

The Concept of Word Economy between Classic Arab Rhetors and Modern Scholars: A Comparative Study

Rima Mahmoud Al-Essa *

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to conduct a comparative study regarding word economy between Arab rhetors and modern scholars. A number of opinions have been provided to explore how Arab rhetors deal with this issue-word economy- as a part of eloquence. They have encouraged being economic, especially to what is attached to literature. Despite the fact that Arab rhetors presented the idea, they do not have a clear vision to what is considered as economic. Besides, modern scholars have studied the issue in details; they have differentiated between non-functional repetition in literature on the one hand, and wordiness as well as redundancy in practical writing on the other hand. The concept agreed upon by the two parties is that word economy is about reducing the space whereas ideas should be perfectly expressed using the minimum number of words.

It is widely believed among rhetors that it is the meaning beyond the words is the aim, so it is better to use as less words as one could in order to achieve a functional piece of writing. However, Arab rhetors disagree on what is more important: the words used or the meaning intended; consequently, the term “word economy”, especially regarding literature, arose to describe the quality of a written work. Two parties processing the debate in the matter of word vs. meaning can be noticed: the first one consists of rhetors who adopted the priority of selecting words over meaning, such as al Jāhīz, Ibn al Athīr and Ibn Qudāma whereas the second party is mainly presented by al Qādī al Jurjānī with his preference of meaning to selected words and his theory of the *naẓm*. The current paper tries not only to investigate what is said about word economy among Arab rhetors but also to conduct a comparative study on how modern studies deal with the matter.

Arab Rhetors

This section provides a general presentation of how Arab rhetors viewed word economy. The rhetors are inspected according to their opinions, starting with al Jāhīz, Ibn al Athīr, as well as Ibn Qudāma and ending with al Qādī al

Jurjānī. Studies about what have been said regarding the issue and how it has been dealt with are also provided.

Considering the poetic nature of al Jāḥiẓ, Al Banani states that his biased affection towards parsing was perceived in the doctrine that tends to austerity, love of simplicity and lack of affectation. This titillates his genius and it was further pushed by activity and thinking to come up with a comprehensive theory of the human economy. (2001: 248) What this implies is that al Jāḥiẓ followed the economy as a methodology in all of his works as *Al Bukhala'* and others.

In reference to al Jāḥiẓ in his book, *Al Bayan wal Tbyyīn*, he was the first to bring forward the issue of the economic selection of certain dictions emphasizing on their relation to the meaning. As he clarifies, the best utterance, or written work, is achieved when less words used to express a righteous meaning; that is to say the careful selection of certain rhetoric words is substantial to deliver the utmost noble meaning which, in turn, elaborated his theory of eloquence - *al bayan*. (1985: 52) He warns authors of literature about being arrogant by exaggerating in their choice of sophisticated dictions and styles. Following this strategy will manipulate on both sides: the listener/reader and the author, who will be taken by the exotic approach, neglecting the meaning behind the written words. Apparently, economy is rhetorical; it is a mediation to avoid complexity. (1985: 82) Nevertheless, al Jāḥiẓ himself falls into the trap of complexity when he describes the matter saying that “*wa-lm'anī idhā kusiyat al-alfādh al-karīmah, wa-ulbisat al-awsāf al-rafi'ah, wa-taḥwwalat fī al-'uyūn 'an maqādīr ṣuwarihā, wa -'arbat 'alā ḥaqā'iq aqdārihā, ... fa-qad ṣārat al-alfādh fī m'ānī al-ma'āriḍ, wa-ṣārat al-ma'ānī fī al-jawārī*”. (1985: 82)

What Warda Ghadiri (2003) asserts in her thesis on word economy is that al Jāḥiẓ regards brachylogy as economy because of his recognition of brevity and/or circumlocution as the number of letters and words. That is to say, it is accessible to achieve unlimited shades of meaning in minimum words used, i.e. to depend on clear, understandable fewer words as al Jāḥiẓ does in his approach. More importantly, Al Jāḥiẓ observes these characteristics in the Ḥadīth of the Prophet as a further guidance. (2003: 60)

Another point regarding economy rose at the beginning and during his discussion in his book. It is the matter of “*al- salāṭa wal-hadhar*” (1985: 1, 71) and “*al'ayy wa -al -ḥaṣr*”. (1985: 1) Al Jāḥiẓ means by “*al- salāṭa wal-hadhar*”: the platonic excessive use of words, whereas “*al'ayy wa -al -ḥaṣr*” is the incompetence to express the intended meaning. What is in between is when the intended meaning is expressed fully with limited number of words. It is called eloquence- the *bayan* as introduced by al Jāḥiẓ and presented online by Najī Iskandar. (2009)

Qudāma Ibn Ja'far was interested in the matter of words and meanings, too. He used the term “*al-ifrāt* or *al-ghuluww*”- the excessive use of words, or lies in poetry taken from the saying “*a'dhab al-shi'r akdhabuh*” as was discussed by Hammadi Sammo. (1981: 72) Qudāma categorizes the consistency between words and meaning into four: firstly, equality: words equal meaning without using extra elements; secondly, the reference: the meaning is revealed implementing as less words as possible; thirdly, synonymy; and finally representation: the illustration of meaning by using different words as indicators to the meaning. Reference, the second type, however, is the intended and the most important category applied in his approach.

The concept of word economy is discussed by Qudāma and employed as a good indicator for the compatibility between the densities of meaning in relation to the number of dictions used. Additionally, he attempts to define the defects of the utterances: any words incapable of delivering the meaning by utilizing more or less words needed. Subsequently, Qudāma tries to apply these concepts to poetry and prose.

Word economy in Qudāma's *Naqd AlShi'r* is projected under the term *al'ishārah* (*reference*). (2002: 54) Reference entails little words that embrace many meanings specified by referring to them or giving clues for further illustration, as said by some rhetors. Ahmad Matlub confirms the idea that Qudāma was influenced by al Jāhiz in his methodology of word economy, in that, the words used should express the meaning fully. (2003: 22) His use of word economy by any rhetorical mean such as parallelism, arcadianism, apostrophe and others made Qudāma among rhetors who were interested in appreciating “meaning” as Al Akhdar Jam'i states in his study. (2002: 69)

Ibn al Athīr (2000: 177) handles the issue of “*al ifrāt*, *al ṭafrīt* and *al iqtīṣād*”. He attests from the Qur'an the principal of these three concepts: “they are those who are neither wasteful nor niggardly when they spend, but keep to a just balance”. (2000: 25, 67) *Al ifrāt* means being wasteful; *al ṭfrīt* is being niggardly and *al iqtīṣād* is being balanced. As argued, these three concepts were applied to rhetoric: wastefulness and niggardliness are at the edge of extremes, whereas economy is the middle point balance. (2000: 178) Clearly noticed, these concepts were formerly applied and widely used in religious matters, commercial issues involving selling and buying, social affairs guiding men's dealings with women and other aspects, and later they were implemented in rhetoric.

Ibn al Athīr followed the path of al Jāhiz: he does not consider embellishments a separate field of study as al Jurjānī, al Zamahkshari and others do. On the contrary, he studies and observes it as inseparable from eloquence;

hence, he surfs in to the concept of eloquence so as to include semantics and *badī'* as a synonym of rhetoric, as Abdul Aziz Atiq states. (1998: 45) In *Fī Kifāyt AlṬālib* the matter of circumlocution is clearly presented. According to Ibn al Athīr's point of view, poets must abide by certain standards, for not to gain unjustified circumlocution, or unnecessary repeated blame. He also affirms the possible presence of what is called poetic necessities which consent to variant demands. For instance, in praise there must be unity and consistent renewal in meaning to be a good author, on one hand, and for the piece of a written work to be respected and in place, on the other hand. (1980: 28-9)

Al Qāḍī al Jurjānī, the founder of the *nazm* theory, has a different sight considering meaning vs. word selection matter. Ihsan Abbas emphasizes on the fact that al Jurjānī has come up with nothing new, yet he effectively gets use of all the former opinions and he well-presents them in his works as well. (2012: 309)

In his theory, al Jurjānī refuses to separate the word selection from the meaning as al Jāhīz and other rhetors do. He believes that no one can deal with words in separate of their meanings. As a consequence, he refuses to deal with single words now that words lead to their meanings; once the intention of the speaker changes, the selection of dictions alters to suite the intended goal of the *nazm*. The number of words selected within the *nazm* and whether or not dictions are regarded of high value should, indeed, be connected to the essence of the purpose in question.

Since both the election of lexicon and their relation to the meaning are equally important for al Jurjānī, he lays the foundation for what is proposed to be a good *nazm*, as presented by *Nahj Al Balāghah*. What can be concluded is that the parts of speech adopted in context should be firmly established and built in a way whenever seen as a whole, unity and harmony must be found. This is what Elghrib wrote in his blog. (2013)

Al Jurjānī says, “fa-law annaka ’amadta ’ilā bayt shi’r aw faṣl nathr fa ’adadta kalimātih ’add^{am} kayfa jā’a wa-ttafaq, wa-abṭalta naḍudahu wa-nidhāmahu al-ladhī ’alayhi bunya, wa-fīhi ufrigha al-ma’nā wa-’ujrya, wa-ghayyarta tartūbahu al-ladhī bi- kuṣūsiyyatihi ’afada ma ’afad, wa-be-nasaqihi al-maḥṣūṣ ’aban almurād”. (1991: 2) This quote illustrates that the number of words counted along with the meaning indulged are both important to show the eloquence of the written work.

The literary elements of simile and metaphor are also discussed by al Jurjānī in reference to word economy. He categorizes two types of similes: assimilated and unassimilated simile. The later is when a hard mental process is not needed to understand the picture the simile presents in as much as the elements of simile

have common features: abstract simile such as comparing some voices with each other, or mental simile like comparing a man to a lion in being courageous. The other type of simile is when a mental process is needed because there is no clear connection between the elements of the simile or metaphor e.g. when comparing “clear evidence” to the sun—a clear evidence cannot be mistaken nor can it have misleading facts. It is as clear as the bright sun when it is shining in the sky. Al Jurjānī puts much emphasis on using the concept “*wa lam yakruj ’an al-iqtisād*”. (1991: 110) In other words, he insisted on the fact that an author or a poet should take in to his account the principal of word economy while forming his images with simile or metaphor.

Word economy was thus contested by four celebrated Arab rhetors who lived over different periods of time: al Jāhīz (255AH), Qudāma Ibn Ja’far(337AH), Ibn al Athīr (630AH) and alQaḍī al Jurjānī (471AH). The first three held the same idea of the connection between word selection and meaning; they preferred one over the other, whereas al Qaḍī al Jurjānī refuses to separate the two because they both have the same prestige in the *naẓm*. In his opinion, a difference in meaning encounters a different selection and/or organizing of words inside the *naẓm*. Nonetheless, all agreed on the idea that word economy is highly needed for it is an indicator for al bayān.

What is remarkably observed is that word economy in Arabic is attached to rhetoric and literature; it has to do with *naẓm*. Word economy for the above critics or rhetors is an abstract concept not concerned with words; when discussing the issue of embellishments with what it entails: metaphor, simile, metonymy and others, the implication of such matters is considered in Arabic as word economy. On the other hand, when word economy in Arabic is adhered to the meaning, a state of confusion appears with regard to the concepts of brachylogy, circumlocution and elaborateness as they are used interchangeably.

Ihsan Abbas conveys his attitude towards how critics should deal with circumlocution. He says that modern critics should not criticize modern rhetors for their circumlocution relying on their comparison with what others did in the past; many would believe that the new is always viewed in terms of the old. Yet, poems narrated from the past, if collected, would be characterized by excessive use of words, as he said. Abbas also states that when the classic rhetors' work has been examined by modern scholars and classified as economic or wordy and redundant, this comparison, as discussed, does not necessarily mean that mistakes or errors should be accepted; presenting this point only means that it is a common mistake which existed throughout ages and for all poets. (2002: 310)

Eventually, Şammo points out linguists have also dealt with the issue of word economy not only as a part of rhetoric but also as a linguistic matter.

Therefore, they studied the linguistic structure and its denotation with care. They have analysed and come up with a number of rules in an admirable way. Their views are mingled with the bases of pragmatics though they are not fully accomplished; if linguists study more than they did, they would come up with an integrated theory about it. Linguists have a proficient interest in utterances and their constructions such as brachylogy and ellipsis, and they were the first to pragmatics and its indications. They were interested in the use of word economy by controlling the utterance in terms of what should be deleted and what should not be omitted, meanwhile avoiding ambiguity was their main concern; a subject that was studied by Sibawayh as well. (1981: 53)

Modern Scholars

This section revolves around two major parts: the first one holds a discussion about how word economy is deliberated in western literature in terms of repetition and pleonasm, and it traces the origin of the current idiom- word economy-back to the time of Aristotle who has been believed to be the patron flourishing the concept of word economy in writing. As for the second part, it displays the modern term of word economy in practical general writing, which is better to be refrained from wordiness and redundancy- problematic rhetorical terms that used to ornament many authors' non-economic writing.

"Therefore, since brevity is the soul of wit, and tediousness the limbs and outward flourishes, I will be brief" (William Shakespeare, Hamlet). The issue of word economy was highly discussed in both literature and practical writing. It is said that the concept of word economy in Arabic is originally taken from Aristotle's *Poetics*. Marc shell states:

Some scholars argue that *oikonomia* is a synonym of taxis (order) and should be translated as "construction," "general management," or "disposition." Aristotle himself, however, criticizes the use of unnecessary synonyms in prose and dislikes Alcidas's sloppy metaphoric misuse of the word *oikonomia* in reference to rhetoric. In the *Poetics*, Aristotle carefully employs the possibly pre-Aristotelian technical term *oikonomia* in a way that comprehends esthetic and political philosophy. (1993: 90)

In the Glossary of literary terms, pleonasm is derived from a Greek word that means "excess". It is a rhetorical device which can be defined as the use of a second or more words (phrase) to express an idea. These words are redundant such as in the following examples of pleonasm, "burning fire" and "black darkness." Sometimes, pleonasm is also called "tautology", which is the repetition of words.

Charles Harrington Elster, in an online article (2012), presents the problem of pleonasm in many details, enclosing several rhetors' and critics' opinions in the matter. In reference to the *Century Dictionary*, Elster claims that pleonasm may be considered to be justifiable in some cases; in literature, for example, pleonasm is regarded as a rhetorical device whenever it is exploited to express emphasis and clarity. As he states, it is not a matter of grammar but style or taste. Accordingly, authors should not end up using it more than needed in so far not to be "boring rather than striking the hearer." The question raised by Elster is whether or not the employment of pleonasm produces the desired effect or warrants it. As Fowler puts it, a writer "expresses the same notion twice over in the belief that he is saying it once" (quoted Elster 2012). It is a far more frequent and troublesome occurrence in edited prose.

"Write with precision, clarity, and economy." (1986: 31) This is a quote from an article written by Richard N. Mack that holds the same title. It is an advice for prospective authors to write scientific or even any other type of texts. As an editor, he argues that the two big enemies of writing regarding economy are the inclusion of extraneous material and redundancy. The reasons for this issue vary, but in order to overcome this problem he mentions a variety of techniques: comparing drafts, rephrasing results and controlling the length of the discussion presented; it should not exceed one-third the manuscript.

Another point discussed is the effect of unnecessary sentences that leads to poorly-written manuscript. This problem might happen due to the writer's reluctance to eliminate any sentence once inserted, resulting in facing loose sentences, or the bad syntax i.e. making sentences long, convoluted, and incomprehensible. (1986: 32) The last problem is using superfluous words which 'also slow down comprehension.' (1986: 32) One reason behind this is that some manuscripts are transcripts of dictation. Another reason refers to the fact that authors often write with the same verbosity permissible in conversational English. The style authors use highly affects the clarity of superfluous expressions.

Williams (2005) says that the matter of style is crucial to illuminate wordiness and redundancy. In order to write in an "economic style", authors should control the flow of ideas and present them concisely-- "compress them into the fewest words." (2005: 115) Authors, while writing prose, should consider the structure and get rid of non-functional repetition by crossing out useless words. For instance, "each and every" is a redundant pair; using "each" individually in the structure is sufficient to reflect the required meaning. (2005: 116)

The problem of redundancy concerning 'doubling words' emerges from the fact that the English language borrows from Latin and French thousands of words that are incorporated into English. Consequently, they are used and learned more than the native ones. Among the common pairs are "full-complete", "true- accurate", "hopes-desires", and "and so on-so forth", yet some standard pairs are not redundant like "willing and able". (2005: 116) One solution has been provided to reduce wordiness and to enhance diction so as to make it sharper and more direct which is replacing unnecessarily formal words with more common ones. (2005: 118) Another type of redundancy is the one which includes excessive detail in a piece of writing. It is the most difficult kind "because in some situations, the writer may have no idea what counts as redundant or excessive." (2005: 120-1)

In the introduction of his book, Kawin says, "we admire people who come gracefully right to the point". (1989: 18) He differentiates between two concepts that are used interchangeably because of the colloquial misunderstanding: repetitious and repetitive. They are defined as follows:

Repetitious: when a word, percept, or experience is repeated with less impact at each recurrence; repeated to no particular end, out of a failure of invention or sloppiness of thought.

Repetitive: when a word, percept, or experience is repeated with equal or greater force at each occurrence. Successful repetition depends both on the inherent interest of the recurring unit and on its context. (1989: 4)

Kawin represents a point in repetition: some authors are better than others in using repetition that can keep the receiver amazed over time, as repeating "never" four times. Then, he states the importance of repetition: "it is fundamental to human experience,... it can strengthen an impression, create a rhythm, flash us back, or start us over; it can take us out of time completely". (1989: 5)

Metzidakis starts his discussion by providing points of view about how repetition is looked at by many, since the time of Aristotle until Derrida. He even provides what Malherbe implies in his article about the "bad reputation" repetition had which, in turn, destroys good style. Repetition, at the time, is an indication of a dull pen and, thus, a dull mind. It was an "evil" that is found in a number of works of many authors: poems and prose.

Still Metzidakis presents a different opinion on the matter; as defined in the dictionary of rhetor, there are characteristics mentioned referring to the importance of using this technique, repetition of any type, as a literary style. Authors, at a certain point, should beat a literary loss of words. The receiver of

the text can grasp any meaning the writer indented what so ever. This, as he understands, can stimulate the receivers of the text to conduct more discussion because someone has noticed something in the written work. However, not every discussion proposed by repetition should be accepted.

For Williams, competent writers should write concise sentences. He hires a wonderful comparison for using wordiness, a muddy abstraction that confuses the reader, with a piano player. He says "you'll be like a pianist who uses only the middle octave: you can carry the tune, but without much variety or range." (2005: 135)

Ramini discusses word economy in practical writing as an element that should be available in a sentence construction. For Ramini, word economy is using as less words as possible to express the same meaning sufficiently. The problem writers face is expressing meaning with loose constructions. As he discusses, this is a common behaviour found in societies where their members are generally used to exceed the proper bounds. His call of economy does not mean being brief, but rather conveying ideas with enough words without "inflating sentences with illegible claim" (2014: 216)

As Ramini says, there must be a balance between words used and meaning expressed. Acquiring that balance protects a good piece of writing from being infected with brevity. In other words, ideas should be provided with sufficient examples. Missing these details is considered brevity, while deadwood is considered a type of wordiness. What is implied in the discussion is encouraging writers to improve their style, taking into account eliminating redundant words in addition to needless space but not ideas. He provides an example of how word economy works:

ومن خلال التاريخ، نلاحظ أن أسهل سبيل للاستعمار لدخول البلد الذي يريد أن يحتله هو القضاء على حضارة ذلك البلد وثقافته وألا يدع للتعلم سبيلا إليه.

وقد علمنا التاريخ أن أسهل طريق لاستعمار الشعوب هو القضاء على ثقافتها. (2014):
(218)

All linguists and rhetors in English deal with the matter of "word economy" by defining it as an antonym to wordiness, redundancy ,non-functional repetition or even pleonasm .It is something related to controlling style, structuring ideas and managing space ,rather than adding extra examples to illustrate the main idea.

Aristotle in his book was the first to bring out the issue of word economy which, later on, was passed to Arab scholars and rhetors throughout translation.

Unlike Arabic, word economy in English is highly attached to practical writing more than to literature. Other terms might be more attached to literature, such as pleonasm and repetition for a justifiable reason: whenever they have an effective function –emphasis- once they are used.

Hundreds of books, guide leaflets and online websites provide tips on how to avoid wordiness and redundancy, which are caused by authors' style of writing and their impression towards the belief that all sentences used are important. In contrast, a second reading, writing drafts or even proofreading and editing might overcome these issues.

The idea behind word economy is to minimize the length of a piece of writing, but not the ideas. (Ramini 2014: 220) Being "economic" is an elementary part of rhetoric; the more the writer can express his ideas completely in an economical style, the more his ideas tender his audience's temper with ease.

In conclusion, the concept of word economy is presented by both Arabs and Westerners. Since Aristotle's era the concept has evolved over time. Arab rhetors took the principles of word economy at the time when the translation from other cultures flourished. What can be noticed is that although Arab rhetors tried to apply the concept of word economy on literary work, they did not have a clear vision of what can be considered as "economy". Their terms and attributes were vague and sometimes they were used conversely: they sometimes misunderstood the opposite concept, i.e. word economy and it was mixed with other synonyms, such as: circumlocution, elaborateness, and embellishments in particular. Whereas Arab rhetors discussed above were divided into two schools as mentioned formerly, Modern scholars had it differently: word economy was presented as a rhetorical device in literature and as an advisable technique followed in practical writing. In literature, the matter of repetition had two visions: it was sometimes aforethought as a defective approach to be used while in other cases it was not seen as an "evil". On the contrary, it was a way for the receiver to have a more open up discussion and better understanding of a written piece. On the other hand, practical writing introduced the two concepts, wordiness and redundancy, as defects found and should be highly considered and eliminated in general writing.

مَفْهُوم "اِقْتِصَادِ اللَّفْظِ" بَيْنَ الْبَلَاغِيِّينَ الْعَرَبِ الْقَدَمَاءِ وَالْدَّارِسِينَ الْغَرَبِيِّينَ الْمُحْدَثِينَ: دراسة مقارنة

ريما محمود العيسى، مركز اللغات، جامعة آل البيت، المفرق، الأردن.

ملخص

يسعى هذا البحث إلى إجراء دراسة مقارنة في مسألة تتعلق بالكتابة، وهي "الاقتصاد في العبارة"، وذلك لدى البلاغيين العرب، من ناحية، والدارسن المعاصرين، من الناحية الأخرى. وقد عرض البحث عددا من آراء البلاغيين العرب، فحص من خلالها كيف تعاملوا مع هذه المسألة بوصفها جزءا لا يتجزأ من مفهوم "البلاغة"، وبين كيف أنهم، على الرغم من اتفاقهم في تأييد الاقتصاد في العبارة، افتتروا إلى رؤية واضحة في تحديد المصطلح، ومن ذلك عدم التفريق بين الحشو والإطناب وأيضا بين التكرار الوظيفي وغير الوظيفي. في المقابل، درس الباحثون المعاصرون هذه المسألة بالتفصيل، ففرقوا بين التكرار الوظيفي وغير الوظيفي في الأدب، من ناحية، وبين الإطناب والحشو في الكتابة العملية، من ناحية أخرى. وبينت الدراسة، في الوقت نفسه، أن الفريقين اتفقوا في جانب يتعلق بالمفهوم، وهو أن الاقتصاد في العبارة لا يؤدي إلى تقليص مساحة النص وحسب، بل يؤدي أيضا إلى وضوحه من القراءة الأولى.

* The paper was received on Feb. 10, 2016 and accepted for publication on July 10, 2016.

References

- Abbas, Ihsan. (2002). *Tārīkh Al-Naqd Al-Adabī 'ind Al-'Arab*. Beirut: Dar Al-Thaqafa.
- Al Banani, Muhammad. (2001). *Al-Nazariyyāt al-Lisāniyya wa-al-balāghiyya wa-al adabiyya 'ind al Jāhīz min kilāl Al Bayān wa-al-Tbyyīn*. Algeria: Diwan al-matbu'at al jami'iya.
- Al Jāhīz, 'amr b. Baḥr. (1985). *Al Bayān wa-al-Tbyyīn*. 5th ed. Ed. Abd Al-Salam Harun. Cairo: Al-Khanji Library.
- Al Naqr, al Tayyib Abdul Raziq. (2010). *Al-Tashbīh wa-Aqsāmuh 'ind al Jurjānī wa-al-Mrāghī*. 15/12/2015 <http://www.odabasham.net/>
- Al-Jurjānī, Abdul-Qāhir. (1991). *Asrār Al-Balāgha*. Ed. Mahmoud Abu fahr. Cairo: Al-Khanji Library.
- Atiq, Abdul Aziz. (1998). *Fī al-Balāgha al-'arabiyya: 'ilm al-Bayān*. Beirut: Dar al Nahda Al Arabiya.

- Elghrib, Bilal. (2013). *Naẓariyyāt al-Naẓm wa-'alāqatuhā bi al-Llafẓ wa-al-Ma'nā 'ind al Jurjānī*. 15/11/2015 http://elghrib.blogspot.com/p/blog-page_7479.html
- Elster, Charles Harrington. (2012). *Pleonasm: A Word Every Writer and Copyeditor Should Know*. 24/11/2015 <http://members.authorsguild.net/>.
- Ghadiri, Warda. (2003). *Simāt al-Iqtisād al-llughawī fī al 'arabiyya: Dirāsa wasfiyya Tahlīliya*. published thesis. Batna: Batna University.
- Ibn al Athīr, Diyā' al Dīn. (1980). *Fī Kifāyt Al Tālib fī Naqd Kalām al Shā'ir wa-al-Kātib*. Ed. Nuri AlQaysi & Hatim Al Damin & Hilal Najī. Al Musol: Al Musol University.
- Ibn al Athīr, Diyā' al Dīn. (2000). *Al-Mathal al-Sā'ir fī Adab al-Kātib wa-al-Shā'ir*. Ed. Ahmad Al Hufī & Ahmad Tabana. Cairo: Dar Nahdat Masr.
- Ibn Ja'fār, Qudāma. (2002). *Naqd al-Shi'r*. Ed. Muhammad Khafajī. Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya.
- Iskandar, Najī A. (2009) *Qaḍiyyat al-Lafẓ wa-al-Ma'nā 'ind al-Qudamā'*. 4/12/2015 <http://www.alfaseeh.com/vb/showthread.php?t=47588>
- Jam'i, Al Akhdar. (2002). *Al-llafdh wa-al-Ma'nā fī al-Tafkīr al- Naqī wa-al-Balāghī 'ind al-'arab*. Damascus: Ittihad Al Kuttāb Al- Arab.
- Kawin, Bruce F. (1989). *Telling It Again and Again: Repetition in Literature and Film*. Colorado: University press of Colorado.
- Matlub, Ahmad. (2003). *Asālīb Balāghiyya: Al Faṣāḥa, Al Balāgha, Al Ma'ānī*. Kuwait: Walalat al Mtbu'at.
- Metzidakis, Stamos. (1986). *Repetition and Semiotics: Interpreting Prose Poems*. Birmingham, Alabama: Summa publications.
- Ramini, Irsan. (2014). *Usūl al-Kitāba wa-al-Baḥth al-'Ilmī*. Irbid: Dar al-Amal.
- Richard N.Mack. (1986). *Writing with Precision, Clarity, and Economy*. The Ecological Society of America. 67:31–35.
- Sammo, Hammadi. (1981). *Al-Tafkīr Al-Balāghī 'ind Al-'arab: Ususuh wa-Taṭawwuruh ilā Al-Qarn Al-Sādis*. Manshurāt Al-Jam'a Al- Tunisiya, Kulliyat Al-'Adab wa-al-'ulum Al-Insaniya 6 (21).
- Shell, Marc. (1993). *The Economy of Literature*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Williams, Joseph M. (2005). *Style: Toward Clarity and Grace*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.