Pun in Arabic Classical Rhetoric with Reference to Translation

Dr. Hamid Hussein AL-Hajjaj
And
Mayyadah Nazar Ali
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
COLLEGE OF ARTS & LETTERS
CIHAN UNIVERSITY

Transliteration :

The following system of transliteration is adopted in the present paper:

No.	Arabic Letters	Transliteration Symbols	Arabic Speech Sounds	Phonological Features
1.	ء	?	/ ? /	Voiceless glottal stop
2.	ب	b	/ b /	Voiced bilabial stop
3.	ت	t	/ t /	Voiceless dental stop
4.	ث	th	/ θ /	Voiceless inter – dental fricative
5.	ج	j	/ d□ /	Voiced post - alveolar fricative
6.	ح	ḥ	/ ḥ /	Voiceless pharyngeal fricative
7.	خ	kh	/ x /	Voiceless velar fricative
8.	د	d	/ d /	Voiced dental stop
9.	ذ	dh	/ ð /	Voiced inter – dental fricative
10.	ر	r	/ r /	Voiced alveolar approximant
11.	ز	z	/ z /	Voiced alveolar fricative
12.	س	s	/ s /	Voiceless alveolar

				fricative
13.	ش	<u>sh</u>	/ □ /	Voiceless post – alveolar fricative
14.	ص	ṣ	/ ṣ /	Voiceless velarized alveolar fricative
15.	ض	ḍ	/ ḍ /	Voiced velarized dental stop
16.	ط	ṭ	/ ṭ /	Voiceless velarized dental stop
17.	ظ	dh	/ ẓ /	Voiced velarized dental fricative
18.	ع	9	/ 9 /	Voiced pharyngeal fricative
19.	غ	<u>gh</u>	/ g /	Voiced uvular trill
20.	ف	f	/ f /	Voiceless labio – dental fricative
21.	ق	q	/ q /	Voiceless uvular stop
22.	ك	k	/ k /	Voiceless velar stop
23.	ل	l	/ l /	Voiced alveolar lateral (approximant)
24.	م	m	/ m /	Voiced bilabial nasal
25.	ن	n	/ n /	Voiced alveolar nasal
26.	هـ	h	/ h /	Voiceless glottal fricative
27.	و	w	/ w /	Voiced labio – velar approximant
28.	ي	y	/ j /	Voiced palatal approximant

No.	Arabic Letters	Transliteration Symbols	Arabic Speech Sounds	Phonological Features
1.	kasrah ⟋	i	/ i /	Closed high front short unrounded vowel
2.	faṭḥah ´	a	/ a /	Open low back short unrounded vowel
3.	ḍammah ُ	u	/ u /	Closed high back short rounded vowel
4.	ي	i:	/ i:/	Closed high front long unrounded vowel
5.	١	a:	/ a: /	Open low back long unrounded vowel
6.	و	u:	/ u: /	Closed high back long rounded vowel

Abbreviations:

SL	source language
SM	source message
ST	source text
SLM	source language message
SLT	source language text
SME	source message expression
TL	target language
TM	target message
TT	target text
TLM	target language message
TLT	target language text
TME	target message expression

Abstract

This paper is an attempt to explore the nature and role of the pun in classical Arabic rhetoric. Looking at as a rhetorical device, pun makes Arabic texts (Quranic, poetic and everyday formal expressions) more vivid and their content richer in

semantic values. Essential rhetorical differences between Arabic and English in the domain of pun have been dealt with in some detail. These result in ruling out phonologically – oriented rhetorical schemes such as paronomasia from being regarded as a type of pun in Arabic as mentioned by a number of recent rhetorical studies. Arabic pun is seen as a lexical process through which a lexical item is used in a tricky manner creating a deliberate confusion of different senses of the same word. Arabic puns used in Quranic and poetic texts   represent a barrier to translatability for they are mostly culture – specific. Suggesting some basic and powerful procedures and techniques for the rendition of Arabic pun into English is also included in the present work.

Key words: pun, translation, function, culture, paronomasia.

الخلاصة :

يُعد هذا البحث محاولة لاستكشاف طبيعة موضوع التورية و الدور الذي تلعبه في البلاغة العربية. فإذا ما نظرنا اليها باعتبارها وسيلة بلاغية ، فإن التورية تجعل النصوص العربية (قرآنية و شعرية وتعابير فصيحة اخرى) اكثر حيوية و إشراقا وتجعل من محتواها اكثر غنىً بالقيم الدلالية المعبرة. لقد تم تناول موضوع الاختلافات البلاغية بين اللغة العربية و اللغة الانجليزية في النظر الى التورية حيث نتج عن ذلك استبعاد الجناس خارج دائرة التورية العربية وذلك باعتباره لوناً بلاغياً بديعياً ذي صبغةٍ صوتيةٍ وظيفية معتمداً كنوعٍ من التورية في البلاغة الغربية بشكلٍ عام. يُنظر الى التورية في البلاغة العربية على أنها عملية تحدث في المستوى المعجمي حيث تُستخدم المفردة ذات المعاني المتعددة بطريقةٍ لاتخلو من الخداع أو اللبس أو الإيهام أو الإبهام لخلق نوع من الاضطراب المتعَمَّد في هذه المعاني. التورية العربية وبكل انواعها وبخاصةٍ تلك المستخدمة في النصوص القرآنية و النصوص الشعرية تمثلُ عائقاً امام الترجمة الى اللغة الانجليزية لكون غالبيتها ذات خصوصية ثقافيةٍ عربيةٍ اسلامية . كذلك تم في هذا البحث اقتراح اجراءات و تقنيات اساسية و مهمة من اجل استخدامها في ترجمة التورية العربية الى اللغة الانجليزية.

1- Introductory Remarks

1-1 Etymological Considerations

Originally, the Arabic rhetorical term "التورية" [?at-Tawriyyah, lit.pun] is derived from the Arabic statement " وَرَّيتُ الخبرَ أو الشىءَ" [warraytu ?al-khabara ?aw ?ash-shay?a] which literally means " I have hidden the news or the thing in order not

to be known by others". Technically speaking, it means intentionally hiding a very subtle sense of a spoken or written text and makes it difficult or impossible to be completely grasped by certain people in an audience. This interpretation is clearly supported by a number of Quranic texts such as:

١ ـ فَبَعَثَ اللهُ غُرَاباً يَبْحَثُ في ألارض لِيُريَهُ كَيْفَ يُوَاري سَوْأَةَ أخيهِ، قَالَ يَا وَيْلْتَىٰ أَعَجَزْتُ أَنْ أَكُونَ مِثْلَ هَذَا الغُرَابِ فَأُواريَ سَوْأَةَ أخِي فَأَصْبَحَ مِنَ النَّادِمِينَ.

> Then God sent a raven,
> Who scratched the ground,
> To show him how to hide
> The shame of his brother
> "Woe is me!" said he;
> "Was I not even able
> To be as this raven,
> And to hide the shame
> Of my brother? Then he became
> Full of regrets.

Ali (1937: pp:251-252), Su:rah V, ?a:yah 31, ?al-Ma?idah

2ـ فَوَسْوَسَ لَهُما الشَّيطانُ لِيُبديَ لَهُما ما وُريَ عَنْهُما مِنْ سَوْءاتِهِمَا.

> Then began Satan to whisper
> Suggestions to them, bringing
> Openly before their minds
> All their shame

Ibid (p:344), Su:rah VII, ?a:yah 20, ?al-?a9ra:f

3ـ يَتوارىٰ مِنَ القومِ مِنْ سُوءٍ مابُشِّرَ بهِ.

> With shame does he hide
> Himself from his people,
> Because of the bad news
> He has had!

Ibid (pp: 670-671), Su:rah XVI, ?a:yah 59,?an-Naḥl

4ـ فقالَ إِنِّي أحببتُ حُبَّ الخيرِ عَنْ ذِكرِ ربِّي حَتى توارتْ بالحجابِ.

> And he said, "Truly

**Do I love the love
Of Good, with a view
To the glory of my Lord,"-
Until (the sun) was hidden
In the veil (of Night):**

Ibid (p:1225), Su:rah XXXVIII,?a:yah 32, Ṣa:d

To go a little bit deeper on this issue, Arabs also say: " وَرَّيْتُ الخَبَرَ أُورِّيهِ تَوْريةٌ" (warrayytu ?al-khabara ?uwarr:hi tawrryatan) to mean exactly giving the sense that a certain speaker or writer "has hidden a specific piece of news and intentionally exposed another one instead" as if the hidden news was put behind the back of the speaker (i.e., put away and covered). This understanding is strengthened by the meaning of the Arabic text "وَرَّيْتُهُ" (warrayytuhu) which is derived from the Arabic adverb of place "وراءَ" (wara:?a) (lit.behind), (?ibn Mandhu:r[1], no date, vol.6 pp:4822 - 4823).

?az-Zabi:di: [2] (1965:486 - 488), on the etymology of the word "تورية", has provided no more information other than what has already been mentioned by ?ibn Mandhu:r.

?al-Jawhari: [3](1956:2523), on the other hand, has almost said the same thing on this issue. He adds that the Arabic word "تورية" might be derived from the Arabic text "وَاريتُ الشىءَ" (wa:raytu ?ash – shay?a) , which refers to the sense of (covering a thing with earth), as when we say "واراهُ التراب" (wa:ra:hu ?at-tura:ba) a metonymy which means "دَفَنَ" (lit. he buried). Or, it could be derived from the Arabic word "توارى" (tawa:ra:) which means اختفى (lit. disappeared).

?al-9a:bid et al (1988:1303) assert the fact that the word "تورية" could be derived from any of the following Arabic verbs:
1- وَرَّىٰ (warra:) to hide an intended thing.
2- وَارىٰ (wa:ra:) to bury an intended thing.
3- توارىٰ (tawa:ra:) things vanished or disappeared.

---

[1] d. 711 A.H / 1311 A.D, see the dictionary entry ورّىٰ (warra:)
[2] d. 1205 A.H / 1791 A.D, see the dictionary entry ورأ (wara?)
[3] d. 393 A.H / 1002 A.D

These three lexical semantic possibilities are revealed by the following morphological derivatives:

1- warra: yu:warri: tawriyatan   وَرَّىٰ يُوَرِّي تَوْرِيةٌ

2- wa:ra: yu:wa:ri: mu:wa:ra:tan وَارىٰ يُواري مُواراةً

3- tawa:ra: yatawa:ra: tawa:riyyan (so he is) mutawa:rin

تَوارىٰ   يتوارىٰ   توارياً (فهو) متوارٍ

Morphologically speaking, the first derivative is much more attested than the other two. This does not mean that the other derivatives have nothing to do with the meaning of the Arabic term ''تورية''. In reality, the three possibilities are semantically related to each other and to the issue in question.

1-2 Clarifying Definitions

Rhetorically speaking, the Arabic term ''تورية'' and its English counterpart "pun" both refer to a figure of speech which is rich in its linguistic (syntactic, semantic, morphological, and lexical) content. However, the English term "pun" represents a murky subject mixed with other rhetorical schemes. This case makes the domain of the English "pun" different from that of Arabic in certain minute details such as its scope of definition and its potential applications. We shall touch upon this issue as we proceed in the present work.

Pun is seen by Arab rhetoricians as a fundamental figure of speech for its rhetorical force in texts. It has been used as a rhetorical device and played an essential role in both poetry and prose since the pre-Islamic era. It has been frequently used in the Glorious Quran as well as in the Prophetic Tradition to express certain semantic values in various textual structures.

This rhetorical device has been defined by too many scholars in various ways. Arab and non - Arab rhetoricians and linguists have established general lines and basic principles, which are always taken into account, when formulating standard definitions for the conception of pun. This fact will be clearly

shown when analyzing representative definitions put forward by well – known rhetoricians and linguists.

?ibn ?abi: ?al-?iṣba9 ?al-Miṣri: [1] (1963:268) says that pun is also called "?attawji:h" (lit. directing , guiding), "it is to have two possible meanings implied in one lexical item one of which is used by the speaker and the second is overlooked, the overlooked one is intended and the used one is not." ?al-Qazwi:ni: [2] (1975:499-500) calls pun ?al-?i:ha:m (lit. ambiguity, vagueness, obscurity) . He does not specify the concept of ambiguity in his statement. He most probably refers to the general sense of this concept in order to cover its all types. Ambiguity occurs in the syntax (the sentence structure), lexicon (meaning that enables the phenomenon of punning) and phonology (sound structure) of the pun domain and it is regarded to be the most important pillar of this figure of speech (Bucaria, 2004: 281). ?al-Qazwi:ni: (1975:499 – 500) considers pun a part of the sublime framework and he defines it as an "utterance which has two shades of meaning one of which is immediate and the other is remote" [3]. Ṣala:ḥ ?ad-Di:n ?aṣ-Ṣafadi: [4] quoted in 9ati:q (1971:115) defines this rhetorical figure as an "utterance produced by a speaker with two meanings the first of which is obvious whereas the second is not. The speaker utters the part of the text that contains the obvious meaning in order to misguide a certain receiver or a certain group of receivers and then he produces a linguistic trace through which he indirectly suggests a clue indicating that the intended meaning is the far-fetched one rather than the obvious one"(see also Ṣaffi: ?ad-Di:n ?al- Ḥulli: 1992:135).

?al-Ḥamawi:[5](2004:39) defines this figure of speech simply as a process of "stating a single word which contains two literal meanings or a literal and a figurative meaning, one of them is immediate and its semantic framework is straightforward and the other is remote and its semantic

---

[1] d. 654 A.H / 1257 A.D
[2] d. 739 A.H / 1338 A.D
[3] For more information on ?al-Qazwīnī's position, see ?as-Sa9īdī, no date, pp:29-30.
[4] d. 764 A.H / 1363 A.D
[5] d. 837 A.D / 1434 A.D

framework is completely hidden. The text producer intends the remote meaning and indirectly refers to it by the immediate one. This makes the receivers think immediately that the obvious meaning is the targeted one but in fact this expectation is not correct and that is why Arab rhetoricians called this device "?al-?i:ha:m", namely, intentional misguidance or vagueness. In this connection, Tondl (2006:235-251) stresses the fact that there are several types of vagueness as there there are many sources of vagueness such as the language users , logical structure of language and the class of signified entities. He further states that vagueness can be measured based on the relation between semantic decision making process and the language users. Regarding the degree of vagueness, Tondl (ibid) points out that proper names and individual characteristics exhibits no or minimal vagueness, general terms exhibits the highest degree of vagueness and theoretical terms exhibits no or limited vagueness only within a certain conception.

Modern rhetoricians (stylisticians) have also presented various definitions for pun which are similar, to a certain extent, in their contents, to the previously - mentioned definitions in Arabic rhetoric. Some of these definitions are comprehensive others lack comprehensiveness and depth. Pun, for instance, is defined by Newmark (1988:217) 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 also to concentrate meaning". Generally speaking, this definition and the like are found to be much simpler than their counterparts in Arabic. Pun in Arabic rhetoric, as a matter of fact, is much more limited in their scope than what we have in the contemporary stylistic studies in other languages such as English, French etc. However, Arabic still has different types and subtypes of pun where this feature could help stylisticians enrich the process of formulating different formal definitions and rules for pun. This case could also result in making these definitions look more established and sometimes intricate. Evans and Evans (1957:400-401) define pun, used by

the native speakers of English, as a "play on words, the use of a word in two different applications, or the use of two different words which are pronounced alike, in such away as to present an incongruous idea and excite our sense of ludicrous". Similarly, Partington (2009:1794) maintains that "punning is the bisociative play between two sound sequences". Clearly, the last two definitions cannot be accepted by Arab rhetoricians. First, they do not differentiate between what is pun proper and what is paronomasia. Paronomasia is a phonologically oriented (i.e. form – oriented) scheme and it is of too many different types. Pun in Arabic has nothing to do with the forms of words. Second, pun in Arabic rhetoric occurs within the domain of only one lexical item resulting in two semantic possibilities. Paronomasia depends on the conception of repeating either the same lexical item or bringing in a word similar or near - similar to another in form. So, the rhetorical techniques, which are used to produce various sorts of paronomasia in Arabic, are completely different from those which are used to produce puns. Furthermore, the two schemes are of totally divergent rhetorical qualities. They have entirely dissimilar applications produced by diverse analytical procedures. Besides, formulating puns is a creative experience in Arabic whereas paronomasia is a mere mechanical work (see section 3).

Leech (1969:209) presents a more comprehensive and productive definition of pun. He (ibid) defines pun as a "foregrounded lexical ambiguity which may have its origin either in homonymy or polysemy". As asserted by Tóth (2010:8), the polysemy–homonymy distinction is clear and unproblematic for the first sight. Homonyms are unrelated words share the same spoken and written form, while a word that has two or more different, but related meanings is polysemous. This distinction is not seen to be universal as far as the constitution of pun is concerned. The second part of this distinction is not operative in Arabic. Corbett (1966:441), on the other hand, looks at pun as representing "generic names for those figures which make a play on words". Hanks (1979:1183) put forward a definition of pun which is more or less similar to

the previous ones. He (ibid) says that pun is "the use of words or phrases to exploit ambiguities and innuendoes in their meaning, usually for humorous effect; a play on words". The first part of this definition may be considered closer to what the Arab rhetoricians want the pun to be. Play on words, on the other hand, is a completely rejected concept to be part of Arabic pun. Cruse (2000:108) explains the nature of the ambiguous words that always refers to in the definitions of pun. He says that "these words are multiple senses that exhibit the phenomenon that (we) call antagonism: you cannot focus your attention on two or more readings at the same time. For instance, when you utter or hear the sentence (We finally reached the bank), it is either the "financial institution" or the "river bank" sense that becomes active for the word bank. He adds that "the speaker will have one reading in mind, and the hearer will be expected to recover that reading on the basis of contextual clues: the choice cannot normally be left open" (ibid). Manser and Turton (1987:558) suggest another definition which is not essentially different from the above - stated ones. They define pun as "a humorous or witty use of a word which has two meanings, both of which are simultaneously evoked, or two words which have the same or similar sound".

Arab rhetoricians believe that a number of basic concepts are always implied in the structure of the definitions of pun, which have been formulated within the framework of western rhetorical tradition. For example, puns are words which have multiple meanings; some words sound like others; puns are playing on words used in a witty way in two senses more or less incongruous and so on and so forth.

Finally, I would like to suggest that in the formulation of a standard   and comprehensive definition of pun one must treat pun as being an aesthetic collection of rhetorical illusion: artistic imagination, ambiguity vagueness and obscurity, all or some of which take place in one word   having two semantic values one is clear-cut and the other is far-fetched. The clear-cut (straightforward) meaning is not intended as a pun but used by the speaker / writer (author) just to cover the pun and obscure its

far-fetched meaning for it represents the intended target. So, there is some natural or contextual connection between the first and the second messages of the word in question. It is also important to adequately capture the distinction between (polysemy) ambiguity and vagueness, in the structure of modern definitions of pun, on the basis that their use is restricted to denotational rather than referential phenomena (For more details on this issue, see Dunbar: 2000 cited in Böhmerova 2010:30).

2- Typology

Arabic puns may be classified into four major types in accordance with the rhetorico-logical and analytical criteria used by Arab rhetoricians. These four types of Arabic pun can also be divided into further subtypes each of which is used in a certain rhetorico-semantic domain. This case might suggest that Arabic pun is quite complicated in its structure on one hand and highly restricted in its semantic use on the other.

These four types of pun are governed and controlled by a logico-semantic contextual framework which determines both their immediate and far-fetched meanings. According to this criterion, pun is divided into ?at-Tawriyyah ?al-Mujaradah (stripped-off pun), ?at-Tawriyyah ?al-Murashaḥah (strengthened pun) , ?at-Tawrriyah ?al-Mubayyinah (clarifying pun) and ?at-Tawrriyyah ?al-Muhayyah (preparing pun).

In what follows, each of these divisions and subdivisions is further explained and supported by empirical data in order to make the interested reader feel the subtle differences between them. It will also make the reader appreciate the great efforts which have been exerted by Arab rhetoricians to arrive at this level of approaching and analyzing rhetorical issues within the subject of pun.

No detailed reference will be made to the well – known western typology of puns since this study is not meant to be contrastive. Also taking such a step is certainly beyond the limited scope of the present work. Briefly speaking, in the West, rhetoricians mostly concentrate on a number of phonologically -

oriented rhetorical figures, which have homophonic, homographic and / or homonymic nature, and consider them major types of pun. Arab rhetoricians treat these western puns as types of paronomasia, therefore they are seen as non- puns in Arabic rhetoric.

2-1 The Stripped-off Pun

As the term suggests, neither the requirements of the punned with (?al-mu:warra: bihi), which normally represents the immediate meaning, nor those of the punned to (?al-mu:warra: 9anhu), which are represented by the remote meaning, are mentioned in the text. In other words, the text which usually contains this sort of pun is completely devoid of such requirements. Consider the following Quranic text:

<div dir="rtl">

الرّحمنُ على العرش اِستوىٰ.

</div>

(God) Most Gracious
Is firmly established
On the Throne (of authority)

Ali (1937:p:790), Su:rah XX, ?a:yah 5, Ṭa:ha:

In the analysis of this Quranic text, we might be faced by a very compact, concise and beautifully designed text. In other words, the overall semantic structure of this text is completely unique, namely, not human, not a man – made text, a text created and revealed by Allah Almighty. As has already been said, the requirements for the two pillars of the pun are not provided since it is a stripped-off pun. The pun in this text lies in the word **"اِستوىٰ"(?istawa:)** (lit.to sit). The literal meaning here represents the immediate semantic value. It is used to play the role of providing a concrete image of Allah Almighty which is rejected by most Muslims. Thus, the other meaning (i.e.to assume power) is preferred. It actually represents the far-fetched (deep) meaning (the pun) which is the real intended image. This Quranic text, which has reached the highest degree of beauty, is considered by most Arab and Muslim rhetoricians and exegetists

as representing a magnificent pun referring to the absolute power and authority.

It seems to me that this text could also be looked at from a different   angle and consequently reveals a different image. The same punnable word "استوىٰ" may contain a strengthened pun since the prepositional phrase "على العرش" (lit. on the Throne) is collocated with the immediate meaning (?aṣ-Ṣa9i:di:, no date, p:30). It can also be analyzed as a metonymy which refers to almost the same meaning. The other rhetorical analyses and different interpretations by various Islamic doctrinal schools cannot be covered in this work for a lack of space.

2-2 The Strengthened Pun

In this type of pun, there must be a lexical requirement for the punned with, i.e. the immediate meaning, which should be stated either before or after the punnable word. According to this restriction, the present type of pun is divided into two subtypes:

2-2-1 Pre-restricted Strengthened Pun

Consider the following Quranic text:

والسماءَ بنيناهَا بأيدٍ و اِنَّا لموسِعونَ.

**With power and skills
Did We construct
The Firmament:
For it is We Who create
The vastness of space**

Ali (1937:p:1427), Su:rah LI, ?a:yah 47, ?a<u>th</u>-<u>Tha</u>:riya:t

This sort of pun might be felt as being quite vague since the text "بنيناها" (lit. We constructed) has heightened and strongly enhanced the punnable word "بأيدٍ " (lit. with hands). This strengthening is heavily reflected on the immediate meaning, which is not intended, whereas the remote meaning intended by Allah Almighty is left without any qualification. In my opinion, this is the reason, which makes the intended meaning become

much less obvious than the immediate one and then made far-fetched in order to carry the subtle pun. The immediate meaning of this Quranic text, which does not represent any pun, is clear whereas the remote meaning is obscure. The pun in this text, which is accomplished by the prepositional phrase **"بأيدٍ"**, refers to "the superiority of the Creator".

2-2-2 Post-restricted Strengthening Pun
          Consider the following poetic text:

<div dir="rtl">

تسوقُ للقلبِ التعبْ   وقلتُ هذيْ راحة

(Cit. in ?al-Qazwi:ni:, 1904:359)

</div>

          Here, the lexical item **"التعبْ"** (lit fatigue) is regarded to be representing the requirement of the punned with word. It is stated after the punnable word **"راحة"** referring to its immediate meaning **"comfort"** whereas its intended or remote meaning, which represents the pun in this word, is **"a kind of wine"**. Thus, a fine vagueness is accomplished by this pun.

2-3 The Clarifying Pun
          As is the case with the strengthened pun in Arabic rhetoric, the present type of pun is divided into two subtypes. In order for this type of pun to work properly, the speaker\writer should provide a lexical requirement for the "punned to" word placed before or after the word which carries the pun. Thus, we have pre and post restricted clarifying puns:

2-3-1 Pre-restricted Clarifying Pun
          The most well-known textbook example for this sort of pun is the following poetic line by the famous Arab poet ?al-Buḥturi: (1972:72):

<div dir="rtl">

بالحُسن تَمْلُحُ في القلوبِ وتَعْذُبُ   ووراءَ تسديةِ الوشاح مَلِيَّة

</div>

          The pun, in this poetic text, can be located in the lexical item **"تَمْلُحُ"** (lit. to become salty) and this is the immediate

meaning which is "the punned with" and of course it is not intended by the poet. The other meaning of the word is **"ملاحة"** (lit. bewitchment). This is the remote meaning "the punned to" which is intended by the poet. The requirement which has triggered this pun is represented by the expression **"مَلِيَّة بالحُسن"** (lit. full of beauty).

2-3-2 Post-restricted Clarifying Pun

In this subtype of clarifying pun, the requirement of "the punned to" word is normally placed after the punnable word. This could be evidently seen in the following poetic line (cited in 9ati:q, 1971:121):

<div dir="rtl">

أرىٰ ذنبَ السرحان في الأفق طالعاً   فهلْ ممكنٌ أنَّ الغزالة تطلعُ؟

</div>

In this poetic line, we have two possible puns the first of which lies in the expression **"ذنبَ السرحان"** (lit.the wolf's tail) representing the immediate or "punned with" meaning which is not intended by the poet. This expression may also refer to **"the light of the day"** which represents the remote or "the punned to" meaning intended by the poet. This analysis is semantically objective and logically reasonable since this meaning is clarified by placing its lexically suitable requirement **"طالعاً"** (lit.appearing) after the remote meaning.

The second pun lies in the word **"الغزالة"** referring to the known wild animal (deer).It represents the immediate or "punned with" meaning which is not intended by the poet. In addition to that, it refers to the **"sun",** to represent the remote or "punned to" meaning. It is the intended meaning and it is clarified by placing its requirement, the word **"تطلعُ"** (lit. to appear), right after it.

2-4 The Preparing Pun

The other major type of Arabic pun is ?at-Tawriyyah ?al-Muhayy?ah (the preparing pun). This pun is subdivided into the following subtypes:

2-4-1 Pre-textually Restricted Preparing Pun

In this type, the pun becomes fully prepared by a word stated in a preceding text as can be seen in the following poetic line by the Arab poet ?ibn Sana:? ?al-Mulk (1958:26) praising the king ?al-Muzdhaffar the governor of Aleppo (Ḥalab):

فروحتَ عن قلبٍ و أفرجتَ عن كربِ   وسيرُكَ فينا سيرةً عمريـــــــــة

فأظهرتَ ذاكَ الفرضَ منْ ذلكَ الـندبِ   وأظهرتَ فينا منْ سميّكَ سُنـة

The pun here is implied in the two lexical items **"الفرض"** and **"الـندب"** (lit. compulsory and optional orders) respectively. Firstly, these two words could refer to **"?al-?aḥka:m ?ash-Shar9iyyah"** (lit. judiciary orders) which represent the "punned with" or the immediate meaning. Secondly, the lexical item **"الفرضَ"** could also mean **"العطاء"** (giving things away) and the other lexical item **"الندبِ"** can refer to "the man who is very fast in solving the problems of the needy people, or the man who is not hesitant in life in general". These two lexical senses represent "the punned to" or remote meaning. Mentioning the word **"سُنةً"** (i.e. religiously and socially accepted sayings and deeds) is considered to be decisive for preparing the puns in the two words. In addition, this word is seen as being the deciding factor for grasping these two words as referring to "judiciary orders" which then make the puns seem natural and readily accepted by receivers.

2-4-2 Post- textually Restricted Preparing Pun

As the subtitle suggests, pun is prepared by post – qualification. namely, stating a lexical item right after the pun in order to be post- qualified. Consider the following poetic lines by the poet 9umar bin ?abi: Rabi:9ah :

قالوا: مريضٌ لايعودُ مريضـــــــا   لولا التطيرُ بالخلافِ وانّهـــــــــمْ

لأكونَ "مندوباً" قضى مفروضا   لقضيتُ نحبيْ في جنابكَ خدمةً

(Cited in ?al – Qazwi:ni:, 1998 p:332)

The word **"مندوباً"** in the above text might be referring to a "moaned dead man" which represents "the punned to", remote or intended meaning by the poet. It can also refer to one of the "judiciary orders", as has already been mentioned, which represents "the punned with" or immediate meaning. The pun in the word **"مندوباً"** is prepared to play this role in the above text simply through stating the word **"مفروضاً"** (lit. obligatory) right after it. If this word has not been placed in this position the word **"مندوباً"** would never be completely grasped by receivers and as a result the pun cannot be prepared.

2-4-3 Collocationally Restricted Preparing Pun

In this framework, puns occur in two juxtaposed lexical items each of which is seen as being essential, in its context, to prepare the pun in the other. If this collocational relationship is destroyed we can never have this specific type of pun. What has been said just now can be clearly exposed in the following poetic text by the Arab poet 9umar bin ?abi: Rabi:9ah (Jabbu:ri: 1935: vol. 2 p:94):

<div dir="rtl">

عَمْرُكَ اللهُ كيفَ يلتقيان؟   أيّها المُنْكحُ الثُريا سُهيلاً

وسهيلٌ اذاما أستقلَ يماني   هيَ شآميةٌ اذا ما أستقلتِ

</div>

To fully understand the above text, it is necessary to be familiar with its historical background. The story behind formulating these two poetic lines is that there was a man called **"Suhayl"** happened to marry a woman named **"?ath-Thurayyah"** . Both are mentioned in the above text. As the story says, there was a big difference between these two people, **?ath-Thurayyah** was very well-known for her exceptional beauty whereas **Suhayl** was very well-known for his unbearable ugliness. . **?ath-Thurayyah** might also refer to the daughter of Ali bin 9abdullah bin ?al-Ḥa:riṯ bin ?umayyah ?al-?aṣghar and Suhayl may be referring to the son of 9abd ?ar-Raḥma:n bin 9awf or referring to another famous man who used to live in Yemen.

This short historical background may make the task of pinpointing the pun/s in this poetic text quite possible and relatively easy. Thus, it becomes clear now that the pun /s lie in the expression **"الثريا و سهيل "** (lit. the Pleiades and Canopus) which constitute a nominal collocation .

It is quite right to say here that the (+ human) proper noun **?ath-Thurayyah** represents "the punned to", or remote meaning intended by the poet while the second rhetorico-semantic possibility indicated by this proper noun referring to the well - known star named Pleiades which is (- human). This is "the punned with" or immediate meaning which is not intended by the poet. **Suhayl**, as a (+human) proper noun, on the other hand, can also represent "the punned to", remote or intended meaning. And the other semantic possibility is to refer to the star named Canopus which is (- human).

Now, we could rightly claim that unless the word **"?ath-Thurayyah"** is mentioned in this poetic text, which refers to a well-known star in the sky, the receiver can never pay attention to the word **Suhayl** despite the fact that it is also referring to a well - known star . Each of them is equally important to qualify the other since they are linked by this strong collocational relationship .Therefore, both play very productive role in establishing these preparing puns in this rhetorical context.

It is important to state, in this connection, that the puns in the above poetic text cannot be analyzed as strengthened or clarified since strengthening and clarifying puns cannot exist unless there is a specific requirement for each of them. The difference between the word/s which makes the pun preparing and that which makes it strengthened or clarified is that if the word which is responsible for creating the preparing pun is not stated then there would be no pun whatsoever whereas the words, which are mentioned in the strengthened and clarified puns, are just playing the role of being strengthening and clarifying factors. In other words, these words are not determining the existence or non-existence of these two types of Arabic pun.

3- Pun and Paronomasia

Most of the features of pun in Arabic rhetoric have already been explored. Many definitions of pun, its possible types and subtypes have been presented and explained in some detail and supported with representative, illustrative and empirical data. The rhetorical tradition in the West in general considers pun and paronomasia as being whole and part. To be more detailed, in the West, paronomasia is used as a type of pun. This issue is always and repeatedly implied in any definition of pun. Thus, pun for western rhetoricians is produced under the conception of being "a play on words" whether using a word in two different applications (meanings) or using words which are alike or nearly alike in their phonological structures but different in meaning. As an Arab rhetorician, the use of a lexical item in two different semantic values could perfectly represent the core of pun in general whereas using lexical items that are alike or nearly alike in their phonological forms but different in meaning is too far away from the conception of pun. This issue should rather be studied within the domain of paronomasia which represents a different rhetorical field in Arabic rhetoric.

To state this case differently and more logically, both pun and paronomasia are lexical in nature, puns in Arabic occur in lexical frameworks which are completely different from that of paronomasia .Pun takes place in a lexical domain which consists of one word containing two major meanings whereas paronomasia occurs in a lexical domain involving two or more lexical items which are similar or almost similar in form. That is to say, these lexical items might have the same phonological form repeated twice or they may have a certain amount of phonological similarity. All sorts (forms) of paronomasia, which are too many in number, could be used as puns in the western rhetoric but none of them could be used this way in Arabic rhetoric.

Arab rhetoricians believe that paronomasia is one of the sublime components of rhetoric. This fact is also agreed upon by Arab linguists and exegetists. Pun, on the other hand, is regarded by Arabs as one of the components of lucidity in rhetoric and

therefore it is seen by Arab rhetoricians as important as the other components representing the whole circle of lucidity in Arabic rhetoric such as simile, metaphor, metonymy, mental trope, linguistic trope and synecdoche.

To provide more support to what we have already claimed, Newmark (1988:217) states that the English words "piece and peace" could be used in a context as a pun since they have the same phonological structure [pi:s] and are semantically different. In addition to that, in the western rhetoric, antanaclasis, which should in reality be a type of paronomasia because it is
 based on repeating a word in two different senses, is used as a pun while it is much better to be analyzed as a complete paronomasia:

**Learn a "<u>craft</u>" so that when you grew older
You will not have to earn your living by "<u>craft</u>"**
                                            (Corbett,
1966:441)
A case of incomplete paronomasia can be clearly seen below. Using the following examples as representing puns in the Western rhetorical tradition lacks rhetorical objectivity. It is more logical to be termed as an incomplete paronomasia since the two underlined lexical items are similar in their phonological forms and different in terms of orthography:

**It was a "<u>foul</u>" act to steel my "<u>fowl</u>"
(ibid)**
Syllepsis, which is the use of a word understood differently in relation to two or more other words modified by it, is used as a productive technique of punning in western rhetoric. This technique can never produce, in my opinion, a single real pun. It rather produces an underlying complete paronomasia. Consider the following:

He "lost" his hat and his temper [i.e., He "<u>lost</u>" his hat and "<u>lost</u>" his temper]

(ibid)

To conclude, the difference in the Arab and Western rhetorical approaches to the question of pun and paronomasia stems from the fact that Arab rhetoricians work in a very restricted and limited lexical semantic domain. They do not adopt the strategy of considering pun as "playing on words" in order not to mix pun with other rhetorical schemes such as paronomasia. Western rhetoricians, on the other hand, work in a more flexible lexical semantic framework. This lexical semantic flexibility comes as a natural result from the adoption of the strategy of "playing on words" which offers the logical justification of mixing pun with paronomasia and other rhetorical figures in order to accomplish a wide range of stylistic objectives. Arabic pun does not need to achieve such a wide area of objectives since its non-flexible lexical semantic domain is used as a positive factor to achieve the objective of formulating proper puns and at the same time keeping this feature always operative in the question of differentiating between what is pun proper and what is paronomasia proper . These figures of speech should always be kept apart because they are different schemes having different senses and produced by different rhetorical techniques.

4- Functions of Pun

As an established fact, pun in Arabic rhetoric is used to add energy, dynamism and color to the text in order to achieve certain aesthetic values among other things. It also assumes various functions and accomplishes certain purposes the most noticeable of which are the following:

1- **Establishing aesthetic domains:** It seems to me that this function is fulfilled through the artistic values implicated in the structure of pun. It is considered to be the most expressive feature in Arabic puns in general and the Quranic ones in particular.

The aesthetic values that are found in the structure of the Arabic puns usually create certain additional semantic hints to sustain the overall meaning of the rhetorical statement in order to be more clarified and noticeable. This function is beautifully crystallized in the Quranic texts. It is penetrated in the structure of this figure of speech to please, entertain and even amuse readers and receivers   and make them have some feeling that they have never had before. Consider the following Quranic text:

وهوَ الذِيْ يَتوفاكُم بالليلِ وَيَعلَمُ ما جَرَحتُم بالنّهار

**It is He Who doth take
Your souls by night,
And hath knowledge of all
That you have done by day:**

Ali (1937:p:304), Su:rah VI, ?a:yah 60, ?al-?an9a:m

The utterance in which this stripped-off pun exists is **"جرحتُم".** It contains two distinct meanings the first of which is literal, immediate obvious (cutting a live human body) and unintended by Allah Almighty. The second meaning (committing sins) is hidden, far-fetched and intended by Allah Almighty. Therefore, it represents the pun in the text in question.

A simple analysis of this Quranic pun reveals compact, concentrated and uniquely formulated details presented in a beautiful and intensified way powerful enough and capable of attracting the attention of readers and receivers alike. In other words, all linguistic and non – linguistic components of this text have been put in an aesthetic mold that can never been found even in the highly poetic styles of non – Quranic Arabic language.

2- **Brevity and conciseness:** A pun in Arabic can create a nice and smart sort of brevity and conciseness in texts that cannot normally be accomplished by literal language. This can be seen in the following poetic lines by the Arab poet Sira:j ?ad-Di:n ?al-Warra:q[1]:

<div dir="rtl">

لقاءَ الموتِ عندَهُمُ الأديبَ   أصونُ أديمَ وَجْهِي عنْ أُناسٍ

ولوْ وافى بهِ لهُمُ حبيـــــبُ   وربُّ الشعرِ عندهُمُ بغيـــــضٌ

</div>

(Cited in ?al – Ja:rim & ?ami:n,1999:276)

The pun here lies in the lexical item **"حبيـــــبُ"**. It refers to two distinct meanings; the first meaning is **"المحبوب"** (lit. the beloved) which is immediate, straightforward and unintended. It is analyzed this way because of the position of the prerequisite word **"بغيـــــضٌ"** (lit.unpleasant) which precedes the punnable word. The second meaning, which is described to be remote, hidden and intended, contains a strengthened pun referring to the very well-known Arab poet ?abu: Tamma:m **Ḥabi:b** bin ?a:ws.

3- **Intentional vagueness and/or ambiguity:** This function is an inherited feature present in the structure of all types of pun in Arabic rhetoric. In other words, it is seen by Arab rhetoricians as a compulsory prerequisite required in the formulation of this figure of speech. Arab rhetoricians even sometimes do not differentiate between pun and ?i:ha:m (vagueness and/or ambiguity).Therefore, they use them interchangeably.

Consider the following poetic text by the Arab poet ?abu: ?al-9ala:? ?al-Ma9arri:[2]:

<div dir="rtl">

بدالٍ يؤمُّ الرسمَ غيّرَهُ النُّقطْ   وحرفٍ كنونٍ تحتَ راءٍ ولمْ يكنْ

</div>

Any native speaker of Arabic, who tries to perceive the above text, will immediately think that the three words **"نون"** (lit.the letter nu:n), **"راء"** (lit.the letter ra:?)

---

[1] d.695 A.H / 1296 A.D
[2] d.449 A.H / 1057 A.D

and"دال" **(lit.the letter da:l)** refer to the names of three characters of the Arabic alphabet. This understanding is supported by the word **"حرف"** **(lit. letter, but in its most generic meaning)** placed before the names of these Arabic letters and used as a lexical semantic trace to serve the overall process of punning. The second trace supporting this understanding comes from the word **"الرسمَ"** **(lit. drawing, i.e. writing)** which means the way or the style of writing these letters. The third and final trace lies in the word **"النُّقَطُ"** **(lit.dots)** referring to the way of dotting these letters. All what we have just said regarding these six words, their immediate meanings and the lexical semantic traces associated with them and supporting their literal meanings are mentioned to mislead the readers/receivers and make them believe that they are not more than just normal Arabic lexical items used by a poet in a normal poetic context (line). Native speakers of Arabic, who are highly competent in Arabic rhetoric in particular, may soon discover that this analysis is far away from being true and that the poet has intended very remote meanings other than the unintended and straightforward senses represented on the surface structure of the poetic line in question. Thus, each of these six words, in reality, has a second sense which is completely different from what we have already mentioned. For example, the sense of the word **"حرف"** **becomes (she –camel)** and ''نون'' **becomes (a weak she – camel with a curved backbone) .**The poet creates these two puns through linking the shape of this she-camel to the curving in the way of writing (drawing) the letter (nu:n) in Arabic , i.e. this she-camel is so weak to the extent that its back looks curving. As a pun, the word **"راء"** is meant to be the present participle of the Arabic verb ''رأى'' which is derived from the Arabic word **"رئة"** (i.e. lung). So, when the cameleer, riding on this she – camel, gently hits her on the lungs with his legs to make her walk faster, he is called **"راءٍ"** in Arabic. This is the remote meaning which is exactly intended by the poet and not the letter (ra:?) .The

letter ra:? is used as a cover to obscure the real sense (i.e. the pun). Again as a pun, the word "دال" is used here as a present participle derived from the verb "دلى،يدلو" (lit.to lift water from a well with a bucket) and not as a name of a letter in the Arabic alphabet. "الدالي" then is a companion in a caravan of camels who performs a number of services one of which is the work of lifting water from a well. In the same way, the word "الرسمَ", as a pun, is used by the poet to indicate traces of demolished houses or places in which dear people are used to live in and not the way of writing words or letters. Finally, the pun in the word "النُقَط" becomes quite clear since it refers to rain rather than to dots. Now, we can appreciate the degree of obscurity, vagueness and /or ambiguity involved in the structure of this text which contains six very beautiful puns all of which are very difficult to be immediately and correctly grasped by Arabs who are not highly competent in Arabic in general and in Arabic rhetoric in particular (see, Ṭaba:nah 1977.vol.2 pp: 938-939 for more details on these puns).

In addition to the above three major functions of pun, we may have some other minor ones such as materializing the abstract entities, adding forcefulness to the details of the expressions used as puns, emphasizing and exaggerating certain shades of meaning contained in puns, producing humor, wittiness, bitterness and irony . These could also be used for ornamental and decorative purposes.

To conclude, puns, in general, and the Quranic ones, in particular, are used for explaining, highlighting, i.e. foregrounding certain linguistic and non-linguistic aspects, features, images and suggestions in order to affect in a specific manner the cognitive capabilities of the readers and receivers of these texts. This could result in creating subtle effects and various semantic values. These effects are oriented by the writers or speakers towards accomplishing one or more of the above-mentioned functions. By punning, the writers or speakers can also show their linguistic and literal abilities to draw the attention of the qualified people

who are capable of dealing with various types and subtypes of pun.

5- Translation and Pun: Some Theoretical Considerations

In reviewing the current approaches to the definition of translation one could arrive at the conclusion that they are varied from one historical period to another. As a natural result, scholars have approached the subject of translation differently (Nida, 1964:161). For instance, Catford (1965:1) defines translation as an "operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another". So, he understands translation as substituting SL meaning by TL meaning (ibid: 35).

Savory (1968:34) believes that translation is considered to be a process which involves conveying SL meaning and style into TL whereas Brislin (1976:1) goes far beyond meaning and style when claiming that translation is, in fact, the transference of thoughts and ideas (For more comprehensive survey on the issue of defining translation, see, Nida, 1964, pp: 161-164).

Translation as a concept is divided by Jakobson (1992:145) into three major types: intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic. The process of translation is seen by him (ibid) as a reported speech in which SM is perceived and transmitted into TM. The SM and TM must be necessarily equivalent to each other.

The theoretical approaches to translation have ranged between word-for-word or literal to free and idiomatic translations. Each of these methods has its own strong and weak points.

Some translation theorists have classified these theoretical approaches according to the nature of the texts to be translated (see, Brower, 1974, and Bassnett-McGuire, 1980).

The French humanist Etienne Dolet (quoted in Bassnett-McGuire, 1980:54ff) believes that a translator should adopt word-for-word rendering in order to arrive at the "spirit of the original". But, literal translation cannot be objective with

literary works since this sort of translation focuses on the word as the translation unit overlooking larger units such as sentence or text as well as the realm of the context of the work and its placement within its natural cultural and historical frames.

In addition to what has been said so far regarding the various views on the approaches of translation, translation theorists cannot forget the importance of the concept of equivalence. Hartmann and Stork (1972:78) provide a general and simple definition of this concept. It is "a word or phrase which corresponds to a similar word or phrase in another language". Catford (1965:27), on the other hand, regards equivalence as "an empirical phenomenon discovered by [bilingual informants] comparing the SL and the TL texts". Van den Broeck (1978:29-30) believes that equivalence represents "the standard relationship between original and translation". So, we could claim that equivalence occupies the heart of the theory of translation so much so that translation process has always been defined according to this central concept. In other words, translation theory and translation practice have always been investigated by translation scholars according to this concept.

Savory (1968:13) asserts the fact that "translation, the surmounting of the obstacle, is made possible by an equivalence of thought that lies behind its different expression". Careful analysis of this quotation would reveal Savory's own understanding of the essential role played by equivalence in translation. To him, differences between languages are regarded to be an intricate barrier to communication, a barrier which, he believes, translation contrives to remove on the basis of equivalence of thought namely cognitive information.

In the translation of literature, equivalence has sometimes been referred to as "similarity", "analogy", "adequacy", "invariance" and "congruence" (see, Van den Broeck in Holmes et al 1978:29 for more details).

It could be propounded that the concept of equivalence has been handled by translation theorists in various ways and from many different angles all of which can be incorporated into two distinct theoretical approaches. The first approach is of purely

linguistic nature whereas the other is described as being non-linguistic, i.e., hermeneutic.

Equivalence may have different types each of which represents an orientation in approaching the process of translation. For instance, we have formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence (for more details, see Nida 1964 pp: 159, 162, 165-171; Catford 1965; Nida and Taber 1969 pp: 12, 14, 24-25, 28 and 200-201; Newmark 1982 A.pp:132-133; Tymoczko 1985:63; Waard and Nida 1986:37-39 and Hatim and Mason 1990:7).

In addition, we have functional equivalence (see, Kachru 1982 and Waard and Nida 1986), textual equivalence (see, Van Dijk 1972), situational equivalence (see, Vinay and Darbelent 1958), cultural equivalence (see, Casagrande 1954), semantic, pragmatic and syntactic equivalence (see, Bassnett-McGuire 1980:27) and lexical equivalence (see, Zgusta 1971:312).

It stands to reason that metaphorical, tropological and sublimic texts cannot be translated unless we have powerful theoretical translating strategies. These strategies can help the workers in the field of translation to score the highest possible degree of fidelity.

Pun, whether considered as a scheme or trope, should be treated as a rhetorical phenomenon which is full of difficulties. Some of these difficulties are of linguistic nature others are culture specific. The linguistically-oriented puns in Arabic rhetoric are usually less problematic than the culturally-oriented ones. However, this does not mean that the first type is devoid of problems and can be easily rendered into other languages. A lot of puns cannot be immediately grasped by native speakers of Arabic unless they are really well – educated and highly competent in Arabic.

Both difficulties need to be thoroughly investigated by translation theorists in order to find out and establish an approach through which translators can find the exact linguistico-cultural equivalents between the SL and TL. For instance, arriving at the most precise and natural equivalent puns between Arabic and English almost always be blocked

particularly because these puns are loaded with cultural aspects. All Quranic puns are in one way or another culturally bound. The cultural specificity of these puns represents the greatest challenge to translators.

The strategies which are to be used in the rendition of Arabic puns into English should take into account these objective considerations. In other words, careful reading of the ST and overcoming its expected difficulties would lead to the stage of thinking about certain theoretical frameworks to guide the process of translation. At this stage, translators can become cognitively motivated to raise some valid questions concerning the necessity of establishing a productive approach that could handle the analyzed text in order to engage in a successful rendition.

Arabic puns, to be objectively translated into English, need to be understood as a domain of aesthetic and literary values created by a net of various images mixed with certain degrees of vagueness, witticisms, collocations and illusions. These pillars and others are presented in a mould expressed as a pun to achieve certain functions intended by the speaker or writer. Puns formulated this way could have different degrees of difficulty. Of course, the final product (mould), as has already been said, is expressed in two distinct semantic values, one is obvious, clear-cut and immediate whereas the other is much less obvious, obscure, and remote and may be far-fetched. Logically, the first semantic value is not intended (and therefore not wanted) by the speaker. It is used just to play the role of being a lexico-semantic trace to cover the real and intended message, which is represented by the pun in the text in question, in order to make it more ambiguous. The second semantic value represents the targeted pun in the text.

Very basic function of pun in Arabic and may be in other languages of the world, is to draw the attention of special groups of people (linguists, rhetoricians, poets, writers , artists , highly educated men etc.) to a certain textual structure which differs from other known types of text, a text with the right touch of a literary flavor.

The functions, which are supposed to be accomplished by puns, are of essential importance in the process of translation. Translators should take into consideration these functions which are naturally implied in the SLM. They must be precisely comprehended in order to be reproduced into the TLM. This would enable the translator to arrive at the closest possible equivalence to the TT and then rendering the original text into the TL with an acceptable degree of accuracy.

The strategies for translating puns are, in actual fact, purely adaptive, adjustmental and substitutional in nature, each of which tends to be shifting a figurative or non-figurative category into a similar or dissimilar one.

It is a commonly known fact among workers in the field of translation that adaptation and adjustment processes are frequently used by translators when working on the lexical level of the text to be translated. These are also adopted in the domain of meaning particularly when the SL and TL belong to two culturally distinct languages. In addition, in translating highly cultural puns such as the Quranic ones, a translator might feel a real need for some sort of cultural substitutional processes to do his work properly.

These principal processes could suggest that the currently used theories of translation are not rigid and productive enough to solve translation problems in the domain of rhetorical figures in general. In other words, these theories are not elaborated and powerful enough to satisfactorily account for all issues of translation practice.

Nida and Taber (1969:107) have put forward three major strategies for translating figurative texts in general. These are: first, shifting from figurative to non-figurative usages; second, shifting from one type of figurative expression to another; and third, shifting non-figurative expression into figurative ones. Theoretically speaking, we could also have strategies to be followed by translators in the rendition of pun. An SL pun might be translated into a TL pun, an SL pun into a TL non-pun and a paraphrased SL pun into a paraphrased TL pun.

The first strategy is quite difficult to apply. For instance, most of the Arabic puns cannot be rendered into English unless we have some sort of cultural overlapping between the two languages which is quite rare. In other words, existence of an overlap of cultural experiences and similarity of semantic associations between the ST and TT can have the power of watering down the cognitive strain experienced on the translator's endeavor to render expressions of pun. Otherwise, he may opt for a TL non-punnable element to substitute the ST pun. This process will frequently be done at the expense of the dynamic effectiveness. Such a process can, in the case of the Quranic puns, destroy the aesthetic values of the pun in question which is created by Allah Almighty.

So, the rendition of the SL pun into TL pun cannot always be empirically verified unless, of course, taking into account different factors on the top of which is the intended reader, the cultural experiences, the semantic associations of the SL pun and the degree of cultural overlap. These requirements, then, play the deciding factor in the translatability of pun in general.

It seems to be true that ST and TT often represent two different languages as is the case of Arabic and English. However, they can sometimes have corresponding metaphorical religious texts indicating a number of ideas shared by Muslims and Christians. Even if this possibility exists, the substitution of the SME for that of the TME must neither be based on the shared linguistic elements of the two texts alone nor be established   on the basis of a corresponding or similar image involved in the two texts. It should rather be established on the function of the pun because it involves the shared image besides other linguistic and non-linguistic elements.

Translators following the strategy of rendering an SL pun into a TL non-pun concentrate on the communicative purpose of the pun where it is regarded to be meaningful in the TL if it is reduced to its basic sense. In other words, in case the TL fails, for one reason or another, to provide an equivalent pun expression to the SL pun, going then for the literal, i.e. non-pun meaning will represent the second and only option available for

the translator. The SL pun expression in such a situation is reproduced as a non-pun through a suitable translation method. Komissarov (1985:210-212) believes that TL lacking equivalence or the SL metaphor is unacceptable in the TL has always been occurred in translation due to TL's inappropriate connotations.

What has just been said may indirectly indicate the non-existence of any solid, powerful and comprehensive approach in the domain of rendering metaphors. Workers in the translation field feel quite reluctant to account for their choices to the extent that Newmark (1988:167) has described this state as "metarophobia", e.g. uneasiness at metaphor's presence.

It is essential to state that rendering SL pun into TL non-pun is considered to be a flexible and productive strategy. It could be the only choice to be followed by translators for the differences which naturally exist between the SL and TL norms, cultures and experiences. Translators of the Arabic Quranic puns in the current Quranic translations always resort to this strategy because they are always faced with the TL culture lacking the required corresponding features to the pun in Arabic.

The third strategy, i.e. a paraphrased SL pun rendered into a paraphrased TL pun, is the simplest and most liberal strategy that cannot whatsoever result in an acceptable standard of fidelity. It depends on grasping the denotation behind the SL pun and then rendering this understanding into a similar one in the TL. Here, only the communicative values of the two texts could draw the attention of the translator. This strategy should be used just in case the previous two translation strategies failed to work properly. That is to say, this strategy represents the last resort since its application may result in losing a lot of subtle aesthetic and non-aesthetic values. Other translators may completely ignore the pun especially when they feel that there is no possible way of transferring the SL pun into the TLT. Having this situation may also push translators to the strategy of creating a new pun in the TLT instead of sticking to the original one since it is blocked by certain cultural or non – cultural factors.

5-1 Speculations on Translating Arabic culture-specific puns

　　　　Before analyzing and discussing a number of selected texts, taken as simple examples of the Arabic culture – specific puns, one should bear in mind that the structural and semantic unity of these puns as well as the non-cultural ones constitute various subtle linguistic structures. Arabic puns could either be used in small clauses or in long and complex Quranic texts. This case is regarded to be an important factor in the task of rendering these puns into other languages because it definitely affects the quality of the translation.

　　　　Furthermore, translators, who are not acquainted with the field of Arabic language; syntax, semantics, lexicon, rhetoric and culture, may think that culture-specific puns in this language are syntactically, semantically and culturally clear and straightforward. But as soon as they get deeply involved in the process of rendering these puns into other languages, which are linguistically and culturally different from Arabic such as English, serious problems soon appear on the surface. In other words, they will immediately discover that unless they are competent enough to deal with these aspects of pun as well as the structural and cultural features of the TL pun, rendering these puns into other languages becomes almost an impossible task to do.

　　　　Let us consider the following Arabic simple puns used in small clauses of kinship terms:

1- **هذا أخي** (lit. This is my brother).
2- **هذه أختي** (lit. This is my sister).
3- **هذا إبني** (lit. This is my son).
4- **هذه إبنتي** (lit. This is my daughter).
5- **هذا أبي** (lit. This is my father).
6- **هذه أمي** (lit. This is my mother).
7- **هذا عَمّي** (lit. This is my uncle) paternal uncle, father's brother
8- **هذه عَمّتي** (lit. This is my aunt) paternal aunt, father's sister
9- **هذا إبنُ أخي** (lit. This is my nephew).
10- **هذه إبنة أخي** (lit. This is my niece).

11-**هذا جَدّي** (lit. This is my grandfather).
12-**هذهِ جَدّتي** (lit. This is my grandmother).

The sentences in (1) and (2) are very frequently used in everyday language. Their literal senses are quite straightforward whereas their non-literal senses refer to a very chummy, warm and close relationship between two people. When further analyze these two seemingly simple small clauses, subtle and nice puns may immediately emerge. Native speakers of Arabic do not have any problem whatsoever in grasping the exact intention behind these structures in case they are provided with the right social background of the situation.

The non-literal senses of these sentences can also be used in English but in a narrower range. The difference in the frequency of use of the non-literal senses of the structures in (1) and (2) can help in pinpointing the cultural gap between the two languages. In other words, the cultural difference between Arabic and English implied in the semantic/pragmatic content of these two sentences is triggered by the difference in the range of their non – literal uses which is social in nature.

The concepts of brotherhood and fraternization (friendship) in the West are different from those which are adopted by Arabs and Muslims. In the West these concepts are more or less materially-oriented whereas in the Arab and Muslim World they are religiously as well as psychically-oriented. This difference refers implicitly to this cultural gap between the SLT and TLT. It means that an English person could expectedly use this non-literal sense in a situation such as listening to a ceremony at a church whereas an Arab or Muslim uses the same sense almost everywhere without any pre-thinking due to certain established Islamic cultural rules and social principles.

Now, we could claim that the semantic features of the non-literal senses of the STs are similar to those of the TTs when a religious institution is involved in the context of situation. Thus, we might say that the original structures and the translated ones in this case have some sort of cultural overlapping. As a result,

the rendition of these sentences into English or vice versa can be relatively easy. However, the cultural equivalence here is not complete. It is rather partial. In the non-religious (and non-literal) situations, on the other hand, translating structures (1) and (2) as **"This is my friend"** is much more acceptable by the TL audience. So, we may claim that the concept of, "friendship" is more frequently used in the Western culture whereas "religious brotherhood" is much more preferred among Arabs and Muslims.

The lexical items **"أخ"** (lit. brother) and **"أخت"** (lit. sister) are regarded to be very productive punnable words in Arabic. They are used in so many various situations most of which can theoretically serve the general purpose of punning. These words have two major semantic values the first of which is straightforward (literal) representing the real sense of "brotherhood and sisterhood", (i.e. brother and sister in blood). The second is less obvious and remote to some extent representing (pun) and referring to brother and sister in hard times (i.e. they are representing religiously, culturally and socially - oriented brotherhood and/or friendship).

When translators come across lexical items such as these, used in cultural and metaphorical frameworks, then exploring the denotative (literal) and connotative (user's) meanings of these words becomes the first step to be taken. The second important step is to look for the most appropriate equivalents for these lexical items. It is an extremely necessary measure taken by translators in order to render the SLT accurately and with a high degree of fidelity. Finally, if translators have failed to overcome all the cultural setbacks in the SLT, explaining the cultural load of such structures in the margin would be of great help to make the translation look more natural and acceptable by the TL audience.

Structures (3) and (4) can also be used as puns in Arabic in a way which is somehow or another similar to the use of (1) and (2). The difference between these two sentences is that when we say **"هذا إبني"** (lit. this is my son), the translation cannot be

considered completely accurate for this Arabic structure could mean two things:

a. This is my son (this is like my son)
b. This is my son (this is my own son.i.e. I am his biological father).

  So, the underlying structure of (a) refers to an emphatic simile in Arabic rhetoric, which is meant to be a pun, whereas the text in (b) refers to the literal and immediate meaning, which is usually not intended by the speaker, but may rarely be understood differently by members of the audience.

    History of Arabic culture provides us with an incident that could be used to support the above claim and clearly reveal the difference between the two uses of the Arabic word **"ابن"** (lit. son). The fourth Caliph Ali bin ?abi: Ṭa:lib (May Allah be pleased with him) was in a very good relationship with the reverend Companion Muḥammad bin ?abi: Bakr (May Allah be pleased with him) . He liked him as one of his own sons. Once the Caliph wanted to express his gratitude and respect towards this Companion, he said "Muḥammad is my son but he is ?abu: Bakr's off-spring". Here, Ali bin ?abi: Ṭa:lib has used both meanings in the same situation in order to emphasize the fact that he very much liked ?abu: Bakr's own son (Muḥammad). He could neither say "Muḥammad is my own son" because he is not nor can he say (Muḥammad is my son) as a pun for this statement in this context might indirectly hurt the reputation of other people. So to avoid this situation, the ambiguity in the text must be unraveled through a disambiguation procedure that works at the linguistic/rhetorical level. This   technique can guide the receiver to the exact understanding of the intended pun (Simpson, 2003:28).

    The instances (5-12) also contain kinship punnable words in Arabic. These words (father, mother, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, grandfather and grandmother) are less frequently used as puns by Arabs in comparison to the kinship words in (1-4). However, the same approach can be applied to these sentences in order to explore their pun's distinctive features. All puns used

in (1-12) and even the other ones that are to be analyzed and discussed are based on intentional ambiguities which are designed to manipulate the language and deliberately mislead the listener/reader (Sageder, 2010:58). In Arabic rhetoric deliberate misleading is not directed to all members of the community. It is rather intended by the speaker/author to misguide a certain group of people and at the same time lead others to a complete understanding of the intended message.

Although the following interrogative sentence is still within the circle of kinship terms, the context in which it is used is totally different. Suppose that an Arab asks a beautiful lady the following question:

13- ؟ كيفَ حالُ الخالِ   (lit. How is the uncle?) maternal uncle, mother's brother.

Here, the receiver should have the ability to grasp the real speaker's intention of the word "خال" since this word could mean something different from what is directly refer to as a maternal uncle. In this context, it could also mean a mole (beauty spot).

We can claim that this situation could become much more intricate especially in case the addressee has both a maternal uncle and a mole at the same time. If she has just one of them, the speaker's intention will be so clear and then there would be no problem at all. To be more detailed, if the addressee has a maternal uncle but has no mole, the reference will be crystal clear and the speaker's intention in this case refers to her maternal uncle. The second possibility, if the addressee has a mole but has no maternal uncle, the reference in this case is to the mole where the rhetorical function is to make some sense of humor. As has already been said, a person who has both (i.e. a mole and a maternal uncle) may be faced with a difficulty of how as an addressee exactly recognize the real intention made by the addressor unless she has some contextual clues that might help figure out the intended reference.

The sentence in (13) has two major semantic interpretations each of which represents an independent intention (reference); one is obvious, immediate and literal, which is:

c. How is the uncle? (How is your maternal uncle, mother's brother?),

and the other is less obvious, remote or far-fetched (i.e. pun), which is:

d. How is the uncle? (How is your mole?)

To translate the pun in (13), we should first realize that this sentence is linguistically and culturally constrained. The salient linguistic meaning of the word **"خال"** in (c) is quite clear in Arabic as referring to a maternal uncle. English native speakers, on the other hand, do not show any difference between maternal and paternal uncles due to cultural and linguistic restrictions. They do not differentiate between **" عم "** and **" خال "** as is the case in Arabic .This situation causes a further difficulty (ambiguity) for the translator from Arabic into English. It has created an additional cultural problem in English for the Arab translators. So, the sentence in (c) can mean either maternal or paternal uncle as far as the TL audience is concerned. If the addressee has both options, the pun here may be lost and replaced by a linguistic ambiguity. The situation has become more complicated. It becomes not a matter of distinguishing mole from uncle but rather distinguishing mole from paternal and maternal uncles leading the translation to be a target language-oriented rather than a source language-oriented pun. Providing the TL audience with a margin is very much required and necessary in this case. The second pun in (13) refers to the mole rather than to any of the two types of uncle. It clearly represents a far-fetched reference.

Gender, as a syntactic feature, participates in creating additional culture - specific puns in Arabic rhetoric. Consider the following:

14- **هذا رجلٌ حيٌّ**   (lit. This is a live man)

15- **هذهِ إمرأةٌ حيّةٌ**   (lit. This is a live woman)

16- **هذا رجلٌ مصيبٌ**   (lit. This is a right man)

17-   **هذهِ إمرأةٌ مصيبة**   (lit. This is a right woman)

18-   **هذا رجلٌ حنفيٌّ**   (lit. This is a Ḥanafi man) [1]

19-   **هذهِ إمرأةٌ حنفيّة**   **(**lit. This is a Ḥanafi woman)

As can be evidently seen, instances (14, 16 and 18) have no puns at all. They are normal sentences which lack any significant rhetorical trope. This state is a natural result since the masculine gender used in these small clauses prevents triggering any type of pun in Arabic rhetoric. On the contrary, the feminine gender used in (15, 17 and 19) is regarded to be the natural and direct reason behind triggering pun in Arabic. The sentence (15) in comparison to its counterpart in (14) can be perceived differently by Arabic native speakers. This sentence has two interpretations:

e. This is a live woman (This is a live woman).

f. This is a live woman (This is a snake).

Of course, the non-literal and idiomatic sense in (f) is the one which is intended by the speaker. The sense in (e) is used by the speaker to cover the pun in (f) and make it misleading to a certain extent. The nature of the pun in (f) is to some extent similar to the nature of the emphatic simile in Arabic rhetoric (see, "a" p: 30). In other words, the underlying structure of the sentence in (f) is similitive and hyperbolic. A mixture of simile with hyperbole makes this pun more realistic and therefore more acceptable by the receiver/reader. This rhetorical framework very much helps to draw an image for the woman in the text described to behave like a snake rather than being a real snake which is not.

If we compare the sentence in (16) with its counterpart in (17) we will find out that the first instance is quite straightforward whereas the second has two readings and the reason for this semantic difference is the feminine gender as well. These meanings are:

g. This is a right woman (This is a right woman).

h. This is a right woman (This is a catastrophic woman "or" this woman is like a catastrophe).

---

[1] Hanificism an orthodox school of theology founded by ?abu: Ḥani:fah d.150 A.H / 767 A.D

The last two sentences, (18 and 19) can be analyzed in the same fashion where the first instance has only one direct (literal) meaning and the second has two different senses. The feminine gender is the only reason for trigging the second sense (i.e. the pun). The sentence (19) can have the following two interpretations:

i. This is a Hanafi woman (This is a Hanafi woman).

j. This is a Hanafi woman (This is a talkative woman).

The instance in (j) has a nice pun where a woman is likened to a tap when turned on (See, "a" p: 30 and "f" p: 32). So, this woman can not stop talking unless she is forced to do so (turned off like a tap of water).The emphatic similitive structure makes this pun more acceptable where the woman in (19) is described to behave like a tap rather than being a real one which is not. The other details of the analysis of (16, 17, 18, and 19) as well as the used analytical procedures are similar to what has already been done in (14-15).

20- هذا رجلٌ حجّاجٌ (lit. This is a man who very often makes pilgrimage to Mecca)

The sentence in (20) could be interpreted in two different ways as in the following:

k. This is a man who very often makes pilgrimage to Mecca (This is a man who very often makes pilgrimage to Mecca).

l. This is a man who very often makes pilgrimage to Mecca. (A man who is tyrant or cruel "related to the Arab governor of Iraq ?al-Ḥajja:j bin Yousuf ?ath-Thaqafi:").

The analysis of these instances is similar to the previous ones. The sentence (k) is the literal one whereas (l) represents the remote meaning. The pun in (l) cannot be grasped by native speakers of Arabic unless they are acquainted with some aspects of this historical character's life.

Theoretically speaking, any word which has two completely different senses can be used as a pun by linguistically and rhetorically competent native speaker in case this word is used in the right contextual framework. Providing lexical clues in the text in which the pun is used is something extra that could either help in figuring out and pinpointing the pun in question or

making it more mysterious or more riddle – like .To give just a few instances in this connection, consider the following Arabic words :

"الحاشيـــة") lit. man's family and/or close friends) could also mean

(**جانب الثوب او حاشية الكتاب**) **,** i.e. the hem of a dress or the edge of a book.The word **" الحاجب"**   (lit. chamberlain) might also mean **"حاجب العين"** (an eyebrow). The word **"الخَاتَم"** (lit. finger ring) may also mean **"الآخِر"** (the last) and so on and so forth.

To conclude, translating Arabic puns into English, as has already been mentioned, should take into account certain convenient strategies, techniques and procedures that are powerful enough to analyze, render and tackle other aspects of this rhetorical trope. Furthermore, the following general steps are also useful:

Translators analyze the text and locate the word which carries the pun. The underlying meaning of the pun is explored for general understanding. Explaining the meaning of the punnable word would make the translation process go smoothly providing that the text is completely free of cultural features. This translation process is literally-oriented for it is arrived at through the literal features of the punnable word. Translators might adopt another way in translating Arabic puns into English. After pinpointing the pun in the text, translators should analyze the remote meaning of the pun through its literal semantic framework and its contextual aspects in an attempt to establish an equivalent, near – equivalent or non-equivalent TL pun.

6- Conclusions

This paper has arrived at a number of conclusions the most important of which are:

1- Rhetorically speaking, pun is a highly – restricted notion in Arabic.

2-Most if not all of the Quranic puns are culture – bound. This restrictive feature makes the task of rendering these puns into other languages an open challenge. As regards puns in Modern Standard Arabic, they are relatively less culture – specific to the extent that they can create some room to translators to deal with certain aspects of this translation difficulty and solve some of its deeply - rooted problems.

3- The classification of puns into a variety of rule – governed types and sub-types is logico - rhetorically organized. It is meticulously done in accordance with their rhetorical features where each type of pun is associated with its own distinct and independent semantic framework.

4- In western rhetoric, puns are frequently mixed with paronomasia despite the fact that they represent two completely different figures of speech. Pun is based on the principle of having a word with two lexical meanings whereas paronomasia is based on the principle of having two or more words similar in their phonological forms but different in their lexical meanings.

5- A number of solutions have been put forward or suggested to deal with the translation of pun in Arabic. They are somehow or another new strategies and translation techniques based on a variety of formal mechanisms to overcome or participate in overcoming the untranslatability of pun.

6- The differences between Arabic and English in classifying, analyzing and translating puns are attributed

to the differences in their linguistic systems and cultural features.

References:

Ali, A.Y. (1937). *The Meaning of the Glorious Quran.* 2 Vols.Cairo: Dār ?al-Kitāb ?al-Misrī Press.

Bassnett-McGuire, S. (1980). *Translation Studies.* London: Methuen and Co.Ltd.

Böhmerová, A. (2010). "Lexical Ambiguity as a Linguistic and Lexicographical Phenomenon in English". In Kehoe, J. *Ambiguity: Conference Proceedings.* Ružomberok: Verbum. pp:27 – 33.

Brislin, R. (1976). "Introduction", in Brislin, R.(ed). *Translation, Application and Research.* New York: R. Gardener Press, Inc., pp: 1-45.

Brower, R. (1974). *Mirror on Mirror.* Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bucaria,C. (2004). "Lexical and Syntactic Ambiguity as a Source of Humor: the Case of News Paper Headlines". *Humor 17(3)pp:279 -309.*

Casagrande, J. (1954). "The Ends of Translation". *International Journal of American Linguistics,* 20: 335-340.

Catford, J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corbett, E.P. (1966). *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cruse, D.A . (2000). *Meaning in Language.*Oxford:Oxford University
Press.

Dunbar,G.(2001). "Towards a cognitive analysis of polysemy,ambiguity and vagueness".*Cognitive Linguistics.*12(1).pp:1 – 14.

Evans, B. and Evans, C. (1957). *A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage.* New York: Random House.

Hanks, P. (1979). *Collins English Dictionary.* London: Collins.

Hartmann, R.R. and Stork, F.C. (1972). *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics.* London: Applied Sciences Publishers.

Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator.* London: Longman.

Jackobson, R. (1992). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation", in Schulte, R. and Biguenet, J. (eds). *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida.* Chicago: Chicago University Press, pp: 144-151.

Kachru, Y. (1982). "Towards Defining the Notion 'Equivalence' in Contrastive Analysis". TESL, 5: 82-98.

Komissarov, V. (1985). "The Practical Value of Translation Theory". *Babel, 13 (4):208-220.*

Leech, G. (1969). *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry.* London: Longman.

Manser, M.H. and Turton, N. D. (1987). *The Penguin Wordmaster Dictionary.* New York: Penguin.

Newmark,P. (1982). *Approaches to Translation.*Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.

----------------- (1988). *A Textbook to Translation.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Nida, E.A.(1964).*Towards a Science of Translation.*Leiden:E.J.Brill.

Nida, E.A. and Taber, C.R. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Partington, A. S. (2009). "A Linguistic account of wordplay: the lexical grammar of punning". Journal of pragmatics: 41: 1794 – 1809.

Sageder,D. (2010). " Ambiguity in Business Language – Communication Barrier or Effective Tool?". In Kehoe,J.Op.Cit.,pp: 56 – 58.

Savory, T. (1968). *The Art of Translation*. London: Jonthan Cope Ltd.

Simpson,P.(2003).*On the Discourse of Satire:Towards a Stylistic Model of Satirical Humer.*Amsterdam:John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Tondl, L. (2006). *Problémy Semantiky*. Praha (UK):Karolinum.

Tymoczko, M. (1985). "How Distinct are Formal and Dynamic Equivalence?", in Hermans, T. (ed). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London: Croom Helm Ltd, pp: 63-86.

Tóth , À.(2010). "On Lexical Ambiguity". In In Kehoe,J. Op.Cit.,pp: 8 – 17.

Van den Broeck, R. (1978). "The Concept of Equivalent in Translation", in Holms, J., Lambert, J., and Van den Broeck, R. (eds). *Literature and Translation.* Belgium: Leuven, Acco, pp: 29-47.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1972). "Foundation for Typologies of Texts". *Semiotica, 6: 297-323.*

Vinay, J. P. and Darbelnet, J. (1958). *A Methodology for Translation.* (J. C. Sager & M. J. Hamel, trans). In L.Venuti (ed), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 84 – 93). London and New York: Routledge.

Waard, J. and Nida, E. (1986). *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating.* New York: Thomas Nelson, Camden.

Zgusta, L. (1971). *Manual of Lexicography.* Czechoslovak: Academia.

Arabic References:

The Glorious Quran

?al - Bu☐turi:, W. 9. (1972). *Diwa:n ?al - Bu☐turi:,* 5 vols. (edited by) ☐assan Ka:mil ?al - ☐ayraffi:. Cairo: Da:r ?al – Ma9a:rif.

?al – Ja:rim, A. and ?ami:n, M. (1999). *?al – Bala:ghah ?al – Wa:☐i☐ah (?ash - Shar☐).* Cairo: Da:r ?al – Ma9a:rif.

?al – Jawhari:, ?. ☐. (1956). *?a☐ - ☐a☐i:☐: Ta:j ?al – Lughah wa ☐a☐i:☐ ?al – 9arabiyyah.* Vol. 6. Beirut: Da:r ?al – 9ilm Lilmala:i:n.

?al - ☐amawi:, ?. Ḥ. (2004). *Khiza:nat ?al - ?adab wa gha:yat ?al - ?arab.* Beirut: Da:r wa Maktabat ?al – Hila:l.

?al - Ḥulli:, Ṣ ?. (1992). *Shuru:☐ ?al – Ka:fiyyah ?al – Badi:9iyyah fi: 9ulu:m ?al – Balaghah wa Ma☐a:sin ?al – Badi:9.* (edited by) Nasi:b Nashsha:wi:. Beirut: Da:r ☐a:dir.

?ibn ?abi: Rabi:9ah ، 9. (1935). *Di:wa:n 9umar bin ?abi: Rabi:9ah.* 3 vols. (edited by) Jabra:?i:l Jabbu:r. Beirut: Da:r ?al – 9ilm Lilmala:i:n.

?az – Zabi:di:, M. M. (1965). *Ta:j ?al – 9aru:s.* vol. 1. Kuwait: Ma☐ba9at ?al - ☐uku:mah.

?ibn Sana:? ?al-Mulk, H. J. (1958). *Diwa:n ?ibn Sana:? ?al – Mulk.* ☐ayddar ?a:ba:d ?al – Dikin: Da:?irat ?al – Ma9a:rif ?al – Hindiyyah.

?a☐ - Ṣa9i:di:, ?. M. (no date). *Bughyyat ?al - ?i☐a:☐ Litalkhi:☐ ?al – Mifta:ḥ fi: 9ulu:m ?al – Bala:ghah.* Vol. 4. Cairo: ?al - Maṭ ba9ah ?an – Numu:thajjiyyah.

?a☐ - Ṣafadi:, Ṣ. ?. (1979). *Fa☐ ?al – Khita:m 9an ?at – Tawriyyah wal - ?istikhda:m.* (edited by) ?al -

Muḥ ammadi: abdul 9azi:z ?al - □ina:wi:. Cairo: ?al – Maktabah ?al - ?azhariyyah liltura:th.

□aba:nah, B. (1977). *Mu9jam ?al-Balaghah ?al-9arabiyyah*. 2 vols. Libya: Manshu:ra:t Ja:mi9at □ara:blis.

?al – 9a:bid, A.; 9abdu: .D.; 9umar, A.M.; ?at - □u9ma, □. J.; ?al- Jayla:ni: ,Ḥ. Y. and Mar9ashli:,N. (1988). *?al – Mu9jam ?al – 9arabi: ?al - ?asa:si:*. Paris: Larousse.

9ati:q, 9. 9. (1971). *9ilm ?al – Badi:9*. Beirut: Da:r ?an - Nah□ah ?al – 9arabiyyah lil□iba:9ah wan – Nashr.

?al-Qazwi:ni:, J. M. (1904). *?at-Talkhi:s fi: 9ulu:m ?al-Bala:ghah*. (edited by) 9abd ?ar-Raḥma:n ?al-Barqu:qi:. Beirut: da:r ?al-kita:b ?al-9arabi:.

————————. (1998). *?al - ?i:ḍa:ḥ fi: 9ulu:m ?al – Bala:ghah*. Beirut: Da:r ?ihya:? ?al-9ulu:m.

?ibn Mandhu:r, J. M. M. (no date). *Lisa:n ?al – 9arab*. Vol. 6. Cairo: Da:r ?al – Ma9a:rif.

?al - Mi□ri:, ?. (1963). *Ta□ri:r ?at - Ta□bi:r fi: □ina:9at ?ash – Shi9r wan – Nathr wa Baya:n ?i9ja:z ?al – Qur?a:n*. (edited by) □afni: Mu□ammad Sharaf. Cairo: Lajnat ?i□ya:? ?at – Tura:th ?al - ?isla:mi:.