

Selected Writings by Ibrāhīm Al-Yāzījī

(Chronological Order)

School Education¹

When you graduate from this school, holders of diplomas qualifying you to access higher studies, my first recommendation would be to persevere in studying what you have been taught here and endeavour for remembering it, for fear of oblivion; for, as it has been said, the bane of culture is to neglect it. Thus, let it be the stream of consciousness in your aloneness, recall it in gatherings, refine your thoughts through its secrets until your mind masters it, your imagination discerns all its issues and your insight captures its images. And do not be satisfied with the proficiency reached through your courses; However, broaden your knowledge as far as you can reach and be addicts to research and erudition in order to comprehend all the issues, grasp their aspects and unfold the illicit and the strange. For school does not promise any student to leave sheathed in erudition nor do schools establish it as a target or within their scope. However, the scholar becomes a scholar at home and through his occupation and he teaches himself truth and brings it to perfection through addiction to endeavour and perseverance in reading and efforts.

I do not deny that many of you have attained such a high-levelled education and reached advanced assets and standards. However, I do not assert that any of them has assimilated any of the science aims nor has he approached the limit of perfection though I inform those who have attained such a level and climbed the education ladder till the last step, that they are qualified to set foot on the first step of the science ladder. And I wish, as I am aware of their emotional intelligence and firm determination, that they would enlighten some of the present scholars' twilight zone by raising their beacon and refining their works unless they are hit by idleness which fades away the bright of the mind and blows out the fortress of stability.

¹ Extracts from a speech he addressed during the ceremony of distribution of prizes to The Patriarchal School students in Beirut, in 1890.

Idleness is the malicious bane I am warning you against and I wish you guard against. And once you overcome idleness, I do not fear your resolve would weaken nor your efforts would fail.

The necessity of specialization

Needless to say that a scholar is of no help unless he is an erudite in his science, extracting its secrets and implicit, savvy about its branches and issues, which is only attained through long experience, training, a clear mind for selected knowledge and serenity to retain it. Hence, my advice, to all who seek further education, is not to show concern about irrelevant aspects to their science, nor to move to other studies unless they acquire the most in-depth knowledge and master their science. And in case they feel capable to broaden their knowledge and keen to expand it, it should be compatible with their aims and relevant to their paths in order not to scatter their minds and not to oppose the scientific elements, which would weaken the ability to master them and narrows the opportunity of retaining them. However, man has an innate inquisitive mind and is keen about discovering the unknown and each science is profitable as it enriches the brain, broadens the mind and extends the foresight. Hence, let it be for he who seeks to enrich his science through other sciences and sharpen his mind through acquired knowledge. And yet, this quest should not veer him from his main art which is worth his deep concern. However, he should merely participate to it with no intention to expand it nor to grasp it, or else he would be bound to consider each science he seeks and ends lagging behind in all of them. And if you ever hear about someone designated as the most erudite of scholars and the philosopher of his century as he grasps the various sciences and has become eminent in each, know that it is merely meant to idealize a utopia and satisfy a pride. And those former and present scientists, who are illustrious for their pioneering and brilliant works, are almost all famous in one and unique field of science and their approach to the other sciences was only participative.

The Art of Criticism and Debate

If you are invited to join a literary society and you prepare to intervene, do not restrict yourself to criticizing, pointing the errors and alerting about the scholars' lapses with intent to display the level of your knowledge and to give the impression that you are superior to those you prove to be mistaken and more erudite than them. For this attitude would engender repulsion and antipathy, your counterparts and compeers would regard you as despicable and

you would expose yourself to the slanderers' libel, become the foes' targets and set tongues wagging no matter your assets and competence. Thus, you will face demean and animosity, you will be awaited to stumble through what you entertain and aspire to. And I earnestly warn you not to contest those who are notorious for some merit or quality, those whose pre-eminence has been acclaimed by the public, notably by the scholars.

For if you do, you would become targets for all their disciples, growing the number of your enemies and adversaries while, as novices, you are in desperate need of expanding the circle of companions and friends, social allies and those enabling progress on the path of fame and merit. And do not expect people to be equal regarding correctness, for the erudite are very few, comprising scarcely any equitable ones and some who are indifferent to knowing truth.

Thus, they do not consecrate time to consider your demand; However, they judge according to their established science only or to the preconceived idea that the most notorious is the best and thus, you would achieve no benefit. And if scholars are such, which is the case in many matters, then, what about those who do not possess any instrument to judge nor limit to arbitrate?

In case you meet with scholars, notably the most erudite, position yourself as beneficiaries and never do object to them though they mistake for they are highly literate to extricate from your allegations and to hurl you into a maze of no return. And in case a cultured person objects to you and points an error you have committed, do not hasten to object and flaunt proudly and arrogantly when you comprehend the truth, as you would deprive yourselves of a multitude of benefits. And in case you were bound to debate, avert impudence and abasement, violence and contempt towards the opponent as a means to convince him of the truth for you would waste the truth, conceal the righteous and show as the offender since impudence is the weapon of the incompetent. And never do debate with anyone who is not as literate as you, nor do engage in sophistry and controversy with him; you must instead, provide straight guidance to righteousness. If he declines and flaunts, step away gently to prevent him from dishonouring your science and luring you into slippery slopes, leading you to the path you first chose and so, you retreat deeply wronged.

I do not know

I warn you against trial for it is a blasphemy to gratitude and a proof of ungratefulness though rightful; It has always been repelling and inequitable, depriving of one's rights; for, although

one could possess ten and asks for ten, they strive to give him nine; what then, can be said of one who possesses ten and pretends to own fifty? And I warn you, never do recourse to concealment in processes nor do confound what you ignore, for someone on the lookout might distort your science and would return it in kind, hence, you would suffer loss while you seek more. And do not believe that a scholar is viewed as a scholar only when he has a response to all the questionings even to those related to a science he does not possess and has not worked on; for science is boundless and it has been conceded that science is most virtuous as it shows the scientist the God Almighty through his failures and proves his ignorance. He who flatters himself and thinks he is absolutely knowledgeable, proves he lacks assets and has his insights reduced. Hence, a scholar must not feel ashamed to say, if asked about a matter he ignores: I do not know; for saying: I do not know is better than to be retorted: you are wrong. Indeed, as far as ethics are concerned, it has been conceded that it is part of the scholar's ethics and the main element of ethical perfection.

Even Al-Suyūṭī dedicated the conclusion of a chapter, in his book “Kitāb Al-Mūzhir”, to those scholars who, when questioned about a matter, said: I do not know, mentioning many among the most notorious and erudite, namely Al-Asma‘ī, Ibn Dūrayd, Al- Aḥfaṣ, Abī-Ḥātim and many others with the same status. Abū ‘Abdallah Az-Za‘farānī said: I was once in the company of Abī-l ‘Abbās Tha‘lab when he was asked about a matter and he answered: I do not know. Some people in the audience retorted: you say I do not know? You whom people come to you from all over the world to seek advice? He replied: if your mother had as many dates as my sayings “I do not know”, she would have become rich. He said: Ash-Sha‘biy was questioned about a matter and he answered: I do not know. He was told: what owes you the Sūltān’s wealth? He responded: to say I do not know when I don’t. And the meaning is clear....

Almost likewise, what was told by some French scholars of the same century. He said: once, a lady confronted a notorious scholar in a crowded gathering, asking: Does the Crescent forerun a rainy or a dry day? He answered: I do not know. She asked: then, why is it so cloudy this year? He responded: this is a phenomenon we ignore. She inquired: do you think inhabitants of Jupiter look like us? He retorted: My Lady, I have no idea about that. She said: Strange, why do people deepen their knowledge in science? He replied: so as to say from time to time, I know nothing.

The danger of authorship

If anyone makes the choice of writing about a definite science, he should aim for the utility and benefit rather than fame. He should reveal the best of his science and his great knowledge in order not to divert his attention from the utility he aims for through his work and abound in the implicit and the fantastic that might exceed the student's competence. Hence, though he aims to prove he is brilliant and highly proficient, he leads the readers through infinite mazes and his book would reduce to confusion. Many scientists among the best and the most notorious fell into this trap losing the merit of their science for the sake of such nonsense and weaned people from their works that were doomed to oblivion.

And whether you are writers or lecturers, never do hasten to prove the scientific provisions, especially those among you who have earned people's trust and offered relief through reliability. Or else, illusion would blurt out and scientific facts would be marred. Do not prove a provision unless you ascertain its veracity and unless you are certain that you have the capacity to explain it whenever questioned about it, in order not to be constrained to say: we quote, which relegates you to the role of a copier who transcribes the letters with no idea about what they mean. And you should know that, whenever you allow yourself to transmit what you ignore, you are drawn into tortuous paths and disastrous earnings as many who seek authorship for fame or profits, whether they understand what they transmit or not. Hence, if you do not commit yourself to researching in every element processed to you, you are not exempt from inextricable knots and you impel illusions to spread and science to mar, mainly for we live in a century with merely a few critics, which indulges error with no one to deny. Thus, people tend to believe it, trustful, and corruption pervades.

You all know what the situation is, regarding science in the region, and the decline and doldrums we have been in for hundreds of years while other countries that have climbed the ladder of civilization after us are still addicted to research and examination, tireless in their efforts to discover and devise until they have reached the established science, through analyzing science in its details, proceeding through its knowledge and investigating its objectives. They have also expanded it and defined infinite and uncountable branches.

However, all this has not been found in our books and our schools. We have even kept nothing from our ancestors' legacy in sciences but the essential which is nothing more than language arts. We are today in dire need to restitute this heritage and transfer these

neologisms to our Arabic language so as to catch up with these people and proceed through the path on which they have preceded us. Hence, if you decide to engage in writing, let your choice deal with one of the needs stated above, in the name of disseminating these sciences in the country, keeping in mind that we live in a century that does not allow to neglect some truths for the sake of grammar and rhetoric nor to dispense with invention to replace it with words of love and praise. Each one of you has acquired some knowledge in one of these languages in addition to the principles you have acquired in natural sciences, mathematics and others, which empowers you with the ability to transmit various benefits concealed by the unknown terminology that you would transcript into Arabic and publish in the country. Thus, the sciences of our erudite would become available and libraries would enrich through these types of works that hold your signature, which would reward you with commendation and perennial recognition.

Ash-Sheikh Ibrāhīm Al-Yāzījī,

“School Education” (Aḍab al-madāris) in **Resources for Arabic Literature (Manāhel Al-Adab Al-Arabi)**, 13, **Selected Writings by Ibrahim Al-Yazigi**, Beirut, Sader Publisher, [n.d.], pages 6-16.

###

Dialect and Classical Arabic

Could Arabic language be written in the Roman script?

This is an old issue in the history of the Arabic language that scholars tried to tackle very often and challenged themselves to list the proofs and arguments in favor of each language. Some have gone beyond the wish to replace the dialect with the classical language and demanded to transcript the Arabic script and replace it with the Roman script. It would be of great interest to hear the most notorious contemporary linguist’s views on the matter, as half a century ago, he was fascinated by one of Mr. Wilmor’s books, one of the British judges in the Civil Court of Appeal in Cairo, in which he aimed at facilitating the learning of the Arabic language by British citizens, adopting the dialect written in the Roman script. Ash-Shaikh Ibrāhīm expressed his view about both matters, stating after a long introduction:

“We understand that the real cause behind this movement and which has engendered this great revolution in the mother tongue is the last-mentioned cause, namely the words that a foreigner reader knows in a written language and that can be understood by scholars only, which has raised his concern about the necessity of learning both languages. For if he learns dialect only, he would not understand all the words he hears as a mere change in the representation of the word would constitute an obstacle to understand its meaning. And people are in need of both languages, one for oral negotiations and daily work, and the other to understand written messages, especially those published in political newspapers. We do not mention official governmental papers, for these entail a third language different from the two others and which is known as the official language... And we ignore how this language could be grasped.

Concerning the use of the dialect as more appropriate to publishing scientific researches, it could be sound. What we appreciate through this argument is the fact that, considering this language presents no connectors and its words are not bound by rhymes nor submitted to diacritical marks as classical structures, it could include all neologism in science, industry and others, needless of synonyms in Arabic or any type of translation. Hence, it would be, in this respect, similar to the Turkish language nowadays. And no offense, but this should be a matter of concern for each Arab citizen as we must, unquestionably, introduce the science of our century into our schools; However, most of these sciences lexicons have no counterparts in our language as they were newly coined after the end of the era of science for the Arabs. Some fields of science might have emerged, with no representations in Arabic or they may have been unknown such as Electricity, Steam Energy and other. Not to mention sciences which representations have been changed, namely Chemistry and Astronomy, as well as the names of machines and industrial lexicon. All this, leads to the absence of Arabic counterparts for most scientific words and the only way to express them was through one of these means: either to use the same terminology, which would distort and deform the language as its rhymes and structures are different from those particular to Arabic, or to bother to translate some of them and find counterparts to some others, which we consider improbable nowadays as erudite linguists are engaged in some of the pioneers’ newspapers, reading between the lines, seeking the inferences and secrets through the implicit of the terms and letters, and so are authors in straightening politics and using their mighty pens to defend the Eastern lands... As long as linguists are indifferent to filling the gaps of the language and

leading it to keep pace with the languages of our century, it would undoubtedly transform to become more grotesque than what was stated by the author of the book and the like-minded; with both scientific and conversational languages becoming part of the Maltese whereas only classical Arabic would be used in mosques and courts. And this is what a dead language means with no other possible description. Thus, if they feel satisfied with this, it could be possible starting today and we find no reason for newspapers to protest against the author for he has provided us honest advice and mentioned nothing but what would contribute to elevate the minds of the nation. Or else, the Easterner of the twentieth century would resemble the Bedouin in the Jāhiliyya period.

Concerning the issue of writing and the absence of phonetic transcription in the Arabic script, it is trivial compared to the nation itself when we consider this matter objectively, although it constitutes the major obstacle to overcome by the foreigner who aims for learning and reading the language. And this is, sincerely, one of the obstacles which is hard to overcome as diacritical marks are extremely numerous in our language. Thus, if they are represented through letters as in European languages, the pronunciation would not be undifferentiated and words would mix up, presenting no difference among each other as in, for instance, salima (salima) , sālim (salim) and salīm (salim), for all letters “a” are preceded by the letter “s” and all letters “i” are preceded by the letter “l”. It could be more undifferentiated as in qatil (qatil) and qātil (qatil) especially that their meanings are totally contradictory. In this case, there would be no other alternative than to use signs to differentiate between diacritical marks and letters, which would lead to the design as a substitute to letters. Not to mention the necessity of diacritical marks in the representation, in both Arabic and Roman scripts, to avoid long spellings and the obligation to write for a longer time for fear of weak expression. In conclusion, Arabic diacritical marks could be written only as symbols for they are not pronounced as complete letters nor are they included in the spelling of the words, their initial role being to move from a part to another. However, the objective is to devise a means which would enable printheads to use these diacritical marks more easily and thus, only the confusing letter would be vocalized, though in Roman script, which would render our prints similar to some printed school books, even if this approach would entail some difficulties.

Supposedly this theory becomes a concrete reality, what the foreigner would have eluded, the native would confront. He would even confront it more reluctantly, as we would mention

below. And through the term native, we mean Muslims who constitute the majority in the country. For, though they learn the basics of the dialect, they cannot dispense with learning the Classical Arabic in order to read the Qūrān, collect the Ḥadīth and understand the texts of the šarīʿa based on their teachings. To reach such level, there is an obligation to read books related to grammar, rhetoric, linguistics and all literary sciences. And if they did not learn all these in the schools of the country, they must learn them in other private schools or through home learning courses; and only rich people could afford these means, not to mention the trouble and the waste of time. Moreover, they must learn two types of reading skills: the first written in the Arabic script to read the Qūrān, for it is forbidden to write it using a foreign script unless necessary, and the second in the conventional Roman script of the country in order to read books published and newspapers issued there, and to study modern sciences which are to be written in the above mentioned language and script, as stated in relation with authorship. We do not believe that it is easy to acknowledge all this. Hence, any author and any person knows that we cannot compare Arabic to Italian or Greek for these two languages do not relate to religion as stated above, and the issues encountered through the translation of the Bible into modern Greek lately, are the best evidence for it, if the warnings above mentioned were not respected. And consequently, this revolution would result into a catastrophe as countless scientific, historical and other books would be lost, for it would be inconceivable to transcript all these books into the new script and there would be no possibility for the coming generations to use their contents in case the script they know changes. Hence, we consider that those who have established this method must restrict to teach the native language of the host country to the foreigner without going further into changing the status of the country as this neologism is neither wise nor easy to achieve.

Ash-Sheikh Ibrāhīm Al-Yāzījī,

“Dialect and Classical Arabic, Could Arabic language be written in the Roman script?”, quoted from Al-Boustany, Foua’d E’phreim, *Al-Rawā’*, 41, **Ash-Sheikh Ibrāhīm Al-Yāzījī, On Language and Literature**, Second Edition, Beirut, Catholic Press, 1956 (First Edition 1952), pages 52-56.

###

Journal Language or Journalese

The previous article presented the impact of the press on the nation and its impact on its perceptions, tastes, arts, language and other assets, mainly because of the multitude of publications and its spread in the present century, reaching thousands of daily issues and distributed to readers whose understanding is relevant to the competence and readiness of each.

No one could deny that it has been a reason for the spread of authorship in our country, the training of the authors on writing genres, their adoption of the various syntax devices and the revival of many dialects accents, even among common authors, which has enabled the resurgence of the language from its hindrance and aroused the hopes for a return to its previous splendor.

Indeed, if you check the same newspapers, you would notice that they have set out into a new stage of rhetoric and eloquent expression as proven through the comparison between many of our present newspapers and all newspapers nearly ten years ago or earlier. This is due, not doubtfully, to this same multitude of newspapers which entailed competition among the authors and an overflow of talents in the arena of writing, as well as the spread of rhetoric and the fluency in the composition.

However, and despite all this, we still find in some of our newspapers aberrant terms, misused or used inappropriately, which would distort the expression and clear away its splendor and the quality of its syntax. Notwithstanding the ensuing delusion and error, especially if mentioned by a person of trust, which would lead to its blind usage with no research or refusal as safeguards.

Needless to say, that a linguistic mistake is more grotesque than a dissonant syntax, and less probable to be corrected as it is freely transcribed. Thus, it is easier to fall into error and writers are more inclined to fall into the void of delusion.

We may wonder how some notorious authors and erudite linguists and writers would have recourse to plagiarism and they might plagiarize less gifted authors, which encourages the

spread of such behavior at all levels and transforms the terms used in journalism into a special style of language, with a need of a dedicated dictionary.

And it is feared that as long as the defendant of the language and those entrusted with its reform pursue such behaviors, they could end up weakening the language, which would constitute an irremediable damage. Hence, we have viewed that we should dedicate this chapter to this issue, to state the most exchanged terms, warning about the errors they enclose and showing their rightness on the basis of the language literature.

There is no doubt that our distinguished young writers would consider our endeavor as a proof of loyalty, with the only intention being to preserve the language and protect their authorship from such flaws as they are overwhelmed by the magnitude of research and exploration in the language literature, known for its complexity and chaotic structures, which undoubtedly, deters from consulting it to establish the proper terms. And we ask God Almighty, to grant us all, by his grace, the gift and sources of rightness.

Among these terms the word “taḥwīr” (adjust) that journalists and authors stated hundreds of times in their writings to indicate revision, amendment, refinement and all the like in regard to conditions, treaties, provisions and such.

And this term was not mentioned in any of the language literature to express one of these meanings. However, it was cited in Arabic Language under the meaning of whitening.

It is said: “ḥawwara” for a dress, when it is trimmed and bleached, or “al-ḥawari” to indicate the white flour, the finest and purest core of the wheat and “ḥawwara” for the flour to indicate it has been refined and whitened. Most terms used in this context indicate the meaning of whiteness.

So why don't they replace this term with one of the synonyms mentioned?

Likewise, they say: “taqaddama ilayhi bikaḏā”, which means that someone wished him to do that, and he asked him to fulfill it. However, it should be said: “taqaddama ilayhi” to indicate that someone instructed him or ordered him. You say: “taqaddama al-āmīrū”, which means: the prince ordered his servant to do this and that, which is, as you notice, contrary to what they mean.

Likewise, they say: we thank him for his charity in three different ways, “šakara lahū a‘la iḥsānihi”, “šakara li iḥsānihi”, “šakara lahū li iḥsānihi”, a misused representation mainly adopted by the majority. It is mentioned in “Tāğ al-a‘rūs”: “šakarahū” and “šakara lahū” which means, I thanked him. It is also said: “šakartūl lāha”, “šakartū lil lāhi” and “šakartū bil lāhi”, that all mean, Thank God; as well as “šakartū ni‘mata llāhi” and “šakartū bihā” that mean I thank God for his Grace. Al-mūšannaḥ mentions: “šakartūhū” and in a more elaborate language “šakartū lahū”, which means I was thankful.

The dictionary Lisān-ul Arab mentions a similar term, ambiguous and inadequate though. The best and most accurate being the term mentioned first.

It said: “šakartūl-lāha ni‘matahū” (I thanked God for his Grace) and “ūškūrū lī” (thank for me), or “šakartū fūlānan” (I thanked someone) to indicate someone’s grace....., which explicitly indicates that the verb “šakara” (thank) is a transitive verb that needs a direct object that receives the action, namely “al-maškūr lahū “ (the person thanked), the graceful expressed through the use of the letter “lām” and “al-maškūr bihi” (the object of the thanks), the grace itself. You say: “šakartū li zaydi ṣanīa‘tahū” (I thanked Zaid for what he did), using the short vowel “e” (kasrat) for the first object and the short vowel “a” (faḥa) for the second object to differentiate them, which is the most common initial use in this script.

Then you might omit one of the linked objects and say: “šakartū li zayd” (I thanked Zaid) and “šakartū ṣanīa‘ta zayd” (I thanked Zaid for what he did) as you might say “šakartū zaydan” (I thanked Zaid) omitting the causal clause.

A causal clause introduced with the connector “a‘la” (for), might be used to add the notion of praise to the thanks, with the omission of the particle “lām”. It is then said: “šakartūhū a‘la iḥsānihi” (Praise be to him for his charity), as you might say “ḥamadatūhū a‘la iḥsānihi” to match both usages. And this is worth reflection.

Likewise, some would say: he ripped the book “iraban iraban” and he cut the rope “iraban iraban”, in other words, bits and pieces. And most would read it “Araban araban” using the initial short vowel “a” (faḥa), which is wrong.

However, it is said: the carcass was cut “iraban iraban” (limb after limb), in other words “iraban fa iraban” with the initial short vowel “e” (Kasrat) and the silent consonant “r”. In

this context, “al-irab” (the limb) is a human or an animal organ, which cannot be used for the book, the rope or alike. However, the term “al-arab”, with two short vowels “a” (fatḥa), indicates the need.

Likewise, it is said: he went out “ū‘šāra yawmi kaḍa” (on the afternoon of that day) to indicate “al-a‘šr” (the afternoon time). The term is mostly heard with the initial short vowel “ū” (dammat) on the “u” and the short vowel “a” (fatḥa) on the ‘r’ as in “qūšāra” and “ḥūzāma”. This term is not mentioned in language books as if it was meant to be pronounced with the initial short vowel “ū” (dammat) on the “u” and the short vowel “e” (kasra) on the ‘r’ and the doubling of the letter “y” (*Āttašdīd*) as if it represents the plural of the word “a‘šriyyat al-nahār” (the afternoon of the day) commonly used as in I paid him a visit in the morning “šoḥḥiyyat” and at noon “zohriyyat”. And never did the Arabs mentioned such usages.

Likewise, it is said: “āwḡabani ȳla kāḍā” (he obliged me to do that) which means “aljaa‘ni ilayhi” (he charged me to do it) or “Idtarrani” (I had to). However, it should be said “ūḡibtū al-amr”. And it is wrong to say “awḡabtū al-raḡol” (I obliged the man) as it is rather correct to say “ūḡiba a‘la kaḍa” (he was obliged to do that).

Likewise, it is said: “ā‘lantū fulān bil amr” (I announced the matter to someone) as in, for instance, “ā‘lantūhū bihi” (I told him about it) whereas it should be said “a‘lantū al amr” and “bil amr” which means I disclosed it and it is said “a‘lantūhū li fūlan” or “aḗhartūhū li fūlan” to indicate that the matter was disclosed to someone. It is also said “a‘lantūhū ilayhi” (I disclosed it to him), as mentioned in *Līsān al‘arab*.

Likewise, it is said: “tawallaḡa fūlān al-amr” or “tawallāhū” which means that someone handled the matter. We assume they insisted on using the last term, namely “tawallā”, thus they changed the “ā” into a “ḡ”, which is a strange distortion. And the word “tawallaḡa” means “enter” such as he penetrated the abstract.

It is said: he ordered him to do that and he complied to his instruction “inšāa‘li mašūratihī”. In other words, he observed his demands and obeyed, which the Arabic language does not mention. However, it is said: someone complied “inšāa‘” if he turned back rapidly. Initially, people comply (inšāa‘ al-qawmū) when they pass rapidly. And in spoken language, “šāa‘”,

“yaṣūū ‘ ṣawa ‘n” so “inṣāa ‘”, is the only term mentioned and it means to divide something so it scatters.

Likewise, it is said: “a ‘hida ilayhi amrū kaḍa” (he entrusted him with the matter) considering the verb “a ‘hida” as a transitive verb whereas it should be used with the particle “fī” to become transitive. It is mentioned in Lisān al-a ‘rab that it is said: “a ‘hada ilayya fī kaḍā” which means he adjured me.....as God Almighty said: O children of Adam, didn’t I adjure you?, which entails the adjuration, demand and promise requested prior to something...The meaning of the word prior being clear in the context.

Likewise, some said, “yanbaḡy ‘alayka” (you must) do that, followed by the particle “a ‘la”, thinking it expresses obligation, which is not correct for he, originally, “baḡa” (was willingful) to do that. In other words, he demanded to do that. Thus, it sounds like asking him what he desires though such usage as “īnbaḡa” and “īnṭalaba” are wrong in this context. However, Arabs used such terms in oral communications and they have been adopted in such usages.

And they used it as a synonym to might, should or could though always connected to the particle “la” such as: the sun cannot “yanbaḡy lahā” reach the moon, we could not teach him poetry nor what we should have taught him “yanbaḡy lahū”.

And it is mostly used in the present tense, as noticed, thus, it is considered by most as a modal verb.

Likewise, it is said: this work is required “yaqtaḍy lahū” that amount of money and I have collected the required “al-mūqtaḍya” sum, using this term to express obligation. However, this usage is definitely wrong for, the meaning of “require” “īqtaḍa”, in this context, is “demand”. It is said: “if ‘al mā yaqtaḍīhi karamūka” (do what your generosity requires), in other words what it demands, as it is initially understood.

Thus, it would be correct to say: this work requires “yaqtaḍy” this amount of money, using the transitive form of the verb connected to the particle related to work; and the required sum has been collected, using the participle “ālmūqtaḍāt”.

Likewise, it is said: this matter depends on “qāṣirōn ‘alā” that, in other words it is restricted to it “maqṣūron a‘lāyhi”, not going beyond it. This strange term expresses obligation as well, and is almost found in oral communications as such.

It is mentioned in Līsān-ul Arab: I restrict myself to something “qaṣartū nafsi ‘ala”, if I restrain it and constrain it to this thing....and I restrict to something “qaṣartū ‘ala” if I do not go beyond it. It is said: I restrict conception to my mare if it can produce enough milk and a camel is restricted to feeding her babies.

It is said, that man is a gentleman “min ḍawī ash-šahāma”, in other words he is noble and proud, which has been never mentioned in the Arabs’ speeches. And yet, “el-šahīm” for Arabs, means the witty and passionate person, namely, the wise judge.

Alfarrā’ said: in the Arabs’ communications, the gentleman is the handler who is good at conducting what he handles. And as you notice, it has little to do with the usage required.

And almost likewise, it is said: that person is “ṭāhir-uḍ-ḍayl”, which means that this person is righteous, free from despicable ambitions and loathsome profits. Thus, it is clear that the term “ṭahārat aḍ-ḍayl” is unmeaningful in this context. However, this metonymy has another meaning that a witty spirit cannot miss. Likewise, the metonymy in “a‘fifū el-mi’zar” for remarkably modest, “naqiyyūl-ṭiyāb” for virtuous, “ṭāhirū el-ḥiḡza” for innocent, and “ṭayyibū mi‘qad el-i’zār” for good. Al-Nābiḡa said:

Gentle people are good and righteous They greet you warmly (āl-rayḡān) in tense days

“Riqāqūl nia ‘ālī ṭayyibon ḡūzātūhūm Yūḡayyūna bilrayḡāni yawma el-sbāsibi”

And it is said: “yāne’” for a tender branch, which means fresh or moist and so is said for a fresh flower and a verdant garden. A fruit is also “yāne’” and “yanī’”, however, it means ripe and it is said “yanaa’” and “āyanaa’” when it matures and is good for the picking. “Yāne’” could also mean anything reddish and the fruit is “yāné’” when it starts reddening.

And it is strange that some erudite pioneers fell into the trap and “Al-ḡarīrī, author of “Dūrrat al-ḡawās” (Jewel of the loon) is among these. He said in Al-maqāma al-naṣḡbiyya:

“It was a blazing hot day and the garden was verdant” (yānia‘l ḡadīḡah)”, which al-šaryṣy explained as a “blossoming meadow”. He also explained in an address: “Each era still bears a

rising moon and the blossom of a tender branch”. The author of “The loss of the deaths” (fawāt āl-wafyyāt) quoted judge šhahāb aldīn bin faḍl āllāh: “until its river flowed and its flowers blossomed”. ālšafaḍy said:

He who rests in the tomb, in his tender age as the eclipse of the moon in its fullness

Ash-Sheikh Ibrāhīm Al-Yāzījī,

“Journal Language or Journalese”, collected and prefaced by Nazir Abboud, First Edition, Marūn ‘Abbūd (Marūn ‘Abbūd) Press, 1984, pages 28-37.