

The Problem of Terminological Multiplicity in Critical Discourse -Displacement as a Case Study-

Dr. Amel Belhout ¹, Dr. Salim Maiza ²

¹ University of Amar Telidji – Laghouat (Algeria) . E-mail : a.belhout@lagh-univ.dz

² University of Amar Telidji – Laghouat (Algeria) . E-mail : sa.maiza@lagh-univ.dz

Received : 05/05/2026 ; Accepted : 29/08/2026 ; Published : 01/09/2026

Abstract

This article examines the problem of critical terminology in Arabic critical discourse by addressing its concept, significance, and function in the construction of critical knowledge, the definition of concepts, and the regulation of procedures for analyzing literary texts. It also investigates the ways in which critical terms are formed and transferred from one context to another. In addition, the article highlights the phenomenon of terminological multiplicity in Arabic literary criticism and the problems arising from the diversity of theoretical references and methodologies, as well as from differences in translation and Arabization practices. These factors have resulted in variation in the definition and use of concepts. To illustrate this problem, the article takes **displacement** (*al-inziyah*) as a case study. Displacement is one of the critical and linguistic terms that has acquired numerous designations and Arabic equivalents, while its meanings have varied according to the theoretical contexts in which it has been used. Through this case study, the article seeks to identify the manifestations and causes of terminological multiplicity and to examine its effects on conceptual stability and the unification of critical discourse. It ultimately emphasizes the need for conceptual precision and terminological consistency when terms are transferred, formulated, and used in Arabic criticism.

Keywords: terminology; critical terminology; terminological multiplicity; displacement; Arabic criticism; stylistics.

Introduction

Critical terminology constitutes one of the principal analytical tools underpinning critical discourse. Its function is not limited to naming literary and critical phenomena; it also extends to defining their concepts, regulating their meanings, and enabling researchers to approach and analyze texts within a clear epistemic framework. Accordingly, the development of Arabic literary criticism, both classical and modern, has been closely connected with the development of its terminological apparatus and its ability to accommodate the transformations that critical thought has undergone, particularly as Arabic criticism opened up to Western methods and theories and to the diverse epistemological references that contributed to shaping its terminology.

Although critical terminology plays a fundamental role in constructing and circulating critical knowledge, the process of producing a term and transferring it from one field of knowledge to another raises several questions concerning its formulation, its precision in expressing the relevant concept, and its suitability to Arabic linguistic and cultural specificities. This situation has led to the emergence of numerous critical terms whose equivalents and designations vary according to the translators, researchers, and methodologies involved. Terminological multiplicity has consequently become one of

the most significant issues deserving scholarly attention because of its effects on conceptual stability, the unification of critical discourse, and communication among researchers.

This problem is particularly evident in the term **displacement** (*al-inziyah*), one of the modern critical and linguistic terms widely used in literary and linguistic studies. Its Arabic equivalents and designations have varied according to the theoretical references and approaches through which it has been examined. Alongside *al-inziyah*, other designations and equivalents have been used to refer to concepts that are close to or overlap with it. This raises a fundamental question concerning the boundaries of the concept, its relationship to terminological multiplicity, and the extent to which such multiplicity affects the precision of critical analysis.

On this basis, this article examines the problem of critical terminology by discussing its concept, significance, and functions; identifying some of the mechanisms involved in its formation; and investigating terminological multiplicity in Arabic criticism. It then takes **displacement** as an analytical model through which to examine the manifestations, causes, and consequences of this multiplicity for critical practice. The article addresses the following questions:

- What is meant by a term, and what is meant by a critical term?
- What are the principal functions of a term and the conditions governing its formation?
- What factors have contributed to the multiplicity of critical terms in Arabic literature?
- How has this multiplicity manifested itself in the term *al-inziyah*?
- Does the multiplicity of designations represent terminological richness, or does it produce conceptual confusion and hinder the unification of critical discourse?

Definition of the Term:

Linguistic Definition

Al-*ṣulḥ* also means peace. The forms *iṣṭalahū*, *ṣālahū*, and *taṣālahū* convey the meaning of reconciliation and agreement. In the form *iṣṭalahū*, the letter *tā'* is changed into *ṣād* and assimilated into it. The expression *qawm ṣulūḥ* describes people who are reconciled with one another (al-Miṣrī, Lisān al-'Arab, 1414 AH, p. 517), as though they were being described by the verbal noun itself. Al-*ṣalāḥ*, with a *kasra* on the *ṣād*, is the verbal noun of reconciliation (*muṣālahah*). In Arabic usage, it may be treated as feminine, whereas the noun al-*ṣulḥ* may be treated as either masculine or feminine. The expression *aṣḥa mā baynahum* means "he restored good relations between them," while *ṣālahahum* means "he reconciled with them" or "he made peace with them." Bishr ibn Abī Ḥāzim said:

They seek reconciliation at Dhāt Kahf,

yet there they have neither goods nor dignity (al-Miṣrī I. M.-I., 1419 AH, p. 384) .

Tāj al-'Arūs defines *al-iṣṭilāḥ* as "the agreement of a particular group upon a particular matter." (Al-Zabīdī, 1969, p. 551) From the linguistic meaning of *iṣṭilāḥ*, two central notions emerge: agreement and circulation. The term therefore refers to the collective agreement of a particular group on the meaning assigned to a particular matter and to the subsequent circulation of that meaning among members of the group. In this sense, *al-iṣṭilāḥ* is a specialized convention: the agreement of a particular group to assign a specific designation to a specific matter (al-Bustānī, 1927) .

According to *al-Kulliyāt*, *al-iṣṭilāḥ* is the agreement of a group to establish a particular designation (al-Kafawī, 1998) . It has also been defined as transferring a word from its linguistic meaning to another

meaning in order to clarify the intended meaning. The term is generally used in a field of knowledge whose propositions are established through reasoning and inference.

Maḥmūd Fahmī Hījāzī explains that a terminological word or expression is a simple concept or a compound expression whose meaning—or, more precisely, whose use—has become established and clearly defined. It is a specialized expression with a restricted technical meaning and the greatest possible degree of clarity (Hījāzī, 1993, p. 11).

In *Kitāb al-Ta'rīfāt*, al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī defines *al-iṣṭilāḥ* as an agreement to name a thing by a designation transferred from its original meaning. It is also the transfer of a word from one linguistic meaning to another because of a relationship between the two meanings. Another definition describes it as transferring a thing from its linguistic meaning to another meaning in order to clarify the intended meaning; it may also refer to a specific expression used by a specific group (al-Jurjānī, 2004).

Functions of the Term:

According to Youcef Oughlici, the functions of terminology may be summarized as follows.

1. The Linguistic Function

This function reflects the genius of the language, the breadth of its lexical resources, and the variety of its terminological mechanisms. It therefore demonstrates the language's ability to accommodate newly emerging concepts in different fields of specialization.

2. The Epistemic Function

Terminology is the language of science and knowledge. No field of knowledge can exist without a terminology—that is, a structured body of terms. For this reason, classical scholars rightly described terms as “the keys to the sciences and the beginnings of the crafts.”

3. The Communicative Function

Just as a term is a key to a field of knowledge, it is also an instrument of communication. It provides the conceptual framework that clarifies a text when its meanings become complex. Discussing any field of knowledge while avoiding its specialized terminology results in distortion. At the same time, specialized terminology may lose its communicative effectiveness outside the relevant field because it is primarily intended for communication among specialists rather than for general audiences.

4. The Economic Function

Terminology performs an important economic function by enabling a vast amount of knowledge to be stored in a limited number of terminological units. This process saves considerable effort, language, and time. In this sense, the term becomes a means of overcoming the constraints imposed by time and of organizing knowledge efficiently.

5. The Civilizational Function

Terminological language is universal because it constitutes a meeting point for human cultures and a civilizational bridge linking the languages of the world. This function is particularly evident in linguistic borrowing, through which languages exchange forms and expressions that testify to the historical, intellectual, and civilizational presence of one language within another. Through borrowing, terms may become international expressions that cannot be exclusively claimed by any one language. Terminology is therefore also a language of globalization (Oughlici, 2008, pp. 42-45).

The Problem of Terminological Multiplicity

Every nation possesses a heritage and a body of knowledge, and every field of knowledge has expressions that represent it. A researcher cannot understand the sciences of a particular tradition without understanding the linguistic resources associated with that tradition. As cultures came into contact and peoples from the East and West—including Indians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans—interacted with the Arabs, foreign expressions entered the Arabic lexicon to designate sciences that had developed outside the Arab cultural environment. This process reflected the mutual influence resulting from the interaction of languages, ideas, and sciences.

Al-Jāhiz explains this process by stating that scholars selected words for particular meanings, derived designations from Arabic speech, and agreed on names for things that had previously had no name in Arabic. In this way, they became precedents for those who followed them (Al-Jāhiz, 1998, p. 75).

Thus began the development of terminological systems. Terms differed from one scholar to another, and individual scholars sometimes attributed to themselves the credit for introducing a particular term. Qudāma ibn Jaʿfar, for example, explains in *Naqd al-Shiʿr* that when he derived a meaning that had not previously been established, he needed to create names for its meanings and artistic form (ibn Jaʿfar, 1978, p. 154).

The present discussion focuses on critical terminology, which is central to the work of writers, critics, and researchers. The problem of terminological multiplicity arises when several terms are applied to one literary concept or when a single term is used for several literary meanings and concepts. This may make a literary concept—especially one imported from different cultural traditions—vague and difficult to define. The divergence between Arabic translations of a single foreign term in the Mashriq and the Arab Maghreb has also contributed to ambiguity among readers and researchers and has hindered the development of Arabic critical studies.

Before discussing the causes of this problem, it is useful to examine several mechanisms that contribute to the creation of terms in Western theories.

1. Derivation

Derivation (*al-ishtiqāq*) is one of the most important mechanisms in Arabic, a language with a highly productive derivational system. It has been defined as “extracting one word from another, provided that the two correspond in meaning and structure while differing in form.” (al-Jurjānī A. i.-S., 1983, p. 43).

Arabic relies heavily on derivation to expand its lexicon. Derivation may be divided into major and minor derivation, the latter being more limited in use.

2. Blending

Blending (*al-naḥt*) consists of taking two words or a phrase and extracting from their combined letters a new word that conveys the meaning of the original expression (al-Maghribī, 1908, p. 21).

3. Arabization

The Arabization of a foreign name means pronouncing it according to Arabic linguistic patterns (al-Jawharī, 1987, p. 179). Arabization may result from direct contact between languages and their speakers, as in war, occupation, study, travel, and migration, or from indirect contact through the media, commerce, and modern means of communication such as the telephone and the internet.

Arabization also refers to using Arabic in the different branches of knowledge—in speech and writing, study and teaching, research, translation, and authorship—and to giving a foreign word an Arabic form when transferring it into Arabic (al-ʿAbbādī, 2021, p. 102).

Factors Contributing to Multiplicity

Several factors have contributed to terminological multiplicity:

- The different intellectual backgrounds of researchers, critics, and scholars have encouraged the use of multiple terms for one concept or the use of one term for several concepts. Critics in the Mashriq were often influenced by English criticism, whereas critics in the Arab Maghreb were more strongly influenced by French criticism.
- The absence of coordination and cooperation in translation, as well as in contemporary Arabic critical research, has contributed significantly to the problem.
- Intellectual partisanship, individual research practices, and the lack of communication and coordination have produced an abundance of terms with two contrasting aspects. On the one hand, this abundance demonstrates the richness of Arabic and its ability to generate terms that keep pace with modern sciences. On the other hand, it makes it difficult to adopt one term for one critical concept, which may result in conceptual vagueness, hinder research, and prevent the coordination of scholarly efforts.
- The reception of terminology by researchers and critics has further complicated the issue. Misunderstanding the concept represented by a term may lead to an inaccurate interpretation of the theory associated with it. For example, 'Abd Allāh al-Ghadrāmī is said to have misunderstood and mistranslated the term "deconstruction" (*al-tafkīk*) by interpreting it as demolition and discussing demolition for the sake of construction. This was not the theoretical meaning intended by Derrida and Western deconstructionists. The problem therefore extends beyond the term itself to the theoretical concept and intellectual content it carries (Jada, 2020).

Some critics and researchers have attempted to address this problem through seminars and conferences devoted to terminology, including the conference held by Yarmouk University in Jordan and special issues of journals devoted to literary terminology. Muḥammad Ways observes that these meetings contained valuable ideas which, if implemented, could produce significant benefits (Wayyis, 1996, p. 29).

Ways attributes terminological divergence to factors that vary from one period to another, including the growth and development of thought, the transmission of experiences and opinions between generations, the expansion of knowledge, and the discovery of new facts.

Displacement as a Case Study

The term **displacement** (*al-inziyah*) has generated considerable debate because critics have attempted to define it in ways compatible with their theoretical perspectives. Linguistically, the Arabic root **n-z-ḥ** conveys the meaning of distance or remoteness. *Lisān al-ʿArab* defines the verb *nazaḥa* as "to become distant," and the expression *nazaḥa bi-fulān* means that a person became far removed from his homeland for an extended period (al-Miṣrī A. a.-F.-D.-I., p. 614).

In *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīt*, *nazaḥa* likewise means "to become distant." *Al-nazīḥ* refers to a distant person, while *nazaḥa al-qawm* means that the people's wells became dry (al-Fīrūzābādī, 2005, p. 244).

The Technical Meaning

From a technical perspective, al-Masdī explains that Riffaterre's account of the stylistic phenomenon remains connected to the concept of displacement. It involves departing from an established expressive

pattern, sometimes by violating rules and at other times by resorting to rare forms (Abd al-Salām al-Masadi, p. 103).

Historically, the term *al-inziyah* is modern, but the concept it denotes is ancient and can be traced back to Aristotle and to the rhetoricians and critics who followed him. Aḥmad Muḥammad Ways defines it as the creative use of language—including vocabulary, structures, and images—in a manner that departs from what is customary and familiar and enables the creator to achieve distinctiveness, creativity, and expressive force (Wayyis, *Wazīfat al-Inzīāḥ min Manzūr al-Dirāsāt al-Uslūbiyya*, 2005, p. 298) .

The terminology associated with displacement has multiplied according to the perspectives of different critics. Some scholars argue that the French term *l'écart* raises a significant problem in modern stylistic studies and that the stylistics of displacement has generated a substantial body of scholarship. This concept has been rendered in Arabic through more than forty terms, a situation that may be partly explained by the fact that Western scholars themselves have used numerous terms to express the broader concept (Būḥalāsa, 2012, p. 13) .

Other designations include **rupture**, **infraction**, **scandal**, **solecism**, **violation of norms**, **transgression**, **madness**, and **distortion**. These terms should not automatically be treated as exact synonyms; their meanings may vary according to the theoretical framework and the critic who uses them (Faḍl, 1978, p. 57).

Ways notes that the concept of displacement has attracted numerous terms and descriptions. Although these terms may differ significantly, their abundance is striking, and the phenomenon is not merely a recent development in Arabic scholarship; it has Western origins as well (Faḍl, 1978, p. 57).

French Terminological Equivalents

Author	French term	English rendering
Valéry	<i>l'écart</i>	displacement
Valéry	<i>l'abus</i>	transgression
Wellek and Warren	<i>la distorsion</i>	distortion
Bataille	<i>la subversion</i>	subversion
Thierry	<i>l'infraction</i>	infraction
Barthes	<i>le scandale</i>	scandal
J. Cohen	<i>le vol</i>	violation
Todorov	<i>la violation des normes</i>	violation of norms
Todorov	<i>l'incorrection</i>	Solecism
Arrigon	<i>la transgression</i>	Transgression
Groupe μ	<i>l'altération</i>	Alteration

In addition to these terms, less common designations such as **rupture** and **scandal** have also been used. To reduce ambiguity, the present study focuses on the three designations most commonly discussed in the relevant literature: **deviation** (*al-inḥirāf*), **departure** (*al-ʿudūl*), and **displacement** (*al-inziyah*).

Deviation (*al-inḥirāf*)

Al-inḥirāf appears to be one of the most widespread Arabic equivalents for a term used in English and French, although its use is more common in English-oriented scholarship. It has also been rendered through terms such as **anomaly** and **departure**. Nevertheless, a large number of researchers and translators use *al-inḥirāf* (Wayyis, *Al-Inzīāḥ from the Perspective of Stylistic Studies*, 1996, p. 60).

In its broad sense, *al-inḥirāf* refers to any departure from established and conventionally recognized norms. It may be understood as a systematic violation of the linguistic code and an attempt to move beyond an accepted linguistic system in order to construct a new pattern according to newly established criteria. The importance attributed to deviation derives from the view that it is a stylistic phenomenon through which the artistic features of expression can be identified and specific analytical results reached by examining how an utterance is constructed and what aesthetic effects it produces (ʿĪd, *Al-Baḥṭh al-Uslūbī: Muʿāṣara wa-Turāth*, 1993, p. 148).

Rajāʾ Muḥammad ʿĪd considered *al-inḥirāf* an equivalent of *al-inziyah*, whereas Muḥammad Ways rejected this use because of the term's negative and non-ethical associations. He notes that critics have sometimes used it in connection with sexual or moral deviance. Mūsā Rabābiʿa also used *al-inḥirāf* to refer to *al-inziyah*, arguing that style departs from standard language. At the same time, he acknowledged the negative psychological associations of the term and observed that it had nevertheless become common in modern critical studies (Rabābiʿa, 2003, p. 44).

Ṣalāḥ Faḍl likewise preferred the term *al-inḥirāf*, noting that it has acquired different forms and associations in Arabic. Some scholars seek an equivalent rooted in the classical concept of *al-ʿudūl*, while others retain *al-inḥirāf* with its moral connotations (Bouhlāsa, 2012, p. 17).

The term *al-inḥirāf*, or *al-tahrīf*, also appears in Ibn Jinnī's discussion of morphological patterns. He explains that a form may depart from its original pattern through addition or through a change in form (Aisha, 2020, p. 504).

Ways provides a chronological account of the use of *al-inḥirāf* as an equivalent of *al-inziyah*. He traces its appearance to Zakī Najīb Maḥmūd's translation of H. B. Charlton's *The Art of Literature*, after which it was used by Muṣṭafā Nāṣif and later by Asʿad Ḥalīm. Although the term became widespread, Ways notes that it has remained subject to occasional confusion because it also appears in non-stylistic and non-critical contexts, often with negative associations such as artistic defect, aesthetic flaw, error, or sterility (Wayyis, *Wazīfat al-Inzīāḥ min Manẓūr al-Dirāsāt al-Uslūbiyya*, 2005, pp. 38-39).

Departure (*al-ʿudūl*)

The term *al-ʿudūl* is not new. It and some of its derivatives appear in books on language, grammar, and rhetoric. The verbal noun *al-ʿudūl* derives from *ʿadala*, meaning to incline, turn aside, or depart (Wayyis, *Wazīfat al-Inzīāḥ min Manẓūr al-Dirāsāt al-Uslūbiyya*, 2005, p. 23).

Ways notes that al-Masḍī was among the first scholars to draw attention to this term as an equivalent of a foreign concept. However, al-Masḍī himself used *al-inziyah* rather than *al-ʿudūl* in his book. When he first used *al-inziyah* as an equivalent of *l'écart*, he intended to emphasize the novelty of a procedural concept that had emerged outside the established conventions of Arabic composition. The term *al-ʿudūl*

appeared later as a traditional rhetorical designation that was less likely to create ambiguity (Wayyis, Waḏīfat al-Inzīāḥ min Manẓūr al-Dirāsāt al-Uslūbiyya, 2005, p. 24).

Al-ʿudūl is rooted in the classical Arabic rhetorical and critical heritage. Several scholars have adopted it as an equivalent of the Western term used in theoretical and practical studies of poetry, including Tammām Ḥassān, Ḥammādī Ṣamūd, Muṣṭafā al-Saʿdanī, ʿAbd Allāh Ṣawla, and al-Ṭayyib Bakkūsh (Rabābiʿa, 2003, p. 45).

In *al-Balāgha wa-l-Uslūbiyya*, Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib divides discourse into two levels. The first is the ideal and normative level, which rhetoricians call the original pattern (*al-aṣl*). The second is a departure from that pattern, taking forms such as fronting and postponement, variation in sentence structure, and the use of concision and expansion. The rhetorical chapters concerned with meanings are fundamentally based on departing from ordinary usage.

The term *al-iltifāt* may also be understood as an expressive feature based on departure. In the view of rhetoricians, it means moving from one mode of expression to another different mode (Abdel-Muttalib, 1994, p. 276).

The term *al-ʿudūl* also appears in the works of al-Qāḍī al-Jurjānī, Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī, al-Zamakhsharī, and Ibn Wahb. These examples demonstrate that the term and its derivatives were used in several contexts, including error, deviation from correctness, and departure from an intended path. Ways therefore concludes that *al-ʿudūl*, like *al-inḥirāf*, is not entirely free from ambiguity because it carries several established meanings (Wayyis, *Al-Inzīāḥ from the Perspective of Stylistic Studies*, 1996, p. 48).

Displacement (*al-inziyah*)

Because of the negative associations attached to *al-inḥirāf*, some researchers sought alternative designations for the phenomenon of departing from familiar usage and transgressing established linguistic conventions. The term **displacement** (*al-inziyah*) became one of the most prominent alternatives and spread widely in modern Arabic critical studies. Its adoption can be understood partly as an attempt to avoid the negative moral connotations associated with *al-inḥirāf* (Rabābiʿa, 2003, p. 44).

Some critics also used *al-inziyah* as an alternative to *al-ʿudūl* in order to modernize the terminology and distance it from its traditional associations.

Among Arab stylisticians and critics, *al-inziyah* ranks second after *al-inḥirāf* in frequency of use. It is the verbal noun of *inzāḥa*, meaning “to move away” or “to become distant.” For this reason, it has been regarded as an appropriate equivalent of the French term *l'écart* (Wayyis, *Al-Inzīāḥ from the Perspective of Stylistic Studies*, 1996, p. 65).

According to Ways, the term first appeared in the introduction written by ʿAbd al-Salām al-Masdī to Riffaterre's *Essais de stylistique structurale*. Al-Masdī also used it in his book *al-Uslūbiyya wa-l-Uslūb*. It is important to note that scholars who used *al-inziyah* were generally influenced by French sources, either directly or through translation, whereas scholars influenced mainly by English sources tended to prefer *al-inḥirāf*. English sources commonly use *deviation*, while the French term *l'écart* has often been associated with *al-inziyah* (Wayyis, *Al-Inzīāḥ from the Perspective of Stylistic Studies*, 1996, p. 66).

Yūsuf Abū al-ʿAdūs argues that both *al-inḥirāf* and *al-ʿudūl* occur in rhetorical and critical works with meanings that are not necessarily stylistic or critical. By contrast, he considers *al-inziyah* less ambiguous and free from the negative moral associations attached to *al-inḥirāf* (Ashour, 2012, p. 67).

Some scholars distinguish between two forms of displacement: a violation of the grammatical norm on the one hand, and a restriction or narrowing of that norm through the use of additional rules on the other (Ashour, 2012, p. 62).

This terminological disorder surrounding a single concept creates a major problem for Arab researchers, who may assume that each designation refers to a completely separate concept. It also reflects a degree of uncertainty regarding the concept itself. A single critic may use several terms for displacement within the same work.

Mūsā Rabābi'a illustrates this problem by citing Moreh Abū Nāṣir, who describes style as "dissonance" and as a departure from familiar speech. Thus, several terms—dissonance, deviation, and departure—are used to refer to one phenomenon (Rabābi'a, 2003, p. 45).

Rabābi'a therefore calls for the regulation of terminology through principles capable of preventing conceptual fragmentation. Establishing firm principles for critical terminology has become necessary in order to protect both researchers and readers from confusion (Rabābi'a, 2003, p. 45).

Ways attributes the multiplicity of terms applied to displacement to the overlap among different fields of knowledge, including psychology, logic, philosophy, and aesthetics in modern and contemporary criticism. He also relates it to the number of scholars who have coined terms across the Arab world and to the diversity of their cultural backgrounds. Some are influenced by French scholarship, whereas others draw on English intellectual traditions. Each group consequently translates the term in accordance with its own intellectual orientation.

The problem is further intensified by the lack of communication between these groups, which prevents later scholars from benefiting fully from the work of earlier scholars. Intellectual partisanship and the belief that each group's preferred designation is the most accurate have also contributed to the problem. Such fragmentation does not serve scholarship or knowledge (Wayyis, *Al-Inzīāḥ from the Perspective of Stylistic Studies*, 1996, p. 30).

Conclusion

This study has shown that critical terminology is a fundamental instrument in constructing critical discourse and defining its concepts and procedures. However, the multiplicity of terms and the divergence of their designations have generated terminological problems that affect the clarity, stability, and circulation of concepts.

The case of **displacement** (*al-inziyah*) reveals an important dimension of this problem. The concept has been represented through several terms, and the interpretations associated with it have varied according to the critical, linguistic, and methodological references adopted by different scholars. Nevertheless, terminological multiplicity should not be regarded as an absolute obstacle. It may constitute a source of critical richness when scholars remain aware of the semantic and methodological differences among the terms they use.

There is therefore a continuing need to regulate critical terminology and to unify its use as far as possible while taking into account the specific contexts in which terms emerge. Such an approach can contribute to greater precision, clarity, and coherence in Arabic critical discourse.

References

1. Ibn Manẓūr al-Ifrīqī al-Miṣrī, *Lisān al-ʿArab*, 3rd ed., entry "Ṣ-L-Ḥ," vol. 2, Dār Ṣādir, Beirut, 1414 AH.

2. Ibn Manẓūr al-Ifrīqī al-Miṣrī, *Lisān al-‘Arab*, 3rd ed., entry “Ṣ-L-Ḥ,” vol. 7, Dār Ṣādir, Beirut, 1419 AH.
3. Al-Zabīdī, Muḥammad Murtaḍā al-Ḥusaynī, *Tāj al-‘Arūs min Jawāhir al-Qāmūs*, vol. 6, Maṭba‘at al-Ḥukūma, Kuwait, 1969.
4. Abū al-Baqā’ Ayyūb ibn Mūsā al-Ḥusaynī al-Kafawī, al-Kulliyāt, ed. ‘Adnān Darwīsh and Muḥammad al-Miṣrī, 2nd ed., Mu’assasat al-Risāla, Beirut, 1998.
5. Maḥmūd Fahmī Ḥijāzī, *al-Usus al-Lughawiyya li-‘Ilm al-Muṣṭalaḥ*, Maktabat Gharīb, Cairo.
6. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-‘Abbādī, “The Crisis of Terminology in Contemporary Critical Studies,” *Majallat Madārāt fī al-Lugha wa-l-Adab*, Tebessa, Algeria, vol. 2, no. 1, 2021.
7. ‘Abd Allāh al-Bustānī, *al-Bustān: wa-huwa Mu‘jam Lughawī*, vol. 1, entry “Ṣ-L-Ḥ,” al-Maṭba‘a al-Amīrikāniyya, Beirut, 1927, p. 1249.
8. ‘Abd al-Qādir ibn Muṣṭafā al-Maghribī, *al-Ishtiqāq wa-l-Ta‘rīb*, Maṭba‘at al-Hilāl bi-l-Jafāla, Egypt, 1908.
9. ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī, *Mu‘jam al-Ta‘rīfāt*, ed. Muḥammad Ṣiddīq al-Minshāwī, Dār al-Faḍīla, Cairo, 2004.
10. ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī, *al-Ta‘rīfāt*, ed. by a group of scholars under the supervision of the publisher, 1st ed., Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, 1983.
11. Al-Jāhīz, *al-Bayān wa-l-Tabyīn*, ed. ‘Abd al-Salām Hārūn, 7th ed., Maktabat al-Khānjī, Cairo, 1998, vol. 1.
12. Qudāma ibn Ja‘far, *Naqd al-Shi‘r*, ed. Kamāl Muṣṭafā, Maktabat al-Khānjī, 3rd ed., 1978, p. 154.
13. Ismā‘īl ibn Ḥammād al-Jawharī, *al-Ṣiḥāḥ: Tāj al-Lugha wa-Ṣiḥāḥ al-‘Arabiyya*, vol. 1.
14. Yūsuf Waghlīsī, *Ishkāliyyat al-Muṣṭalaḥ*, al-Dār al-‘Arabiyya li-l-‘Ulūm Nāshirūn, Beirut, 2008.
15. Ghaniya Jada‘, “The Critical Term between Multiplicity and the Problem of Reception,” *Al-Ibrāhīmī Journal of Literature and Human Sciences*, Bordj Bou Arréridj, Algeria, vol. 1, no. 4, 2020.
16. Aḥmad Muḥammad Wayyis, “Al-Inzīāḥ from the Perspective of Stylistic Studies,” *‘Alāmāt Journal*, 1996.
17. Abū al-Faḍl Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Manẓūr al-Ifrīqī al-Ḥuṣrī, *Lisān al-‘Arab*, Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, Beirut, vol. 2.
18. Majd al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb al-Fīrūzābādī, *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīt*, 8th ed., Mu’assasat al-Risāla, Beirut, 2005.
19. ‘Abd al-Salām al-Masadī, *al-Uslūbiyya wa-l-Uslūb*, 3rd ed., al-Dār al-‘Arabiyya li-l-Kitāb, Libya, n.d.
20. Aḥmad Muḥammad Wayyis, *Wazīfat al-Inzīāḥ min Manẓūr al-Dirāsāt al-Uslūbiyya*.
21. Nawwār Būḥalāsa, “Al-Inzīāḥ between the Unity of the Concept and the Multiplicity of Terms,” *Maqālīd Journal*, University of Constantine, Algeria, 2012.
22. Ṣalāḥ Faḍl, *Balāghat al-Khiṭāb wa-‘Ilm al-Naṣṣ*, ‘Ālam al-Ma‘rifa, no. 164, Kuwait, 1978.
23. Salām ‘Abd Allāh Maḥmūd ‘Āshūr, “The Terminology of Al-‘Udūl and Al-Inzīāḥ among Arab Linguists,” *Ibn Rushd University Journal in the Netherlands*, no. 6, 2012.
24. Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, *al-Balāgha wa-l-Uslūbiyya*, 1st ed., Maktabat Lubnān Nāshirūn, Egypt, 1994.

25. Rajā' Muḥammad 'Īd, al-Baḥṭh al-Uslūbī: Mu'āṣara wa-Turāth, Mansha'at al-Ma'ārif, Alexandria, Egypt, 1993.
26. Mūsā Sāmiḥ Rabābi'a, al-Uslūbiyya: Mafāhīmuhā wa-Tajalliyātuhā, 1st ed., Dār al-Kindī, Jordan, 2003.
27. Nawwār Būḥalāsa, "Al-Inzīāḥ between the Unity of the Concept and the Multiplicity of Terms," Maqālīd Journal, University of Constantine, Algeria.
28. Dubāla 'Ā'isha, "The Phenomenon of Al-Inzīāḥ in Arabic Criticism: Between Linguistic Rooting and Terminological Multiplicity," Arabic Language Journal, vol. 22, no. 55, University of Oran Ahmed Ben Bella, Algeria, 2020.