The Problems of Arabisation in the Arabic Language

Dr. MELAL Wahiba

University of Batna 1 - Algeria .Email: wahibamelal05@gmail.com

Abstract:

The contemporary era has witnessed rapid scientific and technological advancements, resulting in a substantial influx of foreign terminology. This development has rendered linguistic Arabisation in the Arabic language a profoundly contentious and pressing issue. Arabisation constitutes a fundamental means of keeping pace with scientific innovations while preserving linguistic identity; however, its realisation is confronted with multiple challenges. These challenges include the slow pace of term Arabisation relative to scientific progress, the multiplicity of Arabic equivalents for a single concept, the lack of effective coordination among linguistic institutions, and the dominance of foreign languages in education and scientific research. A clear divergence in attitudes towards Arabisation is also evident, ranging from those who regard it as a civilisational and cultural necessity to those who consider the use of foreign terms more precise and easier to disseminate. From this perspective, the present research paper seeks to demonstrate that the success of Arabisation depends on the standardisation of terminology, the organisation of institutional efforts, and the enhancement of cooperation between language academies and scientific institutions. Such measures would enable Arabic to fulfil its role in knowledge production and keep pace with the modern age.

Introduction:

The Arabic language has been regarded as one of the greatest languages throughout history owing to its rich cultural and civilisational heritage and its capacity to express diverse fields of knowledge. With the rapid scientific and technological development of the modern era, an urgent need has emerged to Arabise foreign terminology to facilitate communication and translate modern sciences into Arabic. However, the process of Arabisation has not been free of difficulties, including the rapid pace of scientific

development, the multiplicity of translations for a single term, and weak coordination among linguistic institutions. Consequently, the problems of linguistic Arabisation have become a central issue attracting the attention of those concerned with preserving the identity of the Arabic language and ensuring its ability to keep pace with the times.

1. Semantic Generation:

Semantic generation is a linguistic mechanism for producing new terms to express modern concepts. It is a linguistic procedure that establishes a new or innovative semantic relationship between a signifier and a signified that has previously been associated within a specific field. In other words, it involves the creation of a new meaning that did not previously exist (*sensually*), that is, a meaning to which no linguistic unit (signifier) had been assigned despite the existence of a signifier denoting a particular meaning. It is a (formative and precision-oriented) procedure that serves two objectives: formation and precision. As indicated by its lexicographical meaning, it entails the creation of new lexical meanings and new semantic structures. Accordingly, creativity operates at the level of meaning through reliance on metaphor, which brings together different semantic groups that can be described and whose representations can be analysed, as well as

through semantic composition and lexical semantic annotations. [1] Among the manifestations of semantic generation are metaphor, translation, borrowing, and Arabisation.

2. Borrowing and Arabisation in Arabic:

In the context of openness to other civilisations and cultures, the Arabic language has incorporated numerous foreign terms, a phenomenon known as linguistic borrowing. Borrowing occurs when a word is taken from another language in an almost unchanged form, without significant modification to its structure or pronunciation. With the increasing need to express modern scientific and technical concepts, Arabisation has emerged, in which foreign words are adapted to Arabic grammar, thereby becoming clearer. This process seeks to achieve a balance between benefiting from foreign scientific knowledge and preserving Arabic linguistic identity.

Linguistic borrowing is a form of linguistic cloning, as described by Bani Amiri, who stated: "Cloning is the reproduction of a living organism from another living organism through specific biological procedures. We, however, have applied this term to a living linguistic phenomenon common to all languages, akin to biological cloning. In French, each cloned word

among these exchanged terms is referred to as an *emprunt*, whereas in modern Arabic, the term 'borrowed' (*muqtarad*) is used, which constitutes a semantic derivation or a literal translation of the French term. Early Arabs applied a range of terms to these clones, including *al-dakhīl* (intrusive), *al-gharīb* (foreign), *al-aʿjamī* (non-Arabic), and *al-muʿarrab* (Arabised). Later, scholars added other terms, such as *al-muqtabas* (adopted) and *al-manqūl* (transferred). Contemporary scholars have almost settled on two terms: *al-muqtarad* (borrowed) and *al-muʿarrab* (Arabised) for the cloned word, and *al-iqtirāḍ* (borrowing) and *al-taʿrīb* (Arabisation) for the process of cloning."[2] He then continues by discussing which cloned words were necessary and which were not, without clarifying the criteria for such a distinction, before proceeding to elaborate further on total, partial, and structural lexical cloning.

Among the cloned or borrowed words are *mahrijān* (Persian), *dayr* (Syriac), *riyāl* (Spanish), *sukkar* (Persian or Indian), *istikharah*, *usṭūl*, and *dirham* (Greek), *isṭabl* (Latin), *ṭabshūr* and *manārah* (Turkish), *adrenaline*, *film*, and *master* (English), *isfinj* and *hydrogen* (Greek), *oxygen*, *doctorate*, *licence*, and *qalam* (Latin), and *biṭāqah* (Aramaic).[3]

Despite the importance of borrowing, in both its Arabised and intrusive forms, for generating terminology and filling linguistic gaps, some regard it as an indication of Arabic's inadequacy and a threat to the integrity of the language. In contrast, others view it as an openness to the Other that reaches the level of terminological excess. Nevertheless, the Arabic language resorts to borrowing in various forms, such as Arabised borrowing (which has been subjected to the Arabic system) and intrusive borrowing (which has not been subjected to the Arabic system), when its native terminological resources are exhausted and when no suitable terms exist to denote modern concepts. This vacuum inevitably compels both terminologists and lexicographers alike to borrow the terms of others to express their cognitive needs and enrich their language, despite the inherent risks, primarily the distortion of the phonological structure of Arabic, the difficulty of adaptation, and the violation of Arabic morphological rules, since the transfer of Arabised and intrusive terms into Arabic does not follow agreed-upon rules.

There are two types of borrowing: lexical borrowing, which involves transferring the concept alone (literal translation), and semantic borrowing, which involves transferring both the term and its referent.

The issue of borrowing necessarily reflects cultural contact between Arabs and non-Arabs, and this constitutes evidence of the vitality of the language and its capacity for coexistence, growth, and continuity. Al-Hamzāwī, for his part, applied the designation of borrowing to both Arabisation and intrusive terms, stating: "By linguistic borrowing we do not mean the well-known rhetorical borrowing; rather, we refer to what has come to be known as the Arabised and the intrusive, namely, everything that a given language borrows from another language, whether neighbouring or distant, or inherits at the levels of vocabulary, morphology, syntax, and stylistic patterns, in pursuit of achieving a balance within its system that lacked linguistic categories which it was unable to provide through its own internal means, for civilisational and cultural reasons. We have chosen to use the term 'linguistic borrowing' instead of the commonly used terms for two interrelated reasons:

▪ its general meaning, which comprehensively expresses this phenomenon of linguistic generation without ambiguity;

▪ the ability to follow its various conceptualisations among ancient and modern Western scholars and to ascertain the extent of their theoretical and practical awareness of its meaning on the basis of the different terms they

have applied to linguistic borrowing, which are numerous and prone to ambiguity and confusion. "[4]

Foreign terminology in general, and linguistic terminology in particular, that has come to us encounter a degree of difficulty in its usage and circulation, as Yusuf Maqran notes, since it moves beyond the traditional mechanisms of lexical generation, such as derivation and metaphor, towards Arabisation.

Arabisation in linguistic usage:

Arabisation derives from the root (ʿ-r-b): "*al-ʿurb*, with ḍammah or with vowelisation, is the opposite of *al-ʿajam … mutaʿarribah* and *mustaʿribah* denote outsiders … to avoid grammatical error in speech, and for a child to be born of Arab complexion … such as Arabisation, Arabness, and Arabism, and the rejection of what is faulty … as in Arabisation."[5]

 Terminologically:

Arabisation is a specific term referring to the treatment of lexical items from other Arabic languages, assimilating them in both form and meaning. It is therefore a designation for what follows the phenomenon of linguistic interference at a civilisational level. For this reason, early scholars refined the terminology by designating the general phenomenon as *al-*

dakhīl (the intrusive), while reserving the molding of the intrusive term for the concept of *al-taʿrīb* (Arabisation). They thus stated that the Arabisation of a non-Arabic noun consists of Arabs pronouncing it in accordance with their own linguistic patterns. However, some went beyond this conceptual distinction and applied the term Arabisation to both the phenomenon and its manifestations simultaneously.[6]

Al-Masaddī's definition of Arabisation as a linguistic treatment in which the practitioner possesses an adequate understanding of what the foreign term denotes in both its signifier and signified remains a principle that, regrettably, has not been followed by most scholars. This has distorted the true nature of Arabisation and cast doubt on its necessity.

The *muʿarrab* (Arabised term) is defined as follows: "It is the passive participle of Arabisation, and among scholars of Arabic it refers to a word coined by non-Arabs for a given meaning and subsequently used by Arabs on the basis of that original designation. Scholars have differed over its occurrence in the Qurʾān. Some have affirmed its occurrence, a view reported from Ibn ʿAbbās and ʿIkrimah, whereas the majority have denied it. The evidence of those who affirm it lies in the claim that *mishkāt* is Indian, *istabraq* and *sijjīl* are Persian, and *qisṭās* is Roman. The view of the majority cannot be accepted on the grounds that it is possible for the two languages to coincide in terms such as *ṣābūn* and *tannūr*, although this is unlikely due to the rarity of such cases. The evidence of those who deny it is the Almighty's saying: 'Is it foreign and Arabic?' whereby the Qurʾān negates the possibility of diversity, which would necessarily result from the presence of Arabised terms, and thus it is negated."[7] Therefore, Arabisation is not translation. When we propose an equivalent for the term *phonétique* as *fūnītīk*, we deal with a literal translation that, to some extent, reflects linguistic weakness. In contrast, rendering this term with an Arabic equivalent, such as *ṣawātiyyah*, places us before an instance of Arabisation of a linguistic term.

It is generally agreed that Arabisation is an ancient linguistic phenomenon. It consists of casting foreign terms into Arabic letters within a mould that conforms to their structure and morphological patterns. The process of Arabisation is not recent; the Arabs Arabised numerous foreign words (Greek, Persian, Chinese, and others), particularly during the early phase of the Abbasid era. Even prior to this, the Qurʾān itself contained several Arabised terms, such as *mishkāt* and *istabraq*. The following question then arises: why does the Arabic speaker employ the Arabised term? Is it

due to its lightness or to the ease and speed of its circulation?

This may be attributed to Arabs' enduring admiration for Western countries and the belief that the circulation of intrusive or Arabised terminology constitutes a manifestation of progress and civilisation, as well as of its global diffusion. However, the diffusion invoked in this regard is in fact the diffusion of the English language, followed to a lesser extent by French, Spanish, and others. Moreover, although linguistic interference is a natural phenomenon, excessive borrowing from one side alone, that is, in the absence of a genuine balance, leads the borrower, from whom nothing is taken in return, towards distortion, then assimilation into the other, and ultimately disappearance. Thus, the inclination of some towards mere lexical Arabisation and their preference for it over other methods is, in many cases, indicative of a form of laziness, as it represents the most straightforward approach, and in other cases, thankfully, a few cases of ignorance of the secrets of language and linguistic development or of blind imitation of linguistic theories. On what basis, then, is the expression *ʿilm al-ṭabīʿah* (natural science) preferred over the word *physics*, while at the same time, people are urged to use terms such as *thermometer* and *pendulum* and to abandon *miḥrār*, *miṭyāf*, and *nawwās*? Is

this not due to the diffusion of the former within a particular region?[8]

The choice to circulate one term rather than another has resulted in a conflict between those who hasten towards Arabisation to save time and out of a desire to keep pace with development, such as Muṣṭafā al-Shihābī and Muḥammad ʿAlī al-Dusūqī, and the first group, who maintains that "the closest path is Arabisation, which affords us the opportunity to benefit from the abundance of civilisation attained today by the civilised nations after they have expended exhausting experiments, vast sums of money, arduous efforts, and precious time. The foundation of Arabisation lies in coining Arabic terms for foreign terminology; this is the sole means of transmitting the sciences."[9] This stands in contrast to a group of linguists committed to preserving Arabic. Despite this conflict, Arabisation remains "an instrument of cultural formation and social organisation, and a fundamental factor of political and economic independence. Among its merits are the enrichment of Arabic with original scientific terminology, the facilitation of access to global human knowledge, and the shortening of distances by avoiding the not inconsiderable time required to comprehend the intended meaning of foreign linguistic material before

engaging with the substance of scientific content. "[10]

3. The Distinction between the Arabised, the Intrusive, the Modern, and the Generated (Definition of Concepts):

"The *Arabised* term is a foreign word used within the body of the Arabic language, whether it conforms analogically to one of its morphological patterns or does not so conform.

The *intrusive* term is a word that has entered Arabic from other languages, preserving its original form and not subject to the Arabic morphological system or phonological laws.

The *modern* term is a word or expression used by postclassical speakers after the period of linguistic authority, following a change in its meaning, sounds, or morphological form.

The *innovated* term is a designation introduced by al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmad to denote a nonoriginal Arabic word that does not conform to the phonological fabric of the Arabic word (the law of significance).

The *generated* term is an Arabic word that has changed or a non-Arabic word that has entered the body of the Arabic language. "[11]

This means that the *generated* term is "which the *muwalladūn* used in a manner other than that of the Arabs. It is of two types: one in which they proceed according to the analogical principles of Arabic speech, such as metaphor and derivation, and, as in the terminology of sciences and crafts and similar fields and its ruling is that it is acceptable Arabic; and another in which they depart from the analogical principles of Arabic speech."[12] On the other hand, the *intrusive* term is understood as "that which is intrusive among them, that is, from others and entering among them; the intrusive is every word introduced into the speech of the Arabs that is not originally from it." [13] It is "an absolute phenomenon imposed by geographical contact and civilisational interaction; for this reason, scientific terms have been regarded as ambassadors of languages to one another."[14]

However, some consider both the Arabised and the intrusive terms to belong to the fourth linguistic level, according to the degree of lexical units in the lexicographical corpus, in terms of eloquence, following the levels of classical Arabic, generated Arabic, and colloquial Arabic. Each of them is thus subsumed under the category of non-Arabic vocabulary. "This level is very ancient in Arabic, for it, like all languages, cannot rid itself of the influence of others. The two most important

terms used by early scholars to designate the vocabulary represented in Arabic at this level are *al-muʿarrab* (the Arabised) and *al-dakhīl* (the intrusive). The position we have adopted in Tunisia since the late 1960s is to distinguish between the two terms on the basis of the structure of the borrowed foreign word: the Arabised term is that which has been subjected to Arabic patterns and measures and thus integrated into it, whereas the intrusive term is that which has resisted Arabic measures and patterns and has retained some or most of the features of its foreignness. This classificatory approach has its justification among early scholars. "[15]

The *modern* and *innovat*ive terms are "two synonymous descriptions of borrowing, indicating a speech event according to modern linguistics, and referring to what arises in the speech of the Arabs and in its phonological system by way of innovation, in the sense of a new phonological style that differs from their established phonological style. Al-Khalīl, however, appended a third term to the two preceding terms that deserve consideration, namely, the *generated* term. Al-Khalīl employed four terms: modern, innovated, generated, and intrusive. It appears that these terms are synonymous insofar as they all denote the intrusive and the quality of modernity associated

with it, since it is not original but rather arises from the need for it or from a desire for affect and obstinacy; it is thus an innovation. "[16]

In fact, if we return to the origins of the issue of borrowing, we find that dealing with this linguistic phenomenon requires a high degree of precision, as scholars have differed in their approaches. Some have exempted a portion of these words, leaving them in their original form. In contrast, others have attempted to subject intrusive words to a morphological mould that accords with the receiving language (Arabic) and their semantic content, thereby making them an integral part of Arabic; this constitutes Arabisation. Consequently, the intrusive and the Arabised have continued to oscillate between acceptance and rejection. However, we do not deny that linguistic development has more often than not been confined to borrowing, Arabisation, and translation. Every new field of knowledge requires, and indeed imposes upon us, new terminology. This means that borrowing is "a controversial linguistic phenomenon, insofar as it violates the system of the receiving language by introducing foreign elements that may lead to the neglect of its authentic lexical stock"; however, from another perspective, it may be regarded as a necessary linguistic phenomenon, since it enriches the resources of the receiving language by filling its empty slots

with lexical units or semantic values that it previously lacked. One of its conditions, however, is that it should express realities for which no equivalents exist in the receiving language."[17]

4. Motives for Arabisation:

The motives for Arabisation are summarised by ʿAbd al-Majīd Sālimī as follows:

▪ "The psychological–educational factor: Arabic is the language of childhood, interwoven with feeling and thought; it constitutes part of the psychological being and represents the Arabs' means to understand, assimilate, and internalise, indeed their path to discovery and creativity.

▪ Social–professional factors: the specialist is a member of society, and Arabic is his or her instrument of communication with it.

▪ The national–civilisational factor: Arabic is the repository of culture, the vessel of heritage, and a hallmark of civilisation. "[18]

5. Drawbacks of Arabisation:

Arabisation is a double-edged instrument. While it helps provide Arabic equivalents for foreign concepts, it also contributes to the spread of terminological disorder. Thus, "problems, disturbances, gaps, and deficiencies emerge about newly arisen branches of linguistics with which Arabic had no prior engagement, whether at the level of theory or its application. This compels us to consider that the problems of coined coinage are embodied primarily in their translation into Arabic, both in the signifier and the signified. This implies that these problems stem from factors external to translation, which we regard as among the causes that have exerted a significant influence on the formation of terminology, including the differences arising from the two types of Arabisation and translation for transitional reasons, such as:

▪ *phonème → phoneme, ṣawtam, linguistic sound*;

▪ *sémantique → sīmiyyah, ʿilm al-dalālah*."[19]

It is well known that the coining of this Arabised term (in the broad sense) raises several theoretical problems, in addition to methodological problems, since it introduces an environment that is, to some extent, foreign to us. There is thus a collision and struggle between these incoming terms and representations, which may result in either temporary coexistence or total or partial cultural dominance. Arabic possesses phonemes that are not found in other languages; therefore, when translating from English or French into Arabic, we do not usually translate a prefix with another prefix or a suffix

with another suffix. This rarely occurs. Instead, we translate one morphological form into another as much as possible, for example, by correlating the English *-ing* form with the verbal noun, the *-er* form with the active participle, and *-ize* with causation through gemination.[20]

The view of the Cairo Academy of the Arabic Language on Arabisation holds that "Arabisation has been approved as a supplementary means to the legitimate mechanisms of linguistic generation, which do not always suffice to meet all needs, provided that its use does not affect the sounds of the language or its morphological patterns, which should be preserved as far as possible."[21]

What is essential in this context is that Arabisation refers to the lexical item introduced into Arabic by eloquent linguists. It is distinct from the *generated* term and perhaps more eloquent than it is, since the latter denotes a lexical item introduced into the Arabic language by the *muwalladūn* after the period of authoritative linguistic evidence, that is, after the Arabs' contact with non-Arabs.

6. Reasons for the Arabs' Influence by Borrowed Terminology:

The susceptibility of Arabs to borrowed terminology is attributable to the following factors:

▪ A historical factor, manifested in material, cultural, and political contact with other people;

▪ A psychological factor, evident in the admiration of certain Arab social groups for languages that are prominent in the sphere of civilisation, leading the Arab speaker to circulate foreign terms even when Arabic equivalents exist within the language, out of a desire for ostentation and to assert social affiliation with the elite;

▪ A phonetic–formal factor, determined by the relative ease of pronouncing specific foreign terms compared with their Arabic counterparts;

▪ In addition to the necessity of expressing modern concepts for which no equivalents exist in the Arabic lexicon.[22]

7. Risks of Linguistic Borrowing:

▪ Loss of the expressive value of the Arabic root;

▪ The corruption of Arabic phonological structure;

▪ Disruption of the Arabic lexical system;

▪ Ambiguity of the meaning of the borrowed term in Arabic dictionaries;

▪ Difficulty in regulating the Arabised term;

▪ Violation of Arabic morphological rules;[23]

▪ The decline of the status of the Arabic language in colloquia and conferences, such that it becomes a secondary language in scientific research.

Arabics resort to Arabised terminology when the internal mechanisms of derivation and compounding prove incapable of accommodating the vast number of newly emerging terms. Consequently, the lexicographer finds it necessary to resort to Arabisation as a complementary, rather than alternative, mechanism to afford linguists sufficient time to conduct further research and adapt these borrowed terms in a manner consistent with the system of Arabic.

8. Arabised Terminology in Specialised Dictionaries (Applied Models):

✓ **Arabised Terms in the *Dictionary of Modern Linguistic Terminology in Arabic*:**

Arabised term according to the Arabic system	Foreign term
353. *Dhabdhabah* (67) on the pattern *faʿlalah*	*Vibration*
444. *Shaʾshaʾah* (80) on the pattern *faʿlalah*	*Clichément*
1057. *Imālah* (173) on the pattern *fiʿālah*	*Inflexion*

✓ **Arabised Terms in the Unified Dictionary of Linguistic Terminology, Arabised in Forms Conforming to Arabic Morphological Patterns:**

Arabised term according to the Arabic system	Foreign term
593. *Athālah* on the pattern *faʿālah*	*Étymologie*
95. *Malghamah* on the pattern *faʿlalah*	*Amalgame*

With respect to the issue of phonetic transfer, al-Ḥamzāwī elaborated upon it, stating the following: "With regard to both categories the

Arabised and the intrusive recorded in our dictionaries, the principal problem they pose concerns the transfer of European vowels and

consonants (vowels and letters), particularly in rendering vowels and intrusive sounds into Arabic as pronounced by their native speakers. The transfer of Arabised and intrusive terms into Arabic does not follow regulated rules. Thus, the word *England* is rendered Arabic as *Inklitrā*, *Injilitrā*, or *Inghilitrā*. What, then, is to be done when transferring Arabised and intrusive scientific and technological names accepted in our dictionaries, which require faithful and scientifically precise transmission? Academies, institutions, and individuals have examined this issue in an effort to establish an international Arabic system for the phonetic transcription of foreign consonants and vowels, especially Latin ones, following the model of the International Phonetic System for the transcription of foreign sounds, including Arabic, into Latin-based languages in various forms. The International Phonetic System was first established at the Copenhagen Conference in 1925, subsequently revised, and later approved by the Arab Organisation for Education, Culture and Science, the Arab Organisation for Standardisation and Metrology, and the International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO) in its Recommendation No. 233."[24]

9. Importance of Terminological Standardisation:

Terminological standardisation constitutes a fundamental pillar of scientific research, as it ensures conceptual clarity and precision in usage and limits semantic overlap among terms for specialists and researchers. The absence of terminological standardisation and norm-setting leads to the proliferation of multiple terms for a single concept, thereby hindering the transmission of knowledge and the exchange of scientific information. Accordingly, standardisation is an important instrument for preserving the identity of the Arabic language, facilitating education, and enhancing scientific production across various fields of modern knowledge.

To achieve this, the following principles must be observed when Arabising foreign terms:

a. Preference should be given to forms that are easier to pronounce when there is variation in pronunciation across foreign languages.

b. The form of the term should be modified so that it conforms to Arabic morphological patterns when its pronunciation differs in foreign languages.

c. The Arabised term should be regarded as Arabic, subject to the rules of the language, allowing derivation and compounding, and permitting the use of prefixes and suffixes, provided that it conforms to Arabic morphological patterns.

d. Arabic words that foreign languages have distorted should be corrected and used in accordance with their original eloquent forms.

e. Terms in general, and Arabised terms in particular, should be fully vocalised to ensure correct pronunciation and precision of usage ("The Fundamental Principles for the Selection and Coinage of Scientific Terminology").[25]

From another perspective, ʿAlī al-Qāsimī has called for the necessity of normative standardisation, grounded in agreement on meanings and their semantic fields. By normative standardisation, he means "the assignment of a single term to a single scientific concept, by eliminating synonymy, homonymy, and all that leads to ambiguity or confusion in Arabic and technical language. More specifically, this normative standardisation is achieved through the following steps:

• 'Stabilising the meanings of terms through their definition;

• Determining the position of each concept within the conceptual system in accordance with the logical or ontological relationships among the concepts;

• Assign each concept a clear term, selected with precision from among existing synonyms;

• Coining a new term for the concept when it proves impossible to find a suitable term among the existing synonyms.[26]

In short, when speaking of standardisation, it is helpful for standardisation efforts to focus on five principal approaches:

– Reliance on the primary sources and references related to the subject under consideration;

– The initial assumption that translation yields multiple renderings and that translating a single term with several synonyms is a likely and acceptable occurrence that must be documented and acknowledged in view of the nature of translation and its problems and techniques;

– Surveying and systematically reviewing translations related to a specific field of science and technology;

– Extracting synonymous terms related to the original concept by employing lexical interference charts or semantic analysis frameworks;

– Subjecting the selected synonymous terms, where they exist, together with their sources and verified references, to the principles of terminological norm-setting.[27]

Conclusion:

The problems of linguistic Arabisation in the Arabic language constitute one of the most prominent challenges facing the language in the modern era. Between the need to keep pace with scientific development and the imperative to preserve linguistic identity, Arabisation emerges as a necessary option; however, it requires organised, unified efforts to succeed. The Arabic language remains capable of accommodating modern terminology, provided that Arabisation

is accompanied by systematic scientific planning and practical institutional cooperation.

Recommendations:

✓ The unification of scientific and technical terminology through language academies to avoid multiple translations of a single concept.

✓ Encouraging educational institutions to employ Arabised terminology while providing explanations of their foreign equivalents when necessary.

✓ Supporting scientific research in the Arabic language to develop precise and contemporary terminology.

Endnotes:

[1] Youcef Mokrane. *The Role of Terminology in Linguistics: An Epistemological Study*. PhD diss., University of Tizi Ouzou, Algeria, (2011), 296.

[2] Bani Amiri. "Linguistic Cloning (*Clonage linguistique*)." *Annals of the University of Algiers* 24, no. 1 (2013): 598.

[3] Amiri, Bani. "Linguistic Cloning (*Clonage linguistique*)," 605–606.

[4] Mohamed Rachad Hamzaoui. "Linguistic Borrowing in the Past and the Present: Its Status in Linguistic Generation and the Enrichment of the Modern Arabic Lexicon." *Annals of the Tunisian University* 17 (1979): 5.

[5] Majd al-Din Muhammad ibn Yaʿqub al-Fayruzabadi. *Al-Qamus al-Muhit*. D. 817 AH. Entry "ʿArab," 140.

[6] Abdel Salam El-Masaddi. *Dictionary of Linguistics: Arabic–French/French–Arabic, with an Introduction to Terminology Studies*, 28.

[7] Mohamed Ali al-Tahanawi. *Encyclopaedia of the Terminology of Arts and Sciences*, 1582; citing Qurʾān, Sūrat Fuṣṣilat (41):44.

[8] Abdelrahmane El Hadj Salah. "The Arabic Linguistic Reservoir." *Journal of al-Lisān al-ʿArabī*. Rabat: Bureau for the Coordination of Arabisation, no. 27 (1986): 46.

[9] Abdel Fattah Essoumidi. "Factors of Cultural Unity." *Journal of al-Lisān al-ʿArabī*. Rabat: Bureau for the Coordination of Arabisation, no. 1 (June 1964): 23.

[10] Khaled El-Yaaboudi. "Linguistic Borrowing and Arabisation in Arabic." *Judhūr Journal* 30, vol. 12 (Muḥarram 1431 AH/January 2010): 182.

[11] El-Yaaboudi, Khaled. "Linguistic Borrowing and Arabisation in Arabic," 191.

[12] Mohamed Khan. *Foundations of Arabic Grammar*. Biskra: Mohamed Khider University Press, (2012), 88.

[13] Khan, Mohamed. *Foundations of Arabic Grammar*, 88.

[14] Abdel Salam El-Masaddi. *Dictionary of Linguistics: Arabic–French/French–Arabic, with an Introduction to Terminology Studies*, 28.

[15] Ibrahim Ben Mourad. *The Specialised Arabic Scientific Lexicon up to the Mid–Eleventh Hijri Century*. Beirut: Dar al-Gharb al-Islami, 1st ed., (1993), 99.

[16] Mohamed Rachad Hamzaoui. *Linguistic Borrowing in the Past and the Present and Its Role in Linguistic Generation and the Enrichment of the Modern Arabic Lexicon*, 10.

[17] Habib Ennassraoui. "Terminological Generation through Borrowing in Pharmaceutical Terminology during the Third Hijri (Ninth Gregorian) Century: An Application to al-Razi's *al-Mansuri fi al-Tibb*." *Lexicography Journal*, Tunis, no. 20 (2004): 85.

[18] Abdelmadjid Salmi. *The Problematics of Language in the Teaching of Science*, 14.

[19] Mohamed Rachad Hamzaoui. *Arabic and Modernity, or Eloquence and Its Varieties*. Beirut: Dar al-Gharb al-Islami, 1st ed., (1986), 91–94.

[20] Abdelkader Fassi Fehri. *Linguistic Terminology (French–Arabic Dictionary)*, 142.

[21] Mohamed Rachad Hamzaoui. *The Proceedings of the Cairo Academy of the Arabic Language: Approaches to Language Development in Theory, Terminology, and Lexicography*, 335.

[22] Khaled El-Yaaboudi. "Linguistic Borrowing and Arabisation in Arabic," 183–184.

[23] El-Yaaboudi, Khaled. "Linguistic Borrowing and Arabisation in Arabic," 183–184.

[24] Mohamed Rachad Hamzaoui. *The General Methodology for Translating, Standardising, and Normalising Terminology (The Arab Context)*, 41–42.

[25] Bureau for the Coordination of Arabisation. "Symposium on the Unification of Methodologies for the Coinage of Arabic Scientific Terminology." *Journal of al-Lisān al-ʿArabī*. Rabat, vol. 18, no. 1 (1980): 175–176.

[26] Ali Al-Qasimi. "Terminology Studies: The General Theory of Term Coinage, Standardisation, and Documentation." *Journal of al-Lisān al-ʿArabī*. Rabat: Bureau for the Coordination of Arabisation, vol. 18, no. 1 (1980): 13.

[27] Mohamed Rachad Hamzaoui. *The General Methodology for Translating, Standardising, and Normalising Terminology (The Arab Context)*, 59–60.