

The Natural Linguistic Intuition among the Arabs: Between Historical Reality and Social Context

MOHAMED BELKADI

University of Tlemcen

belkadi13life@gmail.com

Orcid: 0009-0001-9098-3359

Received : 13/01/2026; Accepted : 26/05/2026; Published 25/07/2026

Abstract: This research highlights arabic speakers following the rules of the language are natural speakers due to the presence of the innate ability in their environment where they live out of tribal dialects to compare and establish a standard for fasah (correctness) and to define phonological and semiotic manifestations, with support from the experiences of early linguists such as Al-Jahiz and Ibn Jinni, and through the exploration of classical articles that express how arabic is acquired through uncoded means. The research further evidences that saliqah is both a feeling associated with language and an expression of the rules associated with how mother's speak to children, in addition to understanding that the tribal formations of the environment preserved their original character more than cities; thus, referring to the fact that the tribes represented the main source of classical arabic language. It is also recognized in this research that saliqah originates through the combination of the innate linguistic characteristic that exists in the nature of humans, combined with the society in which they have learned to utilize it.

Keywords: linguistic intuition; saliqah; classical arabic; tribal dialects; innate language ability; arabic linguistic heritage

Introduction

Language, in general, is considered the vessel that contains and carries knowledge, transmitting it from place to place and from one era to another. Were it not for the blessing of language, which Allah bestowed upon His servants, nations would not have inherited the civilizations of others, nor benefited from the lessons of events or the insights produced by the minds of the wise in every art and science. Although the Arabs did not possess an ancient material civilization, their cultural refinement was evident in their care for their language, so much so that errors in speech were rare, and eventually mispronunciation became a flaw in a young man's tongue. It was as if language itself refined their souls, balanced them, and purified them through the elegance of its forms and the nobility of its structures, so that the young grew up internalizing the perfection they observed in their language. They acquired it naturally from their parents and community, and it was further strengthened by the guidance of educators and the knowledge of teachers through books, for it reflects a psychological inclination ingrained in them. In other words, it is a **salīqa**, an innate disposition, which they employ effortlessly and

fluently when using and recalling its meanings.

At the heart of this research study lies a question regarding the nature of linguistic *saliqa* amongst the Arab peoples. Is it an intrinsic human attribute or has it been acquired through socialisation? Language is considered to be the medium through which knowledge and ideas are received and passed down between generations. The Arabs used their language to convey their ideas/knowledge without teaching, this has been indicated by the Arabs exhibiting *saliqa* in their written as well as spoken language. Through the examination of texts written by classical grammarians and rhetoricians such as Sibawayh, Al-Jahiz, and Ibn Jinni, this study will evaluate examples of *saliqa* as found in phonetics, morphology, syntax, and lexicon. The study will ultimately focus on identifying measures of eloquence and the holders of those measures amongst Arab Tribes. The findings from this study indicate that *saliqa* is an intrinsic characteristic of the language that reflects the nature of the person who produces the language, producing off its own rules and preventing deviations from these rules. Furthermore, the findings suggest that Eloquence in Arabic literature continues to exist today because the Arabs were able to develop a pure dialect which was insulated from outside influences due to their geographic location. Therefore, a criterion for measuring linguistic proficiency and an understanding of Arab Heritage is based upon *saliqa*.

1. Defining the Concept of Linguistic *Saliqa*

Saliqa: originally refers to the impression left by feet and hooves on a path, and such marks are called *salā'iq*. (Al-Zabidi 1205Ah, 256)

By metaphorical extension, it is used to describe an eloquent speaker: *khatīb musqa' muslaq*, meaning “eloquent,” referring to the strength of his voice and speech, as transmitted by al-Jawharī. Al-A'shā also composed:

"In them is firmness, generosity, and nobility... and the speaker is al-salāq"—and the term *muslāq* is also reported in this context. (Al-Zabidi 1205Ah, 258)

Saliqa is like a ship: it represents nature and innate disposition. Ibn al-'Arabī said: “*Saliqa* is a man's natural disposition.” Sibawayh stated: “This is his *saliqa*, which he was naturally endowed with and which he acquired.” It is said of someone: he reads with *saliqa*, meaning according to his natural disposition, without having been formally taught. Abu Zayd commented: “He is noble by nature and by *saliqa*.”

It is also said: so-and-so speaks with *saliqiyya*, derived from *saliqa*. Sibawayh noted that this is rare, meaning it comes from innate nature rather than learning. Similarly, it is said: someone reads with *saliqiyya*, meaning according to the natural disposition in which he was raised.

Al-Layth said: “The *salīqī* in speech is that which is not subject to fixed grammatical conventions, yet it is eloquent and fluent to the ear, even if it departs from strict syntax.” Others explained: “The *salīqī* in speech is what a Bedouin utters naturally in his language, even if other expressions might be more polished or elegant.”

Al-Azhari said: “When it is said that someone reads with *saliqiyya*, it means that the reading follows a customary, established practice that should not be transgressed. If a Bedouin reads according to his natural speech without following the convention of urban readers, it is said:

he reads with *saliqiyya*, meaning according to his nature, not by instruction.”

In the report of Abu al-Aswad al-Du‘ali: he established grammar when the Arabs’ speech became inconsistent, and *saliqiyya*—the language in which a speaker proceeds naturally without attending to grammatical rules or avoiding errors—prevailed. He said:

"I do not twist my tongue like a grammarian, but I speak with my *saliqa* and thus it may seem unusual." (Al-Zabidi 1205Ah, 260)

It is said: “A man may be grammatically knowledgeable and eloquent.” *Saliqa* has two aspects: the first is the case of a proficient Arab, who speaks according to his *saliqa*—his natural disposition—which is innate. A poet described this:

"Even if it aligns with grammar, it occurs... yet its *saliqa* is as pure as the dawn."

The second aspect applies to a villager who, despite a speech flaw, speaks according to his *saliqa*; this is a *saliqa* of error. Hence, it was said: so-and-so reads with *saliqiyya* if his reading is not grammatically adjusted. This specifically refers to rural people who lack eloquence. (al-‘Arabi 230 AH, 35)

Saliqa is a type of language that is naturally produced by humans, as a part of their innate ability to communicate, without any formal training or instruction. *Saliqa* is historically associated with the Bedouin people, who developed oral eloquence through extensive use and practice of the Arabic language, rather than any other group of people.

To possess *saliqa*, a speaker must demonstrate the ability to correctly apply all the rules of their language in their speech. If a speaker demonstrates a degree of deviation from the established grammatical and syntactic rules of their language when they speak, that speaker will be viewed as lacking *saliqa* and/or as exhibiting a reduced level of *saliqa*, or a potentially defective or degraded form of *saliqa*.

Saliqa is characterized by two aspects: strength (or potential) and performance (or actual). The relationship between the potential and actual dimensions of *saliqa* must be in complete correspondence; otherwise, a speaker may be perceived as having a degree of *saliqa*, but the speaker is actually lacking *saliqa* in the fullest sense. Within classical Arabic linguistic theory, *saliqa* is understood to include an executive (or action) dimension, which includes a complete correspondence to the established rules of the speaker's language that have been internalized within the speaker's cognitive system or mental space. If the speaker produces speech that deviates from the conventional rules of the Arabic language, the speaker will no longer be eligible to be classified as possessing *saliqa*.

2.The Reality of Saliqa among the Arabs

Al-Jahiz says: Everything among the Arabs was instinctive and spontaneous, as if inspired. There was no hardship, no intellectual effort, no deliberate reflection, nor reliance on assistance. Rather, one simply directed one’s attention to speech—whether in a poem, a dispute, at the edge of a well, while driving a camel, in duels or exchanges, during struggles, or in war—and the meanings would come naturally, and words would flow abundantly. They were neither literate nor trained in writing, yet their speech was clearer, richer, and more powerful than anyone else’s. Each person’s tongue was inherently eloquent, and their position in rhetoric was elevated. Their orators were unmatched in producing speech, and expression was easier for them than retaining or studying it. They were not like those who memorize the knowledge of

others or imitate prior speech; they retained only what naturally adhered to their hearts, became embedded in their minds, and connected with their intellects—without effort, intention, memorization, or study.

And what remains of this in our possession is only a fraction, to an extent known only to Him who encompasses the clouds' span and the number of grains of dust—Allah, who knows what has been and what will be.(Al-Jahiz 1423 AH., 35)

Based on these meanings connected to linguistic *salika*, we find that early Arab scholars were guided by the idea that mastery of Arabic speech is closely linked to the Arab lineage. It is inherited naturally, passed from Arabs to their children, and instilled in them from infancy by their mothers. Therefore, narrators did not hesitate to learn from Arab children and report language from them. For this reason, they did not consider the poetry of Abu Tammam and Al-Mutanabbi sufficient to exemplify that natural eloquence, which they restricted to a particular lineage, a specific era, and a specific environment unique to the Arabs, excluding other peoples.

3.The People of *Saliqa* and Eloquence among the Arabs

Those from whom the Arabic language was transmitted, followed as models, and from whom the Arabic tongue was learned, were primarily from the tribes of Qays, Tamim, and Asad; these were the sources of most of the language that was preserved, and upon them reliance was placed in matters of rare expressions, grammar, and morphology. After them came Hudhail, some of Kinana, and some of Tai, but no other tribes contributed significantly.(Al-Suyuti 2006, 102)

In general, the language was never taken from urban populations, nor from the inhabitants of the desert regions bordering other nations, for example, neither from Lakhm nor Judham due to their proximity to the Levant, where most were Christians reading in Hebrew; nor from Taghlib and Yemen, as they were in Arabia adjacent to the Greeks; nor from Bakr, due to their proximity to the Nabataeans and Persians; nor from Abd Qays and the Azd of Oman, as they lived in Bahrain mingling with India and Persia; nor from the people of Yemen, who had contact with India and Abyssinia; nor from Banu Hanifa and the inhabitants of Al-Yamama; nor from Thaqif and the people of Ta'if, due to their contact with Yemeni traders residing there; nor from the urban population of the Hijaz, because when the language was first being transmitted, those who carried it had already mingled with other peoples, and their tongues were thus corrupted.(Al-Suyuti 2006, 102)

There is only one explanation for this caution in the transmission of the language, as described by Abu Nasr al-Farabi: it was meant to prevent foreign elements from infiltrating Arabic, unless they were adapted to the standard of eloquence in accordance with its Arabization methods. Such unintended or accidental intrusion would distort researchers' understanding of the language's originality and character. From it, one might mistakenly infer characteristics or forms that are not inherent to the language, or constructions that never existed in its pure expressions, because these elements entered Arabic only through linguistic contagion due to proximity and contact—and such cases were numerous and highly problematic.(al-Salih 1379 AH-1960 CE, 113)

Therefore, Ibn Jinni modified their abstention from taking the language from the people of the settled areas—as they had done with the people of the desert—by stating: “whatever

irregularities, corruption, or defects appeared in the languages of the settled people and inhabitants of the towns.” Had it been known that the people of a city preserved their eloquence without any corruption affecting their language, it would have been necessary to learn from them just as one learns from the desert-dwelling Arabs.

Despite this strict standard of eloquence, the Arabs deliberately cultivated the language of the Quraysh to achieve refinement in speech and clarity in expression. Their preference for it indicates that they selected from the speech of Arabs what was most evident, preserved the most elegant forms, and relied on the most excellent expressions. Thus, it is indeed correct, as scholars and Orientalists have observed, that the greatest advantage of Arabic, which preserved its unique character among the Semitic languages, was its isolation from non-Arabic peoples. It relied solely on its inherent capacity for expression, representation, generation, selection, and exclusion—within its original homeland, its natural environment, and among its sister dialects, which exchanged influence with it—while the other Semitic languages dispersed from the Semitic motherland and simultaneously moved away from authenticity and purity.(al-Salih 1379 AH-1960 CE, 115)

This separation helped keep Arabic alive in many ways, such as its full range of grammatical inflection, the way its letters fit their meanings, the way its sounds stayed the same while its phonetic range grew, the richness of its morphology and derivation, the variety of its structures and forms, the abundance of its roots, and the wealth of its vocabulary in terms of synonyms, redundancies, and antonyms, as well as its natural ability to create new words and Arabize.(al-Salih 1379 AH-1960 CE, 116)

4. Standards of Classical Arabic (Al-Fus'ha):

The methodology of the early linguists in collecting and codifying the Arabic language was highly precise and scientific, relying heavily on observation and induction. They sometimes exercised extreme caution to ensure confidence in the linguistic features they documented, avoiding any source whose Arabic might contain even the slightest flaw. As Dr. Sobhi Ibrahim Al-Salih notes, their approach limited the collection of language primarily to Bedouin Arabs, especially those recognized for their eloquence. Sibawayh, for instance, often emphasized correcting linguistic usage by referring only to Arabs whose Arabic was considered pure or trustworthy. Yet, even Sibawayh tended to favor the language of the Hijaz region when dialectal differences arose, considering its speakers the most reliable models of classical Arabic.(al-Salih 1379 AH-1960 CE)

Why should the language of the Hijaz not serve as the standard of eloquence, given its refinement within the Arabian Peninsula, free from abhorrent or objectionable expressions? A researcher would almost see this standard as valid and indisputable, even self-evident, leaving no reason to reject it. Yet a question arises: if the early scholars limited their linguistic examples to the Bedouin Arabs, why then did they favor the language of Quraysh, which in reality had no Bedouin traits? On the contrary, it was the language of civilization among all Arabs.

The Arabs used the Quraysh dialect of Arabic as their common literary language, thereby influencing and influencing the development of the dialect through linguistic agency. The Quraysh dialect was subject to the same influences and interactions as all other languages, as evidenced by the general nature of linguistic influence and interaction, which are applicable to

all languages. However, it must be noted that the language spoken by Quraysh (as stated by Ibn Khaldun) existed “further from the lands of the uncivilized than any other countries,” due to geographic distance from the non-Arabian world, even though that geographic distance did not ultimately preclude the borrowing of Persian and Roman dialects/words. (al-Salih 1379 AH-1960 CE, 110)

And the language of the Qur’an, when it is said that it is the language of the Hijaz or of Quraysh, is the very language in which the Arabs’ poetry, speeches, and rhymed prose were transmitted to us. The Qur’an confirmed this refined and cultivated language, further elevating and polishing it; this is the meaning of its revelation in the language of Quraysh.

The Quraysh dialect—beyond the veneration surrounding it—truly possessed unique qualities that preserved its character and provided it with a level of completeness unmatched by others. Its distance, as described by Ibn Khaldun, from the lands of non-Arabs in all directions, acted as a natural barrier against extensive contact with foreigners. Consequently, it was less influenced by the accents of non-Arabs than other tribes that had close interactions with neighboring non-Arabs. Abu Nasr al-Farabi stated in the beginning of his book *On Words and Letters*: “Quraysh were the best among the Arabs in selecting the most eloquent words, the easiest to pronounce, the most pleasant to the ear, and the clearest in expressing what is in the soul.” (al-Salih 1379 AH-1960 CE, 112)

5. Manifestations and Levels of Saliqa (Linguistic Aptitude):

The linguistic saliqa among the Arabs has various manifestations that reveal the depth of its integration into their linguistic nature. It appears almost as an inseparable part of their mental and intellectual makeup, inherently linked to their verbal expression, even if they were tested or led to strain in its use. This integration was examined through the dialogues that took place between linguists and speakers possessing saliqa. In the book *Al-Khasais (The Characteristics)*, a collection of narratives illustrates these dialogues and sheds light on understanding the true nature of saliqa.

5.1 Phonetic level: According to Abu Hatim Sahl ibn Muhammad al-Sijistani in his *Al-Kitab al-Kabir fi al-Qira’at (The Great Book on Readings)*, he said: Ali read to a Bedouin in the sanctuary: “Taybi lahum wa husn ma’ab” (“Blessed for them and a good return”). I said, “Tuba” (Blessed), and he said, “Taybi.” I repeated, “Tuba,” and he said, “Taybi.” When it went on for a while, I said, “Toto,” and he said, “Ti Ti.”

Ibn Jinni comments on this narration, saying: “Do you not see this Bedouin, whom you consider rude, harsh, and untamed, how his natural disposition shifts from the heaviness of waw to the ya without being affected by instruction, and how his nature does not bend toward lightness through shaking or practice? Imagine what he would be like if left alone with his camel, following his instincts and inclinations.” (Ibn Jinni 392 AH, 76; al-‘Arabi 230 AH)

Indeed, what the Bedouin was questioned about constitutes a phonetic issue, and phonetic phenomena cannot derive their rules from a vocal apparatus other than their own. This is because such an external apparatus may have some weakness from its very formation, or it may have acquired specific phonetic habits, making it difficult to avoid certain characteristics of its linguistic sounds in order to conform to the vocal apparatus of others, who possess different linguistic-phonetic features.

Ibn Qutaybah observes that the Hudhali reads (‘atā ḥīn) while he means (ḥattā ḥīn), and the Asadi reads (ta‘allam) with a kasra on the tā’ while he means (ta‘allam) with a fatha on the tā’.

Ibn Qutaybah says: “If each of these groups were commanded to abandon their own language—the one they had grown accustomed to as children, adolescents, and adults—the difficulty would be severe and the ordeal immense. It could only be achieved after prolonged training and effort of the souls.”(al-‘Arabi 230 AH, 32)

The phonetic conditions described may be due to congenital or injury-related physical problems that affect the vocal tract. They may also occur due to an overall lack of ability. They were certain that “When he has the strength of voice and high spirits to do so, he will be able to do many things none have ever done” and believed that the Bedouins may understand through instinct and natural ability what is obscure or imperceptible to others even after much time spent in conversation and listening.

They exaggerated excessively regarding the Bedouin’s natural disposition when they attributed to him an inability to pronounce a Qur’anic word in any way other than his own dialect and intonation.

5.2 Morphological level:

Ibn Jinni once asked a Bedouin: “How do you pluralize (dukān)?” He replied, “Dukākīn.” He asked, “And (sarḥān)?” He said, “Sarāḥīn.” “And (qarṭān)?” He said, “Qarāṭīn.” “And (‘Uthmān)?” The Bedouin replied, “‘Uthmānūn.” Ibn Jinni said to him, “Why don’t you say ‘Uthāmīn?” The Bedouin answered, “What ‘Uthāmīn! Have you ever heard anyone speak in a way that is not part of their language? By God, I would never say it.”

So, what motivated the Bedouin to change the plural form from a broken plural to the sound masculine plural? And what prevented him from changing the earlier forms? It is his innate disposition that dictates this, and it is what imposes on him the rule not to say otherwise. But does this Bedouin always remain faithful to his linguistic commitment? Are there not slips and lapses of the tongue in which he sometimes departs from the rules of his language? The answer lies in observing this Bedouin throughout the stages of his linguistic life.

5.3 Syntactic level:

Ibn Jinni says: One day I asked Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad ibn al-‘Assaf al-‘Aqili al-Jawthi, the Tamimi – Tamim Jawtha – and I said to him: “How do you say: ḍarabta akhuka (I hit your brother)?” He replied, “I say: ḍarabtu akhāk,” so I changed it to the nominative case, but he refused and said, “I would never say akhuka.” I asked, “How do you say: ḍarabani akhuka (your brother hit me)?” and he used the nominative. I said, “Didn’t you claim you would never say akhuka?” He replied, “What is this! The two sides of speech differ.”

A linguistic unit takes its case ending according to its syntactic function in the sentence, and changing this function may lead to a change in the case ending and consequently a change in meaning. These syntactic changes, which occur quickly in the speaker, are the result of the innate linguistic disposition that guides him correctly, provided that the psychological and social conditions for linguistic production are met.

5.4 Lexical level:

Ibn Jinni narrates from al-Asma‘i that a man from the Arabs entered the court of the king of Dhafar. The king said to him, “Thib,” “and wathib” in the Himyaritic language, meaning

“jump.” The man jumped, causing his feet to strike the ground loudly. The king laughed and said, “This is not Arabic; whoever enters Dhafar speaks Himyaritic,” meaning he spoke in the Himyaritic tongue.

A classical Arab refuses, under all circumstances, to utter anything contrary to the rules of his language—phonologically, morphologically, syntactically, or lexically. His adherence to his linguistic positions is due to the strength of his innate disposition (*siliqah*). It is thus a natural instinct that cannot be imposed. The Bedouin instinctively knows the positions of his speech and its rules because he possesses a strong linguistic sense.

The person endowed with *siliqah* is the speaker who can apply all the rules of his language—strictly—to what he utters. Any deviation from these rules in speech practice is considered a weakness in *siliqah*, if not the absence of it altogether.

Siliqah has two aspects: an aspect of potentiality and an aspect of actuality, and the correspondence between them must be complete. According to Arabic linguistic thought, *siliqah* is not the psychological impression shared by the entire linguistic community, but it has a second aspect, which is the executive aspect. There is no *siliqah* if the second aspect does not fully correspond to the rules stored in the speaker’s mind, and whoever departs from the rules of his language is no longer endowed with *siliqah*. Finally, it appears that *siliqah* is the speaker’s instrument in production, that is, a set of phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and lexical rules.

6. Language between Acquisition and Innateness

Dr. Ahmad Mukhtar Abd al-Hamid Umar states that there were times when the Arabic language was very unstable at an early stage in its development, with regard to both vocabulary and grammar. There were rules for word formation based on letters that evolved as the Arabic language evolved from an early state to its more modern form, and the rules that govern sentence structure evolved along with the development of the Arabic language from its earliest forms to its more contemporary forms. The Arabic language began as a rudimentary form of communication, without any consistent formatting or structure. As the Arabic language progressed through time, it matured into a more complete and mature form of communication, due to a greater number of speakers, who possessed some form of “institution” and commonality with regard to both the structure of the Arabic language and the way in which to form new words, arrange letters, build complete sentences, and utilize various styles and methodologies when writing in Arabic.

As such, many of the manuscripts that exist today are actually examples of the Arabic language during the earliest stages of development, i.e., prior to the formal establishment of grammatical rules created by grammarians. (‘Umar 276 AH, 82)

From here, we can distinguish between two types of speakers of a language: those who are aware of its characteristics and those who hardly sense these characteristics.

The first type refers to the scholar who knows the secrets of the language, for his knowledge of linguistic phenomena is purely scientific. This knowledge is different from the linguistic competence he acquired like any other person in the language he uses. This knowledge, therefore, is not among the precise acts by which one’s speech is safeguarded from error and incorrect usage; rather, it is purely theoretical knowledge concerning the matters of his language.

The second type refers to those who rely on the linguistic faculty they have acquired, which enables them to communicate with others through speech according to the structure upon which their language is built. Every person is innately endowed with this predisposition, which is the ability to acquire one communicative system among various possible systems.

The information that forms this linguistic faculty is unconscious, unless the speaker's awareness reflects upon it as he contemplates how he produces his speech. This occurs whenever his tongue falters or he makes an error in performance. In reality, it is knowledge preceding well-formed action, as our early scholars say. The speakers' knowledge of the structures and conditions of the language through which they communicate is practical, non-theoretical knowledge whose patterns have been imprinted and firmly established in their nervous system, enabling them to regulate their actions. These actions are the hidden processes that transform their intentions into a coherent sequence of words that express those intentions.

Thus, their knowledge is, as Ibn Jinni said regarding the eloquent Bedouin, "by potentiality, not by craftsmanship." (Ibn Jinni 392 AH, 287)

A malakah is a firmly rooted quality in the soul. Its explanation is that the soul acquires a disposition as a result of performing certain actions. This disposition is called a psychic quality and is termed a state as long as it is quick to disappear. When it is repeated and the soul practices it until that quality becomes firmly established and slow to disappear, it becomes a malakah, and in relation to the action, it becomes a habit and a character trait. (Al-Jurjani 1403 AH, 229)

Thus, language is a faculty, a potential, or a capacity, but a specific language is the collective product of this faculty and a set of necessary conventions, socially conditioned to allow the functioning of individual faculties.

Language is built upon a faculty inherent in our nature, while a specific language is something acquired, conventional, and subject to natural instinct rather than preceding it.

It is certain that a specific language must, in itself, be silent and unspoken. Saussure's comparison of it to a dictionary—which contains within its covers an unspoken linguistic stock, yet one that is ready for articulation and use by will and at the appropriate moment—is therefore fitting.

Conclusion

The classical Arab and the early poets, both in their use of language and their composition of poetry, used grammar without knowing what and how the grammar was used. For example, poets wrote all their poetry in meters and themes, but they did not know that their use of prosody was identified as the science of prosody by al-Khalil Ibn Ahmad Al-Farahidi in the century of 2 AH. A typical example of the attributes of the classical Arab is to have an intuitive ability to know the various forms of the language's expression, due to his unadulterated state and his elevated sense of the language.

If linguistic siliqah was connected to the pure Arab environment, free from foreign influence, where the Arabs produced their best forms of expression, varieties of speech, and eloquence, what can we today bring to serve the Arabic tongue in a time when life has become complex, tastes have deteriorated, and there is no place for the weak? The danger is imminent, and the burden of responsibility to avert it is heavy.

It has become necessary to modernize the methods of teaching Arabic grammar by carefully

selecting high-quality literary texts—whether poetry or prose—and using them as a starting point for grammar lessons, while adopting flexible methods capable of instilling linguistic competence in learners.

References:

- ‘Umar, Ahmad Mukhtar ‘Abd al-Hamid. 276 AH. "Linguistic Research among the Arabs." al-‘Arabi, ‘Abd al-Wahhab ibn Harish. 230 AH. "Nawadir Abu Mashal."
- Al-Jahiz. 1423 AH. *Al-Bayan wa al-Tabayin*. Beirut: Dar wa Maktabat al-Hilal
- Al-Jurjani. 1403 AH. *Kitab al-Ta‘rifat*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya
- al-Salih, Subhi Ibrahim. 1379 AH-1960 CE. *Studies in the Jurisprudence of Language*: Dar al-‘Ilm lil-Malayin
- Al-Suyuti, Jalal al-Din 2006. *Al-Iqtirah fi ‘Ilm Usul al-Nahw*. Dar al-Ma‘rifa al-Jami‘iyya
- Al-Zabidi. 1205Ah. *Taj al-‘Arus min Jawahir al-Qamus*. Dar al-Hidaya: group of scholars
- Ibn Jinni, Abu al-Fath ‘Uthman al-Mawsili. 392 AH. *Al-Khasais (Characteristics)*. General Egyptian Book Organization, 4th edition.

AUTHOR BIO:

BELKACEMI MOHAMED is a Doctor of Science in Linguistic Studies, specializing in Arabic Grammar, and a researcher as well as a permanent member of the laboratory "Updating Arabic Grammar" at the University of Tlemcen. He serves as a member of the editorial board of the journal "Updating the Linguistic Lesson" and has participated in numerous national and international conferences, with several scientific and international publications. He is the author of books, teaches additional courses at the university, acts as an active university facilitator, and has held multiple administrative positions across various faculties.