

## Lexical Borrowing in Arabic Language; In the Term and Concept

Majed G. Alzu'bi

Phd in Arabic SYNTAX

The University of Jordan, Language Center

**ABSTRACT:** The research discusses the phenomenon of borrowing both sides of the term and concept. On the side of the term, the research has identified the reasons that led to the selection of the term "borrowing" in recent years, followed by Salah Rawai's using of the term, and concluded that his reasoning was misplaced. And tried to search also differentiate between the significance of the terms "borrowing and lending",.

On the conceptual side, the research established a boundary between "language borrowing", "verbal borrowing". Research has pointed out too, to the breadth of the concept of Arabization in the modern era.

The research also discusses about the concept of 'almuwallad, and what is worth studying the phenomenon of borrowing is what it borrowed by the Muwalladīn. Also mentioned the modernized divisions of borrowed words as a reflection of their consideration of the concepts of borrowing, and tried to divide the borrowed words into an unsustainable division.

**Keywords:** Lexical Borrowing, Borrowing, 'almu'arrab, 'amuwalladm, 'addajīl.

### 1. Introduction

The term "linguistic borrowing" has great attention in ancient and modern times. The old sources had looked at this issue with different visions and ways to deal with the associated words. In this regard, several terms have appeared that can be addressed in the light of linguistic borrowing, such as 'almu'arrab, 'amuwallad and 'addajīl. Alkhaleel has included in his dictionary "'al'ayn" a good deal of borrowed words, in addition to a number of controls and measurements to distinguish between 'addajīl from 'almu'arrab. Sibawayh also addressed this phenomenon in different sections of "'alkitāb", and notice a number of acoustic and morphological changes for borrowed words after entry into Arabic.

Then the linguists and the lexicographers followed the borrowed words, sentencing them, and often referred to the lender languages.

A new directions had formed in Arabization; the most notably was in the fourth century, with tendency that represented by Al-Jawhari: with his book "'aṣṣiḥāḥ" and his agreed; and the meaning that it is necessary to subject the borrowed words to the structure of Arabic morphology when Arabization. However, these words, and those standards, remained in the dictionaries and language books, until Abu Mansur al-Jawaliki (465-540 h), who collected

it in a unique and discrete book says Al-Anbari, called: "'almu'arrab min 'alkalām 'al'a'ŷmiyy 'ala ḥurūf 'almu'ŷam" (1985, p. 474).

What was distinguishing this phenomenon in ancient is the overlap in the use of terms on the function of borrowed words, and the lack of clarity in the perception to parts of this phenomenon between 'almu'arrab, 'almuwallad and 'addajīl.

In modern times, linguists have expanded their research into this phenomenon, and their approaches and attitudes have differed in dealing with it. At the official level, the Arabization was one of the first topics discussed by the Arabic Language Academy in Cairo; it was discussed at its early sessions and took different decisions related to the Arabization, pronunciation and writing. The orientalist too, were not excluded from the historical and descriptive study of this phenomenon. One of these orientalist as Jaroslav Stetkevych, in his book "'al'arabiyyah 'alfuṣḥā 'aḥadīṭah", since the third chapter of it came under the title of "The Arabization of words", and the chapter 6 titled with the "Arabization methods", Stetkevych also displayed the Arabization with ancient and modern, and his opinion was that the first lexicons did not differentiate between 'addajīl and 'almu'arrab, and provided the text of Alkhaleel as one of these lexicons.

Contemporary linguists continued their research, preferring to "Borrow" as a compilation of all foreign languages in Arabic. And one of those who studied this phenomenon under the term borrowing, "Salah Raway" in his book "Fiqh 'allugah wajaṣā'aṣ 'al'arabiyyah waṭarā'iq numuwīhā", and he said that the use of this term is only to keep up with the terminology of modernists.

Because all of that, this research is trying to stand on what goes into the phenomenon of "The Borrowing Language" of the terms, and seeks to distinguish between its concepts, and discussed some of the views that formed around these two centers; the term and concept.

## 2. In the Term

### 1.2. Borrowing

There were many terminologies functions on the foreign words that have entered the Arab for numerous ancient linguists, so they defined 'almu'arrab, 'almuwallad, 'addajīl and 'al'a'ŷmiyy, there were other words that serve these terms as 'almu'rab instead of 'almu'arrab (see: 1988, 4/155. 1964, 6/176), and 'amuhdaṭ instead of 'almuwallad (see: 1988, 3/185), and so on. It has also prevailed they overlap in the use of these terms on the one hand, and bifurcation on the other. Their criteria differed in the judgment of foreign pronunciation in Arabic, therefore, their terms differed. In addition, some of these terms are of a special nature, including the Arabic - not non - foreign words, as 'almu'arrab. Some

linguists also used the term "'almu'a'yâm" for 'almu'arrab; that happened because of the Arabic words that have entered the foreign languages.

Thus, the contemporaries found themselves in need to resolve these problems of the diversity of those conventions, and the specificity of some of them, so they used to denote each foreign word entered the language term "borrowing", in addition that it understanding the concepts of all previous terms; it is also general and usable in every language.

However, this new term with its features did not remain without criticism for some contemporary, and this is clear with Raway in "fiqh 'allugah", he saw that the use of the term borrowing in this phenomenon is only to keep up with the term of modern linguists. The borrowing terms doesn't deny the terms of the basic language, but benefit of both languages together, and the borrowing language doesn't required to refund the borrowed from the words of other languages. (see: 1993, p. 245).

However, it seems that there is another view contrast with Raway, which is that the function of borrowed words should be temporary, and we should leave it with generate or derive valid Arab words that replace the borrowed words (see: 1993, p. 129). Language is therefore required to eliminate foreign words when it can.

The definition of "Rajab Ibrahim "for" lexical borrowing" reflects this view, he said that lexical borrowing is moving of words from one language to another (see: 2002, p. 3), the term "moving" indicates that these borrowed words pulled by languages according to their need, and the term borrowing itself refers to such a sense, that the language take and give, and lend and borrow. It is true that both languages, lending and borrowing, benefit from these moved words, but this does not negate the term "borrowing" for these real words.

The term "lending", confronted with borrowing, and using of these two terms doesn't make any difference between them. The research see that there is a difference should be accurately observed, that the borrowing takes into the process of moving from the one hand the borrowed language only but the "lending" has an excessive significance, which is happening between the parties of the moving process, it cares about both languages, lenders and borrowers. The term borrowing enables us to study the foreign words in Arabic, but cannot study Arabic words, for example, in Hebrew, although it is borrowed, but for Arab is lending, and it is in both languages "borrowed".

Also, some contemporary researchers used the term "linguistic metaphor", rather than "linguistic borrowing", by virtue of the languages that borrow the words they need, to express its lack of implications (see: 2001, p. 25). The difference between the two terms is a matter of the diversity of synonyms in the signification of the one concept. However, the term "borrowing" has been more common among researchers, perhaps because it is beyond the term

"linguistic metaphor" for other terms that may be addressed in the Arabic language lesson, namely rhetorical metaphors.

## 2. 2. 'almu'arrab and 'addajīl

In his book (see: 1985, p. 269), Stetkevych sees that the early lexicons, including Alkhaleel, did not differentiate between almu'arrab and 'addajīl (see: 143). Al-Suyuti mentioned in al-'almuzhir that 'addajīl is called 'almu'arrab, and it is often found in the book of 'al'ayn and 'aljamharah.

Follow up the extraneous and Arabized words in language dictionaries, we disclose the extent of this overlap in the use of the terms ; Sometimes it combines , like in 'al'ayn of Alkhaleel": "'alkurra'ay dajīl almu'arrab" (see: 1988, 5/288), and in the 'al'ayn also: "firind dajīl mu'arrab" (see: 1988, 8/103) , and "'alfurāniq dajīl mu'arrab" (see: 1988, 5/263), and in tahdīb 'allugah (1964, 6/176): "'alhamyān dajīl mu'arrab".

**And sometimes rule on the same word as 'addajīl, and other times as 'almu'arrab.** In 'al'ayn (1988, 6/46) "fa'ammā 'aṣṣan'ay dū 'al'awtār fahuwa dajīl", and in Ibn Durayd (1987, 1/479): "aṣṣan'ay fārisiyy mu'arrab", and combine the two sentences in lisān 'al'arab; He said (1414, 2/311): "fa'ammā 'aṣṣan'ay dū 'al'awtār fadajīl mu'arrab".

But to say that the first lexicons - especially Alkhaleel - did not distinguish between the two terms in use is inaccurate, it was reported from their words, in places, evidence of their separation between 'addajīl and 'almu'arrab, 'addajīl mentioned in those places for what entered the Arabic, The Arabs according to its linguistic system did not change it, and 'almu'arrab against what changed it. Alkhaleel said in 'al'ayn (1988, 5/182): "'albuqqam: a tree, a dyed dye,[...] But we know that it is dajīl because it is not the word for the Arabs its structure on fu'al, even if it is from Arab they will found her peer", and in tahdīb 'allugah(1964, 9/270) "Al-layth said: 'alqatrawān is dajīl, which is most of the military, and most of the convoy, and the origin of qatrawān is Karwān, in Persian".

The obvious sign is to differentiate between use and overlap. This is what attracted some scholars to say that the early lexicons did not differentiate between the two terms at all. It seems that 'addajīl (in the context of comparable with 'almu'arrab) was at **most** of them more general than from 'almu'arrab, there are so many words entered the Arabic and changed according to the formulas in Arabic and templates, and 'addajīl to her, and to what not put in the Arab templates of words. As for the income of the Arabs as it is, and called the term mu'arrab, the standard used by the Arabs, as will come from the opinion of Sibawayh in it. In this context, we can understand the combination of the two terms sometimes, and to differentiate between them at other times, when the ancients.

## 3. In concept

### 3. 1. The concept of borrowing

Raway defines borrowing linguistically (1993, p. 245): "transfer or shift or move one or more word of native language into another language, to use the meaning of the word in the original language". However, this definition contains imperfections that cannot be ignored. Borrowing has defined linguistically to what should be a terminological term, which has led to confusion in the distinction between linguists and interpreters. In addition, borrowing in general, including the borrowing of words, methods, and concepts (translation), so Raway's definition of the general phenomenon is to a special part, "verbal borrowing ". It is also not necessary for the borrowing clause to use the term borrowed as evidence in its original language , as Ibn Kamal Pasha states: "The non-Arabic word after its Arabization may be put into meaning other than its original meaning" (1991, pp. 52- 53), even if it's very little, compared to the words retained in the original sense, but the definition should include the defined Completely. Therefore, we can set definitions characterizes both the concept of the borrowing and lending, the linguistic lending is the transfer of the term or style or concept, from native language to another language, to be used for denote on the evidence in the original language, or on a new meaning. The verbal borrowing, the words are taken from their original language ... etc. but the Linguistic lending is a movement for words or methods or concepts between languages, used to function on what is indicated in the original language, or function on a new meaning. And the Linguistic lending move words between languages ... etc. With these definitions, it is possible to define what is meant by borrowing and lending, and to discern the difference between them and when to use them.

### 3. 2. The concept of Arabization

The difference in the definition of the concept of Arabization, both ancient and modern, is due to the difference in the criterion by which linguists began to look at 'almu'arrab. The positions of the first linguists within the Arabization varied expansion and narrowing, and can talk here about three trends in the Arabization with those scientists; **The first trend is** represented by Sibawayh, his concept of Arabization was a broad concept, encompassing all the Arabic words used by the Arabs, Whether attached to the construction of their words or not attached ; He said in 'alkitāb (1988, 4/303): "of what the Arab change from the non-Arabic letters is that not from their letters at all, maybe they follow it making their words maybe not". This can be explained; that he meant by the changing is the voice change that occurs in the foreign word after the Arab entry, a change attached to the votes are not represented in the Arab tongue steadily, as the sound of "g" the Persian, which turns in Arabic to "ġ" or "q" or "k", and appends voices represented in the Arab tongue, perhaps for sound like "h" in the last of Persian word, they do not prove in their language, but its shift to "" once, and again "y", but the Arab they shift it to "ġ", for her proximity to "y" (see: Sibawayh, 1988, 4/305). The phrase may enter into a state without any change, Sibawayh said (1988, 4/304): "Perhaps they left the name intact, if the letters are of their letters, like jurāsān and jurram and 'akurkum". However, in

Sibawayh, the voice change (in sounds not represented in the Arabic tongue) does not have to change the morphological structure of the word, which means " may follow their semantic and maybe not.

Therefore, the criterion in judging for Sibawayh is "the use of the Arabs". What the Arabs have used is a mu'arrab, whether it is based on their words or not, and Suyuti follow him in 'almuzhir (1/ 268). The Arabization of words, on this basis, is the transfer of the word from a foreign language into Arabic, and the use of it.

The **second trend** is in the Arabization, is represented essentially by Al-Jawhari, Hariri, Al-Zamakhshri and others, a trend that take into account the linguistic structure to decide on the word if its Arabized, Al-Jawhari said in his opinion in the Arabization as saying , "The Arabization for the foreign is to spell it by Arab according their way" (1990, 1/179). The stereotyping , as Stetkevych says (1985, p. 133): "is the only one that makes the foreign word meaning, otherwise it will always be a lexicon". In 'alkaššāf for Al-Zamakhshri (4/183): "the meaning of Arabization that makes the Arab world to act in it, change its methods". As Hariri concept highlights the Arabization of it requires the development of word expressed in his Arab formula weight, was treated for words Arabized according to this perception; in Durrat 'algawwaṣ (1299, p. 61): "they say dastūr, open signifier, measuring the words of the Arabs it be said to include signifier, as it is said buhlūl, 'urqūb, jurṭūm, ŷumhūr, and the analogies of what came on fu'lūl".

This hard-line position, -measured by Sibawayh's position- can be understood by understanding the general linguistic framework of the fourth century AH. "The grammarians and the linguists themselves have been scolded to resist many of the Arabic phonological inscriptions, According to Stetkevych (1985, p. 144), and according to this trend; we can define the Arabization as a shift or moving for word from a foreign language into Arabic, and combined it with Arabs speech framework.

And a **third trend** of linguists' applicants based on "standard time" to consider the Arabized (see: 2010, p. 190), what the Arab has borrowed of words in the era of protest. The disadvantage of this standard neglect of its linguistic structure of the word borrowed, which was a criterion for judging 'almu'arrab in Al-jawhari. This team looks at 'addajīl as the income of Arab after the era of protest, and 'addajīl came confronted 'almu'arrab, in the ancient phrases, entered into the era of protest, which contradicted what this group went to.

In the modern era, the term Arabization was associated with multiple concepts, the most widely is the "national Arabization" which means making the Arab tool for thinking, writing and use in various aspects of life, in other words, making Arab and basic life of the Arab human language, the language of science, thought and feeling ..., offset in this context is the term "Westernization " (relative to Western countries). Arabization on what we might call

"cultural Arabization" as it is called, means the adaptation of foreign business, dispose of them, the requirements of the circumstances, the social and cultural patterns of Arab traditions, and make them an Arab trait in the general framework, and often this happens in the works of art. Arabization is also called translation, namely the transfer of the meanings of foreign words, phrases or texts, and expressing them in words and phrases corresponding to them in the language transmitted to them. (see: 2010, p. 191).

As for foreign words and terms, it did not receive the Arabization of the modern fully accepted, in the face of the urgent need for modern terms all of their areas, and did not confront fully reject, too. The Arabic Language Council in Cairo presented the subject of Arabization early, and issued at the 31st session of the first session the following resolution (1935, 1/202): "The Council permits the use of certain Arabic words, if necessary, in the manner of Arabs in their Arabization", and issued at the same session complementary to the decisions of this decision which is "1. Preferably the Arab word on the old expressed only if famously expressed. 2. utter the name expressed on the image that uttered by the Arabs." (1985, p. 148). It is clear that the Council left the door of Arabization wide, in the qualitative and not quantitative, the capacity of the Arab ways of Arabization, as if to justify all his way of Arabization as long as one of the methods of the Arabs agree, Do not be on those formulas, whether there has been a change of voice or not, as known from the method Sibawayh.

The Council has restricted its decision by two important measures, namely, "nature and necessity", which are inextricably linked to each other, as for the first, it is possible that the Council presented other solutions before Arabization. It was in favor of the Arabic pronunciation of the ancient mu'arrab, unless 'almu'arrab was known. The first scholars, according to Shawki Daif, "influence the translation of the term on its Arabization to accommodate Western scientific terminology" (1984, p. 129), and they fear that the large number of Arabization leads to westernize the Arab. The second measure is the (necessary), explains by Moroccan Abdel Kader as "stating that the intended technical and scientific words that cannot find a comparison, not literary, nor words with ordinary meanings" (1935, 1/ 201). However, these restrictions, and justifications and reasons, quickly collided with the reality that forced us to find quick and accurate solutions to the thousands of scientific terms that have come to the Arabic language because of the great knowledge revolutions of the twentieth century.

Later Arabization has the favor for share in and introduces these new terms into our language. The scientific councils cannot deal with this problem decisively. They wait until the foreign pronunciation is used on every tongue, and it is used by the public and the private, and then the resurrection of the scientific councils is conducted, and it tries to search for an alternative Arabic language, thus the word is born dead" (1994, p. 268) says Ramadan Abdul Tawab .

And for the large number of these words received, and concern for the Arab language of motivation, it has emerged a trend in looking at the issue of Arabization among modernists, represents it Ahmed Alesekondary, which holds that what happened after the periods of protest - with the exception of scientific and technical terms - is not a thing of the word, but purely a pure western, not justified in the use of Arabs (1935, 1/ 202). While Alesekondary seeing that the Arab language is rich with many foreign words contained, therefore we have to narrow the Arabization, Muhammad Alkhoudary Called for expansion, because, in his view, it is the best solution for the words of modern inventions (1985, p. 146).

### 3. 3. The concept of 'almuwallad

It was associated with people found among the Arabs inveterate, on specific; in 'aṣṣiḥāḥ (1990, 2/554): "A man who is muwallad, if he is an Arab is not pure". The use of the word was widened to include group of people, called muwalladīn, and a kind of speech. What matters to us here is the second one. Alkhaleel said in 'al'ayn that the muwallad speech is the innovator that was not one of the Arabs (see: 1988, 8/71). And rarely we find in his dictionary the term muwallad, has been reported in a few places (see: 1988, 2/34, 7/326). The little mentioned to muwallad in 'al'ayn is the rarely mentioned in Arabic.

Alkhaleel died in 173 AH or 175 AH, were mostly included in his dictionary of the words of pure Arabs, does not fall under the birth, according to his view.

The concept in the ancients of the muwallad has emerged through the standard provisions called it on the words muwallad; in ŷamharat 'allugah of Ibn Durayd (1987, 1/64): "'alḥub that makes the water it is Persian Arabized, a muwallad", and in 'aṣṣiḥāḥ (1964, 3/1045): "and 'al'afṣ: ... muwallad and not from the words of the people of Badia".

It is noticed, through the trace, that what was invented by the borners of words is called a muwallad, whether they invented the words of the Arabs in violation of measurement or Arabized of the words of Ajam, and here we understand their plural between 'almu'arrab and 'almuwallad, as mentioned in Ibn Duraid Above. However, it is not advisable to study 'almuwallad under the phenomenon of language borrowing, unless it was invented and used by the muwalladūn of the words of Al-Ajam inside.

According to this concept, 'almuwallad is associated with the time and the linguistic structure standards. Therefore, every word invented by the muwalladūn after the age of protest is distorted by its use, whether by an original Arab or by a foreign language.

The perception of Alkhaleel vand those who came forward was still tilled who came after them from the linguists. Al-Suyuti defined it in 'almuzhir as "what was founded by muwalladūn who did not invoke their words"(1/ 304). Recently, the center defined it as "the word that used by muwalladūn as arab did not use it" (1935, 1/204).



### 3. 4. Divisions of modernists to borrowed words

The used Ajami words in Arab speech can be divided according to the extrapolation into four sections. The first: the words changed by acting in its pronunciation, with annexes to the semantic of the Arab words, and from it "albaharāy: falsehood, which is in Persian, nabharah" (1990, p. 160). Second: The words changed by acting in their pronunciation, and did not follow the semantic of Arab words as 'āyurr and sifsīr. Third: Words that have not changed their pronunciation, but attached to the semantic of Arab words as jurram. Fourth: Words that have not changed their pronunciation, and did not follow the semantic of Arab words, including jurāsān (see Suyuti 269: 1 et seq). This division takes into the linguistic structure of the exotic word. It is also possible to divide the phonetic terms as the time of entry into Arabic, divided the income during the era of protest, and then divided.

According to this introduction we can direct the modernist divisions of borrowed words, which is as follows (see: 2010, p. 249 et seq.):

1. Hassan Zaza went on to say that what came into Arabic from the words of Ajam during the era of protest, called mu'arrab, and that what was entered after that is called an outsider dajīl. This is a consideration of the criterion of time, and it opposes that 'addajīl was sometimes called on the words entered the era of protest, and that the general term for everything that enters the language of foreign words, regardless of language structure, and the time of entry.

2. Abd al-Hamid al-Shalqani and 'EidK halifah went on to say that what came into Arabic and took its image, and followed its approach called a mu'arrab, and that what entered its body in its language and did not take the image of the Arabic word called dajīl, This is a consideration of the linguistic structure as well, and is opposed to the generality of the term 'addajīl, as it progresses, and that all that entered after the ages of protest, and achieve their condition becomes mu'arra, and this is the subject of consideration and difference between scientists and scholars.

3. Salah Raway said that 'addajīl is all that entered the Arab of foreign words, and 'addajīl is divided into two parts; 'almu'arrab: which entered the Arab in the era of protest, and the Arabs work on it, and المولد: which entered Arabic after the era of protest, and 'almuwalladūn Arabized it. Although this division combines the standards of linguistic structure and time, but Raway denies that there are foreign words entered the Arab speech, without subject to Arab morphological molds, and goes to what was found in this capacity, is made by modern who liked the foreign languages"(1993, p. 251), he denied the words that entered in the era of protest, and indicates the validity of its division that; the early linguists did not admit to entry of a foreign term into their Arabic

language, except after it was Arabized, and subjecting it to the law of the Arabic language from a moral balance, derivation, generation, etc." (1993, p. 251).

Sibawayh had a contradictory opinion that all Arabs used were a mu'arrab, and from it, what came into Arabic is the same, without a change of voice or morals, as stated in 'alkitāb.

The search finds that the division of Raway is closer than others to the right, without the pitfalls mentioned earlier. Therefore, the borrowed words can be divided into 'addajīl, 'almu'arrab, 'almuwallad, according to the following explanations:

1. 'addajīl : Every foreigner term entered Arabic by a change of voice or morphine, or without it, regardless of the time of entry.
2. 'almu'arrab: **Every foreigner term entered Arabic in the era of protest** , and this is sufficient according to the doctrine of Sibawayh, and it is increased by the other, **by the morphological change** .
3. The muwallad borrowed: Every foreigner term that entered Arabic after the era of Arab protest, by change the audio or morphological or moral . Except what is most needed, "such as scientific terms, and names of medicines and medical drugs [...]" (1993, p. 252), there is nothing wrong with keeping it as it is, provided that it is approved by the assemblies of the Arabic language and that it is valid for acceptance in the scientific community .

#### 4. Conclusion

The research discusses the phenomenon of borrowing both sides of the term and concept. On the side of the term, the research has identified the reasons that led to the selection of the term "borrowing" in recent years, followed by Salah Rawai's using of the term, and concluded that his reasoning was misplaced. And tried to search also differentiate between the significance of the terms "borrowing and lending", borrowing is transfer, lendingis movement.

And also, responded to Stetkevych opinion that Alkaleel and the ancient lexicons did not differentiate between the use of the term "'addajīl" and "'almu'arrab". The research concluded that they were sometimes differentiating between them and using them for different specific indications. On the conceptual side, the research established a boundary between "language borrowing", "verbal borrowing", And the difference in the view of the old and modern, And tried to put an end to it based on the look of each team. Research has pointed out too, to the breadth of the concept of Arabization in the modern era, and explained the complex with regard to the decisions of Arabizing words, referring to the two modern ways; the first Ahmed Alescandry, which called for the narrowing of Arabization, because there is in Arabic what obviates it; and

second is Mohammed al-Khudari, who called for expansion, as an ideal solution for the words of modern inventions.

The research also discusses about the concept of 'almuwallad, and what is worth studying the phenomenon of borrowing is what it borrowed by the Muwalladīn. Also mentioned the modernized divisions of borrowed words as a reflection of their consideration of the concepts of borrowing, and tried to divide the borrowed words into an unsustainable division.

### References

- Abdul Tawab, Ramadan (1994). fuṣūl fī fiqh 'al'arabiyyah. I.3 Cairo: Al-Khanji Library.
- Al-Azhari, Abu Mansour Mohammed bin Ahmed (1964). taḥdīb 'allugah. Achieving by Abdel Salam Haroun. Dar Alqawmeah Al-Arabiya for Printing.
- Al-Jawaliqi, Abu MansoorMohaweb bin Ahmed bin Mohammed bin al-Khader (1990). 'almu'arrab min 'alkalām 'al'a'ŷmiyy 'ala ḥurūf 'almu'ŷam. Damascus: Dar Al-Qalam.
- Al-Jawhari, Ismail bin Hammad (1990). 'aṣṣiḥāḥ. I.4. The investigation by Ahmed Abdul Ghafoor Attar. Beirut: Dar al-Ilm for millions.
- Alkhaleel, Ahmed bin Abdul Rahman (1988). 'al'ayn. The investigation by Mehdi Makhzoumi and Ibrahim al-Samarrai. Beirut: Al-Amali Institute for Publications.
- Al-Zamakhshri, Abu al-QasimJarallah Mahmud ibn. 'alkaššāf. Cairo: Egypt Library.
- Daif, Shawky (1984). ma'ŷma' 'allugah 'al'arabiyyah fī jamsīn 'ām 1934-1984. Cairo: Arabic Language Complex.
- Hariri, Abu Muhammad al-Qasim bin Ali ( 1299 AH). Durrat 'algawwaṣ fī 'awhām 'aljawāṣ. Constantinople: the printing press.
- Ibrahim, Rajab Abdel-Jawad (2002). 'aliqtirād 'almu'ŷamiyy min wi'ŷhat naẓar 'ilm 'allugah 'ahadīṭ. Cairo: Cairo House.
- Ibn al-Anbari, Abu al-Barakat Kamal al-Din Abdul Rahman bin Mohammed (1985). nuzhat 'al'alibbā' fī ṭabaqāt 'al'udabā'. I.4. Ibrahim Samrai investigation. Zarqa: Al-Manar Library.
- Ibn durayd, Abu Bakr Mohammed bin Hassan (1987). ŷamharat 'allugah. Investigation by MunirBaalbaki. Beirut: Dar Al - Ilm for millions.
- Ibn Kamal Pasha Alwazeer, Ahmed bin Suleiman (1991). risālah fī taḥqīq ta'rīb 'alkalimah 'al'a'ŷamiyyah. Investigation by Mohammed Swai. Damascus: French Scientific Institute for Arabic Studies.
- Ibn Manzoor (1414 AH). lisān 'al'arab. I.3, bairut, dar sadir.
- Ma'an, Mushtaq Abbas (2001). 'almu'ŷam 'almufaṣṣal fī fiqh 'allugah. Beirut: Scientific Books House.
- Raway, Salah (1993). Fiqh 'allugah wajaṣā'aīṣ 'al'arabiyyah waṭarā'iq numuwwiḥā. Cairo: Al-Zahra Library.
- Royal Arabic Language Complex (1935). ma'ŷallat 'alma'ŷma'. Part 1. Cairo: The Amiri Press in Boulaq.

- Sibawayh, Abu-Bishr, Amr ibn Othman Ibn Qanbar (1988). 'alkitāb. investigated by Abdel Salam Haroun. Cairo: Al-Khanji Library.
- Stetkevych (1985). 'al'arabiyyah 'alfuṣḥā 'aḥādīṭah: buḥūt fī taṭawwur 'al'alfāz wal'asālīb. Translated by Mohamed Hassan Abdulaziz. Cairo: Al-Nimr Printing House.
- Suyuti, Abdul Rahman. 'almuzhir fī 'ulūm 'allughah wa'anwā'ihā. I.3 The investigation by Mohammed Ahmed Jad Al – Mawla Bek, Mohammed Abu Fadl Ibrahim and Ali Mohammed Al - Bagawi. Cairo: Heritage Library.
- Zifencki, Safiah (2010). 'almanāhiy 'almuṣṭalaḥiyyah: muškilātuhā 'attaṭbīqiyyah wanahy mu'ālaḥatihā. Damascus: Ministry of Culture.