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ABSTRACT
This article was written with the aim of examining the differing views of the scholars of the art of the trope in the subject of mental trope or tropical predication and tries to compare the different aspects of scholars’ views with an analytical and descriptive method and finally with the help of those scholars’ views and studying the historical evolutionary course of that rhetorical device give a fruitful result to the lovers of this art. Mental trope is one of the devices of the rhetoric in general and art of the trope in specific that the domain of dialectic and arguments about it goes back to the history of rhetoric and it came to known as propositional trope, trope in proof, and tropical predication. Mental tropes are generally given by the construction and the structure of the sentence and is beyond the boundary of the word; that is, each single word of the sentence is used in its conventional meaning, however, the construction of the sentence is not in agreement with its real concept. In other words, the verb and verbal group (infinitive, gerund, and past participle) is attributed to an agent other than its real agent.

Introduction
The mental trope is one of the rhetorical issues which the domain of its dialectic and controversies is going back to the beginning of the rhetoric and it also came to known as the propositional trope, trope in proof, and tropical predication. Shirazi expresses the reasons of these nomenclatures as follows: “the relations of these terms are in this way respectively: it is called the propositional trope because the proposition has the meaning of relation and this trope is about the relation. As for the trope in proof, the most examples of this trope is about the proving, and in addition, the disproof is subordinated to the proven, therefore, the root is the proof; and it is called tropical predication (Majazi, مجازی) with the relational یا (ال) because the trope is about the predication and relation and the relation includes the predicational relation, additional, and harmonic” (Shirazi, 1370, vol.1, p. 253).

The precursors’ views
This term was used by Abd-Al-Ghafer Jorjani for the first time, thus he is known as the originator and discoverer of this kind of trope. Taha Hossein regards him as the one who made the dimensions of this kind of trope clear (Saghiri, بیتا, p.117). It should be said that this issue had also been dealt with before Jorjani; however, the term was coined by him. Sibawayh dealt with this issue in his book “Al-Kitab” with the example “نْامارك ‘مبارك’ and Mobrad in the book “Al-Kamel” discussed the issue by mentioning some famous examples (1988, vol 1, p.160).

Ibn Fares named that kind of trope as “the addition of the verb to what is not being the real agent”, and pointed out to famous examples about it. Therefore, by this definition it can be said that he was the first one who attempted to give a definition and usage of the mental trope and allocated a chapter of his book in this regard (1993, p. 215).

Abd-Al-Ghafer has a detailed discussion about the propositional trope or tropical predication and its different types, but for avoiding the prolongation of the subject and because most of his views will be touched upon in Sakkaki and the other later scientists’ views, here just a division and definition of his views is mentioned that later established a basis for Sakkaki and other men of letters in the art of tropes. He divides the trope in two types, that is, the lexical trope and mental or propositional trope and will be expressed as follows: “the trope through the word, that is, lexical trope and the trope through the meaning, that is, propositional trope” (Jorjani, بیتا, p. 408).

From the viewpoint of Abd-Al-Ghafer Jorjani the reference of understanding the propositional trope is the mentality, therefore, he defines it in this way:

وَأَجْلَسَ النَّامِيرَ[25] ( الأنبياء) (Al-Zelzeleh, 2) that the verb is attributed to an agent rather than its real agent.

Sakaki view
Sakakaki after narrating the views of the former scholars regarding the mental trope considers it as the implicit metaphor and repudiates the existence of mental trope as the way the precursors perceived it in these kinds of examples. He gives his own definition regarding this kind of trope in the fifth part of the different types of tropes in this way:

Meaning: “Mental trope is when the conceived sentence is different from the view and opinion of the speaker, a contrary concept which is not through the original creation but through the interpretation. For example: “The spring grew the plant”. In explaining his example he believes that that sentence is not a mental trope for if it is claimed that the verb “grew” (grew) expressed for using as omnipotent God, it is the conventional lexical trope not the mental trope (ibid). Therefore, from his
view, in this example the "تَمْبَع" is likened to the "real grower", then the Mushahhab bih (vehicle) is omitted and one of its components which is the "الْبَيْنَة" is expressed like an implicit metaphor; thus in contrary to the Sakkaki’s precursors and some of the scholars of the art of tropes after him the mental trope firstly refers to the word not the predication and secondly its truly mentioning the Mushahhab (tenor) and the act of Mushahhab bih (vehicle) in the same way as in the implicit metaphor.

Sakkaki for resolving the doubts in his definition says: I told contrary to what it is about the speaker not what it is about the mentality to exclude the views of those unwise (atheist)s who say "الْبَيْنَة الْبَيْنَة" (The spring grew the plant) with the belief that the growing is caused by the spring (ibid). After that definition and putting delimitation on it he recognizes the forms of trope as four types; conformity with reality and belief, nonconformity with the both, conformity with reality and nonconformity with belief, and conformity with belief and nonconformity with reality which are adopted from Abd-Al-Ghaher views. He also believes that this kind of trope is common among the Arabs and for each context he presented an example (ibid, pp. 396-397).

Qazvini views

Qazvini is not agree with Sakkaki in mental trope, but in contrary to Sakkaki he considers that kind of trope to be exist in predication not in sentence and that is a topic of semantics; that is, the mental trope is related to the attribution of the words, and because the subject is about the words it lies in the realm of semantics he accounts it as the mental trope because the attribution in everything is mental. He defines the trope in this way:

"وَأَما الْمَجَازٍ، فَهُوَ إِسْنَادُ الْفَعْلِ، أَوْ مَعَانَى إِلَى مَالَبِينِهِ، عِنْ مَا وَهُوَ لِهِ مُعْلَمٌ;

Meaning: "tropical predication is the attribution of the verb or its meaning to the associations or the dependents of the verb or its meaning is not originally created for - with putting the indicative link for that attribution is to something other than what it is".

He continued that the verb has many associations and dependents from among them are agent, object, infinitive, place, and cause (ibid). The other point that Qazvini refers to is that the attribution of the verb to the agent and object that it is not originally created for is because of the similarity of those unreal agent and direct object to the dependents of the tropical verb and he presents examples like (Qazvini, 2011, vol. 1, p. 36). (ibid)

The fourth objection to Qazvini is in the verse “وَقَالَ فِرْعَوْنُ إِنَّ هَيْانًا إِنْ لَيْ ضَرَّاً عَلَى الْأَبْنَاءِ” (Qaher, 36). The prerequisite of Sakkaki’s statement is that the Mushahhab (tenor) of "نهار" would become the purpose of the Mushahhab bih (vehicle) and therefore, the purpose is the "نهار" not the "هَيْانَ” and this condition is rejected because we know that the purpose is Haman who is the vizier of the Pharaoh.

The fifth objection of Qazvini against Sakkaki is the examples of "نهار صاملاً" (Shirazi, 2013: vol. 1, p. 289 & Hashemi, 1390: vol. 2, p. 283).

Qazvini thinks that there is also a contradictory objection1 to Sakkaki in this way that in the implicit metaphor he said that mentioning the Mushahhab (tenor) and meaning the Mushahhab bih (vehicle) with the aid of the context that this principle is rejected via the example of "نهار" which the Mushahhab (tenor) and the Mushahhab bih (vehicle) are mentioned. Thus, he says:

1 Contradictory objection is that finding a contradiction to a general criterion or principle (Shirazi, 1367: vol. 1: p. 290)
Tafatanzì’s view

Tafatanzì supports the Sakkä’s view on the issue of mental trope and considers that kind of trope as metaphor. In response to Qazvini he says that your objection is true when we say that the Sakkä’s denomination regarding the implicit metaphor is that the purpose of the Mushabbhah (tenor) would be really the Mushabbhah bih (vehicle), while it is not this way, but the purpose of the Mushabbhah bih is the proclaimed Mushabbhah bih (vehicle) not the real one. Thus, he says:

 Meaning: “...and the response [to those objections against Sakkä]: the basis of all those objections is on the assumption that in Sakkä’s denomination on implicit metaphor the thought is on the Mushabbhah (tenor) and the intention is on the real Mushabbhah bih. It is not this way, but Sakkä’s view is that the proclaiming and hyperbolic Mushabbhah bih (vehicle) is intended, because it is evident when we are saying that “the death has grasped on somebody” our intention of the death is not a real rapacious beast and Sakkä clearly emphasized this in his book “Meflah Al- Oloum”, but he didn’t understand what Sakkä said.”

(Sharechin) Exegetes’ views

Ibn Abel-Esba proposes a general principle for the mental trope or trope in proof and says:

“The general principle of the trope in proof is that the attribution of something to a thing that is not genuinely related to it” (1368: p.251)

Alavi believes that the examples mentioned for mental trope are lexical tropes that are used with an extraneous meaning to the original meaning. He considers the Razí and Qazvini’s view and whoever regards them as the mental tropes corrupted and he does not approve a place for trope in the mental provisions and believes that calling this kind of trope as the mental is a misnomer. Thus, he says:

 Meaning: “the preferable choice is that the trope does not enter the mental propositions and if a proposition is a mental proposition, then the nomination of it as a trope is not admissible, because the trope just belongs to the lexical conditions and status of the word not the mental propositions”.

He regards this denomination as the Jorjani’s brainchild that the other men of letters and scholars of the art of trope followed him. He said in this regard:

 Meaning: “...and any one who is making it in the art of the eloquent is a master of the art of trope” (Sharouh Al-Talkhís, 1992: vol: 1, p.232).

The mental trope from the perspective of contemporary scholars

In contemporary era the mental trope is known with the same nomenclature or predicative trope, and like other issues of rhetoric most of the contemporary scholars of the art of tropes have tried to state, explain, and clarify the precursors’ views. Unfortunately, even the examples were adopted from the same old books and they just limited themselves to reporting those old views. However, a few of them stepped in the intrinsic nature of the issue and represented remarkable points of view which in this section we just mention those viewpoints.

Matloub views the predicative trope as a synthetic trope which every one of its words have the synthetic conventional...
meaning of its own trope has just happened in the predication of these words. So, he says:

«و هو المجاز الذي يكون في الإسناود والتركيب وقد شنّك كلامه في رأى من جهة الإسناود وهو المجاز الغالي. هذا النوع من المجازات تعني فهم الألفاظ المعمرة في موضوعها الأصلية و يكون المجاز عن طريق الإسناود» (مطبوع، ج1: 1986).

Meaning: “that is a kind of trope that happens in predication or synthetic and is nominated with those names (that is, with the name of predicative or synthetic trope), because that is conceived through predication while it is a mental trope. In this type of trope the single words are used with their conventional meaning and the trope is through their predication”.

Salah Fazl unequivocally views the mental trope as lexical trope and a part of the art of trope. He implicitly confirms and accepts Sakkaki’s view. He expressed his idea in this way:

«لا يوجد أن نشير بشكل عام إلى وصفة مرجعية للتصنيفات البلاغية و نسبيها على ضوء الأسلوب الحديث وعلى أساس معايير علم الأمورحلة من ذلك مثلما تقسم المجاز إلى فئتين وعلى واجب، وكلاهما في حقيقة الأمر نسيم يحتوي» (السراج، ج1: 87).

Meaning: “it is necessary to briefly mention the importance of referring to the categories of rhetoric and critiquing it on the basis of new framework and approaches of the linguistics, one example is the division of the trope into lexical and mental, while both are in fact, mere lexical”.

Al-Maraghi used simple and clear words in clarifying and defining mental trope which is understandable and also not possible to have different interpretation of it. Thus, he says:


Meaning: “the mental trope is that the speaker attributes the verb and what is related to it to something that he thinks is not originally created to it, because of the similarity between them by association of a refraining context that prevents the predication of the verb to its intended meaning”.

He continues that the presumption of this trope is mostly rational and sometimes lexical or circumstantial and on the basis of this presumption he also called that a rational trope (ibid, pp. 295-297)

Tabaneh contested the view that the mental trope be discussed in semantics and consider it inadmissible and argued that it is a kind of trope just because the rhetoricians had a consensus on it and all of them discussed it in semantics. Therefore the Sakkaki’s work is right and Khatib brought that kind of trope into semantics without any reason for it, is not even compatible with the definitions of semantics (Tabaneh, 1958: p.287). Following this remark he expresses Sakkaki and Qazvini’s definitions of mental trope, but he didn’t approve or reject any of them (ibid).

Saeidi prefers Qazvini’s definition over Sakkaki’s because it refers to the context and he holds that the mental trope like lexical trope requires the context (2000: p.127).

Haddareh considers Abd-Al-Ghafer as the initiator and discriminator of this kind of trope and explains the Abd-Al-Ghafer, Sakkaki, and Qazvini’s views in a detailed discussion, and then he has clear remarks on two positions. In one case he opposes Sakkaki but agrees with Qazvini, in another case he opposes Qazvini but agrees with Sakkaki. He rejects the view of Sakkaki who says that the mental trope has a metaphorical basis and is counted as implicit metaphor. He thinks that in metaphor should be a ground of analogy between the established meaning and the topical meaning, while in mental trope there is not such a ground. Therefore, in this kind of trope there is not any metaphor or analogy, but the trope is in attribution of the verb or what is in its meaning to an unreal agent (Haddareh, 1989: pp. 54-55).

On the other hand, he also disproves the idea of Qazvini that considers the mental trope a part of the art of invention not in the art of tropes and says:

«و لا نري صحة ما ذهب إليه القزويني، بالمجاز الغالي جزء من المجاز في أصله ومعنا واتباع عن علم البيان» (السراج، ج1: 55).

Meaning: “We don’t approve what Qazvini believes, because the mental trope is a part of trope whether in the real speech or in the meaning and cannot be separated from the art of tropes”.

Conclusion

Abd-Al-Ghafer is the originator and initiator of the mental trope into the field of Arabic rhetoric. The mental trope is also termed as “propositional trope”, “trope in predication”, “tropical predication”, “predicative trope”, “trope in proof”, and “trope in synthesis”. The mental trope is generally related to the construction and structure of the sentence and is beyond the domain of vocabularies; that is, every single word is used in its conventional meaning but the structure of the speech is not the same as the real (literal) meaning. In other words, the attribution of the verbal group (infinitive, gerund, and past participle) to something other than its real agent is a mental trope like the speech of the God almighty: “أَخْرَجَ الرَّجُلَانَ” (“he is the unreal agent and the attribution of the thing to the earth is a mental trope, or the example like “the spring grew the plant” is a trope in proof, for that we attributed the growing of the plant to the spring and this attribution is a trope because the spring doesn’t really grow the plant. Therefore, in mental trope two things are required: 1. the refraining context 2. something that the verb or the verbal attributed and related to.

There are two main ideas regarding this issue from the time of Abd-Al-Ghafer Jorjani up to now, one is Sakkaki’s view which is derived from Abd-Al-Ghafer view. This view maintains that in this kind the trope is in the speech and its connotation which is used as something other than its subject because of the existence of context and interpretation, and for this reason those kinds of trope counted as part of the art of tropes. The other view is of the Qazvini and his followers which is rooted in Ibn Fares idea. They hold that in this type, the trope is in the attribution of the verb or verbal to something other than its subject, and they include its place in the art of invention and exclude it from being a topic in the art of tropes.

On account of its nature which is a kind of trope and its function which is the usage of the word in its connotational meaning, the position of the mental trope should be in the domain of the art of trope, because that is accounted as an important and common type of the art of trope; on the other hand, the personification which defined as the attribution of one of the human features to a non-human and non-speaking creature is also regarded as mental trope which has gained a sublime position in today literature and also the children’s literature.

It should be said that whether it is called an implicit metaphor or a predicative trope, these differences of the views doesn’t have an impact on the function and position of that kind of trope and argument about it is a waste of time and dwindling the mental energy away from the fons of this art. It can be said that the Qazvini’s view is more preferable, at least due to its simplicity, and quick and valid understanding of the subject.
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