

## The Translation of Puns in Shakespeare's Plays into Arabic

Marwan Salam Arif<sup>1</sup> and Omar A. Shihab<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Translation, College of Arts, Tikrit University, IRAQ.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Translation, College of Arts, Tikrit University, IRAQ.

Corresponding Author: Marwan Salam Arif



<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2917-7463>



[www.ijrah.com](http://www.ijrah.com) || Vol. 3 No. 4 (2023): July Issue

Date of Submission: 23-07-2023

Date of Acceptance: 26-07-2023

Date of Publication: 31-07-2023

### ABSTRACT

The term "pun" refers to a literary device that is described as a play on words. This term means using words in an amusing and tricky manner, to produce a pun. However, it is difficult to translate puns between English and Arabic because of their distinctively different linguistic systems, especially the phonology and morphology which are the basic skills in the use of puns. This study aims to study the influence of context in discovering the intended meaning of the pun and also to investigate the problems that translators may face when they translate puns from English into Arabic in some selected Shakespeare's plays. Two main problems and interrelated issues are discussed: How puns are translated? And how they should or can be translated? It is obvious that, in some cases, the translator fails to convey the intended meaning of SL puns due to the fact that they involve more than one meaning (many shades of meaning). Thus, they lead to ambiguity and serious loss or a distortion of meaning. For analysis the data, three models are eclectically adopted, namely: Delabastita's model of translation puns (1996), Kasper's model of pragmatic transfer (PT) (1992), and Hatim and Mundy's model of pun decomposition process (PDP) (2004) to determine the appropriate translation of puns.

**Keywords-** Pun, Tawriya, Jinās, Translation strategies, Delabastita.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Nowaday, rhetoric has become the beating heart of all languages and, in many cases, is probably more important than the commodity itself. For the sake of promoting communication, people tend to apply rhetorical devices, which achieve their goals, such as puns, assonance and metaphors. The main focus of this study is puns since it is highly probable that it will be problematic to translators because it will keep them away from the real meaning. Ling (2006) defined puns as the use of words which has many shades of meaning for many purposes, mainly humor or persuasion. Consequently, in literature, this rhetorical device is frequently employed to achieve special effects. In the movement of translation today, translators tend to

employ several methods in order to deal with puns such as communicative translation, semantic translation and free translation. None of these methods perfectly accounts for context. In other words, none of them explains how to identify the pun word and how to assign the appropriate meaning and context to it.

The cornerstone of the problem of comprehending puns is that their rules differ from one language to another. For instance, Arabic puns are rule-governed, whereas English puns are context-bound. In studying puns, translators have to put two issues under the microscope: context and culture. If translators lack sufficient knowledge about the relevant context and culture, they will probably fail to translate them. At this point, the problem will most likely appear on the surface as a problematic area in translating puns from English

into Arabic in literary texts. Thus, the translators of these literary texts seem to have lost the intended meaning and aesthetic and stylistic effects of the SL puns. As a result, the TL readers may go through different interpretations and end up with an unacceptable or wrong understanding of the translated texts.

## II. PUNS IN ENGLISH

The term Pun is an art that dated back to the Greco-Roman time, as it was used to teach oratory. As a result, philosophers used it skillfully (Corbeil, 1996: 95). According to Online Etymology Dictionary, it is first attested in around 1660s, derives from Italian Puntiglio "small or fine point", since the amount of information about the history of pun is limited, it is very difficult to consider whether these dates are correct or not. According to Redfern (1984: 1-2), puns were a very popular figure of speech used during the Tudors, Elizabethan as well as the Victorian period; puns can be seen in Shakespeare or Donne and many other writers.

Bates (1999: 96) conducted a study on the origin of the word "pun". She discovered that there was a possibility that it might have been derived from the Italian for a "fine point". She referred to other linguistic accounts, which discussed the fluidity of meaning. She resorted to Saussure's signifier signified relationship which talks about the significance of signs in specific contexts. She concluded that its origin is unknown. She linked the ambiguity of the punning word with the ambiguity of the word's parentage. She also said that the punning word subverts the signifier of the sign. In this sense, the true sense of the sign functions in the right context which is assigned in the text.

Pun is part of the human nature. It is used for humor or irony when communicating with each other (Balci, 2005: 8). Pun is a popular literary device that is widely used in English. It defines as "a play on words by using words in an amusing and tricky manner, make a pun" (Gray, 1984: 168). The words aforementioned, amusing and tricky, could carry the meanings of "humor and ambiguity". as a result, "pun" focuses on the alternative meanings or applications of a word or phrase for the aim of making riddles, which has much to do with "ambiguity", or/and plays on different words that resemble to the aim of making auditory jokes, which has much to do with "humor" (Crystal, 2004: 408). Pun carries an amusing and an ambiguous curve to the text. Understanding a pun differs from one person to another; Time, culture, recipient's sex and background influence the way a pun is interpreted (Balci, 2005: 1). Pun is defined as "playing with the various meanings of words". It is considered as a main source of "ambiguity". Here the ambiguity is brought by one word that has various meanings (Salzman, 1998: 102).

Every definition of a pun stresses the similarity of form above the difference in meaning. Leech (1969: 209) defined pun as follows "a pun is a fore grounded

lexical ambiguity, which may have its origin either in homonymy or polysemy". On the other hand, leech neglects somehow those puns which are based on syntactic vagueness or on phenomenon such as homophony or homography.

Newmark (1988: 217) who defines pun as: "Using a word or two words with the same sound (piece/peace), or a group of words with the same sound (personne alitee / personnalite) in their two possible senses, usually for the purpose of arousing laughter or amusement, and sometimes to concentrate meaning". Newmark states that puns are words sharing the same pronunciation with different meanings, and they are usually used to give a humorous effect to the text in which they occur. He also deals with the translability of puns. He also maintains that "puns made by punning poets are most difficult to translate, since they are limited by meter. Often the pun simply has to be sacrificed".

'Oxford English Dictionary' which delves into the core of a pun quite well: "The use of a word in such a way as to suggest two or more meanings or different associations, or the use of two or more words of the same or nearly the same sound with different meanings, so as to produce a humorous effect, a play on words" while Webster's dictionary defines pun as " the humorous use of a word or words , which are formed or sounded a like but have different meanings , in such a way as to play on two or more of the possible applications'

Lund (1947: 83) defines pun as "a rhetorical device that often relies on the different meanings of a polysemic word, the literal and non-literal meaning of an idiom or on bringing two homonyms together in the same utterance to produce witticism". Lund focuses on the double meanings of polysemic and homonymic words, and their humorous effect on the sentence.

Delabastita (1993: 57) offers an operational definition of the pun, which covers the most characteristic aspects of it:

"wordplay is the general name indicating the various textual phenomena (i.e. on the level of performance or parole) in which certain features inherent in the structure of the language used (level of competence or langue) are exploited in such a way as to establish a communicatively significant, (near) simultaneous confrontation of at least two linguistic structures with more or less dissimilar meanings (signified) and more or less similar forms (signifiers)."

Delabastita's definition involves homonymy (same pronunciation and spelling), homophony (same pronunciation but different spelling), homography (same spelling but different pronunciation), paronymy (slight difference in both spelling and sound) and lexical structure (polysemy) (same word that has two possible meanings) and lexical structure (idiom). Delabastita stated that the effect of pun must be "communicatively significant"; therefore we can distinguish it from

unintentional wordplay, which appears from time to time (ibid:131).

Pun plays a significant and important role in literature. Von Flotow (1997:52) states that "pun adds taste to the text or discourse; it triggers unexpected connections between concepts, sounds and words in the reader creating a sense of specialized perception and knowledge, even a sense 'connivance' with the author".

### 2.1 Types of Puns in English

Puns in English are classified according to how they are spelt, pronounced, as well as their various meanings; Culler (1988, 4) mentioned that: "Scholars have sought to define and classify puns, but the results have never met with much success". Thus, there are numerous different typologies where puns are classified into different groups and distinguished into specific types by many scholars.

Salzman (1998: 102) states that for each pun word there may exist a single occurrence of a word, or a recurrence of that word. He divided puns into two types:

1. **Implicit pun:** when a word is mentioned only once but carries two or more meanings that the reader has to decipher for himself.

2. **Explicit pun:** repeating the same word in a different meaning.

Consequently, Delabastita (2004: 604) describes different types of puns including:

#### 2.1.1 Homophonic Pun

This type refers to words sound alike but different in spelling, e.g. "tale" and "tail". Leech (1969: 210-211) points out that "homophonic Pun occurs when words differ in the way they are written, orthographic difference, but pronounced alike". For example:

1) "It is a long and a sad **tale!** Said the mouse, turning to Alice, and sighing. "It is a long **tail!**", certainly, said Alice, looking down with wonder at the mouse tail, but why do you call it sad?" (Carroll, Alice in Wonderland, 1992: 22)

This type is considered as a main source of ambiguity, and pun here is auditory. Both "tale" and "tail" are pronounced as /tāl/ in the above example although there is no etymological relationship between the homophonic words. Crystal (2004: 408) shows that phonological puns play upon different words which sound alike.

#### 2.1.2 The Homonymic Pun

This type refers to lexical items which are of the same form but different meaning, e.g. "axe" (tool, to remove). A homonymic Pun contains aspects of both the homophonic pun and the homographic pun. This type is described by Leech (1969: 209 – 10) as "distinct words spelt and pronounced alike". An example on this pun is taken to extremes in a piece of dialogue from (Shakespeare, Richard II: IV, I):

2) "Surrey thou **liest.**

Dishonorable boy

That **lie** shall so heave in my sword,

That it shall render vengeance and revenge,

Till thou the **lie** – giver and that **lie** do **lie**  
In earth as quiet as they father's skull."

Leech observes that the homonymy of the two words 'lie' (as in 'lie down ') and 'lie' (as in 'tell lies ') is the cause of pun. (ibid)

#### 2.1.3 Polysemic Pun

This type is also called 'semantic' and refers to the phenomenon that one polysemic word has various dissimilar meanings, but obviously related meanings, often with respect to particular contexts. As an example the polysemic word 'neck' could have the following dissimilar meanings: part of the body, type of a shirt and part of a bottle (Leech, 1969:209 – 14). Crystal (2004:408) illustrates that this kind of pun focuses on the alternative meanings or applications of a word or phrase that are common in riddles: -

3) "What has four legs and only one foot? A bed."

#### 2.1.4 Homographic Pun

This kind of puns refers to the lexemes which have the same spelling, different pronunciation, and vastly different meaning, e.g. "Gag" (piece of cloth, joke). These puns are often written rather than spoken, as they trick the reader to read the "wrong" sound. This type can be illustrated by the example taken from Schoster (2005: 166):

4) "What choice does discontent soldier face who is about to be sent to the Sahara **Desert** or **desert?**"

The word "Desert" functions in this sentence as a homographic pun in which the word "Desert" has two pronunciations, the first one is /dI'Z3:t/ (verb) which means to leave somebody or go away from a place and leave it empty, while the second is pronounced /dezət/(noun) which means a large area of land without water and trees often covered by sand.

#### 2.1.5 Parody Pun

This type is based on the needs expressed in the form of the structure of parody well – known as aphorisms, proverbs or so on (Chengming , 2004 : 89).

This type of pun is an existing social, cultural knowledge –based. Here is an example from James Joyce Finnegan's Wake in which he plays on the idiomatic expression;

5) "As different as chalk from **cheese:** As different as York from **Leeds.**"

## III. PUNS IN ARABIC

According to Wahba (1974: 453), pun in Egilsh is a term used to refer two literary devices in Arabic rhetoric: tawriya (تورية) and jinās (جناس).

### 3.1 Tawriya (تورية)

Al-Azhari (2001: 15-221) states that the term tawriya indicates to the meanings of "hiding" and "concealing" for being derived from the verb warrā (روي) which means "hide something" or "hide something and showed something else". Ibn Fāris (1984: 6-104) emphasizes the sense of "hiding" when he draws the attention to the relationship between the word tawriya and the verb yatawārā (يتوارى) which means "to hide

from something or somebody". He also emphasizes the same meaning when he claims that the word tawriya has been derived from the word warā' (وراء) which means "behind". He indicates that when someone puts something behind another it will be hidden because of something front (apparent). His view has been rejected for being built upon the meanings of the words themselves rather than their derivation (Ibn Mandhūr, 1988: 1-193).

The term tawriya may refer another different meaning. Al-Jawhari (1987: 5-22) states that the meaning of the term tawriya has been derived from the verb wārā (واری) which means "blaze fire". It, thus, has the meaning of "displaying and showing" because "blazing fire" includes "displaying it and showing its flames".

It is clear that the term tawriya means different meanings depending on the roots from which it was derived. Some of them are connected in meaning, while others are not. It is also worth mentioning that most Arab scholars believe that the word tawriya means "hiding something and concealing it" or, more accurately, "hiding something by showing something else". (ibid)

Ibn Munqīḏ (1960: 60), defines tawriya, as "the use of a word that has two meanings in a way that when the speaker intends one of them, he covers it up by another". Al-Miṣri (1963: 268) states that tawriya occurs when a word has two possible meanings where the speaker shows one of them and neglects the other. However, the one he intends is the one he neglects not the one he shows. In both definitions, there is an idea that the term tawriya refers to an intentional use of the meanings that a word may have in such a way that enables the speaker to hide what he intends by showing what he does not.

Al-Hamawi (837 A.H.) states that it consists in using one word with two meanings, one denotational and the other metaphorical. The first is the close meaning and the second is remote. Usually, the speaker or the writer aims at the remote meaning. Similarly, Al-Muragh (2000: 338) focuses on what he calls the "near" and "far" meanings of one single word used for. (Cited in Bader, 2014: 18)

Al-Sakkāki (1983: 226), defines the term tawriya, by substituting it with the term ṭhām (أيهام) which means "double entendre". He states that it occurs when the expression has two uses, near muwarrā bih (مورى به) and far muwarrā'anh (مورى عنه). The speaker uses the nearer to delude the hearer till he arrives at the farther. An emphasis on the use of the term 'double entendre' has been drawn by Al-Qizwīni (1998: 331) to refer to the use of an expression with double meaning: near and far in a way he intends the far.

In his book Arabic rhetoric (البلاغة العربية) Maṭlūb (1980: 298) mentions some other names for, tawriya (تورية) such as tawgiḥ (توجيه), takhajjul (تخيل) and mogalta (مغاطة). But he prefers to call it tawriya (تورية) because, it is derived from the verb warrā "ورى" means

to hide something and show another. Al-Ḥalabi (1980: 249), on his part, uses the terms tawriya, ṭhām (أيهام) and takhajjul (تخيل) which means "fancying" interchangeably to refer to the phenomenon in which the speaker uses expressions with multiple meanings. When triggered by the speaker the hearer may understand the nearer though the speaker intends the farther. For instance, what Ibn Daniel said in the following:

"ياسائلي عن حرفتي في الورى وا ضيعتني فيهم وإفلاسي  
ما حالي من درهم إنفاقه يؤخذ من أعين الناس"

"You who ask me among people about my work Alas, they made me lost and bankrupt. How can a person whose penny spent be, If he takes it from people's eyes!"

The near meaning of (أعين الناس) is "giving unwillingly" whereas the far meaning is "people's eyes". The poet intends the later meaning because he is an oculist. (Ibn Danyāl Al-Mawṣili, cited in Abbas, 1987: 281)

### 3.2 Types of tawriya (تورية)

Al-Qizwīni (1998: 331) concerned with this aspect when he categorized tawriya into two types: mujarrada (مجردة) 'the bare' and murashshaḥa (موشحة) 'the nominatd'. His categorization built on the type of the qarīna (قريئة) "contextual adjunct" used in the context of punning. Down through the years and along with the increasing interest of the late rhetoricians, two more types have been added to make the final list consist of four types: mujarrada (مجردة), murashshaḥa (موشحة), (mubayyana (مبنية), muhayya'a (مهيأة) (Al-Ḥamawi, 1987: 2/45). The four types will be discussed in the following:

#### 3.2.1 Tawriya mujarrada (تورية مجردة) bare pun

This type of pun is called mujarrada (مجردة) which means "bare pun" because it does not show an adjunct that strengthens the near meaning it does not include the use of such elements that refer to the near muwarrā bih (مورى به) or the far ṭmuwarrā'anh (مورى عنه) meaning (Al-Ḥamawi, 1987: 2/45) i.e. In this kind we find no reference to the cover (the near meaning), nor to the covered (the far meaning) (Al-Hashemi, 1940: 377). Or a reference is mentioned for both meanings. The following line of verse is a good example:

"أقول وقد شنوا إلى الحرب غارة دعوني فإني أكل العيش  
بالجين"

"I say, and they launched a raid into the war, let me eat bread with cheese."

The word "الجين" has two meanings: near which is "cheese" and its reference is "I'm eating bread\_ أكل العيش فإني". And far which is "cowardice", and its reference is "they raided\_ شنوا غارة" (Feud, 2007: 144).

#### 3.2.2 Tawriya murashshaḥa (تورية موشحة) nominated pun

This type of pun is called murashshaḥa (موشحة) that means 'nominated pun' whose context contains adjuncts supporting the near meaning muwarrā bih (مورى به) which is not intended by the speaker. It, thus, depends on the use of some contextual elements that strengthen the near meaning whether they come before or after the act of punning (Al-Ḥamawi, 1987: 2-45), i.e. in this type

there is a reference to the near meaning only. The result is more delusional type of, because the meaning which is not intended is strengthened by a reference, so ambiguity increases, for example: Ahmed Shawqi is elegizing Ibrahim Hafed:

8) "يا حافظ الفصحى وحارس" وإمام من تجلت من البلقاء"

"Oh Hafiz Al-Fusha and the guard, and Imam of those who manifested themselves from Balqa."

The poet plays on the word "حافظ". The two meanings are: "keeper" which is not intended, but supported by what is mentioned after it "الفصحى وحارس" and the other meaning "the poet's name إبراهيم حافظ" (Feud, 2007: 146).

### 3.2.3 Tawriya mubayyan (تورية مبنية) manifest Pun

This type of pun is called mubayyana (مبنية) that means "manifest pun" because its context contains adjuncts which support the far meaning muwara'anh (مورى عنه) that is actually intended by the speaker. In this type of punning, the intended meaning seems to be too difficult to be recognized without using an adjunct referring to it. It does not matter whether it comes before or after the act of punning (Feud, 2007: 146), i.e. This is completely the opposite of murashshaha (موشحة) because it aims at removing the ambiguity by mentioning a reference to the intended meaning, for example:

9) "أرى العقد في ثغرة محكما" يربنا الصحاح من الجوهر"

"I see the necklace perfect in her mouth. It shows us Al-Şihāh of Al-Jawhari!"

The poet plays on "الصحاح" which could mean either "a title of a linguistic book" or "perfect". But it's a very explicit pun, because the poet refers previously to the second meaning using the reference "in his mouth" to complete his metaphor for his beloved teeth being perfect like pearls. (ʿImād Al-Dīn bin Dabūqā, cited in Alam, 1980: 136)

### 3.2.4 Tawriya muhayya'a (تورية مهيأة) Prepared Pun

This type of pun is called muhayya'a (مهيأة) which means 'prepared pun'. It requires a certain type of contextual adjuncts that includes two expressions related in their meanings in a way by which they prepare the chance of punning to each other. It means that the relationship between these expressions helps to arrive at the far meaning which is too difficult to uncover without it (Feud, 2007: 146), i.e. It is obligatory in this kind to have a preparing word: a word that prepares for Tawriya and without which there would be no Tawriya. As illustrated in the following example:

10) when Ali Bin Abi Talib (p.b.u.h) is asked about someone, he answers "أنه يحوك الشمال باليمين" to mean either he is weaving overgrowth with his right hand or he is crossing the fingers of his right and "left hands الشمال" is muhayya'a (مهيأة) means either "a kind of plants" or "the left hand\_اليمين" is the preparing word without which the sentence would be "أنه يحوك الشمال" that contains no Tawriya at all (Al-Hashemi, 1940: 378).

### 3.3 Jinās (جناس)

It is worthy of mention that tawriya is not the only rhetorical device that relies for its effect on similar-

sounding words (polysemy and homonymy). In Arabic rhetoric, there is another device called jinās that uses words of the same nature. The term jinās is a nominalized noun derived from the Arabic verb janasa, which means 'to be homogenous with something else, i.e., two entities that are of the same kind'. It occurs when there is homogeneity in the letters of words, that is, when words have the same form (spelling and pronunciation) but different meanings, there will be a case of jinās.

In Arabic rhetoric, jinās is used as a technical term referring to one of the lexical embellishments in ilm al-badī (علم البديع) "schemes". It includes using words that are either identical or formally similar in form but semantically different. It is achieved when these words occur in two different positions where they have different meanings (Al-Alawi, 1914: 103).

Arab rhetoricians were generally in consensus that jinās refers to a sense of agreement occurring between two or more expressions in all or most of their letters (Al-Askari, 1952: 249; Ibn Rashīq, 1955: 1–331; and Al-Jundi, 1954: 3–12). Ibn Al-Mutaz (1935: 2, 25) defines Jinās as 'deploying identical or similar words in a certain verse or speech, and being homogenous means that these words are similar in the composition of their letters. Jinās is the similarity between certain utterances in particular formal aspects. When utterances are similar in letter type, number, order, and manner of the diacritical marks, Al-Sakkāki (1983: 429) claims that jinās occurs when there is "similarity in pronunciation between two words or expressions". This refers that jinās occur in the repetition of words that show similarity of form and disparity of meaning. Al-Ṭayyib (1955: 2-233) confirms this idea when he mentions that jinās is 'a type of repetition that emphasizes the tune and strengthens it'. Consider the following examples about jinās:

11) "ما ملاً الراحة" من استوطن الراحة"

"The palm of the hand will not be full, for who used to like laziness."

In this verse, there is jinās since the poet uses the lexical item "الراحة" twice in two different positions where the word means "hand palm" in the first and "laziness" in the second. The poet exploits playing upon identical or similar words as a technique for embellishing texts and drawing attention to his intended meaning, i.e., the lazy person will not become wealthy. (Cited in Abdul-Raof, 2006: 262)

### 3.4 Types of Jinās (جناس)

Since jinās mainly depends on repetition, Arab rhetoricians divide jinās according to the criterion that the repeated words are identical or slightly different. As a result, jinās falls into two main types: complete jinās and incomplete jinās (Maṭlūb, 1980: 267; Abbas, 1987: 298; and Abū Al-Addūs, 2007: 276).

#### 3.4.1 Complete Jinās (جناس تام)

Complete jinās involves using two words that share the same orthographic and phonological form but are semantically distinct.

Al-Qizwīni (1998: 388) states that in this type of jinās, words should be identical in four aspects: the type, number, form, and arrangement of letters. This shows that jinās occurs whenever words agree in pronunciation, meter, and inflection but differ in meaning only (Abbas, 1987: 297), as represented in the following example:

12) **يامغرور أمسك نفسك** وقس يومك بأمسكك  
"O who is snobbish, slow down, and compare your day with your day before."

The complete jinās appears in the following verse, where the lexical item "أمسك" has been repeated twice with two different meanings: "to slow down" and "yesterday" respectively. (Cited in Abdul-Raof, 2006: 622)

### 3.4.2 Incomplete Jinās (جناس غير تام)

Incomplete Jinās depends on resemblance rather than identity; that is, it is achieved when lexical items are orthographically dissimilar, whether in type, number, form, or arrangement of their letters, Al-Qizwīni (1998: 388). As in the examples:

13) **أن البكاء هو الشفاء** من الجوى بين الجوانح  
"Crying is an cure, from anguish among ribs."

The incomplete Jinās, here, is achieved by the two lexical items "جوى" which means "anguish" and "جوانح" meaning "ribs". These items are different from each other in the number of letters. (Al-Khansā', cited in Al-Ḥamawī, 1987: 71)

It is noticed that the incomplete Jinās is not exclusively confined to lexical items but it may occur in grammatical structures as a result of bringing words or parts of words together to make homogenous constructions. Though these constructions look the same they raise different meanings (Al-Shayikh, 1986: 194-5). It, thus, consists of two expressions. Each expression consists of two different words. When the two words of an expression are pronounced together, they sound exactly the same as the other two words of the other expression when it is pronounced together as in,

14) **فلم تضع الاعادي قدر شاني** ولا قالوا قلان قد رشانى  
"My enemies could not undermine my value, neither did they say: someone had bribed me."

In this verse, Jinās is created as a result of using the expressions "قدر شاني" which means "the value of myself" and "قد رشانى" meaning "has bribed me" which sound alike when their constituent words are pronounced together. (Abd Al-Bāqī bin Abi Al-Huaīn, cited in Al-Ḥamawī, 1987: 68)

### 3.5 Distinction between Tawriya and Jinās

We can easily notice that both tawriya and Jinās refer to words showing phonological identity and semantic disparity. This shows the close relationship between tawriya and jinās especially complete jinās. According to Alam (1997: 99-100), the two concepts seem to be different in certain aspects in spite of their close relationship.

1. Jinās is achieved by the repetition of the same word form or construction, whereas tawriya involves a single

occurrence that conjures up two different meanings.

2. The meaning of words involved in jinās is equally manifest; in tawriya, there are always two or more meanings: manifest (near) and latent (far). The latent is the one intended by the speaker.

3. The speaker intends only one meaning in tawriya, while the two meanings are intended in jinās.

The following examples to distinguish between ginās and tawriya:

15) **أبيات شعرك كالقصور** عواقر بها ولا قصور  
من العجائب لفظها وحر ومعناها رقيق  
"Erses are like mansions, with no obstructions imperfections,

Marvelous are their unrestricted, expressions and mild significations."

In this verse, the poet offers an example of jinās and tawriya. Jinās is achieved by the word "قصور" which occurs twice with two different meanings: mansions and obstructions. These meanings are equally manifest. On the other hand, tawriya is represented by the word "رقيق" which appears once and conjures up two different meanings: slaves and mild. In tawriya the poet shows the first meaning but intends the second, whereas in jinās the two meanings are apparently intended by the speaker. Hence, it can be noted that though tawriya and Jinās are similar in the nature of the words used, they are different in their manifestation. (Naīr Al-Dīn Al-Ḥamāmī, cited in Shu ayīb, 2008: 246)

On this basis, most Arab rhetoricians consider 'tawriya and jinās as two separate devices that belong to two different modes in ilm al-badī (علم البيوع) 'schemes' According to them, the function of 'tawriya is for a semantic embellishment, as for jinās, it aims at lexical embellishment, since the first involves playing upon the meanings a word may have, whereas the second involves playing upon similar forms that have different meanings in each occurrence. Alam (1997: 99-100)

### 3.6 Puns in English: Tawriya or Jinās?

Having distinguished Jinās from tawriya, it is the time to see which one of these phenomena represents the pun in English. As mentioned above, tawriya refers to the use of an expression with double meanings: near and far in such a way that the speaker shows the near and hides the far. Apparently, this definition seems to be similar to that type of pun called implicit pun where a word is mentioned only once but carries two or more meanings. In both, tawriya and implicit pun we can see that only one component is visible while the other meaning is hidden and materially not in the text. Hence, it has been clear that tawriya and implicit pun are exactly the same as the following examples may prove:

16) "I have a sin of fear, that when I have spun  
My last thread, I shall perish on the shore;  
But swear by Thy self, that at my death  
Thy **Son**."

Here, the implicit pun lies in the word "Son" which occurs once but has two different meanings: "the sun" and the "Christ" as well. (John Donne, A Hymn to

God the Father, 1950: 177)

17) إذا بدأ كيف أسألوها      لي يا عاذلي فيه قل  
وكل ما مرّ يحلوا      يمرّ بي كل وقت

"Oh, you who blame me for it tell me, if it emerges how should I forget,

It passes by me every time, whenever it passed it gets sweeter."

In this verse, tawriya is represented by the word "مرّ" which occurs once and gives rise to two different meanings "bitter as a verb" and "pass". On the other hand, jinās is defined as the use of two words which are identical or similar in orthographic and phonological forms but are semantically distinct. This definition is exactly as the same as that of explicit pun which is represented by repeating a similar or identical form in a different meaning. In both, words seem to be in a relation of contiguity by occurring one after another in the text. (Badr Al-Dīn Al- ḏahabi, cited in Abbas, 1987: 281)

Therefore, jinās evidently equates explicit pun as shown in the following examples,

18) "Shall shine as he shines now and heretofore;  
And having **done** that,  
Thou hast **done**; I fear no more."

In this example, there is an explicit pun represented by repeating the word "done" which has the same pronunciation of the poet's name "Donne". (John Donne, A Hymn to God the Father, 1950: 177)

19) فدارهم ما دمّت في دارهم      وأرضهم ما دمّت في أرضهم  
"Look after them in their house, and please them in their land."

Here, there are two examples of Jinās achieved by using the expressions dārihim (أرضهم) and 'ardihim (دارهم) twice where the poet plays upon the two meanings of the first word "look after them" and "their house" and the meanings of the second "please them" and "their land". Thus, it is more precise to say that the term pun in English is represented by the two devices tawriya and jinās as well. (Ibn Sharaf Al-Qayrawāni, cited in Shu ayīb, 2008: 250)

#### IV. DELABASTITA'S STRATEGIES OF TRANSLATING PUNS

Delabastita (1996: 134) suggested and discusses a more comprehensive list including eight "translation strategies for dealing with pun which are the following:

- Pun = Pun: "The ST pun is translated by a TT pun". This strategy can be applied if both languages have puns with identical meanings
- Pun = Non Pun: The ST pun is translated by a non-pun in the TL. The translator may or may not recognize the pun, this strategy is divided into three subcategories which are:

1. Non-Selective Non-Pun (one sense): The pun may be rendered by a non-punning phrase that may keep all the initial senses of the pun word, i.e. One of the two

linguistic meanings of the SL pun has been rendered more or less equivalently, while the other has been deleted;

2. Selective Non-Pun (both sense): The pun is rendered by a non-punning phrase which may salvage both senses of wordplay but in a non-punning conjunction, i.e. both meanings of SL pun are represented but in a non-punning way;

3. Diffuse Paraphrase: The original senses may be rendered beyond recognition by treating freely the whole punning passage.

c) Pun = Rhetorical Related Device (RRD): The ST pun is rendered in the TT by using "a wordplay related rhetorical device (like repetition, alliteration, etc.)" which also aims to recreate the effect of the ST pun;

d) Pun ST = Pun TT: "The translator reproduces the ST pun [. . .] in its original formulation, i.e. without actually 'translating' it". The ST pun is conveyed in TT either by a "direct copy" in which the translator reproduces the ST pun in its original form without translating it or by "Transference" in which the ST pun is transferred to the TT without changing its form and meaning ensuring that the text would be understood by the TT reader without any major effort;

e) Pun = Zero (Omission): "The portion of text containing the pun is simply omitted", i.e. , the translator simply deletes the part where the pun occurs, but this is possible only if the pun word is not important in the TT;

f) Non-Pun = Pun (Addition): The translator creates a new pun in the TT which does not exist in the ST in order to compensate a ST pun which is lost elsewhere, or for any other reason;

g) Zero = Pun (Addition): A Pun introduces in the TT without an apparent precedent or a justification for it in the ST but it is added to the TT as a compensatory device;

h) Editorial Techniques (ET): "Explanatory footnotes or endnotes, comments provided in translator's forewords, the anthological presentation of different, supposedly complementary solutions to one and the same source-text problem, and so forth", i.e. The translator can add footnotes, endnotes, bracketing, etc. when translating puns to draw attention to his translation of the wordplay, while referring to the S T pun.

#### V. DATA ANALYSIS

##### 5.1 Homonymy Pun

**SL Text (I):**

"The will of a living daughter is curbed by the will of a dead father" (Shakespeare, The Merchant of Venice: I, II)

**TL Texts (I):**

1. رغبة البننت محددة برغبة الوالد المتوفي.
2. ارادة الاب الميت قيدت ارادة الابنة الحية.
3. وصية الاب المتوفي لم تطبق من قبل ابنته التي على قيد الحياة.
4. وصية الاب الميت قيدت ارادة الابنة الحية.
5. وصية الاب الميت حددت وصية ابنته الحية.

6. ارادة الاب المتوفي كبتت رغبة البنت الحية.
7. وصية الاب المتوفي قيدت رغبة ابنته الحية.
8. رغبة البنت الحية تحكمها ارادة الاب الميت.
9. ارادة البنت التي على قيد الحياة خاضعة لوصية الاب المتوفي.
10. وصية الاب المتوفي حيدت رغبة ابنته التي على قيد الحياة.

**Text Analysis**

The text is represented by a homonymic pun for playing on the word "will" to communicate two meanings, namely: "desire\_رغبة" and "testament\_وصية", leaving the text with ambiguity. This text is extremely helpful to the extent that it indicates the vitality of context. By the implication of the PDP and the PT, the subjects detect the pun word, the context in which it associates meaning, and then depict the correct meaning and the pun word according to the appropriate context. Thus, they successfully reproduce the aesthetic and stylistic effect of the SL pun in the TL.

**Discussion**

As can be noticed, subjects (1, 2, 5, 6, and 8) cannot differentiate the meaning of the first "will" from the second one. Unfortunately, they only understand half of the meaning (due to the confusion that is caused by the use of two words with the same spelling but different meanings). They translate the pun word "will" literally into "ارادة\_رغبة", "ارادة\_ارادة", "وصية\_وصية", "وصية\_وصية" and "رغبة\_ارادة". So, they fail to capture the sociopragmatic meaning of the word "will", presumably because they have little or no exposure to its socio-cultural context. In essence, they fail to perform the PT because they remain unaware of the context. The

aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun is lost by adopting pun-to-non pun strategy. Subject (3) cannot differentiate the meaning of the first "will" from the second one. He responds to the semantic (pragmalinguistic) rather than the pragmatic (sociopragmatic) meaning due to a lack of socio-cultural knowledge. As a result, he fails to perform the PT from SL to TL. So, he translates the first pun "will\_وصية" and omits the second pun "will\_رغبة". By adopting pun-to-zero strategy, the aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun is completely lost. As for subjects (4, 7, 9, and 10), adopt the PDP at three specific levels: sentential, contextual, and referential. They scan what goes under the sentential level, and then move to the contextual level before determining the appropriate context and depict the intended meaning and the pun word. Their understanding of the word "will" is based on the sociopragmatic aspect and not the pragmalinguistic one (due to the fact that they must know the social context in order to understand the real meaning of the word). Consequently, they accurately translate the pun word "will" to "وصية\_ارادة", "وصية\_وصية", "وصية\_وصية" and "رغبة\_وصية". So, they succeed to perform the PT because they inferred the sociopragmatic meaning due to the fact that they have adequate knowledge or exposure to its socio-cultural context. The same aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun is preserved by adopting pun-to-pun strategy.

**Suggested Translation:**

وصية الاب المتوفي قيدت ارادة ابنته الحية.

**Table (1): Analysis of SLT (1)**

Appropriateness	"The will of a living daughter is curbed by the will of a dead father."															
	SLT									PDP			PT		TLT	SUB
	Translation strategies									RL	CL	SL	SPT	PLT	Translation	
ET	Z=P	NP=P	P=Z	PST=PT	T	P=RRD	P=NP	P=P			II					
x							✓				✓		✓		1	
x							✓				✓		✓		2	
x				✓							✓		✓		3	
✓								✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	4	
x							✓				✓		✓		5	
x							✓				✓		✓		6	
✓								✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	7	
x							✓				✓		✓		8	
✓								✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	9	
✓								✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	10	

5.2 Homophonic Pun

SL Text (2):

"Truly, sir, all that I live by is with awl." (Shakespeare, Julius Caesar: I, I)

TL Texts (2):

1. الحقيقة يا سيدي, ان كل ماعشته كان بمشقة.
2. هذه هي الحقيقة يا مولاي , فكل ماعيش به هو مخرزي.
3. حقا يا سيدي, كل ذلك ذهب سدى.
4. حقًا يا مولاي ، كل ما لدي من اجل لقمة العيش هو المخرز.
5. حقا يا سيدي ، كل ما اسد به رمق العيش بمثقاب الجلد.
6. صدقا يا سيدي كل ما اعيشه هو مع وعاء.
7. هذا حق يا سيدي, كل اقتات به هو هذا المثقاب .
8. في الحقيقة يا مولاي, ان كل ماعيش به هو مخصفي (يقصد بالمخصف:المخرز, كل مظاهر بعضه على بعض فقد خصف).
9. الحقيقة يا سيدي, ان كل ما اعيشه بمعانة.
10. بالحقيقة يا سيدي, كل ما اترزق منه هو هذا المخرز (يقصد مثقاب الجلد الذي يستعمله الاسكافي).

Text Analysis

The text is represented by a homophonic pun, which is used to play on two words: "all" to indicate "whole" and "awl" to indicate "instrument of the cobbler", making the text ambiguous. The analysis of the relevant text will depend on the PDP and the PT, which will help the subjects whenever they face a pun. The subjects figure out the shades of meaning that the pun has, then move to the contextual level and determine the appropriate context. After that, the subjects adjust the meaning according to the context (as it enables them to recognize the pun and its real meaning). As a consequence, the aesthetic and stylistic effect of the SL pun will be completely maintained in the TL.

Discussion

As can be noticed, subjects (1, 3, 6, and 9) cannot distinguish the meaning of the two words "all" and "awl", as they only realize the surface meaning (due to the obscurity that is created by the use of two words with the same pronunciation / ôl/ but different meanings). They literally translate the puns "all" and

"awl" into "كل\_بمشقة", "كل\_ذهب سدى", and "كل\_وعاء". So, they fail to recognize the sociopragmatic meaning of the word "awl", maybe because they have inadequate or no exposure to its socio-cultural context. As a result, they fail to perform the PT because they ignore the role of context. By adopting pun-to-non pun strategy, the original pun totally lost all its stylistic and aesthetic value. Subjects (8 and 10) can distinguish the meaning of the two words "all" and "awl". They respond to the semantic (pragmalinguistic) and the pragmatic (sociopragmatic) meaning due to his adequate socio-cultural knowledge. Thus, they completely succeed in performing the PT from SL to TL. Therefore, they translate it into "كل\_مخصفي (يقصد بالمخصف: المخرز, كل" and "يقصد مثقاب الجلد الذي and مظاهر بعضه على بعض فقد خصف". They also clarify and explain the meaning of ST puns in order to be easily and clearly recognized by TT readers. Hence, the aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun is preserved by using the editorial strategy. While subjects (2, 4, 5, and 7) use PDP at three specific levels: sentential, contextual, and referential. They scan what goes under the sentential level, and then move to the contextual level before determining the appropriate context and depict the intended meaning of the pun. Their depiction of the two words "all" and "awl" relies on the sociopragmatic and not the pragmalinguistic meaning (due to the fact that they must know the social context in order to recognize the real meaning of the pun). As a result, they successfully translate the pun into "كل\_المثقاب" and "كل\_مثقاب الجلد", "كل\_المخرز", "كل\_مخزري". Thus, the PT is successful because they inferred the sociopragmatic meaning due to their adequate knowledge or exposure to its socio-cultural context. The same aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun is completely preserved by using pun-to-pun strategy.

Suggested Translation:

هذه هي الحقيقة يا مولاي , فكل ماعيش به هو مخرزي.

Table (2): Analysis of SLT (2)

Appropriateness	SLT		"Truly, sir, all that I live by is with awl."													
	Translation strategies									PDP			PT		TLT	
	ET	Z=P	NP=P	P=Z	PST=PT	T	P=RRD	P=NP	P=P	RL	CL	SL Li	SPT	PLT	Translation	SUB
x							✓					✓		✓	الحقيقة يا سيدي, ان كل ماعشته كان بمشقة.	1
✓								✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	هذه هي الحقيقة يا مولاي , فكل ماعيش به هو مخرزي.	2
x							✓					✓		✓	حقا يا سيدي, كل ذلك ذهب سدى.	3
✓								✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	حقًا يا مولاي ، كل ما لدي من اجل لقمة العيش هو المخرز.	4
✓								✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	حقا يا سيدي ، كل ما اسد به رمق العيش بمثقاب الجلد.	5
x							✓					✓		✓	صدقا يا سيدي كل ما اعيشه هو مع وعاء.	6

✓								✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	7	هذا حق يا سيدي، كل اقتاتت به هو هذا المتقاب.
✓	✓								✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8	في الحقيقة يا مولاي، ان كل ما اعيش به هو مخصفي (يقصد بالمخصف: المخرز، كل ما ظاهر بعضه على بعض فقد خصف).
x							✓				✓		✓	9	الحقيقة يا سيدي، ان كل ما اعيشه بمعاناة.
✓	✓								✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10	بالحقيقة يا سيدي، كل ما اترزق منه هو هذا المخرز (يقصد متقاب الجلد الذي يستعمله الاسكافي).

5.3 Polysemic Pun

SL Text (3):

"Drink off this potion. Is thy union here?" (Shakespeare, Hamlet: V, II)

TL Texts (3):

1. اشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل اتحاذك هنا؟
2. اشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل جوهرتك هنا؟
3. خذ رشفة من هذه الكاس. هل جمعيتك هنا؟
4. أجرع هذا الكأس. أجوهرتك داخله؟
5. اشرب هذه الجرعة. هل نقابتك هنا؟
6. خذ من هذا الكأس رشفة. هل انت متماسك هنا؟
7. أجرع رشفة من هذا الكأس. هل جوهرتك (يقصد الجوهرة المسمومة داخل كأس النبيذ) داخل الكأس؟
8. اشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل وحدتك هنا؟
9. أجرع هذه الجرعة. هل جوهرتك بالداخل؟
10. أحتسي رشفة من هذا الكاس. هل زواجك (يقصد الزواج الذي انتهى بموت الملكة) هنا؟

Text Analysis

The text is represented by a polysemic pun for playing on the word "union" to communicate two meanings. It means either "the poisoned pearl in the chalice of wine\_النبيذ\_ في كأس\_ الجوهرة المسمومة" or "the marriage that is ended by queen death\_ انتهى\_ الزواج الذي انتهى \_ بموت الملكة". By virtue of the PDP and the PT, the subjects must figure out the pun word, the context in which it associates meaning, and then distinguish the real meaning from many shades of meaning according to the appropriate context. As a result, the aesthetic and stylistic effect of the SL pun is perfectly reproduced in the TL.

Discussion

As can be noted, subjects (1, 3, 5, 6, and 8) only understand the surface meaning and neglect the deep one. They translate the pun word "union" literally into "اتحادك", "جمعيتك", "نقابتك", "متماسك", and "وحدتك". So, they fail to understand the sociopragmatic meaning of the word "union", because they concentrate on its

pragmalinguistic meaning at the expense of its sociopragmatic equivalent since they have little or no exposure to its socio-cultural context. As a consequence, they cannot perform the PT due to the fact that they are still unaware of the context. The aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun is totally lost by using pun-to-non pun strategy. Subjects (7 and 10) understand both the semantic (pragmalinguistic) and the pragmatic (sociopragmatic) meanings due to their adequate socio-cultural knowledge. Consequently, they succeed in performing the PT from SL to TL. Therefore, they translate it into " (يقصد الجوهرة المسمومة داخل كأس النبيذ)" "زواجك (يقصد الزواج الذي انتهى بموت الملكة)" and "جوهرتك" they also clarify and explain the meaning of ST puns in order to be easily and clearly recognized by TT readers. Thus, the aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun is preserved by applying the editorial strategy. While subjects (2, 4, and 9) adopt the PDP at three specific levels: sentential, contextual, and referential. They scan what goes under the sentential level, and then move to the contextual level before determining the appropriate context and depict the intended meaning of the pun. Their depiction of the word "union" relies on the sociopragmatic meaning not the pragmalinguistic one (due to the fact that they must know the social context in order to perceive the real meaning of the pun). As a consequence, they successfully translate the pun word "union" into "جوهرتك". Thus, the PT is successfully achieved because they inferred the sociopragmatic meaning due to their adequate knowledge or exposure to its socio-cultural context. The same aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun is totally preserved by utilizing pun-to-pun strategy

Suggested Translation:

أجرع رشفة من هذا الكأس. هل جوهرتك (يقصد الجوهرة المسمومة داخل كأس النبيذ) داخل الكأس؟

Table (3): Analysis of SLT (3)

Appropriateness	SLT "Drink off this potion. Is thy union here?"													SUB		
	Translation strategies									PDP		PT			TLT	
	ET	Z=P	NP=P	P=Z	PST=PTT	P=RRD	P=NP	P=P	RL	CL	SL II	SPT	PLT		Translation	
x							✓				✓		✓	اشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل اتحاذك هنا؟	1	

✓								✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	أشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل جوهرك هنا؟	2
x							✓				✓		✓	خذ رشفة من هذه الكأس. هل جمعيتك هنا؟	3
✓								✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	أجرع هذا الكأس. أجوهرك داخله؟	4
x							✓				✓		✓	أشرب هذه الجرعة. هل نقابك هنا؟	5
x							✓				✓		✓	خذ من هذا الكأس رشفة. هل انت متماسك هنا؟	6
✓	✓								✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	أجرع رشفة من هذا الكأس. هل جوهرك (يقصد الجوهرة المسمومة داخل كأس النبيذ) داخل الكأس؟	7
x							✓				✓		✓	أشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل وحدتك هنا؟	8
✓								✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	أجرع هذه الجرعة. هل جوهرك بالداخل؟	9
✓	✓									✓	✓	✓	✓	أحتسي رشفة من هذا الكأس. هل زواجك (يقصد الزواج الذي انتهى بموت الملكة) هنا؟	10

## VI. CONCLUSION

After analyzing the data in numbers and percentages, it is apparent that:

1. Pun is a literary device that can be known as a play on words which are similar in form but different in meaning; as a consequence, pun is considered misleading due to the fact that each pun word has more than one meaning (shades of meaning). This explains why translators face difficulties when they are dealing with it.
2. Puns are frequently related to ambiguity and inappropriate translations.
3. The translation of puns from English into Arabic in literary texts, in the light of the pragmatic perceptive, is not an easy task for translators, since both languages are systematically, grammatically, and culturally different.
4. Transaltors encounters two main challenges in translating puns, namely: context and culture.
5. Translators should attain vital information about the sociocultural background of the context in which the pun occurs because it improves the perception of the pun and enables translators to capture the real meaning of each individual pun.
6. Translators who adhere to use the PDP and the PT have successfully reproduced the same aesthetic and stylistic effect of the SL pun in the TL.
7. Translators have used almost all Delabstitas' strategies except Zero to Pun and Non-Pun to Pun strategy sine the study only concerns with SL.

## REFERENCES

[1] Abbas, F. (1987). *Al-Balāgha Finūnuha Wa Afnānuha (Ilm Al- Bayān Wa Al- Badī)*. Ammān: Dār Al-Furqān Lilnashr Wa Al- Tawzī.

[2] Abū Al-Addūs, Y. (2007). *Madkhal 'Ilā Al-Balāgha Al- Arabiyya (Ilm Al- Maānī- Ilm Al-Bayān-*

*Ilm Al- Badī)*. Ammān: Dār Al-Masīra Lilnashr Wa Al-Tawzī Wa Al- ibāa.

- [3] Abdul-Raof, H. (2006). *Arabic Rhetoric: A pragmatic Analysis*. London and NewYork: Routledge Taylor& Francis Group.
- [4] Alam, A. (1997). *A study in Al-Balāgha Al-Arabiyya*. Benghazi: University of Qaryoun.
- [5] Al-Askari, H. (1952). *Kitāb Al-inā atayīn*. Edited by Al-Bajawi, A. and Ibrahim, M. *Al-Qāhira: Dār 'Ihyā' Al-Kutub Al-Arabiyya*.
- [6] Al-Alawi, Y. (1914). *Al-traz Al-mutadman lasrar Al-balaghah Walloom Hagaeq Al-ijaz. Tahkiq El-sid Ben Ali Al-Marsefi*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. *Al-Qāhira: Dār 'Ihyā' Al-Kutub Al-khadiwiya*.
- [7] Al-Azhari, M. (2001). *Mu jam Tahōib Al-Lugha*. Edited by Mar'ab, M. 1st ed., Bayrūt: Dār 'Ihyā'ul Turāth.
- [8] Al-Halabi, M. (1980). *Husn Al-Tawassul*. Edited by Yūsuf, A. Bagdad: Dār Al-Rashīd Wa Al-Hurriyya.
- [9] Al-Hamawi, A. (1987). *Khizānat Al-'Adab Wa Ghāyat Al-'Irab*. Edited by Sh'itu, I. 1st ed., Bayrūt: Dār Wa Maktabat Al-Hilāl.
- [10] Al-Hashemi, A. (1940). *Jawahir Al-Balāgha Fi Al-Maāni Wa AlBayān Wa Al-Badī*. *Al-Qāhira: Dār Al-'itimād*.
- [11] Al-Jawhari, I. (1987). *Taj Al-Lugha Wa Šihāh Al-'Arabyya*. Edited by Aṭṭār, A. 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Bayrūt: Dar Al-Ilmi lilmalāyyīn.
- [12] Al-Jundi, A. (1954). *Fan Al-Jinās*. Mir: Maṭbat Al-Itimād.
- [13] Al-Mišri, I. (1963). *Tahrīr Al-Taḥbīr Fi Šinā'at Al-Shi'ri Wa AlNathr Wa Bayān 'Ijāz Al-Qur'an*. Edited by Sharaf, H. *Al-Qāhira: Lajnat 'Ihyā' Al-Turāth*.
- [14]
- [15] Al-Qizwīni, M. (1998). *Al-'Idāh Fi Ulūm Al-Balāgha*. 4th ed. Bayrūt: Maṭba'at Dār'Ihyā'ul Turāth.
- [16] Al-Sakkāki, Y. (1983). *Miftāh Al-Ulūm*. Edited by Yūsuf, A. Bagdad: Maṭbaatil Risāla.
- [17] Al-Shayikh, A. (1986). *Al-Balāgha Wa Qadāyyā*

Al-Mushtarak Al-Lafdhi. Al-'Iskandarīyya: Mu'assasat Shabāb Al-Jamī'a.

[18] Al-Ṭayyib, A. (1955). Al-Murshid Ilā Fahim Ashār Al-arab Wainātihā. 1st ed, Mir:Maṭbaat Muṭafa Al-Ḥalabi Wa 'Awlādūh.

[19] Bader, Y. (2014). A Linguistic and Cultural Analysis of Pun Expressions in Journalistic Articles in Jordan: A Case Study. MA Thesis, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

[20] Balci, A. (2005). A Comparative Analysis of Different Turkish Translations of Alice in Wonderland by Lewis Carroll on Pun Translation. Dokuzeylül University. M. A Thesis, (pp. 1, 5).

[21] Bates, C. (1999). "The points of puns". Modern Philology, 96,421-438.

[22] Carroll, L. (1866/1992). Alice's adventures in wonderland, London: Macmillan.

[23] Chengming, Z. (2004), Advertisement in English Translation Skills, China, Shandong University Press.

[24] Corbeil, A. (1996), Controlling Laughter: Political Honour in the Late Roman Republic, New Jersey, Princeton University Press.

[25] Crystal, D. (1997). Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

[26] \_\_\_\_\_. (2004). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

[27] Culler, J. (1988). On Puns: The Foundation of Letters. New York: Basil Blackwell.

[28] Delabastita, D. (1993). There's a Double Tongue: An Investigation into the Translation of Shakespeare's Wordplay, with Special Reference to Hamlet, Amsterdam, Netherlands, Rodopi. (PP.137-190). Retrieved from [http://books.google.com.mx/books/about/There\\_s\\_a\\_Double\\_Tongue.html?id=F81s7gdXOFIC&redir\\_esc=y](http://books.google.com.mx/books/about/There_s_a_Double_Tongue.html?id=F81s7gdXOFIC&redir_esc=y).

[29] \_\_\_\_\_. (1996). "Introduction". In Wordplay and Translation: Essays on Punning and Translation, Dirk Delabastita (ed.), Special issue of The Translator, (pp.127-139).

[30] \_\_\_\_\_. (1997). "Traductio". Essays on Punning and Translation, Yves Gambier, University of Turku

[31] \_\_\_\_\_. (2004). "Wordplay as a translation problem: a linguistic perspective." In Übersetzung, translation, traduction, Harald Kittel, Armin Paul Frank, Norbert Greiner, Theo Hermans, Werner Koller, José Lambert, Fritz Paul (eds.), (pp.600– 606). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

[32] Donne, J. (1950). Hymn to God the Father, USA: 61 West Superior Street, Chicago, IL 60654.

[33] Feud, B. (2007). Budaiya Science A Historical And Artistic Study Of The Origins Of Rhetoric And Budaiya. Al-Qāhira: Dār Al-alom AL-thakafya.

[34] Gray, M. (1984). A Dictionary of Literary Terms. London: Longman Group Ltd.

[35] Hatim, B., and Munday, J. (2004). Translation: an advanced resource book. London: Routledge.

[36] Ibn Al-Mutaz, A. (1935). Al-Badī. Edited by: Kratshofski. London: Maṭbū at Jub Al-Tiðkātiyya.

[37] Ibn Fāris, A. (1984). Muḥam Maqāyīs Al-Lughā. Edited by Hārūn, A. Al-Qāhira: Maktabat Al-'Ilām Al-Islāmi.

[38] Ibn Mandhūr, J. (1988). Lisan Al-'Arab. Commented by Shīri, A. 1st ed., Bayrūt: Dār 'Ihyā'ul Turāth.

[39] Ibn Muqādh, 'U. (1960). Al-Badī Fi Naqd Al-Shi'r. Edited by Badawi, A. & H. Abd Al-Majīd. Al-Qāhira.

[40] Kasper, G. (1992). "Pragmatic transfer", Second language research, 8(3), 203-231.

[41] Leech, G. (1969). A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry. London: Longman Group Ltd.

[42]

[43] Lund, J. (1947), Newspaper Advertising, New York, Prentice-hall.

[44] Maṭlūb, A. (1980). Al-Balāgha Al-Arabiyya (Al-Maāni Wa Al-Bayān Wa Al-Badī). Baghdad: Jāmiat Baghdad.

[45] Newmark, P. (1988). A Text study of Translation. London: Prentice-Hall.

[46] Redfern, W. (1984). Puns. Oxford: Blackwell.

[47] Salzman, Z. (1998). Language, Culture and Society, Oxford, West View press.

[48] Schoster, Th. (2005), Shun the Pun, Rescue the Rhyme? The Dubbing and Subtitling of Language Play in Film, Sweden University, Retrieved from <http://tranb300.ulb.ac.be/2012-2013/groupe212/archive/files/.pdf>

[49] Shakespeare, W. (1597/2014). Romeo and Juliet. Annotated ed. London: Simon & Schuter.

[50] \_\_\_\_\_. (1597/2016). Richard II. Updated ed. London: Simon & Schuter.

[51] \_\_\_\_\_. (1599/2004). Julius Caesar. Updated ed. London: Simon & Schuter.

[52] \_\_\_\_\_. (1600/2009). The Merchant of Venice. Updated ed. London: Simon & Schuter.

[53] \_\_\_\_\_. (1603/1992). Hamlet. 1st ed. London: Simon & Schuter.

[54] Shu'ayb, I. (2008). Al-Muyassar Fi Al-Balāgha Al-Arabiyya (Durūs Wa Tamārīn). Bayrūt: Dār Ibn Hazm Lilṭibā'a Wa Al-Nashr Wa Al-Tawzī'.

[55] Von Flotow, L. (1997). "Mutual Pun-ishment? Translating Radical Feminist Wordplay in Traductio", Essays on Punning and Translation, (pp.52) St. Jerome Publishing, Manchester.

[56] Wahba, M. (1974). A Dictionary of Literary Terms. Riad Solh Square: Library Du Liban.