

Scientific Linguistic Research Among Modern Arabic Linguists: A Study of 'Research Methods in Language' by Tamam Hassan as a Model

*Madani Ahmed**

*Hassiba Ben Bouali University of
Chlef (Algeria)*

a.madani@univ-chlef.dz

Touzen Abdelkader

*Hassiba Ben Bouali University of
Chlef (Algeria)*

touzene@hotmail.com

Received: 19/11/2025

Accepted: 28/11/2025

published: 26/12/2025

Abstract:

Arabic linguistics has made significant contributions through its scholars, who have greatly enriched linguistic studies across various linguistic levels. They have left a substantial legacy reflected in their numerous and diverse works. Some authored texts on the history of language, serving historical linguistics, while others focused on comparing languages, providing impetus for comparative linguistics. Additionally, some highlighted the necessity of adhering to appropriate methodologies for studying and analyzing linguistic phenomena in general, and texts in particular. They wrote about methodologies such as historical, normative, descriptive, comparative, and contrastive approaches, all aimed at organizing linguistic research, its concepts, and terminologies within a broader methodological framework. Any research lacking a specific methodology may stray from scientific discourse and become disconnected from academic scientific research. Thus, modern Arabic linguists have taken up this task, notably linguist "Tammam Hassan," who enriched linguistic literature and study with alternative ideas and theories compared to those previously adopted by linguists. One of his most important works in this domain is the book "Research Methodologies in Language," where he elaborates on the methodologies employed in modern linguistic analysis, applying their levels to the Arabic language.

Keywords: Methodology - Language - Scientific Research - Linguistic Method - Tammam Hassan - Linguistics - Levels of Analysis.

* *madani ahmed*

Introduction:

Arabic linguistics, whether ancient or modern, is rich in its linguistic propositions and terminologies. There is a profound connection between ancient and modern Arabic linguistics, as modern Arabic linguistic thought has emerged under the phenomena of influence and being influenced by ancient Arabic linguistics. The latter played a fundamental role in highlighting what was previously obscure to scholars of heritage or what remained challenging in some of their texts. For instance, in the book of "Sibawayh," there are still unresolved issues that scholars have yet to find explanations for. These issues remain a spark that can ignite modern scientific linguistic research, bringing forth new insights. This new perspective may involve addressing certain shortcomings in the ancient linguistic study or adding concepts that ancient linguists overlooked, placing some ideas within the framework of objective scientific research. Some scholars may even strive to formulate new linguistic theories, as was the case with Tammam Hassan, who endeavored to propose certain linguistic propositions and theories that scientifically, methodologically, and objectively explain grammatical studies.

His works reflect his extensive knowledge of modern methodologies used in linguistic analysis and the methodological procedures for studying linguistic phenomena. This is notably exemplified in his book entitled "Research Methodologies in Language," where he elaborately discusses linguistic methodologies in addressing linguistic concepts, highlighting the most important methodologies that have been established in modern linguistic research.

Tammam Hassan is recognized not only for his writings on linguistic methodologies but also for extensively exploring the field of scientific linguistic research. He wrote about the nature of language and the essence of modern linguistics, which led to the widespread dissemination of his linguistic contributions. Among his notable works that gained tremendous recognition are "The Arabic Language: Its Meaning and Structure," "Normativity and Descriptiveness," "Text, Discourse, and Action," "Language in Society," and "The Foundations," which is an epistemological study of grammar, in addition to "Research Methodologies in Language," which serves as the focal point of this discussion.

From this perspective, we can pose the following question at the beginning of this research: What are the manifestations of scientific research methodologies in modern Arabic linguistics, particularly in Tammam Hassan's book "Research Methodologies in Language"?

1 .The Methodology from the Perspective of Scientific and Linguistic Research:

It is not the aim of this research to elaborate extensively on the meaning of the word "method" from a lexical perspective. This is because when we consult Arabic dictionaries, particularly the well-known ones, we find that the term "method" generally means a clear path or an established route. Undoubtedly, this general meaning of "method" is sufficient.

However, the terminological meaning of "method" is what we will focus on in this research, as its significance pertains directly to scientific and linguistic research. It allows both the

reader and the researcher to understand the boundaries of the concept of "method" and what it signifies in the field of scientific linguistic research. In ancient sciences and knowledge, the term "method" was understood to mean "research, inquiry, or knowledge," and Aristotle used it in the sense of "search".¹

In addition to this definition, Abdul Rahman Badawi defines it as "a set of rules that the researcher employs to explain a specific phenomenon, with the goal of reaching scientific truth, or the path that leads to uncovering the truth in sciences, through a set of general principles that govern the reasoning process and define its operations until the specified conclusion is reached."² Others have defined it as "a set of clear scientific steps or a collection of rules that the researcher follows while discussing or addressing a specific social, political, or media phenomenon"³.

Additionally, some researchers offer a concept that closely resembles this definition, asserting that the method is "a collection of principles, rules, and guidelines that the researcher must follow from the beginning to the end of the research, aiming to uncover the general and essential relationships that govern the phenomena in the subject of study."⁴ Upon careful consideration of these varied definitions, the researcher finds that they collectively express a comprehensive concept of those steps, rules, and precise scientific logical guidance that every researcher relies on when studying a linguistic phenomenon or any other subject. Without this, their research would lack the controls and methodologies necessary to maintain objectivity and protect against the influence of unscientific trends and ideas. Thus, the method reveals the approach of a particular current or school⁵.

However, the meaning of "method" may be closely related to that of "curriculum," and thus it is important to clarify the boundaries of both meanings. The curriculum is more specific than the method, as it is a term commonly used in the field of education. Therefore, it is utilized by those working in language education, pedagogy, and educational planning. They consider it "the collection of strong experiences and educational activities that the school provides for students to interact with, both inside and outside of school and under its supervision, with the goal of improving students' behavior across all life situations"⁶.

This makes it clear that the curriculum is a concept unique to educators and didactics experts, where conducting any study involving educational research necessitates addressing the concept of the method. This is foundational to both these fields, as it is inconceivable to conduct educational or pedagogical research without it. Entering the field of education without it would be considered a form of randomness in research. Thus, "the curriculum is an educational plan that includes goals, aims, content, and educational activities, along with teaching methods and evaluation strategies"⁷.

If we understand the nuanced difference between the two terms—method and curriculum—it may become confusing for some researchers to distinguish methodology from these concepts. We should emphasize what methodology pertains to and the essence of methodology, which is "the science of methods," as it determines the overall shape of the method or outlines how any method is formed, regardless of its type. Generally, it is a science concerned with

facilitating pathways to reach information, saving effort and time, and also organizing the knowledge material, arranging it according to specific ideas agreed upon by knowledgeable individuals.⁸

2 .Scientific Research Methodologies in Modern Arabic Linguistics:

When discussing modern Arabic linguistics, it is essential to note that its research methodologies and approaches to presenting and formulating linguistic propositions primarily rely on ideas and linguistic theories that have emerged from European linguistic studies. This indicates that modern Arabic linguistics has drawn from contemporary linguistic thoughts under the influence of mutual impact. However, an impartial researcher acknowledges that ancient Arabic linguistics is rooted in linguistic ideas found in the rich heritage left by ancient Arabic scholars. When examining the contributions of our ancient scholars, it becomes clear that they conducted their research according to pure scientific methodologies, pursuing precision and objectivity in their discussions, analyses, theories, and conclusions. Nevertheless, they did not explicitly declare the methodologies they employed in their writings.

We recognize that the well-known methodologies in modern linguistic studies, such as descriptive, historical, and normative methods, were applied by eminent scholars such as "Sibawayh" (d. 180 AH), in his book; Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad (d. 170 AH), in his dictionary "Al-ʿAyn"; and Ibn Jinni (d. 398 AH), in his book "Al-Khasais".

While our linguistic heritage scholars did not clarify their methodologies during their studies, the merit of Western linguistic research is that its scholars announced specific methodologies and labeled them with names now commonly recognized by researchers in the field of linguistics or linguistics studies. Since modern Arabic linguists have accessed the works produced by European linguists, they found it necessary to adopt the methodologies that contemporary linguistic research has established. These methodologies have become widely accepted and employed in their research and studies.

Among the Arab scholars who have emerged in the field of specialized linguistic research during the modern or contemporary era are, for example, "Ramadan Abd al-Tawab" (d. 2001), "Kamal Bashar" (d. 2015), "Ahmed Mukhtar Omar" (d. 2003), "Muhammad Hamasa Abdul Latif" (d. 2015), "Tammam Hassan" (d. 2011), "Abdul Salam Al-Masdi" (1945/...), "Abdul Rahman Hajj Saleh" (d. 2017), and many others whose names this research could hardly encompass due to their abundance.

If we wish to mention the scientific linguistic methodologies adopted and endorsed by modern Arabic linguists, we find ourselves faced with five main types of scientific linguistic methodologies:

1-Historical Method , 2- Normative Method , 3- Descriptive Method , 4- Comparative Method , 5- Contrastive Method

Let us begin by discussing the historical method, as it is the first methodology to emerge in the field of linguistic research.

First: The Historical Method:

The historical method involves studying a linguistic phenomenon over time and its development throughout different eras, as it relates to the past and its successive periods. This method examines how linguistic phenomena evolve over time, resulting in specific terminologies for certain fields within linguistic research, such as historical phonetics, historical semantics, historical morphology, and historical syntax.

This method was followed in linguistic studies by Europeans, known as historical linguistics. Ferdinand de Saussure rejected this approach, advocating instead for descriptive linguistics, or what he termed the descriptive method in the study of human language. Through this approach, he concluded that language study relies on two dualities: diachronic (historical) and synchronic (contemporary). He argued that synchronic study is the one to prioritize in linguistic research since it focuses on the language itself rather than being influenced by external sciences or studies, such as history, sociology, psychology, and others.

In Saussure's view, relying on history—such as in historical studies—would distance the research from scientific inquiry and objectivity in language analysis, as he believed that language is an internal system with its relationships and levels that are unaffected by external influences. According to Saussure, the synchronic study should be our main concern because its results are inherently objective and scientific, aligning with the modern linguistic perspective of studying human language scientifically and objectively. Historical studies do not benefit linguistic research as much as synchronic studies do.

Thus, the historical and synchronic studies give rise to two distinct methodologies: the historical method for studying language and the synchronic or descriptive method for analyzing it.

To clarify this further, let's consider a practical example by examining two linguistic phenomena. The first is the study of relative pronouns in the Arabic language, and the second is the study of relative pronouns in the Quran. The first requires the historical method as it investigates the phenomenon of relative pronouns across historical periods of the Arabic language⁹, beginning from the pre-Islamic era, through the Umayyad and Abbasid periods, and into modern times. The second study, however, pertains to examining relative pronouns in a specific time and context—the time when the Quran was revealed and the environment in which it was revealed.

Consequently, the focus from the perspective of synchronic analysis or the descriptive method would be solely on the Quranic text, without considering external temporal or non-temporal factors affecting the topic. This illustrates the clear difference between the historical method and the descriptive method.

Second: The Normative Method:

The normative method refers to the practice of resorting to a basic standard when studying any linguistic phenomenon. This means that a specific rule is applied in the analysis of various levels of linguistic inquiry. According to this method, the researcher studies the language as it should be, rather than as it actually is. The researcher adheres to the rules established by scholars of that particular language, meaning that those who conform to these rules are deemed correct, while those who do not are considered incorrect.

From this normative perspective, the researcher approaches their study armed with a set of linguistic rules and principles, intending to apply these established criteria to the linguistic phenomenon under examination. For instance, when analyzing a linguistic issue at the syntactic level, the researcher relies on grammatical knowledge and refers to pre-established grammatical rules to determine the correctness or incorrectness of the utterance. If it conforms to the rule, it is accepted in linguistic usage; if it deviates from it, it is rejected.

It's important to note that many contemporary linguists have adopted this method, especially when it comes to simplifying grammatical issues for those who wish to learn this science. Therefore, the normative method is primarily an educational approach that suits those who want to learn the language and its sciences, particularly in teaching the language to non-native speakers.

Third: The Descriptive Method:

The descriptive method entails describing language as it exists, studying it in its real form rather than as the researcher wishes it to be. It accepts and analyzes language as pronounced by its speakers, not as dictated by grammatical rules. For instance, the well-known saying among Arabs "مكره أخاك لا بطل" ("You are forced to help your brother; you are not a hero"), is accepted in its original form as uttered by its speakers and should not be deemed incorrect. It must be analyzed within its own linguistic context. This principle applies to all linguistic levels, including phonetic, semantic, and syntactic levels, all studied within a specific temporal and spatial context.

While modern Arab linguists have followed this method and consider it among the best approaches for linguistic study, ancient Arab linguists also adopted it indirectly, as evidenced by their writings in this field. To clarify the characteristics of the descriptive method, modern Arab linguists have established foundational principles that have gained acceptance among researchers. Undoubtedly, these principles combine the modern study of Arabic linguistics with the authenticity of ancient Arabic linguistic inquiry. These principles can be highlighted as follows:

A - Gathering Scientific Material:

Language should be studied descriptively only after extensive collection from its defined sources, especially the spoken aspect of language. The spoken form represents the language scientifically and objectively, indicating its dynamic nature and changes in usage.

Consequently, spoken language is the focal point for linguists, while written language indicates stability and may not capture many phonetic changes observable in speech—such as phenomena like stress, intonation, nasalization, prolongation, assimilation, and elision. Thus, the reality of language is best reflected in its spoken form, and modern linguists across different schools agree that the spoken word is paramount in linguistic research, as language is fundamentally oral rather than written, and learning begins with its spoken form.

B - Defining the Spatial Context:

Modern Arabic linguistics emphasizes the necessity of studying language within its spatial context for objective research. Ancient scholars recognized this aspect early, differentiating between the language of the Bedouins and urban language, considering Bedouin language as the standard classical Arabic due to its oral transmission. They avoided the urban dialect, as its vocabulary and structures were often influenced by contact with non-Arabic speakers, resulting in perceived imperfections in articulation and syntax.

C - Defining the Temporal Context:

Linguists agree that time must be specified in descriptive language studies. For instance, ancient scholars did not accept texts beyond certain temporal thresholds: for urban language, they limited acceptance of texts to those from the second century AH, while for Bedouin language, they restricted it to the fourth century AH. Anything outside these periods was deemed unacceptable, as these early centuries represented the closest era to eloquence and correctness. Hence, the timeframe between the first and fourth centuries AH became critical for language study, while periods before and after were classified under diachronic research (historical method), whereas the defined periods fell within synchronic analysis, integral to the descriptive method.

D - Defining the Linguistic Level:

In the descriptive method, the researcher must specify the linguistic level when studying or analyzing any linguistic phenomenon. At the phonetic level, it is crucial to distinguish between the standard diction, the traditional dialect level, and the colloquial level, as well as the professional language used by specialists and craftsmen. This approach ensures that the study reflects the language as it exists in social reality, capturing how it is articulated by its speakers within a single linguistic community.

Modern Arabic linguists have heavily relied on this method, viewing it as the most effective approach to reveal objective and scientific results in linguistic studies, aligning with contemporary linguistic theories. Ancient scholars also adopted this methodology, albeit often implicitly. Evidence of their application of this method is found in their collection of materials, including poetry, speeches, vocabulary, and narratives from primary sources.

For instance, scholars like Al-Kisai (d. 189 AH) and Abu Amr ibn Al-Allā' (d. 154 AH) were notable for gathering linguistic material from eloquent Bedouins.¹⁰ They defined specific time frames for legitimate language study, referring to periods like the "Era of Acceptability,"

where Bedouin speech was considered valid up to the fourth century AH, and urban language was acceptable only until the middle of the second century AH. Anything outside these temporal bounds was deemed unacceptable.

Moreover, these scholars specified spatial contexts by identifying key locations, such as Mecca, Medina, and tribes like Quraysh and Tamim, as sources of credible Arabic. They intentionally avoided tribes near Abyssinia, Persia, Rome, and Egypt, as noted by Al-Suyuti in his book "Al-Mizhar fi 'Ulum Al-Lughah wa Anwa'aha." He stated, "Nothing was taken from urban speakers nor from those living near foreign nations".¹¹

In establishing linguistic levels, these scholars relied on listening, narration, and oral transmission. This is evident in the works of Sibawayh, who frequently used expressions like "We heard some Arabs" and "He recited," indicating his reliance on firsthand testimony and narration in studying the language.

Thus, the descriptive method remains the most effective among modern Arabic linguists because it "studies the linguistic reality of a language in a specific place and time, regardless of notions of correctness. The descriptive method describes facts and discusses them without philosophical bias or judgment, promoting a logical understanding of linguistic phenomena."¹²

Fourth: The Comparative Method:

The comparative method studies language across its phonetic, morphological, and other levels within two languages that belong to the same family. The researcher analyzes linguistic phenomena between two languages that share a common ancestry. For example, one might examine a linguistic phenomenon in a language that belongs to the Indo-European family compared to one from the Semitic family, such as analyzing a linguistic level in Arabic alongside the same level in Hebrew. This method has enriched modern Arabic linguistics, leading to the emergence of fields like comparative morphology, comparative syntax, and comparative phonetics.

Fifth: The Contrastive Method:

The contrastive method resembles the comparative method in its exploration of linguistic phenomena, but it focuses on studying these phenomena in languages that belong to different families or lineages. For instance, a linguistic phenomenon might be studied in Indo-European languages, such as Persian, and then compared to a phenomenon in a Semitic language like Arabic. This method allows for a deep comparison across all linguistic levels.

Notably, the contrastive method is particularly beneficial for teaching foreign languages to non-native speakers, as it allows learners to discover the subtle differences between the two languages at various levels, such as phonetics or syntax. Consequently, this makes it easier for

language teachers to simplify complex topics, aiding students in grasping the fundamental principles of the language effectively and efficiently.

Transitioning from the theoretical overview of research methodologies in linguistics to practical application, we turn to the methodology of Tammam Hassan in his book, which consolidates scattered ideas from linguists and elucidates ambiguities that researchers in linguistic sciences may encounter. Through his work, we can question Tammam Hassan's perspective and vision of linguistic research methodologies as outlined in "Methods of Linguistic Research."

3 .The Scientific Linguistic Method of Tammam Hassan

Tammam Hassan is regarded as one of the most prominent scholars in modern Arabic linguistics, significantly contributing to the advancement of Arabic linguistic studies by integrating traditional studies with modern research. He is distinguished by his upbringing in an Al-Azhar environment, where he conducted an in-depth study of the Arabic language, enabling him to uncover its intricacies and rules recorded in classical texts.

Hassan was inspired by the works of many scholars such as Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad, Sibawayh, Al-Farah, Ibn Jinni, Al-Zamakhshari, Al-Jahiz, Al-Jurjani, Al-Sakkaki, and others. His interest in traditional Arabic linguistics extended to Western linguists, including John Robert Firth, who supervised his studies during his graduate studies.

His master's thesis was titled "The Sounds of Karnak and Their Phonetic Structure," where he focused on phonetic analysis and the application of Western methodologies. This clear innovative approach reflects the interplay of influences from Arabic heritage with modern philosophies and theories.

Through his scientific method, Hassan advocated for the necessity of applying precise descriptive methodologies. He established his book, "Methods of Research in Language," published in 1955, as an important reference that discusses aspects of language and suitable research methodologies, helping to create a knowledge base that contributes to the development of linguistic studies.¹³

He also supervised his doctoral dissertation titled "The Dialect of Aden: A Field Study." Tammam Hassan's intellectual development was significantly influenced by Western research methodologies, with one of the first approaches that impacted him being the descriptive method. He applied this method during both his master's and doctoral studies, focusing on a descriptive analysis of dialects. This heightened his interest in the method, leading him to author the book "Methods of Research in Language," his first publication in 1955.

In this book, he discusses the essence of language, the science of linguistics, and the research methodologies in Arabic, indicating the most appropriate approach for studying it. His adoption of this method signaled a need for renewal in the field of linguistic research. This renewal became evident in his approach to simplifying grammar and innovating teaching methods.

This is reflected in the introduction to his book "The Arabic Language: Meaning and Structure," where he describes his method for studying grammar as a personal endeavor to employ the descriptive method. He characterized his effort as "the boldest idea to circulate in the arrangement of linguistic thoughts since Sibawayh and Al-Jurjani."¹⁴

Tammam Hassan further elaborated on the research methodology in the phonetic system, emphasizing the significance of the phonetic aspect (la phonétique). He highlighted its essential components: tone, sensation, and sound.

Tone is described as an auditory effect that lacks continuous vibrations, unlike sounds produced by striking wood, drums, or the noise of traffic. Sensation, on the other hand, is produced by a living speech apparatus, particularly the human vocal apparatus, and does not necessarily carry inherent meaning.

Sound encompasses both linguistic and non-linguistic elements. It is characterized by continuous effects and vibrations, which can be perceived from musical or string instruments as well as human voices. Understanding sound depends on various dimensions, including the quality of the tone, its loudness, and its overall value.

This in-depth analysis reflects Hassan's commitment to providing a comprehensive study of phonetic phenomena, contributing to the enrichment of the field of Arabic linguistics.¹⁵

The researcher, throughout this process, adopts an observational approach, which involves having a language assistant to help with the language and mimicking their pronunciation while indicating errors and ensuring accuracy. He also emphasizes the use of precise sound recording techniques. Despite the detailed scientific explanation of how to conduct research in phonetics and the simplification of complex issues, Tammam Hassan neglects to discuss the second aspect of phonetics known to linguists as phonology (la phonologie), which studies the functions of sound.

The second methodology he discusses is related to the morphological level of analysis. He begins this section by addressing the concept of the morpheme (le morphème), a key term in morphological linguistics. The morpheme represents the smallest meaningful unit of analysis, essential for morphological analysis, much like the phoneme (le phonème) is for the phonetic level.

Hassan emphasizes the importance of morphemes, stating that they are linguistic elements that connect the ideas that constitute the overall meaning of a sentence. He notes that these ideas are clearly represented in semantemes or the core of lexical meaning.¹⁶

Among the research methodologies that Tammam Hassan deemed worthy of investigation is the derivation method. He emphasized the necessity of revisiting the origins of Arabic words and reviewing the views of grammarians regarding the issue of roots and whether they are related to time. He elaborated on the arguments of the Basrans and Kufans, as well as Ibn

Malik's (d. 672 AH) choices on this matter. This focus reflects the author's insightful approach to linguistic research, as derivation is the backbone of the Arabic language.

One of the distinctive features of Arabic is its derivational nature, allowing speakers to generate numerous forms, unlike other languages, which typically have limited forms due to a lack of this vital linguistic element. Given the connection between the topic of derivation and the semantics of Arabic words, Hassan also delves into the methodology of semantics (Sémantique) in his book. He addresses the study of words in dictionaries and the exploration of their meanings through a historical lens.

Hassan points out that the meaning of a word is not stable; it can be influenced by historical factors that alter its meanings from one era to another and from one community to another. He highlights that words derive their meanings from multiple influences, including sounds, syllables, letters, stress patterns, and intonations. He advises that researchers should utilize etymology (Etymologie), which involves studying words from a historical perspective.¹⁷

Through the historical and descriptive methodologies, Tammam Hassan was able to introduce new ideas, particularly what he referred to as the theory of contextual clues. He elaborated on this concept in his book "The Principles: An Epistemological Study of Syntax," where he addressed how to create grammar or grammatical knowledge. He argues that this craft is akin to the art of poetry and other forms of creativity. For him, syntax is not merely a study of words and their meanings, as in the field of lexicology; rather, it focuses on the relationships, forms, and structures that exist between linguistic elements. This is distinct from morphology, which examines the forms of words in isolation from their constructions.

In this context, Tammam Hassan proposed the theory of contextual clues as an alternative to the traditional theory of the agent in Arabic syntax. This agent theory was introduced by Sibawayh, and it has been followed by a majority of grammarians from ancient times to the present, with the exception of Ibn Madda Al-Qurtubi (d. 592 AH), who rejected the existence of the agent with arguments he deemed appropriate to challenge grammarians' reliance on the agent for explaining the system of Arabic sentence structure. However, unlike Hassan, he did not propose a substitute theory.

The contextual clues theory that Hassan passionately advocated posits that the parsing of words is not influenced by agents that determine how one word affects the grammatical case of another. For example, the subject rising due to the action of the verb, or the object being accusative due to the verb's influence, or one element rising as a result of another. The agent theory became so central that grammarians often relied on it for defining terms. For instance, Ibn Ajurrum (d. 723 AH) defined the subject (mubtada) as "the raised noun that is free from verbal agents."¹⁸

Tammam Hassan views this entire scientific foundation as incorrect. He argues that parsing should not be based on movement but rather on the positions that words occupy in sentences. These positions create the relationships that give rise to grammatical markers, which emerge from the roles that elements play within the sentence.

Hassan introduces the concept of grammatical clues (القرينة النحوية), which he believes determine meaning, regulate the position of words in construction, and reveal the underlying relationships between the words in a sentence. Consequently, the agent is not responsible for organizing and controlling these elements; instead, it is the interplay of contextual clues that takes on this role.

He classifies these clues into two types: semantic clues, such as subjectivity, circumstance, dependency, and transitivity, and verbal clues, which include grammatical markers, order, and intonation.

For example, in the sentence "ضرب زيد عمراً" ("Zaid hit Amr"), one might question why the subject is in the nominative case. From Hassan's perspective, the answer is linked to the nature of the word itself—being a noun is a structural clue. This is reflected in its grammatical marker indicating it is the subject, which is preceded by a verb. If it had not been preceded by a verb, it would have functioned as a subject (mubtada).

Additionally, there are other clues, such as the clue of the action being in the indicative form, which serves as an additional structural marker, as well as the clue of reference, indicating who performed the action.¹⁹

Tammam Hassan goes even further, asserting that the construction of grammar is rooted in all types of sounds. He argues that movements are sounds, and that types of assimilation, substitution, and nasalization are also forms of sound. His methodology in comparing the sciences of grammar and morphology leans toward the idea that grammar dominates morphology. In his view, certain grammatical forms are akin to the meanings of morphological forms, and these meanings are not limited to verbs alone but apply to any word in general.

Thus, Tammam Hassan presents his new theory as a departure from the traditional agent theory that has governed Arabic grammatical studies for centuries. In this book, he successfully deduces rules for intonation for the first time, addressing principles of intonation at a time when this field was primarily the domain of European scholars.

Through his exploration of intonation phenomena, he considers tone to also be a clue to meaning. For instance, the question "ما هذا؟" ("What is this?") can shift in meaning depending on whether the speaker lowers or raises their voice. A lowered tone may express mere inquiry, while a raised tone could imply denial. This demonstrates how auditory elements affect the interpretation of structure.

He illustrates this with a verse from the Quran: "سلام عليكم" ("Peace be upon you"). While this is generally a greeting, Hassan suggests—based on his interpretation—that it can also convey a sense of disagreement. He explains that in a situation where a conversation extends and both parties are firmly holding onto their opinions, if one becomes frustrated and wishes to signal

the end of the discussion with hostility, they might turn their back and gesture as if dismissing something behind them, saying "السلام عليكم" while departing in anger.²⁰,

This interpretation is significant, as we find in the verse from the Quran: "سلام عليكم لا نبتغي" ("Peace be upon you; we do not seek the ignorant"),²¹ which holds the potential meaning of disagreement that signifies a rejection of discourse and communication with the other.

Tammam Hassan criticized grammarians for their reliance on the normative approach, wherein they applied rules and imposed them on the study of language while neglecting linguistic clues. He also challenged their dependence on formal logic in their research, differentiating it from natural logic, stating, "Natural or material logic refers to the conformity of the mind with reality, while formal logic refers to the conformity of the mind with itself through general rules and defined forms."²²

In his view, logical study turns grammar into rules that are detached from actual linguistic use and do not represent the realities of language and the types of discourse present in linguistic communities, including dialectal variations from one community to another. Thus, Tammam Hassan highlighted the role of the descriptive method in studying words as they are used within a single linguistic community, without resorting to logical criteria that are disconnected from communication.

He argued that the word is of paramount importance in discourse, as it aids in thought and conveys meaning. This capability helps the listener understand and the speaker express themselves effectively. He pointed out that teachers, through this approach, become more capable of conveying meaning and more successful in their roles, which ultimately benefits both learners and educators alike.²³

However, Tammam Hassan did not limit his research to the descriptive method alone; he also employed the historical method. He challenged the claim made by some researchers that the language of Quraysh is the most eloquent dialect of the Arabs. He supported this view, citing figures like Subhi Saleh, who argue that "they base this claim on the social history of the Arabian tribes, stating that Quraysh held significant importance in pre-Islamic times, which encouraged other tribes to adopt their dialect as a common language for all Arabs."²⁴

He also studied and traced the claims of grammarians regarding the classification of Arabic words from Sibawayh to his own time. He found that they only categorized words into three divisions: noun, verb, and particle. Dissatisfied with this tripartite classification, he proposed, through his application of the historical method and by examining this grammatical assertion across historical periods and referencing sources of Arabic discourse, both poetry and prose, that Arabic words should be classified into seven categories: noun, verb, particle, adjective, adverb, pronoun, and conjunction.²⁵

He justified this by explaining the reason behind the grammarians' approach, stating, "Ibn Malik distinguished between the categories of words based on their form, while the position

we summarized from other grammarians differentiated these categories based on their meaning. A definition based solely on structure or meaning is not the ideal method for distinguishing between the categories of words."²⁶

He arrived at the conclusion that grammarians have overemphasized the use of analogy while neglecting the concept of exceptions in linguistic research. He argued that deviant usages are also eloquent Arabic, even if they deviate from common usage.

Additionally, he diverged from both the Basrans and the Kufans regarding the essence of derivation. While the Basrans believe that the root of derivation is the source (المصدر) and the Kufans hold that it is the verb, Hassan contends that the individual letters, specifically three letters—regardless of their nature—serve as the foundation of derivation. He refers to these as the "germ of the meaning of the event" in modern linguistics, as all forms are derived from them.²⁷

He also proposed that there are two types of time in Arabic: grammatical time and morphological time. The distinction lies in that grammatical time refers to the time of a word within context, while morphological time pertains to the time of a word outside of context. He criticized the traditional grammatical division of time into three categories—past (denoting completion), present (denoting current action), and imperative (denoting future action)—arguing that this classification does not accurately reflect the realities of linguistic use.

He noted that grammarians often find themselves needing to justify their classifications whenever actual usage contradicts their rules. For instance, they make excuses for the present tense indicating the past when coupled with "لم" (indicating negation of past action), or they struggle with expressions like "إن تكن عاد قد بادت فما بادت خصائصه" and in the verse "قد يعلم الله" as well as with the past tense in "وكان الله غفورا رحيمًا." Hassan asserts that this confusion arises from their mixing of philosophical time with grammatical time.²⁸

He further explains, "The function of grammatical time in context is carried out by the verb, adjective, or any other category that is transferred to the verb. This concept of time differs from what is understood in morphology, as it pertains to the function of a verb's form in isolation from context."²⁹

This is a correct direction. For example, in the verse "أتى أمر الله فلا تستعجلوه سبحانه وتعالى عما" "يشركون" ("The command of Allah has come, so do not hasten it; Exalted is He above what they associate with Him")³⁰, the grammatical time reflects an action that is imminent and contextualized within the statement, illustrating how grammatical time operates within its specific linguistic environment.

The verse begins with the verb "أتى," whose tense indicates the past outside the context of the verse. However, within the context of the verse, its time signifies both the present and future, highlighting how the meaning of time can shift based on contextual usage.

Hassan did not limit his criticism to structural aspects; he also rejected—through the application of the descriptive method—the theory of augmentation known among

morphologists, which constrains the letters of augmentation to the phrase "سألتمونيها". According to him, the letters of augmentation are not restricted to those present in this expression.

He pointed out that grammarians have specifically defined the letters of augmentation in eloquent Arabic as those found in "سألتمونيها", asserting that any letter outside of these should not be considered an augment. After conducting comparisons between three-letter and four-letter verbs, he argued, "Do these comparisons not suggest that the letters of augmentation are not limited to 'سألتمونيها'? Rather, any letter in the Arabic language may be suitable for augmentation?"³¹

What can be said about the importance of the book is best summarized by the author himself, who states: "This is a methodology among the various linguistic studies, applied to the Arabic language for the first time. We hope that the reader finds in it something that piques their interest or encourages them to think critically."³²

Conclusion:

Tammam Hassan was not merely a linguist or language scientist like many of his peers, who often rely on recounting what others have said without leaving distinct marks on their linguistic studies and research. Rather, he was a pioneer whose efforts led him to diverge from conventional linguistic studies familiar to his contemporaries. He sought to replace well-known theories, such as the theory of the agent, with new concepts like the theory of contextual clues. In doing so, he effectively employed contextual theory in modern linguistics, which was championed by his mentor, Professor Firth.

Hassan opened the door to scholarly exploration that had been closed to researchers and scholars in the field of linguistics, challenging the notion that later scholars could not innovate as their predecessors did, or adhering to the saying that the earlier generation left nothing for the later ones.

Regardless of the circumstances, he successfully applied linguistic research methodologies with meticulous scientific precision, especially the descriptive and historical methods. He is considered a cornerstone of the descriptive approach among contemporary Arab linguists. Moreover, he enriched modern Arabic linguistic studies with ideas that restored the significance of Arabic linguistic thought, encouraging it to reclaim its rightful place in scientific linguistic research.

All of this was achieved through his extensive body of work, comprising more than twenty-three volumes made available to every reader and researcher in the Arabic-speaking world and beyond.

Margins:

1. Ibn Manzur, Lisan al-Arab, Vol. 2, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyah, 3rd ed., Beirut, 2008.
2. Abdul Rahman Badawi, Research Methodologies, Al-Matbu'at Agency, 3rd ed., Kuwait, 1977.
3. Amir Misbah, Methodology of Research in Political Science and Media, National Publishing House, 1st ed., Algeria, 2007.
4. Fouad Al-Bahi, Social Psychology: A Contemporary Perspective, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi, 1st ed., Cairo, 1999.
5. Idris Yahout, The Concept of Methodology and Its Components, Journal of Educational Sciences for Institutes, No. 65, April 2016, Rabat.
6. Saleh Belaid, Linguistic Methodologies and Research Preparation, Dar Houma for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution, 1st ed., Algeria, 2005.
7. Mohamed Al-Badawi, Methodology in Literary Research and Studies, Dar Al-Ma'arif for Printing and Publishing, 1st ed., Tunisia, n.d.
8. Abdul Salam Al-Masdi, Stylistics and Style, Arab Book House, 3rd ed., Tripoli, Libya, n.d.
9. Said Al-Afghani, In the Origins of Syntax, Islamic Office, 1st ed., Beirut, 1987.
10. Jalal Al-Din Al-Suyuti, Al-Mazhar in the Sciences of Language and Its Types, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyah, 1st ed., Beirut, 1998.
11. Mohamed Mohamed Dawood, Arabic and Modern Linguistics, 1st ed., Dar Gharib for Publishing, Cairo, 2001.
12. Tammam Hassan, Research Methodologies in Language, Anglo-Egyptian Library, 1st ed., Cairo, 1990.
13. Tammam Hassan, The Arabic Language: Its Meaning and Structure, Dar Al-Thaqafa, 1st ed., Casablanca, Morocco, 1999.
14. Ibn Ajrum, Al-Ajrumiya Text, Dar Al-Sumayyi for Publishing and Distribution, 1st ed., Riyadh, 1998.
15. Tammam Hassan, The Foundations: An Epistemological Study of Linguistic Thought Among Arabs, Alami Al-Kutub, 1st ed., Cairo, 2000.

List of references:

- ¹ Ibn Manzur, Lisan al-Arab, Vol. 2, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyah, 3rd ed., Beirut, 2008, p. 265.
- ² Abdul Rahman Badawi, Research Methodologies, Al-Matbu'at Agency, 3rd ed., Kuwait, 1977, p. 66.
- ³ Amir Misbah, Methodology of Research in Political Science and Media, National Publishing House, 1st ed., Algeria, 2017, p. 1.
- ⁴ Fouad Al-Bahi, Social Psychology: A Contemporary Perspective, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi, 1st ed., Cairo, 1999, p. 300.
- ⁵ See: Abdul Rahman Badawi, Research Methodologies, pp. 6/7.
- ⁶ Idris Yahout, The Concept of Methodology and Its Components, Journal of Educational Sciences for Institutes, No. 65, April 2016, Rabat, Morocco, p. 3.
- ⁷ Saleh Belaid, Linguistic Methodologies and Research Preparation, Dar Houma for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution, 1st ed., Algeria, 2005, p. 13.
- ⁸ Mohamed Al-Badawi, Methodology in Literary Research and Studies, Dar Al-Ma'arif for Printing and Publishing, 1st ed., Tunisia, n.d., p. 9.

- ⁹ Abdul Salam Al-Masdi, *Stylistics and Style*, Arab Book House, 3rd ed., Tripoli, Libya, n.d., p. 255.
- ¹⁰ See: Said Al-Afghani, *In the Origins of Syntax*, Islamic Office, 1st ed., Beirut, 1987, p. 98.
- ¹¹ Jalal Al-Din Al-Suyuti, *Al-Mazhar in Language*, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyah, 1st ed., Beirut, 1998, p. 58.
- ¹² Mohamed Mohamed Dawood, *Arabic and Modern Linguistics*, 1st ed., Dar Gharib for Publishing, Cairo, 2001, p. 95.
- ¹³ See: Tammam Hassan, *Research Methodologies in Language*, Anglo-Egyptian Library, 1st ed., Cairo, 1990, p. 69.
- ¹⁴ See: Tammam Hassan, *The Arabic Language: Its Meaning and Structure*, Dar Al-Thaqafa, 1st ed., Casablanca, Morocco, 1999, p. 22.
- ¹⁵ The previous reference, p. 58.
- ¹⁶ The same reference, p. 17.
- ¹⁷ The previous reference, p. 240.
- ¹⁸ Ibn Ajrum, *Al-Ajrumiya Text*, Dar Al-Sumayyi for Publishing and Distribution, 1st ed., Riyadh, 1998, p. 11.
- ¹⁹ *The Arabic Language: Its Meaning and Structure*, p. 345.
- ²⁰ The previous reference, p. 345.
- ²¹ Verse 55 of Surah Al-Qasas.
- ²² Tammam Hassan, *The Foundations: An Epistemological Study of Linguistic Thought Among Arabs*, Alami Al-Kutub, 1st ed., Cairo, 2000, p. 47.
- ²³ The same reference, p. 12.
- ²⁴ Sobhi Saleh, *Studies in Language Jurisprudence*, Dar Al-Ilm for Millions, 3rd ed., Beirut, 2009, p. 109.
- ²⁵ *The Arabic Language: Its Meaning and Structure*, p. 86.
- ²⁶ The same reference, p. 87.
- ²⁷ See: *The Foundations: An Epistemological Study of Linguistic Thought Among Arabs*, 2000, p. 185.
- ²⁸ *Research Methodologies in Language*, p. 21.
- ²⁹ *The Arabic Language: Its Meaning and Structure*, p. 243.
- ³⁰ Verse 1 of Surah Al-Nahl.
- ³¹ *The Arabic Language: Its Meaning and Structure*, p. 162.
- ³² *Research Methodologies in Language*, p. 270.