

The connection between *ma`ani nahwi* in Arabic and *modistae* in Latin:

An approach to the History of Linguistic studies¹

Asst. Prof. Dr. Solehah Hj. Yaacob

Prof. Dr. Abdul Razak Abdul Rahman As-sa`ddi

Dept. of Arabic Language and Literature

Prof. Dr. Attaullah Bogdan Kopanski

Dept. of History and Civilization

International Islamic University Malaysia

Abstract: The research emphasizes on the connection between the Arabic concept of *ma`ani nahwi* and *modistae* in Latin. In order to identify this connection, the researcher has to elaborate on the role of Aristotle's categories in influencing the concept of *modistae* in the Middle Ages first. The paper will then reevaluate the influence of Muslim philosophers such as al-Farabi (c.870-c.950 AD), Avicenna (980-1037 AD) and Averroes (c.1126-c.1198 AD) in Latin and clarify the role of Jurjani (d.1078 AD) in introducing his concept of *nazm* towards *ma`ani nahwi*. The result of the research will also enhance the understanding of the relationship between syntax and semantic which has not been effectively clarified within the framework of traditional Arabic grammatical theory.

Keywords:

Connection, *Ma`ani Nahw*, Arabic Grammatical Concept, The Style of *Modistae* Thinking, Jurjani and Averroes.

Introduction

According to Jurjani, the relationship between syntax and semantics has not been effectively clarified within the framework of traditional Arabic grammatical theory. In his commentary (see Jurjani, *Dalail al-`ijaz*, 1960, p.66-67) he differentiated between meaning and form in a sentence. This concept is presented not to linguists but theologians (*mu`tazilah*) in impressing them with the need to study not only theology but also

¹ The topic has won the Research Endowment Fund at university level. I would like to thank Prof. M.G.Carter from Sydney University for suggesting me to work for the topic.

grammar and literary theory in order to improve their understanding of the inimitability of the Qur'an. In this case, the concept of *nazm* combines three aspects, they are:- 1) *lafza hamil* 2) *makna bihi qaim* 3) *Ribad lahum naazim*. This contribution showed the intellectual capacity of Jurjani, particularly when he said we could not have the right meaning if not constructed with *lafaz* and *rabat* in order to produce a *nazm*. In other words, for those who are in eloquence or *fasahah* style will not produce a coherent sentence unless they combine the group of words according to their concurrence followed by the meaning. Starting from here, we know that he focused more on the system of *nazm* and movement among the words after their combination. This means that the production of eloquence or *fasahah* is not depended on single words only in producing a meaning. In his major contribution to the discussion about the *`ijaz al-Qur'an* he concentrated on *ma`ani* (meaning) and *lafz* (expression). Both concepts have been subject to debate between logicians and grammarians. According to logicians, the meanings are the logical ideas that were signified by the expressions. Otherwise the grammarians concentrated on the functions of the words. According to him, *makna* was what determined the quality of style, and it would be absurd to attribute qualities of eloquence to the expression as such:

واعلم أنك كلما نظرت وجدت سبب الفساد واحدا وهو ظنهم الذي ظنوه في اللفظ وجعلهم الأوصاف التي تجري عليه كلها أوصافا في نفسه ومن حيث هو لفظ وتركهم أن يميزوا بين ما كان وصفا له في نفسه وبين ما كانوا قد أكسبوه إياه من أجل أمر عرض في معناه. (al-Jurjani, *Dalail al-`ijaz*, p.256)

“Know that whenever you look into this (corruption of taste and language) you find that it has only one cause, namely their view about the expression and the fact that they assign to the expression attributes (...) without properly distinguishing between those attributes that they assign to them because of something that belongs to its meaning”.

Expression of Meaning

Al-Jurjani on the other hand, maintains that there is a large semantic difference between the two sentences: the verb always expresses movement, whereas the nominal form of the participle a state:-

"وإذا قد عرفت هذا الفرق فالذي يليه من فروق الخبر بين الإثبات إذا كان بالاسم وبينه إذا كان بالفعل وهو فرق لطيف تمس الحجة في علم البلاغة إليه. وبيانه أن موضوع الاسم على أن يثبت به المعنى للشيء من غير أن يقتضي تجده شيئاً بعد شيء، وأما الفعل فموضوعه على أنه يقتضي تجدد المعنى المثبت به شيئاً بعد شيء فإذا قلت: زيد منطلق. فقد أثبت الإنطلاق فعلاً له من أن تجعله يتجدد ويحدث منه شيئاً فشيئاً بل يكون المعنى فيه كالمعنى في قولك: زيد طويل وعمره قصير. فكما لا يقصد ههنا إلى أن تجعل الطول أو القصر يتجدد ويحدث بين توجيها وتشيبيهما فقط وتقتضى بوجودهما على الإطلاق. كذلك لا تتعرض في قولك: زيد منطلق لا أكثر من إثباته لزيد" (Dalail pp. 121-2).

"The next division (in the nuances of the predicate) is that between an assertion in the form of a noun and that in the form of a verb. This is a subtle distinction, which is indispensable in the science of rhetoric. The explanation is that the semantic role of the noun is to assert a meaning about something without implying its constant renewal, whereas it is the verb's semantic role to imply the constant renewal of the meaning that is asserted of something. When you say Zaydun Munṭaliquun "Zayd is leaving", you assert his actual departure without making this departing something he constantly renews and produces. Its meaning is just like in the expression Zaydun tawilun "Zayd is tall" and `Amrun qāsirun "Amr is short". You do not make length and shortness of stature something that is renewed and produced, but just assert these properties and imply their existence in general. In the same way you do not intend in the expression Zaydun munṭaliquun "Zayd is leaving" anything more than that this is asserted of Zayd"

The idea of semantic as forwarded by Jurjani was taken up by as-Sakkaki (d.1229M) the author of *Miftah al-ulum* "key of the sciences", in which he introduced the term *`ilm al-adab* as the name for a new science, which was to embrace all sciences that in one way or another dealt with language. He divided it into three aspects *`ilm sarf*, *`ilm nahw* and *`ilm bayan*. The innovation is constituted by the third section that about meanings and clarity. He explained the importance of these as follows:-

"أعلم أن علم المعاني هو تتبع خواص تراكييب الكلام في الإفادة، وما يتصل بها من الاستحسان وغيره، ليحترز بالوقوف عليها عن الخطأ في تطبيق الكلام على ما يقتضي الحال ذكره"

(as-Sakkaki, *Miftah al-ulum*, 1983, p.161).

“Know that the science of meanings follows the properties of the constructions of the language in conveying information, and the connected problem of approving and disapproving these, in order to avoid mistakes in the application of speech to what the situation dictates by paying close attention to this”

‘Ilmu bayan according to him is “the knowledge of the expression of one meaning in different ways, by referring to it more or less clearly, which serves to avoid mistakes in the application of speech to the full expression of what one wishes to say.” (see Kees Versteegh, *Landmarks in Linguistic thought* 111, 1997, p. 124) This implies that the science of *bayān* is the final touch to the conveying of information and cannot be separated from the science of meaning. In other words, the discussion on the introduction of semantic elements needs to be related to the technicality of grammatical aspects. In this sense the ideas of al-Jurjani were just an expression of the feeling of dissatisfaction with the way linguistics was developing, whereby as far as he is concerned, his book *dalail ‘ijaz* contains remarks which may be interpreted as criticism of Arab traditional grammarians concerning the relation between word order and meaning. This was also expressed by Ibn Mada` who complained about useless morphological exercises and theoretical discussions that had nothing to do with the living language (see Ibn Mada` *Ar-Raddu` ala Nuhah*, p.78).

Here the researcher does not want to state that the system of *‘irab* by grammarians is not equipped with the necessary elements to develop the idea of linguistics in Arabic. Rather, the idea needs to be supported by other elements such as a meaning in a semantic concept. To express in differently, there needs to be a collaboration between the concepts as formulated by the logicians and by the grammarians.

We can conclude that the special meaning of *nazm* exists when the meaning is quoted after the process of entering *siyak* السياق such as *mubtada`* existed cause of *khavar*. To exemplify this, المنطلق زيد *al-muntoliqu Zaydun* means ‘the one who leaves is zayd’, زيد المنطلق *Zaydun al-muntoliqu*, Zayd is the one who leaves, فاعل *fa`il* (agent) existed cause of فعل *fe`il* (verb) and so on. Accordingly, we can say that the originality of al-Jurjani as a

rhetorician is very clear when he linked his view on meaning as the determining factor in the quality of a text to a linguist dimension by considering it not in isolation but always as it is realized within a coherent text composition or cohesion or نظم *nazm*. This is a key notion of both the *dalail`ijaz* and *asrar al-Balagah*². In both works he attempted to define the principle in linguistic term (Kees Versteegh, 1997, p.119).

To support the ideas above, I will enclose some remarks on the system which show that the concept of meaning is powerful via the concept of إعراب *irāb* and عامل *amil*. The first example is ³ ﴿لَوْ لَا أَخَّرْتَنِي إِلَى أَجَلٍ قَرِيبٍ فَأُصَدِّقَ وَأُكْنَ مِنْ الصَّالِحِينَ﴾ the word وَأُكْنَ *wa`kun* sukun by the thinking of تَوَهَّمُ شَرْطِي *tawahhum*⁴ *sharti* (Sibawayh, *al-Kitab*, 3/117)⁵ indicates for تمنّي *tamannī* and العامل الشرطي *al-amil* of *sharti* is not in speech or *lafaz* style but in thinking concept or معنوي *maknawi* which عطف إلى أُصَدِّقَ *tof on fa usoddiqa*⁶ where it is accusative and not sukun. This idea had been supported by az-Zamakshari who said that it resembled *en akhartani usodiq wa`kun* وَأُكْنَ وَأُصَدِّقَ. The researcher assumes وَأُكْنَ *wa`kun* sukun cause of تخلف الحركة الإعرابية *takhallaf al-harakah al-irabiyah* (Tamam Hasan, *al-lughah al-Arabiyyah Maknaha wa Mabnaha*, pp 204 – 205).

The second example is accusative cause by the removal of genitive jar *an-nazu`ala al-khafid* which means the removal of the genitive is a result of accusative on the governee or *ma`mul*. According to Ibn Malik (see Ibn `aqil, *Sharh Ibn `aqil*, 1998, p.19), the accusative case on the governee or معمول *ma`mul* which cause by case of removal the genitive in speech or *lafz* otherwise in thinking or *maknawi* is based on the meaning or called *at-tadamu al-ijabi* (Tamam Hasan, p.222) such as Allah said in Quran⁷ ﴿وَإِخْتَارَ﴾ *ikhtar* which is a governor of a governee *qawmahu* in thinking called *maf`ulun bih lafzi*, it is because the real governor of it is *min* which is genitive being removed from the *aayah*. However, there is another opinion in its

² Both of the primary kitab by Jurjani.

³ al-Munafiqun: 10.

⁴ *Tawahhum* is a synonym for *iqdmar* or *taqdīr*, which is a central concept of Sibawayhi's analysis.

⁵ showing the meaning of sentence cannot be took for granted.

⁶ The recitation of Jumhur فَأُصَدِّقَ as an accusative.

⁷ Al-A`raf:155.

declension or *`irab* such as the view of al-Akhfash as-Soghiri⁸. He said “to remove the genitive is not a must, but it permissible to avoid an ambiguous situation, as in: *بريت القلم* *baraitu al-qalama as-sikkina* the original is *بريت القلم بالسكين* *baraitu al-qalama bisikkini*. *Baraitu* is a governor or *العامل*, *القلم* *al-qalama* a governee or *معمول* of *بريت* *Baraitu* and *السكين* *as-sikkina* a governee or *معمول* of the removed original governor *الجار* or genitive. Otherwise Sibawayh (Sibawayh, *al-Kitab*, vol. 1 p.73) did not agree with the idea by saying the cause of the removal of the genitive is that the preceding verb became a governor. This opinion is supported by Abu Hayyan (Abu Hayan, *al-Bahru al-Muhit*, vol.4 , p. 297). The word *اختار* *ikhtar* govern of two governees or *maf'ulani* because it is transitive verb or *فعل متعدي* *fe'lun muta'addiun*.

The third example is *العطف على المحل* *al-`tof `ala al-mahalli* it is *al-`athar al-maknawi* or understanding of meaning according to the implicit item (Karim, Abdullah Ahmad Jaad, *at-Tawahhum Inda an-Nuhah*, p.161) such as Allah said:

﴿وما يعزب عن ربك من مثقال ذرة في الأرض ولا في السماء ولا أصغر من ذلك ولا أكبر⁹﴾

By the accusation of *أصغار* *asghar* and *أكبر* *akbar* in this example, they are *mansubani* and not genuine based on the principle *mamnu` `ani as-sorf*. Originally, they should be used with a genitive term *jār*. An accusative here is called being conjuncted by place or situation or *al-mahalla* and not by *`irab* as a speech. *Ma* is a negative type in speech, otherwise in the original text it is nominative case in thinking or *raf' un maknawiyyun* because it is subject of a verb. The subject of the verb is the doer of the action expressed by the verb and must follow the verb (Ibn Hisyam, *al-Mughni al-Labib*, vol. 1, p. 268).

The fourth example is *al-ittisol wa-inqito` bisababi al-makna* connection or disconnection because of meaning such as Allah said:¹⁰ ﴿ما لهم به من علم إلا اتباع الظن﴾. The disconnection of *al-`amal* based on the recitation of *qira`ah sab`ah* which is *itba`a* in the accusative case would imply *al-zann* (allowing for speculation) in contrast to definitive knowledge or *`ilm*¹¹. Otherwise, *itba`u* in the nominative case as recited by Banu Tamim

⁸ Ali bin Sulayman al-Bagdadi

⁹ Yunus: 6.

¹⁰ An-Nisa: 157.

¹¹ See the opinion of Zamakhshari and Ibn Athiyah in *al-Bahru al-Muhit*, vol. 3, p.406.

means knowledge or *`ilm* and does not imply *zann* as in the reading allowing the accusative case. This is so because the word of *`illa* is a disconnector between governor and *itba`a* in the original text was the word *itba`a* disconnection with *min`ilmin* where it is subject in nominative case. The case *`اتباع* because *`ilmin* is a subject being genetived with *min* as a *al-muakkidah* for *itba`a* az-zonn. Sibawayh said in his book *wa kullun wa mak nawa* , i.e. all the words and speech are by intention or *niyyah*.

From the above analysis, it has become clear that *nahw* investigates into the syntactic relation between the words of an utterance. These examples are basically concerned with the function of case endings in the sentence. The kinship between *nahw* and concept of *balagah* is thus self-explanatory. In expressing the realm of *ma`ani* , it is concerned with the means of making the utterances express the desired meaning with utmost exactitude through a number of syntactical devices such as conjunction and disjunction and also the relation between subject and predicate (see Ramzi Balbaki, *Grammarians and Grammatical Theory in the Medieval Arabic Tradition*, 2004, p.9). In other words, the concept of Arabic thinking in grammar is not isolated. Rather, the concept of grammar has been included in the concept of semantics. Thus, without the expression of a desired the meaning, the concept of understanding the meaning could not produced. Actually, more studies are needed on the relationship between *nahw* and its meaning to further clarify this relation, especially in terminology. At a practical level, much of the confusion and inefficiency in teaching Arabic grammar could be avoided if some of the non-functional topics of *nahw* were substituted by those subjects of *balagah* which focus on the relation between form and meaning.

Brief History of Modistae

The Modistae (also called speculative grammarians) were a school of grammarians of the 13th century AD (Vivien Law, *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early Middle Ages* ,1997, p.267). Most of them were active in northern France, Germany, Britain and Denmark, their influence being much less felt in the Southern part of Europe with its opposing tradition of the so-called ‘pedagogical grammar’. Their philosophy was based on a tripartite theory of modes via modes of being (*modi essendi*) or properties of real

world entities, modes of understanding (*modi intelligendi*) of the mind and modes of signifying (*modi significandi*) or grammatical properties which directly reflected the *modi intelligendi*. According to Modistae, the various parts of speech were viewed as representing reality in terms of these modes. Thus, modistae stands for those who attempted to trace a systematic relationship between the reality thought and words.

From the 11th century AD onwards, the incorporation of Aristotle's logic began to play a very important role in the logicisation of grammar. The latter became available from the middle of the 12th century AD (G.L. Bursill-Hall, *Speculative Grammars of the Middle Ages*, 1971 p.37-38). As a result of this, grammar became associated with the formulation of concepts of reality and the expression of language. However, there were three Latin grammarians who contributed to the grammatical theory of the modistae (1971, p.21): Varro (a grammarian by origin)¹², Donatus¹³ (d.350 AD) and Priscian¹⁴ (d.500 AD) had found the significant contributions in the context of medieval grammatical theory. However, there are serious gaps of the development of grammatical theory between the 6th till 11th centuries. Little work had been done by Boethius of Dacia (d.525 AD), Cassiodorus¹⁵ (c.480-c.575), Isidore of Seville¹⁶ (c.560-c.636) and Aelfric of Eynsham¹⁷. From the darkest period to the intellectual revival of the 12th century, the learning

¹² As suggested by Langedoen 'the only grammarian of the ancient classical world to deal with the problem of explanatory adequacy'. He lived in the 1st century B.C., maybe he is not the first Roman Grammarian, but with him the Roman contribution really begins.

¹³ He taught in Rome during the 4th century AD.

¹⁴ He taught in Constantinople during the 6th century AD. book unedited by Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae* was well developed, repertoire of terms to denote a verb or a preposition 'taking' or 'governing' a case i.e. *seruiet dative*, *adiungit dative* and *traheret accusative* in the early middle ages. See Vivien Law, p. 276.

¹⁵ He was Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus, a great cultural personality who is well known to be connected to the founding of university, a centre of teaching and assiduous translation of Greek texts, endowed with a vast library of sacred and secular texts consists of two books, '*Institutiones quemadmodum divinae*' and '*humanae debeant intellegi lectiones*' (c.551-c.562) dealing with the sacred disciplines indicates the literary tools necessary for the study of Bible, while the 2nd book concentrates on secular disciplines. Another popular work was the '*De Orthographia*' aimed primarily at monastic instruction, see Giulio Lepschy, 1994, p.151.

¹⁶ Isidore, bishop of Seville, his book '*Etymologiarum sive origiam libri xx*' were enormously popular in the medieval world, edited two volumes by Lindsay 1911, see Giulio Lepschy, 1994, p.157.

¹⁷ Aelfric was born around the middle of the tenth century in Wessex, the first stages in his training took place under priest whom he remembered with some disdain in later years. In terms of grammar he studied at the same stage under Dunstan and was ordained by him, in 987 he moved to the newly founded monastery of Cerne Abbas, Dorset where he was in charge of teaching in 1005, he became abbot of Eynsham, near Oxford, where he remained until his death in or after the year 1010. He was a prolific author and translator. See G.L. Bursill Hall, 1971, p.22 and Vivien Law, p.202.

especially of grammar was encouraged by Charlemagne. At that time, grammar as a science had not seen any progress. It was defined as the art of speaking and writing in interpreting the poets (1971, p.23). In the 2nd period of the Middle Ages, grammar came to be regarded as a pre-requisite for all scholarship. This state continued until the end of the 13th century which culminated in the complete philosophy of language of the modistae (G.L.Bursill Hall, 1971, p.23). From this stage, there were four important stages which are closely connected to the intellectual history of this period in as far as grammar is concerned:- the discovery of Aristotle and the associated or concomitant introduction of logic into grammar, the influence of Peter Helias (d.1140 AD) and William of Coches, the triumph of the grammarians over the humanist school such as against the rising influence of logic in the school of Paris and the constitution of speculative grammar establishing. (1971, p.23). So, accounted by influencing these above mentioned stages, we can say that the modistae dealt a lot with logic and words in grammatical concepts. They essentially developed the treatment of parts of speech and the treatment of syntax, which was divided into four parts:- orthography (the elements sound, vex, letters and syllables), etymology (part of speech), diasynthetical (syntax) and prosody (Giulio Lepschy, *History of Linguistics Classical and Medieval Linguistics*, 1994, p.290). All of the modistae's studies of grammar tended towards syntax, which connected to speech or sound where it related to philosophical thinking as a sign to create a meaning (1994, p.290). This means that the relationship between logic and grammar had a profound impact on the modistae grammatical theories. On this basis, clearly the modistae were influenced by the metaphysical theory of reality when discussing the terminology to describe the word classes such as nomen (noun) and pronomen (pronoun) (G.L.Bursill Hall, 1971, p.40). A `word`, to them, was not entirely a figment of the mind but it helped to illustrate things inside the mind. In other hand, `word` is not entirely a figment of the mind but must have something correlating in the world of things outside out the mind.

In contrast to Chomsky's TG (Transformational Grammar), the Modistae always took the relationship between syntax and semantics as closely linked. They called grammatical features *modi significandi* because they saw each feature as an aspect of the way meaning is encoded. This stands in contrast to a transformational concept where each sentence has

only one sentence. According to Prof. Bursil Hall, the medieval way of understanding gave rise to `two quasi-parallel types of analysis` namely the logical, which was concerned with the meaning of terms within a particular context, and the grammatical which was concerned with linguistic structure (See Alain De Libera, ` *On some 12th and 13th century doctrines of Restriction in studies in Medieval linguistic thought*`, 1980, p.131). To support this idea Alain De Libera has highlighted that the logical analysis by means of `restriction` fundamentally aims at connecting the grammatical surface structure and the logical deep structure within the way field of logic.

Meaning as a Logical Approach

The Modistae Grammar concept as a dependency framework does not provide phrase structure rules. Each word to word link is called a construction and there are two criteria of headship. The syntactic head, called *primum* or *prius*¹⁸ is the governor or the modified element, and the semantic head, or *terminans*, supplies or points the way to the referent.

Let us discuss a minor concept in the construction of the modistae concept in sentences, such as the construction of `*homo currit*` “The man runs” is an intransitive construction in which a verb has an immediate dependence on the substantive which represents the first constructable. In analytic approach, it would be considered as follows: There is at least one individual, a man, and he is running; or more simply: Something that was a man (regardless of whether it still is or not) has run, or there is at least one individual, which is a man and that it has been the case that he is running, or more simply. Something that is now a man has run. (Alain De Libera, 1980, p.139-140). Otherwise, in `*homo currit bene*`. `the man runs well` the adverb is drawn back to the substantive through the verb. `*Homo albus currit bene*` `the white man runs well` is an intransitive construction in which adjective and verb are immediately dependent on the substantive, and the adverb is dependent on it through the verb (Giulio Lepschy, 1994, p.298).

However, in transitive construction such as *Socrates currit* means Socrate runs, the subject term `Socrate` supposits for a man. Otherwise the intransitive construction (a

¹⁸ In Arabic called *al-`amil al-lafzi* and *al-`amil al-maknawi*

parte post) is presented as a relation between determinable and determinant such as *homo est animal*, man is an animal (1994, p.298). However, there were several debates between them (the modistae scholars) toward this issue, according to Martin of Dacia the construction of acts¹⁹ and construction of person²⁰ does not seem to present problems such as *Socrates et Plato currunt* means Socrates and Plato run, linguistically two nouns are one suppositum (noun phrase). The conjunction of *si Socrates currit* means If Socrates runs, according to him if he runs he moves (1994, p.299). However this idea has been commented by Boethius of Dacia saying that a conjunction does not in construction but only a connector between the words in the sentence, so it is not a constructable. Being constructable, it must be a mode of signifying grammatical properties reflected to the mind. However, Radhulphus adopts the fundamental distinction between intransitive and transitive construction. This can be divided into four basic constructions :-intransitive construction of acts such as *Socrates currit*, Socrates runs, intransitive construction of persons such as *homo albus*, white man, transitive construction of acts such as *lego librum*, I am reading a book, and transitive construction of persons such as *cappa Socratis*, Socrates' cloak (1994, p.299). Another type of construction such as *vado in ecclesiam*, I go to church, the preposition here is considered a medium of the construction of the verb with the complement and assigned to the complement which is *ecclessiam* or church or linguistically called *terminans* or determinator. Otherwise, the two main constructables such as *homo albus currit* and *homo currit bene*, the adjective *albus* and the adverb *bene* are determinants.

In another case, Thomas of Erfurt believed the concept of suppositum (noun phrase) and appositum (verb phrase) such as *Socrates percutit Plato*, Socrates bit Plato, depends on the term of verb either oblique²¹ or not which follows it in a verb + oblique construction (1994, p.300). Therefore, he concentrated on the meaning of the word in the sentence. Actually, we do not want to put ourselves in these polemic issues between the ideas of Radhulpus and Thomas of Erfurt in their different analyses of the construction. As a result of the statement above, we can conclude that the semantics of the modistae puts

¹⁹ Verb

²⁰ Noun

²¹ Similar in Arabic Grammar called *al-fi`il al-muta`ddi*

sense in distinction between formal meaning and material meaning. Where formal meaning is stable, could be defined by the nature of words. Otherwise, the material meaning cannot be properly determined by the context.

We can say, the aim of the grammarians to explore how a word matched things apprehended by the mind and how it signified reality was quite successfully realized. Since a word cannot signify the nature of reality directly, it must stand for the thing signified in one of its modes or properties such as being, understanding and signifying; it is this discrimination of modes that the study of categories and parts of speech is all about. Thus the study of sentences should lead one to the nature of reality by way of the modes of signifying. (<http://www.britanica.com> /The European Middle Ages).

The Role of Arab Logicians in Enhancing the Concept

Even though, some of the modesties claimed that the idea of modistae was taken from the idea of Aristotle directly, we cannot deny the contributions of Arab logicians – whereby they lived in the golden period of muslims- enhanced the concept of meaning in the sentence structure. This statement has been supported by Prof. Bursill Hall when his statement was “*Nevertheless, the attention paid to syntax by the grammarians of the later 12th century laid the basis for the continued close association between logic and grammar, a relationship fruitful enough to create a logical grammar within the domain of grammar and which culminated in the speculative grammars of the modesties. This was a development from the result of the full assimilation of the `new` Aristotle and the works of the Arab logicians*”(1971, p.29).

Charles E.Butterworth in his book highlighted the similar statement by saying “*Aristotle’s writing found a much more receptive audience on the other side of the Mediterranean as learning on his writings flourished in Constantinople, Edessa and Antioch. When the School of Alexandria was forced to close, it moved to Antioch in Syria. In the 6th century, many of Aristotle’s writings had been translated into Syriac. This activity continued until some of Syriac translations were rendered into Arabic . In the 10th century, the school moved to Baghdad*” (Charles E.Butterworth, Averroes` Middle

Commentaries on Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione, 1983, p xi). This statement has been proved by Ahmad Amin when he introduced a number of specialists translated Greek philosophy and science within Islamic world such as Hunain bin Ishak, Yahya bin Bitriq and Ibn al-Muqaffa' (Amin, Ahmad, *Dhuha al-Islam*, vol 1, pp 298 and 313). Due to, the translation of Greek philosophy had gone through a process of serious endeavours when the translation from Arabic²² into Hebrew occurred in the time of Islamic Spain and then into Latin in the middle of the 12th century. Prior to this, the writings of Aristotle were unknown in Western regions. In the East, they had been studied and commented by al-Kindi, al-Farabi and Ibn Sina, then in the beginning of 13th century followed by Averroes. Even after the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 and the discovery of new Greek manuscripts, the most complete translations of Aristotle's works were still those done from Arabic (Charles E. Butterworth, 1983, p xi).

The researcher wants to highlight some of the tremendous contribution of Averroes in enhancing the ideas of Aristotle when he translated the 'Categories' in his 'Middle commentary on Aristotle's categories', thereby giving a big impact on the development of the modistae in Europe and, as it seems, the starting point in the progress of understanding Aristotle's categories in the Middle Ages. In supporting the idea, Charles E. Butterworth wrote *'without exaggeration, the beginnings of scholarship in the later middle ages can be traced to the effect this newly found legacy had upon western Europe, especially to the effect it had upon such important thinkers as John of Salisbury, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus and Roger Bacon'* (1985, p.xi). Averroes, in his commentary tried to present that the 'uncombined utterances which denote uncombined ideas necessarily denote one of ten things either substance or quantity or quality or relation or where or when or position or to have or doing or being acted upon' (Charles E. Butterworth, 1983, p.30). According to our understanding from his view, in order to start something he gave an example of man and horse where to differentiate between human and animal, as both of them have relationship of depending on each other, as in 'Zayd rode a white horse last year'. The words Zayd and horse are understood by the listener when they have been combined. It also gives a new meaning when it comes with the new

²² Arabic and Syriac translations were based on Andronikus Greek edition of Aristotle writings.

word 'white', it is a white horse, the word white showed the concept of quality in the sentence and is called adjective. The analysis shows that he concentrated more on meaning where it has a relation with the concept of thinking, i.e. there is relation between words and mind which depends on the logic of utterances when combined. This statement is look like the nazm introduced by al-Jurjani in his book *Dalail al-`ijaz* when he understood that the sentence is depending on the connection of meanings in utterances. This is highlighted in part two, chapter 14 of Averroes' commentary on the "Categories". On the other hand, the statement and supposition do not admit truth and falsehood in as far as the thing to which the supposition refers outside the mind is itself altered, for example, the supposition that Zayd is sitting is indeed true²³ when Zayd sits and false when he stands` (1983, p.43). What he tried to analyze here is similar to the concept of logic when the action of something needs to be confirmed with the correct word of the action and not vice versa.

In conclusion, the connection between *Ma`ani an-Nahwi* in Arabic and the idea of Modistae in Latin is able to prove that the relationship between the concept of thinking in Arabic grammar and semantic, and the concept of modesties – without exaggeration – existed especially when some of the learned men from Latin were students of Averroes have previously been called Averroists²⁴. This has been stated in the *Opus Majus*²⁵:-

"After Avicenna Came Averroes a man with a solid doctrine, who corrected the sayings of his predecessors and whose contribution is great...The philosophy of Averroes long neglected, rejected and re-proved by the most famous doctors today wins the unanimous approval of the wise man. The 14th and 15th centuries, the influence of Averroes in Europe grew so strong that his works replaced those of Aristotle in the curriculums of European universities. John Baconthorpe of England (d.1340) was so well versed in Averroism that he was called "Prince of the Averroist". In 1473, Lois XI of France regulated the study of philosophy in his realm, designated the works of Aristotle and Averroes as the only allowable philosophical texts. At the university of Padua, Islamic philosophy in general and Averroes in particular were taught until the 17th century. In the 13th century, the Christian priesthood became worried about the propagation of Averroism, which was presented in Europe as the belief in the identity of intellect among all humanity, the negation of the knowledge of particular qualities in God, destruction of Divine providence in the sublunary the world, and the affirmation of two distinct and

²³ Literally, `does admit of truth` (*innama yaqbal al-sidq*)

²⁴ See *Opus Majus* by Roger bacon

²⁵ The major travelling

contradictory orders of knowledge of faith and the knowledge of reason (H.Zainal Abidin Ahmad, *Riwayat Hidup Ibnu Rushd Filosof Islam Terbesar di Barat*, Jakarta: Bulan Bintang, 1975, p.18).

References:

- Ahmad , H.Zainal Abidin, 1975, *Riwayat Hidup Ibnu Rushd Filosof Islam Terbesar di Barat*, Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.
- Amin, Ahmad, 1978, *Dhuha al-Islam*, DBP:Kuala Lumpur.
- Andalusi, Abu Hayan, 2001, *al-Bahru al-Muhit*, vol.4, 1st edit., Darul al-Kutub al-`ilmiah: Beirut.
- Baalbaki, Ramzi ,2004, *Grammarians and Grammatical Theory in the Medieval Arabic Tradition*, Ashgate:USA.
- Butterworth, Charles E., 1983, *Averroes` Middle Commentaries on Aristotle`s Categories and De Interpretatione*, Princeton University Press: New Jersey.
- De Libera, Alain, 1980, *On some 12th and 13th century doctrines of Restriction in studies in Medieval linguistic thought`*, John Benjamin: Amsterdam.
- Hall , G.L. Bursill, 1971, *Speculative Grammars of the Middle Ages*, The Hague: Paris.
- Hasan, Tamam, n.d., *al-lughah al-Arabiyah Ma`naha wa Mabnaha*, Darul As-Saqaafah: Morocco.
- Ibn `Aqil, 1998, *Sharh Ibn `Aqil*, vol. 1. Darul al-Fikr: Beirut.
- Ibn Hisyam, 1999, *al-Mughni al-Labib*, vol. 1, al-Maktabatul al-`Asriah: Beirut.
- Jurjani , Abdul Qahir, 1960, *Dala`il `ejaz*, edit. by Sayid Muhammad Rashid Redha, Maktabah Muhammad Ali Subaih wa Aulaad: Cairo.
- Karim, Abdullah Ahmad Jaad, 2001, *at-Tawahhum Inda an-Nuhah*, Maktabatul al-Adab: Cairo.
- Law , Vivien, 1997, *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early Middle Ages*, Longman:London.
- Lepschy, Giulio 1994, *History of Linguistics Classical and Medieval Linguistics*, Longman: New York.
- Sakkaki, Abu Bakar Muhammad `Ali, 1983, *Miftāh al-`ulūm*, Darul al-Kutub al-`Ilmiah: Beirut.
- Sibawayh,1999, *al-Kitab*, Darul al-Kutub al-`Ilmiah: Beirut.
- Versteegh, Kees 1997, *Landmarks in linguistic thought III*, Routledge: London.
- <http://www.britanica.com> /The European Middle Ages

SUMMARY

This research will compare the Arabic concept of Ma`ani Nahwi and the Latin idea of Modistae. According to Jurjani (d. 471h/1078m) the relationship between syntax and semantic has not been effectively clarified within the framework of traditional Arabic grammatical theory. In his commentary he differentiated between meaning and form in sentence. This concept is presented not to linguists but theologians in impressing them with the need to study not only theology but also grammar and literary theory in order to improve their understanding of the inimitability of the Qur`an. In this case, the discipline of grammar has to be reformed first. However, the need of context is a must because only when the context is properly ordered (Nazm), can there be eloquence and excellent style. The proper ordering refers to a correspondence between the meaning in the mind and the words in the sentence. This is similar with the concept of Modistae, whereby a modista

believed each constituent of reality has modes of being which determine the number of ways in which it can be correctly conceptualized and signified. A modista explains the essential nature and purpose of human speech and the ways in which words have meaning. In conclusion, the Arabic concept of Ma`ani Nahwi and the Latin idea of Modistae are relatively similar. This paper will analyse the concurrence of ideas among Arab and Europe scholars between the ninth and thirteenth centuries C.E.. It will assess the possibility of transmission of Ma`ani Nahwi into the concept of Modistae. It assumes that Muslim Spanish influence during the second Umayyad Caliphate may account to this trend.

Dr.Solehah Hj.Yaacob

Assist.Prof. in Dept.of Arabic Language and Literature

International Islamic University Malaysia

Email: niknajah@iiu.edu.my

Hp:016-2640714