

Dahroj, Fawaz Ahmad (1998) *The effect of modern linguistics on Arabic literary criticism: the stylistic approach and its application to Arabic poetry*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/6494/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

The Effect of Modern
Linguistics on Arabic Literary
Criticism:

The Stylistic Approach
and its Application to
Arabic Poetry

By

Fawaz Ahmad Dahroj

Thesis Submitted for the Degree of
Ph.D in the Faculty of Arts
University of Glasgow 1998

DEDICATION

To my father who taught me that life is an attitude whatever the cost of it is.

To my mother who taught me by her silence the language of silence.

To my brothers and sisters.

To my nephews and nieces, two Aḥmads, Rāmī, Thanā', Şabā, Ranīm, 'Abd Al-Raḥmān, Anas, two Muḥammads and Zahra' whom I have not yet seen, I hope to meet them, at least once together with the rest of the members of my family, in the future.

Fawaz

Acknowledgements

I have to mention the efforts of my supervisor Professor J. N. Mattock who has read, discussed, checked and edited this dissertation.

Many thanks go to Miss Avril MacGgregor, Office For International Programmes for her unforgettable support in eight years suffering with my study in Glasgow University.

I have to thank Professor Whitehead, Clerk of Senate Glasgow University, and his assistant Clerk of Senate Mr. Reynolds for their help and sport .

Thank go to Professor Ward, Dean of the Faculty of Arts Glasgow University, for his help.

Abstract

The main objective of this study is to show how “the Stylistic Phenomenon” has entered Arabic literary critical life. It aims to examine “Practical Criticism” in Arabic, which adopts a “stylistic approach.” In order to achieve this, however, it is essential to have examined a complete picture of this approach in Arabic literary life in all its aspects, most of which are concerned with issues, of stylistic theory rather than practical stylistics. Efforts have been devoted to establishing it as a separate recognised approach: in the theory of translation, in matters of terminology, in traditional Arabic literary criticism, etc.

The “Stylistic Approach” in Arabic literary life, as examined here, also illustrates the whole situation of the real relationship of Arabic literary criticism with modern literary criticism in The West. There are various channels of connection with modern Western literary criticism, such as the translation of the most important works relating to this topic into Arabic, either as monographs or as articles in literary journals. There are also Arab writers who have been educated in The West and who are applying the stylistic approach to Arabic literature.

This study shows the connection of Arab scholarship with the modern linguistic revolution in the West, from which the stylistic approach is the fruit. It is clear that the most important figures in modern linguistics, particularly those whose works are influenced by modern Western linguistics or have been affected

by modern Western literary criticism, are well-known, and the Arab reader is familiar with Althusser, Bakhtin, Bally, Barthes, Brooks, Chatman, Chomsky, Cohen, Derrida, Foucault, Genette, Jakobson, Lévi-Strauss, Saussure and many others.

The contents of this study are as follows:

Part One

The stylistic Approach as a phenomenon in Arabic Literary Life

Chapter One : The Translation of Stylistic Material into Arabic

Chapter Two: Works by Arab Scholars explaining the Stylistic Approach

Chapter Three: The Search by Arab Scholars for the roots of Stylistics in Traditional Arabic Literary Criticism

Chapter Four: Recognised Arab Stylisticians and their Employment of the Stylistic Approach for Investigation of Arabic Literary Materials

Chapter Five: The Stylistic Approach in the Leading Arabic Literary Journals

Chapter Six: Other Aspects of the Stylistic Approach in Arabic
Literary criticism

Part Two

The Application of the Stylistic Approach to Arabic Poetry and other relevant Aspects

Chapter One: A Stylistic Approach to Arabic Poetry

-Conclusion

-Bibliography.

KEY TO TRANSLITERATION

The following system is employed for transliterating Arabic in this thesis.

A. Consonants.

Transliteration	Arabic letter
-----------------	---------------

Not shown initially; otherwise: '	ع
--------------------------------------	---

b	ب
---	---

t	ت
---	---

th	ث
----	---

j	ج
---	---

h	ح
---	---

kh	خ
----	---

d	د
---	---

dh	ذ
----	---

r	ر
---	---

z	ز
---	---

ṣ	ص
---	---

sh	ش
----	---

ṣ	ض
---	---

ḍ	ظ
---	---

ṭ	ط
---	---

ẓ	ظ
---	---

'	ع
---	---

gh	غ
----	---

f	ف
---	---

q	ق
---	---

k	ك
---	---

l	ل
---	---

m	م
---	---

n	ن
---	---

h	هـ
---	----

w	و
---	---

y	ي
---	---

B. Vowels

a
i
u

1. 1. 1.

ā

1. 1.

ī

1. 1.

u

1. 1.

aw

1. 1.

ay

1. 1.

CONTENTS:

.....	page
Dedication.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Abstract.....	4
System of Transliteration.....	7
Contents.....	9

Part One

The Stylistic Approach as a Phenomenon in Arabic Literary Life.

Introduction.....	13
Chapter One:.....	14
The Translation of Stylistic Material into Arabic	
Chapter Two.....	74
Works by Arab Scholars explaining the Stylistic Approach	
Chapter Three:	161
The Search by Arab Scholars for the Roots of Stylistics in Traditional Arabic Literary Criticism	
Chapter Four:.....	176
Recognised Arab Stylisticians and their Employment of	

the Stylistic Approach for Investigation of Arabic literary materials

Chapter Five:.....187

The Stylistic Approach in the Leading Arabic Literary Journals

Chapter Six:.....217

Other Aspects of the Stylistic Approach in Arabic Literary Criticism:

1- Terminology and Lexicography

2- The Making Known of the Leading Figures within the Stylistic Movement

3- Arab Scholarly Dialogue concerning the Intellectual Relevance of the Stylistic Approach

4- An Approach to a New Arabic Stylistics.

Part Two

The Application of Stylistic Approach to Arabic Poetry and other Relevant Aspects

.....page

Chapter One.....237

A Stylistic Approach to Arabic Poetry

.....page

1. Introduction.....
2. ‘Alī ‘Izzat.....
3. Muḥammad ‘Abd Al-Muṭṭalib.....
4. ‘Adnān Ibn Dhurayl.....
5. Shukrī Muḥammad Ayyād.....
6. Jūzīf Mīshāl Shrīm.....
7. Muḥammad Al-Hādī Al-Ṭarābulṣī.....
8. ‘Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī.....
9. Şalāh Faḍl.....
10. Sa‘d Maşlūḥ.....

-Conclusion.....294

-Bibliography.....307

Part One:

The Stylistic Approach as a Phenomenon in Arabic Literary Life.

1. Introduction:

Before examining the various critical works using the stylistic approach to Arabic poetry, we have to look at various other essential matters, such as the following: the material on stylistics which has been translated into Arabic; the considerable number of works by various Arab scholars which has been produced to explain this approach, which has been employed for the investigation of both Arabic prose and poetry; and the attempts by Arab scholars to find the roots of stylistics in traditional Arabic literary criticism. Attempts have been made to produce an equivalent Arabic terminology of stylistics in modern Arabic literary criticism; various Arab scholars have been labelled as specialists on stylistics in Arabic literary criticism; there has been a serious concern with the stylistic approach in mainstream Arabic literary critical journals; effort has been expended both to establish and to make known the leading figures and their works within the stylistic movement, and to introduce Arabic scholarly dialogue on the intellectual and social relevance of establishing a new Arabic stylistics for Arabic literary criticism.

Chapter One:

The Translation of Stylistic Material into Arabic

A survey of stylistics in Arabic demands a separate study, which is beyond the remit of this thesis.¹ Essentially this section aims to prove that there is a real connection between stylistics and modern Arabic literary criticism and to discuss the various works translated into Arabic, using them as examples to cover aspects of how the material on stylistics has been translated into Arabic by various scholars, whether this material is excerpted from longer works or is comprised in works treated in their entirety.

The oldest translation of stylistic material I have found is a speech by Buffon in the French Academy in 1753, translated by Aḥmad Aḥmad Badawī in *Min Al-Naqd wa Al-Adab* (Criticism and Literature) first part.² The speaker tries to define style and its components and illustrates his definition with various examples.

The next is a translation of *Theory of literature* by René Wellek and Austin Warren, under the title *Naẓariyyat Al-Adab*.³

Chapter Fourteen of this book is concerned with “style and stylistics”. This chapter explains the role of language in literature: “Language is quite literally the material of the literary artist. Every literary work, one could say, is merely a selection from a given language, just as a work of sculpture has been described as a block of marble with some pieces chipped off”.⁴ It goes on to explain that “in his book *English Poetry and the English Language*, F. W. Bateson has argued that literature is a part of the general history of language and is completely dependent on it”,⁵ and the chapter quotes from Bateson: “The real history of poetry is, I believe, the history of the changes in the kind of language in

which successive poems have been written. And it is these changes of language only that are due to the pressure of social and intellectual tendencies.”⁶ The chapter criticises these views: “Yet surely Bateson’s case is overstated, and the view that poetry passively reflects linguistic changes is impossible to accept”.⁷ The chapter continues to explain the importance of linguistic study to the study of literature: “The importance of linguistic study is not, of course, confined to the understanding of single words or phrases. Literature is related to all aspects of language,”⁸ and to explain how stylistics is related to the study of literature: “But linguistic study becomes literary only when it serves the study of literature, when it aims at investigating the aesthetic effects of language—in short when it becomes stylistics (at least in one sense of this term)”. We cannot study stylistics without studying language and “stylistics, of course, cannot be pursued successfully without a thorough grounding in general linguistics, since precisely one of its central concerns is the contrast of the language system of a literary work of art with the general usage of the time.”⁹

So in the field of stylistics, “there have been attempts, like that of Charles Bally, to make stylistics a mere subdivision of linguistics.”¹⁰ The chapter emphasises the aesthetic in studying linguistics: “Only if this aesthetic interest is central will stylistics be a part of literary scholarship; and it will be an important part because only stylistic methods can define the specific characteristics of a literary work.”¹¹

Next, the chapter sets out two stylistic methods of approaching the text: “There are two possible methods of approaching such a

stylistic analysis: the first is to proceed by a systematic analysis of its linguistic system and to interpret its features, in terms of the aesthetic purpose of the work, as 'total meaning'. Style then appears as the individual linguistic system of a work, or a group of works. A second, not contradictory, approach is to study the sum of individual traits by which this system differs from comparable systems. The method here is that of contrast: we observe the deviations and distortions from normal usage, and try to discover their aesthetic purpose."¹²

The chapter argues that "stylistic analysis seems most profitable to literary study when it can establish some unifying principle—some general aesthetic aim pervasive of a whole work."¹³

An article translated from French into Arabic is a study concerned with the first chapter from the famous work of Ṭāḥā Ḥusayn, *Al-Ayyām*, entitled *Ṭaḥlīl Naṣṣī li Al-Faṣl Al-Awwal min Kitāb Ṭāḥā Ḥusayn Al-Ayyām* (Textual Analysis of Chapter One of *Al-Ayyām* by Ṭāḥā Ḥusayn. It is by Odette Bitty, translated by Badr Al-Dīn 'Irudūkī.¹⁴ The article has three features. It is a practical study using the stylistic approach for an Arabic text, by an Orientalist, and representing a sample of translation which is not concerned with theoretical study. The aim of mentioning this study is not to summarise it but to give an overview of it and to describe the steps of the stylistic analysis:

1- A statistical inventory of the important words of the text in order to delimit the conceptual fields of the writing, and to define the semantic levels of the vocabulary used by the writer.

2- An analysis of the space (*Al-Faḍā'*) of the text with the aim

of showing the expressive unities of the text and the relationships which connect the unities within each other and their semantics, and the methods which the writer uses and the system with which they exist.

3- A study of the methods and system of the narrative of the writer, in order to identify the narrative elements in detail.

The aim of the above is to discover the particular features of the writer as a novelist, and to highlight the Arab characteristics of the language and the culture of the age of the writer. This article is only an experiment in applying various stylistic concepts to a literary text.

Al-Ṭayyib Al-Bakkūsh translated a book entitled in French *Clefs Pour La Linguistique*, by Georges Mounin, Paris 1971. The translator entitles his translation *Mafātīḥ Al-ʿAlsunīyyah* (The Keys of Linguistics), Tunis 1981. This book is concerned with various linguistic aspects.

However, Chapter Ten of this book is an introduction to stylistics. Therefore, the chapter examines various points of stylistics such as: traditional rhetoric, descriptive stylistics, style as deviation, style as formulation (*Ṣiyāghah*).

He concludes that there is not a single definition of style. This short chapter is followed by glossaries, some of which are related to stylistics.

Fuṣūḥ, the leading Arabic journal of literary criticism, has devoted two volumes to the methods of literary critical approaches. One of these approaches is 'stylistics', and among the articles about

this approach is a translation of a chapter from a book called *The Theory of Literature*, entitled *Al-Uslūbiyyah: 'Ilm Wa Tārīkh*, (Stylistics: Science and History) translated, by Sulaymān Al-'Aṭṭār, from a Portuguese original by Victor Manuel de Aguiar de Silva.¹⁵

The translator introduces the book by emphasising the unlimited importance of the literary text in the work of the critic. The author is concerned with the role of language in literary criticism, as the essential material from which the writer shapes his text. Throughout, he insists on the importance of both the historical and the psychological factors for understanding the literary text throughout its transference from the writer to the reader.

He first defines stylistics as a specific method of study of literary works which deals with their styles, that is, the special way in which the language is used and formulated. He then explains the role of language studies in establishing stylistic studies. Among the scholars whose efforts he examines are Karl Vossler, Leo Spitzer, Damaso Alonso (Spanish school), Charles Bruneau, John Firth and Pierre Guiraud (statistical school).

The translator of the article does not give the original sources of the writer, in English, French or other languages; he introduces the article with a short piece on its features and the author's criticism.

Another essential work in the field of stylistics is *Style and Stylistics*, by Graham Hough, London/New York 1969. The Arabic translation is entitled *Al-Uslūb wa Al-Uslūbiyyah*, by Kāzīm Sa'd Al-Dīn.¹⁶ He prefaces his translation with a very brief introduction to the author, Hough, and the topic.

This book comprises five parts with an introduction by the General Editor, William Righter, and a preface by Hough.

In Righter's introduction, he lays down the guide-lines for 'a new concept of literature': "The study of literature has normally centred on the consideration of work, author, or historical period. But increasingly there is a demand for a more analytic approach, for investigation and explanation of literary concepts, of crucial ideas and issues—topics which are of general importance to the critical consideration of particular works. This series undertakes to provide a clear description and critical evaluation of such important ideas as 'symbolism', 'realism', 'style' and other terms used in literary discussion.... it is often claimed that stylistic study using linguistic methods may provide a new intellectual discipline for literary criticism."¹⁷ Professor Hough "examines the claims of stylistics, in a variety of its forms, to determine both its benefits and its limitations. His is consciously a literary approach, continually asking, 'How does this method advance our understanding of a particular work, or in a wider context, of the phenomenon of literature itself.?' "¹⁸

Hough in his short preface describes the aim of this work thus: "The object of this essay is to give a short account of the modern study of literary style. It is necessarily selective and incomplete, but I have tried to indicate the main directions that such work has taken, and the directions it might take in the future."¹⁹ Hough then delimits the nature of the study: "Style-study has often grown from linguistics, sometimes from other starting-points. But whatever its origin, stylistics is inevitably a study of language."²⁰ He makes it clear that this work "is written from the

literary point of view.”²¹ The work contains the following five parts: the Concept of Style and the Origins of Style-Study; Linguistic Style-Study; Literary Stylistics: Methods and Problems; Some Practitioners; Conclusion.

Under the first heading, he examines three subjects; “older concepts of style”; “the modern concepts of style” and “the beginnings of modern style-study”.

On the first of these, Hough observes that “the concept of style is an old one; it goes back to the very beginnings of literary thought in Europe. It appears in connection with rhetoric rather than poetic, and there seems to be no special reason for this, except that style is regarded as part of the technique of persuasion and therefore is discussed largely under the head of oratory.”²² The principal concept of style in its pre-mature period he characterises thus: “Language is the dress of thought, and style (often, following Quintilian, referred to as ‘elocution’) is the particular cut and fashion of dress.”²³ However he observes that “the word ‘style’ makes very little appearance in the main stream of modern criticism.”²⁴ On the “modern concept of style” Hough states that “the concept of style cannot in practice be simply evaporated; for the kind of considerations that used to shelter under its name are still critically active;”²⁵ and he provides various examples proving that critics use the stylistic approach without adopting the name of style, such as in England, the ‘practical criticism’ of I.A. Richards (1929) and in America the New Criticism or ‘close reading’ of poetry. He states that the belief that “the idea that the nature of a whole work can be deduced from the qualities exhibited in a short passage is still

widely current; and this is a stylistic dogma. Indeed, all that body of modern criticism which prides itself on its close contact with the verbal texture of literature is a kind of style-study. But the modern critic does not talk about style any more than he talks about beauty.”²⁶ He then looks at several definitions of style such as one from Charles Bally: “The study of the ‘affective’ elements in language—these affective elements being conceived as optional additions to an already determinate meaning.”²⁷ Hough then suggests that “style is a part of meaning, but a part which can properly and reasonably be discussed on its own.”²⁸ Finally he concludes that “the word that is magical in a particular line of poetry may be quite inert in a different sentence; the construction that is merely a bungle in one context may serve a powerful expressive purpose in another. It is with these phenomena, whatever our philosophy of meaning, whatever our theory about the psychology of the creative process, that the study of style is concerned.”²⁹ The third and the final subject in part one is the beginnings of modern style-study. In this section, Hough focuses on two main impulses to modern style-study: “One comes from historical linguistics and one from literary criticism.”³⁰ Finally he concludes: “I think it is obvious that *most* of what the science of linguistics now does cannot be usefully related to literature at all; but there are bridges to be built, and it is in the area of stylistics that opportunities for doing this are greatest.”³¹

The second part deals with “linguistic style-study”. Hough discusses two matters: (1) linguistic style-study up to Saussure and (2) the theory of Bally and his successors. On the first he examines different attempts to examine linguistics but, for him,

the most important figure is F. de Saussure, particularly in two specific points of his work. The first, and main particular point is that “he makes an absolute disjunction between *diachronic* and *synchronic* linguistics. Diachronic linguistics is historical linguistics—in effect, the old comparative philology that we have briefly described. By synchronic linguistics is meant the study of the actual state of a language at a given time, conceived as a complete, interdependent system of communication, actualized in daily life and divorced entirely from its history and origins. It is the study of language as a present and living organism, as against the study of its fossil remains.”³² The second point is “the distinction between *la langue* and *la parole*. *La langue* for Saussure is a definite element abstracted from the heterogeneous facts of language in general. It is the public conventional aspect of language, the system established by a sort of social contract among the members of a community which alone makes it possible for them to understand each other. It is *la langue* that is described in dictionaries and grammars; and they are only possible because *la langue* exists, necessary and unalterable by individual volition. For *la langue* is always external to the individual; he inherits it, he is born into it as he is born into a society; it is not a function of his individual will. *La parole*, on the other hand, is individual utterance, an act of will and intelligence, serving individual ends. *La langue* is a code, and *la parole* is the way the code is used in an actual situation or the ways in which it is habitually used by an individual speaker. It is only in *la parole* that *la langue* is actualised; yet *la parole* would be impossible without the public, social system of *la langue*. The linguistics of *la parole* were not much discussed by Saussure and were

considerably more developed by his pupil, Bally.”³³

Another matter that Hough examines is “Bally and his successors.” He observes that “Bally is virtually the inventor of the term ‘stylistics’ but he does not mean by it the study of literary style.”³⁴ Hough gives the definition of stylistics as Bally sees it as: “the study of expressive effects and mechanisms in all language—*la langue de tout le monde*.”³⁵ He continues: “Bally’s stylistics studies all the ways in which this impersonal system is converted into the stuff of living human utterance.”³⁶ Some of Bally’s disciples, however, refuse to apply this to literature, as opposed to common utterance, such as Marcel Cressot: “For us the literary work is simply a communication....We would even say the work of literature is *par excellence* the domain of stylistics, precisely because there the choice is more ‘voluntary’ and more ‘conscious’.”³⁷ Hough ends his discussion by pointing out that “Bally talks of stylistics as a science; and literary style-study is never likely to be that. But the attempt to give it some sort of ‘scientific foundation’, some basis of ordered and demonstrable knowledge, might have made it a less chancy and arbitrary affair than it has been.”³⁸

The third part of the book is entitled “literary stylistics: methods and problems.” In this part Hough examines the following six topics: “Stylistics and Literary Art”; “Special Expressive Devices”; “Individual Style”; “Period Style”; “Historical Style” and “Statistical Methods”.

On the first topic, “Stylistics and Literary Art”, Hough first says that “Bally and his followers were concerned with establishing a

general system of stylistic possibilities that could be applied to all literary work as it could be applied to all types of utterance. A keystone of their system was the setting up of a norm against which stylistic deviations could be measured.”³⁹ He goes on to examine the conclusion of Karl Vossler, which is shared by others, that “style-analysis simply coincides with literary criticism in its ‘objective’ form. It is simply literary criticism with the elements of arbitrary personal preference purged away.”⁴⁰ He ends with another definition of stylistic criticism, from Hatzfeld, that “stylistic analysis is simply philology in the traditional German sense (i.e literary and linguistic study), with the aesthetic dimension added.”⁴¹

As an example of the second topic, “Special Expressive Devices”, he examines in detail what he calls “*style indirect libre*”, and “other stylistic devices that can be studied in similar ways are almost innumerable: word-order, repetition, rhythmical and musical patterns, metaphor, symbol and imagery, local colour, synaesthetic effects.”⁴²

The third topic in this section is “Individual Style.” Hough states first that “the most familiar kind of style-study is the study of individual style, of a single author.”⁴³ He continues that “in fact the study of individual style is universally practised on various levels of technical sophistication. A literary work is a verbal structure and even the critic who is primarily interested in the history of ideas or the social implications of literature can hardly proceed beyond generalities without paying some attention to the way in which words are used.”⁴⁴ He then distinguishes between the natures of “style-study” and “general literary criticism”

pointing out: "The characteristic feature of style-study is that it begins from the literary work itself, from words and the way they are combined in a particular body of writing. There is no limit beyond which the student of style is forbidden to go, but at least he starts from a positive and identifiable point."⁴⁵ In justification of his emphasis on stylistics, he says: "The claim of stylistics rests essentially on the proposition that the farthest ranges of a writer's art, the depths of his emotional experience, the heights of his spiritual insight, are expressed only through his words and can be apprehended only through an examination of his verbal art."⁴⁶

Hough then distinguishes between the nature of "literary studies" and "linguistic studies", in order to explain the nature of stylistic studies: "There is a genuine difficulty in making the transition to these larger considerations from the particular features of vocabulary and syntax with which the style-student generally starts, and.....short-cuts of various kinds are possible. The equipment of the linguist is frequently different from that of the literary student, the one being inclined to positive observation, the other to intuitive perception and speculation; and apart from temperamental differences of this kind there are real difficulties of method. We are most of us incurably inclined to think of ideas as the ultimate reality and words as their merely accidental clothing, and over large areas this view may have considerable justification. An expository writer working within a well-established convention may exhibit nothing particularly individual or characteristic in his way of handling words and may afford very little material for the student of style to work upon. And even when he is considering an imaginative writer the

literary student may often find that he has had very little training in observing the correlation between an intuitively observed literary quality and the specific verbal means by which it has been brought about. It is precisely this kind of training that stylistic study professes to give. But it must be confessed that it was some time before style-study arrived at this point.”⁴⁷

Hough characterises the nature of a pure linguistic approach thus: “At one extreme we have the pure linguistic approach. This tends to work by accumulation, by a complete inventory of the stylistic qualities of an author—vocabulary, sentence structure, syntactic peculiarities, imagery and so forth, listed according to some predetermined scheme. In much early work of this kind no literary conclusions were drawn. What we have is virtually an accumulation of evidence on which such conclusions might be based, but no more. A further effect of this procedure is that in a complete inventory much of what is recorded may virtually be waste matter. Many of the qualities described have nothing particularly characteristic about them and lead to no increase of literary understanding. Much of what presented is not the fruit of authentic observation but results rather from the mechanical application of a set scheme. It is the prevalence of such studies in which the aesthetic dimension has either been renounced or has never been arrived at that has given rise to a suspicion of stylistic work among many literary students.”⁴⁸

He then continues that “much will naturally depend on the nature of the author under consideration.”⁴⁹ He provides two examples. One is Trollope, who can be studied by verbal means and the second is Mallarmé, whose work can be examined by stylistic

investigation.

Literary criticism, according to Hough, deals with stylistic matters but “in an entirely unsystematic way.”⁵⁰ He asserts that “stylistic analysis must begin with an act of submission to the work as it is in itself.”⁵¹ However, he says that “effective style-study must lie somewhere between these two—between hard-line linguistics and subjective criticism. Stylistic description almost inevitably depends on comparison with some norm and this norm should be a relevant one,”⁵² and “style-study need not involve pedantry or a self-conscious excess of system.”⁵³

Hough says of the French stylisticians that “French critics in particular offer many brilliant examples of style-study conducted with that immense sense of responsibility towards language in which French critics are on the whole so much superior to the English, and conducted also with the elegance and lucidity of ordinary literary discourse, entirely without pedantry or technicality. What all genuine literary style studies ought to have in common is that they are not mere catalogues of linguistic features, but are directed to the understanding of a work of art.”⁵⁴

Hough raises the question of how the selection of stylistic features for examination is made. The solution, as he sees it, is “...putting the individual style-study in its historical setting,”⁵⁵ and he concludes that “to discover what stylistic features will be revealing is largely a matter of experience and intuitive talent.”⁵⁶

Hough raises another question: “What the object of an individual style-study ought be.” In his answer to this question he indicates two specific points: “Perhaps the most frequent and obvious aim

of individual style-study has been psychological”⁵⁷ and: “These are easily seen as the expressions of a particular type of character...the literary style-analyst is studying works of art, not varieties of human character...but the real object of the student’s search is organising aesthetic principles.”⁵⁸ “Style-study begins as it were, at the other end of the scale, with the precise verbal manifestations; and this is not only a manner of method; it enshrines a kind of faith—a faith that it is only by the close and intimate examination of verbal texture that the true being of a work of literary art can ever be reached. Movements in this direction can be seen everywhere in modern critical writing”⁵⁹, and “a more exact attention to the verbal medium than informal and intuitive criticism can generally attain. It is this that style-analysis aims to supply.”⁶⁰ “The study of an individual style conceived in this way may broaden out from pure linguistic description to include almost anything found in general criticism. But there are some exclusions.”⁶¹ Finally he argues that “stylistic analysis...aims at objectivity; some have even said its purpose is a scientific knowledge of literature.”⁶² He believes that it is; “possible to point out objectively the existence of certain linguistic features; it is possible to arrange these in order.”⁶³

“Period Style” is the next matter examined by Hough. In his discussion of this matter the main point raised is: “The most obvious development of the individual style-study is its extension to the style of a whole period.”⁶⁴ This matter presents the difficulty of how the selection is to be made of the huge amount of available materials but in general “the style of a period is constituted by its most original literary minds in their most

vigorous moments—the ‘Epistle to Arbuthnot’, the close of the *Dunciad*, rather than the undistinguished mass of couplet-writing at that time; Dickens rather than Wilkie Collins.”⁶⁵

Hough crystallises period style as: “vocabulary, image, sentence-structure, the proportion of nouns to adjectives, of nominal phrases to verbs—all these things go to make up the characteristic flavour of a period style; and they can all be investigated on a quantitative and statistical basis. If this is done the result may have some claim to be scientific, but it is unlikely to be of much literary significance.”⁶⁶ He questions how far we can do anything to make the result more precise and how far it is worth doing. In answering this question he states that “in period studies we can only arrive at that ill-defined and often self-contradictory abstraction, the mind of an age.”⁶⁷

Hough develops an idea related to the styles of different periods, namely that, in the English-speaking world, when, for example the Baroque style is examined the terminology usually is borrowed from the visual arts, using, it is clear, the method of Wölfflin in his *Principles of Art History* (1915). In this book Wölfflin “distinguishes between the linear and the painterly, between plane and recession, between closed and open form, and so forth; and on this basis attempts the distinction between the styles of different periods. I cannot think of any good reason why the same methods should not be applied to literature, yet in practice the results of any such attempt always seem to be both arid and uncertain. It may be that in art history the illustrations can be more immediately and rapidly apprehended; it may be that considering the isolation of particular qualities in this way forbids

all proper consideration of meaning, and that style-study that fails to go on to the consideration of meaning is doomed to sterility.”⁶⁸ He concludes that “it is difficult to arrive at a characterization of the style of a particular period.”⁶⁹

In Hough’s opinion, to write “A History of Style” is a difficult thing to do. He suggests that “the best that can be done is to take a series of cross-sections, or a series of typical examples, and place them side by side. This is not history but it is perhaps the nearest we can get to it. There have been some notable examples of this, the pre-eminent one being Auerbach’s *Mimesis*.”⁷⁰

The “Statistical Method in the Study of Stylistics” is “now becoming much more prominent with the use of computers.”⁷¹ “It is felt on the one hand that insensitive and inappropriate methods are introduced into literary scholarship by such means; on the other, that literary students are unwilling to submit their observations to positive verification.”⁷² But, “if it is asked whether statistical information is ever relevant to style-study the answer must be a qualified ‘yes’. Nearly all criticism, even that most stigmatized as impressionistic, employs it in a loose and informal way.”⁷³

Hough states that “there are people who talk as though any gain in numerical precision is valuable in itself. From the literary point of view this is nonsense.....nothing that the literary judgement can make use of is contributed by these figures.”⁷⁴

He feels bound to say something about the frequency of occurrence in the literary text and he mentions the remark of Stephen Ullmann: “but it is usually enough...to note the significant

recurrence of some linguistic feature without inquiring into precise numerical details. Insignificant figures, even though they may in themselves do no particular harm, tend to vitiate the quality of a whole argument by implying claims to precision, or to a kind of precision, that literary inquiry simply does not admit of.”⁷⁵

He describes various attempts at using the statistical method, and concludes that “the first question for literary students who feel tempted to embark on statistical methods is whether the numerical data that are looked for can contribute anything to the qualitative interpretation of style. If the answer is ‘yes’, three simple rules might be added: (i) make a clear identification of what it is that is being counted; (ii) get the help of someone who can count right, or use a machine; (iii) make sure that the argument is actually supported by the figures. The application of these principles would banish most (not all) statistical arguments from literary studies to some other field, where we need not follow them.”⁷⁶

Part Four is entitled “Some Practitioners” and deals with some “eminent modern exponents of style-study.”⁷⁷ The aim of this part is “to see how the general principles already discussed work out in practice....the choice of examples is necessarily selective...I hope to illustrate the principal trends which ought to be of interest to the English reader.”⁷⁸

Hough examines the scholars in two groups. The first consists of Continental European scholars including: Leo Spitzer, Erich Auerbach, Damaso Alonso. The Second consist of

a group whose works are written in English, including: I. A. Richards, William Empson, John Holloway, Stephen Ullmann and Donald Davie.

The first of the Continental European scholars is Leo Spitzer, Hough justifies his starting with him on the grounds that "he has a particularly well-developed method of style-study and has expounded it in considerable detail."⁷⁹

The most important book of Spitzer and the best introduction to his work is *Linguistics and Literary History*. Spitzer's work, according to Hough's summary, leads to "a growing conviction of the essential unity of literary and linguistic study; a belief that the study of language should lead to an understanding of the greatest achievements of language—works of literary art; and that works of literary art can only be understood by a minute study of the language in which they are realized."⁸⁰

Hough explains that "the essential of his (Spitzer's) method is what he calls the philological circle—a method for which he adduces an elaborate genealogy in German hermeneutics. The procedure is to argue from an observed detail to the central core of a work of art, and then to proceed outward from the centre in search of further confirmatory detail."⁸¹ He explains that "Spitzer gives a simple illustration in the work of an elementary student of Latin construing a Ciceronian period: he can only do it by moving from a detail (the form of a particular word) to an assumed whole (the structure of the whole sentence) and then back to further details in order to confirm and build up the picture of the whole."⁸² He further says: "It is not necessary that the starting-point should

be a linguistic observation: it may be an observation about imagery or plot. Spitzer says somewhere that it was his own philological training that led him to adhere to the linguistic approach. As a matter of fact, he does not always adhere to it; but it remains his favoured method and he does seem to feel that the linguistic detail is the irreducible demonstrable fact which affords the securest anchorage for later speculations....the primary task of the student is the *critique des beautés*, involving the prior acceptance of the work of art as a value in itself, to be apprehended in its totality: indeed any *explication de texte*, any philological study, must start with a *critique des beautés*, with the assumption on our part of the perfection of the work to be studied and with an entire willingness to sympathy;...it must be an apologia, a theodicy in a nutshell.”⁸³

Hough raises the question of what kind of understanding Spitzer’s work seeks to arrive at. His earlier writing was psychological, but “his object then became rather to explain the inner being of the work itself; but for him this always remained quite clearly what the author meant to put into it....but the whole tenor, expressed and unexpressed, of his work was to think of the author’s intention as something specific, definite and, in principle, discoverable. To discover it was indeed the business of stylistics.”⁸⁴

Hough says: “A more serious criticism to my mind is that the link between the linguistic starting-point and the literary insight is often a tenuous one....this points to one of the cardinal difficulties of stylistics. Stylistics claims—must claim—that the

understanding of a work of literary art is continuous with the understanding of its language, and that the close, even technical, study of language is the only sure way to literary understanding. Many critics, while paying lip-service to this view, actually tend to take short-cuts, and proceed to interpret works of literature in moral or ideological terms, without considering linguistic texture in any detail at all. And it sometimes seems that Spitzer's conclusions are those of the scholarly man of letters, that they depend more on wide literary experience, a large range of comparisons, deep knowledge of cultural history, rather than on any expertise that could be called philological in the narrower sense. It is a not uncommon dilemma; stylistics stays firmly within its own terms of reference, and is condemned to triviality: or it proceeds to ideas of great scope and generality by deserting strictly stylistic methods."⁸⁵

He goes on: "It is sometimes the case that the stylistic observations lead to a conclusion not very different from that reached impressionistically by common literary opinion."⁸⁶

In addition: "Sometimes the initial observation is not of a peculiarly linguistic kind....Spitzer's claim is that the slightest linguistic observation may serve as a point of entry. It does not matter what it is as long as the observation is genuine and original. No system or predetermined scheme can serve as a guide. It is here, I believe, that the freshness and liberating power of Spitzer's recommendation is to be found."⁸⁷

Hough allows that in Spitzer's method the student or the scholar is free to make his own way in dealing with the text and to follow

his own course, "but to the work of art as it presents itself, secure in the belief that the work is an organic whole and that the extended study of any part of it must lead to an understanding of the whole."⁸⁸

Hough concludes his study of Spitzer by quoting from Spitzer's own work: "Stylistics as I conceive it is an exclusively auxiliary science. Just as, according to Pascal, for him who knows truth no style, no *art de persuader*, is needed, so stylistics must abdicate once the true nature of the work of art has been perceived. A study of the kind we have attempted could have been made entirely unnecessary from the start by a simple recital of the poem."⁸⁹

The second practitioner among Continental European scholars is Erich Auerbach, and Hough says of him: "His formation and personal history were closely similar to Spitzer's",⁹⁰ but: "He was less exclusively devoted to *explication de texte*."⁹¹

His first work, "his magisterial essay 'Figura', begins as a semantic investigation into the significance of the word, and develops into a profound study of Christian typology, its motives and its procedures. But it is not tied to any particular literary text."⁹²

The second work of Auerbach is *Mimesis—The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. It is a result of his staying in Istanbul. With limited library facilities, he collected texts from different ages and authors. The work is described by Hough as "probably the most profound, most learned, and most wide-ranging work of style-study that has ever been written....Its scope is enormous, nothing less than the various ways in which men's

actual experience, historical, social, moral and religious, has been represented in literary form in all the various phases of Western culture.”⁹³

Auerbach himself says of his work: “The method of textual interpretation gives the interpreter a certain leeway. He can choose and emphasize as he pleases....the great majority of the texts were chosen at random,...studies of this kind do not deal with laws, but with trends and tendencies which cross and complement each other in the most varied ways.”⁹⁴ Hough comments: “The result is probably unique in its combination of the synchronic with the diachronic approach, in doing full justice to the individual being of individual works, yet at the same time giving a valid and substantiated picture of historical developments.”⁹⁵ He continues: “If as I have suggested, the methods of stylistics are sometimes open to question, we have at least in *Mimesis* a triumphant vindication of their proper use.”⁹⁶

Hough says of the book: “It would be impossible to summarize the content of this book, as it contains twenty separated essays, on topics ranging over a span of 3,000 years.”⁹⁷ and again: “One of the central points of the book is the strict separation of styles in classical literature: the high style for noble subjects, the low style for comic and vulgar material.”⁹⁸

Damaso Alonso is the third practitioner whom Hough discusses, although his work “has been confined to Spanish poetry.”⁹⁹ The important issue is that “for stylistic purposes, Alonso would substitute a distinction between outer form and inner form. Outer form is the relation of signifier to signified from the point of

view of the signifier. The inner form is the same relation seen from the point of view of the signified. The study of outer form is the easier, for it starts from concrete phonetic realities. The study of the inner form is more difficult, for, as Alonso sees it, it deals with the psychology of the moment of creation, the moment of internal formation of the signified, and its immediate embodiment in a signifier. The stylistics of the future, he says, if there is to be any, will tend to an equal emphasis on both perspectives, outer and inner. It is easy to see that this has something in common with Spitzer's method of working from an exterior linguistic detail to the internal form of a whole work."¹⁰⁰

Alonso suggests three modes of understanding of any literary work "marked by an increasing degree of precision."¹⁰¹ These degrees of understanding are as follows:

1- The degree of understanding of the common reader

"who seeks neither to analyse nor to exteriorize his impressions. It is a totalizing intuition, which forms itself in the process of reading and comes to reproduce the totalizing intuition which gave rise to the work—that is, the intuition of the author."¹⁰² For Alonso, "the object of literary study is to recover the author's original purpose, though he perhaps expresses himself less in terms of conscious purpose. This 'reader's understanding' is immediate and intuitive, and it is the purer the fewer extraneous elements have come between reader and author...it is simple relation between reader and work; its primary object is delight, and in delight it terminates. It is, of course, the indispensable foundation of all other kinds of literary understanding."¹⁰³

2- The Degree of understanding of the critic:

In this section Hough presents the concept of the critic, in Alonso's terms, as "a type of man in whom the qualities of the reader are exceptionally developed: his receptive capacity is both more intense and more extended than the ordinary. This exceptional creature is the critic.....reading should incite in him profound and luminous intuitions, comprehending the work in its totality."¹⁰⁴

3- The degree of understanding of a literary work which goes beyond that of the critic:

According to Hough's classification of this stage of Alonso's understanding of criticism: "If we begin to ask 'Why does this poem, or verse, move me? What is in it, whence does it originate, this emotion that passes through me, whence does it proceed?' we begin to pass to this third kind of understanding. Criticism answers these questions only in the vaguest and most general fashion because the problem does not really interest it: it is enough for the critic to make a rapid evaluative survey of his intuitions. His conclusions are intuitive and unscientific.

"But we can at least begin to go farther, to our third stage, and consider the possibility of a scientific understanding of artistic facts. This scientific approach is stylistics. Typological classification solves nothing: it is the individual work that must be examined; and the final act of apprehension must always be an intuition. But stylistics offers the possibility of a precise and demonstrable analysis."¹⁰⁵

Hough explains that the function of stylistics is "to investigate the

relation between the two wholes by investigating the relation between all the partial elements. The complete relation will be arrived at by integrating all these partial relations.

“These separate elements are very numerous—far too numerous for complete study. A selection must be made of those which are most relevant and most revealing. There is no cut and dried method available here; the selection can only be intuitive. This is evidently the same as Spitzer's principle of the personal intuitive observation as the point of entry into the work, and it shows the same objection to uniform and mechanical methods.”¹⁰⁶

Hough explains Alonso's method of analysis as follows: “We begin stylistic investigation with the outer form—the signifier—because this is the concrete fact presented to our sense- perception. We consider the inner form—the signified— as a complex of elements: conceptual, affective, synaesthetic and image-producing; and we assert that the same complexity must exist in the signifier. The passage from the outer to the inner form is difficult, but it is precisely the object of stylistics to make it.....Alonso sees the understanding to be attained partly in psychological terms. Indeed, he says that the literary investigator must double his role with that of the psychologist. He has to classify and study all the elements that have touched the spirit of the poet, all the elements which may have determined a certain reaction in him.”¹⁰⁷

“The aim of stylistics is to establish a rigorous and concrete link between signifier and signified, and so reach a full and accurate understanding of the total signs—that it is to say, the total literary existence of the work. Stylistics so considered is the

science of literature, and it is the only possible route to a true philosophy of literature. At present this science is limited and immature. All sorts of mixtures and combinations of criticism and stylistics are possible in practice and the one does not supersede the other. No one can be an investigator in stylistics who has not first been a passionate reader and secondly a devoted critic.”¹⁰⁸

Hough concludes that Alonso considers that “we must always remember the three stages—the reader’s knowledge, which leads to an intuitive pleasure; the critic’s knowledge, which has a pedagogical intention, and stylistics knowledge, which leads to the solution of a problem. And for the final stage, the first two are always necessary.” ¹⁰⁹

Before Hough begins to examine the second group of stylisticians, whose works are written in English, he identifies certain distinguishing features of which “the most important is a sense of ecumenical range in this Continental scholarship, even when it is dealing with a particular national literature....what is striking is the sense of a whole culture with a single indisputable authority, transcending temporary fashion and individual opinion.” ¹¹⁰

“In this matter of range and authority the advantage seems clearly to be with Europe... the anglo-American, on the other hand, employs a strictly stylistic, internal examination of the way that poetry works. The ideas of multiple meaning and accretion of meaning obviously give room for subjectivism, fantasy and eccentricity; but this may be a justifiable risk. Great liberty of interpretation may in the end do more justice to the depth and

multifariousness of complex works of art.”¹¹¹

Hough makes the final point that “the distinction between criticism and stylistics, made explicitly by Damaso Alonso and at least implied by Spitzer, is much less clear in English writing. The critics have made considerable use of stylistic analysis; and literary stylistics with a formal linguistic base is hardly found among writing in English.”¹¹²

The fourth practitioner is I. A. Richards, who wrote two important works, *Principles of Literary Criticism*, (1924) and *Practical Criticism* (1927), which Hough considers “has the distinction of setting stylistics on a new footing almost without reference to hereditary literary disciplines. Its results are not repugnant to the consensus of former literary judgement; they would be self-condemned if they were. But they have been arrived at by new methods and were announced in a new tone. Indeed, the tone of *Practical Criticism* often contrives to suggest that literary interpretation had never seriously been undertaken before, or that all previous attempts at it were quite negligible. This is not true; but it is true that Richards’s work is just about contemporary with new procedures in stylistics in Europe, and so it is part of a general phase of innovation.”¹¹³

The difference between the stylistic works of Bally and Saussure and Richards is that each is addressing a different audience. “Saussure, Bally and the Continental writers on stylistics generally were addressing their peers, scholars in language and literature. They did not feel it necessary to make concessions to ignorance or inexperience. Richards made his experiment in controlled

reading with a class largely composed of undergraduates, and seems to be addressing his book to a general audience. That is the endeavour to find out from the beginning what the process of reading and interpreting poetry is really like; what actually goes on the reader's mind; what are the obstacles to better understanding. This involves asking a number of awkward questions and exposing a number of unwelcome truths; and even if the later consequences have not been as uniformly salutary as might have been hoped, we have every reason to be grateful that the basic elementary difficulties of literary interpretation have been so fully exposed."¹¹⁴

Hough further says of Richards's work that "the procedure of *Practical Criticism* is by now familiar to everyone who is concerned with these matters. A number of short poems or extracts from longer poems were presented to the members of a large university class, without any indication of authorship or date, and they were asked to comment on them. The comments (which Richards, for some impenetrable reason, calls 'protocols') were collected, classified and analysed; and from this body of information an extended series of deductions was made about actual reading habits, about the methods and criteria that readers actually employed, and as a consequence about the state of literary education."¹¹⁵ He then comments on the procedure of *Practical Criticism* that "the conditions of the experiment were severely limited. Historical knowledge, the foundation of traditional opinion, the sense of an accepted literary tradition were as far as possible excluded by the dateless and anonymous character of the extracts presented."¹¹⁶ He adds that "what is of

interest for stylistics is the ensuing analysis of literary meaning. Like Bally in *Le Langage et l'vie* and Damaso Alonso in *Poesia Española*, Richards insists that meaning cannot be reduced to conceptual meaning; the affective and expressive sides of language are also a part of meaning, and a part that has been damagingly neglected. No apparatus for examining it has ever been provided, and this Richards aims to supply."¹¹⁷

He continues: "He divides meaning into four aspects, which he calls sense, feeling, tone and intention. *Sense* is conceptual meaning: Bally's logical or intellectual aspect of language. 'We use words to direct our hearers' attention upon some state of affairs, to present to them some items for consideration, to excite in them some thought about these items.' The three other kinds of meaning represent a classification of Bally's affective and expressive aspects of language; and they are a clear improvement on Bally's very general terminology. *Feeling* is the emotional attitude towards the subject presented by sense. *Tone* directs our attention differently; it is the attitude not towards the subject, but towards the person addressed, actually or in imagination. *Intention* is the purpose, conscious or unconscious, of the whole utterance, the effect that the writer intended to promote. Sense and feeling probably need little further comment. Of tone we may say that it is obviously powerful."¹¹⁸

Hough explains Richards's role in the stylistic approach: "Literary meaning is characteristically a fusion of these four functions. By abstraction they can be considered separately, and in the process of stylistic inquiry they must be so considered. But the total meaning is the integration into a unity of all four. By this piece of

analysis and synthesis, Richards has provided a simple and workable instrument of stylistic inquiry—so simple that it can be employed by students of literature at a very elementary stage, so fundamental that it cannot be neglected by even the most complex and sophisticated literary interpretation. It can be objected that the analysis does not go far enough. Richards shows a strong tendency to set conceptual meaning on one side and to bundle all other sorts of meaning together as emotive. This is more evident in the *Principles* than in *Practical Criticism*, but it is a pervasive element in his thinking, and, looked at more closely, the emotive label turns out not to be satisfactory. It often calls a halt to further inquiry just where inquiry is needed. But for all that, Richards's approach is clear, compact and usable. It is no doubt, a normalization of what the skilful interpreter has always done; but there is an immense gain in having it set forth in this lucid and serviceable form.”¹¹⁹

Hough concludes that “Richards had a lesson to teach and a great number of people have learnt it. That it has not proved a cure for all our cultural ills is another matter”¹²⁰ and “*Practical Criticism* is obviously a prolegomena to style-study rather than an example of it.”¹²¹

The second English practitioner is William Empson. “The work of William Empson both extends Richards's methodological inquiries and affords some massive examples of the method in action. Empson's first book, *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, was written directly under Richards's influence, and it is essentially the application of Richards's method to a particular literary problem. It is what we called.....the investigation of a special expressive

device, but it is a very extended one.”¹²²

Hough delimits the method of the book as follows: “For all the difference of the tone and the manner the method is essentially the same as that of Spitzer and Alonso—an intuitive grasp of the work, followed by an analytical attempt to show how the intuition was arrived at,...Empson remains more closely focused on the reader’s mind. But, like Alonso, he believed that the reaction in the reader’s mind, if it is correct and not merely capricious, reconstitutes the reaction in the mind of the author at the time of creation.”¹²³

Next Hough examines another book by Empson *The Structure of Complex Words*. “To describe complex metaphorical and figurative language in poetry as having ‘purely emotive value’ is to give an inadequate account both of what it achieves and how it works. He sets himself to answer the difficult yet elementary question of how the feelings get into words, if they do get in; or how the words indicate their presence, if the feelings merely accompany the words.”¹²⁴

The more important part of Empson’s book is the practical part, which Hough considers as “extensive essays in which the method is applied. Key words in certain works are examined and their various permutations and combinations are seen in the light of the whole work in question. Examples are: ‘wit’ in the *Essay on Criticism*, ‘honest’ in *Othello*, ‘sense’ and ‘sensibility’ in various contexts, ‘sense’ in *Measure for Measure*. These inquiries are stylistics in the strictest sense; they start from close verbal analysis and end in controlled literary interpretation.”¹²⁵

Hough concludes: "So I believe that Empson's work is immensely important and that it has not yet had its full effect.....yet it is too much like hard work to have a very wide appeal outside the academy. I suspect that literary studies must go on digesting it for some time yet."¹²⁶

The third English practitioner is John Holloway, and Hough says of him: "English style-studies do not show much continuity; they are rather a succession of fresh starts. An entirely new direction is found in John Holloway's book, *The Victorian Sage*. ...Yet it clearly is stylistics—a study of the detailed verbal organization by which larger literary effects are produced. Holloway approaches it from philosophy—Oxford philosophy of the 1940's. This is roughly the change from early to late Wittgenstein; and it is from this later viewpoint that Holloway's work starts."¹²⁷

Hough describes one part of *The Victorian Sage*: "These three essays (Arnold, Carlyle, Newman) do something new. They give an analysis of informal unprofessional philosophical writing from the point of view of a linguistic philosopher."¹²⁸ Of the rest of the book he says that "there is some examination of images and descriptive passages, but a good deal of these essays (Disraeli, Eliot, Hardy) is close and intelligent general criticism rather than stylistics."¹²⁹

Stephen Ullmann is the fourth scholar to be discussed and who published three works which are related to stylistic studies: *Style in the French Novel* (1957) *The Image in The Modern French Novel* (1960) and *Language meaning and Style* (1981). Ullmann is concerned about semantics, and current stylistic methods and

problems, and his work “starts from linguistic observations and tries to indicate how the gap between linguistic and literary study can be bridged.”¹³⁰ Hough continues: “He has a number of separate studies of particular stylistic questions. For instance, the essay on reported speech in Flaubert takes up the question of the *style indirect libre*, gives a report of preceding discussions of the matter and carries them a stage further.”¹³¹

Donald Davie is the last English scholar who wrote about stylistics; he published two works: *Purity of Diction in English Verse* (1952) and *Articulate Energy: an inquiry into the Syntax of English poetry* (1955). His works are described by Hough as “unique and isolated pieces of work.....The first deals with the diction and the second with the syntax of English poetry. These works are isolated because their starting-point is neither linguistics nor conventional stylistic criticism; they arise rather from Davie’s own concerns as a poet.”¹³²

Hough concludes that “these two books illustrate very clearly that whatever contribution linguistics can bring to literary studies there is no substitute for literary understanding and literary ability.”¹³³

The fifth chapter is a conclusion and deals with “Limits and Possibilities”; the important points may be summarised as follows:

1-“The contribution of linguistics to style-study is strictly limited. It is virtually confined to semantics and syntax.”¹³⁴

2-“It (stylistics) studies a particular works (chosen or certain works) in a particular language. A student of style in the modern

French novel is not at all helped by remembering the linguistic habits of the Hopi Indians. And even the French language is of interest to him within narrow limits. *La langue*, the public, shared system of the language, its phonemic, morphemic and syntactical structure, is for him a datum, not an object of investigation. Great harm is done to fruitful collaboration between linguistics and literary studies by linguists who wish to foist on literature a whole battery of apparatus and a whole array of accomplishments that are quite irrelevant to its purpose.”¹³⁵

3- “In fact, Continental stylistics arose out of an older school of historical linguistics. This was indeed the linguistics of a particular language, or group of languages; and so in an obvious sense it was closer to style-study.”¹³⁶

4- “Stylistics makes more modest claims: that it can be the systematic (I will not say scientific) study of literary expression; that within limits it can increase knowledge; that this knowledge can be consolidated, and within limits communicated to others. What are these limits? One is the limit of natural aptitude, the capacity for receiving intuitions from works of literature. About this there is nothing to say. The other is that stylistics, however extended, can never cover the whole field of literary study. Much that literary students are interested in consists of larger units than style-study can cope with: plot, character, and the *ordonnance* of ideas; and without becoming ‘the gay sporting ground of incompetence’, in Spitzer’s phrase, literary study can attack these large structures direct, short circuiting the approach through language and style. The methods are different, but failure of communication between them is not necessary.

Empson, who has approached Shakespeare through language, has said that the Shakespearean critic he most admires is Bradley."¹³⁷

5- "It is hard to see literary study as part of larger whole; and its links with other activities have probably been too many and too unregulated for its own good. The literary philosophy and literary sociology that we have mentioned are cases in point. One contact that is indispensable is that of literature with language, of criticism with linguistics; and it obviously needs more disinterested investigation than it has had. This is not or should not be, a take-over bid by either side; it is the exploration of a common frontier. Stylistics is the border area between these two studies, and as yet it is neither adequately mapped nor firmly settled. It would be a mistake to underrate the difficulties."¹³⁸

Hough concludes: "So I think it quite idle to suppose that literary criticism and linguistics can ever be a united field, though they can form brief alliances for special purposes. The special purposes are likely to be those of the student of literature. I have never, in such reading of linguistics as I have done, noticed any occasion when the linguist has wanted to avail himself of literary knowledge. There are many occasions when the literary student, especially the student of style, wants to make use of linguistic techniques and linguistic knowledge. But he will hardly be equipped with the full range of linguistic skills, and he will probably make brief raids on whatever parts of linguistics suit his purpose. There is no reason to suppose that style-study will be willing to follow wherever the technical exigencies of linguistics happen to lead. As time goes on, it is just as likely that literary thinking about style will be influenced by a general 'science of

signs', a semiology less eccentric and trivial than that of Barthes. It may be more affected by communication theory, some of whose concepts seem admirably adapted to literary use. Works of literature are expressed in language; they are systems of signs; they are communications. Ideas drawn from the sciences that preside over these several areas can all contribute to literary study. But literary works are also works of art of a unique kind, and their proper study has its own methods and its own ends. It even has its own public, different from that of the more specialized sciences. However esoteric literary studies may become, they must fail of their object unless their results ultimately filter through to the intelligent common reader, and unless they are expressible in something like the language of common life."¹³⁹

There are points that have to be mentioned about this translation, *Al-Uslūb wa Al-Uslūbiyyah*, as a translation of Hough's *Style and Stylistics*. It is acceptable, but there are a number of adverse criticisms to be made of it. It is a pity that, in translating a work that is important in the English-speaking world and vital reading for the Arabic-speaking reader who is interested in stylistics, there should not be some general introduction to the subject, a definition of the terms used, references to other works in Arabic, and at least minimal biographies of the stylistic figures discussed in this work. Without these, the book cannot be used in introductory work to the subject; Kāzīm Sa'd Al-Dīn's translation takes no account of his potential audience.

Another translation which deals with stylistic studies is that of one chapter from a book entitled *Mafāhīm Naqdiyyah* (Critical

Concepts), by Muḥammad ‘Aṣfūr, Kuwait 1987. The original is from René Wellek’s book, *Discrimination: Further Concepts of Criticism*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1970.

The chapter is entitled *Stylistics, Poetics, and Criticism*. Wellek states that stylistic studies are not “‘independent’ and can never be total in such matters: clearly, stylistics studies language and thus must inevitably draw on linguistics, and if we assume that it includes the study of the style of verbal works of art, it is necessarily in contact with poetics. The close relationship of stylistics to linguistics needs no discussion; obviously the student of stylistics cannot get along without a knowledge of grammar in all its branches, phonetics and phonemics, morphology, syntax, lexicology, of course, and hence the study of meaning, semantics.”¹⁴⁰

The author divides stylistic studies into “two fairly distinct disciplines: the study of style in all language pronouncements and the study of style in works of imaginative literature.”¹⁴¹

Of the first type, he considers Charles Bally and his followers to be representative. The aim of this type of stylistics is “an account of all devices serving a specific ‘expressive’ end, securing emphasis or explicitness. It will draw for evidence on all language acts, oral ones or those preserved in print. Bally himself quotes examples also from artistic styles and does not rigidly confine himself to collective usage. This type of study has been carried on since antiquity since Aristotle, the Greek rhetoricians, and Quintilian—largely in the context of one language and often

with prescriptive aims: to define and possibly to recommend or even to enforce “good style”: mainly a middle style of exposition aiming at precision and clarity, or an oratorical style bent on persuasion and emotional effect.”¹⁴²

Wellek examines another type of stylistic studies which he calls “Comparative Stylistics”: “In more recent times attempts have been made to compare the styles of different languages, to construe something like ‘comparative’ stylistics.....but I do not think we can really speak here of stylistics in any accepted sense when considering the problems raised by Whorf or, with a different philosophical background, by Ernst Cassirer’s *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*. These speculations lead rather to a study of our ways of constructing and classifying the world: to a theory of knowledge, to epistemology, to comparative philosophy or *Weltanschauung* which uses linguistic evidence.”¹⁴³

He identifies yet another type of stylistic studies: “Finally, there have been attempts to formulate ‘general’ stylistics: to study the devices presumed to permeate all language pronouncements in whatever language... Still, a general stylistics seems a legitimate task, however difficult it may be in practice.

“Stylistics in all these senses—as study of a single language or as comparative, or as general stylistics—is, it seems to me, a part of linguistics. I do not see why one should object to this inclusion if one conceives of linguistics generously and widely. Stylistics in these senses laid claims to independence mainly because some schools of linguistics voluntarily abandoned such problems. I remember Leonard Bloomfield bluntly telling me that he had no

interest in stylistics or the study of poetic language, and there were theorists who considered the study of style merely a remote possibility. But a vacuum has to be filled: whether we call the study of style in language a special branch of linguistics or an independent discipline, it will attract people who think about language and its uses.”¹⁴⁴

The second type of stylistic study is the study of style in works of imaginative literature, and the problem will be changed, according to Wellek, “as soon as we narrow our attention to a study of literary style, in the sense of style in imaginative literature, with an aesthetic function, particularly in poetry. We then raise the question of the nature of literature and the nature of aesthetic effect and response. And the study of style then has to come to grips with poetics and the theory of literature. However, some obvious divisions and choices may be mentioned. First, there is the analysis of a single work of art. It may proceed systematically, by elaborating something like a grammar of a work, an exhaustive description of its features working toward aesthetic ends or more usually, by observing and isolating individual traits which can be contrasted or compared with the traits of non-aesthetic language or may be traced back to the mind of the author to account for their occurrence in genetic terms.”¹⁴⁵

Then Wellek looks at various examples. He begins by arguing in respect of the relationship between stylistic studies and poetic studies: “The claim has insistently been made that such stylistics replaces or rather preempts poetics and literary theory, that stylistics is simply poetics, or even, if we consider stylistics a

branch of linguistics, that literary study is a part of linguistics. Still, I fail to see how linguistic procedures can cope with the many features of a literary work which are not dependent on particular verbal formulations. Let me grant immediately that all our thinking, certainly about literature, is done in language, and that a literary work of art is accessible only through its language. ...(but) a literary work of art is not merely a "Wortkunstwerk" or "sprachliches Kunstwerk" to use the title of Wolfgang Kayser's well-known handbook."¹⁴⁶

Wellek emphasises the importance of the poetic-study. "I have always advocated a sharp focus for literary study on the work itself and have made a possibly over sharp distinction between 'extrinsic' and 'intrinsic' approaches to literature. Still, there are many genuinely literary problems that go beyond the analysis of style as language. They make up a vast body of knowledge which can be called poetics or literary theory. Such an international supra-linguistic poetics or literary theory is, one should emphasize, an empirical science, concerned with a historical manifold which does not and cannot yield a system in the sense in which linguistic study leads to the construction of a system."¹⁴⁷

The author considers that "the term 'style' has been used in a sense which goes beyond the conception of style as language, particularly in the movement that is called *Stilforschung* and has profoundly influenced Italian and Spanish developments."¹⁴⁸

The relationship between poetics and style is one of the interests of the author in his search: "In all these discriminations I have assumed that stylistics and poetics are strictly descriptive

disciplines aiming at the observation, classification, and characterisation either of verbal style or of the verbal devices used in literature. This certainly is the ideal of our scientific age: objectivity, reticence as to value judgement, and abstention from criticism is the dominant mood. Sol Saporta has assured us that “terms like *value*, *aesthetic purpose*, etc “are not available to linguistics. The proliferation of quantitative methods in the study of style, whether statistical or based on computer research, is sufficient evidence. I for one am not disposed to dismiss these methods, though I doubt their adequacy for some problems or refuse to consider them the only panacea. Quantitative relations establish only dependent functions more or less necessary concomitants in the totality of a work of art, but cannot define its central meaning its historical, social, and generally human import.”¹⁴⁹

Wellek then turns to another matter: “Thus we must face the question whether style or any particular style or stylistic device can be considered a criterion of aesthetic value. It can hardly be so considered if we take style in isolation from the totality of a work of art. Descriptions of style have traditionally been governed by criteria of effectiveness of communication: clarity, vivacity, persuasiveness, and so forth—all ultimately rhetorical categories, which cannot by themselves establish the artistic merit of a specific text. In a specific context vagueness and obscurity, illogicality and even monotony may contribute to aesthetic value. Nor can the occurrence of a specific stylistic trait establish the artistic merit of a text.”¹⁵⁰

At the end of this chapter the author concludes: “No grounds of

total evaluation can, I conclude, be established by linguistic or stylistic analysis as such, though an intricate sound texture, a closely knit grammatical structure, or a dense web of effective metaphors may contribute to the total aesthetic value of a work of art.”¹⁵¹

He continues: “We have to become literary critics to see the function of style within a totality which inevitably will appeal to extra-linguistic and extra-stylistic values, to the harmony and coherence of a work of art, to its relation to reality, to its insight into meaning, and hence to its social and generally human import....style is a critical concept, a criterion of evaluation.”¹⁵²

The Arabic translation of this work is by an expert; however, he does not give explanations of any terms or biographies of any of the scholars in the field. He translates the footnotes, but he does not add any commentary of his own.

Another book translated from French into Arabic under the title *Al-Uslūb wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* by Mundhir ‘Ayyāshī, Beirut n.d., is *Le Style et la Stylistique*, by Pierre Guiraud.

The book consists of six chapters with an introduction and conclusion. The introduction is about “style and stylistics”: the author states that the definition of “style” which appears in modern dictionaries is inherited from ancient times. However, it indicates four definitions of style: Style is a method (way) of writing; style is the method (way) of writing of a certain writer; it is the method (way) of writing in a particular genre and finally, it the method (way) of writing of one particular age. ¹⁵³

The “method or way of writing” was the subject of rhetoric. It was used in three concepts: it was the art of literary expression and its foundation, a critical device or tool to be used in evaluating the individual style, and the style of famous writers. That was the case in the classical and medieval age. But at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the situation changed with the birth of new concepts of art and language. For this reason traditional rhetoric fails, because it becomes unable to renew itself to meet the new changes. It has still to find a new place for itself.¹⁵⁴

Guiraud considers that stylistics is a modern rhetoric with two aspects: it is the science of expression and it is a method of criticism of the of individual styles.¹⁵⁵ This new concept of a new science of style is slowly taking shape.

Guiraud identifies, referring to dictionaries, no less than twenty definitions of style, such as: the method of expressing thought and life; the particular method (way) of a writer; the particular method of an artist; a particular method of art; the particular method of a genre; the particular method of an age.

Style may be defined as a particular trace of a certain action. “General stylistics” may be defined as the study of the relationships between the form and the totality of informative mediums. The author indicates that he does not have a full theory of stylistics for all the arts. However, he has his own suggestions for definitions.¹⁵⁶

Guiraud’s own definition of “stylistics” in this book is “the study of linguistic expression.” The primary definition of ‘style’ is “the method of expression of thought through language”.¹⁵⁷

Chapter One deals with “Rhetoric”. It is a rapid examination of various aspects of rhetoric, as follows:

The word “style” is derived from the word *stilus*, which means a method of writing and the usage of a writer of certain devices for literary aims or purposes, and style is concerned only with literary language and its expressive data. The total methods of style are the subject of rhetoric, and it is a linguistic art.

Then he examines the art of writing. The concept of rhetoric covers all literature and it is based on three important concepts: genres: styles or tones; images or devices of expression. Rhetoric in the end becomes in Greek culture the art of persuasion, and it emphasises all elements of persuasion: the organisation of speech, the method of presentation of speech features in presenting it which support speech, actions such as gestures and facial expressions, and speed of speech delivery.¹⁵⁸

Next, Guiraud studies genres. There are many kinds of literary genres and there are many subdivisions. The most important fact is that each subject has its own form and has its particular rules, its structures and its style. The writer must accept these elements.¹⁵⁹

Following this, the author investigates styles. Style is delimited according to the expressive methods, and they determine the construction, vocabulary, grammar, images and other features in the genres. The ancients identify three types of style: simple, moderate, and high.¹⁶⁰

Then he studies images. By this, Guiraud appears to mean that

rhetorical utterances have more vivacity than ordinary utterance, and it is possible to convey an idea more powerfully, more sensitively, by creating an image or by making a comparison, thus drawing attention to its unique qualities. Guiraud's account is obscure. It seems that figurative devices are common in rhetoric, and he names many of them in this section, but the emphasis is on using the image in creating high style.¹⁶¹

Next, Guiraud's account of rhetoric. It is at the same time the art of writing and the art of composition; it is a linguistic and a literary art, and these two features exist in modern stylistics. Rhetoric is the stylistics of the ancients, and it is the science of style. Rhetoric dominated literature from the beginning until the nineteenth century.¹⁶²

Chapter Two deals with The Collapse of Rhetoric. In this chapter, the author studies seven topics.

The first topic is a new concept of language and style. Language becomes a device or tool to express the experience of the human being.¹⁶³

The second topic is the collapse of rhetoric. The concept of style changes and becomes the expression of "individual genius", and it is not related to the idealistic concepts which rhetoric provided as rules. There is a huge change in the method and the perspective of literary study.

Since rhetoric lost its two supports: the metaphysical and aesthetical bases, it has become nothing more than the art of writing, a group of practical descriptions for students to guide

them as to how to write. This is still the case, and day by day rhetoric has become less and less useful.

There are several reasons for what happened to rhetoric. These reasons are related to French literary and political life:

1- The development of literature caused rhetoric to lose all its value for the new audience created by (A) social revolution and (B) the break with classical education, particularly for a generation in (France) which was a supporter equally of republicanism and imperialism.

(2)- The spread of democratic culture and education.

(3)-The knowledge of foreign literature, which provided examples of famous literary works that have little to do with the classical rules of art. These works are not written according to or following the rules of rhetoric in writing.¹⁶⁴

The third topic is historical linguistics and the concept of style. Since rhetoric lost its role, there has been no alternative to replace it. Linguisticans refuse to rehabilitate the concept of style and they have left it to literature and literary genres. The reason for this is that linguisticians are not able to conceive of the nature of style. They believe that style is not suitable as a subject of rational study, entitled to enter the linguistic field.¹⁶⁵

The fourth topic is the idealistic school and the concept of style. The concept of style with this school abandoned its classical meaning; style here is not merely the art of the writer/poet, but it is the totality of the original elements which are considered a feature of the individual and reflects his originality; so the style is

the person. This is the German school, as Guiraud likes to name it. The most important figures of this school are Leo Spitzer and Vossler, and the crucial aspect of this school is bringing clearly to light two issues, "language" and "expression", using terms which are related to linguisticians's terms.¹⁶⁶

The fifth topic is De Saussure's school and concept of style. This school, in its distinction between "Parole" and "Langue", brought to discussion by linguisticians the matter of style. This school does not examine "individual style" because it is free action, isolated, unlimited, beyond observation and analysis and finally beyond classification. On the contrary, this school aims at examining the "collective style", the linguistic events which are related to social, cultural and national groups.¹⁶⁷

The sixth topic is the two kinds of stylistics. The first is "individual stylistics." It examines the relations of style with the individual and within the society within which it is established and used. It is related to literary criticism in that it provides reasons for the language used in the text. The second, is "expressive stylistics." This examines the interrelation of style and thought in general. It examines structures and their functions inside the linguistic system and can be described as descriptive stylistics. It is stylistics of effects. It is related to semantic science or the study of meaning.¹⁶⁸

Chapter Three examines "expressive stylistics." It is especially the study of the expressive and impressive values. It examines all methods or ways of expression in language. There is an idea, but there are different ways of expressing this idea. This concept

was introduced in an early article by Charles Bally, and he elaborates it in his subsequent works.

His earlier work is *Traité de stylistique française*, Heidelberg 1909, third edition, Paris 1915. In his definition of stylistics, Bally emphasises that it examines linguistic events in their emotional aspects. The emotional content is the subject of Bally's stylistics, and it is related to ancient rhetoric in all its forms. But Bally pays attention to language and its changes. He limits stylistics to the emotional aspects, which means that he dismisses educational and aesthetic values. He pays attention to language—vocabulary and grammar— but he does not pay attention to any particular use of language nor to what the individual is able to do in certain circumstances and with specific aims. Then expressive stylistics was expanded to include literary expression. After Bally, there are various works which follow and complete his work and these works basically concentrate on vocabulary. But examining this matter closely shows that sounds, morphological structures and grammatical structures are expressive devices which are as important as vocabulary.¹⁶⁹

Next, Guiraud studies the phonetics of expression. He refers to “Stylistic phonetics”, which was introduced by Trubetzkoy in his work *Grundzüge der Phonologie*. Cercle linguistique de Prague, 1939. “Stylistic phonetics” consists of two elements: the first is “impressionistic phonetics”, which studies the phonetic changes which aim to produce an effect on the hearer; the second is “expressive phonetic”, which studies the changes that result from the mood and spontaneous behaviour of the speaker.¹⁷¹

Following this, Guiraud studies grammatical features of expression. The study of tenses and patterns are an important part of stylistic studies, and for this reason a text is examined from a purely grammatical perspective, in order to delimit the stylistic values. The language when some of these patterns and tenses are suppressed, invents or creates stylistic variables which have an effective result up to the level that these stylistic variables can be assigned to certain genres. The structure of the sentence indicates an important aspect of the grammar of style. The author suggests that comparison between the sentences of two different writers can provide a study which can prove that if vocabulary is the body of the style, the structure of the sentence is the soul or the spirit of the style.¹⁷²

The author then examines the semantics of expression. Bally insists on the study of vocabulary, images and their meanings and what is behind their meanings.¹⁷³

Chapter Four is about "individual stylistics"; this kind of stylistics is that created by Bally. Guiraud then examines the efforts of Leo Spitzer, who offers an account of the link between stylistic features and aesthetic response. After this the author examines the leading figures of expressive stylistics, such as Vossler and Damaso Alonso. He concludes by looking briefly at "psycho stylistics".¹⁷⁴

Chapter Five deals with "functional stylistics." The author examines four topics; "communication"; "forms and function"; "metaphor and metonymy"; and finally "style and writing."

Guiraud states that "language is a system and that it consists of a

group of signs, the value of which comes from the changing relations between them, so that inside the structures the function delimits the form.”¹⁷⁵

The concept of ‘functional stylistics’ exists in Bally’s works in that his stylistics is based on the study of how linguistic expression events form its ‘emotional content’ as opposed to its ‘rational content’.

The author states that “rhetoric is the study of language from the perspective of its function. Its formulations are designed to produce in the reader feelings such as pleasure or displeasure, approval or disapproval.”¹⁷⁶

The function of language is communication, that is, the transference of an idea from speaker to hearer. Guiraud refers to the communication theory as developed by Roman Jakobson is in original form communication theory according to Guiraud. Elements of this theory are that “in any situational context (1) an addresser (2) sends a message (3) to an addressee (4), which requires a code (5) (the language or system of meaning). Contact (6) is maintained between them by voice and gestures, for instance, or by psychological or social factors. Language oriented to any one of these constituents has a different function: to addresser the emotive; to addressee the cognitive; to context (which includes also the non-linguistic world generally) the referential; to contact the phatic, to code the metalingual; and to message (the surface structure, in effect) the poetic”.¹⁷⁷ The analysis of Jakobson underlies the views of Bally, which are based on the emotional function.

Guiraud aims to show how a new stylistics has started to take form as a new discipline, and, in order to prove this, he examines: the connectors (*Al-Rawābit Al-Waḥdiyyah* as devices, for instance conjunctions, pronouns and adverbs. He also examines free indirect direct style, direct style and indirect style, and poetic image.¹⁷⁸

He then studies “metaphor and metonymy” and examines both as literary devices used by the poet or the novelist.¹⁷⁹

Next, Guiraud investigates “style and writing”, according to Barthes’s concept of style, which defines it as different from writing. However, Barthes makes a distinction between three forms of writing: “writing as sign”, “writing as value” and “writing which expresses a certain social class or writing which is related to a certain political group or to a certain author with a certain ideology”.¹⁸⁰

The author concludes that “the word ‘style’ has three meanings: (1) some scholars believe that it expresses the art of the writer/poet/novelist who uses the language for literary purposes; (2) other scholars see it as part of the nature of a man, like his voice; (3) and finally some consider that embraces both senses and often mixes them up.”¹⁸¹

Chapter Six deals with “structural stylistics.” Guiraud examines mainly the views of Jakobson, Riffaterre and Bally. He concludes by examining stylistics and statistics, which is a controversial matter; some scholars consider that stylistics is an individual matter and cannot be dealt with by mathematical treatment. On the other hand, other scholars consider that statistics can be used

in all branches of humanistic studies. It seems that Guiraud supports the use of statistics in some cases, as in that of functional stylistics, which borrows its examples from the theory of communication; functional stylistics uses such concepts as information, repetition and noise, all of which concepts can derive from statistics the content which they do not otherwise have.¹⁸²

The conclusion of this book deals with the tasks of stylistics. Its first task is the definition of style, elements of which are: aspects of utterance, choice of devices of expression and delimitation by the nature of the speaker/writer and his aims.¹⁸³

This book is short but important. However, the translator does not give the title in the original French, or introduce or discuss the author.

An introductory work on linguistics, *Madkhal ilā Al-ʿAlsiyyah maʿ Tamārīn Taʿbīqiyyah* (An Introduction to Linguistics with Practical Exercises) by Paul Faber and Christian Baillon, has been translated by Ṭalāl Wahbah, Beirut/Casablanca 1992.

Generally speaking, this work is a useful introduction to linguistics, covering most important aspects. Our concern is only with the part which is related to stylistics.¹⁸⁴ This is the last part of the book, part seven, which consists of four short chapters.

Chapter Thirty-Two examines Style from the two Angles of Writing and Speaking. The most important point is the author's examination of writing (*écriture*) according to the views of Roland Barthes, who classifies it according to class or ideology. Another important point is their discussion of the classification of style by

Henri Morier, which recognises seventy types of style. They reject this classification, on the grounds that it is both huge and trivial. They conclude with a quotation from Guiraud: "if style is linked to a person's nature, personality, social position and personal vision, as is generally accepted, it is clear that the science of style must be based on logical studies of those relationships."¹⁸⁵

Chapter Thirty-Three is devoted to a study of "Style as Deviation (*écart*)", and the authors conclude that "deviation is a stylistic characteristic but it does not constitute in itself a whole style."¹⁸⁶ "Style is a complex phenomenon, and it is difficult to define it in a general way with a simple, complete model. We need many tools to be able to delimit it sufficiently, because a literary work is a personal human witness and an expression of personality (*shāhid Insānī wa Shakh Ṣī*), and this consists of a precise complex net of different elements."¹⁸⁷ They quote Dupriez, *L'Etude des Styles*, to the effect that "progressing from a literary text to the particularities of any given author and to the interpretation and description of these particularities is the most important aspect of stylistics. It is the concepts, not the methods, of other sciences that stylistics can assimilate".¹⁸⁸

Chapter Thirty-Four is entitled "the Science of Style". The authors state that, "in spite of the expansion of rhetoric, style is still remote from it, even though style understands the lessons of rhetoric".¹⁸⁹ They then examine descriptive stylistics, of which Charles Bally is the founder; this is mainly concerned with "the expressional events of language from the perspective of its emotional content."¹⁹⁰ The authors end with an examination of the genetics of style. Linguistic science is represented by two scholars, Cressot and

Morris, and this type of stylistic studies is concerned with studying the existing relationships between the expression and the individual who creates it.

Chapter Thirty-Five deals with "Stylistics and Linguistics." The authors state first that "if style, in its practical applications, does not benefit from the observations of linguistics, it will tend towards impressionistic literary criticism. In this examination of style and linguistics, we cannot avoid acknowledging that the language of a literary text is a language of communication, and is thus a subject of linguistic studies. In spite of the fact that linguistics gives the scholar of style the tools for the work, in most cases he is aware that if he abstains from participation in literary history, refusing to pay attention to true context, and is satisfied with the investigation of signs (behind which are meanings) in forms (*Ashkāl*), forms of expression or forms of content, he will miss the central aspect of the literary phenomenon. That means that not only linguists have the right to speak about style, and that among linguists who speak about style some have the right to speak about it with tools unrelated to linguistics.¹⁹¹ He ends by mentioning various problems of the science of style, the principle one of which is the role of the science of style and the method of those who use it.¹⁹²

This introductory work is a good choice for translation into Arabic, having many valuable points; it covers the most important branches of linguistics; it uses original sources; it provides exercises, references and indexes of terms.

Finally, most works devoted by Arab scholars to the introduction

and explanation of the stylistic approach rely upon translated materials, because the topic is a new one for them, and they have to refer to non-Arabic resources.

Notes

1 There are two surveys of stylistic studies in Arabic, by 'Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī, published in Tunis; the first is *Marāji' Al-Naqd Al-Hadīth*, 1989, and the second is *Al-Uslūbiyyah wa Al-Uslūb* 3rd edition, (1989).

2 Cairo, n.d pp.181—191.

3 The first edition, Beirut 1972, by Muhyī Al-Dīn Ṣubḥī, revision, by Ḥusām Al-Khaṭīb, the second edition, Beirut 1981.

4 René Wellek and Austin Warren, *Theory of literature*, London 1973 p.174.

5 Ibid., p. 174.

9 Ibid., p. 174.

7 Ibid., p. 175.

8 Ibid., p. 176.

9 Ibid., pp. 176-177.

10 Ibid., p. 178.

11 Ibid., p. 180.

12 Ibid., p. 180.

13 Ibid., p. 182.

14 *Al-Ma'rifah*, no 182, 1977, pp. 18-58.

15 *Fuṣūḥ*, vol, 1, no 2, 1981, pp. 132-144.

16 Baghdad, 1985.

17 Graham Hough, *Style and Stylistics*, London/New York, 1969. p.v.

18 Ibid., pp. v-vi.

19 Ibid., p. x.

20 Ibid., p. x.

21 Ibid., p. x.

22 Ibid., p. 1.

23 Ibid., p. 3.

24 Ibid., p. 5.

25 Ibid., p. 5.

26 Ibid., pp. 5-6.

27 Ibid., p. 6.

28 Ibid., p. 8.

29 Ibid., p. 12.

30 Ibid., p. 12.

31 Ibid., p. 19.

32 Ibid., p. 24.

33 Ibid., pp. 24-25.

34 Ibid., p. 25.

35 Ibid., p. 26.

36 Ibid., p. 27.

37 Ibid., p. 29.

38 Ibid., pp. 29-30.

39 Ibid., p. 31.

40 Ibid., p. 33.

41 Ibid., p. 33.

42 Ibid., p. 38.

43 Ibid., p. 38.

44 Ibid., pp. 38-39.

45 Ibid., p. 39.

- 46 Ibid., p. 39.
- 47 Ibid., pp. 39-40.
- 48 Ibid., pp. 40-41.
- 49 Ibid., p. 41.
- 50 Ibid., p. 41.
- 51 Ibid., p. 42.
- 52 Ibid., p. 43.
- 53 Ibid., p. 43.
- 54 Ibid., p. 43.
- 55 Ibid., p. 44.
- 56 Ibid., p. 44.
- 57 Ibid., pp. 44-45.
- 58 Ibid., p. 45.
- 59 Ibid., pp. 45-46.
- 60 Ibid., p. 46.
- 61 Ibid., p. 46.
- 62 Ibid., p. 46.
- 63 Ibid., p. 47.
- 64 Ibid., pp. 48-49.
- 65 Ibid., p. 49.
- 66 Ibid., p. 49.
- 67 Ibid., p. 50.
- 68 Ibid., p. 50.
- 69 Ibid., p. 52.
- 70 Ibid., pp. 52-53.
- 71 Ibid., p. 53.
- 72 Ibid., pp. 53-54.
- 73 Ibid., p. 54.
- 74 Ibid., p. 55.
- 75 Ibid., p. 55.
- 76 Ibid., p. 58.
- 77 Ibid., p. 59.
- 78 Ibid., p. 59.
- 79 Ibid., p. 59.
- 80 Ibid., p. 60.
- 81 Ibid., p. 61.
- 82 Ibid., p. 62.
- 83 Ibid., pp. 62-63.
- 84 Ibid., p. 64.
- 85 Ibid., pp. 65-66.
- 86 Ibid., p. 66.
- 87 Ibid., p. 67.
- 88 Ibid., p. 67.
- 89 Ibid., p. 68.
- 90 Ibid., p. 68.
- 91 Ibid., p. 69.
- 92 Ibid., p. 69.
- 93 Ibid., p. 69.
- 94 Ibid., pp. 69-70.
- 95 Ibid., p. 70.
- 96 Ibid., p. 71.
- 97 Ibid., p. 71.
- 98 Ibid., p. 72.
- 97 Ibid., p. 71.
- 98 Ibid., p. 72.
- 99 Ibid., p. 73.
- 100 Ibid., p. 75.

- 101 Ibid., p. 75.
- 102 Ibid., p. 75.
- 103 Ibid., pp. 75-76.
- 104 Ibid., p. 76.
- 105 Ibid., p. 78.
- 106 Ibid., p. 79.
- 107 Ibid., p. 79.
- 108 Ibid., pp. 79-80.
- 109 Ibid., p. 80.
- 110 Ibid., p. 80.
- 111 Ibid., pp. 81-82.
- 112 Ibid., p. 82.
- 113 Ibid., pp. 82-83.
- 114 Ibid., p. 83.
- 115 Ibid., p. 84.
- 116 Ibid., p. 84.
- 117 Ibid., p. 85.
- 118 Ibid., p. 85.
- 119 Ibid., pp. 86-87.
- 120 Ibid., p. 90.
- 121 Ibid., p. 90.
- 122 Ibid., pp. 90-91.
- 123 Ibid., p. 92.
- 124 Ibid., p. 93.
- 125 Ibid., p. 94.
- 126 Ibid., p. 95.
- 127 Ibid., pp. 95-96.
- 128 Ibid., p. 98.
- 129 Ibid., p. 98.
- 130 Ibid., p. 99.
- 131 Ibid., p. 99.
- 132 Ibid., pp. 99-100.
- 133 Ibid., p. 101.
- 134 Ibid., p. 103.
- 135 Ibid., pp. 103-104.
- 136 Ibid., p. 104.
- 137 Ibid., p. 105.
- 138 Ibid., p. 108.
- 139 Ibid., pp. 109-110.
- 140 *Discrimination: Further Concepts of Criticism*, New Haven and London, (Yale University Press), 1970, p. 327.
- 141 Ibid., see p. 327.
- 142 Ibid., pp. 327-328.
- 143 Ibid., p. 328.
- 144 Ibid., pp. 328-329.
- 145 Ibid., pp. 329-330.
- 146 Ibid., pp. 332-334.
- 147 Ibid., p. 335.
- 148 Ibid., pp. 335-336.
- 149 Ibid., p. 337.
- 150 Ibid., p. 340.
- 151 Ibid., pp. 341-342.
- 152 Ibid., pp. 342-343.
- 153 Mundhir 'Ayyāshī, *Al-Uslāb wa Al-Uslābiyyah*, Beirut n.d., see p. 5.
- 154 Ibid., see p. 5.
- 155 Ibid., see P. 5.
- 156 Ibid., see p. 6.

- 157 Ibid., p. 6.
- 158 Ibid., see pp. 9-10.
- 159 Ibid., see pp. 10-13.
- 160 Ibid., see pp. 13-14.
- 161 Ibid., see pp. 15-16.
- 162 Ibid., see pp. 17-19.
- 163 Ibid., see pp. 20-22.
- 164 Ibid., see pp. 22-24.
- 165 Ibid., see pp. 24-26.
- 166 Ibid., see pp. 26-27.
- 167 Ibid., see pp. 27-28.
- 168 Ibid., see pp. 28-30.
- 169 Ibid., see pp. 32-39.
- 170 Ibid., see pp. 39- 40.
- 171 Ibid., see pp. 40-41.
- 172 Ibid., see pp. 41- 42.
- 173 Ibid., see pp. 24-44.
- 174 Ibid., see pp. 47-61.
- 175 Ibid., p. 62.
- 176 Ibid., p. 62.
- 177 Katie Wales, *A Dictionary of Stylistics*, London, 1989 pp. 429-429.
- 178 Mundhir 'Ayyāshī, *Al-Uslūb wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* , Beirut n.d., see pp. 65-68.
- 179 Ibid., see pp. 68-70.
- 180 Ibid., see pp. 70-72.
- 181 Ibid., p. 73.
- 182 Ibid., see pp. 74-87.
- 183 Ibid., see pp. 88-95.
- 184 Paul Faber and Christian Baillon, *Madhka alā Al-suniyyah ma' Tamārīn Tathbiqiyyah*, has been translated by Ṭalāl Wahbah, Beirut/Casablanca 1992 see pp. 215-234.
- 185 Ibid., p. 221.
- 186 Ibid., p. 224.
- 187 Ibid., p. 225.
- 188 Ibid., p. 226.
- 189 Ibid., p. 228.
- 190 Ibid., p. 229.
- 191 Ibid., pp 232-234.
- 192 Ibid., see pp. 234-236.

Chapter Two:

Works by Arab Scholars explaining the Stylistic Approach.

The aim of this section is not to summarise the materials which Arab scholars are producing in order to introduce and explain the stylistic approach to the Arab reader; its aim is rather to demonstrate that the introduction by Arab critics and scholars of a foreign stylistics represents one aspect of the influence of modern and contemporary Western literary theory on contemporary Arabic literary criticism. It will also demonstrate that Arab scholars are producing a considerable amount of theoretical material on stylistics, which brings the Arab reader up to date on the development of this topic in the West.

‘Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī is a Tunisian academic critic. His works, in general, are concerned with modern literary criticism and, in particular, with stylistic studies. In fact, he gained his literary reputation in the Arab world by introducing stylistics as a new subject, relying mainly on French sources, into Arabic literary criticism through his book entitled *Al-Uṣlūbiyyah wa-Al-Uṣlūb -- Naḥwa Badīl Alsunī fī Naqd Al-Adab* (Stylistics and Style -- Towards a Linguistic Alternative for the Criticism of Literature) Tunis/Tripoli, first edition 1977, second edition 1982 third edition 1989.

In his introduction, he states that “this book is the fruit of both research and teaching at the University of Tunis.”¹ Questions of style and stylistics involve precise methods, new statements and the interaction of its fields in their concepts and terms. For these reasons, this book is structured in two parts; the first is “the essence of intellectual labour through which I aimed to participate in the battle of the revolution in critical linguistics, whose results we find affecting all other disciplines of human knowledge, day

after day".² The second consists of appendixes concerned with different aspects of stylistic studies, such as a list of terms, Arabic-French glossaries, short biographies of scholars mentioned in the book and a list of stylistic and structuralist studies in Arabic.

The first topic, in Part One, is the Problem and the Foundation of Structure. In this section the author examines various historical aspects of the development of stylistic studies, in order to introduce the topic to the Arab reader. He states that "the stylistic trend that exists nowadays in literary criticism has been advancing since the beginning of this century, with fluctuations at one time towards traditional instructional canons and at others towards the nebulosity of artistic taste and linguistic feeling."³

In his outline of the historical development of stylistics, he points out that Charles Bally is considered to have founded the discipline in 1902. His students, such as Jules Marouzeau and Marcel Cressot, went to extremes in using the rational method, to which the German scholar Léo Spitzer reacted by establishing what may be called 'impressionistic stylistics'. With Roman Jakobson in the 1960s, stylistics was propagated in both theory and practice, and a bridge was built connecting linguistics and literature. In 1965 Tzvetan Todorov published his translation of the Russian Formalists into French; this demonstrated the richness of stylistic studies and gave credence to the future of their objective results. In 1969 Stephen Ullmann considered the advantages or benefits of stylistic studies to both literary criticism and linguistics. The question of poetics and semiotics also arises here. The modern tendency has been towards semiotics, and this is associated with Greimas of the French school.⁴

The second topic is the Discipline and its Subject. In this section, he discusses various aspects of the nature of stylistics, from the definition of style and stylistics to the possibility of stylistics being the alternative to rhetoric.

His first definition of stylistics is: "The search for objective fundamentals for establishing the discipline of style".⁵

His second definition is: "The linguistic dimension of the phenomenon of style, since the essence of the literary work cannot be attained except through the forms in which it is conveyed."⁶ This definition "is concerned with the investigation of the quality of the relationship which connects the event of expression and the meaning of the content of its formulation."⁷ This definition has a basically structuralist tone. Thus it restricts stylistic thought itself to the text by isolating it from all historical and psychological elements.

His third definition associates the linguistic criterion with the artistic literary dimension: "It is delimited by the study of the linguistic features by which discourse changes from its informative context to its aesthetic and affective function."⁸

His fourth definition is that of Roman Jakobson: "It is an investigation into what distinguishes artistic discourse, first, from the other levels of discourse and, second, from all other genres of the human arts."⁹

Stylisticians, led by followers of Bally, had isolated stylistics from purely informative discourse, and had limited stylistics to artistic discourse. From this starting point, Al-Masaddi states that

current linguistics confirms that stylistics is, in fact, the inheritor of rhetoric. That is to say, stylistics is an alternative to literary criticism in the age of alternatives.

His fifth definition is taken from Bally: "Linguistic discourse has an absolute existence at all times, wherever there is utterance." ¹⁰

His sixth definition comes from Guiraud: "It is the art of writing, the art of composition, the art of utterance and the art of literature".¹¹

His seventh definition comes from Michael Arrive: it is "a description of a literary text according to methods derived from linguistics."¹²

His eighth definition comes from Michael Riffaterre: "Stylistics is a linguistic method."¹³ He concludes with his own definition: "It is a linguistic science concerned with the study of behaviour within the structural rules of the system of the apparatus of the language."¹⁴

The third topic is the Definition of the Addresser. In this topic, he discusses a number of definitions of style according to the addresser. His first definition is "it is the foundation of the discovery of the type of thought of the practitioner. With this perspective, the essence of the style is identical with the quality of the linguistic message which is conveyed, in form and content."¹⁵ This definition is related to Buffon's theory that "concepts alone give substance to the essence of the style: thus style is only the arrangement and movement with which we endow our thoughts."¹⁶ This investigation of the similarity between the

concept of style and the thought of its practitioner leads some theorists to consider that "each style is a form peculiar to its practitioner, which illustrates his thought, his method of looking at things and his interpretation of them, and the nature of his feelings"[Quoted by Al-Masaddi from Aḥmad Al-Shāyib].¹⁷ This means that style is the person's philosophy of existence, and, because of this, style is completely subsumed in the personality.

His second definition is quoted from Buffon and indicates that style is identical with its practitioner; in Buffon's own words, style is "the person himself, so that it is impossible to extract it or change it or detach it."¹⁸ This definition of style has affected many scholars in their concept of style.

His third definition is from Spitzer: "Style is simply the methodical practical application of the instruments of language."¹⁹

The fourth topic is the Definition of the Addressee. In this matter, he discusses a number of definitions of style according to the addressee.

His first definition is that of Pierre Guiraud: "it is a collection of colours with which discourse is painted, in order to convince the reader by its excellence, to give him pleasure, to attract his attention and to arouse his imagination." ²⁰

His second definition is from Deloffre: "style rules expression, since it dominates us." ²¹ The same definition is followed by both Colin and Aḥmad Al-Shāyib.

His third definition is from Riffaterre, who delimits style to the effect of utterance on the receiver. "It emphasises some of the

elements of the chain of utterance and causes the reader to pay attention to them, so that if he ignores them he distorts the text, and if he analyses them he finds in them particular distinctive significations; this permits us to state that utterance expresses and style emphasises."²²

The sixth topic is the Definition of Discourse. In this section, Al-Masaddi examines the essence of style by means of the essence of discourse itself. The first of the definitions that he discusses is as follows: "if a text is a child of its producer, style is the child of the text itself."²³

His second definition is from Bally; "Style is usage: it is as though language were a group of isolated charges and style were the putting of these in interaction with one another, as in a chemist's laboratory."²⁴

His third definition is from Warren and Wellek: "Style may be defined from the angle of the relationship of words with things... or by the connections of words with one another, or again by the relationship of the sum of the words with the whole of the linguistic apparatus to which it is subordinate."²⁵

His fourth definition is from Hill: "It is the message which is carried by the existing relationships between the linguistic elements, not on the level of the sentence but on that of a broader framework such as text or utterance."²⁶

His fifth definition is taken from some unnamed stylisticians: "It is the sum of the suggestive capacities in literary discourse."²⁷

The seventh topic is the Relationship between Stylistics and

Literary Criticism. Stylistics inevitably has a relationship with literary criticism, both because it is a science of style and because it is a concept associated with the data of the literary phenomenon. Al-Masaddī states: "Stylistics is a scientific method of dealing with literary style."²⁸ This is based on statements about stylistics by various stylisticians, such as Spitzer and Guiraud. He then discusses whether stylistics is an alternative to literary criticism and whether it can be considered a literary school with its own critical theory. This discussion is based on the assumptions that stylistics is a scientific method of dealing with style and that each critical theory of literature must submit to the arbitration of criteria of style.

Al-Masaddī comes to the conclusion that stylistics cannot achieve a comprehensive critical theory which covers all dimensions of literary phenomena, because it is not able to evaluate the message of a literary work.

One point to be mentioned about this work is that, although Al-Masaddī claims that the second edition (1982) is revised, the body of the text remains identical to that of the first. The revisions occur only in the glossary of terms, in order to accommodate them to agreed Arab standards; he also adds a bibliography of stylistic and structuralist studies.²⁹

The principal merits of this work are [1] the comparatively clear language in which it is written, [2] the accuracy and style of the translation from French and [3] the copious sources to which it refers.

Its weaknesses are that [1] it does not cover all aspects of stylistic

studies, such as feminist stylistics, [2] there is no Arabic-French list of terms and [3] the text in the new edition has not been brought up to date with current stylistic studies.

Sa'd Maṣlūḥ is a prominent Egyptian academic critic, who introduces a new discipline of stylistic studies, statistical stylistics, in his book *Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah Luḡhawīyyah Iḥṣā'iyyah* (Style -- A Statistical Linguistic Study), Kuwait, 1980.³⁰

This book consists of eight chapters with introduction and conclusion. The topics of these chapters are the following: the Need for a Method, the Essence of Style, Statistics and the Study of Style, Fundamental Issues in Studying the Language of Literature, Busemann's Coefficient for Diagnosis of Styles, Practical Examples of Prose Styles, Style in the Play, Style in the Novel.

In the introduction, the critic proclaims that "it has long been his concern to search for objective criteria for the study of literature."

31

He was made optimistic by the arrival of the study of "the language of literature, in general, and the language of poetry, in particular, as an academic discipline in the Arab universities." ³²

He observes that "these studies are mostly lacking in scientific method and disciplined tools, particularly as regards statistics. Researchers are producing enormous quantities of statistical data, as the results of their research, but these are useless because there is no proper analysis."³³

His aims in this work are to introduce statistical stylistics to researchers in the Arab world, so that they may gain experience of

it and use it. This work has two parts, theoretical and practical.

The first chapter deals with the Need for a Method. He discusses a number of matters that lead to the reader's being introduced to the method of statistical stylistics.

The distinction of the differences between styles is based on long accumulated experience, intuition and taste that the expert reader possesses.³⁴ There is a difference, in judging and evaluating, between two types of reader: "the reader with literary taste who reads for pleasure but who is also able to pass judgement on and evaluate the text, and the reader who is a literary scholar, who plays a dual role, with the subjectivity of the ordinary reader and the objectivity of the scholar."³⁵

His belief is that "literature is an art but that the study of literature must be a scientific discipline. The idea that criticism cannot be one of the experimental sciences like chemistry or one of the mathematical sciences like arithmetic can be rejected on the grounds that many of the humanities, like linguistics, require precision and discipline in their various specialities and schools. There is no reason why the study and criticism of literature should be any less scientific than the study of language."³⁶

The formalist school of criticism, as a scientific school, is based on the philosophy of logical positivism. This school concentrates on deep examination of the text rather than on history, sociology, psychoanalysis or the biography of the writer/poet. The importance of the formalist school is that "it emphasises the study of the language of the text and draws the attention of linguisticians to the study of style, thus creating a bridge between the science of

language and the study of literature.”³⁷

Maṣlūḥ proclaims, in this book, “the necessity of establishing, on a scientific basis, a linguistic method of criticising Arabic literature, in which the text and the discourse are to be considered the first subjects of study.

”Modern linguistic studies were established under the influence of a fundamental concept, i. e ‘structuralism’. These modern studies have concentrated their attention, both theoretical and practical, on studying the literary work considered as a distinctive pattern of linguistic use. They have moved from studying ‘sentence grammar’, the grammar which considers the sentence to be the largest unit in linguistic analysis, to attempting to establish a new type of analysis, a ‘text grammar’ which considers the subject of study to be the whole text.”³⁸ He observes that the study of Arabic literature has not yet benefited from the achievements of modern linguistic studies.

Maṣlūḥ asserts that “a literary work is a linguistic message, the penetration of whose secrets and the opening of whose closed doors can be effected only by the analysis of its language.”³⁹

He points out that “the first fruits of this approach to describing a literary text are the checking of the flood of terms which are used without a determined meaning.”⁴⁰ This flood occurred at the beginning of the modern period in the Arab world, and it is perpetuated by most Arab scholars who have a connection with modern literary studies in the west; they are still concentrating on the content of the text rather than the linguistic structure of the text.

He asserts that stylistics is an indispensable basis for analysing a literary work objectively. The reason for this is that stylistics aspires, from a linguistic point of view, to perform the two tasks of describing and analysing the text.

He devotes his work to “one type of objective criteria, quantitative measurement or statistical analysis.”⁴¹ He explains ‘Statistical Stylistics’ as “a discipline of linguistic stylistics. ‘Linguistic characteristics’ become ‘Stylistic Markers’ when these characteristics have a high percentage of repetition and also when they are connected with certain contexts in a particular sense; these stylistic markers appear in texts in varying proportion of ratio, density and distribution.”⁴²

“The literary texts of a certain author or a certain literary genre are characterised by certain ‘linguistic features’, for example:

- 1 -- The use of certain lexical units (lexemes);
- 2 -- The comparatively greater or lesser use of certain forms or of a certain type of word (adjective, verb, adverb, prepositions and so on);
- 3 -- The length or shortness of words used;
- 4 -- The length of sentence;
- 5 -- The type of sentence (nominal, verbal, simple, complex, informative and so on);
- 6 -- The preference for certain constructions, figures and metaphors.”⁴³

The above justifies the importance of the qualitative criterion as a regulated objective standard which is able to diagnose the dominant tendencies in a certain text or in a certain writer/poet's work.

Arabic literary studies have for a long time failed to benefit from statistics and the use of its technical devices for describing texts. However, other humanistic studies, even psychology, use similar devices, beginning with the choice of the samples that they study, and they check their results by measuring validity, reliability and correlation.

Chapter Two deals with the Essence of Style. In this chapter, Maṣlūḥ studies various definitions of style.

The first definition is: "A choice or selection by the speaker/writer/poet of linguistic features in order to express a certain attitude. These linguistic selections of his/her preference rather than other possibilities constitute his/her style, which distinguishes him/her from other speakers/writers/poets. This choice has two different forms:

- 1 -- A choice controlled by the context or situation; this is a pragmatic selection,
- 2 -- A choice controlled purely by the requirements of expression, involving all the principles of language comprehensively -- phonetic, morphological, semantic and syntactical."⁴⁴

The second definition "is based on the reaction of the addressee to the message [text]. A prominent stylistician, Michel Riffaterre,

believes that style is a force that exerts pressure, dominating the sensibility of the reader by bringing out some elements of the range of utterance and making the reader pay attention to them, so that if he disregards them, the text becomes distorted; if he analyses them, he finds that they have a particular distinctive signification. We may thus state that utterance expresses and style highlights.”⁴⁵

The third definition is that style is “a departure or deviation from another type of utterance which is considered standard. The justification for the comparison of two texts is the similarity of the context between them. The tool of stylistic analysis here is the comparison of the linguistic characteristics and features of the standard text, in connection with the contexts, and the equivalent characteristics and features of the deviating text. The comparison of the two texts is based on the experience and knowledge of the scholar, which allows him to hypothesize the features of a standard text, even if this does not actually exist. The comparison is divided into two: ‘explicit comparison’, when the standard text exists, and ‘implicit comparison’, when the standard text does not exist. Whichever type of comparison is used, it constitutes the fundamental methodological means of distinguishing between styles.”⁴⁶

“The fourth definition considers style “as an “addition”. This view presupposes the existence of a neutral expression, which cannot be given any defined stylistic description, but can be called “styleless expression” or “prestylistic expression. Stylistic features are then an addition to this neutral expression so that they may direct it in a particular direction suitable to the expression of a

particular context.

“The role of the stylistician, with regard to this definition, is to strip off the “stylized expression” in order to reach “the original of the expression” or “the styleless expression”; he then makes a comparison between the “neutral expression” and “the stylized expression”.⁴⁷

The fifth definition “is “connotation.” ”This definition indicates that each linguistic feature itself contains a particular stylistic value and that it acquires its value from the environment of the text or its attitude; this value may change with changes in the environment in which it exists and the attitude which it expresses.”⁴⁸

This definition considers each linguistic feature as a potential stylistic feature. Stylistic analysis, with regard to this definition, consists in studying the relationships between linguistic units and their contexts and environments.

“The theoretical differences about the definition of style may be referred to three principles:

1 -- Scholars who concentrate on the relationship between the writer/poet and the text search for the keys of style in the character of the writer/poet and the reflection of that in his choices in the process of his exercise of his artistic invention; thus they believe that style is choice.

2 -- Scholars who pay attention to the relationship between the text and the addressee search for the keys of style in the reactions and responses of the reader/listener to the stylistic stimuli

concealed in the text; thus they believe that style is a pressurising force on the sensibility of the reader/listener.

3 -- Scholars who subscribe to objectivity in their search insist on isolating the two sides of the operation or process of communication, the addresser and the addressee; they believe that the keys of style are to be sought in the linguistic description of the text.”⁴⁹

“A “grammatical model” can be used as a base for distinguishing styles, if the following conditions are fulfilled:

1 -- That it should be able to describe variety in the use of language, and at the same time to allow a systematic description and classification of the context by which the use is determined.

2 -- That statements of the grammatical model should have the characteristic of consistency, so that it is possible, on the basis of these, to describe both the text and the norm, in a sufficiently analogous and harmonious manner as to permit a comparison between them.

3 -- That it should be adequate to provide a description of all the stylistic marks or markers which are relevant to the comparison of the texts.

4 -- That it should allow of a distinction between compulsory rules and optional rules in the language of the texts.”⁵⁰

Maşlūḥ ends his chapter by presenting as “the common denominator of all the above definitions of style the consideration

of style as a particular use of language, which is based on the use of a number of available possibilities and emphasis on these as opposed to other possibilities; the fundamental means for the distinction of styles is comparison, whether open or implicit ."⁵¹

Chapter Three deals with Statistics and the Study of Style. He states that "the statistical dimension in the study of style is the most important of the fundamental objective standards which can be used in diagnosing styles and distinguishing the differences between them.

"The importance of statistics relates to its ability to distinguish between linguistic features or characteristics which can be considered as stylistic features and features which appear randomly in the text."⁵² He bases this on Leech's concept of the importance of distinguishing between the "unique significant deviation" in the use of language which the text contains and the "unmotivated aberration".⁵³ The explanation of this is "that not every deviation can be considered as an important stylistic feature; deviation must be regulated in its relationship with the context."⁵⁴

Some fundamental components in the distinguishing of styles are: "the insistence of the writer/poet on certain forms/patterns of deviation and his preference for them rather than other alternatives, and the result of comparison between the studied text and the standard text, with regard to the kind and density of alternatives used. These components can be discovered by applying semantic quantitative standards."⁵⁵

The use of statistics in studying language has passed through two

stages:

1 -- "In this stage there was a dominant trend which aimed to measure common or general features in the use of language (the universals). Some linguisticians who worked with general linguistics applied their energies to developing studies in this trend.

2 -- In this stage the dominating trend aimed to identify the distinctive features between styles (the differentials). It is natural that stylisticians should devote most of their attention to this trend.

However, both trends complemented one another in the study of style. Stylisticians are enabled, by identifying the general features, to disregard them and to concentrate on distinctive differences."⁵⁶

These studies have combined in an attempt to develop a theory of the science of stylistical statistics, which briefly states that style is a probabilistic concept. This probabilistic concept has two features: first that the expected occurrence of any phenomenon can be computed by means of probability distribution; second that probability distribution describes the expected occurrence of phenomena in a complete set of events which is called a "population" in statistical science, that is the use of collections that are random or restricted by type, i. e. "samples." An example of the first is a count of the probability distribution of specific stylistic features in a novel or a play, and an example of the second is the use of random or restricted samples from such a work.⁵⁷

“One of the fruits of the relationship between the study of style and the study of the science of language is that the concept of style takes on a wider horizon than in the old view. Many who study stylistics believe that style consists of features that may colour any linguistic text. The linguistic features of any language may be divided as follows:

1 -- “Constants”. These are features that shape the fundamental system of the language, such as the construction of nominal and verbal sentences, the genitive construction and the adjective and substantive;

2 -- “Variables”. These are features with which the writer/poet can deal with more freedom; the most prominent of them is vocabulary. These features are the most important for the stylistician, in that they constitute the fundamental capital on which various styles draw for their formulation.

“In this respect, there are strong points of resemblance between styles and “dialects”, particularly “social dialect.” The most important features of style are types of linguistic usage consisting of a collection of linguistic features occurring repeatedly in connection with a certain context; these may be assembled from a long linguistic list of features available in a language. This operation occurs in two different ways: by excluding items from choice and by submitting to what is compulsory.”⁵⁸

In this respect, styles correspond with dialects; it may even be said that styles are a particular kind of social dialect. This stems from the concept that style may be more comprehensive than to be restricted to the study of the language of literature.⁵⁹

Maşlūh's interest is not so much in the differences between "individual styles" as in "collective styles": what distinguishes literary style from scientific style, formal style, style in worship etc. Sociolinguistics classifies these affiliations into two types: group affiliation and cross affiliation.

Statistics merely provides a norm or standard to use in measuring; it is not its task to determine which features should be counted.

"Stylistics studies use statistics in the following fields:

- 1 -- In choosing samples with precision, so that they are representative of the "Population" to be studied;
- 2 -- In measuring the average of the stylistic "Density" of a particular poet/writer or in a particular work;
- 3 -- In measuring the "Ratio" between the repetition of a certain stylistic feature and that of another feature;
- 4 -- In measuring the "Frequency Distribution" of a certain stylistic feature;
- 5 -- In measuring the "Central Tendencies". The most important standards in this are: the "arithmetic mean", the "median", the "mode" and the "geometrical mean." If texts correspond in the central tendency, it is possible to distinguish between them by using the standards of "dispersion", the most important kinds of which are: "range" and "mean deviation".⁶⁰

There are various uses of statistics in the treatment of matters concerning the study of style. It assists in the distinguishing between contemporary styles; this is called "Synchronic Study." It

has a similar use in distinguishing the historical development of style; this is called "Diachronic Study."

The distinction between these two types of study is reflected in two methods, namely "Static Stylistics" and "Dynamic Stylistics".⁶¹

"Another benefit of employing statistics in literary criticism is that it provides more scientific answers to a wide circle of questions to do with language and style which otherwise depends on subjective and impressionistic judgements. If a connection can be made between statistical indicators and subjective judgements, this is useful in various fields of stylistic studies, beyond the mere characterisation of individual style."⁶²

Another important field in which the quantitative standard has achieved good results is that which deals with the attribution of texts which are anonymous or of dubious authorship. There is an increasing need for the employment of the statistical method, when there is a lack of reliable historical or documentary textual evidence for the acceptance of one statement rather than another. In such cases, certain features of texts of known authorship are subjected to quantitative measurement, the results of which are compared with the results of the measurement of similar features of texts that are anonymous or of dubious authorship.⁶³

"The importance of quantitative measuring of style is not restricted to literary study. It also covers other fields of human sciences which are interested in the operation of linguistic communication. The first of these is "Psycholinguistics", in which these standards are used as important indicators for identifying abilities and for examining many aspects of the personality and

the psychological basis of verbal inventiveness. "Content Analysis" is also considered an important device used in Psycholinguistics. In addition, it has a particular position in the study of all the various kinds of media message, whether in radio, television or the press, and whether in the form of article, news report, or advertisement."⁶⁴

Chapter Four deals with Fundamental Issues in Studying the Language of Literature. "The first issue that arises in the study of style is that of distinguishing between "Scientific Style" and "Literary Style."⁶⁵ As a study of this Maṣlūḥ instances the work of Aḥmad Al-Shāyib, *Al-Uslūb* (Style), Cairo, fourth edition, n.d. He ends his discussion by concluding that "the question of objective distinction between pure scientific style and pure literary style and the establishment of standards for distinguishing the intermediate degrees between them still represent a challenge for scholars who study Arabic styles."⁶⁶

It is natural that there should be two perspectives on the treatment of "The Language of Literature": "Linguistic" and "Literary", and that we should expect from both linguisticians and critics continuous active work in attempting to characterise it. Formalist criticism is one of the most important critical movements to pay attention to the analysis of the language of the literary work. This is exemplified in *Principles of Literary Criticism*, by I. A. Richards, second edition, London 1926. Maṣlūḥ quotes from Chapter XXXIV, "The Two Uses of Language": "A statement may be used for the sake of the *reference*, true or false, which it causes. This is the *scientific* use of language. But it may also be used for the sake of the effects in emotion and attitude

produced by the reference it occasions. This is the *emotive* use of language. The distinction once clearly grasped is simple. We may either use words for the sake of the references they promote, or we may use them for the sake of the attitudes and emotions which ensue."⁶⁷ The growth of the critical debate about the "Language of Science" and the "Language of Literature" has intensified the linguisticians's interest in it and has motivated them to clarify their concepts and their methodology and to improve the tools of their study. As result of this there has been a tendency to change from the study of "Sentence Grammar" to the study of "Text (or Discourse) Grammar." In this way the issues of the "Language of Literature" have become the central interest of linguisticians, and studies in "Linguistic Stylistics" and the analysis of the language of texts have become active and numerous. Different approaches have proliferated in accordance with the proliferation of the theoretical and philosophical bases of the various linguistic schools. One of the most significant of these approaches is that of "Statistical Stylistics."⁶⁸

Chapter Five deals with Busemann's Coefficient. The subject of this chapter is "an attempt to present an objective alternative on the basis of which it is possible to distinguish between styles and to find a solution to each of the following issues: distinguishing between the language of science and the language of literature (literary style and scientific style); distinguishing the language of poetry from the language of prose; distinguishing the languages used in different literary genres."⁶⁹

The coefficient used for measuring these features and for producing a quantitative diagnosis of the language of literature is

known as "Busemann's Coefficient." "Busemann's hypothesis may be summarised thus: literary texts may be distinguished by determining the proportion of two aspects of expression. First, expression by action (active aspect), that is to say, words that express events or actions; second, expression by description (qualitative aspect), that is to say, words that express distinctive features of a thing, that is to say, they describe it, either quantitatively or qualitatively.

"The distinguishing of literary texts from other texts depends on the ratio between words that express events and words that express descriptions. This ratio is arrived at by counting the number of words that belong to the first type and the number of words that belong to the second type, then dividing the first group by the second. The value obtained is used as an indicator of the literariness of the style: when it is positive, the language approaches closer to literary style, and when it is negative, the language approaches closer to scientific style."⁷⁰

The ratio of verbs to adjectives is used in Busemann's hypothesis as an indicator for measuring the range of the emotionality or rationality of the language used in texts, and it is then used as a standard for the diagnosis of literary style.

There are two important factors which cause the increase or the decrease of the ratio of verbs to adjectives in utterance: first, the factors that are related to Form, and, second, the factors that are related to Content.

The most important of the "Factors of Form" is the "Mode of Presentation." There are four kinds of this: "Genuine Dialogue",

“Monologue”, “Purely Narrative and Descriptive Writing” and “Conversation Scattered in the Narrative Parts of the Texts.” The most important of the “Factors of Content ” are “Age” and “Sex”.

There are several things to be mentioned about the ratio of verbs to adjectives in texts. The level of the ratio is not fixed, but variable. This depends on various factors, which influence it in different directions: there may be factors both of form and of content in the same text and sometimes they may lead in opposite directions.

The remaining chapters relate to the practical criticism of prose texts, which is not of interest to this thesis.

In his conclusion, Maşlūḥ repeats that the work is based on one idea, that of using the ratio of adjectives to verbs in the texts as statistical indicator, in accordance with which a diagnosis may be made of styles and the progress of the relationship between the writer and the characters of his play or novel, and also of the dramatic dimension of character.

The various fields in which Busemannn’s coefficient may be of use are as follows: first, in Psycholinguistics, the degree of emotion, the degree of emotional balance, the degree of mobility and the precision and the degree of objectivity of expression can be measured. Second, in respect of the author, this standard may used to distinguish the character of the author when he/she speaks directly about himself/herself, to distinguish the sex of the author whether male or female, and as a variable related to the different stages of the age of the author, whether youth, maturity or old age. Third, in respect of literary works, this standard may

be used to distinguish scientific works from literary works, to distinguish poetic from prosaic, to distinguish spoken language from written language, to distinguish texts in standard Arabic from texts in dialect, to distinguish folk tales from stories and novels of known authorship, to distinguish plays as a literary genre on the basis of their relationship with spoken or written language, to distinguish different types of poetry genres, to distinguish styles and modes of presentation of the play and the novel, such as monologue, dialogue, narrative and description, long speeches, short speeches, characters in the play or the novel, the drama of the situation, and the connection of the change in the value of the ratio of verbs to adjectives with the dramatic development in the play or the novel.

The effect of these factors is interpreted on the basis of their classification according to whether they tend to raise or to lower the ratio of verbs to adjectives.

It may happen that a literary work contains factors that operate in one direction (whether upwards or downwards) and, at the same time, factors that operate in the contrary direction; the result of this is that both sets of factors operate in their own various directions.⁷¹

This work has considerable positive points; the author has a strong background in the topic and, in fact, has subsequently produced a second work on it. He is well-read in both Western and traditional Arabic sources. He writes lucidly and stylishly. He is a linguist and has also considerable literary experience.

There are several weak points in the work; there is no explanatory

list of the terms used. He does not follow a strict plan in covering the main points. The practical part of his work deals only with prose; there is no poetic example. His account of Busemann's coefficient is not entirely clear. Sometimes he appears to be unable to produce an Arabic equivalent for an English technical term; since this is an unfamiliar topic for the Arab reader, rather more explanation is required.

'Adnān Ibn Dhurayl, in his book *Al-Lughah wa-Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah* ('Language and Style -- A Study'), Damascus 1980 is concerned with various aspects of linguistics, such as language and thought, structuralism, traditional Arabic grammar, semantics, rhetoric and stylistics. The final chapter comprises a practical study, in which texts are examined from these various viewpoints.

In Part One, Chapter Three, the author examines several aspects of style-study, such as expression, grammar, rhetoric and stylistics, functions of language and forms or figures of style-study.⁷²

Expression, as the author defines it, "occurs when utterances achieve grammatical form and acquire meaning. Thus, the rules of expression are considered to be the rules of syntax and semantics. In former times, the Greeks and then the Arabs considered that the rules of expression were part of rhetoric."⁷³

The term 'expression' is used for 'linguistic appearance' or 'plane of speech', as opposed to 'content'. He mentions Hjelmslev's view that "each communication contains at the same time expression and content; that is, it can be treated from the angle of expression or from the angle of content. Expression can be considered as 'phonological substance', spoken or written, and it can also be

considered as form. The structure of expression exists on two separate levels. The first level is sound, which has no direct connection with the content; the sound unit (phoneme) is without direct connection with the content, and that means that it is in itself without meaning. The second is the constructional level, that is, the basic morphological and syntactical level which combines the structure of the expression with the structure of the content. The grammatical unit (morpheme) is the *trait d'union* linking the surface of expression with the surface of content.”⁷⁴

The second aspect Ibn Dhurayl examines is grammar. He states that the Ancients considered “grammar to be a collection of rules which were concerned with the structure of linguistically correct speech, from which derived the standard form. But with the rise of structuralism, particularly under the influence of the structuralists’ preference for description rather than prescription, the value of the standard form of construction of the expression dwindled, as did that of the principles and rules which controlled it. The science of grammar was a standard science concerned with the correctness of linguistic expression; thus it determined the patterns which regulated its basics. Nowadays, however, grammar is a descriptive science and its task is to describe the structure of the linguistic expression.”⁷⁵

In his account of structuralism, he explains the following oppositional terms of De Saussure:

- 1 -- DIACHRONIC: concerned with linguistic development over time; a historical approach to language.
- 2 -- SYNCHRONIC: concerned with a certain period of a

language's development, but not comparing it with any standard.

3 -- PAROLE: the verbal behaviour or utterances of individuals in speech, dialogue and writing.

4 -- LANGUAGE: the system that controls PAROLE; the structure that lies behind it, so as to permit communication.⁷⁶

The author then examines various issues of grammar and various types of it, such as: descriptive, explicative, generative, comparative and standard.

The term *generative grammar* was introduced by Chomsky in 1965; the two terms from this grammar that the author examines are COMPETENCE and PERFORMANCE, which are compared with the two terms of Saussure's dichotomy, PAROLE and LANGUAGE. COMPETENCE is the ability of any native-speaker to speak the language that he acquired in his childhood, and this COMPETENCE makes him able to produce all kinds of discourse. PERFORMANCE is what we do when we actually speak.

He then explains the SPEECH EVENT, which was developed by Jakobson in 1960, and which contains six keys of communication and related functions.

The third aspect Ibn Dhurayl examines is rhetoric and stylistics. "Rhetoric has played and is still playing a basic role in the sciences of literature and literary criticism, as teaching the best discourse and the most correct construction, through criteria which are based on good taste and sympathy for the heritage. But today the ambition of stylistics is to be a branch of the tree of linguistics, that is, modern linguistics, which draws our attention to the

essence of the rhetorical study, its criteria and its limits.

'Today stylistics wishes to delimit its study to the two integral and interdependent phenomena in literature, both prose and poetry, that is to say, stylistic phenomena and linguistic phenomena. It wishes particularly to study style through language, not through the standard, traditional or analogous, rules of rhetoric or anything else. The new question is: Can stylistics, as a new science of style, take the place of rhetoric? As far as Arab rhetoricians are concerned, they are interested only in linguistic and grammatical constructions. The author concentrates on his examination of rhetoric, rather to the detriment of stylistics."⁷⁷

In Western rhetoric, Aristotle assumes the major role. It is from his *Rhetoric* that most Western rhetorical terms derive. First of all, Ibn Dhurayl lists the principal general rhetorical terms: metaphor, allegory, metonymy, catachresis, antonomasia, synecdoche, litotes and euphemism.⁷⁸

He then examines the figures of thought, dividing them into three categories. The first comprises the figures of the imagination: comparison, hypothesis and prosopopoeia or personification. The second comprises the figures of affection or emotion: apostrophe, interrogation, exclamation, suspension, reticence, optation, deprecation, irony and hyperbole. The third comprises the figures of judgement: prolepsis, concession, pretermision, pleonasm, epitrope, repetition, gradation, allusion, antithesis and correction.⁷⁹

Ibn Dhurayl mentions briefly classifications of rhetorical figures by various scholars. Finally, in this chapter, he criticises the current

vocabulary used to discuss the artistry and particularity of the various literary genres, claiming that it is imprecise, inappropriate and unjustified. For this reason, he intends to examine expression from the point of view of stylistics and on actual stylistic levels.⁸⁰

He concludes that “stylistics is a modern linguistic science, which limits its fields of study to the text, its details, its constructions, its elements and its components. It will give us a true insight into the expressive capabilities of literature and its genres.”⁸¹

He claims that there is no “disagreement between stylistics and the study of rhetoric or literary criticism; in fact, stylistics benefits from both, and it also assists both as far as possible, both scientifically and artistically”.⁸²

In Part Two of the work, the author devotes two chapters out of three to stylistics. Chapter Two is entitled ‘Stylistics is the Science of Style’.

He states that “stylistics or the science of style is a modern linguistic science which examines linguistic devices that give ordinary discourse or literary discourse their expressive and poetic characteristics, and distinguishes them from others. It investigates stylistic phenomena by using a scientific linguistic methodology, and it considers style a phenomenon that is basically linguistic, which it studies in its texts and contexts.”⁸³

The author separates the study of style from the study of rhetoric, because he considers that the former nowadays has a new aim which distinguishes it from the latter, that of being scientific and

definitive, describing events and classifying them in an objective and methodical manner. Rhetoric, on the other hand, studied style in a purely evaluative and critical spirit, and taught the best means of speaking.

Ibn Dhurayl then examines the history of style and the development of stylistic studies. He discusses the role of Charles Bally in studying style by linguistic and scientific methods, in that Bally was attracted by structuralism in language and therefore worked to base the principles of style on this. Bally enthusiastically supported stylistics as a science and particularly wished to distinguish his stylistics from ancient critical stylistics. His two books, *Traité de stylistique française* (1902) and *Résumé de la stylistique*, (1905), based on affective and expressive linguistics, are considered the first brick in the edifice of scientific stylistics. Bally restricted stylistic studies to the affective aspect of language, and in consequence, to its expressiveness.

One of the followers of Bally, Marcel Cressot, changed the concept of expressiveness to that of 'the aesthetic event' and widened the scope of stylistic studies and associated them again with critical considerations.

After that, Pierre Guiraud, in his book *La Stylistique* (1954), endeavoured to demonstrate the functional coupling between the scope of stylistical work and the component of rhetorical thought. The object of the activity of each was, he considered, the same: the art of writing, the art of composition, the art of utterance and the art of literature.

In 1965, Tzvetan Todorov translated the works of the Russian

Formalists into French. This activated stylistic studies and helped to clarify their objectives in the spheres of linguistics and criticism, especially since Roman Jakobson, the pioneer of Russian Formalism, was continuing to enrich linguistics and stylistic studies, in the original Russian, with his brilliant opinions and his independent judgements. Jakobson was the originator of the theory of the functions of language, which employs linguistic, stylistic and semiotic studies.

The result of the function theory was that stylisticians became more confident in their field, scope and method. By 1969, Stephen Ullmann was congratulating the sciences of linguistics and stylistics on their stability, and stylistics on its independence as a linguistic and critical science. Ullmann also demonstrated the superiority of stylistics over both literary criticism and linguistics. Riffaterre published *On Structural Stylistics*, 1971, in which he demonstrated that style was the distinguishing mark of utterance within the limits of discourse and that the characteristic structure of the text is itself its style. Thus language expresses but style distinguishes. For this reason, Riffaterre studied it from the point of view of its effect on the receiver, i. e. the hearer or reader.

Ibn Dhurayl then discusses three trends in the examination of stylistics:

1-Expressive stylistics: Charles Bally emphasises the emotional content of the language; this, in his opinion, is the subject of stylistics. It is this that must be studied through linguistic expression, vocabulary and construction. This study should not

descend to consideration of the individual characteristics of the speaker and particularly not of the literary writer, because this belongs to literary research in style, not to stylistics as a methodical linguistic science.

2- Stylistics of the writer (Leo Spitzer). This is also called literary stylistics or critical stylistics; the reason for this is that it closely scrutinises literature and relies on criticism. Spitzer's basic idea is the examination of a literary work by use of intuition. The important principles of this approach are: the starting point of stylistic studies is the literary work itself, and not any anterior idea outside the work; the work is consequently considered an independent linguistic text; stylistic studies form a bridge between the science of linguistics and the history of literature, because the treatment of a text in itself brings to light the circumstances of its writer; a stylistic peculiarity is a personal deviation by which the writer departs from the ordinary road of linguistic usage; the language reflects the personality of the writer, but, like other tools of expression, it is subjected to this personality; the beginning of a literary work is the thought of the writer, without any corporeal consideration. The thought of the author is the element of the internal cohesion of the literary work; there is no way to achieve the truth of a literary work without sympathy with the writer. Stylistics, in using intuition and applying its analytical and constructive functions to its impressions, becomes an indispensable sympathetic criticism.

3- Structural stylistics, otherwise known as functional stylistics, emphasises that the real sources of style lie not only in language and its form but also in its functions. Style cannot be

defined outside linguistic discourse, as a message, that is, as a text that performs transmissive functions in communication with people and the conveyance of intentions to them; the message creates the style, and each text constitutes a unique structure.⁸⁴

Ibn Dhurayl concludes that "stylistics does not conflict with literary criticism or with rhetoric. In fact, the opposite is the case; both rhetoric and literary criticism can co-exist with stylistics, which is able to incorporate their analyses."⁸⁵

Chapter Three of this part is devoted to the study of style in different languages, but only non-Arabic languages; the study of style in Arabic is given a separate section. Ibn Dhurayl states that "style is the particular method of the writer in his writing, and the study of style is associated with rhetoric because rhetoric studies discourse and teaches how to produce the best of this.

"The Ancients, the Greeks and those who followed them in their rhetorical teaching, represent style as the fruit of the effort that the writer expends in his creative work. Therefore they studied it from different aspects, such as its relation with the writer, its relation with its subjects, its relation with the contents of the writing, its relation with its discourse, its relation with its literary genre, the formal frame-work of these contents.

"In the Twentieth Century, with the flourishing of stylistic studies, linguists and stylisticians began to study stylistic phenomena and their basic relationship with the author and the public."⁸⁶

The Greeks and then the West distinguished three types of style:

- 1 - the simple or easy style;
- 2 - the moderate or intermediate style;

3 - the high and eloquent style.

After this Ibn Dhurayl examines briefly various efforts by Arab scholars to examine stylistics. This will be considered in the section devoted to Arab scholars who have investigated the roots of stylistics in traditional Arabic literary criticism.

A few points may be mentioned about this work, particularly the three Chapters which are concerned with the stylistic approach.

It has a number of virtues such as making a serious attempt to introduce the topic to the Arab reader; since his references are mainly French, in that most of the original works on the topic are in this language, he provides each chapter with a list of French terms with Arabic equivalents.

On the other hand, it has several weak points, for example: the author's method seems more journalistic than academic, so that, in many places, he gives a too succinct account of the ideas that he is attempting to convey; the structure of the work does not help the reader to grasp the subject quickly or easily.

Madkhal ilā 'Ilm Al-Uslūb (Introduction to the Science of Style), by Shukrī Muḥammad 'Ayyād, Riyadh 1982, introduces stylistics to the Arab reader. This book contains two parts: the first is about the theory of style, and the second is devoted to a practical study of selected modern Arabic romantic poems. The author states in the introduction that "style itself is an ancient subject but....the science of style is a very recent subject."⁸⁷ He claims that the science of style has a distinguished history; that its roots can be traced back to the Arabic science of rhetoric, in

which Arab culture has a proud and rich tradition.

He mentions that he had taught Arabic rhetoric at the University for roughly a quarter of a century before he suggested to the Department of Arabic at the University of Riyadh that it might list this item as a course (the science of style) separate from the course in Arabic rhetoric. He believes that this University was the first University, or at least one of the first, to start teaching such a course; however, as taught there, it is still more relevant to traditional Arabic rhetoric.⁸⁸

‘Ayyād’s aim in this work is to “attempt to establish in Arab culture a new science derived from the Arabic linguistic and literary tradition and responsive to the reality of the development of this living tradition. This would also be able to benefit from Western studies, in seeing modern development in a historical perspective and in reading history in a modern perspective.”⁸⁹

Part One is entitled “The Theory of Stylistics”; it aims to teach how to read and how to distinguish styles. It is concerned with the method which stylisticians follow in their own reading of literary texts.

First ‘Ayyād examines the “Concept of Style in the Opinion of Writers”. He discusses the views on style of various Arab writers such as Al-‘Aqqād and Tawfiq Al-Ḥakīm, observing during this that the concept of style is expandable, and has different meanings in the views of different writers. In their view, it is the form of a literary work, and it is difficult to define it or give it a single definition. He concludes by concerning himself with the examination of style with regard to the linguisticians’s views.

The second concept is that of the "Science of Language and the Science of Style." 'Ayyād states that before style was paid any attention by literary critics, it was studied with respect to language and was established in linguistic circles. The concept of 'style' is partly derived from modern linguistic texts such as those of Ferdinand de Saussure, which distinguish between 'langue' and 'parole' in the usage of the language by different classes of people. Thus, the science of style is based on individual differences in using language; language is a social linguistic system. Differences of linguistic usage are also often related to different attitudes towards language. The French scholar Charles Bally maintained that the role of the stylistician was purely that of a linguist, but his student Marcel Cressot insisted on the aesthetic element in the study of style.⁹⁰

The third concept is that of the relation between the "Science of Style, Literary Criticism and History of Literature." 'Ayyād refers to one particular aspect of stylistics, namely deviation, and he quotes Steven Ullmann's definition of "the science of style as the science of deviation."⁹¹ Then he explains that "the task of the stylistician critic is to demonstrate the connection between expression and feelings; he should be able to respond to the text which he is studying, otherwise the text will remain a mere 'dead letter' for him."⁹² Thus, 'Ayyād "distinguishes between the stylistician critic and the impressionistic critic, in that the former is more objective than the latter; the former begins his analysis from the text itself and works according to scientific principles, whereas the latter begins from his individual feelings with regard to the text. These feelings may reflect a true image of the work,

but often they are far removed from the text. There is a distinction between “stylistics” and “literary criticism”, but this distinction does not mean a separation between the two; in fact, they complement and complete each other. The same is true for the relationship between ‘literary history’ and ‘stylistics’.⁹³

The fourth concept is that of the science of style and rhetoric. Stylistics and rhetoric have one point in common, in that the final aim of both is “to present a comprehensive picture of all the various vocabularies and constructions and their implications.”⁹⁴

‘Ayyād indicates “three differences between ‘style’ and ‘rhetoric’”: first, style is a modern linguistic science [a new way of looking at language; it observes the changes and the developments of language] whereas rhetoric is an old linguistic science [which considers language as unchangeable and fixed]; the second difference is that the science of style observes the phenomena of language and acknowledges what changes have happened to it; it is concerned merely with demonstrating its meanings from the points of view of its speakers, hearers and readers. Thus, its nature is to indicate without specifying what is correct and incorrect; whereas the science of rhetoric is a standard science with definite rules, the science of style is a descriptive science. The type of discourse is influenced by the attitude, for rhetoric is concerned with the rational situation of the receiver, whereas stylistics is concerned with the emotions. The difference is in the perspective or attitude of each one of them. As a result of these three differences between stylistics and rhetoric, the horizon of stylistics is wider than that of rhetoric, in that stylistics examines all linguistic phenomena, from abstract sound to meaning.

Stylistics may follow the study of phenomena throughout the ages, or it may examine the characteristics of a certain school or literary genre, the style of a certain writer or a certain literary work.”⁹⁵

The fifth part examines the fields of studies of stylistics. ‘Ayyād states that “the stylistician must consult books on language and grammar when he studies a text, in order to decide how to deal with that text.”⁹⁶ He then points out that “stylistic studies covers a vast area, and he defines three kinds of such stylistic studies:

- 1 - - The general linguistic rules of various languages [the science of comparative stylistics];
- 2 -- The particular linguistic rules of a certain language [the science of descriptive stylistics; the French stylistic school represents this kind];
- 3 -- The literary analysis of a certain work or works, relating to a certain literary genre. This is called either “genetic stylistic studies” or “individual studies”. ”⁹⁷

This vast area of study is delimited in stylistics by the additional emotional effects of the linguistic phenomena which deviate from the ordinary type.

The last section in Part One is entitled ‘How can we read the poetic text?’ This section will be examined separately, in Part Two, Chapter One, ‘The Stylistic Approach to Arabic Poetry’, in the part of the thesis which is devoted to stylistics.

This work in general is an introductory one, so that the

theoretical part of it, consisting of four sections, cannot be considered as a chapter; it simply presents various concepts concerning stylistics. It has certain points of weakness: it is by no means comprehensive, there is no list of terminology, nor is there a list of recommended reading such as is desirable in an introductory work.

One aspect of introducing the stylistic approach to Arab readers is examining the relationships between 'rhetoric' and 'stylistics'. This is the aim of a book by Muḥammad 'Abd Al-Muṭṭalib entitled *Al-Balāghah wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* (Rhetoric and Stylistics), Cairo, 1984.

This work examines in detail the connection of rhetoric in general and Arabic rhetoric in particular with the modern stylistic approach; our concern in this section is only with stylistics.

Part Three of this book is devoted to explaining "the stylistic approach." In this part Muṭṭalib studies the following topics: A Historical View of the Stylistic Approach; The Science of Style and its Trends; Delimiting the Field of Style; The Theory of Communication and its Elements: Addresser, Addressee and the Message.⁹⁸

Under the first topic the author states that "the word 'stylistic' appears in the nineteenth century but does not take on a definite meaning until the twentieth century, with the efforts of De Saussure in modern linguistics."⁹⁹

Then comes Bally, who was concerned with the emotional aspects of the language and became the founder of stylistics in modern times.

Next, Spitzer had his role in making a relationship between language and literature through Frude's method of examining style.

In 1941 it became the task of Jules Marouzeau to return the literary language to the field of literary studies, as a reaction against Bally, who dismissed it. His concerns included: choice of words, spoken and written language, poetic roles, and the style of prose.

Muṭṭalib considers the efforts of the formalist school (1915) an aid to the stylistic approach; the most important of these is to put the poetic word in its context, and the benefit of this is to enrich the study of literary work in its sound, rhyme and constructions.

Muṭṭalib's historical views have no special claims to originality; he summarises what other Arab scholars had done before him.

Under the second topic, he states that "style" represents the different patterns or forms of the language and 'stylistics' seeks to analyse those patterns in their individual aspects. The "stylistic approach" is concerned with literary language, because it represents distinctive individual varieties in utterance and their features such as awareness, word-choice and the deviation of language from ordinary use. "The 'science of language' examines what is said, but 'stylistics' examines how it is said, describing and analysing at the same time."¹⁰⁰

The stylistic approach adds a linguistic dimension to the analysis of the literary text, in that it can reach all dimensions of the text only through its linguistic formulation. The stylistic approach is

under attack on the ground that it isolates the text from other aspects: historical, psychological and social.¹⁰¹

The stylistic approach “concentrates on the discovery of the relationship between the signifier and its signified, which leads us to the operations of the three elements of communication. It also leads us to understand the nature of the message of the literary text without approaching any previous or non-literary information, because stylistics is not able to deal with this sort of information.”¹⁰²

Muṭṭalib asserts that there is a style associated with an age that distinguishes it from others. This ‘style of the age’ does not neglect individual style.

In the examination of ‘individual style’ one must concentrate on the ‘deviation patterns’ from the ‘original patterns’, observing in the linguistic formulation the simulative or reiterated expressions which have an aesthetic continuity, observing the repetition of stylistic features in the literary text.

The fourth topic deals with “delimiting the field of style.” The stylistic approach, according to Bally, concentrates on the expressive devices in the language which appear in both the aesthetic and emotional aspects. It also illustrates social and psychological aspects in the literary text. Chomsky asserts that the fundamental point which stylistic studies are centred on is the “invention aspect of the language.” Stylisticians examine various aspects of the sentence at different levels: phonetic, structural and semantic.

At the phonetic level, the stylistician studies the deviation of the sounds from the ordinary level. The sound and pronunciation can possess an emotional nature.

At the structural level, the stylistician studies: length and shortness of sentence, word order in the sentence, particles = (*Adawāt*) which are used by the writer/poets such as prepositions, coupling particles = (*Adawāt Al-‘Aṭṭ*) = exceptive particles, interrogative particles and their functions in conveying the meaning.

On the semantic level, the stylistician studies the choice of words: the writers/poets are aware of their meaning and of what is hidden behind that meaning.

Stylistic analysis starts from the surface and goes down to the depths of the literary work, observing the stylistic features which are dominant in it and what meaning they have.¹⁰³

According to Freemann, there is a possibility of dividing the field of stylistics into three areas: style as deviation from the rules, style as repetition of certain linguistic types and style as the exploitation of grammatical capacities or possibilities.¹⁰⁴

The sixth topic is “communication theory.” Muṭṭalib here refers to “the speech event theory” of Jakobson: according to this theory there are four elements in every linguistic event: addressee, addresser, content and code.

The first element of this theory is ‘the addresser.’ “The concepts that correlate between style and practitioner have a wide influence on the spheres of thought and analysis.”¹⁰⁵ There is a

view that considers the individual characteristics of the style and accordingly classifies it with respect to the distinctive features of the character of the practitioner. However, the general trend in stylistic studies is not to make an association between the text and the style of the practitioner, but to consider the text as independent from the practitioner.

The second element is 'the addressee'. The operation of reception is not a pure aesthetic pleasure but is a dialogue between the reader and the writer/poet.

The third element is 'the message or the content.' The examination here concerns the linguistic message in its inventive aspect. The task of the stylistician is to break down the elements of the text in order to discover the relationships between those elements which create the distinctiveness of the text; any external elements relating to the writer/poet are to be ignored.

In his examination of 'rhetoric and stylistics' Muṭṭalib studies aspects of stylistics such as deviation, repetition and context, but his main concern is with Arabic rhetoric.

The last part of this book deals with 'stylistics, rhetoric and criticism.' Muṭṭalib describes the aesthetic and interpretative aspects of stylistics, and how it works inside the text to discover the nature of the linguistic elements of the text without making any connection with external elements.

This work has no glossary of terms; the topic is clear in the mind of the author; his references are both Arabic and French.

In the introduction to *Dalīl Al-Dirāsāt Al-Ushūbiyyah* (Guide to

Stylistic Studies) by Jūzif Mishāl Sharīm, Beirut 1984, the author states that stylistic studies are "a type of continuing dialogue between the reader and the writer throughout a specific text, and this dialogue takes place on four levels: text, sentence, word and sound."¹⁰⁶

Chapter One is devoted to Text as the first level in stylistic analysis. The author adopts a psychological structural analysis, and in this chapter it seems that he concentrates on certain aspects of structuralism, such as binary opposition and units. In analysing a story, he combines structuralism with psychoanalysis. He goes on to claim that "psychoanalytic structural analysis is a complete structural, psychological, social, aesthetic and stylistic analysis of the content"¹⁰⁷

Chapter Two is devoted to the "Sentence, and Functional Linguistics and Objective Stylistics." In general, the author asserts that a particular method of analysis is required for each artistic work, and that the method of analysis which is applied to any style must change its direction and its devices according to the status of this style. The author appears to benefit from the method of analysis of C. Bureau by integrating it into a complete work which considers the literary work as a textual unit, consisting of the smallest possible linguistic unit [the phoneme] up to the largest possible unit [the work as a whole], passing through the moneme and the sentence.

In the context of the sentence, it is necessary to study types of sentences and to define their features, before any attempt is made to analyse style. Then, because a literary work has a special

discourse, in order to analyse it, a study must be made of the relations between the sub-units themselves and between them and the complete work. The author considers the analysis of stylistics as a linguistic analysis. This chapter is full of examples to illustrate the theory he presents.

Chapter Three is devoted to the "study of the Vocabule and the Concept of Image in Stylistic Studies." His conclusion from an examination of various opinions about the image in literary criticism is that the image is immersed in psychological concepts. He raises various matters relating to this examination such as the enlargement of the concept of image, including the various figures of speech, and the general obscurity of the concept.

Chapter Four is the last part of this study and is devoted to sound and musical structure. It is concerned with the music of poetry, particularly with respect to metre, and it introduces this topic with examples from French and English poetry. The chapter ends with a practical study of an Arabic poem, which will be discussed in Chapter One of Part Two of this thesis.

The author's recommendation for further work is for a comparative study of the rich Arabic rhetorical tradition and modern stylistic studies.

This work is merely an introductory work or handbook on stylistics, but it nevertheless has many good points: a large list of references, French-Arabic and Arabic-French glossaries of terms, and copious examples. At the same time, the work has certain disadvantages: its approach is not sufficiently clear to give the Arab reader a coherent idea of stylistics and the terms in the

glossaries are not explained. Overall, it is less valuable than a number of the other works considered here.

Another work is entitled *Dirāsāt Al-Uslūb: bayn al-Mū'ā ṣarah wa Al-Turāth* (The Study of Style: between Contemporaneity and Tradition), by Aḥmad Darwīsh, Cairo 1984. This work deals with two subjects: "Style in Modern Studies" and "Stylistics in the Arabic Rhetorical Tradition."

Darwīsh states, in his introduction, that since the eighteenth century the art of expression has changed with the changing of the philosophies of the world and of concepts of many issues, intellectual, political, social and ideological. As a result, the philosophy of expression and the style of expression have changed. It thus happened that the old "Rhetoric" turned into the intermediate "Style" and then into modern "Stylistics".

This change has been reflected in Arabic literary criticism in two ways; in adopting the change and in reconsidering the traditional material.

According to Darwīsh, he has two aims; the first is to pursue the notions of style and stylistics in modern studies, with regard to their use in Arabic literary criticism. In this he is concerned with technical terms and the scope and methodology of stylistics, reviewing the main schools: "Expressive Stylistics", "Statistical Stylistics", "Formalist Stylistics", "Structural Stylistics", "Psycho-Stylistics", "Social Stylistics" and "Literary Stylistics." He proposes to extract something of the essence of the system and the methodology and to ascertain how stylistic studies may benefit from the basic sciences which encompass them.

His second aim is to apply the knowledge thus gained to the examination of traditional Arabic rhetoric. His efforts in this regard will be examined in another section of this chapter. ¹⁰⁸

The first aim deals with "Style in Modern Studies." In this part, he studies the following matters: "the Term 'Style', between Speech and Style"; "the Variety of Stylistic Schools"; "Expressive Stylistics", "Psycho-Social Stylistics;" "Radical (Génétique) stylistics and Literary Stylistics."

He states that 'Style' and 'Stylistics' are two distinct terms that are increasingly repeated in modern literary and linguistic studies. Style (Le Style) is wider in application than Stylistics (La Stylistique), in that it is used in various fields, and means different things at different periods, whereas stylistics applies almost exclusively to literary and linguistic studies. Thus Style may denote "the System and the General Rules", which were traditionally prescribed for individual genres of literature or were associated with particular social classes; on the other hand, in modern usage it tends to indicate 'the Individual Characteristics' of a particular writer. ¹⁰⁹

The reaction against the idea of style as an indicator of class or genre was led by "Georges Buffon (1707-1788), who produced the dictum "Le style c'est l'homme même." From here he attempted to connect the aesthetic values of style with the vital cells of thought that differ from one person to another, rather than with rigid decorative forms that imitators would borrow from their originals, the creators, without any real perception of their values and without making proper use of them."¹¹⁰

At the beginning of the twentieth century, with the emergence of modern linguistic studies, the term 'Stylistics' began to be used. These studies, for the first time, treated style as a science to be studied in its own right or to be used in literary analysis, psychoanalysis or social analysis, in accordance with the tendencies of this school or that.

In "Between Utterance and Style", Darwish examines the distinction between what can be considered 'Ordinary Expression' and 'Style' that can be studied by 'Stylistics.'

The first answer in this matter is provided by Granger, who claims that "it can be delimited by the concept of the role of language in communication. Language relies on symbols or codes, which have certain meanings agreed upon, as a whole, among the group that uses them. These symbols or codes may be charged either with single determined meanings or with a number of different meanings. Examples of symbols charged with a single determined meaning are telegraphs or shorthand, in which there is no possibility of idiosyncratic interpretation. These types of codes, symbols or linguistic units are to be disregarded in the study of style. There is another group of codes or symbols which can be charged with a variety of meanings according to its connection with other linguistic elements. This group may constitute something that can be regarded as deserving of consideration in the study of style. Granger elaborates upon his theory by explaining that in addition to the significance of the 'code' there is another significance which he calls 'the sub-code'; this is a technical term used by particular literary genres for the employment of linguistic symbols in a particular way, such as the

significance of stress or metre in poetry. There is also a third type, which he calls 'the supra-code'; this is related to the individual characteristics of the writer/poet and his ability to arrange or create a particular internal system exploiting the symbol or the sub-symbol. This ability is apparent only to an attentive reader or a thoughtful critic; stylistic reality is thus a difficult but enjoyable attempt in which a good writer and an attentive recipient participate consecutively."¹¹¹

The second answer comes from Roland Barthes. "His distinction between 'style' and what he calls 'Writing Degree Zero' is based on the great development of the function of literature since the end of the eighteenth century, compared with previous periods, and thus the development of the expressive function of style in consequence of the development of the philosophy of literature by means of expression. For Barthes style is closer to observing the author's flight from collective features towards individual features. As Barthes sees it, style is individual and writing is collective."¹¹²

The third answer to the question of the distinction between style and utterance is that "style is utterance for its own sake, which is not concerned with what is said but rather with how it is said."¹¹³

The third topic is that of the variety of schools of stylistics. These schools have "multiplied to accommodate the multiplication of angles of interest in language. Language is, after all, the principal tool for expressing the totality of human ideas and feelings. In spite of the variety of schools of stylistics, there are just four ways of looking at language from the perspective of stylistics; the first

is to regard language as potentiality that serves the community that uses it in a general way. The second is to study the specialised language or 'jargon' used by a particular group, e.g. artistic, social or professional. The third is to study individual linguistic habits. The fourth is to study individual psychology in style."¹¹⁴

Darwish further identifies two main trends of stylistic studies deserving of examination; the "collective descriptive" trend or "expressive stylistics" and the "individual" trend or "genetic stylistics."

First, he considers "expressive stylistics" or "descriptive stylistics." This is associated with Bally, whom he considers as its founder. Bally, as a student of De Saussure adopts and develops the latter's idea that language is a human creation and a product of the soul. It is communication and a system of signs charged with ideas. There are two aspects of language, which are of an equality at the same level of importance, the individual thought and the collective root. Thus, the individual and the collective participate in giving expressive life to the style and they are not satisfied by receiving only the values. Bally's theory is based on "the study which he names the "Emotional Content of Language." It aims to study the expressive values which are hidden in speech. The concentrating of Bally on the emotional content prevents him paying attention to aesthetic aspects, and his concentrating on the spoken language prevents him from taking an interest in literary language. His study is a linguistic study rather than a literary study and his stylistics is a descriptive study. His main question is 'How' rather than other any other question concerning the roots

or sources of expression. Bally is a pathfinder of "Descriptive Linguistics and Collective Stylistics."¹¹⁵

His school is an important one, which has had a vast effect on the stylistic schools that came after it. Stylistic schools have been influenced by the descriptive tendency. First came the "Formalist School", which was established in Russia and elsewhere, and whose scholars moved to the United State or to France. Some of them are still working in the field, such as Todorov. Second, it was the principal influence on the "Statistical School", which by using the devices of this school as in some of Guiraud's works, provides a proof of authorship as that of a certain author rather than another. After that, the American movement followed Guiraud's method in using statistical devices and produced numerous studies, the most important of which were written by Sedlow in America. Third, there is "Structural Stylistics", which is the most popular approach in the Arab world. This school is an extension of the descriptive school. It is also an extension of the opinions of De Saussure in his distinction between the two terms 'Parole' and 'Langue.' The value of this distinction between the two terms is that style is like hidden capacities in the language that the author uses to direct it to a certain aim; and the study of aspects of the style in itself. This means that there is a distinction between the "Level of Language" and the "Level of the Text." The traditional rhetoric did not know this distinction. It existed in various names in the branches of the structural school. Roman Jakobson's distinction between 'Code' and 'Message', which are sometimes named 'Langue' and 'Discours', and Hjelmslev puts in opposition 'Système' and 'Texte.'. In Chomsky's writings the

terms changed to 'Competence' and 'Performance'.

Ṣalāh Faḍl's work is entitled *'Ilm Al-Uslūb -- Mabādi'uhu wa Ijrā'ātuhu*, (The Science of Style: its Principles and Procedures), Beirut 1985.

This work consists of the following sections: "Principles and Early Trends"; "The Theoretical Domain of Stylistic Science"; "The Levels and Procedures of the Investigation"; "The Circle of Stylistic Features and References."

In the introduction to this book, Faḍl examines various matters. First he claims that this book will "cover a new topic that has not been paid enough attention by Arab scholars."¹¹⁶ (This point, about the status of the stylistic approach in Arabic literary criticism, is not actually valid, in that there is, in fact, a large body of Arab research on stylistics that antedates his works).

The second matter is the "status of stylistics": does it have roots in Arabic literary criticism that have the ability to grow?. The stylist is a "legitimate inheritor of the ancient Arabic rhetoric which has reached the menopause and has been condemned by the development of modern arts and literature as sterile."¹¹⁷

The third matter is that stylistics derives from two sources: modern linguistics and aesthetics.

In the first section of the book, which deals with "principles and early trends," Faḍl examines the following topics: the early developments of stylistics; the French school and the technical linguistic expressions; German idealism and intuition; and finally critical trends in Italy and Spain.

The first topic is “the early developments of stylistics.” The birth of the stylistic approach is associated with the development of modern linguistics, so that it is important to know about the development of modern linguistic studies.

The new school of language was established by De Saussure who considers language a tool of communication and a system of symbols with social and psychological origins. Two types of stylistics appeared: “expressive stylistics”, which is similar to rhetoric and “individual stylistics”, which examines the relationships of the individual and the collective style.

Faḍl points out that the date of birth of stylistics is 1886 and that the most important of its subjects are literary style, style of the author, style of a certain school, style of a certain age, style of a certain genre, artistic style and general literary cultural style.¹¹⁸

The second topic is “the French school and the techniques of linguistic expression.” The founder of this school is Bally (1865-1947). His concern is mainly with linguistic expression in its emotional content. His starting point is the search for the hidden meaning of the expressive capacities in language on all levels and the analysis of their relationships with thought and with society.

The third topic is “German idealism and intuition.” In Vossler’s view style is a gathering together of aesthetic and expressive tools.

The method of Spitzer in his examination of style is based on the “personal reading” of the text. This reading has various steps: the reader has to read the text and observe stylistic features in

its language; this can be achieved by his intuition which leads the reader to their stylistic importance. Then the reader compares these features against another stylistic reading, providing other stylistic evidence from the text. His interpretation of the stylistic features of the text starts from the part and extends to the whole of the work. It is an interesting feature of his method that he insists that the only practical way is to read and to read again with patience, awareness and confidence, and with a desire verging on the metaphysical to reach a solution, until this particular sought-after feature is presently revealed to us.¹¹⁹

The fourth topic is “critical trends in Italy and Spain.” The Italian scholar who examines style, Devoto, considers that style is concerned with individual choice in the language of the text.

In 1940 the Spanish scholar Alonso saw that critical stylistics could be applied to both modern and classical literary works. This would require the rebuilding of the constituent elements of the literary work from inside, not from outside, and the identification of the distinctive linguistic forms of the text, in order that the distinctive aesthetic literary features might be understood.

Style as he sees it, aims at close understanding of the literary text and its writer/poet. The principle of Alonso in his stylistic studies is that each linguistic feature in style is identified with a psychological feature.

Alonso established what he calls “the science of the style of language”, to study emotional elements in the collective language according to Bally’s rules, concentrating on analysing the linguistic values in both expression and semantics. The aim of a stylistic

study of a poem is to understand it as a whole, as an individual system of values and to find the unity of this system.

The second section deals with “the theoretical scope of the science of style.” This section consists of four topics: “the concept of style”; “defining the science of style”; “the connection of style with the science of linguistics” and “the connection of style with rhetoric.”

The first topic is “the concept of style.” “There is not a single definition for style which has the capacity to convince all scholars. Neither is there a theory of style which can be agreed upon by all scholars. The different definitions number more than thirty.”¹²⁰

Some of these definitions of are:

“Style is not an embellishment or decoration as some people think, nor is it a matter of “technique”, but it is like the colour in a picture, it is a peculiarity of vision which enlightens the special world which each of us sees alone.”¹²¹

“Style is an attitude to the world and a form of existence. It is not something that we put on and take off.”¹²²

“Style is the method of distinctive writing of a certain writer.” ¹²³

Style is the individual characteristic in literary writing. “Style is the method of linguistic presentation of thought.”¹²⁴

Style is the man himself.

Style is an individual tone.

Literary style is any individual written form with a literary purpose; that is to say, the style of a writer or the style of a particular literary work.

Style is the result of the collection of purposeful choices of elements of the language.

Style is an aspect of utterance which is derived from choosing the tools of expression; these tools are determined by the nature and the intention of the speaker or writer.¹²⁵

The second topic is "defining the science of style." Stylistic analysis deals with three elements: the linguistic element, non-linguistic elements (the author, reader, historical attitude, aim of the message and others) and the literary aesthetic element which illustrates the effect of the text on the reader and the literary interpretation and evaluation. The stylistician must cover all these elements in his analysis but in practice he ignores some of them, such as the author or the historical attitude whose role in creating the text is not clear to him.¹²⁶

According to the French School, the science of style is the study of the method of expression of thought by means of language. This definition has to be explained in detail: "Thought," means the method of using words and grammatical structures. It includes the formulation of thought in the completed utterance; it also covers matters other than thought, which leads some stylisticians to leave out thought in their stylistic analysis. They leave it to those who are examining the literature and aesthetics and they examine only the linguistic side.

There is a trend, in stylistic studies, which connects the psychological aspects and style so that it makes between them a closed connection or organic relationship. It is represented by the French scholar Marouzeau, who said that "the science of style must rely on the analysis of various situations of the human being, whether they are intellectual or emotional or a mixture of both."¹²⁷

The third topic is "the relation between stylistics and the science of the language." This topic is one of the most important in the problem of modern stylistics. It seems that this area is so wide that the relationship between stylistics and the science of language covers a huge number of matters where literary studies have a connection with language in general, such as the Communication Theory and the efforts of Roman Jakobson, study of the image, metaphor, the establishing of stylistics and other relevant issues.¹²⁸

The fourth topic is "the relationship of stylistics with rhetoric." When stylistics is established it becomes the new rhetoric and plays a double role as the science of expression and criticism of individual styles. The efforts of Bally in stylistics are based on rhetoric. The question which arises is whether stylistics is the inheritor of rhetoric.¹²⁹

The Third Section is "the Levels and Procedures of the Investigation." This section consists of four topics: "the Aims and Approaches of the Stylistic Investigation"; "Deviation and Structural Opposition"; "The Functional Statistical View-Point"; and finally "Examples of Experimental Procedures."

As far as the first topic is concerned, the Stylistic Investigation delimits the precise aim of analysis and selects a suitable analytical approach for it. Sometimes it canvasses reader's opinions, by means of questionnaires. It also draws upon psychological, experimental, social and statistical approaches.

As to the second topic, five types of deviations are identified:

1. Deviation classified according to the degree of diffusion or spreading in the text: there are two divisions of this type:

(A) "locational deviation" which affects a small percentage of the text such as metaphor.

(B) "Comprehensive deviation" which affects the whole of the text. The rate of repetition of certain items can be observed by the statistical method. In general, this type of deviation rarely occurs.

2. Deviation classified according to its relationship with the linguistic grammatical rules: There are two divisions of this type.

(A) "Negative deviation": limitation or specialisation; one rule is limited to some particular situation.

(B) "Positive deviation": adding a new rule to existing rules.

3. Deviation classified according to the relationship between the rules and the text studied. There are two divisions of this type:

(A) "Internal deviation": one linguistic unit, with limited distribution in the text, deviates from the dominant rules of the text as a whole.

(B) "External deviation"; the style of the text differs from the existing rules in the language.

4. Deviation classified according to the linguistic level on which it operates: Here the following kinds of deviations can be distinguished: graphic, phonetic, morphological, lexical, grammatical and semantic.

5. Deviation classified according to its effects on the two principles of choice and construction in the linguistic units:

Fadl examines the concept of structural opposition/binary opposition and refers it to Riffeterre. Stylistic analysis basically tends to observe features of structural opposition which lead to understanding the choice of the writer/poet as required by his awareness. ¹³⁰

On the third topic, he remarks that the statistical approach is used in criticism as in other aspects of life, because ours is a statistical age. Even though the statistical stylistic approach is widely used and popular there are reservations: it is not able to pick up the emotional tone and the musical effect in style; it ignores the effect of context on style; and most stylisticians are inadequately trained in using the statistical technique.

However, the statistical stylistic approach still has some advantages: it helps in finding a solution for literary problems: the authorship of literary works; the date of composition of literary works; the repetition, density and significance of a certain phenomenon in a literary text, finally it may indicate aesthetic features of a literary text.

The fourth and final topic is "Examples of Experimental Procedures." One well-known procedure is the "experimental selection" = *Al-hadhf*. The stylistician uses this method to determine the fundamental grammatical structure of the text and to examine its grammatical complexity. This is done by presenting to those whose opinions are canvassed a truncated version of the text, with those elements separated that the stylistician considers irrelevant. This leads to identification of the fundamental grammatical structures of the text. It leads as well to identification of the stylistic effects and then to stylistic interpretation. There is another method which is mainly based on the reader's reaction to the text and its role in identifying its stylistic features. There is also the method of the "key word", of examining the role of certain words in a literary work; their repetition in a work or in a certain author's work indicates the mentality of the author and provides important observations on the internal structure of the work.¹³¹

Two other procedures may be mentioned: one studies the percentage of nominal and verbal sentences; the other is that of Busemann's Coefficient.¹³² At the end of this section Faḍl concludes that these procedures do not vitiate personal views about the text.

The fourth section deals with "Stylistic Peculiarities." This section consists of the following topics: "the functional analysis of *Majāz* = trope, "the problem of the literary image" and "the styles of the literary genres."¹³³

The first topic is the "functional analysis of *Majāz* = trope." "The

aim of modern stylistic analysis of various rhetorical forms is not only the collection and enumeration of these forms in a text. It must also be the ascertainment of their defined positions and the discovery of their harmonious or inharmonious relationships by concentrating on two aspects:

1. Identifying the rhetorical employment of these forms, measuring their extent and describing them.
2. Discovering the relative importance of some of these forms in certain texts rather than in other texts and their roles in establishing their structures. A stylistic study must define the functions and the occasions of the metaphor in the literary text; the most important aspect of the occasions is the content of the metaphor. The study of the symbolic is also an important aspect of concern to stylistic study.”¹³⁴

Faḍl states that there are “three grades in the imaginative operation related to *Majāz*:

1. The images which are based on sense-perception = *Ḥiss* and its relationships.
2. Metaphor, which is based on language and semantics.
3. That which leads to the formation of a related intellectual image, i.e. the symbol.”¹³⁵

Faḍl ends this section by insisting on the value of traditional Arabic rhetoric in this area.

The second topic is “the problem of the literary image.” His concern here is with the expressive linguistic form. The analysis

of the image may concentrate on its type, simple or complex. One of the tasks of stylistics is to establish the necessary foundation for classifying the image, analysing its nature, function, effects, occasions.

The third topic is "the styles of the literary genres." Faḍl states that each genre has its own expressive forms, its vocabulary, its grammar, its artistic devices and its rhetorical tools. There are various divisions of the styles of literary genres according to the topic or according to the writer/poet; simple style, complex style, medium style etc. It seems that Faḍl realises the wideness of this topic because his examination of it is very general. He examines features of lyric poetry which include image, metre and unrestricted grammatical rules. He considers that the most important feature of the epic style is the ability of the poet to change ideas and emotions, making them into events.

This work has a considerable number of strengths, such as the variety of its references, Arabic, French, Spanish and English; it indicates that Faḍl is an expert in modern literary criticism in general and in stylistic studies in particular.

It has also various limitations; it is full of information about stylistics, but Faḍl does not organise it in a systematic or clear manner. Perhaps this is a matter of inadequate translation. There is no conclusion, and there is no list of terms.

Other book by Sa'd Maṣlūḥ is dealing with the stylistic approach is entitled *Fi Al-Naṣṣ Al-Adabī: Dirāṣah Uṣlūbiyyah I ḥ.ṣ'iyyah* (On the Literary Text: A Statistical Stylistic Study), Jeddah 1991.

This work contains four parts in all of which the theoretical and practical are combined. We are here concerned only with the theoretical content that introduces the Arab reader to the stylistic approach.

Maşlūḥ states, in his introduction, that “the statistical perspective in approaching a literary text is only a methodological tool and is not intended to constitute a complete method of examining literature. It is a detective and supportive tool and a promising methodological device. It helps in the study of literature in various ways: it enables us to make considerable progress in rationalising our appreciation, in treating it scientifically, in justifying our judgements logically and, finally, in making an accurate interpretation of literary phenomena.”¹³⁶

Literature is an art, but the study of literature must be a science. He presents again the idea that he presented a decade earlier: that “it is necessary for work to be done in establishing a scientific linguistic method for criticising an Arabic literary text.”¹³⁷

His first subject is the Statistical Study of Style. Within this, he examines three concepts; Notion, Procedure and Function.

He first examines statistical stylistics from the standpoint of notion, beginning with consideration of the theoretical foundation of statistical stylistics. “There are three attitudes towards using statistics in linguistic studies, when examining the variety of language: to ignore it, to restrict the materials examined by environment and situation, and to accept it unconditionally. This last attitude is the scientific methodological solution for the study of the phenomenon of linguistic variation in an accurate scientific

manner. The importance of statistics has been established for historical and deterministic linguistics. The need for its use in stylistic linguistics is more urgent, not only because it approaches linguistic behaviour in its aspect as a variable phenomenon, but also because it approaches it in its aspect as distinct linguistic usage.”¹³⁸

Secondly, he examines the “Nature of Style from the Statistical Perspective.” In his argument about the necessity of statistics in stylistics he considers that “a comprehensive description of the features of any language is one way of analysing literature; he finds that there is a strong relationship between linguistic statistics (which describes the common features in linguistic usage) and stylistic statistics (which studies the peculiar and divergent features). Since statistics helps to describe the features of language, it is also useful in analysing literature.” ¹³⁹

He next examines statistical stylistics from the standpoint of Procedure. He first studies stylistic variables, that is to say “a collection of linguistic features in the broadest possible sense of the term.”¹⁴⁰

There are different types of stylistic variables and under each type there are various sub-types: formal variables, phonetic variables, morphological variables, syntactical variables, semantic variables, and supra-sentence variables.

He concludes that “each distinctive or redundant linguistic feature is actually a stylistic variable and potentially a stylistic feature; thus it may be a subject for statistical stylistic treatment, with the object of obtaining a stylistic diagnosis of the text or of

discovering the various types of stylistic form to which it is subjected by the author.”¹⁴¹ He then examines “stylistic variables and the grammatical model considering them to be, in principle, capable of forming a methodological foundation of stylistic research.”¹⁴² Next, he examines stylization, which is “the regulation of the linguistic features in the text, in such a way that they change from being merely articles in the list of variables to distinctive stylistic features of the text.”¹⁴³ He then, examines the “context parameters”, and he provides various examples such as: individuality, medium, participation, province, modality and singularity. He considers Halliday’s theory of Language Function an important step in stylistic studies, with its three macro-functions: ideational, interpersonal and textual. Next he examines stylistic diagnosis, which is an analytical activity undertaken by the scholar, the aim of which is to discover the stylistic identity of the text. “This takes three steps:

(1) Hypotheses: the stylistician identifies the stylistic variables that produce the stylistic distinctiveness of a particular text, employing his experience and his knowledge of previous studies, or analysing the responses of a number of respondents.

(2) Test of the hypotheses: the stylistician attempts to demonstrate their truth or falsity. This step has two aspects:

(A) Statistical description.

(B) Statistical analysis.

(3)- Conclusion: the stylistician presents the results of the tests of his hypotheses.”¹⁴⁴

He emphasises that “many academic studies that use the statistical method in examining texts, and particularly literary texts, take into account merely its primary function, that of counting.

“In fact, the statistical method involves more than the simple counting of words, different types of sentence, parts of speech and so on. It provides data that may be employed in the process of revealing the precise features of the text on various levels of analysis. The object is to arrive at some kind of numerical data capable of producing significant comparisons.

“Statistical intervention occurs at the stage of stating the hypotheses, or perhaps before that.

In the statistical method we have two choices;

- 1 To submit for testing material that represents a complete “statistical population”, such as a *Dwān* of poetry, an entire literary work or a whole corpus.

- 2 To choose samples, provided that they are good representatives of the statistical population that is to be examined. There are certain rules in choosing the samples. Statistics, in fact, appears before the stages of description and analysis, at the stage of choosing the samples.”¹⁴⁵

(A)_The most important statistical criteria used in description are:

- 1 That of the density of stylistic variables.
- 2 That of the ratio between two stylistic variables.

3 That of the central tendencies of the variables, such as arithmetic mean, median, mode and geometrical mean.

4 That of the dispersion of the data of variables, such as, range, variance and standard deviation.

5 That of the probabilistic distribution of variables.

6 That of the coefficient of correlation between variables.

(B) Means of statistical analysis or deduction:

Some of the means used in statistical stylistic description can also be used in statistical analysis or deduction, such as standard deviation and the coefficient of correlation. There are also two criteria that are widely used, namely the Chi-Square and the Z-score.¹⁴⁶

He then examines the mathematical models of stylistic diagnosis. "Mathematical equations figure greatly in statistical studies of style. This causes a psychological block in many of those who are interested in linguistic texts and particularly literary texts."¹⁴⁷ What is meant by a mathematical model is "the abstract formation of the relationship existing between linguistic variables, in a way that forms distinctive linguistic features."¹⁴⁸ There is a variety of mathematical models that are used in the investigation of style, according to the branch of mathematics employed. These were defined by H. P. Edmundson, who classified them into two principal types: deterministic and stochastic. The first comprises geometric, logical, analytical and algebraic models, and

the second comprises probabilistic and statistical models.

The operation of selecting is a fundamental feature of stylization components. This operation means "selecting one form of expression from among a collection of available possibilities."¹⁴⁹

Selection takes place in three ways:

1 In simple situations the choice is between two alternatives;

2 In complex situations the choice is from among enormous numbers of possibilities; choice is determined by pragmatic factors that can be classified into two kinds: first, the subjective factor, which comprises the linguistic preference of the speaker/writer, which marks the expression of his thought and stylistic skill. Second, the objective factor, which is the context, in the widest terms. This factor is independent of the speaker/writer, even if he employs its effect throughout his speech/writing. It contains the factors that are related to linguistic communication, such as the form of the language, written or spoken, the form of the discourse, individual or dialogue and the genre of the utterance. Both pragmatic factors, objective and subjective, are always present during the production of the text. Theoretically, there are three possibilities for the relationship between the subjective and objective factors in formulating the style:

A - Context-free-speaker/writer;

B - Context-bound- speaker/writer;

C - Context- sensitive- speaker/writer.

3 - The third method of choosing is the most common, and his sample is the speaker/writer who keeps his stylistic

idiosyncrasies.

It may be said that this type of style is the result of the conflict of two forces: the subjective and objective, which act in opposite directions, seeking domination over the field of communication.

Thirdly Maşlūh examines statistical stylistics from the standpoint of Function. The statistical stylistic criterion is “a formal pattern, which establishes a relationship between the variables or special characteristics and what distinguishes a text from other texts or the rules and attributes that it does not require.”¹⁵⁰

“Based on the previous definition, there are two aspects of the use of the stylistic criterion:

(A) The descriptive aim: this means establishing a relationship between the stylistic variables, with the aim of identifying the distinctive stylistic features. The aim here is to ‘diagnose’ styles.

(B) The evaluative aim: this means establishing a relationship between the distinctive stylistic features, with the aim of identifying the characteristics of style. The aim here is to ‘diagnose’ the characteristics of styles.”¹⁵¹

Both of these aspects exist in the field of stylistic diagnosis. The use of each of these forms a wide gate through which the stylistician can enter a vast field in which he can look up to wide horizons of stylistic study. The fields of application and of benefit from statistical stylistic criteria widen to contain the following:

1 In Social Linguistics: matters of the social use of language,

linguistic register, discourse analysis and pragmatics of language;

2 In Historical Linguistics: matters of the distinction of styles according to period, dynamic stylistics and study of historical linguistic documents;

3 In Psycholinguistics: matters of language and thought, language and character, rationalism and emotionalism and study of invention;

4 In Literary Linguistics: matters of the distinction of the styles of individuals, the discovery of unknown authors, the verification of the relationship of texts, the establishing of plagiarism, originality and imitation, the distinction of the characteristics of styles, the identification of the relationship between the author and his novelistic or dramatic characters, types of literary language, the chronological order of a writer investigation of literary genres, and the aesthetics of the linguistic formulation of a literary text.

5 In Educational Studies: matters of basic lexicon, richness of vocabulary, readability and attractiveness in the formulation of the language of instructional texts.

6 In many other Fields, such as sociology, cultural science, information science, semiotics, and communication science, to give examples that indicate the enormous tasks that are waiting for statistical stylistics in all fields of humanistic studies.

He then examines modes of stylistic criteria. These modes differ according to the principles on which they are based. There are four of these modes:

1 The Mathematical Principle: to this mode belong the stylistic criteria which are based on the calculation of relationships between quantities in the form of a mathematical equation. Among these criteria are the calculation of variances, the standard deviation and the rest of the methods of statistical inference.

2 The Linguistic Principle: this is based on the discovery of the linguistic sense among the contextual stylistic variables. Among these the criteria are types of sentence lexical keys and others, measuring the frequency and distribution of the variables of context.

3 The Logical Principle: this is a mathematical calculation of the stylistic variables, the authority of which derives from its congruence with the axioms of logic. Among the criteria is vocabulary diversification, studied by T. M. Jonstone.

4 The Psychological Principle: most of the criteria which are based on the psychological principle derive their authority from the scientific hypotheses in psychological studies. An example of this principle is Busemann's Coefficient which measures the degrees of the emotional and the rational in style according to the calculation of the percentage of verbs and adjectives."¹⁵²

Maşlūḥ concludes his theoretical part by dealing with issues of Arabic and its statistical treatment. In this conclusion, he proposes the following: the completion of a precise description of the contemporary Arabic language, with all its social and regional varieties; the production of a historical dictionary of Arabic; the

production of an Arabic linguistic atlas; the serious participation of Arab linguisticians in formulating a critical theory which would satisfy all the scientific and objective conditions for studying all the various genres of literary text.¹⁵³

At the beginning of the practical part, there is a section about prose, which is not the concern of this thesis, so that I should mention it only briefly.

The title of this section is "Measuring the Characteristics of the Variation of Vocabulary in Style, in Al-'Aqqād, Al-Rāfi' and Ṭāḥā Ḥusayn. In his introduction, he states that the lexicon which is used by the poet or prose writer is one of the prominent stylistic characteristics which indicate their individuality and illustrate the secret of the craft of composition. The term 'poetic diction' is used only when referring to poetry; in fact, it should be used in referring to prose as well. Both the prose writer and the poet formulate their message or literary discourse and transmit their experience by means of the richness of their particular vocabulary, which appears in texts as a feature of their style.¹⁵⁴

He then raises the question of the type of vocabulary used by the prose-writer and the poet. The vocabulary constitutes the bricks used by the prose-writer or the poet in building his text, according to his way of expressing his character and individuality. The richness of the vocabulary of each prose-writer or poet differs in two respects; in size and in the method of use in formulating a text. In measuring the richness of vocabulary of a prose-writer/poet one must distinguish between two different things:

1 The extent of vocabulary familiar to the prose-writer/poet or in other words, the extent of vocabulary that he is able to recognise in reading or hearing.

2 The extent of vocabulary used actively by the prose-writer/poet in formulating his texts.

Vocabulary diversification is a stylistic feature, by the measuring of which the answers to two questions may be arrived at: that of the relative richness of lexicon of any given prose-writer/poet, and that of his method of using vocabulary variables in his text.¹⁵⁵

Maşlūh's work has certain strengths: it introduces an important discipline of stylistic studies to the Arab reader, and the author has a strong background in the topic that he examines and is familiar with literary studies in the perspective of modern linguistic studies. This is evident in various aspects of his work; he is adept at providing Arabic equivalents for technical terms, he chooses appropriate texts for his practical applications, the language of his work is admirably clear, and he most competently puts theory into practice.

The work has also several limitations: there is no list of terms, with explanations, at the end of the work, nor is there a conclusion or a list of English and Arabic references. Sometimes the author appears to have difficulty in providing a translation of a concept that is lucid and accurate; he could have spent more time on edition and revision. Nevertheless, this work is valuable to the researcher in stylistic studies in Arabic; it is written by a prominent and expert scholar who has a good knowledge of

modern literary studies in the West and a strong background in classical Arabic literature.

Another book by Shukrī 'Ayyād (see above, pp. 109-114) is entitled *Al-Lughah Wa Al-Ibd'ā'* (Language and Invention), Cairo 1988. In an attempt to understand style, he states that "it derives from the word *stylus* the stick of iron which was used by the Romans to write with on wax tablets."¹⁵⁶ In general the concept of style in Latin is related to rhetoric; he follows the development of the study of style, pointing out that in the modern era it starts as a linguistic study but the critics have taken it back and stylistic studies are concerned with the language of literature.

Chapter Two deals with "Style and the Modern Science of Language. In other words, he examines the artistic use of language as a separate study, which is the study of style, because stylistic studies derive from linguistics. 'Ayyād studies in this chapter various concepts such as: the concept of "langue" and "parole"; "language and the system of relationships"; "varieties of semantic linguistics"; "register"; "degrees of grammatical correctness"; "deep structure and surface structure" and "term and message".

The first concept is "langue" and "parole"; this distinction is one of the most important parts of De Saussure's theory. His role was "to transfer the direction of linguistic studies from the historical direction to the descriptive direction and from the study of the written literary language to the study of the spoken language which is used in the ordinary affairs of life."¹⁵⁷

'Ayyād then examines the two concepts from Chomsky's theory of

generative grammar (1965), “competence” and “performance.” “They provide a means of distinguishing between “langue” and “parole”, “the linguistic competence is the internalised knowledge users of a language supposedly have about its system, which enables them to construct and interpret an infinite number of grammatically correct...and meaningful sentences.”¹⁵⁸, “Performance was seen as secondary to competence: what we do when we actually speak, i. e the process of speaking and writing.”¹⁵⁹ The second concept is language and the system of relationships. These relationships “refer to the linguistically significant connections between two or more elements in the language.”¹⁶⁰ However, the students of De Saussure claim that the word “style” may indicate any distinct method in using any language and they adhere in their studies of style to the description that Saussure adopted. He summarises this by saying that “language is a form and is not material, which means that language is a system of relations, so that language signs have their meaning by virtue of their relationships with other elements.”¹⁶¹

The third concept is varieties of semantic linguistics. According to Bally, no clause is completely empty of emotional meaning, so that style appears to him as pure linguistics which completes grammar and must not be confused with rhetoric or the art of writing.

In the same way two of Bally’s students, Marouzeau and Cressot, produced work in which Ayyād sees similarities with those of Arab rhetoricians. At the same time the inquiry into meaning was being carried out in England by Richards, his several books, *Principles of Literary Criticism*, London 1925, *Practical Criticism*,

London 1929 and *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, London 1936 .

‘Ayyād claims that Ogden and Richards, in *the Meaning of Meaning* London, tenth edition 1972, distinguish the rational indication which they call ‘reference’ from emotional indications. He cites Richards’s definitions of the three of the four aspects of these emotional indications: feeling, tone and intention¹⁶⁰ “ ‘Feeling’ is “the attitude of the speaker towards what he is saying”; ‘tone’ is “the attitude of the speaker towards the listener”; ‘intention’ “is the effect that the speaker attempts to produce in the listener”.¹⁶²

The fourth concept is “register”, which refers to “a variety of language defined according to the situation.”¹⁶³ ‘Ayyād continues with a study of De Saussure’s examination of the sign, signifier and signified. Next, he gives another definition of register, from Roger Fowler: “a set of contextual features bringing about a characteristic use of formal features.”¹⁶⁴

‘Ayyād also quotes another definition of the register from A. E. Derbyshire: “The doctrine of register can be summed up by saying that in different kinds of language-uses, which arise to be uttered in response to different kind of human activities, different kinds of linguistic features are found to be appropriate.”¹⁶⁵ ‘Ayyād gives yet another definition of register from Raymond Chapman in his book *Linguistics and Literature -- An Introduction to Literary Stylistics*, London 1973: “a linguistic performance in which there appear distinguishing features which have been chosen according to external circumstances.”¹⁶⁶

The fifth concept is “degrees of grammatical correctness.” This is related to Noam Chomsky’s term “grammaticality”, in his theory

of Generative Grammar. This term does not mean following traditional grammatical rules but is related to the social acceptability of the sentence.¹⁶⁷

The sixth concept is “surface structure and deep structure.” This concept also is from Chomsky’s theory of ‘Generative Grammar.’ “In his ‘standard theory’, sentences are held to have a deep underlying structure which generates the surface form by means of transformational rules of addition or deletion, etc. The surface structure is therefore the linear arrangement of the words (the surface syntax), and the phonological or graphological representation. It is that which is important for the distribution of information, values and focus.”¹⁶⁸

The seventh concept is “term and message.” In the theory of communication, there are five elements: message, addresser, addressee, code and medium. Communication is simply a method of exchanging information in writing or speaking in a human language. In terms of literature we have to mention the communication theory of Shannin and Weaver (1949), who used the elements mentioned above, and the theory of communication by Jakobson (1960) should also be mentioned. “One important difference, however, between literary communication and everyday communication is that the roles of addresser/addressee cannot be reversed”¹⁶⁹ ‘Ayyād sees that one of the strengths of communication theory is that it encourages one to go beyond the unit of the sentence, which was the concern of linguistics from De Saussure until Chomsky, and to look to the unit of the text.

‘Ayyād next examines “the uniqueness of the literary text”; this

means “a distinctive way of using language, and this is what he means by ‘style’, when talking about the literary text.”¹⁷⁰ Stylistic phenomena occur only in the context of individuality and peculiarity and, for this reason, they cannot be dealt with in a scientific manner. If stylistics is a science, it is one that operates only on an applied level. It can treat only particular problems; this is what is referred to when criticism is described as a creative.

Chapter Three deals with “the stylistic phenomenon.” In this chapter ‘Ayyād examines various topics such as definition of the stylistic phenomenon, choosing, deviation, context and arrangement.

As far as the first topic is concerned, ‘Ayyād states that a stylistic phenomenon is a particular type of linguistic phenomenon which distinguishes the language of literature from the ordinary use of language [referring to Charles Bally’s *Traité de Stylistique Française*, Paris 3rd edition 1909, and a stylistic investigation cannot exist only as a linguistic investigation. “We have not attempted to apply our approach to any literary texts in this book, partly for pedagogical reasons, partly for reasons of space limitation. But in view of the way in which books, articles and theses on stylistics these days tend to concentrate on literature, our omission is not, of course, due to any lack of interest on our part in literary language; indeed, we feel that the application of stylistic techniques to the study of literature is perhaps the most important reason for carrying on this business at all, and ultimately might well provide the most illuminating information. But no introduction to stylistic analysis should begin with

literature, as this is potentially the most difficult kind of language to analyse—not only because it allows a great range and more extreme kinds of deviation from the linguistic norms present in the rest of language, but also because it presupposes an understanding of the varieties which constitute normal, non-literary language, as we mentioned earlier...Which is why the application of stylistic techniques to literature should be the last part of the stylistician's training, not the first.

'Ayyād continues to quote: "Perhaps causing the most difficult stylistic problems of all are those uses of language which cannot clearly be specified in terms of the above set of definitions, because the phenomena referred to cut across all these dimensions and require specification which refers to qualitative, non-linguistic criteria. 'Literature' and 'humour' are the two central cases which need to be given separate theoretical status in this way. They are essentially different from other varieties, being fundamentally unspecifiable linguistically, and thus statistically: it is impossible to list a set of features and predict that configuration will be called literary or funny. There is a crucial qualitative distinction, which does not occur elsewhere at such a fundamental level".¹⁷¹

The second topic is "choosing"; 'Ayyād states first that the choosing of words takes place in ordinary life. "A very popular view of style is to see it involving choice. An author is seen to select features from the whole resources of the language at his or her disposal; a choice also partly governed presumably by the demands of genre; form; theme, etc.

“In this wide sense, however, writers are no different from all language users: it is part of our competence as native speakers that we select for our utterances the relevant phonemes, syntax, lexical items, etc. appropriate for what we mean to say, and appropriate for the context in which it will be uttered. Not all selections, however, would necessarily be called stylistic, by those who use the concept of choice. To select, for example, a negative rather than the positive construction in identical contexts affects meaning radically.”¹⁷²

‘Ayyād quotes from Richards’s *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, in his examination of the image and “the role of the mind in connecting two things: The mind is a connecting organ, it works only by connecting and it can connect any two things in an indefinitely large number of different ways.” ¹⁷³

The third topic is “deviation”, which “is very commonly used in stylistics, widely applied, and appears in the definition of style itself. It is also used in *Generative Grammar* to refer to any unit which is not grammatical or is ill-formed, i.e. does not conform to the ‘rules’ of the language.....Strictly, deviation refers to divergence in frequency from a norm, or the statistical average. Such divergence may depend on: (a) the breaking of normal rules of linguistic structure (whether phonological, grammatical, lexical or semantic) and so be statistically unusual/ infrequent; or (b) upon the over-use of normal rules of usage, and so be statistically unusual in the sense of over-frequent.”¹⁷⁴

The fourth and the last topic is “context”, which “refers to ‘something which precedes or follows something’. In an utterance

or a sentence this could be the sounds, words, phrases or clauses surrounding another sound, word, phrase or clause; in a text (non-literary or literary), the words, sentences or utterances, paragraphs or chapters, etc. This is also known as the verbal context, or (usefully) the co-text....The contextual grammar developed by Winter in the 1970s is concerned with how we understand sequences of clauses or sentences in terms of relevant grammatical features and meaning"¹⁷⁵ 'Ayyād examines context in the view of Riffaterre, who finds that context is only in the text; he also finds that style is more general than the rules of rhetoric.

This work demonstrates that 'Ayyād has a real connection with the stylistic approach in the West; it is clear from the references which he use that his work is up-to-date in this field. However, there is no glossary, and he is not very accurate in his use of quotations or generous with his references.

Notes

1 *Al-Uslābiyyah wa-Al-Uslūb -- Naḥwa Badīl Alsunī fī Naqd Al-Adab*, Tunis/Tripoli, 1st ed., 1989, p.13.

2 Ibid., p. 13.

3 Ibid., p. 20.

4 Ibid., see pp. 20- 32.

5 Ibid., p. 34.

6 Ibid., p. 35.

7 Ibid., p. 35.

8 Ibid., p. 36.

9 Ibid., p. 37.

10 Ibid., p. 42.

11 Ibid., p. 45.

12 Ibid., p. 48.

13 Ibid., p. 48.

14 Ibid., p. 56.

15 Ibid., p. 64.

16 Ibid., p. 65.

17 Ibid., p. 65, and see Aḥmad Al-Shāyib, *Al-Uslūb*, Cario 1966, p.40.

18 Ibid., p. 67.

19 Ibid., p. 76.

20 Ibid., p. 83.

21 Ibid., p. 83.

22 Ibid., p. 83.

- 23 Ibid., p. 88.
- 24 Ibid., p. 89.
- 25 Ibid., p. 91.
- 26 Ibid., p. 91.
- 27 Ibid., p. 95.
- 28 Ibid., p. 109.
- 29 There is a review article of it, entitled *Al-Uslūb wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* by 'Adnān Ibn Dhurayl in *Al-Ma'rifah*, Damascus 1978, no.196, pp. 179-198.
- 30 *Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah Lughawiyyah Iḥṣā'iyyah*, Kuwait, 1980.
- 31 Ibid., p. 7.
- 32 Ibid., p. 7.
- 33 Ibid., p. 7.
- 34 Ibid., see p. 8.
- 35 Ibid., p. 8.
- 36 Ibid., p. 12.
- 37 Ibid., p. 14.
- 38 Ibid., p. 14-15.
- 39 Ibid., p. 15.
- 40 Ibid., p. 15.
- 41 Ibid., p. 18.
- 42 Ibid., p. 18.
- 43 Ibid., pp. 18-19.
- 44 Ibid., pp. 23-25.
- 45 Ibid., pp. 26- 27.
- 46 Ibid., pp. 27-28.
- 47 Ibid., p. 28-29.
- 48 Ibid., p. 29.
- 49 Ibid., p. 29.
- 50 Ibid., pp. 32-33.
- 51 Ibid., p. 33.
- 52 Ibid., p. 37.
- 53 Roger Fowler(ed.), *Essays on style and Language*, London 1970, see p. 141.
- 54 Sa'd Maṣlūḥ, *Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah Lughawiyyah Iḥṣā'iyyah*, p.37.
- 55 Ibid., p. 37.
- 56 Ibid., pp. 37-38.
- 57 Ibid., see p. 38.
- 58 Ibid., pp. 39-40.
- 59 Ibid., see p. 40.
- 60 Ibid., pp. 42-45.
- 61 Ibid., see p. 46.
- 62 Ibid., see p. 47.
- 63 Ibid., see p. 47.
- 64 Ibid., p. 48.
- 65 Ibid., p. 51.
- 66 Ibid., see p. 56. See also I. A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism*, London, second edition, 1926, p. 267.
- 67 Ibid., see pp. 56-57.
- 68 Ibid., p. 60.
- 69 Ibid., p. 60-61.
- 70 Ibid., p.123-125.
- 71 'Adnān Ibn Dhurayl, *Al-Lughah wa-Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah*, Damascus 1980, see pp. 5-42.
- 72 Ibid., p. 87.
- 73 Ibid., pp. 87-88.

- 74 Ibid., p. 88.
- 75 Ibid., see pp. 42-48.
- 76 Ibid., p. 97.
- 77 Ibid., see pp. 100-101.
- 78 Ibid., see pp. 101-109.
- 79 Ibid., pp. 109- 111.
- 80 Ibid., pp. 112.
- 81 Ibid., pp. 117.
- 82 Ibid., p. 140.
- 83 Ibid., see pp. 140-146.
- 84 Ibid., p. 157.
- 85 Ibid., p. 163.
- 86 Shukrī Muḥammad 'Ayyād, *Madkhal ilā 'Ilm Al-Uslūb* , Riyadh 1982, p. 7.
- 87 Ibid., see p. 7
- 88 Ibid., p. 7.
- 89 Ibid., see. pp. 23-33.
- 90 Ibid., p. 37.
- 91 Ibid., p. 39.
- 92 Ibid., pp. 39-41.
- 93 Ibid., p. 43.
- 94 Ibid., pp. 44-49.
- 95 Ibid., p. 51.
- 96 Ibid., pp. 52-53.
- 97 Muḥammad 'Abd Al-Muṭṭalib *Al-Balāghah wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* , Cairo 1984, pp. 113-179.
- 98 Ibid., p. 117.
- 99 Ibid., p. 129.
- 100 Ibid., see p. 130.
- 101 Ibid., p. 130.
- 102 Ibid., see pp. 142-147.
- 103 Ibid., see pp. 147--148.
- 104 Ibid., see p. 147.
- 105 Ibid., p. 164.
- 106 Jūzīf Miṣḥāl Shariīm *Dakl Al-Dirāsāt Al-Uslūbiyyah* by , Beirut 1984, p. 7.
- 107 Ibid., p. 11.
- 108 Aḥmad Darwīsh, *Dirāsāt Al-Uslūb: bayn al-Mā'āsarah wa al-Turāth* , Cairo 1984 see pp. 6-7.
- 109 Ibid., see pp. 8-11.
- 110 Ibid., p. 12.
- 111 Ibid., p. 14-16.
- 112 Ibid., pp. 16-18.
- 113 Ibid., p. 21.
- 114 Ibid., pp. 22-24.
- 115 Ibid., p. 26-28.
- 116 Ṣalāh Faḥl *'Ilm Al-Uslūb -- Mabādi'uhu wa Ijrā'ātuḥu* , Beirut 1985, p. 5.
- 117 Ibid., p. 5.
- 118 Ibid., p. 15.
- 119 Ibid., see p. 53.
- 120 Ibid., p. 84.
- 121 Ibid., p. 85.
- 122 Ibid., p. 85.

- 123 Ibid., p. 85.
- 124 Ibid., p. 86.
- 125 Ibid., see pp. 87-113.
- 126 Ibid., see p. 115.
- 127 Ibid., p. 120.
- 128 Ibid., see pp. 129-149.
- 129 Ibid., see pp. 147-161.
- 130 Ibid., pp. 180-183.
- 131 Ibid., see pp. 207--231.
- 132 Ibid., see pp. 208-232.
- 133 See the discussion of Maṣlūḥ's work in this thesis.
- 134 Ṣalāh Faḍl, *'Ilm Al-Uslūb -- Mabādī'uhu wa Ijrā'ātuḥu*, Beirut, 1985, pp. 249-262.
- 135 Ibid., p. 267.
- 136 Sa'd Maṣlūḥ, *Fi Al-Naṣṣ Al-Adabī: Dirāsah Uslūbiyyah Iḥṣā'iyyah*, Jeddah 1991, p. 11.
- 137 Ibid., p. 12.
- 138 Ibid., pp. 26-27.
- 139 Ibid., p. 32.
- 140 Ibid., p. 33.
- 141 Ibid., p. 40.
- 142 Ibid., p. 41.
- 143 Ibid., p. 42.
- 144 Ibid., pp. 55-56.
- 145 Ibid., p. 56.
- 146 Ibid., see pp. 59-61.
- 147 Ibid., pp. 65.
- 148 Ibid., p. 65.
- 149 Ibid., p. 76.
- 150 Ibid., p. 87.
- 151 Ibid., p. 87.
- 152 Ibid., pp. 87-88.
- 153 Ibid., pp. 89-90.
- 154 Ibid., see pp. 94-95.
- 155 Ibid., see pp. 99-101.
- 156 Shukrī 'Ayyād, *Al-Lughah Wa Al- Ibd'ā'*, Cairo 1988, p. 22.
- 157 Katie Wales, *A Dictionary of Stylistics*, London 1989, p. 80.
- 158 Ibid., p. 343.
- 159 David Crystal, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, London 1986, p. 261.
- 160 Shukrī 'Ayyād, *Al-Lughah Wa Al- Ibd'ā'*, Cairo 1988, p. 42.
- 161 See I. A. Richards, *Practical Criticism*, London 1929, p. 182- 182.
- 162 Shukrī 'Ayyād, *Al-Lughah Wa Al- Ibd'ā'*, Cairo 1988, p. 43.
- 163 Katie Wales, *A Dictionary of Stylistics*, London 1989, p. 398.
- 164 Roger Fowler (ed.), *Essays on style and Language*, London 1966, p. 14.
- 165 A. E. Derbyshire, *A Grammar of Style*, London 1971, p. 37.
- 166 Shukrī 'Ayyād, *Al-Lughah Wa Al- Ibd'ā'*, Cairo 1988, p. 47.
- 167 Ibid., see p. 50.
- 168 Katie Wales, *A Dictionary of Stylistics*, London 1989, p. 444.
- 169 Ibid., p. 79.
- 170 Shukrī 'Ayyād, *Al-Lughah Wa Al- Ibd'ā'*, Cairo 1988, p. 60.
- 171 Ibid., pp. 65-66.

- 172 Katie Wales, *A Dictionary of Stylistics* , London 1989, pp. 62-63.
- 173 Richards A . I, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, London 1936, p. 125.
- 174 Katie Wales, *A Dictionary of Stylistics* , London 1989, pp. 116-117.
- 175 Ibid., p. 93.

Chapter Three :

The Search by Arab Scholars for the Roots of Stylistics in Traditional Arabic Literary Criticism:

There is a long article by Muḥammad Al-Hādī Al-Ṭarābulṣī entitled *Maẓāhir Al-Taḥkīr fī Al-Uslūb 'ind Al-'Arab* (Aspects of Thought on Style among the Arabs) in a book entitled *qaḍāyā Al-Adab Al-'Arabī* (Concerns of Arabic literature), Tunis, 1978.¹

His approach, as he puts it, is based on a new reading of Arabic traditional literary criticism, in the light of both modern stylistics and linguistics. For the purpose of supporting this reading, he adduces many quotations.²

First, he examines “the definition of style among the Arabs.” He points out that there is no comprehensive definition of style. The concept of style in Arabic is obscure.³

Style as a *concept* in Arabic first appears in *Al-Bayān wa Al-Tabyīn* by Al-Jāhīz, where it is “one of the raw components of the linguistic material.”⁴ As a *term*, it only appears in Arabic, for the first time, in *Minḥāj Al-Bulaghā' wa Sirāj Al-Udabā'*, by Ḥāzim Al-Qartājannī (608-84,H); he is the first Arab scholar to mention *Uslūb* and to devote a part of his book to the examination of it.

Second, he examines the concept of *Naẓm*, which appears in *Dalā'il Al-I'jāz*, by 'Abd Al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī.. This concept is broached by modernist Arab critics such as 'Alī Al-Jārim and Muṣṭafā Amīn in their book, *Al-Balāghah Al-Wāḍḥah*, where they equate it with *Uslūb*

Third, he examines style as an intellectual or mental model = (*Qālib dhihnī*) so that “style is a colouring induced by a model rather than by character.”⁵

Fourth, he examines style as art, and he finds that various Arab scholars examine it from different artistic perspectives, figurative,

selective and aesthetic.⁶

Fifth, he examines style, as it appears in Arabic texts, as a “tendency” or “distinction.” Style here also differs according to the individual.

Sixth, he finds that Arab scholars agree that style “is to be referred to methods of production of the utterance and that it is embodied in potentialities of the expression.”⁷

Seventh, he examines the concept of style as a person, a message and an age.⁸

Eighth he examines the components of style. “The basic component is, of course, language. Style may then be seen from three angles with respect to language. The first angle is deviation of utterance from ordinary to unusual usage. The second angle is choice, which may appear in individual words or in arrangement of vocabulary. The third angle is that of the concept of style as connotative rather than denotative.”⁹

He concludes that “the concept of style in Arabic has four stages:

1. Stage of birth: this is represented in *Al-Bayān wa Al-Tabyiyn*, by Al-Jāhiz.
2. Stage of development: this is represented in *Dalā'il Al-I'jāz* by 'Abd Al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī in the fifth century.
3. Stage of maturity: this is represented in three works: *Minhāj Al-Bulaghā' wa Sirāj Al-Udabā'* by Ḥāzim Al-Qartājannī, *Al-Muqaddimah* by Ibn Khaldūn, and *Lisān Al-'Arab* by Ibn Manẓūr in the seventh and eighth centuries.

4. Stage of renaissance: this is represented mostly by translations of foreign material.”¹⁰

He concludes that “the Arabs have not completed the examination of stylistics and its essentials in order to establish an ‘Arabic stylistics.’ ”¹¹

The article is by an expert academic in the field; it is a good comprehensive survey, clearly planned and well argued.

In *Al-Lughah wa Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah*, Adnān Ibn Dhūrayl (see above, p177, p180, pppp259-261) examines some aspects of Arabic from the perspective of modern Arab linguisticians and provides a brief outline of their views on language. ¹²

The first work that he considers is Aḥmad Amīn’s *Al-Naqd Al- Adabī* (Literary Criticism), Cairo 1952. Amīn deals with the four elements of literature; “idea”, “emotion,” “imagery” and “style.” His definition of “language” is “a tool for expressing thoughts and meanings.” He calls style *Naẓm*. This can be identified in words (length, use, clarity, beauty,...), in sentences (length, strength, type,...), and in constructions. It can also be identified with respect to the character of the writer, to its historical aspect, to its creativity or to its rhetoric. Amīn indicates the characteristics of style as strength, correctness, clarity and brilliance; he limits the study of style to the rhetorician, while it is for the literary critic to identify the relationship between the features as ideological, emotional, or aesthetic and the characteristics of the writer’s psychology or personality.¹³

The second work examined by Ibn Dhurayl is Aḥmad Al-Shāyib's *Al-Uslūb* (Style), Cairo 1949. In the view of Al-Shāyib the subject of rhetoric is divided into two parts "style" and "literary genres."

In "style", rhetoric studies the rules which, if followed, will make expression effective, elegant and clear. It also examines words, sentences, paragraphs, expressions, then the types, elements, features and music of style.

In "literary genres", rhetoric studies the material of the utterance in its choice, division, and organisation and what is appropriate to each genre and its rules: the story, the essay, the letter, the discussion, history and so on.

Style, in the view of Al-Shāyib, equates with method: method of writing, method of composition, method of choosing words, method of composing them, method of *Naẓm*, method of thought, method of depiction and method of expression. He asserts that style is obviously the verbal element which expresses the meanings, or the *Naẓm* of the utterance: its organisation in order to convey ideas. Then he points out two things: the unity of the elements of the text, which cannot exist alone without each other, and the difference between "scientific style" and "literary style", behind which lies such features as idea, emotion and imagery.

Ibn Dhurayl criticises this definition, in that Al-Shāyib makes no distinction between "the elements of literature", which are "thought", "emotion" and "imagery", and "the elements of style", which are "word-choice", "construction", "context" and "music."¹⁴

The third work examined is Aḥmad Ḥasan Al-Zayyāt's *Difā' 'An Al-*

Balāghah (Defence of Rhetoric), Cairo, second edition 1967. Ibn Dhurayl describes this effort as much better than Al-Shāyib and closer to life and literature. There is more than one definition of style by Al-Zayyāt; style is the method of the poet or writer; style differs according to the writer's theme, or the literary genre; style is a method of creating an idea and of presenting it in the appropriate verbal form. Ibn Dhurayl agrees with one of his definitions: style is the method of the writer; but he finds that Al-Zayyāt mixes up the definition of style with other phenomena such as linguistics, grammar and so on.¹⁵

The fourth book examined is Amīn Al-Khūlī's *Fann Al-Qawl* (The Art of Utterance), Cairo 1947, by this title he signifies rhetoric; he does not speak about style.¹⁶

In 1982 there was a seminar (in Cairo) on stylistics, and in it Al-Hadī Al-Ṭarābulṣī pointed out four matters: there is a science of traditional Arabic rhetoric; there is Arab thought about style; there are practical studies, which are, he claims, unique to Arabic; there are 'aspects of style', as they appear in Arabic literary texts. These four matters together form a whole which we can examine and associate with contemporary stylistic studies.¹⁷

In the same seminar Hammādī Samūd argued that Arab critics had no knowledge of the stylistic theory in its development in the West.¹⁸

One attempt, which I have not been able to see, at searching for the roots of stylistics in traditional Arabic literary criticism is said to be made by 'Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī in *Al-Tafkīr Al-Lisānī fī Al-Ḥaqā'iq Al-'Arabiyyah* (Linguistic Thought in Arab

Civilisation), Tunis 1981.

An article by an active and well-known Egyptian critic in the leading Arabic literary criticism journal, *Fuṣūḥ*,¹⁹ is entitled *Maḥūm Al-Uslūb bayn Al-Turāth Al-Naqdī wa Mūhāwalāt Al-Tajdīd*, (The Concept of style between the Critical Tradition and Attempts at Renewal), by Shukrī ‘Ayyād.

The word *Uslūb* (style) was uncommon in Arabic until the *Mutakallimūn* (Theologians) started to use it in the plural form. It meant different methods of using the language in a manner designed to produce an effect, or as we say nowadays in an “artistic” manner.

‘Ayyād searches in traditional Arabic criticism and rhetoric for this concept, the concept of style as different modes of expression for different topics.

‘Ayyād points out that, Al-Bāqillānī, (d.403 H), associates *Uslūb* with “*Naẓm*” but Al-Khaṭṭābī (319-86 or 388 H), associates it with “method” and “school.”

Hāzim Al-Qartājannī (d.684 H), in *Minhāj Al-Bulaghā’ wa Sirāj Al-Udabā’*, expands the concept to include the scope of the whole literary text.²⁰

Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808 H), develops Al-Qartājannī’s approach in two ways: considering style in association with meaning and considering it as an expression for the application of artistic language.²¹

‘Ayyād examines the present renewal of traditional Arabic rhetoric in Amīn Al-Khūlī’s *Fann Al-Qawl* and Al-Shāyib’s *Al-Uslūb*; this

examination, however, as usual with 'Ayyād, appears to be no more than a general presentation, couched in elevated language.²²

In another work by Aḥmad Darwish, *Dirāsāt Al-Uslūb bayn Al-Turāth wa Al-Mu'āṣarah* (1984), there are many details concerning Arabic rhetoric and its relationships with stylistics.

Another work is entitled *Al-Balāghah wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* (Rhetoric and Stylistics), by Muḥammad 'Abd Al-Muṭṭalib (See above pp 141-118) Cairo 1984.

In his introduction to this book, Al-Muṭṭalib points out the necessity of searching in Arabic rhetoric for the roots of stylistics. His attempt, as he puts it, is "an attempt at a stylistic reading of ancient rhetoric."²³

The first "book" of this work deals with the Concept of Style in the Tradition of the Ancients. He examines here five topics: the concept of style in the tradition of the Easterners (*Al-Mashāriqah*), the concept of style in the tradition of the Maghribis, (*Al-Maghāribah*), the philosophy of grammar, *Al-Naẓm* between rhetoric and grammar and the philosophy of metaphor = (*Majāz*).

The first topic is the concept of style in the tradition of the Easterners (*Al-Mashāriqah*). He says that the word *Uslūb* is used metaphorically for "style", the original meaning being "lengthy road" or "line of palm-trees."²⁴ He studies the concept of style in the views of various ancient Arab critics:

1-Al-Zamakhsharī (467-538-H), *Asās Al-Balāghah*:

2-Ibn Qutaybah (213-276 H), *Ta'wīl Mushkil Al-Qur'ān*

3 - Ibn Al-Athīr (?-637 H), *Al-Mathal Al-Sā'ir Fī Adab Al-Kātib wa Al-Shā'ir*

4-Al-Khattābī (319-386 or 388 H), *Bayān i'jāz AL-Qur'ān*

5-Al-Bāqillānī (-?- 403 H); *I'jāz AL Qur'ān*

6- Al-Fakhr Al-Rāzī (543-606-H), *Nihāyat Al-Īz Fī Dirāyat Al-I'jāz*

7- Al-'Alawī (669-749-H), *Al-Ṭirāz*

8- Al-Sakkākī (555-626), *Miftāḥ Al-'ulum*

9- 'Abd Al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī:, *Dalā'il Al-I'jāz*, and *Asrār Al-Balāghah*.

Al-Muṭṭalib then examines various scholars of the Maghribis, (Al-Magharibah), including the following:

1- Hāzim Al-Qartājannī (608-684-H), *Minhāj Al-Bulaghā' wa Sirāj Al 'Udabā'*

2-Ibn Rashīq Al-Qayrawānī (390-456-H), *Al-'Umdah Fī Ṣnā'at Al-Shi'r wa Naqdih*.

3- Ibn Juza Al-kalbī in (??) *Kitāb Al-Tashīl li 'Ullūm Al-Tanzīl*.

4 - Ibn Khaldūn (732-808 H), *Al-Muqaddimath*

The third topic is the Philosophy of Grammar. There are various factors which led scholars towards linguistic studies, religious, nationalist, social and political. As a result of this tendency, in the fourth century A. H. there appeared a philosophy of grammar.

Al-Muṭṭalib observes of early grammatical studies that “there are two levels; the first concerned with correctness in using the language and the second concerned with aesthetics and innovations.”²⁵

In this section, Al-Muṭṭalib stresses the role of ‘Abd Al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī and his theory of *Naẓm*, which emphasises the aesthetic aspects of sentences and constructions. He goes further, asserting that Al-Jurjānī achieves in his theory something close to the achievement of modern Western linguisticians.

The fourth topic is “*Naẓm* between Grammar and Rhetoric.” Al-Muṭṭalib examines the theory of Abd Al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī, which emphasis the position of the word in the text and the relationships of thought with language.

He relates Al-Jurjānī’s theory, with his distinction between the two levels in examining the language, to the theory of Chomsky in his two concepts: surface and deep structure. Al-Muṭṭalib considers Al-Jurjānī’s theory in terms of external surface and internal levels. He believes that Al-Jurjānī was on the point of moving from examination of the individual sentence to examination of the text as a whole.²⁶

The fifth topic is the Philosophy of *Majāz* = (metaphor, trope). Al-Muṭṭalib’s examination of this phenomenon in traditional Arabic rhetoric includes the opinions of major Arab writers on *Majāz*.

The earliest work on *Majāz* is a book by Abū ‘Ubaydah (died 188,H), entitled *Majāz Al-Qur’ān*. His concept of *Majāz* is not the same as that of traditionalist Arab rhetoricians; he aims to give an explanation

of the concept of the Qurā'n, derived from the speech of the ancient Arabs. Al-Jāhiz, in *Al-Hayawān*, is the first to use the word *Majāz* in the sense of "non-literal", that is, "metaphorical."

Al-Muṭṭalib finds in traditional Arabic literary criticism and rhetoric some of the roots of stylistics such as the connection between style and psychological factors and the mingling of criticism, rhetoric and grammar. In other words, "style" appears to connect the meanings of words and the method of conveying these meanings; alternatively, "style" is connected with the literary genre, with the character of the writer/poet or with the objective of the literary work. However, these features do not create a complete theory of style.

The last part deals with Rhetoric and Stylistics. In this part Al-Muṭṭalib studies various aspects of Arabic rhetoric and finds that they are very close to the stylistic approach. Amongst these aspects are: '*Uḍūl* = deviation, *Al-Takrār Al-Namatī* = the repetition of a pattern, *Siyāq* = context.

As for '*Uḍūl* = deviation, this is a rich area in traditional Arabic rhetoric, literary criticism and grammar. *Taqdīm wa Ta'ḥkīr* = anastrophe; *Ījāz wa Iṭnāb* = brachylogy and prolixity; *Itifāt* = apostrophe, are a few examples.²⁷

The second is *Takrār Namatī* = the repetition of a pattern, this includes such things as: *Saj'*, *Tarsi'*, *Tajnīs*, *Mu'āḥḥalah*, and *Mushākalah*.

He concludes that: the attempts of Arab rhetoricians here explore possibilities of language; their efforts are remarkable, but they are unable to arrive at a stylistic approach to the understanding of the

artistic side of the literary work; they cannot connect these tools to the structure of the literary work in such a way as to be able to analyse the process of invention.²⁸

The third is *Siyāq* = context. The traditional Arab vision or concept of the contextual relationship is based on language and artistic expression and connected with semantics and rhetoric.

Al-Muṭṭalib observes of the Arab rhetoricians in respect of *Siyāq* that their starting points are the following:

- (1)- Determining the capacities of the language and what it can produce in actual utterance;
- (2)- Relating stylistic variety to context; they do not have a comprehensive view extending from the word to the sentence.

A book by Naṣr Ḥamid Abū Zayd is entitled *Ishkāliyyāt Al-Qirā'ah wa Āliyyāt Al-Ta'wīl* (Problems of reading and Mechanism of Interpretation), second edition, Casablanca/Beirut, 1992.

In this book, there is a chapter which deals with *Mafhūm Al-Naẓm* 'Ind 'Abd Al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī -- *Qirā'ah fī Daw' Al-Uslūbiyyah* (The Concept of *Naẓm* in 'Abd Al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī -- A Reading in the Light of Stylistics.)²⁹ In this chapter, Abū Zayd examines various matters such as language and poetry, *Naẓm*, style and the role of the speaker, meaning and style, style and metaphor.

The first topic is "language and poetry." Abū Zayd says that nowadays the most important matter in stylistic studies is the relationship between language and poetry, and that the reason for this is the examination of poetry as the literary genre most

expressive of the features of "literature."³⁰

The fundamental topic of the two books of 'Abd Al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī, *Asrār Al-Balāghah* and *Dalā'il Al-I'jāz*, is "the difference between levels of utterance" = (*Mustawayāt Al-Kalām*). These levels range from "ordinary utterance" to *Al-Kalām Al-Mu'jiz* = (*Mu'jiz* utterance.) "³¹ Abū Zayd assumes that 'Abd Al-Qāhir examines "literary utterance." "*I'jāz* in the view of 'Abd Al-Qāhir lies in the text itself, so that he is trying to establish "the science of poetry; in this concept he comes close to the modern stylistic notion that poetry is utterance which originates in language, but has features which place it within the boundaries of "art"; and these are features which can be defined."³²

Al-Jurjānī bases his concept of *Naẓm* on the distinction between one utterance and another utterance, with regard to whether it is "artistic" or "literary."

Abū Zayd agrees with Muṣṭafā Nāṣif that Al-Jurjānī (d. 471 or 474.H) in *Dalā'il Al-I'jāz* attempts to establish a relationship between the study of literature and grammatical matters which are related to the system of words or the construction of phrases.³³

Abū Zayd concludes that there is a similarity between the "science of grammar" and the *Naẓm* of Al-Jurjānī, this allows him to say that the concept of *Naẓm* is very close to the concept of "style" and becomes the *Naẓm* which the "science of grammar" sees as the "science of literature" or the "science of poetry." Thus the "science of poetry" in his view is based on a strong linguistic base which he will examine in the second section.

The second topic is *Naẓm* and style". Al-Jurjānī associates *Naẓm* and

the “science of grammar”, but what he means by grammar is the differences between different styles of “utterance.” Al-Jurjānī uses the word *Uslūb* to distinguish between one *Naẓm* and another. *Uslūb* is a kind of *Naẓm*, and when Al-Jurjānī studies *Iʿtidhāʾ* = (imitation), he is referring to similarity in the means of expression.³⁴

The third topic is “style and the role of the speaker.” The difference between some poetry and other poetry and one utterance and another utterance is related to the particular ability of the speaker in formulating the language and in reshaping it; in other words, it is related to *Naẓm*.

Al-Jurjānī understands the effect of the role of the speaker or the poet in creating *Uslūb* or in other words, in formulating: thus according to this concept style cannot be imitated but can be followed = not *taqlid* but *Iʿtidhāʾ*³⁵

The fourth topic is “meaning and style.” There is a misunderstanding of the thought of Al-Jurjānī, by some Arab scholars that his thought is based on the dualism between “meaning” = *Maʿnā* and “style or *Naẓm*. The confusion lies in that he sometimes uses the word “meaning” = *Maʿnā* when it denotes “objective” = *Gharad*, which is the “idea” and sometimes uses it when he means “semantics”, and he believes that the value of poetry is in *Naẓm* and formulation.³⁶

The sixth topic is *Majāz* and style. Al-Jurjānī expands the concept of *Naẓm* to cover *Majāz*. At the end of this study Abū Zayd asserts that the field is rich enough to be worth further reading and more research.³⁷

Notes

- 1 Muḥammad Al-Hādī Al-Tarābulṣī, *Ma ẓahir Al-Taḥkīr fī Al-Uslūb 'ind Al-'Arab* in *Qadāyyā Al-Adab Al-'Arabī*, Tunis 1978, pp.257-298.
- 2 Ibid., see p.258.
- 3 Ibid., see p. 258.
- 4 Ibid., p. 262.
- 5 Ibid., p. 267.
- 6 Ibid., see p. 272.
- 7 Ibid., p. 276.
- 8 Ibid., see p. 279.
- 9 Ibid., p. 284.
- 10 Ibid., p. 297.
- 11 Ibid., p. 298.
- 12 'Adnān Ibn Dhūrayl, *Al-Lughah wa Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah*, Damascus 1980, see pp. 172-190.
- 13 Ibid., see pp. 173-178.
- 14 Ibid., See pp. 178-183.
- 15 Ibid., see p. 183-186.
- 16 Ibid., see p. 186-188.
- 17 *Fuṣūl*, volume 5, number 1, 1984, p. 214.
- 18 Ibid., p. 215.
- 19 *Fuṣūl*, volume 1, number 1, 1980, pp. 49-58.
- 20 Ibid., see p.51.
- 21 Ibid., see p.51.
- 22 Ibid., see pp. 53-58.
- 23 Muḥammad 'Abd Al-Muṭṭalib, *Al-Balāghah wa Al-Uslūbiyyah*, Cairo 1984, p. 9.
- 24 Ibid., see p. 12.
- 25 Ibid., p. 35.
- 26 Ibid., see p. 49.
- 27 Ibid., pp. 198-214.
- 28 Ibid., see p. 227.
- 29 Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū Zayd, *Ishkāliyyāt Al-Qirā'ah wa Āliyyāt Al-Ta'wīl*, second edition, Casablanca/Beirut, 1992. See pp.149-211.
- 30 Ibid., see p. 154.
- 31 Ibid., p. 155.
- 32 Ibid., see pp. 155-162.
- 33 Ibid., see p. 162.
- 34 Ibid., see pp. 162-165.
- 35 Ibid., see pp. 165-172.
- 36 Ibid., see p. 175.
- 37 Ibid., see p. 183.

Chapter Four:

Recognised Arab
Stylisticians and
their Employment of
the Stylistic
Approach
for investigation of
Arabic Literary
Materials

There are a considerable number of Arab scholars who have been labelled as stylisticians; most of them are academics producing works on the stylistic approach in both theory and practice.

‘Alī ‘Izzat, who has produced several articles introducing the stylistic approach to the Arab reader, applies this approach to Arabic poetry. His publications are in both English and Arabic. He has an Anglo-Saxon background.

Muḥammad ‘Abd Al-Muṭṭalib has produced a book on stylistics and Arabic rhetoric. This book indicates his deep understanding of both Western stylistics and Arabic rhetoric. His effort in this book to prove the richness of Arabic rhetoric is good, readable and remarkable.

‘Adnān Ibn Dhurayl, in the early 80s, introduced the stylistic approach to the Arab reader. In publishing his work on stylistics and style he has collected his articles, with few material. He demonstrates a good knowledge of language studies in French and Arabic, and in particular of the stylistic approach. He introduces the various linguistic theories and applies them eclectically to texts in practical criticism. Most of his work originally appears in newspapers and journals.

Shukrī Muḥammad ‘Ayyād(see abovepp.109-114,pp149-156) is an active Arab critic, with good modern literary connections and a background of Arabic knowledge. He is deeply concerned with the stylistic approach and aims to establish a new Arabic stylistic approach, with the benefit of both traditional Arabic rhetoric and modern literary stylistics. Jūsif Mishāl Sharīm(see abovepp118-121,), who has produced a guide for the Arab stylistic

researcher, shows in his book a knowledge of this approach in French and in English, from both of which languages his sources come. He provides a practical study for poetry and prose which follows this approach.

Muḥammad Al-Hādī Al-Ṭarābulṣī (see above, pp.162-64) has introduced the stylistic approach through translation, book reviews and application of it to Arabic poetry. His practical stylistics for poetry, which is discussed in Chapter One, Part Two of this thesis, is a unique work, which benefits from both traditional Arabic rhetoric and western stylistics. It is a remarkable, excellent work to be welcomed in modern Arabic practical literary criticism.

‘Abd Al Sallām Al-Masaddī (see above, pp. 75-82,166-7) is well-known in the Arab world for modern literary criticism and traditional Arabic rhetoric, in both theory and practice. In the seventies he introduced the stylistic approach seriously to the Arabic reader. His work mainly aims to establish this approach and to make its concepts known in the Arab world. His work shows his interest in applying this approach for the Arab reader. On several occasions he provides practical criticism which follows this approach. Sa‘d Maṣlūḥ (see above, pp.82-100) has produced more than one book on this approach. He covers in his books different aspects in both theory and practice for prose and poetry. His main concern, in two of his books, is the statistical stylistic approach both in elucidating the theory and in applying it to prose and poetry, and in providing useful lists of equivalent terms for the topic in Arabic and English. These are the most important stylisticians in the Arab world. This section does not aim to cover all Arab stylisticians, but rather to

indicate those who are represented in academic literary life.

Sa'd Maṣlūḥ's book, *Al-Uslūb --- Dirāsah Lughawīyyah Iḥṣā'īyyah* (Style -- A Statistical Linguistic Study), Kuwait 1980 has a section in which he applies the stylistic approach to various Arabic novels and plays.

Chapter Six of this book is devoted to examples of prose styles. The aim of this section is not to examine his employment of the stylistic approach to Arabic texts in detail, but to prove that Arab stylisticians have done much practical criticism using the stylistic approach.

It is interesting to consider the results of his practical criticism, from passages from the autobiographies of two Arab writers. The style of *Al-Ayyām* (The Days) by Ṭāhā Ḥusayn has more of a literary and emotional imprint; *Ḥayāt Qalam* (The Life of a Pen) by 'Abbās Al-'Aqqād has a rational and intellectual imprint. The style of *Al-Ayyām* is more sensitive and responsive to the variety of the subjects, whereas in *Ḥayāt Qalam* the character of the writer appears to dominate his style, which weakens the impact of the subjects on his work ¹ Maṣlūḥ also examines, very briefly, pieces from Arab newspapers, using statistical stylistics.² Chapter Seven is devoted to examining "Style in the Play." Maṣlūḥ examines style in four plays by Aḥmad Shawqī. These examinations will not be considered in detail.³

Chapter Eight is devoted to examining "Style in the Novel." He examines a novel by Muḥammad 'Abd Al-Ḥalīm 'Abd Allāh (*Ba'd AL*

-*Ghurūb*) (After Sunset) and another by Najīb Mahfūz, *Mirāmār*.⁴

Part three of a book by ‘Adnān Ibn Dhūrayl, *Al-Lughah wa Al-Uslūb* -- Dirāsah (Language and Style -- A Study), Damascus, 1980, contains practical studies of parts of novels or plays from a stylistic perspective.

In this book he studies parts of different Syrian novels by different novelists. In one section, he points out various, morphological, grammatical and con structural features, indicating that these are stylistic features.⁵ He examines various constructions in part of one novel.⁶

Ibn Dhurayl examines stylistic features of a play entitled *Ri ʿāṭ Qaysar* (The Approval of Caesar), by ‘Alī ‘Uqlah ‘Ursān. He points out some grammatical features and the changes made by the playwright in his text. His notes on the play are very brief and cursory. In another short note on part of another novel, he indicates some morphological features which he sees as stylistic features.⁷ His practical criticism covers no complete work; it consists merely of short passing observations.

Another book is by ‘Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī, entitled *Qirā’āt ma’a Al-Shābbī wa Al-Mutanabbī wa Al-Jāhiz wa Ibn Khaldūn* (Readings with Al-Shābbī, Al-Mutanabbī, Al-Jāhiz’s and Ibn Khaldūn), Tunis 1984.

In this book, as a stylistician, he attempts to examine Arabic prose texts from a stylistic perspective.

He introduces the part which is devoted to an examination of Al-Jāhiz’s *Kitāb Al-Bayān wa Al-Tabyīn*, by stating that it is “a revision of a previous article.”⁸

He examines various terms which appear in the book such as ;*Balāghah* = “rhetoric”; *Iblāgh* = “conveying or communication” and *Ifṣāḥ* = “eloquence (fluency).” He examines these terms and their classification according to content, semantic type, aim, regularity and percentage.⁹

Al-Masaddī, examines Al-Jāhiz’s norms of stylistic criticism. The first is the “principle of choice of words” which involves choosing the actual structure of words = *Bunyat Al-Alfāz* The words must be comprehensible (not unusual), with a restricted range of meaning.

The second norm is the “principle of “choice of *Naẓm* = (arrangement, structure, syntax) of the linguistic material.” The third norm is the “principle of the inherence of stylistic construction in the artistic linguistic arrangement”¹⁰ .

In this chapter, an expert in stylistics identifies features of style as conceived of by an early Arab critic. His insight into both fields allows him to produce a useful, readable, and original work.

In the last part of his book, *Al-Lughah wa Al-Ibdāʿ, --- Mabādīʿ ʿIlm Al-Uṣlūb Al-ʿArabī* (Language and Innovation -- The Principles of the Arabic Science of Style), Cairo 1988, Shukrī ʿAyyād analyses a poem by Al-Mutanabbī. His method of analysis is a mixture of traditional Arabic rhetoric and Western stylistics.

He borrows from traditional Arabic literary criticism the discussion about the occasion = (*Munāsabah*) of production of the poem, and he refers to traditional Arab critics such as Ḥāzīm Al-Qarṭajānī. He also examines features of traditional Arabic rhetoric, such as, simile, image and metaphor.¹¹

Applying modern stylistics, he deals with the semantics of the verbs and nouns, the 'movements' in the text, the internal and external relationships.

A book by Ḥamīd Al-Ḥamadānī, entitled *Uslūbiyyat Al-Riwāyah -- Madkhal Naẓarī* (Stylistics of the Novel -- A Theoretical Introduction) Casablanca 1989, consists of an introduction and six chapters: Style of the Novel and Critique of the Novelistic Style; Style in the Fields of Monologisme and Dialogisme; Style and Rhetoric of the Novel; Language and Style in Narrative; the Novel and the Unlimited Components of Rhetoric; and finally Dialogue, Stylistisation, Pure Dialogue and an analysis of Bakhtin's views.

In his introduction to this study, Al-Ḥamadānī states that "neither Arabic nor western criticism pay enough attention to examining the style of the novel."¹² His study, he claims, is the first attempt in the Arab world to examine the stylistics and rhetoric of the novel and to illustrate its nature and aesthetics.¹³

Chapter One deals with "Style of the Novel and Critique of the Novelistic Style." The main axis of this study is "a theoretical introduction of a new stylistics to study the novelistic art by distinguishing the essential differences between the style of lyric poetry and the style of the novel and the boundaries of a stylistic analysis of both the linguistic and the rhetoric of the novel."¹⁴

In searching for "a new stylistic method of studying the novel", we have to take into consideration terms used by Bakhtin, related to this field: plurilinguisme; polyphonie; dialoguesime and stylistisation.¹⁵

The concern of this study is with "the relationship between the novelist and his novel, the relationship between the individual stylistic phone (voice) and the stylistic phones of the different characters and the stylisation of the different phones in the novel."¹⁶

Al-Ḥamadani notes, in his review of the traditional rhetoric of criticism, that it is dominated by individual views on the definition of style in literary genres, including the novel. He claims that the essential elements of the definition of style are not the practitioners themselves but the particular literary genres, the distinctive characteristics of which control the author and keep him subject to their general tradition. This, however, is not to deny the existence of individual features in the writing of given authors.¹⁷

He concludes that the novel should be considered as a whole, and not simply from the point of view of its linguistic features. Nor is it satisfactory to consider the stylistic features of the genre, and then the particular features of the author. Every stylistic study has to be considered as two matters: an examination of the minor stylistic elements in the light of the totality of the novel, in order to ascertain its position within the general context of the novel, and a consideration of the general characteristics of the literary genre examined.¹⁸

Al-Ḥamadani asserts that the new stylistics of the novel is based on the views of Bakhtin and of other Russian critics. These are based on Bakhtin's criticism of classical stylistics in that it concentrates on the stylistic unity of the novelist; he explains that

the novel differs from lyrical poetry in the analysis of their styles, voices and languages. The sample of the examination of a novel that he provides is by an Arab critic who uses the statistical stylistic approach.

The Second Chapter deals with "Style in the Fields of Monologuisme and Dialoguisme - an examination of the comprehensive and the single vision of reality in the novel." In this chapter he provides practical criticism of one Arabic novel, *Al-Waṭan fī Al-'Aynayn* (The Homeland in one's Eyes) by Ḥamīdah Na'na'. He finds that the aesthetic and semantic values of this novel come not from the use of dialogue, but from other elements such as poetic language and historical reference.¹⁹

The Third Chapter deals with "Style and Rhetoric of the Novel." The rhetoric of the novel does not always derive from the means of expression. It may emanate in a metaphorical manner from a consideration of the total relationships of the novelistic text.²⁰

Chapter Four deals with "Language and Style in Narrative." Bakhtin distinguishes between the language of the novelist and the style of his novel, in that the novel has not only one language but several languages, voices, and styles; all these are the "stylistics of the novel." The stylistics of the novel does not lie in the language in which the novelist writes; it lies in the relation between these languages. They have no value in themselves but only in their connection with each other. The novelist usually does not speak in his own particular style but transmigrates through the various styles of his characters.²¹

Chapter Five deals with "the Novel and the Unlimited Components

of Rhetoric.” “The rhetoric of the novel has to take into consideration the relationships of the stylistic characteristics with the particular characteristics of this genre itself.”²²

He points out that the technical tools of the stylistics and rhetoric of the novel are unlimited: that the novelist faces endless possibilities for attracting the attention of the reader in an aesthetic sense.

Chapter Six, the last chapter, deals with “Dialogisme: *Tahjīn* = L’hybridation; *Aslabah* = stylisation; pure dialogue; analysis of the point view of “Bakhtin.”

The speaker = (*Al-Mutakallim*) in the novel, according to Bakhtin’s view, is not only the novelist but every character who has a voice in the novel; the novelist becomes merely one voice. The novel with dialgeoisme is a novel which has more than one voice in it.

Another book by Sa’d Maṣlūḥ, *Fī Al-Naṣṣ Al-Adabī -- Dirāsah Uslūbiyyah Iḥṣā’iyyah* (On the Literary Text -- A Statistical Stylistic Study), Jeddah 1991, deals with the analysis of non-fictional prose by the stylistic approach.

In Part Two of this work, Maṣlūḥ examines “The measuring of a peculiarity of diversification of vocabulary in the styles of Al-’Aqqād, Al-Rāfi’ī and Ṭāhā Ḥusayn. He justifies his choice in that these three literary figures are important in modern Arabic literature in two respects: Arab thought and the development of Arabic style. The concern of this section is to give an outline of how Arab stylisticians are using stylistics to examine Arabic prose.

The most important of his results is that the most diversified of

the three styles is that of Al-'Aqqād; the least diversified is that of Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, with that of Al-Rāfi'ī coming in between.²³

In Part Two, Chapter One of this study, there are more examples of application of the stylistic approach to Arabic poetry.

Notes

- 1 Sa'd Maṣlūḥ, *Dirāsah Lughawīyah I /ṣā'īyah*, Kuwait 1980 pp. 75-76.
- 2 Ibid., pp. 76-77.
- 3 Ibid., pp.81-97.
- 4 Ibid., pp.101-120.
- 5 'Adnān Ibn Dhūray, *Al-Lughah wa Al-Uslūb* - - Dirāsah, Damascus 1980, see, pp.207-208, 214-216,218- 221.
- 6 Ibid., see p. 223.
- 7 Ibid., see.pp. 212-213.
- 8 'Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī, *Qirā'āt ma'a Al-Shābbī wa Al-Mutanabbī wa Al-Jāhī Ḥ wa Ibn Khaldūn* Tunis 1984,pp. 8-9
- 9 Ibid., see. p.125.
- 10 Ibid., pp. 30-31.
- 11 Shukrī 'Ayyād, *Al-Lughah wa Al-Ibdā' --- Mabādī' 'Ilm Al-Uslūb Al-'Arabī*, Cairo, 1988, pp. 132-140.
- 12 Ḥamīd Al-Hamadānī, *Uslūbiyyat Al-Riwāyah -- Madkhal Nazarī*, Casablanca 1989, p. 4.
- 13 Ibid., see.p. 7.
- 14 Ibid., see. p.9.
- 15 Ibid., see.p9.
- 16 Ibid., p.9.
- 17 Ibid., see pp.9-10.
- 18 Ibid., see. pp.14-15.
- 19 Ibid., see. pp. 36-52.
- 20 Ibid., see. pp. 53-66.
- 21 Ibid., see. pp. 70-77.
- 22 Ibid., p. 79.
- 23 Sa'd Maṣlūḥ, *Fī Al-Naṣṣ Al-Adabī -- Dirāsah Uslūbiyyah I/ṣā'īyah*, Jeddah 1991, see p. 121.

Chapter Five:

The Stylistic Approach in the Leading Arabic Literary Journals

There are different aspects of the stylistic approach: explaining the nature of the approach, providing translations of material on it holding seminars relating to the topic, devoting entire issues of Arabic literary journals to it and reviewing new books on it, both in Arabic and in English.

One article on the stylistic approach is by Mūrīs Abū Nāḍir a Lebanese critic, who has a serious concern with modern criticism and linguistics, and who has published a considerable number of books and articles about linguistics and literary criticism. This article is entitled *Al-Uslūb wa 'Ilm Al-Uslūb* (Style and the Science of Style) ¹

In this article he studies various important aspects of stylistics. The first is "the definition of style and stylistics." " 'Style is a method of writing which distinguishes a writer/poet from others in the same field, or distinguishes a literary genre from others or distinguishes an age from other ages.'"² Style is a deviation and it is the method by which things are said and the method of saying things.³ " 'Stylistics' is the scientific method of the study of style."⁴

He reviews the stylistic schools and their basic concepts. The first efforts of Charles Bally are early stylistic studies, in which he concentrates on the study of the emotional in utterance, but after him his followers expand the field of the study of style to include literary style, to be examined in the same way with respect to the emotional concept.⁵

He then examines Spitzer's efforts in his concern with the use of language whether collectively or individually. His explanation of

the most important principles of this school can be summarised as follows: criticism of the text must come from the text and not by examining outside elements such as literary history and its division into romantic and classical schools.

The literary work is a united whole; every secondary part of the text must help us to enter the heart of the text. The starting point is the distinctive linguistic features. The most important point is the deviation of the style from ordinary style. Stylistic criticism is a symmetrical criticism. It is mainly concerned with individual use of language as embodied in the literary text.⁶

Next Abū Nāḍir examines stylistics in the view of Guiraud, in using the statistical concept to discover the peculiar structures of the units that are the components of the writer's style, and in using the concept of recurring words and themes and the concept of the key word.

Riffeterre's essays on stylistics examine the reactions of the reader to the text and deviation from normal style.

In this article he studies aspects of formalism and communication, but without providing references. However, it is useful as an introduction to the topic for the Arab reader.

One issue of the leading literary journal *Fuṣūl* is devoted to "Contemporary Literary Critical Approaches." Among these approaches, there is a section which is devoted to the stylistic approach. In it, there are various articles, such as two introducing the topic, a translation of an article explaining an aspect of stylistics, and an article on the practical stylistics of

Arabic poetry.⁷

One of the articles that introduce the topic is entitled *Al-Uslūbiyyah Al-Ḥadīthah -- Muḥāwalaṭ Ta'rīf* (Modern Stylistics -- an Attempt at A Definition), by Maḥmūd 'Ayyād.⁸ This article is an introduction which examines various topics.

The first topic is "the Essence of the Science of Style." "It is a field of modern studies that examines literary and non-literary texts, attempting to achieve an objective method as a basis for analysing style. In order to elucidate the visions of the writer's works and to discover the aesthetic values of these works, the starting points, in 'Ayyād's analysis, are in the linguistic, rhetorical phenomena of the text."⁹ Furthermore, he notes: that the stylistic approach is different from other literary approaches in that it is based on an objective method and on the principles of the science of language. Nevertheless, it is concerned with the literary text and consideration of the text is the starting point and the end point in analysing the text.¹⁰

The second topic is " 'The Three Fundamental Methods of the Study of the Stylistic Approach,' which are as follows:

- 1- Examining literary style by considering it as transgressing or breaking the standard style or deviating from it.
- 2- Examining literary style by considering it as a kind of repetition of certain similar linguistic features.
- 3- Examining literary style by considering it as a device for exploiting the capacity of the language and attempting to formulate rules for the possibilities of this capacity."¹¹

The third topic is "the Failure of Stylistics." Even though all the above schools have achieved a considerable advance in literary study and literary criticism, they have not reached a level where they can be an alternative to traditional criticism. Furthermore, stylistics has not been able until now to produce a complete theory to assist in interpreting or evaluating literary texts.¹²

The fourth topic is "The Problems of Stylistic Methods." On the one hand, stylistics is still a partial study and has not reached the level of an "integrated method" which covers the whole of the literary work, and on the other hand, it has not reached the level of a "distinctive method" which separates the study of literary texts from other linguistic studies of other texts. One aspect of the stylistic approach is that it isolates the text as a closed work in itself from societal references. But the fact is that we cannot ignore the social context of the text.¹³

The sixth topic is "stylistics and literary criticism." 'Ayyād raises the question as to whether stylistics can be an alternative literary criticism. This is a question which is still without a final answer.¹⁴

This article is serious and behind it lies hard work and deep knowledge of the topic, ability in argument and discussion. It is extremely good.

Another aspect of examining style is the study of the science of language and literary criticism, and this is addressed in another article, entitled '*Ilm Al- Lughah wa Al-Naqd Al-Adabī -- 'Ilm Al- Uslūb*', (The Science of Language and Literary Criticism -- "the Science of Stylistics") by 'Abdūh Al-Rājiḥī.¹⁵

He puts forward an interesting argument as an introduction to the examination of stylistics. It is on "the Historical Relationship Between the Science of Language and Literary Criticism." "Since ancient times, linguistic studies have been related to literary texts. This appears both in the East and in the West."¹⁶

The Arabs had some sort of "special linguistic study" for their traditional literary texts. This type of examination does not derive from a clear theory or a determined method. It consists of partial linguistic observations without critical basis.

"With the beginnings of the modern linguistic renaissance in the West, De Saussure advocates that the subject of the science of language is only language in itself and for itself. Modern linguisticians assert that the science of language is based on two fundamental principles: it is a science, and it is autonomous."¹⁷

The reason why they separate it from various other disciplines, and particularly literary criticism, is because it is "humane" and "evaluative."

De Saussure arrives at the assertion that the science of language studies the language which represents the collective character of society and must not take into consideration the "language of the singular", because it is produced from "consciousness" and it is characterised by free "choice."¹⁸

Then Bloomfield asserts that the study of "meaning" is the weakest point in the science of language. As a result of all that is mentioned above, a division has come about between linguistic study and critical study.

Even though the science of language is marked by precision and “objectivity”, it fails in its “humanity” and becomes only a pure “description”, flooded with terms and artistic symbols, which appear useless, are strange for non-specialists in the field and may not be of practical use.

Following this period, the science of language recovers some “humanity” with the insistence of Chomsky and his followers on dismissing the “surface” description of language and on support for the rational interpretation of language, which is the most important distinctive feature of the human being, because it is creative and cannot be subordinated to mechanical explanation. For this reason, the science of language must be examined in the light of “human nature” which emphasises this “capacity” of human beings in language; this shows that there are two important aspects, “competence” and “performance.” These are both attempts to create “deep structure” and “surface structure”: this was the motivation for using the theme of “rationality or mind” and the theme of “psychology.” Finally linguisticians have come back to using “the linguistic devices” of literary criticism in what is what now called stylistics.

Al-Rājiḥī offers some definitions: “style” is “ an individual form of variation in language; stylistics aims to describe some variations of language; stylistics is the study of "how" things are said; stylistics is descriptive and evaluative.”¹⁹

Then Al-Rājiḥī examines three trends of stylistics, as follows:

- 1 --- General Stylistics, which is not a practical method but only states the general rules which guide stylistic studies in any

language. He identifies the work of two scholars, Halliday and Ullmann.²⁰

2.---- "Practical Stylistics, which studies the characteristics of styles in a specific language. It aims to examine the expressive capacities of a specific language. It studies the varieties but not on an individual basis."²¹ Al-Rājiḥī mentions David Crystal and Derek Davy's work *Investigating English Style* (1966), where they study non-literary language such as the language of journalism, the language of religion, the language of sport and the language of the documents of the law. Other examples are Leech, *A Linguistic Guide To English Poetry* (1969), and David Lodge, in *Language of Fiction: Essays in Criticism and Verbal Analysis of The English Novel* (1966).

"The aim of this trend is to present the general stylistic environment of a certain linguistic variety, on the basis of context or attitude or on the basis of literary type. The followers of this trend apply general stylistics in the analysis of the different levels on the bases of sounds, words and constructions."²²

3 ---- "Studies of the Language of a Specific Person as Represented in his Literary Work: this trend is the most dominant in stylistic studies. It puts under the microscope the language of a writer by various methods of analysis, and attempts thereby to achieve objective norms."²³

"However there are three linguistic trends in analysing the text in this discipline, as below:

1- The Psychological Trend derives from the concept that the "

‘style is the person.’ This trend asserts that the study of style cannot be valid until it examines the psychology of the writer. An example of this type is the practical studies by Spitzer on various writers, which are influenced by Freud’s theory of psychoanalysis. Spitzer has his approach, called the ‘Philological Circle,’ which is a method rejected by most linguisticians.

2- “Functional Stylistics argues that the literary work should be analysed on the basis of the context. This trend is represented in the work of Firth and his followers.

“ This method is based on the fact that each word is part of a sentence, each sentence is part of a paragraph and each paragraph is part of a text. The stylistician must study the function of each part in the “context” of the artistic work. He can do this by restricting the field of study to a single poem, to a collection, to artistic works over a certain period of time, to the whole output of a certain writer, or to a complete genre, in order to define the general characteristics of a culture.

3- “ The Statistical Trend. This kind of stylistic studies is the dominant one. According to this trend, it is important for the stylistician who is using this kind of study to observe in detail the level of accruing of a certain linguistic phenomenon in a certain personal style. This trend asserts that the stylistician must study the basics of statistical science sufficiently to be able to use it.”²⁴

Al-Rājiḥī discusses statistical trends in detail. He points to the effect on the reader of the overflowing of the studies with diagrams. The reader is not familiar with the strange kind of language, or the strange method of examining the text by using

statistics.²⁵

Furthermore, the statistical approach has various imperfections or weak points, such as that it needs a huge body of material to be examined. Some phenomena can be observed with the naked eye. The infatuation with numbers deceives us into thinking that the approach is precise. The danger of reducing the text to numbers leads to lack of understanding of the effect of “the context” in the literary work, which is so important in understanding the text. The statistical stylistician is unable to catch such matters as the emotion, tones, rhyme and others.²⁶

Nevertheless, the statistical approach has positive points. For example, it presents the literary materials in a precise way, it helps in finding solutions for literary problems such as the attribution of texts of uncertain authorship and assists in understanding “historical development” in literary texts. It leads to searching for the meanings of repeated or reoccurring linguistic phenomena in texts. Finally, it leads to the discovery of “determined norms” in the distribution of the stylistic elements in a certain author which raises questions which can benefit the aesthetic interpretation.²⁷

Al-Rājiḥī ends his section on “Stylistic Trends” by asserting that “stylisticians have no objection to using any of them according to the circumstances.”²⁸

Following this, he examines the “Three Levels of Analysis”, phonostylistics, constructions and words, as follows:

1- The Analysis of Phonostylistics: “This level needs first of

All, a knowledge of the phonological characteristics of ordinary language, then observation of the phenomena which deviate from ordinary language and, finally, investigation of its meaning in a way suggested by stylistic studies.”²⁹

mostly, this phonological analysis does not analyse the details of the literary text such as its consonants and vowels unless it has a remarkable level of repetition to be explained. The most important aspects of this level of analysis are pause, metre, rhythm, intonation, stress and syllable. ³⁰

2- “ constructions: the stylistic approach considers that the study of ‘constructions’ is a very important element in searching for the distinctive features of a certain writer. In general, the stylistician aims at studying the following elements: the length or shortness of the sentence; basic elements of the construction; topic and comment; the verb; the subject; the relationship between the adjective and that which it qualifies; the genitives construction; connectives; and other things the arrangement of the construction; time and verbal forms; active and passive; deep structure according to transformational grammar. This kind of examination of the constructions of a certain writer helps both the understanding of many unclear matters in the text and to identify what the author adds to styles of language. The study of constructions by stylisticians is not limited to examining the sentence or part of it but range from the paragraph to the whole of the work .”³¹

3- THE WORDS OR LEXIS: This is the most important element

in stylistic analysis because it has great influence on the meanings. The stylistician studies at this level the word and its constructions and particularly morphemes, derivative forms and their effects on ideas, collocations, figurative language and metaphor.³²

Al-Rājī's article is readable and useful, covering most of the important points in the field. Its language is clear and adequate, it demonstrates academic experience and it shows a good knowledge of the topic from original sources.

'Adnān Ibn Dhurayl is a Syrian critic mainly concerned with modern Western literary criticism. He is one of the critics who have attempted to introduce the stylistic approach to the Arab reader.

One of his articles is entitled *Al-Uslūbiyyah*, (Stylistics).³³ In this brief article he examines various matters which are related to stylistics, as follows: The first topic is the definition of stylistics; it is "a modern scientific linguistic method, which examines the linguistic tools which make the ordinary or literary discourse distinctive in its expressive and poetic characteristics from other discourses."³⁴

The most important feature of stylistics is that it is scientific, describing events and classifying them in a methodical, objective way. Rhetoric studies stylistics by using critical norms in that it teaches the best of the utterance = (*Al-Kalām*).

Stylisticians have two different attitudes to rhetoric; "Some turn away totally from it, but others are still using the analysis of rhetorical devices in examining style. They consider that

stylistics is indispensable to rhetoric and literary criticism. Linguistic examination in itself is a bridge to the history of literature.”³⁵

The second topic is the historical view of the stylistic approach. He starts with the role of Charles Bally, who studies style in the light of scientific linguistics, because he was so attracted by the structuralist view of language that he based his study of style on it. He was eager to reinforce stylistics as a science and to distinguish it particularly from ancient stylistic criticism. In 1909 he published his book, *Traité de Stylistique française*, Heidelberg. His stylistics is based on emotional and expressive language. His attempt is considered as the first step in scientific stylistics.

Ibn Dhurayl then examines the role of one of the students of Bally, Marcel Cressot, who transformed the expressive concept in stylistic studies into the aesthetic concept.³⁶

After this, Ibn Dhurayl studies the efforts of Pierre Guiraud, who studies the relationship between stylistic studies and rhetoric and argues that they both have the same subject matter; the art of writing, construction, utterance, and literature.³⁷

Following this, in 1965, Tzvetan Todorov translated the works of the Russian formalists into French. This influenced stylistic studies in two aspects, explaining its subject in both the linguistic and the critical fields. The pathfinder of this school is Roman Jakobson, whose crucial efforts have enriched linguistic studies in general and stylistic studies in particular.³⁸

Ibn Dhurayl then studies the 'Speech Event theory,' as developed by Jakobson (1960), on which both stylistic and linguistic studies rely.³⁹

He continues: "Stylisticians are confident in their subject, its field and its methodology, as Stephen Ullmann asserts. By 1979 the separation of stylistics from linguistics, and the independence of stylistics, as a critical linguistic science, from linguistics was complete. Furthermore, he proclaims that stylistics has a role in both literary criticism and the science of language."⁴⁰

He then quotes from Riffaterre's *On structural stylistics* 1971: "style is the distinctive sign of utterance."⁴¹

The third topic he calls "the secret of style." In this section Ibn Dhurayl examines various Western definitions of "style." He gives examples of these definitions but does not cover all of them.

"Stylistics studies both appearance and the method which produced the choice of the speaker of linguistic elements."⁴² (Marouzeau).

"Stylistics analyses the function of the linguistic elements as discovered by deviation, and linguistic science is the bridge which leads to the history of literature."⁴³ (Spitzer).

"When linguistic science devotes itself to the service of literature it becomes stylistics."⁴⁴ (Walak).

Stylistics is related to criticism and by criticism stylistics stands (Jura) "Any stylistics must end in rhetoric."⁴⁵ (Monan).

“ Style is the choice of the writer which is an expression which departs from the linguistic neutral position to become a distinctive discourse.” ⁴⁶ (Marouzeau).

The fourth topic is “trends and methods.” It is natural for trends in stylistics to vary and consequently for its methods to vary: for example, concentration on the sociology of language, the expressivity of language, stylistic structure and the structure of the text.

The Three Main Trends are:

1- Expressive Stylistics, which is concerned with linguistic expression. This type of stylistics is represented by and associated with Charles Bally. He asserts that the “emotional content of the language” is the subject of stylistics and that it must be examined through the linguistic phrase, its vocabulary and its constructions.⁴⁷

2. Literary Stylistics, sometimes named “stylistics of the writer” or “critical stylistics”, which is represented by Spitzer. It is close to literature, it deals with literature and it is based on criticism. The most important principles of this trend are that it is based on phonology; the starting point in the study of a literary work is the work itself and not any idea before the text; the stylistic inquiry is a bridge between the science of language and the history of literature; the study of the text in itself is a matter of discovering its writer; the stylistic feature is in the end a personal deviation; language reflects the character of the writer, but at the same time it is under the control of the writer, and the writer cannot be understood unless we are in sympathy with him;

and this method uses intuition as the key to understanding.⁴⁸

3- Structural stylistics, sometimes named “functional stylistics”, which concentrates on the literary structure of the text, the linguistic body or system of the text, its type, its constructions, its semantics and other aspects. Furthermore, it concentrates on the type of the language and its function. We cannot define style apart from the linguistic discourse as message. That is to say, a text carries a conveying function. This trend is represented by Jakobson, who distinguishes between two matters in his examination of the structure of the text. First “the rules of the poetic grammar”, which is the study of the means of poetic expression in language. Second, “the poetics of the rules of grammar”; the study of the effects on these means: thus, the stylistic phenomenon is basically related to the structure of the text.⁴⁹

The article comes to the conclusion that “stylistics is not incompatible with literary criticism or rhetoric but can benefit both of these and their development.”⁵⁰

This article is a concentrated one by an expert in the field, but Ibn Dhurayl is still sometimes unable to explain his ideas or to present them clearly to the reader.

Another article by the same author is entitled *Al-Ta‘bīr wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* (Expression and Stylistics).⁵¹

In this article the author studies various matters. His examination of the “expression” is on different levels: sound, meaning, con structural, morphological, grammatical; these levels

combine together to produce the expression.

He then considers "grammar." He outlines the history of the development of grammar, and its different types: descriptive, interpretative, generative, comparative and standard. He selects from the generative grammar of Chomsky two concepts, "performance" and "competence." He considers the functions of language, such as descriptive and expressive and then discusses the "speech event" as developed in the presentation of Jakobson. It seems that he is reworking the same materials as he examined in the previous article, but this time with Arabic references.

An article by 'Abd Al-Fattāḥ Al-Miṣrī is entitled *Uslūbiyyat Al-Fard* (Stylistics of the Individual).⁵²

Al-Miṣrī states that there are three types of stylistics; expressive, individual and stylistics; his aim is to examine "the stylistics of the individual."⁵³

the stylistics of the individual" indicates that 'style' is a personal, 'individual matter;' it studies the relationship between expressive devices, the individual and the collective, and it deals with both written and spoken language.

This trend was established as a reaction against various concepts and approaches of stylistic and literary studies. First, it reacts against expressive stylistics in paying attention to both literary works and spoken utterance and in asserting the fundamental relationship between language and criticism on the one hand, and between the study of style and literary criticism on the other hand.⁵⁴

Second, it is a reaction against the dominant philosophical concept at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. This was positivism, which examines language in the light of historical development and changes, rather than considering the present state of the language.

Third, there is a positive factor. In establishing the trend of idealism as presented by Benedetto Croce (1853-1866); he emphasises the connection between the human being and language in an idealistic way on the one hand, and on the other hand, he interprets idealism in such a way that the human being become central; this involves aesthetic studies, so that individual stylistics has two aspects in common with idealism: the connection with the practitioner of the style and the connection with aesthetics.

Al-Miṣrī identifies the pathfinder of this trend as Leo Spitzer. The main principles in his approach are as follows;

The starting point of each critical effort must be internal, that is to say, it starts from the text in operational analysis and ends at the boundaries of the text, not outside the text, examining the language of the text, so that stylistic inquiry is a bridge between the science of language and the history of literature.

The writer is able to express his aim in an absolutely precise way in all cases. Spitzer, in saying this, is rejecting the notion that language must be inadequate or defective. It is possible for the writer to harmonise the linguistic patterns which he uses with his aim, so that he completely performs what he intends.

Style must express the inner life of the writer, his soul and his hidden depths. There are two results of this. First, the essence of the writer can be understood by pursuing his style in the text. Second, criticism can be criticism only when it adheres to the text: We cannot interpret the text by ready-made statements from social psychology; each text has its own statements, and the statements of the text can be found only in the text itself.

In every style there are two things: the soul or spirit of the writer, which is the centre and his language, which is the sign of the centre. The language comes from the soul of the writer, and the two things are complementary.

The deep, close relationship between the soul of the writer and the language of the text must lead to unity and harmony at the end of reading the text. The two points which have to be sought in each text are unity and harmony; these are the soul of the writer.

There are numerous different ways into the text, and the critic or the reader will choose the way that he prefers; all are difficult. Finding one is a matter of living with the text and sympathising with the author until the reader or the critic has an intellectual spark which shows him his way in.

Stylistics attempts to connect the text to the culture of society. This is effected by modern structuralist views. Each individual stylistic study can be enlarged to become a social stylistic study. There is a certain method of stylistic analysis. In it, two stages can be distinguished. Both start from the part and examine it under the microscope:

The first stage is understanding the psychological reality of the writer from the expressive context, then understanding the soul of the collective. The second stage is using the structural method. In Spitzer's practical criticism, he uses only short texts to which to apply his method.

The most important objections to the 'stylistics of the individual' approach are:

- 1--Understanding the style by concentrating on the language leads to a failure to present the aesthetic essence of the text.
- 2- It observes details but ignores the literary work as a whole.
- 3- It uses the key words to examine the text from outside.
- 4- It is too quick to generalise from observations.
- 5- It is not necessary to relate the text to the internal experience of the writer.

Spitzer does not, in his analysis, use social and psychological concepts.⁵⁵

The article covers sufficiently most important aspects of the topic even though the sources are Arabic or translated into Arabic.

Another aspect of presenting stylistic materials is the relationship between stylistics and linguistics. There is an article entitled *Al-Lisāniyyāt Wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* (Linguistics and Stylistics), by 'Abd Allāh Ṣawlah.⁵⁶

Since stylistics was established by Charles Bally, it has always been subordinate to and used the methods of other approaches. It relies mostly on linguistics. The reason for that is that linguistics is a descriptive, analytical scientific method, setting stylistics free from impressionism. Most stylisticians use either a

linguistic or a literary critical approach. Stylistics has two choices: to be independent and free from linguistics or to use other disciplines which are separate from language.

The first part of the article examines "stylistics in linguistics." "As a result of the submission of stylistics to linguistics, the stylistician starts by using in his stylistic analysis devices and methods which are derived from linguistics."⁵⁷

"The most important device used in stylistics and borrowed from linguistics is inquiry into sound, structure, morphology and semantics of construction. It does not, in the main, depart from the linguistic scope and the linguistic content."⁵⁸

As to method, stylistics adopted that taken from linguistics, that is, "the structuralist approach, which mainly isolates the literary text from any factors external to the text which may have an effect on it. One takes the text in itself and by itself, ignoring the writer of the text, and concentrates on examination of what is organised inside the text: the structural relationships. Thus, the text, being defined as "a closed body or system", does not lead to the external world whether near or far. The examination of the text must be through its stylistic characteristics, based on "deviation", which is divided into two types:

1.Deviation from ordinary language in general;

Deviation is a departure from the usual model of expression. It is breaking of the rules, or a using of what is rare or unusual.

2. Deviation from the language of the text which represents the context;

Deviation in this situation is limited by the context, which is the normal pattern. This is a weaving of the discourse or the text and departure from it is the centre of style in this position. Riffaterre's definition of deviation as "limitation of the scope of the normal pattern", which he considers to be an innovation in stylistic studies, in fact, follows the same direction as the general method of his predecessors.⁵⁹

After a short time, this method of stylistic analysis was rejected and became subject to an explicit reaction against it for several reasons; the formality in the method, the dryness of its tools and its disregard of the presentation of the "I-individual". As a reaction to this, Spitzer tries to make a connection between stylistics and the history of literature. The connection is between linguistic events and the individual.

Spitzer's method is based on his attempt to relate style to its practitioner, and this method has attracted certain philosophical and aesthetic schools. Nevertheless, it has become a target for criticism and disapproval by both structuralists and stylisticians. Their criticisms of it are; that it is full of subjectivity and impressionism and that Spitzer's position leaves a gap between description and deduction.

The second part examines "stylistics in the scope of semiotic studies." Bally and his followers knew the definition of "literary discourse." "In the view of Hjelmslev, it has two levels: first, the explicit, which is based on linguistic constructions or clauses and ordinary subjective semantics; second, the suggestive implicit, which is based on the content of this discourse. The problem of

this definition is how we can build a relationship between the two, which are different levels, since the first is linguistic and the other is beyond the linguistic.

“ According to Kristeva the “semiotic literary” provides a solution in establishing a scientific logical relationship. She uses Chomsky’s two concepts “surface and deep structures”, to draw attention to the semiotic level as an element in interpreting deep structures. She then expands the semantic to include psychological, social, historical and other aspects. All these appear in the surface structure in its linguistic constructions, in its sound, its rhyme, its semantics and its constructions. Thus the explicit level of literary discourse becomes the field of appearance of the implicit level. This does not make stylistics disappointed that semiotics opens unlimited horizons for it, and the text becomes, according to this method, merely an excuse to go to the world of imagination.”⁶⁰

The third part deals with the ‘independence level.’ “At this level stylisticians’s efforts are concentrated today on the field of making stylistics free from the mechanism of linguistic reading, in reading the literary work in itself and for itself, and then liberating stylistics from excessive speculation and remoteness from objectivity. The work of Bureau, entitled *Linguistique Fonctionnelle et Stylistique Objective*, represents this method. In this book, he approaches stylistics which is concerned with literary discourse on two levels: that of linguistics and that of content.”⁶¹

1.Linguistic Level,

It is this level which is the base level in stylistic analysis. "It is by deciding what "delimits the structural characteristics of the text as indicated in a list of the sentences". Bureau at this level relies, in his stylistic analysis, on a semiotic concept suggested by Granger.

This is "surcodage", which is based on repetition and frequency of the various linguistic levels in the text. Style in this perspective is not deviation from linguistics; it is communication, combination and intensifying of specific stylistic features which can be discovered only by analytical reading of the whole literary work. It must be carried out by an inexperienced reader, because the expert reader starts from an impressionistic and subjective reading."⁶²

2 The Content Level,

This level considers the other side of the coin of stylistic analysis: that the "structures of a work have a meaning." There are three phenomena in the text, the human, the linguistic and the aesthetic.⁶³

This article shows that the author understands stylistics in depth and from original sources.

Aḥmad Darwīsh^(see above, pp.121-4) is an author who publishes work on stylistics. One of his articles is entitled *Al-Uslūb wa Al-Uslūbiyyah -- Madhhal fī Al- Muṣṭalah wa Ḥuqūl Al-Baḥth wa Manāḥijuhu*, (Style and Stylistics -- An Introduction to the Terminology and to the Fields and Methods of inquiry).⁶⁴ In this article he examines various topics. The first topic is the two terms "style and stylistics." occur frequently in modern literary linguistic studies. The term "style"

is used in a wider sense in various dissimilar or different fields. In the linguistic sense it can mean "system and general rules." It can refer to the "style of living" of a certain people or "style of work" in a certain place. It can be related to "individual characteristics" of a "certain writer", to "a particular musical style" or "a classical style" in furniture."⁶⁵

Then the term "style" has come to be used in rhetorical and critical studies either as meaning "a system and general rules" or as meaning "individual characteristics."

The term "stylistics" is more limited in its meaning in the field of literary studies, though George Mounin expands it to include such fields as fine arts, painting, architecture and music. However, he acknowledges that the only field which stylistics has actually enriched is literary studies.

The term "style" appears in French in the beginning of the fifteenth century, but the term "stylistique" only at the beginning of the twentieth century.

The term "style" was a term of rhetoric. Style even derives from rhetoric. The division of style in the medieval centuries was threefold: "simple", "middle" and "high" style. As a result of this, the idea of "the class style" emerged.⁶⁶

The second topic is "the stylistic schools." First is "expressive stylistics", which is associated with Bally. His theory of stylistics is based on "the emotional content of the language." Second, is "structuralist stylistics." In this school, there is a distinction between two levels: the language and the text.

The third topic is "Genetic Stylistics." This asks, concerning the text, such questions: as "from where?" and "why?." This school has two trends: the first is "social psychological stylistics", which is not widely known. The second is "literary stylistics", which is mainly related to Spitzer's *Linguistics and Literary History: Essays in Stylistics* .Princeton, New Jersey, 1948.

The most important principles of this trend are three: the method is a result of dealing with the text rather than with previous ideas; the details of the work lead to the "axis of the work"; intuition is used as a guide to the examination of the text, and this intuition is a result of talent, experience and practice in literary work: the work must be placed after examining it in its position, genre, age and nation; the starting point in stylistic examination is a linguistic one and can be combined with non-linguistic aspects such as examining thought. In this Spitzer opens a road between language studies and the history of literature, and criticism must be sympathetic criticism.

This article provides general ideas with a French reference. It seems to be written by an expert in the field.

In Arabic literary journals there is concern with the stylistic approach. A whole issue of a journal is sometimes devoted to stylistics, as with *Fuṣūḥ*, vol 5, no 1., 1984, *Al-Mawqif Al-Adabī*, nos 163-153, Damascus, 1928, and *Al-Thaqāfah Al-Ajnabiyyah* [Iraq], vol 2, no,1, 1982.

In his review of 'Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī's *Al-Uslūbiyyah wa Al-Uslūb -- Nahwa Badīl Alsunī fī Naqd Al-Adab* (Stylistics and Style -- Towards a Linguistic Alternative in Literary Criticism), Tunis/Tripoli 1977,

published in *Al-Ma'rifah*.⁶⁷ 'Adnān Ibn Dhurayl makes several critical points. Al-Masaddī hesitates between sciences, he makes very clear the separation between stylistics and the science of literature, and he emphasizes strongly the possibility of linguistics being an alternative to criticism.

In his review of Sa'd Maslūḥ's *Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah Lughawīyyah I ḥṣā'iyyah* (Style -- A Statistical Linguistic Study), Cairo 1984, in *Al-Lisān Al-'Arabī*, no 33, 1989, pp 45-65, Māzin Al-Wa'r finds in it a number of important points, both positive and negative.

The positive points are these: it introduces an important approach to the Arab reader; the author knows both Western and Arabic literary criticism; he uses various tools of different disciplines linguistics, statistics, psychoanalysis and social science; he is scientific in his open-minded discussion and his awareness of relativity in presenting the facts; and, finally, the book is a step forward from previous books and others will follow.

The negative points are these: there is no consistency in employing the approach for different Arabic genres; the author uses only one norm, the statistical, ignoring all others and he does not use semantics or semiotics. It is a valuable academic review.

This is a different type of review from the above reviews in two respects. The book which is reviewed is a dictionary or a collection of terms; it was not written in Arabic but in French and the review is of the French text, not of the Arabic translation. It shows that Arab journals are up-to-date with material in other languages.

There is a review article by *Bassām Barakah*, entitled '*Ilm Al-Uslūb: Mafāhīm wa Tahdidāt Mū'āsirah* (The Science of style: Contemporary Concepts and Definitions), in *Al-Fikr Al-'Arabī Al-Mū'āṣir* no 80-81, 1990, of *Vocabulaire de la Stylistique*, by Georges Molinié et Jean Mazaleyrat, Paris, 1989.

This dictionary represents a trend in French culture which is to assimilate linguistics and its concepts, such as structuralism sound, generation etc. This is creating a new view and clear scientific vision in the field of stylistic studies. The pathfinder of this trend in France is George Molinié, who has been working for a considerable number of years to establish a modern stylistic science with clear features and scientific rules.

The work of the two authors is based on the fundamental principle that stylistics is a study of textual style which ranges from the zero point of writing to the artistic literary threshold. Stylistic analysis, as they see it, must rely on "stylistic reception" i. e. the point of view of the reader. The text is the place where literariness is created or constructed.

The dictionary is based on one concept: that stylistics is "science" and "practice" at the same time. It is a "science", in that it tries to make rules for stylistic analysis and explain the foundations of its concepts. It is "practice" in that it considers the "literary discourse" its field and starts from analysing the theoretical concepts.

The reviewer observes that this work is the result of a considerable amount of university teaching, practical studies and stylistic studies. The author's presentation of their material,

including some very complex topics, is clear and they give practical examples. This review is very short and makes no negative points about the work.

Another aspect of concern with the stylistic approach is the holding of seminars on it for Arab stylisticians or anyone who is interested. A seminar on stylistics took place in Cairo in the office of the journal *Fuṣūl*, in 1982, and its proceedings were published in the journal in 1984. Among the Arab Stylisticians who participated were Sa'd Maṣlūḥ, 'Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī, Al-Hādī Al-Ṭarābulṣī and others who are concerned with modern literary theory in general and stylistics in particular, including Kamāl Abū-Dīb, Jābir 'Aṣfūr and Ḥamādī Ṣmūd. This seminar raised various topics such as the definition of "style" and "stylistic", Stylistics and Linguistics.⁶⁸

It should be mentioned at the end of this section that the aim is not to cover all the materials being produced in Arabic journals concerned with the stylistic approach. The aim is to demonstrate the serious concern with this topic that exists.

Notes

- 1 Mūrīs Abū Nāḍīr, *Al-Thaqāfah Al-'Arabiyyah*, number 9, Tripoli, 1975, pp. 40-46.
- 2 Ibid., p. 40.
- 3 Ibid., see p. 40.
- 4 Ibid., p. 40.
- 5 Ibid., see pp. 41.
- 6 Ibid., see pp. 41-43.
- 7 *Fuṣūl*, part one, 1981, pp. 115-145.
- 8 Ibid., see pp. 123-132.
- 9 Ibid., p. 123.
- 10 Ibid., see pp. 123-24.
- 11 Ibid., p. 125.
- 12 Ibid., see p. 129.
- 13 Ibid., see p. 130.
- 14 Ibid., see pp. 130-131.

- 15 *Fuṣūl*, vol 1, no 2, 1981, pp115-122.
- 16 Ibid., p. 115.
- 17 Ibid., p. 116.
- 18 Ibid., see p. 116.
- 19 Ibid., p.117.
- 20 Ibid., see p. 117.
- 21 Ibid., p. 117.
- 22 Ibid., p. 118.
- 23 Ibid., p. 118.
- 24 Ibid., p. 118.
- 25 Ibid., see p.118.
- 26 Ibid., see p. 119.
- 27 Ibid., see p. 119.
- 28 Ibid., p. 119.
- 29 Ibid., p. 119.
- 30 Ibid., see pp. 119-20.
- 31 Ibid., pp. 120-121.
- 32 Ibid., see p. 121.
- 33 'Adnān.Ibn Dhurayl, *Al-Fikr Al-'Arabī*, vole 4, no 25, Beirut, 1982, pp. 249-257.
- 34 Ibid., p.249.
- 35 Ibid., p.249.
- 36 Ibid., see p. 249.
- 37 Ibid., see p. 250.
- 38 Ibid., see p. 250.
- 39 Katie Wales, *A Dictionary of Stylistics*, see pp. 428-429.
- 40 'Adnān.Ibn Dhurayl, *Al-Fikr Al-'Arabī*, vol. 4, no 25, Beirut, 1982, p. 250.
- 41 Ibid., p. 250.
- 42 Ibid., p. 251.
- 43 Ibid., p. 251.
- 44 Ibid., p. 251.
- 45 Ibid., p. 251.
- 46 Ibid., p. 252.
- 47 Ibid., see p 252.
- 48 Ibid., p. 254.
- 49 Ibid., p. 255.
- 50 Ibid., p. 257.
- 51 Ibn Dhurayl, *Al-Ta'bīr wa Al- Uslūbiyyah, Al-Ma'rifah* ,vol 12, nos 2-3, Damascus, 1979, pp. 48-65.
- 52 'Abd Al-Fattāḥ Al-Miṣrī, *Uslūbiyyat Al-Fard, Al-Mawqif Al-Adabī*, no, 153-36, Damascus,1982, pp.149-164-.
- 53 Ibid., seep 150.
- 54 Ibid., p 150.
- 55 Ibid., see pp. 152-163.
- 56 'Abd Allāh Ṣawlah, *Al-Lisāniyyāt Wa Al-Uslūbiyyah,Al-Mawqif Al-Adabī*, nos135-6-, Damascus, 1982, pp. 143-8.
- 57 Ibid., p. 144.
- 58 Ibid., p. 144.
- 59 Ibid., p. 144.
- 60 Ibid., pp. 145-146.
- 61 Ibid., p. 146.
- 62 Ibid., p. 146.
- 63 Ibid., see p. 147.
- 64 Aḥmad Darwish, *Fuṣūl*, volume 5, number1, 1984, pp. 60-68.
- 65 Ibid., p. 60.
- 66 Ibid., see p. 60.
- 67 'Adnān Ibn Dhurayl, *Al-Uslūbiyyah wa Al-Uslūb -- Nahwa Badīl Alsunī Fī Naqd Al- Adab, Al-Ma'rifah*, no 196, Damascus, 1978, pp179-198 .

Chapter Six :

Other Aspects of the Stylistic Approach in Arabic Literary Criticism

1- Terminology and Lexicography.

2- The making known of the Leading Figures within the Stylistic Movement.

3- Arab Scholarly Dialogue Concerning the Intellectual Relevance of the Stylistic Approach

4- An Approach to a New Arabic Stylistics.

1- Terminology and Lexicography:

The first attempt to provide an Arabic terminology for stylistics was by 'Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī, *Al-Uslūbiyyah wa Al-Uslūb*, (Stylistics and Style), first edition.¹ I use the third edition, 1989, which was published in the same places and by the same publisher. Al-Masaddī points out that he has revised the list of terms in this edition.

In this book, there is a serious concern with French-Arabic stylistic terms, and the author provides us with good explanations of these terms; he is one of the leading stylisticians in the Arab world.

Some samples of his terminology are as follows: L'expression simple = *Al-Ta'bīr Al-Basīt*; La norme = *Al-Namat*; La Déviation = *Al-In'itrāf*. There is a list of terms with explanation, for example:² L'écat = *Inziyāh*, = *Al-'Udūl*, poétique = *Al-Shi'riyah*, La fréquence = *Al-Tawātur*. There is also a list of foreign words in alphabetical order, French-Arabic and

Arabic-French.³

There is an attempt to arabicise stylistic terms in a book entitled *Al-Lughah wa Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah* (Language and Style -- A Study), Damascus 1980, by 'Adnān Ibn Dhurayl. At the end of each chapter there is a French-Arabic list of terms. To give a few examples: *répétabilité* = *Al-Qābiliyyah Lī Al-Tikrār*; *contexte* = *Siyāq*; ⁴ *information* = *Iblāgh*; *communication* = *Tawāṣul aw Ittiṣāl*; ⁵ *forme de l'expression* = *Ṣūrat Al-Ta'bīr*; *fonction poétique* = *Al-Waḥfah Al-Shi'riyyah*. ⁶ There are for further terms in this list.⁷

Sa'd Maṣlūḥ is one of the Arab stylisticians who has introduced statistical stylistics to Arab readers, in a book entitled *Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah Lughawiyyah Iḥṣā'iyyah* (Style -- A Statistical Linguistic Study), Kuwait 1980.

He provides many equivalent Arabic-English terms for stylistics and particularly for statistical stylistics. To give examples: *quantitative measurement* = *Al-Qiyās Al-Kammī*; *statistical analysis* = *Al-Taḥlīl Al-Iḥṣā'ī*; ; *ratio* = *Nisbah*; *density* = *Kathāfah*; *correlation* = *Irṭiḳā*; *choice* = *Ikhtiyār*; *context of situation* = *Mawqif*; *neutral* = *Muḥāyid*; *style-less expression* = *Al-Ta'bīr Ghayr Al-Muta'aslib*; *connotation* = *Taḍnīn*; *consistency* = *Insijām*; *norm* = *Mi'yār*; *population* = *Al-Mujtama' Al-Iḥṣā'ī*.

A work by Jūsif Mishāl Sharīm is *Dalil Al-Dirāsāt Al-Uslūbiyyah* (Guide to Stylistic Studies), Beirut 1984. At the end of this work he gives French-Arabic and Arabic-French equivalents for terms, without any further explanation.⁸

He points out that these lists of terms are limited to terms which

he uses in his work, they are organised in alphabetical order, and they are collected from different sources. There is no indication from the author that he provides new suggestions in this list; he merely collocates what other Arab scholars have provided.

To give examples; “stylistème” = *Wahdah Uslūbiyyah*; “phonème” = *Fūnīm*; “motif” = *Maqta‘ Bāriz*; “point de vue” = *Wijhat Naẓr*; diversité” = *Tanawwu‘*.

One aspect of the production of an equivalent Arabic stylistics is the terminology of the statistical stylistic approach. A book concerning this approach is by Sa‘d Maṣlūḥ *Fī Al-Naṣṣ Al-Adabī -- Dirāsah Uslūbiyyah I ḥ.ṣ.ṣ’iyyah* (On the Literary Text -- A Statistical Stylistic study), Jeddah 1991.

In this work Maṣlūḥ lists large numbers of terms related to the statistical stylistic approach, such as “statistical population” = *Al-Mujtama‘ Al-I ḥ.ṣ.ṣ’ī*; “density” = *Qiyās Al-Mutaghayyir Al-I ḥ.ṣ.ṣ’ī Al-Uslubī*; “ratio” = *Al-Nisbah*; “statistical models” = *Al-Namādhij Al-I ḥ.ṣ.ṣ’iyyah*.

In *A Dictionary of Literary Terms (English-French-Arabic)*, Beirut 1974, under the entry "style", Majdī Waḥba quotes;1- "Style is the dress of thought; a modest dress. Neat but not gaudy, will true critics please." (Samuel Wesley, *An Epistle to a Friend concerning poetry*, 1700) "Proper words in proper places make the true definition of style." (Jonathan Swift, *Letter to a young clergyman*, 1720). Waḥba also presents other quotations from English, French and Arabic to explain style.⁹ In Kāmil Al-Muhandis and Majdī Waḥbah, *A Dictionary of Arabic Literary and Linguistic Terms*, Beirut 1984, English-Arabic stylistic terms are discussed.¹⁰ In this Dictionary, there are several terms related to the field of stylistics such as: "prose style", "idiom", "diction", "collocation", "jargon", "deviation", "metaphor."

‘Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī’s *A Dictionnaire de Linguistique, Français-Arabe-Arabe-Français*, Tripoli Tunis 1984, gives no explanation of the terminology, either in Arabic or in French. He provides only equivalent terms.

In Jabbūr ‘Abd Al-Nūr, *Al-Mu‘jam Al-Adabī*, Beirut 1980, "Style" and "stylistics" have two entries ‘Abd AL-Nūr gives French equivalents and explains the terms in Arabic. However, although he provides references, he works at a basic level and is not up to date.

Ramzi. M. Baalabaki *Dictionary of Linguistic Terms, English - Arabic*, Beirut 1990, devotes a separate section to stylistic terms in Arabic. This section contains the most important terms used in the field, and when he provides explanations of them in the main body of the dictionary, he gives quotations from English, French and Arabic.¹¹

It is essential to state that the aim of this section is to give examples rather than to provide a comprehensive study covering all the linguistic dictionaries in Arabic.

2- The Making known of the Leading Figures within the Stylistic Movement:

Roman Jakobson is a linguist who is an important figure in stylistic studies. There is an article by 'Abd Al-Razzāq Al-Wartānī, entitled *Mafhūm Al-Uslūb 'inda Jākūbsūn* (The concept of stylistics in Jakobson).¹²

Al-Wartānī states that it is too difficult in a short article to cover such a rich life as that of Roman Jakobson; his article gives a brief outline only.

The first stage of his life was in Moscow, where he was born in 1896. His early interest in Russian dialects and folklore gave him an opportunity to read the works of De Saussure and of Dussierl, who is famous for "structuralisme phénoménologique."

In 1915 Jakobson established, with six other students in Moscow The Linguistic Circle, the aim of which was the linguistic study of poetics, metre and folklore. This circle became known later as the Russian Formalists, and it had an effect on the scientific

languages. At this stage Jakobson gave his theory of poetics its shape.

The third stage was in Scandinavia, in Norway and Denmark. At this period he studied children's language and aphasics.

The fourth examination of literature and the language of poetry.

The second stage was in the Prague School, which was established in 1926. The main interests of this school were in four fields; phonology, morphology, poetics and the history of the Slavonic language. The fifth stage was in the U. S. A. , from 1941. It was an important stage in his academic life, during which he met Claude Lévi-Strauss, and they wrote various works together. In this period, he took various posts in America, related to linguistic work. However, at this time linguistics studies underwent an important change, especially through the theory of behaviourism, which was established by Bloomfield and Chomsky, who was a student of Jakobson.

The most important matters in the works are these: language is a social construct; the context is the most important aspect rather than the units in examining the text; communication theory and its elements; poetic functions in the text cannot be examined alone while ignoring the other functions in the text; poetic theory looks at what makes the linguistic message an artistic work, in other words, it searches for the expressions which make up the poetic function within the literary text.

The article introduces the most important part of Jakobson's theory; it mainly relies on French sources, with many quotations

from the French.

Riffaterre is one of the most famous figures in the stylistic field in the world. Arab stylisticians have made him and his important works well-known to Arab readers.

An attempt has been made to introduce his work *Essais de Stylistique Structurale*, Paris 1971. There is a review entitled *Mu'āwalāt fī Al-Uslūbiyyah Al-Haykaliyyah* by 'Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī.¹³

The reviewer states that the role of Riffaterre in stylistics starts in 1950, and that his works are not related to practical stylistics but go further, aiming to establish a comprehensive theory of stylistics, based on a scientific objective way of studying style. The book has an introduction to stylistics, and it was produced by co-operation between the author and the translator.

The book was originally written in English, but a few articles in it were written in French. It seems that the reviewer has used the French translation of the book. The book consists of three parts; the first is theoretical and the second and the third are practical.

The reviewer limits his concern to the theoretical part, under three headings;

1. defining the concept of stylistics;
2. defining the concept of style;
3. defining the practical method of stylistic studies.

1. Defining the concept of stylistics:

“Stylistics” in the book is a science concerned with the study of the style of literary works in a scientific way; literary works are considered as linguistic structures. Because stylistics is concerned with the text in itself, ignoring all historical and psychological considerations, this will enable the reader to have an artistic perception of the organisation of the artistic features with an awareness of the functions of these features in the text.

Stylistics can be defined in two ways: in its aim of liberating literary criticism from impressionistic, aesthetic and rhetorical criteria, all these being norms based on previous ideas; and in its relationship with linguistics, in that it is exploiting the linguistic method in a scientific analysis of literary style.

Riffaterre concludes that stylistics is a linguistic concern with the effects of the linguistic message and communication, it is also concerned with the phenomenon of making the mind understand in a specific way and with a particular perception.

2. Defining the concept of style:

The theory of Riffaterre derives its definition of “style” from two fundamental sources: communication theory and the theory of behaviourism.

3. Defining the practical study or stylistic analysis:

In Riffaterre’s method of stylistic analysis, four trends come together; the theory of the principles of communication, behaviourism, the norms of general linguistic principles and some data of literary criticism. According to this approach, the starting point is not from the text but from the judgements of the reader

about the text. Relying on the reader makes analysis an experimental method.

An article by ‘Abd Al-Fattāḥ Al-Miṣrī is entitled *Ṭarīqat Jākubsūn fī Dirāsat Al-Naṣṣ Al-Shi‘rī* (The Method of Jakobson in Studying the Poetic Text).¹⁴

Jakobson’s theory is based on his rooting the structuralist approach in the examination of language, which is concerned primarily with the relationships between sound and meaning units in the linguistic structures, in order to discover the rules which control these relationships. This method enters the field of literature and literary criticism, creating the stylistic approach which operates upon the language of the text.

Jakobson is the pathfinder of the Russian Formalist School in modern linguistic literary criticism, which has two distinctive important features: first, it rejects the notion of literature as transcription, or recording the lives of the writers or describing ages or environments, or as an echo of philosophical or theological theories. Second, it promotes the search for the features which make the literary work literary.

This school starts the search for literariness in the text by searching for stylistic, rhythmical sound structures in the literary work. As a result of this there was a new direction of this school an important development in the concept from the relationship of the author with the work to the relationships within the literary work itself and its structure and the importance of the complex of networks on which the text is based.

The most important principles of stylistic analysis are the following: it is necessary to have a technique which liberates the analysis of the text from relying on the principles of social science, or religious and political theories. Stylistics is a method based on measuring linguistic deviation in word, sentence and image. There is no separation between the form and the content of the text. Poetic analysis is based on two main aspects, "form" and "meaning"; the aspects of "form" are the paragraphs of the poem in rhythm, harmonising the words with their letters and their form and their characters, the grammatical aspects in the function and construction of sentences, metaphor and metonymy. The aspects of "meaning" are the semantics of words, nouns and verbs.

Al-Miṣrī, concludes that the most important points in this theory are these: the dialectical relationships between the structures of the poetic text in form and meaning; attempting to harmonise and unify these relationships; the distinction between the general phenomenon, examining the problem of the text and considering it as an integrated unit, and the aim of the analysis of the poetic text, an understanding of the world of the poet, his poetic vision and his attitude to the world and to life.

It seems that Al-Miṣrī has published various articles about the topic; this gives us confidence in his work and makes it readable, but his sources are still translated materials rather than original.

There is another article about Roman Jakobson by the same author, entitled *Rūmān Jākubsūn Al -'Ālim Al -Lisānī* (Roman Jakobson the linguistic Scientist).¹⁵

Al-Miṣrī states that Jakobson has an important role in linguistic

studies and that his works have influenced many modern linguists, particularly Chomsky, as one of Jakobson's students.

In the relationship of the science of language with other disciplines Jakobson agrees with Sapir that it is difficult for the modern linguists to limit himself to the classical study of the language, without extending his interests to the common ground between language and anthropology, psychology, philosophy and even physics. He adds two important notions; the independence of linguistics and the integration of it in other disciplines. In phonology, he was the first to establish a theory that the human being can produce only approximately fifty sounds. The article deals with several aspects of his theory, but the references are only to Arabic or source materials translated into Arabic.

Yūmnā Al-ʿĪd, in *fi Maʿrifat Al-Naṣṣ* Beirut 1983, provides, biographies of scholars in her field, mainly related to modern literary criticism. Among them are scholars involved in stylistic approaches: Todorov, Jakobson, Riffaterre and others.¹⁶ There is an article by Muḥammad Al-Hādī Al-Ṭarābulī,^(see above, pp.162-64, pp.178) entitled *Al-Naṣṣ Al-Adabī wa Qadāyāh uʿinda Mīshāl Rifāṭayr min Khilāl Kitābihi Sināʿat Al-Naṣṣ wa Jūn Kūhīn min Khilāl kitābih*, *Al-Kalām Al-Sāmī* (The Literary Text and its Affairs in the Views of Michel Riffaterre in his book *La production du texte* (1972) and of Jean Cohen in his book *Le haut langage*).¹⁷ The article aims to introduce two famous figures of stylistics and their works to Arabic readers. The first figure, Michel Riffaterre, is a scholar with an interest in stylistics. He is one of the pathfinders of structural stylistics, with *La production du texte*, 1979. He is also the author of *Essais de stylistique structurale*,

translated from English into French in 1971.

La Production du texte has chapters that can be read separately. The book is in two parts: a theoretical part and a practical part. This work, together with several other of the authors' works, has contributed greatly to establishing the theory of poetics.

3- Arab Scholarly Dialogue Concerning the Intellectual Relevance of the Stylistic Approach:

In the seminar of 1982, Ḥamādī Samūd told all Arab scholars who wrote about stylistics that they were making a fundamental mistake in their understanding of the phenomenon in the West and of the presentation of this critical movement at the beginning of this century.

At the end of this seminar, they agreed to use works of traditional Arabic rhetoric, for stylistic analysis, such as that of Al-Jurjānī.¹⁸

In a book entitled *Al-Lughah Al -Thānīyah* (The Second Language), Casablanca/Beirut 1994, Faḍl Tāmīr examines the most important contemporary trends in Arabic literary criticism in both theory and practice.

For the stylistic approach, Thāmīr examines the stylistic works of 'Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī. He notes that, at the end of the seventies, some stylistic analysis appeared in the practical criticism of some Arab critics. Thāmīr, classifies these Arab critics and their stylistic analysis in two categories: first, those for whom stylistic analysis has become a linguistic essential; second, those who consider

stylistic analysis only one aspect of the critical perspective and take a comprehensive view.

Thāmir considers the work of Al-Masaddī, a critic and linguist who paid early attention to stylistic analysis, and notes features such as the following: his insistence that stylistics is not an alternative to criticism; his emphasis on three elements of literary critical theory: the human being (author, reader, critic), discourse and art; the development of his criticism to cover pure linguistic analysis, traditional Arabic rhetoric, and psychoanalysis; his representing modernity, in that his criticism relies on the text; and his identifying the stylistic features of the text.

4- An Approach to a New Arabic Stylistics:

An attempt has been made by Shukrī 'Ayyād (see above pp109-114, pp149-56, pp177) to establish an Arabic stylistic approach, in his work *Al-lughah wa Al-Ibdā' Mabādi' I'lm Al-Uslūb Al-'Arabī* (Language and Innovation -- Principles of Arabic Stylistic Science), Cairo 1988.

In his introduction, 'Ayyād states that the object of this is "to establish the fundamental principles of the Arabic science of style as we need it today. We will search for the roots of the artistic features of the Arabic language in the works of the Arabic linguisticians before we search for these roots in the pure Arabic rhetorical tradition. Then we shall define Arabic rhetoric or reveal it in the stylistic shape, since there is no harm in relying on modern linguistic studies."¹⁹ Chapter Four deals with "The Constants = (*Thāwābit*) of style in the Arabic Language." He gives his definition of this term: the constants (*Thāwābit*) of grammar are the rules which cannot be broken. The constants = (*Thawābit*) of style can be broken, or at least are not compulsory, but if they are observed in utterance, it will have an Arabic flavour. What can be observed about this chapter, and about this book generally, is his attempt to find various features in Arabic usage, language and traditional rhetoric, then connect these with some aspects of the stylistic approach and call this Arabic stylistics.

One aspect of this attempt is the examination of *Qiyās*, = (analogy). This is a wide topic in Arabic grammar, and he deals with it in a few pages, relating it to change in Arab life. *Al-Ittisā' fī Al-Kalām* = (connection) is a term from Sibawayh which means departure from the ordinary logical limitation which is the foundation of Arabic grammar.

He ends the chapter by saying that "innovation" lies in the language itself and that all that the "inventor" has to do is to extract the "invention" from the language.

Another work is by Muḥammad ‘Abd Al-Muṭṭalib (see above pp. 114-118, pp. 168-172, p. 177) entitled *Al-Balāghah wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* (Rhetoric and Stylistics), Cairo 1984.

In Part Two of this book, Al-Muṭṭalib examines the views on style of modernist Arab scholars.

1. Ḥusayn b Ahmad Al-Mursifī (? -1890) *Al-Wasilah Al-Adabiyyah li Al-‘Ulūm Al-‘Arabiyyah*: style is related in his view to its practitioner; it is connected to the characteristics of the writer/poet. Sometimes he makes a connection between the style and the object of the literary work; he also relates it to the reader/listener who is to be affected by the writer/poet.

2. Mustafā Sādiq Al-Rāfi‘ī (1870-1937), *I’jāz Al-Qur’ān*:

Al-Rāfi‘ī’s concept of style entered the Arab world at an early period. He examines the concept of construction and its components and connects it with the speaker and reader/listener and their psychological characteristics. The style represents the thought of the practitioner. Al-Muṭṭalib observes that his concept of style is influenced by traditional Arabic rhetoric.

3. Aḥmad Ḥasan Al-Zayyāt (1886-1968), *Difā' 'an Al Balāghah*:

Zayyāt's concept of style is from two sources: traditional Arabic rhetoric and French criticism. He defines style as the particular method of the writer/poet in choosing the words and composing the utterance. He also makes a connection between the art with which the writer writes and style; he also connects it with the subject. He connects the style of the writer with the language. Al-Zayyāt considers the words and the meaning as the soul body, and he indicates three features of style: innovation, brevity = *Wajāzah* and harmonisative = *Talā'um*.. His concept of style is based on the writer/poet and the reader, and style itself, style differs according to; mentality, culture, genre, object, situation, and individuality.²⁰

Aḥmad Al-Shāyib *Al Uslūb*, Cairo 1945:

His concept of style mainly comes from traditional Arabic rhetoric. He defines style as artistic utterance = (*Fann Al-Kalām*) which comes in different forms: story, dialogue, simile, metaphor, saying etc. He also defines style as linguistic construction. So style is a method of writing, a method of composition, a method of choosing the words and a method of composing them to so as express the meaning.

Al-Shāyib considers that style differs according to the writer/poet and the age; he enumerates three features of style: clarity, effectiveness and aesthetic quality.

Al-Muṭṭalib makes a few critical points about this book: Al-Shāyib applies the stylistic norms of the traditionalist Arab rhetoricians, adding only a few from modernists expressions; the work is full of impressionistic descriptions with no definition to help us to understand his concept of style; the book has become an educational guide for Arab students at different levels of study, which makes them tear texts to pieces without pointing out the real aesthetic of the text, which lies in linguistic expression.²¹

5. A mīn Al-Khulī (-? died 1966) *Fann Al-Qawl*, Cairo 1947:

In this book he uses mainly traditional Arabic rhetoric, combining it with a modern view. The plan of the book extends beyond the boundary of the single sentence; it relates it to the whole of the work. It attempts to bring rhetorical studies close to stylistic studies. He connects literature with the writer/poet and connects style with the nature of the subject and with psychological and literary matters. It can be observed that these attempts are serious, showing a connection with both modern Western stylistics and Arabic traditional stylistics.

Notes

1 'Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī, *Al-Uslūbiyyah wa Al-Uslūb*, Tripoli/Tunis, third edition, 1989.

2 Ibid., pp. 129-212.

3 Ibid., see, pp. 212-237.

4 'Adnān Ibn Dhurayl, *Al-Lughah wa Al-Uslūb - Dirāsah*, , Damascus 1980, See pp34- 36.

5 Ibid., see p.78.

6 Ibid, see. pp. 113-114.

7 Ibid, see pp. 137-138; pp. 158-159.

8 Jūsif Mishāl Sharīm, *Dalīl Al-Dirāsāt Al-Uslūbiyyah*, Beirut 1984. See pp. 149-163.

9 Majdī Wahba ,*A Dictionary of Literary Terms (English, French-Arabic)*, Beirut 197, p. 541.

- 10 Kāmil Al-Muhandis and Majdī Wahba, *A Dictionary of Arabic Literary and Linguistic Terms*, Beirut 1984, see. pp. 34-38.
- 11 Ramzi. M. Baalabaki, *Dictionary of Linguistic Terms, English - Arabic*, Beirut 1990, p. 541.
- 12 'Abd Al-Razzāq Al-Wartānī, *Mafhūm Al-Uslūb 'inda Jākūbsūn, Al-Aqlām*, volume 3, number 10, Tunis 1977, pp. 5- 23.
- 13 *Al- Hawliyyāt*, 21/10, Tunis 1973, pp. 275-287.
- 14 *Al-Mawqif Al-Adabī*, no 122, 1981, pp .30- 40.
- 15 *Al-Mawqif Al-Adabī*, no,120, 1981, pp. 30-46.
- 16 Yūmnā Al-'Īd, in *Fī Ma'rīfat Al-Naṣṣ* Beirut 1983, pp. 271-300.
- 17 *Fuṣūl*, vol 5, number 1, 1984, pp. 121-131.
- 18 *Fuṣūl*, vol5, no1, 1984. See p.2451.
- 19 *Mabādii Ilm Al-Uslūb Al-'Arabī*, Cairo 1988, p. 9.
- 20 Muḥammad 'Abd Al-Muṭṭalib, *Al- Balāghah wa Al- Uslūbiyyah*, Cairo 1984, p. 4
- 21 *Ibid.*, see, p. 102.

Part Two

The Application of Stylistics
Approach to Arabic Poetry and
Relevant Aspects

CHAPTER ONE:

STYLISTIC APPROACHES TO

ARABIC POETRY

1 0-- INTRODUCTION:

This chapter seeks to show that Arab stylisticians are employing a stylistic approach in examining Arabic poetry. This chapter does not claim to cover all the works which relate to the topic but its concern is with the most important works in the field surveyed.

1 -- 'Alī 'Izzat:

'Izzat is an Egyptian academic critic. His concern is with modern western literary criticism, reflecting his Anglo-Saxon background. His works, be they articles or books, mainly relate to modern literary criticism and particularly stylistic studies.

One of his articles is entitled “ *'Ilm Al-Uslūbiyyāt wa Mashākil Al-Ta'ālil Al-Lughawī*” (The Science of Stylistics and the Problems of Linguistic Analysis)¹ .

In this article he examines various significant matters related to stylistic studies which need to be mentioned before his practical applications.

The first topic examined is “the aim of stylistic studies”, which is “the study of different linguistic styles: (the styles of ordinary speech, the styles of scientific, literary and artistic writing, the individual styles of certain writers in certain literary genres), through identifying the linguistic features which distinguish the

popular forms in each style. The stylistician indicates, where possible, the connection between these forms and linguistic functions on the one hand and between these forms and the social attitudes which they express on the other. After that, there is interpretation, where possible, of the reason for using these linguistic features and contrasting these features with possible alternatives. Next, he classifies these linguistic features into groups according to one of three bases of their linguistic characteristics (grammatical, phonological and lexical), and he classifies these linguistic features in terms of their functions in the social context or the relationship between them both in the social context and at other levels.”²

The second topic is his adopting of the distinction in linguistic function between “the neutral style” and “the emotive style.” This distinction is based on linguistic fundamentals such as the use of certain forms and grammatical constructions, deviation from the usual functions of parts of speech or grammatical forms, difference of situation, position or arrangement of words or phrases in sentences and the use of phonological features such as stress or tone.³

The third topic is “the role of the stylistician or the analyst who works according to the stylistic approach.” He has to have “a sufficient knowledge of linguistic constructions and deep structures, he must be able to match the constructions with stylistic features, he must be able to analyse the close relationship between the linguistic features and their relationship with social

phenomena: the verbal, grammatical and phonological features that gain their meanings from the social context and cultural environment and, in turn, are part of them. The stylistician is able to select the stylistic features, the selection being personal rather than an objective matter. He selects the features which distinguish a writer from others, particularly the inventive features. These characterise his style and can be considered as distinctive modes in it."⁴

The final topic is the "levels of linguistic analysis". There are "three levels: phonological, grammatical and lexical."⁵

'Izzat first book is entitled *Essays on Language and Literature*, Beirut 1972. This work consists of a preface and four chapters.

In his preface he considers the importance of language in investigating literature: "the study of the science of language, i. e. linguistics, can contribute much towards the interpretation of man's thought and art, i. e. literature, and in a more objective manner than the conceptual tools of psycho-analysis."⁶ He then adds; "whether we are concerned with the investigation of the 'technique' of the writer or with the 'appreciation' of the work of art we need always to have recourse to language as the only observable criterion by which we can judge the writer. It is impossible to reach conclusions about a writer's philosophy without 'a previous analysis of his language'."⁷ After that, he asserts that "I have borne in mind that no 'opinion' about the poem or play is given unless validated by evidence from the text itself."⁸

The first chapter is entitled "Linguistics and the Interpretation of Literature." 'Izzat introduces this chapter as "an attempt in this direction. In order to make it relevant to both English and Arabic cultures I have drawn my examples from English as well as Arabic poetry."⁹

Then, after mentioning his English examples, which are not the concern of this thesis, he explains his choice of his Arabic examples: "I have chosen samples from the writing of two contemporary Arab poets: Ṣalah Abd El-Ṣabour, one of the leading modern Egyptian poets, and Abd El-Wahab El-Bayyati, a modern Iraqi poet, and tried to apply to them the concepts proposed within a given linguistic framework."¹⁰

He states that "modern linguistics can contribute much towards accurate and objective study in general, and that of literary style in particular. In this section an attempt is made to introduce a linguistic framework within which the literary critic or stylistician can operate, together with discussion of problems which may arise in the process of interpretation."¹¹

Then he continues by explaining his application and his selection from Arabic poetry: "the second section is an application of some of the theories proposed in the first part to a sample of modern Arabic poetry."¹²

Next, he explains the nature of this sort of work: "in fact, the 'interpretation' of modern poetry needs strenuous efforts on the part of both linguists and critics in order to convey its artistic and

aesthetic value to the readers, who are often baffled by the stylistic devices employed by modern poets, whether consciously or unconsciously, for the achievement of their effects. In such a 'genre' it is futile to concentrate on the 'content', i.e. meaning, ideas, images etc. Modern poets are concerned most with the discovery of human mind and soul, and in their quest for the innermost secrets of man, they sacrifice surface clarity of meaning, apparent and logical association of ideas, and presentation of connected images. Consequently, vagueness, ambiguity and complexity are among the distinctive features of modern poetry. The attempt, then, to 'understand' the 'meaning' of such verse on the part of the critic or reader will be a failure or, at best, a game of guess-work or fancy. Personal interpretation "may supply opinion instead of educating taste."¹³ Then 'Izzat adds that "personal interpretations may infer meanings which have not occurred to the writers, and they often lack internal evidence from the text itself, i.e. they fail to produce facts."¹⁴

In 'Izzat's analysis of literary texts, as I mentioned earlier, he adopts three levels, or "Levels of Analysis." The stylistician or analyst "may start his attack on the text under consideration from whichever level he chooses. He can also tackle the text from one or more levels. Likewise, he can deal with one or more levels at a time."¹⁵

The first level is the "Lexical Level"; "this level is concerned with the study of lexical items of the text. By a lexical item we do not mean single words only, but lexical units which are closely

related both structurally and semantically. Thus, idioms, proverbs, and phrasal verbs are considered lexical items. These should not be confused with grammatical categories, since a lexical item enters into a choice different from that of a grammatical class.”¹⁶

He explains the stylistician’s task which is “to observe the way in which certain lexical items tend to pattern in the style of a given author, i. e. the use the writer makes of lexical items by way of synonymy, contrariety, word-polarity, word-association, word-formation, derivation, and collocation. The main framework suggested by lexicology for the study of lexical items comprises two theoretical categories of major importance:

1. Collocation

2. Lexical Set.”¹⁷

As to collocation, he differentiates between two types; ‘the normal collocations’, which is “the formal pattern which accounts for the tendency of certain lexical items to co-occur with certain other lexical items. They are habitually associated with each other and usually seen in the same linguistic environment, e. g. cup and tea in ‘cup of tea’. It is also a two-way expectation, for example ‘April’ and ‘fool’ in ‘April-fool’, ‘matter’ and ‘life and death’ in ‘a matter of life and death’.”¹⁸

The second type of collocation is ‘unusual collocations’, “which writers, especially modern poets, resort to at times for producing certain stylistic effects on their readers. They also occasionally

rely on the interaction between normal collocations and unusual ones for evoking certain images and allusions in our minds.”¹⁹

After that, ‘Izzat considers the “Lexical Set”, as the second theoretical category in this lexical framework. His definition and the example which represents it are as follows: “it accounts for the grouping of items which have a similar distribution in collocation. For instance, the word ‘political’ may occur in the same linguistic environment as ‘affairs’, ‘scheme’, ‘programme’, ‘principles’, ‘public’, ‘government’, ‘corruption’, ‘disaster’, and many other lexical items. The item under consideration, i. e. ‘political’, is termed the ‘nodal item’ or ‘node’ whereas the accompanying items, i e ‘affairs’, ‘scheme’ etc, are called the “collocates” of this item. Since these words have similar distribution in collocation, i.e they have the same collocability, they constitute a ‘lexical set.’

”²⁰ He notes that, “the word ‘Friday’ in English is habitually associated with items different from those associated with its fixed term equivalent in Arabic. Friday collocates in English with such words as ‘Good’, ‘Black’ etc.”²¹

He mentions that the collocates may be either contiguous or discontiguous to the nodal item and may follow the node or may precede it. ²²

The second level is the “Grammatical Level.” “This level is concerned with the analysis of the syntactic structures and the types of sentences which are common in or distinctive of a writer’s style. The analyst should be able to choose those grammatical features which characterise the style under

consideration. One should admit that the process of selecting these features is, to a great extent, subject to the 'intuition' or 'internal feeling' of the critic, but we may argue that the selection will be confined to those features which distinguish a given writer from other writers, especially those which are frequent enough to constitute distinctive patterns common in this writer's style."²³

The example 'Izzat provides from the poetry of Ṣalāh 'Abd Al-Ṣabūr, the inversion of predicate or part of predicate, especially in verbal sentences, is one of the grammatical characteristics common in his poetry. His prepositional phrases are front-shifted in the sentence, then the verb and the subject follow.

The third level is the "Phonological Level." "This comprises the study of the phonological features the writer makes use of, e. g:

1. repetition of certain consonants (such as sibilants, nasals, emphatic, non-emphatic etc.) or vowels in a given manner;
- 2 . quality of syllables (open or closed);
- 3 . quantity of syllables (short, medium, long);
- 4 . the position, nature and quantity of prominent syllable(s);
- 5 . elision, liaison, anaptyxis, alliteration, assonance etc;
- 6 . prosodic features of stress, pitch, length and intonation, and their relation to rhythm."²⁴

He quotes Firth's dictum that literary criticism should begin with linguistic analysis, for the statement of the writer's philosophy

“would be almost impossible without a previous analysis of his language.”²⁵

His argument goes further in the direction of ‘objective’ interpretation. He poses questions such as: “is it really possible that we can establish or discover a relationship between the linguistic forms common in a certain style and the functions in which the writer employs them? Does a given writer use distinctive lexical, grammatical, or phonological patterns in the expression of certain feelings or emotions? There is sufficient evidence to prove that this is possible in most cases.”²⁶

In the following section ‘Izzat attempts to investigate the distinctive features of two collections of poems, “on the hypothesis that these two anthologies are samples of their poetry. A more detailed and comprehensive study of the two poets will require reference to all their works.”²⁷ One is by Ṣalāḥ ‘Abd Al-Ṣabūr and is entitled *Riḥlah fī Al-Layl* (A Journey at Night) and the other is by ‘Abd Al-Wahhāb Al-Bayyānī and is entitled *Kalimāt Lā Tamūt* (Words that will not Die). He observes of the poems by Ṣalāḥ ‘Abd Al-Ṣabūr: “the first feature that draws our attention in this collection is the poet’s frequent use of certain lexical items that indicate his pessimism. His themes deal mostly with destruction, frustration, melancholy, boredom and desolation. The common occurrence of such items: death, sadness, sorrow etc.”²⁸ Then he gives more details: “it is noticeable that the frequency of occurrence of each lexical item varies from one item

It may be interesting to give the approximate number of occurrences of each item including its derivatives.”²⁹

He tables his results, from which we can see that the number of occurrences of the item ‘death’ is 49, of ‘evening’ 27 and of ‘sadness’ 16, to give some examples. He makes the point that the poet, according to his table, uses words implying complete darkness such as ‘night’, ‘darkness’, more frequently than words implying partial darkness like “evening.” His conclusion is that “this may indicate that the poet believes that there is still a glimpse of hope for himself and humanity.”³⁰

‘Izzat goes further in his observation that “the sense of loss and the triviality of life which permeates the poems in this collection is also indicated by his characteristic collocations. His *riḥla* (journey), for example, whether mental or sensuous, is associated with loss, darkness and bad times. The word *riḥla* is thus collocated with: *ʔallayl* (night). *ʔaddayaa* (loss, depair), *tahaara* (chastity, *ʔazzamaan* (time).”³¹

Next he provides another table and notes about its data that “all the collocates.....follow the correlated node, except the members of the last set, i. e. *rihla* and *hikaaya*, which precede it.”³²

After examining the lexical features, ‘Izzat starts the examination of the ‘syntactic structures’ by stating that “first, he (‘Abd Al-Ṣabūr) favours the use of short nominal declarative sentences, the majority of which are affirmative.”³³ He offers examples from the poetry, which include both affirmative and negative sentences.

His subsequent observation about the poetry is: "one of the outstanding characteristics of his poetry is the use of indefinite nominal phrases which consist of three elements:

- 1 . an indefinite noun in the first place followed by
- 2 . either an indefinite noun in the genitive case or an indefinite adjective +
- 3 . another indefinite adjective or noun."³⁴

He illustrates this section with examples from the poetry.

'Izzat's third observation about the poetry of 'Abd Al-Ṣabūr is that there is "inversion of prepositional phrases in verbal sentences. The usual position of prepositional phrases in Classical Arabic is at the end of the sentence, following the verb, the subject, and the object (if there is any in the sentence),..but most of Abd al-Ṣabour's sentences, especially verbal ones, are initiated by prepositional phrases which consist of preposition + a definite or indefinite noun, then the verb, the subject (and the object) follow."³⁵

His final observation regarding characteristic features which mark 'Abd Al-Ṣhabour's style is that "the poet rarely front-shifts prepositional phrases in his nominal sentences. For eleven verbal sentences containing inversion of this type in the last 84 pages of this book, only two nominal sentences are distinguished by this feature."³⁶

He observes about Al-Bayyāt's poetry that "most of his verses follow the usual word order of form-classes in Arabic sentences."³⁷

Then he offers a brief discussion of stylistic devices in Al-Bayyāt's poetry as follows:

" i. the use of exclamatory forms which consist of *either* a-the exclamatory particle *maa* (what a...!) + the 1st form of a verb of the pattern *ʔafʔal* indicating surprise followed by a definite noun. These sentences sound like epigrammatic modes of expression, e.g.

maa ʔawhaʔa-lhayaah

(How desolate life is !)

maa ʔabʕada-ttariiq

(How far the way is!)

maa ʔaqalla- zzaad.

(How small the supply is !)

or b - the 'mourning' particle *waa* (*waaw-innudba*) + a definite nominal phrase implying sorrow for the poet's situation.....

ii. the frequent occurrence of vocative sentences formed from the vocative particle *yaa/ʔaya* (O...!) followed by a definite nominal phrase which usually refers to love or to an element of nature or to poetry.

iii. One of the most outstanding stylistic features...is that he defines his objectives, attitudes, emotions and morals in a negative way. A large number of his sentences and phrases are

negative forms. Therefore, particles of prohibition and negation are common in his poems.....

iv. ... his frequent use of rhetorical questions when expressing his bitterness and despair..... ”³⁸

‘Izzat concludes this chapter by raising a question which still remains to be answered: “Can we go beyond description, analysis and comparison to ‘appreciation’ and ‘evaluation’ without being subject to personal ‘interpretation’, personal appraisal, and even personal liking and disliking ?__ a question to which stylistics has not yet found a satisfactory answer.”³⁹

Chapter Two is entitled “Language and the Theory of Context.” ‘Izzat introduces this chapter by saying: “the emphasis here is laid on the fact that language is basically a social phenomenon. Thus, in our investigation of a given language, to disregard the study of the social context in which this language is embedded is to leave much unsaid. The theory is dealt with, first as originated by the anthropologist Bronslaw Malinowski, and then as improved upon by J. R Firth, the founder of the British School of Linguistics, who has adapted it to suit linguistic purposes. Examples from Lebanese and Egyptian Colloquial Arabic are provided to illustrate the points raised in the course of discussion.”⁴⁰ This chapter lies outside the scope of this thesis.

Chapter Three is entitled “English Poetry in the Nineteen Thirties: A Study in Auden’s ‘Poem’ and Macneice’s ‘Autumn Journal.’”

Chapter Four: “O ’Casey’s theatre of the people: a study in ‘Juno

and the Paycock' and the 'Plough and the Stars.' Both chapters lie outside the scope of this thesis.

The part which is relevant to the stylistic approach indicates that it uses the stylistic approach from a confident background and specialist knowledge of the topic that is demonstrated in explaining both the reference to the theory and its application to Arabic poetry. On the other hand, there is no glossary of terms at the end of the book, and there is no bibliography.

The second book by the same author related to a stylistic approach to Arabic poetry is entitled *Studies in Linguistics, Beirut Arab University*, 1975. This book consists of a preface, and three chapters. Chapter One: Language and Implication in the Poetry of Badr Shākir Al-Sayyāb: A Lexical Statement; Chapter Two: A Modern Approach to classical Arabic Grammar; Chapter Three: Notes on Sociolinguistics.

In his preface to this book 'Izzat states that "...linguistics can contribute much to the widening of the knowledge of the critic who is concerned with the study of literary style. It provides him with more observational and objective techniques than the hitherto adopted criteria which are often based on 'impression', 'intuition' or 'opinions.' On the other hand, it is not sufficient, from the standpoint of criticism, to study only the linguistic features of a given style. There are other considerations which distinguish one writer from another, e.g his ideas, images and aesthetic outlook."⁴¹

Then he introduces his first chapter, which is our concern in this thesis, and which "is an attempt towards the establishment of a (constant) relationship between the linguistic features prominent in the literary style of a given writer and his philosophy. This is done in terms of the lexical features correlated with certain themes in the poetry of the leading Iraqi poet, Badr Shakir El-Sayyab"(1926-1964)⁴²

First, he states that the object of this chapter is "an attempt to interpret the poetry of the leading Iraqi poet Badr Shakir El-Sayyab...through the analysis of the linguistic features prominent in his poetic style."⁴³ Then he explains the stylistic approach he adopts: "every poet deals with his themes from his point of view, and there are distinctive stylistic devices correlated with these themes. Sometimes, a steady relationship can be established between certain stylistic devices and a given theme, in the sense that the poet may use certain lexical, grammatical or phonological features in the expression of a given theme, as we shall see in the treatment of the theme of 'time' in El-Sayyab's poetry."⁴⁴

He continues: "but it is not always possible to establish this relationship between a writer's language and each of his themes. All that can be said is that he has 'favourite' stylistic patterns common in his poetry. These stylistic patterns are to be investigated, and generalised statements may be reached."⁴⁵,"what we must insist upon in our literary evaluation is not to impose any external 'law' on the work of art. Every work of art has its own laws which must be deduced from within, i.e from the

inside of the work. Neither should we approach a work of art with preconceived ideas about the writer's style. Our task, whether as stylisticians or as critics, is to investigate and describe the facts observable in the work under consideration and to validate our conclusions by producing evidence from the work itself."⁴⁶

His method of analysing poetry starts thus: "what we need first is an adequate technique within a stable linguistic framework, and then relationships between 'form' and the 'theme', if any, are to be subsequently examined and established. A postulated technique is the one I have employed in the analysis of the poetry of the Egyptian poet Şalah Abd El-Şabour. According to this technique three levels of analysis are suggested."⁴⁷

He defines the themes in the collections as follows: "the poems in these collections have lent themselves to three considerably significant themes about which relevant lexical statements can be made:

1. Theme of time.
2. Theme of futility.
3. Theme of love."⁴⁸

The first theme is time, and 'Izzat states that "the study of the poet's language correlated with this theme reveals that the poet is obsessed by the notion that time is against him. The idea of 'departure' from this life is a frequently occurring motif in his poems: the hour is 'hastening', the day is 'drowning', and time in

general is but 'a calendar inscribed on a shroud'. It seems that the long list of calamities which befell the writer all through his life made him haunted by this idea."⁴⁹

He explains, with reference to the theme of time, that "his collocations with lexical items of time-reference associated with this theme are interesting. The collocates (i.e. habitually accompanying words) of these items imply depression, melancholy and darkness. This applies to (parts of) the day like hour, morning, day-time, evening and night; to (parts of) the year such as day, month and year; and to seasons like winter, autumn and summer."⁵⁰

After he classifies the day, year, seasons and time in general he comments that "The haunting idea of departure and the torture of anticipating this moment make the poet anxious to get all he can from life, especially the enjoyment of love and the beauty of natural scenery. These two major topics are often blended in his poetry."⁵¹ 'Izzat continues that "this pessimistic note is often reinforced by a heavy use of lexical items that are reminiscent of

- a. death and murder
- b. torture and pain
- c. extinction and annihilation."⁵²

'Izzat provides examples of each case from the poetry.

The second theme is futility: and 'Izzat considers that "Connected with the theme of time is the theme of futility, which is particularly observable in his collection ?unfu:datu-lmatar (the song of the Rain). In this collection the poet is expressing his

indignation against the deplorable state of affairs prevalent at that time in Iraq, North Africa, Egypt and Korea. His images correlated with this theme are almost all derived from the language of birth, abortion, sterility and death. Heavy metaphorical use of language characterises the treatment of 'futility.' We find here more unusual collocations than in the other themes,"⁵³ and "another stylistic device associated with the theme of futility is the use of names of implements or natural elements accompanied by the negative or the antonym of their habitually expected collocates."⁵⁴ He provides various examples.

The last theme is love. 'Izzat sees it as follows: "Another obsession in El-Şayyab's poetry is woman. He is in eternal quest for love, but his search is vain. His treatment of love is all, the warmth and incentive to life, yet his love is lost, a state which leads him to boredom and despair."⁵⁵ Then 'Izzat continues with another aspect of the poet's style, in the theme of love; "parallel to this duality between ideal love and carnal desire is duality between the force of love and the force of death. This duality is depicted by the use of a technique of 'polarities' or oppositions. The vast majority of these polarities imply a conflict between his forward movement and regression or standing still."⁵⁶

The third book by 'Alī 'Izzat is *Al-Lughah wa Al-Dalālāh fī Al-Shi'r: Dirāsah Naqdiyyah fī Shi'r Al-Sayyāb wa 'Abd Al-Şabūr* (Language and Semantics in Poetry: A Critical Study of the Poetry of Al-Sayyāb and Şalāh 'Abd Al-Şabūr) Cairo 1976.

This study consists of three chapters and an introduction. The first Chapter: Method and Style; Chapter Two: Poetry of Badr Shākir Al-Sayyāb: A Verbal Study; Chapter Three: Poetry of Ṣalāḥ ‘Abd Al-Ṣabūr: Words and Constructions. This book is a translation, from English, of parts of the first and the second book.

It is worth mentioning several points at the end of this study. ‘Izzat has an Anglo-Saxon background, a close connection with and awareness of modern literary theory in the West and particularly the stylistic approach; his works are of an academic character; he is a respected figure in modern Arabic literary criticism. However, the weakness of his work is that, in general, articles have been written at different times and published in different places and finally collected in one volume. There is no explanation of terms to make the topic clearer, more useful and more accessible to the Arab or general reader.

2- Muḥammad ‘Abd Al-Muṭṭalib(see above pp114-118, pp168-172, p177, pp232-234,):

Al-Muṭṭalib is a critic who has been influenced by the stylistic approach; one of the books in which he introduces the topic to Arab readers is examined in Chapter Two, of Part One of this thesis.

His publications are mainly related to literary criticism and the revival of Arabic traditional rhetoric and apply these in practical criticism and in the field of literary criticism with a stylistic approach.

The title of one of his articles is *Al-Takrār Al-Nama fī Qasīdat Al-Madīḥ ‘ind Ḥafīẓ -- Dirāsah Uslūbiyyah* (Stereotyped Repetition in the Eulogistic Ode of Ḥafīẓ -- A Stylistic Study) *Fuṣūl*, 57

He states that the stylistic examination of the literary text derives from previous theories which see in literary language "characteristics of individual variation." These "characteristics" have two features: first, the language is distinctive in its choice and its awareness; second, it deviates from the ordinary level of language, which is distinguished by spontaneity, in that people use it in ordinary life without any distinction.

He then points out that style is a literary linguistic art. His principal components of style are derived from the following: the aesthetic and the grammatical elements, and the capacities of the lexis. This may be the justification for saying that traditional rhetoric and modern stylistics are closely related.

This leads Muṭṭalib to examine the rhetorical elements of the poetry by means of traditional rhetoric. But his examination is from a new starting point, which helps in understanding the poem deeply and comprehensively. This is because the analysis illustrates the expressive aesthetic capacities of the language of the poet. The aim of his study is to discover the effect of individual sensitivity to language on the poet. He pursues this aim by presenting a stylistic type of analysis of some of the poetry.

His justification of his choice of “stereotyped repetition” in the poems of Ḥāfīz does not mean ignoring the semantic side. The repeating of certain words represents the essence of the meaning in the poem. The poet chooses these words because he is aware of their nature and their influence or effect on the presenting of the idea of the poem. Also he relates these words to the integrated structure of the poetic work.

He justifies his preference for the poetry of eulogy; it is because it constitutes 28 % per cent of the whole of poetry; even though the poet is known as *Shā‘ir Al-Ijtimā‘iyyāt* = the poet of social matters, social poetry constitutes only 13% of the whole of his poetry.

He studies various elements of repetition and gives examples of some of them, as follows:

The first element of his examination is *Tasrī‘* = internal rhyme, leonine rhyme; this means that, from the opening of the poem, the rhyme of the second part of the verse can be known before completing the reading of the whole verse. He finds 29.7% of the lines have internal rhyme.

The second is *Tajnīs* = paronomassia i.e., a root is repeated with a different meaning. The third is *ʾībāq* = antithesis; two terms with opposite meanings are brought together. It is found in 56 % of the poetry.

Repetition illustrates the expressive capacities of the poet. Stereotyped repetition helps in creating numerous relationships within the verse, though not in the poem as a whole. The poet

adopts the traditional method of the Arabic poem in using *Jinās*, *Ṭbāq*, *Tarṣī‘*, even though it indicates his wide knowledge of the capacities of the language and how to use it in changing. This style achieves the conveying of both the message the poet wants to convey and its effects on the readers.

My observations on this analysis are: the purpose is to employ Arabic traditional rhetoric, and relate it to modern stylistic approaches. However, the article gives no references, nor does it explain the terms used, or give Arabic equivalents of the English or French terms.

3 -‘Adnān Ibn Dhurayl(see above pp100-109, pp164-166, p77, p180 :

In his book *Al-Lughah wa Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah* Language and style -- A study, Damascus 1980, Ibn Dhurayl devotes the third section to practical criticism of poetry, fiction and non-fiction, by way of the stylistic approach.

Our concern here is only with practical criticism covering poetry. His examination deals with two poems by one poet and one poem by another poet. He opens his practical study with a theoretical introduction covering the linguistic structures in Arabic, then he studies both deep and surface structure in the light of modern Western linguisticians such as Chomsky.

The first poem he examines is by Muḥammad ‘Imrān. In his analysis, he looks at the following:

1. Linguistic features such as sentence types, nominal or verbal, *Ḥidhf* = ellipsis; *ʿĀmil and Maʿmulāt* = the performance factors and axes, elements, acrostics.
2. The semantics of the change from the dual pronoun to the plural pronoun: he considers this a stylistic feature.

The second text which he examines is a different poem by the same poet. Before his examination of the poem, he provides us with an introduction about the semantics and the social reference of the poetry he examines. In his analysis are:

1. Ibn Dhurayal uses the theory of referential meaning to relate some symbols (words, images ..) in this poem to their referents (in society) and to search for what is behind the meanings.
2. He studies the meanings of the images and their symbols in the poem.
3. He corrects a misinterpretation of this poem by another critic, Muḥammad Jamāl Bārūt, pointing out that it springs from his approaching the text, its constructions and its lexis from the wrong direction, not adhering to linguistic analysis, and, finally, not using a stylistic approach. The critic is making a plea for using what earlier critics have left out in their analysis.⁵⁸

The third poem he examines is by Ḥusayn Al-Ḥamawī. He studies its semantics and constructions, in terms of both the Arabic tradition and of modern Western literary criticism. His plan of analysis is as follows: Analysing the sentences of the poem and their types:

nominal and verbal sentences, and pointing out other grammatical aspects of the poem.⁵⁹

In this very short stylistic analysis, it is worth mentioning that the critic is aware of the importance of the stylistic approach; that he is aware that his practical criticism here is adopting a stylistic approach; he shows a good knowledge of both the Arabic linguistic tradition and Western literary criticism; he covers, in his criticism, various genres, poetry, the novel and the play.

4- Shukrī Muḥammad ‘Ayyād: (see above pp109-114, pp149-156, p177pp, 1801)

‘Ayyād is a well known Egyptian critic. His works, whether articles, books or translations, are mainly concerned with modern literary criticism and show a profound knowledge of modern Western literary theory. He is a prominent stylistician in the Arab world, both producing works on stylistics for Arab readers and employing it to examine Arabic literature, particularly poetry.

One of his articles is entitled *Ṣiḡhat Al-Tafḍīl Fī Shi‘r Al-Mutanabbī* (The Elative Form in the Poetry of Al-Mutanabbī), *Al-Ādāb* ⁶⁰

He states that this study is a stylistic study, aiming to achieve a more precise understanding of the poetic vision of the poet, as is usual in modern stylistics studies. Then he points out that the stylistician usually starts by observing a phenomenon which has attracted his attention in the language of the poet, in his insisting on either a particular word or a certain construction that appears or is repeated more often than by others of his generation, or of

the generations immediately preceding or succeeding. Because he deviates from the normal method of expressing certain concepts, the different forms indicate a difference in content or meaning = *Maʿnūn*. So the differences in quantity or quality in the language of the poet are a starting point in any stylistic studies.

He asserts the necessity for this stylistic study to be supported by statistical analysis, because it is based on quantitative differences which can be objectively observed. It is then necessary to make qualitative judgements to explain the significance of the quantitative observations. This makes statistics valuable in understanding the vision of the poet. This stylistic analysis follows a plan of which only the most important features are illustrated here:

Figures show that the elative is employed 13 times more often in the poetry of Al-Mutanabbī than in the poetry of another nine Arab poets, the samples being taken at random. The elative form is common in the poetry of Al-Mutanabbī in general and at the beginnings of his poems in particular.

This phenomenon is generally associated with *Ḥikmah*. Al-Mutanabbī is fond of the rhetorical device of opening a poem with an epigram, a general and abstract comment on some aspect of life, as a means of attracting his audience's attention. 'Ayyād relates this propensity to the rhetoric of *ʿIlm Al-Kalām*.

This article is short, clear, logical and with a fresh point of view. At the same time it is more of a brief, witty statement of a single idea than a serious, disciplined stylistic analysis.

In his book *Madkhal ilā 'Ilm Al-Uslūb* (Introduction to the Science of Style), Riyadh 1982. 'Ayyād devotes the second part to the practical study of selected modern Arabic romantic poems.

'Ayyād states certain points under the heading "how we can read a poetic text." The first point concerns his choice; even though the two modernist Arab poets belong to the same Apollo school, there is no historical perspective in the study. His point is merely that the poems are very close to the understanding of the young reader in both language and feeling.

He goes on to explain the feeling of the reader; he argues that the "reading of the literary text" cannot deserve to be considered as "a reading" until the reader feels that he has gone behind the words of the poem. This simple fact was recognised by both Spitzer and Riffaterre.

Then he explains the linguistic side. The distinctiveness of the emotion of the poem can be achieved or actualised only through the peculiarity of the expression. The poet must shock us repeatedly by "unexpected linguistic forms" until we understand what he is saying. In order to distinguish these "unexpected forms" we have to be, first of all, sure that the poet is using our language. In other words, we are not able to discover "deviations" in his language if we cannot measure these deviations

by the standard of the common, ordinary language used by the poet and ourselves.

The second point is that the poet writes for us; that if we let the poem contact or touch our ordinary linguistic senses, we will be able to discover his “peculiar usage of the language”, which he wants us to discover and to understand what is behind it; this is the basis for a sufficiently “objective understanding of the poem”.

The third point is to consider the poem as an “object ” = (*Maw ḍi'*); to examine it and to achieve its “objective” meaning as agreed by the majority. Collecting different “choices” and “deviations” in the poem, then classifying the similar items into groups and comparing them with their opposites drives away the ghost of “subjectivity”, but this cannot be achieved without considering the poem as an “object” which deserves our consideration.⁶¹

‘Ayyād mentions two aims of this practical study. First “the immediate aim” is to make the theoretical principles (he provides these in the first section of this book, which is mentioned in Chapter One of this part of this thesis) become habits in the study of literature. Second, “the ultimate further aim” is to return to the method of studying literature by paying attention to the texts, instead of concentrating on historical information, and to make teachers of literature pay greater attention to the study primarily of the text, so that criticism may change from the studying of the history of literature to a lively, active and rich study.⁶²

In this part he examines six poems, the first three of which are by Ibrāhīm Nājī and the second three by Abū Al-Qāsīm Al-Shābī.

The first poem is entitled *Khawā ʿlīr Al-Ghurūb* (ideas at sundown) by Ibrāhīm Nājī. My aim in examining this practical study is not to summarise it but rather to examine his method of analysing poems.

‘Ayyād’s analysis examines the following features: The semantics and meaning of the title and whether it forms an integral part of the poem; the types of metre and rhyme and their influence on the meaning of the poem; the partial obvious senses of the poem, since one of the axioms of stylistic analysis is that a literary work is an integrated unit co-operating in all its parts to achieve one aim; the deeper sense of “the sea” and its “function” as constituting an axis and as creating in various images; these images, which he divides into three groups and considers psychoanalytically; the grammar and syntactic, of the poem, consider stylistically. Finally, he produces a conclusion.⁶³

The second poem which is entitled *Istiqbāl Al-Qamar* (welcoming the moon), is by Ibrāhīm Nājī. ‘Ayyād analyses this poem on the following plan: The semantics of the title of the poem; the method of the poet in addressing the moon; the frequency of imperative verbs and their functions in the poem; the grammatical forms in the poem; the psychoanalysis of the images; the moon a symbol of the mother, conclusion.⁶⁴

The third poem is entitled '*Āsifat Rūh: Al-Zawraq Ughriq wa Al-Mallāh Yastasrikh*' (The Storm of a soul: the boat sank and the sailor is drowned), by Ibrāhīm Nājī. In 'Ayyād's analysis, he discusses the following points: the semantics of the title; the images; the *Isti'ārah* = (metaphor), from a psychoanalytical point view; linguistic features of the lexis of the poem (he observes that the words of the poem are characterised by their extremity, that they reach the utmost limit of the levels of semantics); the semantics of the lexis; the music of the poem; the virtual repetition of one *Maq ṭā'* = (stanza). He sums up in a conclusion.⁶⁵

The fourth poem is entitled *fī Ḍal Wādī Al-Mawt* (In the Shadow of the Valley of Death), by Abū Al-Qāsim Al-Shābbī. His analysis includes the following: the semantics of the title (the fact that the *Idāfah* is repeated it); the characteristics and varieties of the sentences: nominal, interrogative, verbal; the semantics of the words of the poem.⁶⁶

The fifth poem is entitled *Al-Ṣabā ḥ Al-Jadid* (The New Morning), by Abū Al-Qāsim Al-Shābbī. 'Ayyād examines the following aspects of this poem: the semantics of the title; the use of metre to enhance meaning as well as sound; repeated lines; types of sentences; the images; the lexis.⁶⁷

The sixth poem is entitled *Min Aghānī Al-Hayāt* (Some Songs of Life) by Abū Al-Qāsim Al-Shābbī. 'Ayyād analyses the following points: language as the stylistic introduction to understanding any poem; the three subjects of the poem: sheep, the poet and nature.⁶⁸

In conclusion, his analysis adopts a stylistic approach, demonstrating his ability to use both Western and traditional Arabic literary criticism. There is no glossary of terms. On the whole, it is a brief, simple analysis.

Another article by 'Ayyād is entitled *Qirā'ah Uslūbiyyah li Shi'r Ḥāfiẓ* [A Stylistic Reading of the Poetry of Ḥāfiẓ (Ibrāhīm)], *Fuṣṭ* 69

He approaches this poem in the following way: his chosen definition of style is a distinctive method of linguistic expression; he looks for differences between traditional formulations; he distinguishes between these "formulations" = (*Anmāṭ*) and "personal styles" [*Asālib*]; he studies the "deviation" in Ḥāfiẓ Ibrāhīm's poetry between formal and colloquial language.

The aim of this study is to produce an objective judgement on the "distinctive features" of the language of the poet.

This article is a long one with an elaborate explication, investigating such stylistic features as deviation and formulation. There is no explanation of terms nor any references.

In 'Ayyād's book *Al-Lughah wa Al-Ibdāi': Mabāda' 'Ilm Al-Uslūb Al-'Arabī* (Language and Invention -- Principles of the Science of Arabic Style),⁷⁰ there is a poem by Al-Mutanabbī analysed in the light of the stylistic approach. The method of analysis is as follows: he uses both western and traditional criticism in entering the world of the poem; he attempts to identify individual stylistic features which are related to different usages of language, the arrangement of words, the function of verbs and the form in which they appear,

the functions of the openings of poems = *Ma'āli'*, the relevance of context and the function of key-words in a poem.

5 - **Jūzīf Mīshāl Sharīm** (see pp 118-121, p177,) :

In his book, which is entitled *Dalīl Al-Dīrāsāt Al-Uslūbiyyah*, (Guide to Stylistic Studies), ⁷¹ Sharīm uses in his introduction the stylistic approach to support his argument; he studies only a certain aspects of them. There is no full practical criticism of a whole poem, using of the stylistic approach.

He analyses a poem which is entitled *Awraq Al-Kharīf* (Leaves of Autumn), by Yūsuf **Ghuṣūb**. His analysis of this poem supports his argument concerning the music of the poetry. He examines the following aspects: the music of the poem and its aesthetic function; the relationship between the music of the poem and the content of the poem; the features of the language of the poem. He makes no use of the methods of traditional Arabic literary criticism and there is no conclusion.

6 - **Muḥammad Al-Hādī Al-Ṭarābulṣī** (see above ,pp.,162-164, p178,,p228,268-283):

Al-Ṭarābulṣī is a Tunisian, an academic critic, the author of several books and a considerable number of articles, and the translator of much material from French. He is mainly concerned, in his works, with modern literary criticism, and has a deep knowledge of Arabic tradition.

He is one of the stylisticians in the Arab world, so that most of his publications are related to stylistic studies. One of his most

important works, in the field of applied stylistics or practical stylistics, is *Khaṣṣi ʿAl-Uslūb fī “Al-Shawqiyyāt”* (The Characteristics of Style in “Al-Shawqiyyāt ”)⁷²

He states in his introduction four objectives or aims of the study:

1. “A description of the system of the Arabic language (*Niẓām Al-Lughah Al-‘Arabiyyah*), relying on a *tranche* of Arabic which represents it at one particular period, in order that we may determine the extent of stability and change in its rules and usages, and so perceive its distinctive features and the possibilities of development in it.”⁷³

2. “A description of Arab life in poetic texts in order to understand how it participates in creating the poetic atmosphere. This may help us to discern the different levels in utterance and the different functions which are realised at or by these levels.”⁷⁴

3. “A Description of the life of the Arabic language in the poetry of a particular poet, Aḥmad Shawqī, in order that we may determine the individual’s part in marshalling its features, the effect that a poet may have on it and the stamp with which it may be designated in his poetry, and so perceive the way towards the general enrichment of its resources, on the one hand, towards the building of particular distinctive styles based on the possibilities of the common languages on the other hand.”⁷⁵

4. “Establishing ‘practical stylistics’ in Arabic, and its role in the description of the system of the language and in participating in

establishing the scientific rules and methodological starting points in general linguistic research.”⁷⁶

He then says that he adopts a stylistic approach in this study. His method, as he describes it, “is moving from practice to theory and not, as is usual, from theory to practice.”⁷⁷ Also, he points out that “the direction of his investigation is stylisticall linguistic one, and his starting-point is the text.”⁷⁸

This study is concerned with three essential aspects: “poetry”; “language” and “style”. He explains his methodological choice which is the examination of each usage in the poet’s poetry which is original or uncommon, in one aspect or another; in other words it is a new usage and it breaks traditional or modern linguistic rules; it is not an established usage, yet it is more effective in shaping the utterance.

This study is divided into three main parts: the levels of the style of utterance, styles of the structures of utterance and the style of certain parts of utterance.

PART ONE, levels of the styles of utterance, is concerned with the examination of the audible: the music (*Al-Musīqā*).

Chapter One is concerned with the metres; his examination results in statistical figures which are presented in diagrams.

Al-Ṭarābūlī’s first conclusion is that “Shawqī, in the structure of his poetry, does not depart from the metres of *Al-Khalil*; his restriction to them is complete and his respect for them is

absolute. In this respect, Shawqī is one of the most conservative of the rules of the ancients among the modernists.”⁷⁹

His second conclusion is that Shawqī does not use all the sixteen metres; he leaves out *Madīd*, *Munsriḥ*, *Muḍārī’*. None of his verse uses any of them. His third conclusion, from the diagram he provides, is as follows: (only some examples are given here):

1. The most used metre in the poetry of Shawqī is *Al-Kāmil*: one-third of his poetry is written in this metre.
2. The least used metre of the thirteen is *Muqtaḥb*.
3. His poems, in general, are very long, apart from those written in the *Rajaz* metre.
4. The reason for the shortness of the poems which are written in the *Rajaz* metre is that their aim generally is didactic.
5. He uses the *Al-Kāmil* metre for social topics.⁸⁰

This study contains a considerable number of diagrams giving statistical results. Next he examines rhyme, in the same way as metre, providing numbers of diagrams which illustrate the topic.⁸¹

The Second Chapter deals with relationships between the signifier and the signified, such as *Jīnās*, *Tikrār* and other aspects, with details of theory and its application to poetry, drawing upon the Arabic rhetorical tradition.

Al-Ṭarābulṣī concludes that the music of Shawqī’s poetry is traditional, in general; it is not original at all. However, it is beautiful even so, and the reason for this is that Shawqī follows old rules which are stable in the mind of the Arab reader.⁸²

The Second Part is devoted to movement. This part consists of two chapters.

The First Chapter is devoted to the examination of *Muqābalah* = antithesis in *Al-Shawqiyyāt*. Al-Ṭarābulṣī observes that antithesis appears frequently, in a variety of forms. He examines this in detail, explaining it and providing explanatory examples for each case from traditional classical Arabic rhetoric: he looks at the contextual and linguistic antithesis, its semantics and more details about then using the poetry from *Al-Shawqiyyāt*. He concludes that “antithesis is a motivator of the semantics and ideas in the poem; it also supports the music of the poem, or it supports the meaning of the verse by a rich imagination in which visual images are generated.”⁸³

Chapter Two examines other methods of expressing movement, by among them *‘aks* and *Tanāẓur*, *Tadarruj*, *Iṭṭihād*.

Part Three deals with the level of visual images. This part consists of three chapters. In it Al-Ṭarābulṣī uses both Western materials and traditional Arabic rhetorical material.

In Chapter One, he examines various types of images, with examples from *Al-Shawqiyyāt*, such as *Tashbīh*; *Al-Tashbīh Al-Mursal*; *Al-Tashbīh Al-Mu’akkad* *Al-Tashbīh Al-Balīgh*; *Al-Tashbīh Al-Ḍunnī* and *Isti’ārah*;

In his examination of *Isti’ārah*; he studies the most important types of metaphor in *Al-Shawqiyyāt*, and shows how metaphor, in traditional Arabic rhetoric, is divided into a number of categories.

His conclusion about the characteristics of images in *Al-Shawqiyyāt* is that they are simple; there is a balance between the two levels of reality and imagination; and they are clear.

Chapter Two deals with the semantics of the images, in their connection with the notion of similarity. In Al-Ṭarābulṣī's examination of the sources of the images in *Al-Shawqiyyāt*, he indicates that this focuses on the signifier; it is concerned with the different kinds of image and with relating each kind to the semantic domains which have this kind of image in common. The aim of this is to seek to identify the general characteristics of the depiction of the poet and his perspective upon the world. He then observes the variety of the sources of the poet in depiction and classifies them into two main kinds: experiential and cultural sources.

In his study of experiential sources in *Al-Shawqiyyāt*, Al-Ṭarābulṣī identifies a number; inanimate nature is the most important describing either spiritual and religious matters or moral human matters: light (sunlight etc.); plants (flower, rose, narcissus, basil,); water (rainwater, ground-water, sea-water.).

The second type of nature is animate nature. Al-Ṭarābulṣī distinguishes four types of animals: predatory animals, such as the lion (the image of the lion is primary, related mainly to human beings and specifically to fighting men and appears only in military and epic contexts. It is an image which suggests respect, power and praise; the fox (the fox image is restricted to human beings in both political and military contexts. It is an image

which suggests satire and disapproval); birds, of which there are two types; non-predatory, such as the sand grouse which presents the image of gentleness, the bulbul which presents the image of a beautiful voice, and the peacock, parrot and turkey and birds of prey, of which there are two types: the eagle, and the hawk; quadrupeds other than predatory animals. e. g. the deer as an image for beautiful women, or the antelope; and the creeping animals and insects, such as the snake and the bee. He concludes that nature (both kinds, animate and inanimate) has a big influence on *Al-Shawqiyyāt*. But, despite the variety of elements which the poet uses in his depiction, his goal is the same. In respect of inanimate nature he tends to use the images to express brilliance and fruitfulness, and in respect of animate nature he tends to use them to express greatness, strength, usefulness, treachery (fox), and harmfulness (snake). The animals he uses belong to desert, Bedouin fauna.

The third and last experiential source, is human beings. Al-Ṭarābulṣī divides this source into two types: characteristics of human beings (age, marriage, illness, birth and death,) and their situations, and the tools of human beings (tools of war such as swords, of the sea such as fishing boats, of domestic life such as mirrors, scissors, gold, diamonds).

The second main type of source is the cultural. Al-Ṭarābulṣī examines three types: literature (such as names of famous figures in Arabic literature, and sayings from Arabic literature), religion (such as names of the characters in the Quranic stories, religious

events) and morality, history and legend such as ancient Egyptian, pre-Islamic and Islamic history.⁸⁴

Chapter three deals with the relationships of the association of one with another and their semantic meanings = (*'Alāqāt Al-Tadā'ī wa Dilālātih..*) Al-Ṭarābulṣī means by this: "the approximation which occurs between the described and its image in such a way that there is an organic connection between them; and the possibility of each taking the other's place and indicating it. The association between the two is not the similarity between them but the fact that each can be called by the name of the other."⁸⁵

He then says that studying the images which are based on association (one thing being called by the name of another) has led him to classify them into three categories:

1. The relationships of association that are based on *Majāz* = trope; this category contains *Al-Majāz Al-Mursal* = hypallage (he finds three kinds of this in *Al-Shawqiyyāt*: partial, which expresses the whole by the part; causal, which expresses the meaning by its cause, and adverbial, which expresses the meaning by time, place or circumstance), and *Al-Majāz Al-Aqlī* = figure of thought. He offers examples of all these forms.

Finally he observes that this type, with its two kinds, refers to things by mentioning their characteristics or their effects without mentioning their names.

2. The relationships that are based on reality (real or literal meanings), that is to say, *Kināyah* = metonymy, kenning,

antonomasia, which, he observes, have an important role in formulating the images in *Al-Shawqiyyāt*. He enumerates all the sorts of *Kināyah* such as: *Talwīh*, *lshārah*, *Ramz*, *Ta'rīd*, *Dawarān*, *Taltīf*.

3. The relationships which are based on *Wahm* = illusion of which an example is *Tawriyyah* = Paronomasia or pun.

Al-Ṭarābulṣī finds this type of image characterised by richness, variety and comprehensiveness.

His conclusion in this Part is that “the poetry of Shawqī emerges from a three-fold environment with contradiction on three sides: its music has an Arabic breath, its movement is rich and based on a dual axis and its images reflect the Bedouin Arabic environment”⁸⁶.

Part Two deals with the styles of the structures of utterance. This part contains two sections, the first consisting of two chapters, and the second consisting of three chapters.

Part one deals with external structure, and consists of two chapters.

Chapter one deals with *Mu'āra ḡīt* = a form of pastiche, or literary imitation.

Al-Ṭarābulṣī considers that *Mu'āra ḡīt* in *Al-Shawqiyyāt* demonstrate that the Arabic language is able to keep its classical elegance of style in modern times, and that they illustrate the extent of the richness of the Arabic literary tradition and encourage a reversion

to it and assimilation of it. The *Mu'āraḡāt* in *Al-Shawqiyyāt* are not merely pastiches of traditional poems or attempts to put some part of traditional poetry into modern language; they represent work which is complementary or additional: based on traditional roots, they are not restricted to them but, they are a "new reading" of the tradition which preserves that tradition's peculiar tone.

Chapter Two deals with *Hikāyāt* = tales. Al-Ṭarābulṣī states that these tales form one of the most important aspects of *Al-Shawqiyyāt*. Their most obvious features are the shortness of the poems and their attractiveness for children in respect of the rhyme (they are in the *Rajaz* metre) and the ease with which they can memorise them.⁸⁷

He provides statistical figures about the animals appearing in these tales: the fox appears most frequently (in ten of them) then the donkey (in six) and finally a group including the rabbit, the wolf and the monkey (in four).⁸⁸

As for birds, Al-Ṭarābulṣī finds that they appear in one-third of the tales (in seventeen tales); the types of bird are the parrot, owl, bulbul, pigeon, bat (sic), peacock, sparrow, crow, lark, hoopoe and stork.

He concludes that "these tales derive from three sources: "Eastern wisdom", "Arabic proverbial" sayings and "the Qur'ān." They have three flavours: purely Islamic, Arab and general Eastern."⁸⁹

He goes on to examine the structure of these tales: introduction, dialogue (in which a rhetorical and informative tone predominates), time and linguistics requirements (simple and logical language.)

Al-Ṭarābulṣī concludes with his objection to the opinion that tales are worthless in terms of their values. At the same time he agrees that they display weaknesses compared with what he considers to be a reasonable equivalent, western theatrical dialogue. They have various values: historical, educational and moral. It is interesting to note his description of the poet as the La Fontaine of the Arabs.⁹⁰

The Second Part deals with internal structure. It consists of three chapters.

Chapter One deals with constructions in general. Al-Ṭarābulṣī examines various aspects of them.

The first topic is *Al-Taqdīm wa Al-Ta'khīr*. This is an aspect of movement, and his concern is with the reasons for its occurring as a means of limiting or giving prominence to the word in question.

The second topic is *Ī'tirāḍ*. This means to insert elements which are not essential among other elements of the sentence or utterance, in order to lay emphasis on them, or for other reasons. He gives some examples of *Ī'tirāḍ* in verbal and nominal sentences, *Ī'tirāḍ* between two parts which should not be separated and *Ī'tirāḍ* between an adjective and what it qualifies.

The third topic is *Ḥadhf* = ellipsis. He gives several examples of this, such as ellipsis of the object and of the first element of the genitive construction.

The fourth topic is *Al-Thiqal fī Al-Ta'abīr*. His way of measuring this is personal taste. The most important reasons for heaviness in construction are frequency of use preposition and of pronouns.

Chapter Two deals with expression = *Ta'ābīr*. Al-Ṭarābulṣī finds the effect of the culture in *Al-Shawqiyyāt* in two aspects: the ready-made expression and *Iqitibās* = (adaptation or quotation from the *Quran*, the *Ḥadith*, Arab proverbs and Arabic poetry.)

He identifies various qualities of expression in *Al-Shawqiyyāt*. Much of the poetry he describes as *Ta'ābīr Qawimah* = correct expression. However, he also finds many instances of what he calls *Ta'ābīr Saqūmah* = incorrect expression which is inadequate to convey the poet's full meaning. A third type of expression he calls *Dhāt Ḥaddayn* = double-edged, that is meaning one thing and the opposite.

A special aspect is the expression of "wisdom", which accounts for one-eighth of *Al-Shawqiyyāt*. He associates this particularly with two constructions: the nominal sentence and the conditional sentence. The 'wisdom' poems come at the beginning and the end of the collection.

Chapter Three deals with *Al-Asālīb Al-Inshā'iyyah*, he identifies various types of it in *Al-Shawqiyyāt* such as: *Iistifhām*, *Istihlāl*, *Amr*, and *Nidā'*.

The Third Part deals with the styles of certain parts of speech; it consists of ten chapters.

In his introduction to this part, Al-Ṭarābulṣī indicates that his concern is to examine the styles of these parts of speech, not from a traditional linguistic point of view but from that of the poet's originality in his use of language.

Chapter One deals with *Al-Tankīr wa Al-Ta'rīf* = definition and non definition. In this chapter Al-Ṭarābulṣī shows that the poet generates the semantic effects both by respecting the rules of Arabic and by changing these rules or deliberately breaking them.

Chapter Two deals with the evocative semantic use of proper names: names from ancient Egypt, names from Islam, names from the Qur'ān, the names of *Allāh*, names from Eastern and Western countries. These names have the function of indicating time and place.

Chapter Three deals with the pronoun and the effect of altering its position in the sentence.

Chapter Four deals with plural and dual. Shawqī frequently uses uncommon forms of the plural; he also frequently uses the dual for the plural. Al-Ṭarābulṣī expatiates at length on Shawqī's choice of a singular or plural for the frequently-used word *Waṭan* and the semantic implications of this choice. Shawqī does not use the dual for the plural in this case.

One point at which the dual is prominent in Shawqī's poetry is in the opening lines of many of his poems, particularly those of love, of homesickness and of national history, where he follows the Pre-Islamic convention of addressing his discourse to two companions.

Chapter Five deals with *Dilālāt Al-Mabānī wa Al-Ma'ānī* = (Semantics of Structures and Meanings.)

The semantics of structures in *Al-Shawqiyyāt* takes account of the use of rare forms the revival of obsolete forms and the extension of words and forms beyond their normal usage.

He examines the semantics of the word *Fatā* = (youth) it is used widely in *Al-Shawqiyyāt*, 93 times in the singular, 16 times in the plural, and not in the dual at all. In 35 cases it indicates 'young man', and in 25 out of these 35 it indicates the years of adolescence, in 58 cases it does not indicate any specific age but indicates features characteristic of youth, in 26 cases it indicates a hero in politics or in war; in 15 cases it indicates an innovator in a particular field; in 12 cases it indicates an ideal model of morality. He concludes that the word is not used as in the Arabic tradition; as a technical term, it principally connotes the concept of 'hero'.⁹¹

Chapter Six deals with *Al-Nubū wa Al-Tamakkun* = the inconsistent word and the suitable word. The first type of inconsistency is linguistic: the word is found where another word would be more acceptable, particularly when there is a discrepancy between the signifier and signified; the second type is locational: the word is

inappropriate in the context. There is a disconnected character in some of the longer poems.

Chapter Seven deals with *Al -Takh ṣ wa Al-Ta'mīm* = particularisation and generalisation. The particularisation of the general and the generalisation of the particular are methods of changing the semantics of the word used by the poet to enrich the poetic image.

Chapter Eight deals with *Al-Dakhīl* "foreign words or expressions" or "loan-words.". There are two aspects of this phenomenon: the introduction of the foreign word itself, together with its foreign meaning, and the adaptation of a native word to a foreign meaning. Examples come from politics, economics, arts, medicine sociology and technology. Borrowed words affect the sound of the poems, but neither they nor adapted words affect the artistic structure of the poems. Both of these are comparatively uncommon in *Al-Shawqiyyāt*.

Chapter Nine deals with verbs. *Al-Ṭarābulṣī* discusses various deviations in verbal usage in *Al-Shawqiyyāt*.

Chapter Ten deals with particles = *Al-Adawāt wa Al-Ḥurūf*. *Al-Ṭarābulṣī* examines variation in the usage of such things as negative particles, interrogative particles and prepositions.

The work has many good points. The author has a firm grounding in both the Arabic critical tradition and western stylistics. He has produced an extremely comprehensive work.

The limitations of the work are that there is too much explication of Arabic rhetorical theory and that there is no list of equivalent terms in Arabic and French.

7- ‘Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī (See above, pp.75-82,166-7, 178,180):

Al-Masaddī's various books and articles show that he is thoroughly familiar with modern western literary criticism and with traditional Arabic linguistics and literary criticism. The stylistic approach is one aspect of concerns and publications, and he is the one person who can be considered as a stylistician in the Arab world, in that his name has been associated mainly with this approach since the 70s.

One of Al-Masaddī's works is one of practical criticism which adopts the stylistic approach, entitled *Qirā'āt ma'a Al-Shābbī wa Al-Mutanabbī wa Al-Jāhiz wa Ibn Khaldūn* (Readings with Al-Shābbī, Al-Mutanabbī, *Al-Jāhiz* and Ibn Khaldūn).⁹² It consists of articles which have been written, revised and published at various times and in various places. We deal here only with Al-Masaddī's criticism of poetry.

The first article examines aspects of the poetry of Al-Shābbī. Al-Masaddī indicates that this criticism is a result of a critical project which, to crystallise its main features, carries the possibility of blending two critical approaches. psychoanalytical and psycholinguistic. His examination of the poetry lies between two axes: the poetic utterance and its psychological significance.⁹³ The plan of his criticism is as follows: the period of the poet; the

modern era; a brief biography; his poetical gifts; features of his character; the emotions of the poet as subject to different interpretations; Al-Shābbī's combination of emotional elements and linguistic elements in his poetry; Al-Masaddī's attempt to find the answer to his emotional problems in his poetry. His analysis of Al-Shābbī's vocabulary, constructions and phonology finds that all of these elements are directly connected with his personal problems, his unrequited love and his illness.

He analyses a poem, entitled *Ṣalawāt fī Haykal Al-Ḥubb* (Prayers in the Temple of Love), which he refers to as Al-Shābbī's *Mu'allaqah*, and says of it that its constructional formulation "is based on two pillars: the moving word which inspires the construction of the whole, and the generative sound that gives rhythm to the construction of the part." The key-word is the pronoun "you".⁹³

He observes that in the poetry, there are two axes: the poet and his emotion, and the thinker who is addressing his discourse to others. Finally he makes a connection between the life of the poet and the political and social life which surrounds him.

The second article examines the poetry of *Al-Mutanabbī*, its linguistic structures and its personal components. Al-Masaddī points out that here he mixes the psychological and stylistic approaches.

He asserts that this is a new method of reading, which is different from traditionalist methods. There are two disciplines which support the linguist in his examination: psychoanalytical-literary criticism and psycho-linguistic criticism. The plan of his

analysis is as follows: explaining the two disciplines; analysing the problem of the poet by using the psychoanalytical-literary-critical approach. His study provides us with various tables and figures illustrating his analysis of the poetry as to content and style; his examination also deals with the language.

His stylistic criticism is that of an expert stylistician. However, these articles were published at different times and in different places; they have been revised several times, and the concerns of the critic have changed over the years.⁹⁴

8- Ṣalāh Faḍl (see above ,pp.127-37):

Faḍl is one of the most distinguished critics in the Arab world. His concern is with modern literary theory and the most important issues in it such as stylistics, semantics, semiotics; literary criticism and structuralism. His publications are considerable: a number of books and a large number of articles, showing both his interests and his thorough familiarity with modern literary theory.

One of his articles is entitled *Zawāhir Uslūbiyyah fī Shi'r Shawqī* (Statistic Phenomena in the Poetry of Shawqī), *Fuṣūl*.⁹⁵ The plan of this study is as follows: the evaluation of earlier historical methods of the study of this poetry; the stylistic approach as a different method of approaching the poetry, in which it is possible to illustrate his artistic peculiarities and their expressive capacities; the potential of the stylistic approach in practical literary criticism; and finally the concept of the stylistic

phenomenon as “a remarkable expressive feature which carries out a semantic function exceeding its merely linguistic role.”⁹⁶ The method of identifying such a feature, according to Spitzer, is by the intuition of the stylistician and his freedom to take note of it or pay attention to it.

This method is simply a “personal reaction” of the reader to the text and an examination of the effect which is aroused in the reader. It is still only partially developed and has to be made scientific by using a scientific method.

The centre of the stylistic phenomena in the poetry of the poet in this study is based on one axis, “the method of employing repetition.” His explaining of “the nature of the poetic construction” postulates three levels. First, the system of the language as music, sound, metre and rhythm, and all the letters and words which realise this system. Second, the depiction, construction and symbolic mechanism of the poem. Third, the semantic level, which is the totality of the poetic functions which are the result of the other two levels.

The poetry is based on “continuance”, which means the repetition of partial or compound patterns, either consecutively or alternately in various ways, in order to give a high level of musical and linguistic pleasure. He examines aspects of this continuance as follows: *Mū‘āra āt* = (pastiche); the opening of the poem ranges between imperative verbs and vocatives; *Tibāq* = (antithesis), and finally the repetition of interrogative particles

and conditional particles, and the repetition of grammatical forms, and of certain words.

9 -Şa'd Maşlūh(see above pp82- 100,178-180, 185-186):

In the introduction to his work, *Fī AL-Naṣṣ Al-Adabī: Dirāṣah Uṣlūbiyyah I /ḥā'iyyah* (On the Literary Text -- A Statistical Stylistic Study)⁹⁷, Maşlūh says that it covers theory and practice.

The concern here is with the practical part which deals with both poetry and prose. He explains the problems, offers definitions for the terms, determines the stylistic norms adjusts them to fit Arabic grammar, and employs them in a precise way.

The third part of the book deals with establishing the authorship of a text; it is a statistical stylistic study, which assigns authorship of the poetry to Aḥmad Shawqī.

This is not a new concern in the Arabic tradition, in that there are many poems still unattributed to any author. When the literary researcher cannot prove by historical evidence the authorship of a poem, he has to confront the text. He has to rethink his scientific tools and his methodological devices.

It is a matter of facing the text and what is known in stylistics as “stylistic fingerprints”, that which distinguishes one poet or writer from another.

By the use of “stylistic fingerprints” we can distinguish “the stylistic features” of one author from another; we can then use

them as a norm to measure other poetry; we can compare these features with features in the text which we are examining to see in order to identify the similarities, the deviations, and from this we can in the end prove or disprove the authorship the poetry which we have examined.

This matter is one of the concerns of stylistic studies, and the method used is statistical stylistics. For different reasons, political or personal, the authorship of some of the poetry of Aḥmad Shawqī is still under discussion. There have been several attempts to prove that this poetry is indeed Shawqī's, but the critic here uses only the statistical stylistic approach to analyse the language of the poetry.

Maṣlūḥ studies different theories of different scholars regarding the concept of the norm. The most important of them is that the norm has to be objective, reliable and valid. "Stylistic characteristics" are of two types. The first type belongs to the structure of the text itself. There are linguistic usages which distinguish one writer from another; these linguistic features, which create the structure of the text, vary in phonological, morphological, structural, lexical and semantic aspects. The discovery of these linguistic features depends on different linguistic levels that the stylistician examines, using a complete set of analytical tools, most of which are derived from "grammatical models" by means of which he describes and analyses the style. The second type determines the relationships between the text and the context.

This study analyses a large number of poems, and these analyses are set out in diagrams which occupy roughly thirty pages. Maṣlūḥ finds that two of the collections which have never been attributed are very similar, to the collection which is definitely by Shawqī, but he also finds one such collection, that is very different in stylistic fingerprints from that collection. He believes that this type of study makes judgements which are far more objective than subjective.

The fourth part of this book is on the statistical stylistic analysis of the metaphor =(Isti'ārah), a study in the collections of *Al-Bārūdī*, *Shawqī* and *Al-Shābī*. He explains his theoretical perspective of the metaphor in the poetry of the three poets in using statistical stylistic analysis. He aims to add an attempt to earlier attempts to demonstrate that statistical analysis can help to establish groups of norms which can be used when the aim is to achieve objective indicators for examining the language of literary texts and analysing the styles of the writers. This is a methodical way of liberating literary studies from generality, from wandering around the topic without presenting a serious examination and from making subjective judgements without evidence.

This method is not an alternative to personal literary taste; it is a method of rationalising it. It is a necessary, serious and objective study.

Maṣlūḥ's justification for choosing these three poets is that they represent tradition and modernity in Arabic poetry. His objective is an investigation of the characteristics of the language

of their poetry and its development that can illustrate the most important stylistic features.

The samples from the poetry are random, bearing in mind that the amount of poetry under examination must be proportional to the whole body of their work, and that complete poems should be chosen rather than single verses.

Maṣlūḥ's method of examining a poem is shown in the diagrams under the following heads: the title of the poem and the name of poet, the number of verses, the total number of verbal constructions, the total number of non-metaphorical constructions, the total number of metaphorical constructions and the "density of metaphorical language" in the poem.

Maṣlūḥ's conclusion about the density of metaphorical language is that there are essential differences between the three poets in their use of it. Al-Shābbī is the first of the three in employing it, the second is Shawqī and the third is Al-Bārūdī.

This illustrates the development of the language of modern Arabic poetry from the dominance of literal or non-figurative language to the achievement of a high level of density of figurative language in the poets who represent the romantic trend in the modern era, particularly Al-Shābbī.

Maṣlūḥ then examines the differences between poet in using metaphor according to its semantic characteristics. There is a three-fold semantic classification of metaphor: metaphor of reification, of animation, and of personification. In the poetry of

Al-Bārūdī, the percentage of that of personification is 42%, of that of animation 33%, and of that of reification is 25%. In the poetry of Al-Shābbī metaphor of personification constitutes 44% of all metaphor, that of reification 29%, and that of animation 27%. In the poetry of Shawqī the highest percentage is that of metaphor of animation 40%, then of personification, 34%, then of reification 26%. Maṣlūḥ also examines another aspect of study of the metaphor in the differentiation of these poets in their use of metaphor according to grammatical construction.

This work is invaluable; it covers important aspects of the stylistic approach and it is written by an expert with a background in Arabic traditional and modern literary criticism.

Notes

- 1 *Al-Fikr* Al-Mu'āṣir, Beirut, 197, PP. 90-95, see, p. 91.
- 2 Ibid., see p.91.
- 3 Ibid., p.91
- 4 Ibid., p.94
- 5 Ibid., p.94.
- 6 'Alī 'Izzat, *Essays on Language and Literature*, Beirut 1972, p. V-VI.
- 7 Ibid., p. VI.
- 8 Ibid., pp. VI-VII.
- 9 Ibid., p.vi.
- 10 Ibid., p. vi.
- 11 Ibid., p. 4.
- 12 Ibid., p. 4.
- 13 Ibid., p. 5.
- 14 Ibid., p. 5.
- 15 Ibid., p. 7.
- 16 Ibid., p. 7.
- 17 Ibid., p. 8.
- 18 Ibid., p. 9.
- 19 Ibid., pp. 9-10.
- 20 Ibid., p. 12.
- 21 Ibid., p. 13.
- 22 Ibid., see pp. 13-14.
- 23 Ibid., pp. 14-15.
- 24 Ibid., p. 16.

- 25 Ibid., p. 16.
- 26 Ibid., p. 17.
- 27 Ibid., p. 21.
- 28 Ibid., p. 22.
- 29 Ibid., p. 22.
- 30 Ibid., p. 23.
- 31 Ibid., p. 24.
- 32 Ibid., p. 26.
- 33 Ibid., p. 28.
- 34 Ibid., p. 30.
- 35 Ibid., p. 31.
- 36 Ibid., p. 33.
- 37 Ibid., p. 33.
- 38 Ibid., pp. 34-39.
- 39 Ibid., p. 39.
- 40 Ibid., p. VII.
- 41 'Alī 'Izzat, *Studies in Linguistics*, Beirut 1975, p. 5.
- 42 Ibid., pp. 5-6.
- 43 Ibid., p. 13.
- 44 Ibid., pp.13-14.
- 45 Ibid., p. 14.
- 46 Ibid., p.14.
- 47 See., pp. 6-9 of this chapter above.
- 48 'Alī 'Izzat, *Studies in Linguistics*, Beirut 1975,p.16.
- 49 Ibid., p. 16.
- 50 Ibid., p. 17.
- 51 Ibid., pp. 19-20.
- 52 Ibid., p. 20.
- 53 Ibid., p. 27.
- 54 Ibid., p. 29.
- 55 Ibid., p. 32.
- 56 Ibid., p. 35.
- 57 Part 2, volume 3, 1983, pp. 47-60.
- 58 'Adnān Ibn Dhurayl, *Al-Lughah wa Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah* , Damascus 1980 pp. 223-226.
- 59 Ibid., see pp.232-233.
- 60 Volume 25, number11, 1977, pp.29-32.
- 61 Shukrī Muḥammad 'Ayyād, *Madkhal ilā 'Ilm Al-Uslūb*, Riyadh 1982, see pp.67-69.
- 62 Ibid., see p. 9.
- 63 Ibid., see pp. 73-86.
- 64 Ibid., see pp. 87-97.
- 65 Ibid., see pp. 99-109.
- 66 Ibid., see pp.111-124.
- 67 Ibid., see pp. 125-134.
- 68 Ibid., see pp. 135-143.
- 69 Number(3-2), 1983, see pp. 13-27.
- 70 Shukrī Muḥammad 'Ayyād, *Al-Lughah wa Al-Ibdā': Mabādi' 'Ilm Al-Uslūb Al-'Arabī* , Cairo 1988; see pp. 132-140.
- 71 Beirut, 1984.
- 72 Tunis, 1981.
- 73 Ibid., p. 9.
- 74 Ibid., p. 9.

- 75 Ibid., p. 9.
- 76 Ibid., p. 10.
- 77 Ibid., p.10.
- 78 Ibid., p. 12.
- 79 Ibid., p. 27.
- 80 Ibid., see pp. 27-35.
- 81 Ibid., see pp.38-50.
- 82 Ibid., see p.94.
- 83 Ibid., p. 127.
- 84 Ibid., see pp. 141-207.
- 85 Ibid., p. 207.
- 86 Ibid., p. 223.
- 87 Ibid., see p. 264.
- 88 Ibid., see p. 265.
- 89 Ibid., p. 270.
- 90 Ibid., see p. 281.
- 91 Ibid., see pp. 444-449.
- 92 Tunis, 1984, see. p6.
- 93 Ibid., p. 31.
- 94 There is an article about Al- Ṭarābulṣī in Faḍl Thāmir, *Al -Lughah Al -Thanyah* , Beirut / Casablanca, 1991, p p91-101.
- 95 volume 1, number 4,1981.
- 96 Ibid p . 210.
- 97 Jeddah 1991.

CONCLUSION

The First Part examines the Stylistic Approach as a Phenomenon in Arabic Literary Life. Chapter One investigates aspects of the translation of stylistic materials into Arabic. The aim of this section is not to produce a survey of the translations but mainly to demonstrate that there is a significant connection between stylistic studies in Arabic literary criticism and the West and to examine various Western stylistic works, whether translated as a whole or in part, as examples.

The oldest translation is of a speech by Buffon in the French Academy in 1953. Then comes the translation of René Wellek and Austin Warren's *Theory of Literature* by Muḥyī Al-Dīn Ṣubḥī under the title of *Naẓariyyat Al-Adab*, Beirut 1972, 1981. Chapter Fourteen of this book is concerned with "style and stylistics." The next translation is of a French book entitled *Clefs pour la Linguistique* by Georges Mounin, Paris 1971, translated by Al-Ṭayyīb Al-Bakūsh, under the title *Mafātīḥ Al-Aṣṣunīyyah*, Tunis 1981. Another work, *Style and Stylistics* by Graham Hough, was translated into Arabic, under the title *Al-Uslūb wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* by Kāẓim Sa'd Al-Dīn, Baghdad 1985.

A work was translated under the title *Mafāhīm Naqdiyyah* by Muḥammad 'Asfūr, Kuwait, 1978. This translation consists of different chapters from different books by different authors. One of these chapters, concerning stylistics, is entitled "Stylistics, Poetics, and Criticism." It comes from a complete work entitled *Discriminations: Further Concepts of Criticism*, by René Wellek, Yale University Press, 1970.

Another complete work concerned with the stylistic approach was translated under the title *Al-Uslūb wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* by Mundhr ‘Ayyāshī, Beirut n.d. The original title is *Le Style et la Stylistique*, by Pierre Guiraud.

Some translations are of introductory works with practical exercises. An example of this type is a work translated under the title *Madkhal ilā Al-ʿAlsunīyyah ma’a Tamārīn Ta’līqīyyah* (An Introduction to Linguistics with Practical Exercises), by Ṭalāl Wahbah Beirut/Casablanca 1992. The original is by Paul Faber and Christian Baillon but the translator does not provide the original title.

These are examples representing the most important aspects of translation. There are important considerations for the future: care must be taken in choosing materials for translation; there is as yet no real concern with explaining the terms; there is a need for a serious introduction to the topic; there are no biographies of stylisticians with accounts of their works; there is no bibliography for the topic, the translator does not mention the original title of the translation nor its edition, in some cases there is inaccurate translation.

Chapter Two deals with works by Arab scholars explaining the Stylistic approach to Arab readers, who rely mainly on translation, since it is a new topic for them. A considerable number of works by Arab scholars has been produced to explain the stylistic approach. The aim of this section is not to produce a survey or to summarise the materials, but to demonstrate the introduction by

Arab scholars and critics of a foreign stylistics, exemplifying an aspect of the effect of modern and contemporary Western literary theory on Arabic literary criticism. It also shows that Arab scholars are producing a considerable amount of theoretical material about contemporary stylistics in the West. It is essential to list them and their works in order to describe the most significant features of their works.

‘Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī published *Al-Uslūbiyyah wa Al-Uslūb* in Tunis/Tripoli in 1977, 1982, updating it in 1989. Sa‘d Maṣlūḥ published a work on statistical stylistics entitled *Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah Lughawīyyah Iḥṣā’iyyah*, in Kuwait in 1980. ‘Adnān Ibn Dhurayl published *Al-Lughah wa Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah*, in Damascus, in 1980. Shukrī Muḥammad ‘Ayyād published *Madkhal ilā ‘Ilm Al-Uslūb* in Riyadh in 1982.

Muḥammad ‘Abd Al-Muṭṭalib published a work concerning the relationship between stylistics and rhetoric, entitled *Al-Balāghah wa Al-Uslūbiyyah* in Cairo in 1984. Jūzīf Mīshāl Sharīm published a guide to stylistics entitled *Dalīl Al-Dirāsāt Al-Uslūbiyyah* in Beirut in 1984. The relationship of style with modern stylistics and traditional Arabic rhetoric was considered in a book by Aḥmad Darwīsh entitled *Dirāsāt Al-Uslūb Bayn Al-Mu‘āṣirah wa Al-Turāth* in Cairo in 1984. Ṣalāḥ Faḍl published *‘Ilm Al-Uslūb -- Mabādī’uhu wa Ijrā’ātuḥu* in Beirut in 1985. Another work about statistical stylistics, by Sa‘d Maṣlūḥ, is *fi Al-Naṣṣ Al-Adabī: Dirāsah Uslūbiyyah Iḥṣā’iyyah*, Jeddah 1991. Shukrī ‘Ayyād is concerned with establishing a new Arabic stylistics, and to this end he has published another work explaining the stylistic

approach, entitled *Al-Lughah wa Al-Ibdā' -- Mabādi' 'Ilm Al-Uslūb Al-'Arabī*, Cairo 1988.

There are various points to be stated about these works: one of them only provides a glossary of terms in a separate part, with Arabic equivalents. Most of them do not indicate further studies either in foreign languages or in Arabic. None of them has considered the previous Arab scholars in the field or reviewed their works. Faḍl, who is a well-qualified scholar in the field, offers no glossary, and an inadequate account of translated materials on the topic; there is no coverage of all schools of stylistics, such as feminist and educational stylistics. None of them mentions for whom the book is intended; however, they provide up-to-date information on most important points concerning stylistic studies. Arab stylisticians are concerned with the connection of rhetoric with the stylistic approach and they try to exploit this in a positive way.

Chapter Three is devoted to the Search by Arab scholars for the Roots of Stylistics in Traditional Arabic Literary Criticism. It seems that this area is very rich in material that is compatible with stylistics. The significant results of this section can be summarised as follows: attempts are being made to read traditional Arabic rhetoric and literary criticism in the light of both stylistics and modern linguistics in order to investigate features such as *Naẓm* and *Fann Al-Qawl* from a modern stand-point.

One study comes to the conclusion that the concept of *Uslūb* = (style) has four stages: the stage of birth, which is represented in

Al-Bayān wa Al-Tabayīn by Al-Jāhiz; the stage of development, which is represented in *Dalā'il Al-I'jāz* by 'Abd Al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī the stage of maturity, which is represented in the work *Minhāj Al-Bulaghā' wa Sirāj Al-Udabā'* by Ḥāzim Al-Qarṭājannī and *Al-Muqaddimah* by Ibn Khaldūn; and finally the stage of renaissance, which is represented by the translation of foreign stylistic materials.

In a seminar on stylistics, in Cairo in 1982 which was published in *Fuṣūl* in 1984, an Arab stylistician, Al-Hādī Al-Ṭarābulṣī, concluded his discussion by arguing that there is a science of traditional Arabic rhetoric, there is a body of Arab thought about style, there are practical literary studies about style, in which features similar to those of modern stylistics appear.

Ibn Dhurayl, in his investigation of the roots of the concept of style in Arabic, examines the works of the most important Arab modernist critics, who are mainly involved in the teaching of traditional Arabic rhetoric and literary criticism at Arab Universities. The results of his study of them are as follows: for Aḥmad Amīn the style is Naẓm; Aḥmad Al-Shāyīb moves between the elements of literature and the elements of style: Aḥmad Ḥasan Al-Zayyāt argues that style differs according to the theme of the writer/poet or the influence of other phenomena such as linguistics, grammar or other schools of thought.

Shukrī 'Ayyād has searched for the roots of stylistics and particularly of the concept of "style", *Mafhūm Al-Uslūb bayn Al-Turāth Al-Naqdī wa Mūḥāwalāt Al-tajdīd*, *Fuṣūl* vol 1, no.1, 1980.

He found that the word *Usūb* was uncommon until it started to be used by Muslim theologians (*Mutakallimūn*). He concludes that the concept of “style” implied different styles and different methods of expression for different subjects.

In this study ‘Ayyād investigates the concept of *Usūb* = (style) in various Arab scholars, traditionalists and modernists. Some of the traditionalists associate style with one of the following: *Naẓm*, method, school and meaning. One of them extends the concept to include the scope of the whole literary text. ‘Ayyād’s examination of Arab modernists who mention and study *Usūb* is a general, rather than a detailed, presentation.

One study examines the roots of stylistics in detail, investigating a considerable number of works of traditional Arab rhetoricians and literary scholars. Their concept of style has various dimensions, such as the connection between style and literary genres, the connection between style and the writer/poet, the connection between style and the method of expressing meaning, the connection between style and expressive characteristics, the relationship between style and *Naẓm*, and the relationship between style and verbal formulation.

Another study is based on reading the theory of *Naẓm* in the light of stylistics. The theory of *Naẓm* is based on the distinction between one utterance and another with regard to whether it is “artistic” or “literary”, as opposed to ‘ordinary.’ This study tries to find the roots of stylistics in traditional Arabic rhetoric by using the relationship between literature and various grammatical

matters: the system of words and constructions; style and the role of the speaker; and meaning and style. This study also investigates certain features of traditional Arabic rhetoric that are close to stylistic studies, such as: Mājāz, Siyāq and 'Udūl.

Chapter Four studies Recognised Arab Stylisticians and their Employment of the Stylistic Approach for their Investigation of Arabic Literary Material. Various Arab scholars have been labelled as stylisticians in Arabic literary criticism. Their works cover the theory and criticism of Arabic literature. Some examples are 'Alī 'Izzat, Muḥammad 'Abd Al-Muṭṭalib, 'Adnān Ibn Dhurayl, Shukrī Muḥammad 'Ayyād, Muḥammad Al-Hādī Al-Ṭarābulṣī, 'Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī, Sa'd Maṣlūḥ.

The stylistic approach has been employed for the investigation of all types of Arabic literature, the novel, the drama, poetry and other literary texts.

The poetry examined is mostly modern. There are some poems from the 'Abbāsīd period but there is none from the pre-Islamic period.

The Arab stylisticians have analysed the Arabic novel. There are a few examples of approaching extracts from different novels or of picking out various of their stylistic features. There is only one book concerning the stylistic analysis of the novel in which there is a full examination of a complete novel.

The most important points about the Arab stylisticians and their works when they adopt a stylistic approach are: none of them is

without both traditional Arabic literary criticism and a modern Western literary background; they address all literary genres; they apply all the most important aspects of the various stylistic schools; none of them has applied feminist stylistics or stylistics for educational purposes.

Chapter Five deals with the Stylistic Approach in the Leading Arabic Literary Journals. The aim of this chapter is to prove that there has been serious concern with the stylistic approach in the main-stream Arabic literary-critical journals, rather than to summarise the materials in them. The crucial features of the stylistic approach that appear in these forms are: explanation of the nature of the approach; translations of material about the approach; the devoting of seminars to the topic; the devoting of a whole issue to it; reviews of new books on the stylistic approach in Arabic or English; and, in general, the bringing of the Arab reader up-to-date with the development of this approach in the West.

Chapter Six deals with Other Aspects of the Stylistic Approach in Arabic Literary Criticism. Those aspects are as follows:

1- Terminology and Lexicography.

Attempts have been made to produce a terminology of stylistics in Arabic literary criticism. One study has a serious concern with producing a French-Arabic glossary of stylistic terms; another attempts to Arabise French stylistic terms without giving a full explanation; another produces an English glossary of statistical

stylistic terms, but not as a separate section or with a full explanation; yet another offers an Arabic-French list of terms without explanation.

The lexicography of stylistics in most Arabic-English or French linguistic or literary-critical dictionaries has become familiar. One of them even has a separate part for the stylistic approach, which makes the terms of this approach accessible in Arabic, French and English for the Arab reader and critic.

2-The Making Known of the Leading Figures within the Stylistic Movement:

The most important figures of stylistics and their methods, theories and influences on literary studies have become well-known in Arabic literary circles through the efforts of Arab critics and translators in Arabic books and literary journals.

Effort has been expended both to establish and to make well-known the leading figures within the stylistic movement and their major stylistic works. The first example is Roman Jakobson, whose essays on stylistics have become familiar to the Arab reader and critic, as a result of the translations of, and articles about, his works and his concepts in Arabic literary journals. The second example is Riffaterre. Arab stylisticians have introduced him and his works in the field of stylistics to Arab readers and critics. The third, fourth and fifth examples are Todorov, Jean Cohen and Stephen Ullman. A further example is an academic group who publish a journal about stylistics in Britain, *Language*

and Literature, run academic stylistics courses and publish considerable essential works on the stylistic approach nowadays. Prominent among them are Katie Wales, with her unique *A Dictionary of Stylistics*, M. Short and Jeffrey Leech.

3- Arab Scholarly Dialogue Concerning the Intellectual Relevance of the Stylistic Approach:

This discussion has been a long one, as with other modernist approaches. There are different attitudes to it: full acceptance, complete rejection, and a mixture of the two. The interesting point was raised in 1982, at the Cairo seminar, by Muḥammad Al-Hādī Al-Ṭarābulṣī, that the Arab scholars who write about this approach in the Arab World are making a fundamental mistake about how it is understood in the West. At the end of this seminar, Arab stylisticians agreed to treat rhetoric = (*Balāghah*) such as that of Al-Jurjānī as material for stylistics.

4- An Approach to a New Arabic Stylistics:

There has been an initiative towards establishing a new Arabic stylistics for Arabic literary criticism. An attempt has been made by Shukrī 'Ayyād, in *Al -Lughah wa Al-Ibdā'*, to investigate the roots of stylistics in artistic features of the Arabic language and in the works of the Arab linguisticians and rhetoricians. The most important features of this attempt are as follows: it is opening itself to the benefits of modern Western stylistics and linguistic studies; it is searching for roots of stylistics in traditional Arabic rhetoric and grammar, by examining the works of Arab

rhetoricians. There are various attempts to establish Arabic stylistic approach that can be found in the work of modernist Arab rhetoricians, where they try to review the traditional rhetoric that will be the root of the new Arabic stylistics.

Part Two of this study examines The Application of the Stylistic Approach to Arabic Poetry.

Chapter One deals with the Stylistic Approach to Arabic Poetry. It aims to illustrate how Arab stylisticians are employing the stylistic approach in examining Arabic poetry. The examination covers the most important works of nine Arab stylisticians.

Arab stylisticians are gaining knowledge of the topic from Western resources; their main concern is to employ traditional Arabic rhetoric and literary criticism ,with various Western stylistic terms. Their examination of Arabic poetry consists of picking out some stylistic features from a few selected texts. The only serious critical attempt to deal with a complete work is that of Muḥammad Al-Hādī Al-Ṭarābulṣī, which has strong positive points; in addition to examining a complete poetic work, he employs both Western stylistic terms and those of traditional rhetoric and literary criticism; finally his stylistic criticism is limited to practical criticism. The Arabic poetry that they examine is mainly modern. Explaining the stylistic terms that they use is not a crucial aspect of their criticism. One of them, Sa‘d Maṣlūḥ, shows a deep concern with, and a good knowledge of, the topic in his studies, both theoretical and practical, in examining statistical stylistics. ‘Abd Al-Sallām Al-Masaddī also demonstrates a good

theoretical knowledge of the topic in his introduction of it to the Arab reader but his practical criticism is influenced by approaches other than the stylistic. The stylistician's, criticism is written in Arabic; only one of them, 'Alī 'Izzat, writes his criticism in English, subsequently translating part of it into Arabic. Their criticism either forms part of a theoretical work on stylistics or is in articles published in literary journals. In their criticism they examine grammatical features in the text. In the analysis of a poem, they tend to examine mainly: the meaning of the title of the poem, its meter, its ideas, its images and its language.

As far as the question of terminology is concerned, even though it is a most important aspect of stylistic studies, which cannot be ignored, unfortunately the Arab stylisticians do not in general pay sufficient attention to it. It is essential that an agreement should be reached on terminology and that a detailed explanation of the terms employed, in both the theoretical and the practical fields, should be made available. It is true that some few Arab stylisticians do explain the terminology that they employ in their works, but this is not necessarily of help in interpreting the works of others.

Bibliography

1-ARABIC BOOKS:

Aḥmad Aḥmad Badawī, *Min Al-Naqd wa Al-Adab* Cairo, n.d., pp181-191.

‘Aṣṣūr Muḥammad, *Mafāhīm Naqdiyyah*, Kuwait 1987.

Abū Zayd, Naṣr Hāmid, *Ishkāliyyāt Al-Qirā’ah wa Āliyyāt Al-Ta’wil*, Tripoli/ Beirut 1992.

‘Ayyād, Shukrī Muḥammad, *Al-Lughah wa Al-Ibdā’ Mabādi’ ‘Ilm Al-Uslūb Al‘Arabī*, Cairo 1988.

‘Ayyād, Shukrī Muḥammad, *Madkhal Ilā ‘Ilm Al-Uslūb*, Al- Riyahd 1982.

‘Abd Al-Muṭṭalib, Muḥammad, *Al-Balāghah wa Al-Uslūbiyyah*, Cairo 1984.

‘Ayāshī, Mundhr, *Al-Uslūb wa Al-Uslūbiyyah*, Beirut n.d.

Al-Bakkūsh Al-Ṭayyib, *Mafātīḥ Al-Aṣṣunīyyah* Tunis 1981.

Darwīsh, Ahmad, *Al-Uslūb Bayn AL-Mu’ā Ṣirah wa Al-Turāth*, Cairo 1984.

Ibn Dhurayl, ‘Adnān, *Al-Lughah wa Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah*, Damascus 1980.

Faḍl, Ṣalāḥ, *‘Ilm Al-Uslūb -- Mabādi’uh wa Ijra’ātuh*, Beirut 1985.

Al-Hamadānī, Hāmid, *Uslūbiyyat Al-Riwāyah -- Madkhal Na Ṣarī*, Casablanca 1989.

‘Izzat, ‘Alī, *Al-Lughah wa Al-Dalālāt fī Al-Shi’r: Dirāsah Naqdiyyah fī Shi’r Al-Sayyāb wa ‘Abd Al- Ṣabūr*, Cairo 1976.

Al- ‘Id, Yumnā, fī Ma’rifat Al-Naṣṣ, Beirut 1984.

Maṣlūḥ, Sa’d, *fī Al-Na ṢṢ Al-Adabī: Dirāsah Uslūbiyyah I ḥṣā’iyyah*, Jeddah 1991.

Maṣlūḥ, Sa’d, *Al-Uslūb: Dirāsah Lughawiyyah I ḥṣā’iyyah* Kuwait 1980.

Al--Masaddī, ‘Abd Al-Sallām, *Marāj’ Al-Naqd Al- ḥdīth*, Tripoli / Tunis 1989.

Al--Masaddī, ‘Abd Al-Sallām, *Al-Uslūbiyyah wa Al-Uslūb -- Na ḥw Badīl Alsunī fī Naqd Al- Adab*, Tunis/Tripoli 1977 1982.

Al--Masaddī, ‘Abd Al-Sallām, *Al-Uslūbiyyah wa Al-Uslūb* - Ṭab‘ah Munaqaḥah wa Mashfū‘ah bi- Bibliyūghrāfiyā Al-Dirāsāt Al-Uslūbiyyah wa Al-Bunyawiyyah ,Tunis/Tripoli 1989

Al--Masaddī, ‘Abd Al-Sallām, *Qirā’āt ma’a Al-Shābbī wa Al-Mutanabbī wa Al-Jāhi* ẓ wa *Ibn Khaldūn* , Tunis 1984.

Al--Masaddī, ‘Abd Al-Sallām, *Al-Tafkīr Al-Lisānī fī Al-Ḥadārah Al-‘Arabiyyah*, Tunis, 1981.

Sa’d Al-Dīn, Kāẓim, *Al-Uslūb wa Al-Uslūbiyyah*, Baghda 1985

Shāyib, Aḥmad, *Al- Uslūb -- Dirāaah Balāghiyyah Taḥlīliyyah Li Uṣūl Al -Asālīb Al -A dabiyyah*, Cairo 1966.

Shrīm, Jūzīf Mīshāl, *Dalīl Al-Dirāsāt Al-Uslūbiyyah*, Beirut 1984.

Ṣubḥī, Muḥyī Al-Dīn, *Naẓariyyat Al-Adab*, first edition, Beirut 1972, revision by Ḥusām Al-Khatīb , second edition, Beirut 1981.

Al-Ṭarābulsī, Muḥammad Al-Hādī, *Maẓāhir Al-Tafkīr fī Al-Uslūb ‘Ind Al- ‘Arab*, in *Qaḍāyā Al-Adab Al-‘Arabī*, Tunis 1978.

Al-Ṭarābulsī, Muḥammad, Al-Hādī, *Khaṣṣī ṢAl-Uslūb fī “Al-Shawqiyyāt”*, Tunis, 1981.

Thāmir, Fāḍl, *Al-Lughah Al-Thāniyyah*, Beirut/Casablanca 1994.

Wahbah, Ṭalāl, *Madkhal ilā Al-Iasuniyyah m’a Tamnārīn Taḥbiyyah*, Casablanca/ Beirut 1992

Zayd, Abū, Naṣr Hāmid, *Iskāliyyāt Al-Qirā’at wa Āiyyāt Al-Ta’wīl*, Beirut/ Casablanca 1992

2-ARABIC ARTICLES:

Al-‘Aṭ ṭār, Sulaymān, *Al-Uslūbiyyah: ‘Ilm wa Tārīkh, Fuṣūl*, vol 1, no 2, 1981, pp. 132-144.

‘Ayyād, Shukrī Muḥammad, *Ṣiḡhat Al-Tafḍīl fī Shi‘r Al-Mutanabbī*, *Al-Ādāb* vol, 25, no11,1977, pp. 29-32.

‘Ayyād, Shukrī Muḥammad, *Maḥūm Al-Uslūb bayn Al-Turāth Al-Naqdī wa Muḥāwalāt At-Tajdīd*, *Fuṣūl*, vol.1, no.1, 1980, pp.49-58.

‘Ayyād, Shukrī Muḥammad, *Qirā’ah Uslūbiyyah li Shi‘r Ḥafīẓ*, *Fuṣūl*, no 3-2,1983, pp1. 3-27.

‘Ayyād, Maḥmmūd, *Al-Uslūbiyyah Al-Ḥadīthah -- Muḥāwalāt Ta’rīf*, *Fuṣūl*, vol 1, no 2, 1981, pp. 123-131.

Abū Nāḍr, Mūrīs, *Al-Uslūb wa ‘Ilm Al-Uslūb*, *Al-Thaqāfah Al-‘Arabiyyah* part 9, 1975, pp. 40-46.

Badawī, Muḥammad, *Al-Uslūbiyyah- Nadwat Al ‘Adad*, *Fuṣūl*, vol 5, number 1, 1984, pp. 212-226.

Barakah, Bassām, *‘Ilm Al-Uslūb Al*, *Al-Fiker Al -‘Arabī Al-Mu‘āsir*, nos 80-81, 1990 pp. 127-128.

Ibn Dhurayal, ‘Adnān, *Al-Uslūbiyyah*, *Al-Fikr Al-‘Arabī*, vol 4, no 25, 1982, pp. 249-257.

Ibn Dhurayal, ‘Adnān, *Al-Uslūbiyyah wa Al-Uslūb*, *Ma‘rifah*, 1978, no. 196, pp. 169- 198.

Ibn Dhurayal, ‘Adnān, *Al-Ta’bīr wa Al-Uslūbiyyah*, *Al-Ma‘rifah*, vol 12, nos 2-3, Damascus 1979, pp. 48- 65.

Darwīsh, Aḥmad, *Al-Uslūb wa Al-Uslūbiyyah: Madkhal fī Al-Muṣṭalah wa Huqūl Al-Baḥth wa Manāhiḥuh*, *Fuṣūl*, vol 5, no 1, 1984, pp. 60-68.

Faḍl, Ṣalāḥ, “*Ẓawāhir Uslūbiyyah Fī Shi‘r Shawqī*”, *Fuṣūl*, vol 1, no 4,1981. pp. 209-218.

‘IRUDKī, Badr Al-Dīn, *Taḥlīl Naṣṣī Li Al-Faṣl Al-Awwal min Kitāb Jāhā Husayn Al-Ayyām*, *Al-Ma‘rifah*, number 182, 1977, pp.132-144.

‘Izzat, ‘Alī, *‘Ilm Al-Uslūbiyyāt wa Mashākīl Al-Tahlīl Al-Lughawī, Al-Fikr Al-Mu‘āsir*, Beirut 1971, pp. 90-91.

Al--Masaddī, ‘Abd Al-Sallām, *Mu‘āwalāt fī Al-Uslūbiyyah Al-Haykaliyyah, Al-ḥwliyyāt*, Tunis, vol 10, no 12, 1973, pp. 273-287.

Al--Masaddī, ‘Abd Al-Sallām, *Al-Uslūbiyyah, (Nadwat with other several Arab scholars), Fuṣūl*, vol,5 no.1, 1984, pp. 212-256.

Al-Miṣrī ‘Abd Al-Fattāḥ, *Rūmān Jākūbsūn: Al-‘Ālim Al-Lisānī, Al-Ma‘rifah*, no 120, 1981, pp. p. 30- 46.

Al-Miṣrī, ‘Abd Al-Fattāḥ, *Uslūbiyyat Al-Fard, Al-Mawqif Al- Adabī*, nos 135-136, 1982, pp. 149-164.

Al-Mirṣī, ‘Abd Al-Fattāḥ, *Tarīqt Jākūbsūn fī Dirāsāt Al-Na ṣṣAl-Shīrī, Al-Ma‘rifah* no 122, 1981, pp. 30-40.

‘Abd Al-Muṭṭalib, Muḥammad, *Al-Tikrār Al-Nama fī Qasīdat Al-Madīh ‘Ind ḥafī ṣ -- Dirāsah Uslūbiyyah , Fuṣūl*, vol 3, part 2, 1983, pp .47-60.

Rājihī, ‘Abdah, *‘Ilm Al-Lughah wa Al-Naqd Al-Adabī ‘Ilm AL-Uslūb, Fuṣūl*, Vol 1, No 2, 1981. pp. 115- 122.

Ṣawlah, ‘Abd Allāh, *Al-Lisāniyyāt wa Al-Uslūbiyyah, Al-Mawqif Al-Adabī*, nos 153-36, Damascus 1982 pp.149-164.

Al-Ṭarābulṣī, Al-Hādī, *Al-Naṣṣ Al-Adabī ‘Ind Miṣhāl Rifātayr min khilāl Kitāb Ṣinā‘at Al-Nayūmnāel ‘Id fī Ma‘rifat Al-Naṣṣ wa Kūn kūhīn min khilāl kitābih al-kalām Al-Sāmī, Fuṣūl*, vol 5. no1, 1984, pp. 121-131.

Al-Watrānī, ‘Abd Al-Razzāq, *Maḥūm Al-Uslūb ‘ind Jakūbsūn, Al Aqlām*, vol.3. no 10, Tunis, 1977, pp. 5-23.

Al-Wa‘r, Māzin, *Al-Uslūb -- Dirāsah Lughawiyyah Iḥiṣṣ’iyyah, Al-Lisān Al ‘Arabī*, no 33, 1989, pp. 45-65.

3- ENGLISH BOOKS:

Chapman, R, *Linguistics and literature -- An introduction to literary stylistics*, London 1973 .

Crystal, David, *A Dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* , 2nd Edition, London 1986.

Crystal, David, *Investigating English style* , London 1989.

Darbyshire, A. E, *A grammar of style* , London 1971.

Izzat, Ali , *Essay on Language and Literature* , Beirut 1972.

Izzat, Ali, *Studies in linguistics*, Beirut 1975.

Fowler, Roger, *Essays on style and language*, London 1966.

Meisami, J.S. and Starkey, . P, *Encyclopaedia of Arabic literature*, 2 vol, London 1998.

Hough, Graham, *Style and stylistics* London / New York 1969.

Richards, I. A and Ogden, C. K. *The meaning of meaning*, London 1972.

Richards, I. A. *Practical criticism -- A study of literary judgement*, London 1929.

Richards, I. A., *The philosophy of rhetoric* , London 1936.

Richards, I. A., *Practical Principles of Literary Criticism* London 1926.

Wales, Katie, *A dictionary of stylistics* , London 1989.

Wellek, René, *Discriminations: further concepts of criticism*, Newhaven and London 1970.

Wellek, René and Austin Warren, *Theory of literature*, London 1973.

4-French Books

Bally, C, *Traité de stylistique française*, Heidelberg 1909.

Guiraud, Pierre, *Le style et la stylistique*, Paris 1972.

Mounin, Georges, *Clefs pour la linguistique*, Paris 1971.

Riffaterre , Michel, *Essaie de stylistique structurale*, Paris 1971.

5-Dictionaries:

‘Abd Al-Nūr, Jabbūr, *Al- Mu‘jam Al- Adabī*, Beirut 1980.

Baalabakī, Ramzī. M. *Dictionary of Linguistic Terms Arabic -English* , Beirut 1990.

Ba‘labakī, Ramzī, *Mu‘jam Al-Mu ṣālahāt Al -Lughawīyyah*, Beirut 1990.

Massadī, ‘Abd Al-Sallām, *Dictionnaire de Lingustique, Francais-Arabe-Arabe-Francais* , Tripoli/Tunis 1984.

Wahbah, Magdī, *A Dictionary of Literary Terms (Englis-French-Arabic)*, Beirut 1974.

Wahbah, Magdī and Kamāl Al-Muhandis, *A Dictionary of Arabic Literary and Linguistic Terms* Beirut 1984 .

Wahbah, Magdī, and Kāmil Al-Muhandis, *Mu‘jam Al-Mu ṣālahāt Al- ‘Arabiyyah fī Al -Lughah wa Al -Adab*, Beirut 1984.

