

Arabization Revisited in the Third Millennium

Hasan Said Ghazala

Department of English , College of Social Sciences,
Uma Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Arabization has ever been one of the major concerns of the academic circles and the specialists concerned. It has gone through many ups and downs - more downs than ups – throughout the history of Arabic and Arab translation. Hot argument about its legitimacy, possibility and, necessity and usefulness is still going on in the Arab World. Much is written about it more emotionally than rationally in Arabic, but only occasionally rationally - if any - in English. The boundaries of this paper cover the major questions and aspects of the big issue of Arabization: legitimacy of Arabization and background issues; scientific terminology and Arabization: Problems and solutions and means of Arabization. It is hoped that covering this number of topics of Arabization would contribute significantly to the process of Arabization in our age of sunshine industries, computer sciences, the Internet technologies, the amazing revolution of communications, nuclear weapons and nanotechnology. These sciences in particular, and medical and other exact and applied sciences in general, bring forth a huge number of new terminologies that await Arabization in earnest. The ultimate objective of this paper is to argue for the urgent necessity for Arabization in the Third Millennium, not only as a matter of national pride, but also for teaching, educational, academic, socio-political, socio-religious and socio-cultural reasons. Its use, usefulness, validity and feasibility are remarkable linguistically, semantically as well as heuristically . It represents a challenge as the right and the duty to be taken up by Arab academics and specialists to meet the Arab Nation's urgent needs for education and knowledge in her own native Language, Arabic, by means of Arabization.

Key Words: Arabization, translation, scientific terms, problem, Language Academies

Introduction: Definitions and Boundaries

Arabization has been one of the major on-going topics in the field of translation studies and practice in the Arab World for centuries. It can be described as the central issue for Arab speakers and readers in particular. It is a topic that has never rounded up. Hot arguments among academics, specialists and individuals involved in Arabization are still going on about it: its possibility, use, applicability, validity and utilization, especially in this age of globalization, hegemony and superiority of English, the indisputable International Language of the present time.

Before proceeding, we may provide definitions particularly for two key terms used interchangeably and frequently throughout to distinguish between them, *Translation* and *Arabization*. As a field of knowledge and a discipline, translation covers all theories, activities, methods, procedures, problems and practices involving rendering (النقل) from one language into another. In this sense, Arabization is subsumed under the larger umbrella of the field of translation. In a broader sense, translation is taken to refer to rendering meaning from one language into another (see in particular Newmark (1988/95) and Ghazala (2008)). However, in a specific sense, it is an entry under Arabization as one of its major methods to mean the use of words, expressions and phrases which are already available in Arabic.

Arabization (or the awkward, 'Arabicization'!) (التعريب), on the other hand, is believed to be introduced in use for the first time by the widely reputed Arab Grammarian, Sibaweih, in his book, *The Book*. It has a traditional, dictionary, abstract, narrow-sensed and formal meaning of inscribing foreign terms in Arabic letters the way they are pronounced in their native origins – the so-called nowadays 'transference' (التحويل) (e.g. 'Internet' is Arabized as 'إنترنت') (see also Al-Waseet Dictionary, 1987; and Ghazala, 2001). Further, to our predecessors, an 'Arabized' word is a word that is pronounced, used and spelled in accordance with Arabic rules of pronunciation, spelling and grammar (تفوه بها بالكلمة) على منهاج العرب / يطبعها بالطابع العربي – the so-called now 'naturalization' (التطبيع) (e.g. 'topography' is naturalized into (طبوغرافيا)). See also Barazi, 1989, p.157; Sara, 1989, pp. 15-17; Shaheen (1986, p. 321); and the Arabic Language Dictionaries of Al-Waseet, Ibn Manzour, Al-Fairoozabadi, and Az-Zubaidi). In both cases, the foreign essence of the 'Arabized terms' is retained, especially in the former. Thus, they are described by the purist grammarians as (الدخيل / الترجمة الدخيلة) (loan translations / calques), which is a negative term indicating their foreign, non-Arabic origins intruding on Arabic Language and, hence, dismissed as unacceptable, sensitive and inferior to Arabic.

However, this definition is impractical, inefficient and completely partial in both senses of the word. Therefore, today, the definition of Arabization has undergone a considerable change in sense. It happened to interchange with translation in the general sense of the word (ibid.). Yet, I see this misleading, for Arabization is not exactly translation. Arabization is now a reference to all operations, techniques and methods involved in the process of rendering scientific / technical terms in particular into Arabic, using generally Arabic and Arabized words and phrases.

Translation - in the sense of using Arabic words and terms which already exist in Arabic language lexicon - has the lion's share in the whole process. Thus, usually, the Arabization of, say, medicine in Syria is an exclusive reference to the Arabization of medical terms rather than to the translation of medical books in general. Indeed Arabization is an essential means of reproducing the knowledge of the other in Arabic.

Now, it is high time to proceed in this background with the significance of Arabization.

1. Scope of Arabization

'Scope' is taken here in three senses with respect to Arabization. The first sense refers to the types of language and terms Arabized. The second sense refers to the expansion of the scope of the Arabized terms in favor of the Arabic ones. The third sense pertains to the semantic scope of the Arabized terms.

The first sense deals with the types of language and terms tackled by Arabizers. Arabization involves mainly the language of science and technology of all branches and fields: medicine, engineering, mathematics, geology, biology, chemistry, natural sciences, applied sciences, exact sciences, computer sciences, economics, agriculture and so on. This means that Arabization is primarily concerned with scientific (or technical) terms. Yes, but the scope of the type of Arabized terms is much wider than that. Although the major proportion of Arabized terminology is technical, all types of terms are addressed in Arabization to a lesser extent, though: literary, political, journalistic, legal, religious, administrative, institutional and even conversational terms. Therefore, in principle, all types of language, text and terminology have to be attended to, for each variety of language has a characteristic terminology of its own, which requires to be Arabized. Chief among these terms nowadays, and second to technical terms, are political and media terms which are in abundance and, hence, pose a considerable challenge to Arabizers and translators. On the other side of Arabic and Arabization, and by analogy, Anglicization has a real challenge put forward by Islamic terms.

The second scope of Arabization is concerned with the extent to which the door may be open for Arabized terms (in the sense of naturalized and transferred foreign terms vs. terms of Arabic origin). There are two counter views here. The first suggests opening the door wide to naturalized (e.g. 'technicalities' (تقنيات); 'topography' (طبوغرافيا), etc.) and transferred (e.g. 'acid' (أسيدي); 'radar' (رادار), etc.) terms which retain the foreign origin either partly (naturalization) or fully (transference). The reason is that those Arabized terms make no harm to Arabic Language lexicon and structure. A confirmation of this is that foreign languages have by analogy borrowed terms from other languages including Arabic in the same way, and their structures were not negatively affected. On the other hand, all languages borrow from one another throughout human history by way of affecting and being affected by one another. So, there is nothing wrong with Arabic borrowing from other languages in some way. Several languages including English, Turkish, Persian and perhaps more recently French and other live languages have accepted to

borrow a huge number of Arabic words and terms with pleasure, without much sensitivity. So 'why are we sensitive to their terms borrowed into our Language?', a question posed by advocates of this view. Another thin line of argument in favor of Arabized terms is the pretext that some of these terms, especially the transferred ones, are retained in Arabic to reflect and assure their foreign origin. Yet, further supportive argument of this claim is that Arabized terms make technical / scientific terms - which are common among researchers and specialists worldwide - public among Arabic Language speakers as well (see Hijazi, 1993, p. 149).

The third sense of the scope of Arabization deals with the semantic dimension of Arabized terms. It indicates specifically the Arabization of the meaning of a foreign term, or transferring it as such, untouched into Arabic, regardless of its semantic implications. There are certain foreign terms which are unarguably transferred in form only; they include foreign proper names (e.g. Johnson (جونسون)), trademarks (e.g. Microsoft (مايكروسوفت), etc.), names of medicines and drugs (amoxil (أموكسيل), etc.), chemical compounds, substances and elements (e.g. hydrogen (هيدروجين), etc.), names of many plants (e.g. aspidistra (أبيدسترا), etc.), animals (e.g. Plasmodium (بلاسموديم), etc.), minerals (e.g. magnesium (مغنسيوم), etc.), and so on. (Now many names of plants and animals in particular have been Arabized into their sense reference as Arabic terms (e.g. phylum mollusca (شعبة الرخويات) rather than (فيلام مولا سكا); hippotion celerio (فراشة ورق العنب), not هيبوتيون (سيليريو), etc.) (for more examples, see *ibid.*; Olabi, 2006; Ibrahim et al, 1998); and Zeinab et al, 2008).

Apart from these terms, the semantic scope of foreign terms is the basis of the whole process of Arabization. This semantic-based approach is the rule of Arabization into Arabic, and transference is the exception. Arabization is a semantic process that traces the accurate meanings of foreign terms before anything else to be expressed in Arabic Language in the clearest way possible. (See Ghazala, 2012b for extensive details about, and examples for terminology).

A significant view, probably the most renowned, can be pointed out in this connection. It is the viewpoint that dismisses Arabized terms as foreignized Arabic words which are alien to Arabic lexicon and grammar. Instead, foreign terms should be rendered to Arabic through Arabic equivalents of Arabic origin, a view upheld by the so-called purists (الصفائيون). They overemphasize the use of Arabic terms in everything, and scientific language is no exception as Arabic is confidently qualified to be the language of science as much as religion and literature. At the same time, they raise strong objections against borrowing foreign terms into Arabic, the language of the Holy Koran, with the pretext of protecting it from foreign invasion. Hence their negative nickname in Arabic, (المتزمتون) (the extremists). Perhaps they do not realize that the language of the Holy Koran includes a number of Arabized words of Roman, Persian, Assyrian and other origin (see Ghazala, 2012; Shaheen, 1986 and Emery, 1983). More argument about the topic is forthcoming in the next point.

2. Pros and Cons

Arabization is supposed to be an issue that gathers a momentum and consensus among all Arab people. Not quite. Arabization is one of the controversial issues among academics, specialists and individuals interested in the process. There are two major parties involved in the argument about it: Those who are against, and those who are with.

2.1 Cons

The foes of Arabization are the same as those of the Arabic Language. They are three major groups, some of who are vicious and malicious; others are misled; and still others are ignorant or careless. The last two groups are less serious than the first and can be rehabilitated. Yet, the first group is a very serious threat indeed and should be resisted by all academic means possible. It includes the following sub-groups:

- (1) Non-Arab adversaries who fight against the Arabic Language and Arabization by all means to undermine it as old-fashioned, archaic, incapacitated, inert in meeting the challenge of new terminology, and thus, unqualified to be recognized as an international language. Those foreigners started their campaign against Arabic early in the Nineteenth Century. The most notorious names are the orientalist, Wilcos, Wilmore, the orientalist, Vassinon, the orientalist, and Colin who called for substituting Arabic dialect for formal Arabic (see Ghoneim, 1990, p. 25). Arabic is now one of the major Languages of the United Nations Organization as well as the languages of the world today. This aggressive attitude from some Non-Arabs is understandable and expected, especially from enemies.
- (2) The Arab foes of the Arabic Language and Arabization from within the Arab People who followed foreign writers and orientalist suit, calling for disposing of Arabic Alphabet to be replaced by Latin Alphabet. Their alleged reason was that Arabic could not be a universal, civilized Language unless it was transcribed in Latin letters. The most notorious name in this connection was the Egyptian, Abdul-Aziz Fahmi Pasha, the leader of the Egyptian Constitutional Liberals Party in the forties and fifties of the Twentieth Century. He had terrible passion for obliterating Arabic Alphabet entirely, a call which was refuted and attacked viciously by Arabic Language and the Holy Koran lovers. However, his claim gathered momentum in Turkey, Indonesia and Somalia, where Arabic letters were replaced by Latin letters (1977). Other names who supported Fahmi were the Syrian priest, Maron Ghosn and the Egyptian Salamah Mosa.
- (3) Other Arab antagonists to Arabization were those who called for the disposal of formal Arabic, the Language of the Koran, the Prophet's Tradition and Arabic literary heritage, in favor of colloquial Arabic and local dialect, both in speech and writing, including poetry, prose and other literary genres. Their pretext was the latter's easiness, absence of parsing (الإعراب), common form (?) and popularity among Arab speakers. However, implicit in this vicious and suspicious invitation is a call for dividing not only Arab Countries, but also the same Country into several regional factions due to differences among Arabic dialects even in the same Country, as the case may be everywhere in the world. More seriously, it is a call for fanaticism, tribalism, anti-Arab and anti-Arabic movements, like the invitation for Pharaohism, Lebanism, and so on. Chief among those enemies of formal Arabic (in addition to the names aforementioned) were Ahmad Lutfi Assayed, Luis Awad, Mahmood Azmi, Ameen Al-Khuli, Fayez Jader, Yusef Al-Aani, Yusef Al-Khal, Said Horaniah,

Anees Freihah, and Said Aql, to name some (see Ghoneim, 1990 and Barazi, 1989, pp. 48 - 62).

- (4) The penetration of English Language and Western culture of all aspects of life of the Arab Society, especially the language and terminologies of technology, sciences and products these days more than ever. The case being so, a number of academics and specialists who read for higher degrees (MA / MSc and Ph.D.) in the United States, the United Kingdom or in Western Universities were influenced, or misled by a false fact about English, the Universal Language of the age, which can replace Arabic Language at school and higher education levels. Obviously, this means that there is no need for Arabization since the original Language of sciences and technology, English, can be adopted in all fields and departments of education, be theoretical or practical, except for the Arabic Language and the Holy Koran courses. A nudge of unexpected support for their argument was granted by the stumbled process of Arabization and the great shortage in the Arabized terms which are lagging miles away behind. More encouragement is received by their poor Arabic and lack of spirit to Arabization. Yet, this is no justification for them to turn their back to their great mother tongue. The sense of belonging and national pride for an Arab is undoubtedly Arabic-oriented, not English-oriented (see also Ghazala, 2001 & 2012b for further argument).

2.2 The Pros

So much for the cons of Arabization, now we review the pros. This group is gladly the majority. They have many good reasons to argue for the validity, credibility, importance and urgency of Arabization. I believe their argument makes sense:

- (1) It is a matter of course that any live language can render other languages' terms and meanings into its own, however variably. So in principle, Arabic is obviously qualified to Arabize foreign terminology in a way or another. In fact, the controversy among the proponents of Arabization is not about the legitimacy of Arabization, but about its methods and procedures.
- (2) Another matter of fact is that Language is the identity of its native people. Further, it is the cultural tool of thinking and shaping the people's minds. As Saber declares: (ليس التعريب بقضية لغة، بل هو قضية حضارية أساسية ... فاللغة ليست ألفاظاً، بل هي فكر. وبالتالي لا بد من تطوير *Arabization is not merely a linguistic issue, but rather an essential issue of civilization... . Language is not merely words, but thought. It follows from this that the development of the Arab Community and the absorption of today's civilization is a must that cannot be realized otherwise but by means of language as a means and a tool*) (1982. In Ghoneim, 1990, p. 116). Therefore, a change of language leads to a change of identity and culture.
- (3) The originality, solidity, systematicity, orderliness and standardization of Arabic language lexicon and grammar are deeply rooted and well-established a long time ago in history. It has retained all these epithets and developed them regularly and steadily throughout. These facts about Arabic are recognized not only by Arabs, but also by Western linguists and grammarians. A case in point is Crystal's Encyclopedia of Language (1990) on the Arab World. So how come that a language with this proud heritage and history can be disqualified for meeting the demands of Arabization?

- (4) Hebrew, the language of our enemies, the Jews in Palestine, is as ancient as Arabic. It was a dead language and out of use. However, the Jews, who occupied Palestine, established a fake State by force there, whose official language is Hebrew. The extinct language is brought back to life by the Zionist Jews to become their native language in all aspects of life and education, including scientific and technical terms of all branches of science. Thus, a dead language unearthed from the grave has recently been reinstated as the official language of a nation and proved competent to embrace scientific and other foreign terms comfortably. So, naturally, an ever live Language like Arabic should be yet much more qualified and competent than an originally dead language, to accommodate all types of terms through Arabization, no doubt about that. It is just the disability and lack of impetus and willingness of its native speakers who allege its incompetence for Arabization. Jabr said that it is the hope that Arabic Language be set free out of bar to be placed with its native speakers (1994).
- (5) Arabic has always been an influential language. Many languages including European, Turkish, Persian and other languages, old and new, have borrowed from Arabic over the ages. This is another piece of confirmed evidence that Arabic is a solid, rich, systematic and highly elaborated lexically, grammatically as much as phonologically. (see also Barazi, 1989, p. 166). Among the English words that were borrowed from Arabic a long time ago are: سمت (zenith); قطن (cotton); صفر (cipher/zero); صك (cheque); شراب (syrup); دار الصناعة (arsenal); كافور (camphor); كوب (cup); قهوة (coffee); شاي (tea); سكر (sugar); موسمية (رياح) (monsoon); حبل (cable); خرّوب (carob); شاش (shash); الجبر (algebra); العطاراة (alizari); الحنظل (alhandal); and hundreds of others (see Shaheen, 1986, pp. 304-307; Hijazi, 1993, p. 147; Ghoneim, 1990, p. 11-21; Oxford Dictionary of English, 1993 & 2010 and others). In addition to Arabic words in English, Ghoneim also lists some Arabic terms borrowed into the following languages: German, French, Persian, Indonesian, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and Sicilian. Now Arabic borrowings into English in particular have become in thousands, due to the flux of Islamic terms all over the World today.
- (6) Arabic has never been a fossilized or closed-system language. It has been borrowing from other languages since antiquity and still, like any live and lively world language.
- (7) Formal Arabic, though comparatively difficult, should be the type of language used in Arabization. Colloquial Arabic, though allegedly easier than formal Arabic, should not be involved in Arabization. The simple reason is that, unlike English, these two varieties are completely separate from one another. While in English formal and colloquial can be sometimes used in written English, formal Arabic is the only variety used in writing, whereas colloquial Arabic is confined to daily communication and TV and Radio series, dialogues and talk-show programs. So, using colloquial Arabic in Arabization is not recommended. Further, which colloquial dialect (or dialects) would be used, the Saudi, the Jordanian, the Syrian, the Moroccan, the Lebanese, the Libyan or, perhaps, the Egyptian? There is no consensus on a specific dialect of these to be used. Thus, the huge number of Arabic dialects in the Arab Countries and in each Country is another good reason to exclude colloquial Arabic in Arabization. A third reason is the false claim that formal Arabic is difficult and queer. English uses perhaps the most difficult and bizarre language in the world as its source of terminology, that is, Latin, the deceased Language. Some English (or rather Latin) terms are quite awkward to read, spell and pronounce, (as confirmed by many examples cited in this textbook), yet no one

of those objecting to Arabization has protested against it. So, why protest against formal Arabic which is much easier than the Latin jargon? I mean to say that difficulty is a matter of frequency of use and familiarity. The more a term is frequent in use, the less awkward and difficult. By contrast, the less a term is frequent in use, the more awkward. Perhaps the trouble with the great efforts of Language Academies in the Arab World is the lack of field work which was supposed to support their good recommendations for Arabization. That is not to say that Language Academies are responsible for these deficiencies, anyway.

- (8) Arabization is indeed a public demand for the whole Arab Nation and Arab and Arabic speakers, and not limited to specialists and students. Therefore, Arabizers and translators are required to think nationwide and respond to their needs in the first place. Specialists who know the language of the origin of terms need not Arabization, but are required to Arabize for the public and in the public interest (see also Ghazala, 2003).
- (9) Finally, the most influential argument in favor of Arabization is the protection and endorsement of the Language of the Holy Koran, the holiest of the holy books for Muslims. The language of Arabization is the same language of the Koran. The Holy Koran was revealed in 4000 Arabic lexical units out of 40000 units, the total count of the lexical units of Arabic then. Thus, a tenth of Arabic lexicon has with the will of God come out with inimitable language and style that hundreds of translations into most of the live world languages have fallen miles short of it (see Also Ghoneim, 1990, pp.40-42)

This reflects the incredible potential of Arabic lexicon. Now this number has become much greater than that (see Ghazala, 2003). One may wonder how a Language chosen by the Almighty God for His greatest Book ever to be described as rigid, fossilized, backward, closed in system, defective, sterile, incompetent, or disqualified to Arabize. Those writers and specialists are advised strongly to go back on their words and reconsider their attitudes against Arabic in the light of the grandeur of the Language of God in the Holy Koran, if not for any. It is not only the language of religion, as Latin is, but also the language of daily life, education, thinking, perception and all written varieties of Arabic. Unlike Latin, which died a long time ago, the classical Arabic of the Koran has reserved Arabic as a live language and at the same time has enlivened all stages of the development of Arabic Language over time up to now. In effect, a situation of overlap has emerged that any separation between this variety and other new developments is not possible. Oddly enough, when the Arab and Muslim Worlds used to produce knowledge, Arabic flourished, but when they only consume knowledge, their Arabic language use is rather restricted!

In sum, the attitudes of the opponents and exponents of Arabization confirm that the process of Arabization is naturally doomed to continue with a great momentum. Arabization is the natural course of things and unquestionable right for Arabic as much as any other live language in the world. I believe this argument about the legitimacy of Arabization is a waste of time and a part of history now. Instead, focus has shifted some time ago onto the practical problems of

Arabization and how to conduct solutions to them, the point to discuss next. Time never runs back.

3. Problems of Arabization and Solutions: Language Academies

Problems of Arabization and their solutions are legitimate focal points about which constructive, hot argument is still going on. Here we may have different views on the volume of problems and the solutions that may be suggested to them.

One of these problems is the shortage in the number and performance of the official institutions of Arabization in the Arab world. Following is a list of these institutions:

1. Language Academies.
2. The Coordination Bureau of Arabization (CBA) (ALECSO, the Arab League, Rabat, Morocco).
3. Translation Centers.
4. Universities and Colleges.
5. Scientific Research Centers / Institutes.

Theoretically speaking, these institutions are more than enough to meet the demands of Arabization properly. However, in practice, things are not going well. The last three types of institutions contribute little to the whole efforts and process of Arabization for academic, financial and mainly political reasons. As to (2), the Coordination Bureau of Arabization (مكتب التنسيق التعريب) is one of the main bureaus of the Arab League since its establishment in 1945 in Cairo. It celebrated its golden jubilee in 2011, having been founded in 1961 as an independent Bureau and was put to action in 1962. Until 1965, it was called "the Permanent Bureau of Conference of Arabization. (المكتب الدائم لمؤتمر التعريب). Then in 1970, it became one Department of the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific organization (ALECSO), one of the major organizations of the Arab League. Its headquarters is in Rabat, Morocco. Since inception, its sole function has been the Coordination of Arabization in the Arab World. Among its main objectives are:

- (1) Coordinating the concerted efforts to develop Arabic.
- (2) Following up the progress of the process of Arabization.
- (3) Enriching Arabic Language with coordinated terminology.
- (4) Staging Conferences on Arabization.
- (5) Following up the progress of the work of Language Academies.
- (6) Collaborating with Language Academies and other academic institutions.
- (7) Staging the symposia related to the CBA.
- (8) Propagating terminology all over the Arab Countries and some overseas bodies.
- (9) Publishing the dictionaries endorsed by the regular Conference on Arabization which is held every three years.
- (10) Reporting on Arabization affairs and progress.

(See Al-Sayyadi, 1980):

These are really ambitious objectives and put the whole issue of Arabization on the right track. Had these aims been achieved, they would have resolved all the problems of Arabization and settled the whole issue by now. Unfortunately, most of them have not been realized. The Bureau started in 1962 with a great ambition and impetus. Several substantial steps were taken on the ground, and the progression of the functions of the Bureau was amazing. Thousands of foreign terms were Arabized; a good number of dictionaries of different specialisms were published; a number of symposia and conferences were staged by the Bureau and the ALECSO; and annual issues of its refereed Periodical, *Al-Lisan Al-Arabi* were published regularly (fifty issues from 1964-2001).

Those achievements are good, but they are just not enough. Further, although the number of terms Arabized by the Bureau so far are in tens of thousands, they fall sharply short of the many hundreds of thousands – not to say millions - of terms that demand Arabization. More surprisingly, the terms Arabized and the dictionaries published by the Bureau suffered an utter failure of circulation to most Arab Countries and their academic and educational institutions and public sectors. They had no access to these terms, dictionaries, or *Al-Lisan Al-Arabi* due to bad publication and distribution policies and lack of coordination among Arab academic institutions. Arab Universities and academics, for example, have no communications or coordination, direct or indirect, with the Bureau of Coordination of Arabization. Oddly enough, *Al-Lisan Al-Arabi* Journal ceased to be published eleven years ago (the last issue was in 2001), and the latest in the series of the Unified Dictionaries (a total of 25) was published in 1999 (see Ghazala, 2012b for a full list). However, lately, a largely revised new edition of The Unified Medical Dictionary (1973) was published by the Council of Arab Ministers of Health, World Health Organization, in 2009, 4th Edition. In addition, these dictionaries, though undoubtedly useful, are generally small in size and number of terms (The Unified Medical Dictionary just quoted is an exception. The Bureau is not to blame for all that. It is the responsibility of the serious differences among Arab politicians and shameful partition of Arab Countries. No doubt about that.

As to the Academies of the Arabic Language (مجامع اللغة العربية) (Henceforth LAs), they are the official institutions that are mainly in charge of Arabization. They were originally established for this purpose. They are the authorized source to suggest new terminology and export it to the academic institutions and official bodies of the Arab Countries as well as the general public to be put in use. In fact, Language Academies never asked Arab scientists to spread knowledge about basic scientific facts from medicine or any scientific field in simplified Arabic for the public to read and develop an affinity with their language. Supposedly, and as the case in Advanced Countries like Germany, Great Britain, France, Italy and Spain, there should be only ONE Arabic Academy in the Arab World for the Language is ONE. However, and due to political and geographical divisions among the Arab States, there are several Language Academies. Obviously, they are not of equal importance in terms of activity and productivity. The first three on the next list only are in function now; the rest, however, are not, except perhaps for one or two at local level like Rabat Academy. They are many in number, but the most renowned of

them are those of Damascus, (Syria, the Oldest: 1919); Cairo (Egypt, 1932), Rabat (Morocco, 1962) and Amman (Jordan, 1924).

Some of the objectives of the Arabic Language Academies are defined as follows (taken from the objectives of the three major Academies of Damascus, Cairo and Jordan, as defined on their websites, the latest edition, 2011):

- (1) Preserving the integrity of Arabic Language, and enabling it to meet the requirements of Humanities, Sciences and Arts to keep up with the demands of a sophisticated way of life.
- (2) Suggesting scientific, technical, arts, literary and other latest terminologies in accordance with a clearly defined methodology, with a view to unifying them, and then circulating them over the Arab World.
- (3) Reviving Arabic heritage in sciences, arts and humanities with respect to textual criticism and publishing.
- (4) Observing the origins and roots of the Arabic Language, checking its measures and molds, and doing everything possible to serve, develop and circulate it.
- (5) Fighting the serious dissemination of Colloquial Arabic in different fields.
- (6) Encouraging authorship, translation and publication.
- (7) Establishing a library for the Academy.
- (8) Translating the world masterpieces and publishing books translated from and into Arabic.
- (9) Publishing the new terms that are duly unified in the Arabic Language in the various mass media, and disseminating them to the governmental departments.
- (10) Publishing a journal/gazette by the Academy.

Language academies are well-established, well-administered, well-financed and well-equipped governmental institutions. Their members are among the best – some are the best - language specialists in their Countries and the Arab World. They have achieved a good deal of work. They have produced piles of paper work of recommendations, resolutions, proceedings of conferences, agendas and minutes of meetings, and a good number of Arabized terms. They have also published books, and consistent series of unified dictionaries, gazettes, periodicals and journals of their own. (See Ghazala, 2012b, for a list of the Unified Dictionaries published by ALECSO: the Bureau of Coordination of Arabization).

BUT – and it is a big but! - on the ground, they are not all that impressive. They are known to be sluggish in response to Arabizing and devising new Arabic terms for foreign scientific terminologies. Perhaps their routine procedures have led them to lag well behind with respect to the monolithic numbers of ever increasing foreign scientific terms in particular. Tawfeeq Da'bool, a member of Damascus Academy, said recently that the total of what had been translated into Arabic since the era of the Abbasid Caliph, Al-Mamoon (198-218H. / 813-833) up to now is less than the books translated into Spanish in Spain (see Ghazala, 2005). Moreover, the terms Arabized by them either remain on paper in their archives without being given a chance to be used practically in daily life or educational institutions, or are put in use to a limited extent within the home Countries of the Academies by some specialists only. In fact, there are no

applications of the sociolinguistic dimension of Arabization as a language planning issue; no field work surveys on the feasibility of newly Arabized terms; and, eventually, no reference to the frequency of use by large segments of society.

More to that, a number of these terms are purely specialist-oriented, complicated, long and perhaps awkward to spell and pronounce. These are good reasons for the layman Arab to denounce them. Therefore, the need arises for the sociolinguistic parameters to be put in use: feasibility, simplicity, economy and plausibility. One further problem is the differences and discrepancies among the Arab academies and their decisions with respect to Arabization methods and Arabized terms. In other words, with one or two exceptions, the real unification of terms among the academies is absent on the ground, even though they formed a Federation between 1970-1997 to achieve that. For example, on more than one occasion, the academies of Damascus and Cairo agreed upon certain Arabized terms, but one academy changed its mind a little later. A case in point is the Arabization of the term, 'microscope' into (مجهر) by both academies. However, the Cairo academy soon went back on its word and changed it through transference into (ميكروسكوب). To resolve such conflicts, and as pointed out earlier, they have to resort to field work, and frequency of use should be a MUST.

Another snag is the Arabization of a term by academies into a specific term, then later they suggest an alternative for it for one reason or another. An example is the Arabization of 'telephone' into (ارزيز) first, to be changed later into (هاتف); and so on. This distorted situation of the academies was confirmed by dissolving their Federation in 1997 due to sharp differences among them. Yet, one further disadvantage of the Arabized terms of the academies is the lack of accuracy of terminology in Arabic. These drawbacks would discredit them and their resolutions in the eyes of specialists as much as the public. (See also Hijazi, (1993) and Shaheen (1986) for further examples and argument).

A further problem of Arabization - especially these days - is the specialists' lack of passion to Arabize. They are probably misled and overwhelmed by the Anglicized World around them, which gives them the false impression that Arabization has lost its momentum and credibility. English is now everywhere and anywhere; and learning and teaching it would solve the intriguing problem of Arabization. This frustrating view is boosted by the, lethargy and failure of Language Academies and other official institutions of Arabization to achieve substantial objectives. As pointed out earlier, and as has been stressed throughout this work, these are no justifications for a whole Nation like ours to turn its back to the issue of Arabization, which is a matter of life or death for us. After all, specialists Arabize for the whole nation, not for themselves or their peers. We have to admit the shortage, powerlessness and inefficiency of the institutions of Arabization, but we can never give up passion for Arabization

A third problem is the lack of commitment to using Arabized terms on the part of the specialists, educational institutions as well as the general public. This indicates carelessness, irresponsibility and sense of amazement and inferiority toward English. The foreign term still takes precedence to any Arabic term, even an old one, or of an Arabic origin (e.g. *كمبيوتر* rather than *حاسب*; *بنك*, not the old and Arabic *مصرف*; *شيزوفرينيا* instead of *انفصام شخصية*, etc.). This regrettable situation can be rehabilitated by a refreshed effective process of Arabization at all levels of language use.

The inactive role of the mass media relative to Arabization is an ample problem that hinders the promotion of Arabized terms. Nowadays, the media are tremendously influential and can have great impact on the public opinion about Arabization and Arabized terminology. But they have not assumed this responsibility as yet. Perhaps the media would pick on some poor examples of Arabization like the Arabization of 'sandwich' by language academies a long time ago into "الشاطر والمشطور وما بينهما" (rather than لفافة) (see Karmi, 1987) and the explanation of 'elixir' as مشهور الاسم معدوم الجسم (to mean إكسير – which is after all Arabic in origin). Being mostly official and governmental, the media is closer to informal, disorderly Arabization of the daily communication of the man in the street. It is high time now for the media of all types at the age of aggressive Anglicization to take Arabization seriously and positively with the purpose of encouraging the public to use Arabic terms responsibly.

Probably, the most serious stumbling block to Arabization is its politicization and subjection to the political decision. Many Arab rulers support Arabization on paper, in conferences, political rhetorics and propaganda speeches. However, in action, most of them ignore it and barely support it whether financially, academically or educationally. Perhaps with one exception of Syria, the application of Arabization at educational and public levels is limited in most Arab Countries. The only level which can be described as Arabized in these countries is political language (political statements. Communiqués, speeches, press conferences, press releases, political reports and news (see Ghazala, 2012a).

Arabization is a fact that cannot be changed, marginalized or ignored. It is also a fact that academic institutions and politics are not only to blame for the unfortunate situation of Arabization; we, individuals, are to blame too. The lethargic official institutions in the process of Arabization has been compatible with lethargic individuals. The shortcomings of institutions are no justification for individual writers, thinkers, specialists, translation theorists, professional translators and linguists to wait and see with no action being taken on their part. These individuals can do many things indeed. Our heritage of Arabic Language, knowledge, science, humanities and arts has been achieved by individuals, not by academies or institutions. The great masterpieces and encyclopedias by figures like Ibn Manzoor (ابن منظور), (the author of the greatest Arabic Language Dictionary ever: *Lisanu l-Arab* (لسان العرب) (15 vols.)), Al-Jahez (الجاحظ), Ibn Qutaibah (ابن قتيبة), Al-Asfahani (الأصفهاني), Ibn Abd Rabboh (ابن عبد ربه), Al-Qalqashandi (القلقشندي), Ibn Hajar (ابن حجر), and many others (see Ash-Shak'ah, 2009 and its translation by Ghazala, 2010 for an exhaustive list):

The creativity of the Arab Nation never runs out. Today, the series of great works is continued with individuals like Ash-Shihabi's *Dictionary of Agricultural and Allied Dictionary (English-Arabic)*, 1982); Al-Khateeb's *Dictionaries of Scientific and Technical Terms (English-Arabic / Arabic-English)*, 1984 & 2000), the translation of McGraw Hill's *Dictionary of Science and Technology Terms* (4 vols.) by a team of Arab specialists and translators (1986); and *Al-Mawred Dictionaries (English-Arabic / Arabic-English)*, Lane's Arabic-English Dictionary (8 vol.), 1997 and *The Unified Medical Dictionary by the World Health Organization* (2009, 4th Edition), to name some.

3. Significant Statistics about Arabization

Arabization has been at times slow and disappointing, yet it has never come to a complete halt. The following statistics are restricted to modern time, covering the last three decades of the Twentieth Century and the first decade of the Twenty First Century. They are official statistics supplied by official bodies and institutions, Arabic and International. They are meant to trace the movement of Arabization and translation in the past forty years, with a view to give a good idea about the works achieved in the Arab World over this period of time:

The statistics of the books translated in the Arab Countries between 1970-1980, provided by the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO) is provided in Ghoneim, 1990, p. 165. The percentages of these statistics indicate that Egypt is in the first place by 62%, followed by Oman by 17%, then Iraq by 9%. On the other hand, the same statistics of the ALECSO show the percentages of the fields of knowledge of the translated books, with only 14% of the total number being books in basic and applied sciences.

On the other hand, the statistics of the books authored annually in all fields in the Arab World, compared to those written in other Countries over twenty years (1970-1990) are introduced by the *UNESCO Statistical Bookyear* in Paris. The percentage demonstrates that the Arab Countries lag terribly behind the rest of the world in this connection(see Ghoneim, 1990, pp. 189-191).

Further statistics of the books translated annually in some Countries show that the Arab Countries translate the least number:

Germany	8000	Japan	2600
Austria	8000	Sweden	1900
Switzerland	8000	Denmark	1600
Spain	7000	Hungary	1250
Holland	4000	Bulgaria	720
France	4000	Arab Countries	350

Total:	47420
--------	-------

The fourth statistics are taken from the *UNESCO Index Translationum* regarding the number of books translated between 1970-2003 worldwide. The total is 1.5 million works, only 8000 of which are in Arabic. These are generally cultural, educational, political and popular fiction books of public interest, translated from English.

In Saudi Arabia, to take an example of statistics at the individual level, the total of the books translated into Arabic are 1260 between 1930-2005, which means an annual average of 16 books. However, since the translation movement started in 1955 in the Kingdom, the average goes up to 25 books a year (i.e. two books per month). Still the total number of translated books went up higher in 2002 to become 170 works. The number of the books translated between 1990-2004 was 805, which is comparatively remarkable.

In 1999, the number of books translated in the Arab world went up from 175 to 330, then up to 2000 books in 2010. Though still not up to expectations, this latest number is encouraging compared to the number ten years ago, and considering the less spirited enthusiasm to translation. Another incentive has lately emerged with the translation awards in the Arab World: *King Abdullah Translation Award* (English-Arabic-English: five awards in five areas). Over 700 works took part in the fourth session of the Award (1431H. / 2010). Another famous Award is *Sheikh Zayed Book Award*, the Translation Section, which received 200-300 entries in translation only. Added to these statistics are the 100 large-size volumes (10 million words) translated annually by *ARAMCO*, of Saudi Arabia (see also Othman, 2010).

The purpose of providing these statistics is not so much to pinpoint the deficiency of Arabization and translation movement as to stress the significant fact that Arabization is important, possible, innate, impulsive, necessary, inevitable and on the move over time, past and present.

5. Conclusion

This paper has readdressed the major issues of Arabization in the new millennium in contemporary terms. It has demonstrated the persistence of the problem of Arabization despite the fact that all means of solving them have never been as perfectly available as they are now. Yet, thwarting serious attempts of Arabization still prevails. There has been an invitation throughout for specialists, translators, Arabizers and jealous men of knowledge to refuse to despair for Arabic is never on the wane. They have all reasons to be encouraged rather than discouraged to exert yet greater efforts to achieve a satisfactory level of Arabization in our age, the age of the most sophisticated technology and communications and national and cultural pride. This reassures the legitimacy, vividness, continuity, urgency, indispensability and perpetuity of Arabization.

About the Author:

HASAN SAID GHAZALA is currently a full Professor of Stylistics and Translation at the English Department, College of Social Sciences, Umm Al-Qura University, Makkah Al-Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia. He is a graduate of the UK Universities (MA in *Translation and Linguistics*, Bath University, 1983, and Ph.D. in *Stylistics*, Nottingham University, 1987). He has so far published (20) books and (44) papers in the two areas of his specialism

References

- Al-Lisan Al-Arabi* (1995). A journal of Arabization published by the Coordination Bureau of Arabization, 40.
- Al-Sayyadi, M. (1980). *Arabization and its coordination in the Arab World* (in Arabic): Beirut: Markaz Dirasat Al-Wahdah Al-Arabiah.
- Ash-Shak'ah, M. (2009). *Arab scholars' methodologies of authorship: The literary section* (in Arabic). Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lilmalayin.
- Ash-Shihabi, M. (1965). *Classical and modern Arabic scientific terminology*. (in Arabic). Damascus: Damascus Arabic Language Academy Publications.
- Baalbaki, M. (1996). *Al-Mawrid: A modern English-Arabic dictionary*. Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lilmalayin.
- Baalbaki, M. (2004). *Al-Mawrid Al-Akbar: A modern English-Arabic dictionary*. Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lilmalayin.
- Baalbaki, M. (1988 edn). *Al-Mawrid: A modern Arabic-English dictionary*. Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lilmalayin.
- Baalbaki, R. M. (1990). *Dictionary of linguistic terms: English- . Arabic*. (Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lilmalayin.
- Barazi, M. (1989). *Problems of modern Arabic Language* (in Arabic). Amman: Maktabat Al-Risalah.
- Crystal D. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: CUP. not APA we cannot write two years
- Damascus Academy of the Arabic Language Website* (2011).
- Fahmi, H. H. (1961). *A Reference book on the Arabization of scientific, technical and engineering terms* (in Arabic). Cairo: Maktabat Al-Nahdah Al-Misriyyah.
- Ghazala, H. (2001). Arabization from A to Z (in Arabic). *Majallat At-ta'reeb*, 21, 41-65.
- Ghazala, H. (2003). Translation of literary terms (in Arabic). *'Alaamaat*: 48, 7-41.
- Ghazala, H. (2005). Arabization in the age of foreignization (in Arabic). (*A symposium*), 1, 94-101.
- Ghazala, H. (2008). *Translation as problems and solutions: A textbook for university students and trainee translators*. Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lil- Malayin.

- Ghazala, H. (2010). *Arab scholars' methodologies of literary authorship*. Jeddah: Kunooz Al-Marifa. (trans.) Ash-Shak'ah, M. (2009). *Arab scholars' methodologies of authorship: The literary section* (in Arabic). Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lilmalayin.
- Ghazala, H. (2011). *Cognitive stylistics & the translator*. London: Sayyab Books.
- Ghazala, H. (2012a). *Translating the media and political idiom: A textbook for university students*. Jeddah: Kunooz Al-Marifa.
- Ghazala, H. (2012b). *Arabization from A to Z: A textbook for university students*. Jeddah: Kunooz Al-Marifa.
- Ghoneim, K. (1990). *Arabic Language and modern scientific wake* (in Arabic). Cairo: Maktabat Ibn Sina.
- Hijazi, M.F. (1993). *The linguistic roots of terminology*. Cairo: Maktab at Ghareeb.
- Hitti, Y. & Al-Khatib, A. (1989) *Hitti's new medical dictionary: English-Arabic* Beirut: Librairie du Liban: Beirut. *Holy Koran* (the).
- Khayat, M.H. (2009). *The unified medical dictionary: English- French -Arabic* (4th edn). Beirut: World Health Organization & Librairie du Liban.
- Lane. E.W.(1997). *Maddul-kamoos: An Arabic-English lexicon* (8 vols.). Beirut: Librairie Du Liban.
- McGraw, H. (2002). *McGraw Hill's dictionary of science and technology terms*. McGraw Hill's, Inc.
- Newmark, P. (1988/1995). *A textbook of translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Othman, A. (2010). Translation: An issue on hot fire (in Arabic). *Al Qafilah*, 14-23.
- Oxford (1984). *Oxford dictionary of English Language* (24 vols.). Oxford University Press. Oxford (2000). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford University Press.
- Oxford (2002). *Oxford collocations dictionary for students of English* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
- Oxford (2010). *Oxford dictionary of English* (3rd edn). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Qalalah, M.S. (1988). *Westernization of thought, politics and economics* (in Arabic). Damascus: Dar Al-Fikr.
- Sara, Q. (1989). *Arabization: efforts and horizons* (in Arabic). Damascus & Beirut: Dar Al-Hijrah.
- Shaheen , A. (1986). *Arabic, the language of science and technology* (in Arabic). Dammam: Dar As-Salah.
- Stetkevych, J. (2007). *The Modern Arabic of literary language: Lexical and stylistic Developments*: Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Team of University Teachers (1986). *Arabic Translation of McGraw Hill's dictionary of science and technology terms* (2002). Beirut: Ma'had Al-Inmaa Al-Arabi.
- Wikipedia Website*. Available at <http://www.wikipedia.org/World Health Organization> (2005). *The unified dictionary of anatomy*. Beirut: World Health Organization & Librairie du Liban.