



Article

# Study of The Quality of Expression and Meaning In Arab and Western Thought

Hyam Shaalan Wali

1. General Directorate of Education, Najaf, Iraq

\* Correspondence: [walihyam1@gmail.com](mailto:walihyam1@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** The issues in ancient Arabic criticism are multiple and unique, and have generated much ink, and their topics are still fertile for research and study. Perhaps the issue of word and meaning - the subject of this research - remains one of the most important problems or issues that have occupied Arab critics. This is due to the difference in viewpoints that has occurred around it between those who are fanatical about wording and argue for it, and those who see nothing but meaning as something worthy of interest, and a third group in the middle, trying to reconcile the first opinion with the second opinion. The issue of word and meaning is not only an Arab issue, but a human issue; such that we cannot date it to the emergence of Arabic rhetoric; rather, it is the issue that had a presence in Western thought, and Greek thought in particular, represented in the philosophy of both Plato and Aristotle, according to what some books have transmitted. As for the internal aspect, the issue dates back in its first appearance to the theological sects; from the Ash'aris, the Mu'tazila and the Jahmites..., and the story of distinguishing between the Qur'an, which is in our hands, and psychological speech, especially with the Ash'aris.

**Keywords:** Role and Reference Grammar, Privileged Syntactic Argument, Arabic Discourse Analysis

## 1. Introduction

There is no disagreement that the Arabic language is a language that has been connected to different fields of thought because it adapts to new developments through its ability to change the meanings of its words. The ancient scholars were able to establish rules for the issue of (word and meaning) as they imagined it, aware of its importance. The phenomenon of word and meaning has been widely discussed, as we find it among linguists in grammar and morphology, in syntax and dictionaries, among rhetoricians and writers in criticism or interpretation, and in philosophy.

The issue of word and meaning occupied an important space in ancient Arabic thought, and "dominated the thinking of linguists and grammarians, occupied jurists and theologians, and attracted the attention of rhetoricians and those engaged in criticism." The relationship between word and meaning is an ancient subject that scholars have addressed for a long time, as we do not find any ancient scholar who made an effort in the field of language, rhetoric, or criticism without the relationship between word and meaning being one of his purposes and aims. It seems that this matter goes back to the importance of the relationship between word and meaning in linguistic and rhetorical sciences. From a historical perspective, we conclude that Aristotle, Socrates, and Plato, among the Greek

**Citation:** Hyam Shaalan Wali. Study of The Quality of Expression and Meaning In Arab and Western Thought. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy, and Culture 2024, 5(4), 139-149.

Received: 10<sup>th</sup> Apr 2024

Revised: 11<sup>th</sup> Mei 2024

Accepted: 24<sup>th</sup> Jun 2024

Published: 27<sup>th</sup> Jul 2024



**Copyright:** © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

scholars, had views related to this phenomenon. This research discussed the views of ancient Arab scholars and other Indian and Syriac scholars, modern Western linguists, and modern Arab scholars.

Given the importance of the word in meaning, and its connection to many sciences and fields of human knowledge, its study has not remained confined to Arab studies only, but rather the vastness of Western heritage has expanded to include the rest of the world, where the issue of "word and meaning" has grown up in the bosom of various sciences.

The research aims to know what is meant by the concept of word and meaning, and how the ancient Arabs defined word and meaning in their books and dictionaries that extended to the vastness of Western heritage to include the rest of the world. Despite the interest of researchers at the local and Arab levels in studying and researching the role played by the study of the quality of word and meaning in Arab and Western thought, perhaps the most important problems encountered by Arab studies is which of the two sides is credited with the quality of speech, word or meaning.

## 2. Materials and Methods

In this study case, the general comparative method was used to address most related studies that dealt with words and meanings and their relationship in expressing the ideas in different Arab and West cultures.

The research plan included three axes (topics): where the first topic focused on defining the issue of the word and meaning from language to terminology; while the second topic covered the issue of the word and meaning in most common studies in ancient Arabic criticism, whereas the third topic was mainly focused on clarifying the relationship between the word and meaning according to study evidences from different cultures.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### The first section: Defining the issue of the word and meaning from language to terminology

#### First: The concept of the word and meaning:

What is meant by the concept of the word and meaning, or in precise terms, how did the ancient Arabs define the word and meaning in their books and dictionaries. Ibn Manzoor quoted on *Lisan al-Arab*: "The word (speech): is to throw something that was in your mouth, and the action is to utter something, it is said: I uttered the thing from my mouth, I uttered it uttering: I threw it" (Ibn Manzoor, 1994, p. 88). The author of the book *Al-Ta'rifat* (The definitions) (Al-Jurjani, 1983) stated that "the word: is what a person - or someone like him - utters, whether it is neglected or used", and he said in the definition "the meaning: what is intended by something.

As for the author of *Al-Maqayis* (Ibn-Faris, 1964, p. 206), he stated: "(Word): indicates the presentation of something, and it is often from the mouth, you say: a word with speech utters a word, or I uttered the thing from my mouth..., and it is something uttered and uttered".

On the other hand, what is meant by the issue of word and meaning in ancient Arabic criticism (Ibn-Faris, 1964, p. 259), it can be said: that it is the most common critical problem in the critical and Arabic arena, which has received a lot of attention; from the side of critics or rhetoricians, and even from the side of theologians groups. Perhaps the latter was the first to express their opinions and give their positions, especially with the tribulation of the creation of the Qur'an, and the questions raised about it such as: "Is the Qur'an created and not existing then existing? That is, created? Or is it the eternal speech of God and not created"?

As for critics and rhetoricians, opinions clashed and conflicted, although the disagreement between them was not as intense as it was with the theological groups; as it was noted that "some of them attribute the most important components of the literary

work, and the strongest pillars of its success to the meaning, belittling the importance of the word. But some of them focus on the word as a basic factor in the piece, and some of them equate between them, in the course of selecting the appropriate word that gives the meaning splendor and elegance, and which is more eloquent in conveying the intended meaning than others, as their opinions revolved in this area.

#### **Second: The word and meaning in ancient Western thought: (Plato - Aristotle):**

The duality of the word and meaning - or language and thought - is a human duality par excellence, and is not linked to one culture over another. Is there stronger evidence than that the language or thought expressed by this language, and among what all of humanity shares. Likewise, they (the word and meaning) are not limited to one thought, and also from the perspective of temporal logic, the Western intellectual heritage remains the first to raise this issue. According to what has reached us from the books that have been spared from loss, since we do not in fact deny that the roots of the issue are beyond that, as long as the history of humanity, simply put, does not begin with the Greek man. What cannot be ignored or justified is that talking about the issue of the word and meaning in the Western heritage cannot be right without referring to one of the most prominent Greek philosophers (Plato), who mentioned this aspect as reported by the author of the book "On the Theory of Literature" Shukri Aziz Al-Madi (Al-Madi, 1993, p. 260) during his talk about imitation. Plato favored the meaning; where he said that consciousness has priority over matter, "and he proceeds in this from his belief and reliance on idealist philosophy, which sees that consciousness is prior to matter in existence. According to Plato, meanings and ideas are prior, and they are the absolute truths that are beyond doubt, and they exist in the world of ideals.

While, words, according to Plato, represent nothing but an imitation of what exists in the world of ideas and meanings. For this reason, words, according to Plato, remain incomplete and far from the truth, and he referred to this by saying: "The work of the writer is similar to the work of a mirror; meaning that his imitation of things and phenomena is photographic; that is, literal, so he only presents fake images that are not needed; because what we need and benefit us is the original and not the image" (Al-Madi, 1993, p. 18). Plato - through this text - made the original and the image in contrast to the meaning and the word, as the word only represents an image of the original meaning. Accordingly, words cannot reach the level of original meanings. As for "Aristotle", he went to reconcile the word and the meaning; where he refuted the equation that makes the original and the image in contrast to the meaning and the word; where he went to that the word does not represent the image of the original (meaning), but the origin as well; Because nature is inherently imperfect, poetry or art is what completes its imperfections.

#### **The second section**

#### **The issue of word and meaning in ancient Arabic criticism**

##### **First: In the Islamic East**

The status occupied by poetry was the main factor among the Arabs behind the emergence of critical opinions and many issues. The goal was to improve poetry and preserve its artistic and aesthetic value. For this reason, it is possible to see clearly that the Arabs were raising many issues around poetry, such as:

- 1- word and meaning.
- 2- The natural and craftsmanship.
- 3- The unity and multiplicity in the poem.
- 4- The truth and falsehood in poetry.
- 5- comparison between two poems or two poets.
- 6- The issue of poetic thefts.
- 7- The column of poetry. And,
- 8- The issue of the relationship between poetry and morals or poetry and religion.

Most researchers agree that the first beginning of the issue of word and meaning was with Al-Jahiz (d. 255) (Haroon, 1961, p. 18) "who, in addition to his opinion on the sections

of rhetoric in general, and his observations related to linguistic phenomena... - his stylistic concepts and rhetorical standards extend to the entrenchment in his theory of speech... (which assumes that speech is the practical manifestation of the existence of language). That is, speech is the only manifestation of abstract language present in the human soul. On the other hand, Al-Jahiz, contrary to what a number of scholars claim, is one of those who support words at the expense of meanings, relying on his famous saying: (Meanings are thrown in the way). It is most likely that Al-Jahiz was one of the proponents of similarity and correspondence between word and meaning; and our argument in this regard is that Al-Jahiz made word and meaning in contrast to body and soul. Since "names mean bodies, and meanings mean souls. Word for meaning is body, and meaning for word is soul.

Perhaps the matter becomes clearer with what he himself (Al-Jahiz) mentioned in *Al-Tabyeen wa Al-Bayan*: "Whoever wants a noble meaning should seek for it a noble expression... for the noble meaning deserves nothing but a noble expression." Based on the above, Al-Jahiz did not triumph in the expression at the expense of the meaning or the meaning at the expense of the expression. Rather, he went to what he called the similarity and conformity between them. Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276) (Ibn Qutaybah Al-Dinawari, 1423, p. 65) agreed with him, who realized the unity of meaning and expression within the framework of a single formulation, even though he distinguished between four sections of poetry - based on the duality of the expression and meaning, which are: i) A type whose expression is beautiful and its meaning is serious, ii) Another type whose expression is beautiful and sweet, but if you search for it, you will not find any benefit in the meaning, iii) A type of it whose meaning is serious but its expressions fall short of it, and

4- Or some of it was Late and heavy in meaning and wording.

He gave examples of all these sections, as there is not enough space to mention them. For those who want to look at these examples, there is something in *Al-Umda* that will satisfy their thirst. The matter is not much different with Qudamah ibn Ja'far (d. 337) (Al-Marzouqi, 2017, 65), who believed that a literary work should be distinguished by the destruction of its textual elements.. as he says in what he called equality. "It is that the wording is equal to the meaning, so that it does not exceed it or fall short of it. This is the eloquence with which some writers described a man, saying: ((His words were molds for his meanings, meaning they were equal to them, neither of them is superior to the other)). The wording and meaning occupied a primary position among critics of the column of poetry; as we find them at the head of the seven chapters of the column of poetry according to Al-Marzouqi (d. 421) (Al-Marzouqi, 2017, 65), which was the last link in the development of these rules, and it was established with him in its market, as he mentioned:

- 1- The honor and correctness of the meaning.
- 2- The richness and direction of the expression.
- 3- The accuracy of the description.
- 4- The approximation in the simile.
- 5- The cohesion of the parts of the system and their harmony based on the selection of delicious weight.
- 6- The suitability of the borrowed from to the borrowed for.
- 7- The similarity of the expression to the meaning and the intensity of their need for rhyme so that there is no discord between them.

Where he mentioned the standard of each of them - that is, the standard of the word and the standard of the meaning, he said: ((The standard of the meaning is that it is presented to the sound mind and the penetrating understanding, so if the two sides of acceptance and selection are turned towards it, familiar with its contexts, it comes out complete, otherwise it is invalidated according to the extent of its blemish and strangeness)). And he said about the word: ((The standard of the word is the nature, narration and usage, so whatever is free from what disparages it when presented to them is the chosen and straight)) (Al-Marzouqi, 2017, 35).

As for Abdul-Qaher Al-Jurjani (Al-Jurjani, 1954, 95), his time delay from all the schools of thought had a positive effect on his knowledge of the various critical opinions that were said about this issue; Where he gathered their opinions, and benefited from their experience, but he went beyond them to a special opinion, and he had originality and depth in this field and was the owner of a school of criticism, in which he realized what critics did not realize. Abdul Qaher Al-Jurjani was famous in literary criticism in the relationship between the word and the meaning in the miracle of the Qur'an, which he later called (the theory of organization). This theory was special in the Arab East, where he "formulated his rhetorical philosophy, which made its axis his theory of organization in which he linked the word and the meaning and the meaning of stylistic words and their secondary meanings. And he made the organization alone the manifestation of eloquence and aesthetic value in the literary text (Al-Jurjani, 1954, 95).

### **Second: In the Islamic West**

Critics of the Islamic West delved into various critical issues that Eastern criticism delved into, although not with the same intensity that was witnessed in the East, and there is no evidence of that from the various critics of the Islamic West; Such as: (Ibn Rasheeq Al-Qayrawani, Ibn Al-Banna Al-Marrakushi, Abu Al-Qasim Al-Sijilmasi, Ibn Khaldun and Hazem Al-Qartajani...) They raised this issue in their books. Hazem Al-Qartajani, for example, is not interested in the issue of word and meaning, as the critics who preceded him were interested, and he was not biased towards either side; as he emphasized, on the other hand, the importance of (proportion) between the pillars of the poetic work (word and meaning...), in order to preserve the main goal desired from any poetic work, which is "creating an impact on the recipient."

The most striking thing that Hazem has reached in this case is that he is not the first to do it in this way, but, as a rule, he focuses on the idea of proportion. Poetry is a relative composition of different levels, which goes back to meaning and style formulated with words that come together in a comprehensive system of diaspora with complex purposes. There is no doubt that this idea of proportion can only be met by proportion between the pronunciation and the meaning. One of the foundations on which the idea of proportion is based is the issue of the linguistic composition of the imagined image, which is only achieved by the aforementioned proportion between the pronunciation and the meaning. The best verse is the one whose creator has signed the superior proportion between its meaning and its image, and such things should affect the recipient more than others. Not so, Hazem says in it: "And if they fall between these meanings, then we know that the superior proportions will confirm themselves in the chosen image." It was one of the best things in poetry (Al-Jurjani, 1954, 96).

As for Ibn Rasheeq Al-Qayrawani (d. 463), his book (Al-Umda fi Mahasin Al-Shi'r wa Adabuh) is considered a summary of the most important previous critical opinions that raised this issue (word and meaning), where he said: "Then people have opinions and schools of thought after that; Some of them prefer the word over the meaning, making it their goal and their emphasis; like Bashara's saying:

If we get angry with a harmful anger we tear the veil of the sun or it drips blood. Some of them went to the ease of the word, so it was taken care of and he was forgiven for the clumsiness and excessive softness like Abu Al-Atahiya, Abbas bin Al-Ahnaf, and those who followed them and they see the goal as Abu Al-Atahiya's saying:

O my brothers, passion is killing me, so hurry to prepare my shroud

And some of them prefer the meaning over the words, seeking its correctness and not caring where it falls from the hybridity The word and its ugliness and roughness, such as Ibn al-Rumi and Abu al-Tayyib..., and regarding his position, meaning (Ibn Rasheeq al-Qayrawani), he adopted the middle path, for the word without meaning is a dead body, and the meaning without the word is a soul without a body, and therefore he said:



The word is a body and its soul is the meaning and its connection to it is like the connection of the soul to the body, whichever is weaker the other weakens, or strengthens if the other is strong. So, if the meaning is intact and some of the wording is defective, then the poetry is deficient, as is the case with some bodies that suffer from lameness, paralysis, blindness, and the like, without the soul being gone, and likewise if the meaning is weak and some of it is defective (Al-Qayrawani, 1981, 124).

Where the word has the greatest share of that, as is the case with bodies from illness due to illness of the souls, and you do not find the meaning defective except from the aspect of the wording and its flow in it in a way other than what is required, based on what I have presented about the medicine of bodies and souls. If the whole meaning is defective and corrupted, the word remains dead and useless, even if it is pleasant to the ear, just as the dead person does not lose anything from his person in the sight of the eye except that it is not benefited from and does not provide any benefit, so if the wording is defective as a whole and disappears, then the speech will be meaningless; Just as there is no soul without a body (Al-Qayrawani, 1981, 125).

The observation that must be recorded in this regard is: that most critics were on the side of the word and defended it at the expense of the meaning, as evidenced by the saying: "Most people prefer the word over the meaning. I heard some of the experts say: The scholars said: The word is more valuable than the meaning, and is of greater value and more precious in demand; for meanings are present in the nature of people, and the ignorant and the expert are equal in them, but the work is on the quality of the words, the beauty of the style, and the correctness of the composition.

### **Section Three**

#### **The Relationship between Word and Meaning**

##### **First: Word and Meaning in Arabic Dictionaries**

In Al-Sahah, the general meaning of the root word (word) comes first, which is (throwing from the mouth): I uttered the thing from my mouth, the word is a word, I threw it, then he lists the specific meaning, as what is uttered from the mouth is speech: I uttered the speech and uttered it, and after that he specifies the word as (word, plural of words). As for Ibn Faris in Al-Miqyas (Ibn Faris, 1979, 259), he said that the root word means first the meaning of the absolute rejection, then it is mostly from the mouth, then he specifies the action, so you say: (word of speech utters a word), and after that he mentions one of the derivatives, and what it can bear of the meanings of the word. Then Al-Azhari (Al-Azhari, 1964, 93) comes in the book Al-Tahdheeb with the meaning of throwing from the mouth as the first, as the word is that you throw something that was in In you, then he allocates the material with words and expression.

After that, he mentions a metaphorical phrase, which is ((So-and-so pronounced his asabah)) if he died, and his asabah means his saliva (tongue) that was bandaged with his mouth. Here, it appears to us that the expression is the easiest thing to express what is in the human heart of meanings and purposes, and the example of the expression for us is like a ship that travels with the passenger to reach the desired destination. The importance of the expression increases when we remember that the speaker can use many types of expressions for one demand or several demands in one expression. This requires us to take the expression, its study, and its circumstances into consideration.

##### **Second: The meaning.**

Al-Jawhari (Al-Jawhari, 1977, 261) presents us with a general meaning, which is the extraction and manifestation of the meaning of the thing: I extracted it and showed it. Then he turns to the specification, mentioning the verb with the letter ya', I meant by saying such and such, I mean with care: then he specifies the formula (meaning), i.e. the gist, and the meaning of the speech and its meaning are one. As for Ibn Faris (Ibn Faris, 1979, 261), he lists at the beginning of the article its meaning ((whether it is a waw or a ya')), then there is the intention of the thing by contracting in it or being keen on it, and the second indicates submission or humiliation, and the third is the appearance of the thing or its prominence,

and from it the title of the book and its interpretation; that is, it is the thing that stands out from it if it is concluded. Ibn Faris returns to specify what indicates the measure of language in general (the meaning is the intention that stands out and appears in the thing if it is searched for) then he explains it in other words, he said: This is the meaning of speech and the meaning of poetry, i.e. that which emerges from the hidden content of what the word contains. As for Al-Azhari, quoting Al-Layth, which is related to Al-Khalil, who derives the title of the book from the meaning, then he mentions the significance of care in the material about me: This matter concerns me with care, so I am concerned with it. And I have taken care of its matter, Al-Layth says about me: And the meaning of everything is its ordeal and the state to which its matter comes, and after that Al-Azhari says: And the meaning, interpretation, and explanation are one.

If we take into consideration the aforementioned details, we find that the meaning is what the heart settles on and is reassured by when intending to utter the word and it appears, and that this meaning differs from one individual to another, because we can say that we do not find two people who say the same words and settle on them completely from the moral aspect, but we find that there is a difference between the two people, even if it is slight. Likewise, Abu Ali Al-Farsi says in this regard: (The meaning is the intention of what is intended by the saying, because He is the source, and God Almighty is not described as the meaning if the intended is in reality.

### **Second: The relationship of word and meaning according to ancient Arab scholars**

The second century AH represents the pioneering beginning of realizing the connection between sounds and meanings, as he finds indications of the connection between the word and its meaning in Al-Khalil bin Ahmed Al-Farahidi (Al-Farahidi, 1984, p. 113) and the student of Sibawayh (who answers the question of the transformation of words into meanings. Know that among the speech of the Arabs is the difference between two words due to the difference in meanings, and the difference between two words and the meaning is one, and the agreement of two words and the difference in meanings. However, the issue of the transformation of words into meanings is present in almost every chapter of the book, as there is no grammatical issue that he addresses in analysis except that we find him linking between the changes that occur at the level of the word and what results from it in terms of modification or alteration at the level of meaning)

In the third century AH, the Mu'tazila explained the phenomenon of language in a rational way. Al-Suyuti (d. 911 AH) attributed to Ibad bin Sulayman Al-Saymari, one of the Mu'tazila, that he believed that there was a natural connection between the word and its meaning. He thought that the words around the meaning were not placed arbitrarily, but rather he chose for each word its meaning, which its sounds suggest. In the fourth century AH, Ibn Duraid Al-Azdi (321 AH) (Al-Azdi, 1985, p. 232) in his book (Al-Ishtiqaq) took the natural connection in his interpretations of the relationship between the word and its meaning, where he explained the naming of the Arabs of their sons with an interpretation that depends on this natural relationship, saying ((And know that the Arabs have schools of thought in naming their sons, some of them named them as a good omen for their enemies, such as Ghalib, Ghallab, and... and some of them named them as beasts to terrify their enemies, such as; Asd, Laith, Faras, Dhi'b, and...)) Although most Arab linguists do not believe in this opinion, we see many of them linking in their compositions between words and their meanings in a close connection that almost resembles a natural or subjective connection, and perhaps the secret of this trend is their pride in those Arabic words and their admiration for them, and their keenness to uncover their secrets and mysteries.

### **Third: The relationship between the word and the meaning according to the modern Arabs**

Ahmad Faris Al-Shidyaq says in his book *Al-Saq Ala Al-Saq* that each letter is specific to a meaning and not others, and it is one of the secrets of the Arabic language that few have paid attention to. As for Subhi Al-Saleh, he does not only support the existence

of a connection between words and their meanings, but he also admires this opinion, saying: ((As for what we want to explain now, it is what our scholars have noticed about the suitability of Arabic letters to their meanings, and what they have noticed in the Arabic letter of suggestive value)).

There are also those who deny the existence of a natural connection between the word and its meaning, we will explain the opinions of some of them.

1. Hassan (1998) After adopting De Saussure's theory regarding the linguistic relations of thinking, commented on it by saying, "There is nothing in thought that imposes a specific form for phonetic symbols, as these symbols are placed arbitrarily" ((... The relationship between words and their meanings is a customary relationship determined by usage, and recorded in the dictionary)) (Hassan, 1998, p. 63).
2. Abdo Al-Rajhi (1997): He denies the existence of a connection between words and their meanings, saying: However, Ibn Jinni's conviction of this opinion, and Dr. Subhi Al-Saleh's admiration for it, does not prevent him from emphasizing that linguists in general agree to reject it, and they see that there is no connection between the word and its meaning. We see that there is no connection between the symbol and the thing it symbolizes (Al-Rajhi, 1997, p. 35).
3. - Ramadan Abdel Tawab: After he transmitted Al-Suyuti's narration, he doubted its authenticity and commented on it: ((If what he said were true, every person would have been guided to every language on the face of the earth)) (Abdel Tawab, 1982, p. 44).
4. Ibrahim Anis: He says ((The matter that did not appear clear in the treatment of all these researchers is the necessity of distinguishing between the natural, intrinsic connection and the acquired connection. In many of the words of each language we notice that connection between them and their meaning, but this connection did not arise with those words or was born with their birth, but rather they acquired it over the course of days and repeated circulation and use)). (Anis, 1963, p. 71)

#### **Fourth: The relationship of word and the meaning among non-Arab modernists**

The opinions of Western modernists varied on the issue of linking words and their meanings, such that they did not agree on a unified opinion about this phenomenon. Some of them see the existence of a natural connection between words and their meanings, and among them is Humboldt (d. 1835 AD), who believes that language generally affects the expression of things through words whose effect on the ears is similar to the effect of those things on the mind. However, when Humboldt missed this connection in most words of the language and found it ambiguous, he claimed that the connection between the sounds of words and their meanings had undergone some development and disappeared with the passage of time.

He believes that this phenomenon is almost constant in any language, and that some words lose this connection over time, while other words acquire it and it becomes clear in them after it was not noticed. Here also it is worth mentioning that De Saussure ( ) (1989) was one of the most famous opponents of the proponents of the connection between words and meanings, as he sees it as arbitrary and not subject to logic or a consistent system, and with his recognition of that connection in words that are considered an echo of the sounds of nature and he decides that they are few in languages, and of the difference and variation according to the differences of human languages, such that it is not correct to take them as a basis for a consistent linguistic phenomenon or similar to the consistent, they are - then - in his opinion just few words that happen to resemble their sounds and meanings (De Saussure, F. (1989, p51-52).

#### **Fifth: The relationship of word and meaning according to the fundamentalists**

By looking at the opinions of the fundamentalists and jurists in a quick and brief manner, they divide the relationship between the word and the meaning into several divisions, including: The word in terms of the meaning for which it was established, three categories: general, specific, and shared. The word in terms of the meaning in which it was used within the context of two categories: the truth and the metaphor of the word in terms



of the degree of clarity of its meaning, two main categories: decisive and ambiguous. Words are graded from decisive to ambiguous according to the following order:

The interpreter of the apparent, hidden, problematic, and ambiguous text, and the word in terms of the way it indicates what is intended from it, four categories: the indication of the text, the indication of the allusion, and the indication of the requirement. The types of indication according to the Shafi'is are: the indication of the organized and the intended; the indication of the concept, which is two types; the concept of opposition and the concept of agreement, which are types; the concept of limitation; the concept of attribute; the concept of purpose; the concept of condition; the concept of number. (Jami'i, 2001, p. 84).

#### **Sixth: The relationship of word and meaning in hermeneutics**

The classical position for hermeneutics represents its theory, based on the fact that the text is a linguistic means that conveys the author's thought to the reader. Therefore, it refers - in its linguistic aspect - to the entire language. And it refers - in its psychological aspect - to the subjective thoughts of its creator. The relationship between the two sides is a controversial one. The more the text advances in time, the more obscure it becomes to us and we become - consequently - closer to misunderstanding rather than understanding. Therefore, it is necessary to establish a science or art that protects us from misunderstanding and brings us closer to understanding.

It then proceeds to establish the rules of understanding from its conception of the two sides of texts; linguistic and psychological. The interpreter needs two talents to penetrate the meaning of the text; the linguistic talent, and the ability to penetrate human nature... Macher believes that language determines the author's method of expression that he uses to express ideas. There are, therefore, two sides in any text; The objective aspect refers to language, which is the common denominator that makes the process of understanding possible, and the subjective aspect refers to the author's thought and is manifested in the use of his own language (Abdul Karim, 2002, p. 84).

According to Bally and Sechehaye (1981), art and literature are an expression of the lived experience of life. Thoughts and actions express life experiences, not lived experiences. Hermeneutics also focuses on a broader meaning than just the text, as it reveals that it indicates an understanding of the experience - in its entirety - of the literary work, as long as it is embodied through a common medium, which is language, through which it emerges from the framework of subjectivity to objectivity (Bally and Sechehaye, 1981, p96). Things reveal themselves through language. Speech and language here are not a tool for communication, but rather they were invented by man to give the world meaning, or to express his own understanding of things. Language expresses the morality that already exists between things. Man does not use language, but rather language is what speaks through man's tongue. The world opens up to man through language.

Since language is a field of understanding and interpretation, the world reveals itself to man through a continuous process of understanding and interpretation. This does not mean that man understands language, but rather that they understand it through language. Language is not a mediator between the world and man, but rather it is the emergence and exposure of the world after it was hidden, and this language is the existential manifestation of the world... Understanding is not something that can be obtained and possessed, but it is a form of existence in the world, or a founding element of this existence. The process of reception in this conception is not a purely physical pleasure that focuses on form, but rather it is an existential participation process based on the dialectic between the recipient and the work. The process of reception opens up a new world for us, and expands - then - the horizon of our world and our understanding of ourselves at the same time. This means that the work of art is not a world separate from our own world. When we receive the work of art, we do not face a new, strange world in which we are separated from ourselves outside of time, but on the contrary, we are more

present... When we understand a great work of art, we recall what we have previously experienced in our lives, and – then – our understanding of ourselves is balanced.

#### 4. Conclusion

The study of the quality of expression and meaning is not linked to one culture over another, and this confirms that the language or thought expressed by this language is among what humanity shares as a whole, and is not limited to a single thought. We conclude from the study that the multiplicity of issues of Arabic poetry is clear evidence of its richness and wealth, and its status among its people, and the issue of expression and meaning is in fact nothing but a reflection of this interest. It is also clear that ancient Arabic criticism, with its issues, topics and critics, was an ideal criticism that combined the formal and substantive aspects of poetry, etc., with the aim of achieving one goal, which is to improve poetry and preserve its luster. Studying a critical issue of the size of the issue of expression and meaning is not only an inventory of the sayings of scholars and critics, but rather an insight into ancient Arabic thought in general. This is in order to raise the critical cultural awareness of students of criticism and literature in general, and perhaps the importance and benefit of this critical issue is evident in this role in particular. The awareness of the ancient Arab critics of the problem of word and meaning, and the aspects of approach that resulted from the attempts at discovery, go beyond merely supporting this or that aspect, to trying to limit the area of cohesion between the two elements. This is because awareness remained essentially tied to the forms of harmony that can be combined through word and meaning, without losing sight of their interest in different meanings as well. Al-Jahiz's approach to the problem of word and meaning, and the system, was destined to contain most of the seeds that were invested in the following attempts, as his insistence on the necessity of achieving the conformity of word with meaning, and his acute awareness of the cohesion of the elements of the text in poetic discourse in particular and their formation in a cohesive fabric.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Ibn Manzur, Muhammad ibn Mukram. *Lisan al-Arab (the Arab Tongue)*, 3rd ed., Dar Sadir Publishing, Beirut 1414 AH.
- [2] Al-Jurjani, Al-Sharif. *The Book of Definitions*, 1st ed., Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah, Beirut - Lebanon, 1983.
- [3] Ibn Faris. *Al-Sahibi in the Jurisprudence of Language*, edited by Mustafa Al-Shuwaimi, Badran Foundation for Printing and Publishing, Beirut, 1964.
- [4] Al-Madi, Shukri Aziz. *In the Theory of Literature*, 1st ed., Dar Al-Muntakhab Al-Arabi, Beirut - Lebanon, 1993.
- [5] Haroon, Abd al-Salam Muhammad, editor of *Al-Bayan wa al-Tabyin*, Amr ibn Bahr ibn Mahbub Aljahiz, Committee for Authorship, Translation and Publication, Cairo, 1348 AH - 1961 AD.
- [6] Ibn Qutaybah Al Dinawari. *Poetry and Poets*, Vol. 1, Dar Al Hadith, Cairo 1423.
- [7] Al Marzouki, Ahmed Al Taher Ibn Ashour. *Explanation of the Literary Introduction to the Diwan Al Hamasa by Abu Tammam*, edited by Yasser bin Hamed Al Mutairi, Dar Al Minhaj, 2017.
- [8] Al-Jurjani, Abdul Qaher. *Secrets of Rhetoric*, edited by H. Ritter, Ministry of Education Press, Istanbul, 1954.
- [9] Al-Qayrawani, Ibn Rasheeq. *Al-Umda in the Beauties of Poetry and its Manners*, Vol. 1, edited by Muhammad Muhyi Al-Din Abdul Hamid, Dar Al-Jeel for Printing, 1981.

- 
- [10] Ibn Faris. Dictionary of Language Standards, edited by Abdul Salam Haroun, Vol. 5, Dar Al Fikr for Printing, 1979.
- [11] Al-Azhari, Muhammad bin Ahmad. Refinement of the Language, Egyptian General House for Authorship and Translation, Cairo, 1964 AD.
- [12] Al-Jawhari, Ismail bin Hammad. Taj Al-Lugha wa Sahih Al-Arabiyyah, edited by Ahmed Abdel Ghafour Attar, Cairo, 1977.
- [13] Al-Farahidi, Khalil bin Ahmed. The Book of the Eye, Dar Al-Rasheed Publishing, Baghdad, 1984.
- [14] Al-Azdi, Ibn Duraid. Derivation, edited by Abdul Salam Muhammad Harun, Al-Risala Press, Cairo, 1958.
- [15] Hassan, Tamam. The Arabic Language; Its Meaning and Structure, Alam Al-Kutub Publishing, Cairo, 1998.
- [16] Al-Rajhi, Abdeh. Chapters in Linguistics, Dar Al-Ma'rifah University, Alexandria, 1997 AD.
- [17] Abdel Tawab, Ramadan. Research and Articles in Language, Al-Khanji Library, Cairo, 1982.
- [18] Anis, Ibrahim. The Significance of Words, 2nd ed., Englo-Egyptian Library, Cairo, 1963.
- [19] De Saussure, F. Cours de linguistique générale (Vol. 1). Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1989.
- [20] Jami'i, Al Akhdar. Word and Meaning in Critical and Rhetorical Thinking among the Arabs, Publications of the Arab Writers Union, Damascus, 2001.
- [21] Abdul Karim, Muhammad Ali. Chapters in General Linguistics, Alam Al-Kutub Publishing, Beirut, 2002.
- [22] Bally et Albert Sechehaye, editors. Critique préparée par de Mauro, Payot, Paris, 1981.