LANGUAGE USAGE IN THE POSTREVOLUTIONARY

WORKS OF TAWFĪQ AL-ḤAKĪM

by

Sheena Marie Mugavin

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
The University of Utah
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Middle East Studies: Arabic and Linguistics

Department of Languages and Literature

The University of Utah

August 2012

The University of Utah Graduate School

STATEMENT OF THESIS APPROVAL

The thesis of _____**Sheena Oѕtlg'Mugavin**_____

has been approved by the following supervisory committee members:

Marianna Di Paolo_____, Chair		**05/04/12** Date Approved
Asaad Al-Saleh_____, Member		**07/06/12** Date Approved
Peter Sluglett_____ , Member		**05/04/12** Date Approved

and by _____**Kirk Jowers**_____ , Chair of

the Department of _____**Ncpiwciguʼcpf'Nkѕgtcwtg**_____

and by Charles A. Wight, Dean of The Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an analysis of the Arabic language used in two of the post-

revolutionary works of Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm. The dialog of the 1952 short story, "I've Got

It, I've Got It," from the collection, *The Art of Literature,* is examined along with the

dialog from the 1956 play, *The Deal.* In addition to a language analysis and an

overview of the life and works of al-Ḥakīm, the relationship between al-Ḥakīm's themes

and language usage in his works as a means of promoting either Egyptian nationalism

or Arab nationalism is also postulated. Furthermore, this paper reviews the social,

political, and linguistic climate in Egypt that may have had an influence on al-Ḥakīm's

choice of subject matter, while also presenting theories of variation in the Arabic

language and the significance of language in identity creation and nationalism

promotion.

al-Ḥakīm is known for creating a *third language* as a means of generating a sense

of interconnectedness among the less educated people of the Arabic-speaking world,

and this paper looks at the absence or presence of the *third language,* Modern Standard

Arabic (MSA), and Colloquial Egyptian Arabic (CEA) in the two works. The analysis is

two-fold, one section is a qualitative analysis of language tokens in both the play and

the short story, while another section is a quantitative analysis of negation in the play.

This study is unique in that it provides an analysis of language variation in literary

works in the context of societal and political events.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This paper examines the use of language in the short stories of Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm,

Egyptian lawyer, journalist, playwright, poet, and author. In particular, it will provide

an analysis of the language of the dialog in a short story found in *Fann al-ʔadab* (*The Art

of Literature*), published in 1952, the year in which King Farouk abdicated, a landmark

event in modern Egyptian history. In addition to a brief examination of the dialog of

the short story is an examination of the dialog in his 1956 play, *al-Ṣafqah* (*The Deal*), in

which al-Ḥakīm uses his experimental *third language*, a language that is neither standard

Arabic nor a dialect. While Modern Standard Arabic is considered the language of

educated Arabs and is used in literary and public political speech as well as newscasts,

some scholars assert that public speech includes more colloquial markers with the rise

of nationalist ideas (Suleiman, 2003). This is an analysis of al-Hakim's use of features

of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), Colloquial Egyptian Arabic (CEA), and his own

hybrid *third language*, both in the play and in the short stories, in order to enhance both

Egyptian nationalism and pan-Arab nationalism. By means of an examination of al-Ḥakīm's choice of words in specific contexts the paper will try to determine the use of linguistic features of Modern Standard Arabic, Colloquial Egyptian Arabic, or al-Ḥakīm's hybrid.

In order to understand al-Ḥakīm's variation in language usage is vital to situate his works within the social, political, and cultural climate of Egypt at the time; in addition to his creative work the author was a popular cultural critic: hence life in Egypt throughout the first half of the twentieth century will also be explored. This paper will also set out the principal features of both MSA and CEA, as well as examine sociolinguistic aspects of standard, dialect, and hybrid registers, and general theories of identity in diglossic, multilinguistic, or multidialectal societies present the linguistic situation in modern Egypt. Finally, an overview of the life, works, and language of Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm will be presented: while his plays, essays, and novels have attracted attention his short stories have virtually gone unnoticed.

al-Ḥakīm's works were chosen in order to provide a contribution to the greater body of literature on modern Egyptian authors and the formality of the language of theatre and short stories. al-Ḥakīm was acutely aware of the significance of language in

Egyptian society, and he published a number of essays and post-scripts on language and

culture; his insight into language makes his choice of specific language registers in

different contexts especially significant and worthy of study. The originality of this

study is that it provides a multidisciplinary perspective of Egyptian language, culture,

and politics in the early twentieth century. It has significance for the fields of

sociolinguistics, Arabic literature and drama, and Egyptian history, since little research

has been completed on the correlation between linguistic and cultural innovation in the

literature of the time. Starkey (1987) succinctly summarizes the plight al-Ḥakīm faced

while writing in Egypt:

> The problems confronting al-Ḥakīm at the time of his first literary
> endeavors in Arabic were those which have had to be faced by every aspiring
> Arab writer during the 20th century. They include: the question of whether to
> use the classical or colloquial language; the relationship between the literature
> of today and the double heritage ('popular' and 'classical') of the past; and,
> perhaps most important, how to reconcile the use of Western form and themes
> with the desire to remain true to the Arab—and usually, also, the Islamic—
> legacy. To these must be added the lack of an educated reading public of any
> size in the Arab world, at least until quite recently. (p. 195)

Chapter 2 contains a review of literature of the various registers of the Arabic

language, the socio-political climate in Egypt in the middle of the 20th century, and the

work and language of al-Ḥakīm. Chapter 3 provides examples and analysis of the

language of al-Ḥakīm's play and short story. Finally, Chapter 4 concludes with a

discussion of the findings.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter examines the existing literature on larger topics relevant to this

study of the language of Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm. It begins with an overview of the political,

social, and cultural climate at the time the collection of short stories and the play were

written. This is followed by a presentation of the different registers of the Arabic

language, as different registers are used in various social situations and the use of these

registers in the public sphere has changed based on social and political events (Eid,

1988; Ferguson, 1959; Rosenhouse, 2007; Stetkevych, 2002; Suleiman, 2003); then the

concept of language and identity are briefly explored, as language register and identity

have strong ties in the Arabic-speaking world (Irvine, 2002; Shilling-Estes, 2004;

Suleiman, 2003). Finally, this chapter examines the literature on the various works of

Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm, with a focus on reports of language usage in his plays.

Egyptian Culture, Politics, and Society

An analysis of Egyptian culture, politics, and society in al-Ḥakīm's time cannot

simply start at his birth: the social, political, and linguistic climate in Egypt was the

result of centuries of imperialism and revolution. The Egyptian people had to fight

would-be colonizers in order to maintain their political and linguistic autonomy, just as

they had to fight oppressive regimes in order to make social and cultural gains. These

fights were fueled by rising feelings of both Arab and Egyptian nationalism.

Egypt became part of the Ottoman Empire in 1517; the country was able to

remain largely autonomous as a function of the great size of the empire, but Egypt was

neither independent nor sovereign. The Ottomans remained in Egypt for almost 400

years, and under Ottoman rule, Turkish was the language of power and government in

Egypt and the rest of Arab world; although Classical Arabic (the predecessor to MSA)

remained the language of religion and culture.

In 1805, Muhammad ʕali, an Ottoman military commander of Albanian origin,

had been sent to pacify Egypt after the upheavals caused by Napoleon's expedition in

1798. Instead of reintegrating Egypt into the Empire, he effectively created a separate

state, over which he and his descendants ruled until 1952. By the end of the 19th

century, nationalism had taken hold in Egypt, and the Egyptians became increasingly

discontented with their situation and, in particular, with the indebtedness to foreign

banks which their governments' overambitious economic programs had saddled them.

In 1882, Britain occupied Ottoman Egypt on the pretext of assisting the government of

the Khedive against a rebellion against his authority. This enabled Britain both to gain

control of the Suez Canal, and to "control the nascent nationalist movement and

eliminate what it deemed to be potentially destructive political confusion that had

emerged in Egypt" (Botman, 1991, p. 18).

The British occupation led to increased Egyptian nationalism, and this

nationalism was strongly tied to the Arabic language. Throughout the nineteenth

century, the Egyptians pursued the use of Arabic for administrative purposes, and by

the end of the century most official correspondence was conducted in Arabic; however,

in 1909, only Turkish was permitted in legal cases–Arabic was not yet the language of

the courts. In 1913 the Arab Congress convention in Paris called for Arabic to be the

official language of the Ottoman Parliament and local governments, but it would be a

few years before Turkish was eliminated from the Egyptian political system (Versteegh,

2001, p. 176).

The British avoided defining their relationship with Egypt for two decades, as it was legally part of the Ottoman Empire at the time of the occupation in 1882. When the Ottoman Empire sided with the Central Powers on the outbreak of the First World War, Britain declared Egypt a protectorate, enacted martial law, suspended the Egyptian government, and severed Egypt's ceremonial connection with the Turks (Botman, 1991, 25). At the start of the First World War provincial (Arab) discontent with the central (Turkish) government increased and the Arab revolt of 1916 strived to create an Arab kingdom for the Arabic language and its speakers (Versteegh, 2001, p. 177). The Turks lost Egypt completely in 1918 when the end of World War I brought with it the end of the Ottoman Empire.

With the departure of the Turks and their language from Egypt, Arabic was restored as the language of both the public and political spheres, which raised the social prestige of the language (Versteegh, 2001, p. 175). However, the restoration of the Arabic language brought to light various problems in the Arabic language education system. Furthermore, at the time Arabic became the official language of Egypt, scholars believed that Modern Standard Arabic did not spread partly because of the complex organization of the language and partly because of the inadequate educational systems

in the countries that spoke it; this latter issue raised many social concerns.

While the Egyptians were pleased at the end of Ottoman occupation, they were not pleased with the continued British presence. Britain claimed they were permitted to control Egypt, as they had inherited Turkey's liabilities through the Treaty of Lausanne and Egypt's rights through the protectorate (Morsy, 1984, p. 81). The British, of course, remained in Egypt, shaping economic development and political leadership and the British were the focus of an anti-imperial nationalist movement that affected Egyptian politics for decades to come (Cleveland, 2004, p. 103-104). Frustrated with the occupation, in 1919, the ruling Wafd party staged a revolt against the British. People from all backgrounds and social classes participated in the 1919 revolution, but their efforts were quickly stifled[1] (Botman, 1991). The Wafd-led revolution ultimately led to Egypt becoming legally sovereign and independent in 1922: all power was restored to King Fuʔad (r. 1917-36), but Britain maintained a large presence in Egypt, and effectively ran the country until 1952. The limitations on the country's sovereignty frustrated many Egyptians both in the core and on the periphery of society, but they were obliged to accept both the distorted sovereignty and the flawed Constitution of 1923. Egypt held its first parliamentary elections in 1924, in which the Wafd party won

---

1   al-Ḥakīm's first novel was about a family participating in the 1919 revolution.

90% of the seats and the office of prime minister, marking the beginning of Egypt's

troubled fling with democracy (Cleveland, 2004, p. 196). Not only did this time mark

the beginning of a period of fairly unsuccessful democracy, but it was also a period of

unsuccessful independence, and the time when al-Ḥakīm began covertly publishing

plays.

Shortly after Egypt's independence, Isma'il Sidiqi was appointed prime minister

in 1930, he subsequently dismissed Wafd parliament and abrogated the constitution;

these were violent years filled with citizen protests. (Gershoni & Jankowski, 1995, p. 2).

In 1932, during Sidiqi's unscrupulous rule, The Academy of Cairo was founded to "guard

the integrity of the Arabic language and preserve it from dialectal and foreign

influence," and to "adapt the Arabic script and grammar" (Versteegh, 2001, p. 178). It

was also during Sidiqi's rule that al-Ḥakīm began openly publishing his works.

In 1936, the Wafd government drafted another Anglo-Egyptian treaty, under

which British troops were still permitted to be based in Egyptian territory, but would

remain only in the Suez Canal region and "would withdraw from the Canal Zone after

twenty years only on the condition that Egypt was able by her own resources to ensure

the liberty and entire security of navigation in the Canal" (Morsy, 1984, p. 88). Despite

the new treaty of Egyptian independence, the British increased their presence in Egypt

at the start of World War II.

Throughout this unrest in the half-century prior to Egypt's independence in

1936, the population grew at an alarming rate, which put great pressure on the

country's agricultural resources, and this, along with the outbreak of World War II,

stimulated an increase in industrial production in Egypt. Despite the positive effects

associated with the growing industrial sector, Egypt remained mostly resource-poor and

population-rich, but the Egyptian people remained in their homeland. Issawi (1949),

wrote that, at least in his day:

> the Egyptians, through-out the six or seven millennia of their history [have been
> reluctant] to leave their country. In contrast to the Lebanese, Palestinians, and
> Southern Arabians (all of whom have a longer commercial tradition and live
> near the sea), the Egyptians have not emigrated much and the Egyptian
> communities abroad are few and far between. (p. 111)

Because the Egyptian people did not emigrate, by 1950, society as a whole was forced

to become more skilled and educated in order to perform the more complex tasks

associated with working in the industrial sector (Issawi, 1949, p. 112). The increased

number of educated individuals boosted the wealth and numbers of the working-class,

and also promulgated Arabic language and literature, as a better-educated public

became more regular consumers of Arabic literature. In the years after World War II,

Egypt as a whole profited, although the rural population remained impoverished, which

in turn had negative affects on the Egyptian economy, as the poor are generally unable.

However, the growth of the industrial sector was not an economic panacea (Botman,

1991, p. 83).

There existed a large chasm between the rich and the poor in Egypt in the

twentieth century: there were peasants living along the Nile and a very poor urban

proletariat in the slums of Cairo and Alexandria, and rich aristocrats, businessmen, and

government officials living a European lifestyle. Egyptians became increasingly

disgruntled with the social situation and the Wafd rulers; consequently, support for the

opposition factions grew. The return to prewar economic conditions increased support

for existing organizations such as the Communists, the Muslim Brotherhood, and the

Young Egyptians; Botman (1991) states, "the Wafd's anti-British nationalism was

ultimately considered insufficient to deal with Egypt's political, economic, and social

problems" (p. 89).

Amongst the aggrieved Egyptians were the students. Schooling in Egypt had

been a source of concern in the previous century. The Egyptian postsecondary system

was designed in a manner to perpetuate the division between wealthy individuals

educated in the *European-track* and the working class educated in the *Egyptian-track*.

Among its many flaws, the two-track education system created a linguistic divide

between the wealthy and the poor, as the European-track learned the languages of

Europe and the Egyptian-track learned Modern Standard Arabic. Nevertheless, students

in both educational tracks were united in their dissatisfaction with the social and

political climate in Egypt in the interwar period, which led students, along with other

members of the middle-class, to support the various political factions.

In an attempt to calm the situation, King Farouk (r. 1936-52) called for elections

in 1950; the Wafd party won again, and in 1951 Wafd prime minister al-Nahhas called

for the abrogation of the Treaty of 1936 and the removal of the British troops from

Egypt (Cleveland, 2004, p. 303). The political and social systems in Egypt continued to

be chaotic and socially polarized: by 1952, 35% of Egyptian land was owned by .04% of

the population, and 94% of the land was possessed by 34% of the population[2]

(Cleveland, 2004, p. 302). This meant a large portion of the population, including the

laborers, faced more dire living circumstances than they had experienced during the

time of the bread riots during World War II; such an environment increased support for

---

2   The play analyzed in this thesis, *The Deal,* is about land distribution in Egypt.

opposition groups including the Muslim Brotherhood, who called for Islamic values for

the state and complete autonomy from Britain.

January 26, 1952, Black Saturday, marked the beginning of the end for both the

Wafd party and British presence in Egypt, as riots gave way to a massive fire in Cairo's

central business district. On July 23, 1952, the Wafd regime and the monarchy was

overthrown by the Free Officers Party, whose members came mostly from lower-middle-

class and working families. Once in power, the Free Officers organized themselves into

a Revolutionary Command Council (RCC); their stated goals were to eliminate

feudalism, foreign control of the country, and Egyptian supporters of colonialism. The

RCC also aimed to establish social justice, a stronger army, and democracy. Two officers

in the Free Officers' party were largely responsible for the coup, Colonel Gamel ʕabd al-

Nasser and Muhammad Anwar el-Sadat; immediately following the coup, General

Muhammad Najib was named president and prime minister, with Nasser becoming

prime minister in 1954 and president in 1965 (after his supporters had neutralized

Najib) and Sadat was Nasser vice president (Cleveland, 2004, p. 304; Timeline). The

coup occurred the same year al-Ḥakīm published a collection of short stories, *The Art of*

Literature.

Days after the coup, King Farouk was sent into exile, the monarchy, parliament,

and constitution were abolished, and the groundwork for democracy was laid; the RCC

permitted themselves 3 years to get the new government in order—and other political

parties were banned at this time. The RCC immediately began a somewhat hastily

conceived program of social and political reform. The Agrarian Reform Law of 1952

limited the amount of land an individual could own and distributed the excess land to

those with little or no land, and the regime also eliminated (Turkish) civil titles such as

pasha and *bey* to minimize both the Turkish language from Egyptian usage and the

schism between the rich and the poor (Cleveland, 2004, p. 307). In 1953, Britain agreed

to begin withdrawing troops. A new constitution was established in 1956, which

reaffirmed the regime's commitment to a state free of imperialism and feudalism, with

democracy, social justice, and a strong army, as well as protection from discrimination

based on sex, religion, language, or race, and voting rights for women (Cleveland, p.

308). On 26 July 1956 Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal after the withdrawal of British

and American offers to fund the building of the Aswan Dam, setting the scene for the

Suez crisis. The British withdrawal was finalized after the crisis, and this was seen as

the time at which Egypt gained full independence. It was the same year, 1956, that al-

Ḥakīm published his play, *The Deal.*

In the 1950s, Arabic linguists and scholars attempted to simplify Arabic

grammar and to reform the teaching of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). Although,

Versteegh (2001) states, "Since none of these proposals was integrated into a

comprehensive didactic concept, they have remained largely unproductive. Nowadays

there are very few proponents of this road towards an 'easier language'" (p. 185). The

mid-twentieth century was a time of linguistic change in the Arabic-speaking world.

Each Arabic-speaking country sought in its own way to the modernization of the

lexicon; the Academies were unable to unify the terminologies across borders

(Versteegh, 2001, p. 179). This was a large change from the unified expansion of MSA

in the nineteenth century, when scholars in Damascus and Cairo were working together

to perpetuate a form of standard Arabic. Since 1960, the Academy of Cairo has focused

on creating new colloquial and standard Arabic terms and reforming script and

grammar, while the colloquial language continued to gain prestige in society

(Versteegh, 2001, p. 178).

Variation in the Arabic language, the relationship between the Arabic language

and national identity, and the social and political climate in Egypt until the middle of

the twentieth century are all interconnected. The following sections examine how these

linguistic, social, and political factors affected Arabic language usage, Egyptian and

pan-Arab nationalism, and fed into the work of al-Ḥakīm .

Modern Standard Arabic and Colloquial Egyptian Arabic

The Arabic language spreads across an extensive geographical area: Arabic is

spoken as far west as Morocco, south to The Sudan, east to Oman, and north to Syria.

Although these countries share Modern Standard Arabic as a common written language,

they have very different spoken languages; some countries, such as Egypt, have multiple

dialects for rural areas and urban centers that vary from MSA in syntax, phonology,

morphology, and lexicon. Holes (2004) writes that both the dialect and vernacular of

Arabic speakers differ, sometimes drastically, across the Arab world, and the greater the

geographical distance between two points, the greater the linguistic difference. These

geography-based variations in the Arabic language have provided linguists with a

plethora of research topics, primarily phonological and sociolinguistic in nature, and

spurred discussion on theories of language variation and change, namely diglossia

versus hybridization–both theories are based on the idea that specific social contexts

require specific linguistic registers.[3]

Diglossia

Linguists use the term *diglossia* to describe the relationship between the Arabic

language and its dialects (Ferguson, 1959), meaning that there is both a formal (high,

H) and an informal (low, L) version of the language, each used under different

circumstances. Ferguson (1959), who first posited diglossia, explained it as follows:

> A relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the
> primary dialects of the language (which may include standard or regional
> standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically
> more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of
> written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community,
> which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and
> formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for
> ordinary conversation. (p. 336)

For example, two forms of Arabic, MSA and CEA are used in different domains, with

MSA being the *high* (H) language, considered literary Arabic because it is typically the

language of the news, literature, business conduct, and political and public speeches,

and is closely related to the Classical Arabic of the Qurʔān; and CEA is the *low* (L) form

because it is considered colloquial, localized, informal speech.

---

3 Variationsits posit that the difference between a *dialect* and a *register* or *style* is that dialects
   depict variation according to users, while registers demonstrate variation according to uses
   (Irvine, 2002, p. 27), and this paper focuses on uses or context of variation.

Although diglossia has distinct domains in which the high or low level of language are used, these lines of division are not absolute. Even before Ferguson published the model in 1959 al-Ḥakīm was writing in MSA, CEA, and his *third language,* and President Nasser was delivering speeches in both MSA and CEA; therefore, what was reported as happening and the language and what was actually happening appear to be two different phenomena.

In the diglossic model CEA is the primary dialect and MSA is the highly codified form, as MSA has more forms of declension than the dialects. When considering verbal declension, for example, MSA has first person singular and plural, as well as second and third person singular, dual, and plural–all of which, except the dual have masculine and feminine forms. However, CEA eliminates the dual form in declension and instead uses the plural. Additionally, MSA uses inflective case endings and the dialects do not.

Rosenhouse (2007) explains that there are a number of "diglossic differences between literary and colloquial Arabic mainly from the morpho-phonological and lexico-semantic aspects" (p. 653). Generally speaking, MSA and the dialects share a large part of the basic vocabulary, such as pronouns, kinship terms, body parts, social structure, animals, geographical objects, and basic activities (although the MSA "yes" is

different from those used in both the Egyptian and Moroccan dialects). Furthermore,

many of the words that share the same root in the high and low registers undergo

variation in inflection and declension in the dialects (Rosenhouse, 2007, p. 667).

The H and L language can vary phonologically, and alternate pronunciations of

individual orthographic letters can be found in the L register. For example, the MSA ط

is pronounced */ṭ/*, but CEA has the variants of */t/* and */s/* (Eid, 2007, p. 409). CEA has

different phonological vowel and consonant inventories than MSA. Linguists are not the

only ones noticing the dichotomy of the Arabic language, as native Arabic speakers

refer to MSA as *fuṣḥā* and CEA as *ʕāmmiyya*. Hinds and Badawi (1986) state that fuṣḥā

and ʕāmmiyya are learned separately, at school and in the home, respectively, and that

advances in mastery of one register are generally tied the other.

Diglossia poses a problem for speakers and writers alike, and some linguists

(e.g., Brisset, 2004; Eid, 2007; Hinds & Badawi, 1986) argue that the Arabic language

cannot be summed up so cleanly or succinctly, that there are more than two distinct

levels of spoken or written Arabic: there are a number of registers between high and

low. As will be discussed later, al-Ḥakīm, though not a linguist, emphasized that the

creation of a *third language* was necessary for communication among speakers

throughout the Arabic-speaking world; al-Ḥakīm made these claims three years before

Ferguson's 1959 theory of Arabic diglossia was published. Therefore, it can be said that

al-Ḥakīm used an alternative model, the hybrid model.

<div align="center">Hybridization</div>

Eid (1988) supports the diglossic model and explains the contexts in which

individuals *code-switch,* that is, vary their speech between two forms, the formal (H) and

the informal (L), based on social circumstances. However, Eid's 2007 article states that

a hybrid form of the Arabic language exists: "Arabic hybrid or intermediate forms, as

they are sometimes called, include features from both varieties of *fuṣḥā* and dialects

and, therefore, they cannot be clearly identified as belonging to one or the other" (p.

408). Eid (2007) quotes Bakhtin's definition of linguistic hybridization, "a mixture of

two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, between two different

linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social

differentiation, or by some other factor" (p. 408). Eid (2007) provides an example of

the hybridization of يمثل *yu-maððil* 'he represents,' which is written the same in MSA

and CEA, but pronounced differently: *yu-massil-u* is a hybrid of the MSA *yu-maððil-u* and

the CEA *yi-massil*(p. 409). This theory of hybridization or different levels or registers of

Arabic aside from the standard and the dialect is the proverbial grey area in what was

once considered to be only black and white.

This theory of hybridization is in line with the sociolinguistic variationist

perspective, which states that speakers shift linguistic style or register either consciously

or unconsciously based on social cues (Irvine, 2002; Shilling-Estes, 2004). Hinds and

Badawi (1986) present five different registers of Arabic with *fuṣḥā* and *ʕāmmiyya* at

opposite ends of the spectrum. Variationists see style as part of a *system of distinction*, in

which registers are differentiated from one another and are used in distinct settings

(Irvine, 2002, p. 22). The five registers presented by Hinds and Badawi follow the idea

of style-shifting in that each register is appropriately spoken in different settings or by

different individuals. Their system:

> …envisages a synchronic language scheme in which these two systems are at
> extremes from one another, while between them lie three other distinguishable
> systems. Each of these five systems, or *levels*, contains elements which exists
> also in one or more of the other levels but in varying proportions; although the
> *divisions* between the levels are of course blurred rather than clear-cut, each
> level can nonetheless be typified by its own specific combination of linguistic
> and allied, social, educational, and psychological characteristics. (VIII)

These five levels of Arabic language are:
- *fuṣḥā al-turāth*: the language of Islamic high culture
- *fuṣḥā al-ʕaṣr*: contemporary *fuṣḥā*, MSA
- *ʕāmmiyya al-muthaqqafīn*: the everyday language of the highly educated

- *ʕāmmiyya al-mutanawwirīn*: common *ʕāmmiyya* such as CEA
- *ʕāmmiyya al-ummiyyīn*: the language of the illiterate

The variations between these different language levels can be syntactic, lexical, phonological, or morphological. For example, the primary difference between *fuṣḥā al-turāth* and *fuṣḥā al-ʕaṣr* is that the former prefers verbal sentences (V-S-O) while the later permits nominal sentences (S-V-O) (Hinds & Badawi, 1986, VIII). *ʕāmmiyya al-muthaqqafīn,* though colloquial, maintains the phonological markers of *fuṣḥā* that are lost in the dialects. For example, the ق *qāf* is pronounced */q/* in MSA, but */ʔ/* in CEA; in *ʕāmmiyya al-muthaqqafīn* the */q/* pronunciation is maintained, but is infrequently maintained in *ʕāmmiyya al-mutanawwirīn* and is always pronounced */ʔ/* in *ʕāmmiyya al-ummiyyīn* (Hinds & Badawi, 1986, p. IX).

The issue of linguistic registers and their usage is especially pertinent to the works of al-Ḥakīm because he is known for developing and pushing for a third language. Although the standard is typically the language of literature, Egyptian authors, in particular, have been known to mix language and domain usage and incorporate the colloquial for character dialog in novels (Cachia, 1990; Eid, 2007); therefore, it would be no surprise to find dialectal speech in the dialog of al-Ḥakīm's short stories. However, before examining the language used by al-Ḥakīm in his plays

and short stories, an examination of language as an aspect of identity and the influence of nationalism is warranted.

Arabic Language in Identity and Nationalism

Language is an important tool in identity creation and maintenance, and al-Ḥakīm is known to manipulate language in his plays depending on their content and character, indicating that he is well-aware of the connection between language and identity. This section examines the relationship between language, identity and nationalism in order to further situate al-Ḥakīm's language choices. Giles (1978), best known for his Speech Accommodation Theory (1973), states that language can express ethnocentric attitudes towards the self or another group, depict ethnic solidarity, or organize members of a group into social categories. The sociolinguists in the variationist camp have shown that in a language with multiple registers, the H register is correlated with those in higher social classes and the L register is correlated with those in lower social classes, indicating that speech is directly related to one's identity in a social class (Shilling-Estes, 2004, p. 379).

Suleiman (2003) argues in favor of language being added to the criteria believed to constitute collective or national identity; these criteria include genealogy, age,

gender, sexuality, class, occupation, locality, tribe, clan, religion, sect, ethnicity, or

citizenship. Although Suleiman (2003) supports the integration of language into studies

of nationalism, he states that the relationship between language and national identity is

not "a universally accepted premise" (p. 9).

Suleiman claims sociolinguistics is simply the most relevant discipline in which

language, nationalism, and identity may be examined. However, he offers no concrete

definition of nationalism, as scholars have yet to agree upon one, but he believes there

are two types of nationalism itself: the civic/political and the cultural/ethnic[4] (p. 23).

In civic nations, the state came before the national identity; while in cultural nations,

the national consciousness preceded the nation itself. Suleiman explains how various

types of nationalisms have been—and continue to be—created with the help of

language, and he says the Arabic language, with its rich religious and cultural history,

has an especially pertinent role in Arab nationalism.

The rich history of Arabic allows the language to drive the concepts of

nationalism and national identity. As Suleiman (2003) says:

> nationalists therefore use the past as the basis of an energizing dynamism
> which enables the community the address to mobilize for the purpose of

---

4 al-Ḥakīm's nationalism should be considered cultural in nature because the nationalist
   movement helped bring about political change and a 'new' Egypt.

defending itself against the externally generated challenges, while, at the same time, embracing change and projecting it as part of the inner fabric of this past in an almost seamless progression of history into the present and beyond. (p. 39)

This concept of identity in terms of embracing a dual heritage, both the past and the present–in the case of Egypt, Pharaonic versus Western–is a dichotomy faced by many Egyptians, al-Ḥakīm included, as will be discussed below.

The dichotomy between the colloquial and the standard in Arabic allows for one language to propel country nationalism and the other to drive pan-Arab nationalism, respectively. Attention needs to be given to the use of the Arabic language as a uniting force throughout the Arabic-speaking world, connecting Egyptian nationalism to Lebanese nationalism to Saudi nationalism to Algerian nationalism, and so on; Eid (2007) states "*fuṣḥā* is also considered a unifying force, the pan-Arab 'national' language" (p. 404). However, the Arabic language can also promote territorial nationalism, as each Arabic-speaking country has at least one dialect of its own. Territorial nationalism occurs when a shared ideology is present in a given geographical area; this can be a city, country, or region (Suleiman, 2003, p. 163).

Furthermore, according to Giles (1978), language, which is a primary marker of ethnic identity, is greatly affected by heightened social pressures, such as those

experienced in Egypt during the revolutionary time in which al-Ḥakīm's play and collection of short stories was written. President Nasser himself used both MSA and CEA in his public address, a context typically reserved for only MSA, in an attempt to sound both like an educated man of the Arab world, and like a humble Egyptian man. In the case of Nasser and the Egyptian media, the president was able to advance the use of CEA and foster feelings of national identity, equality, and political development by shattering the division between when and where to use the high and low register by using the (informal) dialect in "formal" public speeches.

Although, *The Art of Literature* was published four years before Nasser was elected president and began addressing the Egyptians with markers of CEA, nationalism was ubiquitous in Egypt at the time of its publication, and CEA was seen as a unifier for citizens of various socioeconomic backgrounds. *The Deal* was also published during the Nasser years, and it would be no surprise for *The Deal* to include CEA in the dialog to foster Egyptian identity and promote Egyptian nationalism.

Eid (2007) explains that some public media (broadcast media, theatre) are "in-between spaces that serve as excellent sites for the negotiations of identities" (p. 405), and that the hybrid languages themselves are "understood as the recognition of two

identities or a 'mixture' of identities" (p. 408).

Because language is effected by social pressures, an analysis of al-Ḥakīm's language in his play and short stories written during a time of rising Egyptian nationalism is significant to the field of Egyptian history and Arabic sociolinguistics. Before an examination of the work of al-Ḥakīm is a presentation of the social and political climate in which al-Ḥakīm was writing.

The Language and Works of Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm

Life, Influences, and Inspiration

Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm states that he was born between 1899 and 1903 (al-Ḥakīm, 1964, p. v). He was known a prolific lawyer, journalist, playwright, and author before his death in 1987. From an early age, al-Ḥakīm wanted to become an author, but due to the poor status of literature and writers in Egypt, his father demanded he instead be trained in law. al-Ḥakīm secretly wrote four plays in the 1920s and published five plays during his time in law school: between 1926 and 1974 he published more than eighty plays, four novels, three books of short stories, a biography, and a book of essays, in addition to countless other essays and journal articles on literary criticism, philosophy, and politics.

Altogether he published more than 120 works[5] and is renowned for being linguistically aware, as a few of his plays incorporate what he calls the *third language* into the dialog; this *third language* is a hybrid of MSA and CEA. al-Ḥakīm's created *third language* uses lexical or syntactic items of MSA and uses them outside the grammatical constraints of the H language. By using familiar words in unfamiliar contexts, such as the MSA past tense negator ﻣﺎ *mā* to negate present tense verbs, he was able to ensure maximum intelligibility by speakers from various dialects while making a political point. Of al-Ḥakīm's *third language*, Badawi states:

> Because of the diglossia of modern Arabic, instead of using either the classical or modern language, he employed the 'third language'. This language, while generally following the rules of classical Arabic and understood in its printed form throughout the Arab world, can, with the slightest modification, be made to sound like colloquial speech on the stage. It is a linguistic *tour de force* which illustrates al-Hakim's passion for ceaseless experimentation. (p. 958)

 One of al-Ḥakīm's motivations for writing in the *third language* was to increase intelligibility and relatability of literary and dramatic works amongst the larger population, thereby raising the status of these arts and the artists creating them. al-Ḥakīm used his works to highlight cultural issues both within the Arab world and between the East and the West, and he examined the ties between ancient and modern

---

5   See Hutchins (2003) pp. 239-246 for an annotated bibliography of al-Ḥakīm's work.

Egypt, as well as spirituality, emotions, and social issues in modern Egypt, such as

government corruption, rural peasant life versus city life, and the place of women in

society. The variation in themes also demonstrates al-Ḥakīm's commitment to

identifying with Egyptian and pan-Arab ideas and promoting different levels of

nationalism.

Starkey (1987) hypothesized that al-Ḥakīm used the colloquial in his plays in

order to mimic Ṣannūʕ, the first Egyptian playwright (and also a journalist), who

published his work in 1870. Because there was no broad Egyptian societal interest in

literature, it was not uncommon in Egypt for playwrights and novelist like Ṣannūʕ and

al-Ḥakīm to have other, primary careers. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Haykal also had an

influence on al-Ḥakīm and his work; Haykal, also a lawyer, was the first to write a

novel as defined by Western standards when he published *Zaynab* in 1913 (Starkey,

1987, p. 10).

al-Ḥakīm and his contemporaries were wise to have secondary (or primary)

careers, as Egyptian society was not always receptive to the language arts. However,

Egypt's declaration of independence in 1922 brought with it greater public interest in

politics and political journalism and less interest in theatre (Starkey, 1987, p. 27). al-

Ḥakīm, who wrote on personal and socially relevant issues, even had difficulty getting

his works into circulation. His first novel ʕwdat al-Rūḥ *(Return of the Spirit),* about an

Egyptian family in Cairo during the 1919 uprising, which mimics the author's life, was

originally started in French in hope of garnering a larger audience; although, he ended

up writing the entire thing in Arabic (Starkey, 1987, p. 25). The book was not published

for a number of years because the "intellectual climate" at the time did not favor

literature (Starkey, p. 26). Furthermore, only four of his plays were produced on stage

between 1935 and 1956 (Cachia, 1980, p. 226).

Despite the initial lack of interest in Arab writing, his first novel, *Return of the*

Spirit, was seen as a tribute to Egyptian nationalism, which scholars call *Pharaonic*

because it strays away from Arab or Islamic nationalism while focusing on Egyptian

nationalism–specifically on the ancient aspect of the dual Egyptian heritage (Cachia,

1980; Starkey, 1987). *Return of the Spirit* is said to have spurred Nasser to later lead the

1952 revolution (Badawi, 1988, p. 953). Starkey describes the significance of al-

Ḥakīm's early works, when they were finally published:

> a novel appeared which marked a new departure in Arabic prose-writing and
> whose title, ʕwdat al-Rūḥ [*Return of the Spirit*]*,* seemed to sum up the longings of
> the whole Egyptian people for their nation's revival. The same year saw the
> publication of a play, *Ahl al-Kahf* [*People of the Cave*], based on a story from the

Qurʔān, whose philosophical tone was unprecedented in the history of Egyptian drama. Both works had been written by one man, a prosecuting attorney named Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm. (1987, p. 16)

People of the Cave was based on Sura 18, "The Cave," and al-Ḥakīm leaned away from the Pharaonic or Egyptian nationalism of *Return of the Spirit* and towards Islamic or Arab nationalism; this demonstrates that al-Ḥakīm was either wavering in his nationalistic support, dedicated to all forms of Arab nationalism, or wholly indifferent[6].

Furthermore, Starkey (1987) explains how al-Ḥakīm uses events in Egyptian history and his own experiences in his writing, as he includes the 1919 uprising in his first novel, "to emphasize the fact that the Egyptian spirit transcends religious boundaries; cross and crescent appear together on the Egyptian flag" (p. 125). Connecting with his fellow Egyptians made his work relevant and enhanced nationalist ideas. His 1938 play *Taḥta Shams al-Fikr (By the Light of the Sun of Thought)* is also a piece of Pharaonic nationalism, according to Starkey (1987), as "Even when considering the question how foreigners may best be persuaded to speak Arabic, it is in an Egyptian context that he sets his ideas, with little regard for the wider Arab world" (p. 136).

al-Ḥakīm also continues his theme of Egyptian nationalism during the 1952

---

6   Scholars such as Cachia (1980) believe that al-Ḥakīm was opposed to all forms of nationalism, but this paper will argue otherwise.

revolution; however, after the revolution he focused more on themes associated with

pan-Arab nationalism and used less direct social criticism (Starkey, 1987). Although al-

Ḥakīm's later work deal with more universal themes relevant to those outside of Egypt,

"his allegiance at national level has clearly remained with Egypt rather than with and

larger grouping in the Arab world" (Starkey, 1997, pp. 136-137).

In 1938, al-Ḥakīm began publishing short satirical dialogs in the Egyptian press,

which caused a stir amongst the political parties of the time, because he also criticizes

the state of Egyptian democracy (Starkey, 1987). One essay however was not satirical:

in "ʕdawat al-ʕumyānʔ" ("Enemies of the Blind") al-Ḥakīm posits the idea of creating an

Egyptian "think tank" of experts to remedy political, social, and economic problems. al-

Ḥakīm is a proactive member of society; he did not simply criticize problems in

Egyptian society, he presents solutions. al-Ḥakīm presented the idea of a think tank to

solve national issues and a universal colloquial to remedy the lack of pan-Arab unity.

Works Written Around the 1952 Revolution

Scholars assert that the plays penned after the 1952 revolution are much more

political in nature, as the revolution raised political awareness in the whole of society

(Badawi, 1988). The plays written at this time are also said to have influenced the

elevation of the level of intelligence in popular theatre of the time (Cachia, 1980;

Starkey, 1987; Badawi, 1988; Hutchins, 2003).

al-Ṣafqah and Related Plays

    al-Ṣafqah (*The Deal*) was published in 1956, when its author was beginning to

move away from writing about Egyptian nationalistic ideas and moving towards pan-

Arab themes. However, the play deals with Egyptian issues: *The Deal* is about peasants

trying to secure land, and was written three years after the RCC enacted the Agrarian

Reform Law of 1952. All three acts of the play were set in the town square, and he

incorporated elements of tradition and folklore into the play about village life in order

to appeal to a larger audience.

    His two plays written in 1955, *The Deal* and *al-Warṭah* (*Incrimination*[7]) emphasize

the need for Egyptian society to continue to move forward. Starkey (1987) posits, "al-

Ḥakīm's fear is that, if spiritual values are neglected, Egypt will find that one group of

ignorant land-owners has simply been replaced by another" (p. 173). The two plays

---

7 Hutchins translated the title of الورطة *al-Warṭah* as 'incrimination' in his translation published
    in *Plays, Prefaces, and Postscripts of Tawfiq Al-Hakim: Volume One, Theatre of the Mind* (1981).
    By definition, the noun means 'predicament, dilemma, embroilment,' but form V of the root
    و ر ط mean 'to be come embroiled, or ensnared (in a legal situation), to get into trouble,'
    which is the subject of the play (Cohen, 1993).

published in 1956, with their inclusion of al-Ḥakīm's *third language* understandable to

Arabs outside of Egypt, were the first signs of his shift from Egyptian nationalism to

Arab nationalism.

Fann al-Adab and Short Stories

Although al-Ḥakīm is known for his plays, some scholars and critics have stated

that the short stories are his best work, and that he has contributed greatly to the genre.

His roughly 30 short stories (Hutchins, 2003, 125) show characteristics of oral

traditions and folktales, using lots of "elliptical license, neglecting unimportant details"

(Hutchins, 2003, 126). Additionally, al-Ḥakīm's short stories focus more on philosophy

than character development, and the majority focus on topics he saw as essential to a

civilized society, namely "thought, freedom, justice, truth, and beauty" (Hutchins, 2003,

p. 129).

al-Ḥakīm's stories, plays, and essays are often polemical, political, or

autobiographical, and covers common themes. *Fann al-Adab,* in particular, is a

collection of stories and essays of varying quality, some written as early as thirty years

before the book's publication in 1952 (Starkey, 1987, p. 189). The collection is divided

into a number of sections: in the first 12 al-Ḥakīm explored the concepts of literary

creation and literary criticism. Overall, the collection looked at the obligation of artists to their art.

al-Ḥakīm has also written collections of essay that depict his perspective towards Egyptian society more straightforwardly. His essay, "Creation" compares Greek and Egyptian culture, just as he does more figuratively in the short story "I've Got It, I've Got It," found in *Fann al-Adab*.

Language Usage

As mentioned earlier, al-Ḥakīm was perceptive of the linguistic situation in Egypt, so much so that he was elected to the Arabic Language Academy in Cairo in 1954 (Starkey, 1987, p. 33). He was critical of the way the Arabic language was taught and perceived; in a letter to a French friend al-Ḥakīm writes that the classical writers have created a gulf between literature and the popular heritage (Starkey, 1987, p. 185). This issue of the separation between *literary* and *popular*–which al-Ḥakīm believed was exacerbated by the diglossia of the language–posed problems for al-Ḥakīm throughout his career, but it is believed that he mastered this dichotomy in his postrevolutionary works, partly through the use of his *third language* (Badawi, 1988).

al-Ḥakīm was known to vary the language of the play based on the content and

characters, and he believed that dialog was the heart of drama (Starkey, 1987); his

thoughts on the significance of dialog make an analysis of the language of his dialogs

especially pertinent. Three of his early plays were written in CEA; these plays involved

everyday themes in the lives of ordinary villagers, whereas his plays written in MSA

between 1928-1929 tackled harder issues (Starkey, 1987, p. 27). His 'philosophical'

plays were written in classical rather than colloquial Arabic, "since these plays were a

conscious attempt to raise Egyptian drama onto a new level of literary respectability; as

they were not set in contemporary Egypt, the question of authenticity of language did

not arise" (Starkey, 1987, p. 196). His play *al-Zammār (The Piper)* is set in the Egyptian

countryside and uses CEA as a means of authenticating the characters (Starkey, 1987,

196). Furthermore, his first novel, *Return of the Spirit* used colloquial in the dialog,

while the dialog in his short stories from *The Art of Literature* are in MSA. Although, his

later works used less colloquial, even when the faithfulness or identity of a character

was in jeopardy.

It is difficult to give a specific time period in which al-Ḥakīm did or did not use

colloquial speech for his characters. None of the 21 plays on social themes in the 1950

Masraḥ al-Mujtamaʕ (*Theatre of Society*) used the colloquial (although the plays were

originally published in the press where the use of colloquial was uncommon).

However, his two plays published in 1956 were written with MSA, CEA, and al-Ḥakīm's

hybrid *third language*, but some scholars consider that he returned to colloquial with

Kull Shayʔ fī Maḥallih (*Everything in Salt)* in 1966 (Starkey, 1987, p. 196). Additionally,

at the end of the 1956 play *al-Warṭah* (*Incrimination*) is an essay, *"Lughat al-Masraḥīyah"*

(*"The Play's Language"*), in which he explained his concept of language and theatre. In

the essay he argued that the colloquial has been on the rise, and that the difference

between the colloquial and classical are superficial and often exaggerated. After this, a

few years after the revolution, he refrained from using either colloquial or his third

language in his plays (Hutchins, 1984; Starkey, 1987).

> Al-Ḥakīm explained his reasons for shying away from the colloquial:
>
> For more than forty years I have employed straight colloquial, even in the
> narrative itself as in 'The Troupe' [*al-ʕawalim*, 1927]. Society today, however, is
> developing quickly. Ignorance is diminishing. The colloquial language is rising.
> The classes are coming together. The different levels of the language are joining
> together. (as cited in Hutchins, 1984, p. 328)

Al-Ḥakīm believed the dialects would become extinct, and he explained the linguistic

situation in a manner that suggests he may have also dabbled in linguistics:

> We need only listen to a farmer or worker in parliament or management
> committees to have evidence that ordinary language has risen to the level of

literary eloquence. He will say for example: *da mawduʕ yihimm gamiʕ al-fallahin* [This is a topic of interest to all the farmers] or *al-arb al-Ḥakīmah di tamma tawziʕha bin-nisba li-aghlab al-ʕummal* [These profits have now been distributed among most of the workers] and so forth. With the exception of the change from 'dh' 'd' in the demonstratives *dha, dhi,* and *dhih,* which become in conversation, *da, da,* and *dih,* both sentences are correct. This type of license or abbreviation is found in living languages when they are spoken and even written in dialog. (as cited in Hutchins, 1984,p. 337)

al-Ḥakīm went on to further explain the purpose and function of the colloquial dialects:

Most of what we term colloquial consists of abbreviations which quick speech and talk require. The same thing has happened in other living languages. When we say *biddi* [I want] we are simply shortening through quick pronunciation the expression *biwaddi*...the situation is the same when we say *aywa* [yes] instead of *ay wallah* [aye, by God.] When we say *maʕrafshi* [I don't know] we are just abbreviating *ma aʕrifu shayʔ* [I don't know anything]…. Or, more correctly, we silence the [case] endings and join quick words. Omission of the vowel endings is a characteristic of quick conversation for every Arab people. (as cited in Hutchins, 1984, p. 338)

al-Ḥakīm believed that the problem with the idea of diglossia is that it divided the Arab

people between the educated and the uneducated, the high and the low, he said argued,

There is a deliberate desire on both sides to contrive an artificial chasm between writing and speaking or between two different classes of people. We today, however, are on the road to building a people united in thought and action. We speak of eliminating class distinctions. How can that be completed without elimination of the distinctions in speech. (as cited in Hutchins, 1984, p. 339)

As for remedying the situation, al-Ḥakīm believed, "All that we hope for and think

possible now is to work so far as we can to eliminate the impression of there being two

distinct languages with a vast abyss between them" (as cited in Hutchins, 1984, p. 338).

That is, he sought to use something that carried no stigma and was not rooted in any

particular society or identity.

In an attempt to span the abyss al-Ḥakīm crafted his *third language* so that it

might be well received by speakers of other colloquial dialects; it was his belief that "by

allowing for some license with commonly used substitutions and abbreviations for

demonstrative and relative pronouns in conversation and dialogue, we could in Arabic

also narrow the boundaries, distinctions, and barriers. We could reach as sound as

possible a united form for the Arabic language" (as cited in Hutchins, 1984, p. 337). al-

Ḥakīm believed that the *third language* was not the only way to unite the Arab people

and bring about pan-Arab nationalism; he believed that simultaneously educating the

masses and raising the level of the colloquial would be beneficial to cross-cultural

communication. He posited:

> Uniting the Arabic used in conversation by the different classes for all the Arabs,
> if the literary form cannot be retained, is nothing less than an attempt to make
> the colloquial literary by bringing it as close as possible to the literary. The
> literary-colloquial will be the united language of conversation. This union will
> definitely occur with the raising of the general cultural consciousness among the
> Arab peoples in their entirety. (as cited in Hutchins, 1984, p. 342)

It can therefore be said that the *third language* al-Ḥakīm used was his demonstration of

an educated colloquial that could be understood by individuals in (presumably) most

Arabic-speaking countries. On creating the *third language* he wrote that *The Deal* was an

attempt to work out problems of language and facilities in theater, and that he was

trying to use a language "which is correct and does not offend the principles of classical

Arabic, but which, at the same time, can be articulated by the characters, and is not

incompatible with their natures or their environments" (as cited in Starkey p. 197). al-

Ḥakīm's *third language* would be a facilitator of Arab nationalism just as CEA was his

method of promoting Egyptian identity and Egyptian nationalism. However, al-Ḥakīm's

contemporaries did not join him in creating a pan-Arab national educated language and

he abandoned the language after his two 1956 plays (Starkey, 1987, p. 198).

In the postscript to *Incrimination, "*The Play's Language," al-Ḥakīm recognizes the

problems with diglossia, and he touched on the idea that the division between the

educated standard and the colloquial dialect created a riff in society: "No matter how

simplified an Arabic I introduce, I have felt a need to change it and translate it into the

colloquial dialect in performance. This is a strange situation. The confession of the

existence of two separate languages for one people when it is trying to eliminate class

differences does not augur well" (as cited in Hutchins, 1984, p. 337).

The issue of language usage in theatre is further complicated because plays published in MSA are often translated into the local dialect on the stage; Starkey (1987) says, "one cannot assume, therefore, that because a play has been printed in the classical language, it will necessarily be presented using the same idiom" (p. 197). al-Ḥakīm's writings in the postscripts and prefaces of his plays demonstrate he was aware of this issue of translating theatre for performance, and aimed to create works that did not need to be translated. al-Ḥakīm said his goal was two-fold:

> First, progress towards a unified theatrical language in our literature, which will bring us closer to the unified theatrical language of European literatures; second —and more importantly—to bring closer the various classes of a single people, and the peoples of the Arabic language, by unifying, as far as possible, the means by which they understand one another, without violating the requirements of art. (as cited in Starkey, p. 197)

Starkey states, "in al-Ḥakīm's view, a situation in which works of literature had to be translated from one Arabic dialect to another in order to be understood throughout the Arab world would be a tragedy. It is for this reason that he considers it essential to work towards a unified 'third language'" (p. 198): examples of the *third language* will be presented in Chapter 3.

Conclusion

This chapter has presented the historical aspects of Egyptian culture and politics that may have influenced or been influenced by the Arabic language and the nationalist movement. Then, the various levels of the Arabic language were examined, and the ways in which those levels may be tied to feeling of personal, national, or Arab identity were discussed. Finally, a brief overview of the works and language usage of al-Ḥakīm were briefly surveyed. The following chapters will provide a more technical analysis of some specific works of al-Ḥakīm.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE

Introduction

The previous chapter presented the differences between the registers of the

Arabic language. This chapter examines the variation between Modern Standard Arabic

(MSA), Colloquial Egyptian Arabic (CEA), and al-Ḥakīm's *third language* found in one of

his collections of short stories, فن الأدب *Fann al-Adab The Art of Literature*, and one of his

plays, الصفقة *al-Ṣafqah The Deal*. An examination of all of the short stories in the

collection determined that they all contained only MSA; the dialog in the short stories

was not in CEA or al-Ḥakīm's *third language*. Therefore, this paper will focus on the

language of one story, وجدتها .. وجدتها *wajidatahā..wajidatahā* "I've Got It, I've Got It." A

presentation and analysis of the variation between the dialog of this short story,

published in 1953, and that of the 1956 play, *The Deal*, is the goal of this chapter.[8]

---

8 In the previous chapters the Arabic titles were presented in both the English translation and
   the Roman character transliteration, as this is the convention of English scholars analyzing
   Arabic works; however, in order to carry out a better analysis of the language, titles and
   dialog are given in the original Arabic, the Romanized transliteration, and the English
   paraphrase provided by the author of this paper.

Methodology

While it is known that al-Ḥakīm uses his *third language*–a hybrid of MSA and

CEA–in his play, *The Deal* (Hutchins, 1984), existing literature has not examined the

language used in al-Ḥakīm's short stories, such as that found in *The Art of Literature.*

The analysis of this paper is two-fold: one aspect is a qualitative study highlighting the

types of variation found in both the play and the short story; the second aspect is a

quantitative study of negation tokens found in 35 pages of the play. For this study,

"token" refers to any instance of a studied variable. In the case of the quantitative

study, the tokens are the negators ﻻ *lā* and ﻣﺎ *mā* and the adjacent clause that provide

context, while in the qualitative aspect of the study, tokens are individual words, which

can be classified as belonging to a specific register of the Arabic language.

Qualitative

As mentioned in the previous chapter, contrary to the early status of diglossia,

the lines between the levels of the Arabic language are blurred: both MSA and CEA

share a large, common vocabulary, and analyses of code-switching and language

variation typically code words as *MSA-only, dialect-only,* or *both* (Eid, 1988). In addition

intermediate forms–those with characteristics of both the standard (MSA) and a dialect

(CEA) but are not lexical items in either register–are sometimes found, allowing for four different possibilities for classification per token. Coding tokens in such a manner allows for a more faithful analysis of the language; however, most studies of language variation in Arabic throw out the intermediate forms, as they are very difficult to analyze. This study is unique in that the analysis of the language of the play includes the standard (*MSA-only*), a dialect (*CEA-only*), tokens that fall into both categories (*both*), and intermediate forms–in this case, al-Ḥakīm's *third language* (*3rd*).

This study focuses on the absence and presence of al-Ḥakīm's created language and includes some analysis of language variation with MSA and CEA, but because no *CEA-only* tokens were found in the short story, this study assumes that al-Ḥakīm does not choose the words that would otherwise fall into the *both* category because they also could be used in CEA. That is, he is not choosing intermediate words in an effort to colloquialize the language, but rather, he chooses them because the words are generally considered MSA. Furthermore, because al-Ḥakīm does not use any CEA in the story and because it is assumed that he did not choose words only because they are found in both MSA and CEA, coding was not necessary for the section of this chapter entitled, "Modern Standard Arabic in وجدتها.. وجدتها 'I've Got It, I've Got It.'"

The section "Varieties of Arabic in الصفقة *The Deal*" demonstrates how al-Ḥakīm

uses *MSA-only, dialect-only*, or *both* tokens in the dialog of the play in addition to tokens

coded as *third language*. Because of the variation in language in the short story, the

section "Modern Standard Arabic in وجدتها.. وجدتها 'I've Got It, I've Got It'" will present

parts of the text and show examples of where al-Ḥakīm could have used CEA lexical

substitutions; then the variation of the language used in the play and an analysis of the

third language will be presented.

Quantitative

In the works of al-Ḥakīm negation is a good indicator of what register of the

language he is using: MSA, CEA, or his created *third language.* In order to determine the

register al-Ḥakīm used with the greatest frequency, one aspect of this study is a

quantitative analysis of the negators لا *lā* and ما *mā* throughout the play. These two

tokens were chosen because they are typically verbal negation markers, and verbal

negation is one of the most obvious forms of variation between MSA and the dialects.

Perhaps the most obvious form of variation between the standard and the dialects is

negation. MSA uses ليس *laysa* for the negation of nouns, لا *lā* for present verbal

negation, ما *mā* and لم *lam* for past informal and formal[9], respectively, and لن *lan* for future negation; however, CEA, like most of the dialects, uses ما *mā,* مش *miš,* or the ما-ش *mā-š* circumfix for negation.

The quantitative analysis included 30 consecutive pages of the play, in which negation tokens were coded as *MSA, CEA,* or *3rd* (for *third language*). The pages included 34 tokens of negation. The Appendix contains a table of all tokens, which includes the page number the negator was found on; the clause–or sentence in instances where clause does not provide adequate context for gathering the meaning of the negator–the token was found in[10]; a transliteration of the negator and the context piece; a paraphrase translation of such; classification of the negator as MSA, CEA, or 3rd; and a brief explanation of the reason for classification.

The coding system is based on the grammatical rules of MSA and CEA, and any token not fitting either grammar system is deemed a token of the *third language* (3rd). Examples of explanations of the reasons for classification include:

---

9 As explained in Chapter Two, MSA, though considered the high language, can itself have a more formal register used primarily in literature and a less formal spoken register. Hinds and Badawi (1986) post two levels of MSA and three of the dialects.

10 ما *mā* can mean either 'not/no' or 'what,' so context is vital in determining whether or not the token is actually a negator.

MSA

- <u>lā present</u>: لا *lā* is used to negate present tense in MSA
- <u>idiomatic</u>: the phrase is idiomatic in the given register
- <u>series</u>: لا *lā* can negate past tense verbs in MSA if the verbs are part of a series as in *neither-nor*
- <u>lā as no/not</u>: common usage of لا *lā* in MSA
- <u>lā cond neg</u>: لا *lā* used as a conditional negator in MSA (after a conditional particle such as *if*
- *<u>mā past</u>*: ما *mā* is used to negate a past tense verb

CEA

- <u>idiomatic</u>: the phrase is idiomatic in the given register
- <u>active part</u>: لا *lā* negation is used with the active participle in CEA

3rd

- <u>lā w/past</u>: لا *lā* is not used to negate past tense in MSA or CEA
- <u>not MSA or CEA</u>: the context of the token does not follow the grammar of MSA or CEA; ما *mā* not used to negate nouns in MSA or CEA
- <u>mā present</u>: ما *mā* is used for past tense negation in MSA in addition to a circumfix negator in CEA, so the absence of the suffix ش *š* would indicate the word is not CEA but the *third language*

Limitations of the quantitative portion of this study are that it only includes a small portion of the play, 30 out of 150 pages, and it looks only at forms of negation, not every word or clause. Regardless of the limitations of both the quantitative and the qualitative aspects of this study, its significance as a means by which to analyze the language usage in dialog of both a short story and a play by the same author cannot be overlooked.

Modern Standard Arabic in وجدتها.. وجدتها *"I've Got It, I've Got It"*

This section will examine the language of the short story, وجدتها.. وجدتها

wajidatahā...wajidatahā "I've Got It, I've Got It," found in al-Ḥakīm's 1952 collection of

short stories and essays, and illustrate places in the text where lexical grammatical

changes would have allowed for more natural, colloquial dialog. This section will not

show every instance where simple, common lexical substitutions could be made, such as

having a character say عاوز *ʕāwaz* instead of أريد *ʔurīd* for 'I want', or أيوه *iywa* in lieu of

نعم *nʕm* for 'yes,' as such a feat is beyond the scope of this paper, but the paper will

instead examine some possible grammatical or lexical changes.

The short story, "I've Got It, I've Got It" is about an Egyptian man who comes up

with a scientific theory for hydroelectricity. The story was written during the planning

stages of the Aswan High Dam project, which would provide Egypt with a major source

of hydroelectricity. It is made up primarily of the dialog between two educated

Egyptian men, the narrator and what he calls another "man of the world." The story is

al-Ḥakīm's argument that Egyptians are just as brilliant as the Greeks, as the narrator

states he is Archimedes (famous for his water displacement theory; the narrator, like

Archimedes, makes his discovery in the bathroom).

Although Arabic literature is typically written in MSA, it is common for

Egyptian literature to include colloquial dialog, and al-Ḥakīm himself used CEA for the

dialog of his first novel. Therefore, one might expect, al-Ḥakīm's short story from *The*

Art of Literature, "I Found It, I Found It" to contain colloquial dialog, especially

considering that it was written during a time of increasing nationalism and has

characters from both the educated and the artisan classes. The presence of characters

from different social classes might have provided al-Ḥakīm with the opportunity to use

both MSA (H, the language of the educated) and CEA (L, the language of the

uneducated) in the text; however, the entire dialog is conducted in MSA: there are no

lexical markers of CEA in the story, nor is there evidence of al-Ḥakīm's *third language.*

Below is an example of narrative leading into the dialog[11]. Throughout this

section, items in bold are to be discussed and items in bold and underlined are of

immediate concern.

(1)

فحدق في وجهي ليتاكد له اكتمال قواي العقلية..**ولم أمهله.** فقد اقتحمت الموضوع اقتحاما وقلت له:

---

11 The translations presented here are what Dryden would deem a *paraphrase*, which captures
   the essence of the text, mimicking the author's original style. A metaphrase is a line-by-line,
   word-for-word translation, which still maintains the syntax of the Arabic, but the art of the
   author is lost, as is some of the clarity.

*f-ḥaḍq fī wajahī lītā kad lihu ʔiktamāl qawāī al-ʕaqaliya.. **wa-lam ʔumhila-hu**. f-qud ʔqtahamat al-muḍawaʕ ʔqtahāmā wa-qaltu lihu:*

He stared at my face to make sure I was mentally competent. **I did not give him time** (to continue to do so). I jumped to our subject, and I said to him: (p. 109)

ولم أمهله 'I did not give him'

و	لم	أمهل	ه
wa	lam	ʔumhila	hu
and	not	I give time	him
con	neg	1st sing pres	3rd mas obj pro

Looking at Example 1, above, the narrative says لم أمهله *lam ʔumhilahu,* 'I did not give him time,' which uses لم *lam* to formally negate the verb, أمهل *ʔumhila,* 'I give time.'

When لم *lam* is used the subsequent verb is given in the present tense, but it is the لم *lam* itself that denotes the event happened in the past; the ه *hu,* 'him' suffix attached to the present tense form أمهل *ʔumhila* of 'I give time' means 'I give him time,' with the لم *lam* negating the phrase to 'I did not give him time.'

The phrase لم أمهله *lam ʔumhilahu* occurs in the context of the narrative, where formal negation would be expected; however, below is an example of the same form of formal negation occurring in the dialog:

(2)

<div dir="rtl">

وهو <u>**ما لم يخطر**</u> ولا شك علي بال أحد من خبراء مشروع الخزان..

</div>

wa-huwa <u>*mā lam yaxtur*</u> *wa-lā šik ʕlī bāl ʔhid min xabrāʔ mušrūʕ al-xazān..*

And <u>**it did not occur**</u>, no doubt in the minds of the experts on the Aswan Dam project.   (p. 111)

<div align="center">

<u>'It did not occur' ما لم يخطر</u>

</div>

يخطر	لم	ما
ya-xṭur	lam	mā
occur	not	what
3rd sing. pres.	neg.	dem.

Here, the formal negation construct is used in the dialog, which is unlikely and unrealistic in speech. The ما *mā* in Example 2 is not used as a means of informal negation, but in this case means 'what,' which is a common, alternative meaning for the utterance. That is, ما لم *mā lam* is not a double negative, as that is not an Arabic construction; rather, here ما *mā* means 'what,' while لم *lam* is the (formal) negator.

Looking at a larger piece of the monologue in which Example 2 occurred, one can see how al-Ḥakīm used the MSA masculine and feminine demonstratives, التي *al-litī* and الذي *al-liðī*, respectively, which mean 'which, that, who.' The majority of the Arabic dialects, including those in both Egypt and the Levant, use the gender-neutral

demonstrative الي *il-lī* for 'which, that, who;' however, in Example 3, below, al-Ḥakīm

used both the masculine التي *al-litī* and the feminine الذي *aliðī* of MSA instead of the

dialect gender-neutral الي *il-lī* (in this case the *a* of the definite article ال *al* is

pronounced *i* as *il*):

(3)

<div dir="rtl">

...فاستقبلت هذا الماء المضغوط بكفي من ذلك الارتفاع، فإذابي **أشعر** في اليد برعشة كتلك الرعشة **التي** تحدث من لمس سلك من أسلاك الكهربا.. هنا أدركت لساعتي أن ضغط الماء في ذاته يولد قوة كهربية... وعلي هذا القياس فإن الماء المندفع من عيون خزان أسوان يولد كهرباء بطريقة مباشرة بمجرد الضغط والاندفاع.. وهو **ما لم يخطر** ولا شك على بال أحد من خبراء مشروع الخزان.. لأن **الذي** خطر **ببالهم** هو الانتفاع **بضغط** الماء في إدارة <مراوح> هو **الذي** يولد الكهربا...

</div>

f-ʔistaqbaltu haðā al-māʔ al-maḍaʁūṭ bi-kifī min ðalika al-ʔrtifāʕ, fi-iðābī ʔšʕr fī al-īd b-rʕšah k-talik al-rʕšah **al-litī** *tiḥdϴ min lims salika al-kahirabān.. hunā ʔdrikatu l-sāʕtī ʔina ḍaʁiṭ al-māʔ fī ðātahu yūlid qwah k-hiribiyah..wa-ʕlī haðā al-qiyaās f-ʕina al-māʔ al-mindafʕ min ʕyūn xzān ʔswān yūlid k-harabāʔ b-ṭarīqah mibāšrah b-mjrid al-ḍʁṭ wa-al-ʔndafāʕ..wa-huwa* **mā lam yaxaṭir** *wa-lā šaka ʕlā bāl ʔḥid min xabirāʔ mišrūʕ al-xazān.. lʔna* **al-liðī** *xaṭur* **bi-bālihim** *huwa al-ʕintafāʕ* **bi-ḍʁṭ** *al-māʔ fī idārah <marāwaḥ> huwa* **al-liðī** *yuwalid al-kaharabān...*

The pressurized water poured into my hands from that height, suddenly **I feel** a shock in my hand like **that** which occurs from touching an electric cord.... Here I realized then that water pressure in itself generates electric power... In this same manner, the water rushing from the tunnels of the Aswan Dam generates electricity directly the same way as soon as the pressure builds and rushes out.. This (method) **did not occur** in the minds of the experts on the (Aswan) Dam project.. Because **what** occurred **in their mind(s)** was using water for the utilization **of pressure** "propellors" **that** create electricity.. (111-112)

al-Ḥakīm abstained from using the gender-neutral dialect marker الي *il-lī,* which would

have allowed him to make the dialog truer to the speech of individuals while still

guaranteeing readability in a number of dialects.

Another example of a colloquial grammatical marker missing from the dialog of

al-Ḥakīm's short story is the mood and aspect marker common in the dialects, بَ *ba,*

which is typically connected to present-tense verbs to denote that the verb is

progressive. The MSA equivalent to the present progressive is done with case endings,

which are diacritical marks not physically written in works of literature. The excerpt

from the same piece of dialog used in Example 3 illustrates the lack of the present

progressive marker:

(4)

فإذابي **أشـعر** في اليد برعشة كتلك الرعشة التي تحدث من لمس سلك من أسلاك الكهربا..

*fi-iđābī **ʔšʕr** fī al-īd b-rʕšah k-talik al-rʕšah **al-litī** tiḥdѲ min lims salika al-kahirabān..*

Suddenly, **I feel** a jerk in my hand like **that** which occurs from touching an electric cord.. (p. 111)

In colloquial speech, the speaker would say بأشعر *ba-ʔšʕr* 'I feel.'

However, note that the ﺑ prefix is used in this dialog:

(5)

لأن **الذي** خطر **ببالهم** هو الانتفاع **بضغط** الماء في إدارة ‹مراوح› هو **الذي** يولد الكهرباء..

lʔna **al-liđī** xaṭur **bi-bālihim** *huwa al-ʕintafāʕ* **bi-đʁṭ** *al-māʔ fī idārah*

‹*marāwaḥ*› *huwa* **al-liđī** yuwaliʔd al-kaharabāʔ...

Because **what** occurred **in their mind(s)** was using water for the utilization **of pressure** "propellors" **that** create electricity.. (p. 112)

Although, in these instances the particle is the preposition بِ *bi*, which mean 'in, by, for' in MSA and is a prefix for nouns, not a verbal aspect marker.

This section demonstrated places where Egyptian speech would have been less formal in terms of specific grammatical lexical items, but where al-Ḥakīm chose instead to maintain MSA throughout the text in both the narrative and the dialog. Given the content of the story, Egyptian competence in engineering, and the context of the story–the planning of the Aswan High Dam and the Egyptian revolution against the monarchy–CEA could be expected in the dialog. Theories as to why al-Ḥakīm chose not to include CEA in the dialog of the short story will be discussed in Chapter Four, but first is a presentation and analysis of the dialog in one of al-Ḥakīm's plays published three years after the collection of short stories.

Varieties of Arabic in الصفقة *The Deal*

In the play, *The Deal*, al-Ḥakīm tackles issues of land ownership and the situation of peasants in modern Egypt. There are eighteen characters in the play, with four peasant farmers as the main focus. al-Ḥakīm has produced works in both MSA and CEA, and in the postscripts of some of his plays al-Ḥakīm admits attempting to use an informal language that somewhat follows traditional rules but would be understandable by speakers throughout the Arabic-speaking world; therefore, it is no surprise to see a variety of forms of Arabic appearing in the dialog of the play.

The dialog tokens in *The Deal* can be classified as *MSA-only, CEA-only, both,* or *third language.* Below is an excerpt from the text with a variety of registers included, where items in bold are the *third language,* items underlined are *MSA-only,* and items in regular text are *both (MSA and CEA)*:

(6)

تهامى: **ما هناك حل**[12] غير اننا نمنعه من الخروج من المحطة ! ...

---

12 Although the phrase ما هناك حل is classified as the *third language,* each token in the phrase are found in both MSA and CEA; this demonstrates the difficulty in classifying and categorizing tokens in Arabic. Furthermore, the phrase غير اننا is classified as MSA although اننا can also be used in CEA, the tokens are classified in the context of the phrase.

Tahāmī: **mā hunāk ḥal** ʁiyir ʔnnā naminʕhu min al-xarūj min al-maḥaṭah

Tahāmī: There is **no solution**; <u>except that we</u> prevent him from <u>going</u> from the station! ... (p. 40)

Example 6 illustrates how, unlike the short story which only included MSA, the play uses MSA, CEA, and the intermediate *third language*. The phrase ما هناك *mā hunāk* 'there is no' is an example of al-Ḥakīm's *third language* because although ما *ma* is a negator in both MSA and the dialects, it is not used with the proposition هناك *hunaka/hunika/hunāk* in either MSA or CEA. In MSA the phrase would be ليس هناك حل *laysa hunāk ḥal* 'there is no solution,' and in CEA a speaker would likely say مافش حل *māfiš ḥal* to mean the same thing. In this example the ما هناك *mā hunāk* construction is that of the *third language*, but is universally understood to mean 'there is no solution.'

Example 6 also helps to illustrate that there are many methods of negating nouns, verbs, and adjectives in the Arabic language: the quantitative analysis found that al-Ḥakīm used لا *lā* 27 times and ما *mā 7* times, with 27 *MSA* tokens, 4 *third language* tokens, and 3 *CEA* token. That is, MSA was his primary means of negation, and while ما *mā* was used in MSA, CEA and the *third language,* لا *lā* was only used for MSA and the *third language.* Below are some of the examples of variation in negation in al-Ḥakīm's play, a complete table of examples of variation in the negation of the play are found in

the Appendix.

(7)

PG	PHRASE	NEG	TRANS	GLOSS	FORM
52	ما يقدر	ما	mā ya-qadr	not able	3rd
46	لا يلمح	لا	lā ya-limaḥ	no hint	MSA
39	ما عاد	ما	mā ʕāda	no longer	CEA[13]

al-Ḥakīm used ما *mā* in the context CEA as in ما عاد *mā ʕāda* 'no longer,' (Example 7) and

he used it to negate هناك *hunāk* 'there' in ما هناك *mā hunāk* as an indicator of his *third*

language (Example 6), and he also used it in the MSA construction, below:

(8)

لو كان في قدرتي ما كنت قمت ولا تأخرت

law kāna fi qadirat-ī mā kun-tu qama-tu wa-lāa tʔxna-tu

If it was in my power I would not have stood by and I would not have delayed
(p. 52)

It has been demonstrated that al-Ḥakīm used ما *mā* in three registers: MSA, CEA, and

third language. However, he was not as versatile with لا *lā,* as he only used it for MSA

and his *third language.* Example 8, above, shows لا *lā* in MSA usage, and Example 9,

below, is an example of his use of لا *lā* with a past-tense verb; this is another example of

---

13 لا تعد *lā tʕda* 'no longer' is idiomatic in MSA but is ما عاد *mā ʕāda* in CEA.

his *third language* because MSA would use ما *mā* and CEA would use the circumfix ما-ش

mā-š.

(9)

<div dir="rtl">

لا دخلت جوفي من يومين

</div>

    *lā **daxl-tu** jawfī min yawm-īn*

    It did not enter my throat for two days (p. 37)

Although لا *lā* is in the lexicon of both MSA and CEA, as a verbal negator and general

'no' in MSA and the general 'no' in CEA, the context in the above example (9) indicates

al-Ḥakīm's *third language.* This manipulation of the registers of language through

negation demonstrates al-Ḥakīm's mastery of the language as a playwright.

    In addition to negation, another noticeable difference between the dialog of the

short story is al-Ḥakīm's use of the conditional particles. In MSA إن *inna* is the most

formal and is primarily reserved for literary contexts; where لو *law* is used to denote

impossible 'ifs' and إذا *iđā* is for possible conditions. However, in CEA, لو *law* is used

interchangeably and almost exclusively as a blanket conditional particle. However,

below is an example of al-Ḥakīm using a conditional particle in the dialog of the play:

(10)

محروس: **لو** كان انعقد عقدنا، وتمت دخلتنا من شهرين، بعد ما جمعنا القطن... ما كان حصل ما حصل..

Maḥarūs: ***law*** *kāna ʔtmat daxultanā min šaharīn, bʕd mā jamʕnā al-qaṭan... mā kāna ḥaṣal mā ḥaṣal..*

Maḥarūs: **If** we had our marriage contract, and we had consummated it two months ago, after we gathered the cotton...what happened would not have happened..(p. 16)

In this example, al-Ḥakīm uses the CEA لو *law* to indicate *if*. Considering MSA dictates لو

law only be used to mark impossible conditions, and it is possible that these characters

could have waited two months, it can be determined that al-Ḥakīm was using the

conditional particle with a colloquial meaning.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, MSA and CEA share a number of lexical

items, and in some cases the same spelling of a word is used in both levels of the

language but the meaning itself changes. Such occurrences add to the difficulty of

identifying and classifying tokens into *MSA-only*, *CEA-only*, or *both*. For example, the

word عمل *ʕmal* in MSA means 'to work,' while in CEA it is more commonly used as 'to do'

instead of the MSA 'to do,' فعل *fʕal*. Below is an example of al-Ḥakīm using عمل *ʕmal* in

the play:

(11)

مبروكة: **عملوها** فينا يا ‹محروس›!...
محروس: **عملوها!**..

Mabrūka: **ʕaml-ū-hā** *fī-nā yā Maḥarūs!*
Maḥarūs: **ʕaml-ū-hā!**

Mabrūka: **They did it to us,** *eh Maḥarūs!*
Maḥarūs: **They did it to us!** (p. 16)

'They went to her for us eh Maharūs' عملوها فينا يا محروس

محروس	يا	نا	في	ها	عملو
maḥarūs	yā	nā	fī	hā	ʕaml-ū-
Maḥarūs	eh	us	to	it	did-they
name	dem	obj pro	prep	obj pro	3rd pl past

Perhaps this example is not reason enough to believe that the characters are saying 'they went to her,' because 'they worked for her' also makes sense. However, to prevent the confusion between 'do' and 'work,' Egyptians often say use شغل *šuʁl*, which is MSA for 'to be busy, to work' or 'job.' Shortly after this interaction al-Ḥakīm writes:

(12)

محروس: حتى حلاق الكفر عدلها له ربنا. **وشغله** راج الليلة!...

Maḥarūs: *ḥatā ḥalāq al-kafir ʕvalahā lihu ribnā.* **wa-šaʁilhu** *rāj al-līlah!*

Maḥarūs: Even the village barber, our lord improved his situation. **And**

tonight **his job** is flourishing! (p. 17)

When seeing شغل *šaʁil* used as 'job,' it becomes obvious that al-Ḥakīm uses عمل *ʕamil* as

'to go, to do;' however, this lexical variation is not as popular in the other dialects as it

is in CEA.

While there are many examples where al-Ḥakīm included less formal registers of

Arabic in the dialog of his play, there are still places where he omitted the informal

forms and used MSA. Al-Ḥakīm uses انتهى *ʔintahā* for 'finished,' which is MSA; CEA

would have used خلاص *xalāṣ* instead (16).

Conclusion

The examples presented in this chapter demonstrate how al-Ḥakīm uses MSA in

both the narrative and the dialog of his short story وجدتها.. وجدتها "I've Got It, I've Got It,"

published in a collection of stories and essays, *The Art of Literature,* in 1956. Not only

does al-Ḥakīm use MSA in the dialog, but he uses the most formal versions of the

register by using لم *lam* as the most literary form of negation.

In contrast to the most formal versions of Arabic found in the dialog of the short

story, لم *lam* is not found in the dialog of the 1956 play, *The Deal*. Although the most

formal forms of MSA are missing from the dialog of the play, al-Ḥakīm still uses the

MSA negator لا; however, he uses لا as a token of both MSA and his *third language*, such as in the negation of past-tense verb. Although, لا *lā* is used in CEA as a simple 'no' for nouns, and al-Ḥakīm did use the particle in this context in the play. In addition to لا *lā* as a negator, al-Ḥakīm also uses ما *mā* to negate the dialog of the play in MSA, CEA, and his *third language*. This means that he uses MSA, CEA, and his *third language* in his play, while maintaining only MSA in the narrative and the dialog of his short story written in the same time period.

This chapter demonstrated places where al-Ḥakīm maintains MSA throughout the short story as well as in some places in the dialog of his play. He also varies the language of his play between the standard, the dialect, and his *third language*. The next chapter will posit al-Ḥakīm's personal and political motivations behind the variations within and between some of his different works.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study found that although the dialog in the play contained informal or colloquial speech during times of rising nationalism in Egypt, the dialog in the short story was found to use MSA exclusively. Based on the events occurring in Egypt during al-Ḥakīm's career, his own statements about the state of language in the Arabic-speaking world, and the conventions of language usage in literature, the motivations for his language choices will be given below.

Although al-Ḥakīm was a proponent of a universal dialect and he and other Egyptian authors were known to use the colloquial for the dialog in novels, he maintained the tradition of writing both the narrative and the dialog of his short stories in his 1952 collection, *The Art of Literature*, in MSA. Writing the stories entirely in MSA allowed (educated) Arabs outside of Egypt to understand the text easily, thereby promoting the spread of Egyptian literature. Although, he did not write the short story with CEA in the dialog–which would enhance the Egyptian identity of the characters

and allow Egyptians to identify with this identity, the content and context of "I've Got

It" indicate feelings of Egyptian nationalism. al-Ḥakīm was leery of using CEA for fear

of pushing the colloquial language onto Arabs who maintain their own regional or

national dialects, and he worried about having to translate literature that is too dialect-

heavy (Hutchins, 1984). In fact, not using CEA ensured that readers outside Egypt

would be able to easily read the story and be presented with the idea of Egyptian

engineering aptitude: al-Ḥakīm used MSA, a pan-Arab language to spread the idea of

Egyptian nationalism into the rest of the Arab world.

The variations in al-Ḥakīm's language usage across genres throughout his career

seems to demonstrate the author's conflict over whether to promote Egyptian or Arab

nationalism. For decades he wrote his plays and some of the dialog in his novels with

CEA, but in the postscripts to a few of his plays al-Ḥakīm wrote openly about the

linguistic chasm the between Arabic-speaking countries; he seemed to realize that his

use of colloquial speech may have been contributing to a lack of pan-Arab national

identity. He stated:

> People are beginning to ask in fact in some Arab countries: 'Why is
> Egyptian colloquial imposed on us? Why should we not have our own
> colloquial?' Some harbingers have actually appeared in some types of literature
> and art. If the situation continues we will find ourselves forced one day to

translate books, thoughts and artistic works from one regional language to another within the Arab world. With that, our culture would crumble and our intellectual link be severed" (as cited in Hutchins, 1984, p. 341).

However, the two plays he published in 1956 (one of them being *The Deal*) show the beginning of al-Ḥakīm's shift from Egyptian nationalism to Arab nationalism, as he attempted to solve the old dilemmas of classical vs. colloquial Arabic and ancient vs. modern heritage by employing a new *third language* which can be read and understood as widely as MSA but has the simpler features of a dialect. This *third language* uses lexical and syntactic structures that are modeled after existing forms in both the colloquial and the dialects and can be universally understood by Arabic speakers even if they are unfamiliar with the *third language*. The play included CEA to connect with Egyptians, with MSA and al-Ḥakīm's *third language* integrated to promote oneness with those outside of Egypt. The quantitative aspect of this study found that for negation in the play, al-Ḥakīm used primarily MSA, with a small amount of his *third language*, and minimal CEA: this indicates that linguistically connecting with Arabs outside of Egypt took priority over connecting with Egyptians. However, the Egypt-centric storyline concerning the Agrarian Reform Law of 1952 allowed al-Ḥakīm to promote feelings of solidarity among Egyptians, while, much like in the case of the short story, more

universal registers of Arabic allowed the story to be shared amongst other Arabs.

It appears that 1956 is the year in which al-Ḥakīm shifted his promotion of

Egyptian national identity to pan-Arab identity. Both the story and the play analyzed

here indicate that al-Ḥakīm was taking Egyptian themes and using more universal

registers of the Arabic language to allow the pieces to be shared with other Arabic-

speaking countries, but as the Egyptians had banded together and successfully

overthrown the king, al-Ḥakīm was likely trying to shift his focus and connect with the

Arab brethren. In the postscript for *Food for Millions* (1963) al-Ḥakīm admits to

previously trying to create a language with which all Arabs could identify and be joined

together.[14] However, his two 1956 plays, were the only occasions on which he used the

third language as a means of promoting pan-Arab nationalism.

The short story, "I've Got It, I've Got It," does not use the colloquial language to

promote Egyptian nationalism, but the content of the story does, and the fact that it is

---

14 Chapter 2 provides a number of examples of al-Ḥakīm's thoughts about the registers of the
   Arabic language, but he also said: "The language problem presents itself to me here once
   again. Once more I return in my attempt in 'The Deal' [*al-Safqa*, 1956] and the other works to
   get as close as possible to the colloquial language that the life of some of the ordinary or
   trifling characters call for. It is an experiment of taking the literary Arabic language down to
   the lowest level to come close to the colloquial without being colloquial and to raise
   colloquial without making it literary Arabic. It is a third language in which all people can join
   together. (as cited in Hutchins, 1984, p. 328)

written in a language that could be understood by all educated Arabs ensures the promulgation of the concept. However, until 1956 al-Ḥakīm did use language to promote either Egyptian nationalism (with CEA) or Arab nationalism (with MSA or his *third language*). After his short-lived experiment with the *third language* al-Ḥakīm turned away from using language as an aspect of nationalism or identity. In his later works al-Ḥakīm used less colloquial, even when the faithfulness or identity of a character was compromised; this is no surprise since the content of his plays indicate al-Ḥakīm shifted his interest from Egyptian nationalism to Nasserist pan-Arabism later in his life, when he switched to using more universal themes to promote pan-Arab nationalism instead of Egyptian nationalism.

The aim of this study was to highlight the variations in al-Ḥakīm's language and to explore how these variations are connected to events in Egypt (and the Arab world) at the time the works were written. This study concludes that al-Ḥakīm manipulated both the themes and the language of his works, especially his plays, to reflect sentiments of nationalism or to promote identity. However, further studies should provide more technical and exhaustive analyses of the Arabic of Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm, as he himself remarks on the study of colloquial Arabic, "I hope that those interested in the

matter will investigate whether the spread of regional dialects of Arabic has been or

will be one of the causes aiding in spiritual and intellectual fragmentation" (as cited in

Hutchins, 1984, p. 341).

APPENDIX 1: NEGATION TOKENS

#	PAGE	PHRASE	NEG	TRANS	GLOSS	FORM	REASON
1	35	والله ما تحرجنا ولا تخذلنا	ما	wa-allah mā ta-ḥarij-nā wa-lā taxđāl-nā	by God don't embarrass us and do not forsake us	MSA	mā past
2	35	والله ما تحرجنا ولا تخذلنا	لا	wa-allah mā ta-ḥarij-nā wa-lā taxđāl-nā	by God don't embarrass us and do not forsake us	MSA	lā present
3	37	لا دخلت جوفي من يومين	لا	lā daxl-tu jawf-ī min yawm-īn	It did not enter my throat for two days	3rd	lā w/past
4	39	ما عاد	ما	mā ʕād	no longer	CEA	idiomatic
5	40	انت لا سمعت ولا <خميس افندي> سمع	لا	ānti lā samaʕa-ti wa-lā xamīs ʔfindī samʕa	Neither you heard nor <Khamis ʔfindī> heard	MSA	series
6	40	انت لا سمعت ولا <خميس افندي> سمع	لا	ānti lā samaʕa-ti wa-lā xamīs ʔfindī samʕa	Neither you heard nor <Khamis ʔfindī> heard	MSA	series
7	40	ما هناك حل	ما	mā hunāk ḥal	there is no solution	3rd	not MSA/CEA
8	42	من غير بنادق ولا ضرب نار	لا	min ɣayir banādik wa-lā ḍaribu nār	without guns and not shoot fire	MSA	lā present
9	44	لا أنا ولا اقوى مني ولا اى مخلوق	لا	lā ʔnā wa lā ʔqwā minn-ā wa-lā ʔjī maxlūq	except me, not stronger than me, not any creature	MSA	lā as no/not
10	44	لا أنا ولا اقوى مني ولا اى مخلوق	لا	lā ʔnā wa lā ʔqwā minn-ā wa-lā ʔjī maxlūq	except me, not stronger than me, not any creature	MSA	lā as no/not
11	44	لا أنا ولا اقوى مني ولا اى مخلوق	لا	lā ʔnā wa lā ʔqwā minn-ā wa-lā ʔjī maxlūq	except me, not stronger than me, not any creature	MSA	lā as no/not
12	45	لا غيره	لا	lā ɣīrahu	no body except him	MSA	lā as no/not

#	PAGE	PHRASE	NEG	TRANS	GLOSS	FORM	REASON
13	45	لا حمامد بك>	لا	lā ḥamid bik	not Hamid Bik	MSA	lā as no/not
14	46	لا يلمح منها قصبة	لا	lā ya-limaḥ minn-hā qaSaba	no hint of a reed	MSA	lā present
15	47	لا الهم	لا	lā āl-lahum	not worry—get more context	MSA	lā as no/not
16	48	لا شيء	لا	lā šīʔ	nothing	MSA	lā as no/not
17	49	ما باليد حيلة	ما	mā b-il-īd ḥīlah	I am unable	CEA	idiomatic
18	51	لا أنا حاضر	لا	lā ʔnā HāDir	I am not ready	MSA	lā as no/not
19	51	لا...أنا...	لا	lā...ʔnā...	no...I...	MSA	lā as no/not
20	51	ما يقدر	ما	mā ya-qadr	not able	3rd	mā present
21	52	لا سامع	لا	lā sāmaʕ	not listening	CEA	active part
22	52	ما يقدر	ما	mā ya-qadr	not able	3rd	mā present
23	52	قدرتي ما كنت قمت ولا تأخرت	ما	qadirat-ī mā kun-tu qama-tu wa-lāa tʔxna-tu	I would not have stood by and would not have delayed	MSA	series
24	52	قدرتي ما كنت قمت ولا تأخرت	لا	qadirat-ī mā kun-tu qama-tu wa-lāa tʔxna-tu	I would not have stood by and would not have delayed	MSA	series
25	53	لا تؤاخذني	لا	lā t-ʔāxđa-nī	no offense/pardon me	MSA	idiomatic
26	53	لا اطلب	لا	lā ā-Talab	I am not asking	MSA	lā present
27	54	لا يمكن	لا	lā yu-mkin	it cannot	MSA	lā present
28	57	لا مانع	لا	lā mānʕ	nothing in the way	MSA	idiomatic
29	58	لا نكلمه	لا	lā na-kalim-hu	we aren't talking to him	MSA	lā present
30	58	لا نفتح	لا	lā na-ftahu	we do not open	MSA	lā present
31	60	لا يمكن	لا	lā yu-mkan	impossible	MSA	idiomatic
32	61	لو لا انك	لا	law lā ʔna-ka	if (its) not that you	MSA	lā cond neg
33	62	لا يهمك	لا	lā ya-himu-ka	don't worry	MSA	idiomatic

REFERENCES

Badawi, M. M. (1988). A passion for experimentation: The novels and plays of Tawfiq
      al-Hakim. *Third World Quarterly,* 10.2, 949-960.

Botman, S. (1991). *Egypt: From independence to revolution, 1919-1952.* Syracuse, NY:
      Syracuse University Press.

Brisset, A. (2004). The search for a narrative language: Translation and cultural
      identity. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 337-368). New
      York: Routledge.

Brustad, K. E. (2000). *The syntax of spoken Arabic: A comparative study of Moroccan,*
      Egyptian, Syrian, and Kuwaiti dialects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University
      Press.

Cachia, P. (1988). Idealism and ideology: The case of Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm. *Journal of the*
      American Oriental Society, 100.3, 225-235.

Cachia, P. (1990). *An overview of modern Arabic literature.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh
      University Press.

Cohen, J.M. (Ed.) (1993). *Arabic-English Dictionary: The Hans Wehr Dictionary of Modern*
      Written Arabic. Urbana, IL: Spoken Language Services.

Cleveland, W. L. (2004). *A history of the modern Middle East.* Boulder, CO: Westview
      Press.

Dryden, J. (2004). From the preface of Ovid's Epistles. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation*
      studies reader (pp. 38-42). New York: Routledge.

Eid, Mushira. (1988). Principles for switching between Standard and Egyptian Arabic.

Al-Arabiyya, 21, 51-80.

Eid, M. (2007). Arabic on the media: Hybridity and styles. In H. Motzki and E. Ditters (Eds.), *Approaches to Arabic linguistics* (pp. 403-434). Leiden: Brill.

Ferguson, C.A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word 15*, 325-40.

Giles, H. (1978). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In G. Howard (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity, and intergroup relations.* American Academic Press.

Gershoni, I., & Jankowski, J. P. (1995). *Redefining the Egyptian nation, 1930-1945.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldschmidt, A. Jr., Johnson, A.J., & Salmoni, B.A. (Eds.) (2005). *Re-envisioning Egypt 1919-1952.* Cairo: The American University of Cairo Press.

al-Ḥakīm, T. (1952). *Fan al-ʔadāb* (*The Art of Literature)*. Cairo: Maktebah al-ʔadāb wa-maṭʕatahā bi-al-jamāmīz.

al-Ḥakīm, T. (1956). *al-Ṣafqah* (*The Deal*), 1956. Cairo: Maktebah al-ʔadāb wa-maṭʕatahā bi-al-jamāmīz.

al-Ḥakīm, T. (1992). *Prison of life: An autobiographical essay.* Cairo: American University of Cairo Press.

Hinds, M. & Badawi, el-S. (1986). *A dictionary of Egyptian Arabic.* Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1986.

Holes, C. (2004). *Modern Arabic: Structures, functions, and varieties.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Hutchins, W. M. (1984). *Plays, prefaces and postscripts of Tawfiq Al-Hakim, volume two: Theater of society*. Washington, D.C.: Three Continents Press.

Hutchins, W.M. (2003). *Tawfiq al-Hakim: A reader's guide.* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Irvine, J.T. (2002). "Style" as distinctiveness: The culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation. In P. Eckert and J.R. Rickford (Eds.), *Style and sociolinguistic variation* (pp. 21-43). Eds.. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Issawi, C. (1949). Population and wealth in Egypt. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly,* 27.1, 98-113.

Morsy, L. (1984). The military clauses of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of Friendship and Alliance, 1936. *International Journal of Middle East Studies,* 16.1, 67-97.

Rosenhouse, J. (2007) Some aspects of diglossia as reflected in the vocabulary of literary and colloquial Arabic. In E. Ditters & H. Motzki (Eds.), *Approaches to Arabic linguistics.* London: Brill.

Ryzova, L. (2005). Egyptianizing modernity through the 'New Effendiya' social and cultural constructions of the middle class in Egypt under the monarchy. In A. J. Goldschmidt & B. A. Salmoni (Eds.), *Re-Envisioning Egypt 1919-1952.* Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.

Shilling-Estes, N. (2004). Investigating stylistic variation. In J.K. Chambers, P. Trudgill, & N. Shilling-Estes (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change* (pp. 375-401). Boston: Blackwell.

Shteiwi, M. (2006). Contribution of Arab media to creating social change and developing civil society in the Arab world. In *Arab Media in the Information Age* (121-138). Abu Dhabi: The Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research.

Starkey, P. (1987). *From the ivory tower: A critical study of Tawfīq al-Hakīm.* London: Ithaca Press.

Stetkevych, J. (2006). *The modern Arabic literary language: Lexical and stylistic*

developments. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Suleiman, Y. (2003) *The Arabic language and national identity: A study in ideology.*
    Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
"Timeline Egypt." BBC News online. 10 March 2010.
    http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/country_profiles/790978.stm 20 April
    2010.

Versteegh, K. (2001). *The Arabic language.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.