
A Generative Basic Metrical Analysis of English and Arabic Metrical Verse

Submitted by

Mursi H. Ali

Lecturer in English, Faculty of Arts, Port Said University





Romanization

Consonants			
Arabic	Roman	Arabic	Roman
ء	'	ب	b
ت	t	ث	th
ج	j	ح	h
خ	kh	د	d
ذ	th	ر	r
ز	z	س	s
ش	sh	ص	s
ض	d	ط	t
ظ	z	ع	c
غ	gh	ف	f
ق	q	ك	k
ل	l	م	m
ن	n	هـ	h
و	w	ي	y
ا	a	ة	a(t)

Vowels	
Arabic	Roman
وُ	ū
يِ	ī
اَ	ā

Diacritics	
Arabic	Roman
ُ	u
ُ	un
ِ	i
ِ	in
َ	a
َ	an

1. Theoretical basis

Challenging it is to start off a metrical analysis with a new approach after many a theory from various disciplines has already been proposed. This is why no new theory is suggested or applied, from elsewhere, in this study; rather, a serious attempt to foreground the core concepts of metrical variations and/or deviations of English and Arabic metrical systems and to minimize the diverse theoretical efforts, exerted by prosodists, is intended. It is into the discipline of generative metrics that this tentative framework of analysis should be incorporated, for it moves in the direction of defining meters through a set of generative¹ rules and conditions, not through listing meters and describing them in detail (see Youmans, 1989). Still, the



framework of analysis recommended here sparingly uses the generative metrics apparatus formerly introduced as it seeks to spell out the metrical principles and parameters delineating the contrastive contours of English and Arabic metrics.

The present framework benefits from the generative metrical analyses introduced by Halle and Keyser (1966; see also Fabb & Halle, 2008) and further developed by Kiparsky and Youmans (1989; see also Kiparsky, 2006; Youmans, 2006), the optimality theory developed by Prince and Smolensky (2004), and Prince's (1989) promising universal generative theory applied to the quantitative verse of Greek and Arabic. It also makes use of the insightful outlining of basic feet and their variations as enlisted by traditional metrical studies such as those by Hamer (1969), McAuley (1966), Malof (1970), and Saintsbury (1930). Yet, as a parallel line following or meeting its counterpart, if at all, this research program follows the previous to make its own way.²²¹ Its basic concern is with a formal analytical approach to prosody with an accessible generative basis, formed from within the metrical systems under investigation, and not imposed upon them from elsewhere. This is why it also avoids discussing such Arabic tentative theories as 'al-Kātib's and Mustajr's mathematical approaches to Arabic prosody (أحمد مستجير، 1987; أحمد مستجير، 1980; محمد طارق الكاتب، 1391 AH/ 1971 AD) or Abdel-Malek's "generative" approach (Abdel-Malek, 1996) because they and many others (e.g., سليمان أبو ستة، 1992; سيد البحر اوي، 1993; عبد الصاحب المختار، 1985; محمد رجائي، 1996) have



attempted to replace the classical Arabic theory, which is not the objective of the present study.

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

2. Setting the form: Tripartite–Basis Principle

Boeckx (2006) reasoned that Chomsky, when labelling his research work a program rather than a theory, “means that minimalism asks questions



and follows guidelines that are broad enough to be pursued in a great many directions” (p. 5). That is typically the genuine source of its powerful flexibility. Canonically, the first minimalist metrical question of every ambitious program with a universal outlook is the identification of the metrical type, to which a given verse belongs. To do so, the present research enterprise overlooks the metrical/non-metrical discussion,²²¹ and focuses only on the analysis of metrical verse. Then, it develops to encompass the types of metrical verse.

Metrical verse branches out into (a) simple types, formed by only one element of rhythm (e.g., accentual verse), and (b) compound types, modelled out of two elements (e.g., accentual-syllabic verse). The subcategories of simple-compound verse types are of two main kinds: the quantitative that employs syllable weight, and the qualitative that activates stress and/or other elements. Correspondingly, the four types of metrical systems, categorized by Fussell (1979; viz., syllabic, accentual, accentual-syllabic, & quantitative; pp. 6-16), are subsumed under the quantitative-qualitative classification (for the various types and categories of metrical verse, see Table 1).

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



Table 1
Types and Categories of Metrical Verse

	Types of metrical verse	
	Simple	Compound
Qualitative categories	Accentual	Accentual–Syllabic
	Syllabic	Quantitative–Syllabic, ^b ...
Quantitative categories ^a	Quantitative,

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

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

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

^bThis category is suggested to describe the metrical system of Arabic.

In this regard, a metrical verse is formed through the integration of these three levels. Metrical analysis, in turn, has to address all these levels to



determine whether a given metrical system is (a) simple or compound, (b) quantitative or qualitative, and (c) syllabic, accentual, quantitative, accentual–syllabic, or quantitative–syllabic. The respective threefold question can be roughly phrased as the Tripartite–Basis Principle.

(1) Tripartite–Basis Principle

Every metrical verse system has a tripartite basis of form.

3. Norm and anomalies: Bipartite Principles

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

(2) Bipartite–Basis Regularity Principle

Every compound metrical verse type has a bipartite basis of metrical regularity.



(3) Bipartite–Branching Variation/Deviation Principle

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

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

Similarly, Arabic prosodic system has some metrical variations of the kind of *ziḥāf* زحاف, pseudo-*ziḥāf* الزحاف مجرى, *cilal* عِلل, and pseudo-*cilal* العِلل مجرى on the quantitative level; other variations such as those of *majzū'* مجزوء, *mashtūr* مشطور, and *manhūk* منهوك meters make their way to poems on the syllabic level. Otherwise, tokens of *ziḥāf* or *cilal*, which are uncanonical in a designated *baḥr* بحر, are considered *kusūr* كسور or quantitative deviations. Instances of line-length



variations, which are not recorded by early Classical Arabic metrists, could be treated as syllabic deviations.¹

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

Table 2
Metrical Variations/Deviations of English and Arabic Verse

	Types of metrical variations/deviations		
	Syllabic	Accentual	Quantitative, ...
English metrical system	- substitution, - deletion, ... & - monometer, - diameter, ...	- promotion, - demotion, ...	
Arabic metrical system	- مجزوء majzū, - مشطور mashtūr, - منهوك manhūk		- زحاف zihāf, - عِلّ تجري pseudo-zihāf, - مجرى الزحاف, - عِلّ cilal, - زحاف تجري pseudo-cilal, - مجرى العِلّ



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

Table 3

Variations/Deviations of Compound Metrical Systems

Metrical systems ^a	Types of metrical variations/deviations		
	Syllabic	Accentual	Quantitative
Metrical system X	Named categories, if any	Named categories, if any	Named categories, if any
Metrical system Y, ...	Named categories, if any	Named categories, if any	Named categories, if any

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

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

4. Analysis

The following is a detailed metrical analysis of Ezra Pound's "The Fault of It" (1991, p. 43) and Bishārā(t) 'al-Khūrī's "أغصاضة يا روض" (بشارة)



(الخوري الأخطل الصغير, 1953, p. 110), intended to examine the applicability of the generative basic analysis of English and Arabic verse proposed. The framework of analysis applied here¹ puts the given verse line in bold in the first line while the second line is left for the base level of analysis, where phonetic transcription divides words into basic prosodic units, whether English syllables or Arabic 'asbāb أسباب and 'awtād أوتاد that form feet or tafācīl تفاعيل, ending each in a period. To be foregrounded as the essential prosodic components of each system, English stressed syllables and Arabic 'awtād are marked by a conventional straight single quote and underlining, respectively. English metrical variations and/or deviations and Arabic zihāf and cilal are indicated in English syllables and Arabic 'asbāb and 'awtād by a question mark. The third line is for the top level of analysis that represents English feet (by the symbols /&x for stressed & unstressed syllables) or Arabic tafācīl, and demarcates them by a vertical bar. Single parentheses enclose a modulated foot to indicate that English metrical variations and Arabic zihāf are inherently optional. Double parentheses are used with Arabic cilal and pseudo-cilal while brackets are generally for an offbeat foot or an odd variation in both systems, as introduced below.

(Sample A)

Some may have blamed us that we cease to speak

sʌm 'meɪ?. həv 'bleɪmd. ʌs 'ðæt?. wi: 'si:s. tə 'spi:k



(x /) | x / | (x /) | x / | x /

Of things we spoke of in our verses early,

əv 'θɪŋz. wi: 'spəʊk. əv 'm?. aʊə 'vɜ:s. ɪz 'z:. li?

x / | x / | (x /) | x / | x / | (x /)

Saying: a lovely voice is such and such;

'seɪ? ɪŋ. ə 'lʌv. li 'vɔ:s. ɪz 'sʌtʃ?. ən 'sʌtʃ?

[/ x] | x / | x / | (x /) | (x /)

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

'seɪ? ɪŋ. ðæt 'eɪ?. 'leɪ? diz. aɪz 'weə. 'sæd lɑ:st 'wi:k?

[/ x] | (x /) | [/ x] | x / | [/ x /]

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

weə'rɪm. ðə 'wɜ:ldz. həʊl 'dʒɔɪ. ɪz 'bɔ:n. ən 'daɪz

x / | x / | x / | x / | x /

Saying: she hath this way or that, this much

'seɪ? ɪŋ. ʃɪ 'hæθ. ðɪs'weɪ. ə 'ðæt?. ðɪs'mʌtʃ



[/ x] | x / | x / | (x /) | x /

Of grace, this little mesericorde;

əv 'greɪs. ðɪs 'lɪt. ɪ 'mɪz. rɪ? 'kəʊd

x / | x / | x / | (x /)

Ask us no further word;

ɑ:sk 'ʌs?. nə 'fɜ:. ðə 'wɜ:ld

(x /) | x / | x /

If we were proud, then proud to be so wise

ɪf 'wi: wɜ: 'praʊd. ðen 'praʊd. tə 'bi:. səʊ 'waɪz

x / | x / | x / | x / | x /

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

ɑ:sk 'ʌs?. nə 'mɔ:. əv 'ɔ:l?. ðə 'θɪŋz. jɪ 'hɜ:d

(x /) | x / | (x /) | x / | x /

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

wɪ: 'meɪ?. nɒt 'spi:k. əv 'ðem?. ðeɪ'tʌtʃ. əs 'niə. li

(x /) | x / | (x /) | x / | x / | x /



(Pound, 1991, p. 43)

(Sample B)

وَأَطِلْ إِلَى مَا شِئْتَ صَدَّكَ

وَأَطِلْ إِلَى مَا؟ شَيْءٌ تَصَدُّ ذَلِكَ

متفاعِلن | ((مستفعلاتن))

م بِمُهْجَتِي فَخَنَّمْتُ بَعْدَكَ

مِبِّ مَهْ جَتِي. فَخَ تَمُّ تَبَعُ ذَلِكَ

متفاعِلن | ((مستفعلاتن))

كِ وَقَدْ أَعْرَتِ الْفَجْرَ خَذَّكَ

كِيَوْ قَدْ أَعْر. تَلُّ؟ فَخَ رَخَذُ ذَلِكَ

متفاعِلن | ((مستفعلاتن))

م وَقَدْ خَلَعْتَ عَلَيْهِ بُرْدَكَ

مِوَقَدْ خَلَع. تَع لِي هِبْرُ ذَلِكَ

متفاعِلن | ((متفاعلاتن))

م وَقَدْ أَبَحْتَ الْكَاسَ شَهْدَكَ

مِوَقَدْ أَبَح. تَلُّ؟ كَأ سَشَهْ ذَلِكَ

متفاعِلن | ((مستفعلاتن))

ت، أَمَا رَأَتْ عَيْنَاكَ قَدَّكَ

تَأ مَا رَأَتْ. عِي؟ نَأ كَفَدُ ذَلِكَ

متفاعِلن | ((مستفعلاتن))

تَكَا وَمِنْ عَيْنِي مَهْدَكَ

تَكْ أَنْ وَمِنْ. عِي؟ نِي يَمَهْ ذَلِكَ

متفاعِلن | ((مستفعلاتن))

وَرَفَعْتَ فَوْقَ الْعَرْشِ بِنْدَكَ

وَرَفَع تَفَوْ. قَلُّ؟ عَر شِبِنْ ذَلِكَ

متفاعِلن | ((مستفعلاتن))

عِشْ أَنْتِ. إِنِّي مُتَّ بَعْدَكَ

عِشْ؟ أَنْ تَان. نِي؟ مُتَّ تَبِعُ ذَلِكَ

((مستفعلن)) | ((مستفعلاتن))

كَأَنْتِ بَقَايَا لِلْغَرَا

كَأ؟ نَنْتِ بَقَا. يَا؟ لِلْ غَرَا

((مستفعلن)) | ((مستفعلن))

أَنْقَى مِنْ الْفَجْرِ الضُّحُو

أَنْ؟ قِي مِئَل. فَخَ؟ رِضْ ضَحُو

((مستفعلن)) | ((مستفعلن))

وَأَرْقُ مِنْ طَبِيعِ النَّسِيدِ

وَأَرْقُ فَمِنْ. طَبِ؟ عِنْ نَسِي

متفاعِلن | ((مستفعلن))

وَأَلْدُ مِنْ كَأْسِ النَّدِيدِ

وَأَلْدُ دَمِنْ. كَأ؟ سِنْ نَدِي

متفاعِلن | ((مستفعلن))

مَا كَانَ ضَرْكَ لَوْ عَدَلْ

مَا؟ كَأ نَضْر. رَكْ لَوْ عَدَلْ

((مستفعلن)) | ((متفاعِلن))

وَجَعَلْتَ مِنْ جَفْنِي مُدْ

وَجَعَلْ عَلْ تَمِنْ. جَفْ؟ نِي يَمْتْ

متفاعِلن | ((مستفعلن))

وَرَفَعْتَ بِي عَرْشَ الْهَوَى

وَرَفَع تَبِي. عَر؟ شَلْ هَوَى

متفاعِلن | ((مستفعلن))



ن، تَلَمَّنْتَنِي وَتَلَمَّتْ حَدَّكَ

نَتَّ لَمْ تَنِّي. وَتَ لَمْ تَحْدُ ذَلِكَ
متفاعِلن | (متفاعِلتن))
قَلَّكَ كَأَنَّ أَوْلَى أَنْ يَصُدَّكَ
قَلَّكَ كَأَنَّ أَوْلَى أَنْ يَصُدَّكَ
متفاعِلن | (مستفاعِلتن))

أَنَا شَأَقْنِي فَسَمَّمْتُ وَرَدَّكَ
أَنْ شَأَقْنِي. فَشَأَقْنِي مِمَّ ثَوْرُ ذَلِكَ
متفاعِلن | (متفاعِلتن))
أَنَا رَأَقْنِي فَأَمَمْتُ وَرَدَّكَ

أَنْ رَأَقْنِي. فَأَمَمْتُ ثَوْرُ ذَلِكَ
متفاعِلن | (متفاعِلتن))

دِي مِثْلَمَا الْقُرْآنُ عِنْدَكَ

دِي؟ مِثْلَمَا لَمْ. قُرْ؟ أَمْ نَعْنُ ذَلِكَ
مستفاعِلن | (مستفاعِلتن))
رَقَهَا وَلَمْ تَبْلُغْ أَشَدَّكَ

رَقْ؟ هَأَ وَلَمْ. تَبْ؟ لَغْ أَشَدُّ ذَلِكَ
مستفاعِلن | (مستفاعِلتن))
يَوْمَ الْفِرَاقِ لِنَسْتَرِدَّكَ

يَوْمَ؟ مَلْ فِرَأَ. قَلِ تَسْ تَرِدُ ذَلِكَ
مستفاعِلن | (متفاعِلتن))
بِي يَوْمَ قِيلَ خَفَرْتَ عَهْدَكَ

بِي؟ يَوْمَ مَقِي. لَخْ فَرَّ نَعَهُ ذَلِكَ
مستفاعِلن | (متفاعِلتن))

يَا مَنْ أَسَاءَ بِي الظُّنُّ

يَا؟ مَنْ أَسَاءَ. أَبِ يَطَّ ظُنُّ
مستفاعِلن | (متفاعِلتن))
إِنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ أَدْبِي، فَخَلَّ
إِنْ؟ لَمْ يَكُنْ. أَدْبِي فَخَلَّ
مستفاعِلن | (متفاعِلتن))

أَعْضَاصَةً يَا رَوْضُ إِنْ
أَعْضَا صَاتَنُ. يَا؟ رَوْضَانِ
متفاعِلن | (مستفاعِلتن))
وَمَلَأَمَةً يَا قَطْرُ إِنْ

وَمَ لَا مَتَّنُ. يَا؟ قَطْرُ إِنْ
متفاعِلن | (مستفاعِلتن))

وَحَيَاةِ عَيْنِكَ وَهِيَ عِنْدُ

وَحَ يَا تَعِي. نِكَ وَهَ يِعْنُ دِي
متفاعِلن | (متفاعِلتن))
مَا قَلْبُ أَمَكِ إِنْ تَفَأَ

مَا؟ قَلْبُ بَأَم. مِكِ إِنْ تَفَأَ
مستفاعِلن | (متفاعِلتن))
فَهَوْتُ عَلَيْكَ بِصَدْرِهَا

فَهَ وَتُ عَلِي. كَبِ صَدْرُهَا
متفاعِلن | (متفاعِلتن))
بِأَشَدِّ مِنْ خَفَقَانَ قَلْدُ

بِأَشَدِّ دَمِينُ. خَفَ قَا نَقْلُ
متفاعِلن | (متفاعِلتن))

٥



(بشارة الخوري الأخطل الصغير (1953, p. 110)

In Sample A, the metrical analysis reveals that the dominant foot of Pound's poem is the iambic that consists of two syllables, the first of which is unstressed and the second is stressed. In terms of the Tripartite-Basis Principle, this disyllabic foot defines the three levels of metrical analysis in a bottom-up manner: It displays that (a) the poem belongs to the accentual-syllabic verse type, which is (b) a qualitative verse category, grouped under (c) compound metrical verse types. Typical of compound metrical verse types, the prosodic system here is designed on the Bipartite-Basis Regularity Principle and the Bipartite-Branching Variation/Deviation Principle inasmuch as the collaboration of stress pattern and syllable count in each verse line establishes its metrical regularity, and inasmuch as its metrical variations and/or deviations are evident on the corresponding accentual and syllabic levels. Thus, promotion of normally unstressed monosyllabic words (e.g., "in" l. 2, "a" l. 4, "us" l. 8) are accentual variations; trochaic feet (e.g., l. 3, 4, & 6) are offbeats or accentual deviations, especially when their number in the same verse line is taken into consideration (l. 4). Cretic foot (/ x /, l. 4) is also an accentual deviation. In addition to the deletion of the second syllable of "mesericorde" (l. 7), syllabic variations of the pentameter pattern of the poem occur four times, where an extra final syllable flashes in two (ll. 2 & 11) and a trimeter appears in the others (ll. 7 & 8).



In Sample B, 'al-Khūrī's poem is written on the Arabic baḥr called 'al-kamil الكامل, which is formed by متفاعلن-متفاعلن in each shaṭr شطر. With respect to the bottom-up application of the Tripartite-Basis Principle, the prosodic system of this metrical poem is (a) that of a quantitative-syllabic verse type, in which the prosodic pattern is based on the kind of syllable length (or syllable weight) governed by syllable count. It is (b) a qualitative verse category, classified under (c) compound metrical verse types. Regarding the Bipartite Principles, its metrical regularity and variation and/or deviation manifest themselves on both quantitative and syllabic levels. So, regularity is evidenced by the quantitative-syllabic pattern that runs throughout, in the spite of the quantitative variation of the zihāf called 'al-idmār (i.e., to turn the second mūtaharik متحرك into a sākin ساكن, & change متفاعلن into مستفعلن) that appears in every verse line.¹ The other dominant accentual variation here is the cila called 'at-tarfīl الترفيل (i.e., to add a sababkhaff سبب خفيف at the end of the watad majmūc الوتد المجموع, & change متفاعلن into متفاعلاتن) that is used in 'ad-dārb الضرب all throughout, as ought to be. As for syllabic variations, the poem is modelled on the form of majzū' مجزوء الكامل. المرفل. Finally, no tokens of metrical deviation are recorded in either level.

In this regard, the two poems selected here prove that they are true representative specimen of English and Arabic prosodic systems, for they follow their respective metrical pattern in terms of regularity, variation, and deviation. They also convey that the different conception of such terms in



English and Arabic verse is the genuine cause of differences between the two prosodic systems. Notably, the straightforward application of the generative framework of analysis suggested and the intelligible results elicited show how the new framework could be promising.

4. Conclusion

The significance of generative metrics is that it keeps the core concept of prosodic systems intact, and clearly spells them out. This proposed framework of analysis is, thus, only a way of rewording the basic crux of English and Arabic prosodic systems and rendering a refined, contrastive theoretical machinery that is simplified, yet comprehensible, and applicable to both. It suggests the Tripartite–Basis Principle to describe the form of metrical verse, then sorts out the manifestations of metrical regularity and variations and/or deviations of English and Arabic metrical verse through the Bipartite–Basis Regularity Principle and the Bipartite–Branching Variation/Deviation Principle, respectively. The argument is even carried on to propose a universal framework of analysis, hopefully, suitable for different compound types of metrical verse and their respective types and categories of metrical regularity, variation, and deviation. The entire framework is finally applied in a generative metrical analysis of Ezra Pound’s “The Fault of It” (1991, p. 43) and Bishārā(t) 'al-Khūrī's “أغضاضةً يا روض” (بشارة الخوري الأخطل) (الصغير, 1953, p. 110). In final analysis, this framework has attempted to



answer a research question of prosody through generative metrics, but it needs to develop further. After all, “If we knew already what it is, we wouldn’t [sic] call it research” (Einstein; as cited in Boeckx, 2006, p. 196).

References

- Abdel-Malek, Z. N. (1996, يونيو). Towards a new theory of Arabic prosody. *اللسان العربي*(41), 3-158.
- Ali, M. H. (2017). Metrical regularity of English and Arabic poetry: An interdisciplinary contrastive study. *Proceedings of the first international conference of interdisciplinary studies in literature, language, and translation* (pp. 122–133). Cairo: Faculty of Languages & Translation, October 6 University.
- Boeckx, C. (2006). *Linguistic minimalism: Origins, concepts, methods and aims*. Oxford: Oxford U Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1993). A minimalist program for linguistic theory. (K. Hale, & S. Keyser, Eds.) *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 1-52.
- Creaser, J. (2014). The line in Paradise Lost. In L. Schwartz (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Paradise Lost* (pp. 81-93). Cambridge: Cambridge U Press.
- Fabb, N., & Halle, M. (2008). *Meter in poetry: A new theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- Fussell, P. (1979). *Poetic Metre and Poetic Form*. New York: Random House.
- Halle, M., & Keyser, S. (1966). Chaucer and the Study of Prosody. *College English*(28), 187-219.
- Hamer, E. (1969). *The metres of English poetry*. London: Methuen.
- Kiparsky, P. (2006). A modular metrics for folk verse. In & N. B. Dresher (Ed.), *Formal approaches to poetry: Recent developments in metrics* (pp. 7-49). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.



- Kiparsky, P., & Youmans, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Rhythm and meter*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Lakatos, I. (1970). Falsifications and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In I. Lakatos, & A. Musgrave (Eds.), *Criticism and the growth of knowledge* (pp. 91-195). Cambridge: Cambridge U Press.
- Malof, J. (1970). *A manual of English meters*. Indiana U. Press.
- McAuley, J. (1966). *Versification: A short introduction*. Michigan State U Press.
- Pound, E. (1991). *Ezra Pound's poetry and prose: Contributions to periodicals* (Vol. 1). (L. Baechler, A. Litz, & J. Longenbach, Eds.) New York & London: Garland Publishing.
- Prince, A. (1989). Program in linguistics and cognitive science. In P. Kiparsky, & G. Youmans (Eds.), *Rhythm and meter* (pp. 45-80). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Prince, A., & Smolensky, P. (2004). *Optimality theory: Constraint interaction in generative grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Radford, A. (1997a). *Syntactic theory and the structure of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge U Press.
- Radford, A. (1997b). *Syntax: A minimalist introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge U Press.
- Radford, A. (2004). *Minimalist syntax: Exploring the structure of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge U Press.
- Saintsbury, G. (1930). *Historical manual of English prosody*. London: Macmillan.
- Youmans, G. (1989). Introduction: Rhythm and meter. In P. Kiparsky, & G. Youmans (Eds.), *Rhythm and meter* (pp. 1-14). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Youmans, G. (2006). Longfellow's long line. In B. Drescher, & N. Friedberg (Eds.), *Formal approaches to poetry: Recent developments in metrics* (pp. 135-147). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

أحمد رجائي. (١٩٩٦م). أوزان الأشعار: مقارنة جديدة في العروض. دمشق: مكتبة الأسد.



- أحمد مستجير. (١٩٨٠م). في بحور الشعر: الأدلة الرقمية لبحور الشعر العربي. القاهرة: مكتبة غريب.
- أحمد مستجير. (١٩٨٧م). مدخل رياضي إلى عروض الشعر العربي. القاهرة: المكتب الدولي للتصوير والطباعة.
- الخطيب التبريزي. (١٤١٥ هـ / ١٩٩٤م). كتاب الكافي في العروض والقوافي (الإصدار ٣). (الحسانی حسن عبد الله، المحرر) القاهرة: مكتبة الخانجي.
- بشارة الخوري، الأخطل الصغير. (١٩٥٣م). الهوى والشباب. بيروت: دار المعارف.
- سليمان أبو ستة. (١٩٩٢م). في نظرية العروض العربي. عمان، الأردن: دار الإبداع للنشر والتوزيع.
- سيد البحراوي. (١٩٩٣م). العروض وإيقاع الشعر العربي: محاولة لإنتاج معرفة علمية. القاهرة: الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب.
- عبد الصاحب المختار. (١٩٨٥م). دائرة الوحدة في أوزان الشعر العربي. تونس: المنظمة العربية للتربية والثقافة والعلوم.
- محمد طارق الكاتب. (١٣٩١هـ/١٩٧١م). موازين الشعر العربي باستعمال الأرقام الثنائية. البصرة: مصلحة الموائئ العراقية.

