

# The new Arabic Type classification system

## 1. Abstract

One of the main concerns of Arabic designers, is the lack of a comprehensive classification for Arabic typefaces. Since the spreading of printing press in the Arab world by the first half of the 20th century, Arabic typographers, and design scholars learning, working and communicating without classification system. This deficiency creates misinformation within graphic design practices, and education. The increased number of newly designed Arabic fonts which exceeded the one thousand, and the difficulties by the offered courses: Arabic font design, typography, and editorial design, increased the demand for a clear and user friendly classification system.

The available classifications are mostly limited up to the Arabic scripts of the 18th or/and 19th century and didn't include typefaces. Kühnel's classification in the 1970s is a great help by the identification of archaic styles and for tracing their developments within certain zeitgeists. Since the 1940s, appeared few trials to classify Arabic typefaces, such as the recently established by classification of E. Smitshuijzen, 2015. Mostly based on historical periods, which doesn't help much by the newly designed typefaces, and ended up with confusions.

This paper is aiming to establish an agreeable classification based mainly on the form-language and can facilitate the communication between all parties involved with type and letterforms – designers, typographers, type designers, calligraphers, printers, compositors, students, manufacturers, scholars, and engineers. In chapter 2, the previous categories and terms by other classifications will be briefly discussed. Questions about the misuse of some terms such as “hybrid”, “neo”, “post-modern”, “black headlines”, and “grotesk” will be raised. Chapter (3) will explain the new classification's recourse, method, and used tools, on the light of arguments raised by Elin K. Jacob, the prototype theory, John Downer's explanations for the meaning of “originality” of typefaces, Kühnel's classification, and “VOX-ATYPI” classification for latin typefaces. The latter will assist by comparing characteristics, creating new categories, and identifying the original's grades for the Arabic typefaces. In chapter (4) the final list of classes and their subordinates will be established, and supported with short description for each generic. The research paper will end up with an infographic for the main classes and their subordinates.

Keywords: Arabic Typeface Design, Arabic Typeface Classification, Latin Typeface Classification.

## 2. Background: Challenges and Critiques

The first challenge by the classification was the finding of proper approach and helpful tools to identify of models and building classes, where types organized into groups upon their form similarities without




Figure 1: The classification of Kühnel 1940, based on the five archaic models of Arabic script.




Figure 2: The classification of E. Smitshuijzen, 2015, based on eleven models of Arabic script and types.

overlapping or creating fuzzy boundaries. It was quite obvious that the characteristics of Arabic types demystify variations of models that started with closely follow classical models, through out types follow a mixture of two or more classical models, till types that reflect different new aesthetics, point of views for “modern” typography, and the evolution of industry and the technology of print, and display. The obviously based typefaces on older forms are easily identified as clones or revivals and assigned to one of the classical groups. But the majority of the newly well-designed typefaces, couldn't be classified as subordinates of one of the classical styles (figure 1). Most of them carry different features, and appeared simultaneously. (compare E. Smitshuijzen, 2015) The technological developments by the mid of the 1990s, facilitate the programming of Arabic letterforms that have been often discussed in terms of the need for simplification due to new aesthetical and practical functions and technological limitations. The huge number of previously produced transferrable decal types, have been digitalized. By the beginning of the 2000s, the number of Arabic typefaces have been increased and appeared in a wide range that started from extremely playful types with sloppy baseline like Diwani, till semi-stiff, that reflect hybrid process and different recourses.

The second challenge was the usage of proper terms for each class and subordinate that reflect understandable clear syntactic and semantical patterns. By the most well-known classification, i.e. by E. Smitshuijzen's classification, was quite obvious that we are standing in front of contradicted interpretations of historical scientific facts, and misuse of term. (Figure 2) The classification doesn't impose a systematic and syntactic order on its member categories, and it doesn't establish meaningful relationships between categories. The entire book is reflecting very confusing mechanism for grouping, where the Arabic typefaces defined by: 1) function (e.g. Black Headline), 2) by the process of creation (e.g. Hybrid), 3) unfamiliar terms within the Arabic calligraphy and typography (e.g. Grotesk), 4) by Zeitgeist (post-modern), 5) traditional or classical subordinate such as (e.g. Thuluth and Ruqaa) and, 6) classical classes (e.g. Naskh, or Kufi). Even if we are going to argue and assume that a constitutive classification is also an example of a simple mechanism for grouping; in the case of E. Smitshuijzen's suggestion, dividing the Arabic types into a set of “closely follow original” “loosely follow original” and “unrelated to any Arabic model” without reflecting any meaningful relationships among them, is incomprehensible.

However, we have to admit that Smitshuijzen's book is one of the greatest efforts we ever seen in our field. The authors had raised important issues, and clarified type design processes, historical developments, technological challenges related to programming of Arabic typefaces, and explained how to use the new typefaces within the concept of modern typography. Important was the raised issue about the lack of unified terminologies and categories by the Arabic typeface anatomy and classification.




Figure 3: The classification of Al-Qalqashandi (1356-1418) based on the six archaic models of Arabic script.




Figure 4: Bahnasi classification, 1995.

(Smitshuijzen, p. , 2015) Reasons behind that are not explained! Hypothetically, the intensive usage of hybridizations's techniques (Latin to Arabic) by Arabic type designers, along with the lack of great Arabic calligraphers, and type designers, who are interested on research and examine the variations typefaces as a result of different zeitgeists, build the main reasons behind this dilemma. It is quite obvious that most of today's Arabic designers are using hybrid ideas, borrowing design techniques and features from successful Latin typefaces such as Frutiger, Helvetica, and Universe, without knowing how to classify or categorize their new creation! Some of them used the term "Grotesk" because their fonts maybe based on the above mentioned grotesk fonts, others used terms like "Hybrid", "Post-modern" or "Black Headlines"!

## 2.1. Neo-Naskh or Neo-Kufi

The term "Neo" stands out the Greek word *néos* which means as much as "new," "recent," "revived," "modified," and used in the formation of compound words: neo-Darwinism; Neolithic; neoorthodoxy; neophyte. It reflects almost the same meaning in the Arabic term "Jadid", which means as much as the "new". Logically the Arabic term "Jadid", which has the same meaning, can replace the term "Neo-". Especially when it is assigned to those newly designed typefaces, which are closely follow an archaic model. The question here will be: How close the new fonts to the model should be? and if the newly designed typefaces don't include borrowed features from other cultural domains, but new typographical aesthetics, is it still possible to categories them under "Jadid"? Generally the answer can't be easily given with yes, or no. The features, and the anatomic structures of any "new" or "neo" font should share common with its descenders. No matter how close the new design is to the resources, the term "neo" indicates the extraction from a model that occupied the centre of a classical category or class.

Even when many modern Arabic art historian indicate that the latin Gothic, Fraktur or Black types, are strongly manipulated by the archaic Kufi, still the usage of the term Neo- remain limited up to the tide relation between the new type and its archaic duct. Finally, non of the great and well-known palaeographers or epigraphers or art historians categorized such "mixed-resulted" scripts under "Neo-Arabic", but under "pseudo Kufic". The pseudo Kufic and Naskh styles were known in Europa during the renaissance and have been used for centuries. They were the "latinized imitations" of Arabic scripts in European environment.




Figure 5: The new suggested classification (Taha, 2016-17).




Figure 6: The classification process after E. Jacob, 2012, p.533.

## 2.2. Grotesk

The term “Grotesk” is closely linked with the industrial developments’ Europe and later with the idea of democratizing the Latin letterforms, and has no translation in the Arabic language. The economic features of the grotesk typefaces were mainly created to fulfill the demands of modern European industry, education and culture. The usage of the term “grotesk” for Arabic typefaces is like an squeezing’s experiment of foreign terms into orthodoxical body? The grotesk typefaces such as “Akzidenz-Grotesk”, “Franklin Gothic”, and “News Gothic” are resulted out of the modern Europe in the 20th century, and arrived the East with the French and British and other colonialist European states.

The grotesk typefaces are in use since almost 100 year in the Arab world, and still unknown as a “grotesk” - neither by the latin nor by the Arabic typefaces. The majority of Arabic typographers and graphic designers are using “modern” latin typefaces to reflect the “Arabic” modern visual language, without knowing their functional and aesthetical background. The grotesk typefaces are intentionally designed after the less-is-more principle, and not only because of the used tools or materials. However, the argument of using such terms by the classification of Arabic typefaces because of their similarity to European grotesk, is irrelevant.

Even though the characteristics of many newly designed Arabic typefaces showing similarities to Latin types, this doesn’t change the fact that we are talking about “inspiration” and not about “extension” or “remixing”. Otherwise, again, the usage of the term “Pseudo” will suites better the imitated copies or clones of foreign scripts.

On the other hand, what we can learn from the usage of the term grotesk within the Vox classification is the way of categorizing it as a subordinates of the main class “modern-linear”, and equally categorized beside the Neo-Grotesk, the Humanist, and the Geometric categories. For an amateur, the four categories looks similar, but by a closer look, we will distinguish between the geometrically constructed Futura, Avenir and Avant-Garde, and the humanist typefaces like Optima, and Tahoma, which are not based on the grotesk of the 19th century but on the Roman inscripational letters and the Carolingian script.

## 2.3. Humanist

The term stands out the renaissance humanism or humanitas (lat.), which was a philosophical and ethical stance that emphasis the value and the ethical of human being. Humanitas is the original latin word; *-ism*, entered English in the nineteenth century. The name itself comes from “studia humanitatis”, the renaissance term for the study of classical history, moral philosophy, rhetoric, poetry etc. This means that the term is far from the religious text, and reflect the shift from normatively to individuality. But Humanist “fonts” are those typefaces that basically designed during the 15th century, and following humans values imparted by *bonae litterae* or humane learning (literally “good letters”). By Vox classification, there are two different categories of humanist typefaces: humanist serif, such as “Janson” and san-serif like “Gill Sans” and “Optima”. Both reflecting organic forms and stoke variations.

In Arabic, the word “Humanitas = Insani” means as much as human, and has never been used by Ibn Muqlah (9th - 10th AD.), who “redesigned” the Arabic Naskh upon human proportion. Ibn Muqlah, as Maher Raef (1929-1970) in his dissertation mentioned, never described his creation as humanist-Naskhi or humanist-Kufi! Even by AL-Qalqashandi (1355-1418), Al-Tawhidi (923-1023), and by Raseal Ikhwan Al-Safa “Brethren of Purity” (between the 8th and the 11th century), we cant find such terms as a category that linked letterforms with humanism.

However, within the latin classification there are many new critic against the usage of the term “Humanist”. In his article “The history of ‘humanist’ type”, Craig Eliason argued that while the term specifically denotes certain fifteenth-century texts, only its “humanist” connotations made it attractive to Maximilien Vox. Eliason goes further and even warranted its use in future classifications. Added C. Eliason: “...Maximilien Vox’s employment of “humanes” in his influential 1954 classification scheme did not codify an already accepted category; before Vox the term was rarely used for type, and when it was it

sometimes referred to types other than those which Vox would group under the labels. Moreover, the stylistic features that distinguish a humanist seriffed font in Vox's scheme are not the same features that distinguish the faces later named humanist sans types. Given these vagaries of definition, it is worth asking how and why "humanist" has persisted as a label." (<https://www.atypi.org/type-typography/the-history-of-2018humanist2019-type>)

Eventually, it is not clear why big companies like Monotype allowed the categorizations the Arabic version of the typeface "Palatino" (designed by Nadine Chahine and Hermann Zapf) under "humanist-kufi"? Neither the letterforms are matching with the latin typeface itself "Palatino" as humanist typeface of the 15th century, nor with Kufi as Arabic old-style typeface. The design is based on the Al-Ahram typeface designed by Zapf in 1956 and modified to fit the Palatino nova family. (<http://catalog.monotype.com/font/linotype/palatino-arabic/regular>)

## 2.4. Black Headlines

Another term appears during the 60's and 70's is the "Black Headlines". The explanation for its existence is: "...The old Arabic calligraphic styles don't have the needed weights to make hierarchically distinctions in the modern typography." (Smitshuijzen, E., 2015, p. 20) In fact this claim needs to be discussed. Firstly, there is a calligraphic pen called Al-Ṭumar or Ṭumar in Arabic = Al-Saḥifa, which means in English as much as the newspaper. (Al-Jburi, 1999, p. 65) Al-Ṭumar or Ṭumar is the boldest formal version of the cursive script. It is mostly used for short texts at larger type sizes. (ibid, 1999) Secondly, there is other old Arabic term that could be chosen which is "Jalil", which is well-known by the Arabic typographers and researchers boldest traditional weight among the rounded duct. With Ṭumar pen calligraphers wrote in big Thuluth or Diwani a size named Al-Jalil or Jalil, which means in Arabic as much as the big or bold.

However the term "Saḥifa" or "Sahafi" has almost the same meaning of "Black Headline", and logically, it were be better to use it -even as tentative term- in order to fulfill the new Arabic typographical demands at the time. The term "Black" could be better used as a font styles, rather than a class. Today we create Arabic typefaces with families having light, regular and bold styles that could be extended to include extra bold, black and extended black styles. Moreover the term "Black Headlines" indicates certain letterforms, which are closely linked with the aesthetics of the 60s and 70s: High contrast between horizontal and vertical strokes, relatively small counters, and exaggerated bold horizontal lines, and almost function as visual products of Op-Art.

## 3. The process of classification

### 3.1. Resources

The process of the new classification starts with revising Abdalla's classification, where scripts are chronologically connected with main Islamic epochs and dynasties. (Abdalla, 1997) The form-language of a script with certain dynasty explained, not only the states dogma, but the used technology, tools, and surly the aesthetical norms and values. The second reference was Kühnel's classification - Ernst Kühnel, "Die Kunst der Arabischen Schrift", 2nd edition. 1972, which gives a macro overview for the development of styles with focusing on the characteristics of main archaic models. His classification based partly on form models (rounded, stiff, and playful graphic) combined with geo-political chronology, which is a curtail issue, where Kühnel's classification reflect a fuzzy concept that allow scripts to be categorize in two different subordinates upon semantical perspectives. (Figure 1)

Kühnel's classification has been used in the main Arabic references such as: Bahnasi (1990); Al-Jaburi (1990); Masoud (1990), and Abott (1938) are selectively chosen upon their popularity and well-documented terms and visual samples of archaic styles.

The paper depends on the most comprehensive references about the roots of the Arabic archaic models such as grammatology of Gelb (1958), Jensen (1929), Friederisch (1966), and Kühnel (1972). They were a great help for the chronological documentation, visual comparison, and understanding the form-developments from causal scripts to well-established calligraphic styles. On the other hand, the book “Arabic font specimens book” from Smitshuijzen, published by Khatt book in 2015, built the main source for the examined fonts. Finally, it was important to examine transferable decals types from Linotype, Mecanorma, and transtype, which build, along with all the previous references, an important physical evidences of the fashionable and well-known styles between the 1980s and the 2000s.

### 3.2. From categorization to classification

**Between form-based and chronological** The new system is form-based distinctions between groups of entities. Through its supplementary mechanism such as the semantical or/and historical perspectives of the typefaces, access can be provided, whether to individual categories or to unique category members. The formal criteria of each class and subordinate and the establishment of meaningful of information-bearing relationships build and organized together the system. (Jacob, 2004, p.532) If we admit that classification is the process of assigning group membership labels to unlabelled observations, it will be understandable the reasons behind classifying types chronologically upon “pre-labeled historical periods”. But, “while this is a good way to categorize many of the typefaces from the past, chronological methods become impractical when it comes to contemporary design. Art critics know this problem all too well: what comes after postmodern? Post-postmodern?” (Coles, 2012, p.23). Indra Kupferschmid, shared in his article “Thoughts on Classification of Typefaces” (Published: 27. JULY 2009), almost the same

<b>Closely follow the original</b>	<b>Loosely follow the original</b>
<b>Revivals / Recuttings / Reclamations</b>	<b>Reconsiderations / Reevaluations/Reinterpretations</b>
Closely based on historical models (metal type, hand-cut punches, etc.) for commercial or noncommercial purposes, with the right amount of historic preservation and sensitivity to the virtues of the original being kept in focus-all with a solid grounding in type scholarship behind the effort, too.	Loosely based on artistic successes (of any medium) as a kind of laboratory exercise, often without much concern for their immediate or eventual commercial viability.
<b>Anthologies / Surveys / Remixes</b>	<b>Homages / Tributes / Paeans</b>
Closely based on characters from various fonts all cut by one person, or cut by various hands, all working in one particular style or genre-like a medley or an overview done more for the sake of providing a "sampling" than for the sake of totally replicating any one single cut of type.	Loosely based on historical styles and/or specific models, usually with admiration and respect for the obvious merits of the antecedents - but with more artistic freedom to deviate from the originals and to add personal touches; taking liberties normally not taken with straight revivals.
<b>Knockoffs / Clones / Counterfeits</b>	<b>Encores / Sequels / Reprises</b>
Closely based on commercial successes (of any medium) to belatedly muscle in on part of an unsaturated market, often by being little more than a cheap imitation of what has already been deemed by experts as a legitimate revival. "Me Too" fonts, or "Copy Cat" fonts, as they are called, tend to focus on opportunism rather than on originality. These don't rate as revivals because they don't revive.	Loosely based on commercial successes (of any medium) as a means of further exploring, or further exploiting, an established genre; milking the Cash Cow one more time.
	<b>Extensions / Spinoffs / Variations</b>
	Loosely based on artistic or commercial successes (of any medium) for only rarely more than minor advancements in a tried, popular, accepted style; akin to previous category.
	<b>Caricatures / Parodies / Burlesques</b>
	Loosely based on prominent features of the model, often with humor or satire as the primary objective, but quite often also with humor or satire as an unexpected effect.

Figure 7: Definitions for types qualities by John Downer, Tributes, 2007.

point of view. He suggested to classify typefaces primarily upon their form-qualities and not upon a historical timeline. Even Kühnel's classification of Arabic scripts has its chronological strength, it is based on classifying the archaic styles upon their form-qualities and not only upon their historical order.

**Categorization:** The process starts with categorization, followed by indexing and ended up with well-identified classes. By the "cognitive categorization", typefaces have been viewed, analyzed and assigned to "labeled" and also "unlabeled" groups based on old or/and newly found "prototypes". Some classes accepted not only the natural grading of typefaces and tend to be fuzzy at their boundaries, but also the inconsistency in the status of their components members, such as the "Calligraphic: Graphic class" (see chapter 4.3.1). Referring to E. Jacob, the process of categorization is a creative synthesis of entities based on context or perceived similarity, in contra, the process of classification is a systematic arrangement of entities based on analysis of necessary and sufficient characteristics. (compare Jacob, 2012, p. 528). The differences between both of them goes further: The boundaries between classes and categories are fuzzy or fixed, the membership is flexible or rigorous, the criteria for assignment are context-determined or predetermined, etc.

Theories of categorization such as the "classical view", which is the oldest well-known approach of grouping "types" upon their similar properties, was difficult to use and classifying typefaces upon discrete entities was impossible to start with. Neither a proper set was available, which allow to identify models or prototypes, nor the existed terms are clear and closely linked with certain models. Aside from the "conceptual clustering", which is considered as the modern variation of the classical approach, the prototype theory or/and the fuzzy set theory allow types to belong to one or more groups in varying degrees of similarity, which was the case by different classical types. However, the operation of organizing items was very creative and full of dynamic, where the differences have been recognized, and initial visual comparison of properties and characteristics have been executed. It was sufficient as initial step, where huge number of types with unclear resources have been grouped upon syntactic benchmarks based on models.

**Indexing:** The post-coordinate indexing system allowed us to formulate models with conceptual descriptions after the indexing of typefaces has been compiled. Only by the classical well-known classes, an action of grouping according the pre-listed descriptions has been executed (Figure 1, and 2). The pre-listed descriptions from Kühnel and Al-Qalqashandi, assess by sorting the memberships' level in a set that is perviously designed according to a bivalent condition — an element either belongs or does not belong to the set (Figure 8). It was necessary to use such binary system.

**Classification:** In order to continue the classification, following steps were needed: 1) create new classes with proper terms: Many of the newly designed types resulted out of hybridization's methods, and carrying features of different categories. This point has been raised by Paul Kay (1973), who observed that, in some cases the grade of membership of an object,  $u$ , in the intersection of two fuzzy sets A and B may be greater than its grade of membership in A (or B) (Zadeh, 1982); 2) Ending up with a system that permit the existence of mixed aspects of classes, and hierarchal levels such as the taxonomy in biology or zoology, where the "life-form level, middle level: generic or genus level, and lower level: the species level, could be used. For example: to place the Arabic stiff style, which is known with (kufi or Yabes) in the higher level: "Form quality" level = stiff, middle level: "generic" level = Maghribi or geometric, and lower level: the "structure" level = Geometric Kufi. (fig. 3) The stage of identification was followed by listing down the main description of each subordinate upon three main classes: 1) Classical: includes all the archaic typefaces; 2) Modern: contains all the newly designed typefaces since the 1940s till today; 3) Calligraphic: all styles that owns calligraphic or script effects are included, which will be explained in chapter 4. (Figure 8)

### 3.3. Tools: Evaluation sheet, creating classes and subordinates

When letters enlarged, all sorts of information about any typeface are pulled out: The functions of negative space are easily discovered, and how the shape of one letter affects the shape of the others. More important is discovering that seemingly minor attributes can affect the personality of a typeface as a whole, and forced us to reevaluate its position within the classifications' system, and make assumptions about its originality's level, and to ask to which class it could belongs!

John Downer, the well-known American typeface designer and typographer, explained in his article "Call It What It Is" published in Emigre's Tribute type specimen booklet in 2012, a prototype concept that includes semantical differentiation notions, where the originality of typefaces can be measured. Downer divided his descriptions into two categories: "one for designs that closely follow the original, and the other for designs that loosely follow the original." (John Downer, 10/10/2016). Downer's suggestion has been used and tested successfully in this paper. It allows the creation of evaluation sheets to examine typefaces, in relation to their fidelity to a certain model. The models and the distinction is based more on characteristics rather than chronological accuracy and the pros and cons of modification of historical norms. The evaluation had started with designing one template for the four main classical styles: Kufi, Naskh, Slope, and Maghribi. The comparison's processes are followed with measuring's process that focused on discovering how the examined typefaces implies tradition and conventions, i.e. checking if letterforms have been handed over, and deliver up traditions, or showed legacies (figure 4). Some of the examined typefaces own a combination of one known model such as Naskh and new characteristics. In those cases, it was necessary to group such typefaces together, without using a concrete generic name. In a later stage the same evaluations' sheet has been used to categories the newly created groups, which ended up with creating thirteen templates, one for each model.

The evaluations' sheet is divided into four main parts: Left: Main characteristics of the model: Middle: the examined typeface (single letters); Right: Downer's criteria with its two categories and eight levels; Bottom-left: the name of the examined typeface as appears in its reference. Bottom-right a sample Arabic sentence that includes the most important letters that can give an impression about the typeface. (figure ?) The Left part contains the original characteristics of one model, and is divided horizontally into




Figure 8: The evaluation sheet for the class: Classical: Rounded: Naskh-Jadid. 2016.



three sub-sections: A) The upper section: The stems (=Swayed), upstroke nature - straight, or curvy Ascender(s) height(s); B) The middle section: Baseline strokes nature (curved/stiff connection - the Mada) organic or straight, X-height (in some cases), counter-form: closed, blocked and open, eye form; almond-form, geometric, angels: sharp or semi-curved, rounded-, and thickness, loop height(s), tooth height(s); C) The lower section: Exit stroke (tails), number of descenders and tail's shape: Slack, rounded or straight.

#### 4. Conclusion: The classes and their subordinates

In conclusion, a holistic classification of Arabic typefaces system certainly needs more research and contribution from various specialist, and not only from Arabic typographers and type designers, but also calligraphers and design scholars. Even though, and after examining 400 Arabic typefaces from different companies, and individual type designers, the research resulted with establishing an initial attempt, which includes three main classes for Arabic typefaces and one for non-Arabic typefaces, as follow:

- 1) Classical: (old) form models: forms, contrast and structure, derived mostly from writing with reed pen, but also inscribed into hard martial like wood, and stone, and small brushes.
- 2) Modern: new and rational (modern) form model: forms derived mostly from drawing the linear skeleton with or without the usage of Latin tools such as a pointed pen = expansion
- 3) Calligraphic; (old and new) forms: forms reflect a big variety of used tools, from reed pen, up-to linear based. It includes old and new styles.
- 4) Others: (Non-Arabic): like Latin, Devanagari, Hebrew, etc.

Most of the perviously discussed terms in chapter two have been avoided or replaced. In order to reach well-organized conceptual arrangement within the set that reflects mutually exclusive and non-overlapping classes, it was necessary to create systematic structure of hierarchical, genus-species relationships. (Jacob, 2004) The classification ended up with thirteen subordinates or generics. The relationships between classical generics such as Kufi, Naskh, Slope, and Maghribi, and the newly created: Kufi-Jadid, Naskh-Jadid, etc. are meaningful and information-bearing because they specify principled connections between two or more well-known models (compare figure 1 with figure 5).

##### 4.1. Class 1: Classical

The term is used for those typefaces that carry characteristics, which are recutted or very good revivals of the four well-known Arabic ductus. It is indicate in this regard has less to do with the term "classics [plural], which is the study of the languages, literature, and history of ancient Greece and Rome". (Longman dictionary, p. 185, 2009). According to Kühnel the ductus are:

- 1) Stiff: Also known as Kufi or yabis),
- 2) Rounded: Also known also as Naskh or ),
- 3) Slope: Also known as Taliq = hanging or Persian), and
- 4) Western: A mixture includes Naskh- and Kufi-based forms in different variations.

The classical classes are here to understand as those typefaces with roots that got back to the 7th and 8th century. They are categorized upon the nature of their letterforms (Stiff/Rounded), and baseline (Straight/Sloppy). The Maghribi ductus has been differently developed and carry characteristics of the stiff and rounded ductus. All the variations of the classical typefaces are classified as subordinates and assigned into groups that have traditional terms and are in use since the 9th century till today. Kufi, Naskh, Slope, and Maghribi. There are many variations form each one of the that will be mentioned under each subordinate.



Figure 9: Classical: Stiff: Kufi. Font: AGA Mashq 72.

#### 4.1.1. Classical: Stiff: Kufi (7th Century A.D. - Also known as Kufic or the stiff = Yabis ductus)

Most of the text about the historical development of the Arabic script starts with writings about the simple Kufi rather than about the Naskh styles. However both ductus have been used during the 7th century A.D.- before Islam in different variations. The most dominant version in manuscripts between the 7th to 10th centuries was the Kufi Mushafi = Quranic. Out of the simple Kufi appeared a lot of variations in architect, textile, pottery, etc. with ornamented tails and stems (see class: Calligraphic: Ornamented), and playful skeleton. Between the 12th and the 13th century, Persian extracted other version with sharp edges and squarish look. The square Kufi (known also as geometric or eastern Kufi), as its name suggested based on straight lines and angles. However, the simple Kufi shaped the model of this class. It is characterized with its not so sharp edges and relatively geometric small loops. The oldest versions, as appeared in different references, demystify a mixture between round and straight strokes, but with a holistic stiff image. (Compare Treasures of the Aga Khan Museum,..., 2011, p.24 with Enzyklopaedia des Islam, B1-4, Tafel II, III, and IV, 1938) Because of its bold nature and relatively short descenders, it was widely used in display sizes for titling in many architectural and decorative applications on fabrics, ceramics, or wood, etc. (Jensen, 1925, p. 130). More important here to mention that the many of Kufi's variations won over the past fifty years enormous attention by contemporary font designers. **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Straight horizontal baseline, with variations of "kashidah"
Letterform	Geometric or Linear based letterforms
Stroke	Unified stroke thickness
Ascender	Normal to high ascenders
Loop(s)	Adjusted and almost unified loop-heights
Teeth/Tooth	Unified tooth height
Descender	Short descender




Figure 10: Classical: Rounded: Naskh. Font: KacstBook.

#### 4.1.2. Classical: Naskh (7th Century A.D. / Also known as cursive or rounded = Layen ductus)

The Naskh ductus (Arabic = Naskhi) won its Arabic name from the act of "copying" i.e. writing texts. It has been used in applications that need to be written in small text sizes and in a short period of time. The term itself used as a "generic" name for a huge variety of Arabic rounded styles that have been used since the 7th century and till today. Most of the dated Naskh scripts in 7th century are profane texts. Naskh style is known with its organic nature that encourages great calligraphers, and later contemporary type designers, to create new variations of well-functioned body-text typefaces. The proportional system and the writing rules of the Naskhi are created by the calligrapher "Ibn Muqlah". (Maher, Raef, 1975) Ibn Muqlah created out of the Naskh the "Thuluth" (means the third of the widest used pen "Tumar" at this time), which is the most elegant formal version of the cursive script. It is mostly used for short texts at larger type sizes, and for titling. (Bahnasi, A Dictionary of Arabic Calligraphy Terms and Calligraphers, p. Sad, 1995) It is characterized by its overall lightness, its short descenders and tall ascenders. However, the oldest Quran manuscript in Naskh was written later by Ibn Al-Bawwab in Baghdad in 1000–01.

(Khalili, 2008, p. 51) Naskh has also been used to indicate the styles used in papyri between and the 7th till the 9th century, Naskh is an archaic style, which is characterized by its compact, clear, simple, and curvy letterforms. **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Curvy to arch-shaped horizontal baseline with adjusted to relatively wide “kashidah”
Letterform	Rounded based letterforms
Stroke	Contrasted stroke variation
Ascender	Economic to relatively long ascender
Loop(s)	Different loops and tooth-heights
Teeth/Tooth	Varied teeth-heights
Descender	Adjusted economic to relatively short descenders



Figure 11: Classical: Rounded: Slope. Font: IranNastaliq.

#### 4.1.3. Classical: Taliq: Slope (10th Century A.D. / Also known as Taliq ductus)

Unlike all other Arabic styles, the slope ductus comes in four different variations: Taliq (12th century) Diwani (14th century), Nastaliq (end 14th century, Shikesta (18th century), and later the Ruqaa (18th century). (Abdalla, 1997, p. 135-145) The oldest is the Taliq is based on rounded forms, long descenders, blocked counters in some letters, and arch-shaped kashidah. The diwani won its name from the Turkish term Al-Diwan, which means as much as the palace, and originally used for official Sultan's court during the Ottoman dynasty. It is famous with its hanging baselines and exaggerated low-hanging ending swashes. The third variation is Nastaliq from 15th century. This elegant slope-cursive style is used mostly in Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan. It served mainly the Urdu language, and barely used for Arabic language. Nastaliq is derived from the two words: Taliq and Naskh. (A. Papadoppolo, 2006a, p. 337). It is fluid with letters that hang in clusters like grapes. The fourth slope variation is the informal version of rounded ductus the Ruqaa from the 18th century. It has been created in Turkey by (Mumtaz Bic). The written word in Ruqaa is originally set on a sloped baseline, and it is slightly heavier than Naskh, but more compact script. **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Curvy to arch sloppy baseline with freely adjusted “kashidah”
Letterform	Rounded based letterforms
Stroke	Contrasted stroke variation
Ascender	Economic to relatively long ascender
Loop(s)	In some letters are blocked (Faa, Waw, Ein)
Teeth/Tooth	Varied teeth-heights
Descender	Varied from adjusted economic (Ruqaa) to very long (Taliq, Nastaliq and Shikesta)

#### 4.1.4. Classical: Western: **Maghribi** (10th Century A.D. / Also known as Western ductus)

The cultural and aesthetical nature of the western part of the of the ancient Islamic world (from Tunisian till Cordoba and Andalusia), has a strong impact on the Maghribi ductus and its the subordinates. They come in Maghribi-Kufi and Maghribi-Naskh and under many other names, such as Andalusi, and Timbuktu). The well-known are the Andalusi, the Qairawani, the Tumbuktu, and the Maghrebi. The latter is the most playful and ornamented style and has been further developed under the calligraph Al-Qundusi




Figure 12: Classical: Stiff: Kufi. Font: AXtAl.

(18 century) with new aesthetical norms. However, Kühnel explained how the forms of Maghribi duct are extracted, and how they are resulted out of used tools, material. s a semi-cursive variation of the Kufi style, used in Northern Africa. It is characterized by the rounding of its letterforms into small circular loops or eyes, delicate cursive strokes, and open semi-circular large descenders that hang low from the baseline. It is generally used as text faces set at large type sizes. **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Semi horizontal baseline with variations of “kashidah”
Letterform	Semi-geometric based letterforms
Stroke	Varied to almost unified
Ascender	Slitty-varied ascenders
Loop(s)	Almost unified big sized loops
Teeth/Tooth	Unified teeth-height
Descender	Short slitty-varied descenders

#### 4.2. Class 2: Modern

The term “Modern” is related to the act of departing from traditional styles and values. It was coined in the 16th century to indicate present or recent times (ultimately derived from the Latin adverb modo, meaning "just now"). Historically there are three periods: Early modern period (early 16th century in Europa); Late modern period (late 18th century); and contemporary history (relevant to present time). Aside from the different theories about the this term and its usage within non-western culture, it is characterized by the usage of up-to-date technologies and ideas etc. The modern typefaces are mostly resulted out of hybrid processes which revived through the parallel study of the Latin classes such as Grotesk, Neo-Grotesk, and the archaic Arabic styles. It is well-known in the Arabic culture as Hadieth and widely used to signify all the cultural activities and products that are happing at our present time. For example the translation of modern Arabic art will be “Al-Fan Al-Arabi Al-Hadieth”. Rarely, and almost within art historians’, specialists in art or design, a distinction between “contemporary” and “modern” will be executed.



Figure 13: Modern: Stiff: Kufi-Jadid. Font: B Elham.

##### 4.2.1. Modern: Linear: Kufi-Jadid

Kufi-Jadid is won its name form its descender the Kufi, and same while from being appeared by the 1960s. The increased modernization of the Arabic world, forced designers to the extract new models out the known classical styles. From the Kufi inherited the new model the stiffness, the unified stroke thickness, the short and unified descender and the semi-bold to bold appearance. These characteristics allows Kufi-Jadid to be an excellent style for display size applications. **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Straight horizontal to slitty arc-shaped baseline with adjusted economic “kashidah”
Letterform	Geometric based letterforms
Stroke	Almost unified stroke thickness
Ascender	Economic unified ascender

Loop(s)	Almost unified big sized loops
Teeth/Tooth	Unified teeth-height
Descender	Short descenders




Figure 14: Modern: Rounded: Naskh-Jadid. Font: Droid Arabic Naskh.

#### 4.2.2. Modern: Naskh-Jadid

The Naskh-Jadid appears in late 20th century and is based on the proportion and shared the cursive characteristics with its descender the classical Naskh. This model inherits not only rounded effect, but also the stroke variation and the arch nature of its baseline. The term Jadid means as much as “new” or “neo” in english, and indicates the modernity of typefaces’ features. It distinguished itself from the Naskh in the stroke variation mixed with geometric linear construction. **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Straight horizontal to slitty arc-shaped baseline with adjusted economic “kashidah”
Letterform	Geometric based letterforms
Stroke	Varied stroke thicknesses
Ascender	Varied ascenders
Loop(s)	Almost unified big sized loops
Teeth/Tooth	Varied teeth-heights
Descender	Varied descenders



Figure 15: Modern:Semi-Geometric: Naskh-Sahafi. Font: AXtNada Bold.

#### 4.2.3. Modern: Semi-Geometric: Naskh-Sahafi

The style is closely connected with the development of Arabic newspapers and magazines in the 1970s. It is also known as “Headline”. The Naskh-Linear inherited from the archaic Naskh the rounded effects of the loops, bow, upper-parts of round open counters that looks like half moon, and tails, combined with geometric construction appeared clearly in the thick baseline-stroke, and sharp edges. The Naskh-Sahafi as well with a rounded variation, more rounded, and without sharp edges. **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Straight and thick horizontal to slitty arc-shaped baseline with condensed “kashidah”
Letterform	Geometric based letterforms
Stroke	Horizontal strokes are normally thicker than the vertical
Ascender	Short and almost unified ascender
Loop(s)	Almost unified small sized loops
Teeth/Tooth	Unified teeth-height
Descender	Short descenders with relative thick tails



Figure 16: Modern: Semi-Geometric: NaskKufi. Font: Frutiger LT Arabic.

#### 4.2.4. Modern: Semi-Geometric: NaskKufi

The NaskKufi appears by the 2000s, and is resulted out of the overlapping between Naskh and Kufi. The new hybrid characteristics are revived through the parallel study of the Latin classes such as Grotesk, Neo-Grotesk, and the archaic Arabic styles. **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Straight unified horizontal baseline with adjusted economic “kashidah”
Letterform	Semi-geometric based letterforms
Stroke	Almost unified
Ascender	Slitty-varied ascenders
Loop(s)	Almost unified big sized loops
Teeth/Tooth	Unified teeth-height
Descender	Short slitty-varied descenders




Figure 17: Modern: Semi-Geometric: Naskh-Linear. Font: AXtDamour

#### 4.2.5. Modern Semi-Geometric: Naskh-Linear

The Naskh-Linear is one of the first typefaces that appeared by the 1970s. It is the legal and normal linear extant ion of the classical-Naskh. Its straight horizontal baseline with its slitty curved angels, middle sized to closed loops, and angled tails and stem endings indicate a mixed process between the calligraphic effect of the Naskh and the geometric structure of the modern. **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Straight unified horizontal baseline with adjusted economic “kashidah”
Letterform	Semi-geometric based letterforms with slitty angled edges
Stroke	Almost unified
Ascender	Slitty-varied ascenders
Loop(s)	Almost unified big sized loops
Teeth/Tooth	Unified teeth-height
Descender	Short and slitty-varied descenders

#### 4.3. Class 3: Calligraphic

The third class in the system is based on the calligraphic spirit of the typefaces that reflect the used tools and the uniqueness of the characteristics. It includes four main subordinates, two kinds of scripts, one ornamented, and one graphic. The latter includes the largest amount number of typefaces, and variations, where geometric-decorative forms are dominant. Unlike the script-formal typefaces, which own a lot of classical characteristics, the script-casual typefaces are freely scripted and reflect the subjective visions of the calligraphy. The ornamented subordinate is also known with ornamented Kufi, where all Kufi styles that are known, with ornamented ending are included.




Figure 18: Calligraphic: Rounded: Script-Formal. AXtLAKhdarLight.

#### 4.3.1. Calligraphic: Script-Formal

Even though the script-formal sharing common characteristics with classical subordinates, but they are not strictly following their calligraphic bases: proportion, stroke variations, etc. At the first glance, amateurs will barely notice the differences, which are based on remixed old calligraphic principles with very subjective aesthetics and/or commercial influences. **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Straight unified horizontal baseline with adjusted economic “kashidah”
Letterform	Semi-geometric based letterforms
Stroke	Almost unified
Ascender	Slitty-varied ascenders
Loop(s)	Almost unified big sized loops
Teeth/Tooth	Unified teeth-height
Descender	Short slitty-varied descenders



Figure 19: Calligraphic: Rounded: Script-Casual. Font: AXtNadine.

#### 4.3.2. Calligraphic: Rounded: Script-Casual

Casual scripted typefaces are those that own a mimic of calligraphic writing. They are mostly rounded and connected. The letterforms appear to have been written with a speed flexible pen, or different brush thicknesses. Most of the members of this category own Ruqaa, or Naskh characteristics.

##### **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Straight unified horizontal baseline with adjusted economic “kashidah”
Letterform	Mostly rounded based letterforms
Stroke	Almost unified
Ascender	Slitty-varied ascenders
Loop(s)	varying in size of form
Teeth/Tooth	Varied
Descender	Varied

#### 4.3.3. Calligraphic: Linear: Ornamented

The term ornament within the Arabic culture will be understood as decorative (= Zokhrouf). This linear ornamented style is extracted from the simple Kufi. (fig. x) The Ornamented Kufi appears in different epochs, regions, and applications with large amount of variations in the stroke nature, thicknesses and stem’s heights. We can primarily differentiate them through their tail’s and stem’s endings, which often reflect the nature of the used mediums and the functions of products such as written text with brush or pen on ceramics plates, graved signature or text on copper, etc. Because of the numberless and the decorative look of the ornamented Kufi, like knotted Kufi, or Floral Kufi, it will be possible to categorize them separately in a new category under “Ornamented Kufi” or Decorative Kufi”. **Characteristics:**



Figure 20: Calligraphic: Stiff: Ornamented. Font: AXtNova.

Baseline	Straight unified horizontal baseline with adjusted economic “kashidah”
Letterform	Geometric based letterforms
Stroke	Almost unified
Ascender	Slitty-varied ascenders
Loop(s)	Almost unified big sized loops
Teeth/Tooth	Unified teeth-height
Descender	Short slitty-varied descenders



Figure 21: Calligraphic: Graphic. Font: Asmaa Font.

#### 4.3.4. Calligraphic: Graphic

Most of the Arabic classical and modern typefaces can be differentiated according to ductus which include certain numbers of basic forms. By the calligraphic graphic, especially in the Arab world, where calligraphy considered as visual art equivalent to any other art medium, lettering and graphic playful letterforms are meant to look at rather than through. The graphic letterforms are largely determined by the former writing tools – e.g. the broad nib or pointed nib – and based on stroke contrast, but also reflecting geometric constructions and module-shaped forms. **Characteristics:**

Baseline	Varied strokes baseline with different “kashidah”
Letterform	geometric to Semi-geometric
Stroke	Varied
Ascender	Slitty-varied to unified ascenders
Loop(s)	Varied forms and heights
Teeth/Tooth	Varied teeth-heights
Descender	Varied descenders

#### 4.4. Others: Non-Arabic

All non-Arabic scripts all included in this class, no matter their roots or letterform natures, such as Latin, Devanagari, Hebrew, Chinese, Cyrillic.






<p>Baseline</p> <p>Letterform</p> <p>Stroke</p> <p>Ascender</p> <p>Loop(s)</p> <p>Teeth/Tooth</p> <p>Descender</p>	<p>Classical: Stiff Kufi</p>  <p>7th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Stiff or Yabis</i></p> <p>Straight horizontal baseline Geometric or Linear Unified stroke thickness Normal to high ascenders Almost unified loop-heights Unified tooth height Short descender KufiStandardGK, AGA Cordoba</p>	<p>Classical: Rounded Naskh</p>  <p>7th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Rounded or Cursive</i></p> <p>Curvy to arch-shaped horizontal Rounded based Contrasted stroke variation Economic to relatively long Different loops and tooth-heights Varied teeth-heights Economic to relatively short KacstBook, Adobe Naskh</p>	<p>Classical: Rounded Slope</p>  <p>13th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Taliq</i></p> <p>Curvy to arch-shaped sloppy Rounded based Contrasted boldy stroke variation Economic to long ascender Blocked in some letters Varied teeth-heights Varied B Arabic Style, B Fantezy</p>	<p>Classical: Semi-Geometric Maghribi</p>  <p>13th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Western</i></p> <p>Semi horizontal baseline Semi-geometric based Varied to almost unified Slitty-varied ascenders Almost unified big sized loops Unified teeth-height Short slitty-varied descenders Rabat, AXiKarawouin</p>	<p>Modern: Stiff Kufi-Jadid</p>  <p>20th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Kufi-Hadith</i></p> <p>Straight to slitty arc-shaped Geometric based letterforms Almost unified stroke thickness Economic unified ascender Almost unified big sized loops Unified teeth-height Short descenders B Elham, AXiKarawouin</p>
	<p>Modern: Rounded Naskh-Jadid</p>  <p>20th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Naskh-Hadith</i></p> <p>Straight to slitty arc-shaped Geometric based Varied stroke thicknesses Varied ascenders Almost unified big sized loops Varied teeth-heights Varied descenders Droid Arabic Naskh, Fedra Arabic</p>	<p>Modern: Semi-Geometric Naskh-Sahafi</p>  <p>20th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Jaridah</i></p> <p>Straight thick to slitty arc-shaped Geometric based Horizontal thicker than the vertical Short and almost unified ascender Almost unified small sized loops Unified teeth-height Short with relative thick tails Beirut Regular, AXTNada Bold</p>	<p>Modern: Semi-Geometric NasKufi</p>  <p>20th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Taliq</i></p> <p>Curvy to arch-shaped sloppy Rounded based Contrasted boldy stroke variation Economic to long ascender Blocked in some letters Varied teeth-heights Varied B Arabic Style, B Fantezy</p>	<p>Modern: Semi-Geometric Naskh-Linear</p>  <p>20th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Western</i></p> <p>Semi horizontal baseline Semi-geometric based Varied to almost unified Slitty-varied ascenders Almost unified big sized loops Unified teeth-height Short slitty-varied descenders Rabat, AXiKarawouin</p>	<p>Calligraphic: Rounded Script-Casual</p>  <p>20th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Kufi-Hadith</i></p> <p>Straight to slitty arc-shaped Geometric based letterforms Almost unified stroke thickness Economic unified ascender Almost unified big sized loops Unified teeth-height Short descenders B Elham, AXiKarawouin</p>
	<p>Calligraphic Script-Formal</p>  <p>20th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Hoor = Free</i></p> <p>Straight horizontal baseline Geometric or Linear Unified stroke thickness Normal to high ascenders Almost unified loop-heights Unified tooth height Short descender KufiStandardGK, AGA Cordoba</p>	<p>Calligraphic Ornamented</p>  <p>20th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Mozakhrif</i></p> <p>Straight Geometric based Almost unified stroke thickness Economic to relatively long Different loops and tooth-heights Varied teeth-heights Relatively short KacstBook, Adobe Naskh</p>	<p>Calligraphic Graphic</p>  <p>20th Century A.D. <i>Also known as Hadith</i></p> <p>Varied strokes Geometric to Semi-geometric Varied Slitty-varied to unified ascenders Varied forms and heights Varied teeth-heights Varied descenders AXiLeaA, AXiMounir</p>	<p>Non-Arabic Others: Latin, etc.</p>  <p>All non-Arabic scripts, and aside from styles and typographical function), such as Latin, Devanagari, Hebrew, Chinese, Cyrillic.</p>	

Figure 22: The new Arabic Type classification system, 2016-17.

## 5. Bibliography

- 1) Abdalla, M. H. (1993). *Taha -Die neue arabische Schrift-* (Limited Edition), Münster.
- 2) Abdalla, M. H. (1997). *Analyse der Arabischen Schriftformen*. Wuppertal: Bergische Universität.
- 3) Abdalla, M. H. (2014). *Designing Arabic typeface between global and traditional norms*. 3rd world conference on design, arts and education.
- 4) Abbott, N. (1938). *The Rise of the north Arabic script and its Kur'anic development, with a full description of the kur'an manuscripts in the Oriental Institut*, Volume L. Chicago, Illinois.
- 5) Aicher, O., & Rathgeb, M. (2006). *Die Schrift*. Phaidon.
- 6) Al-Jaburi, Kamel S. (1999). *Encyclopaedia of Arabic Script*. Beirut: El-Hilal Library and Publishing house.
- 7) Abdelkebir Kh., Mohammed S. (1995). *Die Kunst der Islamische Kalligrafie*. Koeln: Dumont.
- 8) Bahnasi, Afifi (1995). *A Dictionary of Arabic Calligraphy-Terms and Calligraphers*. Lebanon: Librairie du Liban Publishers.
- 9) Close, Stephen (2012). *The Anatomy of Type*. England: Quid Publishing Ltd.
- 10) Eliason, C. Retrieve 10/9/2016: <https://www.atypi.org/type-typography/the-history-of-2018humanist2019-type>
- 11) Friedrich, J. (1966). *Geschichte der Schrift*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- 12) Gelb, I.J. (1952). *Study for Writing*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- 13) Hans Jürg Hunziker, Untitled booklet about his Arabic type work in Morocco, Switzerland.
- 14) Hayashi, C., Ohsumi, N., Yajima, K., Tanaka, Y., Bock, H.-H., Baba, Y., (Eds.) (1998). *Data Science, Classification, and Related Methods*. Japan: Springer.
- 15) Herrman, R. (2011) Empirical study about the legibility of typefaces used on signs in public spaces. Retrieved December 24, 2013 from <http://opentype.info/blog/2011/09/20/empirical-study-about-the-legibility-of-typefaces-used-on-signs-in-public-space/>
- 16) Herrman, R. (n.d.) The design of a signage typeface. *I love typography*. Retrieved December 24, 2013, from <http://ilovetypography.com/2012/04/19/the-design-of-a-signage-typeface/>
- 17) Jensen, H. (1925). *Geschichte der Schrift*. Hannover: Orient-Buchhandlung.
- 18) Jean, F. (2014). *Nationality and type design*. *Web- based publication*. Retrieved March, 28, 2014, from <https://typofonderie.com/gazette/post/nationality-and-type-design/>
- 19) Jacob, E. (2004). *Classification and Categorization: A Difference that Makes a Difference*. Retrieve 2/10/2016: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/774e/ab27b22aa92dfaa9aeefafbe845058e85f58.pdf>
- 20) John Downer. (Retrieve: [www.emigre.com/Editorial.php?sect=2&id=1](http://www.emigre.com/Editorial.php?sect=2&id=1), 10/10/2016)
- 21) Kühnel, E. (1972). *Islamische Schriftkunst*. 2nd Edition. Austria, Graz:
- 22) Kühnel, E. (1962). *Die Kunst des Islam*, Stuttgart.
- 23) Majidi, M. (1986). *Geschichte der arabisch-persischen Schrift*. Hamburg: Buske.
- 24) Milo, Thomas (2002). *Arabic Script and Typography, a brief historical overview*. retrieved 12.10.2016 (<http://www.islamicmanuscripts.info/reference/books/Type-2002/Milo-2002-Arabic-script-typography.pdf>).
- 25) Longman dictionary (2009). England: Pearson Education Limited
- 26) Saad Abulhab (2004). *The Mutamathil Type Style*, Visible Language 38.3.
- 27) <http://www.arabicfonts.com/>
- 28) Sakip Sabanci Museum (2011). *Treasures of the Aga Khan Museum - Arts of the Book and Calligraphy*. Istanbul: Sabanci University.
- 29) Smitshuijzen-AbiFares, H. (Ed.) (2001). *Arabic Typography*. London: Saqi Books
- 30) Smitshuijzen-AbiFares, H. (Ed.) (2007). *Typographic matchmaking*. The Netherlands: BIS Publishers.
- 31) Smitshuijzen-AbiFares, H. (Ed.) (2010). *The Typographic Matchmaking in the City*. Amsterdam: Khatt Books.
- 32) Smitshuijzen, E. (Ed.) (2015). *Arabic Font Specimen Book*. Amsterdam: Khatt Books.
- 33) Smitshuijzen, E. (Ed.) (2013). *Arabic Font Design for Beginners*. Amsterdam: Khatt Books.
- 34) Spiekermann, E, Ginger, E. M. (2003) *Stop stealing sheep and find out how type works*. California: Adobe press.
- 35) Yara Khoury Nammour (2012). *Nasri Khattar* Khatt Books. Amsterdam: Khatt Books.
- 36) Zadeh, L. A. (1982). *A note on prototype theory and fuzzy sets*. University of California, Berkeley. Retrieve: 10/10/2016. <https://ai2-s2-pdfs.s3.amazonaws.com/54c5/8d6a64561299bf31c4a7491f96d99b514f58.pdf>