



Published in Nairobi, Kenya by
Royallite Global

Volume 5, Issue 1, 2024

Article Information

Submitted: 29th October 2023

Accepted: 12th December 2023

Published: 20th January 2024

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

Additional information is available
at the end of the article:

To read the paper online, please scan
this QR code:



How to Cite:

Ibrahim, A. M., Almazaidah, I. S., & Allawzi, A. (2024). Literary theory and its role in modern and contemporary criticism: A critical approach. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.58256/zebr1z41>

Literary theory and its role in modern and contemporary criticism: A critical approach

Abdullah Mahmod Ibrahim¹ Ismail Suliman Almazaidah¹ Areej Allawzi²

¹Department of Arabic Languages, University of Jordan, Jordan

²Department of English, University of Jordan, Jordan

Correspondence: i.mazaydah@ju.edu.jo

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1818-3944>

Abstract

This research aims to identify the relationship between the concepts of “literary theory” and “literary criticism”; as a crisis was formed in reaching an agreement between the critics on defining the concept of these terms. Thus, the research seeks to identify these two terms and examine their implications in the modern literary lesson. The research takes an analytical and investigative approach based on how to use terms, understand them and apply them in research writing. The research has found that there is a discrepancy in the use of terms and their understanding and invocation in research writing. These terms came to us from Europe, which took them from the Greek and Latin cultures. The research concludes that there is a difference between critics and writers during the literary study about basic concepts, which requires them to go through them by definition, commentary, and deduction, such as the concept of literature itself, creativity, reception, criticism, literary history, literary schools, and others.

Keywords: literary theory; literary criticism; terminology crisis; modern literature



Public Interest Statement

This study tries to identify the link between the notions of "literary theory" and "literary criticism," since a crisis has arisen in achieving a consensus among critics on defining these terms. Thus, the study aims to identify these two words and investigate their consequences in current literary education. The study takes an analytical and exploratory approach, focusing on how to use, comprehend, and use terminology in research writing.

1. Literary Studies: Definitions and Limitations

One of the real crises that casts its shadow on literary and critical research is what we may call the 'crisis of the term'; where we notice in most literary and critical writings quite a discrepancy in the use, understanding and invocation of terms in research writing. In addition, contemporary literary and critical terms were mostly coined in the European continent, which has interacted with the Greek and Latin cultures, and reached us after having over-gone difficult labors through translation) Lulu'a, 1988). If we are to give significance to the transformations, alterations, approaches and the myriad of applications surrounding the construction of literary thought; more so, the consideration of what had led to the development of these terms over time and through their passage in different minds, understandings, and schools, we will reach the understanding that the problem is more profoundly rooted than thought(Alloush, 1985). The discrepancy of looking at literary and critical concepts is due, in part, to the fact that 'Literary Studies' requires a difference in perception amongst the theorists themselves, who in turn find themselves obliged to clarify their discernment through literature, creativity, literary and non-literary approaches, and criticism. This is one of the inevitable conflicting concepts between critics and writers. As the human sciences dig around concepts and do not aim to define them as is the case in the natural sciences, and although many have tried to take literary research into a space comparable to the space available in the natural sciences, experience has proven their failure (Renee Willick, 1991).

1.1. Literary Studies and Literary Theory

The sheer attempt to providing clear definitions to critical terms that constitute Literary Studies proves impossible, mainly illustrating the impossibility of reaching agreement among critics, which in turn, feeds into the urgency of discussing the issue. My attempt to monitor the relationship between the concepts of "literary theory" and "literary criticism" requires an understanding of these two terms in terms of their definition and handling in the literary lesson.

Our definition of both literary theory and literary criticism must be preceded by talking about the concept of "literary study" first, a concept that represents a great incubator for everything that can be said about literary theory or literary criticism. We can say that literary study does not mean "literature" itself; Literature is a creative activity that pours into art, while that study is concerned with understanding and treating literature. The literary study by its nature is divided into three sections. Literary theory, literary criticism, and literary history. In a quick overview of these three concepts, we can say that literary theory deals with the principles, classifications, and levels in literature, while criticism deals with the study of specific literary works, and literary history comes to monitor the movement of these literary works with influence and influence.

As for literature theory, Rene Willek and Austin Warren discussed in their books "Literary Theory" quite a few literary concepts that fall under this concept, and they defined literary theory as "the study of the foundations, divisions, balances, and the like." This is a definition that contains questions. An important task related to the search for the concept of foundations in literature, as well as the concept of divisions and scales, and most importantly, the interpretation of the phrase "what is like" which seems cloudy in this context. Else This definition tells us that it is literary theory that deals with these already cloudy and conflicting things in literary study; For this reason, all books that deal with the theory of literature or deal

with this type of literary knowledge focus mainly on reaching an effective study of these foundations, sections, and scales and trying to define and extrapolate them. As for the phrase “what is like” in the previous definition, perhaps it refers to everything that can be related to literature as a general idea and not as specific works; Such as the function of literature, its motives and drivers, and other topics studied in literary theory (Willick,1991).

In order to clarify the definition provided by Willek and Warren above, we will use the index they made for their book, as they discuss under the title “The Theory of Literature” a number of issues of concern to literary study in general rather than to specific literary works. For example, their book deals with issues such as: the nature of literature, its function, its being between public and private, universal and national, its relationship to biography, psychology, sociology, thought and other arts. The truth is that all of these chapters represent a basic subject for what is called “the theory of literature”.

And because the term constitutes a crisis, as we have said, it is necessary to use another approach to the term literary theory, which is the treatment of Dr. Samir Saeed Hegazy, where he defined literary theory as “all the rules, concepts and assumptions that determine the elements of literary work, its characteristics, and the nature of the artistic sciences , in a way that tends to abstraction with the intention of extracting general rules and concepts for the origins of literature” (Hegazy, 2004).

The previous definition includes the necessity of “abstraction” in extracting the rules, concepts, and general assumptions of literature, and abstraction is a limitation to thinking about the matter being studied, meaning that if we want to build a literary theory, we must abstract the mind for this theory and it, away from any other considerations, and I see that This definition of literary theory is an extension of the definition of Willick and Warren, and they are two definitions that flow into one stream, They agree that literary theory is a term that aims to study what might be called the philosophy of literary works and not the literary works themselves; Where this concept revolves around answering questions related to the nature of literature, its ideas, philosophies and functions, and may expand to include dealing with the relationship between literature and other human sciences, especially if we realize that many literary theories are based on human theories.

1.2. Literary criticism and literary history

The requirement of abstraction in confronting the theory of literature makes this process open to two other indispensable concepts, the first is the concept of literary criticism, and the second is the concept of literary history. Rene Wilke and Austin Warren have achieved these two concepts in their book referred to, and they said that the study of the literary work itself is described by one of two concepts; Either literary criticism or literary history; Where literary criticism deals with the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of the work, while literary history deals with the study of the text in its development and its influence on other previous works. This means that literary theory cannot be limited to a specific literary work, but rather delves into general concepts of literature, while literary criticism and history try to present a special picture of a single text, using the concepts laid down by literary theory (Willick,1991).

The disagreement about the nature of the concepts related to the theory of literature leads to a sharp disagreement about the definition of criticism, of course. If literature is subject to disagreement, not humility, criticism will be so. Because criticism is subordinate to literature, as we have said, and researchers' definitions of criticism have varied to understand its function, while Ahmed Amin sees that criticism is “a review of literary pieces to know their advantages and disadvantages”(Amin, 1952), Muhammad Ghunaimi Hilal says that the core of the critical work “is based first on the Revealing the aspects of artistic maturity in the literary production and distinguishing them from others by way of explanation and explanation, and then comes the general judgment on them” (Hilal, 1997). We note how Ahmed Amin viewed criticism as a tool that aims mainly to know the good from the bad in the literary text, while the concept expanded by Hilal to include revealing the aspects of maturity in the literary production, focusing on the exposition and the purpose of explanation, in the sense of reasoning. Probing the text, but the general evaluation judgment

is a later stage.

If we want to choose an integrated definition of criticism that stands at the same distance from all definitions, we will draw inspiration from Stanley Hayman's book on criticism, which is called *Literary Criticism and Its Modern Schools*. The research of this book is divided by the division of the tasks undertaken by literary criticism, revolving around interpretive criticism, appraisal criticism, follower criticism, criticism based on biography, criticism based on folklore, psychological criticism, idealistic criticism, realistic criticism, and other topics that deal with it is all about analyzing, interpreting, evaluating and comparing the work with other works. That is why Stanley Hayman realized the difficulty of the literary critic's work. He defined literary criticism a definition that makes the critic's task difficult and complicates it; He saw that criticism is "an organized use of non-literary techniques and knowledge - also non-literary - in order to gain insight into literature" (Hayman, 1958).

1.3. Overlapping literary terms

We can very well understand why Hamelin focused on the use of techniques and non-literary knowledge in his previous definition of criticism, and he represented - as we have noted - on techniques by collapsing in psychology or semantics in language and art and economic models; In excluding all kinds of literary knowledge, he hardly separates literature from criticism, as they are two inseparable bodies. If criticism has to be distinguished from literature so that it has its own nature, then it must use these techniques and knowledge that come from outside literature in order to serve literature itself. Where he says: "Modern criticism raises a number of questions that were not, in most cases, asked in literature before, including: What is the importance of a work of art in terms of its relationship to the artist's life, his childhood, his family, his deep needs and desires? With his economic life, his large society? What does this work do to its owner, and how? What does it lead to, and how? What is the relationship between these two functions? What is the relationship between the artwork and the great primitive models in rituals, between it and the inherited literary material, between it and contemporary and non-contemporary philosophical ideas? What is the order that was followed in its forms, expressions, and general form?" (23).

The questions that Hayman poses before us are questions that are mainly posed in the investigations of literary theory, and Hayman realized this confusion, as he followed his talk about the questions of modern literary criticism by saying: "It is clear that these questions ask about literature in general or about one work of art in particular" (Ibid. 1958) ; that is, as if he makes literary criticism include literary theory, and this is what René Willek clearly stated when he said, "Literary criticism is often used in a way that makes it include critical theory" (Willick. 1987). Therefore, Willick and his colleague Warren have made it clear that the three terms dealt with in literary study (literary theory, literary criticism, and literary history) are so intertwined that it can be said that we cannot imagine the existence of literary theory and history without the need for literary criticism as well. Imagine the existence of literary criticism in isolation from literary theory and literary history, as well as the case with literary history (Willick, 1991), it is the overlapping of these three terms that constitutes, in fact, the solid structure of literary study, as mentioned above. They are terms that combine in order to reach a deeper understanding of literary texts; literary theory gives us general rules, concepts, and assumptions that form for us a deep understanding of the nature of literature itself, its function and its relations in the course of the human sciences. Here we must state the fact that these three sections of literary study combine to serve the literary text between its creator and its recipient.

Accordingly, this section concludes that literary study is based on three main pillars, namely, "literature theory," which deals with the principles, classifications, levels, and general ideas of literature, and "literary criticism," which studies specific literary works to reveal, interpret, and evaluate their aspects. Literary, which is an indispensable basis for tracing the place of the text from other texts and showing its influence and impact. However, these corners cannot be separated from each other, but are always intertwined, and more like colors that unite and mingle in order to create a beautiful artistic painting.

2. Literary theory and literary criticism; approaches

2.1. Literature and criticism

There has been a lot of talk about the relationship between criticism and literature, and we have indicated in the previous section that their relationship appears to be a dependency in the first place. Where literature is prior to criticism, and necessitates it; We do not imagine the emergence of criticism until after the literary work has been established; “Expressing a human’s emotional experience takes precedence over an analysis, tasting, and judgment of it, which is what leads to the claim that literature takes precedence over criticism” (Howaidi,1998), However, many differences can be noted between literature and criticism, on top of which is that criticism revolves around the orbit of science and method, in contrast to “literature that revolves around the orbit of art and does not always comply with the curriculum. On intuition of things, criticism on the contrary; Because it is the precise cultural study of that expression” (Imbert,1991). This does not mean - of course - that there is a separation between literature and criticism, but rather both seem to complement the other and necessitate its presence, and therefore Imbert himself sees that “in every poet lies a critic who helps him to take care of building his poem, and in the depths of every critic a poet teaches him how to sympathize with him from within what he reads” (Ibid, 1991).

2.2. Literary theory and criticism

In the first chapter of this research, we divided the literary study into three main overlapping sections, which are literary theory, literary criticism, and literary history. more overlapping, complex and intertwined; This is because the theory of literature must have within it solid and strong foundations for literary criticism; Literary criticism begins in its study of literary work from a special approach, relying mainly on the general rules and foundations that literary theory frames, meaning that literary theory is a general vision of everything related to literary criticism, which is based on the vision of criticism that is taught in literature. This overlap between the terms “literary theory” and “literary criticism” does not make us take a risk, and we forget that many of those who work in literature were critics and were not theorists, as many were theorists and were not critics; Aristotle, for example, was the author of a literary theory, the theory of purification, which says that literature exists mainly to purify our emotions, but he was not a critic because he did not pursue the application to texts, and in contrast to that, it appears in our theory that “San Historical interpretation of literature(Willick,1991). It is worth noting that most of what we can call theorists or workers in literary theory were critics at the same time; the critic must build or adopt his own theory that motivates his criticism.

If we have decided that literature precedes criticism and thus stimulates it, then criticism, in turn, is an important impetus for the existence of literary theory; It is unimaginable that there is a critic who does not have a general view that deepens and explores literature, and the truth is that every development that takes place in literary theory inevitably reflects on criticism, as well as every development that occurs in literary theory, as well as every evolution that you develop in literary theory. Any literary theory must always be the subject of heated debate; Because it is related to literature and art, which cannot be taken for granted, and therefore K.M. Newton sees that an accurate understanding of any literary theory, whether ancient or modern, does not require knowledge that includes the arguments that I have, but the view that is not the main point of view. It requires possession of other points of view that are alternative positions that differ with that theory, explicitly or implicitly (Newton,1996), In order to demonstrate the correctness of this opinion, it is sufficient for us to go through any literary theory, ancient or modern, to see the amount of controversy that revolved around it. This Plato presents the theory of the world of forms distorted by poetry, which is an old theory, and Aristotle objects to it with his theory of purification And the necessity of looking at poetry in terms of its fulfillment of psychological functions that are necessarily socially reflected, and at a time when the Formalists differ with the Marxists about the necessity of looking at literature as a purely aesthetic structure, We find that the Polish critic Roman Ingarden adopts a new approach that is summarized in the fact that criticism should not be preoccupied with the literary work as a subject nor with

the reader as a subject, but with the fact that the work does not exist except by describing it as a subject; Thus, he adopts the phenomenological approach that focuses on the intentionality of feeling. (Ibid, 1996).

If the matter is on this difference, contrast and conflict, then it is natural that any attempt to monitor the impact of literary theory on modern and contemporary criticism requires a review of the history of literary theory since the Renaissance in Europe and America, which embraced the reference and contemporary efforts in modern criticism and not in our contemporary efforts. When we look historically at this connection Between literary theory and criticism, we need not refer to the ancient Arab efforts in this context; Because we will depart from our study plan, and drown in temporal and spatial comparisons that are not needed here, as the word of quite a few critics agree that the term “modern criticism” began in Europe and America and then ended with the analysis of the literary environment that received the Arab world at the beginning of the century. And by applying and practicing to the texts at other times.

K.M Newton states that the vast majority of readers and critics, prior to the social and political developments of the twentieth century, tended to link texts with their historical context and the intentions of their authors, which means that criticism during the twentieth century and before it was a critique of non-historical changes that carried the twentieth century New forms of critical reading, represented in giving way to modern forms of thinking, such as psychoanalytic criticism theory or feminist theory, And other readings that stem from the interests of the critics and the readers themselves, and they vary between being historical, linguistic, social, biographical, philosophical, psychological, or political. The new, which along with other methods such as Russian Formalism appeared in opposition to the historical method of criticism, then the wide openness in the twentieth century opened the emergence of many opinions saying that the current situation represents a state of “the proliferation of theories” In the words of K.M Newton, and this situation seems to him a natural and healthy, he uses a funny analogy to explain the development that occurred in looking at literature and criticism in the period of the twentieth century, he says:

Thus, perhaps the analogy most able to describe the present position of literary criticism is not that it is made up of a number of separate groups, but that it is like Parliament. It was a small party to which only a minor role was assigned. These two parties were the historical criticism that He emphasized issues such as the text in relation to its age, what the author intended, genre-based views, and the new criticism with its anti-intentionality and its emphasis on the text as a complete intent in itself. What happened to Parliament in the recent period is that this control of the two parties has been threatened; because many small parties have entered Parliament and they prevent any party from achieving a complete majority (Ibid, 1996).

This is how K.M. Newton draws for us the state of criticism at the beginning of the twentieth century; It was based either on history, or on the theory of new criticism that appeared in America. Then, with the succession of developments in life, politics and society, theories began to multiply to the point where many critics circulated phrases, such as: “It is possible that there are theories of literature in proportion to the number of readers” (Ibid, 1996), an opinion that acquires its validity if we look at literary theory from a special angle that focuses on the recipient and his culture, but if we look at it in the general academic framework, not every human being can build on a literary theory The value of his culture, in other words: We accept this phrase on the basis of the strength of the relationship between the reader and the text. But we will not accept it if this relationship is opened from one reader to another reader; Where there is no value for a literary theory that is not based on a solid foundation of literary culture and is engaged in criticism, and at that time it will appear as a crude theory that does not even deserve to be discussed. In the following paragraphs of this study, we will try to focus on the most important literary theories that contributed to the renaissance of modern criticism, as well as historical theory, subject to the impact these theories have had on criticism.

2.3. Russian Formalism Theory

The “Russian Formalism” movement that emerged from the Moscow Linguistic Circle and the Petersburg Society of Literary Language Students is often described as one of the most significant movements in literary

theory in the twentieth century; Terry Eagleton says that the influence of Russian Formalism on literary theory was so great that it can be said that “the meanings of words such as: literature, reading, and criticism, have undergone a profound change” (Eagleton, 1995)

Russian Formalism emerged as a reaction to the dominance of psychological, sociological, historical and ideological approaches on Western literary criticism for a long time, so the study of literature came as a separate aesthetic structure, or a system that includes simple or negative elements that negatively or negatively interact among them (Hamdaoui, 2020).

Russian Formalism appeared between 1915 and 1930, in a historical context that rejected capitalism, and recognized only scientific socialism, which traces its roots back to the writings of Karl Marx, Plekhanov, Hegel, Engels, Georg Lukasz, and other serious dialectical theorists..., Towards linking the literary content with the revolutionary, practical and material reality, and fighting all formal currents and structural tendencies that are concerned with form at the expense of content. Hence, the Russian Formalism was fought for a long time, after the growing role of socialist and leftist literature. Hence, formalism was based on two basic principles:

1- The subject of literature is literary; That is, focusing on the essential characteristics of each literary genre separately.

2- Studying the form in order to understand the content; That is, the formalization of the content, and the rejection of the vulgar duality of form and content.

Accordingly, the researches of the Russian Formalists were theoretical and applied at the same time, and the results of these researches are: the emergence of the Tartu School, which is considered one of the most important Russian semiological schools. A.M. Pentegresc. Their works were collected in a comprehensive book called (Works on Sign Systems... Tartu) (1976 AD). (Newton,1996)

It is important to conclude our discussion of formalism by referring to the most important figures who laid the foundations of this approach with their critical works. The word historians of literature agree that the beginning of Russian Formalism was after the article of the young Russian critic “Shklovsky” labeled “Art as a tool”, and from the Formalist critics who developed the Formal movement Jacobson, as well as Medvedev and Bakhtin. As for Shklovsky’s article, which theorizes of formalism, it focuses on the fact that art renews human perception by finding tools that uproot and undermine the foundations of the usual forms of perception, which means that the task of literature revolves around the pattern. : Habituation preys on work, clothes, furniture, husband, fear of war, and art exists, so that man may regain the sense of life, there is to make man feel things, to make stone “stone”... And the technique of art is to make things strange, to make shapes difficult, The difficulty and length of perception, because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself, and it should be prolonged. Art is a way to test the artistry of a thing, but the thing itself is not of value. (Hamdaoui, 2020)

We notice how Shklovsky presents to us his literary theory, which he termed “Westernization,” in this interesting literary way; The usual language eventually becomes a predator for us, as is the case of getting used to work, clothes, furniture, a husband, and even fear of war, and the function of art here is to create a gap between the ordinary language and the literary language, and to make our awareness of the literary language longer than our normal perception; For there is no value in describing things as they are, but the whole value is in his apprehending these things and presenting them in a new way through language. Thus, it becomes clear to us that Shklovsky established the idea of “Westernization” in literary theory, the idea that the literary work is concerned with undermining the usual forms of perception, and Shklovsky gives us an example from Tolstoy’s literature, which depicts familiar ideas in an unfamiliar way.

2.4. The new criticism theory

New criticism is a form of literary criticism that dominated the literary criticism scene in the period extending from the forties of the last century to its sixties, and John Crowe Ransom had named (New Criticism) on his book, which he issued in 1941, and soon the new criticism became the path taken by the reader. To read

literature and poetry in particular, it found its way into the classrooms of colleges and high schools. Literary criticism, which preceded the new criticism, had used various methods of interpreting and interpreting literature without there being unanimity on a better method; Some critics have adopted a historical viewpoint for evaluating literature in terms of representing the literary products of the historical periods in which they were written or differing from them. As it worked to exclude what the author intended, as it ignored the personal and historical information related to the author, and this criticism focused on the interpretation of literature based on the coherence of the text and not on anything else. The new critic does not care at all what the author aims at; As the form of the literary work leads to the crystallization of new meanings. (1)

We can say that the spatial incubator of the theory of "New Criticism" is America, although the origins of the theory were in Britain with T.S. Elliot and A.A. Richards and in the practice of William Empson, but John Crow Ransom is the greatest theorist of this theory, and he is an American, and we can add Clint Brooks, Alan Tate and Robert Ben Warn, as well as the new criticism is indirectly related to other flags, such as Kenneth Burke, and R.B. Blackmore, and others.

The original aim of the New Criticism in America was to find an alternative to Impressionism and the historical lesson of literature, and so it had some analogies with Russian Formalism; It absolutely rejects the issues that concern the author's intention, but the New Criticism method, unlike the Formalists, sees that it is possible for literature to have knowledge, but it is a knowledge completely different from knowledge in its scientific sense (Newton,1996); That is why they were interested in metaphysical poetry, for example, which presents mythical knowledge, but in a literary form; Where art does not appear to be a clumsy application of knowledge, knowledge comes from it implicitly. Finally, it is worth noting the efforts of two prominent critics of the new criticism: A. A. Richards and Brooks; They agree that the highest forms of poetry embody heterogeneous, or seemingly contradictory elements, but the European Richards was providing a precursor to the new criticism; Where he believes in the reader's emotions, while the American Brooks stresses the study of the poem as an objective structure.

2.5. Chicago Aristotelianism

The Chicago Aristotelian movement was a strong reaction to the emergence of the New Criticism school that we talked about in the previous paragraph, and it is clear that it is inspired by a lot of Aristotle's ideas. Literary, then it dominates it with procedural treatment, so its meaning approaches the meaning of "literature" in its general sense (Murtad, 2009). In other words, poetics is an attempt to divide and naturalize literature. Hence, the Chicago School wanted to revert literary theory to being quasi-historical; They were clearly sympathetic to historical research, but they were - unlike the body of traditional historical critics - concerned with the need for literary criticism to develop a coherent theoretical basis, and thus they tried to show that the kind of formal approach that serious critics liked was not enough; Because he did not take into account the traditional poetics, hence the "Chicago Aristotelianism" had a special focus on the poetics of Aristotle; Because a person should distinguish between the different models of literary discourse, and not treat them as if they were established on identical foundations. (Newton,1996)

An important model in literary theory for the pioneers of the Chicago Aristotelian movement is that article in which Crane attacked the hypothesis of the new criticism, trying to prove that any legitimate criticism needs to combine historical research, demonstrative deduction and practical experience in writing. He says: "Thus, my first complaint from the people who have taken an active interest in the revival of criticism in universities is that a large number of them have done criticism, as well as historical research, a poor service by continuing to speak in the language of contrast between the two, which may have a rhetorical or political justification." (Ibid, 1996). Crane reminds us here of René Willek's claims that the separation between literary history and literary criticism cannot result from the overlap of these two terms with the term literary theory. However, what Crane means here is not literary history as much as history in its academic sense; That is, that which deals with political and social events at a time and place.

2.6. Phenomenological theory and phenomenological criticism

Phenomenology represents a school that relies on the intuitive experience of phenomena as a starting point; That is, what this phenomenon represents in our conscious experience, then proceeding from this experience to analyze the phenomenon and the basis of our knowledge of it. However, it does not claim to arrive at an absolute, abstract truth, whether in metaphysics or in science. Rather, it bets on understanding the pattern of man's presence in the world. Despite the indications of this movement in Hegel, Its true pioneer is the German philosopher Edmund Husserl, who tried to overcome the division between subject and object or between subjective and objective by experiencing feeling and the subject of feeling simultaneously, and looking at feeling as intended, meaning that all states of feeling should be understood intentionally or with a purpose. of a subject, then it is possible to analyze the feeling ostensibly intuitively as an intentional feeling. Roman Ingarden has successfully applied this phenomenology to literature; Where he saw that criticism should not be preoccupied with the literary work as a subject nor with the reader as a subject, but with the fact that the work does not exist except as a subject presented to feeling(Ibid, 1996).

2.7. Marxist theory and Marxist criticism

Marxist literary theory proceeds from the assumption that literature should be understood in relation to historical and social reality. It is causally determined by the economic basis. Perhaps one of the great Marxist critics, Walter Benjamin, who wrote his article "The Artist as a Producer", adopting Marxist theory and trying to apply it to criticism, and he put forward a strange idea in this article, according to which true revolutionary literature must radically sever its connection with traditional forms; For even works that attack capitalism, using traditional techniques, will tend to be mere commodities for the consumption of the bourgeois mass, Indeed, this article exonerates to some extent the accusation that Marxism has neglected aesthetics in literary work in favor of the content that focuses on monitoring the relations of conflict within society; Benjamin clearly states here that true art must carry the revolution in both its form and content. There is no need here to mention the extent to which Marx's philosophy influenced the emergence of literary sects in themselves that pursue writing according to its principles, even with minor modifications, such as materialistic realism and socialist realism.(Hilal, 1997)

Returning to Raman Selden in his book "Contemporary Literary Theory", we will find that he considers the Hungarian critic Georg Lukács the first prominent Marxist critic, and that his work is inseparable from socialist realism, with his development of a realistic literary view, as he was inclined to the Marxist side; He viewed the works as a reflection of a gradually unfolding pattern, and held that a realistic literary work must reveal the pattern of contradictions that underlie a particular social order, and his view remained Marxist in its (literary) urgency.(Selden,1998)

2.8. Psychoanalytic theories

The interpretation of literature on a psychological basis is based on the theory of "Sigmund Freud" in psychoanalysis; It is the theory that he applied in his famous analysis of the novel (Krad Yevia Jensen) in his book (Delirium and Dreams), and in this analysis he looks at the importance of the role of art as a psychological reference. Freud's theory holds that the human soul is composed of the ego, the superego, and the id; As for the ego, it is the outward aspect of the personality; It is an aspect that is affected by unconscious factors on the one hand, and the real world on the other hand; In the real world we find society with its traditions, laws, relations and individuals, and we also find in it times, places and things, and the various influences that we perceive with our senses and are affected by them in a way that enables us to recover them in our next experience. The growth of the ego progresses with the progress of the person's growth in his specific environment, as if the ego is distinguished from the instinctive vital energy after this connection with reality. As for the higher self (or the superego), it is formed from childhood; Because the child weighs and values things and things according to the estimation of his father or who lives with him and under his guidance. The child may admire his father in love with him; Because he combines the two manifestations

of strength and kindness, so he takes on the reincarnation of his personality, which results in him directing the behavior of himself and directing the behavior of others. More precisely, he has in himself an aspect that represents an element of absorbing power, and he is the one who carries out the process of reprimand and reprimand. The main characteristics of the super-ego are summarized in the fact that it is the supreme moral critic who makes the ego feel sinful. Finally, comes the third element: the id; The formation of both the ego and the superego does not eliminate the basic sources of instinctive motives, but these remain alive and motivated to express themselves, and only the superego, and to some extent the ego, prevents them from expressing themselves. Freud believes that this aspect plays an important role in human life, and he calls it God, and one of its characteristics is that it is unconscious, and that it does not go according to moral principles, but rather proceeds on the basis of achieving pleasure and avoiding pain, then it does not adhere to the limitations of logical reasoning, and its innate instincts and values. and repressed, and it is said - according to Freud's opinion: that the most important of these compounds is sexual orientation. (Ismail, 2013)

Among the critical efforts in the field of psychoanalysis are those of Jacques Lacan, who developed Freud's theory and had a literary interpretation based on the stages of child development; Where he sees that the child in his first months feels both himself and the surroundings around him, that each of them is a fragmented, random entity that has no form, and in fact the child does not distinguish himself from his surroundings, and he does not know that the members of his body in particular are parts of his body; Because he has no sense of himself to be able to comprehend such. Lacan then calls the stage that occurs in the period between the sixth and eighth months of a child's life as "the mirror phase", and whether the child looks at himself in a real mirror or sees himself through his mother's reactions to him, the issue is that the child forms a sense of himself as an entity whole, rather than a fragmented, formless entity. Lacan claims that the "mirror stage" is a prelude to what he calls the "imagination system", by which he means the world of images, a world that is not imaginary, but rather the world of perception, which the child perceives through images and not through words. As for the child's acquisition of language, according to Lacan, it means several important things. He refers to it as an entry into the system of symbols; For language is first and foremost a meaningful system of symbols; That is, it is a system of symbols that seeks to make meanings, and the greatest separation is the separation from the close union that the child experienced with his mother during his immersion in the world of imagination; Where Lacan sees that this separation constitutes one of the most important experiences of loss for man, as it will haunt him throughout his life; to look for alternative things, whether they are important or not; In order to make up for the lost union he lived with his mother, he will spend his life subconsciously tracing him in the system of symbols, which is language, which will later take shape for him in literary and allegorical forms⁽²⁾.

2.9. Feminist critical theory

There are many definitions of feminist criticism; It is defined as criticism that deals with works that talk about women, whether the writer is a man or a woman. It makes use of psychological and Marxist theory, and post-structuralist theories in general; So it is multi-directional. The essence of the idea of literary criticism or its philosophy in the women's movement is the injustice that women have faced - according to the movement's belief - throughout its long history, whether in the creative field - that is: the writings of the woman herself - or in the field of criticism if she does not have the opportunity to express her critical opinions. Which may be contrary to the point of view of the man, or in what literature and criticism have led to in consolidating the old conditions of women in society. With regard to the idea of historically feeling the oppression of women, the conception presented by the women's movement expresses its rejection of sex in its traditional form; Which: The concept of women is a source of pleasure, beauty, or charm. This is in the opinion of some of the movement's leaders; Like "Naomi Wolf", the author of the book "The Legend of Beauty", it was one of the pretexts that men deceive women and exploit them throughout the ages. This was behind the idea of questioning literature and criticism as it is theoretical; With the aim of moving

towards the real liberation of women, “Mary Eagleton” summarizes this in her book “Women’s Literary Criticism” published in 1992; Where you see that women have long been subject to the patriarchal theories put forward by men, and they prove that they are inferior to men.(Al-Qaoud, 2010)

2.10. Reception theory (reader response)

This theory focuses on the role of the reader who cannot be neglected, who was not absent before but was present as a consumer of literature and not as a producer or partner in its production. same different readings The researchers of this theory believe that the reader’s understanding of a particular text varies according to different occasions and times, and the knowledge he may acquire between one reading and another may illuminate dark sides of the text that he did not find during his first reading. related to it; Such as the reader’s reciprocal response theory, emotional stylistics, and the reader’s psychological and social response. The use of this term critically refers to the relationship between the text and the reader, and between the reader and the text, and confirms the different and important aspects that the reader contributes to while reading the text, in addition to the various visions that he makes in this reading process. About the text, from the likes of Formalism and New Criticism; where the role of the reader is marginalized; Because the text is the center and the starting point. Among the most important figures who founded the theory of criticism are Yaos and Ezer. Both of them have stated on more than one occasion that the receiving approach is not based on the exclusion of the previous critical approaches, but rather works on investing them and overcoming their shortcomings at the same time. Thus, the theory of reception turned from the field of literary criticism to the field of criticism criticism, or - in the words of Dr. Hamid Al-Hamidani - from the field of knowledge to the field of knowledge knowledge. We can point out in this regard that Yaos did not underestimate the importance of the formal conception of literature, especially Tinyanov’s talk about the concept of literary development; Where he admitted that the credit for renewing the understanding of literature historically belongs to the Formalists, Although this understanding does not take place within the framework of realizing the literary work in its historical process, which is represented in its social function and the influence that readers constantly exercise.⁽³⁾

2.11. Structural critical theory

Structuralism is one of the methods of criticism that is concerned with literature. Because literature is one of the primary means of understanding the world around us, it is a method of analysis that makes literature a field of study. Structuralism attempts to understand the text, and focuses on its access to what it means. What is meant to it is “intentionality.” In its literary dealings, it focuses on three fields; The first is the classification of literary genres, the second is the analysis of narrative processes, and the third is the analysis of literary interpretation.

Among the structural theories is the theory of literary genres, developed by the critic Northrop Frye, who called it “myth theory.” It seeks to understand the structural principles upon which Western literature is based. Structural critic Jonathan Kahler developed the theory of the “structure of literary interpretation”, in which he believes that the structural system that governs both the writing and interpretation of literary texts is nothing but a system of laws and codes that we consciously or unconsciously possess, which help literature to understand texts; For the stories of fairies and magic that people regard as fairy tales should not be taken literally; Because those laws and codes applied by two qualified readers do not lead to one understanding at all, but according to their interpretations they understand the text. In order to trace the emergence and development of structuralism and its most important tributaries, we use what Hussein al-Wad said in his book titled: (Readings in the Curriculum of Literary Studies): “In the middle of this century, the structural method arose from the spread of the gains of linguistics and its familiarity with modern linguistics.” This means that the structural school, or the structural approach, did not appear in the literary criticism arena until the middle of the twentieth century, following the spread of modern linguistics and its intersection with formalism. However, we can observe their points of difference, Mainly represented in the fact that the

latter laid the foundations of the difference between form and content, calling for more attention to form at the expense of content. As for structuralism, it tried to integrate form with content and signifier in meaning (meaning); Because one signifier must produce different connotations for two different people or recipients, according to individual experiences. Accordingly, the text becomes one and the readings are multiple. Many scholars and critics have also agreed that formalism and structuralism have emerged together as a reaction against romantic irrationality and analyzes that link literature to its social environment. We mean Marxism in the first place, here. Among the notable structural criticism in the West, we find Plekhanov, Roland Barth, Tzvetan Todorov, Gérard Genet and others.(Al-Kiri, 2015) We would like to conclude this brief presentation of the most important critical approaches with structuralism. Because it was a crucial stage in the development of many later literary theories, and it suffices to note here that K.M. Newton divided his book on literary theories of the twentieth century into two parts, the first of which revolves around the pre-structural stage, while the second revolves around all subsequent theories.(⁴)

2.12. Post-Structural Theories

After the structural hegemony, critical literary theories emerged, known as “post-structuralism” theories. The terms that came to express the post-structural stage can be summarized in four: meta-structuralism, post-structuralism, and deconstructivism. (Raman Selden) defines the critical position of post-structuralism by following up the effectiveness of continuous functions in the formation of chains and intersecting streams of meaning with other functions, and this position has discovered the unstable nature in the semantic process. Cognitive in the humanities and social sciences, as well as identifying - that is, Selden - post-structuralism as several theories, including (Barth, Julia, Lacan, Derrida, Foucault, and Edward Said), Not to mention that there are those who have studied post-structural data within what are known as discourse theories, starting from the idea that post-structuralism uses discourse instead of logic as the criterion of basic meaning. It should be noted here that Jacques Derrida’s lecture, entitled: (Structure, sign, play in the discourse of the human sciences), was an introduction to the emergence of post-structuralist theories, and the new term that replaced structuralism became (deconstruction)(Saad Allah, 2005).

Conclusion

This research observed the relationship between the concepts of “literary theory” and “literary criticism”, and the crisis in which critics and writers alike fell in trying to understand and analyze these two terms the way they were used and how they were defined. The research concluded that there is a conflict in using, understanding and adopting these terms in research writing. It was also found out that this conflict is due to the association of these terms with cultural reception and literary traditions in every environment that receives the term, and the extent of interaction of those terms with the experiences of researchers and readers. Another reason is that most of these terms came to us from Europe, which in turn, took them from the Greek and Latin cultures. This caused a defect in the translation. Critics and writers, during the literary study, differed on basic concepts and this required them to go through these concepts, define and comment on them, such as the concept of literature itself, creativity, reception, criticism, literary history, literary schools, and others. The terminology crisis is one of the most important crises that cast a shadow over literary and critical research. There is also a disagreement on the concepts related to the theory of literature that inevitably leads to a disagreement on the definition of criticism; if literature is a matter of disagreement, not unanimity, criticism will be the same as latter follows the former. Before defining the theory of literature and literary criticism, we must precede by discussing the concept of “literary study” first, which is a concept that represents a large incubator for everything that can be said about the theory of literature or literary criticism. The research also found that the literary study is based on three main pillars: Firstly, “Theory of literature” which deals with the principles, classifications, levels and general ideas of literature. Secondly, “literary criticism”, which studies specific literary works in order to interpret, corrects and reveals their aspects. Thirdly, “literary history” which is important to trace a given text and to show its impact on other texts.

Bionotes

Abdullah Mahmoud Ibrahim is an Associate Professor of Arabic literature in the Department of Arabic language and literature at the University of Jordan. He obtained his PhD from at the University of Jordan. His area of research is literary criticism, and literary studies. During his career he held many administrative positions like Assistant Dean for Cultural Affairs, School of Arts, University of Jordan.

Chairman, Department of Arabic Language and Literature. University of Jordan, Jordan.

He has many published researches.

Ismail Almazaydah is an Associate Professor of Arabic literature and criticism in the Department of Arabic language and literature at the University of Jordan. He obtained his PhD from Mutah University in Jordan. His area of research is literary criticism, comparative literature and literary studies. During his career he held many administrative positions like Advisor to the President of the University of Jordan for Cultural Affairs, Head of the Cultural Forum at the University of Jordan, and Dean of Student Affairs. He has many published research papers, books and poetry collections. His research interests focus on literary theory, modern Arabic poetry, and comparative literature.

Areej Allawzi is an associate professor of translation and cultural studies in the Department of English at the University of Jordan. She obtained her PhD from Durham University in The United Kingdom. Her area of research is translation theories, comparative studies, translation in conflicts, ideology and media discourse analysis and postcolonial translation. Allawzi's most recent publication is 'Translation as a political action: reframing 'the deal of the century' in the translations of the BBC', 'Building Translator-Oriented English-Arabic Physics Glossary from Domain Corpus'.

References

- Al-Kiri, H. (2015). Structuralism in Literary Criticism, an article in the newspaper "Around the Corner".
- Alloush, S. (1985). Dictionary of Contemporary Literary Terms, 1st Edition, Lebanese Book House, Beirut.
- Al-Qaoud, H.M. (2010). Journal of Islamic Literature, Issue (66) .
- Amin, A. (1952). Literary Criticism, Authoring, Translation and Publishing Committee, Cairo.
- Eagleton, T. (1995). Literary Theory, translated by: Thaer Theeb, International Critical Studies Series.
- Hamdaoui, J. (2020). The Formalist Theory in Literature, Criticism and Art, first edition, Dar El-Reef for printing and electronic publishing, Nador, Tetouan, Morocco.
- Hayman, S. (1958). Literary Criticism and Its Modern Schools, translated by: Ihsan Abbas and Muhammad Youssef Najm, House of Culture, Beirut, 8 vol. 1.
- Hegazy, S. (2004). Literary Theory and its Modern Terminology (An Analytical Linguistic Study), Dar Tiba, Cairo.
- Hilal, M. G. (1997). Modern Literary Criticism, Nahdet Misr Library, Cairo.
- Howaidi, S. (1998). Modern Literary Criticism: Its Cases and Methods, 1st Edition, April 7th University Publications.
- Imbert, E. A. (1991). Literary Criticism Methods, translated by: Al-Taher Ahmed Makki, Library of Arts, Cairo.
- Ismail, I. (2013). Literature and its Arts: Study and Criticism, Dar al-Fikr al-Arabi.
- Lulu'a, A. W. (1983). Encyclopedia of Critical Terminology, 2nd Edition, The Arab Institute for Studies and Publishing, Beirut.
- Muhammad Al-Qasimi, Reading and Interpretation in Modern Literary Criticism, electronic blog.
- Murtad, A. (2009). Poetics Issues, Dar al-Quds al-Arabi for Publishing and Distribution, Algeria.
- Newton, K.M. (1996). Theory of Literature in the Twentieth Century, translated by: Issa Ali Al-Ka`ub, 1st Edition, Ain for Human Studies.
- Saad Allah, M. S. (2005). the term "Post-Structuralism: From Formation to Problematic", an electronic article in the Levant Writers Association.
- Selden, R. (1999). Contemporary Literary Theory, translated by: Jaber Asfour, Dar Qubaa.
- Willick, R. (1987). Critical Concepts, translated by: Muhammad Asfour, The World of Knowledge Series, Kuwait, 110.
- Willick, R. (1991). Theory of Literature, translated by: Adel Salama, Al-Marrikh Publishing House, Riyadh.