RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

The Issue Of Literary (Artistic) Devices In Eastern Literature

🆔 **Salima Rustamiy**

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Department of "Tillar-1", Oriental University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Artistic devices play an important role in imparting general aesthetic qualities to speech. While artistic devices are studied in Arabic philology within the badīʿ section of the science of balāgha (rhetoric), in Western philology—and through it, in modern Uzbek linguistics—they are examined under various terms such as "stylistic devices" or "a system of expressive and emotive linguistic means." In literary studies, they are referred to as "artistic devices" or "poetic devices." Their classification also differs from that of Eastern philology. Specifically, in Arabic rhetoric, badīʿ devices are classified into verbal (lafẓī) and semantic (maʿnavī) groups based on the dominant feature involved in creating artistic effect, whereas Persian scholars additionally introduced a combined verbal–semantic category.

To clarify this issue, it is necessary to refer to the primary sources in which the theory of badīʿ devices was originally developed. This is because badīʿ devices form the foundation of artistic creativity among all peoples, particularly Eastern nations, and the theoretical framework developed within Arabic rhetoric facilitated their rapid dissemination, assimilation, and further development. The authenticity of this process is evident from treatises on rhetoric—especially on artistic devices—written in Persian and Turkic languages. These devices were also widely used in the creative works of Turkic peoples, and it is clear that their classification, definitions, and terminology were adopted and developed through the works of Arab scholars.

In Arabic-language sources, artistic devices are divided into two groups: al-muḥassināt al-lafẓiyya (verbal embellishments) and al-muḥassināt al-maʿnaviyya (semantic embellishments). There has been no significant debate among Arab rhetoricians regarding this classification, and badīʿ devices continue to be studied on this basis to the present day.

This article examines the issue of verbal artistic devices that shape the aesthetics of Arabic, Persian, and Turkic languages, as well as their classification, drawing on works devoted to the science of rhetoric.

Keywords: Science of rhetoric, artistic devices, Arabic philology, literary studies, Eastern peoples.

INTRODUCTION

Before al-Sakkākī, the science of rhetoric (balāgha) had extended beyond the boundaries of the Arabic language and spread among non-Arab peoples, developing in parallel in accordance with the artistic expressive capacities of each language. As a result, works were produced in which literary devices were defined, classified, and illustrated with appropriate examples. Although the devices included in these works were not always arranged into special categories, they followed an order corresponding to the above-mentioned classification.

By the twelfth century, when al-Sakkākī developed a system of rhetoric specifically for the Arabic language, there already existed works written in both Arabic and Persian that were well known among non-Arab peoples.

METHOD

The study of concepts related to literary devices contributes to a correct understanding of theoretical knowledge in linguistics and literary studies and to the exploration of issues related to linguopoetics, linguo-

aesthetics, and linguostylistics in modern linguistics. In examining the research topic, methods such as scientific description and component analysis were employed.

RESULTS

In the discussion of literary devices, the following views of Z. Mamajonov deserve attention:

"In existing treatises, considerable confusion and variation can be found regarding certain terms related to poetic devices, their definitions, and their classification… In Atoulloh Husayniy's works, as well as in most studies devoted to this issue, poetic devices are divided into phonetic (lafẓī), semantic (maʿnavī), and phonetic-semantic (maʿnavī-lafẓī) types. In A. Hojiahmedov's treatise Poetic Devices and Classical Rhyme, it is stated that 'in our literary scholarship, the division of poetic devices into semantic and phonetic types has become a tradition,' and they are classified accordingly… In Shaykh Ahmad ibn Khudoydod Taroziy's work Funūn al-Balāgha, however, poetic devices are presented without any grouping or classification. V. Rahmonov singled out several devices formed on the basis of Arabic letters into a separate group as letter-based devices" (Mamajonov, 2000, p. 47).

In addition, there is also diversity in attributing poetic devices to semantic or phonetic types in these treatises. For example, the devices iyhām, jamʿ, tafrīq, taqsīm, jamʿ wa tafrīq, jamʿ wa taqsīm, and takrīr are classified as semantic by Atoulloh Husayniy (Husayniy, 1981, pp. 122–129), whereas A. Hojiahmedov considers them phonetic (Hojiahmedov, 1999, p. 238).

To clarify this issue, it is necessary to refer to the primary sources in which the theory of badīʿ (rhetorical/literary devices) was originally developed. Since badīʿ devices form the foundation of artistic creativity among all peoples, especially Eastern peoples, the theoretical knowledge shaped within Arabic rhetoric spread rapidly, was easily assimilated, and further developed. The authenticity of this process is evident from treatises on rhetoric—particularly on literary devices—written in Persian and Turkic (Rustamiy, 2000, 2024). Thus, these devices were widely used in the creativity of Turkic peoples as well, and their classification, definitions, and terminology were clearly adopted and developed through the works of Arab scholars.

In Arabic sources, literary devices are divided into two groups: al-muḥassināt al-lafẓiyya (phonetic embellishments) and al-muḥassināt al-maʿnawiyya (semantic embellishments). There has been no disagreement among Arab rhetoricians on this matter, and to this day badīʿ devices are taught according to this classification.

The term lafẓī is applied to devices in which the sound aspect of words is primarily considered in creating the artistic effect, whereas maʿnawī refers to devices in which the semantic aspect is primarily considered. However, as al-Sakkākī emphasized, even in forming phonetic devices, "the wording must be subordinate to the meaning."

Among contemporary Uzbek literary scholars, some argue that

"…a poetic device emerges only through the unity of form and content, and only in specific cases may one of them occupy a more dominant position. A literary work, especially a poetic one, can be regarded as a true artistic phenomenon only when both meaning and form are beautiful… Therefore, basing the classification of poetic devices on 'phonetic' and 'semantic' characteristics is not entirely correct" (Mamajonov, 2000, p. 51).

They thus express doubts about the correctness of labeling devices strictly as "beauty of form" or "beauty of meaning."

To study this issue thoroughly, it is necessary to consult scholars of rhetoric, examine the classifications of literary devices they proposed, consider changes related to the historical development of rhetorical studies, and take into account the views of Arab, Persian, Turkic, and particularly Uzbek scholars.

Among later scholars, Hamid Avni, in his work Al-Minhaj al-Wadiḥ, lists the following phonetic (lafẓī) devices: jinās (tajnis), radd al-ʿajz ʿalā al-ṣadr, ʿaks, sajʿ, and izdivāj (Awni, 1953, pp. 198–234). In Ahmad Hoshimiy's work Jawāhir al-Balāgha, in addition to those mentioned above, information is also provided on the following devices: tashīf, izdivāj, muwāzana, tashrīʿ, luzūm mā lā yalzam, mā lā yastaḥīlu bi-l-inʿikās, muwāraba, iʿtilāf al-lafẓ maʿa al-lafẓ, tasmiṭ, insijām or suhūla, iktifāʾ, and taṭrīz (Hashimiy, 2004, pp. 424–439).

As for classical sources, in al-Sakkākī's Miftāḥ al-ʿUlūm, the following are included among phonetic devices: tajnis

(complete tajnis, incomplete tajnis, augmented tajnis, parallel tajnis, and derivative tajnis), ishtiqāq, radd al-ʿajz ilā al-ṣadr, qalb, sajʿ, and tarṣīʿ. It is also stated that "beauty can be created even from dotted and undotted letters" (Sakkākī, 2000), although their types are not specified.

Atoulloh Husayniy explains the term lafẓ as follows: "The first meanings of the word lafẓ are 'to utter' and 'to speak'; when applied to a word, it refers to its sound aspect" (Husayniy, 1981, p. 39). Thus, phonetic beauty is created through sounds.

In rhetoric, phonetic devices, referred to as "phonetic beauties," are defined as follows: beauty is directed specifically at the wording, while meaning is of secondary importance; meaning is expressed through beautiful wording, which in turn correspondingly embellishes the meaning as well (Qalqilah, 1992, p. 289).

From this it becomes clear that in giving speech an artistic character, the semantic aspect of words is certainly not ignored; however, in phonetic devices, the meaning of the chosen word must correspond to the intended purpose, and if its sound aspect hinders the creation of the device, a phonetically suitable form is selected from among its synonyms.

The emergence of these devices is based on the sound-correspondence properties of language. Our scholars have stated the following in this regard:

"Sounds in a language are not identical from the point of view of sound correspondence. They can first be divided into two types: less sonorous and more sonorous sounds. The least sonorous sounds are unrounded and short vowels… As the vowel becomes wider, the lack of sonority decreases… Less sonorous sounds create euphony. When sonority and euphony combine, resonance arises. In full sonorous correspondence, all sonorous sounds are identical; in partial correspondence, only some of them are identical… If regular sonorous correspondence and euphony combine, complete phonetic correspondence arises. Complete phonetic correspondence differs from homonymy (formal similarity) in linguistics… In art, harmony is more important than equality. However, taking into account the equivalence of complete phonetic correspondence with complete homonymy, we call this complete phonetic correspondence. Yet this represents the extreme point of phonetic correspondence, where it ends" (Rustamov, 1979, pp. 31–33).

Thus, in phonetic devices, the phonetic correspondence of words comes to the forefront. Arab rhetoricians include among such devices formed through phonetic correspondence, as noted above, sajʿ, tajnis, ishtiqāq, radd al-ʿajz ilā al-ṣadr, and tarṣīʿ; some scholars (Jarim & Amin, 1999, p. 308) also add iqtibās.

In forming semantic devices, which are also part of literary devices, the semantic aspect of the word is taken into account, and they are called al-muḥassināt al-maʿnawiyya, that is, "semantic beauties." Their definition is as follows: beauty is directed specifically at meaning, while wording is of secondary importance; a beautiful meaning is expressed through words, and the words that serve as its markers are correspondingly beautiful as well.

The founder of rhetorical studies, Yusuf Sakkākī, in Miftāḥ al-ʿUlūm, included among semantic devices tawriya, ṭibāq, muqābala, ḥusn al-taʿlīl, ṭibāq (mutābaqa, ittidad), muqābala, mushākala, murāʿāt al-naẓīr, muzāwaja, laff wa nashr, jamʿ, tafrīq, taqsīm, jamʿ maʿa tafrīq, jamʿ maʿa taqsīm, jamʿ maʿa tafrīq wa taqsīm, īhām, tawjīh, sūq al-maʿlūm masāqa ghayrih (in other sources – tajāhul al-ʿārif), iʿtirāḍ, istitbāʿ, iltifāt, and taqlīl al-lafẓ (Sakkākī, 2000).

Jalal al-Din al-Qazvini, in Talkhīṣ al-Miftāḥ, lists the following devices: muṭābaqa [(ṭibāq, ittidad), ṭibāq al-ījāb, ṭibāq al-salb], īhām, muqābala, murāʿāt al-naẓīr, tanāsub, īhām al-tanāsub, irsād (tashīm), mushākala, muzāwaja, ʿaks, rujūʿ, tawriya (īhām), istikh¬dām, laff wa nashr, jamʿ, tafrīq, taqsīm, jamʿ maʿa al-tafrīq, jamʿ maʿa al-taqsīm, jamʿ maʿa al-tafrīq wa al-taqsīm, tajrīd, mubālagha, madhhab kalāmī, ḥusn al-taʿlīl, tafrīʿ, taʾkīd al-madh, istitbāʿ, idmāj, tawjīh, tajâhul al-ʿārif, and ittirād.

Among later scholars, the semantic devices included in Hamid Avni's book Al-Minhāj al-Wāḍiḥ are: muṭābaqa, muqābala, mushākala – istikh¬dām, tawriya, laff wa nashr, tawjīh, iqtibās, jamʿ, tafrīq, taqsīm, mubālagha, ḥusn al-taʿlīl, ittilāf al-lafẓ maʿa al-maʿnā, ḥusn al-ibtidāʾ, and ḥusn al-khitām (Awni, 1953, pp. 200–218). Ahmad Hoshimiy, in Jawāhir al-Balāgha, lists more than thirty semantic devices (Hashimiy, 2004, pp. 387–420).

Atoulloh Husayniy includes the following devices in the first group: tawjīh, īhām, taʾkīd al-madh bimā yashbah al-dhamm, taʾkīd al-dhamm bimā yashbah al-madh, istitbāʿ, idmāj, taʿlīq, hazl murād bihi al-jidd, tajâhul al-ʿārif, talmīḥ, irsāl al-mathal, kalām-i jāmiʿ, madhhab kalāmī,

ḥusn al-taʿlīl, tafrīʿ, taḥakkum, jamʿ, tafrīq, taqsīm, jamʿ wa tafrīq, jamʿ maʿa taqsīm, jamʿ maʿa tafrīq wa taqsīm, jamʿ maʿa taqsīm maʿa al-jamʿ, laff wa nashr, maqbūl mubālagha, tablīgh, ighrāq, ghulūw, mardūd ghulūw, īghāl, takmīl, tazyīl, tatmīm, iʿtirāḍ, tawshīʿ, īḍāḥ, rujūʿ, tadāruk, takrīr, tarjīʿ, iṭnāb, musāwāt, ījāz, istit¬rād, tafsīr, tajrīd, taghlīb, iltifāt, uslūb al-ḥakīm, qawl bi-l-mūjib, sawāl wa jawāb, ibdāʿ, muʿammā, lughā, and iẓhār al-muḍmar (Husayniy, 1981, pp. 209–122). Among these, iṭnāb, musāwāt, and ījāz are studied in Arabic rhetoric within the discipline of maʿānī.

He also notes that Qazvini, the author of Talkhīṣ, regarded takrīr, tawshīʿ, iʿtirāḍ, īghāl, tazyīl, and tatmīm as belonging to the category of iṭnāb.

In the second group, he includes the following devices: tashbīh, tashbīh-i muṭlaq, tashbīh-i kināyat, tashbīh-i mashrūṭ, tashbīh-i taswiyat, tashbīh-i ʿaks, tashbīh-i iẓmār, tashbīh-i tafḍīl, istiʿāra, tamsīl, kināya, and taʿrīḍ (Husayniy, 1981, pp. 201–222). These devices are studied in Arabic rhetoric within the discipline of bayān.

Before al-Sakkākī, the science of rhetoric extended beyond the boundaries of the Arabic language and spread among non-Arab peoples, developing in parallel according to the artistic expressive capacities of each language.

As a result, works were created in which literary devices were provided with definitions, types, and appropriate examples. Although the devices included in them were not specially separated by types, they followed an order corresponding to the above classification.

By the twelfth century, when al-Sakkākī developed a special system of rhetoric for the Arabic language, there already existed works written in both Arabic and Persian that were famous among non-Arab peoples.

From the twelfth century onward, Arabic rhetoric continued its development on the basis of al-Sakkākī's classification. In Persian rhetoric, al-Sakkākī's views on bayān and badīʿ were continued, whereas issues of maʿānī, being closely connected with the linguistic features of Arabic and in many respects not suitable for Persian, were not fully adopted, and only certain general aspects were accepted. Therefore, by the sixteenth century, in his work written in Persian, Atoulloh Husayniy created a classification of devices that partially differed from that of al-Sakkākī. This is characterized by their division into phonetic, semantic, and phonetic-semantic types.

In Turkic languages, the situation was somewhat different. Although artistic creativity in these languages reached high levels, theoretical foundations relied on sources in Arabic and Persian. Nevertheless, it is known that the work Funūn al-Balāgha, arranged in the Persian style by Shaykh Ahmad ibn Khudoydod Taroziy in the fifteenth century, has reached our time (Taroziy, 2001, pp. 233–237). This work is valuable for Uzbek literary studies because it encompasses not only literary devices but also issues of rhyme and prosody, as in the works of al-Sakkākī and Husayniy.

CONCLUSION

Thus, scholars of rhetoric distinguished between the semantic and phonetic aspects of speech and, taking into account which of these aspects a device serves, divided literary devices into two types, calling those that embellish meaning al-muḥassināt al-maʿnawiyya and those that embellish wording al-muḥassināt al-lafẓiyya. These terms clearly express their essence and content.

In Eastern poetics, there are two types of classification of literary devices. The first is a classification specific only to Arabic rhetoric: phonetic devices and semantic devices. The second is a classification characteristic of non-Arab peoples: phonetic devices, semantic devices, and phonetic–semantic devices.

REFERENCES

1. Awni, Hamid. (1953). Al-Minhāj al-Wāḍiḥ li-l-Balāgha. Vol. 1. Dār al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyya, Egypt.

2. Hashimiy, Ahmad. (2004). Jawāhir fī al-Maʿānī wa al-Bayān wa al-Badīʿ. Beirut, Lebanon.

3. Jarim, Ali, & Amin, Mustafa. (1999). Al-Balāgha al-Wāḍiḥa: al-Bayān, al-Maʿānī, al-Badīʿ. Cairo.

4. Qalqilah, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. (1992). Al-Balāgha al-Iṣṭilāḥiyya. Cairo.

5. Rustamiy, S. (2024). Key Terms and Definitions in Balāgha. International Journal of Social Science and Human Research, 7(6), 3755–3758.

6. Rustamiy, S. (2020). The role of the science of rhetoric

in classical Eastern literature. Scientific Progress, 1(1), 94–100.

7. Sakkakiy, Yusuf. (2000). Miftāḥ al-ʿUlūm. Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya.

8. Yoʻldoshbekov, J. (2001). "Funūn al-Balāgha and Uzbek literary studies." Uzbek Language and Literature, Tashkent, No. 5, 33–37.

9. Mamajonov, Z. (2005). On the classification of poetic devices. Uzbek Language and Literature, Tashkent, No. 6, 47–49.

10. Rustamov, A. (1979). Navoiy's Artistic Mastery. Tashkent.

11. Taroziy, Ahmad. (1994). Funūn al-Balāgha. Literature and Art of Uzbekistan, March 18, 1994.

12. Hojiahmedov, A. (1999). The Elegance of Classical Poetics. Tashkent.

13. Husayniy, Atoulloh. (1981). Badāyiʿ al-Ṣanāyiʿ. Translated from Persian by A. Rustamov. Tashkent.