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1. Theoretical basis

Challenging it is to start off a metrical analysis with a new approach after many a theory from various disciplines has already been proposed. This is why no new theory is suggested or applied, from elsewhere, in this study; rather, a serious attempt to foreground the core concepts of metrical variations and/or deviations of English and Arabic metrical systems and to minimize the diverse theoretical efforts, exerted by prosodists, is intended. It is into the discipline of generative metrics that this tentative framework of analysis should be incorporated, for it moves in the direction of defining meters through a set of generative rules and conditions, not through listing meters and describing them in detail (see Youmans, 1989). Still, the
framework of analysis recommended here sparingly uses the generative metrics apparatus formerly introduced as it seeks to spell out the metrical principles and parameters delineating the contrastive contours of English and Arabic metrics.

The present framework benefits from the generative metrical analyses introduced by Halle and Keyser (1966; see also Fabb & Halle, 2008) and further developed by Kiparsky and Youmans (1989; see also Kiparsky, 2006; Youmans, 2006), the optimality theory developed by Prince and Smolensky (2004), and Prince’s (1989) promising universal generative theory applied to the quantitative verse of Greek and Arabic. It also makes use of the insightful outlining of basic feet and their variations as enlisted by traditional metrical studies such as those by Hamer (1969), McAuley (1966), Malof (1970), and Saintsbury (1930). Yet, as a parallel line following or meeting its counterpart, if at all, this research program follows the previous to make its own way. Its basic concern is with a formal analytical approach to prosody with an accessible generative basis, formed from within the metrical systems under investigation, and not imposed upon them from elsewhere. This is why it also avoids discussing such Arabic tentative theories as 'al–Kātib’s and Mustajīr’s mathematical approaches to Arabic prosody (أحمد مستجير, 1987; أحمد مستجير, 1980, محمد طارق الكاتب, 1391 AH/ 1971 AD) or Abdel–Malek’s “generative” approach (Abdel-Malek, 1996) because they and many others (e.g., سليمان أبو سلة, محمد رجائي, 1985, عبد الصاحب المختار, 1993, سيد البحراوي, 1992, ستة) have have
attempted to replace the classical Arabic theory, which is not the objective of the present study.

Echoing the early revolutionary minimalist program, originated by Chomsky in his seminal research paper “A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory” (1993), and benefitting from Boeckx (2006) and Radford (1997a; 1997b; 2004), the current generative framework is based on the principle-parameter division. Principles are the set of the general, basic rules of a language system that are apt to be traced in all languages of the world, and from which the concept of Universal Grammar (UG) begets. Parameters are the rubric-like limitations and/or specifications of these general rules and their manifestations in different languages of the world. An open source for comparative and/or contrastive linguistic studies becomes available when “the Principles and Parameters approach (P&P)” is set to work as it “has allowed linguists to cover a truly impressive range of similarities and differences across the languages of the world like never before in the history of linguistics” (Boeckx, p. 3). The following minimalist analysis of English and Arabic metrical systems is steered towards such contrastive destination, while following the track of generative metrics.

2. Setting the form: Tripartite–Basis Principle

Boeckx (2006) reasoned that Chomsky, when labelling his research work a program rather than a theory, “means that minimalism asks questions
and follows guidelines that are broad enough to be pursued in a great many
directions” (p. 5). That is typically the genuine source of its powerful
flexibility. Canonically, the first minimalist metrical question of every
ambitious program with a universal outlook is the identification of the
metrical type, to which a given verse belongs. To do so, the present research
enterprise overlooks the metrical/non–metrical discussion, and focuses
only on the analysis of metrical verse. Then, it develops to encompass the
types of metrical verse.

Metrical verse branches out into (a) simple types, formed by only one
element of rhythm (e.g., accentual verse), and (b) compound types, modelled
out of two elements (e.g., accentual–syllabic verse). The subcategories of
simple–compound verse types are of two main kinds: the quantitative that
employs syllable weight, and the qualitative that activates stress and/or other
elements. Correspondingly, the four types of metrical systems, categorized by
6–16), are subsumed under the quantitative–qualitative classification (for the
various types and categories of metrical verse, see Table 1).

In an earlier analysis of English and Arabic metrics (see Ali, 2017), we
suggest adding a fifth metrical type to Fussell’s (1979) categorization of the
well–known four metrical systems, of which the accentual–syllabic is the
typical1 of English verse. The newly–formed label is the quantitative–syllabic
Table 1
Types and Categories of Metrical Verse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative categories</th>
<th>Types of metrical verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accentual</td>
<td>Accentual–Syllabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabic</td>
<td>Quantitative–Syllabic,b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative categories</th>
<th>Quantitative, ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that describes the compound nature of Arabic verse, based on the collaboration of (a) syllable length (i.e., quantity) and (b) syllable count. Arabic verse is, therefore, as compound as English insofar as each one of them has two components.

Note. The use of the ellipsis here marks the open–sets, into which new categories of different metrical systems of the world can be incorporated, as an indication of the flexibility of this minimalist framework.

a The use of the plural in the word categories is to stress the open–set structure of the table.

b This category is suggested to describe the metrical system of Arabic.

In this regard, a metrical verse is formed through the integration of these three levels. Metrical analysis, in turn, has to address all these levels to
determine whether a given metrical system is (a) simple or compound, (b) quantitative or qualitative, and (c) syllabic, accentual, quantitative, accentual–syllabic, or quantitative–syllabic. The respective threefold question can be roughly phrased as the Tripartite–Basis Principle.

(1) Tripartite–Basis Principle

Every metrical verse system has a tripartite basis of form.

3. Norm and anomalies: Bipartite Principles

Traditional metrists introduce long lists of metrical variations that are dated back to the early beginnings of English and Arabic verse, even if poets stop using some of them due to changes of prosodic tastes along ages. On the basis of generative metrics however, a simplified, yet indicative, categorization of these variations can be suggested (see Table 2). The argument is that, since English and Arabic metrical systems are compound, then the analysis of their metrical regularity and metrical variations and/or deviations has to tackle these respective two levels. The following Bipartite Principles give shape to these generative remarks.

(2) Bipartite–Basis Regularity Principle

Every compound metrical verse type has a bipartite basis of metrical regularity.
(3) Bipartite–Branching Variation/Deviation Principle

Every compound metrical verse type has a bipartite branching of metrical variations and/or deviations.

Here English prosodic system witnesses variations of such modulations as promotion and demotion on its accentual level while variations like substitution and deletion, and the emergence of monometer, diameter, and trimeter appear on the syllabic level. When accentual variations drastically abandon the norm of the dominant foot in a given poem, deviations on the accentual level are evidently circled out. Still, the terms offbeats or metrical deviations are used in this tentative analysis of English verse only if instances of breaking the norm are numerous and/or odd in their position of the verse line.1 As for deviations on the syllabic level, they occur when an unconventional number of syllables within the foot or in the verse line is introduced.

Similarly, Arabic prosodic system has some metrical variations of the kind of zihāf, pseudo–zihāf, cīla, and pseudo–cīla on the quantitative level; other variations such as those of majzū, mashtūr, mishṭūr, manhūk meters make their way to poems on the syllabic level. Otherwise, tokens of zihāf or cīla, which are uncanonical in a designated bahhr are considered kusūr carūdiya(t) or quantitative deviations. Instances of line–length
variations, which are not recorded by early Classical Arabic metrists, could be treated as syllabic deviations.1

Often, but not necessarily always, in both English and Arabic poems, variations and/or deviations of the two levels occur at the same time. In a rather experimental generalization of this framework, Table 3 is attempted to sketch variations and/or deviations of compound metrical systems, whatever they are.

Table 2
Metrical Variations/Deviations of English and Arabic Verse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of metrical variations/deviations</th>
<th>Syllabic</th>
<th>Accentual</th>
<th>Quantitative, ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English metrical system</td>
<td>substitution, - deletion, ... &amp; monometer, - diameter, ...</td>
<td>- promotion, - demotion, ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic metrical system</td>
<td>majzū’, - مجزوء , - مشطوري , - manhūk</td>
<td>- زىخف - علل تجري , - مجري الزحف , -cilal , - pseudo–cilal , - مجري العلل</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. The use of the ellipsis here marks the open–sets, into which new categories of different metrical systems of the world can be incorporated, as an indication of the flexibility of this minimalist framework.

Table 3

Variations/Deviations of Compound Metrical Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrical systems</th>
<th>Types of metrical variations/deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syllabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrical system</td>
<td>Named categories, if any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrical system</td>
<td>Named categories, if any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y, ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The use of the ellipsis here marks the open–sets, into which new categories of different metrical systems of the world can be incorporated, as an indication of the flexibility of this minimalist framework.

aThe use of the plural in the word systems is to stress the open–set structure of the table.

4. Analysis

The following is a detailed metrical analysis of Ezra Pound’s “The Fault of It” (1991, p. 43) and Bishārā(t) ’al–Khūrī’s “أغضاضة يأ روضٍ” (بشاره).
al-‘aqqah al-fatwah, 1953, p. 110), intended to examine the applicability of the generative basic analysis of English and Arabic verse proposed. The framework of analysis applied here1 puts the given verse line in bold in the first line while the second line is left for the base level of analysis, where phonetic transcription divides words into basic prosodic units, whether English syllables or Arabic 'asbāb أسباب and 'awtād أوتوتاد that form feet or tafācīl تفاعيل, ending each in a period. To be foregrounded as the essential prosodic components of each system, English stressed syllables and Arabic 'awtād are marked by a conventional straight single quote and underlining, respectively. English metrical variations and/or deviations and Arabic ziẖāf and cilal are indicated in English syllables and Arabic 'asbāband 'awtād by a question mark. The third line is for the top level of analysis that represents English feet (by the symbols /&x for stressed & unstressed syllables) or Arabic tafācīl, and demarcates them by a vertical bar. Single parentheses enclose a modulated foot to indicate that English metrical variations and Arabic ziẖāf are inherently optional. Double parentheses are used with Arabic cilal and pseudo–cilal while brackets are generally for an offbeat foot or an odd variation in both systems, as introduced below.

(Sample A)

Some may have blamed us that we cease to speak

sam 'mei?. həv 'bleimd. əs 'dæt?. wiː 'siːs. tə 'spi:k
Of things we spoke of in our verses early,

Of things we spoke of in our verses early,

Saying: a lovely voice is such and such;

Saying: a lovely voice is such and such;

Saying: that a lady’s eyes were sad last week,

Saying: that a lady’s eyes were sad last week,

Saying: she hath this way or that, this much

Saying: she hath this way or that, this much

5. Wherein the world’s whole joy is born and dies;

5. Wherein the world’s whole joy is born and dies;

Wherein the world’s whole joy is born and dies;
Of grace, this little mesericorde;

[greis. dɪsˈlɪt. | 'mɪz. ri? 'kɔd]

Ask us no further word;

ɑːsk 'ʌs?. nə 'fɜː. ðə 'wɜːld

If we were proud, then proud to be so wise

ɪf 'wiː. wɜː 'praʊd. ðən 'praʊd. tə 'bɪː. səʊ 'wɜːz

10. Ask us no more of all the things ye heard;

ɑːsk 'ʌs?. nə 'moʊ. əv 'ɔːl?. ðə 'θɪŋz. ji 'hɜːd

We may not speak of them, they touch us nearly.

wiː 'mer?. nɒt 'spiː.k. əv 'dɛm?. ˈdɛrɪtʃ. əs 'nɪ. ˈlɪ
(Sample B)

(Pound, 1991, p. 43)
يا من أساه بني الظلم

نذ لم تنبي. وثبت لم تحذ ذلك

متفعلان (متفعلان)

قل: كأن أولى أن يصدك

إنه لم يكن أديب، فخذ

إنه لم يكن. أذ بني فخل

متفعلان (متفعلان)

أنا شافني فعممت وردك

أغضاضنة يا روض ان

أخ صان، يا صان؟ روا صان

متفعلان (متفعلان)

أنا راققي فامت وردك

ووم لا متن. يا قط رن

متفعلان (متفعلان)

يدي مثلما القران عندك

وحياة عينك وهي عند

دي؟ مثلم ألم قر؟ ألم تبن دين

متفعلان (متفعلان)

رقبها ولم تبلغ أشدك

ما قلب أمك إن نقا

رق؟ ها ولم. تنب لغ أشد ذلك

متفعلان (متفعلان)

متفعلان (متفعلان)

يوم الفراق ليسترده

فهـفت على يل骋 بصرها

يؤى مل فؤ. قل تس ترز ذلك

متفعلان (متفعلان)

بي يومقيل خفرت غهداك

بأ سد من خفقات قد

بيى بيى مقى. للخ فر تغى ذلك

متفعلان (متفعلان)
In Sample A, the metrical analysis reveals that the dominant foot of Pound’s poem is the iambic that consists of two syllables, the first of which is unstressed and the second is stressed. In terms of the Tripartite–Basis Principle, this disyllabic foot defines the three levels of metrical analysis in a bottom–up manner: It displays that (a) the poem belongs to the accentual–syllabic verse type, which is (b) a qualitative verse category, grouped under (c) compound metrical verse types. Typical of compound metrical verse types, the prosodic system here is designed on the Bipartite–Basis Regularity Principle and the Bipartite–Branching Variation/Deviation Principle inasmuch as the collaboration of stress pattern and syllable count in each verse line establishes its metrical regularity, and inasmuch as its metrical variations and/or deviations are evident on the corresponding accentual and syllabic levels. Thus, promotion of normally unstressed monosyllabic words (e.g., “in” l. 2, “a” l. 4, “us” l. 8) are accentual variations; trochaic feet (e.g., l. 3, 4, & 6) are offbeats or accentual deviations, especially when their number in the same verse line is taken into consideration (l. 4). Cretic foot (/ x /, l. 4) is also an accentual deviation. In addition to the deletion of the second syllable of “mesericorde” (l. 7), syllabic variations of the pentameter pattern of the poem occur four times, where an extra final syllable flashes in two (ll. 2 & 11) and a trimeter appears in the others (ll. 7 & 8).
In Sample B, 'al–Khūrī’s poem is written on the Arabic bahr called 'al–kamil, which is formed by متفاعل–متفاعل in each شطر. With respect to the bottom–up application of the Tripartite–Basis Principle, the prosodic system of this metrical poem is (a) that of a quantitative–syllabic verse type, in which the prosodic pattern is based on the kind of syllable length (or syllable weight) governed by syllable count. It is (b) a qualitative verse category, classified under (c) compound metrical verse types. Regarding the Bipartite Principles, its metrical regularity and variation and/or deviation manifest themselves on both quantitative and syllabic levels. So, regularity is evidenced by the quantitative–syllabic pattern that runs throughout, in the spite of the quantitative variation of the ziẖāf called 'al–iḏmār (i.e., to turn the second mūtaharik خوفٍزؾوِّك into a sākin حرف ساكن, & change متفاعل into متفاعل that appears in every verse line.1 The other dominant accentual variation here is the cila called 'at–tarfīl السبب الترفيل (i.e., to add a sababkhafīf جتفل at the end of the watad majmūc الوتد المجموع, & change متفاعل into متفاعل that is used in 'aḏ–dārb all throughout, as ought to be. As for syllabic variations, the poem is modelled on the form of majzū‘ مجزوء الكامل المُرَقَل. Finally, no tokens of metrical deviation are recorded in either level.

In this regard, the two poems selected here prove that they are true representative specimen of English and Arabic prosodic systems, for they follow their respective metrical pattern in terms of regularity, variation, and deviation. They also convey that the different conception of such terms in
English and Arabic verse is the genuine cause of differences between the two prosodic systems. Notably, the straightforward application of the generative framework of analysis suggested and the intelligible results elicited show how the new framework could be promising.

4. Conclusion

The significance of generative metrics is that it keeps the core concept of prosodic systems intact, and clearly spells them out. This proposed framework of analysis is, thus, only a way of rewording the basic crux of English and Arabic prosodic systems and rendering a refined, contrastive theoretical machinery that is simplified, yet comprehensible, and applicable to both. It suggests the Tripartite–Basis Principle to describe the form of metrical verse, then sorts out the manifestations of metrical regularity and variations and/or deviations of English and Arabic metrical verse through the Bipartite–Basis Regularity Principle and the Bipartite–Branching Variation/Deviation Principle, respectively. The argument is even carried on to propose a universal framework of analysis, hopefully, suitable for different compound types of metrical verse and their respective types and categories of metrical regularity, variation, and deviation. The entire framework is finally applied in a generative metrical analysis of Ezra Pound’s “The Fault of It” (1991, p. 43) and Bishārā(t) 'al–Khūrī’s “أّغضاة َِّا روضُ” (شارة الخويا الأخطل, 1953, p. 110). In final analysis, this framework has attempted to
answer a research question of prosody through generative metrics, but it needs to develop further. After all, “If we knew already what it is, we wouldn’t [sic] call it research” (Einstein; as cited in Boeckx, 2006, p. 196).
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