, both procedures may be combined.

tartīb (105, 106, etc.);
tartīb al-kalimāt (106);
at-tartīb al-waḍ'ī lil-kalimāt (107);
mawāḍi' al-kalimāt (106);
mawāḍi' al-kalimāt (4, 105);
mawāḍi' al-kalām (al-iḥtiyāriyya) (viz. *mawāḍi' kalām al-qur'ān al-iḥtiyāriyya* (3), etc.

Nearly all these terms are neologisms of calque origin. The last of them (*mawāḍi' al-kalām al-iḥtiyāriyya* – free word-order) proved to be unintelligible for Egyptian undergraduates at a linguistic specialization (Czech language), with ten questioned from fifteen.

7. In view of the fact that the indigenous grammar developed independently of the living usage, it lead into a more or less closed system which is not able, for the time being, either to record evolutionary linguistic features or to underlie them by new, powerful generalizations in a fully satisfactory way. Furthermore, *i'ṛāb*, in its orthodox interpretation, grows out from a level of abstraction incompatible with that underlying the hierarchy of grammatical notions in mediaeval Europe.

Consequently, every attempt to link up with Western grammatical thought encounters serious difficulties. For the future, one is authorized to believe that there will arise a situation similar to that in natural sciences, modern technology, medicine, etc. (viz. adopting whole scientific systems from outside without any, or with negligible regard to the national achievements). Or, which seems to be even a more promising solution, that a far-reaching re-systemization of the linguistic science on the basis of the national tradition will put an end to the recent stagnancy.