

Stylistics and Its Interdisciplinary Connections

zine abdelkader

University of Djelfa
(Algeria)

aek.zine@yahoo.fr

ABSTRACT

Stylistics is a field of knowledge that arose at the intersection of several linguistic and literary disciplines, which gave it an interrelationship that combines rhetoric, literary criticism, and linguistics. It meets with rhetoric in its concern with methods of expression and considering the role of the context, and in the use of rhetorical means that contribute to shaping the aesthetics of discourse and its impact, It also intersects with literary criticism in its concern with analyzing literary texts and revealing their artistic and semantic particularities, to form a tributary to literary criticism that relies on an analytical mechanism based on the data of the language itself instead of being limited to impression or taste.

As for its relationship with linguistics, it is a relationship of origin and use, as it derives from it its methodological tools and procedural concepts, to monitor the relationships underlying the linguistic fabric at its different levels to reveal how the stylistic phenomenon is formed within the discourse. Thus, stylistics can be viewed as an intermediary field of knowledge that links linguistic analysis and critical study, and seeks to explain the relationship between the linguistic structure of the text and its aesthetic and communicative function.

Article info

Received

March 14;2026

Accepted

April 29;2026

Keywords:

- ✓ *Stylistics*
- ✓ *Rhetoric*
- ✓ *Literary Criticism*
- ✓ *Linguistics*

1. INTRODUCTION

The issue of style is an old yet new issue, with multiple perspectives that give it a timeless relevance, as long as there is creativity and criticism to scrutinize it. However, in the past, the study of style was mostly associated with evaluative judgments that focused on creative work or compared it with others to identify differences, using expressions that were notably non-objective in general. This confined the study of style to a narrow field of literary criticism.

With the emergence of modern linguistics and the Copernican revolution in the field of linguistic studies, the study of style took a different turn as it approached linguistic studies by Charles Bally, a student of De Saussure and a pioneer of modern stylistics. The latter adopted the methods of linguistic study in an attempt to approach objectivity by using description, analysis and statistics to observe stylistic features and escape the shackles of impressionism in which the study of style had been mired for centuries.

If we return to our critical and rhetorical heritage and examine it, we find that the celebration of stylistic studies began early with the study of the styles and miracles of the Holy Qur'an and the mobilization of support for various views from the classical and modern poets, which enriched the Arabic rhetorical system and caused some to view stylistics with confusion. Has our

ancient rhetoric taken on a new form, or is it a new science that has superseded ancient rhetoric and hastened its demise?

Faced with this dilemma, we must acknowledge that stylistics does not stand on a specific epistemological basis, but rather falls under the influence of interrelationships imposed by the overlap of disciplines that we are witnessing in our present era in various fields of knowledge. These relationships can be summarized in three points: The relationship between stylistics and language and its modern science (linguistics), which is a natural relationship, since stylistics is a systematic linguistic science that approaches texts through the language that conveys them. The relationship with criticism, which is a relationship between a tool and its user, since stylistics has become a critical method that is one of the most important sources of literary criticism. and a relationship with rhetoric, which is a relationship of adoption and development, as many rhetorical topics are considered to be at the core of stylistic study. This has led some to call for the investment of this data to advance Arabic stylistics based on rhetoric and its tributaries. In this article, I wanted to explore the connection between stylistics and this knowledge and study the points of agreement and disagreement with a tendency to brevity as much as I could.

1- Stylistics and rhetoric:

Before considering the relationship between stylistics and rhetoric, it is necessary to distinguish between Arabic rhetoric with its three branches (ma'ani, bayan and badi') and European rhetoric, which is an extension of Greek rhetoric, even though Arabic rhetoric was also influenced by Aristotelian logic in its later periods and was confined to the three sciences mentioned above. It entered a period of stagnation that began with Al-Sakkaki's book 'Miftah al-'Ulum' (The Key to the Sciences), which devoted its third and final section to the sciences of rhetoric, based on his expertise in grammar, logic and speech.

Arabic rhetoric originated primarily as a religious Endeavour, with scholars seeking to demonstrate the miraculous nature of the Qur'anic discourse and its distinction from other forms of speech, such as poetry and prose. The works were classified according to the Qur'an's metaphors, miracles, and meanings, and the study of the Qur'anic model as the ideal in artistic performance in all its known forms was the beginning of ancient rhetorical and critical study. However, this descriptive approach did not last long, as it turned into a purely normative one, in which rhetoricians considered themselves guardians of literary creativity through recommendations that they codified and used as a sword hanging over the necks of writers. (Abdul-Muttalib, Rhetoric and Stylistics, 1994, p. 258)

As for Greek rhetoric, which Aristotle was the first to divide into three parts after it had been a single art shared by philosophers, orators and poets, it derived its laws from the forms and phenomena of rhetorical art in its forms commonly known in Greek society. It did not consider poetry to be a theatrical activity rather than a verbal one, and therefore it was not a primary source of inspiration for stylistic phenomena. Perhaps this explains Aristotle's approach of attaching the section on style or expression, which includes most of the rhetorical phenomena of oratory without poetry, Arab rhetoric, on the other hand, drew its images from both poetry and prose, although it rarely relied on rhetoric. (Shafi, Rhetorical Research among the Arabs, 1987, p. 14)

The flaw in rhetoric—and we mean Arabic rhetoric in particular—is that it stopped at the limits of expression, naming and classifying it, and froze at this stage, without attempting to reach a complete study of literary work, nor was it able to study the structural framework of this work. This paved the way for stylistics to emerge in the field of creativity as an alternative that attempts to move beyond the old partial study and establish a scientific structure that moves away from rhetorical formalism, which has been exhausted by the terms of rhetoricians with ramifications that have almost overshadowed all its aesthetic values.

(Abdul-Muttalib, Rhetoric and Stylistics, 1994, p. 259)

This is what happened to rhetoric in its later stages, and the reason for this can be attributed to the scholars of rhetoric who were not eloquent themselves and therefore did not understand the importance of taste in rhetoric and in evaluating literary beauty... They were not connoisseurs, nor were they able to inform us of the sources of beauty if they did appreciate it. They stripped their predecessors' works of anything related to rules and regulations, then classified them according to their own understanding, each according to his knowledge of philosophy, speech and logic. They divided and classified until rhetoric in their hands became, in most cases, devoid of what made it rhetoric. It became devoid of the reasons for life, dry and soulless, complex and without explanation, restricted by boundaries, and if it left them, it led to philosophical debate with no trace of living rhetoric. (Al-Mubarak, A Brief History of Rhetoric, 2006, p. 108). Although this statement is true in general, especially the part related to the divisions that affected rhetoric after logical boundaries crept into it, it is not without a slight injustice to rhetoric, which, as I mentioned earlier, should not be lumped together with European rhetoric.

If we compare rhetoric and stylistics, we find many points of convergence and others of divergence, which Shukri Ayyad

summarised in his pages and Hassan Nazim summarised in four points:

1 - Rhetoric is an ancient linguistic science, while stylistics is a modern linguistic science, and hence the difference becomes a methodological one. The ancient linguistic sciences that guided rhetoric viewed language as inherently stable, while modern linguistic sciences view it as changeable and evolving.

2 - Rhetoric is a normative science, while stylistics is a descriptive science... Therefore, the normativity of rhetoric focuses on deviating from appropriate grammatical structures, which causes rhetorical errors.

3 - Rhetoric dictates that speech should be appropriate to the situation, while stylistics dictates that the style of speech is influenced by the situation. These two terms refer, despite certain differences, to the general circumstances surrounding speech. The general circumstances surrounding speech differ in rhetoric from those in stylistics [He pointed out that rhetoric is influenced by logic and stylistics by psychology in a long speech.]

4 - The scope of stylistics is broader than that of rhetoric, as stylistics studies all linguistic phenomena, from sound to meaning, including syntax. (Nazim, Stylistic Structures, 2002, p. 18)

Many of these comparisons confuse rhetoric before al-Jurjani's era with rhetoric

after it. Those who contemplate rhetoric in its early centuries see that it does not stray far from stylistics, which has led some to call for intensified efforts to develop a science of Arabic style that will hopefully be the legitimate heir to ancient Arabic rhetoric.

Ancient rhetoric – that is, prior to al-Jurjani – was based in most of its discussions on the treatment of the finest examples of the creations of poets and prose writers, and their eloquent sayings to observe the beauty of artistic performance and identify the artistic and aesthetic aspects of these creations. This approach did not last long before scholars of rhetoric abandoned this path and fell into a purely normative approach in which they appointed themselves guardians of artistic creativity. What was beautiful was what met their standards, and what was reprehensible was what deviated from these standards, says Muhammad Abd al-Muttalib about these rules that scholars of rhetoric use to judge literary creations. These aesthetic rules became comprehensive, hardly distinguishing between the nature of beauty in every form of creativity, whether poetry or prose. Rather, they measured literature by its proximity or distance from the standards of rhetoric derived primarily from the style of expression in the Qur'an, considering it valid for all places and times, because it is derived from a source that is valid for all places and times. Rhetoricians in this field

overlooked the difference between a book sent down from heaven, created by a divine power that creates for itself whatever standards it wishes, to the extent that Abd al-Qahir said: 'It has a unique system whose patterns cannot be repeated in any other verbal art'; and literature created by the people of the earth, which is subject to imperfection and perfection, just as it is subject to beauty and ugliness. (Abdul-Muttalib, *Rhetoric and Stylistics*, 1994, p. 259)

Al-Amidi takes the same position as Al-Jurjani and decides on a moderate view of the rivalry between the supporters of wording and the supporters of meaning, where he believes that meanings should be left to choose the wording that suits them best, considering that meanings take on words with varying degrees of difference, such as the difference between luxurious and shabby clothing. He does not neglect language or reduce the care taken with its styles, as he believes that 'good composition and skilful wording increase the revealed meaning with beauty, goodness and elegance, as if it had created a strangeness that did not exist before and an increase that was not known before.' (Al-Amidi, *Al-Mawazina bayn al-Ta'ayyin*, 2006, p. 1/425)

If we extend the line of communication between rhetoric in its heyday and stylistics as it stands today, we must bear in mind that the foundation of rhetoric is different from that of stylistics. as each has its own

environment in which it originated, the code from which it emerged, and the standards it derived from this code. If Arabic poetry and prose, in their rhetorical standards, cannot be compared to the rhetorical standards of the Holy Qur'an due to their different origins – and rhetoric was originally established to prove this distinction – how can we apply Western styles to Arabic styles when the language, culture, and beliefs are different? It is unreasonable to import standards that are not from our environment and society to evaluate our literature. These standards did not originate in the context of our language and literature, but rather are the product of tastes that are not our own. They may be compatible with it at times and incompatible at others (Al-Mubarak, *A Brief History of Rhetoric*, 2006, p. 123).

An example of these differences is (the situation) in stylistics and (the circumstances) in rhetoric; the former is more complex than the latter in its comprehensiveness, since the situation in stylistics—and its influence on psychology, encompasses all the factors that shaped the creative text and contributed to its emergence, whether external, such as the creator and the recipient, or shared by both, such as gender, environment, and social status, or individual factors, such as the creator's mood, character, and tendency towards sobriety or humour, etc.

As for rhetoric, due to its influence by logic, it does not pay much attention to the emotional state, but rather focuses on the circumstances surrounding the speech, i.e. the mental state. This is not a shortcoming on the part of rhetoricians, but rather a limitation, as described by Tamam Hassan, who says: 'I see rhetoricians as deficient, not negligent. Their deficiency is evident when weighing their efforts against the results present in the study of meaning, and their lack of negligence is evident in that their efforts were important by the standards of their time, and we cannot demand that they conform to the standards of another time that is future to them.' (Hassan, *Al-Usul*, 2004, p. 337) In fact, he believes that they were ahead of their time in their understanding that 'every situation has its own discourse.' Since the rhetoricians, in recognizing the idea of 'context,' were about a thousand years ahead of their time, because the recognition of the ideas of "context" and 'discourse' as distinct foundations of meaning analysis is now considered in the West to be one of the discoveries that came as a result of the adventures of the contemporary mind in the study of language. (Hassan, *The Arabic Language: Its Meaning and Structure*, 2001, p. 337)

However, despite this precedent mentioned by Tamam Hassan, the shortcoming of the idea of *maqam* in rhetoric stems from its fragmentation in application. Rhetoricians, especially the later ones, when dealing with a text, would

divide it into sentences if it was prose, or into individual verses or fragments if it was poetry. They never dealt with a speech or poem in its entirety, nor did they benefit from the hidden references pointed out by the ancients. Here, the line of communication between the ancient rhetoricians and their modern counterparts was severed.

Arab stylists were divided into three groups in their view of rhetoric:

One group belittled the value of rhetoric and likened it to an old woman who had reached menopause, rendering her barren and leaving room for stylistics to take her place. Among these was Salah Fadl, who saw stylistics as the legitimate heir to old rhetoric, which had reached menopause and been rendered barren by the development of modern arts and literature. (Fadl, *The Science of Style*, 1998, p. 5)

I cannot fail to mention here the response of Abu Musa Muhammad to this – after he was pained that Arabic sciences were described in such a derogatory manner by people who, in his words, had no experience in them – which indicates that he published his book ‘*Dalalat al-Taraqib*’ (The Meanings of Constructions) and an extensive article on the shortcomings of rhetoric, and that it had penetrated minds that we thought it could not penetrate, and that it was widely said that it was outdated equipment, and that those who armed themselves with it were like those who

entered battle today on horseback with swords and spears in their hands, and they said that it was an old, ugly hag who had reached the point of despair, They said even more than that, and this is the worst thing that can be said about science, and it was not only in rhetoric but in Arabic sciences and even in all Muslim sciences, and this is the worst thing that can be said about nations, and the worst thing their generations can be raised on, and the best thing their enemies can do to them. What can we expect from a generation that despises its civilisation, history, knowledge and men? What can we expect from a scientific movement based on slander and defamation, which is keen to perpetuate this and insists on establishing it as a norm? (Abu Musa, *Dalalat al-Taraqib*, 2008, p. 17)

There is a group that has gone too far in its view of rhetoric and has made stylistics our art form, following the approach of those who believe that all sciences are contained in the Holy Qur'an and who attribute to its verses more than they can bear. Among these is the Moroccan researcher Muhammad Mashbal, who champions rhetoric and argues that rhetoric today is capable of withstanding the ravages of time and absorbing cultural transformations. After succeeding in dispelling the negative connotations associated with it, which resulted from its long association with beautiful figurative language, and syntactic efficiency, it has

been able to establish itself and prove its existence in modern textual theories and compete with new fields such as stylistics, textual linguistics and discourse analysis, whose emergence was in fact nothing more than an attempt to seize the territory originally occupied by ancient rhetoric. Stylistics, for example, which emerged as a contemporary science and a new heir to ancient rhetoric, did not succeed in becoming a contemporary alternative to it or replacing it, as Arab scholars promoted in their excessive enthusiasm... Stylistics is only a part of the broad field of rhetoric, and if stylists have sought to build their views by drawing on linguistic, psychological and sociological approaches, this does not prove that they have surpassed rhetoric, of which style, in its linguistic sense, was only a part of its vast scope. (Mashbal, *Rhetoric and Principles*, 2007, p. 5)

There is a third group that stood between the two teams and attempted to reconcile rhetoric and stylistics by observing the points of agreement and disagreement between them, as Al-Masdi did when he established a functional duality between the field of stylistics and the content of rhetorical thinking. The subject of both is the art of writing and the art of composition, i.e. the art of speech and the art of literature. He says: 'The direction of rhetoric is transcendent, while stylistics takes an experimental direction. This means that the driving force behind rhetorical thinking in the past was

characterised by a conception of "what is", according to which the essence of things precedes their existence, while stylistic thinking is characterised by an existential conception, according to which the essence of things is determined only through their existence.' (Al-Masdi, *Stylistics and Style*, 2006, p. 45)

The fair-minded person cannot but acknowledge two things about the relationship between stylistics and rhetoric:

□ The rhetorical heritage, especially in its golden age, contained intelligent references and analytical mechanisms on which Arabic stylistics could build a distinguished science comparable to Western stylistics.

□ Arabic rhetoric, given the time in which it existed, the purpose for which it was created, its method of analysis, and the antiquity of its means of approach, cannot be considered a substitute for stylistics, which has benefited from the development of knowledge and the emergence of new sciences—such as psychology—that have contributed effectively to shedding light on previously overlooked aspects of creative texts, with a view to understanding, analysing and appreciating them and highlighting their artistry and beauty.

2- Stylistics and literary criticism:

Ahmad Al-Shayeb defined criticism in general by saying: 'Criticism is the study, interpretation, analysis and comparison of

things with their similar or corresponding counterparts, then judging them by stating their value and degree. This is done in the sensory and spiritual realms, in science and the arts, and in everything related to life.' (Al-Shaib, *Principles of Literary Criticism*, 1994, p. 115) He then moved on to the modern definition of criticism as the correct assessment of any artistic work and a statement of its value in itself and its degree in relation to others. Literary criticism is concerned with literature alone, even though the nature of criticism is the same or almost the same, whether its subject is literature, painting or music.

Stylistics, on the other hand, deals with the literary text by studying its elements, artistic components and creative tools through the language that conveys it and in relation to its creator, what influenced it, its audience and what impact it had on their sensibilities as a result of their contact with this work. It intersects with criticism in many ways, making it an important source for criticism in judging the validity and beauty of literary works, even though stylistics refrains from judging literary works or formulating standard rules for them to follow in correcting their language.

Abdul-Muttalib affirms this fact and believes that stylistics, with its precise methodology, can encompass all creativity of a linguistic nature, without straying from the aesthetics of language, and without relying on pre-established rules. Rather, it sees the text as the creator of its aesthetics

through its formulation. In this, one text differs from another, and one literary work differs from another—not through quality and inferiority—but through its system in which the levels of formulation are intertwined, violating familiar ideals in performance, repeating patterns, or multiplying artistic stimuli. (Abdul-Muttalib, *Rhetoric and Stylistics*, 1994, p. 357)

Abdul-Salam al-Masdi addressed this issue somewhat concisely, indicating that stylistics, both as a science of style and as a concept linked to the given phenomenon of literature, necessarily entails some relationship with literary criticism. This relationship may be one of procedure or submission, affirmation or selection. Stylistics and literary criticism are two categories whose fundamental relationship falls into one of three categories: either they coexist, they coincide, or one negates the other. (Al-Masdi, *Stylistics and Style*, 2006, p. 10)

Abu al-Adus also explored these topics in some detail in his book "Stylistics," calling them trends and dividing them into three. I will summarize them here for their usefulness in clarifying the relationship between criticism and stylistics, after some had confused the matter, considering stylistics to be criticism itself. The first approach views stylistics as distinct from criticism, but not a replacement for it. This perspective is based on the idea that criticism is a comprehensive understanding,

while stylistics is more limited in scope. Criticism, in their view, is a scrutinizing process that utilizes all artistic tools, such as language, artistic taste, and style, before judging quality or inferiority based on the available data. Stylistics, on the other hand, has a purely aesthetic aim and does not rise to the level of judging a literary work as good or bad.

The second approach views criticism as having become a branch of stylistics, providing it with new definitions and criteria. The third approach acknowledges the methodologies of both criticism and stylistics, viewing the relationship between them as dialectical. Each methodology can enrich the other with diverse experiences drawn from its respective field of study. This approach emphasizes the prominence of their relationship when both methodologies engage in textual analysis through description, analysis, and interpretation. Criticism then extends to judgment and evaluation, while stylistics focuses on revelation and reporting. This does not negate the benefit that criticism derives from stylistic analyses (Abu al-Adous, *Stylistics: Vision and Application*, 2007, p. 53). It can be concluded that stylistics aspires only to be an objective tributary that nourishes criticism, providing it with an empirical alternative that replaces impression and subjective perception, thus safeguarding the foundations of critical construction. Stylistics, therefore, is an essential and immediate pillar in every critical practice.

This pillar can be considered a link between literary criticism and linguistics, given that language is the basis of stylistic study, which works to discover the nature of the linguistic elements that make up the literary work, which are gathered under one system that represents the integrated literary work, starting from its smallest units, represented by the isolated sound, to the larger unit, which is the text, so that the role of stylistics emerges in exploring the aesthetics of this text starting from its prominent form (language), because language is the tool for formulating this text in which it was written. The literary work is nothing but a linguistic construction that exploits the greatest possible potential of language at its phonetic, syntactic, and semantic levels to embody feelings and emotions in a distinctive way.

Stylistics did not merely rely on language as the foundation of literary study; it also sought to bridge the gap between language and literature. Previously, criticism had largely neglected the language of the text, focusing instead on the psychological and social contexts surrounding the creator. Thus, critical approaches prioritized the lives, histories, and environments of poets and writers, as well as the artistic schools to which they belonged, without considering the text itself as a linguistic construct that demands our attention for its inherent artistic and aesthetic potential before we delve into its aims and objectives.

This intertwining of stylistics and criticism allows them to collaborate and complement each other. While stylistics has grown stronger and become more objective than its older sibling, literary criticism, it harms itself, and even more so than literary criticism, if it attempts to usurp its role. Literary criticism is on its way to becoming a science in its own right, and it is capable – even in its current state – of drawing upon stylistics without relinquishing its right to exist. Stylistics does not aspire to replace literary criticism because it is incapable of transcending the barriers of analysis to evaluate the literary work by appealing to history. The message of criticism lies in unveiling the message of literature. Criticism contains some of what stylistics contains, and more, while stylistics contains only some of what criticism contains. (Al-Masdi, *Stylistics and Style*, 2006, p. 93)

3- Stylistics and Linguistics:

Since Saussure revolutionized linguistic studies at the beginning of the twentieth century by distinguishing between language and speech within his famous dichotomies, considering language as the constant and speech as the changing, after having viewed language as an indivisible whole, as an entity that develops through successive temporal stages; Linguistic studies began to adopt a descriptive, scientific approach, moving away from prescriptive normativity. The focus of linguistic research shifted from

hypothetical scenarios to reality, from the past to the present, and from the ideal to the natural. It was within this rigorous scientific framework that stylistics emerged as a linguistic method dealing with texts through their inherent language. Stylistics confines its study to the embodied aspect of language in use—speech—based on an immanent principle that concentrates on the linguistic phenomenon in its synchronicity, moving away from the historical, sequential study of language that characterized all linguistic studies before Saussure's revolution.

Linguistics directs linguistic study toward sounds, vocabulary, syntax, and related elements, aiming to examine these components and their specific characteristics. Stylistics, on the other hand, focuses on studying the relationships between these elements, their degree of integration, the extent of their connections, and their distribution. Its goal is to discern the artistic and aesthetic values inherent in the unique characteristics of the linguistic phenomenon. The speaker deliberately chooses a specific lexicon from the language, employing it according to their expressive aims and assembling it in a new and unique form, deviating from the familiar and presenting it to the reader in its most splendid form, thus establishing their own distinctive style. They tend to use some words over others, and there are words they never use, even if they understand their meanings, and words they

neither use nor understand their meanings because they fall outside their sphere of experience or awareness. Each individual has their own way of constructing sentences and connecting them, using some forms over others or certain tools over others. (Ayyad, Introduction to Stylistics, 1996, p. 29). Linguistics, however, views this as a distortion of the language and a violation of its rules, which is what stylistics has consistently studied in its various approaches, attempting to explain it on three levels: the writer, the text, and the reader, each according to their role in the process of receiving the creative work, observing the decorative and artistic values within it.

This intertwining of stylistics and linguistics led both Jean Dubois and Roman Jakobson to see stylistics as:

«a branch of linguistics» in Dubois's words, or «an art branch of the tree of linguistics» in Jakobson's words. As for Spitzer, he sees it as « the bridge of linguistics to the history of literature.» (Dubois, Dictionary of Linguistics, 2005, p. 448)

Indeed, Wellek and Warren argue that when linguistic studies approach literature, their approach inevitably becomes stylistic, stating:

« When linguistic inquiry is placed in the service of literature, it becomes stylistics» (Wellek & Warren, Theory of Literature, 1948, p. 244).

Al-Masdi extends this generalization to all human knowledge in our time, attributing a significant debt to linguistics, both in its research methodologies and in the appreciation of its scientific output. (Al-Masdi, Literature and the Discourse of Criticism, 2004, p. 74). However, researcher Abdullah Sawla, in an article published in the Syrian journal "Al-Mawqif Al-Adabi" entitled "Linguistics and Stylistics," criticizes the relationship between stylistics and linguistics. He considers stylistics a parasitic approach that feeds on and derives its legitimacy from modern methodologies, and points out that stylistics in modern times has undergone a phased development that defies all logic. Its history is intrinsically linked to its own unique nature. This is because, since its inception at the hands of Ferdinand de Saussure's student, Charles Bally, it has remained dependent on and dependent on the approaches of modernity. The most important approach to which stylistics became associated, and which it sought refuge from in the rhetorical approach to literary issues, is linguistics. Linguistics, as a descriptive, analytical, and scientific method, offered stylistics a lifeline from the shackles of impressionism and normativity, only to plunge it into the dryness of methodology and confine it to the limits of abstract formal induction. Therefore, most of the new stylisticians who came after Bally offered solutions that liberated stylistics from the dominance of linguistics. They did so by drawing on

some approaches parallel to, or derived from, linguistic research, and at other times by integrating stylistics within the framework of literary criticism to serve as an objective tributary amidst the intermingling of disciplines. (Sawla, *Linguistics and Stylistics*, 1982, No. 135). One of the most egregious flaws of stylistics is the stylistic analyst's use of the very tools and methods that these approaches produced. Linguistics and its application in the field of stylistics.

Anyone who compares this statement to the pronouncements of stylistic theorists like Al-Masdi, for example, will find that there is nothing wrong with stylistics borrowing its methodological tools from linguistics. In light of the "intermingling of disciplines"- as Abdullah Sawla himself states- and how much the former has left for the latter, even in the exact sciences, physics, for example, borrows its mathematical relationships from mathematics to prove quantitative values. This elevates both disciplines; the former through its experimental results and validity, and the latter through the suitability of its relationships in contributing to those results. The same applies to stylistics and linguistics. The dryness, rigidity, and confinement of the methodological approach to the text are also considered shortcomings of linguistics, shortcomings that some modern approaches-such as pragmatics-

have worked to overcome in their studies of speech events.

Thus, Waghliasi points to Al-Masdi's success in extracting the essence of stylistics from the aforementioned body of knowledge, distinguishing it with remarkable precision from its adjacent boundaries. (Waghliasi, *Methods of Literary Criticism*, 2007, p. 81)

Therefore, we can retain the field of linguistic research in its study of words and structures, while stylistic research focuses on identifying the relationships underlying the linguistic fabric and the underlying causes of its difference from other linguistic fabrics, striving to uncover the artistry and aesthetic qualities of the linguistic phenomenon. The differences between linguistics and stylistics can be summarized in two points:

First, linguistics studies what is said, that is, the components of the speech sequence, while stylistics studies speech in terms of how it is said, describing and analyzing the utterance accordingly. Second: Linguistics provides the necessary tools for the writer or speaker to express his idea, in terms of words, structures, and methods of constructing these tools. Stylistics, on the other hand, explores the artistry and aesthetics in these tools used for expression, through which the language user aims to achieve a certain type of influence on the recipient, while respecting what is agreed upon among members of the

linguistic group in terms of verbal connotations and linguistic rules that govern these connotations.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, this research shows that stylistics is no longer a science closed in on itself, but has become a cognitive domain open to a number of other scientific fields. It originated within the embrace of Charles Bally's contributions in modern linguistic studies, a student of the first founder, Ferdinand de Saussure, and then it developed to intersect with multiple knowledge such as linguistics, rhetoric, literary criticism, and others. This cognitive interrelationship has contributed to expanding the horizons of stylistic study and deepening its power to detect expressive and aesthetic values in literary texts. Thus, stylistics today represents an intersectional field that enriches literary research and provides the researcher with precise scientific tools to understand the mechanisms of style formation and the construction of meaning in discourse.

Bibliography List

1) Abdul-Muttalib, Muhammad - Al-Balagha wa Al-Uslubiyya - Al-Sharika Al-Masriya Al-'Alamiya Lil-Nashr, Cairo - 1st Edition / 1994

2) Abu Al-'Adous, Yusuf - Al-Uslubiyya Al-Ru'ya wa Al-Tatbiq - Dar Al-Masirah,

Amman (Jordan) - 1st Edition / 2007

3) Abu Musa, Muhammad Muhammad – The Significance of Structures: A Rhetorical Study – Wahba Library, Cairo – 4th ed. / 2008

4) Al-Amidi - Al-Muwazana Bayna Al-Ta'iyyin - Dar Al-Ma'arif, Cairo - 5th Edition / 2006

5) Al-Masdi, Abdelsalam – Literature and the Discourse of Criticism – Dar Al-Kitab Al-Jadeed, Beirut – 1st ed. / 2004

6) Al-Masdi, Abdelsalam – Stylistics and Style – Dar Al-Kitab Al-Jadeed, Beirut – 5th ed / 2006

7) Al-Mubarak, Mazen – A Summary of the History of Rhetoric – Dar Al-Fikr, Damascus – 6th ed. / 2006

8) Al-Shayeb, Ahmad - Usul Al-Naqd Al-Adabi - Maktabat Al-Nahda Al-Masriya, Cairo – 10th Edition / 1994

9) Al-Sayyid, Shafi' - Al-Bahth Al-Balaghi 'ind Al-'Arab - Dar Al-Fikr Al-'Arabi, Cairo – n.d. / 1987

10) Ayad, Shukri Muhammad - Madkhal ila 'Ilm Al-Uslubi - Dar Asdiqa' Al-Kitab, Cairo - 1st Edition /1996

11) Fadl, Salah – Stylistics – Dar Al-Shorouk, Cairo – 1st ed. / 1998

12) Hassan, Tamam - Al-Lughah Al-Arabiyyah Ma'naha wa Mabnaha - Dar Al-Thaqafa, Casablanca (Morocco) - n.d. / 2001

13) Hassan, Tamam - Al-Usul - Dar Alam Al-Kutub, Cairo - n.d. / 2004

14) Jean Dubois et al. - Dictionary of Linguistics - Larousse, Paris, 2005

15) Mashbal, Muhammad – Rhetoric and Principles: A Study in the Foundations of Arab Rhetorical Thought – Dar Ifriqiya Al-Sharq, Casablanca (Morocco) – 1st ed. / 2007

16) Nazim, Hassan – Stylistic Structures – Arab Cultural Center, Beirut–1st ed./ 2002

17) René Wellek & Austin Warren – Theory of Literature -HARCOURT, BRACE AND COMPANY, New York , 1948

18) Sawla, Abdullah - Article (Linguistics Magazine, Issue 135, July 1982

19) Waghli, Youssef - Methods of Literary Criticism - Dar Joussour for Publishing and Distribution, Algeria - 1st Edition/2007