



اللغة العربية الفصحى ولهجاتها؛ التبادلية والتحديات

آدم محمد عبدالقادر

قسم اللغة الانجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة عمر المختار

Doi: <https://doi.org/10.54172/swdg5d51>

المستخلص: اللغة العربية الفصحى هي وسيلة التقدم للعرب في جميع مساعيهم. فإذا وجدت هذه اللغة الدعم فإنها ستكون لغة العلم والتعلم، وستصبح اللغة العربية نور العلم والتعلم. لقد انتشرت اللغة العربية النبيلة في كل أرجاء المعمورة، وكتبت بها جميع العلوم منذ قرون عديدة؛ ولا يخفى على من يدرسها موضوعاً هذه أهمية اللغة العربية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: اللغة العربية الفصحى - العلم - التعلم

Classical Arabic and its vernaculars; interchangeability and challenging

Adam Mohamed Abdelkadir

English department, Faculty Of Arts. Omar AL-Mukhtar University

Abstract: Standard Arabic is the means of progress for Arabs in all their endeavors. If this language finds support, it will be the language of science and learning, and the Arabic language will become the light of science and learning. The noble Arabic language has spread throughout the world, and all sciences have been written in it for many centuries. The importance of the Arabic language is not hidden from anyone who studies it objectively.

Keywords: Classical Arabic - Science – Learning

Classical Arabic and its vernaculars

Some Western specialists in Oriental languages hold the opinion that the vernaculars of Arabic, which are used nowadays in oral communication, have become so far removed from the genuine Arabic tongue, that it has become possible to consider each one of the vernaculars a separate language. According to this theory, if one who knew only the classical Arabic language went to a land where a vernacular is used in the most Arab countries, such as Libya, Egypt or Morocco, the native inhabitants would be unable to understand his speech or he theirs, until he had lived in their midst for a long time.

Scholars have said that, someone may say that, the relationship between the vernaculars which are used by the Arab communities nowadays and the classical language is that Arabic is the mother tongue of the vernaculars and that the latter are branches of the former. Those who hold this belief go on to say that the vernaculars are adequate for satisfying the basic needs of their native user as the means by which they communicate with one another, and that the natives in each locality use their dialects to express all kinds of ideas, high and low, scientific, literary, technological, juridical, and political. In brief, these specialists say that the vernaculars can be used for all of man's essential, necessary, or complementary needs, which require the use of language. The native speakers of the vernaculars could use them in writing and in books just as they use them in direct communication. As to Arabic, these same scholars say that it is so remote from the vernaculars that it is unusable, in any linguistic sense, for direct communication among the people, unless they spend long periods studying it with all the diligence and energy at their command. Because the sciences, literature, industry, technology, jurisprudence, etc., have always been expressed exclusively in Arabic. These specialists claim that this prevents the Arabs from advancing their knowledge and learning since they presumably cannot understand the classical language.

Speaking about Libya, I would say: I feel that the hope for progress is dim as long as the common people must study the Arabic of the Quran, as they do now, instead of learning the vernacular. The relation of the Libyan vernacular to the language of the Quran is parallel to that of Italian to Latin.

Moreover, Libya is a large country, hence, the dialect, which the Libyans speak, is an independent language according to which region because each region has its own peculiar structure dialect. If such measures as replacing Arabic by the vernacular are not taken in Libya in order to achieve realistic results in the various educational institutions, the new generation will be as if it's predecessor-unfit to serve its country whether in military leadership, technology, or the civil service. And thus, the slogan 'Libya is for the Libyans' will remain what it has been so far, an empty phrase.

To sum up, then, I would say that, if the arts and sciences continue to be stored away in the classical language, Arabic, then might as it to be written in a foreign language; the ordinary citizens will not be able to learn them unless they first spend the better part of their lives studying the language that, they are written in, Arabic. According to this theory, if the arts and sciences were translated into the vernaculars-the language of the child's parents and peers which he learns as easily as he learns to walk, eat, or drink- the learner would save enough time to acquire knowledge of the arts and sciences while he is still young. The time, which is now required to learn Arabic, could be used to acquire more knowledge of the arts and sciences, which are necessary to satisfy the needs of the nation, and to teach these to everybody without exception. However, if this measure is not undertaken, there will be no way to universalize education or to improve it. This illusion has been repeated so often by those who believe in it that it has almost been accepted as an authoritative principle, and is hardly questioned any more.

We disagree with these *specialists* for the *following* reasons:

The great obstacle to education they see in the fact that Arabic is the language of the arts and Sciences, and the exclusive written tongue will be encountered by them in translating the sources of learning into the vernaculars. Indeed, they will find the latter more of a problem than the former. For the vernaculars differ from region to region and from land to land just as much as anyone vernacular differs from the Arabic language, and perhaps even more. Their example of the man who knows only Arabic and who is unable to communicate when he goes to a land where a vernacular tongue is in use, is just as valid for the Libyan who goes to Egypt or Syria (and vice-versa), if such a man is illiterate and has not lived or associated with the people of those lands.

For we have no doubt that if you, Westerners say to a Libyan or to any Arab *Kayfa halukal*, كيف حالك " (How are you?) In the Arabic language, if you pronounce it correctly, you will find that the Libyan understands you perfectly. However, he would not understand a Moroccan who said the same thing in his own vernacular: *ashinnik* or *ashintaya*. The Moroccan's understanding of your *kayfa haluka* is better than his understanding of the Libyan man of the street saying: *Aish launak* or *Aishhalak*, which means the same thing. Similarly, the Libyan understands the Arabic word *ma huwa* (What is it?) better than he does the Moroccan vernacular version: *ashnuwwa* or *shihu*, or the Syrian vernacular: *shuhay*. The Moroccan and the Syrian understand you when you say *ma huwa* (what is it?) more than they do the Egyptian's *ehuwwa* or *huwwa eh*. Similarly, when a Westerner says *han alwaqt* (its time), the Libyan will find it easier to understand than the Moroccan's vernacular expression *tawwa*, or the Nablus Palestinian's *halqit* or the Beirut Lebanese *halla*, with its velarized [I], or the Tarablus Lebanese *halla* with its unvelarized [I]. The Arabic

word, *imamah* (turban) is easier for the Libyan to understand than the vernacular word a Moroccan would use, namely, *kashtah*, or the Syrian's *laffah*.

However, the Libyan only knows *laffah* as meaning the untailored sheet of cloth in which a baby is swaddled. In addition, the Arabic word *sandl or sabat* (sandal) is easier for the Libyan to understand than the Moroccan vernacular *as-sabbat*. The Arabic word *kathir* (numerous) is easier to understand than vernacular *yasir* or *biz-zaf*. In Arabic, *zuqqaq* (narrow street or alley) is easier to understand than vernacular *az-zanqah*. Moreover, the Arabic word, *safinah* (boat) is easier than vernacular *markb*. The Arabic word *tuqia* (signature) is easier than vernacular *imdaa*. The Arabic sentence *waqit ar-risalh* (I signed the letter) is easier than vernacular *amdyat ar-risalh* and Arabic *hal- indaka-sa ah* ('Do you have a watch?') is easier than vernacular *maak saah* and Arabic *kamm issaah* ('What time is it?') is easier than vernacular *gaddash isaah*, and so on.

For a great number of words, the enumeration of which would take too long, which the Libyan would find much easier to understand in Arabic than in any of the Moroccan or Syrian or other vernaculars quoted above, Ashiurakis. (1972. p.34).

We are not trying here to favor one vernacular over the other or to say, for example, that the Libyan vernacular is easier and better than the Syrian or Moroccan vulgar tongues, or that either one of the latter is easier and better than the Libyan vernacular. What we are trying to show is this:

In the teaching of the arts, sciences and technology, Arabic, if we avoid the comparatively few archaic and foreign words, is easier for the common people who speak a multitude of vernaculars to learn such in Libya as we have eastern "*sherqawi*" and western one "*gharbawi*". Libyans attempt to learn both of them as they are used in everyday speech. For the Libyan commoner, the utterances of Arabic are easier than those of the Moroccan or Syrian vernaculars; for the Moroccan commoner it is easier than Libyan or Syrian Arabic; for the Syrian, it is easier than Libyan or Moroccan Arabic. Therefore, it goes for all the vulgar tongues and the peoples throughout the Arab world. This is true because all of these peoples frequently hear the words of the Qur'an and the Traditions and the Friday Sermons, and other religious matter in Arabic. In fact, this applies to all Muslims everywhere, as we shall explain later, (Ibid. p.56)

Two years ago, I happened to be touring in some parts of Egypt with my family and we were easily able to communicate with them. This was not the case in our experience with the common people of Tunisia, who spoke their own vernacular and were often unintelligible to us, especially when they spoke rapidly. In such situations, we could not understand them. The Arabic language brought us from different Arab lands closer together, something, which our regional vernac-

ulars could not accomplish, because our Libyan vernacular is different from their Tunisian vulgar tongue.

However, it's difficult for us to understand the Algerian or the Moroccan vernacular and their speech sounded foreign to us, and none of us could understand each other. Actually, I found that the same problem arose for Algerians and Moroccans whom I met.

Aside from this we may find that it's easier to understand the speech of people of Jordan and Hijaz and even the Bedouins' which seems easier to understand than the vernaculars I have been speaking about. This is maybe due to the similarity between the Hijaz vernacular and the Arabic classical language. Thus, since the Hijazi and Jordanian vernacular are identical with Arabic in some aspects and in others is close, anyone who knows Arabic finds that it is easy to understand most of what the natives of Hijaz say and to look up the meaning of unfamiliar words in dictionaries.

What would anyone of these people do if he received a letter or a book written in a vernacular other than his own? What if there were nobody in his town or nearby who knew that particular vernacular? What if there were no dictionaries available containing the words he needs to look up?

Suppose that some Libyan who lives in a small town and works in agriculture or any other occupation, and he received a letter from one of his friends from Algeria or Morocco, written in their native vernacular, containing words that he does not understand. What should he do? Should he neglect it completely? It is possible that his friend is in urgent need of something. Should he travel to a place where he can find someone who could translate it for him? Even though he might be late. Or should he send it to someone who knows both vernaculars—that of the letter's and his to translate it the way foreign languages are translated?

If we discard the Arabic language which unites us, each one of us would become a stranger to his fellow Arabs who are his countrymen, and this, after we have been through the ages united as one people through a common language.

In addition to the problems we have already discussed concerning the differences between the regional vernaculars there is yet another. Words which are innocent in one dialect may be insulting or vulgar in another. Someone who does not know about this difference may become confused and most unfortunate misunderstandings may arise. Such a situation has happened often to many people.

All that we have mentioned is related to the present day linguistic situation, Anderson, (1991, p. 125), adds, if we wish to discuss the same problems as they existed in connection with the linguistic situation of twenty years ago, for example, and use that as a basis of analogy for a sit-

uation that will develop twenty years from now. The discrepancies would be much greater due to the linguistic changes, which occur in the regional vernaculars as the result of the passage of time and the lack of linguistic stability in unwritten tongues.

We suppose that an Egyptian came to Libya or a Libyan went to Egypt about twenty years ago, we might find that the Libyan understood some words of the Egyptians' vernacular speech. But if we look the other way round, we might find that if any Egyptian heard any Libyan say the following: (*nabidi haget waliya semha fi arushen*), he would not have understood that he or she meant (*Ana raitu emra jamila fi annafida*) which meant that (I saw a beautiful lady by the window ...). Even today if an Egyptian boy heard a boy from Libya says: (*mashyt ala kra'ai*), he would not understand what does it meant (*thahabtu ala rijli*), which meant that (I went on foot). Similarly, if the Egyptian said to the Libyan (*Ana rayh bi alarabiya*), the Libyan would not understand that it meant (*an thaheb bi asyara*), (I am going by car). So if someone wished to record all such instances he would have to write a big volume that would be a dictionary of the two vernaculars.

Whoever would like to translate the letters and sciences from Arabic into the vernaculars of today, he would have to differentiate between the Libyans, the Egyptians, the Syrians, the Tunisians or the Moroccans. Most of the Arabic speaking groups had established an independent language for each one of them that would reflect their own speech, knowledge, education, and arts. If there is any book written by a Libyan would not be accessible to an Egyptian and vice-versa; and the same would be true for all the members of the Arabic-speaking communities and they would lose that binding tie which causes them to cooperate in the Arts and Sciences. They would reach a stage of division worse than that in which they are already.

Moreover, he who carefully observes the Arabs see that in Libya itself, regions differ from one another in speech as much as the Libyan vernacular differs from the classical Arabic language. In Libya we have three main regions, eastern (*sherqawi*), western, (*gerbawi*) and the southern (*sebhawi*). And each of them had their own words and phrases that the people use. Even sometimes it is difficult to understand some expressions which may hear from time to time.

Indeed, the natives of one district in some regions use words that are different in meaning from similar words used by others in the same district. Even the Badouin speech is like that. According to our knowledge, the same situation exists in the various parts of the Arab world. We shall not elaborate by mentioning more examples and citations of this kind. He who wants knowledge to be translated into the vernaculars must differentiate between the knowledge and learning of various Arab regions and separate their thought. By such action, the Arabs would become divided into dif-

ferent nations, the members of each would become divided into different nations the members of each would be unable to understand the members of the others, although they profess one faith, and are under one rule, and they need each other's cooperation in the smallest and greatest of needs, Holes, (2004, p.211).

If those who advocate that Arabic be replaced by the regional vernaculars say that we should compile a dictionary that would contain all the dialects spoken in all the Arabic region. Let us say, all the Libyan words, arranged alphabetically and by chapters, together with the words used in all other districts and regions indicated and translated into the respective vernaculars of all the other Arabic-speaking regions. So that if someone from the *sharq* district encountered a word he did not understand, written by someone from another district, he would turn to that dictionary to satisfy his needs...

Supposing that this was possible, our task would not be any easier than simply to refer to the Arabic lexicographical works which are already available to us nowadays. However, if, in our new industrial and technological books, which the community needs, we would limit our vocabulary to those words which are actually used and are close in their form to Arabic, and would leave aside unfamiliar words which are too far removed from present day usage, our task would become very easy. For example, we would use in such compositions and books instead of Arabic (*fidah*), (silver) the word (*fujrah*), for the same meaning, the latter word, although it is classical, is close to (*faddah*) which is the word for 'silver' in the vernacular dialect, so the words for such example are too many and it's difficult to talk about them now.

Thus, if we carefully adhere to the principles enunciated above in the writing of books which are needed by the common people-not the elite-and use in our writing only those expressions which are familiar to both Arabic and the regional vernaculars, there will be no need to refer often to the medieval philological works except for someone who has taken it upon himself to know scientifically the vocabulary of the language and its various aspects, such as the learned savants, the men of letters, and those who wish to attain the level of the learned in their mastery of Arabic rhetoric. This is not possible for the common people, nor is it necessary for them. Those who wish this kind of learning, those members of the society nose lofty spirit requires that they be above the commoners, and those who want to apply such knowledge in exegesis and the like, and in the writing of poetry and prose and what relates to them, will find the philological books they need in such endeavor available, the way to it paved, and the aim easily reached.

The case would not be the same if we, were to leave the Arabic language altogether in speaking, correspondence, and writing, and were to desert it completely; for this would cause all

classical works to be dispersed and become forgotten and their educational value would disintegrate and fade away.

As time passes by, reaching that objective (i.e., replacing the Arabic language with the various regional vernaculars) becomes more difficult than stripping the tarragon of its leaves. However, working on a gathering together of all the vocabulary of all the Arabic vernaculars, and delimiting their phonetic structure thereof is an undertaking the successful completion of which is extremely difficult. He who would attempt to produce such a comprehensive philological book would not be able to reach his objective until he had lived in all the Arabic speaking regions, indeed all the districts which constitute the Arab world, and had heard the speech of their inhabitants in each and every cultural situation. This is necessary if he is to gather all the utterances of the native users of these vernaculars. The time and expenditures required to do that, if spent on educating the people to speak the classical language, Arabic, would produce the desirable result (i.e. correct speech in a single language) in a most complete and perfect way, Barnn, (1994, p.p 86-87).

The above is the case if we concentrate on investigating only the vocabulary of the vernaculars and the vast differences that exist between them. If, however, we were to look into the structures and forms of speech which are as different as there are regions and districts in the Arabic-speaking world, we would then need a special grammar for each of the vernaculars of these regions and districts; every Arab -would then have to learn all of these numerous grammars which would be written for all the vernaculars in order to be able to understand the writings of each Arabic speaking district. This would present for us greater hardship than learning the classical Arabic language.

We would also need to devise a writing system capable of representing the linguistic forms of these vernaculars: this is necessary in order that the writing system of the vernaculars of Arabic-speaking districts be instituted on the basis of a correct and uniform methodology; otherwise, each individual Arab would write his own speech the way he likes and sees fit, without any controlling method or canon, and the examples are many to those who are interested in more and specific study.

So, it would be necessary that, to institute a writing methodology for these vernaculars if we were to use them in writing and in translating the arts and sciences into them, so that writing in them would be uniform. Otherwise, the writing of the vernaculars would become the subject of wide dispute, for every writer would then follow his own judgment and use what he thought to be the correct spelling. The differences in writing a linguistic form would become very wide between two regions, or even in one region, in as much as opinions on what is the correct writing would dif-

fer, and so on, for that which we would have to devise of writing systems in which to translate books and writings into the vernaculars.

Now, to go back to our previous discussion let us say that the time that will suffice for us to learn the arts and sciences, and the structures of the vernacular dialects, (i.e., writing system, phonology, vocabulary, and grammars) would suffice for us to learn the classical Arabic language. With this we would gain a linguistic uniformity, and we would not be prevented from benefiting from the heritage of our ancestors which goes back some thousand years. As we mentioned earlier, Holes, (2004, p.217), states:

we would restrict our linguistic usage to what the commoners, not the elite, would need. But if one of these specialists were to say: It is not necessary to write grammars for the vernaculars because they are known to both commoners and the elite, through usage, we would say: If this were so, civilized nations would not have had to write grammars of their respective tongues since all people, high or low, eminent or unknown, know it at least as well as our common people know our vernaculars; and despite that, they had to establish grammatical rules for them in order to avoid mistakes and corruption that would result from the lack of conventional grammatical rules, as mentioned previously.

If these specialists said that the method the ancient philologists followed in investigating the Arabic language, controlling its elements, and establishing its canons of speech and writing, would be followed in our work on the vernaculars we would reply: at the time the ancient philologists were active, the Arabic language had reached a fine level of perfection and had become stabilized in a way which established it in the minds and stored it in the memories of its speakers. These speakers associated with one another in all parts of the medieval Arab world, so that all the members of the community knew the way the rest of it communicated. The Yemenite Bedouin spoke with the urban Syrian or Iraqi and the only time one of them became confused by a word of the other's speech was in the case of a loan word whose borrowed form had been Arabicized according to the rules of derivation, a matter that is not too significant in such a vast language as Arabic.

The class whose knowledge of the language was once the model, and whose utterances had authority in linguistic matters, died out, and the language of the people remained the same without change or mutation, until that time. Because of this, it was easy for those who established its canons and rules, and who knew its vocabulary, to know all the linguistic ramifications of the common tongue, and to look at it cumulatively. Islamic jurisprudence provided the language with support and eter-

nal, reinforcing it over a long period of time. This is not the case with the present vernaculars, which are subject to change and mutation.

The Arabic linguistic situation is different nowadays from the way it was in the Middle Ages, and the situation of its current users is just as different from that of their ancestors. In the second place, the Arabic vernaculars have not achieved the status of stable languages, either in their vocabularies or in their structures to the point where they may be relied upon and used as vehicles of the arts and sciences. These vernaculars are but corruptions of a mother language Arabic, because of that, we find all the vulgar tongues containing the changes and mutations about which we spoke earlier. What these Western specialists cited is incorrect and inapplicable: Italian or Modern Greek are languages which became stable; the usage in both of them is now second nature to their respective native users. Agreeing conventionally about them, the native users do not veer away from them because, unlike our vernaculars, they not change much. Because of this the law of nature caused the natives to consider them respectively as the languages of communication in all matters and needs, De Lacy (2008,p.97). The differences between our language and theirs being apparent, we need not elaborate on them nor use exaggeration in this connection. We do need however, to have an idea about it and leave what is beyond that to anyone, that wishes to look into the course of natural phenomena and the laws of causality. Thus, we say:

The Arab nation, prior to the coming of Islam, was restricted to its geographical region and not dispersed over the face of the earth. The true Faith Islam, was then revealed and its adherents became numerous and strong. The faith spread and was propagated through the work of those who head it and the helpers who spread its teachings to their neighbors as well as to those who lived in distant places. Conquests followed conquests until, victorious, the people of Islam spread East and West. In the conquered lands, some adhered to Islam and became part of its people, those who did not become Muslims attached themselves to their conquerors and became their clients. Some of the Muslim Arabians settled in the conquered regions, to govern land administer Islamic justice, to teach the faith and its ramifications, and to preserve the security of the land, which had become theirs, against recon quest. They mixed with the natives of these lands by necessity and through communal living and communication, all that is required by social, cultural, and business intercourse among people:

The natives became attached to the Arabians; they mixed with and learned their language, customs and habits. Through the ages, elements from one culture were adopted by the other due to communal life over the years. These elements were transmitted from father to son and from grand-

father to grandchild until the inhabitants of the lands which the Muslim Arabians entered and conquered became an intertwining mixture.

The Arabic language became instilled in the countries where the Arabs were strongly established, such as Egypt, with whatever corruption and change that entered into it. This increased generation after generation, with the passage of centuries. The situation became especially true after Arab rule over Egypt had been replaced by that of different nations and ethnic groups who entered the land and conquered it. In addition to that, people from many nations migrated there and continue to do so. Some of these immigrants speak the same mother tongue as the natives but with a different kind of corruption while others speak a totally different dialect. Mixing with the natives, they emulate their speech as much as possible while the natives adjust theirs for the purpose of communication with the newcomers. Thus, each group acquires a measure of the bad speech habits from the other. Unquestionably, this is the unalterable method by which linguistic changes have taken place in the language. This fact is known to any learned man; only he who is unaware of this fact denies its being true.

What these specialists have cited, therefore, does not apply to the actual situation; we mentioned this earlier. There are many reasons for this: e.g., think of a foreigner who settles among the Arabs. His language is different from theirs. To communicate with them, such an alien would have to use either his own native language, (a rare case since there would be only a few who would know it) or theirs which is a foreign language to him which he has learned before his migration. In either case, the linguistic changes (i.e., in phonology and structure) that might result from this would not be as great as those which would occur in the case of Arabic since such an immigrant speaks a native tongue that is radically different from his native language.

In Arabic, however, the Syrian or Moroccan who moves to Egypt finds that the origin of their respective tongues are essentially the same, namely Arabic but that each one of them speaks it with his own brand of dialect. It is in this way, that linguistic intermingling and interchanging take place, as is known through objective examination and sound judgment. Thus, the citations which the specialists offer about foreigners are not applicable to Arabic; the analogy here is not valid, for analogy is valid only when applied to two things which are essentially similar. In the above-mentioned case, the difference between the situation and the citation is as clear as daylight.

Furthermore, he who examines the vernacular which is used in our country, Libya, would find that as it changes from region to region, it also changes from one group of speakers to another, and from place to place. Thus, you will find that the vernacular becomes sophisticated to the point of coming close to Arabic when used by educated people and those who associate with

them, and by the inhabitants of localities where newspapers and magazines are widely used. But, you will notice that the same vernacular which when used by the educated rises almost to the level of Arabic, is also capable of falling in to a low level at which it is quite different from Arabic, when it is used by those who know a vulgar tongue exclusively. Items in the Newspapers (which use Arabic exclusively) are unvocalized; thus, when read, the forms of the vocabulary and the syntax change according to the reader's degree of knowledge—none of this is deliberate. You will not find a single utterance that had a stable form when read or used by the uneducated commoners. This is so true that if you utter a word different from the way the commoners know it, these people will think that you have made a mistake. In such situations, the tongue is completely free in handling the Arabic expressions in the papers at the speaker's discretion.

Thus, if we were to institute a vernacular and translate knowledge into it, we would find it difficult to decide on the forms of linguistic units and structure. This is because the vernacular is a corruption of a language rather than a real one, and has no stable form, either in vocabulary or in structure, (Holes, 1994, p.231). We, the learned, have no authority over the people's speech wherein linguistic corruption is a habit with them. We add that no matter how we try to preserve that speaking habit which we call vernacular, we could not help but see it develop a century from now, into something we cannot imagine at this point. The future generation which will emerge a century from now would say of the canons established today for today's vulgar tongues the same thing we are saying now about the Arabic language versus the vernaculars.

Change and mutation in the vernaculars will continue to take place. Writing and books would then have to follow such changes, century after century, and generation after generation, according to the development of the vernaculars, until no one Arab generation would be able to understand the tongue of that which lived before it. Each generation would then become a linguistically independent group of people unrelated to that which came before or after it. This would complicate further the problems already raised by these Western specialists about the use of the vernaculars, i.e., the time required to record and analyze them, the quantity of work required including periodic revisions, and the effort required to decide the forms of the vernacular tongues, generation after generation,

But if we suppose that the change and alteration in the vulgar speech should not be taken into consideration as far as writing and books are concerned, so that the later would keep the form of the initial vulgar tongue in which they are written, no matter how much change and alteration had taken place in it, the situation would then be similar to what it is now—one language for books and another for speaking; the effort exerted and the work done on the vernaculars would then have

been in vain. More than that, we would have invented an additional language, and thereby made the situation worse, because the ancient works produced during more than a thousand years, and in many parts of the world, would have become part of a dead language, Arabic. The books which will have been produced since would then be in another language, a vernacular tongue, which is in use nowadays and which will become dead later. Communication would then be based on a different language that, which would be in use after one generation; and if changing the language of books should be followed by changes in the spoken language, we would then have a fourth language. And once the spoken tongue has changed again, we would then have a fifth tongue; and thus an infinite number of tongues would continue to develop gradually if we allowed something like this to happen (May it not happen).

Ana, (1981,p.77), said that "present day vernaculars are amenable to changes because they were never controlled by writing systems and formal grammars and thus, were left untended to grow and develop in every direction". This is contrary to what would have happened. Had they been controlled by writing systems and grammars? Had books been written in them, and had they been used for learning and instruction? In which case they would have become stable and not amenable to change? If this were pointed out, we would say:

Far from that; for the Arabic language is controlled by a writing system that used in books and for instructional purposes use, in addition to being the language of jurisprudence and the faith. Yet, these specialists say that it has changed to the point of becoming a different language. So is there any reason why principles which apply to the classical language should not apply to other tongues which, at any rate, are below it in cultural importance?

And if the specialists said: After we would have established the canons and rules of the vulgar tongues, we would forbid the masses, through legislation, to change their speech, and would force them to abide by and continue to use the vernacular as established until it had become inculcated and settled in their minds, thereby becoming a stable language, and a continual linguistic habit, we would say:

To do that - if it were feasible - Ana, (1981,p.80), claims that it would be an artificial process and there is no doubt the producing of something artificially is not the same as producing it naturally. Such imposition, would be possible -if it could be achieved - only after many generations. This is true only as far as speaking habits are concerned, but also in the case of official meetings and matters, and governmental correspondence and communication as well. Otherwise, how would such an imposition arise, forbidding people to change their speech, and imposing upon them regulations related to speaking, dialogue, and conversation among individuals and their families and

friends, and those who deal with them in their personal and public matters, in their farms ,factories, shops and offices, so that the rule might become universal and beneficial? This is impossible. It is imaginary and cannot emerge from theory into practice.

The objective that Western specialists seek, namely, to make learning easy to acquire, is still not feasible in all the situations we explained above. The speaking habits of the masses are not under the authority of him who devises a language, there is no way to 'straighten' these habits out, except through education and instruction. But if the innovator himself is interested in popularizing linguistic corruptions, and the tongue is inclined towards such corruptions, there is nothing that would stop corruption from setting in. The spoken language would not be the written one, and the confusion would remain the same language used in direct communication among people and another in writing. In popularizing learning and democratizing instruction, it is necessary to concentrate something else in the third place, the vulgar tongues in general consist of elements which are derived from the classical tongue to which some utterances were added, borrowed from the languages of aliens who have adopted the Arabic but could not master it to the point of becoming as fluent in it as its own native speakers. Thus, in the vernaculars, only those expressions and linguistic forms most needed in speech related to matters of everyday living were preserved in their original form, Arabic. These vulgar tongues had no share in scientific and literary vocabulary and expressions. Thus, if we wanted to transfer the arts and sciences into the vernaculars, we would have to borrow words and other linguistic elements from the classical language, and transform them into vernacular forms, in order that the benefit be had. unless we did that, we would need to institute a new language for the arts and sciences which we would have side by side with the vulgar tongues which are used for direct everyday communication; and we would have to call these various tongues "vernaculars", just as we do with the foreign modern languages.

Moreover, we have a number of books which were composed or translated into Arabic in some Arab countries; these were written in the kind of corrupt languages that are close to the respective vernaculars of these countries because the writers and translators were not proficient in the use of the classical tongue, Arabic. These books are not too different from books written in foreign languages; the reader cannot understand them without the help of their translators or writers.

Thus, since the vulgar tongues are inadequate and cannot accommodate the arts and sciences, jurisprudence, belles letters, or politics, how can they replace the classical tongue?

Had we wanted to elaborately refute these opinions and explain the non-validity of their basic principles, we would have required a big volume. Our objective here is to present a tractate in

support of our own opinion. However, if the need arose for further proofs and examples we would beg to be allowed to present these in the future.

In our opinion, the vulgar tongues of Syria, Egypt, the Arabian peninsula, Iraq, Tunisia, and Libya have not become so distant from Arabic as to become independent languages. Their linguistic elements are the same as those of the classical language except for those word which were added to them and which do not count much in a linguistic consideration. The structural forms are all derived from the basic structure of Arabic. The vocabulary, however, has undergone mutations and changes by addition to or subtraction from its basic classical corpus. This does not obscure the original form of utterances. Consequently if such additions were eliminated or the subtracted components were replaced, or if the corruption were rectified, the basic form and meaning of vernacular utterances would not appear unintelligible to the commoner, Al-sharkewi, (1971, p.212) .

As for these specialists, contention that, if one who knows only the classical language went to a region where the people spoke a vulgar tongue of Arabic, he would not be able to understand them and they him, etc.," we say that most of Arabs speak and have learned the classical language and write it exclusive. This is because a lot of Arabs know by heart verses of the Holy Quran , which they recite in their prayers. In addition to that, the majority of the people know some supplication formulae, supplementary prayers, and some conducts of the prophet Mohamed *p.o.h*, which are used in speech as citations and quotations. There is also, every Friday pray in classical Arabic, and all those present listen to preachers in the mosques and some of the attendance may not speak Arabic in their everyday living, but they understand it, except for those unfamiliar words, and sentences which have complicated structure.

Incorrect speech is not a habit which is impossible to change, as these specialists claim. But Brann, (1994,p.56), changing speaking habits is easier than making the variety of vulgar tongues independent languages of communication and learning, after canons and rules for them have been established. All that is required of him who advocates this kind of change is to popularize education, impose upon the student correct usage of the language in speech, and correct the student's sentences in writing, from the time he begins school to the time he graduates. The linguistic elements contained in the vulgar tongues and the classical language are the same except for incorrectness of usage, as already stated. The syntactical structure is correct except for word order; correcting this requires no more care than that which is needed to the child's speech. The child begins to speak at the age of two or three in an incorrect way, as to words and structure, and people continue to correct him until he has developed speaking habits similar to theirs by the time he has reached age five or six. What these Western specialists consider as the difficulty of acquiring correct Arabic and mas-

tering it through a long period of study is due to faulty teaching methods and incorrect teaching by teachers, it is not due to the difficulty of the language itself.

What we suggest for making the arts and sciences easy to acquire by the masses is to reform their language as we have already indicated. Books dealing with the arts and basic technology should be popularized and made available to the general public in the classical language, on condition that the writer use only that vocabulary which is used, albeit ungrammatically, in the vulgar tongues. This way, the books would display both common usage and correct structure. If the writer wished to say /muglaq/, for example, he would not use /msakkar/ 'locked' because the latter; would be removed from the usage of the masses; he would not say /maqful/, since this is an incorrect form that should be discarded, the correct form being / muglaq/; in case an idea did not have an equivalent in the speech of the masses, a classical word would then be used for it and its meaning explained so that there would be no ambiguity in case it is unknown to the reader. Loan words which have entered the language from foreign tongues could be discarded, and better words, from Arabic substituted for them. The best, easiest, and most secure way to do that would be under the supervision of a learned organization composed of the best known savants; this, suggestion is written in many books that compare the contents of certain principles in the canon law of Islam with matters contained astronomical texts.

If the utterances were done under the supervision of trusted authorities whose linguistic usage is authoritative, they would be received without dissent and so used. Once they become used by some people, the rest would follow them and thus such usage would become instituted in the language of all those who use it. We can see this from the coming into the language of words such as /lajnah/ 'committee' and /mu tamar/ 'conference', which were not known in their present connotations many years ago, except among some of the learned stratum of the community. After they had been used by the editors and Arab writers and they became part of the vocabulary of the vernacular tongue and their meaning is not hidden to anyone now.

This is the case with words; as for syntactical structure, it should be as close to the commoners' usage as possible, on condition that it is correct and clear. After that, the classical language should be looked into and utterances which are needed to express meanings which are not in the vulgar tongues should be taken from it and used in the fields of the arts and sciences. He who wishes to advance in these fields to the fullest would benefit from that. In this manner, the scope of the individual's language would be equal to that of his knowledge and learning. As for rhetoricians, purists, and those of the upper classes, those may use in their communication utterances and structural variety

according to their learning and ability. None of them should avoid words and syntax, other than those which are unacceptable to semanticists, rhetoricians, and those with good linguistic taste. It is perhaps better for this particular class of learned man to avoid in their writings the vulgar, common, and man-of-the-street expressions which the situation does not require, even if they are correct, since their aim is not to communicate with the masses, and since certain writers have been blamed for using vulgar expressions. As for communication with commoners, it behooves the learned to come down to the level where commoners are able to understand them since it is possible for the learned to do so, while for the commoner to rise to the level of the learned is impossible. It is by this linguistic ability that the masses are differentiated from the learned and the rhetoricians, although the language is the same and understanding it depends upon each class's speaking circumstances.

He who has a drive that urges him to reform the language of the Arabs and increase their learning capacity has our best wishes for success, if he carefully looks into the methodology which we presented and perfects it as to improve the method of instruction. This would be the shortest way to reach the objective which is sought, namely, to make knowledge available to all and to popularize it, while preserving the unity of the language and the ability of the Libyan to use a book written by Egyptian and vice-versa, and for both to use one written by a Syrian, etc., and for the Arab to benefit from the writings of Arabs in every Arab country, since the linguistic elements do not differ from those which are found in books known to linguists. Utterances which are vague could easily be checked in the dictionaries in order to be clarified.

To sum up then: Among the methods of modifying, making easy, and reforming the language, which we have mentioned, are:

(1) to restrict the learner's effort to the necessary, leaving out what is not related to the art or technology which he intends to make his profession and occupation for the benefits of his country, including supplementary knowledge gained through additional training and application;

(2) to aid knowledge with research and observation in the learner's field of endeavor, e.g., Chemistry, Physics, etc. For the little which the educated man acquires and masters to the point of becoming an inculcated habit with him is much better than the quantity which he learns by heart without knowing its application, and which he repeats as he hears, the way a parrot does. The professional man's basic knowledge of the Arabic language, which he must have in addition to his specialization, does not stand in the way of his learning other subjects, so that one must choose between the latter and discarding the Arabic language totally. That is needed is not greater than

which is necessary to learn the grammar of the vulgar tongue. If the problem is approached correctly, its solution can be reached easily and without difficulty.

That which caused the illusion as to the difficulty of the Arabic language and made the problem look overwhelming is simply the complicated method of teaching this language and the lack of care in stressing what needs to be stressed, such as treating every category of learners in the manner that befits it and is suitable for it and according to its own need. If these things are taken into consideration, the problem becomes simplified, and the necessity for us to discard our language which unites our heritage and Which came down to us from our ancestors would be eliminated.

Furthermore, the method which we chose to explain is the one that preserves to the Arabs their knowledge and learning which are stored in the books of previous generations. Once the commoner's speech is corrected, as we explained, the way the speech of the child is straightened out; and once good books using simple expressions are written for him so that his mind may be enlightened through the correct literature and ideas contained in them, so his speech and language usage would become close to being correct. The classical language would not prevent him from reading classical works and he would not be deprived of learning the history of his people and the bases of his faith, or from learning good behavior from the biography of the Prophet; nor would the classical language deprive him of the great intellectual and other benefits which are obtainable through knowing his national history. All this would be placed at the disposal of all Arabs if they could be guided in that which we have explained. To acquire all this knowledge would not necessitate the excessive effort which would be needed. If we were to translate all the learning and scholarship stored in the classical books to the vulgar tongues which those Western specialists consider to be different languages. The popularization of learning among the Arabs would be impossible without considering them thus.

In conclusion, the classical Arabic language is the means of progress for the Arabs in all their endeavors. If this language finds a supporter who would handle it correctly, the light of learning would shine upon the Arabs through their noble language, a light similar to that which shone through it upon all the nations of the world., for many centuries: This linguistic situation is not hidden from him who studies it objectively. And Allah knows best.

REFERENCES

- Ashiurakis Ahmed M, (1972), Spoken Arabic self-taught (Libyan vernacular).
- Ana Deumert, (1981), Language Standardization and Language Change.
- Anderson N. (1991), Individual differences in strategy use in second language.
- Al-sharkewi Muhammad. (1971), The Ecology of Arabic: A study of Arabicization.
- Brann C.M.B, (1994), The National Language Question: Concepts and Terminology.
- Holes, Clive. (2004), Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions and Varieties.
- De Lacy O'eary. (2008), Colloquial Arabic.
- -<http://www.soas.ac.uk/courseunits/155901376.html>.