

## The Concept of Poetic Necessity: Between Grammatical and Critical Analysis

DJENIDI RADHOUANE<sup>1</sup>, BACHIR ABID<sup>2</sup>, GASSAB ABDEL KADER<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Tamanrasset, Algeria

Email: [salimdjenidi@yahoo.fr](mailto:salimdjenidi@yahoo.fr)

<sup>2</sup>University of batna 1, Algeria

Email: [albachir72@gmail.com](mailto:albachir72@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>Naama University Center, Algeria

Email: [gassab14tam@yahoo.com](mailto:gassab14tam@yahoo.com)

Submission Date: 25.06.2025 | Acceptance Date: 02.01.2026 | Publication Date: 28.02.2026

### Abstract:

This study examines the concept of poetic necessity, exploring its relationship with grammatical analysis and its normative rules, as well as with critical analysis—specifically focusing on the phonetic-stylistic approach to analysis. It employs methods that encourage a deeper understanding of the meanings of structure and an appreciation of aspects of the creator's psyche, as well as his style of influence and being influenced, through the syntactic, grammatical, morphological, and phonetic structures organized by linguistic shifts and deviations that achieve artistic beauty. On another level, it ensures the integration of the phonetic and syntactic aspects, linking the understanding of the poetic verse containing poetic necessity to the overall meaning of the text.

This research paper affirms the fact that the internal rhythm of sounds is linked to inner psychological movement, as well as to the surge of emotion and its waves; this makes it a defining feature of the poet's individuality and distinctiveness, and a driving force that inspires the reader to explore the worlds of the poetic text. The study attempts to answer the following question: If structure in poetry is subject to variation, is it sufficient to classify it under the heading of poetic necessity, or should its study rely on the distinctive phonetic rhythmic characteristics of the poetic text, given their importance in establishing rules and theories?

**Keywords:** poetic necessity, phonetic stylistic approach, deviation, classical Algerian poetry.

### Poetic Necessity in Traditional Studies:

Many ancient Arab grammarians and critics applied the term "poetic necessity" to a variety of linguistic phenomena found scattered throughout the chapters on grammar and morphology and distributed across ancient literary criticism texts. The term "poetic necessity" has remained somewhat vague; as it is likely "that discussions of poetic necessity originated with the Hadrami grammarians, then developed until the principles of poetic necessity were clarified by al-Khalil and his student Sibawayh, who established a concept of necessity that had a notable influence on those who came after them" (Felfel, 2007, p. 92), which leads us to trace the most prominent statements of those who addressed the concept of poetic necessity in our grammatical, linguistic, and critical heritage.

Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad al-Farahidi established the concept of “poetic necessity” based on the depth of his awareness and the soundness of his taste, recognizing the difference between poetic language and the language of ordinary speech. Al-Khalil says: “Poets are the princes of speech; they shape it as they please, and they are permitted what others are not: to expand and restrict meaning, to simplify and complicate words, to shorten what is long and lengthen what is short, combining its forms, distinguishing its qualities, and extracting what tongues have failed to describe or attribute and minds have failed to comprehend or clarify. Thus, they bring the distant near and push the near away; they use them as evidence and are not contradicted by them; they portray falsehood as truth and truth as falsehood” (Al-Qurtagani, 2008, p. 127). This statement reveals Al-Khalil’s recognition that poets possess unique styles that reflect their will and individuality, and that they are not characterized by linguistic incapacity or constrained by the limitations of poetry in their poetic creations; He acknowledges that the concept of poetic necessity is far from being a compulsion or an obligation; the poet does not fall into it unwillingly or out of necessity, and he regards it as a departure in poetic expression from the universal rules that bind non-poets.

Sibawayh did not provide a specific definition of “necessity,” nor does the term “necessity” appear in his work *\*Al-Kitab\**. Instead, he used expressions that conveyed the meaning of the term without explicitly naming it, employing derivatives of the root itself. He did not establish a clearly defined definition for the term, and —unlike other grammarians—titled the chapter he devoted to necessity “What Poetry Can Convey,” “and the term ‘necessity’ is not mentioned in his book; in this title, the basis on which Sibawayh relied in understanding this chapter becomes apparent, and there is no consideration of the concept of meter” (Ibrahim Muhammad, 1983, p. 19); for he holds that poetry has its own distinct language that sets it apart from ordinary speech.

He acknowledges the existence of necessity but points out that it can be justified correctly, saying: “Know that what is permissible in poetry is not permissible in speech, such as the inflection of what is normally not inflected; they liken it to the inflection of nouns” (Sibawayh, 1988, Vol. 1, p. 26). He did not restrict necessity to the absence of an alternative for the poet, for he concluded the chapter by saying: 'There is nothing they are compelled to do without attempting to find a way around it' (Sibawayh, 1988, Vol. 1, p. 32). This clarifies some features of Sibawayh’s view on necessity, which can be summarized as follows: when the poet is compelled to choose a certain construction, he may consider similarity in structure or form; he may trace the employed structure back to an abandoned root; and he may direct it in a way that seeks to establish a parallel with one of the forms of analogy.

He asserts that poets employ techniques that deviate from the norms of ordinary language; they consciously resort to these techniques to express their individuality and distinctiveness, achieve aesthetic values, and endow their poetic language with qualities that set it apart from prose. Their poetry thus follows its own linguistic rules, which go beyond the requirements of meter and rhyme—even if a modern scholar might see it otherwise - (Felfel, 2007, p. 112); And he did not see necessity as a refuge upon which the grammarian could rely to eliminate verses that violate his principles; Sibawayh realized that poetry has its own system in its grammatical and morphological structures, that the poet has no choice but to adhere to it, and that it is not bound

by the compulsion of poetic meter, but rather, for him, this relates to the very nature of poetry itself.

Ibn Jinni represented the view of the majority of grammarians, without distinguishing between the Basran and Kufan schools, on the issue of “poetic necessity”: “The majority holds that the poet may commit a necessity even though he is capable of avoiding it, and his ability to avoid it does not negate its status as a necessity” (Hamasa Abd al-Latif, 1996, p. 130); Ibn Jinni holds that the Arabs commit necessity despite their ability to avoid it, which demonstrates their strength and mastery and dispels any notion of their helplessness or weakness. He argues this by citing their acceptance of the weaker interpretation when multiple possibilities exist, stating: “The Arabs do this to accommodate you by permitting the weaker interpretation, so that your path may be valid and your understanding may accept it, if you find no other interpretation” (Ibn Jinni, 1955, Vol. 3, p. 609).

He links the poet’s resort to necessity with the need for metrical and rhyming regularity—a need that is, in fact, optional. For the poet, committing such necessities is like a knight charging into battle. He says: So whenever you see a poet committing such necessities, despite their ugliness and their violation of the fundamentals, know that this is due to his own burden; and even if it appears, on one hand, to indicate his injustice and arbitrariness, on the other hand it is a sign of his passion and intensity, and is not conclusive evidence of the weakness of his language or his failure to choose the form that best expresses his eloquence. but rather, in my view, he is like a wild horse running free without a bridle, or a warrior entering battle bareheaded and without modesty; for though he may be blamed for his violence and recklessness, he is renowned for his courage and the abundance of his generosity” (Ibn Jinni, 1955, Vol. 2, p. 60); This reveals the extent of his respect for the poet’s courage and his departure from linguistic norms on the one hand, and his rejection of this creative figure’s violation of linguistic rules and his rebellion against established grammatical principles on the other. He goes further, calling for the avoidance of such grammatical violations, saying: “However, regarding what we have mentioned of the poet’s loftiness, excessiveness, arrogance, and haughtiness, be aware of it and avoid it” (Ibn Jinni, 1955, Vol. 2, p. 393). Thus, he respects poetic will while rejecting the transgression of prescriptive grammatical rules.

While a review of the positions of earlier grammarians reveals their linking of poetic necessity to the integrity of meter and rhyme, and their acknowledgment of the importance of poetic will in deviating from linguistic norms, Ibn Fāris’s position diverges from theirs; for he scarcely acknowledges the existence of poetic necessity, for he views the poet’s deviation from the prescriptive rules of the Arabic language as placing him within the realm of error and mispronunciation. He states his opinion on this matter as follows: “ “There is no merit in the claim that the poet is free to use what is impermissible [...] God did not make poets infallible, immune to error and mistake; whatever is correct in their poetry is acceptable, and whatever is rejected by Arabic and its principles is rejected” (Ibn Fāris, 1997, p. 213), His position thus differs from that of the majority of grammarians, and he bases it on two exclusive possibilities: either the poetic language conforms to the principles of Arabic, in which case the necessity is negated, or it violates the rules of the language, in which case it is deemed to be in error or incorrect.

Ibn Fāris clearly states his viewpoint in the introduction to his treatise (Condemnation of Error in Poetry), rejecting the grammarians' resort to contrivances to interpret instances of necessity in the poetic examples that gave them pause in codifying grammar and deducing its principles. He says: What prompted me to write this introduction is that some of the ancient poets, and those who came after them, were correct in most of the poetry they composed, and erred in a small portion of it. Consequently, Arabic scholars began to point out the poets' errors in various ways and devised interpretations for them, to the extent that they established chapters on the subject and compiled books on the necessities of poetry" (Ibn Fares, 1980, pp. 17–18); thus, necessity becomes equivalent to error, and distances itself from the concept of poetic license that distinguishes poetry from prose.

According to Ibn Fāris, nothing permits a poet to violate a linguistic rule, even if maintaining the meter compels him to do so. He says: "If they say: 'The poet is compelled to do so because he wishes to maintain the meter of his poetry, and if he did not do so, his poetry would not be sound,' it is said to them: 'Who compelled him to compose poetry that cannot be sound except by committing an error?' We have neither seen nor heard of a poet whom a ruler or a person of authority has compelled, with a whip or a sword, to say in his poetry what is impermissible, and what you yourselves do not permit in the speech of others." (Ibn Fāris, 1980, p. 21); he explicitly contradicts the majority view on poetic necessity, whether the poet resorts to it for the sake of meter and rhyme or out of his own poetic will.

Abu Hilal al-Askari's view is not far removed from that of Ibn Fāris regarding the reprehensibility of poetic alliteration; he considers it a linguistic flaw and attributes its presence in the poetry of the ancients to their ignorance of its ugliness and their lack of guidance on how to avoid it. He says: "The ancients used them in their poetry simply because they were unaware of their ugliness, and because some of them were beginners, and the beginning is a stumbling block. Nor were their poems criticized, even if they had been, to highlight their flaws, as is done with the poets of our time, whose speech is scrutinized for the slightest flaw so that they may avoid it" (Al-Askari, 1952, p. 150). He does not elaborate on the reasoning behind his opinion, which makes it a view lacking in precision and specificity, mired in generalization and vagueness.

Abu Hilal al-Askari's remarks lead us to understand the positions of our ancient critics regarding the issue of "poetic necessity," proceeding from the premise that research into it is closer to critical study than to grammatical and morphological discussions. One of the modern scholars confirms this, citing Sibawayh's book: "And in Sibawayh's book—though it is a work of grammar—we find some sections that are foreign to grammar, even if they benefit the student of Arabic literature and linguistic heritage[...] and a discussion of the necessities of poetry, such as what is impermissible in speech—inflecting what cannot be inflected, omitting what cannot be omitted, lengthening what cannot be lengthened, and separating what is originally assimilated—is more closely related to literary criticism than to grammar" (Al-Sayyid, 1968, p. 551).

Turning to the position of Ibn Rashīq al-Masīlī al-Qayrawānī, his rejection of poetic necessity becomes clear to us. This critic devoted a chapter in his book *\*Al-Umda\** titled "The Chapter on Licenses in Poetry," which he began by stating his disapproval of necessity, saying: "I

mention here what a poet may use if compelled to do so, though there is no good in necessity; yet some forms of it are easier than others, and some are heard among the Arabs but not practiced, for they adopted them out of habit, and the modern poet has come to recognize them as flaws, and their inclusion in his work binds him to them” (Ibn Rashiq, 1981, p. 269); for he views necessity as a weakness in poetic expression, indicating the poet’s inadequacy, and reinforces this stance with phrases such as: “It is ugly” (Ibn Rashiq, 1981, p. 269), “and it is not permissible for the modern poet to use this due to its strangeness and ugliness” (Ibn Rashiq, 1981, pp. 270–271).

While necessity may have been accepted by the ancient poets—who found ways to interpret and explain it in a manner that removed it from the suspicion of error and ugliness—modern poets are required to adhere to linguistic norms and the fundamentals of Arabic. One scholar explains the position of critics such as Ibn Rashiq on the issue of necessity: “ Grammatical violations [were considered] by all critics to be lapses [...] and for that reason they tracked what they called the mistakes of al-Mutanabbi and the mistakes of the pre-Islamic poets” (Nasif, n.d., p. 679), These critics view necessity as a deviation from grammatical norms that tarnishes the language and robs it of its beauty and fluidity.

The position of Ibn Rashīq—and before him that of Abī Hilāl al-Askarī—does not imply that the ancient critics who addressed the issue of poetic necessity viewed it uniformly; in fact, their judgments varied: one group was strict and rejected it, another accepted some of it, and yet another was tolerant and defended it.

From the foregoing, the close connection between “poetic necessity” and poetic meter becomes evident, as the nature of poetry is defined by meter and rhyme, and the link between meter and necessity is strong, establishing a cause-and-effect relationship between them. Al-Mubarrad states, “Meter dictates necessity, and rhyme compels ingenuity” (Ibn Qutaybah, 1954, p. 154). It is also evident that grammarians differ significantly and hold conflicting views regarding the concept of “poetic necessity.” One group applied the term to everything found in poetry, whether the poet had a choice in the matter or whether it constituted a flaw in his poetry. while a second group viewed it as something the poet is compelled to do out of necessity; and a third group acknowledged that what grammarians call “poetic necessity” is nothing but an error or an anomaly, concluding with the certainty that if the ancients had known of its flaw, they would have avoided it, and refrained from using it in their poetry, without overlooking the opinion of those who concluded that it is part of the poets’ language, because their tongues have become accustomed to it and have adopted it.

### **The stance of modern scholars on poetic necessity:**

Some modern scholars have addressed the issue of poetic necessity; some have mentioned it in their linguistic and critical studies only partially, in a chapter or subchapter, while others have devoted a comprehensive study to it. Among the former, we mention the researcher Ibrahim Anis, who dedicated a chapter to it in his book *\*The Music of Poetry\**, in which he presented his position clearly and unambiguously. After affirming that he would not address the issue exhaustively, he acknowledged that although prosodists have addressed poetic necessities in their books, in reality they have no connection to the study of prosody through its

music and meters, stating: “Poetic necessities are nothing but concessions granted to poets when they compose, allowing them to deviate from certain rules of language, not the rules of meter and rhyme, which are more closely related to the studies of grammarians” (Anis, 1952, p. 298), He mentioned the classification of necessities by the early scholars; Some of these are considered acceptable and others reprehensible. He considered their classification to be incorrect—especially regarding the reprehensible necessities—because they overlooked the inaccuracies in the texts they cited to support their judgments, failed to account for variations in Arabic dialects, and were overly meticulous in their analysis of poetic examples.

In his book *\*Secrets of Language\**, this researcher highlights the distinction between poetic and prose language, and the poet’s freedom to transcend linguistic norms, break free from their constraints, and soar high in the skies of creativity. He criticizes the ancient linguists for mixing poetry and prose in their formulation of grammatical rules, which resulted in confusion in some of their rulings; often, the poetic examples betrayed them and contradicted their rulings; for “the poetry they relied upon did not aid them except on rare occasions; it provided them with phenomena and styles that left them bewildered and perplexed, so they judged some of them as what they called poetic necessity, and others as anomalies, requiring one to pause upon hearing them” (Anis, 1978, p. 342). He called for avoiding the use of poetic texts in deriving linguistic rules and establishing their norms.

His rejection of their argument is evident in his statement: “Regarding that so-called ‘poetic necessity’—which I consider a stigma they have, in good faith, affixed to Arabic poetry—I know of no other nation that describes its poetry in such terms or brands it with such a stigma. and how much better off they would have been had they studied poetry alone, and confined it to certain rules that should be left to the poets alone, from which they may take what they will” (Anis, 1978, p. 343), which emphasizes their distinctiveness and uniqueness, and imprints their poetry with special stylistic features that express their poetic will.

A contemporary scholar, the editor of the book *\*Critique of Error in Poetry by Ibn Fāris the Linguist\**, does not agree with this view, as he does not see any special characteristics in the poetic text that would permit the occurrence of error within it or justify its acceptance and study in search of its aesthetic values, For literary language has its own “laws and rules, and whoever violates these laws and rules is in error with respect to both, [...] However, Arab linguists—or at least a large majority of them—did not grasp this reality; they considered everything that came to us from the Arabs to be correct, and they shied away from calling things by their true names, speaking instead of necessity, the anomalous, the few, the rare, and so on” (Ibn Fāris, 1980, p. 3), It is no secret that this view contains generalizations and sweeping statements, confirmed by the author’s attempt in his book to justify the occurrence of poetic necessity by attributing it to poets’ preoccupation with meter and rhyme, which leads them into the forbidden, and adding to this a lack of poetic will, since necessity, in his view, “is often nothing more than unconscious errors in language” (Abd al-Tawwab, 1999, p. 163), caused by the compulsion to prioritize the musicality of poetry at the expense of linguistic structure.

This scholar cites a number of examples illustrating the insistence of some ancient linguists on justifying poets’ errors and avoiding the accusation that they made mistakes, and concludes at the end of this chapter, titled “Poetic Necessity and Linguistic Error,” by asserting that “there

is no truth to what people say—that poetic necessity is a license for the poet to commit errors whenever he wishes—because this implies that the poet is permitted to deliberately violate established rules”; For many of the instances of poetic necessity scattered throughout the works of ancient grammarians and critics are—according to this scholar—nothing but linguistic errors and deviations from the Arabic linguistic system, even if they attempt to find justifications or rationalizations for them; Another scholar rejected this view, asserting that poetic necessity does not in any way fall under the category of linguistic errors, as it may conform to linguistic rules that some scholars overlook, or reflect the individual characteristics of the poet.

Among the modern scholars who have devoted a comprehensive study to the subject of poetic necessity, we mention the author of the book *\*The Language of Poetry: A Study in Poetic Necessity\**. In his research, he pointed out the differences among ancient grammarians regarding the concept of poetic necessity, which resulted in outcomes that harmed linguistic scholarship; for “what one considers a necessity cannot be measured against it; another does not see it that way, so he permits its adoption and the modeling of poetry and prose after it, engaging in interpretation and exegesis, and twisting the neck of the linguistic text in their hands, so that it suffocates without a correct interpretation ” (Hamasa Abd al-Latif, 1996, p. 5). The inaccuracy of linguistic interpretation leads to the neglect of the poetic text and its overburdening with extrapolations that deviate from the truth.

The author has defined the objective of his study as advancing the interpretation of poetic necessity, starting from the linguistic text that embodies the phenomenon, with the aim of dispelling the stigma of necessity that has long marked it in linguistic and critical scholarship. He begins with the foundations that gave rise to the phenomenon in traditional scholarship, addressing its various types by linking them to the diversity of dialects and narratives, to ultimately study it in the light of the language of poetry, in which he demonstrated “that poetry is an emotive language not subject to the strict constraints of rules characterized by consistency and continuity, and that phenomena prevalent in poetry cannot be called errors” (Hamasa Abd al-Latif, 1996, p. 407), proposing that the study of poetry be separated from the study of prose due to the distinctive characteristics of each.

This researcher believes that the cause leads to its logical conclusion: if poetry in every language has unique features that distinguish it from prose, this leads to the assertion of the existence of what is called the language of poetry. He states: “ “The conclusion we draw from all this is that poetry is an emotive language, in which the poet, under the influence of emotion, resorts to words and structures that he believes convey meaning more effectively than others. And since the language of poetry is emotive, it is not possible to establish strict rules for it that are characterized by consistency and continuity” (Hamasa Abd al-Latif, 1996, p. 378). After his extensive research, he acknowledges that the most significant conclusion he reached is “that the term ‘poetic necessity’ does not represent a genuine linguistic reality” (Hamasa Abd al-Latif, 1996, p. 405), It was imposed on them by grammarians, driven by their systematic approach to collecting and codifying the language.

Turning to the author of *\*Poetic Necessity: A Stylistic Study\**, we pause at the author’s proposal of an alternative to researching poetic necessity as a linguistic phenomenon, namely stylistic analysis, which proceeds “from the fundamental linguistic features in the study of a

literary work, including instances in the work where the language deviates from the general standard of ordinary language use; and from this perspective comes the study of the stylistic characteristics that make the literary work unique" (Ibrahim Muhammad, 1983, p. 9). He justifies his choice of this research approach by noting the inability of grammatical analysis to uncover the secrets of the phenomenon of poetic necessity, since such deviations from grammar do not reflect the poet's inadequacy, linguistic shortcomings, or lack of creativity—especially when linked to poetic meter— but rather it is “a manifestation of poetic will, in which the spirit and individuality of the writer are revealed; indeed, it is a path to understanding the literary work as a whole” (Ibrahim Muhammad, 1983, p. 9), by focusing on the aesthetics of this deviation from the customary use of language and attempting to explore its artistic aims, not the deviation from language in and of itself.

### **The Rhythm of Sounds in Stylistic Analysis:**

Phonetic characteristics are among the most prominent stylistic devices found in poetic texts, serving to strengthen the bond between the creator and the reader. They have been incorporated into rhythmic analysis, which is linked to two fundamental elements: the first being the regular phonetic structure of meter and rhyme: Meter, as one of the foundations of Arabic poetry, is “the highlighting and creation of a sharp gap in the nature of language and its presence within it; meter is an approach to linguistic material in its phonetic dimensions” (Aboudib, n.d., 89), Then there is the role of rhyme in the rhythm of classical poetry, following which there is a pause that highlights the rhythmic melody and achieves the phonetic balance resulting from the rhyme of the poetic line and the line that follows it; the other is the irregular phonetic element, which is firmly established in Arabic rhetoric as one of its main components and a poetic starting point, and considering the expressive potential inherent in the phonetic material that remains hidden in ordinary language, when the meanings of the words that compose it and the emotional connotations of these words are separated from the values of the sounds themselves.

Perhaps the simplest definition of phonological stylistics is that it is a field of study based on the examination of “sounds that serve to distinguish between meanings” (Al-Zaydi, 1984, p. 61). This stylistic approach focuses on the phonetic level of poetic speech. In his book *\*Phonetic Principles\**, Pierre Giroux conveys Trubetzkoy's definition of phonological stylistics by distinguishing three elements: First, representational phonetics, which focuses on the study of phonemes; second, expressive phonetics, which concerns the study of phonetic variations intended to influence the listener; and third, expressive phonetics, which emphasizes the study of variations produced by the speaker through their mood and spontaneous behavior; The author of the definition holds that the latter two elements together constitute “the subject of phonological stylistics, which aims to establish a classification of the specific methods of expression: intonation, prosody, lengthening, repetition, and so on” (Giro, 1994, pp. 59–60); These are determined by the expressive or symbolic value of the sounds inherent in a language, which possesses a system of phonetic variables that are difficult to define due to their variation from one language to another and their abundance. In our study, we will attempt to focus on the

variables resulting from what is called poetic necessity, and what we propose to call rhythmic shift.

Phonological stylistics links the phonetic variations produced by the speaker to their mood, behavior, and expressive connotations. Pierre Giraud states: “To the extent that language has the freedom to manipulate certain phonetic elements of the speech chain, it can use those elements for stylistic purposes” (Giro, 1994, p. 60); In it, the oral interconnection between meaning and rhythm embodies the vibrations and suggestions of the soul; rhythm is considered the center where form and content unite, and the point where contradictions converge, making the infinite finite without losing its distinctiveness, For a seemingly static phrase may, through the manner of its creation and composition, acquire a poetic quality that imbues it with movement within that stillness, and from this arises the essence of true beauty.

And if rhythm emerges as a fundamental element in poetic structure, it is because phonetic stylistics sees it as intertwining with the rest of the elements that make up the text, as it wrestles with meaning, revealing the conflict within the structure of the poetic work; for it is “not a simple sign; but rather a complex and intricate sign system composed of numerous signs; indeed, each of its elements is in itself a sign system composed of signs that are its vocabulary” (Al-Bahrawi, 1996, p. 33), thereby deepening its role in the poetic text, as it is considered one of the text’s most prominent markers; this makes it “appear as an echo of the poem’s meaning, capable of reinforcing the meaning and introducing meanings, interpretations, and nuances, and it can be used to evoke meaning and suggest the conflict within the poem’s structure” (Al-Bahrawi, 1996, p. 33).

Rhythm, with its subtle internal movement that binds the parts of the text together, constitutes an aesthetic poetic force that is difficult to grasp or attempt to define and control; it is a personal musicality unique to the poet, and to the extent that it distinguishes him from other creators, so too does his uniqueness and originality, for rhythm is the most important element of poetry and its most prominent characteristic; And while the aesthetic quality of rhythm does not lie in the nature of the sounds themselves, but rather in the rhythm of the psychological activity that highlights meaning and emotion—strengthening the connection between the movement of rhythm and the inner psychological movement, as well as the surge and intensity of emotion—this reveals “the importance of poetic rhythm in constructing the overall meaning of the poetic work and the extent to which it reveals the connection between the poem’s melody and rhythm and the poet’s feelings; for the rhythms of the work merge with the initial tremors of the poet’s creativity, emerging colored by the hue of purposeful music” (Eid, 1998, p. 62), which causes this aesthetic aspect of rhythm to merge with the poem’s meter, and the sounds and letters, with their own resonance, to respond to the echo of the poem’s body, thereby enriching the poetic strings.

If the creative text is a dynamic, ever-changing force that knows no closure or complacency in an infallible idea, then the map of its semantic structure extends to both visible and invisible implications; This has been acknowledged by contemporary critical discourse, which holds that the true creative text is one characterized by uniqueness, distinguished from all other texts by features specific to it alone, such that the degree of creativity is measured by the extent to which it achieves astonishment and surprise—often arising from the combination of elements not

expected to be brought together on a single plane; and these characteristics are not included in stylistic analysis unless they carry connotations of deviation from the familiar norm.

**Bibliography List :**

- Ibrahim Muhammad, al-Sayyid (1983). *Poetic Necessity (A Stylistic Study)*. 3rd ed. Beirut: Dar al-Andalus.
- Abudib, Kamal (n.d.). *On Poetics*. Beirut: Arab Research Foundation.
- Anis, Ibrahim (1978). *From the Secrets of Language*. 6th ed. Cairo: Anglo-Egyptian Library.
- Anis, Ibrahim (1952). *The Music of Poetry*. 2nd ed. Cairo: Anglo-Egyptian Library.
- Al-Bahrawi, Sayyid (1996). *Rhythm in Al-Sayyab's Poetry*. 1st ed. Cairo: Dar Nawara.
- Ibn Jinni, Abu al-Fath Uthman (1955). *Al-Khasa'is*. 2nd ed. Edited by Muhammad Ali al-Najjar. Cairo: Dar al-Kutub al-Misriyya Press.
- Giroux, Pierre (1994). *Stylistics*. 2nd ed. Translated by Munzir Ayashi. Aleppo: Center for Cultural Development.
- Hamasa, Abd al-Latif, Muhammad (1996). *The Language of Poetry (A Study in Poetic Necessity)*. 1st ed. Cairo: Dar al-Shorouk.
- Ibn Rashiq, Abu Ali Hassan (1981). *Al-Umda fi Mahasin al-Shir' wa Adabihi wa Naqdihi*. 5th ed. Edited by Muhammad Muhyiddin Abd al-Hamid. Beirut: Dar al-Jil.
- Al-Zaydi, Tawfiq (1984). *The Influence of Linguistics on Modern Arabic Criticism*. 1st ed. Tunis: Dar al-Arabiya li-l-Kitab.
- Sibawayh, Abu Bishr Amr ibn Uthman (1988). *Al-Kitab*. 3rd ed. Edited by Abd al-Salam Muhammad Harun. Cairo: Dar al-Khanji.
- Abd al-Tawwab, Ramadan (1999). *Chapters in Arabic Grammar*. 6th ed. Cairo: Al-Khanji Library.
- Al-Askari, Abu Hilal (1952). *The Book of the Two Arts (Writing and Poetry)*. 1st ed. Edited by Ali Muhammad Bajawi and Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim. Cairo: Dar Ihya al-Kutub al-Arabiya.
- Eid, Raja (1998). *Musical Innovation in Arabic Poetry (A Foundational Study of the Old and the New in the Music of Arabic Poetry)*. 1st ed. Alexandria: Manashat al-Ma'arif.
- Ibn Fares, Abu al-Hasan Ahmad (1980). *Criticism of Poets' Errors*. Edited by Ramadan Abd al-Tawwab. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanji.
- Ibn Fares, Abu al-Hasan Ahmad (1997). *Al-Sahabi on the Jurisprudence of the Arabic Language, Its Issues, and the Customs of the Arabs in Their Speech*. 1st ed. Edited by Ahmad Hasan Basaj. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah.
- Falafel, Muhammad Abdo (2007). *Poetic Language Among Grammarians (A Study of Poetic Evidence and Poetic Necessity in Arabic Grammar)*. 1st ed. Amman: Dar Jarir
- Ibn Qutaybah, Abu Muhammad Abdullah (1954). *The Interpretation of the Difficult Passages of the Quran*. 1st ed. Edited by Sayyid Ahmad Saqr. Cairo: Dar Ihya al-Kutub al-Arabiyya.
- Al-Qurtujani, Hazim (2008). *Manahij al-Balagha wa Siraj al-Adaba*. 3rd ed. Edited by Muhammad al-Habib ibn al-Khoja. Tunis: Dar al-Arabia li-l-Kitab.
- Nasif, Mustafa (n.d.). *The Theory of Meaning in Arabic Criticism*. Beirut: Dar al-Andalus.

