

The poetic theory as expounded in
Kitāb Minhāj Al-Bulaghā by Hāzim Al Qārtājannī.

N.A. AL-EBRAHIM

Thesis presented for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of London
School of Oriental and African Studies



ProQuest Number: 10673185

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10673185

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

To My Husband and Children

CONTENTS

Abstract	v
Preface	vii
Transliteration	xii
Introduction	1
Notes	36
PART ONE : POETRY: ITS NATURE AND FUNCTION	
CHAPTER 1 : The Nature of Poetry	41
I The Definition of Poetry	46
II The Content of Poetry	60
III Poetic Faculties	74
IV Evaluation	88
Notes	115
CHAPTER 2 : The Function of Poetry	121
I Moral Value	128
II Psychological Value in Poetry	141
III Aesthetical Value in Poetry	154
IV Evaluation	165
Notes	180

To My Husband and Children

CONTENTS

Abstract	v
Preface	vii
Transliteration	xii
Introduction	1
Notes	36
PART ONE : POETRY: ITS NATURE AND FUNCTION	
CHAPTER 1 : The Nature of Poetry	41
I The Definition of Poetry	46
II The Content of Poetry	60
III Poetic Faculties	74
IV Evaluation	88
Notes	115
CHAPTER 2 : The Function of Poetry	121
I Moral Value	128
II Psychological Value in Poetry	141
III Aesthetical Value in Poetry	154
IV Evaluation	165
Notes	180

PART TWO : THE AESTHETICS OF A POETIC WORK

CHAPTER 1 : Rhythmical Structure	185
I Metre is the Essence of Poetry	193
II Rhythm as a Basis for Poetical Music	207
III The Role of Rhyme in the Music of the <i>Qaṣīda</i>	221
IV Evaluation	230
Notes	240
CHAPTER 2 : Structure and Form	246
I The Role of the Word in the <i>Qaṣīda</i>	251
II The Poetic Phrase	260
III The Structure	273
IV Evaluation	287
A Final Word	299
Notes	300
Bibliography	304
Glossary	328

A B S T R A C T

The aim of this research is to analyse the philosophical and aesthetic principles of Ḥâzim al-Qarṭājannî's poetic theory, as set down in his *Minhâj al-Bulaghâ' wa-Sirâj al-'Udabâ'*. It is our intent, in addition, to reveal the sources for his theory in Graeco-Arabic and Islamic-Arabic sources as well as his contributions to both.

The preface defines the subject-matter and the methodology. This is followed by an Introduction which places Ḥâzim in his cultural context by looking at his masters and his pupils, and examining not only his works on criticism, but also his influence on the establishment of a school of Arabic rhetoric in the western parts of the Arab world (Andalusia and North Africa) and on the development of Arabic criticism generally.

The thesis is then divided into two parts, each of which has two chapters. Part one, on the nature of poetry in respect of both poet and recipient, deals with; 1) the notion of poetry as it is understood, firstly in the fundamental term of *muhâkât* (imitation) and the complementary terms associated with the root *khayâl* (imagination), and secondly in those issues of classical Arabic criticism which are of central importance to that notion such as the issue of natural

aptitude *ṭab^c* and skill *ṣan^ca*; 2) the question of value judgement in art generally and in poetry, where there are three aspects: the psychological, ethical, and aesthetic; and how these are treated in Classical Arabic critical terminology as well as in the work of Ḥâzim, who is shown to dwell most upon the aesthetic value.

Part two, on rhythmic and linguistic structures in the *qaṣîda*, deals with: 1) the nature of poetic measures, harmony, rhythm, and musicality, generally, as well as the part played by rhyme in creating poetic rhythm and the relation of measures and rhymes to the meaning of poetry; 2) the linguistic features of the *qaṣîda* from individual components to the entire poetic expression of the whole structure of the *qaṣîda*.

Each chapter has four units, of which the first three discuss the main subject of the chapter in relation to Ḥâzim's work and the Greek and Arab traditions of poetics; while the fourth evaluates Ḥâzim's original contribution in the light of his most influential resources, both Arab and Greek. This thesis includes a glossary of some of Ḥâzim's technical terms which have been employed in their original Arabic form as the equivalent English terms fail to illustrate their meaning accurately.

P R E F A C E

Both Western Orientalists and Arab scholars used to be hindered in their study of the classical Arabic cultural tradition by basic difficulties and were unable to reach specific and verifiable scientific results. One of the most marked difficulties was that, while that tradition comprises basic reflections on the philosophy of the art of poetry, those reflections are rarely grouped together in a single work of criticism with a clearly outlined and integrated theoretical structure for poetry. Another such difficulty was that, while the Greek influence on literary theory among the Arabs is perfectly evident in rhetorical, critical and linguistic works, the impact of Greek philosophy and criticism on Arabic poetry and poetics seemed very underdeveloped.

These two major difficulties continued to stand in the way of historians of classical Arabic criticism until almost forty years ago when they stumbled on a manuscript copy of the work entitled *Minhâj al-Bulaghâ' wa Sirâj 'al-'Udabâ'* (*The way of the eloquent and lamp of the literati*) by Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî (608/1211 - 684/1285). The discovery helped greatly to eliminate the difficulties mentioned above and indeed this book became the focus of profound interest. Not only

did it contain the final stage of development in literary thought among the Arabs of the Middle Ages but it also represented the most mature form of receptivity to classical Greek thought in the establishment of a theoretical and aesthetic philosophy for Arabic poetry. The many studies we will mention in the Introduction approach this book from different angles, covering the rhetorical and critical values and standards it contains in general; the influence of Greek philosophy and criticism on those values and standards; and the theoretical development in the issues of classical Arabic criticism, Ḥâzim's additions to that tradition, and the standing of his book among Arabic works on criticism as well as its part in the history of Arabic criticism generally.

Our research is concerned with a study of the philosophical and aesthetic elements in Arabic poetics as represented in Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî's book. In doing this we have had to develop suitable methodological tools. In fact we have used a comparative historical method which traces fundamental aspects of the work to their origins in previous ages, analyses the elements of renewal, development, and maturation, and compares individual ideas between cultures according to the laws of influence and receptivity employed particularly in comparative literary studies and in comparative studies generally. Apart from determining the limits of the sources available to this Medieval theorist, we will analyse his own innovations.

Following this methodological basis, we have gathered the various elements of poetic theory to be found in Ḥâzim's book according to the guidelines approved by scholars in their study of poetic theory, i.e. making a start with the philosophical aspect to the analysis of poetry, its special characteristics, and its significance in relation to the creator and recipient. Then the study of the practical aspects of poetry - its linguistic and rhythmic qualities - is based upon the analysis of those characteristics. For this reason I have divided this research into two parts.

The first part deals with the nature of poetry and the theoretical notions relating to its analysis and the determining of its psychological, ethical, and aesthetic importance. The second part deals particularly with the element of rhythm, as well as poetic musicality in general, and the role of the poetic word and expression in forming the total structure of the *qaṣîda*. In both parts, we have compared the contents of Ḥâzim's book with the indigenous Arab and adopted Greek traditions in order to determine the sources he drew upon and developed. We also analyse the philosophical and aesthetic advances he made on those traditions, especially those elements of the Arab tradition relating to the art of Arabic poetry.

Among the many difficulties we have encountered in collecting, arranging, and analysing this material, perhaps the most striking is the fact that, in order to preserve the spirit of the original text

and to facilitate the reader's understanding, we have been forced to adopt a very literal style of translation for the critical text used in this thesis. In spite of this, we hope we have been able to present a study of the poetic theory as set down by Ḥâzim al-Qarṭājannî in his *Minhâj*, to analyse its sources in the Arab and Greek traditions, and to establish the philosophical and aesthetic additions made by Ḥâzim to those sources.

I hope that the following acknowledgements will in no way appear a mere convention or disguise the sincerity of my feelings toward all those who helped in this thesis.

Firstly, to Professor T. Johnson (may he rest in peace), I am deeply indebted for it was he, in that first crucial year who was a constant source of encouragement and guidance and without him this thesis would certainly never have materialized. He is sadly missed and nothing would give me greater happiness than to have him see the completed work here, today. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Professor H.T. Norris (Near and Middle East Department) for his ever-present patience and reassuring guidance throughout the years of my study. My thanks and gratitude go, in addition, to Professor J.E. Wansbrough (Head of Near and Middle East Department), Professor ^CIzz 'al-Dîn Ismâ^Cîl (Chairman of The Academy of Arts and

Editor-in-Chief of *Majallat Fuṣūl*), Professor ^cAbd al-Mun^cim Tallima (Faculty of Arts - Cairo University), Professor ^cAbdu Badawī (Faculty of Arts - Kuwait University) and Professor Jâbir ^cUṣfūr (Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts - Kuwait University) for their suggestions, advice and valuable comments.

I would also like to express my appreciation and thanks to the staff of the Islamic Culture Centre Library and to my friends and colleagues, Miss Malak Shuqayr, Mr. Robert Jones (postgraduate - Near and Middle East Department - S.O.A.S.), Mr. Ahmet Karamustafa (postgraduate - Institute of Islamic Studies - McGill University, Canada) and to Ms. Valerie Said and Mrs. Angela Levitsky of Lexicon, my thanks for the typing and word processing of this work.

To Kuwait University I am deeply grateful for electing me to a Senior Scholarship. It is, however, to my mother, husband, brothers and children that my deepest thanks must be given and to them I will be eternally grateful for their constant support, encouragement, patience and, above all, their love.

TRANSLITERATION TABLE AND NOTES

أ	a	ظ	z
إ	ʾu	ع	c
ب	b	غ	<u>gh</u>
ت	t	ف	f
ة	in construct t	ق	q
ث	<u>th</u>	ك	k
ج	j	ل	l
ح	ḥ	م	m
خ	<u>kh</u>	ن	n
د	d	ه	h
ذ	<u>dh</u>	و	long û
ر	r	و	in diphthong w
ز	z	ي	long î
س	s	ي	in diphthong y
ش	<u>sh</u>	ـ	i
ص	ṣ	ـ	u
ض	ḍ	ـ	a
ط	ṭ	ا	â

Notes:

1. The definite article *al-* is used before solar and lunar letters.
2. I have used (>) for the *hamza* retaining it in words which start with *hamza* only when vocalized with *qamma* but not with *fatha*.
3. The final (t) in the genitive has been retained but otherwise deleted.
4. A *shadda* is represented by doubling the relevant letter.
5. Arabic terms transcribed into Latin characters are shown in italics.

THE INTRODUCTION

Arab-Islamic culture evolved as the result of a cultural interaction between the unique achievement of the Arabs and Muslims on the one hand and the great heritage of the ancient civilizations on the other. This encounter was an essential cultural phase in human history. It united the culture of the Ancient World with the emergent Modern World; and there is agreement among both Arab and non-Arab scholars that:

Ḥâzim is the first grammarian and rhetorician to have had a philosophical education and to have attempted to develop a synthesis of the indigenous Arabic literary theory and philosophical poetics (1).

In order to give these facts a general outline, we will consider two basic issues in this introduction: first, the general image of Arab-Islamic culture down to the 7th/13th century when Ḥâzim lived. Our major concern will be the field of literary sciences and theories and the influence of Greek culture - Aristotle's *Poetics* specifically - on its development. Secondly, we will be looking at the life of Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî, concentrating especially on his cultural, intellectual and literary achievements and referring to those *shaykhs* (teachers) who influenced his learning. A description of his works in the fields of poetry, rhetoric and criticism will be included in addition to an assessment of his impact on later Arab writers.

I. ARAB-ISLAMIC CULTURE IN THE 7TH/13TH CENTURY

In the pre-Islamic era, the Arabs possessed a cultural life of considerable sophistication. Indeed, in the originality of their poetry, the Arabs surpassed many other ancient peoples, their culture embracing, in addition, other unique features, mostly in the literary field, such as proverbs, stories and speeches. They were also knowledgeable about skills relating directly to their living conditions at that time - scientific skills in limited areas - which were also known to other ancient peoples and which related to the stars, waters, storms, the conditions of birds and of animals, and human medicine, etc... (2).

In addition to their local culture, those pre-Islamic Arabs forged relations with most of the Ancient World.

In Asia their influence reached the Far East, the north of the continent and the north-west; in Europe they were well-renowned in the south and the east; and in Africa they mixed with the peoples of the north and east (3).

Islam enriched this Arab culture and strengthened the relations which it had with the Ancient World thus enabling the early Muslims to establish a deep-rooted human culture which included all the great Ancient cultures - Indian, Persian, Greek and Roman - to which they added their own unique Arab-Islamic achievement, an achievement which has left an impressive record.

Cultural historians have noted three distinct characteristics pertaining to this Arab-Islamic culture (4): firstly, the pre-Islamic Arab skills had developed serious sciences such as astronomy and medicine under the umbrella of Islam; secondly, the

growth of new sciences, most of which arose to serve the understanding of *The Holy Qur'ân*, such as linguistics, *fiqh* (jurisprudence), *tafsîr* (exegesis), and *ʿilm al-kalâm* (dialectical theology); and thirdly, the introduction of sciences from other civilizations such as logic and philosophy which made their impact on the Arabs and Muslims in their Aristotelian form.

Greek philosophical and logical systems of thought had an obvious influence on the development of many Arab-Islamic sciences, especially philosophy, rhetoric and literary criticism, the latter being of greatest concern to us since it is fundamental to the study of Ḥâzim's rhetorical and critical theories.

The period of translation of classical works into Arabic began in the latter years of the 1st/7th century, during the Umayyad era. The first work to be translated was one on alchemy by Iṣṭifân al-Qadîm (5). It was, however, with the rise of the ʿAbbasids that this period of translation reached its peak. Many of the ʿAbbasid caliphs were renowned, not only for their patronage of science and learning, but for their endeavours to establish cultural links with other peoples through the medium of translations. It was during the caliphate of Abû Jaʿfar al-Manṣûr (137-161/754-777), Hârûn al-Rashîd (165-194/781-809) and al-Ma'mûn (198-218/813-833) that Baghdâd became known as the brilliant world centre for science, culture and civilization (6).

In fact the Arabic translations seem to represent the earliest large-scale attempt known in history to take over from an alien civilization its sciences and techniques regarded as universally valid (7).

As is well-known, Greek philosophy was foremost in this respect and acquired an Arab-Islamic form in accordance with the perception that Muslim philosophers had of that philosophy. It is also well-known that Greek philosophy, as known to Europeans during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, was actually in this Arab-Islamic form, and that it was only during the latter years of the Renaissance that the West was able to re-establish direct contact with the Greek heritage in its original form (8).

Among Muslim intellectuals there emerged a group of learned philosophers who were greatly influenced by the philosophical heritage which they not only translated and interpreted, but also added their own individual commentaries. Among these were: Ya'qûb b. Ishâq al-Kindî (d. 246/860), known among historians of Islamic philosophy as 'the Arabs' Philosopher'; Abû Naşr al-Fârâbî (d. 339/950) known as 'The Second Teacher', second, that is, to Aristotle who was 'The First Teacher'; Ibn Sînâ ('Alî b. 'Abbâs) (370-429/980-1037); and Abû Hâmid al-Ghazâlî (450-505/1058-1111), known in the history of Islamic philosophy as 'The Authority of Islam'. Many renowned philosophers also emerged from Andalusia such as Ibn Bâjja (d. 533/1138) and Ibn Tufayl (494-581/1117-1186), but the most prominent from this

region and among Muslim philosophers generally not to mention his worldwide fame in this respect, is Ibn Rushd (520/1126 - 595/1189).

It is imperative for the historian of Arab Islamic philosophy to pay special attention to a purely Islamic Arabic philosophy; *ʿilm al-kalâm*, a form of dialectical theology which was established by the *Muʿtazilites*, otherwise known as *ʿulamâʾ al-tawḥîd* (savants of monotheism). This science, in spite of its purely Islamic origins, developed and matured under the influence of classical Greek logic and philosophy. The principle area of investigation by this science is the essence and attributes of God. It is this particular concern that characterizes *kalâm* and makes it distinct from philosophy in general.

The difference between philosophy and *kalâm* is that philosophy looks into existence from a purely intellectual point of view, whereas *kalâm* looks into existence in a fundamental way, which is rational and true to tradition, so that religious beliefs may be safeguarded against anything approaching falsehood ... All this means that *kalâm* relies on intellectual opinion for determining Islamic beliefs about revealed law; and it investigates the essence and attributes of God as well as His actions in this world and the next, such as the Creation, the Day of Judgement, the sending of the prophets, His rules for appointing Imâms, punishment, and reward. This is in addition to the investigation of existences, essences, accidents, and their laws (9).

The first *Muʿtazilite* to adopt the method of *kalâm* was Wâṣil b. ʿAtâʾ (80-131/699-700 or 748) (10).

... The second generation of *Mu^ctazilites*, of those who began to show direct acquaintance with Greek philosophy, begin with Abû Hudhayl al-^cAllâf of Baṣra (d. 226/849), who lived at a time when Greek philosophy was beginning to be studied with great ardour and was received without question ... Ibrâhîm b. Sayyâr al-Nazzâm (d. 231/845), the next great *Mu^ctazilite* leader, was a devoted student of the Greek philosophers, and an encyclopaedic writer. In this he was typical of the earlier Arab philosophers whose endeavour was to apply Greek science to the interpretation of life and nature generally. The next great *Mu^ctazilite* leader was Bishr b. al-Mu^ctamir (d. 210/825), in whose work we find a more definite attempt to apply philosophical speculation to the practical needs of Islam (11).

Thus it is possible for the historian of Arab-Islamic thought to trace the influence of Greek logical and philosophical ideas on the Arab intellect from the end of the 'Umayyad period down to the extinction of the great translation movement in the 7th/13th century. As the recipient of all this, Hâzim had an excellent understanding of this heritage in the most complete form in which it was known to the Arabs.

De Lacy O'Leary, a historian of western thought, has followed the translation movement down to the 7th/13th century, determining the essential spheres of translation and the categories of Arab-Islamic thought, their influence upon the progress of the Aristotelian *corpus* and the additions made to it, and its preservation until it was eventually taken over by the Europeans at the end of the Middle Ages.

The Aristotelian philosophy was first made known to the Muslim world through the medium of Syriac translations and commentaries, and the particular commentaries used amongst the Syrians never ceased

to control the direction of Arabic thought. From the time of al-Ma'mûn the texts of Aristotle began to be better known, as translations were made directly from the Greek, although these were still largely controlled by the suggestions of the commentaries circulated amongst the Syrians. The Arab writers give the name of *faylasûf* (pl. *falâsifa*), a transliteration of the Greek *philosophos*, to those who based their study directly on the Greek text, either as translators or as students of philosophy, or as the pupils of those who used the Greek text. The word is used to denote a particular series of Arab scholars who arose in the third century AH and came to an end in the seventh century, and who had their origin in the more accurate study of Aristotle based on an examination of the Greek text and the Greek commentators whose work was circulated in Syria.

Thus the term *falâsifa* is employed to denote a particular sect or school of thought... The *falâsifa* form the most important group in the history of Islamic culture. It was they who were largely responsible for awakening Aristotelian studies in Latin Christendom, and it was they who developed the Aristotelian tradition which Islam had received from the Syriac community, correcting and revising its contents by a direct study of Greek text and working out their conclusions on lines indicated by the neo-Platonic commentators (12).

What interests us among these facts is the influence of Greek thought on Arab ideas about rhetoric, literature and aesthetics during the Golden Age and the influence of Aristotle on Arab thought. Many Aristotelian works were translated into Arabic, including his most important works on natural philosophy, metaphysics and ethics. In this study, however, our major concern is for the translation and transmission of Aristotle's works on logic, since this collection contains his two volumes on oratory and poetry. The Arab historians of Aristotle have

identified the *corpus* of logical treatises as the most important of Aristotle's works to have been transmitted to them.

This includes:

Categories, Hermeneutics, Prior Analytics, Posterior Analytics, Topics, Sophistics, Rhetoric, and the Poetics. But the Arabs were not simply content to transmit Aristotle's works. They also translated commentaries on his work, such as those by Alexander, Nicholas, John the Grammarian and others (13).

Some of Aristotle's works certainly suffered from corruption during the process of translation. There are times when this can be traced to the translators' overzealous attempts to produce a literal translation, and on other occasions it was due to a succession of translations, from Greek to Syriac and thence to Arabic. But it must be said that the translators used to alleviate the difficulty of their work by adding commentaries and explanatory remarks; (the most famous transmitter of the *Poetics* was Abû Bishr Mattâ b. Yûnis al-Qinnâ'î, d. 328/940). Some scholars have shown that the obscure passages and corruptions in the Arabic version of the *Poetics* came about due to the fact that they were not originally intended for publication which explains why the content matter is not consecutive (14). Others, in addition related this confusion to Aristotle's own use of terminology (15).

The Islamic philosophers for their part, had their own interpretations and commentaries on the *Poetics* which had a great impact on Arab-Islamic thought. Consequently, to the

philosophers and philosophical critics, the effect on Arab literary thinking was far reaching and fundamental, although the Arab critics in general did not understand Aristotle's doctrines as he originally intended them. Experts agree, however, that Ḥâzim al-Qarṭājannî was the most distinguished of those critics in the field of philosophy generally and Greek philosophy in particular, and it was he who accorded the greatest respect to Aristotle above all others.

It is true that, rather late in the history of literary theory, the Maghribî scholar Ḥâzim al-Qarṭājannî contributed a combination of the two traditions, but this was an isolated attempt, as far as we know (16).

We have already quoted from the writings of a historian of western thought, De Lacy O'Leary, with respect to his view of the course of Arabic philosophy from the 3rd to the 7th century Hijra. But, in addition to this, we would like to mention the view of the modern Arab scholar, Jâbir 'Uṣfûr, who determined the extent of the impact of Greek influence in general, and of Aristotle's *Poetics* in particular, on rhetoric and Arabic criticism in the same period.

It was in the home territories of the *luḡhawwiyûn* (philologists) and the *mutkallimûn* (theologians), and ultimately of the philosophers especially with their commentaries on Aristotle, that ... as I see it, the seeds were sown for the entire rhetorical and critical heritage. The philologists came first, and their efforts began to appear and to bear fruit in the first half of the 3rd century A.H. and, regardless of the outcome of their study, it was they who paved the way for others, especially the *mutakallimûn*. Their territory was first staked out by the Mu^ctazilites in their

efforts to defend Islamic dogmas and through studies on rhetorical matters and the issues of literary criticism ... and perhaps it was due to their cast of mind that translations of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* were undertaken from their early period towards the middle or, at most, the late, second century. Likewise, the *Mu^Ctazilites*, according to many experts, were the most active force in the development of literary criticism in the third century. In any case, there is no doubt that, right from the start, the relationship between the philosophers and the *mutakallimûn* was strong... This brings us to the most important point, namely that the dividing lines between these disciplines were not entirely exclusive. There are always points of contact and undefined areas, and the philologists - in spite of the special attention paid to those controversies that arose between some of their company and some of the logicians (17) they were not divorced from general philosophical culture or Aristotelian logic in particular, and there is no more convincing proof of this than in what the Basran philologists and grammarians had to say about *ʿilal* (causes), *qiyâs* (analogy) and other such essential features common to grammar and language. Furthermore, the philologists were not far removed from the great currents of theological debate. We need only allude to Abû Ḥâtim al-Râzî (195-277/810-890), author of *al-Zîna*, or to al-Rummânî (296-382 or 384/908-992 or 994), al-Fârisî (Abû ʿAlî, 288-377/843-987) or his pupil Ibn Jinnî (d. 392/1001). As for the *mutakallimûn*, in spite of their own philosophical culture, they clearly made an impact on language and grammar. Could the *Mu^Ctazilites* have proceeded with their exegesis of the Quranic metaphors (*majâz*) without relying on a solid linguistic basis? And was not ʿAbd al-Qâhir al-Jurjânî's thought - throughout his writings on rhetoric and grammar - but a web of interwoven threads, some of which trace their origins back to the ideas of the Basran school of language, to the beliefs of the *Ashʿarites* on theology, and to the expositions of Ibn Sînâ's work and other philosophers? The points of contact and intermingling between these fields did not simply arise without issue, but increased as we pass through time and leave the third century behind us ... (18).

Having determined the course of philosophy and its relations to the Greek tradition, and that of the critical and rhetorical thoughts within the same context from the 3rd to 7th century - the time when Ḥâzim lived - these two perspectives have provided the basis for the second part of this introduction which discusses Ḥâzim, his cultural environment and the extent of his knowledge and contributions.

II THE CULTURAL COMPOSITION OF ISLAMIC SPAIN

Apart from being one of the greatest centres of Arab-Islamic civilization, Spain was also the focus for the most important inter-cultural exchange to be seen in the Middle Ages. On the one hand, Spain as a part of Europe brought Arab-Islamic culture into close proximity with the Greek, Latin and Christian heritages; and, on the other, that part of it which formed Muslim al-Andalus was the leading channel whereby Arab-Islamic culture influenced European culture at that time. In Andalusia, Arabic literary criticism's perception of Aristotelian ideas reached a high degree of understanding which is clearly evident in Ḥâzim's *Minhâj*.

- a) Islamic rule in Spain is divided into four major periods, of which the first, that of Umayyads, which lasted until AD 1031, was the most important, long-lasting and flourishing. The founder of this dynasty, ʿAbd al-Raḥmân b. Muʿâwiya b. Hishâm (d. 139/756), is well known to Muslim chroniclers. But it is ʿAbd al-Raḥmân the Third (277-350/890-961) who is accorded the honour of having been the greatest of the ʿUmayyad Caliphs in Spain. He reigned for fifty years, first of all as a prince from 300/912 to 317/929, and thereafter as Caliph. During his reign, Islamic Spain became the foremost cultural centre in the world, and its capital, Cordoba, was the most important seat of thinking, knowledge and art in the Middle Ages. Students and teachers from all parts of the world attended its university

which was a renowned seat of learning, its library being a focus of pilgrimage for experts and intellectuals of every race, colour and creed. However, this intellectual milieu was not destined to last.

The Umayyad dynasty in Andalusia began to fall apart and fragment, ending finally with the Caliphate of Hisham the Third, al-Mu^cttad Billâh, who reigned from 418/1027 to 423/1031. The disintegration of this dynasty resulted in the formation of many smaller regencies whose princes were known as petty kings - *Mulûk al-Tawâ'if* - which forms the second period in the history of Islamic rule in Spain. These kings, however, came into conflict with one another and engaged in internecine war, with the result that government and culture alike eventually went into decline. These weak monarchs found themselves forced to seek help from the *Murâbiṭûn* (Almoravids) - who ruled North Africa and Andalusia from 448/1056 to 514/1120 - and (who had established themselves in Arab North Africa in opposition to Alfonso the Wise, King of Castille). They were in turn followed by the *Muwaḥḥidûn* (Almohads) who established themselves in Arab North Africa and ruled from 514/1120 to 667/1268. After their defeat in 609/1212 at the hands of Alfonso the Eighth, however, decline and dissipation ensued until 898/1492 and the re-conquest of Granada by Ferdinando the Fifth and his Queen, Isabella. This signalled the end of Islamic rule in Spain (19).

- b) After the death of Ibn Sînâ, the last of the greatest Eastern Islamic philosophers, philosophical thought in the East of the

Islamic World went into a decline. At the same time, however, in the West, Spain saw a resurgence of Arab Islamic philosophical activity. It witnessed a philosophical and intellectual movement which is reckoned to have been the highest and final development of Islamic thought in general, as well as the ideal environment for Arab-Islamic originality on the one hand, and for the transmission of Aristotle through Islam to the Christian West on the other (20).

This intellectual and philosophical environment in Spain - both the purely Islamic and the Graeco-Islamic - was also the liveliest philosophical movement seen by the Arab-Islamic civilization in general and the most active of the period worldwide. It was in this environment that three of the most learned men in the universal history of philosophical thought emerged as superlative representatives of the major philosophical schools - both Islamic and secular: Ibn Ḥazm the literalist (*ẓāhiri*) (384-456/998-1064); Ibn Rushd the rationalist (*ʿaqlānī*); and Ibn ʿArabī the ecstatic (*wujdānī*) (560-636/1165-1240). Their involvement with the Arab-Islamic heritage was so profound and solid and their connection with Aristotle so palpably evident that, of the three, Ibn Rushd has gone down in the annals of philosophical history as 'The Great Expounder' (*al-shāriḥ al-ʿAzam*) on Aristotle (21).

Before discussing these three scholars - the men who paved the way for Ḥāzim - attention must be drawn to two other scholars who participated in building that dazzling philosophical milieu in

Spain. First, Ibn Bâjja who was known in the West as Avempace and, according to intellectual historians, was the first Muslim philosopher in Spain (22).

He continues the work of al-Fârâbî, not, it will be noted, of Ibn Sînâ and develops the neo-Platonic interpretation of Aristotle on sober and conservative lines. He wrote commentaries on Aristotle's *Physics*, *de generatione et corruptione*, and the *Meteora*; he produced original works on mathematics, on 'the soul' and a treatise which he called *The Hermit's Guide*. The second was Ibn Tufayl, the first great leader of philosophical thought in Spain (23).

He was a brilliant Aristotelian who reproached Ibn Sînâ for modifying Aristotelian philosophy and bringing it into disrepute; he was also responsible for introducing Ibn Rushd to an Almohad ruler who asked him [Ibn Rushd] to undertake a commentary on the philosophical and logical books of Aristotle (24).

Concerning the three most prominent scholars, their differing schools of thought represented the ultimate development of Islamic thought, especially in its Aristotelian guise. They were: first Ibn Ḥazm, who is considered the greatest Spanish scholar in all aspects of writing in the first half of the 5th/11th century. His great work, *al-Faṣl fî al-Milal wa al-Nihal*, is the most formative book on religious thought in Islam and in other religions. It was the various theological controversies amongst the Muslims, Christians and Jews and the consequent spiritual crisis that had prompted Ibn Ḥazm to write this great compilation. In his work he called for the acceptance of the literal text in order to defend scripture from biased interpretation and misunderstanding (25). For this reason, Ibn Ḥazm was recognised as a *ẓâhirite*.

... The *Zâhirite* school bases itself on *The Qur'ân* and the *Sunna* and adherence to their literal meaning. It rejects exegesis of *The Qur'ân* but, rather, accepts the language of the text at face value. Similarly, it does not attempt to explain precepts, nor to deduce and generalise causes. On the contrary, it accepts the true meaning of expression, neither going beyond its appearance nor attempting to deduce its origins. The exegesis it employs, if any, is within the limits set by the language and sources acceptable to scripture. Recourse to the text is accomplished by means of linguistic proof agreed on by philologists. Ibn Ḥazm insisted on this so that there would be no opportunity for the Word of God to be corrupted; and the whole of his interpretation is conducted in this manner, without the proof permitted in texts or legal constraint. His view of knowledge is based on the recognition that the scholar's sources are provided by perception, sensation and intellect and that, similarly, he had a number of axioms, some of which are revealed and some not, and that each has a path which the *Zâhirite* reconciles in relation to the former, i.e. which is revealed and the realist reconciles in relation to the latter... (26).

The second was Ibn Rushd, who commented on the Aristotelian *corpus*, expanding his philosophy and the additions made to it. And it was these commentaries that prompted the Europeans to call him 'The Great Expounder'. Of course, Ibn Rushd did not simply interpret Aristotle: he also expressed his own views in these commentaries and in other works by him.

His commentaries on Aristotle's *Organon* are distinguished by a depth of understanding, an ability to simplify and fine exposition. In them he disputes various aspects of the theory of Greek commentators such as Adimus, Theophrastus and Alexander, Thamistios and of Muslim expositors, especially Abû Naṣr al-Fârâbî. One need only compare the versions made by the Arab translators and Ibn Rushd's commentaries to see the effort and the excellence of his exposition... He gave his own opinion in an attempt to reconcile the truthful views contained in both Aristotelian philosophy and Islamic canons... Ibn Rushd's own philosophy

appears in individual works he wrote, such as *Tahâfut al-Tahâfut*, *al-Kâshf 'an Manâhij al-adilla* and *Faṣl al-Maḡâl*, and in his own additions to the works of Aristotle. Most important of the distinguishing features of his philosophical belief is his particular theory of the agreement between religion and intellect... (27).

Europeans considered him the very greatest of the Arab philosophers as well as the last; and, indeed, his attempt to reconcile religion and philosophy meant that both seemed to be seeking the single goal of the truth.

He maintained that the task of philosophy was one approved and commended by religion, for *The Qur'ân* shows that God commands men to search for the truth. It is only the prejudice of the unenlightened which fears freedom of thought, because for those whose knowledge is imperfect the truths of philosophy seem to be contrary to religion (28).

Similarly his high regard for Aristotle had the effect of making him divinely inspired and even making his philosophy comparable in its aim to the aims of religion.

The true philosopher allows no word to be uttered against established religion, which is a thing necessary for the welfare of the people. Aristotle he regards as the supreme revelation of God to man: with it religion is in total agreement. In fact, Ibn Rushd really ends the illustrious line of Arabic Aristotelians (29).

The last of the three scholars is Ibn 'Arabî, who took neither the orthodox path of Ibn Ḥazm nor the intellectual route of Ibn Rushd. Rather, he took the way of the heart and of ecstasy, the path of Sufism. In his worship he followed the outward letter of the law of the *Zâhirites*, but in his beliefs he was a

Bâṭinî. Ibn ʿArabi was a contemporary of Ibn Rushd, whom he met, and there is a comparison to be drawn between what Ibn Rushd gained through the path of theoretical thought and what Ibn ʿArabi attained through the path of *Ṣūfî* illumination (30).

It was within this extraordinary intellectual environment that Ḥâzim grew up - an environment which was to reach the highest development in Arab-Islamic thought and the most precise effect upon the Aristotelian philosophical heritage.

III THE LIFE AND WORK OF ḤAZIM AL-QARTAJANNI

Ḥâzim b. Muḥammad b. Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Khalaf b. Ḥâzim al-Anṣârî al-Qartâjannî Abû al-Ḥasan was born in the year 608/1211 and grew up in the town of Cartagena on the south-eastern coast of Andalusia. As a child, he received instruction on the religious, linguistic and literary sciences from his father; he also learnt *The Qur'ân* by heart (31). It is likely that in his adolescence he pursued those same studies of the sciences of religion, literature, language, philosophy and logic, as did his contemporaries Ibn al-Abbâr (d. 658/1260) and al-Makḥzûmî (Abû al-Muṭarîf Aḥmad b. 'Amîra, d. 658/1260). This meant that he often frequented the nearby town of Murcia in order to learn from such teachers as al-Ṭarsûnî (Abû al-Qâsim Aḥmad b. Muḥammad d. 622/1225) and al-'Arûdî (Aḥmad b. Hilâl, d. 640/1242). There he completed his formative cultural training, studying so many of the basic books that he outstripped his peers. He was a *Malikite faqîh* like his father, a grammarian of the Baṣran school like most Andalusian scholars, a traditionalist, a transmitter of chronicles and belles-lettres, and a poet. His zeal for research and study did not stop here; his intense desire for knowledge impelled him to go to Granada and Seville where he gained the approval and acknowledgement of as many scholars as he was able. Biographies of Ḥâzim relate that he acquired knowledge from close on a thousand contemporary

scholars, but the most immediate mentors among all these were his father, al-Ṭarsūnî, al-ʿArūdî, and al-Shalawbîn (Abû ʿAlî ʿUmar b. Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Ishbîlî, d. 645/1247) (32).

It was Abû ʿAlî al-Shalawbîn, the leading grammarian and philologist in his day, who exercised the most profound influence on Ḥâzim's scholastic formation. There is evidence to show that al-Shalawbîn was a pupil under Ibn Ruṣhd and that he then directed his own pupil, Ḥâzim, to the study of Ibn Ruṣhd's works, as well as to the works of other philosophers such as al-Fârâbî and Ibn Sînâ, and to the study of logic, rhetoric and poetry, and also the adoption of the Hellenic sciences (33).

The fact that Ḥâzim was directed towards the study of Ibn Ruṣhd's writings raises an interesting question that has challenged modern researchers of Ḥâzim's work. Essentially the problem is: if it is historically true that Ḥâzim was directed in this way, then why does he never mention Ibn Ruṣhd in his book, the *Minhâj*? It is said that while Ḥâzim relied on Ibn Sînâ's commentary on the *Poetics* and was greatly influenced by it, his recourse to Abû Naṣr al-Fârâbî is only evidenced on two occasions when he discussed his ideas; on the other hand, he ignored *al-Sharḥ al-Waṣîṭ* by Ibn Ruṣhd, and his avoidance of any mention of this book seems to have been intentional. This may have been because he found Ibn Ruṣhd's version of Aristotle's *Poetics* less than faithful; it may also have been because he wished to make an original contribution to the *corpus* of Arabic poetic criticism. In which case, he may have been prompted to

rectify his own master's master with the *Minhâj*, a book which combines both Greek and Arab principles and sources (34). A certain scholar confirms that Ḥâzim was acquainted with Ibn Rushd's work, but that he did not consider it sufficient (35). Another scholar holds an opinion which is close to this when he says that Ḥâzim began his study of Aristotle's *Poetics* with the aid of Ibn Rushd's work, but because of its inaccuracy, passed on to the commentaries of other Arab philosophers:

... the reason for this is to be found in the difference between the nature of the scientific work undertaken by Ibn Sînâ with regard to the *Poetics* of Aristotle and that of Ibn Rushd. While we may perceive that Ibn Rushd's summary was Ḥâzim's starting point for his reading of other translations and commentaries, we can be reasonably sure that Ḥâzim went beyond this initial stage and even deprecated it as he found it full of errors compared with the critical presentation undertaken by Ibn Sînâ (36).

There is a third scholar who considers that Ḥâzim did not mention the influence of Ibn Rushd's commentary on him on purpose so as to display the originality of his intellectual powers and the superiority of his philosophising. It is clear that Ḥâzim was acquainted with Ibn Rushd's thoughts and fully comprehended every aspect of his work. However, in as much as he relied on Ibn Sînâ, his concept of poetry differed from that of Ibn Rushd in most of the critical aspects prompting him to voice his condemnation, albeit indirectly (37).

Whichever of these is the case, it is absolutely certain that Ḥāzīm was deeply involved in philosophy and logic. Ibn Rushayd (d. 721/1321), his pupil, said with regard to this matter that Ḥāzīm was strenuously engaged in intellectual life, and that his *dirāya*, or (innovative) intellectual side, outweighed his *riwāya*, i.e. his role as transmitter (of tradition) (38).

Ḥāzīm left Spain for North-west Africa when he was about twenty-five years of age. In other words, his migration was in the year 633/1235 according to two of his most important biographers, Ibn al-Khūja (39) and Sa'ḍ Maṣlūh, who said:

... we do not believe that Ḥāzīm stayed there until 637/1239 for he saw the danger of imminent and fearful collapse approaching his homeland. To this I would add that he stayed for a period of time in Marrakesh where he composed panegyric odes for the Amīr, al-Rashīd, and that by 639/1247, he had arrived in Tunis. Therefore we are inclined to believe, along with Dr. Ibn al-Khūja, that his flight from Andalusia came shortly after his father's death, i.e. in about 633/1235, and that he stayed in Marrakesh between 633/1235 and 638/1240. Then, after that, he set off for Tunis where he remained until the end of his days (40).

On the other hand, the editor of Ḥāzīm's *Dīwān* mentions in the preface to the edition (41) that Ḥāzīm left his homeland in 637/1239. Most scholars, however, agree with the view of the two just cited. As for his stay in North Africa - Marrakesh and Tunis - it was for more than half a century from 633/1235 to 684/1285; not that this changes his being 'Andalusian', for his cultural formation had been in Andalusia, which he left as an intellectually mature and fully-equipped young man (42). In

fact, his time in Marrakesh was very brief: it was Tunis which was to be his adopted homeland. There he was to settle and spend the rest of his life preserving his Andalusian heritage and hoping that the Ḥafṣite dynasty would liberate Andalusia and return it to its people. At the time of his residence, Tunis was a flourishing centre of scholarship, and Ḥâzim found an environment suitable for writing his books and composing his poetry, remaining under the protection of the Ḥafṣites until he passed away on the night of the twenty-fourth of Ramaḍân, 684/1285 (43).

Ḥâzim's biographers believe that his knowledge and talent singled him out in Tunis; his name was widely known, and he had the status of a *shaykh*, being one of the leading lights of intellectual life in his day, and the greatest contemporary authority in Tunis (44). In fact, his standing was such that many of those whom he educated became outstanding scholars thanks to the knowledge they acquired from him. Among these was Abû Ḥayyân al-Andalûsî, Ibn Sa'îd, Ibn Rushayd, al-Kattânî, Ibn Râshîd al-Qafṣî, and Ibn al-Qûba'. And apart from all these students of Ḥâzim, there were those groups who benefited from his knowledge indirectly by studying his books and following his path (45). Concerning his students, it is worth noting that two important books in the field of Arabic rhetoric and literary criticism have recently been edited in Morocco, both of which clearly indicate that they belong to one school, that of Ḥâzim. They were *al-Rawḍ al-Marî' fî Şinâ'at al-Badî'* by Ibn al-Bannâ' (d. 721/1321) and *al-Manzî' al-Badî' fî Tajnîs*

Asâlib al-Badî^c by Abû Muḥammad al-Qâsim al-Sijilmâsî (date unknown). Both affirmed that the authors were students of Ḥâzim in spite of the fact that neither Ḥâzim's name nor his *Minhâj* were ever mentioned in their books.

Professor ^cAzza al-Nuṣṣ, who supervised the editing of *Kitâb al-Rawḍ al-Marî*^c (46), emphasized in his introductory comment to this academic work that it was one of a critical and rhetorical series of books. In his opinion, if one takes into consideration the nature of the individual author's way of thinking, a close examination of the aims and methods of composition within this series clearly indicates that they not only have the same point of departure, but are obviously students of one school, as their innovative contributions all follow the same path. Their thinking and works reveal that the Arabic literary inheritance had become intermixed with that of the Greeks and with Aristotle's thoughts in particular, his books on logic and criticism being most predominant in this respect (47).

The editor, on his part, stressed that *al-Rawḍ* symbolised Arabic rhetoric in its philosophical frame as comprehended in Morocco at that time by this innovative triangle, Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî, Ibn al-Bannâ' and Abû Muḥammad al-Sijilmâsî. He also pointed out the strong resemblance between *al-Rawḍ* and *al-Manzî*^c and the similarity of certain aspects within each work, i.e. their terminology, definitions, choice of examples and illustrations. However, he could not claim certainty in this respect due to the lack of historical evidence to support his

theory, i.e. that *al-Rawḍ* is the resource of *al-Manzī^C* and vice versa (48). Notwithstanding, the editor was convinced that Ḥâzim took precedence within the Moroccan school. To him, Ḥâzim's critical and rhetorical direction was that adopted by Ibn al-Bannâ' (49).

The method and subject contained within the second book, *al-Manzī^C* bears a strong resemblance to the *Minhâj*, both possessing that same profound understanding of Aristotle's theories, in addition to the enlightened employment of these same theories in the treatment of Arabic critical and rhetorical subjects. Both of these observations clearly indicate that al-Sijilmâsî was under Ḥâzim's tuition, even though extant historical data do not support this premise as al-Sijilmâsî made no mention of Ḥâzim in his book, and the historical literature of the period provides nothing by way of evidence to show that the two scholars were connected - no date of birth, no note of his death, nor mention of his tutor or student (51). The editor (of *al-Manzī^C*) leant towards the opinion that the two scholars were obviously contemporaries given the fact that al-Sijilmâsî's composition was written in 704/1304, only twenty years after Ḥâzim's death in 684/1285, which could also go some way towards explaining why al-Sijilmâsî ignored Ḥâzim (52). Furthermore, this same interval in time convinced the editor that al-Sijilmâsî was one of Ḥâzim's students (53).

Professor Ṭarâbulṣî, who supervised the editing of *al-Manzîc*, went further and determined the issue with greater accuracy by saying:

The seventh century A.H. and the beginning of the eighth acknowledged the existence of a Moroccan rhetorical school which deserves the attention of all scholars interested in comparative, rhetorical and critical studies. It is clearly apparent that this school has bequeathed - through the hands of its renowned scholars - an admirable legacy. For besides being highly specialized in both the Arabic language and literature in general, and in Arabic rhetoric and criticism in particular, they surpassed all Arab critics, from both the East and West in their acquaintance with Aristotle's logic and total comprehension of the profound implications of the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*... These school members were able, through their extensive knowledge of Arabic education and breadth of mind concerning Aristotle's thoughts, to impregnate the extant Arabic rhetorical studies with Hellenic thoughts. The profundity of thought behind this fusion made for a laudable achievement. The three most important scholars to emerge from this school were first, Ḥâzim al-Qarṭajannî (d. 684/1285), author of kitâb *Minhâj al-Bulaghâ*; second, Ibn al-Bannâ', author of kitâb *al-Rawḍ al-Marîc fî Şinâ'at al-Badîc* - a composition which was particularly characteristic of the school...; and the third being Abû Muḥammad al-Qâsim al-Sijilmâsî... His name having been borrowed from Sijilmâsa, the town where Ḥâzim spent many years of his youth, and where Ibn al-Bannâ' spent all his life. Thus if we trust the validity and accuracy of our conclusions, our three learned scholars all lived within the same era, sharing the same scientific, intellectual environment - an environment within which the philosopher Ibn Ruṣhd spent part of his life. What has persuaded us to presume all this is the belief that this school owed its emergence to this part of the Arab world and to those seeds sown and cultivated in this Moroccan sand by the books and expositions of Ibn Ruṣhd (54).

In determining this subject in the above manner, we are given to understand from his conclusion that Ibn Rushd assumed the role of headmaster of philosophy in this school, and Hâzim al-Qarṭâjannî that of headmaster of rhetoric, criticism and the philosophy of literature in general.

There is no doubt that the writings left by Hâzim al-Qarṭâjannî are a rich endowment. Here we will start by listing all the works that have come down to us, whether as separate manuscripts or as appropriations in the works of other classical authors. Modern scholars have gone to great lengths over them and preserved them in publications which are scholarly and definitive. The list is chronological according to their date of publication:

al-Maqṣûra (55)
al-Dîwân (56)
*Minhâj al-Bulaghâ*³ wa *Sirâj al-'Udabâ'* (57)
Qaṣâ'id wa Muqatta'ât (58).

Hâzim also composed a lengthy *qaṣîda* containing the rules of Arabic syntax (*naḥw*) arranged in 217 verses, rhyming in the letter *mîm*, with an opening verse in praise of al-Mustanṣir Abû 'Abd Allâh, and which begins:

وَجَاعِلُ الْعَقْلِ فِي سَبِيلِ الْهُدَى عِلْمًا الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ مُعْلَى قَدْرٍ مِّنْ عِلْمًا
(59)

As it happens, it seems that the majority of works attributed to Hâzim and in printed editions fall under the category of poetry. Scholars consider that among this poetry the *Maqṣûra* is to be

singled out as especially important, attracting a great deal of interest, wonder and study, as is attested by the great number of commentaries upon it that are mentioned in classical sources (60). Ḥâzim composed this *Maqṣûra* for al-Mustanṣir Abû 'Abd Allâh, the Caliph whom he praises in it, along with his brother Abû Yahyâ. The opening verse is:

لِلّٰهِ مَا قَدَّ هَجَّتْ يَآ يَوْمَ النُّوَى
عَلَى فُؤَادِي مِّنْ تَبَارِيحِ الْجَوَى

Muḥammad Mahdî 'Allâm chose to edit and study this long poem in two studies. His work is the first modern appreciation for the life and work of Ḥâzim. As for Ḥâzim's *Dîwân*, this is a collection of *qaṣîdas* put together by the editor and prefaced by a biography of Ḥâzim and a short explanation of his literary and rhetorical works. On the other hand Muḥammad al-Ḥabîb b. al-Khûja edited and published what he thought to be the complete collection of Ḥâzim's poetical works under the title of *Qaṣâ'id wa Muqatta'ât*. Whatever the case may be, scholars hold the view that Ḥâzim's literary and linguistic education is so extensively represented in his poetry by the many quotations from and allusions to *The Qur'ân*, verses of Arabic poetry, and Arabic proverbs, that we cannot but be made aware of a profound education which endows the owner with superiority, originality, and persistence in his achievement (61).

But the composition that has made Ḥâzim's name and attracted the attention of Arab historians of rhetoric and criticism, is the *Minhâj al-Bulaghâ'* - a work in which he strove to establish a

science and theory for Arabic poetry. This book has not come down to the present day in a complete form: in fact a portion has disappeared, and what has survived is a unique manuscript which is incomplete at the beginning. Some scholars stumbled upon this manuscript in the Zaytuna library at Tunis; another copy in the Dâr al-Kutub library in Cairo, was made from the Tunis manuscript. The first publication about the manuscript was undertaken by ʿAbd al-Raḥmân Badawî, who edited one section of the book - the third *Minhâj* of the second part - and published it in 1962 in a volume containing the work of various experts on different topics (62). A few years later, in 1966, the Tunisian scholar made a learned edition of the entire manuscript which then became widespread in scholarly circles.

It is obvious from a study of the *Minhâj* that Ḥâzim composed it with the intention of composing a work on the subject that Ibn Sînâ had promised to write about but never did. For in his summary of Aristotle's *Poetics* he mentions his desire to take in Aristotle's work and to write a book on the theory of poetry in general and of Arabic poetry in particular - subjects which had not been attempted by Aristotle. It was Ḥâzim who revived Ibn Sînâ's unfinished business and created a powerful connection with philosophy in general, and with Aristotelian philosophy in the Arabic commentaries in particular, just as at the same time he forged a substantial link with Arabic poetry, its historic realities and artistic conventions. In the *Minhâj*, Ḥâzim was mindful of undertaking philosophical and rhetorical/critical definitions at the same time; in other words, he was aware of

basing his work on that of Arab philosophers and rhetoricians who had preceded him. He introduced Ibn Sînâ's words about his prospective book on the philosophy of poetry in general and of Arabic poetry specifically, and then refers to it by saying that he had taken note of this statement and composed the *Minhâj* as a formation of this theory.

In his conclusion to his summary of the *Poetics*, Abû 'Alî Ibn Sînâ said: 'This is the summary of what is extant of the First Teacher's *Poetics* as found in this country at the present time. And a substantial portion of it has remained. We will continue to strive to devise words of intense learning and detail on the science of poetry in general and the science of poetry relating to the custom of the time. But this is enough for now'. So ended Ibn Sînâ's words ... and in this book I have mentioned the details of this art and I hope they constitute what Abû 'Alî Ibn Sînâ was alluding to ... (63).

So these words confirm that Ḥâzim al-Qarṭājannî composed his *Minhâj* in order to comprise a general theoretical endeavour (what Ibn Sînâ called *al-shi'r al-muṭlaq*) as well as a theoretical endeavour that was specific to Arabic poetry (what Ibn Sînâ termed *'ilm al-shi'r biḥasbi 'âdat hâdhâ al-zamân*).

Finally, we should pause to consider the efforts of modern scholars in their studies of Ḥâzim and his work in order to point out the value of their efforts and give an indication of their precedence.

IV MODERN STUDIES ON ḤĀZIM AND HIS WORK

Many decades of the modern Arab Renaissance went by - almost a century and a half, in fact - before anybody knew anything about ḤĀzīm and his works. It was Muḥammad ʿAllām's study (64) which was the first to pay attention to ḤĀzīm and, as we explained previously, this study gave an account of ḤĀzīm's life and gathered together the information about him contained in classical sources. But ḤĀzīm is presented in this study as a poet, especially in view of the edition and analysis of the *Maqṣūra* which follows the biography.

With Shukrī Muḥammad ʿAyyād's work (65), however, we come to the first study to look into the *Minhāj*. He places its subject matter within a broad conspectus of Arab rhetoricians and the Aristotelian influence upon them. Where Muḥammad ʿAllām had presented ḤĀzīm as a poet, and Shukrī ʿAyyād had ranked him among those Arab rhetoricians who had been influenced by Aristotle, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Badawī (66) the well-known professor of philosophy, approached ḤĀzīm from the point of view of the extent of his understanding of Aristotelian theory in the art of literature. Thus we may say that these three Arab scholars were the first to introduce ḤĀzīm al-Qarṭājannī and his work to specialists in Arabic studies generally and rhetorical and

critical studies in particular. It is also true to say that these three pieces of research achieved a presentation of Ḥâzim as poet, rhetorician and philosophical theorist.

After that there was a variety of comprehensive studies which incorporated the life and works of Ḥâzim, and which dealt with the general characteristics of his poetry and the basic outline of his literary criticism. In Sa^cd Maşlûḥ we come for the first time to a profound study within which he approached Ḥâzim as a theorist and critic through his theory of imagination (67).

There followed a proliferation of studies which placed Ḥâzim in the critical and rhetorical context. And so Jâbir ^Uşfûr's study (on *The Notion of Poetry*) (68) sets Ḥâzim's theoretical endeavours in the context of the theoretical notions achieved by Arab rhetoricians and critics in a period after two stages had already been reached in critical thought, the first by Ibn Ṭabâṭabâ in his research into the norm (^Uiyâr) of poetry, and the other by Qudâma b. Ja^cfar in his research into the science (^Uilm) of poetry. The result is that Ḥâzim's work in the *Minhâj* is seen as representing a mature and complete phase of literary theory in the history of Arabic thought.

As a result of the interest shown by these Arab scholars for Ḥâzim's work in the field of Arabic rhetoric, research students have, in the past few years, been attracted to the same interest. A group of these students has now completed its

studies - studies which, for the most part, have been saturated by an historical approach, that is to say, an historical treatment of Arabic rhetoric and an attempt to place Ḥâzim's endeavours within that perspective. Excepting the study of Kîlânî Ḥasan Sanad (69), since it is devoted to the life and poetry of Ḥâzim, we find that the studies of Taysîr Yûsuf Ibrâhîm Abû Ḥasna (70), °Abd al-Fattâḥ Muḥammad Aḥmad Muḥammad Salâma (71), Mansûr °Abd al-Raḥmân (72), and Şafwat °Abd-Allâh °Abd al-Raḥîm (73) give extensive treatment to the life and times of Ḥâzim, as well as repeated observations on the history of Arabic rhetoric, so that when we come to Ḥâzim's theoretical efforts, we find that those historical matters take up the lion's share of the study.

Western orientalists have, in the majority of cases, preceded modern Arab scholars in discovering certain aspects of the Arab literary heritage according to modern methodology, their contributions having attained worldwide recognition. One such effort by G.E. von Grunebaum described the aesthetic basis of Arabic literature (74). His article on the field of Arabic criticism tended to adopt a general and comprehensive approach, whereas the work of subsequent fellow Orientalists was more centralized and specific. W. Heinrichs (75), for example, concentrated on the comparison between Arabic literary thought and Hellenic poetic theory. His prime objective being to evaluate the extent of the latter's influence on Arabic thinking. Naturally, he devoted a considerable part of his work

to this matter as evidenced in Ḥâzim's book through the theory of *muhâkât* and *takhyîl*. In addition, he translated part of the third *manhaj* of the second part of the *Minhâj* (the same part that was published by A. Badawî). G. Schoeler (76) followed along the same lines as his colleague but his method was more systematic and cohesive. He studied the genres of poetry, the different standards of poets and the *hiyal* (artistic tricks) employed by the poet, approaching each subject through three levels. In the first level he dealt with the subject from the point of view of classical Arabic criticism; the second level treats the subject in the light of the Aristotelian/Arabic theory of poetry; and in the third and final level he approaches the subject through Ḥâzim's point of view and from the aspect of the contributions he made to the work of his predecessors. He concluded his work with annotated translations of part of *Kitâb al-Minhâj* from page 336-353 in addition to pages 11 and 12 from the supplement. Von Gelder (77), on the other hand, studies the structure of the Arabic *qaṣîda* as conceived by Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî in his article *Critic and Craftsman: al-Qarṭâjannî and the structure of the poem*.

...

These studies, however, were by no means primary contributions on the part of the Western Orientalists for it was, in the case of Ḥâzim, contemporary Arab scholars who discovered his role in the Arab rhetorical and critical heritage, revealing the extent of

his innovative efforts through their research into his rhetorical and critical writing and thus according him the prestige he truly deserved.

We have striven to profit from all these efforts, both Arab and Western, endeavouring at the same time to avoid repeating historical matters that have already been treated and to focus our attention in this study exclusively on the rhetorical principles to be found in Ḥâzim's rhetorical and critical book, i.e. the *Minhâj*.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. von Heinrichs, Wolfhart. *Arabische Dichtung und Griechische Poetik: Ḥāzīm al-Qarṭājannīs Grundlegung der Poetik mit Hilfe Aristotelischer Begriff.* Beirut, 1969, p. 104.
2. Zaydān, Jurjī. *Tārīkh Ādāb al-Lughā al-^cArabiyya.* Cairo, 1957, Vol. I., p. 157 ff.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 193.
4. Madkūr, Ibrāhīm. *Fī al-Falsafa al-Islāmiyya Manhaj wa Taṭbīq.* Cairo, 1976, 3rd. edition, pp. 25-28.
5. Ibn al-Nadīm stated that "Muhammad b. Ishāq says that Khālid b. Yazīd b. Mū^cāwiya b. Abī Sufyān ... is the first to have had translated for him *Kutub al-Ṭibb wa al-Nujūm wa Kutub al-Kīmyā*". He also added that "Iṣṭifān al-Qadīm translated for Khālid b. Yazīd b. Mū^cāwiya *Kutub al-Ṣanā^ca* [alchemy] and other books".
Ibn al-Nadīm. *al-Fihrist.* (Ed. by one of the professors of Cairo University.) Cairo, pp. 497 and 340. Cf. *The Cambridge History of Islam.* (Ed. by P.M. Holt, Ann K.S. Lambton and Bernard Lewis.) Cambridge, 1977, Vol. 2B. Footnote no. 2, p. 784.
6. Dāghir, Yūsuf As^cad. *Maṣādir al-Dirāsa al-Adabiyya.* Lebanon, 1961, 2nd. edition, Vol. I, p. 122.
7. *The Cambridge History of Islam. Op. cit.*, p. 782.
8. *The Legacy of Islām.* (Ed. by Joseph Schacht and C.E. Bosworth.) Oxford, 1974, 2nd. edition, pp. 15, 17-18, 26-28.
9. Ṣalībā, Jamīl. *al-Mu^c jam al-Falsafī.* Lebanon, p. 1982, Vol. II, pp. 235-236.
See, in addition, *The Legacy of Islām. Op. cit.*, pp. 359-362 and p. 6.
10. al-Shahrastāni. *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal.* (Ed. by Sayyīd Kilānī.) Cairo, 1961, Vol. I, p. 48.
11. O'Leary, D.D. De Lacy. *Arabic Thought and its Place in History.* London, 1954, 3rd. edition, p. 124-127.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 135-136.
13. Ṣalība, Jamīl. *Tārīkh al-Falsafa al-^cArabiyya.* Beirut, 1973, 2nd. edition, p. 103.

14. Ibn Rushd. *Talkhîṣ Kitâb Aristûṭâlis fî al-Shiʿr*. (Ed. by Muḥammad Salîm Sâlim.) Cairo, 1971, the editor's introduction, p. 10.
15. Badawî, Abd al-Raḥmân. See his Introduction to *al-Shifâ'* by Ibn Sînâ which he edited. Cairo, 1966, p. 29 ff.
16. See the article *Literary Theory: The Problem of its Efficiency* by Wolfhart Heinrichs in *Arabic Poetry: Theory and Development*. (Giorgio Levi Della Vida Conferences.) (Ed. by G.E. von Grunebaum.) California, 1973, 3rd. edition, p. 33.
17. Here the author is referring to the controversy between the grammarian Abû Saʿîd al-Sîrâfî and the logician Mattâ b. Yûnis. See *al-Muqâbasât* by Abû Ḥayyân al-Tawḥîdî. (Ed. by Ḥasan al-Sandûbî.) Cairo, 1347 A.H. 1st. edition, p. 170, and *Muʿjam al-'Udabâ'* by Yâqût al-Ḥamawî (Ed. by Aḥmad Farîd Rifâʿî). Cairo, 1938, Vol. VIII, p. 221.
18. ʿUṣfûr, Jâbir Aḥmad. *al-Ṣûra al-Fanniya fî al-Turâth al-Naqdî wa al-Balâghî*. Cairo, 1974, pp. 121-125.
19. Kâmil, Maḥmûd. *al-Dawla al-ʿArabiyya*. Cairo, 1961, pp. 140-142.
20. Ṣalîbâ, Jamîl. *Op. cit.*, p. 436.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 443.
22. Madkûr, Ibrâhîm and others. *Aʿlâm al-Fikr al-Insânî*. Cairo, 1984, Vol. I, p. 49.
23. O'Leary, D.D. De Lacy. *Op. cit.*, pp. 244 and 250.
24. Madkûr, Ibrâhîm and others. *Op. cit.*, pp. 190 and 188.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
27. *Ibid.*, pp. 141-142.
28. O'Leary, D.D. De Lacy. *Op. cit.*, pp. 253-254.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 254-260.
30. Madkûr Ibrâhîm and others. *Op. cit.*, p. 205.
31. Maṣlûḥ, Saʿd. *Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî wa Naẓariyyat al-Muḥâkât wa al-Takhyîl fî al-Shiʿr*. Cairo, 1980, 1st. edition, p. 15.

32. Muḥammad al-Ḥabîb b. al-Khûja's introduction to *Minhâj al-Bulaghâ' wa Sirâj al-'Udabâ' Šana'ahu Abû al-Ḥasan Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî* which was edited by him. Tunis, 1966, with adaptation, p. 53 ff.
33. Maşlûḥ, Sa°d. *Op. cit.*, p. 16.
Ibn al-Khûja. *Op. cit.*, pp. 53-54.
34. Ibn al-Khûja. *Op. cit.*, p. 118.
35. Ibn Rushd was a great philosopher and a profound expositor of Aristotle's works but his exposition of the *Poetics* in particular is dotted with errors as has been noticed by scholars. See for example *Kitâb Aristûṭâlîs Fann al-Shi°r - Ma°a al-Tarjama al-°Arabiyya al-Qadîma wa Shurûḥ al-Fârâbî wa Ibn Sînâ wa Ibn Rushd* (trans. and ed. by A. Badawî). Cairo, 1953, p. 55.
36. Maşlûḥ Sa°d. *Op. cit.*, p. 52.
37. Badawî, °Abd al-Rahmân. His article *Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî wa Nazariyyât Aristû fî al-Balâgha wa al-Naqd* in the book *Ilâ Tâhâ Ḥusayn fî°îd Milâdihî al-Sab°în*. Cairo, 1962, p. 87.
38. al-Siyûtî Jalâl al-Dîn. *Buḡhyat al-Wi°â°*. (Ed. by Muḥammad Abû al-Faḍl Ibrâhîm.) Cairo, 1326 A.H., Vol. I, 1st. edition, p. 214.
39. Ibn al-Khûja. *Op. cit.*, p. 55.
40. Maşlûḥ, Sa°ad. *Op. cit.*, p. 18.
41. *Dîwân Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî*. (Ed. by °Uḥmân al-Ka°°âk.) Beirut, 1946, the Introduction, p. C.
42. al-Dâya, Muḥammad Riḍwân. *Târîkh al-Naqd al-Adabî fî al-Andalus*. Beirut, 1968, p. 473.
43. al-Ka°°âk. *Op. cit.*, p. C, D, and H.
44. Ibn al-Khûja. *Op. cit.*, p. 71.
al-Tîjânî said to his student: "Kâna Abû al-Ḥasan Ḥâmil Râyat al-Andalusîyyin".
45. *Ibid.*, p. 70.
46. al-°Adadî, Ibn al-Bannâ° al-Marrâkishî. *al-Rawḍ al-Marî° fî Šinâ°at al-Badî°*. (Ed. by Riḍwân Binshaqrûn.) al-Dâr al-Bayḍâ , Morocco, 1965.
47. *Ibid.*, the Introduction by °Azza al-Nuṣṣ, p. 8.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 48.

49. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
50. al-Sijilmâsî, Abû Muḥammad al-Qâsim b. Muḥammad b. °Abd al-°Azîz al-Anṣarî. *al-Manzi° al-Badî° fî Tajnîs Asâlib al-Badî°*. (Ed. by °Alâl al-Ghâzî.) Rabât, Morocco, 1980, 1st. edition.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
54. Amjad al-Tarâbulsî's introductory comment to *al-Manzi°*, pp. 12-15.
55. Published in two parts with editing by Muḥammad Maḥdî °Allâm in the annual periodical *Ḥawliyyât Kuliyyat al-°Adâb* under the title *Abû al-Ḥasan Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî wa Fann al-Maqṣûra fî al-°Adab al-°Arabî*. Cairo, 1951, Vol. I, pp. 1-21. Cairo, 1953 and 1954, Vol. II, pp. 1-110.
56. al-Qarṭâjannî, Ḥâzim. *Dîwân Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî*. (Ed. by °Uthmân al-Ka°âk.) Beirut, 1964.
57. al-Qarṭâjannî, Ḥâzim. *Minḥâj al-Bulaghâ° wa Sirâj al-°Udabâ°* (introduced and edited by Muḥammad al-Ḥabîb b. al-Khûja). Tunis, 1966.
58. al-Qarṭâjannî, Ḥâzim. *Qaṣâ'id wa Muqaṭṭa°ât* (introduced and edited by Muḥammad al-Ḥabîb b. al-Khûja). Tunis, 1972.
59. This poem was published by the editor of the *Dîwân* as a supplement, pp. 121-133.
60. Maṣlûḥ, Sa°d. *Op. cit.*, p. 24.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
62. °Abd al-Raḥmân Badawî published his article for the first time in *Kitâb Ṭâhâ Ḥusayn* as mentioned in reference no. (37). He published it again separately in Cairo, 1965.
63. al-Qarṭâjannî, Ḥâzim. *Minḥâj al-Bulaghâ°*, pp. 69-70.
64. °Allâm, Muḥammad. See reference no. (55).
65. °Ayyâd, Shukrî Muḥammad. *Kitâb Aristûṭâlîs fî al-Shi°r*. Cairo, 1967, pp. 241-246, 256-258, 263-265, 268-269, 274-278.

66. Badawî, °Abd al-Raḥmân. *Op. cit.*
The comprehensive studies have relied, concerning Ḥâzim and his contribution, on the main classical Arabic resources in addition to the lengthy introduction by Ibn al-Khuja to his edition of *Kitâb al-Minhâj.*, pp. 31-118.
67. Maşluḥ, Sa°d. *Op. cit.*
68. °Uşfûr, Jâbir. *Mafhûm al-Shi°r: Dirâsa fî al-Turâth al-Naqdî.* Cairo, 1978.
69. Sanad, K.H. *Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî Ḥayâtaḥ wa Shi°rah.* Ph.D. research manuscript, al-Azhar University, Cairo, 1976.
70. Abû Ḥasna, E.Y. *al-Itijâhât al-Naqdiyya wa al-Balâghiyya fî al-Shi°r °Inda Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî.* M.D. research manuscript, Alexandria.
71. Salâma, A.M. *Nazariyyât Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî fî al-Balâgha al-°Arabiyya wa Maşâdirihâ.* Ph.D. research manuscript, al-Azhar University, Cairo.
72. Abd al-Raḥmân, M. *Maşâdir al-Tafkîr al-Naqdî wa al-Balâghî °Inda Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî.* Cairo, 1980.
73. °Abd al-Raḥîm, S. *Ârâ° Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî al-Naqdiyya wa al-Jamâliyya fî °daw° al-Ta°thirât al-Yûnâniyya ma°a al-Ta°bîq °Alâ Maqşûratihî.* Ph.D. research manuscript, al-Minyâ University, Egypt.
74. von Grunebaum, G.E. *The Aesthetic Foundations of Arabic Literature: Comparative Literature.* California, 1952, pp. 32-340.
75. Heinrichs, W. *Op. cit.*, pp. 18-69.
76. Schoeler, G. *Einige Grundprobleme der Autochthonen und der Aristotelischen Arabischen Literaturtheorie. Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî Kaptel über die Zielsetzungen der Dichtung und die Vorgeschichte der in ihm Dargeegten Gedanken.* D.M.G., Wiesbaden, 1975.
77. von Gelder. See his article *Critic and Craftsman: al-Qarṭâjannî and the structure of the poem* in *Journal of Arabic Literature.* Leiden, 1979, Vol. X, pp. 26-42.

PART ONE

POETRY: ITS NATURE AND FUNCTION

CHAPTER 1

THE NATURE OF POETRY

- I THE DEFINITION OF POETRY
- II POETIC CONTENT
- III POETIC FACULTIES
- IV EVALUATION

Ḥāzīm al-Qarṭājannī is - as this thesis will show - the most outstanding exponent among Arab literary critics of the classical theory of literary criticism in its ancient and medieval phase. His discussion of the nature of poetry, its basic concepts and definition, together with his discussion of the nature of the creative process itself is well within the tradition of the classical theory of *muḥākāt* (Mimesis). It is the view of the historians of literary and art criticism that the predominance of this theory in ancient and medieval literary thought was a natural thing that can be explained for two reasons. The first is that all branches of human knowledge overlapped. Different disciplines were not as developed at that time as they are now and their scope and methodologies were far from being defined, so the distinctions among them were blurred. In ancient and medieval times, those disciplines aimed first and foremost at acquainting human beings with the world they lived in. So literary critics and philosophers alike sought in poetry an epistemological content. The likeliest method to achieve this was for poetry to imitate both the outer world (objects) and the inner world (sensations and emotions).

The second reason given for the predominance of the Theory of Imitation in ancient literary thought is that thinkers were clearly concerned in those ages with the problem of human behaviour and the nature of values. Therefore, they evaluated all fields of knowledge, thought and artistic creativity on moral grounds. They sought a moral message in poetry, i.e. that it

should use its artistic methods to beautify what is morally laudable, and to villify what is not. The means whereby this was achieved was for the poet to imitate beautiful things so as to make them attractive to the recipient's soul while imitating ugly things with a view to making them look repulsive (1).

The proposition that art in general and poetry in particular is an imitation of nature is as old as human thought itself. But classical Greek thinkers were the first to formulate it into a cohesive theory in a documented form. Socrates (B.C. 469 - 399) was the first to propose it, but his views came down to us mainly through the works of his student, Plato (B.C. 424 - 347) (2). Aristotle (B.C. 284 - 322) took up the work of his two predecessors and elaborated it, giving the concept of Imitation a more distinctly objective nature (3). He was the first to devote an independent work to poetry, his *Poetics*, which is considered by scholars to be the most influential work throughout the history of literary criticism.

When Greek thought was translated into Arabic - during 'Abbasid rule at the beginning of the 2nd. century A.H. - Aristotle came to exert a stronger influence on Arab thought than any other single philosopher. At the time, Arabic literary criticism was not dominated by any one particular theory. In fact, practical criticism was the order of the day and critics were concerned with individual poetic texts in a direct manner. Naturally, Arab literary critics were familiar at the time with a number of

theoretical ideas on the nature of poetry. But when Greek thought was translated into Arabic, those ideas had not yet been formulated into one well-integrated theory. So Greek theories on the subject were instrumental in developing Arabic theories in the field. Anyway, the general thrust of Arabic ideas on literary criticism was not alien to the idea of imitation. This is evident from the fact that Arab critics in the second and early third centuries A.H. used to emphasize two concepts in their critical judgement of descriptive poetry: accuracy of description and pertinence of similes. These imply a close identification between descriptive material and the described object that makes the former a naturalistic reproduction of the latter. Therefore, they found fault with the following description of frogs by the pre-Islamic poet, Zuhayr b. Abî Sulmâ (d. 609 A.D.).

يُخْرِجْنَ مِنْ شَرِبَاتِ مَاوُهَا طَلُوعًا
عَلَى الْجُدُوعِ يَخْفَنَ الِهَمَّ وَالْفَرْقَا

Frogs come out of the shallow waters
And climb onto tree trunks
To escape a precarious life
And the danger of drowning.

"This is because frogs, in fact, come out of the water not out of fear of drowning but in order to lay eggs on the shore" (4).

al-Mubarrad maintained that the accuracy of *tashbîh* (comparison) is connected to accurate perception and subtle observation:

The best poetry is that in which the poet achieves great accuracy in his comparison, which is only bettered by that in which the comparison is absolutely precise, thus revealing by the poet's perception what is concealed to others (5).

In the third century A.H., corresponding to the ninth century A.D., Arabic literary criticism underwent a deep transformation that resulted in efforts, both theoretical and practical, which are considered a truly original contribution on the part of Arabs to the history of literary criticism. This contribution was the product of Arab creativity enriched by Greek thought. Modern studies affirm that Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî developed Arabic literary criticism to a high degree of maturity and originality. This is clearly seen in his definition of poetry and its content, together with his exposition of the psychological and perceptual faculties which the poet makes use of in the creative process.

I DEFINITION OF POETRY

- a) In defining poetry and elucidating its distinct nature, Ḥâzim uses a number of terms, the most important of which are *muḥâkât* (mimesis), *takhayyul*, *takhyîl* and *al-mutakhayyila*. He uses them interchangeably and almost synonymously when he deals with the nature of poetry and the creative process. This kind of usage is deliberate because he is well aware - as we will come to realize from his book as well as from this research - that in art there are four factors at work; the world we perceive (whether outer or inner); the artist who reacts to this world; the work of art itself, poetic or otherwise, which is the outcome of the artist's relationship with his world; and the recipient who responds to the work of art because it is directed at him. When dealing with art in general without specifying any of its four components, Ḥâzim uses the above-mentioned terms interchangeably, something which we find logical, hence acceptable. But when he, on the other hand, deals with the relationship between the poet and his world, he tends to use the term *muḥâkât* alone. In dealing with the creative faculties and innovative powers the poet makes use of, he uses the last three terms. He also uses these terms when he discusses the third component, i.e. the artistic work. This is because the work of art is the outcome of the functioning of these creative powers. It goes without saying that these three terms indicate *khayâl* (imagination) as the prime faculty at work in the creative process. When he comes to

the recipient, the fourth component of the artistic process, Ḥâzim tends to restrict himself to one term and that is *takhyîl* (imaginative response) because the poet, according to him, reproduces in his poetic work his imaginative reaction to the world around him with a view to making the recipient see the world with his own eyes, i.e. those of the poet.

- b) *Takhayyul* is that perceptual-creative faculty which lies behind all artistic creation, not poetry alone. So what Ḥâzim has to say about poetry in terms of *takhayyul* and *muḥâkât* applies fully to all the arts. If we replace the word poetry as it occurs in his writings with the words music or painting etc., his statements will still be valid for defining these arts. This is because his statements on *takhayyul* and *muḥâkât* - as a definition of creativity - if placed in the context of aesthetic and theoretical criticism, apply to all forms of artistic creativity. In one of his definitions he says: "What matters for the nature of poetry is *takhyîl* and *muḥâkât*" (6). In another statement he says:

The proper view of poetry is that its propositions can either be truthful or false but it is poetry in so far as it depends on *al-kalâm al-mukḥayyil* (imaginative discourse) not in so far as it is true or false (7).

The question of truthfulness and falsehood in poetry will be dealt with in another part of this thesis as well as with the distinction between poetry and oratory. What concerns us here is

that Ḥâzim differs from the great majority of Arab literary critics and rhetoricians in that he places his definition of poetry in the context of the nature of art in general whereas they (8) tended to define it in linguistic, prosodic terms only:

The propositions of poetry are either truthful, generally known to be truthful and accepted as such, or doubtful. Poetry is different from logic, debate and oratory, in that it depends on *takhyîl* and *muḥâkât*. It is particularly distinguished by those among its propositions which take on an appearance of falsehood. This type also belongs to the domain of poetry because of the *takhyîl* and *muḥâkât* inherent in it not because of the falsehood it contains. In the same way truthful propositions partake of the nature of poetry only in so far as they depend on *takhyîl* because of the truthfulness implied. As poetry is distinguished by using *muḥâkât* in false propositions we consider every imaginative discourse that uses false propositions to be belonging to the domain of poetry. It is its dependence on *takhyîl* which makes it poetry not the falsehood contained in its propositions. If such a discourse had many things in common with all other discourses and stood apart only in its use of *takhyîl* it is *takhyîl* which gives it its particular nature not the truthfulness or falsehood therein (9).

But Ḥâzim's book is devoted in its entirety to the art of poetry rather than to art in general. He is also fully aware that all arts have two processes in common: the creative process and the process of reception by an audience. They differ however, in the tools they employ in bringing their products into being. In his definition of poetry, therefore, Ḥâzim addresses himself vigorously to the techniques which are exclusive to poetry. In

addition, he focuses his attention on the techniques of Arabic poetry in particular.

Poetry is a measured imaginative discourse. Peculiar to Arabic poetry is its additional use of rhyme. It is made up of imaginative propositions which are either truthful or false. But they are, in so far as they are poetic, subject to no condition other than being the product of *takhyîl* (10).

In discussing the techniques and the components of poetry, both linguistic and artistic, Hâzim does not limit himself to metre and rhyme. Rather he amplifies his definition of poetry by emphasising a fundamental element and that is *ta'lîf al-kalâm* (composition), the means of poetic usage for the words and linguistic relations.

Poetry is measured rhythmic discourse and sets out to win its readers' affections to what it deems of merit while repelling them from what it deems repulsive, thus influencing their actions. This it achieves by good imaginative imitation of the object in question or through good composition, powerful truthfulness, ready acceptability or through all three. This impact can be enhanced by *iqhrâb* which, in evoking wonder and astonishment, stirs *al-nafs* (the soul); when combined to its imaginative impulse, the emotional response is greatly enhanced (11).

In this definition - as well as in similar statements throughout the book - Hâzim combines the tradition of Arab philologists, prosodists, rhetoricians and literary critics with that of Muslim philosophers and psychologists. In defining poetry and illustrating its distinctness, the former group emphasised the

audible components of poetry such as metre and rhyme, together with the linguistic and rhetorical aspects like good composition, good usage and poetical approach to language. The latter group, on the other hand, emphasised the philosophical nature of the work of art and the perceptual-creative faculties which the poet employs in his work. Ḥâzim devoted special attention to Aristotelian commentators who paid considerable attention to the philosophical nature of the artistic work and to the psychological, receptive creative faculty which lies behind the poet's production (the poem).

Since the second part of this thesis will be devoted to a study of the artistic aspects of poetry as expounded by Ḥâzim in his book, a pause will be taken here to elaborate on the psychological and philosophical aspects.

- c) The scope of *muḥâkât* - in Ḥâzim's view - embraces all that falls within the experience and knowledge of man (12). In other words, *muḥâkât* in its artistic sense, can take as its subject all human experiences whether of great moment or trivial, good or bad, sublime or ridiculous, pleasant or painful, beautiful or ugly.

There are certain experiences which are common to all human beings, be they commoners or those of the cultured classes. On the other hand, there are experiences which are the exclusive privilege of the latter. Poetry, however, does not recognize

this distinction because all life is its subject matter. The criterion for evaluating poetry is not whether its subject matter is experienced by commoners, the cultured classes or both. It is, rather, how the poet relates to and sees his subject matter and to what extent he excels in imagining and imitating it.

As to the nature of poetry, there is no difference between those experiences which are common to both *khâṣṣa* wa *‘amma* (cultured classes and commoners) and those which are the sole prerogative of the cultured classes. Equally, there is no distinction between those experiences which are closely related to the familiar subject of poetry and those which are only loosely related thereto, because *takhyîl* is common to both. What matters for the nature of poetry is *takhyîl* and *muḥâkât* regardless of the subject matter in which they happen to be used (13).

The imitated object appears in the work of art either as it is in reality or in a modified form which is the product of the poet's imagination. Therefore, the criterion for evaluating a poem is derived from the poem itself and, as such, it does not consist in referring to the imitated object as it exists in real life but in looking at the poet's ability in imagining and imitating it. A poet's literary merit is determined by his imaginative imitative faculties whether they produce a replica of the imitated object they work on or introduce modifications to it.

Poetic art depends on imitating things and giving them expression by using words and creating images in the mind of the reader by means of *ḥusn muḥâkât* (good imitation) ... *takhyîl* is not diametrically opposed to certainty as it is to doubt because a thing can be imagined either as it is in reality or not (14).

Discussion of the purpose and aim of *muḥākāt* in art is directly related to the function of poetry - which is the subject of the second chapter in this first part. But there are some aspects of this discussion which are particularly concerned with the types of *muḥākāt* and, as such, they are again related to the definition of poetry as Ḥāzim sees it. According to him, *muḥākāt* either beautifies something with a view to attracting the recipient to it, or vilifies something with a view to repelling the recipient thereby. The ultimate aim of both beautification and vilification is to influence the behaviour of the recipient in actual life in such a way as to make him seek good and avoid evil. The first type of *muḥākāt* is called by Ḥāzim *muḥākāt taḥsîn* while the second is called *muḥākāt taqbîḥ*. There is a third type to which Ḥāzim allocates a status inferior to the two main types. This he calls *muḥākāt al-muṭābaqa* which depicts the imitated object as it is in reality, no more no less - or as contemporaries phrase it - direct, literal or photographic imitation. Although Ḥāzim rejects literal, direct *muḥākāt* throughout his book, he justifies some of its forms by saying that if something is depicted as it really is, then it will necessarily have in it that which is worthy of either praise or blame or both. On the basis of this justification, he takes the view that there are cases of this kind of imitation which can be as powerful as one or both of the other two types.

With regard to purpose, *muḥākāt* and the images it produces are divided into these types: *muḥākāt taḥsîn* which seeks to beautify its subject, *muḥākāt taqbîḥ* which seeks to villify it, and *muḥākāt al-muṭâbaqa* which equals the original. The third type is meant only as a sort of recreation and anecdotes in those circumstances in which describing and imitating something by replicating it depends on what it really is in actual fact. This third type can also be used to arouse astonishment on the part of the recipient or drive home a moral lesson. *muḥākāt al-muṭâbaqa*, which seeks to be equal to its original subject, can sometimes be as powerful as the other two types. The attributes of anything that we want to replicate are worthy of either praise or blame even if praise and blame are minimal. It is a natural human tendency to like what is praised and to dislike what is blamed. So *takhyîl* in general is bound to stir *al-nafs* to either appreciation or depreciation. Therefore, that kind of *muḥākāt* which seeks to replicate its subject can often be as powerful as either the *muḥākāt taḥsîn* or *muḥākāt taqbîḥ*. Nevertheless, it is a third category because it does not expressly set itself the task of *taḥsîn* or *taqbîḥ* (15).

These three types of *muḥākāt* are divided according to their subject and whether they are worthy of praise, blame, or neutral treatment. There are, however, two other types which use artistic technique as their point of departure. The first of these is *muḥākāt tâmma* or *tafşîliyya* by which Ḥâzim means the process of conveying (through imitation - that which is concerned with details) the parts and details of the imitated object to the recipient in the context of the poetic work as an integrated whole.

In descriptive poetry *muḥākāt tâmma* means an exhaustive treatment of those parts of the imitated object which will make for a complete image of the object. Concerning moralistic poetry, however, it means an exhaustive expression of all parts of the

subject which the poet adopts as an epitome of the ways of the world, of what is changeable and constant in life. In history, it is an exhaustive treatment of the details of the imitated episode and their arrangement in a sequence similar to that in which it happened (16).

As to the second of these two types, Hâzim calls it *muḥâkât ijmâliyya* (general imitation). Although he prefers the first type he does not seek it at all costs. His criticism is not whether treatment is thorough or general but, rather, whether or not the poet uses his imaginative powers to perceive the essential elements of the imitated object and then turn his attention to the specific minute details.

It is the duty of the poet, whether he imitates an object thoroughly or generally, to take up those attributes in the imitated object which are most representative of beauty and fame if he intends to treat his subject in an appreciatory manner, or those which are most representative of ugliness and notoriety if he intends to treat it in a depreciatory manner. In the first instance, the poet should begin with those attributes in the object which are most illustrative of beauty and most deserving of first place because of the natural sympathy they evoke in *al-nafs*. In the second instance, however, he should begin with those parts of his subject which are most illustrative of the ugliness in it and most worthy of being avoided. Then he should proceed to those attributes that come next in the spectrum, i.e. those which are less and less illustrative of either beauty or ugliness. The poet is thus like a painter who draws first the bold lines then moves on to the finer ones (17).

There are further types of *muḥâkât* like *muḥâkât tashbîhiyya*, but these are not related to poetic definitions, rather to their aesthetic properties which is not our immediate concern.

d) *Muḥākāt* as the basis for understanding art is not - according to Ḥāzim - concerned with producing replicas of the subject, i.e. it is neither literal, direct nor photographic. If it were a matter of photographic reproduction, then it would be closer to crafts rather than to art. In fact, it can easily be seen that the products of photographic imitation are pure crafts. What distinguishes between products of craftsmanship and works of art is the subjective element in the creative process. It is this element in both processes of creation and reception which fulfils the artistic nature of *muḥākāt*. The poet perceives, interprets and reacts to the subject of *muḥākāt* in a subjective way determined by his own artistic experiences, sensitivity and the extent of his participation in his vision of the imitated object. It is this subjectivity on the part of the poet, as well as on the part of the recipient, which gives to *muḥākāt* its true artistic quality. Without it, *muḥākāt* becomes replication which belongs to the domain of any human activity rather than artistic activity.

Naturally, the subjective element in the creative process prompts the study of the imaginative powers and innovative ability that the poet must possess - a study which will be undertaken in the third section of this chapter. Likewise, the subjective element in the act of receiving the poetic work necessitates the study of the function of poetry, which will be dealt with in the second chapter of this, the first part of the thesis. However, the subjective element in both processes implies a few facts which

are related to our immediate task, i.e. Ḥāzim's definition of poetry in his *Minhāj*. It is worth expanding on these facts here in order to illustrate all the implications of his definition.

Ḥāzim draws attention to the fine distinction between the two approaches of dealing with the imitative subject. The first is that of orators, logicians, scientists and non-artists in general; it is less of a subjective and more of an objective approach, describing those of its properties which are not related to human affairs, i.e. the properties which do not have a subjective nature. The artist, on the other hand, sees the imitated object in its relation to those human affairs which possess a subjective element in them. He then goes on to imaginatively reproduce it for the benefit of the recipient by dealing with those aspects in either an appreciatory or depreciatory manner. According to him:

In definition, words are used which denote the essence of the defined object in both general and particular terms. Its secondary and incidental aspects which are not related to human life and affairs are not indicated except by implication. On the other hand, *muḥākāt* uses discourses which aim at bringing out the beauty or ugliness of the object by imagining its secondary and incidental aspects which are related to human life and affairs. Since beauty and ugliness of objects are inherent in them, *muḥākāt* imagines those attributes, or a selection thereof, which are inherent in the objects and at the same time related to human affairs. Definition, however, identifies a thing by referring to things which lie outside it and which are not related to human affairs.

The aim of non-poetic discourse is to define and give credence to those things which are not related to human affairs [i.e., not on an emotional level] and to avoid deluding the recipient into believing what is untrue. Poetic discourse aims at depicting things that exist in reality and producing for the recipient images thereof which represent their beauty or ugliness as they exist in reality outside human minds. Alternatively, poetic discourse can produce deliberately false images of these things. In both cases, it uses words which denote not the essential attributes of the objects but the secondary and incidental ones which are closely related to human affairs (18).

Not only does Ḥâzim draw attention to the importance of subjectivity on the part of the poet and artist in general, but also lays great emphasis on this factor to the extent of allowing it to modify, even perfect the imitated object. In stressing this point, Ḥâzim makes use of a statement by Plato in his *Politics*:

We have no right to blame a painter if he paints a human being in such a way that will make him or her extremely beautiful. We cannot object to his work in perfecting his creation on the grounds that no man or woman can be so perfectly beautiful. In fact the ideal has to be perfect whereas those things to which it serves as a model are beautiful only in so far as they partake of the beauty of the ideal (19).

He bases this concept on the following:

Poetic discourse is most effective when words are selected in such a way that only the best are chosen and constructed together in a suitable harmonious manner. It is then followed up by words which denote those parts of the meaning which are necessary in order to give full expression in whole and in part to the meaning in both its entirety and details. This is how *takhayyul* should be carried

out. To imitate the parts thus makes up the whole. Thereby a mental image is obtained of the object which is either identical to that which exists in reality or more perfect than reality if such a need arises (20).

This discussion has dealt so far with the subjective element in the poet's approach which enables him to give artistic expression by means of his tools. As to the subjective element in the recipient's response, it is described by Ḥâzim in clear-cut terms. He says that if *muḥâkât* is to have the right impact on the recipient, it should be based on *al-maḥâsin al-ta'lifîyya* by which he means the poet's ability to use his linguistic, rhetorical, aesthetic and artistic tools to convey his own image of the imitated object to the recipient. It is this ability which gives the poetic work the power to stir the emotions and have its impact on the recipient.

The reason why *muḥâkât* is so effective on *al-nafs* when combined with *al-maḥâsin al-ta'lifîyya* is due to that natural pleasure which human beings have in gleaning meaning from well-turned phrases and which surpasses anything they feel when they get the meaning independently or through memory, hints, or badly-turned phrases, in which latter case they experience no pleasure at all. But when they get the same meaning through well-turned phrases, they are moved by it. This is similar to the pleasure experienced in seeing glittering, coloured drinks in transparent receptacles such as glass or crystal and which is so different from seeing drinks in opaque receptacles. Poetic discourse stirs the emotions in the same manner because it expresses those aspects which are related to human affairs and is intended to deal with those secondary incidental aspects which are pertinent to the conduct of human life (21).

Thus Ḥâzim completes his definition of poetry on the basis of the classical theory of Imitation. He establishes that imitation should depend on the prime tool of artistic creation, i.e. imagination rather than literal, automatic reproduction. He also establishes the subjective elements in Imitation as a basic element in both poetic creation and reception.

II THE CONTENT OF POETRY

- a) Although poetry, and art in general, is the product of the poet's creative imagination, it is nevertheless true to say that the recipient of the poetic work, whether he is a reader or a listener, can only experience this creative power in as much as it is manifested therein. The poetic work is the outcome of the poet's use of artistic techniques: linguistic, prosodic and rhetorical. By the nature of their structure and interaction, these techniques reveal a meaning. They are techniques governed by linguistic conventions, grammatical and prosodic rules, imagery and metaphor, and the poet is no less bound by these rules. But, unlike the prose writer, the poet uses his imagination to make use of these rules in a way which is appropriate to poetry. Therefore, the poet's imagination creates a language which follows the same rules as ordinary language but goes beyond it in opening new vistas of rhythm and imagery. Equally, the meaning, or content, of the poetic work is governed by universal human values and the norms and social conventions of a particular community, but the poet interprets these values and conventions in a way that imparts a new meaning to them, thus asserting his own vision. So, study of the technical aspects of a poem has a specific object, and that is to explore the poet's ability to create his own language. Such a study looks into the poet's approach to language and its workings as revealed in the music of the poem, its diction, the structure of its units and

the components of its images. On the other hand, study of the content or subject matter of a poem aims at exploring the poet's vision, his psychological, intellectual and social stance as well as his approach to the values prevalent in his times, all of which are revealed through the ultimate meaning of the content.

Both classical and medieval literary criticism are characterized by an approach which addressed both the technique and the content of poetry. One basic concern of ancient critics and rhetoricians was to answer this question: which of the two, i.e. form and content, determines the other? Which comes first? This debate prevailed until the Renaissance (Neo-Classicism) and throughout the 18th and 19th centuries (the Romantic Era) though in a less persistent manner. But modern literary criticism has been able to answer these questions by thinking of both form and content as starting at the same point and mutually influencing each other all through the process of composing the poem, coming to an end with its completion. So it is not a matter of one of these influencing or preceding the other. It is rather an instance of one process in which two factors interact right to the end when the poetic work is completed.

This change in approach to the question of form and content in poetry was a contribution of the two major literary movements of the 20th century. The first was that of the New Critics, one of the most prominent of whom is I.A. Richards, who collaborated with C.K. Ogden on a book that was published in 1923 under the

title, *The Meaning of Meaning*. It is an investigation of the nature of meaning and its relation to symbols and linguistic communication. It was a pioneering work on semantics and one which laid the foundations of this discipline (22).

The second major movement was the development of linguistics as a modern discipline. It was led by F. de Saussure, whose book, *Cours de Linguistique Generale* (1916), was the main landmark of the movement. Just as the first movement is accredited with providing a basis for the rise of semantics as a discipline, so the second is accredited with providing a similar foundation for semiology (23). Modern literary criticism depends heavily on these two movements, especially since the 1960s, in rejecting the dualistic approach to form and content in poetry. It rather looks upon the two as mutually interactive from the beginning of the process of poetic creation to its completion. Moreover, it is their interaction which ensures the success of the creative process as well as the unity of the poetic work itself.

Arab literary critics and rhetoricians in the Middle Ages adhered to the traditional approach to the relation between the technical aspects of the poem and its content. They used several terms to denote the technical aspect, the most important of which were *naẓm* (construction), *ṣiyāqha* (craftsmanship), and *alfāz* (words). Similarly, they used several terms for the content of the poem like *mawḍuʿāt* (subject matters), *maʿānī* (motifs) and *aḡhrāḍ* (purposes of composition). In keeping with the

traditional approach, they saw form and content as separate and polarized. This outlook was strongly pronounced in one of the literary debates which preoccupied the critics, namely that of *al-lafz wa al-ma^cnâ*. One group of critics, advocated the supremacy of form whilst another stressed content as the most important of the two. This debate occupied a prominent place in the history of Arabic rhetoric and criticism. In fact, its origins go back to an early phase of that history, and it can be argued that the well-known, quadripartite formula worked out by Ibn Qutayba (213-276/828-889) is one of its early manifestations. Ibn Qutayba made such a clear-cut distinction between the two aspects of the poem, i.e. form and content, that he could envisage the possibility of a good meaning being couched in badly conceived words and vice-versa. He worked out the following table (24).

Lafz jayyid	+	Ma ^c nâ jayyid (good)
Lafz jayyid	+	Ma ^c nâ radi ^î (bad)
Lafz radi ^î	+	Ma ^c nâ jayyid
Lafz radi ^î	+	Ma ^c nâ radi ^î

Although the question of words and meaning, i.e. form and content of poetry, will be discussed in a subsequent part of this thesis, it is appropriate to refer to a few relevant points to ensure a proper start to our consideration of Ḥâzim's work in this respect. The Arabic terms for the content of poetry, as used by some Arab critics and rhetoricians in the Middle Ages, are rather vague in connotation, thus allowing for confusion. The term *mawḍû^c* (subject matter) could be used to refer to the overall

purpose of the poem (like eulogy, satire, etc.) or used to indicate the several themes that make up the poem. In this case, *mawḍūʿāt* was used to indicate the multiple subject matters rather than the overall meaning. This was especially so when dealing with the traditional *qaṣīda*, which begins typically with lamentation over ruins or description of wine and drinking, moving on to a description of the journey and the riding camels, boasting of the poet's own achievements and those of the clan, eulogizing the person whom the poet has in mind, and finally finishing off with a few moralistic verses.

This applies equally to the term *gharaḍ*, which was used for the overall meaning of the poem, as well as for the transitions within the same poem from one theme to another, in which case the term *aghrâḍ* was again used not for one subject or theme but for many. Concerning *maʿnâ* (meaning), most discussions held by rhetoricians and critics were directed in the main to the partial meanings within one phrase (i.e. within one sentence or one verse at the most). Only very rarely did Arab critics and rhetoricians use a term to refer to the overall meaning of the poem, or what we would now call its content, and then they did so in a vague manner. Taking this fact into consideration, we can say that Ḥâzim made a significant contribution in this respect.

- b) Ḥâzim considers subject matter to be the first element in the poetic work which is made up, according to him, of four elements. "*Takhyîl* in poetry takes as its domain four

elements: *ma^cna*, *'uslûb*, *lafz* and *al-nazm wa al-wazn*" (25). But what does Ḥâzim mean exactly by the term *ma^cnâ*? It is fair to say that he did not fully escape the old connotation which restricted the use of the term to its partial rather than overall sense, thus having it refer to individual ideas each expressed in one statement in the poem or to casual thoughts taking up not more than one sentence or line each. So any student of *al-Minhâj* will find that traditional terms like *mawḍû^c*, *gharaḍ* and *ma^cnâ* are used profusely and with the same old connotations. But a more profound study of *al-Minhâj* will reveal that in defining the term *ma^cnâ* and elucidating its nature and function in the poetic work, Ḥâzim is fully aware of two extremely important facts. The first of these is his dissatisfaction with the usage of these terms in connection with thematic purport, especially those used by certain critics and rhetoricians before him. He rejects Qudâma b. Ja^cfar's (276-337/888-948) well-known classification of the content of poetry into six categories: *madîḥ* (eulogy), *hijâ'* (satire), *nasîb* (erotic poetry), *rithâ'* (elegies), *waṣf* (description) and *tashbîḥ* (simile). He equally rejects the modification introduced by al-Rummânî to these categories, whereby they are reduced to five on the basis that *tashbîḥ* belongs properly to the sphere of *waṣf*. He also refutes the views put forward by Ibn Rashîq (390-456/995-1064) in his book, *al-^cUmda*, namely that the content of poetry can be divided into four main areas: *raqḥba* (desire), *rahba* (fear), *ṭarab* (pleasure) and *ghaḍab* (anger). Likewise, he refutes another

proposition made by Ibn Rashîq in his *al-^cUmda* to the effect that poetry can be in the last analysis reduced to two principles as far as its content is concerned: *al-raqhba wa al-rahba*. Ḥâzim maintains that these divisions are not valid because of the deficiency or overlap in each one of them (26).

The second important fact which Ḥâzim is well aware of in his discussion of the conventional classification of the content of poetry and his rejection thereof is his attempt to base the whole question on philosophical principles. He recognises well enough the significance of the attempt he is embarking on as well as the risk involved, so he commends his own initiative both because he thinks it is the proper way of looking at the meaning of poetry and because it is a pioneering step of its kind (27). He expounds the philosophical basis which he arrives at by saying that the outside world exists independently of human perception and that when any part of the outside world becomes subject to human perception, it is transformed into a mental image. If the perceiver is a poet who seeks to convey his mental image through expressive language, this expressive linguistic form becomes for him the vehicle for communicating that image to recipients. Ḥâzim uses clear-cut terms to explain his meaning.

Al-ma^cânî are the images produced in the mind of things that exist independently outside it. Everything that exists outside the mind acquires, when perceived by the mind of the recipient, an image therein corresponding to the degree of perception. If this image is given expression by means of words with a view to conveying it to

listeners, the meaning or image takes on an additional dimension in terms of words and their connotations (28).

These words by Ḥâzim not only provide a philosophical basis for the question of the content of poetry, but also psychological and aesthetic bases as well. He is fully aware that in the act of perception, the visual or sensory image is converted into a mental one which is then transformed, through the creative process, into a poetic image. In this last stage, meaning unfolds through words. But in terms of its definition and scope, the content of poetry has another more subjective basis related to the poet's experience of life and his role in the poetic work. This point will be elaborated in the next unit.

- c) The content of poetry, for Ḥâzim, is derived from the content of life itself, i.e. its experiences. Therefore, to specify certain subjects or purposes as the sphere of poetry is, in fact, to restrict poetry to narrow nooks selected arbitrarily out of the extensive sweep of life. If restriction is inevitable, it should be based on the most general principles that govern human life: *khayr* (good), *sharr* (evil), *bast* (prosperity), *qabḍ* (dejection). Poetry adopts as its content anything that falls within the scope of human experience. This content is addressed to the recipient with a view to influencing him spiritually, emotionally and morally. This influence depends on the fact that all human affairs, consequently all the elements that make up the content of poetry, must of necessity, fall under either good or evil. Some of these are more central to one than to the other.

The purpose of *takhyîl* as well as of persuasive speech is to induce *al-nafs* to do or believe in something or to abandon such doing or belief. *Al-nafs* is usually induced to either of these by imagining or believing to a great extent that they are *khayr* or *sharr*. Such imagination or belief is promoted by one or another of the methods normally employed for depicting *khayr* and *sharr* (29).

However, people differ widely in their definition of good and evil. Moreover, there are things which are known by the cultured classes, rather than by commoners, while there are others which are common to both. Hâzim puts forward an original view of the controversial question of value in its relation to the content of poetry. According to him, the most genuine content of poetry is that which both the cultured classes and commoners agree upon as being either good or evil. His rationale for this is that such agreement derives its validity from human instinct:

If the content of poetry is the outcome of common belief, it must needs be compatible with the instinctive requirements of *al-nafs* (30).

It is clear by now that when Hâzim designates *khayr* and *sharr* as the two basic concepts in human life which poetry should adopt as its content, he is thinking in terms of moral values which have a social bearing. He then goes on to link these two values with two other basic principles of human life in the individual, psychological sense, namely *baṣṭ* and *qabḍ*. In this connection, he maintains that the object of poetic discourse is to invite beneficial things and repel injurious things by making human beings well-disposed to the former and ill-disposed to the

latter (31). This is achieved through the imaginative perception concerning *khayr* and *sharr*.

In so saying, Ḥâzim seeks to establish bases for the content of poetry which correspond with those basic principles which govern the psychological life of the recipient as well as his social life. Therefore, the true poet, for Ḥâzim, is one who has a deep experience of life and is well-versed in the ways of the world. He is a man with such powers of discrimination and observation that he can see things, times, conditions and issues for what they really are (32).

Since for Ḥâzim, the content of poetry takes as its source this basic concept in human life, it is no wonder that he defines it by clarifying its function in life. He, for one thing, consistently maintains that the content of poetry preponderates in favour of those subjects which are relevant to human life and affairs, a point which will be discussed in detail in the second chapter of this thesis.

The poetic content is biased in favour of certain things and rejects others, some subjects being greatly employed whilst others are rarely used, according to their relationship to human life (33).

This, for him, affirms that poetry derives its raw material from life and then pours back into it in order to perform a function

which he often expresses in unequivocal terms. In one of his statements in this connection, he makes a precise link between the function and subject matter of poetry:

Since poetry by imitating the beauty, ugliness, grandeur, or baseness of things aims at inspiring human beings either to do, seek or believe in them, or to give up such doings, seeking, or believing, it follows that poetry should adopt as its subject matter only those areas which are related to what human beings do, seek, or believe in (34).

We can see Ḥâzim here almost stipulating that the poet should derive the content of poetry from human life and history. This establishes the function which he is trying to define for poetry as one of a social and moral nature which also has behavioural implications.

It is true that Ḥâzim does not escape the dualistic, narrow approach to the content of poetry, so prevalent among Arab critics and rhetoricians before him. Yet it is also true that his philosophical, more comprehensive approach pervades his work to the extent that he never loses sight of it as a basis for tackling the question of the content of poetry. He even seeks to use it as such when he falls victim to the old approach. In other words, Ḥâzim sets out to deal with the question of the content of poetry in a way which is consistent with the profound philosophical basis which he lays down, but resorts, at times, to both the methodology and terminology of his predecessors. In taking this old approach, however, he does two things quite

deliberately. First, he dismisses the old categories which his predecessors established for the subject matter of poetry as being so inaccurate and incomprehensible that they fail to do justice to the extensive world of experience from which the content of poetry is derived. He even pronounces them all as "*kulluhâ qhayr ṣaḥîḥa*" (all are inaccurate) (35). As a result, he modifies and subdivides these categories until he arrives at scores of ramifications, some of which include the old categories at the same time.

Secondly, when Ḥâzim resorts to the traditional outlook with its acute split between form and content in poetry and its rigorous classification of its subject matter, he still uses the philosophical approach so dominant in his work for the purpose of defining and elaborating the sphere of the content of poetry. So the traditional approach is distinctly slight in *al-Minhâj* compared with his own original, more philosophical way of looking at the question. He bases his own division of the subject matter of poetry, inspired as it is by the traditional approach, on the same general principles he used earlier, i.e. *baṣṭ* and *qabḍ*. He derives from them two basic divisions which, for him, constitute the content of poetry. These are *irtiyâḥ* (contentment) and *iktirâṭh* (concern). He subdivides these two main headings into eight branches which he further breaks down into the well-known subjects which poetry has always dealt with, such as erotic poetry, eulogy, etc.

It is evident from this that the subject matter of poetry can be divided into *ajnâs wa anwâ^c* (genre and sub-genre). The primary *ajnâs* are *irtiyâh* and *iktirâth* and the combinations thereof, which are *ṭuruq shâjiya* (the melancholic subjects). These branch out into the following: *istighrâb* (astonishment), *i^ctibâr* (moralization), *riḍâ* (satisfaction), *ghaḍab* (anger), *nizâ^c* (conflict), *nuzû^c* (inclination), *khawf* (fear) and *rajâ'* (hope). They, in turn, are subdivided into *madîh* (eulogy), *nasîb* (erotic poetry), *rithâ'* (elegy), etc. (36).

Ḥâzim carries his philosophical method further by saying that some of these divisions have to do with those emotions of the poet which find expression in poetry while others have to do with emotions that arise in the recipients in response to poetry:

According to these divisions, *ma^cânî al-shi^cr* (the subject matters of poetry) is concerned with describing those states of mind which inspire poetic discourse or those states which people experience as a result of being moved by such discourse. The best and most perfect poetry is that which combines descriptions of both (37).

There are other divisions which Ḥâzim mentions in various other places in his book, such as *araḍiyyât* (incidental discourses), *tarhîbât* (warnings), *takhwifât* (exhortations), *istidfâ^c iyyât* (pleading), *ḥikma* (wise sayings), *ishâra wa istishâra* (advice and consultation), *gharaḍ* (purpose), *iqtidâ'* (inevitability), *kifâya* (sufficient), *istikfâ'* (a granted request), *targhîb* (cajoling), *tarhîb* (threatening), *iṭmâ^c* (promising), *iyâs* (despair), etc. (38). However, he regroups them under four main headings which he calls *ummahât al-ṭuruq al-shi^criyya* (the leading poetic arts), namely

eulogies and allied subjects, satires and allied subjects, congratulations and allied subjects, condolences and allied subjects. Taking that psycho-philosophical approach, which is the cornerstone of his views on poetic content, he links these four main headings with the basic principles which underlie the subject matter of poetry, i.e. the motives behind *irtiyâh wa iktirâth* (39).

We have seen that even when following the example of his predecessors in adopting that narrow classification of the content of poetry, Ḥâzim does not take an identical approach. But there are other differences which have to do more with details than with the basic outlook. So, eulogies, for Ḥâzim, should use as their theme noble actions which indicate human perfection (40). He accepts the idea that it is permissible for the poet to exaggerate in his eulogies, as long as this establishes what are thought to be praiseworthy qualities in setting up a model for emulation. But he opposes many of his predecessors in insisting that eulogies should not be an adornment for those who do not deserve them (41), and in rejecting the idea of using eulogistic poetry as a means of livelihood (42). This is a further affirmation of his views on the source and function of the content of poetry. To sum up, the content of poetry is derived from life itself, whereas its function is related to the moral values of human life with their two basic principles of *khayr* and *sharr*.

III POETIC FACULTIES

a) With regard to poetry, literary criticism concerns itself primarily with three topics: firstly, how the poem comes to be created, the stimulus motivating the poet into writing poetry, and the perceptual and psychological processes involved in receiving the stimulus and working on it until it becomes a concrete linguistic creation: secondly, the properties of the object which is the outcome of the creative process, its content and the specific techniques employed in composing it according to a certain pattern which uses particular diction, music, images and general structure; thirdly, reaction to the poetic work, its effect on readers and audiences, and the influence it has on their behaviour. For the first topic, critics use the term The Nature of Poetry; for the second, The Tools of Poetry; and for the third, The Function of Poetry. Naturally, literary criticism looks at these three topics in the context of a fourth, more comprehensive dimension, which is variously termed as the World, Milieu, Times, Reality, Society, etc.

This section is concerned with one of the basic aspects of the first topic, The Nature of Poetry. It is the aspect which deals in the first place with the stimulus, or motivation for poetic creation, with the perceptual and other psychological faculties which the poet makes use of in the process of creation in order

to transform his sensory experiences into images, and with the aesthetic faculties which help in this transformation.

Literary criticism, both ancient and medieval, dealt with these issues at two distinct levels: firstly, the mythical level; and secondly, the rhetorical-critical level on the one hand, and the psycho-philosophical level on the other.

Mythologies, Greek, Arabian and otherwise, displayed a great interest in a certain idea related to poetic and artistic creativity, and this was later echoed in many historical, critical and philosophical works. It was also an idea which scholars considered to be part of popular traditions. Mythologies held that the poet was inspired and helped in his work by certain powers which existed independently of himself. Except in a few cases, they were invariably invisible powers. If they did not give a poet inspiration and help of their own accord, he could invoke them to do so. "The Ion is the most elaborate presentation in the ancient world of the notion of poetry as pure inspiration" (43).

More specifically, the Greeks believed in the existence of nine muses, each of which specialized in one art and sponsored and aided its practitioners. Thus Eratos specialized in love poetry, Euterpe in music and lyrical poetry, Melpomene in tragedy, Thalia in comedy, Calliope in epics and eloquence, Polyhymnia in oratory and religious poetry, Terpsichore in choral songs and dance, Clio

in history and Urania in astronomy (44). Classics which describe ancient Greek life and art in particular have a lot to say on the relationship between these muses and artists and poets as well as the role of the muses in artistic creativity.

We find a close parallel in Arabian mythology where it was assumed that each poet had a special *jinnî*, *shayṭân* (devil), *qarîn* (invisible companion) or *ra'iyy* (an apparition perceived by the poet alone) which inspired and aided him in literary creation and excellence and helped him to capture the mood of inspiration. The Arabic word *shayṭân* could be derived from the verb *shatana* which means to deviate from truth. But if the "y" in *shayṭân* is genuine and the "n" superfluous, the source of the word could well be the verb *shâṭa yashîṭu*, which means to become *baṭala* (invalid) (45). As to the word *jinnî*, it is derived from the verb *ajanna*, which means conceal (thus *ajannahu al-layl* means to be concealed by dark) (46). In fact *jinnî*, which are midway between spirits and humans, are so named because they are usually invisible. If we bear in mind the linguistic meaning of *shayṭân* (wrongdoing) together with that of *jinnî* (invisibility), we come close to understanding the well-known Arabic pronouncement on poetry: "*aṣḍaq aw a^cdhab al-shi^cr akdhabahu*" (the truest or sweetest poetry is that which is the most deceptive). But *qarîn*, on the other hand, means an invisible companion or mate and, in some contexts,

al-nafs, so a *qarīn* is a spirit which is inseparable (47) from men. A *ra'iy* is a *jinnī* which is visible and likeable (48).

The Arabs also believed that all these creatures dwelled in a well-known place called *Wādī ʿAbqar* (Valley of Abqar) from which they derived an adjective, *ʿabqarī* to describe anything which aroused astonishment or commanded admiration because of its unsurpassed excellence or nobility (49). The word *ʿabqarī* is still used to mean a genius (from which the abstract noun *ʿabqariyya* is derived). In Arabic myths about the creative powers of poetry, the term *shayâtīn al-shuʿarâ* (devils of poets) was the commonest among these terms and Arabic myth abounds in stories about these *shayâtīn*. In some cases they tell of two specifically: *Hawbar* and *Hawjal*. The former was the companion of those poets who composed good poetry, whereas the latter was the companion of those who composed inferior poetry (50). But generally, each poet had only one *shaytân* with a special name.

At the second level, creative powers related to poetry were treated by two groups of people: firstly, philologists, rhetoricians and literary critics; secondly, philosophers, psychologists and *ṣūfīs* (mystics). The first group sought to emphasize the fact that natural aptitude for poetry was inadequate without knowledge of the poetic tradition, the linguistic sciences and other allied branches of knowledge. They

expressed the two sides of the argument in one concise concept - *ṭab^c* (natural aptitude) vs. *ṣan^ca* (art) - which denoted a key concept in ancient Greek and Latin literary criticism, as well as in Arabic criticism.

The second group, on the other hand, emphasized certain psychological faculties, the way they function during the process of poetic creation, and the forms in which they are manifested in the poem after its completion, such as symbols, metaphors, music, images, structure, etc. They combined the two elements, i.e. methods of functioning and the manifestation thereof in the phrase Imagination and Perception, or alternatively, Imagination and Intuition.

Where does Ḥâzim's work fit in with regard to these two levels of treatment?

Ḥâzim, in fact, neither adopted the mythical approach to explaining poetic creativity, nor restricted himself to either of the two branches of the second level. As a critic-philosopher, or a philosopher-critic, he was able to draw on both disciplines, an advantage which helped him to develop a uniform theory of poetry. As to the point under discussion, i.e. poetic creativity, he specified the faculties involved as follows:

- b) Poets, for him, vary in their mastery of their art because they vary in their poetic faculties. He calls these faculties *quwâ*

fikrriyya wa ihtidâ'ât khâṭiriyya (intellectual powers and inspirational discoveries) and ascribes to them the artistic quality of the poetic work because it is they which determine that mastery. He divides these two into ten kinds:

... the ability to construct similes which are not the outcome of spontaneity or mere inspiration; the ability to imagine the whole sphere of poetry, the genres within that sphere and the themes within each genre in order to choose the right rhymes and structures; the ability to envisage the highest model that a poet can aspire to, the optimal ways of bringing that model into being, of grouping and ordering its themes, verses, sections at the beginning, at the transitions from one theme to another, and at the close, and choosing any particular themes or patterns which might be especially appropriate for the close; the ability to capture and experience the themes expressed in the poem in all their aspects; the ability to perceive the right proportions among the themes of the poem and to achieve them; the ability to choose apt words and phrases to express these themes adequately; the ability to manipulate these words and phrases in a way that would maintain a balance among them and create a harmony between their beginnings and ends; the ability to move freely from one theme, mood, emotion to another; the ability to join and put together the sections, verses and discourses of a poem in a felicitous, appealing manner; and the ability to discriminate between well-chosen and badly-chosen words with regard to both the words themselves and their contexts (51).

This is a most lucid statement which sets forth, in detail, the creative faculties and the role of each in poetry. Although Ḥâzim terms them *quwâ fikrriyya wa ihtidâ'ât khâṭiriyya*, he in fact goes beyond the poetic faculties which are by their very nature imaginative and psychological-perceptual faculties to include other abilities which are more related to the actual

making of verse and its techniques. This means that he confuses natural gifts, which operate in the poet's mind before accomplishing the poetic work with nurtured or cultivated skills which operate during the making of the poem. Natural gifts are related to poetic creativity and its nature, which is the subject of this discussion, whereas cultivated skills are more related to the nature of the poetic work itself and to its techniques, which is the subject of the second part of this thesis.

Ḥâzim, however, defines those faculties which are more closely associated with poetic creativity clearly and in a consistent manner which he adheres to throughout his book. He divides them first into four kinds: *ḥâfiza* (retentive), *mâ'iza* (discriminative), *mulâḥiza* (observational), and those which have to do with *ṣâni'a* (artistic faculty), but later wavers a little and adds: "and those others which are of the same type" (52), which gives his division some ambiguity. Nevertheless, he goes on to make them three instead of four and defines them in a clear-cut, consistent manner. Thus, the poetic faculties which guarantee the excellence of a poet's work are the following: *mâ'iza*, *ḥâfiza*, and those related to *ṣâni'a*. The retentive faculty:

... ensures that the images which arise in the poet's mind are orderly, easily distinguishable from one another, with each keeping to its proper sphere. It also ensures that the poet who wants to compose an erotic, eulogistic, or any other kind of poem can find the appropriate set of mental images provided by his retentive faculty in an order which

conforms with that in which they arose during the original experience. So, when his imagination conjures them up, it is like seeing them in reality.

It is often that, through the thoughts expressed in their work, poets reveal confused and disorderly mental images. When such poets remember the descriptions of things and resort to their mental images preserved in their memories, they find them mixed up, therefore, they choose images which do not really suit their purposes or the context in which they are placed (53).

This statement describes the essential role played by imagination - the prime poetic faculty. Hâzim develops this line of thinking further to distinguish between two types of poets: those with *muntazim al-khayâlât* (orderly mental images) and those with *mu^ctakir al-khayâlât* (disorderly mental images). The first are like jewellers who classify their jewels and keep each class in its assigned place. Whenever these jewellers need a certain type of size of stone, they retrieve it from its special, known place and put it to the use it is intended for. The second type of poet is like those jewellers whose stones are so mixed up that it takes too long to retrieve specific stones, if they are retrievable at all, which means that the wrong stones are often used for the wrong purposes (54).

The discriminative faculty helps a poet

... to discriminate between words that suit a certain context, type of versification, style and purpose of composition and those which do not; between what is appropriate and what is not (55).

The third faculty, *ṣāni^ca*, which is concerned with craftsmanship:

... is employed in putting together the components which make up words, themes, versification, schemes, styles, then progressing from each component to the next. It is, generally speaking, the faculty which is concerned with welding together and rounding out all the elements of the poetic craft into a whole (56).

It might appear that in defining these three poetic faculties, Ḥāzīm abandons discussion of the psycho-philosophical nature of poetic creativity and tends instead to emphasize their role in the technical execution of the work, i.e. versification and style, rather than their role in the creative process in terms of its being perceptual and imaginative. But the truth is that he devotes a great part of his discussion of the first faculty to imagination. In his discussion of the other two, he tends to concentrate on composition and style, but the three specific functions which he assigns to them, namely, discrimination, welding and rounding out into a whole, necessarily involve imagination and visualization. It is true that, in defining poetic faculties, he combines both psychological aspects relating to the creative process as it goes on in the mind of the poet and technical aspects relating to methods of composition and style, but at the same time he points out the psychological nature of these faculties quite clearly, as well as their part in the creative process, with unequivocal emphasis on imagination as a common factor.

Ḥâzim considered that the true poet is one who possesses these three faculties as part of his make-up. This is what he called *al-ṭab^c al-jayyid* (right natural aptitude) (57) in the art of poetry. Equating these faculties inevitably leads him to dwell on the question of *al-ṭab^c* which was, in any case, of basic importance in Arabic literary criticism. Indeed it received an extensive treatment by rhetoricians, critics, philosophers, and literary historians alike. In his consideration of *al-ṭab^c* for poetry, Ḥâzim makes two important observations. The first is that natural aptitude alone is not sufficient for a poet because poetry comes into being through the medium of language which has to be mastered by him. It is easy for one to underrate good poetry, as well as overrate inferior poetry and the only safeguard against such errors is knowledge of grammatical and rhetorical rules which prescribe the means of distinguishing between good and bad poetic usage. It is Ḥâzim's view that Arabs did not think that their own natural gift for language precluded further knowledge on their part of rules which usually aim at correcting nature. In fact, they developed those rules into a discipline which embodied all the criteria they needed for good literary judgement. Arabic classics abound with stories to this effect and, if pursued, they will yield a whole body of knowledge about the rules that rhetoricians formulated for poetry. For the Arabs, therefore, poetry was the product of natural gifts which flower with the aid of learning and instruction in the structures of the language, good usage, and patterns of potential errors in the use of words and in meanings (58).

The second observation that Ḥâzim makes is that *al-ṭab^c* cannot bear fruit through knowledge of linguistic and rhetorical rules and conventions alone, but also through awareness of the poetic tradition, a thing which can only come about through studying the works of experts, i.e. distinguished poets, both past and present. This artistic apprenticeship will enable a poet to receive guidance from the poetic tradition contained in those works, as well as to contribute to it in accordance with his own experience. Awareness of the artistic tradition is a deep-seated need which artists feel whatever the culture they belong to. Ḥâzim gives a lucid explanation of this point with special reference to Arabic poetry:

You hardly come across a good poet among them who did not serve a long apprenticeship to another poet from whom he learnt the rules of composing poetry and obtained the necessary experience in the various rhetorical devices. Kuthayyir, for instance, learnt the craft of poetry from Jamîl, who learnt it from Hudba b. Khaṣhram. Hudba in turn, learnt from Bishr b. Abî Khâzim. As for Ḥuṭay'a, he received his instruction in poetry from Zuhayr, who had received it from Aws b. Ḥajar. The same applies to all the excellent Arab poets who achieved prominence (59).

Thus Ḥâzim explains the poetic faculties in psycho-philosophical terms, links them to an age-old concept in Arabic literary criticism, i.e. *al-ṭab^c* and pays due attention to one of the bases of critical thinking in all ages and places, which is the continuity of artistic tradition.

c) Poetic faculties, whatever their number, operate within the framework of the imaginative faculty, which is the tool every artist depends on for creativity. It is through imagination that the artist perceives the world and that sensory experience is transformed into images which are then converted through the use of language and other media into concrete works of art. Images, as used by art, are not identical with those objects and experiences in the real world which gave rise to them in the first place. This is because the creative imagination re-orders the components of the sensory experience in such a way as to create new relationships and patterns among them, which sheds a new light on reality without contradicting it.

Imagination is a faculty which human beings possess in varying degrees. In ordinary people, it is a retrospective activity which aims at recapturing past experience and images. But in an artist, it is an innovative power which goes beyond retrospection to create new relationships between the objects of perception and their images in his mind, thus giving the object which the work of art imitates, a new appearance, a new meaning.

So, whatever the divisions Ḥâzim devises for the poetic faculties, whatever their definitions and functions, for him, they are, in the final analysis, dependent on the creative power of imagination. However, Ḥâzim is aware that, in art, imagination functions in a restrained manner.

In fact, he says quite explicitly that healthy imagination in art should not go beyond the probable to deal with the impossible: "The impossible is that which can neither happen nor be envisioned" (60). In addition, imagination for him is not the sole faculty that comes into play in artistic creation, but rather one among several which go to work simultaneously and overlap with it. He places imagination in an intermediary position between reason and the senses, with the implication that its activity and products are influenced by their own nature and activities. So, reason protects imagination without imprisoning it or trimming its wings. Ḥâzim, in fact, allows the poet a great measure of freedom in the sense that he concedes to his imagination an unlimited scope of free play. But the poet's unfettered subjectivity, which is limited only by his own imagination, is also governed by a scale of moral values, by the dictates of reason and by the poetic tradition (61). His images can turn in every direction and go to any length as long as they observe these limits.

As for the senses, they provide imagination with the material which goes into the making of its end product, i.e. the images which, as mentioned earlier, assume aspects in the work of art which are different from their originals in both reality and sensory experience. Thus, imagination cannot produce images without the raw material supplied by the senses because "*al-takhyîl tâbi^c lil-ḥiss*" (imaginative creation depends on sensation) (62). Nevertheless, a poet can imagine things which

have never been perceived by the senses, though this is only possible by previous experience and knowledge.

To sum up, senses are the source of the sensory material which imagination transforms into images far removed from their original separate realities. This product of the imagination is its means of artistic expression and re-creation of the world. In those cases when images tend to be extravagantly inconsistent with reality, they are corrected by reason which protects art from dealing with the impossible.

So in his discussion of poetic creativity, Ḥâzim defines its tools, i.e. the poetic faculties, and explains their role with special reference to one of the traditional concepts in Arabic literary criticism, namely, *al-ṭabʿ*. He consistently looks at those tools within the framework of creative imagination which is influenced by sensory and mental activities in as much as it exerts influence on both of them.

IV EVALUATION

- a) Arabic literary criticism between the third and seventh centuries A.H. (corresponding to the tenth and thirteenth centuries A.D. respectively) was the concern of two major groups of Arab scholars: critics, philologists and rhetoricians on the one hand, and philosophers, including the commentators on Aristotle and those influenced by his philosophy and psychological writings on the other. The former group concentrated on the individual components of the poetic work such as themes, words, structures, rhetorical devices and on the legacy of rules and conventions handed down to them in which they, again, restricted themselves to details, i.e. to the particular rather than the general. Therefore, their work did not develop into an integrated theory of poetry concerning itself with, among other things, the investigation of the effect of poetry on recipients, or in other words, reaction to poetry.

The latter group devoted their efforts to formulating a philosophical framework for poetry, or to the nature of poetry, which implied a study of the psychological and perceptual faculties which the poet makes use of in his work - in other words, to the process of artistic creation. But the contribution of these philosophers and commentators was marred by two deficiencies, the first of which was related to the shortcomings of the Arabic translations of Aristotle's works, while the second

had to do with inadequate knowledge of Arabic poetry on their part.

However, it was inevitable that these two groups should seek some common ground, so rhetoricians, critics and philologists tried to resort to philosophical theorizing in order to base their prosodic and rhetorical rules and other particulars in the poetic work on some more general foundations. Equally, philosophers and commentators began to use the facts relating to Arabic poetry in order to illustrate the psycho-philosophical foundations they were trying to lay down. It is the convergence of these two opposed approaches which ensured the working out of a general theory of poetry which seeks to interpret poetic creations in all languages, taking into consideration at one and the same time the particular development and tradition of Arabic poetry, together with the rules that govern diction, music, images and the general structure of typical Arabic poems. The fourth and fifth centuries A.H. (corresponding to the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D. respectively) saw the emergence of many important attempts to bring the approach of critics and rhetoricians closer to that of the philosophers. This convergence is evident in al-Jâhiz's work (163-255/780-869) and attained a high standard in the work of Imâm 'Abd al-Qâhir al-Jurjânî (d. 471/1078). Similarly, philosophers and commentators came closer to understanding the technical aspects of Arabic poetry, the particulars of its development and the rules that determine its artistic execution. This convergence is again well evidenced in al-Fârâbî's work (d.

339/950) and in that of Ibn Sînâ. A marked effort was made to bring together the two approaches in individual theoretical works, namely those of Qudâma b. Ja'far. It is an established fact, however, that all these attempts and many others in the same area found their culmination in the work of Ḥâzim. In order to place his contribution accurately within the body of critical work that preceded him, an evaluation of those attempts that were made before him will be given at the end of each chapter in this thesis. In this, the last unit of the first chapter, another look will also be taken at Ḥâzim's views on the concept and nature of poetry, with reference to past contributions to this topic, in order to ascertain how his predecessors treated it, in what ways he was influenced by them, and to what extent he succeeded in formulating a comprehensive concept of poetry which takes into account its definition, content, creative processes, as well as the faculties and powers involved. It is worth noting before embarking on this comparative, historical survey, which seeks to investigate these issues, that Ḥâzim was highly aware of his role and of the fact that he was not trying to compromise the two opposing approaches, but rather to place the linguistic and rhetorical aspects of poetry within a more comprehensive, philosophical framework, or, alternatively, to consolidate the psycho-philosophical approach to poetry by knowledge of the particular features of Arabic poetry and of its special development and technicalities. He was equally aware that the starting point for any theory or philosophy of poetry is to

answer the question about its nature. This basic stand by Ḥāzim is evidenced by many facts.

- i) Firstly, he maintains that poetry is an art which uses language as its medium of communication with its recipients. It embodies the products of creative imagination in words, structures, forms, rhythms, etc. But, by taking a broader view, Ḥāzim also sees that poetry is a creation in terms of the stimuli which motivate the poet and in terms of the imagination and perceptual processes that take place before the poetic work can be actualized in a linguistic form. So, while he is emphatic that linguistic skills are absolutely necessary, he is also unequivocal in his assertion that these linguistic techniques, as manifested in the poem, are completely determined by the psychological processes that precede them. This is why he is so deeply and consistently committed to basing his work on theoretical, psycho-philosophical foundations. He himself reminds us of this fact in many places in his book:

Scholars have discussed types of rhetorical antitheses and juxtapositions at great length, and this obviates the necessity for repeating what has already been achieved in this area, if we intend to go beyond the formal aspects of this craft and the conclusions reached in this respect and begin to deal with other aspects, which have not yet been dealt with adequately (63).

By this, he certainly means transcending the partial issues in poetry, such as the linguistic and rhetorical ones, important as they are, because they have already received an exhaustive

treatment. For him, transcending them must mean laying down a psycho-philosophical basis in explanation of the poetic work and the processes that take place before it comes into being. This is further evidence of his commitment to theoretical investigation as a necessary activity in literary criticism.

- ii) Secondly, this commitment leads him to reject the idea that developing a theory or science of poetry is the task of traditional philologists and rhetoricians, on the grounds that they are concerned with the partial, rather than comprehensive, aspects of the poetic work. Their activity explains neither the creative processes that precede such works, nor the process of reaction to them. It does not even elucidate the components of the poetic work in any comprehensive manner based on a theory.

Those with any insight will not doubt the validity of what I have proposed because it is based on the assumption that only *‘ilm al-lisân al-kullî* will explain the principles of the different branches of linguistics and because *‘ilm al-lisân al-kullî* would normally use the concepts of logic, together with philosophical and musical ideas, etc. ... It is not proper for this art to deal merely with the partial branches of linguistics and go into their details because this is the proper task of rhetoric and the disciplines related to it. The utmost that a rhetorician can do is to formulate general rules from which it is possible to deduce some particular rules in the *šinâ‘ât al-lisân al-juz‘iyya* (different branches of linguistics) (64).

It is evident here that he considers general rules to be the

source of partial ones, which is of course the natural relationship between any theory and its application.

iii) Thirdly, Ḥâzim is aware that the adoption of the Aristotelian philosophy of art does not imply its application to Arabic poetry in any literal or dogmatic way, because Greek poetry, in which that philosophy had its inspiration, is in many ways different from Arabic poetry. Therefore, he argues that Aristotelian theories should be used for formulating a philosophical framework and general psychological principles which will explain human creativity in art generally. Arabic poetry will afterwards have to be examined in the light of these general principles, with special reference to its own rules and development, in order to arrive at a theory which explains its particular nature. Ḥâzim goes as far as saying that had Aristotle been acquainted with Arabic poetry, he would have laid down different, far superior, rules:

If this philosopher, Aristotle, had found in Greek poetry what is usually to be found in Arabic poetry such as those profusions of wise sayings, proverbs, reasoning, variety of innovation in the artistic handling of all sorts of themes and words, profound ideas appropriately ordered and aptly expressed in words with the right associations and structures, *iltifâtât* (exquisite insights), *istiḍrâdât* (digressions), *tatmîmât* (ways of completing meaning within the verse), *ḥusn ma'âkhidh* (fine sources), *manâzi^c* (methods of procedure) and free use of imaginative language, he would have added to his poetic rules (65).

So, Ḥāzim's aspiration was to provide a theoretical framework for the efforts of Arab philologists, rhetoricians and critics, with the ultimate aim of formulating a theory for Arabic poetry. He further specified his objective by saying that he would make the utmost use (66) of Aristotelian philosophy, taking into consideration the facts and rules of Arabic poetry with the intention of explaining it in the light of a comprehensive theory. For this purpose, he made use of Arabic translations of Aristotle's *Poetics*.

Muslim commentators of Aristotle had, in fact, moved in that direction and their efforts supplied him with a rich material which was of considerable use to him in basing his conception of poetry on a theoretical foundation and arriving at an integrated understanding of this concept, unprecedented in Arabic literary criticism (67). Ḥāzim's views on the nature of poetry have already been reviewed in the three foregoing sections of this chapter. It is now necessary to evaluate these views in the light of the work of those critics and philosophers who preceded him.

- b) Some Arab critics, philologists and rhetoricians had adopted some of Aristotle's views as has already been mentioned. It is well-known that *muḥākāt*, together with its variant, *takhyîl*, and the closely-related concept of *takhayyul*, are the cornerstone of Aristotle's understanding of poetry. The Imâm 'Abd al-Qâhir al-Jurjânî, one of the prominent Arab critics

concerned, used the term *takhyîl*, especially in his *Asrâr al-Balâgha* (The Mysteries of Rhetoric) not to define poetry or explain its nature, but rather with three different connotations: logical, artistic (which comes close to the idea of *muḥâkât* in art) and rhetorical (with particular reference to similes, personification and metaphors). In the first case, *takhyîl* was for him the opposite of reality, so its use in poetry was one instance of false syllogism (68). This is how he defined *takhyîl*:

It is that with which the poet seeks in order to establish something which has no foundations, and to make propositions which cannot be verified (69).

This interpretation is quite common in *Asrâr al-Balâgha*, in his usage of *takhyîl*. He divides meaning for example into two kinds: rational and imaginative. The clearest examples of the first are the proofs deduced by logicians and propositions made by philosophers. Imaginative meaning, on the other hand, is that which cannot be considered truthful because what it affirms as well as what it negates cannot be accepted as such. This type of meaning allows an almost endless scope for innovation and variety, which makes it impossible to enumerate and classify its possibilities. Moreover, it has all sorts of grades and levels (70). So it can be said that ʿAbd al-Qâhir, who was sufficiently acquainted with Aristotle's thought to make use of it in his two books, *Dalâʿil al-Iʿjâz* (Proofs of Inimitability) and *Asrâr al-Balâgha*, did not employ *muḥâkât*

as a general concept which explains poetry as an art. Instead, he treated it logically in the form of truthfulness and falsehood. Occasionally, however, he came closer to understanding it in its artistic and aesthetic implications. It can also be said that 'Abd al-Qâhir was influenced in his approach to the Aristotelian concept of Imitation by Ibn Sînâ's summary of Aristotle's works, but failed to adopt it in its comprehensive aspects. It might have been that, for him, *takhyîl* in poetry was associated with a mode of manipulating readers and audiences, a thing which may explain his inhibition about adopting and using it extensively in his discussion of similes, personification, and metaphor which, unlike *takhyîl*, were all devices used in *The Holy Qur'ân* (71).

Qudâma b. Ja'far, author of *Naqd al-Shi'r* (Criticism of Poetry), was the first Arab critic to make an extensive use of Greek logic in general and Aristotle's *Poetics* in particular. He used logic for classifying and subclassifying all topics related to the study of poetry. He also adopted the principles underlying Aristotle's *Poetics*, in its Arabic versions, for studying aspects of poetry which have to do with both themes and technique. It is immediately evident from *Naqd al-Shi'r* that Qudâma depended on logic as an aid in definition and specification. Thus, he defined poetry in his book as follows: "... rhymed, rhythmic discourse containing a meaning" (72), then went on to explain in a rigorously logical manner every word in his definition. Although *Naqd al-Shi'r* is completely within

the Aristotelian tradition, its author does not accept the basic concept of *muḥākāt* as a philosophical foundation for poetry, consequently the word *muḥākāt*, and indeed *takhyīl*, is not encountered once in the whole book. Qudāma's definition of poetry, in fact, deals with the external, formal and logical aspects of poetry, rather than providing a philosophical conception for it which embraces such issues as its nature and the aesthetic implications thereof, together with its function and the values it involves. Thus:

In his approach to poetry, Qudāma did something similar to what Ḥāzim did, i.e. he started by defining it on the grounds that definition is the logical introduction to the nature and function of poetry. But there is a marked difference between them in that Qudāma's definition does not of itself reveal either the function or the value of poetry, whereas Ḥāzim's definition is more comprehensive in scope and embraces both the nature and function of poetry (73).

Ḥāzim came into close contact with the Aristotelian concept of *muḥākāt* as a definition of poetry through the commentaries of al-Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā on the *Poetics*. It was al-Fārābī most probably who coined the word *takhyīl* which Ibn Sīnā took up as an equivalent for the word *muḥākāt* in Matta b. Yūnus's translation in the 3rd century A.H. (74). Ḥāzim adopted the concept as expounded in these two commentaries, and attempts to ascertain precisely his indebtedness to them in this area, i.e. the concept of poetry as *muḥākāt* is unnecessary because he consistently makes direct reference to both and quotes their definitions and views verbatim. For instance, he quotes Ibn

Sînâ's definition of poetry in its entirety (75) and follows it up with that of al-Fârâbî's (76) and never goes beyond that to a discussion of the quotations. This does not mean, however, that he merely repeats their ideas because in adopting the Aristotelian concept of *muḥākāt* as interpreted by al-Fârâbî and Ibn Sînâ, Ḥâzim puts forward independent views of his own as a critic who is seeking to base his work on philosophical principles. For one thing, he goes to great lengths in expounding the concept and classifying its types and pointing out the role of the poet in each one of them. As has been emphasized previously, Ḥâzim used Aristotle's conception of poetry for providing a theoretical framework for Arabic poetry which would allow for its uniqueness:

These are the most important rules that Ḥâzim lays down for *muḥākāt* in poetry. They were inspired by the tradition of Arabic poetry, particularly that of Andalusia, which was largely concerned with descriptive themes. He had none of those literary models which guided Aristotle's steps in formulating his own rules, so Ḥâzim was far from being dogmatic in his approach to them. In fact, he was motivated in his application of the principle of *muḥākāt* to Arabic poetry by the conviction that this poetry was a worthy literary tradition in its own right (77).

So *muḥākāt*, as a philosophical foundation for art laid down by Aristotle, was taken over by Arabic literary criticism via several translations and commentaries and was, in spite of some occasional distortions in these, conveyed to Arab critics in an understandable manner. However, it found its fullest expression in the critical work of Ḥâzim who used it for his ambitious

attempt to formulate a theoretical framework for Arabic poetry from a totally objective standpoint.

- c) We have seen from the second section of this chapter that, for Ḥâzim, human experience is the source from which poetry derives its content. Content is not just the individual themes or ideas expressed in single poetic phrases or sentences, but rather anything encompassed by the poet's perception and imagination. He also maintains that content is inseparable from the techniques used to transform it into a work of art because they are matter and form respectively and because they are both the product of one creative process guided by one faculty, imagination, and as such, they are inseparable. Such a valid conception of content and form in poetry was possible in the case of Ḥâzim because of his adherence to a comprehensive theory of art, i.e. *muḥākāt* as set forth by Aristotle. However, systematic, historical study requires a separation of these two elements in order to determine the origins of each in both Arabic and Greek traditions, after which we will reunite them in order to arrive at an integrated theory of poetry.

Arabic and Islâmic tradition, for its part, abounds with theoretical discussions of the content of art in general, and of poetry in particular. Such discussions are to be found in philosophical, theoretical, logical, linguistic works, etc. As far as the critical and rhetorical works are concerned, this interest in the content of poetry manifests itself in three

closely interrelated debates which occupied a prominent place in the activity of Arab critics and rhetoricians in the Middle Ages. Ḥāzīm took part in them, and while he was careful to adhere to his theoretical framework, he was influenced in some instances, which will be pointed out by the legacy of critical and rhetorical thinking handed down to him, a thing which led to some confusion between the two approaches: the comprehensive which he was attempting to embark on, and the traditional which was more concerned with fragmentary issues. These three debates were, *al-sarq al-shi[°]rī* (plagiarism in poetry), *al-lafẓ wa al-ma[°]nâ* (form and content), and *al-qudamâ[°] wa al-muḥdathūn* (the ancients vs. the moderns).

- i) Around the middle of the second century A.H., two factors emerged which made the codification of Arabic a great religious and cultural necessity. The first of these was the conversion to Islam of many non-Arab peoples who wanted to learn Arabic in order to understand *The Holy Qur'ân* and the Prophet's traditions, with all their commentaries and compilations. The second was Arab expansion and the subsequent inter-mixing between Arabs and non-Arab populations of the conquered lands, which gave rise to the fear that Arabic might lose its purity with the introduction of foreign elements and become corrupted through solecisms. Scholars who codified the Arabic language used Arabic poetry as the authoritative source to be cited and invoked. They, therefore, paid the utmost attention to the documentation and authentication of poetic works, as well as to other processes

which came close to textual editing, in the modern sense of the word, i.e. philology. Since the purpose of collecting poetic works and setting them down in a written form was to ensure the existence of a body of authentic works which could serve as a frame of reference, it was natural that the issue of *al-intiḥal* (piracy) should arise and develop later into a full-scale debate, i.e. that of *al-sarq al-shi^cri* (plagiarism) (78). The need to investigate plagiarisms grew out of three other needs: finding an authoritative source to support linguistic and grammatical rules, identifying authentic poets, and ascertaining a poet's powers of innovation. In so far as the content of poetry is concerned, research into plagiarism resulted in the following conclusions:

- There are themes which are common to all poets.
- There are themes which are peculiar to individual poets but are taken over by other poets, hence plagiarized.
- From these two conclusions one may deduce that there is a good, as well as bad, pursuance - *ḥusn itbâ^c wa sū[>]itbâ^c* of literary tradition.

This discussion, particularly that part of it concerned with *ḥusn itbâ^c*, bore new fruits in the form of a new approach by some critics to poetic technique, which was especially related to the rhetorical and aesthetic aspects of sentences and phrases in poetry (79). 'Abd al-Qâhir al-Jurjânî, for instance, argued that expressing a common and hackneyed theme in a new manner was

a sign of originality (80). It is obvious that the whole issue of plagiarism, together with the conclusions that were drawn, concentrated on partial themes rather than the overall meaning in a poem. Ḥâzim, however, tends to look at the content of a poem as a whole which is organically inseparable from the manner of expression employed in its creation. It is true that he often talks about themes and words, but themes for him are not isolated, but, through versification, lead to a general meaning which makes up the content of the poem. Equally, he considers words components of a pattern which develops into a general linguistic and rhetorical structure. But, in some parts of his book, he follows in the footsteps of his predecessors in the area of plagiarism, takes up the issue of partial themes, and adopts the same approach in dealing with it. Thus, we find him dividing themes into three types: common, infrequent and rare:

There are some themes which are the common property of all minds, while there are others which are only experienced by some, and others still which usually do not occur to anyone but are discovered by some individuals at one time or another, thus becoming part of their experience. The first are those themes which are common and in great supply; the second are those which are infrequent rather than frequent, the third are those which are rare and unique (81). ...

He goes on to link these divisions to the question of plagiarism as his predecessors did:

If the expression of two compositions by two poets are equal, it is *ishtirâk*; if the later poet is more successful in expressing the theme, it is

istiḥqâq being ascribed to him as its originator, so we have in this case an instance of merit; if, on the other hand, the later poet fails to express the theme in as apt a manner as his predecessor, we have an instance of *inḥiṭâṭ* (82).

But Ḥâzim, in fact, does not go to any great length in discussing partial themes, casual side thoughts, individual words, or an isolated sentence in poetry. Neither does the question of plagiarism absorb him. Instead, he pursues his original course of looking upon the content of poetry as signifying an overall meaning and as the expression of all human experience, whether sensory or imaginative.

- ii) The second debate, that of *al-lafẓ wa al-ma^cnâ* sprang from the first because of the close connection between the two. While considering the question of plagiarism and trying to determine the indebtedness or otherwise of later poets to their predecessors, Arab critics and rhetoricians asked themselves: where exactly in the poetic work do aesthetic values lie? Do they lie in *al-lafẓ* or in *al-ma^cnâ*, i.e. form or content? Did the later poet take the theme first then couch it in words of his own? Or did he contribute a new theme which he expressed in a manner already used by a predecessor?

This question later evolved independently and occupied a separate, prominent place in the history of Arabic criticism and rhetoric. In looking at it, critics and rhetoricians split its two elements in a rather arbitrary way because they assumed that

the theme, or meaning, was an abstract idea which the poet took up and couched in words. One group of these scholars was known to advocate the supremacy of *al-ma^cnâ*, while another advocated that of *al-lafz* and the way they are put together, i.e. formulation. This division, however, was neither clear-cut, nor lasting, because the latter group won the day. Anyone who is familiar with *al-Muwâzana* by al-Âmidî (d. 370/980), or with *al-Wasâta* by al-Qâdî al-Jurjânî (d. 392/1001) will find these two authors favouring formulation because a poet's merit, for them, is determined by his technical skill. *Al-lafz* for the formulation group dealt with single words, single sentences and not the poetic text as a whole. In their study of words and sentences, they were concerned with correctitude, i.e. conformity to linguistic and grammatical rules, so sentences in the poetic work were studied at a normative level which adopted as its frame of reference conventional rather than poetic usage. In fact, we do not find in the work of this group of scholars, as a whole, a clear awareness of the aesthetic aspect of words and sentences, or of that particular usage of language which is the domain of poetry.

On the other hand, we come across some individuals among the advocates of *al-lafz* who clearly devoted their attention to this aesthetic aspect by studying the difference between language as used in poetry and ordinary language. It was their view that a poet does not use a language of his own, but that of his fellow countrymen. However, there are certain approaches to language

which are peculiar to poetry and it is these which enable a poet to achieve his own poetic rhythm and images. Foremost among those aware of this difference were some leading philologists, rhetoricians and critics, such as al-Jâhiz in the third century A.H., Ibn Jinnî in the fourth and Imam ^CAbd al-Qâhir al-Jurjânî in the fifth. Al-Jâhiz was careful to point out that the credit which a poet takes is due to the way he formulates meaning:

Al-ma^Cânî are all too plentiful. What really matters is perfection of metre, choice of words, smoothness of transition, fluency, true aptitude and faultless welding of the parts because poetry is formulation, weaving, a kind of painting (83).

Al-Jâhiz was also careful to point out a certain device in Arabic literary arts which consists in the transposition of words out of their usual context in order to achieve a better way of putting them together, i.e. the best formulation (84).

Ibn Jinnî drew attention to this same device of transposing verbs, nouns and particles out of their conventional context with emphasis on its great aesthetic potential which gives words a new expressive power, hence a greater impact (85). He was also aware of one of the basic aspects of poetic language:

Poetry allows for the exceptional as well as for departures from the conventional. Very often in poetry, words are used in other than their usual structures, which means that ideal patterns are often abandoned (86).

This is certainly a deep insight into the special approach to language demanded by poetry.

In his consideration of this point, 'Abd al-Qâhir clarified the principles involved to a degree which was both remarkable and reputable in the history of Arabic literary thought. He pointed out that conventional grammatical systems have a great aesthetic potential which can be actualized by means of the ways in which words are arranged and put together. He explained the characteristics of sentences, their components and special role in literary expression in general and in poetry in particular. 'Abd al-Qâhir did not look at words singly, or in isolation, but rather examined them in their relationships, which for him had an aesthetic function.

Sometimes you find two writers using the same words with one achieving a high degree of effectiveness whilst the other gets nowhere. Indeed if words were apt, excellent and deserving of merit and admiration in themselves, as single words regardless of the relationships among them, especially among those in close proximity, they would not vary at all but remain the same in all cases and be either good or bad in all contexts (87).

This was how the question had been viewed before Ḥâzim. Advocates of the supremacy of formulation prevailed. Some of them discussed sentences in poetry with reference to normative rules alone, while others, especially Ibn Jinnî and 'Abd al-Qâhir, revealed the aesthetic implications for sentences on an artistic level (deviant) of expression which depart from the

conventional ones. Neither group embarked on an examination of the whole poetic text, leaving Ḥāzīm to do so by transcending the issue of *al-lafz wa al-ma^cnâ* and looking upon the poetic work as a whole, made up of matter and form. Moreover, he expanded the aspect of formulation, or composition, *al-naẓm*, to include all the aesthetic aspects of composition in the whole poem. This is where a significant part of his originality and unique contribution lies and it was, again, made possible because of his comprehensive approach. This point was discussed in the second section of this chapter, but composition in poetry - as laid out in *al-Minhâj* - will be more adequately discussed in the second part.

iii) Similarly, the debate between *al-qudamâ' wa al-muḥdathûn* (ancients and moderns) grew out of the other two. Controversy raged about tradition and innovation in poetry and centred around such topics as purposes of composition, i.e. themes, words, images, metaphors, influence of time and place on poetry, and the impact of the foreign languages and cultures with which the Arabs came in contact. Discussion was carried out by two groups of scholars: philologists on the one hand, and critics and rhetoricians on the other. Philologists were concerned first and foremost with the purity of the Arabic language, so they found it necessary to draw chronological limits for the body of poetical works which embodied their own ideals, as well as constituting their frame of reference. The starting point for these works was the earliest pre-Islamic (jâhilî) *qaṣîda*, though the end was

more difficult to define, generally ranging between the end of the first third of the second century A.H. and the first years of the 'Abbasid dynasty.

Rhetoricians and critics, for their part, were concerned with preserving the technical canons of Arabic poetry - *ʿamūd al-shiʿr al-ʿarabī* - by which they meant the techniques Arab poets used for handling themes and working out the appropriate structures. Therefore, they were reluctant to accept new approaches introduced by modern poets such as *Bashshâr* b. *Burd* (95-167/714-814), *Abû Nuwâs* (146-198/763-814), *Muslim* b. *al-Walîd* (d. 208/823), *Abû Tammâm*, etc., consisting as they did of profound philosophical ideas, and technical sophistication, and going to extremes in using similes, metaphors and other rhetorical devices. They called these new approaches *al-badīʿ* (innovations) and their innovators, *muḥdathûn* (the Moderns). In the introduction of his *al-Shiʿr wa al-Shuʿarâʾ* (Poetry and Poets), *Ibn Qutayba* emphasized that literary merit is not a matter of being ancient or modern, but of true excellence. He went on, however, to say in the same introduction that his own preference was for poets who followed the trodden paths in Arabic poetry, both in themes and techniques. It was *Abû al-ʿAbbâs ʿAbd Allâh* b. *al-Muʿtazz* (247-296/861-909) who devoted a whole book to this issue, namely his *Kitâb al-Badīʿ* in which he focused on the Moderns and pleaded their case. It was his view that the so-called *al-badīʿ*, which critics were so reluctant to accept, had

its origins in old Arabic poetry, in *The Holy Qu'rân* and the Traditions of the Prophet, but became more in use in the works of the later poets:

I have presented in several chapters of our book examples of what our contemporaries call Innovations drawn from *The Qu'rân*, Traditions of the Prophet, sayings of the Companions and Bedouin Arabs, early poems and from the Arab language in general. My purpose has been to prove that *Bashshâr*, Muslim, Abû Nuwâs and their likes were not the originators of these techniques but only used them more extensively than previously, thus bringing them to attention and giving rise to this descriptive term, Innovation (88).

Controversy intensified between the supporters of al-Buḥturî, "the Conservatives" and those of Abû Tammâm, "the Innovators", and we find a good record of it in al-Âmidî's book, *al-Muwâzana*. Ibn Jinnî (89) and Ibn Râshiq al-Qairawânî, author of *al-Umda* (90), were among the main participants and the idea which pervaded the whole discussion was that the merit of a poet was not determined by any chronological considerations, but rather by the artistic quality of his work. Ḥâzim took over this notion from his predecessors and elaborated it by adding two features: the first was that changing times produce developments which bring forth new themes and interests unknown before; and the second was that the passage of time provides new motives for poetry. Thus:

Those who argue that earlier poets are preferable to later ones on chronological grounds alone are not the type of scholars with whom one can conduct a debate on this issue. It may very well be that

the later poets are the better poets because they have access to new themes made possible by the revelations of time and the availability of more stimuli and leisure (91).

Apart from the foregoing quotation, this topic is rarely discussed by Ḥāzīm because of its relevance to both content and form in poetry. We have already seen that content for him, encompasses all human experience whereas form means good composition throughout the poetic work as a whole.

- d) The Arabs, both before and after the advent of Islam, were familiar with the idea of ascribing poetic ability to supernatural powers which exist independently of the poet and which they identified as devils, demons, invisible companions or spirits. This idea was a common, popular one shared by poets, critics and laymen alike rather than being restricted to literary criticism. Even after systematic study of criticism and rhetoric began in the second century A.H. and reached its maturity in the third century and afterwards, this idea of supernatural powers being responsible for poetic gifts was still to be found intermittently in books but was marginal to the discussion of those inner powers and faculties which set poets aside from other people and distinguished the excellent poets from the mediocre ones. Two concepts emerged in the course of these new investigations which came to indicate new notions of poetry: *al-maṭbū^C* wa *al-mutakallaf* (natural and artificial); *al-ṭab^C* is something innate rather than acquired through education. It implies purity of nature and disposition, clarity

of thought and faculty, soundness of make-up and instinct, sharpness of intellect, and quickness of grasp and understanding. It is fully manifested when poetry is the expression of a poet's individual talent, different from that of his predecessors, free from any undue influence by any one of them, yet showing full absorption on his part of their work. It is also evidenced in the poet's ability to compose poetry impromptu because this is proof that it is genuinely his rather than borrowed from earlier works.

Takalluf, on the other hand, indicates a lack of genuine talent, a dependence on direct learning for producing poetic works, and exclusive attendance to the outward trappings of poetry like its linguistic, prosodic and rhetorical features. It is, moreover, synonymous with artificiality and affectation, constant revision and correction (92), and emulation of earlier poets to the point of copying their work.

These two concepts were basic to the discussion of poetic faculties and naturally received an extensive treatment by Arab critics and rhetoricians (93) who used them to distinguish between spontaneity in poetry, intuition and the ability to improvise on the one hand, and affectation and deliberateness on the other. On this basis they also distinguished between poetry of high quality and that poetry which has nothing to show except rhyme and rhythm, between poets with genuine natural aptitude and those who depend wholly on cultivated skills (94). The Arab

critics and rhetoricians, however, were fully aware of the difference between that kind of cultivation which is essential for natural talent and that other kind which is a poor substitute for it. Therefore, they called on the poet to acquire the necessary learning, knowledge, experience in and awareness of those technical aspects of poetry which can be cultivated and upon which great emphasis can be laid. In fact, the Arabic root derivative for shi^Cr (poetry) is sha^Cara which helps us to recognise this connection between the creative aspect of poetry which is the product of genuine talent and that which has more to do with knowledge and learning. The word means 'learning, knowledge understanding', so the Arabic phrase *layta shi*^C*rî* means 'I wish I knew'. Similarly, *ash*^C*arahu bi al-amr* means 'told, brought to someone else's knowledge' (95) and in *The Holy Qur'ân*,

وَمَا يُشْعِرُكُمْ أَنَّهَا إِذَا جَاءَتْ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ

means: "But what will make you (Muslims) realize that (even) if (special) signs came, they will not believe". *Ṣûrah VI, Verse 109.*

So poets were urged to learn the rules of poetry, of language, and of rhetoric all the time, to study the works of earlier poets constantly and to adopt them as teaching models. In their instructions to poets, critics and rhetoricians used a number of concepts in connection with the cultivated aspect of poetry, such as avoidance of extravagant flights of imagination, since it is

sufficient to describe something in approximate terms rather than precisely, compatibility between the two sides of a metaphor, choice of appropriate metres, and not resorting to arbitrary rhymes. They went to great lengths in discussing the properties of rhyme and rhythm, the conditions of the correct use of words and their meanings, and the necessity of welding all these elements into a clear pattern (96). Study of the technical aspect of poetry was extended to include minute details in phrases and sentences, as evidenced by the work of Ibn Jinnî in the fourth century A.H., and that of ^CAbd al-Qâhir in the fifth. Arabic rhetoric, however, tended, in later centuries, to restrict this discussion to rigid rules which sought merely to instruct in decorative rhetorical devices.

We have seen from the third unit of this chapter, namely the one entitled 'Poetic Faculties', that Ḥâzim links the concept of *al-ṭab^C* in Arabic literary criticism to the concept of *takhayyul* in Greek literary criticism. The right *ṭab^C*, for him, is equivalent to the imaginative faculty, with the strength of one being proportionate to that of the other. In that discussion, he is less concerned with the technical aspects related to cultivated skills than with the continuity of the artistic traditions of Arabic poetry, according to his own general theory of composition and execution in poetry. He views the creative efforts in Arabic literary criticism before him in the light of his own comprehensive theory of art. Thus, in his treatment of traditional concepts and terms like *ṭab^C*, he

prescribes learning (97) as a means of guidance and correction to *al-ṭab* which may suffer at times from occasional impurity or corruption. Likewise, in looking at *takalluf* in poetry, he recommends simplicity of technique and denigrates deliberateness because it leads to affectation (98). If a critic cannot distinguish between poets with genuine gifts and those with acquired, cultivated ones, he should resort to the proper criterion, i.e. composition and artistic formulation (99). In other words, Ḥâzim makes use of past endeavours in Arabic literary criticism and pursues them in the light of his own comprehensive theory of art which he had adopted from Arabic commentaries on Aristotle's works. He does not seek to arrive at a compromise between the two, but rather to place the views of Arab critics in a philosophical framework, bearing in mind all the time his original aim of formulating a theory of Arabic poetry. So he is painstakingly aware of Arabic poetic tradition and familiar with its development through knowledge of its major works.

NOTES

CHAPTER 1

1. See the notion of imitation (mimesis) in Ion Dialogue in *The Works of Plato* by George Burges, Vol. IV, London, 1903, pp. 291-294. Also Plato, *The Republic* translated by H.D.P. Lee, London, 1962, p. 370, 374.
Read Aristotle's notion of imitation in *The Poetics*, Loeb Classical Library, No. 199, London, p. 5, 9.
The Introduction by John Gasner to *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*. (Trans. by S.H. Butcher. London, 1951, 4th edition.
See the Introduction to the works of Plato in *The Modern Literary Criticism*. Edmund, Irwin. New York, 1956.
Bate, Walter Jackson. (Ed.) *Criticism The Major Texts*. New York, 1952, p. 5ff.
2. Plato's aesthetic thoughts are shown in some of his dialogues, in Ion's dialogue in particular, in book 10 of the *Republic*.
3. Aristotle's aesthetic thoughts can be noted in his collection, specially *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*.
4. al-Murzubânî. *al-Muwashshah*, (ed. by A.M. al-Bajjâwî). Cairo, 1965, pp. 60-61.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 380.
There are many notions concerning the accuracy of waṣf to be found in the classical books on literature. See, for example:
Ibn Qutayba. *al-Shi'ar wa al-Shu'arâ'*. Cairo, 1956, Vol. I.
al-Mubarrad. *al-Kâmil*. (Ed. by Muḥammad Abû al-Faḍl Ibrâhîm.) Vol. III, Cairo, pp. 48-50.
al-Khafâjî, Ibn Sinân. *Sirr al-Faṣâḥa*. (Ed. by 'Abd al-Muta'âl al-ṣa'îdî.) Cairo, 1969, p. 241.
al-Murtaḍâ, al-Sharîf 'Alî b. al-Ḥusayn. *Amâlî al-Murtaḍâ*. (Ed. by Muḥammad Abû al-Faḍl Ibrâhîm.) Cairo, 1954, Vol. II, p. 124.
6. *al-Minhâj*, p. 21.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
8. Read:
al-Jawharî. *al-Ṣiḥâḥ*. Beirut, 1947, Vol. I, p. 66.
Ibn Rashîq. *al-'Umda*. Cairo, 1907, Vol. I, p. 177.
Ibn Khaldûn rejects the whole definition held by the traditionalists, and in particular that of the prosodists and linguists. See the *Muqaddima* (dh.t.), p. 525.
9. *al-Minhâj*, p. 71.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 89.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 20.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 120.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 119.
The Editor suggests that the quotation of Plato was taken from the translation of *Politics* by Ishâq b. Hunayn (d. 298/910).
20. *Ibid.*, p. 119.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 118.
22. Leech, Geoffrey. *Semantics*. Middlesex, England, 1983, 2nd. edition, pp. 1-9.
23. Culler, Jonathan. *Saussure*. London, 1976, pp. 90-93.
24. Ibn Qutayba. *Op. cit.* The Introduction.
25. *al-Minhâj*, p. 89.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 336 ff.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 18..
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 337.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 108.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
Here, W. Heinrichs considers that this is Hâzim's own contribution to philosophical poetics. *Arabische Dichtung und Griechische Poetik*, p. 168.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 337.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 340.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 341.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 351.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
43. Daiches, D. *Critical Approaches to Literature*. New York, 1981, 2nd. Edition, p. 9.
44. Cuddon, J.A. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. England, 1982, definitions of: 'inspiration', p. 330; 'innovation', p. 335; 'muse', p. 406. See, in addition, the two chapters on religion and art in *The Greek View of Life* by Lewis Dickenson. London, 1962.
45. Ibn Manẓūr. *Lisân al-^cArab*. Cairo, 1303 A.H., Vol. XV, p. 244 and Vol. XVII, p. 104.
al-Maḡarrî, Aḥmad b. Aḥmad. *al-Miṣbâḥ*. Cairo, Vol. I, p. 335.
46. al-Bustânî, Buṭrus. *Muḥiṭ al-Muḥiṭ*. Beirut, 1977, p. 130.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 333.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 318.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 572.
50. Zaydân, Jurjî. *Op. cit.* Vol. I, p. 352.
51. *al-Minhâj*. pp. 200-201 (with adaptation).
52. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
53. *Ibid.*, pp. 42-43.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
58. *Ibid.*, pp. 26.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 27.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
61. *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39.
62. *Ibid.*, p. 98.
This notion is well-known amongst philosophers. See, for example, *Ikhwân al-Şafâ*, Vol. II, pp. 471-472 and Vol. III, p. 417.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 244.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 69.
66. °Ayyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, p. 244.
67. °Uşfûr, Jâbir. *Op. cit.*, 195.
68. °Ayyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, pp. 258-261.
69. al-Jurjanî, °Abd al-Qâhir. *Asrâr al-Balâgha*. (Ed. by H. Ritter.) Istanbul, 1954, p. 253.
70. Dayf, Shawqî. *al-Balâgha Taṭawwr wa Tarîkh*. Cairo, 2nd. edition, p. 206.
71. °Ayyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, pp. 195 and 258-261.
72. Ibn Ja'far, Qudâma. *Naqd al-Shi'ra*. Leiden, 1956. See the detailed logical treatment of this definition from pp. 1-8.
73. °Uşfûr, Jâbir. *Op. cit.*, pp. 195, 232-233.
See, in addition, the general evaluation of Aristotle's influence on Qudâma's work in:
°Ayyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, p. 232ff. and p. 247 ff.
°Abbâs, Iḥsân. *Tarîkh al-Naqd al-Adabî °Ind al-°Arab (Naqd al-Shi'ra)*. Beirut, 1971, p. 189.
Dayf, Shawqî. *Op. cit.*, Unit 2, p. 75 ff.
74. °Ayyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, p. 258.
75. *al-Minhâj*. pp. 85-86 Cf. *Fann al-Shi'ra*. (Ed. by A. Badawî.) *Op. cit.*, p. 161.
76. *Ibid.*, p. 86.
77. °Ayyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, p. 265.
78. See:
Ibn Ṭabâṭabâ, al-°Alawî. °*Iyar al-Shi'ra*. (Ed. by Ṭâhâ al-Hâjirî and M.Z. Sallâm), Cairo, 1956.

- al-Âmidî, Abû Bishr. *al-Mûwâzana*. (Ed. by al-Sayyid Ahmad Şagr.) Cairo, 1972, 2nd. edition.
- al-Jurjânî, al-Qâdî °Abd al-°Azîz. *al-Wasâta Bayna al-Mutanabbî wa-Khuşûmuh*. (Ed. by A.M. al-Bajjâwî and M.A. Ibrâhîm.) Cairo, 2nd. edition, p. 64.
79. See:-
Ibn Abî al-Işba°. *Tahrîr al-Taḥbîr*. (Ed. by Ḥifnî Şaraf.) Cairo, 1383 A.H., p. 475.
Ibn Rashîq. *Qurâdat al-Dhahab fî Naqd al-Shi'r al-°Arab*. (Ed. by al-Shâdhîlî bû Yahya.) Tunis, 1972, p. 13ff.
Ibn Ṭabâṭabâ. *Op. cit.*, p. 76.
°Askarî, Abû Hilâl. *Kitâb al-Şinâ°atayn*. (Ed. by Mufîd Qamiḥa). Beirut, 1981, 1st. edition, pp. 217-257.
See, in addition, the article *The Concept of Plagiarism in Arabic Theory* by G.E. von Grunebaum in which he argued this question profoundly. *Themes in Medieval Arabic Literature* (ed. by Dunning S. Wilson). London, 1981, chapter VI, pp. 234-253.
80. al-Jurjânî, °Abd al-Qâhir. *Op. cit.*, p. 313.
81. *al-Minhâj*, p. 192.
82. *Ibid.*, p. 193.
83. al-Jâhîz. *al-Ḥayawân*. Cairo, 1938, Vol. III, pp. 131-132.
84. *Ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 32.
85. Ibn Jinnî. *al-Khaşâ'is*. (Ed. by Muḥammad °Alî al-Najâr.) Cairo, 1957, Vol. II, pp. 436-441.
86. *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 188.
87. *Dalâ'il al-I°jâz*. (Ed. by Rashîd Ridâ.) Cairo, 4th. edition, pp. 39-40.
88. Ibn al-Mu°tazz. *Kitâb al-Badî°*. (Ed. by I.I. Krachkovsky.) Leiden, 1st. edition, p. 1.
89. Ibn Jinnî. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 405.
90. Ibn Rashîq. *Op. cit.* See the chapter *al-Qudamâ' wa al-Muḥdathûn*, Vol. I, p. 90.
91. *al-Minhâj*, p. 378.
92. Ibn Qutayba combined the aptitudes of spontaneous recitation of poetry with ṭab°, and takalluf with laborious composing. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 34-37.

93. Consult the chapters on *The Natural Aptitude and Artifice* in the following:
Ibn Sallâm. *Ṭabaqât Fuḥûl al-Shu^carâ²*. (Ed. by Muḥammad Maḥmûd Shakir.) Cairo, 1974, p. 125.
Ibn Qutayba. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 94.
al-Jâḥiẓ. *al-Bayân wa al-Tabyîn*. (Ed. by ^cAbd al-Salâm Hârûn.) Cairo, 1948, Vol. I, p. 206, Vol. II, pp. 16-18 and read in addition *al-Ḥayawân*. (Ed. by ^cAbd al-Salâm Hârûn.) Cairo, 1357 A.H., 1st. edition, Vol. IV, p. 380 ff.
al-Âmidî. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 6 and pp. 243-256.
Ibn Rashîq. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 129.
94. There is a great deal of information on the controversial debate about the terms Natural Aptitude and Affectation (al-Matbû^c wa al-Mutakallaf) in the work *Kitâb al-Muwâzana* by al-Âmidî. There he states that Abû Tammâm was an affected poet but that al-Buḥturî, on the other hand, had natural aptitude. Vol. I, p. 4.
95. Ibn Manẓûr. *Op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 409.
96. This subject was dealt with extensively and was a common topic for discussion. For example see:
Ibn Ja^cfar, Qudâma. *Op. cit.*, pp. 8-56.
97. *al-Minhâj*, pp. 27, 40-43.
98. *Ibid.*, pp. 301-302.
99. *Ibid.*, p. 341.

CHAPTER 2

THE FUNCTION OF POETRY

- I MORAL VALUE
- II PSYCHOLOGICAL VALUE
- III AESTHETICAL VALUE
- IV EVALUATION

As the history of literary criticism illustrates, study of the function of poetry is in fact a study of value. The oldest texts in literary criticism make clear that in looking at value, aestheticians, rhetoricians and critics were divided into two groups: one concerned with the moral implications of the function of poetry, the other with the aesthetic significance of this function, with each approach acknowledging the other. This meant, in effect, a split between content and form in poetry, a dualism which made the two polarized rather than interactive. Those concerned with the moral aspect of poetry directed their attention to considering the influence of poetry, i.e. its function, on recipients, while the other group examined the aesthetic pleasure resulting from rhetorical and rhythmical patterns in the poetic work. Therefore, the first group focused its attention on recipients, while the second emphasized the text itself. Naturally, there were those who tried to reconcile the two approaches, but on the whole, classical literary criticism in general was dominated, in the early stages of its development, by this dualist outlook.

Alternation between these two divergent approaches persisted until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when the Romantics initiated an approach to literary criticism which lays emphasis on the poet himself. In so doing, they underlined a new dimension in the function of poetry, namely the psychological one which had been a component of the moral dimension, or value, in classical criticism. Classical criticism had not only assigned

the psychological dimension a limited importance, but also restricted its study to a consideration of the process of reaction to poetry, rather than include in it the process of creation as it goes on in the mind of the poet. However, there were some older psychological works which, as part of philosophical writings, propounded explicit notions dealing at times with the creative process as experienced by the poet. Preoccupation with the psychological aspect involved in the function of poetry prevailed throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with one of the factors contributing to it being the rise of psychology as a discipline and the consequent attempts by psychologists to study the psychological bases of poetic creativity such as the faculties involved, the imaginative and emotional processes, and the aesthetic sensibilities on the part of the poet.

But the emergence of The New Critics' movement early in this century put an end to the dominance of Romantic thought in literary criticism and initiated a new outlook based on interest in the poetic work itself. This movement transformed the concept of form in poetry, which for the classicists was an outward framework for the poem, and began to look upon it as a comprehensive, external as well as internal, texture (1). The New Critics were helped in their study of poetic works and the theoretical views they formulated on the nature and function of poetry by the great advances made in linguistics as a modern

discipline. Thus, study of the function of poetry went through three phases in its history.

In its first phase, it was influenced by the classical Greek tradition in literary criticism which was permeated with moral ideas. That tradition viewed the function of poetry in terms of its behavioural, religious and social implications, i.e. in terms of its broadly moral, or, it could be said, utilitarian significance. This utilitarian outlook assumed the presence of an epistemological content in poetry which contributed to character building in the individual, as well as to the building of the nation. Plato's ideas about the function of poetry were to the effect that the best poetry was that which was most beneficial (2). While not objecting to the concept of benefit, Aristotle emphasized in addition the pleasurable experience to be derived from poetry (3). The Latin poet and critic, Horace (1st. century B.C.) combined these two aspects in his consideration of the poet's objective. For him, a poet should aim at making his work both beneficial and pleasurable and so be sure of achieving the proper end of his art (4).

In its second phase, study of the function of poetry was influenced by Romanticism which stressed the subjective elements in poetry, i.e. the emotional, sentimental, psychological and imaginative experiences of the poet. Wordsworth (1770 - 1850) exposed the inner world of the poet on the basis of his belief that the essence of man was his psychological and emotional

reality. His argument was that if the inner world of the poet was the most genuine part of his make-up, then the best poetry was that which gave full expression to that inner world, poetry thereby being "The spontaneous overflow of powerful feeling" (5). Coleridge (1772 - 1834) stressed this same aspect in the poet, i.e. his inner world, paying particular attention to the study of poetic imagination, or in other words, the role of imagination in poetic creativity. He distinguished imagination from other psychological faculties like fancy very precisely, then went on to distinguish between two types of imagination: primary, which is common to all people, and secondary which is the faculty entrusted with helping the poet in his artistic creativity (6), and which could properly be called artistic imagination. This strong emphasis laid by the Romantics on the inner world of the poet meant, therefore, that they tried to base the whole question of the function of poetry on psychological principles related to the poet as the creative agent.

The third phase in these efforts to examine the function of poetry was that represented by the New Critics' movement. As one of their seminal texts, they used a lecture delivered in Oxford by A.C. Bradley in 1901 under the title *Poetry for Poetry's sake*. It was Bradley's view in that lecture that in so far as value was concerned, the function of poetry was neither determined by its subject matter, nor by the effect this subject matter had on recipients. Poetry, for him, should be studied as poetry first and foremost, thus Bradley laid down the firm

principle that meaning in a poetic work was inseparable from its form and that it was impossible to seek a meaning in the poem which could be extricated from its words. According to him: "If you ask what the meaning of a poem is, the answer is that the poem means what it is". Bradley then went on to say that the aesthetic experience inherent in the poem was an end in itself which deserved to be its own justification for being. So Bradley was in fact advocating the independence of a poetic work from all other ends except the aesthetic experience it involved. He, however, did not reject the idea that poetry could have values in religious, moral and other terms, but considered these to be secondary ends which should not obscure the basic value of poetry as an aesthetic experience (7).

These fundamental notions found further expression in the subsequent work of the New Critics, especially that of I.A. Richards (1893 - 1979) who made profound studies of poetic works and reached new conclusions which were very influential in the development of literary criticism. Richards maintained that a poetic work was autonomous and the aesthetic experience poetry involved was distinct from all other experiences. Although he devoted great attention to the linguistic and rhetorical aspects of poetic works and stressed the particularity of the aesthetic experience inherent in poetry, he consistently examined the process of reaction to, and appreciation of, poetry on the part of its recipients, eventually arriving at a definition of value with regard to the function of poetry in psychological moral

terms (8). The contributions of the New Critics, together with the tremendous developments achieved in the field of linguistics in recent decades, were among the foundations contemporary linguists built upon in formulating their own scientific stylistic, rhetorical and aesthetic principles for the study of poetic works and expounding the aesthetic values implied in them.

This tripartite approach, i.e. moral, psychological and aesthetic, to the function of poetry was familiar to classical Arabic literary critics. Jurists were naturally more sympathetic to the moral aspect, while philosophers gave more attention to the psychological one and linguists, critics and rhetoricians tended to emphasize the aesthetic dimension. A historical survey of these efforts will be given in the last unit of this chapter, where an attempt will also be made to place Ḥâzim's work in this area within the framework of relevant contributions of the age. At this point, however, it is necessary to study Ḥâzim's views on the function of poetry.

I. MORAL VALUE:

- a) Ḥâzim believed that the only moral value of poetry was dictated by its own nature which provides the only frame of reference, so he based his study of the function of poetry on his own conception of its nature. We have already seen in the first chapter that, for Ḥâzim, poetry is *muḥâkât* which is achieved by the use of *takhayyul* on the part of the poet and received by readers and audiences by *takhyîl*. Since it is in the nature of poetry to convey the poet's message in an imaginative form, Ḥâzim linked the function of poetry, which is based on *takhyîl*, with the nature of poetry, which is based on *takhayyul*. In making this link, Ḥâzim alienated those values that were not based on its own nature.

Study of the function of poetry - the value of poetry - is in essence a study of the impact of a poetic work on its recipients and it is through *takhyîl*, which is so basic to the nature of poetry, that this impact is achieved in Ḥâzim's view. *takhyîl* in poetry is a method of deception which deliberately aims at having an impact on its recipients. It achieves this end indirectly by appealing to the unconscious mind of the recipient who responds to it impulsively.

Takhyîl is to conjure up in the listener's mind the object which is being imitated by means of the words, themes, ideas, style or arrangements that the poet chooses to use. These elements conjure up for him one or more mental images which, in

themselves, or by virtue of the other images they evoke, arouse an impulsively emotional reaction on his part (9).

He determined this question in an identical manner when he said:-

Takhyîl is by nature something which human beings have such a liking for that they are capable of responding very powerfully to it. They even turn away from *taşdıq* (knowledge based on certainty) in favour of *takhayyul* and they can even obey the dictates of the latter and discard the former (10).

In other words, art, by its imaginative nature has a more powerful impact on human beings than knowledge based on certainty. This being so, art assumes a basic importance in human life and takes on a role unlike that of any other human activity.

But in which direction does poetry, with its strong impact as just pointed out, lead its recipients by means of *takhyîl*? Hâzim has a clear decisive answer to this question: "The object of *takhyîl* is to induce *nufûs* either to do or believe in something or to give up all such doing or belief" (11). He repeats the same meaning in terms which are just as clear and decisive:

The object of poetry is to induce human beings, by means of what they imagine, either to do, seek or believe in something, or to give up all such doing, seeking or believing (12).

In which direction, again, does poetry, with its indirect methods and appeal to the unconscious mind of its recipients, influence thought, action and conduct? The answer is that poetry leads towards good because

... it is meant to attract beneficial things and ward off injurious ones by making *nufûs* well-disposed to the former and ill-disposed to the latter through the imagining of the *khayr* or *sharr* within the poem (13).

Thus Ḥâzim is led by means of looking at the nature of poetry and its function to an examination of the essence of the moral issue involved in it.

- b) For *takhyîl* to be effective, it has either to beautify or vilify its object depending on the message the poet wants to convey to the recipients and the change he wants to effect in their behaviour and stance. For the enhancement, or adornment, of this object, he uses the term *taḥsîn*, while for its opposite, vilification, he uses *taqbîḥ*. There are two other related terms which Ḥâzim uses in connection with the first two, namely *bast* and *qabḍ*, both of which are widely recurrent in the works of classical Muslim philosophers. *Bast* means contentment, satisfaction, acceptance and inclination towards something, while *qabḍ* means aloofness, dislike and repulsion from something. So *takhyîl* adorns the imitated object, whether a person or a thing or an idea, to make it look attractive to the recipient, thus inducing him to do, seek or believe in it.

Likewise, it vilifies its object in order to repel the recipient and dissuade him from doing, seeking or believing. In this way, *takhyîl* uses *taḥsîn* as a means of creating a state of *bast* in the same way as it used *taqbiḥ* as a means of creating a state of *qabḍ*. So both *taḥsîn* and *taqbiḥ* are closely associated with morality because they are the poet's imaginative way of stressing certain values and norms in such a manner that leads either to good or evil. In so doing, Ḥâzim bases both adornment and vilification on moral values and social norms which are accepted by human beings.

Taḥsînât and *taqbiḥât* in poetry tend towards certain subjects and turn away from others. They are used either profusely or sparingly in subjects depending on how closely related these subjects are to human norms and to what extent they are useful or harmful (14).

Since *takhyîl* in poetry aims at having an impact on readers and audiences by using both adornment and vilification as a means to that end and since these two methods are closely associated with moral values because of their capacity to modify the recipient's ideas and behaviour, Ḥâzim puts aside his theoretical approach for a while and resorts to instructing poets in the best ways of using these two methods effectively in art:

I direct, at times, *taḥsîn* and *taqbiḥ* in poetry either towards the object itself, or towards the doing or believing of that object, or at times towards both of them. For instance, if we want to use poetic discourse in order to persuade an old man to give up his infatuation with a beautiful girl, we resort to vilifying the act itself and

point out the faults of pretension to youthfulness and other related things. But if the girl was ugly or could be made to appear ugly by means of *takhyîl*, a description of her ugliness can be added to the vilifying of the act itself. If, on the other hand, the infatuated man was young, we try to bring out those weaknesses in the character of women such as treachery and propensity to listlessness in order to dissuade him. This is because in a young man the act of infatuation is not usually made an object of vilification, except from a moralistic standpoint (15).

Tahsîn and *taqbîh* occupy a prominent place in Ḥâzim's thought because they are the means of carrying out the function of poetry, which, as we have seen earlier, he bases on his own conception of its nature. Bearing in mind that poetry is *muḥâkât*, Ḥâzim tries in his discussion of *tahsîn* and *taqbîh* to reject that type of *muḥâkât* which seeks merely to replicate (*muṭâbiqa*) its object on the grounds that it does not use either *tahsîn* or *taqbîh*, a fact which makes it, for Ḥâzim, beyond the pale of art. He does not succeed in this, however, because he is greatly influenced in this matter by Ibn Sînâ, who accepts it. Therefore, Ḥâzim minimizes it at first, then accepts it, making it in the process a third type of *muḥâkât*, distinct from the other two types which are acceptable to him. As he says: "It is a distinct type anyway because it does not set out to do either. Ibn Sînâ mentioned this and divided *muḥâkât* in this manner" (16).

- c) *Tahsîn* and *taqbîh*, as instruments of *takhyîl*, are related to another important issue in critical theory, namely *al-ṣidq wa al-kadhîb* (truthfulness and falsehood). For Ḥâzim, true poetry

is the product of imagination, involving of itself either beautification or vilification. It must, therefore, of necessity, involve *al-ṣidq wa al-kadhib*. In both cases, a poet - if he is successful as an artist - aims at having an impact on his readers and audiences which will in all cases lead eventually to good. So Ḥâzim maintains that it is *takhyîl* which matters in art, whether it uses true or false material. A poet achieves the impact he is after by means of successful *takhyîl*, and this impact can only lead to good in the case of true art. It is also Ḥâzim's view that, in art, everything depends on artistic ability. He unequivocally rejects falsehood in the moral sense of the word, but, on the other hand, he accepts artistic falsehood, which he sometimes calls *al-kadhib al-nâfi'* (useful falsehood), as always leading to moral truth. So the ability to use *takhyîl* in art in such a way that suggests an appearance of truthfulness is an artistic skill:

A listener will accept what is said about something if it is ingeniously imitated and imagined in such a way that will create either an inclination towards it, or a repulsion from it. This is done by means of fine craftsmanship, which consists in choosing the right words, giving them appropriate outward forms and making sure that they are compatible with one another, using hyperbole in the sentiment expressed and adding to discourse elements such as sombreness, awe and other shades of feelings to make it ring true. Take, for instance, the case of a man who claims that he is being chased by an enemy and at the same time looks pale and distracted: *nufûs* are inclined to believe him and accept his claim as true (17).

In fact, the best poetry for Ḥâzim is that which is the product of a poet's artistic ability to cover up what Ḥâzim calls artistic falsehood and delude the recipients into accepting it.

He says in this respect:

The best poetry is that which uses *muḥākāt* plausibly, has an authentic outward form, leaves a strong impression of truthfulness or acceptability as such, covers up falsehood, and lays a claim to strangeness. Careful thought will show that a poet's ability to enforce falsehood in this way, cover it up and induce *al-nafs* to be moved impulsively by it, is a sign of artistic mastery. It is due to the ingenious methods he uses to give his discourse an appearance of truth (18).

So the use of falsehood in poetry serves an artistic purpose. But if art makes use of all the artistic resources it can command in order to be good art, it will come to possess artistic truth which is equivalent to moral truth. This is the authoritative solution offered by the theory of literary criticism to the question of truthfulness and falsehood in literary works.

Poetry is not to be read for truth or falsity of reference ... The poet as historical author is typically dead or absent; what we have as the poem is the message itself, *writing* ... Poetry consists *only* of artifice ... We never have the 'presence' of a poet; what we have is language, fiction, artifice, means of representation, poem (19).

It is also the solution offered by Ḥâzim, who attributes everything in art to artistic ability. In looking at the

content, or subject matter, of poetry he admits that both truthfulness and falsehood are involved but stipulates that each should be used only when needed.

There are situations where only truthful discourses can be used in poetry, while there are others when only false ones can be used. On the other hand, there are situations when both can be used, with preference given to falsehood in some and to truthfulness in others, while there are occasions when both can be used indiscriminately. So there are five situations in all, each requiring a different treatment (20).

One particular idea, which found a widescale acceptance among Arab critics on the basis of the concept of *takhyîl*, assumed that *a^cdhab al-shi^cr akdhabahu* (the best poetry was that which was the most full of untruths). Relying on the basic principle of his philosophy of art, Hâzim attacks this misunderstanding by saying that *takhyîl* in poetry uses both adornment and vilification, together with the two opposites, truthfulness and falsehood, in order to move its recipients and achieve its desired impact on them. In true art, this impact can only have consequences which are compatible with morality. So *takhyîl* adopts adornment, vilification, truthfulness and falsehood as a means to achieve artistic truth, which is equivalent to moral truth. On this understanding, the criterion in good art is the use of both powerful imagination and effective *takhyîl*.

I have found it necessary to prove that poetry can deal with truthful discourse so that I can dispel

the misconception that it can only deal with falsehoods. It is a misconception which Ibn Sînâ refuted in many places in his book. In fact the mainstay of poetry is *takhyîl* which can use any material whether truthful or false, and the poet's task consists in *ḥusn muḥākāt* and *jawdat al-ta'âlîf* (excellence of composition) (21).

Ḥâzim is always divided between two of his own deep-seated characteristics which dominate his thought: an overwhelming moral instinct on the one hand, and a strong aesthetic sensibility on the other. He is able, with the help of his philosophical resources, to reconcile the two by arguing, in spite of his distaste for moral falsehood in both life and art, that art has its own justification for its use of falsehoods. This justification, which is valid not only artistically but also rationally, transfers falsehood to a place which transcends that of morality only to make it more able to contribute to it, i.e. to morality, in the form of artistic truth. In other words, a poet has to tell lies in order to achieve artistic truth which leads to moral truth. Ḥâzim expresses this quite aptly:

A poet resorts to falsehoods when he realizes that truthfulness, or statements which are generally accepted as truthful, are not available according to his aim. In the process of vilifying a good thing, or adorning an ugly thing, he may neither have recourse to truthful discourse nor to others which can be generally accepted as truthful, so he has to use false discourse (22).

This idea of the artistic necessity of falsehood allows Ḥâzim a great freedom in expressing his powerful moral instincts, while at the same time doing justice to his sensitive concern for the

aesthetic aspects of poetry. He is naturally inclined towards truthfulness, but he wants it to be compatible with the nature of art. His resources as a philosopher help him to compromise the two by arguing that if both falsehood and truthfulness are rendered by means of equally powerful imaginative treatment, truthfulness will still be more effective, not on moral grounds, but on a purely aesthetic basis. This is because truthfulness is by its very nature more able to move, sway, and have an impact on human beings. Therefore, even when the same powerful imagination goes into the rendering of both, truthfulness will still have a better chance of moving the recipients and exercising a strong impact on them. For this reason - which has nothing to do with morality - truthfulness is more able to fulfil the artistic requirements of a work of art.

Just as pleasant-sounding words, which normally receive a fair amount of circulation are the best to use in poetry due to their greater acceptability to the ears and emotions even though a poet is compelled at times by the requirements of metre and rhyme to use odd and disused words, so too those themes using discourse which are neither truthful or generally acceptable as such are the best to use in poetry because of their ability to move human beings very powerfully. False discourse can only be moving when falsehood is concealed or when recipients find it possible to accept them because of the fine craftsmanship that went into their making in spite of their being hateful and unreliable as such. Yet these are less moving than truthful discourse which receives an equally powerful imaginative treatment, together with those other elements, verbal and otherwise, which are usually part of that treatment. The impact of truthful discourse is strong and common to all, whereas that of false discourse is weak and restricted and it is obvious that that which has a common, strong appeal is more deserving of being

made the standard of usage whenever possible in the same way as pleasant-sounding, ordinary words, which are neither colloquial or odd, are made the standard in poetry. But a poet is compelled on those occasions when he wants to adorn an ugly object or idea, vilify a beautiful one, or complete an imperfect thing, to use hyperbole in description in order to maximise effect. In such cases, he resorts to using false discourse, or that which does not give an impression of truthfulness; he similarly resorts to using odd or colloquial words out of necessity, or because he wants to give himself the freedom to capture random thoughts or words which readily suggest themselves to him, or because he prefers to base his discourse on imagined, rather than actual, situations out of a conviction that they have a more powerful and lasting effect on the soul and touch the heart (23).

This is how Ḥâzim resolves the question of truthfulness and falsehood in poetry in a way which reconciles its moral and aesthetic aspects.

- d) The foregoing conclusions guide Ḥâzim's footsteps in handling other questions in critical theory, some of which are particularly important to Arabic poetry. For instance, in looking at the issue of seriousness and levity in poetry, *al-jadd wa al-hazl*, he takes the same attitude as in dealing with truthfulness and falsehood, thus justifying the use of levity in poetry on artistic grounds and even arguing that it may involve some "beneficial effect" (24). In examining philosophical-moralistic (*al-ḥikma*) poetry which some critics (25) usually look upon as more oratorical than poetic, Ḥâzim tries to provide a theoretical explanation which endows some philosophical-moralistic poetry with true artistic quality and imaginativeness. He even goes as far as saying that this genre

is better able than others to encompass all facets of its object of imitation because it is the summation of variegated experiences, thus:

Such discourse (i.e. *ḥikma*) is oratorical in so far as it uses persuasion, and poetic in so far as it involves *muḥākāt* and *takhīl* (26).

In addition:

Ḥikma poetry usually exhausts all possible means of expression in order to imitate the idea which it adopts as its subject in a comprehensive way (27).

Ḥâzim also takes a long look at eulogistic poetry, which is one of the prominent genres in Arabic poetry, in order to instruct poets in the methods of composing it in such a way that fulfils its artistic nature. He then draws their attention in a marked sense of moral righteousness to the fact that they should not heap praise on a person undeservedly. He says to this effect:

In praising a certain type of person, a poet should use those attributes which are really befitting, together with those virtues and qualities related to them which really suit those people. No virtue should ever be made to adorn those who do not deserve it, or those whose real qualities are a far cry from it... This is how eulogistic poetry should be written. A poet should, moreover, stick to those virtues appropriate to each class of praised persons without giving expression to other virtues which are either higher or lower (28).

Ḥâzim also censures those poets who offer their eulogies in return for gifts from the praised ones, and attributes the deterioration of Arabic poetry in his age to this moral decline.

Another issue particularly related to Arabic poetry is the belief on the part of Arabs in general that poetry should serve a moral purpose. Ḥâzim naturally shares this belief and notes that Arabs have always used well-written verse and prose for offering advice, moral teaching, and exhortation to good deeds (29), by which he does not mean direct, oratorical exhortation. For Ḥâzim, as we have already seen, there is no conflict between aesthetic and moral ends in poetry because artistic truth is identical with moral truth.

II. PSYCHOLOGICAL VALUE

Literary critics, ancient and modern, agree that the process of poetic creation, as well as that of poetry appreciation, involves a subjective, psychological aspect, exemplified in the poet's use of particular faculties in the process and also as manifested in the appreciative faculties of the recipient. They do differ, however, in their approach to this subjective, psychological aspect. Classical critics used to think of it as part of the moral significance to be derived from poetry so they demanded of poets that their works should contain guidance on social and moral good, which meant in effect that classical critics were in this respect thinking in terms of the content of poetry. Modern critics, on the other hand, argue that this subjective, psychological aspect cannot be studied either in the artist or the recipient, except through the aesthetic skills of the former, as manifested in his work, and the aesthetic sensibilities of the latter. In other words, the modern critics reviewed this question from the standpoint of form. This subjective aspect which forms such an essential part of the creative process has already been discussed in the first chapter, especially in the section entitled 'The Poetic Faculties'. This, the second chapter, is devoted to the function of poetry, a topic which naturally centres around the recipient, on the impact, emotional and psychological in general, which poetry has on him.

The most significant idea handed down by the ancients in this connection was that expounded by Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*. Aristotle distinguished between three methods of relating to other people by means of speech, or conduct in general: the first addresses the mind, reason (logos), the second uses example (ethos) as a means of communication, and the third is directed towards emotions (pathos). To Aristotle, poetry as a human activity functioned exclusively within this dimension, i.e. directed towards the recipient's feelings; so he argued that the function of tragedy was *catharsis* (30), a term which has preoccupied scholars and students ever since. What Aristotle meant by this term was emotional purification, similar to the effect of medicine on the body. Tragedy did this by arousing both pity and terror in the recipient: terror of the tragic hero's fate and the fear that it might befall him (the recipient) and pity for the hero in his plight. Terror is an inwardly-directed feeling which combines all the feelings one has for oneself, whereas pity is a feeling which is directed outwards and is also a combination of all feelings one has for others. For this reason, pity and terror are all-encompassing human feelings and *catharsis* leads to emotional equilibrium which contributes to noble human relationships (31).

This was the most pronounced view in ancient literary criticism emphasizing the psychological impact of poetry as one which arose out of its aesthetic nature, rather than out of its content. Twentieth-century criticism, for its part, has been dominated by

I.A. Richards's views which adopt psychology, neurology and medicine as methods for studying the impact of poetry on recipients. Richards comes to the conclusion that the aesthetic experience is not something inherent in the poem but rather in the recipient; it is a state of mind, a view which implies that the proper impact of poetry is that which produces an emotional equilibrium in the recipient. It is evident that Richards's psychological approach to the function of poetry is based on its own aesthetic properties because he makes clear that poetry performs this psychological function through a particular use of language for aesthetic purposes (32). The idea that the psychological impact of poetry arises out of its aesthetic structure was not unfamiliar to classical Arabic critics but it was not as defined and clear-cut as in the work of either Aristotle or Richards. In addition it may well be that this idea is not prevalent in Ḥâzim's work, though he certainly formulates it in clearer terms than any other classical Arab critic.

- a) Looked at in the light of the psychological faculties and emotional energies which contribute to its creation, a poem is an activity of *takhayyul*; it is, on the other hand, an act of *takhyîl* when we take into account those emotional and psychological faculties with which it is received. So the poetic work is the outcome of the psychological faculties of the poet and it is addressed to the same faculties in the recipient with the purpose of producing an impact on him. Since we are concerned here with the recipient and impact, there are two facts

which deserve to be emphasized in this respect. The first is that poetry is, by its very nature, intended to provoke an emotional response on the part of the recipient by means of its artistic techniques and "the devices it uses in order to address its discourses in such a way as to make it acceptable and moving" (33). Secondly, that response to poetry is a state of mind on the part of the recipient; a fact pointed out not only by Richards, but also one referred to by Ḥâzim himself, some seven centuries ago, when he stated that reception is a psychological movement - *ḥaraka lil-nafs* (see quotation No. 11, Chapter I) (34).

In fact he goes a long way in stressing the importance of the state of the soul that results from emotional response to poetry and argues that poetry is unique among human activities in its ability to arouse emotions and appeal to the subjective side in recipients. So poetry, in fact, is the most powerful stimulus of human emotions:

We find that human beings learn some facts by remembering them, hearing a hint of them, or receiving them in ill-conceived phrases, in all of which cases they find the experience far from being pleasurable. But if these facts are communicated to them in well-turned phrases, they are moved and swayed by them. This is similar to the pleasure felt on the part of the eyes and soul at the sight of colourful, glittering beverages in transparent receptacles such as glass and crystal, which is very different from what they experience at the sight of opaque receptacles which they know to contain beverages. So poetic discourses are the most able of all to move emotionally because they are most expressive of those subjects which are

basic to human affairs and are intended to point out particular aspects which are related to those affairs" (35).

This is certainly one of the rare instances in classical literary criticism of describing response to poetry in psychological terms. Ḥâzim goes further by examining two important points relating to the process of reaction to poetry. The first is that a poetic work does not achieve its emotional impact only by imitating a new thing or experience, but may in fact imitate an experience which the recipient went through before. Thus the revival of old memories is one of the established methods of poetic imitation.

The ways of arousing *takhyîl* in *al-nafs* are either by imagining something which crosses the mind or by witnessing something which is reminiscent of something else (36).

Response to poetry which involves the revival of an old memory is the most powerful method poetry can use to move human beings. Ḥâzim agrees with Ibn Sînâ that the pleasure derived from *muḥâkât* and *takhyîl* becomes complete when the experience imitated is one which the recipient already went through or is familiar with (37).

The second point, which Ḥâzim discusses in specific, and concise terms, is what in modern literary criticism is known as continuous training in the proper reaction to poetry. Ḥâzim calls this requirement *isti'dâd al-nafs wa tahayu'uhâ*

(personal aptitude and readiness for emotional response) and it implies another, namely, the belief on the part of the recipient that poetry is an activity which necessarily calls for emotional response.

There are two types of *isti'dād*: to be in a certain mood or inner state which makes it possible to be moved by a certain discourse which is compatible with it, and to a degree which is proportional to this compatibility. The second type is to believe that poetry is like a judge or antagonist who demands of noble souls that they should meet his requirements by experiencing the pleasure which well-accomplished *muḥākāt* brings (38).

It is in this way that Ḥâzim lays down the psychological foundation for the process of reaction to poetry.

- b) As a necessary result to the foregoing, it is imperative that sensation should precede thinking in this process and likewise, the emotions precede the intellect. From Ḥâzim's point of view, no one human faculty can either be accorded a nobler place than the rest or considered to be more useful than all the others. But he does believe that in each human activity there are certain faculties which occupy a prominent place because they are very closely related to the nature and function of the activity concerned. On this basis, he argues that in creating poetry and reacting to it, the faculties which are foremost are sensation and feeling on the part of both poet and recipient. So, feeling precedes intellect in the process of reaction to poetry because it is the natural sphere of poetry, any intellectual components

it may contain being only subservient to the emotional content and dependent on it. He explains this by saying:

This is because scientific matters which usually have more to do with the intellect, do not accommodate the elements of *al-ḥusn wa al-qubḥ wa al-gharâba* in as clear a way as those subjects which appeal to sensation. It is these latter which are the concern of poetry and are, moreover, its end. As to the subjects which address the intellect, they are not central to poetry, but subordinated therein to those addressing the sensation perspective and are used by way of illustration and comparison which put the less obvious and the more subtle at the service of the more obvious and well-known. But this use of illustration and comparison in poetry is different from their use elsewhere because, in poetry, they are intended to help in imitating something by resorting to those elements which arouse powerful emotions in human beings in order to make them either well or ill-disposed towards it (39).

This is a further emphasis of a point which Ḥâzim very often draws attention to, namely that human beings are more likely to respond to *takhyîl* than to science, reason, or knowledge based on intellectual certainty. This is because human beings have a natural predilection for *takhyîl* which they readily obey as a result. Thus when human beings find themselves in situations which call for choice between artistic *takhyîl* and intellectual belief, they will unhesitatingly choose *takhyîl*, (40). This statement is directly related to the distinction Ḥâzim makes between the impact of poetry and that of other human activities and branches of knowledge, such as science, philosophy, history and knowledge based on rational proof.

For Ḥâzim, poetry is more relevant to human emotions and aspirations than any other activity pursued by human beings. For this reason it is the most powerful stimulus that can move and influence human emotions.

The product of the former pursuit, i.e. science, is exemplified by the knowledge we gain about whether a pot is full or empty by observing such facts as oozing, heaviness, lightness, the pot being turned over or in an upright position. But the product of the latter pursuit, i.e. poetry, is similar to that knowledge we glean at the sight of transparent receptacles and their contents. Thus poetry is much more moving and pleasurable than any other discourse. The fact that poetry is more relevant to human life and affairs makes it more moving and of greater impact (41).

Poetry, therefore, is closer than reason to the sphere of human emotions, a fact which is recognised by classical literary criticism. Ḥâzim, however, is not content with a hurried statement, so he embarks on an explanation and proof of it based on his own investigation of the psychological faculties involved in the process of reacting to poetry and of the relationship between those faculties on the one hand and the nature and function of poetry on the other.

- c) Ḥâzim does not think that any one psychological faculty should be given precedence or superiority, but rather distinguishes among faculties on the basis of the role of each in human activities and notes that emotions are more relevant to the nature of artistic creativity than any other psychological faculty. But when it comes to the relationship between the human soul in its

totality and the body in all its aspects, Ḥâzim puts forward an altogether different view to the effect that the soul is decidedly superior to the body in terms of function, importance and sublimity. In this, he is consistent with classical psychology and philosophy with regard to their dualistic outlook separating soul and body and according superiority to the former.

Ḥâzim goes further by saying that the actions of man are beneficial either to his body or soul. In working for the good of the latter, man cannot be expected to produce either evil, injustice or ugliness, while in working for the good of the former, he does produce these things. Consequently, Ḥâzim makes it imperative for the good man to seek the gratification of only minimum physical needs and maximum spiritual ones. In this lies true superiority and inner equilibrium.

Since man seeks in all his strivings to arrive at conditions which are beneficial to his soul and others which are beneficial to his body, with the former, unlike the latter, entailing no harm or injustice to others in any of their aspects, and since injustice can only lead to evil, it follows that true excellence lies in contenting oneself with those acquisitions of the body which do not lead to competition with deserving people, as well as in striving for all those conditions which are the exclusive privilege of the soul (42).

As previously mentioned, the idea of separation between the soul and the body existed within classical philosophy and psychology. Also the theoretical bases of this notion assumed that the needs of the soul were related to everlasting and holistic values,

whereas those of the body had more to do with the transient, the casual and the fragmentary. Ḥâzim gives expression to this assumption as follows:

Conditions which are the true privilege of the soul involve goodness and perfection relating to everlasting bliss while those of the body involve goodness and perfection only in so far as transient bliss is concerned (43).

Ḥâzim sees the highest good in giving priority to the soul over the body, and to that of others over oneself, both of which practically sum up the concept of virtue for him, thus "it is commendable to give priority to the soul over the body and to others over oneself" (44). He goes further in this direction by observing that whereas the virtuous man is he who gives priority to the good of others, the highest expression of virtuousness lies in actually incurring harm in pursuit of the good of others. If it is a harm which is imposed by the dictates of duty, it falls within the bounds of justice, but if not, it is a voluntary act of generosity. He tries to make these views relevant to Arabic poetry, especially eulogistic poetry, by stating his approval of eulogies which stress these voluntary acts of generosity and he goes as far as saying that this is the best type in that genre and that Arabs were unanimous in their approval of it.

The actions to which Arabs give greatest consideration in eulogistic poetry are those which are the expression of men's readiness to bear hardship for the sake of others who may be in need

or worthy of it. Such actions are sometimes undertaken in order to establish rights, hence they are duties which justify the courting of hardship. Otherwise, they are acts undertaken voluntarily and generously out of selflessness, in which case they are a great credit to the doer. The best eulogies are those which adopt such actions as their subject (45).

Ḥâzim, in completing his theory is not content merely to state that poetry addresses the soul, and sensation emotions and feelings are the strongest faculties most intimately involved in the process of reaction to poetry, but goes on to construct an integrated theory on the concept of the perfect man, in which he devotes considerable attention to the relationship between soul and body, as well as to the moral and social relationships between such a man and others. The logical conclusion that must be drawn from the theoretical formulation is that since poetry, by its nature, is directed towards the soul and since the soul is given precedence over the body, thus poetry is to be considered the most superior human activity.

- d) Ḥâzim further explores the feelings involved in the process of reaction to poetry and arrives at a coherent theoretical framework which clearly specifies them, together with the other psychological faculties involved, and describes their activity in that process. It is evident that he bases his work in this area on certain concepts of human nature and it is worth remembering in this connection that Aristotle linked art, the nature of art - imitation - to the nature and instincts of man by saying that human beings are instinctively fond of imitation, rhythm, and

music. This is the same basis Ḥâzim depends on for the theoretical framework he formulates for the psychological value involved in the act of responding to poetry.

Since human beings are constituted in such a way as to make them, from their early years, naturally receptive to all types of *muḥākāt*, willing to use them and ready to derive pleasure from them, and since this make-up is more strongly marked in them than in other animals, it is fair to say that they are extremely fond of *takhayyul* (46).

This link which Ḥâzim perceives between the psychological value in art and human nature is not a casual one, but rather a consistent awareness which comes up in many places in his book with great clarity and specificity. For instance, he draws attention to the fact that the subjects which art imitates are either familiar to commoners, as well as to the cultured classes, or the preserve of the latter. He further observes that the best poetry is that which imitates what is familiar to both commoners and the cultured classes because it is closer to what people in general instinctively like and dislike. In explaining response to poetry in terms of states of mind and other conditions, he equally gives priority to instinct and natural make-up.

Things which are deemed or imagined to be *khayr* or *sharr* are either familiar to commoners as well as to the cultured classes or exclusive to the latter. Since those things which are unanimously considered to be *khayr* or *sharr* are central to human affairs and notions, and since those things which human beings instinctively or habitually experience as pleasurable or painful are the most deserving of being made the subject of likes and dislikes, it follows that the most genuine subjects

of poetry are those which are most closely related to human affairs and notions as well as being liked or disliked by both commoners and the cultured classes, either instinctively or as a matter of habit. It is equally true that those subjects which are not essential to human affairs, and of which acquiring knowledge is exclusive to the cultured classes, are not central to the art of poetry in comparison with those familiar subjects which are the property of people in general (47).

Thus, in explaining the psychological value inherent in the act of responding to poetry, Ḥâzim progresses from one principle to the next until he arrives at the most ultimate of all, i.e. the instinctive elements in human nature.

III AESTHETIC VALUE

A work of art must have a moral, psychological, social or educational significance which, according to some literary critics, is derived from its subject matter. Consequently, throughout the history of literary criticism there have been thinkers who have demanded that a work of art should convey a distinctly moral message and have even drawn the artists' attention to the subjects which are relevant to this message. There have been other critical thinkers who have emphasized the psychological, educational or social significance. This kind of attitude assumes that artistic creativity is identical with intellectual activities pursued by moralists, psychologists and educationalists. In other words, it is an attitude which misses the individual nature of art or simply waves it aside. Another attitude, one which has persisted since Aristotle's time, consistently takes this particular nature into account and acknowledges the moral, social and educational significance in art, but considers it to be derived from the techniques employed for the artistic expression of a particular subject matter in art rather than from the subject matter itself. This may imply that this particular approach to art gives precedence to form over content, but the fact is that it looks upon this moral, psychological or any other significance in art as inherent in form, rather than dependent on either form or content alone. Literary critics who take this approach argue that of all the

millions of works of art which have adopted love as their subject matter, only a few have been artistically successful and of these, only a handful have achieved immortality. The fact that the subject matter is the same in these works means that the crucial factor lies in the artistic techniques employed for its expression, so any meaning that they may have is inherent in those techniques.

It was natural that Arabic thought should witness, just like any other tradition, purist moralists who gave priority to content as well as formalists who gave priority to form. There were also critics who took a more objective approach and looked upon the two elements as equally important and attributed the function and impact of a work of art to its very nature. Ḥâzim was open to all these influences, Greek as well as Arab, but, as we shall see from this section, he leaned more to the objective approach mentioned above:

- a) Ḥâzim distinguishes the art of poetry from other activities which have an epistemological content such as philosophy, logic, social affairs, etc. by saying that although all these activities have one object in common, namely, to deal with the interaction between man and his world, each one of them has a distinctive approach to this end. He tries to draw clear outlines to define the nature of poetry in this respect by pointing out that the techniques of aesthetic expression which are peculiar to poetry are markedly different from the methods of logical proof and

reasoning. Since the function of each of these activities is dependent upon the typical techniques it adopts for expression and exposition, poetry cannot be judged by such criteria as truthfulness, falsehood and others which are alien to its unique nature, but rather by artistic considerations linked to it.

In poetry propositions can either be truthful, generally accepted as truthful, or doubtful. It is different from *burhân* (logical reasoning), *jadâl* (eristic) and *khaṭâba* (oratory) in that it uses *muḥâkât* and *takhyîl*. It is particularly distinguished by its use of false statements which are given an appearance of truthfulness, in which case its nature as poetry is determined by its use of *muḥâkât* and *takhyîl*, not by the falsehood contained therein. By the same token, it is not the truthfulness contained in poetry which determines its claim to being poetry, but rather the use of *takhyîl* in it. Because the art of poetry is unique in its use of *muḥâkât* in false statements, any such discourse should properly belong to the realm of poetry on account of the *takhyîl* used, not the false statements contained in it. Even if poetry had everything in common with all other products of intellectual activities, but used *takhyîl* throughout, it is *takhyîl* which is the crucial element that sets it apart as poetry, not the truthfulness or falsehood contained therein (48).

Ḥâzim is not merely content to point out the features which distinguish poetry from other intellectual activities which have an epistemological content, but goes on to specify the minute details which set poetry apart from other literary arts which have language in common as a medium of expression and communication. Since oratory was considered to be one of the genres of ancient literatures, literary critics have - since Aristotle - made a point of comparing it with poetry. Thus, in

comparing these two literary arts with a view to defining the nature of each, Ḥâzim observes that a poet sometimes adopts techniques which are peculiar to oratory, an art which usually seeks to sway by *iqnâ^c* (persuasion). Equally, an orator sometimes adopts the techniques of poetry, in which *takhyîl* occupies a prominent place. But if *iqnâ^c* outweighs *takhyîl* in poetry, it corrupts the nature of the art in the same way as oratory ceases to be such if *takhyîl* in it outweighs *iqnâ^c*. Ḥâzim does not only show remarkable insight into the nature of poetry, but also a thorough knowledge of the history of Arabic literature, best exemplified by the profound remarks he makes. It is his view, for instance, that al-Mutanabbî (303-355/915-965) used the techniques of oratory just as all other poets did, but only to an extent which allowed *iqnâ^c* to be supplementary to *takhyîl*, a fact which enabled him to excel in his art and leave his mark on the history of poetry. Ḥâzim defines al-Mutanabbî's approach to the art of poetry and pronounces it to be the approved approach which deserves to be emulated.

There are some poets who use *takhyîl* for most of their themes without ever resorting to oratorical persuasion except in a minority of cases, whilst there are others who use persuasion for most of the themes they want to express. The craft of poetry, in fact, makes limited use of *iqnâ^c* in the same way that oratory makes use of poetic expressions in order that *muḥâkât* may support *iqnâ^c* and *iqnâ^c* may support *muḥâkât*. But a poet is truly blameworthy if most or a substantial part of his discourse is oratorical, and the same is to be said of orators who use poetic techniques for most or for a substantial part of their discourse.

Therefore, the practitioners of each art would do well to use a modicum of the techniques of the other because that enables them to reinforce their own techniques and alternate poetic and oratorical discourse in such a way that will make for recreation and pleasure. There are actually poets who use *takhyîl* in most of their work and *iqnâ^c* for the remainder while there are some who use *iqnâ^c* in most of the verses throughout the parts of the poem. Al-Mutanabbî excelled in his choice of the positioning of the persuasive verses. He used to begin each section in the poem with imaginative verses using *takhyîl* and end them with a persuasive verse to support the previous verses and to prepare *nufûs* for the reception of the imaginative, for this reason, his poetry aroused great pleasure and his method should be adopted as a model because it is excellent (49).

This precise specification of the particular nature of poetry confirms that any meaning which can be derived from a work of poetry is attributable to this nature.

- b) These facts determine the aesthetic aspect in poetry which distinguishes it from all other activities which have an epistemological content. But this aspect is itself determined by the interaction between technique and subject matter in poetry. How does technique affect subject matter in a way that gives the poem an aesthetic impact? To begin with, Ḥâzim decides that this impact is not produced by the subject matter of a poem, but by the techniques used to express it. It is technique, rather than subject matter, which is the crucial factor in this respect.

Perhaps the source of their mistake is the assumption that poetry which uses truthful statements belongs to the domain of deductive reasoning, that which uses statements generally accepted as truthful belongs to eristic discourse,

and that which uses statements preponderating towards truthfulness belongs to oratory. What they did not realize is that all these statements properly belong to the realm of poetry as long as they use *muḥākāt* and *takhyīl* because what matters in poetry is not subject matter but the handling of subject matter in such a way that allows the use of *takhyīl* (50).

So it is not subject matter which constitutes the criterion of poetry. Moreover, this subject matter undergoes modification, addition and deletion, all of which removes it further from its original state in real life.

As for the *takhyīl* of something itself by means of imitative expression, it has the same relationship to the soul and the hearing as that of transparent bottles revealing their contents has to the eyes. It is also like the sight of statues laden with lights or of blooming trees reflected on the surface of water and producing illusive images which are the more pleasurable because they are less common than their originals. The juxtaposition between an admirable thing and its image is the source of a certain harmony, similar to that produced by mixtures of colours (51).

Ḥâzim goes further in theorizing on the aesthetics of poetry and concludes that in poetry the imitated object does not only appear far removed from what it is in reality, but can also have an impact which surpasses that which it has in reality even if it is of extreme beauty. In this case, the impact of the poetic work is not the outcome of the beauty of its subject matter but of artistic excellence and masterly execution. Ḥâzim cites as proof of this the case of a woman whose beauty moves men emotionally in reality, but whose portrait, or the love poem she inspired produces even greater impact. The explanation for Ḥâzim is that

emotion stirred in men by the beauty of a real woman is attributed to her beauty itself as well as to her desirability, that is to say, to the incidental, materialistic aspect which is implied. But that which men feel when seeing the portrait of the woman or reading a poem about her is attributed to well-accomplished *muḥākāt* and artistic mastery, in which case the emotion is stronger, richer and more lasting.

The statue is different from the real person after whom it is modelled in the impact it produces. The former moves by arousing wonder at well-accomplished *muḥākāt* in it and the fine craftsmanship demonstrated in accurately proportioning it to its original. But the latter moves by arousing love for her or his beauty as well as the desire to achieve a certain purpose, which is usually associated with her or him as in the case of the person being a girl for instance. Also, the impact which the statue can achieve by arousing wonder is far more powerful than that of the original person, and it is so in the majority of cases (52).

Ḥāzim's study of the relationship between artistic expression and subject matter in poetry is related to one of the difficult topics in aesthetics, i.e. ugliness in fine art. It is the established view in this respect that art deals with all subjects since there are no such things as subjects which are suitable for art and others which are not. Therefore, fine art can adopt as its content ugly or hateful subjects, in which case it is considered fine art in as far as its artistic handling and expression of those subjects is concerned. This is another argument used by literary critics and aestheticians to prove that aesthetic value is the source of every other value inherent in

the function and impact of poetry. Here, Ḥâzim is one of these aesthetic critics when he gives expression to this view in no uncertain terms:

One of the instances which serve to show the extent of the pleasure aroused by *takhyîl* in art is that of the ugly images engraved, sculptured or drawn in such a way as to make them resemble their originals very closely. They are a source of great pleasure not because of their innate beauty but because they are revealed by comparison to be a good *muḥâkât* of their originals (53).

Fortunately for the poet, it happens at times that the subject which his poem seeks to imitate is one which is universally liked while the techniques employed in imitating it are artistically successful. In such a case, he reaches great heights of excellence and effectiveness:

Wonder aroused by discourses is achieved either by the excellence of *muḥâkât* of the object or to the fact that the imitated object itself is one which arouses wonder and contains strangeness in itself. But if the sense of wonder emanates from these two factors simultaneously and in the greatest degree possibly obtained from each, it then reaches its apex, and this is a state of mind to which *nufûs* usually aspire (54).

- c) After distinguishing poetry from all other arts and activities and defining the relationship between techniques and subject matter in poetry, Ḥâzim pauses for an elucidation of the nature of these techniques, a topic which will be discussed in the next part of this thesis. Here, however, we will outline the general theoretical framework which Ḥâzim formulates for poetic

techniques and their role in producing an impact on recipients.

Poetry cannot acquire a psychological, moral, social or educational value except by fulfilling its own artistic requirements. In other words, poetry cannot perform any function unless it is good poetry in which successful aesthetic comparison is used.

The worst poetry is that in which *muḥākāt* is far from being ingenious, the form is unattractive, falsehood is evident and strangeness is lacking. It would be better not to call such works poetry even if they used rhyme and rhythm because they lack the essential properties of poetry and fail to move emotionally. Their unattractive form is a hindrance to emotional response and ill-executed *muḥākāt* in them obscures the beauty or ugliness of the imitated object, thus immobilising emotional reaction to it while evident falsehood extinguishes the emotional impact of the poem altogether (55).

Ḥâzim draws attention in this extract to the principles mentioned above, foremost among which is that poetry can only move emotionally if it fulfils its artistic requirements. This is a fact which Ḥâzim repeatedly emphasizes and he goes further to say that the emotional impact of poetry is proportional to this fulfilment. So, if a poem meets a great many of these requirements it will not only convey to the recipient an image of the imitated object as it is in reality, but will also give a more precise and perfect image (56).

Ḥâzim sums up the whole issue of value, on which the function of poetry depends, in one clear, definite, principle, namely, that

the value of a poem is determined by how well-accomplished it is from the artistic point of view. This directly implies that this value is aesthetic in the first place because its criterion is bound up with artistic mastery and excellence of composition. It is important to point out in this connection that in stating this principle, Ḥâzim does not ignore the recipient's contribution, i.e. his state of mind at the time of reacting to the poem, nor does he ignore his psychological and educational readiness for proper reception. It is well worth remembering that many poems which achieved an ultimate degree of artistic excellence were not properly appreciated because of the lack of experience and training on the part of the recipient in the appreciation of poetry. In other words, Ḥâzim lays down the principle that the impact of poetry is achieved by means of artistic excellence and accomplishment, but he at the same time links it to readiness and aptitude on the part of the recipient for proper response to poetry.

Muḥâkât does not always achieve a maximum degree of emotional impact because it is dependent in this on the degree of artistic excellence it attains, on the concrete verbal form in which it is manifested and on the readiness to receive it and be moved by it (57).

It is clear that Ḥâzim recognises that poetry has a psychological and moral value which implies that it can be an educational instrument and a source of guidance to responsible social behaviour. But he considers this value to be dependent on artistic criteria which are basic to poetry. An evaluation of

Hâzim's notion of value in poetry will follow in order to disentangle the legacy of relevant Arab and Greek ideas which came down to him, from those ideas which were an original contribution on his part.

IV EVALUATION

Having illustrated Ḥâzim's views on value in art in general and in poetry in particular, it is fitting at this juncture to turn to a historical, comparative survey in order to place each component of the question of value in the context of classical Arabic criticism that preceded Ḥâzim and determined his place in, and contribution to, that tradition with a special reference to Greek influences on that tradition and on Ḥâzim's work as a critic in particular.

- a) Researchers of Arab-Islamic culture usually observe that the characteristic Arab way of thinking is to progress from the general to the particular, i.e. from a general principle to its practical applications such as the specific rules of thinking and conduct that can be deduced from it, rather than to progress from the particular to the general by observing individual phenomena and events and looking for the principles underlying and offering an explanation for them. They further observe that this is demonstrated most clearly in the field of ethics, an area which receives particular emphasis in Arab-Islamic culture:

In comparing Arab-Islamic culture with other cultures, we find that there are certain themes which run through each such as scientific analysis of natural phenomena, militarism and warfare together with their side issues of victory and defeat, artistic creativity manifested in such visual arts as architecture, sculpture and painting, etc. Arab-Islamic culture, for its part, is a system which is based on principles of human

conduct and transactions, a sphere which is closely associated with ethics (58).

It may appear at first sight that this general ethical preoccupation has dominated all other aspects of the culture to such an extent that it has obscured their individuality and variety. Thus it may appear that ethical principles, which are so paramount in Arab-Islamic culture, have suppressed the spirit of artistic creativity and narrowed it down to an explicitly educative, instructive role which frustrates the nature and function of art. But this is not so and we shall see from this section that the ethical principles which this culture emphasizes are so broad that they are able to accommodate various activities which are specific in nature and function such as experimental science, philosophy, artistic creativity, etc. It is true that the great teachers of Islam in its early history expected poetry to perform an unmistakably moral function, but their approach was that of responsible leaders entrusted with building a new social order, not that of literary critics. The Prophet (the blessing and peace of God be upon him) once said: *Inna min al-shi^cri laḥikma* (or *laḥukman*) (Verily wisdom is to be found in some poetry). Similarly, 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (d. 24/644) the second Caliph of Islam, once expressed his preference for Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā, the pre-Islamic poet, over all other poets because he was "*lā yu^cāzilu fī al-kalām wa lā yatba^c waḥshiyyahu wa lā yamdah al-rajul illā bimā fīhī*" (he does not employ enjambment nor barbarism, nor praise a man with qualities which he does not truly have) (59).

Professional critics and rhetoricians, on the other hand, did not demand of poetry that it should convey a direct, moral message, but were rather inclined to expect from it an indirect social and moral meaning emanating from its artistic execution rather than being superimposed on it regardless of its own requirements. But scholars can still prove that some critics and rhetoricians did seek a moral meaning in poetry, albeit a tentative quest which does not become immediately evident upon a general reading of their works. For instance, the prominent critic, Ibn Qutayba, rejected al-Jâhîz's unqualified preference for words over themes and maintained that the excellence of a poetic work could equally be ascribed to either words or themes and that this excellence could reach great heights if both possessed aesthetic merit, whereas if both were inferior, a poetic work would lose all aesthetic beauty. This, in fact, was the gist of his quadripartite formula (60) which I mentioned in the first chapter, and a casual reading of Ibn Qutayba's statements on this topic may indicate that he was of the opinion that the two elements, i.e. themes and words (or wording), were of equal importance. However, this is not the case since he consistently sought in each line of poetry a worthwhile meaning centring around a philosophical idea or moral point which was relevant to life. This meant that he was a believer in the priority of themes and there are two further proofs to support this view. The first is that Ibn Qutayba had such an admiration for the following line by Abû Dhu'ayb:

والنفس رَاغِبَةٌ إِذَا رَغِبَتْهَا وَإِذَا تَرَدَّتْ إِلَى قَلِيلٍ تَقْنَعُ

When encouraged, human desires know no limit,
But when bridled, they are contented with meagre
gains.

that he approvingly quoted al-Aṣma'î's (d. 215/830) pronouncement about it: "This is the most beautiful line ever written by an Arab poet" (61).

The second point is that Ibn Qutayba studied certain poems which he acknowledged to be superior in artistic composition but which he nevertheless rejected because they were devoid of any useful content. A case in point is his use of the following well-known lines to illustrate the second section of his quadripartite formula, i.e. discourse which uses well-turned phrases but lack any significant meaning:

ولَمَا قَضَيْنَا مِنْ مِثْنَى كُلِّ حَاجَةٍ وَمَسَّحَ بِالْأَرْكَانِ مَنْ هُوَ مَسَّحٌ
وَشَدَّتْ عَلَى هُدْبِ الْمَهَارِيِّ رِحَالُنَا وَلَمْ يَنْظُرِ الْغَمَادِي الَّذِي هُوَ رَاشِحٌ
أَخَذْنَا بِأَطْرَافِ الْأَحَادِيثِ بَيْنَنَا وَسَالَتْ بِأَعْنَاقِ الْمِطْنِ الْأَبَاطِحُ

When in Mina we completed all rites
And touched all holy corners to be touched,
Our paniers were loaded on to black camels,
And those going no longer recognized
those who were coming,
We took up 'the ends of conversation'
between us and the valleys flowed
with the necks of the mounts (62).

There were some other critics who shared Ibn Qutayba's view that these lines were superbly composed but without any worthwhile

content. One of them was Abû Hilâl al-[°]Askarî (d. 395/1004) who thought that these words, although admirably beautiful (63), did not reveal any significant meaning. So, Ibn Qutayba sought in poetic works philosophical ideas and moral good, a fact which makes us disagree with Ihsân [°]Abbâs in his following statement about him:

A balanced approach and a desire for reconciliation are two things which characterize Ibn Qutayba's contribution in various fields, including literary criticism. They were of more far-reaching influence on his thinking than they were on al-Jâhiz, and their respective approaches to the controversy about *lafz wa ma[°]nâ* are among the most evident differences between them: while al-Jâhiz upheld the supremacy of *lafz*, Ibn Qutayba was inclined to think that *lafz* and *ma[°]nâ* were of an equal importance" (64).

On the other hand, there are some researchers who have already acknowledged the tendency which Ibn Qutayba's works reveal, i.e. his advocacy of the superiority of themes as well as his moral approach to poetry (65). This same tendency is to be found, though in a milder and more tentative form, in the works of Ibn Ṭabâṭabâ, a prominent fourth century A.H. critic. Like Ibn Qutayba, Ibn Ṭabâṭabâ made a distinction between form and content in poetry. He even went as far as saying that it was possible to express a certain meaning first in prose, then in verse. It was not surprising, therefore, that he should emphasize the appropriateness of themes. He came close in this respect to Ibn Qutayba's quadripartite division for *lafz wa ma[°]nâ* and, as a result, argued that the wording of a poetic work could be good

while the meaning dull, and that meaning could be appropriate while the verbal expression feeble (66). Jâbir ʿUṣfûr, who devoted a whole chapter in his book to a study of Ibn Ṭabâṭabâ, is of the opinion that he accepted the split between form and content in poetry but was superior to al-Jâḥiẓ in that he realized that the themes of poetry were not all of equal value and had a more broad-minded understanding of the relationship between form and content (67). But Jâbir ʿUṣfûr goes on to say that Ibn Ṭabâṭabâ belonged to that group of critics who emphasized the explicit moral function of poetry and considered mastery in handling this aspect of poetry to be an expression of artistic excellence at its highest levels. Thus, Ibn Ṭabâṭabâ:

... referred to the norm of poetry to its adequacy to the situations it sought to express. His interpretation of those situations was purely and directly moral, and thus he opposed the view that poetry could do some harm by emphasizing the moral end of poetry and linking good poetry to portrayal of moral ideals cherished by Arabs and enshrined in Islam (68).

The dominant tendency among Arab critics and rhetoricians, however, was to seek social and moral ends in poetry through its artistic tools, thus distinguishing between poetry and other pursuits, especially linguistic and instructive ones such as oratory. This tendency, which was to emerge as early as the second century A.H., went as far as separating art from the mainspring of moral and social instruction, namely, religion. It is reported that al-Aṣmaʿî, a philologist, hence a conservative, explained the weakness which characterized Ḥassân

b. Thâbit's poetry after he embraced Islam by saying that in preaching moral good directly, poetry usually becomes soft, i.e. weak.

It is in the nature of poetry to weaken when it is consciously made to serve moral purposes. A case in point is Ḥassân b. Thâbit, who reached prominence both before and after the advent of Islam, but whose poetry lost its vigour when it adopted moral preaching. The proper themes of poetry are those of the great masters such as Imru' al-Qays, Zuhayr and al-Nâbigha, i.e. satire, eulogy, erotic poetry, boasting, description of habitations, travel, wine, horses and warfare. But in seeking goodness poetry becomes weak (69).

This tendency paved the way to a clear separation between the sphere of religion, which is the source of moral values in Islamic culture, and the art of poetry. Thus al-Ṣulî (Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. Yaḥyâ, d. 335/946) answered the attacks made on Abû Tammâm because of his weak religious faith with a statement which was decisive as well as far reaching: "I do not think that atheism detracts from poetry any more than proper faith improves it" (70). Al-Qâḍi al-Jurjânî explained the issue in the following logical way:

If religion had anything to do with poetry and faulty religious faith was good reason for a poet to be inferior, we would have to efface the name of Abû Nuwâs from both the anthologies of poetry and the biographies of poets, but the two subjects are separate and religion is distinct from poetry (71).

In dealing with this issue in literary criticism, Ḥâzim was, as already seen in the first section of this chapter, not only the

rightful heir of the critical and rhetorical thought which preceded him, but also the contributor of a successful theoretical formulation of the question which is consistent with current universal trends in literary criticism. As previously noted, Ḥâzim dealt with the relationship between art and morality considering the nature of art itself which is *takhyîl* and the proper criterion for a work of art was the extent of the artist's success in the process of *takhyîl* regardless of subject matter and the good, evil, truthfulness or falsehood involved. At this stage we will not repeat the assumptions which helped Ḥâzim to formulate this principle, the following lines being sufficient for the researcher as they bear out this principle and find support in the pronouncements of prominent critics:

Poetic discourse do not fall at one or another of the two extremes represented by truthfulness and falsehood, but rather alternate between them. This is because *takhyîl*, which is the mainstay of poetic art, does not contradict either of these two, so the proper view of poetry is that its propositions can be either truthful or false. It is poetry in so far as it uses imaginative discourse, not truthfulness or falsehood (72).

This statement represents the ultimate point reached by Arab aesthetic thought in its relationship between art and morals.

- b) A historical survey of Arabic approaches to psychological value in art will show that Arabic literary criticism was replete with significant psychological insights. One of the first Arab critics to produce systematic writings was Ibn Qutayba and

scholars will find in his book, *al-Shi^cr wa al-Shu^carâ'*, a lucid psychological justification of the structure of the traditional Arabic *qaṣīda*. It is well known that this *qaṣīda* was made up of parts each expressing a partial theme within the overall theme of it, so it started, for instance, with a mention of habitations, then moved on to a description of the journey and so on. Ibn Qutayba was the first to interpret this structure in psychological terms which dealt with the impact on readers and listeners of those structural units as well as of the transitions from one to another:

The poet began by mentioning habitations and lamenting over them as a pretext for talking about their former dwellers who had moved away. This developed into *nasīb* centering around a description of the pain of separation, intensity of passion and excess of ardent love and longing in order to win sympathy and command hearing because love poetry has a strong emotional appeal. When the poet thus made sure that he had attracted the attention of his audience or readers, he went on to prove his deserts by describing his arduous journeying both at night and in the heat of the day. Realizing that he was now in a position to ask for things from his addressee, he started eulogy hoping to prod him on to reward his efforts with financial gifts (73).

Iḥsân ʿAbbâs, author of a comprehensive history of Arabic literature, arranges Ibn Qutayba's interpretation around three topics, asserting that this critic attained psychological insights unrivalled by al-Aṣma^cî and Ibn Sallâm, who both preceded him. Al-Aṣma^cî, for instance, ascribed variation in artistic excellence to differences in poetic themes and purposes of composition, whereas Ibn Sallâm ascribed it to differences

among the poets themselves. Ibn Qutayba, for his part, revealed the psychological factors which underlie and explain the differences. According to Iḥsân ʿAbbas:

In turning his attention to *al-ṭabʿ* [in this context he meant temperament], Ibn Qutayba had to deal with states of minds and their role in poetry, and he did so by distinguishing three aspects:

- Psychological motivations behind the composition of poetry, such as hope, longing, pleasure, anger, as well as stimuli such as drinking and seeing beautiful scenery.
- Time of day as a factor in poetic creativity. It is known that there are certain times of day, such as the first part of night and mid-morning, which are not particularly conducive to composing excellent poetry. There are also some emotional and physical conditions which are not very helpful in this respect either, such as stress and malnutrition. These factors can produce variation among works by the same poet, but a poet is forced at times to ignore proper states of mind and times of day, and therefore his work shows some variation in quality. It is worth remembering in this context that al-Aṣmaʿî ascribed the variation in Ḥassân b. Thâbit's poetry to subject matter, while Ibn Sallâm ascribed it to differences among narrators and transmitters who plagiarized his poetry. Ibn Qutayba, on the other hand, resorted to psychological interpretation in this respect, which meant that he had probably a more subtle understanding of human nature than his two fellow-critics.
- The audience's state of mind (74).

Following Ibn Qutayba's lead, Arab literary critics became consistently interested in the psychological interpretation of both the creative process and the nature of response to poetry. But study of the psychological factor in both processes was in fact more evident in Arabic works on psychology, which were part

of Muslim philosophical works. So it is more proper to seek such approaches in the works of Muslim philosophers, especially those who translated and wrote commentaries of Aristotle's works because these were the sources on which Ḥāzīm drew in his study of the psychological value in poetry. These philosophers were al-Fârâbî, Ibn Sînâ, Ibn Rushd. It was they who introduced Aristotle's philosophy into Arabic thought and each had, of course, a direct knowledge of Aristotle's *Poetics*, its summaries and commentaries. For Aristotle, the function of art was to provide a combination of pleasure and benefit (75). Muslim philosophers adopted this same attitude with some variations among them in methods of exposition and analysis.

Al-Fârâbî undertook a rigorous philosophical analysis of the concept of *aesthetic pleasure*, arguing that the end of art could be restricted to pleasure in itself.

There are many kinds of knowledge which are acquired through sensation and fall outside the scope of the sciences which deal with the causes of sensory experience. These are attractive to men, who are content to know them and experience the pleasure inherent in that knowledge. They are such things as myths, histories of persons and nations which are all learnt by men and used merely for pleasure, that is for comfort and enjoyment. It is the same with watching imitators, hearing imitative discourse, listening to and reading poems and myths because these are used by the seeker of pleasure merely to enjoy what he understands thereof. The more thorough the knowledge of these things is, the greater the pleasure; the better and more perfect the object of this knowledge is, the more perfect the pleasure. These are forms of knowledge which need only to be grasped and the pleasure involved in them to be experienced (76).

But is it possible to seek pleasure alone in art? Furthermore, is it possible to separate pleasure from benefit? Al-Fârâbî went on in his analysis to say that play (pleasure) was a preliminary to serious pursuits (benefit) and that nothing was an end in itself. Therefore, if pleasure was to be sought in art, this was because it was a first step towards benefit, which in this case was emotional and behavioural equilibrium, i.e. human betterment and maximum happiness.

All forms of play are meant to enhance rest, which in turn aims at restoring the energy needed for serious pursuits. So play in all its forms is, in fact, directed towards the more serious side of life. It is not an end in itself but rather a means to some of the things which ensure maximum happiness, so it is possible in this context to consider play as having a beneficial role to humanity (77).

This link which al-Fârâbî forged between pleasure and benefit made it easier for him to maintain that the impact of art involved a combination of the two.

Some poetic discourse is used for serious purposes, while others are used as kinds of play. Serious purposes are those which are instrumental in arriving at the greatest of all human privileges, i.e. maximum happiness (78).

Ibn Sînâ separated these two elements, arguing that the function of poetry was either to arouse *ta^cjîb* (awe) or to deal with civil issues (i.e. social and moral issues) (79). This separation was quite evident in his discussion of the function of poetry as seen by Arabs.

Arab poets had two objects in mind, the first of which was to arouse *al-nafs* preparing it for a certain action or reaction. The second, however, concerns ^c*ajab*, using similes for almost everything to arouse *ta^cjīb* at the excellence of comparison (80).

But the issue was not that simple because in going back to the principles underlying the nature of art, i.e. *muḥākāt*, Ibn Sînâ stated clearly that *muḥākāt* by its nature aroused pleasure, so it was a powerful device for creating an emotional impact. Human beings, he argued, responded more powerfully to poetry than to reason, truth, or logical proof, so art, by its nature, combined in its impact both pleasure and benefit. According to him: "Wa lil-muḥākāt *shay^un min al-ta^cjīb laysa lil-ṣidq*" (*muḥākāt* arouses awe which truthfulness certainly cannot" (81).

Ibn Rusḥd took the same approach by maintaining that the function of art consisted in giving both pleasure and benefit. For him, the explanation lay in the nature of art itself, i.e. its being *muḥākāt*

The evidence that it is natural for human beings to experience pleasure and joy at similitudes is when objects are enjoyed, not by sensation but rather by imitation, especially the most complete *muḥākāt* such as is to be found in thorough drawings and paintings of animals produced by skillful artists. For this reason, similitude is used in education as a useful aid in teaching, verbal communication and signs because of the pleasure inherent in the latter due to the imagination involved, all of which makes it possible for people to accept *muḥākāt* more readily (82).

Ibn Rushd then made a link between the nature of art and that of man by saying that man was unique amongst other creatures in that he was by instinct inclined to *muḥākāt*: "Man takes pleasure from the object experienced previously in a sensory manner and from its *muḥākāt*" (83).

It is possible to assert unequivocally that throughout his lengthy discussion of the psychological function of art in his book, Ḥāzim is thoroughly influenced by these three philosophers, or, in other words, by Aristotelian ideas in their Arabic garb. Ḥāzim has even spared scholars the trouble of tracing this influence by stating it explicitly in many contexts and mentioning the influence particularly of al-Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā in this and other aspects. His acquaintance with Ibn Rushd's work is no less clear and it will be referred to whenever possible. However, Ḥāzim does not mention Ibn Rushd in his book - a point that was dealt with in the introduction to this study.

- c) As to aesthetic value in poetry, it has been restricted in the third section of this, the second chapter, to a discussion of Ḥāzim's effort in formulating a theoretical framework for it which constitutes the basis of the whole question of poetic technique, i.e. musical structure, principles of rhyme and rhythm, imagery, literal v. unliteral, the structure of the poem itself and the interrelation among words and sentences within the context of poetic usage. These topics will be discussed in detail in the second part but an investigative reading of Ḥāzim's

book and a survey of the material related to these topics allow me to state two facts. Firstly, Ḥāzim's study of poetic technique was a continuation of the efforts of preceding Arab critics and rhetoricians but it was particularly so with respect to those efforts which applied Aristotelian methodology to Arabic language and poetry, such as those of Qudāma b. Jaʿfar, Ibn Ṭabāṭabā, Ibn Jinnī and ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī. He made a significant contribution to those endeavours as will be revealed through this thesis.

Secondly, Ḥāzim arrived at brilliant aesthetic insights, many of which deserve to be put on the same level as those of prominent modern and contemporary aestheticians, especially I.A. Richards of the New Critics School and others who studied literary usage of language in general and poetic usage in particular.

NOTES

CHAPTER 2

1. See the three introductions by W.J. Bate in which he discussed the development of the theory of literary criticism from Plato up to the New Critics.
Bate, Walter Jackson (Ed.). *Op. cit.*
2. Plato, *The Republic*, Lee, p. 382, 384.
Atkins, J.W.H. *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*. London, 1952, Vol. I (Greek), p. 64 ff.
3. Aristotle, *The Poetics*, Loeb p. 45, 46.
4. Atkins, *op. cit.* Vol. II. See the writer's discussion of Horace's critical ideas in both of his books, *Satire and Arts Poetica*, p. 47 ff.
5. Saintsbury, George. *A History of English Criticism*. London, 1911, p. 310 ff.
6. *Ibid.* See the discussion about Coleridge in Chapter 6, Vol. I. See, in addition, Chapter 4, p. 54-60 and Chapter 13, p. 161ff. of Coleridge's book, *Biographia Literaria*. (Ed. by George Watson.) London, 1982.
7. This lecture was published with other articles by Bradley in 1909. He altered the original and added seven important notes plus one additional note on the same subject in the last edition of 1917.
Bradley, A.C. *Lecture on Poetry*. London, 1917. First Lecture, p. 3 ff., *Poetry for Poetry's Sake*, pp. 394-395.
8. Richards, I.A. *Principles of Literary Criticism*. London, 1983, pp. 13-14, 28ff.
9. *al-Minhâj*, p. 89.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 337.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 108.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 108.
It is worthwhile to note, since we are dealing with moral values, that there was a linkage between language and its levels and social behaviour in early ages when Sibawaih (d. late 8th century A.D.) in *al-Kitâb* (the *Book*) showed that language is

a social behaviour. See the article by Carter in which he elaborates on this subject [Sibawaih's understanding of language as social behaviour and his treatment of the notions of *al-ṣawâb wa al-khata* (right and wrong), *ḥusn wa qubh* (beauty and ugliness)].

Carter, Michael G. *An Arab Grammarian of the Eight Century A.D.: A Contribution to the History of Linguistics. Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 93, p. 147.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 346-347.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 71-72.
19. Lerner, Lawrence. (Ed.) *Reconstructing Literature*. Oxford, 1983, p. 4 Cf.
Ḥâzim's statement: "... it is *takhyîl* which is the critical element that sets it apart as poetry, not the truthfulness or falsehood contained therein." *al-Minhâj*, p. 71.
20. *al-Minhâj*, p. 85.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 72.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 81-82.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 329-330.
25. Moreh, S. *Modern Arabic Poetry 1800-1970*. Leiden, 1976, p.4.
See, in addition, the writer's book *Ḥarakât al-Tajdîd fî Mûsîqâ al-Shi^cr al-^cArabî al-Ḥadîth*. (Trans. and introduced by Sa^cd Maşlûḥ), Tel Aviv, 1970, pp. 57, 77.
Mandûr, Muḥammad. *Fî al-Mizân al-Jadîd*. Cairo, 3rd. edition, pp. 97-98.
26. *al-Minhâj*, p. 67.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 170-171.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 122.
See Aristotle's conception of this matter in *The Poetics*, Loeb, pp. 45-51.
In addition read the arabic translation to Aristotle's ideas in this matter in ^cAyyâd, Shukrî, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-82.
30. Atkins, J.W.H. *Op. cit.*, See the 4th. and 5th. chapters, Vol. I.
31. ^cAyyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, pp. 76-82.
32. Richards, I.A. *Op. cit.*, where he evaluates the critical aspects covering this field until the second decade of the 20th. century and defines aesthetic experience among other human experiences.

33. *al-Minhâj*, p. 361.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 118.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 89.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 118.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.
40. To avoid repetition, see quotation no. (10) in this chapter. See, in addition, *al-Minhâj*, p. 116.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 120.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 162.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 162.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 163.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 164-165.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 293.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 128-129.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 127.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 127.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 72.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 119.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
58. Maḥmûd, Zakî Najîb. *Qîma min al-Turâth*. *Majallat Fuṣûl*. Cairo, 1980, Vol. I, No. I, pp. 19-24.

59. Ibn Sallâm, al-Jumaḥî. *Op. cit.*, p. 63.
60. Ibn Qutayba. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 64 ff.
61. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 65.
62. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 66.
These verses are attributed to either Kuthayr ʿAzza, Yazîd b. al-Ṭathariyya or ʿAqaba b. Kaʿb b. Zuhayr. See *Dîwân Kuthayr ʿAzza*. (Ed. by Iḥsân ʿAbbâs.) Beirut, 1971, p. 525. These verses were translated with the help of Kamâl Abû Dîb, translation in his book *al-Jurjânî's Theory of Poetic Imagery*. England, 1979, Vol. I, p. 297.
63. Abû Hilâl al-ʿAskarî. *Op. cit.*, 1st. edition, p. 59.
64. ʿAbbâs, Iḥsân. *Op. cit.*, pp. 106-107.
65. Haddâra, Muḥammad Muṣṭafâ. *Kitâb Mushkilat al-Sariqât fî al-Naqd al-ʿArabî*. Cairo, 1958, p. 197.
66. Ibn Ṭabaṭaba. *Op. cit.*, p. 83 ff.
67. ʿUṣfûr, Jâbir. *Op. cit.*, p. 41.
68. *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.
69. al-Murzubânî. *Op. cit.*, p. 85.
70. al-Şûlî, Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. Yahya. *Akḥbâr Abî Tammâm*, (ed. by Khalîl Maḥmûd ʿAsâkir and others.) Cairo, 1937, 1st. edition, p. 172.
71. al-Jurjânî, al-Qâdî ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz. *Op. cit.*, 2nd. edition, p. 64.
72. *al-Minhâj*, pp. 62-63.
73. Ibn Qutayba. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 21.
74. ʿAbbâs, Iḥsân. *Op. cit.*, pp. 111-112.
75. Daiches, D. *Op. cit.*, pp. 23-24.
76. al-Fârâbî, Abû Naşr. *Falsafat Aristûṭâlîs*, (ed. by Muḥsin Mahdî.) Beirut, 1961, p. 61.
77. al-Fârâbî, Abû Naşr. *Kitâb al-Mûsîqâ al-Kabîr*, (ed. by Ghattas ʿAbd al-Malik *Khashaba* and Maḥmûd Aḥmad al-Ḥifnî). Cairo, 1967, p. 1185.
78. *Ibid.*, p. 1184.
79. Ibn Sînâ. *Fann al-Shiʿr, Kitâb al-Shifâʾ*. *Op. cit.* (Ed. by A. Badawî), p. 162.
80. *Ibid.*, p. 170.

81. *Ibid.*, p. 162.

82. Ibn Rushd. *Talkhîṣ Kitâb Aristûtâlîs fî al-Shiʿr*. *Op. cit.* (Ed. by A. Badawî), p. 206.

83. *Ibid.*, p. 206.

PART TWO

THE AESTHETICS OF POETIC WORK

CHAPTER 1

THE RHYTHMICAL STRUCTURE

- I METRE IS THE ESSENCE OF POETRY

- II RHYTHM AS A BASIS FOR POETICAL MUSIC

- III THE ROLE OF RHYME IN THE MUSIC
OF THE QASĪDA
...

- IV EVALUATION

The composition and the aesthetical structures of the poem are both based on the poetic approach to language and the manner in which this approach is achieved.

It is obvious that the poet makes use of the same language adopted by writers of artistic prose, not to mention people in general; but it is only the poet who uses the language in such a way that makes it display all of its creative and innovative potentialities; namely, all of its artistic capabilities and latent aesthetical possessions. The relationship that holds between the poet on the one hand and the language and its workings on the other might be called the 'Poetic Approach' which, in turn, brings about two co-operating, though interrelated, structures. These two are resolved into a more general structure, namely the poem.

First: The poetic approach to language on the part of the poet creates a vocal composition that depends on the temporal alternation in the formations of the letters - movent and quiescent constituting a rhythm, the basis of which is prosody: nevertheless, the rhythm, is more general (1). This vocal composition, however, establishes the rhythmic structure.

Second: A linguistic system is created by the poetic approach to language. This system in bringing about poetic images in a specific way, depends on metaphorical relations in composing both words and sentences, as well as morphological and grammatical

compositions (2). These images are the units out of which the constructive structure is established. The two structures cannot be separated, for the poem is formed out of their mutual co-operation and interrelation, not to mention that they are the product of one process, i.e. the poetic approach to language. However, for the purposes of this research, it is necessary to treat them independently, and therefore this part comprises two chapters, each of which deals with one of these two structures.

Literary historians hold that epic poetry (heroic poems) and tales were common in Arabic colloquial folklore. They composed no other genre of verse in classical Arabic save lyric poetry and *qaṣīdas*. However, epic and dramatic poetry was alien to them. Lyric poetry in classical Arabic possesses a special system as regards both metre and rhyme. The Arabs fully developed their knowledge of this genre of poetry in 200/800 at the hands of the philologist al-Khalīl b. Aḥmad al-Farāhīdī (100-175/718-791) who established the science of *ʿarūḍ* (3). To him, Arabic poetry is attributable to fifteen types of metre according to the specific patterns - *tafʿīlāt* (feet) - by which each metre is formed. Later on, one more metre was added to this number by al-Akhfash. He called it *mutadārik*. The Arabs up to the present time, depend on these sixteen metres in the study of their verse. The specification of this metrical system is as follows:

The Arabic poetic (prosodic) system is based on *mutaḥarrik wa sâkin*, letters within words, the temporal cadence (succession) of which creates the poetic rhythm. Literary prosodists have placed these letters into the following six categories:

1. *Sabab khafîf*; one *mutaḥarrik* followed by a *sâkin*, e.g. ^can.
2. *Sabab thaqîl*; two *mutaḥarrik*, e.g. *laka*.
3. *Watad mafrûq*; one *sâkin* in between two *mutaḥarrik*, e.g. *kayfa*.
4. *Watad maqrûn*; two *mutaḥarrik* followed by a *sâkin*, e.g. *mata*.
5. *Fâşila şuḡhrâ*; three *mutaḥarrik* followed by a *sâkin*, e.g. *ma^cakum*.
6. *Fâşila kubrâ*; four *mutaḥarrik* followed by a *sâkin*, e.g. *ḍarabakum*.

Consequently, prosodists have made out of the *sabab*, *watad* and *fâşila* eight parts, i.e. *taf^cîlat*. All of the metres are based on these patterns as follows: *fa^cûlun*, *fâ^cilun*, *mafâ^cilun*, *fâ^cilâtun*, *mustaf^cilun*, *maf^cûlâtun*, *mufâ^calatun*, *mutafâ^cilun*.

The complete *bayt* (verse) is composed of two *shaṭr* (hemistichs), each of which is formed of similar patterns of *taf^cīlât*. The last *taf^cīla* of the first hemistich is called *carûḍ*, that of the second *shaṭr*, *ḍarb*, the other *taf^cīlât* of the verse being *hashw*.

These *taf^cīlât* undergo changes (from 66 to 85 variations), i.e. *ziḥâfat wa cillal* (4). Arab poets have preferred to employ certain metres rather than others. The most commonly used metres are: the *ṭawīl*, the *kâmil*, the *wâfir* and the *basīṭ*. Those that are less popular are the *muqtaḍab*, the *mujtathth*, the *mudâri^c* and the *mutadârik* (5). Furthermore, there is a special technique for the rhyme in the Arabic poetic system - which will be shown later on in this chapter - in which the rhyme plays a role in creating the poetic rhythm.

There are actually different modes of metre and rhyme in the history of Arabic poetry, past and present, the aim of which has been an attempt to modify the poetic system discussed earlier. In classical Arabic poetry, the *Muwashshah* composer was able to dispose of the composition of the two *shaṭr* on equal *taf^cīlât*, i.e. not on traditional lines. In modern Arabic poetry - especially after World War II - the poets have composed the *bayt* on the basis *taf^cīla*. These old and modern modifications have no bearing on what is being discussed here, namely the study of modern scholars, Arabs and Orientalists, and of their study of the Arabic poetic system in the light of the

science of phonetics, rhythm and linguistics. By this investigation we are therefore able to evaluate the work done by Hâzim al-Qarṭājannî in this respect.

Considerable efforts have been exerted by Orientalists to study the Arabic poetic system relying, in their explanation of both linguistic bases and the value of the rhythmic and musical components, on the comparison with the Greek poetical system, modern European poetic systems and the theory of the science of music (6). Likewise, modern Arab scientists have started studying *al-[°]arûḍ* of al-Khalîl in accordance with the modern scientific theories. Muḥammad Mandûr has reached the conclusion that the poetic system established by al-Khalîl is not of much help to ascertain both the essential values and the rhythmic and musical aspects existing in Arabic poetry (7). Similarly, this criticism has also been voiced by Ibrâhîm Anîs, who adds that this system is too difficult to study because of the numerous terms it contains (8).

Arab studies of Arabic poetry have gone to the extreme in making use of the results of modern sciences in order to investigate the system of Arabic poetry. Shukrî [°]Ayyâd in the sixties, published his treatise which was based on both phonetics and the science of music (9). In the seventies, Kamâl Abû Dîb likewise published his research work based singularly on the role played by stress in bringing about the poetic rhythm (10). Both these scientists started their treatises with a lengthy and detailed

introduction (11) of the other previous studies in both Arab and Orientalist circles. It is to be noted that the bases laid down by Shukrî ʿAyyâd are still applicable in the study of the Arabic poetic system from a scientific point of view. He has laid down his research work on two bases. First: (Linguistic) Arabic ʿarûḍ is studied according to the nature of the linguistic sound. Second: (Musical) It shows the relationship that holds between rhythm and metre, as well as revealing the distinctive nature of each.

The research work carried out by Shukrî ʿAyyâd has a direct bearing on this dissertation as it points out on two occasions the importance of two notions discussed by Ḥâzim.

The first notion is that ʿAyyâd justifies the infrequent usage of the *munsariḥ* metre by saying that this was due to the fact that its music is different from the nature of music prevailing in other metres. He also stated that Ḥâzim alone held the same opinion regarding this analysis when he described the looseness of this metre (12).

Secondly, in one of the chapters of his research work, ʿAyyâd studies the music of poetry and its relation to its contents; he states that the Arabs upon translating Aristotle's book on poetry, *Poetics*, in the beginning of the 4th/10th century, found in its first part a discourse on *muḥâkât* (Mimesis) associating poetry with music and imitation through

speech with that of tune. Furthermore, in the fourth chapter of the said book, they found a reference to the natural relationship that holds between certain artworks of poetic imitation with particular metres. To 'Ayyâd, despite the fact that Arab philosophers understood these two aspects very well, this understanding in actual fact had no apparent effect on Arab critics and rhetoricians. The only critic throughout the history of Arab literary criticism whose work benefited from this understanding was Ḥâzim al-Qarṭājannî (13).

Undoubtedly, the light shed on the above two notions by 'Ayyâd is particularly helpful in appreciating Ḥâzim's efforts in respect of the musical structure of Arab poetry as will be shown in this chapter.

I. METRE IS THE ESSENCE OF POETRY

- a) The Nature of Poetry, as mentioned in the first section of this thesis, is *takhayyul*. *Takhayyul* is achieved by the poet's psychological potentialities and the use of his creative faculties and innovative powers. The poetic work, then, is accomplished by using *takhyîl* on the part of the poet to stimulate the recipient's imagination, his means in this *takhyîl* is specific linguistic performance. Ḥâzim was aware of this fact, namely that the poet stimulates the recipient's imagination by illustrating the meaning through his own individual usage of words. He is of the opinion that this *takhyîl* in poetry is manifested in the metre alongside the other three aspects - meaning, style, words and metrical composition (14). Actually if we, however, continue along the same lines of thought that Ḥâzim was pursuing we find ourselves closely approaching the modern theory which states that the foundation of the poetic approach to language is that the words are measured, i.e. the words in a poem are rhythmically performed. Such rhythmic performance is part of the intrinsic core out of which the meaning is conveyed (15).

In this respect Ḥâzim stated that the poet achieves *takhyîl* by means of language. In addition, the metre, from his point of

view, depends on the rhythmical criteria within the word. Therefore, the metre is essential in the process of *takhyîl* (16) which is the essence of poetry.

Ḥâzim, moreover, goes on further to study this fundamental process from different angles until he gets its full picture explicitly as regards aesthetical composition. In this composition, we find him openly state that *takhyîl* shows the meaning by linguistic means depending on the sense of hearing, i.e. on the rhythmical characteristics of the words.

As long as poetry is concerned with so varied purposes, it is necessary that these subjects should be imitated by suitable metres by which it is possible to evoke the soul's imagination. This composition, which makes the rhythmical performance achieve *takhyîl*, i.e. making the rhythm the essence of poetry, is an original one aesthetically. Ḥâzim resolutely points out that poetry is *takhyîl* of meanings through words (18). He specifies that he finds the composition of the same foundations in the artworks of Ibn Sînâ: "what I mentioned regarding *takhyîl* of meaning by metres was noted by Ibn Sînâ in many statements in his book." (19). He refers to a specific statement in the book *al-Shifâ'*.

Nevertheless, the previous composition becomes unsteady when Ḥâzim reiterates the traditional notion which does not intimate that meaning originates in the poet's mind, inter-connected with

its metrical composition simultaneously, but that meaning is crystalized in the mind of the poet in its prosaic composition. The poet, then, starts searching for an appropriate metrical pattern for the already available meaning. It seems, so to speak, that this process is performed in two stages (or degrees) with one preceding the other; the first being the presence of meaning in its prosaic nature, whilst the second being its presence in a versified nature. This concept was well-known in ancient Arabic literary criticism. It was Ibn Ṭabāṭabā, who formulated this concept in a specified logical manner (20). As regards Ḥāzim, he shows up the *waṣiyya* (instruction) of Abū Tammām. He then tries to complete it by a detailed account showing that meaning goes before metre in time.

I am going to add to the *waṣiyya* of Abū Tammām in a way that illustrates it further - presenting it in detail - and supplementing where it is incomplete. I say that if the composer adopts the advice of Abū Tammām by choosing a suitable time, keeping the mind in a state of readiness, laying oneself open to the motives which inspire poetic creation and keeping the mind unfettered so that it is free to go where the thoughts beckon him, then he should do the following: if he chooses *rawiyya* (deliberation) it is necessary to first prepare within his mind and his thoughts his intended meaning, together with the subject matter which is the main theme behind his intended purpose. He must then imagine them one by one in his thoughts, first as scattered phrases, observing them and choosing which ones are the most exquisite and best suited, in respect of harmonious wording and valid syllables, to the construction of the rhyme. He then puts down the metre and the intended rhyming letter accordingly, thus creating competent rhymes which succeed - not precede - the meanings [the rhyme is dictated by the meaning] (21).

Furthermore, he expresses his thoughts in a pedagogical way that aims at directing the poet to the methods he has to use to find the metrical composition of the prosaic framework he has had at his hands:

Then he divides the meanings and phrases among the *fuṣūl*, beginning with the ones most appropriate to his purpose to start with, the other *fuṣūl* being followed in the same manner, one by one. He then has to treat in verse the prosaic phrases which are already present in his mind. He then measures them metrically, either through replacing them word for word synonymously or increasing the amounts of the speech where there is a particular benefit, or, decreasing this amount in a way that may alter its meaning or modify the derivatives to change the discourse position by inversion, or he may make more than one choice of these procedures (22).

As a matter of fact, with respect to Ḥâzim's works, this inherited concept has not detracted from his staunch stance in respect of the rhythmic performance and that what achieves *takhyîl* is the nature of poetry.

- b) Ḥâzim presents the Arabic metrical formulations in an original and authentic manner - in relation to the period he lived in and his literary heritage. He rejects the idea that prosody should be restricted to the confinements of its *sabab*, *watad* or *taf'îla* without taking into consideration their other functions, i.e. musical, rhetorical, etc. He directs the prosodic lesson into an entirely new destination when he links this lesson with linguistic and rhetorical purposes on the one hand, and with rhythmical and musical ones on the other. It is

important, in this respect, that the investigator pays due attention to Hâzim's consciousness regarding the necessity of making the prosodic studies extend beyond the traditional boundaries: "It is not appropriate that this artwork should become *takhruj ilâ maḥḍ ṣinâ^cât al-lisân al-juz'iyya*" (mere partial tongue procedure) (23). The investigator cannot but notice that he was aware of the necessity of these studies in the light of both linguistics and science of music:

That which I have mentioned as to the nature of metres and their respective formulations together with what is permissible in them is the sound opinion which is supported by both rhetorical and musical laws (24).

Hâzim lays down the scientific foundation for these studies in that he specifies the elements out of which the poetic metre is composed, the basis of these elements being the *mutaḥarrik wa sâkin* of letters. He then points out that the characteristics of each metre stems from both the number of *mutaḥarrik wa sâkin* therein and the proportion of one to the other, as well as the position each one takes in relation to the other. Finally, he also points out the overall relationship to the rhythmic performance reaching the proportionality which is the aim behind all arts:

Since the metres are composed of *mutaḥarrik wa sâkin*, they differ proportionally according to the percentage of each in every metre and their respective positions and order, not to mention the overall metrical patterning according to the acceptable rules concerning strength, weakness,

lightness and heaviness. Thus, each metre has its own individuality according to the degree of difference existing within its order, quality, overall metrical patterning, the proportion of *mutaḥarrik wa sâkin*, or some of these four aspects, which imparts to each metre a distinctive aural quality concerning its criteria and the characteristic quality pertaining to it in relation to what it possesses, whether it be a *sabâṭa wa suhûla* (flowing) or *ja^cûda wa tawa^cur* (awkward) oral quality; not to mention being *bâhiyan* (sublime) or *ḥaqîran* (trivial), as well as other aspects that make what is visible appropriate to what is heard (25).

It is, therefore, of particular importance to point out, first, the linguistic foundation of the prosodic formulations as seen by Ḥâzim and also to point out, secondly - in the second section of this chapter - the musical foundation of these formations.

When he speaks about the metrical composition, Ḥâzim depends on the linguistic sound. The first, or rather the smallest, linguistic unit in the metre is the state of the letters of words in being *mutaḥarrik* or *sâkin*. Metre, according to its linguistic foundation, is linguistic sounds temporally successive in accordance with a specific system. As such, both of the *mutaḥarrik wa sâkin* are composed with each other comprising of units, namely the *asbâb* and *awtâd* that are both called *arjul* by Ḥâzim (26). It is possible to employ these *arjul* in producing varied patterns, but the Arabs have selected those patterns that contain real rhythmic value:

The genres of patterns are of a great variety. The Arabs, however, have employed from among them those which have lightness and proportional relation

within them. There are basically no genres of patterns, the position taken by both the *mutaḥarrik wa sākin*, as well as the parts contained therein, better than those which have been laid down by the Arabs in their metres. If you go through what I have said regarding the order and variety of the patterning of the *mutaḥarrik wa sākin* and the pleasant aural effect that is achieved by combining them in different ways as mentioned earlier in this book, you cannot but agree with me that what I say is correct (27).

Out of a succession of *sabab wa watad*, i.e. *arjul*, the *taf[°]îla* is composed, which is the basic part of the *shaṭr* and then the *bayt*.

Ḥâzim describes *taf[°]îlât* according to the number of letters contained therein: they are *khumâsiyya* (that of 5 letters), *subâ[°]iyya* (that of 7 letters), *tusâ[°]iyya* (that of 9 letters) (28). A certain collocation of *taf[°]îlât* constitutes a *baḥr* (metre) in specific patterns. These are as follows:

- Certain metres are constituted by means of the recurrence of the same *taf[°]îlât*, e.g. *kâmil*, its *shaṭr* being composed of four *taf[°]îla* - *mutafâ[°]îlun*, *mutafâ[°]îlun*, *mutafâ[°]îlun*, *mutafâ[°]îlun*.
- ...
- Other kinds of metres, the *ṭawîl* for example, are composed alternating different *taf[°]îla* - *fa[°]ûlun*, *mafâ[°]îlun*, *fa[°]ûlun*, *mafâ[°]îlun*.

- Some other metres are constituted of two similar *taf^cîla* separated by a different *taf^cîla*, e.g. *madîd*, the *shatr* being: *fa^cilâtun*, *fâ^cilun*, *fâ^cilâtun* (29).

These formations are accompanied by positions of the relations of the *taf^cîla*, the aim of which is to avoid discord and to achieve vocal values that realize, first the proportional relation, and then the harmony. Ḥâzim calls these four positions as follows:

- *Taḍâ^cuf*, i.e. the interconnection between two dissimilar feet occurring twice in the hemistich in an alternating order, e.g. *fa^cûlun*, *mafâ^cilun* in the *ṭawîl* and the recurrence of *mustaf^cilun*, *fâ^cilun* in the *basîṭ*.
- *Taḍâru^c*, i.e. the interconnection of two similar feet separated by a different foot, e.g. the *madîd*, its hemistich being *fa^cilâtun*, *fâ^cilun*, *fâ^cilâtun*.
- *Tamâṭhul*, i.e. the recurrence of the same type of foot, e.g. the *mutaqârib*, its hemistich being *fa^cûlun*, *fa^cûlun*, *fa^cûlun*.
- *Tashâfu^c*, i.e. one of the interpretations being the interconnection of two feet of the same type which are followed by a different foot, e.g. the *sarî^c*, its

hemistich being *mustaf^cilun,* *mustaf^cilun,*
maf^culâtun (30).

Thus, Hâzim starting off by the letter - either *mutaḥarrik wa sâkin* - ends up by constituting the entire metre comprising of parts strictly defined. Further, he disclosed their phonetic values through their positions and relations. In addition, he went on to describe the metres and this description merits an analysis and discussion.

Hâzim places his understanding of the reality of the poetic metres on the basis of the temporal succession of both the *mutaḥarrik* and *sâkin*, the proportional relation in the number of these letters according to each other and their relevant position. As such, he distinguishes the criteria of each metre. Thus each of the *mutaḥarrik* and *sâkin* has a role in constituting the metre; the *sâkin* being a vocal halt, whilst the *mutaḥarrik* is a vocal continuation and rhythmic overflow. He, therefore, draws attention to the necessity for a balance in the distribution of these caesuras and continuities, namely, the distribution of *mutaḥarrik wa sâkin*. This is because excessive *sawâkin* make the metre drawn together and rigid, i.e. having rhythmic contraction and shrinking. In contrast to this, a minority of *sawâkin* alongside a larger number of *mutaḥarrikât* generates in the metres an extended overflow, freedom from constraint and grace, i.e. generating a rhythmic breadth and extension. Naturally, a succession of

mutaḥarrik must include *sawâkin* intervals, but the latter should be limited, the presence of which thereby contributing in achieving the rhythmic abundance in the metre. Consequently, the most prominent accepted quality of the metre is *sabâṭa*, i.e. both an overflow and easiness (of no constraints) in the phonetical constitution of the metre; whereas the most unacceptable quality of the metre is *ja^cûda* which means halting and rugged constitution. *Ja^cûda* also incorporates two further terms - *kazâza* (tediousness) and *taqabbuḍ* (shrinking and rough) - being used by Ḥâzim as extended illustrations. To Ḥâzim, metre is *sabṭ* when there are three successive *mutaḥarrik* in its phonetic constitution and it becomes *ja^cd* when this constitution contains four successive *sâkin*:

Poetic metres are of two kinds, either *sabṭ* or *ja^cd*. Those which are *sabṭ* contain three successive *mutaḥarrik* in its constitution, the *ja^cd* metres being constituted by means of four successive *sâkin* which either come in two parts (*taf^cîla*) or contain three *sâkin* in one part. 'By their successive' I mean that only one *mutaḥarrik* separates two *sâkin* (31).

Concerning the metres, there are those which hold a mid-way position between *sabṭ* and *ja^cd* states. These medium metres "are those in which three *sâkin* exist in *juz'ayn* (two feet) or two *sâkin* in one *juz'* (one foot) (32).

Ḥâzim summarizes this outlook in a statement of considerable import in which he indicates that the phonetic proportional

relation he has already referred to is the essence of poetry. He concludes his remark as regards the balance between the *mutaḥarrikât* and *sawâkin*, i.e. that which achieves the realization of the phonetic proportion. He, furthermore, specifies the proportion of the *sâkin* in relation to the *mutaḥarrik*, limiting it to around one-third.

Constitution out of the proportional relation has a sweetness to the ear. That which has been constituted out of the non-proportionally related or equivalent, is by no means sweet or pleasant. To that which has been constituted in accordance with the technique formulated has to be called poetry, having of necessity a recognized system; for we put forward our conditions to be observed in the poetic system, namely, that it should be gratifyingly sweet. That which has been constituted with too many *sâkin* is rugged and lacks grace; whilst that of a majority of *mutaḥarrik* possesses gracefulness and smoothness. The metre containing many *sâkin* can be made the same if we reduce, though not excessively, some of its *sâkin*, thereby creating a balance. They [the prosodists] have always been of the opinion that the number of *sâkin* should hover on one-third of the total number of both the *mutaḥarrik wa sâkin*, though a slight increase or decrease is allowable, but, when it is less than one-third, it is more appropriate than when it is more than one-third (33).

The proportion according to which Ḥâzim specifies the number of the *sâkin* in relation to the *mutaḥarrik* in the acceptable phonetic constitution of the metre, has in actual fact materialized in the constitution of the *taf^cîla*:

It will be interesting to note that Ḥâzim's concept regarding the number of *sâkin* in the metre is correct if we study this phenomenon by means of the quantitative analysis of any *taf^cîla*. It is of

interest to note that the proportion of the *sâkin* in relation to the total number of the whole - hovering normally on one-third - could be fractionally more or less, but it will not conspicuously surpass one-third (34).

In fact, three centuries before Ḥâzim, this theory of phonetic proportionality was illustrated at length and with great accuracy in *Rasâ'il Ikhwân al-Şafâ*, their analysis of Arabic metres being based on a theoretical hypothesis of the ideal metre, i.e. proportionality exists only in metres which do not contain *ziḥâf* and *illa*.

Wa aladhi ghayr munzaḥif min al-ash'âr (poetry composed in a complete form) i.e. without the employment of *ziḥâf* or *illa*) within which there lies a proportion between its *sâkin* and *mutaḥarrik* letters, e.g. *ṭawîl*, *madîd* and *basîṭ*, each of which are composed of eight *maqâṭi'* (*taf'îlât*):

<i>fa'ûlun,</i>	<i>fa'ûlun,</i>	<i>mafâ'ilun,</i>
<i>mafâ'ilun,</i>	<i>fa'ûlun,</i>	<i>mafâ'ilun,</i>
<i>fa'ûlun,</i>	<i>mafâ'ilun,</i>	<i>fa'ûlun,</i>
<i>mafâ'ilun.</i>		

These eight *taf'îlât* are composed of twelve *sabab* and eight *watad*, totalling forty-eight letters; twenty letters are *sâkin* and twenty-eight letters are *mutaḥarrik*. *Maşra'* (*shaṭr*) is composed of twenty-four letters; ten are *sâkin* and fourteen are *mutaḥarrik*. Half of the *maşra'*, which is a quarter of the verse, comprises twelve letters; five are *sâkin* and seven are *mutaḥarrik*. The percentage of the *sâkin* to the *mutaḥarrik* within the quarter is the same as the percentage of the *sâkin* to the *mutaḥarrik* in the half which is also the same as the percentage of the *sâkin* to the *mutaḥarrik* in the whole. And the percentage of the *sâkin* to the *mutaḥarrik* within the third is the same between them in the half; and it is the same, like the percentage between the *sâkin* and *mutaḥarrik* in the verse as a whole. Each verse in poetry which is free of *ziḥâf* and *illa* exists in this form (35).

There is no doubt that Ḥāzīm was acquainted with *Ikhwān al-Ṣafā'* - their respective estimations being almost identical - but his distribution was on a more practical level considering the reality of the metres as they existed in Arabic poetry (i.e. taking *ziḥāf* and *ʿilla* into consideration). This matter raises the question that if proportionality, in the eyes of *Ikhwān al-Ṣafā'*, does not exist in those metres which contain *ziḥāf* and *ʿilla*, "does this then mean that they laid down the condition that proportionality cannot be achieved within those metres containing *ziḥāf* and *ʿilla*?" (36)

Ḥāzīm extended this notion by describing and evaluating in depth the phonetic potentiality of the Arabic metre.

Whoever follows up what the poets have said concerning all the prosodic patterns may find that the things said about them are as varied as their variations in metre. In addition, some of them may make one more infatuated by them rather than others. Of most sublime degree are *ṭawīl* and *basīṭ*; next to these two are *wāfir* and *kāmil*. The poet has more scope at his disposal in *kāmil* than in any of the others. As regards *sarīf* and *rajaz*, they are noted for their rigidity. *Basīṭ* possesses smoothness and grace; *kāmil* is lucidly plentiful and of smooth flow; *khafīf* also possesses gracefulness; and *mutaqārib* is of smoothness and ease (37).

It is this foundation that makes Ḥāzīm reject the proposition that there are sixteen metres in the Arabic verse as is commonly known. Rather, he is of the opinion that there are only fourteen metres:

The metres which show proof of having been used by the Arabs are fourteen in all, i.e. *ṭawīl*, *basīṭ*, *madīd*, *wāfir*, *kāmil*, *raġaz*, *ramāl*, *hazaj*, *munsariḥ*, *khafīf*, *sarī^c*, *mutaqārib*, *muqtaḍab*, *mujttath* ... As regards the metre which they call *mudāri^c* and its claim to Arabic origins, I cannot find a greater fabrication or a falsehood more deserving of rejection because it is a total impossibility for Arab nature or taste to produce something of that ilk It is the most ridiculous, despicable metre which has ever been heard and therefore cannot possibly be accepted or even used (38).

Clearly enough, the proportional relation in its phonetic foundation discussed previously, is the criterion applied by Ḥāzim not only in defining metres and their relative characteristics, but in both negotiating some of these metres and rejecting the idea that they are some of the produce of the Arabs. Such a criterion assumes a decisive stance in rejecting the *mudāri^c*:

About *mudāri^c*, it contains nothing but ugliness and it should not be counted as one of the Arabic metres; it has been established analogically but it is an ineffectual analogy (39).

Ḥāzim then places metre as the essential part of poetry, as the metre, which contains the principal theme, is constituted by the phonetic performance and as such presents that theme in an imaginative way before the audience, be it a listener or a reader. In addition, he discloses the essential core of this performance and the phonetic constitution, a revelation in which he constantly affirms the aesthetic basis in the art of poetry and of music - this being the subject of the following section in which we will examine rhythm as the essence of the metre.

II RHYTHM AS A BASIS FOR POETICAL MUSIC

As we have seen, the previous section of this chapter examined the concept that metre is the essence of poetical work. This section takes that notion further, for metre, although being the essential part of the music of poetry, is not the sole contributor as poetic music is far more comprehensive than just metre. Modern studies have discovered an enormous musical potential in the poem which arises out of the special treatment of language. All these discoveries have been focused on the term 'Rhythm' which is established on proportion. These modern studies of the rhythmic basis of poetical work have reached the following conclusions: Firstly, rhythm includes metre in addition to other elements; that is to say, the music of poetry includes traditional metric forms and goes beyond that to include some other elements. Secondly, the 'other elements' which have been added to rhythm and poetical music to extend beyond metre and traditional prosodic studies are related to the ways in which words have been organized and put in proportional order within the poem.

...

On these bases, rhythm in poetry results from the poetical language, which in itself, is just ordinary language but the poet deals with it in a special way by exploring the richness in sounds and revealing the hidden potentiality of the language and organizing the recurrence of those sounds in equal time periods.

There is no doubt that this equality in the time periods is the tool which achieves the proportionality which is the foundation and principle of rhythm in poetry, in music and in all types of art.

Modern Arab scholars have adopted this concept by looking at rhythm from the aspect of proportion. This team of scholars have started to evaluate classical Arabic prosody from this new standpoint by re-interpreting the rules and form of Arabic prosody and consequently re-evaluating both the classical and modern forms of Arabic poetry as a whole. Some of these scholars have arrived at very important results in this field. They not only found that the term *wazn* is equivalent to the term *metre* in English but that *metre* is more specific than *rhythm*. As the Greek philologist Suidas (dates unknown - presumed 10th. century A.D.) claimed, "Rhythm is the origin of metre". The Arab scholar sees that *rhythm* is a category in itself and *metre* is a sub-section of that category. Viewed in this light, the word 'rhythm' is sometimes used to refer to the existence of proportion in general and at other times to the manifestation and the investigation of its existence (40).

According to the scholars of this new approach, this research leads us to a precise and thorough interpretation of the 'music' in Arabic poetry as this tendency requires researching issues which have not been explored in classical prosody, such as the study of *rhythm* and its relationship to *metre*, the

characteristics of each individual consonant and vowel sounds and the difference in syllable length and stress. These aspects have to be investigated by any scholar researching Arabic prosody today (41). This new approach explains in a direct way that Khalîl's [°]arûḍ remains a basis for research as the modern prosodic approach is founded on the explanation of his [°]arûḍ and also builds upon it.

As a matter of fact, we see that Khalîl's system ([°]arûḍ) ... as a framework of Arabic metre which could be used and benefited from, even though it is not adequate enough to explain the nature of rhythm in this metre. We can also see, through the rules of *ziḥâf* and [°]illa which are associated with the different forms of *taf[°]îla* certain phenomena inducted through Arabic poetry and which cannot be rejected except by a similar or more comprehensive induction. Thus the rules of the [°]arûḍ of al-Khalîl are like a frame within which we try to fit rhythmic study. The study of rhythm from our point of view is the most important aspect as it can yield the general rules of the music in Arabic poetry. In the light of these general rules we can attain what lies behind the partial rules listed in al-Khalîl's [°]arûḍ in addition to understanding the relationship between them, whether these rules deal with the reality of the Arabic metres or finally if this hypothesis is based merely on theory rather than the reality of poetry. We can find out whether those rules are incomplete and whether they require supplementation on the one hand, or deletion, if excessive, on the other (42).

The modern approach has settled at this point and become the dependable theory in the study of traditional prosody and of the Arabic poetic heritage itself. In this respect, it seems that this theory follows the same direction as that of modern science; in this field it considers that rhythm is more comprehensive than

metre and poetical music is more comprehensive than conventional prosody. It accepts that rhythm includes metre and has been based on its principle and poetical music includes conventional prosodic forms founded on their principle.

According to the previous argument, an inevitable question should be asked at this stage of research. Should Ḥâzim's concepts, in this respect, be confined to the traditional *‘arûḍ* as an indistinguishable component? Or do his concepts still contain some notions which can be considered helpful in modern research for poetical music in Arabic poetry?

- a) Ḥâzim surpassed the old Arab scholars of prosody in having a more comprehensive range of vision. However, as a result of his thorough research and unique genius he went further to discover other concepts. We are going to explain here those issues of agreement and disagreement that lay between him and his predecessors - the rhetoricians, critics or philosophers - thereby reaching the concluding results of this chapter, the estimations of his special points of view and his ideological diligence in the field of poetical music.

A large proportion of his work *al-Minhâj* is devoted to the discussion of prosody and the music of poetry - a subject which clearly took first priority from Ḥâzim's point of view. What is of great import, however, is that the treatment of this subject has been based on the same linguistic principles as modern

studies of poetical music. These linguistic principles do not seem to be arbitrarily mentioned in short ambiguous sentences that occur occasionally without calculated intent in Ḥâzim's work. Rather, they appear with purposive deliberation in every discussion concerning the subject. This therefore, clearly indicates that, to Ḥâzim, these linguistic principles are the fixed perspectives and the essential part of his general artistic philosophy. These principles are summed up in one rule which is the backbone of poetical and all artistic work, i.e. the rule of order and proportion.

To Ḥâzim, the principle of proportion was of paramount importance. On this proportion - according to his view and formulation of it - the artistic work is based through which comprehensive rhetorics can be reached and the essence of the nature of art can be attained.

According to what I introduce into the types of estimation of the breakdown of Arabic metre, what is combined with it and suspected of being the Arabic origin or associated with it, have to be depended on, as the fulfilment of the division of the proportional form of metre requires that the estimations of these metres should be according to the method I mentioned and its division according to the way I explained previously. Anyone with the slightest sense of perception will have no doubts that what I mentioned is the indisputable truth regarding what I said related to *‘ilm al-lisân al-kullî*, which is the only principle according to which *‘ilm al-lisân al-juz’î* - i.e. *‘arûḍ* - and its principles can be explained, as *‘ilm al-lisân al-kullî* is founded on logical principles, philosophical and musical views and others. Our discourse on this subject deserves to be trusted and relied on (43).

Proportion, for Ḥâzim, requires intuitively the principle of timing in poetry; that is to say, the principle of allowing equal periods of time. Ḥâzim does not hint at this principle in an indeterminate fashion but rather he established it originally and convincingly. For him, poetic measurement can be defined according to the principle of proportion on the timing articulation of linguistic phonetic elements that constitute the poetical phrase. Ḥâzim took his notion regarding time further, thereby extending this idea by making these equal timing periods in articulation within the metre as a means whereby the metre can be identified and its essence determined.

Metre is one of the essential elements upon which poetry is based. In itself, metre is that the rhyming measurement possesses parity in time as both the amount and order of the *sakanât* and *ḥarakât* contained within it are in agreement. If we reduce some of them [according to the rules of *ziḥâf* and *‘illa* previously explained] we can depend on the remainder and make the *sakanât* and *ḥarakât* replace the time of articulation that has been cut off. In this way the two entities are balanced and become parallel. The increase of one entity to equal the others is achievable on condition that the *sawâkin* alone are used as they are the shortest letters in time and are found acceptable on the grounds of familiarity. They are considered permissible on the basis of taste for that reason (44).

As has been mentioned, Ḥâzim's approach to these principles led him to what is called *al-‘ilm al-kullî* by which he interpreted the nature of poetical work relating its nature to the aesthetic, structural, musical and imaginative aspects of this work. Ḥâzim himself, has mentioned on more than one

occasion that the principle of proportion leads the literary critic towards comprehensive knowledge, that is to say, knowledge of comprehensive rhetorics for the original aesthetic and theoretical principles of literary art.

Knowledge of the proportion system in what we hear and what we understand cannot be approached by any means of the linguistic sciences. It can only be reached by the comprehensive knowledge which is the science of rhetorics that includes all the structural details such as the genres of proportion and position. As a result we discover what lies behind the means of considerations which exists in all these different aspects. The objective in all of this is directed toward one goal which is to adopt what is suitable and to avoid what is repulsive (45).

Naturally, this rhetorical method does not satisfy both the traditional prosodic and rhetorical points of view as they were - as Ḥâzim assumed - unfamiliar with it; that is to say they were unfamiliar with proportion as the real explanation of poetical metre and its principle.

For these reasons, and all those of similar nature which cannot be mentioned in this situation, the rhetoric prospective necessitates a different adjustment of the many estimations of metre than that considered by the scholars of prosody who, being ignorant of the means of proportion and incompatibility, divided many metres into certain partitions that resulted in discordance. Therefore, we investigated and correctly re-established the proportional division of every metre (46).

We are gratified here to see Ḥâzim's awareness of proportion and his belief in it as a foundation for poetical music, not to

mention observing the extent of his far-sightedness in this subject compared to the traditional rhetoricians and prosodic scholars. He reached such a degree of confidence that he concluded that they were totally unaware of this main principle.

- b) The principle of proportion cannot be overlooked by anyone reading Ḥâzim's work, as it dominates the book quite clearly. At almost every turn he explains 'rhythm' as a dynamic part of poetry and arts in general. To him, the subject is quite clear and therefore his establishment of it is so decisive and definite.

The proportional components occur in the association among *mutamâthilât* (isometric feet) and among *mutadâri'ât* (symmetric feet) but cannot exist in association amongst *mutadâddât* (opposing ones) or *mutanâfirât* (discordant ones) (47).

There is nothing further to be added to Ḥâzim's notion of harmony resulting in proportion, and incompatibility resulting in disproportion, the concept itself being the essential origin of art. Ḥâzim was not only content to explain that proportion is the prime aesthetic principle of artistic creativity in general, but he went on to establish in a theoretical and philosophical manner, the association of this essential aesthetic principle with the nature of the process of human perception or human intuition itself, *shîmat al-nafs* ('temper of the self') and with the means of total perception. Man tires of perceiving plain invariable elements but becomes appreciative and stimulated on perceiving multifarious complex elements and their

construction. Naturally, therefore, the simple plain element bears no relation to proportion as the lack of variety of elements cannot create harmony whilst compatibility is part and parcel of the variable complex element. For proportion to be achieved it is essential that the various different components within the structure harmonize with each other, which thereby protects these elements from discordance.

Everything the human being perceives is either a plain simple thing without any variety in origin or something composed of a variety of elements. *Shîmat al-nafs* naturally prefers mental diversity which involves stimulation. It is logical, therefore, to get bored with simple things of no variety which limit the scope of perception. Although human nature likes to change from one variable to another, it can retain interest in the complex perceived object far longer than in that which is simple. The more the varieties of the things and its types are arranged in a harmonized system and proportional composition, the more it becomes admirable and exciting to the human self, thus giving contentment (48).

It is important here, while discussing rhythm - and its dependency on proportion - to stop a while in order to adequately peruse Ḥâzim's extensive study of the association of poetry and music. Although the rhythmical association between poetry and music was recognized within Arabic philosophy (49) at that time, Arabic literary criticism on the other hand was unaware of this principle.

However, regarding Ḥâzim, this was not the case for his setting of the aesthetic principles depends on both the philosophical and

critical heritage. We find him using the heritage of philosophy as a base for the theory of poetry and he made the aesthetics of poetry associated with that of the other arts, especially music. On the issue of rhythm, we find him dealing with the problems of Arabic prosody depending explicitly on musicology. He illustrates this problem in the following quotation:

It is clear that in the work of music, *fa^cûlât* is in antipodal opposition to *fâ^cilât*. In the same way, *fa^cûlun* is also in antipodal opposition to *fâ^cilu* [names of feet] because of the difference in their position. The first begins with a vowel followed by a consonant and ends with a consonant followed by two vowels; while the second begins with two vowels followed by a consonant and ends with a vowel followed by a consonant. How is it, however, that the two oppositions are treated symmetrically in an order that is intended to achieve auditory proportion? (50)

When Ḥâzim decided to set down fixed objective criteria to what he called *al-^cilm al-kullî* of poetical art, we find him considering these criteria clearly as "logical origins, philosophical and musical views and others." (51). However, the phrase "and others" is ambiguous as it does not determine exactly Ḥâzim's intended meaning. Therefore, he replaced it with what could clearly explain his intention. He concludes many a discourse - within the book - with three criteria: rhetorical, musical and aesthetical. He mentioned that he contradicted the scholars of prosody and opposed their limited partial knowledge based on his opinion of "rhetorical criteria, musical laws and good taste." (52).

It is known that good taste for Ḥâzim is not an individual matter of absolute subjectivity, but it is built upon knowledge of all the heritage of poetry, depth of vision and much practising and training.

- c) Ḥâzim's uniqueness amongst traditional Arab critics stems from the fact that he combined the traditional theoretical principles of philosophy with those essential artistic facts deduced from the Arabic literary heritage that preceded him. Upon this foundation he was able to establish the principles of a general theory for the art of poetry which explains the philosophical, ideological and aesthetic aspects contained within it. It seems so clear in this general theory that he is referring to rhythm as an essence of the art of poetry - as it is an essence of arts in general. He related this essence to the principle of proportion. It seems clear that he associates - in his unique foundation of rhythm and proportion - the arts of music and poetry.

But the theory of art refers in its general rules that although arts share common principles, they differ in others. The main differences between them are the tools which the arts invented in order to convey their messages. Every art is distinguished one from another by the tool that formulates its content. However, what is Ḥâzim's perspective of this subject? He paused at length to think about the association of the art of poetry and that of music. However, the question is, did he look at the distinctive

features of every art? Ḥâzim was clearly aware that the principle in the two arts - music and poetry - is the same but they differ from each other in the nature of their tools. He had no doubts that rhythmic and musical effects created by poetry are the products of the actual characteristics of its tool, which is its language. That is to say, these effects arise out of the way in which the linguistic sounds are used and the way language is treated in general. This idea of aesthetic origin, the distinction of poetry by its tool, has been established in Ḥâzim's work. But there are three points that need to be mentioned in this respect as they adhere to the traditional approach.

First: Ḥâzim's conception that the formulation is a process which follows the content. In this notion he was in agreement with the *waṣiyya* of Abû Tammâm - as mentioned previously in the first section of this chapter - that the poet should keep his mind unrestricted to follow at will the inclinations of his thoughts, after which he then chooses deliberation, etc. (53).

Second: The poet thinks of his meaning in prose before he formulates it in a suitable metrical form; that is to say, the poetical work could be accomplished in two stages, arriving at the meaning in prose and then transferring this meaning which is in prose form to poetic metric form (54).

Third: As a result of the previous two procedures, the selected metre that is closest to the meaning that had been thought of in prose form, can be one of three possibilities; either the metre matches the meaning in terms of size, is greater than the meaning or falls short of it.

It is inevitable for the prosody of poetry to be long, short or medium; the long is mostly a surplus in amount according to the measurement of meaning, which necessitates the need for tautology. The short is too narrow to accommodate the meaning and shorter than it, which makes it necessary to adopt summarizing and deletion. The medium is mostly equal in its phrases to metrical amounts, therefore ensuring there will not be any surplus or shortage and consequently will be no need for tautology or deletion. But it shares with the long and the short the need for other procedures of *cadl* (the replacement of meaning), *wa badl* (the substitution of one letter for another), *taqdîm* (precedence) and *ta>khîr* (anastrophe), or possibly more than one of these procedures (55).

In fact, these procedures themselves are the general characteristics of the classical, aesthetical and linguistic thinking in which there is a separation between content and form and which gives the content preference over the form. Meaning is first perceived by the poet as scattered phrases; he then arranges them in "measured poetical phrases. It is important to mention these defects in the old ideology - Arabic or non-Arabic - to attract attention to the fact that Ḥāzīm al-Qarṭājannī was following the same known approach ideologically and aesthetically at his time. He, however, went beyond that approach, adopting the principle of proportion as being the essential foundation in the arts. In addition, he surpassed his predecessors - the

prosodists and critics - by mastering the knowledge of poetical and philosophical heritage. He arrived at the precise theoretical formations of the principles and aesthetic rules for artistic work by associating poetry and music with proportion and rhythm and distinguished them on the basis of their tools.

III THE ROLE OF RHYME IN THE MUSIC OF THE QAṢĪDA

- a) Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî recognised the rhythmic and semantic functions of rhyme. He not only linked the effective performance of the meaning with the successful choice of the rhyme, but discovered, in addition, an essential rhythmic function of the rhyme in Arabic poems.

Modern Arabic studies on the music of Arabic poetry have, in the main, agreed with Ḥâzim's observations which clearly demonstrates that he was the pioneer in this field. In this respect, Shukrî 'Ayyâd, saw that rhyme has an individual musical value besides its rhythmical function and tried to justify the constant usage of rhyme in Arabic poetry which he put down to the multiple choice of rhyming words that are available in the Arabic language. This is the reason why the principle of a one-rhyme poem has persisted in the Arabic *qaṣîda*. In addition, he also mentioned another feature in the Arabic language, namely the flexible use of root derivatives which facilitates the task of the poet in forming words of one rhyme derived from different ending stems in origin. He gives, as examples, the following words: *'alâ'im*, *qâ'im* and *yulâ'im*. From this we can see why the Arabic language is so fertile in the creation of poems of tens of verses of in one rhyme (56).

Jâbir ʿUṣfûr confirmed the strong relationship between rhyme and the meaning (content) which metre tries to imitate by means of sound, especially the point that:

... rhyme is the centre of the important emphasis in the verse, being *ḥawâfir al-shiʿr wa mawaqifah* (the hooves and halts of poetry) [Ḥâzim's expression]. If the rhyme occurs in an appropriate position, the concordant metre is established naturally with good caesuras and endings. So, there should be nothing happening within the rhyme apart from that which has a favourable effect on the self according to the theme on one hand and to the proportion of the metre on the other. Moreover, the relativity of rhyme to metre makes rhyme function as an ending of a verse in the same way the 'finale' works in the musical phrase (57).

Ḥâzim began his definition of rhyme in the Arabic poem with what had already been outlined in the extant literature on prosody. It is common knowledge that rhyme is that part of speech which occurs at the end of each verse of the poem. The first verse in the poem governs the rest according to both the metre and the rhyme. The essential part of the rhyme is the letter called *rawiyy* which is the last consonant (sound) in the verse. The poem is built upon *rawiyy* by which it is described, e.g. *sîniyya* (S-rhyme poem), *mîmiyya* (M-rhyme poem), etc. *Rawiyy* could be found standing by itself with the minimum amount of sounds needed to make a rhyme. "Rawiyy could be considered then, as the backbone and the focal point of rhyme with everything else going 'marginally' around it" (58). Thus, *rawiyy* is the letter on which the *qaṣîda* or poem is built and

which has to be repeated in each verse. Ḥâzim summed up all these rules in the following:

Rhymes have to be committed to many things; those things are letters and *ḥarakât* and *sukûn*. It is necessary for the rhyme to have *maqṭaʿ*^c - which is *rawiyy* - either *mutaḥarrik* or *sâkin* (i.e. combined with a vowel or not) which has to be repeated throughout the length of the whole poem. It is not acceptable to use any approximate sound in its place (or in conjunction with it), or, to combine with it two different vowels, for example, (a) *raf*^c and (b) *khafḍ* or anything else (59).

However, as far as Ḥâzim was concerned, rhyme could only be used in Arabic poetry and did not exist in any other poetry. "Poetry is a metrical imaginative discourse. Arabic poetry, in addition, possesses rhyme" (60). In this respect, he adopted the notion from Ibn Sînâ and al-Fârâbî. This opinion is given from a historical point of view from the inception of rhyme (61). The most important point in this subject is to look at the aesthetic, rhythmic and musical principles which Ḥâzim has discovered in the rhyme of the Arabic poem.

- b) The first essential role that rhyme plays, from a semantic aspect, is in conveying meaning. Ḥâzim, in this respect, deals with rhyme aesthetically as it plays a certain role that differs from the role of all the words of the verse. He sees rhyme as being the brightest part of the verse. This, therefore, makes it necessary for the poet to pay more attention to this part rather than the other parts of the poem so that the use of improper, strange or unsuitable words in the rhyming position may be

avoided. The reason for this is that the audience or reader will pay undue attention to the reading of these words. By the same principle, any improper utterance used within the building of the verse - other positions apart from rhyme - could be concealed by some other words; but the rhyming word remains a prominent point.

What should be a rhyme, from the point of view of *inâyat al-nafs* (self-interest), should include the favourable but not the repulsive meaning; it should not happen to include anything apart from that which could have an effect on the self and which matches with the intended purpose. We should avoid disliked meanings and disgusting utterances, especially those that could be repulsive. What could cause antipathy, if it happens within a verse, might be followed by what covers it and direct the self intention from it. But that which occurs within the rhyme, occurs in the most prominent position and is more inter-linked with *inâyat al-nafs* thus leaving the soul free to observe it and be engaged with it (62).

Ḥâzim's observations, in this matter, are sound as they lay down the right principles regarding the position of the rhyme in the verse and its relationship to the meaning of the verse. This view of his could be one of the most precise treatments of the way a meaning is conveyed in the history of Arabic criticism. He examines things diligently, to approach through this topic the way that art, in general, tries to make the self appeal to certain things and matters or to be deflected from other things and matters.

The *maqâṭi*^c should be the best part of the discourse, considering the verse as a whole. He [the poet] should be aware of not finishing the speech with a disliked utterance or a meaning that

could turn the self away from what it should have been attracted to, or attract it to what it should have been turned away from. In addition, he should take care in the choice of the first part of the final verse of the poem in order not to use what could be disliked even in a deceptive way which could be misinterpreted by the reference of the phrase at the first reading, even though it may rectify the ambiguity later on and refer to a favourable meaning.... Care should be taken in this position because it is the stop of the speech and its end. Making mistakes in this position can erase the previous good effect on the self and there is nothing uglier than disturbance after peace (63).

Scholars have been grateful to Ḥâzim's awareness of the essential aesthetic part which rhyme plays in conveying the meaning.

The first thing Ḥâzim is aware of, is rhyme as the focal point around which the self is concerned. Therefore, his aesthetic direction is conditioned by using nothing with it apart from what is suitable to the subject-matter of the poem. Ḥâzim warns of using disliked utterances or repulsive meanings within the rhyme which could have a bad effect on the self of the recipient (64).

According to this, the first principle is the clearest among the aesthetic principles that deal with the role of rhyme in the Arabic poem. There is no doubt that the clarity of this principle is due to the validity of the general aesthetic theory in Ḥâzim's book.

- c) The second principle is the structural aesthetic principle which is the role of rhyme in the structure of poetic verse. Moreover, its role in the establishment of the relationship of a verse with the preceding and following verses of the poem. Here, in

general, Ḥâzim shows an originality in his artistic sense and the conciseness of his poetic theory in particular. He originates the role of rhyme by putting it in four categories. The rhyme, whether dependent or not, can not help but be anything except these four categories as distinguished by him:

... which should be rhyme, in respect of being separate and independent from what follows or is combined to it, cannot be anything apart from: a word occurring within the rhyme is not dependent on what follows nor what follows is dependent on it; both rhyme and what follows are dependent on each other; the rhyme itself is dependent on what follows but what follows is not dependent on it; and what follows is dependent on the rhyme but the rhyme is not dependent on what follows (65).

Ḥâzim does not stop at the mere categorization, but he gives an aesthetic evaluation, grading these four categories according to the goodness and badness from an aesthetic point of view.

The first division is the most favourable one of all. The worst one is that division which stands in exact opposition to the first. The need for the completion of the first verse to the other is called *taḍmîn* (enjambment), for the completion of its meaning lies within the second verse (66).

Ḥâzim makes use of this principle, as outlined above, in setting a complete perspective of the structure of the verse of the poem relying, in this perspective, on the position of rhyme and its rhythmic, structural and semantic role. There are two basic methods available to the poet in the constitution of the poetic verse. Ḥâzim summarizes these methods as follows:

The poet cannot help building the first part of the verse dependent on the rhyme or building the rhyme dependent on the first part of the verse. Both users of these two methods must either intentionally contrapose meanings [by employing antithesis or similitude, etc.] or deliberately avoid it (67).

There are only two obvious ways in constituting the verse. They are based on a fixed aesthetic principle; either the *ṣadr* (first half of the verse) is built on the rhyme or the rhyme is built dependently on the *ṣadr* and based on its structure. According to both methods, the poet either bases the structure on the contraposition between the verse and the preceding verses of the poem or he does not base it on such a method.

Ḥâzim determines his view of this precise aesthetic problem as he notices from the aesthetic point of view, the preference of having the poet base the *ṣadr* of his verse on the rhyme. He relies, in this respect, on aesthetic origins which he explains in two general methods. The first method is to build the *ṣadr* depending on the rhyme.

The first one, depending on contraposition with the *ṣadr* of its verses being built on the rhymes, possesses *ḥusn al-naẓm* (excellence of versification) because of the harmony between the first parts of the verses and the preceding verses - which are essential to the structure - is arrived at easily in most cases, as every meaning has other meanings which are associated with it either by the aspects of *mumâthala* (resemblance), *munâsaba* (suitability), *mukhâlafa* (contradiction), *muḍâdda* (opposition), *mushâbaha* (similarity), or *muqâsama* (sharing). If he [the poet] chooses the meaning of the rhyme, or what follows the rhyme, and contraposes it with the *ṣadr*,

employing one of the aspects just mentioned, then it will not be difficult to find a meaning which can be attributed to the rhyme meaning or to the meaning of the preceding verse (68).

The second method is based on building the rhyme on the *ṣadr*.

The one depending on contraposition in which rhymes are based on the *ṣadr* chooses the meaning of the *ṣadr* first, then looks at what could be a rhyme in itself; or, what could be combined to the rhyme as an addition to the implication of the meaning in order to form a contrast with the first meaning. Although the user of this method has made it easy for himself in choosing what could be used as the *ṣadr* of his verse to build his discourse on and what could be related to the preceding meaning, he, at the same time, has restricted himself. This is because of the difficulty involved in finding a meaning that contraposes the *ṣadr* and which either matches the *rawiyy* and its sentence structure and end, or which relates to what is suitable to the *rawiyy* in its sentence structure and end. Both ways are very rare although the second type can be found more often than the first. If he [the poet] uses this method he is likely to fall prey to affectation by using the discordant meanings instead of using the intended suitable meanings (69).

Thus Ḥâzim ends - according to the two previous principles - to a complete and thorough perspective of the rhyme and its semantic and formal functions or, in general, its aesthetic role. This perspective of rhyme attracted the attention of modern scholars who are concerned with Ḥâzim's works, studying them in the light of modern criticism theory. Some of these scholars have seen a successful and serious attempt in Ḥâzim's concept of rhyme to justify its importance in Arabic poetry. This justification is based on two aspects. The first is related to the desire of the Arabs to distinguish between the precise differences of

meanings. This is because it was possible for the Arabs - Ḥâzim claims - to make certain signs to distinguish the differences in meaning apart from the differences of the endings in the same way as some other nations did.

The second aspect is related to the joy produced by the regular repetition of the final syllables. If Arab poets used - Ḥâzim claimed - the endings of the discourse in poetry haphazardly, then there would be no indication of joyful effect, as joy is always related to a proportional system. There is no doubt that such justification takes us back to the essential aspect of metre and music as it is related to distinctive aesthetic value (70).

An evaluation of Ḥâzim's theory of the rhythm and music of poetry will be discussed in the following section.

IV EVALUATION

- a) Poetry is composed of words which have a special order according to a sequence of *mutaḥarrikat* and *sawâkin* from which poetry gets its peculiarity of metre and rhythm. This order depends on the unique synchronisation between the sounds of the words and the equal weight given to each which determines the final shape of the metre which is the essential element of poetry.

The essential part of poetry and its essence ... to be a discourse composed of that which imitates the matter. It should be divided into parts to be articulated in equal timing (71).

Opinion has it that the element of time in Hâzim's poetry manifests the criteria of harmonious sounds between the letters of the words; he defined metre according to that equal timing in articulation, following his revered master, Ibn Sînâ, in his belief that rhythm:

... is the measurement of the timing of taps. If the tapping happens to have a tune, then the rhythm becomes a melody. If this tapping occurs through the ordered letters from which the discourse is composed, the rhythm then becomes poetic (72).

This proportionality is the essential principle in the musical form of the metre that evokes pleasure within the soul. "It is the harmonious structure of prosody that gives poetry its beauty" (73) just like the harmony that results from the regular impulses

of music. The analogy between music and prosody is an old concept in Arabic tradition that dates from the *Mu^Ctazilite* Jâhiz who stated that "the measurement of both poetry and music is from the same species". "The book of prosody is from the book of music" (74).

Ibn Fâris (d. 395/1004) also stated:

The prosodists were in agreement that there is no difference between the art of prosody and the art of rhythm [rhythm here refers to music]. The art of rhythm is defined by tunes and the art of prosody defined by letters] (75).

It had also become a traditionally accepted practice amongst philosophers to look at poetic music through the psychological and emotional evocation on both the creator and the receiver.

It is in the nature of animals and of men that when transported by joy they voice a sound and man when seized by regret, or mercy, or anger or any such emotion, also gives it voiced expression (76).

It has also been said that:

...
The generating causes behind poetic talent is the tendency of people to love harmonious composition and melody, and as metre was found to be akin to music in this respect the souls leaned towards it and gave it existence. Poeticalness was born because of these two factors (77).

- b) Hâzim, however, although in agreement with those prosodic rules established by al-Khalîl, found that Arabic poetic music

extended beyond these rules to encompass the way in which poetry employed the language, i.e. what he called the poetic language in itself. In addition, Ḥâzim agreed with the emotional and psychological effect but he also realised that this matter did not stop here. Rather, it reached out further to embody the relationship between the poetic music and its meaning.

Thus, by inter-weaving the conclusions reached by his predecessors in both fields, Ḥâzim tried to re-build a complete, theoretical framework which included, as a result of his critical and artistic awareness, his own original notions. This theoretical framework, as noted in the three previous sections of this chapter, was built upon three aesthetic, theoretical pillars.

- i) The first was philosophy about poetic metres: it was customary for rhetoricians and critics to account for the components of metre, i.e. *sabab*, *watad*, and *taf'ila*, etc. in a statistical, normative fashion, and they therefore failed to consider the possibility of further theoretical causes to explain this discipline. Ḥâzim, in trying to elaborate on this point, found that the words in poetry were brought together in a specific, individual order, according to the successive *mutaḥarrik wa sâkin* letters. In his opinion it was this which gave poetry its measurement, rhythm and music because this harmony is dependent on the timing proportion and compatibility between the letters of the words. As a result, Ḥâzim stated that the essence and philosophy of poetry is the proportionate timing

of sounds because it is this proportion which lends the metre its
aesthetical value.

- ii) The second is a linguistic philosophy for poetic music: Arab rhetoricians and critics, in dealing with Arabic poetical music, used to restrict themselves to the prosodic units or elements themselves. Ḥâzim, on the other hand, was much more far-sighted and in his observations regarding the manner with which the poet deals with the language he looked beyond the confines of this limited attitude to the tools of poetry, i.e. the language itself. By taking this viewpoint, he found that the music of the poem emanated from the language itself, which is a phonetic potential which poetry employs in particular sequences and relationships, the fruition of which brings about the music of poetry - in this respect, Ḥâzim was ahead of his time as his results agree with contemporary aesthetical and linguistic studies. From this, Ḥâzim distinguished between the art of poetry and the art of music. So, to him, when the phonetic potential in the language occurs within a concordant order or relationship, it has its own significance and is connected with a specific meaning or subject. Therefore, the poetic music emerges from the language potential itself; it cannot be considered imitation of artistic music in its rhythm and its tune. This conclusion was of prime importance. Here, Ḥâzim paused at length, the end result being identical to those conclusions reached by modern research.

iii) The third basis is the connection between the music of poetry and its meaning. Here, Ḥâzim found that the aim of the rhythmical structures in the poem is to reveal the semantics and the meaning. The purpose behind the rhythmical composition in the poem is to generate the meaning and connotation, i.e. the meaning, whilst being the fruition of the musical composition, is at the same time, that which gives it its clarity and perfection.

These three pillars determined the general framework for the aesthetical, theoretical construction which Ḥâzim established in the field of poetical music. At the same time, they also determined those aspects of agreement and disagreement that lay between him and the rhetoricians and critics on the one hand, and the psychologists and philosophers on the other. These differing viewpoints, however, need to be illustrated further and examined in detail - a task which will be undertaken in the following two paragraphs.

c) As mentioned before - the conventional prosodic rules of al-Khalîl only cover a part of the music of poetry thus prompting Ḥâzim to intervene in its disciplines, terminology and circles, etc. in a manner that illustrated his disagreement with the prosodists which is outlined in the following three paragraphs.

i) The first is the idea of *al-dawâ'ir al-^carûdiyya* (prosodic circles). It is common knowledge that al-Khalîl divided the Arabic metres into groups based on the similarity between the

syllables, i.e. *asbâb wa awtâd*. He allocated each group of metres to what he referred to as circles, of which there were five in all, each including some of the sixteen metres and each possessing an artistic term (78). Ḥâzim accurately criticized the fundamental basics of these prosodic circles (79). His criticism resulted from his general, aesthetic point of view which was mentioned three units previously.

ii) Secondly, there existed the necessity of establishing compatibility between prosody and the reality of Arabic poetry and its development. This was because the rhetoricians were so conservative in their general attitude towards their literary heritage that they refused to accept the musical development which arose as a new movement in the history of Arabic poetry. Ḥâzim, on the other hand, totally accepted this new innovation in the music of poetry and he encouraged the rhetoricians to acquiesce and incorporate it into Arabic prosodic disciplines. He emphasized that the *dubaytî* metre (80), as used by the new poets, was not Arabic in origin but was employed by the new, progressive rhetoricians. He stated that: "There is no harm in using it because it is pleasing and has an appropriate position" (81).

In addition to accepting the new musical ideas, which had been rejected by the rhetoricians, Ḥâzim also found some of the notions held by the same rhetoricians unacceptable. This rejection was not based on his own personal preference but rather

on artistic grounds and aesthetic principles. The basis on which he established his rejection was extremely important as it was concerned with the incompatibility of the subject matter to the nature of Arabic poetry and to Arabic taste. In this respect, we have for example, Ḥâzim's opinion regarding *muḍâri*^c metre - as mentioned in the first section of this chapter - as being, from his point of view, totally alien to Arabic taste and as such he demanded that it should not be used. He claimed that the metre was merely an invention of *Shu*^c*ba b. Birsâm*, being just a thought which was established on the pretence of using analogy (82).

To summarize what Ḥâzim says in this respect, he accepted new metres and prosodic forms which had been rejected by the prosodists. The reasoning behind his acceptance was based on the condition that Arabic prosody was open to new notions as long as they complied in terms of suitability. In addition, his rejection of the other metres and forms traditionally established by prosodists, depended on Arabic poetic history and the nature of Arabic taste.

iii) Thirdly, Ḥâzim's employment of new prosodic terms, the most renowned being the term *arjul*, which had been used in philosophical circles, but under Ḥâzim's treatment, it became distinguished and much more comprehensive by the inclusion of additional prosodic detail. *Rijl* is a musical, phonetic and prosodic term which indicates that part which includes the short

and the long syllables. According to this premise, the sequence of the *arjul* compose the *taf^cîla* and from the sequence of the *taf^cîla* the verse is composed.

Thus, the manner in which Ḥâzim differed from traditional prosody is apparent in his treatment of poetic music in the light of general, aesthetical and linguistic theory.

- d) Ḥâzim absorbed the Muslim philosophical heritage which he then combined to the critical, rhetorical and linguistic legacy, fusing the whole amalgam into an aesthetic, theoretical framework by means of his intellectual abilities. As we have seen, he retained part of the critical, rhetorical and linguistic legacy on the one hand, but disagreed with some aspects on the other. Similarly, whilst keeping part of the Muslim psychological and philosophical legacy intact, he, on the other hand, did not hesitate to disagree with and disregard traditionally accepted principles.

The fundamental or essential rhythmical basis amongst Muslim philosophers was that they connected it to the psychological aspects of the recipients. So, from their point of view, each kind of rhythm contains its own individual, phonetic elements which is why it evokes a special emotional kind of response from the recipient; it means that each melody or tune arouses a specific emotional effect in the recipient, each tune specializing in a certain emotion. Then the Muslim philosophers

drew a parallel between rhythm in the art of music and rhythm in the art of poetry and in doing so, found that just as a specific melody or tune arouses a specific emotion, so each metre of poetry can also arouse a certain kind of feeling which is related to a particular subject. And, according to what has just been said, al-Fârâbî gave the same name to the tune or melody as to the particular emotion which is aroused by it. He drew attention to the necessity of categorizing the tunes and to call them according to the category of the emotions and their names.

The name of the tune is derived from the names of different emotions. We should compose a variety of melodies which correspond to those emotions from which they derive their names. We can call the melody which causes *ḥuznu* (melancholy) either *muḥzinu*, or *ḥazaniyy*, or *taḥzîn*; and that which causes *‘azâ’ wa salwâ* (condolences or forgetfulness) can be called *mu‘azziyan* or *musalliyan* (83).

The same idea was adopted by Ibn Sînâ when he discussed the movement involved in the changing between different rhythms and tunes. From his point of view, he saw a switch in rhythm and tune

... to a sharp rhythm as being that which resembles irascible behaviour and to a heavy tune that which resembles a nature full of composure and forbearance. When the changing, which is built on the lower tune, is lifted effortlessly at the correct moment, it gives the soul a sense of sublimity, wisdom and honesty whilst the opposite gives the soul a sweet condition (84).

Ḥâzim adopted this basis which is to elicit from each kind of rhythm - in both music and poetry - a kind of arousing emotion,

and also to choose a suitable subject for each metre.

Each metre, as it differs from other metres in its order, quantity, percentage of its *mutaḥarrik* and *sâkin* letters, or in some of these aspects, becomes individually distinguishable to the ear. We can distinguish the metre according to this criteria as being mature or immature, or whether it is sublime or despicable and so on, thereby enabling the visual to become proportional to the auditory (85).

This basis, however, which Ḥâzim adopted from the philosophers did not completely dominate his book, but what does is that poetic music is seen to spring from its language which means that the different kinds and forms of poetic music that can be created are infinite because there is no limit to the variety of linguistic expressions. So the poetic metre, from Ḥâzim's point of view, did not confine itself to a few determined subjects, but became more comprehensive to include all the different kinds of emotions or purposes. In this light, the possibilities are uncountable and limitless.

This profound observation of poetic music is the basic difference that lay between Ḥâzim and his psychological and philosophical predecessors and opens the way for us to look at the language of poetry itself.

NOTES

CHAPTER 1

1. °Ayyâd, Shukrî. *Mafhûm al-'Uslûb Bayna al-Turâth al-Naqdî wa Muḥâwalât al-Tajdîd*. *Majallat Fuṣûl*. Cairo, October 1980, Vol. I, No. I, p. 95.
2. °Ayyâd, Shukrî. See the article *Qirâ'a 'Uslûbiyya li Shi'r Ḥâfiẓ*. *Majallat Fuṣûl*. Cairo, March 1983, Vol. III, No. 2, p. 14.
3. There is evidence that the Arabs knew about prosody (°arûḍ) although their knowledge had not attained a theoretical standard, i.e. the standard of documentation and use of terminology as found in al-Khalilî's °arûḍ. Ibn Fâris (d. 395/1004) is known to have commented that: "... somebody says: oral tradition tells of Abû al-Aswad as being the first to establish al-°Arabiyya and al-Khalîl as the first to talk about al-°arûḍ. Somebody replied to this saying that they did not deny this fact but it should not be said that the two sciences existed only in the past, eventually vanishing with time until the two Imâms came and revived them ... but there is evidence that al-°arûḍ was very well-known as there was an agreement amongst those in the know that al-Mushrikîn (idolaters), on hearing the Qur'ân, exclaimed 'This is poetry!' This was vehemently denied by al-Walîd bin al-Mughîra who stated that on comparing Muḥammad's readings with poetry - *hazjahu wa rajzahu*, etc. etc. (names of two Arabic metres) - no resemblance was to be found between them. Could this, then have been said by al-Walîd if he had been ignorant of Arabic metre?" Ibn Fâris. *al-Ṣâhibî*. Cairo, 1910, p. 10.
4. One also distinguishes two groups of deviations, the *ziḥâfât* and the °illa. The *ziḥâfât* (relaxations) are ... smaller deviations which occur only in the *ḥashw* (stuffing) parts of the line in which the characteristic rhythm rhymes strongly, and their effect is a small quantitative change in the weak *asbab* syllables. As accidental deviations, the *ziḥâfât* have no regular or definite place, they just appear occasionally in the feet. By contrast, the °illa ('diseases', 'defects') which appear only in the last feet of two of the lines, ... cause considerable change as compared to the normal feet. They alter the rhythmic end of the line considerably and are thus clearly distinct from *ḥashw* feet. As rhythmically determined deviations, the °illa do not just appear occasionally but have to appear regularly, always in the same form and in the same position in all the lines of the poem. A further difference between the two groups of deviations is the fact that the *ziḥâfât* fall only on the *sabab* (and there on its second consonant), while the °illa alters the *watad* in each of the last feet of the two hemistichs as well as in their *sababs*.

- Encyclopaedia of Islam*. Material of [°]arûḍ, Leiden, 1913, Vol. I, from A to D, p. 464ff.
5. All these basic prosodic rules are available to all in hundreds of both ancient and modern Arabic books. Here, two have been chosen:
Muṣṭafa, Maḥmûd. *Ahdâ Sabîl ilâ [°]ilmayy al-Khalîl (al-[°]arûḍ wa al-Qâfiya)*. Cairo, 1955, 3rd. edition, pp. 16-20.
Âl Nâṣir al-Dîn, Amîn. *Daqâ'iq al-[°]Arabiyya*. Beirut, 1952, 1st. edition, pp. 230-232ff.
 6. Look, for example in M.S. Guyard's article *Theorie Nouvelle de la Metrique Arabe*, Paris, 1877, the prosodic material ([°]arûḍ) which was written by Weil Gotthold in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*; and pp. 350ff., Part 4 in *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* by W. Wright. Cambridge, 1981.
 7. Mandûr, Muḥammad. *al-Shi[°]r al-[°]Arabi: Ghinâ'uhu, Inshâduhu, Waznuhu*. *Majallat Kuliyyat al-Âdâb*. Alexandria University, 1943, pp. 142-143.
 8. Anîs, Ibrâhîm. *Mûsiqâ al-Shi[°]r*. Cairo, 1965, 3rd. edition, pp. 50-54.
 9. [°]Ayyâd, Shukrî. *Mûsiqâ al-Shi[°]r al-[°]Arabî: Mashrû[°] Dirâsa [°]Ilmiyya*. Cairo, 1968, 1st. edition.
 10. Abû Dîb, Kamâl. *Fî al-Bunya al-Iqâ[°]iyya lil-Shi[°]r al-[°]Arabî: Naḥwa Badil Judhrî Li[°]Arûḍ al-Khalîl wa Muqaddima fî [°]ilm al-Iqâ[°] al-Muqâran*. Beirut, 1974, 1st. edition.
 11. *Ibid.*, pp. 7-35, 37-44, 45, 50, 62-64.
[°]Ayyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, pp. 11-28.
 12. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
See, in addition, what Ḥâzim says in this respect in *al-Minhâj*, p. 268.
 13. Mandur, Muḥammad. *Op. cit.*, p. 134.
 14. *al-Minhâj*, p. 89.
 15. Chatman, Seymour. *A Theory of Metre*, University of California, Berkeley. The Hague, 1965, pp. 223-224.
 16. *al-Minhâj*, p. 89.
 17. *Ibid.*, p. 266.
 18. *Ibid.*, p. 266.
 19. *Ibid.*, p. 266. Cf. *Fann al-Shi[°]r* by Ibn Sînâ. (Ed. by A. Badawî), p. 152.

20. Ibn Ṭabâṭabâ. *Op. cit.*, p. 5.
21. *al-Minhâj*, pp. 203-204.
Ḥâzim mentioned the *waṣiyya* in his book and the editor inserted another text for this *waṣiyya* which was different in some of its criteria as a footnote on the same page.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 204.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 244.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 258.
What Ḥâzim says here has only just been proclaimed by modern scholars who have stated that: "The study of rhythm, in our opinion, is the most important through which it is possible to give all the general rules of the music of poetry and by which we can understand the underlying reasons of the partial rules behind al-Khalil's prosody in addition to discovering those links between them and the rational registration of the phenomena of the poetic metres".
ʿAyyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, p. 80.
25. *al-Minhâj*, pp. 265-266.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 236.

This term was originally used by the Greeks to indicate a foot. It was then adopted by the Muslim philosophers who employed it to denote the whole *tafʿîla*.
Abû Rayḥân al-Bayrûnî stated that in Indian prosody this term is employed to indicate a prosodic unit which contains no less than four letters.
al-Bayrûnî, Abû al-Rayḥân. *Fî Taḥqîq mâ lil-Hind min Maqûla*. Ḥaydar Abâd, India, 1958, pp. 111-113.
27. *al-Minhâj*, p. 232.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 226.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 227 ff.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 246.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 367.
34. ʿUsfûr, Jâbir. *Op. cit.*, pp. 394-395.
35. *Rasâʾil Ikhwân al-Ṣafâ: Risâla fî al Mûsîqâ*. (Ed. by Buṭrus al-Bustânî.) Beirut, 1957, Vol. I, pp. 218-219.

36. al-Rûbî, A.K. *Naẓariyya al-Shiʿr ʿInd al-Falâsîfa al-Muslimîn*. Lebanon, 1983.
37. *al-Minhâj*, pp. 268-269.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 243.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 268.
40. ʿAyyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, the footnote (A) on p. 58. See, in addition, *Aristûṭâlîs Fann al-Shiʿr*. (Ed. by A. Badawî), in which he stated that "metres are merely a part of rhythm", p. 13.
41. Abû Dîb, Kamâl. *Op. cit.*, p. 531.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
43. *al-Minhâj*, p. 244.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 263.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 226-227.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 231.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 248.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 245.
49. al-Fârâbî stated that: "The attribution of discourse measurement to the letters is like the comparison between the measured rhythm and the tune, that is to say the measured rhythm is a disciplined transference upon the measured tune and the measurement of the poetry is a disciplined transference upon measured letters".
al-Fârâbî, Abû Naṣr *op. cit.*, p. 1085.
50. *al-Minhâj*, p. 234-235.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 244.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 235.
53. This part of Ḥâzim's addition to Abû Tammâm's *waṣiyya* has been mentioned in reference no. (21). (See *al-Minhâj* pp. 203-204.)
54. *Ibid.*, p. 204.
See, in addition, the evaluations of Jâbir ʿUṣfûr, *Op. cit.*, pp. 377-378, and Ṣafwat ʿAbd al-Raḥîm, *Op. cit.*, p. 165 ff.
55. *Ibid.*, pp. 204-205.
56. ʿAyyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, pp. 95-114.

57. °Usfur, Jâbir. *Op. cit.*, p. 407.
58. Darwîsh, °Abd Allah. *Dirâsât fî al-°Arûḍ wa al-Qâfiya*, Cairo, 1977, pp. 102-104.
See, in addition, Ibn Rashîq. *Op. cit.*, p. 152.
59. *al-Minhâj*, p. 272.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 89.
61. "All Arabic poetry, ancient and modern possesses rhyme apart from those ones which were atypical. However, ancient poetry from other nations does not employ rhyme although some of their modern poetic works have used rhyme because of a desire to imitate Arabic poetry."
al-Fârâbî, Abû Naṣr. *Op. cit.*, p. 1091.
Cf. Ibn Sînâ. *Op. cit.* (A. Badawî), p. 161.
Cf. *al-Minhâj*, p. 123.
62. *al-Minhâj*, p. 276.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 285.
64. °Abd al-Raḥîm, Ṣafwat. *Op. cit.*, p. 202.
65. *al-Minhâj*, p. 276.
66. *Ibid.*, p. 276.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 278.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 278.
69. *Ibid.*, p. 279.
70. °Uṣfûr, Jâbir. *Op. cit.*, p. 409.
71. al-Fârâbî, Abû Naṣr. *Jawâmi° al-Shi°r*. (Ed. by Muḥammad Salîm Sâlim.) Cairo, 1971, p. 172.
72. Ibn Sînâ. *Jawâmi° °ilm al-Mûsîqâ: min qism al-Riyâḍiyât min al-Shifa°*. (Ed. by Zakarîya Yûsuf.) Cairo, 1956, p. 24.
73. *al-Minhâj*, p. 268.
74. al-Jâḥiẓ. *Rasâ°il al-Jaḥiẓ*. (Ed. °Abd al-Salâm Harûn.) Cairo, 1965, No. 2, pp. 160-161.
75. Ibn Fâris. *Op. cit.*, p. 230.
76. al-Fârâbî, Abû Naṣr. *al-Mûsîqâ Kabir*, p. 64.
77. Ibn Sînâ. *Fann al-Shi°r*. (Ed. by A. Badawî), p. 172. Cf. *al-Minhâj*, p. 117.

78. Darwîsh, °Abd Allâh. *Op. cit.*, p. 150.
79. *al-Minhâj*, pp. 229-232.
80. The *dubaytî* is kind of *al-murabba°* poetry in which the poet divides his poem into parts, each part including four hemistichs with one rhyme. It is a Persian metre described by prosodists as follows: *fa°lun, mutafâ°ilun, fa°ûlun, fâ°ilun*. Anîs, Ibrâhîm. *Op. cit.* (with adaptation), pp. 238-240 and 336.
81. *Ibid.*, p. 243.
82. *Ibid.*, p. 243.
83. *al-Fârâbî*, Abû Naşr. *Op. cit.*, p. 1178.
84. Ibn Sînâ. *Jawâmi° °ilm al-Mûsiqâ*. (Ed. by Zakariyyâ Yûsuf.) Cairo, 1965, p. 75.
85. *al-Minhâj*, p. 266.

CHAPTER 2

STRUCTURE AND FORM

- I THE ROLE OF THE WORD IN THE *QASĪDA*
- II THE POETIC PHRASE
- III THE STRUCTURE
- IV EVALUATION

"A work of art is, first, a system of sounds, hence a selection from the sound system of a given language" (1). The poet makes use of this potentiality in language in order to create beauty. But, whereas this is the essential feature of the poet's art, in the art of criticism it is the critic's business to turn his attention to the poetic text as an object for investigation. To be more specific, he must concern himself with the quality and method of the poet's treatment and selection of the various linguistic features. The reason for this is that the poet does not simply choose words; he arranges them in a particular way in his effort to reproduce the sonic homogeneity which will create the timbre, resonance and rhythm of the poem. It is by exploiting the arrangement of the words that the poet makes new semantic, phonetic and inspirational connections. Similarly, metaphors are used to create new images, the linguistic flow of sounds to create new rhythms. It is by language alone that the poet creates allusions, images and rhythms.

Although the poet employs everyday language, he relies on the fact that this language has vast resources of possibilities. Moreover, he exploits these potentialities through a process of selection that he considers suitable for the critical forms of beauty on which he attempts to base his work. The choice he makes determines how successful he is as a poet; they also distinguish his work from that of other poets. This process of selection is the basic component in what is known to critics as Style; and the study of the ways in which linguistic

possibilities have been subjected to a process of selection for aesthetic purposes which used to be the concern of Rhetoric, is nowadays the business of Stylistics:

... 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 (2).

There are two important points to be made about contemporary Stylistics. In the first place, although this science is rooted in linguistics, it actually became a part of the science of literary criticism from the moment when the critics directed their efforts towards that aspect of literary language we described above - namely, the processes of selection made by all poets in the light of the linguistic possibilities available to them.

Modern Stylistics began as a linguistic science but the critics regained it from the linguists. Perhaps we should really say that the contemporary critic has become a linguist as well as a critic and that in this respect he is like the classical critic, though obviously there are important divergencies between modern and classical linguistic concepts. The majority of modern critical studies have become stylistic studies just as the majority of stylistic studies have become oriented towards the language of literature (3).

In the second place, Stylistics has become intrinsic to the scientific study of literature and at the same time there is the prime, universal notion of Style in its scientific connotation.

We can summarise it as the method for characterising linguistic expression. Obviously the important thing is that this characterisation should show us everything that poetry conveys: meanings, emotions, visions, or whatever other words one wishes to use to indicate what is behind the expression. But these are vague categories which merge into one another and the modern critic prefers to replace them with a single word which conveys the composite sense. For example, 'vision' and 'attitude'. Moreover, the various methods for stylistic research differ only in terms of the definition of the nature and extent of this characterisation and the ways for exploring and interpreting it (4).

Having characterized Stylistics by these two basic facts, it is appropriate to turn to the areas which this science studies and the limits of its concerns. Scholars and critics have agreed that the field of Stylistics has been extended to comprise five general areas of investigation:

... the study of styles, as the various choices between the methods of expression which the nature of the text and the interventions of the writer prescribe; the categorisation of the styles according to different systems, whether literary, social, instrumental or psychological; the science of the functions of style with its study from the genesis of expression until its aim is achieved; the science of the structure of synthetic style; and stylistic criticism in specifically defined texts without regard for general critical rules (5).

So this is the current position in the scientific study of literary language. As for modern Arabic Stylistics, the classical Arabic legacy has a vast linguistic and rhetorical reserve to assist in its establishment. In the course of this research it has been seen that Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî faithfully preserved the contribution of the Arab philologists and

rhetoricians prior to him and presented it in the light of the classical Greek philosophy he had mastered in order to deduce his own notions. This chapter will consider Ḥâzim's assimilation of his own inheritance in his study of literary language in order to see how he dealt with that inheritance with his philosophical background and his own particular views. Our evaluation of his work will be made in the light of the limits of modern Stylistics that have already been put forward.

I THE ROLE OF THE WORD IN THE *QAṢĪDA*

The poet alights on the phonetic potentials in words intuitively and exploits the resonance of their letters. This is the fundamental building block on which he relies when he begins to put together the components of his structure. Those components depend essentially on the expressive and musical possibilities in words. All this applies to every poet in every language. They are methods that are universal to poetic composition. There are, however, particular features in the expressive and musical language of Arabic poetry which scholars point out. The fact that the letters of the Arabic alphabet are differentiated one from another by different speech organs obviously means that the Arabic language has a broad phonetic range. Moreover, individual words are derived according to specific word-patterns and therefore a great number of sounds can be produced. Furthermore, the inflectional endings of Arabic - *raf^c*, *naṣb*, and *khafḍ* - endow the language, whether written or spoken, with a distinctly musical quality.

How did Ḥâzim treat all these potentials contained within the Arabic word and what is the role of the word and its possibilities in poetic construction?

- a) Since it is with the single word with which we are concerned, we should state that what the poet is aiming for in the single word

is what was called *faṣāḥa* (eloquence) by the Arab rhetorical and linguistic tradition. In that tradition *faṣāḥa* meant that certain conditions should be fulfilled in the individual word, the most important of which was there should be a clarity and musical harmony between letters that does not infringe the rules of morphology. In other words, the poet is required to aim for a phonetic reverberation in the word, that would help to convey its meaning, and to avoid what is known in phonetics as dissonance. Ḥāzim was aware of these elements in the structure of the Arabic word and drew attention to the necessity of adhering to them in order that the word should play its part in poetic construction and, indeed, in literary construction generally. His book begins with an indictment of recent poets from the East, i.e. the contemporary poets from the 6th and 7th centuries A.H., for disregarding the true nature of poetry by failing to take any trouble over the selection of linguistic material from which they constructed their *qaṣīdas*.

... there are not any among them to be found throughout the whole of this period who have followed the path of the *fuḥūl* (champions) or adopted their method for establishing the principles of words, consolidating their composition, and picking out the material from which they must be fashioned. Thus they deviated from the path of poetry and entered into mere speech (6).

In a particular *ma^clam* (a name given by Ḥāzim for a specific section) on the formation of expressions, the embellishment of their forms, elegance in the selection of their material, and

excellence in their composition and arrangement, Ḥāzīm draws the poet's attention to methods of *taḥsîn* (embellishment) and means of *ikhṭiyâr* (selection) and norms for the arrangement of letters and fashioning of texts whereby the poet may achieve excellence of discourse and avoid vilification.

The achievement of eloquent phrases comes about through the poet possessing a power by which his thought masters all the aspects necessary for achieving *ḥusn al-kalâm* (eloquent discourse). These aspects are the *ikhṭiyâr* of the expressive verbal elements in the first place with respect to what is the best point of articulation of its letters, its concordance, its formation and quantity, and the avoidance of what is unacceptable in respect of that ... That *ikhṭiyâr* is also made with respect to what is good due to usage and the avoidance of what is bad to that. Furthermore, the *ikhṭiyâr* is according to what is good in view of one of the conventional paths and the avoidance of what is ugly with respect to that (7).

Thus, with the realization that the failure of the compositions of 'the latest poets' was caused because they did not select their linguistic material well, Ḥāzīm's initial response is to adopt a logical analysis of the matter. But when he goes on to draw the poet's attention to the method of making correct choices, he approaches the matter from a didactically linguistic point of view. ...

- b) In establishing the above principles, Ḥāzīm al-Qarṭājannî's aim - indeed, the aim of every rhetorician - is to assert proportion as a first foundation in literary creativity and to avert discord which is the error. Here, our main concern applies to the

individual word. Thus, Ḥâzim's goal in this respect is that phonetic harmony and concord should be present in that word. These two ingredients derive from the word's morphology; in other words, from the relations between its letters. That is to say, phonetic harmony and concord in a word produce what is called assonance between successive words and culminate in what is called harmony between the phrases of the literary work.

The rhetorical concept of proportion has a greater importance for Ḥâzim than any other concept mentioned. It occurs frequently throughout the book. He attributed the knowledge of this principle to the knowledge of *al-ilm al-kullî*. Indeed, rhetoric is the science which defines the various types of proportion for the creative writer and averts him from the discord which we mentioned as the basic error that thwarts true literary creativity.

Knowledge of the paths to proportion in what is heard and understood cannot be acquired from any of the linguistic sciences other than from *al-ilm al-kullî*. It is rhetoric which classifies the types of proportion and convention among the particulars of its totality. By it, the knowledge of what is acceptable in this field may be acquired by analogy and in all this the aim is a single one: to use what is suitable and to avoid what is discordant (8).

There is no doubt that from the above the poet's success in realising phonetic harmony for his words produces an assonance which is not just restricted to the confines of each word but also exists between all those words. Ḥâzim also believes that

this assonance produces another important element, i.e. *al-tanawwu*^c (variation), and guards against another important error, i.e. *takrâr* (repetition). Then he goes on to relate all this to the psychological effects on the recipient.

It is also a good thing to employ variation in the discourse by using different sentence arrangements, thereby achieving different meanings. Agreement and simulation should be avoided and words taken from every source so that everything is new and not in the least repetitive. In this way it will be charming to the emotions and most acceptable to the psyche. This he can achieve by being familiar with morphology, syntax and semantics, understanding the ways in which it can be constructed as well as its various sources, and through the power of mental insights into types of utterances, types of forms, and forms of meaning (9).

Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî not only treats the linguistic and rhetorical basis for the role of the word in the art of poetry, but also links this basis with morphological structure and the possibility contained within this structure for relations between letters achieving either harmony or discordance. In the Arabic language, however, among the morphological features with musical qualities there is something which partakes of both prose and poetic creation, i.e. *saj*^c (rhymed prose). It is worthwhile to pause at Ḥâzim's commentary on this and to study and evaluate it.

- c) *Saj*^c is a well-known form of discourse in the classical Arabic language. Its aim is to produce a literary music which will assist the effect on the listener or reader and facilitate the conveying of ideas to him. *Saj*^c is the agreement of the

final syllables or letters in the final word of consecutive sentences. The reason for discussing *Saj^c* in the context of the treatment of the single word is that the poet's success in enhancing the musical quality for the morphological structure of the last word in the first sentence has a subsequent effect because he must adhere to the last syllable or letter of that word in the final words of subsequent sentences. The agreement of the final words in the two subsequent sentences in prose resembles rhyme in poetry. Indeed this agreement, or *Saj^c*, is equally present in both prose and poetry as shall be seen.

Saj^c in the Arabic language predates Islam. At first it was associated with magical and spiritual practices. For this reason some Muslims declined to allude to its existence in *The Holy Qur'ân*. Instead they called the passages of *saj^c* in *The Qur'ân fawâşil*. The point is that if *saj^c* confers additional musical qualities to different styles, why was not the whole of *The Holy Qur'ân* revealed in *saj^c*? This question is frequently raised in commentaries and language books and they give many answers to it. A modern scholar has summarised them as follows:

The Holy Qur'ân was revealed as a guide, law-giver, champion of ideas, and establisher of beliefs, to debate, narrate, warn, inform, excite and win over. Certainly, it alternates in its utterances between generalizations and details, between rhymed prose and free prose according to the subject and the occasion. For this reason it was revealed in prose and its style is unique,

sometimes a free flow and sometimes in rhymed prose (10).

There is a well-known genre of *saj*^c called *tarṣīf*^c (homeoptoton) by the Arabs. In this the majority of words in a paragraph or sentence resemble the majority of words in the next paragraph or sentence. Examples of this in *The Qur'ân* are:-

فَأَمَّا الْيَتِيمَ فَلَا تَقْهَرْ	،	وَأَمَّا السَّائِلَ فَلَا تَنْهَرْ	Q.S,82,13-14
إِنَّا إِلَيْنَا يَأْتِيهِمْ	،	ثُمَّ أَنَّ عَلَيْنَا حِسَابَهُمْ	Q.S,88,25-6
إِن الْأُبْرَارَ لَفِي نَعِيمٍ	،	وَإِن الْفُجَّارَ لَفِي جَحِيمٍ	Q.S,82,13-14

In this treatment of the role of the single word in the art of poetry, Ḥâzim al-Qarṭājannî observed that it may have abundant new and additional musical qualities. For this, he refers to the styles of the Arabs and special features of the Arabic language. Indeed, he refers to *The Holy Qur'ân* itself in order to make a profound comment on the reasons behind the usage of *saj*^c in it.

How can *saj*^c possibly be an error? *The Qur'ân* was revealed in accordance with the elegant styles of the Arabs' speech. So the *fawâṣil* entered it [*The Qur'ân*] as a counterpart to the entry of *saj*^c into the Arabs' speech. But it did not come in one style since it is not a good thing in speech for it to continue entirely in one fashion because that would be mannered and it is natural to tire of that. Since gaining [different] types of *faṣâḥa* is more excellent than persisting in one type, some verses of *The Qur'ân* have final syllables which correspond, and others do not have them (11).

One scholar of Ḥâzim's theory commented as follows on the above passage:

In Ḥâzim's discussion of *saj*^c we find that he only addresses himself to the necessity of varying its use as attested by the employment of *saj*^c in *The Qur'ân*. In other words, in treating a style in this way, Ḥâzim concerns himself almost exclusively with the aesthetic aspect of its use - whether in terms of variety, proportion or any other principles of aesthetics (12).

However, Ḥâzim goes far beyond this and realizes that *saj*^c is a peculiar feature of Arabic. This matter does not require further investigation since every language has its own means for enhancing the musicality of its words, phrases and sentences. But here attention could be drawn to the fact that Ḥâzim combines this opinion with a comparison between the role of *saj*^c in prose and the role of rhyme in poetry with regard to the music of the word and the effect of this music on the recipient.

Because of the Arabs' intense need to embellish their speech, their words were characterised by features which are not found in other peoples' languages. For example there is the similarity of the final words in *saj*^c and in rhyme with their exceedingly close correspondence. There is also the difference of endings and the use of the same vowel in most of them. Furthermore, there is their employment of rhyming letters on the end of words of the kind that occur frequently because this embellishes speech and makes sound flow easily and because the soul has limits for the transference of word-endings (13).

Ḥâzim's words go on to bear on the endings of words, i.e. *saj*^c. In this respect he complies with the Arabs' need for the embellishment of their words. *Saj*^c, as he says, realizes new phonetic and musical elements in the word. If we add this talk, relating to the endings of words, to his discussion in the

previous pages on the internal morphological structure of the words and the extent of its realization for other phonetic and musical elements, we have understood that this critical rhetorician has grasped expressive and aesthetic possibilities in the single word and on the role of this word in the structure of the sentence and especially in literary and poetic activity.

II THE POETIC PHRASE

In the previous section we illustrated how Hâzim treats the individual word in the poetic text, not as a separate entity but rather within the context of its construction with other words. That is to say, he deals with it as part of the poetic phrase. In this particular section, a pause is necessary to consider his view of this poetic phrase, the aesthetic features which distinguish it from other types of language and its employment of figurative expressions for poetic imagery, as well as rhythm for poetic musicality.

Any sentence or phrase, from the aspect of conventional linguistic performance, comprises words used merely in accordance with the correct grammatical rules so as to convey a certain meaning. The poetic performance is no exception to this linguistic convention but extends beyond to include other features; its value is not simply a question of vocabulary and grammaticality but of a process of *ikh̄tiyâr* which chooses between words and their grammatical systems. In other words, significance in the poetic phrase is determined by the grammatically successful arrangement of words, i.e. what is defined as the meaning in the art of poetry. Thus, the poet's talent is identified by the exploration of new connotations within words, previously unthought of until inserted in a new construction formulated by him (14).

It was the great Arab rhetorician, ʿAbd al-Qâhir al-Jurjânî, who formulated this principle and included it within his well-known theory under the term *al-naẓm*. He encouraged poets and writers to make a profound study of grammar so as to become aware of what could result from changing the position of words within the phrase and propounding fresh interpretations for new meanings. For ʿAbd al-Qâhir the individual word has no importance unless it is given a context through construction (15). Ḥâzim al-Qarṭājannî took ʿAbd al-Qâhir's theory and built on it, extending it to incorporate the basic elements of construction, formation and rhythm.

- a) Ḥâzim begins his book with a profound investigation of the nature of poetic utterance and a discussion of how the poet may achieve new poetic expressions; he goes on, as stated previously, to extend the discussion from deliberations on the meaning of the individual word, its form and order, to an account of the use of poetic metre. The relationship between the poetic phrase and metre will be dealt with in a subsequent paragraph. Here, consideration will be given to the poetic phrase from the point of view of construction, observing how Ḥâzim unites construction and content, basing them both on the process of *al-ikhtiyâr* or, in other words, that same feature mentioned previously as revealing the poet's talent. R. Welleck and A. Warren argued that:

The meaning of poetry is contextual: a word carries with it not only its dictionary meaning but an aura of synonyms and homonyms. Words not only have a meaning but evoke the meanings of words related either in sound, or in sense, or in derivation - or even words which are contrasted or excluded (16).

This ability can only be attained through the means of *ikhtiyar* on the part of the poet:

... this he is able to do through knowledge of the means for managing expressions and the forms of their order and the order of words and what they convey, and insight into the genres of their construction and their various forms of treatment; and also through strong intellectual observations of the types of expressions, their forms and meanings; and of the devices by which these expressions are arranged into the requisite forms for the method of measure through abridgement, interpolation, substitution of one word for another, or extra-position; and through swift reconciling of the position of the sentence within the metre in its order of the *ḥarakât wa sakanât* letters. And he impresses them in that position, and joins them to what precedes by means of augmentation, depletion, substitution or whatever else ... (17).

Ḥâzim called this activity the very essence of poetry - *ḥaqîqat al-shi'r* - i.e. for him this is the establishing of the principles of speech and of its position and the selection of the material from which he has to sculpt it (18). In fact Ḥâzim elevates construction in order to reach *al-ʿuslûb* through it. Then he makes *ʿuslûb* a basic principle for success in the art of poetry on the part of the poet himself. Thus it can be seen that he points to the aspects through which *takhyîl* is realised. Of these aspects he makes four, and he gives *ʿuslûb* priority over them - since it is *ʿuslûb* that makes these

aspects 'poetic', i.e. produces the artistic and aesthetic essence of poetry. To Ḥâzim, it is imperative for *takhyîl* in poetry to incorporate four basic elements: *'uslûb*, *lafz*, *ma^cnâ*, and *naẓm* and *wazn*.

Takhyîl, in respect of poetry is divided into two types: necessary and unnecessary. It is imperative or desirable through perfecting the necessary and helping it to encourage the soul to seek something or avoid something. The necessary ones are the *takhyîl* of meanings prompted by words. The desirable ones are the *takhyîl* of words in themselves; the *takhyîl* of *'uslûb*; and the *takhyîl* of *naẓm* and *wazn*. The most imperative one is that of *'uslûb* (19).

What matters most is the process of *ikhtiyâr* in which the poet succeeds if he gives a unique position to the word in its grammatical arrangement.

Having drawn attention to the fact that the structure of the poetic phrase is the basic component in the art of poetry, Ḥâzim turns to an extensive study of the poetic phrase itself which deals with three essential points. The first is the expressive and aesthetic features of the poetic phrase, which distinguish it from other non-poetic phrases. The second is the role of construction in "the poetic phrase in the maintenance of the poetic image. The third is the rhythmic elements in the poetic phrase, i.e. those elements which give a basic musicality to poetry.

b) In the first place, Hâzim distinguishes between versification and poetry from the point of view of the nature of the structure of the phrases. Whereas versification uses those meanings which in their specificity may be scientific or technical, poetry uses meanings which are general knowledge and which may be understood by non-specialists. This distinction between meanings in the versification and in poetry is reflected in the nature of the phrase in each of them. The sentences in versification aim to impart *knowledge*, whereas poetry aims at causing an *effect*. There is no doubt that there is a considerable distinction between the two forms of expression when it comes to artistic structures. Hâzim's formulation of this principle is as follows:

Of conceivable things there are those that suit the very essence of what is commonly held to be the subject matter of poetry. Some of the conceivable things can be used either as the primary or secondary theme. The ones which can be used as primary and secondary meanings and what is conceivable in them, should relate to that which is familiar and well-known to the general public thus making them feel at ease and pay heed; this thing being either conceived by the senses or something else. Those which cannot be used in a primary sense but are proper as a secondary meaning, are only conceivable in the nature of something exclusive and unfamiliar to the general public. ... I am making it easier for those who are unacquainted with the art of rhetoric in order that they may accept what I have said by following in the books of literature and rhetoric, the view of the scholars of poetry on each verse composed by both ancient and modern poets, or any poetry, whatever the poetic genre or category, whether it be erotic, eulogistic, elegiac or satiric. In doing this he will not find any matter that is laudable by the world at large except that it is what I mentioned in respect of being primary and secondary. In addition, he will not find the matter at all unless it be secondary ... Qudâma b.

Ja^cfar and his kind all rejected the usage of scientific meanings and technical phrases and commanded that they were not be used (20).

Thus Ḥâzim stresses this distinction between versification and poetry according to a precise artistic principle. But by its very nature he does not rule out the existence of something he calls 'scientific meanings' in good poetry, though it must never take the leading role. Sometimes, however, as Ḥâzim says, a poet will see in himself the artistic ability and *ḥusn al-ta'lif* so as to be able to reconcile the two. By giving this poet as an example, Ḥâzim means that it is more important to direct artistic ability, *ḥusn al-ta'lif* and *al-naẓm* towards the goal of poetry, which is the causing of effect rather than to disperse these abilities outside the realm of true poetry:

He who uses scientific meanings in his discourse does so in order to impress others that he is both poet and scientist. And as we have already explained, by doing this he achieves the opposite of what is required in poetry. He cannot prove that what he has said is poetry except to those who have no knowledge of poetry. A poet cannot prove his worth by using scientific meanings. It is not unthinkable, however, for the versifier to conceive some scientific issues, even if on a small scale, and attach them to some of the meanings of his poetry thus bringing them into concordance with some of the aims of his construction. The one whose aim is "to show that he is capable of finding compatibility between far-removed things and to use *ḥusn al-ta'lif* to cover what is between them in the way of disparity, in doing this he hides his true capabilities by exerting his mind needlessly instead of directing his thoughts towards more effective goals, thereby not reaching the intended aim of poetry which is the moving of souls (21).

The above text may be the most powerful statement in classical Arabic criticism relating to the distinction between not just versification and poetry, but between poetry and science in general. Indeed, this text is possibly reminiscent of the distinction between the two spheres made by modern critics and particularly by I.A. Richards (22).

Just as Ḥâzim maintains the distinction between versification and poetry, with the concern of the former being to convey meaning and of the latter the causing of effect, so he established the distinction between poetry and oratory by saying that the function of poetry is *takhyîl* and the aim of oratory is persuasion (23).

The important point to be made in all of this is that Ḥâzim here places the differences between poetry and the rest on a technical basis relating to the nature of the structure of the poetic sentence and how it differs from the structure of other non-poetic sentences and phrases. The best criteria which illustrates this difference is shown in the two poetic spheres of poetic image and rhythm.

Naturally, we are not going to undertake a study of these two features here, i.e. we are not going to deal with the poetic image as a product of imagination as it has already been dealt with in Ḥâzim's theory of imagination outlined in Chapter I of the first part. Likewise, rhythm has already been treated in

terms of phonetic and linguistic possibilities in the first chapter of this part. In this context, however, these two features - image and rhythm - will be discussed as two of the ingredients that distinguish poetic utterance.

- c) Ḥāzīm based his theory of poetic technique on *muḥākāt*. He made *al-khayāl* the instrument of this *muḥākāt* and the poetic expression as the instrument of *al-khayāl*, because it formulates through language what has been conceived by the imagination. The poet evokes the recipient's imagination and he depends in this on the choices of linguistic potential.

Through the poet's words, meaning, style and the setting up of images in his imagination, he is able to stir the unconscious emotions of the recipient who is thus inclined either towards the repulsive or towards the pleasurable (24). This observation of the role of the poetic image compares favourably with that of the contemporary critic I.A. Richards, who determined this same notion as follows:

There are indeed very good reasons why poetry should personify. The structure of language and the pronouns; verbs and adjectives that come most naturally to us, constantly invite us to personify. And, to go deeper, our attitudes, feelings, and ways of thought about inanimate things are moulded upon and grow out of our ways of thinking and feeling about one another (25).

It is worth mentioning here that Ḥāzīm does not make the poetic image correspond with its origin in reality. This is on account

of his awareness that the image is the production of imagination, and imagination does not contradict reality, but at the same time it is not merely a copy of it. "Wa kullamâ iqtaranat al-gharâba wa al-ta^cjîb bil-takhyîl kâna abda^c". (Takhyîl becomes more innovative as long as strangeness and wonder are combined with it) (26). For Ḥâzim, this concept is the very origin stipulated by modern criticism in its theory on the creative imagination and the relation between the product and the imaginative origin. A modern Arab critic views this argument as follows:

Poetic imagination ... is a creative energy which does not aim in the formulation of its images to copy the universe and everything it contains, or to be a literal reflection of conventional systems, or a kind of escapism, or naive catharsis of feelings; yet, his aim is to push the recipient to re-contemplate his own reality through poetic vision, the value of which lies not in the mere newness or attractiveness but in its capacity to enrich his sensitivity and give greater depth to his awareness. One of the criteria of the original poetic imagination is to demolish the boundaries of our epistemological perception, jolting the senses into a fresh awareness of reality, giving the feeling that everything has a new beginning and as if everything has gained a unique meaning in its newness and originality (27).

The interesting point here is that Ḥâzim grasped in a highly perceptive way, what modern criticism has only established centuries later. Moreover, he linked this matter with his own particular view of the poetic phrase when he pointed out the incompatibility between the poetic image and its origin which results from the practice of words and the various means whereby

they are ordered and arranged (28).

Ḥâzim al-Qarṭājannî took refuge in the comparison made by the great critics regarding the production of imagination in poetry as realized and embodied in language with the production of imagination in the other arts such as drawing, painting, sculpture and so forth. The aim of this comparison is to deepen awareness of the role of language in the formulation of the product of the imagination. As has already been mentioned, Ḥâzim moves on from the individual word to its construction and then expands this notion of construction till he reaches what in modern criticism is called style. Ḥâzim has this to say about this comparison between the exercise of language and the exercise of other non-lingual instruments and then on construction and style:

Takhyîl, with respect to things it depends on, is divided into two parts: first to imitate the object by means of the discourse and other things related to it; and secondly, the imaginative way in which this discourse is produced from the aspect of its words, meaning, construction and style. The first *takhyîl* resembles the sketch of an image in a painting and the way it is formed whilst the second *takhyîl* can be likened to the embellishment of the sketch, embroidery in clothing or the detailed sorting of gëms and precious stones for necklaces. After what I have said about the composition of words and their compatibility as regards their meaning, I am going to mention the different systems involved in the composition, the joining of *abyât* and the combining of *fuṣûl*, in addition to the various systems and the most effective ways of formulation (29).

Inevitably, this passage raises two matters: first Ḥāzīm's extension of his understanding of construction and style so that he almost includes the whole art of poetry in them; secondly, the degree to which this extension contains new ideas concerning the efforts of other Arab critics and rhetoricians prior to him. The first matter is the subject of the third section of this chapter where we deal with structure. The second matter is the subject of the fourth section where we evaluate his view of construction generally. But here we will consider his view of the element of rhythm in poetic expression.

- d) Ḥāzīm's views on metre, rhythm and all the musical elements of poetry have already been discussed but now this musical aspect will be treated in respect of being one element of construction, i.e. in the light of its role in the poetic phrase or sentence. From this point of view it is possible to give a detailed presentation of Ḥāzīm's endeavours towards three distinct matters. Firstly, Ḥāzīm's notion of the aesthetic elements in poetic texts causes him to discount as poetic anything in which these elements do not exist collectively. Thus we see that he excludes that work which only contains the two elements of rhyme and metre. This is because, in his view, aesthetic elements are much broader and include all the phonetic possibilities and conceivable potentialities in language. In as much as it relates to his discussion of composition and construction, it was to his credit that he denied that the mere composition of words in metre and rhyme amounts to poetry:

Now you will find those who are keen to be among the literary people, the composers of metrical patterns or a section of the people of our time who regard it as a disgrace to require, notwithstanding his natural disposition, the teaching of a scholar or the insights of an educationalist. If he manages to compose a complete, measured discourse which only contains a few, bad verses, he becomes arrogant and believes he is competing with the champions and has become one of their company; but this is foolhardy and ignorant, since he thinks that every discourse containing rhyme and metre is poetry (30).

Secondly, his awareness of the role of rhythm as an integral part of expression made him adopt the path of methodical instruction in order to convey this knowledge to the poets and critics of his own age - his comments in this respect having been discussed previously in a different context (31).

Thirdly, he links the phrases with the metre and compares the capabilities of the poets on the basis of this correlation. Indeed, he draws attention to the ways in which the two are linked so that unmeasured becomes measured. According to this, Ḥâzim envisages three kinds of poet: the one who can change the poetic phrase with ease, or the one who makes the changes slowly and with difficulty and, lastly, the one who comes in between. From this standpoint, he then suggests various ways of changing whereby the poet can make the end measured either by making the *mutaḥarrik* letter *sâkin* or vice versa, augmenting or diminishing a word or by changing one word for another and so on (32).

There need be no doubt in thinking that this complete view of poetic expression with its constructional, formational and rhythmic elements is not sufficient on its own to establish a theory for all poetic texts. Indeed, inevitably there remains the consideration of the overall structure of these texts. This matter will be taken up in the following section of this chapter.

III THE STRUCTURE

The two notions of structure and unity are closely interlinked in any artistic work. That is not to say that they are indistinguishable. From a lexical point of view, their separate identities are quite obvious. According to the Arabic dictionary *binya* (structure) is defined as "the ordering of the different parts from which something is composed" (33) and unity is "the existence of something which as such cannot be divided" (34).

However, literary critics - of both the classical and medieval periods - generally combined both these notions in a way which is reminiscent of the views expressed by earlier theorists. They claimed that different artistic features could unite to form a single cohesive structure. Both Aristotle and Plato alluded to the importance of unity or structural cohesiveness as the basic aesthetic ingredient in a work of art. Plato first propounded this law in two of his dialogues, the *Phaedrus* and the *Symposium* (35); and Aristotle asserted the unity of the artistic work and outlined its criteria and elements in his book *Poetics* (36). Literary critics of the Roman and Renaissance periods followed in the footsteps of their Greek predecessors in confirming the principle of artistic unity (37). In the late eighteenth century, literary critics of the Romantic era developed a theory of unity known as 'organic unity'. By this they meant the unity of feelings, thought and nature necessary

for the production of good poetry, as well as the unity of creative imagination as revealed by S.T. Coleridge (38).

Arabic critics of the classical period were preoccupied by the structure and unity of the *qaṣīda* - a subject which will be examined in further detail in the fourth section of this chapter. Here, however, a pause will be taken to consider the general theoretical principle of artistic unity in the *qaṣīda* as it was established by the Arabic critical tradition. There are two essential points. Firstly, the individual verse of the traditional Arabic *qaṣīda* was - as first perceived - self-sufficient. In other words, a verse has independent meaning and form and its recitation alone should satisfy the listener. Secondly, the classical Arabic *qaṣīda* contained - again from the same first impression - a collection of different thematic entities. The poet begins by mentioning the traces of the encampment and animal droppings; then he laments and elicits his friend's laments, and remembers the people who were there; then he relates that to an erotic prelude, to his desire and his sense of separation. Then he goes on to describe the trials and tribulations of his journey, his mount, and his relationship to his mount. Only then would he come to the central purpose of his poem, whether it be a eulogy or not; and he ended with gnomic verses or proverbs.

Some scholars have held that these two points - self-sufficiency of the verse and the thematic variety of the poem - prevent the

classical Arabic *qaṣīda* from having a unity or any organic unity. But literary criticism of the Arabic tradition has given a full justification of the unity and structural completeness of the *qaṣīda* which take these two points into account. This conception of the unity of the *qaṣīda* was applied to the heritage of Arabic poetry as a whole - a point which will be taken up in the final section of this chapter. Here, however, consideration will be given to the modern critical appreciation of the classical Arabic conception of artistic unity:

[This conception] ... brings us first of all to the fact that the poet used to think of his work as a unity with connecting parts, each of which surrenders to its companions, with some of them preceding others because that is the natural order. He [the poet] never believed that his *qaṣīda* was a disparate mixture and unharmonious. Secondly, there is the fact that scholars of Arabic poetry also realized that the poet did not give free rein to his words and that his poetry was made up of unrelated parts. Indeed, the poet's introduction of gnomic verses and descriptive passages throughout his *qaṣīda* does not make it fragmentary since he only produces them when the situation requires their presence in order to bear witness to his intention or to encapsulate its idea; and the same applies to descriptive passages. It is enough for one to return to the Arabic *qaṣīda* to see the proportion and harmony in it ... (39).

How, therefore, did Ḥāzīm al Qartājannī treat and explain this significant critical issue, the structure and unity of the *qaṣīda*; how did he expound upon traditional Arabic artistic structure; and what did he add to the Arab critics' conception of that structure?

- a) As already seen, Ḥāzīm established poetic form according to the way in which words are arranged, basing this arrangement on the theory of *naẓm*. Here it will be seen that he relates the structure and unity of the *qaṣīda* to a harmony between that formal arrangement of words and the arrangement of meanings. In this matter he believes that there exists an internal harmony between the words and between the meanings. It is the unity of the *qaṣīda* which gives the overall concordance and thereby bringing together these two harmonies. The first of which was called *al-naẓm* by Ḥāzīm and the second *al-ʿuslûb*. His statement on this matter is clearly defined:

... it is imperative to attribute *al-ʿuslûb illâ al-maʿânî* as one attributes *al-naẓm illâ al-alfâz*. This is because *ʿuslûb* is the outcome of the continuation of the description of each *jiha* (aspect) of the *jihât* (aspects) of the purpose of the discourse and the *kayfiyyat al-iṭṭirâd* (method of transition) of the descriptions progress from one to another. Thus it was the equivalent of *naẓm* to words which is the way of showing the continuity among words and phrases, and the form resulting from the method of transference from one to another and which position and order is required in types of composition and arrangement. *ʿUslûb* is the shape that arises from *al-taʿlîfât al-maʿnawiyya* (thematic compositions) and *naẓm* is the shape that arises from *al-taʿlîfât al-lafẓiyya* (wording composition). When *ʿuslûb* in meanings is the equivalent of *naẓm* in words, it is necessary to observe in it *ḥusn al-iṭṭirâd* (good transition), proportion, and ease of progression from one aspect to another and development from one theme to another just as one observes in *naẓm* the *ḥusn al-iṭṭirâd* among sentences, a respect for proportion and smoothness of progression. It is imperative that the condition of both *ʿuslûb* and *naẓm* should reflect the image of the situation imagined by the poet in his mind, whether it be of softness, harshness, etc. (40).

Those criteria given by Ḥāzīm are now considered essential attributes in the modern definition of ›*uslûb*›; he linked ›*uslûb*› to the manner in which a discourse is formulated, considering its content. By this he implied that ›*uslûb*› relates to the significance of the structure of the text as a whole rather than to the significance of the individual discourses, persisting all the while that ›*uslûb*› is the outcome of the method of continuation on the one hand, and the method of progression on the other. In stressing this, he drew attention indirectly to the necessity of recognising ›*uslûb*› through the context. We can thus understand his appreciation for Ibn Sînâ's comparison between good proportionate linking among meanings to that good composition from eloquent words.

... Look and you will see how this great Imam made a link between truthful poetry and *muḥākāt*, because good *muḥākāt* in truthful speech and the right links and proportionality between meanings is like good composition in very eloquent words (41).

Naturally, Ḥāzīm attempts to give a justification for unquestionable unity in the Arabic *qaṣīda*. Thus we see him justify that unity by saying that the poet's transfer from theme to theme is the transfer from artless simplicity to a rich construction. By simplicity he means a single state whereas construction is his term for a variety of states. He sees that construction can more easily fulfil the poet's need for self-expression, just as it has a greater effect on the listener or reader by enriching him with an abundance of meanings and

states and relieving him of boredom and monotony.

Likewise, it is not proper for him to persist in a long discourse for the description of a simple state. Rather, the construction of different states and the combining of one to another must be used, for example, in the combination of the description of the state of the lover to that of the beloved. Indeed, to extend discourse to a variety of areas, from aspect to aspect, with different constructions and forms, to compare some with another according to suitable ways in every method he applies, is much more pleasant than being confined to one state in every area of discourse (42).

Ḥāzīm summarises his conception of the structure and unity of the *qaṣīda* extremely well by clarifying the elements of both *nāẓm* and *'uslūb* and defining the poet's craft in terms of excellence of composition, proportionality, and connections between all the elements:

... since the poet's craft is of itself *jawdat al-ta'lif wa ḥusn al-muḥākāt* (excellence of composition and good imitation); the means of these two being words and what they signify. The *ṣidq* (truth), *kaḏhib* (deceit), *shuhra* (reputation) and *ẓann* (suspicion) are the things that relate to *mafhūmāt* (that which are comprehensible) which is part of the means; their attribution to the *madlūlāt* which are *ma'ānī* is like the attribution of *'umūmiyya* (commonness), *ḥūshiyya*, the intermediate ones and *gharāba* (strangeness) to the *adilla* which are the *alfāẓ* (utterances). All these kinds of words occur in poetry. The poet's craft in respect of them is to make good composition. In addition the above meanings occur within it and the poet's skill with respect to them is achieved by good *muḥākāt*, proportionality and the union between meanings (43).

In this manner, Ḥâzim conceives of artistic unity or a broad harmony which covers the concordance which exists in both meanings and utterances. There is no doubt that both of these call for a moment's contemplation so that it may be seen how Ḥâzim threads them together. Each composition will be dealt with separately in the following two paragraphs.

- b) Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî compares the verses of the *qaṣîda* and its divisions, with the letters and the words of ordinary language. He maintains "that the verses correspond to the letters of the word, and that corresponds to words, and that the *qaṣîda* corresponds to the complete phrase or sentence" (44). Ḥâzim concluded by demanding that the *qaṣîda* should be based on good composition and excellent proportionality in the same way that he demands the sentence be based on concordant letters and related words.

In establishing a structure for the *qaṣîda*, Ḥâzim is concerned about the relationship of every *faṣl* in the *qaṣîda* to what precedes and succeeds it; he makes every *faṣl* express one of its themes; and, when discussing artistic unity, it is as if he means by that the way of arranging the *fuṣûl*, i.e. the ordering of the themes of the *qaṣîda*. He propounded four rules for this arrangement:

The debate relating to the *dhawât al-fuṣûl* [traditional *qaṣîda*] and what is required for their conformation and their arrangement, one with

another, is contained in four rules:

Rule one: the right estimation of the material of the *fuṣūl* and the selection of their essence.

Rule two: the placing of the *fuṣūl* in order and their continuity from one to another.

Rule three: the placing of what occurs within the *fuṣūl* in order.

Rule four: which *faṣl* should come first and which should come later, and which should come at the end (45).

Rule one is the basis in the establishment of artistic unity because this basis determines *binya* (the structure of the *qaṣīda*) which includes all the formal and semantic elements in one construction. (It is worth noting that Ḥâzim was the first to employ *binya* as a term in this context.)

As for rule one on the right estimation of the material of the *fuṣūl* and the selection of their essence, proportionality must exist between *masmû'ât wa mafhûmât, ḥasinat al-iṭṭirâd* without weakness of texture, being strongly interwoven one with another. The interweaving prevents each verse from being isolated or excluded from other verses creating a relationship between them within the formal or the semantic *binya* in a manner that makes the verse's relative position within it correspond to that between the two hemistichs within the verse. This method of composition is preferred and it is imperative that it maintains a correlation between form and content of the *faṣl*. *Jazâla* is employed, for instance, in *fakhr*; and *udhûba* (sweetness) in *nasīb*. It is also necessary for the *fuṣūl* to be of moderate length neither too long nor too short (46).

If one dispensed with any consideration of Ḥâzim's division of the *qaṣīda* into *fuṣūl*, or verses grouped together according to semantic criteria, and therefore his ideas about each *faṣl* expressing one of the themes of the *qaṣīda*, one can concentrate

on Hâzim's understanding of artistic unity in a general way and deduce two matters of the greatest importance from the text above: firstly, the correlation between the method of arrangement and the theme; secondly, the dependence of *binya* on formal and semantic harmony.

As for the other three rules, they relate to methods of establishing poetic structure in detail. The second rule is the one which relates to the ordering of the *fuṣûl* one with another. In Hâzim's opinion, it is necessary to start with the *faṣl* that is most attractive to the soul according to the main purpose of the discourse with awareness of the expressions which are most suitable and preferable to begin with, which is followed by others in decreasing degrees of importance. In the case of semantic necessity, the poet may leave aside the basic rule on ordering and take that necessity into consideration so that the semantic structure may be well ordered. The third rule (on the placing of what occurs within the *fuṣûl* in order) relates to the composition of the verses within the *faṣl*, one with another. In this rule the poet must observe, in placing the verses of the *faṣl* in order, that a verse's position is determined by the fact that the verse expresses a meaning which relates to what precedes it, since the method favoured by Hâzim stipulates that "the verse's meaning must relate to what precedes it" (47). The fourth rule (on which *fuṣûl* should come first and which should come later and which should come at the end)

relates to the joining of the *fuṣūl*, one to another. There are four ways in which they may combine:

- One kind possessing continuity in their dictions and their themes.
- Another possessing continuity within their dictions but not within their themes.
- Another possessing continuity within their themes but not within their dictions.
- Another where both lack continuity (48).

It is clear that this conception relies, in the first place, on semantic harmony or a semantic basis for artistic unity. Our view is strengthened by the fact that Ḥâzim differentiates between the *qaṣîda* that is meant to be short and that which is meant to be long, and that which is meant to be of moderate length, and he also differentiates between those that are simple and others that are complex. In all of this the criteria he adopts is the number of themes contained in the *qaṣîda*; and a large number of themes, provided there is harmony, is proof of excellence according to Ḥâzim:

Concerning the *muqaṣṣarât*, if their contents divided into two themes, the poet will not have significant scope to fulfil the demands of the perfect *qaṣîda* ... as for the intermediate and long ones, the scope available in them in respect of that is extensive. Some are simple, in terms of theme, and some are complex. The simple ones are like those poems which are only eulogies or elegies. The complex ones are those in which the discourse comprises two themes such as those that comprise an erotic prelude and an eulogy. This is more fitting for truly sensitive souls in view of what we said about people's passion for variety in methods of discourse and types of *qaṣîda* (49).

If this is the nature of thematic harmony, what then is the nature of formal harmony? And how do their two natures meet in artistic unity?

c) Ḥâzim sees formal harmony as the result of many intellectual, imaginative and psychological factors. These are limited to four *ḥâlât asâsiyya* (basic states); and he regards these four factors or states as a plan on which the poet relies before and during the formation of his *qaṣîda*. In Ḥâzim's theory one can observe two obvious aspects: first, spontaneous imagination; and second, intentional artistry. The important point to be made is that formal harmony is more indebted to intentional artistry, even though imagination is required for producing the whole image of the poem. The four basic states according to Ḥâzim's plan are as follows:

- The first state is the one in which the poet conceives all the general themes which - or most of which - he wishes to introduce into his composition.
- The second state is that he conceives a constant method or methods for his themes, whether compatible or incompatible, through which he conveys his general meaning.
- The third state is that he conceives the arrangement of the themes within those methods; and the most important one is the place of *mawḍi' al takhalluṣ wa 'al-istiṭrâd*.
- The fourth state is to conceive the suitable expressions for the meanings in his thoughts, to recognise from amongst these expressions those which are parallel and those which have similar *maqta'* upon which he can establish the *râwiyy*. In this state he must also observe what is most deserving with which to start the discourse, and at the same time he may perhaps take the opportunity of noticing *mawḍi' al-takhalluṣ wa al-istiṭrâd*.

Ḥâzim completes his plan with four other more detailed states which relate to the poets imagining of meanings, one by one, his conception of their embellishment and completion, of metre and the compatibility between *mutaḥarrrik wa sâkin* letters, and his conception of the corresponding rhymes etc. (50).

All these elements of this plan relate to the form of the *qaṣīda* (i.e. to the aesthetic elements of words, phrases, metre and rhyme within it), just as all these aesthetic elements might give the impression that they are the result of an imaginative plan relating to nature, or that they are the result of an artistic plan relating to epistemology and intention. But Ḥâzim returns us to the basis from which he always emerges. That is *al-ṭab^c al-bâri^c wa kathrat al muzâwala* (soundness of natural aptitude and long-term practice). He comments on his plan for formal structure and formal harmony, by saying that they all result from talent and practice together:

In this way transition is the root of the formation of poetry. The poet may achieve this through outstanding natural gifts and plentiful practice. Through them the transition of his mind in these imaginings is so swift that people think that his quick mind means that his thoughts do not bother to consider these imaginings, even though he did not attain them except by observation, however small ... This is because the craft of the composer of words is like the craft of the weaver who, on one occasion, weaves a garment in a day and, on another occasion, takes a year. Each garment has its price. Yet he who is ignorant of the subtleties of speech and from whom the secrets of *naẓm* are hidden thinks that this variation in quality does not exist between different types of discourse (51).

These passages by Ḥâzim relating to the plan for the structure of the *qaṣīda* express a powerful and essential theoretical conception. If we were to pause at just this conception, however, we would find a large quantity of logical and formal analysis clouding the issue. If, on the other hand, we leave aside the logical and formal aspect and link it to the semantic harmony which we have already presented, we emerge with an integral conception for the structure of the *qaṣīda*. This is a unique conception in the Islamic critical tradition. As for the logical and formal aspect alone, it seems to be inspired by engineering and artificiality and removed from the subjectivism and emotional vision which Ḥâzim confirms in many places in his book. For this reason we see scholars paying attention to this logical aspect in Ḥâzim's conception; Jâbir ʿUṣfûr noticed that:

This logical understanding of the nature of poetic meaning paves the way for the notion of unity in the *qaṣīda* and leads to the treatment of the whole structure of the poem on a basis that it is a structure, in which its elements correspond formally and externally, and this deprives the *qaṣīda* of harmonious dimensions for its internal relationships. The formal assemblage restricts it to logic, firm independent elements meet together in it, what is between them reaches an external proportion which leads to a limited understanding of the unity of the *qaṣīda* which is made from discriminating, creative and observant powers equally. [The poetic faculties as categorized by Ḥâzim.] In this framework it would be easy to conceive of the fashioning of the *qaṣīda* in practical terms as completed without successive stages, every stage having an independent intellectual power, so that the formation of the *qaṣīda* begins with the poet's understanding of the logical correspondence between things ... (52).

This logical aspect, however, is combined with the semantic aspect so that we see that - as this same scholar says himself - "all the elements relate to one another within a more comprehensive structure" (53).

The integral conception which Ḥâzim proposed for the structure of the *qaṣīda* has prompted some scholars to say that his whole book almost revolves around this topic and that Ḥâzim intended to compose a complete conception for the structure of the classical Arabic *qaṣīda* in the same way that Aristotle did for the structure of Greek dramatic poetry (54). The idea that Ḥâzim proposed the most powerful conception for the structure of the Arabic *qaṣīda* recurs in many studies concerning the history of classical Arabic criticism. But the idea that Ḥâzim's conception of the structure of Arabic lyric poetry has its counterpart in Aristotle's conception of Greek dramatic poetry is a matter which deserves a critical and comparative study which will be undertaken in the final section of this chapter.

IV EVALUATION

The formal structure of the poem includes all the linguistic elements which formulate it, evolving from the single word into those constituent units of words that comprise the poetic phrases and sentences until eventually the complete formulation of the poem is attained, i.e. the unity, whole and complete. Thus the formal construction of the poem is concerned with two distinct issues: first, the fundamental criteria of the language out of which the poem is composed. In the case of the Arabic *qaṣīda*, the efforts on the part of the linguists, rhetoricians and classical Arab critics succeeded in reaching valuable specific results dependent on their study of the legacy of Arabic poetry. They determined, in addition, the means whereby the Arabic language formulated this heritage. Concerning this matter, the scholar or researcher will find that the critical, rhetorical and linguistic material within this same legacy is pure Arabic, a fact which is attributable to its dependency on the expressive and aesthetic criteria of the Arabic language itself. The second matter deals with the general aesthetic, psychological and philosophical notions concerning the unity of the poem and its structure, irrespective of the language employed. The aestheticians, psychologists and philosophers desired to establish the unity of the artistic work - that is all kinds of art forms created by any expressive means - as the fundamental basis of the process of innovation of the artist, in addition to

forming the basis of the process of reception on the part of the listener, reader or audience in general. It is clearly evident to the scholar that this second matter incorporates within it Arabic intellectual reasoning in conjunction with the unmistakable influence of the ancient Greeks.

In accordance with the above, the formal structure of the *qaṣīda* is the most comprehensive, critical area that enables the modern scholar to distinguish between what is pure Arabic and that which came about as a direct result of the influence of the ancient Greeks on Arabic thought, the most predominant in this respect being the influence of Aristotle's aesthetic thoughts. So we find in this case - the field of the formal structure of the Arabic *qaṣīda* - the most precise criteria in the evaluation of the aesthetic basis which Ḥâzim aimed at, firstly from the aspect of the connection between this basis and the Arabic critical heritage which preceded him and the influence of ancient Greek thought. Secondly, from the point of view of Ḥâzim's originality and the extent to which his innovations were incorporated into the formulation of this basis.

- a) Traditional Arab critics view the formal structure of the poem from three standpoints: first, from the relationship that exists between meaning and words or wording; secondly, from the composition of the words and sentences or what the classical Arab critics call *al-naẓm* or *al-'uṣlûb*; and finally from the unity of the poem. The question of words and meanings has already been

discussed in the first chapter of this research and the relation of this question to that of formal structure will be dealt with briefly here. The most preeminent and oldest testimony regarding this question in classical Arabic criticism, is al-Jâhîz's famous statement in which he clarified the important role of the words in the formulation of the poetic image in addition to establishing the complex and complete interweaving of poetry: "Poetry is formulation, a genre of weaving a type of imagery" (55).

Although the literary historian is able to trace two distinct groups of critics in the history of Arabic criticism, one of which were of the opinion that meaning held first priority whilst the other group gave preference to locution, he will, at the same time, find the most accomplished critics referring to the artistic excellence within the poem to the method the poet employs in the composition of the words and likewise in his composition of the sentences and phrases. Qudâma b. Ja^cfar upheld this notion (56) and Ibn Rashîq proved that most of the critics, rhetoricians and linguists were of the same opinion (57). Abû al-Ḥasan al-^cÂmirî (d. 381/992) stated that the relation of words to meanings is more like the relation of soul (*al-nafs*) to bodies (58). His contemporary, al-Khaṭṭâbî (d. 388/998), developed the duality of *ma^cnâ* and *lafz* and the relation between them; he noticed the close relationship between words and meaning in the text through which *The Qur'ân* achieved its inimitability:

... and by expressing it in the most eloquent words woven together in the most closely knit and most harmonious construction, that *The Qur'ân* has reached its degree of supremacy and inimitability (59).

This principle attained the utmost significance in the eyes of 'Abd al-Qâhir who rejected the idea of any separation existing between words and meanings as he noticed the coherence that lay between them and drew attention to the role of this coherence in establishing the formal construction of the poem. He "linked words and meaning in poetry in an extremely coherent and compact way when he identified them with form and matter and with the body and the soul" (60).

Style as a means whereby the words, sentences and phrases are composed, was held in high regard by the classical Arab critics although there were four critics in particular in the 4th and 5th centuries who became distinguished for their assiduous attentiveness to style in addition to the fact that they also determined its means and criteria within the Arabic poem. They were 'Abd al-'Azîz al-Jurjânî, al-Âmidî, Ibn Rashîq al-Qayrawânî and 'Abd al-Qâhir al-Jurjânî. 'Abd al-'Azîz al-Jurjânî appealed to the poet not to compose all his poetry on the basis on one method but to ensure that the style is compatible to both the occasion and the subject matter of the poem; just as the situation and the poetic purposes differ so to their methods of formulation must differ in order to achieve compatibility, within which lies the criteria for the excellence

of the poem, thereby enabling the poet to gain complete mastery over its expressive tools:

I would never ask that you systemize all the genres of poetry according to one system or apply a universal means based on one method alone. What I see is that you should allocate wording according to the different thematic levels; so do not make your love poetry akin to your vain-glorious poetry nor your eulogy similar to that which is menacing, or your satire the same as tardiness ... but attribute to each its appropriate level, giving it its full right and when you make love poetry, be gentle and when you make vain-glorious poetry, make it full of grandeur and use eulogy for what it is best suited, i.e. eulogy with bravery differs from eulogy with tactfulness and the description of warfare and weaponry is not comparable to the description of conviviality, each one of the two respective situations requiring a different treatment suitable to it alone (61).

Al-Āmidī - a contemporary of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Jurjānī - established four criteria to determine the excellence of the poem. The first is the mastery of the required tools; second, the accurate pinpointing of the main aim; third, the most apt form of composition; and fourth, the completeness of the artwork (62). He then placed the correctness of the composition over and above the others in terms of priority:

Each one which has the healthiest composition in terms of correctness should become the one most qualified to do this work as opposed to the one whose composition is confused (63).

In the fifth century A.H. we find Ibn Rashīq inciting attention by saying that the subject matters of Arabic poetry - eulogy,

satire, elegy, erotic prelude, etc. - are combined of necessity with different styles; for each one of these subjects an individual method should be used for its formulation; so he therefore described the good poet as one who:

... when he composes an erotic poem he becomes subservient and fawning, when he eulogises he overpraises at length, in satirizing he is brief but hurtful, when full of vanity his self-glorification is exaggerated; when he reproaches it must be gentle without degrading the wrongdoer, ... and finally, when his constant beseeching fills you with pity and pulls at your heart, then in this he can use repetition (64).

ʿAbd al-Qâhir established a comprehensive notion of style: "He thinks that it is *al-ḍarb fî al-naẓm wa al-ṭarîqa fîhi* (a method of composition, the means lying within it) (65). In the true nature of things, the 'composition' or 'style' becomes the gateway through which artistic writing or the formal structure of the poem is attained. In actual fact, that is precisely what happened in the old Arabic literary heritage. Ibn Ṭabâtabâ called upon the poet to:

... contemplate his poetry and to co-ordinate the verses in order to ensure good neighbourly relations and compatibility as a result of which the meaning becomes ordered and coherently related within his discourse. He must not insert between what he starts to describe and its completion, a part of the 'filling' which is unrelated to the core of his involvement as the audience will then forget the original meaning on which the discourse is based (66).

Al Ḥātami (Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Muẓaffar - d. 388/998) made a comparison between the poem and man, linking them to the co-ordination that exists between all the working organs of the body; "to remove one part from the whole is to completely alter its constitution with the ensuing result that the body is left deformed and thus its beauty disfigured" (67). The link between construction and unity attained a high degree of import to ʿAbd al-Qāhir who, as has been stated previously, asserted with unmistakable clarity that "al-naẓm is no more than the linking between some words with others, some of them again reasoning others to come to them" (68).

The parts of the discourse to be united, some of which are interchangeable, and to strengthen those links between them, that is the second with the first ... when you are familiar with this type of discourse, the one within which its parts are unified to the point that it becomes as one to your knowledge this is the most superior type, the paramount 'portal' through which one is able to perceive the utmost in terms of excellence (69).

These texts - and those of similar nature - have prompted Arabic contemporary scholars into making certain observations. One such important result concludes:

The way in which the traditional Arab critic discusses the question of unity deals with the phrases, sentences, singular verses, or two or three verses conveying the meaning of one part, but it is clear that their treatment in traditional Arabic poetry - either applicative or theoretical - did not treat the unity of the poem as a whole (70).

It is this in particular which set Ḥāzīm al-Qarṭājannī apart from his contemporaries by revealing his ingenuity and individuality within classical Arabic criticism, a fact which has been observed in the three previous sections of this chapter and which will be further illustrated in this section.

- b) The most authoritative and significant treatment of artistic unity in classical criticism was that given by Aristotle who dealt with the issue - in *Rhetoric* and his *Poetics* - a treatment which comprises the essential truth surviving to the present day and which still remains effectively applicable in the theory of literary criticism. Aristotle only dealt with the tragedy and the epic - bearing in mind that part of the *Poetics* is missing - but his treatment of the epic and the tragedy includes, besides the application, aesthetic notions on the unity of the artistic work whatever its kind. He combined the principle of the unity of the play with the function and impact upon the recipient. He then prescribed that tragedy precede the epic because tragedy implicitly includes an internal coherence which is not available within the epic, the resource of the internal coherence in the tragedy emanating from the unity of action. To scholars, Aristotle's understanding of the unity of action form the natural entrance to the perception of his understanding of the formal construction and artistic unity in general. To him, tragedy depends on an action which contains a beginning, a middle and an end. The beginning is that which comes after nothing but there are other events which come after

it; the end is that which comes after events but is followed by nothing and the middle being the one which follows the others and is followed in itself by others (71). Aristotle went further to establish the complete unity of the artistic work by bringing together the beginning, middle and the end in conjunction with the whole unity within the artistic constitution and its part in the complete structure.

It is inevitable that the story, being an imitation of an action, must imitate one complete action and the partial action must be in order. In such an arrangement if you alter part of the action or even remove part then the whole becomes confused and disorderly. If, on the other hand, an entity causes no discernible effect if it is removed or remains as it is, it would not then constitute a part of the whole (72).

These essential principles described by Aristotle have survived in literary criticism despite the fact that they were outlined on an occasion when he referred to a particular literary subject (tragedy).

- c) Hence, a vast, theoretical and applicable legacy was bequeathed which contained within it all the aspects that constitute the formal structure of the *qaṣīda*, from the singular phonetic words which evolve into phrases and poetic sentences ending finally with the complete artistic, structural unity of the poem. But as we have seen, the traditional Arab critics understood that artistic unity includes a phrase, sentence or group of phrases and perhaps one or two verses, or even a small

group of verses which formulate part of the meaning of the subject of the poem. However, their understanding did not extend beyond these limits to reach the comprehensive meaning of formal structure. Ḥâzim, on the other hand, not only inherited and assimilated these efforts but ventured beyond the existing Arabic notions in respect of artistic unity to benefit from Aristotle's theoretical conception which treats this aspect of the artistic work as a whole.

The three issues which have been our main concern in this research are firstly, the aspect of inheritance (i.e. Ḥâzim's inheritance) of the legacy of Arabic criticism; the extent to which he was influenced by Aristotle's aesthetic thought; and finally, his ingenuity and individual contribution towards that inheritance.

Ḥâzim excelled in his understanding of those immense legacies, both Arabic and Greek, but he differed with each of his two resources, an area within which his originality and additions are most apparent. Unlike his Arabic predecessors, Ḥâzim made the notion of the artistic unity include the complete formal construction of the poem and he differed with Aristotle's resource which studied the artistic unity within the epic and the play. He shifted this lesson or investigation to a different literary subject, i.e. lyric poetry. It is through the above that all of what has been said throughout the chapters on many an occasion is finally verified, i.e. the area of the formal

structure of the poem which forms the basis in this aesthetic study of the field of poetry which illustrates Ḥâzim's excellence. Shukrî [°]Ayyâd - being the first scholar to notice Ḥâzim's critical legacy and the first to study it - has asserted that he is unique within Arabic criticism as he was the only one to approach the notion of the formal structure of the whole unity of the poem, adding that Ḥâzim, in this respect, was influenced by Aristotle's notion. However, he also maintained that Ḥâzim's conception was not identical to Aristotle's understanding and this difference came about as a result of his awareness of the essential reality of the nature of Arabic lyric poetry, in addition to his subjective experiences and his own individual achievement (73). Another Arabic scholar expressed this matter in the following way:

Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî was the one most influenced by Aristotelian and Greek thought, being the most eminent voice to speak about unity amongst the traditionalists and the first Arab critic to speak about the coherence between the parts and their relatedness in terms of compatibility within the poem as a whole. He is therefore distinguished by this among all the critics for he broke away from the old established rules of Arabic poetry - [°]Amûd al-Shi[°]r al-[°]Arabî. His notion was more all-encompassing, profound and comprehensive; the depth of his reasoning concerning the poem's construction and his awareness of its unity within the poet's thoughts all compare with the views of modern criticism as is clearly manifested by the experiments and opinions of contemporary critics and poets (74).

What precedes asserts Ḥâzim's position within classical Arabic criticism, emphasizing the survival of his critical thoughts as

one of the bases of modern Arabic criticism which has revived the classical Arabic critical inheritance and which has also opened the way to the world wide critical inheritance, classical and modern, asserting in the end that Ḥâzim's critical theory treated the essential principle which has occupied the minds of the greatest critics since Plato and Aristotle right upto the present day.

A FINAL WORD

Hâzim's theory came at a time when Arab civilisation was just entering its "Dark Age". For this reason, it is impossible to find any later Arab scholars who built on that theory or used it to advance towards new intellectual and aesthetic horizons. In fact, after the seventh century, with Hâzim's contribution to the rhetorical aspect of literary practice, and the eighth century, with Ibn Khuldûn's contribution to historiography, the stagnation of Arab thought in the late medieval period meant that rhetoricians and literary critics only turned to sources that were prior to Hâzim. They did not understand the special features of his artistic philosophy which remained obscure until the discovery and exhaustive studies of Hâzim's work by modern Arab scholars in the middle of the present century.

We have discussed the attempts of western scholars to assess the part played by Hâzim's work within the overall history of literary criticism. But these attempts to place his work within this context are still at an elementary stage. As a result of our own research, we believe that a precise understanding of Hâzim's work in all its philosophical, linguistic and aesthetic aspects, can give us a glimpse of elements which place it within the general history of literary thought and which seem to prepare the way for modern studies on the role of language in literary works by, among others, I.A. Richards, R. Jakobson, and J. Mukarovsky, as well as the attempts of M. Riffaterre and other contemporary literary critics to discuss structural issues.

NOTES

CHAPTER 2

1. Welleck, R. and Warren, A. *Theory of Literature*. New York, 1977, 3rd, edition, p. 176.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 176-177.
3. °Ayyâd Shukrî. *Mafhûm al-°Uslûb Bayna al-Turâth al-Naqdî wa Muḥâwalât al-Tajdid*. *Majallat Fuṣûl*, Cairo, 1980, Vol. I, No. I, p. 58.
4. °Ayyâd, Shukrî. *Qirâ'a °Uslûbiyya li Shi°r Ḥâfiẓ*. *Majallat Fuṣûl*, Cairo, 1983, Vol. III, No. II, p. 14.
5. Wahba, Majdî. *Mu°jam Muṣṭalahât al-Adab*. Beirut, 1974, p. 544.
6. *al-Minhâj*, p. 10.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 222.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 227.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
10. al-Ḥufî, Aḥmad. *Saj° al-Qur°ân*. *Majallat Majma° al-Luġha al-°Arabiyya*, Cairo, 1972, Vol. 29, p. 91.
11. *al-Minhâj*, p. 389.
12. °Abd al-Raḥîm, Şafwat. *Ârâ Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî*. Ph.D. Research not published yet, al-Minyâ University, Egypt, 1983, p. 189.
13. *al-Minhâj*, p. 123.
14. Regarding this subject, refer to the article *al-Naḥw wa al-Shi°r Qirâ'a fî Dalâ'il al I°jâz* by Muṣṭafâ Nâṣif. *Majallat Fuṣûl*, Cairo, 1981, Vol. III, No. 3.
15. Tallîma, °Abd al-Mun°im. *Madâkhil ilâ °ilm al-Jamâl al-Adabî*. Cairo, 1978, p. 126.
This theory was discussed in detail in *al-Jurjânî's Theory of Poetic Imagery* by Kamâl Abû Dîb, pp. 24-64.
16. Welleck, R. and Warren, A. *Op. cit.*, p. 175.
17. *al-Minhâj*, p. 16-17.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
A strong parallel can be drawn between these notions of Ḥâzim concerning the role of the word and expressions and the modern, general dimensions in the study of poetic language. I.A. Richards and Ivor Armstrong led the field in the usage of words within poetry and the development of this research finally established itself by the science of semantics and semiology through the works of Roman Jakobson and Jan Mukarovsky.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 89.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 245.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
22. Bate, Walter Jackson, (Ed.). *Op. cit.*, pp. 573-587.
23. The subject of poetry and oratory was treated in detail within the question of *al-ṣidq wa al-kadhib* in the first part.
24. *al-Minhâj*, p. 89..
25. Richards, I.A. *Practical Criticism*. London, 1982, p. 199.
26. *al-Minhâj*, p. 91.
27. °Uṣfûr, Jâbir. *al-Şûra al-Faniyya fî al-Turâth al-Naqdî wa al Balâghî*. Cairo, 1984, p. 18.
28. *al-Minhâj*, p. 92.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 93.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 204.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 211.
33. Şalîbâ, Jamîl. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 218.
34. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 567.
35. Atkins, J.W.H. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I (Greek), p. 131.
36. Butcher, S.H. *Op. cit.*, p. 145 ff.
37. Bate, Walter Jackson. *Op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.
38. Welleck, R. *A History of Modern Criticism 1750-1950*. London, 1966, Vol. I, pp. 12-30.
See, in addition, Majdî Wahba, *Op. cit.*, p. 585.

39. Badawî, Aḥmad. *ʿUsus al-Naqd al-Adabî ʿind al-ʿArab*. Cairo, 1960, 2nd. edition, p. 321.
40. *al-Minhâj*, p. 363-4.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 84.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 348.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 287.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 288.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 288.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 289.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 290.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 303.
50. *Ibid.*, pp. 109-110.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
52. ʿUṣfûr, Jâbir. *Mafhûm al-Shiʿr*. Cairo, 1978, p. 453.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 444 ff.
54. ʿAbd al-Raḥîm, Şafwat. *Op. cit.*, p. 191.
55. al-Jâḥiẓ. *Kitâb al-Ḥayawân*. Cairo, 1938, Vol. III, p. 132.
56. Ibn Jaʿfar, Qudâma. *Op. cit.*, pp. 17-25.
57. Ibn Rashîq. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 127.
58. al-ʿÂmirî, Abû al-Ḥasan. *Kitâb al-lâm bi-Manâqib al-Islâm*. (Ed. by A.A.H. Ghurab.) Cairo, 1967, pp. 186, 197-199.
59. al-Khaṭṭâbî. *al-Bayân fî Iʿjâz al-Qurʾân*. (Ed. by ʿAbd al-ʿAlîm.) Algarth, 1953, pp. 6-8.
60. ʿAyyâd, Shukrî. *Kitâb Aristûṭâlîs fî al-Shiʿr*. Cairo, 1967, p. 222.
61. al-Jurjânî, al-Qâḍî ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz. *Op. cit.*, p. 24.
62. al-Âmidî, Abû al-Qâsim. *Op. cit.*, p. 382.

63. *Ibid.*, p. 383.
64. Ibn Rashîq. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 199.
65. al-Jurjânî, ʿAbd al-Qâhir. *Dalâʿil lʿjâz*. Cairo, p. 40.
66. Ibn Ṭabâṭabâ, al-ʿAlawî. *Op. cit.*, p. 124.
67. The text of al-Ḥâtamî in *al-ʿUmda*. Vol. II, p. 117.
68. al-Jurjânî, ʿAbd al-Qâhir. *Op. cit.*, the Introduction.
A parallel can be drawn between ʿAbd al-Qâhir and the notion held by F. de Saussure, the modern linguist, who stated that: "Language is a system of interdependent terms which simultaneously depend on each other".
Hawkes, Terence. *Structuralism and Semiotics*, p. 26.
69. al-Jurjânî, ʿAbd al-Qâhir. *Op. cit.*, p. 65.
70. Shukrî ʿAyyâd indicated that the unity from ʿAbd al-Qâhir's point of view does not extend beyond the phrase, one verse or more.
ʿAyyâd, Shukrî. *Op. cit.*, see different places between pp. 274-289.
71. *Ibid.*, p. 58.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
73. *Ibid.*, p. 275.
74. Bîkâr, Yûsuf Ḥusayn. *Binâʿ al-Qaṣîda al-ʿArabiyya*. Cairo, 1979, p. 487.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

In order to avoid confusion, I have retained the system of transliteration as set out in the beginning of this thesis; *qâf* has been transliterated as *q*, *yâ* as *î*, the *hâ* has been deleted from the end of all words and titles and replaced with *a*; and the *hamza* has been retained in names which start with *hamza* only when vocalized with *damma* ('U' sound).

I The Resource of this Thesis

Ḥâzim al-Qarṭājannî (Abî al-Ḥasan).

* *Minhâj al-Bulaghâ wa Sirâj al'Udabâ?*

(Ed. by Muḥammad al-Ḥabîb b. al-Khûja.)

Published by Dâr al-Kutub al-Sharqiyya. Tunis, 1966#.

II. Other works

‘Abbâs, Iḥsân.

* *Târîkh al-Naqd al-Adabî ‘Ind al-‘Arab.*

Beirut, 1971.

Ḥâzim's other books which have been used as a resource for this thesis will be mentioned in Section 2 of this bibliography.

°Abd al-Rahîm, Şafwat.

* *Ârâ Hâzim al-Qartâjannî al-Naqdiyya wa al-Jamâliyya fî daw' al-Ta'thîrât al-Yûnâniyya ma'a al-Taṭbîq °alâ Maqşûratihi.*

Egypt, 1983. Ph.D. research manuscript al-Minyâ University.

°Abd al-Rahmân, Mansûr.

* *Maşâdir al-Tafkîr al-Naqdî wa al-Balâghî °ind Hâzim al-Qartâjannî.*

Pub. by Maktabat al-Anjlû al-Mişriyya, Cairo, 1980.

Abû Dîb, Kamâl.

* *Fî al-Binya al-Iqâ'iyya lil-Shi'r al-°Arabî: Naḥwa Badîl Judhrî li.-°Arûḍ al-Khalîl wa Muqaddima fî °ilm al-°iqâ' al-Muqâran.*

Pub. by Dâr al-°ilm lil-Malâyîn, 1st. edition, Beirut, 1974.

* *al-Jurjânî's Theory of Poetic Imagery. No. I.*

Pub. by Aris & Phillips Ltd., Wiltshire, England, 1979.

Abû Ḥasna, T.Y.

* *al-Itijâhât al-Naqdiyya wa al-Balâghiyya fî al-Shi'r °Ind Hâzim al-Qartâjannî.*

M.D. research manuscript, Alexandria University.

al-^cAdadî, Ibn al-Bannâ' al-Marrakishî.

* *al-Rawḍ al-Marî^c fî Şinâ^cat al-Badî^c.*

(Ed. by Radwân Binshaqrûn.)

Pub. by Dâr al-Nashr al-Maghribiyya, al-Dâr al-Baydâ,
Morocco, 1965.

Âl Nâşir al-Dîn, Amîn.

* *Daqâ'iq al-^cArabiyya.*

1st. edition, Beirut, 1952.

al-Âmidî, Abû Bishr.

* *al-Mûwâzana.*

(Ed. by al-Sayyid Aḥmad Şagr.)

Pub. by Dâr al-Ma^cârif, 2nd. edition, Cairo, 1972,
Vol. I.

al-^cÂmirî.

* *Kitâb al-I^clâm Bimanâqib al-Islâm.*

(Ed. by A.A.H. Ghurâb.)

Cairo, 1967.

Anîs, Ibrâhîm.

* *Mûsîqâ al-Şhi^cr.*

Pub. by Maktabat al-Anjlû al-Miṣriyya, 3rd. edition,
Cairo, 1965.

Aristotle.

* *The Poetics*, Loeb, Classical Library, No. 199.
London, 1973.

* *Fî al-Shi^Cr: Naql Abî Bishr Matta b. Yûnus al-Qunnâ'i.*
(Edited, translated and studied by Shukrî M. ^CAyyâd.)
Pub. by Dâr al-Kâtib al-^CArabî, Cairo, 1967.

* *Fann al-Shi^Cr Ma^Ca al-Tarjama al-^CArabiyya
al-Qadîma wa Shurûh al-Fârâbî wa Ibn Sînâ wa Ibn Rushd.*
(Translated, interpreted and edited by ^CAbd al-Rahmân
Badawî.)
Pub. by Maktabat al-Nahḍa al-Miṣriyya, Cairo, 1953.

al-^CAskarî Abû Hilâl.

* *Kitâb al-^CSinâ^Catayn.*
(Ed. by Mufîd Qamîḥa.)
Pub. by Dâr al Kutub al-^CIlmiyya, Beirut, 1981.

Atkins, J.W.H.

* *Literary Criticism in Antiquity.*
London, 1952, Vol. I (Greek) and II.

^CAyyâd, Shukrî Muḥammad.

* *Maḥûm al-'Uslûb Bayna al-Turâth al-Naqdî wa Muḥawalât
al-Tajdîd. Majallat Fuṣûl. Vol. I, No. I.*
Pub. by al-Hay'a al-^CÂmma lil-Kitâb, Cairo, 1980.

* *Mūsīqā al-Shi^cr al-^cArabī (Maṣhrū^c Dirāsa ^cIlmiyya)*.

Pub. by Dār al-Ma^crifa, 1st. edition, Cairo, 1968.

* *Qirā'a 'Uslûbiya Li-Shi^cr Ḥafiz.*

Majallat Fuṣūl, Vol. III, No. 2.

Pub. by al-Hay'a al-^cĀmma lil-Kitâb, Cairo, 1983.

Badawî, ^cAbd al-Raḥmân.

* *Ḥāzim al-Qarṭājannî wa Naẓariyyât Aristû fî al-Balâgha wa al-Naqd in the book: Ila Ṭâhâ Ḥusayn fî ^cid Milâdihî al-Sab^cîn.*

(Ed. by A. Badawî.)

Pub. by Dār al-Ma^cârif, Cairo, 1962.

Badawî, A. Aḥmad.

* *'Usus al-Naqd al-Adabî ^cind al-^cArab.*

Pub. by Maktabat al-Nahḍa, 2nd. edition, Cairo, 1960.

Bate, Walter Jackson (Ed.).

* *Criticism, The Major Texts.*

New York, "1952.

Bîkâr, Yûsuf Ḥusayn.

* *Binâ' al-Qaṣida al-^cArabiyya.*

Pub. by Dār al-Thaqâfa lil-Ṭibâ^ca wa al-Naṣhr, Cairo, 1979.

Bradley, A.C.

* *Lecture on Poetry. The first lecture: Poetry for Poetry's Sake.*

Pub. by Macmillan, London, 1917.

al-Bustânî, Butrus.

* *Muḥîṭ al-Muḥîṭ.*

Pub. by Maktabat Lubnân, Beirut, 1977.

Butcher, S.H.

* *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art.*

Pub. by Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1951.

Chatman, Seymour.

* *A Theory of Metre.*

University of California.

Pub. by Moutan & Co., The Hague, 1965.

Coleridge, S.

* *Biographia Literaria.*

(Ed. by George Watson.)

Pub. by J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., London, 1965, 1982.

Cuddon, J.A.

* *A Dictionary of Literary Terms.*

Pub. by Penguin, England, 1982.

Culler, Jonathen.

* *Saussure.*

London, 1976.

Dâghir, Yûsuf As^cad.

* *Maşâdir al-Dirâsa al-Adabiyya.*

Pub. by al-Maktaba al-Sharqiyya, 2nd. edition, Lebanon,
1961, Vol. I.

Daiches, D.

* *Critical Approaches to Literature.*

Pub. Longman, 2nd. edition, New York, 1981.

Darwîgh, ^cAbd Allân.

* *Dirâsât fî al-^cArûd wa al-Qâfiya ..*

Pub. by Maktabat al-Shabâb, Cairo, 1977.

al-Dâya, Muḥammad Riḍwân.

* *Târikh al-Naqd al-Adabî fî al-Andalus.*

Pub. by Dâr al-Anwâr, Beirut, 1968.

Dickenson, Lewis.

* *The Greek View of Life.*

London, 1962.

Dayf, Shawqî.

* *al-Balâgha: Tatawwur wa Târîkh*.

Pub. by Dâr al-Ma^Cârif, 2nd. edition, Cairo.

Edmund, Irwin.

* *The Modern Literary Criticism*.

New York, 1956.

Encyclopaedia of Islam.

* Vol. I.

Leiden, 1913.

al-Fârâbî, Abû Naşr/Muhammad.

* *Falsafat Aristûtâlîs wa Ajzâ' Falsafatihi wa Marâtib Ajzâ' ihâ*.

(Ed. by Muhsin Mahdî.)

Pub. by Dâr Majallat Shi^Cr, Beirut, 1961.

* *Kitâb al-Mûsîqâ al-Kabîr*.

(Ed. by Ghaţţâs ^CAbd al-Malik Khashaba and A.M. al-Ĥifni.)

Pub. by Dâr al-Kâtib al-^CArabî lil-Tibâ^Ca wa al-Naşr, Cairo, 1967.

* *Jawâmi^ç al-Shi^çr.*

(Ed. by Muḥammad Salîm Sâlim.)

Pub. by al-Majlis al-A^çlâ Lil-Shu^çûn al-Islamiyya,
Cairo, 1971.

von Gelder.

* The article *Critic and Craftsman: al-Qarṭâjannî and the Structure of the Poem* in: *Journal of Arabic Literature*.

Pub. by E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1979, Vol. X.

von Grunebaum, G.E.

* *The Aesthetic Foundation of Arabic Literature.*

Comparative Literature IV, Eugene, Oregon, 1952.

Republished in *Themes in Medieval Arabic Literature* by
Variorum Reprints, London, 1981.

* *The Concept of Plagiarism in Arabic Theory.*

Journal of Near Eastern Studies III, Chicago, 1944.

Republished in *Themes in Medieval Arabic Literature* by
Variorum Reprints, London, 1981.

Guyard, M. Stanislas.

* *Théorie Nouvelle de la Mètrique Arabe.*

Paris, 1877.

Haddâra, Muḥammad Muṣṭafâ.

* *Kitâb Muṣḥkilât al-Sariqât fî al-Naqd al-^cArabî.*

Pub. by Matba^cat Lajnat al-Bayân al-^cArabî, Cairo,
1958.

al-Ḥamawî, Yâqût.

* *Mu^cjam al-³Udabâ'.*

(Ed. by Aḥmad Farîd Rifâ^cî.)

Pub. by Dâr al-Maṣḥriq, Cairo, 1938, Vol. VIII.

Hawkes, Terence.

* *Structuralism and Semiotics.*

Pub. by Methuen, London, 1985.

von Heinrich, Wolfhart.

* *Literary Theory: The Problem of its Efficiency.*

(Giorgio Levi Della Vida Conferences).

Pub. in *Arabic Poetry: Theory and Development.*

(Ed. by G.E. von Grunebaum.)

3rd. edition, California, 1973.

* *Arabische Dichtung und Griechische Poetik: Ḥâzim
al-Qarṭâjannî Grundlegung der Poetik mit Hilfe
Aristotelischer Begriffe.*

Pub. by Franz Steiner, Beirut, 1969.

Holt, P.M.; Lambton, Ann K.S.; Lewis, Bernard.

* *The Cambridge History of Islam.*

Pub. by Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1977.

al-Ḥufî, Aḥmad.

* The article: *Saj[°] al-Qur'ân.*

Majallat Majma[°] al-Luġha al-[°]Arabiyya.

No. 29, Cairo, 1972.

Ibn Abî al-Iṣba[°].

* *Taḥrîr al-Taḥbîr.*

(Ed. by Ḥifni Sharaf.)

Cairo, 1383 A.H.

Ibn Fâris, Abû al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad b. Fâris.

* *al-Ṣâhibî.*

Pub. by al-Maktaba al-Salafiyya, Cairo, 1910.

Ibn Ja[°]far, Qudâma.

* *Naqd al-Shi[°]r.*

Pub. by Bonipak, Leiden, 1956.

Ibn Jinnî.

* *al-Khaṣâ[°]iṣ.*

(Ed. by Muḥammad [°]Alî al-Najjâr.)

Pub. by Dâr al-Kitâb al-[°]Arabî, Cairo, 1957, Vols. I,

II, and III.

Ibn Khuldûn.

* *Muqaddima*.

Pub. Dâr al-Qalam, 4th. edition, Beirut, 1981.

Ibn Manzûr.

* *Lisân al-[°]Arab*.

Pub. by al-Maṭba[°]a al-Amîriyya, 1st. edition, Cairo,

1303 A.H., Vol. IV.

Ibn al-Mu[°]tazz, [°]Abd Allah Abû al-[°]Abbâs.

* *Kitâb al-Badî[°]*.

(Ed. by I.I. Krachkovsky.)

Pub. by Gibb, 1935, 1st. edition.

Ibn al-Nadîm.

* *al-Fihrist*.

(Ed. by one of the professors of Cairo University.)

Pub. by al-Maṭba[°]a al-Rahmâniyya, Cairo.

Ibn Qutayba.

* *al-Shi[°]r wa al-Shu[°]arâ[°]*.

Pub. by Dâr al-Ma[°]ârif, Cairo, 1956, Vol. I.

Ibn Rashîq.

* *al-[°]Umda*.

(Ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyy al-Dîn [°]Abd al-Ḥamîd.)

4th. edition, Cairo, 1907, Vols. I and II.

Ibn Rushd.

* *Talkhîs Kitâb Aristûṭâlîs fî al-Shi^cr.*

(Ed. by A. Badawî.)

Pub. by Maktabat al-Nahḍa al-Miṣriyya, Cairo, 1953.

* *Talkhîs Kitâb Aristûṭâlîs fî al-Shi^cr.*

(Ed. by Muḥammad Salîm Sâlim.)

Pub. Maṭâbî^c al-Ahrâm al-Tijâriyya, Cairo, 1971.

Ibn Sallâm, al-Jumaḥî.

* *Ṭabaqât Fuḥûl al-Shu^carâ*.

(Ed. by M.M. Shâkir.)

Cairo, 1974, Vol. I.

Ibn Sînâ.

* *Fann al-Shi^cr, Kitâb al-Shifâ*'.

(Ed. by A. Badawî.)

Pub. by al-Dâr al-Miṣriyya, Cairo, 1966.

Second edition.

(Ed. by A. Badawî.)

Pub. by Maktabat al-Nahḍa al-Miṣriyya, Cairo, 1953.

* *Jawâmi^c 'ilm al-Mûsîqâ.*

(Ed. by Zakariyyâ Yûsuf.)

Pub. by al-Idâra al-Âmma lil-Thaqâfa, Cairo, 1956.

Ibn Ṭabâṭabâ, al-^CAlawî.

* ^C*Iyâr al-Shi^Cr.*

(Ed. by Ṭâha al-Ḥâjirî and M.Z. Sallâm.)

Pub. by al-Maktaba al-Tijârîyya al-Kubrâ, Cairo, 1956.

Ikhwân al-Ṣafâ.

* *Rasâ'il Ikhwân al Ṣafâ' wa Khullân al-Wafâ'.*

(Ed. by Buṭrus al-Bustânî.)

Pub. by Dâr Ṣâdir, Beirut, 1957, Vols. I, II and III.

al-Jâḥiẓ.

* *Kitâb al-Ḥayawân.*

(Ed. by ^CAbd al-Salâm Hârûn.)

Pub. by Maktabat Muṣṭafâ al-Bâbî al-Ḥalabî, 1st. edition,
Cairo, 1938, Vols. I, II, III, IV and V.

* *Kitâb al-Bayân wa al-Tabyîn.*

(Ed. by ^CAbd al-Salâm Hârûn.)

Pub. by Maṭba^Cat Lajnat al-Ta'lîf wa al-Tarjamâ, Cairo,
1948, Vols. I and II.

* *Rasâ'il al-Jâḥiẓ (Risâlat al-Qiyân).*

(Ed. by Abd al-Salâm Har.)

Pub. by al-Khânjî, Cairo, 1965.

al-Jawharî.

* *al-Siḥâḥ.*

Beirut, 1947, Vol. I.

al-Jurjânî, ʿAbd al-Qâhir.

* *Asrâr al-Balâgha*.

(Ed. by H. Ritter.)

Pub. by Dâr al-Maʿrifa, Istanbûl, 1954.

* *Dalâʿil al-Iʿjâz*.

(Ed. by al-Sayyid Muḥammad Rashîd Riḍâ.)

Pub. by Maktabat al-Manâr, 4th. edition, Cairo.

al-Jurjânî al-Qaḍî, ʿAlî b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz.

* *al-Wasâṭa Bayna al-Mutanabbî wa Khuṣûmuh*.

(Ed. by A.M. al-Bajjâwî and M.A. Ibrâhîm.)

Pub. by Maṭbaʿat al-Ḥalabî, 2nd. edition, Cairo.

Kâmîl, Maḥmûd.

* *al-Dawla al-ʿArabiyya*.

Pub. by Dâr al-Maʿârif, Cairo, 1961.

al-Khafâjî, Ibn Sinân.

* *Sirr al-Faṣâḥa*.

(Ed. by ʿAbd al-Mutaʿâl al-Şiʿîdî.)

Cairo, 1969.

al-Khaṭṭâbî.

* *al-Bayân fî Iʿjâz al-Qurʾân*.

(Ed. by ʿAbd al-ʿAlîm.)

Algeria, 1953.

Kuthayr °Azza.

* *Dîwân Kuthayr °Azza.*

(Ed. by Ihsân °Abbâs.)

Pub. by Dâr al-Thaqâfa, Beirut, 1971.

Leech, Geoffrey.

* *Semantics.*

Pub. by Penguin, Middlesex, 2nd. edition, England, 1983.

Lerner, Lawrence (Ed.).

* *Reconstructing Literature.*

Pub. by B. Blackwell Ltd., Oxford, 1983.

Madkûr, Ibrâhîm.

* *Fî al-Falsafa al-Islâmiyya Manhaj wa Taṭbîq.*

Pub. by Dâr al-Ma°ârif, 3rd. edition, Cairo, 1976.

* *A°lâm al-Fikr al-Insânî.*

Pub. by al-Hay'a al-°amma lil-Kitâb, Cairo, 1984, Vol. I.

Maḥmûd, Zakî Najîb.

* *Qîmat al-Turâth.*

Majallat Fuṣûl.

Pub. by al-Hay'a al-°amma lil-Kitâb, Cairo, 1980, Vol.

I, No. I.

Mandûr, Muḥammad.

* *al-Shiʿr al-ʿArabî: Ghinâʾuhu, Inshâduhu, Waznûhu.*

Majallat Kuliyyat al-ʿAdâb.

Pub. by the College of Arts, Alexandria University, 1943.

* *Fî al-Mizân al-Jadîd.*

Pub. by Maktabat Nahdat Miṣr, 3rd. edition, Cairo.

al-Maḡarrî, Aḥmad b. Aḥmad.

* *al-Miṣbâḥ al Munîr.*

Pub. by Maṭbaʿat al-Ḥalabî, Cairo, Vol. I.

Maṣlûḥ, Saʿd.

* *Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî wa Naẓariyyat al-Muḥâkât wa*

al-Takhyîl Fî al-Shiʿr.

Pub. by ʿĀlam al-Kutub, 1st. edition, Cairo, 1980.

* *Mafhûm al-ʿUslûb.*

Pub. by Dâr al-Buḥûth al-ʿIlmiyya, Kuwait, 1980.

Moreh, S.

* *Modern Arābic Poetry 1800-1970.*

Pub. by E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1976.

* *Ḥarakât al-Tajdîd fî Mûsîqâ al-Shi^cr al-^cArabî al-Ḥadîth.*

(Trans. and introduced by Sa^cd Maşlûḥ.)

Pub. by Dâr al-Naşr al-^cArabî, Tel Aviv, 1970.

al-Mubarrid.

* *al-Kâmil.*

(Ed. by Muḥammad Abû al-Faḍl Ibrâhîm.)

Pub. by Dâr Nahḍat Mişr, Cairo.

al-Murtaḍâ, al-Sharîf ^cAlî b. al-Ḥusayn.

* *Amâlî al-Murtaḍâ.*

(Ed. by Muḥammad Abû al-Faḍl Ibrâhîm.)

Vol. II, Cairo, 1954.

al-Murzubânî, Muḥammad Ibn ^cImrân Ibn Mûsâ.

* *al-Muwashshah.*

(Ed. by A.M. al-Bajâwî.)

Pub. by Maṭba^cat Lajnat al-Bayân al-^cArabî, Cairo,
1965.

Muṣṭafâ, Maḥmûd.

* *Ahdâ Sabîl ilâ ^cIlmayy al-Khalîl (al-^cArûḍ wa al-Qâfiya).*

Pub. by Maktabat Şabîḥ, 3rd. edition, Cairo, 1955.

Nâsîf, Muştafâ.

- * *al-Nahw wa al-Shi^Cr Qirâ'a fî Dalâ'il al-I^Cjâz.*
Majallat Fuşûl, No. 3.
Pub. by al-Hay'a al-^CÄmma lil-Kitâb, Cairo, 1981.

O'Leary, D.D. De Lacy

- * *Arabic Thought and its Place in History.*
Pub. by Routledge, & Kegan Paul Ltd., 3rd. edition,
London, 1954.

Plato.

- * *The Works of Plato.* (Trans. by George Burges.)
Pub. by George Bell & Sons, London, 1903, Vol. IV.
- * *The Republic.* (Trans. by H.D.P. Lee.)
Pub. by Penguin Books, London, 1962.
- * *Jamhûriyyat Aflâtûn.* (Trans. by Fu âd Zakariyâ.)
Pub. by Dâr al-Kâtib al-^CArabî, Cairo, 1967.

al-Qarţâjannî, Hâzim.

- * *Dîwân Hâzim al-Qarţâjannî.*
(Ed. by ^CUthmân al-Ka^{CC}âk.)
Pub. by Dâr al-Thaqâfa, Beirut, 1964.
- * *Abû al-Hasan Hâzim al-Qarţâjannî wa Fann al-Maqşûra fî al-Adab al-^CArabî.*
(Ed. by Muḥammad Mahdî ^CAllâm.)
Pub. by Hawliyyât Kulyyat al-Âdâb, ^CAyn Shams University,
Vol. I, 1951, Vol. II, 1953-1954.

* *Qaṣā'id wa Muqatta'ât.*

(Introduced and edited by Muḥammad al-Ḥabîb b. al-Khûja.)

Pub. by al-Dâr al-Tûnisiyya, Tunis, 1972.

Richards, I.A.

* *Practical Criticism.*

Pub. by Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1982.

* *Principles of Literary Criticism.*

Pub. by Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1983.

al-Rûbî 'Ulfat Kamâl.

* *Nazariyyat al-Shi'r 'Ind al-Falâsifa al-Muslimîn.*

Pub. by Dâr al Tanwir, Lebanon, 1983.

Saintsbury, George.

* *A History of English Criticism.*

London, 1911.

Salâma, A.M.

* *Nazariyyât Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî fî al-Balâgha
al-'Arabiyya wa Maṣâdirihâ.*

Pub. by Azhar University, Ph.D. research manuscript, Cairo.

Ṣalîbâ, Jamîl.

* *al-Mu^cjam al-Falsafî.*

Pub. by Dâr al-Kitab al-Lubnânî, Lebanon, 1982, Vols. I and II.

* *Tâ rîkh al-Falsafa al-^cArabiyya.*

Pub. by Dâr al-Kitâb al-Lubnânî, 2nd. edition, Beirut, 1973.

Sanad, K.H.

* *Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjannî Ḥayâtuh wa Shi^cruh.*

Pub. by Azhar University, Ph.D. manuscript, Cairo.

Schacht, Joseph; Bosworth, C.E. (Eds.).

* *The Legacy of Islam.*

Pub. by Oxford University Press, 2nd. edition, Oxford, 1974.

Schoeler, von Goregor.

* *Einige Grundprobleme der Autochthonen und der Aristotelischen Arabischen Literaturtherie. Ḥâzim al-Qarṭâjännî Kapzel über die Zielsetzungen der Dichtung und die Vorgeschichte der in ihm Dargeegzen Gedanken.*

Pub. by Franz Steiner GmbH, Wiesbaden, 1975.

Shahrastâni.

* *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal.*

(Ed. by Sayyîd Kilânî.)

Pub. by Muṣṭafa al-Bâbî al-Ḥalabî, Cairo, 1961, Vol. I.

al-Shintamarî, al-A^clam.

* *Shi^cr Zuhayr b. Abî Sulmâ.*

(Ed. by Fakhr al-Dîn Qabâwa.)

Pub. by al-Maṭba^ca al-^cArabiyya, Syria, 1970.

al-Sijilmâsi, Abû Muḥammad al-Qâsim b. Muḥammad b.

* *al-Manzi^c al-Badi^c fî Tajnîs Asâlib al-Badi^c.*

(Ed. by ^cAlâl al-Ghâzî.)

Pub. by Maktabat al-Ma^cârif, 1st. edition, Rabat, Morocco, 1980.

al-Ṣûlî, Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. Yaḥya.

* *Akḥbâr Abî Tammâm.*

(Ed. by Khalîl Maḥmûd ^cAsâkir and others.)

Pub. by Maṭba^cat Lajnat al-Ta'âlîf wa al-Tarjama, Cairo, 1937.

al-Suyûtî Jalâl al-Dîn.

* *Bughyat al-Wi^câ'.*

(Ed. by Muḥammad Abû al-Faḍl Ibrâhîm.)

Pub. by Maṭba^cat al-Ḥalabî, 1st. edition, Cairo, 1326 A.H., Vol. I.

Tallîma, °Abd al-Mun°im.

* *Madâkhill Ilâ °Ilm al-Jamâl al-Adabî.*

Pub. by Dâr al-Thaqâfa, Cairo, 1978.

al-Tawhîdî, Abû Hayyân.

* *al-Muqâbasât.* (Ed. by Hasan al-Sandûbî.)

Pub. by al-Maṭba°a al-Rahmâniyya, 1st. edition, Cairo,
1347 A.H.

°Uṣfûr, Jâbir.

* *Maḥûm al-Shi°r: Dirâsa fî al-Turâth al-Naqdî.*

Pub. by Dâr al-Thaqâfa, Cairo, 1978.

* *al-Şûra al-Fanniyya fî al-Turâth al-Naqdî wa al-Balâghî.*

Pub. by Dâr al-Thaqâfa, Cairo, 1974.

Wahba, Majdî.

* *Mu°jam Muṣṭalahât al-Adab.*

Pub. by Maktabat Lubnân, Beirut, 1974.

Welleck, R. and Warren, A.

* *Theory of Literature.*

Pub. by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 3rd. edition, New York,
1977.

Wright, W., L L.D.

* *A Grammar of the Arabic Language.*

Pub. by Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981.

Zaydân, Jurjî.

* *Târikh Âdâb al-Luġha al-^cArabiyya.*

Pub. by Dâr al-Hilâl, Cairo, 1957, Vol. I.

GLOSSARY

This glossary has been compiled in order to ease the reader's understanding of Ḥâzim's technical terms as employed within this thesis. The main purpose has been therefore: to determine those terms which Ḥâzim accorded a new dimension; to avoid repeating well-known terms which can be found in most Arabic literary books; and lastly, to concentrate solely on those terms which occur repeatedly throughout this work. In addition, certain terms have been included which, although not employed within this thesis, may be of interest to the reader as they are peculiar to Ḥâzim alone. Every endeavour has been made to outline Ḥâzim's definition as accurately as possible, whether it be by direct translation, or by adaptation, e.g. *al-tanâsub*, *al-muḥakât*, *al-kadhîb* and *al-şidq*. In the latter case, no specific page from the *Minhâj* has been given.

al-basîṭa

- a monothematic *qaşîda*.

al-basîṭa is a *qaşîda* of simple composition, i.e. with one theme, such as a solely panegyric or elegiac *qaşîda* (p. 303).

al-basṭ

- prosperity.

al-basṭ is the feeling of pleasure, happiness and hope. It can be brought

about by wonder caused by innovative comparability (p. 11).

al-bayt s.

- a verse.

al-abyât pl.

al-bayt is composed of two *shaṭr* [see *shaṭr*] which are equal in the position and order of their feet (p. 249).

al-binya

- structure.

al-binya is that formal and semantic internal unity which includes all the parts of the *qaṣīda*, being strongly interwoven, one with another (p. 288).

al-dâ'ira s.

- prosodic circle.

al-dawâ'ir pl.

al-dâ'ira means to create one prosodic metre from another by starting from the second part of the first foot in the first metre, combined with the first part of the second foot, ending with the second part of the last foot, combined with the first part of the first foot. From this new combination another metre is formed (p. 230).

al-dubayfī

- a type of metre which is composed out of *subâ^Ciyya* and *tusâ^Ciyya* (*taf^Cîla*).

It was created by the latest Eastern poets, its hemistich measurement being: *mustaf^Cilātun, mustaf^Cilun, muftâ^Cilun* (p. 241). (Compare with that definition of I. Anîs within this work, p. 245, No. (80).

al-faṣl s.

- part.

al-fuṣūl pl.

al-faṣl is verses grouped together to form a part within the traditional *qaṣīda* according to semantic criteria (with one theme), governed by the metre and rhyme of the *qaṣīda* (pp. 88-291).

al-gharaḍ s.

- purpose.

al-aghṛâḍ pl.

al-aghṛâḍ are psychological states to which the meanings (of the *qaṣīda*) are addressed (p. 77).

al-ḥaṣhw

- the 'filling' of the verse.

al-ḥaṣhw is that which lies in between the beginning and end of the verse (p. 285).

al-ḥūshiyy .

- exclusive word.

al-ḥuṣhiyya .

al-ḥuṣhiyy is that kind of word which is exclusive in its usage within select literary circles (pp. 83, 185, 189).

ḥusn al-ta'lif

- cunning composition.

ḥusn al-ta'lif is the compatibility between letters within the word and between neighbouring words and phrases; it is ensuring that the letters which have been chosen arise from distant points of articulation. It is choosing the word dependent upon its resonance and significance with painstaking detail taken in the choice of the parts of the phrase, i.e. words, which signify the parts of the meaning (pp. 119-222).

al-iḡhrâb .

- strangeness (de-familiarization).

al-iḡhrâb relates to constructed quality, the poet creating his own peculiar arrangement of the words by which he explores new aesthetic and significant dimensions whereby the poetic language is distinguished (p. 71).

al-ikhtirâ^c

- invention.

al-ikhtirâ^c is when the poet invents or reveals a new meaning through inventive poetic imagery which is portrayed by means of excellent phrases, thus imparting a uniqueness to it (p. 195).

al-ikhtiyâr

- selection.

al-ikhtiyâr is a selection of verbal elements with respect to what is the best in the point of articulation of their letters, their concordance and their formation and quantity. It also selects what is the best according to acceptable usage governed by conventional methods (p. 222).

'ilm al-lisân al-juz'î

- partial linguistic and rhetoric sciences.

'ulûm al-lisân al-juz'îyya are those branches of the linguistic and rhetorical sciences which have drawn their rules from the laws of comprehensive rhetoric (p. 245).

- ilm al-lisân al-kullî* - the philosophy of rhetoric.
ilm al-lisân al-kullî is that which is based on logical origins, philosophical and musical views and others; it is the science of rhetoric by which we approach the means of proportionality in what we hear and what we understand (pp. 227, 244-245).
- al-inhiṭât* - decline.
al-inhiṭât is when two poets use the same meaning but the composition of one is far inferior to that of his predecessor, (p. 193).
- al-ʿiqnâ* - persuasion.
al-ʿiqnâ is contrary to true discourse because it is far-removed from truth, being based upon mere supposition (pp. 62-67).
- al-irtiyâḥ wa al-iktirâth* - contentment and concern.
al-irtiyâḥ wa al-iktirâth constitute the two main genera, the content of poetry which are then sub-divided into categories and sub-categories (p. 12).

al-ishtirāk

- sharing.

al-ishtirāk is when one poet composes the same meaning as employed previously by another poet and equals him in the quality of his composition (p. 193).

isti^cdād

- readiness.

Ḥāzīm defined *isti^cdād* on two levels. The first type is when the soul happens to be in a certain mood or condition similar to that described by the poem. The second type is to believe that poetry is like a judge who demands of noble souls that they should meet his requirements (pp. 122-123).

al-istiḥqâq

- entitlement.

al-istiḥqâq is that situation when two poets share one meaning and one surpasses the other in the quality of his composition, thus deserving the attribution of the theme to him (p. 193).

al-iṭṭirâd

- transition.

al-iṭṭirâd is the smooth progression of well-connected parts, i.e. phrases

and verses, within the discourse (p. 321).

al-ja^cad .

- halting and rugged

al-ju^cûda .

constitution.

ja^cûda occurs when four quiescent letters exist within a single foot in a certain sequence, i.e. when only a single movent letter lying between each quiescent letter (p. 260).

al-jazâla ..

- purity.

al-jazâla exists where there is a strong dependency among neighbouring words and when there is agreement in their quality, considering their usage.

jihât al-shi^cr .

- the aspects of poetry.

jihât al-shi^cr are those aspects described and imitated by means of figurative language, e.g. the lover and home in an erotic theme (pp. 77, 216-217).

al-kadhib .

- falsehood.

al-kadhib is incompatibility between the discourse and meaning (subject

matter) as it exists in reality. In Ḥāzim's view, the artistic falsehood is that which has an appearance of truth achieved by means of artistic mastery (pp. 64, 79-86).

al-kazâza .

- tediousness.

al-kazâza exists in those prosodic parts which contain excessive consonants (p. 267).

al-khayr wa al-sharr ...

- good and evil.

al-khayr wa al-sharr are those issues that human beings are inclined towards or repelled from by their very natures alone, according to the pleasure or pain induced, or from sheer habit (p. 20).

al-lafz s.

- word, words, wording.

al-alfâz pl.

Ḥāzim uses this term, either in the singular or plural, to indicate words and phrases, but mostly to indicate the form of the *qaṣīda* (pp. 63, 89, 177, 119, 344-346).

al-ma^cnâ s.

- meaning/subject matter.

al-ma^cânî pl.

To Ḥâzim, poetic meaning is the image produced in the mind of something that exists independently outside it (pp. 18, 173).

al-manzi^c s.

- method of procedure.

al-manâzi^c pl.

1. *al-manzi^c* describes the poet's individual treatment of his subject, a method by which he is distinguished. The discourse is determined accordingly until eventually an image takes shape which is either accepted or rejected by the soul (pp. 69, 365).

2. *al-manzi^c* is that individual treatment employed by the poet in the structure of his compositions and the formation of his phrases and which becomes his own exclusive law (p. 366).

al-maqtâ^c s.

- the end.

al-maqtâtî^c pl.

Ḥâzim employed this term to define either the end of the last syllable of the first hemistich (p. 283) or the last letter of the rhyme, i.e. *al-rawiyy* (pp. 271, 286) or to define the last verse of the poem (p. 285).

al-mawdû^c s.

- theme/subject matter.

al-mawdû^{ât} pl.

The subject matter is that area which relates to what human beings do, seek, or believe in (p. 106).

al-muḥâkât

- mimesis, imitation.

al-muḥâkât, to Ḥâzim, has two dimensions concerning poetry. The first is the conventional, limited conception, i.e. imitation as description, simile, or metaphor (pp. 94-97). The second definition of imitation closely identifies with that notion of Aristotle in which he claims that imitation is to imitate the object in action within the frame of probability and necessity (p. 99, 220).

al-mukḥayyil

- figurative speech.

al-mukḥayyil is poetical discourse which employs devices in order to address its discourse in a way that makes it acceptable and moving (p. 361).

al-muqaṣṣarât

- short *qaṣîdas*.

al-muqaṣṣarât is that within which if the contents are divided into two

themes, the poet will not have sufficient scope to fulfil the demands of the perfect *qaṣīda* (p. 303).

Ḥâzim also used this term as a synonym to the term *majzû'*, i.e. when the metre has been shortened by cutting some of its parts (p. 238).

al-murakkaba

- a polythematic *qaṣīda*.

al-murakkaba is a *qaṣīda* of two or more themes, e.g. one which contains an erotic and panegyric theme (p. 303).

al-mutaḥarrik s.

- a movent letter.

al-mutaḥarrikât pl.

al-mutaḥarrik letter (from a prosodic point of view) is composed of a quiescent letter compounded with a short or long vowel.

al-nafs s.

- soul or psyche.

al-nufûs pl.

al-nafs is that part of the recipient to which, being the seat of the emotions, poetry and the arts is addressed (pp. 11, 20-23).

al-naẓm

- composition.

al-naẓm is an arrangement among words; it is a form emanating out of the composition of words and phrases (p. 364).

al-qabḍ

- dejection.

al-qabḍ is the feelings of fear and depression caused by the change from a happy to sad situation (p. 11).

al-qâfiya s.

- rhyme.

al-qawâfi pl.

al-qâfiya is that which occurs between the nearest movent letter followed by a quiescent letter and the last letter of the verse which is *al-rawiyy* (p. 275).

al-qaṣîda

- a traditional Arabic poem.

To Ḥâzim, *al-qaṣîda* is a poem containing an unlimited number of verses, though not less than seven, and which is formed into parts sharing one rhyme and one metre; it can be either monothematic or polythematic (pp. 296, 303-305).

- al-raf^c* wa *al-khafḍ* n. - grammatical terms.
Arabic terminology used by Ḥâzim to indicate phonetic characteristics, i.e. 'ah' and 'oo' - *raf^c*; and 'ee' - *khafḍ*, etc.
- al-rawiyy* - a rhyming letter.
al-rawiyy is the last letter, either quiescent or quiescent combined with a vowel, within the last syllable of the verse (p. 274).
- al-rijl* s. - the smallest constituent
al-arjul pl. units which comprise the
foot.
Ḥâzim used this term to denote the *asbâb* and *awtâd* with no differentiation (p. 237).
- al-sabab* s. - a syllable composed out of
al-asbâb pl. two letters.
al-sabab is the smallest prosodic syllable possible in the formation of a movent and quiescent combination.

- al-sabṭ* . - smoothness.
- al-sabāṭa* . *al-sabṭ* occurs when three movent letters follow each other throughout the metre (pp. 260, 267).
- al-sâkin* s. - a quiescent letter.
- al-sawâkin* pl. *al-sâkin* is that letter which is not combined with a short or long vowel.
- al-shaṭr* - a hemistich.
- al-shaṭr* is that composed of a limited number of similar or different kinds of *taf'îla*, thus achieving proportionality and concordant measurement in their order (p. 249).
- al-ṣidq* .. - truthfulness.
- al-ṣidq* is the compatibility between poetic discourse and meaning (subject matter) as it exists in reality. To Ḥâzim, artistic truth is that which is produced when imitation does not go beyond the limits of probability (pp. 79-86).

al-ṭabʿ ..

- right natural aptitude.

al-ṭabʿ indicates, to Ḥâzim, one's intrinsic love of art in general and the inclination toward the purpose that the poem deals with in addition to being the completion of the soul by understanding the secrets of discourse and knowledge of the methods and purposes exclusive to poetry (pp. 199, 378).

al-taḍâdd ..

- opposition.

1. *Al-taḍâdd* occurs among feet when the position of their parts are opposite to each other in order to create rhythmical proportionality (p. 247).

2. *al-taḍâdd* is to contrapose two opposite meanings in order to create contrast, e.g. day and night (pp. 45, 48).

al-taḍâruʿ .

- symmetry.

al-taḍâruʿ is the equality between the largest constituent parts, considering the order of movent and

quiescent letters, of two feet which are employed in the same metre (p. 247).

al-taḏâ^cuf,

- two duplicated feet.

al-taḏâ^cuf is the duplication of two identical *taf^cîlât* within one hemistich but not necessarily closely situated (p. 246).

al-taḏmîn .

- enjambment.

1. *Al-taḏmîn* is when a poet adopts another poet's expression, verse or sentence or any historical event, or any Quranic expression and inserts it in his own poem (p. 39).

2. *Al-taḏmîn* is when one verse is dependent on that which succeeds it, as the completion of its meaning lies within the latter (p. 227).

al-taf^cîla s.

- a foot.

al-taf^cîlât pl.

taf^cîla is the constituent unit from which the *qaṣîda* is composed, each differing according to the number and kind of *sabab* and *watad* contained within it (p. 246).

al-taḥsîn s.

- beautification.

al-taḥsinât pl.

al-taḥsîn is poetical discourse which adorns what human beings do, seek or believe in (pp. 106-108).

al-taḥjîl

- *al-taḥjîl* is a form of embellishment whereby the last verse summarizes the part as a whole and makes an objective general statement concerning human affairs within the context of the part (p. 300).

al-ta^cjîb ..

- awe (feeling).

al-ta^cjîb arises out of the excellence of imitation and when the object being imitated possesses in itself rarity and newness (p. 127).

al-takalluf

- artificiality.

al-takalluf is used to describe rugged articulation, disjointed discourse or when the number of words in the discourse is excessive or insufficient (p. 223).

al-takhalluṣ

- digression.

wa *al-istiṭrâd*

To Hâzim, *al-takhalluṣ* is the gradual digression from theme to theme whereas *istiṭrâd* is the sudden digression from theme to theme (p. 316).

al-takhayyul n.

- imagination.

al-takhayyul is that poetic capacity which catches those meanings which exist in the world at large, observing those aspects through which the meanings attain compatibility and proportionality and what distinguishes one from another; and it is to create a variety of images from different meanings for different purposes (p. 39).

al-takhyîl n.

- figurative, imaginative discourse.

This term is employed by Hâzim in three different connotations:

1. *Al-takhyîl* as a synonym for *muḥâkât* [see *muḥâkât*] (p. 116).
2. *Al-takhyîl* as a specific, figurative, linguistic performance which is achieved by means of words, themes, ideas, style and the

peculiar arrangements that the poet chooses to use (p. 89).

3. *Al-takhyîl* as imaginative response whereby the poetic image or images which arise in the recipient's imagination move him either to do or to believe in something or to give up all such doing or belief (p. 20).

al-tamâthul ..

- isometry.

1. *al-tamâthul* is the recurrence of the same type of foot used to compose one metre (p. 246).
2. *al-tamâthul* also occurs among meanings (p. 44) in the same manner.

al-tanâsub ..

- proportionality.

Proportionality, from Hâzim's point of view, has a logical dimension which demands that all poetic elements, formal and semantic, function concordantly as separate entities or in unison until eventually the whole unity of the poem is achieved (pp. 178, 245, 227).

al-taqbîḥ s.

- vilification.

al-taqbîḥât pl.

al-taqbîḥ is poetical discourse which vilifies what human beings do, seek or believe in (pp. 106-108).

al-tashâfu^c ..

- a pair of identical feet.

1. *al-tashâfu^c* comprises two identical *taf^cîla* closely situated in the metre, with one following the other (p. 246).

2. *al-tashâfu^c* is applied, in addition, when two words, identical in meaning, are closely situated (p. 44).

al-taswîm

- an initial distinctive feature.

al-taswîm, a form of adornment, is when the poet starts the part with a markedly innovative verse which intimates the main theme of the chapter (p. 217).

al-'uslûb ..

- style.

al-'uslûb is the arrangement of meanings; it is a form arising out of semantic compositions (p. 364) and the

thematic continuity among meanings (p. 363).

al-watad s.

al-awtâd pl.

- a syllable composed out of three letters.

al-watad is composed of a simple part (letter) in combination with a *sabab*.