

## Theoretical and Applied Perspectives of Paradox Structure in the Poem of Amal Dongol "The Last Words of Spartacus"

Qutaiba Habashneh<sup>1</sup>, Tamadour Habashneh<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Language Center, The University of Jordan, Jordan.

**Abstract:** This study aims at clarifying the forms, shapes and methods of the paradox in a text that the researcher considers as full of models compatible with deeply theoretical aspects of this concept. The study was characterized by theoretical and applied perspectives, where the researcher depended on some studies that focused theoretically on this concept. The most important study was the "Encyclopedia of Critical Terminology" by D. C. Muecke (translated version), in addition to the study of Nabila Ibrahim "The Paradox (Al-Mofaraqah), which conveyed the theorization of paradox to the domain of Arab research. On the applied side, the researcher was guided by the studies of Samih Rawashdeh "Poetic Spaces" A Critical Study of the Poetry of Amal Dongol", and the study of Khalil Suleiman "The Paradox and Literature: Studies of Theory and Application". We can assert that the concept of paradox itself implies entanglement, so we can look at each paradox from several angles, where paradox may be personal, sarcastic or implied philosophical thought and alike. The difficulty of transfer a theory into application stems from that the most examples argued by Muecke are not brought examples from plays, novel, press articles and advertisement.

**Keywords:** Paradox, Verbal Paradox, Behavioral Paradox, Literary Personal Paradox, Amal Dongol.

### Introduction

Tracking the concept of a paradox, in an attempt to clarify its boundaries, makes us in touch with a clear fact of multiplicity and equivocation of the concept. Such thing urged Muecke to say: "If someone discovered internal motif to make another person be in lingual and intellectual disorder, he will not find better than asking him immediately a definition of paradox (Muecke, 1993).

If we looked at the reason of this, hoping to find it implied in paradox as a literary practice that intercepts with concepts, the mental and literary practices, as well as that the paradox has a real existence represented in the realistic in incidences on the theatre of life, so these things make paradox in contact with reality in the same time that it tries to stay away from it in case of being literary.

In this respect, Khalid Suleiman says: "Since the paradox is a literary practice and has a long history extends back to the first ages of literary, it will be difficult to find a definition that combines the concepts of writers and critics against it or combines all of its kinds and grades.

Therefore, absolutely there is no surprise if we find multiple and varied views, while there is also no surprise if the concept of critics still obscure or unstable (Suleiman, 1999).

In fact, the ancient time of the paradox doesn't present a reason for it in the concepts, but it makes diversion upon the time (Suleiman, 1999). Such a phenomenon existed before it was named, before dedicating its concept, while the word "paradox" was created before it was connected to the phenomenon (Muecke, 1993).

The Lexicons indicate that the word "paradox" hadn't been created in the English language before 1502 and hadn't been used in the public language until the early 18<sup>th</sup> century (Muecke, 1993). But such word has deep roots in THE Plato Republic named "Eironepa" in the same meaning. The term had been used by a victim of Socrates dialogues. It is a type of debate to lure a person. The same word meant to Socrates "the dodging use of language", and to him the word itself had been a form of eloquence which includes the praise in the form of satire, and satire in the form of praise (Ibrahim, 1986).

Despite the old Arabic critique is free from mentioning clearly the term "paradox", no doubt that some critical and eloquence terms touched this concept and focused on the meaning of the term or approaches it like insinuation, knower disregard, and assert the vituperate to sound like praise.

In this regard, we will mention some examples of the introduced concepts in the critique of the "paradox" term in Arab and Western literature, so as to find out the common sense between them, since such investigation is not our goal in this context.

For Richard, the paradox means the balance of opposites (Shawqi, 2001), while Schlegel considers it as a "form of contradiction" (Shawqi, 2001). Muecke tried to simplify and brief its definition, since for him the paradox is "saying something without mentioning it in fact". Therefore, there must be a strain of the surface structure of the language of paradox. It is not a matter of considering an actual or false meaning, but a matter of considering a dual image in one page (Bani A'amir, 2005).

When Arabic studies discussed this phenomenon, it started from the western concepts. For Nabila Ibrahim the paradox is a lingual and eloquence expression based on the mental relationship between vocabularies rather than depending on the phonetic of formative relationship (Ibrahim, 1986).

For Seeza Qasim the paradox is "a method for deceiving the control since it is a form of eloquence that is similar to exchange in the duality of meaning (Qasim, 1984).

The above-mentioned definitions meet in one point, as Samih Rawashdeh says: "the common sense of these limitations doesn't go far from the saying which suggests that paradox is based on a contradictive expression in one part, but through testing it looks like the reality" (Rawashdeh, 1999).

It may exist in the spoken expression at the level of vocabulary adherence. It also may be found at the spoken expression as a whole against the situation. It might be hidden within the contradiction among incidences, or it is hidden within the abstracts to touch the cosmic and pre destinative perceptions, hence it gets in relation with philosophy and romance on the other hand.

Muecke expression, on discussing the opposites, may look as a content axiom, where he says that "the paradox will be more effective with more contradiction (Muecke, 1993), but it dismantles the secret of showing the paradox itself clear for observer as the third party of the paradox besides the initiator and victim of the paradox.

### Paradox Level

Muecke (1993) defines the paradox : "paradox made by someone who intends the paradox, where it can be called the "behavioral paradox. It seems that Muecke's definition doesn't shed the light completely on the concept. What he proposes is the deliberated paradox and its apparent intention by its speaker. He adds that "the behavioral paradox is a state of spoken paradox".

By trying to clearly investigate the concept through Muecke's examples find that it is a spoken contextual paradox, or adherence of speech forms. In this regard, Khalid Suleiman writes: "studies agree that spoken paradox is a kind of speech pattern or expression method in which the intended meaning is contradicted to the apparent meaning (Suleiman, 1999).

It is useful to present an example that was quoted from "Encyclopedia of Princeton for Poetry and Poetic" for this kind of paradox of Mercatio in Shakespeare's play "Romeo and Juliette" when he commented on the killing wound that he was injured by, Saying (Suleiman, 1999):

*"No, It is not deep as the well....*

*Not wide as the gate of the church...*

*But it is a wound that achieves the goal..."*

Rawashdeh suggests that the spoken paradox is a stuck pattern of directness, but such directness doesn't eliminate its close relationship with the deep situation it expresses (Rawashdeh, 1999). This makes it match the oppositeness but surpasses it to the mental processes since the sense of paradox doesn't include only the capability to see the opposites in the framework of paradox, but it also includes the ability to provide it also shape in the mind (Muecke, 1993).

In following up the definition of Muecke, we focus on the behavioral paradox that can be represented by the irony, since many studies of spoken paradox in theory or application, including only the step out of the mental dimension of the contradiction of speech level.

We find Muecke in his 2<sup>nd</sup> edition book writes that "I will handle the aiming paradoxes that it's mean is the language (Muecke, 1993). Therefore, no disagreement that spoken paradox is presented linguistically but the disagreement stays in the position of contradiction. If contradiction exists within the speech itself, the paradox will be spoken, but if the contradiction was between speech and context it will be a spoken-behavioral paradox.

Muecke says that "If the oppositeness between the appearance and core is a basic feature of the paradox, awareness of such oppositeness will be a basic prerequisite for perceiving the paradox. In the spoken paradox, the contradiction may exist between content and context

(Muecke, 1993). The context in Muecke's speech is the context of events because he provides examples about spoken paradoxes that speech is not in harmony with situation.

### The Spoken Paradox

The spoken-behavioral paradox seems to be able to occult if the observer doesn't know the reality of the situation, when the text content, with its forms, is' fee of signs of tension. Its topic might be included for its surface level or able to be the holder of complete contradiction, such as the opposition representative praises the plans of the government. Here, we will discuss examples of spoken paradox in the text by Dongol (1978):

*“Sisyphus is no longer carrying the rock over his shoulder,  
The holders are who born in the cages of slavery, and the sea like the desert doesn't quench  
thirst”.*

The epic shows a spoken paradox between sea and desert, since the desert is poor of water, so how the sea changes to be a desert? In this paradox Dongol surpasses the apparent contradiction between two words derived from the text (Sea, desert) to a tension presented by the poetic text showing the demise of the sea, as an element of welfare, to a desert with thirst and waterless space. Here the sea surrounds its basic role and gets free of positive elements, which lets us see the paradox of roles as Rawashdeh calls it, where the element gives up its original associated role in the memory of culture to perform a new role totally different (Rawashdeh, 1999).

“Dongol says:

*O the Master of white guides in the darkness  
O the Caesar of Frost”*

This paradox is based on adherence of two corresponding colored elements (white and black) in the sequence (white and darkness). The deep darkness included the blackness in the scene. This paradox exists in the lexical contradiction.

It means that the poet meant by his prose the alignment of "guides and white", while the stasis of these guides doesn't be eased whether being white or black, since the color is a trick while black or darkness is the reality in the white guides. Here the white color dodged the recipient then returned to hit the darkness, since darkness/injustice provides Caesar with dominance.

### The Behavioral Paradox

In this example, Dongol writes as Spartacos speaking:

*“Raise your eyes at the hanged rebel  
you will be like him ... Tomorrow  
Here, kiss your wives ... at the road  
you will end up here ... Tomorrow”*

Spartacos was hanged because he said "No" to Caesar. Spartacos requested the pedestrians walking at the Great Alexandar Street to keep alive or make absurdity "kissing wives", since the remaining time is short. They will be hanged tomorrow like him because he saw the end and stated that the "farewell" in front of injustice is not a successful way to survive, the end is coming even with the servility.

The paradox is manifested here in the request of Spartacos the Rebel to others to ignore and are not the problem to the extent of kissing at the street, as an assertion of the death of humanity sense, and assuring the proximity of human to animal when he becomes free of the measures of humanity in liberty and dignity.

This paradox created a tension between the scene of hanging and the dramatic end, and what Spartacos said, so the speech seemed to be against the expectations based on the context.

*If you saw my child who I left him on her arm without arm*

*Teach him the bending and bowing*

The tension intensifies when the death-bended Spartacos commends others to teach his deformed child the bending and bowing alive:

*I am hanged by the morning gallows*

*My front is bended by death*

*Since I didn't bow it alive*

Both situations are contradicted: The scene of hanging and the speech of the hanged, which makes the paradox a result of no alignment of speech and situation.

### Paradox Approaches

For Muecke this classification is based on the personality of paradox speaker or the presenter, because it may be "impersonality". This means that making the paradox "doesn't depend on any weigh dedicated to the personality of paradox presenter (Muecke, 1993).

In fact the clarification by Muecke needs more clarification, since the paradox was created on different forms according to its source. The writers focused on creating personalities who present the paradox and are featured by special characteristics of foolishness, naivety, stupidity and sloth.

Therefore, when the paradox is spoken or behaved by the presenter, without the help of special personality, it will be "impersonal", but when it is said by a "moulded" personality it will be personal. The personal paradox is divided into:

#### a. The Paradox of Self Deprecation:

This is the Socratic paradox, "where Plato showed him in an image of a person setting haunted at the feet of a wise man hoping to learn from him at the end (Muecke, 1993). In this way the paradox real creator "the writer" is hiding away the scene of paradox, where he wears a mask of the positive impact of a personality embodiment (Muck, 1993).

#### b. The Paradox of Freaking

In this type the writer of paradox goes far away the scene, but without claiming special features of personality, like the self deprecation, but he makes the paradox process linked to a naive boy, who behaves on his behalf without knowing the matter (Muecke, 1993), but this enhances the process of illusion to step forward.

In this type the writer completely withdraws or creates characters who bring for themselves paradoxes unconsciously. While the first type represented completely the paradox writer, but through adopting features that allow him to perform the paradox, while the second was a projection of paradox by the consciousness of its writer on a specific self-characterized by naivety, so this paradox is characterized by abstraction and the unconscious disclosure of the whole paradoxes of life.

It is naturally, within this sequence, to reach the paradox of incidences, since this approach, the paradox of showing the self, is connected directly to the incidences and its relationships, as well as connected to the dramatic paradox.

When we track the poem of Dongol we notice that the poet showed several methods of presenting the paradox.

### **Impersonality**

*Spartacos Speaks to Caesar:*

*O my killer, I forgave you*

*At the moment after which*

*you got rid of me*

*I got rid of you*

The writer presents here a latent speaking paradox in contradiction between "I forgave you" and the context of "killing", to make it a behavioral paradox. Here we notice the tough and strict style, which is the feature of this type of paradox.

Muecke suggests that the tone of speech belongs to a sane speaker talking freely (Muecke, 1993). The spots here are numerous like:

*O my brothers, The virgin Carthage burns*

*Kiss your wives*

*If you saw my chopped- armed child who I left on her arm*

*Teach him bowing*

*Teach him bowing*

*Sysephus has no longer holding the rock over his shoulders*

*The rock is held by those who are born in slavery.*

As Muecke tells about the speaker of impersonal paradox "his own words, or their contradiction with what we know lead to paradox" (Muecke, 1993). Therefore, the reader or the observer is a participant in the paradox.

This what was expressed by Nabila Ibrahim when she asserted that "the paradox is an intelligent and skillful lingual game between two parties: the writer and the reader (Ibrahim, 1986). It is worth mentioning that most speaking is of this type (Muecke, 1993).

### The Self Deprecation Paradox

It is the paradox of Socrates where the paradox writer or speaker deprecates himself (Muecke, 1993) ,as we showed previously, represented by the following:

*O great Caesar, I confess ... I committed mistakes  
Let me ... kiss your hand ... while preparing me for hanging  
I am kissing the rope which will squeeze my throat  
It is your hands ... and your glory which obliges us to worship you  
Let my atone my sin  
I give you, after my death, my skull  
To make it a goblet for your strong wine*

Here the hanged Spartacos, the rebel, adopts a situation that fits the presented bowing of the poem sequence. The lowering-eyed crowds walk leanly in the square. They don't raise their heads at him so he talked to Caesar by this method based on self deprecation. He, who struggled for freedom, says "I was mistaken" and asks Caesar to let him kiss his hands though Spartacos is hanged and Caesar is the killer. Spartacos even sought to kiss the hanging rope, because it represents the authority of Caesar. The Poem continues in the self deprecation to the extent that Spartacos submits his skull to let Caesar use it for drinking strong wine, because in this moment Spartacos was haunted by the power of Caesar where he saw each item belonged to Caesar as representing his power. Here, the self deprecation is enveloped by sarcasm and pain, so this part of the poem is an example for the paradox of mockery, but later we will discuss these features.

### The Self Disclosure Paradox and Dramatic Paradox

We have mentioned the connection between self-disclosure and dramatic paradoxes, since they are linked to the event and the unconscious disclosure of contradiction - Here we see the scene of bowing crowds walking:

*O my brothors who walk through the square lowering their eyes  
At the sunset time walking along the street of Alexander the Great  
Don't be ashame.. Raise your eyes at me..  
Because you are hanged beside me.. by the gallows of Caesar  
...  
Raise your eyes to the hanged rebel  
You will meet the same end .. tomorrow  
The spider weaves the death over the necks of men.*

Spartacos was hanged by orders of Caesar. The poem shows him looking down at the walking crowds: "Raise your eyes".. Such highness might be moral by his honored end compared to their inferiority resulted from their weakness and servility. He asked them to raise their eyes at him since their fate will be the same as his. They are equal with him at the end, which he insights while they ignore it, to leave their shame of that hanged rebel who said: "No".

Therefore, they are continuing to droop to gain survive, beside their claimed shame of Spartacos (lowering-eyed, bowing, raise) - but they are not aware of the same fate - that makes them victims of the paradox.

According to Muecke the basic element of the dramatic paradox is "calm carelessness that consists a blend of pride, vanity, self-satisfaction, naivity, simplicity, and innocence (Muecke, 1993).

No doubt that such carelessness of crowds is stemmed by their naivity, but Spartacos the observer is completely aware of their actual status of carelessness. This is what makes the paradox dramatic. This type is called "the Paradox of Sophocles" which is defined by Green as "the core of contradiction sensed by the observer against the ignorance and carelessness of the character who behaves upon these elements (Suleiman, 1999).

The dramatic paradox is frequently linked to the fate, "because the paradoxed victim doesn't know the fate" (Muecke, 1993). As an example, for this type is what Throal stressed in that the contradiction within the human through his fears, ambitions, expectations, work and his stubborn fate lets us discover this type of paradox (Muecke, 1993).

In this paradox we don't see the direction of fate, perhaps it is aligned with the whole poem which we will present as "the paradox as a text".

Here we raise a question: Is the encounter of fate by Spartacos is a paradox??

*If you Saw Hanibaal on the road*

*Tell him that I waited him at the tired gates of Rome*

*But Hanibaal didn't come with his army*

*Tell him I waited him - but He didn't come*

*I waited until my end.. hanged by the death ropes*

The life of Spartacos represents a life empty from time, because he waits Hanibaal who preceded him by one century and didn't see Rome Empire. He waited him for a long time until being hanged by the ropes of death and fate. So we can say that this dramatic end makes this part of the poem a dramatic and tragic paradox, as seen by Throal and Muecke.

## Features of Paradox

### Paradox of Laugh, Sarcasm and Mockery

Thomson, in his book "The Rough Mockery", suggests that the contradiction of paradox should be painful and comic too to be considered a contradiction (Muecke, 1993). For him, paradox should be featured by pain and comedy, but Muecke doesn't agree him on such



constraint, since Muecke considers comedy as an optional feature, but he agrees that the paradox will be more effective if it combines both comedy and pain elements (Muecke, 1993).

Here we mention the perspectives about the comedy element when talking about mockery and sarcasm due to their interrelationship not their synonyms. Nabila Ibrahim discusses the paradox in the poetry of Al Mutanabi saying "we have to not forget that the paradox had achieved its most important feature, in that it didn't leave the reader until it drew a calm smile on his lips associated with satire of victim (Ibrahim, 1986). She suggests that this paradox contains both fun and sadness in the same time, so it urges the reader to smile which is covered immediately by sadness (Ibrahim, 1986).

This view agrees with Thomson, as discussed above, but Muecke doesn't agree of necessity of pain or comedy. He says: "The painful element, that Thomson suggests its necessity in the paradox, doesn't reflect any formative feature but it reflects the sympathy with the victim (Muecke, 1993), while he mentions paradoxes didn't leave painful impact, thus Muecke denies that the comedy or pain are essential elements of the paradox, but merely features.

On the other hand, the sarcasm is not a paradox in general but it intersects with it when it creates the contradiction. Ibrahim suggests that sarcasm is not a paradox due to its function and distance from the victim. The sarcasm is a deliberate attack on a person aiming at taking all his weapons and taking off any element that hides and protects him (Ibrahim, 1986).

When we notice this feature of the paradox in the poem "The Last Words of Spartacos", we find that such feature has no clear influence on the paradoxes spreading throughout the poem, but has a slight influence.

*Raise your eyes at me*

*Perhaps.. If your eyes met the death in my eyes*

*The cessation will smile inside me .. because ..*

*You raised your heads once.*

Spartacos insisted that those inferior crowds should raise heads. In an attempt to justify such insist to urge them respond and ascend, he expects their eyes will meet his eyes at the moment when the death smiles. Such smile is not innocent but a mockery and satire of those walking people who performed a task that opposes the bowing "The death". The paradox is complete in "once", but perhaps the cessation knows that the behavior of those walking crowds is characterized by continuity, so the paradox stressed the uniqueness of the incidence which seemed to be normal, against the contradiction which was characterized by odd and error "the bowing".

### **The Romantic Paradox**

The concept of romantic paradox is not easy, (Muecke, 1993), despite that it gained or acquired more interest in the western studies than other types of paradox, hence, there is the romantic irony theory (Suleiman, 1999).

Therefore, in the romantic paradox the writer creates an aesthetic illusion on any figure, then suddenly he destroys this illusion through changing or reversal of pitch or style, or through snapped and quick view or through a violation and contradictive emotional idea (Suleiman, 1999).

For Schlegel, the paradox is the objectivity since it means the complete highness over the self, and the maneuver of playing all possibilities, and even play on the self (Ibrahim, 1986). Thus such recognition was later adopted as a definition with the concept of beauty when she said: "the beautiful thing is that which has relationship with unlimited universal (Ibrahim, 1986).

While the romantic paradox supposes that the world is based on chaos and such world views that is potential is limited and deceiving in front of the absolute and the infinite (Suleiman, 1999), so its writer has special features, passionate, skeptical and critical (Suleiman, 1999). No doubt that the degree of transparency of paradox writer or speakers determines its level (Ibrahim, 1986).

*Dongol says:*

*Allah didn't forgive Satan when he said no!!*

*The kind people...*

*are the ones who inherit the earth at the end.*

*because they are not hanged.*

In this quartet the poet draws a beautiful illusion, where good people get the best reward that fit their kindness, so they get what they deserve and inherit the earth at the end. Then the low tone takes back the recipient to the reality where the best reward is represented by unchanging them. The last idea is violent and contradicted while the poet creates a kind of equilibrium between creation and destruction (Suleiman, 1989) to achieve the tension that stores the paradox.

It is worth mentioning here to say that this type of paradox, not the romantic one absolutely, but that through which the tension creates different deserve rather than the deserve of right by writer, which Rawashdeh called it "The Paradox of Deserving" where we followed him in mentioning this example (Rawashdeh, 1999).

### **The Paradox of Heritage**

In general, the paradox is created by the writer upon special forms, where we find writers characterized by a special feature of paradox such as 'Sophoclese Paradox, Aristotle Paradox) which became terms later.

The paradox is not limited to take several forms only, but upon the concept it is in continuous evolution (Muecke, 1993). There are still some types of unnamed paradoxes while other named ones are still in a state of repetition and interference (Muecke, 1993).

This urged the critics tend to classify the paradox for someone, in their studies, according to what the texts present. Therefore, the features of the paradox of any writer become clear, so the critic creates names that fit the types of these paradoxes, as what Rawashdeh made in his book

"Spaces of Poetics" where he introduced the classification of the paradoxes that are found in the poetry of Dongol Completely. In this regard he says: "It is worth mentioning that the classification I adopted is stemmed from the meanings of paradox and its situations and indications, not any other base. (Rawashdeh, 1999).

Here, a type of paradox attracted the attention of the researcher related to the heritage, where the inherited scene or text is stable to the observer, while its writer suddenly rejects the expectation through shifting drastically to the contradiction:

Here Dongol says in his preface;

*Glory to Satan.. The God of wind*

*who said "No" at the face of whom who said "Yes".*

The recipient will be suddenly shocked with the drastic shift since his mind is full of the mercy of Glory for God.. Peace on earth

In another part, Dongol says:

*Sisyphus has been no longer holding the rock over his shoulders*

*The Rock is held over those who are born in slavery.*

The mythology of Sisyphus presents his eternal agony, as a punishment against his evils, so he has to hold the rock over his shoulders and climb the mountain, but before reaching the summit the rock runs down so he has to descend and hold it again. But in the poems Sisyphus threw his load and a load of other poems.

This drastic shift doesn't half at the frontiers of meaning but goes far through discovering a type of paradox, which is the philosophical considers the universe as based on contradiction and absence of control.

### **The Philosophical Paradox**

The philosophical paradox may be represented in a part of the text, where it is based on it we can construct a full text. We preferred to study this feature through our discussion of paradox as a full text, since the philosophical paradox formed the base of text totally.

### **Explicit and implicit Paradox**

The explicit paradox is a result of the clear contradiction, so the paradox will be more effective which more internal contradiction (Muecke, 1993). We also add to the contradiction the clear contrast, so if the contradiction is implicit and hidden, its deep structure that hides the paradox will be less affective.

Here we can't ignore the role of paradox reader or observer, since he is a party in this argument. The paradox often needs to know the common background between its writer and reader to get the best result. Muecke called the proximal sourced paradox as "the paradox of

simple repulsion, where two phenomena adhere with strong repulsion or no consistency at all (Muecke, 1993).

One of the positions of hidden paradox in the poem is what the poet says:

*O my brothers - who cross the square lowering their heads*

*Walking at the street of Alexander the Great at the end of evening.*

This paradox is not presented in a form of simple repulsion, since those crowds walking and lowering their heads at the place which witnessed the victory - The street of Alexander the great. The crowds present a scene that may deserve the expression of Ibrahim (1986) when she says: "the strange and horrible". Therefore, if the observer of paradox has no awareness in the role of the street of Alexander the great and its implications he will lose the sense of tension in the scene and will not touch the paradox.

We will present another type of mystery, which we discussed part of it previously in the verbal-behavioral paradox, whose the contradiction exists between speech on one hand and the contextual situation on the other hand. The paradox will change to be a "matter of suspect" when the context is free of an indication to the contradiction and looks at the paradox speaker if he says what he doesn't do in the life.

Here, Muecke says: "The paradox may consist of more mystery, so we can't determine if it is a paradox or not" (Muecke, 1993). He asserts that the person will not be able to distinguish the paradox if the core is under dispute, and if he has no previous knowledge with the writer and his views, especially when the text has no positions of meaning (Muecke, 1993).

But Ibrahim is decisive in determining the paradox when she says: "If the surface level of speech doesn't provide the reader with the tip of evidence that helps him find the implied level that stands beyond the first level, there will not be a paradox" (Ibrahim, 1986).

The researcher doesn't agree with Ibrahim in this part of discussion, since many forms and images of paradox are free of indications to the implied meaning that stores the contradiction. The text of Dongol included parts of this paradox:

*.. and if you saw my armless child whom I left on her arm -*

*Teach him bowing ..*

*O brothers .. Virgin Carthage burns ..*

*Kiss your wives ..*

So we don't know if Spartacos says this speech seriously or covers it with the paradox.

### **The philosophical Paradox**

The term "paradox" was created in a philosophical setting with Plato, Socrates and Aristotle, then it became present in the contemporary philosophical studies beginning with Kantt.

No surprise in this argument when the research that studied the viewpoint of human mind towards the finite or infinite, the reality and example, the constraint and freedom. All of these

topics are the care of modern philosophy in one hand, and are corrected strongly to the sense of paradoxes in our universe (Ibrahim, 1986).

Kantt discussed what he called the "Supreme Structure", which he means the self Transcendental consciousness (Ibrahim, 1986), which is the awareness of existence, where "I think" is associated with each experience. This arguments enabled his theory to affect the emergence of paradox concept in criticism as seem by philosophy with "Schlegel" and "Kierkegaard" (Ibrahim, 1986).

Schlegel says: The life is a box of contradiction and contrasts that we can't grasp it in one mono perceptive framework, except after we reach to a state of perceiving the paradox as the core of life (Ibrahim, 1986).

Therefore, the literary paradox emerges from a paradox implied in the truth of things, as seen by philosophy, where the paradox doesn't represent a surface display, but it is the core of life.

On the philosophical paradox, Samuel Hintz suggests that "the paradox is a view to the life through which we perceive that experience is subject to several explanations, which no one alone is correct, and we perceive that the existence of repulsions is a part of cosmos" (Muecke, 1993). The philosophical perspective made the paradox a universal phenomenon, not constrained to a specific place that can be separated from the universe a whole.

According to Kirkgaard, if the paradox, not philosophical in general , doesn't show itself but to only those who have desire in reading or observing it (Muecke, 1993), in addition to its abstraction and objectivity, which Muecke described its synonyms as: commitment, freedom, purity, and objectivity; if these elements are not present then the philosophical paradox needs a transcendental self (Ibrahim, 1986), that is not featured by bias, be superior to itself and free of any limit but the language (Ibrahim, 1986).

The reader of the poem "The Last Words of Spartacos" will see that it constructed the paradox as a whole in a philosophical vision which considers the universe as based on faulty contradictions. We read this paradox in the overture: The first Blend that glorifies Satan

*Glory to Satan.. God of Winds  
who said "No" in the face of whom who said "Yes"  
who taught human being to tear down the nothingness  
who said "No"... and didn't die  
He stayed an eternal-pained soul*

These lines bring a sudden surprise to the reader, were letting him in front of contradiction directly, due to the religious axioms that glorifies God and peace on earth. This belief is one element of the limited universe, represented by the religious text as a tool. But the poet gives up all the usual and habitual things according to his own view, during his trip to the unlimited universe which contains the core of things (Ibrahim, 1986), so he admits that the glory is to Satan who stood against good then didn't die.

This universe is built over this philosophical paradox, where the stable religious thought, which we can call it tangibles, can be found mistaken by the transcendental self in front of the other contrasting truth.

Here, the supreme self runs far from the crowds, separates from "we" that are united in one entity for those believers that evil will not last and the justice is the holistic general law of the universe. It adopts a paradoxical situation.

Spartacos says:

*by the gallows I am hanged in the morning  
my front is lowered by death.*

.....

*O brothers walking through the square lowering heads  
descending at the end of evening*

.....

*Don't be ashamed and raise your eyes at me*

He is in a distance moment, sensually and intellectually enough to touch the truth they ignore to modify the world for them. This is similar to Ibrahim in the function of philosophical paradox in that: it deepens the shattering between the realism and idealism (Ibrahim, 1986).

Spartacos / the poet dismantle the dream of salvation:

*Don't dream a happy world*

*Every deceasing Caesar brings another Caesar and futile sadness*

Spartacos, the transcendental character, has in his blood the deep sense of the great crime in the life (Ibrahim, 1986). Even the axioms which settled in the mind, he considers them another fact:

*Sysephos has been no longer holding the rock over shoulder*

*The rock is held over whom born in slavery*

Even the intellectual heritage is subject to adversity about the paradox of myth. The punishment doesn't hurt the guilty people but the simple and miserable ones who, when irritating the Satan and say "No" will not be given the glory but more tears.

*Because who says "No" will not drink but tears.*

This is another paradox "why the Satan obtained the glory when he said "No", while laymen sink in tears when they say "No", and when they say "Yes" they are awarded: not to be hanged. This is a humiliating balance with the inheritance of earth.

*The simple laymen*

*will inherit the earth ultimately*

*since... they are not hanged*

The text contains a clear mockery of divine promises, and the heaven justice, and shows another Spartacos's feature of the transcendental self features. That moment when he discovers the absurdity of what it does and "stand to laugh on himself when it drops its vision supported by its renaissance and in seriousness (Ibrahim, 1986).

This is what made Spartacos to disregard himself and kissed the hand of Caesar, saying:

*O Great Caesar... I was mistaken... I admit*

*let me, hanged by my gallow, and kiss your hand*

In another text we find him talking to the crowds and urging them to teach his son the bowing and submission.

*Teach him submission...*

*Teach him submission*

Since Spartacos lives in a moment of awareness of the supreme idea absurdity. In an attempt to intensify the vision of philosophical paradox, we find the text puts us between two blocks:

1. The first is the walking crowds across the squares, who said "yes" and born in slavery.
2. The second is Caesar, Satan and Sysephus.

The paradox is impeded in the dominance of the second block where no permission is given to the rebellion of the first block, so their fate becomes in the hands of the new God, the Satan, who disobeyed Allah while the act and punishment of Allah against him was absent.

For this, the overture scene didn't present Allah while it glorified Satan who didn't die, and Sisyphus was not punished since he is the face of Satan, while the simple miserable people were punished despite their satisfaction and held the rock instead of Sysephus, where Caesar is an extension to Satan and hangs whom who says "No", while he is worshiped by weak and poor people who say "Yes" so where is God?? If Satan hangs whom who says "No", then why Satan dominates when he refuses and disobeys?? Who is the more powerful? Who has existed?

## Conclusion

Amal Dongol shows many parts of interwoven paradox that Muecke explained it. Such a poem is an intact text based totally and applicable on the paradox of a part of the text and the whole text. paradox may be personal, sarcastic or implied philosophical thought and alike. The difficulty of transfer a theory into application stems from that the most examples argued by Muecke are not brought examples from plays, novel, press articles and advertisement. Moreover, the high-intensity paradox resulting from strong or clear contradiction declares itself easily, with a fast and eloquent impact, while the low or hidden contradiction, with no relation with each other, will need more focus by an observer or he leaves it with little impact.

## References

- Dongol, Amal. (1987). The Poetic Complete Collection. Maktabat Madbouli. Cairo. ed3.
- Muecke, D. C. (1993). Encyclopedia of Critical Terminology: The Irony, Features, Coding. (Translated by Abdulwahid L'aloa'h. Al Mo'assatul Alarabiyato Llidirasati wan nashir, Amman. 1st ed. vol. 4.
- Suleiman, Khalid (1999). Irony in Literature: Studies in Theory and Application. Darusharq Publ. 1st ed.
- Ibrahim, Nabilah (1986). Irony. Majallat Fosoul, vol. 7. No. 3+4.
- Shawqi,, Saed (2001). Construct the Irony in the Poetic Drama. Dairak for P.d. 1st ed.

- Bani Amir, Asim M. (2005). *The Language of Contradiction in the Poems of Amal Dongol*, Dar Safa. P. D., Amman, 1st ed
- Seiza, Qasim. (1982). *The Irony in the Contemporary Arab Novel*, Majallat Fosool, vol. 2. No. 2
- Alrawashdeh, Samih. (1999). *Spaces of Poeticity: A Study in Collection of Amal Dongol*. Al Markez Alqawmi. P. D., Irbid.
- Enright. D. J. (1988). *The Alluring Problem*. Oxford Paper books