Jan Scholz

6. Cicero and Quintilian in the Arab World? Latin Rhetoric in Modern Arabic Rhetorical and Homiletical Manuals

One usually does not associate Arabic rhetoric with Roman authors who wrote in Latin. Instead, one is rather concerned either with Arabic rhetoric, i.e. the autochthonous Arabic tradition of rhetoric *(ʿilm al-balāġa)*, or the reception of Greek rhetoric *(ʿilm* or *fann al-ḫaṭāba)*, in particular Aristotle's rhetoric, in the heyday of Arabic Aristotelianism between the ninth and the thirteenth centuries.[1] Modern Arabic rhetorical manuals constitute an important primary source for the history of rhetorical theory in the Arabic world, which has received hardly any scholarly attention so far.[2] These manuals start appearing from the end of the nineteenth century onwards, first in Lebanon, then in Egypt, where they still play an important role today. Designed either for a more general public or concretely addressing

1 A note on terminology: Arab authors mostly use the expression *fann al-ḫaṭāba* (or *ʿilm al-ḫaṭāba*) when referring to rhetorical theory, i.e. to the theory of public speech. Sometimes also, the mere term *al-ḫaṭāba* is used, although it literally designates public speech and not its theory. Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is mostly referred to as *Kitāb al-ḫaṭāba*.

2 The only article explicitly analysing such a modern rhetorical manual is Abdulrazzak Patel, "Nahḍah Oratory: Western Rhetoric in al-Shartūnī's Manual on the Art of the Orator," *Middle Eastern Literatures* 12, no. 3 (2009), 233–269. Patel provides a number of crucial observations, among others with regard to the influence of Cicero on al-Šartūnī's manual. Philip Halldén, "What is Arab Islamic Rhetoric? Rethinking the History of Muslim Oratory Art and Homiletics," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 37, no. 1 (2005), 19–38, mentions some of these manuals, calling for the need to study rhetorical theory in the Arab world, but he does not provide a concrete analysis of the modern rhetorical manuals, and speaks of rhetorical theory in a general sense, without identifying the rhetorical awakening at the end of the nineteenth century. Charles Hirschkind, *The Ethical Soundscape: Cassette Sermons and Islamic Counterpublics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), refers to the manuals and provides some quotations. However, he does not enter into a detailed analysis of the phenomenon. Furthermore, see Jan Scholz, "Modern Arabic Rhetorical Manuals: A Transcultural Phenomenon," in *Engaging Transculturality: Concepts, Key Terms, Case Studies*, ed. Laila Abu-Er-Rub et al. (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 170–184. The article Jan Scholz, "Dramatic Islamic Preaching: A Close Reading of ʿAmr Khālid," in *Religion and Aesthetic Experience: Drama – Sermons – Literature*, ed. Sabine Dorpmüller et al. (Heidelberg: Heidelberg University Publishing, 2018), 149–170, in turn, draws on modern Islamic televangelism and its modern homiletical basis.

the needs of Islamic preachers, thus designed as homiletical manuals, they are used, for instance, to teach preaching at al-Azhar University. Available in the bookshops of Lebanon, Egypt, and other Arab countries, they sell quite well, as a bookseller in Cairo told me.

Because they unite the different rhetorical traditions mentioned above, these manuals constitute a transcultural phenomenon.[3] For the history of Latin-Arabic entanglement, they constitute an interesting object of research for different reasons: they not only draw upon Arabic and Greek, but also upon elements of Roman, i.e. Latin rhetoric, even though to a lesser degree. I will explore this entanglement through an examination of writings on rhetorical performance, this being one field in which Latin-Roman authors were particularly prolific. Graeco-Roman rhetorical tradition forms part of the (so-called) 'Occidental' philosophical tradition. Since it is often considered an important element in the construction of what is defined as 'European' or even 'Western' thought, one can regard it as a sort of cultural marker.[4] In his article "Rhetoric and *ʿilm al-balāġa*," William Smyth goes as far as to state that, "[t]raditionally, rhetoric has formed one of the bases of Western culture."[5] The role rhetorical traditions occupy in acts of cultural differentiation is also evident in the recurring distinction between Arabic rhetoric on the one side, and European, Western, or Occidental rhetoric on the other side, e.g. in manuals.[6] Against this backdrop, the reception of Latin rhetoricians in the Arabic context also assumes relevance in terms of cultural identity construction, a topic to be explored at the end of this chapter.

The chapter is structured as follows: Firstly, I will differentiate between the different understandings of rhetoric, Greek (and later Graeco-Roman, or today Western) and Arabic rhetoric.[7] In a second step, I will explain why it seems fruitful to search for Latin or Roman influences in those sections of Arabic rhetorical manuals dealing with performative questions.[8] Subsequently, I will discuss whether it is justified to speak of a Roman influence on Arabic rhetorical manuals by tracing processes of transmission that reveal strong links between Egyptian and Lebanese manuals. In a last step, I will show that some passages by al-Ǧāḥiẓ also play an important role in the discussion of the performative aspects of rhetoric. As references to al-Ǧāḥiẓ are particularly prominent in Muslim rhetorical manuals, such references can be understood as a kind of cultural marker.

---

3 Scholz, "Modern Arabic Rhetorical Manuals."

4 William Smyth, "Rhetoric and *ʿIlm al-balāgha*: Christianity and Islam," in *The Muslim World* 82, no. 3–4 (1992), 242–255.

5 Smyth, "Rhetoric and *ʿIlm al-balāgha*," 242.

6 See for instance Thomas Bauer, "[Rhetorik, außereuropäische] V. Arabische Kultur," in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, ed. Gert Ueding (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2007), vol. 8, 111–137; Smyth, "Rhetoric and *ʿIlm al-balāgha*," 254.

7 Particularly in this part of the chapter, but also in other parts of the article, I draw on observations outlined in Scholz, "Modern Arabic Rhetorical Manuals."

8 Roman influence also plays a role in parts of rhetorical manuals that deal with other questions. However, given the importance of performative aspects within rhetorical theory, this chapter will focus on the latter.

6.1 Different understandings of rhetoric

Although it is common to use the term rhetoric with regard to both the Arabic *(ʿilm al-balāġa)* and the Greek *(fann al-ḫaṭāba*[9]*)* traditions of rhetoric, these two variants are only partly comparable. Consequently, using the term rhetoric in a general sense can easily lead to misunderstandings. Originally, rhetoric refers to the theory of public speaking, literally of the public speaker (Greek: *rhḗtōr*).[10] The tradition of Graeco-Roman rhetoric treats all aspects of public speech relating to the speaker, the speech, and the audience. Therefore, it is particularly important to stress that the Graeco-Roman tradition reflects not only upon how the text should be structured, written, and stylistically elaborated, but also considers performative questions, i.e. the question of how a speech should be delivered. It is therefore common to distinguish between text-oriented and performance-oriented parts of Graeco-Roman rhetorical theory. The former, for instance, deal with figures of style (or tropes), linguistic embellishments, rhetorical argument, and reasoning, all of which are regarded as serving the aim of persuading the audience. The performance-oriented parts discuss how to use and modulate the voice, as well as how to employ gestures, facial expressions, and body language in order to express different emotions and affect the audience.

Arabic rhetoric *(ʿilm al-balāġa)*, in turn, is primarily a tradition of literary rhetoric. It reflects upon the text-oriented parts; figures of style, semantic questions, appropriate expressions, linguistic embellishments, etc., but—except for some rather marginal considerations at the beginning of the tradition—does not attribute much importance to the performative aspects of speech.[11] In view of this difference between the Greek and the

9 A note on vocalization: It has been stated that "*ḫaṭābī* [and thus *ḫaṭāba*] refers to the logical rhetoric of *falsafa* [renvoie à la rhétorique-logique de la *falsafa*], *ḫiṭābī* [and thus *ḫiṭāba*] to the pragmatic rhetoric of *balāġa* [à la rhétorique-pragmatique de la *balāġa*]. (Pierre Larcher, "Eléments de rhétorique aristotélicienne dans la tradition arabe hors la *falsafa*," in *La Rhétorique d'Aristote: Traditions et commentaires de l'antiquité au XVII*[e] *siècle*, ed. Gilbert Dahan and Irène Rosier-Catach (Paris: Vrin, 1998), 241–256, here 254.) However, the difference in vocalization is not always as clear as Larcher suggests. The modern rhetorical manuals often use the vocalization *ḫaṭāba*, and they indeed explicitly link to the Greek tradition. However, this understanding is not simply a rhetorical-logical one, but also pragmatic. I have therefore opted for the vocalization *ḫaṭāba* throughout this chapter.

10 Gregor Kallivoda et al., "Rhetorik," in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, ed. Gert Ueding (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005), vol. 7, 1423–1740, here 1424.

11 The need for this differentiation is not always emphasized. It is quite common to simply speak of Arabic rhetoric without insisting that it is a literary tradition. See, for example, Bauer, "[Rhetorik, außereuropäische] V. Arabische Kultur"; Muhsin J. al-Musawi, "Arabic Rhetoric," in *Encyclopaedia of Rhetoric*, ed. Thomas O. Sloane (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 29–33. Other authors do make this distinction, e.g. Kristina Stock, *Arabische Stilistik* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2005), 4; Renate Würsch, "Rhetorik und Stilistik im arabischen Raum," in *Rhetorik und Stilistik (Rhetoric and Stylistics): Ein internationales Handbuch historischer und systematischer Forschung—An International Handbook of Historical and Systematic Research*,

Arab traditions, one might suppose that the former would supplement the latter. In pre-modern Arabic writings on rhetoric, however, the two traditions generally stayed separate. This is mainly because—following the late Alexandrian tradition—Greek rhetoric was received as a branch of logic in the Arabic context.[12] Consequently, it was mostly separated from the context of the *bulaġāʾ*, i.e. those practicing *balāġa*. Furthermore, it was not conceived as a theory of public speech that would allow speakers to enhance their rhetorical performance.

This changed in the course of the late modern period.[13] From the second half of the nineteenth century onwards, rhetoric as a theory of public speech became gradually more important in the Arab world. Some manuals serve to illustrate this. A rhetorical manual designed for Christian preachers, written in the eighteenth century by Ǧarmānūs Farḥāt, the Maronite bishop of Aleppo, at some point before his death in 1732, has been republished in different editions.[14] One of the most important authors of what is later referred to as the "awakening of rhetoric" (*ḫaṭāba*),[15] is the Jesuit

---

ed. Ulla Fix et al. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 2041. In Anglophone studies, the distinction is sometimes made by referring to literary rhetoric as rhetoric, and by using the term oratory to refer to a theory of public speech. For instance see, Seeger A. Bonebakker, "Aspects of the History of Literary Rhetoric and Poetics in Arabic Literature," *Viator* 1 (1970), 75–95. This distinction is unsatisfying, however, for two reasons: first, the term rhetoric in its original understanding refers to a theory of public speech; it is only with the literarization of rhetoric, and the increasing concentration of rhetorical theory on literary texts, that the term is *also* used in the sense of literary rhetoric. On this, see Julia Schmid, "Rhetorik und Stilistik in der Literaturwissenschaft," in *Rhetorik und Stilistik*, ed. Ulla Fix et al. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 1887; Elias Torra, "Rhetorik," in *Einführung in die Literaturwissenschaft*, ed. Miltos Pechlibanos et al. (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1995), 101. Second, etymologically speaking, the terms rhetoric and oratory can be regarded as synonyms, deriving respectively from the Greek term *rhḗtōr* and its Latin counterpart, *orator*.

12 Renate Würsch, "Die arabische Tradition der aristotelischen *Rhetorik*," in *Aristotelische Rhetoriktradition [. . .]*, ed. Joachim Knape and Thomas Schirren (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2005), 381. The integration of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* into the *Organon* is described within the "context-theory." For this see Deborah L. Black, *Logic and Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics in Medieval Arabic Philosophy* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 1.

13 Al-Musawi, "Arabic Rhetoric," 32–33 addresses the increased search for Greek elements within Arabic rhetoric *(ʿilm al-balāġa)* at the beginning of the twentieth century, but he does not mention the role of modern rhetorical manuals. This has to be explained by the fact that he limits Arabic rhetoric to *ʿilm al-balāġa*. However, doing so perpetuates the established problematic differentiation, and neglects the role that the term *ʿilm al-balāġa* plays in the modern rhetorical manuals using the designation *fann al-ḫaṭāba* (sometimes only *al-ḫaṭāba*). See Scholz, "Rhetorical Manuals." The modern Arabic rhetorical manuals are treated by Patel, "Nahḍah Oratory," 233–269; Halldén, "What is Arab Islamic Rhetoric?," 19–38.

14 Patel, "Nahḍah Oratory," 264 fn. 59, mentions an edition made in Beirut in 1821. A later edition was produced by the Lebanese Saʿīd al-Šartūnī (1849–1912): *Faṣl al-ḫiṭāb fī l-waʿẓ li-Ǧarmānūs Farḥāt*, ed. Saʿīd al-Šartūnī (Beirut: Al-Maṭbaʿa al-kaṯūlikiyya li-l-ābāʾ al-yasūʿiyyīn, 1896).

15 The term is used by Muḥammad Abū Zahra in *Al-Ḫaṭāba: Uṣūluhā wa-tārīḫuhā fī azhar ʿuṣūrihā ʿinda al-ʿArab* (Cairo: Dār al-fikr al-ʿarabī, 2012 [first ed. 1934]), 14, one of the most successful Arabic rhetorical manuals. It should be noted that one can also translate the Arabic term as "awakening of public speech." In Abū Zahra's usage, both meanings (public speech and rhetoric) seem to be implied.

Louis Cheikhô (1859–1927). His *Book on the Science of Literature (Kitāb ʿIlm al-adab)*, published in three editions, treats rhetoric *(ʿilm al-ḫaṭāba*) in the second volume.[16] While the first of these modern Arabic rhetorical manuals, treating rhetoric as a theory of public speech, were written by Christian authors, the interest in rhetorical theory soon gained relevance beyond this sphere. Cheikhô, for instance, states that—in his times—rhetoric began assuming importance in Muslim intellectual circles, and cites important intellectuals of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, such as Ǧamāl al-Dīn al-Afġānī (1838/39–1897), Muḥammad ʿAbduh (1849–1905), and Muṣṭafā Kāmil (1874–1908), as examples of Muslims interested in the art of public speech.[17]

An article by Muḥammad Kurd ʿAlī (1876–1953), published in 1918, "*Al-Ḫaṭāba ʿinda l-Ifranǧ*"[18] (Rhetoric among the Europeans) illustrates the new importance of rhetoric. Drawing on two French rhetorical manuals by Maurice Ajam (1861–1944)[19] and Silvain Roudès (dates unknown),[20] Kurd ʿAlī introduces the reader to many French orators, briefly sketching their techniques for preparing, rehearsing, and delivering their speeches. Kurd ʿAlī does not provide many details on ancient rhetoricians, but relates a story that goes back to Cicero:[21] The Roman Sulpicius Galba, when he practiced his performance at home, worked himself into such a state of excitement that, when he eventually left his house, his eyes shot arrows. We also find the amusing detail that, when Galba went to the forum to deliver his speech, his secretaries, who followed him, still suffered from

---

16 It has been published in three editions: Luwīs Šayḫū [Louis Cheikhô], *Kitāb ʿIlm al-adab: Maqālāt li-baʿḍ mašāhīr kuttāb al-ʿarab fī l-ḫaṭāba wa-l-šiʿr*, vol. 2: *ʿIlm al-ḫaṭāba* (Beirut: Maṭbaʿat al-abāʾ al-mursalīn al-yasūʿiyyīn, 1889); Luwīs Šayḫū, *Kitāb ʿIlm al-adab*, second ed., vol. 2: *ʿIlm al-ḫaṭāba* (Beirut: Maṭbaʿat al-abāʾ al-yasūʿiyyīn, 1913); Luwīs Šayḫū, *Kitāb ʿIlm al-adab*, third ed., vol. 2: *ʿIlm al-ḫaṭāba* (Beirut: Maṭbaʿat al-abāʾ al-yasūʿiyyīn, 1926). Patel dated this manual by referring to the second edition from 1913, apparently overlooking the first edition from 1889. On this basis, he concluded that Saʿīd al-Šartūnī's rhetorical manual (*Al-ġuṣn al-raṭīb fī fann al-ḫaṭīb*) is "one of the first, if not the first known, work devoted entirely to the art of oratory in the *nahḍah* period." See Patel, "Nahḍah Oratory," 261. In so doing, he contradicts Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ġanī Ḥasan, *Al-Ḫuṭab wa-l-mawāʿiẓ* (Cairo: Dār al-maʿārif, 1980), who states that Cheikhô wrote the first book on rhetorical theory during the *nahḍa.* This misunderstanding is probably based on the fact that Ḥasan does not provide the title or the date of the work by Cheikhô he refers to, whereas Patel overlooks the first edition, concluding that Cheikhô's book is from 1913. See Patel, "Nahḍah Oratory," 239. Contrary to what Patel states, Cheikhô is indeed the first author in the *nahḍa* of a book devoted to rhetorical theory.

17 Šayḫū [Cheikhô], *ʿIlm al-ḫaṭāba,* 238.

18 Muḥammad Kurd ʿAlī, "Al-Ḫaṭāba ʿinda l-Ifranǧ," *Al-Muqtabas* 95 (1914), accessed September 30, 2017, https://ar.wikisource.org/wiki/مجلة_المقتبس/العدد_95/الخطابة_عند_الإفرنج.

19 Maurice Ajam, *La parole en public: physio-psychologie de la parole, rapport du langage intérieur avec la parole, étude des procédés oratoires depuis l'Antiquité, esquisse d'une méthode scientifique d'art oratoire, enquêtes psychologiques sur la parole en public* (Paris: Chamuel, 1895).

20 Silvain Roudès, *L'Orateur moderne: L'éducation de la parole, ou l'art d'apprendre à parler en public* (Paris: Pancier, 1909).

21 Cicero, *Brutus. Orator*, trans. George L. Hendrickson and Harry M. Hubbell (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939), 80–81.

the punches and slaps he had given to them while rehearsing his speech.[22] In his narration of the story, Kurd ʿAlī chose a rather ironic tone. However, the fact that he focused on the importance of delivery is significant: from the nineteenth century onwards, the increasing importance of rhetoric as a theory of public speech (*fann al-ḫaṭāba*) in the Arab world would not be limited to the text-oriented parts of speech, but would include a number of reflections on performative aspects.

This new interest is reflected in the publication of a number of Arabic rhetorical manuals, particularly since the beginning of the twentieth century. While some of these manuals deal with public speech in a general sense,[23] a large number, addressed at Islamic preachers, were used for training purposes at al-Azhar University from around 1918 onwards.[24] Among the first manuals is *The Art of Rhetoric and the Preparation of the Orator* (*Fann al-ḫaṭāba wa-iʿdād al-ḫaṭīb*) by ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ,[25] written between 1926 and 1942.[26] Abū Zahra, who taught rhetoric at the "Department of Principles of Religion" (*uṣūl al-dīn*) and at the Faculty of Law at Cairo University,[27] published his manual *Rhetoric: Its Principles and its History during its Most Flourishing Ages Among the Arabs* (*Al-Ḫaṭāba: Uṣūluhā wa-tārīḫuhā fī azhar ʿuṣūrihā ʿinda al-ʿarab*) in 1934. To this day, it is still one of the most successful rhetorical manuals and has been published in several editions.

Both types of manuals—those addressing public speakers in a more general sense and those designed for preachers—belong to the tradition of *al-ḫaṭāba*. The term is used to distinguish the Graeco-Latin tradition of rhetoric, which includes reflections on performative aspects, from the more text-oriented Arabic tradition known as *ʿilm al-balāġa.*[28] As these new manuals deal with the art of public speech as developed in Greek antiquity and, in particular, in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, it is hardly surprising that these manuals draw extensively upon the work of Arabic Aristotelians such as al-Fārābī (d. 339/950), Ibn Sīnā (d. 427/1037), and Ibn Rušd (d. 595/1198). Although these authorities play an important role, they do not necessarily constitute the primary source of information on the performative aspects of public speech. This is where Latin rhetoric comes in.

---

22 Muḥammad Kurd ʿAlī, "Al-Ḫaṭāba ʿinda l-Ifranǧ."

23 Among the most important are Niqūlā Fayyāḍ, *Al-Ḫaṭāba* (Cairo: Idārat al-Hilāl, 1930); Abū Zahra, *Al-Ḫaṭāba*; Aḥmad Muḥammad al-Ḥūfī, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, fifth ed. (Cairo: Nahḍat Miṣr, 2007 [1949]).

24 Hirschkind, *The Ethical Soundscape*, 44, 48.

25 In the title, the term *ḫaṭīb* and *ḫaṭāba* can be understood as referring particularly to the liturgical Friday preacher and the activity of preaching. However, many manuals address general rhetorical aspects and instruct the preacher in other regards besides the liturgical Friday sermon.

26 ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba wa-iʿdād al-ḫaṭīb* (Cairo: Dār al-iʿtiṣām, 1984). Although published posthumously in 1984, it must have been written between 1926 and 1942 as can be deduced from the Introduction, 7–12.

27 Ibrāhīm Ḫalīl Ibrāhīm, "Al-Šayḫ Muḥammad Abū Zahra," accessed October 18, 2016, http://www.misralbalad.com/page.php?id=58084.

28 Nonetheless, they do also refer to the tradition of Arabic rhetoric *(ʿilm al-balāġa)*: see Scholz, "Rhetorical Manuals."

6.2 Roman rhetoricians and the issue of performance

The conception of rhetorical theory as a theory of public speech goes back to Aristotle (384–322 BCE), who laid the theoretical foundations of this discipline. He became a timeless authority in this field and the "measure for the time to come."[29] Rhetorical literature produced in Europe today, for example, often relies essentially on the categories established by Aristotle in the fourth century BCE.[30] In his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle emphasized that rhetorical theory should attribute much importance to the delivery of a speech, and "no treatise has yet been composed on delivery."[31] Despite his insistence on rhetorical delivery, Aristotle's treatment of this issue is rather short. He does address several important aspects of delivery, namely the role of the voice and the importance of gestures. Moreover, he compares the public speaker with an actor in the theatre, introducing a comparison that has subsequently played an important role in the whole so-called Western tradition of rhetorical theory. Ultimately, however, Aristotle does not provide many details on the orator's performance and mainly focuses on the voice.[32] In view of Aristotle's limited reflection on performative questions, one cannot expect his Arabic-Islamic commentators, al-Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā, and Ibn Rušd, to have devoted considerably more attention to this issue, especially since they were primarily interested in logical questions, not the art of public speaking. Roman authors, in particular Cicero (106–143 BCE) and Quintilian (ca. 35–ca. 100 CE), developed much more detailed reflections on the subject.[33] Since they built on and expanded Aristotle's theoretical framework, it is common to speak of a Graeco-Roman tradition of rhetorical theory.

---

29 Gregor Kallivoda et al., "Rhetorik," 1484. Trans. Jan Scholz.

30 For an example of the role of ancient rhetoric, see Tim-Christian Bartsch et al., *Trainingsbuch Rhetorik*, third ed. (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2013).

31 Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, ed. and trans. John Henry Freese (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926), 346–347.

32 See Volker Saftien, "Rhetorische Mimik und Gestik: Konturen epochenspezifischen Verhaltens," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 77 (1995), 201. He exaggerates, however, when stating that, for Aristotle, *hypókrisis* meant only the voice. The comparison with the actor is already present in Aristotle; in fact, the term *hypókrisis* refers to it. See Bernd Steinbrink, "Actio," in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, vol. 1, ed. Gert Ueding (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992), 43.

33 Cicero's rhetorical works are *On invention* (*De inventione*), *The Best Kind of Orator* (*De optimo genere oratorum*), *Topics* (*Topica*), *On the Orator* (*De oratore*), *On Fate* (*De fato*), *Stoic Paradoxes* (*Paradoxa stoicorum*), *Divisions of Oratory* (*De partitione oratoria*), *Orator* (*Orator*), and *Brutus* (*Brutus*). The *Rhetoric: For Herennius* (*Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi*), the oldest preserved book on rhetoric in Latin, was formerly attributed to Cicero, but is now attributed to an anonymous author. Quintilian's main work on the subject is Quintilian: *The Institutio Oratoria*, ed. and trans. Harold E. Butler, 4 vols (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1920–1922). See also the more recent edition and translation: Quintilian, *The Orator's Education*, ed. and trans. Donald A. Russell, 4 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001–2002). For Quintilian's statements on rhetorical performance, see: Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, ed. and trans. Butler, vol. 4, Book XI, chapter III, 243–317.

Based on the preceding overview, and considering that the aforementioned ancient authors remain relevant in modern times, an important question arises: to what extent did Roman authors leave a mark on modern Arabic rhetorical manuals with regard to the treatment of performance? This question is not only crucial in order to understand the transcultural character of modern rhetorical theory in the Arab world; it also links to issues which have gained momentum thanks to the so-called "performative turn." In the twentieth century, the performative aspects of speech have gained increasing attention. This was largely, but not exclusively, due to technological developments such as radio broadcasting, cinema, and television. In the Arab world, radio broadcasting began in the 1920s and state-owned national broadcasting in 1934. Foreign films arrived in the 1920s, increasingly complemented by local production since the early 1930s.[34] Television was introduced in the 1960s.[35]

When searching for a Roman influence in modern Arabic rhetorical manuals, one must bear in mind that the works of Cicero or Quintilian do not yet seem to have been translated into Arabic.[36] However, since Arab authors could have had access to English or French translations of these authors, a direct influence obviously cannot be ruled out. Ancient Roman authorities are named in many rhetorical manuals that often rely on *ʿIlm al-ḫaṭāba*, which the Jesuit Louis Cheikhô published at the end of the nineteenth century.[37] His status as a pioneer in the field of modern Arabic rhetorical manuals is closely associated with his studies in France and the fact that Jesuits historically attributed much importance to rhetorical theory. Born in 1859 in Mardīn (close to the Syrian border in modern-day Turkey), Louis Cheikhô went to Lebanon in 1868, and began his novitiate in the Jesuit seminary Lons-le-Saunier/France in 1874. There, he studied rhetoric in the third year.[38]

In his work on rhetorical theory, Louis Cheikhô explains that rhetorical theory *(ʿilm al-ḫaṭāba)* began with the Greeks and continued with the Romans. Although he insists on Aristotle's great importance, he also points to the role of rhetorical theory in the writings of the sophists Prodicus of

34 Walter Armbrust, "The Formation of National Culture in Egypt in the Interwar Period," *History Compass* 7, no. 1 (2009), 155–180, here 161; *The Oxford History of World Cinema*, ed. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 662.

35 Rasha A. Abdulla, "An Overview of Media Developments in Egypt: Does the Internet Make a Difference?," *Global Media Journal, Mediterranean Edition* 1 (2006), 91.

36 For a list of classical, medieval, and early modern Latin texts available in Arabic translation, see, Daniel G. König, "The Unkempt Heritage: On the Role of Latin in the Arabic-Islamic Sphere," *Arabica* 63, no. 5 (2016), 419–493, here 453, 471–473.

37 Among these are Fayyāḍ, *Al-Ḫaṭāba*, 5, 7, 22, 119, 127; Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 21; al-Ḥūfī, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 199, 204; Muḥammad Maḥmūd Muḥammad ʿImāra, *Al-Ḫaṭāba bayna al-naẓariyya wa-l-taṭbīq* (Cairo: Maktabat al-īmān, 1997), 238; ʿAbd al-Ǧalīl ʿAbduh Šalabī, *Al-Ḫaṭāba wa-iʿdād al-ḫaṭīb*, third ed. (Cairo: Dār al-šurūq, 1987), 151, 159–161. Cheikhô explicitly names the ancient Roman authorities in Šayḫū [Cheikhô], *ʿIlm al-ḫaṭāba*, 194, 229–230.

38 Camille Hechaïmé, *Louis Cheikho et son livre "Le christianisme et la littérature chrétienne en Arabie avant l'Islam:" étude critique* (Beirut: Dar el-Machreq, 1967), 37.

Ceos (ca. 465–ca. 395 BCE), Protagoras (ca. 490–ca. 420 BCE), and Gorgias (ca. 485–ca. 380 BCE). Then he lists the most important Roman successors: Cicero, Quintilian, and Longinus. Clearly relying on Cheikhô's pioneering work, later authors of rectorical manuals depict the history of rhetorical theory *(ʿilm* or *fann al-ḫaṭāba)* in the same vein.[39] It is thus obvious that rhetorical manuals in Arabic aim at conveying a certain historical understanding of the development of the so-called Graeco-Roman rhetorical tradition.

Against this backdrop, one might expect the rhetorical manuals to draw directly upon the various authorities mentioned. One does indeed find explicit references, primarily to Aristotle and to his Arab commentators, and occasionally to the Latin rhetoricians as well—not only in Cheikhô's, but also in other manuals. However, citations or borrowings are rarely marked explicitly. In a number of cases, Arab authors rely on Latin works, either quoting them literally or paraphrasing their ideas, but failing to name these works or their authors. I will illustrate this by discussing several passages in which the Arabic manuals obviously draw upon the works of Latin rhetoricians.

Following the Graeco-Roman tradition, rhetoric is regarded as an art (Greek *téchnē*, Latin *ars*). This means that public speech follows rules that can be learnt. Rhetorical performance is not a question of talent alone, but of training as well. The example of the Greek orator Demosthenes (384–322 BC) often serves to illustrate this point. Not being particularly gifted, and suffering from a narrow and weak voice, it was his persistent training that allowed him to become one of the most notable orators of his time. To train his voice, he pronounced long speeches while holding pebbles in his mouth. To train his lungs, he would speak while climbing a mountain or hill. This account can be found in the works of both Cicero and Quintilian.[40] It was retold by ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ and Muḥammad Abū Zahra who, however, neither quoted the account verbatim nor provided references to the original work(s).[41] The same applies to a story about Demosthenes's training in front of a mirror to improve his bodily delivery, told by Quintilian[42] and retold by ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ.[43]

Cicero reports another anecdote about Demosthenes, which frequently serves in modern manuals of rhetoric to emphasize the importance of delivery. When asked about the most important facet of public speech,

39 See e.g. Abū Zahra, *al-Ḫaṭāba*, 10–11.

40 Cicero, *On the Orator: Books 1–2,* ed. and trans. Harris Rackham and Edward W. Sutton (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942), 190–193; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, ed. and trans. Butler, vol. 4, Book XI, chapter III, 54, 270–273.

41 Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 20; Abū Zahra, *al-Ḫaṭāba*, 21, 50. Abū Zahra (p. 21) refers to the book *Tārīḫ al-ḥaḍāra* in his first mention of Demosthenes. It is a translation of Charles Seignobos's *Histoire de la civilization*.

42 Quintilian, *Institution Oratoria*, ed. and trans. Butler, vol. 4, Book XI, chapter III, 68, 280–281; see also Quintilian, *The Orator's Education*, ed. and trans. Russell, vol. 4, 120–121.

43 Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 20.

Demosthenes replied, "Delivery." When asked which the second and third most important facets were, again he replied, "Delivery."[44] One of the first Arabic rhetorical manuals, written by the Lebanese author Saʿīd al-Šartūnī, reproduces this account, again without citing the source.[45]

The discussion of developing one's own skills to overcome a weakness or defect, which has been outlined so far, shows the importance these manuals attribute to delivery. This emphasis results from the conceptualization of rhetorical theory as elaborated within the Graeco-Roman tradition. Roman rhetoricians, in particular, theorized upon the possibilities of affecting the listener emotionally by means of the oral and bodily performance, and consequently took great pains to explain how a successful orator uses both voice and gestures to transmit his emotions to the audience. Arabic rhetorical manuals often reproduce these explanations. They not only adopt the general concept of affecting the listener emotionally by means of voice and gestures, but also include a number of details that confirm their indirect or direct dependency on a work of Roman rhetoric. Cicero, for example, emphasizes in *On the Orator*: "[e]verything depends on the countenance, while the countenance itself is entirely dominated by the eyes;"[46] [. . .] "the whole delivery is an expression of the soul, and the facial expressions, an image of the soul, where the eyes indicate the state of the soul."[47] Another passage is found in his *Orator*, a later work on rhetoric: "as the face is the image of the soul, so are the eyes its interpreters, in respect of which the subjects under discussion will provide the proper limits for the expression of joy or grief."[48] Similarly, Quintilian states that gestures appeal to the eye and the voice to the ear, "the two senses by which all emotion reaches the soul."[49] And elsewhere he asserts, "But of the various elements that go to form the expression, the eyes are the most important, since they, more than anything else, reveal the temper of the mind."[50]

Arabic rhetorical manuals contain very similar assertions. ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ writes: "delivery is particularly important because through it, he [the orator]

44 Cicero, *On the Orator: Book 3. On Fate. Stoic Paradoxes. Divisions of Oratory*, ed. and trans. Harris Rackham (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942), 168–169.
45 Al-Šartūnī, *Al-Ġuṣn al-raṭīb fī fann al-ḫaṭīb*, 44.
46 Cicero, *On the Orator: Book 3*, ed. and trans. Rackham, 176–177.
47 My translation into English follows Cicero, *De oratore: Lateinisch–deutsch*, ed. and trans. Theodor Nüßlein (Düsseldorf: Artemis & Winkler, 2007), 418–421. Rackham's translation avoids the term "soul" here, see Cicero, *On the Orator: Book 3*, ed. and trans. Rackham, 176–177: "For delivery is wholly the concern of the feelings, and these are mirrored by the face and expressed by the eyes." [Animi est enim omnis actio, et imago animi vultus, indices oculi.]
48 Cicero, *Brutus. Orator*, trans. Hendrickson and Hubbell, 350–351.
49 Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, ed. and trans. Butler, vol. 4, Book XI, chapter III, 14, 250–251. Russell's newer translation avoids the term "soul" and instead translates *animus* as "mind." See Quintilian, *The Orator's Education*, ed. and trans. Russell, vol. 4, 90–91.
50 Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, ed. and trans. Butler, vol. 4, Book XI, chapter III, 75, 284–285.

transports his feelings to the soul of the listener and moves his affects";[51] the orator's delivery "illustrates what is in the soul;"[52] "The face as well as the gaze should be like a mirror of the soul, illustrating its emotions."[53] This corresponds to Louis Cheikhô's understanding.[54] Although the respective sources are not cited, both the analogies regarding the conceptualization of performance and the chosen wording clearly indicate that the Latin authors served as a model.

A necessary condition for a good delivery is that the speech is memorized. Consequently, Latin rhetoricians treated *memoria* as a section of rhetorical theory in its own right. Modern Arabic rhetorical manuals also deal with the memorizing of a speech (Arabic *ḏākira*, sometimes *ḥāfiẓa*) in sections addressing aspects of performance. Again, the influence of Graeco-Roman conceptions is clearly visible: the Arabic manuals regularly emphasize that a speech learnt by heart will have greater effect than a speech read from a sheet of paper, thus insisting that the orator should memorize it.[55] But while the Latin authors elaborated on this topic in great detail—Cicero, for example, even developed a proper mnemonic technique—the treatment of memory is comparatively short and general in the Arabic manuals. However, attentive reading shows that the latter rely on the Roman authors: in the Roman rhetorical tradition, memory is repeatedly referred to as a treasure-house (*thesaurus*). This metaphor is first used in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, originally (wrongly) attributed to Cicero, and later in Cicero and Quintilian as well.[56] Among the Arabic manuals, Saʿīd al-Šartūnī uses the Arabic equivalents *ḫizāna* (storage, treasure-house) and *kanz* (treasure) when speaking of memory.[57]

Although the quoted Arab authors do not explicitly refer to the Roman authorities in the above-mentioned passages, it is impossible to ignore the many parallels—ranging from the role of the face and the gaze to express emotions via their conceptualization as mirrors of the soul to the metaphor of the treasure-house. This also applies to the conceptual idea, so prominent in the Graeco-Roman tradition, that a listener is emotionally affected by the orator's bodily performance. To illustrate this idea, Graeco-Roman

51 Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 64: "Šaʾnuhu [šaʾnu l-adāʾi l-ḫaṭābiyyi] fī l-ḫaṭābati ʿaẓīmun li-annahu bi-ḥusni l-adāʾi yanqulu ilā nafsi l-sāmiʿi mašāʿirahu wa-yuḥarriku ahwāʾah." Trans. Jan Scholz.

52 Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 65: "bayān mā fī l-nafs." Trans. Jan Scholz.

53 Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 67: "Wa-yaḥsunu bi-l-waǧhi wa-l-naẓari an yakūna ka-mirāʾati li-l-nafsi fī bayāni ʿawāṭifihā." Trans. Jan Scholz.

54 Šayḫū [Cheikhô], *ʿIlm al-ḫaṭāba,* 142: "Wa-yaḥsunu [. . .] bi-l-waǧhi wa-l-naẓari an yakūnā ka-marāʾati l-nafsi fī bayān ʿawāṭifihā."

55 For instance Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 64.

56 [Pseudo-Cicero], *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, ed. and trans. Harry Caplan (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954), 204–205; Cicero, *On the Orator: Books 1–2*, ed. and trans. Rackham and Sutton, 14–15; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, ed. and trans. Butler, vol. 4, Book XI, chapter II, 1, 212–213. The Latin term *thesaurus* is obviously of Greek origin (θησαυρός). However, the metaphor referring to memory as a treasure house does not stem from Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.

57 Al-Šartūnī, *Al-Ġuṣn al-raṭīb*, 45.

rhetorical theory regularly compares the orator to the actor; emphasizing, however, that the orator should not only act, but also ensure that the emotions he expresses are truly his own.[58] In order to successfully transmit his emotions, the speaker is advised to first affect himself with the emotions he wants to express. This aspect had not yet been developed by Aristotle, who only commented, "the hearer suffers along with the pathetic speaker."[59] Cicero and Quintilian, in turn, addressed the topic of self-affectation explicitly and in more detail.[60] The most famous version of the concept within the Graeco-Roman tradition was formulated by Horace (65–8 BCE).[61] Most Arabic rhetorical manuals formulate the concept in general terms, for instance: the speaker should "affect himself until the sign of his straight excitement becomes evident in his voice, his gestures, and his facial expressions";[62] or that "only the self-affected can affect others."[63] Although kept in general terms, such passages are clearly influenced by the Graeco-Roman concept. We find clear proof of such an influence in the rhetorical manual by Aḥmad Muḥammad al-Ḥūfī, first published in 1949. The manual quotes Horace literally: "*Iḏā aradta minnī an abkiya fa-ʿalayka an tabkiya awwalan.*" ("If you would have me weep, you must first weep yourself.")[64]

6.3 Channels of transmission and the interdependence of Egyptian and Lebanese manuals

The preceding elaborations show that we can find a number of quotations—some marked, others not—which lead back to Roman authors. Since many manuals neither mark their quotations nor cite their sources,

58 For the relevant passages, see Steinbrink, "Actio."
59 Aristotle, *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, trans. George A. Kennedy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 235 (II 7, 5).
60 Cicero, *On the Orator: Books 1–2*, ed. and trans. Rackham and Sutton, 332–335; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, ed. and trans. Butler, vol. 3, Book VI, chapter II, 25–36, 431–437; see also: Quintilian, *The Orator's Education*, ed. and trans. Russell, vol. 3: Books 6–8, 58–61.
61 Rüdiger Campe, "Affizieren und Selbstaffizieren: Rhetorisch-anthropologische Näherung ausgehend von Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, VI 1–2," in *Rhetorische Anthropologie: Studien zum homo rhetoricus*, ed. Josef Kopperschmidt (Munich: Fink, 2000), 138.
62 Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 66: "Wa-anna yataʾaṯṯara ḥattā yaẓhara aṯara l-infiʿāli l-muʿtadili fī ṣawtihi wa-išāratihi wa-malāmiḥi waǧhih." Trans. Jan Scholz.
63 Abū Zahra, *al-Ḫaṭāba*, 58: "Inna lā yuʾāṯṯiru illā l-mutaʾaṯṯir." See also: al-Šartūnī, *Al-Ġuṣn al-raṭīb*, 48.
64 Al-Ḥūfī, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 128. The Latin original: "Si vis me flere, dolendum est/primum ipsi tibi." See Quintus Horatius Flaccus (Horace), *Ars poetica: Die Dichtkunst. Lateinisch/Deutsch*, ed. and trans. Eckart Schäfer (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1998), 10. In English, this passage is sometimes translated as "If you would have me weep, you must first express the passion of grief yourself." See Quintus Horatius Flaccus (Horace), *The Works of Horace*: *Translated Literally into English Prose*, trans. Christopher Smart, (Philadelphia: Whetham, 1836), 2: lines 102–103. The earliest Arabic translation of Horace known to me is: Hūrātiyūs [Horatius Flaccus, (Horace)], *Fann al-šāʿir* (Cairo: Al-Hayʾa al-miṣriyya l-ʿāmma li-l-taʾlīf wa-l-našr, 1970).

establishing concrete dependencies first requires detecting literal quotations and paraphrases of Roman authors in the Arabic manuals, then comparing them to the original statements, not limiting oneself to the sections on performative aspects. This done, one would have to take into account that authors of Arabic manuals quoting or paraphrasing Roman authors may have had recourse to earlier Arabic as well as to European works on rhetoric. Thus, reconstructing channels of transmission would entail establishing interconnections first between various Arabic manuals by taking note of their different publication dates, then between Arabic and European manuals, taking into account which manuals in which European languages would have been available to the respective authors. Such a study would be highly valuable for a better understanding of the modern history of rhetorical theory in the Arabic context. However, given the number of works to consider, producing such a study would require considerable effort.

Since it is impossible to pursue this objective in the current chapter, the following elaborations will focus on the connection between the Egyptian and Lebanese manuals. A closer look shows that the former rely on the latter, suggesting that the Egyptian reception of Roman authors depends on previous Lebanese engagement with them. Since the use of Lebanese manuals is not always indicated by the authors of Egyptian manuals, it is again necessary to establish interdependencies by highlighting obvious parallels. I will base my discussion on the Egyptian manuals by ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ, written between 1926 and 1942, and Abū Zahra, published in 1934, which figure among the most influential Egyptian rhetorical manuals. Both manuals shall be related to the Lebanese manuals by Louis Cheikhô, first published in 1889, then republished in a third edition in 1926, and Saʿīd al-Šartūnī, published in 1908.

ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ does not provide any sources for his discussion of performative aspects. It is plausible to assume, however, that he draws on the Lebanese manuals, which were published before his manual was written. In fact, ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ quotes Saʿīd al-Šartūnī literally, but without marking the quotation, when he points to the importance of the voice during delivery. In the following quote I have used square brackets to mark the amendments to al-Šartūnī's text made by Maḥfūẓ and to indicate slightly differing formulations in the footnotes. The amendments are not marked in the English translation.

> Li-l-ṣawti fī l-ḫaṭābati l-taʾṯīru l-akbaru[,] li-annahu[65] al-mutarǧimu ʿan maqāṣidi l-ḫaṭībi wa-l-kāšifu ʿan aġrāḍihi li-muṣāḥabatihi l-alfāẓi[66] ka-l-šāriḥi lamma urīda bi-hā mimmā lā tastaqillu bi-l-kašf ʿanhu [, li-annahu l-ṭarīqu ilā qalbi l-sāmiʿi wa-l-mumaṯṯilu li-ṣūrati l-maʿānī amāmahu]. Wa-ṭabaqatu l-ṣawti wa-l-lafẓu wa-hayʾatu l-waǧhi

65 Šartūnī: *fa-huwa* instead of *fa-innahu*.
66 Šartūnī: *li-annahu yaṣḥabu l-alfāẓ* instead of *li-muṣāḥabatihi l-alfāẓi*.

> wa-ḥarakātu l-ǧismi kulluhā tataḍāfaru ʿalā bayāni mā fī l-nafsi[,] wa-taṣwīri mā bi-l-ḫāṭir.[67]
>
> The voice has the greatest effect in public speech, because it translates the speaker's purposes and uncovers his intentions, because it accompanies the words. It is like the commentator when something is intended by the words, which is not independent from its uncovering [i.e. which needs to be uncovered, in order to be understood]. [The voice has the greatest effect] because it is the way to the heart of the listener and illustrates the meanings' form in his presence. The register of the voice, the wording, the mien of the face, and the movements of the body, they are all tightly interwoven in the explanation of what one bears in the soul and the illustration of what one bears in mind.

In the following passages, Maḥfūẓ's manual also relies repeatedly on that of al-Šartūnī.[68] In addition, Maḥfūẓ also quotes Louis Cheikhô literally, for example when he discusses the voice, insisting on its moderation (*iʿtidāl*) and the need for variety (*tafannun*), and underlining that "every letter has to get its own right," i.e., must be pronounced properly. Moreover, his remark that "the wide place and the abundance of listeners need a more precise and stronger voice," is taken literally from Louis Cheikhô.[69] Here again, the quotation is not marked. These quotations—to which one could add others—confirm the assumption that ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ engaged intensively with the Lebanese manuals.

It is difficult to explain why ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ did not mention the two Lebanese authors. One might suppose that it was because the two Lebanese manuals were written by Christians, but there is no evidence to corroborate such an assumption, especially since Abū Zahra, a conservative Muslim scholar,[70] explicitly honours Cheikhô's role as an intellectual pioneer, responsible for what he calls an "awakening of rhetoric."[71] This suggests that, in 1934, when Abū Zahra's manual was published, Cheikhô's faith did not impair his intellectual reputation among conservative Muslim scholars. Assuming that this was any different for ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ would be speculation.

In sum, both Maḥfūẓ's and Abū Zahra's manuals show that Muslim authors of rhetorical manuals, writing in Egypt between the 1920s and 1940s, had recourse to Lebanese manuals written by Christian authors around the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century. Although this intellectual

---

67 Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 65; al-Šartūnī, *Al-Ġuṣn al-raṭīb*, 46.

68 This is the case, for example, when he emphasizes the need for good pronunciation (*ḥasan al-lafẓ*). See Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 65. Al-Šartūnī, in turn, uses the term *nuṭq faṣīḥ* (clear articulation). See al-Šartūnī, *Al-Ġuṣn al-raṭīb*, 46.

69 Maḥfūẓ, *Fann al-ḫaṭāba*, 65; Šayḫū [Cheikhô], *ʿIlm al-ḫaṭāba,* 141. Some passages are slightly paraphrased. However, this is evidently a literal quotation.

70 Ibrāhīm, "Al-Šayḫ Muḥammad Abū Zahra."

71 Abū Zahra, *Al-Ḫaṭāba*, 14.

transfer from Christian to Muslim contexts was not always acknowledged explicitly, apparently it was not regarded as problematic. To further explore this issue, I would like to discuss another aspect of Arabic rhetorical theory and the recourse to a particular rhetorical tradition. The following section will highlight how Abū Zahra's manual deals with the remarks of al-Ǧāḥiẓ (d. 255/869) on performance. Al-Ǧāḥiẓ was a Muslim intellectual who stands at the beginning of the Arabic tradition of rhetoric. While further studies would be needed to provide a satisfying answer, his reception might be interpreted as revealing a certain desire, on Abū Zahra's part, to assign a more prominent place to the Muslim author, who, in many cases, did not play a comparable role for earlier Christian authors discussing performative aspects.[72]

6.4 Entangled legacies: The use of al-Ǧāḥiẓ vis-à-vis the Graeco-Roman tradition

While it is generally true that the Arabic tradition of rhetoric *(ʿilm al-balāġa)* has concentrated on the text-oriented parts of rhetoric without attributing a central role to performative questions, one cannot claim that the tradition of Arabic rhetorical theory did not feature performative reflections at all. Particularly in the early ages of Arabic rhetoric, some reflections on performance indeed existed. The most important author of these is al-Ǧāḥiẓ. While his statements on this topic are not particularly extensive, they nonetheless occupy an important place in some of the modern Arabic rhetorical manuals, as I will outline in the present section. The role of al-Ǧāḥiẓ links to the issue of Latin-Arabic entanglement, because the modern manuals—particularly those published in Egypt—refer not only to the Roman authors, but combine these references with additional references to al-Ǧāḥiẓ. From an external perspective, one could regard the Roman authors as Western authorities, and al-Ǧāḥiẓ as an Islamic authority. Although Abū Zahra does not use these categories, it is striking that, in his rhetorical manual, al-Ǧāḥiẓ gains considerable importance as a reference point with regard to performative aspects. Several later manuals follow in Abū Zahra's footsteps when quoting al-Ǧāḥiẓ.

Differentiating between the various ways of producing meaning, al-Ǧāḥiẓ conceptualizes gestures as "associates" (*šurakāʾ*, sg. *šarīk*) of words. A gesture can translate, i.e. reproduce meaning by different means, accompany, and even substitute for a word. The ways to express meaning with the help of the eyes, the eyebrows, and the extremities, are thus—in al-Ǧāḥiẓ's view—"a great help" for the orator.[73]

---

72 However, one must be careful with premature conclusions, given that the Lebanese author Niqūlā Fayyāḍ, *Al-Ḫaṭāba*, 13, 23, 25, 26, 27, 36, 51, 52, 73, 111, for example, refers to al-Ǧāḥiẓ several times, although generally not in reference to performative aspects.

73 Abū ʿUṯmān ʿAmr b. Baḥr al-Ǧāḥiẓ, *Al-Bayān wa-l-tabyīn*, ed. ʿAbd al-Sallām Muḥammad Hārūn, seventh ed., 4 vols (Cairo: Maktabat al-Ḫānǧī, 1998), vol. 1,

While al-Ǧāḥiẓ mentions quite a number of elements that enhance vocal performance, including gestures and facial expressions, his view on performative aspects is less elaborate than that offered by Roman authors. Quintilian, for instance, enters into much more detail, elaborating on gestures, the eyes, the gaze, facial expressions, the moving of one or both eyebrows, tears, eye-lid positions, and movements of the head, vigorous movements of the arms, single gestures, and movements of the hands, the shoulders, pointing to one's chest, clapping hands, walking during the speech, etc.[74]

To understand why Roman authors provide much more detail on body language, we must consider the respective cultural contexts. The theatre played an important role in ancient Greece and Rome; accordingly, Aristotle and the Latin authors reflected upon the actor's performance and the effect it had on the audience from an aesthetic point of view. In consequence, these authors emphasized the degree to which body language and voice modulations could express different emotional states.[75] It is not surprising that the orator was thought of in comparable terms: he could achieve an emotional effect on the audience by making use of these performative elements. This is not the case in the Arab tradition, where theatre did not play a major role until the nineteenth century. There were some theatrical traditions, such as street theatre and shadow plays, but the cultural elite did not attach a degree of social importance to it that could be compared to the attention showered upon the theatre in the Graeco-Roman world or in modern Europe.

When al-Ǧāḥiẓ provides some outlines concerning bodily performance, he does so—to speak anachronistically—from a semiotic perspective. He is well aware that gestures play an important part in conveying meaning, and says so. However, he does not discuss the ways in which gestures can affect the listener and how these can help in conveying emotions. The few remarks he offers on gestures are quite general and focus on the possibilities of expression.[76] His aim is not to provide a detailed and systematic theorization of how an orator is able to affect the listener.[77]

---

78. The section is partly translated into English in: Abū ʿUṯmān ʿAmr b. Baḥr al-Ǧāḥiẓ, *The Life and Works of Ǧāḥiẓ: Translations of Selected Texts*, trans. Charles Pellat and D. M. Hawke (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969), 103.

74 Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, ed. and trans. Butler, vol. 4, Book XI, chapter III, 61–III, 136, 278–317.

75 Aristotle, for instance, explicitly hints at the effect of gestures when he "implies that acting out a role [by means of gestures] will help to induce the concomitant feelings." See Aristotle, "Poetics," ed. and trans. Stephen Halliwell, in *Aristotle: Poetics, Longinus: On the Sublime, Demetrius: On Style* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 89 note c.

76 His minimal attention to the subject does not lead to the conclusion that gestures and facial expressions were not used in practice, or would not affect listeners. The difference between authors writing in Arabic and other authors lies in the way the authors theorize upon these aspects.

77 Another feature that seems to have influenced the reflections on gesture in the Graeco-Roman tradition is the central role played by the concept of persuasion. The notion of persuasion, around which the Graeco-Roman rhetorical tradition

That the Graeco-Roman tradition attached such a high degree of importance to performative aspects is one of the reasons why this tradition was increasingly acknowledged and received in the Arabic context from the end of the nineteenth century onwards. The Graeco-Roman tradition provided reflections and instructions on various facets of bodily performance that the autochthonous tradition did not offer. However, yet to be discussed below is the extent to which a distinction between autochthonous and foreign elements makes sense. It is obvious, in any case, that these reflections and instructions became increasingly important in the modern Arab world of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Asserting that the Graeco-Roman tradition put more emphasis on performative aspects certainly does not imply that the Arabic tradition lacks a detailed treatment of performance. Treating this facet of the Arabic tradition in terms of a deficiency or a shortcoming would be decidedly essentialist as well as Eurocentric. The Arabic tradition did not "fail" to meet a need, e.g. because of a lack of effort or theoretical sophistication. An elaborate theory of rhetorical performance did not develop because the need for one did not arise. It is only from a Western rhetorical perspective that the need for a detailed treatment of rhetorical performance was conceived. On what basis could one conclude that the same need existed in a different socio-political, socio-economic, and/or cultural environment? Theatre did not play the same role in Arab society, which is why a need to reflect on oratory performance along the lines of the Graeco-Roman tradition did not arise. Consequently, a different perspective on oratory practice emerged and developed.

---

evolved, does not play a comparable role in Arabic rhetoric (*ʿilm al-balāġa*). Aristotle defines rhetoric as "an ability in each [particular] case, to see the available means of persuasion," see Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, trans. Kennedy, 36 (I 2,1), amendment in the original. Arabic rhetoric, in turn, discusses the correct conveyance of a message. In order to attain this goal, "the speech has to conform to the requirements of the situation with concomitant linguistic purity" (*muṭābaqat al-kalām li-muqtaḍā l-ḥāl maʿa fasāḥatihi*). See Masʿūd b. ʿUmar al-Taftazānī, *Muḫtaṣar al-saʿd: šarḥ talḫīs kitāb miftāḥ al-ʿulūm*, ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Hindāwī (Beirut: al-Maktaba al-ʿaṣriyya, 2003), 31, quoted in: Bauer, "[Rhetorik, außereuropäische] V. Arabische Kultur," 111; Antonella Ghersetti, "Quelques notes sur la définition canonique de *balāġa*," in *Philosophy and Arts in the Islamic World*, ed. Urbain Vermeulen and Daniel De Smet (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 58. On the role of persuasion in Arabic rhetoric, see also Geert J. van Gelder, "The Apposite Request: A Small Chapter in Persian and Arabic Rhetoric," *Edebiyât* 12 (2001), 1–13. Nonetheless, definitions of Arabic rhetoric (*ʿilm al-balāġa*) exist, which include the notion of persuasion explicitly, as for instance the anonymous definition quoted by al-Subkī: *balāġa* is "attaining one's demands and persuading the listener," see Bahāʾ al-Dīn al-Subkī, *ʿArūs al-afrāḥ fī šarḫ talḫīṣ al-miftāḥ*, in *Šurūḥ al-talḫīṣ* (Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa l-amīriyya, 1317/1899), 1:124–125, cited in van Gelder, "The Apposite Request," 6. Moreover, Merlin Swartz, "Arabic Rhetoric and the Art of the Homily in Medieval Islam," in *Religion and Culture in Medieval Islam*, ed. Richard G. Hovannisian and Georges Sabagh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 36–65, here 36, states that "in the case of the homily, persuasion constituted its very *raison d'être*." While it seems plausible to assume that this was the case in practice, in the theoretical discussions the notion of persuasion hardly plays any role at all.

In the Arabic-Islamic sphere of pre-modern times, the most important place of rhetorical activity was the Friday sermon. Here, the focus lay on the preacher's calm and dignified attitude. A homiletical manual for Friday preachers written by Ibn al-ʿAṭṭār (d. 724/1324) in the fourteenth century illustrates this. The homiletical manual collects different performative instructions from earlier writings, and therefore offers a concise overview on how the issue of rhetorical performance was treated in connection with preaching. The author explicitly advises the preacher to avoid any greater use of gestures. Rather, one hand should lean on the sword or staff, the other on the support (*qāma*) of the pulpit (*minbar*). The preacher should stand in an upright position and keep his head and his body calm.[78] He should radiate sobriety (*sakīna*) and dignity (*waqār*) in his performance. The rejection of extensive use of gestures is also evident in the work of Ibn al-Ǧawzī (d. 597/1201), a famous preacher in twelfth-century Baghdad. He actively discourages any kind of theatrical performance or rapid gestures, emphasizing that a preacher should always remain sober.[79] It is certainly difficult to deduce from such instructions that the practice of preaching in the pre-modern Arabic-Islamic sphere always adhered to this normative framework. Quite the contrary, Ibn al-Ǧawzī's admonitions prove that vivid rhetorical performances existed in Arabic-Islamic preaching, but that an excess of "theatrical" elements was connoted negatively: a dignified performer avoided vivid gestures. Particularly with regard to the liturgical Friday sermon, such historical advice for preachers is generally valid even today. While one would need further research to prove this hypothesis, it seems as if the Friday sermon, because of its ritual rules, has "conserved" a different conceptualization of public speech.

In addition to the absence of theatre, this different conceptualization of public speech, in which gestures can compromise a speaker's reputation, is probably responsible for the fact that Arab authors accorded less attention to performative issues than Roman authors.[80] It goes without saying that an extensive study of public speech in Arabic history would need to analyse a much larger corpus of sources, thus allowing for a more detailed elaboration of the relationship of norms and practice in the field of rhetorical performance.

---

78 ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. al-ʿAṭṭār, *Kitāb Adab al-ḫaṭīb: Awwal kitāb ufrida fī ādāb ḫaṭīb ṣalāt al-ǧumʿa*, ed. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Sulaymānī (Beirut: Dār al-ġarb al-islāmī, 1996), 131.

79 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAlī Ibn Ǧawzī, *Kitāb al-Quṣṣāṣ wa'l-mudhakkirīn: Including a Critical Edition, Annotated Translation and Introduction*, ed. Merlin L. Swartz (Beirut: Dar el-Machreq, 1971), ٩٥ (Arabic text) / 174 (translation).

80 It should be noted that overly vivid gestures could compromise the orator's esteem in European venues as well. However, apparently, the use of gestures was not only theorized upon much more prominently, but also better accepted within the European tradition of public speech. It goes without saying that such considerations remain preliminary without further analysis of available sources on the topic.

In this light, it is interesting to note that the positions of al-Ǧāḥiẓ feature less prominently in the Lebanese rhetorical manuals written by the Christians Cheikhô and al-Šartūnī, while they play a dominant role in manuals written by Muslim authors in Egypt. Abū Zahra's manual, among the most popular specimens of this genre, illustrates this: Abū Zahra adds a footnote to the heading of the chapter on gestures (*al-išārāt*), in which he quotes the deliberations of al-Ǧāḥiẓ on the relationship between gesture and word (*lafẓ*).[81] Obviously, Abū Zahra's remarks on performative aspects are not limited to al-Ǧāḥiẓ, but include a number of observations. He stresses, for instance, that the performative elements "are the silent speech, the language of general understanding, and often the voice of emotions, as well as the expression of feelings *(ʿibārat al-wiǧdān)*."[82] He underscores the importance of both intentional and unintentional gestures in public speech and criticizes the use of superfluous gestures. The speaker should, for instance, not wipe his forehead continuously, as some lawyers are apt to do, without there being any perspiration to wipe off. Similarly, he should not lift his tarboosh, because such gestures "do not point to any meaning." Instead, the gestures should follow the speech, and should not be over-abundant. The amount of gesturing "depends on the manner of the speaker, his respectful attitude (*mahāba*) and his pleasing appearance (*ruwāʾ*)."[83] Here, the repeated association of gesture and meaning indicates that the author thinks along the lines of al-Ǧāḥiẓ, whose quotation he puts in a most prominent place. At the same time, however, Abū Zahra's remarks follow the line of thought characteristic of Roman authors, even if a literal quotation is not to be found in this part of the manual.

This entanglement of traditions is a characteristic of modern Arabic rhetorical manuals. On the one hand, they receive, process, and digest different elements from the Graeco-Roman tradition and, on the other hand, they draw upon and refer to Arab authors. Abū Zahra's emphasis on al-Ǧāḥiẓ might be understood as a kind of Arabic-Islamic counterbalance to the influence exerted by and attributed to Graeco-Roman authors.

6.5 Conclusion

Modern Arabic rhetorical and homiletical manuals of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries boast many explicit references to Aristotle, but contain relatively few and only implicit clues to an impact from Roman or Latin rhetoric. The preceding analysis, with its focus on the performative aspects of rhetoric, shows clearly, however, that the authors of modern Arabic rhetorical manuals drew not only upon Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and his Arabic commentators, but also on a variety of Roman authors, including

81 Abū Zahra, *Al-Ḫaṭāba*, 133.
82 Abū Zahra, *Al-Ḫaṭāba*, 133.
83 Abū Zahra, *Al-Ḫaṭāba*, 133–134.

Cicero, Quintilian, and Horace. The metaphors of the eye as a transmitter of the speaker's emotions, the face as their mirror, the memory as a treasure-house, and finally Horace's remarks on the best and most powerful methods of affecting an audience, all stem from this tradition. While the many, partly explicit references to central figures of the Graeco-Roman rhetorical tradition allow us to corroborate Roman influence, many rhetorical manuals written by Muslim authors, such as Abū Zahra, also draw upon al-Ǧāḥiẓ. In doing so, such manuals revive an early authority of the Arabic rhetorical tradition, which had lost importance over time.[84]

Against this backdrop, we must speak of an entanglement of different traditions: the Graeco-Roman on the one hand, the Arabic on the other. Greek rhetoric plays a crucial role because of the impact of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* on Arabic Aristotelianism, whereas the influence of Roman authors is also clearly visible. Historically, this "awakening of rhetoric" should be understood as a facet of the *nahḍa*, a period of cultural revival in the Arab Middle East in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, parts of which involved a conscious engagement with cultural traditions regarded as European. As Daniel König outlines in chapter 2.6.1 of this volume, the introduction of Greek and Latin studies in Egyptian universities constitutes one of the most prominent examples of Latin-Arabic entanglement in the modern Arab world. The interest in Greek and Roman rhetorical theory not only fits the *Zeitgeist*, but it shows the extent to which the academic orientation towards Greek and Roman cultural heritage could assume importance within practical life.

Because of the historical differences between Arabic and Graeco-Roman rhetoric, Arabic rhetoric can function as a cultural marker. It has made, and still can make, a difference whether one draws upon Arabic or Graeco-Roman authorities. At least one author of an Arabic rhetorical manual, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ǧīra,[85] goes as far as to criticize the historical engagement of Muslim authors with Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, and blames this engagement for the decline of public speech. In his view, the Arabs offered a practical, the Greeks a theoretical view on the issue. However, given that Greek rhetoric developed in a pagan society, it had little to offer to a Muslim.[86] Ǧīra hopes that one day public speech will be practised as if Aristotle has had no place in intellectual history.[87] This example, in which the reception of a "foreign" tradition is not welcomed and the author refuses to engage with types of what he regards as Western rhetoric, shows that

84 Bonebakker, "Aspects of the History of Literary Rhetoric," 76, insists that a theory of oratory once existed, which later became incorporated into *balāġa*. He is not very explicit, but seems to refer to the early reflections we find in al-Ǧāḥiẓ. It is according to this perspective that the modern reference to al-Ǧāḥiẓ constitutes the revival of an old element.

85 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ǧīra, *Al-Ḫaṭāba wa-iʿdād al-ḫaṭīb*, third ed. ([Cairo]: Maṭbaʿat wizārat al-awqāf, al-idāra l-ʿāmma li-l-marākiz al-ṯaqāfiyya, n.d). Also see Scholz, "Modern Arabic Rhetorical Manuals."

86 Ǧīra, *Al-Ḫaṭāba*, 14.

87 Ǧīra, *Al-Ḫaṭāba*, 42.

referring to Graeco-Roman or later European authorities can also constitute a political message. This applies not only to authors who refuse to engage with the Graeco-Roman tradition, but also to those welcoming such engagement. Other Arabic rhetorical manuals repeatedly associate rhetorical theory with democratic structures. Šalabī, for instance, not only insists that Greek culture "constitutes the foundation of human thought in different regards."[88] He understands public speech, and thus rhetorical theory, as an integral element of ancient Greek democracy, and refers to the importance of public speech in European history, most significantly during the French revolution.[89]

From a transcultural perspective, it is important to acknowledge distinctions between "the autochthonous" and "the foreign." In some cases, the manuals do not explicitly address the origin of different influences, in others the recourse to Aristotle is understood as a recourse to a "foreign" tradition. It is important for the researcher not to reproduce conservative Arabic-Islamic positions by perpetuating a differentiation between Graeco-Roman and Arabic rhetoric. A clear distinction between the two is only partly tenable from a historical point of view: not only is it impossible to completely separate medieval Arabic from ancient Greek thought; it is also extremely difficult to unambiguously allocate modern Arabic rhetorical manuals either to the Graeco-Roman or the Arabic tradition. Although the manuals are associated more with *ʿilm al-ḫaṭāba* (or *fann al-ḫaṭāba*), the Graeco-Roman tradition, than with *ʿilm al-balāġa*, the Arabic tradition, it would be wrong to understand the Arabic rhetorical manuals as products of a purely Graeco-Roman tradition. Quite the contrary is true: the manuals draw upon the Graeco-Roman tradition, but in doing so continue a long process of entanglement, which leads back to the Arabic reception of Greek rhetoric approximately a millennium earlier. As a consequence, it is hardly possible to describe the engagement of Arabic rhetorical manuals with Aristotle in terms of one culture dealing with the product of another. The engagement of Arabic-Islamic authors with Aristotle's *Rhetoric* obviously produced results, which were Greek and Arabic at the same time.

As I have shown in this chapter, the modern Arabic rhetorical manuals also include Latin elements, which contribute to the elaboration of performative theory. Again, however, an interest in the performative aspects cannot be reduced to the reception of a Latin tradition represented by such authors as Cicero and Quintilian. Rather, performative aspects are also treated with reference to al-Ǧāḥiẓ, not only in Abū Zahra's manual but also in many later manuals, which I have not considered in this chapter. Arabic rhetorical manuals that combine Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and al-Ǧāḥiẓ cannot be allocated to one single cultural tradition, but are characterized by the entanglement of different cultural traditions, even if the

88 Šalabī, *Al-Ḫaṭāba*, 142.
89 Šalabī, *Al-Ḫaṭāba*, 70, 144.

authors who serve as sources for these traditions are not accorded the same weight.

From the perspective of transcultural studies, such forms of entanglement constitute a methodological challenge. A researcher engaged in "cultural fossil hunting" can either decide to search for bigger concepts, in order to assign them to a specific cultural tradition, or to search for "smaller fossils" and traces that help to establish connections and influences. While this is the normal everyday business of academic research in the field of reception history, and while this is also what I have done in this chapter, there are disadvantages to this methodological practice. When referring to a certain cultural heritage, particularly when this heritage belongs to an allegedly "other" tradition, one must be aware of the challenges implied in the act of classification. What is implied when a European researcher seeks Greek and Roman elements in modern Arabic rhetorical manuals, exerting some effort in order to identify them? Given that these ancient elements are found only in Arabic rhetorical manuals from the late nineteenth century onwards: do Graeco-Roman elements thus constitute a marker of "modernity"? While this may be the case in a certain sense, one has to be careful—not only because of a long history of ancient Greek influences on medieval Arabic texts, but also because Arabic intellectual history is also marked by Latin influences. The emphasis on performative elements that is a characteristic of Arabic rhetorical manuals of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is inspired by Latin-Roman rather than by ancient Greek authors. Given the long, mainly European and American scholarly tradition of identifying Europe as the exclusive heir to Graeco-Roman antiquity, this search for Roman elements has peculiar implications in that it makes Arab modernity dependent on what is defined as a "European" import. Thus, the search for Roman elements in Arabic rhetorical manuals can contribute to the perpetuation of cultural dichotomizations, which the transcultural approach actually tries to overcome.

Is it legitimate to stress the Graeco-Roman heritage in Arabic manuals? Doing so certainly highlights the cultural heterogeneity of modern Arabic rhetorical culture and illuminates the entanglement of different literary traditions. This is why I have chosen to build on this differentiation in this chapter, not least because distinguishing between Western and Arabic rhetoric is a well-established tradition in the realm of Arabic and Islamic Studies. However, as I have similarly put forward in another article,[90] in view of the aim to overcome culturalist dichotomizations, one must acknowledge the historical dimension of this process of entanglement: at present, the mingling of different traditions in modern Arabic rhetorical manuals is approximately one hundred years old. One can indeed still stress these Roman elements today, marking them as Roman, and setting them off from Arabic elements, as one can generally make efforts to distinguish the different cultural influences that make up cultural artefacts

---

90 Scholz, "Modern Arabic Rhetorical Manuals."

of any kind. Such a procedure certainly leads to a better understanding of how different traditions merge. At the same time, however, one has to be aware that such an understanding also entails the risks of culturalization outlined above. In his important article on Sāʿid al-Šartūnī's rhetorical manual, Abdulrazzak Patel uses the term "Western rhetoric" to designate those elements commonly regarded as part of the Western tradition. Good reasons exist for doing so. Nonetheless, in the twenty-first century, at a point in time, at which Arabic rhetorical manuals form a genre that is over a century old, it seems more appropriate to highlight the entanglement of different traditions without having recourse to the dichotomizing distinction between Western and Arabic elements. In doing so, one can raise awareness of the fact that entanglements are an integral feature of cultural processes. The category "Western" may have a certain didactical function, but its use obscures the understanding of modern Arabic rhetorical manuals as the product of entangled traditions. These can be classified as "Arabic," "Greek," "Roman," "Latin," and even "Western" in a modern European sense, if one chooses to focus on a question of origins. However, if one deems this question secondary or even irrelevant, one could also claim that these manuals are just concerned with different facets of rhetoric.