CHAPTER II

‘ABDUR-RAHMAN SHUKRI

1886-1958
'Abdu' Rahman Sukri was born in Port Said in the year 1886. He was brought up in a family having national feeling and cultural taste. His father was an army officer.

He had participated in the revolution led by Ahmed 'Urabi Pash (d. 1911) and was imprisoned after it ended in failure. His interest in culture can be understood from the attention he paid to Arabic books. He built a personal library and collected in it most important books on language and literature available at that time. 'Abdur Rahman Shukri had inherited these two traits from his father. In the beginning of his life he devoted his time to the study of books which were preserved in the library of his father. Side by side he received formal education in schools. After passing primary and secondary examinations, he joined the Law college. But soon after he was rusticated from it on account of provoking students to go on strike in favour of the nationalist party. Then he joined the Teachers' Training College at Cairo. During his studentship in this institute, he studied eagerly the Arabic and English literatures, made friendship with Ibrahim al-Kazini and contributed to the modernist paper of the time al-Jarida, which was edited by Lutfi al-Sayyid.

Shukri graduated in 1909 and was sent to England by the Egyptian government on an educational mission to continue his studies at Sheffield University College. Thereby he got an opportunity to improve his knowledge of
English learnt first in the Teachers' Training College and to deepen his scholarship in its literature in general and in the works of the romantics in particular. He remained in England for three years. After coming back to Egypt in the year 1912, he was appointed teacher in Rasut-tin secondary school in Alexandria. In this year he met 'Abbas al-'Aqqād. Afterwards Shukri took up several positions in the Ministry of Education as head master and inspector alternately until he retired in the year 1944.

From the year 1909 up to 1919 he published seven volumes of poetry. What he composed later on and published in newspapers and magazines was collected by Niqūlā Yusuf to form the eight volume and printed his whole poetry in one volume in the year 1960. In addition to this, Shukri wrote Al-I'tirāfāt (i.e. the confessions) and published it in the year 1916 and attributed it to an imaginary friend Mim Nun. It is actually his autobiography but covers only a few years of his life. Towards the end of his life, he suffered from paralysis and died in the year 1958 in Alexandria.

Shukri is one of the three persons who form the group known as "Jamā'at al-Diwān" in the history of Modern Arabic literature and criticism. 'Abbas Mahmūd al-'Aqqād and Ibrāhīm al-Māzinī are his other two associates. All of them were born in the last but one decade of the previous
century. When they became young, the Arabic poetry was under the process of revivification led by Mahmūd Sāmī al-Būrūdī (1838-1904), Ahmad Shawqi (1869-1932), Ḥāfīz Ibrāhīm (1870-1932) and other eminent "Classical" poets. The credit must go to this process of revivification that the growing generation was able to read a poetry which in its eloquence and solidity was of the level of the ancient Arabic poetry and it was introduced to the incent poets. This raised the literary standard of this generation through introducing it to special understanding for the poetry which emanated from the excretions of the old poetry and what followed it till the poetry did not remain indicative of a rhetorical expediency or skilful point or playing with the words which prevailed in the earlier centuries.

Besides this cultural environment, there occured an opportunity for learning a foreign language and for imbibing its culture. Whether it was due to personal impulse for amplifying the individual culture or due to the encouragement by the foreign governments especially Britain and France - for the sake of cultural ties with Egypt due to its important strategic location and hence to capture it through the cultural entrance.

Whatever the case may be, the members of the group of al-Dīvān paid attention to the English language till
they learned it up to the mark of perfection, so they became acquainted with the European literature in general and with English literature in particular. In this way they combined in themselves two cultures: Arabian and European. Whatever the level of these two cultures may be, what we believe is that they were dazzled by the Western literary approach and hence endeavoured to popularize it as a whole or in parts among the contemporary Arabs either by holding out new literary concepts, i.e., critical theory or by the process of poetical creation itself.

Although all the members of al-Dīwān are critics as well as poets, yet they do not share the degree of their excellence equally. Perhaps al-'Aqqād and al-Māzinī were taken as innovating theoreticians propagating their ideas at various places in their writings. But Shukri was considered as one who applied and established these ideas in his poetry.

This, however, does not mean that Shukri is anyway inferior to them in status. On the contrary, by virtue of being the teacher of both of them, he may rather be placed just above them. That he was the teacher of them was recognized by al-Māzinī as well as al-'Aqqād, the former mentioning it clearly and the latter alluding to it indirectly, as we shall see in the following pages.
In addition to this, it does not mean that Shukri was satisfied with composing poetry alone and did not pay attention to criticism or recording it. In the preface to his Divans he has inserted certain valuable critical views which had their effect on the movement of modern Arabic criticism.

In spite of their importance, these views do not represent Shukri as a critic completely, for he did not care to register all his critical opinions and ideas. He noted only some of those opinions and ideas and was generally satisfied with making comments in the literary meetings. Al-'Aqqad, while speaking about Shukri's critical prudence and the accuracy of opinions, has referred to this aspect. He says: "In addition to his broad knowledge, he was a true observer, of sharp intellect, fine in ideation and could distinguish readily between the shades of speech. Hence undoubtedly he had full control over the faculty of criticism. Because he reads much and makes distinction between what he approves and what he does not approve out of it, criticising literature does not impose any problem for him. He has just to look into one or a few pages and when he puts the book aside the evaluation is complete. This could not be done by anyone else even after reading it for a long time ... Nothing is more enjoyable than to hear Shukri reciting an Arabian or European poem and making comments on
it verse by verse. What he wrote in his compilations about the criticism is just a drop out of the sea of those precious opinions which he put forward on the spur of the moment and did not care to record."

At another place he says: "What Shukri said to his companions and students in elucidation of his opinion is much more than what he wrote or published about his literary call. He was disposed to make comprehensive critical comments on what he or others read. He takes a divan or a book or an article and throws a cursory glance over it and then puts it aside having completed its evaluation and estimation like an expert jeweller who completes the evaluation of a gem after having a glimpse of it and touching it with his hands. So if anyone reads a book even repeatedly after having listened to Shukri on it, he cannot reach an opinion regarding it which is truer than what Shukri has pronounced just in one sitting. As such the person who hears Shukri speaking is likely to take his opinion as to have been formed momentarily and without deliberation. But in reality such an opinion was the result of a long deliberation which he kept reserved to be expressed only when the proper occasion for it arose."

This faculty which Shukri possessed is, in our view, partly a product of his innate ability and partly a result of his wide and deep culture in the Arabic and European
literatures, al-'Aqqād was dazzled by this vast knowledge and mentioned that he did not witness anyone before or after Shukri having knowledge wider than him. He did talk to him about a book but found him very well acquainted with it and often he used to speak about the books which al-'Aqqād and Shukri's audience did not know.

What we have said above indicates al-'Aqqād's indirect confession that Shukri was his teacher or, at least, guide in the beginning of his literary and cultural life. Al-Mazini also refers to his being a student of Shukri and gives us a clear indication to the extent of Shukri's knowledge. About himself and his old friend Shukri, al-Mazini observes as follows: "In those days we were students of Teachers' Training College. My relation with him was so strong as if we were one and the same. But at that time I was a beginner while he had framed a specific doctrine about literature and had formed a decisive view what its nature should be. It would be mean on my part, which I disdain, to repudiate that he was the first one who launched me, directed my steps to the right path and showed me the way to the clear argument. I would have been most likely moving aimlessly for some more years and missing the right path had it not been his continuous help."
The literary doctrine to which al-Mazini refers was quite new and different from the understanding of literature prevailing amongst most of the litterateurs at that time. Shukri sought guidance from his English culture on the formation of his literary concepts and endeavoured to apply them to his poetry. When these concepts penetrated into his soul, they formed as a whole a doctrine which was reflected in his poetry and on which he depended in his thinking and expression. Dr. Muhammad Kandur once called it the doctrine of meditation and at another time the doctrine of personal introspection. This doctrine combines "the intellectual meditation and the warm sentimental feeling. Consequently his every notion has a special emotional colour flowing from Shukri's soul and his warm and restless sentiment, leaning, for the most part, towards pessimism and severe revolt."

What is Poetry?

It is in this frame that the critical views of Shukri revolve. Poetry, in his opinion, is a product of sentiments which have different levels of strength. Poetry, therefore, has to be sincere in unveiling the sentiments and showing their different degrees of intensity. This would be materialized if the poet, while composing poetry, responds spontaneously to his emotions instead of compelling himself just to say something.
It is understood from Shukri's observation that he divides poets into two categories: great poets and those who are of a lower status than them. The maximum objective of this second category is only to introduce the people to what twitches in their souls and to make them understand which is lower than the mission of the great poet who is not satisfied with this much but excites the feelings and sentiments of the readers and creates a vital admixture between his and their feelings. So he says: "The great poet is not he who is satisfied with making the people merely to comprehend, but is one who tries to intoxicate and excite them... So he mixes his feelings and sentiments with theirs. In the poetry of sentiments there is a resonance and tune which you do not find in other types of poetry. A day will come when the people shall become aware that it is this which is the real poetry. As such, the poetry, no matter what its subject matter be, should possess a sentiment. But the sentiments expressed by the poet are different from one another."

It becomes obvious from this text, and especially from his saying, "in one poetry of sentiments...", that here he is talking about the subjective poetry. And this is natural because the Arab litterateurs at that time did not know the other kinds of poetry.
The line which bestows a special value to this subjective poetry is 3or1i 1nt. But Shukri does not clarify for us the nature of this sentiment besides shunning from demarcating it. Verily he does not, as he mentions, mean "by the poetry of sentiment" to set the dead words indicating the suffering or shedding tears. For, the poetry of sentiments marks a delicate brain, intelligence and broad imagination for studying the sentiments, recognizing and analysing their secrets, studying their differences and similarities, harmony and discord, admixture, manifestations, tunes and every min, etc. of life's affairs and people's actions with which the sentiments deal. So the poet should take up what stirs in him in sentiments and poetic manners and should live a poetic and musical living as per his ability and should habituate himself to search every sentiment of his heart and every motive or his soul. Poet's heart is a mirror of the cosmos in which every great, noble and virtuous or ugly, despised and his sentiment is reflected."

But does mr, by this anyway, clarify what he means by sentiment? Undoubtedly he does not mean by it the faded feeling or the superficial and artificial emotion and the like which could be covered by resonant words and exaggeration. If we knew that the poet seeks resort to high-sounding words and exaggeration only when there is dearth of genuine feeling and sentiment in him, then we realize
truth is the essence of sentiment, be it in the motive of composition or in the composition itself. What we mean here by truth is the artistic truth or what can be named as poetic experience. The pivot of this experience is the poet's personality and it indeed is the mirror through which he sees the reality and by it he distinguishes between various sentiments. This does not mean that in this way Shukri limits the scope of the subject matter for the poet or that he asks him to express his personal concerns alone but wants that the personality ought to remain present and it shall point to the objects about which he writes.

Perhaps this attitude becomes clearer when he says: "I do not wonder at any one as much as at the litterateurs who compose poetry on subjects about which they are asked to write. They compose for the sake of satisfying one who asks them to do so as if poetry is some sort of weighing machine. But the poet who does not compose until that paroxysm happens to him which pushes him against his will to give poetic expression to the matter for which his soul prepares." The same is the case with his saying: "The great poet does not but compose under the paroxysms of nervous emotion in which condition poetry's forms bubble up in his mind and the sentiments collide in his heart. This collision, however, does not disturb the birds of poetic tunes which murble in his mind. Then the poetic forms
gush up like a torrent without involvement of the discretion of the poet in their selection. But without these paroxysms the poetry which he creates becomes a tepid sentiment having little elegance and impact. Addiction to reading and observing is the basis of poetry because it is this which develops the faculty. But the (conscious) selection of forms at the time of composition is the proof of the fact that the poet's faculty is undeveloped and barren and that there is neither a tune in his nerves nor a sentiment in his heart ... sentiments are the moving power in the life and they are for poetry equal to light and fire."

So the poetic experience is the principal support in the process of artistic creation. The emotion which accompanies the experience enables the poet to harmonize the numerous and contradictory stances in the sources of his creation until these stances become united in which there is no loophole for discordance or disarray or interference. This means that the process of composition is not instinctual reaction to a certain emotion. It is rather a conscious process which the poet goes through after his primary emotion tranquilizes and lets bereft of the blemishes mingled with it. In other words, the process of composition is the power of recollecting the circumstances
of experience. We have witnessed in a previous text an indication of this fact when Shukri mentions that the poet studies and analyses the sentiments and recognizes their secrets and that this process does not come to completion instantly. At another place he clearly refers to this fact when he says, "Poetry is bright and words emerging from the soul. If the sentiment makes the poet to express (himself), it may make him also silent. On account of this, the recollection of sentiment and the reminiscence about it is poetry. We mean that recollection which returns the sentiment and that reminiscence which revives it."

Shukri's concentration upon sentiment does not mean that he makes poetry empty of another element, i.e. the thought. But he declares that sentiment and thought are not found in the same degree in all the compositions of a poet. The cause of their disparity is the subject matter of the poem concerned, for every subject has a special kind of sentiment and a certain quantity of thought. "So in some of the poet's compositions the sentiment becomes more evident and more necessary and in some of them it becomes less evident. There is no doubt that love poetry, for instance, necessitates a special kind of sentiment which differs from that which motivates the notions of aphorisms and sermons."
We can epitomize Shukri's position by the following points.

1. Poetry is a spontaneous expression of the sentiment in which there is no affectation, either in content or in form.

2. Poetry cannot be created without emotion.

3. A poem includes within it various feelings and ideas which the poet melts into one crucible and collects in one structure until they become harmonized.

4. Poetry does not aim merely at disclosing the reality but at the creation of impact on the reader and at creating a sentimental cohesion between him and the poet.

These views of Shukri about poetry are akin to the fundamentals upon which the romantics in general and the English romantics in particular depend in putting forth their concept of poetry. In the formation of these views Shukri is directly influenced by three root English romantics, namely: Keats, Wordsworth and Coleridge.

The romantics opine that poetry is an expression of the feelings of the poet. According to Keats poetry should make the reader feel that it is an expression of his own feelings and ideas and it should overwhelm him by its images and its emanation should be natural like that
of leaves from the tree. This reveals two essential things. First, poetry is a natural expression of the feelings of the poet in which there is no affectation and artificiality. Secondly, communication of the expression to the reader should be so impressive as to make him imagine that the composition expresses his own emotions. This fact leads to a living incorporation of the sentiments of the two parties of the artistic process: the creator and the reader.

These two principles, i.e., expression and communication, are two of the important pivots of the romantic thought in regard to poetry. This is obvious in the view expressed by Shukri that the style of poetry should gush up like a torrent and make the reader excited and intoxicated rather than create deeper understanding in him.

We have seen in Shukri's observation that the realization of this mission requires from the poet an awareness of the experience and an emotional preparation vis-a-vis. For this phenomenon he uses the phrase "paroxysms of the nervous emotion." This emotion, as we think, is only a shadow of Coleridge's saying in this connection that the emotion which befalls a poet during the process of artistic creation is what distinguishes the poetry.
This creation gains depth and serenity when it is the result of meditation over the emotional condition and of the power of recollection of the sentimental situation. Wordsworth has made out this point by saying:

"Poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings it takes its origin from emotions recollected in tranquility. The emotion is contemplated till by a species of reaction, the tranquility gradually disappears; and an emotion kinder led to that which was before the subject of contemplation, is gradually produced, and does itself actually exist in the mind. In this mood successful composition generally begins."

The sentiment casts its impact upon the things which the poet adopts from life. These things appear contradictory and conflicting. But by the poet's act they become harmonic and systematic and united by one spirit. This is a conception which Coleridge adumbrates in his Discourse when he says: "The poet, described in ideal perfection, brings the whole soul of man into activity, with the subordination of its faculties to each other according to their relative worth and dignity. He diffuses a tone and spirit of unity that blends, and (as it were) fuses, each into each, by that synthetic and magical power, to which I would exclusively appropriate the name of imagination."
From the remark of Coleridge this much at least is evident that the poetic elements react on one another according to the romantic critical view. As such, beauty, imagination, pleasure, emotion ... etc. are sustained by one another to form one universal energy and they are not par­titive and disunited.

But Shukri, who seeks inspiration from the English romantics in the formation of his critical attitude, could not keep pace with them in this respect. Hence emanates his observation on truth, taste and imagination indicating that they are separate from and do not sustain one another except the interrelationship between imagination and simile, as we shall see later on.

**Categories and Objective of Poetry:**

We have seen earlier that sentiment, in the opinion of Shukri, is the element whose prevalence is absolutely necessary in a poetic creation and that it is this element which serves as the ground for discriminating the poetic from the prosaic. According to this observation division of poetry into subjects like aphorisms, love-poetry, descriptive poetry ... etc. is wrong. In fact, poetry is not restricted to any particular subject. The poem as a whole represents the poet's notions and vital experiences on
which he thinks clearly and with which he mixes his emotions so that they come to his trunk spontaneously. As such, "the rank of poetry's division in the soul is equal to the rank of meanings in the intellect. For every meaning there is no separate room in the intellect. But they intermARRY and regenerate in it. So there is no justification for one who wants to place every sentiment of the soul in a cage all alone.

In spite of his denial of partition of the human sentiment, he speaks about love-poetry as an independent sentiment and more minutely as a source of the sentiments as a whole. He predicates to it also a special characteristic, i.e. love of beauty and life. In his view the love of beauty points to the love of life. Accordingly, if the love of beauty is deep or shallow, the love of life will follow suit. He reckons this love as a strong social motive in raising the society up and elevating it.

On the strength of this view he pays attention to love poetry but at the same time ignores erotic poetry or what is concerned with mere corporeal descriptions. He aims at the elevated platonic love from which the various sentiments, like affection and hate, bravery and cowardice, generosity and miserliness etc. emanate. Due to this the love-poetry occupies a lofty position amongst (all types) of poetry. Consequently it is a source of the sentiments.
and revealer of their conditions. So the love poetry expresses all the internal sentiments. As the love of beauty is the love for life, you find in love poetry the poet's opinions and the notions which strike him in life, the experiences which he gathers, the objects his mind aspires or his heart yearns for and every aspect of the life with which he deals. To associate a sentiment to an individual and restrict it to him alone, though it makes the sentiment more apparent, is not the condition of the love poetry which is the centre of the necklace, string of beads and the spirit of poetry. The love poetry with which we are concerned the motivating force behind it is the sentiment which makes man realise strongly all manifestations of beauty; be it the beauty of faces and bodies, or flowers and rivers, or lightening in the clouds, or night and its stars, or the morning and its breeze, or souls and morals, ... an individual's love for another individual is only a manifestation of this wide sentiment which has a passion for every beauty manifest in life. This poetic sentiment throws its light upon every thing, even upon the dark and repulsive sides of life. It bestows upon them an artistic beauty like that of a marvellous painting the artistic beauty of which appeals to man even if it is a painting of slaughter or like the beauty of sad tunes which melt the heart. Like the painter, the poet of love seeks dictation from the images of prettiness lying in his mind ... Likewise pleasures and sufferings
experiences by the poet incite him to compose poetry. So he composes poetry based upon his own pleasures, sufferings and hopes as well as based upon the pleasures, sufferings and hopes of the people."

It is evident from the above quotation that Shukri pays attention to love poetry only on account of two essential things. The first of them is that the poet by means of it goes deep into his personality and feelings until he reaches the substance of the general sentiments through his personal experience. The second is the result of the first point and what is to uncover the mysteries of the souls on the one hand and to create intercommunication between them and the life on the other.

This position represents that function of poetry which does not stop at the exterior of the things and at meanings which are just commonplace. It is a deeper and greater function which is concerned with "the exposure of connections which bind together the parts and manifestations of the cosmos and deals with the nature of accord between the realities. Because of this poet should be farsighted, not paying so much heed to the comeliness of manifestations as to the light of the truth. He, therefore, must make a distinction between the meanings of life known to the common men and the ignorant (on the one hand) and the meaning
of life which the eternity reveals to him (on the other). Every poet, who is a genius, is worthy of being regarded as a predictor. Is he not the person who looks into the secrets of eternity with the hawk's eye, removes from them the cover of darkness and shows us the great mysteries which the people revere, so the ignorant and the foolish become blindly attached to poetry?"

Indeed this function has a great importance. Poet's penetration into the depths for extracting the realities of things makes incumbent on him the realization that he writes for the spiritual human intellect and soul in all ages. Hence he does not confine himself to what satisfies a particular locality or nation, though he is influenced by them and proceeds from them towards the spacious horizon of humanity. So the poet is distinguished with "that intellectual hunger which makes him inclined towards every thought and every feeling. This is the motive which compels him to express certain realities for which he was created and for which the nature prepared him. He is able to endure the ignorance of the people because the great poet creates the generation which understands him and prepares it to understand his poetry."

In addition to this he subjects the source of his inspiration, that is the nature and life, to the principle of selection and liberates himself from the slavery of time.
Thus he cares for what deserves his attention. "The great poet is not the one who cares for petty affairs but one who rises above the day in which he is living. Then he looks into the depths of the time beholding what has passed and what will happen in the future. Thus his poetry becomes eternal like his look. He is one who penetrates into the core of the soul and then unveils it. He is one whose poetry, if thrown to the throat of the eternity, is swallowed by it. The fault of our poet is that they ignore the majesty of the poet's function. In the past he served as a boon companion of kings and as an ornament in the houses of princes. But today he is a messenger of the nature which supplies him the sweet melodies for the sake of polishing and awakening the souls by them, as also to increase their light and fire. Hence the greatness of the poet lies in the greatness of his feeling the life and in the sincerity of heart which is the source of this feeling. If you see a poet considering the trifles as great, and regarding the minor incidents as great incidents, then (you should) know that his poetry is weak. One whose poetry is weak, is misled by the clamour of incidents and does not know that the events of soul, in spite of their silence, are the most glorious."

Shukri once quoted Wordsworth's negative answer given in response to a question regarding the poetry of a certain poet. Wordsworth characterized it as a piece of
writings that were not destined to be. Shukri was inspired by this characterization when he considered great poetry as a piece of the dust; the happening of which is unavoidable. In continuation to this he further observes: "If you want to distinguish between the high and the low poetry, take a divan and read it. If you observe that the poetry there is a part of the nature like the star or the sky or the sea, then take it to be the best poetry. But, if you observe that the most of it is just false craftsmanship, then know that it is the worst poetry."

Directing the poet to this path and showing him this objective imply looking forward to eternal poetry. It is not sufficient that the poet seeks inspiration from the nature and searches the reality, in whatever manner it might be, to attain this type of poetry. But it is indispensable for him to know how to treat them.

Shukri advises the poet to look at the nature as if it is a living being like himself. The romantics also held the same view; and Shukri has referred clearly to the English romantics and to the quality of their looking at the nature as also to their treatment of it. In this regard he says: "In observing things the ancients were more correct than us because the egotism did not govern them as it governs us. (It is on account of the egotism that) we pretend that the nature has no life like us. Does a person not
see in each of its leaves a multiplicity of meanings? Is it not due to the fact that the nature has a greater life than we who have no conception of it except the feeling of its futility? The reason is that in spite of the alterations in the phases of nature, its life is contented. But our life is the captive of jealousy, hatred and sordidness... the ancients were better than us in observing things, because when they looked at nature they looked at it as if it were a highly animated being full of eloquent meanings. And due to this the nature induced in their souls reverence and solemnity or ardent desire, tears and love. All these are just shades of the meanings of worship which made them worthy of acquaintance with what we ignore out of the secrets of the sound faith. Poets differed in their view of nature. Shelley considered it as a vessel of love and fine sentiments. Wordsworth observed the changes in its conditions and difference of its shapes and thought that they were the result of graceful meditation (on the part of nature itself)..."

So far as the reality is concerned, he finds fault with those who delight in an unsound imagination and admire the impossible and the unfamiliar because they find the sweetness of poetry in reversing the realities therefore connect the poetry with falsehood. This, in his opinion, is one of the most important evidence of their
ignorance of poetry's function. Poetry is not falsehood. It is rather a mirror of the realities and their interpreter.

"The sweetness of poetry does not lie in reversing the realities but in setting the reversed realities upright and placing each one of them in its proper place. If a part of poetry is a pleasure trip, then a part of the pleasure trip is duty and if a part of poetry is a journey, then it is a journey to a world which is more beautiful, complete, and truthful than this world, a journey to a world in which man feels the pleasures of meditation more than he feels them in this terrestrial world."

The objectives of poetry may briefly be put as follows:

1. Love of beauty.
2. Unveiling the connections between the Being's manifestations.
3. Disclosing and extracting the reality and not being restricted to the fascinating manifestations.
4. Pleasure.

These are the objectives which become integrated as a whole and cease to be separated in the critical treatment of the romantics. Really we find the romantics concentrating sometimes on any one of these values but this is done not at the cost of the rest.
Indeed the poet reveals the secret connections between the objects and events and surpasses the apparent phenomena in order to reach the reality and thereby to make his creation beautiful so as to evoke the sense of pleasure in the soul of the reader. Actually they are connected with one another though they do not seem to be so in Shukri's writings.

In any case, the indication of the objective of poetry in this manner is one of the influences of the romantics on Shukri's thinking regarding criticism. Revealing the connection between the Being's manifestations is one of the principles of criticism according to them. While the revelation of the connections is an objective of poetry for Shukri, it is a means of unifying the form and the content organically for the romantics. In other words, it is the bond between the artistic mould i.e. the form of the poem and the poetic experience which results from the poet's identification with his environment, particularly the natural environment. In such a condition, the Being, as the poet's environment, acquires a unity and a bond which qualify it also to become organically one with the artistic form of the poetry.

But Shukri does not differ from the romantics in other details. He agrees with them on surpassing the fascinating manifestations to reach the profound. The roman-
tics aimed at exposing what lay behind the world of the sens
because the metaphysical world is the real one which the
poet must aspire for.

This aspiration is not an escape from the life; it is a search for the reality. What is this reality? Shukri and the romantics did not clarify its nature. Consequently, we do not know what they are searching for, whether it is the laws of nature as Coleridge says, the secret of the cosmos, the man, the art or anything else? We are not able to determine what they want to arrive at. But positively they are searching for "something" precious and immortal.

Perhaps the ambiguity regarding this "reality" on the part of the romantics impelled Shukri also to use the word "reality" vaguely, even innocently when he used it as contrary to falsehood! Whatever the case may be, this objective Shukri borrowed from the romantics. Coleridge indicated to it when he spoke about the difference between poetry and prose in form and content. He said: "it is possible that the object may be merely to facilitate the recollection of any given facts or observations by artificial arrangement ... The immediate purpose may be the communication of truth; either of truth absolute and demonstrable, as in works of science; or of facts experienced and recorded."
as in history." Wordsworth also said that "the Poet, singing a song in which all human beings join with him, rejoices in the Presence of truth as our visible friend and hourly companion."

Making the reader experience pleasure is the prime objective of the poet according to the romantics as a whole which indeed is the result of the community of feeling between the poet and the reader. But we believe that in this matter Shukri was affected more by Coleridge than others on account of his philosophical argumentation while defining poetry and explaining its target to be truth and pleasure. Verily the poet's singing, as mentioned by Wordsworth, cannot attract the ears or make the humanity join it if it does not have pleasure in it. But this relationship between the poet and the reader is not so explicit in Wordsworth as it is in Coleridge.

As pointed out earlier, Shukri refers to the fact that the pleasure or the sweetness, as termed by him, lies in setting the realities upright. This means that pleasure follows the attainment of reality. This view has been clearly expressed by Coleridge. At the same time he has indicated indirectly that there is a latent connection between reality and pleasure as may be understood from his saying: "Pleasure, and that of the highest and most permanent kind, may result from the attainment of the end (i.e. the reality);
but it is not itself the immediate end."

THE LANGUAGE OF POETRY:

Shukri observes that his contemporary poets paid much attention to the form of poetry, to be more precise its dicti-

tion, that is to say that they directed their attention to-

wards the linguistic din which the poetic feeling does not
dean necessary and hence they neglected the core, i.e. the
meaning, so much so that queerness, word's splendour and
cloquenre became the real criteria of the poetic capacity
as well as of the evaluation of poetry.

Although a section of the litterateurs was not pre-
occupied with the verbal resonance, or indulged in its cre-

ation for its own sake, yet the shallow and formal vision
of poetry became the order of the day. Hence Shukri striv-
oses to set right the distorted view regarding the language
of poetry. As we shall see later on, it can be inferred
from his statements that the language of poetry is not sepa-
rate from its meaning, and that the relation between these
two elements is one of interaction and union. But he does
not proceed further to elucidate this relation as much as
he, as an innovator, endeavours to state his opinion as to
the nature of the language of the poetry.
Before anything else, he finds fault with the thinking that the splendour and eloquence of poetry lie in the queerness of its words. In his view this thinking points to a shallow observation and confusion between the style/splendour and fluency on the one hand and regarding the queer words as one of the necessities of the beauty of style/the other. He maintains that this thinking is faulty and absurd. For example, the poetry of al-Ḥariri is full of queer words, but it is not good poetry while the famous poem of Ibn Zurayq al-Baghdadi, although devoid of queer words, is one of the greatest and most magnificent poems and, if you like, you may say par excellence. For, par excellence is the characteristic of a powerful style which resembles the dissolved volcamics flowing from the crater of volcano. It is the style which gets inflamed by strong sentiments."

Although the term "style" suggests the composition of the words and their relation with one another in expressing a crystallized idea or palpitant feeling, yet we think that here he does not drive at this meaning because his discourses revolve totally around the vocables.

Verily he indicates subconsciously to the fact that the spirit circulating naturally among the verses of the poem is what brings splendour and eloquence to the poem.
This does not require the poet to constrain his mind and brain to hunt the stray queer words to which the rhymers are habituated. They only conceal their sentimental and intellectual deficiency in this manner or it is a reaction of the weakness which has become common in the phrases and styles of Arab litterateurs during the last two centuries. But quickly he returns to the vocables as the main topic of the discussion. So he allows the poet to use the queer words provided their use be as natural as of the other words which he adopts for weaving his ideas. To quote him: "The poet is allowed to use every correct style no matter whether it is queer or known to us, but certainly he is not allowed to use certain styles with affectation."

This text, in fact, clearly indicates that Shukri does not believe in the division of the vocabulary into permissible and unpermissible for the poet. But he makes the language, as a whole, a joint property from which he takes without affectation though what he takes from it may be queer. Moreover, in his view, the division of the vocabulary will conduce to narrowness of taste and anarchy of opinion. To quote his words: "I have found some of the litterateurs classify words into the noble and the ignoble and think that the usage of any word frequently makes it ignoble while a rare use of it makes it noble. This results in the narrowness of taste and anarchy of opinions in literature."
This is a sound principle and an accurate attitude because the single word is a symbol and sign which does not have a specific characteristic while left alone. But it gains its value when it is placed in a suitable position in the context and when it has expressive and communicative power.

Shukri refers to this fact when he brings parity between ignoble and noble words and shifts the fault to "the use of words not at proper places." He further observes that "the poet should know which one of his words expresses perfectly the meaning or the sentiment which he wants to portray. The word may be noble or ignoble according to its use. The nobility of the word lies in its signification of the meaning and in its use at the appropriate place in the poetry and not in its queerness. If the munching of tongues (i.e., long use) makes words ignoble and debased, then surely 't would debase the Arabic language since tongues have munched them throughout the ages. As such, a particular word is ignoble when it hides the meaning and the sentiment and increases their obscurity and its spoils the poetry's tune, spirit and vivacity of nature and misrepresents the meagerness of meaning and sentiment and conceals the poet's feebleness and incompetence."

In this attitude Shukri follows Wordsworth who opposed the clear differentiation between the language of
poetry and of prose which was common in the 18th century. Though Shukri's opinion revolves around poetry's language only, yet he is influenced by this English critic in forming the general view about the language and nature of its use as well as in undoing the division of its vocabulary. At the same time he is influenced by Coleridge's view partly though the latter insists that the language of poetry and prose is not one and the same and Shukri does not comprehend his opinion adequately.

Regarding style, Coleridge suggests the existence of two types of languages and refutes Wordsworth's opinion in this matter. The language basically communicates the ideas in a simple manner. There is another language also and that is the language of nature as termed by Coleridge figuratively. This is the language of the external world which is real by virtue of its living and palpable objects. The excellent poetry is that whose language is intermediate between these two languages.

The basic use of the language according to Shukri is the expression of the reality of things. Words indeed are symbols and the poet should use them in such a manner that they serve the meanings and do not become the object of the poetry themselves or become the means by which the poet covers his incompetence and his extinguishing sentiments.
By this approach he comes close to Coleridge who asks the poet to select only such words which can express his sentiments most faithfully. If he fails in his endeavour, it is a sign of the ignobility of the words he uses. Perhaps this interpretation, besides being connected with the earlier concept of Coleridge, relates to one of his definitions of poetry that is "the best words in the best order."

At any rate, it is understood from Shukri's observation that the language is an agency for transporting the meaning. As such, it should be capable of bringing home the meaning faithfully. This does not mean, as some scholars have opined, that he prefers the meaning to the word and craftsmanship. So far as we think, Shukri cannot be supposed to have preferred the meaning to the word not only on account of admitting the inseparable relationship between the word and the meaning but also on account of his being the person who called for the revitalization of the poetry's spirit. This invitation of Shukri can materialize only by laying emphasis on both the important elements, that is, the meaning and the word. His wish for excellent poetry and great poet cannot be fulfilled by meaning alone. In addition to this, he does not deny the splendour and eloquence of the word wholly; only believes that they do not consist of paying attention to the queer, using similes for their own sake, as we shall see later, and the like which lay
emphasis on the manifest, the ringing and the resonance as was the practice at that time. His concern for the meaning is intended to bring the erring to the right path. Poetry, indeed, in human activity reflecting a condition which is either intutional or intellectual. The fruit of this activity ought to find its way to the masses. This mission cannot be fulfilled except through sincerity and truth in diagnosing the feelings and ideas and through the suitable way of expressing them. These two elements, therefore, are intertwined and support each other. Hence one is not more important than the other.

SIMILE:

As regards the commensurated relationship between style and meaning, simile is one of its manifestations. Shukri is of the opinion that the simile is not sought for itself and its multiplicity in a certain text does not indicate the richness of imagination or elevation of versification in the same way as the text's emptiness of simile does not mean its lack of the artistic value. For, simile is not an object in itself; it is only a tool which the poet makes use of for the embodiment and projection of his feelings. Its utility lies in its function of embellishing the text with an artistic mark from the point of view of evoking remembrance or hope, or any other sentiment out of
the sentiments of the soul, or revealing the truth...The object for the sake of which the simile is used is not sought for itself but for its relation with the human soul and man's intellect.Whenever the object becomes more contiguous with the soul and comes nearer to the intellect, it become worth describing. This makes evident the invalidity of the doctrine of one who wants to describe the material things simply because they are visible. This type of description deserves to be named as mechanical description. Hence the description of things is not poetry if it is not connected with man's sentiments, notions, remembrances, hopes and the associations of his soul."

Perhaps there is another cause, besides one he has mentioned, behind his dislike for the description of material objects. It is that the description of the palpable does not give the poet an opportunity to show his poetic skill not only in regard to his sentiments and feelings but also in regard to his ability to fathom the courses of intercommunication and symmetry underlying the things sought to be described which would not be possible for a poet unless he possesses a fertile imagination.

In brief, Shukri wants the simile not for itself but he considers it as a tool for transmitting the impact of the object on the soul directly or indirectly to the reader.
On the basis of this view, Dr. Muhammad Mandur reached the conclusion that Shukri agrees perfectly with the symbolic expression and disagrees from the scholars of Arabic rhetoric as well as their explanations of the simile and its artistic function.

Though we do not deny Shukri's inclination towards symbolic expression in his observations, yet we think that Dr. Mandur is not right in considering this inclination as a result of the impact of symbolism on Shukri's soul due to the enormous variety of his studies.

It seems to me that Shukri follows Coleridge's footsteps in this matter too and we may find a clear resemblance between their views. Shukri wants the poet to make simile a tool for expressing his internal emotions. It is the same thing to which Coleridge refers in his following observation:

"The difference is great and evident between words used as the arbitrary marks of thought, our smooth market-coin of intercourse, with the image and superscription worn out by currency; and those which convey pictures either borrowed from one outward object to enliven and particularize some other; or used allegorically to body forth the inward state of the person speaking; or such as are at least the exponents of his peculiar turn and unusual extent of faculty."
In fact, the words which convey pictures are are what is important for us here. Hence the borrowing of the image from an external object in order to enliven another object seems to us to mean a kind of simile, may be it does not involve likening of two things palpable to each other; it rather involves likening of an intangible object to a palpable one or at least creation of some sort of relationship between them, i.e. the internal condition or personal tendency of man on the one hand and a certain object in the external world on the other. This is what Shukri also points out regarding the liaison between the human sentiments and feelings on the one hand and the object used as simile on the other.

It is the poet who unveils the connection between the objects and the impact of these objects on his soul plays a decisive role in his style. This is due to the fact that the poet in his story expresses himself more than anything else. This is the view of both Shukri and the romantics.

In addition to what has been stated above, Shukri seeks inspiration for most of his critical observations from the romantics. Hence it is logical that he seeks guidance from their views, and not from the views of others like the symbolists for instance, regarding simile also. In fact, as we have observed in Coleridge's writings, the romantics themselves wished to be symbolic in their expression.
Shukri defines imagination as "whatever the poet conceives regarding the details of life, analysis of the soul's sentiments and conditions, thoughts with all their changes, the poetic subjects and their differences, and the poetic motivations." As such, imagination is a power which assists the poet to comprehend various tendencies and situations however minute they may be. The richness of imagination is connected with this analytical capability and it does not lie in the multitude of similes; rather the simile is one of the tools of imagination meant for explaining a sentiment, illustrating a condition or describing a reality. The greatest poetry is that which is free from far-fetched similes and logical fallacies.

For the sake of illustrating his view in this regard, Shukri quotes the following verses of Muwaylik in the elegy to his wife who left behind a small girl.

He comments on those verses saying: "He neither informed you of a new thing unknown to you nor dazzled your imagination by absurd similes and fallacious meaning; but he has stated a reality. His skill lies in imagining and describing this condition minutely, and this is the highest
As a matter of fact, the poet did not just imagine the condition portrayed here, but experienced it actually and suffered deeply and then gave an artistic expression to the suffering in the form of the poem. I imagine that the human feeling embodied in these verses along with their ability to affect the reader so that he shares the anguish of the poet and sympathizes with him is what led Shukri to make the above observation.

Shukri connects imagination with poetic meanings and thinks that they are "man's notions, his opinions, experiences, conditions of his soul and phrases of his sentiments." Further he observes that "the poetic meanings are not, as some people think, the absurd similes and imaginations and poor fallacies which the people of ugly taste seek."

Shukri, no doubt, seeks help from imagination to bring out the meanings, but he does not connect imagination with the general form of the poem, particularly with its organic structure. He divides imagination into two types according to its connection with the meaning. To quote his own words: "we call one of them imagination and the other fancy. Revelation of the connection between the objects and the realities by the poet is imagination. In this type of imagination the poet has to express the truth. Suspecting a connection by the poet between two objects, which
indeed there is not, is fancy. Small poets are deeply attached to this second type and great poets also can not save themselves from it. Its example is the following verse of Abu al-'Ala al-Ma'arri:

So the connection between the simile and the object of simile is something fanciful, having no existence of its own. As far as the example of the real imagination are concerned, they are what a man says 'the light of hope shines in the darkness of misery,' or as al-Buhturi says:

He thinks that imagination cannot tolerate affectation. For, in such a case, it would be like the mirage which looks real if seen from a distance and false if approached. To harmonize two things which are discordant may be the cause of false imagination. As such, if the point of harmonisation between the simile and the object of the simile is distant and the connection between them is obscure, the use of simile in such cases is not objectionable provided the point sought to be made out by the simile is sound and the connection between the two objects is strong. Hence the obviousness of the connection for every reader is not a proof for its solidity. It may be obvious but feeble and obscure but sound and genuine. Indeed every imagination
flashing through the mind of the common man cannot be taken to be genuine and true; this is one of the reasons of confusing the great poets with the small and people's inability to distinguish between them. The genius poet may be interested in extracting strong and true connections between the objects which the common man would normally fall short of not realizing. This is the way of the poetaster and the rhymer who is fond of finding weak connections between realities which have no such connection at all."

In spite of the fact that every language has its own attributes and taste it does not mean that it is distinguished by great imagination and admirable meaning while the other languages are devoid of them. These things are not exclusive to any language whichever because their source is the human intellect and soul. As far as the false imagination or fancy is concerned, it is related to the attributes of the languages and the tastes of the people using them.

Shukri's writings regarding imagination form an important document in the history of modern Arabic criticism. Perhaps he is the first Arabic critic who has dealt with imagination in this way. Indeed he is a pioneer among the Arabs in making a distinction between imagination and fancy. Al-'Aqqād talks highly of this unprecedented achievement of Shukri and maintains that the latter discerned the one
from the other though they are ambiguous even in the writings of certain Western critics. Thus he raises Shukri to the level of great litterateurs and thinkers of the world.

But Shukri's treatment of al-Ma'arri's verse to which we have referred above puts him in a contradictory position as al-Ma'arri dealt with natural meanings as if they were animate beings acting and feeling in their own way and Shukri also is of the same view regarding them.

Whatever may be the case, Shukri takes the terms: "imagination" and "fancy" from Coleridge but he differs from him in their interpretation. Coleridge regards imagination as an element which predominates the text and as a power which unifies its parts and lends it the distinct artistic mark. He divides it into the primary one which makes the human perception possible and the secondary one which is an echo of the former and similar to it in function but is distinct from it in the degree and mode of operation. The latter is depended upon as far as the process of artistic creation is concerned because "it dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to re-create; or where this process is rendered impossible, yet still at all events it struggles to idealize and to unify. It is essentially vital, even as all objects (as objects) are essentially fixed and dead."
Fancy does not undertake such a vital role; it is rather contrary to imagination, as Coleridge says, because its field "fixities and definites. The fancy is indeed no other than a mode of memory emancipated from the order of time and space; while it is blended with, and modified by, that empirical phenomenon of the will, which we express by the word choice. But equally with the ordinary memory the Fancy must receive all its materials ready made from the law of association."

This minute distinction between imagination and fancy, as made by Coleridge, remained the basis from which the romantics of the 18th century sought inspiration and the prop upon which they relied in their explanations and interpretations without dissenting from the frame which Coleridge fixed. But we think that Shukri chose a simple distinction in this regard. He looked at imagination as a power which enables the poet to penetrate into the objects in order to find out the real connections lying between them. These connections may be so much hidden that no one except a great poet can visualize them. Moreover Shukri did not bisect imagination into two as Coleridge did. Fancy is not like imagination. It interrelates those objects between which there is no relation whatsoever.
POEM'S UNITY:

As we mentioned in the first chapter that some of the Arab litterateurs have referred to the problem of unity in poetry. But they have not paid so much attention to it as it really deserved. Hence we may consider Shukri as a pioneer in clarifying the attitude of criticism towards this problem and laying the foundation of this unity in the modern Arabic criticism.

He considers poem as an integral artistic structure. Hence it is obligatory on us to look at the poem in the context of the structure and to avoid taking certain verses from it out of context and pass judgment on the poem as a whole on their basis. For, any verse disconnected from the theme of the poem is valueless. Similarly to consider each verse as complete in itself is wrong. The verse is a complementary part of the poem, it is not independent. If we want to comprehend the subject handled by the poet, we have to take within our purview all its parts (that is verses) which cooperate among themselves in disclosing completely the idea of the poet.

In view of the historical importance of the above view in the modern Arabic criticism it would be desirable to quote Shukri here as follows: "When the readers read a poem, they pick up from it what is according to their tastes
and discard the rest without searching for the reason which rendered the poet string these meanings in his poem,... and they pass judgment on his poem on the basis of the verses which win their hearts rightly or wrongly because they consider every verse as a complete unit. And this is wrong. The value of the verse lies in the connection between its meaning and the poem's subject. For, the verse is an integrant part of the poem and it would not be correct for it to become out of place in the poem and to fall apart from its subject. To feel the grace of the verse and prettiness of its meaning may rest on the comprehension of the connection lying between it and the poem's subject. On account of this, it would not be correct to judge the verse just by one rash and speedy look. Rather it should be judged on the basis of an artistic and deliberate study. Indeed we ought to look at the poem as one complete thing and not as (a collection of) independent verses. For, if we do this, we would find that the verse may not excite the reader due to its oddity. Even then it is great and necessary for the completion of the poem's meaning. The poet who does not care for the poem's unity as it deserves is like the painter who gives the same share of colour to all the parts of his painting."

It is evident that Shukri favours organic unity in the poem. Due to the presence of this element, it would be
impossible to take out a certain verse from the poem without disturbing its structure. Through it Shukri tries to impart higher value to the poetic creation, both in respect to the poet and the reader. As regards the poet, he should pay attention to this element in his composition. So far as the reader is concerned, he has got to be aware of this element and evaluate the composition in its light.

May be that one thinks that this organic unity does not materialize in Shukri's view unless the poem contains only one subject or has only one design. This thinking seems to get support from Shukri's use of "subject" in the singular. Previously he has mentioned that the subject may include more than one sentiments and may be these sentiments are contrary to one another. Under such a circumstance it is the poet who imparts harmony to the sentiments and unity to the poem.

The organic unity indeed is one of the most important factors of the critical thought of the romantics which formed the source of Shukri's concepts. We think that he was influenced particularly by Coleridge's observation about this unity and his rendering it a definition of poetry. Coleridge says: "If the definition sought for be that of a legitimate poem, I answer, it must be one, the parts of which mutually support and explain each other; all in their
proportion harmonizing with, and supporting the purpose and
known influences of metrical arrangement."

In Coleridge's view there is great importance of
this unity which lies in creating a close connection be­
tween the poem and the reader. It is a connection to which
Shukri does not refer. The unity of the poem is an ever­
growing structure. And hence, according to Coleridge, "the
reader should be carried forward, not merely or chiefly by
the mechanical impulse of curiosity, or by a restless de­
sire to arrive at the final solution; but by the pleasur­
able activity of mind excited by the attractions of the
journey itself. Like the motion of a serpent, which the
Egyptians made the emblem of intellectual power; or like
the path of sound through the air; at every step he pauses
and half recedes, and from the retrogressive movement co­
78 llects the force which again carries him onward."

In addition to this, the organic unity is one of
the most important results of imagination. Coleridge cla­
rifies this strong connection between these two elements
by saying: "imagination, or the power by which one image
or feeling is made to modify many others and by a sort of
fusion to force many into one... as they would have app­
cared in the description of an ordinary mind, described
slowly and in unimpassioned succession, a oneness, even
79 as nature, the greatest of poets."
Thus while in the opinion of the romantics, including Coleridge, imagination and organic unity are related with each other, in the opinion of Shukri they are separate. Hence we do not find in his writings on the subject anything referring to the vital relation between imagination and the poem's unity. Consequently we can say that Shukri did not assimilate adequately Coleridge's view on this problem.
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67. Like a brilliant star whose light has been purified by the darkness until it glitters and radiates.
68. Ibid., 5:365.
69. Ibid., 5:365-366.
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71. 'Abdās al-Aqqāḍ : Hayāt Qalam, p.201; and see Dr. Muhammad Mandūr : al-Naqd wa al-Nuqqād al-Muʿāṣirūn, p.64.
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What is worth mentioning here is that we find in the critical heritage of the Arabs certain indications to the interdependence of the verses in a poem. This suggests that they had indifference towards the independence of verses in the poem. One such indication is in what 'Umar b. Laja' said to a certain poet: "My poetic skill is higher than thine. He asked how? He ('Umar) answered: because I compose the verse along with its brother while thou composit the verse along with its cousin." See, al-Jāhiz: al-Bayān wa al-Tabī'īn, 1:206.

Since the above indication is just an incidental one and at that it does not represent the general critical convention, it is not possible for us to consider it as well as other ones of the type as the source of Shukri's view about the unity of poem. At the same time we cannot attribute Shukri's view to what the ancients said about the necessity of making connection between the subjects of the poem as also the creation of the proper situation for shifting from one subject to another in the same poem. (About this theme see Ibn Tabātabā' Iyar al-Shīr, p.6; Dr. Ihsān 'Abbās: Tārīkh al-laqd al-Adabi ... p.138). For, the above view
relates to the creation of connection between various parts of the poem and not among the verses contained in it. Besides, the Arabic poetry often depends on a weak pivot in shifting from one subject to another. This type of shifting may be included within Coleridge's concept of fancy.