

THE DILEMMA OF CULTURAL CRITICISM IN TERMS OF LITERARY THEORISATION

Ousama EKHTIAR¹

Geliş: 30.05.2020 / Kabul: 13.08.2020

DOI: 10.29029/busbed.745668

Abstract

The Cultural Criticism Theory since its appearance caused a kind of disagreement between those who adopted it with satisfaction and acceptance, and others who found it a staunch enemy of literary criticism. Therefore, the current study follows moderation and objectivity away from the view of complete satisfaction or complete hostility towards the issue. We will discuss the phenomenon of cultural criticism in terms of the problem of its validity to be applied to literary texts. To achieve this goal, we divided the study into three essential points. First, we will address the origin of cultural criticism. Second, we will reveal the importance of cultural criticism in the literature to know the dilemma in the issues of theory. Third, we will search for the solution to identify what is called the interruption of communication which is supposed to exist between the cultural criticism and literary criticism as well as the relationship between cultural criticism and the essence of literary theory.

Keywords: *Modernity, Postmodernism, Cultural criticism, Cognitive formats.*

KÜLTÜR ELEŞTİRİSİNİN EDEBİYAT TEORİSİ AÇISINDAN SORUNSALI

Öz

Kültürel eleştiri teorisi, ortaya konulduğundan bu yana büyük bir tartışma yaratmıştır. Kimileri onu kabul ederken, kimileri de onu edebî eleştirinin güçlü bir düşmanı olarak saymaktadır. Çalışmamızda bu meseleyi, kabul veya reddetme görüşleri çerçevesinde bağımsız bir şekilde tarafsız bir bakışla ele almakta ve bu

¹ Prof. Dr., Bingöl Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi, oehtiar@bingol.edu.tr, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8511-0545>.

epistemik olguyu kültürel eleştiri teorisinin incelediği ana sorunsal çerçevesinde tartışmaktayız. Bu bağlamda araştırmamız üç bölüme ayrılmaktadır. Bunların ilkinde, genel olarak kültürel eleştirinin ortaya çıkış sürecinden söz edilmektedir. İkincisinde, teorik konulara ilişkin sorunsalın iyi anlaşılması için kültürel eleştirinin edebiyat bağlamındaki ehemmiyeti incelenmektedir. Üçüncü bölümde ise, kültürel eleştiri ile edebiyat teorisinin özü arasındaki ilişkiye göre burada bir zıtlığın mı yoksa bir uzlaşımın mı söz konusu olduğunun tespit edilmesi için çözüm aranacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Modernizm, Postmodernizm, Kültürel eleştiri, Epistemik formlar.*

The Origin of Cultural Criticism

Cultural criticism, in its general concept, is concerned with the cultural methods inherent in human life. Based on this point, it can be described as an ideological critique because it deals with intellectual products in terms of content and its relationship with the cultural patterns inherent in it regardless of art or aesthetic standards, and it does not care whether this intellectual product is literary or non-literary. That is, cultural criticism is a critical approach that focuses on all aspects of thoughts in terms of undeclared attitudes towards the culture rooted in everything around us. Moreover, its features influence all aspects of life, including literature. Cultural criticism will be clarified through critically reviewing the previous studies which addressed the issue of cultural criticism and our analyses of it.

The most critical period of cultural criticism is dated back to the early 1990s when the American researcher Vincent B. Leitch, a professor at the University of Oklahoma, advocated cultural criticism as an alternative for all approaches to study the civilisational perspective of human actions (Leitch, 1992: 11). Leitch's efforts were different and valuable because he tried to transfer the issue of cultural criticism from the general cultural criticism to the literary-cultural criticism in a focused manner. In contrast, cultural criticism was not previously assigned to a specific domain. It should be noted that Leitch's bold steps were atonement for the mistakes committed by advocates of cultural criticism previously in trying to formulate a theory of cultural criticism. Their efforts were fraught with pitfalls; therefore, they lost their way.

Undoubtedly, the idea that emerged in Birmingham 1964 at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) was indicative introductions of cultural

criticism particularly the idea of culture by Birmingham scholars which was holistic and non-specialised in one of the fields of knowledge. Instead, it is linked to all aspects of social and political life, as well as humanities and art. In other words, the critics of this school attempted to address and discuss all humanities based on the cultural system (Turner, 2003: 10-20). However, the Birmingham School, which devoted part of its efforts to acculturation, fell into a significant mistake by relying on formalism. This is clear in the writings of Hall, who is one of the members of that school (Hall, 2017: 10). On the contrary, the cultural approach founded by Leitch in the 1990s goes beyond structuralism and seeks post-structuralism. This fact can be observed in the integrated formula developed by Vincent Leitch in the contemporary cultural criticism.

The Birmingham School formed a confusing start of cultural criticism since its views were scattered and unclear. Theoretically, cultural criticism was not shaped to suit the environment in which it occurred. Instead, it was a mixture of everything, thus leading to failure. Due to the lack of their research continuation, the Centre of Contemporary Culture was closed, the project failed, and its supporters were no longer interested in it because of the ambiguity of the vision they presented. In addition to the principles that contradict the local cultural criticism project, which was not appropriate in some aspects of fields of humanities knowledge, it was challenging to find a general critical approach for all fields of knowledge. Also, the researchers have not considered the needs of each of the humanities fields for their cultural criticism, and a severe mistake existed in the idea of general cultural criticism.

Similarly, the Frankfurt School of criticism also failed, because it attempted to make cultural criticism applicable in different areas, as well as make it an approach to explain everything. However, in our view, this comprehensive approach cannot be applied. Each field of life needs specific cultural criticism associated with it; the illusions of the Enlightenment's victory could not rise in establishing a theory of literary-cultural criticism. The features of this case can be found in the writings of Horkheimer and his colleague Adorno in the dialectic of reason, who are the founders of the Frankfurt School (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1974: 83). The need to establish multiple cultural approaches instead of only one is the problem that is faced by both Birmingham and Frankfurt critical scholars who applied general cultural criticism to literary and non-literary works.

No theoretical framework for literary-cultural criticism existed at Frankfurt School, which focused mainly on several critical methods, including the cultural approach. Hence, reaching an original composition of the cultural theory could

not be achieved. More specifically, the criticism of the Frankfurt School was not balanced since it was based on a mixture of existentialism and materialistic philosophy to explain the prevailing political and social conditions in Germany rather than the interpretation of literature. Such a problem is similar to the problem that occurred at Birmingham School. Consequently, the cultural criticism deviated from the spirit of creative literary works, whereby no integration between the spirit of literature and an appropriate cultural approach was employed in terms of discussing the literary examples.

The cultural project at the Frankfurt School did not come unexpectedly. Instead, it emerged and developed as a result of objective circumstances represented by material conditions. The methodological approaches that paved the way for the cultural perspective of the Frankfurt School were related to the vision of the previous philosophical and critical opinions. These approaches are very interested in exploring new methods in social criticism, society, culture, and the prevailing systems according to an inconspicuous intellectual structure and a sophisticated methodology, which is closer to the public life compared to the creative literary fields.

Like the Birmingham School, the Frankfurt School attempted to formulate a cultural theory. Although this theory emphasised on the political and social aspects and lost the compass of literary creative work, it was not able to affect even the political or social life. Consequently, the scholars' opinions of those two schools were rejected by the same school.

The initial period was characterised by some optimism and was ambiguous due to the introduction of conflicting curricula in cultural criticism. This cultural criticism in those two schools was not limited to one field of knowledge in the field of application. This failure was shocking in terms of a mismatch between the spirit of literary work and the cultural approaches at that time. Therefore, it was necessary to establish a cultural theory for each field of knowledge separately. Then the work is carried out critically in this field in conjunction with the system of standards governing the cultural approach in each field. What works and is successful in the other sciences may not succeed in the literary field because each knowledge has its tools, especially literature that is linguistically more complex compared to the social life. As a consequence, Leitch succeeded in identifying this problem and overcome it by creating an extraordinary theory of cultural criticism of literature that avoided the defect of the previous two schools.

The real beginning of specialist cultural criticism appeared in America with Vincent Leitch's Theory which emphasised only on the field of cultural criticism

of literature. In this respect, cultural criticism moved with Leitch to a new stage that is different, accurate, and balanced. This theory is based on studying the literary texts, without going away from this goal, as well as linking literature to implicit cognitive formats, and each cultural aspects associated with it. As long as it remains neutral, it does not impose on the texts of literature what is not in it. Thus cultural criticism was established on the study of literature in terms of its cultural norms that were based on it. However, it was not initially confined to the literary field like Structuralism. Initially, the cultural criticism started as a general theory with general perceptions, and later it was directed towards specialisation in specific fields, as well as circulated in the field of literary criticism.

We are interested in the Cultural Criticism Theory in order to make us understand cultural structures through some of the implicit cognitive patterns that form within the literary texts and why they continue or change. Besides, the Cultural Criticism Theory enables us to identify the distinctive features of forms of culture in literary texts that appear through the process of literary creativity, and reveal the relationship between the cultural theme and the characteristics of literary works. This leads us to define the cultural framework in all its deep dimensions, whether they are near or far in terms of the era. For example, when the fields of knowledge overlap within the poet's mind and turn into complex emotions, it will be difficult to separate culture from emotions. However, cultural criticism can discover the clues of this underlying culture, and it can chart the path of literature through the cognitive structure. Leitch mentioned this vital point and benefited from it for a deep understanding of the literature in terms of analysing the cultural formats in texts (Leitch, 1992: 75).

Even though cultural criticism is a unique type of literary criticism, it still suffers from problems in terms of practical applications in the field of contemporary literary studies related to the dilemma of understanding the importance of cultural criticism in literature. Therefore, we aim at solving this dilemma by explaining the precise aspects of the theory so that we can apply it to literary texts. This will explain how the confusion previously started between what is literary and non-literary, which was a real reason for the imbalance in the cultural approaches of Leitch's pre-writings.

The Importance of Cultural Criticism in Literature

The significance of cultural criticism has attracted the interest of scholars and critics in this field. One of these is Leitch who performed a critical academic project while trying to build the theory of cultural criticism. This project was based on a cultural critique appropriate to the field of literary studies. The

common element between his efforts and the efforts of previous scholars is their agreement that cultural criticism is pluralistic. Therefore, Leitch made cultural pluralism a core element of the theory. However, he broke some of their theoretical rules when he made an essential change in the essence of the theory, and he got rid of the tyranny of material principles and the interpretation of dialectical materialism of literature. Leitch was also very interested in changing the cultural approach to become a critical approach for literature. For this purpose, he made a set of critical tools inside the theory that is suitable for studying literature according to the critical cultural approach, such as linking an implicit cultural theme to a literary condition. Consequently, Leitch has built for us the theory of cultural criticism specialising in literature which can be employed to explore more in-depth literary texts.

Previously, a mixed cultural theory was created and conducted in the field of social, political, and literary studies, whereas Leitch's theory became a specific effort with a single epistemic field. After that, he supported his cultural theory with what is needed to explain the literary phenomena in a precise revealing manner. As a result, we could overcome the problems that existed earlier, such as mixing and interference. However, several questions arise which should be addressed, including how Leitch achieved the harmony between cultural criticism and literature in his theory, our remarks on that achievement, and whether this theory is perfect and no important missing aspect exists.

Leitch used political, social, and historical themes, customs, and references in cultural criticism. However, he did not neglect literary elements, nor did he turn literature into a dry field for other science experiments. Therefore, acculturation was combined with the essence of literary work and the cultural pluralism was present in literary analysis, but it is a tool and means for analysing literary text rather than an end imposed on it compulsively. We have endeavoured to list five main points, which are the fine lines of the modified cultural criticism theory for application in the field of literary studies. First, cultural criticism broke modernity down to postmodernism to search for the hidden cultural element, whether taken from the ancient or the recent past. Then, it searched for the influence of this cultural element in the literary text and explained its effects and changes. The philosophy of modernity is aesthetic, but the cultural philosophy in the theory of cultural criticism of literature is a philosophy of pure knowledge, whose aim is to examine the cultural component objectively rather than subjectively. This issue is entirely different, thereby implying that studying literature is partly a cognitive structure to explore the implicit knowledge in the text, taking into account the appropriate tools for analysing literature. Leitch could do this without abandoning

the methods of critical literary analyses that help him uncover the implicit cognitive formats in poetic and prose types (Leitch, 1992: 129). Although the cognitive structure of literature is a subject that we can understand aesthetically from a discourse in light of modernity and postmodernity, it is only a cultural topic in the theory of cultural criticism. We are looking for its elements in literature, such as the revelation of implicit cultural patterns, the sources of the cultural component, the reasons for their emergence, the overlap in the formation of knowledge for the individual and the nation in literature, as well as the system of knowledge that the nation believes in. This is a major issue because it makes literature a great document of knowledge. However, the cultural theory does not depend on the philosophy of cognitive beauty as much as on knowledge itself and its influence in shaping the mindset of perception of the nation. Thus literary cognitive formats have become a standard science rather than only curious.

Second, in the theory of cultural criticism related to the field of literature, we reveal the functional analysis of knowledge. Then we turn to the functional and critical aspects of the mental system of cognitive problems. Literature according to Leitch is not linked to an institutional viewpoint (Leitch, 1992: 125) because the institutional viewpoint governs the collective mind in the field of literary studies, whether it is the academic institution that imposes critical quotes on literature or the collective mindset of the previous critical approach imposed on literature. Accordingly, Leitch called to override the previously prepared academic critical shape that was issued on the knowledge system of the literary stage previously.

Third, the necessity of finding new laws to reveal the cognitive structure of literature away from the gnostic perspective of rhetoric led Leitch to study literary texts within their contradictory cognitive contexts from the simplest literary topics, such as the prevailing habits to their most complex ones like the ego controlling literature. For example, the focus was on why this cognitive style is the dominant poetic writing system and how we read the previous critical judgments in the light of cultural criticism. A well-known Arab critic is Abdullah Al-Ghazhami who relied on this theory to apply it to the Arabic literature. He has opened a new track that was not previously known in the study of Arabic literature. More specifically, he discussed the concept of poetic virility in ancient literature and modern Arab poetry based on the perspective of the theory of cultural criticism of literature. He concluded that examples of ancient poetry were the poetry of virility and the singing of the male tyrant. This has led to the spread of the poetry of modernity, which has become reactionary because it follows the old approach of glorifying virility and tyranny (Al-Ghazhami, 2005: 252). This is

a fact drawn from the epistemological forms of cultural criticism that Al-Ghazhami applied the theory to ancient and modern Arab literature.

Fourth, the critical sense comes from multiculturalism, but the understanding mechanism is still limited to reading impartially from any impressions of the literary product. The literary text alone is the official spokesperson; therefore, we define the required textual disclosure mechanism, especially in an era when every culture has become open to cultures. The institutional discourse has become weak in the perception and knowledge of the text culture by Pre-modernism methods. That is, the cultural criticism represents a post-structural and post-deconstructive stage. As a consequence, it can be realised that the mechanism of cultural criticism in reading literary texts has become different from the previous period. More specifically, cultural criticism is a study of the cognitive structure through three tools that are cultural patterns, the nucleus of history, and the cultural consumer criticism rather than the culture in general.

Fifth, cultural criticism in the literary field studies the dominance of cognitive perceptions of one literary genre and literary prescriptions on the part of the implicit knowledge system, such as perseverance and transformation, what was in the cognitive discourse, and what should have been. That is, cultural criticism is interested in these issues because literature should deal with the mind and thought rather than a piece of sad emotional music for a tragic issue or a chaotic revolutionary rejection in the space of the literary text.

However, these visions are not perfect in all aspects. Therefore, we have two remarks on these ideas; one is related to the theoretical, cultural criticism, and the other is related to practice. The first is the exaggeration of cultural criticism in establishing the concept of the cultural consumer's criticism as if it were a theory in the consumer's criticism of culture. Cultural criticism attempts to avoid the institutional classification, but gradually, it begins to establish an inclusive collective authoritarian culture, which may be just a whim after a period of change. This criticism is still panting behind endless interpretations of the cognitive style. I mean the function of cultural criticism in the literary field should not be limited to the phenomenon of epistemic systems of culture. Preferably, it should have been added to the beautiful colour of knowledge that is compatible with the theory of modern literature. Therefore, this still forms a problem in cultural criticism, and we should not ignore it.

The second is the problem of separating cultural criticism and literary criticism, which still exists among some major critics even though Leitch laid out

his theory and developed it. Therefore, it would be a way to analyse literature. Here, a scientific debate arose between two well-known critics who are Abdullah Al-Ghazhami and Abdul Nabi Estif. The first is a professor of criticism at King Saud University in Riyadh, whereas the second is a professor of criticism at Damascus University. The difference of their views resulted in a book that could be called the book of disagreement about the function of language itself in literature. In terms of its title "cultural criticism or literary criticism," it seems that a conflict exists between these two critics about culture criticism from two different perspectives (Al-Ghazhami & Estif, 2004: 18, 76). The most important aspect is that during my meeting with Estif, when I was teaching Andalusian literature at Damascus University, I asked him about his perception of the gap between literary criticism and cultural criticism.

I had a keen goal to apply the theory of cultural knowledge to some Andalusian poems and to present it to my students. To know the secret of the defeat of politics in Andalusia whereby the Andalusian literature was overflowing with intellectual giving, especially in the era of sects, we can go beyond the fundamental point of the difference between literary and cultural criticism. The question was the possibility of calling it literary-cultural criticism. From my point of view, the death of literary criticism was a metaphorical expression since it implies reviving a new method of new literary criticism. All these critical approaches enrich the analysis of the literary text. Therefore, we need cultural, literary criticism and structural literary criticism. Literary criticism is based on a stylistic theory, and all critical approaches can enrich literature. This point attracts the attention, but the critic Estif continued to consider only the real literary criticism and Al-Ghazhami critic continued with a separate cultural criticism. For me, I think that each critical approach has its characteristics and new findings.

This aspect needs to be defined, whereby during the past ten years, I have called for the statement that I believe in implying that the literary text imposes the appropriate method for its analysis. However, we should not impose the analysis method on the literary text. The diversity in literary doctrines and critical methods are various means for a deep understanding of literature which can be employed to realise the secrets of the literary language. As a result, the multiplicity of critical methods has opened the door for the scientific discussion. This issue was previously discussed in the introduction to understand the relationship between the text and its linguistic approaches. In other words, we still think that the linguistic approaches are valid methods for studying literary texts, and cultural criticism is not associated with the literary text from the point of view that is far from language (EKHTIAR, 2019: 188- 187).

The truth is that Leitch did not aim at driving out the literary criticism. Instead, his goal was to develop it. Therefore, he stated that a difference exists between cultural criticism and literary criticism. However, the points of convergence between them led him to present a new criticism theory whose function is to be applied in the literary field. Therefore, it can be called a critical theory of literature and some of Leitch's figurative speeches were understood as a real struggle between culture and criticism. This case is similar to the critical opinion that determines the writer's death after producing the literary text; the cause of the poet's death is very similar to the purpose of the issue of the temporary exclusion of the institution's critical authority over the text. The cultural criticism aims at extracting the primary cultural metaphors that go beyond the individual linguistic and literary metaphors, whereby the text or speech turns into metaphorical cultural influences. This means that we need to decipher the metaphors of the main language (Ibrahim, 2003: 65). For each discourse, a linguistic connotation is employed through metaphors and expressions to create an indefinite semantic value and discover the needs to delve deeper into the systemic formation of language invented by its users in the minds.

If poetry responds to the cultural pattern, we must study it accordingly. Discourse is not everything in literature; rather, it is a way to the end. An eloquent text can be found in the concept of ancient rhetoric, but cultural criticism can obtain a result from scratch. In other words, we advocate the discourse that builds an ethical rhythm like the revolutionaries of rhetoric by Abdel-Qahir al-Jarjani, who renewed the old traditional rhetoric and reformulated the rhetoric analysis in the old Arabic criticism. We also find that contemporary critical approaches seek a new understanding similar to the cultural criticism that studies the concept of cultural pun as objective equivalence of the cultural context in the literary language. Thus criticism and the multiplicity of analytical schools in the study of literature remain a praiseworthy phenomenon in criticism, especially during the study of the literary phenomenon that should not be limited to one method. The convergence of many schools of criticism like cultural criticism has begun to pave the way for a critical academic discourse with the expansion of dialogue (Kheder, 2001: 29).

As a consequence, we build trends in literary discourse, thereby expanding the circle of keys to a literary text. This is evidenced by cultural criticism attempts to analyse the critical textual concepts for multiculturalism, and more details about this issue by Berger can be considered by the reader (Berger, 1995: 32). Therefore, cultural criticism has resulted in new cultural alternatives such as

collective consumption, particularly the implied cognitive forms instead of the regulations imposed by the educated elite groups on literature.

Separation or Communication: What is the Solution?

Why do we call for the death of a thing when something else is born? Can these literary-critical spaces co-exist without the struggle to erase the other? We must leave time to judge between them; this is my view towards the issue. That is, an indisputable link exists between literature and cultural criticism; we do not pretend the dissociation of either one from the other, but we affirm the opposite. When the poetic symbol was found in the stage of modernity, modernist critics revealed that the metaphor had died. In terms of the great poetry of modernist poets, metaphors and measurements, as well as the symbol, were left in making the poem, but the symbol was overwhelmed by it because it presented something new to the poem. This issue is very similar to the dilemma of our understanding of cultural criticism when some cultural critics called for the death of ancient criticism. All these are allegorical expressions that imply the new stage included an element that deserves attention, but poetic texts remain valid for interpretation according to multiple critical lines provided that, as we mentioned earlier, they are not imposed on the literature. I still remember when I wrote my structural essay on the interpretation of the spatial dimension in the poetic images of Zalrumah, twenty-seven years ago, whereby some fundamentalists were not happy as if I had created something that they could not bear (EKHTIAR, 1993: 41- 65). These people found themselves after a period of two parts. These two parts are outside the circle of time, and these paths disappeared, and a section that entered the circle of the new interpretation of literature after it was found that it can present a new vision. The new issues cannot be neglected if they require knowledge. This motivates me to argue that everything new is problematic in terms of the real experiment. Let us make these critical approaches give us what can be produced from them. Therefore, we may stand on something that explains the dawn light to us. On the one hand, some of us consider it a little thing that is not enough to see everything, whereas others consider it as a natural physical phenomenon. Others view it as a new day, as well as overtime these critical theories will reveal to us their ability to tackle issues we could not understand before.

It seems to me that the adversarial industry in critical studies still occurs in the blood of literary critics, although the issue is straightforward, whereby you can leave the doctrines of literary criticism to continue towards development. If the literary criticism can prove its existence, it will continue, but if it cannot, it

will discontinue. However, we do not find it necessary to inflate the issue between literary criticism and cultural criticism. The scientific mission was driven by a desire to portray the debate about everything, and the struggle for everything with what is cultural and what is literary even though I still see it intertwined. This is similar to the conflict that has been amplified in the field of literary criticism between critics and criticism (Binhabib, 1986: 112), whereby asymmetrical relationship exists between them from our point of view, and they agree on some matters and disagree on some other matters but not to the extent that they are separated.

Indeed, cultural criticism is not a research or an excavation in culture as much as it is a research in the implicit cultural systems as defined by the rules of cultural criticism (Khalil, 2012: 7). However, until now, this has not given us the right to claim that a significant gap exists between cultural criticism and literature since cultural criticism is literary criticism that differs from the usual previous literary criticism. The difference is that literary criticism at an earlier stage viewed literature from the point of beauty and rhetoric, what is aesthetic and what is rhetoric. In contrast, cultural criticism viewed literature based on the implicit cognitive modes. Although this does not lead it out of the circle of literary criticism, but it does not mean that it corresponds to the literary criticism that was at the period earlier to it. Thus this is a postmodern issue imposed by the complexities of life and the attraction of knowledge.

The reality proved that cultural criticism had something to offer to us to understand the literary text based on the implicit cognitive pattern view. For example, the cultural criticism of pre-Islamic poetry could reveal to us the content of the human struggle, whether a struggle for survival as depicted in poetry or a struggle of the ego. Besides, the phenomenon of Tramp's poets can be understood from an implicit perspective of that oppressed ego that is hidden. This is a new perception far from the concept of unilateral moral values. That is, the centre's authority is the tribe, and the margin rebellion is the Tramp (Olyemat, 2004: 60), which is the concept of new historicism in cultural criticism of literature.

Cultural criticism is pioneering and a way of revealing what is not announced in the cultural context. Hence, we can argue that it is a new approach from literary-critical approaches that can present us with a new perception from another perspective that differs from the view that was adopted earlier. This does not mean that we accept the statement, which implies the death of criticism as an announcement of the separation of cultural criticism from literature. Instead, it is

a metaphor used by inappropriate cultural critics. The truth is that cultural criticism is literary criticism, but it is based on another revealing perspective.

In our view, supporters of cultural criticism assumed that it was separated from literature and who did not prefer cultural criticism captured this illusion. Therefore, the conflict occurred, which is just a misunderstanding that has led to more chaos and confusion. Because of the complexity of this issue, the current study aimed at revealing its complex aspects through a new understanding of the theory of cultural criticism, whereby nothing that can completely erase something else in the world of literary cognitive doctrines. Therefore, these doctrines overshadow some, but they cannot altogether abolish them. However, we are not afraid of the application of cultural criticism, nor do we call for the eradication of literary criticism. Cultural criticism is literary criticism because it accepts applying it to literary texts.

Results

We found that cultural criticism is a mental process that focuses on culture as a subject for research and reflection, and expresses unspoken attitudes towards a culture that is rooted in everything around us. However, neither Birmingham School nor Frankfurt School considered the needs of each of the humanities fields for their cultural criticism, which implies that they applied general cultural criticism to what was literary and what was non-literary. The theory was revised by Leitch to correspond to the field of literature using political, social, and historical themes, customs, and references in cultural criticism. However, he did not neglect the literary elements, nor did he turn literature into a dry field for other science experiments. However, these visions are not perfect in all aspects; therefore, we have two remarks on these ideas; one is related theoretically to cultural criticism, whereas the second one is associated with cultural critics. The first is the exaggeration of cultural criticism in establishing the concept of cultural consumer's criticism as if it were a theory in the consumer's criticism of culture. That is, the function of cultural criticism in the literary field should not be limited to the phenomenon of epistemic systems of culture. The second is about the problem of separating cultural criticism and literary criticism which still exists among some major critics. However, cultural criticism is not a research or an excavation in culture as much as it is a research in the implicit cultural systems as defined by the rules of cultural criticism. Hence, cultural criticism is literary criticism, but it differs from the usual literary criticism used previously. The difference is that literary criticism at an earlier stage viewed literature from the point of beauty and rhetoric, and what is aesthetic and what is rhetoric, whereas

cultural criticism viewed literature from the side of implicit cognitive modes. Although this case does not get it out of the circle of literary criticism, it does not mean that it corresponds to the literary criticism that was in the period earlier. Thus cultural criticism has its way of revealing what is not announced in the cultural context as long as cultural criticism is applied to literary texts. This result solves the dilemma that cultural criticism has raised in its cognitive formats.

SOURCES

BERGER, Arthur (1995), *Cultural Criticism a Primer of Key Concepts*, New York, Sage publications.

BINHABIB, Seyla (1986), *Critique, Norm, and Utopia A Study of the Foundations of Critical Theory*, New York, Columbia University Press.

EKHTIAR, Ousama (2019), *the Common Methodological Errors in Stylistic Analysis*, Issue: L, Turkey, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi.

EKHTIAR, Ousama (1993), *the Spatial Dimension in the Poetic Images of Zalmurah*, 12 Volume, Issue: 52, Damascus, Arab Heritage Magazine, Union of Arab Writers.

AL-GHAZHAMI, Abdullah (2005), *Cultural Criticism Reading In Arab Cultural Systems*, 5. Edition, Beirut, publications of the Arab Cultural Centre.

AL-GHAZHAMI, Abdullah & Estif, Abdul Nabi (2004), *Cultural Criticism or Literary Criticism*, Dar Al-Fikr, Damascus.

HALL, Stuart (2017), *Race Culture and Communications Looking Backward and Forward at Cultural Studies*, UK, University of Warwick Publications.

HORKHEIMER, Max. Adorno, Theodor (1974), *La Dialectique De La Raison*, Paris, Publications de Gallimard.

IBRAHIM, Abdullah (2003), *Al-Ghazhami and Cultural Critical Practice*, Beirut, Arab Foundation for Studies and Publishing.

KHALIL, Sameer (2012), *Cultural Criticism from Literary Text to Discourse*, 1. Edition, Baghdad, Dar Al-Zawahiri.

KHEDR, Mustafa (2001), *Criticism and Discourse an Attempt to Read in Contemporary Arab Critical Review*, Damascus, Arab Writers Union publications.

Leitch, Vincent (1992), *Cultural criticism literary theory poststructuralism*, New York, Columbia University Press.

Olyemat, Yusef (2004), *Aesthetics of Cultural Analysis, Pre-Islamic Poetry as a Model*, 1. Edition, Jordan, Arab Foundation for Studies and Publishing.

Turner, Graeme (2003), *British cultural studies*, 3. Edition, London, Rutledge Taylor & Francis Group.

KAYNAKLAR

BERGER, Arthur (1995), *Cultural Criticism A Primer Of Key Concepts*, New York, Sage publications.

BINHABIB, Seyla (1986), *Critique, Norm, and Utopia A Study of the Foundations of Critical Theory*, New York, Columbia University Press.

EKHTIAR, Ousama (2019), *el-Ahtai'l-Menheciyyeti'l-Mütedaveleti Fi'l-İcrai'l-Uslubi*, Sayı: L, Türkiye, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi.

EKHTIAR, Ousama (1993), *el-Bu'du'l-Mekaniyyu Fi Suveri Zi'r-Rumme el-Fenniyye*, c. 12, Sayı: 52, Dımaşk, Mecelletü't-Türasî'l-Arabî, İttihadü'l-Küttabi'l-Arab.

HALIL, Samir (2012), *Cultural Criticism From Literary Text To Discourse*, 1. Baskı, Bağdat, Darul-Cevahiri.

HALL, Stuart (2017), *Race Culture and Communications Looking Backward and Forward at Cultural Studies*, UK, University of Warwick Publications.

HIZIR, Mustafa (2001), *en-Nakdü ve'l-Hitab Muhavele Fi Muracaatin Fakdiyyetin Arabiyyetin Muasıra*, Dımaşk, İttihadü'l-Küttabi'l-Arab.

HORKHEIMER, Max. Adorno, Theodor (1974), *La Dialectique De La Raison*, Paris, Publications de Gallimard.

İBRAHİM, Abdullah (2003), *el-Gazzamî ve Mümamereseti'l-Nakdi'l-Sakafi*, Beyrut, el-Müesseseti'l-Arabiyye Li'd-Dirasat ve'l-Neşir.

EL-GAZZAMÎ, Abdullah (2005), *Nakdü'n Sakafıyyün Kiraatü'n Fi'l-Ensaki's-Sakafıyyeti'l-Arabiyye*, 5. Baskı, Beyrut, el-Merkezü's-Sakafıyyü'l-Arabî.

EL-GAZZAMÎ, Abdullah & Estef, Abdalnabi (2004), *Nakdü'n Sakafıyyün Em Nakdü'n Edebî*, Daru'l-Fikr, Dımaşk.

- LEITCH, Vincent (1992), *Cultural criticism, literary theory, poststructuralism*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- TURNER, Graeme (2003), *British cultural studies*, 3. Edition, London, Rutledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- ULEYMAT, Yusuf (2004), *Cemaliyyatü't-Tahlili's-Sakaifi eş-Şiirü'l-Cahiliyyü Ünmüzeceñ*, 1. Baskı, Ürdün, el-Müessesetü'l-Arabiyye Li'd-Dirasat ve'l-Neşir.