Article

Dr. Rashid Al-Abidi's critical approach to modern linguistics

Nasir Ghafil Shanan Al-Wazir

General Directorate of Education in Karbala Province, Karbala, Iraq

Correspondence **naseeralwazeera@gmail.com**

Abstract: This research aims to analyze the criticism of linguistics by one of the prominent figures in the field of modern linguistic studies in Iraq, Dr. Rashid Abdul Rahman Al-Obaidi. This is due to the scientific efforts we have seen in some of his books aimed at reviewing what contemporary linguistics has provided with its methods and research, a critical review that is not limited to presentation and summary. In order to achieve this goal, the research was divided into several axes, each axis addressing a critical trend from his orientations in evaluating linguistics, with the aim of drawing a comprehensive picture whose features are the intellectual system from which it stems and the references he relies on in his analysis, which helps in identifying the motives behind this critical approach of his. Dr. Rashid Abdul Rahman Saleh Al-Obaidi is considered one of the most prominent figures in the field of linguistic studies in Iraq during the second half of the twentieth century. Dr

Rashid Al-Obaidi was born in 1940 in the Al-A'dhamiyah district of Baghdad. He obtained a master's degree in grammar and morphology, and a doctorate in linguistics from Cairo University. He was then appointed as a rapporteur for the Arabic Language Department at the College of Education at the University of Baghdad. He played a prominent role in academic and cultural work; He held the position of professor in a number of Iraqi and Arab universities, and he left a valuable scientific heritage specializing in the research of the Arabic language and its various fields, including: Abu Uthman Al-Mazini and his views on morphology and syntax, Al-Azhari and the Arabic lexicography, research and texts in Arabic philology, problems in linguistic composition in the second century AH, the practical implementation of the linguistic research method, discussions in linguistics and linguistics, Arabic and contemporary linguistics, and a dictionary of linguistic sounds. Dr. Rashid Al-Obaidi's efforts were not limited to these works, but he also had documents and research published in a number of Iraqi and Arab magazines, and he was also chosen as a member of the Iraqi Scientific Academy, Dr. Rashid Al-Obaidi [1] = may God have mercy on him, passed away on Saturday, corresponding to: 22/Muharram/1428 AH February/2007 AD/10. [2]

It is noteworthy that his scholarly efforts vary between traditional linguistic studies, or what can be described as ancient, on the one hand, and contemporary linguistic studies, on the other hand. This appears in his recent works and research, in which he focused on following modern methods in the field of language and its study, whether as an explainer or a critic. Anyone who peruses his scholarly output will find that he was not confined to the old aspects of our Arab heritage, but rather was receptive in his intellectual orientations and interests to all new developments in his field of specialization, which bore

---

1. See: Encyclopedia of Iraqi Personalities in the Twentieth Century: 1/73

2. See: Dictionary of Phonetics: 3, publisher's footnote: Center for Islamic Research and Studies, No.: (1)

fruit in some of his works mentioned previously. Our study aims to shed light on his contributions to the field of language criticism, in particular, and to clarify his opinion on them. Was he a supporter of adopting everything that modern linguistic methods have provided, or did he have a different position on them? This research aims to identify the most important features that characterized his criticism of - linguistics? And on what did he base his position on them? This research also begins with a question which he considers fundamental - namely, whether Dr. Al-Abidi has deeply studied linguistic efforts and represented them in their authentic sources to the point of being able to criticize them. This research also seeks to identify what prompted Dr. Al-Abidi to reject and disregard linguistic studies or their methods, and to explain the reasons for this.

Dr. Rashid Labidi's interest in the study of linguistics and its introduction is evident in his two books: Arabic and Modern Linguistics, and Studies in Linguistics and Linguistics, in addition to some studies devoted to this purpose, which will be mentioned in the course of this research, God willing. Dr. Rashid Al-Abidi's references in his research on linguistics consisted of several primary or original sources such as the book Lectures in General Linguistics by Ferdinand de Saussure, in Arabic and not in his original language, and the same applies to Structuralism by Jean Piaget, and Semantics by John Lyons, most of which are in Arabic, such as Linguistics: An Introduction to the Arab Reader by Dr. Mahmoud Al-Saaran, Language Between Normative and Descriptive by Dr. Tamam Hassan, The Problem of Structure by Dr Zakaria Ibrahim, Linguistics: Contemporary Linguistics by Dr. Michel Zakaria, and Transformational Generative Linguistics by him as well, Structuralism in Linguistics by Al-Hanash Muhammad, The Phonological Method in Arabic Structure by Dr. Abdul Sabour Shahin, Lessons in Arabic Sounds by Kantino, Arabic Morphology by Al-Tayeb Al-Bakoush, and Studies in Arabic Phonology by Dr. Daoud Abdo. These were the most prominent sources and references that the doctor relied on. The way they were used and referred to differed in his style. Some of them were adopted in presenting linguistic research methods such as the descriptive, generative, and transformational approaches, and in presenting the levels into which language is divided during study such as phonetics, morphology, syntax, semantics, and others. It appears from a return to Dr. Al-Abidi's references in his books in which he dealt with linguistics that he relied mostly on Arabic references, the most prominent of which were structuralism in linguistics, and the problem of structure in revealing the features of contradiction between linguistic theories. He also relied on some Arabic books such as: The Phonetic Approach in Arabic Structure, Arabic Morphology, and Studies in Arabic Phonology by Dr. Daoud Abdo; to clarify the errors of some modernists in using Western linguistic theories and methods in the Arabic language.

Linguistics , as some scholars know it, is the knowledge that studies human language from a scientific perspective based on description and observation of facts. Linguistics, apart from the educational trend is distinguished by several characteristics, including that it shows independence, is [3] and standard rules concerned with the spoken language before the written, is concerned with dialects and does not prefer the classical language over it, and linguistics seeks to build a linguistic theory that is characterized by generality and enables Scholars who study all human languages, without distinguishing between languages, also study language in its entirety in a gradual manner, starting with sounds and reaching meanings. [4] Dr. Al-Abidi believes that the basis of these characteristics is Saussure's linguistics, and that these characteristics were the same steps upon which Arabic linguists studied their language. [5] However, Saussure's students developed these foundations, expanded and enriched the characteristics, and perhaps even surpassed him with some individual, subjective opinions that led to the expansion of the field of linguistic research, resulting in diverse and divergent schools and approaches far removed from the objective linguistic research approach. [6] This vision, as we see, constituted one of the intellectual foundations that Dr. Al-Abidi was convinced of. Consequently, he became critical of contemporary linguistic research in general, and the findings of these linguistic studies in the field of Arabic language study in particular. Therefore, anyone reading his efforts in this area might feel that there is a rupture or a relationship of substitution between the Arabic language and linguistics, while the relationship between

3.See: Principles of Linguistics: 15

4.See: himself: 16, and the Arabic language and contemporary linguistics: 13

5.See: Research in Linguistics and Linguistics: 255

6.See: himself: 44

We can explain the most important manifestations of .[7] them is one of complementarity and benefit linguistics criticism by Dr. Rashid Al-Abidi as follows

Criticism For Co ntemporaryL inguisticStudies in Ge neral

We can discover Dr. Al-Obaidi's opinion on modern linguistics through his general view of it first, or what we might call general criticism. It is an assessment directed towards linguistic sciences in general, without focusing on a specific axis or highlighting a ,particular point for criticism. In it, we find that he considers linguistics a modern imported science that has no significant value for Arabic, its speakers, or those interested in studying it. This is a type of criticism that does not focus on a specific idea, but rather is based on the general vision he adopts and believes in, as stated in the introduction to his book (Researches in Linguistics and Linguistics): ((What modern linguistic research has provided has been nothing but a blind imitation of Western European research and a simulation of the concepts known to European studies that are in line with their ideas of analyzing the European language... completely removed from the characteristics of Arabic and the meanings of its words, the methods of structuring its vocabulary and its methods of expression, the stability and precision of its grammar, and the distinction of its phonetic system from the systems of the European language, which have not known It is noteworthy that this judgment is based ([8] (..stability or constancy in its long history on feelings expressing explicit bias towards the Arabic language and its teaching methods, without taking into account the development witnessed by those methods and the modernization and renewal of their curricula as a result of progress in the sciences and human ideas in general. He points out elsewhere: ((The point is not in the terminology and form invented by modern linguistics, as these terms are characterized by ambiguity, confusion and change from one language to another. Rather, the important lesson is the search for the scientific and objective truth that originated with the Arabic linguist and developed and grew in his embrace and at his hands, and then he presented a ripe fruit for the Europeans to build upon it, claiming novelty and novelty, but it was .[9] ((not as they claimed

Although this text, which we relied on, came after his discussion of a group of linguistic phenomena for which scholars - including Dr. Al-Abidi - discovered origins in our linguistic heritage. The old one carries a generality and openness that is not adopted by the contemporary research method. Dr. Al-Abidi pointed out that this type of research does not benefit the Arabic language and is far from its essence. Rather, he believed that the purpose of contemporary linguistics is to distance Arabs from their interest in their original linguistic study to these new methods. He said: ((Perhaps I am not exaggerating if I say: There is extreme extremism adopted by a group of those interested in European linguistic study in this century, aiming to move away from traditional Arabic research towards contemporary linguistics, especially those concerned with Arabic, who have learned something from Westerners... It is research forced on Arabic, far from its breath and characteristics, and it introduces its people into a field that is not suitable for it and ((does not conform to its nature at a time when original Arabic studies have borne fruit One manifestation of general criticism, not specific or directed towards a specific .[10] scientific model or method, is what he sees in his interpretation of the influence of Western linguistic approaches on Arabic studies, as an influence that resulted in overlap and complexity rather than facilitation. He said of linguistic studies approaches in the West: "This approach - or approaches - has left an impact on the trends of current Arabic research, leading to complexity, overlap, and differences in viewpoints and beliefs, rather

---

7.See: Arabic and Contemporary Linguistics: 32

8.Himself: 6

9.Himself: 219

10.Discussions in Linguistics and Linguistics: 209

than facilitating the understanding of language in its structure, forms, compositions, and the subjects, meanings, and development of its words as they have reached us from our ancient scholars and the forms of their interpretations, and the interpretation of phenomena according to their understanding. These approaches have introduced into Arabic studies many interpretations and terms that have no connection to authentic We will limit ourselves to this amount of texts that highlight his ".[11] Arabic research general vision of linguistics and modern linguistic research methods. Additional texts will be presented during the research in due course, God willing.

The concept of linguistic terminology and its extent

Perhaps one of the most important areas in which his criticism of linguistics is clearly evident is what we find in his discussion of the scope of contemporary linguistics and the lack of clarity of what this linguistic term represents, which seems - to him - to have ,unclear features. Therefore, we find that he was not interested in tracing the term criticizing it, or presenting his opinion on it; so that the reader feels that he was not concerned with the issue of linguistic terminology in general, because its features are not ,distinct for him, as we have indicated. That is why he says: ((In the twentieth century the features of European linguistic research emerged and dominated the cultural and cognitive market in the Arab world.... What was called linguistics, in relation to ,language, or linguistics, in relation to tongues, or linguistics, in relation to tongue appeared clearly, and they all mean one thing, which is research into language for its One of the forms of neglecting the clarity of the term and its ([12] (.own sake and in itself limits in contemporary linguistics is what we encounter in his statement: ((The only difference between linguistics in Arabic studies and linguistics in our present age is the specialization of linguistic study among Arabs. By this I mean the researcher's focus on the Arabic language compared to all other languages, and the generality of linguistic study in modern studies. By this I mean the study of linguistics in language... without It is possible to note in his ((.[13] specifying a specific language or group of individuals discussion of the term linguistics and contemporary linguistics In their relationship to linguistics, we find the distinction between linguistics and philology; this has been made clear by placing commas between them and defining the topics of each of them among contemporary researchers. He said: ((Contemporary linguistics is called linguistics, a ,term that modern language researchers see as having no relation to the term linguistics which was common a long time ago..., and while Arab researchers call those active in the field of language a linguist or a language specialist, and they also call research that deals with language issues such as vocabulary structure, derivation, forms, and language characteristics... philology, the Europeans, until a recent era, called those working in Dr. Majeed Al-Mashta[14] ((these fields... linguists and called work in them: philology pointed to some of this trend, in Dr. Rashid Al-Obaidi, while he was standing at the title of his book (Researches in Linguistics and Linguistics), as he noticed in the choice of This title explains the difference between: linguistics and linguistics, or that it considers them two separate terms, although they are expressions of one thing. Dr. Majeed Al-Mashta said: ((The first thing that attracts attention is the title of the book "Researches in Linguistics and Linguistics." Does this indicate that the book differentiates between linguistics? And linguistics? What I know is that they are two terms that refer to one field corresponding to the wordlinguistics. The Egyptians call it linguistics, the Tunisians call .[15] it linguistics, and the Lebanese call it linguistics

---

11.Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 203

12.Conversations in Linguistics and Linguistics: 197

13.same: 13

14.Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 219

15.Arabic Language and Contemporary Linguistics: 265

An example of this is his preference for the Arabic definitions set by Arabic scholars over what linguists have come up with. For example, what he mentioned in his discussion of the term language. After presenting their statements in defining it, he says: "If contemporary researchers were fair in their view of language and what Arab scholars knew about it, they would have ignored all the opinions that have been presented about it, contenting themselves with the doctrine of Abu al-Fath Ibn Jinni (d. 392 AH) when He came .[16] he said: (Language is sounds used by each group to express their purposes) with comprehensiveness and immunity... Most modern definitions are incomplete, or focus on one aspect only, such as focusing on its nature and neglecting the function or Dr. Al-Abidi appears - in the previous text - to be extremely enthusiastic as[17] .vice versa he supports Ibn Jinni's definition of language. He even goes so far as to say that his definitions Westerners seem to consider it incomplete or deficient, while the Arabic definition is superior in terms of clarifying the nature of language, its role and the objectives of its use. From his talk, he seems to believe that contemporary linguistics has made the ancient heritage appear in a new form, embodied in terminology only, and that ...it has not presented anything new. He said: ((These issues that I have listed here indicate the existence of interactions and agreements between Arabic linguistic study and contemporary linguistic research. Indeed, the precedence is for Arabic, because it precedes in time. The point is not in the terminology and form invented by modern linguistics, which are terms dominated by ambiguity, confusion and change from one language to another. Rather, the most important lesson is to arrive at the scientific and objective truth that appeared in Arabic linguistics and developed and grew in its He relies primarily on time or temporal priority in preferring Arabic ([18] .environment boundaries over what modern linguistic studies have provided in terms of boundaries and definitions. This is a criterion that cannot always be relied upon, as it may be objective at times, as in many of the details and issues that modern linguistic research has dealt with, which has gone in understanding, interpreting, or directing them in approaches that differ from what was decided by ancient studies. He emphasized that Arab grammarians established the rules of Arabic grammar relying on the descriptive without defining the concept of description, but rather relying on what is ,[19] approach known from the style of Arab grammarians in establishing the rules of Arabic grammar by observing the speech of Bedouins and eloquent Arabs. Among the matters related to the controls established by contemporaries for linguistic terms that form part of the ,prevailing intellectual system for those working in linguistics and those engaged in it Dr. Al-Abidi stopped at some of them and discussed them ; including what we find in his discussion of the term (the syllable), where a section was devoted to it and in which he presented the scope of its application, and as is clear in the recitations of the Holy Quran; He stated: "Contemporary phonetics believe that the fate of phonetic segmentation is that it is a method for dealing with the difficulties that occur in the composition of words, ..., or overcoming some phonetic phenomena that surround the Then he presents the[20] ".word or phrase, ..., or other issues that occur in linguistic sound most important definitions of the modernists of the syllable and shows the extent of their disagreement in defining it and ends by saying that "these definitions differ in their theses, varying in what they indicate of defining the idea, and assuming that we arrive at an accurate definition of the phonetic segment, then the benefit desired from it is not of These "[21] great scientific value, such that it calls us to such a difference in definition rules issued by Dr. Rashid Al-Obaidi are based on an intellectual perspective that

---

16. Properties 2/34

17. Studies in Linguistics and Linguistics: 212–213

18. Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 257

19. Conversations in the Field of Language and Linguistics: 254

20. Himself: 87

21 . Himself: 92

influences his way of thinking and determines the directions of this thought. This idea is embodied in that what modern linguistic and linguistic research has provided does not differ significantly from what the Arab mentality has produced, except for partial and formal differences in some terms and titles. He said: ((It is also true to say that modern research methods, tools, and terminology differ from advanced linguistic research, and ,hence the slight difference in some results, and the formal difference in names, terms Here we note that Dr. Al-Obaidi acknowledges the cognitive progress of[22] ((.and titles the human race and what technology has achieved in this regard, pointing to the impact it has had on the study of language. However, he disagrees with this and considers the .difference to be partial and formal in some titles and terminology

Methodological variation in contemporary linguistic

Dr. Rashid Al-Abidi devoted an important study to this critical section entitled "The Contradiction between Modern Linguistic Schools." In it, he touched upon the contradictions and conflicts he observed between linguistic approaches. He also pointed out the characteristics of the discrepancy between linguistic schools in various places in his works. He began by presenting images and examples of the contradiction from De Saussure. He clarified Hjelmslev's position on the meaning of the signifier and the signified according to Saussure, as he considered it ambiguous, and that his approach to analyzing the linguistic sign is a rational analysis. He also referred to Martini's criticism of Saussure, saying that he was a minister in granting language all this mental .characteristic that was a result of He was influenced by the social tendency at the time Then he moved to Barthes' position, who disagreed with Saussure, who believed that semiology is general knowledge and that linguistics is part of it. Barthes believed that the opposite is true. Dr. Rashid Al-Abidi also sought to link this linguistic research to the nature of Western societies in which these approaches emerged. He said: ((Such conflicting currents found fertile soil in France. After structural trends grew there, we saw them lead to intellectual contradictions and clash with other strong opinions and trends. Many researchers explain their emergence in France by saying that the French He also ([23] (...intellectual... was attracted by the history of thought that abandons history ,stopped at what he called the contradictions between Saussureanism and Chomskyanism in which he presented a group of ideas or axioms that Saussure presented to show Chomsky's point of view on them, saying: "For Saussure, language does not arise or emerge, but rather it is symbols stored in memory that are retrieved when used, and are determined by similarity to the previous position. This Saussurean interpretation is a mechanical interpretation of the process of language production, and it is an opposing interpretation that Chomsky sees in the act of creativity and linguistic formation within the human psyche. The speaker has the ability to generate an infinite number of sentences that are heard, and have not been read before, and this means that the producer does not have…" Designed forms are referred to when drafting, and we also have a And elsewhere, documenting the contrast .[24] comprehensive internal standard template between Chomsky and Saussure's structural complexity, he said: "Perhaps one of the most prominent Western researchers who challenged structuralism is the American Chomsky in his book (Syntactic Structures)... In it, he went beyond the concepts of description and classification that Saussure placed within the framework of structuralism and that European structuralism adopted. Chomsky added a third concept in his generative grammar, which is linguistic creativity that distinguishes humans from other Thus, we see him pointing to the conflicts and doctrines that arose from .[25] . .languages structuralism or appeared in response to it, starting, in that, that these differences and ;modern methods appear to be inappropriate for application to the Arabic language

22.Linguistics between Abd al-Qahir and the modernists: 15

23.Conversations on Language and Linguistics: 238

24.same: 244

25.Himself: 259

therefore, he says: "And further, if most structural linguists have disavowed structuralism, and it is now considered one of the traditional curricula for Europeans, and they are searching for a new method with which to occupy themselves and the world again, what appears to us today is that we need to review the pages of a book that has become old and no longer has any use for its author, who has begun to strive to write He has used These contradictions strengthen his point .[26] . .another that is more useful that these Western linguistic schools are unsuitable for application. On the Arabic ,language, evidenced by the fact that its proponents did not agree on it, on the one hand ,and evidenced by the fact that they abandoned it and moved on to search for new theories so he spoke about structuralism after Saussure: ((After him, this structure became ,conflicting doctrines, transformed into forms of philosophical thought for its pioneers and was no longer suitable as a method for purely linguistic research... Rather, it has transcended this extent of its reality, and consequently led to the demise of man, because he became a device operating according to mandatory laws, without being a choice, and this is the reason that made Chomsky explore man's capabilities and creativity in the field Dr. Rashid Al-Abidi explains the failure of structuralism to continue .[27] ((of language by saying that the structuralist approach relies ((on form and sound in researching language and examining its structures without taking into account the meaning and purpose of the product, which is the aspect that was focused on in linguistic behavioral research, and which Abdul Qaher preceded in the theory of systems and grammatical His criticism did not stop at what was raised regarding .[28] ((and contextual meaning ,Saussure's efforts, but rather focused on the observations directed at Chomsky's theory, including his indication that Chomsky based his theory on two elements: the structural system and the traditional system, and that he tried his best to find a middle way between them, indicating the lack of originality of the aforementioned theory or that it is based Jean Piaget's view of the theory was also conveyed, as he .[29] on previous approaches considered it to be a normative theory because it did not take into account the synchronic He .[30] system previously established by structuralism as the basis for its approach concludes by saying: "These and other comments related to transformational generative grammar provide an idea of the challenges facing the development of the theory of universal grammar that Noam Chomsky is working to achieve and its application to all natural languages due to problems related to semantics, phonology, constructions, and vocabulary. These issues arise from the fact that every language in the world has features .[31] that make it unique from other languages

Ancient Arab heritage and its linguistic roots

Another characteristic of Dr. Rashid Al-Abidi's linguistics evaluation that is clearly evident is his interest in rooting some Western linguistic theories in the ancient Arab heritage. We can present this in the following manner:

structural characteristics that Dr. Al-Abidi investigated in the Arab heritage is the way in which structuralism viewed language as a system, structure, or arrangement . He said We now return to the perception of these views in language and its)) :[32] about it .composition, in what Al-Jurjani presented in his two books (Al-Dala'il and Al-Asrar) We see that language as an entity, composition, or even structure has been clearly expressed by Al-Jurjani in all the chapters of his book (Al-Dala'il); because Al-Jurjani

---

26 .Himself: 254

27.Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 252

28.Same: 252−253

29.Studies in Linguistics and Linguistics: 269

30 .Himself: 273

31 .Himself: 276− 277

32.See: Structuralism in Linguistics: 100−102, and 150

established a method for this view of language through which he wanted to The idea that language is composed of systems that include rules, regulations, and meanings, which are called the meanings and aspects of grammar, and that it is a structure that increases in cohesion according to the requirements of rules and techniques, was more explicit and He also linked the idea of language as a system according to the structuralists .[33] clear and the systems theory of al-Jurjani, saying: ((Since the system according to the structuralists is based on a law that regulates relationships in speech, this was also the goal of Abd al-Qahir's systems theory; indeed, it is the essence of the theory. The system must revolve around rules and systems that govern its work. Therefore, the idea he presents in this field is not far from the connection to the laws and foundations of He cited as evidence for this the saying of al-Jurjani: ((System is nothing[34] ((.language ,but arranging your speech in the manner required by the grammar of the language working according to its laws and principles, and knowing its methods that you have ([35] (.followed and not deviating from them

And from that what was mentioned in his discussion of the idea of the signifier and the signified according to Saussure and the expressive level and the level of content according to Helmslev, if the signifier is present but does not match the signified, then it becomes an auditory mental psychological image devoid of the signified, Dr. Rashid Al-Abidi believes that this topic is one of the matters that the scholars of Arabic have pointed out, he said: ((And this is what the Arab researchers knew as the used and neglected, so (Zayd) is a used word and has its meaning, but (diz), which is a sequence of sounds (d-And from that, for example, is the connection that he .[36] ((y-z), is devoid of the signified created between what Saussure discovered in semantics; Where he considered the signifier a phonetic component and the signified a psychological representation of the ,and Al-Jahiz's (d. 255 AH) conception of the sign ,[37] image that is formed in the mind he says: ((And when we make a link between what Saussure notes, and the signification according to Al-Jahiz, we find that the statement according to Al-Jahiz is (a comprehensive name for everything that removes the curtain for you from the signification.... and all types of indications of meanings, from words and non-words, five ,things that do not decrease or increase: the first of which is the word, then the indication ([38] ...then the contract, then the line, then the state

The difference between what Al-Jahiz explained and what Saussure sees is that Al-Jahiz clearly demonstrated the methods of indicating meanings, with different words and another style, so he investigated their types and ways of conveying them, while Saussure We note here that Dr. Al-Abidi searched .[39] limited clarification and expression to form for the origins of the idea proposed by Saussure here, and saw in Al-Jahiz's words that he had described a similar Arab intellectual school of thought. However, he did not stop at that, but rather proceeded to make a comparison between them, going on to say that Al-Jahiz conducted a comprehensive analysis of the methods of meanings, while Saussure did not. Dr. Al-Abidi conducted - in Al-Jurjani's legacy - research into the On the relationship between the word and the [40]origins of the structuralist theory meaning, especially with De Saussure, he presented texts from his authors; and

---

33.Linguistics according to Abdul Qaher and the modernists: 7

34.Himself: 7

35.Evidence of the Miracle: 64

36.Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 225

37 See: Lectures in General Linguistics: 104−105, Linguistics, An Introduction for the Arab Reader: 303, and Linguistics: Modern

.Linguistics: 57

38.The text is found in: Al−Bayan wa al−Tabyin 1/82

39.Discussions in Linguistics and Linguistics: 183−184

40.See: Structuralism in Language: 108−109

concluded that the talk of Sheikh Abdul Qaher includes the most prominent thing that structuralism has presented in this field in terms of its awareness that linguistic sounds are one thing and the meanings associated with them are another, and that there is no logical connection between the word and its meaning, and that it is a conventional, technical relationship[41]. In this context, Dr. Al-Abidi addresses the issue of interpreting the signifier, the signified, and the reference or thing among those who adopt the structuralist approach; Starting with Saussure, who introduced the terms (signifier = sound) and (signified = concept or meaning)[42], then what Helmslev introduced of new expressions for the study of language, such as the distinction between content (which is an aspect of the signified) and expression (which is an aspect of the signifier), and dividing the two previous terms into form and essence (i.e., the form of the content and the essence of the content, and the form of expression and the essence of expression)[43], then he compares them with what Al-Jurjani said about words ((How is it conceivable that meanings precede them, and is it possible for them to precede them in the conception of the self? If that is possible, then it is permissible for the names of things to be established before things are known and before they exist[44]. He believes that Sheikh Abdul Qaher here clarified "precise linguistic concepts," namely that words cannot exist in reality unless there is a meaning that precedes them, and that the thing must be visible and noticeable, and then it is agreed to call it words (he extracted from Al-Jurjani's statement three concepts of the theory of semantics, which are words, meanings, and things[45]. Then He adds to what was mentioned previously by saying: ((Therefore, language - in his opinion - is a human creation. All of this highlights the importance of the precise linguistic vision in Abdul Qaher's theory of systems, and his establishment of the foundations of modern structuralism in language studies[46].

Another example of authentication in this regard is what he mentioned in his discussion of the efforts of the linguist Martini, who distinguished between sound and phoneme: "Sound is the phonetic content in the human phonetic system. At the same time, phoneme means the sound that carries a distinguishing value. This means that the letter "lam" is a physical sound with a specific point of articulation... but this sound is sometimes thickened and sometimes softened, according to the function in the speech chain. Thus, it is said that the letters of Arabic are twenty-eight sounds, or twenty-nine, but they are forty-two phonemes"[47]. Dr. Al-Abidi comments on this by saying: ((It is noted that this conclusion that Martini reached is not new in the field of Arabic linguistic research. Quranic recitation scholars have studied and analyzed this phenomenon from all its aspects. Rather, Sibawayh was concerned with it in his book, and he is the one who indicated that it became (42) sounds, and he meant by this number the original sounds in addition to the phonemes generated from speech cases... What Sibawayh decides is what modern linguistics intended with its various phonetic terms. Arabic linguistic studies have known it, and it has advanced over it before others thanks to learning the language of the Quran, and its recitation and intonation))[48].

Abdul Qaher Al-Jurjani's legacy was a major source for establishing structural theory. He even pointed out that Abdul Qaher Al-Jurjani was the first to lay the theoretical foundations for structuralism that emerged in the twentieth century. He said: "Whoever stands on Abdul Qaher's theory of systems stands on the first linguist in the world who

41 .See: himself: 150

42.Lectures in General Linguistics: 104−105

43.See: Structuralism in Linguistics: 213

44.Evidence of the Miracle: 417

45.See: Linguistics between Abd al−Qahir and the Modernists: 10−11

46 .Himself: 10

47.Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 239

48 .Same: 240−241

laid the foundations of structural theory that emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century in Europe. The early grammarians were satisfied with Abdul Qaher's principles without seeking to develop them or reformulate them with new thought... The linguists of Europe moved towards developing Saussure's structuralism and consolidating its He also explored additional points of agreement between structural " .[49] concepts linguistic approaches and what was mentioned in Al-Jurjani's evidence and secrets, then he arrived at a scientific statement that was somewhat exaggerated, saying: ((Such meetings between the structural schools on the one hand and Al-Jurjani's view of systems on the other hand confirm for us a fact that cannot be overlooked, that structuralism in modern linguistics does not go beyond being a reconsideration of Al-Jurjani's theory of systems, even if the former - I mean structuralism - changed its terminology because it spoke in the language of the era, and the language of a people who were not Arabs, and conducted its studies with tools other than the tools used by the .[50] ((ancients

Behavioral and contextual foundations and principles and their origins : He also seeks to establish Bloomfield's theoretical approach to analyzing language as a visible behavioral phenomenon that can be measured and observed by observing and analyzing and linking them to some similar ,[51] speech situations based on stimulus and response features in ancient Western heritage and its phenomena such as stress and intonation. He said: "As for speech situations and their impact on changing meaning, as well as the impact of the speaker's psychological state, which is what the behavioral school believes in, texts have been included on intonation and stress, and the softening marks in speech He then moved on to the context ".[52] indicate their knowledge of their impact on meaning theory, of which Firth is one of its most prominent pioneers, as they believe that words acquire temporary meaning under the influence of the context that imposes its extension and effects . He links it to the projects of our previous scholars in their keenness on the accompanying context and its impact in defining and clarifying meaning. He said: "As for the context theory, Arab lexicographers paid attention to usage, context, and accompanying evidence, and they provided many examples of this in language This is represented by the change in the meaning of the word[54] " .[53] dictionaries (literature) from its linguistic use to mean: banquet to other meanings according to the .[55] uses in which it occurs, the context and the evidence

While seeking to establish a connection between Chomsky's transformational generative theory and the efforts of Abdul Qaher Al-Jurjani, he argues **that the method of transformational generative grammar** closely resembles that proposed by traditional Arabic grammar in its research and examination of language. He explains that transformational grammar: "is concerned with constructing sentences with a focus on their basic structures, and with what the underlying structure requires in terms of correctness of construction and acceptance of sound and meaning... This view is not new in the world of linguistic research, especially Arabic studies, as Abdul Qaher Al-Jurjani believes that the speaker of a language works on assembling meaning within himself before uttering anything, and then he seeks to organize ideas in his mind... The transformational generative method is considered a method close to that of traditional

---

49 .same: 253

50.Language between Abd al-Qahir and the Hadith: 13

51.See: Introduction to Linguistics and Methods of Linguistic Research: 186

52.Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 203

53.See: Linguistics: An Introduction for the Arab Reader: 253

54.Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 203

55.The page margin mentioned in the previous source is checked

Arabic grammar, due to its formalism and the standards known to Arabic linguistic study " .[56]

Thus, we conclude that what the generative transformationalism presented is not something innovative, and that it has a counterpart in the legacy of Abdul Qaher Al-Jurjani. He assumed that Chomsky was influenced by the Hebrew and Arabic methods after reviewing what was translated from them by Andalusian grammarians. He said: "The features of transformation and generation appeared among the Arabs in the study of language in rhetorical styles, the origins of speech, logic, and theology. Perhaps scholars of origins and rhetoric are considered – with merit – to be among the first attempts to explore language, from Chomsky's transformationalism. Rather, we can say: Chomsky's familiarity with Hebrew grammar and Arabic grammar, from what was translated from it by Andalusian grammarians, we can assume…" Chomsky and the transformational school were influenced by ancient Arabic linguistic studies[57]. Here he follows the words of Dr. Ali Zouin, who also said that Chomsky was influenced by Arabic grammar[58]. He returned to study this idea in a different context by talking about his deep and surface structure. After defining them, he said: ((Whoever contemplates this image of Chomsky's doctrine and compares it to what Abdul Qaher Al-Jurjani says about transforming the sentence from the speaker's self before uttering it into a familiar sentence will find that Chomsky did nothing but repeat what the linguist Abdul Qaher[59] said)) He turned to the comparison between what Chomsky presented about the idea of deep structure; For him, language is a product and a talent that transforms from implicit understood rules into innately spoken phrases, while Abdel Qaher believes that the speaker aims to organize thoughts within himself and then articulate them. He says: ((There is a clear difference between the two schools of thought. In fact, Abdel Qaher's opinion is not uncommon. Rather, he visited Saussure, a linguist who believed that sentences are pre-prepared templates that the speaker reuses. However, Chomsky's approach was not as stagnant as Saussure indicated in sentence construction. He is the owner of a distinct approach[60].)) He also mentioned elsewhere: ((The logical approach in Chomsky's thought has had a significant impact on the study and interpretation of linguistic phenomena. It approaches this aspect of research in the Arabic language in terms of reasoning, analogy, logic, and dialectics[61].))

There is something of a contradiction in Dr. Al-Abidi's behavior. While he advocates for rejecting Saussure's structuralism, demonstrating its unsuitability for Arabic, and calling for its rejection—in light of the contradictions and intellectual divisions it left behind—and calling for the adoption of what Arab linguists have left us, we find him, on the other hand, arguing that Saussure's structuralism has a general form and characteristics in the Arab heritage, manifested in Al-Jurjani's theory of systems. In addition, his statement implies, on the one hand, that Al-Jurjani's system theory includes features of both the Saussurean and Chomskyan linguistic methods, without stating or clarifying this, in order to avoid what could result from such a proposal containing a contradiction, whether obvious or at least formal. Dr. Al-Abidi sought to link the issue of differences in the correctness of a structure, which is called grammatical correctness (or the degree of grammatical correctness), and the grammatical correctness of a structure (grammaticality) a term that refers to the conformity of a sentence or part of a sentence , with the laws of a particular language's grammatical system. Judging whether a sentence conforms or does not conform to the grammatical rules of a language is not always easy, as native speakers may differ in their judgments. These judgments are not related to the

---

56. Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 216

57 . Himself: 218

58 See: Between Heritage and Modern Linguistics: 44, and Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Studies: 218. (Margin note)

59. Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 249

60 . Himself: 247

61. Himself: 215

meaning of the sentence or its acceptance or rejection in society. A sentence may be grammatically correct, compatible with the grammatical rules of the language, or correctly formulated, but it lacks meaning. A phrase may be grammatically correct but not accepted for some reason. [62]

Dr. Al-Abidi believes that this new linguistic standard is what Al-Jurjani had previously mentioned, where he said: "This idea that linguists are proposing, and discussing its subject on this scale of justification and explanation is the text of the hadith of Abdul-Qaher Al-Jurjani in his allusion to the differences between one system and another, as he says: (There is a system here that is better than another, and that is according to the application of the meanings of grammar... since people's differentiation is achieved by their knowledge of it) . From the above, it becomes clear to us that (the fundamentality of the sentence) and (its quality) or (its deviation) from fundamentalism did not go beyond what the Arab grammarians understood about the construction of the sentence, its connection to the rules of the language, the strength and weakness of this connection, and the effect of all that on its quality, poor quality, or deviation [63] " [64] Dr. Rashid Al-Abidi also discussed Chomsky's concept of linguistic instinct in the native speaker, as he argued that a child learns his mother tongue consciously and with understanding even" at a very early age, and that once he becomes aware of the various rules upon which language is based, he develops the ability to create, that is, to construct the various sentences he wants [65] " . Dr. Rashid Al-Abidi linked this concept to some historical references from Ibn Jinni and Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani, from which it can be concluded that there is cooperation between what Chomsky proposed and what was presented by ancient Arabic scholars. [66]

The Foundations and Origins of Semantic Theory

This also includes what we find when he discusses the theory of semantic fields, while introducing Western semantic theories, when he says about it: ((It is a theory that linguists preceded in their dictionaries that they wrote about meanings and topics. These books deal with the classification of language based on semantic relationships in the world of animals, plants, humans, inanimate objects, nature, the heavens and the earth. However, this topic, which the Arabs addressed in their dictionaries, was characterized by generality and required a more precise and effective methodological arrangement [67])). He believes that the theory of semantic fields has Arabic roots in our Arab heritage, manifested in the dictionaries of meanings and letters that the ancients devoted to a

---

62 .See: Language and Linguistics, John Lyons, translated by: Mustafa Zaki Al-Tuni, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, first edition, p. 147

(Footnote: 1)

63 The text in Dalāʾil al-Iʾjaz 2/546 with a difference: ((There is no one who has the slightest knowledge except that he realizes that there is a system here that is more advanced than another system, and then you see them, if you want to observe them, their eyes falter, and their minds become distracted from them. The reason for that is that in the beginning they lost knowledge of it itself, as they believed that it was something far removed from understanding the meanings of grammar, and they made it limited to words without meanings. So we confront with effort until you distance them from their beliefs, because you are treating a chronic condition and a deep illness. Then if the evidence leads them to be convinced that there is no meaning other than searching for the meanings of grammar, you present to them after that an idea that amazes them, until they almost return to the essence of their subject. This is because they consider us to be claiming distinction and beauty to arrange a hadith from However, it includes some grammatical meanings that individuals are supposed to excel in knowing.

64.Linguistics between Abd al-Qahir and the critics: 17

65.Arabic and foreign grammar and linguistics schools: 267

66.Linguistics between Abd al-Qahir and the modernists: 19

67.Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 202

specific topic such as water, colostrum, palm trees, and others. However, he acknowledges that what the ancients wrote in this field was characterized by generality and that there is a need for organization. However, several lines later, he returns to describe what the most prominent theories that have spread in Western studies have presented as ((a repetition and iteration of the Arab method of interpreting linguistic materials semantically)). [68] He also describes the interest of the Arab linguistic researcher in the subject of semantic fields as "a precedent to be credited to the scholars of Arabic, before the emergence of the theory of semantic fields in European linguistic studies".[69] Continuing his efforts to reveal the similarities between the Arab semantic study and contemporary semantic studies, he pointed out the importance of These theories are linked to the ancient Arabic semantic study, as he linked the elements that de Saussure identified for the connection between the word and the signification, on the one hand[70], with the efforts of the Arab lexicographers in their dictionary, and on the other hand, the commentators' approach to the Arabic word and the interpretation of its meaning. He said: ((Whoever follows the Arabic dictionary and the commentators' methods in analyzing the Arabic word and presenting its meaning, considers them to look at the word and its meaning as two sides of the same coin, as Saussure sees it, and they are the signifier and the signified in his concept.)) [71]

Analysis of the problems arising from the application of <u>linguistics methods to Arabic</u>

While introducing linguistic approaches, Dr. Al-Abidi studied the attempts of a number of Arab researchers to use some of these methods on a group of aspects of the Arabic language and its linguistic characteristics. They considered that these methods are only suitable for studying European languages; and that ((if we tried to apply them to the phenomena of Arabic, we would see that there is a clear constraint between what the Arab researcher has composed and what the European researcher sees)).[72] Then he began to enumerate a number of forms of interpretation and graduation for morphological issues, comparing the classical linguistic study with the contemporary phonetic study; indicating that this study had an impact in destabilizing Arabic linguistic thought and thus deviating from the traditional path of generations of the Arab and Islamic nation.[73] This included a comparison between the old grammatical rule established by previous grammarians; This rule indicates that the waw or the yaa turns into an alif if either of them is moved and what precedes them is open, such as (qala) from (qawl) and (baa'a) from (bay'a). This rule is applied in Arabic in any movement that falls on the waw or the yaa, whether it is a fatha, damma, or kasra, such as (tal) from (imtidad) and (khafa) from (rahabah), according to the ten conditions that were specified by Arab morphologists.[74] Dr. Rashid Al-Abidi believes that this rule is something that generations have acquired and become accustomed to, so it has become part of their linguistic identity.[75] Therefore, he sees, in contrast to that, that when the modern lesson applied its own method - after being influenced by Western phonetic research - it was not satisfied with what the ancients had concluded, so it tried to innovate and find an alternative. The pioneers of the contemporary lesson went ((to the conclusion that what happened to words like:

68.Himself: 202

69.Himself: 203

70.in General Linguistics: 104 Lectures

71.Arabic and Contemporary Linguistic Research: 202

72.Studies in the Study of Language and Linguistics: 217

73.See: himself: 217

74.See: Jami' al-Durus al-Arabiyyah 2/107, Shadha al-Arif fi Fann al-Murf: 132, and Mubahith fi Ilm al-Lugha wa al-Linguistics: 217

75.Discussions in Linguistics and Linguistics: 217

(qawl) and (bay'a) is the fall of the waw or the ya', so the fatha on them slipped to the attached fatha