



ISSN 1989-9572

DOI:10.47750/jett.2024.15.04.004

The Concepts Theories of the Relative Linguistics Theory of Mohamed Al-Awraghi

Dr. Boughar Mohamed

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol.15(4)

<https://jett.labosfor.com/>

Date of reception: 02 May 2024

Date of revision: 15 August 2024

Date of acceptance: 26 September 2024

Dr. Boughar Mohamed. (2024). The Concepts Theories of the Relative Linguistics Theory of Mohamed Al-Awraghi. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol.15(4),36-49.



The Concepts Theories of the Relative Linguistics Theory of Mohamed Al-Awraghi

Dr. Boughar Mohamed

University Center Morsli Abdellah (Tipaza, Algeria)

Email : boughar.mohamed@cu-tipaza.dz

Abstract

The theory of relative linguistics formed a modern invitation and difference in language research in both levels Arabic and western through an calling for an epistemological rupture with what is idol for the modern theories of linguistic also by giving a different concept for the linguistic theory topic (language) according to Mohamed Al Awraghi prevailed many concept of language which it's doesn't give it scientific value especially with the two streams once descriptive with structuralism theories, the second one the interpretative with Chomsky, based on this internal and external criticism of all linguistic theories, Al Awraghi see that the concept of language have be based on two basic principles which are; position and acquisition, with this conception emerged a set of theatrical concepts that helps to answer all questions that will bring the language closer to their speaker or learner.

This article came to discover a set of theoretical concepts which based on it the relative linguistics theory above the concept of language.

Keywords: Linguistics, Relative, Universal linguistics, Language, Types grammatical.

Introduction:

All modern and contemporary linguistic approaches and theories have worked towards providing a precise and scientific definition of language by offering a concept that delineates the scientific nature of linguistic research. Through this, all theoretical and procedural concepts of linguistic theory emerge. This concept has been divided, within both Arab and Western linguistic studies, into a descriptive concept aligned with structuralism theories and an interpretive concept found in universal grammar, such as generative-transformational theories, pragmatics, and functionalism.

A completely different concept appears in the theory of linguistic relativity as proposed by Mohammed Al Awraghi. His theory frames language as a subject of linguistic theory, built on entirely different foundations compared to both descriptivist's and interpretivists. It stems from an operational hypothesis that language consists of both innate and acquired components, and that these two principles cannot be separated. This stance directly opposes the naturalists and conventionalists, who argue that language is entirely innate and cannot be acquired.

What led Al Awraghi to this perspective is his critique of the epistemological principle upon which naturalists, particularly Noam Chomsky, base their concept of language. Chomsky views the subject of linguistic theory as abstract, constructed through theoretical and methodological rules rather than derived from the structure of language itself. As a result, the impact is unidirectional—from theory to language only. One of the significant criticisms of universal grammar is that it intrudes on the uniqueness of languages and dismisses many of their features, such as non-fixed word order and general binding rules.

In contrast, Al Awraghi argues that the influence flows from language towards the theory. This, along with other related aspects, is shaped by the concept that the theorist assigns to language. The concept of language determines the later goals and methodology of the theory.

Thus, this scientific paper aims to clarify the foundational concept upon which the theory of linguistic relativity is built, which is the concept of language itself, and to examine the resulting concepts that guide linguistic research within the framework of linguistic relativity theory in general.

The central problem this paper seeks to address can be formulated as follows: What is the concept of language in the theory of linguistic relativity? What are the concepts derived from this primary concept? And what are Al Awraghi's objectives in proposing this concept?

The methodology employed in this paper is a composite of description, analysis, and interpretation, achieved by describing the conceptual framework surrounding the concept of language in the theory of linguistic relativity, followed by an analysis and interpretation of the various concepts related to it.

This research is structured into an introduction, followed by a section addressing all aspects of the central problem, and concluded with a summary of the main findings.

The Concept of Language in Relational Linguistics:

Mohammed Al Awraghi grounds his concept of language on two essential pillars, which encapsulate the objectives and motivations behind this foundation:

1. The creation and establishment of a new theory that offers a fresh perspective on language, ultimately enhancing our understanding of human languages and revolutionizing linguistic studies by categorizing linguistic patterns.
2. The development of this novel theory based on principles that differ from those of universal grammar theory.

Building on these two pillars, Al Awraghi proposes a concept of language that contrasts sharply with the one found in universal grammar. According to the rationalist view, to which Noam Chomsky adheres, language is defined as "a natural faculty imprinted biologically in the cells of a brain organ, passed down through generations via genetic inheritance" (Al Awraghi, 2010, p. 182). Chomsky's perspective supports the hypothesis of what is known as innateness (Inneisme), meaning the initial existence of ideas and cognitive structures, including linguistic structures in humans. Humans, unlike other living beings, are born with an innate linguistic structure, a primary knowledge independent of any environment, which enables them to use language without specific learning. The notion of innateness also implies a special biological predisposition in humans for language, akin to the special capability of birds to fly (Mustafa, 2010, p. 33).

In contrast, language in relational linguistics, as described by Al Awraghi, is "an acquired faculty, established through voluntary convention and transmitted through learning" (Al Awraghi, 2010, p. 16). Here, Al Awraghi explicitly states that language is an acquired faculty, where its origin lies in convention and its development through learning. It is transmitted from one generation to the next and is "not a part of the compulsory natural properties passed down through generations by natural inheritance, as is the case with animal languages, but rather it belongs to the realm of voluntary conventions, acquired through inductive reasoning and deductive evidence. The linguistic faculty in humans is a mental organ capable of conceptualizing through external vocal expressions and producing them in a structured manner based on possible relations and connections" (Mohammed, 2014, pp. 269-270).

The meaning of this statement is that language is composed of three realms, which represent the linguistic sign:

1. **The Symbolic Realm** → The phonetic image → The signifier (الدال)
2. **The Mental Realm** → The mental image → The signified (المدلول)
3. **The Existential Realm** → The object in the external world → The referent (المرجع)

Each of the mentioned elements that make up the concept of language and its nature has its own feature. The symbolic universe is an external element to the speaking self, and the self has no role in it. As for the mental universe, it is an element within the speaking self, and it necessarily follows the existential universe because it is a reflection of it. The self has no role in shaping it, except for what pertains to imagination. The existential universe, however, is an artificial one, created by the speaking self to express the other two universes. The self has the ability to control it by placing laws within it that organize signs (Nasir, 2018, p. 193).

Thus, these three universes, no matter how different their patterns may appear in human languages, ultimately point to one thing: the symbolic nature of human language, which represents the universal aspect of languages. On the other hand, these universes also point to a conceptual system that aligns with reality. These two aspects manifest in languages, regardless of how their symbols differ, under the concepts of composition and regularity. This ties the essential principles that shape the nature of language to these universes through the composition of sounds in a specific way and the composition of words in a specific way as well.

What distinguishes the concept of language in the theory of relative linguistics, with its acquisitive tendency, is that human languages are acquired faculties, whose essence and nature consist of four fundamental principles: the semantic principle, the pragmatic principle (both representing the universal aspect of languages), the principle of selected positioning of one of the linguistic mediums, and the formal principle. Relative linguistics assumes that the cells of the human brain are biologically predisposed to incorporate subjects from the external world, which enables the brain's ability to acquire language. This predisposition or structure includes the feature of language formation, as language is considered an independent subject, acquired and not innate.

This formation, according to Al-Awrighi, is referred to as the concept of the "lobe." He argues that language, when it settles in the human brain, takes the form of lobes. He believes that "the linguistic system can be divided into lobes rather than broken into sub-systems by procedural division, not by conventional fragmentation. Each sub-system transforms into a linguistic lobe, and the number of lobes in each language becomes one. Each lobe in any language is characterized by its independence in its subject matter, its connection at both ends with the following lobe, representing a specific linguistic level or belonging to it, and its contribution to the linguistic structure" (Mohammed, 2014, pp. 150-151).

Hence, Al-Awrighi sees that the lobes that constitute the essence of language in every language are unified, consisting of four interconnected lobes.

1. A phonetic lobe, with auditory content, branches into:
 - a) Phonetics.
 - b) Phonology.
2. A lexical lobe, whose content consists of an unlimited number of entries, each distinguished by two representations: word and speech, branches into:
 - a) A lexical reality whose entries are roots.
 - b) A prospective lexicon whose entries are derived forms.
3. A transformational lobe, whose content consists of rules for generating derived entries from their roots, branches into:
 - a) Derivation, whose content is the rules for forming words.
 - b) Inflection, which contains the rules for changing speech.
4. A syntactic lobe, which includes the rules of syntax, branches into two or three components depending on the linguistic pattern (Al-Awrighi, 2010, p. 202)..

In conclusion, the concept of language within the framework of relative linguistics is an acquired faculty and a system composed of a set of rules distributed across sub-systems or principles. Each sub-system or principle corresponds to a linguistic lobe.

The Concept of "Langue" (Language):

Al-Awrighi approaches the concept of "*langue*" by rejecting the notion put forth by proponents of the innate linguistic theory, which considers language as a linguistic structure reflecting the necessity of a real-world structure (Mustafa, 2010, p. 48). This is the view held by Chomsky and those who follow his approach. Chomsky adopted this hypothesis to methodologically and theoretically justify his universal approach, creating a universal grammatical model for all human languages.

Al-Awrighi, in denying this naturalist view, starts from the principle of the independence of the linguistic faculty from the speaker. He argues that language, as a perceived subject, is separate from the perceiving self and is not a part of it. He supports this by stating: "If we exclude:

First: The mental faculties prepared as a basis for accepting the perception of what is particular and universal in language, just like other perceptions.

Second: The human vocal apparatus, distinguished by its ability to form structures that produce distinct sounds.

Third: The foundational principles in the external world, on which linguistic laws are based to organize the composition of sounds in a specific way to ensure correspondence between the expressed and the expression itself.

If we exclude these three things, as they are natural and beyond human will and choice, then nothing about the linguistic faculty is natural" (Mohammed, 2014, p. 113).

As for Al-Awrighi's concept of "*langue*," he says:

"*Langue* is a set of available possibilities" (Mohammed, 2014, p. 21). By "available possibilities," he means the totality of linguistic mediums chosen by the speaker to appear as concrete or formal in a specific grammatical pattern.

Here, one might mistakenly think that "*langue*" and grammar are the same, but there is a difference between them according to Al-Awrighi. The "*langue*" selects the linguistic medium and the formal composition of this medium according to chosen rules, which is grammar. In other words, we can say that Arabic, for instance, selected the

medium of "constructive composition," which belongs to "*langue*" because it exists in other languages. However, the formal rules within which this medium operates belong to grammar, as these rules do not exist in other languages.

From another perspective, Al-Awrighi sees "*langue*" as "a set of opposing possibilities distributed across various linguistic levels, through which certain possibilities are selected while their opposites are disregarded" (Mohammed, *The Linguistic Medium and the Decline of Universal Linguistics*, 2001, p. 392). These available possibilities constitute the linguistic faculty, which differentiates one language from another. The selected possibilities contribute to the diversity of linguistic expression even within the same language.

In Arabic, there are many examples, such as the choice of the medium of negation, which belongs to "*langue*." This medium includes several tools for negation, and certain grammatical origins are chosen for these tools, such as one tool being operative for some groups and not for others, as in the case of "لا, لا" or "ما لا" which functions similarly to "ليس" in some cases.

Al-Awrighi denies that the linguistic faculty is utilized based on the meaning of structures, forms, or any term that indicates a natural aspect of a part of the brain or the brain as a whole. He believes that "whenever the term 'faculty' is used, it refers to an acquired, deeply-rooted trait" (Mohammed, *Language Acquisition in Ancient Arab Thought*, 2014, p. 112). He supports this with a quote from Ibn Khaldun, who states: "Faculties are only acquired through the repetition of actions, and with more repetition, the faculty becomes a deeply-rooted trait. Just as a child hears the use of individual words in their meanings and is taught them first, then hears sentence constructions and is taught them afterward. The child's hearing continues to be renewed, and their usage repeats until it becomes a faculty and a deeply-rooted trait. This is how languages pass from one generation to the next" (Khaldun, 1992, p. 289).

From the above, we conclude that Al-Awrighi approached the concept of "*langue*" (language) from the opposite direction to the naturalist view of language and "*langue*," as represented by Chomsky. Al-Awrighi sees "*langue*" as an independent faculty that can be acquired through a set of principles, which we will address next.

Principles of the Existence and Acquisition of "*Langue*": According to the theory of relative linguistics, the linguistic faculty is based on a set of principles, some of which we will mention here:

a) Pre-linguistic Principles:

These refer to the set of prior principles that precede the emergence of language and the linguistic faculty in an individual. There are four principles:

- **The Principle of the Necessity of Socialization:** This principle is expressed by the idea that "humans are naturally inclined to socialization" (Mohammed, *Language Acquisition in Ancient Arab Thought*, 2014, p. 110). Additionally, "Since humans are naturally inclined to cooperation and are compelled to socialization—because their existence aims at not being self-sufficient in maintaining survival through seeking help—it becomes necessary to have a means to inform and understand their partner's intended purpose" (Mohammed, *Language Acquisition in Ancient Arab Thought*, 2014, p. 111).
- **The Principle of the Necessity of Convention:** This principle refers to the creation and development of vocal expressions that communicate various needs and objectives arising from the necessity of interacting with others and socialization. From here, it becomes essential that what humans use to communicate is something invented and crafted, serving as a tool to express infinite purposes, even though its formation follows limited, structured laws. It is an artificial creation belonging to the realm of crafted inventions (Mohammed, *Language Acquisition in Ancient Arab Thought*, 2014, p. 112).
- **The Principle of the Conventional Possibility of Different Patterns:** Al-Awrighi envisions this principle as being related to the intellectual faculty, since the establishment of the linguistic system takes place at that level. This faculty is described as normative. In other words, when a speaker constructs language according to chosen foundations that they believe the language should be built upon to achieve their goal while minimizing effort, it is possible for their creation to take one form, while another person who chooses different foundations may create a different form. Therefore, it is necessary to include within the direct principles of language creation what each speaker chooses to explain or justify their specific approach (Mohammed, *Language Acquisition in Ancient Arab Thought*, 2014, p. 114).

b) The Emergence of the Distinction Between the Natural and the Artificial:

This principle relates to the linguistic faculty, which can be created in two ways either naturally or artificially. Al-Awrighi argues that there is no difference between what is artificial and what is natural except in terms of how they are related. The first (artificial) is connected to human will and choice, while the second (natural) is characterized by its existence being independent of anything connected to humans. He describes this distinction as being related to the active principle, which is of two types: divine power and human power. As Al-Awrighi puts it:

"The convention, in one respect, removes the distinction between the natural and the artificial, both of which are generated from the change in the active principle, whether it be divine power or human power. On the other hand, it

affirms the distinction between the two creations, which are generated from the change in the human active principle” (Mohammed, *Language Acquisition in Ancient Arab Thought*, 2014, p. 115).

- **Linguistic Principles:**We previously discussed the essential principles that precede the emergence and formation of the linguistic faculty. This section focuses on the systematic principles that shape "*langue*" (language) and how they form in language. The formation of language encompasses four principles: the *semantic or material principle*, the *teleological or communicative principle*, the *active or conventional principle*, and the *formal or representational principle*.
- **The Material or Semantic Principle:**This principle refers to anything that has the potential to be organized and composed, thus becoming connected and forming a unified meaning. This principle is governed by two foundational elements:
 1. What encompasses both particular and universal perceptions.
 2. What includes relationships governed by primary sciences, through which perceptions are organized (Mohammed, *Language Acquisition in Ancient Arab Thought*, 2014, p. 117).
- **The Teleological or Communicative Principle:**This principle relates to the purpose for which language was created, and Al-Awraghi identifies two main purposes:
 1. Achieving benefit and exchange of information through communication.
 2. Facilitating communication with minimal effort, which can be referred to as the principle of lightness and economy.
- **The Active or Conventional Principle:**This principle refers to the fact that the speaker is obliged to adhere to a specific linguistic pattern and adopt certain mediums for this pattern. On the other hand, the speaker has the freedom to choose the type of mediums through which they express and structure their speech. This principle is governed by two foundational elements:
 1. **The Principle of Etymology:**This is a conventional principle that belongs to the active or conventional principle, and it is necessary for every speaker in order to implement one or more of the obligatory foundational elements in the construction of language (Mohammed, *Language Acquisition in Ancient Arab Thought*, 2014, p. 123).
 2. **The Principle of Grammar (Derivation ,I'rab):**According to Al-Awraghi, the principle of grammar belongs to the active principle if it is established that one speaker has chosen it, while another speaker may choose a different principle. Both aim to mediate in the implementation of one or more obligatory foundational elements (Mohammed, *Language Acquisition in Ancient Arab Thought*, 2014, p. 125).

The Concept of Speech (Natiq), Utterance (Qawl), and Discourse (Kalam):

The Concept of Speech (Natiq):

Al-Awraghi addresses the concept of speech and utterance from a universal and patterned perspective as a starting point. He also refers to classical writings and uses them to support his position, particularly the writings of Abu Hamid Al-Ghazali about the stages of existence. Al-Ghazali states:

“A thing has four stages of existence: the first is its reality in itself, the second is the establishment of its image in the mind, which is referred to as knowledge, the third is the composition of sounds through letters that indicate it, which is the verbal expression that points to the image in the mind, and the fourth is the composition of signs perceived by the sense of sight that indicate the utterance, which is writing. Writing follows utterance when it indicates it, utterance follows knowledge as it points to it, and knowledge follows the known as it corresponds to and agrees with it. These four stages are parallel and consistent, but the first two are real and existential and do not differ across times and nations, while the last two utterance and writing differ across times and nations because they are subject to human choice” (Hamid, 1997, Vol. 1, p. 21).

According to Al-Awraghi, what matters most is the existence of something in the second and third stages, i.e., the establishment of the image of the thing in the mind and the composition of sounds through letters to indicate it. The establishment of the image of the thing in the mind is what Al-Awraghi refers to as the *mental universe*, which is a universal concept in languages and exists among all peoples, regardless of their specific languages. This is what Al-Awraghi calls *natiq* (speech), which is the fixed mental universe in the minds of speakers of a language and a universal principle.

The Concept of Utterance (Qawl):

Utterance is a patterned and relative concept because it falls within the realm of medium choice. It changes over time and place and differs in form between the languages of various nations. The reason for classifying utterance as *patterned* is that it exists in the stage of phonetic composition in a specific way. It is known that composing sounds through letters to express and indicate the established mental images can only be done in a patterned way. Al-Awraghi states:

“We are only concerned with the existence of something in the second and third stages, because in the second stage it is existential, meaning it is fixed in the minds of all peoples regardless of their specific language. Since it exists in this stage, we refer to it, following Al-Ghazali, as *natiq* (speech), and because it is fixed in the minds of all people and exists in all languages, the content of *natiq* deserves to be characterized as universal in the sense of relativity as explained in linguistic theory. When something exists in the third stage, it becomes conventional by choice, changing in form over time and across languages of different nations. That which changes in this way, we call, following Al-Ghazali, *qawl* (utterance). Since this change occurs within the limits allowed by the mediums, *qawl* deserves to be characterized as patterned” (Al-Awraghi, 2010, p. 197).

The Concept of Discourse (Kalam):

Al-Awraghi believes that *natiq* (speech) is universal and *qawl* (utterance) is patterned. Therefore, another term is needed to bridge the conceptual gap in his theoretical framework and its technical language. The previous universal principle (*natiq*) cannot directly connect to the subsequent patterned principle (*qawl*), so a linking element must be introduced. In this regard, Al-Awraghi proposes the term *kalam* (discourse) as a bridge between them. He states:

“It became clear that ‘discourse’ (*kalam*) serves as a connecting link, as it simultaneously functions as both a ‘successor and origin.’ It is an ‘origin’ for its form because it serves as a sufficient condition for the formation of *qawl* (utterance) afterward. It is also a ‘successor’ because its predecessor, *natiq* (speech), is not a sufficient condition for the formation of *kalam* (discourse). *Natiq* is only part of the complete condition, the second part being the ‘medium.’ From the combination of ‘universal *natiq* and the optional medium,’ a necessary origin is formed to create ‘patterned discourse,’ which in turn becomes the origin of its form, the ‘patterned utterance.’ Since the patterned principle must match the pattern, it, too, must be patterned like it” (Al-Awraghi, 2010, p. 198).

The concepts of *qawl* (utterance), *natiq* (speech), and *kalam* (discourse) can be structured as follows:

(External World)

↑ ↓

Universal Speech (*Natiq Kulli*) → Optional Mediums → Patterned Discourse (*Kalam Namti*) → Patterned Utterance (*Qawl Namti*)

It can be understood from this diagram that “the duality of *kalam* (discourse) and *qawl* (utterance) enjoys the characteristic of parallelism in all languages, meaning that the structure of utterance mirrors the structure of discourse. Since *kalam* (discourse) applies to what is extracted from pure meaning (semantics), it must be uniform across all languages. In contrast, *qawl* (utterance) differs within the limits of possibility from one language to another due to its subjection to the principle of optional convention” (Mohammed, *Linguistic Mediums, Relative Linguistics, and Patterned Syntax*, 2001, p. 489).

Linguistic Lobes and Grammatical Templates:

Al-Awraghi approaches the concept of linguistic lobes by considering the lobe concept as one of the fundamentals of relative linguistics. Each linguistic lobe corresponds to a system or principle that constitutes the essence of language.

The Concept of the Lobe:

Al-Awraghi defines the lobe as “a set of homogeneous rules that apply to a subject that is inherently distinct from other subjects involved in forming the linguistic system. All human languages must branch into the same number of lobes, with the same nature, function, and sequence” (Mohammed, *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*, 2018, p. 89). This means that a lobe consists of a set or system of rules that are homogeneous and complementary, each set serving the function of the lobe being studied. The rules of one lobe form a sequential and functional system that complements the function of the following lobe in the formation of the essence of language. The number, function, and nature of these lobes are the same in all languages.

As previously mentioned, the lobes that make up the essence and nature of language are four. Each lobe, with its rules, serves the subsequent lobe, and the number of lobes is fixed in all languages. However, the mediums through which they operate vary in pattern from one language to another. Thus, the essence of language, within the framework of relative linguistics, is formed starting with the auditory lobe, followed by the lexical lobe, the transformational lobe, and finally the syntactic lobe.

The Auditory Lobe:

This is the first of the linguistic lobes that form the essence of language. Al-Awraghi defines it by its function, stating: “Individual or initially composed linguistic sounds form an independent linguistic subject governed by specific rules related to this subject, which is called the auditory lobe” (Mohammed, *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*, 2018, p. 92).

This means that the first component that brings language out from the latent or mental realm into the active or existential communicative realm is the feature of sound production, whether as individual sounds or as sounds

composed into words or phrases. The composition of these individual or combined sounds is governed by specific rules that distinguish them and their subject matter from the rules and subjects of other lobes.

Types of the Auditory Lobe:

The auditory lobe in all languages is divided into two components:

1. The Phonetic Component:

This component is defined as including a limited number of phonetic units and their alternatives. The characteristic of phoneticity refers to any linguistic sound whose replacement by another in the phonetic context changes the meaning of the word (Mohammed, Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models, 2018, p. 93). This means that the phonetic component has the distinguishing ability to differentiate between linguistic sounds that can replace one another in a particular phonetic context, as in the following example: ('ilm / Silm) – ("علم" / "سلم"), (Qasam / Qalam) – ("قلم" / "قسم"), (Nashara / Nasha) – ("نشر" / "نشأ"), (Makkah / Bakkah) – ("مكة" / "بكة")

2. The Phonological Component:

Al-Awrighi defines this component as comprising the rules for composing phonetic units and their alternatives in order to create spoken utterances that can be heard. Ultimately, the construction within this component leads to the creation of the lexical component (Mohammed, Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models, 2018, p. 93).

The Content, Structuring, and Impact of the Phonetic Component: The content of the phonetic component is universal in human language, as no language can exist without it. In other words, every human language requires a specific set of sounds, limited in number, to be able to express existence or convey emotions. Each language contains two types of sounds: consonants and vowels. For any human language to be able to produce speech, its pronunciation process must consist of three elements:

1. The use of an unlimited number of sounds selected from the existential universe.
2. The use of mental faculties to replicate and store these sounds.
3. The use of a biological organ equipped for sound production.

To establish languages, their phonetic lobe must select from the consonants and vowels previously discussed. This selection is never the same across all languages, which falls under the mandatory aspect. However, from the optional aspect, this selection and choice take place within the framework of the "excluded middle" principle (*tertium non datur*), meaning that this selection does not exceed two phonetic patterns. According to Al-Awrighi, this is confirmed by languages selecting their derived vowels from root vowels, which are common to all languages and limited in number: *Dhamma* (u), *Fatha* (a), *Kasra* (i), and *Sukun* (o). In order for human languages to form derived vowels, they choose either the process of segmentation or doubling.

By "doubling," it is meant the process of adding a vocal length to the short vowel, which is what Arabic has adopted for its short vowels by lengthening them and turning them into long vowels. Thus, it created the long *Dhamma* (uu), the long *Fatha* (aa), and the long *Kasra* (ii). Therefore, the total number of vowels selected by Arabic from the existential realm is seven: three short vowels *Dhamma* (u), *Fatha* (a), and *Kasra* (i) and three long vowels long *Dhamma* (uu), long *Fatha* (aa), and long *Kasra* (ii) along with *Sukun* (o). This applies to languages that adopt the doubling method as a medium.

On the other hand, languages that adopt segmentation as a medium, such as French, use the method of splitting or dividing their vowels into smaller ones. As a result, they end up with more vowels than others. For instance, they might split the *Dhamma* (u), *Fatha* (a), or *Kasra* (i) into smaller vowel sounds. This segmentation expands the range of individual phonetic combinations, as seen in French examples where the consonant "p" is combined with different vowels to form various words: *pot*, *peut*, *poux*, *peau*, *pue*. This feature also exists in languages that use doubling as a medium, like Arabic, but in its own distinct way. For instance, in Arabic, the meaning of a word composed of the same phonetic units changes by simply changing the vowel of the first syllable, as is evident in trilateral words like: *Ghamr* (غمر), *Ghimr* (غمر), and *Ghumr* (غمر).

From this, we can conclude that the phonetic component is universal in human languages and operates within the "excluded middle" principle. Accordingly, human languages select a group of vowels based on this principle, either through the process of vowel doubling, as in Arabic, or through segmentation, as in French. The benefit of these two processes is clearly shown in the way they create semantic differences in words and structures, allowing these languages to enrich their lexicon through these methods.

Content, Structure, and Impact of the Phonological Component:

The phonological component represents the second part of the auditory lobe and governs the content of the phonetic component, according to Al-Awrighi. The phonological component works on combining vowels and consonants to "produce individual phonetic forms, which are utterances... in order to construct an unlimited number of individual phonetic forms (utterances)" (Mohammed, Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models, 2018, p. 99).

The phonological component is patterned, as human languages do not adhere to a single rule when constructing their phonetic units and individual sound forms. Instead, they follow patterned rules. According to the foundational hypothesis of relative linguistics, these rules can be traced back to two main patterns:

1. **The First Pattern:** This pattern builds phonetic roots using rules that allow for the attachment of prefixes and suffixes on either side of the root (Mohammed, *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*, 2018, p. 99). The construction of the root follows two rules:
 - a. **Constructing individual phonetic forms (utterances) using only vowels**, as in French, English, German, and other languages. In this case, the number of possible combinations is limited, as vowels are finite, and thus, the combinations of those vowels are also limited. Examples include: *eau, ou, y, à, é*, etc.
 - b. **Constructing individual phonetic forms (utterances) using consonants along with vowels**, producing roots. For instance, languages that follow the root system place a consonant followed by a vowel to form their utterances, such as in *panorama, autre, magasin, radicale*, etc.
2. **The Second Pattern:** This pattern is used in languages such as Arabic, which employs a set of rules to form root-based utterances. First, these utterances are composed only of consonants, and then "it moves secondly to the vowels, constructing templates and forms with different rules from the previous ones to accommodate the roots. Thirdly, the soft root is inserted into the template. Through these three processes, the individual, spoken utterances are produced" (Mohammed, *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*, 2018, p. 100).

The process of constructing utterances in Arabic using this pattern can be demonstrated as follows:

- **In nouns:**
ض ر ب, ح ل م → (ف ع ل) Examples: (فَعْل - ضَرْب, فَعْل - حَلْم)
- **In verbs:**
ح ل م → (ف ع ل) Examples: (فَعْل - حَلْم, فَعْل - حَلِم, فَعْل - حَلْم)

This pattern applies similarly to other nouns derived from the same root, as well as verbs, verbal nouns, adjectives, and other forms.

The Lexical Lobe:

Definition:

Al-Awrighi defines this lobe by its content, stating: "It is the 'understood words associated with spoken utterances, which form a distinct linguistic subject that must be governed by specific rules and given a unique name, referred to as the lexical lobe'" (Mohammed, *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*, 2018, p. 92). This means that the content of the lexical lobe in all human languages consists of an unlimited number of lexical entries preserved in the collective memory of linguistically homogeneous individuals. These entries are composed of two parts:

1. **The audible part**, referred to as the *utterance* (قولة): The *utterance* is "a phonetic form stored in the pictorial faculty, which is naturally programmed to store sensory images."
2. **The understood part**, referred to as the *word* (كلمة): The *word* is "a meaning represented in the mnemonic faculty, which is programmed to store abstract meanings" (Mohammed, *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*, 2018, p. 130).

Components of the Lexical Lobe:

The creation of lexical entries is based on the two parts mentioned earlier. In other words, entries are formed through the auditory part receiving the *qawlah* (utterance) from the auditory component as a phonetic form. This *qawlah* is then passed to the conceptual part, which translates it into an understood or abstract word. This is the first process the lexicon undergoes to create entries.

There is a second process for creating original lexical entries, which occurs in three stages:

1. Receiving an *auditory utterance* from the auditory part, which is supplied by the auditory lobe.
2. Receiving an *understood word* from the conceptual part, which is supplied by the existential universe.
3. Combining the auditory utterance with the understood word to create an original lexical entry.

Once the original lexical entries are created, a fourth process allows for generating derivative lexical entries from these original entries through the *transformational lobe*. Through this, "the derivational generation of derivative entries from their roots is prioritized using the transformational lobe, which is responsible for deriving some entries from others. This is the approach of root-based languages, such as Arabic. The results of this approach include an increase in the number of derivative entries and the formation of derivational fields. In these fields, a limited number of words are united by shared meanings and structures derived from the same root" (Mohammed, *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*, 2018, p. 132). Examples of this include: *salaba* (سَلَبَ), *salb* (سَلَب), *salib* (سَلَب), *maslub* (مسلوب), *sallab* (سَلَاب), and *istilab* (استلاب).

Types of Lexicons in Relative Linguistics:

Al-Awraghidivides the lexicon into two types:

a) Fraternal Lexicon:This type of lexicon is characterized by a broad derivational field and by the consistent derivation of some lexical entries from others. For each original or root verb, there is a specific number of related verbs. Similarly, for each original or root verb, there is a limited number of descriptive entries, and for each descriptive entry, there is a second level of descriptive entries. This is how lexical entries are generated in every mini-derivational field. For example:

(*istaktabا* استكتب, *katabا* كتب, *katibا* كاتب), (*mustaktibا* مستكتب, *yaktubا* يكتب, *maktubا* مكتوب), (*istiktabا* استكتاب, *kitabا* كتابة, *maktabا* مكتب).

b) Miscellaneous Lexicon:This type of lexicon is characterized by a disproportionate derivational field, with some lexical entries not being phonologically consistent with others. This inconsistency arises from the prioritization of conventionalization over derivational generation (Mohammed, *Linguistic Mediums, Relative Linguistics, and Patterned Syntax*, 2001, p. 144). **The Transformational Lobe:**

Definition:

Al-Awraghidefines this lobe by its function, describing it as responsible for “deriving some understood words from others and transforming audible utterances from one structure to another, thus forming a new linguistic subject governed by appropriate rules. It is thus called the transformational lobe” (Mohammed, *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*, 2018, p. 92).

This means that the task of the transformational lobe is to multiply and expand the number of lexical entries. It serves as an intermediary between original lexical entries and derivative lexical entries, as illustrated in the following example:

- **Lexical Lobe:** Original lexical entries → **Transformational Lobe** → Derivative lexical entries.

Components of the Transformational Lobe:

The content of the transformational lobe is divided into two parts: the derivational component and the inflectional component.

1. Derivational Component:

This consists of a set of rules that help derive certain secondary meanings from an original meaning in the base word, such as deriving meanings of participation, intensification, passivity, comparison, plurality, and transformation.

2. Inflectional Component:

This consists of morphological rules that assist in altering the structure of lexical entries from one form to another.

The relationship between these two components is one of functional complementarity. What the derivational component allows, the inflectional component does not restrict. Al-Awraghinotes that the reverse may be true in some cases, but it does not apply universally. This is because the inflectional component is not responsible for overseeing the semantics of an entrythat is the role of the derivational component. This means that while a structure may be morphologically correct, its meaning could be flawed in terms of derivation.

Patterning of the Transformational Lobe:

Al-Awraghibelieves that the discussion on the patterning of the transformational lobe does not apply to the derivational component because the role of the derivational component is to oversee semantics. As mentioned earlier, the semantic component is a universal principle in languages. Therefore, the content of the derivational component must also be universal due to its connection to meaning. Consequently, the patterning of the transformational lobe is specific to the inflectional component.

The patterning of the inflectional lobe in human languages occurs through the introduction of a component or medium that facilitates the transition from generating original lexical entries to derivative lexical entries. The patterning of this generation in languages occurs through two suitable mediums: one for languages that use the stem-based system and another for languages that use the root-based system.

In stem-based languages, the generation of derivative lexical entries occurs "through the medium of affixation. This medium is more suitable for stem-based languages that, through their auditory lobe, constructed solid stems by arranging consonants with vowels. Thus, the only method left for morphological generation is to attach inflectional elements to the stems in the form of prefixes (e.g., *en+terror*) or suffixes (e.g., *ter+ain*) or both (e.g., *en+terre+ment*). The affixes may appear in sequences, as in this lexical entry: *mond+ial+isationn+iste*" (Mohammed, *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*, 2018, p. 136).

As for synthetic languages that use the root-based system, such as Arabic, the process of generating derivative lexical entries from original ones occurs through the use of the *template medium*. "This medium involves returning to the auditory lobe to utilize vowels in shaping the derivational forms into which the root is inserted, resulting in a derivative lexical entry" (Mohammed, *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*, 2018, p. 137).

Al-Awraghisees that the patterned structure of the two mediums (template and affixation) is equivalent. That is, the template-based medium corresponds to the affixation-based medium. An example of this equivalence is the fa'il (فاعل) pattern in Arabic, such as in raqis (راقص), which is equivalent to the suffixes -er and -eur as in dancer in English and danseur in French. Similarly, the ifta'al (افتعل) pattern in Arabic, such as in ightasal (اغتسل) and ikhtaba'a (اختبأ), is equivalent to the prefix se- as in se laver and se cacher in French.

Based on the previous examples of the template-based morphology, this does not mean that Arabic, by choosing the template medium, neglected the affixation medium, just as languages that use the affixation medium do not entirely disregard the template medium. This is evident in the Arabic language, where certain words shift from the template medium to the affixation medium to change their meaning. Examples of this transition include:

(1) From singular to broken plural and then to plural of plurals:

- Rajul (رجل) → Rijaal (رجال) → Rijaalaat (رجالات)
- Haram (هرم) → Ahram (أهرام) → Ahramaat (أهرامات)

(2) Transition from the verb with an added letter, such as: (Aslama - أسلم), to the agent form in the pattern (Muf'il - مفعل), its feminine form by adding the suffix (ة), its dual by adding the suffixes (ان or ين), its feminine plural by adding the suffix (ات), and its masculine plural by adding the suffixes (ون or ين):

Aslama (أسلم) → Muslim (مسلم) → Muslimah (مسلمة) → Muslimaan (مسلمان) → Muslimeen (مسلمين) → Muslimaat (مسلمات) → Muslimoon (مسلمون) → Muslimeen (مسلمين)

4.3.2. The Syntactic Lobe:

1.4.3.2. Definition:

In relative linguistics, syntax, or the syntactic lobe, represents the fourth lobe that forms the essence of human language and constitutes its core. This lobe is prepared to function and conduct research based on the output of the previous lobes. The lexical lobe, which produces both types of lexical entries, transfers its output to the syntactic lobe. The syntactic lobe applies specific rules to arrange these entries either in individual contexts or within sentence structures, enabling communication, understanding, interaction, and exchange between language users.

Function of the Syntactic Lobe:

The role of the syntactic lobe involves many functions, but its most important ones, in the context of relative linguistics, include:

- Composing a sequence of lexical entries into a linguistic unit through which language users communicate.
- Defining the relationships and grammatical rules that link lexical entries together to form sentences and linguistic phrases.
- Forming small linguistic structures by joining one word to another, such as adding the definite article "ال" to *rajul* (رجل), or by joining one word to another that carries its own independent meaning, such as adding the word *kitaab* (كتاب) to *Zayd* (زيد). This introduces a syntactic rule like placement in the subject position or the possessive structure to form the phrase: *Kitaab Zayd* (كتاب زيد).

Patterning of the Syntactic Lobe:

As mentioned earlier, the syntactic lobe represents the fourth of the lobes that constitute the essence and core of language, and these lobes are universal across all human languages. Therefore, the syntactic lobe follows the same rule. Its function is to compose a series of lexical entries into a linguistic unit, through which language users communicate, and to define the relationships and grammatical rules that link lexical entries to form sentences and phrases. However, the function of syntax, through its various rules and grammatical relationships, operates on two levels in Arabic and other human languages.

The first level is composition, where different words are linked by relationships that create a linguistic unit. The second level is order, where these composed words are placed in specific positions relative to each other. However, not all languages apply these two levels in the same way. Some languages handle syntax in two stages: first, they use relationships to compose words while keeping them loosely connected, and second, they arrange these composed words in a specific order. In contrast, other languages apply both composition and order simultaneously, composing and arranging words at the same time.

This idea is supported by Al-Awrighi's reference to Nasir al-Din al-Tusi, who said: "Composition precedes order, and order is more specific than composition not that there is composition without some kind of arrangement, for that is impossible. Rather, it means that a specific order necessitates a specific composition, while a specific composition does not necessitate a specific order, but some kind of arrangement is necessary" (Al-Tusi, 1993, Vol. 1, p. 21).

An example that demonstrates both composition and order is the sentence: (*DarabaZaydun Amran*) (ضرب زيد عمرا), which can produce several variations:

(*DarabaZaydun Amran*) (ضرب زيد عمرا)
(*Daraba Amran Zaydun*) (ضرب عمرا زيد)
(*ZaydunDaraba Amran*) (زيد ضرب عمرا)
(*Amran DarabaZaydun*) (عمرا ضرب زيد)
(*Zaydun Amran Daraba*) (زيد عمرا ضرب)

All these variations are structured in Arabic by first composing the words and then arranging them in different ways, facilitated by the free word order and the use of inflectional markers.

An example of composition without a specific order can be seen in the sentence: (*Sawfaashrabu maa' al-bahr ams*) (سوف أشرب ماء البحر أمس), which can produce:

(*Sawfaashrabu maa' al-bahr ams*) (سوف أشرب ماء البحر أمس)
(*Ashrabusawfa maa' al-bahr ams*) (أشرب سوف ماء البحر أمس)
(*Amssawfaashrabu maa' al-bahr*) (أمس سوف أشرب ماء البحر)
(*Maa' al-bahr amssawfaashrabu*) (ماء البحر أمس سوف أشرب)

In these examples, composition is present, but order cannot apply meaningfully because the word order does not align with Arabic syntax or its chosen structure.

This is echoed by Sibawayh, who expressed this issue with the concept of correctness in syntax: "This is the chapter on correctness in speech and impossibility. Some speech is correct and good, some is impossible, some is correct but false, and some is correct but ugly, and some is impossible and false. As for the correct and good, it is like saying: 'I came to you yesterday, and I will come to you tomorrow.' As for the impossible, it is to contradict the beginning of your speech with the end, like saying: 'I will come to you tomorrow, and I came to you yesterday.' As for the correct but false, it is like saying: 'I carried the mountain and drank the water of the sea.' And as for the correct but ugly, it is like putting the words in the wrong order, as in: 'QadZaydanra'aytu' (قد زيدا رأيت) or 'Kay Zaydanya'tiyk' (كي زيدا يأتيك). And as for the impossible and false, it is like saying: 'I will drink the water of the sea yesterday.'" (Sibawayh, 1988, Vol. 1, pp. 25-26).

Patterned Components of the Syntactic Lobe:

As mentioned earlier, all human languages operate with two meanings in their syntactic structures: the composition of words and their arrangement. However, this process is not the same in every language. Some languages first compose their words and then arrange them in a specific syntactic pattern, while others compose and arrange their words simultaneously, as their structure allows it. The reason behind some languages following the two-step process (composition followed by arrangement) and others doing both at once is the linguistic medium chosen for syntax.

The languages that compose and then arrange their words correspond to synthetic languages like Arabic, which has chosen the medium of free word order and inflectional markers. On the other hand, the languages that compose and arrange simultaneously are referred to as "tree-structured" languages, which have chosen the medium of fixed word order.

The first thing the selected syntactic medium in all human languages determines is the role of syntax or the type of syntactic construction. Based on this, the choice is made. Regarding function, all languages must distinguish between the different roles that syntactic structures can take on, such as distinguishing between the role of the subject and the object. This distinction is made by choosing the appropriate medium assigned to this task.

Regarding the type of syntactic construction, it is clear that languages, by logical and realistic division, must have a system for expressing the types of events they wish to convey, and these are generally expressed through verbs. The concept of the verb, both transitive and intransitive, is universal. It encompasses expressing the previous functions of subjectivity, verb action, and objectivity. According to the theorist, languages can be divided into two categories:

- **Languages that arrange and compose their syntactic structures to express the functions of subject, verb, and object (SVO) by choosing the medium of inflectional markers.** A key feature of this medium is the added clarity in expressing meanings, removing ambiguity between functions.
- **Languages that arrange and compose their syntactic structures to express the same grammatical functions (SVO) but by choosing the medium of fixed word order.**

It is important to note that the logically and conceptually permissible syntactic patterns involving the verb, subject, and object fall into six categories:

S V O O S V
V O S V S O
S O V O V S

Languages that have chosen the fixed word order medium, such as English and French, "select one of the six possible patterns resulting from the logical division of the subject-verb-object triad and standardize it, making it the basic structure with a fixed order. From this, derived patterns are generated according to a rule that allows the verb and its arguments to switch positions" (Mohammed, *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*, 2018, p. 197).

English and French, as tree-structured languages using the fixed word order medium, have chosen the (SVO) pattern to express different grammatical functions. This pattern allows for alternation or transformation, which enables a variety of sentence structures. For example:

Mohammad (S) wrote (V) the lesson (O). (محمد كتب الدرس).

This order can be transformed using a passive construction: *The lesson (O) was written (V) by Mohammad (S)*"

(الدرس مف كتب من طرف محمد).

Here, we mention the languages that have chosen one of the six syntactic patterns mentioned earlier to express their syntactic functions and have adopted the fixed word order medium. Among them, we mention:

- **Singaporean language and Indian Tamil language**, which have chosen the (S O V) order, base their syntax on this pattern for composition and arrangement of words. For example:

Mohammad (S) the lesson (O) wrote (V). (محمد الدرس كتب).

- **Irish language** and many South American tribal languages have chosen the (V S O) order. For example:

Wrote (V) Mohammad (S) the lesson (O). (كتب محمد الدرس)

This pattern allows for word order variation through certain rules, such as the "move the vowel" rule, which permits changing the position of words.

- **Malagasy language and Buri tribes' language on the Bolivian coast** have chosen the (V O S) order. For example:

Wrote (V) the lesson (O) Mohammad (S). (كتب الدرس محمد)

This structure allows for transformations through internal syntactic rules.

- **Warao tribes in Venezuela and Ndeb tribe in Brazil** have chosen the (O S V) order. For example:

The lesson (O) Mohammad (S) wrote (V). (الدرس محمد كتب)

- **Surinamese language and Abalese in the Caribbean islands** have chosen the (O V S) order. For example:

The lesson (O) wrote (V) Mohammad (S). (الدرس كتب محمد)

Conclusion:

In conclusion, we can summarize the results of this research as follows:

- The proposed model of the theory of relative linguistics regarding the concept of language and *langue* and the principles of the linguistic faculty can be considered a comprehensive model, not disconnected from the traditional Arab linguistic model.
- The concepts of language and *langue*, which form the subject of the theory of relative linguistics, require further clarification by the theorist, especially in terms of the lobes, templates, and principles underlying the linguistic faculty.
- The proposed concept of language and *langue* in relative linguistics presents an alternative to what contemporary linguists have proposed, blending the properties of convention and acquisition. This results in a starting hypothesis predicting two valid syntactic patterns for describing the structures of all human languages, in contrast to Chomsky's theory of innate language, which predicts a universal syntactic model for all languages.
- The theory of relative linguistics requires extensive terminological precision by scholars of Arab linguistic studies, considering the unfamiliarity of many terms and their attribution to the theorist, especially in the division of words within the theory.
- Finally, it can be said that the theory of relative linguistics attempts to provide a different perspective on language and *langue*, and the related concepts, claiming to create an epistemological break from the generative-transformational grammar theory and from the traditional Arab grammatical theory. The theory has succeeded in some respects but not in others, due to the descriptive tools employed by the theorist, which include many ambiguous and sometimes unjustified terms or terms that can be traced back to the scholars of the linguistic tradition.

References:

1. Ibn Khaldun. (1992). *Al-Muqaddimah*. Beirut: Library of Lebanon.
- Journal for Educators Teachers and Trainers JETT, Vol. 15(4);ISSN:1989-9572*

2. Al-Awraghi, Mohammed. (2014). *Language Acquisition in Ancient Arab Thought*. Algiers:Ikhtilaf Publications.
3. Al-Awraghi, Mohammed. (2001). *Linguistic Mediums and the Decline of Universal Linguistics*. Rabat: Dar Al-Aman.
4. , Mohammed. (2001). *Linguistic Mediums, Relative Linguistics, and Patterned Syntax*. Rabat: Dar Al-Aman.
5. Al-Awraghi, Mohammed. (2018). *Lectures on Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Models*. Algiers:Ikhtilaf Publications.
6. Al-Ghazali, Abu Hamid. (1997). *Al-Mustasfa from the Science of Usul*. Beirut: Al-RisalaFoundation.
7. Ben Benaji, Abdul Nasser. (2018). *Modern Arab Linguistics: From Scientific Foundation to Practical Application*. Algiers: Doctoral Dissertation.
8. Sibawayh. (1988). *Al-Kitab*. Cairo: Khanji Library.
9. Ghulfan, Mustafa. (2010). *On General Linguistics: Its History, Nature, Subject, and Concepts*. Beirut: Dar Al-Kitab Al-Jadeed Al-Muttahidah.
10. Al-Awraghi, Mohammed. (2010). *The Theory of Relative Linguistics: Reasons for Its Emergence*. Algiers:Ikhtilaf Publications.
11. Nasir al-Din al-Tusi. (1993). *Commentary on Ibn Sina's Al-Isharatwal-Tanbihat*. Beirut: Al-Naaman Foundation.