

The Revolutionary and Scholarly Turns in the Marxist Criticism of the Moroccan Novel in Arabic¹

Mohamed Sali

University Hassan II of Casablanca

Abstract: Part of a larger scholarly endeavour which addresses the Marxist criticism of the Moroccan Arabic-language novel, this study considers four texts, including Driss Nakouri's *Al-Muṣṭalaḥ al-Mushtarak* (*Common Terminology*, 1979), Najib Elaoufi's *Darajat al-Wa'y fī al-Kitābah* (*The Degree of Consciousness in Writing*, 1980), Abdelkader Chaoui's *Sulṭat al-Wāqi'iyah* (*The Power of Realism*, 1981) and Hamid Lahmidani's *Al-Riwāyah al-Maghribiyah wa Ru'yat al-Wāqi' al-Ijtimā'ī* (*The Moroccan Novel and the View of Social Reality*, 1985). In particular, it explores the political, social and cultural landscapes within which those texts arose or, in Edward Said's words, their "circumstantiality" and "worldliness." This circumstantiality-centred endeavour argues that Marxist criticism took two major historical turns. In the late 1970s, it took a revolutionary turn made by Nakouri, Elaoufi and Chaoui, who advanced a Marxist/Realist criticism steeped in and themed by the revolutionary zeitgeist. In the early and mid-1980s, it took a scholarly turn made by Lahmidani (among others), who embraced Goldmann's Structuralism and produced scholarly studies and theses characterized by depth and rigour. Despite the scholarly turn with its emphases upon the poetics and politics of literary works, Marxist criticism should not be seen as two separate strands because it could never abandon the unravelling of the works' worldliness.

Keywords: Marxist Criticism, Arabic-Language Novel, Nakouri, Elaoufi, Chaoui, Lahmidani, Worldliness, Circumstantiality, Revolutionary Turn, Scholarly Turn

This study endeavours to address the Marxist criticism of the Moroccan Arabic-language novel, an understudied sphere in Morocco and a roughly uncharted territory in the Anglophone academia. It considers the larger backdrop in which Nakouri's *Al-Muṣṭalaḥ al-Mushtarak*, Elaoufi's *Darajat al-Wa'y fī al-Kitābah*, Chaoui's *Sulṭat al-Wāqi'iyah* and Lahmidani's *Al-Riwāyah al-Maghribiyah wa Ru'yat al-Wāqi' al-Ijtimā'ī* emerged and evolved. It attempts to investigate what the late chief critic Edward Said calls the "worldliness" of those inaugural and influential texts in Moroccan literary criticism at large. In *The Text, the World, and the Critic*, Said argues that "texts are worldly, to some degree they are events, and, even when they appear to deny it, they are nevertheless a part of the social world, human life, and of course the historical moments in

1. PhD Student. Moroccan American Studies Laboratory (MAS), Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences, Ben M'sik, Casablanca. This study would not have come about without the continued guidance and support of my doctorate supervisor, Dr. Karim Bejjit, the Chair of the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences, Tétouan. To him, I extend my deepest gratitude.

which they are located and interpreted.”² The study seeks to unravel those texts’ affiliations and connections: “what enables a text to maintain itself as a text... status of the author, historical moment, conditions of publication, diffusion and reception, values drawn upon, values and ideas assumed, a framework of consensually held tacit assumptions, presumed background, and so on and on.”³ It is grounded in an array of primary and secondary sources mostly in Arabic – including seminal books, newspaper articles and extensive interviews. It studies the political, social and cultural conditions in which the Marxist critical texts evolved and with which they interacted. It is argued that circumstantiality amidst the revolutionary zest was marked by student upheavals, state crackdowns, class struggles and criticism disputes throughout the 1970s. When this zest was on the decrease, academic institutions, scholarly journals and intercultural interactions began to thrive, auspicious circumstances thought to have brought forth scholarly (university) criticism in the style of Goldmann’s Structuralism. Despite this scholarly turn, it is worth maintaining that the Goldmannian turn does not signal a discontinuity in the Marxist criticism of the Arabic-language novel. It may have re-shifted emphasis upon literary works, foregrounding both their poetics and politics through two analytical modes or stages: comprehension and explanation. But, Goldmann’s Structuralism is an offshoot of Marxist criticism which cannot abandon the circumstantiality of literary works.

Revolutionary Turn

Born Amidst the 1970s Tumult

In a *Mashārif* interview broadcast in 2012, the host Yassin Adnan asked the lead and long-time critic Najib Elaoufi about the motive behind and the moment of writing the three major works of Marxist/Realist criticism – Driss Nakouri’s *Al-Muṣṭalah al-Muštarak*, Elaoufi’s *Darajat al-Wa’y fī al-Kitābah*, and Abdelkader Chaoui’s *Sulṭat al-Wāqī’īyah*. Elaoufi revealed, “It was a magical and seminal moment in the course of [Moroccan] literary criticism.”⁴ Positive as they may sound, the two attributive adjectives “magical” and “seminal” in Elaoufi’s emotionally-enthused answer describe the consecutive years of releasing the three works or the works themselves as innovative criticism, not the broader context in which the works were written.⁵ Enthusiastically, Elaoufi continues to

2. Edward Said, *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1983), 4.

3. Said, *The World, the Text, and the Critic*, 172.

4. *Mashārif* is cultural weekly TV programme which was broadcast by *al-Aoula*, a mainstream TV channel in Morocco, and hosted by Yassin Adnan, a Safi-born author and broadcaster whose debut 2016 novel, *Hot Maroc*, was nominated for the Arabic Booker Prize.

5. As yet to be seen, the three Marxist/Realist works were written against a cultural background stricken by a “criticism” controversy. It is worth noting that Chaoui’s *Sulṭat al-Wāqī’īyah*, a collection of essays looking into contemporary Moroccan Arabic-language literature, was written in custody. One may wonder what would be “magical” or “pivotal” about writing a critical work while imprisoned (though writing may be self-emancipatory exercise).

explain that the three critics, not to mention Ibrahim el Khatib, took “the torch of criticism” from the “founding fathers” in order to lay the groundwork of “critical modernity.”⁶ For him, unlike “critical salafism,” “critical modernity,” “the critical left,” or “the modern uprising in criticism” designates a body of innovative criticism which, in the 1970s and early 1980s, built on West-grown criticism, featuring Marxism and Structuralism, to “advance the critical discourse, refining its terms and tools and injecting into it the newest and most effective scientific methods.”⁷ Unlike the “magical” chronology of this “critical modernity” brought to light by those “seminal” releases, the larger context in which they arose was politically and socially turbulent.

Indeed, they came out amidst the tumultuous Years of Leads. In “The Absent Perpetrators,” el Guabli characterizes those years (1956-1999) as a quagmire of violence sponsored by the state.⁸ Quoting the Equity and Reconciliation Commission’s 2006 final report, el Guabli outlines the most notorious “milestones” of this state-sponsored violence, which spanned more than four decades: “[t]he bloody Rif War (1959), the repression of the Marxist-Leninist activists (1972-1990), the disappearance of soldiers and civilians to multiple secret prisons (1973-1991), the mistreatment of Islamist detainees, and the brutal clampdown on social movements from the 1960s to the early 1990s.”⁹ Among the most extreme crackdowns was the one targeting the March 23 student upheaval in 1965. In “Min Intifādat al-Shāri‘ ilā Intifādat al-Adab” (“From a Street Uprising to a Literature Uprising,” Elaoufi writes in retrospect, describing the student upheaval – which appealed to the masses too, as “seismic” and “tragic.”¹⁰ For him, the upheaval left “deep scars” in the Moroccan body and mind but transformed the Moroccan consciousness and encouraged revolutionary literature. Other upheavals took place in the 1970s and gave rise to what Elaoufi deems the “new left,” inspired by Marxism-Leninism and including the *Māris 23* (March 23) and *Ilā al-Amām* (Forward) movements, which were operating incognito in fear of state crackdowns.¹¹ El Guabli considers *Māris 23* and *Ilā al-Amām* along with *Linakhdam al-Sha‘b* (Let’s Serve the People!) one revolutionary force which

6. Like Nakouri, Elaoufi holds that the “founding fathers” of literary studies in the Moroccan scene include Mohamed Berrada, Ahmad el Yabouri, Hassan el Mniai and Ibrahim Soulami, among others.

7. Najib Elaoufi, *Darajat al-Wa’y fi al-Kitābah: Dirāsāt Naqdiyyah* (Al-Dār al-Bayḍā’: Dār al-Nashr al-Maghribīyah, 1980), 17.

8. Brahim el Guabli, “The Absent Perpetrators: Morocco’s Failed Accountability, Tazmamart Literature and the Survivors’ Testimony for Their Jailers (1973-1991),” *Violence: An International Journal* (1) (1) (2020): 80. In it, el Guabli argues that testimonial writings by Tazmamart detainees expose the state impunity given to those executioners behind human rights violations throughout the Years of Lead.

9. El Guabli, “The Absent Perpetrators,” 81.

10. Najib Elaoufi, “Min Intifādat al-Shāri‘ ilā Intifādat al-Adab,” *Maghress, Al-Itihād al-Ishṭirākī*, 23 March 2010, last modified January 16, 2021, <http://maghress.com/alittihad/105914>.

11. Elaoufi, “Min Intifādat al-Shāri‘ ilā Intifādat al-Adab,” para. 4.

made up the Moroccan Marxist-Leninist Movement (MMLM).¹² For him, it was revolutionary since it was geared towards ousting the monarchy and disrupting the 1970s party system in the hope that it could establish a proletarian state and a classless society. To accomplish this, el Guabli, like Elaoufi, contends that the Marxist-Leninist force was involved in underground activism which was largely embraced by student activists, trade unionists and cultural revolutionists.¹³ As el Guabli notes, “This revolutionary endeavour focused on *conscientizing* the workers, mobilizing students, and spreading MMLM’s ideas.”¹⁴ Increased impetus for and impact over this burgeoning left came from landmark events worldwide, Elaoufi reveals. Among them, the most cataclysmic was the Arab debacle in the Six-Day War in June 1967, and the most historic was the French student protests and strikes in France in May 1968.¹⁵ In a sum-up of the revolutionary scene and zeal in the 1970s where the Moroccan university took an active role, Elaoufi recalls,

Like the 1960s and worse, the 1970s are notoriously kept in the Moroccan memory as the most simmering years on all the scenes: politics, society and culture. The left and new left fought a class and political battle in a tough wager while cherishing the dream of change and revolt. The Moroccan university was a combative, ideological and inventive workshop open for people and united with the underprivileged classes in the Moroccan society. Prison camps, public and secret, waylaid anyone who rose up.¹⁶

Amidst this national and global discontents in the 1970s, literary works, both in poetry and prose, were inspired by the angst of state violence and the zest of revolutionary change. Numerous poems and short stories were steeped in and themed by the revolutionary upheavals. They sought to articulate the revolutionary zeitgeist which seems a recurrent leitmotif as these titles quoted by Elaoufi evidence: “Linudrik Nabḍ al-Ḥayāt” (“Let us Feel the Pulse of Life”), “Riyāḥ Altī Sata’tī” (“Wind to Come”), “Ākhiru A’wām al-‘Uqm” (“The Last of Sterile Years”), “Al-‘Ad ‘alā Al-Ḥadīd” (“Biting Iron”), “Nidā’ ‘Azrā’īl” (“Azrael’s Call”) and “Al-‘Unf fī al-Dimāgh” (“Violence in the Brain”).¹⁷ The criticism which set out to address them was no less revolutionary. To requote Elaoufi’s celebratory words, it is a “critical upheaval.”¹⁸ It gave rise to what Kharmach

12. Brahim El Guabli, “Reading for Theory in the Moroccan Marxist-Leninist Testimonial Literature,” *African Identities* (58) (1-2) (2020): 145.

13. El Guabli, “The Absent Perpetrators,” 145-46.

14. El Guabli, “The Absent Perpetrators,” 146. Italics are his. Also, it is worth noting that, upon discovering the Marxist-Leninist students, unionists and writers, the state violently squashed them. Quoting two Amnesty International reports (1977/1978), el Guabli writes, “[T]he *Frontistes* [the Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries] were kidnapped, forcibly disappeared, and tortured before being sentenced to very long jail times in high profile trials” (146).

15. Elaoufi, “Min Intifāḍat al-Shāri’ ilā Intifāḍat al-Adab,” para. 10.

16. *Ibid.*, para. 15.

17. *Ibid.*, 12; 13.

18. *Ibid.*, para. 14.

and most critics, including its advocates, call “ideological criticism.”¹⁹ It is a Marxist/Realist criticism advanced by the left-wing Nakouri, Elaoufi and Chaoui, eyewitnesses to the March 23 uprising who wrote continually and favourably in newspapers and journals like *al-Muḥarir al-Thaqāfī* and *al-Thaqāfah al-Jadīdah* albeit under pseudonyms.²⁰ Nakouri, the most devout among the three Marxist critics, depicts the newborn criticism as socially “conscious” and “committed” to forging and lauding the hopes of the enormous masses, namely freedom, justice and equality.²¹ It is Marxist/Realist because it sought to study literary works in connection with the socio-political tumult from which it arose. On the basis of Marxist-Realist sources, Kharmach maintains that the critical involvement in the political and social landscapes is a “natural outcome” of the class reorder which took place in the wake of independence, one which grieved and ignored intellectuals who aligned themselves with the vast masses.²² In revolt, the grieved intellectuals strove to involve criticism as a cultural weapon, so they could redress inequality and injustice, opposing the upper classes which were in control and supporting the underclasses which were under control.²³

On January 14, 1979, an influential *al-Muḥarir al-Thaqāfī* article entitled “Al-Thaqāfah al-Dīmūqrāṭīyah wa Mahām al-Naqd al-Adabī” (“The Democratic Culture and the Tasks of Literary Criticism”) came out. It is a critical and political manifesto whose anonymous authors outline their ideological commitments to establish “an independent culture incorporating the masses’ ambitions for social change.”²⁴ It calls upon critics to create a culture to counter the bourgeois criticism which divorces literary works from their socio-historical conditions and class divisions – the unwavering underpinnings of Marxist/Realist criticism. Scathingly, it does consider bourgeois criticism and culture in general to be socially unjust: it favours the reigning classes; it advocates a “false consciousness”; it lauds bourgeois aesthetics in the name of free speech, defending heritage and art-for-art’s-sake theory; and it maintains the status quo.²⁵ As the manifesto goes on disparagingly, the bourgeois beneficiaries – both authors and critics – could not help but “abuse” literary criticism to “beautify” their Machiavellian attitudes and justify their vested interests. Through material and political means, they

19. Mohamed Kharmach, *Al-Tawājuhāt al-Thaqāfīyah wa Taṭawur al al-Fikr al-Naqdī ḥtā al-Thamānīnāt* (Fās: Maṭb‘at Info-Print, 2006), 37; 40. Its devotees – Nakouri, Elaoufi and Chaoui – employ multiple names besides “ideological” to dub the critical approach they embrace: “socio-historical,” “Realist,” “Realist-dialectical” or “socio-dialectical.”

20. Arguably, because of state crackdowns on left-wing authors and intellectuals, Nakouri wrote under the pseudonym Bachir Ouadnouni. In the same way, Chaoui, who was a leading activist in the *Māris 23* and *Ilā al-Amām* movements, wrote under Irchad Hassan and Toufik Chahid, among others.

21. Driss Nakouri, *Al-Muṣṭalaḥ al-Mushtarak: Dirāsāt fī al-Adab al-Maghribī al-Mu‘āsir* (Al-Dār al-Bayḍā’: Dār al-Nashr al-Maghribīyah, 1979), 9.

22. Kharmach, *Al-Tawājuhāt al-Thaqāfīyah*, 41; 99.

23. *Ibid.*, 41-42.

24. *Ibid.*, 40.

25. *Ibid.*, 41.

strove to recruit bourgeois and quasi-bourgeois intellectuals who favour greed over enduring morals and values.²⁶ By contrast, Nakouri and Elaoufi, who may or must have been behind constructing the manifesto, self-identify as avant-garde, democratic, revolutionary and socially conscious critics. They believe that they craft an anti-bourgeois culture in the humanities to scotch bourgeois thought through “analysis” and “criticism” and serve cultural values seated in the Moroccan people’s heritage and literature.²⁷ Indeed, they went beyond literary works to embrace and transform society: they sought to expose class struggle between the bourgeois elite and the disadvantaged masses; to champion intellectual commitment; to craft a “correct” consciousness capable of countering the bourgeoisie and reconstructing the Moroccan society; and to accomplish the “historical inevitability” – socialism.²⁸ Overall, the backdrop in the build-up to the rise of the aspirational Marxist/Realist criticism of the Arabic-language novel was turbulent, and its upshot is a revolutionary criticism which would ignite a critical controversy.

Grown Amidst the 1970s Controversy

While turbulence spread through the political and social landscapes in the 1960s and 70s, the critical/cultural scene bore the hallmark of belligerence. Indeed, so bellicose was the backdrop against which Marxist/Realist literary criticism in Morocco emerged over the mid and late 1970s. It was alloyed by a criticism controversy thought to have been tantamount to a “criticism conflict” or a “criticism crisis.” The controversy arose between whom Elaoufi, in *Darajat al-Wa’y fī al-Kitābah*, deems “the cultural right” versus “the cultural left” in the pages of two antagonistic news-paper supplements: *al-‘Alam* and *al-Muḥarir al-Thaqāfī*.²⁹ In “Tarikat al-Maḍī wa Shar‘iyat al-Tasā’ul” (“The Legacy of the Past and Legitimacy of Questioning”), el Khatib – a non-left-leaning critic – observes that the criticism controversy was an “ideological conflict” behind the veneer of a critical conflict.³⁰ Elaoufi, who depicts the 1970s controversy as “dust in full swing,” reveals that it was composed of two parts, the largest of which is “nothing but theoretical and verbal dust” abutting onto the critical sphere’s surface without impregnating any seeds.³¹ For him, “it is more of a recurrent talk *about* criticism than a recurrent talk *in* criticism; it is more critical [identifying faults and flaws] than critical [involving critics and criticism].”³² Similarly, Bennis explains that the controversy was generally groundless and pointless, and the majority of its writings and counter-writings was steeped in bellicosity and far removed from a

26. Ibid., 42; 108.

27. Ibid.

28. Elaoufi, “Min Intifāḍat al-Shāri‘ ilā Intifāḍat al-Adab,” para. 31.

29. Elaoufi, *Darajat al-Wa’y fī al-Kitābah*, 402.

30. Ibrahim el Khatib, “Tarikat Al-Maḍī wa Shar‘iyat al-Tasā’ul,” *Al-Thaqāfah al-Jadīdah* (9) (1) (1978): 30.

31. Elaoufi, *Darajat al-Wa’y fī al-Kitābah*, 8.

32. Ibid.

literary criticism grounded in methodology, philosophy and teleology.³³ For him, it was “a conflict about minutiae whose instigators strove to thrust them into the conflict’s forefront and about marginalia which do not avail criticism and critics, nor do they bear upon the Moroccan literature and its problems.”³⁴ On the controversy’s outcome, el Khatib notes that it did not satisfy the critical and cultural aspirations of those critics who were behind its dramatic intensification.³⁵

According to Elaoufi, two “critical” trends emerged amidst the criticism controversy: one was extremely theoretical seeking to offer a supreme model that critics should champion while another was critical (fault-finding) striving to establish what Elaoufi calls “the utopia of criticism” and “the holy shrine of criticism” at which critics should worship.³⁶ On the contrary, a small part of the controversy was not as polemically nor theoretically driven: it concerns a few “avant-garde critics,” including Nakouri, Elaoufi and Chaoui, who abstained from polarizing criticism and delved into analyzing, criticizing and theorizing, instead. They espoused a wordly Marxist/Realist movement whose ultimate aim is to comprehend criticism in its socio-historical conditions and through “diagnostic identifications and manifestations” before it comprehends criticism in its theoretical sphere and through “abstract deductions and impositions.”³⁷ Those few, however, could not expand nor impose their stance amidst the continued controversy, and the smallest writings that relate to criticism were marginal.³⁸ While the two highly polemical and theoretical trends, usually branded by the cultural-left critics as “rightist/traditionalist,” derive from a theoretical model to construct criticism, the Marxist/Realist movement, self-dubbed “leftist/modernist,” derive from reality, the milieu from which criticism emerges and evolves. Avowedly aligning himself with the Marxist/Realist stand, Elaoufi discredits abstractions and deductions, arguing that “when theorization does not find the *base* [critical production] on which it draws or the *subject matter* on which it works, it will operate in vacuum and hover in haze.”³⁹ Extreme or moderate as the controversy over criticism may have been, the eventual outcome was facile talk. To Requote Elaoufi, [T]he talk which interwove over criticism is nearly ampler than the critical talk itself. The effort that has been invested in this talk which borders on becoming routine and byzantine should have been invested first and foremost in the sphere of criticism itself, theoretically and practically.⁴⁰

33. Bennis, Mohammed, “Waḍ‘unā Al-Naqdī: Ba’d Min Simātih wa Imkāniyātih,” *Al-Thaqāfah al-Jadīdah*, 10-11, no. 1 (1978): 44.

34. Bennis, “Waḍ‘unā Al-Naqdī,” 44.

35. El Khatib, “Tarikat Al-Maḍī wa Shar‘iyat al-Tasā’ul,” 31.

36. Elaoufi, *Darajat al-Wa’y fī al-Kitābah*, 8.

37. *Ibid.*, 9.

38. Bennis, “Waḍ‘unā Al-Naqdī,” 41-42.

39. Elaoufi, *Darajat al-Wa’y fī al-Kitābah*, 11. Italics are in the original.

40. Elaoufi, *Darajat al-Wa’y fī al-Kitābah*, 9.

As no strangers to the criticism and culture controversy, Nakouri and Elaoufi, two major Marxist/Realist critics, kept from calling the controversy a crisis. For them, it is a misnomer that was proselytized by bourgeois “traditionalist” critics, including Hassan Taribak and Abdelali Wadghiri. In an extensive journal interview with Elaoufi titled “al-Manhaj al-Jadalī” (“Dialectical Approach”), Bennis, the interviewer, considers those critics “the enthusiasts of the descriptive, ahistorical and non-dialectic approach.”⁴¹ To illustrate the “traditionalism” of those critics, Bennis refers to Taribak’s study of Moroccan Arabic-language poetry in late 1976 and early 1977, one which he views as a mere reproduction of terms and values derived from “orthodox” criticism coupled with terms and values derived from impressionistic criticism.⁴² Bennis attempts to dispute Tribak’s approach as a chaotic melange unscientifically supported by reference to certain historical events to corroborate the judgement made. His is an impaired handling or reading that is lodged in too marginal a consciousness and does not interpret the literary text as a linguistic production whose ontological and social roots should be traced to reality.⁴³ Similarly, in “Difā‘ā ‘an al-Manhaj al-Ijtimā‘ī,” Nakouri characterizes “traditionalist” critics as the advocates of “old criticism” who include Abdelkrim Ghallab and Abdeljabbar Shimi, bourgeois Independence critics whose ulterior and ultimate motive was to push forward certain political and social views that were ostensibly progressive and revolutionary but, in actuality, they only served their class and party agendas.⁴⁴ For him, the bourgeois critics were not committed to developing a critical approach grounded in scholarly methodology and terminology. Instead, they strove to establish and maintain bourgeois ascendancy through critical and cultural practices.⁴⁵ Other critics and intellectuals, supposed to have been progressive thanks to the class to which they belong and whom

41. Najib Elaoufi, “Al-Manhaj al-Jadalī: Ḥudūd Mutaḥarrikah wa la Nihā‘iyah,” *Al-Thaqāfah al-Jadīdah* (9) (1) (1978): 44. Nakouri’s “Difā‘ā ‘an al-Manhaj al-Ijtimā‘ī” (“In Defence of the Social Approach”), Elaoufi’s “Al-Manhaj al-Jadalī: Ḥudūd Mutaḥarrikah wa la Nihā‘iyah” (“The Dialectical Approach: Restless and Limitless Boundaries”) and el Khatib’s “Tarikat Al-Māḍī wa Shar‘iyat al-Tasā‘ul.” (The Legacy of the Past and Legitimacy of Questioning”) are in-depth *al-Thaqāfah al-Jadīdah* interviews administered by Mohammed Bennis and Mustapha el Mesnaoui in a special issue investigating literary criticism in the wake of the “criticism” controversy. Chaoui could not have been called for the interview because he was held in custody.

42. Elaoufi, “Al-Manhaj al-Jadalī,” 47. In *Al-Tawājuhāt al-Thaqāfīyah wa Taṭawur al al-Fikr al-Naqdī*, Kharmach surveys the most acrimonious battles and debates which triggered the criticism controversy. Albeit fleeting, the survey offers an almost blow-by-blow description based upon primary sources, including to-and-fro articles from *Al-‘Alam* and *Al-Muḥarir* newspapers. In this contentious to-ing and fro-ing, Hassan Tribak, whom Kharmach seems to sarcastically portray as the “unwavering knight” in the critical battleground, stood as a lead instigator who sought to distance literary works from politics and society (100). His Marxist/Realist critics who were immersed in the moment’s ideological zeal, including Elaoufi and Bennis, saw him as but a cog in “critical salafism” or the bourgeois machinery as a whole who is not theoretically and methodologically equipped to mount a critical stand (106). Consider pp. (97-117) for a feel of this standoff.

43. Elaoufi, “Al-Manhaj al-Jadalī,” 47.

44. Driss Nakouri, “Difā‘ā ‘an Al-Manhaj al-Ijtimā‘ī,” *Al-Thaqāfah al-Jadīdah* (9) (1) (1978): 14.

45. Nakouri, “Difā‘ā ‘an Al-Manhaj al-Ijtimā‘ī,” 16.

Nakouri abstains from identifying, were deceived into favouring and furthering the bourgeois scheme, too.⁴⁶

Nakouri believes that “old” bourgeois criticism consolidates “exploitive” and “negative” views and is incompatible with a historical stage characterized by an increasing consciousness of the mounting contradictions in the post-independence Moroccan society.⁴⁷ In the 1960s and 1970s, which saw harrowing clampdowns and experiences, intellectuals and the masses were politically and socially too conscious to be misled by bourgeois critics and highbrows. The incompatibility of “traditionalist” criticism is brought to the foreground by Elaoufi in “Al-Manhaj al-Jadalī,” too. Elaoufi asserts that “descriptive,” “impressionistic” or “obsolete” criticism could not comprehend the cultural and social momentum which was increasing in the 1970s: its view remains shallow and syncretic while its apparatus is backward and infertile.⁴⁸ Its devotees are imprisoned by the derisory methodology and fragile ideology of an “outmoded” criticism and continue employing archaic concepts and terms which were once in vogue during Mustafa Sadiq al-Rafii, Ibrahim al-Māzini and Zaki Mubārak.⁴⁹ Like Nakouri although quite scathingly, Elaoufi believes that the criticism controversy was brought up and made up by the “traditionalist” critics, including Taribak and Wadghiri, in so prejudiced and troubled a way which reveals that the crisis was but “a tissue of hallucinations” in those critics’ psyche.⁵⁰ A la Marxist, Nakouri remarks that the controversy was a normalcy indicator of a deeper social conflict which had been in dormancy throughout the protectorate, one which was concealed by the anti-colonial movement led by the masses along with political and intellectual institutions.⁵¹ But, since independence was attained, the conflict had been mounting and unveiling once obscured social, political and intellectual contradictions. Among those underlying contradictions unveiled, Nakouri reveals, was the controversy between those Marxist/Realist critics and the “traditionalist” ones. Elaoufi concurs with Nakouri’s broad look into the controversy, holding that cultural reality is part and parcel of social reality on account of the entwined link between the base and superstructure.⁵² For him, conflicts in literature and the humanities at large and the very antagonistic camps, leftist or rightist, with which those critics in the controversy align themselves, reflect the historical and social conflicts and camps in reality.

The Marxist/Realist Nakouri maintains that the controversy over criticism in Moroccan literature was not a crisis but a “social conflict”: it was an articulation of a new consciousness and development in the Moroccan society, a society

46. *Ibid.*, 14.

47. *Ibid.*, 14-15.

48. Elaoufi, “Al-Manhaj al-Jadalī,” 43.

49. *Ibid.*, 43.

50. *Ibid.*, 42-43.

51. Nakouri, “Difā’ā ‘an Al-Manhaj al-Ijtimā’ī,” 11-12.

52. Elaoufi, “Al-Manhaj al-Jadalī,” 40.

which was in a state of flux and held the potential for growing into socialism.⁵³ Advocating the belief that progress cannot be attained without conflict, Nakouri embraces “modernist” criticism and opposes “traditionalist” criticism. Nakouri discounts the latter’s concepts as antiquated, its primary objective as apolitical and asocial, and its *l’art-pour-l’art* theories as hegemonic and oppressive, ones which divorce literature and criticism from politics and society.⁵⁴ Because of its apolitical and asocial character, “traditionalist” criticism must be “aggressively” and “unmistakably” confronted whereas Marxist/Realist criticism, which Nakouri considers closer to scientific method, must be extolled because it connects every cultural or literary production to its social reality in an attempt to uncover the exploitive and oppressive practices through which the bourgeoisie holds the upper hand over the underclasses in Morocco.⁵⁵ On the other hand, Elaoufi considers the criticism controversy a watershed moment, citing two major motives. First, the social reality on which the cultural sphere is dependent was undergoing an extremely dialectic dynamism and was swarming with contradictions which had to clash head-to-head, so the strongest would survive.⁵⁶ Arguably, the meaning borne by the “strongest would survive” in Elaoufi’s obscurantist statement may signify the rise of the left-wing movement whose supporters, including Nakouri and Elaoufi, tend to deem themselves avant-garde, anti-bourgeois, progressive, revolutionary and socialist. Second, the cultural sphere was swarming with glaring contradictions to the degree that it could explode anytime: its intellectual concepts, methodological terms and epistemological instruments were obscured by “traditionalist” intellectuals.⁵⁷ Arguably, the criticism controversy afforded ample opportunity to uproot those “outmoded” and “undesired” intellectuals. As Elaoufi admits, the controversy was “ideologically critical” because it was aimed at connecting the “traditionalist” intellectuals to the classes they stood for, so their identity would be uncovered and their standing unmasked in the open. Beyond dispute, the controversy was not “scientifically critical” because it lacked the scholarly apparatus which would advance critical consciousness and enhance its armoury and terminology.⁵⁸ Indeed, it is Elaoufi’s supposition that the criticism controversy, notwithstanding its shortcomings, was an opportunity to reconsider the “delusory harmony” among Moroccan intellectuals. It is a reconsideration which would usher in the outset of a shake-up in cultural structures, so they could be reconstructed on solid grounds to be flaw-free, avant-garde, effective and trailblazing.⁵⁹

53. Nakouri, “Difā’ā ‘an Al-Manhaj al-Ijtīmā’ī,” 12.

54. Ibid., 13.

55. Nakouri, “Difā’ā ‘an Al-Manhaj al-Ijtīmā’ī,” 12; 13; 16. Nakouri, it is worth noting, ascribes the “authenticity” and “scientificity” of the Marxist/Realist criticism to its emphasis upon conflict and class as chief concepts in addressing the Arabic-language literature in Morocco (21).

56. Elaoufi, “Al-Manhaj al-Jadalī,” 41.

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid.

59. Ibid.

Scholarly Turn

While university over the Marxist/Realist heyday in the 1970s was a ground for ideological and revolutionary zest, it has become an important watershed in the study of the Moroccan Arabic-language novel from the 1980s onwards. In *La Literatura Marroquí Contemporánea*, the chief Spanish Arabist Fernández Parrilla believes that the Moroccan university took a pivotal role in advancing modern literature and literary studies.⁶⁰ It could aid in training would-be critics and offering literature students opportunities to conduct critical and literary studies characterized by depth, efficacy and guidance, the Moroccan critic Azerouil explains.⁶¹ Most of those behind teaching and training students, the “founding fathers” as Nakouri and Elaoufi see them (Berrada, el Yabouri and el Mniai, to name but a few), have always been household names in literature and criticism. Azerouil quotes statistics compiled by Abdeslam Tazi in 1985 (outdated nowadays but germane to the literary scene over the 1980s), indicating that almost seventy percent of Moroccan authors and critics had a teaching career then.⁶² In accord with Azerouil, Parrilla confirms that most trailblazing critics descend from the university milieu.⁶³ Likewise, Elaoufi maintains that most, if not all, critics are closely connected with the groves of academe.⁶⁴ For him, the university has served as an authoritative space which supports the critical landscape and as an extensive “workshop” which sustains critical theory and practice.⁶⁵ Game-changing as it may have been in the beliefs of Azerouil and Elaoufi, the university was but one major part in the literary and critical advances made.

The university has not been the only big factor behind the critical boost to the exploration of the Arabic-language novel and literature at large. In “Morocco,” expounding upon earlier views about the background against which the Moroccan novel emerged, Parrilla maintains that “a cultural infrastructure” built since independence was the new impetus behind critical and cultural activity.⁶⁶ The major cultural impetuses, along with the establishment of Mohammed V University in 1957, included the emergence of Itiḥād Kuttāb al-Maghrib (Union of Moroccan Writers) in 1961 and major cultural journals like *Da’wat al-Ḥaq* in

60. Gonzalo Fernández Parrilla, “Morocco,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Arab Novelistic Traditions*, ed. Wail S. Hassan (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 339-57, 343. Parrilla’s “Morocco” is one of the most thorough explorations that encompasses the latest scholarship about the Arabic novel throughout the Arab world and diaspora.

61. Fatima-Zahra Azerouil, *Mafāhīm Naqd al-Riwāyah bi Al-Maghrib: Maṣādiruhā al-‘Arabīyah wa al-Ajnabīyah* (Al-Dār al-Bayḍā’: Al-Fanak, 1989), 26.

62. Azerouil, *Mafāhīm Naqd al-Riwāyah bi Al-Maghrib*, 26.

63. Gonzalo Fernández Parrilla, *La Literatura Marroquí Contemporánea: La Novela y la Crítica Literaria*, trans. Sanae Chairi (Toledo: Escuela de Traductores de Toledo, 2006), 97.

64. Najib Elaoufi, “Al-Mashhad al-Naqdī fī al-Maghrib,” *Fikr wa Naqd* (6) (1) (1998): 52.

65. Elaoufi, “Al-Mashhad al-Naqdī fī al-Maghrib,” 52.

66. Parrilla, “Morocco,” 343.

1957 by the Ministry of Religious Affairs and *Āfāq* in 1963 by the Union.⁶⁷ The nascent “infrastructure” was enhanced by the launch of independent journals, ones whose twin role was to improve the journal “industry” and impugn the nationalist hegemony. Parrilla considers two remarkable instances of left-wing journals: *Aqlām* established in 1964 by Ahmed Sitati and *Souffles-Anfās* established in 1966 by Abdellatif Laâbi and a number of avantgarde intellectuals. For him, those independent journals could influentially help at two fronts: enriching the cultural and literary scenes and challenging mainstream nationalist ideology.⁶⁸ Apart from the emerging cultural base brought to the foreground by Parrilla, Nakouri, while exploring the theory and practice of Goldmann’s Genetic Structuralism in Morocco, lays emphasis on one more vital factor in advancing the enquiry into the Moroccan novel: acculturation. For him, acculturation has been one of the longest-standing intercultural conversations between the Arab world and the West, and the espousal of Goldmann’s Structuralism is one of its critical aspects.⁶⁹ From the late 1960s to the 1980s, it rose to ample renown among Berrada, Bennis, Alouch and Lahmidani, key Arabic-literature critics who were interplaying with Western and world cultures alike. Nakouri views Goldmannian Structuralism as one movement among others (Marxism, Existentialism, Structuralism and phenomenology) which had crept into Moroccan literature and thought since the late 1960s and could hold broader appeal for university students and scholars.⁷⁰ For him, those Western-born movements’ contact with, not to say impact over, the literary and critical scenes was initiated by a variety of channels: political organizations, trades unions and youth movements; Arabic journals originating in the East together with foreign books and newspapers; and student missions bound for Europe, especially France and England.⁷¹ Since the 1960s, the push towards the criticism of the Arabic-language novel was stronger and wider than university as there were various macro-spurs besides its advent. The Union of Moroccan Writers, state-sponsored and left-wing cultural journals, and the acculturation conditions could help novelistic studies make incremental progress. Still, studies and theses by university scholars have always been incredibly contributory to the novelistic criticism.

According to Azerouil, the scholarly output at university has been crucial to the growth of the Arabic-language literary criticism.⁷² In the 1980s, seminal university-grown studies ushered in the adoption of critical approaches

67. Ibid., 343.

68. Ibid. Consider Parrilla’s “The Challenge of Moroccan Cultural Journals of the 1960s” to better grasp the revolutionary “role” and “spirit” brought by those cultural journals to the critical and cultural scenes. For him, they “managed to open spaces for contestation, challenge and change, and today they remain an important point of reference.”

69. Driss Nakouri, “Al-Binyawiyah al-Takwīniyah,” *Fikr wa Naqd* (6) (1) (1998): 67; 68; 78.

70. Nakouri, “Al-Binyawiyah al-Takwīniyah,” 69.

71. Ibid.

72. Azerouil, *Mafāhīm Naqd al-Riwāyah bi Al-Maghrib*, 62; 27.

unfollowed before, including Genetic Structuralism. A number of critics, two of whom include Elaoufi and Kharmach, choose to attach the epithet “university criticism” to studies and theses written by students and scholars at university.⁷³ Kharmach characterizes those students and scholars, contrary to the Marxist-leaning Nakouri, Elaoufi and Chaoui, as having been bound by the norms of academic enquiry, rigour and the incessant search for knowledge.⁷⁴ For him, “those [scholarly works] could be designated as “university criticism” marked by the utmost caution to methodology and commitment to analysis as a measure towards comprehension, interpretation and achieving outcomes supposed to be an implicit evaluation of the works under consideration.”⁷⁵ Elaoufi narrows down the scope of criticism cultivated at university to comprise only theses, published or otherwise, which bear intimately upon modern literature in Morocco and the Arab world in general.⁷⁶ For him, the designation “university criticism” should not be a sticker to describe whatever critical thinking or writing undertaken at university. Elaoufi, therefore, compiles a shortlist of major studies and theses which came out between the 1970s and 1990s, ones whose scholarly merit continues to date.⁷⁷ “Those university works,” Elaoufi explains, “were closer to the sphere of practical and analytical criticism, close readings of artistic and literary texts and discourses that probe their aesthetic, intellectual and historical values and meanings.”⁷⁸ The critical readings may espouse multiple approaches, varying from description, Formalism, Genetic Structuralism, semiotics to narratology. At times, the methodology is eclectic in that it combines two or more approaches in an attempt to unravel disparate strands of the works investigated. In brief, albeit somehow scant, the output of university-grown criticism has had a cumulative impact upon the study of the Arabic-language novel, one in which Structuralism à la Goldmann features highly among other critical approaches.

The late 1970s and early 1980s were the glory years of Goldmann’s Genetic Structuralism in Morocco. It made what Azerouil depicts as a “discernible impact” upon the criticism of Arabic-language novel, arousing increased

73. Najib Elaoufi, “Al-Mashhad al-Naqdī fī al-Maghrib,” 51; Kharmach, *Al-Binyawīyah al-Takwīnīyah*, 5.

74. Kharmach, *Al-Binyawīyah al-Takwīnīyah*, 3.

75. Ibid.

76. Elaoufi, “Al-Mashhad al-Naqdī fī al-Maghrib,” 52.

77. Ibid., 52-53. Among the seminal studies which concern the Moroccan Arabic-language novel are: Said Alouch’s *Al-Riwāyah wa al-Idyūlūjyah fī al-Maghrib* (*The Novel and Ideology in the Maghreb*, 1981), Hamid Lahmidani’s *Al-Riwāyah al-Maghribīyah wa Ru’yat al-Wāqī’ al-Ijtīmā’ī* (*The Moroccan Novel and the View of Social Reality*, 1985), Said Yaktin’s *Tahlīl al-Khiṭāb al-Riwā’ī* and *Inftāḥ al-Naṣ al-Riwā’ī* (*The Analysis of Novelistic Text and The Openness of Novelistic Text*, 1989), Hassan Bahraoui’s *Binyat al-Shakl al-Riwā’ī* (*The Structure of Novelistic Form*, 1990) and Bachir Kamari’s *Shi’riyat al-Naṣ al-Riwā’ī* (*The Poetics of Novelistic Text*, 1991). Elaoufi’s chronologically ordered shortlist includes other studies on Moroccan and Arab poetry, fiction, drama and criticism. To consider the entire shortlist, consult 52-53. Elaoufi, it is worth noting, does not fall short of mentioning them without mounting criticism fleeting as it may be.

78. Elaoufi, “Al-Mashhad al-Naqdī fī al-Maghrib,” 53.

interest among critics.⁷⁹ Similarly, Nakouri asserts that criticism in Morocco took a commanding lead in the employment of Genetic Structuralism; it was “enamoured” with Genetic-Structuralist concepts, methods and terms insofar as it could convey them to the Arab East where they were not as widely embraced.⁸⁰ Writings by Moroccan critics about Goldmann’s theory of literature came in various shapes. In 1977, the journal *Aqlām*’s fourth issue features a scholarly article by Ben Abdelali studying Goldmann’s sociology of literature.⁸¹ In 1982, the journal *Āfāq*’s tenth issue was devoted completely to translations of chief academic articles and book chapters by Goldmann and his students, a special which was converted into a full book in 1984.⁸² Apart from grabbing journal articles and issues, Genetic Structuralism caught the attention of university studies and theses. Highly inspired by Goldmann, scholarly works by Bennis, Berrada, Alouch, Lahmidani and Rajii endeavour to approach Arabic poetry, novel and criticism.⁸³ What critical appeal, one may wonder, Goldmann’s Genetic Structuralism held for the Moroccan scholars throughout the late 1970s and 80s.

Towards the close of the 1970s, the adoption of alternative approaches to the investigation of Arabic-language novel in Morocco began. Working within the academia, scholars sought to ease and evade the seventh-decade tensions, ones which were substantially driven by politics and were escalating among Marxist/Realist critics and so-called traditionalist critics. Advanced by Nakouri, Elaoufi and Chaoui, the Marxist/Realist criticism, whose scholarship cannot be dismissed as inconsequential, was branded as “ideological,” not to mention “reductionist” and “reflectionist” in character, since it discredits the artistic and aesthetic features of literary works.⁸⁴ As Kharmach argues, aesthetics and stylistics, it was advocated, deserve closer attention just as does the socio-historical backcloth against which the works emerge.⁸⁵ The call to refocus attention upon the in-text aesthetic and stylistic facets, however, was not easy to answer because the then socio-historical conditions still compelled strong commitments from authors and critics alike. In actuality, critics were confronted by a chronic conundrum: while they had to study the literary work itself to unravel its inner depth and truth in light of growing critical scholarship, they had to stay loyal to outer socio-

79. Azerouil, *Maḥāhīm Naqd al-Riwāyah bi Al-Maghrib*, 41; 81.

80. Nakouri, “Al-Binyawīyah al-Takwīnīyah,” 69.

81. Ben Abdelali’s article is entitled “Sūsyūlūjyat al-Adab ‘Inda Lucien Goldmann” (“Lucien Goldmann’s Sociology of Literature”).

82. Azerouil, *Maḥāhīm Naqd al-Riwāyah bi Al-Maghrib*, 81.

83. Including the aforementioned Alouch’s *Al-Riwāyah wa al-Idyūlūjyah fī al-Maghrib* (1981) and Hamid Lahmidani’s *Al-Riwāyah al-Maghribīyah wa Ru’yat al-Wāqi’ al-Ijtīmā’ī* (1985), those studies feature Bennis’ *Zāhirah al-Shi’r al-Mu’āshir fī al-Maghrib* (*The Phenomenon of Contemporary Poetry in Morocco*, 1979), Berrada’s *Mohamed Mandour wa Tanẓīr al-Naqd al-‘Arabī* (*Mohamed Mandour and the Theorization of Arabic Criticism*, 1979) and Rajii’s *Al-Qaṣīdah al-Maghribīyah al-Mu’āshirah* (*Contemporary Moroccan Poetry*, 1987).

84. Kharmach, *Al-Binyawīyah al-Takwīnīyah*, 1; Azerouil, *Maḥāhīm Naqd al-Riwāyah bi Al-Maghrib*, 41-42.

85. Kharmach, *Al-Binyawīyah al-Takwīnīyah*, 1.

historical responsibilities in the meantime.⁸⁶ For them, connecting the work's inner poetics and outer politics, therefore, was inescapable. To circumvent this conundrum, there was a crying need for a critical approach which considers its poetics and politics. Thus was the shift towards Goldmann's Structuralism in the late 1970s, a critical approach which was highly hailed as an attractive alternative to "orthodox" and "revolutionary" Marxism/Realism. Kharmach comments on this Goldmannian-inspired shift,

Critics in Morocco sought an approach that combines evaluating the social content which, because of compelling historical circumstances, must be explored and esteemed as well as respecting the literary specificity which critical thought cannot afford to dismiss or discuss without attempting to illuminate its character and components.⁸⁷

Chief Moroccan critics like Bennis, Alouch and Lahmidani chose Structuralism in the style of Goldmann to satisfy a twin sensibility: literary and social. Echoing the motive behind Berrada's espousal of Genetic Structuralism in the late 1970s, Kharmach comments that Goldmann's theory connects the literary to the historical and the social while it evades value judgements characteristic of conventional Marxist critics who antedated Georg Lukács and Goldmann and disregarded the inner worlds woven by authors to create a new consciousness unparalleled by the existing one.⁸⁸ It insists upon the interplay between culture and society in a cultural landscape where committed intellectuals were esteemed, and any invitation to detach or de-commit literature from society was incompatible, if not intolerable.⁸⁹ As Azerouil reveals, attempts by Formalists to detach literature from politics and society, for instance, seemed "alien" in the Third World where critics assumed the responsibility of accomplishing change through culture and literature.⁹⁰ For them, to de-politicize and de-socialize literature is to abdicate one's commitments. Nakouri, whose Marxist-leaning zest did not seem to wear off even in the late 1990s, claims that, amidst Moroccan intellectuals' interplay with European and world cultures, certain critics took Goldmann's Genetic Structuralism in the late 1970s as it could help them indulge two interests. At a contextual front, it was seen as a means to achieve revolutionary change – the sought-after socialism in economy, politics and society – thanks to its association with Marxism. At a critical front, it was seen as a means to analyze literary works, one which derives illuminating insights from other major Western Marxists like Luis Althusser and Antonio Gramsci, too.⁹¹

86. Ibid., 191-92.

87. Ibid., 54.

88. Ibid., 2.

89. Azerouil, *Mafāhīm Naqd al-Riwāyah bi Al-Maghrib*, 42; 45.

90. Ibid., 45.

91. Nakouri, "Al-Binyawiyah al-Takwīniyah," 69-70.

Azerouil, who holds that not only Moroccan but Arab critics in general sought to embrace Genetic Structuralism, calls into question Nakouri's claim that its broader appeal emanates from a socialist vision motivated by Marxism. In rebuttal, Azerouil argues that Arab critics in Goldmann's footsteps rethought revolutionary Marxist/Realist criticism in the 1980s, so they could counter-balance the impact of history, politics and society on literary works.⁹² Kharmach agrees that, in attempting to offset socio-historical conditions in the approach to literature, Arab critics sought to ensure an increased autonomy for literary works, unravelling their inner patterns and structures, notably at what Goldmann describes as the comprehension stage.⁹³ What further enhanced the greater appeal of Goldmann's Structuralism among Moroccan critics is its critical openness: it allows them the possibility to glean insights into the inner dynamics of literary works, deriving from contemporary narratological and Structuralist approaches.⁹⁴ Another reason behind those critics' attraction to and adoption of Goldmannian Structuralism is scholarly clarity: Goldmann's writings are usually acclaimed for clarifying the theoretical bases laid there and the methodological steps made.⁹⁵ Indeed, they consider the difficulties which humanities scholars encounter as they address their subject matter, literary or otherwise. All in all, besides its elasticity and lucidity, the magnetism of Genetic Structuralism owes to a double emphasis upon the poetics and politics of literary works through two modes: comprehension and explanation.

To conclude with Said's guiding statements on worldliness, this undertaking has sought "to study and to recreate the bonds between texts and the world."⁹⁶ It has argued for the circumstantiality or worldliness of the Marxist criticism of the Moroccan novel (literature) in Arabic. It has made a distinction between two watershed moments shaped by the broader backdrop in 1970s and 80s: revolutionary and scholarly. The revolutionary turn occurred over the "seismic" 1970s years – the glory years of revolutionary upheavals in culture in which literary and critical works were steeped in and themed by the angst and zest of revolutionary change. Birth, therefore, was given to an "anguished" criticism self-identifying as ideological, dialectical, Realist and socio-historical. It seeks to study the Arabic-language novel in connection with the socio-political post-independence tumults and, above all, to remedy the underlying injustices and inequalities between the bourgeois classes and disadvantaged underclasses. Politically and socially conscious, this Marxist/Realist criticism self-styles as avant-garde, democratic, revolutionary and socialist and eventually seeks to scotch bourgeois culture and transform society through an exposure of class and

92. Azerouil, *Maḥāhīm Naqd al-Riwāyah bi Al-Maghrib*, 42.

93. Kharmach, *Al-Binyawīyah al-Takwīnīyah*, 198.

94. Azerouil, *Maḥāhīm Naqd al-Riwāyah bi Al-Maghrib*, 42.

95. Ibid.

96. Said, *The World, the Text, and the Critic*, 175.

culture wars. In a word, it is activism through criticism. In so belligerent a critical landscape mired by the across-the-board turbulence, the lead Marxist/Realist critics –Nakouri, Elaoufi and Chaoui – took upon the “critical/cultural right” to uproot what they deem ahistorical, descriptive, impressionistic, orthodox and traditionalist criticism which served as an ideological apparatus complicit in protracting the status quo and obstructing revolutionary change. In the early 1980s, however, the ideological split and zeal were on the decline. the Moroccan university entered to enlighten the critical/cultural scene. Its entrance was extolled as a landmark scholarly turn along with watershed impetuses, including the growth of academic institutions like the Union of Moroccan Writers and cultural journals, both state-sponsored and left-leaning, amidst a growing acculturation with new critical scholarship originating in Europe. Albeit somewhat scant, critical scholarship, notably studies and theses in the style of Goldmann’s Genetic Structuralism, began to thrive, one which attempts to conform to the academic norms of depth and rigour unwitnessed in the early Marxist/Realist works. After Goldmann, critics rethought revolutionary criticism, so they could counteract the impact of history, politics and society on the Arabic-language novel to ensure an increased autonomy for the novel and to explore its patterns and structures. It is not an attempt to unworld the Moroccan novel in Arabic. Genetic Structuralists, including Lahmidani, could not de-politicize, de-revolutionize or de-socialize novelistic criticism because they continue “to make visible, to give materiality back to, the strands holding the text to society, author and culture.”⁹⁷

Bibliography

- Azerouil, Fatima-Zahra. *Maḥāhīm Naqd al-Riwāyah bi Al-Maghrib: Maṣādiruhā al-‘Arabīyah wa al-Ajṅabīyah*. Al-Dār al-Bayḍā’: Al-Fanak, 1989.
- Bennis, Mohammed. “Waḍ‘unā Al-Naqdī: Ba’ḍ Min Simātih wa Imkāniyātih.” *Al-Thaqāfah al-Jadīdah* (10-11) (1) (1978): 41-52.
- Chaoui, Abdelqader. *Sulṭat Al-Wāqī‘īyah: Maqālāt Taṭbīqīyah fī Al-Riwāyah wa Al-Qīṣah*. Dimashq: Ittiḥād al-Kuttāb al-‘Arab, 1981.
- Elaoufi, Najib. “Al-Manhaj al-Jadalī: Ḥudūd Mutaḥarrikah wa la Nihā‘īyah.” *Al-Thaqāfah al-Jadīdah* (9) (1) (1978): 40-53.
- _____. *Darajat al-Wa’y fī al-Kitābah: Dirāsāt Naqdīyah*. Al-Dār al-Bayḍā’: Dār al-Nashr al-Maghribīyah, 1980.
- _____. “Al-Mashhad al-Naqdī fī al-Maghrib.” *Fikr wa Naqd* (6) (1) (1998): 46-54.
- _____. “Min Intifāḍah al-Shāri‘ ilā Intifāḍah al-‘Adab.” *Maghress*. 23 March 2010. Last modified January 16, 2021, HYPERLINK “<http://maghress.com/alittihad/105914>” <http://maghress.com/alittihad/105914>.
- _____. *Mashārif*. By Yassin Adnan. 14 November 2012,. Last modified January 16, 2021. HYPERLINK “<http://youtube.com/watch?v=WRH3Rln3NW4>” <http://youtube.com/watch?v=WRH3Rln3NW4>.
- El Guabli, Brahim. “The Absent Perpetrators: Morocco’s Failed Accountability, Tazmamart Literature and the Survivors’ Testimony for Their Jailers (1973-1991).” *Violence: An International Journal* (1) (1) (2020): 80-101.

97. Ibid.

- _____. "Reading for Theory in the Moroccan Marxist-Leninist Testimonial Literature." *African Identities* (18) (1-2) (2020): 145-61.
- El Khatib, Ibrahim. "Tarikat Al-Mḏī wa Shar'iyat al-Tasā'ul." *Al-Thaqāfah al-Jadīdah* (9) (1) (1978): 30-39.
- Kharmach, Mohamed. *Al-Binyawīyah al-Takwīnīyah Bayna al-Nazar wa al-Taṭbīq*. Fās: Maṭba'at Info-Print, 2001.
- _____. *Al-Tawājuhāt al-Thaqāfīyah wa Taṭawur al-Fikr al-Naqdī ḥtā al-Thamānīnāt*. Fās: Maṭb'at Info-Print, 2006.
- Lahmidani, Hamid. *Al-Riwāyah al-Maghribīyah wa Ru'yat al-Wāqī' al-Ijtīmā'ī: Dirāsah Binyawīyah Takwīnīyah*. Al-Dār al-Bayḏā': Dār al-Thaqāfah, 1985.
- Nakouri, Driss. "Difā'ā 'an Al-Manhaj al-Ijtīmā'ī." *Al-Thaqāfah al-Jadīdah* (9) (9) (1978): 11-29.
- _____. *Al-Muṣṭalah al-Mushtarak: Dirāsāt fī al-Adab al-Maghribī al-Mu'āṣir*. Al-Dār al-Bayḏā': Dār al-Nashr al-Maghribīyah, 1979.
- _____. "Al-Binyawīyah al-Takwīnīyah." *Fikr wa Naqd* (6) (1) (1998): 67-78.
- Parrilla, Gonzalo Fernández. *La Literatura Marroquí Contemporánea: La Novela y la Crítica Literaria*. Translated by Sanae Chairi. Toledo: Escuela de Traductores de Toledo, 2006.
- _____. "Morocco." In *The Oxford Handbook of Arab Novelistic Traditions*, edited by Waïl S. Hassan, 339-57. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Said, Edward W. *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1983.

العنوان: المنعطفان الثوري والأكاديمي في النقد الماركسي للرواية المغربية المكتوبة بالعربية

الملخص: تعد هذه الدراسة جزء من مسعى علمي أكبر يتناول النقد الماركسي للرواية المغربية المكتوبة باللغة العربية. وتتناول الدراسة أربعة نصوص: المصطلح المشترك لإدريس النقوري، ودرجة الوعي في الكتابة (1980) لنجيب العوفي، وسلطة الواقعية لعبد القادر الشاوي (1981)، والرواية المغربية ورؤية الواقع الاجتماعي (1985) لحمداني. وتسعى لكشف الخلفيات السياسية والاجتماعية والثقافية التي نشأت فيها تلك النصوص أو، على حد تعبير إدوارد سعيد، "ظرفية" و"دنيوية" تلك النصوص. وتجادل هذه الدراسة القائمة على مفهوم الظرفية بأن النقد الماركسي اتخذ منعطفين تاريخيين رئيسيين. في أواخر السبعينيات من القرن الماضي، أسهم كل من النقوري والعوفي والشاوي في إحداث منعطف ثوري وقدموا نقداً ماركسياً واقعياً مستلهما روح العصر الثوري. وفي أوائل ومنتصف الثمانينيات، اتخذ حمداني، من بين آخرين عاصروه، منعطفاً أكاديمياً، حيث تبنى دنيوية غولدمان التكوينية مسهماً في دراسات وأطروحات علمية تتميز بالعمق والدقة. وعلى الرغم من التحول الأكاديمي المركز على شعرية الأعمال الأدبية وسياستها، لا ينبغي النظر إلى النقد الماركسي على أنه تجسيد لشقين منفصلين، لأن تلك الدراسات عجزت في التخلي عن دنيوية الأعمال الأدبية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: النقد الماركسي، الرواية المغربية بالعربية، النقوري، العوفي، الشاوي، حمداني، الدنيوية، الظرفية، المنعطف الثوري، المنعطف الأكاديمي.

Titre: Les tournants révolutionnaires et académique de la critique marxiste du roman marocain écrit en arabe

Résumé: Dans le cadre d'un effort scientifique plus large abordant la critique marxiste du roman marocain écrit en arabe, cette étude considère quatre textes, dont *Al-Muṣṭalah al-Mushtarak* de Driss Nakouri (*La terminologie commune*, 1979), *Darajat al-Wa'y fī al-*

Kitābah de Najib Elaoufi (*Le degré de conscience dans l'écriture*, 1980), *Sulṭat al-Wāqī 'īyah* d'Abdelkader Chaoui (*Le pouvoir du réalisme*, 1981) et *Al-Riwāyah al-Maghribiyah wa Ru'yat al-Wāqī 'al-Ijtīmā'ī* de Hamid Lahmidani (*Le roman marocain et la vision de la réalité sociale*, 1985). Notamment, elle explore les scènes politique, sociale et culturelle dans lesquelles ces textes sont nés ou leur "circonstancialité" et leur "mondanité," selon Edward Said. Cette tentative centrée sur la circonstancialité soutient que la critique marxiste a connu deux tournants historiques majeurs. À la fin des années 1970, elle a pris un tournant révolutionnaire élaboré par Nakouri, Elaoufi et Chaoui, qui ont avancé une critique marxiste/réaliste marquée et thématifiée par le *zeitgeist* révolutionnaire. Au début et au milieu des années 1980, elle a pris un tournant académique élaboré par Lahmidani (entre autres), qui a adopté le structuralisme de Goldmann et a contribué à la production des études et des thèses académiques caractérisées par la profondeur et la rigueur. Malgré le tournant académique avec son accent sur la poétique et la politique des œuvres littéraires, la critique marxiste ne doit pas être considérée comme deux volets séparés car elle ne pourrait jamais abandonner le démêlage de la mondanité des œuvres.

Mots-clés: La critique marxiste, le roman marocain écrit en arabe, Nakouri, Elaoufi, Chaoui, Lahmidani, mondanité, circonstancialité, le tournant révolutionnaire, le tournant académique.