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1. **Scientific Background**

Style far more than content is at the core of the development of Arabic literature through the ages — especially that of classical Arabic literature — with rhetoric its primary underlying stylistic feature. In Arabic culture, Both the development of the pragmatic (practical) rhetoric–i.e., the study of how rhetoric in literary texts was used through ages— and that of the rhetorical theory –i.e., the theory as presented in the anthologies about rhetoric— are still of need of much research. The study of rhetoric and its development in *practice* and in *theory* is important not only in literary and critical studies, but also in other fields of knowledge. Heavy use of periphrasis, for example, in poems from a specific era followed by its neglect favour of simile in another period and of metaphor in a third may indicate mental or psychological change in Arab communities through ages. Rhetorical analyses and conclusions may thus provide a rich lode for anthropologists, cultural scholars, community psychology researchers, sociologists and historians in their understanding of specific societies through their changing historical times. Despite the importance of this field of knowledge, however, the study of rhetoric becomes very ignored in the modern research. This is due to one main reason: The ambiguity of the rhetorical theory. This theory is rich of diverse and to a great degree unclear material. The number of rhetorical elements differ from one anthology to another, the definitions often are diverse; and more importantly, not always they are clear, they differ in one anthology from another and moreover, in many cases they are contradicting too. The elements –to take one example only— which are responsible to creating an accustic order in the sentence –being a verse of poetry or a prosaic line— are diversified and their definitons are still unclear and contradicting. In one reseouce, these are called the *tashṭīr*, *tarṣīʿ*, *muwāzana*, *tajziʾa*, *tasjīʿ*, *mumāthala*, *tasmīṭ* and *taṭrīz* in one source [(Ṣafiyy al-Dīn al-Ḥillī 1992), 198-198]; and *tarṣīʿ*, *tashṭīr*, *mujāwara* and *taṭrīz* in another [(Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī 1952), 375-379, 411-415, 425-426]. And they do differ in other sources. Moreover, the notion of *tarṣīʿ*, which is common in the two quoted resources,is not exactly similar in the two, while that of the *tarṣīʿ* and *tashṭīr* is totally different in both anthologies. This diversified and, to a great degree, ambigious data in the theory of rhetoric led to a general state of rhetorical ambiguity, which led in its turn to the refrain of the scholars of literature from this branch of literary studies. This was a main reason for rarity of expersts in the field. In order to solve this ambiguity, there is a need to a reseach which studies the development of the definitons of all rhetorical elements mentioned in these anthologies from their ealiest stages. Only by juxtaposing one definition by the another, and studying the devleopemnt of this element, an accurage picture of the notion of such an element in medieval Arab culture would be clarified; and the rhetorical elements would be then sufficiently clarified and understood.

While the pragmatic, or let us say the practical, approach of studying rhetoric is emerging recently, mainly by the PI in his studies which were the fruit of another ISF project (see details below), preceded by (Heinrichs 1994)]; however, the study of the rhetorical theory is still in need of big contributions in the field. As will be shown below, the existing theoretical studies on Arabic rhetoric are still far from giving a holistic and clear picture of what the rhetorical elements are all about. This was the main reason laid behind the present proposed research. It will be the first holistic study for the development of the rhetorical theory in medieval Arabic anthologies since their outsets in the 3rd/9th century till they reached their peak at the end of the Mamlūk period which ended in the year 923/1517. The proposed project is ambitious to study the rhetorical data mentioned in these anthologies: Their contents and development and answering main question such as how the different rhetorical elements were defined in these anthologies and how these defenitions developed through time? The proposed project will analyse this data, and analyse the differences and even discripancies that exist between them. The output of this research –which will see light in journal articles and them accumulated in a research book— is apt to clear the ambiguity that envelopes this field of research and pave the way for future researchers to accomplish further studies on the practical use of rhetoric in literature.

Modern studies on Arabic rhetoric can be classified in four main categories: (A) General handbooks that present simple, short, and brief defintions of the rhetorical elements. They often target students for Arabic literature and therefore they are semi-pedagogic books rather than research books that aim to study the development of these elements as this project aims to do; (B) books that make their objective to study the development of the definitions of Arabic rhetorical elements, but they do not fulfil their targets; (C) studies that clarify the rhetorical elements according to one specific medieval resource. These are more deep studies than the first two categories; however, they are very few studies and they often do not deal with the question of the development of these definitions, neither they discuss the discrepant and ambiguous data related to these definitions; (D) studies that do follow the development of the definitions of a certain rhetorical element; however, the number of elements studied are very restricted and the number of the studies in this domain is much more restricted.

In the following, these four categories are clarified:

1. Category A: General handbooks that present simple and short defintions of the rhetorical elements:

The handbooks in this category deal with a long list of rhetorical elements but provide only succinct, very shrinked, and mostly incomplete definitions of these elements; such as Hussein Abdul-Raof in Chapters 5 and 6 (pp. 196-270) of his book (Abdul-Raof 2006) whose definitions address mainly non-native learning Arabic as a foreign language. The book tends to be more pedagogical that a research book and tends to be useful as a simple handbook on Arabic rhetoric (see Amidu Sanni’s criticism on this book in (Sanni 2012). Equvalent school books on Arabic rhetoric have been published in Arabic too; such as (Al-Jārim and Amīn 1999).

In 2007 and 2009, Fahid Abu Khaḍra published two books *al-tawāfuq al-lafẓī* (“Verbal Similarity”) and *al-Ḥaqīqa wa-l-majāz* (“Reality and Trope”) consecutively. The first includes definitions of the rhetorical elements stylistic embellishment while the second deals with the tropes and figurative elements. It is to note that rhetorical elements in later medieval periods (particularily since the 7th/13th century) was divided into three main branches: the *maʿānī* (“notions” or “stylistics of syntax”) *bayān* (“mode of presentation” or “tropes and figurative speech”) and the *badīʿ* (“embellishment of speech” or “stylistic embelishments”) [(Ḍayf 1995), 315-358; (Van Gelder 2008), 223; (Hussein 2015b), 1, 7-8]. Fahid Abū Khaḍra’s two books hence deal with rhetorical elements that are included in the second and third branches. The two books include 53 elements in the first and seven in the second. Abū Khaḍra collects different terminology used in medieval resources for those elements. The two books do not cover all the rhetorical elements and sub-elements, neither all of their terminology, mentioned in medieval Arabic sources, and not their detailed definition and of course do not deal with any historical development of these elements. The author himself declares in the introduction of his first book [(Abū Khaḍra 2007), 5], that his aim was not to deal with the history and the historical development of the rhetorical elements in the Medieval Arabic books; but to provide simple definitions of these rhetorical elements; sometimes subjectively interviening to provide his own definitions of the term. The different terminology mentioned in the two books are not supplied with biographical information and therefore the reader can never have an idea who is the critic who adapted a certain definition, and what was the chronological appearances of the different definitions related to a specific rhetorical element. His medieval rhetorical resources are only ten in the two books, and many other resources (a detailed list is found in the references’ list at the end of this proposal) are ignored. Important information about the rhetorical elements are not always provided even from the sources that he quotes (compare for example the definition of the *majāz ʿaqlī* or “the intellectual trope” in [(Abū Khaḍra 2007), 33-37] to that found in [(Hussein 2018a)]), and also main terminology and their definitions for some elements and sub-elements are ignored (such as the two old terms *tashbīh yaḥtaju ilā taʾawwul* (“a simile that needs an interpretation”) and *tashbīh lā yaḥtāju ilā taʾawwul* (“a simile that needs no interpration”) mentioned in [(ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī 1991), 90-93]). Some of the terms are wrongly defined, and the examples provided to them are also erroneous (see for example the *tashbīh al-tamthīl* “anaglogy based on simile” in [(Abū Khaḍra 2009), 323]; and also the *unāsaba lafẓiyya* “the verbal congruence” mentioned in [(Abū Khaḍra 2007), 113-117]). Abū Khaḍra’s two books do not cover the gap in the rhetorical research as described in the “Objectives” of this proposal.

In 2017, Hala Farrag published her *Wörterbuch der arabischen Rhetorik Arabisch-Deutsch* (Farrag 2017). It is a dictionary with brief defenitions, in the German language, of Arabic rhetorical elements. The importance of this dictionary is especially for its offering translations of the Arabic terms into another language, German this time. Farrag, in her introduction to the dictionary highlights the problem of the terminology related to Arabic rhetoric. Each medieval rhetorician depended on the terms of his predecessors, often modified them and in other cases offering new terms. This resulted with a large list of terms for the Arabic rhetorical elements. Farrag adopted only the most frequent terms. Since many of these terms have not been translated into other langauges, such as the European languages, Farrag offered in plentiful cases her own translations of the terms. As for the Arabic terms and their brief defentitions, she absorbed them from (Maṭlūb 2006). As the case was in Abū Khaḍra’s two books, here too, different terms are abscent from this dictionary. The definitions are too brief and they do not reflect the different, sometimes, paradoxing, definitions found in medieval sources; neither they reflect any historiacal development. In some cases, the examples provided are not accurate or at least they are controversial (such as the Haman’s example on p. 159, which is described as an example of the prädikative Übertragung [intellectual trope], while it should be an example of the synechdoche/metonymy; and Bashshār b. Burd’s verse on p. 70 which is mentioned as an example of the Gleichnis [an analogy based on simile], but it should be an example of the compound simile).

1. Category B: Books that are targeted to study the development of the definitions of Arabic rhetorical elements, but fail to do so:

The most serious attempt to compose a historical research for the Arabic rhetorical elements remains Aḥmad Maṭlūb’s book published in the year 2006, and entitled *Muʿjam al-muṣṭalaḥāt al-balāghiyya wa-taṭawwuruhā* (“A Dictionary for the Rhetorical Elements and their Development”) [(Maṭlūb 2006)]. The objectives, as mentioned in the outset of this book, are outstanding and they are similar to those presented for this proposed project. Maṭlūb explains in his introduction the need for such a study that collects all the rhetorical elemetns mentioned in medieval resources, regestering their terms and highlight the development in their definitons. And yet, Maṭlūb manages to collect more than one thousand rhetorical names. However, reading the entries in this book reveals that the aforementioned objectives are too far from being achieved in this book. Maṭlūb does not really follow the development of the rhetorical definitions in medieval sources as promised. He hardly quotes the definitions of a certain term in two or three medieval sources only. His material includes direct quotations, often unclear ones, from these resouces, with almost no attempt to analyse and explain them. The interrelationship between one diffention and another are almost not discussed. To take an example, the entry of *istiʿāra tamthīliyya* (analogy based on metaphor) (pp. 156-157) includes two directly quoted definitions; one appears in two books by al-Khaṭīb al-Qazwīnī from the 8th/14th century (d. 739/1338); the other is a short sentence quoted from Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī from the 9th/15th entury (d. 911/1505); a quotation that appears also in a third resource by Ibn Maʿṣūm al-Madanī who lived two centuries later (d. 1119/1707). The quotation from al-Khaṭīb al-Qazwīnī was complicated, but not explained or interpreted. Most of the entry includes poetry examples quoted, mostly without analysis, from medieval resources. The important and detailed notes, that can lead to a thorough understanding of the notion of analogy based on metaphor that appear, for example, in the two famous books of ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī from the 5th/11th century are not mentioned at all in this entry )see his two books [(ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī 1991), cf. 115-139, 238-262 and (ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī 1992), cf. 66-79]. Moreover, one of the examples quoted by Maṭlūb is a problematic verse by al-Mutanabbī (p. 157). It tends to be an analogy based on simile (a type of what is known as the “implied simile”, or *tashbīh ḍīmnī*) rather than a metaphor. The verse is quoted in [(ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī 1991), 118] in a chapter that analyses the affection of the use of analogy in literature on the readers/receivers. The chapter by ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī deals mainly with analogy based on simile cases. Maṭlūb does not explain why he quotes this specific verse as an example of an analogy based on metaphor and not on simile. In brief, this books by Maṭlūb is not an analytical comparative study of the rhetorical terms, the history of these terms and the development of their definitions in medieval Arabic resouces.

There are several other studies that fall under this category –such as (Ṭabbāna 1958), (ʿAbd al-Qādir 1983), (Sulṭān 1986), (Al-Marāghī 1991)— however, they have the same lacks as mentioned above and they do not close the research gap nor achieve the objectives that this proposed project aims to close and achieve.

All studies included Categories A and B do not address problematic questions related to the rhetorical elemens; such as those ambigous details that are related to a specific rhetorical element, or the contradiction in the definitions of the same rhetorical element in different medieval anthologies, or the development of this definition in its historical perspective, or covering all the different terminology that appears for the same element in different books, or covering all the sub-types of a certain rhetorical element. When moving from theory to practice, or in other words, when moving to study the rhetorical fabric in a certain literary text, these definitions found in the modern studies are not sufficient and the researcher grambles with rhetorical ambiguities which none of these modern studies are able to provide answers to them.

1. Category C: Studies that clarify the rhetorical elements according to one specific medieval resource.

These studies are more useful for our proposed research; since they will help understanding how rhetorical elements were dealt with in single sources which are part of the sources that will be used in the present project. The studies in this category address two main late medieval sources from the Mamlūk (648-923 / 1250-1517) and Ottoman periods (923-1341/1517-1922).

The main studies in tthis category include the works of August Ferdinand Mehren and that of Pierre Cachia. Mehren’s book (Mehren 1853) depends mainly on al-Khaṭīb al-Qazwīnī’s (d. 739/1338) book called *Talkhīṣ al-miftāḥ* (“A Summary for the *Miftāḥ*”); which is a summary of the third section –dedicated to the rhetorical elements— of the *Miftāḥ al-ʿulūm* (“Key to the Sciences”) by al-Sakkākī (d. 626/1229). Al-Kaṭīb al-Qazwīnī’s books was a famous rhetorical book in medieval ages and in our days. Mehren explains the rhetorical elements mentioned in, and according to, this book, and he adds explanations for this data extracted from two commentaries written by al-Taftāzānī (d. 793/1390) on al-Qazwīnī’s book – the long and shortened commentaries, *al-sharḥ al-muṭawwal* and *al-mukhtaṣar*—, and on a versification of al-Qazwīnī’s data found in al-Suyūṭī’s (d. 911/1505) known as *ʿUqūd al-jumān fī ʿilm al-maʿānī wa-l-bayān* (“The Nickleces of Pearls in the Two Sciences of the Notions and the Good Style”).

Cachia’s study, on the other hand, relies on the book of the 12th/18th century Ṣūfī scholar form Damascus ʿAbd al-Ghanī l-Nābulsī (d. 1143/1731), called *Nafaḥāt al-azhār ʿalā nasamāt al-asḥār fī madḥ l-nabī l-mukhtār* (“The Exhalations of Flowers on the Daybreak Breezes in Praise of the Chosen Prophet”). This is a voluminous commentary of a *badīʿiyya* that al-Nābulī composed in praise of Prophet Muḥammad. The term *badīʿiyya* indicates a poem in praise of Prophet Muḥamamd, in each verse one rhetorical element is used. The commnetry of al-Nābulī includes a definition of these rhetorical elements and the book of Cachia includes an Arabic and English summary of these definitions. Although the book by Cachia is considered a main rhetorical handbook that is helpful for the use of the use of students of classical Arabic literature who are interested in rhetoric; however, it depends only on the definitions of one scholar only who is considered one of the latest medieval authors on Arabic rhetoric. It is, as Cachia identifies in the outset of his book, a “handbook of *late badīʿ* (the term *badīʿ* is generally used here to refer to the rhetorical elements). As Cachia himself acknowledges, his books is a sift al-Nābulsī’s material, condense it, order it and make it as usable. From the plentiful illustrations and definitoons mentioned by al-Nābulsī, Cachia offered only the most revealing of them. The book misses many types and sub-types of rhetorical elements (such as for example the *majāz ʿaqlī* or intellectual trope, and many sub-types of metaphors, similes and metonymies). The definitions of other rhetorical elements are in contradiction of the definitions of the same elements found in other medieval rhetorical books (see for examples the difference in the definition of the term *tasjīʿ/sajʿ* in [(Cachia 1998), English Part, 13] with its equivalents in [(Ibn Jābir al-Andalusī 1985), 57]). Besides, the terminology used by al-Nābulsī to indicate the rhetorical elements sometimes differ from what was used by other medieval scholars. Cachia was aware to the terminological non-stability in the writings of the medieval Arabic scholars and stated in the introduction of his book that this is an enormous task and expressed hope that future research will trace each term back in time to ascertain when it came into being and how its meaning has changed.

One of the problems that confronted Cachia is the translation of the Arabic terms into English. Cachia offered an English name for each Arabic term. Where there is an identical or very similar rhetorical element in English, the English term was adopted. However, in many cases, the Arabic element cannot be translated. Where there is no or only partial equivalence, the term was translated by Cachia to reflect the meaning of the Arabic. In many cases, the English term has no-sense to the English reader. The scholar who uses Cachia’s terminology has to accompany these terms with explanatory notes to clarify their notions and meanings.

1. Category D: Studies that do follow the development of the definitions of a certain rhetorical element:

There are studies which clarifies a single rhetorical element, or a group of relative elements, according to one main medieval book. Here, Sieger A. Bonebakker’s contribution from 1966 (Bonebakker 1966) is a good example of these studies. Bonebakker studied the notion of *tawriya* (“double entendre”) and other rhetorical elements related to the *tawriya* (mainly the *istikhdām*; “a compound sentence where the main clause and the subordinate each make use of one of the double meanings of the term on which the figure depends”) based on al-Ṣafadī’s (d. 764/1363) unpublished manuscript (now edited and published [(Ibn Aybak al-Ṣafadī 2013)]) *Faḍḍ al-khitām ʿan al-tawriya wa-l-istikhdām* (“Removing the Seal of the *tawriya* and *istikhdām*”). Bonebakker has discussed also the definition of the term according to other rhetoricians besides al-Ṣafadī.

Another vital contribution includes studies on the historical development of the definitions of medieval critics for a single rhetorica element. Here, Wolfhart Heinrichs’ studies on the metaphor are the most prominent, and possibly deepest, in the domain. In 1977, Henirich published his study on the notion of metaphor as understood by medieval critics (Heinrichs 1977). He scanned the definitions of several medieval scholars of the term, and also analysed the verses which they quoted to conclude further data about how each scholar conceived the notion of metaphor. The main conlusion in Heinrichs was that the medieval scholars in the early four-five centuries after Islam considered only one type of metaphor, which is the *istiʿāra makniyya* or, what Henirchs calls, the “old metaphor” (when borrign A to B; such as the case in the “*hand* of the north wind” where wind has no hands in reality). Only later, critics focused on another type of metaphor, which is the *istiʿāra taṣrīḥiyya* or the “new metaphor” (using A instead of B; when using “narcissus” as a metaphor for the beloved’s eye). The difference between the two sub-types of metaphor is the reliance of the first on analogy and the reliance of the second on the similarity between the two parts of metaphor. Henrichs discussed also notions on the “verb metaphor” and examines additional sub-types of this rhetorical figure. Heinrichs did not, as in other cases which have been described above, quote definitions mentioned by medieval scholars only, but he deeply analysed them and made through them thorough conclusions. Heinrichs enriched his analysis of the notions of the medieval Arab critics on metaphor particularily and on trope (or *majāz*) generally in other studies; such as (Heinrichs 1984a), (Heinrichs 1984b), (Heinrichs 1991), (Heinrichs, n.d.). Heinrich’s entries on some rhetorical elements in the Enclyclopaedia of Islam –such as (Heinrichs, n.d.), (Heinrichs, n.d.), – include also a similar historical, deeply analyzed, approach and they do highlight some of the development in the conception of the medieval scholars for these rhetorical elements. In order to shed a stronger light on metaphor, Heinrichs examined verses that included this rhetorical element and he suggested a further sub-type of metaphor, which was not examined in the writings of the medieval rhetoricians, called the Paired Metaphor (Heinrichs 1986).

In her unpublished PhD dissertation (Noy 2016), Avigail Noy traces the development of *ʿilm al-bayān* (she translates it as “the science of good style”; free translation “figures of speech”) which includes mainly the *majāz* (she translates it in its broader sense as “figurative language”) in the rhetorical writings from the 7th-8th/13th-14th centuries in Great Syria and Egypt. As a case study, Noy analyses in depth the development of the *majāz* in these writings and compares them to earlier notions found mainly in the writings of ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, one of the most important literary theorists of the mediaeval Arab world. She concludes that the conception of *majāz* in these later writings have been changed from that in earlier works, and that only now, constituting a non-Jurjānian notion of the *majāz*, became suitable to explain the compatibility of this concept and metaphor. Noy explains how in the latter writings, rhetorical elements of *ʿilm al-bayān* which were not considered a *majāz* by ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, were classified under the *majāz*.

The rhetorical notions in the writings of ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, specifically his theory on the poetic imagery (including metaphor, trope in general, and simile), were also studied by several modern scholars; the main of them are Kamal Abu-Deeb in (Abu-Deeb 1971) and (Abu-Deeb 1979); Lara Harb in (Harb 2015) and (Harb 2020), the PI (Hussein 2018a), and Avigail Noy in her (Noy 2019).

Besides the vital contribution of Heinrichs, there are additional studies which examine further rhetorical elements and their definitions in late medieval rhetorical books; such as ʿAlī l-Jundī’s studies on the rhyming in poetry and prose (*sajʿ*) and paronomasia (*jinās*) [(Al-Jundī 1951); (Al-Jundī 1954)]. The contributions of Geert Jan van Gelder are prominent here through his articles on the “fluency” (*insijām*) (Van Gelder 2003), the “fantastic aetiology” (*ḥusn al-taʿlīl*) (Van Gelder 2008); and later his article on the “stylistic excellence” (*ibdāʿ*); i.e., the accumulation of several figures in the same line. In these articles, van Gelder analyses the meaning of each of these elements based mainly, but not only, on main *badīʿiyyāt* commentaries(“poems illustrating the various rhetorical figures and embellishments usually taking the form of a eulogy on the Prophet”). These articles are counted besides van Gelder, and other scholars’, entires of *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* such as the contribution on the enjambment (*taḍmīn*) (Van Gelder, n.d.).

**B. Research Objectives & Expected Significance**

The main objective in this project is to provide a deep and holistic study for the historical development of definitions of rhetorical elements as do they appear in medieval Arabic books on rhetoric, starting from Ibn al-Muʿtazz’ book, *Kitāb al-Badīʿ* (“The Book on the fine Style”), which is considered the first classical Arabic book on rhetoric, and ending with the Late Mamlūk period in the the year 923/1517. The diffentions, and terms, related to a specific rhetorical element would be scanned in these books (a list of them appears in the appendix). The definitions and terms of each rhetorical elment and sub-element would be carefully studied dicachronically. Differences, contradictions, and similarities and unclarities, related to the definitions would be analyzed. Since one of the three branches of Arabic rhetoric, namely the *ʿilm al-maʿānī*, is closer to Grammar more than to rhetoric, the concentration of this research would be only on the other two branches which are the *ʿilm al-bayān* and *ʿilm al-badīʿ*. While opening the opportunity, for conducting a similar research in the future dealing with *ʿilm al-maʿānī*. The results of this research would be presented gradually in journal articles. The articles, and also further chapters, will be collected later and published in one book to be entitled “The Historical Development of Arabic Rhetorical Theory: The *ʿilm al-bayān* (“Figures of Speech”) and *ʿilm al-badīʿ* (“Rhetorical Embellisments”) in Medieval Rhetorical Anthologies Till the Year 923/1517”. The main objective of this publication is to offer a deep understanding of the development of the rhetorical theory as it is presented in the rhetorical anthologies in medieval ages. The results of this project will be a vital contribution towards understanding the rhetorical elements mentioined in these anthologies including providing a hoslitic and deep picture of their historical theoretical development. The project’s final output will open doors to future reseach on Arabic rhetoric; a field of research which till this date is still suffering mainly due to the complications and unclarities incorporated in it.

The research will investigate the following questions:

1. What are the rhetorical elements and sub-elements found in medieval Arabic books on rhetoric?
2. How each element/sub-element was defined in these books? And how these definitons changed and developed through time?
3. What are the terminology used to each element/sub-element? And how this terminology changed and developed through time?
4. Can this historical analytical treatment of the rhetorical data help in setting unclarities and contradictions found in some of these books?
5. Can this research lead to a compromising simple definition of each rhetorical element/sub-element?

The significance and novelty of this study derives directly from the fact that it will be the first holistic and comprehensive study of the two branches of rhetoric. The present research will be the first systematic study that analyzes the historical development of these elements. It will lead to a deep and accurate understanding of these elements/sub-elements; and hence will encourage studies on the role Arabic rhetoric played in the development of Arabic literature through ages, and Arabic culture through times. Once the theory of medieval Arabic rhetoric is understood, it will open also the way towards comparative studies between Arabic and non-Arabic rhetoric.

**C. Detailed Description of the Proposed Research (Methodology)**

Corpus

Systematic discussion of rhetorical elements started in *Kitāb al-Badīʿ* (“The Book of the New Style”) by Ibn al-Muʿtazz (d. 296/908) which was composed in the year 274/887. Since then, Medieval Arabic critics dealt rhetorical elements through two types of sources: Some included main chapters that define rhetorical elements; and others were completely dedicated to the definition and clarification of these elments. The number of the elements and sub-elements arouse through time. Shawqī Ḍayf in his (Ḍayf 1995) listed and described a large number of these books. In the present research, the PI will rely on the sources mentioned in Ḍayf’s book in addition to others which are not included in his reference. Modern research believe that the development of Arabic theoretical theory reached its peak in the third part of al-Sakkākī’s book *Miftāḥ al-ʿulūm* (“Key to the Sciences”) and by the summary al-Khaṭīb al-Qazwīnī wrote on this part particularly his *Talkhīṣ al-Miftāḥ* (“The Summary of the *Miftāḥ*”). Later books were based mainly on a commetary or abbreviation of the data found in these two books [(Ḍayf 1995), 314-358]. The Mamlūk period (648-923 / 1250-1517) witnessed a development of a genre called *badīʿiyyāt* (defined in the Scientific Background). As the books of al-Sakkākī and al-Khaṭīb al-Qazwīnī, the *badīʿiyyāt* too included a large number of rhetorical elements and sub-elements. Commentaries on these poems, based particularily on detailed denfinitions of their rhetorical elements have been composed often by the poets themselves in large volumes. The period that the proposed ISF research will cover is the books composed sicne *Kitāb al-Badīʿ* of Ibn al-Muʿtazz, ending by the commentaries on the *badīʿiyyāt* written till the end of the Mamlūk period in the year 923/1517. A list of these references is found in an appendix at the end of this proposal.

A Previous ISF Project by the PI on Arabic Rhetoric

In 2014, the PI received the ISF grand for his proposed project “The Rhetoric of the Traditional Tripartite Pre-Islamic and ʿAbbāsid *Qaṣīda*: A Comparative Study” (application number 1861/14). The project was funded for three years and aimed at studying the pragmatic development of Arabic rhetoric as was used in poetry since its earliest ages in the pre-Islamic times till the 5th/11th century. The question of how rhetoric developed in Arabic poetry remained unanswered and therefore the main objectives of that project was to propose scientific anaswers for such a question. The main research questions of that project were: (1) Which rhetorical elements are used in each of the three ancient eras (the pre-Islamic, the Umayyad in the 1st-2nd/7th-8th century, and the ʿAbbāsid till the 5th/11th century)? Do these eras have their own characteristic rhetorical elements or sub-elements? (2) If they do, which are the rhetorical characteristics of each period? (3) Can rhetoric be a criterion for dating classical poems whose period of composition is unknown? This project resulted some studies that have been already published describing the rhetorical fabrics in that poetry [(Hussein 2014); some chaptes in (Hussein 2015a); (Hussein 2015b); (Hussein 2018b); (Hussein 2021); (Hussein 2022); (Abd Alhadi, Hussein, and Kuflik, n.d.)]; and others that the PI is still writing today [mainly (Hussein, n.d.)]. In these studies, the PI analyzed the poems and notified the rhetorical elements used in them and studied their characteristics. The present proposed project (application no. 362/23) deals with rhetoric from a totally different research angel. It deals with rhetoric not as it practically used in literary texts, but with the theory of rhetoric as it is experessed in the theoretical anthologies composed by medieval Arab critics since their earlierst manifestations till they reached their full development in the Mamlūk era. The present proposed project, once accomblished, together with the previous one will give a holistic analytical picture on Arabic rhetoric both the pragmatic side and the theoretical one. It will analyze how rhetoric developed by the Arabs: pragmatically in their literary texts (the previous project) and theoretically in the critical books (the present one). It is of interest to studying, in the future, whether the pragmatic Arabic rhetoric and the theoretical Arabic rhetoric overlap, or whether they collide. In other words, whether and to which degree the thetoretical material found in medieval rhetorical anthologies reflect truly the practical side of rhetoric as used practically in classical/medieval Arabic literature.

Methodology, Research Team and Expected Output

The present project is proposed for four years. It aims to analyze the rhetorical data in 37 medieval rhetorical anthologies; and hence it is based on the following main stages:

1. Year 1: Classification of the data accomplished by 10 Research Assistants (RAs): All anthologies that will be used in this research have been already collected by the PI as pdf documents (37 anthologies). During the first year (months 1-12) of the project, ten RAs, fully accompanied and supervised by the PI, will classify the data in each of the anthologies according. The data related to each rhetorical element in each anthology will be saved, as pdf document, separately. Each anthology will have one file that includes pdf docuemnts, each document has the data extracted from that anthology classified according to the rhetorical elements (Example: anthology no. 1 will include pdf files entitled “simile”, “metaphor”, paronomasia”, etc.). The RAs chosen for this mission would be MA students who are well trained to reading and understanding classical critical materials especially materials on the Arabic rhetorical theory. Each of the RAs be occupied for 50% job. Since there might be other books that are not yet collected by the PI, or additional manuscripts on rhetoric that might see light during the work on the project, one of the RAs will accompany the research team during years 2-4, dedicating 10% of her/his time, to classify additional materials that have not yet been classified.
2. Years 2-4 (Analysing the data and writing the publications):

The data related to each rhetorical element, and sub-element, will be studied and analysed by the research team which includes five research fellows and the PI as detailed below. The analysis will include interpretations and clarifications of the data, following the historical development of the data related to each rhetorical element, comparing similarities and discripancies of the definitions between the different anthologies. In case of discripancies, the research team will detect and analyse the reasons that led to them. Was it a misinterpretation of the anthologier for a certain data quoted from earlier sources? Or was it an addition made by the anthologier because of the development of a specific notion related to the rhetorical element in the literature of his time? The project will follow the different terminology registered for these elemnets and sub-elements. Equivalent transaltions to English of each rhetorical element / sub-element will be sought. Here, the research team will seek the help of research specialists of rhetoric in western literature. This procedure will be accomplished according to the following:

1. Five Research Fellows (RFs) who will be MA students from the Department of Arabic Language and Literature at the University of Haifa, will write their MA thesis supervised by the PI about the historical development of some of the rhetorical elements in the 37 anthologies. The theses would be article-theses; i.e., each of the RFs will publish the results of her/his studies as journal articles. The rhetorical elements for each RFs will be chosen later in a full consultation with the students themselves. Each of the five RFs will be employed for a 100% job dor three years (years 2-4). To facilitate the work of the RFs, they will depend on the data that have been previously classified by the RAs. It would be ideal if the five RAs could be the same persons who will later continue their work as RFs. I.e., the five students who will classify the data during the first year, will be the same MA students who will write their theses on the classified meterial.
2. The PI will study the rest of the rhetorical elements, during the same period. He will dedicate 40% of his time for the project, and will publish part of the results of his work as journal articles.

The articles of the whole research team, together with additional chapters not included in the articles, will be collected and edited by the PI alone, and published as a book entitled *A Historical Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric: ʿilm al-bayān and ʿilm al-badīʿ; Based on the Rhetorical Arabic Books from the 3rd/9th to the 10th/16th Centuries*.

Conferences and Woskshops

In order to share the research procedure and main results with the world research community, the research team will present their work annually in world conferences such as DAVO-Congress (Deutsche Arbeitsgemeinschaft Vorderer Orient)), BRISMES (British Society for Middle Eastern Studies), MESA (Middle East Studies Association), ACLA (American Comparative Literature Association), *From Jāhiliyya to Islam* (held in the Hebrew Univeersity of Jerusalem) and other ocnferences/workhsops on medieval Arabic literature that might be an appropriate stage for presenting the project’s grdaudal outcomes.

In year four, a workshop is planned to be held at the University of Haifa, in which the final results of the project will be presented. In this workshop, selected specialists of Arabic rhetoric from Israel and abroad will be invited to participate; not only as listeners but also to present their own research in the field. The workshop will be planned to be accomplished in a hybridic form: physically and online; this in order to ensure the full participation of persons who might not be able to attend physically to the University of Haifa.

**D. Pilot Studies and Preliminary Results**

The PI has published several studies on Arabic rhetoric (mentioned previously and listed in the Bibliography). In most of these studies, the PI extracted the rhetorical elements as they were used in pre-Islamic and post Islamic poems. When presenting these elements, a reference was made to medieval rhetorical books from were some definitions were quoted and analysed to clarify the rhetorical elements in question. In these studies, new rhetorical elements that are not found in the medieval rheotical theory have been revealed. The PI suggested definitions for these (see for example all the astrecised elements in the Glossary found in (Hussein 2022) and in (Hussein, n.d.)). Although these studies will not be part of the proposed project, since the latter deals with rhetoric as appeared theoretically in rhetorical anthologies, however, they enriched the experience of the PI in dealing with classical Arabic rhetoric and made him familiar with some contents of the rhetorical anthologies.

In two articles of these [(Hussein 2018a) and (Hussein 2021); the latter is a modified and updated version of the first], the PI did not depend on the analysis of the poems only, but also he dealt with theory. The first parts of the two articles were dedicated to presenting and analysing what is termed by medieval rhetoricians as the *majāz ʿaqlī* (“intellectual trope”, other translations of the term into English were presented). The first detailed mention of this element was made in ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī’s two books *Asrār al-balāgha* and *dalāʾil al-iʿjāz* from the 5th/11th century. Despite the importance of this rhetorical element (its importance is shown in detail in the two articels), it was ignored in modern studies on rhetoric. In brief, the *majāz ʿaqlī* is a sentene in which the verb is not attributed to its real subject, but to another –unreal- one. Such as the phrase *is fa-mā rabiḥat tijāratuhum (*A qurʾānic verse [Q2:16] quoted by ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī; meaning“their merchandise did not profit”). Here, the subject of the verb ‘profit’ (*rabiḥa*) is the “merchandise”. It is not, however, the merchandise which profits but the traffickers, and they are the true subject of the sentence. In the two articles, the PI analyzed ʿAbd al-Qāhir’ al-Jurnānī’ s notion of this element; then discussed its semantic aspects in classical Arabic poetry as manifested in an episode on wine composed by Abü Dhu᾿ayb al-Hudhalı (d. 28/649). The problematic side of this element is its close relationship, or similarity, with the verb metaphor. It is difficult, in many cases, to differentiate between the two. In the present articles, the PI, examined the notion of metaphor as understood by ʿAbd al-Qāhri al-Jurjānī and compared it to that of the *majāz ʿaqlī*. He concluded that for the medieval rhetorician, intellectual trope is definitely not a metaphor, and phrases which use it should not, therefore be defined as “personification” (a subtype of metaphor). The difference between intellectual trope and metaphor can be simply stated through an analysis of al-Jurjānī’s material on the two rhetorical elements: all three ingredients that shape the *majāz ʿaqlī* — the verb, the false and the true subjects — appear in the sentence, and tropic attribution can by adjusted by simple rephrasing, making the sentence realistic and non-tropic. A sentence containing a verb metaphor, however, has only one subject, and rephrasing will not demolish the metaphor. In the example “their merchandise did not profit”, there are two subjects — the true subject, “they”, and the false, “merchandise”. Its attribution can easily be altered to: “*they* did not profit from *their merchandise*”. No manner of rephrasing can change the sentence into a non-metaphorical expression.

Besides these two articles, the PI supervised several MA and PhD theses and dissertations abouth rhetoric in classical Arabic poetry and in the Qurʾān. The first chapters of these studies included a theoretical survey of the rhetorical element in question as it was defined in the medieval rhetorical anthologies. Thus, in (Ewayda 2016) about the metaphor in the love poetry of Bashshār b. Burd (d. 167/784), the different sub-types of metaphor in several medieval anthologies, compared to the notion of metaphor in Western rhetorical sources, were scanned and analyzed. Echoing the rhyme at the beginning of the verse, or *radd al-aʿjāz ʿalā l-*ṣudūr, was another rhetorical element which treated in an MA thesis supervised by the PI (Mansur 2016). Here too, this element’s definitions in the medieval rhetorical anthologies was scanned before its partictical use in pre- and early Islamic poetry was analyzed and studied. In a third MA thesis (Bayān Amāra 2019), the analogy based on metaphor was studied in the Qurʾānic text; however, the thesis started with a thetoretical survery of this subtype of metaphor in medieval rhetorical anthologies. In the MA thesis (ʿAwāwida-ʿAdawī 2020), different shapes of the *kināya* (translated by the student as “metonymy”, a better translation is “periphrasis”) in the Qurʾān were notified and analyzed. Here too, the thesis starts with a theoretical chapter in which the different sub-types of this rhetorical element in medieval rhetorical sources were collected and interpreted. In another MA thesis (Manāl Ḥijāzī-ʿAwwād 2015), the theretical notion of two subtypes of the simile, the “proving” and “clarifying” similes (*tashbīh bayānī* and *tashbīh burhānī*), were studied then the attestations of these elemtns in the Qurʾān were notified and analyzed; and in a PhD thesis shortly submitted (Shalata 2022), the notion of a third subtype, the prolonged/extended simile (*al-tashbīh al-muṭawwal*) was scanned and analyzed in its first chapter based on the medieval anthologies, as a background for studying this element in the poems included in Ibn Maymūn al-Baghdādī’s (d. 597/1201) poetry anthology known as *Muntahā l-ṭalab min ashʿār al-ʿarab* (“The utmost in the search of Arab poetry”).

All these pilot studies, besides several courses tought by the PI on the rhetorical elements as they are expressed theoretically in medieval rhetorical anthologies – “The *Badīʿ* (“New Style”) in the Epistles of the *Kuttāb* (“the State Secretaries”)”, “Old Arabic Rhetoric (2010)”, “*Naqd al-Shiʿr* (The Book on the Criticism of Poetry) by Qudāma b. Jaʿfar (2010)”, “Simile and Metaphor (2011)”, “Classical Rhetoric (2013)”, “*Asrār al-balāgha* (“ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī’s book *Secrets of Eloquence*) (2013)”, “The ‘Notion's Doctrine’ According to ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī's Book *Dalāʾil al-iʿjāz* (*Signs of inimitability of the* Qurʾān) (2013)”, “The *majaz* (trope) in Classical Arabic Rhetoric (2014)”, “Metonymy in Classical Arabic Rhetoric (2015)”, “The Rhetoric of the Traditional Arabic *Qasida* (2016)”, “The *Badīʿiyyāt* and their Commentaries in Classical Arabic Heritage (2018)”— all this paves the way by the PI and his research team to accomplish the proposed project in an appropriate research.
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**F. Appendix (Medieval Anthologies on Arabic Rhetoric)**

The books are arranged according to the date of death of the author. Biographical detaisl are in the Bigliographical list.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Author** | **Title of the Book** | **Reference (details are in the Bibliography)** |
| 1 | Ibn al-Muʿtazz (d. 296/908) | *Kitāb al-Badīʿ* | (Ibn al-Muʿtazz 1967) |
| 2 | Ibn Ṭabāṭabā (d. 322/934) | *ʿIyār al-shiʿr* | (Ibn Ṭabāṭabā al-ʿAlawī 2005) |
| 3 | Qudāma b. Jaʿfar (d. 337/948) | *Naqd al-shiʿr* | (Ibn Jaʿfar 1956) |
| 4 |  | *Naqd al-nathr* or *Kitāb al-Bayān* (attributed to Qudāma) | (Ibn Jaʿfar 1980) |
| 5 | Al-Rummānī (d. 384/994) | *Al-Nukat fī iʿjāz al-qurʾān* | (Khalafallāh and Salām 1968) |
| 6 | Al-Āmidī (d. 371/981) | *Al-Muwāzana bayn Abī Tammām wa-l-Buḥturī*s | (Al-Āmidī 1992) |
| 7 | Al-Qāḍī l-Jurjānī (d. 392/1002) | *Al-Wasāṭa bayn al-Mutanabbī wa-khuṣūmih* | (Al-Qāḍī l-Jurjānī 1966) |
| 8 | Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī (d. after 400/1010) | *Kitāb al-Ṣināʿatayn* | (Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī 1952) |
| 9 | Al-Bāqillānī (d. 403/1013) | *Iʿjāz al-qurʾān* | (Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī 1997) |
| 10 | Abū Manṣūr al-Thaʿālibī (d. 429/1038) | *Kitāb al-Kināya wa-l-taʿrīḍ* | (Abū l-ʿAbbās al-Jurjānī 1908) |
| 10 | Ibn Rashīq al-Qayrawānī (d. 463/1071) | *Kitāb al-ʿUmda fī maḥāsin al-shiʿr wa-ādābih wa-naqdih* | (Ibn Rashīq al-Qayrawānī 1981) |
| 11 | Ibn Sinān al-Khafājī (d. 466/1074) | *Sirr al-faṣāḥa* | (Ibn Sinān al-Khafājī 1982) |
| 12 | ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī (d. 471/1078) | *Asrār al-balāgha* | (ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī 1991) |
| 13 |  | *Dalāʾil al-iʿjāz* | (ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī 1992) |
| 14 | Abū l-ʿAbbās al-Jurjānī (d. 482/1089) | *Al-Muntakhab min kināyāt al-udabāʾ wa-ishārāt al-bulaghāʾ* | (Abū l-ʿAbbās al-Jurjānī 1908) |
| 14 | Al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1144) | *Tafsīr al-Kashshāf ʿan ḥaqāʾiq al-tanzīl wa-ʿuyūn al-aqāwīl fī wujūh al-taʾwīl* | (Al-Zamakhsharī 2009) |
| 15 | Al-Waṭwāṭ (578/1182-1183) | *Ḥadāʾiq al-siḥr fī daqāʾiq al-shiʿr* | (Al-Waṭwāṭ 1945) |
| 16 | Usāma b. Munqidh (d. 584/1188) | *Al-Badīʿ fī naqd al-shiʿr* | (Ibn Munqidh 1960) |
| 17 | Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) | *Nihāyat al-ījāz fī dirāyat al-iʿjāz* | (Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī 2004) |
| 18 | Al-Sakkākī (d. 626/1229) | *Miftāḥ al-ʿulūm* | (Al-Sakkākī 1987) |
| 19 | Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn ibn al-Athīr (d. 637/1239) | *Al-Mathal al-sāʾir fī adab al-kātib wa-l-shāʿir* | (Ibn al-Athīr 2000) |
| 20 | Ibn al-Zamlakānī (d. 651/1253) | *Al-Tibyān fī ʿilm al-bayān al-muṭliʿ ʿalā iʿjāz al-qurʾān* | (Ibn al-Zamlakānī 1964) |
| 21 | Ibn Abī l-Iṣbaʿ al-Miṣrī (d. 654/1256) | *Taḥrīr al-taḥbīr fī ṣināʿat al-shiʿr wa-l-nathr wa-bayān iʿjāz al-qurʾān* | (Ibn Abī l-Iṣbaʿ al-Miṣrī 1963) |
| 22 |  | *Badīʿ al-qurʾān* | (Ibn Abī l-Iṣbaʿ al-Miṣrī 1947) |
| 23 | Ibn al-Nāẓim (d. 686/1287) | *Al-Miṣbāḥ fī  l-maʿānī wa-l-bayān wa-l- badīʿ* | (Ibn al-Nāẓim 2001) |
| 24 | Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAmr al-Tanūkhī (no date of death is given. The manuscript of the printed version refers to the date 692/[1293]) | *Al-Aqṣā l-qarīb fī ʿilm al-bayān* | (Al-Tanūkhī, n.d.) |
| 25 | Al-Khaṭīb al-Qazwīnī (d. 739/1338) | *Talkhīṣ al-miftāḥ* | (Al-Khaṭīb al-Qazwīnī 2010) |
| 26 |  | *Al-Īḍāḥ fī ʿulūm al-balāgha* | (Al-Khaṭīb al-Qazwīnī 2003) |
| 27 | Ṣafiyy al-Dīn al-Ḥillī (d. 750/1349) | *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya l-badīʿiyya fī ʿulūm al-balāgha wa-maḥāsin al-badīʿ* | (Ṣafiyy al-Dīn al-Ḥillī 1992) |
| 28 | Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1350) | *Al-Fawāʾid* | (Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, n.d.) |
| 29 | Yaḥyā b. Ḥamza al-ʿAlawī (d. 749/1348) | *Al-Ṭirāz al-mutaḍammin li-asrār al-balāgha wa-ʿulūm ḥaqāʾiq al-iʿjāz* | (Al-ʿAlawī 1914) |
| 30 | Bahāʾ al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 772/1370-1371) | *ʿArūs al-afrāḥ fī sharḥ Talkhīṣ al-Miftāḥ* | (Al-Subkī 2003) |
| 31 | Al-Taftāzānī (d. 793/1390) | *Al-Muṭawwal fī sharḥ Talkhīṣ Miftāḥ al-ʿulūm* | (Al-Taftāzānī 2001) |
| 32 |  | *Sharḥ al-mukhtaṣar* | (Al-Taftāzānī, n.d.) |
| 33 | Ibn Jābir al-Andalusī (d. 780/1378) | *Al-Ḥulla l-siyarā fī madḥ khayr al-warā* | (Ibn Jābir al-Andalusī 1985) |
| 34 | Ibn Ḥijja al-Ḥamawī (d. 837/1434) | *Khizānat al-adab wa-ghāyat al-arab* | (Ibn Ḥijja al-Ḥamawī 2001) |
| 35 |  | *Naẓm al-badīʿ fī madḥ khayr shafīʿ* | (Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī 1995)ṣ |
| 36 | Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) | *Sharḥ ʿUqūd al-jumān fī ʿilm al-maʿānī wa-l-bayān* | (Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī 2011) |
| 37 | ʿĀʾisha l-bāʿūniyya (d. 923/1517) | *Al-Badīʿiyya wa-sharḥuhā: Al-Fatḥ al-mubīn fī madḥ al-amīn* | (ʿĀʾisha l-bāʿūniyya 2009) |